UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 98—PART 2

FEBRUARY 26, 1952 TO MARCH 24, 1952
(PAGES 1365 TO 2786)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1952

J
11
R
v. 98
pt. 2

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
12-10-52

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who has bidden the light of the day to shine out of the darkness of the night, we would still our hearts for this hallowed moment as we bow now for the benediction of Thy loving kindness in the morning; for new mercies each returning day hover around us while we pray.

Grant us, we pray, in all our duties Thy help and in all our perplexities Thy counsel. Thou knowest how we are tempted, the drain of our daily work and the limitations of our strength, and how our yearnings after nobler life are so often frustrated by the down drag of a cynical and covetous world about us. Direct us to the sources of moral energy. Grant us this day the grace to live on the altitudes of our aspirations. Save us from false choices as we face this shattered earth, and guide our hands and minds to heal and bind and build and bless. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's Name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 25, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett;

H. R. 2205. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd;

H. R. 2398. An act to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session;

H. R. 2669. An act for the relief of Maria Sarandrea;

H. R. 2672. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham;

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 3860. An act to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3981. An act to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 386), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control";

H. R. 3985. An act for the relief of Hai Soon Lee;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley;

H. R. 4419. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

H. R. 4703. An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4749. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.;

H. R. 4877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli;

H. R. 5097. An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5235. An act to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make such studies and investigations deemed necessary concerning the location and construction of a bridge over the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5256. An act to secure the attendance of witnesses from without the District of Columbia in criminal proceedings; and

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the act relating to the incorporation of Trinity College of Washington, D. C., in order to make the archbishop of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Washington an ex officio member and chairman of the board of trustees of such college.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

Also on request of Mr. GILLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to transact routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 22

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation to provide for compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of acquisition of property by the Federal Government

Whereas Virginia counties, cities, and towns are suffering tremendous losses of tax income by reason of acquisition of property by the Federal Government and its removal from local taxation; and

Whereas the Federal Government continues to acquire more property in various parts of the State, such property then becoming tax exempt; and

Whereas a tabulation of tax-exempt property in Virginia made in 1943 shows that the Federal Government had acquired at that time property in various parts of the State aggregating over 2,100,000 acres and with a total value in excess of $250,000,000; and

Whereas in the case of Federal acquisition of real property, a heavy tax burden is unjustly imposed upon those taxpayers remaining in the community from which taxable areas have been removed by Federal acquisition; and

Whereas the loss being suffered in Virginia is constantly increasing through Federal acquisition of additional property, and the growing seriousness of the problem calls for speedy action and early solution; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States is now considering legislation which will provide for the payment of compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of acquisition by the Federal Government of property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Delegates of Virginia (the Senate concurring)—

1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to give its earliest possible attention to the adoption of the legislation which is now before it to provide for compensation in lieu of taxes lost by reason of Federal Government acquisition of property.

2. That members of the Virginia delegation in Congress are requested to support such legislation; and

3. That the clerk of the house of delegates is hereby directed to forward a copy of this

resolution to the members of the United States Senate representing Virginia, to the Virginia Members of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Agreed to by the house, February 14, 1952.
Agreed to by the senate, February 21, 1952.
A true copy.

E. GRIFFITH DODSON,
Clerk of the House of Delegates.

GREAT LAKES SHORE EROSION PROBLEM—RESOLUTION OF MILWAUKEE (WIS.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have commented previously on the floor of the Senate regarding the gravity of the Great Lakes shore problem. At this time there is pending before the House of Representatives legislation dealing with the erosion problem, which is not, however, regarded in many expert quarters in my State, as constituting a constructive answer to this very serious situation. On the contrary, it is believed that diversion of the lake water into the Illinois waterway would actually increase the Lake Michigan shore front erosion problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of a resolution forwarded to me by the Milwaukee (Wis.) County Board of Supervisors on this issue be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas several bills have been introduced in the second session of the Eighty-second Congress of the United States, relating to control of the level of Lake Michigan by permitting a diversion of lake water into the Illinois waterway at Chicago, notably H. R. 6080 by HOFFMAN of Michigan, H. R. 6098 by KLUCZYNSKI of Illinois, H. R. 6100 by SHEEHAN of Illinois, all of said bills being under the guise of erosion control; and

Whereas it is believed that the damage to lake harbor channel depths, which would be occasioned by such diversion, would greatly exceed the erosion prevention benefits, if any; and

Whereas Milwauwkee County owns a large amount of lands fronting on Lake Michigan; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the county board of supervisors of Milwaukee County is opposed to any diversion of Lake Michigan water as contemplated by said congressional bill and requests that the Represenatives in Congress from Wisconsin and the United States Senators from Wisconsin oppose such legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to said congressional and senatorial representatives at their offices in Washington; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Public Works at Washington, D. C., with a request that the county clerk of Milwaukee County be notified at the time public hearings are to be held on the legislative bills, to wit: H. R. 6080, H. R. 6098, and H. R. 6100; and be it further

Resolved, That the corporation counsel of Milwaukee County or one of his assistants be and is hereby authorized and directed to appear at said hearings and express the opposition of Milwaukee County to the passage of said legislation.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 539. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon; with amendments (Rept. No. 1214).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2725. A bill for the relief of Hanni Marie Matuschke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 2726. A bill to authorize the Federal Civil Defense Administrator to acquire, by lease or license, warehouse space for civil defense purposes at Sikeston, Mo.; Zanesville, Ohio; Downingtown, Pa.; and Paw Paw, W. Va., respectively; and

S. 2727. A bill to amend the act of July 16, 1892 (27 Stat. 174 ch. 195) so as to extend to the Secretary of the Navy, and to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the Coast Guard, the authority now vested in the Secretaries of the Army and Air Force with respect to the withholding of officers' pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2728. A bill to amend the act of July 12, 1950 (Public Law 609, 81st Cong.), as amended, so as to extend free mailing privileges to members of the armed forces of foreign nations serving under the United Nations command in Korea on a reciprocal basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2729. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Department of the Army the Birmingham General Hospital, Van Nuys, Calif.;

S. 2730. A bill to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section; and

S. 2731. A bill to authorize the transfer of hospitals and related facilities between the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2732. A bill for the relief of Michiko Takagi; and

S. 2733. A bill for the relief of Donald Lee Ferguson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 2734. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 2735. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes," approved July 2, 1940, as amended; and

S. 2736. A bill to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 2737. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the prospecting, development, mining, removal, and utilization of mineral resources of national forest lands or lands administered for national forest purposes or in connection with national forest programs not subject to the operation of the general mining laws, the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, or for the development of which no other statutory authority exists; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BENNETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 2738. A bill to equalize the treatment accorded to commissioned officers of the Veterinary Corps with that accorded to commissioned officers of other corps of the Army Medical Service, and for other purposes; and

S. 2739. A bill providing for the rank of certain officers in the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2740. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2741. A bill to amend section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912, as amended, with respect to the recognition of organizations of postal and Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 2742. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of operations, the disposition of the properties, and the liquidation, of the Inland Waterways Corporation, and for other purposes;

S. 2743. A bill to authorize and direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine and prescribe reasonable user charges to be imposed for the use for commercial transportation purposes of inland waterways constructed or improved at the expense of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2744. A bill to establish the procedure for the determination of the economic justification of certain inland waterway improvement projects, and for other purposes; and

S. 2745. A bill to eliminate certain sections of the Interstate Commerce Act which provide for preferential treatment in the matter of rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MINERAL RESOURCES OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the prospecting, development, mining, removal, and utilization of mineral resources of national forest lands or lands administered for national forest purposes or in connection with national forest programs not subject to the operation of the general mining laws, the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, or the Mineral Leasing Act for Ac-

quired Lands, or for the development of which no other statutory authority exists. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill, S. 2737, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the prospecting, development, mining, removal, and utilization of mineral resources of national forest lands or lands administered for national forest purposes or in connection with national forest programs not subject to the operation of the general mining laws, the Mineral Leasing Act, as amended, or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands, or for the development of which no other statutory authority exists, introduced by Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. WATKINS), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The explanatory statement by Mr. BENNETT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BENNETT

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to permit the prospecting for, development, mining, removal, and utilization of mineral resources of national forest lands or lands administered for national forest purposes or in connection with national forest programs under the Secretary of Agriculture which are now not subject to the operation of the general mining laws, the Mineral Leasing Act, of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (61 Stat. 913), or for the development of which no other statutory authority exists.

This bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior, under general regulations to be prescribed by him and upon such terms and for specified periods or otherwise as he may deem to be in the best interests of the United States, to permit the prospecting for and the development and utilization of such mineral resources. The Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to issue permits for such prospecting, development and utilization of the mineral resources only with the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture and subject to the conditions the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe for the adequate utilization and proper protection of national forest lands or lands administered for national forest purposes or in connection with national forest programs. Where mineral resources on any lands which are also withdrawn or reserved for any purpose other than national forest purposes, the permit would be issued by the Secretary of the Interior only when the agency of the Government for which such other withdrawal or reservation was made concurs that the prospecting for, development or other utilization of such mineral resources will not be inconsistent or incompatible with the purpose of such other withdrawal or reservation.

All receipts derived from the permits or licenses issued under the authority of the proposed act would be paid into the same funds or accounts in the Treasury and shall be distributed in the same manner as prescribed for other receipts from the lands affected by the permit or license. It is the intention that the bill would not affect the distribution of receipts pursuant to existing legislation applicable to such land.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior access to the title records of the Department of Agriculture relating to the lands affected by this act, to the extent necessary for the administration of the proposed act.

At the present time there are some large areas within national forests or within the confines of lands administered in connection with the national forests which, because of technicalities of law are not open for mineral exploration, utilization, or development. I understand that there are also many small areas within the forest lands which are not open for utilization. The bill which I have introduced would supplement existing statutory authorities for the exploration, development, utilization, or removal of mineral resources from national forest lands or lands administered in connection with national forests and would open up new areas to exploration for critical, strategic, and other domestic mineral resources which are now legally locked up.

One of the large areas in the United States which is not now open to prospecting for utilization and development of mineral resources is the Grand Canyon Game Preserve in the Kaibab National Forest in Arizona. I first began to look into this matter because citizens of southern Utah reported to me that valuable copper deposits were to be found within the Grand Canyon Game Preserve which was closed to mineral prospecting and development. When I explored this matter with the Forest Service, I was advised on January 14 by a letter of the Chief of Forest Service that legislation would be required to open the Grand Canyon Game Preserve for mineral prospecting and development. At that time I was advised that not only would the Forest Service look favorably upon legislation designed to open the Grand Canyon Game Preserve but that it would favor general legislation unlocking possible mineral deposits in all the forests of the United States by authorizing prospecting and development on a permit basis such as that provided in the bill which I have sent to the desk. Since that time I have received a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, pointing out that general legislation would be desirable because it would tend to obviate the need for special bills.

The provisions of the bill are such that the Secretary of Agriculture can protect the interests of the United States in the forest lands and the Secretary of the Interior and the heads of other departments and agencies for which special withdrawals and reservations have been made can protect other interests of the United States in the process of issuing the permits for prospecting for and the utilization and development of mineral deposits. It is anticipated that the conditions and regulations imposed by the Secretary of the Interior will preclude the use of the leases or permits issued under the proposed act for purposes other than prospecting for and the utilization and development of mineral resources.

I am confident that the bill would be in the interests of the United States and an aid to national defense by permitting the prospecting for and development of critical minerals. Since it has general application and is important in the present emergency, I hope that the bill will receive favorable consideration by the Congress and will become law in this session.

PRINTING AND BINDING OF REVISED EDITION OF CONSTITUTION (ANNOTATED)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for the printing and binding of a new edition of the Constitution of the United States, annotated. I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the subject be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 65), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Constitution of the United States of America (Annotated) prepared by the Librarian of Congress under authority of Senate Joint Resolution 69, Eightieth Congress, and comprising a revision and extension of Senate Document 232, Seventy-fourth Congress, be printed and bound; and that 3,000 copies shall be printed, of which 2,200 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 800 copies for the use of the Senate.

The statement by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

NEED FOR A NEW EDITION

I have before me the text of the annotated edition of the Constitution of the United States as published in 1938 in the form of Senate Document No. 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, second session.

This document, in some 1,246 pages, lists all of the decisions of the United States Supreme Court construing the various provisions of the United States Constitution, up until that time.

I need hardly tell my colleagues how completely invaluable this book is in particular to every attorney in our country, to every serious student of political science and, yes, indeed, to businessmen, laboring men, and just about everyone else who is interested in following the work of the Supreme Court on the great and small constitutional questions of our time.

The 1936 document had been prepared in accordance with Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 35 submitted by one of our distinguished predecessors, Senator Ashurst, of Arizona. That resolution had been adopted on May 14, 1936. Today, I am introducing a companion resolution under which there will be reprinted identically as provided 16 years ago, a new Senate document. As before, 3,000 copies are to be printed and bound for extra allotment purposes by Senators and Representatives—800 for the use of the Senate and 2,200 for the use of the House. This would be in addition to the normal amount reproduced for distribution to the Senate and House libraries, the Library of Congress and designated depository libraries throughout the Nation.

Of course, in turn, this would be independent of the number the Government Printing Office would publish for sale. The 1936 document was sold for $2.50 each and had a very wide circulation, as was expected.

I have a personal and deep interest in this subject, because it was during my chairmanship of the Judiciary Committee in the Republican Eightieth Congress that I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 69, which became Public Law 95. That resolution directed the Librarian of Congress to revise and edit the Annotated Constitution of 1938. It authorized a limitation of $35,000 on the expenses of preparation, but, of course, it made no provision for the ultimate printing.

The preparation work has now been completed under the able editorship of one of the greatest constitutional scholars of our Nation, Prof. Edward S. Corwin, of Princeton University.

It is a great privilege for me to have played a small part in helping to bring about the revision of this vital document. I need hardly state that a study of the United

States Constitution on the part of every citizen has become more imperative in these times than ever before in American history. And, of course, no study of the Constitution is complete without a consideration of the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Needless to say, moreover, the speed with which the new Annotated Constitution can be printed is a matter of deep interest, particularly to the legal profession of our Nation. An incalculable amount of time is saved by consulting an up-to-date edition, of course. I am hoping, therefore, that the resolution which I am offering today can be be taken up promptly and that it can be handled independently of the legislative appropriation bill for the next fiscal year.

I feel that the new annotated Constitution is a work of which the Library of Congress itself, under Dr. Luther Evans and the Legislative Reference Service, under Dr. Ernest Griffith, can be proud, as it was rightly proud of the previous edition which had been prepared under the direct supervision of Mr. Wilfred C. Gilber of the Legislative Reference Service.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO COMPENSATION OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and request that they be printed.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in support of the amendments, which would exempt compensation of certified public accountants from salary stabilization, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENT OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT TO EXEMPT COMPENSATION OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS FROM SALARY STABILIZATION

In the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951, Congress exempted from salary stabilization compensation paid to physicians employed by certain medical institutions and compensation paid to attorneys licensed to practice law, employed in a professional capacity by an attorney or firm of attorneys engaged in the practice of the legal profession.

This amendment was written into the law by a conference committee in lieu of a provision in the bill passed by the House which would have exempted wages, salaries, or other compensation paid for professional services.

The amendment now proposed would grant similar exemption to certified public accountants holding State certificates as such, who are employed by certified public accountants or firms of certified public accountants. Their position is comparable to that of the doctors and lawyers who have been granted exemption, both in that they hold licenses from the State, and also in that the fees charged by their employers are exempt from price control.

Certified public accountants like lawyers furnish a variety of services to clients which are of special importance in a period of national emergency like the present. Among these services are the preparation of tax returns, assistance in the preparation of data required by Government agencies and services in connection with financing by public and private lenders, price controls, contract negotiation and renegotiation. In all of these areas a fundamental safeguard of the public interest is provided by the competence, professional standards and sense of public responsibility of the certified public accountant. The defense emergency has also brought a substantial increase in the work of many certified public accountants in connection with excess profits taxes and figures required under Government contracts. Employees who have added work and responsibilities as a result deserve to have their compensation adjusted accordingly.

Granting of the proposed exemption would not be inflationary, since the number of CPA employees affected, I am advised, is small (about 10,000), since stabilization of their compensation is not a requirement for protection of any existing price ceilings, and since any increase in their compensation would, in all probability, be derived from funds accruing to the individual practitioner or partnership by whom they are employed.

If regulations make it difficult or impossible to recognize the certified public accountants' work with compensation commensurate with his worth, he can improve his status by organizing his own firm to render services on a fee basis or by taking a position in private industry. Traditionally there has been a flow of men to industry where certified public accountants now hold many of the responsible executive positions. This flow is healthy so long as it is moderate, but during the past year this flow has accelerated alarmingly. This is especially serious since it takes several years to train men for advanced professional work. Professional firms cannot make it attractive to able men to remain with them unless they can be given a fair share of the income their services produce. This is difficult to accomplish under stabilization regulations which were not drafted to meet the unusual situations that arise in professional work.

The group affected by the requested exemption is small. In terms of inflationary pressure, even substantial increases in compensation to this group would be negligible. Certified public accountants, like any employers, have every reason to be conservative in granting increases of compensation to their staffs. The exemption is requested solely because a large measure of discretion as to compensation matters is essential to maintenance of healthy professional organizations. As indicated above, maintenance of such healthy organizations is an important factor in promoting the objectives of the Defense Production Act.

The proposed amendment would therefore provide fair treatment for a group which is small in numbers but highly important to the economic health of the community, without in any way endangering the stabilization program.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Address on Federal funds for education, delivered by Senator GILLETTE, and broadcast over Stations WGN, Chicago, and WHO, Des Moines, February 2, 1952.

Article relating to rearmament, entitled "The True Picture," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post of February 14, 1952.

Article discussing use of funds from Federal oil lands for education, written by Dr. Benjamin Fine, and published in the New York Times of February 10, 1952.

Article on Federal funds for education, published in AFL News Reporter of February 13, 1952.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Statement issued by former Senator Claude Pepper at Tallahassee, Fla., on January 26, 1952.

Article entitled "Murder in the Mines," written by Willard Shelton, and published in the Nation magazine for February 9.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Sundry editorials and articles from newspapers throughout the United States, relating to proposed amendment to Constitution relating to treaties.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled "Ten Hours With Mr. Whelan," an account of an interview with United States Ambassador Thomas E. Whelan, published in Novedades, of Managua, Nicaragua, on February 25, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Statement of agricultural production on 48 farms, East Donegal Township, Lancaster County, Pa.

By Mr. MORSE:

Editorial entitled "Hidden Enemy," written by Harold S. Tuttle, and published in the Portland Oregonian of May 23, 1951.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Editorial entitled, "Fight Must Go On to Protect Schools," published in the Salt Lake Tribune, of February 20, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Significance of Atlantic Pact Extension," published in the Salt Lake Tribune of February 15, 1952.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Editorial entitled "Let's Take Another Look at TVA," written by Floyd F. Anderson, and published in the Joe Wheeler News.

Article entitled "Epilepsy: A Social Handicap," written by Dr. Jerome K. Merlis, and published in the February 1952 issue of Valor.

Article entitled "Chiang's Army Has Many Weak Spots," written by Henry R. Lieberman, and published in the New York Times of February 17, 1952.

Article entitled "Basic Aims in Far East Bar Real Peace There," written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of February 17, 1952.

Article entitled "Invitation to Opportunity," written by Paul W. Chapman, and published in the February 1952 issue of th Progressive Farmer.

PRIVATE-INCOME SOURCES OF FEDERAL OFFICIALS—ARTICLE IN WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the Washington Times-Herald this morning there appeared an article entitled "Morris Plans Extra Income Quiz of Aides." I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORRIS PLANS EXTRA INCOME QUIZ OF AIDES—FULL DETAILS WILL BE REQUIRED

The administration's clean-up chief, Newbold Morris said yesterday he is planning to ask officials throughout the Federal service for full details of their private-income sources.

Morris said a questionnaire, now about complete, is expected to be in the hands of the Government Printing Office by the end of this week and will be distributed to Government officials as soon as it is printed.

This will be the first step in Morris' search for any official misconduct in the Government—an inquiry ordered by President Truman in the wake of congressional disclosures

of tax collection scandals and other irregularities.

HITS UPPER LEVELS

Morris, a New York Republican, was appointed a special assistant to Attorney General McGrath to undertake the task.

A congressional inquiry into McGrath's own income sources was demanded last week by Harold E. Stassen, candidate for the Republican presidential nomination, who said he had heard the attorney general, himself, became a millionaire after taking public office.

McGrath issued a statement thanking Stassen for the compliment but declining further comment.

Morris told reporters his survey of outside income is not intended for rank-and-file Government workers but is aimed at upper-level officials.

A list of those to be questioned is being worked out with the Civil Service Commission.

M'CARRAN ASKS DELAY

Chairman McCARRAN, Democrat, of Nevada, said meanwhile he wants his Senate Judiciary Committee to postpone action on the President's unparalleled request for revolutionary powers, as McCARRAN put it, for Morris.

Morris said his questionnaire would require officials to list all income received in addition to their Government salaries, with a detailed explanation of any services performed to earn such income.

President Truman already has directed everybody on the Federal payroll to give Morris any information he asks.

Morris said answers given on the questionnaire will be kept confidential unless they disclose irregularities calling for prosecution or other Government action.

McCARRAN'S committee held a closed session yesterday to discuss the President's request that Morris be given special powers. The chairman said in advance:

"I am going to recommend that we give much more extensive study to this request for authority to set up an inquisition, if you please, which could deny Congress access to important information in its own investigations."

OTHERS FAVOR STUDY

Three Republican members of the committee—Senators FERGUSON, of Michigan, WILEY, of Wisconsin, and WATKINS, of Utah—also said before the meeting they favor more study of the President's request.

A week ago McCARRAN set up a Judiciary subcommittee with himself as chairman to look into Mr. Truman's request for clean-up powers. The group was instructed to report to the full committee today.

McCARRAN said in an interview he would report "no sentiment at all" in the subcommittee for giving Morris authority to promise witnesses immunity from prosecution. The House Judiciary Committee already has rejected the President's request for such authority, but has taken no action on the subpena-power issue.

Morris said last week he had not asked for witness immunity authority. He added, however, that he might just as well quit if he didn't get subpena power.

McCARRAN said yesterday he would favor granting subpena authority only if Congress provided it would have access to any material Morris obtained, a view FERGUSON has said he shares.

Mr. LANGER. After reading that article, Mr. President, I wrote a letter to Mr. Newbold Morris, as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1952.

Hon. NEWBOLD MORRIS,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MORRIS: I like the excellent way you are taking hold of your job to clean up graft and corruption in the Government, and I particularly approve of the plan as expressed in the newspapers this morning of your asking officials throughout the Federal service for full details of their private income sources.

The fact that you are going to hit the upper levels is particularly intriguing to me. For some time there have been those of us in the Senate who have believed that investigation of outside income is not intended for the rank and file Government workers alone, but should be aimed at upper level officials.

We believe that every member of the Cabinet and every Member of Congress should be asked to fill out the questionnaire you are having printed. As one of the Senators from North Dakota I should like to have the privilege of being the first to do so from the Senate body. It has always seemed most incongruous to me that a man who is a candidate for the Senate, knowing what the salary is when he becomes a candidate for the office, nevertheless takes on outside sources of income such as continuing to practice law, being a member of a law firm, and other ways with which you are familiar.

Certainly, if a Senator cannot live on the salary of a Senator he should either assist in getting the salary raised or resign his office, and even more certainly, any Senator should not be averse to filing a complete report of just exactly what his sources of income are.

I trust that your questionnaire will request information as to just exactly what outside sources of income the Member has received from the time he entered the service until the present date.

It seems to me that in these troublesome days when we have one investigating committee of Congress after another that the Members of Congress themselves ought to be glad to set the example of disclosing their financial status, just as they took the lead in the economy drive during World War I in reducing their own salaries.

It is my considered judgment that the overwhelming Members of the Senate are honest, hard working individuals, and that the impression prevalent among the public as to the contrary is entirely unjustified. Nothing, in my opinion, would overcome this totally unwarranted assumption better than to have you make the proposed investigation and have the questionnaires returned by the Members of Congress. The people, I am sure, will welcome this, and the constituents of any Senator who voluntarily refused to fill out the questionnaire and return it to you would look askance at that particular public servant.

With every good wish to you, and assuring you that I have often thought of you since the time that you and I addressed the breakfast together at the St. George Episcopal Church in New York, where you gave such a splendid talk in behalf of American leadership, I am,

Very sincerely yours.

Time and time again on this floor various Members have brought the matter of outside income to the attention of the body as a whole, and have asked that legislation on the subject be enacted. Various bills have been introduced. I know of no time more appropriate than the present for Mr. Newbold Morris, who is in charge of the current investigation, to have it include members of the Cabinet and Members of Congress.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed such time as may be necessary to make a few brief remarks in explanation of certain material which I wish to introduce into the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator will permit the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Oregon without the necessity of his obtaining unanimous consent.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 50, to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

CONDITIONS ON THE HOME FRONT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently I received from Col. Preston B. Waterbury, a retired Army officer living in Ashland, Oreg., an article from the American Legion magazine, entitled "All's Quiet on the Home Front." The subheading is: "An angry report by a marine who recently returned from the Korean combat zone."

The first paragraph of the article reads as follows:

> Americans in Korea have been double-crossed by Americans in the United States. And some of us who have come back from that peninsula of misery are mighty ashamed of the home folks.

The article continues to express keen disappointment and harsh criticism on the part of this marine as to what he observed upon his return to the home front.

For a long time past, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have urged the strengthening of our mobilization program. I have endeavored, within the proprieties and in keeping with the confidences which it was my trust to protect as a member of the Armed Services Committee to advise the American people that we have not developed our defenses to the point where we could absorb the first shocks of an all-out war with Russia in Asia without suffering tremendous casualties on the home front, casualties which we would not need to suffer if we would only speed up our mobilization program and start producing planes on a mass production basis so that if we should find ourselves in an all-out war with Russia, we would not be in any doubt as to whether or not we had superiority in the air in Asia, Europe, or elsewhere in the world.

I must confess that it is a matter of great sadness to me that we have not moved forward more rapidly in connection with the matter of mobilization. As a member of the Armed Services Committee I have heard the officials of our Military Establishment, both those in civilian capacities and those in uniform, point out that such sudden and rapid changes are taking place in connection with aircraft production that it may be a matter of only a few months—and certainly only a matter of a year or two—before some of the most modern planes may be considered obsolete.

But Russia confronts the same problem. She is producing planes. I want to prevent every dollar of waste in the Military Establishment that can be prevented, and I think a great deal of waste can be eliminated. But there are certain things called waste which I think cannot be avoided.

I am perfectly willing to write off as waste the mass production of airplanes in the immediate future, which may be obsolete in 3 or 4 years or less, in the interest of obtaining a quantity of planes so that we shall no longer hear that we are not presently in a position to absorb the first shocks of an all-out war with Russia, if it should come, because of a serious question mark as to whether or not we have superiority in the air in Asia, Europe, and elsewhere.

One cannot read this article by James C. Jones, Jr., to which I have referred in these remarks, without having a great deal of human understanding of the reactions which he has set forth in these paragraphs, even though they are not very complimentary to us on the home front. I think it is good for us to read of some of these reactions. I would that the reports coming back from our boys in Korea were all that we needed to speed up mobilization to the point I have been suggesting as a member of the Armed Services Committee, so that we might be in a position to leave no doubt in the minds of the Russian leaders that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain by a continuation of their aggressive course of action. I believe that articles such as this are good for us to read. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL'S QUIET ON THE HOME FRONT

(By James C. Jones, Jr.)

Americans in Korea have been double-crossed by Americans in the United States. And some of us who have come back from that peninsula of misery are mighty ashamed of the home folks.

Yanks of the Eighth Army, an infinitesimal cluster of men compared to the United States potential, have carried the fight for a Nation which gives every indication of not caring, which appears to prefer looking the other way, which concerns itself virtually not at all with the fearful casualties, and which has dedicated itself almost exclusively to the betterment of its individual backyards. Those families which have members in Korea evidently are the only people who side completely and devotedly with United States fighters.

Veterans of Korea experience a momentary, ephemeral exhilaration when the ships ease up to United States piers: We are alive, not all of us are crippled, we are as healthy as can be expected, and there is joy in knowing that the next minute or week or year will not be spent fighting—at least, not in Korea. Much of that exquisite, high tension happiness is dispelled in short order.

When we settle down enough to permit a searching look-around, what we see confirms the suspicions that were bred overseas. In the vernacular, nearly everyone here is fat. Despite all the bellyaching about high prices and high taxes, it is quite apparent that nobody is starving, that millions of television aerials stud the housetops, that a vast number of the cars on the streets are sleek new models, and that most of the home-fronters are so busily occupied in tending their own gardens that they seldom have time to drop in at a blood-donor center to squeeze off a pint for the guy who is dribbling his away in a cruddy rice paddy. Giving blood to the Armed Forces is quick, painless, free, soul-satisfying, and lifesaving. Yet tens of millions of backsliding Americans cannot be bothered.

Stepping on to United States shores is, indeed, a pleasant change, environmentally, but more than a little disquieting. When many of us made a similar trip home from the various battlefields of World War II, we enjoyed an abiding sense of pride. There was the feeling that the whole country had been at war, seriously bent upon whipping the common enemies. We survivors returned, knowing the Nation had been solidly behind us, had counted heavily on us, and we were proud because we had not failed.

Precious little pride accompanies the current homecoming. (And I speak for a sizable number of buddies, as well as for myself. My military job as a combat correspondent enabled me to meet many men, to learn much about their feelings and convictions.) None of us can see where we failed this time, but most of us can see where the home guard corked off. No, homecoming is not the great fun it was in 1945. Rather, it is a little embarrassing, because some of us hatch the hot idea that we are little more than red-faced suckers.

Bear in mind that we were probably less inspired about going into battle in 1950 than any other Americans in any other war. Why we were hustled into that stinking land at all was well worth pondering. At first, many sloggers entertained the notion that we were buying time for America. What happened? Seven United States divisions came to Korea in the first 4 months of the war, then the tap was shut off. We felt that we had purchased the time, at prohibitive prices, but where were the rest of the soldiers our Nation of 155,000,000 people was supposed to be supplying? A few were in Europe, but most of them were home, and there still are seven United States divisions in the line.

That pittance of incoming manpower sent tumbling the conjecture that we might be trying to keep the Communists out of Japan, too, for we learned belatedly that another of the Yalta deals had situated the Russians only a canoe's ride from Hokkaido, the northernmost island of Japan. Keeping the Reds from engulfing Korea would not prevent them from sweeping across the last American bastion in that part of the world, if they had a yearning to occupy Nippon. Seven not-so-hot-to-trot divisions in Korea would not, at any rate, and the lonesome pair of United States divisions now occupying Japan would be unable to do much about it, either.

Morale could never be strong under such circumstances, and mustering up courage (or developing a strong enough feeling of futility) to attack that next hill was excruciatingly difficult. Especially after that first bit of sweet scuttlebutt concerning peace talks. The capers at Kaesong soon appeared to be largely in the nature of international diddling, though, and viewing it thus, the infantryman found going up that hill a little easier, although he could not see the worth of it. He might die, wondering to the last if a cease-fire would be in effect next morning, or even at the moment he died. It took more than the usual allotment of guts, but he had it, and so he went up that hill day after day.

Morale was anything but aflame in Korea, and it helped not one whit to be prodded ungently by a long shaft from the home side. The American in Korea fought gallantly because he was fighting for his life and he knew it. Americans at home, most of us feel, should be fighting for theirs. Instead, they seem to think this war is a two-bit skirmish being fought on Mars or Venus. This home-front neglect has prompted many a bitter remark which no American should ever feel called upon to make. The 33-year-old two-war corporal who sat in a deep fox hole with me last June in Shrapnel Alley north of Yanggu only repeated what had been said, in effect, many times before.

"I wish to hell a herd of these gooks would blast the berries out of some state-side cities with these high-velocity 76's. San Diego, maybe, or Kansas City or Chicago. Maybe those eight balls would snap out of their hockey then, if a few thousand of 'em got racked up by rusty fragments."

That was not an ill-considered growl made to the accompaniment of incoming mail, and I am not apologizing for the corporal. His was a concrete conviction, genuinely expressed, in the hope that such a catastrophe would result in those eight balls realizing indeed that this war was not being fought on a far-away planet.

One of the first things to raise the hackles of the returning vet is a daily reading of the newspapers. The schoolmasters of the Republic, we soon discovered, very often relegate stiff Korean battles to less than a quarter-column in the second section. We recall that Lt. Gen. James Van Fleet termed the over-all conflict a "dim-out war" after the truce negotiations began. The dim-out was short-lived. Nobody was hiding his light under a basket at Bloody Ridge, the Punchbowl, the month-long battle of Heartbreak Ridge, the incessant slugging in the Iron Triangle sector, the savage infighting on Kim Il Sung Ridge, and the brutal give-and-take at See-Saw Hill and Little Gibraltar. Battle reports in the newspapers dimmed out only because editors and the public preferred to divert the beam to peculiar doings at Kaesong, on manners and morals at the RFC and Internal Revenue Bureau, on hectic but pleasant Saturday gridiron scraps, or on other news sights less bloody than the battle line in Korea. The basket that fell over the terrible glare of combat was dropped from the United States, not Korea.

Are you able to understand the thoughts that pass through our minds when at midweek we pick up newspapers, almost any newspaper, and see that the latest casualty report has received treatment no more dignified than would a filler to the effect that "Texas is the largest State in the Union"? Can you understand our anger when we see that an inconsequential local gang killing has crowded an important thousand-casualty Korean battle off the front page and jammed it into an insignificant corner 15 or 20 pages back?

This almost deliberate disregard of many a dying effort can be interpreted in just one way by the war-weary veteran. He sees it as another shaft, sharpened by the knowledge that it was hurled from home.

Perhaps even more infuriating is the discovery that the blood bank is broke, or nearly so. Red Cross officials tell us that they number our own kind among their heaviest contributors. * * * "You boys know the need for it." Do all Americans have to bleed or watch another bleed before they see the need for it?

It's a little thing, giving a bottle of blood to the sincerest group of Americans I know. Yet I was all but reduced to tears of rage when, after a recent intensive 1-day radio campaign, I heard a newscaster report at 6 p. m. that from a city the size of Detroit, only 350 pledges had been made. Detroit is no exception. Its shamefully small response was directly in line with the national pattern.

When we talk to people, we are surprised to learn that the biggest thing about this war—from a civilian standpoint—was the relieving of General MacArthur. I've heard this a hundred times or more: "What did you fellows think about Truman firing MacArthur?" I produced a stock reply, as have most of my friends from the new war.

"I didn't think Thought One about it. Why should I? Where I've been, when you talk back to a superior, no matter whether

he's a screwball or a first-rate statesman or soldier, you expect punishment."

Which is true, of course, but not the whole story. Mostly, I choose to believe that I am expressing a sort of back-handed contempt for the type of shallow thinking that prefers to dwell on matters of personality at the expense of the larger issues at hand. If we felt it necessary, most of us in all likelihood would say (regardless of whether we admire the general or detest him) that we agree with his views on warfare. We know all too well that nobody wins a war by limiting himself to the use of only one fist. The home front limited itself, true enough, but the sloggers suffered because the wheels of America's war machines, and the minds of many home-front leaders, are rusty.

We wore ourselves out puzzling over the United States failure to employ the fleet that was already in far eastern waters in blockading the China coast. Nor has anyone given a logical answer to our question about why the Air Force and the air arms of the Navy and Marine Corps were not permitted to clobber the Communist staging areas beyond the Yalu.

"We crossed the thirty-eighth parallel more than once, didn't we?" I've heard GI's and marines ask. "We were violating a border, weren't we, if you want to get technical? We crossed it to get at the North Koreans. Well, the Chinks have been slugging us for more than a year. Are we afraid to cross into Manchuria to get at them? Is somebody yellow, or just plain nuts?"

May I add that I too believe that the object of war is victory, and that I believe you're full of kimchi if you think you can win or limit a war by staying off the enemy's ground?

Many people will say to the vet: "We don't want to provoke them. If we move into their ground, they might start a war."

This, to men who have served with that relatively small force which has suffered more than 100,000 casualties, who have fought in a country where literally millions of natives have been killed or wounded, who have fought against a force which has suffered an estimated million-and-a-half casualties.

"They might start a war."

"No," a friend said to me, splendid irony in his voice, "don't provoke them. If you do that, they're liable to get mad. They might shoot you twice in the gut, instead of just once."

When we talk to people of the threat we recognize as emanating from Russia, we are apt to hear wishful thinking expressed like this: "I don't think we'll ever have to go to war against them. I think they'll collapse from within." Like Germany, maybe? Or Japan? I heard the answer to that dream voiced nicely last winter, after the dreadful Chosin Reservoir operation.

"So what if you don't agree with the philosophy?" a marine snorted. "You don't agree, so you think they'll fold. All right, I was on the butt-end of the column coming out of Koto-ri. There were hundreds and hundreds of civilians trying to join us and get out. So they didn't agree, but I ain't noticed any collapse from within around there. Their system's winnin' right now, ain't it? They run us out, didn't they? They been workin' on the same theory for a hundred years. You think they'll quit now?"

Perhaps you can sketch out an answer for the discussion I heard in Pusan, while waiting for transportation to the United States:

"What do you think we're gonna do with the atomic bombs we been building? Grow wheat with 'em to feed the hungry gooks? Or just scare every Commie to death by talking A-bomb talk? The only good you'll ever get out of those biscuits is shoving 'em through a hole in the deck when the bomber is over the right spot. We won't do that, though; we aren't that savvy. We'll wait until they do it * * * then we've had it."

You can take that any way you wish: A violation of Christian ethics, historically improper or warmongerish. To those of us who helped fight communism to a bloody draw in Korea, it is nothing less than realistic thinking.

I passed that thinking along to a prominent Washingtonian.

"Human life means more to us than that," he said. "Indiscriminate bombing and killing is a Communist tactic, not American."

He had not taken a bearing on just how fully acquainted he was with killing, indiscriminate or otherwise, and was angered by this challenge:

"You're right, human life does mean more to us. Can you tell me, within 5,000, how many Americans have been killed in this war? How many wounded? How many missing? The total casualties? How many weather casualties?"

He could not. He told me that he was not statistically minded. He's not alone. Millions of my Christian countrymen, I am sure, could not tell me how many statistical troopers have gone down the drain.

Most veterans of Korea and World War II have other figures on killing, figures which emphasize the fury and intensity of this war. In the first 17 months of this war, 100,000 casualties were suffered. World War II was in its twentieth month before that figure was reached. Over the first 15 months of this "two-bit skirmish," the number of United States dead was more than twice the number of killed-in-actions for the same period in World War II. And that was the big war, the World War.

There are those embittering home-front attitudes, and there are others, perhaps less galling, but serious, nevertheless.

All the yapping about high taxes, for instance. Well, perhaps that is somewhat justified. The latest crop of veterans would like to know, too, just what happened to those between-wars billions for defense. How was it that after those monumental sums were spent, the United States military could not afford to equip its fighters adequately last winter? Could not even supply footwear capable of withstanding the Korean winter? Could not come up with much of anything in the way of new weapons? Could not supply our broken-down allies, the Republic of Korea troops?

Or can you answer the questions of the reservists who grabbed their nightsticks and sailed into the police action? Thousands of us—particularly Marine reservists—are now assured that we took the dirty end of a political pole when we were jerked from home and hurried into battle. The situation could not have been so desperate as all that, we learned, when no new American ground combat unit entered the battle line after October 1950. When he saw the limp, loop-holed draft law of the land, a friend of mine was convinced somebody had dropped the dunce cap on his head.

"All you have to do if your draft number is upcoming," he noted, "is scrape up tuition money and enter college. Then they let you take an exam, and if you have brain one, you pass it and you're automatically exempt from induction. When you graduate you can hustle out and grab a defense job, because they provide a period of grace for that. The idea isn't what it used to be. Nowadays you don't do your bit for Uncle Sugar. He does his bit for you if you happen to be standing in the right spot. It's a big yak if you can stay home and let the other guy pound the hills for you. It adds up to that old Civil War stunt of buying your way out."

The Regulars, the career men, can frown right along with the reservists. They do just that when they note the dearth of voluntary enlistments. It is no longer fashionable to step forward like a man and serve in the toughest way possible—by putting your life on the block. A badge of honor no longer goes with that sacrifice. The temper of the times bids otherwise. The best thing a veteran of Korea can do, I find, is file his memories in dark slots (in the case of the two-war vet he will just have to find room in those World War II slots), accept the unassuming Government which has forgotten its original purpose in sending troops to Korea, and live with the unattentive public. If he dwells at length on this matter of the subtle betrayal, the effect is as if he has had salt rubbed in his wounds, had many insults heaped on many injuries.

There will be one development we can watch with interest: The armistice and its after effect. Who leaves Korea? Where will the new boundaries be established? Who won?

Nobody won, of course. We did not rid North Korea of Reds. We did not contain communism. Instead, the Chinese Commies extended their borders to include half of Korea. We were thousands of miles from the root of the festering sore that is communism.

We can watch, all right, but we won't expect any brilliant change of pace. There is nothing in the record to show us that our country will come through with a sterling victory. What we will be watching for most closely will be treacherous appeasement. That seems to be the most likely course of action, viewed in the light of previous performances.

And while the veterans ponder all this and try to forget the disgusting home-front exhibition, they might be excused for murmuring to their countrymen, "You ought to be ashamed. But since you're not, may you all rest in peace."

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to preface the question by making a short statement. I would like to join with the able Senator from Oregon in his concern about our present military preparedness situation, particularly with respect to our Air Force. I think it is tragic that after all the money we have appropriated we are apparently outnumbered 2 to 1 in planes in Korea and there is a serious question of whether our planes are even equal to those which the Communists have in Korea. We are confronted with this bad situation in spite of the fact that we have appropriated tremendous sums of money for the Armed Forces, particularly the Air Force.

The question I should like to ask of the able Senator from Oregon is this: Does the Senator from Oregon believe that any additional appropriations would help correct the situation with respect to the Air Force? Do they not now have all the money they can possibly use?

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion, I will say to my good friend from North Dakota, we should be shown some results from the money we have appropriated.

Mr. YOUNG. I have been reading some figures on the amount of money appropriated to the armed services for research alone. I do not have the exact total before me, but it apparently reaches a sum far above $2,000,000,000 from 1945 through 1950. It is regrettable that we did not have strictly modern planes in at least blueprint stage at the start of the Korean war, which could

have been put into mass production shortly afterward.

Mr. MORSE. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from North Dakota. Of course, the record will speak for itself, but I want to say that there were quite a number of us in the Senate from 1946 on who urged greater expenditures in connection with the development of air power than we were able to persuade our colleagues in the Senate to approve.

I remember very well what to me was a sad afternoon in the Senate, in 1947, when there were only 9, 10, or 11 of us who were willing to support a substantial increase in appropriations for the Air Force. I was of the opinion then that we had better err in the direction of waste in the building of an Air Force than err in the direction of what was called in those days necessary economy.

Of course, I would point out to the Senator from North Dakota that, from the standpoint of the cost factor, some very drastic changes have taken place in air warfare since 1946. I have seen reference to the subject in the press, which is based upon testimony of high officials of the Pentagon given before various committees in recent months. I always thought the subject was top secret, and I am inclined to believe that probably it would have been better to keep that kind of information top secret. Nevertheless, it bears on what the Senator from North Dakota is commenting on. The fact is that by the end of World War II the cost of a B–29 bomber, manufactured on a mass-production basis, had been reduced to a sum between $300,000 and $350,000.

To give some idea of what has happened since World War II, when we did most of our bombing with B–29's, the bomber we are now building, which we must have because of changes that have taken place in air warfare, particularly in view of the fact that bombing is now carried on at heights of 45,000 and 50,000 feet, costs not between $300,000 and $350,000, but between $3,000,000 and $3,500,000 for each bomber.

Let me cite what I consider to be another dramatic figure, which illustrates the tremendous change in the cost of air warfare. I speak within reasonable brackets of accuracy when I say that at the end of World War II the cost of the Norden bombsight, on a mass-production basis, had been reduced to a figure of approximately $4,800 per bombsight. Of course, in World War II our planes were bombing with the aid of the Norden bombsight, on the basis of the naked eye. Our planes do not bomb that way today. The bombsight we are building for the jet bomber, which is the bomber that will have to be used in case of another world war, costs not $4,800, but in the neighborhood of $300,000 for each bombsight, or almost equal to the cost of a B–29 bomber in World War II.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield in a moment after I have finished the thought I have in mind.

In other words, we are confronted with what amounts to a tremendous revolution in the whole field of aviation construction. Of course, it will cost a great deal of money, even on the basis of mass production, for the kind of bomber which will give us superiority in the air. However, I believe that American freedom is worth it no matter what the cost. I am not arguing for waste. I am arguing for the strictest economy, consonant with maximum protection for the security of our country so far as air superiority is concerned.

Thus I could go on citing examples, but I shall not do so because those are the only two items I have seen mentioned in the press. I cite them to buttress a generalization I wish to make. I assure the American people that it is a generalization which can be backed up with the facts. The generalization is that, to gain the supremacy of the air for which I am arguing the cost will be tremendous.

That is all the more reason why I believe, in connection with the budget we will deal with this year, that every Member of this body must be exceedingly hard-boiled in the use of the pruning knife. We shall have to cut from the budget every possible item which can be eliminated, so that we can keep it down to a sum of approximately $70,000,000,000, instead of $85,000,000,000, if we are to protect the greatest defense weapon we have, which is our economy.

Let us not mislead the American people into believing that we can have the kind of mobilization program referred to by the marine in the American Legion article, which I have inserted in the RECORD, without its costing exceedingly large sums of money.

I close my discussion of this point, before again yielding to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], by saying that I believe it to be the duty of the Committee on Armed Services to continue to press the Air Force officials with what I believe to be a very important question, which is: "What can you show us that you are accomplishing by way of production results?"

I ask that question because until we are able to have in the air a sufficiently large number of planes to stop a Russian attack and to make our own attack, in my judgment there is no hope of convincing the Kremlin that it has everything to lose and nothing to gain by continuation of its aggressive course of action.

I should like to make a further point, Mr. President. Consider the matter of jet fighters. On this occasion I do not wish to do more than to insist that a larger number of jet fighters be provided. I am at a loss to understand why there should be any dispute as to whether ours are superior to the Russians. In view of the great productive power of the United States and the inventive genius of our engineers, certainly we should have superiority in jet fighters. However, that does not change the fact that there is great doubt about it. The American people should face the fact that because of the great revolution which has taken place in air warfare techniques, we shall have to have bases a great deal closer to Russia, from which to put jet fighters into the air, than we now have.

That statement leads me to point out that the atomic bomb cannot be delivered in sufficient quantities to knock out the industrial power of Russia unless we have a canopy of jet fighters sufficiently large to protect the bombers and permit them to bomb and to return. I ask today, Mr. President, who in this Government thinks he can tell the American people that we have such a canopy? I am satisfied that we do not have it.

We also need to keep in mind the fact that in order to conduct that kind of warfare, no matter where such a war may be fought, we need allies, and we are not going to get them on the basis of any perimeter theory for the protection of Europe. In my opinion, we shall get such allies only to the extent that we implement the North Atlantic Pact and the NATO military program which goes along with it, otherwise we shall drive our potential allies into a position of neutrality with Russia and into a determination that they should also remain neutral in case of war between Russia and the United States because they alone are not going to do all the bleeding on the ground of Europe and because they are not interested, either, in liberation by the United States through a pulverization of their cities and their economy. They have had all of that kind of liberation they want.

That is why I have been heard to say so frequently, and will be heard more and more across our country by way of warning the American people, that in the campaign for the Presidency which now is under way in the United States, we, as a people, had better be on guard against proposals which will cost us the allies in Europe that we need in order to maintain air supremacy in a battle for Europe, or will cost us the allies in Asia that we need in order to maintain an all-out war in Asia with the air supremacy we must have in case we become involved in war there.

Mr. President, I say to the Senator from North Dakota that what should be of immediate concern to us is the production of equipment which will give us the superiority we need both in the air and on the land. Obviously we have superiority on the sea, except for a submarine problem.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me at this point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think what confronts every citizen today, myself included, is the question of just what we must do in order to obtain the Air Force we need. We have in our country great industrial production and sufficient economic strength, and in my opinion Congress has appropriated sufficient money. For research purposes alone, to develop new planes and other war matériel, since 1945 Congress has appropriated approximately $4,241,000,000. In the period from 1946 through 1951, Congress appropriated for the Air Force alone $673,000,000. These figures were presented to

the Appropriations Committee's subcommittee on Armed Forces appropriations.

Let me point out again that Congress has appropriated from approximately $4,241,000,000 for research, alone. Congress has provided all the money the military have requested for the Air Force, and more, too; but still with respect to planes we have what amounts, practically speaking, a second-rate Air Force.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, and also to my friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who now is on the floor, and who is an able colleague on the Armed Services Committee, and is the ranking Republican member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee, that I believe it is fair to ask from the Air Force an accounting as to what it has done with the money Congress has appropriated for its use.

I know the Air Force would not object to making such an accounting, for the American people are entitled to know the facts, and from the standpoint of security protection, they can be given all the facts. I favor doing that; and I am sure my colleague, the Senator from New Hampshire, is of the same mind.

As I said earlier in my remarks, I am of the opinion that we are not showing enough finished products in the matter of air power. We should show more planes in being, rather than so many planes on the drafting boards.

Mr. President, if we are to meet the kind of criticism which I think the marine to whom I have referred very correctly sets forth in his article which appears in the magazine of the American Legion, I insist that the time has come when we should show the boys in uniform that we are backing them up on the home front, not with promises, but with finished goods.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer to another matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a very beautiful editorial from a Greensboro, N. C., newspaper. The editorial is entitled "The Mysterious Frank Graham," and is the reply of the editor of the North Carolina newspaper to the very vicious attack which Soviet Delegate Malik, of the United Nations Security Council, made upon Frank Graham at the recent Paris meeting of the Security Council. The editorial is so unanswerable and is such a beautiful defense of a former colleague of those of us who serve in the Senate, and a colleague whom I am sure all of us love, that I consider it a great privilege to offer this editorial for printing in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MYSTERIOUS FRANK GRAHAM

When Soviet Delegate Malik at the U. N. Security Council meeting in Paris called Frank Graham a "secret agent of the Pentagon" in Kashmir, he got some quick responses.

The foreign minister of Pakistan described the charge that the United States is seeking military bases in Kashmir as "utterly false and without any foundation whatsoever."

Sir Gladwin Jebb, of Britain, told the Council:

"But when it comes to accusing our friend Mr. Graham of being the secret agent of the Pentagon—well, that should, I think, cause even the most ingenious to sit up and think and think. Does Mr. Graham look like a secret agent? I can only say that I am sorry that the absence of television cameras prevented the public from forming its own conclusion on this important point. Anyhow, Mr. Graham is used to this kind of thing. When he was in Indonesia, you will remember he was always called by the Soviet Union the secret agent of Wall Street—a slight difference. Now he is the secret agent of the Pentagon. But that did not prevent the secret agent of Wall Street from ultimately achieving in Indonesia a solution of a very difficult dispute, which even, I think now, the representative of the Soviet Union would admit was both statesmanlike and in accordance with United Nations principles. That is what the secret agent of Wall Street did in Indonesia."

The Soviet Union has been balked in its aim to foment war in Kashmir. So its agents take out their disappointment on the man who helped maintain the peace.

The Fayetteville Observer points to what Dr. Graham did in Indonesia and says:

"Hundreds of thousands of people are living today who quite possibly would be dead were it not for Dr. Graham's quiet, human understanding and tact, his deep grasp of global historical trends, his complete abhorrence of power politics."

No wonder Frank Graham is a deep, dark secret to the men of the Kremlin. No wonder they look on him as a "secret agent" of something or other. He has mystified people over here too. For Frank Graham is that rare phenomenon, a practicing Christian—but Messrs. Malik and company wouldn't be expected to know anything about that.

PROPOSED CANADIAN OIL PIPELINE TO BYPASS PACIFIC NORTHWEST STATES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum which I have received in regard to the Canadian oil pipeline problem. It would appear that there is under way a design—and I use the word advisedly—to bypass the Pacific Northwest States in the construction of a Canadian oil pipeline.

The first three paragraphs of the memorandum read as follows:

For several months, the Petroleum Administration for Defense has been considering the allocation of steel for the construction of a pipeline from Edmonton, Canada, to the Pacific Northwest. Its purpose—to meet a shortage of oil on the Pacific coast and to augment our United States oil supply from the vast Canadian reserves. Two proposed routes have been suggested:

1. A line to extend from Edmonton south through Calgary, which is through the plains country east of the mountains. The line to come into the United States near the Washington-Idaho line, thence southwestward, passing near Spokane to the Seattle-Tacoma area with the line extending south to Portland.

Thus the line would provide oil for the refinery at Spokane, Wash., and provide a source of oil for new refineries to be built in the Seattle-Tacoma and Portland areas which afford ideal refinery locations, in that plants could be built on deep water for ocean transportation, but located 50 to 100 miles from the Pacific shore line.

However, Mr. President, it appears that there is on foot a design to bypass that very logical area for the location of the pipeline, and once again discriminate economically against the Pacific Northwest. The owners of the Canadian oil pipeline are Standard Oil of British Columbia, Imperial of Canada, Shell Oil, Canadian Gulf, Union Oil, and Richfield; and the contractor is Steve Betchel.

So I am asking unanimous consent to have all of the memorandum on this subject printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as part of my remarks, because the memorandum speaks for itself and is, I think, an adequate defense of the position I take here today, namely, that cause should be shown on the part of the responsible officials as to why that Canadian pipeline should not go to the area of the Pacific Northwest where the Seattle-Tacoma refineries could be served, and so that other refineries in that area could be built and served.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANADIAN OIL PIPELINE TO BYPASS PACIFIC NORTHWEST STATES

For several months, the Petroleum Administration for Defense has been considering the allocation of steel for the construction of a pipeline from Edmonton, Canada, to the Pacific Northwest. Its purpose—to meet a shortage of oil on the Pacific coast and to augment our United States oil supply from the vast Canadian reserves. Two proposed routes have been suggested.

1. A line to extend from Edmonton south through Calgary, which is through the plains country east of the mountains. The line to come into the United States near the Washington-Idaho line, thence southwestward, passing near Spokane to the Seattle-Tacoma area with the line extending south to Portland.

Thus, the line would provide oil for the refinery at Spokane, Wash., and provide a source of oil for new refineries to be built in the Seattle-Tacoma and Portland areas which afford ideal refinery locations in that plants could be built on deep water for ocean transportation but located 50 to 100 miles from the Pacific shore line.

From the standpoint of national defense, this affords much greater protection than refineries in California which are built near the shore line and were shelled by enemy submarines during the war.

If the proposed pipeline followed this route, it would bring the oil to rest in the United States, where it would be under jurisdiction of the United States.

2. The other proposed route is to have the line extend from Edmonton in the Province of Alberta, to Vancouver, British Columbia, where new refineries may be built and the refined products exported to the Seattle-Tacoma area or shipped by tanker to California to be refined and the products shipped back to Oregon and Washington.

This route would bypass the State of Washington's one refinery at Spokane, the operation of which is restricted because it must receive its oil supplies by tank car, which is expensive and uneconomical. This plant would use 25,000 barrels per day if it could be served by pipeline.

It now appears likely that this route will be selected because two companies, the Gulf

Oil Co. and the Imperial Oil Co. of Canada (owned by Standard of New Jersey), favor this route.

The proposed pipeline will have a capacity of 200,000 barrels of oil a day. The steel for the line must be supplied from the United States during a time of great shortage because of the defense program. Only 25 percent of the oil to be transported through the pipline will be required for local use in the Vancouver area, while 75 percent of it must be marketed in the United States in the form of crude oil or refined products. The Vancouver requirements could be supplied from the Seattle-Tacoma area by barge or by the use of a much smaller pipeline.

While the crude-oil supply of California is diminishing, the oil requirements of the Pacific Northwest States are increasing; they have more than doubled since 1940 and, according to reliable estimates, the demand for the Portland-Seattle-Spokane areas will soon reach 300,000 barrels per day, practically all of which is now be'ng supplied from California refineries.

There is no area in the United States with more potential possibilities of industrial growth than in Oregon and Washington. There is no more logical location for new refineries than in this area, refineries that could supply local needs, as well as off-shore military requirements.

Canada has far more oil than it can use and must find markets for it elsewhere. This oil is needed to supply the west coast States. Seattle, Takoma, Spokane, and Portland are the logical locations of refinery centers to supply this area.

This would bring new industries to these States to supply markets that already exist. As a matter of fact, the oil consumed in these areas will amount to twice the 150,000 barrels per day that will be available to the United States.

The Trans Mountain Oil Pipe Line Co. proposes to build a crude-oil pipeline from a point near Edmonton in the Province of Alberta to Vancouver, British Columbia. They show, on page 4 of their prospectus, the following demand and estimated demand figures:

Refined products demand and estimated future demand (in terms of barrels of crude oil required per day)

Area	1940	1949	1955	1960
Portland	50, 609	97, 640	119, 851	130, 416
Seattle	40, 553	87, 884	108, 302	121, 495
Vancouver	19, 213	37, 633	45, 310	50, 603
Spokane	9, 892	20, 585	26, 310	30, 909
Pasco	5, 171	10, 431	13, 523	15, 863
Total	125, 438	254, 173	313, 296	349, 286
Alaska	4, 994	7, 141	8, 360	8, 955
Total including Alaska	130, 432	261, 314	321, 656	358, 241

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last insertion for the RECORD is in the form of a letter which I have received from Mr. Miner Aylesworth, attorney, of Hunlock Creek, Pa., who is also an elder in the Presbyterian Church. It is a letter which has enclosed therewith a statement by Mr. Aylesworth who, as I say, is a ruling elder of his Presbyterian Church, in reply to a witness who appeared before the Armed Services Committee testifying against UMT. In view of the fact that the witness set forth arguments against UMT based upon what he claimed to be matters of religious faith and principle, I think it fitting that there should be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reply to this churchman, because I think Mr. Aylesworth provides very cogent argument in his article answering those very sincere church members who believe that those of us who are supporting UMT, someway, somehow, are sort of walking out on their own Christian training.

I want only to repeat today what I have said before, Mr. President, regarding this UMT bill, namely, I cannot accept the argument that the support of UMT is un-Christian. As a churchman myself, I take the position that, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have to find the answer to two questions: First, is there a need for a universal military program? And, second, will a universal military training program best meet the military manpower needs of our country? On the basis of the evidence which has been submitted to date at our hearing, I think the answer to each of the questions is in the affirmative; and, therefore, as a Christian, contrary to the criticisms of a great many church members who have been abusing me of recent date, I support the UMT bill. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have the letter and the article inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and accompanying article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUNLOCK CREEK., PA., *February 15, 1952*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Presbyterian Life's recent articles on universal military training provoked the enclosed discussion. Thought you might be interested to know reader reaction.

Very truly yours,

MINER AYLESWORTH.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

Presbyterian Life's editorial statement, January 19, 1952, on the question "Should Americans Adopt Universal Military Training," together with the arguments of United States Senator WAYNE MORSE and the negative position of Dr. Charles J. Turck, have been carefully read, with these results: (1) As a veteran of World War I, I could readily agree with the frank, dispassionate, factual, and logical arguments of the Senator; and (2) as a ruling elder, I was shocked, disturbed, and embarrassed by Dr. Turck's presentment.

The article by Dr. Turck contained simply statements of his personal opinions or conclusions without giving any facts to support them; an appeal to the emotions such as his appeal to ministers to preach pacifism; and aspersions upon the civil authorities, such as are contained in his words, "sinister influence of the military," victims (of military training), and "your gold braid and your brass hats."

In his opening paragraph, Dr. Turck says: "I oppose universal military training, because in my judgment this system would operate against every ideal which our Lord and Saviour represented in His life and sustained by His death." Obviously this eminent lay leader of our church expected us to accept his judgment or conclusion as an established fact, for he gave no citations to support his judgment.

What were the ideals of our Lord and Saviour with respect to military training? We must rely on the Scriptures for the answer. Certainly Jesus never cast aspersions upon soldiers, as such, nor upon their training, nor upon the Government that conscripted them. Jesus drew the line separating church and state in that famous piece of advice: "Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's." Jesus recognized that military training belonged to Caesar (the state) and did not condemn it.

Nowhere do we find Jesus condemning soldiers because they were soldiers or because they were subject to military training.

On the contrary, we find Jesus paying to a soldier the highest compliment, the greatest praise that could come to any man, and rated him better than civilians. He said (Matthew 8: 10): "Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." Could this be an example of the sinister influence of which Dr. Turck speaks?

For a concise statement of the Scriptures on this subject see the constitution of our church, the confession of faith, chapter 23, which reads as follows:

"I. God, the Supreme Lord and King of all the world, hath ordained civil magistrates to be under Him over the people, for His own glory and the public good; and, to this end, hath armed them with the power of the sword, for the defense and encouragement of them that are good, and for the punishment of evildoers.

"II. It is lawful for Christians to accept and execute the office of magistrate, when called thereunto; in the managing whereof, as they ought especially to maintain piety, justice, and peace, according to the wholesome laws of each commonwealth; so, for that end, they may lawfully, now under the New Testament, wage war upon just and necessary occasions.

"III. (This section relates to the duties of civil authorities toward the church and need not be quoted here.)

"IV. It is the duty of people to pray for magistrates, to honor their persons, to pay them tribute and other dues, to obey their lawful commands, and to be subject to their authority, for conscience' sake," etc.

The foregoing constitutes the true traditional position of our church, and leads inevitably to a conclusion directly opposite that upheld by Dr. Turck and by the resolutions of our general assembly, as cited by Presbyterian Life's editors. The Scriptures in this respect are plain and do not admit of any other interpretation.

Military training is strictly the business of the state and our church has fallen into error in not following the plain mandate of Jesus regarding obedience to the civil authorities. By meddling in the affairs of Government we thereby compromise our position in opposing the Vatican on the very same grounds, of which we, too, have been guilty in this instance.

The resolutions of the general assembly, being clearly contrary to scripture, were void, and bind neither the church nor its members individually, but they have brought embarassment to its members and loss of stature to the church. The moderators of those assemblies should have declared such resolutions out of order.

We admit that "the purest churches under heaven are subject to mixture and error" (Confession of Faith, ch. XXV, sec. V.). But we should, at the next general assembly admit our error and resolve that such resolutions should not, in the future, be permitted. The church has no right to intervene in the affairs of government except where the government trespasses upon the rights of the church. Individual members may make such recommendations to the State as their conscience dictates, but those prominently connected with the church should make it clear that their opinions are not necessarily those of their church.

To intervene in the affairs of government on the ground that a moral problem is involved, is not sound, for to follow that reasoning, we might find our church deeply involved in politics, perhaps advocating the election of a Republican President because the corruption in a Democratic administration presents a moral problem. Jesus clearly drew the line against involving His church in such matters.

Since the scriptures and the historic position of the church do not oppose military training, whether it be called selective service, draft, conscription, universal military training or some other name, are there any other cogent reasons which would justify the church in opposing military training?

Dr. Turck seems to have a suspicion or fear that universal military training will destroy democracy. Granting, merely for the sake of argument, that such might be the case, the church is without authority to say what form of government any nation shall have. The church of Christ operates under any form of government, whether it be a democracy or even a dictatorship such as Caesar's.

Could there then be some nonscriptural reason for Dr. Turck's fears? He states that "selective service is admittedly the only way by which we can get enough manpower to resist Russian aggression." He does not oppose conscription but apparently approves it. He does not say how moral problems involved under universal military training will differ from those under selective service. His objection is the emotional plea that young men will be taken from their cozy homes and put into an "artificial and harsh world" known as a military camp. Will it be any more rigorous than for those taken under the system he approves? Obviously not.

The evidence is overwhelming in opposition to the opinions of Dr. Turck. The "victims" of "the sinister influence of the military," as represented by the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, are the staunchest supporters of the democratic processes which Dr. Turck fears they will destroy. Graduates of military schools are among our finest citizens. Subversives and opponents of democracy are more likely to be found among pacifists.

As to the morals of those "victims," it should be sufficient to point out that the American Legion has recently instituted throughout our country a "Back to God" and "Go to Church" program. Of course some veterans have been guilty of crimes, but their criminal impulses are no more traceable to their military training than crimes committed by ministers of the Gospel could be attributed to their theological training. All in all, veterans will testify that military training has improved rather than harmed their moral understanding.

As one of the victims of World War I, I have since become a ruling elder. It might be suggested that having such sinister influence I ought, for conscience' sake, to resign. However, I shall not resign for such reason, but shall stay in and fight for the purity of the church and the elimination of that mixture and error which has been permitted to creep into it.

In seeking the cause of the mixture and error wherein a majority of ministers and elders at general assemblies adopt resolutions clearly contrary to the confession of faith which they vowed to receive and adopt as containing the system of doctrine taught in the Holy Scriptures, we must look not to military training, or the affairs of state, but to their theological training for the answer.

Overemphasis of parts of God's word to the exclusion of others can be very dangerous. That, it seems to me, is the cause of our present predicament. It is a disease which is doing immeasurable harm to our church, and a remedy should be administered at once.

Too many ministers preach only of God's love and mercy. They will not preach of the wrath of God. Too many will not use the words "damn" or "hell" in a sermon. Jesus used them. Perhaps they do not have the intellectual equipment to distinguish between profanity and God's wrath. Our church, through its seminaries, should caution ministers against such prudishness. An inactive, stagnant church will be found to have a prudish minister. Where a church is virile and active, you will find a pastor who does not hesitate to tell you, as Jesus did, that if you do not believe you will be damned to the everlasting torments of hell.

Too many pastors preach only of peace. Yes; we all like peace, but the trouble here is that they do not, or are unable to, differentiate between peace between nations and the peace which Jesus taught. The latter is peace between the individual and his Creator. What a whale of difference there is between these two kinds of peace. The latter type we must have; the former is not essential to salvation. Peace between nations has no value whatever in the salvation of souls. I dare say that no such sermon ever gained a soul for Christ's kingdom. Yet sermons are usually about this kind of peace and that is what Dr. Turck asks more of. So far as Christ is concerned they are a waste of time. They are contrary to the express doctrine of Jesus. He said there will be "wars and rumors of wars"; and here is His mandate to us: "See that ye be not troubled; for all these things must come to pass." Yet ministers ignore this, and do trouble themselves and everybody else. They will not preach that God is the author of war; that wars are part of God's plans, though that is enjoined upon them, as reference to the confession of faith will divulge.

Too many ministers, in ignoring parts of the scriptures, conceive God to be only kind and gracious, because that is the kind of God we would prefer to have, not having then to worry about His wrath. In substituting their own notions of God and His son for that given in the scriptures they create a false doctrine, and thereby become "false prophets, deceiving many." (Read the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew.)

Hardly ever in recent years has a meeting of presbytery, synod, or general assembly adjourned before one of these prudes gets up and introduces a resolution against war or military training, even though God's plans might call for such a war. To pray God to spare us the horrors of war is one thing, but to be found in opposition to God's plans is something else. Unconsciously they make themselves eligible for God's wrath.

"They who, upon pretense of Christian liberty, shall oppose any lawful power, or the lawful exercise of it, whether it be civil or ecclesiastical, resist the ordinance of God." (C. F. ch. XX, sec. IV).

Since so many ministers have become afflicted with this disease, we must conclude that there is something lacking or faulty in the instruction given in our theological seminaries.

In conclusion I would offer the following recommendations:

1. That institutes for ministers and elders be held throughout the jurisdiction of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to make sure that they become familiar with the confession of faith;

2. That we recommend to our theological seminaries a course of instruction that will not cause distortion of the Holy Scriptures;

3. That we recommend to our next General Assembly that we admit our "mixture and error" and restate our position with respect to government, war and military training in accordance with the principles set forth in the confession of faith; and

4. That the moderator and stated clerk of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America initiate such procedures as may be necessary to make effective the foregoing recommendations.

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON SETTLEMENT OF EXTERNAL DEBTS OF THE FEDERAL GERMAN REPUBLIC

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, as a usual thing I consider it very discourteous to place a letter in the RECORD, or to read it from the floor, particularly when it has been addressed to one of the executive departments, before an opportunity has been accorded the recipient of the letter to reply; but because the subject matter of the letter which I now hold in my hand seems to me to be of transcendent importance, and because of the fact that it was addressed to the Assistant Secretary of State, as of last Thursday, and pertains to a meeting scheduled to be held on February 28, there has not been time for the State Department to reply; and, in the hope that the reply will be received so that I may make it available to the Senate, I am presuming on their reply to read into the RECORD at this time the letter which I addressed to the Department of State. The letter is as follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1952.

Hon. JAMES E. WEBB,
Acting Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SECRETARY: According to State Department press release No. 30, dated January 14, 1952, there is to be held in London on February 28 an international conference on the settlement of the external debts of the Federal German Republic, at which the United States Government and private American creditors will be represented.

There are a number of issues involved in these negotiations on which I should like to have the views of the Department of State, within the shortest possible time.

A study of State Department releases concerning steps toward settlement of the German prewar and postwar external debts (issued on March 6, May 25, June 19, and December 11, 1951, and on January 14, 1952), reveals a pattern or set of facts on which I would appreciate having the Department's further comment.

The Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France have obtained from the Government of the German Federal Republic an acknowledgment of its responsibility for the external debts of the former Reich, for the most part contracted prior to the coming to power of the Nazis, and for the debts derived from postwar economic assistance given by the Allied Governments to Germany. The German Government has also granted priority to reimbursing debts of the latter category.

The Allied Governments, however, have very clearly signified their intention to forego this priority when the time comes, to the extent necessary to insure the fair and methodical settlement of prewar claims.

This can only be interpreted as meaning that the Allied Governments will defer payments by Germany on postwar debts owed them by the German Government in order to guarantee settlement of prewar claims.

The total amount of the German governmental debt to the allies for postwar economic assistance amounts to $3,500,000,000, of which $3,200,000,000 is owed to the United States Government.

The total amount of the prewar German external debt is estimated as ranging from one to two billion dollars.

The prewar external debt subject to settlement includes liabilities arising from the Dawes and Young loans; and debts of States, municipalities, corporations, and individuals located in the German Republic, involving 100 issues of foreign currency bonds floated during the 1920's, as well as commercial and bank debts, including those involved in the Hoover moratorium.

These prewar obligations are held mainly in the United States, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, France, Belgium, Holland, and Sweden, with lesser amounts held in some 15 other countries.

It is thus established that the German prewar external debt ranges in dollars from one to two billion, owed to private institutions, banks, and individuals, and that the German postwar external debt for economic assistance amounts to approximately $3,500,000,000 owed to the allied governments, principally the United States.

The United States Government has announced (State Department release No. 1082, December 11, 1951) that it is prepared to accept, in settlement of its claim on the German Federal Republic's Government for postwar economic assistance, approximately $1,200,000,000, or 37 cents on the dollar, a scaling down from three billion two hundred million to one billion two hundred million dollars, or about two-thirds.

State Department release No. 30 (January 14, 1952) calls this a considerable write-down. For the United States it amounts to a considerable write-down of $2,000,000,000, for the United Kingdom £51,000,000 (roughly equal to $142,000,000), and for France $3,860,000 payable in francs.

It is thus evidence that if Germany agrees to satisfy the claims of her prewar private creditors (banks, individuals, etc.), the allied governments will permit her not only to defer payments on postwar intergovernmental debts owed them but will also scale down by nearly 65 percent the total of these postwar debts, with the United States Government, of course, taking by far the greatest loss.

In return for Germany's agreeing to settle prewar debts to private institutions and citizens, the United States is willing to write off $2,000,000,000 owed our Government.

This, in effect, is nothing but the transfer of a $2,000,000,000 load to the banks of the American taxpayer, present and future, in order that a small group of banks and other private creditors may be paid off.

There is no thought in my mind of preventing a fair and proper settlement of legitimate debts owed American creditors for loans on which they risked their money during the twenties to finance various German governmental, corporate, and private borrowers. They knowingly risked their money in purchasing these obligations, and they are entitled to seek repayment if they can and to the extent possible.

But I would vehemently protest an arrangement whereby the debt load and the tax burden of the American people is increased by the enormous sum of $2,000,000,000 in order to make possible the repayment of from one to two billion dollars in private debts.

I note the comment of the New York Times on January 15, 1952, writing of the willingness of our Government to settle intergovernmental postwar claims for about 37 cents on the dollar: "This willingness to compromise official claims would furnish the framework within which West Germany's prewar private creditors would bargain direct with the officials and private creditors of the Bonn republic for the settlement of claims totaling about $1,500,000,000, including interest."

The international conference in London on February 28 is designed to secure international sanction for the debt settlement as proposed by the Tripartite Commission on the German Debt.

By what authority can the United States representative on the Tripartite Commission proceed to seek international sanction for a debt settlement of this magnitude without the sanction of the United States Congress? The $2,000,000,000 reduction in Germany's postwar debt to the United States Government would represent, in effect, an additional American grant to the Bonn government without the approval of Congress.

I am not persuaded that there exists any authority under which the Department of State or its representatives can commit this Government, by executive agreement, to such a vast scaling down of a legitimate intergovernmental debt, particularly in view of the fact that the obvious purpose of this settlement is to arrange for satisfying the claims of a small number of financial and other private creditors at public expense.

I am strongly of the opinion that this is a matter to be handled as a treaty and that, as such, it must be submitted to the Senate for ratification.

I do not believe that the Congress or the people, when they know the facts, will applaud such bountiful generosity on the part of appointed officials, unless approved after due consideration through the constitutional processes of treaty-making.

What is the purpose of this agreement if not to reduce the governmental debt owned by the German Federal Republic to the United States Government in an amount amply sufficient to permit Germany to pay off prewar debts owed to private creditors in the United States and elsewhere?

What conclusion can be drawn from these transactions other than that the United States Government is willing to charge to the Nation's taxpayers the sum of $2,000,000,000 owed it by the German Government, in order that banks and other private creditors holding German prewar bonds may receive payment?

Does the proposed settlement also have as one of its purposes to liquidate outstanding prewar claims of American private investors in Germany in order to facilitate new flotations of German bonds in the American market?

Is not the effect of the proposed settlement to permit private American and other creditors to receive payment on German prewar debts at the expense, not of the German Government, but of the American people?

By what authority can the Department of State, through its representative, Ambassador Pierson, increase the ultimate tax burden of American citizens by the enormous sum of $2,000,000,000?

By what authority can the Department agree to a reduction of a debt owed the United States Government by a foreign government unless that agreement be in the form of a treaty ratified by the United States Senate?

I await reply to this letter and urge the speediest possible action, since the international conference at which these transactions are to be finally negotiated is to take place on February 28.

In closing, I note for the record that the head of the German delegation which has been negotiating these matters with the Tripartite Commission on the German Debt is the same person about whose mysterious visit to this country I wrote to the State Department on December 5, 1949: Herman J. Abs, head of the Deutsche Bank under the Hitler regime.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

Mr. President, as I stated at the outset, the letter is dated February 23. In view of the fact that it referred to an anticipated conference scheduled for February 28, there has been no reasonable time for the State Department to reply to the numerous questions I have raised and asked in the letter addressed to that Department. In fairness to them, I could not wait, and in fairness to the American people I could not wait until opportunity had been given to reply, because of the fact that the conference is to be held on the day after tomorrow, and, to me, it involves one of the most vital matters presented for consideration for some time. I think we are entitled to answers. I hope the answers will be forthcoming soon, and I certainly shall make them available to the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. From the text of the letter which I heard read it would appear that the matter is not being negotiated as a treaty.

Mr. GILLETTE. It is not.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would come in the realm of an executive agreement?

Mr. GILLETTE. I can reach no other conclusion. The entire letter was based on releases issued by the Department of State. Therefore I have asked the question under what authority they proceeded to scale down the debt from $3,500,000,000 to $1,500,000,000, and at the same time give priority to private debts, which, in effect, would transfer the whole obligation to the backs of American taxpayers.

ROBERT P. PATTERSON

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 22, a great American, Robert P. Patterson, met a tragic death in an airplane crash at Elizabeth, N. J. I had known and greatly admired Secretary Patterson for more than a quarter of a century. He was a man of unusually high standards, of great personal and moral courage, and of absolute integrity. He gave of himself without stint to many great causes. He was not one to give mere lip service. The nobility of his life demonstrated that he practised what he preached. No man has served his country both in peace and in war better than has Robert P. Patterson, and his untimely death has been a great loss to his country which will long hold him in grateful remembrance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks editorials which appeared in the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Washington Post on January 23 and January 24, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of January 23, 1952]

ROBERT P. PATTERSON

Tragedy has struck again in the air over New Jersey, and this time its sorrow-laden list of casualties includes the name of an American who has served his country with

extraordinary distinction. Robert P. Patterson was one of the great and gallant figures of the times in which we live. He was a soldier on the battlefront in France during the First World War. Returning to his practice of the law, he was appointed a judge of the District Court of the United States at the age of 39, a judge of the high Court of Appeals a few years later. He left the bench, soon after the outbreak of the Second World War in Europe, to become Assistant Secretary and then Under Secretary of War. Few men contributed more notably to the success of the whole American war effort. When Henry Stimson resigned as Secretary of War in 1945, Robert Patterson succeeded him. His own resignation from that office in 1947 was followed by his return to the practice of law in New York City, his selection as president of the Bar Association of the City of New York and his willing and eager participation in a wide range of public-spirited activities.

Here was a man of superlatively high standards, complete integrity and boundless enthusiasm for whatever task he took in hand. No one whose privilege it was to know him is likely ever to forget the candor of his speech, the courage of his faith, the warm and glowing brightness of his friendship. He was a man who never dodged a responsibility, never refused to take on a hard job if it needed to be done. What he preached, he practiced. What he believed, he believed with heart and soul. He fought hard for every cause in which he enlisted, and the causes for which he fought were good and right.

It is tragic to lose so useful a man at the ago of 60 with so much to live for, so many unfinished battles needing the strength of his good arm. He served his country greatly. He will be mourned, and missed.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1952]

ROBERT P. PATTERSON

Many in the past hours have wished to pay tribute to Robert P. Patterson; and through the kind of things that have been said, and the kind of people who have said them, there emerges a sharp picture of a man—a man of intelligence, ability, and courage. He was a man of complete integrity, of charm and of toughness, who was willing to give his high qualities without stint to the public service and, when he had returned to private life, to those various public causes which seemed to him of vital national and human significance.

He was an outstanding exemplar of a type of public officer which, if not exactly new in our history, emerged with a new importance in the great crisis of the second war. Often from modest backgrounds, their initial training was neither in government nor in politics but—as lawyers, bankers, or business men—in the climate of competitive enterprise. Like Patterson, however, most of them had given service, and often combat service, to their country as young men during the first war; they were touched with the soldier's ideal of duty as well as the citizen's ideal of freedom and initiative. They had their politics, but theirs was never a politician's attitude toward either the rewards or the obligations of high office. It was Roosevelt's move in 1940 to broaden his administration against the impending storms by appointing Stimson and Knox to his Cabinet which brought many of them into the public service. Patterson was drafted from the Federal bench to become Stimson's Under Secretary of War at about the time that Forrestal was drafted for the equivalent post in the Navy; the two men were unlike in personality, but their two careers ran thereafter in close parallel in the posts they held, the devotion they gave to them and the achievements they accomplished in the Nation's behalf.

Patterson munitioned the Army as Forrestal munitioned the Navy. As the last Secretary of War, Patterson hammered out with Forrestal the problems of unification; the two men's ideas differed, but the result was a joint work, and Patterson might well have been first Secretary of Defense had he not preferred to return to private life. But there he could never regard private practice as any discharge from his public responsibilities. Rugged, colorful, brave, and high-minded, he still had much to give to his country when his career was cut suddenly short in the blazing airplane wreck in Elizabeth. The loss is tragic, and all the more so because one does not know how many like him we may be breeding today. We desperately need men of his character, background, outlook and capacity if we are to manage the staggering governmental machinery which we insist on building; one wishes that it were possible to feel greater confidence that we shall get them.

[From the Washington Post of January 24, 1952]

ROBERT P. PATTERSON

The manner of Robert P. Patterson's death in the air crash at Elizabeth, N. J., adds to the sense of shock which his death will evoke from his wartime associates. If ever there was a man who had a dedicated patriotism, it was Robert Patterson. All his life he had responded to the call of duty, and duty to his country was paramount. It did not particularly matter how and where he served. He had austere tastes, and the odd fact that he was doing KP in training camp when he was told of his appointment as Assistant Secretary of War in 1940 made a good anecdote, but left his friends scarcely surprised. Wherever there was something useful to be done, no matter how humble, there was Robert P. Patterson contributing all he had to this or that work, this or that cause, with an unsleeping and dour indefatigability.

On first acquaintance, the stern-visaged Patterson struck one as somewhat wintry, and one called him "Judge" right away. But his fellow-feeling and modesty came through in such short order that in addressing him it was the most natural thing in the world to slip from "Judge" to "Bob." As Bob Patterson he was at the very center of the administrative stage throughout the Second World War. Everybody was glad that the President made him Secretary of War when Secretary Stimson, whom he served with zeal and devotion as Under Secretary, resigned in 1945. It is said that he was the first choice as first Secretary of Defense, for he had been in the forefront of the struggle for unification. But he had done his war job, and was anxious to get back to the law, not only because this was his love but also because his depleted means required replenishment.

Mr. Truman, it is also said, promised him a place on the Supreme Court. He would have liked this, but told Mr. Truman that the President ought to know he had written a letter in behalf of Alger Hiss, so the matter was dropped. He went back to private life. Here he quickly recovered a lucrative practice, but he kept up his participation in public affairs, particularly in the field of international relations. He held fast to his beliefs and never wearied in working for them. He became an eloquent advocate of Federal Union and held offices in Federal Union, Inc., which Clarence Streit had founded.

The key word in Mr. Patterson's life was integrity, a stubborn integrity. Whenever his point of view was sought, as it was by this newspaper several times, he always made a point of explaining any professional interest past or present in the matter under discussion. We refer to this because the last time we mentioned Patterson it was by way of criticism. His legal services had been sought by a German industrial group, and the intervention for a while appeared to hurt the negotiations on the Schuman plan. The retainer, it turned out, was the result of a misunderstanding, but we well recall the hornet's nest that we brought down on our heads—all out of respect for a man who was upright in all his relations and dealings. We mourn his passing. He will be missed, but his example of disinterestedness and public service will not be forgotten for many a year.

COMMUNIST CONTROL OF CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made by the President of the United States on February 25, 1952, concerning the seizure of control of Czechoslovakia by Communists 4 years ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Four years ago today the Communists seized control of the free country of Czechoslovakia. By infiltrating every important branch of the Government, they had strangled all sources of independent opposition in that nation—all but one—the students and young people.

In the last few hours of Czechoslovakia's freedom, more than 5,000 students of Charles University marched toward their president's house to plead with him to save their country from the Communists. But before they could reach their destination, Communist police fired into the orderly crowd, wounding several students.

February 25 should be a very special day for the young men and women of all nations. Let it serve as a symbol—a reminder of youth's determination and will to resist, in the face of hopeless odds.

But let it also serve as a warning to all people, young and old, who are so fortunate that they still have their freedom.

Since February 25, 1948, the world has learned the lessons of Czechoslovakia. The world has learned that communism is aggressive—that communism means conquest, oppression and slavery.

Four years ago the students of Charles University taught us that we must do more than resist—we must be prepared to resist. We are putting this lesson of collective security into practice in Korea, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the Pacific defense treaties.

All this we learned at the price of freedom for Czechoslovakia and other nations temporarily under the Communist yoke. Let us never forget our lesson.

NATO COUNCIL MEETING AT LISBON

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the meeting of the NATO Council which closed yesterday at Lisbon has been a truly historic landmark in the history of international cooperation. It marks a great step forward in the joint efforts of the western nations to create a strong defense establishment in Western Europe and it is a victory for the diplomacy of the United States.

It demonstrates the genuine willingness of our NATO partners to shoulder their share of this enormous defense burden despite the serious economic difficulties which most of them face internally.

These nations have agreed to undertake a $300,000,000,000 defense effort.

They have agreed to raise 50 divisions of men during this year and 100 divisions before the job is finished. They have agreed to the inclusion of German forces in their continental defense system: and this is perhaps the most difficult decision they made. Furthermore, these nations in this unprecedented collective action agreed to a wholesale reorganization of the NATO administrative structure whereby it will be streamlined and capable of flexible and prompt administrative action.

General Eisenhower's command responsibility now extends from the Aleutians to North Africa, from Northern Ireland to the Turkish Caucasus border, and from Norwegian Arctic frontiers to the Moroccan desert. Never before in history have peaceful nations delegated such far-reaching jurisdictional responsibility to an international command.

We are making progress all along the line. European integration has moved closer to reality in the past 2 years than in the previous two centuries. European military budgets are growing rapidly—I hope not too rapidly for their own economic stability. A paper army is fast becoming an army of men and steel. Confidence is mounting both here and in Western Europe.

We all owe a vote of thanks and appreciation both to the American statesmen and the European statesmen whose patient and skillful negotiation have overcome so many hurdles to bring about the significant accomplishments of the past week.

Mr. President, the agreements which have been adopted by our NATO partners and ourselves at Lisbon are subject to the support of the parliaments of the participating states. I feel certain that the Senate, the Congress as a whole, and the American people will watch with anxious eye the further progress toward implementation of these agreements. So I think it only proper and right to have made the comments I have made today upon what may well prove to be one of the most significant meetings of the past 10 years.

PROPOSED TREATY AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION—NEWSPAPER AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a number of editorials and articles from newspapers published throughout the United States relating to the proposed amendment to the Constitution involving treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[The articles and editorials will appear hereafter in the Appendix of the RECORD under the appropriate heading.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, recently the Subcommittee on Internal Security, of the Committee on the Judiciary, had before it a question involving the principle of this proposed constitutional amendment, when a witness refused to answer a question as to whether or not the State Department had aided the witness in getting employment with the United Nations. The refusal to answer that question was on the ground that the United Nations was a superior government, and that when the United States Senate had ratified the Charter of the United Nations, the Senate had allowed the United Nations, by rules and regulations which in effect would be much less than legislation by this body, to give to a witness who had worked for the United Nations the right to refuse to testify before legislative bodies or courts of the United States. I may say that at the time the testimony of this witness was given, I presided as the acting chairman of the subcommittee.

The Committee on the Judiciary has unanimously voted to send to the Senate a recommendation for citation of this witness for contempt, in order that the question may be litigated before the Supreme Court to ascertain whether it is a fact that ratification of the United Nations Charter has abrogated the domestic laws of this land. I ask the Senator whether or not he feels that his amendment is sufficiently broad to cover that subject.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the amendment does cover that subject. Of course, it is a matter which ought to be litigated up to the Supreme Court of the United States. If the rules and regulations of the United Nations set aside the powers of the Congress or of a committee of the Congress, certainly it emphasizes the need for the consideration of the amendment which I have submitted, which goes to the extent of prohibiting a treaty which would in any way nullify the provisions of the Constitution of the United States or set aside the laws of the various States and of the Congress, and the constitutions of the States, without an act of Congress. Furthermore, it would prohibit any treaty from depriving the Congress, or a committee of the Congress, to which the Senator refers, of their rights or powers, so that they could not be nullified or restricted in any way by treaty or, certainly, by the rules and regulations of a subcommittee of an organization such as the United Nations. So I think that point emphasizes the need for consideration of the amendment.

I am gratified that today the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee has appointed a special subcommittee for the purpose of examining into the question and taking testimony with regard to the amendment which I have submitted. I am also gratified to know that the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan is a member of that subcommittee. So we will give consideration to this subject together when it comes up.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. Even though I am one of the Senators who sponsored this amendment, I wish to make certain that we are going to be able to cover all the ramifications which might be claimed by those who feel that the United Nations Charter has become the supreme law of the land, nullifying constitutional provisions as well as statutory law. Take a case such as the one to which I have referred, a case in which we have cited an individual for contempt. If we could get such a case quickly before the courts, we might find, in the arguments as well as in the opinions to be rendered for or against the idea which is contended for by the witness, further ramifications of the claim. So when the constitutional amendment is framed we should be able to cover the subject completely, rather than find ourselves later, after it is ratified, in the position of having missed another loophole.

Mr. BRICKER. I certainly agree with the Senator. I expressed that wish at the time I presented the amendment, as the Senator will remember.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do remember.

Mr. BRICKER. There is a serious situation in California. The California statutes were set aside because of the ratification of the United Nations Charter by the Senate, under the contract entered into by the President and by the San Francisco Conference. The problem which the Senator cites goes even further than anything we have yet seen. Under a rule or regulation of a committee of the United Nations, or a subcommittee, the Senate of the United States might be deprived of the powers which it otherwise would have under our Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Even the Secretary of the United Nations might make a rule or regulation which would abrogate the Constitution of the United States, or the statutory law of the United States, or of a State.

Mr. BRICKER. The amendment which I have submitted clearly covers a situation of that kind, in my judgment. However, I wish to examine every possibility. That is why I am so gratified that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has today appointed such able members of the subcommittee.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, at this time I desire to make a few statements outlining my position on the pending bill, the Alaska statehood bill. Before doing so I wish to compliment the very able and distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I believe he has devoted more time to the Alaska statehood bill than has any other member of the committee. I commend him for the thorough and complete manner in which he has presented the Alaska statehood point of view. There is nothing that I, or anyone else, for that matter, could add to the arguments which have already been set forth and presented by the very able chairman of the committee.

A few years ago I had the extreme good fortune and pleasure of visiting Alaska with a Senate committee. At that time I was surprised to learn at first hand of the interest and the emotional desire of the great majority of the people of the Territory, that Alaska should become a full-fledged member of the American Union of States. I was so impressed with their attitude and with

their problems as they presented them to us, as well as with the solutions which they had for many of those problems if we would but grant them statehood, that I told them at that time that I would support the Alaska statehood bill.

I was so impressed with their good citizenship, their loyalty to this country, and their great desire to become a member of our Union of States that I told them that if we could not obtain statehood for them, I knew that my people in Montana would be most happy to take them into Montana and let them become a part of what we consider to be a great State.

I was very much impressed by the number of young people who had made their determination to remain in Alaska after the cessation of hostilities at the end of World War II, and to make their homes there and raise their families and educate their children. They told me that they did not believe they could properly hew out the type of home upon which they had set their life ambitions, and that they could not properly educate their children into the ways of good Americanism, as they had in mind, so long as the area of Alaska remained only a Territory. They were sincere and honest in that belief. I know from actual contact with those people that while they have good schools, and while they have been trying to develop a good university, yet most of them feel that it will be impossible to go ahead and fully develop the Territory of Alaska as it would be developed if it became a part of the United States, a full-fledged State with all the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of a State.

The people of Alaska were exercised about the necessity of having later to send their children back to the United States to complete their education. They said, "We love Alaska. We realize its potentialities, and we would like to build our homes and our communities into a full-fledged State of the Union."

After coming back to Washington I had the further privilege of listening to good people, citizens of the Territory, who came by the dozens from Alaska to testify before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. They represented every walk of life in Alaska. They were businessmen, professional men, and representatives of labor unions. They were all united in their desire and insistence to be one with our Nation. At that time many questions were propounded to them with respect to how they would tackle this or that problem. After listening to their testimony before the subcommittee, of which I was privileged to be a member, I came to the further conclusion that if they were given statehood status, they would be in a position to develop the Territory as it should be developed, to build it up industrially, to go ahead with the development of their agriculture—and there is considerable agriculture in Alaska, notwithstanding reports to the contrary—and that an inducement would be afforded to people in overcrowded sections of the United States to migrate to Alaska and make their future home there. I agree with that attitude.

Because of present world conditions I think we all agree that Alaska occupies a strategic position in our whole defense effort. It is separated from Russia by a very narrow body of water. From all the information we have been able to acquire with regard to the activities of the Soviet Union in that area, they have built up a great military potential very close to the northern borders of Alaska.

When we were there we went into the defense problem of Alaska. The people of Alaska confided to us that they would feel much safer and much better protected in these precarious times if they were accorded the privilege of statehood, with the honor and confidence which go with it. I do not know how many people realize it, but there have been many assertions made that Russia still considers that we underpaid her for the Alaskan Territory. In view of the many claims that she has been making all over the world, with distortions of fact, I have never been fully convinced that she has given up all idea of moving against the Territory of Alaska at some time in the future.

Mr. President, I believe it is important that we grant statehood to the people of Alaska. They have pioneered in that Territory, and they have given their substance and their energies and themselves in protecting it and in supplying manpower and facilities during World War II. They have demonstrated that they have the capacity for citizenship. They have been electing their own legislatures. They have been trying to iron out some of their very knotty problems concerning taxation and representation. They have amalgamated the natives and assimilated them into their own society just about as well as the people of any other section of our country have been able to do. They have even elected officials in their territorial government who are of native stock. The people of Alaska are full-fledged Americans, and they are ready and willing to accept the responsibilities of citizenship.

My own State of Montana had a very sparse population when it was admitted into the Union, but we got along very well. We built up our own State government, our own county governments, and our own municipal governments. Our population increased. Our resources were developed to a greater extent than they ever would have been developed had we remained a territory. I could name many other States which did not have a very large population at the time of their admission into the Union, but they have grown and developed. They have built up their institutions and integrated themselves with the other States of the Union.

It has been mentioned that statehood has been promised Alaska and Hawaii for many years by both political parties. Those people have worked toward that objective. At times I have thought that they had been promised what perhaps those making the promise did not know whether they could fulfill or were not too interested in keeping it. Statehood has been held out to these people for many years. A statehood bill was passed in the House on several occasions, only to be held up in the Senate. The time has come when we should either give Alaska statehood or should vote down that bill, so that the people of Alaska will know where they stand.

Personally, I feel that it is grossly unfair to the people of Alaska to continue to hold out to them the possibility of statehood and promises of statehood, but never to do anything about it. Certainly that is grossly unfair. I believe it would be unfair to ask representative people of Alaska to come all the way to Washington to testify further regarding this bill. As I stated before, I have been privileged to sit through two very long hearings on bills proposing statehood for Alaska and for Hawaii. At this time the question is whether we favor or do not favor statehood for those Territories.

Now that the Alaskan statehood bill is before the Senate, I hope the Senate will reach a final determination regarding it, so that the citizens of Alaska will know where they stand. As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I do not understand how any additional information on this subject could be developed. It seems to me that all the facts regarding it have been presented in a correct and proper way.

I am well aware of the various objections to statehood which have been submitted. I am frank to admit that at first perhaps I myself entertained some of those sentiments. For instance, in the beginning I doubted that it would be proper for us, as the United States of America, to take into full statehood a noncontiguous Territory. However, after having studied that problem from every angle, in order to make up my mind on that point, I can now see no particular validity to that argument, especially in view of modern modes of transportation.

I have visited with a great many persons who have driven their automobiles from Great Falls, Mont., through Canada, all the way to Alaska, and back again. Of course, it is true that at present the roads there are not very good; nevertheless, that trip has been completed a great many times.

Of course, only a few hours of air travel are required to reach either Juneau, Fairbanks, Anchorage, or Ketchikan, even from Washington. I have known people who had dinner in the evening here in Washington, and had lunch the next day in Alaska. That shows how our transportation facilities have overcome great distances. Thus, Mr. President, in my opinion the argument that Alaska is a noncontiguous Territory does not hold water.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will vote favorably on this bill as soon as possible. At this time I am glad to join those who are supporting the move for statehood for Alaska. In the committee I supported that move and the bill for that purpose, and I intend to vote for the bill on the floor of the Senate.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I desire to ask consent to have reprinted the remarks I made before the Senate in 1950 on the subject of the Alaskan statehood bill, when the bill was then before the Senate.

There being no objection, Mr. ECTON's previous remarks were ordered to be reprinted in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 1, 1950]

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I realize it is impossible for me to add anything to the forceful and impressive arguments which have already been made in behalf of statehood for Alaska. I believe that about everything that has been said in the arguments advanced against the admission of Alaska was said against the admission of Montana into the Union. Montana was admitted to the Union on November 8, 1889. I know that many people at that time thought that about all Montana had was a great many Indians and snow-covered mountains. We did have many Indians and we did have snow-covered mountains. But we had a few people who had migrated into that Territory, who had built their homes there, were rearing families, and intended to proceed to develop the country for their children and children's children.

Three years ago I was one of several members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who visited Alaska. I then discovered that Alaska had snow-covered mountains and also had many Indians, and Eskimos as well. We do not happen to have Eskimos in Montana. We found likewise a people in Alaska who had migrated there, people with courage, with ambition, with vision, who were building homes, and rearing families, and who intended to stay in Alaska, if possible.

We found that many people from my own State had gone to Alaska. I suppose life in Montana had become too easy for them, so they wanted to go to Alaska to satisfy the old pioneering spirit. They were doing good work there. But back in their minds they hoped for the time when eventually Alaska would become a State. That has been in the minds of the people there for years and years and years. I was surprised to meet as many persons as I did who thought it was essential that Alaska be admitted to the Union, with all the rights of statehood.

Mr. President, I talked to a great many GI's who had been in Alaska during World War II, and who had returned there, bringing their brides with them, and were attempting to make a home there and provide for themselves a livelihood. Many of them told me, however, "We do not expect to stay here all our lives." I asked, "Why?" They said, "This is a Territory. We simply do not like to raise our children to maturity in a Territory. It is all right for them to stay here for a while, but after a bit they will want to go to school, and we will have to make arrangements to go back to the States. Now, if you Members of Congress would give us statehood we think we would be willing to stay here and make it our home for the future. We can develop this country just as those in the West have developed their States, which at the time of statehood were sparsely settled." A great many of them felt that it would mean much to them and to their children if they could say they were citizens of the State of Alaska rather than of the Territory of Alaska. That made a deep impression upon us.

Mr. President, I met in Alaska the finest kind of people I have met anywhere in the world. They are friendly, they are generous, they are hard-working, and they are most forward-looking.

I do not believe we need to worry about whether the resources of Alaska are sufficient to support statehood. In my opinion, Alaska has practically everything that any other State of the Union has except agriculture, and Alaska is developing agriculturally. Under modern methods of using various kinds of soils under differing climatic conditions, I believe eventually Alaska will have a pretty good agriculture, and will develop agriculturally as well as in other ways.

I believe Alaska has more resources than most of the other States of the Union have at the present time. The Senator from Oregon mentioned the natural resources of Alaska. Natural resources abound in Alaska. Nearly every kind of mineral that can be imagined is hidden away in the mountains and the hills and the valleys of Alaska.

Mr. President, I am happy that years ago someone had the foresight to secure Alaska as a Territory for the United States. In the face of the world situation as it is, and knowing of all the strategic materials we need to protect ourselves in this modern age, I am glad that we have the Territory of Alaska under our control.

In view of the fact that the people of that Territory have been promised statehood for so many years, and have been on trial for so many years, since at least a majority of them have worked earnestly and continuously for advancement to statehood, and in view of the fact that the Alaska statehood bill has already been passed by the House twice, that we have for 2 years held long and tedious public hearings on the subject, and that the Senate committee has seen fit to advance it to the floor of the Senate, I had hoped that we could have the bill brought before the Senate, at least so a vote could be had on it, in order to let the people of Alaska see the real picture.

Mr. President, when I was in Alaska 3 years ago I told the people there that I honestly thought statehood legislation could be put through the Congress of the United States. They wanted to know why. I said, "Because in my opinion you occupy the most strategic place on the face of the globe. From a military standpoint all eyes are going to be turned on Alaska in the next few years. I think we are going to recognize your strategic position and realize that we can do a better job if Alaska is a State of the Union, rather than merely a Territory."

Mr. President, I merely wish to say this evening that I honestly believe that Alaska is the key to the proper defense of the North American continent, that it is the key spot on the map where will be determined in the future whether we shall have world peace or not.

Mr. President, now all our eyes are turned on Korea. That is all very well. Korea, however, is not the key to Asia. Korea is not the key to the peace of the world. I say in all sincerity and honesty that I believe Alaska, our own Territory, which belongs to the United States, is the key. I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we had better be spending our time and our money in making plans for any eventuality, because in my opinion Alaska is the pinnacle of the world.

Senators may say, as I have heard it said here, "Well, what if it is? We will defend Alaska." Of course, we are going to defend Alaska whether it is a Territory or a State. It belongs to us. The people of Alaska are a part of us, even though they live in a Territory, and even though they cannot vote for national officers, and even though they do not have representation in Congress, except through one Delegate, whom they elect, but who has no vote in Congress.

It is no secret that Russia is putting forth propaganda that the United States bought Alaska years ago too cheaply, and that rightfully and justly Alaska should belong to Russia. Mr. President, the good people of Alaska hear those stories and are worried by them. Inasmuch as Alaska now is merely a Territory, some of her people wonder whether perhaps, if the going became tough, the United States would move out and would let them go, rather than put up a fierce battle and possibly involve the entire world.

Mr. President, I say to you that we need to do everything we possibly can to build up the morale of the good citizens who live in Alaska. We should make them understand that they are full-fledged American citizens, with all the rights, privileges, and protections of American citizens, and that they are supported by the determination of a great Government to see that they are protected. That will help their morale; it will give them additional courage; and they, in turn, will give greater morale to the thousands of our citizens who, as members of the Armed Forces, have to be stationed in Alaska.

Mr. President, the towns in Alaska and the homes in Alaska remind me a great deal of towns and cities and homes in my own State of Montana. Naturally the houses in Alaska have to be built well in order to withstand the cold, but they look very much like houses in any other modern city or town. Alaska in the total respect is not the wilderness it is sometimes portrayed to be.

Alaska possesses some of the most beautiful scenery in the world. If we admit Alaska to the Union as a full-fledged State I think that eventually there will be a paved highway between this country, across Canada, to Alaska; and every summer many of our citizens will wish to travel there, instead of going to Europe, South America, or some other foreign land. I do not see how anyone could find in Switzerland or in any other foreign country any sights more beautiful than those which can be found in Alaska.

Mr. President, a large delegation of Alaskans came to Washington and appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and we went into every detail in regard to what will be involved if Alaska is granted statehood. I know that there are arguments in opposition; but the splendid group of people who came here last winter and who were honest and sincere had given the problem much serious consideration. They are united in believing that Alaska, if admitted to the Union as a State, will be able to finance herself and will be able to overcome all obstacles. They recognize that there are certain obstacles to be overcome if Alaska is granted statehood; but they wish to try, they wish to go forward, they wish to accept the challenge and the responsibility. They are certain they can manage it. I believe they can; and I believe they will if they are granted the opportunity to do so.

Mr. President, I am sorry that certain aspects of the matter have developed in the course of the argument and the effort to bring this bill before the Senate for consideration. In that connection I am not blaming anyone. I know how certain Senators feel about the balance of power and other questions. However, I do not think we need worry about that; I think all those matters can be taken care of. I believe that any Senators or Members of the House of Representatives who might be elected from Alaska and sent to the United States Congress would be fair and open-minded, and would not take undue advantage of anyone. I am not fearful of that situation. Knowing the people of Alaska as I believe I do, I have confidence that they would elect as representatives of the State of Alaska Senators and Representatives who would be fair, open-minded, and sound on all questions of national interest.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I have not changed my mind since I was in Alaska 3 years ago, when I promised those good people that I would support their statehood bill; and I am supporting it now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order

for a quorum call be vacated and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the position of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in recommending statehood for the Territory of Alaska, and in opposition to the pending motion to recommit the bill to that committee for further study. As I view it, Mr. President, a recommittal of this bill at this time would serve no purpose other than to kill any hope which the people of Alaska might have, either for the passage during the present session of a bill granting them statehood, or for even having that question voted upon on its merits.

To many of them with whom I have talked, Mr. President, there is a feeling that, whatever the attitude of Members of the Congress might be with respect to granting or denying statehood, and however the Congress might approach that question on its merits, and whether the Members of the Congress believe that incorporation of a Territory is definitely a step toward statehood, and that statehood should thereafter certainly follow, whatever might be the views on these basic propositions, at least there can be no question that a petition, in whatever form it may come, from the people within a geographical area, wherever it may lie, which is under the American flag, should be answered, and answered on its merits. The citizens of the United States are guaranteed by their basic structure of government, the American Constitution, the right of petition. Mr. President, the right to inquire, without the right to an answer, is nothing. The right to petition, without the right to have the petition properly considered and acted upon, is an idle gesture and is of the essence of futility.

Certainly whatever the Members of the United States Senate individually may feel is the proper thing to do with respect to voting for or against statehood, there should be no question in the minds of any that some action should be taken. I can understand those—and there are many, with whom I have talked—who have a feeling that this is not the time to grant statehood to Alaska. I can understand the reasoning of many with whom I have talked. I can understand it, Mr. President, because, not too long ago, I shared their feeling. On the first vote I cast on the question of reporting favorably a statehood bill from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I had to follow my conviction and vote "no." The reasons which constrained me to cast that vote were similar to those I have heard presented by colleagues on the floor for opposition to statehood for Alaska at this time. At the time I cast that vote I felt sure that there was a grave question as to whether the Territory of Alaska had sufficient economic strength to justify our placing upon its citizens the additional financial burdens of statehood. In other words, I was a little bit afraid that the people of Alaska at that time could not afford statehood. So I voted against a favorable report on the bill.

I am not at all certain today, Mr. President, that the people of Alaska are fully prepared to blossom and burgeon at once into a full-fledged, modern statehood, with all the trappings the years have added to the vehicle of statehood. But, Mr. President, I do know that not a Territory has come into the Union since the beginning of the United States of which it could be said at the time of its admission that it was fully prepared to assume all the responsibilities, including the financial overhead, of statehood as statehood was known at the time of its admission. I want to make that particularly clear.

The Territory of Alaska today could assume all the burdens of statehood that any other Territory ever assumed at the time of its admission into the United States. The difficulty is that in the years since 1912 the people of the several States have required that their State governments assume more and more of the obligations which, in the opinion of old "horse and buggy" people like the present speaker, still should be borne by the citizens themselves.

But, however we may view the matter of whether the burdens are properly those of the individual or of the collective group under the term "States," the fact is that the States have assumed them, and the result is that a greater portion of the productive dollars of the citizens of a State must be taken by the State to be invested by the State in services to the people from whom the money is taken.

If we take as our yardstick the present overhead of the States, if we take the present overhead of, let us say, the States with the least population, or any one of the several States in the group with the least population, we would still find at the present time that the Territory of Alaska had an economic disadvantage.

So, Mr. President, I understand those who feel that that economic disadvantage is sufficient to constrain them to vote against admission at the present time. It was sufficient to cause me to vote against a favorable report on the bill at one time. But, remembering, Mr. President, as I did when I reviewed my history, that none of the States were economically prepared for Statehood when it came to them, remembering that there is not in the history of the United States a single instance of a Territory which has gained admission as a State not justifying its admission and becoming economically sound as a State unit, I turned back to the Senate hearings and to the hearings on the House side, again took a look at the facts with respect to Alaska, and changed my mind. I reached the conclusion, Mr. President, that if Alaska at the moment is perhaps at an economic disadvantage, it is not the fault of Alaska. The fault rests with the United States Government which has never given to Alaska its birthright or any hope for the future.

When the other States came into the Union—I speak of those which came in after the Thirteen Original States—there was a policy in the United States of holding all natural resources of the soil as a trust to be available to the individual citizens in any geographical area, either on a basis of free acquisition or upon a basis of a very small, nominal payment. That was true throughout the West. The West was settled by pioneers who had but one major problem, that of keeping body and soul together until they could develop their tracts, their homesteads, their donation land claims, and make themselves economically sufficient. There was never any question as to whether they could have the land. It was there for them. It had been held for them since the American flag first flew over it.

That fact, Mr. President, accelerated the development of all the so-called public land States, and that acceleration would have been, I undertake to say, much greater than it was had the same philosophy continued to prevail. But, Mr. President, long before Alaska was anything more than a distant Arctic outpost, an area thought to be a land where one could gather gold with a spade, drop it into a bucket, become a millionaire over night, and come back to the play spots of the big cities—long before Alaska was anything more than that sort of an outpost, the policy of the United States with reference to its natural resources changed. The Government ceased to become a trustee holding a naked title for transmission to settlers, and became a managing property agent. That type of agency was impressed upon every acre of land in the Territory of Alaska, and rests upon it to this day. If Alaska is not developed at an accelerated rate, we can know why if we will only study the history of land ownership, acquisition, retention, and management by the United States of America.

Mr. President, Congress is responsible for that situation, Congress can change it, Congress can remedy it. The laws will be changed if the people of Alaska are given a voice in Congress, and their representatives can stand in the halls of Congress on an equality with the rest of us and insist on their rights. Then they can plead for the things we should have given them without their plea, and they can demand the things which the law gives them, but which administrative interpretation has withheld from them. Then they can picture their needs to the minds of the Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives—open minds, Mr. President, I undertake to say, without reference to any aisle down the middle of the floor—who desire to do the right thing, but do not know what the right thing is. If we have from Alaska voices to present those facts on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House, then the people of Alaska will have an opportunity to obtain the key which will unlock their economic future, and we shall see a growth such as has been seldom paralleled in all the history of the United States or of the Western World.

True, there are those who, fortunately, have had their being under the warm

southern sun and the palms of the tropics and the near-tropics, who will raise their voices against the rigors of the north, and deny that there are any strong souls who are willing to experience the rigors of the climate and build for themselves homes in the Far North. But we know there are such persons.

We know that other areas in the Far North have been built up, and that there will be many young men and women faring forth gladly to great adventure in the Alaskan area, when they know before they leave that they will have a chance to win.

Mr. President, I do not undertake to say that the bill now pending is a complete answer to the economic needs of a new State in Alaska. I do not know whether or not it is. Nobody else knows. But I undertake to say that that is wholly beside the point. If it is enough, then we do not need any more. If it is not enough, the Congress that grants statehood and grants aids to relieve economic necessity can add to them.

No argument can be made against statehood based upon any shortcomings in this bill. There is finality, true, in the granting of statehood, but there is no finality with respect to the aid which may be granted to a new State in order to assist it in overcoming its economic handicaps of the moment. Along that line, Mr. President, Congress may act again and again and again. Let us not question that statement.

There may be those who will say that all the other Territories got their grants when they became States, and that ended it, and that we should know what we are doing before we grant statehood to Alaska, so that we will not have to take further action. Mr. President, in order that the question or the allegation may be answered before it is raised, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have placed in the RECORD, lists of grants to States at the time of their admission to statehood, grants to States subsequent to their admission to statehood, and the relinquishment by States from time to time of what had been granted to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the lists were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. GRANTS TO STATES ON THEIR ADMISSION TO THE UNION

Alabama

Act of admission, March 2, 1819, (3 Stat. 491, sec. 6).

Grant to Alabama: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; all salt springs in the State; 36 sections for a seminary; 1,620 acres for the seat of government; and 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be reserved for construction of public roads and canals and improving the navigation of rivers by the State.

Arizona

Act of admission, June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 572–573).

Grant to Arizona: Sections 16, 36, 2, and 32 or their equivalent in each township for schools; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, September 28, 1850, and July 2, 1862, above: 200,000 acres for the university, 100,000 acres for public buildings, etc., 100,000 acres for insane asylums, 100,000 acres for penitentiaries, 100,000 acres for schools and asylums for the deaf, dumb and blind, 50,000 acres for hospitals for disabled miners, 200,000 acres for normal schools, 100,000 acres for charitable institutions, etc., 150,000 acres for agricultural and mechanical colleges, 150,000 acres for school of mines, 100,000 acres for military institutes and 1,000,000 acres for payment of certain railroad bonds; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

Arkansas

The act of admission of June 15, 1836 (5 Stat. 50–52, ch. 100) made no grant, but a supplementary act of June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 58–59, ch. 120) made the following grant:

Grant to Arkansas: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; up to 12 salt springs, etc.; 5 sections for public buildings, in addition to 10 sections granted to the territory under act of March 2, 1831 (4 Stat. 473, ch. 67); 72 sections (two entire townships) for a seminary (which had been granted to the territory under an earlier act); and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be reserved for making roads and canals by the State.

California

The act of admission, of September 9, 1850 (9 Stat. 452–453, ch. 50) made no grant.

Colorado

Act of admission, March 21, 1864 (13 Stat. 34, secs. 7–9).

Grant to Colorado: Sections 16 and 36 in every township or its equivalent, for schools; 20 sections for public buildings; 20 sections for a penitentiary or State prison; and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads, ditches, or canals, to effect a general system of irrigation of the agricultural land. [Superseded by an act of March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 475–476).]

Florida

The act of admission, March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 742–743, ch. 48) made no grant, but a supplemental act of the same date (5 Stat. 788, ch. 75) made the following grant:

Grant to Florida: 8 sections for the seat of government; section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; 2 townships, in addition to two already reserved, for two seminaries; 5 percent of the net proceeds of the sale of lands within the State thereafter sold by Congress, for educational purposes.

Idaho

Act of admission, July 3, 1890 (26 Stat. 215–217).

Grant to Idaho: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 50 sections for public buildings, 72 sections for a university, a penitentiary, 90,000 acres for an agricultural college, and in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850, above, and any grant of saline lands; 100,000 acres for a scientific school, 100,000 acres for normal schools, 50,000 acres for an insane asylum, 50,000 acres for a university at Moscow, 50,000 acres for a penitentiary, and 150,000 acres for other charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

Illinois

Act of admission, April 18, 1818 (3 Stat. 430, sec. 6).

Grant to Illinois: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; all salt springs in the State; 36 sections for a seminary; 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be reserved for appropriation by the State for encouragement of learning, of which one-sixth is to be used for a college or university.

Indiana

Act of admission, April 19, 1816 (3 Stat. 290, sec. 6).

Grant to Indiana: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; certain salt springs, etc.; one township for a seminary; four sections for the seat of government; 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be applied to construction of roads and canals by the State.

Iowa

The act of admission, March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 742–743, ch. 48), made no grant, but a supplemental act of the same date (5 Stat. 789–790, ch. 76) made the following grant:

Grant to Iowa: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university (reserved by an act of July 20, 1840); 5 sections for public buildings; up to 16 salt springs, etc.; 5 percent of the net proceeds of the sale of public lands within the State sold by Congress after its admission, for roads and canals.

Kansas

Act of admission, January 29, 1861 (12 Stat. 127, sec. 3).

Grant to Kansas: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 10 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of receipts from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads and internal improvements.

Kentucky

The act of admission, February 4, 1791 (1 Stat. 189, ch. 4) made no grant.

Louisiana

The act of admission, February 20, 1811 (2 Stat. 641–643), provided in section 5 that 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands after January 1, 1811, were to be applied to construction of roads and levees by the State.

Maine

The act of admission, March 3, 1820 (3 Stat. 544, ch. 19), made no grant.

Michigan

The act of admission, June 15, 1836 (5 Stat. 49, ch. 99), made no grant but a supplementary act of June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 59–60, ch. 121), made the following grant:

Grant to Michigan: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university (reserved under an act of May 20, 1826, 4 Stat. 180, ch. 90); 5 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State is to be appropriated for making roads and canals by the State.

Minnesota

Act of admission, February 26, 1857 (11 Stat. 167, sec. 5).

Grant to Minnesota: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 10 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads and internal improvements.

Mississippi

Act of March 1, 1817 (3 Stat. 349, ch. 23, sec. 5).

Three percent of receipts from sale of public lands in Mississippi is to be applied to construction of roads and canals by the State. No lands were granted.

Missouri

Act of admission, March 6, 1820 (3 Stat. 547, sec. 6).

Grant to Missouri: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; up to 12 salt springs, etc.; 4 sections for the seat of government; 36 sections and lands previously

reserved for a seminary (an act of February 17, 1818, 3 Stat. 407, sec. 3, had reserved 2 townships for a seminary); 3 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in Missouri is to be reserved for making roads and canals by the State.

Montana

Act of admission, February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 679–681).

Grant to Montana: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; lands for a penitentiary and 90,000 acres for agricultural colleges; 100,000 acres for a normal school, 50,000 additional acres for agricultural colleges, 50,000 acres for a reform school, 50,000 acres for a deaf and dumb asylum; and 150,000 acres additional for public buildings; in lieu of grants under the acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850; and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

Nebraska

Act of admission, April 19, 1864 (13 Stat. 49, secs. 7–11).

Grant to Nebraska: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 20 sections for public buildings; 50 sections for a penitentiary; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State are to be paid to the State for schools.

Nevada

Act of admission, March 21, 1864 (13 Stat. 32, secs. 7–9).

Grant to Nevada: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 20 sections for public buildings; 20 sections for a penitentiary; and 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State are to be paid to the State for roads, ditches, and canals to effect a general system of irrigation of agricultural land.

New Mexico

Act of admission, June 20, 1910 (36 Stat. 561–563).

Grant to New Mexico: Sections 16, 36, 2 and 32 or their equivalent in each township for schools; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, September 28, 1850, and July 2, 1862, above; 200,000 acres for the university, 100,000 acres for public buildings, etc., 100,000 acres for insane asylums, 100,000 acres for penitentiaries, 100,000 acres for schools and asylums for the deaf, dumb and blind, 50,000 acres for hospitals for disabled miners, 200,000 acres for normal schools, 100,000 acres for charitable institutions, etc., 150,000 acres for agricultural and mechanical colleges; 150,000 acres for school of mines, 100,000 acres for military institutes and 1,000,000 acres for payment of certain railroad bonds; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

North Dakota

Act of admission, February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 679–681).

Grant to North Dakota: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 72 sections for a university, lands for a penitentiary and 90,000 acres for agricultural colleges; 40,000 acres for a school of mines, 40,000 acres for a reform school, 40,000 acres for a deaf and dumb asylum, 40,000 acres for the agricultural college, 40,000 acres for the university, 80,000 acres for normal schools, 50,000 acres for public buildings and 170,000 acres for other educational and charitable purposes; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

Ohio

Act of admission, April 30, 1802 (2 Stat. 175, sec. 7).

Grant to Ohio: Section 16, or its equivalent in each township, for schools; certain salt springs.

Oklahoma

Act of admission, June 16, 1906 (34 Stat. 272–275).

Grant to Oklahoma: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; $5,000,000 in lieu of sections 16 and 36 in Indian territory; section 13 in all lands opened to settlement and lands selected in lieu thereof, one-third for the university and university prepartory school, one-third for normal schools and one-third for the agricultural and mechanical college and the colored agricultural normal university; section 33 and lands selected in lieu thereof previously reserved for charitable and penal institutions and public buildings; and in lieu of grants under the acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850, above; 250,000 acres for Oklahoma University, 150,000 acres for the university preparatory school, 250,000 acres for the agricultural and mechanical colleges, 100,000 acres for the Colored Agricultural and Normal University and 300,000 acres for normal schools; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

Oregon

Act of admission, February 14, 1859 (11 Stat. 383–384).

Grant to Oregon: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 10 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads and internal improvements.

South Dakota

Act of admission, February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 679–681).

Grants to South Dakota: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 72 sections for a university, lands for a penitentiary and 120,000 acres for agricultural colleges; 40,000 acres for a deaf and dumb asylum, 40,000 acres for a school of mines, 40,000 acres for a reform school, 40,000 acres for the agricultural college, 40,000 acres for the university, 80,000 acres for normal schools, 50,000 acres for public buildings and 170,000 acres for other educational and charitable purposes; and, in addition, land for an insane asylum; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850; and 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

Tennessee

The act of admission, June 1, 1796 (1 Stat. 491, ch. 47), made no grant.

Texas

The act of admission, March 1, 1845 (5 Stat. 797–798), and December 29, 1845 (9 Stat. 108), made no grant.

Utah

Act of admission, July 16, 1894 (28 Stat. 109–110).

Grant to Utah: Sections 2, 16, 32, and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 100 sections for public buildings, two townships and 110,000 acres for a university, 200,000 acres for an agricultural college, and in lieu of grants under the acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850, above; 500,000 acres for water reservoirs for irrigation, 100,000 acres for an insane asylum, 100,000 acres for a school of mines, 100,000 acres for a deaf and dumb asylum, 100,000 acres for a reform school, 100,000 acres for normal schools, 100,000 acres for an institution for the blind; 50,000 acres for a hospital for miners and a penitentiary; 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

Vermont

The act of admission, February 18, 1791 (1 Stat. 191), made no grant.

Washington

Act of admission, February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 679–681).

Grant to Washington: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 72 sections for a university, lands for a penitentiary and 90,000 acres for agricultural college; 100,000 acres for a scientific school, 100,000 acres for normal schools, 100,000 acres additional for public buildings, 200,000 acres for charitable, educational, penal and reformatory institutions; in lieu of grants under acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850; 5 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

West Virginia

The act of admission, December 31, 1862 (12 Stat. 633–634, ch. 6), made no grant.

Wisconsin

Act of admission, August 6, 1846 (9 Stat. 58).

Grant to Wisconsin: Section 16 or its equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university (reserved under an act of June 12, 1838, 5 Stat. 244, ch. 110), 10 sections for public buildings; up to 12 salt springs; and 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for roads and canals.

Wyoming

Act of admission, July 10, 1890 (26 Stat. 222–224).

Grant to Wyoming: Sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools, 50 sections for public buildings, 72 sections for a university, lands for a fish hatchery, a penitentiary, 90,000 acres for an agricultural college and in lieu of grants authorized by the acts of September 4, 1841, and September 28, 1850, above, and any grant of saline lands; 30,000 acres for an insane asylum, 30,000 acres for a penal, etc., institution in Carbon County, 30,000 acres for a penitentiary, 5,000 acres for a fish hatchery, 30,000 acres for a deaf, dumb, and blind asylum, 10,000 acres for a poor farm, 30,000 acres for a hospital for miners, 75,000 acres additional for public buildings, and 260,000 acres for charitable institutions; and 5 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands within the State is to be paid to the State for schools.

II. GRANTS TO STATES SUBSEQUENT TO THEIR ADMISSION TO THE UNION AND PRIOR TO 1900

General provisions of law making grants to all States or to States subsequently admitted into the Union:

May 20, 1826 (4 Stat. 179, ch. 83). The Secretary of the Treasury was to select school lands to be reserved in lieu of section 16 in each township where no such lands had been appropriated as authorized by laws granting section 16 to certain States.

June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 55, secs. 13, 14). Money in the Treasury on January 1, 1837, in excess of $5,000,000 was to be deposited with the State treasurers, who were to give certificates of deposit for safekeeping and repayment when required by the Secretary of the Treasury; payments were to be made in four instalments. An act of October 2, 1837, 5 Stat. 201, c. 1, postponed payment of the fourth instalment of these funds until January 1, 1839, but according to Edward G. Bourne's History of the Surplus Revenue of 1837, p. 41, there was no surplus on January 1, 1839, and so the fourth instalment was not paid.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453, secs. 2, 8–9). After deducting 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in certain States for certain expenses and 5 percent for new States, etc., the proceeds from the sale of

public lands is to be divided among the 26 States, the District of Columbia, and 3 Territories on the basis of population (secs. 1–2).

Five hundred thousand acres is to be granted to each new State for internal improvements (less any lands granted for internal improvements while a Territory), including roads, canals, bridges, etc. (secs. 8–9).

September 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519–520). Swamp and overflowed lands unfit for cultivation in each State where such lands are situated are granted to the States; proceeds from such lands are to be for reclamation of same.

March 2, 1855 (10 Stat. 634–635). States are to be indemnified for swamp lands erroneously sold.

March 3, 1855 (10 Stat. 719, ch. 21, sec 14.). Money collected from vessels on account of the death of passengers was to be paid by the collector of customs to State boards for care of sick or destitute immigrants. (Repealed by act of August 2, 1882, 22 Stat. 191 sec. 4.)

The Morrill Act of July 2, 1862 (12 Stat. 503–505). Grant to each State, of 30,000 acres of nonmineral lands for each Senator or Representative in Congress under the 1860 apportionment; the Secretary of the Interior was to issue land scrip for and deficiency in lands; the proceeds from the sale of such lands and scrip were to be invested Government bonds, etc., and are to constitute a perpetual fund the interest from which is to be used for endorsement, support and maintenance of at least one college for agriculture and the mechanic arts.

January 30, 1865 (13 Stat. 567, No. 10). Acts passed in 1864 granting lands to States, etc., to aid in the construction of roads, etc., are not construed as embracing mineral lands, which in all cases shall be reserved to the United States unless otherwise specifically provided in the act making the grant.

July 23, 1866 (14 Stat. 208, ch. 209). The grant under the Morrill Act of 1862, above, is extended to any new State which may be admitted to the Union.

March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 467–469). A trust fund of $250,000 was established to aid in education of the blind. The interest from this fund was to be paid to the American Printing House for the Blind, for manufacture, etc., of books to be distributed among all the public institutions for the education of the blind in the States, etc., upon requisition by the superintendents of such institutions, who are ex-officio trustees of the fund. (An act of June 25, 1906, 34 Stat. 460, ch. 3526, appropriated $10,000 annually for this purpose, instead of the interest from the fund. The amount has been increased many times since then.)

March 3, 1881 (21 Stat. 521, No. 26). The Secretary of the Treasury was to cause a complete set of weights and measures to be delivered to the governor of each State for the use of land grant colleges, the cost of each set not to exceed $200. (This function was later transferred to the Secretary of Commerce.)

Hatch Act of March 2, 1887 (24 Stat. 440–442). Agricultural experiment stations are established in land-grant colleges and $15,000 a year is authorized to be appropriated to each State for expenses of the stations. (This authorization has been increased and supplemented many times since then.)

August 27, 1888 (25 Stat. 450). The Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was to pay the States $100 a year for each disabled veteran in State homes. (These functions have been transferred to the Veterans' Administration and the amount of payments has been increased several times since then.)

March 2, 1889 (25 Stat. 975). The States are required to pay half the cost of maintenance of each disabled veteran for which payments are made under the act of 1888, above.

The Second Morrill Act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 417–419). Annual appropriations, increasing from $15,000 to $25,000 for each State, are authorized for payments to States for further endowment of agricultural and mechanical colleges established under the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, above. (These authorizations have been increased several times since then.)

The Carey Act of August 18, 1894 (28 Stat. 422, sec. 4). Grant of 1,000,000 acres of desert lands to each of the public-land States, to aid in the reclamation of such lands, provided the States have them irrigated, etc.

Acts of February 24, 1897 (29 Stat. 594, ch. 313, sec. 3) and May 5, 1900 (31 Stat. 169–170). Fines collected from persons setting fires to timber on public lands, etc., are to be paid into the public-school fund of the county in which the lands where the offense is committed are situated. (Now incorporated in 18 U. S. C. 3613.)

Alabama

May 3, 1822 (3 Stat. 675, ch. 46). The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in Alabama to the State for roads, canals, and improving the navigation of rivers, as provided in the act of admission of March 2, 1819.

May 23, 1828 (4 Stat. 290, ch. 75). Grant of 400,000 acres for purpose of improving the navigation of certain rivers.

July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 116, sec. 3). Five percent of the proceeds from sale of certain lands ceded by the Chickasaws is to be reserved for construction of public roads and canals and improving the navigation of rivers by the State.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9, 17). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State of Alabama and certain other States was to be paid to Alabama and the other States (sec. 1). (An act of August 30, 1842 (5 Stat. 567, sec. 30) suspended the 10-percent payments, etc.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose (secs. 8–9)).

Two percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in the State which had been reserved for construction by the United States of roads leading to the State under the act of March 2, 1819, above, was to be paid to the State for certain roads, etc. (sec. 17).

August 11, 1848 (9 Stat. 281, c. 152). Receipts from sale of public lands may be used for schools.

September 20, 1850 (9 Stat. 466–467), May 17, 1856 (11 Stat. 15–16), March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195–197). Grants of lands for construction of railroads.

April 23, 1884 (23 Stat. 12, ch. 27). Grant of 46,080 acres additional for the university.

Arizona

Act of admission was subsequent to 1900 (June 20, 1910).

Arkansas

See act of June 23, 1836, in part I, above.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Arkansas and certain other States was to be paid to Arkansas and the other States (sec. 1). (An act of August 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30, suspended the 10-percent payments.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

July 29, 1846 (9 Stat. 42, ch. 68). The use of the 72 sections granted under the act of June 23, 1836, in part I above, for the benefit of common schools is authorized, instead of for a seminary.

September 28, 1850 (9 Stat. 519–520). Grant of swamp and overflowed lands unfit for cultivation in Arkansas to the State; proceeds from the same are to be for reclamation of same.

February 9, 1853 (10 Stat. 155, ch. 59). Grant of rights-of-way and lands for a railroad.

California

March 3, 1853 (10 Stat. 246–248). Grant of sections 16 and 36 or their equivalent in each township for schools; 72 sections for a university; 10 sections for public buildings.

July 23, 1866 (14 Stat. 219, sec. 4). The Commissioner of the General Land Office is to certify over to California as swamp or overflowed lands all such lands upon approved township surveys and plats.

Colorado

March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. 475–476). Supersedes the act of admission of March 21, 1864, above. Grant of 50 sections for public buildings (instead of 20), 50 sections for a penitentiary (instead of 20), an additional 72 sections for a State university and up to 12 salt springs, etc.; the 5 percent of proceeds from sales of public lands within the State are to be used for internal improvements.

April 2, 1884 (23 Stat. 10, ch. 20). Colorado is permitted to select for school purposes other lands in lieu of lands in sections 16 and 32.

Florida

Act of March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 788, ch. 75). See part I, above.

May 17, 1856 (11 Stat. 15–16). Grant of lands for railroads.

Illinois

March 3, 1819 (3 Stat. 525, ch. 95). Grant of 4 sections for the seat of government.

December 12, 1820 (3 Stat. 610, ch. 2). The Secretary of the Treasury is to pay the 3 percent provided in the act of admission, above, to the State.

March 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 234, ch. 51). Grant of lands for a canal.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Illinois and certain other States was to be paid to Illinois and the other States (sec. 1). (The 10-percent payments were suspended by act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

September 20, 1850 (9 Stat. 466–467). Grant of lands for a railroad.

Indiana

April 11, 1818 (3 Stat. 424, ch. 49). The Secretary of the Treasury is directed to pay to Indiana the 3 percent of proceeds from the sale of public lands provided in the act of admission of April 19, 1816, above.

March 2, 1827 (4 Stat. 236, ch. 56). Grant of lands for a canal.

March 2, 1833 (4 Stat. 662, ch. 87). The State was authorized to use the lands granted under the act of 1827, above, to aid in construction of a railroad, instead of a canal.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Indiana and certain other States was to be paid to Indiana and the other States (sec. 1). (The 10 percent payments were suspended by act of August 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose (secs. 8–9).

May 9, 1848 (9 Stat. 219, ch. 36). Grant of additional lands for the canal.

Iowa

Act of March 3, 1845 (5 Stat. 789–790). See part I, above.

March 2, 1849 (9 Stat. 349, ch. 78). Iowa was authorized to use the receipts from sale of its 500,000 acres granted under the act of September 4, 1841, above, for schools (instead of internal improvements).

May 15, 1856 (11 Stat. 9, ch. 28). Grant for railroads.

Louisiana

March 3, 1827 (4 Stat. 244, ch. 97). The Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to locate two townships which had been reserved by acts of 1806 and 1811 for seminaries in Louisiana Territory and title to such lands are vested in the State for use of a seminary or seminaries.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Louisiana and certain other States was to be paid to Louisiana and the other States (sec. 1). (An act of August 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30, suspended the 10-percent payments.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

March 2, 1849 (9 Stat. 352, ch. 87). Grant of certain swamp lands.

June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 18–19). Grant of land for railroads.

Michigar

Act of June 23, 1836 (5 Stat. 59–60). See part I, above.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Michigan and certain other States was to be paid to Michigan and the other States (sec. 1). (An act of August 30, 1842, 5 Stat 567, sec. 30, suspended the 10-percent payments.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

August 26, 1852 (10 Stat. 35, ch. 92). Grant of land for rights-of-way and for a ship canal.

June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 21–22). Grant of land for railroads.

March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 797). Grant of land for a military wagon road.

June 20, 1864 (13 Stat. 140, ch. 137). Grant of land for wagon roads for military or postal purposes.

Minnesota

March 3, 1857 (11 Stat. 195–197). Grant of land for railroads.

March 12, 1860 (12 Stat. 3, ch. 5). The benefits of the act of September 28, 1850, above, are extended to Minnesota.

March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 208, ch. 79). Grant of lands for the university.

Mississippi

February 20, 1819 (3 Stat. 485, ch. 31). Grant of two sections of land for a seat of government and one township for a seminary.

May 3, 1822 (3 Stat. 674, ch. 46). The Secretary of the Treasury is to pay 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in Mississippi to the State for roads and canals.

March 14, 1826 (4 Stat. 149, ch. 15). Receipts from sales of public lands received under act of admission in 1817 may be used for improvement of navigable rivers and bays.

July 4, 1836 (5 Stat. 116, sec. 1). Five percent of the receipts from certain lands ceded by the Chickasaws are to be reserved for construction of roads, canals, etc.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State of Mississippi and certain other States was to be paid to Mississippi and those States (sec. 1). (The 10 percent payments were suspended by an act of August 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose (secs. 8–9).

September 20, 1850 (9 Stat. 466–467). Grant of land for a railroad.

August 11, 1856 (11 Stat. 30–32). Grant of land for railroads.

June 20, 1894 (28 Stat. 94, ch. 110). Grant of 23,040 acres for the university.

February 20, 1895 (28 Stat. 673, ch. 106). Grant of 46,080 acres for agricultural and mechanical colleges.

Missouri

May 3, 1822 (3 Stat. 674, ch. 46). The Secretary of the Treasury is to pay 3 percent of the proceeds from sale of public lands in Missouri to the State for roads and canals.

January 24, 1827 (4 Stat. 200, ch. 5). Provision for selection of lands for a seminary or seminaries and that title be vested in the State.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9, 16). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in Missouri and certain other States was to be paid to Missouri and those States (sec. 1). (The 10-percent payments were suspended by an act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.)

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose (secs. 8–9)). Two percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State which had been reserved for construction by the United States of roads leading to the State was to be paid to the State for certain roads, etc.

June 10, 1852 (10 Stat. 8–10). Grant of land for rights of way and railroads.

February 9, 1853 (10 Stat. 155, ch. 59). Grant of land for rights-of-way and a railroad.

March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 395, ch. 116). Confirmation of grant of certain lands to Missouri.

Nebraska

March 30, 1867 (15 Stat. 13, ch. 23). The benefits under the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, above, are extended to Nebraska.

Nevada

July 4, 1866 (14 Stat. 85, ch. 166, sec. 2). Grant of 72 sections for a university.

June 16, 1880 (21 Stat. 288, ch. 245). Grant of 2,000,000 acres for schools in lieu of sections 16 and 36 in each township.

Ohio

March 3, 1803 (2 Stat. 225–226). Grant of additional school lands and one township or 36 sections for an academy; 3 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in the State is to be paid to the State for roads.

March 3, 1827 (4 Stat. 242, ch. 93). Grant of certain lands to aid in making a road.

May 24, 1828 (4 Stat. 305, ch. 108). Grant of land for extending the Miami Canal.

June 19, 1834 (4 Stat. 679, ch. 56). Grant of additional lands for support of schools in the Connecticut Western Reserve.

September 4, 1841 (5 Stat. 453–458, secs. 1, 8–9). An additional 10 percent of the proceeds from the sale of public lands in Ohio and certain other States was to be paid to Ohio and those States (sec. 1). (The 10-percent payments were suspended by an act of Aug. 30, 1842, 5 Stat. 567, sec. 30.).

Grant of 500,000 acres for internal improvements (less any lands already granted for this purpose) (secs. 8–9).

Oregon

March 12, 1860 (12 Stat. 3, ch. 5). The benefits of the act of September 28, 1850, above, were extended to Oregon.

March 2, 1861 (12 Stat. 208, ch. 79). Grant of lands for the university. (An act of September 27, 1850, 9 Stat. 499, sec. 10, amended by an act of July 17, 1854, 10 Stat. 305, sec. 4, had granted two townships to the Territory of Oregon for a university.)

July 2, 1864 (13 Stat. 355, ch. 213), July 4, 1866 (14 Stat. 86), July 5, 1866 (14 Stat. 89), December 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 374), February 25, 1867 (14 Stat. 409), and March 3, 1869 (15 Stat. 340). Lands were granted to Oregon for military wagon roads.

February 9, 1871 (16 Stat. 595, No. 24). Oregon was authorized to use receipts from lands granted by act of September 4, 1841, above, for schools (instead of for internal improvements).

Tennessee

February 28, 1867 (14 Stat. 569, No. 31). The benefits of the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, above, are extended to Tennessee.

West Virginia

April 14, 1864 (13 Stat. 47, ch. 58, sec. 2). The benefits of the Morrill Act of July 2, 1862, above, are extended to West Virginia.

Wisconsin

August 8, 1846 (9 Stat. 83). Grant of lands for the purpose of improving the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers, etc.

March 3, 1847 (9 Stat. 179, sec. 3). The State is authorized to dispose of its 5 percent fund for roads and canals, granted in the act of admission of August 6, 1846, for purposes recommended by a certain State convention.

June 3, 1856 (11 Stat. 20–21) and April 25, 1862 (12 Stat. 618, No. 30). Grants of land for railroads.

March 3, 1863 (12 Stat. 797) and June 25, 1864 (13 Stat. 183, ch. 153). Grants of land for military wagon roads.

III. RELINQUISHMENT OF CLAIMS TO LANDS BY THE ORIGINAL THIRTEEN STATES

Previous to the establishment of the United States, the States laid claim to western territory. Cession of such lands to the Federal Government were made by New York on March 1, 1781, Virginia on March 1, 1784, Massachusetts on April 19, 1785, Connecticut on September 13, 1786, and South Carolina on August 9, 1787.[1]

Virginia consented to the formation of Kentucky (out of the District of Kentucky within Virginia) by act of December 18, 1789 (see act of February 4, 1791 (1 Stat. 189, ch. 4), admitting Kentucky into the Union).

North Carolina ceded her western territory to the United States and the United States accepted the cession by act of April 2, 1790 (1 Stat. 106–109, ch. 6). See act admitting Tennessee into the Union, June 1, 1796 (1 Stat. 491, c. 47).

New York by an act of March 6, 1790, consented to the formation of Vermont and Vermont was admitted by an act of February 18, 1791 (1 Stat. 191, ch. 7).

Connecticut ceded the Western Reserve to the United States in October 1797 and Congress authorized the President on April 28, 1800 (2 Stat. 56–57, ch. 38) to accept the cession.

Georgia had laid claim to western territory. Congress by an act of April 7, 1798 (1 Stat. 549–550, ch. 28) supplemented by an act of May 10, 1800 (2 Stat. 69–70, ch. 50) provides for a Commission to settle the limits of Georgia territory. An agreement was reached and was signed by Georgia on April 24, 1802, whereby Georgia ceded her western territories and received payment of $1,250,000 from the United States. (See 3 Stat. 118–119, ch. 39, sec. 5).

Massachusetts consented to the formation of the State of Maine (out of the district of Maine in Massachusetts) by act of June 19, 1819 (see act of Mar. 3, 1820 (3 Stat. 544, ch. 19), admitting Maine into the Union).

Texas agreed when admitted to the Union that new States, not more than 4, might be formed out of its territory, with its consent (see joint resolution of March 1, 1845 (5 Stat. 797–798, No. 8, consenting to the annexation of Texas).

Texas on November 25, 1850, ceded certain lands to the United States in return for payment of $10,000,000 by the United States, under act of September 9, 1850 (9 Stat. 4466–452, ch. 49).

---

[1] See Donaldson's, The Public Domain, published by the Government Printing Office in 1884, pages 65–88.

Virginia consented to the formation of West Virginia out of certain counties of Virginia by an act of May 13, 1862 (see act of Dec. 31, 1862, 12 Stat. 633–634, ch. 6, admitting West Virginia to the Union).

For a more detailed description of cession of lands to the United States, see Donaldson's the Public Domain cited above.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I believe these lists are complete, and are an adequate answer to any charge which might be made that we may later have to do something different for Alaska than is provided for in the pending bill. We have a wealth of precedent if we find it proper and equitable to act in accordance with it.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to compliment the newest Member of the United States Senate, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] upon his masterly presentation the other day of an argument in favor of Alaskan statehood. I hope that every Member of the United States Senate will read the statement by the Senator from Nebraska, and if he has read it, will reread it. In it there will be found, quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, every argument which has been made on this floor in opposition to statehood for Alaska, except one—all of them addressed to requests for statehood for other Territories, all of them answered adequately at the time on the floor, and answered finally by the record of the years.

There has been one proposition advanced up to this time which I do not find multiplied in all the old debates down through the years over admissions to statehood. That argument was made by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I listened to it most carefully and promptly started an investigation to determine its validity.

The junior Senator from Florida called attention to the language in the pending bill describing the Territory of Alaska and the people of Alaska with respect to identity of the area and the people to be admitted as a State. The junior Senator from Florida called attention to the fact that in an earlier bill there had been different language, which had included a description of a boundary line one marine league at sea. He called attention to the fact that there was no such added description in the pending bill. From that he drew the conclusion that, with the present description, if Alaska were admitted into the Union she would be forever cut off from any rights which might accrue to other States if tidelands bills were hereafter passed.

Mr. President, I am one of those who believe, first, that the Supreme Court erred in its tidelands decision; and second, and it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to correct the error. I believe that every maritime State has a right to whatever natural resources rest within its boundaries, and that those boundaries, in every instance in which international waters are concerned, extend at least one marine league to sea.

So it can readily be understood that I was troubled by the conclusion reached by the junior Senator from Florida. I confess that I had not given the matter as full consideration at the time the bill was before us as perhaps I should have done with respect to that particular question. I had gone into the situation with reference to Hawaii, and had reached the conclusion that if Hawaii were made a State its rights with reference to tidelands would be exactly the same as those of the martime States of the United States. I assumed that Alaska would be in the same situation. In any event, I was concerned when I heard the junior Senator from Florida suggest that perhaps we were short-changing Alaska with respect to tidelands.

A rather careful investigation reassured me; and, oddly enough, Mr. President, the reassurance came from the Senator's own State of Florida. The State of Florida was admitted to the Union as "that part of east and west Florida as annexed to the United States by reason of a treaty between the United States and Spain." I will not be held to the exact language, but that is the substance of it. That is the language which we used in connection with Alaska. The area came to the United States as the result of a treaty between the United States and Russia.

In other words, the junior Senator from Florida was evidencing great concern with respect to what he said might be a short-changing of Alaska in connection with her tidelands, the while he was claiming exactly all the rights for Florida which he suggested to the Senate of the United States we were taking away from Alaska.

Mr. President, a careful examination and analysis have convinced me that there will be no loss to Alaska as the result of that description. I base that conclusion upon the proposition that the State of Florida came into the Union under almost the identical language, and upon the fact that in the past, many of the decisions of the courts upon which rest the almost universal conviction and interpretation with respect to States' rights in the tidelands, arose from cases which had their inception in the tidewaters of the State of Florida. So we do not need to worry in that regard about Alaska.

There are those—and particularly on the Republican side of the aisle—who have been told, and have told me that they have been told, that Republicans in Alaska are not in favor of statehood as a general proposition, that there is a partisan aspect to the request for statehood for Alaska, and that we who believe in the principles of the Republican Party should therefore proceed with caution when American citizens of our own political faith in Alaska oppose statehood. That suggestion seemed to me to be somewhat sound. If statehood for Alaska had been made a political football, I wanted to know it. If members of the Republican Party in Alaska were, generally speaking, opposed to statehood, I not only wanted to know the fact, but I wanted to know why; so I set about determining the facts.

I hold in my hand a large collection of telegrams which came to me from American citizens in Alaska who are members of the Republican Party in Alaska. I received no telegrams from any Republican in Alaska in opposition to Alaskan statehood.

The senders of the telegrams favor statehood. Some of them are not full-fledged citizens, as, for example, the senders of the following telegram:

SKAGWAY, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We want statehood for Alaska or freedom. The reasons are we could vote, we could control our industries, and build up population.

22 GRADE-SCHOOL STUDENTS.

Mr. President, I have from Mr. L. H. Johnston, a telegram, which reads:

SKAGWAY, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

I'm a Republican general agent in the transportation business. Have lived in this Territory 40 years and urge Congress to grant statehood. We have shown ability to meet all tax obligations and will continue to do so. Our area and strategic position demand we have greater representation at Washington.

L. H. JOHNSTON.

Mr. President, I have another telegram. It also comes from Skagway, and reads:

SKAGWAY, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
GUY CORDON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

From the viewpoint of a banker it is my conviction that we must have statehood to bring about the sound development of Alaska. With less than 200 miles of highway in the first judicial district we must demand statehood in order to secure necessary inland transportation.

F. D. CALKINS,
Active Vice President National Bank of Alaska, President, Skagway Commercial Club.

From Kodiak, Alaska:

KODIAK, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Am lifelong Republican resident of Alaska. Fourteen years practiced as certified public accountant. Nine years before assuming presidency of bank of Kodiak. Urge statehood for Alaska believing it will bring great growth in Territory. Believe Territory has ample resources to support State government. Alaskan people are loyal American citizens and deserve political recognition.

MARSHALL CRUICHER.

I have a telegram from Nome, Alaska. It reads:

NOME, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge passage statehood bills now before Congress. I am Republican candidate, house, second division; past president, Alaska Native Brotherhood.

SAMUEL MOGG.

From Anchorage, Alaska:

ANCHORAGE ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I favor statehood with control of resources comparable to that given other Territories upon admission. I am Republican and banker by profession.

RODNEY JOHNSTON.

Mr. President, I interpolate for a moment to say that here are citizens of Alaska who take the position which the

senior Senator from Oregon has been taking on the floor. All they ask in Alaska is that Congress give them the opportunity to control their own natural resources, and they will do the rest, just as Mr. Rodney Johnston says in his telegram.

From Anchorage comes another telegram:

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Like many other Republicans I favor statehood under terms of present bill. It is my sincere belief that land and other provisions are adequate as proposed.

ROBERT B. ATWOOD.

Again I want the RECORD to show that I am reading telegrams from Republican citizens of Alaska, because of what I believe to be a studied effort to make my colleagues on this side of the aisle believe that the American citizens in Alaska who believe with us in the principles of the Republican Party are opposed to statehood. I made inquiry to determine whether they were opposed to statehood, and the telegrams I am reading gave me the answer.

This telegram comes from Kodiak:

KODIAK, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

As an Alaskan Republican, an attorney by profession, it is my definite conviction that all true Alaskan Republicans are wholeheartedly in favor of statehood for Alaska. We strongly support the statehood issue as the basis and the foundation of a healthy Alaska.

PAUL A. DUPLER.

Another telegram from Kodiak:

KODIAK, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Senator GUY CORDON,
Care of United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

The sender has 23 years residence covering most of Alaska and all of its industries. I endorse statehood; am a Republican. Earn my living as a merchant. Statehood would give us some self-government.

EMIL KNUDSEN.

From Anchorage, Alaska, comes a telegram:

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Present bill appears suitable for Alaska statehood and I favor it. Am Republican and hotel owner and past president Alaska Hotel Association.

WILBUR WESTER.

Another telegram from Anchorage:

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY CORDON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I favor statehood as proposed in present bill. Am a Republican and a gold-mine owner.

HAROLD STRANDBERG.

I am glad to learn that there is one gold-mine owner who is a Republican.

From Skagway, comes this telegram:

SKAGWAY, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

It is my personal hope that the United States Senate give Alaska every consideration for statehood. Alaska is the child not the bastard of United States of America and taxation without representation is tyranny. Alaska fisheries cannot continue to produce adequate amount of sea food under present regime. Local control with personal knowledge re people terrain conditions and without influence of outside interests with purpose of exploitation are necessary to fulfill over-all and year-out capacity.

KENT L. FULLER, *Broker.*

I take it he is a fish broker.

From Fairbanks comes this telegram:

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Senator GUY CORDON,
Washington, D. C.:

I firmly believe majority rank and file Republicans of Alaska are in favor of statehood for Alaska; this includes Republicans who have filed for legislative offices this month, in fact have contacted hardly anyone who definitely states he is against statehood. I sincerely hope the statehood bill will pass the Senate.

ANDREW NERLAND,
Former Senator, Alaska Legislature.

That is the sort of telegram that should mean something to the Members of the United States Senate. Here is a man who has taken the time to go among his neighbors and inquire about the subject and to send to the Senate the result of his inquiry. It may be even that he had talked with some Democrats.

From Juneau, Alaska:

Please be advised that the Republican Party in Alaska at its last convention—

I do not see many Republicans on the floor of the Senate, but I am addressing myself now particularly to those who are on the floor. The telegram reads:

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY C. CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please be advised that the Republican Party in Alaska at its last convention held at Sitka made the following statement of its principles and convictions by including in its platform: "We advocate immediate statehood for Alaska." The position taken by that convention was affirmed by the National Republican Convention and on every occasion has been reaffirmed by Republican organizations both within and without Alaska.

HENRY A. BENSON,
Secretary, Republican Central Committee for Alaska.

Probably I have driven home this point, but I shall put in about three more spikes. Another telegram, coming from Juneau, Alaska, reads as follows:

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY CORDON,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

As a lifelong Republican and one long active in party politics, I urge your support of statehood for Alaska. We cannot hope to develop to our full capacity under the crippling restrictions of territoriality. We need full voting representation in Congress and all the rights of first-class citizens at home. I have been a practicing attorney in Alaska for the past 18 years and am presently a candidate for the senate on the Republican ticket. Have lived in Alaska for more than 30 years, and am intimately acquainted with people all over the Territory. I voice their sentiments as well as my own when I say Alaska is ready for statehood, Alaska can support statehood, and Alaska needs statehood. There is no party line on the statehood movement. Its supporters come from both political parties in about the same number, and its foes likewise. And its friends greatly outnumber its foes in both parties.

MILDRED R. HERMANN.

Another telegram coming from Juneau, Alaska, reads as follows:

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I am for Alaska statehood. I am a lifelong Republican. Have been in grocery business in Juneau for 30 years, have served during three sessions of the legislature as a member of the house and the senate, and am now Republican candidate for auditor. I am for statehood because I believe it is necessary if we are to develop our natural resources and build an effective government up here. We need voting representation in Congress, and we need all the privileges of first-class citizenship. All these benefits and many others will come to us with statehood.

Senator ANITA GARNICK.

I have just two more spikes to submit, Mr. President. The next telegram comes from Skagway, Alaska:

SKAGWAY, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

I'm a Republican born in Alaska, manager of a motion-picture theater, World War II veteran who fought with the Third Infantry Division in Italy. I want statehood for many reasons. One time this Territory was too young, too large, and far away. Today this changing world makes us much older, not large enough, and so close to Washington we know what you're doing right after you do it. The true economy of our Territory is at a stalemate and will remain that way until statehood is granted and I feel previous Members of Congress and those who are today fighting against statehood have no right to deny Alaskans their much-earned privilege of being a State of the Union.

WM. E. FEERO,
Mayor of Skagway.

Also from Skagway comes the following telegram:

SKAGWAY, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Alaska, becoming a State, will help those people get more out of their industries instead of the Northwestern States making all the profits.

PETER VAN ZANTEN,
Musician.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, immediately following the telegrams which I have read to the Senate a letter under date of February 19 of this year, addressed to me by Mr. Lee C. Bettinger, who is, I believe, Mayor of Kodiak, Alaska, and, incidentally, is a member of the Republican Party, and a man who has been very much interested in Alaskan statehood. In his letter he outlines more clearly than could I the situation as it has existed politically in Alaska and the feeling of Alaskans toward favorable action on the statehood bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY C. CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CORDON: As a lifelong Republican, I have been vexed to discover

while talking with members of my party in the Senate recently that some of them have gained the impression statehood for Alaska is opposed by Republicans in Alaska. Nothing could be further from the truth. No statement could be more damaging—if Republican Senators believed it and acted upon it—to the fortunes of the Republican Party in Alaska.

The fact is that statehood is supported and desired by an overwhelming majority of the Republican citizens of Alaska. I want to cite in this letter numerous incontrovertible evidences of that fact. First, I want to identify myself. I am a Republican. I live at Kodiak, Alaska, and I have been mayor of that city for six successive terms.

As some evidence of the attitude toward statehood of the citizens of Kodiak, who have so many times shown their confidence in a Republican candidate for their principal local office, let me state that in the official referendum election in October of 1946 on that subject, the vote in Kodiak was in favor of statehood by a margin of better than 3 to 1.

On a Territory-wide basis, let me mention that the voters of Alaska who in October of 1946 returned a favorable majority of 3 to 1 in the statehood referendum, in that very same election, from the same polling booths on the same day, elected 13 Republican members to the house of representatives of the Territorial legislature as against only 11 Democrats, and elected 6 Republican members to the Territorial senate as against only 2 Democrats. There could be no clearer evidence that the Republican electorate in Alaska strongly favors statehood.

Those who maintain the opposite, and they must have been very busy in Washington to judge from the impression which I find altogether too widespread among the Republican Members of Congress, are not representative of the Republican rank-and-file in Alaska.

As far as the official position of the party organization in Alaska is concerned, I would like to quote a plank from the platform of the Republican Party in Alaska, adopted at the last Territorial Republican convention in 1948. That plank, the official and latest statement of the Republicans of Alaska on the subject, said: "We advocate immediate statehood for Alaska." There were no ifs, ands, or buts connected with that straightforward endorsement.

There are even more recent evidences of what representatives of the Republican Party in Alaska think of statehood. At the session of our Territorial legislature in 1949, a memorial was adopted urging Congress to grant statehood to Alaska without further delay. The vote on that among the Republican members of the legislature was 5 to 3 in favor in the senate and unanimously in favor in the house.

In that same session of the Territorial legislature, a bill was passed creating an official Alaska Statehood Committee which was empowered to do everything possible to obtain passage of statehood enabling legislation from Congress and otherwise to prepare for statehood for Alaska. Republican members in the Territorial senate voted 7 to 1 in favor of that bill. Republican members in the house voted 4 to 1 in its favor. The committee is composed of six Democrats and five Republicans of which I am one.

Statehood is strongly favored, as these evidences show, at least by the kind of Republicans who are elected to office in Alaska.

For the Republican Members of the United States Senate to give credence to the anti-statehood talk of the little minority of Alaska Republicans who oppose statehood is, in the face of all this evidence, fantastic. If Republicans in Congress vote to defeat or sidetrack or delay the Alaska statehood bill, they will be doing the worst kind of disservice to Republicans in Alaska. They will be insuring that the Republican Party in Alaska will lose all the headway it has gained in recent years.

Alaska is not traditionally Democratic. It is traditionally exactly what the Nation is. A remarkable identity exists, in fact, between political trends nationally and political trends territorially. In every election since 1916, the political party successful in Alaska in electing a Delegate to Congress has been successful that same year in the Nation in electing a President of the United States.

As Alaska goes, so goes the Nation. This is a statement of truth. It can be a statement of good omen for the Republican Party in the Territory and nationally this year. But it will certainly be a statement of despair for Republicans everywhere if the Republican Members of the United States Senate demonstrate extreme isolationism by voting down statehood for Alaska, for then Republican fortunes in Alaska—now so bright and promising—will certainly wane.

Let me mention that the Republican standard-bearer in Alaska, Robert C. Reeve, who is campaigning for election as Delegate to Congress, is for statehood. I quote from a report in the Anchorage Daily Times, a Republican newspaper, on the speech in which Mr. Reeve announced his candidacy: "In outlining his program," the story said, "Reeve declared that 'statehood as soon as possible' is the first need of Alaska." On the same day the Anchorage Daily News, another Republican newspaper, said of Mr. Reeve: "The candidate made himself very clear on the issue of statehood. He said he was one of statehood's 'most enthusiastic supporters.'" Will Republicans in Congress now repudiate their candidate in Alaska, in the face of party endorsement of statehood in both Territorial and National platforms? I sincerely hope not.

Anything you can do to enlighten the Republican Members of the Senate on this issue, and thus avert the political disaster which would ensue in Alaska if Republicans in Washington vote to defeat, delay, or recommit the Alaska statehood bill, will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

LEE C. BETTINGER.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I have listened with a great deal of interest to the catalogue of leading Republican citizens of the Territory of Alaska who are in favor of statehood for Alaska. It is emphasis for the oft-repeated assertion of those of us who have supported statehood for Alaska that this is a matter which is above partisanship.

Likewise, Mr. President, the fact that the Senator from Oregon, like the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who now is on the floor, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], has taken his place on the floor in support of statehood for Alaska is most encouraging evidence of the fact that this is a basic issue which is far greater than any mere factionalism or partisan division.

For a long time I have been observing political events in the United States. I do not believe there ever was a period in my experience when among the leaders of the respective parties there was greater confusion as to what their particular parties stand for. I think there has been no time within my experience when there was a larger independent vote in the United States than there is now. I venture the prediction that no man can judge what will happen to be the political flavor of the Senators and Representatives who are elected from the proposed two new States.

On this floor there has been a false notion, I believe, that Alaska would certainly and without fail elect Democratic Members to the House and to the Senate, and that in Hawaii the voters would certainly and without fail elect Republican Members. There is no possibility of making any such prediction at all; the result may be completely the reverse. Hawaii might send Democratic Senators and Representatives, and Alaska might send Republicans, because the issues upon which party votes will be cast in November, 1952, are very different from anything we are discussing here at this time.

I feel that the Senator from Oregon has made a most important contribution to an understanding of the basic facts pertaining to the statehood issue, by submitting to the Senate this long list of declarations in support of statehood by prominent Republicans of the Territory of Alaska. I very much appreciate what the Senator from Oregon has done, and I desire to compliment him upon the manner in which he has presented this issue.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement which has been made by my friend, the senior Senator from Wyoming, and particularly his kind reference to me. However, Mr. President, most particularly do I appreciate the meat and the logic inherent in what the Senator from Wyoming has said. I only wish that all of the other 95 Members of the Senate could have sat here in the Chamber and heard the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, on a question of this kind it is silly for any person to base his action upon any supposition as to what will be at some time in the future the majority vote in any given Territory. For one, Mr. President, I wish to say that if I could be granted the gift of prophesy at this moment, and if I knew beyond peradventure of a doubt that every one of the four Senators to be elected from the two new States would bear the Democratic label, I would be standing where I am standing now, asking for statehood for those two Territories. If the party of which I am a Member cannot take to the people there the kind of basic political principles which the people of the Territories believe are for their own good, then the party does not deserve to prevail. It is childish for anyone to think in any other terms, Mr. President.

I am afraid we have lost sight of the basic principle involved in the application of the men and women of Alaska and the men and women of Hawaii for statehood. They seek what our forebears fought for. They seek what our young men through the years have died to preserve. At this time they seek nothing more than what all our protestations of faith and of loyalty are predicated upon, namely, individual liberty

and the individual right of determination in the field of government. That is all they ask; and how, Mr. President, can we, who enjoy those rights and privileges, we who believe in them—yea, we who have fought for them—deny them to the people of Alaska and Hawaii? In the last analysis, Mr. President, that is the very heart and blood and bone of what we here seek to do, namely, to grant to American citizens, not to non-American citizens, but to American citizens, the full right—and again I say "right"—of citizenship.

I hope, Mr. President, the Senate will make its decision on the basis of principle and not on the basis of evasive expediency brought about by a parliamentary gadget.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, I want to join with the Senator from Wyoming in commending the able senior Senator from Oregon upon the presentation which he has made today. I also am sorry that more Members on both sides of the aisle could not have heard him. It so happens that the able Senator from Oregon represents in part one of the Pacific Coast States. I represent in part one of the others, and quite recently the Senators from Washington were in the Chamber, Senators who represent the third State which borders the Pacific Ocean.

My State of California was admitted into the Union in 1850; the State of the able Senator from Oregon came into the Union 9 years later, I believe, in 1859, and the State of Washington in 1889. Our three States together are the closest neighbors to the Territory of Hawaii and the Territory of Alaska; and I think the people of our three States are overwhelmingly in favor of admitting into the Union as new States these two great Territories. As a matter of fact, these two great Territories are much closer in time and in means of communication than was any one of our three States at the time of its admission into the Union.

When the vote comes tomorrow, I hope the Members of the Senate of the United States will have the foresight to stand up and be counted in favor of statehood. I hope they will exhibit the same quality of statesmanship which was evidenced by those who sat in the Senate of the United States in 1850, 1859, and 1889, in the chamber later occupied by the Supreme Court of the United States. I hope the Senate will have a vision of the future of America, and will admit these two great Territories, which I feel are destined to add greatly to the growth and to the wealth of our common country.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the statement of my friend, the senior Senator from California. Again, we have what seems to me to be unanswerable logic in favor of the position we take.

Mr. President, I want at this time to compliment the Senator from Mississippi, who made a major address a few days ago in opposition to statehood for Alaska. I was able to be on the floor during the major portion of his address. I differ with him; and of course we have both known that for some time. I appreciated the sense of absolute fairness with which the Senator approached his subject. I appreciate the fact that he so clearly recognized that there were other Members of the Senate who differed with him, and who as honestly differed with him as he differed with them. I appreciate the fact that at no time did he intentionally draw from any statement of fact a conclusion which he himself did not feel to be clearly warranted. I think that, from his standpoint, he made a marvelous presentation of the subject, and I am not at all certain that, if I had not already been convinced on the other side, he would not have convinced me. But, Mr. President, as I followed the Senator from Mississippi I felt that it would be proper for the RECORD to show wherein the Senator was in error in his conclusion. So far as I know, he was never in error in his facts.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to say to the Senator from Oregon and to the other Members of the Senate that his very generous, indeed, his overgenerous words about me are very highly appreciated. I appreciate them particularly because I am familiar with the fine work which the Senator from Oregon has done in the two committees and on the floor. I have observed his work especially in the Appropriations Committee. Few realize how much work he does in committee and in the Senate.

Mr. President, this is not a mutual admiration society, I can assure the Senator from Oregon, and I am not trying to return compliments, but I used him as an illustration in speeches I made in Mississippi last fall. He is one of the effective, hard-working, and industrious Members of the Senate. He works all the time. In many parts of the Nation he is certainly not what we call a "headline Senator," but with me he is a headline Senator, doing the work connected with the people's business. I appreciate him greatly.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

Mr. STENNIS. I have enjoyed his fine presentation today, most of which I was privileged to hear. I found it necessary to leave the Chamber once to answer a personal telephone call. I appreciate his contribution and his very fine work.

Mr. CORDON. I thank my friend.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Oregon will yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to my friend from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask this indulgence, Mr. President, because I desire to say that the Senator from Mississippi stated to me this morning in a private conversation what he has now stated publicly, in respect to the qualifications of the Senator from Oregon. I know from remarks made by the Senator from Oregon, also in private conversation, that he entertains the sentiments toward the Senator from Mississippi which he has expressed. But I want to advise the Senator from Mississippi that I have a little information about the Senator from Oregon which he does not have. That information, Mr. President, is, that the Senator from Oregon is a native of the South. [Laughter.]

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate that statement very much, Mr. President.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I was saying that I felt that the conclusions of the Senator from Mississippi in some instances were in error, and I felt that there should be a traversing of those conclusions in the RECORD. I am not going to take the time of the Senate to follow through, paragraph by paragraph, the statements of the Senator from Mississippi or the statements of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], but I have had reduced to writing what I believe are fair, completely accurate, and wholly adequate answers to the propositions which were predicated in the nature of conclusions upon factual data which were presented in every instance as a condition precedent to the conclusions reached.

I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks there be included in the RECORD this over-all general answer to the arguments of the two Senators to whom I have referred, so that the entire picture may be in the RECORD for those who care to read it.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Answering Senator STENNIS, who said:

" 'Outsiders' who are residents of disconnected areas should not have a part in determining our own military policy or the far-reaching question of taxation."

Precisely because they are American citizens who live on what have become the military frontiers of the Nation, the residents of Alaska and Hawaii should be welcomed into the councils of the Congress on military policy. They should have an influence on that policy not for their own welfare primarily, but because they are in a better position than any other people to assist the Congress with respect to the defense of their own area for the Nation's welfare.

The residents of Alaska and Hawaii are subject to all the tax laws of the United States. Of course, under our democratic system, they should have a part in determining those policies. Taxation without representation was an issue which because it was ignored by Great Britain, led to the founding of this Nation.

The United States cannot in good faith now seek to keep permanently in a dependent status Americans who have asserted their desire to participate on an equal basis, and who have shown they are qualified to do so.

Answering Senator STENNIS, who said:

"It would be a mistake to give political power to people disconnected from our area because between Alaska and the States there is no commingling or passing back and forth; there is not the same extent of interchange of thought and ideas as there is between the people of the various States."

The exact opposite is true. There is more commingling of Alaskans with the people of the States, and of people from the States with Alaskans, than occurs even within the United States proper between citizens of the various States.

Alaskans are great travelers. There is hardly an Alaskan who does not as a matter of course make a trip out to the States at least once every 2 or 3 years, and many habitually travel to the States every year. This is partly because of the high average income of Alaskans which permits them to afford travel and partly because, owing to the newness of settlement, nearly everyone in Alaska is still from somewhere and enjoys a visit to the friends and relatives he left behind.

Similarly, an increasing number of people from the States are visiting Alaska each year. In 1951 more than 75,000 visitors from the States traveled to the Territory as tourists between the months of May and September. The total travel between the States and Alaska annually amounts to more than 100,000 passengers. In other words, nearly as many people pass through Alaska each year as reside there.

Alaska now enjoys not only the traditional steamship connection with the west coast ports, but also receives frequent and regular airplane service and is connected overland by the Alaska Highway. Planes from Seattle fly daily to Ketchikan, Juneau, Anchorage, and Fairbanks. There is also regular air service to Alaska from Minneapolis-St. Paul and from Portland, Oreg. More than eight regular passenger flights daily are made between the States and Alaska by four-engine airline planes.

The Alaska Highway, which is open and traveled throughout the year, connects Alaska overland with Montana, Idaho, and Washington. In 1950 for the first time in history more people traveled to Alaska in their own automobiles than went by steamship. That year the total number of vehicles entering Alaska was 9,733, carrying 22,507 passengers. Some 7,174 vehicles, carrying 16,623 passengers, passed back out again. Note the balance of nearly 6,000 people who stayed in Alaska and presumabaly became new residents of that fastest-growing area under the American flag.

Alaska receives network radio programs, which are broadcast by 12 commercial radio stations, making audiences in Alaska simultaneous listeners with audiences in the States to news and other programs.

The Territory has 20 newspapers. Seven of these are dailies which receive their news by teletype from the Associated Press and United Press at the same time the news is ticking into the offices of newspapers all over the United States.

The same magazines, periodicals, and motion pictures are distributed in Alaska as in the States. Time and Newsweek magazines are carried to the Territory by air each week under special arrangements so they can be distributed on exactly the same day there as in the States.

Alaskans are great readers. Every town of any size has a well-patronized public library. The educational attainment of the average Alaskan is high, far above the national average. This produces there a lively interest in current events of the Nation and world.

In summary, Alaska is not an isolated section whose interests differ from those of all the States. The Nation would gain, not lose, by taking Alaskans into their political counsels as equal participants.

Answering Senator STENNIS, who said:

"Only three-tenths of 1 percent of Alaska is in private ownership."

That this should be so after 85 years under the American flag in dependent status is proof that Alaska is never going to be developed under territorialism.

The statehood bill will improve the situation in two ways: First, by making an outright grant to the new State of nearly 23,000,000 acres, which will by that much reduce Federal ownership; second, by spurring economic development and settlement, so that additional areas will pass from the public domain into private ownership through operation of the appropriate land laws.

Answering Senator STENNIS, who said:

"Agriculture in Alaska is not expanding, but declining. There are fewer farms there now than in 1940 and less acreage in cultivation."

And Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"Alaska today is not a burgeoning, growing, or expanding Territory. * * * The number of farms has been reduced."

This is an erroneous conclusion drawn from census figures which in 1940 included under the category of "farms" a large number of fur farms embracing more than 1,000,000 acres of unimproved land. Actually the number of bona fide farms increased 12.4 percent between 1940 and 1950. Similarly, acreage in cultivation increased 30.8 percent in that decade. The value of crops sold from farms in Alaska increased between 1940 and 1950 by 480 percent. This is certainly evidence that agriculture, like every other form of productive activity, is on the upgrade in Alaska.

Of course, agriculture is but little developed in Alaska compared with the potentialities there. Land considered suitable for farming exists to permit agriculture in Alaska to be increased a hundred-fold.

Answering Senator STENNIS, who said:

"The referendum in Alaska on statehood 'was held more than 2 years ago' and I am informed 'that the bill would not receive as many votes today as it did 2 years ago'."

The referendum was held not 2 years ago, but in 1946. Alaskans have repeatedly since that time shown that the sentiment for statehood is growing, not declining.

In 1947, the elected Representatives and Senators of the people of Alaska in the Territorial Legislature adopted a memorial to Congress urging statehood. The vote in the legislature favorable to statehood was 15 to 9 in the House and 10 to 5 in the Senate, or by a margin of nearly 2 to 1.

In 1948, both political parties in Alaska in their territorial conventions adopted planks urging statehood. The official Republican platform most recently adopted says: "We advocate immediate statehood for Alaska." The Democratic platform most recently adopted says: "We urge passage of legislation by Congress enabling Alaska to become a state."

In 1949, the Territorial Legislature, made up entirely of members who are elected directly by the people of Alaska, again adopted a memorial calling upon Congress to grant statehood. The vote on that occasion was 23 to 9 in the House and 13 to 3 in the Senate, or by a margin over all of 12 to 1.

How, in the face of such evidence, can anyone contend that the sentiment for statehood in Alaska is not so strong now as it was at the time of the referendum? The evidence is that statehood sentiment has continued to grow until it is now overwhelming. In fact, the memorial adopted by the Alaska Legislature in 1949 said that very thing. That official memorial to the Congress said: "The people of Alaska now are virtually unanimous in their desire that Alaska shall speedily become a State."

Answering Senator STENNIS, who said:

"The elective governor bill, proposed by Senator BUTLER, would give Alaskans the right to elect their own governor and their own judges and every measure of political power and sovereignty, except membership in the Union."

The Senator from Mississippi must not have studied very carefully either of the two measures sponsored by Senator BUTLER pertaining to an elective governor. (S. 50 an amendment to the Statehood bill now under consideration in the form of a substitute and S. 105, "to provide that the Governor of the Territory of Alaska shall be elected by the people of that Territory, and for other purposes.")

Where in either of the bills is there any provision for Alaskans to elect their own judges?

Where in either of the bills mentioned is there any grant of land to Alaska, as is provided in the Statehood bill?

Where in either of the bills is there any provision for Alaskans to regulate their fisheries?

Where in either of the bills is there a provision that Alaska shall receive half the net proceeds from the Pribilof seal fisheries?

Neither the elective governor bill nor the substitute S. 50 are legitimate substitutes for statehood or significant steps toward that goal.

The elective governor bill, S. 105, provides only for the election by the people of the Territory of their governor. The Secretary of Alaska would be appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the Senate of Alaska.

The substitute measure (S. 50) provides for the election by the people of the governor, the secretary and the auditor of Alaska. Now, of course, Alaskans elect their auditor.

Answering Senator STENNIS, who (in urging the elective governor bill) said:

"Let us give them this training in government and see how far they can go in developing a stable government and financing it on their own economy."

The Senator mentioned that Alaskans already elect members of their territorial legislature. Apparently he is unaware of the fact that the people there also elect their other principal officials with the exception of the governor. They elect a territorial auditor, a treasurer, an attorney general, a labor commissioner and a highway engineer. They also elect, of course, a Delegate to Congress from Alaska. All these elections are carried out in the same manner as elections in the States, with primaries and general elections.

All of the municipalities in Alaska, of which there are 25 incorporated, elect their own mayors and city council members. School boards and public utility district commissioners are also elected. Alaskans already have had substantial training in government.

Alaskans also finance all of this territorial, municipal, and local government out of their own resources, with the exception of about $7,000,000 a year which is spent by the Federal Government to pay for the legislative sessions, the governor's office, the Federal court system, care of the insane and administration of the fisheries. All of these will become State responsibilities under statehood. One result of that will be a saving of $7,000,000 annually in Federal appropriations, a particularly happy reduction in Federal expenditures, as someone has pointed out, because it will entail no reduction in services and the very people who will have to pay the bill, the Alaskans, have been clamoring to assume the burden under Statehood.

Answering Senator STENNIS, who said:

"Alaska claims to have no public debt, yet the law provides that half of the cost of a current $70,000,000 public works program undertaken by the Federal Government there may be recovered from the Territory. Does anyone believe that half of those expenditures will be recovered by the Federal Government? Of course not."

Senator STENNIS to the contrary notwithstanding, administrators of the Alaska public works program referred to have insisted that 50 percent of the cost of each project be repaid from local sources in Alaska to the Treasury. The local government unit there sponsoring the project, whether it be a school district, a municipality, or the Territory itself, must make a showing in advance of exactly how it will repay its share of the cost.

So far as projects sponsored by the Territorial government are concerned, the administrators of the program have required, because of the provision of law prohibiting the Territory from incurring a debt or pledging

its credit, that the money for the Territory's 50 percent actually be appropriated by the legislature and in hand before the project is commenced.

Answering Senator STENNIS, who said:

"There are no reports from the treasury as to the condition of the economy under the present local government."

The Territorial treasurer of Alaska, Henry Roden, has submitted a statement of the general condition of the treasury as of January 31, 1952, just a few weeks ago. This statement shows a net cash balance of $5,787,202.07, of which $4,104,544.87 is in special funds earmarked for specific purposes, though they are all Territorial government purposes. The balance of cash in the general fund, even after allowing for all the earmarked funds, was $1,682,657.20.

It should be mentioned that there has been deducted from the actual bank balance of the Territory in making this compilation all sums collected under two tax acts which have been attacked in the courts. This is granting to the prophets of financial despair all possible comfort, probably a good deal more than they are entitled to, for one of these acts, the Territorial property tax, was just last week upheld on every point by the Federal district court, while the other, a tax on nonresident fishermen, was recently sent back by the Supreme Court for rehearing after it had been held invalid by a two-to-one decision of the circuit court of appeals. Many millions of dollars of revenue will become available to the Territory treasury as a result of the upholding of the property tax act.

When we take this statement of financial condition, and consider along with it the fact that Alaska has no debt, it is easy to see the Territory is in excellent shape and has demonstrated financial responsibility to undertake statehood.

The statement of the Territorial treasurer is submitted in full for incorporation in the record at this point:

General condition of the treasury

Bank balance as of Jan. 31, 1952	$6,680,429.91
Less outstanding warrants	893,227.84
Net cash balance	5,787,202.07
Less special funds and funds incorporated in the general fund which are not available for the general operation of the Territory:	
Public school permanent fund	2,915.27
University of Alaska, permanent	408.67
Smith-Lever	57,571.45
Engineers' and architects'	13,701.93
Museum bequest and donation	1,261.59
Radio telephone	4,974.49
Teachers' retirement	17,984.70
Vocational education (Federal)	7,023.49
School-lunch program (Federal)	55.28
Forest reserve (Federal)	36,509.62
Aleutian Island moneys (Federal)	1,302.85
Old-age assistance:	
Grants (Federal)	99,462.54
Administration (Federal)	24,094.16
Child welfare service (Federal)	13,635.17
Allowances to mothers:	
Grants (Federal)	74,598.46
Administration (Federal)	11,153.62
Employment security commission (Federal)	41,244.32
General health (Federal)	36,691.52
Maternal and child health (Federal)	20,067.43
Crippled children (Federal)	34,866.29
Venereal-disease control (Federal)	7,109.23
Control of tuberculosis (Federal)	17,620.69
Hospital survey (Federal)	528.58
Alaska grants (Federal)	243,706.24
Heart-disease control (Federal)	1,808.73
Water pollution (Federal)	7,453.64
Military base schools (Federal)	154,261.63
Polio epidemic (special)	4,582.48
Veterans' Administration, revolving (special)	177,836.40
Veterans' housing, revolving (special)	18,945.99
Alaska merit system (special)	551.91
Territorial building fund (special)	543.63
Vision-conservation program (special)	305.53
Alaska Crippled Children's Association (special)	17,824.36
American Red Cross (special)	----------
Motor fuel-oil tax (ch. 33, SLA 1947) (special)	124,077.14
Alaska aeronautical revolving fund (special)	63,887.30
Second injury fund (special)	19,511.03

General condition of the treasury—Con.

Less special funds and funds incorporated in the general fund which are not available for the general operation of the Territory—Continued	
Nurses' examining board (special)	$816.63
Military fund (special)	112,023.38
Estimated net income refunds (special)	150,000.00
School fund (tobacco tax) (special)	611,219.00
Fisheries experimental, special research (special)	1,063.58
Alaska Tuberculosis Association (special)	461.14
Refund of amusement device tax (special)	88,005.62
Refund of business licenses (special)	357,090.54
Refund of punch board (special)	10,255.11
Property tax (special)	257,640.16
Refunds, nonresident fishermen's licenses (special)	350,000.00
Vital statistics fund (special)	1,757.10
Production marketing program (Federal)	1,043.68
Alaska on-base schools (Federal)	147,355.40
Johnson O'Malley schools (Federal)	4,849.25
School survey (Federal)	1,554.22
Invested funds (special)	419,985.21
Liquor refunds (special)	99,275.00
Contribution fund (special)	18,082.99
Loan to World War II veterans (special)	[1]50,000.00
Certifications to old-age assistance (special)	108,231.00
Certifications for aid to dependent children (special)	52,975.50
Certification for aid to the blind (special)	783.00
Total	4,104,544.87
Balance of cash to general fund	1,682,657.20

[1] Balance of $400,000 to be earmarked later.

Answering Senator LONG, who said:

"Thirty-seven and five-tenths percent of all the revenue produced from all the land in Alaska—365,000,000 acres—will go to the State of Alaska as royalties from oil, gas, and minerals."

The total land area of Alaska is 365,000,000 acres. Some of this is already in private ownership. Approximately 23,000,000 acres will be granted to the new State of Alaska under the terms of S. 50 for support of schools and State institutions.

The provision of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 to which Senator LONG refers does not operate throughout even the balance of the area of Alaska left after subtraction of the acreage cited. It does not operate, for example, with respect to the 49,000,000 additional acres which have been withdrawn in naval petroleum reserves. No royalties will accrue to the State from oil taken from these Federal reserves.

The oil discoveries to which the Senator referred have been made in the Federal petroleum reserve. All royalties from them will go to the people of the United States as a whole, not to the people of Alaska.

The statehood bill before the Senate will have no effect whatever on proceeds from oil royalties. Alaska, as a Territory, already participates from oil and gas leases on exactly the same basis as any State. It does so not under special legislation but under the general terms of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, which was amended to include Alaska in 1947.

Answering Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"Once we depart from the rule of admitting only Territories which are contiguous to other States, we shall have brought before us the cases of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and others."

The States of Louisiana and California were admitted when they were not contiguous to other States. Modern communications make Alaska closer from every practical consideration than were immediately adjacent States in earlier times.

The case of Hawaii, which is a good one, is already before the Congress. It, like Alaska, should be admitted. These are the last two incorporated Territories of the United States.

The cases of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands are totally unlike those of Hawaii and Alaska. They are different from the legal standpoint, because none of these is an incorporated Territory, and the promise of eventual statehood is given only by the act of incorporation. They are different from the moral standpoint, because the people of the other island areas have not, like those of Hawaii and Alaska, petitioned for statehood. They don't want it and haven't asked for it.

Answering Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"S. 50 calls for action by the Territory of Alaska and, if it complies, the wheels set in motion can never be stopped."

S. 50 is merely an enabling act. It does not make Alaska a State. Only Alaskans can do that, even after S. 50 is passed. The bill provides that delegates elected by the people of Alaska will draft a proposed State constitution which then must be submitted to the people of Alaska for ratification. If Alaskans should refuse to ratify the proposed constitution, that would stop the wheels. Congress, too, would retain a measure of control, for S. 50 provides that the proposed State constitution after it is ratified by the people must be submitted to the Congress for approval. If Congress disapproves, that would stop the wheels at the Washington end.

Answering Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"In all the history of the United States, no State has ever been admitted with so small a population, compared with the total population of the United States, as would be the case with Alaska."

Alaska's population in 1950 was reported by the Bureau of the Census to be 128,643. The population of the United States in that census was 150,697,361. In other words, the population of Alaska constituted approximately nine one-hundredths of 1 percent of the population of the United States.

Let us look at the figures for the last census immediately preceding admission of other Territories. Minnesota, in 1850, the census preceding her admission as a State, had less than three one-hundredths of 1 percent of the population of the United States at that time. Alaska, remember, had nine one-hundredths of 1 percent of the 1950 population of the Nation.

Oregon, in 1850, the census preceding her admission, had less than six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the population of the Nation.

Nevada, in 1860, the census preceding that Territory's admission, had only two one-hundredths of 1 percent of the United States total.

Nebraska, in 1860, the census preceding admission, had slightly better than eight one-hundredths of 1 percent of the United States total.

Montana, in 1880, the census preceding admission, had less than eight one-hundredths of 1 percent of the total population of the United States.

In all of these States, then—Minnesota, Oregon, Nevada, Nebraska, and Montana—the census preceding their admission as States showed them to have less population, compared to the population of the Nation as a whole at that time, than Alaska has compared to the 1950 population of the United States. Nevada, as a matter of fact, bore a population ratio to that of the United States which was less than one-fourth as great as Alaska's today. Minnesota, which has become a great State, had only one-third as much population, compared to the national total, as is the case with Alaska now.

It might be contended by some opponents of Alaska Statehood that it isn't fair to cite the population of those earlier Territories at the census which in each case was taken immediately preceding admission. Yet that is what those opponents are themselves doing in Alaska's case. That Territory has not yet been admitted to Statehood.

Nobody can say with exactness what the population of Alaska will be when admission is actually accomplished. It is certain, however, based on all the evidences, that it

will be substantially greater than was Alaska's population in 1950. The count there was taken on April 1 of that year. By July 1, 1950, just 3 months thereafter, the Bureau of the Census estimated that Alaska's population had increased to 135,000. There is little doubt that it has by now passed the 150,000 mark.

Even if S. 50 should be passed by the United States Senate today and by the House of Representatives next week, Alaska's admission could not occur until 1954. There is a long procedure set up by this enabling act. The people of the Territory would have to elect delegates to a constitutional convention, draft a constitution, hold an election on its ratification, gain approval of the proposed State constitution by the Congress, elect State officials and Congressmen, and the like, all prior to the actual event of admission. By 1954, the earliest date at which this process could be carried through, Alaska should have a population of at least 180,000, based on the trend of growth there since 1940.

This is without giving any effect to the phenomenon which has occurred on every previous occasion when a Territory of the United States became a State. This phenomenon is the very pronounced spurt of population growth which occurs coincidental with and because of statehood. When national attention focuses on Alaska as a new State, there is no doubt but what we shall see this historic precedent fulfilled again.

Alaska has the area and the resources to in time become a great and populous State. It will never become very populous as a Territory, as the history of the United States has demonstrated everywhere else and in Alaska itself. The sleeping giant in Alaska needs to be unchained by striking off territorial bondage. Then watch it grow.

Answering Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"Alaska is going downhill. In 1947 some 31,163 acres were filed upon for homesteading; yet in 1951 only 18,143 acres were filed upon, indicating a decrease of almost 50 percent."

The figures used by the Senator were furnished by the Bureau of Land Management and are correct—as far as they go. At the time they were given to him the Bureau went on to say that in Alaska there has been a trend away from homesteads, which are only one means of land acquisition, and toward other methods of taking up land for settlement.

The Senators were told, for example, that in the 2 years he cites for illustrative purposes, there were only 26 small tract leases embracing 31 acres in effect in 1948, while in 1951 there were 1,126 such leases comprising 5,677 acres. This was an increase of 4,000 percent in number of settlers in this category, and an increase of 18,000 percent in amount of land taken up under it. Compared to this, the 50 percent decrease in acreage of new homestead filings to which the Senator refers is seen in proper perspective.

The junior Senator from Florida referred to the number and acreage of homestead entries allowed. He said nothing about homesteads which actually went to patent in Alaska in the 2 years he cites as examples. In 1948 the Federal Government issued 20 patents embracing 1,719 acres of Alaska land. In 1951 it issued 207 patents embracing 23,679 acres. The increase was 935 percent in number of homestead patents and 1,277 percent in their acreage. This, mind you, was land actually passing from the public domain into private ownership.

In addition, the other means of land disposal in Alaska all show large increases. Many new townsites are being opened up and town lots within them sold at auction. Numerous additions are being made to existing townsites. The taking up of homesites, as distinguished from homesteads, has shown a steady upward trend.

Considering all the various methods of disposal of the public domain together, the Bureau of Land Management estimates that the number of applications for land use and disposal in Alaska have increased seven-fold since 1946. This is the answer to any charge that settlement in Alaska is declining. It is actually increasing, and at a very satisfactory rate.

Answering Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"Federal income-tax returns reveal that from 1945 through 1950 the income declined in the Territory of Alaska, and was only revived after the Korean war broke out, and the Federal Government, through the military department, put tremendous sums of money into Alaska."

The figures on income taxes paid by Alaskans, which are readily available from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, show no such trend as the Senator described in his remarks.

World War II ended in 1945, practically simultaneous with the beginning of the 1946 fiscal year. Starting with that year, a steady growth was shown in Federal income taxes paid by Alaskans.

The figures, supplied by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, are as follows:

Income taxes paid in Alaska

Fiscal year:	
1946	$15,187,544.11
1947	15,831,344.82
1948	18,891,145.13
1949	18,226,201.68
1950	17,393,930.93
1951	38,762,327.11

Note that in fiscal 1947 tax collections were slightly better than in 1946. In fiscal 1948 they again increased, this time substantially. While it is true, collections fell off very slightly from the 1948 level in 1949 and 1950, in each of those years they were better than in years before 1948. In 1949, collections were 15 percent greater than they had been in 1947. In the next year, 1950, they were 10 percent above the 1947 level.

Now it is perfectly true that tax collections in Alaska increased phenomenally in 1951. They were in fact just about double the amount ever collected before in history. Is this any argument against statehood for Alaska? Are we operating here on some basis of "no taxation without representation" in reverse? Are we saying that the more taxes an area pays the less that area is entitled to self-government?

The fact that Alaskans in fiscal 1951, the year which ended last June 30, paid the Federal Government $38,762,327.11 in income taxes should be a powerful argument for the admission of Alaska as a State.

There is a circumstance relative to Alaska's contribution in taxes to the Federal Government which does not even appear from the figures we get from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, favorable as those figures are to Alaska's case. The Bureau's figures show only collections made in Alaska. Many of the largest taxpayers earning all or nearly all their income from Alaska activities do not file their income tax returns in Alaska at all. They are the big corporations, salmon canning companies, steamship companies, mining companies, airlines, construction firms, trucking companies—which have their business headquarters in what Alaskans refer to as "the outside." Their offices are in Seattle, Bellingham, Tacoma, Portland, Boise, San Francisco, Salt Lake City, Omaha, and Boston. It is in offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in those cities and not in Alaska at all that these companies file their returns and pay their Federal taxes. It has been estimated that if the taxes on income generated by activities in Alaska were all paid in Alaska the collections of Federal tax money from the Territory would be seen to be double what the present figures show.

Answering Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"The people of Alaska are having such economic difficulties that they are already having a hard time meeting the costs of their government."

The most recent report of the Territorial Tax Commissioner shows that for calendar 1951 tax collections in Alaska totaled $13,979,813. This is at the rate of $27,959,626 for the biennium. Since appropriations voted by the Territorial legislature for the 1951–53 biennium totaled only $21,832,155, this indicates that existing tax laws in Alaska are currently producing over $6,000,000 more for the biennium than is required to finance all the costs of the Territorial government.

In the face of these figures on the actual collections and expenditures, how can anyone contend that Alaskans are "having a hard time meeting the costs of their government"? They are having such an easy time that they are raising 30 percent more money than they need. They are, in fact, producing from existing tax laws very nearly enough revenue to finance State government.

Answering Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"Even the proponents of statehood for Alaska will admit that the cost of carrying on State government will be anywhere from 50 to 100 percent more than the present cost."

The financial presentation of Alaska statehood proponents was made at the Senate hearings by Mrs. Mildred Hermann, an attorney residing at Juneau. Her estimate was that the additional gross cost of State government in Alaska over Territorial government would be $4,242,500 per year. Against this gross cost must be credited new revenues which will go to the new State under the terms of S. 50. These, including half of the proceeds from the Pribilof seals, were estimated in the 1950 hearings at $1,442,500 per year. The net added cost of statehood, therefore, according to the proponents of statehood, would be $2,800,000 annually.

Operating the Territorial government currently is costing Alaskans $21,832,155 for the biennium, or $10,916,078 per year. The increased cost of operating a state government as computed by statehood proponents, are seen therefore to be not 50 to 100 percent, as stated by the junior Senator from Florida, but 25 percent greater than the present cost of Territorial government.

In this connection it should be mentioned that the tax system already in effect in the Territory produced in 1951 some $3,100,000 in revenues more than the total of expenditures. If the proponents of statehood are correct, and they will spend $2,800,000 a year more for State government, they are already producing more than enough revenue with their present tax system to pay for statehood.

Answering Senator SMATHERS, who said:

"The figures show that, with the costs of their present Territorial government, Alaskans are having to pay a higher per capita tax than the citizens of any State are having to pay for their State government."

It would be interesting to know where the Senator's figures come from. Figures on the per capita tax burden of the various States are available from the publication Facts and Figures on Government finances, 1950–51 which is published by the tax foundation. It shows that per capita State taxes in 1950 ranged from $30.10 in New Jersey to $90.86 in Louisiana. Alaskans that year were paying $68.40 per capita. Among the residents of States paying a higher tax per capita than Alaskans were the people of Oklahoma, Colorado, California, Washington, Delaware, New Mexico, Louisiana, and the Senator's own State of Florida.

This comparison, even though it shows Alaska's tax burden is not the highest in the Nation, is extremely unfair to Alaskans for a number of reasons.

First, since Alaska has no county form of government, the functions which elsewhere are performed by counties are in Alaska a responsibility of the Territory itself. Thus the tax burden shown in Alaska should really be compared with the total of State and county taxes in each of the States. In any such comparison, Alaska would be seen to have not the highest per capita tax in the Nation but the lowest.

Second, the figures cited in the study are in the case of all the States for the fiscal years ending in 1950 while those for Alaska are for the calendar year 1950. The difference is significant because this is an era of rising State taxes. In fact, State taxes have been increasing on the average about 10 percent per year since 1945. In such a situation, a difference of only a few months in the actual 12-month periods being compared makes a big difference in the totals. This difference works to Alaska's disadvantage in comparisons, because the "year" spoken of in the case of the Territory is later than the fiscal year spoken of in the case of any State. For calendar 1950, the average per capita tax of all the States was probably about $64.90, or very nearly that of Alaska.

The third circumstance tending to make the tax burden in Alaska look higher than it actually is, when figured on a per capita basis, is that in addition to the year-round population reported by the census and which is used to compute per capita taxes, Alaska each year has a migratory additional population of nearly 100,000 persons. These include nonresident workers in the fishing, mining, and construction industries. They include nearly 75,000 tourists who go to Alaska each year. All of these people help in one way or another to pay taxes there. The workers are taxed directly through the Territorial income tax, which has withholding features. The visitors pay taxes directly through the Territorial gasoline and liquor taxes and indirectly every time they spend money for board, lodging, or other purchases or services. The fact that there are so many "part-time Alaskans" helps very substantially to decrease the actual per capita tax burden of the people who live there.

Fourth, a very large percentage of the taxes collected in Alaska are not on the people of the Territory at all but upon the products of the Territory. Severance taxes in Alaska account for 23.74 percent of total revenues as compared with only a 2.6-percent dependence on this category of taxation by the States as a whole. There is no necessary coordination between the number of people, which is the basis for a per capita tax computation, and the amount collected from products of the Territory. For example, it is probable the Territory could collect just as much from its taxes on canned-salmon production if there were only a few thousand people in Alaska as it would if there were several millions. If we adjust the Alaska tax computation to reflect only taxes paid by the people of Alaska, as differentiated from taxes paid on the products of the Territory, which would seem reasonable if it is a per capita comparison we want, we would find that Alaska has one of the lowest per capita levels of taxation in the Nation. In 1950 it was $51.30. A comparison with the per capita burden in each of the 11 western States, similarly adjusted by subtracting severance taxes, shows the Alaska tax is lower than that of any of them except Idaho.

Finally, the per capita method of comparing taxes between areas may be a convenient one, but it is no real measure of ability to pay or of seriousness of a tax burden. Taxes are nowhere assessed on a per capita basis. They are based instead on extent and value of property controlled and the volume and profitableness of business transacted. A high per capita tax is more an indication of a vigorous, profitable economy than it is of a staggering burden. It is a better index to ability to pay than it is to inability. We might for example compare the per capita tax burden of the United States with that of India or China and, if we should fall into the same fallacy as that which has enmeshed the junior Senator from Florida go on to argue from that that China and India can afford things in the way of government service that the United States cannot because our tax burden is greater.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I regret that we could not have gone over the answers sentence by sentence on the floor. It would have provided an interesting interchange.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] indicated this morning that he wanted to add his voice to those which have been raised upon the floor in support of statehood for Alaska. Unfortunately, he is detained at a meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee where he is testifying with respect to the St. Lawrence seaway.

It has been observed on many occasions this afternoon and previously that Senators who rise to discuss the pending business or any other business, for that matter, have been talking to empty seats. As the speeches have been made I have been observing parties of visitors coming in and out of the galleries of the Senate. I never notice them without a feeling that those who visit the galleries and find only a few Senators upon the floor will inevitably go away with the feeling that Members of the Senate are not paying attention to their duties. I think I should take advantage of this opportunity, while waiting for the Senator from Minnesota to reach the floor, to point out from the RECORD what is transpiring. I am talking to the visitors in the galleries and not to Members of the Senate.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, every day, at the conclusion of the proceedings, there appears in the Daily Digest a list of committee meetings which are scheduled for the following day. Five of the standing committees of the Senate are meeting this afternoon, holding hearings in various committee rooms.

The Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions of the Committee on Appropriations is meeting in one of the rooms of the Capitol in connection with an appropriation bill.

The Committee on Banking and Currency was called to order at 2:30 o'clock today for the purpose of discussing in executive session procedure under the proposed extension of the Defense Production Act.

The Committee on Foreign Relations, as I remarked a moment ago, was in session this afternoon taking testimony on the proposal to build the St. Lawrence seaway.

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was scheduled to have a meeting in the Senate Office Building this afternoon and is now in session.

Meanwhile, a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is holding a hearing.

This goes on day after day, and here upon the floor, where the business of the Senate is transacted in the final analysis, we have empty seats while the Members are preparing various bills for consideration later on.

Last week a unanimous-consent agreement was entered by which the Senate agreed that on Wednesday, tomorrow, there would be a limitation of debate upon the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to recommit the Alaskan statehood bill with certain instructions.

So that absence from the floor is not evidence of a lack of something to do on the part of Members of the Senate. It is only evidence of the concentration in Washington of legislative responsibility over the entire United States and over a large part of the world.

I see that the distinguished and able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] has arrived, so I shall merely complete my sentence and then yield to him.

It came to my mind, as I looked over this catalog of committee meetings, that the argument has been made against statehood, particularly for Alaska, upon the ground that Alaska should not have statehood because so much of that area is under the control of a bureau of the Federal Government in Washington. Is it not clear that to deny statehood to Alaska is the most sure and certain way to make permanent bureaucratic control from Washington over the destinies of the people of that Territory and over the utilization and development of its resources?

Unless we find a way to stimulate local government at the State level as well as at the municipal level, this concentration of political and executive power in Washington is bound to continue. If there was ever a time when statehood should be granted, this is the time. We are dealing with the only two incorporated Territories that are left.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Referring to bureaucracy, let me ask the Senator from Wyoming if he really believes that the incorporation of Alaska as a State into the Union will prevent the Department of the Interior operating in Alaska, or lessen its activity there; or, on the other hand, if he does not believe that the activities of the Department of the Interior will be increased, when more than 99 percent of the land will continue to be owned by the Federal Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. While the enactment of the pending bill will not prevent the Department of the Interior operating in Alaska, yet it will lessen the responsibility of the Department of the Interior, and will give to the people of Alaska a power which they now completely lack, namely, power to develop their own resources.

This bill makes a grant of almost 23,000,000 acres of public land to the proposed new State of Alaska. Therefore, it conveys to that prospective State and its people an opportunity, which they do not now have, to develop those lands.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator from Wyoming know that bureaucracy in Washington will continue to build

most of the roads in Alaska, even though Alaska should become a State?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say to the Senator from Mississippi that the Bureau of Public Roads is at this moment building most of the roads in the State of Mississippi, the State of Wyoming, the State of Minnesota, indeed, in all the States of the Union, and has been doing so ever since 1916, when, under a Democratic President, the late Woodrow Wilson, the original Federal highway aid law was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as the Senator from Wyoming probably will agree that is true only to the extent of the contribution by the Federal Government of a part of the cost of road construction. Of course, Federal agencies have their engineers in the States, but primarily the construction of roads is the responsibility of the States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me give the Senator from Mississippi another example. The United States Forest Service was created during the administration of Theodore Roosevelt, a Republican President, as it happened. But after a few years there was passed by Congress a special law which was, if I recall correctly, initiated by members from the Southern States, by which great areas of land within the boundaries of Southern States were voluntarily conveyed to the United States Forest Service by those States.

Mr. STENNIS. Largely for experimental or demonstration purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But they were conveyed, and the United States Forest Service now has control, just as it does in Alaska.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have said in debate that I thought the reservation of some land in Alaska for forestry purposes was a sound provision of the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is gratifying to know that the Senator has found something sound in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know that I am ready to surrender as much of that land as is the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand the Senator from Mississippi to say, then, that he desires to retain this land for the Federal Government?

Mr. STENNIS. We shall not go into that now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Ah, but the Senator has said he is not sure that he wishes to have the Federal Government surrender that much land.

Mr. STENNIS. I think the question of minerals and forests, and matters like that should certainly be looked into further than it has been possible for the Senator from Wyoming to do recently, with reference to deciding what shall be done with them.

If I may, I wish to continue with my line of questions dealing with bureaucracy. Does not the Senator from Wyoming know that the Alaska Railroad will continue to be operated by Washington bureaucracy, even though the pending bill should be enacted?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, this bill has nothing to do with the railroad. But I venture to say to the Senator from Mississippi that the granting of Statehood will result in promoting local means of transportation. Private initiative may even be developed to take over this railroad, which was originally built by the Government for the purpose of attempting to develop Alaska.

Mr. STENNIS. But under the terms of the bill, Washington bureaucracy will continue to operate the railroad. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Mississippi is quite correct about that. This bill does not attempt to deprive the Federal Government of its functions immediately, certainly not, any more than it did when any other State was admitted into the Union. The functions which the Federal Government has had, it has retained. Unfortunately, some functions have been added, but my whole point has been that there seems to be very little logic in the argument that we can prevent the growth of bureaucracy by refusing to take any responsibility away from bureaucracy, which is the argument the Senator from Mississippi makes.

Mr. STENNIS. I beg the Senator's pardon. That is the Senator's interpretation of the argument the Senator from Mississippi is making.

Further, with reference to bureaucracy, of the approximately 108,000 people in Alaska—and that is my understanding of what the population is, except for those in the military service——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Census has put the figure somewhat higher.

Mr. STENNIS. About 35,000 of them are referred to as natives, are they not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are a highly intelligent group of people.

Mr. STENNIS. So far as Washington bureaucracy is concerned, they will still be governed largely by the bureaucracy, will they not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I do not think so.

Mr. STENNIS. What does the bill do to change the situation with reference to the natives?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. According to the last count, there were at least six natives in the Territorial Legislature of Alaska.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not casting any aspersions on them. My question is, What are we going to do to get away from Washington bureaucracy? The question is, What does the bill do to change the situation with reference to Washington bureaucracy as it pertains to the natives?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What I am pointing out to the Senator is that the natives are free and independent except by their own choice.

Mr. STENNIS. Is that the answer of the Senator to the question as to what the bill does?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator to a statement on page 514 of the report, a statement prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in which they very briefly refer to these matters and list the treatment of the natives as being one of the matters that is left unchanged. There is an admission which tends to show that the natives are treated more or less as many of our American Indians are, and that they will still be semiwards of the Federal Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from Mississippi that in my sincere judgment we shall do more to prevent the Alaska Indians and natives from becoming wards of the Federal Government by granting statehood than we shall by denying statehood, because when statehood is granted there will be a greater opportunity for more of them to assume the full responsibilities of citizenship, which so many of them have already assumed, and by reason of which they have been trusted by the other citizens of Alaska by election to public office, both municipal and Territorial.

Mr. STENNIS. But the Senator is clear, is he not, that so far as the bill itelf is concerned, it brings about no change in the activities of bureaucracy as they relate to Alaska?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, the bill does not change that, but the bill does not attempt to deal with the Forest Service, the Grazing Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, or any other Federal function that operates in Alaska, just as the law admitting any other Territory did nothing of the kind. This bill grants to the people of the Territory statehood privileges.

When such statehood privileges are granted, I assure the Senator that he will find that the powers of bureaucracy will be reduced. If the Senator is interested in reducing the powers of bureaucracy, he cannot accomplish his purpose by refusing statehood, because he will be denying the very instrument by which bureaucratic control can be reduced.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Just as I entered the Chamber the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming was referring to me, and also referring to the fact that many committees were in session. They were permitted by unanimous consent to remain in session. Personally I appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon to testify in behalf of the approval of the bill authorizing the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Does the Senator from Wyoming yield the floor?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I took the floor merely to hold it until the Senator from Minnesota arrived. I shall be very happy indeed to yield the floor.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator from Mississippi care to continue the colloquy?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, let me say, in the time of the Senator from Wyoming, that I do not wish to delay the Senator from Minnesota. I had in mind one or two further questions, but I shall defer them. I am very glad to have the Senator from Minnesota proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should have liked to be present when the Sena-

tor from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] made his statement in support of the Alaska statehood bill, and also the bill granting statehood to Hawaii. Any time I am privileged to hear the senior Senator from Oregon speak I am not only enlightened, but thrilled by the message he brings us, because he never speaks unless he has a positive and constructive statement to make. Therefore it was a source of regret to me to learn that he had already spoken on the subject of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii.

As I have previously stated, I appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee this afternoon, and therefore I was not able to be present in the Chamber. However, I have studied the question of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii. I am a cosponsor of both Senate bill 50 and Senate bill 49. I have given much thought to the interesting question, What are we endeavoring to do in the world today? What is the major conflict? The Soviets are endeavoring to capture the minds of men in their section of the world, while we, comprising the children of all nations, seek not to bring warfare to mankind anywhere on earth, not to suppress peoples or to deny them their liberties, but, as a great nation, a democracy, to try to hold the minds of men by our philosophy and our ideology.

In the world today there are two camps, one endeavoring to promote communism and the other endeavoring to promote the dignity and freedom of mankind. How shall we win? Shall we win by means of a great armament program? We know that many billions of dollars were appropriated last year for military defense. We know what has been requested in the way of appropriations for military defense this year. We know that the Committee on Appropriations, through its various subcommittees, is studying this question every day. Huge appropriations must be made to maintain our military strength.

What is to be the ultimate result? It is not many years since World War II was fought. We were victorious in that war; but, even though we were victorious, what have we been compelled to do? In order to establish a society of free people in the South Pacific, including Japan, and in order to redevelop their industrial economy so that it can support the people there in a decent standard of living under a stable government, we have spent five and a half billion dollars rehabilitating the islands, exclusive of the occupation expenses in Japan.

We were victorious on the European Continent in World War II. We did not do as was done by the ancient Romans when they engaged in warfare. They enslaved the people whom they conquered and exploited the resources of the conquered country for their own special benefit. We went back into the territory of the people with whom we had been engaged in war and endeavored to rehabilitate their economy and reestablish their society. We endeavored to uphold the dignity of those people and to establish an economy which would support a government. We have endeavored to rehabilitate and aid in the reestablishment of the governments and economies of the countries of Western Europe so that they could be self-supporting.

What did it cost us? We have spent more than $20,000,000,000 in the reestablishment of the economies of the countries of Western Europe, including Germany. That is exclusive of the occupational costs in those countries. In the South Pacific and in Western Europe we have expended more than $25,500,000,000 to reestablish governments and maintain societies which could resist the infiltration of the communistic ideology and philosophy.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I am happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator believe that the facts which he has just recited conclusively prove that we are not imperialists, that we are not aggressors, and that we are not trying to set up a colonial system?

Mr. THYE. I will answer my distinguished and cherished friend by saying that what he has said is positively true. However, the purpose of doing what we did was to turn men's minds and cause them to embrace the philosophy of a free people, so that they could be clothed with the dignity of freedom. After having spent this great sum of money in trying to capture the minds of men, how do we proceed from now on, to win the people to our ideas, our way of government, and our way of life? We do it by undertaking to make it plain that we are not aiming to suppress peoples, but to aid them in establishing themselves. Nothing could destroy the confidence of the people of Asia, the Near East, or anywhere else on earth more than denying statehood to two Territories of Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

Mr. THYE. Let me continue my thought. I sat and listened to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the day he delivered his speech. I agreed with him in part, and I disagreed with him in part. But with all due respect to my cherished friend from Mississippi, I did not endeavor either to ask him questions at the time or to disturb his chain of thought.

Mr. STENNIS. It is not my purpose to try to interrupt the Senator's speech. I thought perhaps he would like a little interchange of views.

Mr. THYE. I wanted to lay a foundation by showing what we are endeavoring to do in all our defense program. We have done all this in order to get men to think in terms of our democracy and our philosophy of government, rather than to follow the philosophy of the communistic type of government.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. THYE. We have done all this in the South Pacific in order to rehabilitate Japan and the South Pacific islands. We have followed a similar program in Western Europe, not only with respect to Germany, but with respect to countries which suffered the ravages of occupation—countries such as France, the Netherlands, parts of Denmark, and other sectors of Western Europe, such as Norway. We have endeavored to repair the devastation which Great Britain suffered, not only in order to establish a free society, but to establish a Government which could support itself and resist the encroachment of the communistic ideology and philosophy, which cannot be seen or attacked physically, because they find lodgement in the hearts and minds of men.

If we have done all that in furtherance of the type of philosophy of government which prevails in our country, how else can we proceed to make certain that mankind will follow us and embrace the principles which we hold dear that all men are equal, so far as practicable and possible, that all men should be free to worship God as they learned it at their mother's knee, and that all mankind should have the right of self-government? Mr. President, we certainly cannot assure the people of Alaska and Hawaii that they have such opportunity for positive self-government unless we make them a part of this great Republic as States of the Union.

I have cited the Far East and I have cited the European Continent with respect to what we have done in rehabilitating those areas. My statements have been made for no other purpose than to give light to the tremendous sums of money we have expended in order to keep other peoples moving in our direction rather than in the direction and within the orbit of the Soviets.

I do not believe we can completely convince the European and Asiatic people that we are a freedom loving people and that we wish all mankind to be free unless we make Alaska and Hawaii parts of the United States.

Some of us are the offspring of pioneer or immigrant families who laid the trails across the wilderness of North America. Our forefathers did not go forth looking for adventure. They did not go through the wilderness on a lark. They went because they wanted to be the possessors of property of their own and because they wanted to have a part in the development of this great country. Many of the areas settled by them were in Territories which later became States. Those pioneers blazed trails into the wilderness, many of them in covered wagons. My own parents went by wagon beyond the railroad, to settle in the great Midwest.

Our great Nation was built by the pioneers' desire to be a part of it. They wanted to have a part in the building of this great Nation. They built well, Mr. President. We have been the beneficiaries of their building.

Those who go into the Territory of Alaska have the same burning desire to play the part of the builder. If they know they are building a new State and if they know they will eventually become a part of the local government and a part of the State government, as well as a part of the great United States of America, they will have the same burning desire that our parents had when they blazed trails into the wilderness.

Mr. President, we must not deny the people of Alaska and Hawaii the right to statehood. Statehood would develop their industry and agriculture. We do not have to stretch our imagination to realize that Hawaii has every possibility of making a valuable contribution to the great American Republic, both in what it produces and in wealth which lies dormant to be further developed, the development of which will add to the strength and resources of our country.

Both Alaska and Hawaii will contribute to the cause we are all striving for; namely, the right of mankind to be free and not suppressed by communistic ideology and philosophy, and thus able to stand on our side, rather than to stand on the Communist side. We certainly do not set the best example when we continue to hold Alaska as a Territory under the dominion of our Government. The same applies to Hawaii. By not granting them statehood we deny them the right to be self-respecting and ambitious citizens such as our parents and the friends of our parents were when they entered the wilderness to establish their homes, schools, and churches, knowing that the day would come when the Territory in which they lived would be permitted to stand as a self-respecting sovereign State within the Union.

Mr. President, if we were willing to spend the billions of dollars we have spent in Western Europe and in the Pacific, and if we were willing to make the sacrifices that our taxpayers have made in aiding Western Europe, all for the purpose of making it possible for mankind to continue to be free, we cannot deny Statehood to Alaska or Hawaii.

Reference to the history of this great Nation discloses how fallacious were the arguments and the verbal exchanges upon this floor against the admission of other Territories which finally achieved statehood. History is only repeating itself in the Senate. We can turn to the early pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to find what was said in the days when the Territory of which Minnesota was a part was being considered for admission into the Union as a State.

If we hope to be able to win men's minds and hearts to our side in the struggle between the ideology and philosophy of a free people and those of communism we had better demonstrate here in this section of the world that we are willing to let Alaska and Hawaii become States.

Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] that I did not intend to be rude to him, because I respect him too highly. I merely wanted to carry through with my thought at the time. I do not have a prepared statement. I came directly from a committee meeting (and I spoke from my mind and heart, not from a prepared statement. If I had been interrupted at various time it would have been very difficult for me to carry through with the thoughts I had in my mind at the time. That is the only reason why I said to the Senator from Mississippi that I would rather not be interrupted.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me briefly?

Mr. THYE. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota that not only was I not offended by his asking me not to interrupt him further, but that it was not my intention to interrupt him in his very fine presentation of his splendid thoughts. At the time I thought he had a prepared statement before him, which he could leave for the moment to permit me to ask him some questions.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I was attending a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations when the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] sent a message to me, which I hold in my hand, informing me that debate on the Alaska bill was about to come to an end today. I hurried to the Chamber because I wanted to speak my thoughts and convictions on the question before debate was closed.

Mr. STENNIS. I will say that I am glad the Senator spoke this afternoon, and I appreciate his fine thoughts on the subject. I know he speaks with great sincerity. I had the pleasure of traveling in Europe with him and of visiting Norway, and I know the great thrill he had in visiting the homeland of his father and mother. Is the Senator from Minnesota on the committee which considered this bill?

Mr. THYE. No; I am not.

Mr. STENNIS. I did not think the Senator was.

In my studies of the subject I have been greatly impressed with the idea that more than 40 percent of the people of Alaska have voted against statehood. Because I seek enlightenment on that subject, I ask the Senator from Minnesota whether he can give us any information regarding the matter that 5 years ago more than 40 percent of the people of Alaska voted against statehood.

Mr. THYE. No; I cannot enlighten the Senator from Mississippi on that matter, because I am not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and I have never visited Alaska. My own study of Alaska has been confined to reading the testimony given at the committee hearings and to listening to Senators speak on the subject on the floor of the Senate.

I am able to judge the reaction of others only by my own reaction. I cannot conceive of anyone living indefinitely in a Territory without hope of being a part of the governmental body of the Territory and without hope that he and his children would be a part of the national governmental body. For the life of me, Mr. President, I cannot understand why a person would live in a Territory if he did not wish to have that Territory become a part of the great United States of America and to be on the same level as all the present States. Accordingly, I could not even project my own thinking into that of those who may have said they were opposed to their Territory becoming a sovereign State within the great United States of America.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Minnesota will yield further to me, let me say that I have the same conception. It seems to me that everyone in Alaska would want Alaska to become a state. My impression was that if so many of the persons living in Alaska voted against statehood for Alaska, there must be some overwhelming reason therefor. From my further investigation I concluded that those persons did not think the present economy of Alaska could carry the burden which would be imposed by full-fledged statehood for Alaska.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for yielding to me.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator fron Mississippi.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it has been with a great deal of interest that I have observed a growing restiveness among Senators in regard to conditions in Puerto Rico. As all of us know, there has been among Senators much informal discussion of that subject, and recently at least three Senators have spoken on this floor concerning it.

The senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has called our attention to charges of dictatorship which have been made against Governor Muñoz-Marín of Puerto Rico, and has suggested that action on the nomination of a federal district judge for Puerto Rico be deferred until those charges can be investigated.

The junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has pointed out that the Department of the Interior has contributed to an atmosphere conductive to dictatorship in Puerto Rico by failing to follow through with the appointment of a federal coordinator for Puerto Rico, although in 1947 a statute calling for such an appointment was enacted. The Senator from South Carolina has joined the Senator from Maine in calling for an investigation.

The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has raised the highly pertinent question of whether American taxpayers' funds are being squandered in Puerto Rico by a dictatorial regime operating with thorough approval of the Department of the Interior. He, too, has joined in the call for investigation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Within the past week or 10 days, some reference was made here on the floor to the alleged development of dictatorial government in Puerto Rico. At about that time last week, I believe it was, there was transmitted to me by the Commissioner for Puerto Rico who sits in the House of Representatives a copy of the new constitution for Puerto Rico, which within the past month or so was drawn up by a convention authorized by Congress. That constitution, which I placed in the RECORD at that time, and which was adopted with the full approval of Governor Muñoz Marín of Puerto Rico—who, by the way, was elected Governor under a bill sponsored by the distin-

guished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]—takes away from the Governor powers which he now has. So actually the new constitution will result in a reduction of the executive powers of the Governor and an expansion of the powers of the legislature and other branches of the government of Puerto Rico.

Last week the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] made some comments about the sums of money which have been expended in Puerto Rico. At that time I assured him that inasmuch as under the existing law the constitution of Puerto Rico will have to be approved by the people of Puerto Rico before it comes to the United States for approval by the Congress of the United States, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs would be very happy indeed to go into all those matters. If there is any abuse of the generous fiscal policy which the Government of the United States has adopted toward the island of Puerto Rico, of course every Member of Congress will, I am sure, wish to make any necessary modifications. However, I think it important to point out the fact that the Governor, far from seeking more power, has voluntarily surrendered powers which he has under existing law.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is very interesting, Mr. President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I trust that the study the committee will make when the constitution, which is to be voted upon by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, is presented to us, will cover every aspect of all the intimations, allegations, and charges which have been made.

Mr. BRIDGES. I trust it will, and I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. CORDON. A little later in his discussion will the Senator from New Hampshire indicate specifically what are the charges against the Governor of Puerto Rico?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Oregon probably is aware that I was merely referring to charges which have been made by others. For instance, I was going to refer particularly to the subsidizing in Puerto Rico, by the Puerto Rican Government, of textile industries in competition with those in our own country. Already I have referred to the remarks previously made by three Members of the Senate; I did so at the beginning of my statement today. I myself have not made any charges; I have only referred to charges which have been made by others.

Mr. CORDON. I think there is no question that Puerto Rico has granted subsidies to any group which would set up in the island of Puerto Rico processing plants which would give employment to Puerto Ricans. However, so far as I know, such subsidies have never taken any form other than that of relief from taxation for a specific period of time, and have been predicated upon the number of persons employed.

If the Senator from New Hampshire could refer me to any place where I could be able to determine exactly what has been charged as misconduct or misdeeds by the Governor of Puerto Rico, that would be of help to me as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and as one who has supported the present self-government law for the island of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Oregon. At the present time I do not have the details regarding that matter, for I did not intend to cover that phase of the subject. However, I shall be glad to talk to other Senators who have gone into it, and to call the matter later to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, insofar as those Senators have information on the subject. I myself do not have information on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield further to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When I heard those statements, I immediately initiated an inquiry. I asked the Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico, Mr. Fernós-Isern, to provide me with a statement, from his point of view, at least, regarding the legislation which has been enacted by Congress for Puerto Rico since the occupation of Puerto Rico by United States troops during the Spanish-American War.

I think the first law which Congress passed for Puerto Rico was enacted in 1900. In recognition of the fact that the island of Puerto Rico was without industrial enterprises, to any practical extent, that Puerto Rico was an agricultural area which was very much overpopulated, and in which poverty had reached a very distressing level, the Congress of the United States at that time, under a Republican regime, undertook the first of the generous fiscal grants; and since that time there have been several others.

If the Senator will bear with me, I shall merely say that at the conclusion of his speech I intend to ask leave to insert in the RECORD the report which I have received from Dr. FERNÓS-ISERN, which I am sure will be enlightening to all persons who are interested in this matter. Let me read one paragraph from the summary:

> In 1950–51, Puerto Rico sold $284,839,190 worth of merchandise to the United States (including the value of tax on rum shipments, $13,027,348, and sugar-benefit payments, $17,474,000). In the same year, Puerto Rico purchased from the mainland $400,397,676 worth of goods at domestic prices and carried by high-cost transportation in United States registry vessels. Foreign ships cannot be used, since Puerto Rico is included in the coastwise-shipping laws.

In other words, Mr. President, this paragraph, itself, tends to bear out the evidence which has been submitted to our committee since the chairmanship of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] in the Eightieth Congress, when a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, including the Senator from Oregon, who is presently on the floor, the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Nebraska, and numerous other Senators, went all through the island. Frankly, I say I was very much impressed with the progress which was being made in raising the standard of living by this very device of seeking to encourage the establishment of local industries. It was my impression, I may say, that the purpose was not to induce industries to move from the States, but to provide an incentive to bring about the creation of new industries. Whether that effort has been successful, I do not know.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Wyoming is a little optimistic, or is perhaps looking through tinted glasses in that respect, because industries have certainly been drawn to Puerto Rico from my section of the country. It is pitiful, as I shall proceed to show the Senator by a few examples.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I said to the Senator, I have no knowledge of the facts which have recently developed. It was my understanding, at the time, that the purpose of the program which had been initiated was as I have stated.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I also am considerably apprehensive about conditions in Puerto Rico. I, too, feel that an investigation is in order, an investigation into the questions raised by the three Senators who have made known their views but there is a particular phase of the Puerto Rican matter which, in my judgment, requires special attention in such an investigation.

A number of our States, in particular those which comprise New England, have a special interest in this Puerto Rican matter, owing to the fact that our economy is being seriously damaged, and our people consequently are suffering, by a competition which is unfair and which helps no one but a group of politicians in Puerto Rico. I refer to the Puerto Rican Government's program to lure industry away from the United States by the unfair use of the incentives of tax exemption and low-wage scales.

Every Senator the economy of whose State is based in part on a successful textile industry is familiar with the fact that Puerto Rico has held out to this industry the bait of cheap labor and exemption from taxes for a considerable period. I am sure that these Senators would join with me in the statement that we have no fear of fair competition in the American tradition. What we do object to, however, is the impoverishment of our textile communities by taking away whole organizations on this patently unfair basis. On the one hand our communities must operate under a system of laws which provide minimum wages and certain stipulated working conditions while on the other hand the Puerto Rican program involves no such high standards either in wages or working conditions. When there is added to this the fact that a tax-incentive bait is provided our communities are placed at a considerable disadvantage.

For many years management and labor have struggled with the problem of eliminating the sweatshop in American industry. This has been particularly true in the textile field. Only recently have we had an equitable arrangement whereby the American textile worker has

enjoyed fair pay, reasonable hours, and other good conditions, while at the same time a legitimate profit has been assured to ownership. Now through the siren song of Puerto Rico these advantages are being taken away. Certain areas in New England are becoming distressed, it would seem, only to contribute to a sweatshop economy in Puerto Rico. If some positive action is not taken this can well become a major national problem.

The question of destroying the textile economy is not peculiar to New England alone; it applies equally to the Southern States. Of course, there has long been high competition between the Southern and New England States in the textile field. This has been a healthy competition in recent years since a minimum-wage law has been equally applicable in both areas.

It is ironic to note that the Puerto Rican industrial development program, which is designed to take our industries away from us by using unfair tactics, is in effect being subsidized by the American taxpayer. It is really a ludicrous situation when, for example, the New Englander pays taxes, a part of which are used to impoverish his own community and his own family, while the Puerto Rican, who receives the alleged benefits of this shift in locale of industry, continues to work for substandard pay and, of course, contributes nothing to the general economy of the United States through payment of taxes.

The most charitable view of this situation would make it appear to be a matter of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

The good people of New England would not feel so badly about their own sad plight in losing their industries to Puerto Rico if they felt that the Puerto Rican people were profiting thereby. But let us consider how much this industrial development program has meant in benefits to Puerto Rico as balanced against damages to New England and southern textile communities.

It is impossible to discover just how much the Puerto Rican development program has cost to date. As far back as 1949, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported, following an investigation of the closing of Nashua, N. H., mills, that—

> The Government has no complete and accurate compilation of figures to show the extent of our various subsidy programs conducted under our various Federal departments.

The committee at that time felt it serious enough to recommend "that the Department of the Interior be authorized and instructed to obtain current figures and to provide the Congress with a complete picture of our subsidy program and that reports be rendered to the committee periodically.

Insofar as I have been able to determine, this recommendation has not been followed and it remains well-nigh impossible to get a clear and complete picture of the use of Federal funds in Puerto Rico for the development program or any other program.

It is certainly true that a great deal of money has been spent by the Puerto Rican Industrial Development Administration, and it is further true that this money has come largely from the pockets of the American taxpayer. It is hardly justifiable that our own money should be used against us in such a way that whole American communities are distressed and no tangible benefits can be seen in Puerto Rico. I am told that the industrial development program in Puerto Rico is a costly flop. It is tragic that fine communities throughout New England and the South have so seriously suffered in order to make this flop possible.

Although there appears to be no way of determining just how much the Puerto Rico Industrial Development Administration has squandered, all reports agree that it is an expensive operation and that the tangible results are pitifully negligible. The administration maintains plush offices in four American cities and employs a high-salaried, high-pressure staff plus a New York publicity firm. The latter alone is said to draw $120,000 annually for singing Puerto Rico's siren song in the press, radio, television, movies, and wherever else the propaganda may be effective.

Yes, the industrial development administration spends millions to lure industry from our States to the tax-exempt, cheap-labor paradise where large Government subsidies ease the way for the faithful. But, according to reports by interested and objective persons, the administration's program has fallen far short of its goal of giving gainful employment to the poverty-stricken Puerto Rican people.

In the words of the 1949 report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, after its investigation of the closing of Nashua, N. H., mills:

> Any program conducted or tolerated by our Government should not be at the undue expense of our continental wage earners and our continental industries.

Mr. President, I have before me a copy of the subcommittee print, Senate Report 101, on the closing of Nashua, N. H., mills. It is a report by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, Eighty-first Congress, first session. I read from the report:

> The subcommittee was unable to get current figures to show the extent of United States subsidies to Puerto Rico. The latest figures available from the Puerto Rican University show that in excess of $150,000,000 a year was provided to Puerto Rico by the United States Government in 1944, 1945, and 1946, the amount in the latter year being $184,986,000. This is substantially in excess of the total amount the Puerto Rican government received from its own taxpayers. Accordingly, one cannot escape the conclusion that the United States Government, to a very substantial degree, is by its subsidizing program enabling the Puerto Rican government to institute its widely advertised tax moratorium program and thereby lure from the continental United States industries employing thousands of workers. In stating this fact we again emphasize that Puerto Rico pays none of its tax funds into the United States Treasury.
>
> It may fairly be said that our continental industrial concerns, our farmers, our wage earners (through the withholding tax), and indeed all of our taxpayers are paying a higher tax to support our subsidy program with respect to Puerto Rico. In short, they are being penalized by threat of loss of jobs and by threat of unfair competition, and are being forced by added taxation to pay the cost of the penalty which is being imposed upon them.
>
> The subcommittee recognizes that when our Government acquired Puerto Rico it assumed an obligation to take reasonable steps to help this impoverished territory to improve its economic condition, with the hope that eventually it could arrive at an economic parity with the continental United States. However, any program conducted or tolerated by our Government should not be at the undue expense of our continental wage earners and our continental industries.

Mr. President, I have various newspaper articles about the general situation regarding our textile industries and the hardships faced today in many communities in the New England States. I have one from the Washington Evening Star of February 4, 1952, entitled "Poverty Amid Plenty—Hard Hit New Hampshire Cities Fight To Avert Grim Disaster."

Another one is entitled "Poverty Amid Plenty—New England Textile Industry, Union Locked in Death Battle."

Another one is entitled "Poverty Amid Plenty—New England Textile Industry in Doldrums, Fights for Life."

Another one is entitled "Poverty Amid Plenty—Once-Prosperous Textile City Faces Threat of Extinction."

Another one is entitled "Poverty Amid Plenty—Economy Sets Near-Record Clip But Jobless Suffer in Some Areas—Unemployment Concentrated in New England, New York City, Detroit, and Hard-Coal Areas."

Mr. President, I think those articles tell the story.

I did not intend to go into the charge of dictatorship or anything of that kind when I started. I merely quoted from other Senators and other authorities, because I had made no special study. But I do know what is happening to the industrial communities in New England, on the eastern seaboard, and in the Southern States as well, and I do know of the unfair competition which is created when Puerto Rico pays substandard wages, with workers employed under sweatshop conditions, combined with tax exemptions offered by Puerto Rican communities to our industries, luring them away from our country. That is unfair competition to our communities and our industries, and it is unfair to our workers. It has created a very serious and critical situation in city after city. Today men and women are walking the streets in this land of so-called prosperity, because of the displacement problem which has been brought about by unfair and vicious competition that cannot be justified.

Mr. President, I feel that the American Congress which has doled out money so generously to Puerto Rico, almost shoveling it out, should look into the situation. The lot of the Puerto Ricans has not been improved. The money goes into huge profits for those who own the industries and who are using tax exemptions to lure our industries away. The

United States is contributing to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars to the island of Puerto Rico which makes that situation possible.

I say, Mr. President, the situation demands attention. One can be a "one-worlder" or a "do-gooder," or anything else, and I myself have a global outlook on the world, and am glad to meet anyone on that issue, but when it comes to taking the bread out of the mouths of the people of certain communities in our own country, the Congress of the United States and the administration owe a duty to the American people to meet the issue. It should be done by getting the facts, and, after the facts are secured, then taking appropriate action to meet the situation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the articles to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star]

POVERTY AMID PLENTY—ECONOMY SETS NEAR-RECORD CLIP BUT JOBLESS SUFFER IN SOME AREAS—UNEMPLOYMENT CONCENTRATED IN NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK CITY, DETROIT, AND HARD-COAL AREAS

(By James Y. Newton)

The American economy as a whole is moving along at a near-record clip, yet important segments of that economy are bogged down in a state of near depression.

There are more than 61,000,000 civilians working, all but 2.7 percent of the country's total work force. Yet there is heavy unemployment in a number of areas, enough to constitute a national problem.

The total number of people seeking work—about 1,700,000—is small, so small, in fact, as to be the cause nationally of more concern from the standpoint of labor shortness than from the standpoint of labor surplus.

But this unemployment is heavily concentrated. Most of the jobless are in New England, New York City, the hard-coal mining section of eastern Pennsylvania, the Detroit area, and some other localities scattered over the country.

Unusual situations are numerous. Connecticut, as a whole, with its new metal-working industry geared to defense work, is booming. But adjacent Rhode Island, a large part of Massachusetts and New York City are in the throes of slump because their economies are tied principally to civilian work.

Tiny Rhode Island, population 791,000, has 35,000 unemployed; Massachusetts, over 100,000; New York City, over 200,000 and increasing. Yet, Hartford, Conn., a few miles away, cannot find enough people to man its busy defense plants or enough housing for those who are there.

Scranton, Wilkes-Barre, Pottsville, Pa., are in bad shape, with unemployment running over 10 percent of the work force. Most of the jobless are hard-coal miners, who can't find work in the dying industry. Not far away are centers of steel and other industries, where manpower is badly needed.

A call for workers to remove the snow from Detroit streets results in a mob scene of the jobless eager to earn a few dollars.

Schemes reminiscent of the 1930's are being used by merchants trying to drum up business. In Fall River, Mass., books of coupons good for $25 in trade at various stores are being offered at $2.50.

Speaking generally, there are two types of unemployment. The type receiving the most attention is so-called defense unemployment, resulting from the transfer of scarce metals—copper, steel, nickel, aluminum—from civilian to military production.

Detroit is the most spectacular example of a city suffering from defense unemployment. Estimates of the number of jobless in the city and environs run from 125,000 up.

Senator MOODY, Democrat, of Michigan, said more than 175,000 workers in the State, most of them in the automobile and auto parts manufacturing industries, have been laid off because of cutbacks in civilian production. The automobile industry is operating at about half of capacity because of transfer of scarce metals to military production.

The other type of unemployment is one caused by curtailed buying of some types of civilian goods, notably soft goods—cottons, rayons, woolen, and worsted textiles and shoes.

Present-day economic troubles of a large part of New England are directly the result of this last-mentioned situation. New England's many textile cities are fighting hard for existence. The threat to them comes from the general slump in textiles, plus a growing inability of its mills to compete for business with low-wage areas of the South.

SHORT- AND LONG-TERM PROBLEM

The New England situation poses both an immediate and a long-term problem of jobs. Finding a cure for the area's economic ill health will be a vastly more complicated task than that of relieving defense unemployment in Detroit.

New England, too, has a large jewelry industry which, like manufacture of automobiles, has been hard hit by cut-backs in metals usage.

In order to find out first-hand something of conditions in areas of unemployment, how people were faring in these local depressions, what was being done to correct the situations. The Star conducted a survey of New England and the Detroit area.

The jobless person of 1952 is hard put to provide for self and family, but his plight is not nearly so desperate as was that of his apple-peddling counterpart of the early 1930's.

PRICES CAUSE MOST TROUBLE

High prices cause him the most trouble. In the big depression, living costs were at rock bottom. But more than off-setting that are the cushions against economic hardship available to the present-day unemployed. He has unemployment compensation and help in the form of organized relief. Generally, he has some savings to fall back on. There may be another member of the family still working.

Then, something the jobless man of 1932 couldn't do because the depression was general, he can in most instances get a job in another town. Most of them are not moving, however, like the big Irishman in the employment office in Lawrence.

"Ain't it a helluva note," he remarked, putting the $25 weekly compensation in a pocket. "Over in Hartford they rain C-notes on a guy just for decorating one of them airplane engine factories. But the old lady won't have none of it. She's been here all her life, and she's going to stay here even if she starves."

MISERY LOVES COMPANY

In the misery-loves-company department, another unemployed New Englander didn't bat an eye when a guest on a television quiz show said he was a jobless textile worker. But his interest picked up when the man said he was from Charlotte, N. C.

"It sort of helps you to know that at least some of those people down there are not working," he remarked later.

Since the depressions both in Michigan and New England have been going on for some months, the matter of the unemployed running out of compensation is becoming more serious each day. Many thousands already have exhausted allowances.

The proposal has been made that Michigan extend its benefit period from the present 20 weeks to a year. The employment crisis is expected to last at least that long.

BILLS ENTERED IN CONGRESS

In addition, Senator MOODY and Representative DINGELL, Democrat, of Michigan, have introduced bills in Congress to supplement the States' payments by 50 per cent with Federal funds. On the national average this would add $10.50 to the $21 weekly now paid by the States.

The Moody-Dingell bill is aimed at helping those persons thrown out of work because of transfer of materials to defense production. But, obviously, there would be no way of separating defense unemployment from any other type.

Senator Moody, Governor Williams, of Michigan, the automobile industry, and Walter P. Reuther, president of the CIO United Auto Workers, have tried hard to persuade the Government to increase allocations of metals to the industry. So far, they have had little success.

The best hope of relief from unemployment is offered by the Government's program to channel defense contracts into distressed areas. A ruling by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren permits Government procurement officers to award contracts to companies in the areas even though they might get lower bids elsewhere.

TASK FORCE COMMITTEE

As a means of carrying through this plan, Production Administrator Manly Fleischmann, appointed a task force committee to survey plant facilities and manpower to determine just what and how many contracts can be placed in the hard-hit sections.

The task force is headed by Reginald P. Gillmor, vice president of the Sperry Corp. On it are representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Atomic Energy Commission, and General Services Administration.

Mr. Gillmor's group arrived in Detroit yesterday on its first assignment.

POVERTY AMID PLENTY—NEW ENGLAND'S TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN DOLDRUMS, FIGHTS FOR LIFE

(By James Y. Newton)

BOSTON, January 31.—The long fight for life of New England's once great textile industry has reached a dramatic climax.

A decision whether it will be life or death may come in the next few months.

Manufacture of woolen, worsted, cotton and rayon cloth, although far smaller than it was once, still is the biggest industry, the largest employer in this area, and particularly in Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

Whether textiles will remain a major factor in the New England economy probably will be decided by events immediately ahead. The industry is making its last stand in Yankee land.

The business barometer in New England as a whole rises and falls with the state of the textile industry. It is the backbone, and in some instances, almost the whole, economy in cities like Providence, R. I.; Fall River, New Bedford, Lowell, Lawrence, Mass.; and in Manchester, New Hampshire's largest city.

TEXTILE BUSINESS BAD

Right now the textile business is very bad in woolens and worsteds, as well as in cottons and rayons, and there is no improvement in sight.

So a large part of New England is in a slump at a time when the economics of most parts of the country are riding at all-time high levels. Unemployment is heavy and mounting. Many mills, including some of the largest employers, are threatening to shut down permanents or move to the South.

If they carry through the threats, New England, or a large part of it, will be in a major depression.

"Unless the situation is changed shortly," said Edward F. Walker, of the Rhode Island Textile Association, "there will be no situation to change."

There are two reasons for the critical situation. One is that the textile business nationally has been in a slump since last May and it has gradually become more severe. High inventories of goods and apparel at all levels of trade and slackened civilian demand have caused it.

The other reason is the old one of the inability of northern producers to meet the competition for business of mills in the South, where the costs are much less because of lower wages, higher worker output, and more favorable tax situations.

CAN'T MATCH BIDS

Effects of this one-sided competition obviously become more acute when the industry nationally is in the doldrums. The northern producers cannot match the bids of the South either for military or civilian orders.

Only when the demand for textile products equaled or exceeded the national supply have the New England mills enjoyed prosperity. This has happened three times in the last 30 years and never in a normal period. It happened during the war, when the Government was supplying a huge Army; for 3 years right after the war, because of abnormal pent-up civilian demand, and for 10 months after Korea, when buying was active because of fear of shortages and high prices.

Right now, textile production of all types in New England is off more than 50 percent. Mills are closing almost daily because there are no orders. Within a few days, five plants shut down in Fall River, Mass., alone, throwing 4,100 people out of work. Some may not reopen. The number drawing unemployment compensation in this city of 100,000 increased 2,500 in a week to over 10,000. Thousands of other jobless have exhausted their compensation.

SOME SLUMP IN SOUTH

Business has slumped in the South, too, but not so markedly—an estimated 25 percent. The South has been doing better in getting both civilian and military orders. Some northern mills have even been buying yarns and other materials in the South for less than they can produce them in their own plants.

The current situation has brought the pattern of southern competition to a showdown. All sides—the State governments, the labor unions and, above all, the managements—are acutely aware that something must be done, and quickly. Just what will or can be done involves a wide difference of opinion among the three groups.

A large number of people believe that loss of the entire textile industry to the South is inevitable and that little should be done to save it. They say efforts should be concentrated on bringing in new industries, particularly in the metal-working field. Connecticut has done much in that direction, and the State is booming.

But the bringing in of new and different industries is a long, slow process. It probably could not be done in time to save the economies of Massachusetts and Rhode Island. After all, the New England textile industry still employs more than 160,000 people, and that's a lot of jobs to write off or fill.

NO ANSWER YET

It is safe to say this textile situation has been studied and investigated more than anything else in the country. There are two studies aimed at determining what to do going on right now. One is sponsored by the six New England Governors and the other, by the National Planning Association.

"Everybody surveys us, but no one comes up with the answers to our problems," commented one city official.

Thirty years ago, 80 percent of cotton goods manufactured was concentrated in New England and 20 percent in the South. Now, the situation is just about reversed. Mill employment in Fall River has dropped from 35,000 to 10,000 during that time. The whole New England cotton and rayon industry now employs about 70,000.

The movement southward of the woolen and worsted industry has developed fairly recently. Only 15 percent even now is located in the South. Most of it is in New England. But the movement is on. Thirty-two woolen mills have been liquidated or moved since the war. Worse still, some of the biggest producers, including the American Woolen Co., which makes over 20 percent of the Nation's wool cloth, are considering moving south.

Woolen and worsted mills in New England employ about 90,000 persons.

POVERTY AMID PLENTY—NEW ENGLAND'S TEXTILE INDUSTRY, UNION LOCKED IN DEATH BATTLE

(By James Y. Newton)

BOSTON, February 1.—A big industry and a big union are fighting for their lives in New England, and the health of the area's economy depends on the outcome. The industry is textiles, New England's biggest. The union is the Textile Workers Union, one of the CIO's largest.

Their interests are nearly identical, and one would think they would be battling together. But the truth is they spend much more time fighting each other. A blockbuster of words is loosed almost daily by labor or management.

Each blames the other for the sad plight of textile manufacture in New England—the industry's inability to meet southern competition and the consequent long lines of jobless at the employment offices of mill cities. Obviously, little good can come from such a situation.

The two sides will battle it out face to face in wage and contract negotiations to start soon. The negotiations are unusual, in these times, in that they were demanded by the managements, who are seeking more favorable terms. The union said earlier it would not demand a wage increase and is seeking to maintain status quo in wages and working conditions.

MANY CANCEL CONTRACTS

A large part of the woolen and worsted industry has served notice of cancellation of its contracts on March 15, the expiration date. Some companies are demanding a wage cut. All are demanding an increase in the work assignments of the men who operate their machines.

Most of the cotton and rayon contracts run into 1953 but can be reopened on wage issues this March 15. The manufacturers have served notice of reopening. Here, too, there is some talk of wage cuts, and a unanimous demand for increasing employee work loads. Contracts involving part of cotton and rayon, notably in Rhode Island, run until 1954 and may not be reopened.

The union warned the woolen and worsted people there would be a strike if there is no contract after March 15. The industry replied, in effect, let them strike, we are not doing much anyway.

The consensus of employers is there will be no cut in wages. Their real demand will be for an increase in daily work assignments as a means of lessening the competitive advantage of the South. In other words, the manufacturers say, their employees must work harder for the same pay they now receive.

UNION ON THE SPOT

There is little or no talk on the surface of trying to bust the CIO union. Relations over the years have been better than in most industries. Strikes have been few. But the union definitely is on the spot.

New England textiles are nearly 100 percent unionized in the CIO, the smaller AFL United Textile Workers and a few independents. Despite 6 years of intense effort, the CIO and AFL have been able to organize only 10 to 20 percent of southern mills. Operation Dixie, into which the CIO poured millions, was nearly washed away in an unsuccessful strike last spring.

The CIO union has done an excellent job in New England of lifting textile wages, once very low, to a point where they compare not too unfavorably with pay of other industries. It has won holidays and vacations with pay, insurance, sickness benefits, for its members. But in so doing it has created a wide differential of wages and costs with the unorganized South and, in effect, pulled the rug from under its members.

In luring New England interests to warmer climes, the South has taken full advantage of the appeal of lower wages and costs in general, greater per worker output theme.

It is undoubtedly true that many New England manufacturers in the past granted wage demands in the belief the South soon would be unionized and the cost differential largely eliminated through efforts of the union and other factors. Now they see it will not come to pass any time soon and they are taking matters in their own hands to reduce the differential. They say, if unsuccessful, they must either move South or quit.

BUILD-UP CATCHES WORKERS

"We have no objection to high wages, so long as we can secure business and sell our goods," says President K. B. Cook, of the Rhode Island Textile Association. "And we are very happy that textile workers earn good wages. Unfortunately, however, one group has been favored over another and the gradual build-up over the years has caught up with its proponents (the union) with the result many textile workers are losing their jobs and many more are facing that disagreeable certainty."

Employer and union estimates of the size of the competitive advantage of the South vary widely. In cost of wages and fringes—welfare, paid holidays, vacations, etc., which are not prevalent in the South—the union places the difference at 10 cents per hour per worker or slightly above.

William F. Sullivan, president of the National (New England) Association of Cotton Manufacturers, says the difference in fringes and wages amounts to 31 cents per hour. He estimates the average hourly pay at $1.46 an hour in the Fall River-New Bedford area and $1.22 an hour in the South. Difference in fringe benefit costs is placed at 7½ cents an hour per worker.

The gap in average hourly earnings between North and South has widened the last 2 years from 11 to 24 cents an hour, Mr. Sullivan says.

To this already wide cost spread, Mr. Cook adds 10 cents as his estimate of the work load differential translated into cents per hour. Mr. Sullivan did not attempt to evaluate that item, although he said the worker output was considerably greater in the South.

WORK DIFFERENCES CONCEDED

The official union position is that the New England mill worker puts out as much effort and produces as much as his southern contemporary. But privately, some will admit not only differences in work loads between North and South, but between different parts of New England.

They attribute these differences largely to newer mill machinery, better supervision,

better management. They also point out that, in most of their contracts, the work load for a particular job is subject to arbitration, if management and the union are unable to agree on size.

"Unfortunately," says Solomon Barkin, research director of the textile workers, "many New England textile managements were more keen upon withdrawing their investments than in using their new-found wealth to modernize. Their equipment has been among the most backward; their methods have needed the greatest change; their supervision needed the most training."

In other words, the union charges, Yankee employers have failed to keep pace with the times in either plant machinery or management methods. The employers reply they have installed more than $100,000,000 worth of new machinery the last 5 years.

Francis W. White, president of the giant American Woolen Co., says "our mills' managements are equal to those of our competitors in New England or anywhere else in the world. We apologize to no one." The big company is considering moving south largely, Mr. White says, because it is unable to get "a fair day's work" from men and machines.

He adds that arbitrary limitation of production, worker slow-downs, and make-work schemes on the part of the union are responsible for much of American Woolen's troubles.

WORKER OUTPUT FINDINGS

On the subject of per worker output, North versus South, Seabury Stanton of New Bedford, a leader to keep the industry in New England, points to a survey made by textile engineers of comparative work assignments in mills of both sections. He says it showed that work performed by New England's 70,000 cotton and rayon employees would be handled by 52,278 workers in the South.

The union replies that, because of differences in managements, machines, and materials with which they work, it is impossible to get a fair comparison of work loads in two adjacent mills, much less in northern and southern plants.

Some employers say tradition is responsible for limitation of production. A woolen executive said his employees had the attitude of, "My father operated four looms. Why should I handle more?" The executive said the workers fail to take into account easier operation of present-day automatic machines as compared to the old ones operated largely by hand. On that point, the union says, it is up to managements to educate their employees.

Mr. White offered to rent a mill to the union "if these self-styled textile experts who profess to know all the answers would like to show us how to operate at a profit in this area." He said they could keep whatever profit they made "if they will agree to pay any losses and pay all of the taxes that business must pay."

American Woolen paid $2,262,000 last year in State and city taxes in Massachusetts.

EIGHT HUNDRED AND SIXTY-ONE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED AND SIXTY-SEVEN DOLLARS IN SOUTH

"Our total tax bill for the same operations in one Southern State would have been $861,467," Mr. White said.

A New England manufacturer who is moving South will be free of property taxes on the new $6,000,000 mill he will operate. The city in Mississippi floated a bond issue to build and equip the mill. The manufacturer gets it on a long-term lease.

As a means of meeting this sort of competition, Governor Dever has proposed to the Massachusetts Legislature setting up of a State authority to build plants, lease them to industry, and pay a fixed fee in lieu of taxes to communities where they are located.

Similarly, Gov. Dennis J. Roberts, of Rhode Island, has suggested creation by the State of a revolving fund to be used to induce new industry to come into the State, help acquire plant sites, etc.

STIPULATIONS TO UNION

Mr. Cock, of the Rhode Island Textile Association, said that to solve the crisis the union should agree to:

"Give blanket approval to all New England mills to install workloads comparable with the South, with the understanding the workloads must be checked by impartial and competent firms of textile engineers.

"Declare a moratorium on all demands on northern mills until such time as the 30-cent (pay) differential is wiped out or, at least, narrowed to not over 10 cents an hour."

Since the manufacturers' solution involves getting employees to work harder for the same pay, obviously it will be a very tough proposition to put over.

POVERTY AMID PLENTY—ONCE-PROSPEROUS TEXTILE CITY FACES THREAT OF EXTINCTION

(By James Y. Newton)

LAWRENCE, MASS., February 2.—A threat of extinction hangs heavily over Lawrence, Mass., and it is not caused by fear that a Russian plane may drop an A-bomb.

This once-prosperous textile-manufacturing center, almost due north of Boston, is in more trouble than at any time since an enterprising group of Yankees, known as the Essex Co., dammed the Merrimack River, built two canals, and laid out the mill city over a century ago.

There are over 13,000 workers unemployed in Lawrence, a city of 85,000 with an area population of 126,000. More than 20 percent of an unusually big work force of 60,000 are looking for a job and not finding it. The State employment security division listed 68 job openings, most of them in small shops or as domestics.

FUTURE ALSO UNCERTAIN

But that is only part of the story of the sad plight of Lawrence, a story that is repeated many times in the cities and towns of Massachusetts and other New England States. The threat to Lawrence and other textile cities lies more in what the future may bring rather than in its present low economic state.

The American Woolen Co.—the General Motors or United States Steel of the wool industry and producer of over 20 percent of the country's woolen and worsted cloth—has hung a veritable Sword of Damocles over Lawrence.

Francis W. White, American Woolen's president, bluntly told the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce recently, "We are now giving serious consideration to moving all our operations out of this, and other New England communities."

CAN'T COMPETE WITH SOUTH

The news shook New England like an earthquake. The reason American Woolen is considering moving out, bag and baggage, is an old story in cotton textiles, a much newer one in woolen and worsteds. It is the inability of northern mills to operate on a competitive basis with mills in the South. Lower costs, Mr. White said, enable southern mills to undersell his company from 30 to 50 cents a yard.

For this situation, Mr. White blamed high State and local taxes that are more than double those of the South, lower productivity of northern workers, and "make work" policies of the textile unions. Most New England workers belong to unions, against comparatively few in the South.

Mr. White and other producers held the matter of what they called getting "a fair day's work" from men and machines of more immediate importance in meeting southern competition than the wide differential in pay that exists. Most of this gap, estimated at 30 cents an hour per worker in wages and fringe benefits, they feel can be bridged by superior know-how of Yankee management and workers, provided the work assignments of North and South are equalized.

PRODUCE MOSTLY WORSTEDS

Lawrence's over 22,000 textile workers are employed almost exclusively in making worsteds, tight-woven woolen cloth used in making suits for American Woolen and other concerns. The woolen-worsted industry in the South is growing, but as yet amounts to only about 15 percent of the national total.

Mr. White's words were not unexpected in Lawrence. American Woolen already was opening a new mill in Raleigh, N. C. But business, union leaders, and workers still were deeply shocked by the announcement. It meant that movement southward was on in full force if this old New England firm was considering moving out. Mr. White said his company was searching for other mills and mill sites in the South.

"We have, at present, every intention of removing a great deal more of our machinery from this area," he said. "Whether any of it will remain here depends entirely on whether we and our workers can operate mills in this city, and in New England, on a competitive basis with the mills and workers of the South."

EMPLOYS 20,000 WORKERS

American Woolen employs 20,000 persons at present, the vast majority in a score or more New England mills, and from 6,000 to 8,000 in three big mills in the Lawrence area. Full employment of the company in Lawrence is 12,000. If American Woolen moves, other mills likely would follow. Add this to the already long list of unemployed and an appreciation may be had of the enormity of the threat to Lawrence's existence.

The busiest place by far in Lawrence is the employment security office, where those who are out of work come to file claims for unemployment compensation, pick up checks, and sometimes look for a job. The unemployed come in droves, over 2,000 a day, and about 70 percent are textile workers. Well dressed and well fed for the most part, they form a true cross section of the New England population. They are old-line Yankees, people of Irish, Italian, and French extraction.

MUCH LIKE DEPRESSION

An Italian construction worker said he was having a tough time supporting his two children because his wife, a worsted-mill employee, was out of work, too. He couldn't find anything much to do in winter, a few odd jobs shoveling snow, etc. She was getting about a week of work per month. They were getting by with a big assist from unemployment compensation of $25 a week each, plus $4 extra for the children.

"This is as bad as the depression as far as I am concerned," commented a big Irishman who said his compensation had about run out. An unmarried millworker, he had worked only 3 weeks the past 6 months. A brother, who worked about half the time, helped support their aged parents.

A wool sorter, 39, said he had a difficult enough time supporting his wife and three young children even when working full time at $35 a week. He had worked very little since last spring, but the neighbors "have been wonderful."

"Things are rotten around here," said a 34-year-old mill truck driver who was out of work a week. "But they are going to get tougher, especially if they (the mills) go South."

A well-dressed woman, 36, said both she and her husband had been laid off by a mill which had run out of orders. Neither was able to find another job.

A first-aid girl, 40, had been out of a job since November. She had recently married a small-dairy farmer of nearby New Hampshire whose 15 cows "help see us through." She was discouraged about the job outlook "because they don't want women around here after you are 40."

None of those interviewed blamed the employers for the situation. They seemed to accept unemployment as a matter of course in New England's feast-or-famine textile industry.

FEW CASES OF DISTRESS

Despite the high unemployment, there are few instances of distress among the people of Lawrence. There were 360 families on relief, compared to 340 a year ago when there were only about half as many jobless.

Another paradox was that business in the city was surprisingly good, as gaged by the usual barometers. Savings deposits dropped 10 percent the past year; goods carried off by train and trucks was down 20 percent; retail sales were off 2 or 3 percent; delinquencies on time sales were less than one-fourth percent.

But city officials said all of this could change quickly for the worse unless things picked up at the worsted mills, and a pick-up wasn't in sight. There were about 10,300 persons receiving weekly unemployment checks, and new claims were running about 2,000 a week. A total of nearly 6,000 had exhausted compensation. This number is increasing because the present depression in Lawrence began last May, the end of the post-Korean boom in textiles.

WORK DIVIDED UP

Both business and union officials said that share-the-work clauses in union contracts with the mills had done much to prevent real hardship in Lawrence. Whatever work the mills get is divided among what is called the normal work force—generally about 65 percent of capacity employment. These are workers of 10 years or more seniority. This results in the regulars getting somewhat less than a week's work out of every two. They get unemployment compensation for the week they are out.

"This plan has been the salvation of Lawrence," said Philip Salem, vice president of the AFL United Textile Workers.

"It has prevented people from choking up on their spending," commented Jack Berry, of the chamber of commerce. "Most workers here are making about $180 a month. They get $60 a week for the 2 weeks they work and $25 a week compensation the other two."

ONE WEEK'S WORK IN 10

William DiChessi of the CIO Textile Workers said that despite the share-the-work plan some of their members were getting only a week's work out of each 10.

"The employment situation here became acute last July and people are running out of compensation now," he said. "The picture will get very dark the next month or so unless the mills pick up."

Lawrence inaugurated a new mayor this month, John J. Buckley, 35, a graduate of Georgetown University. Running on a platform built around immediate action on unemployment, he unseated, in a nonpartisan election, a man who had held the job for 10 years. Both are Democrats.

Mayor Buckley admits constructive fulfillment of his campaign promise will be very difficult. He plans to offer full cooperation of his government to both labor and management in the effort to solve the employment problem, hire a trained industrial engineer, appoint a new industrial development committee to replace the old one which resigned when he came in.

"We must retain our present industries and bring in new and diversified ones," he said.

New and diversified industry is Lawrence's real hope of curing unemployment. Mr. Barry, of the chamber of commerce, said:

"We need 10,000 new jobs in diversified industries to provide pretty full employment. Of course, if our woolen manufacturers move out that would change the picture. In 1948 and 1949 we got 1,500 new jobs in the needle trades, men's clothing, plastics, electronics. We are shooting for anything but textiles."

Mr. Barry attributed Lawrence's plight to an excess capacity of the worsted industry generally; diminished civilian demand for clothes; heavy inventories of cloth at all trade levels; competition of synthetics—rayon, nylons, blends—and competition of southern producers "who are underbidding us on Government orders."

UNION DEFFENDS WORKERS

The CIO and the AFL cited those reasons. They said poor management and ancient machinery rather than the workers are largely responsible for low productivity at the mills.

Union contracts with most of the mills expire March 15. American Woolen and others have served notice they are not renewing on present terms. The big issue in forthcoming talks about a new contract is certain to be what is a fair day's work, rather than wages. The unions will renew the present contract. They point out the size of workloads for the employees are subject to arbitration under the present agreements where managements and unions are unable to agree.

"Productivity is where they beat hell out of us," said Mr. Barry, of the chamber. "They run four to six looms here, far more in the South."

TAKES SLAP AT EMPLOYERS

"They, employers, believe a man has done a full day's work when he is carried out on a stretcher," commented Francis Schaufenbil, of the AFL.

Mr. White of American Woolen said worker slow-downs and "arbitrary limitations on employees' production" are among New England's major problems. And he added contracts with the unions "should allow us to accomplish the job that labor and management must do if we are going to find solutions to this problem" of southern competition.

"How much longer are we people in New England going to be outsmarted politically, economically, and industrially by other sections of this country?" Mr. White asked.

URGES LAST-DITCH FIGHT

"Our taxes have developed these competing areas and have aided our competitions. Our shoe industry has practically vanished to the West. Our cotton and synthetic fabric mills have, for the most part, migrated to the South. And now the once great New England woolen and worsted industry is on its way to this area. What kind of people are we to let this thing happen?

"Are city and State governments of New England ready to meet southern competition? Is this community ready to meet the competition of southern communities? Are you workers ready to meet the competition of southern workers? You are going to have one more opportunity to do this and, if you are ready, I solemnly promise you that as president of the American Woolen Co. I will join you in the fight of our lives to keep our mills here."

POVERTY AMID PLENTY—HARD-HIT NEW HAMPSHIRE CITIES FIGHT TO AVERT GRIM DISASTER

(By James Y. Newton)

MANCHESTER, N. H., February 4.—The two largest cities of New Hampshire—Manchester and Nashua—prove today that an industrial community by hard work and enterprise can turn back from the brink of economic disaster.

Each had its economic foundation knocked out by sudden collapse of textile industries upon which the cities were dependent. The way each picked up the pieces and built a new and sounder business foundation should be inspiration to other hard-pressed New England textile cities and other one-industry towns about the country.

Both Manchester and Nashua still have many problems. They must bring in additional new industries to furnish jobs. Unemployment still is severe, particularly in Nashua, which recently received the second hard blow in 4 years in the closing of a big textile mill. But both cities have passed most of the rough spots to security.

The Nashua story is largely one about the efforts of a young ex-GI, 33-year-old Hugh Gregg, who pulled the city together when it was falling apart and, as a reward, may be elected the next Governor of New Hampshire.

Manchester faced virtual extinction and became a national problem in 1936 when the Amoskeag, world's largest cotton mill, closed its doors in bankruptcy. The mill buildings stretched more than a mile along the Merrimack River beside the city, and in them worked 13,000 persons, over half the city's breadwinners.

PURCHASED HUGE MILL

This blow came before the country, and Manchester, had pulled out of the depression of the 1930's. It took a long time for Manchester to recover, but the city was saved when a group of enterprising citizens, led by Arthur E. Moreau, a hardware dealer, formed a company to purchase the Amoskeag property. They bought it for $5,000,000, with the help of the seven Manchester banks in handling the financing.

The new company gradually sold parts of the huge property, some to firms already in the city, others to new outside interests, until today 127 different companies are doing business in the mill yard. There is more textile manufacture than any other single type, but the enterprises are well diversified, making literally everything from soup to caskets. The firms employ 12,500, well over half of the city's industrial workers.

The two largest manufacturing industries are textiles and shoes, in the city of 82,000. Both have been in the doldrums, but the shoe companies dropped prices a dollar a pair, and business has picked up. Manchester's rayon and blended textile mills also are busier than those in other parts of New England.

Unemployment has been reduced in the past year to 2,600, or 6 percent of the working force. Total payrolls in the city have risen nearly 10 percent in the last year, and business was reported as generally good.

CIO REPRESENTS WORKERS

The textile workers are organized in the CIO Textile Workers Union, which represents most employees of the industry in New England. On the subject of productivity, Michael Botelho, CIO State director, said the Manchester workers produce more than those of adjacent cities, because they worked with newer machinery and daily work assignments were larger.

New England manufacturers blame low workloads largely for their inability to compete with textile mills of the South.

"We pioneered in higher workloads," Mr. Botelho said, "and the rest of New England is going to follow. The employers in this neck of the woods tackled the problem of modernizing their plants in very vigorous fashion. They didn't wait until the bottom dropped out of their machines. Now they are reaping the benefits."

Nashua, hard by Manchester, and near the Massachusetts border, received its biggest jolt in 1948 when the Textron Corp., employer of 3,600 people in a city of 33,000, announced it was closing its two cotton mills. The company, headed by Royal Little, was one of the country's largest cotton goods manufacturers. It had purchased the mills only 2 years before, and the Nashuans flocked there to work.

LED TO SENATE PROBE

The shut-down of the mills led to a congressional investigation of Textron and its charitable trust operations, by a committee headed by Senator TOBEY, Republican, of New Hampshire.

Textron sold the machinery in one plant, employing 2,200, and it was moved away.

It was at that time young Hugh Gregg started to move. The son of a wealthy woodwork manufacturer, he had opened a law business in 1946 after 4 years in the Army. Meantime, he was elected as alderman-at-large of Nashua.

Mr. Gregg rounded up some of the leading citizens of the town to buy the Textron mill properties. They set up the Nashua Foundation, a public trust, main purpose of which was to promote the welfare of Nashua and solve the job problem created by the Textron closing. Any profits made by the foundation were to go to the New Hampshire Society for Crippled Children and Handicapped Persons.

The foundation bought the two mills for $500,000, raising a down payment of $100,000 from banks and other firms and giving Textron a $400,000 mortgage. They leased the smaller mill, electric plant, bleachery, and die works back to Textron at $66,000 a year. Textron, meantime, had decided to continue operations at the smaller plant and the lease was for 10 years.

SOLICITED NEW BUSINESS

Then, Mr. Gregg and his coworkers scurried about the country persuading new business to move into Nashua and take over the larger mill property purchased from Textron.

They succeeded well, bringing in 12 firms, the largest of which make electronic equipment, greeting cards, and shoes. The firms employ about 2,350 people, more than were laid off by Textron.

The enterprise has worked out so well that the foundation has paid off the $400,000 mortgage to Textron and most of its debts about town. The Society for Crippled Children is assured of a large and steady income. Property owned by the foundation now is valued at $1,000,000 and the rents are coming in.

Largely because of his work for Nashua, Mr. Gregg was persuaded to run for mayor in 1949. He surprised friends by winning, despite some heavy handicaps. Nashua is a Democratic mill town. Sixty-five percent of the people are Catholic and of French-Canadian descent. Mr. Gregg, a Republican, is from a wealthy Protestant family. His opponent was an elderly doctor, of French-Canadian descent, who said if only all of the babies he had delivered would vote for him he would win. But he didn't.

TO RUN FOR GOVERNOR

Now Mr. Gregg, who was called back into the Army on a Reserve commission before his term as mayor was up, has declared for the Republican nomination as Governor. He is expected to be released by the Army soon and his friends are betting he will win again.

Meanwhile, Textron last fall began closing their second plant—the one it .eased from the Foundation. So far about 1,200 persons have lost their jobs. Officers of the Foundation said that Textron is still paying the rent but it does not appear they will reopen the mill.

It poses a new problem for Nashua. The city has 2,000 unemployed, about half of whom are still out of work because of the latest Textron shutdown. There are 1,800 receiving unemployment compensation.

The Foundation set up by Mr. Gregg and his friends is stymied for the moment because Textron still has a lease on the plant and it is the only vacant manufacturing space in the city.

HARDSHIP CASES

The situation has brought real hardship to some of Nashua's people.

Thomas J. Pitarys, head of the CIO Textile Workers' Union in the city, cited the case of a man and wife and 11 children, who lost his job with Textron. He has been unable to get work and is collecting $28 a week compensation. One daughter is netting $23 a week in a shoe factory. A boy in the family has just reached the age of employment and hopes to go to work soon. Meantime, the whole 13 are getting by on $51 a week.

Another case, Mr. Pitarys said, involves a widower with 7 children, the youngest only 4 years old.

"His means of support," continued Mr. Pitarys, is $28 per week unemployment compensation, some aid from charitable organizations in the community and a little aid from the neighbors."

Another man, 56, has a wife, who is in poor health, and four children. He gets the $28 a week, but he has to pay $45 a month rent. He doesn't know where his next job will come from, because the textile industry seldom hires men his age.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

TEXTILE MARKETS—COMPANIES SELL BELOW COST TO KEEP MILLS BUSY; TWO MORE PLANTS CLOSED

(By T. A. Wise)

The gloom overhanging the textile industry grew thicker last week.

More mill closings or curtailments were announced, new price reductions were made and trading in the textile markets showed no signs of picking up. Mills also were selling their products below cost to keep operating.

Last week a mill closed in the North and one in the South. The Hathaway Manufacturing Co. in New Bedford, Mass., announced it was closing its rayon division this week and would reopen on February 25 operating on a two-shift, three-day-week basis.

The curtailment is due to the extremely adverse market conditions, the management stated.

Seabury Stanton, president, in explaining the action, said the company finds itself undersold by a substantial margin almost every day, "even when we cut our prices below our actual costs."

"We recently bid on a Government order for approximately 10,000,000 yards," Mr. Stanton noted. "We put in a bid substantially below our actual cost because we wanted this order badly enough to keep our plant running on its present schedule. But when the bids were awarded we were able to get only a small part of it, less than 500,000 yards—because we were greatly underbid by other mills. As a matter of fact, ours was the highest bid which was awarded any part of the contract and our bid was sharply below our actual cost."

Several other mills in the rayon, woolen, and cotton goods market agreed that many mills are submitting below cost bids on Government contracts merely to keep their plants busy and their working force intact.

Last Friday, Albert A. List, president of William Whitman Co., of Lawrence, Mass., said he was able to buy goods from a Pennsylvania mill for 30 cents a yard less than it would cost his mill to make.

MILL CLOSED IN GEORGIA

The mill closing in the South was announced by A. D. Juilliard, Inc. The company said it is closing its Floyd Mills plant in Rome, Ga. The plant manufactures cotton corduroy and light duck. The company blamed poor market conditions and added that a recent 8 cents an hour wage boost to employees had made the plant wage scale the highest in the South.

The action of Celanese Corp. and Tennessee Eastman Corp. in slashing the price of acetate staple fibre from 48 cents to 42 cents a pound was one attempt to boost sales. Stocks of acetate staple have piled up to a point where they are over seven times greater than the inventories on hand a year ago.

The move is also significant because for the first time it wipes out the traditional gap between the prices of actetate and viscose staple rayon. Some rayon men immediately forecast a price cut in the price of viscose rayon. But the statistics don't bear out their predictions. In the last 3 months of 1950 shipments of acetate staple totaled 31,000,000 pounds, while in the last quarter of 1951 they were only 24,000,000 pounds. But viscose staple shipments jumped in the same period from 49,200,000 pounds in 1950 to 52,800,000 in the last 1951 quarter.

The rayon fabric makers took the news in stride, asserting it would be some months before the benefits of such a price cut would mean much at the mill level where fabric prices are already depressed.

NYLON ALLOTMENTS CUT

Hosiery and lingerie makers raised a sort of "tempest in a teapot" when it was announced that the DuPont Co. was cutting March nylon allotments by 20 percent. The reason: The Government is buying more of the synthetic fabric for military use.

But before the threat of a nylon shortage could be spread some nylon dealers explained that production of the synthetic yarn had increased rapidly since last fall. It is probable that even after the 20 percent cut in allocations there will be more nylon yarn available to the industry as a whole than was produced last fall.

The hosiery industry had one other stormy development last week when Julius Kayser Co. and the rest of the Nation's hosiery makers clashed. Kayser claims patent rights on a specific technique of finishing off stockings. The "loopless toe" system of making a pair of women's stockings has been used widely in the industry since the introduction of nylon. But Kayser claims it has patent rights on the method and informed an estimated 500 manufacturers they are infringing on its patent rights. Last week 100 hosiery makers joined to file suit voiding Kayser's patent rights.

Actual trading in the Worth Street cotton goods market last week was nil as buyers stayed on the side lines watching the erratic price movements of cotton futures. Raw cotton prices tumbled as much as $4.50 a bale at the beginning of the week, recovered some ground and then declined again on the week end. The mills again asserted they are confident some of their customers will be forced to buy soon but those customers seem able to go to the second-hand market to get goods.

In the wool goods market trading was still in nominal amounts. Wool men noted, with some uneasiness, that raw fleece prices declined about 5 percent in the Australia auctions last week.

The Chatham Manufacturing Co. reported its 1952 blanket line prices would be reduced. An example: One all-wool blanket that sold for $14.95 last year will be $12.95 this year.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I am sure all Members of this body share the belief that Congress should give the very closest scrutiny to the problems he has outlined.

All members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are, I am sure, concerned that no improper advantage of the generous laws of the United States should be taken to the detriment of any State in the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a memorandum on conditions in Puerto Rico, which has been submitted to me by Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, in response to my request. This memorandum is accompanied by two exhibits, one a résumé of legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States for Puerto Rico since the occupation of Puerto Rico by United States troops in the Spanish-American War, and the second, a list of expenditures from Federal grants-in-aid made to agencies of the government of Puerto Rico from the year 1949–50 to 1951–52.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection the memorandum and exhibits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM FROM A. FERNÓS-ISERN, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER OF PUERTO RICO

Puerto Rico has been termed the Gibraltar of the Caribbean. The headquarters of the Tenth Naval District is there; the Army Antilles Command has its quarters there; the Air Force has its Fifty-fifth Strategic Reconnaissance Wing. Expenditures in Puerto Rico by the Defense Department vary from year to year. Neither the people of Puerto Rico nor the government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have any authority or control over these expenditures. Defense expenditures are by far the largest made by the Federal Government in Puerto Rico, more so if payments to veterans are included. Puerto Ricans are subject to military service as are all other United States citizens.

The people of Puerto Rico do not share the tax burden for defense, but they do make notable contributions to it. These contributions are in blood, loyalty, and devotion to democratic principles.

More than 75,000 Puerto Rican youths served the colors during the Second World War. Since the beginning of the current conflict, the Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment has been fighting for the cause of democracy in Korea. The Sixty-fifth Infantry Regiment is made up mostly of Puerto Ricans. Its fine record speaks for itself.

Puerto Rico is the one spot where the prestige of American institutions, as wise and proper for Spanish-Americans, either rises or falls.

Puerto Rico contains only 3,500 square miles. It is densely populated. Its population figures, according to the last census, exceed 2,200,000; more than 600 people per square mile. It is an agricultural community. Land is too scarce and too precious for the people to give up. However, whenever the Defense Department requires land for its installations, the Federal Government acquires it under the same procedures as in the mainland. Owners are compensated for their land acquired by the Government, but the available arable land area in Puerto Rico grows even smaller as the defense installations expand. Production is thus diminished, and the commonwealth government and its municipalities are deprived of taxes.

The greater part of the municipality of Culebra and two-thirds of the land in the municipality of Vieques have been taken over by the Navy. Culebra and Vieques are unable to finance their own municipal governments. It is necessary each year for the commonwealth government to appropriate money to help maintain local government in Culebra and Vieques. Many people from Culebra and even more from Vieques, have had to emigrate to the Virgin Islands.

Large expanses of agricultural land are held by the Navy in the eastern part of Puerto Rico (Ensenada Honda). Fine sugarcane land is held by the Army at Camp O'Reilly. The Air Force has a sizable area on the northwest tip of Puerto Rico, and it is still expanding. Valuable lands in and around San Juan have been relinquished by the insular government for defense installations. Puerto Rico has always been entirely willing that the military acquire land to the extent that it is necessary in the interest of the national defense.

The economic development of Puerto Rico is of concern not alone to Puerto Rico. It is to the economic interest of the United States that Puerto Rico be developed economically. Amongst other reasons, and since the United States tariff is operative in Puerto Rico, Puerto Rico is an almost exclusive market for United States products. In 1950–51, Puerto Rico sold $284,839,190 worth of merchandise to the United States. This includes the added value of the tax on rum shipments to the tune of $13,027,348 (this tax is paid directly by Puerto Rican producers), and the benefit payments to sugar producers in the amount of $17,474,000. In the same year, Puerto Rico purchased $400,397,676 worth of goods at domestic prices, from the mainland. There are no customs duties on trade between Puerto Rico and the mainland.

Since 1900, under the first organic act, it has been the policy of Congress to exempt Puerto Rico from federal taxation and to let the government of Puerto Rico be entirely locally supported.

From 1900 when the first organic act was passed until the years of the great depression, there were few Federal services operating in Puerto Rico. No grant-in-aid laws existed, and no special Federal help of importance was extended to Puerto Rico except following the 1928 hurricane when Public Resolution 74, Seventieth Congress created the Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission to assist in the rehabilitation of agriculture in the island and to aid in the repair and restoration of schools and roads and to aid in providing employment for unemployed and destitute laborers. The resolution authorized $6,000,000 for agricultural loans with 5 percent interest and $2,100,000 for schoolhouses and roads and seeds. An additional authorization for $2,000,000 loans and $1,000,000 for rehabilitation were given in 1930.

Puerto Rico was included within the emergency recovery measures designed to meet the depression, and was thus tided over until the inception of the Second World War. Since that time, Federal services have been gradually and increasingly extended. Federal legislation especially extending such services to Puerto Rico is listed in exhibit 1.

TABLE OF THE MORE IMPORTANT CIVILIAN FEDERAL AGENCIES OPERATING IN PUERTO RICO

1. Department of Agriculture including—
(a) Farmers Home Administration.
(b) Production and Marketing Administration.
(c) Soil Conservation Service.
(d) Agricultural experiment stations.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Federal Security Agency.
4. Department of Justice.
5. Department of Labor.
6. Post Office Department.
7. Selective Service System.
8. Veterans' Administration.

During the Second World War, Puerto Rico was hard hit economically because of the submarine blockade. Its sugar production was severely curtailed for lack of fertilizer and converting the sugar fields for the production of food crops—all due to shipping difficulties.

No war industries were established in Puerto Rico. However, the rum industry boomed, since production of whisky was reduced in the United States. This allowed Puerto Rico to collect unprecedented revenues from rum shipments. But the boom in the rum industry ended as soon as whisky production in the States was resumed. The rum tax dwindled to very low figures. It has been gradually recovering to a little higher prewar levels. Reference is made below to the exact income from this source.

The revenues of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are derived from customs duties, locally imposed internal-revenue taxes, including the income and the excise taxes; from its real-estate taxes and from the excise tax on shipments of certain Puerto Rican products to the States, which is collected under law of Congress and is equal to United States excise tax on like products.

Customs duties yield very little as follows:

Income from customs in Puerto Rico

1944–45	$2,150,000
1945–46	3,439,000
1946–47	2,875,000
1947–48	2,567,000
1948–49	2,197,000
1949–50	2,193,000
1950–51	3,054,000

A résumé of the situation: Since Puerto Rico came under United States sovereignty it has been the policy of Congress not to tax the people of Puerto Rico to support the Federal Government. The government of Puerto Rico has been required to support itself with its own income, without Federal appropriations. Foreign imports coming into Puerto Rico are subject to tariff rates equal to those applied in the United States. This revenue has been covered in the insular treasury. There has been no tariff between Puerto Rico and United States. Federal agencies operating in Puerto Rico as elsewhere in United States are supported and administered by the Federal Government. Special appropriations for Puerto Rico have been made from time to time only because of serious emergencies.

The Sugar Act, as will be explained, has modified free-trade arrangements between Puerto Rico and the United States by curtailing the free and unhampered admission of Puerto Rican sugar into the continent.

That Puerto Rico's government be locally supported was provided under the 1900 organic act as follows:

"SEC. 12. That all expenses that may be incurred on account of the government of Puerto Rico for salaries of officials and the conduct of their offices and departments, and all expenses and obligations contracted for the internal improvement or development of the island not, however, including defenses, barracks, harbors, lighthouses, buoys, and other works undertaken by the United States, shall be paid by the Treasurer of Puerto Rico out of the revenue in his custody."

Section 6 (1917 Organic Act of Puerto Rico): "That all expenses that may be incurred on account of the Government of Puerto Rico for salaries of officials and the conduct of their offices and departments, and all expenses and obligations contracted for the internal improvement or development of the island, not, however, including defenses, barracks, harbors, lighthouses, buoys, and other works undertaken by the United States, shall except as otherwise specifically provided by the Congress, be paid by the Treasurer of Puerto Rico out of the revenue in his custody."

This latter provision will continue in force as part of the Puerto Rico Statute of Federal Relations after the Constitution of Puerto Rico goes into effect.

Appropriations are made by Congress for the support of the Territorial governments of Hawaii, Alaska, Guam, Samoa, and the Virgin Islands, but not for Puerto Rico. In this sense, Puerto Rico therefore has occupied a unique position, similar only to that of the Philippine Islands while they were under United States sovereignty.

Puerto Rico participates in grant-in-aid programs as shown in exhibit 2. The Government of Puerto Rico matches these funds according to Federal law either within the formulas applied to the States or by special formulas.

The Government of Puerto Rico operates within the scope of a State government. Federal Government agencies operate in Puerto Rico as anywhere else in the United States. This stems from section 9 of the organic act which is preserved in the Puerto Rico Statute of Federal Relations. Section 9 reads as follows:

"That the statutory laws of the United States not locally inapplicable, except as hereinbefore or hereinafter otherwise provided shall have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States, except the internal revenue laws: *Provided, however,* That hereafter all taxes collected under the internal revenue laws of the United States on articles produced in Puerto Rico and transported to the United States, or consumed in the Island, shall be covered into the Treasury of Puerto Rico."

The latter taxes are those levied on Puerto Rican shipments to the United States. They are collected from producers before shipment.

There are two fundamental practical differences between the status of Puerto Rico and that of a State:

1. Puerto Ricans, although under the jurisdiction of Federal law, equally as citizens of any State (under sec. 9 of the organic act above quoted), take no part in National elections and are represented in the Congress only by a voteless Member of the House of Representatives.

2. Puerto Rico is included in the United States Customs Union (Federal Tariff System) but customs collected in Puerto Rico are deemed to be local revenue. No Federal revenue taxes are collected in Puerto Rico, except on income derived from sources outside Puerto Rico. As before mentioned, taxes equal to United States internal revenue taxes are collected on locally produced merchandise before shipment to the mainland, and are deemed to be local revenue.

Puerto Rico is unincorporated Territory. That is to say, although subject to the sovereignty of the United States in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Paris of 1898, constitutionally it is not a part of the United States.

As aforementioned, there are no customs duties on trade between Puerto Rico and the mainland, although this does not exactly mean free trade. Congress has extended the Federal minimum wage law to Puerto Rico under a flexible arrangement, and merchandise shipped from Puerto Rico to the United States must be produced under a minimum wage system established and enforced by United States officials under United States law.

Again, sugar, Puerto Rico's most important product, is subject to the quota system. The sugar act allows a fixed amount of Puerto Rican sugar to be sold in the mainland and only a small proportion of it may be refined in the island. It must be sold raw to be refined in the mainland. There are no restrictions to shipments from the mainland to Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico is included within the coastwise shipping laws of the United States. Trade between Puerto Rico and the United States must be carried by United States registered boats.

Since merchandise produced in Puerto Rico and shipped to the mainland is subject to a tax equal to the internal revenue tax of the United States regularly collected before shipment and covered into the Puerto Rico Treasury, United States manufacturers are protected from unfair competition from Puerto Rican producers in the mainland market. They are also equally protected in Puerto Rico against any discrimination, since under the organic act, excise taxes in Puerto Rico on mainland products therein consumed must be equal to those collected on local products.

Excise taxes collected on merchandise shipped from Puerto Rico to the United States have yielded to the Treasury of Puerto Rico:

Year:	*Total*
1944–45	$37,448,000
1945–46	33,217,000
1946–47	18,232,000
1947–48	2,661,000
1948–49	7,440,000
1949–50	9,575,000
1950–51	13,501,000

During the first 6 months of the fiscal year 1951–52 revenues from this source amounted to $6,946,638.

This tax, principally from rum, apparently has brought about great confusion and misunderstanding. Naturally, it is to be expected, the Puerto Rican producers pass as much of this tax along to the consumer as they are able to do. Moreover, the tax is collected by United States Treasury officials in Puerto Rico. Therefrom comes the interpretation that Federal tax money is turned over each year to Puerto Rico. It comes to be a rather technical matter. In practice this arrangement, as I see it, was established by the Congress in 1900 in consideration of the fact that under the Spanish regime, the customs and export taxes were very important sources of revenue for Puerto Rico. The application of United States tariff rates on foreign imports into Puerto Rico and free trade with the mainland would channel Puerto Rico's commerce toward the United States, and very little foreign trade would take effect. This is exactly what has come to pass. The tax on shipments to the United States would have to take the place of the former customs and export tax revenues.

Fifty years have elapsed, however. Sugar has become our mainstay. But free trade has been curtailed in this important commodity under the sugar-quota system. Tariff rates have been revised. Tariff protection on Puerto Rico's products (sugar, rum, needlework, fruits, tobacco, and coffee) either have been reduced or are nonexistent. Food Puerto Rico buys in the mainland in large amounts continues to have substantial tariff protection—rice, beans, meat, etc.

Although, upon acceptance of Public Law 600, the people of Puerto Rico agreed to the continuation of present economic relationships, as soon as the constitution of the Commonwealth goes into effect, it might be desirable to give attention to the 50-year-old arrangement for its over-all reexamination and possible readjustment in the light of all factors concerned, and in line with the principle of compact of Public Law 600.

The people of Puerto Rico consider themselves to be free citizens individually, and collectively to form a free commonwealth within the terms of their union with the United States. This will be more firmly established once their constitution goes into effect. They comprise a community of United States citizens living in a territory subject to the sovereignty of, but not a part, of the United States. Their status and relationship has been determined by Congress until, as aforementioned, they have come to be the subject of a compact under Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress.

The people of Puerto Rico love, understand, and practice democracy. They resent charges of dictatorship on the government they freely elect in honest elections, free from the taint of any fraud or pressure. They would resent any attempt to curtail their liberties either directly or indirectly. They would never tolerate dictatorship. They abhor it. They do not like colonialistic overlordship any better.

SUMMARY

In 1950–51, Puerto Rico sold $284,839,190 worth of merchandise to the United States (including the value of tax on rum shipments, $13,027,348, and sugar-benefit payments, $17,474,000). In the same year Puerto Rico purchased from the mainland $400,397,676 worth of goods at domestic prices and carried by high-cost transportation in United States registry vessels. Foreign ships cannot be used, since Puerto Rico is included in the coastwise shipping laws.

The Government of Puerto Rico is self-financed with insular funds. No Federal moneys are appropriated by Congress for this purpose. The United States spends approximately $10,000,000 per year to maintain Federal civilian agencies operating in Puerto Rico. Roughly, $10,000,000 additional is appropriated for Puerto Rico in connection with joint grants-in-aid programs. Puerto Rico often shares in these programs under special formulas which are unfavorable to Puerto Rico as compared with the formulas applied to States. During the past 10 years an estimated average of $100,000,000 in Federal moneys may have been spent per year in Puerto Rico for defense (including bases and personnel) and payments to veterans. Only by including the latter figure could it be said that $1,000,000,000 in Federal funds is spent in Puerto Rico in a 10-year period. Against this, it has been estimated that Puerto Rico is deprived of an income of approximately $25,000,000 per year under Federal sugar legislation which prevents Puerto Rico from selling all its sugar in refined form.

EXHIBIT 1

RÉSUMÉ OF LEGISLATION ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FOR PUERTO RICO SINCE THE OCCUPATION OF PUERTO RICO BY UNITED STATES TROOPS ON THE 25TH OF JULY 1898

1. Public Law 44, approved March 24, 1900:

An act appropriating, for the benefit and government of Puerto Rico, revenues collected on importations therefrom since its evacuation by Spain and revenues hereafter collected on such importations under existing law.

2. Public Law 69, approved April 12, 1900:

An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Puerto Rico and other purposes.

NOTE.—This was the first organic act for Puerto Rico. Under section 2, the same tariffs, customs, and duties shall be levied, collected, and paid upon all articles imported into Puerto Rico, from ports other than those of the United States, which are required by law to be collected upon articles imported into the United States from foreign countries.

This provision of law was continued under section 58 of the organic act of 1917, and will continue to be in effect under the Puerto Rican Statute of Federal Relations when the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico becomes effective.

Under section 3 of this same act, all merchandise coming into the United States from Puerto Rico and coming into Puerto Rico from the United States, was to be admitted at the several ports of entry, upon payment of 15 percent of the duties which are required to be levied, collected, and paid upon like

articles of merchandise imported from foreign countries. This provision was to cease not later than the 1st day of March 1902. After March 1, 1902, all such merchandise and articles were to enter and have continued to enter at the several ports of entry free of duty.

These two measures in reality created a customs union between the United States and Puerto Rico. The same section provided that articles of merchandise of Puerto Rican manufacture coming into the United States and withdrawn for consumption or sale, shall be entered at the several ports of entry upon payment of a tax equal to the internal revenue tax imposed in the United States upon the like articles of merchandise of domestic manufacture. This is what has come to be known as the rum tax.

Under section 4, the duties and taxes collected in Puerto Rico in pursuance of this act, less the cost of collecting the same, and gross amount of all collections of duties and taxes in the United States upon articles of merchandise coming from Puerto Rico, were not to be covered into the general fund of the Treasury, but held as a separate fund and placed at the disposal of the President to be used for the government and benefit of Puerto Rico until the government of Puerto Rico was organized. All moneys collected under the above provisions were to be transferred to the local treasury of Puerto Rico. Thereafter all collections of duties and taxes in Puerto Rico under the provisions of the act, were to be paid into the treasury of Puerto Rico, instead of being paid into the Treasury of the United States.

Under this act, trade between Puerto Rico and the United States was regulated in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such trade between any two great coasting districts of the United States.

Under section 11, Puerto Rican coins in circulation were substituted by coins of the United States.

Under section 12, all expenses incurred on account of the government of Puerto Rico, were required to be paid by the treasurer of Puerto Rico and of revenues in his custody; not, however, including defenses, barracks, harbors, lighthouses, buoys, and other works undertaken by the United States.

Under section 14, statutory laws of the United States not locally inapplicable, except as thereinbefore or thereinafter otherwise provided, have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States, except the internal revenue laws, which in view of the provisions of section 3, do not have force and effect in Puerto Rico.

This act became effective on the first day of May 1900.

3. Public Resolution 23, approved May 1, 1900:

Amongst other things, provides that no corporation shall be authorized to conduct the business of buying and selling real estate or be permitted to hold or own real estate except such as may be reasonably necessary to enable it to carry out the purposes for which it was created, and every corporation hereafter authorized to engage in agriculture shall by its charter be restricted to the ownership and control of not to exceed 500 acres of land.

NOTE.—This provision has been included as part of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

4. Public Law 133, approved May 31, 1900:

An act to facilitate the entry of steamships engaged in the coasting trade between Puerto Rico and the Territory of Hawaii and the United States.

5. Public Resolution 32, approved June 6, 1900:

Joint resolution to authorize and empower the Banco Español de Puerto Rico to amend its bylaws.

6. Public Law 55, approved March 22, 1902:

An act for the acknowledgement of deeds and other instruments in the Philippine Islands and Puerto Rico affecting land situated in the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States.

7. Public Law 89, approved April 29, 1902:

An act to refund the amount of duties paid in Puerto Rico upon articles imported from the several States from April 11, 1899, to May 1, 1900, to confer jurisdiction of the Court of Claims to render judgment thereon and making an appropriation therefor.

8. Public Law 249, approved July 1, 1902:

An act authorizing the President to reserve public lands and buildings in the island of Puerto Rico for public uses and granting other public lands and buildings to the government of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

9. Public Law 166, approved March 3, 1903:

An act to refund the amount of duties paid on merchandise brought into the United States from Puerto Rico between April 11, 1899, and May 1, 1900, and also on merchandise brought into the United States from the Philippine Islands between April 11, 1899, and March 8, 1902, and for other purposes.

10. Public Law 221, approved June 11, 1906:

An act to empower the Secretary of War, under certain restrictions, to authorize the construction, extension, and maintenance of wharves, piers, and other structures on lands underlying harbor areas and navigable streams and bodies of waters in or surrounding Puerto Rico and the islands adjacent thereto.

11. Public Law 294, approved June 25, 1906:

An act defining the qualifications of jurors for service in the United States district court in Puerto Rico.

12. Public Law 359, approved June 29, 1906:

An act to provide means for the sale of internal revenue stamps in the island of Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—This act allowed payment of the tax on merchandise shipped from Puerto Rico to the United States, to be paid in Puerto Rico before shipment. Under the 1900 law, these payments could only be made at the port of entry in the mainland. At present, this tax is paid almost exclusively in Puerto Rico before shipment. The law provided for the appointment of a deputy collector of internal revenue to have charge of collections in Puerto Rico.

13. Public Law 262, approved March 4, 1907:

An act to readjust the boundaries of the naval reservations in Puerto Rico, established in pursuance of the act of July 1, 1902.

14. Public Law 265, approved February 4, 1909:

An act to impose a tax upon alcoholic compounds coming from Puerto Rico, and for other purposes.

15. Public Law 275, approved February 25, 1909:

An act to authorize Behn Bros. of San Juan, P. R., to construct a bridge across a portion of the Condado Bay at the eastern extremity of San Juan.

16. Public Law 4, approved July 15, 1909:

An act to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; approved April 12, 1900."

NOTE.—A provision was added to the first Organic Act of Puerto Rico to the effect that if at the termination of any fiscal year, the appropriations necessary for the support of government for the ensuing fiscal year, shall not have been made, an amount equal to the sums appropriated in the last appropriation bills for such purpose, shall be deemed to be appropriated.

It also provided that all reports required by law to be made by the Governor or members of the Executive Council of Puerto Rico to any official in the United States, shall hereafter be made to an executive department of the Government of the United States to be designated by the President, etc.

Under this act the President placed Puerto Rico under the War Department.

17. Public Law 210, approved June 14, 1910:

An act to authorize the President to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain land and buildings not needed for purposes of the United States.

18. Public Law 333, approved August 24, 1912:

An act to authorize the government of Puerto Rico to construct a bridge across the Caño de Martin Peña and estuary of the harbor of San Juan, Puerto Rico.

19. Public Law 346, approved January 7, 1913:

An act to provide for holding the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico during the absence from the island of the United States District Judge and for the trial of cases in the event of the disqualification of or inability to act by the said judge.

NOTE.—Under this provision a justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico under Presidential appointment, acts as a temporary judge of the United States District Court in the absence of the judge of the United States District Court.

20. Public Law 73, Sixty-third Congress, approved March 24, 1914:

An act to authorize the government of Puerto Rico to construct two bridges across the Arecibo River near the City of Arecibo, Puerto Rico.

21. Public Law 241, approved January 28, 1915:

An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

NOTE.—Under this act, Puerto Rico was included in the first circuit together with Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Maine.

22. Public Law 312, Sixty-third Congress, approved March 4, 1915:

An act to provide for the allowance of a drawback of taxes on articles shipped to the island of Puerto Rico or to the Philippine Islands.

23. Public Law 368, approved March 2, 1917:

NOTE.—This is the second organic act adopted by Congress for Puerto Rico. The main changes were:

It included a bill of rights; Puerto Ricans were declared to be citizens of the United States; an elective senate was created to take over the legislative functions of the executive council, which theretofore had both executive and legislative functions. (The executive council theretofore had been appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice of the Senate of the United States.)

In addition, four out of six heads of departments were to be appointed by the governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico. Two of the heads of departments were still to be appointed by the President of the United States with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States. The governor and the auditor were also to be appointed by the President of the United States, as well as the supreme court.

Under section 58, such provisions of the first organic act as were not in conflict with the new organic act, were continued in effect. These include provisions on customs, internal revenue, coin, coastwise shipping, etc. (Already discussed above.)

24. Public Law 301, Sixty-sixth Congress, approved February 3, 1921:

To amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico. It provides that no public money or property shall be appropriated, donated, etc., for the support of any sect, church, etc. Also it establishes a limit to the public indebtedness of Puerto Rico.

25. Public Law 334, Sixty-sixth Congress, approved February 27, 1921:

Amend section 4 of the Federal Farm Loan Act extending its provisions to Puerto Rico.

26. Public Law 327, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved September 21, 1922:

Confers to the territorial courts of Puerto Rico concurrent jurisdiction with the United States courts on all offenses under the National Prohibition Act.

27. Public Resolution 102, Sixty-seventh Congress, approved March 4, 1923:

To authorize the transportation to Puerto Rico of a committee representing the Fourth Ohio Infantry War with Spain.

28. Public Law 311, Sixty-eighth Congress, approved January 8, 1925:

Authorizes the Court of Appeals for the First Circuit to hold sitting at San Juan.

29. Public Law 467, Eightieth Congress, approved February 25, 1925:

An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the Federal Land Bank of Baltimore certain land in the city of San Juan, Puerto Rico.

30. Public Law 128, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved April 17, 1926:

An act to provide for the enlargement of the present customs warehouse at San Juan, Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—An amount not to exceed $230,000 was authorized to be paid out of duties collected in Puerto Rico.

31. Public Law 165, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved May 1, 1926:

An act to provide for the completion and repair of customs buildings in Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—The sums of $7,700, $1,826.80, and $300 were to be paid out of duties collected in Puerto Rico.

32. Public Law 296, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved May 26, 1926:

An act exempting from the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 certain Spanish subjects residents of Puerto Rico on April 11, 1899.

NOTE.—According to the Treaty of Paris, these persons had been recognized as having a right to stay in Puerto Rico after the change of sovereignty.

33. Public Law 635, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved February 24, 1927:

An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the Asociation Siervas de Maria, San Juan, Puerto Rico, certain property in the city of San Juan, Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—For the sum of $4,000 which was to be made available for the construction of noncommissioned officers' quarters on the military reservation at San Juan, Puerto Rico, to replace quarters then occupied by a noncommissioned officer on the land to be conveyed, as certain property was ceded under quit-claim deed to the Siervas de Maria, a religious order. The property is located on the top of the old fortifications of San Juan and contains about 6,000 square feet. It adjoins Fortaleza, the Governor's residence. It was to be used for an extension to hospital facilities therein existing. A passage of 1 meter in width was to be left along the outer wall of the fortification to remain military property.

34. Public Law 797, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved March 4, 1927:

Amends the organic act of 1917. Most important provisions are amended. Refers to acquisition of citizenship by persons born in Puerto Rico not previously provided for; increases the salary of the auditor; limits the legislative session to 60 days; creates a public service commission. It also provides that no suit for the purpose of restraining the assessment or collection of any tax imposed by the laws of Puerto Rico shall be maintained in the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico.

35. Public Law 302, Seventieth Congress, approved April 23, 1928:

An act for the relief of certain Puerto Rican taxpayers.

NOTE.—This refers to lawsuits affected by Public Law 797.

36. Public Law 414, Seventieth Congress, approved April 23, 1928:

An act to provide for the completion and repair of customs buildings in Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—The total sum of about $50,000 was appropriated out of duties collected in Puerto Rico.

37. Public Resolution 74, Seventieth Congress, approved December 21, 1928:

Joint resolution for the relief of Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—This was passed as a result of the hurricane which swept over the island in September 1928. The Congress appropriated $50,000 for administrative expenses of a commission made up of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of Agriculture, with the Secretary of War as chairman. The commission was empowered to make loans to individual coffee planters, coconut planters, fruit growers, or other agriculturists in the island of Puerto Rico in amounts not to exceed $25,000. Six million dollars was authorized. Moneys received as repayments were to be used as a revolving fund thereafter to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Also, an appropriation of $2,000,000 was authorized for the rebuilding and repairing of schoolhouses, and for the employment of labor and the purchase of materials for repairing insular and rural municipal roads. One hundred thousand dollars was authorized for seeds and seedlings.

38. Public Resolution 33, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 4, 1929:

To amend the second paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended.

NOTE.—Extends certain provisions of the Federal Farm Loan Act to Puerto Rico and Alaska.

39. Public Resolution 33, Seventy-first Congress, approved January 22, 1930:

Joint resolution to authorize additional appropriations for the relief of Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—An additional appropriation of $1,000,000 was made for loans and $2,000,000 for the building and repairing of school houses and employment of labor and for repairing and constructing of insular and rural municipal roads.

40. Public Law 677, Seventy-first Congress, approved February 18, 1931:

To amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, approved March 2, 1917.

NOTE.—It added a Department of Labor to the Government of Puerto Rico.

41. Public Resolution 129, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 3, 1931:

It extends sections 1, 2, 6, and 7 of the act of Congress entitled, "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor" to the territory of Puerto Rico, approved June 7, 1924.

NOTE.—This seems to be the first time a special law was passed extending a permanent Federal service to Puerto Rico since the enactment of the 1900 Organic Act where such services as lighthouses, buoys, maritime quarantine were placed under Federal Government.

42. Public Law 791, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 3, 1931:

An act to extend the provisions of certain laws relating to vocational rehabilitation to Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—$105,000 was authorized for Puerto Rico.

43. Public Law 846, Seventy-first Congress, approved March 4, 1931:

An act to provide for the extension of agricultural experiment stations to Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—The agricultural experiment station to be connected with the College of Agriculture of the University of Puerto Rico. There is a separate Federal Agricultural Experiment Station in Puerto Rico conducted for general national purposes.

44. Public Resolution 29, Seventy-second Congress, approved May 17, 1932:

To change the name of the island of "Porto Rico" to "Puerto Rico."

NOTE.—Since 1900, through error, Puerto Rico had been officially designated as "Porto Rico." Evidently a misspelling.

45. Public Law 108, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 2, 1934:

An act to repeal prohibition in Puerto Rico.

46. Public Law 411, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 18, 1934:

Ratified a resolution by the Legislature of Puerto Rico imposing an import duty on coffee imported into Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—Coffee is the only item on which the Puerto Rico tariff is not identical with United States tariff.

47. Public Law 477, Seventy-third Congress, approved June 27, 1934:

Amends the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, approved March 2, 1917.

NOTE.—Provides for certain persons to become citizens of the United States.

48. Public Resolution 29, Forty-fifth Congress, approved June 17, 1935:

Provides for the extension of cooperative work of the Geological Survey to Puerto Rico.

49. Public Law 236, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 3, 1935:

Exempts refunding bonds of the Government of Puerto Rico from the limitation of public indebtedness under the Organic Act.

50. Public Resolution 51, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 20, 1935:

Amends the previous act ratifying a Joint Resolution of the Legislature of Puerto Rico on the importation of coffee.

51. Public Resolution 59, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935:

To permit an adjudication with respect to liens of the United States arising by virtue of loans under previous joint resolution for the relief of Puerto Rico after the 1928 hurricane.

52. Public Resolution 60, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935:

Amends the joint resolution for the relief of Puerto Rico approved December 21, 1928.

53. Public Law 442, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved February 11, 1936:

Provides that funds allocated to Puerto Rico under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935 may be expended for permanent rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

54. Public Law 766, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved June 23, 1936:

Extends to Puerto Rico the act to provide aid in the construction of rural post roads.

55. Public Law 116, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved May 26, 1937:

Authorizes the Secretary of War to transfer to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate pertaining to the post of San Juan, P. R., in exchange for insular property.

56. Public Law 313, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 17, 1937:

Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to transfer to the government of Puerto Rico a portion of land.

57. Public Law 315, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 17, 1937:

Authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to exchange with the people of Puerto Rico the Guanica Lighthouse Reservation for two adjacent plots of insular forest land.

58. Public Law 391, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 26, 1937:

Amends the Organic Act, increasing the borrowing margin of the municipality of Mayaguez.

59. Public Law 400, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 28, 1937:

Amends the Revenue Act of 1926, to exempt persons traveling between Puerto Rico and the continental United States from the payment of a stamp tax on steamship tickets.

60. Public Law 407, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved August 28, 1937:

Extends the benefits of section 21 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico.

61. Public Law 449, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved March 26, 1938:

Increases the salary of the judge in the United States District Court for Puerto Rico.

62. Public Law 494, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved April 26, 1938:

Authorizes the transfer of certain military reservations to other agencies of the Government and to the people of Puerto Rico.

63. Public Law 521, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved May 16, 1938:

Corrects United States citizenship status of certain persons born in Puerto Rico.

64. Public Law 570, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 1, 1938:

Amends the Organic Act of Puerto Rico relative to vacancies in the legislature.

65. Public Law 641, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 16, 1938:

Provides for the ratification of all joint resolutions of the Legislature of Puerto Rico and of the former legislative assembly.

66. Public Law 707, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 23, 1938:

Authorizes the Secretary of War to transfer to the Government of Puerto Rico certain real estate of the War Department.

67. Public Law 745, Seventy-fifth Congress, approved June 25, 1938:

To authorize the Legislature of Puerto Rico to create public corporate authorities to undertake slum clearance and projects, to provide dwelling accommodations for families of low income, and to issue bonds therefor; and for other purposes.

68. Public Law 414, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved February 12, 1940:

Refers to rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States to be applicable by the United States District Court of Puerto Rico.

69. Public Law 15, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 17, 1941:

Authorizes an exchange of lands between the people of Puerto Rico and the United States.

70. Public Law 214, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved August 18, 1941:

Extends to Puerto Rico the permission to organize military units not a part of the National Guard.

71. Public Law 30, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved April 10, 1943:

Authorizes the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States.

72. Public Law 86, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved June 22, 1943:

Authorizes an appropriation for work relief in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

NOTE.—The sum was not to exceed $8,000,000.

73. Public Law 464, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 6, 1944:

Authorizes the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico for school purposes a certain building and lot known as the Mayaguez Barracks Military Reservation now under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

74. Public Law 362, Eightieth Congress, approved August 5, 1947:

Amends the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—This act allowed Puerto Rico to elect its Governor and the Governor to appoint all members of the executive council. The auditor and the supreme court were still to be appointed by the President of the United States.

75. Public Law 746, Eightieth Congress, approved June 24, 1948:

Relating to salaries of certain officers and employees of the United States and certain officers and employees of Puerto Rico.

76. Public Law 776, Eightieth Congress, approved June 25, 1948:

Amends the Organic Act of Puerto Rico to take care of the citizenship status of certain persons in Puerto Rico.

77. Public Law 294, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 7, 1949:

To amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico. Provisions concerning the salaries of the judges in the supreme court.

78. Public Law 406, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 26, 1949:

Extends the benefits of section 23 of the Bankhead-Jones Act to Puerto Rico.

79. Public Law 433, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 29, 1949:

Amends the Federal Farm Loan Act to authorize loans through national farm-loan associations in Puerto Rico.

80. Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 3, 1950:

Authorizes the organization of a constitutional government in Puerto Rico.

NOTE.—This law enacted in the nature of a compact would become effective upon its acceptance by the people of Puerto Rico as expressed in a public referendum. This was held on June 4, 1951. The people of Puerto Rico, having accepted the law, elected delegates to a constitutional convention which met in San Juan on September 17, 1951, and adjourned on February 6, 1952. The constitution as drafted by the convention shall be voted upon by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952; thereupon, it shall be submitted to the President and the Congress of the United States for approval. Upon the the constitution becoming effective, most sections of the present organic act shall stand repealed and the remaining sections shall be continued and referred to as the Puerto Rican Statute of Federal Relations.

81. Public Law 615, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 18, 1950:

Enables the Governments of Alaska, of Hawaii, of Puerto Rico, and of the Virgin Islands to authorize public bodies or agencies to undertake slum clearance, etc.

82. Public Law 708, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 17, 1950.

Amends the Organic Act of Puerto Rico to increase the borrowing capacity of the municipalities of Arecibo and Rio Piedras.

83. Public Law 734, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 28, 1950.

Extends and improves the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system and amends the public assistance and child welfare provisions of the Social Security Act.

NOTE.—Under its terms, old-age and survivors' insurance was extended to Puerto Rico as well as public assistance to be extended to Puerto Rico according to a special formula.

84. Public Law 775, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 8, 1950:

Extends United States Employment Service to Puerto Rico.

85. Public Law 140, Eighty-second Congress, approved September 1, 1951.

Extended the Sugar Act of 1948; increased Puerto Rico's quota by 170,000 tons; continues the provisions limiting the amount of refined sugar Puerto Rico may sell in the United States to 126,000 tons.

EXHIBIT 2

Expenditures from Federal grants-in-aid made to agencies of the government of Puerto Rico, 1949–50 to 1951–52

	1951–52 [1]	1950–51	1949–50
FOR OPERATING EXPENSES			
Office of the Governor: Civilian defense programs of Puerto Rico	$120,000	0	0
National Guard of Puerto Rico: Rental of hangers	15,000	$23,214	$12,892
Department of the Interior: Highway research	41,159	72,869	131,043
Agricultural Extension Service: Smith-Lever, Bankhead-Jones, Clark-McNary and Flanagan-Hope Acts	641,589	614,923	542,935
Agriculture Experiment Station: Hatch, Adams, Purnell, Bankhead-Jones, etc., acts	270,616	247,865	247,865
Department of Labor: Employment Service Administration	431,302	129,499	0
Department of Health:			
Mental health	53,400	68,510	11,136
Hospital survey and planning	0	4,500	1,575
Cancer control	55,700	62,911	31,559
Child Welfare Service, title V	340,871	136,895	82,503
Social security fund, titles I, IV, X, and XIV	4,061,000	262,875	0
Water pollution control	26,220	18,937	4,541
Heart disease control	35,600	28,662	0
Tuberculosis control	198,700	207,349	207,962
Maternal and child health, fund "A"	138,905	137,933	133,762
Maternal and child health, fund "B"	251,776	257,101	287,232
Crippled children, fund "A"	118,672	97,283	88,158
Crippled children, fund "B"	211,316	160,056	125,753
General health	339,539	365,433	366,522
Venereal disease control	250,643	205,334	273,270
Maternal and child health-maternity care	0	0	0
FOR OPERATING EXPENSES—continued			
Department of Education:			
School needs survey	[3]33,755	[3]7,536	0
Cooperative vocational rehabilitation	291,252	231,373	[3]202,110
George Barden Act	394,491	370,757	227,816
Vocational agriculture	105,000	105,589	88,309
School lunchrooms program [2]	3,500,000	3,510,046	4,102,443
Future Farmers of America, Puerto Rico chapter	6,700	6,761	6,144
University of Puerto Rico: University fund	60,000	82,463	115,243
Department of Agriculture, Marketing and Research	17,000	36,684	26,885
Pittman-Robertson Act	3,012	2,251	
Subtotal operating expenses	12,013,218	7,455,609	7,317,649
FOR CAPITAL EXPENSES			
National Guard of Puerto Rico: Construction of armories	[3]480,000	0	0
Department of the Interior: Highway Survey and Construction Act	1,758,841	1,522,427	1,274,957
Department of Health: Hospital Survey and Construction Act	[3]2,487,331	[4]1,208,472	0
Transportation Authority: Airports Construction Act	600,000	471,295	515,000
Public Housing Administration	299,971	322,000	262,000
Subtotal capital expenses	5,626,143	3,524,194	2,051,957

[1] Estimate.

[2] Includes estimated $1,100,000 for 1951–52, $1,160,830 for 1950–51, and $1,755,790 for 1949–50 of Federal grants in kind (foodstuffs).

[3] Allotment.

[4] In addition to this amount, $121,871.93 were reimbursed by the USPHS to the General Conference Corporation of the Seventh-Day Adventists, sponsors of Bella Vista Hospital and Sanatorium, project Puerto Rico 6 through the Department of Health.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] spoke as he did today. We in the South, and particularly in South Carolina, are feeling the effects of the conditions to which he has referred.

Is it right to be sending to Puerto Rico aid to the extent of millions of dollars, collected from the taxpayers of the United States, and then, on the other hand, to have Puerto Ricans starting industries with our money, in some instances competing with industries in the United States? I am not so fearful of cotton mills being located in Puerto Rico, if they will meet us on an equal footing, if they will pay the salaries which are paid in the United States, and if they will have to pay the same taxes as those paid in the United States.

I have been led to make this statement because I have found that some of the industries which have been established in Puerto Rico are making so many seconds that they cannot sell their goods. Some of the production is running as high as 80 percent in seconds.

Having worked in a cotton mill for 11 years, I know what it means when an attempt is made to sell such goods. The price at which the seconds sell is not nearly so much as the prices obtained for goods that are not seconds. There is a reason for the making of so many seconds.

With the experience I have had in a mill—in the spinning room, the carding room, and the weaving shop—I know that the condition begins even further back. It begins with the grade of cotton. A really and truly good garment cannot be made unless good cotton is used. I fear that many Puerto Rican manufacturers are now buying a cheap grade of cotton, the shortest staple. I fear also that all along the line these manufacturers have not had experience in processing. They do not have what is needed to meet competition in the United States. For instance, to make a good weaver requires at least 2 years' experience; to make a good loom fixer, from 3 to 5 years. The manufacturers in Puerto Rico have not had the necessary experience. It is going to take time for them to gain it. I warn people who go there now that when they begin operations without experienced help they are not going to be able to meet competition, particularly when they pay the taxes they will have to pay.

Americans ask only that they be enabled to meet Puerto Rican manufacturers on an equal footing, and they can well take care of the situation.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I gather from the remarks made by the Senator from South Carolina that there exist in his State and in other sections of the South conditions similar to those which I have described as existing in the New England States. I think the condition is more extreme in the New England States, where in community after community there is supposed to be, at least in normal times, prosperity, but where today people are walking the streets, out of employment, as a result of the removal of textile industries to Puerto Rico.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. People are walking the streets 4 or 5 days a week, and many mills are running only 2 or 3 days a week, instead of 5 days. So I fear the situation. I think the only thing for the United States as a nation to do is to have Puerto Rican manufacturers meet our own manufacturers on an equal footing.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that some of the textile industries that have left his State, and mine, have gone into the State of the Senator from South Carolina. One reason for that has been the passage by Congress of what is known as the Taft-Hartley Act. I do not know whether the Senator is aware of that.

In that act we wrote a provision that if a State was against the union shop, the Federal Government would not force the union shop, even though the union shop were desired by a majority of employees of the shop. This fact has been pointed out by chambers of commerce in New Hampshire and Connecticut. In those States there will be labor unions regardless of the Taft-Hartley Act. Labor unions are so strong in numbers there that they do not need the protection of the Federal Government to maintain their integrity.

I should like to advise the Senator that some of the troubles with textile plants in our section of the country have been caused by the Taft-Hartley Act, which was supported in the Eightieth Congress by so many Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I do not agree entirely with the Senator from Connecticut. I believe that the textile plants were moving South to some extent even before the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. I voted against the Taft-Hartley Act when it was under consideration, and I offered a substitute for it at the time. I think the trouble goes deeper than that. I did not want to go into this question today on the floor of the Senate. I did not come here anticipating that I would do so. However, it must be said that when the raw product is available near the source, and there is plenty of labor, suitable climate, ample power, and other things which enter into the process of manufacture, such competition is difficult to meet. That is what has happened in the South. I think it happened to a great extent even before the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not deny that some of those considerations have been helpful to the South. The South is certainly entitled to the benefit of its natural advantages. The same may be said of all other sections of the country. They are entitled to the benefit of their natural advantages and resources. However, I say to the Senator that the movement which is in progress has been hastened by the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act and by the diversity in wages which that Act has helped to stimulate, as between the South and the North.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think it will be found that today wages paid in the cotton mills in the South are equal to those paid in the North.

Mr. McMAHON. That is not my information.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is my information.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a great deal of the debate with reference to the Alaska statehood bill has revolved around a claimed premise that those of us who happen not to favor this particular proposed legislation are trying to suppress the people of Alaska or deny to them a freedom to which they are entitled, and keep them from having control of their own affairs. It is said that it is our aim to control their affairs by a bureaucracy from Washington.

Mr. President, there is no basis whatsoever for such a claim. I think it is addressed to the emotions and feelings of the people. It is an effort to have them assume the role of underdog.

Let me point out, not what the Senator from Mississippi says about some of these things, but what the people of Alaska themselves say. I have before me an editorial from the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily News of December 26, 1950, entitled "Why Not Elect Our Own Governor?" This editorial was published soon after a bill for that purpose had been under consideration on the floor of the Senate, but had failed of passage. The editorial has this to say with reference to home rule in Alaska:

> Delegate BARTLETT is only practicing heroics when he says in effect that nothing constructive for Alaska must be done until statehood is granted.
>
> That was the stand he took recently when he was asked to support a bill calling for the election of a governor of Alaska.
>
> Such a move was recently proposed by Senator HUGH BUTLER, the Republican Senator who led the opposition fight against H. R. 331, the Alaska statehood bill.
>
> It might have been expected that Delegate BARTLETT would not feel kindly toward any measure proposed by the Nebraskan Senator, but in denouncing support of BUTLER'S proposed bill Delegate BARTLETT put himself squarely on record as opposing one basic principle of free democracy so far as Alaskans are concerned.

As I say, this is not the Senator from Mississippi speaking. This is the people of Alaska speaking, through one of their responsible agencies, one of the leading newspapers of that Territory. They are not talking about me or about the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who opposed their bill. They are talking about Delegate BARTLETT, their own chosen representative. Of course, there is nothing personal in my references to

Delegate BARTLETT. He is a very estimable Member of Congress, whom I respect very highly. This is the comment of the people of Alaska on freedom for Alaska. Quoting further with reference to Delegate BARTLETT:

He has said in effect that he will block any move allowing Alaskans to use their right of franchise until statehood is granted.

That is the cry of the proponents of the bill. It is not an attitude of saying, "We want local self-government, but if we cannot get it all now, we will take a part." That is not the attitude. The slogan is "Statehood or nothing."

The bill to which reference has been made is gathering dust, and has been gathering dust for some time in the very committee which is proposing this legislation for statehood and parading before the Nation the idea that those who do not go along with them are trying to suppress the people of Alaska, trying to deny them their freedom and the rights of citizenship. Some of the people of Alaska are proclaiming that the thing to do is to get the right to elect their governor, and then continue to work for statehood.

I think this explains something which none of the proponents of the bill have been able to explain. They have not explained why 42 percent of the people of Alaska voted against statehood about 5 years ago. I submit that that has never been satisfactorily explained. It cannot be explained by them according to their viewpoint on the bill. But when we look back into the files of local newspapers we find that some reasons come seeping through.

Quoting further from the editorial:

"I regret that I cannot agree with you that Alaska is only entitled to an elective governor," Delegate BARTLETT replied to Senator BUTLER when asked if he would support an elective governor bill in the next session of Congress. "It seems to me that the first step toward statehood was taken a long time ago and the final step preceding statehood occurred on August 12, 1912, when Alaska's Organic Act was signed. In urging statehood now I stand for an elective governor plus many other things. Some of those changes would be far, far more important than the privilege of electing our own governor."

That is the end of the quotation from Delegate BARTLETT. Continuing with the editorial:

Delegate BARTLETT and the others who made such a valiant and commendable effort for their cause should come down to earth again, forget the grandstand and play the game for the people in the bleachers. Moaning a lost cause now is a pitiful waste of time.

Delegate BARTLETT's stand is especially puzzling now when 2 years ago he himself pledged unqualified support to an elective governor bill. It was later shelved at his insistence with the reason given that it might harm the cause of statehood.

These are the words which come from the mouths of the people of Alaska themselves. I believe that the governorship bill would win almost unanimous support in the Senate. However, the proponents of statehood for Alaska say "No; down with that idea. It is statehood or nothing."

Quoting further from the editorial:

Clear-thinking people fail to see how a measure to elect our own governor could possibly harm statehood. Statehood will come when the time is ripe, and in the meantime a governor, elected by the people, a governor in whom the people of Alaska had faith and confidence, a governor who had Alaska at heart, could do more to aid the cause of statehood than any other form of strategy that could be adopted.

Those are well chosen, reasonable, and logical words. I submit them to the reasoning processes of the Senate. They represent a sound approach. They say, in effect, that they must take these steps progressively.

I pointed out the other day that Alaska has no county government. Consequently, they have no place where American citizenship is trained. I am not boasting that they do not have it; I am sorry that they do not have it. However, if they attain statehood, though they may not realize it now, they will find the woeful inadequacy of the system they have now. When it comes to training in the fundamental system of self-government from the lowest levels to the top, they need the experience that would come from a governorship.

I quote from another newspaper of almost the same date as the other newspaper to which I referred. The editorial from which I am about to quote appeared in the Ketchikan Daily News. It reads:

In the first place, the bill giving us the right to elect our governor would not conflict or interfere with the statehood bill in any manner.

That is the editor speaking.

Even if the 1951 Senate had a change of heart and voted approval of the statehood bill in January, it would still require 2 or 3 or 4 years before the people of Alaska could elect a constitutional convention, draft and approve a State constitution, and receive favorable action from Congress on the work accomplished. In the meantime, if the chance were given us to elect our own governor this work could be carried on under a man in whom the people have faith and trust.

I will not quote the remainder of the editorial. Some of it is of a rather personal nature, and I shall not quote it. However, the point is that they recognize the fact that a logical step to statehood would be the process of electing their own governor and in going through other democratic processes.

With all deference to the Senators in charge of the bill, I submit that that is another reason why I believe they are rushing it along before the Senate just as they rushed it before the committee. Six of the thirteen members of the committee asked in all sincerity for further hearings. Nevertheless the bill was rushed onto the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, when the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] came to the Chamber, the Senator from Mississippi had been asking some questions with reference to the assertions made by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on the subject of elimination of bureaucracy by the granting of statehood. I submit that we are going to have bureaucracy augmented from Washington if we pass the statehood bill. Most of the functions of government in Alaska would be continued on a Federal basis. That is a matter which is overlooked by many of the proponents of the bill. It is not generally known by Members of the Senate that most of the major operations of government in Alaska would continue to be on the Federal level even though statehood were granted. The most that they would get by way of hard terms with respect to the Federal activities in Alaska would be two Members on the floor of the Senate as Senators from the new State, who would be able to contact the many departments of Government in trying to get money for that area. That is bringing the matter down to practical terms. That is how it would operate. They would have two Senators who would be in a position to urge appropriation of funds for Federal programs in Alaska.

I do not say that such programs would not be worthy programs. My point is that the functions of government would go on just the same as they are going on now. We would not get out from under financial responsibility by granting statehood to Alaska. We would not add one ounce of democracy; but we would augment, intensify, magnify, and multiply bureaucracy.

I am certain of my facts and of my conclusions with respect to those facts.

I submit that the serious side of this matter is, Where do we go from here? Where do we go from here with reference to the admission of areas beyond the confines of our present 48 States?

One step leads to another. About 50 years ago when these Territories were taken under the American flag I doubt that anything was said about statehood. Let us look at Guam, for example. Guam has a population now of 59,498 people. It is a way out in the Pacific Ocean. We have already created Guam as an unincorporated Territory. We did it by Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress. Nothing was said about Statehood.

The next logical step, of course, will be to put Guam into the next category, that of an incorporated Territory. As times change a little it will become more important that we have more bases in that area, and it will become logical for Guam to become an incorporated Territory. Then the next logical step will be to say, "Having given them all this preparation and having created a Territory which the Supreme Court calls an inchoate state, why should we not make Guam a State?" The same arguments will be made on the floor of the Senate. It will be said that for the survival of our Nation we should take Guam into the Union.

Mr. President, 50 years is not a very long time. It will probably come in less than 50 years. It will come sooner if we continue to go into other noncontiguous areas to take in more States.

Let us look at the Virgin Islands. It may be said that it is preposterous to talk about the Virgin Islands in terms of statehood within the United States. Mr. President, the Virgin Islands have a population of 26,665. Their status now is

that they are organized, but unincorporated. They are operating under an organic act. They are not an incorporated Territory. We have already taken the first step. They have an appointed governor and they have an elected legislature. I am glad that they have both. However, my point is that the same logical steps will be followed with respect to the Virgin Islands.

Where are we going? We have trusteeships in the Pacific with respect to the Marianas, Marshalls, and Carolines. They are held in some way under a trusteeship from the United Nations. They were awarded to us for strictly military reasons. They do not have an organized status, as the Virgin Islands have, but they are all a part of the picture.

The relation of Puerto Rico to the United States is almost the same as that of Hawaii. In the Eighty-first Congress we sidestepped Puerto Rico in the great march of freedom. Much has been said about bringing down the iron curtain on freedom unless we grant statehood to Alaska and Hawaii. It seems that the freedom train failed to stop at Puerto Rico.

There are advocates on the floor of the Senate who favor statehood for Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico has a population of 2,210,703. They organized under a form of self-government by virtue of Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress. Their constitution probably will be ratified next month. It is a good form of government that has been set up in Puerto Rico. I am not critical of it. My point is that they have a logical claim for statehood. Morally I think they have just as much right as is claimed for some other Territories.

However, Mr. President, there is no use in debating at this time the relative weight of those matters. We must recognize the fact that when we open this door, we shall be adopting a new policy and shall be going further than we have ever gone before and shall be opening up a new field.

It is not a matter of treating the people of Alaska properly. Anyone who does not know that we want to treat them properly will never be convinced that we want to do so. If our record in the past, particularly in the past 10 years, does not convince everyone of our willingness and our sincere desire to treat these people properly, such persons will never be convinced that that is our desire.

The question goes far deeper than that. The question is whether we shall take these people into the bosom of our own Government, particularly the legislative branch of our Government, and give them power, not merely over themselves, but over all of us, as well. For instance, the other day I mentioned the question of taxation. I say to the Members of the Senate, Mr. President, that that question is becoming the most serious of all questions, either foreign or domestic, before the American people, because when any nation reaches the point where it is collecting in taxes approximately one-third of all the earnings of all its people, some kind of a danger line is rapidly being approached.

With all deference to the people of these outlying Territories, I do not believe they will be so deeply concerned as we are with that problem; they will not have the capacity to be so deeply concerned with it as we are, because the problem will not be of immediate concern to them, even though it is of immediate and grave concern to us. I do not think they will have the knowledge that we have of that problem.

So, Mr. President, with all deference to them, I do not think that power over us should be given to them. I speak of the 160,000,000 people who at the present time comprise the United States of America. It seems to me that during this debate very little has been said in behalf of the people of the United States itself; practically all the remarks which have been made relate to those who live in the Territories.

I do not mean to be selfish about this matter; but somehow, somewhere down the line, in respect to our policies affecting ourselves and all the rest of the world, someone must consider the Union itself, the Federal Union which already takes one-third of all the income of all the people of the United States and uses the money to pay the bills of the Federal Government.

That is why I say that before we take into the Federal Government, and particularly into its legislative branch, the people of these two Territories, we must give great consideration to this matter. We must be very careful that we consider all phases of the problem before we take the proposed step which, I repeat, can never be retracted or retraced, once it is taken.

The people of Alaska and Hawaii already have more power, more political independence, more opportunities in life, more freedom, and more of all the so-called good things in life than do any other people who ever have lived along the shores of the Pacific Ocean, save those who live in the States on the western border of the United States of America. The people of these two Territories already have everything that goes with sound government and constitutional liberties as we know them. In that respect they have much more than do any other people in that area of the world. We can give them more, and I am willing to give them whatever is considered to be sound after the arguments are heard and after the evidence is taken. But in order to do all those things and in order to protect those people, we do not have to surrender control over our own affairs and over our own taxation system and over the establishment of our own foreign policy.

So, Mr. President, tomorrow will be a historic day for the 48 States of the United States. If the Territory of Alaska is to be given statehood—a step which will open up new avenues and new doors—we shall be taking a step which we cannot retract or retrace. We shall be committed; the die will be cast.

I believe we can provide strength, security, protection, and greater measures of self-government to these people, and can make them strong and can develop the areas where they live just as well and just as effectively under other measures, and not take the proposed fateful step, certainly not until world affairs subside just a little, anyway, and until we feel that we are standing on surer and safer ground.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MATTERS PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). At this time the Chair, in his capacity of Senator, wishes to request the insertion of certain matters in the Appendix of the RECORD. If there is no objection, the matters will be inserted as requested.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Zadok D. Harrison, for appointment as senior assistant sanitary engineer in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Norman B. Atkins, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Seventeen postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles M. Eldridge, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understand that there is agreement on both sides in regard to this nomination, and that there is no objection to confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 26 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Watson B. Miller, of Maryland, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 3 years.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leonard A. Scheele, of Michigan, to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Percy C. Fountain, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1952.

William W. Hart, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1952.

Howard L. Doyle, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1952.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Arthur J. B. Cartier, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 22, 1951.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 26 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Charles M. Eldridge, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Supreme Intelligence, show us how we may interpret and decide wisely and rightly the great questions and problems which we are about to consider.

Thou knowest how deeply and vitally concerned we are about the defense and safety of our Republic and the welfare of the whole world.

We humbly confess that our own finite judgment is so faulty and fallible that we cannot predict what lies before us.

Forgive us for sinning against Thee and against ourselves by allowing our minds and hearts to be tortured and tormented with feelings of doubt and despair.

The future belongs to Thee. May we then daily put our trust in Thee and seek Thy divine guidance faithfully and confidently for Thou alone art too wise to err and too kind to injure.

Hear us in Christ's name.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett;

H. R. 2205. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd;

H. R. 2398. An act to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session;

H. R. 2669. An act for the relief of Maria Sarandrea;

H. R. 2672. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham;

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 3860. An act to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3981. An act to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States, which are subject to his administration, custody, or control";

H. R. 3985. An act for the relief of Hai Soon Lee;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley;

H. R. 4419. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

H. R. 4703. An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4749. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.;

H. R. 4877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli;

H. R. 5097. An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5235. An act to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make such studies and investigations deemed necessary concerning the location and construction of a bridge over the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5256. An act to secure the attendance of witnesses from without the District of Columbia in criminal proceedings; and

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the act relating to the incorporation of Trinity College of Washington, D. C., in order to make the archbishop of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Washington and ex officio member and chairman of the board of trustees of such college.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1012. An act to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes;

H. R. 3219. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus;

H. R. 4645. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell; and

H. R. 5317. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 194. An act to prohibit age requirements or limitations with respect to the appointment of persons to positions in the competitive civil service during periods of war or national emergency;

S. 523. An act for the relief of Walter Duschinsky;

S. 554. An act for the relief of Boutros Mouallem;

S. 853. An act for the relief of Dr. Ying Tak Chan;

S. 1032. An act to authorize each of the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to pool royalties derived from lands granted to it for public schools and various State institutions;

S. 1085. An act for the relief of Kane Shinohara.

S. 1121. An act for the relief of Matsuko Kurosawa;

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Demetrius Alexander Jordan;

S. 1234. An act for the relief of Toshiko Konishi;

S. 1333. An act for the relief of Maria Seraphenia Egawa;

S. 1344. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer;

S. 1372. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore;

S. 1429. An act to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof;

S. 1470. An act for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis;

S. 1534. An act for the relief of Midori Akimoto, also known as Sharlene Akimoto;

S. 1539. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service," approved March 2, 1931;

S. 1566. An act for the relief of Constantin Alexander Solomonides;

S. 1580. An act for the relief of Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina;

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Doreen Iris Neal;

S. 1639. An act for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez;

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Helen Sadako Yamamoto;

S. 1681. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Seidl and Sister Anna Ambrus;

S. 1692. An act for the relief of Hilde Schindler and her minor daughter, Edeline Schindler;

S. 1697. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Gasparetz;

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Else Neubert and her two children;

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Rhee Song Wu;

S. 1796. An act for the relief of Bruno Leo Freund;

S. 1798. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico relating to the waters of the Canadian River;

S. 1822. An act to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended;

S. 1833. An act for the relief of Barbara Jean Takada;

S. 1836. An act to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422), so as to provide for the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of special policemen, and for other purposes;

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi;

S. 1853. An act for the relief of Hidemi Nakano;

S. 1879. An act for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig;

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell;

S. 2113. An act for the relief of Martha Brak Foxwell;

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior;

S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States;

S. 2150. An act for the relief of Joachim Nemitz;

S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement;

S. 2211. An act to amend section 221 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to clarify certain requirements relating to the designation of persons upon whom process may be served;

S. 2214. An act to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code;

S. 2232. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.;

S. 2322. An act prohibiting the manufacture or use of the character "Smokey Bear" by unauthorized persons;

S. 2381. An act to amend section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, as amended;

S. 2383. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923;

S. 2394. An act to repeal the 10 percent surcharge on postcards;

S. 2408. An act to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts;

S. 2418. An act for the relief of Britt-Marie Eriksson and others;

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Hanne Lore Hart;

S. 2447. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act;

S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 504, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department;

S. 2549. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders;

S. 2566. An act for the relief of Niccolo Luvisotti;

S. 2658. An act to amend the act of September 25, 1950, so as to provide that the liability of the town of Mills, Wyo., to furnish sewerage service under such act shall not extend to future construction by the United States;

S. 2667. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District;

S. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; and

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens;

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York, Mr. ROBERT TRIPP ROSS, be permitted to take the oath of office. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and there is no question as to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present himself to the bar of the House to take the oath.

Mr. ROSS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

ALIENS ENTERING OR REMAINING IN THE UNITED STATES ILLEGALLY

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 1851, with Mr. HERLONG in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read the first section of the bill. Are there any amendments to that section?

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, S. 1851 as we are considering it on the floor today, purports to be an answer to the demand voiced by the Government of Mexico that the United States take decisive steps to close our borders to the flow of Mexican citizens who stream into southwestern United States seeking work on our farms. It purports to comply with the President's demand that our Immigration Service be given the enforcement tools it needs to cope with the hundreds of thousands of so-called wetbacks who cross the Rio Grande and other border points each year to add to our swollen migrant farm-labor population and to fan out into industrial areas throughout the country. S. 1851, in its present form, will do neither of these jobs in the way that they should be done.

As originally introduced in the Senate in S. 1851, and as originally provided in section 274 of H. R. 5678, the omnibus immigration bill which the House will consider shortly, the legislation contained the teeth necessary to really bite into the problem. But, as passed by the Senate, so much dental surgery has been applied that the measure cannot begin to do the job it should do. It cannot begin to clean up the stinking cesspools of human misery which we are now tolerating within our borders. It cannot begin to dry up the traffic in human flesh, the bottomless pool of cheap labor, which is the source of the shameful condition we now have throughout the Southwest; in California, in many of the Southern States, and which continues to spread like a cancer.

This bill now contains no effective search procedure for rooting out illegal aliens. Further, it goes out of its way to make a special exception of the one circumstance and one group which contributes more than anything else to the growth of the vicious peonage system resulting from the swarming of wetbacks into the United States. It is the willful desire to create this miserable peonage that is the cause of our failure to control entry into the country by its potential victims. And it is the very group responsible who are singled out for special consideration in S. 1851. I refer to the employers of illegal aliens, for the most part the large farmers of the Southwest who knowingly encourage the traffic and build it up, and now have the temerity to ask that their practices be exempt from penalty, and that their lands not be subject to any effective method of ferreting out the poor humans whom they are exploiting.

It is these large scale farmers who send their emissaries into Mexico to advertise the blessings lying across the border, and even make arrangements for their entry, or who deal with so-called labor contractors—the modern version of the slave trader—to provide them with the number of hands they need and no questions asked. These are the people who use the wetbacks as they need them, pay them little or in some cases nothing, and then turn them out to live in the ditchbanks and to starve. It is their lands which are the scenes of the degrading conditions reported in the press, denounced by the President's Commission on Migratory Labor, and repudiated by every socially conscious group and individual in the country. Theirs are the practices we are here today to do something about. If it were not for them we would have no problem. And yet, if S. 1851 passes the House in

its present form, we will have virtually written them, and any chance of forcing a change in their vicious policies, out of the bill.

With the present number of border patrolmen, and with the present limited funds available to the Immigration Service for its operations, we cannot hope to stop up the open sieve the border has become. Our only chance to apprehend and take action against any effective percentage of the great numbers of wetbacks who penetrate beyond the border is to find them where they "hole up" in this country—on the large farms. When information is received as to the presence of wetbacks on any farm, if the Immigration Service cannot move immediately they might just as well not move at all. Limiting free entry to farm lands to a distance of 25 miles from the border, and prescribing exceedingly limited and time consuming search-warrant powers in all other areas, effectively hamstrings any chance of cleaning out the concentrations of wetbacks on farms in the interior—the great bulk of those now here. In addition, it makes almost impossible any thought of imposing any penalty upon any employer in those areas no matter how guilty he may be of evading the intent or actually violating the letter of the law. Unless the wetback can be found on the property, and strong evidence of the employer's willful and knowing action to harbor or conceal him can be produced, the proviso of paragraph (4) of section 1, of this bill exempting employment from definition as "harboring," will permit the employer to laugh at the law. And remember that the law is necessary only because of this same employer's activities.

The bill would limit authority to issue administrative search warrants to six officials in the three Immigration Service districts between the Gulf of Mexico and the Pacific coast—an area of thousands of square miles, and the area now most blighted by the influx of wetbacks. It would limit the search authority to one immigration officer named therein who, in many cases involving the most flagrant offenders, would have to cover hundreds or thousands of acres. It would limit the use of the warrant to a certain specified time of the day or night; and it places a 30-day time limit upon the period in which the warrant could be used. Judge for yourself the hopelessness of making any effective use of such a system with all the opportunities for giving warning in advance to the suspected offenders. The time required to prepare evidence, travel possibly hundreds of miles to a district immigration office to secure a warrant and return to make a search, would give ample time for the offending farm or farms to move their wetbacks out or lend them to a neighboring farm long before the enforcement officer could hope to put the warrant into the limited effect possible. The employer would need to remove his wetbacks only for the hour named in the warrant, and could at any other time put them to work in the fields while he laughed at the officer outside the fences. What a farce. It is a well known fact that the associations of large farmers have more than enough friends in a position to know of warrants, as issued, that they need never fear the effects of such a procedure. Until our law enforcement authorities are given power to act immediately on reasonably sufficient information that illegal aliens are employed on any particular farm, and until we provide enough officers to give effective coverage to the large farming sections of the affected areas, we cannot hope to cure the wetback problem and its attendant evils. No law is any better than its enforcement provisions. S. 1851, without more drastic powers for uncovering evidence of violations, would be hardly better than no law at all.

I shall most certainly support any amendment designed to replace the procedures I have outlined. Authorized immigration service officers should not be hamstrung in apprehending illegal aliens whom they have valid reason to believe are in a particular area. They should be provided with the authority to enter farm lands when acting in their official capacities and in the performance of their duty. Without that authority practically the whole of the Southwest becomes a sanctuary within which the authorities are powerless to act effectively.

The bill's proviso that "for the purposes of this section, employment (including the usual and normal practices incident to employment) shall not be deemed to constitute harboring," is an unnecessary weakening of the purposes of the bill. The long fight which the associations of large farmers waged with the committee to have the proviso included is, in itself, proof of their intention to continue the schemes for obtaining wetbacks which they have accepted as usual and normal practices incident to building up their cheap labor pool. All they want is the cloak of congressional sanction so that they can continue on their merry way and continue to avoid paying decent wages to the people who harvest their crops. When we consider how such a proviso may be interpreted in practice and in the courts it would be more than unwise to permit it to remain in the bill. It would amount to a mandate from Congress that the farming corporations are a privileged class, and that they may not be interfered with in their pernicious practices. It would be a barefaced admission that our only reason for passing this bill is to throw a sop to the Government and people of Mexico who demand that we do something to clean house before they will permit any more of their contract nationals to cross the border. Mexico is righteously indignant at the conditions under which their people must work and live on the farms of the United States. They recognize that only if we force the corporation farmer to provide decent living conditions and pay decent wages will he do so. They also recognize that as long as the border is open to crossings at will, and as long as a mass of cheap wetback labor is available, conditions will get no better and their contract nationals as well as our native migrant labor will pay the penalty. Writing this protective clause for the employer of wetbacks into S. 1851 simply underwrites the purpose of the large farmer's associations to have Congress pass the kind of a measure which will persuade the Government of Mexico to extend its agreements with the United States to provide a continuing supply of contract nationals, while at the same time doing nothing to jeopardize the supply of wetbacks who can be more easily ground into the dirt from which they squeeze fantastic profits for the corporation farms.

The proviso in paragraph (4) of section 1 of this bill must be stricken out if we are to keep faith with ourselves and with our Mexican neighbors. It must be stricken out as a sign that this Congress is in no mood to temporize with the forces responsible for the human misery spreading through the South, the Southwest, and into other sections of the land. It must be stricken out if we are to raise the intolerable living standards of American farm labor in those areas, and if we are to keep the millions of legitimately run small farms in this country secure from the merciless competition of the corporation farms. We do not want our food supplies brought to us from farms made more fertile by the flesh and blood of ill-fed, ill-housed, and ill-clothed human beings.

There is no reason why the same standards of living cannot prevail among our farm labor population as prevails among our factory workers. No reason save the greed and selfishness of those who are willing to grind people into the ground so that they may grind more profits from it. The factory sweatshops of the 1800's find their counterpart on many of the corporation farms of America today. It is time we legislated them out of existence just as enlightened Congresses legislated the sweatshop out of existence. S. 1851 as it now stands is only a gesture in that direction. If we give real authority to our Immigration Service officers and eliminate from the bill the free hand given to employers of wetbacks we shall have taken a giant stride.

Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to move or support amendments which will be offered to strike from S. 1851 the proviso protecting the willful employers of wetbacks, and to revise paragraph (c) of section 1 of the bill so that Immigration Service officers may effectively root the wetbacks out of the farms on which they are hidden in semislavery. I strongly urge my colleagues who value humanity more than the fattened profits of the corporation farmers to do the same.

The bill, unless drastically improved, is a weak approach to a solution of a critical social and international problem. True it is some approach, and any improvement in the present loosely legislated situation is for the better. I hope the bill is made better than it is.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 3, line 10, after "officers", strike out "of the United States."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make it

possible for any law enforcement officer to make an arrest. It is necessary because under the language as contained in the Senate bill the only officers authorized to make arrests are members of the Immigration and Naturalization Service or of the FBI. Now quite obviously it is not always possible to attract the attention of officers of those classifications, and I feel that any law enforcement officer, whose duty it is to enforce the criminal laws, should have the authority under this statute to make an arrest of a felon.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALTER: Page 3, line 17, strike out "issue his warrant" and insert "obtain a warrant under oath from any court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to require the Attorney General or his subordinates to obtain a search warrant where it is the intention of these officers to make a search. It is the intention by this language to give jurisdiction to any court of competent jurisdiction, whether it be a State or a Federal court.

Those who argue that it would be very difficult to obtain search warrants in certain sections of the country should bear in mind the fact that in the event that local judges would not issue search warrants, then, upon cause shown, it would be entirely possible for the enforcement officers to obtain the necessary search warrant in the United States courts.

While there is authority, and I believe it is ample authority, for this administrative search warrant, so-called, nevertheless I feel that we ought not to take any chances on running afoul of the provisions of the Constitution. For that reason, I feel that this amendment is necessary.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. In the gentleman's opinion, the amendment he is now offering will definitely satisfy the constitutional provision under amendment 4 of the Constitution guaranteeing the right of protection against unlawful and unreasonable search and seizure; is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; that is correct. There are, of course, precedents for the so-called administrative warrants. The Postmaster General has the authority to issue an administrative search warrant. The Public Health Service has the same authority. However, on examination of the cases I do not find where the constitutionality of either of those statutes has been passed upon. In my judgment, there is a very serious question as to whether or not the language in the Senate bill violates the fourth amendment of the Constitution.

Mr. HILLINGS. In effect, what the gentleman's amendment will do is substitute existing law as codified in rule 41, title 18 of the United States Code, for the language now in section (c) of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; that is in effect what this language does.

Mr. HILLINGS. I believe the amendment is most worthy of support, particularly at a time when we are concerned about our freedoms in this country. It seems particularly important that we guarantee the protection of those freedoms as outlined in the Constitution.

Mr. WALTER. More than that, I think it is essential that we endeavor to enact legislation that will make it possible to impose a penalty on the most serious offenders in cases of this sort, namely, those people who are willfully and knowingly harboring aliens illegally in the United States.

Mr. HILLINGS. I agree with the gentleman. I think this amendment will make it possible to properly enforce the law as contained in the other sections of the bill.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Will the gentleman again read his amendment? I must have missed part of it.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again read the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. FISHER. Is that the only amendment the gentleman proposes to offer to subsection (c) on page 3?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. Then the language would continue, "authorizing the immigration officer named therein," meaning the search warrant thus obtained.

Mr. FISHER. Does the gentleman feel that the Constitution authorizes the issuance of a search warrant for going on private property for the purpose of interrogating people, not searching for anything, but just the general interrogation authority?

Mr. WALTER. I actually do not think the search warrant is necessary for that purpose, but in an overabundance of caution, to see that violence is not done to the Constitution, this language has been offered. I feel that under the law where an immigration officer has reason to believe that aliens are illegally on a man's premises he has a right to interrogate those aliens. I do not think any search warrant is necessary.

Mr. FISHER. I am sure if he has probable cause under the proper circumstances he can do it, but I am sure the gentleman would agree that he would be responsible for the abuse of that authority if he did not have proper authority.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, merely possibly to clarify the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

When the gentleman uses the words "Court of competent jurisdiction" I presume he means a court of record; is that not correct?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. CELLER. By the rules of criminal procedure, rule 41, under the title "Search and Seizure," which rules of criminal procedure were adopted by the Congress under title 28 of the United States Code, we have the following:

Authority to issue warrant: A search warrant authorized by this rule may be issued by a judge of the United States or of a State or of a Territorial court of record, or by a United States Commissioner within the district wherein the property sought is located.

So I think in any future interpretations of this amendment, if it is adopted, and I hope it will be adopted because I am in favor of it, the courts are now instructed (as per the following), at least so far as I am concerned, and if I hear no objection to what I say, the courts are deemed to consider this as the view of the House: That when the words "competent jurisdiction" are used that means a court of record either of the State or of the United States.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HILLINGS. Did I understand the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, to refer to the rule, which he has been reading, as title 28 of the United States Code?

Mr. CELLER. No, I was referring to rule 41 of the Rules of Criminal Procedure, which is title 28 of the United States Code.

Mr. HILLINGS. I see. There was a confusion in my mind over the fact that the law as to the issuing of warrants is codified under rule 41, title 18, but the rule to which you are referring comes under the Rules of Criminal Procedure, is that correct?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. I just wanted to make this statement so the courts interpreting this amendment will be guided by what we say here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am no doubt laboring under the same disadvantage as many other Members of the House in that we lack time to give this legislation the consideration on which it merits. But having the greatest confidence in the judgment and ability of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] and in that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] as well as in like qualities of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], I would like to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] tell me whether this legislation, as now proposed, authorizes anyone other than the courts to issue search and seizure warrants.

Mr. WALTER. The bill, as it passed the other body, authorized the Attorney General to designate certain commissioners in the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization to issue search warrants. The amendment, which I offer, requires the warrant application to be

made under oath to a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Instead of to an immigration official?

Mr. WALTER. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that the understanding of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes; that is my understanding.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, that would take care of the objection of the gentleman from Texas; would it not?

Mr. GRAHAM. We think so.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to try to get a little more clarification of the import of the pending amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Is it true under the terms of the pending amendment that the Attorney General or any district director or any assistant director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service would not be permitted to issue a search warrant for any purpose?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; it is very plainly stated. The words are "must obtain a warrant under oath from any court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. FISHER. When the court issues that warrant it must be based upon probable cause; is that correct?

Mr. WALTER. Certainly; and I do not think that the Immigration Service is going to work under any particular hardship, even in those counties in Texas where judges of the courts are the most flagrant violators of the law. I think that in those circumstances the immigration authorities can go to the United States courts, and upon proper showing obtain a search warrant, and search premises in which illegal border crossers are being concealed and harbored.

Mr. FISHER. But, under the amendment proposed this warrant would be obtained "upon information indicating a reasonable probability that in any designated land or other property, aliens are illegally within the United States." That language remains in the bill. In other words, it must not be based necessarily upon probable cause at all, but, to quote again, "upon information indicating a reasonable probability." Does not the gentleman think that the language ought to be the same as it is now in the issuance of a warrant for search for stolen property, or other similar offenses under the criminal code? I am afraid this merely gives them a blank check to obtain a search warrant upon a hunch, without any probable cause at all. It is a complete departure from the constitutional protection that has always been recognized in making searches.

The gentleman's reference to the courts is, I can assure you, both unwarranted and unfair.

Mr. WALTER. Well, I do not know whether the gentleman can determine "probable cause" as contained in the fourth amendment to the Constitution from the language contained in this statute. Frankly, I cannot. I have examined authorities. I am sure the terminology is synonymous.

Mr. FISHER. I will confer with the gentleman further regarding that. The gentleman has offered an amendment and he says it has a certain meaning. I want to be sure of that.

Let me ask the gentleman another question. Under the terms of this bill these search warrants, which may be more accurately described as a fishing expedition, have to be returned in 30 days. In other words, the applicant says: "There are some illegal aliens at a certain place at this time." The search warrants are issued and they have 30 days within which to go out and look for them. Does the gentleman think that is a reasonable time?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me on the prior question?

Mr. FISHER. My time is about to expire.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman can get more time. I would like to read to the committee rule 41, subsection (c):

> Warrant shall issue only on affidavits sworn to before a judge or commissioner, establishing the grounds for issuing the warrant. If the judge or commissioner is satisfied that the grounds for the application exist and there is probable cause to believe that they exist, he shall issue the warrant, identifying the property, naming or describing the place or person to be searched.

You have that in the law now.

Mr. FISHER. Is the gentleman agreeable to inserting that in this present bill?

Mr. CELLER. Why have it in this bill? It is now the law. A warrant can only be issued on probable cause.

Mr. FISHER. But you can change laws and amend them and the present bill proposes amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman's position is that this does not in any way affect the main provisions of existing law which he has just read?

Mr. CELLER. It does not.

Mr. FISHER. Is it the gentleman's position, then, that the language which he has put into this bill saying that a search warrant can be issued on information indicating reasonable probability is meaningless, and that it will actually have to be on probable cause? Is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. CELLER. I do not think there is any real difference between the language of the rule I have mentioned and the language of the bill.

Mr. FISHER. I regret that the amendment to the bill before us is not more specific. It provides an improvement in the bill, and I am pleased to have the gentleman's assurance that there will be the same requirement for probable cause in obtaining a search warrant under this bill as would be the case if a warrant were issued for the search of stolen property, for example.

Mr. CELLER. It is very difficult to amend a bill as carefully considered as this has been. These are words of art, legal art, that have been used in the bill. Now, suddenly to come upon us and ask us to change that language—I would want as a result of mere surface thinking to accede to the gentleman's request; so I think it perfectly safe when you have the provisions in rule 41 that the warrant can only be issued upon probable cause; then in addition when you have the safeguards that are in the bill itself, I do not think the gentleman need be concerned at all.

Mr. FISHER. I appreciate the gentleman's solicitude about my concern, but I still am at a loss to understand why the gentleman says that because of the art in which this language was designed and put into this bill there is something sacrosanct about it and it should not be changed to conform to the exact words now in the existing law on other subjects.

One other question I was going to ask the gentleman: I should like to know why the gentleman feels that these general search warrants to look for anybody without any description of the people they are going to look for, without any allegation of what they look like, their names, or anything else, that they are going to use blanket search warrants, general search warrants, and have the right to use them for 30 days without making a report—why wait 30 days to look for a criminal or violator when he is known? The general practice on time for making these reports is 10 days.

Mr. CELLER. The rule now applicable, which is not changed by these provisions, says that the warrant must identify the property, must name or describe the person or place to be searched. I do not know what more the gentleman wants. That is in the law now.

Mr. FISHER. There is no description whatever in the bill; it does not require the description of any persons they are searching for, none whatever. It is just a fishing expedition; that is what it means. Now, it is all right for them to have the power to search places, but let it be in conformity to established rules and procedures that have always been followed in protecting people against unreasonable searches and seizures.

One further question of the gentleman before I conclude, Mr. Chairman; will the gentleman indicate, if he knows, how long a time is permitted an officer under present law to return a search warrant that is issued for searching for stolen property?

Mr. WALTER. There is no limit.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes; it is 10 days.

Mr. WALTER. What is it?

Mr. FISHER. Ten days.

Mr. WALTER. I do not know of any limitation on any Federal search warrant.

Mr. FISHER. Yes; there is, if the gentleman will only read it. Why should we wait for 30 days? That, of course, puts the imprint of blanket authority, a general right to search with absolute freedom and without any restriction and without any immediate anticipation of what they are going to do when it is

issued, because they will have 30 days to make the search day after day, night after night, day or night. Why grant it for 30 days? That is a very dangerous departure from every precedent in every law we have ever had. If you know a man is wanted why wait for 30 days to get him? As a matter of fact, why not go out and get him right away? What are they doing waiting 30 days? That in itself raises a question of the good faith of those who obtain warrants under these circumstances.

This bill contains some provisions which every one approves, and I wish some undesirable provisions could be corrected to prevent unwarranted abuse of the authority that is given.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to have this matter clarified. Amendment IV to the Constitution reads as follows:

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

Now, in reference to the unreasonable search part of it, I take it that what is meant generally is when an officer sees a person in the commission of a crime he has a perfect right to make an arrest and to make a search as an incident to the arrest; also when an officer discovers by seeing, smelling, and so forth that an offense is being committed in his presence he has a right to search as an incident to that arrest. But the Constitution provides, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat, that no warrant shall issue but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation.

Section (c) on page 3 of this bill provides:

> When the Attorney General or any district director or any assistant district director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service has information indicating a reasonable probability.

It seems to me that is not sufficient under the Constitution of the United States.

I ask, where in section (c) do you find any provision whatsoever that the warrant will issue upon oath or affirmation? How can you pass any law without that provision?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The gentleman was not here when the amendment was read apparently. It provides that it is necessary to obtain a warrant under oath from any court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. MORRIS. Has that been adopted?

Mr. WALTER. It has not been adopted. It is before the committee at this time.

Mr. MORRIS. I am speaking on that amendment. The amendment ought to be adopted, there is no question about that, else it would be unconstitutional and very dangerous.

This says that the Attorney General or any district director or any assistant director may issue the warrant. Will this amendment take care of that? Does it provide that the warrant can only be issued by a court?

Mr. WALTER. By a court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. MORRIS. Then we ought to adopt the amendment and that will cure it.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. If the amendment is adopted, will that be sufficient? I am of the opinion it will be. There seems to be some difference of opinion here.

Mr. MORRIS. I would want to study the language and I shall study it immediately. I rather think it will from what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has suggested. I believe it will be sufficient, but I want to study the language before I answer that finally.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> SEC. 2. The last proviso to the paragraph headed "Bureau of Immigration" in title IV of the act of February 27 1925 (43 Stat. 1049; 8 U. S. C. 110), as amended by the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 865), is hereby further amended so that clause numbered (2) shall read:
>
> "(2) within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States, to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States and any railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle, and within a distance of 25 miles from any such external boundary to have access to private lands, but not dwellings, for the purpose of patrolling the border to prevent the illegal entry of aliens into the United States, and."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 4 strike out the words on line 10 beginning with "and within," all of line 11 to and including the words on line 12 ending with "but not dwellings."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered follows the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment which requires that a search warrant be secured from a court of competent jurisdiction. That is the proper way to handle the matter.

Now that the first part of the bill has been amended to make it necessary to go to a court of competent jurisdiction, which is correct, and which I was glad to support, it becomes unnecessary to have in the bill this area, this band of 25 miles along the external border. It is discriminatory and it is unnecessary and I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania will accept the amendment.

What I am striking out are the words "and within a distance of twenty-five miles from any such external boundary to have access to private lands."

This is antagonistic to the basic theory of our Government of the right of a man to have his property, his home—and these are homes as well as farms—free and safe from search except under the provisions of a search warrant procured from a court of competent jurisdiction. That is the intent of the amendment.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment would mean that we are merely restating existing law. The purpose of this language is to permit the border patrol and the Immigration and Naturalization Service to patrol those vast areas, not any dwelling houses, not any buildings, for the purpose of apprehending people who are being surreptitiously brought across the border at points other than the established border crossings. The adoption of this language would make it absolutely impossible for the immigration people to patrol our borders.

It is indeed unfortunate, and I repeat what I said yesterday, that we should consider this as being only a wetback bill. It is not anything of the sort. Those of us along the Atlantic seabord, it seems to me, are on one side trying to get rid of aliens illegally in the United States, and there are other people here who want to keep them. I should think that the gentleman from California would consider the fact that this is a law now under consideration applying to all parts of the United States. As far as this border patrol phase is concerned, there are hundreds and thousands of miles along the borders between the United States and Mexico and the United States and Canada. Now if our border patrol would not have the right to pass freely over that open territory in order to attempt to apprehend these people, then it certainly seems to me that we are not doing our full duty toward aiding the properly constituted officers to enforce the law.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the first thing we should do in connection with this matter is be properly informed on the law. The fourth amendment to the Constitution has been quoted. Remember what it states, "their persons, houses, papers, and effects." It does not mention the transport of human beings. These human beings that are being imported into this country are not only the so-called wetbacks but others that come across the border in other places. You can locate a paper or the personal effects of an individual, but you cannot locate the individual if he moves around from place to place.

If this amendment were to succeed, instead of the border patrol going right along for 25 miles, they would have to look in and out, in and out, leaving bare great unexplored and uninspected places.

The second thing it seems to me we ought to realize is this: In the case of *Hester* v. *United States* (265 U. S. 52), the Supreme Court has said:

The amendment does not mean that the lands or premises of a person shall not be searched; these are not included in the term "house."

Note that the lands and premises may be searched.

There is nowhere any provision against an officer searching one's land or premises without a warrant.

That is exactly what these border patrolmen will do. They will search the land without entering the house. Therefore, there is no violation of the fourth amendment.

Finally, let us realize the nature of deportation proceedings. In the case of *Quan Quan Poy* v. *Johnson* (273 U. S. 352), the Supreme Court held that deportation proceedings are not criminal. All the arguments in the last 2 days we have heard on the authority of the issuance of search warrants have been directed to the fact that they were criminal proceedings. Deportation proceedings are not criminal proceedings. They are intended to get these individuals who have been surreptitiously and illegally brought into this country. We have now the word of the Supreme Court that deportation proceedings are not criminal prosecutions within the meaning of the fifth and sixth amendments.

It is stated:

The authority to deport is drawn from the authority of Congress to regulate the coming of aliens within the United States and to impose conditions upon the performance of which the continued liberty of the alien to reside within the country may be made to depend; and findings of fact reached by executive officials after a fair though summary hearing may constitutionally be made conclusive.

Now, to crystallize this matter, here is a provision in this bill which provides for a search along a great border, either the Mexican or Canadian border, whatever border it may be, going back for 25 miles, for the purpose of searching the lands, not the houses but the lands, in furtherance of the authority as laid down in the fifth and sixth amendments, of deporting those aliens who have been unlawfully brought into this country. It is not to search the persons, houses, papers, and effects, but to search for aliens illegally within our borders.

There is the whole thing in a nutshell. What we are asking for is not the case of Texas alone, but for the whole border of the United States. In the section around New York it is estimated there are over 200,000 aliens at the present time who have come in in avoidance of the law, who have been gathered up by certain contractors and herded and used for their selfish purposes. The same thing applies along the Canadian border. So, in fixing a law that embraces the whole territorial extent, all of the 18,000 miles of the boundaries of the United States, taking care of all the 48 States, it is necessary that we apply this in a manner that will cover the whole thing.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman says a deportation proceeding is not a criminal proceeding?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is so held by the Supreme Court.

Mr. MORANO. Under the proposed law, the harboring of such illegally entered alien would be criminal; is not that so?

Mr. GRAHAM. If it is done with the knowledge that he entered unlawfully, and was being harbored in violation of the law.

Mr. MORANO. There would not be any criminal procedure against the alien who entered, but there would be against the man or woman who harbored him; is that correct?

Mr. GRAHAM. The proceedings would be possible against both in this sense, that while the importation proceedings are not exactly criminal in nature, they are in effect in that the man is to be deported or returned to where he came from. That is to be done on the part of the immigration official. On the part of the individual who has harbored him unlawfully, knowing that he entered unlawfully—and get this chain of thought, as explained yesterday in the Supreme Court decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, offered by the gentleman from California. I hesitate to take more of the time of the House, which has already heard quite a bit of explanation from me about the different phases of this bill today, but since it happens that I represent a district which runs along the Mexican border for some distance, I think I am fairly well acquainted with the situation there.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain very briefly what this situation is. I think there is a great deal of confusion about it, and if I can contribute anything toward a better understanding of what we are dealing with, I feel I will be doing my duty here with respect to this proposition.

What is being attempted? A few moments ago there was approved tentatively an amendment to this bill which gave quite a bit of latitude in the issuance of search warrants for the searching for illegal aliens without naming them, or identifying them, or describing them in any way when the search warrant is obtained. That search-warrant provision applies along the 25-mile area. But, they are not satisfied with that. They want authority—blanket authority—a permanent easement, if you please, for all of the immigration officers in the country to have access to people's property to come and go, day or night, any time of the year, any time of the week, over an area of 25 miles from the border for the purpose of patrolling the border. Of course, you have to patrol the border. No one would defend the position that officers should not have reasonable access to the border in order to prevent aliens from coming in who are illegals—of course not—they have that authority now. Several members of the Committee on Agriculture are present on the floor at this time. They had a great deal to do with the foot-and-mouth disease and the patrol work that goes with it. At one time 660 patrolmen were patrolling the Rio Grande. Did they come to Congress to get blanket authority and a permanent easement to enter land 25 miles from the border in order to patrol that area? Of course not, because they did not need it, they have that authority. The immigration authorities have that same authority now, but they cannot abuse it, they cannot go out miles from the border without any possible recourse to any person for abuses or indiscretions that may be involved in searching over a distance of 25 miles from the border. They must be reasonable about it, and they must not abuse that right. The question was raised about the authority of the patrolmen to go up and down the border under the foot-and-mouth-disease program, under the quarantine. I have a letter here from Dr. Simms, in which he discusses that. Here is what he says in a letter which was written on February 8 of this year. Dr. Simms is in charge of this program, and this is a statement that he made.

Some years ago when a question came up concerning the authority for Bureau of Animal Industry inspectors to enter private property in patrolling the Mexican border, we were advised that although there did not appear to be any specific legislative authority for the entry of our inspectors upon private property for the purpose of patrolling the border to enforce the foot-and-mouth-disease quarantine, which such entry is essential to the carrying out of the quarantine, a position of implied authority to enter exists.

And, he said he had the legal authority to do that. The letter reads further as follows:

Under these conditions it was of course desirable that entry of private lands for the purpose of patrol should be made with the cooperation of the property owner.

He went on to say:

However, we have been further advised that if the entry cannot be made with the cooperation of the property owner that the implied authority may be relied upon.

In other words, they have the authority now. There is no question about it. If they have authority to go on property, as he indicates here, to prevent livestock from coming across under the livestock quarantine, certainly the immigration authorities have the implied authority to go along the border for the purpose of patrolling or enforcing the quarantine against illegal aliens coming in. But that authority applies to the border—not to a 25-mile area far removed from the border itself.

There is no question about it. But why should we give them a 25-mile permanent, perpetual easement, to go on property at all hours of the day or night, break down gates if they need to, interfere with livestock, and run roughshod if they so desire—and some of them

sometimes are inclined to do that—over that vast area? Why do they not go and get the search warrant they have been fighting for? They can already operate within a reasonable distance of the border under the present law, and this amendment should be adopted. You will still have all the enforcement you need under this law, all that any person could reasonably ask for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I observe what it is that is causing the argument over the amendment, which I did not think was that controversial. I ask unanimous consent, at the end of the amendment as I placed it on the desk, that the word "and" may be added.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That makes it read in brief "within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States, to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States," under the provisions adopted in the previous amendment, "and for the purpose of patrolling the border to prevent the illegal entry of aliens into the United States."

It was not intended to shut off the right to patrol the border under the terms of the act as it presently exists, or under proper patrol. It was my intent, as it was the desire expressed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], to confine it, not to a 25-mile limit arbitrarily, not to a fixed distance, but only to that necessary area required for patrol. I think this is a desirable and necessary amendment.

Mr. HILLINGS. Would the gentleman read the entire section as it would read with his amendment?

Mr. PHILLIPS—

Within a reasonable distance from any external boundary of the United States, to board and search for aliens any vessel within the territorial waters of the United States and any railway car, aircraft, conveyance, or vehicle and for the purpose of patrolling the border to prevent the illegal entry of aliens into the United States.

Mr. HILLINGS. I thank the gentleman. I think the clarification which the gentleman has made of the amendment to that section shows that there is no intention of preventing reasonable search of border territory in conformity with the operation of the Immigration Service. With that purpose in mind the amendment is worthy of support.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILLINGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. On what basis would the arbitrary distance of 25 miles be fixed?

Mr. HILLINGS. Perhaps that question had better be directed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. The distance of 25 miles was a compromise agreed upon by the proponents and the opponents of the bill. It was a distance arbitrarily selected. In the House omnibus bill it is "reasonable distance," but the objection still exists to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], because access to private lands is not given. That is the important part of the whole amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman denies access to private land for patrolling purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I was born and reared 5 miles from the Rio Grande on the Mexican border. Down there on the Rio Grande in south Texas we feel that our private-property rights are just as sacred and just as much to be preserved as those in the interior of the United States.

If we say we are going to require that search warrants in the interior of the United States be issued by a recognized court, then we along the borders are also entitled to the same right. We have no objection to patrolling the Rio Grande; certainly I would agree to an amendment which left it at 1 mile, because I can see the necessity for patrolling the border, but I believe that the present amendment which sets a 25-mile limit where border patrolmen can come into private property without a search warrant is arbitrary. We will find most border patrolmen are capable and of good judgment but in a force of that size some overzealous border patrolmen will abuse their authority. It would be a very serious thing to have happen to those border areas. Over in Russia today they have set up an iron curtain and they have condemned the land along the borders for an area of several miles for the purpose of catching people going across. Are we going to do the same thing here in the United States? Are we going to violate private property along the border? Are we who live within 25 miles of the border to be denied the rights that citizens in the interior of the country enjoy? We enjoy our privacy as much as you do yours. This legislation without the proposed amendment is discriminatory.

I know the argument will be made that they can catch them better in 25 miles than they can in 1. That may have been true in years gone by in the horse and buggy days, but in this age of modern transportation a person trying to cross the border and evade the border patrol is not limited to the first 25 miles, for in 30 minutes he can be far into the interior of the United States. I agree that they should have authority to patrol along the Rio Grande to enforce our laws and to enforce the bill; but there is no justification to say that those of us who live as much as 20 or 25 miles away from the border are without private property rights, but when we suddenly reach a patrol line of 25 miles once again regain our rights in our private property.

I know that people who live in the cities sometimes do not realize the situation we along the border are up against, that we too are entitled to the same property rights. We feel just the same about our private lands as they do about their homes, and we do not want a pistol-toting overzealous border patrolman abusing our rights and violating our private interests; and we very sincerely ask the sponsors of this discriminatory legislation to see that we have the same private rights that you have in the interior of the United States, and require that search warrants issued by a recognized court must be obtained before they can invade our private property.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question, if I may: Where do you read in this bill inability to patrol the immediate area along the border within a reasonable distance from any external boundary for the purpose of patrolling the border to prevent illegal entry?

Mr. WALTER. It was felt by the proponents of this legislation that in view of the action on the part of certain Texans in resisting patrolmen by using sawed-off shotguns, rifles, and what not, that it was necessary to spell out the right to have access, to ride their horses and their jeeps along over private lands, and by eliminating this language "the private lands" if the gentleman's amendment is adopted then the right to patrol the border is certainly limited.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It confines it to a reasonable distance. I might ask where the patrolmen were who were being resisted by the Texans, but I do not think that has anything to do with the discussion.

Mr. BENTSEN. To some extent, this seems to be aimed at Texans. Let me cite the case of a Texan, Mr. Cavazos had a family living in their home; he had a rather large family, so he had to house some of them in a garage apartment. Early one morning his children were awakened to find some overzealous border patrolmen were shining lights in their eyes without any warrant of any kind. And do not tell me that some of them will not abuse authority if they have it, because I have seen it from past experience. That is why I ask you to see that we have the same protection as the rest of the citizens of the United States have.

Mr. WALTER. Does not the gentleman feel that the language already adopted is sufficient?

Mr. BENTSEN. No; not in the 25-mile limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALTER) there were—ayes 53, noes 46.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WALTER and Mr. PHILLIPS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 76, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER: On page 4, line 10, strike out the words "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "five."

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee is willing to accept this amendment. In other words, the committee having just acted to refuse to strike out the 25-mile blanket authority provision to all the patrolmen in the service, the pretended purpose and objective of it being to allow them to patrol the border, we now say that it should be at least within a reasonable distance, if that is the position the House desires to maintain. We feel that 5 miles is a reasonable distance. As has been very well pointed out here, property rights, security, the privacy of those who happen to own land within a 25-mile radius of an international border is just as sacred as that owned by people 1,000 miles away over in Michigan, Ohio, or any other place in the Nation. Five miles is enough.

As I have already pointed out, it has been demonstrated by the patrolmen in the foot-and-mouth-disease quarantine program along the Rio Grande, that they have no difficulty whatever; that they now have legal, implied authority to patrol the Rio Grande in preventing livestock from coming across. Likewise there is no question but what the immigration officers now have the implied authority against illegal aliens coming across to go on people's land. They are doing it every day, and all this poppycock here about somebody using a shotgun on somebody, somewhere, at sometime, is the kind of a story that could not withstand a very severe cross examination, I am sure. I never heard of such things in all my life, and I have lived down there all my life. I never heard of an instance where immigration officers had any difficulty in patrolling along the river. They have been doing it for 100 years. Now what do they want to do? They just do not want ordinary patrol along the Rio Grande; that is not what they want. The immigration authorities wrote this language, and not the committee. They want authority, a permanent easement for 25 miles, to send their men day or night, 10 and 20 times a day, if they desire, to break down a gate or a fence or anything else in order to carry out their functions of patrolling the border maybe 25 miles away from where an event took place. Now, do you want to give that kind of blanket, unrestricted authority to a large group of people to invade the privacy of people's own land, their own premises? They can get a search warrant, which has already been authorized in this bill, with practically no showing of probable cause. But, let them do it according to law. Let us not give them a permanent easement, a perpetual right, at all hours of the day or night, to go on people's private property, who happen to live in that 25-mile area. I dare say if that authority was extended in your district, in the Middle West, or in the North, or any place else, you sure would be in here fighting this kind of a thing giving them permanent privileges to go on your land day or night. You know, on the ranches in the country of the Rio Grande people raise sheep and goats. During the lambing and kidding seasons—as I have already pointed out in general debate—it is a custom—and a necessary one—to lock the gates and keep even their neighbors out. Just driving through a pasture during those times disturbs the livestock, separates the young animals from their mothers, and heavy losses usually result.

Perhaps that does not mean much to you in the East because your constituents are not affected, but mine are. It is important.

It is not a matter of giving the border patrol the authority to enforce the immigration laws against illegal aliens. They can go along there for a distance of 5 miles without any kind of search warrant. So I beg of you in this instance, at least, let us compromise this particular authorization to bring it within reasonable limitations and put it at a distance of 5 miles. It has already been said that the 25 miles was purely arbitrary, something picked out of a clear sky. It was put in by a compromise and set by somebody over in the other body. Let us take it out by a compromise and, in this body, put it down within reason.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to be able to vote for this bill, but I cannot with these objectionable and unnecessary provisions in it. If the objectionable provisions were removed there would still be ample authority for necessary enforcement of laws against illegal aliens.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I personally think that the language should be "reasonable distance," but apparently there is so much opposition to anything as vague as that that I will not propose any amendment. However, we must bear in mind this fact in fixing the limit at 5 miles. These aliens are not congregated close to the border, they are spread way up into the State. It is necessary for our border patrolmen to go over the lands leading to the trunk highways. There are many small feeder roads these people get on that the border patrolmen never get on. It is essential that the border patrolmen be given the authority to go across the lands to get onto those feeder roads to apprehend people on the way up to move over to the trunk highways.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will make this short. If the majority of the Committee here today has made up its mind to discriminate against private property rights in border districts, I ask you if you will please cut the discrimination of those property rights from 25 miles to 5 miles. The border patrol will be well able to do their job despite that cut. I urge you to support the amendment.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. It is my understanding from the committee, and I should like to have a clarification if it is not true, that the search warrant provision as adopted by the majority as applicable to section (c) would also apply to clause 2 on page 4.

Mr. BENTSEN. No, that is not my understanding. If that were the case, why would they have the 25 miles?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, my attention has just been called to the fact that by inadvertence the amendment I offered proposes to strike the words "twenty-five" from line 9 instead of line 10 on page 4 of the bill. It seems there are two versions of this bill, which has caused the confusion. I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be changed to apply to line 10 instead of line 9.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the committee position that the "reasonable-distance clause" should be retained in the bill. I think we should remember that the border between Texas and Mexico is not the only land border that we are concerned about in this bill; that the whole northern half of the United States borders on Canada. The State of Minnesota, for example, has a northern border, which in some places is entirely swamp land and lake so that over a distance of 25, 50, or 100 miles, it is impossible to adequately patrol the border. I think that the 25-mile limitation is a reasonable compromise, and that it should be retained in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISHER) there were—ayes 38, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HERLONG, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, pursuant to House Resolution 529, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FISHER) there were—ayes 162, noes 10.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

FEBRUARY 26, 1952.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I herewith submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to take effect immediately.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY A. FINE.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 535) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That SIDNEY A. FINE of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on the Judiciary.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, March 4 is the two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], after disposition of the legislative business of the day and other matters on the Speaker's desk, may have permission to address the House for 1 hour, and that he may have control of the time and may yield to other Members.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 528 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continued not to exceed 12 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, by way of suggestion to the Committee on the Armed Services, I should like to say that that committee will have to carry the burden of combating the argument that is being heard in the cloakrooms now that this measure is expected to be used as an Anna Rosenberg social integration scheme.

We are here being called upon to make an important decision. The question is not whether this is the kind of legislation that we want, but it is whether it is the legislation that necessity demands. To make a political issue out of the measure would be a discreditable thing to do. It would be playing fast and loose with the most precious thing we possess, our liberty. To beat our swords into plowshares might be excusable procedure after war has ended and all danger passed, but it would be an act of self-destruction if done in time of deadly conflict. If to make surrender there went with it a reasonable hope of survival, then there might be some excuse for the cowards, but even these should know that to those arrayed against us, mercy and compassion are virtues that are unknown.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the midst of a world conflict between atheistic paganism on the one hand and Christian civilization on the other, and the role that we are playing is by no means inconsiderable. Under the compulsion of the law of self-preservation, we are expending the lives of the young manhood of the country and billions of our national resources, all believed to be necessary to national survival. In making up our minds as to what we should do, it might be well to take into consideration the attitude of those with whom we are at war. Does any one doubt that there is a Communist or a Communist sympathizer who does not want to see this measure fail of adoption? I cast no reflection upon the millions of Christian and right-motived people who oppose compulsory military training. They are so much entitled to their views as I am to mine. I simply think they do not see the picture in its entirety, and therefore do not realize the deadly peril that hangs over our heads—a drawn sword in the iron hand of a spiritual and blood descendant of Genghis Khan.

Is there any doubt anywhere about the designs of Russia? Witness what has happened during the last several years. Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, Czechoslovakia, and Eastern Germany have disappeared behind the iron curtain. Witness what Russia has done to China and is attempting to do to India, and what she is doing to undermine the still free governments of Europe and the countries of North and South America. Her minions are everywhere. Her long and sinewy tentacles are fast drawing into her ravenous maw the entire world.

Are there those who, in the face of this record, still contend that to refer to what has happened and is going on is to try to create hysteria and stampede the adoption of this measure? To those who still doubt, who hesitate, let me ask: Has not Stalin in Korea already "opened the purple testament of bleeding war" in which the flower of our young American manhood is dying? What more is needed that the people realize that the security of all mankind is in peril, that the life of the Republic is in jeopardy? How can we afford to longer rely upon reason and moral suasion? Is it safe to merely hope and pray for the restoration of reason and sanity before we go the way of Poland and the Ukraine?

The fact that we have never lost a war does not mean that we cannot lose one. Ours is a great country, but as mighty and powerful as it is, it is not strong enough to contend with the rest of the world organized against us, which means that it would be suicidal for us to draw within our own shell. We either go forward or we perish.

What of the military power of the Soviet Union? It is widely known that in land power the Russians have 4,000,000 soldiers, with 15,000,000 reservists maintained on a war footing; that she has at her command a million European satellite troops and 4,000,000 highly trained and highly disciplined Chinese. She has more than 50,000 heavy tanks, with a productive capacity of 90,000 annually, and is capable of producing 350,000 pieces of artillery annually. A year ago Russia could produce 900,000 machine guns each year, and had the expectation of increasing this to 1,350,000 annually. It is estimated that by 1955 she can produce 15,000,000 small arms annually and 22,000,000,000 bullets annually—and here I should like to point out that we never approached these figures in the peak of our production in World War II—and, what is extremely important, it can be done with half as much steel as is available to America.

The Russian ground forces are exceedingly formidable and will become steadily more so as time passes on. Their armored vehicles are excellent; the tenacity of their soldiers is superb; their numbers are tremendous; and their geographical location in the heartland of Europe and Asia gives them an impressive strategic advantage, especially since, from the Russian viewpoint, Western Europe is little more than a peninsula extending from Russia proper—but a peninsula which will more than double Russian production if it falls into Russian hands—a production which, added

to Russia's, would overwhelm even the vaunted industrial might of America and make our doom follow as surely as day follows night.

As to Russian aerial strength, it is estimated that they have from 25,000 to 30,000 aircraft, with a potential annual production of approximately 80,000. This can be increased to approximately 120,000 annually by 1955, even though we thought our top aircraft production of 96,000 annually in the last war was a production miracle. Russia's new MIG jet fighter has already demonstrated it is as fine an airplane as our Nation has immediately available, and there is no reason to believe that the Russians do not have more like it, not only in fighters but in other aircraft types as well. We know that they have some 400 B–29 type of aircraft, identified as the TU–4 bomber, which were seized by the Russians when they made forced landings in Russian territory during the war. These aircraft have the capability of attacking every point in America on one-way, one-refueling missions, and we know further that the Russians are now building jet bombers and that their air strategy envisages an increased role for their strategic bombing force. Combined with this aerial might, which is steadily growing, is the Russian atomic bomb which we know is being produced in daily increasing numbers.

We know further, from repeated public statements by the leaders of our own Air Force, that we cannot hope to destroy even as much as half of an attacking aerial fleet, so that the time will inevitably, inescapably, surely come when Russia will have immediately available the force to deliver a terribly devastating attack on the United States in a sort of gigantic, horrible Pearl Harbor.

We understand that the Russians have the ability to produce some 250 jet fighters monthly, and a professor of the Armed Forces Industrial College announced a year ago that the Russian production of guided missiles and rockets equals our own. We know, furthermore, that the Russians have developed an extremely capable defensive fighter force to intercept American bombers, and that they have decentralized their industry in vital areas to a degree undreamed of even yet by America, so that it is problematical at best as to the damage America could do to the Soviet Union through its vaunted strategic bombing attack on the outbreak of war. It was announced as long as 2 years ago by an authoritative organization in Europe that Russian military aircraft production in 1949 was almost 12,000 aircraft, including 5,000 fighters, mostly jet propelled, and 5,000 to 6,000 heavy and medium bombers, of which a third or perhaps half were jet propelled. We know further from former Air Force Secretary Symington that a Russian surprise atomic offensive might inflict a mortal wound from which our Nation might not completely recover in time. More than a year ago Mr. Symington announced to the Nation that Russia has the largest air force in the world, and combined with that grim fact is the knowledge that Russian tactical air power, like her mighty ground forces, is strategically located in the immediate proximity of the greatest commercial, industrial, and cultural prize of the world, Western Europe.

Combined with this force of great attacking capabilities is a vast air network comprising thousands of aircraft and covering more than 50,000 miles now in operation in the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc nations. This system, known as Aeroflot, was a year ago announced to have 96 landing fields stretching from Finland to Albania, across Europe and Asia to Siberia and the Bering Straits. There can be no doubt that the Rusian air power is exceedingly impressive and formidable and capable of inflicting terrific damage both to America directly and to her present and potential allies abroad.

As to Russian naval power, surfacewise it does not compare to the American fleet, but in underwater craft, it has been authoritatively estimated that Russia, quite some time ago, had at least 360 submarines, and it is further estimated that some 70 of these are Snorkel types. The significance of this force cannot be discounted. It was with less than 50 submarines that Germany commenced the last war, and these almost ran the Allied fleets off of the ocean. These submarines are, like the Russian air and ground forces, strategically located throughout the world. In the Far East they could virtually crumble the American sea power there through a sudden unannounced attack, and in Europe the submarine pens of the Soviet Union are skillfully hidden in carefully protected areas which would make it virtually impossible to destroy the Russian capability of continuing and expanding this formidable force even under attack by American air power.

In the face of this exceedingly threatening standing military force now available to the Soviet Union, we have in western Europe today some 5 divisions and supporting elements thereto, of whom scarcely 50,000 are combat personnel. We cannot lose sight of the fact, furthermore, that in western Europe there are from 50,000 to 60,000 women and children who are dependents of American military personnel now stationed in that area. There can be no doubt that an attack by Russian forces there must necessarily mean war in which America is fully engaged. There can be no question that modern America will not stand idly by and permit the slaughter of 60,000 American women and children, not to speak of the 100,000 American military personnel who would also face destruction unless America turned every available source of power to their support.

In the Far East the situation is very comparable. There is no thinking American but who realizes full well that our forces are there at the mercy of the Soviet Union. If Russia turns loose her ground forces in Asia, if Russia attacks with her air power in this area, if Russia releases suddenly the Russian submarine force against the American Navy and American transports in the Korean region, then the military effort now operating in Korea would very likely be completely crumbled within a relatively short time.

It has not been the tradition of the great American Republic to exist on mercy or hope alone. It has not been the tradition of America intentionally to place American lives in the hands of a foreign power without providing adequate protection for them. Our forces in Europe are at the mercy of Russia. Our forces in Asia are in a similar situation. This afternoon, tomorrow, a week from tomorrow or next month—at any time, and entirely at Russia's choosing—the world could suddenly dissolve in flames in the cataclysm of a third world war, which would make all of the haggling, all of the fault-finding on this bill, not only academic but hideous in retrospect.

Knowing as we do the brutality of Russian leadership; knowing as we do the intensity of Russian leadership for world conquest; knowing as we do the Russian contempt for life and for western ideals; how utterly unrealistic and dangerous and short-sighted it is to treat the requirements of national defense in an atmosphere of business as usual, of complacency, and as if American lives were not being daily lost on the battlefields of Korea.

In the face of an alien and brutal force consisting of the largest ground forces in the world, the largest air forces in the world, and the largest submarine force in the world, a force working day and night within the national structure of other nations to subvert their institutions of government and their will to resist, a force bent on conquest of the world and dedicated to the complete destruction of every standard beloved by our Nation, our course is clear. It can be only to prepare as swiftly as possible an adequate counterforce. It is to devise at once a long-range military policy which will stand up to the long-range challenge this alien force presents.

So, Mr. Speaker, in the light of these facts, what is the proper thing that we should do? Would not the defeat of this bill be construed as a surrender to fear? Would it not in fact and in truth be accepted as a cowardly appeasement of Russia?

I am not advocating all-out war with Russia, but I am pleading for preparation for the all-out war that the Soviet Union has expressed determination to wage, if she has not already started in Korea and other parts of the world. I want peace, but in this modern world where there are no longer barriers erected by nature to aggression, I know this is something that cannot be had except through strength. George Washington himself said that "to be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Mr. Speaker, what is here proposed is completely consistent with what we have been doing in the endeavor to organize group resistance to terrorism. We have spent billions to strengthen the remaining free countries of the world in order to make possible their contributing their part to the cause of freedom and and security. We have urged economic federation and political confederation on the countries of Western Europe. We

helped bring into existence the Atlantic Pact, and have had General Eisenhower in Europe for a long while. We have seen France and Western Germany lay aside their age-old animosities and join hands in the determination to live in peace. We see them, in cooperation with their neighbor countries, setting out to organize a Western European Army of 50 divisions in order to hold back Russian aggression, all done at our instigation. What would happen to this upsurge of patriotism, this will to live as free peoples, which is rooted in the confidence that we are standing with them, if we defeat this bill? Would they not feel, and rightly so, that we had let them down and had become indifferent about our own safety? Would it not be a breaking of a thread in the loom that would cause the whole pattern to unravel under strain?

Mr. Speaker, the argument that the adoption of this bill would lead to moral decadence of American youth is sickening. Does not the young man owe some duty to his country, and if so, when has it become immoral for him to perform it? What answer have the more than 18,000,000 veterans of the country to make to this indictment lodged against them? Are they prepared to say that they were debased because of their military service, and that their morals are of an inferior quality to the morals of those who did not have the privilege of waging war for the flag? What say our brave boys that are bleeding and dying in Korea? Those of this body who bear the scars of war will this day have their opportunity to make answer. And let no one dignify the slander by adopting the argument as his own.

I have four grandsons, all schoolboys, all subject to the draft and the provisions of this bill. I should feel disgraced if I thought that they would not feel that I had cast dishonor upon their names were I to vote against this measure.

And so, Mr. Speaker, here in the atmosphere in which we operate, the law of sacrifice and the law of love take the form of positive duty, and in its performance may God give us the courage and the determination to consecrate our every faculty.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURDOCK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill presently before us because it is impractical. At the present time we have the selective-service law. It provides that every young man 18½ years of age or older who is mentally and physically fit can be conscripted into Federal service for 24 months.

As you know, this bill provides that instead of youngsters being conscripted for 24 months, instead of being 18½ years of age they are to be taken at 18 years of age, and they are to be put in for a period of 6 months, after which they will be held in servitude and bondage for 7½ years. They will be subject to the whim of the President of the United States, minute after minute, both day and night, for 7½ long years, to be sent at the slightest whim of the President of the United States to any place in the entire world. If there is any question about that, I refer you to our esteemed ex-colleague, Senator Wadsworth, in the hearings before the Armed Services Committee, on page 2315, so admitted.

I am opposed to this indenture and slavery of our young men for 7½ or 8 years. If you will pardon a personal reference, I volunteered in World War I and was at the active front in France; my eldest son served in World War II in Europe, and my youngest son now is in Ellington Field, Tex., training to be a pilot after having volunteered for 4 years. In my opinion 4 years is plenty long to serve one's country unless there is more evidence of insecurity than there is at the present time. I, for instance, see these young pages here. Can you conceive of forcing them into this slavery and bondage and keeping them tied up for 7½ years after they come out of service? For instance, one of them might go down to a banker for a loan to help him get started in business. The banker looks at him and says: "You are a fine young fellow; just what do you want?" "Well, I would like to borrow a little money. I served my country. I have an idea that I can make work profitably." The banker looks at him and it appears very clearly that this young man is honest, that he has a good idea, but the banker says to him: "I am sorry, young fellow; we appreciate that you served your country, but now you are subject to conscription for 7½ long years, and much as we would like to lend you this money we cannot do it because of the uncertainty of your position." The young man goes down the street and probably winds up using a broom on the street.

I am sorely disappointed that I am in conflict with my friend from Georgia [Mr. COX] the State that previously had stood for States' rights and not regimentation especially of our youngsters. I am indeed sorry that I cannot go along with him in this matter. I am opposed to this bill because it is not practical. The military brass, Anna Rosenberg, and others, come up and testified that it will cost about $4,000,000,000. We know about those estimates that the military make; you cannot depend on them. But you can depend on its costing two or three times more than they say it will cost. The reason I say that is because Senator WADSWORTH said they would start off with 60,000 and then raise it to 800,000 youths. You cannot house 800,000 of the young men of our country for peanuts; it takes considerable money and materials at a time when there is a shortage of material.

The bill provides for a staff of reserves, inspectors, traveling inspectors, and technicians; it would require hundreds of doctors, and dentists, and nurses, and technicians to provide for the welfare of these youngsters. That would require money; it would require expenditure for hospitals, entertainment halls, churches, and many other things. It all would require money; it would require the services of many tens of thousands of civilians. I think all admit that they would have to be housed.

The bill also provides for dependency allowance; it provides for death benefits; it provides for physical disability; which are expensive. So I say to you that I think it is really fanatic that Members will rise on this floor and say these things can be obtained without its costing anybody anything. We have heard that for a good long time. Every time the Congress appropriates money that must be borrowed some say, "Why worry, we owe it to ourselves?"

Another reason why I do not think this is practical is because it does not conform to our true American way of life as I have been brought up to understand it. I was amazed at the testimony of that esteemed and great naval hero, Admiral Kinkaid, before the committee. Of course, we know that when this commission was formed, and we all agree to this I am sure, it was stacked. The commission was going to be for the conscription of our youngsters and insist upon it even should they have heard no evidence. That is the reason they were named. Not one Member had an open mind in the matter. But speaking about our American way of life I was surprised at this gentleman and naval hero, Admiral Kinkaid, and his testimony. I wish to quote what he said before the Armed Services Committee, and this appears on page 2341 of the hearings. The paragraph is entitled "The American Heritage," and reads as follows:

> Last but not least, the instruction and training he would receive under UMT would give every young man of 18 a better understanding of the principles upon which our country was founded and a realization of his obligation to do his part in the defense of those principles.
>
> Each year between 800,000 and 1,000,000 young Americans will reach the age of 18 and become ready for training under the proposed program. What a wonderful thing it would be if they could be made to feel not only the spirit of greatness of our country but something of the power that animated past generations and gave purpose and meaning to their lives.

I do know about past generations and our ancestors who came over here; and as a history student I have always been under the impression that our ancestors came over to this country to get away from this same sort of regimentation and goose step as provided in this measure. May I say that my great grandfather said he left foreign soil to come over here because he wanted freedom of thought and action. He left because of but a 2-year term of servitude. This provides for 8 years. Recalling the days of Hitler and Mussolini, even they did not dare to saddle that many years on to the youngsters of their nations.

Here is another reason why I do not believe this bill is practical. It is my idea that the best defense of a nation includes a solvent government. Today we find ourselves owing $257,000,000,000, which is practically the assessed valuation of all property west of the Mississippi River. We owe $257,000,000,000 and

we have our tax rate at the confiscatory level now so far as our taxpayers are concerned. We are going into the red this year by fifteen to twenty billion dollars more.

I say to the people down at the Pentagon it is about time for us to stop, look, and listen. We know that in the United States we have tremendous resources. We have the knowledge and know-how to produce. But there are some here who not only want us to furnish military equipment for our own soldiers and military equipment for all our allies, but they want us to furnish food for ourselves and food for our allies, and they want us to do all of the combat fighting in addition. All this I do not believe we can do and keep our solvency. Remember, officially Russia has not fired a shot or lost a life.

Inasmuch as we do have these tremendous and marvelous resources, we have the know-how of mass production, our allies should be told that we will confine our effort to doing those particular things and they will have to come in and furnish some combat troops. I think it is a shame that they call upon us to furnish 90 percent of the combat troops in Korea after we have done so much for them.

I was astonished in talking with a representative of the Pentagon the other night. He said, "Congressman, the reason the western democracies are not sending any combat troops to Korea is because they need their able-bodied men to build up their war-torn countries."

I emphatically replied to him, "If through some miracle tonight the immigration restrictions were taken off of the books of the United States and Canada and Australia and South American countries, why, those same able-bodied men over there that they say are needed for war-torn countries would be flocking over here by the millions, and they would be aided and assisted and encouraged and given the finances to do so by their own countries."

We hear about young men being conscripted off the farms in the United States and sent to Europe to defend them over there and then able-bodied men in Western Europe who should be in uniform defending themselves come over here as DP's and take the places on the farms of these youngsters who have been conscripted. Maybe that makes sense to some people, but it does not to LEO ALLEN.

Now, in addition to those countries of Western Europe furnishing some of these troops, I cannot see for the life of me how the State Department can refuse to accept 500,000, or at least a few hundred thousand troops of Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, which are now defending Formosa. Why could not the State Department accept a few hundred thousand of those troops to go up there into the land they know about. Our Navy and Air Force could well guard Formosa.

In addition to that, I believe had we left General MacArthur over in Japan, the Japanese people, having great respect for him would have volunteered for combat service in Korea. In my opinion, they would have been eager to have served under him as he brought them the first taste of democracy.

Another thing that confuses me is this. I talked to a young fighter who had lost his legs and arms. I said, "How did you lose them?" He said, "I was over in Korea last winter. They ordered us to take a hill about 100 yards ahead. It was 20 degrees below zero." He said, "Now, Congressman ALLEN, can you tell me the military objective or what we accomplished when they ordered us to go ahead and take a hill 100 yards ahead, with a loss of 3,000 casualties? What did we accomplish? Where are we trying to go?"

Well, of course, I could not answer that. I do not believe anyone can answer that. I know if I were over there and somebody would order me to go and dig in for a couple of weeks and then we were ordered to take a hill, and about 3,000 of us were lost and we did not know where we were going or what the purpose to be accomplished was, I would wonder, too.

So I say in my opinion I believe that the United States should use its energies in furnishing military equipment and food for ourselves and our allies, and let some of these so-called friends of ours aid themselves by furnishing their share of combat troops.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. My friend knows something of my admiration for him. It is seldom that we are in disagreement. I regret that we are not together on this bill. May I ask my friend if, in his opinion, militarily speaking, our present strength is sufficient to insure our safety.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I would say this to the gentleman, my dear friend from Georgia, that in my opinion it is, because right now selective service provides for the drafting of youngsters down to 18½ years of age. We have 3,500,000 now, and they are still in the 20-year age bracket. If they wanted more, if they had the facilities to provide for more, they would be drafting those boys down to the 18½-year bracket. They have not even reached all of the 19-year-olds.

Mr. COX. No; not satisfactorily, of course.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Why have they not drafted them down to those 18½ years of age? If they need more, they have the power to do that, and my experience has been that the more in uniform the better, as far as they are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to hear in this debate who is for this bill and who is opposed to it. Every farm organization is opposed to this bill; the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Farm Union. The American Federation of Labor and the CIO are opposed to the bill. Every ministerial organization in the United States, of every church denomination, with millions in all the churches, is opposed to this bill. Educators, civil leaders, patriotic leaders, and, above, all, the people back home are against this bill, as evidenced by the letters you have received in regard to it. Those letters were written with pencils and with pens on scratch paper and in every conceivable manner. We cannot laugh off the fact that each of us are receiving 25 to 50 of these self-inspired letters opposing conscription to every one that favors it. They have accepted the selective-service bill. There is probably some partiality shown, but little. We have given them a bill that brings it down to 18½ years of age. They can draft those boys. The people generally have accepted that, but they are not accepting this servitude for 7½ or 8 years for youngsters who are too young to be taught to kill.

You are going to hear plenty about how this will save money. I must leave today to go back to Illinois, but I would like to be here to hear those sponsoring this measure explain how it can be done.

In conclusion, I have attempted to be practical in this matter. I am not going to ask for a vote on the rule because I want the membership to see how ridiculous the whole thing is. Then I am certain it will be decisively defeated.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, last year when the proposed study of universal military training passed the House I voted against it. I am going to vote against the present House Resolution 594, which places it in effect.

I have studied the resolution and the committee print of pertinent questions and answers.

After doing this and other research, I have concluded that I should vote "no" on this resolution exactly the same as I voted "no" last year on the study legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on December 16 last, a Washington Associated Press article contained the following information:

SIX THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED DEPENDENTS GO ABROAD MONTHLY TO JOIN SERVICEMEN

WASHINGTON, December 16.—The Armed Forces said today that 6,700 dependents embark each month to join husbands or fathers serving overseas.

About 3,000 go to the Far East. Another 3,700 leave for the European and Caribbean areas.

Many of these wives and children waited a long time to embark. Many more await calls to go.

The services hope to increase gradually the number sent to the Far East. They doubt if an increase can be made soon in the number headed for Europe.

The speed with which dependents receive calls depends on the travel space and housing where the serviceman is stationed. Right now, the supply is limited and a waiting period is required.

In general, only officers and men in the top three enlisted grades may have their dependents join them. In a few cases, dependents of men in the lower enlisted grades may go to Europe.

After reading this article, I came to this conclusion. Either those in charge in this country do not think we are in danger of war with Russia or they are guilty of criminal carelessness. Not only that, but they are guilty of discrimination when, in general, only officers and men in the top three enlisted grades may have their dependents join them.

Surely a private, corporal, or sergeant wants and is entitled to have his family near him just the same as officers. Case after case in our area of reservists with many years' service have been recalled, left their start in business, professions, and farming when they wanted to serve in the United States, if at all.

With 6,700 dependents monthly being sent overseas at heavy Government expense, how could they be evacuated if war actually would start in Europe.

This situation of itself is enough of a paradox to cause me to vote "no."

The recommendation in 1945 in the report of the economic policy and planning committee of this body, and of which I was a member, was to take a firm stand on Russia. The recommendation to the best of my knowledge was not followed.

The present draft is taking capable young men experienced in mechanized farming from agriculture. The same land owned by parents of these young men is being returned to grazing instead of grain. If this continues the United States Army and the United States people may suddenly come up hungry in the near future.

If you take boys too young to be drafted off the farms for 6 months' training and then the Reserve period, a large percentage of that year's crops will be badly curtailed.

Taking them out of 4-H Clubs from butter to guns, will not help our national position. This resolution in addition, removes the spirit of the pioneer mothers.

The National Guard has always been trained in State armories. With many State Guard units called into service, could not a volunteer training program be placed in effect in these armories? Could it not be effected on nights the Guard was not using them, if the Guard itself has not been called?

Would not every service club in the United States such as Rotary, Lions, Kiwanis, and all others, sponsor and help with, through their members, a training program for these boys? Could not older, uncalled reservists help at home with this training?

I believe they would. Many present members of these service clubs were noncoms and officers in World War II. It might be worth the trial, training these boys two nights a week. Would not every American Legion and Veteran of Foreign Wars post do the same as a patriotic duty? It should be a great deal cheaper from an expense standpoint. The suggestions will not cost $1,434 per year per boy. Under the committee questions and answers in No. 1 question, it states:

> The sole objective of universal military training is to create a Ready Reserve of nonveterans.

One of the three things to be done on starting universal military training in the committee pamphlet is to pass the code of conduct and penalties for young boys.

Is it more severe than civil laws and reform schools for minor violations? Is it a military court and stockades? All of this when you are not at war. Are you going to vote for a different military penalty for American youth of nonvoting, nondraft age than you do for civil violations? I am not. In my opinion, these young boys, if violators, should be tried by civil courts, not the military.

On page 3 of the questions and answers, it states:

> Universal military training will save tremendous sums of money which may mean—
>
> Think of it—
>
> the difference between economic collapse and economic stability.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Armed Services Committee asked the advice of the Ways and Means Committee before they had that one printed. Have we sunk so low as a Nation that this one piece of legislation will make or break us? Then God help us. We need it. If we are that near broke, let us nationally sink with the parents happy and their boys at home and with them. If we cannot afford an Army, how can we afford a war.

Speaking of economic stability, Mr. Speaker, and I make no pretense of being an economist, I want to make an observation. If this resolution becomes public law, what effect will it have on the Nation 3 to 7½ years from now? These boys being in the Reserve for that many years will be 21 to 26 years of age. They in these 7½ years probably will be in business, farming or in a profession for themselves.

No doubt they will have gone in debt on the business or profession or for a home.

If they are called in this Reserve period, who pays the interest, their notes at the bank? Who pays their life insurance? Who supports their family? Who gets their car, their tractor, their home, their refrigerator, when in good faith they have made honest future obligations in the American way for better living conditions? It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body had better give this legislation a good thinking over before they forfeit the future of the next 10 years. I am not condoning police action by voting for it.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Every student of American history knows that we have been unprepared for all our wars and thousands of our youth have been slaughtered unnecessarily because they were green troops without adequate training in military fundamentals.

Every student of world history knows that today the Soviet Union is training their youth in the art of modern warfare as never before. Boys are inducted into training at the age of 15.

I am not going to have any difficulty in voting for this measure and my people will not be surprised. In every campaign for the last 6 years I have stressed my honest and sincere belief in this program and my conclusions have not been based merely on home studies. I have gone abroad and I have been with our men under fire and I know something about their feelings on the issue now to be resolved.

There are safeguards in this bill and as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations I desire to emphasize that every year our committee will have to reappraise the program as to the funds needed. Will we with your concurrence go along with a program that is keeping our boys in slavery or any kind of bondage such as has been referred to? Not for a minute.

Let me document what I have in mind about the tragic story of green troops in our fighting forces. I could tell you hundreds of stories but here is one I know very well. Every 10 days or so I have my hair cut by a barber in my home neighborhood in Paterson, N. J. His name is Tom Aufiero. There used to be a young Tom but he is no more. This lad of 18 years was killed at St. Lo, France, in World War II, 4 months and 5 days after he was inducted into the Army of the United States. As his father trims my hair he drums into my ears this theme:

"That kid, my boy, Congressman, never knew what it was all about. He never had the proper training. It is something every American boy should have in the future."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I am reading from the Cincinnati Inquirer:

> It is a saying born of the desert that once a camel's nose enters beneath the tent, the whole camel shortly enters.

I think it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on the Armed Forces cannot cram this thing down the throats of the majority of the Members here; consequently, I think it is apparent that they are going to water this bill where it means nothing, send it over to the Senate, and let them put in these slavery and bondage provisions, return it here and then try to have us accept the conference report. I now bring that to the attention of the Members of this body.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, it is completely unfair that anyone should argue that there is any compulsory feature to the measure that is to be compared to slavery. The bill does provide that after the boy has had his training he remains subject to call provided Congress intervenes or takes cognizance of the measure and enacts a law.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is entitled to recognition for 6 hours and

the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] for 6 hours.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, 175 years ago this Nation embarked on a course of action that has led it to the unchallenged position of the greatest world power in the history of mankind.

This was achieved through sacrifice, bloodshed, and heartbreak. The War for Independence, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and the current struggle in Korea, have all been challenges which our Nation has met through the common virtue of uncommon valor.

To defend their freedom, every generation of Americans has had to fight. Our people, composed of every nationality in the world, have never failed in their obligation as citizens to preserve this great democracy.

In each war in which this Nation has been engaged we have had one great ally, time, in which to prepare.

We had 3 years to prepare for World War I; two full years to prepare for World War II. We may still have some little time on our side, but every one of you knows that sudden and devastating war of incomparable magnitude could be unleashed upon us tomorrow.

Friendly nations that once absorbed the initial onslaught of a determined enemy may not be able to provide the time that heretofore has permitted us to train and mobilize our manpower.

In this atomic age every Member of this House knows that every city, village, and hamlet throughout our land is today on the front lines.

War can be brought to our own shores in a matter of hours.

In the alternative, and just as deadly, is the realization that we may be facing insidious self-destruction through economic chaos, brought about by maintaining our standing forces at tremendous costs, for an indefinite period.

A healthy American economy is just as necessary in the struggle with communism as any other feature of our defense program.

In the opinion of some people, we have almost reached the limit of deficit financing, but regardless of whose opinion we accept, it is obvious that we cannot continue this tremendous borrowing and deficit spending for any extended period of time. That path leads us straight into national bankruptcy.

Our American economy is based on the profit motive. If the answer to deficit spending is higher and higher taxes over a long extended period, we will most certainly destroy private enterprise.

We are faced with a possibility of sudden war tomorrow and a threat of war over an extended period of time. Both threats require preparedness. We must provide that preparedness in a manner which will not gain for the Communists a bloodless victory. Such a type of preparedness is what this bill will accomplish.

These are perilous times.

Since the end of World War II we have been faced with a giant and ever-growing challenge.

Our action in response to this challenge will determine the fate of this Nation.

We all recognize that the Soviet Union is progressively and brutally acting to enslave and dominate the world, and all freemen therein.

This threat cannot be ignored.

By the action of our Government in resisting aggressors, by our courageous and ever-expanding moves throughout the world to meet aggression, we have accepted the Soviet challenge. Let this thought ever remain with you, to meet this challenge we must be strong both economically and militarily. This bill gives us both military and economic strength at the same time.

If we fail to adequately arm those nations who are our allies, Russia will take them one by one through external military aggression, and finally will so control the world that the United States will stand alone. But in providing for our military defenses we must guard against overextending our energies, both militarily and economically.

The Congress must solve the problem of strengthening those nations who are our allies, providing for our own defenses, and assuring against economic collapse.

I do not pretend that these problems will be fully solved by UMT. However, I do contend that any legislation which will solve any part of these problems, is essential to our freedom and a duty which this Congress owes the Nation.

For that reason UMT should be adopted as speedily as possible. It is one of the most important steps, both economically and militarily, that we will ever be called upon to take to assure our safety.

Through UMT this Nation will have adequate preparedness, and at the same time, economic solvency.

Now, as you know, military strength is measured in several ways.

It is measured in matériel.

It is measured in scientific know-how.

It is measured in industrial potential.

It is measured in adequacy of transportation.

It is measured finally in that most important of all elements, the capabilities of the individual citizen.

The ultimate weapon is not the A-bomb.

The ultimate weapon is man.

Preparedness, then, is the proper mixture of these elements, men and materials.

Whenever either is not of top quality, whenever the ingredients are carelessly or fraudulently mixed, the Nation suffers.

All of our production, all of our tanks, repeating rifles, A-bombs, and other military weapons are of no value if our men do not know how to use them. This bill is a training bill. It provides the machinery to train the young men of the Nation how to use these weapons; and how to survive in battle.

In this day when force alone is recognized, trained military manpower is the basis upon which any successful foreign policy must be placed.

Unfortunately, trained and equipped manpower costs money and a great deal of it. It costs a great deal of money for matériel—the munitions of war.

A great deal is added to that cost by the expense of training and maintaining large numbers of men in our armed forces.

In looking about for a place to save money, we must search all possible nooks and crevices without impairing our security. One of these is readily apparent. It is set out in the bill now before you.

Military strength is measured not only by forces in being in the field and in the camps but also, and just as important, by the numbers of trained ready reserve forces which can be called to the colors on a moment's notice.

Trained ready Reserve forces cost far less to provide and maintain than a huge standing force. A trained Reserve is the objective of this bill.

It is certainly obvious that the cost of food, housing, clothing, equipment, and salaries for three and one-half to four million men per year indefinitely would be exorbitant, and I warn you, if continued indefinitely, will imperal the economic stability of the Nation.

It is obviously much cheaper to train men for 6 months, place them in the Reserve where they are kept fresh in their skills, and subject to call in the number and manner which Congress determines, when absolutely needed.

The bill provides for the training of approximately 800,000 men per year. These trained nonveteran Reserve forces which we are seeking to obtain through this bill will give to this Nation an adequate defense to meet the Communist threat.

After full implementation of UMT, as the report indicates, the program will provide these trained Reserves, and will reduce our expenditures for national defense by $13,000,000,000 annually, without weakening our security.

This Congress and the Nation faces the difficult but inevitable choice of maintaining for the foreseeable future a large standing force, unprecedented in our history—or adopting a system of universal military training—under which the youth of the Nation would be trained for 6 months and then be transferred to Reserve components in sufficient numbers to permit us to reduce the size of our standing forces.

The issue is clean cut.

No one can fail to understand it. We can enact the legislation now before us and make it possible to implement universal military training with its resultant benefits—or we can tell the Nation that for years and years to come we must continue to draft their sons for service, maintain a large standing force with its staggering costs, and continue, again and again, to call out our veteran reservists.

Let me emphasize again that the sole objective of universal military training is to create a strong, well-trained, ready Reserve, made up of nonveterans,

which will permit us to stop drafting men for service, and will likewise permit us to reduce the size of our standing forces.

The issue is squarely up to you.

This is the time to make that choice.

On many occasions I have stood in the well of this House urging the adoption of defense legislation which I sincerely believed to be in the best interests of the Nation. But I can say to you today that nothing that I have urged in the past can compare with the far-reaching importance of this bill. Its enactment may shape the destiny of this Nation and possibly the peace of the world for the rest of this century. Its enactment will be reflected in all of the diplomatic negotiations in which this Nation will be involved for the foreseeable future.

The bill before you contains all of the legislation necessary to implement a program of universal military training—from the oath that the trainee takes to the code of conduct under which discipline will be maintained. It provides for maintenance and moral safeguards.

It is complete, intact, and easily administered. It provides for civilian control.

It is not a surrender of the youth of the Nation to the military, but on the contrary, subjugates the military to civilian control.

You will note that we have strengthened the civilian control of this program by giving to the Commission authority to first approve the budget estimates proposed by the Defense Establishment for the implementation of the program.

This is training under a civilian commission—it is not military conscription. It is universal military training under civilian control for 6 months followed by service in the Reserve. And to further strengthen civilian control we have provided categorically and without reservation, that men transferred to the Reserve components following their training in the corps may only be ordered to active duty in such numbers and in such manner as the Congress may hereafter determine.

There can be no charge that this is hastily considered legislation; no one in fairness can say that all views have not been presented. The choice is crystal clear. Accept this bill and establish the machinery for UMT, or defeat it once and for all.

The time has arrived to make your choice.

UMT can never be started unless legislation is enacted to permit its initiation. Every day that passes without the Congress enacting a UMT program forces us to maintain a large standing force and brings us that much closer, day by day, to economic disaster.

I am fully aware of the fact that we cannot implement UMT on a full-scale basis at this particular time. But we must make a start now. We must begin the process of building up the Ready Reserve without delay. We will never have it if we do not start it.

Let me say to those who oppose UMT that I am fully conscious of their charge that we are seeking to capitalize upon the hysteria of the present emergency. And yet these same people would also argue in peacetime that UMT was unnecessary because there was no immediate danger. And strange to say, I find that these same people are the greatest proponents of economy. Let me say to you that if you defeat UMT you are placing a burden upon the American taxpayers from which there may be no recovery.

We have only two ways to provide adequate military defense. We can continue to travel the road we are on today—a large expensive standing force based upon conscription; or we can take the new road that affords adequate defense through the creation of a trained reserve brought about by universal military training. That is the issue—take your choice.

When I think of the billions and billions of dollars that this Nation has wasted, thrown down the drain, scattered to the winds, because of its refusal to prepare for the worst when the skies were relatively clear, I shudder. When I think of the billions and billions of dollars that this Nation has spent when hasty mobilization was forced upon us and then threw away through hasty demobilization, I cannot help but feel how short-sighted our policies in the past have been. I suppose that it is impossible to calculate the manpower and dollars that have been wasted as a result of our past philosophy of frantic mobilization and training of our youth when war has come to the United States followed by our equally frantic efforts to demobilize when a temporary peace has resulted from that war. It probably involved enough to cancel the national debt.

Now, how would we prevent this from happening in the future. Well, that is what universal military training will accomplish.

In plain language, the objective and purpose of universal military training is to create a strong, virile, Ready Reserve of trained young men capable of rapid mobilization should war or a threat of war appear on the horizon.

Its implementation will eventually permit us to suspend or eliminate entirely the drafting of men for service in the Armed Forces and will also permit us to reduce the size of our standing forces without impairing our national security.

Now how do we propose to start UMT? The law which this Congress enacted during the last session is clear on that. The program can be initiated after this implementing legislation has been enacted whenever the President, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, reduces or eliminates the period of service in the Armed Forces for young men under the age of 19.

Bear in mind then that the Congress has already enacted into law the method by which this great economy program can be started. All that remains is for the Congress to pass the housekeeping legislation contained in the proposed bill now before you.

When is UMT to start? That, in my opinion, is a military decision to be made when the Joint Chiefs of Staff and other military advisers feel that it is possible to induct young men for 6 months of training followed by transfer to inactive duty in a Reserve component. I repeat—when it should start must be a military decision.

Under the bill now being considered, no young man who has been trained in the corps and transferred to a Reserve component can be ordered to active duty except in such manner and in such numbers as the Congress may hereafter determine. For that reason, the military leaders of the Nation must make the decision as to when we can initiate the program, with the knowledge that the men trained in the program will not become active members of the Armed Forces unless the Congress takes further action.

Now let us look at the manpower situation.

The Director of Selective Service advised us that the manpower pool will be in excess of 900,000 men in June of this year, and would permit a withdrawal of sixty, seventy, or eighty thousand young men for the purpose of initiating universal military training. The manpower situation, therefore, will permit its early initiation.

The committee has made no recommendations as to when the program should be started, although it recognizes the fact that the sooner the better.

The Department of Defense suggested the initiation of universal military training in a different manner than provided for in the bill. But I want the Congress and the country to distinctly understand that this is not a Pentagon bill. This bill is the result of study on the part of the Commission and the Armed Services Committee.

The Department of Defense proposed to initiate universal military training through the use of volunteers who would agree to serve 18 months on active duty following their 6 months' training. The committee gave this suggestion careful study, but reached the conclusion that this was not the way to initiate the program. The objection was made, and rightfully so, that universal military training followed by immediate service in the Armed Forces would not create the Ready Reserve of nonveterans which this bill seeks to attain.

Every young man who has been inducted or who has enlisted in the Armed Forces since June 24, 1948, is required by law to assume a Reserve obligation following his period of active duty. Most of these men are the veterans of Korea and we must not subject them, and other veterans, to be called again should another emergency arise.

For that reason we have taken the firm position that universal military training should be initiated as soon as possible and on an ever-increasing scale.

If another emergency comes upon us we will first call upon those reservists obtained through UMT who have not seen prior service.

We deleted from the proposed bill a provision which would have allowed the trainers, that is, the men who will train these young men, to be in addition to the authorized strengths of the Armed Forces. Our objective is to reduce the size of our standing forces—not to enact

provisions of law which would permit additional permanent personnel in the Armed Forces.

Speaking of the trainer-trainee relationship, I want to call your attention to a provision in the bill which prevents the Armed Forces from requesting additional personnel for implementing universal military training, except for medical, dental, and religious personnel. We are of the firm opinion, as are many others who testified before the committee, that the ratio of two trainees to each trainer is unreasonably high. The provision which I have cited will force a drastic reduction in this.

In summarizing our position with respect to the initiation of this program it is fair to say that we feel it is basically a military decision. I am firmly of the opinion that the sooner we start the program, the better off we will be, although obviously it must start on a small scale basis of probably not more than 5,000 men per month.

If started on this basis, no new camps will be needed. Since we are not permitting the services to request additional personnel for the trainers in this program, there will be no additional funds required in that respect. The only cost involved in the initial implementation, therefore, will be the direct costs for the trainees, such as pay, food, and clothing, which is estimated to be about $44,000,000 for fiscal 1953, and I shall propose an amendment requiring the Department of Defense to absorb this cost.

As the program increases in size, as world conditions permit, and as the size of the Regular Armed Forces is reduced, present training facilities and equipment will be used. Let me repeat that no new training camps will be established for the initiation of UMT.

It is our sincere hope and belief that no matter when or how this program begins, that it will be increased as the months go by so that eventually only young men between the ages of 18 and 19 will be inducted into the National Security Training Corps and then all drafting for service will cease. Our objective, as I have stated, is to train these young men for 6 months and then send them home to become members of a Reserve component as now required by law. That will create the strong Ready Reserve of nonveterans and I again impress upon you that it will permit the Congress to reduce the size of our standing force.

I grant you that we must continue to draft men for service in the Armed Forces during the transition period while we are building up our Ready Reserve of nonveterans, but the drafting of men for service will terminate when we have a sufficient number of reservists to permit a considerable reduction in the standing forces.

You just cannot stop drafting men for service the day you inaugurate UMT. Both must run simultaneously for a limited time. But when UMT gets into full swing, drafting for service will fade away.

Our manpower pool is sufficiently large to permit us to do this as those inducted for UMT will be between 18 and 19, half of whom would otherwise be deferred by the time they reached the age of 19.

As the months go by and we start to build a Ready Reserve of young men who have received this training, the Nation will then be in a position of having well-trained young men in sufficient numbers to permit a reduction in our standing forces.

It is possible that by this time next year, we can, with reasonable safety, begin to reduce our Armed Forces. At the proper time I will offer an amendment that will insure reduction in our standing forces as the Reserves are built up, without impairing our national security.

This is the objective of the bill—this is what makes it possible for us to save billions of dollars annually. This will be our savings account.

Now, let me explain that further. If you will visualize the present Selective Service System as a checking account and universal military training as a savings account, I think you will get a very good understanding of this whole problem. Whenever we draw a man out of the manpower pool, and draft him for service in the Armed Forces, we are drawing on our checking account to meet our current needs. But when we induct a man into the National Security Training Corps for 6 months of training and then transfer him to a Ready Reserve, we are building up a savings account to be used should a rainy day descend upon us.

Now, I recognize the fact that under selective service every man we draft into the Armed Forces has a Reserve obligation. But I believe that every member of this House has firmly resolved that never again will he quietly sit by and permit the heartbreak that occurred when we indiscrimately ordered our veteran reservists to active duty to meet the Korean situation. I cannot believe that any Member of this House wants to force upon the veterans of this war the obligation to serve in any future emergency because they were unfortunate enough to be drafted for service, while their neighbors go to college or obtain some other deferred status which permits them not only to escape the draft for service but likewise permits them to escape any Reserve obligation.

In the name of decency and common justice we simply cannot continue the policy of placing the sole obligation on those who have already served once or twice to be first on the firing line again in the event of a national emergency.

A universal military training program will more evenly distribute this responsibility among the young men of our Nation before they have had an opportunity to place themselves in a protected status. When they have completed their universal military training they will be fully aware of this obligation, which is the obligation of every young man in the Nation, to be ready to serve his Nation in time of need.

It is my sincere hope that under universal military training 9 men out of every 10 will receive this training and assume an obligation to serve in the Ready Reserve.

Now suppose universal military training is initiated in the very near future. If that happens, I know that some of you will say that we will then be inducting some young men between the ages of 18 and 19 for 6 months of training while other young men over the age of 19 and those not inducted into the Corps before they attain the age of 19, will be drafted into the Armed Forces for 24 months.

Let me say here and now that the young men who receive this 6 months' training and who are then transferred to a Ready Reserve unit will, due to the fact that they have seen no service, be the first to be called if it becomes necessary to suddenly increase our Armed Forces or if another emergency is forced upon us. They will be the readiest of the Reserves and rightfully so, for they will be the recently well-trained young men.

While it may appear on the surface to be unfair to induct one man for 6 months and to induct another man, a year older, for 24 months, it must be remembered that it is a lot fairer than the present system which permits many young men to escape all obligation to serve in the Armed Forces because they are either in college or have obtained some other deferred status which removes them from any obligation to serve in the Armed Forces or in the Reserve.

Complete fairness in any system which seeks to obtain service through compulsion is impossible to obtain. Is it fair to place one young man in the front lines in Korea while another man hands out trousers in a quartermaster depot back in the States? Is it fair for one young man to be drafted because he has good health, while another man who has a physical impairment which does not prevent him from obtaining employment in private industry assumes no obligation to serve his Nation whatsoever? Is it fair to defer a young man who is needed on a farm while his brother is required to serve in the Armed Forces? Is it fair to draft into the Armed Forces a married man without children while deferring another married man who is fortunate to have a family?

The whole question of fairness is one of degree. We have got to start UMT some time in order to reduce the size of the standing forces. We cannot reduce the size of the standing forces unless we have a strong Ready Reserve. Unless we want to wait until we have a Reserve composed of veterans who would be subject to call to serve again, we have to initiate UMT now in order to move into the transition period between the build-up of a Reserve of nonveterans while at the same time we are maintaining the standing force necessary to provide the protection deemed necessary by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Suppose we do not pass this bill, and in the next year or two international conditions indicate that we might begin to reduce the size of our standing forces without UMT, what then happens? Now, listen, I will tell you exactly what hap-

pens. You fix it so that only men who are inducted for service assume a reserve obligation. And who are they? The veterans of Korea. Let me repeat that. Only draftees or men who enlist voluntarily in the Armed Forces assume a reserve obligation, and they are forced to do so by the plain letter of the law. Therefore your reserve is made up of men who have seen prior service. Are these the only ones in the Nation that should be called upon to serve if an emergency arises? Therefore, if for any period of time we reduce draft calls or cease drafting men for service, thousands upon thousands of young men completely escape their obligation to serve their Nation—lock, stock, and barrel. And should another partial mobilization occur again in the future or should it be necessary to suddenly increase the size of our Armed Forces short of total mobilization, it will be the reservists who have previously served in the Armed Forces, the veterans of Korea, if you will, who are required by law to retain a reserve obligation, who will be called upon to again serve their Nation. Other young men who escape the draft during the temporary lull will bask in the protection that has been afforded them through failure to enact UMT.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great virtues of this training program is its equity of application. Its operation on a full-scale basis means that no young man capable of bearing arms will escape the duty to serve this Nation whenever its existence is threatened. It distributes the load on a more equitable basis than any system yet devised.

I do not know of a single Member in this body who has not raised his voice in protest against the involuntary recall of inactive reservists, many of whom were combat veterans of World War II. That unfortunate situation would not have occurred had this Nation had in operation a universal military training program prior to Korea.

The sad truth is that we had to call on these veterans who remained in the Reserve even though in an inactive status because it took less time to retrain them than it would have taken to induct the same number of men and train them for combat. For those of you who have raised your voices in public condemnation of the treatment of the recalled reservists, I can only say that I know of no better method of preventing a repetition of this incident than through the adoption of the bill now before us.

When our Nation possesses a Ready Reserve made up of well-trained young men who will have received their training at an early age—young men who will be liable to call in most instances before they have acquired substantial civilian responsibilities, we will not again impose upon our citizen soldiers the heartbreak and broken homes that was the inevitable result of recalling our veteran reservists for this emergency.

Mr. Chairman, I have touched only upon some of the more important features of universal military training. I could discuss the moral safeguards that will surround these young men, the restrictions against the use of alcoholic beverages and the protection against prostitution, but I do not want to unduly emphasize those features as compared with the basic military training which they will receive.

However, let me say that when young men from all walks of life: The millionaire's son, the farmer's son, the laborer's son, and the doctor's son all live and work together for 6 months they will have acquired a common understanding and a philosophy for their life ahead which will make each of them a better citizen when he returns to his community.

Now, I would like to turn to the subject of the economy that will be achieved by this bill.

The budget submitted by the Department of Defense for fiscal 1953 for direct appropriations for our Armed Forces involves approximately $52,000,000,000. For this $52,000,000,000 we can support an armed force of 3,700,000 men on active duty.

The House should understand that all of this $52,000,000,000 is not for the maintenance of our Armed Forces alone, since portions of it will be used for the projected build-up in our defense program. That is, part of this money will be used for the modernization of anti-aircraft guns, tanks, bombsights, aircraft, artillery pieces, ships, submarines, and other instruments of war. In addition, portions of this $52,000,000,000 will be used for the procurement of new additional aircraft for the Air Force and the Navy over and above present operating forces, the construction of new additional ships, the construction of new major military installations here and abroad, and the establishment of reserve war materials such as ammunition, fuel, parts, vehicles, and other necessary items all of which will cost approximately $11,000,000,000. That leaves $41,000,000,000 for the maintenance of an armed force of 3,700,000 men, or $11,000 per man.

Now bear in mind that it will cost us $41,000,000,000 per year to maintain an armed force of 3,800,000 men, after we have modernized our equipment and completed the procurement of new capital investments. This forty-one billion is the amount that it will take merely to maintain an armed force of 3,700,000 men.

But we can reduce our Armed Forces from 3,700,000 men to 2,000,000 men and save $13,000,000,000 annually if we have in existence a Ready Reserve of 2,500,000 men and a training program involving 800,000 men annually being trained under the universal military training program. Such a program will provide the same degree of security as a standing force of 3,700,000 men at a cost of $41,000,000,000.

Let us examine that defense structure for just a moment.

To maintain a Military Establishment of 2,000,000 men in the Armed Forces, would cost on an average of $11,500 per man. This amounts to $23,000,000,000 annually. The additional $500 per man is brought about by the many recurring fixed charges which increase the cost per man as the size of the Armed Forces is reduced.

Now, a Ready Reserve that is really ready will cost money. And we estimate that a Ready Reserve of 2,500,000 men might well involve an additional $2,500,000,000 per year.

This would be enough for the cost of training. It would be enough to keep the equipment up to date and would provide for expanded training facilities.

To train the 800,000 young men under universal military training, including the cost of the trainers, will cost approximately $2,400,000,000 per year. Thus, if you add the $2,500,000,000 for the Reserve, the $2,400,000,000 for the universal military training program, and the $23,000,000,000 for maintaining a standing force of 2,000,000 men in the Armed Forces, the total amounts to almost $28,000,000,000.

Thus, the total cost of a defense program based on 2,000,000 men on active duty in the Armed Forces, a really Ready Reserve of 2,500,000 men, and 800,000 young men in training annually, including the cost for keeping the equipment and units of the Reserve up to date, would amount to approximately $28,000,000,000 a year.

Compare that with the $41,000,000,000 we will spend in fiscal 1953 and every year thereafter for a defense program that will not add a single nonveteran reservist to our Ready Reserve.

Here is a saving of $13,000,000,000 a year that can be brought about without impairing the adequacy of our national security in the slightest degree.

Here then is economy of the highest order.

Pass this legislation and build a ready reserve of 2,500,000 men kept constantly fresh and recently trained through the in-put of new trainees who graduate from the program each year.

Pass this legislation and we can eventually eliminate the necessity of drafting men into the Armed Forces for 2 years.

Pass this legislation and we tell our heroic veterans of World War II and Korea that they will not be the first to be called in the event of another emergency but that the obligation to serve the Nation will be placed upon all young men capable of bearing arms.

Pass this legislation and we can reduce our standing force to 2,000,000 men and save the taxpayers of the nation $13,000,000,000 a year.

But if the Congress chooses to kill this legislation, then it is saying to the Nation that it prefers to continue drafting its sons into the Armed Forces for 24 months, for an indefinite period, instead of training them for 6 months and sending them home to join reserve components.

Kill this legislation and the Congres has killed an opportunity to save the taxpayers of the Nation $13,000,000,000 a year.

Kill this legislation and the Congress has told the veterans of Korea and World War II that they will again have to be called if another emergency arises.

Kill this legislation and the Congress will have saddled a burden upon the backs of the American people which may lead us into economic chaos.

The issue is clear cut. The choice is yours.

Never before has the Congress had a greater opportunity to equalize the obligations to serve one's Nation. Never before has there been a greater opportunity to eliminate the drafting of men into the Armed Forces. Never before has the Congress had a greater opportunity to save the taxpayers such a tremendous sum of money.

Here is your opportunity—take it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the most important measure to come before the Congress. It deals with human lives. It proposes a transgression on individual liberties. A bill of this character should give us pause. It should give us cause to reflect hard not alone on its military aspects but also upon its far-reaching economic and social consequences.

As the free representatives of a free people, we profess to be guardians of individual rights and liberties of our people. We not infrequently declare our abiding faith in and allegiance to American tradition. We represent ourselves to our people as being their unyielding protectors of American principles of government and uncompromising defenders of their personal liberties.

The bill now before us presents an actual test to these worthy claims. It is proposed by this bill that hereafter, and forever more, every American boy shall, upon reaching the age of 18, forego his cherished individual freedom for a period of 8 years. It is proposed by this bill that hereafter, and forevermore, every 18-year-old American boy shall no longer be completely free to follow his normal peacetime pursuits. Our vote on this bill is the test of our professed adherence to American principles.

Simply but accurately stated, this bill proposes a stockpiling of young Americans. The boy is first given 6 months' basic training. During this 6 months' period he will be taught the fundamentals of warfare, the rudiments in how to kill, and be mentally conditioned to unquestioning obedience to military commands. That is the primary purpose of the basic training. It can have no other purpose and be justified at all in a military sense.

The sponsors of this legislation persist in stressing the training to be given during this 6 months' period in religion, morals, and citizenship. Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, one of the Commissioners of the National Security Training Commission, made an excellent statement on this phase when he appeared before our Committee on Armed Services.

As important as that is in the training of our youth, we certainly are not so naive as to believe that any military camp, however carefully supervised by civilians, is a good training place for character building and virile American citizenship. By its very nature mass military training is not conducive to making real Americans of independent thought and action. On the contrary, it produces a disciplined, regimented mind entirely unprepared for the responsibilities of free citizenship. This is inevitable for, as Hanson Baldwin, the Nation's leading military writer, describes military life—"their lives are regulated, ordered, and directed in neat patterns, with 'security assured' and the hard processes of thinking too often reduced to a minimum."

I am not exaggerating when I say that this much ado in the Commission's report and in our committee report about training in morals, religion, and character during this 6 months' training period is just a "lot of window dressing." It is part of the masquerade to try to make this militaristic bill more palatable to the American people. It goes without saying that there is no substitute for the freedom and environment of the home, for the freedom and environment of the community, church, and schools in producing the kind of men that made this country what it is.

Dr. Hutchins, former chancelor of the University of Chicago, said:

> It stands to reason that though free and independent citizens make the best army, the Army is not the best place to make free and independent citizens.

Surely we have sufficient insight into the nature of this proposal to recognize that it is not really a defense measure made necessary by the existing emergency. That is also part of its masquerade. Whatever the merits of the proposal, above all else, let us recognize it for what it actually is. Let us accept it or reject it for what it is, and not allow ourselves to be misled by the pretense of its sponsors.

The legislation before us today is not new. For many years some of our military men have been advocating a program of this character. But they have never been able to sell the American people on their glorious military dream of requiring every young man to serve in war or peace a period of his life under their command.

It is perhaps not without significance that one of the leading advocates of such a program as this has been Gen. George C. Marshall, and one of the leading opponents is Gen. Douglas MacArthur. The committee report quotes General Marshall. I prefer to quote General MacArthur. He said of UMT:

> While intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, it carries within itself the very germs of freedom's destruction • • • it etches the pattern to a military state.

With our people naturally concerned over our national security, with the war in Korea and the present emergency being foremost in their thoughts, the sponsors of this program have seized upon this anxious state of public mind as a good opportunity for them to put across their military training program, which, in truth, has no relationship whatever to the existing emergency. Relying on public anxiety, they are cleverly endeavoring to saddle on the American people something which the American people do not want. They have selected this apparently auspicious time to revive an old, old plan, giving it a new name and dressing it up with some fancy clothes to conceal its true identity.

The bill before us is officially titled the National Security Training Act, but was previously called and is more generally known as the universal military training bill. They are innocuous-sounding titles, no doubt selected by the advocates of this program for peacetime conscription to try to make their product more saleable. I suspect these titles have been selected, if not to conceal, at least not to reveal the true nature of this legislation. I suspect the title "National Security Training," or "Universal Military Training," has been selected more for propaganda purposes than to describe the bill itself. They well know the opposition of the American people to their program. By hook or by crook, military brass in the Pentagon is determined to get on the statute books some kind of peacetime conscription so that at least a beginning is made for realizing their dream of a great stockpile of men under their jurisdiction.

This is not a universal military training bill. There is nothing universal about it. Exactly the same standards will be used for inducting 18-year-old boys under this proposed law as are now used for induction of 18½-year-old boys under the Selective Service Act. The bill before us is nothing more or less than a compulsory military training law. It sets up a system for permanent peacetime conscription. It provides that henceforth, and forevermore, every 18-year-old American boy shall be subject to military service for a period of at least 8 years. Whether we adopt or reject this proposal, let it at least be clearly understood by all of us, and particularly by the people we represent, what kind of a program we have before us.

There is another very important fact with respect to the pending bill I wish to get straight. The proponents, including our beloved chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, Mr. VINSON, of Georgia, have been contending that the Congress has already approved the principle of universal military training. That is also part of their propaganda line. They state that Congress approved UMT in principle when we passed the draft extension bill last year. When our Committee on Armed Services began the hearings on this bill, our chairman stated in his opening statement that the witnesses who appeared before our committee should direct their testimony to the plan itself rather than to the principle of universal military training.

By no stretch of the imagination can it be said that the Congress voted for the principle of universal military training when we passed the bill last year to extend the draft law. I voted for the extension of the Draft Act. It was passed by an overwhelming majority as an emergency measure. I, for one, certainly did not express approval of the principle of universal military training by that vote. I believe most of you take the same position. The RECORD substantiates this fact.

There is no Member of this House for whom I have a greater affection, greater respect, and greater admiration than the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of our Committe on Armed Serv-

cies. I am proud to serve on the committee under his chairmanship. In this I believe I am expressing the sentiment of the entire committee membership from both sides of the aisle. Our committee is charged with tremendous responsibilities involving our national defense. We have our differences in committee but they are not now and never have been differences arising out of political considerations.

Our chairman is extremely able. He must be appreciated for his skill in strategy and procedure, as well as for his knowledge of subject matter. He is more than well informed. He is astute. He is an exceptionally clever strategist in devising ways and means to sidestep opposition to reach his preconceived destination. He is ingenious in finding methods by which you are forced to say a hesitant "Yes" on something you normally would utter an emphatic "No."

By shrewd parliamentary maneuvering when we considered the draft extension bill last year the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the advocates of UMT believe they maneuvered us into a position where we unknowingly approved the principle of UMT. Not being able to secure favorable action by the House on UMT itself standing on its own merits, the proponents of the program, aided and abetted by the gentleman from Georgia, decided to incorporate provisions for UMT in the bill to extend the Selective Service Act. They conceived the idea of putting their program across by incorporating unwanted permanent legislation in a necessary emergency measure. They well knew that the American people and the Congress as a whole would approve extension of the Draft Act, but were bitterly opposed to UMT. They had hoped that by tying a permanent measure to a temporary measure they could by this means saddle the American people with something they did not want. To avoid an out-and-out vote on UMT as such they did not present it as a separate and distinct title to the draft extension bill, but cleverly interwove the UMT provisions in with the draft provisions to make them almost inseparable.

It soon became apparent, however, that the provisions for UMT contained in the Selective Service extension bill would be completely stricken from the bill or possibly the Congress would not even extend the draft bill. The Congress was insisting that it at least be given the opportunity to pass on UMT on its own merits. It was obvious that one way or another the UMT program was destined for a complete defeat on the floor of the House. It was then that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] made one of his adroit parliamentary maneuvers. He offered as an amendment, which was certainly preferable to what was in the bill, the rather unusual provision which provided for the setting up of the National Security Training Commission of five members to draw up a plan for UMT and requiring that the committee must act on it within 45 legislative days. Everyone recognized this as a very unusual provision whereby UMT legislation was made privileged, but all of us were more or less willing to accept it in lieu of the original plan to make UMT permanent, as we would at least have the opportunity to pass on UMT itself on its own merits. It would, at least, avoid our being stampeded into adopting the program as a part of an emergency bill.

My distinguished chairman now contends that by virtue of this unique provision being in the emergency draft legislation we have approved the principle of UMT. This simply is not a logical conclusion. If you read carefully the record of the debate on this particular provision you will find that the question of approving UMT in principle was raised. The chairman repeatedly was asked the question in various forms as to whether acceptance of his amendment would mean acceptance of UMT. He never answered the question directly. He avoided a direct answer. He tried to satisfy those who were skeptical by repeatedly saying that nothing could happen until Congress approved a plan.

During the course of this discussion, however, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], whom all of us recognize as an extremely able lawyer with unusual ability for analyzing and clarifying issues, made the following statement to allay the expressed fear of Members that we might be approving UMT in principle. I now quote the words of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 3, page 3600. He said:

> Is it not perfectly apparent to the gentleman and to all others hearing this debate that those opposing the UMT provisions of the committee bill have won their fight and that the Vinson amendment means this, and nothing more—an expression of concern or an expression of interest or desire for further exploration of the subject, all in the interest of establishing a basis for enactment of the law, if it is the will of the Congress to so legislate?

Those assuring words of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] expressed the understanding of all of us. In other words, when the Congress accepted the provision that was contained in the draft extension bill for the setting up of the Commission to submit a plan, it was not expressing its approval of UMT in principle but simply expressing a willingness to explore this subject. That was what we voted for, and nothing more. The chairman of the Committee on Armed Services may sincerely believe that he cleverly maneuvered us into a compromising position whereby the UMT proponents can claim approval in principle, but I think he will find when the vote is taken on this pending bill how wrong he is.

It should be apparent to all of us from the legislative history of this bill that the proponents of UMT are determined to get some kind of a program into effect, public opinion to the contrary notwithstanding. That is why they have masqueraded this bill in several particulars; that is why they have endeavored to make it appear as innocuous as possible; and that is why they have employed the step-by-step strategy in getting it through the Congress. They are not to be denied their ultimate objective. They recognize that the strongest opposition to UMT comes from this side of the Capitol. We are closer to the people. The military believe that if they can get this bill passed by the House, and sent to the other side of the Capitol, they will ultimately be able to get practically the type law they want.

It is for this reason that I believe I should call your special attention to the committee amendment to the bill which provides that after a boy has completed his 6 months' training and has been placed in the Reserves, he cannot be called to active duty until Congress specifies the number and the manner in which they are to be called. The proponents repeatedly emphasize this protective provision in their propaganda. They point out that the Congress will retain control over, when, and in what manner the boys will be called to active duty. They believe that by including this provision, not in the original bill, the House is more likely to accept the program.

Of course such a provision makes the program more acceptable. We too well know the hit-and-miss manner by which reservists were called to active duty at the outbreak of war in Korea. We have been extremely critical of the military in their method of recalling and releasing reservists.

But I seriously doubt that this provision to give Congress control over calls to duty will remain in the bill in its final form. The Pentagon is opposed to it. Some of the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee have already expressed publicly their opposition to it. The Senate committee did not include it in the bill they reported.

Under the Reserve bill which is still pending in the other body, the President would be authorized to order to active duty all reservists in case of a war or a national emergency declared by the Congress. That bill does not specify that the Congress shall subsequently determine the manner in which reservists shall be called. There is, therefore, this inconsistency between the pending proposal and the pending Reserve bill in the other body. Moreover, the President has, under existing law, the authority to order all reservists to active duty for a period of 24 months.

Obviously, these differences with respect to the time and manner in which reservists will be called to active duty as provided in existing law, the pending Reserve bill and the pending UMT bill must be ironed out. I venture to say that when the legislation takes its final form, the President and the Pentagon will get exactly what they want, and the amount of control which the Congress will have over the time and the manner in which reservists will be called will be reduced to a bare minimum, if any congressional control at all. While all of us approve the proposed committee amendment to the pending bill, let us not allow the UMT proponents to lead us to believe it represents an absolute safeguard. You may be reasonably certain

that if this bill passes the House, they will then work to get the provision removed or amended. It has happened before. It will happen again.

A pertinent question to ask is why we are now called upon with such great haste to consider a UMT program designed for building up a Reserve Corps when we have not yet taken final action on a Reserve program as a whole. The proponents of this bill stress that all UMT really amounts to is a method of building up of a large Reserve Corps. Accepting that thesis, that UMT is a procurement method for reservists, why, then, not wait for the final enactment of the Reserve program in the bill we sent to the Senate before taking action on a bill designed to raise the manpower for the Reserve Corps.

It is also rather strange that the military brass should emphasize the absolute necessity of UMT to inaugurate a Reserve program when they themselves have been so derelict and so wanting over the last several years in developing a proper Reserve program. If Gen. George C. Marshall so fervently believed in the necessity of a sound Reserve program, why did he not develop such a program following World War II? Why did we find our Reserve program so completely lacking in so many particulars when reservists were called to active duty following the outbreak of war in Korea?

There are some who believe that the military deliberately sabotaged the Reserve program in order to have an excuse to secure this proposed UMT legislation. It is contended that the military are not as interested in a so-called Reserve program as they pretend, but their real desire is to secure the enactment of this proposed permanent peacetime conscription law.

When is this proposed program to begin? To be sure, the proposed law is clear that either the President, by Executive order, or the Congress, by concurrent resolution, can initiate the program. But when as a practical matter, as distinguished from the legal, can the program be initiated when we are already scraping the bottom of the barrel to get sufficient manpower for an armed force of 3,700,000 men, the goal set for next year. With the war in Korea continuing, and other outbreaks in prospect, there is nothing in the present international picture, as I see it, to encourage us to reduce the size of our standing Army. If the UMT program is initiated at this time some boys would serve 6 months under the UMT law and then go into the Reserve Corps for service at some future date. Other boys would be drafted for 24 months' service under the Selective Service Act. It is obvious that the operation of the draft law and UMT concurrently is not practical from the point of view of equity. It discriminates.

Something should also be said with respect to the cost of this proposed program. It is fair to say that no one really knows how much it will cost, if for no other reason than that no one knows when it can begin or to what extent. The so-called National Security Commission has estimated that the total cost for the full implementation of the program in the first year would be over $4,000,000,000 and in excess of $2,000,000,000 for each year thereafter.

These are, of course, estimates prepared by the Pentagon. Inasmuch as it is the military that is so anxious to have the proposal adopted, we can be reasonably certain that the cost estimates are on the ultra-ultra-conservative side.

Any estimate of the cost of UMT must include both the cost of the 6 months' camp program of UMT and the cost of the 7½-year Reserve program which is a part of the same bill. The UMT program is divided into two parts. Each boy would be drafted into 6 months of training in Army, Navy, Marine, or Air Force camps. At the end of 6 months he would be placed in the Reserves for 7½ years. Although the Reserve program is a complicated one, each boy would be subject to 15 days' refresher training each year. Many would be expected to drill each week in the year for at least 3 years. The Armed Forces have estimated the cost of the 6 months' training program, but have not announced any figures for the Reserve program.

The cost of a 6-month program of UMT for 800,000 boys has been estimated for the first year of full operation as $4,187,983,600, and the recurring annual cost as $2,158,746,200.

The Defense Department, in submitting a proposed bill for a Reserve program to implement UMT, stated in its covering letter of July 18, 1951:

> Cost and budget data: It is not possible to estimate the fiscal effect of this proposed bill. (House Armed Services Committee hearings on Reserve components, August 6, 1951, p. 534.)

It is our normal experience with the executive departments that they deliberately set the initial cost of their new programs extremely low. The important thing is to get the program authorized. Once that is accomplished and underway, the basic estimates go out the window, and the necessity for larger and larger appropriations increases.

Under the terms of the pending bill, the trainees are to be paid $30 a month during the 6 months they are in training. As you know, the men drafted under the Selective Service Act are paid $75 per month. I venture to predict that if this program is inaugurated it will not be long before there will be irresistable pressure on the Congress to raise the pay of the trainees from $30 a month to equal or approximate that paid those inducted under the Selective Service Act. I also venture to predict that once this program is adopted, the number, size, and nature of the military installations claimed to be necessary for the carrying out of the program will substantially increase. It will be argued that to vote against them will be voting against a defense need. It is a fair assumption that the costs are likely to be two, if not three times and maybe four times, greater than the estimate of $4,000,000,000 submitted to us by the Commission.

The proponents have recognized that the potential enormous cost of the program is one of the strong public objections to it. The country is, at long last, becoming cost conscious. In order to meet this public objection, our ingenious committee chairman sharpened his pencil, consulted a crystal ball, and, by a formula which not even Einstein could understand, suddenly advises us in the committee report that if this program is adopted, there would be annual savings of $13,000,000,000. We discussed costs rather extensively in committee, but this hypothetical conjectural saving the chairman now claims for UMT came as a complete surprise to all of us when we saw the statement for the first time embodied in the committee report. The very best that can be said for this estimated savings is that the chairman's additions and subtractions are mathematically correct but he bases the figures on mere assumptions in order to arrive at his predetermined conclusion. He must prove his case.

You will note that the committee report does not say in so many words that the savings will amount to $13,000,000,000 annually if this program is adopted. I call your special attention to the very guarded language used in offering this wishful figure, which is obviously designed solely for propaganda-selling purposes.

I now quote from the bottom of page 26 of the committee report:

> Full implementation of UMT may eventually save in excess of $13,000,000,000 annually.

They do not say that it will save $13,000,000,000 annually. They state that it may save that amount annually. You will also note they say that it may eventually save $13,000,000,000. Moreover, this figure is based upon the full implementation of the law.

It is perfectly apparent that the alleged projected savings will be realized when we are no longer drafting men into the service, when the present emergency is past, and the world is at peace. When that day arrives, what they project as a saving will actually be an added peacetime expense to our defense budget.

With respect to this figure as to UMT cost saving, I will say to my beloved chairman exactly what he said to a witness who appeared before our committee. The witness was Mr. John C. Lynn, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, and he was discussing the large number of reservists who would be attending Army training camps, pointing out that during the summer of 1959 we would have a total of 11,900,000 men in Army camps. To his projected figure, our chairman said, and you will find his statement on page 2515 of the hearings:

> We all recognize the inalienable right of every applicant to always get figures to fit his case. So that is universal, that every man has an opportunity to do that so we never criticize anybody when he gets his figures to fit his case.

Accordingly, I am not criticizing the State of Georgia's greatest mathematician.

That is what our chairman told witness Lynn, and I suppose that is the position that we should take with respect to the chairman's own figure as to the cost of UMT. For my part I do not see any other conclusion, but that UMT will cost

the American people at least several billion dollars every year. After this emergency has passed, this will represent a continuing peace-time cost which would be otherwise avoidable.

This proposed program is based on the premise that for many years to come the United States will need a large army for our own defense. It is proposed by this program that we build up an enormous Reserve Corps, on the theory that we will have available men who can be readily mobilized and put into service. Do not overlook the fact that should an emergency arise and the reservists be called to duty, it would still be necessary to give them refresher courses and still be necessary for them to take extensive training to condition themselves physically and prepare themselves technically for the task at hand. When you consider that equipment is constantly improved and changed, that the technique of warfare is constantly changing, it should be obvious that 4, 5, 6, or 7 years after a man has concluded his basic training, additional training will be necessary before he is ready for combat duty. The money that would be spent for this so-called UMT and the reservist program could well be spent for other defense purposes. It could well be spent on equipment or on research improving existing equipment.

The great strength and power of the United States has not been in the immediate availability of a trained mass of men, but rather in our superior equipment and our great productive capacity. We have fought and won two world wars without resorting to the old Prussian system of a mass army. We have been able to quickly recruit and train an army, because so many of our boys have been technically trained in their civilian pursuits and readily utilized along the same lines in military fields.

The committee report places great emphasis upon the need for a program of this character in order that we may have young men available for service in the event of full mobilization. To substantiate this contention they point to the speed with which the German armies overrun Holland and Belgium, and brought France to its knees.

This thesis overlooks three extremely important facts: One is that the countries so quickly overrun by Germany were geographically adjacent to Germany itself. Do not forget that France had a conscripted army, but France was economically weak. The Germans did not bring England to its knees. The English Channel represented a natural barrier to a quick and easy invasion, and there are thousands of miles of water between the United States and our potential enemies.

The second important fact which the committee argument ignores is that the strength of the German Army was not so much its size but its striking power in guns, tanks, and aircraft. It should be borne in mind that while Germany was stopped by Soviet Russia, it was not because Russia was superior in the number of men but because Russia had American equipment to put into the battle.

A third important fact to which the committee has apparently closed its eyes is that with the advances in aircraft and the destructive power of the atom bomb, no modern warfare will be conducted by great masses of men. It will be largely a war of attrition. I am convinced that if we emphasize having a superior Navy, a superior Air Force, and a strong, mobile Marine Corps as shock troops, we will have the basis for a defense no country can overcome, so long as we remain economically strong.

I am frankly surprised that the Committee on Armed Services is thinking in eighteenth century terms in their reasoning with respect to our defense needs. I am frankly surprised that the majority on our committee should in this day of air power and atomic power be disposed to place so much reliance on a mass army as a defense need. Of course, if it is proposed that the United States is to send its troops all over the globe, if it is proposed that we station our troops in the Far East, the Middle East, in Africa and in Europe, if that is what is contemplated by national defense, then we should enact this bill. Indeed, I doubt that this bill will provide the manpower we need for such global purposes, and that certainly is not what I have in mind when I speak of our national defense requirements. Nor do I believe that the American people have any such conception as the entire globe being a part of our national defense.

This is a permanent peacetime conscription bill, brought here under the guise of an emergency need and on an erroneous conception as to our defense requirements. This bill is abhorrent to the thinking of the free people of America. They are violently opposed to it.

The people have expressed themselves on this bill in no uncertain terms. The farm organizations are against the bill: the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange and the National Farmers Union. Organized labor is against this bill: The American Federation of Labor, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the CIO, and the United Mine Workers. The churches of all denominations have expressed their opposition to this proposed legislation. Every major educational organization has registered its opposition. Various civic organizations have expressed their opposition.

The only major non-Government organizations that have endorsed this proposed program of peacetime conscription or compulsory military training are the veteran organizations, such as the American Legion. I hold a great respect for the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the other veteran groups. But I do not believe that the leaders of these organizations are on this issue expressing the sentiment of the rank and file of their members.

I have been and continue to be an active legionnaire. I proudly boast that at one time I had the honor of being a district commander of the Illinois department of the American Legion. I have personally talked with a great many rank and file Legion members. Some of them have been misled by the military propaganda as to what this bill really is. When I explain to them what is proposed by this legislation they invariably express their surprise and emphatic opposition.

As representatives of the people we have the duty of translating into legislative action the wishes, wants, ideas, and ideals of the people who elected us as their voice in Congress. We represent the people as a whole, not the Pentagon or any organization. To vote for this bill is to betray the people whose liberties we were sent here to protect. To vote for this bill is to saddle on the great American people an obnoxious program, repugnant to the very principles of freedom that have been our constant source of strength. A vote for this bill is a vote against the wishes of the American people. You may be quite certain that if this legislation is adopted those who are responsible for it will one day, perhaps not too many months hence, be forced to stand in judgment as guilty before the bar of public opinion.

When I urge the House to reject this proposal as being undemocratic, costly, impractical, inequitable, and unnecessary, I know I am expressing the sentiment of the great mass of our free and independent citizens. They want to remain free and independent and not become mere pawns for a military hierarchy in Washington.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Will the gentleman kindly explain to me and other Members of the House where and how this vast reservoir of manpower is to be trained, after they have completed their 6 months' tour of duty?

Mr. ARENDS. Under a provision of the bill we are going to send the 18-year-olds who have taken 6 months home, and let them stay there in Reserve units until called to duty. When called to duty, we will then train them all over again. Each boy will be a reservist, subject to call, for 7½ years. He may be obliged during these 7½ years to leave his work or profession, his home and family, to take tours of duty.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], who will answer the question that has just been asked.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman starts his discourse, will he yield to me in order that I may add to the list of those organizations which have been indicated and identified as being opposed to this proposal?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. In addition to the labor organizations and the farm organizations and the church organizations which are opposed to this proposal, it should also be noted that the American Labor Party is opposed to it, the Young Progressives of America is opposed to it, the Daily Worker is opposed to it, and the Daily Compass.

Mr. BROOKS. At this point, Mr. Chairman, I should like to add to the list of those mentioned as in favor of it a letter I have received today from the General Federation of Women's Clubs of America, who are very much in favor of it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure this afternoon because the debate which starts this afternoon represents the climax of two continuous decades of debate on this subject, universal military training.

Since the conclusion of World War I, when the need for training for combat troops was so desperately shown, as a result of the reading of the history of that World War there has been this movement in the United States for universal military training. It has not subsided regardless of the vicissitudes and the changes of events in the United States. On the contrary, the world events and the history of this country have served but to increase the tension and increase the demand on the part of the American people for adequate national defense and, in doing so, for universal military training. They are again demanding, as they have demanded before of the Congress of the United States, that we take a definite position in reference to universal military training. I am certainly glad, as I have said repeatedly before, that we are here today and that we are going to vote definitely one way or the other on this whole momentous and historical American question. For 10 years, in my judgment, I have thought the Congress of the United States ought to have expressed itself in reference to universal military training. But they have failed.

Mr. Chairman, my advocacy of universal military training far precedes my service in the House of Representatives. It goes back, Mr. Chairman, to the First World War when men were mowed down on the field of combat in squads of eight because of the lack of military training, and when life was wantonly taken away from our citizens because we had failed to train them properly before putting them into battle. My advocacy of this cause goes back to the time when I saw men come back from the front, badly wounded, on hospital trains with less than 30 days of actual military training. Then and there, at that time I solemnly pledged myself that should the hour come when I would be able to vote on whether or not American boys are going to be given a fair chance, if they should be called into battle again, to vote in favor of proper military training. I am not going to change my thoughts on this occasion on the proposition that if we are going to send men into combat, then we ought to send them into combat properly trained, and not take the lives of American boys by failing to give them, before they are used in combat, the background and training to protect themselves and safeguard the interests of the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, this matter came to the forefront again when Korea broke, as it did, with stunning suddenness upon the whole world. It was at that time that the Armed Forces called from peaceful pursuits thousands upon thousands of reservists who had served in World War II. We had what we thought was a vast reservoir of reserves from which we could call in the event of need. We had that reservoir set up in such a way that we thought, and they thought, they would be called only in the event of an all-out war, and many of those men performed duty in World War II as combat troops—as soldiers, sailors, and airmen, 85 percent of our reservists at the time of Korea were men who were veterans. In spite of that fact, we had to reach down and call those men back into service again to send a great many of them to Korea. At the present time, Mr. Chairman, there are over 800,000 reservists on active duty in the Armed Forces of the Nation, and of those 800,000 Reserves, 85 percent of them are veterans—men who have already served their country in uniform and men who up until that time had felt that they had discharged their military obligation to the people of the United States, and to the cause of safeguarding the safety and national defense of this country.

Yes, I have heard criticisms, Mr. Chairman, of the call of those men back into service. I have heard criticisms that were amply justified and borne out by events which occurred then, and have since followed. I join with those who have criticised the Pentagon for failure to use proper intelligence and proper principles of justice in handling the recall of these reservists. But I think more important than anything else is the fact that 85 percent of our reservists were men who were veterans who had already served their Nation.

Someone asked me the other day, "Where do we now get our Reserves from?" I said, "We get our Reserves now from only two sources: one is from the volunteering of men who come in and agree to go into the Reserve Establishment." I might say that source has practically dried up since Korea. I see my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri nodding affirmatively. I must say that he and I agree completely that the source of our Reserves has dried up insofar as the volunteers are concerned, and we have very little hope of stimulating enough interest and enough enthusiasm in the future in our Reserve program to reopen that source by attracting our Reserves in voluntarily. The other source from which our Reserves now come is the draft. We draft the boys and we send them to Korea. They spend 2 years over there. Then they come back to the United States and they are put in the Reserves. Those will be our trained Reserves in the future. Those will be the men we will have to call upon should another emergency strike this country, such as Korea. Those will be the men who will be called out a second time, like we have called out the veterans of World War II. Unless you pass this bill there is no escape from it. You have no adequate number of Reserves for the future except from Korea and the Second World War. As we move away from the Second World War, the importance of that source as a means of supplying our reserve needs of course becomes less each year. So in the future, without UMT, the Nation, in the event of a sudden emergency, must call upon those who have already served their Nation 24 months over there in Korea. That is the situation.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEARNEY. I wonder if the gentleman can answer the question that I asked the gentleman from Illinois. After an individual has completed a 6-months' tour of duty or training, and he goes into the Reserves, can the gentleman tell me how that individual is going to be trained and where?

Mr. BROOKS. Surely. I will answer the gentleman. I think I can answer him very briefly, because I have only limited time. After these trainees, under universal military training, finish 6 months' training they are given the option, within reasonable limits, of selecting what branch of the service they care to go into. They will be assigned to the proper branch of the service, their own desires being considered. They will be put into the Reserve organizations in the ranks that they have expressed an interest in. They will be required to serve 6 years in the Ready Reserves. If they want to, by attending drills regularly, by performing satisfactory Reserve service, that time can be reduced to a minimum of 3 years. During that period they are required to have 2 weeks' training in midsummer. That will be in the form of a refresher course. So, while they are in the Ready Reserves, they will have that refresher course during the 2 weeks in the summer.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. What the gentleman has just explained to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY] is all set out in the Reserve bill which the House passed during the last session, is it not?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. It has all been taken care of?

Mr. BROOKS. Yes. It passed the House unanimously. The Reserve bill which was passed unanimously by the House is now in the Senate. I am assured that it will be acted upon in the very near future. It is, in effect, a Magna Charta for our Reserve establishments; but regardless of how badly that Reserve bill is needed by our Reserves at the present time, and regardless of how the National Guard and the Reserves and the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars, and all other patriotic organizations plead for the passage of that bill, that bill is not going to be adequate to do the job unless we supplement that bill by universal military training. Without UMT, which will provide Reserves for the future because we are not going to be able to get those Reserves from volunteer sources—without UMT that bill will break down and not be able to function properly.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from the State of Georgia, believe that there are facilities all over the United States to train these Reserves?

Mr. VINSON. After they have gone through the 6 months' period, facilities will be provided, as the gentleman from Louisiana just stated, a period of 30 days after they go into the Reserves. I will say that the country is large enough and there are plenty of places in the country that the Reserves can be mobilized and trained without the establishment of a single new training facility for a Reserve. Now, it may be necessary in certain cases to build armories, and that is already provided for in the armory bill that has been passed.

Bear this in mind: There are three things that are provided for step by step: The armories have been provided for by legislation; the Brooks bill for the reservists has been passed by the House; now the UMT bill is before us. If you do not have a UMT bill you will not have anybody in your Reserves and you will not have anybody to utilize your armories.

Mr. KEARNEY. And these various bills the gentleman is speaking about will cover the entire area of the country?

Mr. VINSON. That is right; it will cover the whole thing.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me say to the membership that the gentleman from New York has an excellent record in his service in the House in supporting defense legislation, and I hope he will go along with this piece of legislation.

Mr. VINSON. If you do not pass UMT then who is in the Reserves? No one except the veterans of Korea or any boy who has been inducted or who has enlisted since 1948 who are by statute pulled over into the Reserves. Those would be the only people in this country in the Reserves, the veterans and those who have volunteered or those who have been drafted since July 2, 1948.

Mr. KEARNEY. Does the gentleman recall the testimony before the Armed Services Committee by General Walsh, the president of the Guard association, stating that if this bill went through it would mean the ruination of the National Guard?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. General Walsh was apprehensive of that; as a matter of fact you will find in the report a letter that the general wrote to me and which I incorporated in the report because I anticipated that the question might be raised. The maximum authorized strength of the National Guard is 399,000. We will ultimately get together on some kind of process whereby we can assure the National Guard that it will get its proportionate share of these reservists and ultimately be filled completely up. We deal with that entire subject matter in the report.

Mr. KEARNEY. Would the gentleman favor an amendment in the pending bill which would guarantee that enough men would be sent to the National Guard to enable the Guard to maintain its full strength?

Mr. VINSON. Not if we are going to say to the States, in effect, that the State could not decide who it wanted in its National Guard. It is for the State to say, not the Federal Government, what men they will have in the National Guard.

Mr. KEARNEY. Even after the Guard is federalized?

Mr. VINSON. The Guard is not federalized as long as it is under State control; it is only federalized when it is called in by the Federal Government; in fact, prior to federalization, that is, called or ordered to active duty, it is under the jurisdiction of the States completely, and the State has the right to say who goes into the National Guard.

Mr. KEARNEY. That is absolutely true, but at the same time the Government can call the National Guard.

Mr. VINSON. That does not make a particle of difference. The country can understand and the House can understand that the position of the Armed Services Committee is that the National Guard is a State organization and no bureaucrat or anyone else in Washington can force this or that individual into the National Guard over the protest of the sovereign States of this country. The only time the Federal Government has anything to do with it is when units are called into the Federal service.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I want to go ahead and finish my statement; then if I have further time I will be very happy to yield. May I say in addition to what has already been said in reference to the Guard that we in the committee have a friendly interest in the Guard and I think the needs of the Guard are going to be well cared for. I do not think the Guard has one single reason to worry about the results of the bill; as a matter of fact when we put through the Reserve Act the Guard came in and was 100 percent satisfied with the Reserve Act. It is only since the Reserve Act was passed that the Guard has brought up the question which gives the Guard some degree of uneasiness which I think is not really justified at the present time.

To me, the equality of obligation of universal military training is one of its greatest virtues. Eight or nine out of every ten young men who attain the age of 18 will undergo this training. They will not escape universal military training as they are now being omitted under the draft.

In other words, at the present time you have some men being drafted and sent to Korea for 2 years. When they come out from Korea they are put in a Reserve and in the event of an emergency in the future those same men will be called first into active service to defend the Nation. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it is unfair to place the whole burden of military obligation on certain limited groups in the United States of America.

When my friends from the Congress came to me at the time the Reserve matter was being heard by the subcommittee on reservists in the Armed Forces, as you did, and you told me you thought it was unfair to call the veterans of World War II with 4 or 5 years' service to go to Korea, I fully agreed with you. By the same token I say that in the future it is going to be unfair to take a man who has served 2 years in Korea, over on the bleak steppes of that country, fighting the Communists over there, when he finishes and has come back, it is unfair, I say, to contemplate calling him first in the event of another limited emergency during which we will need suddenly well trained troops. Without UMT we have no alternative.

We have talked about economy. Now here is an opportunity to practice what we preach. Anyone who will analyze this program will quickly realize that there are tremendous savings involved through the initiation of a universal military training program. But instead of considering these savings; instead of accepting this method of equalizing the obligation to serve one's nation; instead of giving our veterans a fair break in life, there are some who oppose the program because war or anything militaristic is wrong. Of course war is wrong—and it has never been the choice of this Nation. But the best way to avoid world war III is to be prepared for it. Is this House going to permit an organized minority to overcome the wishes and desires of a majority of the American people? I think not. I think the membership of this House will meet this issue squarely and will approve the legislation. I think the membership of this House wants economy in government. I think the membership of this House wants equality of obligation to serve one's nation and, above all, I think the membership of this House wants to give the reservists and the draftees who are living in the mud and cold of Korea the assurance that should another emergency arise, they will not be the first called but, instead, other young men in their communities, who will otherwise escape service, will do their share.

Russia today stands threateningly at the gateway of world peace. She is building atomic-powered submarines and when war comes, they will be there. She is building atomic-powered airplanes and when war comes, they also will be there. Russia's development of atomic bombs and artillery and submarines and airplanes make it necessary that our defense be ready and available at a moment's notice if they are to serve this country before the stunning crash comes.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, since the birth of this Republic, we have depended upon a reasonable Military Establishment expanded in time of emergency by men taken from a strong, well-organized and well-trained Reserve. This has certainly been our objective although many times the Nation found itself in critical emergencies without a strong Reserve.

As the generations have come and gone, in my judgment, the Regular Establishment has been built up in strength

and in effectiveness and in power. Regardless of the criticisms and the complaints which we hear on all sides at the present time regarding the waste and inefficiency of the Armed Forces, and many of these criticisms and complaints are fully justified, we have yet the best Regular Establishment of any nation on the globe, and this includes Russia. I, therefore, am not casting off on the Regular Establishment, but my criticism is in our failure to develop our Reserve components.

The father of his country, George Washington, proclaimed the principle of a reasonable regular military establishment supported in time of emergency by a well-organized reserve establishment, and yet Gen. George Washington found himself most of the time commander of poorly trained and ill-equipped troops and without reflection upon the magnificent chapters of patriotism of the Revolution, it is obvious that many mistakes and failures of the Revolutionary period were the result of poorly trained and inefficient troops. In fact, so poor was the training of the militia which had been brought into the Revolutionary Army that in the depth of the Revolutionary War, General Washington brought from Europe General Van Steuben from the armies of Frederick the Great to give his force during the winter at Valley Forge the discipline and the training and the efficiency which later was reflected in the victories at Trenton and at Yorktown.

Although this Nation is a peace-loving one, it is a matter of record that we have been engaged in war every 20 years since the Constitution was adopted, and they have been defensive wars and practically everyone of these wars we entered either without any Reserve or with a poorly organized and trained and equipped Reserve. Our best showing, of course, was in the Second World War; but even in this instance the National Guard required 12 months training before it was considered efficient and ready for major combat operations. The like was the case with reference to other Reserve components. The strength of European defenses and the benediction of the Almighty gave us the time necessary to train our troops taken from civilian walks of life or from the Reserves in both World War I and World War II.

Korea gave us some idea what we may expect in the future. There was no time for training for Korea. If our men reached there in time they were compelled to go at once. They were called out with short notice and many were sent overseas in a hurry. As a result of that fact, the veterans with previous training were taken from civilian walks of life although at another time and on another field of battle, they had discharged their military responsibilities to the United States.

The future is not going to change the military posture of this country. It is going to increase rather than decrease the dependency which we have upon our Reserve establishment and upon the citizen soldier. As the wealthiest Nation in the world with the highest form of civilization, the burden is going to fall heavily upon this country to furnish the leadership in world affairs and to back it up with proper support in the future. This can be done only by universal military training by which men are trained and placed in well organized Reserve units. They are kept there available for the defense of the Nation in times of critical and immediate emergencies. They are civilians and yet they are soldiers of the highest order who have an abiding faith in the United States of America and are willing to do their just part to meet their military responsibilities under a system of universal training.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The testimony of General Hershey discloses that under the Selective Service System approximately 1 draftee out of every 10 who are called goes into the service. He estimated, too, that under universal military training they hope to be able to take in 8 out of 10 who are called for service. Will the gentleman tell me how the system of deferments would work?

Mr. BROOKS. Let me tell my friend this, and I do not mean to cut him off at this point. I think that is something that cannot be developed within the limited time I have here. I would far prefer for my chairman to take the lead in answering that and developing that question.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that there are only two statutory deferments, only two deferments fixed by law. The other deferments it is to be hoped will be kept at the very minimum. I am hoping that when it gets into full implementation it will apply so universally at least 8 or 9 out of every 10 will have the benefit of service.

Mr. YATES. Suppose that under this plan people are called for universal military training and are accepted under the training program. The time comes when they conclude their 6 months training and they are subject then to selective service.

Mr. VINSON. No, they are not subject to selective service. I want the House to understand that. When he has once been inducted into universal military training and gets the 6 months training and is put in the Reserve, he stays in the Reserve until the gentleman and the other Members of this Congress take him out of it. He is not subject to the draft.

Mr. YATES. Did not General Hershey testify, then, that the present manpower, if that be the system, would not be adequate to supply sufficient men for selective service?

Mr. VINSON. No. General Hershey testified that in June of this year we will have a pool of 900,000 men, and with ease we can take at least sixty or seventy or eighty thousand this year. That is what he testified and that is in my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 hour, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an excerpt from Fortune Magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, buried away on page 128 of the February issue of Fortune magazine is a simple truth which provides a profound commentary on the morals of our Federal servants as compared with those of the businessmen with whom they deal.

This clipping again brings to our attention the fact that the greatest danger to our republic comes from the would-be briber or corrupter, the fast-money boy who believes that everything is for sale. Too often our investigations bring to public view the tempted, but fail to reveal the tempter. Let us search more intensively and get to the real root of the trouble. Let us bring forth the bribers, the corrupters, the fixers, the underground lobbyists, and the election buyers who attempt to seduce public officials from the performance of their duty, or who try to subvert by back-door methods the will of the people as expressed at elections.

I insert the following passage from page 128 of the February issue of Fortune in the RECORD:

There is excellent evidence that the demand for venality in government, and for improper influence short of venality exceeds the supply. Shocking numbers of American businessmen are quite prepared to bribe their way through Washington. Shocking numbers of them persist in believing, even when

advised to the contrary, that decisions in their favor can be obtained only by the purchase and exercise of improper influence. The proportion of public officials who are open to bribes and to improper influence short of bribery is far lower than these businessmen tend to believe.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEPENDENTS OF MEN AND WOMEN OF UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, one of the primary concerns and responsibilities of this Nation and of this Government is to protect the rights and privileges of the dependents of the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States. It comes as a shock to me to learn that we have one large group who seems to have been forgotten. I am speaking specifically of the dependents of the men and women of the United States Coast Guard.

The Coast Guard by act of Congress is a member of the Nation's Armed Forces. The Coast Guard is a military service, yet its members are denied the complete benefits and protection of medical care for dependents that presently are provided for the dependents of all other members of the armed services.

The Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, operating by reciprocal agreement under the Unification Act, provide medical and hospital care to dependents of any of the members of these three services. However, the Coast Guard, while a member of the Armed Forces, was not included under the Unification Act and by reason of this fact Coast Guard dependents are not eligible for hospital care in the medical facilities of the other services.

Blame for this situation should not be directed against the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force. Neither should we blame the Public Health Service, which provides medical and hospital care for Coast Guard dependents under most circumstances. All of them are required by law to operate within well-defined limits.

Obviously, it would not be practical to build and operate Public Health Service hospitals at every Coast Guard Establishment. To me, it is just as obvious that the needs of the Coast Guard could be met if its dependents were made eligible to receive care in the medical facilities presently available to the dependents of members of the other branches of the Armed Forces.

I have the honor to represent the congressional district in which is the home of the United States Coast Guard Academy. Also in my district is one of the important training facilities for Coast Guard personnel. It is at these facilities that the men whose work is of such immense importance to safety, as well as to science and security, are trained. I am happy to serve once again on the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy. I, therefore, consider it my duty as a Member of this House to arouse interest in, and to seek action to remedy a situation which has caused much suffering among the dependents of our Coast Guard personnel.

This is not a matter of appropriating additional money. It will not lay any further burden on the taxpayers of this Nation. The enactment of legislation now presently before both the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will open the legal door making possible the proper care for the dependents of the Coast Guard.

There is not a Member of this House who does not recall some memorable deed of the Coast Guard. We who live in New England know that story well, and its continuing epic is being written in the news of the day as the winter sea reaches out for the lives and property of this Nation. The historic missions of the Coast Guard in all parts of the globe during World War II is a glorious chapter in the ever-widening battle for freedom. Today the name Coast Guard is being carried forward with honor in many places but the families of these brave men are deprived of the medical care and comfort to which they ought to be by law entitled.

The facilities of the Public Health Service are not always available in the many areas to which duty sends the fathers of these families. This lack of Public Health Service facilities places an undue hardship on the dependents of Coast Guard personnel due to the ever-rising costs of comparable medical care in civil institutions.

I do not come before you today to criticize—but rather to correct. I come in support of enabling legislation to open the doors of countless medical facilities of the armed service to these worthy Coast Guard dependents. I do not blame the Department of Defense, because today there are legal barriers to such a policy. We must break these barriers. It is the responsibility of the Congress to act and to act with speed in this matter.

A recent letter from the wife of an enlisted man of the Coast Guard Air Detachment at Barber's Point Naval Air Station, Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, has been brought to my attention. I quote directly from this letter:

> I am 7 months pregnant again, but with the cost of living here I don't see how we can pay for this baby. My big question is why are the Coast Guard dependents excluded from medical services of the Armed Forces? I am told the reason Coast Guard dependents cannot go to Tripler Army Hospital (the only service hospital in this area) is because the Coast Guard comes under the Treasury Department and Public Health in times of peace—and during the last war we were part of the Navy.
>
> That leaves us holding the bag now because there is no public health hospital in Hawaii. I can go to the public health office for my office calls, but I still have to pay the $75 delivery fee to the doctor and the hospital bill for me and my child. * * *
>
> The Coast Guard men must stand duty every third night, carry firearms on watch, pass markesmanship tests, are subject to transfer, come under the service pay bill, etc., wear the same uniforms as the Navy except for the shield on the sleeve. Why is there this discrimination against us when it comes to medical attention?
>
> Coast Guard babies cost about $200, while Navy, Army, and Air Forces, and so forth, pay only $12 to $15, which is for laundry and food while the mother is in the hospital.

This touching letter just about sums up the case against the present inequality in medical care for dependents of the Coast Guard. This mother knows what she is writing about. She certainly has every moral right for admission to that Army Hospital, and it is up to this Congress to give her the legal right.

Coast Guard dependents in Argentia complained about their plight back in 1946. Last December, the commanding officer of the Loran Transmitting Station at Port Aux Basques, Newfoundland, reported that dependents there suffered for lack of medical attention. In November 1950, the commander of the Coast Guard Depot at Tongue Island Naval Station, Astoria, Oreg., asked for the alleviation of a similar condition. Last May, the commander of the Fifth Coast Guard District reported that Coast Guard dependents were being denied treatment at the Naval Clinic at Wilmington, N. C., and at Camp Le Jeune. Even at the huge installation of the Great Lakes Naval Training Station, dependents of Coast Guardsmen have been refused treatment, even though it is immediately available. The same situation currently prevails in Alaska.

I merely cite these instances to demonstrate that my views are based on facts—poignant human facts—that plead for themselves. Since proper legislation has already been introduced in the House and Senate to adjust these inequities, I do not propose any further measure. I do call your attention in particular to H. R. 342, introduced on January 3, 1951, by the gentleman from South Carolina, Congressman RIVERS. This bill is presently before the Committee on Armed Services. I also call your attention to S. 1557, introduced on May 29, 1951, by Senator MCCARRAN, and to H. R. 6212, introduced January 24, 1952, by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman BONNER.

I bring this message to you today lest we in the haste of an election year may forego action. I am sure such will not be the case if we can be made to realize the gravity of the situation which I have attempted to describe.

Like every other facility in these atomic days, the duties and the scope of the Coast Guard have broadened with the times. Its members are asked to do more and to be ready for even more hazardous undertakings than those which brought that service such a distinguished record of courage and daring. We ask much of these men of the Coast Guard. We expect much of them. We must not ask them to bear financial burdens beyond their ability.

These men wear the uniform and carry the flag of the United States. There very motto—Semper paratus—describes their willingness always to be ready for any emergency. This is an emergency for the Congress. We, too, must be prepared to fulfill the duty which rests upon us. I hope that every Member of this House will join with me in urging that immediate action be taken by the appropriate committees on the legislation to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

LITHUANIA

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial from the Lowell Sun, a resolution of the Lithuanian Council, and a letter from the director of the Lithuanian American Information Center.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Lithuania is a small country, even though it is the largest of the three Baltic countries, with a population of about 3,000,000. The story of the Lithuanians and their historic homeland goes back to the early middle ages, but their history as an independent nation begins in the thirteenth century. In the middle of that century they formed a unified state to protect themselves against the Teutonic knights and other disturbers of their peaceful life. The next century was the most glorious in Lithuanian history. Under the grand dukes the country grew in size and stature, becoming one of the largest and most important states of medieval Europe. In 1385 Lithuanian Grand Duke Jagello married the daughter of Poland's king and thus was brought about a close alliance between these two countries. In the sixteenth century when they both were hard pressed by the Russians, Poland and Lithuania were completely merged—in 1569. This union, however, proved to be of no avail against the threat from the east; it was impossible to forestall advances of the ponderous Russian bear. Finally, in 1795, when Poland was partitioned and ceased to exist as an independent country, Russia annexed all of the eastern part of the country and with it Lithuania.

From 1795 to 1918, the history of Lithuania is one of continuous subjugation to the Russian czars. At first the Lithuanians enjoyed considerable autonomy, but soon they were deprived of all vestiges of political, cultural, and even spiritual autonomy. A policy of Russification was carried out ruthlessly. Suppression and exile were the principal methods employed by the czar's officers. Russian was made the official language; monasteries were closed; and the teaching of the Lithuanian language in the schools was forbidden. In this manner growth of an intellectual class was purposely discouraged. But during all those years, underground activity on the part of national-conscious Lithuanians continued. They rebelled against their ruthless oppressors in 1830, in 1863, and in 1905, each time falling short of their aim, that of securing either complete autonomy or full independence.

During World War I Lithuania was invaded by the Germans and remained under their occupation for more than 3 years. Toward the end of 1917, the Germans acknowledged the strength of the Lithuanian nationalist movement by permitting its leaders to hold a conference. A 20-member national council was formed, and this council, under the leadership of Antanas Smetona, proclaimed Lithuania's independence on February 16, 1918. Thus began the independence of modern Lithuania, the thirty-fourth anniversary of which is being celebrated today.

The history of Lithuania during the interwar years from 1918 to 1940 is remarkable in many ways. The country literally pulled itself up from chaos by its own bootstraps. Overrun by war, despoiled of resources for generations, oppressed for centuries, the Lithuanian people in the course of less than 25 years created a self-supporting, progressive, and modern democratic state. By 1920 Russian and German troops either had left the country or were expelled. Lithuanians settled their internal and external problems by their own efforts. They evolved a stable government and managed to secure a balanced economy for the country. In short, Lithuania became a model state in northeastern Europe. Unhappily this progressive period did not last long. In mid-1940 Lithuania's independence became a casualty of World War II.

In October 1939, the nation was forced to accept the quartering of a certain number of Soviet troops in strategic bases along the Lithuanian Baltic Coast and in the country. In May, the following year, the Soviet Government ordered its forces to occupy the entire country at once, and demanded that the Lithuanians agree not to oppose this occupation. Having no alternative, the latter reluctantly accepted the harsh terms of the ultimatum. Immediately the entire country was overrun by the Red army. The Lithuanian Government was summarily dismissed by the occupying authorities and, following an "election" conducted under strict Soviet supervision, a new left-wing government, "friendly to the Soviet Union," was instituted. This government voted "unanimously" on July 21, for the union of Lithuania with the Soviet Union, thus bringing about the formal incorporation of that once independent, sovereign and democratic country into the U. S. S. R. This first phase of Soviet annexation lasted only about a year, but it was long enough to upset the entire political, economic and social structure of the country. Collectivisation of farms and the socialization of all means of production and distribution were pressed vigorously. Arrests, detentions, deportations, and executions took place on an unprecedented scale. Former government functionaries, prominent men in all walks of life who were unable to flee the country were deported to the interior of the Soviet Union. In June 1941, when Hitler attacked the Soviet Union, the Germans expelled the Russians from Lithuania. The Germans in turn occupied the country for more than 3 years. In late 1944 the Russians returned as "liberators," again with their dreaded secret police and military commissars. They have been in full control ever since. Instead of being liberated, however, the Lithuanians have been held down and literally crushed by some of the most ruthless oppressors in all history—Stalin's heartless henchmen.

Today, Lithuania is best described as one large prison camp, sealed off from the outside world behind an iron curtain. We hear very little of what goes on behind that barrier. And that little is disheartening. There is every reason to believe that tens of thousands, perhaps hundreds of thousands of innocent men and women have been liquidated—martyred for their patriotism, for their religious faith, for their steadfast resistance to tyranny. Lithuanians have been wrested from their families, their homes, their native towns and villages for service as slaves in Siberia. Some estimates hold that 700,000 Lithuanians have been sent off to the interior of the Soviet Union. The ruthless Soviet policy is to extirpate all ideas of national freedom and national independence; to rid the country of all patriotic, independent-minded, liberty-loving Lithuanians, and then colonize it with Russians and Mongolians brought in from far-off Asiatic regions. It is reliably reported that the coastal areas of the country are already colonized "almost exclusively by the Russians."

Now, 34 years after the declaration of their independence, Lithuanians everywhere solemnly celebrate their independence day. With their country still writhing under the heel of the conqueror they commemorate that day with heads unbowed. In spite of the severe repressive measures operating in Lithuania, no decrease has been reported in the armed anti-Soviet resistance on the part of the underground guerrilla forces. Until recently, they retained the mastery of the countryside. Against the heaviest odds patriotic Lithuanians carry on the seemingly endless struggle. In such fights they are showing their finest characteristic: their devotion to the high ideals common to the civilized west. They have shown themselves willing to sacrifice their lives for freedom and independence. To them these words are sacred. They are fighting not only for their own freedom but to rouse the conscience of the world against tyranny.

It is to the everlasting credit of this country that we have never recognized the annexation of Lithuania and its incorporation into the Soviet Union. Lithuanian people still continue to have their diplomatic representatives in Washington who, as their true spokesmen, make constant appeals to the governments of the West and to the United Nations. Let us hope that soon the world will take note of these appeals and, in the name of justice and humanity, give them the recognition they deserve.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of February 14, 1952]

REPORT ON LITHUANIA

It has been Lithuania's tragic fate to have suffered under the oppression of both the Nazis and the Soviet tyrants; and if this

ill-fated land were to speak out, it might say, "A plague on both your houses."

The Lithuanian national resistance carries on against the Russian occupation forces, but it is only a matter of time before whatever spirit is left in the patriots will be gone. The force of the Russian control is too great, and the methods used to kill nationalism are brutal.

A report in the Lithuanian Bulletin, published in Washington, says that the Soviet occupational regime systematically and without interruption is trying to merge Lithuania organically into the Soviet economic system, to assimilate ideologically the Lithuanian people with the Soviet people, and to exterminate the hostile native anti-Soviet element. The latter is accomplished by genocidal operations, by killings of the resistant groups and by Russification and colonization by Russian elements.

All efforts are concentrated on leveling the social, economic and cultural standards of the occupied nation to the standards of the USSR.

Lithuanian patriots in exile and descendants of Lithuanians who now live in the United States and other lands have little hope left in respect to the country of their forebears. The situation has gone from bad to worse, and while there was a time when it was expected that the United States might effectively intervene in behalf of the beleaguered country, there is now little hope of such action. The Soviets would reject all and any American proposals, just as they have tossed aside so many other ideas that have come out of Washington.

The main hope of Lithuania and other European countries that are suffering under the yoke of the Communists is a possible break-up of the whole red pattern. Already there has been considerable dissension among the Communists, and when this breaks out into open hostility on a major scale, then the Lithuanians may have a chance to regain their place in the sun and to again enjoy the freedoms of their ancestors.

In anticipation of a positive break in the Communist association of nations, exiles from eastern Europe have already banded together in organizing a Central-Eastern European Commission in Washington, to try to stimulate resistance in the nine iron curtain lands that they came from, and to plan for the union of their lands into a group dedicated to the task of meeting communism head-on.

Their planning goes forward, day by day, and they are confident that they will have the chance to move against the Soviets who now control their homelands.

But even as this type of patriotic work goes on, so, too, are the Soviets continuing their relentless business of Russification of the small iron curtain lands. In their own savage, barbaric way they are reducing hopefulness to helplessness.

The spirit that still lives vividly in the hearts and minds of all Lithuanians is probably no greater than that of other patriots of other small lands that have been swallowed up by the Russians.

Their day of reckoning as a united group anxious to escape from tyranny and oppression cannot come too soon—and the free world is fully in sympathy with them.

Unanimously adopted at the mass meeting of Lithuanian Americans of the city of Lowell, Mass., held under the auspices of the local branch of the Lithuanian American Council, Inc., on the 10th day of February 1952, to commemorate the thirty-fourth anniversary of the declaration of independence of Lithuania:

"Whereas the people of Lithuania, one of the first victims of the Stalin-Hitler conspiracy, have been forcibly deprived of the exercise of their sovereignty and of the basic rights of individual, religious, political, social, cultural, and economic liberty, and are subjected to inhuman policy of oppression, terror, murder, and mass deportation to Siberia and other parts of vast Soviet territory;

"Whereas the freedom-loving Lithuanian Nation is strongly opposed to any alien domination and continues to resist enslavement with an ardent desire to regain freedom and independence;

"Whereas because of their manifest and unmistakable attitude toward international communism, the people in Lithuania, backed by their kinsmen in the free world, represent a reliable outpost in the present defense line of the free nations against Communist aggression;

"Whereas when the evil forces of enslavement are directed by the single hand of the Kremlin masters of hundreds of millions of human beings, no nations, great or small, can regain freedom unaided by others;

"Whereas the eyes of the unfortunate are set on the United States of America which always has been looked upon as the strongest champion of the oppressed: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That this meeting appeal to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of the United States Senate with the request to do everything possible—

"(1) That the Genocide Convention which represents the most powerful legal instrument for preventing the crime of genocide, be immediately ratified by the United States Senate, thus demonstrating to the world that this country not only professes but also stands for humanitarian ideals;

"(2) That the ratification of the Genocide Convention be thereafter implemented by energetic and unceasing efforts of the United States Government within the United Nations to enlighten the world regarding the barbaric practices of the Soviets against enslaved peoples and to take all steps that this horrible crime be stopped;

"(3) That the liberation of Lithuania and other Russian-occupied countries be included in the program of the American foreign policy; and

"(4) That the existing underground movements behind the iron curtain be given direct and effective assistance in their unequal life-and-death struggle for freedom and independence; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this meeting expresses its gratitude to the Government of the United States for its ever-growing initiative in supporting the cause of free Lithuania and for its favorable attitude toward the suffering Lithuanian Nation; and be it finally

"*Resolved*, That we, the Lithuanian Americans of the city of Lowell, Mass., reaffirm our adherence to the American democracy and pledge our wholehearted support of the Government in its efforts to stop Communist aggression and to secure an international peace founded on principles of freedom and justice for all the peoples on the earth."

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.,
REV. JOHN J. SKALANDES,
Chairman.
MONICA P. BLAZONIS, *Secretary.*
LOWELL, MASS.

LITHUANIAN AMERICAN
INFORMATION CENTER,
New York N. Y., January 29, 1952.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
United States Representatives from Massachusetts, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Lithuanian Americans on February 16 will observe the thirty-fourth anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania. Because the voice of the Lithuanians in the homeland has been stilled, it is but fitting that their descendants, wherever they may be, should pause and mark an independence which has been temporarily set aside.

Most Lithuanian Americans still have relatives in the homeland with whom all contact has been broken. Today a letter from America is a ticket to Siberia.

Lithuania's progress during her days of independence was exemplary in the economic and cultural fields. Today, as a nation, Lithuania is being exterminated. She has lost over 500,000 of her people because of political executions, planned starvation, torture, and exile to death camps; and finally collectivization is leveling her social, economic, and cultural standards to those of Soviet Russia. Collectivization has converted the farmfolk into such slaves of the state as the Lithuanians have never experienced in their long history.

The Lithuanian American Information Center, as spokesman for the Lithuanian-American Council, representing the overwhelming majority of one million Lithuanian Americans requests an expression of your sentiments on this occasion. It may bring a shred of hope to a tragic nation which is still resisting a merciless occupant.

Thanking you in advance, we beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

MARY M. KIZIS,
Director.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. YORTY] is recognized for 1 hour.

MOST SHOCKING TAX SCANDAL IN HISTORY — ADMINISTRATION TRIES TO HAMPER COMMITTEE—MILLIONS LOST TO GOVERNMENT IN SECRET BARGAINING

Mr. YORTY. Mr. Speaker, surely this century has witnessed the most shocking tax scandal in the history of our Nation. The Bureau of Internal Revenue has proved to be a sensitive agency which requires constant supervision and surveillance.

During the past 40 years, the duties of the Bureau have increased tremendously. The staff of the Bureau has grown proportionately and the responsibility of those who collect most of the Nation's taxes has become more and more a responsibility which requires for its proper discharge the highest kind of integrity and devotion to the public trust.

Congressional committees digging into Internal Revenue irregularities deserve the unstinting cooperation of the administrative agencies of the Government. It is lamentable indeed that there have been occasions when this has not been forthcoming. In fact, there have been occasions when the administrative agencies tried in every way to hamstring and scuttle the work of our committees of the Congress. In spite of this, it has been proved that untold millions of dollars have been lost to the Treasury of the United States and shifted to other taxpayers by questionable secret bargaining procedures employed by the Bureau without demonstrable authorization from Congress. On occasions too many discretionary power has been delegated to or usurped by Bureau division heads. One report dealing with this subject says:

DIVISION HEADS SUPREME

The practically unlimited discretionary power vested in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is actually exercised by the

division heads. These division heads are governed by no adequate rules or instructions, and unless a taxpayer is dissatisfied with the determination of his tax, or unless a refund exceeding $50,000 is involved, there is no review of the work done under a division head.

Under the procedure of the Bureau of Internal Revenue there is no way for any tax determination which is satisfactory to the taxpayer and which does not involve a refund of $50,000 or more to be brought to the attention of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or any other superior of a division head, except by the protest or complaint of a subordinate of such division head.

All communications from subordinates of division heads to superiors of division heads are forwarded through the division heads. Communications from section chiefs to the Commissioner and solicitor relating to official business have been suppressed. It is the policy of the Income Tax Unit to discourage complaints and protests by subordinates. This policy leaves the division heads supreme and their superiors in ignorance of how the law is really administered.

Publicity of principles and practices: Many of the principles, practices, methods, and formulas applied in the determination of tax have never been reduced to writing, and only 15½ percent of the formal written rulings applicable to income taxes have been published.

This failure to promulgate and publish the principles and practices to be followed in the determination of tax liability has had the following results:

1. Information for the guidance of the employees of the Income Tax Unit is so incomplete that gross discrimination results from the failure to apply uniform principles to similar cases.

2. Taxpayers, in many instances, have failed to claim allowances granted others similarly situated.

3. To secure the benefit of unpublished precedents, taxpayers are forced to employ former employees of the Income Tax Unit to advise and represent them in tax cases.

4. Their exclusive possession of information as to the unpublished precedents and practices of the Income Tax Unit has placed an artificial premium upon the value of the services of exemployees which enables them to demand and receive immense fees for information which should be freely available to everybody.

5. This artificial premium, thus placed upon the exclusive information possessed by the employees of the income-tax unit, and the opportunity thus afforded for highly lucrative outside employment, is the cause of the extraordinary turnover among the employees of the unit and of the difficulty experienced by the unit in retaining the services of competent employees at salaries within the range of the salaries paid by the Government for comparable services.

6. The failure to consider closed cases as precedents and to publish the principles and practices followed in closed cases as precedents has deterred the formation of a body of settled law and practice. The unsettled state of the law and practice has encouraged the filing of claims for allowances and require the constant rediscussion and reconsideration of questions, which should be settled by precedents established by closed cases.

7. The fact that a ruling will be published, and the benefit of its principles claimed by taxpayers similarly situated, is the strongest possible deterrent against making unsound rulings.

8. During the course of the hearings there has been a great deal of evidence tending to show that it is the policy of the bureau to fix taxes by bargain rather than by principle. Rulings based upon bargains cannot be published as precedents. The best and most persistent trader gets the lowest tax and gross discrimination is the inevitable result of such a policy.

Publicity of records: The unsatisfactory conditions developed by this investigation are the inevitable result of the delegation of almost unlimited discretion to be secretly exercised. It is believed that but few of the unsound settlements to which attention has been called would have been made if it were not for the belief that they would never become public.

While the objections to throwing the records of the income-tax unit open to the public are recognized, the necessity for the opportunity for some outside scrutiny is imperative.

Congress is imposing a system of taxation the administration of which necessarily involves the exercise of so much discretion assumes some duty to the public to see that such discretion is not abused.

Causes of delay in disposal of cases: This investigation discloses that the principal causes of the delay in the disposal of old cases may be stated as follows:

1. Bargaining with taxpayers instead of assessing taxes in accordance with published precedents.

2. Innumerable conferences incident to the bargaining policy.

3. Granting innumerable extensions of time for furnishing information required to determine the validity of deductions.

WAR PROFITS CONTROL

Every one of us wants to see war-profiteering stopped. Yet provision for accelerated amortization of defense facilities has proved a wise inducement to the indispensable increase of our defense capacity, but such amortization in fairness to older established industries and in fairness to the taxpayer generally must be carefully limited and controlled. The rulings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in the matter of amortization allowances have not always been fair or ethical. For instance, one congressional report said:

While the purpose of the amortization provision was to encourage the acquisition of facilities for the production of war necessities, a large part of the allowances are upon facilities acquired by contract entered into before April 6, 1917.

Amortization has also been allowed on prewar facilities in full operation on April 6, 1917, because they were transferred from a corporation to its subsidiary or by a group of corporations to a consolidation without any real change of ownership or increase of capacity for war production.

There has been gross discrimination in arbitrarily allowing amortization for reduced postwar cost of replacement in some cases and in denying it in others similarly situated, in allowing amortization to some transportation companies, while it is generally denied others, and in allowing amortization on land.

RULES SHOULD BE PUBLISHED

Mr. Speaker, one of the worst practices in which the Bureau has ever indulged is a failure to publish the principles and rulings guiding its action. Any failure to set out clear guideposts for the guidance of taxpayers and especially the employees of the Bureau itself cannot help but lead to confusion, discrimination and opportunity for irregularity. As an example of this, I should like to cite the following from one of our reports. It is particularly shocking because it shows that hundreds of millions of dollars were refunded to a long list of corporations without satisfactory records of the transactions being kept or the principles on which they were based being publicly published by the Bureau:

Principles not published until October 1925: The solicitor's ruling in this case, published on October 26, 1925, 8 years after the amortization provision was inserted in the law, and a year and 8 months after the close of the period within which amortization allowances could be redetermined, constitutes the first official statement of the principles which are to govern the determination of amortization allowances ever promulgated by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for the guidance of either the taxpayers interested or the engineers whose duty it is to pass on these deductions. Thus amortization aggregating approximately $600,000,000 is allowed before there is any authoritative definition of the principles which are to be applied to its determination. This is a clear case of "locking the barn after the horse is stolen."

OFFICIALS SHOULD NOT PERSONALLY PROFIT

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that we must look askance at transactions by which the Bureau of Internal Revenue refunds taxes to corporations in which the Secretary of the Treasury has an interest. This was done and is most certainly to be condemned unless it can be clearly shown that the fact of the Secretary's interest had no relation whatsoever to the determination made by the Bureau. There have been times when this has certainly not been made very clear. These cases have also been mentioned in the congressional report referred to above.

FRAUD ENCOURAGED

Another practice of the Bureau which has been condemned, and which we all condemn, is one found to actually encourage fraud. As one of our reports showed, an attempt of the Bureau to protect creditors of a corporation guilty of fraud at the expense of the Government was a policy most certainly not in the public interest, and one not actually authorized by the Congress. The report in question in dealing with the subject says:

If the fraudulently concealed income of a taxpayer is discovered after the taxpayer has suffered such losses that the payment of the legal tax will bring its liabilities above what can be recovered on the forced sale of its assets, this policy declares that such taxpayer shall be relieved of tax upon its fraudulently concealed income to the extent necessary to save it from insolvency. Such a policy places a premium upon concealing income and speculating with the money due the Government as tax, because if a loss results the Government stands the loss. * * *

Delegating discretion as to how much of a legal tax the Government can collect is one thing. Delegating discretion as to how much tax a taxpayer can pay without becoming insolvent is quite another thing. Congress has fixed the rate at which profits shall be taxed without regard to the solvency of taxpayers. Injecting the element of solvency fixes another standard than that fixed by Congress. An insolvent person or corporation may earn a taxable income, and Con-

gress has not seen fit to exempt from tax income earned either before or after insolvency.

Compromising taxes on the basis of ability to collect is within the power delegated by section 3229, Revised Statutes. Deliberately compromising taxes for less than can be collected is an abuse of discretion and constitutes a voluntary relinquishment without consideration of a debt due the Government. This, the Attorney General has said, the Commissioner is not authorized to do. In making such compromise the Commissioner has arrogated to himself the function of determining, not what can be collected, but the tax rate at which the taxpayer should be taxed. It is doubtful whether Congress could delegate such authority, and it is clear that it has not attempted to do so.

WAR PROFITS TAX

We all recognize the serious responsibility of the Bureau in the matter of collecting excess war profits and the trust placed in Bureau officials in dealing with fraudulent tax evasion. Our committee, in reporting relative to this and other subjects, said:

The importance of this subject can also be seen from the amount of refunds, credits, or abatements which have been made through the application of this provision of the law. As there are still about 7,000 undetermined cases pending in the special assessment section of the Income Tax Unit, the present importance of this subject is appalling.

Notwithstanding the importance of the subject and the admitted difficulty of a proper application of the provisions of the law, the Bureau, as in the case of amortization, has failed to lay down any adequate statement of the principles and method to be applied either by the taxpayers or the auditors of the special assessment section.

The time limitations upon the authority of this committee permitted only a hasty examination of this subject. This investigation did develop the fact that the authority delegated by the revenue acts is being exceeded and abused and that the following conclusions are justified:

1. The Bureau has, without authority, made retroactive the provisions of sections 327 and 328 of the 1918 revenue act in regard to abnormalities of invested capital and income in determining taxes for the year 1917.

2. No scientific basis has been set up by the Bureau for determining when a company is entitled to special assessment.

3. The grounds for special assessment granted by the Bureau are in some cases economically unsound and in other cases result in nullifying those provisions of the act limiting the allowance of good-will values in invested capital, excluding borrowed capital from invested capital, providing for the taxation of gains due to appreciation after March 1, 1913, and providing for the valuations of stock issued on reorganization. In certain cases the results which would be obtained from the application of the war-profits tax are also nullified.

4. The Bureau's methods in administering the special assessment provision of the act have resulted in gross discrimination between taxpayers.

FAITHFUL EMPLOYEES PUNISHED

Mr. Speaker, one of the most shocking practices revealed by investigation of the Bureau is the discrimination against employees faithful to their trust. That such employees should be discouraged, demoted, and even discharged, for insisting upon protecting the interests of the Government is something to give concern to all of us. An example of the way conscientious employees of the Bureau have been treated is set forth in the following report of our committee:

There was no way for this case to come to the attention of any higher authority unless the auditor had protested over the head of his division chief. The efficiency rating of this auditor, his chances of promotion, and liability to discharge were all under the absolute control of this division head, and if this auditor had any desire to hold his position, to say nothing of being promoted, it was necessary for him to keep silent.

Protests of subordinates discouraged: Notwithstanding the fact that under the established procedure the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the officers of the income-tax unit, superior to the division heads, are absolutely dependent upon protests from the subordinates of these division heads for information as to irregularities, it has been and now is the policy of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to discourage such protests and to make examples of subordinates who make them.

The case of Mr. John H. Briggs, former chief of the nonmetals valuation section of the engineering division, is an example of what happened to an able, conscientious engineer who sought to protect the interests of the Government.

John H. Briggs: Mr. Briggs, an engineer and a graduate of Yale, entered the service as an auditor. His work attracted the attention of Mr. Hamilton, then head of the metals section, who caused him to be transferred and promoted to the position of appraisal engineer. Mr. Briggs was successively promoted to the position of assistant chief and then chief of the nonmetals valuation section.

Mr. Nash, assistant commissioner, testified that the work under Mr. Briggs' direction had been so nearly disposed of that it was possible to consolidate his section with the metals valuation section.

A most thorough examination of the work of the nonmetals valuation section while under Mr. Briggs' direction failed to disclose a single case in which the determination of that section was not sound and proper. Our investigation did disclose several cases in which Mr. Briggs had been overruled by the head of the engineering division, a special conferee working directly under the head of the engineering division, and the committee on appeals and review, and most ridiculous results determined. Some of these cases have been reviewed in the depletion section of this report. The harmful results of these determinations were not confined to the cases involved, as they established precedents which, if followed, would upset the sound principles being followed in the nonmetals section, and which, if not followed as precedents, would result in gross discrimination.

Mr. Briggs filed a protest against the determination of the committee on appeals and review in the Penn Sand & Gravel case and against the action of the conferee in the Climax-Fire-Brick Co. case. In response to his protest in the Penn Sand & Gravel case he received a memorandum from S. M. Greenidge, head of the engineering division, which concludes as follows: "It is my opinion that the above-named case should be closed in accordance with the instructions of the committee on appeals and review, and also that something be done to curb the tendency of engineers toward taking issue with the decisions or instructions of their superior officers" (1405).

For some time the amortization allowances were handled by the nonmetals section. While Mr. Briggs was chief of this section, he was not permitted to see the reports to which his name was signed (4105).

Mr. Briggs finally laid the whole situation before Mr. C. B. Allen, Assistant Deputy Commissioner, who advised him "to keep still and leave things run along as smoothly as possible" (4105).

After the Penn Sand & Gravel case, the Climax-Fire-Brick case and other cases, against the determination of which Mr. Briggs protested, were presented to this committee, they were ordered reconsidered by the commissioners, and upon reconsideration Mr. Briggs was sustained (4071). Notwithstanding the fact that Mr. Briggs' protests in these cases have saved the Government an immense amount of tax, he was summarily dismissed on April 23, 1925, in the interest of economy.

This investigation disclosed the fact that the chiefs of the metals, coal, and timber valuation sections of the engineering division were exceptionally capable men, who have consistently tried to protect the Government from the unsound bargaining policy which has been pursued in the Income Tax Unit. Since the conclusion of our hearings every one of these men has been removed from the executive position he held.

The dismissal of Mr. Briggs, the resignation of Mr. Tanner, chief of the timber section, and the demotion of Mr. Grimes, chief of the metals-valuation section, and Mr. Davis, chief of the coal section, stand as examples of what happens to employees of the Income Tax Unit who protest against the action of their superiors.

No communication except through division heads: The office practice requiring all official communications from any subordinate to a superior of a division head to be transmitted through the division head is effective in preventing anything reaching the commissioner, deputy commissioner, or solicitor which the division head desires to keep from him.

DISCRIMINATORY REFUNDS IN SECRET

Most shocking, of course, is the fact that refunds of hundreds of millions of dollars have been made to taxpayers in accordance with principles which were not made clear even to the employees of the Bureau, and most certainly not to taxpayers generally. Many similarly situated taxpayers were unable to request refunds because there were no published rules to guide them in making such requests. This, of course, resulted in the favored few with proper access to tax information getting refunds at the expense of their less fortunate competitors all to the detriment of the other taxpayers in the Nation. In dealing with this subject, a report of our committee said:

Only 15½ percent of formal rulings published: As of March 6, 1925, there had been issued by the solicitor, the tax advisory board, the committee on appeals and review, and by the rules and regulations section 20,311 rulings, of which only 3,163, or 15½ percent, had been published. * * * The representatives of the commissioner stated to this committee that all rulings upon novel questions of general application were published, provided it were possible to so delete the facts as to destroy the identity of the case, and that unpublished rulings are never used as precedents. This statement is not sustained by the facts as disclosed by the investigation. * * *

Unwritten rules and practices: Many rules and formula for the determination of tax liability followed by the unit have never been even reduced to writing, except in the particular cases to which they were applied. Formal rulings are made only in response to

taxpayers' inquiries upon taxpayers' appeals, and when requested from the solicitor. Where the taxpayer makes no such inquiry and is satisfied with the unit's determination of his tax there is no occasion for a ruling. The rules and formula applied in such case can only be ascertained by digging such cases out of the files. As there is no record or index of cases showing the questions involved, the location of cases to ascertain how any particular question has been determined is entirely dependent upon the personal recollection of the employees of the unit. * * * Notwithstanding the fact that taxes amounting to over $100,000,000 were lost through improper amortization allowances, there is nothing to show that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had ever had his attention called to one amortization case or ever gave this great subject one moment's consideration until attention was called to it by the Senate investigating committee. It was also impossible for this committee or anyone else to ascertain how this subject was treated by the Bureau, except by examining the record in each particular case.

The generally recognized published precedent on the valuation of good will provides for the capitalization of prospective profits at 20 percent, while in some cases good will has been valued on a 6 percent basis. These rates are as important as precedents as the formula to which they are applied.

The tax expert: This system had not only led to the lack of uniformity and lack of consistency in rulings upon the same and closely related questions but has given rise to and now maintains the lucrative business of the tax expert or "fixer." There is nothing so involved, complicated or technical about the procedure in the Income Tax Unit that anyone of ordinary intelligence cannot understand it, provided he has access to the information. Taxpayers generally, however, to secure the advantages accorded others similarly situated find it necessary to employ someone with "inside" information.

To illustrate this situation, let us again resort to the subject of amortization.

A solicitor's ruling published in November 1924, held that the value in use of facilities, upon which amortization is claimed, is to be determined by the actual use or usefulness of that particular facility in the taxpayer's postwar business. Until October 1925, this was the only published rulings on the subject, and no one not initiated in the secret methods of the department would ever dream that the unit would hold in the face of that opinion, as it has, that the usefulness of a new, modern facility which is the last word in efficient, economical operation, and which is in constantly daily operation, would be reduced because the taxpayer also possessed other facilities which had about reached the end of their useful lives and the actual use of which had been abandoned because they could not be economically operated.

Taxpayers found that by employing "experts" with inside information they could secure the allowance of deductions in amounts vastly in excess of the claims made in their original returns, upon a basis specifically condemned by the only published ruling upon the subject. The "expert" with "inside" information knew that such allowances had been made in other cases and could urge such cases as precedents to be applied to his own case.

Amortization is not the only subject with reference to which this situation exists. It is generally true throughout the Income Tax Unit.

This system has created, as a favored class of taxpayers, those who have employed "tax experts." It has created a special class of tax practitioners, whose sole stock in trade is a knowledge of the secret methods and practices of the Income Tax Unit.

This special knowledge of secret precedents has created a demand by large taxpayers for the services of Income Tax Unit employees, and is the principal cause of the immense turnover in the personnel of the unit.

ALL SHOULD BE TREATED ALIKE

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that irregularities are encouraged by failure to mandatorily treat all taxpayers alike in accordance with fixed rules made available for the study and guidance of everyone. If we had always insisted upon this, some of the practices discovered by the aforementioned committee could never have existed. The committee deserves commendation for directing attention to them and calling for correction. Permit me to quote here what the committee had to say on this subject:

Practice and procedure should be written and published: No taxpayer should receive the benefit of special treatment which is not to be given all other taxpayers similarly situated. It therefore follows that every ruling, practice, and formula which has been followed in any case should be a precedent whether published or unpublished or whether written or unwritten.

Our system of legal and equitable jurisprudence are both the result of the accumulated precedent, arising out of the decisions of courts, in the application of law and equity to particular cases. This body of law is evidenced by, and is preserved in, the written decisions of the courts. When the courts give to a statute a construction which is contrary to the public will, the Congress or the State legislature are advised by the publicity given the decision of the construction so given it by the courts and can amend it. Anyone desiring to know how a statute has been construed by the courts has but to look to the published decisions, which are open to everyone. A system of jurisprudence which provided for the secret trial of cases without published decisions and guided by no published rules would not be tolerated by any free, self-governing people.

All practices and formula being followed in the work of the Income Tax Unit should be reduced to writing, at least tentatively approved by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and published. There can be no such thing as uniformity of treatment among taxpayers similarly situated unless there are written rules for the government of the employees of the unit.

The commissioner should be subject to the same responsibility for the practice of the Bureau in cases where taxpayers are satisfied and there are no "rulings" as in cases where the appeals of dissatisfied taxpayers result in "rulings." Under the present practice it is doubtful whether the Commissioner, in whom all authority under the act is vested, has the least idea how the law is being construed and applied in the case of satisfied taxpayers. It is certain that, under the present procedure, there is no provision for bringing the principles applied to such cases to the Commissioner's attention.

Every taxpayer also has the same right to know the standard applied to other taxpayers in cases where there are no appeals as in cases where there are appeals. Congress should be as interested in knowing how the law has been construed and applied in the cases of subjects which have been so unfirmly handled to the taxpayer's satisfaction that no appeals resulting in published rulings have been taken.

The methods followed by the Bureau in handling amortization cases indicate that when the entire body of taxpayers are so well satisfied that no appeals are taken the Government is most liable to suffer.

AUDITING AND INSPECTION

It must be obvious to every Member that, while income-tax records cannot be thrown open to all kinds of public inspection, there most certainly must be some means of checking on these records, and checks must constantly be made by auditors with the power to carefully investigate every transaction made by the Bureau. That this was not the case one of our committees reported in the following words:

Publicity of records: The unsatisfactory conditions developed by this investigation are the inevitable result of the delegation of almost unlimited discretion to be secretly exercised. It is believed that but few of the unsound settlements, to which attention has been called, would have been made if it were not for the belief that they would never become public.

While the objections to throwing the records of the income-tax unit open to the public are recognized, the necessity for the opportunity for some outside scrutiny is imperative.

Congress, in imposing a system of taxation the administration of which necessarily involves the exercise of so much discretion, assumes some duty to the public to see that such discretion is not abused. It is suggested that the law should provide that any Member of Congress or Senator shall have the right to examine any return or record at any time and take a copy thereof.

To insure the full publicity of the rulings, practices, methods, and formulas in use in the determination of tax, it is suggested that the law provide that no settlement of any tax be considered final unless the principles applied in determining such tax shall have been published within 30 days after such determination.

ADMINISTRATION SHOULD COOPERATE

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the report of our committee from which I have quoted so copiously deals with a scandalous situation; one that certainly cried out for correction. Under the circumstances one would think that the administration would have gladly cooperated to see that proper reforms were promptly carried out. Instead, the man who led the committee was hampered at every turn. In fact, the attitude of the administration toward him was so hostile that the Secretary of the Treasury caused suit for $10,000,000 in back taxes to be brought against him. The court case ran right along with the investigation which he led. In the end, he was vindicated not only by the court but by the Congress. In the tax case filed against him the court caused a refund to be made to him when it found he had actually overpaid his taxes. Senator James Couzens, of Michigan, who led this investigation into the worst internal revenue scandal in our history, signed the majority report, along with two Democrats. Two Republicans on the committee refused to sign the report, and instead filed a minority report attempting to whitewash the scandals dis-

closed by the committee. These two men were both later defeated in seeking reelection.

The report of the committee which conducted the investigation touched off by Senator James Couzens, Republican, of Michigan, is available to every Members of Congress. It is entitled "Investigations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Sixty-ninth Congress, First Session, 1925–26."

THIS ADMINISTRATION IS COOPERATING

In contrast with the defiant attitude of the administration then under investigation, the present administration is cleaning out those found guilty of wrongdoing instead of firing those found trying to protect the Government as was done during the last Republican era of control of our Government.

The Couzens committee listed a long list of corporations constituting a veritable who's who of the industrial giants of America, all of whom received refunds from the Republican-led administration. To make matters worse, much of the money refunded was money collected during the war and constituted wartime taxes.

WE ALL DEPLORE IRREGULARITIES

Every one of us deplores any irregularity in any Government agency, and particularly in an agency entrusted with the collection of taxes. We all know the results that flow from failure to treat all taxpayers alike, from failure to collect taxes in accordance with the law. In view of this deplorable record of the last Republican regime, it seems to me that all Republicans should recognize the fact that the present committees of this Congress, led by Democrats, are vigorously endeavoring to ferret out all cases of irregularity. That such cases exist, we readily admit, but we are trying to put our house in order. The administration is not hampering our investigators or opposing their inquiries as was done by the last Republican regime. Certainly in view of these facts, and in view of the fact that the present scandals, serious as they are, have disclosed nothing to compare in magnitude with those which were exposed during the last Republican regime, it seems that the Republicans who are trying to make a political issue out of the current Internal Revenue scandals can afford to be a little bit less self-righteous in pretending to have given the American people such honest government when they had the opportunity to do so.

REPUBLICANS SUFFER BY COMPARISON

The last Republican regime would be made to look pretty bad by any comparison between the wrongs exposed by Senator Couzens and those which our committees have exposed to date. Perhaps we should just admit that neither party has a monopoly on virtue, and that human frailties are apt to cause a relatively small number of employees to succumb to temptation which they lack the strength to resist. In any large organization entrusted with vast responsibilities, there are likely to be some who will depart from the straight and narrow path. This will happen in either a Democratic or a Republican administration. Neither vice nor ethics is partisan.

CLEAN-UP SHOULD BE UNPARTISAN

Each one of us owes a duty to cooperate in an unpartisan spirit to keep our Government as honest as it possibly can be—that goes for the Congress, the President, and every member of the administration. Our Democratic administration, we admit, has been somewhat slow in appreciating the seriousness of the conditions existing in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, but it is now vigorously acting to clean up the situation. It is not trying to fight the committees of Congress which are investigating the Bureau. It is not trying to employ partisan politics to whitewash the Bureau as was done by the last Republican regime. One should, in this connection, point out that former President Herbert Hoover was a member of the Cabinet during the time these Internal Revenue scandals were being exposed. So far as I know, he never spoke out against them. He has condemned the moral climate existing in Washington now, but he is hardly the one to criticize the present administration when he was part of one which not only condoned the irregularities exposed by Senator Couzens but refused to cooperate with Congress in exposing them. In fact, Senator Couzens even had to personally pay committee counsel part of the time.

PERSPECTIVE NEEDED

In dealing with matters of this kind, Mr. Speaker, we need to keep our perspective and to realize that this is not the first time that we have found that a relatively small number of public employees have strayed away from the straight and narrow path. Unfortunately, it will probably not be the last time. Neither one of the great political parties has been above reproach but, in all fairness, one must admit that considering the amount of money the Democratic administrations have been compelled to handle during the course of a long and costly war, the scandals, bad and inexcusable as they are, have not involved the kind of brazen and wrongful special favoritism to certain industrial giants at the expense of the people which existed under the last Republican regime.

I hope we can all, Republicans and Democrats alike, cooperate in exposing any wrongdoing in any part of our Government, in finding the wrongdoers and punishing them where they have violated our criminal statutes, and in seeing to it that they are not given the opportunity to repeat such wrongs. In view of their record, set forth above for the benefit of Republicans with short memories, the Democrats are entitled to say to the Republicans, "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone." We may differ on some issues, but when honesty is involved we must stand together to prevent corruption from undermining the fundamental structure of our Government. The present circumstances call for reasonable partisan restraint lest exaggeration result in despair and disillusionment not warranted by a sober appraisal of the facts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING OF CONGRESSIONAL SESSIONS AND COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 62 to amend rule XXXV to permit televising and broadcasting of important congressional debates has been pending since January 12, 1951. Discharge petition No. 3 which followed the failure of the Rules Committee to report the resolution after a hearing has been pending since May 2, 1951.

The Speaker has with typical candor stated that if the House rules are changed he will be guided by them but until then bars televising and broadcasting of committee hearings. My bill proposes to effect this change and gives the Speaker the administering authority. The fundamental question is whether the limited facilities of the public galleries and of the committee hearing rooms shall now be extended to 15,000,000 American television and 45,000,000 American radio sets because this is made possible by modern science. I am firmly convinced this should now be done as a logical and necessary extension of our democratic system. It should not be done on a partial basis but should be authorized for both important congressional sessions and committee hearings with the selection and administration entrusted to the Speaker. Such vital issues as the war in Korea, price and wage controls, selective service and military training, the protection of civil rights and the United States part in European defense all demand the most informed public understanding. Voting in presidential years is off to about 50 percent of those eligible. I believe that much can be done to increase this percentage in this vital presidential year by televising and broadcasting congressional proceedings and getting our people to feel part of Government. The protection of witnesses, fairness in presenting both sides in debate and an opportunity to answer charges against individuals under congressional immunity can all be dealt with by appropriate rules and proper administration.

I am very glad to see such outstanding support for this measure from my Republican side of the aisle and urge my colleagues to sign the discharge petition so that legislation for a rules change may be before us. Every public opinion survey shows that the people of the country want this opportunity to see legislation made and the least the Congress can do is to consider it in a deliberate way.

Appended is an article from the New York Times of January 13, 1952:

CASE FOR TELEVISING CONGRESS

(By Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York)

Television has long since come into its own as teacher of living history. It aroused the indifferent against political corruption by making them eyewitnesses of the Kefauver crime committee hearings. It broadened the American people's interest in world affairs through its coverage of the United Nations. This year it will bring the political conventions into homes from coast to coast, and it may well prove decisive in the presidential campaign to follow. Why, then, should Congress continue to be blacked out? Why shouldn't TV bring crucial House and Senate debates to American voters?

The right of the people to see and hear their elected representatives in action is recognized now in principle but hardly in practice: any citizen is privileged to pay his own way to Washington and hunt for a place in the public galleries—616 seats for spectators in the House of Representatives, 621 in the Senate. We ought to make it possible for everyone to share it—free. Broadcasting important congressional debates would be a tonic for our democracy. It is the best opportunity under modern conditions for bringing to the people knowledge of the basis for the far-reaching decisions made for the people.

The test of our democracy's strength is the degree to which people take an active part in it. Voting figures suggest the need for stimulating such popular interest. On the average, not over half of all eligible Americans vote in congressional elections, scarcely more in presidential years. The Eighty-second Congress was voted in by only 43.7 percent of those who might have participated; only 52 percent voted for President in 1948.

Bringing Capitol Hill more intimately in touch with the public by way of the TV screen—or radio receiver—might not cure this situation overnight. But it should at least provoke some healthy improvement. The impact of TV, as commercial advertisers soon discovered, makes the not negligible influence of radio on American life seem almost pallid by comparison. Yet Congress has not caught up with even the first of these twentieth century revolutions in mass communications.

Radio coverage of legislative proceedings has been amply tested and already proved to be practical. New Zealand, despite a cautious respect for British parliamentary traditions, has authorized radio broadcasts of its national legislature since 1936. Australia also permits regularly scheduled broadcasts of its Parliament 2 days a week, a program which has been in operation now for 5 years; so does the Canadian Province of Saskatchewan.

In our country, Oklahoma has thrown open its State legislature to radio listeners. Many communities have long since permitted municipal court or legislative proceedings to be put on the air over local stations. Congress itself now permits broadcasting and televising of joint sessions—but only when addressed by the President, dignitaries like General MacArthur, or visiting heads of state. In addition, certain committee hearings are also broadcast from time to time.

Yet the proposal to let 15,000,000 TV sets and 40,000,000 radios in on the day-to-day work of Congress continues to receive a mixed reception from our Federal lawmakers.

A recent magazine poll on this question among 20 Senators found 9 in favor, 6 against, and 5 who said "perhaps." A confidential poll which I took recently in the House of Representatives showed 61 opposed out of 118 Members interviewed. House Resolution 62, which I sponsored, proposing that televising and broadcasting of important House debates be authorized under conditions established by the Speaker, has not yet been approved.

The arguments in opposition to giving TV and radio the same privileges as the press and other on-the-spot observers boil down to these points:

It is not practical for the reason that a great deal of congressional business is routine or technical, and therefore boring.

It would interfere with serious consideration of public business because it would lead some members to play to the gallery.

It could produce serious injustices because demagogic Members might—under the protection of congressional immunity—make charges against individuals or organizations lacking equal facilities for reply.

About the first point—practicality—there seems to be general agreement in Congress that it would be unwise to televise Congress on indiscriminate schedules. It is true enough that televising all the proceedings would show up plenty of dull moments, and that floor debates alone do not give anything like a full picture of legislative activities on Capitol Hill. In the Senate, particularly, discussion often wanders far afield under its broad parliamentary rules.

But the serious advocates of congressional broadcasts propose coverage of only the most important debates and most significant votes. These are frequently scheduled in advance at both ends of Capitol Hill under limitations which restrict the length of speeches and apportion the time equally between supporters and opponents of the issue at hand.

To make the most of telecasts of important congressional debates they should be held at night and legislative schedules should be especially arranged for that purpose. Britain's House of Commons generally meets at night. Such night sessions, however, would compete for the best commercial broadcast time and some critics of the idea argue that the networks wouldn't want to give up that time to nonpaying public interest programs. There have already been some criticisms because the private networks televised only the opening session of the San Francisco conference on the Japanese Peace Treaty some months ago and omitted later sessions of world-wide importance.

However, NBC, CBS, and ABC have all recently expressed interest in televising the important debates of Congress. In a letter to a Senate subcommittee, the National Broadcasting Co. said: "We believe we should have the right to televise proceedings of Congress and other legislative bodies on important occasions. * * * We believe that televising Congress should be on the basis of news merits and that the television medium should have the same access to important news events that the press services, newsreels, and newspapers have."

Whether the commercial networks could arrange to do the job thoroughly, if televising of Congress should be approved, is an uncertainty that could only be cleared in the actual practice. If they do not, Government-operated facilities might be set up to do the job.

One of my colleagues, Representative ARTHUR KLEIN, has suggested that Congress establish two broadcasting outlets—one east and one west of the Mississippi—as an exclusive network for programs originating on Capitol Hill.

About the second point—interference with serious legislative business—there have been misgivings by some congressional leaders. Senate Majority Leader ERNEST W. MCFARLAND is one who has raised this objection. "I do not object to the Senators making a show outside of the Senate," he is reported to have said, "but I do not think they should in the Senate."

The fact is, however, that both branches of Congress down through the years have contained many Members who played to the galleries. A broadcaster has sagely observed that "if a spectacle ensues, its elements must have been there in the first place before they were picked up by the eye of the camera."

I believe that if congressional debates were televised the incentive to stop clowning and get on with important business would actually be increased. Members who now realize that debates can be only partially reported in the news columns sometimes feel the urge to attract special attention to themselves. The penalty for "hamming" in full view of thousands of their constituents might be much more severe than it is now. In the very first election after radio broadcasts of Australia's Parliament were instituted, many of the more bombastic performers were defeated.

I think it fair to say that Rudolph Halley's remarkable victory in the recent election for president of the city council of New York was heavily influenced by housewives who saw him in action during the Kefauver hearings and kept that memory vivid, though the hearings had been over for many months. It should be noted, moreover, that Mr. Halley's role was made spectacular by events rather than by an eye-catching display of his own; his performance, in fact, was restrained in comparison to the witnesses from the underworld.

About the third point, possible injustices done by character assassins under the cloak of congressional immunity, most members agree that it presents a serious problem. The fact is that the evil already exists. Drastic charges have been made from the floor of Congress, widely published, and broadcast on news programs and subsequent denials or refutations have often failed to catch up with the prominence given the original attack.

It is a rare case when attacks of this kind are not answered by some other Member of Congress. But the rebuttal often loses out in the competition for newspaper space and air time. Television and radio broadcasting of the living event would, I believe, improve the situation rather than aggravate it.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, a member of the Kefauver committee, has proposed a code of fair practices to deal with this problem. The Kefauver committee, in its code of procedures, provided that persons or organizations whose names were mentioned in a hearing should be afforded an opportunity to give their own stories. Such rules would be an essential preliminary to putting my proposal to televise Congress into effect.

Here, again, if the private chains are unable to spare the time for adequate and equal reply to damaging accusations made under the cloak of legislative immunity, Congress itself might supply the facilities.

In the last analysis, the good sense of the people is the ultimate protection of our democratic system against rabble-rousers. The more people who are directly exposed to demagogues in action—filtered through no eyes but their own—the more there will be who are practiced in reaching judgments with discrimination. I believe in bringing demagogues out into the open and taking our chances on the judgment of an informed electorate.

When we consider the complex problems of the future, we may well resolve to get a maximum number of minds at work on the solutions. Here is a place for showing our faith in democracy as well as preaching its benefits. To make public participation effective in our decisions, the public must be

equipped with the necessary information. How better to inform the American people than through using the vast capabilities of television and radio?

The average citizen realizes the value of such broadcasting. A public opinion survey shows that 65 percent are in favor of televising Congress for at least an hour a day, with 18 percent opposed and 17 percent doubtful. Let me quote a few samples from the mail I have received since sponsoring the proposal.

A New Yorker writes to commend my "courageous effort to help every American citizen understand what is happening so that he may be aided in supporting, to the best of his abilities, the right issues." A voter from California says that televising Congress will bring home exactly what our representatives are doing in Washington instead of the hot-air promises they hand out during elections. A student from Brooklyn says it would "be of great aid to students such as myself in learning what makes America tick."

People will listen and people will look. The facilities for televising and broadcasting important congressional debates are available. The possible evils can be handled by appropriate rules and by a discriminating public. It certainly should be tried. To defer it any longer is to take counsel of our fears and to remain firmly rooted in past traditions despite the urgent needs and opportunities of the present.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I regret the necessity of taking the time of the House at this late hour to discuss the subject of universal military training, which has already consumed a major part of the afternoon. Unfortunately, however, this became necessary by the refusal of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee to honor his promise to me—that I would be given time during general debate today. I would not transgress on your time or patience to give a comprehensive discussion of universal military training today. I am opposed to the bill which has been reported to the House by the Armed Services Committee, and it is my hope that I may, at some time during the ensuing days of general debate, have an opportunity to discuss my reasons for opposing the program which has been reported to the House.

The reason I have taken the floor today is that I have certain information in my possession which I think should be made available to the House at the very outset of its consideration of UMT. This information is so vital—as it may affect certain sections of this country—that I feel it my duty to place it in the RECORD at this time.

With that in mind, I now address my remarks to my colleagues who happen to represent that great patriotic section of this country known as the Southern States.

I realize that many southern Members of Congress, as well as some from other sections of our country, have been greatly disturbed over recent policies promulgated in the Armed Forces with reference to nonsegregation. Although Congress has repeatedly refused to enact laws to provide for a nonsegregated Military Establishment, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, has promulgated Executive orders to the Armed Forces which outlaw the practice of segregation and to integrate Negroes into white units.

I have for the past several weeks waded through countless hundreds of pages of committee hearings on the subject of UMT in search of some definite statement in regard to racial segregation as it is contemplated under the UMT program. I have read the committee's reports, as well as the report of the Commission. Nowhere in these official documents have I been able to find the subject mentioned, or any definite policy stated. The bill fails to deal with the subject of racial segregation and apparently leaves this matter to the discretion of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Commission.

For weeks I have attempted to elicit a statement from the distinguished Armed Services Committee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], but on each occasion he has artfully dodged the answers to my questions.

After having failed to secure any satisfactory answer from an official source concerning contemplated racial policies under universal military training as it is now projected, I wrote letters to Hon. James W. Wadsworth, Chairman, National Security Training Commission, and Mrs. Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, requesting this information.

The following is the text of my letter to Mr. Wadsworth:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 14, 1952.

Hon. JAMES W. WADSWORTH,
Chairman, National Security Training Commission, Geneseo, N. Y.

DEAR MR. WADSWORTH: As you know, the House is soon to consider legislation providing for a system of universal military training.

I have read the Commission's report to the Armed Services Committee, as well as the hearings before the committee on the bill, H. R. 5904, implementing legislatively the Commission's recommendations. Nowhere in the report or hearings do I find any definite information relating to the question of racial segregation as it is contemplated under the program.

As the stated policy of the Defense Department has, in recent years, been directed toward the elimination of racial identities within the armed services by providing integration of Negroes into white units, and as this is a matter of grave concern to the people whom I represent, I feel that I am entitled to know whether such a policy will be continued into the projected universal military training program.

I would like to know the following:

1. Is it contemplated that State laws will be followed with regard to racial segregation in all States wherein this training is given?

2. Is it contemplated that racial segregation will be maintained, or will the general policy be to provide for integration of trainees into mixed racial units?

3. Is it contemplated that a trainee may have a free choice of serving with an all-white, all-Negro, or mixed unit?

I trust that in replying, answers to these questions will not be evaded. I hope, and am confident, that you will not be reluctant to furnish specific answers to these questions.

Looking forward to hearing from you within the next few days, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN BELL WILLIAMS.

On February 25, I received, from Mr. Wadsworth, this letter in reply:

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Permit me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 14 addressed to me at Geneseo, N. Y., and forwarded to me here in Washington.

Replying to your inquiries concerning racial segregation, let me say that during our long discussions relating to universal military training we were assured by people representing the Armed Forces that the policy now being pursued within those forces with respect to nonsegregation would be maintained in a universal military training program. Our Commission, believing that the present policy is working satisfactorily and being assured that it would be applied to UMT, decided that we need not refer to it in our report. Incidentally, the present nonsegregation policy as applied to members of the Armed Forces is uniform in its application throughout the country. In other words, it is not subject to State laws.

I wrote an almost identical inquiry to Mrs. Rosenberg under date of February 14, and received, this morning, the following reply from her:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1952.

Hon. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you for your letter of February 14, expressing your interest in the vital legislation to provide for a system of universal military training. With reference to your particular inquiry concerning racial segregation, at the present time there is no segregation on the grounds of race, creed, color or national origin in the training establishments of the Armed Forces, nor is any such segregation contemplated for the training establishments of the National Security Training Corps. In carrying out the current policy in the training establishments of the Armed Forces, insofar as is known to the Department of Defense, there have been no difficulties or incidents of any kind.

To give you specific answers to the three questions in your letter, the answer to your first question is that, in accord with present policies, outside the confines of the training installations, military personnel and trainees will be expected to conform to applicable State laws and to observe local practices and customs with regard to social relations with the civilian community. Further, when visitors from the local civilian community are present in our installations, every precaution will be taken that they will not be embarrassed by required deviation from the social customs and practices they expect in their own community. However, on the actual grounds of the training establishment, racial segregation will not be maintained among the trainees. As to your second question, it is not contemplated that racial segregation will be maintained. Trainees will be integrated into mixed racial units. In this regard the services, insofar as possible, follow the normal percentage distribution of racial groups in the population in making assignment to training units. In answer to your third question, in accord

with the policies indicated above, the answer is "No."

These policies concerning our training establishment have been made after careful consideration of all factors involved, including the experience of the Armed Forces in conducting basic training programs. As previously indicated, they have been successful in our current training programs. It is believed that these policies, properly administered as they will be, will not cause injustice to any particular group and that they will contribute to the primary purpose of military training, which is to prepare all of our citizens to defend our country in time of emergency.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

I realize that Mrs. Rosenberg has been a most controversial figure since receiving her appointment to the high position which she now holds. But regardless of anything else that might be said of her, it must be admitted that she speaks openly and frankly. I appreciate the frank reply which she has given me, although I cannot appreciate the position which she has taken on the subject of racial segregation.

Mrs. Rosenberg said in her letter to me—and I quote—"Insofar as is known to the Department of Defense, there have been no difficulties or incidents of any kind." I would remind Mrs. Rosenberg of last year's racial riot at Camp Rucker, Ala., which was called to the attention of the House by my good friend and distinguished colleague on the Armed Services Committee the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENREID]. Other such incidents have occurred at Camp Chaffee, Ark., and various other installations throughout the country where Negroes have been integrated with white units. Either Mrs. Rosenberg has closed her eyes to these incidents or she is so naive that she refuses to believe they could occur.

It will be noted that the bill now under consideration by the House provides, in effect, that trainees will be trained—insofar as possible—in the States where they reside. Applying Mrs. Rosenberg's policy to the situation in the State of Mississippi, where the ratio of white to Negro is 54 to 46, is it to be expected that Mississippi youths being trained in the State will be mixed in interracial units in those proportions? The same question is of course, applicable to other States in our Union.

I do not believe that any Member of Congress from my section of the country can conscientiously support legislation of this type, which fails to provide safeguards against the integration of our white sons into mixed racial units. As far as I am concerned, I do not intend to vote for such a bill, when one of its admitted purposes is to promote the administration's program of racial amalgamation.

Amendments will be offered under the 5-minute rule which would provide these safeguards. I hope that the membership of this House will fully appreciate the dangers to our democratic institutions which are inherent in this type of bill, and amend it so as to make the program conform to State laws—at least in this respect. In the absence of any such safeguards, I do not intend to support universal military training.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WHAT OUR ACTION IN KOREA MEANS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, General Ridgway, speaking last Thursday—February 21, 1952—rightly answered those faint hearts who ask, "Why are we in Korea?" Such faint hearts existed also at Valley Forge. Today, as then, they are a small minority.

The great bulk of the Nation knows, as General Ridgway said, that we resisted aggression in Korea because "to have done otherwise would have been a repudiation of every principle we had previously professed."

The great majority of Americans knows that we have already accomplished great things in Korea. This Nation knows that the Korean effort is an indispensable part of our world-wide struggle against communism, designed to preserve both the freedom and general peace. It knows the bitter cost of our fight in Korea, but also that these sacrifices have not been in vain.

Let us review the record:

On June 27, 1950, President Truman electrified the world by his decision to halt Communist aggression in Korea.

This now historic act prompted Gen. Douglas MacArthur to say:

> The decision of President Truman lighted into a flame a lamp of hope throughout Asia that was burning dimly toward extinction. It marked for the Far East the focal and turning point in this area struggling for freedom. It swept aside in one great monumental stroke all of the hypocrisy and the sophistry which has confused and deluded so many people distinct from the actual scene.

Since then the whole free world has come to share this view, for it is now plain to see how much has been accomplished by this courageous and farsighted decision, and also how much would have been lost had it not been made.

I. WHAT WE HAVE WON IN KOREA

Starting from scratch, and under great handicaps, the United Nations forces first completely destroyed the North Korean army in 3 months' time. Then these gallant forces recovered from the first surprise offensive of the Chinese Communists in which huge masses of manpower were thrown against them. Finally, General Ridgway's forces chewed to bits the new Communist armies that were thrown against them one after the other.

OUR MILITARY SUCCESS IN KOREA

By last spring the enemy's casualties had passed the million mark and all of South Korea had been retaken and liberated.

For the first time since the World War the United States had a real battle-tested Army, Navy, and Air Force. Their record should inspire every American. And also for the first time, Chinese Communist armies tasted serious defeat and the prestige of the Communist regime in China was seriously impaired.

REDS BEATEN—ASKED ARMISTICE

In their testimony before the Russell committee last spring General Marshall and other military leaders suggested that the enemy could not indefinitely afford such destruction of their armies. They were right. In June 1951, just a year after the outbreak of the war, they did propose an armistice. The final terms of this armistice have not yet been agreed upon, but a virtual cease-fire condition has been achieved; no further offensives have been launched by the Communists, and U. N. casualties are now at a minimum.

OUR KOREA ACTION AVERTED DISASTER

Had the Red Army not been checked in Korea it is probable that it would have swept over Indochina and Malaya, which are just as important to the United Nations as Korea.

Had not the Red Army been thrown back in Korea, it would also have threatened Formosa and Japan itself.

Had we abandoned Korea as some suggested, it is almost impossible to calculate the disaster which might have followed. Above all else, we must keep in mind the fact that Korea bought us time to prepare our defenses of even more important fronts.

ACTION IN KOREA BOUGHT TIME IN FAR EAST

In the Far East it bought us time to fashion a whole new chain of defense which now secures the Pacific for the free nations. In the last year we negotiated the new Japanese Peace Treaty and a new military agreement for common defense.

Our Seventh Fleet protected Formosa from invasion and our military mission has greatly strengthened the defensive forces on that island.

We have achieved a new mutual defense pact with the Philippines and have negotiated an alliance with Australia and New Zealand for the protection of the Pacific.

KOREA RESISTANCE GAVE TIME IN EUROPE

On the western front we have changed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization from a mere piece of paper into a real fighting alliance which holds promise of securing Europe from aggression. And, with our cooperation, Korea has given our European allies time to pool their common resources in the Schumann plan and the European defense community. Despair and defeatism have been largely banished from Western Europe. Inspired by the determination of the United States to resist aggression, Western Europe has clearly shown a new spirit of hope and a will to resist Communist aggression.

Most important of all, however, Korea awakened America to its danger, and the gallant resistance of our Armed Forces bought us time to launch our present great mobilization effort, the success of which may very well deter Soviet Russia from risking another world war.

II. KOREA A PART OF THE WORLD-WIDE STRUGGLE

As we now look back to June of 1950, Americans may well feel like crossing their fingers that not only the right decision was made but that it was made in time. The hour-by-hour history of just what took place in Korea and what took place in Washington after the invasion started has now been documented. This record shows very clearly that had

the President faltered or procrastinated, Korea would have been lost.

OUR ANTIRED STRUGGLE REQUIRED KOREAN ACTION

In reviewing those tense hours it is important to understand that the President's swift decision was not merely a lucky or fortunate one made on the spur of the moment. That great decision sprang naturally and consistently from the foreign policy which the administration began to fashion shortly after President Truman took office. Therefore, in order to understand the Korea decision it is first necessary to put it in its proper perspective.

For the last 5 years the United States has been engaged in a unique struggle against Communist imperialism and aggression.

This is an unprecedented situation for America and has called for unprecedented measures to deal with it.

For the last 5 years, therefore, our supreme policy has been to curb Communist aggression and, if possible, to avoid another world war in doing so.

TO PREVENT WORLD WAR III: PATIENCE, FIRMNESS, DETERMINATION

The execution of this policy has required extraordinary patience, firmness, and determination in meeting, and helping our allies to meet, the challenges in Iran, Greece, Turkey, Trieste, Berlin, Indochina, and finally Korea. The results speak for themselves. Year by year the United States has opposed these aggressions with courage and poise, and in each instance the threats were curbed or overcome without involving the United States in a total war.

The struggle between the democracies and the Communist powers is a continuing one. It has already lasted for 5 years and it may last for as many more, or even longer. There can be no quick and decisive solution to this global struggle short of resorting to another world war. The cost of such a conflict, both in lives and treasure, is beyond calculation. It is therefore our policy to contain Communist aggression without resorting to total war if possible. This policy also is costly, but even if maintained over a period of years, the price would be small in comparison with that of atomic war.

CONTAINMENT AND PEACE REQUIRE LONG, HARD PULL

Korea is only the latest challenge in this long, hard, continuing world-wide struggle. We are applying there the same policy that we have successfully applied in the attempted aggressions that preceded it elsewhere in the world. Each incident has required different military and diplomatic efforts on our part to cope with the situations as they developed. In one way or another all of them have been costly, but Korea the most costly of all for it has involved the lives of American troops.

Nevertheless, even though the conditions have been different, our policy has been uniform in the following respect: First, we have spurned appeasement; second, we have brought to bear whatever has been necessary in money and manpower to curb the aggressor; and, third, we have sought in every possible way to avoid world war III.

The application of this policy has not always been easy or popular.

KOREAN COMPLAINTS NOT THE ONLY ONES

Korea is not the first time that there have been complaints of a stalemate. And it is not the first time that there have been demands for a quick and decisive solution. Korea has lasted 20 months, but the Berlin crisis lasted almost 15 months. There were times when the fight for Berlin also looked like a stalemate, but we kept our heads and persevered and in the end won a notable victory. This, too, was costly in money and manpower.

There were those who wanted to end this situation by smashing through the Russian blockade, even though this might have precipitated world war at once. We refused to take that risk as long as there were other means of accomplishing our ends.

It should also be recalled that there were critics who were impatient over our policy in Greece. The effort to free Greece from Communist aggression took 18 months. There were those who said that this was a hopeless adventure and that we were merely wasting our economic and military assistance to that country.

It is true that our rescue of Greece was costly but it is also true that it paid off. Not only did we save Greece but during the course of this fight, Russia suffered its greatest post-war setback in the defection of Yugoslavia. Had Greece succumbed to the Communists it is hardly conceivable that Tito would have dared to break with Russia.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY IS SUCCEEDING

While our foreign policy has placed considerable burdens upon the United States in recent years, it is likewise true that it has imposed great strains on Russia and has created significant tensions within the Soviet orbit which, in the end, may yield decisive advantages to this country and our allies.

II. OUR SACRIFICES ARE NOT IN VAIN

The contention that Korea has been and is a hopeless and fruitless stalemate is a shallow view of the matter. We have lost 18,000 dead and 76,000 men in wounded and missing. These sacrifices have not been in vain.

NO EASY WAY OUT IN THIS GRIM WORLD

There are those who hold out the alluring promise that extra measures in Korea would end all of our troubles. That is not likely to be the case. For even an armistice in Korea is not likely to bring a quick and decisive solution to the world struggle in which we are deeply engaged. There is no assurance that Korea will not be followed by new aggressions elsewhere.

How long this will go on, no man can say. We may, in the next few years, be called on to check even more dangerous challenges. This is a grim prospect but the alternatives to persevering in our present policy are: First, appeasement and surrender; or second, atomic world war.

There is no blinking the fact that Communist aggression cannot be contained without paying some price for it. But if we become involved in another world war, the price will not be thousands dead, but many millions.

OUR PRESENT COURSE THE BEST

As a result of our present foreign policy, the United States can now face the future with renewed courage. For 5 years this policy has safely steered us through dangerous waters mined with the explosive threat of another world war. But there is still a distance to go, and the fate of the world depends on how well the ship of state is piloted the rest of the way.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE RESCUE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, heroism is part of the day's work for all who serve in the United States Coast Guard.

Their job is to protect and save the ships and men who engage in commerce on the oceans that border three sides of our country and on the Great Lakes.

When a radio call for help goes out from a vessel that is in distress, the crew members hope that the Coast Guard will get there first, because the high morale and expert skill of the men in this service can be depended upon when all else fails.

I do not believe that they get the credit that is due them from the people of the United States. At a time when the leadership of some Federal agencies is not living up to the trust that is reposed in them, it is refreshing to honor the integrity of the United States Coast Guard and all of its personnel.

I ask that the Representatives from our 20 landlocked States join with us in public acknowledgment of those who serve us above and beyond the call of duty.

With characteristic brevity and modesty, the Coast Guard says that its functions are to enforce maritime laws, laws relating to internal revenue, customs, immigration, neutrality, and to be responsible for the conservation and protection of fisheries and wildlife in cooperation with other agencies. It watches over life and property on the seas, provides navigational aids to maritime commerce and to transoceanic air commerce, promotes the efficiency and safety of the American merchant marine, and is ever ready for military operations.

This covers a lot of water.

Recently two tankers split in half under the impact of raging seas off Cape Cod, Mass. Most of the crew members from both ships were saved from certain death by the amazing courage and seamanship of the United States Coast Guard.

A motor lifeboat out of the Chatham station and the cutter *Yakutat* went to the aid of the broken tankers, the *Pendleton* and the *Fort Mercer*. As the Boston Post of Tuesday, February 19, reported, it was a "feat that is without parallel in the centuries-old tradition of the sea and its hazards along the New England coast."

The cutter *McCulloch* also took part in the operations.

As Fred Brown, one of the survivors of the *Pendleton*, said to John S. Mannion, a Post staff reporter who covered the disaster:

> Believe me, when I saw the dancing light of the rescue boat bobbing its way toward us, I offered up a prayer of thanksgiving and a second prayer for the Coast Guard and the brave men who risked their lives to save us.

It was like two epochal rescues in one. The two tankers, within miles of each other, were split by mountainous waves that were whipped up by a severe northeast blizzard. As night began to close in, it seemed impossible that anyone could be saved.

Even now we cannot understand how so many were snatched from the broken ships that were wallowing in tempestuous seas, half hidden by the blinding snow and spume.

They are alive today, thanks to the "guts" and "know-how" of the United States Coast Guard and the divine guidance that comes to men of courage and unselfishness.

All hands share the credit, but I would like to give special mention to bosun's mate first class, Bernard C. Webber and his three crewmen, Andrew Fitzberald, Richard L. Livesey, and Irving Maske, who manned the 36-foot motorboat in this incredible victory of a few men in a frail craft over the terrifying power of the angry ocean.

And Commander Theodore F. Knoll, who directed operations from the bridge of the cutter *McCullough*. The two doors of his home at Reading, Mass., were sealed by the snow, at the time he received the call to report back to his ship in a hurry. The skipper tore through the interior decorating that covered an unused porch doorway to get out and fight his way through the storm so that he could reach his ship and get on with the job.

As 16-year-old Carroll Kilgore, of Portland, Maine, who was making his first trip aboard the tanker *Pendleton*, said: "I'll say one thing though, the Coast Guard is wonderful."

He knows it, as hundreds of others who have been saved from shipwreck in past storms know it.

With all the evil news about us that weakens our faith in human nature, I believe it is time to recognize the clean and inspiring courage that too often goes unnoticed.

These men would be the last to seek recognition, but I say that we would be derelict in our duty if we failed to express our thanks and gratitude.

Therefore, I ask the Congress of the United States to pass a resolution commending all members of the United States Coast Guard who took part in this gallant rescue, and expressing our admiration for the high standard of public service that they have set for us by their example.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include a report.

Mr. YORTY in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHUDOFF and to include a speech.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan and to include a table.

Mr. BAKER and to include an editorial.

Mr. BERRY and to include an editorial.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. COLE of New York.

Mr. LANE in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include an editorial.

Mr. HILL and to include an address by George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business.

Mr. HILLINGS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DORN and to include an article.

Mr. DOYLE in three instances and to include in each appropriate material.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa and to include his own compilation of the returns from a questionnaire.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include a letter from the Governor's conference.

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) to include a statement.

Mr. BROWNSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. FORD.

Mr. SHORT in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. BOW and to include a resolution.

Mr. JUDD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. YATES).

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 194. An act to prohibit age requirements or limitations with respect to the appointment of persons to positions in the competitive civil service during periods of war or national emergency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 523. An act for the relief of Walter Duschinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 554. An act for the relief of Boutros Mouallem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 853. An act for the relief of Dr. Ying Tak Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1032. An act to authorize each of the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington to pool royalties derived from lands granted to it for public schools and various State institutions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1085. An act for the relief of Kane Shinohara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1121. An act for the relief of Matsuko Kurosawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. An act for the relief of Demetrius Alexander Jordan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1234. An act for the relief of Toshiko Konishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1333. An act for the relief of Maria Seraphenia Egawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1344. An act to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1372. An act for the relief of Mrs. Madelaine Viale Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1429. An act to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of lethal munitions except when movement is arranged for, or on behalf of, the United States of America or an instrumentality thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1470. An act for the relief of Panagiotes Roumeliotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1534. An act for the relief of Midori Akimoto, also known as Sharlene Akimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1539. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide extra compensation for overtime service performed by immigrant inspectors and other employees of the Immigration Service," approved March 2, 1931; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1566. An act for the relief of Constantin Alexander Solomonides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1580. An act for the relief of Alevtina Olson and Tatiana Snejina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1637. An act for the relief of Doreen Iris Neal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1639. An act for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Helen Sadako Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1681. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Seidl and Sister Anna Ambrus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1692. An act for the relief of Hilde Schindler and her minor daughter, Edeline Schindler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1697. An act for the relief of Sister Maria Gasparetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1715. An act for the relief of Else Neubert and her two children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1731. An act for the relief of Rhee Song Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1796. An act for the relief of Bruno Leo Freund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1798. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact entered into by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, and New Mexico relating to the waters of the Canadian River; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1822. An act to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1833. An act for the relief of Barbara Jean Takada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1836. An act to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422), so as to provide for the appointment by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of special policemen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1846. An act for the relief of Misako Watanabe and her daughter, Irene Terumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1853. An act for the relief of Hidemi Nakano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1879. An act for the relief of Ernest Nanpei Ihrig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1988. An act for the relief of Leslie A. Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2113. An act for the relief of Martha Brak Foxwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2147. An act for the relief of Arthur K. Prior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2149. An act to confer Federal jurisdiction to prosecute certain common-law crimes of violence when such crimes are committed on an American airplane in flight over the high seas or over waters within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2150. An act for the relief of Joachim Nemitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2199. An act to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 and to abolish the Appeal Board of the Office of Contract Settlement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2211. An act to amend section 221 (c) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to clarify certain requirements relating to the designation of persons upon whom process may be served; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2214. An act to amend section 709 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2232. An act for the relief of the Detroit Automotive Products Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2381. An act to amend section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2383. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to create a board of accountancy for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved February 17, 1923; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2418. An act for the relief of Britt-Marie Eriksson and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2440. An act for the relief of Hanne Lore Hart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2447. An act to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2549. An act to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2566. An act for the relief of Niccolo Luvisotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2667. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. Con. Res. 58. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. Con. Res. 63. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett;

H. R. 2205. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd;

H. R. 2398. An act to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session;

H. R. 2669. An act for the relief of Maria Sarandrea;

H. R. 2672. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham;

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 3860. An act to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3981. An act to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control";

H. R. 3985. An act for the relief of Hai Soon Lee;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley;

H. R. 4419. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

H. R. 4703. An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4749. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.;

H. R. 4377. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli;

H. R. 5097. An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5235. An act to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make such studies and investigations deemed necessary concerning the location and construction of a bridge over the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5256. An act to secure the attendance of witnesses from without the District of Columbia in criminal proceedings; and

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the act relating to the incorporation of Trinity College of Washington, D. C., in order to make the archbishop of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Washington an ex officio member and chairman of the board of trustees of such college.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett;

H. R. 2205. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd;

H. R. 2398. An act to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session;

H. R. 2669. An act for the relief of Maria Sarandrea;

H. R. 2672. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham;

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 3860. An act to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 3981. An act to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control";

H. R. 3985. An act for the relief of Hai Soon Lee;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of Elfriede Hartley;

H. R. 4419. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947;

H. R. 4703. An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 4749. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.;

H. R. 4877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli;

H. R. 5097. An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5235. An act to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make such studies and investigations deemed necessary concerning the location and construction of a bridge over the Potomac River, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5256. An act to secure the attendance of witnesses from without the District of Columbia in criminal proceedings; and

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the act relating to the incorporation of Trinity College of Washington, D. C., in order to make the archbishop of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Washington an ex officio member and chairman of the board of trustees of such college.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 27, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1198. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 31, 1951, with compensation payable from the allotment contained in section 202, General Provisions, Department of Justice, pursuant to the Department of Justice Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952, approved October 22, 1951; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1199. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States

Courts for 1951, and the annual report of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges of the United States for 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5900. A bill to repeal the 10 percent surcharge on postal cards; with amendment (Rept. No. 1427). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committes were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5931. A bill for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5936. A bill for the relief of Kunio Itoh; with amendment (Rept. No. 1423). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6012. A bill for the relief of Gylda Daydel Wagner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6026. A bill for the relief of Joseph Yukio; without amendment (Rept. No. 1425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DONOHUE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6172. A bill to effect entry of Manami Tago to be adopted by a United States citizen; with amendment (Rept. No. 1426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 6799. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 6800. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER (by request):

H. R. 6801. A bill to amend part IV of the Interstate Commerce Act, so as to require the obtaining of a certificate of public convenience and necessity as a prerequisite to engaging in service as a freight forwarder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6802. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide more definite standards for determining who is entitled to exemption from part IV of said act as an association of shippers or a shippers' agent; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DORN:

H. R. 6803. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to assure continuance of insurance benefits to certain veterans who are permanently and totally disabled; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 6804. A bill to provide that the costs of certain functions served by reclamation projects shall be nonreimbursable under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS (by request):

H. R. 6805. A bill to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 6806. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 6807. A bill to exempt certain parcels containing educational reading matter, articles, objects, and material from the reduced size and weight limitations imposed by the act of October 24, 1951, on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 6808. A bill to implement section 25 (b) of the Organic Act of Guam by carrying out the recommendations of the Commission on the Application of Federal Laws to Guam and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 6809. A bill to amend part III of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that veterans of all wars shall be considered to be permanently and totally disabled at age 70; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 6810. A bill to provide that an individual who is entitled to a monthly insurance benefit under title II of the Social Security Act shall not be deprived of that benefit because of work performed by him or by the person on whose wage record that benefit is based; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia (by request):

H. R. 6811. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a tax on motor-vehicle fuels sold within the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved April 23, 1924, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 6812. A bill to provide that the existing project for navigation on the Guadalupe River, Tex., be incorporated with and made a part of the project for the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI (by request):

H. R. 6813. A bill to amend section 1020c, title 12, banks and banking, United States Code, and to provide for payment by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation of the unpaid balance due on defaulted joint stock land bank bonds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Res. 536. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct thorough studies and investigations relating to matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee under rule XI (1) (e) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. Res. 537. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of the performance by the executive agencies concerned of their duties, responsibilities, and other activities under the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and any amendments thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to enact laws which will lower the high cost of food; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to enact legislation authorizing a loan to alleviate hardship to certain persons in Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress in favor of supplementary unemployment compensation payments from Federal funds as provided in H. R. 6437; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to enact legislation providing funds for public-works projects for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to enact laws which will lower the high cost of food; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of the enactment of legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to adopt the Edwards perpetual calendar; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to enact legislation authorizing a loan to alleviate hardship to certain persons in Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to enact a Federal fair employment practices act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the President of the United States for a complete investigation of criminal acts against minority groups in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts urging Congress to lower the premiums on national service life insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of supplementary unemployment compensation payments from Federal funds as provided in H. R. 6437; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to reduce to 63 years the age for eligibility for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts favoring increase of bicycle importation tariff; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6814. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6815. A bill for the relief of Lee Kwang Nong (George Clifford Roeder); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. J. Res. 392. Joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Army to furnish a flat bronze marker for the grave of George Roddenbury, a veteran of the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the fourth calendar quarter of 1951.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1951:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

File two copies with the Secretary of the Senate and file three copies with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
Place an "X" below the appropriate letter or figure in the box at the right of the "Report" heading below:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------	REPORT PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT	QUARTER				
		P	1st	2d	3d	4th
		(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) In General: This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee," state in Item "B" the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee.")
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer," write "None" in answer to Item "B."
(b) Separate Reports.—An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING.—(1) State name, address, and nature of business; (2) if this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.
B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C."—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—Section 302 (e).
(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PULICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, place ☐ an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) description, (*b*) quantity distributed, (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed.)

4. *If* this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. *If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C 4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page.* Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1

NOTE ON ITEM "D".—(a) In General. The term "contribution" includes *anything of value*. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302 (a) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN EMPLOYER.—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(c) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE.—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $580 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution, under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. RECEIPTS (INCLUDING CONTRIBUTIONS AND LOANS):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $_____Dues and assessments
2. $_____Gifts of money or anything of value.
3. $_____Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $_____Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $_____Received for services (e. g., salary, fee, etc.)
6. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $_____Received during previous Quarters of calendar year
8. $_____TOTAL from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (a).

9. $_____TOTAL now owed to others on account of loans
10. $_____Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $_____Repaid to others during this Quarter
12. $_____"Expense Money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or More
(from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?
Please answer "yes" or "no":_____
14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last day of this Quarter, total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor* ("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through _____, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N. Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	TOTAL

NOTE ON ITEM "E".—(a) In General. "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302 (b) of the Lobbying Act.

(b) IF THIS REPORT IS FOR AN AGENT OR EMPLOYEE. In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (item "E 7").

E. EXPENDITURES (INCLUDING LOANS) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $_____Public relations and advertising services
2. $_____Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $_____Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $_____Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $_____Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $_____Telephone and telegraph
7. $_____Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $_____All other expenditures
9. $_____TOTAL for this Quarter (add "1" through "8")
10. $_____Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year
11. $_____TOTAL from January 1 through this Quarter (add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302 (b).

12. $_____TOTAL now owed to person filing
13. $_____Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $_____Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of, the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following headings: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates*	*Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7-11:	Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshblanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7-15, 8-15, 9-15:	Britten & Blatten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D. C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	TOTAL	

A. J. Carson Adkerson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Strategic minerals, including manganese. (a) Amendment to Contract Settlement Act. (b) H. R. 3418.
E. (4) $5.60; (5) $2.50; (6) 90 cents; (7) $13.05; (9) $22.05; (10) $462.52; (11) $484.57.

A. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Generally any legislation which will affect the aircraft industry. No specific bills at this time.
E. (1) $3,666.66; (9) $3,666.66; (10) $10,769.32; (11) $14,435.98.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests are continuous. (2) H. R. 2, 13, 25, 92, 104, 114, 134, 189, 190, 191, 194, 196, 198, 207, 285, 391, 402, 466, 505, 506, 507, 508, 520, 541, 544, 1031, 1277, 1285, 1308, 1309, 1890, 1898, 1985, 2332, 2379, 2466, 2567, 2739, 2740, 2749, 2816, 2827, 2925, 2985, 2986, 3303, 3307, 3310, 3320, 3413, 3622, 3675, 3678, 3682, 3683, 3693, 3742, 3765, 3901, 3905, 3910, 3914, 4006, 4473, 4621, 4740, 4827, 5505. House Joint Resolution 20. S. 8, 9, 10, 12, 114, 305, 436, 437, 439, 475, 477, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 1139, 1141, 1146, 1183, 1218, 1309, 1335, 1402, 1539, 1588, 1659, 1818, 1889, 2055, 2148, 2149. Senate Joint Resolution 16. Senate Resolution 154.
D. (6) $11,300.68.
E. (2) $10,203.26; (4) $970.18; (7) $127.24; (9) $11,300.68; (10) $10,731.88; (11) $22,032.56.

A. Nels Peter Alifas, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $2,000.06.
E. (7) $5; (9) $5; (10) $55; (11) $60.

A. W. L. Allen, 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Commercial Telegraphers' Union, International (AFL), 5913 Georgia Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) No definite date. (2) Labor-Management Relations Act, 1949; wage-and-hour law.

A. R. G. Allman, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Until section 8 of the War Claims Act of 1948 is passed.
E. (5) $30; (6) $20; (7) $50; (9) $100; (10) $900; (11) $1,200, all sums approximate.

A. Ellsworth C. Alvord, World Center Building, Sixteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee of American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Taxation of American employees engaged in foreign work; (a) Revenue Act of 1951; (b) H. R. 4473; (d) for.
D. (6) $14,919.73.
E. (6) $9.66; (9) $9.66; (11) $9.66.

A. American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests are continuing. (2) Federal aid to education, ECA and point 4 program, qualified equal-rights amendment, strengthening the United Nations, school construction and teachers' pay, independent status to the United States Office of Education, reciprocal trade agreements without peril points.
E. (10) $157.82; (11) $157.82.

A. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.
C. (1) Two years. (2) I. R. C., sec. 116 (a) to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

A. American Coalition, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,008.25.
E. (2) $750; (5) $165; (6) $70.54; (8) $393.23; (9) $1,378.77; (10) $4,526.47; (11) $5,905.24; (15) $165, October, November, December, Smoot Sand & Gravel Corp., Washington, D. C., rent; $12.24, October 1, Fox-Jones Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $128.70, October 8, collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding and social-security tax; $22.93, October 9, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., service; $23.25, November 17, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., service, etc.[1]

A. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation involving the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.
D. (6) $4,275.
E. (10) $54.88; (11) $54.88.

A. American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203–A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting the cotton textile industry, including tariffs, corporate taxes, price and production controls.
D.[1] (6) $1,627.05.
E. (2) $1,332.30; (5) $64.17; (6) $8.35; (7) $222.23; (9) $1,627.05; (11) $1,627.05; (15) $756.10, October–December 1951, Robert C. Jackson, 416 Argyle Drive, Alexandria, Va., salary and expenses; $375.29, October 1–December 31, 1951, C. G. Caffrey, 215 South Royal, Alexandria, Va., salary and expenses; $264.09 October 1–December 31, 1951, C. T. Murchison, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $46.50, October 1–December 31, 1951, Irma J. Irwin, 2120 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. stenographic and clerical, $42.50, October 1–December 31, 1951, B. N. Muhly, 11 Sherwood Road, Silver Spring, Md., stenographic and clerical, etc.[1]

A. American Council of Style & Design, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Indeterminate. (2) Interest of council is in securing adequate legislation to protect original commercial styles and designs on textile fabrics and other commodities.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting the dental profession.
D. (1) $4,681.42; (6) $4,681.42; (7) $19,742.46; (8) $24,423.88.
E. (2) $4,681.42; (9) $4,681.42; (10) $19,882.12; (11) $24,563.54; (15) $2,425.90, October 1, 1951, Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago 11, Ill., salary as counsel for council on legislation; $1,316.34, October 1, 1951, B. J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago 11, Ill., salary as legislative assistant; $1,041, October 1, 1951, O. O. Norberg, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago 11, Ill., salary as secretary to Mr. Garvey; $741, October 1, 1951, Helen Hofener, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago 11, Ill., salary as stenographer; $75, October 1, 1951, Barbara Hull, 142 Washington Street, Albany, N. Y., salary as stenographer.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Will continue during the coming years. (2) Legislation affecting agriculture directly. (3) The Nation's Agriculture and a news weekly.
D and E.[1]

A. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of working people. (3) American Federationist.
E. (1) $6,691.50; (2) $12,934.94; (4) $4,639.10; (5) $1,150.25; (9) $25,415.79; (10) $78,841.10; (11) $104,256.89; (15) $6,691.50, October 1 to December 31, 1951, Furman Feiner & Co., 117 West Forty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y., radio; $4,639.10, October 1 to December 31, 1951, Ransdell, Inc., 805 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., printing; $1,150.25, October 1 to December 31, 1951, postage on American Federationist; $2,730, October 1 to December 31, 1951, W. C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $249, October 1 to December 31, 1951, W. C. Hushing, expenses; etc.[1]

A. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2)[1] S. 1202, opposed; S. 1318, for; H. R. 3559, for; H. R. 4748, for; H. R. 4051, for.
D. (6) $6,431.55.
E. (2) $1,000; (5) $150; (6) $50; (7) $50; (9) $1,250; (10) $5,805; (11) $7,055.

A. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry. (3) No publications except bulletins to State hotel associations and to members thereof.
D. (6) $123,452.28.
E.[1]

A. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation which may affect hospital care for the American people.
D. (6) $12,957.34.
E. (2) $6,828.50; (4) $1,210.43; (5) $780.17; (6) $449.30; (7) $983.70; (8) $755.24; (9) $11,007.34; (10) $30,250.94; (11) $41,258.28.

A. American Institute of Marine Underwriters, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation which affects the conduct of the business of marine insurance. (a) Merchant Marine Act of 1936.
E. (2) $3,750; (7) $1,239.53; (9) $4,989.53; (11) $4,989.53; (15) $4,989.53, December 27, 1951, Bigham, Engler, Jones & Huston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y., counsel fee for services, together with their disbursements.

A. The American Legion, national headquarters, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) and (3).[1]
D. (6) $365.17.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E.[1] (1) $728.82; (2) $11,168.50; (4) $4,085.11; (5) $1,418.49; (6) $532.39; (7) $4,922.25; (9) $22,855.56; (10) $67,945.06; (11) $90,800.62.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life-insurance business. (a) Revenue Act of 1951, H. R. 4473; Federal Unemployment Tax Act, H. R. 3392; Defense Production Act, House Journal Resolution 278; Securities Exchange Act, H. R. 4143; National Bankruptcy Act, S. 25; War Disaster Act, S. 1848; various bills concerning veterans' insurance benefits.

D. (6) $4,053.43.

E. (2) $2,787.67; (5) $431.57; (6) $441.66; (7) $392.53; (9) $4,053.43; (10) $10,957.70; (11) $15,011.13; (15) $2,500, September 30 to December 31, Robert L. Hogg, salary; $287.67, September 30 to December 31, Emma F. Randel, salary; $416.66, September 30 to December 31, Randall H. Hagner & Co., Inc., rent; $441.66, September 30 to December 31, telephone and telegraph; $14.91, September 30 to December 31, supplies and miscellaneous office expenses $393.52, September 30 to December 31, Robert L. Hogg, travel, hotel, meals, taxi, tips, and miscellaneous expenses.

A. American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. Counsel keeps us advised of Federal legislative developments as they may arise. (2) Legislation which affects the business of hull insurance. (a) Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

E. (2) $3,750; (7) $1,239.52; (9) $4,989.52; (11) $4,989.52; (15) $4,989.52, November 21, Bigham, Englar, Jones & Huston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.: counsel fee for services, together with their disbursements.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) The general legislative interest of the American Medical Association is to advance the science and art of medicine. The specific legislative interest of the American Medical Association at the present time is shown on pages 3, 4, and 5 of this report.[1]

E. (1) $75,000; (2) $33,347.13; (5) $4,219.34; (6) $1,159.12; (7) $2,616.49; (8) $1,136.16; (9) $117,478.24; (10) $332,894.33; (11) $450,372.57; (15) $8.25, October 5, 1951, M. D. Lamborne, Jr., AMA, Washington office, staff sundry; $4.50, October 5, 1951, James W. Foristel, AMA Washington office, staff sundry; $16, October 5, 1951, D. M. Perry, AMA Washington office, staff sundry; $22, October 5, 1951, George L. Connery, AMA Washington office, staff sundry; $17, October 5, 1951, C. H. Maxwell, AMA Washington office, staff sundry, etc.[1]

A. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) Price controls, quotas, land legislation, tax matters, etc.

D. (6) $21,894.36.

E.[1] (2) $4,950; (6) $79.14; (7) $1,120.81; (8) $14; (9) $6,163.95; (10) $22,965.89; (11) $29,129.84.

A. The American Optometric Association, Inc., Development Fund, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio.

C. (1) Continuing interest in legislation in the health field affecting the profession of optometry. (2) S. 106, bill to amend the District of Columbia optometry law; S. 337, bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Vocational Education Act of 1946; H. R. 146, bill to improve health services; H. R. 2707, bill to provide for Federal grants-in-aid for health; all bills pertaining to health and visual care; H. R. 4675 and H. R. 4528, bill to prohibit transportation of fireworks into any State.

E. (6) $7.26; (9) $7.26; (10) $9,542.63; (11) $9,549.89; (15) $7.26, Dr. C. G. Melton, Wade Building, Fayetteville, Ark., long-distance telephone calls.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Bills affecting the public health; such as H. R. 910 and S. 2301, nurses education aid; H. R. 5215, funds for National Science Foundation; H. R. 4473, hospital exemption from admissions tax; S. 337, medical education aid.

D. (6) $450.72.

E. (2) $375 (10 percent); (5) $69 (10 percent); (6) $6.72 (10 percent); (9) $450.72; (10) $1,765.13; (11) $2,235.85.

A. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Legislative interests will continue indefinitely. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the paper and pulp industry, its operations, practices, and properties.

D. (6) $115.

E. (2) $100; (6) $10; (7) $5; (9) $115; (10) $1,620.88; (11) $1,735.88.

A. American Parents' Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.; 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Interest will continue indefinitely. (2) National school health services bill, H. R. 3238; public school construction bill, H. R. 3362; national child-research bill, H. R. 1879; Federal aid for medical education, S. 337, 2707; local public-health units, H. R. 274, S. 445; physically handicapped children's education bill, S. 3102, H. R. 7396; school-lunch appropriation; Children's Bureau appropriation; Cabinet status for the Federal Security Agency; Federal aid to day-care centers in defense areas; Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools; emergency maternal and infant care, S. 1245; defense housing and community facilities, H. R. 2988, S. 349.

D. (6) $1,587.

E. (8) $486.47; (9) $486.47; (10) $12,166.10; (11) $12,652.57; (15) G. J. Hecht, railroad fare, $18; Charity Wells, Inc., Wishing Well, $300; Mrs. D. B. Stough, travel expense, $37.64; Washington Post, want ads, $10.60; Smith Transfer & Storage, $10.50; Wishing Well expense, $18; Bachrach, printing expense, $18.10; board of directors' luncheon, $63.63.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

D.[1] (6) $227.

E. (2) $5,400; (5) $3,400; (6) $380; (6a) $1,548; (9) $10,728; (10) $32,986; (11) $43,714; (15) $2,400, October 1–December 31, 1951, J. E. Kane, API, Washington, D. C., salary; $735.65, October 1–December 31, 1951, J. E. Kane, API, Washington, D. C., expenses; $483.60, October 1–December 31, 1951, J. E. Kane, District of Columbia Petroleum Institute, Washington, D. C., expenses; $3,000, October 1–December 31, 1951, J. L. Dwyer, API, Washington, D. C., salary; $328.63, October 1–December 31, 1951, J. L. Dwyer, API, Washington, D. C., expenses, etc.[1]

A. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Legislative interests will continue indefinitely. (2) Legislative interests include all measures affecting the pulpwood industry, its practices or properties.

A. American Retail Federation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $46,391.42.

E.[1] $8,750; (4) $66.09; (5) $785.83; (6) $465.10; (7) $371.76; (9) $10,438.78; (10) $26,132.93; (11) $36,571.71.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Continuous. (2) See pages 170 through 173 of Proceedings, copy attached. (3) Annual Proceedings.

D.[1] (6) $1,415.51.

E. (2) $250; (4) $154.81; (5) $501.12; (6) $28.10; (7) $164.61; (8) $316.87; (9) $1,415.51; (10) $5,120.86; (11) $6,536.37; (15) $41.14, October 4, J. M. Hood—reimbursement personal expenses, total $411.36—10 percent of which estimated to be in furtherance of legislative program; $16.78, October 26, Margie Witt, Canal Building, New Orleans, La.—reporting annual meeting, total $167.82—10 percent of which estimated to be in furtherance of legislation; $154.81, November 2, Wilson-Epes Printing Co., Washington, D. C.—1,000 copies Proceedings, total cost $1,548.05—10 percent of which estimated to be in furtherance of legislation; $65.64, November 7, J. M. Hood—reimbursement personal expenses, total $656.37—10 percent of which estimated to be in furtherance of legislative program; $300.09, November 13, Superintendent of Documents, GPO, Washington, D. C.—copies all bills during Eighty-second Congress—100 percent legislation, etc.[1]

A. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 5505.

D. (6) $12,450.

E. (1) $500; (2) $9,084.14; (4) $3,217.98; (5) $1,385.53; (6) $182.61; (7) $3,095.06; (8) $1,234.14; (9) $18,699.46; (10) $39,546.84; (11) $58,246.30; (15) $870.97, October 17, November 8, December 13, Charles F. Noyes Co., 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., rent and electricity; $675.17, October 17, November 8, Argo Photo-Offset Corp., 333 Avenue of America, New York City, printing and distributing literature; $173.79, October 17, November 8, December 13, Graham Stationery Co., 26 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, stationery and supplies; $136.99, October 17, Aetna Printing Co., 64 Reade Street, New York City, stationery; $169.50, October 17, November 8, December 13, New York Telephone Co., post-office box 0, New York City, telephone service, etc.[1]

A. America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 4059, Copyright amendment bill, relating to the manufacturing clause. H. R. 3711, Photoengraving; temporary free importation of samples under bond. H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification bill. Tuna bill.

D. (6) $4,080.

E. (2) $4,059.01; (6) $33.64; (7) $37.95; (8) $82.99; (9) $4,213.59; (10) $12,995.04; (11) $17,208.63; (14) $55.75; (15) $1.04, October 5, District Unemployment Compensation Board, taxes, third quarter; $9.20, October 19, C. & P. Telephone Co., telephone bill; $30.80, October 31, O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, October expenses out of pocket; $12.14, November 2, Trades Unionist, Washingaon, D. C., printing salary receipts; $12.22, November 20, C. & P. Telephone Co., telephone bill, etc.[1]

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; The Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; The Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; Roscoe, Snyder & Pacific Railway Co., Abilene, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex. Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; The Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; The Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; The Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex; Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Walter Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston 2, Tex.

C. (1) Through year 1952. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads. For: S. 1335 and H. R. 3465, parcel post rates, etc. H. R. 2416, exclusion from gross income from discharge of indebtedness. S. 1657, air mail subsidy separation. H. R. 4483, to amend section 307 (d) of the Interstate Commerce Act. H. R. 3587, third supplemental appropriation bill. S. 1603, bill to assure allocations for building and repair of freight cars and locomotives. S. 719, clarifying Robinson-Patman Act. H. R. 3232, Post Office appropriation bill, for clarifying amendment with reference to unlimited powers of Postmaster General as to mail movements. Opposed: House Joint Resolution 2 and Senate Joint Resolution 27, St. Lawrence seaway. H. R. 4473, tax bill as to withholding dividend and interest payments. H. R. 3880, Independent Offices appropriation bill as to Long amendment giving borrowing power to inland barge lines. H. R. 1998, to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act relating to communication systems and operating rules. S. 1347 and H. R. 3669, and S. 1353 and H. R. 3755, amending Railroad Retirement Act, but for Priest bill, H. R. 4641, on same subject. Neither for nor against H. R. 4386, appropriations for civil functions of Army.

E. (2) $4,374.99; (8) $700; (9) $5,074.99; (10) $18,291.07; (11) $23,366.96; (15) see page 3.[1]

A. Richard H. Anthony, The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. The American Tariff League, Inc., 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) H. R. 5505.

D. (6) $3,125.

E. (7) $20.64; (9) $20.64; (10) $604.64; (11) $625.28.

A. Hector M. Aring, 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) During present session of Congress; (2) Tax legislation; labor legislation; amendments to the Clayton Act; merchant-marine legislation; price basing point legislation; Defense Production Act.

D. (6) $1,250.

E. (8) $771.01; (9) $771.01; (10) $2,425.89; (11) $3,196.90.

A. W. C. Arnold, 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

B. Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash.

E. (10) $1,952.30; (11) $1,952.30.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) See rider C-2.[1] (3) See rider C-3.[1]

D. (6) $49,796.43.

E.[1] (2) $28,600.86; (3) $9,000; (4) $1,317.02; (5) $3,331.83; (6) $288.53; (7) $2,499.73; (8) $4,658.46; (9) $49,796.43; (10) $188,013.46; (11) $237,809.89.

A. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C.[1]

A. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. Specific legislative interests: H. R. 5566 amending section 5 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to exclude liability for loss of services and loss of consortium. (3) Casualty and Surety Journal.

D. (6) $1,658.72.

E.[1] (2) $1,241.98; (4) $42.63; (5) $111.61; (6) $34.23; (7) $45.95; (8) $182.32; (9) $1,658.71; (10) $5,005.51; (11) $6,664.23.

A. Association of Petroleum Rerefiners, 2201 North Oak Street, Arlington, Va.

D. (6) $3,429.41.

A. (1) The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) All Federal legislative proposals which may affect the western railroads.

A. Atlantic Union Committee, Inc., 537 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (7) $37,548.93.

E. (2) $18,291.49; (4) $5,078.25; (5) $847.80; (6) $1,179.13; (7) $4,959.25; (8) $866.22; (9) $31,222.14; (10) $127,492.34; (11) $158,714.48.

A. Charles E. Babcock, route 4, box 73, Vienna, Va.

B. The National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States, 3025-3029 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (1) Continue indefinitely. (2) Patriotic legislation; restriction of undesirable immigration; improvement in free public schools; suppression of communism, etc.

D. (6) $249.99.

E. (5) $60; (6) $2.33; (7) $19.76; (8) $5.40; (9) $87.49; (10) $345.20; (11) $432.49.

A. Charles B. Bailey, 2035 South Avenue, Toledo, Ohio.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Terminated October 20, 1951. (2) Various legislation affecting members of the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks.

D. (6) $400.

A. Gibbs L. Baker, 1044 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) The Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and proposed amendments thereto, i. e., S. 2092, S. 2104, and S. 2170.

A. Mary Alice Baldinger, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) The major activities of the American Civil Liberties Union are nonlegislative. It is interested, however, in congressional, as well as other, action in any way affecting civil liberties. Among its specific legislative interests are: (generally supported) antilynching (H. R. 28; S. 127, S. 1733); antipoll tax (H. R. 1320; S. 1734); omnibus civil rights (H. R. 29); FEPC (S. 1732); home rule for the District of Columbia (S. 1976); statehood for Alaska and Hawaii (S. 49, S. 50). Also immigration legislation including the omnibus immigration bills (H. R. 5678, S. 2055) on which some sections are supported and some opposed.

D. (6) $375.

E. (5) $14.50; (6) $9.06; (7) $14.55; (8) $2.75; (9) $40.86; (10) $225.30; (11) $266.16.

A. Joseph H. Ball, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) During the period for which this report is filed the registrant did not support, advocate, or oppose any specific legislation.

E.[1]

A. Loren C. Bamert, post-office box 189, Ione, Calif.

B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.

C.[1]

E. (6) $69.02; (7) $868.19; (9) $937.21; (10) $1,036; (11) $1,973.21.

A. Hartman Barber, room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street. Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor.

D. (6) $1,691.31.

E. (2) $218; (6) $228.67; (7) $336.12; (8) $47; (9) $829.79; (10) $2,105.14; (11) $2,934.93.

A. Joel Barlow, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) and (2). The undersigned was retained to advise the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks in connection with H. R. 4473, which became the Revenue Act of 1951, Public Law 183, Eighty-second Congress. The association and the undersigned opposed enactment of secti n 313 of the Revenue Act of 1951, which repealed the exemption of mutual savings banks from Federal income tax. (3) (See attached, p. 3.)[1]

A. James T. Barnes, 203 Capital Club Building, Raleigh, N. C.

B. Medical Society of the State of North Carolina, Raleigh, N. C.

C. (1) Continuous. (2) H. R. 14, 87, 149, 274, 348, 417, 483, 910, 913, 1140, 1272, 1368, 1502, 1545, 1644, 1752, 1781, 3298, 3456, 4371,

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

4373, 4473; H. Res. 38; S. 1, 101, 337, 349, 351, 445, 1186, 1328, 2171, 2246, 2247, 2248.
E. (2) $1,875; (9) $1,875; (10) $5,625; (11) $7,500.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Of indefinite duration. (2) (See appended statement, p. 5.)[1]
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (6) $2.56; (7) $277.23; (8) $37.28; (9) $317.37; (10) $1,670.86; (11) $1,987.93; (15) $11.25, October 10, 1951, Colony, Washington, D. C. (restaurant); $10.55, October 31, 1951, La Salle, Washington, D. C. (restaurant).

A. Irvin Barney, Jr., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend Railroad Retirement Act. House Resolution 426 to integrate railroad retirement funds with social security. All legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. A. K. Barta, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Proprietary Association, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Bills affecting proprietary medicines industry. (3) (a) Legislative bulletins; (b) approximately 500; (c) weekly average; (d) mimeographed.
E. (7) $125; (9) $125; (10) $375; (11) $500.

A. J. A. Beirne, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America–CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. C. Jasper Bell, 904 Bryant Building, Kansas City, Mo.
B. National Institute of Oil Seed Products, P. O. Box 3500, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (1) This is final report; services terminated. (2) Seeking amendment of paragraph 23 of H. R. 1535, entitled "Customs Simplification Act of 1951" or any companion bill in the United States Senate.
E. (10) $1,207.34; (11) $1,207.34.

A. Bell, Taylor & Co. (a partnership consisting of Luther K. Bell & O. A. Taylor) 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. See statement attached.[1]
C. (2) (a) 1951 Defense Production Act; (b) S. 1717; (c) S. 1717; (d) our studies, investigations, recommendations would in effect support the main provisions of S. 1717.
D. (6) $47.87.
E. (5) $20.10; (6) $17.80; (7) $9.97; (9) $47.87; (10) $2,091.98; (11) $2,139.95.

A. Julia D. Bennett, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Interested throughout the session. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians. Library services bills, S. 1452, H. R. 5229, H. R. 5195, H. R. 5190, H. R. 5216, H. R. 5227, H. R. 5221, H. R. 5222, H. R. 5311, H. R. 1535. Customs Simplification Act as it affects libraries. H. R. 2982 and S. 1046, postal rates and their affect on library budgets. Senate Joint Resolution 76 and S. 1579 on educational television. House Resolution 474 on school construction as it affects higher education and libraries. Senate Joint Resolution 20, oil-for-education amendment as its affects libraries.

A. Wendell Berge, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Independent Industries, Inc., 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Pending bills to abolish RFC, opposed; Fulbright bill to revise RFC, in favor.
E. (6) $1.32; (9) $1.32; (10) $431.56; (11) $432.88; (12) $192.09.

A. Wendell Berge, Posner, Berge, Fox & Arent, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interest to continue to October 19, 1952. (2) Any legislation affecting third-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) 83 cents; (7) $215.76; (9) $216.59; (10) $533.96; (11) $750.55; (12) $1,650.17.

A. Kenneth W. Bergen, 84 State Street, Boston, Mass.
B. The Merchants National Bank of Boston, Executor.
C. (1) Matter completed by enactment of section 609 of the Revenue Act of 1951. (2) Section 609 of Revenue Act of 1951—transfers taking effect at death.
E. (See statement attached.[1])

A. Preston B. Bergin, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (See page 3.[1])
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $29.49; (7) $4.85; (9) $29.49; (10) $12.30; (11) $41.75.

A. Bigham, Engler, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. The firm represents companies engaged in the business of marine insurance and as members of The American Institute of Marine Underwriters, The Association of Marine Underwriters of the United States; American Cargo War Risk Reinsurance Exchange; American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) General questions affecting the insurance of ships and their cargoes against marine risks; reparations; subrogation. (a) Merchant Marine Act, 1936. (b) H. R. 2562, taxation of marine insurance; H. P. 2110, a private bill for relief based on subrogation.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (6) $10.80; (7) $72.17; (9) $82.97; (10) $2,396.28; (11) $2,479.05; (14) $2,479.05.

A. Norman E. Biorn, 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (1) Legislative interests will continue indefinitely. (2) Federal and State taxation and governmental expenditures.
D. (7) $216.82.
E. (2) $150; (5) $16.19; (9) $166.19; (10) $609.67; (11) $775.86; (15) $166.19; (16) $150, October-November-December. Miscellaneous stenographers.

A. James C. Black, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
D. (6) $600.
E. (7) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,500; (11) $2,000.

A. William Rhea Blake, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $72.11.
E. (7) $35.49; (9) $35.49; (10) $893.11; (11) $928.60.

A. Charles B. Blankenship, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $1,862.14.
E. (2) $1,732.78; (5) $10.20; (7) $108.55; (8) $10.61; (9) $1,862.14; (10) $7,652.43; (11) $9,514.57.

A. Bleakley, Platt, Gilchrist & Walker, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Elisabeth von Elverfeldt, Hotel New Weston, Madison Avenue at Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Legislative interest has terminated. (2) Person filing had been interested in furthering pasage of S. 302, H. R. 1620, H. R. 2559, H. R. 6656, or other substantially similar legislation.
E. (6) $18; (7) $149.46; (8) $5; (9) $172.46; (10) $90.59; (11) $163.05; (15) $31.92, Sept. 5, railroad fare to Washington and return; $25.54, September 17, railroad fare to Washington and return; $92, September 17–20, hotel bill, meals, and taxis in Washington.

A. Morton Bodfish, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Continuous. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions. During present quarter registrant has been interested in H. R. 4473 (a bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes). (3) Washington Notes; Flash Notes.
E. (7) $272.64; (9) $272.64; (10) $1,205.58; (11) $1,478.22; (15) October 8, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $4.42; October 19, Morton Bodfish (for taxis, meals, and incidental expenditures), $115.85; October 19, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $11.69; October 22, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., $45.82; November 6, Cosmos Club, Washington, D. C., $52.54; November 27, Eastern Airlines, 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York 20, N. Y., $42.32.

A. Paul H. Bolton, 708 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wholesalers, Inc., 708 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Sanford H. Bolz, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Jewish Congress, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) General; to oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms, and to defend civil rights incident thereto. Specific; (a), (b), and (d), H. R. 2379, S. 716, S. 2055, and H. R. 5678, omnibus immigration bills, against; S. 2343, immigration bill, for.
D. (6) $125.
E. (7) $3.25; (9) $3.25; (10) $12.12; (11) $15.37.

A. R. B. Bowden, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C., and 100 Merchants Exchange, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (1) Legislative interests continue indefinitely since 1896. (2) Interested in legislation affecting the grain and/or feed trade. Specifically during this quarter, interested in equal taxation of cooperatives in general tax bill.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $841.07; (9) $841.07.

A. Charles M. Boyer, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation for development of a military policy for the United States which will guarantee adequate national security. (3) (a) The Reserve Officer and ROA Washington Newsletter.

A. D. H. Brackett, post-office box 622, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (1) Through Eighty-second Congress or longer. (2) Interested in Federal legislation to prohibit unbonded, unelected, irresponsible city policemen from being armed with deadly weapons (and the same to apply to all other petty arresting officers), or otherwise to require them to be underwritten by solvent bonds, as is required of elected and bonded responsible high sheriffs.
D. (6) $35.
E. (4) $10; (9) $10; (11) $10; (15) Paid Atlanta, Ga., post office $5 for postal cards, and $5 for multigraphing the cards. Multigraphing was done by Ace Letter Service, 306–11 Pryor Street Building, Atlanta, Ga., on December 29, 1951.

A. Fontaine C. Bradley, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Accountants and its members, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Duration—During the pendency of any proposed legislation tending to restrict the right of accountants to appear before Government agencies. (2) S. 17, H. R. 3097, S. 1725.
E. (5) $30.80; (8) $60.30; (9) $72.30; (10) $133.10.

A. Joseph E. Brady, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
B. International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, Soft Drink, and Distillery Workers of America, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
(C) (1) As long as registrant holds present office and legislation affecting interest of employing organization is pending. (2) All legislation involving or in the direction of national prohibition, taxation of alcoholic beverages, etc. (3) The Brewery Worker.
E. (10) $189.46; (11) $189.46.

A. Harry R. Brashear, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite; (2) any legislation affecting transportation matters in which members of the Association are interested. No specific bills at this time.

A. Glenn A. Brennan, 27–31 Cleveland Street, Hammond, Ind.
B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (1) Final report.
D. (6) $400.

A. James M. Brewbaker, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. O. O. Bright, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the lumber-manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (7) $58.70; (9) $58.70; (10) $153.35; (11) $217.05.

A. H. E. Brinckerhoff, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 220 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Dawes E. Brisbine, 952 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 952 National Press Buildington, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Continuous, as long as there be legislation pending before the Congress dealing with Federal grants-in-aid to States for highways, or repeal, modification, or extension of Federal excise taxes on motor vehicles, gasoline, oil, tires, or auto parts. (2) Such legislative interest is primarily for analysis and reporting: (a) Revenue Act of 1951; (b) H. R. 4473, and the Senate version; (d) for modification of automotive excise tax provisions.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation related specifically to food processing and farming.
D. (6) $250.
E. (6) $25; (9) $25; (10) $1,665; (11) $1,690.

A. A. E. Brooks, 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
B. American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Edificio Bearn, Plaza Santos Degollado, Mexico, D. F.
C. (1) Two years. (2) I. R. C. sec. 116 (a) (to exempt from United States income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad).

A. William F. Brooks, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employes, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting labor, more particularly railroad labor.
D. (1) $7,804.10; (6) $7,804.10.
E. (2) $4,940.23; (7) $2,863.87; (9) $7,804.10; (10) $22,871.91; (11) $30,676.01.

A. C. R. Brown, room 411, Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act; and H. Res. 426, to integrate railroad retirement funds with Social Security.
D. (6) $2,977.22.

A. Paul W. Brown, 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Postal legislation.
E. (4) $3,937; (9) $3,937; (10) $299.10; (11) $4,236.10.

A. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the NAEC.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (2) $8,441.57; (5) $375; (6) 81 cents; (8) $38.55; (9) $3,855.93; (10) $21,349.31; (11) $30,205.24; (15) $1,250, December 1, 1951, $416.67, December 7, 1951, Brown & Brown, St. Ignace, Mich., services; $450, October 15, 1951, $150, November 15, 1951, $450, December 7, 1951, B. M. Fitzgerald, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., services; $1,253.33, October 15, 1951, $1,258.33, November 15, 1951, $2,458.24, December 7, 1951, A. Manning Shaw, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., services; $150, October 15, 1951, $150, November 15, 1951, $150, December 15, 1951, Geraldine DeFoe, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., stenographic services; $100, October 1, 1951, $100, November 1, 1951, $100, January 2, 1952, Washington Loan & Trust Co., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent; $75, stationers, engravers, and Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C.; stationery, office supplies, miscellaneous; and local telephone service, $25 per month.

A. Russell B. Brown, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests are continuing.
E. (8) $4; (9) $4; (10) $8, (11) $102.

A. Thad H. Brown, Jr., 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation, local, State, or Federal, which relates to the television-broadcasting industry.
D.[1]

A. William A. Bryans III, 1044 Gas & Electric Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Public Service Co. of Colorado, 900 Fifteenth Street, Denver, Colo.
C. (1) Legislative interests to continue indefinitely. (2) Legislation having to do with activities of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Rural Electrification Administration, and tax matters, all of which directly affect the interests of the company.
E. (10) $2,606.69; (11) $2,606.69.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Jack Bryson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Any legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

D. (6) $6,280.79.

E. (7) $1,211.23; (8) $644.90; (9) $1,856.13; (10) $5,602.31; (11) $7,458.44; (15) $699.59, October, November, and December, Shoreham Hotel, food and entertainment; $146.33, October, November, and December, Mayflower Hotel, food and entertainment; $365.31, October, November, and December, Statler Hotel, food and entertainment.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

C. (1) For an indefinite term. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects. Specific legislative interests during this calendar year (1951) included appropriations for civil functions of the Army, H. R. 4386.

D. (6) $1,350.

E. (8) $49.64; (9) $49.64; (10) $169.70; (11) $219.34.

A. Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

B. The Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. The Budd Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (1) During the Eighty-second Congress. (2) Corporate income and excess-profits taxes. (a) Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950 and revenue bill of 1951. (b) H. R. 4473. (c) 64 Stat., ch. 1199. (d) For amendment of Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950.

E. (2) $7,500; (6) $16.35; (7) $22.49; (9) $7,538.84; (11) $7,538.84.

A. George Bugbee, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,562.51.

E. (7) $443.35; (9) $443.35; (10) $1,087.88; (11) $1,531.23.

A. Harold J. Buoy, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, Kansas City, Kans.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669, S. 1347 (amendments to Railroad Retirement Act).

D. (6) $326.76.

A. George J. Burger, Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Federation of Independent Business, 714 Bond Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in rubber-tires bill, basing-point legislation, antitrust law legislation, spare-tire monopoly, all legislation affecting independent small business.

A. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, post-office box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (7) $9,533.50.

E. (9) $4,239.28; (10) $13,226.35; (11) $17,465.63; (16) $255, rent (office for Mr. Taylor); $99.58, telephone and telegraph; $2,153.16, Hugh W. Taylor, salary; $632, Inez M. Pontier, salary; $295.50, Margaret Adair; etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 5653 College Avenue, Oakland, Calif.

C. (1) Probably until desired legislation is passed. (2) Legislation for the relief of the Burnham Chemical Co., Senate Joint Resolution 23, House Joint Resolutions 181, 182, 183, 186, and 199.

D. (6) $2,359.46.

E. (2) $800; (4) $763.45; (5) $355.44; (6) $44.02; (7) $364.94; (8) $11.61; (9) $2,359.46; (10) $5,544.70; (11) $7,904.16; (15) $600, various, G. B. Burnham, 132 Second Street SE., Washington, D. C., salary; $200, various, Pearl M. Burnham, 132 Second Street SE., Washington, D. C., salary; $384.94, various, travel, food, lodging, miscellaneous; $61.86, various, ABA Electric Typed Letters, 1013 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., typing; $125.30, November 21, Commercial Printing Co., 517 New Jersey Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., printing, etc.[1]

A. F. Hugh Burns, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) (a) St. Lawrence legislation; (b) Senate Joint Resolution 27, House Joint Resolutions 2, 3, 4, 15, 101, 122, 159, 337.

D. (6) $1,805.

E. (7) $732.09; (9) $732.09; (10) $2,008.84; (11) $2,740.93; (15) November 14, Hotel Morton, Atlantic City, N. J., $15; December 9, Hotel Sherman, Chicago, $23.88; December 10, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $88.66; December 13, Savery Hotel, Des Moines, Iowa, $15.32; December 14, Hotel Onesto, Canton, Ohio, $13.11.

A. Robert M. Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Duration not predictable. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, and electric fans.

D. (6) $260.16.

E. (7) $220.46; (9) $220.46; (10) $194.83; (11) $415.29.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely, as needed. (2) All legislation dealing with the electrical workers in particular and labor in general, such as attempts made by Congress to reduce annual and sick leave for Federal employees, and to support unemployment coverage and other more liberal benefits for the workers.

D. (6) $2,067.

A. Eugene J. Butler, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting religious, charitable, and educational institutions and organizations.

D. (7) $2,474.99.

E. (7) $64.33; (9) $64.33; (10) $570.45; (11) $634.78.

A. Carl Byoir and Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (1) Legislative interests expected to continue. (2) Opposed the proposed increase in the rate of Federal excise tax on distilled spirits.

E. (1) $9,000; (2) $10,287; (4) $125; (6) $25; (7) $80; (8) $265; (9) $19,782; (10) $61,991; (11) $81,773.

A. Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa.

C. (1) Interest expected to continue. (2) Interested in the Defense Production Act of 1950 and such other bills as may pertain to economic controls over industry, especially during emergency periods.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 203-A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C.

C. (1) So long as Congress is in session. (2) H. R. 1724, Renegotiation Act of 1951. H. R. 5505—Customs simplification. H. R. 4473—Revenue bill of 1951 (Public Law 183, 82d Cong.). Public Law 773, Eighty-first Congress; Public Law 96, Eighty-second Congress. The Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1951. H. R. 1612 (Public Law 50, 82d Cong.), Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951.

E. (7) $75; (9) $305; (10) $375.

A. Wallace J. Campbell.

B. The Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. John L. Carey, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Duration—during the pendency of any proposed legislation tending to restrict the right of accountants to appear before Government agencies. (2) S. 17, to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies (against, unless amended); H. R. 3097, to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies (if any legislation is needed in this field, we are for this bill, and in any event are not opposed to it); S. 1725, to protect the public with respect to the practice of the law by others than duly licensed attorneys before Government agencies and United States Tax Court (against); S. 913, to provide for the establishment of Joint Committee on Budget (against); H. R. 4371 and 4373, to provide for retirement fund for self-employed persons (not opposed to these bills).

D. (7) $917.

E. (6) $50; (9) $50; (11) $50.

A. R. B. Carothers, Paris, Tenn.

B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Inc., Paris, Tenn.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; all mine and ship ball and sagger clay.

C. (1) Our interest in retaining percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays. This is allowed by section 114, Internal Revenue Code, title 26. (2) I am interested in retaining percentage depletion allowance and shall continue my effort in behalf of the H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Inc., and the other companies. This title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code.

E. (6) $53.76; (7) $1,585.19; (8) $225; (9) $1,868.95; (10) $2,568.14; (11) $4,437.09.

A. T. C. Carroll, Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) At present working for passage of H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act; also House Resolution 426, to integrate retirement funds with social security, which we oppose.

A. Henderson H. Carson, 640 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; 600 First National Bank Building, Canton, Ohio.

B. East Ohio Gas Co., 1405 East Sixth Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

C. (1) Unknown. Regular client for many years. (2) All legislation of interest to natural-gas industry.

D. (6) $3,461.79.

E. (1) $37; (2) $98; (3) $75; (4) $17; (5) $88.66; (6) $19.43; (7) $97.60; (8) $29.10; (9) $461.79; (10) $1,456.10; (11) $1,917.89.

A. Joseph K. Carson, Jr., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

B. The Propeller Club of the United States, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Any matters affecting the welfare of the American merchant marine, arising under the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and other legislation affecting the shipping industry.

A. Albert E. Carter, 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

D. (6) $3,000.

E. (5) $634.86; (6) $35.80; (7) $370.70; (9) $1,041.36; (10) $3,245.88; (11) $4,287.24; (12) $1,041.36; (14) $1,317.34; (15) $634.86, October 1, November 1, December 1, Munsey Trust Co., rent; $36.80, October 15, November 15, December 15, C. & P. Telephone Co., telephone; $341.20, December 18, United Air Lines and S. P. R. R., travel; $29.50, December 20, Statler Hotel, University Club.

A. Clarence B. Carter, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn.

B. Railroad Pension Conference, post office box 798, New Haven, Conn.

C. (2) For enactment of 30-year, half-pay railroad retirement legislation, S. 1308, H. R. 63, H. R. 382.

E. (7) $19.32; (9) $19.32; (10) $156.58; (11) $175.90.

A. D. E. Casey, 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 419 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Lawrence J. Casey, Jr., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry. (3)[1]

D. (6) $708.34.

E. (7) $205.55; (8) $6.25; (9) $211.80; (11) $211.80.

A. Larry Cates, 1185 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

B. C. N. Sayen, president, Air Line Pilots' Association, International, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Aviation legislation, Railway Labor Act.

D. (6) $1,386.22.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William E. Chace, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.[1]

D. (6) $20.

A. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H. Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation pertaining to business. (3) Legislative Daily, Legislative Outlook, Special number, etc.[1]

D.[1] (6) $711,294.49.

E. (9) $24,278.07;[1] (10) $92,104.83; (11) $116,382.90.

A. Walter Chamblin, Jr., 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.

D. (6) $10,650.96.

E. (9) $2,650.96.

A. Chase National Bank of the City of New York, 18 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

E. (10) $899.87; (11) $899.87.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.

C. Promoting Senate Joint Resolution 29 and House Joint Resolution 156, a proposed Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States. (3) The Christian Patriot.

D. (6) $3,677.56.

E. (1) $849.32; (2) $2,600.80; (4) $1,200.16; (5) $188.27; (6) $56.05; (7) $160.05; (8) $5; (9) $5,059.65; (10) $9,323.08; (11) $14,382.73; (15) $75, Mrs. T. B. Boyle, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans., office rent; $67, Joseph R. Bryson, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., copies of House Joint Resolution 156; $15.37, Crane & Co., East Eighth Street, Topeka, Kans., office supplies, $15.95, Mrs. T. B. Boyle, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans., clerical services; $580.50, Floyd Burres Printing Service, Harrison Street, Topeka, Kans., printing; etc.[1]

A. Citizens' Committee on Foreign Policy, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Foreign policy.

E. (10) $343.94; (11) $343.94.

A. Robert M. Clark, 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the interest of the railway company.[1]

D. (6) $4,275.

A. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

C. (2) General interest in second-class postal rates; particular interest H. R. 2982 and S. 1046.

D. (6) $1,721.73.

E. (2) $1,500; (8) $221.73; (9) $1,721.73; (10) $5,603.84; (11) $7,325.57; (15) $23.58, C. & P. Telephone Co. for telephone and telegraph charges including tax; $1,721.73, Donald M. Counihan, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., for services as legislative counsel at $500 per month plus out-of-pocket expenses.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Oppose any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I-A clear-channel frequencies or the limitation of the power of class I-A standard broadcast stations. CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950.

D. (6) $7,042.39.

E. (2) $5,625; (3) $35.58; (4) $40.80; (7) $202.64; (9) $5,904.02; (10) $18,276.84; (11) $24,180.86; (15) $5,625 Ward L. Quaal, CCBS director, salary; $40.80, Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., mimeographing; $16.22, Brentanos, books; $25.78, Mayflower, food and refreshments; $19.36, Waldron Flowers, Inc., flowers; etc.[1]

A. Francis P. Cleere, 3831 Drysdale Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

B. Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, amendments to Railroad Retirement Act.

D. (6) $180.

E. (7) $100.56; (9) $100.56; (10) $114.40; (11) $214.96.

A. W. Frank Clucas, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Marcus Cohn, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Genocide, the President's civil rights program, H. R. 2467, H. R. 2379, H. Res. 364, S. 728, S. Res. 105.

E. (2) $93.75; (5) $68.89; (6) $7.38; (7) $5.42; (9) $175.44; (10) $612.58; (11) $788.02; (15) 3450, Cafritz Co., 1404 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent; $808.98, Helene Braun, 2904 Argyle Drive, Alexandria, Va., salary.

A. C. Fred Coleman, Lewisville, Ark.

B. St. Louis Southwestern Railway Co., Lewisville, Ark.

C. (2) H. R. 3669, known as railroad retirement bill.

D. (6) $315.

E. (7) $748; (9) $748; (10) $3,269; (11) $4,017.

A. Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

B. The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.[1]

D. (6) $100.

A. Marvin J. Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Keystone Shipping Co., et al.[1]

A. Marvin J. Coles, Ingoldsby & Coles, 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Committee for the Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under the American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (4) $79.56; (5) $2; (6) $21.38; (7) $17.75; (9) $120.69; (10) $208.94; (11) $329.63; (15) $79.56, Bowman Service Corporation, Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $21.38, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., long-distance charges; $17.75, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment.

A. Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) General legislative interests of the group is the taxing of competitive business on the same basis without regard to exemptions under section 101 of the present Internal Revenue Code.

E. (4) $160.32; (5) $42; (6) $6.57; (7) $28.18; (8) $60; (9) $297.07; (10) $3,018.02; (11) $3,315.09; (15) $101.46, Smith-Brooks Printing Co., Denver, Colo., letterheads and envelopes; $28.25, Edna P. Hubbard, Symes Building, Denver, Colo., stenographic services; $58.86, Laman for Letters, Denver, Colo., mailing letter to membership; $60, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; $13.75, Russo and Russo, Symes Building, Denver, Colo., stenographic services; etc.[1]

A. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee,[1] 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.

C. (2) All legislation both general and special that affects the above-named railroads.

E. (2) $475; (7) $371.52; (9) $846.52; (10) $2,741.38; (11) $3,587.90; (15) $846.52, Leo J. Crowley, 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (2) Opposing S. 75 and H. R. 1500; favoring passage of Senate Joint Resolution 26 and House Joint Resolution 21. (3).[1]

E. (1) $2,408.10; (2) $9.942; (3) $334.49; (4) $3,123.94; (5) $1,882.61; (6) $992.02; (7) $4,883.81; (9) $23,566.97; (10) $69,055.73; (11) $92,622.70; (15) $110; Viola M. Adrian, 310 Lima Street, Burbank, Calif., salary; $15.33, Aldine Co., 232 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, office supplies; $66.96, Allen's Press Clipping Bureau, 124 West Fourth Street, Los Angeles, clipping service; $15, Amarillo Tent & Awning Co., Amarillo, Tex., display stand; $61.90, Max R. Brents, Imperial irrigation district, Imperial, Calif., expense account; $49.94, Burbank Chamber of Commerce, 162 East Orange Grove Avenue, Burbank, Calif., stationery, etc.[1]

A. Committee on National Affairs, 100 East Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $25.

E. (10) $1,224.82; (11) $1,224.82.

A. Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests: President Truman's national health plan as embodied in H. R. 27 and H. R. 54; also interested in the following measures: S. 337, S. 445, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 913, H. R. 14, H. R. 149, H. R. 342, H R. 416. (3).[1]

D. (6) $10,703.29.

E. (2) $5,404.34; (4) $385.62; (5) $2,071.17; (6) $236.90; (7) $332.46; (8) $308.51; (9) $8,789; (10) $29,050.32; (11) $37,789.32; (15) $750, estate of Henry K. Willard, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent; $590.38, postmaster, Washington, D. C., stamps and envelopes; $45, Washington Report on the Medical Sciences, 903 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., subscription renewal; $32.90, Eastern Photoprint Co., Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., photostat of a reprint; $92.36, Frederick E. Robin, 4415 Maple Avenue, Bethesda, Md., out-of-pocket expenses; $93.89, Channing Frothingham, 101 Bay Street Road, Boston, Mass., travel reimbursement, etc.[1]

A. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.

C. (2) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies was organized and functions to protect the legitimate interests of petroleum pipeline.[1]

E. (2) $9,644.24; (4) $649.44; (5) $523.61; (6) $233.91; (7) $525.31; (8) $1,901; (9) $13,477.51; (10) $32,180.55; (11) $45,658.06; (15) $3,694.40, Gordon C. Locke, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $410.16, Barbara L. Coogan, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $539.68, Flavia Ann Lee, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary; $5,000, Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., legal services; etc.[1]

A. Committee on the Present Danger, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Mutual Security Act of 1951.

D. (6) $2,651.74.

E. (1) $13.39; (2) $1,154.01; (5) $849.47; (6) $365.11; (7) $399.74; (8) $501.24; (9) $3,282.96; (10) $99,440.44; (11) $102,723.40; (15) $738, Kass Realty Co., 4461 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., office rent; $29.74, Wilfred J. Garvin, 1213 Radnor Place, Falls Church, Va., adjustment for deduction of FICA taxes in excess of $3,600; $132.16, Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding taxes; $39, Thomas J. Gletner, 2816 Eighth Street South, Arlington, Va., accounting services; $13.39, J. Walter Thompson Co., 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., advertising; etc.[1]

A. Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The committee is interested in amending existing shipping legislation in order to extend operating and construction differential subsidies to American-flag vessels engaged in so-called tramp trades. A bill to this effect has been introduced in the House as H. R. 5346.

E. (1) $1,250; (4) $30.10; (6) $23.23; (7) $522; (8) $75; (9) $1,900.33; (10) $1,116.91; (11) $3,017.24; (15) $1,250, Seth Levine, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., consultant; $650.33, American Foreign Steamship Corp., 80 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., printing, stationery, postage, telephone, traveling.

A. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union. (3) CWA News.

D. (6) $913,350.04.

E. (2) $3,195.30; (5) $10.20; (6) $322.47; (7) $13.36; (8) $3,541.33; (9) $3,778.94; (10) $7,320.27.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Arthur D. Condon, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

D. (6) $674.

A. D. C. Cone, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and all legislation directly affecting the interests of railroad employees in particular and labor in general.

D. (6) $100.

A. John C. Cone, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Pan American World Airways, Inc., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Very infrequently interested in any legislation, but may be interested in supporting or opposing any aviation legislation that might have a bearing on the operation of Pan American World Airways, Inc.

A. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives. (3) Legis-letter.

D. (6) $10,168.63.

E. (2) $1,775; (3) $6,000; (4) $601; (5) $430; (6) $900; (7) $22.75; (8) $439.88; (9) $10,168.63; (10) $20,552.32; (11) $30,720.95; (15) $925, Marguerite Nadonley, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., clerical salary; $850, Patricia Shilby, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., clerical salary; $22.75, Nathan Cowan, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C., travel; $4,000, CIO Housing Committee, 723 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution; $2,000, CIO Housing Committee, 723 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., contribution; $101, Cornelius Printing Co., 912 Burlington Avenue, Silver Spring, Md., printing and distribution costs; etc.[1]

A. Julian D. Conover, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.

D. (6) $2,500.

E. (6) $35.19; (7) $9.10; (9) $44.29; (10) $183.28; (11) $227.57.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 505 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Provisions of H. R. 4473 which were enacted as section 15 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) $12,500.

A. Cooperative League of the United States of America Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Defense of the general public interest of the American people; defense of the right of any group of people voluntarily to organize cooperative business enterprises without discrimination against them on the part of Government, and the securing of such enabling legislation for this purpose as may from time to time be necessary; the over-all problem of agriculture and the preservation of the family-sized farm; representation of the interest of the people as consumers: conservation of natural resources, and the extension of true economic freedom and the combating of monopoly.

E. (2) $500; (5) $125; (6) $50; (7) $210; (9) $840; (10) $2,520; (11) $3,360.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John T. Corbett, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, B. of L. E. Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting labor and transportation.
D.[1] (6) $3,294.56.
E. (5) $357.39; (6) $29.80; (9) $367.19; (10) $1,238.52; (11) $1,625.71.

A. Cordage Legislative Committee, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. Bills to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the free entry of baler twine, H. R. 1005 and S. 449, approved October 25, 1951, effective October 26, 1951; opposed.
D. (6) $600.
E. (2) $90; (4) $59.66; (5) $27.97; (6) $71.03; (7) $95.51; (9) $344.17; (10) $690.37; (11) $1,034.54; (15) $59.66, Cordage Institute, 350 Madison Avenue, New York City, mimeographing and mailing memoranda and circulars, including postage; $27.97, Pope & Vernum, Inc., 295 Madison Avenue, New York City, stationery and supplies; $41.03, Jackson, Nash, Bropy, Barringer & Brooks, 15 Broad Street, New York City, telephone and meeting expense; $54.33, Cordage Institute, 350 Madison Avenue, New York City, telephone charges.

A. Harold B. Corwin, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committee of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,120.

A. John M. Costello, 3434 Porter Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American League for an Undivided Ireland, care of Charles T. Rice, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation which may help to effectuate the unification of all Ireland.
D. (7) $1,558.
E. (4) $550.19; (6) $17.45; (7) $240.36; (9) $808; (10) $694.10; (11) $1,502.10; (16) $550.19, Government Printing Office, reprint congressional debate on rule for Fogarty resolution; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $17.45; TWA, round trip, Chicago, $80.50; the Calvert Shop, Washington, $140.36, entertainment.

A. Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices, 1 North La Salle Street, room 3500, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) S. 719 and H. R. 2820.
D. (6) $11,865.
E. (2) $10,000; (7) $4,200; (9) $14,200; (11) $14,200; (15) $14.200, Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, and William Simon, a partner, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., fees and expenses.

A. Council for Social Action, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Generally interested in welfare, international, civil liberties, and economic legislation where ethical principles of interest to the church are involved, such as point 4 program, grain for India, reciprocal trade agreements, farm labor legislation, and national housing program. (3) Social Action magazine and Advance.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $700; (4) $50; (5) $400; (6) $50; (7) $300; (9) $1,500; (10) $4,500; (11) $6,000.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Association, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.
C. (2) General interest in second-class postal rates; particular interest in H. R. 2982 and S. 1046.
D. (6) $1,721.73.
E. (2) $1,500; (8) $221.73; (9) $1,721.73; (10) $5,603.84; (11) $7,325.57; (15) $23.58, C. & P. Telephone Co., telephone and telegraph.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Harnischfeger Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) General interest in defense production and economic controls, tax increase, and housing legislation.
D. (6) $321.80.
E. (2) $300; (8) $21.80; (9) $321.80; (10) $3,150; (11) $3,471.80.

A. Nathan E. Cowan, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place, NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $2,795.
E. (7) $920; (9) $920; (10) $2,730; (11) $3,650.

A. W. W. Coxe, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
E. (10) $260.03; (11) $260.03.

A. Charles J. Crampton, 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.
B. State Tax Association, post-office box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) State and Federal tax legislation and administrative rulings and court decisions in tax matters affecting community property taxpayers inequitably.
E. (7) $43.20; (9) $43.20; (10) $1,275.04; (11) $1,318.24.

A. F. M. Crance, 408–409 Young Building, Lynchburg, Va.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act and other bills pertaining to labor.
D. (6) $532.20.
E. (2) $532.20; (7) $360; (9) 892.20; (10) $2,539.21; (11) $3,431.41.

A. W. A. Crawford, 545 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
B. Railroad Association of Georgia, 545 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga.
C. (2) The general legislative interests of the person filing this report concern legislation of general or specific relation to the railroads.
D.[1] (6) $3,750.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D.[1] (6) $13,754.62.
E. (10) $35.84; (11) $35.84.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, Denver, Colo.[1]
C. (2) All legislation, both general and special, that affects the railroads.
D. (6) $846.52.
E. (2) $475; (7) $371.52; (9) $846.52; (10) $2,741.38; (11) $3,587.90; (15) $151.52, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., accommodations, meals, and incidentals; $30.93, Pennsylvania Railroad, pullman accommodations and dining car services; $33.14, Union Pacific Railroad, Pullman accommodations and dining car services.

A. Leo P. Cullinane, 4906 Westway Drive, Washington, D. C.
B. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,230.32.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. General Refractories Co., 1520 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.; Harbison-Walker Refractories Co., Farmers Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; A. P. Green Fire Brick Co., Mexico, Mo.; North American Refractories Co., Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation involving percentage depletion allowances.
E. (10) $12.50; (11) $12.50.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of Margery Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.
C. (2) To extend to the estates of living incompetents the benefits of the Technical Changes Act of 1949.
D. (6) $3,500.
E. (6) $10.38; (7) $24.54; (9) $34.92; (11) $34.92.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Amendment of section 1000 (e) of Internal Revenue Code to permit an executor or administrator to release powers of disposition where the decedent was under a disability during his lifetime.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation and proceedings relating to postal rates.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (6) $29.06; (7) $5.50; (9) $34.56; (10) $318.09; (11) $352.65.

A. Ralph E. Curtiss, 944 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting tavern and restaurant industry.
D. (6) $1,900.
E. (6) $84.46; (7) $63.91; (9) $148.37; (10) $357.56; (11) $505.93.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the dairy industry.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. William L. Daley, 911 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Newspaper Publishers' Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 3760, H. R. 2682, H. R. 505, H. R. 2516, S. 1137, S. 719, H. R. 2188, H. R. 1514, S. 672, H. Res. 116, S. 106, H. R. 1768, H. R. 116, H. R. 525, H. R. 3341, H. R. 5575, S. 436, H. R. 5379, H. Res. 423, H. R. 5056, H. R. 4745, H. R. 5204, H. R. 4741, S. 2170. (3) The Publishers Tab and The National Publisher.
D. (6) $825
E. (5) $59.36; (6) $64.07; (7) $100; (8) $56.31; (9) $279.74; (10) $878.63; (11) $1,158.37; (15) $60.15, C. & P. Telephone Co., telephone service; $49.10, United States post office, postage.

A. William V. Dameron, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 277 and similar legislation dealing with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail; study of Federal legislation re same; examination of reported cases concerning constitutionality of proposed bills; preparation of legal memoranda and briefs re same; study of economic data and preparation of hearings.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (10) $10.95; (11) $10.95.

A. John A. Danaher, 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn., and 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 277 and similar legislation dealing with distribution of motor vehicle tires and prevention of manufacturers from selling goods at retail; study of Federal legislation re same; examination of reported cases concerning constitutionality of proposed bills; preparation of legal memoranda and briefs re same; study of economic data and preparation of hearings.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. N. R. Danielian, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) St. Lawrence legislation.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $1,523.14; (9) $1,523.14; (10) $2,882.30; (11) $4,405.44; (15).[1]

A. Paul J. Daugherty, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Ohio Chamber of Commerce, 820 Huntington Bank Building, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Such matters affecting business and commerce in Ohio as are referred to me from time to time by the Ohio Chamber of Commerce; proposals in the fields of taxation, general appropriations, old-age and survivors insurance, unemployment compensation, industrial development and other management problems.
D. (6) $2,749.98.
E. (10) $445.36; (11) $445.36.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Aled P. Davies, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the meat-packing industry.
D. (6) $2,307.72.
E. (6) $108.09; (7) $1,776.08; (9) $1,884.17; (10) $9,981.09; (11) $11,865.26.

A. Sherlock Davis, 1117 Barr Building, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Anything which pertains to sugar or trade with Cuba.

A. Homer R. Davison, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislature affecting the meat packing industry.
D. (6) $500.
E. (4) $60; (9) $60; (10) $2,163; (11) $2,223.

A. Robert N. Denham, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Continental Baking Co., 630 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Labor relations and general industrial regulatory legislation.
D. (6) $2,530.38.
E. (6) $11.11; (7) $19.27; (9) $30.38; (10) $209.06; (11) $239.44.

A. A. W. Dickinson, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policy, etc.
D. (6) $1,375.
E. (6) $0.25; (7) $8.80; (9) $9.05; (10) $88.20; (11) $97.25.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3408 and legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.
D. (6) $3,900.
E. (7) $1,300; (9) $1,300; (10) $3,400; (11) $4,700.

A. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV semimonthly.
E. (2) $5,066.60; (7) $95.41; (9) $5,162.01; (10) $14,544.22; (11) $19,706.23.

A. Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F. Street NW., Room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.[1]
D. (6) $1,365.68.
E. (7) $100.50; (9) $100.50; (10) $246.20; (11) $346.70.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Potash & Chemical Corp., Trona, Calif.
C. (2) Specific legislation was for percentage depletion.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Magnesia Talc Co., 206 Bank Street, Burlington, Vt.
C. (2) Specific legislation was for percentage depletion.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests include any matters affecting the natural-gas industry.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $188.55; (9) $188.55; (10) $1,001.64; (11) $1,190.19.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Talc Co., Inc., 41 Park Row, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Specific legislation was for percentage depletion.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Building Granite Quarries Association, 114 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Specific legislation was for percentage depletion.
D. (6) $8,000.

A. Wesley E. Disney, World Center Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Ozark-Mahoning Co., Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) Specific legislation employed was for percentage depletion.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (10) $30.25; (11) $30.25.

A. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the sale or distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $483.60.
E. (2) $300; (7) $183.60; (9) $483.60; (10) $1,608.75; (11) $2,092.35.

A. Homer Dodge, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation or policies involving a constitutional question.
D. (6) $870.

A. William C. Doherty, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $6,000.

A. W. J. Donald, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, elec-

tric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, electric fans, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor Management Relations Act.

A. Thomas J. Donovan, Tax Council of the Alcoholic Beverage Industries, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting excise taxes on alcoholic beverages. (3) America's Greatest Tax Leak.
D. (6) $50,806.63.
E. (3) $98.22; (4) $27.68; (5) $37.33; (7) $8,072.30; (8) $8,855.70; (9) $57,204.50; (10) $66,080.22; (15) $8,072.30, Glass & Lynch, 170 Broadway, New York, N. Y., retainer and miscellaneous expenditures; $620.17, Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y., public relations counsel; $58.83, Select Multigraph Service, 76 Ninth Avenue, New York, N. Y., preparing and mailing letters and releases; $39.39, Commerce Photo Print, 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y., photostats; $26.43, Postmaster, New York, N. Y., postage; $37.33, New York Telephone Co., New York, N. Y., telephone.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.
D. (6) $90.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.[1]
D. (6) $1,239.12.
E. (7) $28.65; (9) $28.65; (10) $52.70; (11) $81.35.

A. John E. Dougherty, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.[1]
D. (6) $2,271.07.
E. (9) $43.90.

A. Robert E. Dougherty, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interest of the lumber manufacturing industry.
D. (6) $1,850.
E. (7) $168.50; (9) $168.50; (10) $815.50; (11) $984.

A. John H. Davis, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951; S. 892, Revenue Act of 1951. (3) Washington Situation.
D. $3,874.98.
E. (7) $226.92; (9) $226.92; (10) $1,091.26; (11) $1,318.18.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Fayette B. Dow, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies is interested in any legislation which if enacted would divorce pipe lines that are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act from their existing owning companies.

A. M. J. Dowd, El Centro, Calif.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
E. (10) $1,689.06; (11) $1,689.06.

A. Adin M. Downer, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combatting of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the National Council of Administration. (3) VFW Foreign Service and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (7) $7; (9) $7; (10) $65.80; (11) $72.80.

A. Sheridan Downey, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Board of Harbor Commissioners of Long Beach, Calif., 1333 El Embarcadero, Long Beach, Calif.
C. (2) These legislative interests relate to all proposed legislation which will affect the controversy between the Federal Government and Long Beach concerning title to the inland and territorial waters off the coast of California.
D. (7) $9,000.
E. (2) $2,719; (5) $1,106.87; (6) $443.55; (7) $817.32; (9) $5,086.74; (10) $13,987.95; (11) $18,974.69.

A. W. A. Dozier, Jr., 17 Molton Street, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Medical Association of the State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.
C. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action; pending legislation and legislative actions are reported to all members of the association. (3) PR Notes.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (4) $225; (9) $225; (10) $675; (11) $900.

A. Robert M. Drysdale, Jr., Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Federation for Railway Progress, Railway Progress Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 436, Airmail subsidy bill, for, with amendments; S. 1134, S. 1139, S. 1143, S. 1146, S. 1150, Hoover Commission bills, no position; S. 1335, H. R. 3465, to readjust size and weight of parcel-post shipments, against; H. R. 4572, S. 1018, to alleviate freight car shortages, for; H. R. 4473, 1951 tax revision bill, against increase in corporate taxes for railroad companies.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (2) $157.50; (4) $5.16; (5) $200.10; (6) $57.31; (7) $267.24; (9) $687.31; (10) $2,612.05; (11) $3,299.36.

A. Stephen M. DuBrul, 5-141 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
E. (6) $36.96; (7) $604.95; (9) $641.91; (15) $96.86, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; $137.62, Plaza Hotel, New York City, N. Y., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; $38.72, Waldorf-Astoria, New York City, N. Y., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, laundry, valet, etc.; $11.94, Michigan Bell Telephone, Detroit, Mich., telephone calls; $64.68, Wabash Railroad, transportation; etc.[1]

A. Alice Dunlap, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting libraries and librarians.[1]

A. Read Dunn, Jr., 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, post office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
E. (10) $232.85; (11) $232.85.

A. William M. Dunn, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of the union.

A. Joseph L. Dwyer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Petroleum legislation, S. 1498, Senate Resolution 50, and various petroleum bills before House Interstate Commerce Committee; current tax bills, Senate Joint Resolution 42 and House Joint Resolution 206.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $328.63.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense Production Act.
D. (6) $19.86.
E. (2) $24.81; (4) 54 cents; (5) $1.64; (7) 74 cents; (8) 21 cents; (9) $37.94; (11) $37.94; (15) $16.06, LaRue, Brown and Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., counsel fee and expense; $10.39, C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., secretary, salary and expense.

A. George S. Eaton, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association, 906 Public Square Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Bills especially affecting the interests of contract tool and die shops, which are small businesses.
D. (6) $300.

A. John W. Edelman, 910 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.[1]
D.[1] (6) $2,017.66.
E. (7) $392.66; (9) $392.66; (10) $995.72; (11) $1,388.38.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Bernard H. Ehrlich, 1367 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1940 and other legislation relating to GI education for Korean veterans.
D. (6) $600.
E. (6) $42.25; (9) $42.25; (10) $12.50; (11) $54.75.

A. Louis Eisenstein (on behalf of the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pabco Products, Inc., 475 Brannan Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) An amendment to section 444 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide more equitable excess-profits taxation for expanding companies; section 520 of the Revenue Act of 1951, H. R. 4473, contains this amendment.
D. (6) $25,000.
E. (6) $105.18; (7) $2; (8) $36.72; (9) $145.90; (10) $103.61; (11) $249.51.

A. Courtleigh W. Eliason, 5-139 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,973.48; (15) $254.76, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging, meals, telephone, telegraph, valet, and laundry; $12, Hotel Cleveland, Cleveland, Ohio, lodging; $61.16, Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, lodging, telephone, meals, and laundry, $124.60; Southern Pacific Railroad, transportation; $56.37, Multnomah Hotel, Portland, Oreg., lodging, meals, telephone, valet, laundry; $69.09, Western Pacific Railroad, transportation, meals, etc.[1]

A. Newell W. Ellison, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Accountants and its members, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. S. 17, to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies, against, unless amended; H. R. 3097, to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; S. 1725, to protect the public with respect to the practice of the law by those other than duly licensed attorneys and counselors at law, before the United States Government departments, bureaus, commissions, and agencies, and in the United States tax courts, against.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $60.80; (9) $60.80; (10) $72.30; (11) $123.10.

A. John H. Else, 302 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, 302 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the retail lumber and building materials dealer.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $250.73; (9) $250.73; (10) $427.08; (11) $617.81.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Promotion toward passage of H. R. 2678, Eighty-second Congress, first session, generally known as the Townsend plan.
D. (6) $910.
E. (7) $292.62; (9) $292.62; (10) $138.86; (11) $431.48.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Law offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (10) $194.71; (11) $194.71.

A. Law offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River and other matters, including S. 75, to authorize the Central Arizona project; H. J. Res. 42 and counterparts, Central Arizona project examination and report, and H. J. Res. 21, S. J. Res. 26 and counterparts, Colorado River litigation resolutions; S. 18, adjudication of water rights; Public Law 171, San Diego Aqueduct.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Law offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 512 Sixteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (10) $152.72; (11) $152.72.

A. Law offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River and other matters, including S. 75, to authorize the Central Arizona project, H. J. Res. 42 and counterparts, Central Arizona project examination and report, and H. J. Res. 21, S. J. Res. 26 and counterparts, Colorado River litigation resolutions, H. R. 2813 and S. 943, Collbran project; Public Law 171, San Diego aqueduct.
D. (6) $2,550.28.
E. (4) $142.49; (6) $35.06; (7) $250; (8) $22.73; (9) $450.28; (10) $705.65; (11) $1,155.93; (15) $17.56, Western Union Telegraph Co., Washington, D. C., telegrams; $17.50, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone, long distance; $95.66, Henry Schroen, Albee Building, Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $46.83, Leet Bros., Washington, D. C., Photostating; $250, airline companies, hotels, etc., travel.

A. Law offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Six Agency Committee and Colorado River Board of California, 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River and other matters, including S. 75, to authorize the Central Arizona project, House Joint Resolution 42 and counterparts, Central Arizona project examination and report, and House Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 26 and counterparts, Colorado River litigation resolutions, H. R. 2813 and S. 943, Collbran project; Public Law 171, San Diego aqueduct.
D. (6) $6,513.18.
E. (6) $15.38; (7) $248.86; (8) $18.94; (9) $283.18; (10) $757.54; (11) $1,040.72; (15) $15.38, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service; $23.86, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner conferences; $225, airline companies, motels, etc.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Law offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on legislation affecting the Central Valley project including Public Law 136, Interior Department appropriations, 1952; H. R. 413, Kings River Water Rights; H. R. 6 and H. R. 7, saltwater research; H. R. 1637, National Water Resources basic data; S. 75, Central Arizona project; Public Law 171, San Diego aqueduct; H. R. 5368, Santa Margarita River; S. 18, adjudication of water rights; S. 943 and H. R. 2813, Collbran project.
D. (6) $1,584.15.
E. (7) $84.15; (9) $84.15; (11) $84.15.

A. Law Offices of Northcutt Ely,[1] 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Conferences and reports to clients on H. R. 4963, civil functions appropriations bill, 1952; S. 528 and H. R. 1618, California levee and flood-control damage; and H. R. 1307, flood control on Redwood Creek, Humboldt County, Calif.

A. Emergency Committee of Small- and Medium-Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Interested in H. R. 2982 and S. 1046, postal rate legislation.
E. (2) $1,500; (6) $122.13; (7) $93.18; (8) $122.40; (9) $1,837.71; (10) $10,089.10; (11) $11,926.81; (15) $1,837.71, Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., fees and expenses.

A. Leon J. Engel, 20 Hopkins Place, Baltimore, Md.
C. (2) Excise taxes.

A. Oliver F. Erickson, 1016 Twentieth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Master Plumbers, 1016 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Herman Fakler, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation dealing with wheat and wheat flour.
E. (10) $8.90; (11) $8.90.

A. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (legislative office).
C. (2) The general legislative interests of this organization are all matters affecting the interests of farmers or matters which from time to time may be regarded by the board of directors as affecting the program of the National Farmers Union as set forth in the program adopted by the convention of the National Farmers Union.[1]
D. (6) $183,366.50.
E. (15) $39.20, Angus McDonald, Washington, D. C., travel, telephone, and newspaper expense; $103.84, Dorchester House, Washington, D. C., rent; $81.23, The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service; $16.90, Telephone Secretary, Washington, D. C., secretarial service; $15, Mountain Valley Water Co., Washington, D. C., water service; $22, The National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues; etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Charles J. Farrington, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All Small Business Committee legislation, tax-revision, funds for public roads, highway-safety legislation.
D. (6) $6,249.99.
E. (7) $1,836.30; (9) $1,836.30; (10) $3,183.82; (11) $5,020.12.

A. Donald D. Farshing, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (7) $87.65; (9) $87.65; (10) $415.90; (11) $503.55.

A. Harold E. Fellows, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.[1]

A. Abner H. Ferguson, 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.
D. (6) $900.
E. (6) $10.71; (9) $10.71; (10) $53.95; (11) $64.66.

A. John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite, 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tax legislation and any other bills affecting the natural-gas industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (10 $973.68; (11) $973.88.

A. Josiah Ferris, 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Sugar Corp., Clewiston, Fla.; Fellsmere Sugar Producers Association, Fellsmere, Fla.; American Sugar Cane League, New Orleans, La.

A. Stephen E. Fitzgerald, doing business as the Stephen Fitzgerald Co., 502 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.; and Raymond C. Baker and Jay Richter, as employees.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Assists the NAEC in articulating and expressing its point of view with respect to general legislative questions which affect the interests of the public and of electric light and power companies.
D. (7) $14,576.16.
E. (4) $7.54; (6) $337.67; (7) $1,482.86; (8) $248.09; (9) $2,076.16.

A. F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation in the general field of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. George E. Flather, Jr., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Section 131, Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $1,820.
E. (6) $16.88; (8) $55.25; (9) $72.13; (10) $69.14; (11) $141.27.

A. Donald G. Fletcher, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Rust Prevention Association, 745 McKnight Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting funds for research on plant-disease control and crop improvement; items in Agriculture Department's budget affecting research and control work on black-stem rust through plant breeding and barberry eradication.
D. (6) $1,625.
E. (2) $325; (4) $184; (5) $107.25; (6) $59.25; (7) $84.67; (9) $760.37; (10) $2,993.53; (11) $3,753.90.

A. W. G. Flinn, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.
C. (2) Potentially interested in all legislation affecting river and harbor works, flood control, and other water use and conservation, and related subjects. Specific legislative interest during this calendar year (1951) included appropriations for civil functions of the Army, H. R. 4386.
E. (2) $1,350; (8) $49.64; (9) $1,399.64; (10) $4,215.70; (11) $5,615.34; (15) $1,409.44, Henry H. Buckman, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.

A. Florida Railroad Association,[1] 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.
C. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association.
D. (6) $2,512.50.
E. (2) $1,320; (6) $27; (9) $1,337; (10) $4,116.08; (11) $5,453.08.

A. E. F. Forbes, 604 Mission Street, suite 906–907, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 906–907, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat-packing industry; elimination of Government controls from our industry, as imposed under the Defense Production Act of 1950; advocating the effective methods and principles of the free-price system.
D. (6) $5,000.04.

A. Aaron L. Ford, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Nicholas B. Perry, 1841 Columbia Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Retained to assist in obtaining passage of a private bill to provide compensation from blocked or vested funds to Nicholas B. Perry for losses suffered as a result of seizure of his property by the Governments of Rumania or Hungary, or either of them.
E. (7) $5.25; (9) $5.25; (11) $5.25.

A. Mrs. J. A. Ford, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679, bills to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60. (3) The Townsend National Weekly.
D. (6) $1,040.

A. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Box 692, Valdosta, Ga.
C. (2) Agricultural appropriations bill for 1952 (forestry items), H. R. 3904, S. 1767, H. R. 2752, S. 1149, and H. R. 5474. (3) The Forest Farmer.
E. (4) $7.75; (9) $7.75; (10) $9.15; (11) $923.65.

A. J. Carter Fort, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally to keep informed with respect to legislation affecting transportation; to support such legislation as members of the Association of American Railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy; and to oppose legislation which they believe to be contrary to such interests.[1]
D. (6) $6,343.32.
E. (7) $211.46; (9) $211.46; (10) $296.90; (11) $508.36.

A. Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV semimonthly.
D. (6) $2,160.

A. George H. Frates, 1163 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retail Druggists.
C. (2) To oppose legislation detrimental to independent retail druggists and to further legislation favorable to the profession. (3) NARD Journal.
D. (6) $2,800.
E. (2) $675; (5) $399; (6) $105; (9) $1,179; (10) $2,396; (11) $3,575.

A. Dr. John H. Frederick, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation having anything to do with transportation including pending bills before the House and Senate.
D. (6) $2,166.88.
E. (9) $216.88; (10) $319.48; (11) $608.36.

A. Fred J. Fredrickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C. (Home address: 247 Third Street SW., Valley City, N. Dak.)
B. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $2,867.19.
E. (5) $142.48; (6) $172.34; (7) $816.37; (9) $1,131.19; (10) $4,253.33; (11) $5,284.52.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. H. Maurice Fridlund, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Alloys Development Co., 2537 Koppers Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) For H. R. 4054, to provide patent extensions.
D. (6) $520.
E. (7) $20; (9) $20; (11) $20.

A. H. Maurice Fridlund, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 3715 and H. R. 3797, to amend Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950; for these bills or equivalent.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control and reduction of armaments; recognition of its responsibility on the part of the United States Government for assuming its share in the burden for world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties; and adequate recognition of rights of conscience.
D. (6) $13,391.56.
E. (2) $5,878.44; (3) $150; (4) $2,447.24; (5) $1,401.34; (6) $219.66; (7) $873.95; (8) $797.21; (9) $11,767.84; (10) $39,577.39; (11) $51,345.23; (15) $32.87, Addressograph-Multigraph Corp., 1200 Babbitt Road, Cleveland, Ohio, office supplies; $46.95, Ellen S. Brinton, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., travel and services; $172.81, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., telephone; $595.60, National Savings & Trust Co., Fifteenth and New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., withholding taxes deposited; $283.50, collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding taxes; $32.64, Congressional Quarterly News Features, 1156 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., subscription; etc.[1]

A. George M. Fuller, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry, American industry, and free enterprise.
D. (6) $4,075.
E. (7) $975.98;[1] (9) $3,567.93; (10) $4,543.91.

A. Wallace H. Fulton, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Charles E. Gage, 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Room 904, Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Minnesota railroads.[1]
C. (2) Interested in all matters affecting railroads, and particularly any matters relating to Railroad Retirement Act and proposed amendments; Interstate Commerce Act and proposed amendments; Federal Employers' Liability Act and proposed amendments.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $578.24; (9) $578.24; (10) $356.06; (11) $934.30; (15) $13.28, Pullman Co., Chicago, Ill.; $173.58, Taft Hotel, New York City, N. Y.; $13.28, Pullman Co., Chicago, Ill.; $172.61, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Earl H. Gammons, 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., 485 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation applicable to or affecting the radio and/or television industry, including S. 658, S. 1579, Senate Resolution 127, H. R. 10, H. R. 73, H. R. 4473.
E. (7) $142.41; (9) $142.41; [1] (10) $248.84; (11) $391.25.

A. Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, 1126 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Lehigh Valley Railroad Co., 143 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y.; Agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; and other holders of awards of Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, World War I.
C. (2) Legislation relating to World War I awards of the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, such as H. R. 6074, Eighty-first Congress; H. R. 4702 and H. R. 5802, Eighty-second Congress.
E. (6) $3.25; (7) $58.58; (9) $61.83; (10) $120.53; (11) $182.36.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops.
D. (6) $2,289.25.
E. (8) $1.75; (9) $1.75; (10) $36.91; (11) $38.66.

A. Francis J. Garvey, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Explanation and analysis of Federal bills; rendering of advice concerning their relationship to ADA policy.
D. (6) $2,425.90.

A. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.,[1] 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc.
E. (10) $4,887.72; (11) $4, 887.72.

A. Mrs. Paul Gebhard, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. The Board of Christian Education of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.

A. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
E. (10) $7,353.80; (11) $7,353.80.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) H. R. 2982, S. 1046, H. R. 30, H. R. 525, H. R. 3392, S. 1335, H. R. 3465, Senate Joint Resolution 60, House Joint Resolution 235, S. 1369.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. J. M. George, H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, constituting the partnership of George, Brehmer & McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) H. R. 2982, S. 1046, H. R. 30, H. R. 525, H. R. 3392, S. 1335, H. R. 3465, Senate Joint Resolution 60, House Joint Resolution 235, S. 1369, H. R. 3298, S. 345, S. 1186.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Leo E. George, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Union Postal Clerk.
D. (6) $4,000.

A. John S. Gibson, Sibbett Building, Douglas, Ga.
B. St. Marys Kraft Corp., St. Marys, Ga.
C. (2) An appropriation for dredging at St. Marys Harbor and up St. Marys River.
D. (6) $750.
E. (10) $476.97; (11) $476.97.

A. Ernest Giddings, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $1,340.83.
E. (7) $42.10; (9) $42.40; (10) $173.15; (11) $215.25.

A. C. C. Gilbert, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
C. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system.
D. (6) $2,012.50.

A. William Glazier, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in legislation affecting trade-unions and their members and the maritime industry as well.
E. (10) $1,694.63; (11) $1,694.63.

A. Richard Gonzales, 825 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Farm Labor Union, AFL, 825 Victor Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Farm-labor legislation, immigration, social security, housing, health, fair-labor standards, labor relations.
D. (6) $2,050.
E. (2) $2,050; (10) $2,309.65; (11) $4,359.65.

A. Dr. H. T. Gordon, post-office box No. 2214, Washington, D. C.
B. The Townsend Legislative Bureau, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679, to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement, with benefits, etc., at age 60,

and also covering total disability, from any cause, etc.
D. (6) $910; (9) $50; (11) $50.
E. (7) $444.42; (9) $444.42.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., suite 603, Washington, D. C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Bills affecting the public health such as H. R. 910 and S. 2301, nurses' education aid; H. R. 5215, funds for National Science Foundation; H. R. 4473, hospital exemption from admissions tax; S. 337, medical education aid.
D. (6) $375.

A. Government Employees' Council, American Federation of Labor, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation that affects Government employees is of interest to this council.
D. (6) $4,060.29.
E. (2) $3,034.06; (4) $232.05; (5) $490.20; (6) $121.13; (8) $251; (9) $4,128.44; (10) $14,194.93; (11) $18,323.37; (15) $2,230.06, Thomas G. Waters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $804, Gladys M. Monroe, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary.

A. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
D. (6) $505.80.
E. (10) $293.56; (11) $293.56.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) To promote general interests of locomotive firemen and enginemen.
D. (6) $10.50.
E. (2) $3,686.65; (5) $398.85; (6) $56.36; (7) $848.89; (8) $31.53; (9) $5,022.28; (10) $16,300.24; (11) $21,322.52; (15) $2,500.03, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,186.62, Glenn C. Russell, 310 Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., salary; $337.50, Labor, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C., rent; $30, Jonas A. McBride, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., postage; $12.45, Mallorey Office Supply Co., 732 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., supplies; etc.[1]

A. Cassius B. Gravitt, Jr., 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate.
D. (6) $1,375.

A. David G. Gray, Humble Oil & Refining Co., Houston, Tex.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., post-office box 3180, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Legislation affecting business in general.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, 821 Cafritz Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) St. Lawrence legislation.
D. (6) $30,948.50.
E. (1) $1,807.65; (2) $9,843.27; (4) $1,521.50; (5) $1,470.26; (6) $782.29; (7) $2,242.88; (8) $362.58; (9) $18,030.43; (10) $83,182.69; (11) $101,213.12; (15) Enders Advertising, Inc., Washington, D. C., printing, $107.06; Postmaster, Washington, D. C., postage, $375.76; Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., restaurant, $15.07; National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues, $12; Colony Restaurant, Washington, D. C., restaurant, $23.72; etc.[1]

A. Ernest W. Greene, 731 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, post-office box 2450, Honolulu, T. H.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are general in character and we are interested in any legislation which affects the coal industry.
D. (7) $3,200.

A. Mrs. Enid H. Griswold, 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
D. (6) $685.
E. (10) $85; (11) $85.

A. John J. Gunther, 1740 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (7) $444.81; (9) $444.81; (10) $449.58; (11) $939.39.

A. Violet M. Gunther, 1740 K Street, Washington, D. C.
B. Americans for Democratic Action, 1740 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills covered by convention-adopted program of organization.
D. (6) $1,462.50.
E. (7) $297.15; (9) $297.15; (10) $604.38; (11) $901.53.

A. David J. Guy, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (10) $32.65; (11) $32.65.

A. Frank E. Haas, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect western railroads.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
B. CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support legislation in interest of seamen; oppose legislation detrimental to them.
D. (6) $1,560.
E. (6) $64.75; (7) $98.37; (9) $163.12; (10) $704.32; (11) $867.45.

A. Radford Hall, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (10) $2,180.23.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $2,395.80.
E. (7) $199.93; (9) $199.93; (10) $729.27; (11) $929.20.

A. Harry G. Hamlet, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits, and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services, the Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $750.

A. Joseph J. Hammer, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,417.58.
E. (6) $5.28; (7) $287.30; (9) $292.58; (10) $1,498.66; (11) $1,791.24.

A. Murray Hanson, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Tax and other legislation affecting the securities business.
D. (7) $600.
E. (2) $97.50; (5) $134.16; (6) $34.08; (7) $141.91; (9) $407.65; (10) $1,570.21; (11) $1,977.86; (15) $407.65.

A. Ralph W. Hardy, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is interested in any legislation—local, State, Federal, or international—which affects the broadcasting industry.[1]

A. L. James Harmanson, Jr., 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to transportation, legal, and tax matters of interest to farmers cooperatives. (3) Washington Situation.
D. (6) $2,274.84.
E. (7) $178.03; (9) $178.03; (10) $257.16; (11) $435.19.

A. Harnischfeger Corp., Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (2) General interest in defense production and economic controls, tax increase, and housing legislation.
E. (2) $300; (8) $21.80; (9) $321.80; (10) $3,150; (11) $3,471.80; (15) $321.80, Donald

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

M. Counihan, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Miss Elsie D. Harper, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Narcotics, settlement of refugees, child-care centers in defense-housing areas, foreign aid, point 4, and UN appropriations.
E. (2) $150; (4) $70; (6) $20; (7) $60; (9) $300; (11) $300.

A. Robert E. Harper, 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Suite 55, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $2.80; (9) $2.80; (10) $72.93; (11) $75.73.

A. Winder R. Harris, 441 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Maritime matters; interested in passage of S. 241, to amend Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

A. Merwin K. Hart, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
B. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) My legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.
E. (10) $284.63; (11) $284.63.

A. Stephen H. Hart, 350 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.
B. National Live Stock Tax Committee,[1] 515 Cooper Building Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Interested in general livestock tax matters including specifically proposed amendments to the Internal Revenue Code concerning capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deduction of soil conservation, brush control and other ranching expenditures.

A. John E. Hartshorn, 1625 K. Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation involving percentage depletion allowances.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $3,375.
E. (7) $59.05; (9) $59.05; (10) $259.05; (11) $38.10.

A. Kit H. Haynes, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) General agricultural and farmer cooperative legislation. (3) Washington situation.
D. (6) $2,025.
E. (10) $148.86; (11) $148.86.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 474 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Interested in any and all Federal legislative proposals which may or do affect Western Railroads.

A. John C. Hazen, suite 808, Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Drygoods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) H. R. 1938, all appropriation legislation, all parcel post legislation, H. R. 3622, S. 1309, H. R. 5505, S. 2170, H. R. 5189, H. R. 5767, H. R. 5101. (3) Stores.
E. (6) $17.54; (7) $58.95; (8) $2.50; (9) $78.99; (10) 219.58; (11) $298.57.

A. Thomas P. Healy, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Communications Workers of America, CIO, 1808 Adams Mill Road NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting the interests of the membership of this union.
D. (6) $1,533.79.
E. (2) $1,462.52; (7) $68.52; (8) $2.75; (9) $1,533.79; (10) $3,169.36; (11) $4,703.15.

A. Felix Hebert, 602 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
B. Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Companies, Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.
C. (2) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code, Section 207.
E. (7) $232.20; (9) $232.20; (10) $234.66; (11) $466.86.

A. K. W. Heberton, room 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General legislative interests cover any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company.
E. (7) $83.35; (9) $83.35; (10) $401.02; (11) $484.37.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Parents' Committee, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) National school health services bill, public school construction bill, national child research bill, Federal aid for medical education, local public health units, physically handicapped children's education bill, school lunch appropriation, children's bureau appropriation, cabinet status for the Federal Security Agency, Federal aid to day care centers in defense areas, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, emergency maternal and infant care, defense housing and community facilities.

A. Leo J. Heer, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 822, Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Defense Production Act, seek retention of Herlong amendment; oppose principle of Federal sales tax. (3) National Furniture.
D. (6) $500.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $250; (11) $275.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y., and 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense Production Act.
D. (6) $875.01.
E. (7) $164.25; (9) $164.25; (11) $164.25.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense Production Act.
D. (6) $1,644.20.
E. (7) $1,302.71; (9) $1,302.71; (11) $1,302.71.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.
D. (6) $2,202.47.
E. (7) $12.40; (9) $12.40; (10) $226.65; (11) $239.05.

A. Maurice G. Herndon, 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Insurance Agents, 60 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y., and 1002 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which affects either directly or indirectly the interests of local agents. (3) The American Agency Bulletin.
D. (6) $114.23.
E. (7) $114.23; (9) $114.23; (10) $529.55; (11) $643.78.

A. Ewart A. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation affecting the brewing industry, wool industry, etc.[1]
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Robert C. Hibben, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 1103 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which may affect the ice-cream industry.

A. M. F. Hicklin, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee,[1] 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.
E. (10) $2,567.08; (11) $2,567.08.

A. H. C. Hicks, 2201 North Oak Street, Arlington, Va.
B. Association of Petroleum Re-refiners, 2201 North Oak Street, Arlington, Va.
D. (6) $600.

A. Ray C. Hinman, 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,427.01.
E. (6) $10.31; (7) $166.70; (9) $177.01; (10) $301.14; (11) $478.15.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John L. Hoen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., and Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc., 40 Central Street, Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Any legislature affecting the interest of the American Merchant Marine.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,999.98.
E. (7) $3,800; (9) $3,800; (10) $11,150; (11) $14,950.

A. Donald D. Hogate, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Brantford Cordage Co. Ltd., Brantford, Ontario, Canada.
C. (2) Passage of H. R. 1005 to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of baler twine.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (4) $80.38; (5) $75; (6) $21.39; (7) $70.50; (8) $7.60; (9) $254.87; (10) $823.83; (11) $1,078.70; (15) $66.78, Henry M. Schroen, 820 Albee Building, Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $13.60, Ever-Ready Sterro Service, 1741 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., typing.

A. Robert L. Hogg, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All prospective legislation which will or may affect the life insurance business.[1]
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (6) $26.19; (7) $366.34; (9) $392.53; (10) $940.33; (11) $1,332.86.

A. Charles W. Holman, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.
D. (6) $4,125.
E. (10) $5.90; (11) $5.90.

A. J. M. Hood, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Victor Hood, Twelfth and Delaware Streets, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors' International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware Streets, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The District Barber Act, Veterans Regulation Act, Defense Production Act, S. 573, H. R. 1656, H. R. 3102, H. R. 1668, S. 1717, H. R. 3871.
D. (6) $1,901.56.
E. (7) $521.56; (9) $521.56; (10) $2,363.79; (11) $2,885.35.

A. Richard Hooker, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act; House Resolution 426, to study integrating railroad retirement funds with social security; all legislation of interest to railroad employees and labor in general.
D. (6) $100.

A. Jesse V. Horton, room 100, Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, post-office box 2013, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the postal service and its employees, including supervisors. (3) The Postal Supervisor.
D. (6) $2,125.
E. (7) $134.78; (9) $134.78; (10) $319.53; (11) $454.31.

A. S. H. Howard, 1414 Evergreen Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act, and all legislation directly affecting the interests of railroad employees in particular and labor in general.
D. (6) $600.

A. Robert B. House, employed by Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. New Process Co., Warren, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation and proceedings relating to postal rates.

A. Harold K. Howe, Suite C, 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Laundering, box 1187, Joliet, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof.
D. (6) $2,649.99.
E. (2) $929; (7) $470.89; (9) $1,399.89; (10) $5,186.49; (11) $6,586.38.

A. Robert E. Howe, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.[1]
D. (6) $3,302.

A. Hudson, Creyke & Lipscomb, 400 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
D. (6) $2,400.
E. (7) $755.16; (9) $755.16; (10) $4.75; (11) $759.91.

A. W. T. Huff, 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation generally favorable to economic development of airline operation.
D. (6) $2,201.03.
E. (7) $242.90; (9) $242.90.

A. C. A. Hummel, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis.
B. Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroads and transportation generally.
D. (6) $348.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

E. (7) $304.83; (9) $304.83; (10) $559.91; (11) $864.74; (15) $90.86, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging; $54.15, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging; $18.50, The Good Earth, Washington, D. C., meals; $14.75, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals; $20.99, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., pullman space; etc.[1]

A. Carroll B. Huntress, 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.
B. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project; House Joint Resolution 337, opposed.
E. (6) $86.32; (7) $1,276.38; (9) $1,362.70; (10) $3,552.89; (11) $4,915.59.

A. George Hurley, 49 Westminster Street, Room 810, Providence, R. I.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting mutual savings banks which may be before the House Ways and Means Committee or Congress.
D. (6) $3,500.
E. (6) $7.51; (9) $7.51; (10) $1,721.60; (11) $1,729.11.

A. William C. Hushing, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,730.
E. (2) $2,730; (6) $20.50; (8) $228.50; (9) $2,979; (10) $8,411; (11) $11,390.

A. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
E. (11) $41,040.73.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tax legislation, and any other bills affecting the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $24,340.90.
E. (2) $5,750; (5) $300; (9) $6,050; (10) $31,683.93; (11) $40,733.93; (15) $3,750, John A. Ferguson, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,250, W. E. Disney, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $750, Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $300, Herbert Harvey Real Estate, Inc., 912 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent.

A. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.
E. (1) $7,773.45; (2) $2,800; (4) $2,275; (5) $22.87; (6) $18.32; (7) $462.10; (8) $33.07; (9) $13,384.81; (10) $17,360.02; (11) $30,744.83; (15) $620.60, Betty Palmer, Indianapolis, Ind., salary; $1,883.20, James A. Waggener, Indianapolis, Ind., salary; $168.78, James A. Waggener, Indianapolis, Ind., traveling expenses; $18.32, Indiana Bell Telephone Co., Indianapolis, Ind., tolls; $28.07, Columbia Club, Indianapolis, Ind., luncheon meeting; $296.20, Fletcher Trust Co., Indianapolis, Ind., income tax withheld; etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. The Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Board of Trade Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Bills affecting equality of taxation.
D. (6) $35.
E. (2) $600; (4) $117.72; (6) $7.40; (9) $725.12; (10) $3,695.08; (11) $4,420.20; (15) $600; Maurice C. Gronendyke, salary; $117.72, Indiana State Chamber of Commerce, printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost.

A. William Ingles, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting industry.
D. (6) $6,324.50.
E. (2) $600; (5) $797.01; (6) $200.26; (7) $231.60; (8) $360; (9) $2,188.87; (10) $9,301.50; (11) $11,490.37.

A. J. Stuart Innerst, 426 North Raymond Avenue, Pasadena, Calif.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Work in the general field of constructive foreign policy, support of the United Nations; international reduction of armaments; and opposition to the enactment of the Universal Military Training and Universal Military Service Act of 1951.
D. (6) $400.01.
E. (2) $34; (4) $5.24; (5) $13.07; (6) $5.43; (7) $46.76; (9) $104.50; (10) $369.45; (11) $473.95.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.
D. (6) $1,650.
E. (1) $750; (4) $250; (5) $150; (6) $200; (7) $300; (9) $1,650; (10) $4,950; (11) $6,600.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, room 311-222, East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Federal and State legislation affecting the interest and welfare of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, including its affiliate local unions and members.
E. (2) $3,750; (9) $3,750; (10) $11,250; (11) $15,000; (16) $15,000, Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C., services.

A. Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
C. (2) H. R. 2982, S. 1046, H. R. 30, H. R. 525, H. R. 3392, H. R. 3465, Senate Joint Resolution 60, S. 1335, House Joint Resolution 235, S. 1369, H. R. 3298, S. 1186.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (10) $80.73; (11) $80.73.

A. Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc., 463 Westwood Drive, Ames, Iowa.
C. (2) H. R. 240, H. R. 1177, S. 892, H. R. 4473; favor those calling for real tax equality as it applies to payment of income taxes on annual net profits, savings, earnings, etc.
D. (6) $25.
E. (2) $893.25; (4) $10.40; (5) $26.37; (6) $109.60; (7) $92.69; (8) $77.37; (9) $1,209.68; (10) $7,981.99; (11) $9,191.67.

A. Seward H. Jacobi, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
B. Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 119 Monona Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting business and industry.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. C. Clinton James, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Building and Loan League, No. 1 Thomas Circle, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Federal legislation affecting savings and loan business.
D. (6) $300.
E. (5) $125; (9) $125; (10) $485; (11) $610.

A. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.[1]
E. (1) $37.50; (2) $900; (3) $428.30; (4) $44.20; (5) $294.16; (6) $49.32; (7) $41.45; (8) $8.41; (9) $1,803.34;[1] (10) $4,558.45; (11) $6,361.79.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn.; Bell Clay Co., Gleason, Tenn.; United Clay Mines Corp., Trenton, N. J.; Old Hickory Clay Co., Paducah, Ky.; Kentucky-Tennessee Clay Co., Cooley Clay Co., and Kentucky Clay Mining Co., Mayfield, Ky.
C. (2) We are interested in retaining our present percentage depletion allowance for ball and sagger clays as shown in title 26, section 114, Internal Revenue Code, as now shown in House bill H. R. 4473.
D. (6) $4,608.73.
E. (6) $17.19; (7) $578.18; (8) $13.36; (9) $608.73; (10) $672.84; (11) $1,281.57.

A. Peter Dierks Joers, Mountain Pine, Ark.
B. Dierks Lumber & Coal Co., 1006 Grand Avenue, Kansas City, Mo.
C. (2) Flood Control Act of 1945, Millwood Dam; legislation affecting lumber industry.

A. Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax legislation, labor legislation, amendments to the Clayton Act, merchant marine legislation, price basing-point legislation, Defense Production Act.
E. (2) $1,250; (8) $771.01; (9) $2,021.01; (10) $5,342.55; (11) $7,363.56.

A. Elmer Johnson, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees, S. 995, S. 500, and H. R. 2732. (3) The Annuitant.
D. (6) $250.
E. (2) $250; (9) $250; (10) $999.70; (11) $1,249.70.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.
C. (2) All legislation affecting aviation.
D. (6) $3,510.
E. (7) $1,250.32; (9) $1,250.32; (10) $2,757.96; (11) $4,008.28.

A. W. D. Johnson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
C. (2) H. R. 1998, to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act, St. Lawrence seaway, and all legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally and employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, in particular.

A. Bascom F. Johns, 930 Broadway, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I railroads operating in Tennessee.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads operating in Tennessee.

A. O. C. Jones, post-office box 24, North, S. C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.
D. (6) $54.97.

A. J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
C. (3) National Wool Grower.
D. (7) $2,499.99.
E. (10) $4,087.63; (11) $4,087.63.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect the petroleum industry.
E. (8) $11; (9) $11; (10) $51; (11) $62.

A. Rowland Jones, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $273.26; (8) $273.26; (9) $850.91; (10) $1,124.17; (11) $1,124.17.

A. The Journeymen Barbers, Hairdressers, Cosmetologists, and Proprietors' International Union of America, Twelfth and Delaware, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The District of Columbia Barber Act, Veterans' Regulation Act, Defense Production Act of 1950, S. 573, H. R. 1656, H. R. 3102, H. R. 1668, S. 1717, H. R. 3871.
E. (1) $1,901.56; (9) $1,901.56; (10) $6,273.79; (11) $8,175.35.

A. H. B. Judd, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H. R. 3660 and S. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act, and House Resolution 426, for integration of railroad retirement funds with social security.
D. (6) $285.01.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.
D. (6) $2,100.
E. (7) $735.65; (9) $735.65; (10) $1,789.25; (11) $2,524.90.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the sale or distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $300.
E. (7) $183.60; (9) $183.60; (10) $708.75; (11) $892.35.

A. Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.
C. (2) Tax equality and other legislation affecting independent business.
E. (5) $154.21; (9) $154.21; (10) $596.74; (11) $750.95.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.
D. (6) $1,374.

A. Thomas J. Keefe, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Road Builders' Association, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the road-building industry.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (6) $48.50; (7) $1,162.80; (8) $136.89; (9) $1,348.19; (10) $4,362.46; (11) $5,710.65.

A. Thomas B. Keehn, 1751 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Churches, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Generally interested in welfare, international, civil liberties, and economic legislation where ethical principles of interest to the church are involved. (3) Advance.
D. (6) $700.
E. (7) $300; (9) $300; (10) $900; (11) $1,200.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, including civil functions appropriation, civil defense, payment in lieu of taxes, airports and aviation, merchant marine development, national defense appropriations, housing and urban development, transbay bridge, taxation and Government controls.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (5) $1,015; (6) $429.57; (7) $1,501.56; (8) $199.25; (9) $3,145.38; (10) $6,724.63; (11) $9,870.01.

A. Isaiah L. Kenen, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Zionist Council, 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation for financial aid to Israel. (3).[1]
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (2) $640; (4) $128.50; (5) $250; (6) $165.34; (7) $655.65; (8) $156.70; (9) $1,996.19; (10) $23,607.63; (11) $25,603.82; (15) $195.89, Du Pont Plaza Hotel, Washington, D. C., hotel bills; $31.74, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D. C., hospitality; $93.89, New York Telephone Co., New York City, N. Y., phone bill; $88.50, Schulte Press, 119 West Twenty-third Street, New York City, N. Y., printing; $400, Ruth Ludwin, 1202 Hudson Street, Hoboken, N. J., salary; $240, Rae Blitzstein, 811 Ninth Avenue, New York City, N. Y., salary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 203 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Ohio Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
C. (2) Generally interested in all legislative matters that would affect the oil and gas industry.
E. (6) $25; (7) $10; (8) $25; (9) $60; (10) $947.50; (11) $1,007.50.

A. Miles D. Kennedy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agriculture development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies, and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in Civil Service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services, etc. (3) The American Legion magazine.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (2) $1.25; (4) $4.75; (5) $1.13; (7) $814.87; (8) $7.90; (9) $829.90; (10) $520.22; (11) $1,350.12.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 1151 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $2,550.
E. (2) $2,550; (9) $2,550; (10) $7,650; (11) $10,200.

A. Omar B. Ketchum, Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
C. (2) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the Armed Forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the National Encampment and the National Council of Administration. (3) VFW Foreign Service and VFW Legislative Newsletter.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $105.50; (9) $105.50; (10) $276; (11) $381.50.

A. H. Cecil Kilpatrick, 912 American Security Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eangamo Electric Co., Springfield, Ill.
C. (2) Employed to seek adoption of amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950; H. R. 9827, Eighty-first Congress, second session; Public Law 909.

A. Willford I. King, room 300, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Favor all constitutional legislation according with sound economic principles.
D. (6) $3,075.

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, P. O. Box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $150.
E. (7) $27.73; (9) $27.73; (10) $112.64; (11) $140.37.

A. C. W. Kitchen, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. W. H. Kittrell, Empire Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. Melben Oil Co., Benedum-Trees Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
C. (2) Legislation affecting oil industry, especially tidelands.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $601.63; (7) $409.17; (9) $1,010.80; (10) $11,462.70; (11) $12,473.50; (15) $101.10, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lodging and related expenditures; $168.48, American Airlines, fare to and from Washington, D. C.; $24.59; Harvey's Restaurant, Washington, D. C., restaurant expenses; $576.23, Southwest Bell Telephone, Dallas, Tex., long-distance calls; $25.40, Western Union, Dallas, Tex., business wires; etc.[1]

A. Robert F. Klepinger, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 45 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Excise taxes, H. R. 4473.
D. (6) $250.
E. (10) $1.38; (11) $1.38.

A. Allan B. Kline, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) The legislative interests cover only the legislative matters in which American Farm Bureau Federation is interested, primarily matters affecting directly American agriculture. (3) The Nation's Agriculture and Official News Letter.
D. (6) $5,000.

A. A Joint Venture Agreement, care of Charles Klint, post-office box 1962, Fresno, Calif.
C. (2) To obtain relief for applicants for leases on submerged lands and for those persons whose activities led the Government to assert title to submerged lands.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $1,200; (9) $1,200; (10) $8,202.30; (11) $9,402.30.

A. J. Daun Knisely, 350 Kenwood Avenue, Delmar, N. Y.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) Railroad Retirement Act amendments, S. 1347 and H. R. 3669; changes in parcel-post packaging, S. 1335 and H. R. 3465.
D. (6) $380.

A. Oscar R. Kreutz, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Legislation affecting water and power projects, flood control, and reclamation.
D. (6) $3,492.
E. (10) $7,358.66; (11) $7,358.66.

A. Lake Carriers Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to Great Lakes maritime industry.
E. (2) $991.12; (7) $46; (9) $1,037.12.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Amana Refrigeration, Inc., Amana, Iowa.

A. Alfons Landa, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Director of Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Fair Trade Council, 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. State Tax Association, post-office box 2559, Houston, Tex.
C. (2) Study of State and Federal tax legislation to bring about constructive cooperation between community property and common-law States for the development of a plan of tax equalization which will afford an equitable basis for income, estate, and gift taxation in the State and Federal tax structure; to support complete retroactive repeal of the 1942 estate and gift tax amendments as they apply to community property States in an unfair, discriminatory, inequitable manner; to support the elimination of Federal estate taxes and restore estate taxation to the several States.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Fritz G. Lanham, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex.
D. (6) $900.

A. LaRoe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Statler Hotel, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 2170 and S. 2180, Defense Production Act of 1950 amendments.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $2,889.61; (7) $106.16; (9) $2,995.77; (10) $6,636.35; (11) $9,632.12.

A. LaRoe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 2170 and S. 2180, Defense Production Act of 1950 amendments.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (5) $2,889.61; (6) $125.32; (7) $837.60; (9) $3,852.53; (10) $7,512.90; (11) $11,365.43.

A. William V. Lavelle, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity and general welfare, oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (7) $1,664; (9) $1,664; (10) $4,910; (11) $6,574.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $6,333.32.
E. (7) $5.10; (9) $5.10; (10) $32.25; (11) $37.35.

A. Joseph S. Lawrence, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (House and Senate) relating to health and medicine.
D. (6) $9,878.58.
E. (7) $1,414.03; (9) $1,414.03; (10) $1,315.04; (11) $2,729.07.

A. John G. Laylin, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills, and statutes relating to mining, smelting, and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade or commerce.
D. (6) $6,250.
E. (10) $541.80; (11) $341.80.

A. A. Alvis Layne, Jr., of the firm of Posner, Berge, Fox & Arent, 1002 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Associated Third Class Mail Users, Inc., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting third-class postal rates.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) 83 cents; (7) $215.76; (9) $216.59; (10) $533.96; (11) $750.55.

A. Clarence F. Lea, 842 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) I am interested in all legislation having anything to do with transportation, including pending bills before the House and Senate.
D. (6) $1,697.94.
E. (7) $197.94; (10) $454.38; (11) $652.32.

A. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (3) The National Voter, significant roll calls, memo.
D. (6) $1,015.15.
E. (2) $412.50; (4) $804.40; (6) $9.52; (9) $1,226.42; (10) $2,415.49; (11) $3,641.91.

A. Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the importation by the United States of sugar produced in Cuba. (3).[1]
D. (6) $7,669.42.
E. (4) $1,264.49; (6) $24.21; (8) $230.72; (9) $1,519.42; [1] (10) $5,521.21; (11) $7,040.63.

A. James R. Lee, 604 Albee Building, 1426 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) In general, legislation which concerns or affects members of the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association.

A. Legislative Committee of the Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the Federal excise tax on business and store machines imposed by section 3406 (a) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code.
E. (10) $3,000; (11) $3,000.

A. Legislation-Federal Relations Division of the National Education Association of the United States (J. L. McCaskill, director), 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills pending before the Eighty-second Congress relating to public education. (3) Legislative News.
E. (2) $1,558.96; (4) $562.77; (7) $42.10; (9) $2,163.83; (10) $19,423.85; (1) $21,587.68; (15) $562.77, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; $218.13, J. L. McCaskill; $1,340.83, Ernest Giddings.

A. Joseph F. Leopold, 936 National City Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation relating to corporate income taxation; specifically interested in those provisions of the Revenue Act of 1951 which dealt with the taxation of cooperative corporations, savings and loan associations, and other tax-exempt commercial corporations.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $441.52; (8) $176.63; (9) $618.15; (10) $1,788.55; (11) $2,406.70.

A. Wilbur R. Lester, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Kennecott Copper Corp., 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests are resolutions, bills, and statutes relating to mining, smelting, and refining, and to foreign or international investment, trade, or commerce.
D. (6) $6,250.
E. (10) $7.74; (11) $7.74.

A. Arnold Levy, 829 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Anthracite Institute, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the anthracite industry.
D. (6) $4,635.84.
E. (6) $20.64; (7) $89.32; (8) $25.88; (9) $135.84; (10) $560.67; (11) $696.51.

A. George J. Lewis, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
B. Kentucky Railroad Association, Union Station Building, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the railroad industry.
E. (10) $824.75; (11) $824.75.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Frederick J. Libby, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as appropriations and supplementary appropriations, particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation, including military training and services, proposed peace treaties with Japan and Germany, economic assistance (point 4), universal disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange, etc.
D. (6) $1,440.31.
E. (7) $215.28; (9) $215.28; (10) $553.42; (11) $768.70.

A. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y., and 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.[1]
D. (6) $3,793.05.
E. (2) $2,541.39; (5) $1,030.21; (6) $121.10; (7) $100.35; (9) $3,793.05; (10) $19,242.21; (11) $23,035.26.

A. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance, as it relates to Federal policies or measures deemed to be inflationary in character.
D. (6) $14,024.64.
E. (2) $2,676.20; (4) $3,089.17; (5) $835.23; (6) $293.85; (7) $3,856.98; (8) $151.50; (9) $10,902.93; (10) $15,710.45; (11) $26,613.38; (15) $200, 116 Realty Corp., 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., office rent; $63.33, New York Telephone Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y., telephone; $19.18, Goldsmith Bros., 77 Nassau St., New York, N. Y., office supplies; $11.55, Massachusetts Bonding & Insurance Co., 10 Post Office Square, Boston, Mass., disability insurance; $19.92, Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., San Mateo, Calif., telephone; etc.[1]

A. Walter J. Little, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Major steam railroads of California.[1]
C. (2) H. R. 337, H. R. 3669, St. Lawrence Seaway, Railroad Retirement Act.
D. (6) $2,150.94.
E. (6) $8.60; (7) $1,547.53; (9) $1,556.43; (10) $2,823.53; (11) $4,379.96; (15) $86, Old New Orleans, Washington, D. C., dinner; $36.40, Congressional Hotel, Washington, D. C., lunch; $20,338, United Air Lines, Washington, D. C., transportation; $1,119.42, Carlton Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals, lodging, telephone, etc.

A. L. Blaine Liljenquist, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. E. F. Forbes, president and general manager, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Support or oppose legislation affecting the livestock and meat industry.
D. (6) $2,675.04.
E. (10) $265.79; (11) $265.79.

A. John W. Lindsey, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All Federal legislation that might affect its members as going electric utilities.[1]
D. (6) $2,749.88.
E. (6) $32.40; (7) $847.04; (8) $137.70; (9) $1,017.14; (10) $1,769.74; (11) $2,786.88; (15) $63.24, Mayfair Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., room; $225.15, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., fare; $38.20, Fan and Bill's, Washington, D. C., luncheon.

A. Norman M. Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington D. C.
B. 46 Bands of Mission Indians of California.[1]
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the above-named Bands of Mission Indians of California.

A. Norman M. Littell, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Navajo Tribe of Indians residing in Arizona, Utah, New Mexico, and Colorado; address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to the Navajos.
D. (6) $1,875.
E. (10) $15.87; (11) $15.87.

A. John M. Littlepage, 840 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Tobacco Co., Inc., 111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of tobacco products, specifically H. R. 4473.

A. Gordon C. Locke, 643 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Box 1107, Shreveport, La.
C. (2) My general legislative interests are those of the Committee for Pipe Line Companies, which was organized to represent and act for a group of interstate petroleum pipe line companies, which are subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; such representation naturally includes services in support of legislation favorable to the pipe line industry and activities against any proposed legislation we think harmful to the industry.
D. (6) $4,500.

A. F. S. Lodge, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy.[1]
D. (6) $25.

A. Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Agency of Canadian Car and Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

A. Mrs. Frances B. Lucas, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Defense Committee, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, 1776 D Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In general, all legislation concerning defense and freedom; all bills concerning world government, such as S. 56, S. 57, and S. 66; and all bills relating to socialized medicine. (3) Press Digest and D. A. R. Magazine.
E. (7) $13; (9) $13; (10) $19.40; (11) $32.40; (15) $13.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. James C. Lucas, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.[1]
D. (6) $750.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., a partnership of which the partners are Scott W. Lucas and Charles A. Thomas.
B. Acacia Mutual Life Insurance Co., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Interested in aiding the company as consultant counsel in connection with Federal tax matters affecting life insurance companies.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (7) $5.50; (8) $2.50; (10) $8; (11) $8.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C., a partnership of which the partners are Scott W. Lucas and Charles A. Thomas.
B. American Finance Conference, Suite 1200, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which may deal with credit controls.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (4) $433.35; (6) $66.31; (7) $19.35; (8) $3.75; (10) $522.76; (11) $522.76; (15) $118.35, Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing; $14, Treasurer of the United States, Washington, D. C., for transcript of testimony; $114, Columbia Reporting Co., 631 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., for transcript of testimony; $187, Sybil A. Sills, 1805 H Street NW., Washington, D. C., for transcript of testimony.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co., 623 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill., Billiard and Bowling Institute of America, 257 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y., Bowling Proprietors Association of America, 6626 Gratiot Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $8.35; (8) $2.50; (10) $10.85; (11) $10.85.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Legislative interests will probably continue throughout Eighty-second Congress. (2) General legislative interest in tax bills and other measures intended to classify trailer coaches as homes.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $13.68; (7) $4.50; (8) $2.50; (10) $20.68; (11) $20.68.

A. Lucas & Thomas, 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Radar-Radio Industries of Chicago, Inc., 77 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (6) $13.88; (8) $1.25; (10) $15.13; (11) $15.13.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Dr. Carl E. Lunn, 2315 East Yale Street, Phoenix, Ariz.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (1) Until Townsend plan, as per H. R. 2679, is adopted.
D. (6) $163.49.
E. (5) $1; (6) $3.34; (7) $28.60; (9) $32.90; (11) $32.90.

A. A. L. Lynn, Huntington, W. Va.
C. (1) Of a continuing nature. (2) Legislation affecting the coal industry, such as taxes, transportation, Government controls, Government expenditures, etc.
D. (7) $5,500.

A. A. E. Lyon, Railway Labor Executives Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railway labor. All bills affecting Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Act.
D. (6) $600.

A. Avery McBee, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Hill & Knowlton, Inc.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Am generally interested in legislation affecting aviation, the steel industry, and other industries which may be clients of Hill & Knowlton.

A. Edward A. McCabe, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $2,250.
E. (7) $336.65; (9) $336.65; (10) $425.44; (11) $762.09.

A. J. L. McCaskill, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Division of legislation and Federal relations of the Nation Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Bills pending before the Congress relating to public education.
D. (6) $218.13.

A. Frank J. McCarthy, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co., including: S. 1657, H. R. 189, separation air-mail subsidies; H. R. 1998, railroad communications and operating rules; H. R. 1528, H. R. 2957, Federal barge lines; H. R. 3669, H. R. 3755, H. R. 4641, S. 1347, S. 1353, railroad retirement; Senate Joint Resolution 27, House Joint Resolution 3, St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 4473, H. R. 2416, taxes; Senate Resolution 55, House Resolution 107, transportation investigation.

A. Bryson deHaas McCloskey, 404 Woodford Avenue, Baltimore, Md.
B. Because of acts precipitated by the organizations against which lobbyist herein has been demanding congressional investigations, lobbyist herein adds to previously reported interests Happy Homes, Inc., and Homeowners Honest Service, Inc., of which he is president.
C. Because it has been found that the organizations investigations of which have been demanded have no patriotic feelings but rather are taking advantage of the semi-war conditions, all of the demands previously made are hereby renewed, and particularly those which have a bearing on the preservation of free enterprise, good housing at reasonable prices and better title VIII housing for military and civilian personnel in critical areas in or near military installations, and stopping and preventing unethical and illegal actions in restraint of trade by organizations which are working for big business. Plans are under way to resume publication of Publix Patriot monthly tabloid. Attached copies of prepublication releases and full-page ad.[1]

A. Warren C. McClure, Mississippi Valley Association, box 207, Camden, Ark.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to soil conservation and flood control.
D. (6) $900.
E. (10) $233.51; (11) $233.51.

A. Glen McDaniel, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television manufacturing industry. Special legislative interests are: Revenue Revision Act of 1951; electromagnetic-radiation bill (S. 537). (3) RTMA Industry Report.

A. A. J. McFarland, 126 North Eighth Street, Sterling, Kans.
B. Christian Amendment Movement, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) Working for a Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States, House Joint Resolution 156 and Senate Joint Resolution 29.
D. (6) $800.
E. (7) $400; (9) $400; (10) $1,625; (11) $2,025.

A. M. C. McKercher, Order of Railroad Telegraphers Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, Order of Railroad Telegraphers Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees, S. 1347 and H. R. 3669.
D. (6) $435.

A. Joseph V. McLaughlin, 923 Chestnut Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.
B. Railway Express Agency, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (7) $861.28; (9) $861.28; (10) $2,754.18; (11) $3,615.46.

A. Robert E. McLaughlin, 400 DeSales Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Storekeeper-Gaugers, care of above representative.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and particularly that which would affect storekeeper-gaugers.
D. (6) $449.99.
E. (8) $11.72; (9) $11.72; (10) $131.93; (11) $143.65.

A. W. H. McMains, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting the domestic distilling industry; specifically during the fourth quarter of 1951, H. R. 2745 and H. R. 4473.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Continuous. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: (See p 3.[1])
D. (6) $250.
E. (7) $12.42; (9) $12.42; (10) $7.23; (11) $19.65.

A. Joseph P. McSparron, 320 North Hopkins Street, Sayre, Pa.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Subject to call for lobbying assignment in 1952. In such case report will be filed pursuant to the act. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingmen, including all pending legislation dealing with railroad matters.
D. (6) $496.50.
E. (2) $192.50; (7) $304; (9) $496.50; (10) $2,620; (11) $3,116.50.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests for the clients listed under C (2) hereof will continue for an indefinite period. (2) S. 106, bill to amend the District of Columbia optometry law; S. 337, bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Vocational Education Act of 1946; H. R. 146, bill to improve health services; H. R. 2707, bill to provide for Federal grants-in-aid for health; all bills pertaining to health and visual care; H. R. 4675 and H. R. 4528, bills to prohibit transportation of fireworks into any State on behalf of the District of Columbia and American Optometric Associations, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio. On behalf of Ruth Obre Dubonnet, 50 East Seventy-second Street, New York City, bill to reacquire American citizenship, S. 1772; on behalf of Vera Sarah Keenan, Franton Court, Greens Farms, Conn., bill to permit residence in the United States, S. 1126; on behalf of Remington Rand, Inc., H. R. 4473, bill to revise the tax laws insofar as it proposed a manufacturer's excise tax on electric shavers; on behalf of John J. Braund, 900 Alabama Avenue SE., Washington, D. C., H. R. 4507, bill to compensate John J. Braund for use of patents by the United States Government.
E. (6) $47.87; (7) $34.69; (8) $11.35; (9) $93.91; (10) $157.99; (11) $251.90.

A. Lachlan Macleay, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (1) Matters relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement; the American merchant marine; soil conservation; flood control; regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (7) $922.48; (9) $922.48; (10) $2,643.23; (11) $3,565.71; (15) October 1–9, 1951, St. Louis to Houston, Tex., New Orleans and return, $287.04; October 11–November 4, St. Louis to Kansas City, Mo., Omaha and Lincoln, Nebr., Columbia, Mo., and return, $143.81; November 7–10, St. Louis to Chicago, Ill., and return, $74.28; November 22–December 7, St. Louis to New Orleans, La., Birming-

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

ham, Ala., Memphis, Tenn., and return, $409.76; December 19, expenses in Kansas City, Mo., $7.59.

A. W. Bruce Macnamee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 5215, Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952. H. R. 5693, duties on importation of tuna. S. 241, H. R. 4729, amendment of Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (long-range bill).

D. (6) $1,050.

E. (7) $43.15; (9) $43.15; (10) $73.66; (11) $116.81.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.

B. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Interest to continue indefinitely. (2) All legislation affecting the members of the above-named trade association.

D. (6) $600.

E. (6) $12.65; (7) $194.28; (9) $206.93; (10) $567.32; (11) $774.25.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, Falls Church, Va.

B. National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Interest to continue indefinitely. (2) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry.

D. (6) $2,600.

E. (6) $12.65; (7) $194.28; (9) $206.93; (10) $567.32; (11) $774.25.

A. Olya Margolin (Mrs.), 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Council of Jewish Women, 1 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $1,400.

E. (8) $37.65; (9) $37.65; (10) $271.21; (11) $308.86.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members. H. R. 1316, 3022, 1612, 257, 268, 2658, 1019, 3282; House Joint Resolutions 102, 7, 4; S. 1, 1040, 397, 990, 984, 1301.

D. (6) $3,302.

A. John J. Marr, 3 Raymond Heights, Barien, Conn.

B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting railroad employees.

A. Mrs. Etsu M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (1) Eighty-second Congress. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States (legislation is a part of this activity). (a) To provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in occupied Japan, H. R. 2865; (b) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, S. 865; (c) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, S. 2055 and H. R. 5678, and similar bills.

D. (6) $300.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C.

B. Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, 406 Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (1) Eighty-second Congress. (2) To promote the welfare of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States (legislation is a part of this activity). (a) To provide for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost United States citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in occupied Japan, H. R. 2865; (b) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, S. 865; (c) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality, and for other purposes, S. 2055 and H. R. 5678, and similar bills.

D. (6) $600.

A. Langdon P. Marvin, Jr., 3032 Q Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Throughout the year 1951 and thereafter for indefinite period. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific relationship to air transportation costs. H. R. 508 by Mr. Kennedy (air mail subsidy separation bill). In favor of enactment.

E. (4) $187.37; (9) $187.37; (10) $797.64; (11) $985.01.

A. Will Maslow, 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

B. American Jewish Congress, Inc., 15 East Eighty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) To oppose anti-Semitism and racism in all its forms and to defend civil rights incident thereto. Senate Resolution 203.

D. (6) $112.50.

E. (7) $30; (9) $30; (10) $90; (11) $120.

A. Walter J. Mason, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.

D. (6) $2,340.

E. (2) $2,340; (6) $20; (8) $176; (9) $2,536; (10) $7,952.75; (11) $10,488.75.

A. P. H. Mathews, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Legislative interest is continuing. (2) Generally to support legislation which the railroads believe to be in their interest and in the interest of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose legislation which they believe contrary to such interest. Bills opposed in whole or in part were House Joint Resolution 337, to authorize construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; H. R. 3669, S. 1347, amendments to Railroad Retirement Act. Bills supported were H. R. 3465, S. 1335, sizes and weights of fourth-class mail; House Resolution 426, study and investigation of the Railroad Retirement Act; certain amendments to H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.

D. (6) $4,399.98.

E. (7) $596.11; (9) $596.11; (10) $1,090.75; (11) $1,686.86; (15) Sir Walter Hotel, Raleigh, N. C., $14.36, for room, meals, and telephone calls; Southern Railroad, $11.70 for meals; Ansley Hotel, Atlanta, $18.42 for room, meals, and telephone calls; St. Charles Hotel, New Orleans, $38.48, for room, meals, and telephone calls; Grady Manning Hotel, Little Rock, Ark., $10.96 for room and meals.

A. Cyrus H. Maxwell, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) All bills (House and Senate) relating to health and medicine.

D. (6) $3,341.53.

E. (7) $607.55; (9) $607.55; (10) $184.84; (11) $782.39.

A. Medical Association of State of Alabama, 537 Dexter Avenue, Montgomery, Ala.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All health matters covered by legislative action. Pending legislation and legislative actions are reported to all members of the association. Our purpose is to keep the rank and file of the membership acquainted with the Washington scene and this is but a small part of our total activities which do not relate to legislative activity. (3) PR Notes.

E. (2) $1,650; (4) $225; (9) $1,875; (10) $5,475; (11) $7,350.

A. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Society's interest is continuous in legislation affecting the public health. (2) Interested in legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.

D. (6) $2,828.55.

E. (8) $2,828.55; (9) $2,828.55; (10) $26,133.95; (11) $28,962.50.

A. E. A. Meeks, National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, N. C.

C. (1) Permanently. (2) Any legislation which affects the interests of postmasters. (3) The Postmasters' Advocate (monthly magazine).

D. (6) $1,500.

A. James Messer, Jr., 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

B. Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla., an association composed of Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., Seaboard Air Line Railroad Co., Louisville & Nashville Railroad Co., Southern Railway System, Florida East Coast Railway Co., Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay Railway Co., Live Oak, Perry & Gulf Railroad Co., and St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Proposed legislation of interest to members of Florida Railroad Association set forth under B. Crosser bill amending Railroad Retirement Act (H. R. 3669); S. 1335, parcel post bill, St. Lawrence seaway.

D. (6) $1,320.

A. Ross A. Messer, post-office box 1611, Washington, D. C. (room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.).

B. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, post-office box 1611, Washington, D. C. (room 512 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.).

C. (2) All beneficial legislation affecting the custodial employees of the Post Office and GSA.

D. (6) $500.

E. (7) $9; (8) $122.60; (9) $131.60; (10) $1,593.33; (11) $1,724.99; (15) $122.60, October 1, 1951, November 2, 1951, postmaster, Washington 13, D. C., postage and stamped envelopes.

A. Harold M. Miles, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Measures affecting steam railroads, including H. R. 3669.
D. (6) $117.50.

A. Milk Industry Foundation, 1625 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Such legislative interests as the foundation has are expected to continue indefinitely. (2) The foundation has a general legislative interest in statutes or bills which affect the interests of milk dealers. It has no specific legislative interest at present.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (3) $1,500; (9) $1,500; (10) $4,531; (11) $6,031.

A. Charles C. Miller, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Through the first session of the Eighty-second Congress. (2) Excise taxes on rubber products; H. R. 2823; any legislation relating to I. T. O. and/or customs simplification; any hearings with reference to administration of the Rubber Act of 1950 and the rubber program. (3) National Defense Bulletin series.
E. (10) $2,871.84; (11) $2,871.84.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Dallas (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce.
C. (1) At will of employer. (2) General legislation affecting Dallas and Texas, such as appropriations and revenue bills.
D. (6) $2,060.
E. (2) $75; (5) $136.58; (6) $28.87; (7) $960.50; (8) $39; (9) $1,239.95; (10) $2,664.80; (11) $3,904.75.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Second National Bank Building, Houston, Tex.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) For adequate river and harbor authorizations and appropriations; H. R. 4386.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $32.32; (6) $37.82; (7) $581.94; (8) $12.50; (9) $664.58; (10) $1,650.07; (11) $2,314.65.

A. Dale Miller, Mayflower Hotel, 372, Washington, D. C.
B. Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y.
C. (1) At will of employer. (2) For retention of existing depletion allowances in tax laws, H. R. 4473.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (5) $825.57; (6) $112.91; (7) $195.24; (8) $122.12; (9) $1,255.84; (10) $3,698.70; (11) $4,954.54.

A. Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, and William Simon, a partner thereof, Room 3500, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices.
C. (1) Life of S. 719 and H. R. 2820. (2) Good-faith competition, S. 719 and H. R. 2820.
D. (6) $10,000.
E. (6) $39.70; (7) $479.61; (8) 69 cents; (9) $520; (10) $5,045.18; (11) $5,565.18.

A. Justin Miller, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests will continue for an indefinite period. (2) General legislative interests: Those relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television broadcasting industry. Specific legislative interests presently are: Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C. 151), Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. 1001), McFarland bill (S. 658) to amend Communications Act of 1934, copyright bills (H. R. 3589, H. R. 2464), radio fraud bill (H. R. 2948), bills to establish National Citizens' Advisory Board on Radio and Television (S. J. Res. 76, S. 1579), bills exempting organized sports from antitrust laws (S. 1526, H. R. 4229–4231), bill to amend section 315 of Communications Act (H. R. 5470), transmission of gambling information in interstate commerce bills (S. 1563, S. 1624, S. 2116).

A. Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
E. (10) $594.40; (11) $596.40.

A. Charles J. Milton, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. Y.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (1) No definite period. (2) General legislative matters to do with insurance companies.

A. Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn.
C. (1) Legislative interests will continue indefinitely. (2) Federal and State income taxation and governmental expenditures.
E. (4) $183.76; (5) $216.82; (7) $93.72; (8) $10.50; (9) $504.87; (10) $6,089.35; (11) $6,594.22; (15) $216.02, October, November, December, Norman E. Biorn, St. Paul, Minn., stenographic, postage, travel; $183.76, October, November, December, St. Paul Letter Co., St. Paul, Minn., mailing and postage; $93.79, October 13, Edward J. Bachman, St. Paul, Minn., telephone, postage, travel; $10.50, October 13, W. C. Sexton Co., Minneapolis, Minn., reports.

A. Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 301–303 Millsaps Building, P. O. Box 1329, Jackson, Miss.
C. (1) Until objectives are reached. (2) Legislation relating to Government economy, Government regulations of business, and taxation, such as Mason bill (H. R. 240), Davis bill (H. R. 1177), and Senator Williams' bill (S. 892).
D. (6) $690.
E. (2) $567.16; (3) $305; (4) $78.29; (5) $289.30; (6) $63.18; (7) $15.84; (8) $16.86; (9) $1,335.63; (10) $2,509.68; (11) $3,845.31; (15) $517.16, October 1, 5, 12, 19, 26, November 2, 8, 16, 26, 30, December 7, 14, 21, 28, Mrs. Marie F. Walker, Jackson, salary for 3 months; $120, October 1, November 2, December 3, James M. Walker, Jackson, office rent for 3 months; $16.86, October 1, collector of internal revenue, Jackson, S. S. taxes; $21.43, October 2, Sleigher Office Supplies, Jackson, supplies; $36.94, October 11, Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., Jackson, phone; etc.[1]

A. Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (1) Don't know. Depends upon type of legislation.

A. F. E. Mollin, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
B. American National Cattlemen's Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Tax matters, price controls, quotas, etc.
D. (6) $3,300.
E. (6) $10.12; (7) $252.62; (8) $14; (9) $276.74; (10) $3,399.66; (11) $3,676.40.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Donald Montgomery, 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), Solidarity House, 8000 East Jefferson, Detroit, Mich.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,300.
E. (6) $15.75; (7) $319.65; (9) $335.40; (10) $1,425.20; (11) $1,760.60.

A. William W. Mooney, 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash.
B. The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio.
C. (1) Until action has been taken by United States Congress on the bill. (2) Townsend plan bill in the Ways and Means Committee, H. R. 2678 and H. R. 2679. (3) Townsend National Weekly.
D. (6) $1,182.08.
E. (3) $15; (7) $308; (9) $323; (10) $905.85; (11) $1,228.85.

A. George W. Morgan, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Association of American Shipowners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) The duration of registrant's employment is indefinite.

A. The Morris Plan Corp. of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) While legislation similar to that proposed in S. 2318 and H. R. 5744 of the Eighty-first Congress is pending. (2) (a) Bank-holding company bills and similar legislation. (d) Against.
E. (10) $6,997.20; (11) $6,997.20.

A. Giles Morrow, Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting freight forwarders.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (5) $23.82; (6) $4.11; (7) $30.01; (9) $57.94; (10) $147.35; (11) $205.29.

A. Harold G. Mosier, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.
B. The Glenn L. Martin Co., Baltimore, Md.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All legislation in the aircraft field.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (6) $117.25; (7) $152.60; (8) $6.75; (9) $276.60; (10) $2,030.83; (11) $2,307.43; (15) $117.25, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone conferences; $52.35, various Washington and Baltimore cab companies, transportation; $100.25, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., entertainment and meals.

A. Walter J. Munro, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.
C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. Dr. Emmett J. Murphy, 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Chiropractic Insurance Co., Webster City, Iowa.
C. (1) Permanent. (2) Insurance coverage of employer is restricted to chiropractors. Legislative interest of employer is to promote the welfare of its policyholders and prevent discrimination against the chiropractic profession. H. R. 1368.
D. (6) $300.
E. (8) $300; (9) $300; (10) $300; (11) $1,200.

A. John S. Murphy, 355 Boyce Building, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

B. American Pyrotechnics Association, 6711 Loch Raven Boulevard, Baltimore, Md.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Pending and prospective legislation affecting the pyrotechnics industry, including but not limited to the following bills: H. R. 4528 and H. R. 4675.

E. (6) $11.35; (9) $11.35; (11) $1,820.76; (12) $2,500.

A. Ray Murphy, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. No specific interests during fourth quarter of the year.

D. (6) $90.

A. J. Walter Myers, Jr., post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

B. Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, post-office box 692, Valdosta, Ga.

C. (1) Indefinitely, as there is legislation introduced on forestry matters. (2) Agricultural appropriations bill for 1952 (forestry items). H. R. 3994 and S. 1767, to amend the definition of "agriculture" as contained in section 3 (f) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. H. R. 2752, to encourage the prevention of water pollution. S. 1149, reorganization act of Department of Agriculture. H. R. 5474, to provide for accelerated amortization of stream-control expenditures. (3) The Forest Farmer.

E. (4) $7.75; (9) $7.75; (10) $915.90; (11) $923.65.

A. National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) To confirm and establish title in the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

D. (6) $4,000.

E. (2) $5,222.67; (4) $70; (5) $558.06; (6) $196.80; (7) $1,079.58; (8) $819.30; (9) $7,946.41; (10) $24,518; (11) $32,464.41; (15) $128.70, collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding and social-security taxes; $225, Riggs National Bank, Washington, D. C., rental allowance; $329, Walter R. Johnson, Arlington, Va., expenses; $105.42, Ann M. Conway, Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. National Association and Council of Business Schools, 418–419 Homer Building, 601 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation concerning education of all types, particularly S. 1940 and other bills relating to GI education for Korean veterans. (3) Business School News.

D. (6) $17,802.74.

E. (2) $5,510.14; (4) $1,686.27; (5) $672.16; (6) $273.33; (7) $2,146.76; (8) $977.34; (9) $11,266; (10) $32,851.45; (11) $44,117.45; (15) $181.74, Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., wrapping, mailing, and postage; $2,000, National Accreditation Authority for Private Business Schools, 132 West Chelten Avenue, Philadelphia, Pa., loan; $63.12, International Business College, 512 North Mesa Avenue, El Paso, Tex., refund; $158.78, O. J. Dickey, 3301 Chestnut Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $75.17, R. G. Cooley, 4317 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., wages; $850, J. S. Noffsinger, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary, etc.[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (2) H. R. 2982, S. 1046, H. R. 30, H. R. 525, H. R. 3392, S. 1335, H. R. 3465, Senate Joint Resolution 60, House Joint Resolution 235, S. 1369, H. R. 3298, S. 345.

D. (6) $12,693.75.

E. (6) $14.39; (9) $14.39; (10) $741.07; (11) $755.46.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation that might affect its members as going electric utilities.[1]

D. (6) $18,791.71.

E. (1) $20,378.36; (2) $72,414.16; (3) $25; (4) $2,350.52; (5) $4,809.04; (6) $1,986.70; (7) $5,057.69; (8) $3,758.10; (9) $110,779.57; (10) $323,546.34; (11) $434,325.91; (15) $44.54, Addressograph-Multigraph Corp., 1200 Babbitt Road, Cleveland, Ohio, addressograph plates; $617.01, American Airlines, Inc., 910 South Boston Avenue, Tuls., Okla., transportation; $98.74, R. P. Andrews Paper Co., First and H Streets SE., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $6,308.37, Awalt, Clark & Sparks, 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., counsel fee and expenses; $669.78, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Baltimore, Md., transportation; $317.07, Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., miscellaneous and traveling expenses, etc.[1]

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Any legislation which affects, directly or indirectly, local property insurance agents.[1] (3) American Agency Bulletin.

D. (6) $2,633.43.

E. (2) $3,436.63; (5) $455.19; (6) $351; (7) $114.23; (8) $55; (9) $4,412.05; (10) $17,-125.24; (11) $21,537.89; (15) $2,566.63, Maurice G. Herndon, 207 Fairfax Road, Alexandria, Va., salary; $870, Margaret E. Yeager, 4115 Nicholas Avenue SW., Washington, D. C., salary; $360, Washington Loan & Trust Co., Washington, D. C., office rent; $114.23, Maurice G. Herndon, 207 Fairfax Road, Alexandria, Va., travel expense; $331.94, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service, etc.[1]

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 1525 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal and Federal employees.

D. (6) $25,427.91.

E. (2) $3,674; (4) $1,867.01; (6) $3,394.67; (9) $8,935.68; (10) $37,472.86; (11) $46,408.54; (15) $1,867.01, Ransdell, Inc., 810 Rhode Island Avenue NE., Washington, D. C., printing and mailing of N. A. L. C. Bulletins; $2,791.23, Western Union, Washington, D. C., telegraph service; $603.44, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in passage of H. R. 3207, Eighty-second Congress, first session, to amend navy ration statute (34 U. S. C. 902a); interested in any other legislation that may relate to margarine.

E. (10) $36; (11) $36; (15) $30, Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

D. (6) $54,325.33.

E. (2) $22,975; (6) $588.43; (7) $3,395.79; (8) $704.09; (9) $26,663.36; (10) $34,315.82; (11) $60,979.18; (15) $127.37, A. George Gilman, Malden, Mass., travel; $217.22, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., expenses of A. George Gilman and John W. Sandstedt; $132.24, Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., expenses of E. B. Schwulst; $1,001.45, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., reimbursement of expenses; $76.23, J. Milton Cooper, Washington, D. C., travel and telephone; $142.43, Charles A. Knight, Gardiner, Maine, travel and telephone; etc.[1]

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, room 100, Continental Hotel, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the postal service and its employees, including supervisors. (3) The Postal Supervisor.

D. (6) $6,194.

E. (2) $2,125; (4) $1,879.35; (5) $225; (6) $35; (9) $4,264.60; (10) $13,284.12; (11) $17,-548.72.

A. National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees, room 512–513, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Beneficial legislation affecting postal employees and General Services employees, and Post Office custodial employees and GSA employees in PBS, in particular. (3) The Post Office and General Services Maintenance News.

D. (6) $3,476.44.

E. (2) $500; (4) $333.99; (5) $110; (6) $278.58; (7) $9; (8) $122.60; (9) $1,354.17; (10) $4,325.70; (11) $5,679.87; (15) $500, Ross A. Messer, post-office box 1611, Washington, D. C., salary; $33.99, Progressive Printing Co., H Street NW., Washington, D. C., printing; $110, New Victor Co., 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C., office rent; $278.58, Telephone Co. and Western Union, Washington, D. C., telephone and telegrams; $131.60, Ross A. Messer, post-office box 1611, Washington, D. C., travel and postage.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting retired civil employees, particularly during this quarter, S. 995, S. 500, and H. R. 2732. (3) The Annuitant.

D. (6) $250.

E. (2) $250; (9) $250; (10) $999.70; (11) $1,249.70.

A. National Association of Travel Organizations, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of the travel industry.

D. (6) $6,925.

E. (9) $417.50; (10) $1,252.50; (11) $1,670.

A. National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, 4543 North Hicks Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) All legislation affecting Federal classified employees, and that in particular

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

which would affect our position, United States storekeeper-gagers.

D. (6) $697.20.

E. (2) $500; (9) $500; (10) $1,500; (11) $2,000; (15) $500, Robert E. McLaughlin, care Roberts & McInnis, 400 DeSales Building, Connecticut Avenue and DeSales Street, Washington, D. C., legal representation and advice.

A. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) NAB is generally interested in laws affecting businessmen, particularly with relation to taxation, labor, Government regulation of business, social security, and tax-privileged corporations in business.

E. (2) $5,880.22; (4) $7.14; (5) $984.03; (6) $215.71; (7) $219.06; (8) $573.70; (9) $7,879.86; (10) $19,999.70; (11) $27,879.56; (15) $1,230.32, Leo Cullinane, 4906 Westway Drive, Washington, D. C., salary; $649.90, Helen Herman, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $105, Corporation Trust Co., 100 West Tenth Street, Wilmington, Del., annual statutory representation service; $280.20, United States Collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., taxes; $26.01, Allpure Spring Water Co., 1225 Twenty-fifth Street NW., Washington, D. C., service and charges; $28.13, Western Union, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., charges; etc.[1]

A. National Board, YWCA, 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Narcotics, settlement of refugees, child-care centers in defense housing areas, foreign aid and point 4, UN appropriations.

E. (2) $150; (4) $70; (6) $20; (7) $60; (9) $300; (11) $300.

A. National Business Publications, Inc., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., suite 55, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) That which affects postal rates of periodicals published by members of the above-named association.

E. (2) $600; (7) $2.80; (9) $602.80; (10) $1,872.93; (11) $2,475.73.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Defense controls and all measures directly affecting the food-canning industry.

D. (6) $362,182.72.

E. (2) $3,702.47; (4) $73.13; (5) $14.69; (7) $127.47; (9) $3,917.76; (10) $6,390.18; (11) $10,307.94; (15) $2,202.47, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., salary; $12.40, Robert B. Heiney, McLean, Va., local transportation; $1,500, Otto Lowe, Washington, D. C., legal services; $115.07, Walter L. Graefe, Griffin, Ga., travel; $10, Farm Reporter, Washington, D. C., subscription.

A. National Coal Association, 802 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All measures affecting bituminous coal industry.

D. (6) $467,791.52.

E. (1) $8,933.29; (2) $18,838.55; (5) $4,454.41; (6) $212.59; (9) $32,438.84.

A. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation.

E. (2) $7,032; (6) $40.55; (9) $7,072.55; (10) $52,517.05; (11) $59,589.60; (15) $1,500, Leon Henderson, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., professional services; $2,466, Addison B. Clohosey, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., professional services and expenses; $1,816, Lerner and Lerner, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., professional services and expenses; $1,250, H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., services; $40.55, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., telephone charges.

A. National Committee for Strengthening Congress, 1135 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislative interests include any and all legislation dealing with the organization of Congress.

E. (4) $5.10; (5) $43.26; (7) $91.86; (9) $140.22; (10) $813.65; (11) $953.87; (15) $43.26, William Feather Co., Cleveland, Ohio, stationery; $91.86, Robert Heller and Associates, Cleveland, Ohio, traveling expenses for Mr. Beckwith.

A. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn., and 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton compress and warehouse industry.

E. (10) $994.89; (11) $994.89.

A. National Cotton Council of America, postoffice box 18, Memphis, Tenn.

C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting the raw-cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.

D. (6) $1,481.85.

E. (2) $494.24; (4) $41.21; (5) $196.50; (6) $108.79; (7) $641.11; (9) $1,481.85; (10) $15,072.24; (11) $16,554.09; (15).[1]

A. National Council Against Conscription, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Its only legislative interest is opposition to peacetime conscription. (3) Conscription News.

D. (6) $4,051.94.

E. (2) $330.65; (4) $6,312.95; (5) $545.61; (6) $31.16; (7) $223.12; (8) $4.99; (9) $7,448.38; (10) $10,469.51; (11) $17,917.89; (15) $223.91, Drake Press, 916 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., printing; $1,000, R. Alfred Hassler, R. F. D. No. 1, Pomona, N. Y., services; $255, Sowers Printing Co., Lebanon, Pa., printing; $97.50, National Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City, N. Y., printing; etc.[1]

A. National Council on Business Mail, Inc., 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) H. R. 2982 and S. 1046, H. R. 3465 and S. 1335, and all other similar legislation relating to the postal service.

D. (7) $3,199.49.

E. (1) $2,499.99; (4) $393.54; (5) $24.33; (6) $236.84; (7) $10.82; (8) $33.97; (9) $3,199.49; (10) $13.707.31; (11) $16,906.80; (15) $10.82, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., meals and lodging; $10.34, George F. McKiernan & Co., 1035 West Van Buren, Chicago, Ill., printing; $280.09, Olson Letter Service, 19 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill., mimeographing; $2,499.99, Sam O'Neal, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C., public-relations council fee; $19.08, Superintendent of Public Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., publications.

A. National Council of Coal Lessors, Inc., 316 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Legislation affecting the interests of lessors of coal lands.

E. (3) $1,943.25; (5) $16.98; (6) $2.04; (7) $192.71; (8) $14.05; (9) $2,169.03; (10) $7,468.72; (11) $9,637.75; (15) $31.27, Jewell Ridge Coal Corp., Tazewell, Va., telegrams; $22.01, Western Union Telegraph Co., Washington, D. C., telegrams; $500, L. H. Parker, Washington, D. C., retainer; $49.25, Virginia Talbott, Washington, D. C., salary; $44.49, Jewell Ridge Coal Corp., Tazewell, Va., telephone; $49.25, Virginia Talbott, Washington, D. C., salary; etc.[1]

A. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act, for amendments; H. R. 5792 and S. 2104, repeal section 104, Defense Production Act, opposed; S. 2180, to provide livestock quotas under Defense Production Act, opposed; S. 1149, Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act, for amendments; S. 892, to provide special tax treatment for cooperatives, opposed; H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951, in favor of some provisions, opposed to others; H. R. 1005, to amend Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay straw, etc., for.

D. (6) $31,671.25.

E. (1) $147; (2) $15,959.72; (4) $337.84; (5) $2,158.14; (6) $3,058.50; (7) $1,024.68; (8) $883.08; (9) $23,568.96; (10) $87,967.41; (11) $111,536.37; (15) $25.45, Freda B. Couch, Washington, D. C., postage; $22.90, George S. Peer, Washington, D. C., taxicabs; $485.80, Interstate Properties, Inc., Washington, D. C., rent; $12, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., club membership; $31.46, L. James Harmanson, Jr., Washington, D. C., taxicabs; $57.07, Norwood Office Supply Co., Washington, D. C., office supplies and expenses; etc.[1]

A. National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

C. (2) Restriction of immigration, suppress communism, patriotic legislation, support American free public schools. (3) Junior American.

E. (2) $249.99; (3) $129.22; (9) $379.21; (10) $1,123.80; (11) $1,503.01.

A. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Bills affecting world peace, such as appropriations and supplementary appropriations, particularly where they bear on military matters or on the government of occupied areas, manpower legislation including military training and services, proposed peace treaties with Japan and Germany, economic assistance, (point 4), universal disarmament, expellees and displaced persons, educational exchange, etc. (3) Peace Action.

D. (6) $8,027.11.

E. (2) $5,134.02; (3) $123; (4) $803.27; (5) $1,360.27; (6) $149.25; (7) $374.30; (8) $1,061.17; (9) $9,005.28; (10) $30,074.92; (11) $39,080.20.

A. National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Our legislative interests are in favoring any legislation that tends to support private enterprise and maintain American independence, and to oppose any measures that work contrariwise.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $28,223.82.
E. (2) $15,129.03; (4) $4,711.88; (5) $3,906.41; (6) $639.12; (7) $2,966.91; (8) $805.09; (9) $28,158.44; (10) $90,321.22; (11) $118,479.66; (15) $465.85, Brooklyn Eagle Press, Inc., 24 Johnson Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., printing.

A. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance such as S. 1140, S. 337, H. R. 54, H. R. 274, H. R. 910, H. R. 913, S. 401.
D. (6) $19,258.15.
E. (1) $12,873.34; (4) $6,384.81; (9) $19,258.15; (10) $77,188.13; (11) $96,446.28; (15) $1,720.69, Medical Mailing Service, Inc., 2611 Indiana Avenue, Chicago, Ill., printing and mailing; $13.75, The Outlook, Lawrence, Kans., printing; $24.54, Railway Express Agency, Inc., 817 South Wells Street, Chicago, Ill., express; $2,610.93, Mercury Press, 942 Howard Street, San Francisco, Calif., printing; $2,400, E. Hofer & Sons, 1405 SW. Harbor Drive, Portland, Oreg., subscription; $287.21, Norman Letter Service, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., mimeographing and mailing; etc.[1]

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation regarding excise taxes on electric refrigerators, electric ranges, electric water heaters, domestic electric appliances, commercial electric cooking equipment, and legislation with respect to amendment of the Labor-Management Relations Act.
E. (2) $344.83; (4) $13.24; (5) $60.92; (6) $93.82; (7) $308.45; (8) $100; (9) $921.26; (10) $1,157.20; (11) $2,078.46; (15) $260.16, R. M. Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., salary; $84.67, Margaret Johnson, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., wages; $220.46, R. M. Burr, 155 East Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y., travel expenses; $87.99, Eastern Air Lines, Inc., 10 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y., airline tickets; $100, Craige & Craige, 119 Lawyers Row, Salisbury, N. C., services; $13.24, Batt, Bates & Co., Inc., 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeograph work.

A. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc.,[1] 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. J. Res. 337, H. R. 5215, S. J. Res. 104, H. R. 5693, S. 241 and H. R. 4729, S. 1221, H. R. 1764, H. R. 3419.
E. (2) $31,956.25; (5) $1,350; (6) $217.01; (7) $143.37; (9) $33,666.63; (10) $22,000; (11) $55,666.63.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the interests of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Woman.
D. (6) $68,338.20.
E. (2) $833.32; (5) $230.68; (6) $45.48; (8) $30.85; (9) $1,140.33; (10) $3,050.67; (11) $4,191.

A. National Federation of Post Office Clerks, room 502, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation pertaining to postal service and the welfare of postal and Federal employees. (3) The Union Postal Clerk and Federation News Service Bulletin.
D. (6) $127,048.87.
E. (2) $7,463.85; (4) $10,832.45; (5) $380; (6) $18,086.27; (8) $6,006.90; (9) $42,774.47; (10) $65,558.47; (11) $108,332.94; (15) $65.48, E. C. Hallbeck, legislative expenses; $4,906.84, Western Union Telegraph Co., service; $91.36, Postmaster, Washington, D. C., postage; $71.50, Ransdell, Inc., printing; $70, Radio Station WCFM, postage on transcriptions; $1,389.05, Radio Station WCFM, talent, program time, packing charges, etc.[1]

A. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private non-tax-supported schools.
D. (6) $260.
E. (4) $78.14; (6) $19.31; (9) $97.45; (10) $1,132.03; (11) $1,229.48.

A. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. Opposing S. 719 and H. R. 2820.
D. (6) $922.39.
E. (2) $500; (4) $392.39; (5) $30; (9) $922.39; (10) $2,238; (11) $3,160.39; (15) $190.39, Leo D. Gatlin, 751 Terminal Street, Los Angeles, Calif., printing and postage; $500, Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., salary.

A. National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $16,532.50.
E. (9) $15,514.16.

A. National Housing Conference, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $21,495.65.
E. (1) $50.40; (2) $6,753.50; (3) $10; (4) $1,502.21; (5) $1,712.31; (6) $491.81; (7) $1,223.28; (8) $3,966.79; (9) $15,710.30; (10) $41,465.66; (11) $57,175.96; (15) $50.40, Survey Associates, 112 East Nineteenth Street, New York City, N. Y., directory listing; $80.22, Western Union, Washington, D. C., telegraph and messenger service; $411.59, Chesapeake and Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service; $10, Police-Fire Post 2979, F. F. W., Washington, D. C., contribution; $18, Urban Land Institute, Washington, D. C., pamphlets; $50, Ajay, New York City, art work; etc.[1]

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Matters affecting meat packers.
D. (6) $24.50.
E. (1) $17.74; (2) $96.42; (4) $40.03; (5) $25.42; (6) $6.40; (7) $16.49; (8) $6.08; (9) $208.58; (11) $208.58; (15) $29.46, C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $12.60, Washington Gas Light Co., 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C., rent; $48.87, La Roe, Brown & Winn, 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., counsel fee and expense; $14.58, Onslow & Brown, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., public relations counsel; $61.76, Batt Bates & Co., Inc., 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing.

A. National Labor-Management Council on Foreign Trade Policy, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4059, H. R. 3711, and H. R. 5505.
D. (6) $285; (12) $65.50.
E. (2) $1,625.01; (4) $93.74; (5) $603.41; (6) $72.93; (7) $133.77; (8) $131.76; (9) $2,660.62; (10) $9,549.97; (11) $12,210.59; (15).[1]

A. National Livestock Tax Committee, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo.
C. (2) Amendment of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $4,583.60.
E. (2) $3,166; (8) $1,130.43; (9) $4,296.43; (11) $9,693.40.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of the lumber manufacturing industry. (3) National Lumber News.
D. (6) $10,113.07.
E. (1) $2,948.34; (2) $3,634.24; (4) $1,235.26; (5) $200.01; (6) $18.76; (7) $1,596.63; (8) $1,180.42; (9) $10,813.66; (10) $35,317.93; (11) $46,131.59; (15) $704.37, Darby Printing Co., Twenty-fourth and Douglas Streets NE., Washington, D. C.; $101.21, R. P. Andrews Paper Co., First and H Streets SE., Washington, D. C.; $106.79, Lithographic Photo Services, Inc., 1713 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; $20.40, George Lohr Studios, 937 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) Dairy Director, News for Dairy Co-ops, and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $46,802.82.
E. (1) $2,192.48; (2) $11,282.04; $25,421.91; (3) $5,025; (4) $4,044.31; (5) $655.13; (6) $1,521.14; (7) $3,075.35, $3,309.45; (9) $56,826.81; (10) $128, 486.95; (11) $185,315.76; (15) $300, Postmaster, Washington, D. C., postage; $52.29, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Washington, D. C., travel; $80, Margaret K. Taylor, 3636 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., travel; $309.02, Val C. Sherman, 411 Highland Drive, Kenwood, Md., salary; $323.40, Otie M. Reed, 8009 Westover Road, Bethesda, Md., salary; etc.[1]

A. National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which would specifically have an effect upon the production, consumption, import, export, or taxation of any animal or vegetable fat or oil as well as all legislation generally affecting business, particularly small business.
D. (6) $2,700.
E. (2) $862.41; (4) $78.61; (5) $115.87; (6) $70.53; (7) $217.74; (8) $19.43; (9) $1,364.59; (10) $4,596.52; (11) $6,961.11.

A. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.[1]
D. (6) $9,582.65.
E. (2) $6,974.97; (4) $555.09; (5) $795.65; (6) $339.30; (8) $6,729.01; (9) $15,366.93; (10) $36,455.89; (11) $51,822.82; (15) $1,224.98, M. H. Kroeger, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $12.43, E. V. Wuerth, Denver, Colo., public stenographer; $70.14, Franks Duplicating Service, National Press Building, Washington,

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. C., mimeographing; $546, National Press Building Corp., National Press Building, Washington, D. C., rent; $71.97, Mallorey Office Supply Co., Washington, D. C.; $305.68, Ransdell, Inc., Washington, D. C., printing, etc.[1]

A. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Fair Labor Standards Act; Defense Production Act; Revenue Act of 1951; H. R. 5765, resale price maintenance; Fur Products Labeling Act; H. R. 1938, LIFO; S. 1335 and H. R. 3465, postal legislation; S. 1309, war-damage insurance; H. R. 1535 and H. R. 5505, customs simplifications; S. 2164, cotton labeling; H. R. 5189, Consumers' Research Bureau; S. 1046 and H. R. 3982, postal rates; H. R. 5101, unemployment compensation.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (2) $3,250; (4) $1,545.06; (5) $517.60; (6) $17.54; (7) $58.95; (8) $5; (9) $5,394.15; (10) $16,112.07; (11) $21,506.22; (15) $2,953.99, John C. Hazen, Kass Building, Washington, D. C.; services; $377.50, Erskine Stewart, Kass Building, Washington, D. C., services.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Defense Production Act, seek retention of Herlong amendment; oppose principle of Federal sales tax. (3) National Furniture.

E. (2) $1,966.66; (4) $200; (5) $500; (6) $100; (7) $271.28; (9) $3,037.94; (10) $6,018.27; (11) $9,056.21; (15) $525, Leo J. Heer, suite 822, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., salary; $1,226.32, Willkie, Owen, Farr, Gallagher & Walton, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., travel expenses; $437.62, Isaac Benwitt, 21 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y., professional counsel.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation; soil and water conservation, and related subjects.

D. (6) $1,145.

E. (2) $1,330.60; (3) $3; (5) $129.84; (6) $13.43; (7) $153.87; (8) $390.40; (9) $2,021.14; (10) $14,389.95; (11) $16,411.09; (15) $13.43; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., telephone bill; $376.30, collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md., withholding tax; $13.70, Gulf Oil Corp., 1515 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa., charges; $150, Hamilton National Bank, 619 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., payroll-deduction bonds; $20.95, the Mayflower, 1127 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., charges; $15, National Press Club, National Press Building, Washington, D. C., dues, etc.[1]

A. National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation with reference to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project.

D. (6) $11,000.

E. (1) $125; (2) $4,559.19; (4) $2,585.05; (5) $845.29; (6) $631.41; (7) $1,823.92; (8) $226.89; (9) $10,796.75; (10) $58,871.23; (11) $69,667.98; (15).[1]

A. National Savings and Loan League, 907 Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Member Associations of the League.[1]

C. (2) Support of bills to improve facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home financing; oppose legislation inimicable to interests of savings and loan industry.

D. (6) $212.40.

E. (2) $2,000; (4) $511.09; (6) $669.11; (9) $3,180.20; (10) $11,921.69; (11) $15,101.79; (15) $2,000, Oscar R. Kreutz, salary; $511.09, Batt, Bates & Co., Washington, D. C., printing and mailing; $519.11, Western Union Telegraph Co., telegrams; $150, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., phone calls.

A. National Small Businessmen's Association, 2834 Central Street, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $5,000.

E. (2) $4,011.25; (5) $1,723.62; (6) $208.39; (7) $251.60; (8) $388.93; (9) $6,583.79,[1] (10) $47,390.20; (11) $53,973.99.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, specifically the Taft-Hartley Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, the Bacon-Davis Act, universal military training and selective service, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence bills, National Science Foundation, Hoover Commission bills.

D. (6) $9,334.45.

E. (2) $875; (9) $875; (10) $2,625; (11) $3,500; (15) $90, Colortone Press, Washington, D. C., printing.

A. National Tax Relief Coalition, box 401, Greensboro, N. C.

C. (2) Favor tax limitation.

D. (6) $712.50.

E. (2) $375; (7) $337.50; (9) $712.50; (10) $2,435; (11) $3,147.50.

A. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

D. (6) $689.86.

E. (2) $1,075; (5) $369.61; (8) $9.95; (9) $1,454.56.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.

C. (3) National Wool Grower.

D. (6) $46,668.06.

E. (2) $2,499.99; (7) $312.99; (8) $825; (9) $3,637.98; (10) $18,859.13; (11) $22,497.11; (15) $2,499.99, J. M. Jones, 414 Pacific National Bank Building, Salt Lake City, Utah; $312.99, W. H. Stiewer, Fossil, Oreg.; $825, Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo.

A. William S. Neal, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Reduction of Federal expenditures, revision of tax laws with approval of manufacturers' excise tax, maintenance of labor-regulatory laws, protection of patent system, maintenance of antitrust laws, freedom of competition, opposition to price and wage controls, and opposition to extension of existing economic controls. (3) NAM News.

D. (6) $4,477.59.

E. (7) $727.59.

A. Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.

C. (2) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

D. (6) $300.

E. (4) $308.26; (8) $1,301; (9) $1,609.26; (10) $1,465.85; (11) $3,075.11; (15) $1,275, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., for aid in solicitation of funds and furnishing information; $306.86, Nebraska Farmer Printing Co., 1418 P Street, Lincoln, Nebr., printing; $10, postmaster, Lincoln, Nebr., 1952 bulk third-class mailing fee; $15, William P. Helm, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., 1952 subscription to Reports From Washington.

A. C. Roger Nelson, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).

E. (6) $1.10; (8) $6.86; (9) $7.96; (10) $38.31; (11) $46.27.

A. G. W. Nelson, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable labor legislation.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Interested in substantially all legislation affecting the socio-economic and political interests of the American workingman including all pending legislation dealing with social security, national health, aid to physically handicapped, labor relations, displaced persons, etc.

D. (6) $900.

A. Herbert U. Nelson, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

D. (6) $2,591.24.

E. (6) $29.35; (7) $1,311.89; (9) $1,341.24; (10) $6,062.28; (11) $7,403.52; (15) $41.28, D. E. Wilder, railroad travel; $50, Carey Winstone Co., 739 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., apartment rental; $17.50, Beatrice Fitzhugh, 2723 P Street NW., Washington, D. C., cleaning apartment; $37.84, Olymic Hotel, Seattle, Wash., room, laundry, breakfast, etc.[1]

A. Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.

B. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.

C. (2) Removal of exemptions granted by section 101 of Internal Revenue Code.

D. (6) $375.

E. (10) $111.70; (11) $111.70.

A. New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc.,[2] 112 Bowers Street, Jersey City, N. J.

C. (2) Any laws or proposals adversely effecting business.

D. (6) $435.

E. (2) $20; (5) $18; (6) $33.63; (8) $4.90; (9) $76.53; (10) $1,094.52; (11) $1,171.05.

A. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (2) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

E. (10) $5,759; (11) $5,759.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

A. Russ Nixon, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,105.
E. (10) $410; (11) $410.

A. W. R. Noble, suite 509, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Farm Equipment Association, 207 Hotel De Soto Building, St. Louis, Mo.; and National Retail Hardware Association, 964 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) Keeping associations informed as to pending legislation and interpretations of legislation; special attention given to all labor legislation, tax bills, the Defense Production Act, and all legislation affecting the retail farm equipment and hardware trade. (3) Farm Equipment Retailing and Hardware Retailer.
D. (7) $3,375.
E. (6) $832.19; (7) $597.70; (8) $294.30; (9) $1,724.19; (10) $1,843.38; (11) $3,567.57.

A. J. S. Noffsinger, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Private School Associations, 2601 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All legislative proposals that affect private non-tax-supported schools.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect its members as going electric utilities.[1]
D. (6) $4,041.68.
E. (6) 85 cents; (7) $488.68; (8) $92.17; (9) $581.70; (10) $2,204.18; (11) $2,785.88; (15) $17, National Press Club, dues; $26.50, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., dinner; $16.80, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., breakfast; $22.75, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., lunch; $24.45, Herrington Hotel, Amarillo, Tex., hotel.

A. North Dakota Resources Board, 311 Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the development and utilization of the land, water, and other natural resources of North Dakota, including authorizations and appropriations.
D. (6) $1,750.
E. (2) $1,736; (5) $142.48; (6) $172.34; (7) $816.37; (9) $2,867.19; (10) $7,727.03; (11) $10,584.22; (15) $2,867.19, Fred J. Fredrickson, Lafayette Hotel, Washington, D. C., salary and expenses.

A. Northern Hemlock and Hardwood Manufacturers Association, Washington Building, Oshkosh, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the timber industries of Wisconsin and Michigan; taxation, forestry, and labor-management relations.

A. Harry E. Northam, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All matters concerning the practice of medicine and surgery for the self-improvement and protection of its dues-paying members. (3) News Letter.

A. Charles E. Noyes,[4] 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. American Institute of Accountants, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) S. 17, S. 1725, S. 913, against; H. R. 3097, H. R. 4371, and H. R. 4373, for.
D. (7) $1,083.
E. (6) $50; (7) $228.21; (9) $278.21; (11) $278.21.

A. T. C. Nugent, 1111 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.
B. The California Company, 1111 Tulane Avenue, New Orleans, La.
C. (2) The business of the company requires that it be interested in all types of legislation, regulation or order affecting the lands of the United States and the procedures by which exploration and production of oil and gas are to be accomplished.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $75; (7) $1,125; (9) $1,200; (10) $8,160; (11) $9,360.

A. Peter Q. Nyce, 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Affiant is interested in acquiring information from time to time on all legislation pertaining to land of the United States.

A. Edward H. O'Connor, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) H. R. 27, to provide a national health insurance and public health program, and H. R. 54, to provide a program of national health insurance and public health.
D. (7) $1,436.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr.,[2] Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 334 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) General interest in any proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on any food products produced or handled by this company; (3) Press Release—150 copies—December 21, 1951—mimeographed.
E. (4) $51.03; (6) $51.33; (7) $55; (8) $20.90; (9) $178.26; (11) $178.26.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr.,[2] Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) General interest in proposed legislation having direct or specific impact on the wool textile industry.
E. (6) $21.16; (7) $2.20; (9) $23.36; (10) $57.85; (11) $81.21.

A. Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests.
E. (7) $393.16; (9) $393.16; (10) $203.10; (11) $596.26; (15) $393.16, E. C. Shively, reimbursement for travel, food, lodging and entertainment.

A. Fred N. Oliver, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Investment Building, Washington, D. C., partner in the law firm of Oliver & Donnally.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the mutual savings banks or railroad security owners have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.
D. (6) $7,762.50.
E. (10) $2,122.06; (11) $2,122.06.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Legion, 760 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities, with particular attention to our Immigration and Naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agriculture development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies, and the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; etc. (3) The American Legion magazine.
D. (6) $1,837.50.
E. (2) $2.25; $384.65; (9) $386.90; (10) $379.56; (11) $766.46.

A. Order of Railway Conductors of America, O. R. C. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (2) $2,125; (5) $1,145.70; (6) $70.77; (9) $3,341.47; (10) $9,733.58; (11) $13,075.05.

A. Thomas R. Owens, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Rubber, Cork, Linoleum and Plastic Workers of America, High at Mill Street, Akron, Ohio.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose all legislation detrimental to these objectives.
D. (6) $1,220.
E. (8) $704.26 (9) $704.26; (10) $1,462.76; (11) $2,167.02.

A. Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Better laws for maternal and child health and welfare.
D. (6) $48.13.
E. (7) $48.13; (9) $48.13; (10) $125.57; (11) $173.70.

A. Lovell H. Parker,[2] 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Coal Association, National Council of Coal Lessors, American Trucking Association, and Television Broadcasters' Tax Committee, all of Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the bituminous coal industry, the highway freight industry, and the television broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $19,500.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. George F. Parrish,[2] Charleston, W. Va.
B. West Virginia Railroad Association, post-office box 7, Charleston, W. Va.
C. (2) Railroad retirement legislation.
D. (7) $3,000.
E. (7) $250.82; (9) $250.82; (10) $431.75; (11) $682.57; (15) $250.82.

A. James G. Patton,[2] 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.

A. Randolph Paul (on behalf of the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass.
C. (2) Amendment of section 127 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide more equitable treatment of war losses.
D. (6) $35,000.
E. (6) $31.06; (8) $14.50; (9) $45.56; (10) $42.33; (11) $87.89.

A. Randolph Paul (on behalf of the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison), 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Pabco Products, Inc., 475 Brannan Street, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) An amendment to section 444 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide more equitable excess-profits taxation for expanding companies.
D. (6) $25,000.
E. (6) $105.18; (7) $2; (8) $38.72; (9) $145.90; (10) $103.61; (11) $249.51.

A. Edmund W. Pavenstedt, c/o White & Case, 14 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.
B. International Minerals & Chemical Corp., 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) To amend section 34 of Trading With the Enemy Act to protect interests of domestic corporations owning stock in enemy corporations, assets of which have been seized by the Alien Property Custodian.
E. (7) $106.86; (9) $106.86; (10) $359.43; (11) $466.29.

A. Albert A. Payne, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.
D. (6) $2,000.
E. (6) $13.44; (7) $711.16; (8) $4.44; (9) $729.04; (10) $405.58; (11) $1,144.62.

A. Merl B. Peek, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water and land conservation measures.
D. (6) $1,749.99.
E. (7) $484.50; (9) $484.50; (10) $837.07; (11) $1,321.57.

A. George S. Peer, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

C. (2) H. R. 1005, to amend Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation of twine used for baling hay, straw, etc.
D. (6) $1,624.98.
E. (7) $65.16; (9) $65.16; (10) $276.82; (11) $341.98.

A. Pierson & Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Bridgeport Brass Co., Bridgeport, Conn.
C. (2) Excess-profits tax bills.
D. (6) $5,410.
E. (9) $463.30.

A. Pierson & Ball, 1007 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Radio Television Manufacturers Association, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Excess-profits tax and excise tax bills.
D. (6) $2,130.
E. (9) $178.26.

A. Albert Pike, Jr., 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.
D. (6) $50.

A. Rufus G. Poole, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Retail Shoe Committee for Equitable Taxation, 345 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests ended with the disposition of section 123 of H. R. 4473, the enactment of which section registrant opposed.
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (6) $12.07; (9) $12.07; (10) $9.38; (11) $21.45.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Basic Vegetable Products, Inc., Vacaville, Calif.; Gentry, Inc., Los Angeles, Calif.; Puccinelli Packing Co., Turlock, Calif.; and J. R. Simplot Dehydrating Co., Caldwell, Idaho.
C. (2) Tariff legislation, Trade Agreements Extension Act, for; customs-simplification bill, against.
E. (6) $21.63; (9) $21.63; (10) $37.18; (11) $58.81.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. California Fruit Growers Exchange and California Walnut Growers Association, Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers, Dundee, Oreg.; and California Almond Growers Exchange, Sacramento, Calif.
C. (2) Agricultural and farmer cooperative matters; tariff and tax legislation; Trade Agreements Extension Act, import quotas, Revenue Act of 1951, agricultural appropriations, for; customs revisions, against.
D. (6) $1,441.25.
E. (2) $1.75; (4) $13.73; (6) $27.76; (7) $21.15; (8) $3.28; (9) $67.67; (10) $377.65; (11) $445.32.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mushroom Growers Cooperative Association and Cultivated Mushroom Institute of America, both of Kennett Square, Pa.
C. (2) Tariff legislation; Trade Agreements Extension Act, for; customs-simplification bill, against.
E. (10) $2.06; (11) $2.06.

A. Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. The Parker Pen Co., Janesville, Wis.; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; and Fountain Pen and Mechanical Pencil Manufacturers Association, New York City.
C. (2) Trade Agreements Extension Act, H. R. 1612, for; Revenue Act of 1951, H. R. 4473, against.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (10) $90.25; (11) $90.25.

A. Frank M. Porter, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y.

A. James E. Poulton, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.

A. William I. Powell, Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting mining, such as income taxation, social security, public lands, stockpiling, monetary policies, etc.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $3.20; (9) $3.20; (10) $110.33; (11) $113.53.

A. Kenneth L. Pray, 1632 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.
C. (2) Legislative matters affecting Schenley Distillers, Inc., and affiliated companies.

A. William H. Press, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.
D. (6) $3,712.50.

A. Allen Pretzman, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. Scioto-Sandusky Conservancy District, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. William M. Price, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council of Canal Zone, Balboa, Canal Zone.
C. (2) All legislation affecting employees of the Canal Zone.
D. (6) $1,733.
E. (1) $40; (2) $175; (3) $110; (4) $80; (5) $50; (6) $155; (7) $1,127; (9) $1,743; (10) $1,720; (11) $3,463.

A. Harry E. Proctor, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Oliver & Donnally, 1110 Investment Building, Washington, D. C., representing National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y.
C. (2) Tax revision bill, H. R. 4473; in opposition to repeal of section 101 (2) of Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $4,750.
E. (7) $28.30; (9) $28.30; (10) $231.64; (11) $259.94.

A. The Proprietary Association, 810 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Measures affecting proprietary medicines industry.
E. (11) $193,805.97.

A. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.
E. (2) $3,500; (7) $525.05; (9) $4,025.05; (10) $17,858.75; (11) $21,883.80; (15) $4,025.05, Milo J. Warner, Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio, services.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Dr. Walter Duschinsky, 93 Perry Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation to grant permanent residence to client (S. 523).
E. (6) $1.10; (8) $6.86; (9) $7.96; (10) $38.31; (11) $46.27.

A. Ganson Purcell, 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., 1405 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) General legislative interests of client are those affecting foreign commerce of the United States, including tax and tariff legislation.
D. (6) $1,400.
E. (6) $3.06; (8) $1.25; (9) $4.31; (10) $64.84; (11) $69.15.

A. Alexander Purdon, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the declaration of policy as expressed by the Congress in the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and such other legislation as may affect the development of an adequate merchant marine.
D. (6) $406.25.
E. (7) $66.62; (9) $66.62; (10) $192.52; (11) $259.14.

A. Edmund R. Purves,[2] 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.
D. (6) $200.
E. (10) $149; (11) $149.

A. C. J. Putt, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. The Atchison, Topeka, and Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
C. (2) General legislative interest in matters affecting railroads.
E. (7) $297.15; (9) $297.15; (10) $1,162.01; (11) $1,459.16

A. Ward L. Quaal, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (OCBS), suite 532, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) OCBS will oppose any proposed legislation (such as S. 491 and H. R. 4004, 81st Cong.) calling for the duplication of class I–A clear channel frequencies, or the limitation of the power of class I–A standard broadcast stations; CCBS opposes ratification of the so-called NARBA agreement signed November 15, 1950. See page 6.
D. (6) $5,625.
E. (7) $176.86; (9) $176.86; (10) $1,306.61; (11) $1,483.47; (15).[1]

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

A. Frank Quigley, 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Matters affecting Bell System communications.[1]
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (7) $838.38; (9) $838.38; (10) $2,079.18; (11) $2,917.56; (15) $66.38, Atlantic Coast Line Railroad, transportation; $35.87, Chevy Chase Club, Chevy Chase, Md., conference; $15.42, Metropolitan Club, Washington, D. C., conference.

A. F. Miles Radigan, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect its members as going electric utilities.[1]
D. (6) $1,500.

A. Alex Radin,[2] 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the generation, transmission and distribution of electrical energy by local publicly owned electric systems, and the management and operation of such systems.
D. (6) $1,999.98.

A. Radio-Television Manufacturers Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Excess profits tax or additional corporate income tax bills and regulation W.
E. (2) $1,510; (8) $593.31; (9) $2,103.31; (10) $40,294.05); (11) $42,307.36; (15) $2,103.81, Pierson and Ball, Ring Building, Washington, D. C., services and expenses.

A. Leon Raesly, suite 624, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) S. 1671 and S. 1672.

A. Railroad Pension Conference, post-office box 798, New Haven, Conn.
C. (2) Enactment of 30-year half-pay railroad retirement legislation, based on 5 years of highest earnings, H. R. 63, H. R. 382, and S. 1308.
D. (6) $110.74.
E. (4) $71.39; (5) $39.62; (7) $19.32; (8) $8.06; (9) $138.39; (10) $486.15; (11) $624.54.

A. Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) The general legislative interests consist of any legislation which the members of the association have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting labor, especially railroad labor; all bills affecting Railroad Retirement and Unemployment Insurance Act.
D. (6) $9,175.
E. (2) $5,252.71; (5) $3,846.46; (6) $75.83; (9) $9,175.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

C. (2) Interested in any legislation affecting the marketing and distribution of fresh fruits and vegetables, directly or indirectly.

A. DeWitt C. Ramsey, 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the aviation industry.

A. Donald J. Ramsey, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 1321, to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.
D. (6) $4,249.98.
E. (7) $828.68; (8) $2,340.48; (9) $3,169.16.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,287.50.
E. (10) $1; (11) $1.

A. Retail Shoe Committee for Equitable Taxation, 345 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislative interests ended with the disposition of section 123 of H. R. 4473, the enactment of which section registrant opposed.
E. (2) $7,500; (9) $7,500; (10) $7,775; (11) $15,275; (15) $7,500, Rufus G. Poole, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., services.

A. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, Regular and Reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature, dealing with personnel matters, pay and retirement benefits and pensions, studying and analyzing bills, preparing statements for presentation to the cognizant committees, and drafting amendments where indicated, appearing before committees of Congress, principally the Committees on Armed Services and Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and the committees dealing with various privileges, opportunities, and obligations of the personnel involved. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $18,469.75.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., room 314, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests are: Retention and improvement of the Civil Service Retirement and United States Employees Compensation Acts.[1]
D. (6) $2,475.60.
E. (2) $3,314.17; (4) $403.94; (5) $576.99; (6) $37.27; (8) $1,962.51; (9) $6,294.88; (10) $17,077.81; (11) $23,372.69; (15) $121.58, Standard Typewriter Co., 910 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., typewriter repairs and adding machine; $1,466.38, Walter L. Disbrow, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C., salary and expenses; $141.99, Commercial Office Furniture Co., 915 E Street NW., Washington, D. C., office supplies; $108.80, Shepherd Printing Co., 110 High Street, Portsmouth, Va., printing; $548.80, Hotel Raleigh, Twelfth Street and Pennsylvania Ave., Washington, D. C., annual banquet costs; $110,

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Thomas W. Filer, 7419 Kenmore Drive, Norfolk, Va., convention expenses; etc.[1]

A. Hubert M. Rhodes, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) Legislation affecting credit unions.
D. (6) $400.
E. (10) $35.84; (11) $35.84.

A. Charles R. Richey, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $1,800.
E. (7) $59.75; (9) $59.75; (10) $537.29; (11) $597.04.

A. Siert F. Riepma, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any specific legislation that may relate to margarine; also interested in passage of H. R. 3207, Eighty-second Congress, first session, to amend Navy ration statute (34 U. S. C. 902a); also interested in passage of H. R. 5012, which is likewise designed to amend Navy ration statute.
E. (10) $6; (11) $6.

A. John J. Riggle, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.
C. Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 5505, Customs Simplification Act, for amendments; H. R. 5792 and S. 2104, repeal section 104, Defense Production Act, opposed; S. 2180, to provide livestock quotas under Defense Production Act, opposed; S. 2149, Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act, for amendments.
D. (6) $2,325.
E. (7) $26.05; (9) $26.05; (10) $75.44; (11) $101.49.

A. George D. Riley, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (3) All bills affecting the welfare of the country generally, and specifically bills affecting workers.
D. (6) $2,340.
E. (2) $2,340; (6) $19.30; (8) $205.70; (9) $2,565; (10) $7,721; (11) $10,286.

A. H. J. Ripp, 811 North Twenty-second Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (1) Services terminated October 20, 1951. (3) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347, amending Railroad Retirement Act and other legislation affecting labor generally.
D. (6) $400.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 3, Washington, D. C.
B. National Water Conservation Conference, 341 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (1) No limitation as to time. (2) All legislation relative to development, utilization, and conservation of natural resources, including bills to authorize projects and appropriations for construction of projects.
E. (2) $232.50; (4) $102.77; (5) $167; (6) $19.80; (7) $50.59; (9) $572.66; (10) $1,837.12; (11) $2,409.78; (15) $232.50, wages: Mrs. Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., stenographic, October $64,69, November $60.44, December $57.80; District unemployment, 23 cents; collector of internal revenue, Baltimore, Md., taxes and wage deduction, $49.34. $102.77, printed and duplicated matter: Mississippi Valley Association, Washington, D. C., $27.15; United States Post Office, $7.88; Andrews Paper Co., Washington, D. C., $67.74. $167, office rent, etc.: Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md., $165; Pacific Northwest Development Association, Portland, Oreg., $2. $19.80, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.: October $6, November $6, December $7.80. $50.59, travel: Union Pacific Railway Co., $40.59; E. W. Rising, Washington, D. C., $10.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation Project, Inc., P. O. Box 1576, Boise, Idaho.
C. (1) Length of legislative interest ceased as of December 31, 1951. (2) All legislation affecting directly or indirectly the development and utilization of the land and water resources of the United States. Specifically interested in legislation pertaining to Snake and Columbia River basins. No bills have been introduced in Congress at this session for authorization of projects in which we are interested in the Snake or Columbia River basins.
D. (6) $1,050.
E. (2) $200.47; (5) $285; (6) $32.27; (7) $682.28; (9) $1,200.02; (10) $1,580.67; (11) $2,780.69; (15) $200.47, Ann Glass, stenographic, Washington, D. C.; October, $74.71; November, $64.16; December, $61.60. $285, rent, etc., Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md.; October, $80; November, $80; December, $80; E. W. Rising, use of furniture; October, $15; November. $15; December, $15. $32.27, telephone and telegrams, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; October, $21.75; November, $10.52. $682.28, travel, C. B. & Q. Railway Co., Washington, D. C.; November, $84.28; December, $40.42; Capital Air Line, Washington, D. C., December, $31.40; Herring Hotel, Amarillo, Tex., October, $25; E. W. Rising, Washington, travel expenses, meals, hotels, stationery, cab fares, auto service, and miscellaneous expenses; October, $183.56; November, $146.04; December, $171.58.

A. E. W. Rising, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Suite 3, Washington, D. C.
B. Western Beet Growers Association, P. O. Box 742, Great Falls, Mont.
C. (1) No limitations as to time. (2) Legislation that may affect or limit right of American farmers to grow and market sugar beets; H. R. 4521, recently enacted by Congress.
D. (6) $310.
E. (2) $27; (4) $51.94; (5) $47; (6) $2; (7) $110.66; (9) $238.60; (10) $736.81; (11) $975.41; (15) $27, wages, Mrs. Ann Glass, Washington, D. C., stenographic, October $7, November $10, December $10; $51.94, printed matter and postage, postmaster, Washington, October $25.72, November $26.22; $47, office rent, etc., Mrs. Miriam Keller, Simpsonville, Md., $30; E. W. Rising, Washington, $15; Sugar Journal, New Orleans, $2; $2, Western Union Telegraph Co., $2; $110.66, Great Northern Railway Co., November $23.06, December $13.79; Union Pacific Railway, December $12.26; E. W. Rising, travel expenses, October $10, November $29.60, December $21.95.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 1121 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) All legislation affecting the interests of professional engineers, specifically the Taft-Hartley Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, the Bacon-Davis Act, universal military training and selective service, Great Lakes-St. Lawrence bills, National Science Foundation, Hoover Commission bills. (3) Legislative Bulletin.
D. (6) $250.

A. Dr. Frederick E. Robin, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Committee for the Nation's Health, 1416 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests will continue until the passage of national health insurance as stated in attachment A. (2) Legislative interests: President Truman's national health plan as embodied in H. R. 27, H. R. 54. This individual is also interested in the following measures: S. 445, S. 337, H. R. 1781, H. R. 2152, H. R. 516, H. R. 910, H. R. 274, H. R. 913, H. R. 14, H. R. 149, H. R. 342, H. R. 146. (3) The Government in Medicine, Draft Taft Clubs of America, The Compulsory Proposal—Its Advantages.
D. (6) $2.374.98.
E. (7) $92.36; (9) $92.36; (10) $103.79; (11) $196.15.

A. Watson Rogers, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Opposing S. 719, a bill to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor. Opposing H. R. 2820, a bill to clarify the right of sellers to engage in competition by in good faith meeting the equally low price of a competitor.
D. (6) $500.

A. Carlton H. Rose, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Lead Co., 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Legislative interests are to continue indefinitely. (2) Legislative interests are confined to legislation affecting the operation of National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products. S. 770, H. R. 4390, H. R. 4948, H. R. 5448, H. R. 2998, H. R. 2862.

A. Roland H. Rowe, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, 400 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting interests of wholesale grocers. (a) Future legislation for taxing co-ops, Basing Point-type bills, amendments to Interstate Commerce Act, Fair Trade legislation. (b) H. R. 2820, S. 719, S. 1889, H. R. 5767. (c) Revenue Code, Robinson-Patman Act, Federal Trade Commission Act, Interstate Commerce Act, Miller-Tydings Act. (d) For more adequately taxing co-ops; for H. R. 5767; against S. 719, H. R. 2820 and S. 1889. (3) United States Wholesale Grocers' Association's Activity Report Bulletin.
D. (6) $62.70.
E. (9) $44.72; (10) $62.80; (11) $53.52.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. John Forney Rudy, 1809 G Street NW., Washington D. C.
B. National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Legislative interests expected to continue indefinitely. (2) General legislative interests are concerned with the Declaration of Policy as expressed by Congress in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Specific legislative interests apply to proposals that support or contravene this policy.
E. (7) $33.60; (9) $33.60; (10) $714.43; (11) $748.03; (14) $33.60.

A. Edward A. Rumely, 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
D. (6) $6,999.64.

A. Charles J. Rush, 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) While Congress is in session and measures affecting local real estate are being considered. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia are of interest.

A. Albert R. Russell, 162 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the Council is organized.
D. (6) $153.75.
E. (7) $541.38; (9) $541.38; (10) $908.27; (11) $1,449.65.

A. Francis M. Russell, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) As a part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including supervision of the company's network activities in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (7) $47.50; (9) $47.50; (10) $931.50; (11) $979; (15) $47.50; (16) October 8, 1951, Willard Hotel, six persons, $47.50.

A Horace Russell, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the savings and loan business.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (7) $139.04; (9) $139.04; (10) $849.91; (11) $988.45; (15) October 2, 1951, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad round-trip ticket Chicago to Washington, D. C. (reimbursed by league), $75.38; the Pullman Co. (reimbursed by league), $9.55; October 5, 1951, miscellaneous expenses (reimbursed by league), $54.11.

A. M. O. Ryan, 777 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any and all bills and statutes of interest to the hotel industry.
D. (6) $3,750.
E. (7) $296.40; (9) $296.40; (10) $940.05; (11) $1,236.45.

A. Sterling St. John, Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 998, 1001), as amended, to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes. In opposition to H. R. 5263 (82d Cong.), to amend the act of June 18, 1934, in order to extend foreign-trade zone privileges to certain types of warehouses.
D. (6) $17.25.
E. (7) $163.49; (9) $163.49; (10) $545.59; (11) $709.08; (15) $163.49, October 22, self, out-of-pocket expenses in connection with attending a meeting in New York of foreign-trade zone grantees and a luncheon in connection therewith.

A. St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
E. (10) $267.47; (11) $267.47.

A. Benjamin F. Saltzstein, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
B. Hedwig Lydia Riedner, Astor Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (1) During Eighty-second Congress or until client's matter is finally determined. (2) S. 302; H. R. 1620 and H. R. 2656; amendments to Public Law 859.
E. (4) $12.79; (6) $78.15; (7) $64; (9) $154.94; (10) $396.83; (11) $551.77; (15) Robert A. Saltzstein, as reimbursement of expenses, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C., $90.94.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Emergency Committee of Small and Medium Size Magazine Publishers, 400 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) During Eighty-second Congress. (2) Interested in H. R. 2982 and S. 1046, postal rate revision legislation.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $82.25; (7) $35.85; (8) $13.75; (9) $131.85; (10) $722.51; (11) $854.36; (15) October 30, 1951, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $82.25; December 30, 1951, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $35.62; November 27, 1951, travel, plane fare, $30.85; October 30, 1951, secretarial services, Washington, D. C., $13.75.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 511 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Benjamin F. Saltzstein, attorney for Hedwig Lydia Riedner, 625 North Milwaukee Street, Milwaukee, Wis.
C. (1) During Eighty-second Congress or until client's matter is finally determined. (2) S. 302; H. R. 1620 and H. R. 2656; amendments to Public Law 859.
E. (4) $12.79; (6) $78.15; (7) $64; (9) $154.94; (10) $396.83; (11) $551.77; (15) October 30, 1951, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $63.15; December 30, 1951, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $15; October 17, 1951, Batt, Bates & Co., 1407 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., mimeographing 60 copies of memorandum of testimony, S. 302. $12.79.

A. L. R. Sanford, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y.

A. Sangamo Electric Co.,[4] Springfield, Ill.
C. (1) Throughout present session of Congress. (2) Seeking amendments to Excess Profits Tax Act of 1950; H. R. 9827, Eighty-first Congress, second session; Public Law 909.
E. (10) $2,200; (11) $2,200.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. John T. Sapienza, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) and (2) The undersigned was retained to advise the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks in connection with H. R. 4473, which became the Revenue Act of 1951, Public Law 183, Eighty-second Congress. The association and the undersigned opposed enactment of section 313 of the Revenue Act of 1951, which repealed the exemption of mutual savings banks from Federal income tax.
D. and E.[1]

A. Stuart T. Saunders, 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
B. Norfolk & Western Railway Co., 108 North Jefferson Street, Roanoke, Va.
E. (10) $488.36; (11) $488.36.

A. Henry P. Schmidt, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 particularly, which are amendments to the Railroad Retirement Act, and all other legislation generally affecting labor.
D. (6) $400.

A. Paul W. Schoen, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (1) Legislative interests will continue during employment. (2) Legislative interests are those of employer.
D. (6) $100.
E. (6) $10; (7) $5; (9) $15; (11) $15.

A. Schoene & Kramer, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Railroad retirement and unemployment insurance matters. No specific bills under active consideration at present.
D. (6) $4,500.
E. (6) $12.31; (7) $40.35; (9) $52.66; (10) $13.80; (11) $66.46.

A. Mrs. Andrew Mackay Scott, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. League of Women Voters of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (1) Indefinitely.
D. (6) $412.50.
E. (7) $4; (9) $4; (10) $50.90; (11) $54.90.

A. Jack Garrett Scott, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Motor Bus Operators.
C. (1) Legislative interests are to continue indefinitely. (2) General legislative interests are in the field of transportation and other measures which may affect the interests of intercity motor-bus operators, and the ability of that industry to perform adequate service in the public interest.

A. Mildred Scott, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (2) S. 1202—National services for disabled persons amendments of 1951 (introduced March 22, 1951, by Senator DOUGLAS and others), opposed. S. 1318—To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped—an act to increase defense manpower, and help preserve our Nation, by establishing the Federal Agency for Handicapped (introduced by Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY), for. H. R. 3559—To establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped—an act to increase defense manpower, and help preserve our Nation, by establishing the Federal Agency for Handicapped (introduced by JOHN W. MCCORMACK); similar bills: H. R. 3560, Hon. PAUL W. SHAFER; H. R. 3581; Hon. HAROLD C. HAGEN; H. R. 3640, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER; H. R. 3747, Hon. GARDNER WITHROW; H. R. 3762, Hon. FRANCK R. HAVENNER; H. R. 3769, Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES; H. R. 3805, Hon. THOR C. TOLLEFSON; H. R. 3809, Hon. CHARLES F. WOLVERTON; H. R. 3836, Hon. HUGH B. MITCHELL; H. R. 3848, Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS; H. R. 3902, Hon. RAY J. MADDEN; H. R. 4912, Hon. CARL D. PERKINS, for. H. R. 4748—Tax exemptions for handicapped and for those who support handicapped who cannot care for themselves (introduced by Hon. GEORGE M. RHODES), for. H. R. 4051, National Leprosy Act, Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST.

D. (6) $300.

A. Vernon Scott and Loring A. Schuler, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Firm retained by National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) General legislative interests relate to taxation, Government regulation of business, and other legislation directly affecting business. Specifically interested in legislation affecting businessmen, such as the Revenue Act of 1951.

D. (6) $4,000.

E. (7) $47.30; (9) $47.30; (10) $203.45; (11) $250.75.

A. W. J. Sears, suite 210, Marsh Building, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Legislative interests stated in second quarterly report terminated with quarter ended June 30, 1950.

A. Harry See, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

C. (2) Advocating legislation favorable to labor and opposing unfavorable legislation.

E. (7) $29.14; (9) $29.14; (10) $699.56; (11) $728.70.

A. E. J. Shackelford, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (2) H. R. 3669 and H. R. 1347, to amend Railroad Retirement Act; House Resolution 426, to make study of integrating railroad retirement with social security.

D. (6) $800.

A. A. Manning Shaw,[2] Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald, Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that might affect the members of the N. A. E. C. Public Law 9, Eighty-second Congress (renegotiation of contracts). Appropriations for the Interior Department, fiscal 1952. Revenue Act of 1951. Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 1). TVA Act (48 Stat. 58). Federal Power Act (49 Stat. 803). REA of 1936 (49 Stat. 1363). Reclamation acts (25 Stat. through 45 Stat). Flood Control Act, 1944 (58 Stat. 887). Modifications.

D. (6) $4,974.90.

A. Mark R. Shaw, 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.

B. National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely, as long as I continue as secretary of the NCPW. (2) Favor economic aid to Europe and Asia, point 4 program, etc. Favor plans for universal disarmament. Favor full cooperation with the U. N. economic and social welfare. Oppose UMT, UMS, and military-aid programs. Other measures related to the issues of peace and war. (3) Peace Action.

D. (6) $800.

E. (7) $115.70; (9) $115.70; (10) $347.38; (11) $463.08.

A. Bruce E. Shepherd, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Continuous. (2) General: Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants. Specific: None.

D. (6) $100.

E. (10) $9.56; (11) $9.56.

A. Earl C. Shively, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting railroad interests. (a) Parcel post bills, H. R. 3465 and S. 1335; railroad retirement bill, H. R. 3669; St. Lawrence waterway, House Joint Resolution 4. (b) H. R. 3465, S. 1335, H. R. 3669, and House Joint Resolution 4.

D. (6) $393.16.

E. (7) $393.16; (9) $393.16; (10) $596.26; (15) $14.66, October 5, 1951, Pennsylvania Railroad Co., pullman expenses. $32.81, October 5, 1951, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses. $36.06, October 23, 1951, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses. $195.61, November 26, 1951, Hotel Raleigh, Washington, D. C., hotel expenses.

A. Paul Sifton,[2] 734 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW-CIO), 8000 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

D. (6) $1,560.

E. (6) $31; (7) $488.49; (9) $519.49; (10) $899.41; (11) $1,418.90.

A. Silver Users Association 1612 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation involving silver, H. R. 1321: To repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes.

D. (6) $295.

E. (2) $5,462.48; (5) $1,118.57; (6) $863.44; (7) $1,468.81; (8) $1,061.31; (9) $9,974.61; (10) $28,061.96; (11) $38,036.57.

A. Six Agency Committee,[4] 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting California's rights in the Colorado River and legislation relating to reclamation and water resources policies including S. 75, to authorize the central Arizona project, House Joint Resolution 42 and counterparts, central Arizona project examination and report, and House Joint Resolution 21, Senate Joint Resolution 26, and counterparts. Colorado River litigation resolutions, H. R. 2813 and S. 943, Colbran project; Public Law 171, San Diego aqueduct.

D. (6) $100.

E. (2) $4,030; (8) $283.18; (9) $4,313.18; (10) $21,967.54; (11) $26,280.72; (15) $1,850, October 16, 1951, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; $239.15, October 16, 1951, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., reimbursement of expenses; $2,180, November 28, 1951, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., retainer and per diem; $44.03, November 28, 1951, Northcutt Ely, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C., reimbursement of expenses.

A. Stephen G. Slipher, room 911, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Continuous. (2) H. R. 3178, 1385, 3177, 4473, S. 610, 1212. (3) Washington Notes, Flash Notes.

D. (6) $1,000.

E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $129.80; (11) $154.80.

A. Miss Elizabeth A. Smart, 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.

B. National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill.

C. (1) One year. (2) Legislation dealing with alcohol, international relations, narcotics, women and children; H. R. 1749, sale of alcohol to members of the land and naval forces, etc.; H. R. 2187, reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials to security of the United States; H. R. 2188, advertisement of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; H. R. 2340, violations of narcotics laws; H. R. 264, use and sale of intoxicating beverages to Indians; H. R. 1206, District of Columbia sales-tax exemptions of foods in hotels, cafes, bars, etc.; H. R. 1736, excise tax on cabarets, roof gardens, etc.; H. R. 3072, abolish functions of Indian Bureau, repeal act of June 18, 1934; H. R. 2982, increase postal rates; S. 1046, increase postal rates; S. 1, universal service and training bill.

D. (6) $612.

E. (5) $138.13; (6) $30.14; (9) $168.27; (10) $473.17; (11) $641.44.

A. Anthony W. Smith, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinite continuation. (2) General, forestry, regional development, resource conservation; specific, none.

A. Harold O. Smith, Jr., 400 Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., Investment Building, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

[4] Filed with the Clerk only.

A. Howard J. Smith, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

C. (1) Legislative interest will continue through the Eighty-second Congress. (2) S. 75, Bridge Canyon Act; and H. R. 1500 and H. R. 1501, Bridge Canyon Act (known more frequently as central Arizona project bill). (3) The Case for Water in Central Arizona, Work for Water, California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River, What the Central Arizona Project Means to You, Truth, Settling Up Time, Facts You Should Know Respecting the Central Arizona Project, National Tax Benefits From the Central Arizona Project.

D. (6) $9,294.77.

E. (1) $1,233.37; (2) $8,418.26; (3) $35; (4) $477.72; (5) $1,493.05; (6) $276.82; (7) $1,764.73; (8) $319.60; (9) $13,988.55; (10) $52,830.37; (11) $66,818.92; (15).[1]

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 425 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting directly or indirectly the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., including the following bills being considered this session: Railroad communications and operating rules bills, H. R. 1998; Federal bargeline bills, H. R. 1528, H. R. 2957; Railway Labor Act bills, H. R. 2658; transportation investigation, Senate Resolution 55; all measures purporting to amend the Railway Retirement Act.

D. (6) $2,085.

A. Purcell L. Smith, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Of indefinite duration. (2) H. R. 4386, 4473, 3400, 1642, 4963, 5743.

D. (6) $16,249.97.

E. (6) $9.38; (7) $280.40; (9) $289.78; (10) $1,432.14; (11) $1,721.92; (15) $193.90, various restaurants; dinners and lunches for company executives and NAEC employees; $16.20, November 30, Dayton-Biltmore Hotel, Dayton, O., lodging; $11.70, December 13, Pennsylvania Railroad, transportation.

A. Robert E. Smith,[2] 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) General education concerning the effect of inflation on the purchasing power of life insurance, as it relates to Federal policies or measures deemed to be inflationary in character. (a-b-c-d). In support of House Joint Resolution 323, proposing constitutional amendment relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances and gifts. (3) Stop inflation.

D. (6) $900.

E. (7) $936.92; (9) $936.92; (10) $1,376.26; (11) $2,313.18; (12) $4,800.47; (13) $2,000; (15) $56.30, October 1–8, restaurants, Seattle, Tacoma, meals; $38.55, October 1–8, hotel and motel, Seattle, Tacoma, lodging; $19.25, October 1–8, miscellaneous, Seattle, Tacoma, phones, postage, etc.; $88.40, October 9–20, restaurants, Portland, Salem, Medford, San Francisco, meals; $53.65, October 9–20, hotel and motel, Portland, Salem, Medford, San Francisco, lodging, etc.[1]

A. R. G. Smith, 10 Independence Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Kansas City, Mo., International Brotherhood Firemen and Oilers, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $778.24.

A. Sylvester C. Smith, Jr., 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

B. Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J.

C. (1) During my official connection as general counsel of the company. (2) General interest in all legislation affecting the business of the company.

A. Calvin K. Snyder, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

D. (6) $5,250.

E. (6) $154.19; (7) $1,449.27; (8) $25.85; (9) $1,629.31; (10) $2,784.52; (11) $4,413.83; (15) $18.23, November 12, 1951, Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio, breakfast conference; $22.60, December 1, 1951, George C. Shaffer, Inc., Washington, D. C., flowers for Wherry family; $114.35, December 22, 1951, Jeweler's Market, 3904 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., purchases in connection with dinner meeting November 22, 1951; $40.20, December 22, 1951, Avignone Confections, 5612 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C., purchases in connection with dinner meeting of January 22, 1951; $35, December 22, 1951, Thomas Norman, 1024 Browning Place NE., Washington, D. C., wages for services in connection with dinner meeting of January 22, 1951.

A. J. D. Snyder, room 1040, La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

B. Illinois Railroad Association, room 1526, 33 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation affecting railroads.

D. (6) $500.

E. (6) $13.14; (7) $296.10; (8) $66.37; (9) $375.61; (10) $192.73; (11) $568.34.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Support of legislation favorable to free enterprise system and opposition to legislation unfavorable to that system. (3) Southern States Industrial Council Bulletin.

D. (6) $32,624.50.

E. (2) $15,815.43; (4) $3,150.58; (5) $1,184.17; (6) $176.84; (7) $534.58; (8) $388.47; (9) $21,250.07; (10) $80,175.89; (11) $101,425.96; (15) $325, Mecklenburg Real Estate Co., rent; $150, postmaster, postage; $4.08, Elliott Typewriter Co., rent of machine; $17, Manufacturers Record Co., printing; $28.98, Travel, Inc., transportation, etc.[1]

A. Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.

B. Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

A. Lyndon Spencer, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Jerome H. Spingarn, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. United World Federalists, Inc., 125 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Legislative interests will continue indefinitely. (2) H. R. 64 and other measures to strengthen the United Nations; aid and technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. Support of United Nations and its specialized agencies.

D. (6) $2,124.99.

A. Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

D. (6) $23.

E. (4) $8.75; (5) $123.81; (6) $6.70; (7) $48.13; (9) $187.39; (10) $1,772.50; (11) $1,959.89; (15) $22, November 5, 1951, Willike Memorial Buildings, New York, room rent for meeting; $10.30, November 5, 1951, Plaza Typewriter Exchange, New York, typewriter rent; $24.41, December 11, 1951, Universal Reporting Service, New York, 21 Spruce Street, stenotypist; $48.13, December 14, 1951, Mrs. Theodor Oxholm, New York, travel.

A. Thomas G. Stack, 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.

B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One Hundred and Fourth Place, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) H. R. 166, H. R. 2129, S. 399, H. R. 2423, S. 510, H. R. 2422, H. R. 2688, H. R. 2313, H. R. 2343, H. R. 1313, S. 1125, Public Law 234, and any bills before the various committees of Congress, pertaining to improving our Railroad Retirement Act, and to secure additional benefits for the rank and file of railroad employees covered by the act. (3) Rail Pension News.

D. (6) $1,320.

E. (1) $214.50; (2) $1,320; (4) $1,400; (6) $31.80; (7) $264.95; (9) $3,231.25; (10) $10,899.97; (11) $14,131.22.

A. Howard M. Starling, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies. Numerous House and Senate bills dealing with the subject of bonding of Federal employees, and bills reactivating War Damage Corporation.

D. (6) $150.

E. (10) $79.45; (11) $79.45.

A. State Tax Association, post office box 2559, Houston, Tex.

C. (1) A continuous study of Federal tax legislation and administrative rulings and court decisions in tax matters affecting community property taxpayers inequitably. (2) No specific legislation.

D. (6) $2,895.

E. (2) $828.12; (4) $141.22; (7) $43.20; (8) $338.76; (9) $1,351.30; (10) $5,771.70; (11) $7,123.

A. Otts D. Steinback, room 407, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express, and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3669 and S. 1347 and other legislation affecting labor, more particularly railroad labor.

D. (5) $300; (6) $400; (7) $2,804; (8) $2,804.

A. Charles I. Stengle, room 716, AFGE, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Federation of Government Employees, room 716, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

C. (1) Permanently. (2) All bills of interest to Federal Government employees and District of Columbia government employees.
D. (6) $1,615.32.
E. (7) $17.60; (9) $17.60; (10) $125.60; (11) $143.20.

A. Charles T. Stewart, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry. (3).[1]
D. (6) $3,872.47.
E. (7) $511.06; (8) $61.41; (9) $572.47; (10) $976.37; (11) $1,548.84.

A. Erskine Stewart, Suite 808, Kass Building, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) LIFO, all appropriation legislation, all parcel-post legislation, Fair Labor Standards Act, war-damage insurance and other war-damage insurance bills, customs simplification, unemployment compensation, cotton labeling, consumers research bureau, and fair trade.
D. (6) $375.
E. (8) $2.50; (9) $2.50; (10) $18.95; (11) $21.45.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the American merchant marine and transportation generally.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (7) $4.90; (9) $4.90; (10) $112.38.

A. Edwin L. Stoll, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.
D. (6) $2,454.33.
E. (7) $244.38; (8) $34.95; (9) $279.33; (10) $116.90; (11) $396.23; (15) $12, National Press Club, Washington, D. C., dues.

A. Benton J. Stong,[2] 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
B. Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1555 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. (home office); 300 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation of interest to the National Farmers Union.
D. (6) $2,750.

A. Paul A. Strachan, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, 1370 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Opposed S. 1202; for S. 1318, H. R. 3559, H. R. 3560, H. R. 3581, H. R. 3640, H. R. 3747, H. R. 3762, H. R. 3769, H. R. 3805, H. R. 3809, H. R. 3836, H. R. 3848, H. R. 3902, H. R. 4912, H. R. 4748, H. R. 4051.
D. (6) $700.
E. (7) $50; (8) $50; (9) $50; (10) $390; (11) $440.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4059, copyright amendment bill, relating to the manufacturing clause; H. R. 3711, photoengraving; temporary free importation of samples under bond; H. R. 5505, customs simplification bill, and tuna bill.
D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $37.95; (8) $17.80; (9) $55.75; (10) $234.58; (11) $290.33.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) H. R. 4059, copyright amendment bill, relating to the manufacturing clause; and H. R. 3711, photoengraving, temporary free importation of samples under bond.
D. (6) $625.

A. O. R. Strackbein, 424 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,625.01.
E. (7) $65.50; (9) $65.50; (10) $448.82; (11) $514.32.

A. William C. Stronach, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. American College of Radiology, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the practice of medicine and all national health insurance legislation.

A. Arthur D. Strong, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
B. Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn.
C. (2) All legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the Upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits.
D. (6) $1,160.97.

A. Arthur Sturgis, Jr., 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Retail Federation, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Registrant is generally interested in all legislation and legislative proposals affecting the retail industry, including the industry's relations with the Federal Government, with its suppliers, with its employees, and with its customers.
D. (6) $625.
E. (7) $10; (9) $10; (10) $13.40; (11) $23.40.

A. J. E. Sturrock, post-office box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
B. Texas Water Conservation Association, post-office box 2084, Capitol Station, Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources; opposed to House Joint Resolution 102, approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin; for H. R. 1344, to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State; for H. R. 2646, to facilitate the development of small reclamation projects; for bill quitclaiming title to tidelands to the several States. (3) Texas water.
D. (6) $1,500.
E. (2) $57.38; (5) $15.42; (6) $7; (7) $631.87; (8) $211.37; (9) $923.04; (10) $1,091.54; (11) $2,014.58; (15) $404.25.[1]

A. Sullivan, Bernard, Shea & Kenney, 804 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.
B. An informal group of finance companies.[1]
C. (2) Employer was opposed to the proposal, which would amend Internal Revenue Code so as to permit only one surtax exemption and one minimum excess profits tax credit to a group of affiliated corporations; this proposal became section 23 of H. R. 4473, as it passed the House and was eliminated from such bill as it passed the Senate; a compromise proposal was adopted by the conferees and enacted as section 15 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $35,000.
E. (2) $12,500; (6) $13.32; (9) $12,513.32; (11) $12,513.32; (15) $12,500, J. Milton Cooper, Washington Building, Washington, D. C., fees.

A. Francis M. Sullivan, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, National Headquarters, 1423 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
C. (2) All legislation affecting war veterans, their dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. (3) DAV Semimonthly.
D. (6) $2,906.60.

A. A. D. Sutherland, 104 South Main Street, Fond du Lac, Wis.
B. Bankers Farm Mortgage Co., Fond du Lac, Wis., in behalf of former bondholders of the Bankers Joint Stock Land Bank of Milwaukee, Wis., and F. A. Carlton, 135 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (7) $31; (9) $31; (10) $173.80; (11) $204.80.

A. Thomas N. Tarleau, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Retail Furniture Association, 666 Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill., and 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) In favor of amendment to internal revenue law giving excess profits tax relief to instalment basis taxpayers.
D. (7) $2,500.
E. (2) $15.30; (6) $24.20; (7) $110.50; (9) $150; (11) $150; (15) $150.

A. James A. Tawney, 504 Hibbs Building, Washington D. C.
B. Grain and Feed Dealers National Association, 100 Merchants Exchange Building, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) All legislation affecting members of the association.
D. (6) $1,687.50.
E. (7) $1; (8) $1; (9) $2; (10) $10; (11) $12.

A. James A. Tawney, 504 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Fan Manufacturers, Inc., and Propeller Fan Manufacturers Association, 2159 Guardian Building, Detroit, Mich.
C. (2) H. R. 4473, to provide revenue, and for other purposes; favored clarifying amendment with respect to applicability of tax on fans.
D. (6) $350.
E. (6) $5; (7) $4; (9) $9; (10) $8.39; (11) $17.39.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

A. Tax Equality Association of Montana, McKay Building, 107 East Main, Missoula, Mont.
C. (2) Repeal of the exemption contained in section 101 (12) and (13) of the Internal Revenue Code and all bills so to do which apply to the conduct of business competition with goods and services produced for a livelihood by the citizenry.
D. (6) $10.
E. (2) $1,063; (6) $0.63; (7) $77.30; (8) $0.45; (9) $1,141.38; (10) $4,430.94; (11) $5,572.32.

A. Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky.
C. (2) Advocating revision of section 101, Internal Revenue Code.
D. (6) $688.
E. (2) $521.25; (4) $38.60; (5) $210; (6) $9.76; (8) $22.84; (9) $302.45; (10) $3,117.14; (11) $3,919.59; (15) $375, Donald F. Nemitz, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., salary; $146.25, Dorothy Gates, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., salary; $38.60, Franklin Printing Co., 416 West Main, Louisville, Ky., printing and stationery; $210, Kentucky Tax Research Association, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky., joint office expense; $15, William P. Helm, Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., subscription.

A. Edward D. Taylor, 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute, 1903 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting Federal excise tax on business and store machines.

A. Hugh W. Taylor, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky.
C. (2) Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; H. R. 4473, the 1951 tax-revision bill; H. R. 4475, authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make additional increases in tobacco-acreage allotments to meet market demands.
D. (7) $2,500.
E. (7) $238.89; (8) $85.16; (9) $324.16; (10) $790.60; (11) $1,114.76.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,288.65.
E. (8) $1.15; (9) $1.15; (10) $39.45; (11) $40.60.

A. Television Broadcasters' Tax Committee, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tax legislation affecting the television broadcasting industry.
D. (6) $25,530.
E. (2) $14,000; (5) $50.72; (6) $661.14; (7) $2,765.93; (8) $1.44; (9) $17,479.20; (10) $4,524.46; (11) $22,003.65; (15) $390.51, The Fort Industry Co., 199 Pierce Street, Birmingham, Mich., telegrams; $500, Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., retainer fee; $13.13, Birmingham Eccentric, Birmingham, Mich., stationery; $5,000, Lovell H. Parker, 614 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C., retainer fee; $3,036.53, Poole, Warren & Littell, 924 Ford Building, Detroit, Mich., travel and hotel expense; $7,500, Poole, Warren & Littell, 924 Ford Building, Detroit, Mich., fee; etc.[1]

A. Marjorie L. Temple, 1917 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which affects the interest of women in business and the professions. (3) The Independent Woman.
D. (6) $68,338.20.
E. (2) $833.32; (5) $230.68; (6) $45.48; (8) $30.85; (9) $1,140.33; (10) $3,050.67; (11) $4,191.

A. John U. Terrell, 424 Wyatt Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
C. (2) S. 75 and H. R. 1500.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street (P. O. Box 2084, Capitol Station), Austin, Tex.
C. (2) Interested in all legislation concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; opposed to all legislation creating Federal Valley Authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources; opposed to House Joint Resolution 102, approving agreement between United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin; for H. R. 1344, to prohibit establishment of valley authority in any State without vote of people of the State; for H. R. 2646, to facilitate the development of small reclamation projects; for bill quitclaiming title to tidelands to the several States. (3) Texas water.
D. (6) $6,1C7.75.
E. (2) $1,829.45; (4) $2,144.13; (5) $236.93; (6) $289.99; (7) $1,509.01; (8) $1,286.44; (9) $7,295.95; (10) $18,479.22; (11) $25,775.17; (15) $225, C. S. Heacock, Austin, Tex., office rent; $26.59, Vivian Meeks, Austin, Tex., salary; $174.99, United States post office, Austin, Tex., stamps; $1,236.60, J. E. Sturrock, Austin, Tex., salary; $566.26, Mildred B. Vaught, Austin, Tex., salary; $146.65, The Whitley Printing Co., Austin, Tex., printing; etc.[1]

A. Whitney Tharin, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Potato Council, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev.
B. Nevada Railroad Association, 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev., composed of Union Pacific Railroad Co., Western Pacific Railroad Co., and Southern Pacific Co.
C. (2) All Senate and House bills and resolutions affecting the interests of Nevada railroads.
D. (6) $675.
E. (7) $65; (11) $65.

A. Chester C. Thompson, 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters affecting barge and towing vessel industry and water transportation.[1]
D. (6) $6,000.
E. (4) $159.63; (7) $69.25; (9) $228.28; (10) $287.02; (11) $515.90.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, 1000 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 488 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Legislation which might affect the welfare of policyholders and annuitants.[1]
D. (6) $833.33.
E. (7) $87.93; (9) $87.93; (10) $559.83; (11) $647.76.

A. Arthur P. Tiernan, 201 Southeast Third Street, Evansville, Ind.
B. Vanderburgh County Medical Society, 201 Southeast Third Street, Evansville, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. E. W. Tinker, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.

A. William H. Tinney, 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 1740 Broad Street Station Building, Philadelphia, Pa.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the interest of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.[1]
D. (6) $1,842.36.
E. (9) $46.15.

A. S. G. Tipton, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) General legislative interests for the proper advancement of the airline industry.[1]
D. (6) $7,500.
E. (7) $5; (9) $5; (10) $105.06; (11) $110.06.

A. Fred A. Tobin, 438 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (3) News for Dairy Co-ops and Legislative Letter.
D. (6) $2,136.66.
E. (8) $27.10; (9) $27.10; (10) $147.80; (11) $174.90.

A. John A. Todd, 1008 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Any matters substantially affecting the cotton compress and cotton warehouse industry.
E. (10) $92.33; (11) $92.33.

A. Wallace Townsend, 306 Commercial National Bank Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Shreveport, La.
C. (2) My interests have been in the appropriation for the Southwestern Power

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

Administration in the appropriation bill for Department of the Interior.
D. (6) $600.
E. (10) $522.05; (11) $522.05.

A. Trailer Coach Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
E. (1) $900; (2) $1,450; (4) $306.52; (6) $7.95; (7) $154.39.

A. Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Legislation which bears upon the future of competitive private ownership of any form of transportation and related subjects.
D. (6) $83,740.22.
E. (2) $5,025; (5) $998.69; (6) $206.41; (7) $949.11; (8) $397.23; (9) $7,576.44; (10) $12,207.73; (11) $19,784.17.

A. Matt Triggs,[2] 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Proposed legislation on the following has been supported or opposed: Mexican farm labor importation, farm machinery and supplies, baler twine, fertilizer, agricultural labor, tobacco, ICC decision on prohibition of trip leasing, control and eradication of brucellosis, establishment of revolving fund for financing exports of farm commodities.
D. (6) $2,166.76.
E. (7) $1,050.95; (9) $1,050.95; (10) $1,053.67; (11) $2,104.62; (15) $835.97.[1]

A. Trucking Industry National Defense Committee, Inc., 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
E. (15) $169.20, collector of Internal Revenue, Baltimore, Md., social-security and income-tax deduction; $139.27, E. Dowty, Washington, D. C., salary; $13.63, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., telephone service; $99.05, A. D. Condon, Washington, D. C., expenses; etc.[1]

A. Paul T. Truitt, 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Plant Food Council, Inc., 817 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Generally interested in legislation affecting the fertilizer industry.

A. Harold J. Turner, Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co., Southern Pacific Co., and Union Pacific Railroad Co., Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
C. (2) All bills which directly affect railroads of Oregon.
D. (6) $2,291.25.
E. (6) $25.94.

A. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

A. United States Cuban Sugar Council, 30 Pine Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Statutes and bills affecting the importation by the United States of sugar from Cuba, tariff rates on such sugar, and trade between the United States and Cuba, particularly sugar.
D. (6) $1,927.46.
E. (1) $7,711.88; (4) $1,401.83; (9) $9,113.71; (10) $28,856.17; (11) $37,969.88; (15) $7,711.88, Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., fee, salary of council secretary, and incidental items; $37.08, Graphic Presentation Services, 239 East Sixtieth Street, New York, N. Y., services; $1,364.75, J. C. Dillon Co., Inc., 227 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y., printing.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.[1]
E. (2) $3,685.19; (4) $3,369.04; (5) $493.22; (6) $1,137.63; (7) $449.63; (8) $423.70; (9) $9,558.41; (10) $40,891.37; (11) $50,449.78; (15).[2]

A. Albert F. Versen, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Albert F. Versen, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.
B. St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo.

A. A. L. Viles, 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

A. Tracy S. Voorhees, 711 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Supporting the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

A. H. Jerry Voorhis, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Cooperative League of the United States of American Association, Inc., 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting the health, welfare, and safety of the American people.

A. Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.

A. James A. Waggener, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Indiana State Medical Association, 1021 Hume Mansur Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
C. (2) All bills pending before Congress which would create national health insurance.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation that might affect members as going electric utilities.[1]
D. (6) $6,625.02.
E. (6) $43.40; (7) $578.46; (8) $90.45; (9) $712.31; (10) $1,462.13; (11) $2,174.44.

A. Thomas G. Walters, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Government Employees' Council, A. F. of L., 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Represent the member unions and the Government Employees' Council on matters affecting them before the Congress.
D. (6) $2,013.40.

A. Milo J. Warner, 904 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio.
B. The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.
C. (2) Attention to legislation which may affect the interests of the mutual policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.
D. (7) $3,500.
E. (6) $3.06; (7) $521.99; (9) $525.05; (10) $1,456.74; (11) $1,981.79.

A. Washington Board of Trade, 204 Evening Star Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting the District of Columbia, of interest to the Washington Board of Trade.

A. Washington Real Estate Board, Inc., 312 Wire Building, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All local measures affecting the District of Columbia.
E. (10) $495; (11) $495.

A. Vincent T. Wasilewski, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Association of Radio and Television Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation relating directly or indirectly to the radio and television industry.[1]
D. (6) $1,824.11.

A. J. R. Watson, room 1, I. C. R. R. passenger station, Jackson, Miss.
B. Mississippi Railroad Association, room 1, I. C. R. R. passenger station, Jackson, Miss.
C. (2) Legislation affecting railroads in Mississippi.
E. (10) $873.70; (11) $873.70.

A. Newton Patrick Weathersby, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
B. District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general.
D. (6) $1,499.94.

A. William H. Webb, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) All matters pertaining to river and harbor development, flood control, navigation, irrigation-reclamation, soil and water conservation, and related subjects.
D. (6) $1,299.82.

---

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.
[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

E. (3) $7; (4) $29.58; (5) $26.95; (6) $34.05; (7) $184.41; (8) $449.99; (9) $634.40; (10) $1,635.20; (11) $2,269.60; (15).[1]

A. Ernest N. Webster, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.
B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) For passage of S. 1347 and H. R. 3669.
E. (2) $440; (6) $12.58; (7) $312.22; (9) $764.80; (11) $764.80.

A. J. W. Weingarten, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation or regulation affecting the railroad business.
D. (6) $3,200.

A. Wayne Weishaar, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Aeronautical Training Society, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting aviation training or contract overhaul of aircraft which may arise at any time in future; also interested in bills dealing with ROTC as they apply to colleges, universities, and other schools engaged in aviation training.
D. (6) $3,300.

A. W. S. Weismann, Jr., suite 400, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Airlines, Inc., suite 400, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting air transportation.
D. (6) $2,750.
E. (6) $10; (7) $400; (9) $410; (10) $464; (11) $874.

A. Bernard Weitzer, 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Support such legislation as will carry out the purpose of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution and to oppose legislation which would tend to frustrate the purpose therein expressed. (3) The Jewish Veteran.
D. (7) $2,250.
E. (5) $19.19; (6) $11.07; (7) $324.27; (8) $5.56; (9) $360.09; (10) $1,125.40; (11) $1,485.90; (15) $247.59.

A. Don Welch, P. O. Box 231, Madill, Okla.
B. The seven railroads named in original declaration.
C. (2) The interests of the railroad industry generally; particularly S. 1335 and H. R. 3669.
D. (7) $1,241.70.
E. (7) $483.41; (9) $483.41; (10) $485.22; (11) $968.63; (15) $1,241.70.

A. Edward M. Welliver, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $1,350.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. William E. Welsh, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Reclamation Act, 1902 (53 Stat. 1187, 43 U. S. C. 485), and all amendatory and supplementary acts thereto; all other statutes relating to water- and land-conservation measures.[1]
D. (6) $4,000.
E. (7) $1,226.14; (9) $1,226.14; (10) $2,632.88; (11) $3,859.02.

A. Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Lerner Stores Corp.; Howard Clothes, Inc.; Franklin Stores Corp.; Diana Stores Corp.; National Shirt Shops; A. S. Beck Shoe Co.; Miles Shoe Co.; Dee-Jay Stores; Lane Bryant, Inc.; the Felsway Shoe Corp.; United Merchants & Manufacturers, Inc.; Kitty Kelly Shoe Corp.; Mangel Stores Corp.; Seligman & Latz.
C. (2) Revenue Act of 1951; opposition to section 123 of H. R. 4473.
D. (6) $12,500.
E. (6) $19.69; (7) $75.28; (8) $2.75; (9) $97.72; (11) $97.72.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, suite 906–907, San Francisco, Calif.
C. (2) Interested in legislation affecting livestock and meat-packing industry.
D. (6) $5,165.38.
E. (10) $265.79; (11) $265.79.

A. Howard C. Westwood, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Institute of Accountants and its members, 270 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Against S. 17 unless amended; against S. 1725; H. R. 3097, not opposed.
D. (6) $1,000.
E. (6) $60.80; (9) $60.80; (10) $72.30; (11) $133.10.

A. Edward K. Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Shore Line Oil Co., Las Vegas, Nev., and Craw Co., Las Vegas, Nev.
C. (2) Measures pertaining to the so-called tidelands-oil question.
E. (8) $4.50; (9) $4.50; (10) $121.99; (11) $126.49.

A. George Y. Wheeler 2d, 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation affecting National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and/or its affiliated companies.
E. (7) $25; (9) $25; (10) $29.65; (11) $54.65; (15) $25.

A. Wheeler & Wheeler, 704 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Contract Carrier Conference, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any proposed legislation pertaining to the investigation of domestic land and water transportation under Senate Resolution 50 or to the Motor Carrier Act.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

D. (6) $3,000.
E. (7) $111.60; (8) $20; (9) $131.60; (10) $27.93; (11) $159.53.

A. Clem Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance.
D. (6) $6,262.50.
E. (4) $70; (7) $327.04; (8) $27.88; (9) $424.92; (10) $1,673.60; (11) $2,098.52; (15) $424.92.[1]

A. Leone Baxter Whitaker, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. National Education Campaign, American Medical Association, 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) Any legislation for compulsory health insurance.
D. (6) $6,262.50.
E. (4) $70; (7) $327.04; (8) $27.88; (9) $424.92; (10) $1,673.60; (11) $2,098.52; (15) $424.92.[1]

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Cotton Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) Legislation affecting cotton and foreign trade, such as ECA, CCC, commodity futures exchanges, and price control.
D. (6) $250.
E. (6) $11.06.

A. Richard P. White, 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry directly.
D. (6) $3,125.02.
E. (2) $31.25; (4) $7.58; (5) $18.06; (6) $2.81; (7) $5.81; (9) $65.51; (10) $170; (11) $235.51.

A. Albert V. Whitehall, 1756 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,812.51.
E. (7) $540.35; (9) $540.35; (10) $1,288.12; (1) $1,828.47.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Any and all legislation particularly affecting the interests of manufacturers of gas appliances and equipment.
E. (10) $1,352.03; (11) $1,352.03.

A. H. Leigh Whitelaw, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
B. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation.
D. (6) $1,250.
E. (10) $256.66; (11) $256.66.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., suite 501, Washington, D. C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Tax legislation and any other bills affecting the natural gas industry.
D. (6) $750.
E. (10) $17.25; (11) $17.25.

A. John J. Wicker, Jr., 501 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. American Mutual Alliance, 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All legislation affecting mutual fire and casualty insurance companies, including, for example, Federal tax legislation and war damage insurance legislation.
D. (6) $3,634.22.
E. (2) $2,580; (5) $178.85; (6) $22.43; (7) $853.26; (9) $3,634.22; (10) $10,347.78; (11) $13,982; (15) $622.53.[1]

A. Claude C. Wild, Jr., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
C. (2) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting the oil and gas industry.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (5) $675; (6) $121.49; (8) $25; (9) $821.49; (10) $2,588.51; (11) $3,410.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Retired Officers Association, Inc., 1616 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any and all legislation pertinent to the rights, benefits, privileges, and obligations of retired officers, male and female, regular and reserve, and their dependents and survivors, of whatever nature. (3) The Retired Officer.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. John C. Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Realtors' Washington Committee, National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislative interests are those affecting the real-estate industry generally and of concern to the National Association of Real Estate Boards.
D. (6) $1,200.
E. (7) $381.37; (9) $381.37; (11) $381.37.

A. John C. Williamson, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Trailercoach Dealers National Association, 39 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,025.
E. (7) $249.77; (9) $249.77; (10) $486.37; (11) $733.14.

A. Carl H. Willingham, Washington Loan and Trust Building, Washington, D. C., and 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
B. Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y., and National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Excise taxes and health insurance.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

A. Frank E. Wilson, M. D., 1523 L Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
C. (2) All bills (House and Senate) relating to health and medicine. (3) Informational Bulletins and weekly letter published in Journal of American Medical Association.
D. (6) $4,791.72.
E. (7) $1,066.49; (10) $1,210.81; (11) $2,277.30.

A. E. Raymond Wilson,[2] 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) The general legislative interest is to work where legislation is involved for the development of the United Nations into a world federation; the international control and reduction of armaments; recognition of its responsibility on the part of the United States Government for assuming its share in the burden for world-wide economic rehabilitation and development; protection of recognized civil liberties; and adequate recognition of rights of conscience. (3) The Washington Newsletter.
D. (6) $1,812.50.
E. (6) $24.45; (7) $133.76; (9) $158.21; (10) $636.31; (11) $794.52.

A. Robert J. Wilson, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. Washington Restaurant Association, 2003 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., and National Restaurant Association, 8 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Everett T. Winter, 719 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo.
C. (2) Legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, and regulation of domestic transportation.
D. (6) $2,500.
E. (10) $1,935.95; (11) $1,935.95.

A. Theodore Wiprud, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. The Medical Society of the District of Columbia, 1718 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Legislation pertaining to the practice of medicine and all related services and that affecting the public health, including extension of social security into the field of the practice of medicine. (3) Medical Annals of the District of Columbia.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis.
C. (2) All legislation affecting railroads and transportation generally.
D. (7) $652.83.
E. (2) $348; (7) $304.83; (9) $652.83; (10) $1,023.91; (11) $1,676.74; (15) $652.83, C. A. Hummel, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis., salary and expenses.

[2] Filed with the Secretary only.

A. F. B. Wise, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Renderers Association, 1424 K Street, Washington, D. C.
C. (2) Any legislation which would specifically have an effect upon the production, consumption, import, export, or taxation of any animal or vegetable fat or oil as well as all general legislation affecting business, particularly small business.

A. Walter F. Woodul, Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.
B. Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; the Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Ft. Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; the Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International-Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle and Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris and Mt. Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme & Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; Roscoe, Snyder & Pacific Railway Co., Abilene, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas South-Eastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; the Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; the Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; the Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.
C. (2) Generally legislation affecting Texas railroads.[1]
D. (6) $5,023.44.
E. (6) $61.51; (7) $350.43; (9) $411.94; (10) $5,698.25; (11) $6,110.19; (15) $116.91, Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., hotel expense; $26.57, Austin Hotel, Austin, Tex., hotel expense; $26, Reeck's Manitowoc, Wis., supplies; $38.98, Pullman Co., Fort Worth, Tex., pullman.

A. Wyatt, Grafton & Grafton, 300 Marion E. Taylor Building, Louisville, Ky.
B. National Committee for Fair Emergency Excise Taxation, 60 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y.
C. (2) Fair emergency excise taxation, H. R. 4473, Revenue Act of 1951.
E. (6) $16.37; (9) $16.37; (10) $2,621.36; (11) $2,637.75.

A. J. Banks Young, 1832 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, post-office box 18, Memphis, Tenn.
C. (2) The National Cotton Council of America favors such action on any legislation affecting raw cotton industry as will promote the purposes for which the council is organized.
D. (6) $54.
E. (7) $29.63; (9) $29.63; (10) $265.99; (11) $295.62.

[1] Not printed. Filed with Clerk and Secretary.

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1951:

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy, questions are not repeated, only the answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number. Also for economy in the RECORD, lengthy answers are abridged.)

FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE THREE COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:
This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.
PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:
"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.
"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------ ←

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th
(Mark one square only)				

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:
(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)
(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".
(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:
(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.
(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names of agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers; except that: (a) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (b) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(a) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302 (e).
(b) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).
(c) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (a) Short titles of statutes and bills; (b) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (c) citations of statutes, where known; (d) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed, in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (a) Description, (b) quantity distributed, (c) date of distribution, (d) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out Items "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ←

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1←

A. Ellsworth C. Alvord, World Center Building, Sixteenth and K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Committee of American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) During Eighty-second Congress, first session. (2) Taxation of American employees engaged in foreign work. (3) None. (4) Anticipated expenses are actual out-of-pocket expenses for telephone, telegraph, travel, etc. Compensation to be determined at conclusion of work.

A. Harold J. Buoy, home address, rural route 6, Decatur, Ill.; business address, 825 Bowen Building, Washington, D. C.

B. International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders and Helpers of America, A. F. of L., Kansas City, Kans.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Legislation pertaining to labor generally. (3) None.

A. Lawrence J. Casey, Jr., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry. (4) $4,250 per year.

A. The Consumers' Lobby, room 1, 826 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Robert I. Fine, Philip L. Rizzo.

C. (1) One year. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer, specifically S. 169, of which we are in favor. (3) None. (4) $1,500 (for office and literature).

A. Cooperative Health Federation of America, 343 South Dearborn, Chicago, Ill.

C. (2) Senate bill 1875. (4) Approximately $250 per quarter, or $1,000 per year, which represents approximately 10 percent of the total income of the organization and which will be spent for portions of salaries of the regular staff, telephone and telegraph, and general office expenses.

A. J. G. Corona, suite 101, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Will continue during tenure of my position. (2) Any legislative proposals affecting the interests of the telegraph company. (3) Nil. (4) Anticipated quarterly expenses for travel, food, lodging, and entertainment, $100. Registrant is paid an annual salary for his general legislative and administrative duties and is not allocated any specific sum for legislative activities.

A. M. F. Crass, Jr., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) H. R. 3257, H. R. 1535, and H. R. 5505; S. 2170. (4) Compensation is on a fixed-salary basis of $15,000 per year, payable semimonthly, plus actual expenses.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, attorneys and counselors, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of Margery Durant Green, 1 Atlantic Street, Stamford, Conn.

C. (1) Not determined. (2) To extend to the estates of living incompetents the benefits of the Technical Changes Act of 1949. No such legislation pending at this time. (4) (a) Compensation is to be paid by retainer covering both legislative and nonlegislative interests, with additional compensation depending on nature and result of services to be performed; (b) $3,500 of current retainer allocable to services relating to legislative interests; proper allocation of part of retainer to be paid in 1952 cannot be determined at this time but will be subsequently reported; (c) not determined; (d) nominal, may not exceed $100.

A. Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross, attorneys and counselors, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Estate of W. D. Johnson, deceased, 900 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Mo.

C. (1) Not determined. (2) Amendment of section 1000 (e) of Internal Revenue Code to permit an executor or administrator to release powers of disposition where the decedent was under a disability during his lifetime. No legislation to this effect now pending. (4) (a) Compensation is to be paid by retainer covering both legislative and nonlegislative interests, with additional compensation depending on nature and result of services to be performed; (b) $5,000 of retainer allocable to services relating to legislative interests; (c) not determined; (d) nominal, may not exceed $100.

A. Eastern Meat Packers Association, corporate address, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y.; mailing address, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 and amendments. (3) Mimeographed bulletins to members occasionally contain some legislative matter. (4) Nature: Cabs, telephone, mimeographing, and mailing; amount unknown at this time.

A. Robert I. Fine, room 1, 826 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Consumers' Lobby.

C. (1) One year. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer, specifically Senate Resolution 169, of which I am in favor. (3) None. (4) $750 for office and literature; compensation contingent.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Salary of $9,450 per annum, effective December 1, 1951, paid by the above employer, and is to be reimbursed for all actual expenses incurred in connection with his work.

A. J. M. George, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

B. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.

C. (1) Indefinite, dependent upon legislative occurrences. (2) Federal legislation is a very minor part of my services to employer. (4) Amount of expenses unknown until incurred. Expenses, if any, will be transportation, hotel and meals, communications, and similar items necessary or incidental to services performed. Compensation is $500 per month, payable monthly and without regard to whether any legislative service or expense is incurred.

A. W. W. Gerhard, 1549 Burmont Road, Drexel Hill, Pa.

B. Household Finance Corp., 919 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Legislative interests will probably continue indefinitely. (2) (a) The general legislative interest of registrant is Federal regulation and control of consumer credit; (b) the particular statute in which registrant is interested is section 601 of the Defense Production Act of 1950. (4) Registrant's annual salary is $7,560, but registrant has numerous other duties on behalf of his employer not connected with Federal lobbying and estimates that not more than 50 percent of total employable time will be spent in such lobbying activities. Registrant anticipates that his only expenses will be travel expenses and will not exceed $2,400 per annum.

A. George S. Goldstein, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers of America, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Support all legislation favorable to national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and the general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives. (4) Salary, $390 monthly; expenses, $65 monthly (cab fares, meals, etc.).

A. Robert C. Harris, 440 Downing Avenue, Fort Wayne, Ind.

B. National Retired Teachers Association.

C. (1) During Eighty-second Congress. (2) H. R. 2764.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Eastern Meat Packers Association; corporate address, Hotel Statler, New York, N. Y.; mailing address, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington 1, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 and amendments. (3) None. (4) Nature, cabs, telephone, etc.; compensation, percentage of $3,500 annual fee; amount, unknown at this time.

A. C. B. Heinemann, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinite period. (2) Defense Production Act and amendments. (4) Nature, percentage of trade association expenses; amount, unknown at this time; compensation, percentage of $10,000 salary.

A. William Ingles, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. American Steel Foundries, Chicago, Ill.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Legislation affecting industry. (3) None. (4) (a) Annual; (b) undetermined; (c) indefinite; (d) none, excepting traveling expenses authorized as necessary.

A. Vernon A. Johnson, 1000 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Any legislation affecting aircraft manufacturing. (4) Salary is at rate of $14,040 per year.

A. Robert J. McBride, 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) It is not known how long legislative interest will continue. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. No known bills have been introduced in which registrant is interested. (4) Registrant is compensated at an annual rate.

A. Mackoff, Kellogg, Muggli & Kirby, Dickinson, N. Dak.

B. Brooks Keogh, Roy Lillibridge & John H. Hanson, trustees operating under the name of Mineral Recovery Trustees, Dickinson, N. Dak. Trustees in behalf of former owners of lands sold to United States, seeking recovery of mineral rights.

C. (1) During present session of Congress. (2) Will be interested in a bill proposed to be introduced seeking the recovery or right to repurchase mineral rights by former owners of lands which were sold to the United States. (3) (a) Circular letter with form of acceptance of trust was issued by trustees addressed to former owners of lands; (b) approximately 200 or 300 have been distributed; (c) about October 1951; (d) Doherty Printing Co. (4) Attorneys are to receive cash out-of-pocket expenses and the contingent fee of one-fourth of minerals recovered for the persons who join in the trust agreement.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 246 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) The association has a general interest on behalf of its members in any legislation affecting the chemical industry. (3) Regular association bulletins, including Federal Legislative Bulletins (weekly listing and occasional digest of pertinent bills), State Legislative Bulletins, General Bulletins (biweekly), Defense Mobilization Reports (biweekly), Labor Relations Reports, etc. (4) Anticipated expenses are indeterminate at this time, and will probably consist of an allocated proportion of public relations fees (the association has recently employed a public relations firm for the first time), together with such incidental disbursements as travel, per diem, meals, etc.

A. National Independent Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Defense Production Act of 1950 and amendments. (3) Regular mimeographed bulletins, issued to members, occasionally contain legislative material. (4) Nature, percentage of trade association expenses; amount, unknown at this time.

A. National Tobacco Tax Research Council, 204 Broad-Grace Arcade, Richmond, Va.

C. (1) The organization's legislative interests are expected to continue indefinitely. (2) Our present Federal legislative interests are confined to excise taxes imposed on tobacco as presently contained in subtitle B, chapter 15, of the Internal Revenue Code and to any and all modifications of the said chapter. (3) We have not published any specific documents with reference to such legislative interests. (4) We do not anticipate any expenses in the immediate future.

A. Eugene O'Dunne, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Wilbur-Ellis Co., Inc., 334 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (fish and other food products).

C. (1) Throughout the year 1951 and thereafter for indefinite period. (2) H. R. 5693, Eighty-second Congress, an amendment to the Tariff Act of 1930; amendments to this bill will be proposed. (4) For all services, my compensation including that covered by item C–4 is $15,000 per year commencing November 5, 1951. Any incidental expenses (telephone tolls, travel, taxis, etc.) are reimbursable.

A. Mr. F. M. Parkinson, 204 Broad-Grace Arcade, Richmond, Va.

B. National Tobacco Tax Research Council, 204 Broad-Grace Arcade, Richmond, Va.

C. (1) My legislative interests are expected to continue during the course of my employment with National Tobacco Tax Research Council. (2) My present Federal legislative interests are confined to excise taxes imposed on tobacco as presently contained in subtitle B, chapter 15, of the Internal Revenue Code and to any and all modifications of the said chapter. (4) I do not anticipate that my employment will require any expenditures of this nature in the immediate future.

A. Hugh Peterson, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

B. United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y., and 408 American Building, Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation referring to the cane sugar refining industry. (3) I have considerable doubt as to my activities necessitating my filing under this act. However, so that there can be no question, I am doing so. (4) The expected compensation is $2,000 for the first quarter of 1952.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, attorney at law, post-office box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Alaska Statehood Committee, Juneau, Alaska, organized under the Territorial Laws of Alaska.

C. (1) During time S. 50 is pending in the Senate. (2) Statehood for Alaska, S. 50, for the bill. (4) Only expense anticipated railroad fare to Washington and living expense while here and small amount clerical, $300.—Compensation $1,500, plus actual expenses.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, post-office box 2097, Dixieland Station, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Government of Guam, an unincorporated Territory of the United States, Agana, Guam, M. I.

C. (1) Till October 1, 1952, and through second session of the Eighty-second Congress. (2) Legislation affecting the welfare of Guam. To make applicable laws to Guam which should be made applicable and to oppose those that should not be made applicable. A bill making certain laws applicable to Guam and declaring some laws inapplicable. Certain bills amending National Guard and housing acts making same applicable to Guam. (4) Estimated expenses $2,500 covering traveling expenses and living expenses when away from home, stenographic, telephone and telegraph. Compensation $10,000 per year and $2,500 in lieu of expenses and actual traveling expenses (payable quarterly). This covers other legal work other than legislative but impossible to accurately divide.

A. Pope Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Pin Clip and Fastener Association, 74 Trinity Place, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Indefinite. (2) Tariff, customs, and foreign trade legislation generally. Customs simplification bill H. R. 5505, against certain provisions which are not truly simplifications of customs procedure or administration. (4) Anticipated expenses; minor cash expenditures, travel, taxis, telephone, telegraph, etc.; rates of compensation (fees), $125 per day.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Applicant is paid and is to receive a salary of $9,450 per annum effective December 1, 1951, paid by the above employer, and is to be reimbursed for all actual expenses incurred in connection with his work.

A. Regular Common Carrier Conference of the American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) It is not known how long legislative interests will continue. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. (4) The only compensation expected to be made by this conference for legislative activity is to its staff, particularly to its general manager in the form of an annual salary for the composite of his numerous duties, as shown in his registration made this day.

A. The Retail Shoe Committee for Equitable Taxation (David W. Herrmann, chairman), seventh floor, 345 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) and (2). Legislative interests will continue until the disposition of section 123 of H. R. 4473, the enactment of which section registrant opposes. (4) Fair and reasonable attorney's fees to be determined at the conclusion of the legal services, with a retainer of $7,500. Ordinary out-of-pocket expenses for telephone, telegraph, trips to Washington, travel, food, and lodging, amount of which is indefinite.

A. Roland Rice, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.

B. Registrant performs legal services for, among others, the Regular Common Carrier Conference of American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) It is not known how long legislative interests will continue. (2) The general legislative interest of registrant is the protection and fostering of the interests of federally regulated motor common carriers of general commodities. No known bills have been introduced in which registrant is interested. (4) Annual salary.

A. Philip L. Rizzo, room 1, 826 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

B. The Consumers' Lobby, room 1, 826 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) One year. (2) Legislation directly affecting the consumer, specifically S. 169, of which I am in favor. (4) $750 (for office and literature) compensation: Contingent.

A. Mrs. Ada Barnet Stough, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C.

B. American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.

C. (1) Interest will continue indefinitely. (2) National school health services bill, H. R. 3238; public school construction bill, H. R. 3362; National child research bill, H. R. 1879; Federal aid for medical education, S. 337 and H. R. 2797; local public health units, H. R. 274, S. 445; physically handicapped children's education bill, S. 1302, H. R. 7396; school-lunch appropriation; Children's Bureau appropriation; Cabinet status for the Federal

Security Agency; Federal aid for day-care centers in defense areas; Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools; emergency maternal and infant care, S. 1245; defense housing and community facilities, H. R. 2988 and S. 349. (3) A mimeographed newsletter entitled "Washington Report on Legislation for Children." About 250 copies, 6 to 8 times a year. Mimeographed by Parents' Institute, Bergenfield, N. J. (4) Salary, $416.66 per month. Anticipated expenses for taxicabs, incidentals, probably less than $50 a month.

A. Margaret K. Taylor, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Applicant is paid and is to receive a salary of $9,450 per annum, effective December 1, 1951, paid by the above employer, and is to be reimbursed for all actual expenses incurred in connection with her work.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.

C. (1) Indefinitely. (2) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk. (4) Applicant is paid and is to receive a salary of $8,715 per annum effective December 1, 1951, paid by the above employer, and is to be reimbursed for all actual expenses incurred in connection with his work.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this still moment, pausing reverently at this altar of prayer, make us vividly aware of Thy divine invasion through all the areas of our yearning lives. Give us the grace of hospitality to the highest. As citizens of a world that carries on its bent shoulders a burden of suffering greater than humanity has ever borne, make us inwardly adequate to be Thy ministers of reconciliation. May the poisoning evils which now blight the earth not devastate our own inner lives, subduing us to its low standards, confusing us by its chaos, or crushing our faith under its tragedy. Clothed in the undefiled garments of love's pure vestment, humbly may we walk with Thee in white as in the spirit of the Master we face the infinite pathos of this troubled world we fain would serve before we fall on sleep. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 26, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 26, 1952, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2119) for the relief of Claudia Tanaka.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Also on request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate the remainder of this week.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is operating under a unanimous-consent agreement which provides that beginning at the hour of 12 o'clock noon today debate on the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to recommit, with certain instructions, Senate bill 50 shall be limited to not exceeding 4 hours, to be equally divided, and controlled respectively by the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. In accordance with the agreement the Chair lays before the Senate the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business, without debate, the time not to be charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Virginia, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 32

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts

Whereas the Federal Government has abused the taxing power to the point of confiscation, the General Assembly of Virginia respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration; provided that in no case shall the maximum rate of tax exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 3. The maximum rate of any tax, duty, or excise which Congress may lay and collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall in no case exceed 25 percent.

"SEC. 4. The limitations upon the rates of said taxes contained in sections 2 and 3 shall not apply during hostilities while the United States is in a state of war declared by Congress and shall be subject to the further qualification that in the event of a grave national emergency requiring such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may for a period not exceeding 1 year increase beyond the limits above prescribed the maximum rate of any such tax upon income subsequently accruing or received or with respect to subsequent devolutions or transfers of property, with like power to repeat such action as often as such emergency may require.

"SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on the 31st day of December following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on income for any period ending on or prior to said 31st day of December laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"SEC. 6. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States to collect any tax on any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of delegates concurring), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourth of the several States; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted by the keeper of the rolls of the State to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

Agreed to by the house February 5, 1952.
Agreed to by the senate February 21, 1952.
A true copy:

E. GRIFFITH DODSON,
Clerk of the House of Delegates and Keeper of the Rolls of the State.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2390. A bill to amend section 302 (4) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act

of 1940, as amended, relating to penalties; without amendment (Rept. No. 1215).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 2485. A bill to provide for the issuance of a distinctive service ribbon bar in recognition of the services of merchant seamen; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1216);

S. 2530. A bill to provide certain decorations for outstanding and heroic conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1217);

S. 2721. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1218); and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise;* without amendment (Rept. No. 1219).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2552. A bill to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 1220).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1221).

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. R. 3401. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system; without amendment (Rept. No. 1222).

WELFARE OF COAL MINERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1310) amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, with the recommendation that the bill be passed, and I submit a report (No. 1223) thereon. The bill was unanimously ordered reported by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RELATED PROBLEMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I report favorably, with an amendment, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56) providing funds for a study of the Railroad Retirement Act and related problems, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The amendment simply corrects a typographical error by substituting the word "Eighty-second" for the word "Eighty-first," in line 3.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2746. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for a Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, to be elected by the Commission, and in whom administrative authority shall be vested; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 2747. A bill to provide for more effective administration of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2748. A bill authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during 1952; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOODY:

S. 2749. A bill for the relief of Leonard Lewis Buhler; and

S. 2750. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Kosonoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 2751. A bill to provide for the exchange of farm units on Federal irrigation projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. CAPEHART).

S. 2752. A bill to require the establishment of actual rates by contract carriers;

S. 2753. A bill to provide additional standards to govern the granting by the Interstate Commerce Commission of certain operating rights; and

S. 2754. A bill to amend the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 2755. A bill for the relief of Ferdinando Pambianchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 2756. A bill for the relief of Yoko Okuno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 2757. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2758. A bill to amend section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on gasoline); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2759. A bill for the relief of Mariko (Hirohuji) Willis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 90, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 284), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 90, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1952

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1, transmitted to the Congress by the President on January 14, 1952.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 285) submitted by Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN) was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 1, transmitted to Congress by the President on January 14, 1952.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO FREIGHT FORWARDERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2712) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to subject freight forwarders to the requirement for obtaining certificates of public convenience and necessity, and to make applicable to freight forwarders the uniform provisions of the law concerning combinations and consolidations of carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report was submitted:

By Mr. McMAHON, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive C, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada, relating to the operation by citizens of either country of certain radio equipment or stations in the other country, signed at Ottawa on February 8, 1951; without reservation (Ex. Rept. No. 3).

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Letter of February 27, 1952, addressed by the President to the Second Reorganization Conference of Citizens Committee for Reorganization of the Executive Branch.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

Address delivered by Donald R. Wilson, national commander, American Legion, at American Legion dinner honoring Members

of Congress, at Washington, D. C., February 26, 1952.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

Letters received by him from the American Institute of Baking and the Millers' National Federation, taking issue with certain statements contained in Senate Report No. 604, Eighty-second Congress, dealing with the utilization of farm crops.

By Mr. WILEY:

Census report indicating leadership of Wisconsin among dairy States.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "Politics," published in the Lynchburg (Va.) News of February 9, 1952.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, in the absence of the minority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to recommit the bill with certain instructions. The time is under the control of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming stated that he would yield me a few minutes in order that I might state my position.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I to understand that the call for a quorum has been withdrawn?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. After the quorum call had started, I stepped out of the Chamber momentarily. Had I been present I would have resisted the withdrawal of the quorum call, because it is obvious that a quorum is not present. I wish to have it understood that I reserve the right to call for a quorum later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may call for a quorum at any time he wishes, but the time thus consumed will be taken out of his time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with the understanding that the time consumed by the call shall not be taken from the time of either side, since that was the request which was originally made, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No request was made in that connection. There was merely the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, so far as concerns what little I have to say, it does not make any difference to me whether a quorum is present or not. However, under the circumstances, if the Senator from Wyoming feels that there should be a quorum present, inasmuch as he was absent when the order for the quorum call was withdrawn, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call may be completed, and that the time be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Another call would have to be begun. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Anderson	Hendrickson	McMahon
Bennett	Hennings	Millikin
Benton	Hickenlooper	Moody
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Murray
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Nixon
Byrd	Ives	O'Conor
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Clements	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Seaton
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Duff	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Magnuson	Taft
Ferguson	Malone	Thye
Flanders	Martin	Tobey
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Wiley
Gillette	McClellan	Williams
Green	McFarland	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not feel that I can add anything to what has already been said in the course of the argument in behalf of statehood for Alaska.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to ask the majority leader whether it is his opinion that the motion to recommit Senate bill 50 with instructions has to do only with the Territory of Alaska.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is my understanding, Mr. President. Of course, I feel that the arguments made against statehood for Alaska could be made with equal force against statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry, namely, is the time for this discussion on the parliamentary status being taken out of the time allotted to the Senator from Florida or out of the time allotted now to the Senator from Arizona by the Senator from Wyoming, who is in charge of part of the time; or is the time now being taken on the parliamentary status not being charged to either side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has the floor, and the time being taken now is being charged to him.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent that this time not be charged to either side, in view of the fact that we are trying to get the parliamentary situation straightened out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think there is no question but that the motive involves only the recommittal, with instructions, of the bill proposing statehood for Alaska. However, I think that, very largely, the arguments for or against statehood for Alaska are the same as those for or against statehood for Hawaii or those for or against statehood for any other Territory, as I shall try to develop in the few minutes I have at my disposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Arizona will permit me to do so, I should like to ask him whether he knows as a practical matter that there are a number of Senators who are in favor of statehood for one of these Territories but are not in favor of statehood for the other Territory.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that is true.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator from Arizona will permit me to continue for a moment, I should like to say that the argument to the effect that the pending bill affects Hawaii is one of the oldest strawmen used in the Senate of the United States to confuse issues and to compel Senators to feel that they are voting against a bill they favor, when actually they are voting on a bill on which they have different feelings. That is one of the oldest devices in the Senate, through parliamentary procedure, namely, the building up of a strawman beclouding the parliamentary issue.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, to pursue this parliamentary discussion, if I may do so with the indulgence of the Senator from Arizona——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to assure the Senator from Georgia that there is no purpose on my part to becloud the issue. I wish to clarify the issue.

When the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] came upon the floor of

this body on the 20th of February and asked the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to modify his motion to recommit with instructions, and when the Senator from Florida accepted the requested modification, he accepted it in precisely the words used by the Senator from Oklahoma. I read now the statement made at that time by the Senator from Oklahoma:

> Would the Senator be willing to modify his motion so as to make of it a motion to recommit the bill with instructions for further study, and also to consider the granting of commonwealth status to these Territories—

The word at that point is in the plural—

> if consistent with the later determination of the Congress? It would require a constitutional amendment to establish the new status, in which Territories could approach statehood. If they were not quite strong enough or did not have sufficient population to attain statehood, they would still have a self-governing status. I believe that a motion to recommit should provide not only for the study of the question whether or not these Territories should be granted statehood, but also the question of whether perhaps, another status, between statehood and territorial status, might be proper.

Mr. President, it seems to me that no one can read that language without knowing that the distinguished and very able Senator from Oklahoma meant precisely what he said. He wanted commonwealth status for both Territories. That is borne out by the fact, permit me to say, that only a few days before, the Senator from Oklahoma made a public release in which he made clear that he was opposed to statehood, that he wanted commonwealth status. The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], after having heard that precise and unambiguous statement by the Senator from Oklahoma, said the following:

> I am happy to modify my motion, so that in addition to instructions to hold hearings on Senate bill 50, the committee will also be instructed to study the question raised by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, it seems to me that that is clear, definite, and specific.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me at this point?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to observe that the tenuous argument made by the Senator from Wyoming absolutely confirms my statement that this argument could only becloud the issue. It matters not what is the position of the Senator from Oklahoma on any bill which is on the calendar. It matters not what is the position of the Senator from Florida in regard to recommittal of both these bills. As a cold parliamentary fact, the motion now pending cannot affect any piece of proposed legislation other than Senate bill 50, the bill now before the Senate. It matters not whether the Senator from Oklahoma included in his motion a specific statement that the other bill should also be recommitted, for it would be a parliamentary impossibility to recommit both the bills at the same time.

The only issue now before the Senate is the question of the proposed recommittal of Senate bill 50, the bill providing for statehood for Alaska; and the discussion between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Oklahoma is mere obiter, and cannot affect the real parliamentary issue that is before the Senate. The Senator from Wyoming may desire that it have the effect he suggests, and he may make such a motion in the future; but certainly it does not affect the vote of any Member of the Senate on the pending motion, which can only relate to Senate bill 50—and no one knows that better than does the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He has been around the Senate entirely too long to be under any impression that the motion can have the effect of recommitting the Hawaiian statehood bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Ah, Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Georgia. Will the Senator from Georgia now guarantee me and the other Members of the Senate that, when the Hawaiian statehood bill comes up, assuming—which I do only for the purposes of the argument—that the motion to recommit will prevail, that no member of the group which is opposing statehood for both these Territories will fail to rise to say, "Why, we voted to recommit under instructions to study commonwealth status"? Will the Senator give me that guaranty?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, that statement shows the desperate length to which my friend has been driven by this tenuous argument—asking me to make a guaranty at this time as to what 95 Members of the Senate might say. I have heard some very foolish propositions advanced, Mr. President, in my time in the Senate, and if I serve the remainder of my 2 years, I shall probably hear a great many more, though I hope I do not hear many as weak as that advanced by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. He has now come down to the point of saying that the argument may be used, but its use cannot affect any vote.

What I wished to make clear was the fact that the only effect of a vote on the pending motion to recommit goes to S. 50, and that when the Hawaiian statehood bill comes before the Senate in its own good time, Members of the Senate who feel that they wish to support that bill will have a perfect right to do so; and I doubt that they would be deluded by any far-fetched argument such as the one suggested by the Senator from Wyoming, even though someone might make it. But he has now come to a question based on a supposition that the argument might be made. The argument may be made. I hear a great many arguments made, but even if were made, I do not think it would be any more fallacious or any further away from parliamentary fact than the original position taken by the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from California, that the motion to recommit carries with it the Hawaiian statehood bill. As a matter of fact, as a parliamentary fact, the motion does not affect the Hawaiian statehood bill in the slightest degree; and I repeat, no one knows that better than does my distinguished friend from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I may ask the indulgence of the Senator from Arizona for a few more words, I am very much complimented by the many adjectives which the Senator from Georgia has used in discussing what I said, and I am particularly grateful to him for saying that, though he thought the argument was silly, yet when it was attributed to me, it was only weak; so I am very much complimented by that distinction which the Senator has made. But, Mr. President, the point now is clear, that the Senator from Georgia can give no such guaranty. Why can he not give the guaranty? Because this instruction with respect to commonwealth status was conceived and designed to kill statehood for both these Territories. I am willing, with that last word for the moment, to allow the Senator from Arizona to proceed without further interruption from me.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to say that the change of adjectives, as applied to the discussion, grew out of my profound affection for the Senator from Wyoming and my desire to protect him from making rash statements when he is overenthusiastic in a cause which he espouses. I may say further, and then I shall take my seat, that I doubt whether ever before in all history, in any parliamentary body, unless it were the German Reichstag, any one member has ever been asked to give a guaranty as to what other members might say in the course of debate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield, provided the time is not charged to me.

Mr. LONG. I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that there is at least one Member of the Senate who will assure him that when the Hawaiian statehood bill comes up, although the junior Senator from Louisiana expects to vote against statehood for Alaska, he will support the Hawaiian bill and will vote for it, when it comes to a vote.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, though I should like to complete my few remarks.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to say that the Senator from Oklahoma unfortunately is not with us today. He is ill, but I talked with him only a moment ago, and his understanding, completely in accord with that of the majority leader, is that the motion to recommit which is now before the Senate, is to recommit S. 50, which includes only statehood for Alaska, with instructions to consider the possibilities of a commonwealth status for Alaska. The Senator from Oklahoma then argued, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Georgia, purely as obiter dicta, that he

thought it would be a good idea for both Territories. But he recognizes that the basic parliamentary question affects S. 50 only.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I was happy to yield for this colloquy, because it has stirred up on the floor of the Senate more interest than I have heretofore seen manifested in regard to this subject; and I have felt that the Senate should take more interest in this important question.

Mr. President, as I have stated, the arguments which have been made heretofore, in regard to statehood for Alaska, are, I think, complete; and, for that matter, I think they are also complete in regard to statehood for Hawaii. The question of the government of Territories of the United States has confronted the Congress ever since I have been in the Senate. There are those who feel that the ctizens of the District of Columbia should have the right to vote. Puerto Rico has presented a problem, and it is only a matter of time, of course, until Guam will constitute a problem; because, when I visited Guam, the people of that island felt that they should have a right to govern themselves.

Mr. President, the question which confronted me and which troubled me the most, in considering statehood for Alaska, was that it was noncontiguous to the United States. The same question is involved in connection with statehood for Hawaii. As to the other arguments, I feel that they fall by the wayside, as I shall point out in a few moments. I have considered them carefully. I think that one of the factors which have made the United States great is transportation, the fact that the people of one State may travel cheaply to any other State within continental United States. There is some difficulty in regard to transportation in noncontiguous Territories. It is more expensive. Therefore, in my opinion, there are arguments against statehood on that ground. But there is a highway to Alaska on which people may travel by automobile.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are about to begin negotiations with Canada for the purpose of making preliminary surveys for a railroad to Alaska.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was about to state that it is my hope that, whether statehood is granted or not, a railroad to Alaska will be constructed. The lack of transportation is one of Alaska's greatest problems.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. In connection with the remark just made by the distinguished Senator from Washington, I think he knows that I have been quite as much interested in the development of the proposed railroad to Alaska as has any other Member of the Senate. We have been trying for years to get an agreement with Canada, which is a prerequisite because the railroad will have to be constructed over Canadian soil, but, to date, we have not the faintest chance of consummating such an agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not agree with my distinguished friend's pessimism in regard to the matter. As Chairman of the International Highway Commission, I went through the samc experience years ago in connection with the highway to Alaska; but the highway was finally constructed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, personally I feel that the transportation problem will be solved, and I think it will be solved more quickly if statehood is granted to Alaska. As I have indicated, the fact that Alaska and Hawaii are noncontiguous and there is a transportation difficulty constitutes the most serious objection which can be raised against statehood for either Territory. Of course, sooner or later the question of statehood for Puerto Rico will arise, and we already have taken action on a home rule bill for the District of Columbia.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that all the officials of Puerto Rico have clearly indicated to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, when we were considering the authority to draft a new constitution, that they did not want statehood; and furthermore, that question was settled by a plebiscite in the island of Puerto Rico, in which three different parties voted, the Independents, the Coalition Party, and the party of the Government which won by an over-all majority over the other two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The time of the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield additional time? I shall have to refrain from yielding further.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield the Senator from Arizona 3 minutes additional time.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am afraid I cannot finish my remarks in 3 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield 5 minutes, if the Senator so desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as I was about to state when I mentioned Puerto Rico, Guam, and other Territories, I have come to the conclusion we shall have to decide what is to be done in regard to each of those Territories separately when the question comes before us. We cannot decide everything in one bill. We shall have to determine a policy. What are we going to do with the two large Territories of Alaska and Hawaii? Are we going to keep them forever as Territories and deny their people the right of national suffrage?

That is one of the important questions involved.

I recognize the problem involved in making noncontiguous Territories States but I am of the opinion that this argument does not apply as strongly against Alaska as against some of the other Territories.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have only five additional minutes, and I cannot yield at this time.

I have in my hand a statement which was issued by the Hawaiian Statehood Commission in regard to Arizona, and I want to read from it briefly because it gives a factual history of my own State.

On February 14, 40 years ago, Arizona was admitted as the forty-eighth State of the United States. I now read from the statement:

> Arizona, just as many of its sister States, had no easy road to statehood during the 49 years it was a Territory of the United States. In 1906, Arizona Delegate Marcus Smith told the House Committee on Territories that his predecessor had presented a bill for Arizona statehood in the Forty-ninth Congress. "It was also made," he continued, "in the Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh and Fifty-eighth Congresses. During that time we have passed the Arizona bill three times and twice have had favorable reports from the Senate."
>
> But again in 1906 Arizona was to be denied statehood, as it was in the Sixtieth Congress. The enabling act was finally passed on June 20, 1910.

Mr. President, I shall not read the statement in detail, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a part of the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that in 1900 the Census showed Arizona had a population of 122,931, of whom 26,480 were Indians.

The population, according to the last census, was 749,588, and it is now larger.

The mines in Arizona which were once considered of little worth have rendered valuable aid to the United States in its defense effort. Arizona is now the leading State in the production of copper. Its agriculture has grown. Arizona is handicapped because of a shortage of water, but it has under cultivation some 750,000 acres of fertile land and has produced important fibers and food which have been needed in the United States, particularly during the last war, as they are needed in the present emergency.

Mr. President, I personally feel that if Alaska is given statehood, it will advance more rapidly. It has uncounted natural resources, and with statehood it is my humble opinion that the transportation problem will be solved at an early date, and that many persons will go to Alaska to cast their lot with the new State. I feel that the important question is not what the population of the Territory is, but whether its natural resources are sufficient to support a State and to support a larger population.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for his courtesy in yielding me additional time.

EXHIBIT 1

ARIZONA CELEBRATES FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF STATEHOOD

On February 14 the youngest State of the Union, Arizona, celebrates the fortieth anniversary of its admittance as the forty-eighth of the United States.

Arizona, just as many of its sister States, had no easy road to statehood during the 49 years it was a Territory of the United States. In 1906, Arizona Delegate Marcus Smith told the House Committee on the Territories that his predecessor had presented a bill for Arizona statehood in the Forty-ninth Congress. "It was also made," he continued, "in the Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, Fifty-third, Fifty-fourth, Fifty-fifth, Fifty-sixth, Fifty-seventh, and Fifty-eighth Congresses. During that time we have passed the Arizona bill three times and twice have had favorable reports from the Senate."

But again in 1906, Arizona was to be denied statehood, as it was in the Sixtieth Congress. The enabling act was finally passed on June 20, 1910.

During those years, the statehood movement for Arizona suffered many of the same ills that statehood bills for Hawaii and Alaska are suffering today. Objections were continuously raised by committees of the Congress as to the future of the Territory. It was said that her mines were used up; that her soil would not support any large population; that her people were for the most part Indian and Spanish; that there were too few who could read the Constitution in English.

It was argued that in 1900, the census showed Arizona "had a population of 122,931, of whom 26,480 were Indians."

On the floor of the Senate on June 6, 1910, Senator Alexander S. Clay, of Georgia, said: "For 12 years both political parties have set forth in their platforms in favor of statehood for both Arizona and New Mexico. We were delayed by speeches for 3 months with a view of killing the proposed statehood."

That same day, Senator James B. Frazier, of Tennessee, in an impassioned speech championing the cause of Arizona statehood said: "No State was ever refused admittance into the Union when it had 60,000 inhabitants upon the ground that it did not have enough people. Let no Senator deceive himself, or believe that the country will be deceived if statehood for these Territories is again denied. It has been stated in the press recently that the majority upon the other side, were loath to admit these Territories to statehood, because, forsooth, they might possibly send four Democratic Senators to this Chamber."

After these years of argument, of frustration, Arizona became a State 40 years ago today. And what of the false prophets who saw unarable land?

Today the people of Arizona, a population which has multiplied six times since 1900, have made the desert bloom. Irrigation enterprises have made fertile some 500,000 acres. Citrus fruits, dates, olives are grown commercially. Principal products of the land include cotton, hay, wheat, barley, corn, oats and potatoes. Stock raising is of great importance. A lumber industry cuts millions of feet of yellow pine each year.

And of the useless mines? Today Arizona ranks first in the mining of copper. Some of the largest gold mining camps in America are in Arizona. Other minerals mined include lead, zinc, lime, clay, gypsum, as well as gems and semiprecious stones.

All this today. But 40 years ago, Arizona's delegate to Congress sat on Committee with the Delegate from New Mexico, and two others—Delegates from Alaska and from Hawaii. Arizona's Delegates waited through 14 Congresses until their statehood bill was finally approved. Hawaii's attempts to gain statehood started while Arizona was still a Territory.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I wish to address myself only briefly to the matter pending before the Senate, which I fear has been afforded a maximum of hasty debate and a minimum of calm, logical reasoning. I refer to the statehood bill for Alaska, Senate bill 50.

As preface to my remarks, I want to state that the senior Senator from Nebraska feels the same emotional sentiment toward this great frontier as has been so dramatically expressed by the proponents of this measure. I am certain there is not one of my able and distinguished colleagues who do not join me in desiring to aid this American Territory in every way possible to attain its full stature as a potential member of our family of States.

But it is this very desire to aid the Territory which prompts me to urge caution, reasoning and deliberation in the consideration of this statehood bill.

Mr. President, 6 years have passed since Alaskans were afforded the opportunity to vote on the statehood issue. Many changes have occurred in those years, and thousands of new residents have settled in the Territory.

The 1946 referendum, which favored the general proposition of statehood by the narrow majority of 3 to 2, was voted upon by only 16,452 persons. Of these, only 9,630 voted in favor of statehood. There are now approximately 108,000 residents in Alaska. We have heard no expression of feeling from anything remotely resembling a majority of this population.

Are we to consider burdening 108,000 people with the added cost of statehood when less than 10 percent of those people have indicated they desire statehood?

Mr. President, I do not believe it is fair or in the interests of justice to take any action whatsoever on this bill before we have ascertained beyond any doubt that the people of Alaska not only desire immediate statehood but that they desire the brand of statehood offered by Senate bill 50.

Before taking this momentous step, the Senate must have before it all of the pertinent facts, both for and against statehood. To date we have heard only from the small faction which has made repeated trips to Washington at the taxpayers' expense to present us with their reasons for desiring statehood.

Opponents of immediate statehood, who do not enjoy such ready access to the public coffers, have been forced either to sit at home, some 5,000 miles away, while hearings affecting their entire future were conducted here in Washington, or to come here at their own expense to oppose the measure.

Mr. President, I submit that, in all fairness to the great bulk of the Alaskan populace, the Senate should conduct hearings on statehood within Alaska itself, to give both opponents and proponents equal opportunity to state their case.

I further submit that the 1946 referendum, upon which the Alaska statehood committee bases so much of its argument, is today not the least indicative of the tenor of Alaskan thought.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. If the junior Senator from Louisiana recalls the statistics correctly, actually only about 9,000 people voted for statehood and about 6,000 voted against it, representing a total of 15,000 votes. We are told that there are about 140,000 people in Alaska, or a population at least in excess of 100,000. If only 15,000 votes were cast, how are we to know that that was representative of the actual thinking of the people of Alaska?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that that is the point I was attempting to make in stating the figures I have just cited.

Mr. LONG. Only about 8 or 10 percent of the population voted in that election.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct, and that is based upon the lowest estimated population of Alaska.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that there were before the last session of the legislature in Alaska two resolutions, one of them urging Congress to grant statehood, the other urging Congress to grant the right to Alaskans to elect their own governor?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not a fact that the legislature did not adopt the one which asked Congress to grant statehood, but did adopt the one asking for the right to elect a governor?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct. I shall refer to that later in my brief statement.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Are those thousands who have moved to the Territory within the past 6 years to have no voice whatsoever in the matter?

It has been 2 years since hearings have been held on this question. And the Senate has never held hearings on the issue in Alaska.

Looking at the question from a purely objective viewpoint, I cannot see how it is at all practical to impose statehood on this potentially rich Territory when so little has been done to develop the natural resources upon which it will have to depend for income to pay the costs of State government.

At the present time, all but three-tenths of one percent of Alaska's land is owned by the Federal Government, and only one-tenth of 1 percent is privately owned.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Did I understand the Senator from Nebraska correctly to say that the United States Senate had never held hearings in Alaska on the question of Alaskan statehood?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. A Senate committee has never held official hearings in Alaska.

Mr. SMATHERS. Then of course the Senate has never held hearings on Senate bill 50.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. That is correct. I shall state now, for the benefit of the Senator from Florida, that I doubt if there are more than 12 copies of S. 50 in the entire Territory of Alaska, outside the hands of the statehood committee.

In our desire to aid the Territory, there are other obvious steps we can take to prepare it for statehood before casting upon its people the overwhelming tax load which will surely result.

First and foremost we must give the residents of Alaska the opportunity to develop their country without the hampering controls of the Interior Department. We must remove the restrictions which have hamstrung Alaska for so many years and release from Federal control the vast forests, the potentially rich oil fields, the mineral deposits, and the limited farm lands. Give Alaska her fair share of income from the lucrative Pribilof Islands.

To prepare the citizens of Alaska for the responsibilities attendant on statehood, we should pass legislation giving them the right to elect their own governor.

In that connection, with reference to the remarks just made by the distinguished majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND], I should like to say that I agree with him that the United States Government should adopt a policy that can be followed with reference to the treatment of lands not adjacent to our own mainland. I think we have already adopted such a policy, and it has worked extremely well. I believe it was in the closing minutes of the Eightieth Congress that a bill was passed by the House and the Senate, and signed by the President, giving to Puerto Rico the right to elect its own governor and granting certain other privileges which the people of Puerto Rico had not had up to that time. Since then there have been no more contented people in the Western Hemisphere than the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question. A while ago he said we ought to free Alaska from Government control of Federal lands.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. What would the Senator propose should be done with those lands? Should they be given outright to the proposed State of Alaska?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. No. I would arrange for a disposal of them under lease, perhaps. At this time there is before the Senate a bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], providing for just such an arrangement with respect to lands in some of the States that are now burdened with public lands over which they have no control.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am now speaking about Alaska. The Senator says that there is a large amount of federally owned land there. What are we going to do with it, in order to get rid of Federal control over it? They are Federal lands, are they not?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. They are.

Mr. CONNALLY. How does the Senator propose to get rid of Federal control of them?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I may say to the Senator from Texas that I have some illustrations I could give, but I did not bring the material with me. If I had known that the Senator was going to ask these questions, I would have brought with me memoranda of applications filed with the Department of the Interior for leases or purchases. These applications for lease or purchase have been before the Department of the Interior not for 1 year but, in some cases, for many years.

Mr. CONNALLY. Perhaps we ought not to do anything along that line. I do not know. I am just inquiring. The Senator from Nebraska wants the Government to release these lands. I am merely inquiring what the Senator would have the Government do with them. They belong to the Federal Government, and the Federal Government ought to retain them.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas if Texas or any other State was ever developed by the United States or any Federal agency, or was it done by private enterprise?

Mr. CONNALLY. It was done largely, of course, by private enterprise, but that does not mean that we should give away every foot of land in the Territory of Alaska. That land belongs to the United States.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Neither should we want to keep it bottled up forever.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not what I am talking about. I am asking how the Senator would unbottle it.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I am sure that many ways can be found by which it can be done.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; but we are now about to act on a bill to grant statehood to Alaska. I should like to know what the Senator has in mind.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I do not want to see a bill for statehood passed until some of these questions are solved or answered.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Nebraska is not supporting the bill for Alaskan statehood, is he?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am glad to hear that. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. In the judgment of the Senator from Nebraska, would it be a good idea to release this land to the Territorial government of Alaska, or to leave it in the control of the Department of the Interior, so that the land could be opened up to homesteading?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I think that would be a great improvement upon the policy which has been followed by the Federal Government. For many years, from the time Nebraska was granted statehood, there was a large area of Federal land in Nebraska, but I do not believe there are many acres of it left, if a single acre, because the land has been taken over by individuals who own it and have developed it.

I think a similar arrangement should be made before we extend statehood to a very small percentage of the Territory of Alaska, which is two and one-half times the size of Texas, I believe—and that is certainly large—with a population of approximately 100,000.

I was referring to the situation in Puerto Rico when the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] asked his question. I made the statement that I think the Federal Government has established a policy of extending to the Territories and the District of Columbia the right to elect their own officers.

Another suggestion which I have made in the past, and which I think is perfectly logical, is to attach a Territory to the State which is nearest to it. I understand that Montana or Washington would be very glad to have the Territory of Alaska attached to its domain and made a part of either State. I think that would be a great improvement over the present arrangement, and also over the pending proposal.

During the last session of the Territorial legislature two memorials were introduced germane to the statehood bill, as was noted by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. One was a memorial urging the Congress to grant immediate statehood. The other urged Congress to permit the Territory to elect its own governor. The statehood memorial failed, and the memorial asking for the election of the governor passed by a wide margin.

I wish it were possible for the 96 Members of the Senate to absorb that one statement. This question was submitted to the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, and it turned down the request for statehood. It passed the memorial asking for permission to elect their own governor.

The bill which I introduced in this body in 1951, Senate bill 105, providing for the election of the governor of Alaska by Alaskans, has not been reported from the committee. Of course the Interior Department objects to it, and I think perhaps other Departments of Government object. So the bill remains in the committee. It will be my intention, at the proper time, if the pending bill is under further consideration, to offer that bill as a substitute for the statehood bill. I suggest that my bill, Senate bill 105, offers a simple solution to one of the Territory's most urgent needs, a need so eloquently expressed by the members of its own legislature during the last session.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LONG. There has been so much complaint on the part of those who advocate Alaskan statehood about bureaucratic control from Washington that it would seem that the Alaskan people would like to have more powers in their own local government. Should there be

any great difficulty in drafting a bill to grant a greater degree of home rule to Alaska, if the Territory wants a greater degree of home rule?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that so far as I am concerned, I am perfectly willing to grant to the Alaskan people the right to elect their own governor, and perhaps further powers which would be in keeping with the policy of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does it not seem likely, from the argument the Senator is making, that some people simply do not want to improve on the Alaskan government, because any improvement on the government which presently exists would weaken their argument for Alaskan statehood? The proponents of Alaskan statehood like to argue that there is such great difficulty in doing business in Alaska that it should be made a State.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I will say to the Senator that it is my opinion that the real purpose of the statehood bill is not statehood itself, because under the provisions of a bill similar to the bill which was passed in the case of Puerto Rico, the people of Alaska could have practically every right which they would have under statehood. The reason for the statehood bill lies in some other purpose, and I leave it to the distinguished Senator to figure out for himself what that purpose is.

The majority of Alaskans must certainly favor statehood in its true sense, whereby the State is master of its own destiny, with the same control over its land and resources as that enjoyed by other States. But it does not follow that the Alaskans must be burdened with a form of statehood which enables the Federal Government and its agencies to own and exercise control over every resource of the land and sea and thus dictate the manner and degree of their development.

Under the pending bill, Alaska would be relegated to the status of a poor and distant relation of the Federal Union.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not know whether the Senator was present in the Chamber yesterday when the assertion was made by the proponents of the bill that the bill would free the Alaskan people from Washington bureaucracy. The Senator from Nebraska is a member of the committee and knows all the facts. Will he give us an opinion as to the correctness of that assertion? Would the bill free the Alaskans from Washington bureaucracy?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Is the Senator referring to the bill which I introduced?

Mr. STENNIS. No; I am referring to Senate bill 50.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I do not believe that Senate bill 50 would give them any more liberties than they enjoy at the present time, if as many.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I shall be happy to yield additional time to the Senator from Nebraska. How much more time would he like?

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like 5 minutes more.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield 5 minutes additional to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I have just stated that under the pending bill Alaska would be relegated to the status of a poor and distant relation of the Federal Union. Public hearings previously held on this matter have been confined almost exclusively to the merits and demerits of statehood, with little thought or consideration to the terms under which Alaska should be admitted to the Union.

In that connection I should like to read from page 5 of Senate bill 50, beginning with line 9:

> Said convention shall provide in said constitution:
>
> * * * * *
>
> Second. That said State and its people do agree and declare that they forever disclaim all right and title to any lands or other property not granted or confirmed to the State or its political subdivisions by or under the authority of this act, the right or title to which is held by the United States or is subject to disposition by the United States, and to any lands or other property (including fishing rights), the right or title to which may be held by any Indians, Eskimos, or Aleuts (hereinafter called natives) or is held by the United States in trust for said natives; that all such lands or other property, belonging to the United States or which may belong to said natives, shall be and remain under the absolute jurisdiction and control of the United States until disposed of under its authority, except to such extent as the Congress has prescribed or may hereafter prescribe, and except when held by individual natives in fee without restrictions on alienation; and that no taxes shall be imposed by said State upon any lands or other property now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States or which, as hereinabove set forth, may belong to said natives, except to such extent as the Congress has prescribed or may hereafter prescribe, and except when held by individual natives in fee without restrictions on alienation.
>
> Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Alaska shall be assumed and paid by said State and all debts owed to said Territory of Alaska shall be collected by said State.
>
> Fourth. That provision shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of said State and free from sectarian control.
>
> Fifth. That all provisions of this act reserving rights or powers to the United States, as well as those prescribing the terms or conditions of the grants of lands or other property herein made to said State, are consented to fully by said State and its people.
>
> Sixth. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

In connection with the question which was asked by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] a moment ago, the public-land States are having their problems in connection with the control of property within the State boundaries which is owned and controlled by the Federal Government. The junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] understands that situation. On February 25, a day or two ago, he introduced Senate bill 2723, to which I invite the attention of Senators. So far as I can see at the moment, it is a bill which should be enacted. It provides a method by which federally owned lands may become the property of the people within the State where they are located.

The people of Alaska are almost completely uninformed as to the provisions of the pending measure, since the only public hearings held on the statehood question within the Territory were on a measure so different from Senate bill 50, which is now under consideration, that any similarity found between them is entirely coincidental. I seriously doubt if there are more than a dozen copies of Senate bill 50 in the hands of the rank and file of the people in the Territory of Alaska. I am personally well acquainted and on friendly terms with a great many of the leading citizens of Alaska, from whom I receive constant indications as to the trends of thinking and action within the Territory. Every source of information at my command leads me to the unalterable conclusion that Alaskans are being asked to plunge blindly into an impossible situation.

I hold great affection for the people of Alaska. As a body, they are the living symbol of the character, daring, and fortitude which distinguished the pioneer spirit of our founding fathers. On the whole, they are an alert, awake, and industrious people. They are deserving of help, but they are also deserving of our confidence. We must make certain that every resident of the Territory has had the opportunity to read and study this bill and pass judgment upon it.

Mr. President, I cannot understand the urgency of taking up the statehood question at the present time. There is no pressing emergency requiring the immediate granting of statehood. There is not the slightest need for haste on this matter. We have pending before us many other bills of a complex and pressing nature which we should consider and get out of the way before settling down to what will undoubtedly require many weeks of study, consideration and debate.

This question of immediate statehood is very familiar to the senior Senator from Nebraska, through his acquaintance with the history of his own State. Nebraskans, too, were very enthusiastic and emotional over the prospects of statehood during the Civil War. But Nebraskans had to wait until the war was over before Congress would consider their application for admission to the Union.

This was as it should be. "First things first" has always been a logical rule to follow.

In summary, Mr. President, I propose that the Senate postpone action on this

bill until the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has had the opportunity to conduct hearings within Alaska on the question. I submit that the vast majority of Alaskans have never indicated their feelings on statehood, and that they should be given the opportunity to do so. I further submit that there are other means, less costly and harmful to Alaskans, by which this Congress can help them develop their resources and prepare themselves for eventual statehood.

Let us proceed, Mr. President, to the urgent business of the day, rather than bog this assembly down with a matter which, by the very nature of the hasty action that is being urged on us, threatens to deprive a group of Americans of their fundamental right to be heard in the councils of their Government.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with whom I have worked very pleasantly over many years presented several documents for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in support of his position. I have had several studies made with respect to the subjects of corruption, use of the public purse for private gain, use of the public purse for political gain, bureaucratic pressure on voters, the statehood referendum, the statehood committee, irresponsible propaganda, manipulation of the native vote, and imperfections in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the statements which have been prepared with respect to these subjects, together with a foreword, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREWORD

The Alaska statehood bill has been the unfinished business before the Senate for nearly a month. During that period there have been many sincere and able arguments offered on both sides of the question.

The debate on statehood has been related to the national defense, Alaska's potential wealth, the Territory's financial condition, its future development and the desires of the Alaska people themselves.

Eloquent argument that the Congress has an obligation to grant statehood to the Territory, dating from its purchase from Russia, has even been tossed on the swaying scales.

But these are intangible questions and subject to honest differences of opinion.

There has been little said here regarding Alaska's present administration, the honor with which it has acquitted itself, or the manner in which it has prepared the people of the Territory for statehood.

Yet these, too, are subjects for consideration by the Senate of the United States.

The material that follows does not pretend to be the whole story, or an appreciable part of the story. It is a beginning.

These facts merely show a pattern of conduct which has many grave implications.

Much has been said here about what Alaska will get from statehood. Little has been said about what Alaska may be expected to contribute to the Federal Union in the integrity of its officials and the dignity and vigilance of its citizens.

It is for this reason that these facts of record are herewith submitted to the Senate.

CORRUPTION

Corruption in the present Alaskan administration has been widespread for many years.

Perhaps the most outstanding example of this was the notorious Palmer land deal.

This transaction was investigated by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the Government. The committee found that "as the result of collusion between Territorial and CAA officials there was an attempt to shift the entire cost of the new improvements on the Palmer airport to the Federal Government."

The committee also noted that the case was unique in that it was the first time within the memory of the Members that a subdivision of the Federal Government, namely the Territory of Alaska, has been discovered attempting to secure funds from the Federal Government "in a manner which would do violence to the spirit and the letter of the law."

On the floor of the Senate, the deal has been labeled an attempted fraud on the United States Treasury. The General Accounting Office has to this day refused payment of any Federal funds to the Territory in connection with this project.

Facts developed by the subcommittee showed:

Between 1946 and 1949, the Territorial Government claimed to have spent some $53,000 on the Palmer airport, located in the Matanuska Valley. Under the Federal Airport Aid Act, this money, spent before the act went into effect in Alaska, could not be claimed as basis for Federal matching funds.

In order to obtain reimbursement for this money, the Territory inflated the value of the airport land from $5,500 to $150,000. This inflation was accomplished by an exchange of checks between the Territory and the Palmer Airport Association, in which the Territory paid the association $150,000, and 6 days later received a kick-back of $145,000 from the association.

At this point, Alaskan newspapers discovered the subterfuge and publicized the entire transaction. Governor Gruening, in reply to subsequent criticism, defended the deal as "highly intelligent and conservative."

Since the investigation by the subcommittee, two of the officials involved in the Palmer deal have again run afoul of the law.

Shell Simmons, a member of the Alaska Aeronautics Board—the agency which acted for the Territory in the land deal—recently was fined $5,000 on a plea of nolo contendere to a charge of bribing a Federal official in connection with the disposal of surplus airplanes.

Jack Maze, a member of the Palmer Airport Association and one of three men who appraised the airport land at $150,000, has been arrested and charged with embezzling funds from the Matanuska Valley Bank at Palmer, of which he was manager. Amount of his alleged defalcations has been estimated at $160,000.

But the Palmer deal is only one of a long series of incidents of corruption within the Alaskan administration.

Oscar Olson, former Territorial treasurer, is serving a 5-year sentence in the McNeil Island Federal penitentiary for stealing $45,000 of the taxpayers' money. His shortages were uncovered in an audit made in 1949 by the firm of Arthur Anderson & Co., of Seattle.

This audit, required by Territorial law to be made biennially, had been blocked for 2 years by the Territorial board of administration which refused to provide funds to finance it. Governor Gruening is the head of the board of administration. Immediately prior to the audit, records and supporting data of other treasury disbursements totaling $762,339 were destroyed.

The audit revealed some 20 other irregularities in the handling of public funds, among them the disappearance of $20,000 worth of liquor stamps which have not as of this date been accounted for.

Also sentenced to McNeil Island last year was a Territorial tax official, Archie L. Brown, convicted of embezzling $4,350 during his 3-year term of office as Territorial deputy tax collector at Anchorage.

His successor, Paul A. Odlaug, was indicted last year for stealing $650 in Territorial tax funds between January 1950 and December 1950.

Both these men resigned before their indictments, and each was given a clean bill of health by the Territorial administration at the time of his resignation.

Just last November, David K. Brower, postmaster of Point Barrow, was arrested after a shortage of $13,800 was uncovered in his accounts.

These are but a few of the more recent exposures of corruption, malfeasance, and misfeasance in the present administration.

Among others was the removal from office by the Territorial legislature of the administrator of veterans affairs, after irregularities were uncovered in his accounts. They include also the removal of the administrator of the Territorial welfare board by the legislature under similar circumstances.

It is significant that action by the legislature was necessary to remove these men who had remained safely in office for years with the sanction of Governor Gruening.

THE AUDITOR'S REPORT ON TERRITORIAL FINANCES, 1947–48 BIENNIUM, AS PUBLISHED BY FAIRBANKS DAILY NEWS-MINER

The Alaska Legislature at its 1949 session authorized and appropriated funds for an audit of Territorial finances as required by law for each biennium. Results of the audit were made public by a special legislative committee following receipt of the report from the auditing firm, Arthur Anderson & Co. of Seattle.

It was the first audit report submitted to the people of Alaska in many years, despite the long-time existence of the Territorial statute making mandatory an examination of the Territory's books each 2 years and transmittal of the report to the legislature within 10 days of its convening.

The auditors' findings were carried in full in the columns of the Daily News-Miner at the time of their release and are reprinted in the following pages for the information of the public. For a more complete understanding of the issues involved, also included here is the News-Miner's detailed account of the contents of the report and its editorial comment made at that time.

Only through the widest possible dissemination of such material as this can a repetition of the sorry state of affairs described in the auditors' report be prevented in the future. Only by taking every avenue at its command to make sure that the information reaches the hands of the public can any newspaper worthy of the name fulfill its primary obligation to its readers; i. e., to furnish that check upon the excesses of government which no constitution has been able to provide.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner]

TERRITORY AUDIT STORY—REPORT CHARGES FEDERAL FUNDS USED TO COVER CASH SHORTAGES—20 OTHER IRREGULARITIES IN HANDLING OF PUBLIC MONEYS DISCLOSED IN STUDY OF BOOKS; VIOLATION OF LAWS IN NINE CASES ASSERTED

The treasurer of Alaska during the 1947–48 biennium used $23,237.65 received by the Territory from the Federal Government to conceal shortages in the Territory's cash balance, it is disclosed in the recently pub-

lished findings of a special audit of Alaska's finances.

Twenty other irregularities in the handling of Territorial cash are described in the report by the Seattle firm of Arthur Andersen & Co.

The audit, ordered by the last legislature, was completed in mid-July. As a result of its disclosures, the auditors were instructed to extend their examination of the treasurer's records to cover the period from October 1, 1944, to May 7, 1949.

The published report enumerates nine instances in which practices of the treasurer's office were contrary to Territorial laws, as interpreted by the Alaska attorney general.

The auditors reported similar defections in procedures of the offices of the Territorial auditor, department of education, department of public welfare, department of taxation, and the administration of the University of Alaska.

The treasurer, according to the auditors, drew checks totaling $14,742.80 on Territorial bank accounts which were not in payment of authorized warrants, the return of deposited items or tax refunds.

"The shortage arising from these disbursements," the report stated, "and from similiar disbursements made in prior periods was concealed by the treasurer by depositing amounts received from the Federal Government, in payment of railroad income taxes, in the Territorial bank accounts without recording these amounts on the books. Such unrecorded deposits amounted to $23,237.65 during the biennium under review."

In addition, the report said, the treasurer—

1. Made a practice of drawing checks to individuals in anticipation of warrants being issued by the Territorial auditor.

2. Executed certain refunds of taxes by check without the preparation of a warrant.

3. Left records inadequate to determine whether he had complied with a Territorial law requiring the treasurer to obtain from banks collateral security with a market value of 120 percent of the funds deposited. Records showed a deficiency of $460,018 in this connection as of December 31, 1948.

4. Informed the auditing firm that he had made no attempt to fulfill the law requiring the allocation of Territorial funds in all Alaska banks in relation to the capitalization and financial condition of the banks.

5. Failed to collect from three banks an interest rate of one-half percent per annum on Territorial funds deposited.

6. Left cash balances showing that money from special funds had been used for general purposes, and

7. Failed to comply with the statute requiring the treasurer to examine and approve all vouchers chargeable to appropriations of the Territorial auditor or his office before the warrants are prepared for payment.

IRREGULARITIES

Four irregularities involving the department of education were specified in the auditor's report. These were:

The sum of $30,375.40, representing insurance payment after fire destroyed a school at Bethel, was deposited in a bank account under supervision of the commissioner of education. The money was later expended by the board of education for construction of a school at Teller and for plans for schools at Clark's Point and Aniak. The auditors were informed by the attorney general that the insurance money should have been paid to the treasurer as unrestricted funds, and that the board of education had no authority to open a special bank account, nor to direct the use of the funds.

The commissioner of education, after collecting $1,188.50 in fees for teachers' certificates, deposited $500 of the amount in an account under "Territorial Office of Education." Part of the $500 was spent with no supporting data available for examination by the auditors. The attorney general stated that all such fees should go to the treasurer, and that all education expenses are payable only from appropriations for that purpose on vouchers from the Territorial auditor.

The practice of the commissioner of education of authorizing quarterly advances of 25 percent of the current year budgets of school districts resulted in advances in excess of statutory limitations. The allowable quarterly advance was defined as not more than 25 percent of refunds to the districts and cities from Territorial funds during the previous school year.

The commissioner of education used the current year's enrollment, rather than that of the previous year, as the basis for determining refunds from the Territory to schools.

The Andersen & Co. report cited instances in which the Territorial auditor paid vouchers to the department of education and to the department of welfare without supporting documentary data.

During the biennium, benefit payments by the department of welfare to individuals amounted to $13,263.40 more than the statutory maximum, the auditors said records showed.

The auditors said they were informed by the attorney general that the University of Alaska, without authority, had borrowed $211,000 from various sources. Of that amount, $191,000 remained unpaid as of December 31, 1948.

University records failed to show the classification of all expenditures with relation to the source of funds, whether by Federal grant or Territorial appropriation, the audit report stated. Of 12 student loans with unpaid balances totaling $2,202.46, 8 loans with unpaid balances of $1,422.46 were past due as of December 31, 1948.

The auditors reported a shortage of $555.29 in the accounts of the deputy tax collector in Anchorage on May 9, 1949, adding that the full amount was restored on May 10.

SURETY BONDS

Of 15 wholesale liquor dealers required to provide surety bonds of $25,000 each to the department of taxation, only 4 bonds were on hand at the time of the auditors' examination, they reported.

The auditors took notice in their summary that the freezing of Territorial funds by the board of administration in April 1947 "did not succeed in keeping expenditures within the available funds."

They also remarked that data supporting grants of $206,267 to schools for the period July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947, and substantially all applications for unemployment benefits during the year 1947 together with the earning records of claimants were destroyed prior to the commencement of our examination and were not available for our review. Unemployment benefits paid during 1947 totaled $556,072.

The results of the firm's extended examination into the period from October 1944 to May 1949 will be submitted in a later separate report.

AUDITOR'S REPORT

JULY 15, 1949.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING, Governor, and Hon. FRANK A. BOYLE, Auditor,
Territory of Alaska.

SIRS: We have examined the statements of cash receipts and disbursements of the Territory of Alaska for the biennium ended December 31, 1948. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and accordingly, included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances. The general scope of our examination of the recorded transactions for the period under review is summarized in the following paragraphs.

Cash in banks and on deposit in the Treasury of the United States at the beginning and end of the period, as shown by the records of the Territory (except the January 1, 1946, balance, $3,752.64, in the unemployment benefit account at the First National Bank of Juneau), was reconciled with amounts confirmed directly to us by the depositors. Cash reported as on hand at those dates was traced to subsequent deposit in Territorial bank accounts. Securities pledged by banks as collateral for Territorial funds on deposit therewith were confirmed to us by the banks and by the custodians holding such securities in safekeeping for the Territorial treasurer.

Recorded receipts of taxes and licenses collected by the department of taxation, the unemployment compensation commission, and the auditor, were checked on a test basis to tax returns and records of licenses issued. Tax and license revenues collected for the Territory by United States district courts were confirmed to us by the clerks of the respective courts. Grants, matching funds, and other funds recorded as received from the United States Government were confirmed to us by the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government administering such funds. Recorded miscellaneous receipts of the Territory were tested, where practicable, by reference to records of the departments and agencies collecting such funds.

Cash disbursements for goods and services furnished to the Territory were checked, on a test basis, to payrolls, invoices and other supporting documents. Grants made by the Territory (school maintenance refunds, unemployment benefits and health and welfare payments) were tested by reference to documents held by the administering departments and agencies setting forth the recipients' eligibility to receive such grants. We tested the distribution of expenditures to appropriations and special funds but we did not attempt to pass upon the legality of the expenditures since this would involve legal interpretation of appropriation acts and other statutes which is beyond our purview as accountants.

The unexpended balance of appropriations and special funds at January 1, 1947, are shown in the accompanying statements in the amounts reflected by the records of the departments and agencies of the Territory. Since we have not examined the Territory's accounts for any period prior to the biennium 1947–48, we are not able to express an opinion as to the propriety of balances in the individual accounts.

The cash receipts of the Territory consist principally of taxes, licenses, and grants from the Federal Government which, because of their nature, cannot be measured and recorded prior to collection. Accordingly, it was not possible for us to determine independently that all revenues received by the various departments and agencies of the Territory had been recorded and covered into the Treasury.

Data supporting grants of $206,267 made by the Territory to independent school districts and school boards of incorporated cities for maintenance expenses for the period July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947, had been destroyed prior to the commencement of our examination and were not available for our review. Substantially all applications for unemployment benefits during the year 1947 together with claimants' earnings records had been destroyed prior to our examination and were not available for our review. Unemployment benefits paid during 1947 totaled $556,072.

Subject to the limitations upon the scope of our examination as set forth in the preceding three paragraphs, in our opinion, the accompanying statements (schedules 1 through 14) present fairly the recorded receipts and disbursements of the Territory of

Alaska and the source and disposition of such funds for the biennium ended December 31, 1948.

A discussion of the more important matters which came to our attention during the course of our examination together with our comments regarding particular items of receipts and disbursements are contained in subsequent paragraphs of this report. Our comments and suggestions with regard to the Territory's accounting procedures and system of internal control are being submitted in a separate memorandum.

GENERAL

Inasmuch as the various departments and agencies of the Territory, other than the unemployment compensation commission, do not maintain records of unliquidated obligations, it was not practicable to determine the amounts by which appropriations and special funds had been encumbered at December 31, 1948.

During April 1947, the board of administration froze all appropriations except those which were specifically exempt from such restriction. The board's order stated that this step was taken after their survey showed that Territorial revenues for the biennium ending March 31, 1949, would fall about $3,750,000 short of meeting the more than $10,000,000 appropriated by the legislature. This action did not succeed, however, in keeping expenditures within the available funds. At December 31, 1948, the records of the auditor's office indicated that there were unpaid vouchers on hand totaling $729,630.83 as against unrestricted cash balances in the hands of the treasurer of $7,010.77. At the same date collections held by departments and agencies, which were transferred to the treasurer during January 1949, were as follows:

Held by:	*Amount*
Auditor	$5,197.55
Department of taxation	135,775.29
Total	140,972.84

The statutes provide that all indebtedness be paid in the order of its creation. The Attorney General has ruled that this provision applies to all types of obligations, irrespective of their nature or purpose. During the biennium, salaries of Territorial employees were paid in preference to other indebtedness and vouchers were paid without regard to the date the indebtedness was incurred.

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

Unauthorized withdrawals and unrecorded deposits

During the course of our examination of this office, a number of transactions came to our attention which are commented upon below. A summary of such transactions for the biennium ended December 31, 1948, is as follows:

1. Checks drawn on Territorial bank accounts which were not in payment of warrants issued, deposited items returned by the banks or tax refunds, $14,742.80.

2. Receipts of Territorial funds deposited in Territorial bank accounts but not recorded in the treasurer's accounts, $23,237.65.

Warrants prepared by the auditor and countersigned by the treasurer are issued in payment for goods and services. The reduction of the appropriation or special fund accounts is recorded at the time the warrants are issued. On the other hand, the actual disbursement of funds in the custody of the treasurer is accomplished by checks signed only by the treasurer who also reconciles the Territorial bank accounts. Generally, checks are drawn to banks each day in payment for warrants accepted for collection by the banks. Checks are also drawn to banks in reimbursement for items deposited with but returned by the banks because of noncollection. These latter items are carried by the treasurer as cash on hand until cleared by redeposit or collection. No changes in appropriation or fund balances are made if the item is eventually cleared. It was also the practice of the treasurer to draw checks to individuals in anticipation of warrants being issued by the auditor. The warrants covered by these checks, when received from the auditor, were used to record the charges against the appropriation or fund accounts and then canceled. Certain refunds of taxes were made by check without the preparation of a warrant.

Warrants were not issued for any of the checks making up the amount of $14,742.80 shown above, and therefore the appropriation and fund accounts were not charged with these disbursements. Consequently, the cash balances shown by the books would have exceeded the actual amount of cash on hand and in banks by the amount of the unauthorized disbursements. The shortage arising from these disbursements and from similar disbursements made in prior periods was concealed by the treasurer by depositing amounts received from the Federal Government in payment of railroad income taxes in the Territorial bank accounts without recording these amounts on the books. Such unrecorded deposits amounted to $23,237.65 during the biennium under review.

As soon as these transactions came to our attention, we reported them to officials of the Territory. As a result of these disclosures, we were instructed to extend our examination of the treasurer's records to cover the period from October 1, 1944, to May 7, 1949. The results of this examination are being submitted in a separate report.

Collateral security for Territorial funds

The treasurer is required by Territorial law to obtain from banks in which Territorial funds are deposited collateral security having a market value of at least 120 percent of the amount of such funds held. The records of the treasurer were inadequate to permit us to determine whether this requirement had been complied with throughout the biennium under review. As shown on schedule 10, the treasurer had not secured sufficient collateral from all banks to cover balances on deposit with them at December 31, 1948. We understand that during the 1949 session of the legislature the requirements were amended, effective July 1, 1949, to permit banks to furnish United States Government obligations as collateral in principal amounts equal to 100 percent of the cash balances to be secured. The requirement with respect to securities other than United States Government obligations remained unchanged. The deficiency in collateral security at December 31, 1948, computed in accordance with the Revised Statutes, is summarized below:

Bank	Balance on deposit	Collateral		Deficiency if covered by deposit of U. S. Government obligations
		U. S. Government obligations at par	Other securities at quoted market value	
The B. M. Behrends Bank	$482,179	$416,350		$65,829
The First National Bank of Juneau	874,221	607,000		267,221
The Seattle-First National Bank	114,540	100,000		14,540
The First Bank of Valdez	223,273		$133,014	112,428
Total				460,018

Allocation of cash balances among banks

The treasurer is required by law to allocate the funds of the Territory among all of the banks of Alaska in relation to the capitalization and financial condition of the banks. We were informed by the treasury that no attempt had been made to fulfill this requirement.

Interest on bank balances

Territorial law requires that banks holding deposits of Territorial funds shall pay interest thereon at the rate established by the Territorial banking board (one-half percent per annum). During the biennium under review, the following banks did not pay interest on balances deposited therein: The B. M. Behrends Bank, the First National Bank of Juneau, the Seattle-First National Bank.

We were informed that these banks did not pay such interest on the ground that the cost of handling the Territorial accounts offsets any interest earned by the balances in these accounts.

Special funds

As shown in schedule 1, at December 31, 1946, the cash balances of the Territory held by the treasurer totaled $223,630.18. At that date unexpended balances of special funds under the jurisdiction of the treasurer totaled $603,246.79, or $379,616.61 in excess of the cash balances which indicated that special fund cash had been used for general purposes. This situation did not exist at December 31, 1948. We were informed by the Attorney General that cash receipts for or appropriations to special funds are available only for the specific purposes of such funds and should not be used for payment of general Territorial obligations.

Review of vouchers drawn by the auditor

Territorial statutes require the treasurer to examine and approve all vouchers chargeable to appropriations of the auditor or his office before warrants are prepared for payment thereof. We were informed that the treasurer had not examined these vouchers during the biennium under review.

OFFICE OF THE AUDITOR

Support for vouchers passed for payment

Our examination of vouchers passed for payment indicated that, generally speaking, adequate supporting data were attached thereto to enable the auditor to pass upon the propriety of the claims. However, the following types of vouchers either did not contain adequate support or related information necessary to pass upon such claims had not been secured by the auditor:

Type of Voucher and Information Lacking

Department of education school maintenance refunds: Copies of budgets or estimates of costs submitted by school boards and approved by commissioner.

Rural school teachers' salaries: Statement of amount of refund for prior year and copies of contracts with teachers.

Department of health and public welfare expenditures chargeable against Federal funds: Regulations and restrictions applicable to Federal grants.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Expenditures of insurance proceeds

During 1944 the board of education received $30,375.40, representing insurance proceeds resulting from a fire in the school building at Bethel. These funds were deposited in a bank account under the supervision of the commissioner of education. At the

instruction of the board of education these funds were used for the construction of a school at Teller and for plans and preliminary work on schools at Clark's Point and Aniak.

We were informed by the attorney general that the insurance proceeds should have been paid to the Territorial treasurer as unrestricted receipts and that the board of education had no authority to place these funds in a special bank account, to direct the use of such funds, or to expend these funds.

Teachers' certificate fees

During the biennium under review $1,188.50 representing fees for teachers' certificates was collected by the commissioner of education. Of this amount $688.50 was transferred to the territorial treasury and credited to the appropriation for administrative expenses of the department of education. The remaining $500 was deposited in a special bank account maintained under the title of the "Territorial Office of Education." At January 1, 1947, this account had a balance of $383.60. Expenditures totaling $511.82 were made from this account during the biennium leaving a balance at December 31, 1948, of $371.78. No data supporting these expenditures were available for our examination. Notations in the check book indicated the larger payments to be as follows:

Payee and particulars:	*Amount*
Cash, education film	$50.00
Alaska airlines, office contingent	50.00
Ada Winther:	
Travel	120.05
Salary for 12 days	91.77
National Council of School officers, membership	100.00

The attorney general informed us that the statutes require that all fees from teachers' certificates be deposited with the treasurer as unrestricted receipts and all expenses of the office of the commissioner of education be paid from appropriations for that purpose upon vouchers approved by the auditor.

School maintenance refunds

The commissioner of education has the authority to make advances each quarter of the school year against refunds due to incorporated cities and school districts for their allowable maintenance expenses. The statutes limit the amount of each of these quarterly advances to not more than 25 percent of the sum which such municipality or school district received as a refund for the previous school year. The commissioner has followed the practice, however, of advancing quarterly 25 percent of the approved budget of each municipality or school district for the current school year. This has resulted in advances being made in excess of the statutory limitation since the current budgets have been exceeding previous year's refunds.

School boards are required to furnish the commissioner with detailed statements of their maintenance expenses together with vouchers and supporting documents. At the time of our examination no such reports had been received from the City of Fairbanks School Board for the school year 1948–49.

The percentage of maintenance expenses which is allowable as a refund to incorporated cities and school districts is based upon resident school enrollment, varying from 75 to 85 percent as enrollment decreases. The percentage of refund used by the commissioner of education has been based upon the preceding year's enrollment. The attorney general advised us that the current year's enrollment should be used as the basis for determining the percentage of refund.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WELFARE

Temporary aid to indigents

During the biennium under review it was the policy of the department of public welfare to consider that the statutory limitation of $30 per month to any individual applied only to cash payments made directly to indigents and did not relate to the cost of goods and services furnished to indigents. It was the opinion of the attorney general that the law required that aid to indigents in all forms, exclusive of medical care, must not exceed $30 per month. Payments made to individuals during the period in excess of the statutory maximum totaled $13,263.40.

DEPARTMENT OF TAXATION

Tax and license collections

As previously stated, since receipts of taxes and licenses cannot be measured or recorded prior to collection, it was possible for us to determine independently that all revenues from these sources had been recorded and covered into the Treasury. While prenumbered receipts are issued for certain taxes and licenses, the recorded collections could not be proved except by accounting for the entire issue of tax receipts printed. It was impractical for us to check the recorded tax collections in this manner, but the tax commissioner has undertaken to account for all tax and license receipts printed. This work had not been completed at the conclusion of our examination.

The major portion of tax revenues is evidenced by tax returns prepared and filed by the taxpayers. We were not able to determine that all persons liable for Territorial taxes had filed returns and paid the taxes due but our tests of the records of the department of taxation indicated that all taxes represented by returns on file had been recorded and transmitted to the Territorial treasurer. We made no attempt to verify the amounts of taxes reported in the returns filed.

Examination of offices of the deputy collectors

We examined the records maintained by the deputy tax collectors at Juneau, Ketchikan, Anchorage, and Fairbanks, counted cash on hand and confirmed cash in banks, counted unissued tax receipts and reconciled the accounts of each deputy collector with the control records maintained in the commissioner's office. Our examination of the office of the deputy collector at Anchorage on May 9, 1949, disclosed a shortage of $555.29. On May 10, 1949, the deputy collector deposited the full amount of this shortage in the bank account of his office and transferred all collections made to that date to the office of the commissioner.

Liquor wholesalers' bonds

The statutes require every wholesaler of intoxicating liquors to furnish a surety bond of $25,000 to the tax commissioner to guarantee payment of Territorial excise taxes on liquors. At the time of our examination the department's records were incomplete with respect to these bonds, but the commissioner is taking steps to put these records in order.

The following tabulation sets forth the number of wholesalers who currently pay liquor excise taxes and their status with respect to the bond requirement:

Particulars:	*Number*
Wholesalers whose bonds were on hand and examined by us	4
Wholesalers who claimed to have furnished bonds but which could not be located for our examination	7
Wholesalers who have not furnished bonds	4
	15

UNIVERSITY OF ALASKA

Indebtedness incurred by the university

During the biennium the university borrowed $211,000 from various sources and used these funds to defray operating costs. At December 31, 1948, $191,000 of these loans were unpaid. The Attorney General has advised us that the university does not have authority to borrow funds.

Appropriation expenditures

The university records do not show a classification of all expenditures by source of funds. Expenditures of Federal grants and certain Territorial appropriations are classified in the accounts but expenditures for administration, maintenance of physical plant and faculty salaries not chargeable to Federal grants, are not charged against any specific appropriations. Consequently, the records do not reflect a breakdown of the unexpended balances by appropriations.

Student loan fund

Twelve loans receivable having unpaid balances of $2,202.46 at December 31, 1948, were submitted to us for examination. We requested confirmation of these balances from the borrowers with the following results:

Particulars	Number	Unpaid balances
Balances confirmed	7	$974.19
No reply received	3	978.27
Request returned for lack of proper address (no other address available)	2	250.00
Total	12	2,202.46

Four loans having unpaid balances of $780 are current and the remaining eight loans having unpaid balances of $1,422.46 are past due.

Upon request, we shall be pleased to discuss with you any of the matters set forth above or to furnish you with any information contained in our working papers. We appreciate the courtesies and cooperation extended to our representatives during the course of the examination.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR ANDERSEN & CO.

[From the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner]

A SHABBY RECORD

For the information of its readers, the Daily News-Miner today publishes the text of the auditor's report on the state of Territorial finances during the 1947 and 1948 biennium.

The document tells a disgraceful story of inept and slipshod handling of the people's money by members of the Gruening administration in that period. And worse, it details the manner in which ex-treasurer Olson used Federal funds to conceal shortages in his accounts. Olson has been charged with embezzlement and is awaiting grand jury action.

A total of 20 other alleged irregularities in the handling of Alaska funds are cited by the auditing firm, Arthur Andersen & Co., of Seattle. Nine practices contrary to Territorial law, as interpreted by the attorney general, were found in the treasurer's office. Other such practices were found in the Territorial auditor's office, in the department of education, department of public welfare, and the department of taxation.

Some accounting methods of the University of Alaska in the period under scrutiny were criticized by the auditors, who also disclosed that the attorney general has ruled that the university is without legal authority to borrow funds from private sources to defray operating costs.

The auditors also noted cases in which the department of education had set up its own bank accounts without legal authority and arbitrarily disbursed funds from these accounts without regard to required procedures under Territorial law.

A further shocking example of the Juneau administration's disregard for the public interest is found in the disclosure that records

and other supporting data for grants totalling $762,339 out of the Territorial treasury during the biennium were destroyed prior to the audit. These included "substantially all" the applications for unemployment benefits and earning records of claimants for 1947, as well as data supporting grants to independent school districts from July 1, 1946, to June 30, 1947.

A more brazen appearing attempt by some officials to evade an examination of their activities by the auditing firm is impossible to imagine. Destruction of records only two and three years old is not normal procedure, nor can it be dismissed as someone's oversight.

An immediate investigation into this and other matters cited in the report should be made by proper authorities and the officials involved required to explain their dealings publicly. If the responsible leaders of the administration remain derelict in this regard, it then should be the obligation of members of the legislature to undertake the inquiry in the public interest.

The audit was ordered by the legislature at the insistence of Senator John Butrovich, a Fairbanks Republican, and Representative James Nolan, a Wrangell Democrat. It is the same audit that was blocked for 2 years by the Territorial board of administration which refused to provide funds to finance it while continuing to finance such nonsense as the development board.

The report is the latest chapter in the story of Gov. Ernest Gruening's administration of Alaska affairs. As a result of the findings, the audit has been ordered extended to cover the period from October 1, 1944, to May 7, 1949.

We will await with interest the next chapters in this shabby record.

USE OF THE PUBLIC PURSE FOR PRIVATE GAIN

Surprised Alaskans learned a few years ago that members of the Territorial legislature had been given jobs on the payroll of the executive branch, under Governor Gruening, a practice which certainly strikes at the foundation of the usual concept of government in this country. Needless, to add, the lawmakers who thus benefited from the Territorial treasury were invariably supporters of the Gruening administration in carrying out their legislative "duties."

A noteworthy example of this practice was the case of Stanley J. McCutcheon, a member of the Alaska House from Anchorage, also, the Gruening administration's floor leader during the 1949 legislative session.

At that session, McCutcheon actively supported and voted for legislation creating the Alaska Aeronautics Commission, whose primary function was to oversee the building of civilian airports in Alaska, of course, with the aid of Federal matching funds. McCutcheon voted for the appropriation for support of that agency.

Thereafter he was hired as attorney for the same agency. He drew fees which totaled at least $5,623 for legal services over an 8 months' period. The number of the Territorial voucher by which he was paid was 284303, dated April 19, 1950.

McCutcheon has benefited from his association with the Gruening administration in other ways. He is president of Alaska Airlines. For years the Alaska Airlines owed the Territory $22,000 in back sales tax for which it had collected and then failed to turn over to the Territorial treasurer as required by law. A "token" payment of $1,000 made in April, 1950, did not even cover the interest on the delinquency. Now, we come to the quid pro quo.

It was also Alaska Airlines that transported the prostatehood claque to Washington for hearings before the Senate committee in April, 1950. The round-trip fare charged by the airline (which couldn't afford to pay a tax debt to the Territory) was $125 per person, a fraction of the commercial rate which statehood opponents were forced to pay to testify before the committee against the pending bill. The exchange of favors between Governor Gruening and McCutcheon is, or should be, obvious.

Another among the legislators who have profited from close association with the Gruening regime was Victor Rivers, a member of the Alaska senate, who also voted for the creation of the Territorial aeronautics agency and voted for the appropriation for that agency. Rivers, the record shows, was subsequently hired by the same agency as an engineer. He drew fees totalling several thousands of dollars, including $4,320 paid to him on vouchers Nos. 274203 and 280552 in January and March of 1950.

Rivers has also received pay from numerous other agencies of the executive branch of the Territorial government, whose appropriations he supported as a member of the legislature. Some of the agencies and amounts paid him by each are as follows: Department of Education, $18,760.50;, Department of Public Health, $12,151.58 and Highway Department, $1,544.65.

But the members of the legislature are not the only ones who profit from the largess of the Gruening administration at the expense of the taxpaying public.

Mrs. Mildred Hermann, wartime OPA administrator in the Territory, is a devoted follower of the Alaska administration, as well as being a loud exponent of the statehood cause. She it was who suggested before the Senate committee that Alaskans ought to be willing to "eat beans" to support a state government.

Records of the General Accounting Office show that Mrs. Hermann received total pay from the Federal Government for her services as OPA Administrator amounting to $27,146 between May 16, 1942, and May 3, 1947. Alaska's former Delegate, now a Federal district judge in Anchorage, is authority for the disclosure that Mrs. Hermann received her Federal appointment through the personal intervention of Governor Gruening. (See letter.)

Mrs. Hermann is currently serving as a paid secretary of the Alaska Statehood Committee, a promotion agency for the statehood cause supported entirely by tax funds. When the legislature is in session, she broadcasts over the radio in Juneau 3 nights a week, bitterly assailing in most personal language the activities of those lawmakers who are opposed to the Gruening regime, while blessing with glowing approbation those who have stood in favor of its various programs.

This is a pressure tactic, and there can be little doubt where it had its inception.

Mrs. Irene Ryan is another who has been similarly rewarded. Her testimony and that of her husband, strongly favoring passage of the statehood bill, will be found in the record of the hearings before the Senate committee. Both took advantage of the reduced $125 fare to travel to Washington to state their views in favor of the legislation.

It therefore becomes pertinent to refer to the financial records of the Territorial government which show that Mrs. Ryan drew a total of more than $30,000 in tax funds as an engineer on a number of Territorial airport projects. Her husband is also on the public payroll, serving as an engineer at Fort Richardson, near Anchorage.

This is the same couple to whom Senator ANDERSON referred on the floor of the Senate on February 4 (see RECORD, p. 764) when he referred to witnesses at the last statehood hearing 2 years ago in the following language:

"A fine group of people appeared and testified on the statehood issue. There were some who had lived in Alaska a long time; there were some who were newcomers to the area. I was surprised to find among the group who appeared from Alaska two young people, a man and his wife, who were mining engineers. It had been only a few years before that I had been the speaker at the commencement exercises at the school of mines in my home State and had handed the diplomas to these young folks. The wife was the first mining engineer of her sex to be graduated from that school.

"These two young people were living in Alaska. They had been to Washington many times, because they believe statehood will accomplish wonderful things for the whole mining industry. They believe that as a result of statehood we can look for a tremendous development in the production of minerals which are now badly needed by this Nation, and their testimony stands uncontradicted in all the hearings we have held."

The foregoing is certainly all very lovely, but what are the Ryans doing toward development of the Territory? Where is their contribution? How does a female mining engineer qualify as a designer of airports? Under the circumstances, their enthusiasm for statehood, or anything else desired by the present Alaska administration, isn't hard to understand.

William Baker, editor of the Ketchikan Chronicle, is another follower of the present Alaska administration. The record shows that he has on occasions in the past received a total of more than $5,000 in printing business from Territorial government agencies without competitive bids. He is the only Alaska publisher thus favored by the administration. A second paper published in Ketchikan and unfavorable to the Alaska administration has not been as fortunate in the securing of work financed from the Public Treasury, the record shows.

Another who has been handsomely rewarded at the expense of taxpayers for his loyalty to the Alaska administration is Herbert Hilscher of Fairbanks. Mr. Hilscher is a public-relations counsel and proved of invaluable aid to the Territorial administration 3 years ago during that administration's campaign to outlaw fish traps, a device vital to the economical and efficient operation of the salmon industry.

Hilscher handled the publicity for those seeking to destroy the traps, including leaders of the Gruening regime, as a means for dealing a crippling blow to the salmon industry. At the same time, as an editor of a weekly newspaper, he was able to support his campaign in its news columns.

Hilscher has now been honored by appointment to the Alaska Development Board, a post which enables him to travel about the Territory to meetings, conferences, and what not at public expense, free to promote at the same time his public-relations business. He has also been placed on the payroll of the University of Alaska at $300 per month. He was hired by the Alaska Statehood Committee to produce that agency's biennial report and was paid $1,237.36 out of the public purse. More lately, he has been placed on the payroll of the Federal Government by the Bureau of Reclamation to whip up sentiment in favor of a public power project near Fairbanks.

Another who found a place on the public payroll after acknowledging his support of the policies of the present governor was John Pegeus, now deceased, who was an editor and columnist for various Alaska newspapers during his lifetime. Mr. Pegeus was ODT administrator in the Territory during the war. Records of the General Accounting Office show he received a total of $4,633.77 from the Federal Treasury between March 3, 1944, and August 31, 1945. Pegeus' loyalty to the Gruening administration is no more difficult to comprehend than that of the other recipients of pay from tax funds who have been cited herein.

The penchant of Governor Gruening for bringing newspaper people into his administration is well known in Alaska. The influence of officials of the press in their home communities can hardly be overestimated.

Among those on whom the gubernatorial blessing has thus been bestowed are Paul Solka, placed on the Territorial veterans board at a time when he was also a newspaper editor; Robert Atwood, publisher of the Anchorage Times, presently the chairman of the statehood committee; his wife, Mrs. Evangeline Atwood, named by the Governor to the Territorial welfare board, and William Baker, the Ketchikan publisher previously mentioned, who is also on the statehood committee.

Lest the report get about that the parcelling out of favors by the Gruening administration was entirely altruistic, it is perhaps germane to remind the Senate of the private road, built at public expense, a few years ago for the sole purpose of serving property outside Juneau occupied by the Governor or members of his family. Construction of the road is a matter of record and cost taxpayers more than $2,200. It was the subject of litigation in the district court in Juneau in 1949.

At the hearings on the Governor's confirmation before the Senate committee later that same year, members of the committee expressed interest in the project, an obvious convenience for the Governor and members of his family, and one which doubtless enhanced the value of the property. The Governor's explanation was that the road was built by the Territorial highway department on an occasion when he happened to be absent from the Territory and, therefore, he could not be held accountable for it.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 2, 1942.

WALTER P. SHARPE, Esq.,
Juneau, Alaska.

DEAR WALTER: Your letter of May 25, expressing doubt as to the wisdom of the appointment of Mrs. Mildred R. Hermann to the position of Price Administrator for the Territory of Alaska, was received this morning and I have read it with much interest.

The news of Mrs. Hermann's appointment came to me as a complete surprise for I had not been consulted on the subject. At the Office of Price Administration here I was told that she had been appointed upon the recommendation of Governor Gruening.

Thank you for having told me what you think of the appointment. The times appear to be troublous in more than one respect.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ANTHONY J. DIMOND,
Delegate.

USE OF PUBLIC PURSE FOR POLITICAL GAIN

Charges that the public purse in Alaska has been used for the private gain of a select few individuals are clearly supported by the record of the present Territorial administration.

That public money has also been used for political gain by leaders of the same administration is also a matter of record.

By carefully timing the expenditure of funds to coincide with primary and general elections in the Territory, the officials in control of Alaska's purse strings have sought to influence the voting of the rank and file of Territorial inhabitants.

The administration was aided in this practice by the stringent financial condition in which the Territory found itself in 1949.

Because of the failure of anticipated revenues to meet the appropriations made by the 1947 and 1949 legislatures, the Alaskan board of administration froze more than $5,000,000 of the appropriated funds soon after the legislature adjourned.

These frozen funds included money for the University of Alaska, welfare agencies, the veterans' revolving loan fund, the statehood committee, and others.

In the intervening period, tax collections have far exceeded the expectations of the most optimistic Territorial officials. Revenues to meet these projected expenditures have since been collected, thanks to the millions pumped into the Alaska economy by the Federal Government, and the frozen funds have now been entirely released.

The political implications in the handling of this public money became the most pronounced during 1950, an election year. The bulk of the appropriations had remained blocked throughout 1949, a nonelection year, by the board of administration, of which the Governor is chairman.

Governor Gruening and his followers will claim that the money could not be released until a number of the usual court tests of new tax laws had been brought to a successful conclusion.

To some extent, this cannot be denied. But no one can claim that the court tests continued up to within a few days of both the primary and the general elections of 1950, which is when a large proportion of the funds with the widest popular appeal were released.

Nor can the Governor's most enthusiastic followers support an argument that the court tests were of such a nature as to force the Territory to deny the appropriation of funds for the welfare agency adequate for the care of delinquent children, while releasing funds for such governmental activities as the board of dental examiners, the board of cosmetology, and the Alaska statehood committee, a surperlobbying agency created by the present Territorial administration.

That was what happened just prior to the 1950 primary election and the record will so show.

The frozen funds also included, among other items, $1,200,000 earmarked for payment into the Alaska World War II veterans' revolving fund at the rate of $50,000 a month. The law clearly provided that these payments were mandatory.

Because the entire appropriation had been frozen, no payments were made to the veterans' funds for nearly a year, in spite of constant requests by the veterans' board that such payments be made according to law.

Less than a month before the 1950 primary elections in April, the Territorial treasurer refused to make the payments to the veterans, saying, "The financial picture of the Territory at the present time is not clear."

Four days before, the treasurer had spoken in glowing terms of the Territory's improved financial condition which had permitted the board of administration to unfreeze $25,000 for the statehood committee, $5,000 for the Alaskan National Guard, and other amounts totaling $261,564.

Then, 6 days before the primary election, the board of administration announced it had unfrozen $100,000 of the money due the veterans. The treasurer said he had just discovered fine print in the law making payment mandatory.

No further payments were made on the delinquent balance until the following October when, 6 days before the general election, the board of adminstration announced it had unfrozen $50,000 more of the veterans' money.

Funds for the tax-supported University of Alaska were withheld in a similar manner until just prior to election.

The frozen account included $900,000 appropriated for new construction at the university.

Less than a month before the April primary election in 1950, the board of administration released $85,450 to the university.

No further payments were made until 6 days before the general election in October, at which time the Governor announced the release of $90,000 more of the money owed the university. This announcement carried also the promise that the board of administration would release the balance in 1951 at the rate of $100,000 a month.

The university is located near Fairbanks. Money spent by the university would normally flow into Fairbanks coffers. Fairbanks was also the scene at that time of a bitter political battle between the administration and its foes. The bold attempt of the administration to tamper with the views of the electorate through timely release of university funds is, or should be, obvious.

As it turned out, the administration's gesture in this respect was in vain. The Governor took the worst beating of the election in Fairbanks, where he lost all except one seat in the legislature to Republicans.

Other funds released by the board of administration within days of the 1950 primary election, after they had lain dormant in frozen accounts for many months, were $50,000 for aid to hospitals and clinics, $20,000 for the public employees' retirement fund, $25,114 for the Alaska housing authority, $75,000 for the department of fisheries, $750 for the board of dental examiners, and $250 for the board of cosmetology.

The record shows that these funds were released at a time when the Alaskan department of public welfare was closing its doors to all juveniles except those already under its care because there was not enough money in the department to operate it effectively.

This lack of money for the care of delinquent children was the direct result of action in the administration-controlled 1949 legislature, which chopped $90,000 off the request made by the board of public welfare.

The same legislature appropriated $30,000 for the statehood lobby. Part of this money was used to hire a professional lobbyist who previously had represented the satellite Government of Poland in Washington circles.

In the same month (April 1950) that the board of administration released $25,000 for the statehood committee, the director of public welfare made the following report:

"With the serious shortage of juvenile code funds, the agency will only be able to provide assistance for a very limited number of these younger children. This action means that the adolescent boys and girls who are in trouble in the communities and are committed to the department of public welfare will suffer as there will be no funds available for their care. * * * As a result, the child welfare service program will be critically hampered by lack of adequate funds."

BUREAUCRATIC PRESSURE ON VOTERS

Early in 1950, Mr. Arvo Saario, president of the Northwest Alaska Chamber of Commerce in Nome, asked the Alaska Development Board to establish an office in Nome to aid in promoting a tourist business for the Territory.

He received a reply soon thereafter from George Sundborg, at that time a consultant for the development board, who wrote to Mr. Saario from Washington where he was staying at taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Sundborg's reply (see photostat marked "F") consisted of a refusal to accede to the request for a development board office in Nome. In the same communication, Mr. Sundborg attacked the records of certain Alaskans who represented Nome in the Territorial legislature in 1949 and concluded with this revealing statement:

"Whether we will be able to proceed toward these objectives next biennium will depend entirely on action taken by the 1951 legislature and, of course, upon the make-up of that body."

For many years, Alaskans have anticipated that soon a flourishing tourist trade will someday be a major source of income. But, when the Nome Chamber of Commerce wrote asking for help along this line, it received

back only a threatening letter attacking its legislators.

Thus, the citizens of Nome, who desire a portion of tax funds from the Territorial administration for the betterment of their community, now know how to go about getting those funds. In simple language, they must send to their legislature only those representatives acceptable to Mr. Sundborg and other administration leaders.

Sundborg's letter, significantly, was written about a month before the 1950 Alaska primary election.

Government by pressure is commonplace in Alaska.

It works both ways. Those individuals and those communities that are loyal to the administration are amply rewarded, as in the case of legislators who have been placed on the payroll of the executive branch. Those who offend the administration, as in the case of Nome, are penalized. The record shows that both Senator Munz and Senator Jones were subsequently defeated in their races to win reelection to the legislature.

Little pressure is required to control the outcome of the balloting in sparsely populated regions such as northern and western Alaska. There are only about 500 votes cast in Nome and only about 2,000 in the entire division, the majority of which are natives and subject to further pressure through the Interior Department and the Alaska Native Service.

Yet this division elects one-quarter of the membership of the Senate and one-eighth of the membership of the House.

As to Mr. Sundborg, his annual salary at the time he wrote the letter to Nome was $8,000, paid out of Alaska tax funds. Records also show that he drew an additional sum for expenses amounting to $6,800 between April 1, 1949, and April 1, 1950.

This was during a period when more than $5,000,000 in appropriations for the Territorial government remained frozen for lack of funds to meet them, and there was insufficient money in the treasury to finance adequate care for delinquent children by the welfare department.

Mr. Sundborg's pay has since been increased to $12,000 per year.

ALASKA DEVELOPMENT BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1950.

Mr. ARVO SAARIO,
President, Northwest Alaska Chamber of Commerce, Nome, Alaska.

DEAR MR. SAARIO: Your recent night letter has been forwarded here by my office at Juneau. The interest of your organization in building up a real tourist business in Alaska is greatly appreciated by us and we hope your attitude will be emulated by other chambers of commerce in the Territory.

Mr. Polet, our Alaska Development Board member for the second division, has long advocated our establishing an office at Nome. We have been unable to do this because of budgetary reasons. As you may know, all four of the senators from the second division voted in the 1947 legislative sessions to completely abolish the Alaska Development Board. These men were O. D. Cochran, Tolbert Scott, Charles Jones, and William Munz. They were also instrumental in that session in obtaining a vote by which our board was given no appropriation whatsoever for the entire biennium. In the 1949 session Senators Jones and Munz again voted to cripple the Alaska Development Board in every possible way but the two new senators who had been elected in the meantime, Howard Lyng and Ed Anderson, supported us strongly. The Alaska Development Board, as a result, received an appropriation of $30,000 for the current biennium. This does not permit us to maintain an office in Nome or to spend any money on a tourist-promotion program. Whether we will be able to proceed toward these objectives next biennium will depend entirely on action taken by the 1951 legislature and, of course, upon the make-up of that body.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE SUNDBORG,
Consultant.

THE STATEHOOD REFERENDUM

Proponents of immediate statehood for Alaska have placed strong emphasis on the results of the statehood referendum held in the Territory in 1946.

The statehood group claims that the outcome of the referendum reflected the will of the majority of Alaskan voters for immediate admission to the Union.

The facts do not support this contention.

The question on the referendum ballot was so worded that the voter had only a "Yes" or "No" choice on the general proposition, "Are you in favor of statehood for Alaska?"

There are many Alaskans who look forward to eventual statehood for the Territory, but who believe it is not yet economically prepared to carry the tremendous added financial burden of a State government.

These were faced with the choice of voting "Yes" on the general principle of statehood or registering their opposition to statehood for all time.

The affirmative votes in these cases expressed no desire, much less a demand, for immediate statehood.

But, even with the support of these Alaskans, the margin of victory for the statehood adherents in the referendum was a slender one, 9,630 to 6,822. Under the terms of the ballot, those who voted "No" went on record as being opposed to any kind of statehood at any time.

The figures also show that more than 500 Alaskans who cast ballots in the general election, held at the same time as the statehood referendum, did not bother to vote on statehood at all. This is about 3 percent of the electorate which thereby registered its complete disinterest in the question.

Alaska is divided into four political divisions. Each division voted separately on the referendum. Two of these divisions voted against the statehood proposition.

The other two divisions which voted for it are notorious strongholds of the Federal and Territorial administrations. They include the capital city, Juneau, with its large payroll of Territorial employees, and the city of Anchorage, largest in the Territory, filled with thousands of both Territorial and Federal employees.

The voting for and against the referendum, by division, was as follows:

Division	For	Against	Result
First (Juneau)	3,872	1,983	Carried for statehood.
Second (Nome)	742	933	Carried against statehood.
Third (Anchorage)	3,427	2,257	Carried for statehood.
Fourth (Fairbanks)	1,589	1,679	Carried against statehood.
Total	9,630	6,822	

Total number of persons voting on this question was 16,452.

That was 6 years ago. Today the population, swelled by new settlers attracted by high-paying Federal construction jobs, stands at about 108,000.

Thus the 9,630 persons voting for statehood represent less than 10 percent of today's total population. Yet the statehood group constantly refers to this referendum as the expression of the will of the majority.

Opponents of immediate statehood have repeatedly asked the administration to hold a new referendum, posing the question: Do you favor immediate statehood for Alaska? This the Gruening administration has refused to do.

When the statehood referendum was held in 1946, those who opposed the measure on the grounds that Alaska is not able to carry the financial burden of statehood had little or no time to present the pertinent facts to the voting public.

Proponents of the move made public only the glowing reports of the benefits they said would result from statehood.

Consequently, the residents of Alaska had only a one-sided viewpoint of the issue.

Since then, however, the series of financial crises in which the Territory has found itself, plus the staggering number of disclosures of corruption within the Gruening administration, have awakened Alaskans to the true state of their fiscal and administrative affairs.

Thus enlightened, these residents have sought in vain the opportunity to restate their position on the "statehood now" question.

Instead the exponents of statehood are assiduously holding the Territory inhabitants to the results of a referendum that was held nearly 6 years ago.

THE STATEHOOD COMMITTEE

The Alaskan statehood committee was created by the Territorial legislature as a superpromotion agency for the statehood cause, supported entirely out of public funds.

To date its achievements have been limited to the hiring of a highly paid lobbyist who formerly represented Soviet Poland, and the publication of a pamphlet which consists largely of newspaper articles and lists of names and which was printed outside of the Territory.

The lobbyist cost Alaskan taxpayers $8,000. The pamphlet cost $1,237.36 plus printing costs. The latter is the only tangible evidence Alaskans have as to how thousands of their tax dollars have been and are being spent.

The lobbyist, Randolph Feltus, a former Treasury employee who left Government service to become a lobbying agent for foreign governments, received $8,232.21 from Red Poland in 1948 for his activities on the behalf of that communistic government. The following year he received another $8,198.56 from the Polish Government for publicity work. His total take from foreign governments in the years 1948 and 1949 amounted to $68,000, according to a Look magazine article of November 20, 1951.

This is the man chosen by the Alaskan administration to represent the Territory in Washington on behalf of statehood.

No accounting as to how he was hired or what he did to earn $8,000 has ever been given to the Alaskan taxpayers. Yet his salary amounts to more than 86 percent of the $15,000 turned over by the statehood committee to Alaskan Delegate to Congress E. L. BARTLETT as a "Washington fund."

In fact, when the Territorial auditor, Mr. Neil Moore, demanded an accounting of the money from Mr. BARTLETT, the delegate flatly refused to give such accounting.

Territorial law requires that the Territorial auditor audit or cause to be audited each biennium the accounts of every officer, department head or individual handling Alaskan funds.

Following Mr. BARTLETT's refusal to submit an accounting voluntarily, Mr. Moore, in pursuance of his duty as auditor, commissioned an auditing firm to visit Delegate BARTLETT's Washington office and audit his accounts.

The auditor appeared in Mr. BARTLETT's office and presented his credentials, but was refused access to the necessary records.

And to date there has been no such audit made.

This is not the first instance in which Territorial officials of the present administration have, for one reason or another, blocked

the auditing of public books as required by law.

For 2 years, 1947–48, the Territorial board of administration, headed by Governor Gruening, blocked the audit of the Territorial treasury by "freezing" the funds appropriated for this purpose. The 1949 legislature overrode the board and appropriated other money for an audit, and the firm of Arthur Anderson & Co. of Seattle was hired for the audit.

This auditor's report disclosed a $45,000 shortage in the office of the treasurer, and some 20 other irregularities in the handling of public funds. Among these was the "disappearance" of some $20,000 in liquor stamps, the absence of which has never been explained.

The audit also disclosed that vouchers covering disbursements of $762,339 had been destroyed.

As the result of that audit, the Territorial treasurer, Oscar Olson, is now serving a 5-year sentence in the Federal Penitentiary at McNeil Island.

Mr. BARTLETT'S refusal to have his books audited as required by law must be attributed to one of two possible reasons: either he is frightened at the prospect of an audit or he holds himself to be "above the law" in respect to the accounting for public moneys placed under his management.

The statehood committee's pamphlet, labeled "A Report on 2 Years Achievement," was prepared by an administration favorite, Mr. Herbert Hilscher, a public relations counsel of Fairbanks.

The pamphlet, while purporting to show the taxpayers what the statehood committee has accomplished with the money it has spent, studiously avoids any mention of the Feltus episode.

Hilscher is a governor-appointed member of the Alaska Development Board and is on the payroll of the tax-supported University of Alaska as publicity agent at $300 a month.

That he is a champion of the Gruening administration and spokesman for the Department of the Interior has been evident for years; one of the latest indications being his employment by the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation to promote a new power project near Fairbanks.

The pamphlet for which Hilscher was paid $1,237.36, consists of a listing of the Members of Congress; listing of the members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; listing of the House Committee on Public Lands; listing of the members of the statehood committee; listing of State governors purported to be in favor of statehood, and a list of newspapers said to favor statehood.

Also in the pamphlet are quotations from newspapers and from prominent individuals. Of the latter, only two are Alaskans, and these are both members of the statehood committee.

Aside from the hiring of the lobbyist and publication of the pamphlet, the statehood committee has confined its efforts to sending its officials on junkets to Washington, with the trips financed, of course, by the taxpayers, many of whom voted against statehood in a referendum 6 years ago.

And it is on this referendum, which was approved by the narrow margin of 3 to 2, that the statehood committee bases its often-repeated contention that "Alaskans want statehood now."

The fact is that the 1946 referendum did not mention "statehood now." It merely posed the general proposition of statehood—yes or no.

No effort has been made by the committee to learn the true feelings of the majority of Alaskans on the question of the pending bill or on the question of immediate statehood.

Not content with the expenditures of tax money already recorded in the promotion of immediate statehood, the Alaska committee has hired another lobbyist, Emil Hurja, and has begun paying him from the statehood fund. The Alaska Delegate has also announced his intention to hire as still another lobbyist a former Member of the Congress, Mr. Hardin Peterson. These would necessarily augment the Interior Department's unceasing lobby for statehood and the lobbying of Governor Gruening for passage of the pending legislation.

When before have taxpayers been called upon to support efforts of such magnitude in the consideration of legislation affecting only Federal agencies and wholly concerned with the functions of government?

IRRESPONSIBLE PROPAGANDA

Statehood advocates have repeatedly resorted to the use of irresponsible propaganda in their efforts to frighten, cajole, or threaten Congress into hurried passage of statehood legislation.

Most recent of these attempts was a charge that Russia is beaming 24-hour radio broadcasts to the Territory, claiming that Alaska was stolen from the Russians and the Reds "will come back."

Author of this statement was Robert Atwood, publisher of an Alaska newspaper and chairman of the Alaska statehood committee. As leader of that group, he must be regarded a member of the Territorial administration.

His statement was carried in a news story from Washington which was published January 24, 1952, in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

The story quoted Atwood as saying that the broadcasts "go on for 24 hours and it is next to impossible to drown them out."

The publisher was further quoted as saying:

"They tell all who listen that Alaska should never be permitted to the Union because it is just so much land which was illegally obtained from Russia and which should be returned."

These serious charges by one who is presumably a responsible spokesman for an agency of the Territorial government, have been fully investigated both by Alaskans and by the Federal Government.

A group of Alaskan radio technicians, comprised of both military and civilian personnel, who frequently and at different times monitor short wave broadcasts, declared there had been no such broadcasts made to their knowledge, and they challenged Mr. Atwood to supply the time and radio frequency of the alleged broadcasts.

But perhaps the most clinching refutation of Mr. Atwood's charge comes from Secretary Lovett of the Defense Department.

Mr. Lovett, when apprised of Atwood's claims, requested an investigation by the Government agencies dealing with such matters. On February 15, 1952, Mr. Lovett reported in a letter to a Member of the Senate:

"An inquiry addressed to the cognizant agencies has revealed no information to confirm extensive broadcasts of the kind reported in the newspaper article. The Russians are actively broadcasting to the area, but in most cases the subject of their broadcasts is of a different nature."

To date, neither Mr. Atwood nor any other member of the statehood committee has submitted further information to support his allegations.

These charges, if true, are certainly of a most serious nature. If untrue, they become even more serious.

The statehood committee has persistently contended that the granting of a statehood to Alaska would result in a rush of new settlers to the Territory. Yet, on the other hand, its chairman has spread apparently unfounded rumors of a planned Russian invasion of Alaska, which rumors would certainly be a deterrent to any prospective settler.

Mr. Atwood's statement was made, according to the published account, when he was en route to Washington to plead for the granting of immediate statehood by Congress. One of the arguments which has been advanced by Mr. Atwood and his compatriots in favor of passage of the pending bill is that it will strengthen the national defense.

Whatever differences of opinion may exist on this point, there can be only one view on the issuance of exaggerated and alarming statements at a time when international relations are being held in delicate balance.

Probably the kindest thing that can be said of Mr. Atwood's allegations is that they constituted merely an impudent reflection upon the intelligence of Members of the Senate and other national officials.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of January 24, 1952]

RED RADIO HITS AT STATEHOOD—ALASKANS ARE TARGET IN PROPAGANDA DRIVE

(By William P. Flythe)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—Red Russia has launched a vicious propaganda drive to obstruct statehood for Alaska, Robert Atwood of Anchorage today warned Senate and House leaders.

As chairman of a special committee on statehood created by the Territorial legislature Atwood flew to the Nation's Capital to plead for quick admission to the Union as a necessary security measure. A bill for this purpose will be taken up in the Senate within a few days.

Atwood said:

"Just before I left Anchorage Russian radio stations in Siberia began beaming anti-statehood propaganda into Alaska. It goes on for 24 hours and it is next to impossible to drown it out.

"They keep on repeating that Alaska was illegally sold to the United States by an unscrupulous czar and that they intend to take it back.

"In English and in native dialects they say over and over again 'we will come back.'

"We are confident their agents are active all along the coast and on some of the islands in the waters between Alaska and Siberia.

"They tell all who listen that Alaska should never be permitted to the Union because it is just so much land which was illegally obtained from Russia and which should be returned."

Atwood conferred with Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming) and MAGNUSON (Democrat, Washington), was are sponsoring the legislation in the Senate, and E. L. BARTLETT, Delegate of Alaska to Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 15, 1952.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I refer to your recent letter inquiring about a January 24, 1952, news story in the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer concerning Russian propaganda broadcasts into Alaska.

An inquiry addressed to the cognizant agencies has revealed no information to confirm extension broadcasts of the kind reported in the newspaper article. The Russians are actively broadcasting to the area, but in most cases the subject of their broadcasts is of a different nature.

I hope this reply will be adequate for your purpose. I return herewith the copy of the newspaper clipping you inclosed with your letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

MANIPULATION OF THE NATIVE VOTE

The Bureau of the Census has reported officially that Alaska has a native population of 33,884 out of a total nonmilitary population of 108,236.

The natives include Indians, Aleuts, and Eskimos.

It has been charged that the Interior Department and Governor Gruening have sought, not without success, to control and direct the voting of that portion of this population qualified to participate in Territorial elections.

Certain facts of record support these charges.

On August 31, 1945, an Alaska Native Service teacher, Mr. C. Hureline, was instructed by the Alaska superintendent of the office of Indian Affairs to proceed to a number of specified native villages and there to establish voting precincts. (See enclosure A.)

In September of the same year, the same teacher received further instructions from the same source, including detailed information on the manner of establishing the voting precincts. (See enclosures B, C, D, and E.)

This was an off year in Alaska for elections.

But the following spring, on April 9, 1946, Governor Gruening addressed a lengthy letter to the same native service teacher telling of his objections to a particular candidate for the legislature. The letter was written just prior to the Alaska primary election of that year. Only one sentence—the final one of the letter—mentioned the native service teacher's official duties; i. e., the teaching of the Eskimos to paint. The rest of the communication was a bold piece of electioneering, concluding with the all-revealing statement:

"I thought you should know this in case the question arises of whether Whaley is what he is alleged to be saying or not."

Where did the governor expect the question to arise in this case, except among the natives? And whom did the governor choose to make known to the natives his wishes regarding the election? A representative of the Interior Department. The same man, incidentally, who had been charged by the Department with responsibility for establishing polling places for Eskimo voters. Is this not a violation of the spirit, if not the letter, of the Hatch Act?

It is interesting to note that the candidate whom the governor wanted to be defeated was defeated in that 1946 election.

This is not the only matter of record where Governor Gruening, a creature of the Interior Department, has attempted to interfere in an Alaska election through the native service.

Prior to the primary election of 1944, on March 22 of that year, he wrote a letter to Mrs. Grace Kohler, a native service teacher, which was addressed to her at Hope, Alaska, an Indian village. In this communication, the governor boldly asked this teacher, holding her appointment at the pleasure of the Interior Department, to cast her ballot for the candidate of the governor's choice.

The implication is plain. The teacher, known to the natives as a representative of the parent government and doubtless the most respected member of the community, had been fully informed of the political desires of her superiors. Doubtless she was expected to act accordingly.

These circumstances take on added significance against a background of ever-increasing Federal expenditures by the native service in Alaska. A total of $2,894,225 was spent by this agency among Alaska natives in the 1945 fiscal year. The total in the last fiscal year was more than $12,000,000, a 400-percent rise in 7 years. Plainly the native service holds enormous power over a small segment of the Alaska population, though one which could well hold the balance of power in the Territory's tiny electorate. It is equally plain that the Department will continue to wield this power through its vast Federal expenditures. If Alaska is granted statehood, the Department thus would be in a position to influence strongly the elections of Members of Congress as well as the State officials.

There can be no question that a detailed analysis of the election returns from Alaska precincts will show a deadly pattern of managed and dishonest balloting among natives in the Territory. Certainly there is nothing in the pending statehood legislation to safeguard against a continuation of this practice should Alaska be admitted to the Union.

Generally speaking, the 1950 election and the primary in Alaska showed a marked Republican trend. Six Republican senators were elected to the legislature as against two by the Democrats. The Democrats elected 14 members to the Territorial house as against 10 by the Republicans. This was a rather sharp reversal for the Democrats who 2 years earlier elected 19 to the house as against 5 Republicans.

The Republicans showed their greatest strength throughout the Territory in the population centers—Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Ketchikan, and Nome. These are urban areas where the balloting is supervised and where the electorate is kept informed through newspapers and the radio of the doings of the Government.

In the scattered villages, there is little election supervision and virtually no way—without an enormous and totally disproportionate expenditure of campaign funds—that the candidates of one party or the other can station watchers at polls hundreds of miles into the wilderness to make sure that those in authority in the villages conduct the voting in a legal and honorable fashion.

In the city of Fairbanks, for example, the Republicans registered a sizable margin over their opponents. The total of all ballots cast for legislative candidates in the general election was 4,854 for the Republicans and 3,476 for the Democrats. In Slaterville, an adjoining community, the margin was 1,241 for the Republicans and 625 for the Democrats. In South Fairbanks, another adjoining community, the vote was 831 for the Republicans and 675 for the Democrats.

That was the trend in the center of population in the fourth division covering most of the interior of Alaska. It was not the trend in the isolated villages, particularly those in which native service employees are stationed.

In Kwigillingok (Kwee-heé-ling-gok), where there are two native service teachers, the vote was 236 Democrats and 17 Republicans.

In the village of Beaver, where there is a native-service nurse, the vote was 224 for the Democratic candidates and 7 for the Republicans. In the primary, the vote was 193 Democrats to 10 Republicans.

In Northway, where there is one native-service teacher, the vote was 140 Democratic to 22 Republican. In the primary it was 110 to 25 in favor of the Democratic candidates.

In the village of Sleitmute (Sleét-mute) the vote was 115 Democratic to 25 Republican.

In Rampart, where there are two native-service teachers, the vote was 135 Democratic and 72 Republican.

The vote in Káltag was 132 Democratic and 6 Republican; in Stevens Village, 253 Democratic and 16 Republican, in the primary.

In Nulato (New-la-to) it was 192 Democratic to 25 Republican; in Quinliagak (Kwin-lea'-gok) it was 224 Democratic and 29 Republican.

The Territorial Democratic Party did not predominate in all villages but it did predominate in most of them, records show, and by margins so contrary to the general trend as to be remarkable.

Nor did the Democratic Party derive its strength from only those villages with native service personnel stationed there. There are also the villages where the United States Commissioner is the leading citizen and the one who passes out the pension and welfare checks. He is not without his following among the villagers.

Not only are the figures on the party vote in these precincts an interesting subject for study, but also the results of the primary election in which there were certain candidates running on the Democratic ticket who did not enjoy the support of the Gruening administration.

One of these was Mr. Robert Hoopes, of Fairbanks, who was among those who came to Washington at his own expense to testify before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs against the confirmation of Governor Gruening for a third term as chief executive of Alaska. Mr. Hoopes was one of three candidates in the Democratic primary last April for two seats in the Territorial senate.

He had two opponents and led them both in the voting in and around Fairbanks. But when the votes from the villages were counted he ranked third and was therefore eliminated from the race. Another was Mr. Frank Angerman, who also testified here against Governor Gruening's confirmation. Mr. Angerman ran well in Fairbanks and its environs but was far down the list of house candidates after the returns from the villages came in.

Anyone experienced in the field of politics knows that such things do not just happen. They know that when votes are delivered in blocs for one party or another, from certain precincts, contrary to the election trend, the chances are very strong that the voting in those precincts is corrupt.

[Enclosure A]

ALASKA NATIVE SERVICE,
Juneau, Alaska, August 31, 1945.

Mr. C. HURELINE,
Barrow, Alaska.

DEAR MR. HURELINE: This letter is to authorize you at a later date to proceed to the following villages to establish your work in art classes: Wainwright, Point Lay, Point Hope, Kivalina, Noorvik, and Noatak. If we are unable to secure a teacher for Point Hope it is quite possible that we may request you to go to Point Hope at a later date and take charge of the school there this winter.

While you are in these villages we would appreciate having you assist the teachers in establishing voting precincts. The matter of establishing voting precincts is vitally important to the Eskimo people, and we will appreciate your active assistance in getting them established.

Very shortly I will mail to you full information as to the proper procedure to follow in getting precincts established. You can deliver this information to the teachers at the stations you visit. You will receive another letter from us very shortly.

Sincerely yours,

DON C. FOSTER,
General Superintendent.

[Enclosure B]

ALASKA NATIVE SERVICE,
Juneau, Alaska, September 19, 1945.

Mr. C. HURELINE,
Barrow, Alaska.

DEAR MR. HURELINE: I wrote you under date of August 31 about going to certain villages to establish your work in art classes. We also mentioned to you the fact that while you were in these villages, we would appreciate your assisting the teachers in establishing voting precincts. Enclosed herewith you will find information as to the proper procedure in getting voting precincts established.

You can assure the teachers, and have the same assurance yourself, that no one can legitimately and honestly accuse you of political activity in assisting the natives in the establishment of voting precincts in their respective communities. This is a definite responsibility we have as representatives of a minority group of people. There is no greater privilege of an American citizen than the right of franchise, and we should assist the Eskimo, the real and true American of the Arctic, in exercising this privilege and right.

We will appreciate being advised how you get along.

Sincerely yours,

DON C. FOSTER,
General Superintendent.

[Enclosure C]

PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF VOTING PRECINCTS IN ALASKA

The procedure for the establishment of voting precincts outside of incorporated towns in Alaska is that prescribed by chapter 17, C. L. A. 1933. It requires the United States Commissioner to (1) define his election district (which is coextensive with the recording district) into as many voting precincts as may be necessary or convenient: provided that each precinct has not less than 30 qualified voters; (2) define the boundaries of each precinct by reference to natural objects and permanent monuments or landmarks so that such boundaries may be readily determined; (3) give each precinct a name, and (4) specify a polling place for each precinct.

The boundaries of a precinct may include one or more villages, but no territory should be included that for geographical or other reasons might better be included in another precinct. Any citizen of the United States 21 years of age or more, who has resided in the Territory for a year, and within the proposed precinct for 30 days immediately preceding the election, and who is able to read and write the English language, is qualified to vote. The literacy test does not apply, however, to anyone who voted at the general election of November 4, 1924. Tax liability is not affected in any way by voting.

Any village or area having the requisite number of qualified voters may petition the United States Commissioner for the establishment of a voting precinct in substantially the following form:

"United States Commissioner----------.

"DEAR SIR: The undersigned qualified voters of the village of ---------- (or residing in the area roughly bounded by ----------) respectfully request that a voting precinct be established in said village (or the area referred to) and that the boundaries thereof be fixed as follows: Beginning at ---------- and proceeding in a (northwesterly) direction to ----------, thence to ----------, thence to ----------, etc., to the place of beginning.

"More than 30 qualified voters reside in the village (or within the boundary of the proposed precinct) and the most convenient place for use as a polling place is ----------.

"Respectfully."

This petition should be transmitted to the Commissioner not later than 20 days before the time fixed for the general election in October of even numbered years.

The failure of any United States Commissioner to take any action on a petition of this kind should be reported to the United States district judge for the division in which the precinct presided over by the Commissioner is situated.

GEORGE W. FOLTA,
Counsel at Large.

[Enclosure D]

VOTING PRECINCTS

Outside of each incorporated town the recording district constitutes an election district but the Commissioner of such election district has the authority to divide the district into voting precincts provided that each voting precinct has not less than 30 qualified resident voters. Requests for establishing voting precincts should be made to the recording commissioner of the district. For example, in the second division if an outlying village with 30 qualified voters desires to become a voting precinct their request should be made to the United States Commissioner in the recording district of Nome. Election law gives complete authority to the Commissioner to act in such instances.

[Enclosure E]

UNITED STATES COMMISSIONER,
----------, *Alaska.*

DEAR SIR: The undersigned qualified voters of the village of ---------- respectfully request that a voting precinct be established in said village, and that the boundaries thereof be fixed as follows: Beginning at----------, proceeding thence in a general---------- direction to thence----------, thence ----------, etc., to the place of beginning.

More than 30 qualified voters reside in ---------- (or within the boundaries of the proposed precinct), and the most convenient place for use as a polling place is---------- in the village of----------.

Respectfully.

[Enclosure G]

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, April 9, 1946.

Mr. C. HURELINE,
Barrow, Alaska.

DEAR RUSTY: Haven't heard from you in quite a while, except that John Paden told me he had seen you recently. I hope all goes well with you.

I do not know whether Frank Whaley has been in your parts recently, but I have word from various quarters that he is alleging that he and I are very close together and, in effect, are working along the same lines. I want to correct this impression if he has left it with you. The contrary is the case; Frank Whaley has fought bitterly just about everything I have tried to do for the Territory since he came to the legislature. That, of course, is his right and privilege if he wishes to do so, but he shouldn't allege that he is one of my supporters. He has repeatedly tried to injure the Territorial guard. In the 1943 session, although we were still at war, he fought for an appropriation to reduce it to $15,000 for the biennium, the purpose of which was to wind it up. Although we managed to get the appropriation worked up to $49,000, it was still much less than we needed, and Whaley voted for every reduction.

In the last session a bill, senate bill 18, introduced by Coffey, would have wound up the guard immediately. Whaley was the second division member of the committee on finance and corporations, to which the bill was referred. The committee unanimously recommended that the bill do pass, and Whaley, as chairman of the rules committee, had it put on the calendar. There was enough opposition from other members so that it was plain that the bill would be killed, and when the vote was taken, Whaley, being the last on the list to vote alphabetically and seeing that it would not pass, switched his vote and voted against it. But I know that he is opposed to the guard, largely, I suppose, because it helps build up the morale of the Eskimo people, although he may also be against it because he seems opposed to almost all measures taken for defense, which is particularly paradoxical in an able-bodied young flyer of draft age who did not see fit to enlist as did other flyers much older in years.

What is worst about him, in my judgment, is that he is violently prejudiced against the Eskimo, among whom he lives.

In 1943, when an antidiscrimination bill was introduced which passed the senate 6 to 1, Whaley cast the deciding vote against it in the House, where it was defeated by the smallest possible margin of 8 to 8—a tie vote.

In the 1945 session the bill came up again, passed the house by a 19 to 5 vote, having been introduced by Edward Anderson of Nome and being strongly supported by Bess Cross. When this bill came over to the senate, Whaley spoke against it with the utmost bitterness. I was in the gallery and heard him make his speech. He said the Eskimo smelled, and he did not wish to sit near him in a theater or restaurant. He said the Eskimo was dirty and that he ought to be kept in his place, and much more along the same lines.

He has consistently voted against progressive measures—against the housing bill in 1943. We could have had the housing authority 2 years earlier than we did. Against the planning council in the same year—we could likewise have had that 2 years before the present development board. And when the development board came up in the regular session in 1945, he voted for a $40,000 appropriation for the biennium, which would have made the board practically useless, instead of the $120,000 which I had asked for and which finally passed.

Worst of all, in this extraordinary session, when the veterans' bill came up in the senate, Whaley voted for every amendment to diminish the benefits to veterans. The excellent bill which was finally passed, however, contained the provisions which Whaley voted against, except for the sales tax, which I personally think is an unwise and objectionable tax.

I thought you should know this in case the question arises of whether Whaley is what he is alleged to be saying or not. I hope to get up to your part of the country before too long, but I don't know just when I can make it. Hope you are teaching a lot of youngsters how to paint.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
Governor.

[Enclosure H]

TERRITORY OF ALASKA,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Juneau, March 22, 1944.

Mrs. GRACE KOHLER,
Hope, Alaska.

DEAR MRS. KOHLER: I am writing you this personal letter on what seems to me to be a matter of vital importance to the Territory. As you know, Tony Dimond has resigned—a great loss to the Territory. Alaskans have been so long accustomed to his invaluable service that they probably do not fully realize what a difference it will make unless an able, devoted, intelligent, and progressive man is chosen in his place. Fortunately, there is an opportunity to select such a one in E. L. (BOB) BARTLETT, who served for 2 years as Tony Dimond's secretary in Washington and therefore knows the ropes, and who for 5 years has been secretary of the Territory, where he has been able both to maintain his Washington contacts and to keep in the closest touch with our Alaska problems. As secretary he is likewise the Acting Governor during the Governor's absence from the Territory.

The fight will be in the Democratic primary on April 25 in which there are two opposition candidates—Henry Roden, present attorney general, and A. H. Ziegler, a Ketchikan lawyer. Without going into the

relative merits I wish to say that BOB BARTLETT has all the qualifications needed, including the right kind of experience and also the proper vigor and youth (he is just 40) for this terrifically strenuous job, which has really worn Tony Dimond out in the service of the people of Alaska. Tony evidently believes as I do, since for the first time in his long public career he has gone out of his way to endorse a political candidate, having sent BOB BARTLETT a telegram of endorsement.

I am writing this to you not because of any personal friendship or affection I feel for Bob. No matter how close a friend he were, I would not urge anyone to vote for him unless I believed the public interest clearly demanded it. Isolated communities like yours get little or no assistance from the Territory; nearly everything they get depends on the Federal Government, and it is highly important that we have in Washington a man who can be effective, who will be well liked by his associates and therefore able without a vote to persuade his fellow Members in the House and in the Senate to give to Alaska what it is entitled.

As I have said, the fight is in the primary, April 25, and undoubtedly whoever is nominated then will be elected, so I would appreciate it should you share my views and Tony's, if you cast your vote for BOB BARTLETT on primary day. The election will be hard-fought and close and every vote will count.

Cordially yours,

ERNEST GRUENING,
Governor of Alaska.

IMPERFECTIONS IN THE BILL

Land grants: It is historically customary to allot to new States grants of a large proportion of their unoccupied lands to help support public schools and defray other costs of operating a State government.

This has been a comparatively simple matter for most States where surveys of public lands have been completed, or nearly so, at the time of admission.

In the case of Alaska, it was impossible, although the usual provisions relating to grants from surveyed lands were written into earlier versions of the legislation.

Less than 1 percent of Alaska land has been surveyed. To limit, in effect, the granting of land from this tiny percentage was ridiculous and the bill has now been changed to authorize the transfer of land to the new State government in the following fashion:

Upon achieving statehood under the pending bill, Alaska would be entitled to 400,000 acres of land (the area of the Territory is 365,481,600 acres) for community development. A total of 200,000 acres would be selected by the State from "vacant, unappropriated and unreserved public lands" and 200,000 acres would be selected from the national forests.

The long arm of the Federal bureaucracy is evident even in the projected transfer of this small amount of land to the State. The bill provides that the selections shall be made with the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture and the approval of the Secretary of the Interior. It is specific on this point.

There is no protection in the bill for the new State against abuses by the Secretaries and the bureaucrats under them. There is no guarantee that the Secretaries will not force the State to choose the least desirable land. As far as the language of the bill is concerned, the Federal bureaucracy could accomplish this simply by refusing to approve selections of the most desirable tracts, leaving the State officials no alternative except to take only the land which the Secretaries will yield; that or take no land at all.

And this land would be transferred purely for community development.

Not until 5 years after its admission to the Union would Alaska receive lands for support of schools. The bill provides a grant of 20,000,000 acres for this purpose under certain important limitations.

The question immediately arises as to how it is expected to meet its school expenses, aside from direct taxation, during the intervening 5 years.

The problem is ignored by the bill.

This land must be selected from "vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved public land in the State."

Under the bill, the choices cannot affect any valid claim, location, or entry made under United States law prior to the granting of statehood.

Where selections are made in unsurveyed areas the bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall survey the exterior boundaries of the area requested and shall issue a patent in terms of this survey.

The bill does not state when the Secretary shall make the survey. It fails also to place any time limit on when the patent shall issue upon completion of the survey.

But this section gives rise to more serious questions. Nowhere does the bill define a valid, existing claim. Nor does it spell out a solution to a problem that is most certain to arise when the new State selects tracts which embrace a scattering of unpatented mining claims, homesteads, or other claims.

It cannot be said that tracts which include any of these encumbrances are vacant or unappropriated, which they must be, according to the bill, to be available to the State.

Therefore the Secretary could simply refuse to make the survey. Or if he did make the survey and issue the patent, how would the existing rights of claimants within the tracts be protected? Suppose the Secretary or the officials of the new State considered such claims invalid?

Failure of the bill to include specific language on these points seems to open the door to endless litigation, while foreshadowing a protracted period of negotiation between the Secretary and the officials of the new State.

Lawsuits would certainly follow if the Secretary issued patents on land which included existing claims.

He, of course, might include a reservation in the patent, similar to that contained in the statehood bill, stating that all valid existing rights are unaffected by the transfer.

But no one would know what those valid existing rights were. The State's powers in relation to those rights are not defined. No one would know how many claims were involved, their area or location, or what other rights might be affected. The bill contains no provision for handling these questions.

The confusion implied in this section might well delay for years the acquisition by the State of clear title to vitally needed public lands.

The measure also provides for the transfer of 2,500,000 additional acres vacant, unoccupied and unreserved land for internal improvements such as the construction of public buildings, institutions, normal schools and the like.

But it specifies that these are to be taken only from surveyed lands. At the rate at which surveys have been made in the past, it is estimated that several thousand years will be required for the completion of them. The bill offers no explanation of what the new State would be expected to do in the meantime to secure these grants.

The 200,000 acres of forest land which the State would receive for community expansion (out of a total of 20,882,679 acres in national forests in Alaska) is the sum total of grants from these fertile areas which the new State would receive.

In lieu of further grants from national forests, the State would receive 12½ percent of the revenues derived from the forest by the Federal Governmnt. The Federal Government thus would hold authority and could be expected to dominate any pulp industry that might come to Alaska.

The industry, when it materializes, will be a basic one in the Alaska economy. Retention of Federal control over it is an unreasonable provision.

Plainly the proposed new State would be left totally at the mercy of the Secretary of the Interior, as it has been in the past.

Fisheries: The pending bill contains no language guaranteeing the proposed new State control over its fisheries, long the basic Territorial industry, prior to the start of the current Federal spending for war.

This must be regarded as a significant departure from earlier drafts of the legislation, notably H. R. 331 which stated specifically:

"The State of Alaska shall possess and exercise the same jurisdiction and control over the fisheries and the fur and game of Alaska as are possessed and exercised by the several States within their respective territorial limits, including adjacent waters."

This seemed to transfer to the State the authority over the fisheries now held by the Secretary of the Interior and to repeal existing Federal laws regulating these resources. But the measure now before the Senate does none of these things.

Meanwhile, an official of the Interior Department, Mr. Mastin G. White, the Acting Assistant Secretary, has been widely quoted in Alaska newspapers as saying:

"This Department (Interior) has strongly urged the enactment of legislation providing for the statehood of Alaska and it has been my view that the responsibility for management of the fishery resources ultimately would be assumed by the State of Alaska."

Alaskans are asking, "What does 'ultimately' mean?" The bill does nothing to help answer this question.

Statehood proponents have attempted to answer the questions of their fellow Alaskans, when the matter of control of the fisheries arises, by quoting from the committee report on the measure. This states:

"The new State would have the same control over the invaluable fisheries and wildlife within its borders as do other States of the Union."

To this, one of the Territory's most renowned newspaper men recently observed in an article:

"It is not necessary, I think, to point out that when the Senate acts on statehood it will not be voting on the report of its Interior and Insular Affairs Committee or on any other report. It will be acting on the bill itself and the language contained therein."

Still unanswered is the question as to why the clear and unmistakable language of the earlier bill, the last on which public hearings were held 2 years ago, giving Alaska control of its fisheries, has been omitted from the present measure.

Tidelands. At the end of section 4 of the pending bill the following amendatory language has been inserted:

"The United States shall retain title to all property, real and personal, to which it has title, including public lands, and shall retain the right of ingress to and egress from its lands across adjoining lands which are subject to the ebb and flow of the daily tides."

Thus is raised the delicate, though vital, issue of future control of Alaska tidelands.

Legal experts insist there is no doubt that the insertion of this amendment is warning that the Interior Department intends to retain control of the tidelands in the Federal Government instead of granting them to the State as was done in all previous admissions.

Logically, the question is asked: "If Alaska is admitted as a State, and by the terms of the bill of admission, the tidelands do not pass to the State but are retained in the control of the Federal Government, what happens to the thousands of Alaskans who have developed homes, businesses, and industries on the tidelands under the previ-

ously existing policy laid down by Congress in section 2 of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stat. 409)?

"If the trust policy established by that act is to be repudiated by the bill of admission, then will not occupants of tidelands in Alaska retain their occupancy after statehood at the whim of the Interior Department?"

Still another change affecting the tidelands has been written into the bill in the description of Alaska's boundaries.

The earlier version stated:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That all that part of the United States now embraced within the Territory of Alaska, including a distance of one marine league from the line of the coast, shall become the State of Alaska."

The present bill states:

"*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the inhabitants of all that part of the United States now constituting the Territory of Alaska, as at present described, are hereby authorized to form for themselves a constitution and State government, which shall be admitted into the Union, and that the said State of Alaska shall consist of all the territory now included in the said Territory of Alaska."

Elimination of a State boundary "one marine league" or 3 miles from the coastline in favor of a boundary "as at present described" has never been explained.

There is little doubt that the wording would automatically deprive Alaska of its coastal fisheries.

Hence the intentions of the Federal bureaucracy toward the new State of Alaska becomes increasingly plain.

Indian claims: The claims of the Indian tribes to vast tracts of Alaska land have hung like a sword over the economic life of the Territory since the Interior Department gave them substance a decade ago.

They constitute a cloud over the title to the most valuable areas in Alaska.

Thus they have throttled hopes for development of a pulp industry in the Territory.

More recently the Indian claims have been used to discourage a projected oil development in southeastern Alaska.

Reason and logic demand that these claims be settled before admission of Alaska to statehood is considered.

Records show little progress in this direction. Indeed, language in the previous bill which would have prohibited creation of vast Indian reservations while the Territory was in the process of achieving statehood has been eliminated from the present version without explanation and presumably at the behest of the Interior Department.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, very soon we shall come to a vote on the motion to recommit the pending bill to admit Alaska as a State of the Union. By this vote we will in effect decide whether the Senate means to challenge the overwhelming sentiment of the American people or whether we are in fact, going to follow the will of the people.

The American people are overwhelmingly convinced that Alaska is ready for statehood, that Alaska deserves statehood, and that the Union of American States should be increased by the admission of Alaska and of Hawaii into that Union.

We were originally 13 States. Today we are 48. If we are going to be true to our history, to our traditions, and to the spirit animating our Constitution, we are going to vote against the pending motion to recommit.

There is no rhyme or reason for a recommital of the Alaska statehood bill. Hearings have been held; the bill has been extensively debated. Every angle and aspect of it have been considered. All the facts are available. They are spread out in the record. Every question can be answered. Every question has been answered. A vote to recommit is a vote to delay, to put aside, to kill this bill.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from New York to say that all the questions have been asked and all the questions have been answered. Does the Senator from New York mean to say that there have been public hearings held on the bill during this session of Congress?

Mr. LEHMAN. There were public hearings held on substantially similar bills in the House. In 1949 we held very extensive hearings in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. In 1950 extensive hearings were held. The record of the hearing covers more than 350 pages. We have discussed the question in executive session and otherwise in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs time and time and time again.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would not the Senator from New York agree that there have been no public hearings held on S. 50 during this session of Congress, or last year?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think it makes any difference, in view of the fact that exhaustive and intensive hearings were held on the subject of the admission of Alaska. The subject has been before the Congress for a long time. It would be a complete waste of time to go over the same ground time and time again.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would not the Senator from New York agree that new members of a committee, who have been appointed to the committee for the first time and know nothing about a bill, should have the privilege of attending public hearings if they ask that public hearings be held on a subject? Should they not be recognized as Senators and entitled to a hearing on the question?

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course I agree with the Senator that every Senator should be recognized in his own right, whether he be a new member of a committee or an old member of a committee, and to have full information available to him. I do not think it is fair to say, however, that every time there is a change in the membership of a committee the pending bill or resolution before the committee must be reopened through the holding of additional hearings. If I may add one more word to my answer to the distinguished Senator from Florida, I would say that he was not a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs until this year. I have been a member of it ever since I came to the Senate. Certainly the record was available to the Senator from Florida in very great detail, and there was really nothing he could not have obtained through a careful study of the record.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to ask the Senator from New York whether he does not agree with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] when the Senator from New Mexico made this statement in response to an inquiry as to why the committee did not hurry along with the consideration of the bill:

Senator ANDERSON. You are certainly not outside of your rights in saying you want immediate statehood, and I think the delegation down here and the sentiment in Alaska indicates that immediate statehood is desired, and I think this committee, although I cannot speak for the other members, but as one member of it, I would like to see you have statehood immediately, but I do not see how you can have it without consideration being given to this bill line by line. There are questions in it that we may not understand.

I am sure the Senator from New York agrees with that statement. Would he not have to say also that that was not the treatment which was accorded to the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the junior Senator from Florida, when they asked that public hearings be held on the bill and when no public hearings were held on it?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Florida that I do agree with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that a bill should be considered line by line. However, certainly nothing in the proceedings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has prevented that. We have had this bill under discussion time and time again, and the Senator from Florida could have discussed every line separately or every word separately if that had been his desire.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will not the Senator from New York agree that a Senator has a right to have witnesses appear before the committee and testify regarding the various provisions of the bill? I am sure the able Senator from New York will agree that Senate bill 50 has many provisions which are not at all like the provisions of House bill 331, on which the committee last held hearings.

Mr. LEHMAN. Again let me say that there have been many bills on which hearings have been held, and to which amendments were offered after the hearings were concluded and when the bills were being considered in the committee. We do not hold hearings on every amendment. If that were done, the work of the Senate would never be concluded in a million years.

Let me also say that at the time when we held the hearings, I believe 35 persons came from Alaska to testify.

Mr. SMATHERS. That was in 1950, was it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. President, I know there is pending an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma on which hearings have not been held; but this amendment is, I must say, a delaying amendment. We cannot seriously contemplate an amendment to our Constitution which would change the whole system of Government of the United States, the whole philosophy underlying the American Union of States. We are not

an empire. We do not aspire to be an empire. The American people would overwhelmingly reject the concept of colonialism implicit in the Monroney amendment.

We are against colonialism in whatever form. The British commonwealth of nations is possible only because there is a king through whose person and powers the commonwealth is held together.

In America we believe in a free and equal Union of States. As soon as Territories are ready for statehood, if they desire statehood, they are to be admitted as States.

Mr. President, Alaska is ready. The people of Alaska desire statehood. The Territory is certainly large enough to support a State of the Union.

The addition of Alaska and Hawaii to the States of the Union can restore to us the sense of expansion that we sorely need in our thinking and in our outlook. All material evidence points to the fact that Alaska can become as great and thriving a State of our Union as Texas or Florida or California or Oregon.

When Louisiana was admitted into the Union, it certainly was not contiguous with the other States. When California was admitted into the Union, it was separated by hundreds and hundreds of miles from the nearest State. Today, Juneau, the capital of Alaska, is less than 24 hours away by air from Washington. It is only 5 hours by air from Seattle. Honolulu is only 24 hours by air from Washington and only 12 hours from San Francisco. Noncontiguity is no argument against statehood. There is no valid or substantial reason in the argument of distance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Let me ask the Senator from Wyoming whether I may have an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield an additional 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the question remains, Is Alaska ready to be a State? Alaska has been preparing for statehood for almost a century. It has been a Territory of the United States for that long. It is time to free Alaska from the shackles of Territorial status. It is time to expand America, to expand the American Union of States. This will bring benefits to every State in the Union and to every citizen of the United States. The direct beneficiaries will be Alaska and Alaskans, but the indirect beneficiaries will be all of us.

Mr. President, we are now engaged in a struggle with those who wish to blot out democracy in the world—the rulers of the Soviet Union. We have preached democracy and equality. Yet here we deny equality to men and women living in Alaska and to men and women living in Hawaii, in a way which contradicts everything we have stood for and preached as many years as anyone in this Chamber can remember.

Here we have a chance to show to the people of Asia that we are not influenced or bound or controlled by racial considerations. Here we have a chance to show that if a man has given evidence of continuing loyalty, patriotism, and devotion to his country, we are not going to allow the fact that he is an Indian or an aborigine of Alaska or a Chinese or a Filipino or a Negro to stand in the way of our recognizing his right to equal protection under the laws of the State to which he aspires.

The men and women of Alaska are citizens of the United States. They are not citizens of a State, but they aspire to citizenship in a State.

I tell you, Mr. President, we shall do more to give a weapon of propaganda to our enemies in the Soviet Union, the rulers of the Soviet Union, than almost anything else we could do, if after all these years of discussion, debate, and study, we now refuse to give statehood to these two Territories.

Finally, Mr. President, let me say that Alaska is of the utmost importance to the United States in respect to matters of defense. Alaska is only a few miles from Siberia, one of the strong points of the Soviet Union. Certainly we should do everything within our power to strengthen our defenses in Alaska. The leading military men of our country have testified time and time again that our defenses will be greatly strengthened by giving statehood to Alaska.

Let us not delay deciding this question by voting to recommit this bill. We have reached the point where a decision must be made and made now. We have no right to continue to put off the decision, and, under the device of recommittal, under the device of a delaying motion, to make it impossible for the Senate to act on this bill at the present session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I would be glad to yield, but unfortunately I have no more time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President——

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was my understanding with the junior Senator from Florida that I would have the next 15 minutes. If there is no objection, I shall now avail myself of that time.

I now ask unanimous consent that I may yield for 1 minute to my senior colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At this point Mr. ELLENDER submitted two letters in regard to another matter, for printing in the Appendix, where they appear under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall vote for Hawaiian statehood, when that bill is before the Senate on the question of final passage. However, I will not vote for Alaskan statehood. As a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs I have not had an opportunity to make as much of a study of this question as I should like to have made, because no hearings were conducted.

However, I shall say that I am positive that hearings would not necessarily change my mind, but would make me only more firm in my convictions. I believe that further hearings would show only more clearly that statehood for Alaska is not justified at the present time, but that statehood for Hawaii is justified.

It seems to me to be completely fallacious for some to attempt to let the question of statehood for Alaska ride on the back of the question of statehood for Hawaii.

Hawaii has approximately half a million people, and it has civilization which in some respects exceeds that here in the United States. In Hawaii we have a Territory which is paying into the Federal Treasury more taxes than many States of the Union pay. It is a Territory with high educational standards; it is well able to contribute its share to the support of the National Government. It has a very thoroughly developed system of government.

On the other hand, a completely different question confronts us so far as Alaska is concerned. In that Territory there are only about 123,000 people as compared to the 500,000 people in the Territory of Hawaii—only about one-quarter as many people. The great Territory of Alaska is very sparsely settled, indeed in some areas a person could travel 1,000 miles without ever seeing a human being.

The Governor of that Territory, Mr. Gruening, in an article written by him sometime back, December 1951, for the Scientific Monthly, a very learned article on Alaska, makes the statement:

> It is an area just outside the cities, where the municipal police force have no jurisdiction, that the no man's land of lawlessness lies.

That is not the same type of situation we have in Hawaii. Think of that—a no man's land of lawlessness, speaking of the inadequacy of Federal enforcement of laws.

The point has been made that Alaska is close to the Soviet land mass. True, Alaska is close to the Soviet orbit; but, on the other hand, that does not prove that it should be a State. One of the letters in the hearings which were conducted 2 years ago mentioned that point. Here was a man trying to get to one of the Diomede Islands, which are close to Russia. He spent a week trying to get there, but never did reach the island. Probably much less serious an incident would be created by a Russian landing at some place in the Territory of Alaska than would be created if Alaska were a State. I believe statehood would probably increase the possibility of some incidents occurring which would cause friction between the United States and Soviet Russia.

It is true in my opinion that the argument of congressional neglect of Alaska is very well founded, but we see from the writings of the Governor of that Territory that Hawaii has developed its government to a greater extent than has Alaska. It seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that before we undertake to say that Alaska should become a

State, we should attempt to provide for more adequate home rule for Alaska.

It is unfortunately true that some people would apparently like to stymie the proposal that the Alaskans elect their own Governor, on the theory, apparently, that the more inadequate the government of Alaska is, the better the possibility of getting a statehood bill through and relieving Alaska of Federal control. Of course, that is ridiculous. We ought to encourage the Alaskans to develop their Territorial government just as thoroughly as they possibly can, to make it as adequate as they possibly can for their needs, and that the better they can develop their government, the more they will have proved to us that Alaska is ready for statehood.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, only 123,000 people live in that Territory, although it has been argued that Alaska could support a population of several million. Well, it would seem to the junior Senator from Louisiana that we should do something about getting the population there. For my part, I should be glad to support legislation which would provide for the expenditure of additional Federal funds to encourage people to go to Alaska.

We are told that there are millions of displaced persons, Poles, Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, and possibly many from other countries, who might be interested in settling in Alaska. So far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned I believe it would be a good investment if we would spend some money to induce some of those people to go to that Territory, to help settle and develop that great area, and prove what can be done with it. I am certain much good could be brought about by following such a course.

Furthermore, it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that before we grant statehood, something should be done to see whether the enormous resources of Alaska can be developed. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Insular Affairs, I have listened to testimony by some of the geologists, who tell us that, acre for acre, it is impossible to condemn any section of the earth's surface, so far as the prospect of oil and gas, coal and iron ore, lead and other mineral deposits are concerned. All the available evidence and testimony indicate that Alaska has abundant, indeed enormous, natural resources.

What is the attitude with respect to natural resources when they are found? Those who take the view of the present administration want every last cent of those resources, retained by the Government of the United States, but, until they are found, they are apparently, willing to let anyone have them. No one was particularly interested in the oysters, shrimp, and the other marine life along the shores of the coastal States of the Nation until they were developed. However, in California, for instance, it was found that not only was there oil in the uplands, but that oil could be produced from the adjacent area offshore. The Federal Government then took a great interest in it. Even the then head of the Department of the Interior had signed letters stating that that was State property, but the Federal Government then reversed itself and claimed that area. It filed lawsuits, and notwithstanding the fact that there were 52 Supreme Court decisions saying that that was State property, or indicating that it was, the Federal Government today claims—at least the present administration claims—that that is entirely Federal property, and that the States have no interest whatever in it. We are even told today that if the States receive a small belt of the submerged lands along their shores—which, if we look at the map behind me, will be seen to be about the width of a pencil mark—it would be the greatest steal ever perpetrated in the history of the country. On the other hand, Mr. President, take a look at Alaska on the same map. What Alaska would receive would not be the width of a pencil mark. The area of Alaska appears to be that of the United States. It will be seen that in the proposed State of Alaska, there are 376,000,000 acres, if I recall correctly, more acres than there there are in the State of Texas, multiplied by 2. The acreage of Alaska is enormous; and I am sure that it would be possible to block out an area of probably as much as 150,000,000 acres in which there are no more than 1,000 people living, at the outside.

We may dispose of all of this land, before anyone finds the resources it contains, but I know that some of those who are advocating statehood for Alaska, once the resources were found, would like to have those resources for the Federal Government. Would it not seem that we should develop those resources to some extent, to see what their magnitude is, before we make disposition of such a vast area?

Mr. President, the Territory of Alaska, on an acreage basis, would compare with the original Louisiana Purchase. When the Louisiana Purchase was consummated, the State of Louisiana, shortly thereafter, about 10 years later, was taken into the Union; but the State of Louisiana was not given all the territory, which now comprises Arkansas, Missouri, and all the other States in the Louisiana Purchase area—quite the contrary.

A certain section which was reasonably well populated was delimited and taken in as a State. The same argument could be applied to Alaska. Only on the southern rim of Alaska is there any substantial population, with the exception of the cities of Fairbanks and Nome. The only reason I could observe for taking in all the enormous acreage between those points is that someone might say, "Well, it is not big enough to be two States, and possibly will never have sufficient population to make two States, and, therefore, we should make all the whole great area into one State."

Mr. President, I believe if that is done, a very basic mistake will have been made, because I see no reason why a State which may never have a population of more than 200,000 or 300,000 people should include hundreds of millions of acres on countless thousands of which no one lives. Therefore, it seems to me that some effort should be made to develop the natural resources of this great Territory before all of this property is disposed of.

To show how little consideration was given to the question of statehood, if Alaska becomes a State under Senate bill 50 the Mineral Leasing Act will apply to it. What would be the effect? It would mean that insofar as oil and gas were found in the other three-hundred-and-some-odd millions of acres, 37½ percent of the proceeds would go to the newly formed State of Alaska, 10 percent to the administrative fund of the Federal Treasury, and 52½ percent to the reclamation fund. Alaska would not be one of the reclamation States. That would mean that 17 other States would have the benefit of the fund, and unless and until Alaska became a reclamation State it would not share in those revenues.

On the other hand, if Alaska decided it wanted to become a reclamation State, it probably would be entirely different from the other 17 reclamation States, because, as we know, Alaska's difficulty would be more that of flood control and transportation than one of a shortage of water. There are very few places in Alaska where any reclamation project would be indicated.

Mr. President, I have pointed out these matters because I do not think they have been adequately considered.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the Senator from Louisiana is overlooking the fact that there is such a project adjoining the Matanuska Valley project. Many people think of it as a great agricultural possibility. It possesses a climate which is not very different from the climate of the State of Illinois.

Mr. LONG. That is not saying it has a climate similar to that of some of the arid States of the Nation.

If it should happen to be the case that Alaska should become one of the reclamation States, I would say it would be entirely by accident, because no one thought of it ahead of time. When the Secretary of the Interior came before the committee, he told us Alaska would not be one of the reclamation States. Can anyone inform us as to the location of the arid areas of Alaska, unless it be the Matanuska Valley?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask for one more minute.

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator a minute of my time.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. President, all these questions have not been considered. There are many things we should know about all these problems before we attempt to make Alaska a State. I believe it would be a very foolhardy mistake for the Senate, merely because someone might make a good case for Hawaii, to grant statehood to Alaska at this time.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote to recommit the bill, hoping we may be able to improve upon the Territorial

government in the future and to provide for the further orderly development of that great Territory.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, 38 years have passed since New Mexico and Arizona were admitted to the Union as the forty-seventh and forty-eighth States. In the interval, Mr. President, we have seemingly become accustomed to thinking of the United States as now being rounded out, since it reaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans and all the space in between is now filled by States. For some reason there has been in our minds a mental barrier which must be surmounted before other States can be taken in under the flag.

Mr. President, I do not feel that the Union of States has yet been completed; I do not think it is yet fully rounded out. We have been asked repeatedly by American citizens in Alaska to admit them to full citizenship by granting statehood to that Territory. In my opinion Alaska is qualified for statehood. It has been the property of the United States for 82 years. Since 1912 it has been recognized as an organized, incorporated Territory, and it has been serving, since 1912, an apprenticeship, so to speak, for admission as a State. I believe it has a right to statehood, and that it is ready. We have today, in 1952, Mr. President, an historic opportunity to add the forty-ninth star to our flag.

There has never been a period before in our history when so long a time elapsed between the appearance of new stars in our flag. After the admission of the original 13 Colonies, it was only a year's time before the fourteenth State gained statehood. That was the State of Vermont. Then there followed in rapid succession Kentucky, which was the fifteenth, and Tennessee, Ohio, and Louisiana followed in rather prompt sequence. In every year from 1816 to 1821 a new State came into the Union. Four were admitted in 1889 and two in 1890, including my own State of Wyoming and the State of Utah. In 1912 the process seemingly came to a halt. The delay has been all too long. When an area such as Alaska meets all the qualifications, to my way of thinking, it deserves admission into the Union.

Mr. President, in 1946, in company with 11 other State Governors, I spent some time in Hawaii. I visited the various islands and met with various groups of persons in Hawaii. Let me say that those who really have the greatest interest in these matters and those whose wishes I think we should recognize were practically unanimous in their desire for statehood.

In November of last year, Mr. President, in company with two other Senators, I had the privilege of visiting Alaska. I visited Nome, Fairbanks, Seward, Ketchican, Whittier and Anchorage. What kind of people did I find there? I found just as intelligent a citizenship as there is in any State of the Union. I am not sure of the degree of illiteracy that may prevail in Alaska, but I might suggest that possibly some of our States have a higher degree of illiteracy than is to be found in Alaska.

I visited the very finest of country clubs at Fairbanks. I found in Alaska practically every type of business that we have in the United States. I can see absolutely no reason why those people are not just as fully qualified to be citizens of the United States as is the present Presiding Officer or as is the junior Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, it seems to me that both these Territories have now served more than a proper probationary period. It does not appear to me that there are any justifiable reasons for denying to them the same privileges which we in the Senate are today enjoying. I think the Congress should either grant the privileges or that we should allow both Territories to seek freedom by any other method or procedure which they might wish to follow. I ask what situation we would find ourselves in after denying citizenship to those fine people year after year, should they suggest they would like to withdraw from any connection whatsoever with the great United States of America? I think we would be in a rather foolish situation. We would say, "No, we shall not take you in, and you cannot leave us." Such a situation has been recorded in history prior to this time, Mr. President.

Facts have been cited during this debate setting forth that a very small percentage of Alaska is privately owned and that a very great area is federally owned. That is precisely the one situation which statehood, to my way of thinking, would correct.

It is a well known fact that industry, investment capital, will not go into a Territory and develop the area with the thought in mind that eventually statehood will be granted, and at the same time not know what the tax structure of the new State may be. Alaska is not fully developed at this time. It will never be fully developed as a Territory. Practically ever State that has been admitted to the Union, except the original 13 Colonies, has argued that until private capital and industry knew what the tax structure of a new State would be, development would be negligible.

Mr. President, there are States which have existed for many years whose land area is primarily federally owned. That is true of my State, 53 percent of whose area is federally owned. I often hear people in my State complain about the Government in the distant city of Washington having more authority over their lives than do local authorities or the State government.

If my memory serves me correctly, Mr. President, there is one State in the Union that has been in existence for 88 years; yet 64 percent of its land area is still federally owned or federally controlled. I know of another State whose area is still 60 percent federally owned. That State has been a member of the Union for a great many years.

One county in my State is only 4 percent privately owned, and unfortunately that percentage is diminishing from time to time as the Federal Government finds it necessary or wishes to withdraw additional area for a Federal project.

I find that people everywhere and anywhere like to be masters of their own destiny. I have always felt that that was one of the cardinal points in our American democratic way of life.

Most certainly the fact that two additional Senators from Alaska might be considered as northwestern Senators should have no bearing or effect upon the position of the Senate with reference to the question of statehood for Alaska. By the same token, when, and if, Hawaii is admitted to statehood, there will be two more western Senators. That might perhaps call for a change in our rules and regulations and our system of functioning in the Senate, but I do not think we should at all allow that to be an important or decisive factor in our consideration of this matter.

It seems to me that Members of the United States Senate should look upon the requests of these two great Territories as though we were citizens of those Territories, living under the absentee form of government which they have, and which they have endured so patiently for so many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the junior Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I extend to the Senator an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Certainly no selfish factional or sectional considerations should guide our thinking and actions in this most important matter.

Mr. President, the other evening there came to my home a compilation of writings by Theodore Williams Noyes, of the District of Columbia, who throughout a long period of years had worked for home rule for the District of Columbia. In the first two or three pages of his book I found a few lines from article III of the treaty signed by this country when Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867. I wish to read those three lines:

> The inhabitants of the ceded Territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within 3 years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded Territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, to my way of thinking, that is a treaty which we of the Senate should live up to. That is a firm commitment to the people now living in Alaska which, in my opinion, we have no honorable right to disregard.

I wish to make one other point. Down through the years, when our Nation was being formed, States were admitted in pairs—one Northern State and one Southern State. That was true of Kentucky and Vermont, Tennessee and Ohio, Mississippi and Indiana, Alabama and Illinois, Missouri and Maine, Arkansas and Michigan, Florida and Iowa, and so on.

I realize, Mr. President, that there is no longer available territory that might be

admitted as Southern States to offset, possibly, the admission of Alaska and Hawaii. We of the United States Senate this afternoon have an obligation, under the treaty I have quoted, to do what the Secretary of State, with the approval of the Senate, at that time said we would do.

I am very hopeful that the Senate, when the vote comes, will reject the motion to recommit the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] has charge of the time. I did not realize he was in the Chamber when I looked for him a moment ago. I shall defer to him.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, and that the time taken for the quorum call be not charged against either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the question has been raised recently by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] with respect to the agricultural development of the Matanuska Valley.

In the first place, the question upon which we are now passing does not involve individual liberty or individual justice with respect to anyone in Alaska or Hawaii, or in the United States. The question is not to be settled on the basis of individuals. The primary question involved, as I have said many times, is a question of policy. That policy is far-reaching, and the steps to be taken will be irrevocable if we grant statehood to any group or any area beyond the present confines of the 48 States.

I shall discuss some of the questions which pertain to the economy and to the prospective State government of Alaska. I wish to mention briefly the subject of agriculture. It is a myth and a dream so far as the Matanuska Valley project is concerned. I refer the Senate again to the facts and figures which show that in the 1930's the Federal Government spent $4,681,856 in the atempt to settle 200 families in Matanuska Valley. That is an average of $23,409.50 for each family, and an average of $520.15 for each acre, for the 90,000 acres under cultivation in the valley.

I believe those figures would have been of some benefit to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] if he had been Secretary of Agriculture during that time. From a financial standpoint the figures reflect the utter futility of any great agricultural development in Alaska. I submit the idea of any significant agriculture being developed in Alaska is a joke and a dream.

For one reason it is due to the intolerable climate. In previous remarks on this subject I quoted from the report of the Governor of Alaska in which he states in effect that the trouble with agriculture in Alaska is the inferior quality of the products which are grown.

I put the report into the RECORD the other day. It has not been denied up to this time. It cannot be denied, of course, because it is the truth. It is the Governor's report, and again it shows that wild statements have been made about agriculture being developed in Alaska.

Mr. President, about a week ago I raised on the floor of the Senate a very serious point with reference to the military situation in Alaska. The argument is made over and over again that if we strengthened our defenses and the defenses of Alaska through statehood it would greatly aid our military position. I quoted a statement from a reputable newspaper reporter to the effect that the military had said that only one-fourth of Alaska would be defended in case of an attack and that three-fourths of it would be expendable and would have to be abandoned. That statement was a challenge to the proponents to refute it if they could.

To this very moment Mr. President, the only refutation which has come into the RECORD was suggested by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. He said later in the debate that he had conferred with General Collins and the Department of Defense with respect to my statement. The Senator from Wyoming never quoted one word from what General Collins had said. Instead, he put into the RECORD a letter from Mr. William C. Foster, Acting Secretary of Defense, which says in effect that statehood would be a great aid to the military defense of the Nation. General Collins is as silent as an Egyptian tomb on that vital question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be very glad to yield, but only very briefly, because I am speaking under a limitation of time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish the Senator from Mississippi to be quite certain in his mind that the only reason I did not quote General Collins was because under the system of responses to the Senate the response had to come under the signature of the Secretary of Defense. The statement in the letter, to the effect that an occupation of Alaska by an enemy air force would open the industrial centers of America to attack, is the statement of General Collins, as well as of the Department of Defense.

Mr. STENNIS. The statement does not so state.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator from Mississippi to take it upon my assurance.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall not argue the point. The only statement we have before us, however, is in the letter. I am amazed to find that the major part of it or at least the gist of it is an exact reproduction, word for word, of a letter written on April 18, 1950, by the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson. That statement of Mr. Johnson appears at page 3 of the report which was filed with the pending bill. It is a statement which consists of 11 printed lines. The same 11 lines showed up in the letter, written in February 1952, by the Acting Secretary of Defense, in which he says:

By the same token it would seem to me—

And so forth. Exactly the same words were used by former Secretary of Defense Johnson.

I think it is a further illustration of the propaganda that is coming from the bureaus of the Government in attempting to bolster the pending bill. No military man has been put on the stand in any hearing before the committee and subjected to cross examination. Perhaps it is not correct protocol to do so.

Mr. President, I state on my own responsibility that under this system we are not getting the true facts. The newspaper article from which I quoted, stating that only one-fourth of Alaska would be defended at all, still stands uncontradicted directly. It cannot be successfully challenged, because it is the truth.

I submit to fair-minded Members of the Senate that there is before the Senate the statement that based on World War II experience, Alaska as a whole cannot be defended, and that it would not be defended in case of an attack, except to the extent of one-fourth of the area, and that there are no plans now contrary to the statement I have made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield, but very briefly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Mississippi will read the letter from Mr. Foster, he will find in it the specific statement that the plans of the Department of Defense for the defense of Alaska naturally cannot be made public.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. I am sure he would say that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I submit to the Senator from Mississippi that therefore he cannot cite the article of a newspaperman, who is not a military expert, as evidence that the Department of Defense plans to surrender three-fourths of Alaska in case of an attack. I think the statement is absurd on its face.

Mr. STENNIS. I stand on my original statement. I feel that the Senator from Wyoming has enough ingenuity to have brought in proof if he could have found such proof to offset my statement. It raises a very serious issue.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to put into the RECORD, with the consent of the Senator from Mississippi, the statement of Rear Adm. Ralph Wood, who was the commandant, during World War II, of the Seventeenth Naval District, which includes Alaska. He said:

In my opinion it makes no difference whether Alaska is a State or a Territory as far as national defense is concerned. Were Alaska to become a State tomorrow it would not alter, I am sure, the general over-all consideration of our defense problem.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution which has been made to the debate by the distinguished Senator from Florida. Admiral Wood was the commandant of the naval district of which Alaska was a part during World War II. Is that correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall proceed rather hurriedly, of necessity, on my charge that the proponents of the bill are attempting to rush the bill through the Senate without first holding hearings on it. The Senate is being asked to pass on this important bill without having had submitted to it any budget under which the proposed State of Alaska would operate. The only thing I have been able to find, after a great deal of research, is a proposed budget which was incorporated in the old hearings on H. R. 331. In connection with that bill the proponents of statehood proposed a budget and the opponents proposed a budget. The opponents said it would take $17,000,000, and the proponents said it would take $6,000,000.

I have before me a statement from the Legislative Reference Service, which is the only impartial evidence I have been able to find on the subject of a budget. The information is 2 or 3 years old. Therefore it does not reflect present conditions. However, the Director of the Legislative Reference Service said:

Due to these varying factors, therefore, one is forced to conclude that no accurate estimates can be made of the additional costs of statehood to Alaska.

The statement will be found at page 514 of the hearings. It is based, of course, on the facts which the Director of the Legislative Reference Service had before him at the time he made the statement, and when he had before him the two budgets to which I have referred.

He said:

Possibly, the figure might lie somewhere in between the two extremes of estimates. Much depends, however, upon the number of functions willed to Alaska by the Congress and upon the financial ability of Alaska itself.

There we have an impartial witness who says that it is not possible to tell much about the situation and that there is not enough before him to enable him to give an accurate estimate.

It is a sad fact that although more than 2 years have elapsed, today there is nothing before the Senate that is any more accurate or any more dependable than the estimate to which I have just referred. In fact, no budget at all has been presented for Alaska for the current year.

It has been claimed that Alaska is debt free. So far as the whole Territory is concerned, that statement is correct. However, that statement certainly does not tell the whole story, in view of of $70,000,000 development program which is now in progress in Alaska, in connection with which some agencies of the Alaskan government are responsible for paying one-half of that amount back to the Federal Government. Under that program $7,000,000 was spent from the 1952 appropriations. In 1953 it is proposed to spend $20,000,000 under that program, which already is pledged to continue until a total of $70,000,000 has been expended. So someone in Alaska will have a $35,000,000 debt, which is a considerable amount of money, considering the sparsity of the population of Alaska. That is an accurate figure with reference to the debt.

Mr. President, during several weeks of inquiry and effort to bring to the Senate true facts, the full facts, and the up-to-date facts—because they are not available since there have been no hearings—I have been calling for a report by the government of Alaska to the Secretary of the Interior. That report covers the activities of the various agencies of the Territorial government and includes a general discussion of the Territory's finances, population, and so forth. Ordinarily that report is in Washington in November, following the close of the fiscal year for Alaska, which ends on the 30th of June of each calendar year. However, for some reason or other, the report has not been filed, according to the information given my office.

I also wish to refer to a report by the Secretary of the Interior in reference to Alaska. Ordinarily that report covers all the activities of the Department of the Interior, including the Territories. Normally, that report is filed each year, in November, and relates to the fiscal affairs of Alaska, including the receipts and the disbursements. I have checked many times with the Office of Territories, Department of the Interior. As late as February 5 of this year that report has not been filed; for some reason or other, the Senate is left entirely in the dark.

Instead of having an official, accurate, down-to-earth statement of the fiscal affairs of Alaska, we have only a statement in regard to cash balances. That statement was filed yesterday by the Senator from Oregon, in response to some remarks I made. I know he thought the figures he submitted were accurate. Doubtless they are accurate as far as they go, but that report does not reflect the true condition of fiscal affairs in Alaska; the report merely shows what was the cash balance on January 31, 1952. Although I do not know it to be a fact, it may be that that was a period of high taxes and high tax collections.

At any rate, anyone knows that the cash ballance of the Treasury at any given time during the fiscal year does not reflect the true state of conditions; the only thing that counts is the fiscal condition when the fiscal year is over. Then there can be shown the true state of governmental affairs.

So we are without the benefit of those facts and figures. I do not know why they were withheld. I do not charge anyone with bad motives, but this situation is strikingly strange, and it fits in with the program of propaganda and the program of activities emanating from the various Government departments which would conceal the true facts regarding these matters. That is the situation today, and that is what prevents us from obtaining the true figures.

The statement submitted by the Senator from Oregon shows a cash balance of $1,682,000 in the general fund at the end of January 1952.

In a newspaper article approximately one month before that, it is shown that the cash balance was approximately one-tenth of the amount set forth in the statement submitted by the Senator from Oregon. I do not have that newspaper article before me now, but when I find it I shall place it in the RECORD. At any rate, approximately 30 days before the time of the cash balance set forth in the statement submitted by the Senator from Oregon, the cash balance was approximately 10 percent of that figure.

I have before me a news item from the January 16, 1952, issue of the Daily Empire. The headline is "Treasurer reports general fund balance $114,756 at year's end." That means at the end of 1951.

I submit that news article for printing at this point in the RECORD, just to show the contrast.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURER REPORTS GENERAL FUND BALANCE $114,756 AT YEAR'S END

Quarterly report by the office of the Territorial treasurer showed a cash balance of $114,756.42 in the general fund as of December 31.

Figures from which the balance was ascertained were: Bank balance of $6,195,353.20, less outstanding warrants of $2,182,266.22, and less special funds and funds incorporated in the general fund which are not available for the general operation of the Territory, of $3,896,330.56.

Taxes collected were listed for the period January 1 to December 31, of 1951 at $13,016,-791.43, including $1,649,569.36 excise on liquor and $5,170,796.90 on net income taxes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly something further in regard to the sentiment of the people of Alaska themselves. It is strikingly strange to me that if this proposal were so sound from their standpoint, approximately 42 percent of the people of Alaska who participated in an official election 5 years ago on this question voted against statehood. That fact has not been explained to me or to the Senate, and it is all the more striking inasmuch as the Territorial administration of Alaska was moving heaven and earth to get out every vote they possibly could in favor of the statehood bill. Statehood is their theme song.

I do not criticize them for wanting statehood; it seems to me that every person in Alaska would want statehood in the United States of America, unless there was some overwhelming reason

against it, unless their common sense and good judgment told them plainly that Alaska was not ready for statehood. I believe that is the reason why most of them voted as they did. Nine thousand six hundred and thirty-four votes were cast in favor of statehood, and 6,822 votes were cast against statehood. That was the vote in Alaska; that is the official record of the Alaskan official election on that issue.

Mr. President, in further reference to the sentiment in Alaska, let me point out that following the failure of the Alaskan statehood bill to pass the Senate of the United States in December 1950, the Alaskan Territorial Legislature passed a resolution memorializing the Congress that they desired an additional measure of self-government, through provision for the election by the people of the Territory of their own Governor. The Territorial legislature is the most representative group to speak for Alaska, and it passed a resolution requesting the Congress to allow the people of Alaska to elect their own Governor.

However, in the face of that resolution, their delegate to the Congress opposes the movement to let the people of Alaska elect their own Governor.

I have before me various editorials from newspapers in that great Territory; and I also have before me other evidence coming from the Territory of Alaska.

After the Alaskan statehood bill had been before the Congress in 1950, and failed of passage by the Senate, the Territorial Legislature of Alaska memorialized the Congress of the United States to allow Alaska a 15-year exemption from all Federal taxation, in favor of corporations which would develop the territory of Alaska. The Territorial legislature was taking a very sound and practical approach to a practical matter, when it memorilized the Congress of the United States for that special tax provision for 15 years. However, such a provision could not stand if Alaska were a State, because throughout all the States of the Union taxation must be uniform, according to fixed schedules. Here is a constructive, down-to-earth proposal by the people of Alaska, not by us; but it is being opposed and played against by the Delegate from Alaska to the Congress of the United States.

I have before me two editorials which reflect the public sentiment in Alaska. I read these editorials, not on criticism of Delegate BARTLETT, who is a very fine gentleman, but because I wish to show the sentiment in Alaska on this question:

> Delegate BARTLETT is only practicing heroics when he says in effect that nothing constructive for Alaska must be done until statehood is granted.
>
> That was the stand he took recently when he was asked to support a bill calling for the election of a Governor of Alaska.
>
> Such a move was recently proposed by Senator HUGH BUTLER, the Republican Senator who led the opposition fight against H. R. 331, the Alaska statehood bill.
>
> It might have been expected that Delegate BARTLETT would not feel kindly toward any measure proposed by the Nebraska Senator, but in denouncing support of BUTLER'S proposal, Delegate BARTLETT put himself squarely on record as opposing one basic principle of free democracy so far as Alaskans are concerned.

In connection with the proposal for statehood for Alaska, the freedom cry has gone up in the Senate. Some Senators cry "Freedom! We must extend the horizons of freedom in Alaska; otherwise we draw around Alaska an iron curtain."

Mr. President, I submit in all deference to those who raise that cry, that there never was a more false issue raised on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Wyoming had his freedom train moving west the day the debate opened. I asked him, "What about Puerto Rico?" "Ah," he said, "Puerto Rico involves a different legal situation, and certain technicalities." I said, "Waive the technicalities. What about freedom for the Puerto Ricans?" He said, "Puerto Rico cannot support a State government. Its economy is not strong enough." This is not merely a question of freedom. That is a false issue. The people of Hawaii, Alaska, and all the other Territories have freedom, and with a high standard of living, they come nearer to conducting their own affairs than any other people living on any land which has ever touched the Pacific Ocean, except our three Western States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield very briefly to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. In the case of Puerto Rico, I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that the people of Alaska have $76,000,000 worth of bank deposits, while the people of Puerto Rico have $257,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad the Senator brought out that fact.

Mr. SMATHERS. So far as the Selective Service is concerned, in World War II Puerto Rico sent 50,235 men; in the Korean war, 17,000. Alaska, in the Korean war, sent 641.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's contribution very much. I have before me another editorial, from which I shall read but one sentence. It is an editorial from the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily News of December 26, 1950. I read:

> Clear-thinking people fail to see how a measure to elect our own governor could possibly harm statehood. Statehood will come when the time is ripe and in the meantime a governor, elected by the people, a governor in whom the people of Alaska had faith and confidence, a governor who had Alaska at heart, could do more to aid the cause of statehood than any other form of strategy that could be adopted.

That reflects the sentiment of the people of Alaska, who feel that it is a reasonable suggestion that they should train themselves in government. They realize that one step in that direction is the selection of their governor, and getting some tax exemptions which will enable them to travel somewhere under their own power.

Mr. President, with all deference to those who, when they come to Washington, make the argument that the Senate must pass this bill in order to prevent being criticized by Russia or her satellites, or to avoid being condemned in the eyes of nations elsewhere in the world, in view of our fine record over the decades, for almost two centuries, it seems to me that such an argument is merely an echo of Russian propaganda, and ought not to be made on this floor. I believe that if we submit and succumb to the arguments which come from the so-called international set, we are merely grabbing at straws. Such arguments amount to appeasement, they are arguments of fear, arguments of frustration. America will never grow strong by trimming its sails to catch the winds which blow from every area of the continent. That is a begging attitude, and I think we should repudiate such reasoning. It has no place in the arguments of the council chambers of a Nation which has spent more than $71,000,000,000 toward civilian relief and construction in various areas of the world since the year 1940. It has no place in the council chambers of a Nation which is taking the lead in the United Nations with respect to problems of the world, and which is furnishing more than 90 percent of the manpower, the money, the matériel, and the casualties to fight the war which is now going on in Korea. It has no place in the council chambers of a Nation which has given freedom to the Philippines, to Cuba, and to a host of other states I could name.

If our attitude against imperialism has not been entirely demonstrated in the eyes of the impartial people of the world, then we shall never be able to prove our case. I submit, Mr. President, that to make such arguments in the Senate indicates a compromising attitude, and those who make them and try to inject such issues into this debate unwittingly become the cohorts, aiding and abetting an extension of the influence of the Kremlin itself. I say it is being done unwittingly and without realizing its import, because those who make the argument are quite as patriotic as am I or anyone else.

I wish now to refer briefly to the original statement I made, that there is involved a question of policy. That is what we are to decide today. It is a question of policy, and the question is, How far shall we go, once we open the door to the admittance to statehood of areas lying beyond the confines of continental United States? What are we to do with Guam?

Guam is far away in the Pacific Ocean. It cannot become more closely connected with us militarily than it is. Guam has a population of 59,000, almost as great a population now as Alaska has, if we exclude the military personnel and their families and the temporary construction workers who are in Alaska.

By the way, something has been said about taxation without representation. Alaska pays into the Treasury about $18,000,000, according to the latest figure I have. In contrast to that, the Federal Government this year is spending approximately $500,000,000 in that area. But, referring again to Guam, with her 59,498 people, we have already passed an organic act making Guam an unincorporated Territory. The next step logically would be to make Guam an incorporated Territory, and, according to the argument which is being made at

this time, the next step would be to admit Guam as a State of the Union. Would we want to do that?

Let us consider the Virgin Islands. They constitute an unincorporated Territory with a population of 26,665. The next step would be to make of the Virgin Islands an incorporated Territory; the next step, to make them a State within the United States. If we consider their strategic importance, we hear the same argument, we have a citation of the same facts, and we have people of the same type. The question is, Are we to go beyond the confines of our present 48 States, to launch out on a policy which will lead, God only knows where?

Mr. President, much has been said about the people of Alaska and Hawaii. Let me say one word for the people of the 48 States. They are being left out of consideration in this matter. They are the ones who are paying the taxes. If any one of those 152,000,000 people will look at the globe pin-pointed with markers to show every spot in the world where we have men and materials, and where we are spending money, where we have launched out on policies which we must defend with our blood, with our brawn, and with our finances and our reserves——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDERSON in the chair). The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. May I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield four additional minutes to the Senator from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for four additional minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, there are 152,000,000 people in the United States. Much has been said in the course of the debate about the 75,000 people in Alaska. I think we may well spend a part of the four minutes talking about the 152,000,000. If any one of them will look at a globe pin-pointed to show all the places in the world where we have a program, an agency, or a commitment that we are already bound to defend with our blood, with our brawn, and with our money—yes, with everything we have—I think he will take a long look, and, with a sigh, he will return to his work with a realization similar to the one that is gradually creeping into my mind, namely, that we had better take a little trend toward isolationism. Mr. President, I am not an isolationist, but this accumulation of world facts is awakening me to a realization that we are over-spending ourselves. I believe a realization of these things will awaken the American people.

We had better think about our strength at home and to our commitments already given, rather than to go out into some vague field to dream of a budget which can be balanced, when no budget has been presented. We should overcome the trend of making commitments farther and farther from home, particularly irrevocable commitments such as would be involved in making Alaska a part of the United States. There is no turning back when we do that. We cannot repeal the law or change our minds; we cannot remove the error. I say, Mr. President, we ought to take a long last look at our own situation before we go chasing into vast areas of the world on a policy from which we cannot turn back.

I want to thank the Senator from Florida for granting me additional time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a very brief reference to what the Senator from Mississippi has just said about national defense, and to the interpolation by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The Senator from Florida quoted Rear Adm. Ralph Wood, retired, as a military expert, to the effect that the national defense would not be aided, whether Alaska were a Territory or a State.

On page 369 of the hearings on Alaska statehood, Mr. W. C. Arnold, the head of the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., though a resident and a citizen of Seattle, Wash., asked permission for Rear Admiral Wood to be heard. He said:

> First, I ask permission for Rear Adm. Ralph Wood, retired, who during the late war was the Commandant of the Seventeenth Naval District, which comprises Alaska, and who was the deputy commander of the Alaska Sea Frontier, and the deputy commander of the North Pacific Force and area, to make a statement, expressing his views on the relationship between statehood and national defense.
>
> Rear Admiral Wood comes here at my request and at the expense of the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc.

The Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., is the industry, under the directorship of Mr. Arnold, which financed the campaign against statehood because it wants to impose absentee landlordship upon the people of the Territory of Alaska. It will be a happy day for Alaska and for the defense of Alaska and of the United States when industrial corporations cannot continue longer to impose their absentee control over the people and the industries of that area.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I cannot yield now, because some time has to be allotted to other Members of the Senate.

I desire to add, Mr. President, that the Senator from Mississippi has spoken about the next step being the incorporation of Guam, the incorporation of Puerto Rico, and the incorporation of the Virgin Islands.

Mr. President, all those questions have been settled. The Senate has acted upon bills reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs providing a constitution for the people of Puerto Rico, and they are satisfied with it, because they chose it at a public election.

The committee recommended the same sort of local self-government for the people of Guam, because we knew that statehood could not and should not be granted to such areas.

To compare Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam with the incorporated Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, which were positively and affirmatively given the promise of statehood when they were incorporated is, to use the words of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], on the floor this morning, merely an attempt to becloud the issue.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I decline to yield at the moment. I will give the Senator time later on.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, would the Senator from Wyoming permit me to ask who paid the expenses of those who came from Alaska to testify?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, as I see it, the question is whether our country is to continue to be an expanding nation, a nation which retains the pioneering spirit that made the United States of America the greatest nation in the world, or whether we are going to limit our future expansion, and curtail our future expansion.

Every expansion and development of our country has had its opponents, the Louisiana Purchase, the Northwest Territory, the Panama Canal, among others. Even today there is opposition in the Senate to the St. Lawrence seaway although delay in its consideration allows millions of kilowatts of electric power to be bled away from our country out into the sea, and continues to landlock the heartland of industrial and agricultural America.

It has been a matter of great concern to me, in listening to the debate, that implicit in the opposition to this bill there seems to be an idea that Alaskan residents are somehow inferior to or different from the residents of the 48 States.

Three-fourths of the present residents of Alaska Territory went there from the United States. They are American-born. They know just as much about how our Government operates as do the citizens of Mississippi, Florida, California, New York, or any other State. They are just as well qualified to take part in the discussions of national policy as are the residents of any other area under the American flag. They are as well informed, as alert, as progressive, and as accomplished as are residents of the States. They read the same magazines and books, see the same movies, listen to the same radio programs, read the same news as reported by the press services, in exactly the same words as are printed in the newspapers in the 48 States.

Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] a few minutes ago raised the question of taxation without representation. I think that issue is as good today as in the early days of our history. I do not believe many Americans question the fact that taxation without representation was discarded long ago as a principle on the North American Continent, so far as we are concerned. And I might point out that the taxes paid last year by every man, woman, and child in Alaska, were approximately $300 each. That is a greater amount than the taxes paid in a number of the States of the Union. The

total paid into the Federal Treasury, despite the small population of the Territory of Alaska, was more than $38,000,000.

It was also mentioned that perhaps it might be a good idea to cultivate a trend toward isolationism. I am sure the Senator who said that is, as he asserted, not an isolationist. But the idea of cultivating a trend toward isolationism, when the very survival of the Nation depends on a proper, broadly-developed organization of world teamwork against the threat of world Communist domination, would be a terrible mistake. The very suggestion seems to me to strike an off-key note when introduced into this particular issue.

Mr. President, not long ago the President of the United States welcomed a new Finnish Minister to the United States in the person of Johan Nykopp, and when he presented his credentials to the President, Mr. Truman suggested that we would like to welcome a couple of hundred thousand Finns from Finland to immigrate to Alaska.

What he meant, I believe, was that in many respects the development of the Territory of Alaska does have a similarity to the development of the Republic of Finland. I believe that if proper opportunity is given to Alaskan genius, to enable that Territory to produce, we shall have a Territory which will attract people of Scandinavian descent who have settled in our country—in Minnesota, northern Michigan, and other latitudes which are similar to those of their homelands—and people from other countries, who will help develop the Territory and bring their great industry to our country. In Michigan we have probably more native Finns and persons of Finnish ancestry than any other State of the Union. We are proud of them. We are proud of their industry; we are proud of their enterprise, and we are proud of their patriotism.

I think we ought to remove the shackles which now bind us on a Territorial basis, and give to Alaska the same freedom, we have to other Territories. If we do that, there is no limit to the enterprise and vigor which may be put into the development of this Territory.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MOODY. I am sorry, but I have only a few minutes left, and the time is in charge of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I believe he had better apportion the time.

Those of us who favor this statehood bill have seen in it the prospect of a future Alaska peopled by all races and from all States. We can discern such a pattern in the development of some of our own Northern States. Europeans have come to as nearly identical areas in the United States as they could find conforming to their homelands. Thus, Swedes and Norwegians have come to central Wisconsin and central Minnesota; Finns to central Michigan, northern Wisconsin, and northern Minnesota, and Danes to the more southern States. I believe the development of Alaska's resources will be a challenge to those people, and that those who go to that area will help develop it as they have helped develop their own home areas.

There is one other note that I should like to inject into the debate before the roll is called. One of our great shortages in the last few years has been wood pulp, newsprint. The cost of our principal medium of communication, the newspaper, has been sharply increased because of the lack of a sufficient supply of newsprint and too high a price for the paper on which newspapers are printed.

I believe one of the greatest opportunities for the growth of the Alaskan Territory lies in its forests. A United States Government survey has shown that 15,400,000,000 feet of timber lie in two forest reserves in southwestern and southeastern Alaska alone.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MOODY. I have only a few minutes, but I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan would mind pointing out how the granting of statehood to Alaska will increase the growth of trees in that Territory, or how it will produce more pulp.

Mr. MOODY. I am sure that the granting of statehood will not result in the growth of any more trees, but I feel sure that the status of statehood, if I may say this to my good friend from Florida, will attract capital to Alaska, and will make it possible for the general development of the Territory to proceed at a faster pace.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator from Michigan recognizes, as even the proponents of the bill admit, that statehood will raise the cost of government to the citizens of Alaska anywhere from 60 to 100 percent, and that, rather than helping to attract people, it may result in the reverse.

I agree thoroughly with what the Senator has said, but it seems to me that the best way to accomplish what is sought is to break the hold of the Department of the Interior, which this bill does not do.

Mr. MOODY. It seems to me, and perhaps the Senator from Florida will agree, that the status of statehood would give an entirely different psychological aspect to the development of this Territory.

As a newspaper man, I hope that we shall get a great deal of newsprint out of Alaska. I feel that this will be stimulated by the admission of Alaska as a State. I am informed that Alaska can produce an estimated 1,000,000 tons of paper products a year. Looking ahead, that output could be greatly increased.

As the Senator from Florida probably knows, much of our present newsprint comes from the northern part of our continent, from Canada. It seems to me it would be a good thing, in order to keep the cost down of keeping the channels of communication open, to develop newsprint industries in Alaska. I think that would be stimulated by the admission of Alaska as a State.

Mr. SMATHERS. I may say to the very able and distinguished Senator from Michigan, who is also my good friend, that I thoroughly agree with him about the need of newsprint. On the other hand, there is no reason to believe that those who might desire to go to Alaska and develop newsprint or pulp could not do so now, even under Territorial status. The fact of the matter is that statehood would not change the hard facts. It takes about $5,000 to move to Alaska. It is a long way from Chicago, and ordinarily the weather is not very good. Those conditions will continue, unfortunately, whether statehood is granted or not.

Mr. MOODY. I understand that, but I am sure that my esteemed colleague will agree with me——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, may I have five additional minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield additional time to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator.

I should like to point out to the Senator from Florida that certainly in travel time and in ease of access, Alaska is today much closer to Chicago than was California when California was opened up for development. Perhaps the weather in Alaska is not quite so good as it was in California.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator from Michigan will agree that it is not right to try to judge what is to be done in 1952 with the Territory of Alaska on the basis of 1860 standards, which is what seems to be what is proposed at the moment.

Mr. MOODY. Oh, no. I merely think that people are recognizing the fact that with modern means of transportation Alaska is not so remote a Territory as it was when it was first taken in with a promise of future statehood.

I think I had better conclude my statement, if I may. I should like to point out also that there are many products which can be developed in Alaska other than those already referred to. Newsprint is merely one facet of the problem. There are many other riches in Alaska which can be developed, and which I believe will be developed if Alaska achieves the status of statehood.

There are the salmon fisheries. Already 5,000,000 cases of salmon are packed annually in Alaska. There is also a great potential for the development of metals which are now scarce. There are many other rich resources in Alaska which, in my judgment, will be developed more speedily if Alaska is admitted to statehood.

Since my time is limited, I should like to conclude by reading into the RECORD once more the platform planks of the two major political parties in 1948 on Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood. There are some who may think that political platforms are merely window dressing for election campaigns. I have never believed that should be the case, and I do not believe it now. Therefore, I should

like to read what both parties said about the matter of statehood.

The Democratic platform said:

We urge immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

That is about as categorical as any statement could be. I believe it can be interpreted as an implied pledge.

The Republican platform said:

We favor eventual statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

That is a little more equivocal. It says "eventual statehood." Nevertheless, it seems to me that if it means anything at all, it means that the Republican Party is in favor of admitting Alaska into the Union as a State. I certainly hope that when the roll is called this afternoon the members of both parties will live up to their party platforms and vote for the admission of Alaska as a State of the Union.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an additional statement on this subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The treaty by which we acquired Alaska reserved a plot of land for the Finns—the site of the Finnish Lutheran Church in Sitka, the capital. Among the population at the time of the transfer were a hundred or so Finns, employed by the Russians as artisans and clerks, as navigators and explorers.

In the 1840's, the Governor of Alaska was Adolph Etholin, a Finnish officer. And again in 1853, the Governor was another Finn, an admiral—Humpus Furuhjelm—whose daughter was born in Sitka. So the imprint of Finnish character is in evidence in our far Northern history. Let us have more of it. Let us give their love of independence and liberty a chance to develop on our northwest frontier—our last frontier.

Alaska and Finland lie in practically the same latitude. Anchorage is virtually in an identical latitude on this continent that Helsinki, Finland, occupies in Europe.

Recently I came upon a special report prepared by Mr. Reino Sarvola, a scientist from Finland, who made an 8-week survey of northern Alaska under the auspices of the United Nations. He reached most interesting and valuable conclusions.

Mr. Sarvola was financed by a United Nations public-health grant, and while his impartial survey covers much territory not particularly germane to our present fight for Alaskan statehood, I am sure the Senate will indulge me the few minutes necessary to summarize the report.

Here it is:

"ALASKA

"(By Reino Sarvola)

"In Alaska I traveled for 8 weeks and observed the Alaska Native Service, the Territorial Health Service and the Public Welfare Service. I will relate briefly the questions which have been most interesting to me.

"Alaska is a very big territory, of about 586,400 square miles in area, or about one-fifth the size of the United States. But the population is small. There are only 126,661 inhabitants. In Finland, which is as far north as Alaska, we have 130,661 square miles—which is about one-fourth the size of Alaska, but our population numbers 4,500,000 people. In the district where I live—which is like northern Alaska—there are 160,000 people in an area of about one-twelfth the size of all Alaska. They maintain themselves by forest and reindeer industries.

"The most important industries in Alaska are fishing, mining, and furs. Where the country is very rich the people live by taking only the best of the natural resources. But they should develop other industries, such as forestry, farming, and expansion of the reindeer industry.

"The purpose of social work is to help people help themselves. Thus the people of Alaska must begin to plan more clearly about what they need to develop—a better standard of living for themselves. First I have taken into consideration such general questions as housing, temperance and liquor trades, the labor market and unemployment situation, farming, forest and reindeer industries. These are all very important background factors for the above-mentioned services.

"Housing is the least developed among the native people. Their houses are too old, run down and overcrowded. It cannot but be very difficult to take care of the public health in such homes. Tuberculosis has free circulation. Homes are very small and thus it is difficult to consider an adequate foster-home program for children needing placement in boarding homes. Part of the buildings are only temporary. The inhabitants first have intended to stay in Alaska for a year or two and thus built for themselves only a temporary shelter, which, however, after remaining in the same place for decades has become their permanent residence.

"Building of new houses is very expensive when wages are so high and the forest industries are not developed by the Alaskans. I think that the Government must very strongly support the building of new individual houses. I have not noticed any difference in the method of building between the buildings here and in the States. So first it must be determined what is the best and cheapest type of building for this climate, taking into consideration also the long winters and snow and the difficult heating possibilities. The weight of snow is to be particularly noted when building roofs.

"In particular, it was amazing to discover that in regions where there was plenty of firewood available, expensive oil heating was being used for the reason that it was easier to use. The Eskimos no longer care to collect and use the driftwood, which is left to rot on the beaches. When planning and constructing new buildings and houses, in my opinion, the fireplace should be taken into consideration in order to make available the use of wood, at least partly, for heating purposes. And when you find different types of homes for the people here, you can build sawmills and factories and make building materials and precut parts for these buildings.

"In Finland we have prefabricated buildings, with the components made in factories, easy to transport and put together at the place where the house is to be built.

"As compensation for war debts we send such prefabricated houses in great numbers to Russia. They are cheap but they make good dwellings.

"From the economic point of view, if we are thinking only about costs I do not know which is the more expensive—to aid the natives obtain proper homes, or continually increase expenditures for their health and social services.

"When the forest industry will have been developed in Alaska, it will provide continuous and steady livelihood for the majority of the people of southern Alaska and at the same time will advance the rapid progress of all Alaska. After realizing the great wasteful use of various raw materials in Alaska, it should be noted that the same mistake made in many areas of the United States, where the forests were cut down without the least consideration of forestry conservation or that posterity too would need wood, shall not be repeated.

"I further believe that greenhouses would have a great future in Alaska just as well as within the arctic circle in the Scandinavian countries, where greenhouse projects have brought excellent results. The produce thus grown is superior to that grown in the south, with the result that vegetables and greens are now brought from the north to the south. Vegetables as well as meat are products transported from the States to Alaska. However, before the greenhouse project could be developed, a glass factory should first be built in Alaska, to facilitate and make more advantageous the obtaining of the glass for the greenhouses.

"One big trouble in Alaska is the unstable, seasonal labor market and the moving of working people, this year about 50,000, who come from outside the Territory. These people are often not the best working people, but may be searching for adventure and escape and they give much trouble. We had the same trouble in Lapland after the war during the rebuilding program. But then we gave work to only completely professional and skilled workers and gave vocational training for workers in our own district in order to make them more efficient.

"Another factor in Alaskan life may well be a larger, rejuvenated reindeer industry. The first importation of reindeer from Siberia into Alaska was made in 1872. In the following 10 years a total of 1,280 head were brought to Alaska. In 1894 a total of 16 Lapps were brought to Alaska to train the natives in reindeer husbandry. Around 1932 there was estimated to be around 600,000 head of reindeer. At present there are 17 herds with a total of 27,245 head of reindeer.

"During my trip I observed the various reindeer areas of Alaska and these are my observations:

"1. Reindeer summer feeding areas are excellent.

"2. Winter feeding areas on the coast are not too good, but in the interior there is plenty of lichen.

"3. Reindeer herding could now be much larger than it is, as reindeer can live in the same areas that support caribou. For the future it would be well to examine all of the potentials of a reindeer industry.

"4. The present herds are in good condition and herds are growing rapidly.

"In Finland before the war there were 250,000 reindeer in one-tenth the feeding areas which exist in Alaska. At that time the industry brought a return of 250,000,000 Finnish marks. Eighty percent of the production was exported. Direct reindeer herding produced employment for 16,000 people. During the war the number of reindeer dropped by 180,000. In the last 6 years it has increased by 100,000.

"As the population increases in Alaska the reindeer industry would have a chance to expand, thus benefiting the native people and the whole Territory as well. As caribou decrease the opportunity in grazing for reindeer increases and also the need for reindeer can increase. The reindeer need not be a source of products for the natives only as it can afford a good return for all the people of the Territory. Later the industry could be developed into an export business if markets and circumstances permit.

"Transportation of reindeer to market is a problem in Alaska. Because of this problem the coastal areas of Alaska are the logical areas for herding. In the coastal areas 200,000 reindeer could be herded. This would comprise at least 100 herds of 2,000 each. This should take care of 6,000 people. Reindeer herding could be very suitable to the Eskimo.

"In the foregoing I have already briefly visualized to what direction, according to my understanding, the conditions of living, live-

lihood, and education of the natives, retaining their special characteristics, should be developed. It should always be borne in mind that they have a long tradition behind them, and to attempt to alter their mode of life and thought from what they are accustomed to, must be very gradual. One of the greatest weaknesses in Alaska is the incoherence of the administration which makes it difficult to determine what activities or duties belong to each department of the government.

"Native crafts are changing. In their crafts, they are using strange and foreign ideas that are not their own. The crafts would be superior and more valuable if they adhered to their own original designs. There are some excellent Eskimo artists who could furnish the ideas for their basic designs.

"A trade-mark should be established for all crafts made by native artists and craftsmen. This would increase their value and protect the native crafts from exploitation.

"It is to the advantage of the native to maintain his customs, traditions, costumes, and dances. Morally it is good for these people to maintain their heritage of customs and traditions."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I allot 7 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will defeat the motion to recommit Senate bill 50, and will instead proceed to pass this measure for Alaskan statehood, and will then follow such action by passing the bill providing for Hawaiian statehood.

The substantial objection that seems to be working against the admission of Alaska and Hawaii is the feeling of Senators from certain regions of the country that the addition of four new Senators will so dilute existing voting strength as to threaten the interests of those sections in Congress. I can understand this feeling, but it should give way, in my opinion, to important national considerations.

Thus, it may well be against the apparent and immediate interest of the large tax-paying States, like my own State of Illinois, to have a new State admitted which is likely to join with the public works bloc and be a substantial recipient of Federal funds for development.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have only 7 minutes, and I should like to be permitted to conclude.

If I were considering this measure solely from the standpoint of the interests of my own State, I think I might have to vote against the admission of Alaska, because I think we can be quite certain that the Alaskan Senators, no matter what their good intentions may be at the time they enter the Senate, will later want large Federal grants for public works, which the taxpayers of the great industrial States will then be called upon to pay.

I should like to point out for the benefit of the Senate and the country the degree to which the large industrial States are underrepresented in this body. The five largest States in the Union are New York, California, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and Ohio.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I should like to be permitted to complete my statement. I have only 7 minutes. I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion of my statement.

These States include more than one-third the population of the country. Their citizens and corporations pay nearly one-half the Federal taxes of the country—that is 47.5 percent—yet we have on the floor of the Senate only 10 out of 96 Senators, or approximately one-tenth of the voting strength of the Senate, and we possess much less than one-tenth of the political influence in the Senate. There is not a single Member of the Senate from any of the five largest States who is chairman of any committee of the Senate. Generally Senators from those States occupy a very inferior position on the committees. In fact, I am inclined to believe that politically our five States occupy the position of conquered provinces. We pay the bills, but we have very little voice in determining what is done. I do not complain about this——

Mr. GEORGE. Does not the Senator think that is a fortunate circumstance?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not think it is a fortunate circumstance. [Laughter.]

If I were considering this question solely from the standpoint of sectional or State interest, I would vote against the admission of Alaska, because it is not going to help my State at all, and it will mean bigger bills which Illinois taxpayers will have to pay. But in my judgment our narrow sectional interests should give way in this matter to the clear and overriding national interest in making this strategic Territory and the Territory of Hawaii sister States.

It is my earnest hope that the South, which with certain notable exceptions has been opposing admission for differing regional reasons, will likewise subordinate these sectional interests in this critical period.

The Southern States apparently fear that if Alaska and Hawaii are admitted there will be four more Senators who will vote for civil-rights legislation.

But let me point out to the South what its representatives are undoubtedly perfectly well aware of, namely, that already the South, with the help of hidden allies from other scattered areas, can now control more than one-third of the seats in the Senate. Hence it can filibuster to its own sweet will and prevent cloture from being enforced on a civil-rights measure.

In the old days the South insisted that for every free State admitted, there should also be a slave State admitted—a ratio of 1-to-1. This was before the filibuster was practiced. Now a filibuster can defeat action so long as one Member more than one-third by voting or staying away can prevent cloture from being enforced and hence can prevent a vote from being taken or affirmative action carried out in the matter of civil rights. So long as the anti-civil-rights group can get 33 of the 96 Members of the Senate either to vote against civil rights or to have a feigned illness and go to the hospital when the issue is before the Senate, it can prevent civil-rights legislation from being carried into effect. Moreover, by the terms of the Wherry amendment, we cannot change that rule, because under rule XXII, as it now stands, cloture cannot be enforced in connection with any proposal to change the rules. We of the big industrial States who believe in civil rights are hog-tied, with the heavy chains loaded down upon us, ready to sink us to the bottom of the ocean.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I have only 7 minutes. When I shall have concluded my statement I shall be willing to answer questions.

Now the ratio which the South seeks is not 1-to-1, but many of our southern friends are apparently insisting that the ratio should be 2-to-1. Here is a case in which it is feared that four pro-civil-rights Senators from Alaska and Hawaii would be admitted without any corresponding anti-civil-rights Senators. I think that is true. There would be four civil-rights Senators from Alaska and Hawaii—I hope so, in any event. But since the South already has the filibuster available, and since it can defeat the will of a majority and prevent cloture by the joint action of only one more than one-third of the Senate, it certainly should not in my judgment seek additional protection at the expense of the national interest.

The South can now defeat any civil-rights bill by the open or concealed opposition or by the indifference of a total of 33 out of the 96 Senators.

Were Alaska and Hawaii to come in, only 34 Senators out of a total of 100 would be needed to block action. The issue really boils down to whether our southern friends will be willing to sacrifice the national interest for the sake of one vote. Believing in the high patriotism of the South, I cannot believe that upon mature reflection they will do this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield as much additional time as the Senator from Illinois needs to complete his statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can state quite briefly the principal affirmative reasons why I favor the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as full-fledged States.

First. This action is required by our fundamental belief in local self-government. People should have not only the right but the obligation to govern themselves. They should not be governed from Washington by representatives and an executive they have no part in choosing. The people in these Territories want to assume these responsibilities, and the apparent will of a great majority of the American people is that the Alaskan and Hawaiian people be granted these rights.

Second. The judgment of our defense leaders, both civilian and military, is virtually unanimous that statehood for Alaska and Hawaii will strengthen the defense of our country against Communist aggression. These Territories are strategic points on the globe, and stable local governments add greatly to the strength of a defending force.

Third. By granting statehood to these Territories we can give to the world another clear demonstration that we are firmly committed against colonialism. We have assured the peoples of the world that this is our position on principle. Welcoming Alaska and Hawaii on an equal footing with other States will back up our declarations with affirmative action.

While some opposition has been expressed to their admission on the grounds of their population, their resources, and their distance from the main body of the country, these factors wash out when comparisons are made with the status of other Territories at the time of their admission.

Our principles of self-government argue for admission. Our country's defense and the maintenance of the cooperation and unity of the free world will be strengthened by Alaskan and Hawaiian statehood.

If we of the big States are willing to subordinate our regional interests on this issue, is it too much to ask of the South that it do likewise? I ask this without any regional self-righteousness but with the hope that we all will put first things first.

I hope, therefore, that the motion to recommit will not be approved and that the Senate will today take a favorable vote on Alaskan statehood and follow it with similar action with respect to Hawaii.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Mr. Senator," published in the Chicago Herald-American of February 26, 1952, and the text of a radio address which I made over 15 Illinois radio stations.

There being no objection, the editorial and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. SENATOR

The Alaskan statehood bill comes up Wednesday in the Senate.

The margin between victory and defeat hangs on the votes of a few wavering Senators.

We say to them: Put aside petty sectional interests and obey the public will.

We say: You cannot afford, either from self-interest or the immeasurably greater interests of the United States, to be on record as opposing a bill supported by all branches of the military and backed up, according to latest polls, by the 9-to-1 approval of the men and women of America.

We say: Every military leader of consequence, including General MacArthur and General Eisenhower, wants statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii to strengthen American unity and defense in this time of crisis.

We ask: Are you, at a time like this, going to run counter to the best military thinking we have? Are you going to disregard overwhelming public opinion?

DON'T KILL IT

The vote in the Senate tomorrow will be on a motion to recommit the Alaskan bill to committee "for further consideration." This is an evasive means of killing the bill with no blood on the knife, no smoke from the muzzle. But it would kill it just the same.

Alaskan statehood and Hawaiian statehood are separate technically, but they are interwoven psychologically and emotionally. So to kill Alaskan statehood would kill Hawaiian statehood, too.

Since the number of Senators definitely favoring and opposing the bill are about equal, the issue will be decided by a wavering fringe group, which could be as small as four or five men.

It is to them that this is chiefly addressed.

To our own Senators—PAUL H. DOUGLAS and EVERETT M. DIRKSEN—we urge: Vote to keep Alaskan statehood alive.

TALKING IT OVER—THE ISSUE OF STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII, WITH SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS, DEMOCRAT, OF ILLINOIS

ANNOUNCER. This is the program Talking It Over, with Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

Recently the United States Senate has been debating the issue of whether or not to admit Alaska and Hawaii into the Union. What about this issue? Should these Territories be admitted as States? What about the danger of communism in Hawaii? Could it be helpful to this country's defenses to make these Territories into States? These are some of the questions we shall ask Senator DOUGLAS during this broadcast.

First of all, Senator DOUGLAS, how do you stand on the issue of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii?

Senator DOUGLAS. I support the admission of both Alaska and Hawaii as full-fledged States. There are three main reasons why I believe that this should be done:

First is the belief which we all have in local self-government. The people should have the right to govern themselves and not be governed from Washington. And the people in both Hawaii and Alaska want self-government.

Secondly, and something which is extremely important now, is the fact that to admit them as full-fledged States would help our country to have a better defense against the possibility of Communist aggression in the Pacific.

A third reason is that by making these Territories into States we give the world a clear demonstration that we have no desire to practice colonialism. The United States has spoken out on many occasions in the United Nations against colonialism, and we, of course, freed the Philippines. By permitting Alaska and Hawaii to come into the United States on an equal footing with other States we would show that we are willing to back up our position.

ANNOUNCER. Senator DOUGLAS, how do you think the inclusion of Alaska and Hawaii into the United States would be helpful from a standpoint of national defense?

Senator DOUGLAS. The more stable a local government can be, the more successful can be that government in defending that area in the case of sudden attack. There's no substitute for State and local instrumentalities of law and order. The local police and civil defense units would be of great help in cases of sudden danger. We should realize that both of these areas are very likely to be strategic points where the initial attacks by Russia or its satellites might take place. Alaska, for example, is a mere 54 miles across the Bering Straits from Soviet territory. Hawaii is an extremely important outpost for our defenses in the Pacific.

ANNOUNCER. On what grounds has opposition been expressed to the inclusion of Alaska and Hawaii as States?

Senator DOUGLAS. Let us take up the objections to Alaska first, and then consider the objections to Hawaii later.

ANNOUNCER. All right.

Senator DOUGLAS. In the first place, I think it's very significant that no resident of the Territory of Alaska itself has appeared to testify before the Senate committee against this legislation. In other words, the objection is from people outside Alaska, not from people inside Alaska.

There have been three reasons, however, advanced by people outside Alaska against admitting it as a State. First, that it is too small from a population standpoint for representation in Congress and too small to support a State government. Second, that its natural resources are not sufficiently developed to permit it to support the financial burdens of statehood. Third, the fact that Alaska is noncontiguous (this is true of Hawaii, too, of course), namely, that it does not border on the United States proper.

ANNOUNCER. What about these objections, Senator DOUGLAS? Do you think Alaska is too small to become a State?

Senator DOUGLAS. The population is now 128,000 and the bulk of the people are native-born Americans. Thus, Alaska has a greater population than did Idaho, Nevada, or Wyoming when they were admitted as States—more even than Illinois when it was admitted as a State in 1818.

ANNOUNCER. But what about Alaska's resources? Would they be adequate to support a State government?

Senator DOUGLAS. I think so. Alaska produces about $375,000,000 worth of goods and services annually—mainly, in mining and fisheries. And, furthermore, it collected about $20,000,000 in taxes during the period 1949–51. It is estimated that these same tax rates will produce $25,000,000 during the 2-year period 1951–53. Alaska has been able to balance its budget which is more than certain States have done and more than the Federal Government seems to be able to do.

ANNOUNCER. I guess in comparison with the other States which were small at the time they came into the Union, Alaska is not too small and probably has adequate resources to support a State government. But I suppose there's no denying the fact that Alaska does not actually border on the United States and is noncontiguous, as you call it.

Senator DOUGLAS. That is, of course, true. You only have to look at the map to see why. But, on the other hand, when California was admitted, that State was 1,500 miles away from the nearest border State, namely, Nebraska. The fastest possible travel by pony express required 9 days to get from Nebraska to California. Travel by stagecoach required 25 days. For those who wanted to get to California by clipper ship, the time required was 97 days. The same thing was true of Oregon in even greater measure. Yet California was admitted as a State and Oregon was admitted as a State. On the other hand, Alaska is but a few hours away from the United States by airplane and only 2 or 3 days by ship. The truth of the matter is that the world has shrunk because of the development of radio, telegraph, aviation, and fast ocean shipping.

ANNOUNCER. Yes. And I suppose nobody's really sorry that we admitted California and Oregon, even though they were noncontiguous at the time.

What are some of the positive reasons for admitting Alaska into the Union other than those you mentioned for defense purposes and for our reputation in the eyes of the rest of the world in denying colonialism?

Senator DOUGLAS. I pointed out that if we believed in self-government, we should allow people to govern themselves and not be governed from Washington. Alaska has had a popularly elected Territorial legislature since 1912. It's been a United States Territory for 84 years, longer than any other United States Territory which is not now a State. The bulk of the Alaskan population consists of native-born Americans, and the Territory is certainly mature enough to be admitted as a State on an equal footing with the other States in the Union. It should not be kept in the cellar indefinitely, or in cold storage indefinitely.

ANNOUNCER. Then what about Hawaii, Senator DOUGLAS? Do the same general rea-

sons hold, in your opinion, on the advisability for admitting Hawaii as a State?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; I would say the same three basic reasons: need for self-government, advantages in terms of national defense, letting the world know that we have no desire to hold a colonial empire. This last point is perhaps particularly important in the case of Hawaii.

ANNOUNCER. Then I suppose that much of the same type of objections have been raised to the admission of Hawaii as have been raised against the admission of Alaska.

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes; but the objections are not as strong in the case of Hawaii as in the case of Alaska, because the population of Hawaii is about half a million, or almost four times the population of Alaska. The population of Hawaii is even now larger than the population of Vermont, or Delaware, or Wyoming, or Nevada.

The ethnic make-up of this population shows that the groups long loyal to the United States are in a majority. Besides Hawaiians and Filipinos, there are about 114,000 Caucasians. And I may say that Hawaii has been extraordinarily successful in getting harmony out of various groups and in getting these various groups to live together on terms of comparative friendship with each other—native Hawaiians, part Hawaiians, Caucasians, Japanese, Chinese, Filipinos—they live together in comparative harmony, and they are a great demonstration to the world that American institutions can be absorbed and lived by other groups rather than merely native whites.

ANNOUNCER. What about the financial resources of Hawaii?

Senator DOUGLAS. Hawaii has very great financial resources. It has a huge $124,000,000-a-year sugar industry, and an $80,000,000-a-year pineapple industry. They've exported 60,000,000 pounds of coffee, and of course they do an enormous tourist business.

ANNOUNCER. Hasn't it been contended that Hawaii is, if not controlled by the Communists, certainly in danger of falling into the control of the local Communists?

Senator DOUGLAS. That charge has been made by some. It's based on the left-wing control of one of the large longshoremen's unions—Harry Bridges' union, which has also organized some of the agricultural workers in Hawaii in addition to the dock workers.

But the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, headed by Senator O'MAHONEY, has investigated these assertions with great care. The House Un-American Activities Committee during April 1950, went out to Hawaii and conducted an investigation. After the conclusion of these investigations, the two committees reported that, in their judgment, there was not sufficient communism to justify withholding statehood from the Territory.

ANNOUNCER. What about the politics of admitting Alaska and Hawaii into the Union as States, Senator DOUGLAS? Would it help the Republicans or the Democrats?

Senator DOUGLAS. As a matter of fact it probably wouldn't help either one very much. They would balance each other. At the present time Hawaii would probably send Republican Senators here; Alaska would send Democrats. The two would balance each other in the Senate. In the House, there would probably be one more Republican than Democrat, so that on the whole, it would slightly help the Republicans rather than the Democrats. But the Democratic Party in the North is very strongly supporting the admission of both.

ANNOUNCER. What seems to be holding up the admission of these two Territories as States? Haven't both the Republican and Democratic Party platforms advocated that they be admitted?

Senator DOUGLAS. Yes. Now, the real difficulty is this: The Southern States know that if Alaska and Hawaii are admitted there will be four more Senators who will vote for civil-rights legislation. As long as the South, with the help of allies from other scattered areas, can keep one more than one-third of the seats in the Senate under their control, it can filibuster and prevent cloture being enforced on a civil-rights measure.

In the old days the South insisted that for every free State admitted, there should also be a slave State admitted—a ratio of 1 to 1. Now they are insisting that the ratio should be 2 to 1. Here is the case of where four civil-rights Senators would be admitted without any anti-civil-rights Senators. Therefore the South, in general, is opposing the admission of these States with some honorable exceptions, such as Senator HOLLAND of Florida. I hope that the South will place the national interest above its prevailing regional concerns.

As a matter of fact, it's against the regional interest of the big States to admit these small States because they would probably join the public works bloc and obtain large grants of Federal money for which the big States would pay. But since we of the big States are subordinating our local interest to the national interest, I hope the South will do the same.

ANNOUNCER. Then the large States such as New York and Pennsylvania and your own State of Illinois, I would think, would be the ones who would suffer most by a dilution of their Senate strength.

Senator DOUGLAS. We're already more or less a conquered province. We're ruled by the combination of the South and the semi-arid Western States which run the United States Senate. But in the national interest we believe that Alaska and Hawaii should be admitted, and we're willing to subordinate our regional interest. In view of that fact I think it's not too much for us to ask the South to do likewise.

ANNOUNCER. Senator DOUGLAS, how would the legislation currently before the Senate provide for admitting Alaska and Hawaii into the Union?

Senator DOUGLAS. The legislation would permit the people of Alaska to elect a constitutional convention to formulate a State constitution. Then when this constitution is approved by Congress, Alaska would become a State.

Now Hawaii on the other hand has already had a constitutional convention. This convention was held in 1950. The legislation which we are considering would validate this constitutional convention so that the Hawaiian state constitution could then be submitted to Congress for approval. When this was done, Hawaii would be admitted.

ANNOUNCER. Thank you, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois. Ladies and gentlemen, you have just heard a discussion with Senator DOUGLAS on the issues surrounding the admission of Alaska and Hawaii into the United States as States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I was very much interested in the observation which was made by our esteemed colleague the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], that now is the time for us in the United States to take stock of our position in the world and the drain on our resources, and perhaps to curtail some of our commitments, instead of extending them.

It occurs to me that our commitments so far as Alaska are concerned are already in existence, and that any commitments which geography has made for us cannot be curtailed if the safety of America is to be a consideration, which it must be in this and in all other matters.

I presume the words of General Mitchell have been quoted previously in this debate. He said:

> Whoever controls Alaska, controls the world.

I think the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] will agree that in this atomic age, when Juneau, Alaska, is approximately 22 hours by air from Washington, D. C., we are confronted with a physical condition which demands that we strengthen Alaska by every appropriate measure we can devise.

The question therefore arises: Is the granting of statehood to Alaska designed to accomplish that objective? I believe history demonstrates that areas of our country have developed most rapidly when they came into the Union as States. Certainly the examples of Washington, Oregon, and California are before us, and they illustrate that with statehood came a development of their marvelous resources. I believe that the resources of Alaska are comparable to the natural resources of all the States west of the Rocky Mountains.

I believe that one of the things that militates unfavorably in a consideration of this proposal is the thought which was advanced by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], to the effect that perhaps Alaska is a land of snow and ice, and therefore unsuitable for any future development of a large population.

Of course, we know that the junior Senator from Florida comes from a very well advertised section of the country. However, Jacksonville can be rather cold. In fact, on one occasion when I arrived at the airport in Jacksonville I nearly froze, and when I arrived at Miami I had to turn on the electric heater.

Perhaps I should read into the RECORD the following statement:

> The average annual temperature varies from 45° above zero at Ketchikan to a low of 9.9° above zero at Point Barrow.

That is a little lower than temperatures at Miami.

> The January mean temperature of 20° above zero in Anchorage compares to that in Concord, N. H.

Perhaps we should call this fact to the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

> The January mean of 33.6° at Ketchikan is about the same as Denver and New York. Ketchikan's record low of 8° below zero approximates record low temperatures for—

For where, Mr. President?

> for Washington, D. C., and is considerably warmer than the record cold in such cities as Chicago and Boston. Ketchikan's all-time high is 96; Juneau, 89; and Fairbanks, 99. The temperature at Fort Yukon, 20 miles above the Arctic Circle, has often reached heights of 100° above zero. The temperature has also been known to drop below minus 70° during the winter in that community.

So much for the climate of Alaska. It is fortunate that it is so, because the natural resources in that Territory are

very great indeed. I am told that some of them have not been very accurately assessed. Certainly so far as the supply of pulpwood is concerned and so far as the supply of some of our most precious minerals, including tin, are concerned, we do know that they are there in great quantity.

I do not share the sentiments expressed by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut three additional minutes.

Mr. McMAHON. I do not share the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that the admission of Alaska as a State would militate against the interests of my State. True it is that my State is not one of the five largest States of the Union, but it is an industrial State located in the northeastern part of the country. I am also aware of the fact that I have one ninety-sixth of the voting power of the Senate. If Alaska and Hawaii were admitted into the Union, I would have one one-hundredth of the voting power of the Senate.

But advert to the argument made by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] that his regional interests would be prejudiced by the admission of Alaska——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Connecticut is aware of the fact, is he not, that I said even though it did conflict with regional interests, in my judgment such interest should give way to the national interest?

Mr. McMAHON. I appreciate the comment of the Senator from Illinois. Permit me to congratulate him on his statement. I wish to make the point that every time the boundaries of the United States have been enlarged in our history, and every time new States have been brought into the Union, the Union as a whole has become richer, better, and stronger.

Mr. President, I feel that the admission of Hawaii and Alaska as States, with the speedy development and exploitation of their resources, which would come through the protection that statehood would give to new settlers, would constitute a source of productive wealth which would flow both ways. Of the wealth that flows into the continental United States some finds its way into my State of Connecticut, which I have the honor to serve in the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has again expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, some people in Connecticut make the argument that we collect more in income taxes in Connecticut than is appropriated out of the Federal Treasury to be spent in Connecticut. They refer, of course, to the direct appropriations which are made for river and harbor development in Connecticut and other Federal expenditures.

I say that is a fallacious way of looking at it, because if we bring about the creation of great wealth by the development of natural resources, such as the Bonneville Dam, for example, which is 3,000 miles from Connecticut, people in that area will have money with which to buy insurance policies which are issued by insurance companies in Hartford, Conn. They will have money to purchase some of the 10,000 articles we make so well in Connecticut.

In my opinion nothing could constitute a more fallacious argument. If that argument were any good, then at any time in the past when we have extended the boundaries of the United States, the States which were in existence before that extension occurred would have become poorer, instead of richer. However, the fact of the matter is that we have become richer.

Alaska is the richest Territory now undeveloped, and contains the largest amount of natural resources to be found in any place we know of on the face of the globe. The quicker we integrate Alaska into our own system and admit it as a State, with Members of Congress to represent it, the quicker we shall become a greater, more productive, and stronger Nation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, since the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who describes himself as one of the hog-tied representatives of the conquered provinces of Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and Ohio, has replied very frankly, sincerely, and, I think, straightforwardly to an argument I have been making as to why I intend to vote to recommit this measure, I wish to explain my position, in the hope that the explanation will not be worse than the offense.

As the Senator from Illinois has said, the vote of the southern States will be diluted. However, Mr. President, Kentucky did not secede from the Union in the Civil War; and Kentucky did not secede from the Union in 1948, when President Truman ran for the Presidency of the United States.

In Kentucky, we are now in the unfortunate position that our legislature, which now is in session, is trying to redistrict the State, with great turmoil and distress, with the likelihood that we shall lose one of two of the ablest men who have represented our State in years, either Representative JOE B. BATES, of Greenup, Ky., or Representative BRENT SPENCE, of Fort Thomas, Ky., both of whom are well known and are highly esteemed by so many of the Members of Congress. This year our State is to lose one of its Representatives in the Congress of the United States, due to the reapportionment. Yet we are asked to give Alaska one Representative and two United States Senators.

This fall I must campaign for election to the United States Senate, and at that time I must try to make to the people of my State the plea, which I believe is an honest one, that the fate of this Nation hangs in the balance, depending upon whether the control goes one way or the other, now being determined, as it is, by only four votes, or before that by only three votes, until the time when our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY] was appointed to the Senate.

If there is any validity to that argument, there is no way on earth by which I could explain why I voted to give two votes in the Senate to Alaska, which has a population only as large as that of the county in which I live, which is but one of the 120 counties in the State of Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Does either the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Wyoming desire to be heard at this time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of discussion as to whether by admitting Alaska we shall be admitting a Territory which has too small a population.

Before the Senate votes today, I think we should examine the record. According to the report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as of 1950 Alaska had a population of 128,643.

Let us examine the record of the population of some of the present States at the time when they were admitted into the Union.

At that time their populations were as follows:

Idaho, 88,548; Florida, 87,445; Wyoming, 62,555; Mississippi, 75,448; Arkansas, 97,574; Missouri, 66,586; Ohio, 45,365; Oregon, 52,465; Illinois, 55,211; Louisiana, 76,556; Tennessee, 105,602; Nevada, 6,857; North Dakota, 109,983; Alabama, 127,901; Kansas, 107,206.

Mr. President, Alaska alone has at this time a population greater than 15 of the States now represented in this Chamber had at the time when they were admitted from territorial status into the status of statehood.

Sometimes it is argued by some of my friends on this side of the aisle that there is some doubt about how the Republicans of Alaska feel regarding the admission of Alaska to statehood. I am sorry that more Members of the Senate were not present when my distinguished colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] spoke yesterday. However, for the benefit of those who may be interested, let me say that he placed in the RECORD a number of telegrams, which appear on pages 1386 and 1387 of the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD. At this time I shall read to the Senate only one of those telegrams, as follows:

JUNEAU, ALASKA, *February 19, 1952.*
Hon. GUY C. COBDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please be advised that the Republican Party in Alaska at its last convention held at Sitka made the following statement of its principles and convictions by including in its platform: "We advocate immediate statehood for Alaska." The position taken by that convention was affirmed by the National Republican Convention and on every occasion has been reaffirmed by Republican organizations both within and without Alaska.

HENRY A. BENSON,
Secretary, Republican Central Committee for Alaska.

Mr. President, who is authorized to speak for the Republicans of Alaska, if not their official central committee? So at least the argument about alleged opposition by Republicans should not carry any weight with Members on this side of the aisle.

At this time I wish to read to the Senate the following information which I received just yesterday:

In the discussion of statehood for California, the prime factor involved was the reluctance of the Senators from the South in admitting another free State. At that time, there were 14 slave and 15 free States in the Union; and California, it was felt, would swing the balance, especially since she had written into her constitution a provision against slavery.

In the CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE Appendix for the Thirty-first Congress, page 1537, are contained the following remarks by Senator Houston, during this debate. His speech was made on August 13, 1850, as follows:

"I am for admitting them (California) as a State. I contend that it is an inherent right in the American people, wherever they are thrown together in sufficient numbers, that they shall establish some government for themselves. You cannot plant upon a spot of the earth a thousand Americans that will not establish for themselves free institutions. Sir, I contend that, upon the principle of self-government, California is entitled to come into this Union as a State."

This statement is all the more surprising in the light of the strong opposition and road blocks put up by the other southern Senators. D. L. Yulee, of Florida, filibustered for 3 days. Others tried every means at their disposal to block the vote. Even after the Senate had voted and approved the statehood bill, feeling ran so strongly that 10 Members of that body signed a protest over the admittance. This was put into the record some 2 days later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield 3 additional minutes to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from California the additional time he requests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes more.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So, Mr. President, the present opposition to the admission of a new State is not new. If men had not had sufficient vision at the time when the present States were admitted into the Union, we would have had a much smaller and a much weaker Union than we have today.

Mr. President, nations and individuals cannot stand still; for them there is no such thing as a status quo; they either grow or they die.

I believe this great Union of ours must have some of the same faith that was had by those who were responsible for bringing into the Union the States which are represented in this Chamber today. We must renew the faith they had, without which we would not have the great assembly that we have here today.

Certainly I am sure that the future will prove that Alaska and Hawaii are destined to be two of the great States of the United States.

This is no time for us to adopt a defeatist attitude. This is no time for us to say that America has had her greatest growth, and that now she must wither away. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I think we are just on the threshold of important new developments.

So I hope that by an overwhelming vote the Senate will reject the motion to recommit. I hope that even Senators who, for reasons best known to themselves, may be opposed to the granting of statehood to either Alaska or Hawaii, will at least permit us to vote on the definite, clear-cut issue of granting statehood, and not by indirection deny the Senate of the United States an opportunity to vote either up or down this important issue.

Mr. President, this is the time and the place for the Senate of the United States and the two great parties represented in it to stand up and be counted and to carry out the pledges in their platforms.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield me a few minutes?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield a few minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, last week I told the Senator from Mississippi I would place in the RECORD statistics showing the exact vote of the people of Alaska in the referendum which was conducted on the statehood question. I have those exact figures before me at this time. In a direct referendum the vote of the people of Alaska, on the question of statehood, was 9,630 for, 6,822 against.

Those figures show, of course, what the people of Alaska, regardless of political affiliations, think about this matter.

I also told the Senator from Mississippi I would place in the RECORD the exact figures of the Gallup poll, February 2, 1952, showing what the people of the United States think of this proposal. On the question of statehood for Hawaii, the vote was 69 percent for, 11 percent against; 20 percent, no opinion. That shows conclusively what the American people think of statehood for Hawaii. On the question of statehood for Alaska, 76 percent were for, 8 percent were against, and 16 percent were of no opinion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion concerning Alaska's strategic position and air mileages from Alaska to other points in the world. I think those mileages should be placed in the RECORD at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the absence of the Senator from Wyoming, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

In order that the RECORD may be clear, I desire to state the distances from Fairbanks, Alaska, to various other places in the world. From Fairbanks, Alaska, to Rome, Italy, it is 5,050 miles; from Fairbanks to Prague, Czechoslovakia, 4,480 miles; from Fairbanks to Paris, 4,450 miles; from Fairbanks to Warsaw, Poland, 4,350 miles; from Fairbanks to Berlin, Germany, 4,320 miles; from Fairbanks to London, England, 4,280 miles; and from Fairbanks to Moscow, 4,150 miles. This demonstrates that, speaking in global terms, the farther one goes from Fairbanks into Russian territory, the closer he gets to Fairbanks.

From Fairbanks to Stockholm, Sweden, it is 3,870 miles; from Fairbanks to Oslo, Norway, 3,800 miles; from Fairbanks to Tokyo, it is 3,500 miles due west. It is almost as far from Fairbanks to Japan as it is from Alaska to many of the strategic points in Europe. From Fairbanks to Washington, D. C., is 3,270 miles; from Fairbanks to New York, 3,255 miles; from Fairbanks to Chicago, by way of the inland route, it is 2,790 miles, and from Fairbanks to Seattle, down the coast, it is 1,525 miles.

I know of no more graphic illustration of what the late Gen. Billy Mitchell meant, when he said, "He who controls Alaska controls the world," than a statement of these air distances as I have read them into the RECORD.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at the outset, once again I should like to express my admiration and respect for the very able chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. Certainly in the 13 months I have been a member of that committee, with the exception of Senate bill 50 and Senate bill 49, he has conducted hearings fairly, impartially, and always very pleasantly. E regardless of what I may say hereafter, I want that to be well understood by him.

I should also like to say to the Senator from Illinois, when he suggests that the reason for many southern Senators being against this bill is because they are worried about the diminution in the power of their votes, that I know that is not true insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned. I know, too, that it is not true insofar as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned; I know

it is not true insofar as the junior Senator from Oklahoma is concerned, and I doubt whether it is true of hardly any of the Senators from the South. It is unfortunate that every time somebody wants to whip somebody else into line it is necessary to bring forth the old argument that those attempted to be whipped into line are against civil rights or that the question at issue has something to do with civil rights. Such is not the case here. It is unfortunate that every time somebody stands up to express a conscientious belief against a certain program, he is immediately branded as an obstructionist, or un-American, or something of that nature. In this morning's newspaper there appears an advertisement inserted by citizens who want statehood for Alaska, in which they say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] to the motion to recommit, which amendment requests hearings on the plausibility of a commonwealth status, is a specious, un-American suggestion. It seems to me the time has come when Senators should be able to discuss these matters without attributing base motives to those who may choose to disagree with them.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the pending proposal to admit the Territory of Alaska into the Union at this time, for very basic reasons. It has generally been admitted today that it is a most important subject, and every Senator who has spoken has said that the world is looking at us; that Russia might decide what course she will follow by reason of what we do with 108,000 civilians. There can be no doubt that the move contemplated is an important one, and one of my reasons for being opposed to this bill being brought up as it has been is that, important as it is, there has never been one single day of hearing held on it in this Congress. There has never been one witness permitted to come before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to say that he was for the bill or against it, and to have an opportunity of expressing his reasons for his position.

As a matter of fact, during the Eighty-second Congress there has never been any public hearing whatever as to whether Alaska should even be admitted as a State; and on the bill, Senate bill 50, so far as I know, there has never been any hearings whatever, in all the history of the Congress.

Earlier today the very able Senator from Nebraska said there have never been any hearings held in Alaska, where the people most concerned would like to have an opportunity of stating how they feel about the bill. There has never been such a Senate hearing in that Territory for the poor people who might realize that statehood would mean greater burdens to them and who would like to have had an opportunity to testify. They had no opportunity if they did not have about $600 with which to pay their way from Anchorage to Washington. If they did have it they could then come to Washington to make their voices heard.

No, Mr. President, when this bill came up before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the junior Senator from Florida asked that hearings be held, because we felt that it was of great importance.

Finally, after we insisted that hearings be held, the question was put to a vote, a very unusual procedure, and by a vote of 7 to 6 we were denied hearings. Six members of the committee asked that hearings be held, but this was not permitted.

Mr. President, I feel that this very important departure from ordinary good legislative procedure is almost as important as is the whole questoin of statehood. It has been my understanding that the reason why we have committees in the United States Senate is because the Senate as a body is too large to consider in detail the great volume of complicated matters which come before it. So the various bills must be referred to committees, where the committee members can have an opportunity to go into the questions involved very thoroughly.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, it is also my understanding that each Senator who sits on a committee has a responsibility to his fellow Senators to examine very closely into the facts, the arguments both for and against, and then, when a measure comes to the floor, to give the arguments pro and con so that other Senators who have not had an opportunity to study it may be advised as to the merits of the proposed legislation.

Opportunity to fulfill that function was denied the junior Senator from Louisiana and the junior Senator from Florida. It is significant, Mr. President, I submit, that since the last hearings were held on this very important matter 17 new Senators have come into this body for the first time, and there have not been any hearings.

Mr. President, at the risk of being repetitious, it seems to me we should emphasize once again that Congress is not a continuing body, that every time it ends a 2-year period, it legally comes to an end. At the beginning of the next Congress any proposed legislation which was not acted upon during the previous Congress has to be reintroduced. Committees have to be reconstituted. Hearings are once again held; and that is the reason why we see hearings being held on subjects on which countless pages of hearings have previously been held.

The able Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], a member of the Armed Services Committee, has been present at hearings on universal military training and the very able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is holding hearings of that committee today. Hearings are being held on the St. Lawrence waterway project. Hearings have been held in the past on Alaska and Hawaii, but that is no reason why we should upset orderly procedure and not give six Senators the right to have further hearings.

It is interesting to observe, Mr. President, that another matter—the so-called tidelands bill—came up a few weeks later, and a tidelands bill was reported. Before that happened, however, the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] offered an amendment to the tidelands bill which was disposed of by a vote of 7 to 4. After the amendment had been disposed of, and after the major part of the bill had been disposed of, the very able chairman of the committee [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said he was going to hold hearings on that particular amendment, even though the amendment and the bill had already been disposed of and the bill reported. He made a most meritorious and praiseworthy statement, when he said there had been a substantial request for hearings and, therefore, he was going to grant hearings even though the matter had already been disposed of.

I am sure the Senator did not mean to imply that the six Senators who asked for hearings on the Alaskan statehood question were not substantial Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator will recall that before the committee had acted upon the submerged lands bill the committee, by unanimous consent, called the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] before the committee to explain his amendment. He took about 10 minutes to do that, and he said he had come unprepared and had hoped that he would have additional time.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was for that reason and only for that reason that the action was taken.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator somehow considered that it was a substantial request from one Senator, but when two members of his own committee asked him to hold hearings, and six voted to hold hearings, he did not consider it a substantial request in connection with one of the most important issues now pending before this body.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida knows that the chairman of the committee did not control the votes of the Senators who voted.

Mr. SMATHERS. There was a one-vote margin. The Senator could have voted with us.

There were a number of questions which I should naturally have liked to propound to certain witnesses, both for and against the proposition of statehood for Alaska. I was not permitted to do that.

Mr. President, I think it is important for us to keep in mind the size of Alaska. If we lay a map of Alaska over a map of the United States we will find it reaches from Charleston, S. C., to San Francisco, Calif. Alaska has a coast line as long as that of the coast line of the States of the Union put together. It has 375,000,000 acres of land, and yet we find in that vast Territory only 108,000 civilians, 35,000 of them natives, Aleuts, and Eskimos.

From the arguments we have heard today it seems to be suggested that because Alaska has a population of 108,000 and other Territories previously admitted had no more, therefore Alaska is entitled to be admitted into the Union.

It seems to me it is unfair to base the case of a 1952 Territory on 1845 standards.

The very able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] referred to the admission of the Territory of Florida into the Union. In 1845—when Florida was admitted—there were only 20,000,000 people in the entire United States. There was 1 person in Florida for every 285 persons in the United States at that time. If we look at Alaska today, we find there is only 1 person to every 1,388 people in the United States. Alaska, to be equal to Florida percentagewise, would have to increase its population five times.

Let us not forget that if we admit Alaska, we are, in the matter of population, lowering the standard percentagewise to a point to which it has never been lowered before. Certainly it is undisputed that there are fewer people in Alaska per square mile than there have ever been in any other Territory at the time it was admitted to the Union. This can be an important question, insofar as admitting Territories into the Union is concerned, depending upon how we look at it. It seems to me it is important because of the fact that there are so few people in Alaska, and because it is such a vast Territory and its present government is burdensome. Even the proponents of Alaskan statehood admit that statehood will raise the cost of government anywhere from 50 to 100 percent. If we care to examine the figures, I think we will come to the conclusion that the cost will be raised 100 percent rather than 50 percent.

I think a perusal of the figures will show that if, under statehood the cost of government is raised 100 percent, taxes in the proposed State of Alaska will be 216 percent higher than in any State in the Union. I should like to have those who desire to help Alaska think about that. Is that the way to develop a Territory? Is that the course to follow to encourage new people to come in, to put in front of them a mounting tax burden? Ordinarily, people go where they can get away from high taxes, not to places where they will have a higher tax load placed upon them.

Mr. President, we did not have the opportunity to hear the testimony of the proponents of statehood. We had to dig it up ourselves in the Library of Congress, as was suggested to us. But we went there and dug it up, and we learned something about Alaska. In any even, if anyone desires to read the hearings held 2 years ago, he will find that even the proponents of the bill admitted that for a person to go to Alaska, it was necessary for him to have $5,000 in his pocket, and extremely good credit. I feel, Mr. President, that if a person has $5,000 in his pocket, plus the cost of transporting himself and his family to Alaska, he would probably find no reason for going to that frontier area. Furthermore, he can understand that if he has $5,000, plus the cost of transportation, and gets to Alaska he is then necessarily going to have his taxes increased 100 percent if statehood is granted at this time.

Perhaps this is not the way to develop Alaska. Perhaps we should not grant statehood at this time. Perhaps there are better ways by which we can help Alaskans. Certainly, Mr. President, Senate bill 50 does not in any way remedy any of the problems which Alaska has today. We can pass S. 50, but it will still not change the fact that the distance from Chicago to Anchorage is 4,016 miles. It will still not change the fact, as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] may be interested to know, that Juneau, the capital city of Alaska, has less sunshine annually than has any city in continental United States. It will not change the fact that there is a large glacier around the capital, Juneau. There is no road at present, and apparently there will never be one, because it would have to be built over a moving glacier, and no one as yet has been able to devise a way to construct it.

Mr. President, if we are desirous of helping the Territory of Alaska, it may be that we should not consider admitting it as a State at the moment, but should consider breaking the hold of the Department of the Interior, which now seems to have Alaska by the neck.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Figures have been presented here to show how mild the weather is and how warm the temperature is in the southeastern section of Alaska. I believe it should be pointed out to Members of the Senate that the reason why the temperature is so mild is that the Japanese current runs so close and the rainfall is so great that that section does not have a chance to get cold.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator. We can help Alaskans by breaking the stranglehold of the Department of the Interior on 99.4 percent of the land in Alaska. Senate bill 50 does not do that. Even if the bill should be passed in its present form, it would still leave the Department of the Interior in charge of more than 90 percent of all the land in Alaska.

As a matter of fact, what Alaskans want is to break this stranglehold. They do not want statehood at the moment. The most recent vote on the question of what they really want was held at the last session of the legislature, when two resolutions were considered. One was No. 36, the other was No. 26. Resolution No. 26 asked Congress to give Alaskans the right to elect their own judges and governor. Resolution No. 36 urged Congress to grant statehood, but that resolution was not adopted. I submit that that was the most recent vote indicating what the people of Alaska really want.

It seems to me there are many questions which should have been asked about the pending bill. I wanted to ask some of the witnesses about section 1 of Senate bill 50. When House bill 331 passed the House of Representatives, and hearings were held upon it in the Senate committee, the bill described the boundary of Alaska as being one marine league from the coast line. But Senate bill 50 does not provide for the boundary being one marine league from the coast line. As a matter of fact, by legislative action that provision has been deleted. Yet, Mr. President, when the great States of California, Oregon, and Washington were admitted to the Union, either the enabling acts or their constitutions provided that the boundary line should be one marine league from the coast.

Mr. President, I submit that what is being attempted here is to settle the tidelands issue in the bill for Alaskan statehood. Proponents of the bill would like to have the United States Senate go on record as not favoring for the proposed new State extending beyond its immediate coastline, which would affirm the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case. If this is done, then in 2 or 3 weeks, when we have before us the tidelands issue, we will find ourselves in the very embarrassing situation of having voted 2 weeks previously to limit the coast line of the States to the area right along the shore, and we shall be estopped from voting for a quit claim bill.

This is rather a subtle way to have the Senate affirm the California case without having the matter brought up in public hearings, as should be done.

I have noted, Mr. President, that many Senators have said they favor statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, or one of them, but nothing more.

I should like to say that we are setting a pattern. It is not going to be very easy for some Senators, who may today vote for statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, to stand upon the Senate floor and say that they cannot vote statehood for Puerto Rico. They will try to excuse their stand on the ground that Puerto Rico is an unincorporated Territory, while Alaska and Hawaii are incorporated Territories.

Mr. President, I am sure the average citizen who walks the streets of Puerto Rico, or the average citizen who walks the streets of Alaska, has no more idea of what it means for a Territory to be incorporated or unincorporated than has my 8-year-old son, and he has no idea whatsoever.

I think it would be unbecoming for this great deliberative body to give statehood to 108,000 civilians in Alaska, but opposed giving it to two and one-half million in Puerto Rico, merely because Alaska is incorporated, while Puerto Rico is unincorporated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield myself two additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. We are setting a pattern for taking into the Union noncontiguous areas. The only two States to come into the Union which were noncontiguous to other States were California and Louisiana. All States which have come into the Union have been contiguous either to another State or to another United States Territory which it could logically be assumed would itself some day become a State.

I am sure that even the able Senator from Wyoming, who is chairman of the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, cannot explain how Alaska will ever be contiguous to the United States.

I feel certain he does not for a moment profess that we are going to take in the great Commonwealth of Canada. It may be that if we could take in Canada, we could also take in Ireland. I do not know.

If we take in Alaska and Hawaii, then obviously we shall sooner or later have the same argument made for statehood for Puerto Rico, Guam, and our other possessions. It may be that that is what we should do. I do not know. But I will say that a question of such tremendous importance as this should have come before the committee, where public hearings could have been held, where 17 new Senators who had never had the benefit of hearings could have been present to listen if they cared to do so, where a new record could have been made, and where up-to-date facts could have been brought out.

Mr. President, I submit that what has been done in this instance is not in accord with good parliamentary procedure and is not fair to new Senators. If it is, then everyone is going to say, "Do not elect new Senators in the future. Keep the old ones."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator think it would be a pretty good idea to keep the older Senators? [Laughter.]

Mr. SMATHERS. All of us must agree that proper legislative procedure calls for hearings. There have never been any hearings in the Eighty-second Congress on this bill. The provisions of the bill have not been examined with the minuteness and care becoming a deliberative body such as the United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Florida has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, by agreement with the Senator from Florida, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that the time will be taken from neither side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chief Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Dworshak	Ives
Anderson	Ecton	Jenner
Bennett	Ellender	Johnson, Colo.
Benton	Ferguson	Johnson, Tex.
Brewster	Flanders	Johnston, S. C.
Bricker	Frear	Kefauver
Bridges	Fulbright	Kem
Butler, Md.	George	Kerr
Butler, Nebr.	Gillette	Kilgore
Byrd	Green	Knowland
Cain	Hayden	Langer
Capehart	Hendrickson	Lehman
Case	Hennings	Long
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Magnuson
Clements	Hill	Malone
Connally	Hoey	Martin
Cordon	Holland	Maybank
Douglas	Humphrey	McCarran
Duff	Hunt	McCarthy
McClellan	Nixon	Smith, N. C.
McFarland	O'Conor	Sparkman
McKellar	O'Mahoney	Stennis
McMahon	Pastore	Taft
Millikin	Robertson	Thye
Monroney	Russell	Tobey
Moody	Saltonstall	Underwood
Morse	Schoeppel	Watkins
Mundt	Seaton	Wiley
Murray	Smathers	Williams
Neely	Smith, Maine	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I hope to be able to return a part of the 5 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming for use by someone more able than I am to present this case. However, I wish the RECORD again to show that I rise in favor of the bill for statehood for Alaska and in opposition to the motion to recommit the bill with instructions.

This question has been debated pro and con for days. There has been no argument made for the proposal or against it that has not been heard in the United States Senate on at least 35 previous occasions. Such arguments are heard every time there is a bill before this body to grant statehood to a Territory of the United States. Many of those debates, or excerpts from them, have been made a part of the RECORD. It would be idle to refer to them again. They are there for all who desire to inform themselves on the subject.

There has been nothing presented here in opposition to statehood for Alaska which has not been heard time and time again, and, no doubt, it will be heard on this floor if, as, and when the bill for statehood for Hawaii shall come before us. I hope it may seasonably follow the bill now under consideration.

Mr. President, this subject has received consideration before the committee. Hearings have been held. If it be a sound basis for recommittal of the bill that the subject has not been reopened for hearings every time a request has been made for hearings, or every time the committee finds it necessary to change some portion of the language, to insert a comma or semicolon, or delete a word, we shall never have anything in the Senate but committee hearings, and we shall pass nothing but the time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I have only 5 minutes allotted to me. I am sorry I cannot yield. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Florida as I have already stated to him, that he did request hearings time and time again. I opposed his position, and I opposed it for the reason that I am setting forth today, namely, that in my opinion we had all the hearings that were necessary to be held to present all the facts. Hearings would have been superfluous from that time on. If we had opened the subject it could have dragged on until we would never have had an opportunity to act on the question in this session of Congress, time and conditions being what they are. For that reason I opposed any additional hearing. I believe that my position was the correct one to take.

Mr. President, I shall not go into the merits of the question again. I shall take the liberty, if I may, of reading into the RECORD what I said on the same subject at another time:

> My position with reference to statehood for Alaska and statehood for Hawaii can be summed up thus: If taxation without representation was tyranny in 1776, it is tyranny today. If the right of people to govern themselves, to participate in their Government, was so dear to those giants of old who gathered and promulgated and signed the Declaration of Independence, that they were willing to pledge their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, in support of that proposition, it is just as dear today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we Democrats throughout the country during this season are observing Jefferson-Jackson Day and are having many dinners in honor of these two great Americans.

Andrew Jackson is the shining light in vindicating the democratic principles enumerated by the founder of our Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson.

Andrew Jackson, I believe all of us will concede, had a pretty good idea of what was in the interest of this Nation and of the kind of expansion we should consider in the years to come.

In the 1830's, he saw the importance of Alaska.

Andrew Jackson was the first Member of Congress from the State of Tennessee. There was doubt about him among his neighbors in those early days of our Republic, just as there is often doubt today about persons as well as measures.

I recall a letter that was written to Jackson about that time. It was from a neighbor, Mark Mitchell. He wrote:

> DEAR ANDREW: So you're going to offer for Congress. Your size is against you. I don't know anyone weighing a hundred and forty in Congress.
>
> But get yourself a pair of cotton overalls and wear your great coat. You've got a loud speech and you might make it.
>
> MARK MITCHELL.

History pretty well takes care of Andrew Jackson—as a Member of Congress, as a governor, as a Senator, as a general, and as President.

It is not generally known, however, that President Jackson took the very first American steps to "brush up" on what are now Alaska and Hawaii.

We generally think of the first interest manifested by us in what is Alaska today as stemming from the negotiations that opened in the Polk administration around 1845 to 1847. Two offers of $5,000,000 for the territory of the Russians on this continent are reported. But what history does not mention is that Andrew Jackson had his eyes on the west as early as 1836. He wanted to know more about Russian America, and a forgotten chapter of our interest in the Pacific comes to light in a letter written from Mexico in 1836 by William A. Slocum, an agent of our State Department, operating under the supervision of Secretary of State John A. Forsyth.

Slocum met Baron Wrangell, ex-governor of the Russian settlements, in Cali-

fornia, then a part of Mexico, and reported:

I feel perfectly satisfied that the Hudson Bay Co. is making encroachments within our line, even as far as 45° north latitude, destroying the beaver dams where there is any doubt as to jurisdiction. * * * The Russians' principal establishment is at Sitka-New Archangel. * * * I think it will be worth the attention of our Government to allow me to go to Sitka after visiting the Oregon * * * from the Sandwich Islands. I can get a small vessel to take me thither * * * then go from Sikta to Okatsh, and then overland to St. Petersburg * * * the cost will be about $500.

If the President thinks favorably of my views, I doubt not I could get much useful information for our Government, and I am willing to endure any privations and hardships for the good of my country.

Andrew Jackson read the letter from Slocum, and in his own handwriting told the Secretary of State that—

The information suggested by Mr. Slocum's tour is well worthy of the expense. I will have no hesitation in approving it as required.

I am happy to say that my State, Tennessee, has always had the vision of western development. When the treaty for the cession of Russian America came before the United States Senate in early April of the year 1867, 37 votes were cast in favor of it. Two were cast against it. Senators David T. Patterson and Joseph S. Fowler from the Volunteer State were among the 37 affirmative votes. Later, the next year, when the bill came up for paying the sum of $7,200,000 for Alaska, Tennessee had eight Congressmen, and when the final vote was taken, Tennessee registered her opinion, seven votes for, with but one against.

It is not necessary to remind you that Alaska was added to the United States domain under the administration of another Tennessean—President Andrew Johnson. To William H. Seward, of New York, his Secretary of State, was entrusted the task of the negotiations that gave us a Territory one-fifth the size of the whole United States, 584,600 square miles.

The vision of Andrew Jackson and Andrew Johnson was for a great America. Events have fully justified them.

Today, let our vision for America in 1952 be no less than that of 1836.

Let us vote for Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the vote on the pending motion will constitute a very clear and direct test of how much a political-party platform means and to what extent it is respected. It is a test of whether campaign pledges made to the electorate are to be kept or broken.

The platforms of both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party pledge statehood for Alaska. I consider a vote for this motion to be a vote to pigeonhole the bill and thus to defeat it under a parliamentary smoke screen. If the motion carries and the bill is thus defeated, then both parties might as well junk their platforms and not make any more, for they then become fraudulent farces upon the American people.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA AND HAWAII IS THE ROAD TO PEACE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it has been stated that all the arguments against statehood for Alaska are old arguments which have been raised against the admission of almost every State into the Union. That is the fact. The timid warnings of Daniel Webster against the admission of California have been repeated by those who have far more reason than he to know their opportunities for growth presented by distant Territories. "What can we do with the western coast?" he asked in an eloquent but worried voice, "a coast of 3,000 miles, rockbound, treeless, uninviting, and not a harbor in it. I will never vote one cent from the Public Treasury to place the Pacific Ocean one inch nearer Boston than it is now."

How tragically wrong was the great orator. But not more so than those who today see in Alaska nothing but a wilderness. These old arguments are as worthless today as when they were uttered over and over again against the admission of almost every Western and Southern State.

However, if Senators were to think that there are no other issues involved than these threadbare fears of early days, they would be making a great mistake.

I am reminded of the fact that when Napoleon was taken to St. Helena after Waterloo and the period of war which his ambition had brought upon Europe was brought to an end, 55 years elapsed before Bismarck again bathed Europe in blood by his invasion of France. When the Franco-Prussian War was over many people thought that perhaps there would be an end to war, or at least a century of peace. They were mistaken, for only 47 years elapsed before the Kaiser again forced Europe into war, a conflict which eventually involved the United States and became the First World War.

The Kaiser was defeated and banished from Germany as Napoleon had been banished from France.

The victors sought to make peace. World War I was ended, but only 11 years elapsed between the fall of the Kaiser and the rise of Hitler and Hirohito in the beginning of World War II.

There we have the history of modern times, a constantly and steadily diminishing period of peace and the recurrence of more bloody and widespread wars. Members of the Senate who have the opportunity of sitting upon the Appropriations Committee and, indeed, all Members who have the opportunity of reading the reports, know that the cost of war is mounting with even greater rapidity than that which marks the outbreak of international war.

We are now drifting into a third world war, Mr. President. The cost of that war in blood and money will be beyond imagination. Our preparedness program is more costly than previous wars.

Mr. President, I say the time has come to try the way of peace. I assert with all the earnestness at my command that the way of statehood is the way of peace.

I have before me in the Chamber a chart of the Territory of Alaska, which I trust will soon be a State. The chart shows the distribution of the unmeasured natural resources of this vast Territory.

Let us bear in mind that in war we have been spending the mineral resources of continental United States. In World War II we shot away one-fifth of all the iron ore that had been dug in 100 years from the Mesabi Range. One-half of all the aluminum and the copper we are producing will be used in the preparedness program. Not for industry and the building of a world at peace, but for the weapons of war are we using our resources.

Let us look at this map of Alaska. In Alaska are found not only gold, but also coal, oil, tungsten, power, bismuth, zinc, antimony, tin, platinum, lead, more tungsten, manganese, more bismuth, copper, more coal, more oil, more power, more antimony, wood pulp, and fishing of all kinds up and down the peninsula are the resources that can help us to build for peace, the resources that will help to make us independent of foreign sources of supply, the mineral resources we need for defense.

On the map of the world, the Territory of Alaska lies in exactly the same parallels of latitude as those in which the Scandinavian peninsula lies. We can look forward to a steady expansion of population and industry when statehood is granted.

Mr. President, that is not all. Not only does Alaska have resources which we need, but let me now show the Senate on the map of the world how statehood for Alaska and Hawaii will be a long step toward peace. The Bering Strait is 50 miles across. The one hundred and fifty-sixth meridian of longitude passes directly through both Territories. I say without hesitation or reservation of any kind that these two incorporated Territories when admitted into the Federal Union as States will be worth 10 divisions to the free nations, for this action by the Congress will not only raise the morale of the Americans in both Territories but will prove to the people of Asia and of the whole world that we are not colonial imperialists.

The testimony before the Appropriations Committee shows how the cost of defense is rising. The B–17 bombers, for example, which destroyed the German military power in World War II cost approximately $117,000 each. The modern bomber we are building now flies so much higher and so much faster than the B–17 that each unit costs $3,500,000—approximately eight times as much. This is the monetary measure of war.

Mr. President, there is no inflation in statehood. There is no unbalanced budget. There is no mounting cost, for statehood will uncover new resources for the United States. There is no added national debt in making it possible to recover these minerals. We shall only be showing the world how to help itself. We shall be promoting peace.

Furthermore, there is the argument on the spiritual side that by admitting Alaska and Hawaii to statehood we shall be winning the minds of mankind for we shall be practicing what we preach. Let it be known throughout the Asiatic world that we are admitting to statehood these

two great incorporated Territories—Alaska, the property of the United States for 85 years, promised statehood over and over again by the Congress; Hawaii, an independent republic which came into the United States by treaty of its own volition, and was promised statehood—the propaganda of Russia will then fall fruitlessly on the ears of those who seek release from imperialism.

O Mr. President, the vote today will tell us whether we are going to take a step along the road to peace or whether, by sacrificing our solemn promises to these people, we are to tell the world that reliance cannot be placed upon the promises we make to our own people. The latter is the message which will go out from this Chamber today if the Senate votes to recommit.

O Mr. President, an effort is made by our friends who oppose statehood for these territories to divide and conquer; they say now in the face of the instructions in the motion to recommit that Alaska and Hawaii are separate issues. Beware. They would defeat Alaska today, and at some time in the future defeat Hawaii. If the recommittal vote is carried they will change ground and say that Hawaii was defeated when Alaska fell.

Mr. President, these two Territories stand together in reason, in logic, in philosophy, and in good sense. Let us keep them together.

Mr. President, I urge upon the Senate the rejection of the motion to recommit, with all its instructions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida is recognized at this time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly the reasons why I shall vote in favor of the motion to recommit.

Although I do not agree with all the reasons included in the minority views, which were signed by five Senators, among them three Republican members of the committee, I think the basic conclusion of those views is correct. That is why I shall vote for the motion to recommit.

Under the provisions of this bill, I think Alaska would remain an economic dependency of the Federal Government. Under those conditions, Alaska would not be a free State. I think the Senators and Representatives who would come from Alaska would be controlled, regardless of whether they were Democratic or Republican, by the administration in power.

Mr. President, it seems to me that at the present time, at least, Alaska is not an economic unit. I do not think Alaska can fulfill the financial responsibilities and obligations of statehood. In that respect, Alaska is in great contrast to the Territory of Hawaii.

I am strongly in favor of voting for statehood for Hawaii. Not only does Hawaii have 5 times the population of Alaska, but Hawaii has economic resources which make her entirely self-supporting and will make her a full member of the congregation of States which make up the United States.

I do not mean to suggest that we cannot hope to have statehood for Alaska; but I think this particular bill could have been improved and should be improved by the committee, when the bill is recommitted, so that Alaska may be more self-supporting. As one instance, let me point out that the bill grants to Alaska certain lands—the Federal Government now owning most of the lands—for her use, and the bill provides for the selection of such lands from public lands which remain vacant, unappropriated, and unreserved. The lands available for such selection would be of doubtful value, because all the desirable public lands in Alaska have heretofore either been reserved or withdrawn. That is one respect in which Alaska might be made more self-supporting by the liberal grant of Federal lands.

Referring to the Republican Party's platform of 1948, it says:

> We favor eventual statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico.

That platform pledge particularly looks in the same direction in which I am suggesting that the committee may look, by saying:

> We urge development of Alaskan land communications and natural resources.

I should say that could be brought about by their assignment to the public or to the new State, in such a way that Alaska could finally become a completely self-supporting community. If that objective could be attained, I would be very much in favor of statehood for Alaska. It seems to me, therefore, that the committee, by further consideration of this bill, can endeavor to set Alaska up as an economic, self-supporting unit, and it can bring back to the Senate, certainly in time, a bill which will provide for such an establishment and enable us to grant statehood to a Territory, which will, in fact, become an independent State, not a dependency of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes. The Senator from Ohio makes a very amazing argument. He says that the Department of the Interior controls too much of the area of Alaska and, therefore, asks the Senate to condemn Alaska to the continued control of the Department of the Interior. The bill before us grants 23,000,000 acres of Alaska to the people of that State, under a State government, and the experience of other States in the West has been that after admission grants have on occasion been increased, after Congress has found that the need for more land had arisen.

The Senator from Ohio says he disagrees in the main with the minority report but favors some of its basic conclusions. Therefore the Senator is on both sides of this issue of statehood.

I want the friends of Hawaiian statehood to realize where the Senator is standing upon this issue.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. What I said was that, while I did not agree with all the statements in the minority report, I did agree with the basic conclusion that Alaska would not be a self-supporting economic community, under the bill as here presented.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understood the Senator correctly, and that is what I tried to say. The minority report says, "Alaska cannot afford statehood at this time." The truth is, Alaska will have a surplus of several million dollars.

The minority report says, "There are no industries for Alaska in prospect now." The truth is that a $40,000,000 pulp-mill development has been started in Ketchikan.

The minority report says that Alaska suffers from "grave economic ills" which are an effective bar to statehood now. This is the ground upon which the Senator from Ohio stands. The truth is that statehood itself is the remedy for the economic ills which the report has discussed. The way to release Alaska from bureaucratic control is to make a State of it. The way to condemn it to continued control by the Department of the Interior is to vote to recommit the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to me under date of January 10, 1952, by the secretary of the Alaska Statehood Committee, Miss Mildred R. Hermann.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA STATEHOOD COMMITTEE,
Juneau, Alaska, January 10, 1952.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The 1951 report of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on the Alaska statehood bill, has been studied with great interest. It is heartening indeed to know that Alaska has the support of such stanch friends as you and your colleagues who signed the majority report, and also to note the report's masterly summation of the case for statehood.

I should like, however, to comment briefly on the arguments set up in the minority report, if I may be permitted to so.

I would not go so far as to say that this section of the report was written by the nonresident canned salmon industry, but certainly I do not hesitate to say that point for point, it bears a striking similarity, to the arguments presented by the industry before your committee in April of 1950, and that it presents no argument that has not been used by the industry, its satellites and camp-followers, throughout the 85 years in which they have opposed every step toward greater autonomy for Alaska and every piece of progressive legislation affecting Alaska introduced either in Congress or the Territorial legislature.

I shall not bother to answer all the inaccuracies that characterize the minority report. Most of them have been answered in minute detail before they were offered as the minority view. To answer them again would be merely to duplicate the arguments in hearings on the bill and in the majority report which summarizes them.

I do, however, wish to point out a few statements in the minority report which

represent glaring inaccuracies, in view of the present status of Territorial affairs.

1. The minority report says "Alaska cannot afford statehood at this time," and attempts to prove the assertion by a categorical charge that the Territory will have a deficit of $2,000,000 at the end of the current biennium.

The truth is that Alaska will have a surplus of several million dollars at the end of the present biennium. Tax revenues paid into the Territorial treasury during the calendar year 1951 totaled $13,982,799.72. Appropriations were made by the last legislature on the basis of an estimated biennial income of $19,000,000. It should therefore be noted that the chairmen of the legislative tax committees whom the minority report has quoted so fulsomely, either guessed wrong to the extent of approximately $7,000,000 for the biennium, were simply talking for the record, or were trying to keep appropriations at a minimum. It is worth noting, I think, that every time these chairmen predicated a deficit for the current biennium, they were challenged by the tax commissioner, the treasurer, the governor, or some other official or citizen who knew the financial picture. These challenges are not mentioned in the report.

Incidentally, to nail another misstatement to the masthead, there is no frozen appropriation of $2,000,000 or any other amount in the Alaska financial picture at the present time.

All the appropriations of the preceding sessions which were frozen because of litigation instituted by the opponents of statehood, and because of the ghastly failure of the 1947 legislature to discharge its responsibility by making revenues match appropriations, have been defrozen and the money made available for the purpose for which appropriated.

So the facts are that not only will Alaska have a substantial surplus for the present biennium, she will also have met the service deficit of $2,000,000 created through the necessity for freezing appropriations during the four preceding years. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance has recently authorized a very inspiring story about the present financial outlook of the Territory. A copy of this has been sent to the members of your committee.

Therefore, our $64 question to the signers of the minority report is: "How many States in the Union can boast a similar sound financial condition and an equally high level of government services?" Can any of their own States?

2. The minority report further says, "There are no industries for Alaska in prospect now."

The truth is a $40,000,000 pulp-mill development has been started in Ketchikan, a plywood factory in Juneau, a tin-mining industry in the second division and numerous new small businesses throughout the Territory have been added to the territorial economy during 1951.

As for those industries still in contemplation, the Alaska Visitors Association, created by Territorial statute at the session of 1951 and financed jointly by private subscriptions, has already made notable progress in setting up the machinery to capitalize on Alaska's unparalleled tourist attractions.

Alaskans believe, and are backing that belief with good, hard cash, that in this field also Alaska has potential resources of untold value.

And two additional pulp mills now being projected can certainly be considered among new industries in prospect—industries that will create new pay rolls and add substantially to the soundness of the economic structure of the Territory. Others, of course, may be anticipated when Alaska is freed, by statehood, from the crippling restrictions that are part and parcel of territoriality.

3. The minority report says that Alaska suffers from "grave economic ills" which are an effective bar to statehood now.

The truth is statehood itself is the remedy for the economic ills which the report has discussed at length.

Alaska is not the first or the only segment of these United States to so suffer. The South has for years suffered from grave economic ills, including those of absentee ownership and high transportation costs such as Alaska is burdened by today.

The West also has suffered from grave economic ills, including the handicap of vast areas of public lands in Federal ownership, a shortage of processing plants for its raw materials, and high transportation costs, even as Alaska.

Nevertheless, in each of these regions, a dozen States comparable, in the aggregate, to the area of Alaska have been carved out, and all of them, it must be assumed, are financing adequate State governments and providing satisfactory service to their citizens, as well as discharging their obligations to the Federal Government.

4. The minority report further asserts that, not statehood, but an elective governor is the answer to Alaska's needs at this time. Here again we see the unmistakable technique of the canned salmon industry—a diversionary appeasement.

The truth is that the right of Alaskans to elect their own governor would not by itself, correct the manifest evils engendered through remote control by Federal agencies. What Alaska needs is voting representation in both Houses of Congress, the kind of representation that all sovereign States have. No governor, elective or appointive, however able or popular, is in a position to work, with full effectivenesss, for Alaska without that supporting representation. All the privileges of first-class citizenship, of which the right to elect their governor is only one, is what Alaskans are fighting for and should have.

5. The minority report says that more hearings in Alaska are necessary, to enable the opponents of statehood who cannot afford to go to Washington to be heard.

The truth is that in hearings held in Alaska, on Alaska's statehood, only a handful of Alaskan residents stood up to be counted as opposed to statehood. They were outnumbered almost 20 to 1 by those who urged passage of the enabling legislation.

And surely it must be apparent to anyone that the industry which has spent such stupendous sums to defeat statehood could have chartered half a dozen planes to bring anti-statehood witnesses to Washington, if they could have found the witnesses to fill them. The fact is that the industry failed to produce a single resident of the Territory who was willing to stand up before your committee and be counted as against statehood for Alaska.

So it is with deep regret that the proponents of statehood for Alaska view the conversion of five members of your committee to the minority position on this bill. As a lifelong Republican expressing the sentiment of a large number of Alaskan Republicans, who are working for statehood, I especially regret that the opposition seems to be led by members of my own political party. It is good to note, however, the Republican sentiment or statehood is strongly represented in the majority report, though actually, of course, the issue is in no way partisan.

Someone has said, "No power on earth is strong enough to withstand the force of an idea whose time has come." It is the humble opinion of this Alaskan that a majority of the Members of the United States Senate will recognize that statehood for Alaska is an idea whose time has come. I am sustained in that faith by the splendid support given the statehood bill by those members of your committee who are responsible for the majority report.

With deep appreciation of their tireless work, I am,

Respectfully yours,

MILDRED R. HERMANN,
Secretary, Alaska Statehood Committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida has 15 minutes, the Senator from Wyoming, 7 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as the mover of the motion to recommit, I believe I have the right to close the debate. If that is the case, I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has no rule on that subject.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had hoped to have a few minutes. I think it is unquestionable, under any rule of law in any court of which I have ever heard, that the mover has the closing time, and I would ask that that rule be applied here.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very anxious indeed to accommodate my friends of the opposition, but the Senator from Georgia this morning refused to guarantee that no Senator on his side, after recommittal, would assert the claim that statehood for Hawaii had been defeated by the recommittal of the Alaska statehood bill; and I want to reserve 3 or 4 minutes of my time to deal, very ineffectually I grant, with the incisive logic and the great skill in debate of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in view of the flattery of the Senator from Wyoming, I suggest that we permit him to maintain his straw man until the time to vote on the motion, and that the Senator from Florida yield the remainder of the time to whomever he may desire.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield the remaining 15 minutes to the junior Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, with the limited time at my disposal it is manifestly impossible for me to do other than make a few general observations on this matter. I wish first to say that I regret very much that the distinguished Senator from Illinois saw fit to label this as purely a sectional issue. I have observed, Mr. President, in times past, that when we of the South vote with our Democratic brethren from other sections who delight in the label of "liberals," we are very fine and purified Senators; no objection whatever is found to us. But when a majority of us should happen to be opposed to the views of those who delight in the label of "liberals," the red flag is raised, "Contagion here—Southern Democrat—Beware—You will be condemned if you are found anywhere in this vicinity."

I regret very much that that red herring, or red shirt rather, should have

been dragged through this debate. I wonder how it makes the southern Democrats who happen to be voting against the motion to recommit feel, to find that they have been labeled in effect, at least by inference, as traitors to the South, because they are found cleansed and purified and in full stature of statesmanship because they are voting with the "great liberal" element in the Senate.

Mr. President, I wish to say it was impossible for me to have completely analyzed this bill, in the light of the fact that there were no hearings explaining it. It is quite clear to me, however, that this bill grants to the proposed State of Alaska powers in the Department of the Interior which no bureau should have over any sovereign State. Alaska should either come in as a State or it should retain its present status, or some other status, as a Territory, until the time when the Department of the Interior is willing to relinquish the complete powers which they hold over that Territory and permit it to become in fact a State.

The Senator from Wyoming, in his discussion with the Senator from Ohio, talked about all of this land which was going to be given. Bear in mind, Mr. President, that under the terms of this bill it will be 5 years before the proposed State will get an acre. In the 5 years' time then, the Secretary of the Interior grants to the sovereign State, which will have been in existence for 5 years, 20,000,000 acres.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The Senator is not quite accurate.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not have the benefit of hearings on the bill to completely elucidate it, but that is the construction I place upon this bill, that it is a step-up job, that the Secretary of the Interior has these vast powers over this proposed State, and, as it limps along, trying to become a full-fledged State, the bill grants additional lands. I am sure I am correct in that part of the statement.

Mr. President, if Alaska is to have statehood it should be a State; it should not be a principality of the Department of the Interior. I make that statement as an American, without regard to the section of the country from whence I come.

We have heard a variety of arguments regarding this bill. Some Senators, in advocating the measure, have said that the new devices and means of transportation which are available have brought Alaska closer; and, of course, that is true. But another one argued with equal seriousness that the people of Alaska should not be compelled to come to Washington to testify on this bill, because it was so far away and such great expense would be incurred.

Mr. President, I want to say that if the officials of Alaska had been as diligent in appearing before the committee as they have been in buttonholing Senators with respect to the pending bill, there could have been hearings. They are all here.

We have before us a case in which a great many legislative agents, I might call them, have been brought in to bring pressure to bear upon Senators to vote against the motion to recommit and to vote to admit Alaska without hearings and without having a complete understanding of the bill.

I want to say, Mr. President, that this is one of the dangers which confront the American people in legislative matters. There is great pressure brought to bear upon Senators by organizations, and there is no countervailing force to resist it, and when a man does undertake to resist it on grounds that might not be in anywise connected with that which has been charged, he is accused of making a purely sectional appeal.

Reference has been made to party platforms. Perhaps I am not as regular as are some Democrats, and I cheerfully admit that I am not, but I want to say that we have a very sad picture in this country of both political parties in writing platforms yielding to almost any group that promises them a few votes. Indeed, 6 or 12 delegates from territories can have a great deal of influence in writing platforms if they commit themselves to the candidate for the nomination who controls the platform committee.

I do not consider it as being any reason for the Senate to abandon its wise policy of careful scrutiny of legislation merely because it might appear in both party platforms.

Mr. President, I want to say only a word or two to those who have raised the cry that this bill should be enacted forthwith because of certain Communist propaganda being spread over the world. We are told, in all seriousness, by eminent men, that because of Communist propaganda that we are holding the people of Alaska in a colonial status, we should immediately grant statehood to Alaska. That argument could be applied to Puerto Rico, to Guam, or to other islands. It is brought to bear only on this piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. President, I was never more serious in my life than when I say that this constant repeating of the statement that we must legislate to combat Russian propaganda is making us a fear satellite of the Soviet Union. If we ever see the day when Senators will be influenced by that argument, we are fast approaching the destruction of this Republic. We do not have to combat Soviet propaganda by doing unusual and undesirable things against our better judgment.

Let Russia compare the economy of Alaska with that of any spot behind the iron curtain. Tell them to look at the wages paid in Alaska. Even the Federal Government pays 25 percent more to every Federal employee in Alaska than it pays to those in continental United States. Let them see the housing which has been constructed in Alaska. Let them see the highest wage scales known under the American flag, and refute Russian propaganda with the truth, not with a state of confusion. May God forbid that we should ever rely on specious claims and pleas, or we shall surely be slaves of the Russians even as are those unfortunates who are behind the iron curtain and subject to Russian bayonets.

Mr. President, the question of hearings has been very ably discussed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. For my part, I wish to compliment him for the courage he has shown in coming into this body, a relatively new Member, and insisting upon being recognized as a Senator of the United States from a sovereign State.

Mr. President, we should not abandon our system of hearings because hearings have been held at some time in the past. I was intrigued with the argument of the Senator from Oregon that hearings had been held. Mr. President, we have hearings upon tax bills for this Nation each and every year. We have exhaustive hearings each and every year upon appropriation bills. But when the very serious question was raised by the Senator from Florida as to whether the economy of the Territory of Alaska would support statehood, no hearings were allowed to determine the true status of the tax system in Alaska, the true relationship of income to expenditures, the nature of the expenditures now being borne by the Federal Government which the proposed State would be compelled to bear.

I submit that hearings 3 years ago could not possibly reflect any light on the subject, in view of the changing conditions which exist today. If there ever was a case where hearings should have been held, it is this particular measure and on those specific questions.

Mr. President, I announce it as a general proposition that when there are members of a committee who have not been in a previous Congress, as has been disclosed to be the case in connection with the present issue, who earnestly and zealously have sought to have hearings upon a measure, they are entitled to have such hearings, even though hearings were held during the last Congress. I submit that as a proposition which is essential to the orderly conduct of legislation and the life of a parliamentary system.

I do not wish to labor that question. I have served as chairman of committees. I would vote to recommit any bill which I support, if any members of the committee requested hearings and were not allowed them. I know how onerous it is to conduct long hearings. I suppose I sit through as many hours of committee hearings as do any other Members of the Senate, but a subcommittee can always be appointed, of which the Senator who desires the hearing is a member. We do not have to have the entire committee sitting around in every instance to conduct the hearings. The matter can be left to a subcommittee to deal with, and let that particular Member of the Senate who desires hearings have that right which, in my judgment, is inherent in each Member of this body, to produce the facts by his own questions, instead of having a 2-year-old dish of hearings served up to him.

I want to make just one more mention of the importance of hearings, Mr. President. The motion provides for recommitting the bill with instructions to have hearings. There has been an effort to drag in the fact that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who did not make the motion, said "Territories" instead of "Territory." It is claimed that that affects the Hawaiian

statehood bill, but, of course, that claim is completely untenable.

Mr. President, I have never been one who could exactly define who is a liberal and who is a conservative. It never disturbed me deeply. I have been called a reactionary in my time. I have also been called a radical, both charges having been pressed with equal vigor. Neither charge has greatly disturbed me. But this I do assert. A true liberal will give his colleagues and the American people hearings on important issues.

I have been amazed at the so-called liberal newspapers, those who boast of their liberalism, and at some of my colleagues who do not shy from the appelation of "liberal," who talk about their being great liberals and who have been so insistent on pushing this bill through without granting hearings. Not one of these great metropolitan newspapers that boast of their liberalism has even mentioned in their editorials the very solid and substantial fact that no hearings have been held on the pending question in this Congress.

Mr. President, if it be contended that one is a reactionary who insists upon the full right of speech for the American people, and to the right of examination and investigation by Senators, then I will accept the title, because I know in my own heart that a true liberal is one who upholds the right of all Members of the Senate to make an investigation. That is truer than ever when six members of a committee vote for hearings, and two or three of them insist vigorously upon having them.

Mr. President, the bill should be recommitted for hearings.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise now merely to say for the RECORD that after prolonged association with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], over 18 years of service in this body, I can testify that he is a liberal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia has demonstrated it to me on a dozen or more occasions. One of the occasions which is clearest in my mind is that which took place during the last Congress, the Eighty-first Congress, when a motion was made to take up the Alaska statehood bill. The problem before the Senate at that time was whether Senators who favored Alaskan statehood would have an opportunity to vote by taking up the bill, or whether there would be a filibuster to prevent a vote. There was a filibuster, but I am happy to say that the Senator from Georgia did not participate in it. The Senator from Georgia was liberal enough to permit the matter to come up, because he is willing to have Senators vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I dislike interrupting the Senator from Wyoming in the limited time we have, but he does me more credit than I deserve when he absolves me from participation in all the extended educational discussions which have taken place in the Senate. [Laughter.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia deserves all the commendation and all the applause that I or anyone else can give him, but a filibuster by any other name is still a filibuster.

If Members of this body wish to know the reason why the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs voted against holding further hearings, it is that the committee knew, with all the hearings at hand, that if another hearing were granted the report of the bills would be delayed and we would be face to face with a filibuster to prevent the bills from being taken up, just as we were in the last Congress. I cannot weep with my friend because we did not hold a dilatory hearing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit Senate bill 50.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McMahon
Anderson	Hennings	Millikin
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Benton	Hill	Moody
Brewster	Hoey	Morse
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Bridges	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Nixon
Byrd	Jenner	O'Conor
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Seaton
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Duff	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Ferguson	Malone	Taft
Flanders	Martin	Thye
Frear	Maybank	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarran	Underwood
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Hayden	McKellar	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to recommit the bill to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with certain instructions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARTHY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If he were present and voting, I am informed that he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is absent because of illness, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is absent on official business, and his pair with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has been announced previously.

On this vote the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is paired with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay" and the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—45

Bennett	Hayden	McKellar
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Connally	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Taft
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarran	Wiley
George	McClellan	Young

NAYS—44

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Anderson	Holland	Murray
Benton	Humphrey	Neely
Cain	Hunt	Nixon
Case	Ives	O'Conor
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kefauver	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Seaton
Duff	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Langer	Sparkman
Ecton	Lehman	Thye
Flanders	Magnuson	Tobey
Gillette	McFarland	Watkins
Green	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Moody	

NOT VOTING—7

Carlson	Lodge	Welker
Dirksen	McCarthy	
Eastland	Smith, N. J.	

So Mr. SMATHERS' motion to recommit was agreed to.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. What is the joint resolution to which the Senator refers?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is the so-called submerged lands measure.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator have any intention of taking up the Hawaiian statehood bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no intention of making such a motion at this time. The statehood bills have, in effect, been considered together. The Alaskan statehood bill was recommitted for the purpose of holding hearings. No more hearings were held on the Hawaiian statehood bill than on the Alaskan statehood bill.

We have had the Alaskan statehood bill under consideration for approximately 4 weeks. Even deducting the time taken for the purpose of Lincoln's

birthday addresses, we have devoted 3 weeks to the consideration of the bill.

The joint resolution relating to the submerged lands is very important, and I feel that we should take it up and consider it at this time. We need development of the submerged lands for the benefit of the national defense, and we should not proceed to consider legislation granting statehood to Hawaii after such a vote as we have just had, and after having consumed all this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from California. He was first on his feet.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would a substitute motion to take up Senate bill 49, Calendar No. 296, which is the statehood bill for Hawaii, be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that an amendment of that kind would not be in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the motion of the Senator from Arizona is subject to a yea-and-nay vote, and if that motion is rejected, will a motion then be in order to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 49, Calendar No. 296, the bill granting statehood to Hawaii?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Any Senator who can obtain the floor will have the right to make a motion to take up any other bill, if the pending motion is rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I still have the floor. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, is the motion debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is debatable. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the joint resolution which the Senator from Arizona moves to take up also comes from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I should like to say, as chairman of the committee, having been on the floor throughout the 4 weeks, which the Senator from Arizona has mentioned as having been consumed in the discussion of the Alaska statehood bill, that it would be overworking the chairman of the committee just a little bit if the Senate were to proceed now to the consideration of the very debatable and controversial joint resolution on submerged lands. I feel that the record before us indicates that we should proceed to the consideration of the Hawaii statehood bill. I hope that the Senator from Arizona will agree to proceed to the consideration of S. 49, which is on the calendar and which stands in equal strength with the Alaska bill.

We have heard a great deal of argument today to the effect that Senators should be accorded the privilege of having their expressed desires carried out.

When the Democratic Policy Committee met last year, near the close of the last session of Congress, it was stated that the statehood bills would have priority at this session of Congress. The Senator from Arizona, who has worked and voted in favor of the Alaska statehood bill, spoke about the legislative program for this session. I shall read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 10, page 13681. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], on the previous page of the RECORD, made reference to the Hawaii statehood bill. I took the floor and I said:

> Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad that the Senator from California has referred to the statehood bills. I believe the RECORD is clear that the policy committee of the majority party in the Senate, at one of its meetings during this session, decided that the statehood bills would have priority of consideration at the beginning of the new session.
>
> The Governor of Hawaii has been in the city during the past week or 10 days. I have had numerous conferences with him. I know from him and others that the people of the Territory of Hawaii are waiting anxiously upon the action of this Congress with respect to the statehood legislation.
>
> I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that it will be my purpose, as chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to take the earliest practicable step in the new session to bring up for consideration the statehood bills for Alaska and Hawaii. The people of those two Territories are entitled to have a decision made by Congress, and nothing will be left undone at the beginning of the next session to bring that about.
>
> I thank the Senator from Arizona.

In those words I believe I made my position perfectly clear. After I had taken my seat the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] went on to say:

> Mr. McFARLAND. The senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has been very diligent in moving the statehood bills forward not only in his own committee but before the policy committee. The bills were not taken up for floor action, as he well knows, because we were working almost entirely on important national defense matters and appropriation bills. Of course, they will be given early priority in the next session.
>
> The District of Columbia home rule bill is in the same category but should not take as long to consider. I feel it should be disposed of promptly and I have agreed that we would make the fats and oils bill the second order of business. That bill, also, will not take very long to consider, in my judgment. Thereafter we will decide on the order of succeeding bills but the statehood bills and the measure referred to by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are both on the calendar and will receive our early attention.

I wish to invite the attention of Members of the Senate to the fact that the RECORD is thus perfectly clear that the plan which was laid down by the policy committee has been carried out, with one exception. Alaska was given priority. The fats and oil bill was taken up. Home rule for the District of Columbia was taken up. There remains only the Hawaii statehood bill. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I shall vote, if a yea-and-nay vote is had, against taking up the submerged lands bill until we have had a vote on the Hawaii statehood bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understood the Senator from Wyoming to say that the agreement had been carried out with one exception, namely, the Hawaii statehood bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the exception also of the bill offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] providing for the establishment of a joint committee on fiscal policy.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Arkansas has been very patient.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I voted my sentiments on the Alaska bill. I understood that following consideration of the Alaska statehood bill either the tidelands bill or the bill to create a joint committee on the budget would next be called up. I am ready to proceed with the bill to create a joint committee on the budget. It is a bill which has for its purpose bringing into our Government in this time of crisis some measure of economy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill of the Senator from Arkansas is very important. However, the record is that the statehood bills had priority. I am very firmly of the opinion that the Hawaii statehood bill can be disposed of very quickly if we can get a vote on it. I am ready to vote on the Hawaii statehood bill this afternoon.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much hope that the motion of the Senator from Arizona, the majority

leader, will prevail. The tidelands measure has been pending before Congress for a long period of time. It is of the highest importance that the bill be voted upon and some production had. There is no production from these lands now. There cannot be any production until some kind of tidelands bill is passed. I very much hope that Senators, regardless of their opinion on the measure—whether they intend to vote for or against it—will follow the leadership of the majority leader and bring the bill before the Senate for action. No doubt a number of amendments will be submitted by certain Senators.

I plead with the Senate not to reject the motion which has been made by the Senator from Arizona, but to proceed to consider the so-called tidelands joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 20.

I am very strongly in favor of having the Senate take action on that measure. The Senate, the highest authority in this land, should not permit the tidelands to remain endlessly without development, without exploration, without having any activity in regard to oil and gas take place.

I plead with Senators not to reject the motion the Senator from Arizona has made, but to support the motion and let us have an opportunity to obtain an enactment of some kind in regard to this pressing matter.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I seek recognition in my own right.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator from Missouri will pardon me for just a moment, he may have the floor.

Mr. President, in regard to the program, I wish to say that I think the majority has given a great deal of consideration and a great deal of thought to bills similar to Senate bill 50.

First we considered the bill providing home rule for the District of Columbia. We took a great deal of time in considering that bill.

Now we have been considering the bill proposing statehood for Alaska. Of this session 2 months have elapsed. I do not know how much time we shall have to spend in consideration of measures such as the Hawaiian statehood bill.

However, let me say to the Senate that the Government needs the oil which lies under the submerged lands. Senators can talk about being ready to vote for statehood for Hawaii, but they know there will not be a vote on that measure this evening; there can be no question about that.

If the majority had not pushed hard to have the Alaskan statehood bill considered by the Senate, do Senators think that bill would have been brought up at this session? Perhaps I am wrong, but I doubt that it would have been considered. Now we have had a vote and that measure has been recommitted.

Both of these two Territories stand in the same position, and they should be treated alike. I say to my good friend the Senator from Wyoming that it is not right to give statehood to Hawaii and to reject Alaska's application for statehood.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I agree with the Senator from Arizona that the two statehood bills stand in the same position and should be treated in the same way. Why is not the Senator willing to have both bills treated in the same way and to give the Senate an opportunity to vote on the second statehood bill? Is there any reason why that should not be done?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senate already has recommitted the Alaskan statehood bill because hearings were not held upon the two statehood bills. Personally, I voted for hearings; I thought we could have saved time by having hearings. However, a majority of the committee voted against holding hearings on these bills.

But, Mr. President, the Senate has decided that hearings should be held on the Alaskan statehood bill. If those who wish to have hearings held on the Alaskan statehood bill are entitled to have them held, they are also entitled to have hearings held on the Hawaiian statehood bill.

Mr. President, we need the time which now is available. Two months of the present session have already elapsed. Important proposed legislation is ready and waiting to be considered. If we do not move on, we may find that we will not have time to consider much vital legislation. If we have any extra time, we can consider bringing up the Hawaiian statehood bill at such time.

Mr. President, last year the tidelands bill, one of the bills relating to the submerged lands, was passed by the House of Representatives, but the Senate did not take action on that bill. Long hearings on that subject have been held.

I say to my good friend the Senator from Wyoming that he does not need to have any fear that he will be overworked in connection with Senate Joint Resolution 20. There are many other Senators who will talk about the joint resolution. There are a good many Senators who are more interested in it than is the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. If we do not take up that measure now, we may not take it up at this session.

Those who wish to dictate to the Senate and to say that the Senate must do this or do that, in this way or that way, and who talk about what was decided by the majority policy committee, should bear in mind that I told that committee what I was given permission to do, and everyone of the members of the committee, except the Senator from Wyoming, was in favor of having the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution relating to the submerged lands. I mention that only because it was brought up by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the able majority leader whether it is true that in the amendment which was made a part of the motion which was just agreed to, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was directed to make a study covering both Territories, provided the bill was recommitted; I refer to the Monroney amendment or modification of the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

Mr. McFARLAND. I assume that that amendment is sufficiently broad to cover all Territories, including Hawaii; the language is "other Territories," and the Senate voted for that.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In other words, the Senate voted to the committee instructions to make a study covering both Territories; is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to say to the able majority leader that all along I have taken the attitude of favoring statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii. However, I have firmly believed that we should treat them together and should bring up both the statehood bills and pass them at the same time. For that reason, if a motion is made to have the Senate proceed at this time to the consideration of the bill proposing statehood for Hawaii, I shall certainly vote against taking up the Hawaiian statehood bill at this particular time.

If the Senator from Arizona will yield to me for a further moment, in order to permit me to ask just one question, I should like to ask the question, because it relates to a matter with which I am greatly concerned, and is one with which all other Members of the Senate should be concerned, namely, when are we going to reach the question of the Japanese peace treaty? Last year we indicated that we would take up that treaty at an early date, and the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] urged us to take up the Japanese peace treaty, even if it was necessary to have a special session called in the winter, in order to do so. By means of various statements which were issued, we said that treaty would be taken up very soon after this session of Congress began. However, 2 months of the session have now elapsed.

So I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona whether he can tell me where that matter stands in the legislative schedule.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me answer my good friend from Alabama by saying that I am in favor of having the Senate consider the Japanese peace treaty at an early date. We have not brought up other matters thus far because we did not wish to interrupt consideration of the Alaska statehood bill. However, merely because we have had consideration of one statehood bill does not mean that we have to stymie the whole session by having statehood debate for another month. Where shall we be unless we can work out some understanding regarding the statehood bills? It may be possible to do so; I do not know.

However, while we are talking about them, we can pass the joint resolution relating to submerged lands; and it is important that we do so.

In view of the situation in which the Senate finds itself today, we can proceed with some other measure until we can make a check and can determine what is best to be done.

COMPENSATION OF LOBBYISTS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on the desk of each Senator is a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26. Beginning at page 1451, and for the next 45 pages, Senators will find quarterly reports submitted by registered lobbyists.

I have taken the trouble to have compiled some figures based upon the earnings of the various lobbyists for the quarter, and have multiplied those earnings by four, because we may assume that they earned something for the previous three quarters, although there may be an error in such assumption.

Senators may be interested to know that the following result was obtained: The number of lobbyists receiving under $5,000 a year was 170; the number receiving between $5,000 and $10,000 a year, 144; the number receiving between $10,000 and $15,000, 73; the number receiving between $15,000 and $20,000, 37; those receiving from $20,000 to $25,000, 21; from $25,000 to $35,000, 22; from $35,000 to $50,000, 18. Those who received as compensation for their lobbying more than $50,000 during the past year numbered 40.

There may be errors as to the number of lobbyists in each category, because the actual earnings may not have been the same during the previous three quarters as for the fourth quarter of 1951. It is also possible that some of the fourth-quarter reports were not correctly made. Nevertheless, the figures clearly indicate that, so far as private industry is concerned, it is willing, in more than 100 instances, to pay more for its legislative representation in Washington than are the people of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to know what investigation of this subject, if any, is being conducted by any committee.

Mr. HAYDEN. All that has been done has been to carry out the provision of law which provides that any person engaged in lobbying shall file a report.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has any committee of Congress investigated this subject, or is it now under investigation by any committee of Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not that I know of at the moment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does not the Senator believe that a committee of Congress should investigate the subject? Everyone else is being investigated except the people who harass us to earn their living.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are so many investigations now under way that I do not know whether we ought to add any more expense for that purpose.

I wish to point out that what appears in the RECORD is merely a brief statement of the name of the lobbyist, by whom he is employed, and the compensation he receives. Anyone interested in obtaining further information can obtain it in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate or the Office of the Clerk of the House, where the complete reports are filed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, lobbyists are paid huge salaries because of their influence, or supposed influence.

Mr. HAYDEN. I assume that must be true. Otherwise they would not be receiving such large incomes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator give the figures as to the total amount reported by lobbyists as being their compensation?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have not totaled up the amounts received. I have merely divided the lobbyists into categories. In a case in which a lobbyist might have received compensation from more than one source, I have added up what he receives during the quarter from all sources, and have multiplied it by four, on the assumption that he received the same amount in each of the previous three quarters. In that way I arrived at the conclusion that there were 40 lobbyists in Washington who were receiving more than $50,000; 18 receiving between $35,000 and $50,000; 22 receiving between $25,000 and $35,000; 21 receiving between $20,000 and $25,000, and so forth.

PEACE, OR MORE WAR?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, America faces dangerous days. The years just ahead will be years of thoughtful reexamination. They may be years of fateful decision. We are at the crossroads in our national life. It will be tragic if we take the wrong road.

WE HAVE BLUNDERED INTO WAR

Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson have blundered into one war. They may be steering us into more war. Congress did not declare war in Korea. Mr. Truman made war. Mr. Truman talks peace while he makes war.

In 1945, when Mr. Truman became President, the United States was the greatest potential instrument for peace the world had ever known. The first thing Mr. Truman did was to go to Potsdam and there resort to a habitual breeder of wars—the secret treaty.

Instead of repudiating the disastrous, behind-the-back agreement made by his predecessor at Yalta, Mr. Truman chose to go along with the State Department "pinks." He confirmed the deals that gave much of Eastern Europe to Russia, that cost us the friendship of the Republic of China, and that now threaten our position in Japan.

The folly of Mr. Truman's course is now evident. By every test the Truman-Acheson policy has failed. Let us take one yardstick as an example: In April of 1945, there were approximately 200,000,000 people behind the iron curtain under the Communist regimes. Today there are 800,000,000 behind the iron curtain under Communist regimes.

WAR—CAUSE AND REMEDY

The founding fathers, who set up on the North American Continent the experiment in free government that we call the Republic of the United States of America, knew a great deal about war. They and their immediate ancestors had had many opportunities to observe it in the countries beyond the seas. The soil of Europe has been drenched with human blood every few years since the dawn of history.

Even before we have any authentic record, there were wars over there like the Trojan War, in which we are told, the face of a woman, Helen of Troy, "launched a thousand ships and burnt the topless towers of Illium." We read that the shape of a woman's nose—Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt—changed the map of Europe. Then, one day a British sailor came into port and told a harrowing tale of how he was seized by the Spaniards, who cut off his ear. So the King of England went to war with the King of Spain, and before they got through thousands of their subjects on both sides had been killed.

The founding fathers gave thoughtful consideration to the cause of this incessant bloodletting. They put their finger on the cause. They said, "The cause is too much power—too much authority in the hands of one man or a small group of men." Then they set about to devise a remedy. The remedy they wrote into the Constitution of the United States. It is so plain and simple that any man or woman, boy or girl who came after them could understand it. It was as simple as this: "Congress shall declare war." No more, no less. But Mr. Truman ignored the injunction of the founding fathers. The first the Congress knew of the Korean war was from a press release that was read in the Senate by the then majority leader, former Senator Lucas, of Illinois. This press release said that 24 hours before, the President had ordered our troops into action in Korea. As soon as this press release was read, as some of the Senators who are present will remember, I immediately rose in the Senate and made the point that the President and those about him had arrogated to themselves the right to declare war, which was the duty and responsibility of the Congress.

In Korea, Mr. Truman made war upon the recommendation of his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson. For the first time in our history, the United States is involved in a major war by the direction of the President alone. The consent of the Congress was not asked, and it has never been given. As Mrs. Jesse Hollar, of Camden Point, Mo., wrote me the other day: "If we can get along without a Congress, we could save a lot of money." Certainly no one wishes for America a military dictatorship.

MR. TRUMAN REVERSED HIMSELF

Truman administration apologists, weeping crocodile tears, say plaintively, "What could we do? We had to stop the Communist aggression." Mr. President, they purposely omit the important fact that the administration had, less than a year before our troops were ordered into Korea by the President, withdrawn our troops from South Korea, because they were told by military advisers that the peninsula was militarily indefensible. Then Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State, was sent to the National

Press Club in Washington, where correspondents from all over the world gather, to make an important pronouncement. He said that our line was drawn through Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines, and that that was the line we would defend. He made no reference to Korea. It is generally conceded now that, had not this assurance been given by the State Department itself, the men in the Kremlin would not have ordered their troops to move into South Korea. When Mr. Truman suddenly, without warning, reversed our policy and ordered our troops into the Korean war, Mr. Stalin was probably the most surprised man in the world.

KOREA IS A UNITED STATES WAR

The Trumanites have come up with another choice piece of propaganda. They say that this is not a United States war at all—this is a United Nations war. There are three reasons why this contention is unsound.

First, we were engaged in the war in Korea for 24 hours before any deliberative Assembly of the United Nations requested the member states to furnish assistance to the Republic of Korea. Mr. Truman made war, then went to the United Nations and asked help in a war in which the United States was already engaged.

Second, the United States has furnished 90 percent of the troops and has sustained 95 percent of the casualties, not including the South Koreans. When Mr. Truman sent out an S O S to the members of the United Nations—many, incidentally, had been the beneficiaries of our largess under the Marshall plan—and asked them to send troops to Korea, he got regrets to his invitation. One by one these nations said, "We are sorry, we are just as sorry as we can be. We will send token forces, but American boys will have to do most of the fighting, and American taxpayers will have to foot the bill."

Third, the act of Congress which permitted the United States to join the United Nations contemplates that under no circumstances will the Armed Forces of the United States, the young men of America, be ordered into battle without the consent of the American Congress. To call this a United Nations war is what the late Al Smith would have denominated a "phonus bolognus."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is the Senator from Missouri familiar with the fact that when the United Nations Charter was adopted, the specific question was asked of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, "Can the United Nations involve the United States in a war, without a vote on the part of Congress?"

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. And before the Congress ratified the United Nations Charter, it relied, did it not, upon that promise on the part of Democratic administration—a promise they have broken?

Mr. KEM. The Senator from North Dakota is entirely correct, and that intention appears clearly in the Enabling Act which was passed by the Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, is the Senator from Missouri referring to the Participation Act of 1945 in which Congress authorized the President to proceed to make agreements, with the understanding and the requirement that they would be submitted to Congress before any police troops were established?

Mr. KEM. I am referring to the act under which the United States became a member of the United Nations organization.

Mr. WATKINS. We became a member by the ratification of the treaty, but I am calling the Senator's attention to the Participation Act.

Mr. KEM. There was an enabling act passed at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. It is sometimes referred to as the Participation Act.

Mr. KEM. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. In that act it was provided that agreements which were to be negotiated would be submitted to the Congress for approval. It also set forth that no Armed Forces of the United States would be furnished except those covered by agreements.

Mr. KEM. Exactly. So I say that act clearly contemplates that the young men of America will not be ordered into action without the consent of the American Congress.

Mr. WATKINS. So the President circumvented the conditions of the United Nations Charter and of the participation act.

Mr. KEM. He violated the spirit of the charter and the actual letter of the charter, as well as the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, is it not true that the United Nations was never able to negotiate any agreements for police forces to enforce the peace or to engage in action such as we are now engaged in in Korea?

Mr. KEM. That is correct.

Mr. WATKINS. No machinery whatsoever had been established for a police force, and nothing had been done in this country other than to pass the enabling act or participation act of 1945. No agreements had ever been submitted to the Congress for ratification; no request had ever been made to the Congress for the right to send troops.

Mr. KEM. I think that is quite correct; and there is no more reason to call it a United Nations war than to call it a San Salvador war or a Honduras war or an Iraq war, or any other words that might come to one's mind. It is a United States war, a Truman-Acheson war, an unconstitutional war. It is an undeclared war, and we cannot make anything else out of it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. WATKINS. It has been said many times by apologists for the President for taking us into this war that the Congress itself probably would have declared the war and authorized him to take the action he did take if the question ever had been submitted to the Congress. Does the Senator from Missouri agree with that statement?

Mr. KEM. The grace of prophesy was one of many that were not present at my birth. I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet. I do not know what Congress would have done if the matter had been fully and carefully debated. If the fact that we were not prepared to go into Korea, that we had been told by military authorities that it was militarily undefensible—if those facts had been brought to the attention of the Congress, I do not know what the Congress would have done.

Mr. President, I have no illusions or delusions about the superior wisdom of individual Members of Congress, but I do have a profound respect for and a profound confidence in the constitutional procedures of the Republic.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, all the matters which the Senator has mentioned, the matter of separation, the matter of whether we were ready to enter into a war of that kind, whether we had the approval of our military leaders, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and others who would be responsible for conducting a war of that kind—all that could have been inquired into if it had been brought to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. KEM. Exactly.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it not a fact that the representatives of the Joint Chiefs of Staff previously testified before Senate committees and in their testimony had advised Congress and the people of the United States that staying in Korea was not desirable because the position was untenable if the Russians were in control of Siberia, Manchuria, and China.

Mr. KEM. I think the Senator from Utah is quite correct. I appreciate the point he has made. But, Mr. President, I think it is idle and futile for us to undertake to predict what might have been done if the Constitution had been followed. Mr. Truman said he went into Korea to establish constitutional government there. Korea is now a barren waste, and we find that constitutional government may be slipping away from us at home.

The Truman-Acheson war in Korea has been under way longer than the American participation in World War I. World War I, which lasted 585 days, ended in total victory for America. The Truman war in Korea is about 600 days old, and victory is not yet in sight. Who knows how many newly-dug graves, marked with white wooden crosses, lie ahead? Who among us can say that if the present peace negotiations in Korea are successful—which we hope and pray they will be—that it will be a victory for America?

A few days after he made war in Korea Mr. Truman said: "We are not at war." Korea will work out all right, he said. But it has not worked out all right. We in Missouri know that Mr. Truman's projects often have not worked out all

right. "The nurses know," says Lt. Helen Ely, of the United States Air Force Nurses Corps, "as most Americans do not, that this war is the worst in all history—not in scale but in its almost unbelievable primitive intensity. Our men are having to unlearn the rules of ordinary warfare. They are becoming experienced at hand-to-hand fighting, learning how to break bones with their bare hands, how to kill with knives, clubs, and stones."

ASKED TO DIE, BUT DENIED THE RIGHT TO WIN

No, Korea has not "worked out all right." It has not worked out at all. For the first time in our history our boys are asked to fight and die, and at the same time denied the right to win.

Someone had blundered.
Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die.

Our bumbling administration, responsible for the tragedy of China, for the unnecessary war in Korea, is trying to sell itself to the people as the peace party. I will leave it to the mothers and fathers of the 106,000 American dead and wounded in battle in Korea to expose this untruth. I will leave it to them to label such propaganda for what it is. The Truman-Acheson war now ranks among the longest, the most bitter, and the most costly of wars in our history.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator aware that in the past 50 years, under three Democratic administrations, the American people have suffered more than 1,400,000 casualties in Democratic wars, and no casualties whatever under Republican administrations?

Mr. KEM. The Senator is quite right. Mr. President, in one generation, the American people have been plunged into three major wars—the worst wars in the history of our Nation. Can the same party and some of the same men who have led us three times into war, be trusted to lead us into a just and lasting peace? Can we continue to entrust America's future to leadership that removes a great general because he dares advocate victory and retains a Secretary of State, who will not turn his back on a convicted traitor? MacArthur and Acheson—what a contrast.

A POLICY FOR PEACE

There are those who have again raised the cry of "isolationist." I am not authorized to speak for anyone else, but, for my part, I am neither an isolationist nor am I an interferist. I do not believe in isolating ourselves from other nations, nor do I believe in interfering in the internal affairs of other nations.

I believe in peace. I believe we should study how to live at peace with our neighbors as one of the most important and useful of the arts and sciences. I believe that peace can best be had by frank, above-board foreign policy based on sound constitutional procedure.

I shall continue to oppose permitting the President to make war on his own—war that must be fought by millions of voiceless people. No one should be given a blank check on the blood of the young men of America.

We cannot remind ourselves too often of the words of Washington's Farewell Address, which is so fittingly read every year in the Senate of the United States—on February 22, the birthday of the Father of our Country. Washington said:

> If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the Constitution designates. But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed.

Korea must be an unforgettable lesson to us. Never again must we permit one man or a small group of men to arrogate to themselves the power to plunge this Nation into a state of war. Never again must Congress stand idly by while the President of the United States usurps its power to declare war.

In the past 19 years there has been entirely too much evasion of the fundamental law of the land. We have witnessed instance after instance of attempts to circumvent the Constitution. To the detriment of America, many of these attempts have been successful. The tragedy of Korea is only the inevitable consequence of having in public office men of limited vision and with a great thirst for power, who, though sworn to uphold the Constitution, consider it an outmoded instrument and treat it with a measure of contempt.

It is not too late for Congress to reassert itself. If America is to remain free—if America is to have peace in the days to come—the Congress must serve unmistakable notice on the President of the United States that it will tolerate no more of his war making; that henceforth before American boys are sent to die in distant foreign lands the elected representatives of the people in the Congress must by majority action approve an act of war.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEM. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Let it be said to the everlasting credit of the senior Senator from Missouri that he is one Senator who raised his voice at the time the action was taken by the President to send troops to Korea, and to the best of my recollection he opposed it. However, if I may say so, many Senators at that time did not care to assert that responsibility. In the argument the Senator is making, I believe he should also propose a remedy, for Senators seem not to have been too anxious to go on record as to whether troops should have been sent into Korea.

So far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, he was engaged in a political campaign for his own reelection, and took the position that the President probably had no choice in the matter as it developed at that time. I sometimes wonder whether Members of the Senate actually want to go on record in the matter of our troops going into Korea.

Mr. KEM. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that I am not here to judge my colleagues. I recall that my seat mate, the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], also raised his voice to assert the authority of the Senate, on that fateful day, June 27, 1950, when the press release had already been issued by the White House and read in the Senate. Well do I remember that press release, Mr. President. It contained more than 400 words, but nowhere did the word "Congress" appear. "I"—"I"—"I," said the President, "am sending our forces into action in Korea."

Mr. LONG. I will say that, to his eternal credit, the senior Senator from Missouri did affirmatively state his position. He said he thought it was a mistake, and that such action should not have been taken. I recall having raised the issue before, and he reminded me that that had been his position.

However, it has been the impression of the junior Senator from Louisiana that Congress could have spoken on this matter if a majority of Senators had agreed to join in a declaration, one way or the other, as to whether they felt the President was right or wrong at the time the decision was made. Some Senators who may have been under the impression at the time that it was the correct thing to do may have changed their minds since the action was taken, but they have not actually gone on record as saying so.

Mr. KEM. It may well have been as the Senator from Louisiana has indicated, that some Senators were at first of one opinion, and it may also be that they would have changed that opinion when the question was tried out here in the crucible of debate, when the constitutional implications of it were brought to their attention.

Regardless of what the ultimate action may be, I should like to say to the junior Senator from Louisiana that it is a different thing for us to engage in a constitutional war on the one hand and to engage in an unconstitutional war on the other hand. It may be that after full and careful consideration, the two Houses of Congress, acting within their constitutional orbit, would have approved the sending of our Armed Forces into Korea. I do not pretend to say that that might not have been done.

The matter of war psychology is a very difficult thing to predict, but I do say that we would have been better off then, and we shall be better off now and in the future, if we steadfastly adhere to the constitutional procedures of the Republic.

Mr. LONG. The Senator realizes, does he not, that if this Nation had paused long enough for the Congress to have deliberated on whether troops should have been sent into Korea, the Communists probably would have taken all the territory in Korea?

Mr. KEM. I do not agree that there was any justification for violating the Constitution. I recall the dramatic action at the time President Wilson appeared before a joint session of Congress, which resulted in prompt action on the part of the Congress. I recall,

too, and only a few years ago, the dramatic appearance of President Franklin D. Roosevelt before a joint session of Congress. Many Senators now present doubtless were sitting here at that time. That procedure resulted in prompt action on the part of Congress.

Mr. LONG. I certainly agree that there is some merit to the argument made by the Senator from Missouri, that if Congress had passed on the action it certainly would have tended toward unity. There is more likelihood of unity and less likelihood of disagreement in such a situation as that in which we found ourselves if the legislative body has an opportunity to pass upon it.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the observations made by the junior Senator from Louisiana. I think he is quite right from the standpoint of national unity. It is of vastly more importance to maintain the freedoms and liberties of the people as guaranteed to us in the Constitution of the United States.

I believe the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] asked me to yield.

Mr. MCMAHON. No. I will seek the floor when the Senator from Missouri has finished.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, as I was saying, henceforth American boys should not be sent to die in distant, foreign lands except when authorized by the elected representatives of the people. The elected representatives of the people in the Congress must by majority action approve an act of war.

Let us say to Mr. Truman that he must not enter into secret commitments with foreign nations which may produce other Koreas in other parts of the world.

Mr. President, this is not Stalin's Russia or Hitler's Germany or Mussolini's Italy. This is the United States of America, where one man cannot legally wage war. Let us be warned that it has happened here; let us make certain that it will not happen again.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, it is not my intention to read into the RECORD the debate which was carried on in this Chamber on June 27, 1950. I should like to refer to the fact that our esteemed colleague from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] seemed to reflect the majority sentiment of the Senate when he stated:

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say, if the able majority leader will permit me, that I think this statement of the President of the United States today has drawn a line in the Far East which was essential to be drawn at some time. Certainly the free world could not protect itself if the line were to be drawn in Europe, with no similar line in Asia. I believe that in this very important step which the President of the United States has taken in order to uphold the hands of the United Nations and the free peoples of the world, he should have the overwhelming support of all Americans, regardless of their partisan affiliation.

I should like to read also some remarks which were made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. He said:

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is in line with the action of the Security Council in asking for the war to stop, and for the invaders to withdraw. The invaders have shown no intention to comply with the request of the United Nations Security Council. Therefore the Security Council was put in the position where their order needed implementation with some force. I refer to chapter VII, article 39 and following, of the United Nations Charter. In line with the fact that there is no United Nations force in existence which can be called upon, we, along with other nations were asked to implement the order of the Security Council. The President's statement is in line with our responsibility under the United Nations Charter to meet this crisis.

I understand that negotiations have been begun with other members of the United Nations. I am advised that at 3 o'clock this afternoon the Security Council of the United Nations is meeting to determine what further action should be taken. However, the action which has been taken is distinctly in line with our responsibility, as agreed to in the United Nations Charter.

I wish to join with the Senator from California in the statement that this is a clean-cut and direct stand by the United States to carry out our obligation to the United Nations to make the United Nations exist as an organization which can function in an emergency. That is our responsibility, and that is what we have done.

As the Senator from California has stated, I feel that all of us should back up the action of the President in what I believe to be a real stand in the Far East, comparable to the stand we have taken in the Atlantic area.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] subsequently stated:

I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois, as I indicated earlier, that I applaud the firm leadership of the President of the United States. I wish merely to add the hope that he will not shrink from using the Army, if the best military judgment indicates that that is the effective course to take.

There has been some discussion about the lack of consultation with the Congress, and it might be interesting to place in the RECORD at this point the statement by former Senator Lucas, in answer to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who asked the then majority leader the following question:

I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if we may expect the President to consult with the Senate as the situation develops?

Senator Lucas replied:

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] was there and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was there. Most of the Members of the Senate and the House who attended the conference are members of the Committees on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I should think that they would be the appropriate committees from which members for such a conference should be selected.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I want to say to the able majority leader that present at the conference were members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and members of the Senate and House Committees on Armed Services. Both Democrats and Republicans were present. As I observed the conference I felt that an attempt had been made to have both sides of the aisle in the House and in the Senate present when this important decision was made. Military and naval representatives were also there.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCMAHON. In a moment I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

I should like to invite attention to the fact that the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] then made a statement which went on for some length, and in which he stated:

Mr. President, I intend to support the hand of the President in carrying out what I think are the clear implications of the President's statement.

Mr. President, I have not attempted to make exhaustive research with respect to the debate, but I believe it to be highly appropriate that at this point in the RECORD, after the moderate speech of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], in which he reviewed the situation, that this illuminating bit of history should be adduced.

I have seen other statements made in this Chamber go unchallenged. From the fact that they went unchallenged there came about what I believe to be—shall I say—some untrue characterizations of recent history. It is in the interest of attempting to recreate some of the atmosphere which existed on that fateful Monday that I have now suggested that our recollections be refreshed.

I have not yet been able to find in the RECORD the remarks by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who I believe is chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, in which he stated that if it had been put before Congress he would have approved the action of the President.

I dare say there is not a Senator in the Chamber who will challenge the statement I now make: If a vote had been taken on a resolution supporting the stand that was taken in Korea, there would not have been 15 votes cast in opposition.

Other Members are entitled to make their own estimates as to what the vote would have been. I think it was unfortunate that there was not offered a resolution which would have endorsed the action of the President. However, as to what the result of a vote would have been I believe there can be little question, in view of the almost entire unanimity with which the Members of the Senate greeted the announcement of the action which had been taken in Korea.

I recognize the fact that the Senator from Missouri gave some plain indications at that time—as did also the Senator from Utah—that he was not entirely in sympathy with the action then taken; but it is significant that neither the Senator from Utah nor the Senator from Missouri offered a resolution which would have repudiated the President's stand on that occasion.

As for it being a Truman-Acheson war in Korea, or an unconstitutional war, the Senator from Missouri is entitled to his own opinion. There are millions of Americans who believe that this war is perhaps one of the most glorious blows that have ever been struck in the cause of collective security and freedom.

We should not overlook a consideration of what the alternative would have

been. To suggest that the alternative would have been anything other than an entire repudiation of the United States position in the Pacific is, in my opinion, very naive.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, inasmuch as he has read from the RECORD what took place on that fateful June 27, 1950, whether he has read my statement which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 7, page 9228. For the purpose of refreshing the recollection of the Senator from Connecticut, I should like to read it:

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I realize fully that the distinguished Senator from Texas regards it as an act of supererogation for any other Member of the Senate to express an opinion on the foreign affairs of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no.

Mr. KEM. I heard him say that to the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on an occasion not long ago. I am sure that if the Senator from Texas believes that to be so in the case of the distinguished Senator from Ohio, a fortiori he believes it in the case of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. President, I wish to say that I think there are several matters in connection with the pending measure which have not received adequate consideration on the floor of the Senate.

Yesterday the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], discussing the crisis in Korea, said:

"This is a matter of tremendous importance. We want to solve the problem presented, but we want to solve it after we know all the facts; we want to solve it in the light of our obligations and duties; we want to solve it in the light of our own safety and national integrity and national security."

Mr. President, those are eloquent words, and I should like to associate myself with them.

Mr. President, I need not remind the Senate that the pending measure and the crisis in Korea are very closely related. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] tells us that of the $1,222,500,000 authorized by the bill, $16,000,000 is allocated to Korea and the Philippines, and $75,000,000 to countries in the general area of China.

I submit that this, too, is "a matter of tremendous importance." We want to solve the problem presented, but we want to solve it after we know all the facts. We do not have all the facts.

It occurs to me that before we vote to send additional millions of dollars to Korea, we should know just what the President and his Secretary of State are going to do about the situation in Korea. What is to be our policy there? What is to be our policy in regard to other countries in the general area of China? It would seem foolish indeed to continue pouring arms into Asia if our policy there is to continue to be, as has been said, "waiting for the dust to settle."

How about Formosa? How about southeast Asia? Just where do we stand? What is our policy?

Mr. President, we are now reaping the harvest for the tragic transactions at Yalta in 1945. It was at Yalta that the deal was made to divide Germany. It was at Yalta that a still-secret agreement is believed to have been made to split Korea in half along the thirty-eighth parallel.

As the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] said yesterday, after considerable investigation it appears not to be possible to find out just where the agreement to divide Korea at the thirty-eighth parallel was made.

It was also pointed out yesterday by the Senator from Nevada, and I should like to say that I do not think it can be referred to too often, that one of the leading State Department advisers for the President at Yalta was Alger Hiss.

The far-reaching decisions at Yalta were made in secret, without the consent of the Senate of the United States, as required by the Constitution.

Yalta should serve as a warning to the American people to stand by the principles of the Constitution. Yalta is a warning not to turn over to the President and the bureaucrats surrounding him the duty and responsibility of making decisions that may affect the peace of the world for generations to come. Such matters should be debated here and should be debated on the floor of the other body of the Congress. There is no reason to believe that when we put a pair of striped pants on a man and give him a high-sounding title and an elaborate office in the State Department he acquires any of the characteristics of a demigod or gains a capacity for unerring judgment.

I may say in passing, Mr. President, so that credit may be given where credit is due, that the quotation which I am about to read was referred to by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]:

I am among those who believe, as did the British statesman who was referred to the other day, there is no such thing as an inevitable war, and that if war comes it will be from a failure of human wisdom.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I do not wish to curtail the Senator from Missouri, but I should like to ask whether he has about concluded his question.

Mr. KEM. I am sure the Senator from Connecticut, with his sense of fairness, would not want unduly to curtail me.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I may say that I yielded to the Senator from Missouri for a question. I permitted the Senator from Missouri to read at length from the RECORD. If he is going to read a speech I wish he would do so in his own time.

The Senator from Missouri has read the speech he previously made.

I stated that the RECORD made it plain that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Utah took more or less the same position.

I am quite willing to have the Senator from Missouri introduce 25 pages of the former RECORD, if he wishes to do so; but I cannot remain here and have that done in my time and listen to it being done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). The Senator from Connecticut declines to yield.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield for 30 seconds more, I shall be able to finish this portion, and then I shall refer later to other portions.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. I do not wish to encroach unduly on the Senator's time.

I continue, Mr. President, to read from my speech on June 27, 1950:

We want peace. Our people hope and pray for peace. So far as the American policy is concerned, it should be decided by all the people, acting through the President and their duly elected representatives in Congress. I do not favor shifting these important decisions to the bureaucrats of the State Department. I believe these questions should be threshed out on the floors of the two Houses of Congress. The arguments should be weighed in the balance of public opinion.

In a time of crisis such as this, the decisions of the Government should be the product of the joint thinking of all of us.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield further for one or two questions, I shall appreciate it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to do so. However, I have another excerpt from the RECORD which I desire to place in this RECORD. I shall quote now from a statement made to the Senate by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] on June 28, 1950. I shall not read the statement in extenso, but I shall read only a very brief paragraph from it. At that time the Senator from Ohio said:

I hope at a later time to put into the RECORD a historical statement of the position of various Republican leaders on the general question of China policy, showing that it is very different, indeed, from what the President has heretofore advocated, and that, in general, it is more in accord with what he is now proposing.

The Senator from Ohio then went on to say:

I shall discuss later the question of whether the President is usurping his powers as Commander in Chief. My own opinion is that he is doing so—

Incidentally, Mr. President, an opinion which was not shared by the two Senators from Massachusetts or the Senator from New Jersey or the Senator from Oregon.

Then the Senator from Ohio said:

But I may say that if a joint resolution were introduced asking for approval of the use of our Armed Forces already sent to Korea and full support of them in their present venture, I would vote in favor of it.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. McMAHON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KEM. The Senator from Connecticut referred to the fact that certain Members of the Senate who happened to be members of the Foreign Relations Committee were consulted by the President in regard to this matter. Will the Senator permit me to call his attention to the fact that only 12 States are represented on the Foreign Relations Committee, and the other 75 percent of the States are not represented on that committee. Would the Senator from Connecticut contend that those States, constituting 75 percent of the States of the Union, are not entitled to participate in the discussion of such a momentous question as the question of whether the young men of American should be sent to war?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, of course, I regret that we cannot have the distinguished presence of the Senator from Missouri on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. KEM. I appreciate the generous solicitude of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I am sure that his advice and counsel would be most helpful.

Mr. KEM. I think the RECORD——

Mr. McMAHON. I ask the Senator to pardon me.

However, the rules of the Senate, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, provide for the selection of the membership of the committee. Either the Senator from Missouri has not had the good fortune to be appointed to that committee, or else he has not sought assignment to that committee.

Suffice it to say that the Senator from Missouri did have an opportunity to introduce a joint resolution of disapproval of the action which had been taken, as did any other Member of the Senate on that day. Either the Senator from Missouri thought it was a fruitless thing to do or he thought such a measure would be overwhelmed or he thought it was not worth while to do so. I cannot judge his motives. It is unfortunate that he did not take that course of action.

I did not rise to engage in debate with the Senator from Missouri, so much as I did to try to put a little bit of recent history in a context where it would do the most good, so that, when people read the remarks of the Senator from Missouri, they might be reminded of some other things which happened so recently in this Chamber.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to have an opportunity to reply to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President I understand my motion to recess will be resisted. There are present some Senators who are ill and are here against doctor's orders. They are anxious to know the pleasure of the Senate. I am willing to yield for 5 minutes or any reasonable time to the Senator but I would like to get a vote.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I do not want the Senator from Arizona to yield to me for any particular length of time; I am seeking recognition in my own right, under the well-established principles and rules of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have the floor.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair——

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Arizona, who has made a motion.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I desire to debate the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, reserving my right to object——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Was not the Senator from Missouri on his feet for half an hour or more before the Senator from Arizona was recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to take a recess has been made, and on this question the yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I desire to reply to the Senator from Connecticut, and to make some observations on his gentle sarcasm.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to take a recess has been made, and it is not debatable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the motion of the Senator from Arizona is not debatable.

On that motion the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: What is the motion on which the yeas and nays are to be taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a motion that the Senate take a recess.

Mr. TOBEY. Until when?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Until 12 noon, tomorrow.

Mr. TOBEY. What becomes of the motion of the Senator from Arizona to have the Senate consider Senate Joint Resolution 20 and to take it up as the next order of business? Does not that motion take precedence over the motion to have the Senate take a recess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It does not take precedence over a motion to take a recess, which motion is not debatable.

A motion that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at noon has been made, and on this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—43

Anderson	Holland	Moody
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kefauver	Robertson
Ellender	Kerr	Russell
Frear	Kilgore	Smathers
Fulbright	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
George	Long	Sparkman
Green	Malone	Stennis
Hayden	Maybank	Tobey
Hennings	McClellan	Underwood
Hill	McFarland	
Hoey	McMahon	

NAYS—37

Aiken	Hendrickson	Nixon
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brewster	Ives	Schoeppel
Bricker	Jenner	Seaton
Bridges	Kem	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Knowland	Taft
Cain	Langer	Thye
Capehart	Magnuson	Watkins
Case	Martin	Wiley
Cordon	McCarthy	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Young
Ecton	Morse	
Ferguson	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—16

Benton	Flanders	Monroney
Carlson	Gillette	Murray
Chavez	Hunt	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Lodge	Welker
Duff	McCarran	
Eastland	McKellar	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 27 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Leland S. Finney, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 6, 1952.

IN THE ARMY

The officers named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act, as amended:

To be major generals of the line

Maj. Gen. George Francis Ferry, O184877, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Alsop Redding, O126852, Louisiana National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

To be major general, Adjutant General's Corps

Maj. Gen. Earle Marian Jones, O224982, California National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

To be brigadier general of the line

Brig. Gen. Calvin Edward Barry, O271325, Kansas National Guard, to date from November 20, 1951.

To be brigadier general, Adjutant General's Corps

Brig. Gen. John Burris Morris, Jr., O384787, Arkansas National Guard, to date from November 19, 1951.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, grant that this Lenten season, upon which we are entering today, may inspire us with a greater concern and interest in the culture of our souls.

We penitently confess that our daily life so frequently becomes sodden with materialism and we yield ourselves to a quest for that which dwarfs and deadens our capacities for the loftiest instincts and aspirations.

May this period of inner discipline and self-examination, of cleansing of heart and consecration of purpose, challenge us to the higher and nobler ways of character and conduct.

We pray that the day may be hastened when all men everywhere shall be brought into right relationship with Thee and their fellow men.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

NATIONAL DAY OF PRAYER

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 382 to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether this is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BRYSON. It is, sir.

Mr. ARENDS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President shall set aside and proclaim a suitable day each year, other than a Sunday, as a National Day of Prayer, on which the people of the United States may turn to God in prayer and meditation at churches, in groups, and as individuals.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Friday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 10]

Abbitt	Dorn	Martin, Mass.
Allen, Ill.	Ellsworth	Mason
Aspinall	Fulton	Miller, Calif.
Barrett	Gamble	Miller, Md.
Bates, Ky.	Garmatz	Morrison
Battle	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Moulder
Beall	Hall, Leonard W.	Murray, Wis.
Betts	Hart	O'Neill
Blatnik	Hays, Ark.	O'Toole
Bolton	Herter	Potter
Buchanan	Hess	Powell
Buckley	Jackson, Calif.	Ramsay
Camp	Kennedy	Rooney
Case	King, Calif.	Sabath
Celler	King, Pa.	Secrest
Chatham	Lanham	Sheehan
Cole, Kans.	Larcade	Thompson, Mich.
Combs	Latham	Tollefson
Corbett	McConnell	Wheeler
Coudert	McGrath	Wickersham
Crawford	McIntire	Wier
Dawson	Marshall	Wood, Ga.
Dingell		
Dollinger		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 364 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, during the debate yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] in emphasizing his opposition to the bill, and the fact that the action which the Congress took last year did not indicate approval of the principle of UMT, undertook to cite as his authority General MacArthur. He quoted General MacArthur as saying, referring to UMT:

> While intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, it carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. It etches the pattern to a military state—

Knowing the great respect which all Members of the House have toward General MacArthur and the great weight which they put upon his recommendations, I felt it might be of interest that you should have the full quotation from which this excerpt used by the gentleman from Illinois was taken. The source of the quotation was an article in the American Legion Magazine of January 1952, by General MacArthur entitled "The Citizen Soldier and His Role in Our National Military Policy." In that article General MacArthur says:

> Now our military policy again requires revision. Under Selective Service and other statutes, we have called up large increments of our citizen soldiery with which to prosecute the Korean war and to bolster our own defense and the defense of many other lands. We have adopted the principle of universal military training and the outlook is toward maintaining for many years—even in peace—an armed readiness for war.
>
> All this, while intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. For it etches the pattern to a military state which, historically under the control of professional military thinking in constant search for means toward efficiency, has found in freedom possibly its greatest single impediment, to brush it aside as inimicable to established military policy. To avoid this historic pitfall, it is essential that civilian control over the citizen army be extended and intensified. Particularly is this true in the administration of the program of universal military training, if the youth of our land is to avoid being corrupted into a legion of subserviency to the so-called military mind.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the Nation's defense must always be the prime concern of every patriotic American. To dismiss our responsibility to protect our homes and loved ones from the aggressor is to deny our responsibility to preserve the God-given privileges which are our rightful inheritance from the founders of the Republic.

There are those today who sincerely argue that plans for war are not the way to lasting peace. There must always be the differentiation, however, be-

tween those who plan aggressive war, in which this Nation has never engaged, and those who keep their military houses in order as the best protection against aggressors-on-the-loose.

As a Christian people we should miss no opportunity to strengthen the machinery which may be used to settle international problems by arbitration and negotiation. We must not, however, despite our determination not to promote war or entertain aggressive designs on the rights and property of other people, lose sight of the fact that those who espouse the cause of communism simply do not believe in the Golden Rule and having no respect or regard for truth cannot be relied upon to live up to the obligations which devolve upon all peace-loving peoples. Indeed, their oft-repeated statements that they are determined to destroy the democratic way of life should be all the warning we need as to their intentions and the necessity of being on our guard.

The proponents of universal military training have apparently in complete honesty advanced this plan as the answer to the need for a continuing program of defense. And I am personally not greatly moved by the arguments of those who fear that such a plan will militarize the youth of America since my own service in the United States Marine Corps taught me that your American boy will accept military duty no farther than the end of the emergency or the compulsory period. The most comforting assurance we have had at the end of every war is the cry that lifts from the throats of our soldiers, "We want to go home."

Having made this preface, I feel that I can now state with emphasis that my present opposition to UMT stems solely from the conviction that it will not produce combat soldiers and, furthermore, that it never can be fully implemented in a period in which we already have such heavy calls through the draft for the men necessary to maintain our Regular forces in combat readiness.

In addition, I feel that the military planners are putting the horse before the cart by urging UMT before they have set up a completely integrated Reserve program, since this proposal is designed primarily to induct our country's youth for basic training preparatory to specialist or advanced training in an Organized Reserve. Following World War II the military systematically sabotaged the Reserve in order to make the need for UMT more compelling and, as a consequence, there are many of us who question the sincerity in their promise to train these graduates from UMT in the specialized skills needed to make them fit for combat duty. Certainly there is no evidence that such an advanced-training program has yet been worked out and section 5 of the committee report on H. R. 5904 confirms and deplores this primary defect.

On the matter of the cost of UMT we are promised that after the first year the training program will operate on less funds. It is inescapable, however, that the military just does not do things that way and it is my personal opinion that UMT will, instead, confront the American taxpayer with an increasing rather than a diminishing expense.

It must also be apparent to everyone that UMT is not an equitable induction plan as witness the fact that one boy can be selected for this type of training and will be faced with only 6 months' basic after which he will pass over into the comparative safety of the Reserve, while another lad in the same group will be called up under the draft for 2 years of combat service to be followed by 6 more years in the Reserve. Indeed, it is this discrimination that denies the universality of universal military training and at the same time underscores it as impractical so long as the draft must be kept in operation.

The committee report on H. R. 5904 on page 16 recognizes that the present emergency may last from 15 to 20 years, which carries with it the implication that we cannot appreciably reduce our active troops under the North Atlantic Treaty agreements or our United Nations commitments in the Pacific. What troubles me as a practical matter is how for each two men added to the Reserve under UMT we can reduce our combat troops by one, as is suggested in the committee report. Certainly Reserves stationed in this country cannot take the place of troops who are standing athwart the path of the aggressor on foreign soil. This problem is also emphasized by the fact that under the draft new men, when used as replacements, have the advantage of being put with battle-trained troops, whereas under the UMT-Reserve set-up we would have units made up entirely of men without combat experience.

In conclusion, I want to again emphasize that I am not motivated by any pacificist concept in my present opposition to UMT and I would respectfully point to the fact that I have always supported the principle of selective service and have never knowingly failed to support every legitimate request for defense funds. And when we find opposed to UMT organizations such as the Grange, the Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers Union, the CIO, the A. F. of L., and the chamber of commerce, none of whom can be classed as pacifistic, it is all the more convincing that resistance to this program centers primarily in the belief that the stockpiling of millions of semitrained young men is neither practical nor desirable from the standpoint of military security. As we, then, reluctantly face the fact that there is no cheap or easy way to defend ourselves we must increasingly insist that our military program be divorced of all unnecessary waste and expense and that so long as our way of life is threatened from without we must not jeopardize it from within by setting up socialistic devices for bringing to our people costly services which they do not need and which they cannot afford if we are to remain economically strong in a world in which might alone presently seems to set the rules.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself directly to those who have been unremitting in their demands for UMT. I address myself to the Truman administration—current grand patron of this program; to the Pentagon "yes men" of the administration; to the professional drum beaters for so-called permanent peacetime conscription who view virtually all young Americans as candidates for veterans' organizations; to the perennial sponsors of UMT in this House, and, particularly, to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who, up to now, have subscribed to this item of the Truman program of bigger and bigger government. I especially urge those members of this House who have not yet made up their minds on this issue to mark my words well.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I challenge the efforts to foreclose a real decision on UMT. Last year you, the sponsors of UMT, issued pleasant and soothing reassurances that legislation authorizing the creation of a UMT commission did not and would not constitute approval of UMT. The distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, speaking on the conference report in this House on June 7, said that the report assured that "Congress must take another look at UMT." He said that it meant that "Congress would have another opportunity to examine UMT."

In good faith acceptance of this assurance, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] answered in the affirmative this question asked by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]:

> Is the gentleman willing to state unequivocally that acceptance of this conference report does not make it mandatory upon Congress to adopt some type of UMT program if and when the proposed commission reports a program?

That was last year. But you talk differently now. The Commission report asserts that—

> Through enactment of Public Law 51, the Nation gave official approval, for the first time in its history to the principle of UMT.

On the basis of this same claim, our distinguished chairman said, prior to the recent hearings, that—

> The committee expects the witnesses to direct their testimony to the plan which is now before it.

In other words, you now tell us that we are only to look at the plan. Heaven knows, the committee has seen a veritable parade of plans—the Commission's plan, the Pentagon plan, the Rosenberg plan, the Hershey plan, the Vinson plan, and doubtless we can expect still more plans as you try to maneuver UMT through this House.

I propose that we look at more than the plans. It is our duty, and in accordance with pledges made on this floor last year, our right, to take another look at UMT—at the basic idea and principle of UMT. That I propose to do.

The administration has changed its mind about how soon UMT should start if adopted, as often as it has come up with new plans. In August 1950 President Truman said—in a letter I might add—that UMT could not be put in

operation "in the immediately foreseeable future."

Last year, although he shared General Marshall's desire to get going, our distinguished chairman said it might not be possible to reach the training phase of UMT for a great, great many years. This year, many different answers have been given on this point. The UMT Commission Chairman, our former colleague, Mr. Wadsworth, said he did not know when UMT could start. On January 17, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said that UMT may not go into effect for a great many years. Secretary Lovett testified that it is the Pentagon intention to start UMT on a voluntary basis 6 months after enactment of the law. And Mr. Lovett admitted that this early start could lead to possible misunderstandings on the grounds that the Pentagon was substituting UMT for the draft.

I do not think there is any possibility of misunderstanding. This haste to get going with UMT cannot possibly mean anything except that UMT is to become a draft system which will put men into training at 18 and into service at 18½—6 months ahead of the timetable laid down by Congress under last year's draft law. Mrs. Rosenberg made that very clear in her testimony before the committee. She said, in opening her statement:

> There is the one, of course, which is called the perfect plan, to let us put it into effect right now and take imediately those who are between the ages of 18 and 19, give them 6 months training, and put them into service so that we can gain this very important experience and also begin to build up the kind of a reserve we need.

I challenge the advocates of an immediate UMT to offer any positive proof that this will not be the result. It was brought out several times during the committee hearings that UMT would replace the draft rather than start at the expiration of the draft, which was the promise last year.

While I understand that supporters of UMT are now likely to compromise on a cut-off date in order to get this legislation through, they have, throughout committee hearings, adamantly refused to place a cut-off date on the legislation. Even the acceptance of a termination date cannot alter the fact—and indeed tends to confirm the fact—that immediate operation of UMT will make it a substitute for the draft law which runs to July 1, 1955.

But it is argued that we need to start UMT immediately in order to start building up our reserve force. We are told building up this force through UMT will enable you to reduce the Armed Forces in being, and so save billions of dollars for the hard-pressed American taxpayer. I challenge that claim. I believe it is an attempt to pawn off a multi-billion dollar gold brick on the American people in order to gain your objective of an immediate UMT.

You can do just as much—no more and no less—to build up the Reserves under the existing draft law, which runs to July 1, 1955, as you could do in the same period under UMT. You can, under the draft law, induct all available young men at 18½ for training. You can, at the end of their training, transfer to the Reserves all such young men not needed in active service. The number available under the draft for assignment to the Reserves after training will be no more and no less than the number who would be available under UMT.

Insofar as building up the Reserves will make possible reduction of forces in being, that same reduction of standing forces would be possible under the present draft law. You can give the American people performance and not just promises—and I tell you frankly, the American people are sick of this administration's empty promises.

In answer to the chairman's comments as to the lack of Reserves, you know who is to blame. We could have all the necessary Reserves today had there been any desire on the part of the Pentagon to build a Reserve under the present Draft Act.

Of course, the Pentagon has never answered the challenge issued by Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, in his statement before our committee when he said the Pentagon "cannot get us coming and going with plans that point to a continued, large, even increasing standing armed force on the one hand, and talk about a UMT program to reduce the size of this same armed force on the other hand."

Mr. Carey was right when he added:

> Realistically, there is no prospect that anyone has yet been able to unearth that the size of the Armed Forces can or will be reduced in the next few years. The proposal to start UMT under these circumstances, aside from all other questions as to its wisdom, is unreasonable.

The Pentagon has not answered that because it cannot answer it. The best Secretary Lovett could offer was the statement:

> We are not at the present time aiming at an indefinite build-up in the Armed Forces. We hope to get a level-off point and then begin to slope down.

Mrs. Rosenberg's comment on this point is particularly interesting. So is Mrs. Rosenberg's logic. I quote:

> We can't give you a guaranty of how soon, whether it is 2 years from today or 3 years from today, that we can discontinue selective service and start reducing the size of the Armed Forces. But we can say this, positively and with conviction, Mr. Chairman, that under current conditions, unless we start UMT, unless we build up a young Reserve which has not seen service in one or two wars before, we will never be able to reduce the size of the active Armed Forces; and not only the size of the Armed Forces as of today, but what we expect to build them to by 1953. That is not the desired size of the Armed Forces, but that is the calculated risk that the Joint Chiefs, the Secretary of Defense, and the President have decided to take in hopes that we are building a Reserve.

That is a somewhat staggering statement. I take it to say, among other things, that the Pentagon does not know when it is going to be able to start reducing the size of the Armed Forces. It seems to say that the Armed Forces are going to get even bigger before they get smaller. It seems to say that even though the Armed Forces are going to get bigger still, they will not be as large, even then, as the administration wishes they might be. And this statement of Mrs. Rosenberg does say that the Armed Forces can never be reduced if UMT is not adopted. I wonder if we want to vote more power to a so-called manpower expert who talks in this fashion.

General Collins testified that you could not put on a mathematical basis the proposition that a build-up of Reserves would bring a reduction in standing forces. If there really is to be a cut in the forces in being, I do not know of any other basis than a mathematical one for accomplishing it. General Collins did say that the number of active-duty units here at home could be reduced if we had 2,000,000 well-trained Reserves, but he added that even that reduction would depend upon our general estimate of the world situation at that time. By adroit questioning, the distinguished committee chairman finally got General Collins to say "yes, sir" to the question: "Just as soon as we begin to build up a large, well-organized Reserve, it is the intention of the Department, is it not, to reduce the standing force?"

That is quite different than promising a reduction in standing forces after we have 2,000,000 well-trained Reserves. It took quite a bit of coaching to get the right answer from General Collins, but the chairman's efforts were finally rewarded.

Actually, the answer does not mean a thing. The promise of a reduction in the Armed Forces does not mean a thing. For that promise you expect the American people to pay billions, on top of the present defense billions, to put UMT into operation. For that promise of "pie in the sky, by and by," you ask the American people to adopt permanent peacetime conscription. But you are not willing to start building up the Reserve, as you could be doing, under the draft and without UMT. You are not willing to prove—as you have never proved—that you can operate a sound Reserve program. No, you must have UMT first.

You know, and we know, that if you get UMT you will forget the promises. The first angry grunt or sharp belch from the Kremlin will cause you to toss your glib promises of a reduction in standing forces into the wastebasket. If those promises are sincere, why have you not been proving it by full utilization of the draft to build up the Reserves?

Yesterday the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee said he challenged anyone to disprove his figures, his estimates on the savings which would be made possible through reduction of the Armed Forces if UMT is adopted. I say to the distinguished chairman that the burden of proof rests upon him. I say to him that he is the one making the claim, and it remains for him to prove it. Performance is the only proof, and the means of performance have been available, and unused, under the present draft law.

In your hurry-up insistence on starting UMT right away you are faithful

disciples of General Marshall who said that he wanted to get going. Like General Marshall you don't trust the American people. It was General Marshall who insisted that if UMT was divorced from the draft law we are sunk again. You have no faith in the ability of the American people to find the right answers except under the pressure of an emergency.

I contrast this lack of faith in the American people with the sober counsel of Gen. Douglas MacArthur:

I should advise most seriously, if I were considering the problem—of UMT—that I would wait and get through with the emergency that faces us now, and then on what has resulted and what exists then, I would sum up the facts, and make my decision.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I wish the gentleman would let me finish.

Mr. COLE of New York. Only to ask the date of the quotation, is all.

Mr. SHAFER. I will furnish that to the gentleman. It was during Senate hearings last year.

Mr. SHORT. If the gentleman will yield I think I can answer that. It was in direct answer to a specific question by the junior Senator from Texas, Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON, when the hearings were held over in the Senate less than a year ago.

Mr. SHAFER. This is the same great American who said: "I have confidence in us."

I share that confidence "in us." I have confidence in the ability of the American people to solve the problems of national security without such pressure tactics. I do not have the same confidence in the UMT plan you are trying to pressure through this House.

One reason for my lack of confidence is that you continue to dodge certain fundamental issues. I offer a few examples.

General Collins, in his testimony, opposed splitting the 6 months' training under UMT into two segments. He said:

The men would not retain enough of the basic training—

After 6 months' time—

to carry on during the second period with team training.

Yet, neither General Collins nor any of the other brass have explained how UMT would fit men for active duty, without extensive retraining and reconditioning, if they were called to service 1 year, 3 years, or 5 years after their original training.

Mrs. Rosenberg told the committee that "we will not drop any of the experiences of Fort Knox that apply to the present-day problem." But she added, significantly:

That was in 1945 or 1946 and the times have changed radically. Our type of training and our type of warfare have changed.

I assume there will be similar changes in the future. What value, then, will UMT training in 1952 have for the man called to fight in 1956 or 1958—unless he is extensively retrained?

The truth is, we are asked, under UMT, to accept a Maginot-line psychology and a Maginot-line method of preparedness. We are asked to prepare for a possible third world war with World War II training methods. And we ignore the fact that delay in putting large numbers of ground forces into action after a war starts has always been due to problems of weapons and materiél production—not the training of manpower.

And, speaking of manpower, it does not make sense to me that we should give the military an 8-year mortgage on the lives of all able-bodied young men without first carefully appraising the total manpower needs of the Nation. Those needs must be appraised in terms of agriculture, industry and the professions, as well as service in a uniform.

That was precisely what General MacArthur was talking about when he said:

I believe there are many complicated considerations. I believe the fitting in of the manpower, of the expert efficiency of the country, is a very intricate problem that can't be settled in such a broad general way as that.

That was also what Mr. James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, was talking about before our committee. Mr. Patton cited Agriculture Secretary Brannan's call for increased crop production this year. He pointed out that there was a net reduction of 329,000 farm workers in this country in 1951 compared to 1950. Mr. Patton warned that UMT would weaken the agricultural productive capacity of the Nation even more than has the draft. You cannot add to the exodus from the farms and the abandonment of farms without giving point to my question to General Hershey during the hearings: "When do we Americans start our capsule diet?"

During committee hearings I heard a distinguished representative of a national farm organization, a veteran of combat action and a Reserve officer, by the way, called a manicured farmer. I thought that was plumbing the bottom in the way of insolent abuse of a citizen for his opposition to UMT.

Yesterday, however, we heard even worse. We heard proponents of UMT offer a comment that Communists also oppose UMT and name a list of several Communist-front organizations who oppose it. This is the last resort of those whose arsenal of logic and reason is exhausted. By implication it identifies conscientious American citizens, including able clergymen, God-fearing church people, representatives of labor, farmers, even veterans of combat service, with Communists. Such a statement, of course, is completely uncalled for. However, since the statement has been made, I should like to remind proponents of UMT that they are on the side of Hitler, Mussolini, Tojo, and others who went down to inglorious defeat in the war. UMT did not save them.

Many a Member who would not dare stand up on this floor and demand socialization, nationalization of industry, or medicine, or finance, or housing, does demand the socialization and nationalization of our most vital resource—our young manhood.

A pilot plan approach to the problem of building up an adequate Reserve, through full use of the draft—the approach which I am urging—would enable you to face some of these problems I have cited. It would enable you to seek the solution to difficult problems gradually, carefully, by trial-and-error methods.

But that does not satisfy the professional drumbeaters for UMT. They want the power and the glory. They want a permanent system of peacetime conscription, signed, sealed and delivered.

At the outset, I referred to the Truman Administration as the grand patron of this proposal for more power, more controls, more big Government.

UMT has been brought closer to realization today than ever in American history by the Administration of Truman, Acheson, and Marshall, And why not? It fits the pattern of that administration. No wonder manpower conferences under high administration auspices are already being held to perfect plans for telling young Americans which ones shall go to college, what they shall study, and so, eventually, who shall be the doctors, who the lawyers, who the factory workers, who the garbage collectors.

Yes, UMT is rightfully this administration's program. Certainly it is not the program of a MacArthur who so eloquently warned that "while intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, UMT carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. For it etches the pattern to a military state."

UMT is today a favorite project of an administration in which a majority of this House, more than once, has declared a lack of confidence; an administration whose demand for immunity powers for the so-called investigator of administration corruption was unanimously rejected by a congressional committee; an administration which was called upon by this House to disclose any secret conversations or commitments made to the Prime Minister of Great Britain; an administration whose blunders in starting a war, and in trying to stop that war, have created the overwhelming disgust and distrust so eloquently voiced the other day by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN]; an administration whose request for power to license all business concerns was emphatically denied by this House a year ago; an administration whose acts of reckless and criminal folly in firing MacArthur brought a Nation-wide outcry for impeachment; an administration whose reckless dispersal of American troops around the globe brought insistence that congressional approval be secured before more troops are sent to Europe.

It is this administration for whom you, the advocates of UMT, now speak.

It is for this confused, corrupted, discredited administration that you are speaking when you seek an 8-year mortgage on the lives of all American boys through permanent peacetime conscription.

Of course, you are in a hurry. Of course, you want to get going. You—and the administration—are racing against time. You are fighting the deadline of next November's judgment day.

You are parroting the demands of a leadership which, however, adroit and bellicose in the committee room and on this floor, has proved itself incompetent in statecraft; timorous on the battlefield; ineffectual in the negotiation tent, and committed to the doctrine—unprecedented for Americans—that there is a substitute for victory.

Here is one battle, your battle for UMT, in which you brave and belligerent battlers are willing to accept no substitute for victory. And you may win. You may win the control you seek over the lives of American youth—you may win the sort of victory which, through your own folly, eludes you on the battlefield and at the conference table.

But I say to you that if you do win it will be a Pyrrhic victory.

Neither you nor the American people and the American way of life—and it is for the American people and the American way of life that I am concerned—can stand many more such victories for the cause of Big Government.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. I do not wish my remarks to be construed in any sense of the word to be even touching upon partisan politics. I do not wish them to be construed to mean that in any sense of the word the issue here is a political issue. It is not with me. Whether it may be with some others, I am unable to say.

I want to talk a little bit about a piece of legislation that has rocked this country from shore to shore, more than any piece of legislation it has been my pleasure to know anything about during the 18 years I have served in this House.

I have heard mention of letterhead organizations, and so forth. I want to tell you that literally thousands of letters have been pouring into my office, and far more than 50 percent of them were not written on letterheads. They were written on scratch tablets, and with pen and ink and pencil, if you please. And not 1 out of 500 favored this bill.

It is true that virtually all of the big organizations, or at least those we usually refer to as organizations, the church organizations, labor organizations, farm organizations, school teachers' organizations, college organizations, as far as I know, without exception are opposed to this legislation. I understood last night that some of the service organizations were 100 percent for this legislation, and I heard it said that the Legion was 100 percent for it. I have been a member of the American Legion virtually since its beginning. I have held many offices in that fine, useful, and patriotic organization. But I have never construed that organization to be one that would, through its commander, dictate the formation of my judgment. I do not so construe it now. It is a great organization and has done a lot of good, but I hope it will, through our commander, get a little bit in balance, for if it does not it will lose some of the good influence it has enjoyed since its organization. A conscientious conviction is as dear to me as it could ever be to him. I respect his, and hope he will be equally generous to me and others.

I want to talk a little bit about the people of this country. There has been a lot of loose talk around here, that they did not know this and they did not know that; they did not understand this or that or the other. Let us just go back to the American family for a few minutes. Maybe there is a reason for their being worried and disturbed. Let us analyze a few trends and conditions that have confronted the average American mother and father who are raising a family in this country, and visualize, if you please, their sitting before the radio or television, reading the newspapers, and they see and hear of bad faith in government, mismanagement of their tax money, corruption, waste of funds, expansion of military power, and expansion of administrative powers, and all the time they have the feeling that their very walls are closing in on their freedoms, and the Government's powers expanding.

The trend and the tendency has been to cut down on the individual freedoms. I am not pleading innocent to my share in it; all of us have at times participated in it, in the hope and with the desire that it was best for America. But sometimes we see a different picture here from what the man sees sitting by his radio; so I say that we might say a few words in behalf of the American people. They are bitterly opposed to this legislation and overwhelmingly so; and if they are bitterly opposed to it because of what they read, see, and hear, we cannot shirk our responsibility for we are at least supposed to be an important part of their Government. If it is a good measure, then we have made our contribution toward framing their minds, and I will not shirk my share of that responsibility.

I say now that we had better look this squarely in the face. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution there was never the slightest question about where the power to declare and carry on a war should rest; that was in the Congress of the United States, the duly elected representatives of the people. But since June 1950, we have had a dangerous and deadly major war going on that has already resulted in approximately 125,000 fine young American men being killed or wounded.

The American people are asking the question: When, where, and how did the nullification of section 8 of the Constitution, which says: The Congresss shall be the one to declare war, come about? When did it come about? And then we sit here and cannot understand why the American people are confused and disturbed. I think they are entitled to an answer instead of making further demands on them for a grant of more powers.

I can tell you the very thing that I think is causing the most trouble. Somebody is shaking their confidence.

So far as I am concerned all the facts should be made available to the whole Congress of the United States, and we should either declare war on somebody and fight an objective war, or get out of Korea. We cannot laugh that responsibility off. They are burying boys in every community in this Nation. To the Defense Department it is No. 5,433 being buried; to some mother and father it is their boy. No sacrifice of that kind should ever be demanded of a people unless strict compliance with the basic and fundamental law of the land has been had. I cannot feel that it is right or good to continue to feed our boys to a veritable meat grinder under present conditions. Yes, the boys are asking questions, and properly so. I realize it is not pleasant to vote a declaration of war—I have experienced it—it will shock any man in his right mind to vote a declaration of war. At the same time it is not pleasant to fight a war But it is our responsibility to let the people know that the war was the result of the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives and so declared officially, and we should not long shirk that responsibility. During all of this debate nobody has touched on that unpleasant subject and 75 percent of you are probably saying that it is indiscreet for me to mention it. However, I know what is honestly in my mind and I know that here is the place for me to say it, not in the parlor or on the street corner.

I have been in one war, under one, and I do not know where I am in this one. There can be no doubt about its being a war. Those who have heretofore been calling it "a police action" are now calling it by its real name, "war."

Mrs. Anna Rosenberg on Monday, February 11, 1952, over the ABC network, and I have a copy of the release—I would not trust my ears, I sent for an original copy—said, and these are her words:

> We are fighting a war and we are demobilizing an army at the same time.

That was on the program Time for Defense, one of the many propaganda programs put on by the Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, if there has ever been a time on this earth when we need to consolidate Americans, it is now. It is not the time to confuse them with an issue of this kind. If we are in the danger that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said we are—and there is no more patriotic man in America than GENE COX—and if there is tne danger lurking and hovering over us that he says, and if there is as much danger as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services says, who also stated "we may have a little time left," what are we doing here trying out experiments and working on an experimental UMT bill? We better be at our post of duty, getting ready for what may be awaiting us, if such is the case.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to work out a practical training program. I have done my best to work with those in authority on a training program that could be fitted to our American way of life. I wanted to coordinate the military with our economic, educational, religious, and social way of life. I

wanted to coordinate our military training program with our educational institutions, with our apprentice training programs, with our vocational training programs, with agriculture and industry, and such can be done and done in a manner consistent with our American way of life and in cooperation with our American institutions already in operation. But the military said, "No; subordinate or nothing."

Can you just imagine the effect that this legislation would have on the school system of America? I do not like the adamant attitude of the military. I would like for them to content themselves to stay on the other side of the Potomac and let us attend to our business on this side. It is not their job to educate and rebuild America according to their own pattern, but to defend America as is. I know there are some of the Pentagon military in the gallery now, as there were the last time I spoke on this subject, wisecracking over what I am saying. But that does not affect or bother me. I know this: I know the top officials of the Pentagon have been effective enough to close the mouths of generals and admirals. I can prove that by Admiral Denfeld and some others. If they can close their mouths with the shift of their lips, I want to inform you that a bayonet and a rifle is a pretty influential instrument. We may get ours closed sometime unless the Congress exercises due caution and good sense in dealing out powers to the military. I think their place is on the other side of the Potomac carrying out the responsibilities and legislation given them by the Congress of the United States. They are useful to the Congress as consultants but not as directors.

I know what they want. They want to indoctrinate. They want to plan education. They want to carry on every conceivable kind of a school. And they have been doing just that. I want you members of the committee to know that as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor I set about with what I regard as the best research man in the Congressional Library to delve into this thing. He has done a marvelous job and the report is now finished and will be available within the next 2 or 3 days. Two volumes of it have already been made available. Would it be news to you members of the committee to know that the Federal Government during 1950 spent over $4,000,000,000 in the field of education? Would it be news or of any interest to you members of the committee to know that the Defense Department during 1950, in running every conceivable kind of a school—not a service school for bakers, and so forth, but running every conceivable kind of a school, spent over $275,000,000? And it is much more than that during 1951, and that is in the record over their signatures. Then we ask the question, Why should the American people be concerned over this? Yes; they teach democracy, the kind of democracy they believe in. They prescribe the textbooks. They teach that the military alone can survive. Well, now, maybe that is right, but we have been getting along pretty well with our ordinary American way of educating our youth. Without setting up the machinery for a thought-control program by the military. That sounds too much like the famous or infamous youth movement of old Germany we spent so much to destroy.

I say to you that if you search your records you will find why they do not want to coordinate the military with the educational institutions. No; they would rather disrupt than to coordinate. I find now, even under the atmosphere of slowing down and holding back, there are 670 educational institutions in America now training reserves. I am told there are approximately 160 applications of schools over in the Pentagon that could have been training reserves for nothing, except the United States Government furnishing equipment, if they wanted to let them. In that group of 670 schools there are 328,480 students as of 1950 in the Reserves. But the minute you begin to take on the job of fitting the educational institutions or fitting our economy or fitting our industrial set-up or fitting the apprentices or fitting any other kind of a set-up they say, "No; we want the whole thing or nothing." And there is where I part.

I did not give up reaching some kind of solution of this until just a few weeks ago. I still thought there was a way to work it out, until I reached the definite conclusion that there was only one pattern, that if a part of the pattern was reached here there was another part of the pattern waiting somewhere else in another legislative body, and when they got together they would make the picture all right. I do not propose to be caught in that kind of a squeeze, and so far as I am able I am going to do my best to stop it where it is. We know we have not done right by the Reserves of this country. We know too well that we have not done right by the National Guard of this country. We know well that we can make a better showing there than we have made if the military will cooperate.

America has not always been strong by virtue of the military alone. America has been strong because of its educational institutions, its American way of life, its know-how, its productivity, and when we begin to brush aside the effect and the ultimate good to come from our institutions, industrial and otherwise, then watch out, we are headed for a pitfall, because we might remember this, that even radar, which was of such invaluable help to us in the last war, was perfected by men of an average age of less than 26. Had they not been permitted to become scientists, they probably would have been truck drivers, tank drivers, or infantrymen. I think we had better give some attention to that.

We want to give a little bit of consideration to the cost of this situation. There are but two ways to cut down the cost of the United States Armed Forces; one is, when the time comes and when it is safe, cut down the size; the other is, cut out waste and extravagance. That is all. It does not make any difference if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] figures $11,500—and he rolled it out as long as my arm—for each individual soldier, there is not a person in this House, but who knows that $11,500 did not just count keeping that boy in camp. If it did, somebody ought to be shot for waste. That took into consideration all of the camps and installations all over the world; but they are not going to transfer any of that to the Reserves.

I love him like a brother, but I was a little bit interested in that he got so economy-minded that he started off talking about 52 billion, and he had not been talking long before he left off the "billion" and it was 52 million, and he had not been going long on that before it dropped down to 50 thousand, and then he said they are going to absorb that. That is what the American people have been doing for a long time, absorbing.

As delightful as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is, and as close personal friend of mine as he is, I am going to try to see that he is given his proper place in history, because while Greece had its Pythagoras, Georgia has its VINSON, who is a better figurer than he was. He is a better mathematician than Pythagoras ever was.

There is no need to talk about this program not going to cost. We know it is going to cost. I have been furnished some figures that are equally as startling as the savings claimed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and I am sure they are just as reliable, which indicate that instead of saving money this UMT proposal and its huge Reserve program would cost the people of America about $46,000,000,000 over the next 9 years, and would be an unnecessary addition to the current rate of military spending. I can prove by the chairman that I have the inalienable right to adopt these figures if I so choose.

The American people are willing to pay the insurance premium for a well-defended country. Yes; we want the Marines; we want the Navy; and we want the Army and the Air Force; and we want the Reserve—and we want our American way of life left with us at the same time.

They say we are going to save money. The only money you are going to save is the difference between the $30 that you pay the trainee and the $75 that you pay the trainer, because they say it is going to take one trainer to train two trainees. That is a high percentage of school teachers in my book. And that is in the RECORD. They are going to take one trainer to train two trainees, and they are not going to be in the Army. So here we are facing all this danger, fixing to take about 300,000 men out of Europe or Korea or somewhere and put them to training people who are not going to be in the Army. Now, that does not add up. When they come down to saying that it is not going to cost but somewhere in the neighborhood of $3,000 to train a trainee for 6 months, that is also a high-priced college education in my book. Imagine, $3,000 to give a boy 6 months' basic training. And that is not the worst part of this kind of thing. Go down here for instance to VMI, which turns out just as fine military men as West Point ever did. They may let them go along until the end of the college year, and then they take them out for 6 months to give them basic training. Now,

that will be cute—take a boy out of training at VMI and put him under some Regular Army sergeant to give him basic training, when they have the tanks and guns and everything else at VMI right now, which the Army uses and which the Army has. But, we are going to exempt the three service schools, the Coast Guard Academy, Annapolis, and West Point. Then to talk about not being able to fit this program to our American way of life is absurd. I do not like this business of calling on these boys for $30 a month. The American people are willing to pay what is necessary to defend this country, and $75 is either too much for the Regular—and it certainly is not—or $30 is not enough for the trainee. I, for my part, am perfectly willing to pay my share of the same pay to all.

Now let us get on with this economy business for a minute. According to what the people on the Committee on Armed Services tell me, they have never discovered such waste, extravagance, and foolish spending as has been going on within the Armed Services. Now I think that is an honest statement of some of you people on that committee. Are we going to look to them for economy? Are we going to give them another blank check, and with that turn over to them the 18-year-old boys? No, not with my vote—we are not going to do that. I am opposed to the destruction of my country from within or from without. I do not think that this House can afford to do it either. We must have our vocational training programs in this country; we must have our educated boys in this country; we must have the production in this country; and we must above all retain and preserve our freedoms in this country because free men make the best soldiers on earth. Why? Because they have more to fight for. They have their freedom to fight for. That is worth everything else.

Now, we have had these boys confused and mixed up enough for the last 10 years. There has been some kind of a proposition of this kind meeting the average 18-year-old boy who is already confused, just about every week. If he is in college he studies a while and then he goes downtown to get a newspaper to see if he will be at college next week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. SUTTON. I understand that at Fort Meade Lieutenant General Brooks is now spending $27,000 of the taxpayers' money to build him a personal hunting lodge down at A. P. Hill, and he also has a master sergeant as his house boy down there.

Mr. BARDEN. Well, I do not know about that. I hope that is not so. If it is, I hope he gets what he ought to have; that is, a kick in the pants, as far as I am concerned. I hope it is not so, but you do not have to go further than around the suburbs of Washington, according to the morning newspapers, and you will find some millions of dollars wasted and misspent; and according to some of the members of the Armed Services Committee, fifty or sixty million piled up in other places.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I wish every Member of the House would get a report from the two subcommittees of our Armed Services Committee, one headed by the distinguished and able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT], and the other by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY], and you will learn a little of the enormous waste.

Mr. BARDEN. I want North Carolina to claim a little of that credit. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] has a few secrets also.

Mr. SHORT. He certainly does, and I am sorry I overlooked mentioning his name. All three of those committees are doing valuable work for the Congress and for the country.

Mr. BARDEN. The thing that bothers me is that here is a group already investigating, and they already know how much waste has been going on and what is happening, and then they come in here with some funny figures and say, "They are right because we got them from the Defense Department." I want some better and more reliable and dependable authors of figures before I annex them to my way of thinking. That is exactly the way I feel about it.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you have been very kind to me. I do not like this bill. I hope you have gathered that much. I could take some time going into it further, but I do want to tell you something that is really ironic. I am not going to trust my memory, but I want to read you something. We have been trying to settle the situation over in Europe, prescribing the methods of raising armies, and so forth. I want to read this paragraph from the committee hearings, page 2717:

> It is a strange irony of fate that in the very moment in history when the land of Bismarck and Hitler has adopted the selective-service plan of the United States, that the United States, the land of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, should be contemplating the adoption of compulsory military training and service, which we inherit from the German state most largely.

In other words, just a few days ago the Atlantic pact, upon recommendation of the United States, adopted and recommended that Germany raise its own army by the selective service system, the system we employed when we defeated Germany the first time; the system we employed when we defeated Germany the second time; and now we are considering adopting the system that Germany went down with, and that is the so-called universal military training system, probably worse than the orthodox type. They have mongrelized it until it is very difficult to tell just what it is, especially when you find such language as the following:

> The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe rules and regulations not inconsistent with law—

Which is liable to mean almost anything. I will tell you what is the truth: You know the committee is pretty good; they have kept the situation well in hand. I started out studying the bills as they came out. First the Commission came down with their recommendation and I went to work on that; then the committee came out with a bill and I said: "Well, I will work on that a while;" and I thought I was beginning to understand a part of it when all of a sudden up came committee print No. 1. Well, I kind of "snuck" a copy of that, Mr. Chairman; I got hold of a copy of committee print No. 1. In about 2 or 3 days out came committee print No. 2. Then by the time I got No. 2 in my mind out came committee print No. 3. I said: "Now, that is bound to be the last one." But, lo and behold! a few days after that out came committee print No. 4, and then out comes the bill we have here before us, and I understand they are now trying to sweeten it up.

I can take a licking if I have to, as far as that is concerned, but it is embarrassing to be out smarted, and knowing the designs I do not want any of this amending business. As far as I am concerned I am swinging at it from the floor. I am in favor of its burial without benefit of clergy, and I do not care if you do not even mark the spot.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this proposal for permanent peacetime compulsory military training.

I do so with high respect for the proponents of this measure, on both sides of the political aisle. This is not a partisan matter, but one of paramount importance to present and future generations. There can be no personalities in our debate, but only discussion of the merits of the proposal. I mention as typical of the supporters of universal military training the distinguished and able gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], a Member who has rendered outstanding and unselfish service to his country, in war and peace; a man whose vigorous, patriotic leadership in veterans' organizations and programs has won the respect and esteem of all of us and our comrades who have worn the uniform of our country. The gentleman from Georgia, the distinguished chairman of the committee, is typical of the honorable, patriotic supporters of UMT. There is no question of motives, of patriotism, of desire best to serve our country in this time of confusion and crisis.

Furthermore, there is no division among us as to our ultimate purpose, which is to find the best possible ways and means to protect and defend our Nation and our allies in the free world from the world-wide conspiracy of Soviet communism. We are agreed that we must prevent further aggression and

another major war if possible; and if all our efforts fail and a major war breaks upon us again, we must be able to win the conflict as speedily as possible. Every official, every citizen, worthy to enjoy our free institutions, is agreed on that noble aim.

The only differences of opinion, therefore, are on methods to strengthen our position in world affairs so that governments of, by, and for the people might not perish from the earth.

Having said that, let us get down to the merits of the proposal to conscript into military training all the fit young men at the age of 18. Close study of the report and recommendations of the UMT Commission reveals that the plan is based upon certain assumptions, many of them plainly false and others so questionable as to have little value in the defense of the free world today. Let us examine a few of them:

From a military standpoint, UMT for the United States at this time is indefensible. We are now at war in Korea, however much those responsible for sending our boys into Korea without a declaration of war would like to have this country forget it. We are at war, with selective service going full blast to supply the manpower to fight that war. Will anyone contend that adoption of this watered-down plan of conscripting boys at 18 years of age for military training in peacetime would help our present war effort? Of course not. UMT would interfere with, rather than strengthen, our war effort in Korea and our defense efforts everywhere else on earth. It would hinder, rather than help, in the creation and maintenance of the only type of military force, for both offense and defense, needed to meet the conditions of modern aggression.

If I were a four-star general or admiral, I honestly believe I could advance the same arguments against UMT from a military standpoint that so many Members of this House know to be true—that is, if I were free to speak my mind, as generals and admirals are certainly not free to do today.

The truth of the matter is that we do not need UMT to win the war in Korea—if our political commissars ever decide to let our military men win it. If we are actually confronted with an impending major war, then certainly we do not need to mix a diluted peacetime UMT with our military preparedness. From all over the Nation, rise the distressed voices of parents, of teachers, of workers, of young men of military age, begging us to map a plan which will give hope for the solution of the present world crisis, before we take the plunge backward into reliance upon an outmoded, obsolete type of goose-stepping militarism, before we turn our backs on the American tradition of selective service for war and a small, effective standing army for peace, before we adopt the system that has failed to prevent wars in Europe but has helped to lead the weary peoples of that Continent into endless, needless struggles for the last two centuries.

I venture to assert that in the minds of our constituents, from whatever State or district we come, there is the growing realization that the crisis we are in is not due to the bravery of our fighting men in past and present wars, not due to lack of military strength, and certainly not due to a lack of peacetime conscription, but due to the complete breakdown of our foreign policy. Nothing could illustrate more clearly the complete bankruptcy of national leadership today than to fall back upon an obsolete system of military conscription that has never prevented war, has never been needed to help us win a war, will not prevent modern all-out war and will not be effective if such a war breaks upon the world.

Yet we are asked to support UMT, and in public thinking it is inseparably connected with our discredited, ineffective, impotent misdirected foreign policy. Can I find no better answer for my constituents as to how we might implement our foreign policy, than to tell them we must abandon the cherished American tradition of no peacetime compulsory conscription?

The entire UMT proposal rests upon another false assumption, namely, that we are going to be cursed with these wars all around the world, as in Korea, indefinitely, and therefore we may as well build our Nation into a garrison state and accustom ourselves to live in an atmosphere of tension and turmoil forever. If there ever was a policy of fear, of helplessness and hopelessness, that is it. Actually, this is the repeatedly expressed policy of our State Department, echoed by their faithful puppets in the Pentagon. They tell us that this is the America of the future. I quote from a letter I just received from one of our chief policymakers, Anna M. Rosenberg, bearing the exalted title of Assistant Secretary of Defense, in which she says to me:

> As we view world conditions, it appears that this period of unrest and grave danger may persist in varying degrees of intensity indefinitely, even if hostilities in Korea are over—just how long no one can predict.

If ever there was a policy of fear, of helplessness, of hopelessness, that is it.

While I recognize, as every official and citizen must, the fact of Communist aggression and its world-wide challenge to free governments and institutions, yet I refuse to admit that free peoples do not have the intelligence and strength to meet this problem squarely, and solve it promptly. Because of the abysmal mistakes in our foreign policies which have permitted Stalin and his Kremlin tyrants to dominate vast areas of the world with 800,000,000 people, we cannot bring about peace and security overnight. But the alternative is not a state of perpetual military preparedness. There is a better way. Let us find it. Let us meet this threat of communism not with an ineffective, insufficient, obsolete military program, but with the type of weapons needed to win this tragic struggle in which free peoples find themselves engaged.

I offer three points of a constructive program, taking into account the integration of our military, economic, diplomatic, and psychological strength. The first two are for the immediate emergency, while we are faced with the aggressions and threats of aggressions of Soviet communism. The third is for a long-time program, for which we should now plan.

First. Let us determine the military contribution which the United States can best make to the collective security of the free world. On that score, every factor is opposed to the UMT theory. The major contribution of the United States can never be manpower—the fighting land troops which UMT would begin to train.

Our major contributions must be equipment. This means the sum total of all production for security—the scientific know-how, the raw materials, the industrial capacity, the skilled labor pools, the management, the effective distribution of every item needed for the sinews of collective security, the weapons of our international police force.

Next in order, in the contribution we in this great Nation must make, is air power. Here we excel because of our equipment and our general progress in aviation, civilian and military, since its beginning. Third in order is our naval power, in which we also now excel in all the world. Fourth is the military staff work, to which we can furnish officers and personnel for every branch and for every purpose of planning, directing, and commanding.

That leaves to other nations of the free world, our allies in this struggle, the major contribution of manpower. That is the contribution they are best equipped to make. And yet yesterday morning papers announced in glaring headlines that selective service is to be stepped up, that more and more young men are to be drafted from off the farms and from out the factories and schools of this Nation. The place of every one of these men taken from our productive capacity could be filled by two other men standing or sitting in idleness in some friendly country. This simply does not make sense to the fathers and mothers of American boys. It does not make sense to say to them, "We are going to add another burden to what you now carry—peacetime compulsory military conscription that will take every able-bodied boy away from his home at 18 years of age."

Let us set ourselves to the task of an over-all survey of the manpower of every member of the United Nations willing to resist aggression and preserve the peace of the world, and exert whatever leadership may be needed to enlist their contribution in manpower. Let us get the present war and the present emergencies out of the way, and then calmly survey the need for permanent collective security to preserve peace on earth based upon justice and order.

Second. Let us strengthen and utilize the resistance of peoples enslaved by the Communist regimes to the end that they may revolt and overthrow their Kremlin oppressors.

Here is a bold new program, and one that will take us from the defensive, where we have been in this conflict with communism, to a vigorous, effective offensive. Let us realize this great and

fundamental truth: That the struggle against communism is the struggle for the minds and hearts of mankind. It cannot be won by guns and bombs alone. The strongest weapon that we hold in our hands is truth itself. Our strongest and most valuable asset in the crusade to overthrow communism without war is the burning desire of captive peoples for freedom.

Let us then move boldly to prevent further aggression and war by a crusade to liberate the masses enslaved by communism, in all the captive lands, and in Russia itself. Our primary weapons will not be guns, but ideas. Our first task will be to give assurances of hope to the now hopeless millions of captive peoples, that we intend to work unceasingly for their liberation. Our next and continuing task will be to find and employ the best methods of strengthening resistance among the victims of Soviet enslavement, and enlist our governments and our peoples to making those methods effective.

If we adopt these two courses of action, we shall take the initiative and gain hope for the creation of a world untroubled by totalitarian dictatorships which thrive upon perpetual unrest, conflict, and war. We shall offer hope for an international order in which peacetime compulsory conscription would be as outmoded as the suit of armor or the flintlock musket.

Third. Let us map a practical, constructive program of peace—not of war. One of the clearest facts of history is this: compulsory peacetime conscription, to build up stronge military units and reserves, was the very heart of the militarism of European nations in modern history. No amount of nice words can hide the fact that UMT for the United States would be an indication of our abandonment of the ideals of peace through international justice and collective security, and our relapse into complete dependence upon stark military power.

Have we nothing better to offer suffering humanity than that? Of course we have. It is a program of peace. It calls for the creation of peace by the removal of the deep and fundamental causes of war. After removal of the immediate cause of aggression and war, it holds out to peoples who have been dominated by the imperialist control of so-called favored races and favored nations that they too can be free. It holds out to the hungry the hope that through their own peaceful production they may be fed. It holds out to backward nations the assurance that through a just international order they may receive their share of natural resources and raw materials for production and trade.

And best of all, it holds out to mankind the recognition of humanity as a brotherhood, capable of living in cooperation and mutual helpfulness.

In such a future world as that, the proposal of UMT would be as out of date as policemen equipped with bows and arrows. We need not go backward through the centuries to find security and peace when with vision and courage we can go forward.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have consistently opposed universal military training during peacetime. I have voted against it on every occasion when it was considered in the House of Representatives and I expect to vote against it when it comes to a final vote in a few days.

I hope that it will come up for a straight vote on the issues that the measure now before us raise. I hope the real issue is not lost in a maze of dilatory amendments that might be offered by the proponents of the measure when they find that they cannot pass the bill as it is now written. I also hope that the issue is not postponed by a vote to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

I have pridefully, on many occasions, complimented the Military Affairs Committee and the Naval Affairs Committee of the House before their two great committees were combined together into the Committee on Armed Services. This was done when Congress passed the reorganization bill a few years ago. I opposed that measure and all subsequent events have justified my position.

I would not have you think, however, that I was or am opposed to all or any plan for reorganizing the Government when and where it is plain and patent that economy of time or money can be accomplished. But when reorganization is advocated for the purpose of giving more power to Government bureaucrats, I am opposed to it; or when it seeks to take power away from Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people, and repose it in boards or groups selected by the President or some member of the President's Cabinet or by a political gang that has for its purpose the advancement of the political fortunes of the President or his political satraps, I am opposed to it.

The bill presently before the House for consideration is the product of this legislative philosophy that seeks to restrict the powers of Congress and to supplant the Congress by a board or a commission.

In the last session of Congress a bill was passed setting up a board to study this matter of universal military training. Originally it was the intention to give this board such power as would amount to a complete supplanting of the Congress by the board. If this original plan had been accepted in toto, it would have amounted in effect to the board's having to make recommendations to the House, which recommendations would become law unless the House would by affirmative action reject the recommendations of the board. This would amount to an abdication by the House of its constitutional powers and to me it would seem to be a cowardly retreat of the House to satisfy the constantly increasing desire of bureaucracy to supplant lawfully constituted authority.

Mr. Chairman, while I am as I have stated opposed to universal military training during peacetime, I am more opposed to the pending measure because it is a surrender of the House of constitutional authority that belongs to the legislative branch of government and not to the Executive.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution gives to Congress the exclusive power to declare war and to raise and support armies. It does not contemplate that a board appointed by the President or by anyone else shall declare war or raise and support armies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this pending measure fundamentally and eternally because it is the forerunner of dangerous legislation that must inevitably follow the enactment of this bill that we are now considering. This bill figuratively is the nose of the camel under the tent. If this bill is passed, even if it is a compromise bill, the next step will be to pass legislation that will go further and further down the road toward complete compulsory military training with all its expense and with all its dislocation of the lives and lifetime prospects of all the boys in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, as a student in school and in college and as a teacher, I always felt that ours was a peaceful Nation with no designs on the territory or property of any other nation or people. As a lawyer and a lawmaker for many years, I have swelled with pride because I was a citizen of a great country that respected its Constitution and its laws. We fought the Revolutionary War with volunteer soldiers and won it and gave to the world an example of what a free people can do when they are harassed by an inferior and more powerful government. We fought and won the Civil War with volunteer soldiers to show the world that a government of the people, by the people, for the people could and would endure. Our heritage clearly teaches us that we must carry on maintaining our own liberties and coveting nothing that does not belong to us.

Mr. Chairman, again I say our course as a nation is toward universal peace. Germany, before the First World War and before the Second World War, was an advocate of universal military training and practiced it rigorously. Kaiser Bill brought on the First World War with results that we all know about. Hitler, the paperhanger, was an ardent advocate of universal military training and was always preparing for war. He plunged the world into a frightful war that challenged the extinction of our present civilization. He got just what universal military training brought to him and his country. History is replete with proof that universal military training leads to war.

Mr. Chairman, our face as a nation is constantly toward universal peace and not toward universal war. May we always keep it thus.

Mr. Chairman, what I have said is not a discussion of abstruse legislative principles of government. It is just what the most unlearned and unlettered patriotic citizen of our great country understands thoroughly. The parents and wives and children of many thousands of our fine American boys killed in Korea know what war is from its terrible results.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not break faith with them. I shall take their side of the issue, because the course now being taken by President Truman and his State Department is not consistent with the course Washington and Lincoln would take, and neither is it the course that General MacArthur, America's most outstanding military man, would take.

Mr. Chairman, a number of very able addresses have been made in this debate with which I agree most heartily. I especially refer to the speech made by Mr. ARENDS of Illinois yesterday and the one made today by Mr. BARDEN, a very able and prominent Democrat from North Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, I have received thousands of letters and communications from many fine and highly respected citizens from the district which I have the honor to represent. These were farmers, teachers, ministers, businessmen, housewives, and persons from all walks of life. They have not only given me their views on this pending legislation but they have implored me not to vote their sons into a compulsory universal military training Army or Navy. I have few, if any, communications favoring this UMT program provided for in the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a controversy with the people on one side and some of the military leaders on the other. As a Congressman charged with legislating for the best interests of our people and our country, my duty is clear. I shall follow the Constitution and I shall try to do what the overwhelming number of the people that I represent would want me to do. And I shall be consistent with my past record.

Mr. Chairman—

> Long may our land be bright
> With freedom's holy light,
> Protect us by Thy might,
> Great God our King.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in the beginning that my decision on this matter has not been dictated by anyone. There has been some inference here at the present time that the Pentagon is dictating to the members of our committee as to how we should vote on the measure and how we should act. I first voted for this measure in 1922, when it was first presented to the first American Legion convention. I have consistently felt during all these years that we made a great mistake in not adopting some form of training after World War I. I feel somewhat like the gentleman who was supposed to follow Lord Lister, when he made one of his famous speeches in Parliament. When the toastmaster at the finish of the lord's speech turned and asked someone else to speak, he said, "No; when the nightingale sings, all other birds remain silent for fear of disturbing the music." The oratory we have heard is outstanding in rhetoric. I am not qualified to compare at all with such scholars of rhetoric. But, I have tried in a humble way to write out and express my opinion honestly and sincerely.

My good friend the gentleman from North Carolina, who preceded me, comes from down near Roanoke Island where the first white man set foot in America. I have the highest regard and opinion of his integrity and honesty, but in this case I feel that his judgment is bad. I am going to try to point out to you some of the reasons why I think we should adopt this measure.

At the present time, and there has been some indication of it here on the floor of the House, this opposition is being hung on the mothers of America and those here in America who do not want their boy to give at least 6 months of his life in the service of his country. Think of it gentlemen. I would like to use the words of Van Dyke when we think of the mothers of this country, when he said, "Gentlemen, I love the men of the West. They have hope; they have faith; they have courage." I can say this of the American mother. She has hope, faith, and courage. If you gentlemen here today in this great deliberate body will go back to the hip roof, covered wagon days of 1700 to 1756—56 years of war—when those wagons moved out from our State of North Carolina, South Carolina, from the red hills of Georgia, from Virginia, across the Blue Ridge Mountains, Pennsylvania, and New York across the plains of Illinois and Iowa, fighting every day, every inch of their way, establishing for us here in America the greatest country on the face of the earth. The mothers of that day met their responsibility. They knew what it was to suffer and die. Think of it—56 years of war. If you do not believe it, read Theodore Roosevelt's Winning of the West, in seven volumes. It will give you a perfect picture of the sacrifices that the women made in that era. If that war had not been fought and won we probably would have had European states set up here in America and not be here debating this issue. They fought the French; they fought the Spanish, and they fought the Indians, and they kept right on fighting, men and women, and moved on to the Pacific Ocean. You people from the far West today, I think, should appreciate that fact.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING UNDER DEMOCRATIC CONTROL UMT—TRADITION

We have heard arguments from many of the opponents of universal military training that such a program would be undemocratic, that it would be peacetime conscription, that, if adopted, it will lead to the militarization of our Nation, stifle individual initiative, and that it will be a means by which we forfeit our freedoms; in short, it is alleged that it is contrary to the great American tradition of subordinating the military to control by the people.

These arguments are out-and-out distortion of fact. One of the primary purposes for adopting UMT is so that we may be able to reduce the huge standing Military Establishment which unsettled world conditions force us to maintain under present circumstances. Would such a reduction be a step in the direction of militarization? Of course not. The building of a strong, trained, dependable reserve force of citizen soldiers who could be called to the service of their country in time of peril is in the best tradition of America. Those who use such arguments against UMT either ignore or fail to examine the early history of our nation where the tradition was fear of large standing forces and not revulsion at the training of citizens to defend their freedoms.

It should be made clear once and for all, the many misrepresentations to the contrary notwithstanding, that universal military training is not conscription. Conscription is compulsory military service for an extended period of time—not for a number of years. UMT is just what its name says it is—training. The first settlers in America brought individual military training with them; and it is little wonder that in the young years of our country, when danger of attack was just as close as the nearest cover for hostile bands, our forebears accepted the need for military training and the maintenance of a constant state of readiness as calmly as they accepted the need for planting their crops. During the period 1607 to 1775 the Colonies passed more than 600 ordinances and laws for the creation of effective forces of civilian soldiers. The oldest traditions of our country, then—the traditions under which our Nation was founded—included the concept of compulsory training. It was only in relatively recent years that some of those opposed to this American philosophy manufactured a new tradition which has endangered us in all of our recent wars.

Let us reflect for a moment on the sage words of our great patriots who produced American tradition. In 1790 in his first annual address to both Houses of Congress Washington stated:

> To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace.

What has become of the once cherished American tradition that was born from Nathan Hale's famous words: "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country"? Why have so many otherwise substantial citizens of this Nation sought to be excused from all liability or resisted giving even 6 months to preparation for the defense of their country and closed their minds to the philosophy of that great oracle of democracy, Thomas Jefferson:

> It proves more forcibly the necessity of obliging every citizen to be a soldier. This was the case with the Turks and Romans, and must be that of every free state. * * * We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens. We can never be safe until this is done.

Why is it that we have permitted these fine American traditions to be forgotten and have accepted a system which permits the courageous and conscientious to volunteer their services for hazardous duty in time of peril, while the unwilling accept the benefits of military security and yet offer nothing in the hazard of national defense? The reasons given for such shirking of responsibility are fatuous, based on wishful thinking, and dissolve before fact and experience. We have said that we

do not want to train our young men to die on the battlefields of war. It takes no training to die on a battlefield. The untrained are those who die. It takes training to live. From the moment of their birth we watch over our children, protect them, prepare them for the life ahead, teach them to protect themselves from traffic when crossing the street on the way to school. We rush them to the doctor at the first sign of illness. We save, toil, and sacrifice in order that these children may have the very best education it is within our power to give them so that they will be able to cope with the problems of life and satisfactorily solve them. At the very same time we ignore the realities of the world, and reason that since we do not want our sons to die in a war, we do not want them trained for a war, hoping against hope that the fact that they are not trained will prevent us from having a war and will prevent them from being called upon to fight. Such reasoning is obviously ridiculous. Let us take notice of the words of Gen. Henry Lee, who states:

> Government is the murderer of its citizens which sends them to the field uninformed and untaught, where they are to meet men of the same age and strength, mechanized by education and discipline for battle.

No; UMT is not training for death, it is training for life.

We have heard from other opponents that UMT will make militarists of our young men. What a mockery. What an insult to the boys of America, their parents, their schools, and their churches. After 18 years of his life a young man is not likely to be transformed in six short months into a militaristic automaton. Eighteen million of our citizens who are veterans of service in our Armed Forces and who have returned to their local communities to become outstanding students and civic leaders attest to the fallacy of that argument. It is significant that the stanchest supporters of UMT are civilians—members of the service organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and so forth, as well as their women's auxiliaries and the Gold Star Mothers. These are men who have placed their lives in jeopardy and the women who are their mothers, sisters, and wives. They are not pleading the contaminating influence of military service. The program of UMT will be supervised by the civilian National Security Training Commission, and carried out by the Department of Defense which is controlled by the people of this country through their elected representatives in the Congress. Under such circumstances, the allegation that the program would lead to militarism seems absurd.

It is shocking to hear intelligent people say that we must not disturb the education or the careers of 18-year-old boys so that they may receive this training. Many, many thousands of courageous Americans have suffered and have given their lives on the battlefield from the Revolution to this day just so that these young men could pursue their careers in freedom, and so that our schools and churches would remain the mighty institutions they are in this Nation, and for no other reason. It is bewildering that many of those who now enjoy these great benefits cannot be bothered to make the meager sacrifice necessary to prepare them to carry on the high purpose of our fallen heroes.

We can no longer tolerate a system which places the burden of preparing for the defense of America upon the willing, brave, and conscientious who volunteer while the selfish reap the benefits. Modern warfare strikes like lightning and requires most rapid utilization of manpower. We have been fortunate in the last two global wars in having had strong allies who could hold our enemies at bay while we mobilized leisurely and trained our boys. There is no assurance that this will be the case in future wars. On the contrary, it appears that because of our world-wide deployment we will be the first to be attacked and combat will be simultaneous with mobilization. At such time every physically fit young man will be needed for the defense of his country, and he will be needed fast. We owe it to every single man and boy who may have to fight to give him the necessary preparation for war now and thereby increase his chance of survival.

It is interesting to note that many of the leaders of groups opposing universal military training have never seen a battlefield, never been inside a military camp, and have never had training themselves. Few of the organizations who are opposed to the program of training have ever made any request to the responsible agencies for information and explanation of the purpose and nature of universal military training. They are not interested in the necessity for it nor the contribution it will make to our security. They disregard the threat of Communist engulfment without weighing the consequences.

It is also noteworthy that the Communist Party and their propaganda instruments vehemently oppose UMT. Communism fears UMT as a means of preparing our youth to defend the Nation just as much as it fears the atomic bomb or any other of our powerful weapons, all of which are important but completely dependent upon trained men to make them effective. This should cause some of those with honest misgivings to pause and consider.

George Washington once said at Valley Forge during that frightful winter:

> This liberty will look easy by and by when nobody dies to get it.

How right he was. Is this Nation now inhabited by the sons and daughters of the vigorous and courageous men who spilled blood and were splashed out over the ramparts so that we might enjoy the benefits of a great, free democracy, or is it inhabited by a population of spineless, weak-kneed individuals?

To this generation of Americans has passed an inheritance of the greatest array of human values ever enjoyed by mankind. This inheritance was bought only by the blood, and incredible hardship, and the strain of aching muscles of men who were determined in their conviction that the cause they were fighting for was worth while.

Some of the basic problems raised by long-range planning under Democratic control can, in my opinion, be detected by an analysis of what I have just said. Long-range planning is too often taken for granted. It is by nature more beneficient than short-range planning.

Some of our weakness has been due to the fact that we have been short-sighted and have been short-range planners. The unwillingness of our people to commit themselves to long-term plans, especially its effects that demand continued efforts and sacrifices, is an example of this. The measure which is before us today has been before the general public since 1920. There have always been, and I suppose there always will be, people on the scene who seem to have a pathological fear of any long-range program of planning in our methods of defense. To me this has become rather comical, and it has been rather detrimental in many instances, in my opinion, to our own best interests and purposes. There are those today who will argue that this long-range planning measure for defense of Christian democracy—and to me this is the No. 1 item of importance—will prove to be a measure which will bring about spiritual demoralization and physical insecurity. To get this whole matter straight I think we can ask ourselves one simple question, What kind of system are we trying to promote? This is certainly only one part of the entire defense of our whole system of government, but it is an important one. We are trying to establish here in this measure a part of our system which will be fair and the burden of which will be equally distributed in the future years before us. We can ask ourselves a further simple question today: In all of these measures we consider here, does this one fit into the framework that will likely promote a free and peaceful world? If it does and we arrive at that conclusion in our minds, I believe we can all feel conscientiously obligated to support such a measure.

Our way of life here in America is more than a promise. Our system has demonstrated what it can do for humanity. I could point out to you the accomplishments over the past 35 years—the most amazing accomplishments in the history of civilization. We have won the last two wars; we have educated more boys than ever before in college; we have increased the living standards of our people; and although some will not agree with me when I say this, I feel that America will not become weaker but that it will grow stronger as the years roll along. I do not minimize the critical problems of our age, which are many. We must maintain moral objectives and ideals. These wielded together will work in such a way as to put an end to acts of violence and will promote peaceful approaches to problems which may face us.

The framers of our American Constitution believed in a responsible enlightened moral government. Those who fear that our young men will fall into moral decay because they are asked to give a few months of their time to the defense

of this great Christian democracy in the Western Hemisphere are unmindful of facts that exist in the present day period. Today there are 58 Senators and 234 Members of the House of Representatives who have served in either one or both of the past two wars. This makes a total of 292 Members of Congress, more than one-half of the membership, who have fought for their country. The head of the executive branch of the Government, our President, has seen service. If these periods of service had destroyed the morals of our society, our Government would be in a state of chaos today, and so to me that argument just does not stand up.

We are only asking the younger generation to share the responsibility of widening the rim of freedom in this twentieth century. If one cares today to examine the purposes of this country without prejudice and without bitterness and a hostile attitude, politically or otherwise, he simply cannot in fair judgment of the facts misunderstand our over-all purpose.

Today the American mission in the world is to be the effective leader in establishing freedom and order, or as our forefathers put it, freedom under law. It is a huge task and undertaking and it should evoke in each of us a prayerful humility, but we should think of and never forget from the very beginning of the establishing of our country, we have had cut out for us a heavy burden. We have always carried the hope and the faith and the courage of establishing a good society for freedom under law; and as some have said in recent years, we are just only beginning.

This is a great country of ours and the only one today able to defend itself. We were never more powerful than we are today. In my opinion, we are prepared to extend a dynamic and courageous leadership in this period.

It is a time when timidity and indecision simply does not fit into this era. I fully believe that we are able to meet the exacting tests and I believe those whom this measure will affect will in the future appreciate what those of us here today are trying to do. Our faults and our weaknesses are many, but nevertheless my faith remains the same—that is that American youth has always met its responsibility and will again do so.

Universal military training is the democratic American way to carry out that responsibility. We must do no less.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

(Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a letter and a resolution from the General Federation of Women's Clubs.)

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I have received the following communication from the General Federation of Women's Clubs:

GENERAL FEDERATION
OF WOMEN'S CLUBS,
DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1952.

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BURNSIDE: Knowing that the security of the United States is of paramount importance to you, it is felt that you will be interested in the enclosed copy of testimony presented by the General Federation of Women's Clubs, before the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 13.

Many of these women are numbered among your constituents—the opinion of no group should carry more weight on the question of universal military training, because the protection of home and family is the primary interest of our members.

Most of us have lived through two world wars. Dry-eyed we have bid Godspeed to husband, father, sons—weeping we have returned home praying that God in His wisdom would show us the way of peace once again. We have felt through the years that there should be some transition period for our boys who, from comfortable sheltered homes, shielded as so many were from the realities of life, with far too short a training period, have gone into the grimness of battle.

We have no fear that a 6 months' training period will lead to a militarized nation, as has been expressed by well-meaning but ill-informed opponents of the legislation. We do know it will be an insurance against an aggressor nation—that by setting up this program we shall serve notice on potential enemies that we are prepared.

We feel that to be a citizen of the United States is the greatest honor given to any man—that no sacrifice is too great to maintain the ideals of our forefathers. Certainly 6 months for basic training out of the whole life of a citizen of this free Nation is not too much to ask.

Respectfully,

LESLIE B. WRIGHT
(Mrs. C. D. Wright),
Chairman of Legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

STATEMENT OF THE GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS REGARDING THE PROPOSED NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT, PRESENTED BY MRS. C. D. WRIGHT, CHAIRMAN, LEGISLATION DEPARTMENT, AT HEARINGS OF THE SENATE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 13, 1952

I am Mrs. C. D. Wright, chairman of legislation of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation of Women's Clubs is the largest organization of its kind in the world. It has within the United States a membership of over five and one-half million women and 780,000 voting members. It is a truly representative women's organization, qualified to present the Nation-wide views of the mothers and women of America.

During the week of May 13, 1951, at its sixtieth annual convention in Houston, Tex., the General Federation of Women's Clubs passed the following resolution:

"UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE

"Whereas the General Federation of Women's Clubs recognizes that conditions have forced the United States to reexamine its traditional attitude toward maintaining a large body of men trained in military science and practices; and

"Whereas the necessity to have available an adequate, equipped, and ready military force may extend over an undetermined period of years and must, therefore, provide for—

"(1) the present emergency;

"(2) the future military needs of the Nation; and

"(3) preservation of the American way of life: Therefore

"*Resolved*, That the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in convention assembled, May 1951, declares its belief in and support of a plan for universal military training and service for the United States as long as a definite threat to the national security continues and a mobilization system which—

"1. Is democratic and universal in application.

"2. Provides not a large professional standing army but a civilian reserve constantly reenforced by newly trained men.

"3. Safeguards the health, education, and morals of young people during the period of training and service.

"4. Provides for the future development and needs of our country by utilizing to maximum advantage the skills and abilities of young people called into service and by giving appropriate training to those showing particular aptitude in the sciences, for the vital professions and vocations, and the necessary social services.

"5. Is administered by a commission composed of both civilian and military personnel, with a majority (always) of civilians.

"6. Makes available the manpower of the Nation beginning at age 18."

The General Federation of Women's Clubs has favored the adoption of a program of universal military training since the submission of the Compton Commission report in 1947 and desires to reaffirm its position and urge prompt enactment of the legislation now before you.

Contrary to the belief of many people, neither the basic characteristics of our present grave danger nor the principle of universal military training as a means of meeting that danger are without parallel in our history. In the young years of our country danger of attack was just as close as the nearest cover for hostile bands. These lurked in stealth, ready to take instant advantage of any relaxation in the colonials' defenses. Our forebears readily accepted these frontier facts of life and, consequently, they prudently maintained a constant state of readiness against a foe who could, and often did, strike suddenly without warning. To those under the shadow of this constant threat the need of military training was as obvious and as calmly accepted as the need for planting maize. During the period 1607 to 1776 the Colonies passed more than 600 ordinances and laws for the creation of effective forces of civilian soldiers.

Thus, universal military training as envisioned in Public Law 51 of 1951 is not a departure from true American tradition as some of its opponents would have us believe, but is merely a confirmation of the principle enunciated by George Washington in 1783 when he wrote:

"It may be laid down as a primary position and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government owes not only a proportion of his property but even his personal services to the defense of it, and, consequently, that the citizens of America (with a few legal and official exceptions) from 15 to 60 years of age should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice. * * * They ought to be regularly mustered and trained and to have their arms and accoutrements inspected at certain times * * * (and) able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 25 * * * drafted to form a corps in every State * * * to be employed whenever it may become necessary in the service of their country."

I appear before you not only as the representative of the largest women's organization in the land but as a mother of three boys, all of whom have had wartime service in the Armed Forces. Therefore, I am confident that I speak for the vast majority of American women when I say that while none of us want our sons, husbands, and brothers to have to fight wars, we realize that the present world conditions are such as to constitute a threat to our existence as a free nation, and that the preservation of our most sacred possessions, our homes and loved ones, may well depend upon our ability to defend ourselves against this threat. Therefore, if our men are to be called to bear arms in defense of their country, we feel that it is only fair to afford them the opportunity

of proper and adequate training. We have been fortunate in the last two global wars in having had strong allies who could hold our enemies at bay while we mobilized leisurely and trained our boys. There is no assurance that this will be the case in future wars. On the contrary, it appears that because of our world-wide deployment we will be the first to be attacked, and combat will be simultaneous with mobilization. We owe it to every single boy and man who may have to fight to give him the necessary preparation for war and thereby increase his chance of survival.

With specific reference to the plan for universal military training which was developed by the National Security Training Commission, I believe that it is adequate to achieve the objectives desired from the program and should be placed in effect as soon as possible. There are sizable numbers of our young men who are not being called upon to serve in the Armed Forces and, therefore, are not being trained. These boys would have to fight just as soon as the country became involved in an all-out war. The time to prepare them is today—not after the war begins, when it may be too late.

In closing, I should like to make reference to two of the most common arguments against universal military training by opponents of this program and to tell you why I believe them to be fallacious.

Some individuals contend that to adopt a program of UMT will indoctrinate our boys and our Nation with militarism and will result in the loss of our personal liberty. Fourteen million of our citizens who served in the Armed Forces during World War II and returned to their local communities to become outstanding students and civic leaders attest to the fallacy of that argument. It is significant that the stanchest supporters of UMT are civilians—members of the service organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and so forth—who have seen military service, as well as their women's auxiliaries, and the Gold Star Mothers. This program will be supervised by a civilian commission and carried out by the Department of Defense, which is controlled by the people through their elected representatives in the Congress. Under such circumstances, I can foresee no danger of our country becoming militarized.

We also hear the charge, voiced by opponents of UMT, that our boys will be subjected to all sorts of demoralizing influences in the camps where they receive training. The Bible tells us that if we bring a child up properly, he will not depart from the ways of righteous living. A boy of 18 will be subjected to no more demoralizing influences in a military installation than in a civilian community or on a college campus. If by the time he reaches 18, he has not developed the character to resist temptations in an army camp, neither will he resist them in any civilian community. Military installations of today, with their planned recreational activities and wholesome atmosphere, as well as close and continual controls over young men in training, certainly do not present as many moral hazards and pitfalls as those confronting young men in civilian communities and on college campuses.

UMT will result in strengthening the moral fiber of our youth and, consequently, of our Nation. By bringing together young men from every part of the country, from every walk of life, to share in a common experience and to fulfill a common obligation to their country, a substantial contribution will be made to the development of national unity—the bedrock of our security.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 16 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I voted against opening the door to conscription last year and I intend to be entirely consistent by voting against the vicious implementing program now before us.

In the first place, this bill reeks with subterfuge and plain deception, not only in its intentions but in its very wording. Every possible effort has been made to deodorize this decayed foreign import. We need look no further than the first page for the first example. I refer to the lyrical title, "National Security Training Corps Act." The American people know this bill provides for universal military conscription, and it should be so titled. The people have been doused and deceived with perfumed titles to such an extent and for so long that they are nauseated. Certainly universal military training, or UMT, sounds and looks less obnoxious than universal military conscription, and, indeed, the proponents, and those who voted with them last year, thought it was salable. What a rude awakening has been their lot to discover that, to the American people, who are usually far ahead of official Washington on practically every issue, universal military training meant exactly what it is—universal military conscription; that a louse is a louse for all of that, to paraphrase Burns. Yes, how the complexon of this arena has changed since last year. Only the die-hards, by now, have failed to recognize the obvious will of the people, and a sorry bunch these die-hards are, whistling in the graveyard and persisting with their phony title, terms, and catchwords.

To sniff more perfume: Beginning on page 4 of the bill, and throughout thereafter, we have "trainee" instead of "conscriptee"; and "training agency," instead of "conscription agency." Anything to try to make the bill fragrant.

In case anybody thinks this charge is farfetched, look at lines 6 and 10, on page 13 of the bill, and see the pains the committee took to amend the honest but harsh-sounding word, "draft," in favor of the sweetened "selective service." If the conscription drumbeaters are not trying to put something over on the American people, why are they afraid to call a spade a spade? None of us should fear public opinion. We are elected and paid to serve public opinion. I for one am perfectly willing to drag this scheme out in the open, in front of the people, where, like the mackerel in the moonlight, it can shine and stink.

The deception in this bill is symbolic of the moral degradation of these times wherein right seems to be anything you can get away with, and wrong only that which you cannot get away with.

Universal conscription is simply another Old World importation which has been a contributing factor to the downfall of every major power putting it into effect. We have won all our wars without conscription, and we do not need it now.

The hue and cry for universal conscription is part of the international malignancy eating away our freedom, standard of living—and American lives. International militarism, always hungry, has drunk deeply of American blood and thirsts for more. No doubt its fangs drip with anticipation at this bill which could throw 18-year-old American boys into combat after 6 months of so-called training, perhaps to replace the 18 to 25 thousand Americans who have already died in Korea, the thousands of other Americans maimed, wounded and diseased, and those yet to be consumed in that war in which the battle lines stand almost exactly where they stood at the beginning 18 months ago—longer than United States participation in World War I.

It matters not that the spider-web banner of the United Nations waves over the graves of the unreturned dead; the bodies, on our side, are mostly Americans or South Koreans, a sickening indictment of how few are the so-called friends we have in the U. N. when the blood flows. How many more Koreas, promoted with American lives, including the conscriptees envisioned in this bill, are planned through the United Nations organization in which we are outnumbered 7 to 1 on a population basis and 59 to 1 on a voting basis, 3 to 1 by Russia?

Winston Churchill, the modern-day British raider, told you recently he wanted American boys to help quell Middle East revolts against centuries of British colonial tyranny. Do you propose to make available to him 18-year-old American conscriptees? France would like to have 18-year-old American conscriptees do the dying in Indochina. Do you want to make them available? If you do not think this could happen, think back a moment to June 25, 1950—Korea.

Yes; universal military conscription would complete the sell-out to the same brand of international despotism and intrigue which American patriots, at great sacrifice, hoped they abolished forever in 1776, but which now threatens to destroy us.

Is it coincidental, or is it a part of the same international plot, that only a few days before this legislation came before the House, propaganda bugles blared in Lisbon, Portugal, with the announcement that the people of the United States are committed to a $300,000,000,000 proposition, under the so-called North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to furnish equipment and troops for the so-called Western European army, sometimes called the Eisenhower army.

In an historic underestimation of the intelligence of the American people, the announcement implied, while carefully omitting definite statistics to back up the implication, that the fantastic cost of $300,000,000,000 would be prorated among the members of NATO. I am at a loss to understand how anyone could expect the American people to swallow that in view of the fact that NATO countries, since 1945, have hornswoggled American taxpayers for between twenty and twenty-five billion dollars—including seven billion to Britain and four and one-half billion to France; that, only recently, Britain was handed another $300,000,000 and France an additional half-billion dollars for the avowed purpose of preventing the collapse of what remains of the teetering economy of both nations.

Thus, who is gullible enough to think these countries will foot any such thing as prorated share of the $300,000,000,000 for the so-called Eisenhower army?

The Lisbon announcement came as no great surprise to me, or to my constituents, because, on February 14, 1951, more than a year ago, I stated publicly in a news release widely circulated in my district that Eisenhower, in his testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, let slip what might be the forerunner of one of the most startling spending schemes of all times, and at the American taxpayers' expense.

Testifying in favor of the Truman-Rosenberg universal military conscription scheme, the forerunner of the legislation now before us, Eisenhower let it be known that he expected to have considerable trouble as European commander because of what he called unequal pay of troops of various countries. He then admitted that the subject of equalizing pay will be considered later. It took no crystal ball to figure that one out a year ago, and it takes none now.

I said at the time that obviously the seeds had already been planted, fertilized, and watered for the American people to subsidize the pay of every foreign serviceman under Eisenhower's command. But as it turned out I was too conservative. The cat is now out of the bag. We are committed to subsidizing far more than the pay of foreign troops. We are committed to subsidizing practically the whole thing—$300,000,000,000 worth.

There can be no doubt about it. The financial burden will be ours. And will it be any different with respect to manpower? Remember, NATO countries are members of the United Nations. We have seen in Korea how our alleged foreign friends in the U. N. perform when the shooting starts and when it comes to furnishing human gun fodder. With these so-called foreign friends of ours, Korea has been, "Let's you and him fight." That's the way it will be in the NATO army, too, and everybody knows it. Under the legislation before you, 18-year-old conscripts could be available for the lion's share of the NATO army, alongside whatever foreign troops show up. These 18-year-old American conscripts could be tossed in the same pot with Eisenhower's favorites—what he described before the Senate subcommittee as the free-companion type of soldier, aliens enlisted in the United States Army along the lines of the French Foreign Legion—those, he said, "with adventurous spirits or disappointed in love"; those, he said, "who make soldiers that he would be delighted to have," those, for whom, in his testimony, he shed crocodile tears as regards their pay because, to quote him, "During World War II the comparative wealth of the American soldier made it easier for him to buy the wine in the villages and spend more money on the girls."

We can only assume from this that Eisenhower's NATO army is envisioned as a sort of international foreign legion, and, like all foreign legions, a haven for rascals, cutthroats and fugitives of practically every nationality and description, alongside of which, in the hoary ranks, could be 18-year-old American conscriptees. Those of you who support this universal military conscription bill had better be devising some way of perfuming that to the parents of the 18-year-olds you insist on grabbing for the international military.

From the inception of this legislation last year, the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee has been willing to water it down—anything to get even part of a foot through the legislative door and I have no doubt he will offer or sanction further amendments to this proposal if necessary to get it through.

The deal is to get this thing through the House and into the hands of the other body. I predict here and now that if this conscription scheme is approved in this Chamber, in any form, it will come back here, as a conference report, in the form that the Pentagon wants it. Even though I were not opposed to the principle of this legislation, I would be opposed to the Pentagon, and a hand-picked and padded commission of international meddlers, writing a law which will directly or indirectly affect every fireside in this Nation. How much longer is this House of Representatives going to farm out to the President and his specially anointed commissions the duties and responsibilities for which we were elected?

I urge you to beware of those supporters of this bill who, under the 5-minute rule, will come bearing beautifully wrapped gifts in the nature of so-called clarifying and economy amendments. They know that this House stands today as the one obstacle to enactment of this nefarious Truman-Rosenberg scheme.

Prepared by certain people connected with the House Armed Services Committee is a print alleged to contain pertinent questions and answers to this bill. I am intrigued by the following which appears therein:

> While it may appear on the surface to be unfair to induct one young man for 6 months and to induct another young man, a year older, for 24 months, it must be remembered that it is a lot fairer than the present system.

It must be taken for granted that the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee [Mr. VINSON] approved this committee print and therefore is a party to this indictment of the unfairness of the present draft act. Well, what steps has he taken to correct it? Or does he offer his legislation as a cover-up for failures of the past to make the draft act fair and equitable?

If the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee had spent even a fraction of the time he has devoted to slipping this scheme on the doorstep of the House to correcting the inequities in the draft act, he would not now be in the position of indicting himself.

If a lesser period of training is adequate as he admits it is in this bill, then why not cut the period of service under the draft and spread it to a greater number?

But why a huge conscript army, anyway? Do we or do we not live in an atomic and jet propulsion age? Is it contended here that these developments are myths—that like the Athenians and Romans of old we must maintain huge armies, and in order to provide an excuse for maintaining them, make sure that they are periodically engaged in battle?

I have no doubt that in the foreseeable future we could defeat the Russians, but who among you here dares predict any other fate for this Nation than that which befell the Athenians and Romans as they themselves corroded under the weight of their military machines and collapsed upon the shambles and ruins they had made of Sparta and Carthage?

I believe in adequate defenses for this Nation, but I have no patience whatever with those who point to Pearl Harbor and Korea as evidence of military unpreparedness that would have been solved had this diabolical octopus of 18-year-old conscription been fastened on the Nation.

The tragedy of Pearl Harbor and the early days of the fighting in Korea rests in the main upon a little clique of individuals in Washington, D. C., who failed their responsibilities and who have never, for some mysterious reason, been punished. It was a comparatively few Japanese planes and warships that produced Pearl Harbor—not masses of invading troops.

It was the withdrawal of 50,000 combat troops in Korea that wrote the invitation and opened the gate to invasion from the north. It makes no difference whether we might have had 2,000,000 conscripts in training and 5,000,000 Reserves in June 1950, the same fumbling and bungling in Washington would have produced the same results.

And are our memories so short that we cannot recall the French Army of 1939? Built of class upon class of conscripts, and class upon class of reserves, it was touted as the finest European army in the world since Napoleon. I have no doubt that statements were made to that effect on the floor of this House at that time.

As everyone knows, the Germans, using air power and mechanized equipment—not masses of troops—shattered and scattered that army of more than a million men to the four winds in a matter of days. Have we learned nothing from our own bitter experience and that of others? When is some official of Government, in or out of Congress, and including the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, going to tell us and the people we represent why we have not the planes to meet the Russians on equal terms over Korea, and who is being held accountable for that failure?

Why are we outnumbered? If the Russians are willing to commit their planes to Korea we should do likewise. If the quality or quantity of our production is inferior we are entitled to know it now.

I recall very vividly two full days of so-called orientation conferences which I attended at the Pentagon Building following the adjournment of Congress in the late fall of 1949. I was the only Member of Congress present. The late and distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Bates, was flying to Washington from his home to participate in

those conferences when he was killed in an air crash.

If memory serves me correctly, every member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as other military and diplomatic notables, appeared personally and spoke to those assembled. Time after time, and from the lips of speaker after speaker, I heard a variation of the following: "If an enemy moves at 4 tomorrow morning, we'll be ready at 5." That, remember, was after 50,000 American combat troops had been withdrawn from Korea in the face of repeated warnings from the South Koreans that trouble was brewing on the north. Were we ready?

Now the Members of this House are apparently expected to have full confidence in, and accept as administrators of the most sweeping conscription program in the world today, the same military hierarchy which has not met its responsibilities to the Nation in its latest hour of need. I refuse to be a party to any such proceedings.

The time has come to compel the military to stop its wanton waste of men, materials, and money.

And the time has come for Truman and his administration henchmen to move out of that little world of make-believe in which they live, face the facts of life, and stop mortgaging the economy and the future of our people on the quicksands of borrowed money and one alleged crisis and emergency after another.

There appears to be no doubt of the parentage of this legislative monster we have with us today. As far as I can determine, it was sired at the White House; its birthplace is the Pentagon Building and it has been wet-nursed by the Committees on Armed Services. It is to the undying credit of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and some of his committee colleagues that they have refused to have a hand in putting diapers on this hybrid which could open new fields for the distribution of deep freezers and mink coats, and unlimited professional opportunities for the wearers of the brass and braid.

Procurement of equipment, food, and clothing and construction of training camps to implement the terms of this proposal, mean the spending of untold billions and in the light of present experience—plenty of graft.

There is no valid reason for fastening permanent military conscription upon this Nation. The draft act, volunteers, National Guard, and other training units are capable of supplying the necessary manpower needs for the defense of the United States, and in this connection it is high time Congress put an end to the use of American boys as targets in every shooting gallery in the world.

I warn you that enactment of this legislation, combined with present foreign policy, is one of the last steps to permanent, complete centralization of Government in Washington and regimenting of the people. The very life of this Republic—this democracy and all its institutions: economic, educational, cultural, political, and religious—demands diffusion, not concentration of power.

This is the only country to which I owe and have sworn allegiance. I refuse to undermine and betray it by supporting this legislation which will mire the American people only deeper in debt, in the moral degradation of foreign exploitation and corruption; and which will be an admission to the world and ourselves that we have lost faith and hope for any possibility of peace in the world.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, last week the voice of a great patriot of France was heard throughout the world. The distinguished Chamber of Deputies was silent, it was still, as Georges Heuillard, a soldier of France and the Deputy from the Seine-Interieure made his way to the rostrum. Crippled and scarred, his battle-shattered body was assisted to the Speaker's tribune. As he stood there with hearing aids hanging from both ears, his twisted body supported by his strong hands on the tribune, his courageous honorable face looking out over the Chamber to his Deputy colleagues, he began to speak. His subject was the rearmament of Germany. As he began to speak the Chamber of Deputies was tense. It was a dramatic moment. It was a critical moment for the Government of France. Everyone there seemed to sense that this was not a political speech. They knew he was once again mustering all of his strength for his country. His plea was eloquent. It was a moment of greatness.

He spoke of the horrors of the war with Germany and related the oath he had taken with other soldiers of France, never to permit Germany to again recreate her military strength.

I am going to die—

He shouted, and turning to his Foreign Minister he said:

Monsieur le Ministre, I am going to die because of the German army.

In conclusion he cried out:

I have fulfilled my mission. I had promised my comrades to do it. I am happy that destiny today should have enabled me to replace the force which I lack with the energy to come and cry to you. Beware of Germany. Beware of Germany.

With deep seriousness I can say to you that if you visit the military hospitals throughout America and talk with thousands of soldiers of America with their shattered but honorable bodies as I have over these timeless years, I know you would find they would cry out too: Beware of Germany. Beware of Germany. If you will talk with the thousands of mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers who treasure so dearly the memory of their own glorious hero, I am confident they will tell you: Beware of Germany. Beware of Germany.

Deputy Heuillard, not only kept the faith with his brother soldiers of France, but he kept the faith with his brother soldiers of America, of Great Britain, of Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Norway, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Greece, and the entire free world.

The rearmament of Germany within 7 years after the end of the great catastrophe in which Allied power smashed the invincible German military might and industrial power is almost unbelievable. It is illustrative of the times in which we live. The rising fury of Russian communism makes this bold move necessary. In the defense of Western Europe I believe Western Germany not only has much to defend but also has a duty to perform for the free nations of the West. Not only does Germany have a duty to perform but also a duty to prove her intentions and ability to cooperate with the western nations.

Because of this fact Germany is in no position to bargain. She is in no position to demand concessions for the rearmament of the German legions. Germany must prove herself beyond all reasonable doubt if she is to be admitted into association with honorable nations. She must establish her honor. The employment of force is not the soil in which to grow honor. Honor is nourished from truth and right and faith.

German invasions from Bismarck to Hitler not only have left their scars on Western Europe but have shaken the entire world. By force Germany tried to control all of Europe. By force she would conquer. By force Germany pressed her objectives. By force, German diplomacy functioned and operated. Twice within this generation we have seen this method of achievement by force broken, only to see it rise again. Now once again it appears that German leadership is turning to this old method of force.

Because Germany believes her armies are indispensable to the western nations she has decided to extract concessions. She has decided to force the Western Powers to accept her as an equal by—

First. Requesting membership in the North Atlantic alliance.

Second. Demanding a return to German control and use of the Saar.

Third. Requesting the establishment a complete sovereignty under a peace contract. This involves the withdrawal of all allied troops and controls within Germany.

Fourth. Demanding the setting up of a clemency board having a majority of German members for the review of convictions and sentences of all German war criminals.

Fifth. Demanding the reestablishment of the German general staff.

If the German soldier is to be used in the new European defense army the German people, as represented by the Bonn Government, state these demands and others must be met. Here is the old method of force in operation again. Here it is again in less than 7 years after it was supposed to be annihilated for all time.

Force them to meet our demands if they want our armies, cries Western Germany. Force them to pay our price. Upon a moment's reflection I believe you will conclude the price is too high. It is sovereignty and the re-creation of the German Army and in the end the entire German military system. It is the re-creation of the great German armament industry. It is the re-creation of German might. I say this price is too high. The Bonn government under the leadership of Dr. Adenauer, is the reconstruc-

tion government of Western Germany. It cannot adopt the methods of the defeated and discredited leadership of the past. The method of force cannot be used against the nations of the North Atlantic community. Because of misused German might the world of our time is struggling to save itself. Time, time will never erase the memory of wrongdoing but a change of spirit can. Let us experience a new German faith nourishing a new German soul of kindness, understanding, and cooperation among the nations of mankind. If freedom is to prevail in this struggle with communism the free nations must not resort to Communist methods. The methods of cooperation, understanding, and faith only can bind the free world together.

I believe German troops should be used in the new European army of defense now being formed under General Eisenhower. Germany is just as much involved as the rest of Western Europe and more. German troops employed in the European army can help to relieve the great strain placed on the United States and other countries of the North Atlantic community. I do not subscribe, however, to the use of German troops on the basis demanded by Western Germany. German troops must be completely under allied direction and leadership. The re-creation of Germany's industrial might must not take place except under rigid and adequate guaranties to the western allies. Germany must be made to clearly understand that the only way she can rise again as a sovereign nation and gain the respect of her Atlantic neighbors is by the method of cooperation with the Western Powers and not by force. Germany must clearly understand she has to earn her way back into the trust and confidence of free nations. Germany must clearly understand that Russian communism is her enemy and can cause her doom just as it can any other nation.

It is well to remember our tragic world will never gain peace if monsters are created to subdue monsters. Let us not create another monster. From an old enemy let us welcome an honored friend. Let us master the age-old problem of man's inhumanity to man.

Deputy Heuillard, of France, the world has heard your cry: Beware of Germany. Beware of Germany. Through your two hearing aids I hope you heard the thunder of the great ovation given you by your distinguished colleagues in the Chamber of Deputies. Today, I wish that you might hear the continued ovation ringing throughout the world of free men and women.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, as one who has been an independent in this House for 14 years, and voted for those measures only which I felt to be the right measures, I think I can say that I am going to speak upon this subject without any political influence of any party.

I want to recite a little history to the chairman of the Armed Service Committee and some of the other friends of his in this House, that no universal military training nation ever had a long history. It has invariably fomented war. For the past hundred years Germany adopted that system. Instead of educating the young men for peace they educated them for war. When the iron hand of the military, Prussia, got hold of the situation, the German people lost control of their government. During both of those wars there was nothing wrong with the German people. They lost control of their government. We do not need to read history today to tell you what became of the great German Empire, that we now hope will be strong to aid us in preserving the peace of the world. It has been destroyed, and destroyed by themselves.

Did not Italy try the same thing? And look at Italy today.

Some say that the great military example is Rome. It adopted this program, and where is Rome today? Rome was not conquered by the fierceness of the German tribes of the north, Rome was conquered because of the system she set up of compulsory military training to the extent of abandoning their farms. You do not have to labor through the pages of history to find that the great Roman Empire exists today only in the ashes of the past.

Greece is another example. We do not have to read history to understand that Greece is no more the great power in this world.

The next example of it is Russia. Russia is a great military nation. They have to be military because they have to control the people of their country. The people do not dare to express themselves. They must be under the military, and they are training their young men today not for peace, and yet they talk peace; they are training their young men for war, and everybody knows it.

Are we going to do the same thing? Is that what we are going to do? Do you suppose I want to be a Member of this Congress and vote a big reservoir of men for anybody to use anywhere, any time, for any purpose, when the Congress of the United States is denied the right given to it under the Constitution? I had nothing to say about the present war and you had nothing to say about it. You had no chance to exercise your right under the Constitution.

You say it cannot happen here in the United States; but it can. It can happen again because it has happened everywhere it was ever tried. Young men schooled in war, young men schooled to kill and destroy and spend, makes them different men.

The next point I wish to make here is that this program is economically unsound. In the draft you depleted the farms of my section, the bread basket of the world, where we raise more wheat than any other State in the Union, hard wheat, without which you could not have bread. We have appealed to the Army to leave some of those boys home, or at least enough of them to run the farms. But, do you know what they say to me? They say, "Why these boys on the farms are skilled mechanics and we need them to run these tanks and operate these guns. Go and pick up somebody else and hire them to run your machines." They do not realize that farming today is a great scientific undertaking, and that the horse and buggy days of farming have gone. These men who operate these machines have to be skilled mechanics, and most of them are. You can imagine our going out, I will say to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs—imagine us in North Dakota going out and hiring some soda jerk from New York to run a combine. He would not know whether he was running a combine or some new invention of television. And the damage they do is more than they get in pay. We had an instance the other day when a farmer in North Dakota lost two boys, and wanted to keep his other boy at home. But, they said they could not let him stay at home because they needed him to run these machines. Now that farm will be abandoned. The father wrote me that the stock would be sold. Nobody seems to care in the Army about the food of the country. The greatest power of defense that this country has is its power to raise food. They tell us that in the history of the United States that we defeated the South in the War Between the States and that we whipped them. We did nothing of the kind. They starved out. Every war that humanity has ever seen which was ever finally won, was won because the other side did not have food. But, yet these Army officials will take the last boy even though two of his brothers were killed on the battlefield, and close up that farm because the brass hats are in control.

This universal military training will take more men from those farms, and the first thing the Army knows, and the first thing you know, we will have a shortage of food. The United States is in a position of great national leadership. How did they get it? We acquired that leadership from the time of the beginning of this Government in 1789 up to 1914. During that period we became a great Nation. We were respected throughout the world. But, in 1914, we made a fatal mistake of entering on a program that all our great colonial leaders said we should not enter. We entered World War I. Why did we enter it? I will repeat the words of President Wilson, whom I greatly admired. We entered this war "to make the world safe for democracy." We poured out our blood and our money and exhausted our resources. When the war was over, was democracy safe anywhere in this world—even here? So, we accomplished nothing. But, in World War II, the administration had a better slogan, and this, too, came from a man I greatly admired, President Roosevelt. He said that we were going to banish fear and that that freedom of fear was one of the four freedoms that we were going to establish throughout the world. Fear was the cardinal principle underlying all four. Since that war ended has there been fear in this world anywhere? Why, we have had nothing but fear ever since. Fear prevails today. So what did we accomplish in that war?

Now, in the third war, which some say is a police action, but I never believed

that—the third war is to stop communism. We are going to stop it from spreading. We are going to any part of this globe, any time, any hour, to put it down, not by persuasion, but we are going to shoot it down. Some of you are so patriotic perhaps you never studied anything about communism, but I have tried to find out what it is so I can say what it is. Communism is an idea and you cannot stop an idea with a gun. Communism works when people are in distress, when they are hungry and homeless. That is when communism works. If we had spent half the money on the peoples of the world to insure them against that situation of dire need, we would have accomplished a great deal more than we have with guns. People who are in distress do not ask what kind of a system they are going to get. The Chinese did not ask what kind of title they would get for their land in China, but they have now discovered they did not get any. But they were hungry at the time, and they embraced communism. Many people think the first line of defense against communism is in Europe, but I want to go on record this afternoon by telling the American people and this Congress that our first line of defense against communism is right here in the United States. It never started anywhere on earth unless the people were in distress and hungry. This Nation can be dragged down to a position where our people are hungry and homeless; when we have depleted our resources, lost our young men and piled up a stupendous debt, and in that condition communism will find a fertile field. Then communism will spring right up here in the United States, and Russia will not have to land a single division. Yet, we say our first line of defense is in Europe or some other place across the seven seas.

Now, what is the present situation? Western Europe thinks that the Russians are going to take them, and we have encouraged that thinking. So we have gone into this Atlantic Pact; a hundred divisions; $300,000,000,000 more. Who finally is going to pay the money? Who finally is going to furnish the men? You remember what Churchill said in World War II. I heard him right here on this rostrum. He said, "All we want you to do is to give us some money and some materials, and we will do the fighting." I said, "That is all right. I am for you." But they started out, and they did a little fighting. They got up into Norway, a long ways from home, and the fighting did not stop, and war raged on the Continent. He came right back here and he said, "I just want you this time to send us some token forces to show the world which side you are on." So we did. We sent them token forces. Pretty soon we discovered that Churchill was right back here again, and he said, "Boys, I am going to tell you the truth this time. I led you on before; but, by the eternal, you have got to do the fighting now, because we are holding that crazy Hitler away from the United States." He scared a lot of people in this Congress stiff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlemen five additional minutes.

Mr. BURDICK. Then while England moved out of Norway in the nighttime and when they "skiddooed" in their boats at Dunkerque we had to invade France and do the fighting—and I mean we did the fighting. But we could fight only so much. We could have taken Berlin in 24 hours. The Germans pleaded with us to come and take them, but we did not do it; the administration held up those armies until the Russians could come in; held them there until the Russians did come in. Now, have we any complaint to offer against Russia's getting into Germany when we made it possible for her to do it?

At Potsdam who gave the Russians the circle of country around Berlin so tight that we had to fly airplanes to get food in. Who created that situation? The administration.

Russia has never gone anywhere without our consent. We abandoned the Baltic Republics; we abandoned Poland and Czechoslovakia and gave them free run in the Balkans. We abandoned South Korea because we pulled out. I remember what our Secretary of State said. I have never condemned him, because I knew he spoke for the President, not himself. He said: "Korea is no part of our western defense." We pulled out and the Communists came in.

Who established the Russians in North Korea? The administration. We set a line and put them in there.

Who was it that encouraged the defeat of the Nationalist Army in China? The administration did. I remember hearing Marshall say that with 1 stroke of his pen he dissolved 18 divisions of the Nationalist Chinese Army. The administration is responsible for the collapse of the Nationalist Chinese Army. Now we are fighting against all these mistakes, we fear Russia, and yet the facts show that Russia has never gone in with her armies any place except with the consent of the United States. Read what happened at Yalta and Potsdam, and you will see the administration gave everything Russia asked.

I was inexpressibly proud of the action taken the other day by the Legislature of Virginia, where the voices of Washington, Jefferson, Patrick Henry, James Madison, James Monroe, John Marshall, and John Randolph resounded in that legislature, which voted overwhelmingly to oppose any attempt to put this great Government into the strait jacket of a world government.

Those American citizens who are now traveling over this country with propaganda advising the American people to go into this world organization and submerge the dignity of this Government, the authority of this Government, the sovereignty of this Government to the control of a world government—I say they are the enemies of this Republic.

I do not want to live to see the day when the Stars and Stripes of this great Republic shall be hauled down and supplanted by the insignia of a world government which now waves over many training camps in this country. I do not want to surrender free speech and a free press or see our citizens tried for offenses in any court except a court of the United States. I do not want a world government to pass conventions—laws—which will set aside the laws of this Government and the laws of the various States. Yet that very thing is not only being attempted here, but courts have already upheld these conventions.

Why do we stand here idle while our country is being destroyed? Why are we willing to make more men available to strengthen the hands of this insidious attempt to destroy all the builders of this democracy have brought down to us? Do the people of this country cherish liberty? Are they willing to surrender all the previous rights of freemen? I think not, and I refuse to vote for any more reservoirs of men to be shot, wounded, and murdered in prison camps in wholly aimless wars. When this country is in danger, Congress will not fail to act and citizens will come forth by the millions to defend it.

I stand today just where I stood when I swore to defend the Constitution of the United States of America against all enemies, foreign and domestic. So long as I can utter a word, I will in the defense of that Constitution. As long as I remain in public life, my every effort will be to preserve here on this continent the greatest experiment of democracy that was ever devised by freemen.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, during the brief period in which I have been a Member of Congress, I think I have never encountered a bill which more properly should be recommitted for further study and clarification than H. R. 5904. Winston Churchill once referred to Russia as a riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma and I think this description might well apply to H. R. 5904 because some of its most ardent proponents admit privately that the bill is so loosely drafted as to make it difficult, if not impossible, to ascertain just what results will be achieved if the bill becomes law in its present form.

I must confess, however, that I can think of one salutary result which will be obtained through the passage of H. R. 5904: if this bill, together with the committee report and a transcript of the debate, falls into the hands of the Russian general staff there will be as many conflicting opinions within that group as to how this country intends to meet its manpower requirements for the armed services and Reserve components as there are members on that general staff.

May I say at the outset that I have maintained right along that until the potential explosiveness of the international situation was alleviated some kind of UMT program in this country appeared inevitable.

Prior to the issuance of the committee report on H. R. 5904 my replies to those who wrote me in support of UMT were brief and to the point. In effect I said that very reluctantly I had reached the decision that in the absence of iron-clad guaranties to insure world peace UMT was a necessary adjunct to our national

defense, and that I would support any fair, realistic and workable means to achieve this.

On the other hand, the letters which I wrote in reply to those who had expressed opposition to UMT were much more detailed and comprehensive in scope. I felt that it was incumbent on me to try and justify my position in the minds of those among my constituents who challenged my thinking with respect to the question at issue.

It has not been difficult for me to share at least partially the views of those who oppose UMT in principle or question the validity of many of their objections to it. However, I do consider it highly important that we dispense with the altogether too prevalent tendency toward wishful thinking and alert ourselves to existing realities. It seems to me that we must be fully cognizant of the fact that our world has changed drastically since most of us first saw the light of day; that we are faced with an unprecedented situation and that, in some degree at least, we must be prepared to deviate from traditional practices however repugnant such innovations may be to most of us. Recently James Reston suggested in a New York Times article that however much we might wish to, we simply cannot repeal the twentieth century and I think the sooner we realize this the better.

It is my conviction that had we been more realistic in our thinking following the end of World War II; had we been less naive in our attitude toward Soviet Russia and more conscious of the tides of hatred, ruthlessness and designs for world conquest emanating from that nation; and had we maintained our armed strength, either activated or in the form of a Ready Reserve, at a level commensurate with the dangers besetting us we would not now be confronted with the greatest threat in our history as a Nation, American boys would not be fighting in Korea and we would not be keeping our fingers crossed against the possibility of further outbreaks in a world from which we cannot escape.

Most of us will agree that Russia respects nothing except superior force, and keeping in mind the nature of our adversaries I think we must anticipate a prolonged period of international tension which can be held in check only if the United States and the other free nations are in a position to take swift, retaliatory measures against unprovoked aggression when and if this occurs.

It has been my contention right along that if Congress were to authorize a UMT program now which would become operative when this was possible on an equitable, efficient, and practical basis such action in itself might well nullify the need for actual implementation of the program, for the leaders in the Kremlin are realists and if they become convinced beyond doubt that America cannot be lulled into any sense of false security, and will keep itself constantly on guard against any eventuality Russia may decide that it is in her own best interest to give up all dreams of world domination and agree to work out any problems, real or fancied, on a peaceful basis. This may be but a forlorn hope on our part, but one thing is certain—we must be adequately prepared if we are to maintain the peace or be in a position to win a war if we find ourselves with no alternative other than to fight.

There are those who say that we should not have peacetime conscription in this country. With that I agree. But I also submit that with more than 100,000 casualties in Korea we are, to say the least, in a twilight zone between peace and all-out war and are likely to find ourselves in this position for an indeterminate number of years.

In a general way then, these thoughts are those which I have advanced in an effort to persuade some who do not look with favor upon UMT that they should reexamine the premises which lead them to their present conclusions.

But in taking a stand in favor of UMT I never inferred that I would vote for any UMT plan which might be presented to Congress for its consideration. I would be opposed to a suggestion that the age bracket for those eligible for UMT should be between 15 and 50. Likewise I should vote against any proposal to conscript women. In other words, my attitude toward UMT generally will not be reflected by my vote on this bill. If, after the debate has been concluded and amendments have been adopted, I am of the opinion that the provisions of this particular bill are not sound or equitable, I shall not feel under any compulsion to vote for it simply because I have advocated a system of universal military training in the past.

The announced objectives of the provisions contained in H. R. 5904 are: First, to insure an adequate defense without the excessive costs involved in the maintenance of a large standing Army; second, to provide equality of service for all citizens eligible for such service; and, third, to broaden and expand the Reserve base so that men who fought in World War II or those serving in the Armed Forces at present will not be faced with the possibility of immediate recall to active duty in the event of hostilities at some time in the future.

With these objectives I am in complete sympathy, but I seriously question whether they can be realized in any appreciable degree under the provisions of H. R. 5904. For to my mind this bill is so riddled with inconsistencies, uncertainties, and inequities that the claims made by its advocates at best must be regarded as mere hypotheses. I don't think anyone knows or can determine on a basis of sound analysis that any of the objectives which I mentioned earlier can even be approached if this bill becomes law in its present form.

Numerous figures have been quoted to indicate that huge savings may be anticipated in the event that this bill is passed. For example, we are told that the cost of keeping one man in the armed services for 1 year is $11,000 and that the cost of maintaining a man in the Ready Reserve for a similar period of time is only $1,434, so that a net saving of $9,566 per year per man is easily obtainable. Such a reduction sounds fine and very easy to accomplish but, in my judgment, the possibility of reducing the size of our Armed Forces substantially in the foreseeable future is so remote as to be scarcely worthy of consideration. So, for the time being, hopes of achieving this aim must remain somewhat illusory.

Incidentally, I tried to obtain a breakdown of the $11,000 figure represented as the cost per year for maintaining one man in the armed services, and was informed that I would have to obtain this information from 35 different agencies. Knowing that it would be impossible to even locate each of these 35 agencies before action on the bill had been completed I gave up my attempt to obtain pertinent cost data. This situation does suggest, however, the need for a central statistical bureau where such figures could be correlated. Actually, I believe this figure of $11,000 was determined by subtracting the capital expenditures of the armed services from total disbursements and dividing the difference by the number of personnel in the services.

It has also been suggested that savings in the amount of $13,000,000,000 annually eventually can be achieved if this bill becomes law. But eventually may mean 10 years or 50 years. While some explanation has been given for the projected savings of $13,000,000,000 annually at some indefinite time in the future, it seems to me that the variables involved preclude any accurate computation and that this figure of $13,000,000,000 was arrived at simply by subtracting one hypothetical figure from another hypothetical figure.

Now if this bill is passed just what happens? Does it mean that a UMT program will be implemented at once? It does not. Until the President by executive order or Congress by the adoption of a concurrent resolution determines that the period of service required under the Universal Military Training and Service Act for persons under the age of nineteen can be reduced or eliminated no one can be inducted into the National Security Training Corps. When or if the President or Congress will see fit to take the necessary action to effectuate a UMT program is a question which I am unable to answer. But when and if such action is taken by either the President or Congress, it will mean in effect that the minimum draft age for service in the Armed Forces has been raised from 18½ years to 19 years. In other words, this increase in the minimum age will reduce substantially the number of men who otherwise would be available for the armed services under existing law.

The number of men who are leaving the armed services this year just about equals the number who are entering them through enlistment, re-enlistment, and induction under Selective Service. If persons between 18½ and 19 years of age are no longer available to the Armed Forces, it will be necessary to draft men in the older age groups, many of whom have family and other responsibilities, if we are to maintain the Armed Forces at their present strength.

Now if UMT does become a reality what happens to the 800,000 young men who would be eligible each year for this training? Only 50,000 or 60,000 would

go into the NSTC. These favored few will serve for 6 months; others of the same or of approximately the same age will serve for 2 years in the armed services, and still others will be able to avoid any service whatsoever by reason of acquiring a deferment status when they reach 19. To my mind such a system represents anything but equality of treatment. Heaven knows that there are enough inequalities under selective service; let us not bring these into any proposed UMT program.

If manpower shortages make it difficult to carry on NSTC and the Selective Service System concurrently, there remains the problem which would have to be faced at some time of how we are to effect an equitable transfer from one program to the other. The two systems are separate and distinct, each having a different purpose and thus there is inherent in the situation the difficulty of bridging the gap between them. Selective service is now responsible for obtaining certain numbers of men who are members of the Regular Armed Forces. Apparently NSTC members will not be considered as members of the Armed Forces. The purpose of the present system is to build up combat-ready forces to 3,600,000 or possibly more whereas the purpose of NSTC is to insure a well-organized Reserve system. The present system implies the imminence of the threat of war whereas UMT implies the hope and possibility of peace but a peace based on prepared strength.

Until it is feasible to implement a UMT program on a much larger scale than is contemplated at present I do not think it will be possible to reduce the size of our Armed Forces to any appreciable extent. It is going to take a long time to develop an adequate Reserve strength among nonveterans if we only train them at the rate of 50,000 or 60,000 a year. And I am afraid, too, that those who now or soon will constitute the bulk of our Reserve forces will be old men before they can pass this responsibility on to those who have received their training in NSTC.

As long as we are faced with an undiminished threat of war we must maintain our armed services at top strength and, obviously, this presents a serious obstacle to the successful execution of any UMT program. But I should like to make it very clear that I am perfectly willing to vote now to authorize a UMT plan which will become operative just as soon as it can be carried out on something other than a mere skeletonized basis. I think each physically fit young American regardless of who he is or where he lives should render the same service to his country as that required of his contemporaries if we are to have a real universal military training system.

I think H. R. 5904 contains so many obvious defects that it should be recommitted to the Committee on Armed Services for further study and clarification. I believe if this is done the committee can develop a plan which many of us can support with a clear conscience and which will be just and fair in all respects.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman has stated that he would support a UMT bill, but this bill is not the kind he wants. Will the gentleman do the House and the committee the pleasure of setting out what he thinks should be the type of UMT adopted, so that we can have the benefit of his judgment on that?

Mr. PROUTY. I am afraid that would not be possible in 1 minute.

Mr. VINSON. I know that, but the gentleman has all the time he wants. He has tomorrow and the next day, and he will have time during the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule. The House would like to have the benefit of his judgment. He is for UMT, but he says this bill is wholly inequitable.

Mr. PROUTY. When all boys eligible for UMT are treated alike, then I am for it. I shall probably have more to say concerning this matter if I am able to obtain recognition under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman show us how they should be treated, and where we have failed to do that?

Mr. PROUTY. Instead of taking 800,000 boys who will be eligible each year for UMT, you are taking 50,000 or 60,000 and putting them in the UMT program. The rest of them may have to serve in the Armed Forces.

Mr. VINSON. May I say that there is not a line in the bill as to how many go in—50,000 or 60,000 or 70,000 or 80,000 or 100,000.

Mr. PROUTY. I think that is one of the things that is wrong with it. I want to know how many are going in.

Mr. VINSON. I think the gentleman is just trying to dodge the issue. He wants to be for UMT, and at the same time he says that he is against it because of some undetermined inequalities and discriminations.

Mr. PROUTY. I am for universal military training when it is fair and equitable to all the boys who are eligible for universal military training. I do not like the inequalities which seem so apparent in this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Many of the farmers in our part of the country, and many of the farmers in my State, are experiencing a critical manpower shortage under the present Selective Service System, and they are worried as to what a universal military training program on top of a selective-service program will do with regard to this particular problem.

Mr. VINSON. May I state to the gentleman that the chairman of the Training Commission stated with reference to seasonal agricultural workers, which means the sons of farmers, that they would be liberal with reference to those deferments.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Further with reference to the point raised by the gentleman from Connecticut, at the committee deliberations, as the chairman knows, I offered an amendment, which would allow each trainee to select the month in which his 6 months of training would start. That was accepted by the committee in principle, but because the amendment had not been drafted as to its technical implications, it is not in the bill. But, I expect to offer an amendment, and I am confident that it will be adopted. If adopted, it would answer the gentleman's question concerning manpower in the field of agriculture to the extent at least of allowing the farm boy to start his 6 months' training in the winter months.

Mr. VINSON. Along that line, may I call the committee's attention that the Commission's report says that they recognize the need for young men in agricultural work and the need for seasonal deferments, but that such deferments should not be continued for an extended period, and that there should be no other occupational deferments.

So, the Commission went on record as stating that the only occupational deferments they recommend are for agricultural workers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the American Legion. I am very proud of the Legion, its leadership, and its program. I have never known the American Legion to stand behind any cause which was not for the best interests of the United States of America. Last night I was invited with other Members of the Congress to the Legion congressional dinner. When I left Capitol Hill to attend that dinner, I assumed and I hoped that the national commander of the American Legion would discuss the burning issue of this hour—universal military training. Don Wilson, the national commander, did just that very thing, and, in my mind, he did it very forthrightly. I was not surprised nor was I offended in any way. I saw the ovation given him, both before and after his speech, and I did not note many Members of the Congress leaving the Chamber as has been stated here today.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Did not the Members of the Congress of both the House and the Senate stand up and cheer the national commander both before and after?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is just what I said. In his remarks before the Members of Congress, the commander was accurately interpreting the mandates of the Legion's national convention at Miami last year. Speaking in behalf of our fighting men, as he has the right to do, he put it right on the line just where

the American Legion stood on this issue. He said in effect just this, "Members of the American Legion have been campaigning for this thing up and down the United States of America for the last 34 years. We believe most sincerely that it is a safety factor, dedicated to the best interests of our country. We are being told that the American Congress will not face this proposition properly in an election year, but we, the American Legion, do not believe that this is so. We are continuing this fight and of course we are going to keep tabs on the votes."

Now, what is wrong about that? It was an exercise of the right of freedom, this frank statement of Commander Wilson.

Now, back in the spring of 1945 the leading nations of the world were gathered at San Francisco in a conference to build what they called a United Nations Charter. Among the newspaper men attending that convention was Gould Lincoln, representing the Washington Evening Star. On May 31, 1945, he sent to his paper in Washington the following dispatch:

SAN FRANCISCO, May 31.—Moscow's announcement of the biggest peacetime military-training schedule ever ordered in the Soviet Union, with thousands of 15- and 16-year-old boys called up for Red army training, lays an emphasis on national defense, an emphasis which should not be lost sight of in the United States. Not because this country need expect or fear war with the Soviet Union—there is every reason to believe that the two nations can and will live at peace—but because of the wisdom of universal military training.

Twice within a quarter century the United States was caught without adequate military forces when attacked. It can happen again. This country, along with Russia and the other United Nations, is at work in San Francisco on a charter for a world organization to maintain peace. It is a great adventure. Nevertheless, the United States must take adequate measures to insure its own safety, certainly until it has been proved the world intends to live in peace.

For months there have been pending in Congress proposals to establish a universal peacetime military-training system. Similar proposals were made after the close of the First World War, but were kicked aside. If they had not been thrown into the discard, the whole course of history might have been different, and this country might not have been compelled to fight the greatest war of all time, war which is not yet ended.

In order to avoid giving an impression that the United States was talking of world peace in San Francisco while in Washington Congress was preparing to set up universal military training, the House Committee on Future Military Planning laid the training proposals aside. "Let's do nothing to rock the boat" was the argument advanced. "Let's wait and see what comes out of the United Nations Conference." The Soviet Union is more realistic. It has gone right ahead with its plans for peacetime defense training. At the same time it has joined with the United States and the rest to form a peace organization.

Everyone hopes the new organization will work 100 percent. No one knows whether it will or not. In any event, it still remains for the great powers to be in position to enforce peace by arms, if necessary, and to do so they must have military strength. This country has huge armed forces today. But even now partial demobilization has begun since the war in Europe ended. The sooner a military training plan for the years ahead is developed, the better. President Roosevelt had come around to the support of such a plan. President Truman can give it added impetus, if he will, with a special message to Congress.

Russian Lt. Gen. N. N. Pronin, chief of the training administration of the Commissariat for Defense, announcing the call for Russian youth, said, "General military training in the present period should be conducted on an even higher level than in the days of war. The peaceful period into which our country has entered should not lessen our attention to the problems of defense." He stressed, too, the value to the youth of the nation of military training, for physical hardening, for the inculcation of decisiveness, endurance, stubbornness, and initiative.

The Charter of the proposed world organization for peace refers to possible future regulation of armaments and disarmament. The military staff committee, which it proposes to set up to aid the Security Council, is to look into such matters in the future, but its main job is to assist the Council on all questions relating to military requirements for the maintenance of peace. Obviously, any question of limitation of armaments or of disarmament lies in the dim future. It's up to Americans to prepare for national defense in the world as it is today.

Mr. Chairman, it was on June 1, 1945, that I made my first speech on the floor of this House for universal military training. I stressed the fact that whether we liked it or not we lived in a hard-boiled world, one that I had seen with my own eyes in my visits to our fighting boys on many fronts. I pointed out that bitterness, intolerance, hatred, and suspicion still plagued the hearts and minds of men and we could ill afford to let our defenses down while the Soviet Union went all out in building theirs.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to make reference to the address just made to the membership by our distinguished colleague from New Jersey. I, too, was at the meeting last night; I, too, have been a member of the American Legion for a long time, a very long time, and I always enjoy the association of my Legion comrades. But I was quite disturbed by the remarks made by the national commander last night; I thought they were distinctly unwarranted in certain respects. In the first place, the program that is here outlined and in the act that was passed last fall to which most of us acceded in the hope that some improvements would be brought in at this time—that act and this one together do not carry out the program of the American Legion for universal military training. The Handbook on Universal Military Training, published by the American Legion some time ago advocates, for example, a training period of 17 weeks, not 6 months. It also has a great many other differences from the program that is here brought before us.

Last night following the dinner it was my privilege to sit with some of the top officers and commission members of the American Legion, some of whom I have known for a great many years. Those questions were placed before them and they freely admitted that what I have just now said is quite true. Unfortunately, some of our great organizations in the United States, and I say occasionally my beloved organization, the American Legion, attaches itself to a fetish; anything with the initials UMT on it is very liable to be approved by many members of that organization. As I talked it over with them last night I said: "You could hang those three initials on a skunk and be for it, but that would not make it smell any better"; and they admitted it. I went one step further with some of these gentlemen; they are old-timers in the American Legion, just as I am. I asked: "Have you read the bill and its predecessor to which it alludes? Have you read in this connection the other acts which are directly involved with it such as the Reserve Act, the ROTC Act, and certain other acts? Do you not think you ought to give this the same careful study that is required to be given by the Members of Congress before you take any such position?" They agreed with me that they should have so done. These men, of course, are not the present officers of the American Legion; they are some of the past leaders and present advisers and some of them have served a long time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, if the gentleman from Georgia will yield me the time he consumes.

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure. I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I judge from the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from California that the complaint he finds with this bill is that it does not follow the pattern of the length of training set up in a Legion proposal.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I merely spoke of that as one element of the American Legion program which is certainly not carried in this bill.

Mr. VINSON. I was going to say that I judge the gentleman was for 4 months instead of 6 months. Did I not gather that from the gentleman's statement?

Mr. HINSHAW. No; the gentleman is assuming something which is incorrect and I cannot consent to accepting those as my words. I have not made them at any time.

Mr. VINSON. I thought the gentleman was pointing out a difference between this bill and the American Legion bill and said that was one of the differences.

Mr. HINSHAW. No; I did not say the American Legion bill. I said the American Legion universal military training program as set forth in the manual published by them shortly after the conclusion of World War II and which they are still following in all branches.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. May I ask the ranking minority Member if I will be able to get a little more time in the event I need it?

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I am sure my colleague will agree with the statement I am about to make that regardless of the viewpoint of the American Legion, of which the gentleman and I are members, it is still our responsibility as Members of Congress to use our own judgment on bills before us. Does not the gentleman feel that way?

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes. We are responsible, we are absolutely responsible for every action taken here in this body. It is our responsibility alone and we must assume that for ourselves. We are delighted to have the guidance, the advice, the counsel of any agency in the United States, including all of the veterans' organizations. As the gentleman from Georgia very well knows, my record in support of the national defense is just about as good as anybody's in this House. Nobody has any complaint I know of about that; and I am willing to discuss any aspect which I am competent to discuss at any time.

There have been hopes on my part that this committee would go carefully into the relationship between this bill and the Reserve Act, correct the Reserve Act where it needs to be corrected, improve and add to it where it needs to be added to, and there are a great many places where corrections and additions could be made.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman was responsible for that act and did a fine job; however, this act was not before him at that time.

Mr. BROOKS. The able and distinguished gentleman from California has long been most intelligently interested and constructive in the interest of proper national defense. May I say to the gentleman that when the Reserve Act came out it was acceptable universally to all of the units that were affected by it.

Mr. HINSHAW. I agree with the gentleman and thank him for his kindness.

Mr. BROOKS. I think it is still acceptable to them.

Mr. HINSHAW. I voted for it, but this is a new unit which has had no chance to take a look at the Reserve Act as it affects them under this one.

Mr. BROOKS. The Reserve Act contemplated an act of this sort and it will operate perfectly when this act is passed.

Mr. HINSHAW. If I had about a half hour I could discuss some of the effects with the gentleman because I have had the privilege of sitting in with some of the top experts in the United States Government, by invitation, if you please, who have to do with the technical and scientific manpower of the Government. They are very, very fearful that this act will not permit the satisfaction of even the needs of Government, let alone the municipalities and government contractors, in reference to scientific and technical personnel requirements and that extends on into all industry.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, assuming I could prevail upon my colleague to allow an extra minute to be yielded to the gentleman from California, I wonder if the gentleman from California would yield to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. I will be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman who is a distinguished and veteran member of the Armed Services Committee, and, with me, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from California one additional minute.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would like to have the gentleman help me and give me some guidance. I am not a member of the American Legion nor the VFW, never having rendered military service. I do sense my responsibilities as a Member of Congress in providing for the national defense and seeing that our Nation is secure.

Mr. HINSHAW. We all have that responsibility.

Mr. COLE of New York. Now, to the extent that the recommendations of an outside organization might influence my judgment, what would the gentleman's recommendation to me be: Should I be guided by the recommendation of a farm organization, a labor organization, a church organization, or an organization composed of citizens who have rendered military service to their country? To the extent that those people may influence my judgment, to which should I give greater reliance?

Mr. HINSHAW. On a problem of this sort, in my opinion, it is up to every Member of Congress to listen to anyone who wants to talk. It is his responsibility to make a decision, to act in what he believes to be the best interest of his country after considering all aspects of the matter.

Mr. COLE of New York. What is the gentleman's recommendation to me?

Mr. HINSHAW. In what respect?

Mr. COLE of New York. As to which organization I should listen?

Mr. HINSHAW. Listen to all of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me for tomorrow be vacated and that I may address the House today for 10 minutes following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ASSIGNMENT OF TRAINEES TO HAWAII

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a letter from one of my constituents in regard to our trainees assigned to Hawaii. The letter in part reads as follows:

> I am the mother of a boy who is in Hawaii for basic training. He is our only child and I needn't tell you how important it is both for him and for us for him to be able to come home on leave before he is assigned probably to the Far East. It seems to me that the least the Army could do is to transport these boys home without cost to them for their short leave. I don't think it is necessary to go into detail about the importance of morale of both parents and boys in cases like mine. In order for us to bring him home we would have to give up a lifetime of savings, and I am sure there are many, many families in the same position as we.
>
> It is therefore my hope that you will be able to do something for me in this connection.
>
> I will appreciate any help you can give.
>
> Respectfully yours.

Mr. Speaker, investigation reveals that many of our boys from the East are in the same plight as a result of an error of judgment on the part of the War Department officials. I, myself, have received 30 protests from people in my district. While the War Department officials state there was no discrimination in the assignments of trainees to Hawaii, they do admit that the situation needs correction. They also admit that the policy has placed a great financial hardship on the families of the boys from the east coast who had to use part of their life savings for the opportunity of bidding Godspeed to their sons leaving for foreign assignments. I have been told that the granting of a 7-day furlough to the boys is a policy inaugurated by the War Department to help bolster the morale of not only the families, but also the inductees. The Department states that there is no requirement of law compelling them to do so. Yet in following out the policy they did not anticipate the financial burden of an outlay of approximately $700—a mighty big sum to pay for the opportunity of spending 7 days with their sons prior to overseas duty. I am told that authority to send boys out of continental United States stems from the lack of prohibitory language in Public Law 51, which we passed last July. Since training facilities were available in Hawaii and since the use of those facilities was more economical than opening new posts in the United States the Defense Department anticipated no difficulty in sending the boys there from all parts of the United States.

In this connection I am told that a sizable portion of the quotas sent to Hawaii from different parts of this country are volunteers for this training. Men are sent to Korea from Hawaii in the same ratio as from posts in the United States. Those who come back to this country for additional training or those

who go to Europe, of course, get the same advantages for leave as men who are trained at posts within the continental limits of the United States. The real problem lies in the cases of those who go to Hawaii involuntarily and then are sent to the Far East. In all fairness I can say that the Army is now working to correct this injustice in the future, but I understand, can do nothing about the past. Since the deluge of protests—I understand some three hundred have been filed—the Department of Defense has realized its error and I am told that hereafter it will assign only boys from the West to Hawaii.

But what about the parents of the boys who have suffered because of this error? Is there no redress? The Department of Defense can in no way reimburse them for the money expended. In my opinion it was never the intent of the Members who voted for Public Law 51 to impose such hardships upon any inductees whatsoever, and I ask the members of the appropriate committees to give consideration to a plan of reimbursement. I trust the Congress will enact legislation to correct this injustice. This added financial burden is more than the families of the inductees should be asked to bear.

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am causing a letter to be sent to every Member of the House inviting signatures on discharge petition No. 3, which relates to House Resolution 62, expressing the will of the House as to televising and broadcasting of important congressional proceedings and giving the Speaker the power of selection and administration within that policy.

Mr. Speaker, I had an extended statement on this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, which goes into the questions raised by the Speaker's action in finding that no further television or radio broadcasting of committee proceedings could take place, which brings this whole question to the front.

I think the time has come to solve the fundamental question, and my resolution, I feel, deals with the fundamental question of the will of the House as to televising and broadcasting of important congressional proceedings with the confidence that once that will is expressed the Speaker will exercise the power granted with great ability and fairness.

The distinction made between debates on the floor and committee proceedings involves the question of the rights of an individual as a witness and there a code of fair procedures and the exercise of a wise discretion to preserve fairness in handling witnesses and in other arrangements, under the Speaker's general supervision, should be adequate safeguards.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TELEVISING OF HOUSE COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced in the House of Representatives a resolution to amend the rules of the House so as to authorize House committees to allow their hearings to be televised.

Monday, February 25, in response to a parliamentary inquiry by Minority Leader JOE MARTIN, Speaker of the House SAM RAYBURN ruled that proceedings of House committees could not be televised. This ruling came about in connection with the hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee held in Detroit this week.

Recognizing that the question may be a close one, I interpret the rules otherwise than the Speaker did. I call attention to the provision of the Legislative Reorganization Act which orders all hearings to be public unless the committee—by majority vote—decides they should be executive. This is section 133 (f) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and reads as follows:

> All hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public, except executive sessions for marking up bills or for voting or where the committee by a majority vote orders an executive session.

This would seem to me to mean that any citizen has a right to be present at committee public hearings. It also seems to me this rule would include the press, radio, news reels, and television. If any citizen has a right to be present in person, why should he be denied attendance through television or broadcasting?

I also call attention to the fact that there is nothing in the rules of the House of Representatives or in the Legislative Reorganization Act which expressly prohibits the telecasting of proceedings of the House of Representatives or its committees.

Mystery surrounds the origin of this move to prevent Michigan citizens from personally witnessing the inquiry into Communist influences in Michigan.

According to reports, Speaker RAYBURN acknowledged to the press that he had received a call from Detroit regarding the telecast of the Un-American Activities hearings but refused to disclose the name of the caller.

Obviously reasons and advantages to the Democratic Party which would result from suppressing the possible disclosures of Communist activity in Michigan have led commentators and the press and radio generally to speculate on the motives of those who apparently urged Speaker RAYBURN to act.

It is suggested that they feared influential officials in Democratic Party circles would be shown to have a sympathetic leaning toward Communist principles, objectives, and activities. It is also suggested that Michigan's Republican member of the Un-American Activities Committee, Representative CHARLES E. POTTER, of Cheboygan, might gain prestige and acclaim through the committee's work. Representative POTTER is frequently mentioned as a possible candidate to oppose the incumbent Democratic Senator from Michigan.

I myself hesitate to accept these charges. I certainly reject them with respect to the decision by Speaker RAYBURN. I believe the record will fully substantiate his statement that he has consistently sought to prevent telecasting of committee hearings whenever he has learned of it. I also am completely satisfied that the Speaker's ruling proceeded from a sincere interpretation of the rules.

Believing this, it seems to me that to prevent injustice and to curb the speculation as to motives which has sprung up, the mystery should be dispelled and clarity should prevail. If the call from Detroit did not urge suppression of the telecasting for political advantage, the public is entitled to know it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I want to commend the gentleman for stating that he did not have any feeling that the Speaker had any ulterior motive in regard to the hearings that are now being held in Detroit. Over a week ago, long before the Detroit hearings, the Speaker mentioned to me, as chairman of the Committee Investigating the Polish Massacres at Katyn, that we would not be allowed to televise our hearings. So I am satisfied that the Speaker's ban had nothing whatsoever to do with the situation in Detroit, because of the fact that he had spoken to me about my committee's hearings long before the hearings in Detroit.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman. I was aware of a conference which the Katyn Massacre Committee had with the Speaker, and I understood that he had opposed the televising of certain hearings, which the committee planned to hold in Chicago, although as I recall it, the gentleman from Indiana did have television at the hearings here in Washington where the committee heard witnesses on the Katyn Massacre.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right. But, that was 3 weeks ago, and the Speaker of the House called my attention to the rules of the House. That might have been 10 days ago so the ruling of the Speaker could not have anything to do whatsoever with the present hearings in Detroit.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very glad to see the gentleman entering into this situation. I do not wish to express a judgment with respect to the political mo-

tives involved. We all love the Speaker, and I use that term advisedly. That is something the gentleman himself will deal with. I am interested though in the major question. I want to compliment the gentleman on his taking the cudgels for opening the doors for committee hearings, and I hope the gentleman will extend his view to the important debates of the Congress. I would like, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to ask the gentleman two questions. First: Does not the gentleman feel that the public has its right to have modern science expand the walls of this Chamber so that they can see and hear on the television and the radio the important debates of this body?

Mr. MEADER. I would like to make a distinction, as I will later on in my remarks, between the hearings of the committees and the proceedings in the Chamber itself. I believe the Speaker of the House now has authority, if he so desires, to permit the televising of the proceedings of the House, and he has permitted proceedings in the House Chamber to be televised in the past, as I point out in my remarks. I would like to withhold any further comment on the use of television in the House Chamber proceedings, as is contained in the gentleman's resolution, until a little later, if I may.

Mr. JAVITS. Surely.

Mr. MEADER. Because I do discuss that and draw some distinction between committee hearings and the debates in the House Chamber.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman, and may I ask him this further question which relates to a specific point, and that is: Does not the gentleman feel that if his resolution should carry and the will of the House should be expressed that committee hearings can be opened up to television and radio, it would be necessary to promulgate a code for the protection of witnesses, and although I do not know if the gentleman is a lawyer, although I believe he is, that it is very essential to protect witnesses, and that the indiscriminate use of television and radio could very easily in many cases work out to invade individual rights?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman is correct. I am an attorney. In fact, I have had a little experience with congressional committees, having served as assistant counsel for the Truman committee and chief counsel to the Mead committee, and chief counsel to the Fulbright committee. Based upon that experience, I have some misgivings about proposals for a code of conduct for committee procedure. I do not believe it is desirable for congressional committees to attempt to set up anything like the rigid rules of evidence governing procedure in the courts. I have written two law review articles on that subject. One in the Michigan Law Review for April of 1948, I believe, and then a subsequent article last Spring for a symposium of the Chicago Law Review. My views are fully expressed in those articles. But, I do not believe that is pertinent to this discussion except in this way, that it is my belief that the committees should control their procedure including the means of dissemination of news of their proceedings.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the gentleman would rely upon the committee over which the Member is presiding to use its discretion as to the extent to which the witness needs protection of his individual rights?

Mr. MEADER. I would have some faith in the good judgment of the members of the committee, and I rather resent the frequent implication in the press that all Congressmen and Senators are irresponsible.

Mr. JAVITS. I never had in mind any code which would prescribe legal rules of evidence. That would obviously invalidate many wonderful congressional investigations, and make impossible the obtaining of statements from witnesses. But does not the gentleman feel we should erect some guideposts for the committees? For example, if a witness is obviously unable to be at ease or to do himself justice under the probing of the television camera, and if it should appear in a particular case that charges are made which are entitled to refutation, charges which receive very, very wide currency over the television and radio, that then an opportunity should be afforded in some fashion to refute those charges by those whom they are made against.

Mr. MEADER. Let me answer that question by saying I believe fairness is always a measure of the prestige and dignity and effectiveness of any committee. The press and the people are very sensitive to overreaching, browbeating of witnesses, and unfair treatment on the part of congressional committees. I do not know how you are going to reform human beings. If you entrust power to them, they always have the opportunity of abusing that power. I do not know of any rigid code of conduct that can be enforced upon congressional committees which would prevent any possible abuses without also preventing the committee from doing any good.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not want to take any more of the gentleman's time, except to advise the gentleman that both in the other body and here various Members have proposed such a code. I hope the gentleman will study them in connection with his resolution.

Mr. MEADER. Yes. I have. One of my articles in the Law Review dealt with a proposal made by Senator Lucas, made some time ago, and I attempted to analyze the effect of the rules he proposed upon the conduct of committee proceedings.

If the call from Detroit did urge consideration of political strategy, the public should also know that. The identification of the caller, preferably by the caller's disclosing himself, would remove suspicion which now surrounds others who might benefit from the suppression of telecasting of the hearings. It is no more than fair to them that the inferences and innuendo proceeding from the anonymity of the caller be removed.

Speaker RAYBURN's ruling, whether right or wrong, serves to bring to the attention of the public and the Congress, in a forceful way, the basic issue of telecasting of congressional proceedings. This issue should be thoroughly considered in all of its phases and implications. The broadcasting and television industry should be heard; the general public should be heard, and—after thorough consideration—a congressional policy should be announced. It is for this reason that I have introduced the resolution which would authorize committees—in their discretion—to control the media of communication in the dissemination of news of their proceedings to the general public.

The executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' Galleries yesterday expressed their views on the reporting of congressional activities, which presents briefly the position of the affected industries.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of the radio correspondents to the Speaker of the House be included at this point in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAVENNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The letter is as follows:)

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker, United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The undersigned members of the executive committee of the Radio Correspondents' galleries offer herewith our respectful but deep-felt dissent from your interpretation of the House rule so as to exclude radio, radio recording, television, and television newsreel cameras from sessions of House committees.

We feel strongly that this is discrimination against two of the major media for news dissemination. Newspapermen cover committee sessions with pencils and copy paper. We use the microphone, the camera, tape recordings, and film. Your ruling deprives us of the full use of the tools of our trade.

We submit that radio and television reporting is the most accurate possible. We use excerpts of actual questions by committee members and answers by witnesses. These reach millions of American listeners and viewers not only in actual voice, but in the exact phrasing as official as the printed committee record. Daily newspaper circulation amounts to 54,000,000. Presently there are over 105,000,000 radio sets and more than 15,000,000 television sets in use throughout the country. This is the size of the audience deprived by your decision of full access to the news developed by your committees.

As this committee has noted before we feel a matter of principle is involved in this question of full radio and television coverage of committee hearings. This principle we would define as one of full as opposed to limited reportage. While we have noted above that we feel we are being discriminated against by not being permitted the full use of the tools of our trade, we also respectfully submit that in restrospect it is easily demonstrable that the constitutional rights of witnesses before congressional committees are better protected by full radio and television coverage than by the traditional kind of press coverage. There is no intention to be derogatory about press coverage in noting that unavoidable limitations of space in even the largest newspapers make it impossible for newspaper reporters to provide more than a precis of any witness' testimony before a congressional committee.

We respectfully submit that it is the fundamental function of all reporters, no matter what media they employ, to inform the public fully on matters of public concern, and we maintain that full radio and television coverage need not interfere with the orderly procedure of committee hearings.

We feel, Mr. Speaker, that our concept of our job as we have outlined it above need not conflict in any way with your concept of the dignity of the House of Represent-

atives. We are certain that these two concepts are reconcilable, and we would appreciate an opportunity to sit down with you in the quiet of your office to talk over what we regard as a definite handicap in our covering of committee proceedings.

Respectfully,

Executive Committee of Correspondents: Charles Shutt, Member at Large; Howard L. Kany, Member at Large; Rudolph Block, Member at Large; Willard F. Shadel, Member Ex Officio; Hollis M. Seavey, Chairman; Martin Agronsky, Vice Chairman; Joseph C. Harsch, Secretary; Richard Harkness, Treasurer.

Mr. MEADER. Apparently the ruling of the Speaker on Monday banning telecasting of the Detroit hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee is the first time this precise parliamentary question has been raised in the House itself.

However, as we all know, live telecasting, retelecasting, live broadcasting, and rebroadcasting and news-reel photography have been permitted extensively by committees and subcommittees of both the House and the Senate, without effective objection.

I am having prepared a comprehensive and accurate list of the reporting of congressional committee hearings, in which I understand the practice is just as old as the television industry itself. I propose to show, if possible, in this list the name of the committee holding the hearings, the date, the subject matter and the particular media of communication through which the accounts of its proceedings were reported. When such a list is compiled, I will insert it in the RECORD for the information of the Congress.

I believe this compilation will reveal that the telecasting and broadcasting of hearings has been so extensive over such a long period of time and without effective objection that it may fairly be said that a practice and custom has grown up which should be treated as having the same validity as an express rule of the House of Representatives.

I believe a distinction can appropriately be drawn between committee proceedings and proceedings in the Chamber of the House itself with respect to the telecasting of debates, events and activities. However, I do think it is pertinent that the House has frequently permitted telecasting of its proceedings. Joint sessions of the Congress, to receive messages from the President or foreign notables such as Prime Minister Winston Churchill, have uniformly been telecast and broadcast. Moreover, the separate sessions of the House of Representatives have also been televised. The opening days of both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congress were reported by live telecast. The opening session of the Eighty-second Congress was recorded and filmed and retelecast.

Over a period of time I have given considerable thought to the arguments pro and con on committee procedure, including the publicity attendant upon committee hearings.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Again I do not want to take any of the gentleman's time, but do I infer that the gentleman would favor the televising and broadcasting of important House debates? I know that has never been done; the Speaker has never permitted it, and from his expressions recently he would not permit it unless the House exclusively authorized it.

By important debate I mean, for instance, such as that which will come up on Monday and Tuesday of next week when we will be amending the UMT bill which is vital to the American people. Does not the gentleman feel about that as he does about committee procedures? But this debate emphasizes the importance manyfold in terms of critical importance to the people in seeing just what takes place on the floor of Congress.

Mr. MEADER. My inclination is to go along with the gentleman on that. I think there are a lot of questions that could be raised, but I feel, as the gentleman will see from my further remarks, that the benefit of bringing the Government closer to the people and informing them more completely on public affairs is in the public interest, because our people in this country are the ultimate sovereigns and they can only exercise their responsibility and their authority intelligently if they are informed. Televising and broadcasting and other means of reporting to the people things that occur in their National Government is in the interest of a better informed citizenry, and would result in better government.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MEADER. My approach to this question stems from my firm conviction that the great need of the country today is to strengthen the Congress. I believe firmly in democratic processes and in the determination of national policy through representatives elected and controlled by the people. I am likewise convinced that in the past two or three decades there has been a great gravitation of governmental power into the bureaus, departments, and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. I am further convinced that this trend is not in the interest of government by the people but, on the contrary, is in the direction of totalitarianism, where the executive branch controls the affairs of a nation to the exclusion of the judicial and legislative branches of the Government.

Fascism and communism are, in essence, overgrown bureaucracies where government officials are the masters of the people, not their servants.

The founders of our Constitution displayed outstanding foresight and wisdom in setting up the structure of our Government so as to provide for the separation of governmental powers. The checks and balances they created were designed to prevent tyranny.

Elsewhere, in congressional debates, in speeches and in law review articles, I have outlined at some length my views that the Congress has lost control in a large measure of its policy-making authority and even of its appropriating power. I have urged the Congress to streamline, modernize, and strengthen itself to discharge more adequately its constitutional responsibilities. I have suggested that this could be done effectively by staffing congressional committees with competent, able, and patriotic investigative talent, loyal to the Congress itself. I have pointed out that Congress under present-day conditions is dealing with complex, intricate economic, and social problems. It is attempting to solve these problems, in a sense, with its bare hands; Congress cannot hope to deal intelligently with these difficult problems unless, by the use of an investigative instrument it penetrates beneath the surface generalities of a subject and reaches the bedrock of fact.

When national policies and programs come to be based upon fact and logic instead of prejudices and emotions, the democratic system of government will have proved itself workable.

It is in this light that it seems to me that dissemination of news concerning the activities of congressional committees assumes transcendent importance. In a democracy, the people, who are the ultimate sovereigns, cannot act intelligently unless they are informed. It would not be in the public interest for an iron curtain to be drawn between the people and their representatives. The more the people know about their government, the more likely they are to base their decisions at the polls on sound facts and arguments rather than on emotions and prejudices.

I know of no public official who would seriously advocate, or dare to advocate, that the operations of the Government should be hidden from the people. Why, then, should there be opposition to the use of television and radio broadcasting as a means of accurately and vividly presenting to the American public exactly what transpires in the national arena?

Newspaper reporters, news cameramen taking still pictures, radio commentators, movie cameras, tape recording and telecasting are the agencies through which happenings are brought to the public. For the life of me I have difficulty in distinguishing between these news agencies on any rational, legal, or functional basis.

The only thing unique about television is that it is, perhaps, the most effective form of transmission of news, because it utilizes both the senses of sight and hearing. One viewing television is personally present at the event. Indeed, because of the poor acoustics and arrangement of some of our committee rooms, the person viewing committee hearings on television may have a much better and clearer view of the proceedings than spectators personally present in the hearing room. Furthermore, it is difficult, if not impossible except by editing, to distort television or radio broadcasting of the proceedings themselves. In a sense, they are a primary record. No better evidence of what happened could be obtained.

The argument is used that televising congressional proceedings would tend to encourage showmanship on the part of legislators. To me, this argument is not a valid one. The 531 Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate constitute the board of directors of

the greatest institution on the face of the earth. For the most part, these men and women are patriotic public servants. At the very least, they are a cross section of the American people; if their quality is inferior, it is only because the people of the country have permitted it to be so. Whatever tendency there is for demagogery in the Congress exists whether the proceedings are televised or not.

It would seem to me that the actual witnessing of the conduct of the Congress by the people would have a tendency rather to encourage Representatives and Senators to be more statesmanlike, if that is really what the people want in their representatives.

The voters and the media of communication have a way of taking care of persons who would do anything to get publicity regardless of its effect upon the welfare of the country. The only thing that television would do would be to throw the spotlight on public activities and public events. I cannot believe that this would be harmful if we take as our basic premise that government by the people is desirable.

Television is one of man's miracles which can have great impact on our society in the future. In the political field it can serve to bring Government closer to the people. It seems to me all citizens who have lost any yearning to go back to the horse-and-buggy days will welcome this new instrument of our modern age. It may well prove to be a valuable tool in reversing the trend toward bureaucracy and restoring policy-making power to the Congress where it rightfully belongs.

I am firmly convinced that the people will take action to strengthen their Congress and, thus, to preserve and promote the cause of democracy if the people are fully and accurately informed on national affairs. I believe the telecasting and broadcasting of congressional proceedings is an effective way of providing the people with that information.

I, therefore, am convinced that authorizing congressional committees to decide what type of publicity will be permitted concerning their proceedings is in the public interest.

Resolved, That rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees and its select and special committees, so far as applicable, with the following exceptions:

"(A) A motion to recess from day to day is hereby made a motion of high privilege in such committees;

"(B) Each committee, and each subcommittee thereof, is authorized to fix a lesser number than a majority of its entire membership which shall constitute a quorum thereof for the purpose of taking sworn testimony: *Provided*, That any such quorum of less than a majority of its entire membership shall consist of not less than one member of the majority party and one member of the minority party;

"(C) Each committee, and each subcommittee thereof, is authorized, in its discretion, to permit the dissemination of news of its proceedings, during such proceedings or thereafter, by radio and television, and by such other methods and media of communication, and upon such terms and conditions, as it deems advisable."

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a copy of a resolution he has introduced.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not want to interrupt the gentleman too much while he was speaking. I think the gentleman has stated the argument in favor of televising and broadcasting important congressional proceedings very well. I certainly welcome him into this fight because I think it is very much in the interest of the American people. I would like to say something to the gentleman, however. I have been at this a little over a year now and I must say that there are a lot of Republicans that need to be convinced and I hope that the gentleman, now that he is in it, will go about that task which I have been trying to do almost alone.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I suggest that the matter has not been brought to a head before because the committee have uniformly and at will, it seemed to me, gone ahead and reported their hearings as they saw fit and have permitted different reporting agencies as they thought appropriate to cover their hearings. But the ruling made by the Speaker, which is the first ruling in the House of Representatives on this specific subject, as I understand it from the Parliamentarian, has brought this matter to the fore. I was very gratified to note the attitude of the Speaker, that if the rules of the House were to be changed he, of course, would abide by the rules of the House. The Speaker indicated it was a matter that should be considered by the Rules Committee, and I urge that the Rules Committee take action. I was astonished by the comments in the press today that some Rules Committee members have made up their minds already. I hope those accounts did not accurately report their views.

Mr. JAVITS. May I say to the gentleman that I was before the Committee on Rules on this very proposition, I think in April of last year, and the reception was not very enthusiastic, but I do not believe that is universally true of the Committee on Rules. Let us hope that with a number of other hands working we can get better results.

Mr. MEADER. I only want to point out to the gentleman again, as I have before, that the telecasting of the debates in the House of Representatives, in my judgment, is a somewhat different problem from the proceedings of the committees. I base that view primarily on this theory. As I understand the philosophy of the rules of the House, the Speaker is a very powerful influence upon what happens in the Chamber of the House. He now, as I understand it, has the discretion to allow or not to allow the telecasting of proceedings here. In his discretion he has decided not to allow the debates to be broadcast and televised, but with his permission joint sessions or joint meetings of the Congress can be and have been televised. Now, that is a discretionary matter. All I am seeking to do, which is somewhat different from the gentleman's resolution, is to give to the committees of the Congress the same authority that the Speaker now has with respect to the Chamber, namely, in their discretion to control the media of communication by which their proceedings are reported.

Mr. JAVITS. Obviously, if the House does not express itself on the fundamental issue, the Speaker is not going to permit it either for committees or in the Chamber. That is my point.

Mr. MEADER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I merely want to correct the impression that the gentleman gave when he made the statement that the ruling Monday by the Speaker was the first ruling against television in committees, because about 10 days ago he advised me, as chairman of the Special Committee Investigating the Katyn Massacre, that we could not televise any more. The Detroit hearings were 10 days later. I received the ruling 10 days ago.

Mr. MEADER. I did not mean to say that that was the first time the Speaker expressed himself against it. What I meant to make clear and will emphasize again is that so far as I could learn from the Parliamentarian this was the first time that a parliamentary inquiry on the question had been presented and was passed upon by the Speaker in a formal ruling, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I understand, and I think I stated in my remarks when the gentleman interrupted me before, that the Speaker has consistently, when he learned about it, expressed his disapproval of the telecasting of committee hearings.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. He expressed his views that it violated the rules of the House; that was simply what he ruled the other day in response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MEADER. I believe that modification is correct, in the light of my statement. I was not personally present when he made the statement, so I do not know what he said.

Mr. McCORMACK. His approval is one thing; his interpretation of the rules as the Speaker is another thing. The gentleman recognizes that distinction.

Mr. MEADER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is why the word "approval" might appear to a reader of the RECORD that it was purely discretionary with the Speaker as to whether or not committees could be televised when, as a matter of fact, in accordance with his construction of the rules of the House as presently constituted, with which I am in complete agreement, television is not permitted, not only in the House but in committees of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MEADER. That raises a question I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader. I may have been misinformed. Is it not true that telecasting of proceedings of the House has been permitted, and is that not discretionary with the Speaker under the rules?

Mr. McCORMACK. The Speaker has, under the rules, certain discretionary power which he has properly limited in the absence of any change of the rules by the House itself. The question of what should be done and what the House wants to do is separate and distinct from the Speaker's ruling. To my recollection this is the first time the matter has been raised by a parliamentary inquiry. So far as I know, whenever the Speaker has received information that any committee is televising or acting contrary to the rules, he has so instructed the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

SABOTAGING THE WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 532, introduced on February 22, calls for an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board by the House Committee on Education and Labor. I want to serve notice that as a member of the Rules Committee to which this resolution has been referred I shall oppose it. The Wage Stabilization Board must be free to arrive at decisions based on fact, without coercion or intimidation from any source—including the Congress of the United States.

The purpose of the resolution is crystal clear. It is intended as a congressional club to be used against the Wage Stabilization Board on the union-shop issue now pending before the Board in the steel wage case. It seeks to use the Congress of the United States as an ally of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Committee for Constitutional Government, and the barons of the steel industry in their current high-financed, Nation-wide propaganda campaign directed against a possible recommendation for the union shop by the Wage Stabilization Board. In my opinion the resolution calls for unjustifiable, prejudicial interference by Congress in the decision-making authority of the Board.

The very timing of the introduction of the resolution stigmatizes it as an attempt at undue influence on the Wage Stabilization Board in the first major dispute case to come before it. It will be recalled that on January 10 of this year a special panel of the Wage Stabilization Board began hearings on the dispute case between the major steel-producing companies and the United Steelworkers of America. Those hearings were concluded on February 16. Six days later—I repeat and emphasize this because it is of the utmost importance—6 days later, on February 22, a resolution is introduced in this House calling for an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board.

What is the basis for the investigation? In the words of the resolution itself, to determine whether the Board has exceeded its authority and jurisdiction with respect to labor disputes, to determine whether the Board has failed to respect the national labor policy as expressed in the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Defense Production Act, and other applicable laws with regard to collective bargaining. There is no excuse for congressional time and money being wasted on prejudicial investigations designed to influence and harass Government agencies in the administration of their lawful duties.

Legitimate investigations by committees of Congress of Government agencies or personnel based on specific charges of corruption, fraud, or maladministration are, of course, always in order, and I would not be one to oppose such investigations. I do object, however, vigorously and emphatically when this House is called upon to approve an investigation by one of its committees of an agency of the Government where the obvious purpose of such investigation is made at a time when the welfare and well-being of hundreds of thousands of American workers and their families are involved in a major case currently pending before that agency.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does not the distinguished gentleman from Indiana think that when the House turned down the Lucas amendment in the last session of the Congress they gave an answer to that question?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is entirely correct.

You will recall that last year when this body had under consideration amendment of the Defense Production Act, an attempt was made through the Lucas amendment to take away from the Wage Stabilization Board its powers to handle nonwage dispute cases. After full debate on the matter this House took decisive action by a vote of 217 to 113 to reject the Lucas proposal. It was recognized at that time by the Members of this House, and rightly so, that more than the oppressive provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were needed for the settlement of disputes in critical defense industries. The President of the United States likewise recognized that fact in assigning dispute functions to the Board under his constitutional powers. No one can successfully challenge the correctness of the decision made by this House or of the action taken by the President with respect to the dispute authority of the Board.

Nor can anyone in good faith contend that a union shop recommendation by the Wage Stabilization Board would be a violation of national labor policy as expressed in the Labor-Management Relations Act, the Defense Production Act, or any other applicable law pertaining to collective bargaining. Is anyone's memory so short as not to remember that just last year this Congress—by unanimous vote of the Senate and by a vote of 307 to 18 of this House—amended the Taft-Hartley Act by eliminating the need for elections to authorize a union shop? The union shop in American industry is not a violation of national labor policy, and no one knows that better than the proponents of House Resolution 532.

The leaders and members of the United Steelworkers of America are to be highly commended for the patience and forbearance they have shown in their dispute with the major steel producing companies of the Nation. In their month-long series of conferences between mid-November and mid-December with representatives of the steel industry they were unable to receive any counter-proposals from the industry in response to their own proposals for improvement of the collective bargaining contracts. "No" was the one and only answer given by the industry to each of the union's proposals.

In patriotic recognition of the needs of the defense program the union postponed a scheduled strike to enable the dispute to be heard and considered by the Wage Stabilization Board. Just last week the union again set back the strike date until midnight of March 23 in order that the Board might have ample time for full consideration of the issues and evidence presented in the hearings which ended on February 16.

All this has been done by the union despite the campaign of vilification conducted against it by the steel industry and its cohorts. All this despite the weeks and months of conferences and hearings. All this despite the overwhelming sentiment for the union shop among steelworkers as expressed by them in a truly American and democratic way—through the secret ballot. All this despite their firm insistence on acceptance of their proposals by the steel industry as expressed in open special convention held on January 3 and 4 of this year. All this despite the continued response of "No" given to the union proposals by representatives of the steel industry in the Wage Stabilization Board hearings.

It ill behooves this House to inject itself at this time into the steel-dispute case on the side of the steel industry. And that is exactly what we would be doing were we to approve House Resolution 532 and thereby authorize an investigation of the Wage Stabilization Board.

I call upon all fair-minded Members of this House to join me in vigorous and outspoken opposition to this resolution in order that the Wage Stabilization Board may arrive at a decision in the Steel case based on facts; a decision completely free from coercion or intimidation by the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

CONSUMERS BEWARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, American consumers are about to be submitted to one of the biggest scale drives against their pocketbooks, which the country has yet seen. The campaign is designed to accomplish nothing less than repeal of all price controls, this despite the accumulated evidence that the price-control law is essential, and the fact that in the current report by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for the first time in 5 months, the consumers price index has not shown a price increase. This campaign is signalled by a meeting to be held tomorrow morning at 10 a. m. at the Hotel Sherman in Chicago called by the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association of that city with the objective of organizing a big campaign, and I quote their words "eliminating the OPS," from their letter calling for the meeting. This organization says frankly, and I quote:

Our association wants to get rid of OPS and price control.

Addressing a number of the major organizations of food producers and distributors in the country, the call for the meeting also says:

Your association wants to get rid of the OPS and price control.

Another disquieting feature of this proposed drive is the statement contained in the association's call for the meeting:

This will be a confidential meeting without publicity.

Those invited are exhorted in the following words:

And please come prepared for action.

The speakers on the tentative program at the conference make up an impressive list of trade association officials concerned with producing and distributing of important items in the Nation's diet, and in the ordinary family's budget.

The Corn Belt Livestock Producers Association certainly has a right to organize a campaign to repeal the OPS and price controls although I think the idea of a confidential campaign is ill-advised. But consumers certainly should be alerted so that they in their massive, but unfortunately unorganized way, can be sure that their Representatives in Congress understand what they want and what they need for their own economic protection.

I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 194 on January 28 to establish a joint congressional committee for the protection of consumers to meet just such a threat as is here posed for consumers by the activities of the Corn Belt Livestock Feeders Association.

Other points that consumers should know particularly, too, are that the meat producers who are supposedly in this association, and others to whom it has appealed, have enjoyed a preferential standing under the price-control law—not being subject to controls unless their products reach 100 percent of a very favorable parity price formula; that meat is the highest priced item in the family diet; and that the Department o Agriculture estimates the cattle feeders to be making a profit of $35 a head as against a 10 year average profit of $23 a head. The same meat producers were very important in the drive of defeating the provision authorizing slaughter quotas when wage and price control legislation was last before the Congress, and Members who have spoken to me about it have since been doubtful as to whether this was the right thing to do in view of the continuing high cost of meat.

Mr. Speaker, it is for these reasons, which I have just described, without in any way trying to stop or interfere with any American or group of Americans from running any campaign they want to, though I do think that as large associations they ought to tell the American public about it, that I have called it specifically to the attention of consumers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to—

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama and to include an editorial.

Mr. PRICE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GORDON and to include a letter that he received from a constituent.

Mr. FISHER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana and to include a petition from his constituents and his reply.

Mr. ANGELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. POULSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADAIR and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. BAKEWELL in two instances and to include editorials appearing in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. BRAMBLETT and to include an address delivered by Mr. PHILLIPS entitled "Moses Was a Republican."

Mr. JAVITS.

Mr. HILLINGS and to include a resolution.

Mr. NORBLAD in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a resolution.

Mr. ALBERT and to include a speech by Hon. Paul Walker.

Mr. LESINSKI and to include an article appearing in Reader's Digest.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in three instances and to include editorials.

Mr. GWINN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HINSHAW and to include a clipping appearing in the Moline Register.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD in five instances.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a magazine article.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 28, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1200. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the activities authorized by Public Law 763, Eighty-first Congress, pertaining to war-risk insurance, for the period ending December 31, 1951; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1201. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners of the Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Leave Act of 1949"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 1428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4285. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1429). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4694. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup-

Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5489. A bill to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1431). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5630. A bill to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6133. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; with amendment (Rept. No. 1433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6242. A bill to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same; with amendment (Rept. No. 1434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6675. A bill to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa unified school district for use for school purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REDDEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4410. A bill to amend section 16 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relative to disqualification of legislators; with amendment (Rept. No. 1436). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PRIEST: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5767. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum resale prices and which are extended by State law to nonsigners; with amendment (Rept. No. 1437). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1447. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 1448. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6561. A bill for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht; without amendment (Rept. No. 1446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 836. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harumi China Cairns and George Thomas Cairns, with amendment (Rept. No. 1438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3534. A bill for the relief of Gabriella Rubido Zichy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4343. A bill for the relief of Erika Bammes (Patricia Ann Cox); without amendment (Rept. No. 1440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5920. A bill for the relief of Kimberly Ann Cibulski, also known as Belle Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 1441). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6055. A bill for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour; without amendment (Rept. No. 1442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6088. A bill for the relief of Hisako Suzuki; without amendment (Rept. No. 1443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6117. A bill for the relief of Deliana Meulenkamp; with amendment (Rept. No. 1444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6480. A bill for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 6816. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNES:

H. R. 6817. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 6818. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6819. A bill providing for construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 6820. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the $50 work clause shall not apply in respect of work performed by individuals who have attained the age of 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6821. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6822. A bill to amend section 12 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 6823. A bill providing for the construction of a highway, and appurtenances thereto, traversing the Mississippi Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 6824. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that individuals may deduct from gross income expenses paid or incurred for transportation to and from work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6825. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to require that every ship subject to the provisions of part II of title III of such act, carry suitable radio equipment for all lifeboats; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. Res. 538. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives relative to broadcasts of committee hearings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 539. Resolution amending House Resolution 390, which provides for an investigation and study of the Katyn Forest massacre; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 540. Resolution amending rule XI (2) (f) of the Rules of the House of Representatives to authorize committees to establish a quorum of less than a majority for the purpose of taking sworn testimony, and to regulate the dissemination of news of their proceedings; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. Res. 541. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of offensive and undesirable books and radio and television programs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 542. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 505, part 1, Eighty-second Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Joint Resolutions Nos. 32 and 7 respectively, in regard to the maximum income tax rates, and the proposing of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 10, providing for the repeal of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for the adoption of the twenty-second amendment thereto, relating to limiting the rates of taxes on incomes, gifts, inheritances, and estates to 25 percent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. R. 6826. A bill for the relief of the Lake States Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6827. A bill for the relief of Edith Mathis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 6828. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Scavone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. R. 6829. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fazio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 6830. A bill for the relief of Martha Farah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 6831. A bill for the relief of Francisco Albino-Martinha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6832. A bill for the relief of Irving Polonoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6833. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nike Varga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6834. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Antonio Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6835. A bill for the relief of Nicholas M. Papadopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 6836. A bill for the relief of Dr. Mary Youn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

597. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mrs. Arthur L. Bliss, Washington, D. C., relative to a grievance involving illegal eviction, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, who art filled with compassion and tender mercy toward us, we thank Thee that each day is a new beginning. In its possibilities we revel, for its potential blessings we are grateful, and even in its problems we see the benefits of Thy hand. Throughout its hours may we think with diligence and act with dispatch that, whatever may come of bane or blessing, we may be qualified in spirit to meet it as men and triumph through it or over it as we serve our fellow men. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 27, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. WILLIAMS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. AIKEN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was authorized to hold a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND, Mr. KEM, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. KILGORE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, yesterday evening when I made the motion to recess I offered to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] for 5 minutes, or a reasonable time. He evidently did not hear the "reasonable time." My reason for not yielding the floor at that time was that three Senators who were present were under the care of physicians. I knew that the motion to take a recess would be resisted, and that a vote would be necessary. I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Missouri shall have the floor. I think he is entitled to the floor to make his speech. I wish to be fair at all times with Senators on both sides of the aisle.

Before the Senator from Missouri speaks, if he does not object, I should like to ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business, without debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED GARRISON RESERVOIR ROAD RELOCATION—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, WILLIAMS COUNTY, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Williams County, Williston, N. Dak., favoring in principle the proposed Garrison Reservoir road-relocation plan.

I call attention to the fact that if the dam is left at the high level, it will mean that the city of Williston will have to be diked in order to keep it from being flooded.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has proposed a program of relocation of roads in the areas of Williams County to be affected by the operation of the reservoir of the Garrison Dam; and

Whereas a substantial portion of such program will be required by a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas the proposed relocation program will be implemented by the Federal Government substantially without any cost whatever to Williams County, and such program is compatible with a maximum normal operating pool level of 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas we have heretofore, on several occasions, expressed our steadfast opposition to the operation of the maximum normal pool level of such reservoir at an elevation higher than 1,830 feet above sea level; and

Whereas we stand firm in our conviction that a higher maximum normal pool level of such reservoir is wholly unnecessary and is detrimental to the interests of this area and should be vigorously opposed; and

Whereas we believe the proposed road-relocation program will materially improve the system of county highways in Williams County and thereby reduce road-building expense to Williams County: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners of Williams County, N. Dak., That we do hereby approve in principle the Proposed Garrison Reservoir road-relocation plan submitted by the Corps of Engineers, but without obligation on the part of Williams County to contribute financially to the construction phases thereof, and without withdrawing our firm and unaltered opposition to the operation of the maximum normal pool level of such reservoir in excess of 1,830 feet above sea level; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be mailed to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of North Dakota and to the district office of the Corps of Engineers.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2760. A bill for the relief of Tokuko Kobayashi and her minor son; and

S. 2761. A bill for the relief of Norma J. Roberts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2762. A bill for the relief of Pedro Giocoechea Bengoechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2763. A bill for the relief of Harry Ray Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2764. A bill for the relief of Ellenor Carola Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COMPENSATION FOR OVERTIME AND HOLIDAY EMPLOYMENT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 354) to amend Public Law 106, Seventy-ninth Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime and holiday employment; which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 382) to provide for setting aside an appropriate day as a National Day of Prayer, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

Address delivered by him before the Industrial Conference Board, Tacoma, Wash., on February 25, 1952.

By Mr. THYE:

Letter addressed to him by the general manager of the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association with respect to the importation of certain agricultural commodities.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Copy of letter written by Harold F. Hohly, rector of Christ Church, Bronx, N. Y., to Daniel E. Woodhull, Jr., on the subject of Americanism.

By Mr. WILEY:

Resolution of the Association of Wisconsin County Highway Commissioners relating to the use of structural steel in highway construction.

Booklet by E. J. Reid entitled "Why We Should Vote in All Elections."

PREVENTION OF ILLEGAL ENTRANCE OF ALIENS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, which were, on page 3, lines 8 and 9, strike out "of the United States", and on page 3, line 15, strike out "issue his warrant" and insert "obtain a warrant under oath from any court of competent jurisdiction."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate later today.

Subsequently, the President pro tempore appointed Mr. KILGORE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRICES OF EGGS AND FEED

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for some time I have been reading letters into the RECORD showing that the farmers in the Northwest are not getting adequate prices for their eggs. I took the matter up with the Department of Agriculture to find out why the farmers were not getting at least parity for their eggs. I have received the following letter, under date of February 19:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, February 19, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reference to a letter from Mr. Edward Matzke, Marion, N. Dak., which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7. Mr. Matzke writes of low farm prices for eggs and high prices for feed.

During January prices of eggs in all parts of the country averaged 81 percent of parity which is about the same percentage of parity that existed in January 1951. In February or March farm prices generally reach their low point of the year. It is hoped that some improvement in farm prices will soon take place as the demand for eggs for storage purposes, in shell and frozen form, and for hatching purposes increases.

The low egg prices now being received are of particular concern to poultrymen because of the relatively high level of feed prices. It is unlikely that the price of feed will decline in the near future, perhaps not until after the harvest of 1952, and then only if the harvest is a plentiful one.

We are making a day-to-day study of trends in egg and feed prices. As yet, however, no decision has been made with respect to the removal of surplus eggs in 1952.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the distinguished Assistant Secretary is mistaken as to the price of eggs being low at this time of year. As a matter of fact, all over the Northwest farmers get more for their eggs in the winter time than they do in the summer. I wish particularly to call this letter to the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who stated the other day that he thought egg prices were about right.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. MCFARLAND that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 2 minutes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I understood that I was to have the floor today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. The Senator from Missouri will be recognized when the transaction of routine business has been concluded. Does the Senator from Missouri object to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. KEM. Other Senators have made similar requests. I cannot accede to the request of my friend, the Senator from Nebraska, unless I similarly agree to yield to my friend, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. I would prefer to proceed, and ask that the distinguished Senator from Nebraska follow me with his remarks.

PEACE OR MORE WAR

1. THE TYRANNY OF A MAJORITY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, Mr. Truman, on June 27, 1950, announced that he had ordered American forces into war in Korea. He had the power to do so, but he did not have the right.

Yesterday, February 27, 1952, 1 year and 8 months to the day after Mr. Truman's action, the majority leadership had the power to impose gag rule in the Senate Chamber, but it did not have the right.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] had made certain sarcastic observations pertaining to me. Fair play demanded that I be given an opportunity to answer. Yet immediately after the Senator from Connecticut had concluded, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] proceeded to choke off further debate. He had the power to do so, but not the right. Right and truth are greater than power. All power is limited by right.

Government by a chosen few—a palace guard from the ranks of the Senate—is an oligarchy. It is not a republic.

The beautiful monument to Thomas Jefferson on the shore of the Tidal Basin here in Washington is visited each year by thousands of our people. Engraved there in unperishable marble are the words:

> I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man.

These words were spoken by Mr. Jefferson early in his career. How steadfastly he adhered to this concept is known by all who are interested in our history and our institutions.

It is of no importance that yesterday in the Senate I felt the whiplash of the tyranny of a majority. It is of great importance for the American people to know to what extent what was formerly the party of Mr. Jefferson has departed from his teachings, and the consideration for the rights of others, that so long characterized its leadership.

One hears that the shrine of the Democrat Party has recently been moved from Monticello to the Hermitage. If this is true, as an American I deeply regret it. I was taught in my youth to believe that Mr. Jefferson was one of the greatest men to be born on this continent. I still believe so, I still revere his teachings.

"Liberty is the only thing you cannot have," said William Allen White, "unless you are willing to give it to others."

The action of the astute majority leader in calling for a recess before I had an opportunity to reply to the sarcastic remarks of the Senator from Connecticut, calls to mind the story of the justice of the peace who adjourned court after hearing the plaintiff's case because, as he said, if he heard both sides he might be confused. The confusion which seems to characterize the present majority leadership in the Senate has often been remarked on. I shall be happy if what may be considered a discourtesy to me will contribute in any small measure to relieving the unfortunate confusion that may in the end work havoc to our beloved Nation.

2. CONSENT BY CERTAIN SENATORS IS NOT CONSENT BY THE SENATE

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut would make much of the fact that certain Members of the Senate and House—and only certain Members—attended a conference at the White House shortly before the President made known his views to the full Senate through the issuance of a press release.

Actually the President called this conference, not so much to consult but to inform. The decision to intervene with air and sea forces in Korea seems to have been made at the White House on Monday evening, July 26, 1950.

In testimony before the combined Senate Committee on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, former Secretary of Defense, Louis A. Johnson, testified in part as follows—on June 14, 1951:

> Many of us met the President at the airport on Sunday evening when he came in. Secretary Acheson and myself rode to the Blair House with the President. There was a period of time before dinner at 7:45, to which dinner there had been invited all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Chairman thereof, and the Secretaries of Army, Navy, and Air Force, and myself, Secretary Acheson and several others of the State Department.
>
> * * * * *
>
> When we adjourned, the impression was that we would get together the next day, and there were conferences the next day, but that whole group, less a few but not less any of the military men I named, met again on Monday evening, and at that time the decision on motion of Secretary Acheson was made to send the Navy and the Air Force into the situation, the United Nations having met at 3:00 o'clock on the previous Sunday afternoon and declared North Korea an aggressor.

Members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as is well known, are selected on the basis of seniority. The State of Missouri has had no representative on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for several years. The present Senators belong to the "Class of 1946" and the "Class of 1950" respectively. I am not persuaded that for this reason a Missouri Senator should not address himself to the grave questions of foreign policy, about which the people of our State are so deeply concerned.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution makes it mandatory for every Senator—not merely those on the Foreign Relations Committee—to take an interest in matters of foreign policy. Presidential ratification of treaties requires the "advice and consent of the Senate" and the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senators present. Under his constitutional duty in the field of international contractual obligations, every Senator is not merely entitled but is expected to possess "full and complete" information on these matters.

The Constitution further gives Congress the power to "declare war." It does not provide that a committee picked from the membership of the Senate or the House or both may speak for the entire Senate on such a question of awful moment. That is the duty and the responsibility of the full membership of both the Senate and the House.

Mr. President, the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will readily agree that the primary purpose of our committees is to expedite the Senate's business. Their existence in no way lessens the solemn responsibility of every Member of the Senate in matters pertaining to our foreign policy.

As I have said before, I have great respect for the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. They have rendered valiant service to their country. I am confident they will continue to do so.

The Constitution makes no provision for congressional committees. In fact, the Congress managed to get along without them for a number of years after the Constitution went into effect. It was not until 1816 that a Senate Committee on Foreign Relations was established. Previous to that time questions relating to foreign affairs either were dealt with directly on the floor of the Senate or were referred to a select temporary committee appointed to consider a particular subject.

Senators from 12 States presently comprise the membership of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The people of 36, or three-fourths of the States, have no representative on that committee. The people of the 12 States represented on the committee make up 24 percent of the population of the United States. More than 75 percent of the American people are without representation on the committee.

Mr. President, I submit that the representatives in the Senate of the 75 percent of the American people who have no representation on the committee are entitled to be heard on the question of whether or not the sons of the fathers and mothers in the respective States are to be called on to fight and die 7,000 miles from home.

3. THE SENATE IS NOT BOUND BY THE VIEWS EXPRESSED BY SOME OF ITS MEMBERS, NO MATTER HOW DISTINGUISHED

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] made reference to statements by certain members of the minority, including the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] at the time when the President ordered American forces into war in Korea. I think the statement of the Senator from California was made on the same day the announcement was made, namely, June 27, 1950, and the statement of the Senator from Ohio was made on the following day.

Mr. President, my duty here is to represent the people of Missouri. I do not consider myself bound by the views expressed by Senators from other States—Senators of either the majority or minority party.

I have always had, and still have, great respect for the thinking of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from California. On many issues I have found myself in agreement with them. Occasionally, we have disagreed.

But my first obligation is to the people of Missouri.

It cannot be said that any one of the Senators referred to by the Senator from Connecticut, has been chosen by a process of representative government to make decisions for the people of Missouri on such an important question as that of war or peace.

I was convinced on June 27, 1950, as I am now, that the people of Missouri firmly believe and desire that before American boys are sent to die in distant foreign lands, the elected Representatives of the people in Congress shall by majority action approve an act of war. I was convinced then, as I am now, that the people of Missouri are fed up with government by haphazard guess and fickle intuition.

4. WHY WAS THE SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT CHOSEN TO ANSWER?

Mr. President, it is interesting to note that there arose to answer my observations, not the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], but, instead, a relatively new member of the committee, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], who, incidentally, does not have to answer to the people of his State for some time to come.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. Of course, the Senator from Missouri is aware of the fact that I answered to the people of my State in 1950, and the Senator is also aware of the fact that he will answer to his people this year.

Mr. KEM. Yes, I am prepared to do that.

Mr. McMAHON. When the Senator from Missouri returns here again, after that, I will be more willing to listen to him.

Mr. KEM. I recall that the Senator from Connecticut recently entered the State of Illinois, which adjoins my State, as a candidate in the presidential primary. I think perhaps that was the shortest presidential campaign on record; he got in and got out quicker than any other presidential candidate in history. The State of Missouri has no presidential primary. However, if the Senator from Connecticut would like to know what the people of the Midwest think of his ideas, I suggest that he reenter the presidential primary in Illinois, and he will learn quickly and completely.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield again to me?

Mr. KEM. I yield for a question.

Mr. McMAHON. I think the Senator from Missouri will find out in Missouri this year, when he consults the people of Missouri. I imagine that the candidate against the Senator from Missouri may in good part hold some of the views which I hold, and that may furnish a good test in the Senator's State of Missouri as to the differing viewpoints as between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. KEM. Perhaps the Senator from Connecticut would take time off during the campaign to come into Missouri and instruct the people of Missouri as to what they should do. Our people are hospitable, and he will be given an attentive hearing.

Mr. President, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is sometimes eloquent. He is always articulate. On June 27, 1950, the Senator from Texas was an ardent defender of the Truman-Acheson foreign policy in the Far East. He advised against any criticism of the policies being followed by Mr. Truman and Mr. Acheson.

What now accounts for the eloquent silence of the Senator from Texas?

5. SHOULD A RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL HAVE BEEN INTRODUCED?

Yesterday the Senator from Connecticut repeatedly referred to the fact that at the time when Mr. Truman plunged the Nation into war in Korea, I did not offer a resolution which would have repudiated the President's stand on that occasion.

Mr. President, I have learned the hard way, from long bitter experience, how idle it is to offer a resolution which is referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Time and again, I and other Senators have submitted resolutions pertaining to matters of grave import to the Nation, only to see them bottled up, pigeonholed, by the majority members of that Committee.

On December 6, 1950, at the time Prime Minister Attlee held his secret conference with Mr. Truman, I submitted on behalf of myself and 23 other Senators, a resolution to obtain a full report from the President on the results of the conference and to prevent the President from making agreements with Mr. Attlee affecting in any important way the course of action of this country, except by treaty entered into with the advice and consent of the Senate, as provided by the constitution.

That resolution was pigeonholed in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

On January 14, 1952, I joined the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and a number of other Senators in sponsoring a resolution calling for full publicity on the hush-hush Truman-Churchill conferences. That resolution is now gathering dust in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. No action has been scheduled on it.

On January 16, 1952, I submitted in the Senate a resolution calling for a sweeping investigation of the State Department. Among other matters, my resolution called for a probe of the extent to which our allies are diverting critical materials to the enemy. That resolution is resting quietly in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Last week, the House voted 189 to 143 to demand from Acheson all data on troop commitments. Did the House vote, in effect, say to the Senate, "This was your baby but you abandoned it?" Does this mean that the constitutional functions of the Senate in connection with foreign affairs are being lost through disuse?

It is too much to hope that the Administration leadership of that committee will retrieve these resolutions from their dusty receptacles in the cemetery section of the committee's files. The distinguished chairman of that committee seems quite content to let them rest in peace. I am sure that his fellow Democrats on that committee who acted as pallbearers feel likewise.

A Kem resolution repudiating the one-man war making in Korea would have shared a similar fate. There is no disposition on the part of the President or his congressional Democrats to assume responsibility for their tragic blunders in the Far East.

Mr. President, let the Senate have an opportunity to repudiate the President's unconstitutional war making in Korea. I challenge the Senate leadership to permit such a resolution to reach the Senate floor. We shall then see who is for peace and who is for war.

I will submit such a resolution immediately, if the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] will give assurance that they will give it prompt clearance, so that the Senate may go on record for or against this misadventure in Korea.

But does the senior Senator from Texas take the position that it is right for President Truman and Secretary Acheson to send American troops into battle, to bleed the taxpayers without mercy, to make world-wide commitments to Mr. Churchill, but that this all will be kept secret, and that he, the senior Senator from Texas, will eagerly collaborate with the Executive in this conspiracy of suppression?

The Senator from Connecticut yesterday assured the Senate that—

> If a vote had been taken on a resolution supporting the stand that was taken in Korea, there would not have been 15 votes cast in opposition.

And yet, a few minutes later, we find the Senator from Connecticut chiding me for not offering such a resolution, and saying, referring to the senior Senator from Missouri:

> I cannot judge his motives. It is unfortunate that he did not take that course of action.

I am sure that the Senator from Connecticut has not been so long away from the practice in the courts of justice that he has forgotten the maxim, "Equity does not require one to do an idle and futile thing." If the Senator was so sure of the action which would be taken on such a resolution, why does he think it unfortunate that I did not offer it? It would undoubtedly have reached a convenient pigeonhole in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The trouble with the argument of the Senator from Connecticut is that it proves too much. He says that a resolution repudiating the President's action in sending our troops into Korea without the consent of Congress would not have gotten anywhere. At the same time, he solemnly assures the Senate it is unfortunate that I did not offer it.

During the congressional debate on Senate Resolution 8, relative to the implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty, an amazing document appeared on the desks of the Members in this Chamber. It was entitled "Powers of the President To Send the Armed Forces Outside the United States." It was introduced by a foreword signed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, who presented the document as a careful review and analysis of the President's power from the executive point of view.

This document, after conceding that the powers of Congress which have a bearing on this subject are the power to declare war—Constitution, article I, section 8, clause 11; the power to raise and support armies—clause 12; the power to provide and maintain a navy—clause 13; and the power to make rules for the government and regulation of land and naval forces—clause 14; finally, on the last page, reaches the amazing conclusion that the use of the congressional power to declare war has fallen into abeyance because wars are no longer declared in advance.

Since when has this power of Congress been in abeyance? And how long will the period of abeyance continue? How long, Mr. President, will the foundations of our constitutional liberty be subjected to mining and sapping by such theories and such theorists?

> The greatest dangers to liberty—
>
> Said Mr. Justice Brandeis—
>
> lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning, but without understanding.

Mr. President, yesterday, during a colloquy with the Senator from Connecticut, I read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I had made on June 27, 1950, immediately preceding the reading in the Senate of the statement of the President that he had ordered our Armed Forces into Korea. At

that time, the Senator from Connecticut objected to my introducing any further portions of the RECORD, suggesting that I might do so in my own time. At the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Connecticut, the Senate was precipitately recessed on a motion by the Senator from Arizona, the majority leader. I should now like to read into the RECORD the colloquy between the then majority leader, former Senator Lucas, of Illinois, and myself, which immediately followed the reading of the statement of the President in the Senate, as shown by the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 7, at page 9228, as follows:

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I notice that in the President's statement he says, "I have ordered the fleet to prevent any attack on Formosa." Does that mean that he has arrogated to himself the authority of declaring war?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri will have to place his own interpretation upon the President's statement.

Mr. KEM. Can the Senator from Illinois, as leader of the President's party on the floor of the Senate, elucidate that statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care to debate that question with the Senator from Missouri. I do not believe that it means war, but the Senator can place his own interpretation on it.

Mr. KEM. I am not asking the Senator to debate it; I am asking for information.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not debate it with the Senator. I repeat he can place his own interpretation upon it. Obviously, it is a very firm commitment in respect to Formosa. It is in line with suggestions made a number of times in the past by Senators on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Of course, it is true that the Constitution places in the Congress the authority to declare war; is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEM. Can the Senator tell me under what authority of the Constitution the President of the United States has authorized the fleet to make an armed attack?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not agree with the Senator that the President has authorized the fleet to make an attack, but I can assure him that history will show that on more than 100 occasions in the life of this Republic the President, as Commander in Chief, has ordered the fleet or the troops to do certain things which involved the risk of war. I shall not be drawn into a long debate on the point. A little later the Senator can exercise his own right on the floor of the Senate and debate it as long as he desires.

So, Mr. President, the record is clear:

First, the President ordered the Armed Forces of the United States into Korea to take part in hostilities between the forces of North Korea and South Korea.

Second, the President did not ask or obtain the authority of the Congress of the United States to do so.

Third, the Constitution gives to the Congress the power to declare war.

So, Mr. President, I shall continue to object to the action taken by the President of the United States, as a result of which the Armed Forces of the United States are today engaged in an unconstitutional, undeclared war in Korea. This war has become one of the bitterest, bloodiest wars in history.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, last night, at the time of taking the vote on the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate stand in recess until today, I was present in my office, but was not in the Senate Chamber itself, and did not reach the Chamber in time to vote on that question.

I simply wish to let the Senate know that I was in my office, but did not vote for the reason that I did not reach the Chamber in time to participate in the vote.

TAX CASE OF JACOB (JACK) UDELL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, today I shall discuss another tax case which was handled by the law firm of Joseph D. Nunan and John P. Wenchel; namely, the case of Jacob (Jack) Udell—address: New York City; Frankford, Del.; and Miami Beach, Fla.

This is another case which had been pending in the Treasury Department during the employment of Mr. Nunan and Mr. Wenchel.

The proposed deficiencies including penalties against Jacob Udell for the years 1942 to 1945, inclusive, were $792,094.

During the years involved Mr. Udell, who formerly resided in New York City, was operating a poultry processing plant at Frankford, Del. His residence is now Miami Beach, Fla.

On July 23, 1948, about 1 year after his retirement, John P. Wenchel, former Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, applied for a waiver to represent this taxpayer. On August 8, 1948, the waiver was approved.

On November 17, 1948, powers of attorney were filed by Warren Canaday and Joseph D. Nunan, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

I can find no record of Mr. Nunan's having been granted a waiver to represent this taxpayer whose case had been pending during his term of office. The waiver is in the name of John P. Wenchel while Mr. Nunan filed the power of attorney in his name.

I might add that in a discussion this morning I was given to understand that when a waiver is extended to one member of a firm, it covers the entire membership of the firm.

On December 31, 1948, this case was sent to the Tax Division of the Department of Justice with recommendations for criminal prosecution. At that time the Chief of the Tax Division was Lamar Caudle.

On January 7, 1949, 6 weeks after Mr. Nunan filed his power of attorney, Charles Oliphant, who succeeded Mr. Wenchel as Chief Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, telephoned the Justice Department and requested the return of the case to his office.

On March 22, 1949, upon the request of the Treasury Department, Jacob Udell was given a medical examination by Dr. W. L. Pierce of the United States Public Health Service, Miami, Fla.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a copy of the medical report dated March 23, 1949, signed by Dr. W. L. Pierce. In this medical report Dr. Pierce points out that the outstanding feature of Mr. Udell's illness is his anxiety.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
OUTPATIENT CLINIC,
Miami, Fla., March 23, 1949.

In re Jacob Udell.
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Internal Revenue Service,
Miami, Fla.
(Attention Mr. George H. Smith, special agent.)

DEAR SIR: This patient was examined in our office March 22, 1949. He gives a history of stomach trouble for 8 years characterized by epigastric and lower chest pain before meals. These pains are squeezing in character. About 5 or 6 years ago he began having substernal chest pain, aching in character, radiating to the left shoulder and arm. These attacks are of short duration and are aggravated by walking and excitement. He also states that the pains in his stomach are aggravated by excitement.

When asked about his occupation he says he goes to his office but does no work. He states further that his son takes care of the business for him.

He brings with him copies of letters from Leonard H. Jacobson, M. D., Miami Beach, Fla., who saw him on March 21, 1949, and Julius R. Pearson, M. D., Miami Beach, Fla., who saw him on January 7, 1949. According to the laboratory work done in their offices he has an anomaly of the stomach and deformity of the duodenal bulb indicating an ulcer.

Electrocardiograms done in Dr. Jacobson's office revealed nonspecific changes but his impression was that the patient was suffering from marked coronary artery disease. Both of these physicians are of the opinion that any severe excitement, sustained emotional or physical activity could easily lead to a coronary occlusion or perforation of the ulcer.

Physical examination in this office revealed: Blood pressure 140/96; the heart sounds were normal and the chest was clear. There is acute tenderness in the epigastrium. No other abnormalities were noted.

Diagnoses: (1) Duodenal ulcer, (2) spastic gastrointestinal tract, (3) anginal syndrome, (4) anxiety state.

Discussion: The most outstanding feature of this man's illness is his anxiety. According to his history he has a severe type of coronary artery disease. The symptoms are typical. It is not necessary in every case of this type for the electrocardiographic tracings to be markedly abnormal. Also most of his symptoms are probably due to his anxiety. The important thing is that he has typical symptoms of heart disease, therefore it is my opinion that criminal prosecution in court would endanger this man's life.

Very truly yours,

W. L. PIERCE
(For the medical officer in charge).

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on May 26, 1949, about 10 months after Mr. Wenchel and Mr. Nunan had entered the picture, the Udell case, accompanied by the medical report, was resubmitted to the Department of Justice by Charles Oliphant, chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

This time, however, Mr. Oliphant, speaking for the Treasury Department, suggested to Mr. Caudle that their previous recommendations for criminal prosecution against Mr. Udell be dropped.

Thus we find that less than 1 year after Mr. Nunan and Mr. Wenchel entered this case the Treasury Department had recalled the tax case from the Department of Justice, a doctor's certificate had been obtained, and then the case was resubmitted minus the recommendations for criminal prosecution.

It is my understanding that the customary procedure is that after a case has been submitted to the Department of Justice with recommendations for criminal prosecution, the Department of Justice—not the Treasury Department—explores any question of health.

On December 14, 1949, the Department of Justice confirmed to the Treasury Department their concurrence in the decision that prosecution of Jacob Udell could not in good conscience be undertaken because of the report of the precarious condition of his health, and accordingly, the case was returned to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, where for the past 3 years it has been allowed to gather dust. Criminal prosecution for Mr. Udell's evasion of taxes has been barred by the statute of limitations.

The $782,094 proposed tax deficiency still remains unpaid, and chances of its collection at this late date are rather slim.

As in previous cases I am not passing on the merits or demerits of the tax claims by the Government. But if, since their assessments, the Treasury Department has decided that in this or in any of the other cases they were in error, then they should amend or withdraw their claim.

On the other hand we must never overlook the fact that the taxpayer always has the right under the law to contest any proposed assessment. The mere recommendation of criminal prosecution or the recommendation of assessment of proposed deficiencies does not mean that the Government's claim is infallible.

Ours is a Government of laws and not of men, and while we may criticize the manner in which certain tax cases are handled, we must be careful that we do not jeopardize the right of the American taxpayer, who feels that the assessment is in error, to protest the Government's claim through the normal channels of law.

But while we are safeguarding those rights, at the same time we have a responsibility to see that our tax laws are enforced impartially.

Whenever any taxpayer carries his case to conference or to courts, that case must be considered on its merits and not on the basis of whom the taxpayer knows or who he employs as his attorney.

This is the sixth case handled by Mr. Nunan and his associates to which attention has been called, and in each instance recommendations for criminal prosecution have been ignored, and proposed taxes totaling over $3,500,000 remain uncollected.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a letter to the editor as appearing in yesterday's St. Louis Post-Dispatch, entitled "Two Sides of the Story."

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO SIDES OF THE STORY

To the EDITOR OF THE POST-DISPATCH:

Internal Revenue Commissioner John Dunlap claims the Government has not lost a cent of tax money in spite of the scandals uncovered in the tax bureau.

How dumb does the man think we are? Senator WILLIAMS has reported that an Indianapolis brewery was permitted to settle a $636,000 tax claim for a measly $4,500 after a former tax official was given special permission to represent the company.

V. ROGAN.

RECESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I promised the distinguished minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES] that there would not be any votes taken in the Senate until after 2:15 p. m. I feel obligated to carry out that promise. For that reason, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was desirous of obtaining the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. He is not now in the Chamber. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 2:30 this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 2:30 p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The recess having expired, the Senate is now in session, and will come to order.

Let the Chair state the pending question: The pending question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, the so-called submerged lands measure, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

HOW TO KEEP OUR LIBERTY—BOOK BY RAYMOND MOLEY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I do not wish to seem to attempt to develop in this body too literary an atmosphere. However, since it is incumbent upon us, as part of our function, to serve in some measure to educate the American people in regard to the issues, it has also seemed to me to be necessary to recognize the various organs of opinion which are moving in that direction.

Some time ago I took occasion to point out what seemed to me the impact upon public opinion of so great a journal of opinion as the New York Times in its book reviews. I went into a rather detailed discussion of the book reviews in the magazine section of the New York Times over a considerable period of years, which, it seemed to me, had not been entirely calculated correctly to inform the people or to give them an accurate picture of the contents of the books discussed in those reviews. That involved me in considerable controversy with the editor of the book-review section of the New York Times, but I felt that in the long run it served a useful purpose.

Since that time I have indulged in one other venture of this character, namely, that in connection with a book by Miss Freda Utley on the China question. At that time I pointed out how her book seemed calculated to correct many misapprehensions about the China problem and to give what seemed to me, at least, to be a somewhat more accurate account of how all our tragic situation in the Orient came to pass.

This afternoon I wish to discuss for a few minutes a somewhat related problem which is concerned with the general problem. I wish to speak for a few minutes in regard to a new book, just issued, which it seems to me may well invite the attention of all thoughtful students of the American republican form of government which is guaranteed under our Constitution, and to which I wish to address myself, contrary to the attempts to persuade our people that this is a democracy.

This book is by a very distinguished citizen. In recent days we have had a good many reformed Communists educate us. Now I have a reformed New Dealer, Mr. Raymond Moley, who was one of the early architects of the policies of the New Deal, and for some 6 years was very intimately associated with all its activities as that vast experiment unfolded before our eyes.

About 1936, at which time Maine and Vermont stood all alone in the country in opposition to the New Deal, Mr. Moley had a change of heart. I like to think that perhaps the example of Maine had an impact upon him; and he became converted to what, of course, seems to us in Maine a somewhat better way of life.

Mr. Moley has been inveighing against the errors of the New Deal, for some of which I think he must confess he was responsible, ever since that time, as editor or associate editor of the Newsweek magazine, with which I do not always agree.

Now Mr. Moley has finally compressed his philosophy out of his experiences of the past 20 years into a book entitled "How To Keep Our Liberty." I think the subject is one which will invite very general attention. While we sometimes are told that our liberty is not being restricted, yet I think that when the Government takes between 35 and 40 percent of all the earnings of everyone in the country, almost without exception, it must be considered that our liberty is restricted at least to that degree.

In his book Mr. Moley presents a program for political action, and I find myself rather heartily in accord with his conclusions in that regard.

I believe that the early part of his book may also stimulate interest; and certainly it is time that we stimulated some interest, because in 1948 there were 45,000,000 Americans who were not sufficiently interested in the New Deal or the Fair Deal or the Dewey Deal to turn out and vote. That was 49 percent of the eligible electorate—the largest percentage of the potential voters, I think, to fail to vote in the entire history of our country; only 51 percent of the eligible voters participated in that election.

I see in the Chamber at this time my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who I believe was a student of Mr. Raymond Moley; and I assume that accounts for some of the brilliance which our distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon frequently exhibits in debate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. If I have ever made a constructive contribution in the Senate, I am perfectly willing to give credit for it to Mr. Raymond Moley. However, I do not want to have him charged with what some persons might consider to be my mistakes.

I have not read the book which the distinguished former Columbia University professor has written. However, if the Senator from Maine will permit me to do so, I should like to suggest a modification of a statement he made when he said that Raymond Moley wrote for the New Deal. I think I correctly understood the Senator from Maine when he placed on Dr. Moley's shoulders certain responsibilities for some of the early proposals of the New Deal. In fairness to Dr. Moley, I think it should be said that in the early stages of the New Deal he was primarily concerned with foreign-policy matters, particularly in the field of relationship between economic problems at home and better economic conditions abroad.

However, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator further, except to say that I always found Dr. Moley to be a very keen student of the Constitution; and I shall be very surprised if in his book there is not found a strong defense of what I have been pleased to call, on so many occasions, sound constitutional liberalism.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think the Senator's analysis is prophetic; the Senator from Oregon has made it even before he has read the book.

Let me quote one sentence from the book which warrants the statement the Senator from Oregon has made in regard to Mr. Moley's early attitudes. On page 79 of his book, under the title "The Perversion of the New Deal," Mr. Moley says:

> The early New Deal measures, with the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority plan—

This is Mr. Moley's own statement—

> were fairly mild reforms. They came from many sources.

Mr. Moley develops that point somewhat further, in referring to the various measures relative to farm and industrial activity. Then he goes on to say that—

> After 2 or 3 years some of these measures were extended, not to say perverted, by Roosevelt into a trend that is the source for much of our present danger. * * * The relief program and the carrying on of public works on a modest scale were perverted into a great spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect Government agency.

In other words, Mr. Moley conceives that it gradually evolved into the Frankenstein which he fears now may spell our doom.

However, I was addressing myself to the fact that in the 1948 election, 45,000,000 Americans, constituting 49 percent of the eligible electorate, did not vote. I cannot conceive that any thoughtful student of government on either side of this aisle or in this country does not realize that if that trend continues—namely, the decline of popular participation in elections—we shall rapidly approach the day which now has dawned in Russia, where some 3,000,000 Communists are dominating not only 175,000,000 people in Russia but also some 700,000,000 people elsewhere in the world.

That is the road toward which we started.

It is interesting to note that in Italy, when an important election was held 2 or 3 years ago, with communism from across the Adriatic, breathing down the necks of the Italians, with 89 percent of the potential vote being cast—an unprecedented turn-out—the Italians repelled communism. That was the significant effect and conclusion.

It is intimated that if we got more voters out, they would not vote so satisfactorily from our standpoint. Well, if we are Americans, we are prepared to take the judgment of the majority of our people. But we have at present an administration in power with scarcely 25 percent of the potential vote, which is nothing for us on this side of the aisle to be proud of, because we had only 23 percent; so we did not do our job any better than our friends on the other side of the aisle did theirs. That is why I feel that Mr. Moley has done a very great work, perhaps the greatest piece of work to date, in analyzing the cause of the decline in political interest and the measures by which we may hope to see public and popular interest revivified.

I am going to ask that certain passages from the book shall be incorporated in connection with my remarks. I shall read only brief excerpts from them, if I may have the unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the passages from the book How To Keep Our Liberty by Raymond Moley, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAYMOND MOLEY

Roosevelt sent for Moley on January 1932, as he seemed to think that he would be useful.

"I believed that Roosevelt would be elected President in 1932. I had no political ambitions. But I did want to see and know intimately what went on at the heart of politics, which had been the absorbing interest in my life. It had dictated my choice of courses in the small college from which I graduated. The next year, 1907, it led me to take on a successful campaign for village clerk in my Ohio town. It moved me to the inevitable study of law, under difficulties at night in Cleveland; to the decision to study and teach politics, after a 2-year siege of tuberculosis in New Mexico had blasted my law studies, to a brief return to the field of local politics as mayor of an Ohio town when I was able to complete my return to the East; to graduate studies in politics at Columbia; to a teaching job on the Mark Hanna foundation in Western Reserve University; to the directorship of Americanization activities under Governor Cox during the war; to a return to New York and Columbia; up to 10 years of intensive professional investigation of the seamy sides of criminal law administration in Ohio, Missouri, New York, and numerous other places; to the writing of three books and many articles on the relationships of politics and criminal justice."

Moley was the founder of the brain trust, the brains behind the head, Roosevelt, directing him in all of his policies.

Moley broke with Roosevelt after the London Conference at which time he was the Assistant Secretary of State. He foresaw that the new deal was becoming perverted and wanted no part of the beast which was slowly being hatched.

Moley also fought and opposed the trend set up by Roosevelt and his partners. He wrote against their methods and tried to warn the American people in his articles in Newsweek magazine, of which he is a contributing editor.

"I had rendered service to the chief in office between March 1932 and September 1933, but I assumed the field of professional journalism in September 1933, and believed in the essential virtue of independence" (p. 343, After Seven Years).

Words from Roosevelt's acceptance speech of 1936 "economic royalists, new dynasties, thirsting for power, economic tyranny, the resolute enemy within our gates, the Revolution, the Minute Men, et cetera." All these things at which he was crying out against were being solidly established by his own planning and economic royalists were making a great headway in the Government. (Senator's words.)

EXCERPTS FROM HOW TO KEEP OUR LIBERTY

(By Raymond Moley)

THE PERVERSION OF THE NEW DEAL (P. 79)

The early New Deal measures, with the exception of the Tennessee Valley Authority plan, were fairly mild reforms. They came from many sources.

In general the early or, as I would designate it, the first New Deal was merely an extension of the 1912 Progressive Party platform. It seemed in 1932 that we had merely picked up the trail abandoned two decades before. The famous National Recovery Act was an adaptation of the Progressive idea of a cooperative effort of competitors in an industry for wholesome common purposes under the mediating but not the controlling influ-

ence of the government. The farm program was created by organized farm movements in the Middle West. The idea of regulating the issue and exchange of securities for the protection of investors was taken from the "blue sky" laws of several States and from century-old British legislation. The Tennessee Valley plan, the socialistic potentialities of which were not widely realized at the time, came largely from the public-ownership ideas of Senator George Norris. The fiscal policies of Franklin D. Roosevelt were largely hit-or-miss improvisations mixed with plenty of the old inflationary ideas of Bryan and others. Social security plans later were derived from those of some of the States and Britain.

After 2 or 3 years some of these measures were extended, not to say perverted, by Roosevelt into a trend that is the source for much of our present danger. After the NRA, there was enacted the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which threw the power of government on the side of labor in industrial disputes and authorized government intervention in organizing labor. The relief program and the carrying on of public works on a modest scale were perverted into a great spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect government agency. The farm program, which Roosevelt originally said would not be a burden on the Treasury, developed into an immense structure of subsidies, supports, and guaranties. The TVA excited the imagination of the planners and led to the present effort to create such authorities on a Nation-wide scale. And the acceptance of deficits, first regarded as a necessary evil, finally, under the influence of the new economics, was regarded as an unmitigated good. Meanwhile, bureaucracy and Federal power grew apace at the expense of the taxpayers and the States.

AMONG THE BUREAUCRATS (P. 81)

In the early days of the New Deal, I was in a position to see clearly and in detail the great migration of those who came to Washington seeking, and for the most part finding, Government employment. The accession of Roosevelt was regarded by them as a political, almost a social revolution. As in all such upheavals, thousands were inspired to participate, either in response to a wholly idealistic impulse to help, or as a means of slaking a thirst for adventure, or for the more prosaic purpose of getting gainful employment after years of more or less impoverished dedication to opposition to things as they were.

These people were a variegated lot. Nonconformity is infinitely diversified. There might be some uniformity in a belief that the country is sick, but prognosis and treatment in politics depend upon personal predilection and character. It is unnecessary to suggest the kinds of remedies and nostrums that were advocated. The point is that nearly everybody who applied for employment sooner or later found it. There was little sifting or investigation, far too little adaptation of the employee to the job. Those who made the selections, even some Cabinet members, were themselves new to public service. Allegiance to the policies and personality of the President was a test. But this was a poor test, because the Roosevelt policies were themselves an amalgam of many philosophies.

One test was fairly well observed, and the President himself regarded it as important. People were not to be put in charge of matters in which they had lived their lives and acquired their habits of thought and action. Thus, it was believed, private interests would be kept from places of privilege and power. One Cabinet member, in seeking to fill a responsible place in his department, told me that he wanted only college professors, for only in them could he find "intellectual honesty." Skills were at a discount. Ideological sympathy was at a premium.

To anyone of even mildly conservative instincts, it was deeply disturbing to witness at first hand the activities of some of these innovators. The possession of power spurred them to new schemes for Government action. An abundance of leisure, permitted by the lax discipline of bureaucracy, offered them time for the exercise of fervent imagination.

It was no secret that a great number of these reformers were admirers of the "great Soviet experiment." And some, we now know, were secret agents of communism.

In my opinion there is a greater danger in collectivists than in the betrayal of our secrets to foreign powers. The danger lies in what can be done to a nation by public officials who do not believe in a free economy. In Roosevelt's day there were many people working for the Government who regarded his reforms as a mere prelude to revolution. "He is only a Kerensky," they were in the habit of saying.

THE CAPTURE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY (P. 86)

There is little likeness between the Democratic Party of 1932 and the Democratic Party of 1951. The personnel of its leadership and the nature of its policies have undergone a profound change.

When Roosevelt was nominated, the party stood for a series of traditional principles—the constitutional rights and powers of the States, economical government, reduction of the bureaucracy, and justice in industrial relations. It has gradually been transformed into a Federalist party, a collaborator with labor unions, with an unprecedented bureaucracy, an unbalanced budget as a first principle, and a welfare state as an objective.

An intense struggle within the party has accompanied this change. In the early Roosevelt years the more conservative northern leaders broke away from the party leadership. Southern conservatives remained nominally Democratic, but carried on their dissent in Congress.

The change in policy and strategy by Roosevelt and others was calculated. Labor-union leaders, particularly those of the new CIO, abandoned the traditional detachment of the Gompers era and moved bag and baggage into the party. A whole battalion of socialistic planners moved into positions of political power in the Government. City machines and bosses, little concerned with principle and aware of the vast patronage involved in the Government's new policies, learned the jargon of the welfare state and went along. Persistent preference in appointments by Roosevelt raised the more radical partisans to high places.

The most vivid demonstration of the power of the statists was in the Democratic convention of 1948, when over the opposition of traditional Democrats and despite the plans of the nominal leaders of that convention a resolution on civil rights was jammed through.

The party that began with Jeffersonian distrust of government has became a powerful instrument of statism through Federal power.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN (P. 65)

It is one of the great ironies of American history that at the very outset of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal the phrase "Forgotten Man" became a major slogan and rallying cry. It so happened that I provided him with the phrase and wove it into an early precampaign speech. I took it from a great, perhaps immortal essay by William Graham Sumner, written in 1883. It is well to recall that it was meant to apply by its author, by me, and, I believed, by Roosevelt to the members of a large and substantial group in society, which, incidentally, included all self-dependent farmers and wage earners, as well as many others. I may add, further, that it represented exactly the people I thought the New Deal was going to benefit and exactly the group I am writing about in this chapter.

"Now, who," wrote Sumner, "is the forgotten man?"

Sumner defined him as the man who earned his living by productive work, who paid taxes, who accumulated a little capital, who was neither the object of help from government nor the beneficiary of artificial or politically bestowed advantage, who lived up to his contracts, and never asked for favor.

The forgotten man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide. He works, he votes, generally he prays—but he always pays—yes; above all he pays. He keeps production going on. He is strongly patriotic. He gives no trouble. He excites no admiration. He is not in any way a hero or a problem nor notorious nor an object of sentiment nor a burden nor the object of a job nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiments. Therefore he is forgotten.[1]

It was for him that the New Deal was originally conceived. Later, because of political expediency, Roosevelt shifted his appeal to a congeries of small segments of the voting population. The early New Deal ended in an alliance of minorities.

THE AMERICAN MIDDLE INTERESTS

The Marxists' hatred for and fear of what they call the middle class can easily be understood when we consider the nature and distribution of wealth among Americans, as well as the interests, economic and otherwise, and the ideals of those who are neither rich or poor. For not only does the preponderant part of the Nation's wealth lie with this middle group, but the preservation of national well-being utterly depends on the maintenance of individual liberty and the limitation of the power of Government. Moreover, the nature and size of interests of this group make it the appropriate trustee and defender of the interests and ideals of the Nation itself (p. 38).

The most common bases for defining distinctions are either income or property ownership. If we adopt those criteria we find a graduation from very small to very large individual or family income or ownership. The broad picture of our society is a small fringe at either end, with the vast mass in the middle. The superficial impression is that of great, almost monolithic stability.

But the real situation is not so simple. Many hired workers have high incomes and many own property. Many employers and property owners have low incomes. The earnings of many small businessmen come in part from their own personal labor and in part as return from capital invested, with no clear distinction between these two sources. The bulk of American families have annual incomes between two and five thousand dollars. They form a fluid mass, constantly fed from above and below, and constantly losing members in both directions. Nearly every working American has passed through this group some time in his life: young men starting from scratch work up; old men reaching the age of retirement come down; men in the prime of life enter or leave the middle group acording to their business fortunes" (p. 38).

WHO OWNS WHAT?

Figures arranged by income groups, on income groups and property ownership by the able economist, Rufus S. Tucker, are very interesting and worthy of study. His statistics show that "4 out of 10 families have assets worth $5,000 or more. One out of ten have assets worth $25,000 or more."

---

[1] William Graham Sumner: The Forgotten Man and Other Essays (New Haven, Yale University Press; 1918).

Only 1 in 10 have debts greater than assets. And strange though it may seem, red ink is more common among people in higher-income groups.

The ownership of automobiles is very general. It ranges from 24 percent in the lower groups to 89 percent in the highest. The relatively low percentage in the lower group must be partly accounted for by the presence in those groups of many elderly retired people. But in the groups with incomes from $1,000 to $3,999, automobile ownership from 1949 to 1950 made a spectacular increase.

One-half of all nonfarm families, or approximately 21,000,000, owned their own homes. Members of all groups had considerable holdings of real estate other than their own homes.

Nine percent of the lowest income group and 15 percent in the group between $2,000 and $5,000, owned other real estate.

WAGE EARNERS AND MIDDLE INTERESTS

In 1950 there were 40,930,000 full-time employees in private industries. An estimated 15,000,000 of these workers were members of labor unions of various kinds.

When we measure the economic and social status of the people who used to be identified as the middle classes and compare it with the present status of wage earners in the more fortunate ranges of their group, striking similarities appear. Millions of workers, both union and nonunion, are now receiving incomes that compare favorably with those received by small independent business, professional and so-called white-collar workers. The status as property owners is favorable by comparison.

That being true, their sympathies, their associations, their standard of intelligence and culture and those of their children are merging with those who in earlier days were regarded as more fortunate. Their political outlook is rapidly approaching that of the other middle (interest) groups. They can no longer confidently be expected to vote as a labor group. This changed status should be thoroughly grasped by the conservative political leaders. In fact, by tradition a large proportion of union members have never voted as their leaders and others have expected and hoped they would.

In a day when their status was much less fortunate than it is now, Theodore Roosevelt said the Republican Party could expect to receive about a third of union members. John L. Lewis before one election rather bitterly remarked that while he could tell his people how to vote there was no assurance that they would do so.

The political shift was clearly shown in the results of the 1950 senatorial election in Ohio. In the face of stupendous efforts by the United Labor League of Ohio, which was composed of the political arms of the AFL, the CIO, the railway brotherhoods, and labor organizations, Senator TAFT carried his appeal to the workers themselves. He carefully avoided the implication that there was any issue at all between him and wage-earners. He avoided identifying "labor" with the leader who opposed him. In fact, he clearly made a differentiation between the workers, including union members, and the official heads of the unions. He carried every industrial county.

(Mr. Moley points out in his statistics that the statement "that a third of our people are ill-fed and ill-housed and ill-clothed" is a gross misstatement that has served to divide our people in the interests of political objectives. The falseness of such a statement is revealed in the figures of the very Government whose political head pronounced that judgment.)

Even those figures showing the large number of people receiving incomes of, say, $2,000 or less to "prove" that such people are unable to obtain a decent living standard are engaged in statistical chicanery. For the Federal Reserve figure on incomes and assets make clear that a great many of those people own considerable property. The percentage of people in the lowest-income group—"under $1,000—who own their own home is 50, which is higher than the three groups above them, and nearly equal to the $4,000–$4,999 group. These home owners have the benefit of relatively free rent, not ccunted as income. Considerable percentages of this low-income group own other types of property, especially 'liquid assets.' The fallacy in assuming that this group is in dire need lies in failing to recognize that many of them are retired and living on self-made means of security, and others do not care to work, either because they do not need to or because they are willing to forego earnings for the joy of a lazy life. The latter, as as any American knows, are numerous."

ESSENTIAL POLITICAL WEAKNESSES OF THE MIDDLE GROUP

The essential political weakness of the middle-interest group lies in several circumstances. It has had a tendency to split the two parties. This has been especially true since there has been a Solid South. The shopkeeper in Memphis votes for Truman. A shopkeeper in Indianapolis, with exactly the same economic concerns and social outlooks, votes for Dewey. A machine member in Chicago and a pensioner in Los Angeles count more than both shopkeepers.

Another factor contributing to the political weakness of the middle group has been the complex, almost indefinable nature of its economic concerns. Politics requires interpretation of these shared concerns in broad, easily understandable terms. It is easy to describe and activate the interests of cattle raisers or cotton growers. But it is not easy to describe the interwoven common concerns and economic kinship of cotton and cattle growers with New England shopkeepers or with skilled workmen in a watch factory in Lancaster, Pa. Politicians have fished in cloudy waters and have profited by complex relationships.

Since this has been true, the tactic of self-seeking politics has been to split the middle group by appeals and promises to specific minorities. Two of these minorities have been farmers and wage earners. The means for achieving this division has been to stress the factors that set these minorities off from others, rather than the great ties that bind them to others. Demagogues, in appeals to farmers and wage earners portray their prospective adherents as the very salt of the earth, the foundations of economic life, and the only "indices, and plenty of infusion of the minority class-consciousness, the substantial middle group has been divided and rendered impotent to unite on the broad issues that might have provided unity and real political power" (pp. 64–65, How to Keep Our Liberty).

BLUEPRINT FOR POLITICAL ACTION—WHAT OBJECTIVES?

We are concerned here with militant political action, which means positive support of specific candidates and policies and opposition to other specific candidates and policies. I am not concerned here with vague and generalized efforts to teach good government, to clean up affairs in specific cities, counties, and communities, or to create and distribute educational and propaganda material. Such objectives are generally good and sound. But their consideration lies beyond the scope of this book.

The first decision that must be made by any group intent upon organizing militant political action is its objective.

1. Does it intend to keep itself independent of any legally constituted party organization but support the candidate or candidates of one of the other party? In short, will it cooperate with a party for the purpose of gaining party control?

2. Does it intend to work within the legal framework of a party for the purpose of gaining party control?

3. Does it intend to limit itself to a specific function, such as to get out the vote?

It is very important to make this decision. For to confuse the first and second of these possible objectives will result in misunderstanding, waste, and duplication of effort, and the ultimate weakening of both citizen activity and party responsibility. The ideal of all effective citizen action should be the creation of responsible party government of such a character as to win the active and devoted support of many citizens (p. 294).

(N. B.—Some of the suggested blueprints can be found on the following pages.)

SOME BLUEPRINTS, INDEPENDENT ORGANIZED POLITICAL ACTION

Page 295:

Preliminary organization: In an area of some size, such as a county, congressional district, city, or even a State, small groups of 20 to 30 carefully selected men and women should first be called together. Then the initiators can explain the need, purposes, and methods of action. Since members of such groups have many contacts and connections through their businesses, clubs, clients, and the like, further meetings can be held by the initial members. Such groups should later be called together in every strategic place in the area to be covered.[2]

Since the members of such groups are generally quite inexperienced in political activity, a process of education should begin with them. It is best to move slowly at first, until complete understanding has been reached on objectives, policies, and methods, and until adequate financing has been assured.

It is significant that some of the most successful citizens' organizations in this country have operated from the beginning without a specific name, without a letterhead, without any formal officers. Perhaps nothing more than some such unpretentious name as citizens' committee is needed. The purpose of anonymity has been to frustrate opposition attack.

In the preliminary movements of such a group it should be remembered that its strength will at first be overestimated by the opposition. Professional politicians are panicky people. They rush into hostile counteraction. This must be anticipated and effectively met with firm and rapid action by the citizens' group. A citizens' group must not start until it is.

Expert management: Those who initiate and control citizens' organizations should themselves serve without compensation, but they will find it essential to employ expert management. A businessman who started a highly successful movement says: "A political campaign is like a sales campaign. The candidate and his principles must be 'sold' by word of mouth and by advertising. 'Sales' managers and division managers direct routine 'salesmen' and hundreds of volunteers."

Page 297:

Finances: A citizens' organization should operate on sound budgetary principles. A yardstick should be established for contributions. The C.I.O.-P.A.C. has tried to get $1 a member; the A.F.L. $2, although both have fallen far short of their goals. Busi-

[2] Scott Wilson, the successful manager of a citizens' movement in New Orleans has this to say of the preliminary steps in setting up a citizens' group: "It is best to start with a small group first—say four business and professional men. Then have another meeting with the group enlarged to eight. Then 12. But if for the next meeting twice that number is invited, maybe only 15 will come. That may be because somebody is scaring off the early converts. It is best then to put the whole matter square on the line publicly and have a big meeting and get under way."

nessmen and professional men and women should contribute according to their means and importance. Paid solicitors are not suitable for collecting contributions and pledges. This should be done by businessmen and others in the original group who can talk plainly to their friends and business associates.

Too much money is just as dangerous as too little. The appearance of opulence may be deadly. In a citizens' group it antagonizes the political party that is the object of its help. The public, however, is quick to penetrate any phony demonstration of poverty. Tammany leaders have never lost the support of their followers by living well, dressing well, and assuming a reasonably dignified and forthright appearance of well-being. Perhaps the golden mean is an efficient, well-equipped organization that is neither wasteful nor parsimonious.

Getting good candidates: A primary task of a citizens' group is to use every legitimate means to get good candidates to run. That is not easy. To run for Congress and to remain there is a formidable matter for anyone who has a successful business or profession that needs attention. And most people suitable for an important office have such obligations.

Even if elected, a person in political life has financial and other obligations that are heavy. He must ordinarily depend on and get along with a political organization at home that may be sluggish, incompetent, indifferent, or worse. He gets little financial help in campaigns, poor publicity, tepid encouragement, and plenty of criticism. Moreover, there are always enemies and rivals at home working against him while he is struggling with his job in Washington.

Enlisting and training political workers: When groups of leaders have been strategically placed in the area from which activity should fan out, when some money is in hand and more is pledged, and when expert professional workers are employed, the preliminaries are completed.

The second step is to get volunteer workers to make direct contact with voters. This can be done first by carefully going over the ward, precinct, town, and township election returns to see where work should be concentrated. It is important to recognize that the greatest need and opportunity for citizen action are in the spots where there has been the highest proportion of stay-at-homes in recent elections.

Publicity and advertising: Candidates usually know little about means of getting publicity or about the nature of good publicity. Expert service is needed.

Here the citizens' group can find and pay the right person, perhaps on the advice of advertising agency men or editors. It is almost always possible to get a skilled newspaperman or a public-relations man.

A political campaign has many of the characteristics of a commercial sales effort. The candidate and his attributes and views need advertising. His name, his face, and his right hand should be everywhere. The impression of success must be put over. Campaign "literature," various forms of paid advertising, outdoor advertising, press, radio, and television should be expertly prepared. This function might, with the consent of the party, be taken over by the citizens' group.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I think no one challenges the statement that Dr. Moley was one of the keymen in what was called the original Brain Trust, which evolved many of the so-called New Deal ideas. He broke with President Roosevelt after the London Conference, to which the Senator from Oregon referred, over fiscal matters and international controls. It was a rather curious things that President Roosevelt, who believed so strongly in our international missions, should have been the one to be responsible, apparently, for upsetting the London Economic Conference in 1934, from which subsequently flowed so many of our ills. It is a curious commentary upon the extent to which he had evolved his concepts at that time.

In later passages of his book Dr. Moley goes on to speak about the words of the acceptance speech of 1936, which was the point where Dr. Moley finally broke. The language which President Roosevelt used on that occasion will be remembered, "economic royalists," "new dynasties," "thirsting for power," "economic tyranny," "the resolute enemy within our gates," "the revolution," and "the minute men"; and I believe it was there that he used the familiar expression that "we have created an instrument of power which, in the hands of other men, might be very dangerous to the welfare of the state." Apparently, Dr. Moley felt that if that were the situation, it was perhaps time to call a halt.

All these innovations for which President Roosevelt was crying out at that time were being established by his own planning, and the "economic royalists," as we are now, all too late, beginning to learn, were making very great headway in the Government.

I have referred to this perversion of the New Deal, and have read certain passages from it, which I shall pass over until we reach the concluding sentence. The program was gradually developed into the acceptance of deficits, first regarded as a necessary evil, which finally, under the influence of the new economics, came to be regarded as an unmitigated good; and meanwhile bureaucracy and Federal power grew apace, at the expense of the taxpayers and the States.

He then speaks about the bureaucrats, and of how they flooded into Washington; and he speaks with a rather kindly and generous voice about them. I should like to read the passage. He says:

In the early days of the New Deal, I was in a position to see clearly and in detail the great migration of those who came to Washington seeking, and for the most part finding, Government employment.

I think I should interpolate that the horrible crime record of Washington did not begin with the coming of these out-of-employment Democrats to Washington, but it certainly was not mitigated by their arrival. I do not place any more responsibility upon them than upon their predecessors. I continue:

The accession of Roosevelt was regarded by them as a political, almost a social revolution. As in all such upheavals, thousands were inspired to participate, either in response to a wholly idealistic impulse to help, or as a means of slaking a thirst for adventure, or for the more prosaic purpose of getting gainful employment after years of more or less impoverished dedication to opposition to things as they were.

These people were a variegated lot. Nonconformity is infinitely diversified. There might be some uniformity in a belief that the country is sick, but prognosis and treatment in politics depend upon personal predilection and character. It is unnecessary to suggest the kinds of remedies and nostrums that were advocated. The point is that nearly everybody who applied for employment sooner or later found it. There was little sifting or investigation, far too little adaptation of the employee to the job. Those who made the selections, even some Cabinet members, were themselves new to public service. Allegiance to the policies and personality of the President was a test. But this was a poor test, because the Roosevelt policies were themselves an amalgam of many philosophies.

One test was fairly well observed, and the President himself regarded it as important.

This is very interesting.

People were not to be put in charge of matters in which they had lived their lives and acquired their habits of thought and action. Thus, it was believed, private interests would be kept from places of privilege and power. One Cabinet member, in seeking to fill a responsible place in his department, told me that he wanted only college professors, for only in them could he find intellectual honesty.

I should like to commend to the disciples of that doctrine the testimony of Professor Jessup, to whom, as a member of a subcommittee, I listened for about 2 weeks. What I found to be to me most missing in him was intellectual honesty. I could not discover it in the devious way in which he sought to explain the many difficulties which were found in his past record.

I do not condemn college professors as a class. I sat under them. I am looking at one, now, a very distinguished one, and I know there are others in the Senate. I think probably their average of honesty runs about as high as that of anyone else, no better and no worse. I hope the distinguished former dean of the University of Oregon will agree with me, perhaps, in that statement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Maine wants my testimony, I may say I completely agree with him that college professors, like Members of Congress, are pretty much a fair cross section of the American populace.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is, they are good and bad.

Mr. MORSE. Included among them are some sophists, and some intellectually dishonest persons; but I think they are decidedly in the minority, just as I think, among Members of Congress, the overwhelming majority are a fair cross-section of the honest elements of the American populace. As a lawyer, it is always a matter of regret to me when I find a shyster developing in the legal profession. There are a few, comparatively speaking; but, by and large, that profession, too, is a fair cross-section, I think, of the general morality of the American people, mostly good, a few bad.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is very true, because there is a tendency to find a few miscreants. This is also true in government. We have millions of Government employees. I think the growing impression in the country that there is a very large percentage of dishonesty is not justified. We know it

is not true. We know that the vast majority of Government officials and employees are quite as honest as other people. It was David Harum, a very wise observer, who spoke of a phase of life where sometimes some men may be suspected, referring to the fact that there is dishonesty even in horse racing. He said there would never be an honest horse race until there was an honest human race. That is perfectly true. So let us not be surprised when we find some college professors who do not measure up to the standards of intellectual honesty which should prevail in the Senate; but let us not on that account condemn them all.

He goes on to say that it was no secret that a great number of these reformers were admirers of the great Soviet experiment.

I do not know that I should say there was a great number, but he says a great number of these reformers at that time, in 1934 to 1936, were admirers of the great Soviet experiment, and some we now know were secret agents of communism, he says.

He goes on to say:

In my opinion, there is a greater danger in collectivists and in the betrayal of our secrets to foreign powers.

Undoubtedly, that is true.

Then he discusses the transformation and capture of the Democratic Party by groups who were certainly at variance with the fundamental concept of Thomas Jefferson of the least governed being the best governed. The transformation of the party of Jefferson into the centralized bureaucracy of today as far closer to the federalist concepts of Hamilton is one of the most interesting discussions of modern times.

Then he comes to the most stimulating passage, with reference to the forgotten man. He says, at page 65:

It is one of the great ironies of American history that at the very outset of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal the phrase "Forgotten Man" became a major slogan and rallying cry. It so happened that I provided him with the phrase and wove it into an early precampaign speech. I took it from a great, perhaps immortal essay by William Graham Sumner, written in 1883. It is well to recall that it was meant to apply by its author, by me, and, I believe, by Roosevelt to the members of a large and substantial group in society, which, incidentally, included all self-dependent farmers and wage earners, as well as many others. I may add, further, that it represented exactly the people I thought the New Deal was going to benefit and exactly the group I am writing about in this chapter.

"Now, who," wrote Sumner, "is the Forgotten Man?"

Sumner defined him as the man who earned his living by productive work, who paid taxes, who accumulated a little capital, who was neither the object of help from Government nor the beneficiary of artificial or politically bestowed advantage, who lived up to his contracts, and never asked for favor.

The Forgotten Man is delving away in patient industry, supporting his family, paying his taxes, casting his vote, supporting the church and the school, reading his newspaper, and cheering for the politician of his admiration, but he is the only one for whom there is no provision in the great scramble and the big divide. He works, he votes, generally he prays—but he always pays—yes; above all he pays. He keeps production going on. He is strongly patriotic. He gives no trouble. He excites no admiration. He is not in any way a hero or a problem nor nortorious nor an object of sentiment nor a burden nor the object of a job nor one over whom sentimental economists and statesmen can parade their fine sentiments. Therefore he is forgotten.

It was for him that the New Deal was originally conceived. Later, because of political expediency, Roosevelt shifted his appeal to a congeries of small segments of the voting population. The early New Deal ended in an alliance of minorities.

He then discusses the American middle interests and goes into detail about the wage earners, about the statement that one-third of America was ill fed, ill housed, and ill clothed, which he very vehemently denies, and he demonstrates the fallacy of the statement, as he undertakes to show. He reaches conclusions as to what we are going to do about it; and that, I think, is what concerns us all.

He does not deny the importance of political parties. In fact, he believes in political parties and wishes to see them continued, but he points out that in the last three presidential elections the Republican Party had 22,000,000 votes, no more, no less. Our Democratic friends across the aisle have been losing votes. They have gone from 27,000,000 down to 24,000,000 votes. In the 1950 election they went off approximately 3,000,000 votes, while the Republican Party went off only 1,000,000 votes. We conducted a vigorous campaign and attacked vigorously, and apparently were rewarded by stirring up more interest, and gained five Senate seats.

Mr. Moley concludes that if America is to be saved in our generation it will be the result of our taking more serious individual interest. The party organizations are fine. We want to see them improved and stimulated and become more active, but in the final analysis, in this horrible trend of lack of interest sufficient to vote, when half of our population is not interested enough to vote after all the sacrifices of the last century, very serious measures are required. Mr. Moley believes that salvation is to be found in individual acts, just like we called the minute men out at Concord and Lexington, who grabbed their muskets and got down to the stone wall and started shooting at the enemy nearest to them. He suggests that all the people who write us letters, all the people who inveigh against things as they are and against corruption in high places, expressing their discontent with Government as it is, instead of seeking to move in at the top and take over the political parties and tell them how to run our affairs, they should start out to get ten of their neighbors to take enough interest to vote. If one person out of ten of those who voted Republican in each of the last three presidential elections would just get one out of ten of the 45,000,000 persons who did not vote—they do not have to persuade any Democrats; leave them alone with their own discontented lot——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator from Maine mean to say that he is thinking about someone else with a discontented lot? Is he not a little bit——

Mr. BREWSTER. I might accept the suggestion of the Senator from South Carolina that we on this side of the aisle are a little disunited, but that is our problem, and I was leaving the Senator to handle his own problem.

If the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I can come somewhere near agreeing, then we have made a great advance. When we go to the theater, when we go to church, when we walk on the street, the fellow on the right or on the left of us did not vote. Thirty-five percent of the wives did not vote, and they are supposed to be even better citizens than are the men.

Mr. Moley undertakes to make a suggestion about the individual American. He addresses his suggestion to the 45,000,000 uninterested persons who do a lot of talking. I am sure it will be found that of the 45,000,000 persons who did not vote, very many of them are willing to tell us what all the trouble is about. We find them giving very strong ideas. But on election day something happens. They are mesmerized. They stay at home.

Mr. Moley shows in his book how all interested Americans, both inside and outside party organizations, can make themselves effective and how they can do something to recapture for America the priceless privilege of a self-governing republic, by which alone we may hope to make America secure.

Mr. President, I end as I began, by saying that the Constitution guarantees a republican form of government. That is what it says—a republican form of government. I hope my great constitutional friends on the other side of the aisle will occasionally remind themselves of that. I do not say that means the Republican Party, although that was the party of Thomas Jefferson. He called himself a Republican, and it was his idea that there was to be very little government—the less government, the better.

I think we have to correct the notion that America will ever be a pure democracy. Certainly with a population of more than 150,000,000, it is impossible. But I do commend to the people of this country consideration of this matter, and I hope that as time goes on we too may give a little more of a literary flavor to the deliberations of this body by occasionally calling attention to the fact that we have to have a certain modicum of intellectual life.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad the Senator from Maine has taken time on the floor today to call attention to the latest writing, the latest book, by one of the teachers who exercised a tremendous influence on my political thinking, especially in relation to the importance of constitutional guaranties.

The outline or synopsis of the book the Senator from Maine has given us

falls very definitely into the pattern of teaching which it was my privilege to enjoy as I sat at the feet of Dr. Moley at Columbia University.

I feel certain that the Senator from Maine will be interested to know that Dr. Moley is a very keen student of political movements which during our history have had a tremendous appeal to independent voters. I remember very vividly Dr. Moley's discussions of the Bull Moose movement. He was a keen student of the political movement that gave rise to the power of the elder La-Follette in Wisconsin.

As I recall many of Dr. Moley's lectures, he always stressed the importance of the parties strengthening themselves by reducing the number of independent voters. He said that if there continued to be an increase in the number of independent voters, the parties had better look to themselves to find the reason. Parties will usually find the answer within themselves if they will closely scrutinize their programs, polices, and procedures, particularly their election procedures, and their failure to bring about reforms in election laws that will give to the people a true freedom of choice in the selection of their candidates, as, for example, in State primaries.

Mr. President, I am very much pleased that the Senator from Maine has called our attention to this book, because I surmise that both parties, including my own, will find in it some very valuable food for thought as to what can be done within their own party organizations in respect to programs and improvements in party procedure which will really reduce the size of the independent vote. Thereby, I trust that more and more independent voters will be brought back into our party, in support of what I shall continue to insist is its real objective, that is, to put into legislative practice what I have so frequently called the property and human rights guaranties of the Constitution, which is merely another name for constitutional liberalism.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am very much interested in the comments made by the Senator from Oregon, and I appreciate them.

I believe that today we should be very much more excited and concerned about nonvoters than independent voters. I believe that distinction should be clearly kept in mind. To know that there are 45,000,000 nonvoters really gets me quite excited. I hope that in this campaign year, during the next few months, as a result of good, stimulating discussion, we may arouse a great number of such people from their torpor and apathy and awaken them to the opportunity which is presented to them to record themselves at the polls.

PURCHASING POWER OF THE AMERICAN DOLLAR

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, during the past 12 or 15 years, the value of our money has declined to the point where each dollar is worth only 53 cents, compared with its value during the period just before the outbreak of World War II. That is, each dollar today will buy only 53 cents worth of food, clothing, shelter, and other necessities, compared with what it would buy during the prewar period.

This collapse in the value of our money has created a desperately serious problem for millions of people who have saved up to buy Government bonds or other bonds, who have savings accounts, and who have bought life insurance for themselves and their families. It has caused great hardship for millions who must live on pensions, annuities, and retirement funds. They find that the income they counted on to support them is no longer sufficient to buy even the bare necessities. A man who has attempted to make provision for his family through life insurance finds that the policies on which he has paid premiums are no longer adequate to take care of their needs in the event of his death.

What is the cause of this destruction of the value of our money? Who has stolen away almost half the buying power of our savings?

There is only one answer. It is due to the excessive spending and borrowing of this administration. History gives us numerous examples of nations which have destroyed their money by overspending and inflating the currency. For example, Germany, following World War I, spent so recklessly that finally it took a whole bushel of paper currency to buy a loaf of bread.

In many European countries during the last few years, the same thing has happened. As governments have spent and spent, the value of their money has gone down and down. The French franc, which was worth 20 cents 40 years ago, is now worth only a small fraction of a penny. In our own country during the period of the Revolutionary War, the Continental Congress spent money it did not have. The currency soon became worthless, and that is where we get our phrase "not worth a continental."

In the field of government finance, as in our personal lives, there are basic moral laws that control our actions, whether we like it or not. For a short time it may seem easier to borrow and spend than to balance the budget and pay our just debts, but there is always a day of reckoning. Eventually we find that by this policy, the savings of our people have been destroyed.

I do not believe we can afford to go through the wringer of inflation. Too many millions of people are dependent on a fixed weekly salary or wage, or a pension, an annuity, or the receipts from a life insurance policy taken out many years ago when the dollar was worth a hundred cents. In Germany, the destruction of all savings by the inflation of the 1920's created such desperation that it paved the way directly for the advent of Hitler. We must not let such conditions come into existence here.

To keep our Government strong, we must keep our money sound. As long as I am in the Senate, I intend to continue to work and vote against the spending and waste which is destroying the buying power of our dollars.

USE OF UNITED STATES MAILS FOR CIRCULATING COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate, and to place in the body of the RECORD, several communications which I have received relative to the use by the Soviet Union and its agencies of the American postal system for circulating Communist propaganda in this country. I think Members of the Senate will find the correspondence of interest.

The first item is a letter dated November 19, 1951, addressed to Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States, Washington, D. C., and signed by Alexander J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools of Los Angeles, in which he says:

DEAR MR. DONALDSON: Our attention has been called to the fact that a booklet entitled "U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin," which is evidently a communistic propaganda publication, is being circulated through the United States mail free of charge to public-school libraries. The purpose of this letter is to inquire whether there is anything in our postal regulations that would prevent the circulation of this kind of material through the mail. Any information that you can give me on this subject would be deeply appreciated.

Yours respectfully,

ALEXANDER J. STODDARD,
Superintendent of Schools.

The next is a letter dated January 7, 1952, addressed to me by Mr. Bruce A. Findlay, associate superintendent of the Los Angeles schools, calling attention to the letter which had previously been written to the Postmaster General.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOS ANGELES CITY
BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 7, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: On October 29, 1951, Superintendent Stoddard of the Los Angeles City Schools presented to the board of education a statement in which he directed the attention of the board to the fact that the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin was being mailed to the libraries and to some of our school people without their consent. Superintendent Stoddard wrote to the honorable Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States, under date of November 19, 1951. Copy of this letter is enclosed. No reply as of this date has been received from Postmaster General Donaldson.

Last week, a repetition of the same incident occurred. Some individuals in libraries received additional copies of Russian propaganda.

At the meeting of the board of education held January 3, 1952, President Burke introduced a resolution which was unanimously carried. The resolution states:

"The board of education direct a communication to Senators KNOWLAND and NIXON and to our Representatives protesting the bombardment of the public-school system with communistic and subversive propagandistic material; that the elected Representatives in Congress be requested to bring this matter to the attention of the Congress of the United States with the view of taking appropriate action to prevent abuse of the United States mail; and that our Senators and Representatives be informed that a letter on this subject was written to the

Postmaster General weeks ago but has not yet been acknowledged or answered."

The board of education and the superintendent of schools of Los Angeles city would be grateful to you for any suggested steps that you might take to conform with the spirit of the resolution.

Very truly yours,

BRUCE A. FINDLAY,
Associate Superintendent,
Office of Board Services.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The next is a letter which I have received from Mr. F. M. Chase, Jr., district superintendent of the Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High School District, of California, calling attention to the fact that the same thing was being done in his area of California.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCEANSIDE-CARLSBAD UNION
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,
Oceanside, Calif., January 9, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KNOWLAND: The board of trustees of the Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High School and Junior College District has noted with deep concern the numerous publications of the U. S. S. R. and its satellites which are being sent through the mails to our high school and junior college offices, to our district office, and to the school library. These papers, pamphlets, and booklets are, in general, printed by the embassies of these Communist countries. They are direct propaganda favoring the Communist form of government, and slanted to influence American thinking in favor of the Communists. Our board feels that the public schools are one of the vital organs in the development and functioning of the Government of the United States and they resent this open and continued effort at discrediting that way of life.

The board furthermore feels that since we are virtually at war with the proponents of this Communist ideology, that steps should be taken to minimize, at least, their efforts within our own borders even though such measures in normal times might be contrary to one of the basic tenets of the United States Government which we seek to protect.

The board, therefore, respectfully urges that you seriously consider means of barring from the United States mail Communist propaganda emanating from the U. S. S. R. and its satellites.

Respectfully,

F. M. CHASE, Jr.,
District Superintendent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The next is a letter which I addressed to Mr. Findlay, associate superintendent of the Los Angeles City Schools.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1952.

Mr. BRUCE A. FINDLAY,
Associate Superintendent, Los Angeles City Board of Education,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. FINDLAY: Thank you for your letter and enclosure concerning certain publications which are being mailed to the libraries and schools.

I appreciate your bringing this matter to my attention, and will request the Post Office to investigate the situation.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The next item is a letter which I received from Mr. Roy C. Frank, Solicitor of the Post Office Department, dated January 30, 1952, in which he says:

DEAR SENATOR: This will acknowledge your communication of January 24, 1952, addressed to the Postmaster General, transmitting a letter from Mr. Bruce A. Findlay, Los Angeles associate superintendent of schools, wherein inquiry is made concerning a communication from Mr. Alexander J. Stoddard, superintendent of schools of that city. You also enclose a letter addressed to you by Mr. F. M. Chase, Jr., district superintendent, Oceanside-Carlsbad Union High School District, Oceanside, Calif.

There is transmitted herewith a copy of a letter sent to Mr. Stoddard on January 7, 1952. If you desire any further information, I shall be pleased to supply it upon request.

The enclosures which accompanied your communication are also herewith.

Sincerely yours,

ROY C. FRANK,
Solicitor.

The next is a letter which the Solicitor of the Post Office Department sent to Mr. Stoddard, and which reads as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., January 7, 1952.

Mr. ALEXANDER J. STODDARD,
Superintendent, Los Angeles City Schools, Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. STODDARD: This will acknowledge your letter of November 19, 1951, addressed to the Postmaster General, relative to a publication entitled "U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin," which you state is being circulated through the United States mails free of charge.

Several issues of this bulletin have heretofore been examined in this office. There is no authority under existing law for the Post Office Department to exclude such material from the mails.

Foreign propaganda literature may be treated as nonmailable if sent by one subject to and not registered in accordance with the provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. However, the provisions of this act are not applicable to a duly accredited diplomatic officer of a foreign government or any member of his staff. The magazine in question is published by the embassy of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Washington, D. C.

This publication is not distributed without payment of postage. Examination of the copies in our files shows that the postage was paid on them at the third-class rate.

It is regretted that the volume of correspondence received in this office delayed the sending of an earlier reply to your letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROY C. FRANK,
Solicitor.

More recently I received a letter from a private citizen calling my attention to another device being used by the Soviet Union. He says:

DEAR SENATOR: In reference to the enclosed. My first magazine came today, and was sent back marked "refused."

I don't like the decorations on the stationery; I don't know who "Sam" may be; and I don't see why the Soviet Embassy is allowed to publish this stuff and send it through the mails.

Respectfully,

RALPH D. KNOWLES.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

The device which was used was a holiday greeting addressed to him. This carried postage. It says:

HOLIDAY GREETINGS

The U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin (published by Soviet Embassy in Washington) is being sent to you for 1 year as the gift of Sam.

No last name is given. Apparently it is a dodge or blind, because the man who wrote to me stated that he had no information as to who the donor of this gift might be.

The next item is a letter which I addressed to Mr. Ralph D. Knowles in response to his request.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1952.

Mr. RALPH D. KNOWLES,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR MR. KNOWLES: This will acknowledge with thanks your letter of January 21, together with the attached notice that a 1-year subscription to the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin would be forwarded as a gift. I appreciate your calling this matter to my attention.

I have taken the matter up with the Post Office Department and you may be assured the subject will receive my very careful attention.

With kindest regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to do any further research on this matter. I merely wish to call it to the attention of the Senate. I do not know whether this barrage of Soviet propaganda is being sent through the United States mails aimed only at Californians, or whether other Senators may also have had the matter called to their attention.

I submit the material for the information of the Senate and for the information of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, in order to ascertain what, if anything, can be done with respect to this matter. I have very grave doubt in my own mind, if the United States wanted to circulate from its Embassy in Moscow a United States Information Bulletin through the mails to Soviet citizens of its own choice, whether in the first place it would be allowed to do so, and, secondly, what might happen to the Soviet citizens who received such bulletins from the United States Embassy.

I have felt for a long period of time that the sooner we get on a quid pro quo basis with the Soviet Union the more respect we will command at home and abroad.

Assuming that we would not be permitted to use the Soviet mails for such a purpose I doubt very much the wisdom of permitting the Soviet Embassy and the Soviet Government to use the United States mails to distribute communistic propaganda.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, when I ran for reelection in 1946, I predicted that by the end of my second term the REA would bring electric power to practically every farmer in Nebraska who wanted it, where physically feasible to do so. That seemed like a rather risky prediction to make at the time and it was received with skepticism. Less than one-third of the farmers had electricity at that time, and it had taken

a good many years to bring electrification even up to that point.

My second term will run not quite another year, but I am pleased to announce that my prediction is already nearly fulfilled. Of the 107,000 farms in Nebraska, about 96,000 had central station electric service on last November 30. As of that same date, loans had been approved to bring electricity to an additional 9,500 rural consumers, including a few in villages. Putting those figures together, 98 or 99 percent of the farms and ranches in the State already either have electricity, or are on the schedule for approved construction.

When we consider it, this program of REA construction represents one of the most tremendous achievements in Nebraska history. For most Nebraska farmers, it has made more of a change in their daily lives than any other single thing during this past 6 years.

I have felt a special obligation to help the REA locals with their construction programs in every way possible. Most of the construction job, of course, was a matter of plain hard work and sound financing—plus adequate Government loan funds. But there were times when the farmers needed help from their Senators and Representatives. Times without number I have been called on to help an REA local secure a loan, or help in some other manner, and I have always been glad to do it.

For example, there has been a constant problem of securing materials. The shortage of materials was at its worst in 1949, when orders for aluminum were back-logged 18 months.

I and other Members of Congress went to work for aluminum allocations, for more power for aluminum production, for imports. We stirred up enough fuss to secure diversion of considerable tonnages of aluminum production to fill the construction need.

We had another problem last year, when it appeared that controls on aluminum and copper might be placed in hands unfriendly to the REA program. I personally worked very hard and successfully to have these controls transferred into the sympathetic hands of the Rural Electrification Administration itself.

Through it all, the program has been kept on a sound financial basis. Rural electrification has been financed by loans, not gifts. These loans are being repaid, with interest. Of the 36 REA borrowers in Nebraska, not one is delinquent in its repayments, and almost two-thirds of them have made payments in advance. The whole program has been conducted without any graft, without influence peddlers or 5 percenters, without loss to the Government. I wish the same could be said for other Government agencies.

Now that the construction job is nearly finished, it is gratifying to look back on what has been accomplished. I know that farmers are grateful for the tremendous convenience of electricity. For my part, it has been a real source of gratification to reflect on the contribution I have been able to make toward the success of this great development.

XCVIII—101

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SENATOR RUSSELL'S CANDIDACY FOR THE DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am honored to be privileged to read into the RECORD at this time an announcement just made by one of our distinguished and esteemed colleague, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. It is, I believe, of great interest to very citizen of this Nation. I quote the statement of our distinguished colleague, issued to the press this afternoon:

The people of my native State have never failed to make generous response to every request I have ever made of them. In the same spirit, I can do no less than to comply with the unanimous requests of the General Assembly and the State Democratic Executive Committee of Georgia that I permit my name to be presented as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency.

The real issues facing the American people today, are those which rightfully should unite men rather than divide them. If there be one universal yearning in the minds and hearts of the American people, it is the desire to avoid the calamity of a third world war. Insofar as our international relations are concerned, the strength which must come from unity is the only way to peace.

Whatever sacrifice may be entailed, we must maintain a defense system adequate to our needs.

We cannot escape the responsibilities of world leadership, but in dealing with the problems of today's troubled world, we should ever be mindful of the limitations of the economic system which is the basic source of our greatness and the foundation upon which our precious way of life is erected. If we are to survive, it must be conserved and protected. National spending, including our assistance to other free people, must be carefully weighed against our ability to pay and produce.

No honest candidate for public office in these times can consider the tempting prospects of promising "all things to all men." Our future security depends upon our self-restraint and ability to cooperate with one another. Our cherished liberties were not easily won. In today's troubled world they will not be easily held. Our hopes for salvation can only be realized through willingness to serve and sacrifice.

The very foundation stone of popular government is the confidence of the people in their public servants. Fraud, corruption, and divided loyalties cannot be tolerated in positions of trust and confidence.

Among the dangers to our continued freedom is any unchecked trend toward the concentration of all of the powers of Government in the National Capital. The founding fathers, who had suffered the tyrannies of overcentralized government, wisely sought to define and limit the Federal power.

I am a Jeffersonian Democrat who believes in the greatest practicable degree of local self-government. The maintenance of the rights of the States in an indissoluble union is our protection against that loss of individual rights and liberties which has always followed undue centralization of authority.

In accepting this call I welcome the support of all American citizens who have faith in the democratic system of government and willingness to work for its preservation.

Mr. President, that is one of the most profound declarations of views and principles that it has been my privilege to read, or to have heard, since I have been a Member of this body. I am sure this announcement will strike a sympathetic interest and an enthusiastic response in the hearts of our people. In my opinion, it will and should command the support of millions of Americans who today have begun to wonder about some of the policies which our Government is pursuing and about the ultimate destiny of our Nation.

This solemn declaration of principles comes from one whom we personally know and who is admired and esteemed by all of his colleagues and by millions of his fellow citizens. It will give encouragement to many who have become discouraged. It will offer some hope to those who have despaired. It will hearten many who have been disillusioned. It is a declaration of principles to which all good Americans can repair with complete faith and trust, and with full confidence in the capacity, integrity, and character of its author.

His candidacy offers to our people an opportunity to select for the Presidency a man of stature and possessing those qualities of leadership that are so sorely needed at home and abroad in this era of grave world crisis.

Mr. President, I am happy indeed to make these brief remarks and comments for the RECORD.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Millikin
Brewster	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Murray
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Neely
Byrd	Ives	Nixon
Cain	Jenner	O'Conor
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kefauver	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kerr	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kilgore	Seaton
Douglas	Knowland	Smathers
Duff	Langer	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Ferguson	Malone	Thye
Flanders	Martin	Tobey
Frear	Maybank	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Wiley
Gillette	McClellan	Williams
Green	McFarland	Young
Hayden	McKellar	
Hendrickson	McMahon	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Idaho

[Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is recognized.

COORDINATOR OF FEDERAL AGENCIES IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, last week on the Senate floor I called attention to the fact that the Interior Department had ignored a law enacted in 1947 which created the position of Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico. At that time, I read into the RECORD a letter I had written to Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman asking for an explanation in the matter and I stated that I would put his reply in the RECORD when I received it.

I have here the reply of the Interior Department, signed by Dale Doty, Assistant Secretary, acting for Mr. Chapman who was away from his office.

That letter reads as follows:

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This will acknowledge your letter of February 11, 1952, regarding the position of coordinator of Federal agencies in Puerto Rico.

The position of Coordinator of Federal Activities was created by an amendment to the organic act of Puerto Rico made by the Eightieth Congress. The provision relating to the position was added by a Senate amendment to H. R. 3309, which authorized the people of Puerto Rico to elect their Governor beginning with the 1948 election, the Governor's term to begin on February 2, 1949. The position of coordinator was devised to provide for a position filled by appointment of the President after the time when the governor's position became elective. The position was suggested by Senator TAFT. No such provision appeared in the House bill or in the bill reported on by the Department of the Interior. The Department had no opportunity to comment on this provision of the bill.

The position as originally created carried a salary of $7,500 to be paid by Federal appropriation. It appeared unlikely that any person of competence could be found to fill the position at that salary, and Senator BUTLER accordingly introduced a bill in April 1948 to raise the salary of the position from $7,500 to $10,000. The salary increase was enacted on June 24, 1948, effective 30 days from that date. It had the Department's endorsement.

As stated, it was not intended that the position would be filled until there was an elected governor in 1949. No supplemental estimate was submitted by the Department during 1949 to take care of the position because of the policy of the Bureau of the Budget that it would not consider supplemental estimates unless due to circumstances not foreseeable at the time the annual estimates were submitted or to subsequent action by the Congress.

However, an estimate was included in the Interior Department submission for 1950, covering a salary for the coordinator of $10,330, the salary of a stenographer, and travel, communications, and other expenses, totaling in all $15,000. The Director of the Office of Territories appeared before the House Appropriations Subcommittee to justify the estimate. The Appropriations Committee, however, refused to approve the request. The committee's report (H. Rept. No. 324, 81st Cong., 1st sess.) states, on page 25:

"The 1950 budget requests $15,000 for establishing a coordinator of Federal agencies in Puerto Rico. The request is not approved by the committee and no funds for this purpose are contained in the bill. The coordination of Federal activities in Puerto Rico can be effected through firm and administrative directives to agencies having programs in this area. The establishment of a coordinator would merely palliate the conditions sought to be controlled or prevented."

The matter was discussed with various interested Senators who agreed with the view expressed in the House report. No funds were made available by the Senate.

The Department did not resubmit the item for the fiscal year 1950, because there was pending before the Congress the bill which was enacted on July 3, 1950, the constitution bill for Puerto Rico, which authorized the people of Puerto Rico to adopt their constitution and provide that upon approval of the constitution by the Congress, many of the provisions of the organic act, including the one relating to the coordinator, would automatically be repealed. For that reason, it appeared unnecessary and undesirable to request funds for the position which has been left in abeyance for possible activation if any developments in Puerto Rico should make such action desirable. Happily, under the administration of Governor Muñoz-Marín, Federal relations with Puerto Rico and the internal affairs of the island have been better than at any previous period. The Puerto Rican government under full democratic controls has demonstrated in a fashion which has attracted world-wide attention and approval the ability of the people of Puerto Rico to meet their very difficult economic and social problems. It is the view of this Department that in this effort they deserve the understanding and support of this Government in all its branches.

Sincerely yours,

DALE DOTY,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, that letter seems to beg the question. It is an alibi for not having complied with a statute which is crystal clear in its requirements and meaning.

Close examination of Mr. Doty's letter reveals that it is largely an apology for the government of Puerto Rico. This raises another question. Where is the primary loyalty of the Interior Department? To the government of Puerto Rico or to the people of the United States whose taxes support the Interior Department?

Mr. President, let us examine just what kind of a government it is which Mr. Doty and the Interior Department defend for the major part of their long letter to me.

At the end of my remarks I shall insert in the RECORD an item from El Mundo, which has been described as the leading Spanish-language newspaper in Puerto Rico. This item is dated December 3, 1950, and it is very damaging to the Puerto Rican Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín. One statement in this item interests me very much, just as I am sure it will interest every other loyal American. The item, among other things, states that Governor Muñoz, in 1936, refused to mount the speakers' platform at a political meeting of the Liberal Party in Caguas until the United States flag—our flag—was removed from the platform.

I do not know whether that statement is based on fact, Mr. President, but I say that if it is, it is a very serious matter, which should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress.

What manner of man is this who is being kept in power by the Interior Department? If he has insulted our flag, is it not an outrage to pour millions of American tax dollars into the hands of an anti-American demagog?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Does the distinguished Senator from South Carolina question the fact that the present Governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín, was elected by the people of Puerto Rico at a free election, by an overwhelming majority?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not questioning his being elected by the people; but even though he were elected by 90 percent of the people, if it is true that he said, "Down with the American flag," I am one who would say, "Down with the Governor of Puerto Rico."

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If it is a fact that Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín was elected by an overwhelming vote of the people of Puerto Rico at a free election, how can the distinguished Senator from South Carolina claim that he is being kept in office or has been kept in office by the Department of the Interior?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am saying that the facts ought to be brought out, and that the coordinator should be appointed to look into the spending of our money and how it is used in Puerto Rico. If it is being used by political parties, then I think it is time for us to wake up.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator has just read a statement which showed that an appropriation for a coordinator which was asked for was eliminated by the House in an appropriation bill, and that there was no appropriation made to pay the salary or expenses of a coordinator. Under those circumstances, how could a coordinator have been selected?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator, if he has been listening, heard me read also that the Department of the Interior did not thereafter ask for the appropriation.

Mr. LEHMAN. How would the distinguished Senator from South Carolina propose to pay the salary of a coordinator, if an appropriation was not made by Congress? I know of no way.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. When Congress passes legislation providing that there be a coordinator, I think it is the duty of the Department of

the Interior to go before the committee year in and year out and ask for necessary appropriations to carry out the direction until the law is repealed.

Has Mr. Dale Doty the effrontery to plead before us in the interest of a government which is headed by a man who has demonstrated extreme contempt and disloyalty for our great Nation? If these statements are true, then they should be investigated.

Can we, as the elected representatives of the American people, countenance a deplorable situation of this kind? How must we appear in the eyes of the world when we pay homage to a man who has so grossly insulted our national dignity if what this newspaper says is true?

These are questions which demand answers.

After a series of excuses for the earlier years, all of which added up to the fact that a law has been sidestepped, the Department of the Interior states as its reason for not complying in 1950, that the statute would be automatically repealed if the new Constitution of Puerto Rico were adopted in Puerto Rico and ratified by the Congress.

Mr. President, we are now in 1952, and that constitution is still not a reality. I understand that it will come before Congress for discussion and approval or rejection within a few weeks, but it might be a very long time before that constitution becomes a valid instrument which automatically repeals anything whatsoever.

It would seem to be rather strange reasoning on the part of the Department of the Interior when they argue that there was no compliance with this law, because it would be repealed by Public Law 600 when the latter became operative. If we are to follow this line of reasoning, we might as well abandon the collection of taxes under existing tax laws, for the reason that amendments to those tax laws have been introduced in Congress. In other words, Mr. President, a law is a law the moment it is passed by the Congress and signed by the President, and any failure to comply with the law by a Federal agency is a violation of the intent of Congress. It is hardly valid for a Federal agency to claim the right to ignore a law because it might be repealed in the future. My statement is borne out in this particular instance by the fact that the statute calling for a coordinator in Puerto Rico was enacted in 1948, and we are now in 1952, with no repeal having been effected, and with no assurance that it will be in the foreseeable future.

If there is any question as to the intent of the Congress in enacting the statute to which I refer, let me cite the Senate report on the measure, which gives the following explanation of why it was enacted:

> Section 7 provides for the position of Coordinator of Federal Agencies in Puerto Rico. At the present time, there are at least 58 Federal agencies with field offices or branches operating in the island. Many of them are engaged in giving aid to Puerto Rico on bases that seem to be at times conflicting and contradictory. Based on a recent inspection trip by several members of the committee, there seemed to be a need to bring the activities of all these agencies into focus and eliminate unnecessary duplication and waste.
>
> In some cases, the committee feels that Federal laws and systems of regulation, drafted with an eye to conditions in the 48 States, may have been extended too fast and in too far reaching a manner into an island with cultural traditions and economic methods dissimilar from those on the mainland. The establishment of the position of coordinator will permit a continuing study of the application of such Federal statutes and of the operation of these Federal agencies to the life of the island. The coordinator will have power to recommend measures of coordination among them or even the elimination of those which duplicate or conflict with each other or with activities of the island government. He will have no power except to make recommendations. It is felt that such recommendations can be of tremendous benefit to the Congress and the President in placing the functioning of our Federal agencies on a sounder and more efficient basis in Puerto Rico.

There seems always to have been a cloak of secrecy about the office of coordinator. In the printed House hearings on the Department of the Interior appropriations bill in 1950 the following appears:

> Mr. NORRELL (Representative from Arkansas). What will he do?
>
> Mr. DAVIS. His functions are in general to observe the operations of Federal agencies in Puerto Rico and report them to the President.
>
> (Discussion off the record.)

It appears according to the record, that there was discussion off the record. Why should a discussion of this important question be off the record?

It would seem that the Interior Department has very cleverly postponed for one reason or another the appointment of a Federal coordinator, as required by law, thus defeating the intention of the Congress to have a watchdog in Puerto Rico to protect the interests of the American taxpayer.

Regardless of whether or not the Puerto Rican Constitution is approved in Congress, the Interior Department still stands guilty of noncompliance with a directive of the Congress. I repeat my statement of last week that the Department nurtures an atmosphere in which dictatorship in Puerto Rico can flourish, and at the same time use American dollars.

Mr. President, it is time to get on with an investigation of the present regime in Puerto Rico.

Several of us have said on the floor that charges of un-American conduct have been made against the Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín. Among examples of such charges there has come to my attention one which I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It is contained in an article from the Puerto Rican daily newspaper El Mundo of December 3, 1950. I ask unanimous consent to have this newspaper article printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question or two before the article is placed in the RECORD.

Who is the publisher of this newspaper?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know, but it is one of the leading newspapers in Puerto Rico.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator know that it is a very biased newspaper, owned by the big capitalists of Puerto Rico who have been fighting this governor for many years? Does not the Senator know that when the governor tried to help the poor people of Puerto Rico so that the little man could buy a small piece of land, that newspaper fought every attempt on the part of the United States Government to hold down the large sized ranches and farms?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that the United States has been the agency which has built houses in Puerto Rico. It has been the United States that has paid for them. Our money has been used there. That is one reason why I want a coordinator to look into the subject and see just what has been done, and who should get credit for it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator know that only a few houses have been built when many thousands were needed? Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt went to Puerto Rico and made a personal investigation, which showed that the housing which has been built is so far out in the country that a poor man cannot afford to live there. By the time he pays his fare into town and back again, the small amount of money which he receives makes it impossible to live in one of those houses.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So the Senator from North Dakota acknowledges that much of the building that has been done on the island by the Government of the United States has probably been located in the wrong place.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to my distinguished friend——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. There should be a coordinator to look into the building program. That is what I want.

Mr. LANGER. I want to tell my distinguished friend the Senator from South Carolina that some of those buildings are a little too far out of town. They are almost at the city limits. Conditions are so horrible and the slums are so terrible as absolutely to beggar description.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am not disagreeing with the Senator from North Dakota concerning the conditions there. My information agrees with his, that conditions in Puerto Rico are terrible.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator agree further that the man who has done the most to alleviate those conditions is the present Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín, who has done an outstanding job after being elected by the people, in trying to remedy conditions, and that he has had strong opposition all the time from the newspaper El Mundo?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I must disagree with the Senator from

North Dakota. The United States itself has done a large part of the building in Puerto Rico.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say to my distinguished friend from South Carolina that we have not begun to do one one-hundredth of what should be done in the way of building to take care of the poor, desperate people of Puerto Rico. I believe that the Governor, instead of being criticized by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, should be complimented for the job he is doing.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator agree that there should be an investigation which would prove that Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín has been a good Governor, if that is a fact?

Mr. LANGER. We have had a great many investigations——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I want to know the facts.

Mr. LANGER. I have sat and listened to committees upon their return from Puerto Rico. When we read their reports, what do we find? We find description after description of poverty, want, suffering, and starvation. I would rather see an investigation made, not with respect to the coordinator, but with respect to the reason why the United States Government, which is today trying to tell everyone else in the world how to live, has not made a success of Puerto Rico, with its 2,000,000 inhabitants.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Perhaps we have not been advised as we should have been. We probably need a coordinator to advise us.

Mr. LANGER. We have sent committee after committee to the island. I have no objection to the article being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the admission of the article—and I do not intend to object—I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina whether or not he knows that this newspaper is an extremely biased publication, antagonistic to the present governor. I believe that it took the side of certain contractors in their fight with the Governor of Puerto Rico. These contractors claimed certain tax exemptions, which the Governor refused to grant. The claims for tax exemption were then taken to the courts of Puerto Rico, and I believe to the Federal court in this country, and were rejected. I think it would be interesting for the distinguished Senator from South Carolina to look into the cause, for the opposition of this newspaper to the Governor. The newspaper has been opposed to the Governor of Puerto Rico, Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, for a number of years. It has fought him tooth and nail.

When the Senator from South Carolina suggests that we investigate the regime of the Governor of Puerto Rico, it seems to me that he is enunciating a very unusual doctrine. The Governor was elected by the people under authority given to Puerto Rico by the Congress of the United States. Certainly we are not going to investigate a governor who has been elected by the people, whether it be the people of a State or of a Territory. He was not appointed by the President of the United States or by the Congress. He was elected by the people of Puerto Rico in a free election, by a great majority. The vote was a thoroughly well invested expression of confidence in a man who has long been a fine public servant.

With respect to the Constitution, which the Senator from South Carolina has discussed, and of which he is critical, I wish to point out that the proposal to hold an election, leading to a constitutional convention, was favorably reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, and was passed by the Congress. The people voted for it. The Constitution is now completed, and will be referred to the people for approval at an election on March 3. I do not know what greater or finer demonstration of democratic government we could have than in just what has happened in Puerto Rico.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Has the Senator been in Puerto Rico recently?

Mr. LEHMAN. I have been there, but I do not claim to be an expert on Puerto Rico.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator does not claim to be an expert?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; but I know a great many Puerto Ricans. There is a large population of Puerto Ricans in my State. They are good citizens—hard working and thrifty.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand that they are leaving Puerto Rico by the thousands and going to New York at the present time. They are pouring into New York, are they not?

Mr. LEHMAN. A great many are coming in and we welcome them, but I think that bears out what the Senator from North Dakota has been saying. We have never done enough for Puerto Rico, and we should do more. Puerto Ricans are receiving only a pittance in the form of aid or social security and they have great difficulty in finding gainful employment at home.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from New York realizes that at the present time we are pouring millions of dollars into Puerto Rico. We certainly should watch how we are spending those millions of dollars there, as well as our expenditures in the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly we should and I believe we are doing that.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It makes no difference where we spend the money, it is the Senator's duty and mine to look into the question and see whether we are spending it in the right places and in the right amounts.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no objection to the article referred to being printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEHIND THE SCENES

(By J. M. Garcia Calderon)

Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín—one-time champion of the cause of independence for Puerto Rico—is conducting superhuman efforts to convince our fellow citizens in the United States that the only person responsible for the propaganda being circulated from Mexico to Argentina and which presents our Nation as a cruel and inhuman and imperialist people who tyrannize and exploit the Puerto Rican unmercifully is Mr. Pedro Albizu Campos, the Nationalist leader who inspired the Nationalist uprising during the thirties and last October's insurrection.

Without any doubt, Mr. Albizu Campos shares the responsibility for the existence of this black story which is now being used by the agents of Moscow, and those countries south of the Rio Grande, to poison the feelings of those people toward the United States, and to sow prejudice and suspicion against the United States.

It is very, very true that part of the responsibility for the existence of this absurd story is Mr. Albizu Campos. But another part of the responsibility hangs on the very same leaders of the present government of Puerto Rico who contributed and cooperated in the sad mission of discrediting and defaming the United States.

YANKEE IMPERIALISM

The ink is still fresh which was used to print pamphlets and propaganda articles by the leaders of the present insular government denouncing "the Yankee imperialism in Puerto Rico." In many libraries—and amongst them my modest one—there are pamphlets written by leaders of the Insular Government accusing the United States of maintaining in Puerto Rico a regime of inhuman exploitation and loaded with falsehoods which would detract from the prestige of the United States.

The systematic campaign of discredit against the United States is not the work of Mr. Albizu Campos exclusively. In that unjust campaign can be seen the brain, the hand, and the name of Mr. Luis Muñoz-Marín.

Because its occurrence was fairly recent, many people must remember that Mr. Muñoz-Marín demanded in the year 1936 that the United States flag be removed from the speaker's platform in a meeting of the liberal party in Caguas before he would enter that platform.

POINT TO SIMILARITY

Such a conduct demonstrates nothing but hostility against the United States, and furnishes material for the black legend which was being woven to discredit the United States.

What was done by Mr. Muñoz-Marín in Caguas in 1936 was very similar to the preachings of Albizu Campos, about whom the one who is now Governor of Puerto Rico (Muñoz-Marín) then called the greatest thing that has happened in this country.

And it should also be remembered that about 13 or 14 years ago, when the Nationalists were fighting against Governor Blanton Winship, and other American and Puerto Rican officials, and were kicking and ripping the American flag in the university and in the central high school in Santurce, leaders of the present government of Puerto Rico (of Muñoz-Marín) applauded until their hands burned and expressed their support of the aggressors and offenders against the law.

Proof of this assertion and proof that leaders of the present Muñoz government of Puerto Rico tolerated the violence which was advised by Albizu Campos in the year 1936, and proof also that those leaders contributed and cooperated to the creation of the black legend which still discredits the United States, is contained in these declarations which Mr. Luis Muñoz-Marín made for the press on March 19, 1936. Regarding the Nationalists' violence, Mr. Muñoz-Marín then stated:

THEY ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE

"I only want to state today that, in any event that may occur, no Puerto Rican Gov-

ernment official who respects himself should fire on any student or against any other Puerto Rican. I state this with a full feeling of responsibility, and because I know that we Puerto Ricans are not responsible, but rather it is due to the incapacity of the Government of the United States that we face the situation prevailing in Puerto Rico, and which stimulates such collective tragedies."

Such words of Mr. Muñoz-Marín, as well as the words of Mr. Albizu Campos—more sharp but more, more serious than those of Mr. Muñoz-Marín—did not remain in the insular atmosphere; they expanded, flew, and circulated throughout the world, carrying a false but terrible accusation against the United States, which gave rise to suspicions that the Puerto Ricans were being burned alive, or that they were being shot ir the streets by the Americans.

During those same days—the year 1936—while Mr. Albizu Campos advised the overthrow of the Government of the United States in Puerto Rico, and Mr. Muñoz-Marín preached the abstinence of the "active and militant" voters, the late boss of the Liberal Party, Don Antonio Barcelo, denounced from the papers that "Albizu Campos was the instrument of someone in a conspiracy against holding the elections."

Who was the conspirator? Whose instrument was Albizu Campos in a conspiracy to avoid the holding of the elections? However, in spite of all of this damning coup, the leaders of the present [Muñoz] government of Puerto Rico still pretend to convince American citizens on the continent that they have always been traditionally loyal to the American citizenship and that the only evil and enemy of the United States, and slanderer of the United States, and poisoner of consciences against the United States, is Mr. Albizu Campos.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO TAKE A RECESS UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, several Senators are ill and under the care of their doctors. There is before the Senate the motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

That motion is being resisted.

If the motion were voted upon today or tomorrow it would require at least three Senators to leave their sick beds, contrary to doctors' orders, and come to the Senate to cast their votes.

The question is important, but it is not that important.

I have talked to Senators who are interested in the subject, and I understand that a motion may be made to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the motion to recommit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the Alaska statehood bill. Such a motion could be made and acted upon on Monday as well as today or tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. President, in order that Senators may know what the situation is I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks which the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is about to make the Senate take a recess until Monday, March 3, 1952.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have to object to such a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. My only object in presenting the unanimous-consent request was for the purpose of not making it necessary to keep Senators in the Chamber who are not physically able to be present. There seems to be some kind of bug going around other than the presidential bug.

MATERIAL SHORTAGES — UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE AUTOMOBILE AND OTHER INDUSTRIES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, new developments in the unemployment situation in Detroit, throughout Michigan, and other parts of the Nation have taken place in the past day or two, and I believe the Senate should be advised of them and their implications.

First, however, I would like to review the situation, as it was the latter part of January when I first addressed the Senate on the Michigan unemployment problem. On January 31 I pointed out that the newspapers were making much, and properly so, of the serious unemployment situation which has been created in the automobile-production centers by administration policies of curtailing the production of motor vehicles. From a level of 1,900,000 passenger cars produced in the third quarter of 1950, production has been progressively reduced through restrictions of material to not over 1,000,000 passenger cars for the first quarter of 1952, but with copper for only 930,000 cars. Employment has been correspondingly reduced by more than 150,000 workmen, and working hours have also fallen about 3 hours a week for those still employed.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. It is true, is it not, that most of the men who have been laid off are those who were last employed by the automobile corporations, which means that invariably it is American veterans who are being laid off? Is that not correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. In many cases that is the situation.

Mr. THYE. Invariably it is the youngest men on the payroll who are laid off. Quite often it means that it is the veteran who is laid off, because he is the man who got his job after he returned to civilian life. It has been my observation and understanding, from the information which has come to me, that very often the first one to be laid off is the young veteran who is in the process of accumulating what might be termed his little nest egg. It is he who is being discharged in many cases. When he loses his job, his unemployment compensation is usually not sufficient to meet his obligations, either for furniture or household equipment or in the purchase of a new home for which he has contracted. It is a very serious situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very serious. That is the way it works. In fact, although I have not made a complete survey of the subject, particularly with respect to the length of service of the men who are being laid off, it is reasonable to assume that the newer or junior workers are always laid off first.

On January 31, I said the worst, it seemed, was still to come. The action of the Administration guaranteed that another 65,000 workmen in the automobile industry alone would be laid off beginning with the second quarter, for the National Production Authority had released only enough copper in the second quarter of 1952 to build 800,000 automobiles.

To illustrate how figures are juggled, while production was being reduced to 1,000,000 passenger cars in the first quarter of 1952, sufficient copper was released for only 930,000 cars. In the second quarter, however, only sufficient copper was released to build 800,000 cars. That cut production by 130,000 cars below the available steel, yet saved only 3,000 tons of copper. Sixty-five thousand automobile workers were to be laid off during April, May, and June, which is the second quarter, because the National Production Authority could not find 3,000 tons of copper to keep the workmen employed. Their wage loss will be in excess of $60,000,000. The unemployment compensation during this period of unemployment will be more than $20,000,000.

Controlled materials plan tickets are issued for materials, but the Defense Production Administration acknowledges that there is an error of from 5 to 15 percent on the allocations because the tickets which would allow the manufacture of considerably more than 100,000 automobiles are not being cashed. This production of automobiles represents only one-tenth of 1 percent of the available copper. Yet there is a variation of from 5 to 15 percent in the allocations actually used throughout the Nation.

That was the situation in Detroit and in other parts of Michigan. The same situation existed in many other areas, as evidenced by an official Labor Department report on 174 major labor markets.

I have used the automobile industry to point up this subject because in certain automobile factories it can be demonstrated that for every 100,000 cars not manufactured in each quarter approximately 50,000 men are laid off. In scarcely any other business is it possible to make such an accurate survey as in the automobile business. That is why I have used the automobile industry to demonstrate what is happening.

Ninety-three of these areas were experiencing some unemployment toward the end of 1951 because of material shortages. These areas were widely spread across the Nation.

Mr. President, I should like to give a few examples: At Los Angeles, Calif., the losses in fabricated metals and autos as a result of materials restrictions nearly offset other manufacturing gains. At

Denver, Colo., materials restrictions check construction. At Waterbury, Conn., the decline in the important brass industry as a result of the copper, zinc, and scrap shortage and the short work weeks continues. Further cuts are likely at Wilmington, Del., because of the cutback in automobile production; and at Atlanta, Ga., because of a construction lay-off caused by the materials shortage.

I could go on at length, but I do not want to take the time of the Senate to list all 93 of these areas.

The critical situation with respect to copper was further highlighted on February 6 at a press conference by officers of the Defense Production Administration. At that time reporters asked whether it was true that a proposed restriction on new home construction would save only 300 tons of copper. The official answer was that despite this small saving the order was receiving serious consideration because every pound of copper was regarded as vital to the defense effort. Apparently every pound of copper was allocated for the second quarter of 1952.

Early this year, even the Defense Mobilizer said that copper and aluminum shortages threaten defense and civilian production quotas. He forecast "no help in the copper shortage situation until at least 1954." Think of it, Mr. President. At that time we were told there would be no help in connection with the copper shortage until at least 1954; so we were faced with the prospect of having our civilian economy limp along for another 2 years with severely reduced supplies of copper.

Let me refer to lead and zinc. By December 1951 the lead picture was so bad that the President authorized the transfer of 30,000 tons from the strategic stockpile in order to alleviate what appeared to be extreme shortages.

Mr. President, in connection with this record I have shown that these shortages are caused by the action of the International Materials Conference in allotting these materials to all the countries in the world outside the iron curtain, regardless of whether such countries are participating in the war effort or the defense build-up.

Furthermore, on February 1, 1952, the President authorized the withdrawal of 29,000 tons of zinc from the stockpile. Failure of zinc imports to reach normal volume was given as the reason for diversion of the metal.

It will be recalled that I showed that import price ceilings had been imposed on both lead and zinc. From the official statement of the Office of Defense Mobilization I read the statement that these ceilings would "reduce the pressure of United States demand on free world supplies, ease the problems of friendly consuming countries, and make any international allocation arrangement more effective."

That statement shows what is going on. Our officials fix a price on zinc which makes it impossible for zinc to be purchased in the open market. That is done in order that we may aid friendly consuming countries, and to make the international allocation arrangement more effective; in other words, to enforce the arrangements of the International Materials Conference, a cartel among the nations, a cartel of which the United States is the chief sponsor. Such arrangements applied to copper, zinc, and lead; but they do not apply to materials of which some of the participating countries already have control, for instance, tin. Tin was not acted on by the conference, although the United States has been short of tin. However, the conference created what is known as a study group, another kind of cartel, by which the conference hopes to exercise further control. So it is that the United States of America suffers because of the action taken by these international cartels.

The directive of the Defense Mobilizer also said:

> The establishment of a ceiling which is somewhat below current world prices involves the calculated risk of some decrease of imports.

Mr. President, why would not that be the case? Will foreign producers sell their goods to us if we will not pay the current price in the world market?

Why were we taking that step? We were doing so in order to enable the other countries to obtain lead and zinc, although at the same time United States industries would not be able to obtain those materials. Thus there would be a shutdown among United States industries which require lead and zinc, and a resultant curtailment in United States production for war purposes. Apparently the risk was not calculated very well because, as I showed a few moments ago, the zinc did not come into this country.

This was the situation, as presented by the defense officials, until early in February. Lead had to be removed from the stockpile in December. Zinc was removed from the stockpile on February 1.

Yet on February 6, Defense Production Administration officials at their press conference said, "We are getting adequate supplies of zinc."

Mr. President, if American industries wish to operate, apparently they must attend all the press conferences of the defense production agencies and of the other boards, in order to be able to know what is going on and to operate their businesses.

I wonder whether there is any connection between my remarks on the International Materials Conference of January 31 and February 4, and the February 6 statement that there is plenty of zinc, which sharply contrasts with the Government's action in removing zinc from the stockpile only 5 days before, only the day before my first speech exposing the International Materials Conference.

I am sure that no new zinc supplies were found during those 5 days, and I am equally sure that the military and defense situation did not change that much in less than a week. The procurement and allocation agencies simply did a somersault. Now, within a month of my first speech on this floor on the international allocation of materials by the International Materials Conference, we are seeing some more somersaults.

However, Mr. President, those in charge are not yet willing to acknowledge their mistakes. They are not yet willing to acknowledge that they are participating in a cartel which has control of the raw materials of the world. Until they reach the point where they are willing to acknowledge generally, particularly to the people of the United States, what is being done, we shall have no relief, or at least we shall not have the amount of relief we sholud have. Of course, it is true that some steps of a remedial character are being taken.

First, let us examine the acrobatics in the lead situation. Withdrawals from the stockpile were made in December. Orders controlling the use of lead in automobile storage batteries, issued as recently as December 19, are now about to be revoked by the National Production Authority, and the lead allocations will be made on a quarterly basis, instead of monthly, as a result of improved supplies of the material.

Second, we are about to witness a turnabout in the copper situation. In my previous speeches I have contended that copper is available in both the domestic and international markets. Previously I referred to a telegram which I received from a New York firm which offered to sell copper in the world market. Now the National Production Authority apparently has discovered the same thing.

We now learn that the National Production Authority is considering allocating sufficient copper to prevent the predicted lay-off of 65,000 additional automobile workers in the second quarter of 1952. Of course, that should be done; and copper should also be available for use in connection with the construction of homes and other buildings and for other civilian uses. But, remember that on January 31 it was said there was only sufficient copper to produce 800,000 cars in the second quarter, and I am wondering where the additional copper really came from.

I said then, and I now repeat, that there is only one quick way to raise employment in the automotive centers to a tolerable level, namely, to increase the allowable passenger-car production to 1,100,000 cars per quarter and the allowable truck production to 275,000 per quarter, the rate allowed during the fourth quarter of 1952.

If production of automobiles in the United States is limited to 3,900,000 in the entire year, in view of the fact that at the present time 4,000,000 automobiles are being taken off the roads each year, the result would be a decrease to the extent of 100,000 in the number of automobiles in operation.

Mr. President, the authorities have classified automobiles with toys and jewelry, not as necessities.

I point to the people who will not have automobiles when their old cars are taken off the road. How will they get to work? How will they be provided with the necessary transportation? Railroads and other means of transportation are treated as necessary for defense, but, up

to this time, that is not true of automobiles. The rate allowed during the fourth quarter of 1951 is, as I said, 1,100,000 cars per quarter, and 250,000 trucks. This will require so little additional scarce materials in comparison to the cost of the unemployment itself that there can be no justification for permitting a further continuation of this unjustifiable situation.

I called this situation to the attention of the defense mobilization and production agencies on February 21 in a letter to Mr. Wilson, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and Mr. Fleischmann, Administrator of the Defense Production Agency. My letter reads:

FEBRUARY 21, 1952.

CHARLES E. WILSON,
Director of Defense Mobilization, Washington, D. C.
MANLY FLEISCHMANN,
Administrator, Defense Production Administration, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIRS: May I strongly urge that allocations of steel, copper, and aluminum for the automobile industry in the second quarter of 1952 be immediately increased to permit the production of 1,000,000 cars and 275,000 trucks.

The immediate unemployment and the unemployment forecast for the second and third quarter which Detroit and other parts of Michigan now face can only be corrected through increased allocations for civilian production.

An increase in the allocations of steel, copper, and aluminum for the automobile industry in the second quarter will prevent the unemployment of an additional 65,000 men on April 1 and bring about the reemployment of additional thousands.

Steel and aluminum are in surplus and are available. Copper, the most critical of the three materials, is available in the international and the domestic market. Such an increase in allocations will have no adverse effect on the defense effort.

I am one of those who are advocating that we should first take care of the defense requirements; but, Mr. President, I do not want to see materials accumulated merely for the reason that the Defense Department has the dollars with which to buy them, although it may not have the factories within which to manufacture the needed defense items. That is what we have to watch, and that is what is taking place. I continue:

In fact, by maintaining a strong national economy, this increase in allocations will assist the defense effort.

I sincerely hope that you will immediately increase the quotas of these materials and cancel the present second quarter cut-back in the number of cars and trucks which may be manufactured. Delay will only cause further unemployment and dislocations because the production cannot be increased overnight.

I signed that letter.

I predict that by the third quarter of 1952, as the election draws near, the National Production Authority will discover enough copper to permit the production of at least 1,100,000 passenger cars and 275,000 trucks as demanded in my letter of February 21.

I am sure that in the fourth quarter we will again be operating at this level. Mr. President, I wonder if the fact that the election falls in the fourth quarter has any bearing on these increased allocations, particularly in view of the statement of the Defense Mobilizer that the copper shortage will last until at least 1954.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan whether there has been an accelerated demand on the part of the Defense Department for additional trucks to be manufactured by the automobile companies.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; there has been an increase in the number of trucks.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. If the Senator will yield further, has this cut-back order affected any of the truck quotas?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not understand that it affects military trucks.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. As I understand from what the distinguished Senator has said, the greatest bottleneck is in copper allocations.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. There is even a surplus of steel. We have all heard it said that steel could not be obtained for schools, hospitals, and so forth; but we are now discovering that some blast furnaces have to be closed down because there is more steel than can be used. That is what I am complaining about. An effort is being made to hold up on steel, on the theory that, if it is needed, the dollars are available with which to buy it; and, by the way, there was available on January 1 $80,000,000,000, with which material for defense could be purchased. The Congress has appropriated so much money, more money than can possibly be used. But the material is being held up, and tickets are being issued on the theory that the money is available with which to buy it, therefore it can be obtained.

But it is impossible to use it, and that accounts for the surplus of steel at the present time. As I have said, blast furnaces are being shut down. It is still necessary to consult the Defense Department, before steel can be obtained to meet the demands of schools and municipalities. For example, in a town in Michigan very recently steel was needed for the erection of a jail; but it has been impossible to obtain an allotment of steel, though we now discover that steel mills are closing down as the result of a lack of orders.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Referring to his remarks about schools and jails, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, that the senior Senator from Kansas has been trying to be of assistance to certain communities in the State of Kansas procuring necessary materials. I have been informed that the steel is not available. Yet there is a plentiful supply, and I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I think his comments are very pertinent. I am unable to understand why, all at once, there is a surplus. I do not wish to be critical. I am able to understand why cut-backs may become necessary in some instances, as in the case of certain critical types of material, such as copper. We have encountered serious bottlenecks in connection with obtaining steel necessary for hospitals, schools, and churches, although, as the Senator from Michigan says, blast furnaces are closing down at this time because of a lack of orders. To me that presents an inconceivable situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

THE MASTER MINDS OF THE WASHINGTON SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT—FOREIGN NATIONS OUTBID US WITH OUR MONEY

Mr. MALONE. Does the Senator from Michigan understand that with the money we have furnished European countries they are outbidding us for copper and other strategic materials on the open market, and that the price of copper in European countries is now running as high as 50 and 60 cents a pound compared to a ceiling on our domestic copper of 24½ cents per pound and 27½ cents per pound that we can pay for foreign copper?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; we have found that to be so in the case of copper and also in the case of lead and zinc. Our Government places a price on lead and zinc and on copper, then, in order that they may be bought by other countries in the open market, and in order that the market may not be flooded, our Government sees to it that other countries are financed so as to be able to buy copper, zinc, and lead at the higher prices.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, there is no top price and there is no limit to what the foreign countries may buy with our money on the foreign markets.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. We have a ceiling price of our own, a ceiling on what we may pay for our own copper and also for foreign copper, and also on lead and zinc. Is that not true?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. The price of foreign copper is 3½ cents a pound more than in the local market, which is 24 cents.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. The socialistic free trade administration last year, when there was a great argument in the Senate in favor of free trade in copper, as the junior Senator from Nevada recalls, he called attention to the fact that that very condition would result if we removed the tariff or duty. I now understand that the same thing is happening in connection with lead and zinc; the foreign trading price is running 10 to 15 cents more than the domestic ceiling price.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. All three of these metals were forced through the free trade wringer a few weeks ago, on the Senate floor. An effort was recently made to force through free trade on tungsten, a strategic mineral, but the effort was abandoned when objection was made.

Does the distinguished Senator from Michigan believe that the great master

minds have outmasterminded themselves on the question of price control and allocations in a peacetime market?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think what has happened is the result of the action of a few people in Washington. I am giving full credit to Mr. Wilson as an able industrialist; the job is too big for the minds of some other officials. That is my honest opinion. They will not do necessary things at the time they ought to be done.

The difficulty in Washington is that people acquire a vested interest in error, and once a politician acquires a vested interest in an error, we cannot change his mind. He continues to carry on. That is the difficulty in this whole question.

THE ADMINISTRATION HAS A VESTED RIGHT TO THEIR OWN MISTAKES

Mr. MALONE. It seems to me that the junior Senator from Nevada made a speech 6 or 7 months ago in which he stated that they had a vested right in their own mistakes.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not mean to take the honor of having used that expression away from the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. But is not that what is the matter? In other words, there are master minds in Washington who know all, see all, and judge all, when, as a matter of fact, no human and no small group of human beings can do that, and everyone knows it except a Socialist. Yet that is what we have in the White House and what we have operating the Government. They do not know enough about the business of this Nation to realize that they do not know—and that is the most colossal ignorance on earth.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are many men in our Government who are not collectivists or Socialists, but I say that there are enough of them so that when the others obtain the facts from those who have collectivist minds, big Government minds, big bureaucracy minds, their opinion is colored in such a way that the true facts cannot be obtained. Some of them are honest in their opinions. I do not say that a Socialist is not honest in his opinion when he says everything ought to be run by the Government, that we ought to have one world so far as raw materials are concerned; that we ought to say to the American people, "Why worry about 65,000 workers in Detroit when we can put people to work in India or some other country? Should we not be willing to share unemployment?"

They think that is right. In their own mind, as humanitarians, they believe that is the way it should be done, that we should not consider the United States as a whole, but should consider the world, and as we are now having a real war with certain countries of the world, we will exclude those areas.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MALONE. Of course they do not admit that there is a real war, do they? They say it is simply a police action, do they not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I know the soldiers consider it to be a real war.

THE PRESIDENT'S POLICE ACTION

Mr. MALONE. The veterans of other wars think it is a real war, too. But the Socialists in this administration say it is a police action; and they say that we are going to have similar police actions in Egypt, the Malay States, and Indochina.

I am glad the Senator has brought out the fact that it is possible to so surround a man of the caliber of Mr. Wilson so he also becomes one of them. He is surrounded by Socialists, and even though he himself is not a Socialist he is following their lead.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think Mr. Wilson would be the first to admit that he must rely upon some persons who have collectivist minds. It is impossible to do the job perfectly alone. That is why there is an error of 5 to 15 percent in estimates for material.

DESTROY THE INCENTIVE TO PRODUCE

Mr. MALONE. Is it not a fact that most of those in the key subordinate positions have either failed in business or have never been in business? They are planted in the Government. They can write very convincing books about business, but in reality they know nothing about it, so that in the long run they simply destroy the incentive to produce.

Pressing down on the price without producing more goods is like putting their fingers on the snout of the teakettle to hold in the escaping steam without pulling the fire—everybody gets hurt.

Mr. FERGUSON. The more the Government comes in to take care of the situation.

Mr. MALONE. Finally the whole thing blows up, but then it is too late.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator realizes that while I cannot agree that all these "tops" are Socialists——

AVERAGE OUR LIVING STANDARDS WITH EUROPE

Mr. MALONE. They go along with the Socialists who believe in a one economic world.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that in some places in the Government there are those who, in their own minds, honestly believe in collectivism or socialism.

Mr. MALONE. Therein lies our danger. The State Department has continually recommended that we make up Europe's trade balance deficit in dollars—Marshall plan—each year until such time as we could divide our markets with them through free trade—reciprocal trade—to the point that there would be no trade balance deficits—the living standards would be averaged.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is the province of the Senate and of the House to understand what is being done. It is stated in a letter from the State Department that the International Materials Conference is a good thing; that materials should be divided up with the world, regardless of whether this country is actually endeavoring to mobilize and produce materials for the war effort; that we ought to seek to bring about harmony in the world, even to the extent of giving up our high standard of living, for it is not fair for a nation like America to have such a high standard of living.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator has put his finger right on the crucial point for the first time. That is exactly the objective of the entire foreign-policy program of the administration—to destroy our economic system and average the living standards of America, Europe, and Asia. Does the Senator agree with that theory?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. That is why I am on the floor today.

Mr. MALONE. Then let us fight it from here out and make it an issue in the campaign this coming fall—the Socialist administration's four horsemen of disaster—free trade, deficit financing, progressive taxation, and progressive education.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is not free trade. They get around that. They advocate free trade out of one side of their mouth, but they institute quotas and price controls. So it is not a question of free trade. This international cartel deals in quotas. Copper can be bought outside the United States today, but people cannot use it when they bring it into this country.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Since March 4, 1948, the junior Senator from Nevada has been standing at this desk emphasizing that free—reciprocal—trade as practiced by the Secretary of State cannot work for the very reason that the foreign countries practice the quota system, embargoes, specifications, and the manipulation of their money systems for trade advantage.

The whole sterling-bloc system, for example, is set up as a form of piracy to rob other nations, and to pull down our standard of living. European nations even claim a dollar shortage, which is caused by fixing the price of their currency in dollars higher than the market price, and, of course, no one will pay dollars for it, except an ignorant Congress. A wonderful idea, and it was sold to a trusting American public through the so-called bipartisan group on the Senate floor.

The American public will not continue falling for this kind of tommyrot much longer.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not blame the people of other countries.

Mr. MALONE. Neither do I blame them for getting away with it if they can, but I blame the Senators on this Senate floor for voting for it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think they are looking out for their own interests.

Mr. MALONE. The American people are catching up with the so-called bipartisan group which continually pushed through free trade-deficit financing, progressive taxation, and progressive education, and I believe that November 5 will see the last of it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, automobile workmen are not the only ones

who are victims of this administration's global economic planning. Thousands of workmen in other industries are suffering from the same mistaken actions.

The construction industry is one of the groups I have in mind. We now learn that relaxation of controls on construction is viewed by Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer as one of the signs of an accelerating pattern of decontrol in the months ahead, and the National Production Authority is giving the green light to certain construction projects previously banned.

I have contended for some time that many Government officials seem to believe in control for the sake of controls, and not for the sake of the defense effort. We have granted sweeping powers to the administration to defend the free world, and we did so with the assurance that no control would be retained longer than it was needed. About a year ago, the National Production Authority banned the manufacture of white sidewall tires in order to conserve natural rubber. The rubber industry raised no protest, as the Government was building its stockpile of natural rubber, and everyone wished to cooperate. Today the National Production Authority is amending the rubber order so that private contracts for the purchase of natural rubber may be made, as the stockpile has apparently reached safe levels. However, we find that the National Production Authority plans to remove the year-old ban on the output of white sidewall tires by July. They are holding it until July. Why cannot that ban be lifted now, since its only justification was a shortage of natural rubber? White sidewall tires are coming into the United States today from Canada and other countries and are being sold at black-market prices because of these restrictions. Employment in our own rubber centers is again being adversely effected. Perhaps the lifting of the white sidewall ban by July may be connected with administration efforts to extend the Defense Production Act. They may wish to show how ready they are to decontrol when they are asking for more controls.

The continuation of this or any other unnecessary control is a very expensive proposition for the taxpayers of the United States, when one considers the cost of maintaining the controls and enforcing them, not to mention the loss in employment and tax revenue caused by restricted production. There is also a tremendous burden of paper work for every producer caused by the red tape incident to controls.

The additional materials now being released to industry will swell employment and payrolls during the period immediately preceding November. These companies probably have crews of men merely to read press releases about what is going on in Washington with respect to price controls.

So long as the provisions of the Defense Production Act may be used to implement international allocations we have no assurance that after November more somersaults will not be in order. Perhaps then we may find that materials have again become scarce and unemployment rampant as a necessary part of our world planning.

I shall continue to bring these matters before the Senate until we have taken the necessary action to prevent the provisions of the Defense Production Act from being usurped for unauthorized and socialistic purposes.

RECESS TO MONDAY—ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Arizona if he would not be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement that by 4 o'clock on Monday afternoon we might have a vote on his motion that the tidelands bill be made the unfinished business before the Senate.

The Democratic Party has control of the Senate, and the majority leader has made a motion to bring before the Senate a piece of proposed legislation. We on this side of the aisle wish to be cooperative in getting a vote on the bill. All we ask is that instead of prolonged discussion without a vote, we be allowed to vote the Senator's motion either up or down. It seems to me that is perfectly fair. It does not seem to be unreasonable.

The motion was made by the Senator last night. We would have been glad to vote upon it last night. We have been here all day today without having had an opportunity to vote on the motion of the Senator from Arizona. We are perfectly willing to cooperate in agreeing to take a recess until Monday, but it seems to me there should not be any hesitation on the part of the majority leader to agreeing that after 4 hours of discussion on Monday there might be a vote upon his own motion. That is all we ask.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from California that it has not been my hesitation that has prevented a vote by the Senate. If we were to have a quorum call, which we should do where the interested parties have not been consulted, I am informed that some Senator would object to a unanimous-consent agreement.

I am willing to do my best to work out a plan on Monday to reach an agreement. However, knowing the temperament of the Senate this afternoon, I feel that nothing can be accomplished by trying to arrange a unanimous-consent agreement at this time.

I may say also that I know there are Senators present on the floor who left sick beds to come here. One Senator in particular, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], came here from his sickbed because of his interest in the tidelands oil bill. I do not think it is fair to jeopardize the health of Senators by seeking to do what I believe would be a useless thing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say most respectfully to the able majority leader that all we are asking is that we be allowed to vote on his motion. I may say very frankly that I shall oppose his motion when it is laid before the Senate, because I think there was a commitment that the two statehood bills would be the first bills taken up, namely, the bill granting statehood to Alaska, which the Senate voted to recommit to the committee, and following that the bill granting statehood to Hawaii.

I think not only Senators, but also the people of Hawaii, are entitled to have the issue clearly raised, so that the sentiment of a majority of the Senate on the question of statehood for Hawaii may be made plain.

The Senator has mentioned the fact that Members of the Senate are tired, and that some of them are ill. I have no doubt that there are 500,000 people in Hawaii who are somewhat sick today by reason of the action which was taken yesterday with respect to Alaska, and that probably 128,000 people in Alaska are a little sick because after 80 years of waiting, they were barred at the door and their hopes for statehood were sent back to committee.

If the Senator from Arizona is not willing to agree that there be a vote on Monday, would he be willing to agree to have a vote on Tuesday?

This is such an unusual situation, since it involves a motion by the majority leader himself, that I should like to have some assurance about when there will be a vote on his motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. It is not within my power to work out a unanimous-consent agreement at this time. I know that there is objection to unanimous-consent agreements being made now, and there is nothing to be gained by making such a request. When Monday arrives, I will see what can be done. But the Senator should not speak to me about what I am willing to do. I do not govern in these matters. It is the desire of the Senate which governs.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Since it is necessary to have a quorum call to see whether a unanimous-consent agreement can be reached, I wonder if the Senator would be willing that we have a quorum call now and determine whether we could get a unanimous-consent agreement. If Monday is too early for a vote on the Senator's motion, I shall not press for a vote at that time, but it would be satisfactory if we could have a vote at 2 or 3 o'clock Tuesday afternoon, so that the Senate will not be placed in the ridiculous position of not being able to get even a preliminary vote on the question of whether the tidelands measure shall be taken up. Until that is disposed of, a motion cannot be made to take up the statehood-for-Hawaii bill. I am merely trying to expedite the business of the Senate.

I quite agree with the Senator from Arizona that the tidelands bill is an important legislative proposal. I am sure there is no State in the Union that has greater interest in this subject than has the State of California, and if it were not for the fact that I believe we have a firm

commitment to the people of Hawaii that the Hawaii statehood bill shall be considered, I would be joining with the Senator in asking that the tidelands bill be proceeded with. But I believe we have a commitment to the people of Hawaii, and all I am trying to do is to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, before the request of the Senator from California could be acted on it would be necessary to call for a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. Under the circumstances we should consult the interested parties or call a quorum. It would not be necessary to call for a quorum on a request to set a time for a vote on a motion to take up a measure. That rule applies only to final vote on a measure. It would not be necessary to have a quorum call before entering into an agreement on a time to vote on a motion to take up.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can a unanimous consent request for a final vote on a motion to take up a measure be made without a previous quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that a quorum call is not necessary in the case of a unanimous-consent request to take up a measure, but an agreement to vote on final passage cannot be made without a quorum call first being had.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is a motion pending to take up a joint resolution. I am referring to a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on a motion to take up a measure. What I am inquiring is whether such a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on a motion to take up a measure at a certain time can be made without a quorum having first been called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that in such case a quorum call is not necessary, but that an agreement to vote on the final passage of a bill cannot be entered into without a previous quorum call.

Mr. McFARLAND. I so understood. So far as I personally am concerned, I should certainly be willing to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote at any time. However, as majority leader, I feel that I would have to consult with other Senators who are interested and I would do so whether the Senators interested happened to be on this side of the aisle or on the other. I have never yet proposed a unanimous-consent agreement without first consulting with the interested Senators.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The only reason I made the parliamentary inquiry was to make sure it is not necessary to call for a quorum to determine whether unanimous consent shall be given this afternoon.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I hope some arrangement can be arrived at by Monday. I have no objection, in the meantime, to trying to arrive at an agreement. I know that a good many Senators are absent at the moment. Some have gone home because of illness. I should certainly object if the request were made without calling for a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator will have that privilege, when I make my motion to recess. The Senator from Arkansas has just stated that he would object to any unanimous-consent agreement being made without a quorum call. The question now is whether or not the Senate is to take a recess until Monday. We can in the meantime try to reach an agreement. I can see nothing to be gained by colloquies or speeches on one side or the other. I am trying to be fair to all Senators. I see nothing to be gained by a quorum call, but if the Senator from California wants it he is entitled to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. As the acting minority leader I am merely exploring the situation to see if there is any reasonable basis for conducting the business of the Senate, so that we can have some assurance of a vote on Tuesday, if not on Monday. The able Senator from Arkansas has indicated that he would object to an agreement for a vote on Monday. It is his right, as a Member of this body, to do so. I was trying to explore the situation to see whether he would have the same objection to an agreement for a vote on Tuesday.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The Senator from Arkansas will object to any agreement being made this afternoon for a vote until further progress is made toward working out a satisfactory arrangement. The Senator from California can call for a quorum if he so desires. It will not inconvenience me. It will simply inconvenience other Senators.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Before I ask for a quorum call, if the Senator from Arizona does not mind, I should like to have the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] express his view.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon thinks this is the most fantastic situation he has ever seen on the floor of the Senate. Yesterday the majority leader took the position that the critical need of this country for oil was such that we must get to work on the tidelands bill without delay. If he wants to get to work on it, why does he not do something toward that end? Why does he not get at it? What is the reason why we stand idle today, and face idleness tomorrow? What is the answer?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will give the Senator the answer.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to have it.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator well knows that the discussion is not getting us anywhere, and will not get us anywhere.

Mr. CORDON. I am afraid that is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. I know the temper of the Senate. I know that I cannot get a vote on my motion this evening, and I will not be able to get a vote on it tomorrow. If we continue to make plays, one side against the other, we shall get nowhere. I am trying to find a solution for our difficulties. I think perhaps we can agree upon a time for a vote, but I know that it cannot be done this evening.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator try it tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not going to try it tomorrow. I am going to make a motion that the Senate take a recess until Monday. The Senator can resist that motion if he so desires, and the Senate can resist it if it so desires. I know what is taking place, and the Senator from Oregon knows.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon certainly thinks he knows, and he does not like it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Will the distinguished majority leader tell us why, in his opinion, it would not be wise to have a session of the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. McFARLAND. I believe that the only result would be a great deal of talk. As I have said previously, one Senator got out of his bed to come here and be on the floor of the Senate, against the orders of his physician. And three other Senators are ill. Some of those Senators will probably vote against my motion, but they would have to get out of their sick beds and come here to do so.

I know what is going to take place. I know that until we can fix a time when Senators can be present and have a fair vote, we are not going to be able to get an agreement to vote.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is a situation which the Senate will always face. If we postpone action for 3 days, 3 other Senators may be unable to be present, or 10 other Senators may be compelled to be out of the city. All we are asking for is a vote on the pending motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator knows how to get it, I am perfectly willing to yield to him to do so.

There is no need to point the finger of accusation at me because the Senator cannot get a vote. The Senator knows he cannot get it, just as well as I do and all this opposition to my motion to recess is just horseplay for the benefit of the newspapers.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is mistaken. There are some of us who feel just as strongly that the horseplay which is taking place is at the expense of 500,000 people of Hawaii and 128,000

people of the Territory of Alaska who were promised faithfully in the Democratic national platform that they would be granted immediate statehood, and who were promised in the Republican platform that they would be granted eventual statehood. We feel that there is a commitment and a covenant with the people of both those Territories, as well as with the people of the United States. The Senate should not be placed in the ridiculous position of not being able even to reach a vote on the motion of the majority leader. I think I know why we cannot reach a vote. It is because the majority leader of the Senate knows that he has not the votes to sidetrack the bill providing statehood for the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; the Senator may go ahead and talk and talk and talk if he so desires. Let him conjecture and speculate as to what he thinks the majority leader has or has not. However, I know the practical situation and we are not going to be able to reach a vote this evening. I have asked Senators to quit talking in order that the Senate may take a recess until Monday, because nothing can be accomplished today. I have worked out unanimous-consent agreements in the past, and I think I know something about what is required for such an agreement as is now contemplated. I know that this kind of horseplay does not result in an agreement.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I always consult interested Senators on both sides of the aisle. I have always tried to extend the utmost courtesy to Senators on both sides of the aisle. I know that this kind of talk does not do anyone any good. It does not do the people of Hawaii any good. We cannot arrive at an agreement by stirring up dissension, or by agitation which produces more talk.

I now yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. As the majority leader knows, all of us are interested in saving time. If there were to be a session of the Senate tomorrow, would it not be reasonable to assume that the majority leader could conveniently, between now and the session tomorrow, confer with absent Senators, in order that perhaps tomorrow a decision might be reached as to when a vote could be had on the pending motion?

Mr. McFARLAND. I consulted the distinguished minority leader before he left the floor. I do not wish to speak for him, but certainly I would not have suggested a unanimous-consent agreement to recess after the senior Senator from Michigan concluded his remarks if I had not felt it was agreeable to the distinguished minority leader. I consulted the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I consulted the Senators who are interested in the subject. It was thought advisable, in view of the situation as it exists, to have the matter go over until Monday, so that Senators would have time to think it through.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say, as acting majority leader, that I shall not suggest the absence of a quorum in view of what has taken place on the floor of the Senate, and the statement of the Senator from Arizona that there are a number of Senators who should not be on the floor because of illness. I regret that it is not possible for the Senate to meet tomorrow. I say that very sincerely, and not in any sense of horseplay, because I am as deeply interested in the bill as is any other Member on the floor, and have been for the 7 years I have been a Member of the Senate. Obviously we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow, and we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Monday or Tuesday. Under the circumstances I do not see that any purpose can be served by bringing Senators to the floor at this late hour in the day.

Mr. McFARLAND. In behalf of the Senators who are ill I wish to express my appreciation. So far as I am concerned, it does not make any difference, because I am on the floor.

Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from California, that if I thought it would serve any purpose or accomplish anything to have a session of the Senate tomorrow, I certainly would be in favor of such a session. However, there comes a time when Senators must be given an opportunity to consider the situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to make this inquiry: Suppose the Senate adjourns until Monday, would a motion to reconsider be in order on Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would be in order on Monday. I made that statement a little earlier in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states it would be in order to make such a motion on Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. That was another reason why we thought it was advisable to go over until Monday. By doing so Senators would have two additional days before making a motion to reconsider and would make it possible for them to be present.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senate has been in session for almost 2 months. The Senator from Idaho comes from a State which is far removed from Washington. It is impossible for him to spend every week end or 2 or 3 days a week in his home bailiwick. The Senator from Idaho would like to know when the Senate will begin to undertake seriously the consideration of a program which will enable Senators to complete their work prior to next Christmas.

I recall that in the first session of the Eighty-second Congress I was in complete accord with the efforts of the distinguished majority leader in his appeal for cooperation from the Members of this body, so that the work of the Senate could be expedited.

Just recently a unanimous-consent agreement was entered into on a Wednesday for the taking of a vote on the succeeding Wednesday. It meant that in the intervening week there was virtually no business transacted in the Senate, and Members were free to leave Washington.

I should like to know when it will be possible to get down to a workable program. Otherwise, I believe that Senators from States in the far West and in the Rocky Mountain region are entitled to take 3 or 4 days off each week, or probably a whole week, and perhaps arrange for some additional mileage, so that they can return home every week or perhaps every other week. In that way the Senate probably would be in session throughout the 12 months of the year.

The Senator from Arizona knows how difficult it is to continue with sessions of the Senate for only 2 or 3 days a week. I am sure that he likewise would like to see some program of accelerated action adopted by this body. We are frequently subjected to criticism by the public because we allegedly do not get something done, particularly this year, the possibility being that we probably will not accomplish very much other than the passage of appropriation bills.

Can the distinguished majority leader give us any definite and specific information as to what we may expect, so that we may plan accordingly?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Idaho, that he is, of course, asking the $64 question. If I could have my own way about it, I would proceed very rapidly with quite a number of matters. I had hoped yesterday that we could take up the consideration of the tidelands joint resolution and that we could debate it today and tomorrow, and probably get a vote on it on Monday or Tuesday of next week. That would have given Senators who are interested in the statehood bills time to consider what course of action they wanted to take. However, I did not get my way. Several Senators resisted my effort in that direction. Therefore, I find that I must do the best I can.

I hope that we shall be able to get an agreement. I concur very heartily in what the Senator from Idaho has said, namely, that we cannot afford to work merely 2 or 3 days a week. Actually, we have worked 5 days a week most of the time. We took some time off to enable Senators on the other side to make the Lincoln Day addresses. It has been customary to do that, and in yielding to the request that that be done I did not yield to anything that had not been done during previous years. I hope that we shall be able to make more progress in the future.

My only reason for making the motion to recess until Monday, I may say to my good friend from Idaho, is that in my opinion nothing could be gained by being in session tomorrow. I know that neither side will allow a vote until they

feel they have a good representation on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Senator from Virginia would like to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] to the fact, which he would realize if he were a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that the committee has been making hay while the sun has been shining for Senators who have not been in Washington. Time has not been lost, by any means. The most important legislation which we will consider at this session is a bill which could wreck the Government financially, and that bill, when it reaches the floor, will occupy the Senate fully. That is the kind of essential legislation which we will have to consider at this session.

So far as the Senator from Virginia is concerned, in recent years he has had more complaint about what we have done than about what we have not done. I do not feel that the majority leader is properly subject to criticism if committees are spending time in preparing the essential legislation the Senate must consider.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho in no way intended to be critical of the majority leader. He merely wished to point out that we have fallen into the dubious practice of reaching unanimous-consent agreements to vote in a week or 2 weeks from the time the agreement is entered into, with very little being accomplished during the intervening time.

The Senator from Virginia stated that the Committee on Appropriations is functioning. All committees, I assume, are functioning; but, regardless of what is being accomplished by committees, a certain amount of work must be done on the floor of the Senate. If we defer indefinitely from one week to another, we will be here all summer and all fall.

If the Senator from Arizona will yield further, I should like to point out that I know that some concessions were made for the convenience of Lincoln Day speakers during one week. However, I am sure that we cannot go on justifying a delay in the legislative program merely because during one week several Republican Senators engaged in Lincoln Day speeches. I am sure that within a very short time members of the majority party will be making speeches at Jefferson-Jackson Day dinners. That cannot be used as justification for deferring indefinitely the transaction of business by this body.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend I merely wanted to make it plain that in consenting to that arrangement I did not think I should be criticized, because it had been done in the past and was customary.

I realize that the Senator from Idaho is anxious to proceed. During the last session he was very cooperative in helping to reach votes on proposed legislation. He was one of those on his side of the aisle who was very helpful in that respect; I say "one of those" because from his side of the aisle we had a great deal of cooperation with respect to expediting action on the business before the Senate. Certainly I am not claiming the credit for myself or saying that some of us on this side of the aisle were the only ones who tried to expedite consideration of and action upon various measures. Senators on both sides of the aisle were most helpful in that respect.

However, when we come to a situation that does not permit of action we may as well recognize it. That is what I meant to convey. I only resented being attacked for the situation existing on the floor of the Senate, for which I am not responsible.

I am not to blame if Senators differ in their views or if they have different ideas regarding the best time to have various legislative proposals considered by the Senate or the best time for the taking of votes on them. Such differences of opinion occur among Senators on both sides of the aisle. I realize that every Senator wishes to have the vote on any measure taken at a time when he believes there will be fair representation on the floor of the Senate.

Let me say now that I do not like to have unanimous-consent agreements objected to for the reason that some Senator is to be out of the city.

On the other hand, I know that some Senators are ill, and no one should be blamed for that.

RELEASE OF NONBATTLE CASUALTY FIGURES FOR THE KOREAN WAR

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I addressed to the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense, under date of February 23, 1952. The letter reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 23, 1952.

Hon. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Late on Thursday afternoon, February 21, I requested through a member of my staff, from the Department of Defense, the accumulated nonbattle casualty figures for Korea, since June 26, 1950. On Saturday, February 23, I received word that this information could be made available on my written request.

It would be very much appreciated if you would have one of your staff obtain the above information for me at the earliest possible moment.

With many thanks.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

Mr. President, let me say that I expected to obtain the information requested in that letter, because during the so-called MacArthur hearings the Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff brought that information before the committees conducting those hearings.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate and as a member of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Appropriations Committee, I have never been so shocked as I was when I received from the Secretary of Defense a letter which gives me a rather polite brush-off in regard to this matter.

For the information of the Senate, because I shall make an issue of this matter before the Armed Services Committee and before the Appropriations Committee, I shall read into the RECORD at this time the letter I received in reply, from the Secretary of Defense:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 28, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In response to your request for data on so-called nonbattle casualties, I have had the subject explored and am advised that Army regulations for some time have excluded from the casualty category any person not killed, missing, captured, interned, wounded, or injured in action. All of these categories are included in the Department of Defense weekly battle casualty releases and battle casualties totaled 105,992 for the period through February 22, 1952. The total of 151 battle casualties for the week ending February 22 is the lowest for any week since July 1950.

You will recall that in the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations last May, General Collins testified as to the lack of significance and unreliability of any so-called nonbattle casualty figures and told you that if a person goes, for instance, to ask for an aspirin tablet he is included as a nonbattle casualty. The general added that, "If he gets on sick call for any reason whatsoever, he is termed a 'nonbattle casualty.' Frankly, it is sheer doggerel in my opinion."

As a result of a study conducted by the Assistant Chief of Staff, G–1, the Department of the Army has adopted new terminology to replace the term "nonbattle casualties," as being more descriptive and less subject to misinterpretation. The new terms, "nonbattle dead," "missing," "evacuated sick," and "injured," were developed and published in Army SR–600–400–5, September 28, 1951. In the interest of complete accuracy and accountability, totals of so-called nonbattle and noneffectives among the forces in Korea have not been released for many months.

You may be interested to learn that worldwide total deaths in all our uniformed services from the beginning of the Korean conflict through December 1951 were 26,689 including 17,754 battle deaths and 8,935 deaths from all other causes. The average total strength of these services for this same period was approximately 2,700,000. Of this world-wide total of 8,935 deaths from all other causes, only some 1,600 were in the Japan-Korea area.

The latest Army medical treatment facilities admissions data show that since the start of the Korean operation 94.3 percent of the world-wide total of those admitted for medical treatment for disease and nonbattle injury conditions have returned to active duty compared with 94.1 percent in the Japan-Korea area.

For your information and files, I am enclosing a copy of our latest Report of United States Casualties.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

The Secretary attached to his letter the report referred to; and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this

point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The report shows the battle casualties.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of United States casualties—Summary No. 79

The Department of Defense today announced the following report of battle casualties in the Korean area, based on notifications to next of kin cumulated for the period through midnight, February 22, 1952:

	Total Department of Defense	Army	Navy	Marine Corps	Air Force
1. Total casualties (sum of items 3, 4, and 5)	105,992	86,852	1,232	16,868	1,040
2. Total deaths (sum of items 3, 4a, and 5a)	18,384	15,478	243	2,298	365
3. Killed in action, total	16,463	13,995	182	1,938	348
4. Wounded in action, total	76,911	61,305	147	14,614	45
(a) Died of wounds	1,727	1,346	12	[1]360	9
(b) Other (current wounded returned to duty, evacuated to the United States, etc.)	75,184	59,959	135	14,254	36
5. Missing in action, total	[1]12,618	[1]11,552	103	316	647
(a) Died	194	137	49	0	8
(b) Returned to military control	1,389	1,327	2	20	40
(c) Current captured	999	996	0	0	3
(d) Current missing	[1]10,036	[1]9,092	52	296	596

[1] Reflects revisions of previously reported figures.

NOTE.—These figures represent cumulative casualties for which notification to next of kin was effected through midnight Friday, Feb. 22, 1952. They do not reflect all casualties which have occurred up to that time, because of the time lapse required to receive notifications of individual casualties from the Far East and to verify and process these notifications in the headquarters of each service. The data indicate the cumulative number of permanent and temporary losses from effective military strength as the result of enemy action.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the information I requested is pertinent information which the Senate Armed Services Committee is entitled to have. Just last week I noticed that the Air Force released the figures on planes lost in combat, and also released the figures on planes lost as a result of bad take-offs or for other reasons not having to do with air combat or with antiaircraft fire.

I assume that the argument might be made that to release the figures on battle casualties might result in permitting that information to reach the enemy. However, so far as I can remember, during World War I and during World War II, as a matter of public policy, the United States Government did release the casualty figures, and has been doing so during the Korean war.

The Congress of the United States and the congressional committees are entitled to obtain a frank answer to the question, How many nonbattle casualties have there been in Korea? That information was given to us during the MacArthur hearings.

I wish to say now, and to serve notice on the Defense Department, that the first of next week I intend to make this matter an issue before the Senate Armed Services Committee. The Congress of the United States, which under the Constitution is charged with raising and supporting armies, and which also has the constitutional power to declare war, cannot and should not be deprived of this information.

Mr. President, I think this issue is a basic one. It is one which will have to be fought out. I say with the deepest regret, because there is no public official in the Government of the United States for whom I have a higher regard than Secretary Lovett, that this is the first time in my long experience when we have been given a complete run-around by the Secretary of Defense; and I, for one, do not sit complacently by when that is done.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me let me say that in sharing the regard and respect of the Senator from California for the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Lovett, in the first place it would be my impression—although obviously I could not prove it—that the Secretary did not write the letter the Senator from California has read to the Senate; and, in the second place, I would doubt whether the Secretary even saw the letter, because it is my view that the Secretary of Defense would give no such meaningless or doubtful answer to an inquiry made by a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

I wish to ask my colleague from California a question. Does he know whether soldiers in Korea who have suffered seriously from frostbite or trench foot, and in consequence have been incapacitated and relieved of active duty, are carried on the rolls as wounded in action?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe they are not.

Mr. CAIN. Then can the Senator from California give an approximate figure regarding how many such nonbattle casualties may have been suffered in the Korean war up to this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I cannot do so, unless we use the rather devious device of taking the figures which were given to us by General Bradley and General Collins in April, May, and June of last year and totalling them, and then dividing the total figure by the number of months up to that time, and then multiplying the resulting figure by the number of months which have elapsed since then. However, I do not think that process would result in giving us an accurate figure, because in the intervening period there have been varying degrees of activity, sometimes more and sometimes less. Therefore, if we were to resort to that type of guessing, we might arrive at figures which would be wholly unreliable.

I believe the Congress of the United States, as the elected representatives of the people of the United States, have the right to have accurate information. The officials of the Defense Department are not superior to the Congress of the United States. This is a coequal branch of the Government of the United States, and I think it high time that the Senate, and I would say the House of Representatives, should begin to bring home to those in the executive department the fact that we are, under the Constitution, a coequal branch.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California permit me to add a word?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I remember the information concerning noncombat casualties which we received during the far-eastern hearings, and how important that information was to those of us who have serious concern about the war in Korea. The Senator from Washington, for that reason, wishes to join most strongly with his friend from California in any possible proposal which may result in getting accurate information of this kind, in order that our Nation may be better informed concerning the size, scope, implications, and severity of the actions in Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would like to say to the Senator from Washington that I also received part of a letter written by one of the men who are fighting in Korea at the present time. I think the Senator, with his military background, might be interested in this extract from a letter:

> Our tanks are set up on a ridge and have unlimited targets to shoot at, but they only give them a very limited supply of ammunition, so they fire their load for the day in about a half hour or 45 minutes, and then make secure for the day. The same for the artillery and air support. This country seems to want to fight a war on a budget. At the rate this war is going, it ought to last at least 20 years. I think the next step will be to take away the weapons and start throwing rocks. It will be cheaper that way.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say one further word?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield further to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I have a reaction as an American to what the Senator from California has just read. Not too long ago a soldier in Korea in writing back to someone in this country said, "Death deserves a reason." My conscience tells me that too many Americans have died in Korea for too little reason.

That is how strongly I feel about what the Senator from California has read. Since the day when the United States, in concert with its allies, decided policywise to seek an armistice short of a military decision, my own Government has refused to give men a sufficient reason to die. I could not be more sad over

that revelation, in the young soldier's letter, which obviously speaks the truth, by pointing up the futility of a war which will wind up by proving nothing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator, as I said before, and as I shall repeat many times again, I do not believe that either the Government of the United States or the United Nations has a right to ask men to fight and die, while denying them the right to win. I think that is the very basic issue with which the American people are confronted. I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to say to the Senator from California, Mr. President, that I am very much interested in the work he is doing. I hope he will carry it on to an effective conclusion. I think there is good reason to believe that some of the men who are now running this Government think they have a blank check on the blood of the young men of America, that they can fill it out from day to day, and that the people generally will not even know the amounts for which it is filled out. That seems to be what is going on. I, myself, have recently had a little experience along that line. When the atrocities affecting the prisoners of war in Korea were disclosed, I sent Secretary Lovett a telegram asking him for more definite information about it, and particularly whether the facts in that connection had been known for some time. He sent me what was in effect a handout from the Department of Defense, which, in effect, said that the officer who had been responsible for disclosing the information in regard to the prisoner-of-war atrocities had been reprimanded; and that is all I have received. Apparently that is all that it is intended I shall receive.

If the Senator from California is successful in his efforts to obtain the information he is seeking, I think he would perform a great public service if he would take up the question of obtaining information in regard to the prisoner-of-war atrocities, to ascertain how many Americans have been killed in cold blood, how long the Department of Defense, or the administration, has known about that situation, and why the information has not been made public.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 3, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert T. Bartley, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1951, vice Wayne Coy, resigned.

IN THE ARMY

Maj. Gen. Horace Logan McBride, O4430, United States Army, for appointment as commander in chief, Caribbean, with the rank of lieutenant general and as lieutenant general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 504 and 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr., O3102, commander in chief, Caribbean (major general, U. S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

Alfred R. Harris for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Kirby P. Ambler	Edward C. Franzen, Jr.
Rex D. Andrews	James W. P. Gregory, Jr.
Paul T. Armistead	Dale W. Johnson
Earl E. Bethke, Jr.	Jack E. Koslow
Earl R. Blue	Edwin F. Laak
Charles H. Brewer, Jr.	Kenneth D. Lindquist
Henry Bowers	Fred M. Lurie
William C. Bostic III	Benjamin G. Mattox, Jr.
Carl S. Crittenden	"J" "H" Mohrman
Daniel W. Davis	Vincent D. Morrison
Wallace F. Flitter	Raymond A. Nelson
Edward W. Fox	Norman L. Sothan
	Wallace C. Palmer
	George M. Starr
	Robert G. Pipkin, Jr.
	Raymond W. Stein
	Sheldon J. Plager
	George M. Stephens, Jr.
	William S. Pregnall
	James L. Whitney
	Tad T. Riley
	Andrew T. Sheets

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy, in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name:

Wilbert M. Fiander
Lucio W. Hill

Guy J. Lookabaugh (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

James W. Firoved
Albert E. Morris

LIEUTENANT

Louis R. Krasno

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James E. Banta, Jr.
Franklyn C. Hill, Jr.
William C. E. Pfischner, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Richard V. Peterson

LIEUTENANTS

John F. Bucher	William A. Peterson
William A. Monroe, Jr.	Leon G. Suehs
Merlin E. Naylor	Simon W. Susewind

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Fred M. Amman	Raymond "W" Millbourn
John R. Anderson	Charles "S" Scruggs
Charles W. Cogar	
Frank J. Malone, Jr.	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Paul L. Austin
Elwin N. Sire

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Mary P. Beaulieu	Elnora J. McCarty
Mary A. Conley	Alice J. Miller
Beverly J. Denison	Mary I. Rignall
Irene C. Knapka	Ann Sefchok
Elizabeth V. Lurenz	Mary L. Steele
Frances A. McCann	Mary J. Wathen

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Alice M. Boogaerts
Ann O. Watson

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Henry C. Williams, Atmore, Ala., in place of J. G. Brown, resigned.

Roy L. Nolen, Jr., Montgomery, Ala., in place of R. L. Nolen, deceased.

Charles O. Mason, Jr., Pine Hill, Ala., in place of J. L. Slaughter, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Ernest M. Echols, Amity, Ark., in place of H. L. Lay, transferred.

Cora M. Wise, Thornton, Ark., in place of C. R. Wise, deceased.

Kenneth R. Bradley, Winslow, Ark., in place of Paul Stonesifer, transferred.

CALIFORNIA

Francis V. DeDecker, Blythe, Calif., in place of O. A. Eddy, failed to qualify.

Marion H. Moorehead, Modesto, Calif., in place of J. W. Moore, retired.

John L. Murphy, Salinas, Calif., in place of J. P. Souza, retired.

Grace A. Belardes, San Juan Capistrano, Calif., in place of C. A. Romer, transferred.

Glenn H. Jamison, Willits, Calif., in place of J. V. Breen, resigned.

COLORADO

Virginia M. Gabriel, Frederick, Colo., in place of A. J. Beynon, deceased.

FLORIDA

Helen B. McWhitney, Lake Hamilton, Fla., in place of J. L. Justice, resigned.

GEORGIA

Mittie K. Carter, Lake Park, Ga., in place of Elliott Redding, transferred.

Jack H. Bowman, Rock Spring, Ga., in place of A. F. McDaniel, transferred.

Hugh W. Hudsputh, Temple, Ga., in place of W. F. Lambert, retired.

Norment A. Barnes, Waycross, Ga., in place of G. L. Warren, deceased.

HAWAII

Bella Pung Puaa, Pearl City, Hawaii, in place of E. Koi Leong Lau, deceased.

IDAHO

Richard D. Gibler, Kamiah, Idaho, in place of Hastings Brown, deceased.

Arnold L. Runyon, Wendell, Idaho, in place of G. P. Smith, retired.

ILLINOIS

Mabel V. Vaughan, Cropsey, Ill., in place of E. A. Wagoner, resigned.

Leona L. Schmidt, Fieldon, Ill., in place of C. L. Wedding, retired.

Grace M. McKeon, Gifford, Ill., in place of G. R. Bunting, resigned.

Robert W. Straus, Island Lake, Ill. Office established November 1, 1950.

Leroy M. Moore, Lake Forest, Ill., in place of A. G. Lucas, retired.

Carl V. Fellers, Pana, Ill., in place of Walter Hill, resigned.

John F. Hora, Richmond, Ill., in place of M. D. Brown, resigned.

Ralph E. Plappert, Sorento, Ill., in place of M. M. Wilber, resigned.

Forest Wayne Neal, Tuscola, Ill., in place of G. A. Larimer, resigned.

Ernest J. Bammann, Washburn, Ill., in place of W. W. Lesch, retired.

William E. Maher, Waverly Ill., in place of G. M. Mader, retired.

INDIANA

Harold K. Nutty, Brookville, Ind., in place of J. R. McDonald, retired.

Milton D. Freeman, Ellettsville, Ind., in place of J. E. Freeman, retired.

John B. Hupp, New Castle, Ind., in place of M. C. Goodwin, retired.

Edward T. Jansen, Osceola, Ind., in place of W. H. Menaugh, retired.

IOWA

Verlyn I. Gemberlin, Alburnett, Iowa, in place of R. C. Loes, resigned.

James C. Jenson, Council Bluffs, Iowa, in place of F. H. Garrett, retired.

Anton E. Rasmussen, Forest City, Iowa, in place of G. B. Chryst, retired.

Herbert H. Wiebel, Lowden, Iowa, in place of E. J. Rutenbeck, retired.

Luther R. Horn, Moulton, Iowa, in place of Forest Davis, retired.

Cecil W. Campbell, Ollie, Iowa, in place of H. C. Campbell, deceased.

KANSAS

Hazel H. Stoehr, Murdock, Kans., in place of G. B. Viney, resigned.

Florian L. Zeller, Paxico, Kans., in place of F. A. Glotzbach, deceased.

Sara L. Becker, Vermillion, Kans., in place of M. A. Schafer, deceased.

Mary A. Mallams, Weir, Kans., in place of V. A. Miller, retired.

KENTUCKY

Lawrence L. Aylor, Florence, Ky., in place of F. L. Scott, retired.

Irene G. Gulley, Sharpsburg, Ky., in place of Lula Sharp, retired.

LOUISIANA

Roxie E. Eeds, Cullen, La., in place of Elbert Matthews, resigned.

Travis E. Albritton, Farmerville, La., in place of Henry Preaus, deceased.

Ashton, J. Lafargue, Keithville, La., in place of A. I. McCord, resigned.

Huey G. Ragus, Pioneer, La., in place of W. F. Derrick, retired.

MARYLAND

John F. Stevens, Annapolis, Md., in place of W. A. Strohm, retired.

Edward J. McPartland, Lonaconing, Md., in place of J. F. Quinn, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Minnie E. Bateman, Dudley, Mass., in place of H. E. Bateman, resigned.

William N. Sheehy, Middleboro, Mass., in place of J. F. McClusky, retired.

Harold J. Cuff, South Deerfield, Mass., in place of E. J. Redmond, deceased.

Fernand P. Como, Wheelwright, Mass., in place of A. O. Delaney, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Meta W. Huff, Belmont, Mich., in place of Daniel Koert, retired.

Herold M. Stark, Cedar Springs, Mich., in place of D. D. Davis, retired.

Peter H. Timmer, Charlevoix, Mich., in place of J. M. Foster, retired.

Thomas V. Manor, Newport, Mich., in place of W. W. Francisco, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Mel Sheridan Dale Swanson, Argyle, Minn., in place of C. A. Hedquist, transferred.

Martin H. Lindeman, Brownton, Minn., in place of P. L. Hakes, transferred.

Vincent P. Fermoyle, Graceville, Minn., in place of J. F. Fahey, retired.

Beatrice M. Dumas, Long Lake, Minn., in place of E. N. Dumas, deceased.

Leroy W. Rodgers, Minneiska, Minn., in place of R. E. Gentzkow, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

William P. Loper, Forest, Miss., in place of I. E. Ormond, retired.

Marion A. Ousley, Goodman, Miss., in place of J. H. Boyette, transferred.

James Cecil Young, Nettleton, Miss., in place of E. B. Young, resigned.

MISSOURI

Marion A. Mitchell, Aldrich, Mo., in place of E. L. Griffin, deceased.

Jessie L. Coleman, Dalton, Mo., in place of W. P. Carskadon, retired.

Alfred L. York, Fort Leonard Wood, Mo. Office reestablished September 16, 1947.

Gladys G. Simmons, Laclede, Mo., in place of C. T. Hoover, transferred.

Charles J. Shaw, Oronogo, Mo., in place of M. B. Whitfield, deceased.

MONTANA

Helen M. McCollim, Cascade, Mont., in place of A. T. James, retired.

Humphrey D. Howell, Hungry Horse, Mont. Office established May 16, 1948.

NEBRASKA

Glen L. Christensen, Newman Grove, Nebr., in place of P. V. Erickson, resigned.

Harold J. Hoeppner, North Loup, Nebr., in place of Frank Johnson, retired.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

David L. Jones, Bartlett, N. H., in place of E. L. Stillings, retired.

Henry J. Proulx, Franklin, N. H., in place of G. F. Garneau, retired.

John S. Gould, Hanover, N. H., in place of R. A. Lewin, retired.

Donald T. Bonnette, Hillsboro, N. H., in place of M. L. Doyle, retired.

William F. Byrne, Winchester, N. H., in place of S. M. Tarbell, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Emanuel E. McBride, Berlin, N. J., in place of W. L. Mongan, resigned.

Margaret H. Ardin, Chester, N. J., in place of A. W. Thompson, retired.

Warren K. Lehr, Columbia, N. J., in place of L. R. Gunter, transferred.

William Frank Carling, Gibbsboro, N. J., in place of L. M. McIntyre, resigned.

Edward J. Wojcik, Great Meadows, N. J., in place of H. P. Topoleski, transferred.

Harold J. Sadlock, Paramus, N. J. Office established June 1, 1950.

Wilmer Johnson, Jr., Seaside Park, N. J., in place of M. J. Lippincott, retired.

NEW YORK

Bruce M. Austin, Attica, N. Y., in place of F. C. Timm, retired.

Elizabeth C. Paga, Hannacroix, N. Y., in place of E. A. Spencer, retired.

Herman J. Misner, Little Falls, N. Y., in place of W. H. McLaughlin, deceased.

Grace L. Patch, Prattsburg, N. Y., in place of H. C. Olney, retired.

Rita H. Wells, Schaghticoke, N. Y., in place of G. P. Dickinson, transferred.

DeMaris Fishbaugh, Waterport, N. Y., in place of D. C. Brown, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Milton N. McLaughlin, Cleveland, N. C., in place of C. H. Roseboro, retired.

James W. Nantz, Sr., Mount Holly, N. C., in place of O. L. Hoffman, retired.

Annie P. Southerland, Willard, N. C., in place of A. J. Deese, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph A. Scholand, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of D. F. McMenamy, transferred.

OHIO

Paul D. Smith, De Graff, Ohio, in place of R. T. Smith, retired.

Robert W. Schroeder, Elmore, Ohio, in place of F. J. Tank, retired.

Lawrence D. Beardmore, Salem, Ohio, in place of A. E. Beardmore, deceased.

Effie R. Miller, Terrace Park, Ohio, in place of L. M. Droescher, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Robert V. Jamison, Fort Supply, Okla., in place of M. L. Vaughan, deceased.

Pearl A. Notley, Morrison, Okla., in place of G. M. Coffman, retired.

Lela Estella Pate, Ravia, Okla., in place of J. F. Pate, retired.

OREGON

Bernice R. Reuterskiold, Bonneville, Oreg., in place of B. E. North, retired.

Clifford V. Bride, Sheridan, Oreg., in place of C. W. Flynn, resigned.

Lucille M. Schultz, Westfir, Oreg., in place of P. H. Ryman, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

William J. B. Reitz, Cairnbrook, Pa., in place of J. D. Houck, resigned.

Ronald F. Hayman, Confluence, Pa., in place of M. M. Brooke, retired.

Lyonel D. Ritchey, Curryville, Pa., in place of G. H. Gartland, transferred.

Paul M. Kulhamer, Fullerton, Pa., in place of H. P. Hartman, retired.

Alice M. Springer, Glenmoore, Pa., in place of C. V. Slyder, resigned.

Harry L. Smith, Mifflinburg, Pa., in place of W. L. Doebler, removed.

Robert F. Oliver, New Milford, Pa., in place of C. W. Aldrich, deceased.

Homer L. Budinger, Salladasburg, Pa., in place of C. K. Flook, retired.

Henry C. Johnston, Smithton, Pa., in place of F. G. Christopher, retired.

PUERTO RICO

Junot Franco Soto, Sabana Grande, P. R., in place of M. A. Franco Soto, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Orin H. Garner, Jonesville, S. C., in place of I. S. Littlejohn, retired.

TENNESSEE

Arthur C. Puckett, Jr., La Vergne, Tenn., in place of P. P. Howse, retired.

Francis E. Durrett, White House, Tenn., in place of M. B. Baggett, retired.

TEXAS

Helen K. Humphries, Balmorhea, Tex., in place of T. M. Delaney, retired.

Joel Parker Carroll, Bryan, Tex., in place of Wilson Bradley, retired.

Gurley N. Sellers, Coolidge, Tex., in place of T. L. Satterwhite, resigned.

Thomas L. Cheatham, Edgewood, Tex., in place of A. B. Hobbs, deceased.

Floyd S. May, Iowa Park, Tex., in place of E. E. Wallis, transferred.

Paul D. Cauley, Sr., Kingsville, Tex., in place of J. D. Gibbs, deceased.

Almer D. Woods, Jr., Marquez, Tex., in place of A. D. Woods, retired.

Roy L. McGuire, Seymour, Tex., in place of Otis Avery, transferred.

VERMONT

Frederick R. Rousseau, North Hero, Vt., in place of K. A. Tudhope, transferred.

VIRGINIA

Marion Irene Davenport, Lancaster, Va., in place of G. P. Gresham, retired.

Robert E. Booker, Jr., Lottsburg, Va., in place of G. C. Watkins, retired.

Rolla Wallace Rosen, Staunton, Va., in place of R. E. Fifer, retired.

WASHINGTON

Elmer F. Pardee, Lake Stevens, Wash., in place of E. A. Kinney, retired.

James S. Wise, Lebam, Wash., in place of G. W. Adams retired.

Velma I. Jennings, Spangle, Wash., in place of F. I. Jennings, retired.

William C. Manly, Jr., White Salmon, Wash., in place of B. B. Pollard, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Vernette M. Means, Rothschild, Wis., in place of A. K. Means, retired.

Harry Gelb, White Lake, Wis., in place of W. R. Collins, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 28 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer, effective date of acceptance

Zadok D. Harrison

To be senior assistant surgeons, effective date of acceptance

Norman B. Atkins	Allan B. Carter
Edward L. Burwell	Harry Y. Spence
Mitchell R. Zavon	John P. Fort, Jr.
Mario Stefanini	Charles L. Hoffman
John T. Gentry	John L. Grow
Harvey A. Itano	George L. Gee, Jr.
Alexis I. Shelokov	Lance S. Wright
Seymour M. Perry	Robert K. Williams
Calvin R. MacKay	Alfred S. Ketcham
David M. Fried	George W. West
Robert W. Summers	Nicholas C. Leone
David S. Howell	Walter P. Scott
William J. Browne	

To be assistant surgeons, effective date of acceptance

Laurens P. White	Walter T. Snow
Alan S. Rabson	Marlin D. Greenhalgh
Hugh A. Storrow	Carson R. Jones
Clarence T. McGraw	Donald L. Toker

To be senior assistant dental surgeons, effective date of acceptance

Lewis V. Lortz, Jr.
Russell S. Wright

POSTMASTERS

IDAHO

Wilburn J. Adams, Rockland.

NEW YORK

Louis C. Nielsen, Amagansett.
Rene J. Panuska, East Islip.
Charles E. Statia, Granville.
Hewlett H. Davis, Miller Place.
Victor Rowe, Ontario Center.
Walter G. Kluge, Orient.
John A. McGarr, Oyster Bay.
Mary B. Bunnell, Scio.

NORTH DAKOTA

LeRoy A. Anderson, Binford.
Herbert W. Booth, Towner.

PENNSYLVANIA

Lawrence W. Nees, Geistown.
Thomas J. Cavanaugh, Nanty Glo.

WASHINGTON

William K. Wuesthoff, Davenport.
Donald J. Auvil, Entiat.
Vincent B. White, Okanogan.
Troy T. Dean, Otis Orchards.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal Spirit, we pray that this day may be blessed and crowned with the wonder and glory of a God-illumined vision of life's moral and spiritual values.

We humbly acknowledge that it is becoming increasingly clear that we cannot meet and master our human problems without the comradeship and consolation, the inspiration and strength of these sacred spiritual realities.

Grant that they may never be obscured and supplanted by habits of character and conduct that are unworthy of the sons of God.

To Thy name we shall ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE POSTAL SERVICE—NEED FOR BETTER SERVICE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am today requesting in a letter to the Honorable TOM MURRAY, chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, prompt hearings on my bill—House Resolution 58—and other measures to bring about rescission of the order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal services. My bill also calls for an investigation of this curtailment and calls on the appropriate standing legislative committees of this body to examine into the necessity for and propriety of this curtailment. The American people, now obliged to pay increased rates for mail service totaling an estimated $250,000 annually, ought to be receiving in return the services which they had received prior to the Postmaster General's April 18, 1950, order. Instead we are faced with deficit for 1952 estimated by the Postmaster General to be $768,008,261, an increase of some $217,000,000 from the 1951 year, and no idea of restoring services.

The New York World-Telegram and Sun, in an editorial climaxing a series of five articles—which are inserted in the Appendix—surveying the poor condition of our postal service, puts some blame on the Congress for tying the hands of the Postmaster General and also forcing the hiring of temporary employees.

These articles point out two major defects and make one important comparison. They raise the whole question of political influence in the personnel system of the Post Office, a political influence which is admitted. This is a serious blight on the whole system and very serious to the career employees. It harms the efficiency of the system. It often causes the career employees to be saddled by the public with blame for conditions for which they are certainly not responsible. Secondly, the articles point up inefficient methods, archaic, old-fashioned—which do not belong today. Finally, they show that mail service in London and Paris which are comparable cities to New York is so much better than our own that it must be hard reading for every American. And these are the countries which have deep economic troubles as compared with our own relative prosperity.

The Hoover Commission reports show how the Post Office could be run efficiently. What has happened about recommendations of the Hoover Commission is summarized in excerpts from the address of Mr. Walter D. Fuller, chairman of the board, Curtis Publishing Co., at the Second National Reorganization Conference of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report held in Washington on February 18, which is also set forth in the Appendix.

The Congress has within its power the restoration of services to the previous state of dependability. Further increases in rates, especially in other than first-class mail and post cards may need to be considered. Efficiency in operation and personnel policies need to be dealt with. Members cannot really complain unless the Congress exercises this power to do all that Congress can do to change conditions and then sees that the executive department does the rest.

It is well that the joint committee of the House and Senate, authorized in the last session to conduct a thorough study and investigation in respect to the general operations of the postal service, will shortly begin to function. In the meantime, American families and American businesses should not be made to suffer because of curtailed mail deliveries, post office office hours and similar inconven-

iences. Postal services should be restored now. Progress, not retrogression, should be the keynote of our postal service.

CHANGE IN PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Chair to say that no one will be recognized for 1 minute this morning?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, in view of that fact I wonder if it would be a proper parliamentary inquiry to inquire of the majority leader as to the action next week on the measure that is pending? The notice of the whip indicated it would be read for amendment on next Monday. We have all proceeded on that basis. However, we have received some information that that plan as announced and as I thought was agreed upon has been changed.

Mr. McCORMACK. I welcome the inquiry of my friend. The first appropriation bill is ready for consideration. Of course, we all know the importance of getting those bills through as quickly as possible. So the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill will be considered on Monday. It is expected that will be disposed of on Monday. We will try to dispose of that bill on Monday. Then consideration of the UMT bill will follow.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, many of us had expected that this present bill would be read on Monday for amendment, although we must recognize, I suppose, that the program is in control of the majority. Let me ask the majority leader one further question: If consideration of the Treasury-Post Office bill is not concluded on Monday, will consideration continue over on Tuesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. HALLECK. And consideration of that bill will continue until the appropriation matter is disposed of?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is my intention and that is what will be done. In other words, the Treasury-Post Office Departments appropriation bill will come up for consideration on Monday and we hope to complete its consideration on that day. If not we will proceed with its consideration until it is disposed of.

Mr. HALLECK. I would seriously doubt whether that bill, which is quite an important one, could be concluded on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have answered the gentleman's question. We hope to have it concluded on Monday, but, if not, we will proceed with its consideration until it is concluded.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say to the majority leader that I am a little disappointed in his statement. As minority whip of the House I sent notice to every Republican Member, in conformity with what was stated by the majority leader last week, that the bill now under consideration would be read for amendment on Monday. As a result of the gentleman's statement, I am placed in somewhat of an embarrassing position.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sorry for the embarrassment of the gentleman, but there is nothing about what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said but what is consistent with time-honored custom. There is no change in the program. There is a variance and the variation is to bring up an important appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the parliamentary inquiry has been answered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

Abbitt	Feighan	Morrison
Allen, Ill.	Fine	Moulder
Anfuso	Flood	Murray, Wis.
Aspinall	Fugate	Nicholson
Bailey	Fulton	O'Toole
Baring	Gamble	Potter
Barrett	Garmatz	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Granahan	Prouty
Beall	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rhodes
Betts	Hall, Leonard W.	Rooney
Buchanan	Hart	Sabath
Buckley	Herter	St. George
Camp	Hess	Sasscer
Case	Ikard	Scott, Hardie
Celler	Jonas	Secrest
Chatham	King, Calif.	Sheehan
Chudoff	Klein	Staggers
Combs	Lanham	Stockman
Cooley	Larcade	Sutton
Corbett	LeCompte	Wheeler
Coudert	McGrath	Wickersham
Crawford	McIntire	Wolcott
Dawson	Martin, Mass.	Wood, Ga.
Dingell	Mason	Wood, Idaho
Dollinger	Miller, Md.	Woodruff
Ellsworth	Morrison	
Fallon		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MEMORIAL SERVICES

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 543) covering memorial services in the House to be held on Wednesday, May 14, 1952, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, May 14, 1952, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on House Administration under the provision of clause (1) (j) (2) (C) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave for 60 legislative days to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on the life, character, and public service of deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings, the Speaker shall call the House to order and then as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased he shall declare the House adjourned. The necessary expenses connected with such memorial services shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on House Administration and approved by such committee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 31 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, of course we are not debating a new subject today. I doubt if there has ever been a subject debated as frequently by the Congress as has been this subject of universal military training. We all recall that last year when the matter was under consideration I stated on a number of occasions that this was one issue which I felt should be considered by the Congress without reference to politics. It is one which so closely affects the safety and well being of the Nation that it should never at any time be regarded as a political issue.

I also felt at that time, as I feel now, that it is a subject that should be considered very calmly and without the importation of irritating issues and things which may arouse the passions and prejudices of people on collateral issues. Unfortunately, again we have had brought in here every controversial issue of the day. They have all been thrown in adroitly at some time or other during the past 2 days.

I have been very much intrigued by the debate, however, Mr. Chairman, because it has been so thoroughly apart from the bill now pending before the committee. I have listened to practically every word which has been said in opposition to this bill, and I now find myself in the position of discovering that very little of it relates to this bill. The vast majority of the argument has concerned the idea of having an 8-year total obligation, including service in the Reserve, or a question of 6 months of training; and the question of whether or not there should be universal military training.

Now, let us go back to last year, at the time we passed Public Law 51 of the Eighty-second Congress. That is the law today, passed by the overwhelming vote of this House, and placed upon the statute books. Now, what did we do in Public Law 51? In Public Law 51, we created

the National Security Commission, whose report is the basis for this bill. We created then the National Security Training Corps so that neither of those issues are pending here, the permanent law having been enacted in Public Law 51 of last year.

At that time we also increased the total service obligations, including service in the Reserve, of persons inducted, enlisted, or appointed in any of the Armed Forces from 6 years to 8 years. So we are not here debating the question of whether the Reserve obligation should be 8 years or less because last year we passed into the law that the total obligation of persons thereafter entering the service in any manner would be a period of 8 years. At that time we fixed the pay at $30 a month. At that time we provided by law that the active duty training period would be 6 months, so that that matter is already the law.

Of course, we had a number of routine provisions in that law. We provided that the Selective Service System would attend to the inducting of the persons to be trained under the program, and we established a mechanism by which the program could be put into effect either by the President or by the Congress by concurrent resolution. Then why are we here with this provision again? Because we provided in Public Law 51 that the Commission within a stated period of time should report to the Congress what it recommended as to certain very limited things. They were to report a broad outline for a program to assure that the training would be military in nature. That is the provision of Public Law 51.

Another thing the Commission was required to report on were measures for the personal safety, health, welfare, and morals of the trainees; also a code of conduct and their provisions for disability and death benefits and the obligations and liabilities of the trainees. In Public Law 51 we provided as a condition precedent to the induction of any man into the National Security Training Corps that this report should be made and that the committees of the House and the Senate should consider the report, and that certain provisions would have to be enacted into the law by the two bodies before anybody could be inducted into the corps. So why all of the debate we have had here about whether there should be universal military training, and the great time that my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] spent as to whether we had committed ourselves to the principle of military training? I do not think there is any implication that we committed ourselves to the principle of universal military training. I think we adopted into positive law a system of military training to take effect upon the passage of a law which would provide for these benefits to the trainees and which would insure that it was military training and not some other social program under the guise of military training.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is not the real issue whether or not the plan submitted is actually military training of the type contemplated by Public Law 51? Is that not the only issue in the case?

Mr. KILDAY. I am just coming now to what this bill does. It is very surprising how little it does do. It fulfills the condition precedent that we required in Public Law 51.

There are certain routine things in the bill such as the wording of the oath, which, by the way, requires upholding the Constitution, things of that kind, but the balance of this bill is primarily in the interest of and for the protection of the trainee. Practically everything in the bill is for the benefit of the trainee.

For instance, it provides that he shall have the same protection that is enjoyed by civilian employees of the Government; that is, he shall have the protection of the Federal Employees Compensation Act. He will have the same $10,000 gratuity insurance benefit as is possessed by members of the active military service while he is on duty and for 120 days thereafter.

It provides the moral atmosphere in which he is to be trained. It prohibits the sale of intoxicating liquors on the posts where these boys are to be trained. It gives power to the executive branch of the Government to control vice and the sale of intoxicating liquors at or near the places where these boys are to be trained.

Then it provides for a code of conduct. It had been our feeling, and this is the reason we asked the Commission to give its recommendation, that perhaps the trainee should not be subjected for military offenses to the same type of court-martial procedure as would be the regular or the contract soldier or the soldier on full military duty or service.

The Commission recommended, however, and this bill so provides, that the new uniform code of military justice shall constitute the code of conduct for the trainee with certain very important exceptions. He cannot be tried before a court martial for certain designated offenses without his personal permission given in writing. If he does not agree to trial by court martial, then, of course, if it is an offense that is cognizable under the law, and this enacts the code of military justice into the Federal code for the purposes of this act, he would be subject to trial in a Federal court the same as if he had not been taken into the corps. If he prefers to be tried by court martial, then he must agree to do so in writing, and that would be a condition precedent to the attachment of jurisdiction by a court martial.

So those are the things which this bill actually does. You will see that there is very little compulsion on the part of the trainee. Most of the things in this bill are for his benefit.

Let us remember that last year, last April 12 and 13, we voted on this matter. Public Law 51 whose provisions I have briefly outlined here was passed on a roll call vote by 372 to 44. That was on April 13. The House refused to recommit that bill by 296 to 21. Of course, I understand the contention is made that that bill also extended selective service that, therefore, a vote against it would have prevented the extension of selective service. But, you will recall that my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] was quite active in that debate. You will recall that he had an amendment which, as I recall, was in the nature of a substitute which eliminated all of the provisions of that bill which had anything to do with universal military training, and retained only the extension of the draft. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina, if that is not substantially correct?

Mr. BARDEN. That is substantially correct, I will say to the gentleman from Texas, but that is not the issue upon which the substitute bill was defeated. Immediately those of you who helped to combine with the minority which was after that bill, joined together and said if we did not pass both, we would not have any selective service.

Mr. KILDAY. I enjoyed the gentleman's talk of yesterday as I always do. I love to participate in debate with the gentleman because he asks no quarter and gives no quarter. He is one of the few men I know who is able to dish it out and also to take it. I would like to say to the gentleman now that I am glad that he has said something with reference to this bill, because of the speech yesterday, while it was most enjoyable, could have been made in opposition to the Statute of Frauds or the Magna Carta or anything else. It did not touch this issue at all, and I am glad that the gentleman has finally said something about this bill.

Mr. BARDEN. I will be glad to take either side of the issue with the gentleman.

Mr. KILDAY. But, Mr. Chairman, I insist that was the case. Anyway, the gentleman from North Carolina states that I am substantially correct in the statement I made as to the content of the Barden amendment of last year. We had a teller vote in Committee of the Whole, and there were 140 favoring Mr. BARDEN's amendment at that time, and 232 opposing it. By 92 votes here in the Committee of the Whole we sustained the provisions of that bill having to do with universal military training because the Barden amendment was a clear-cut, straight-out elimination from the bill of everything having to do with universal military training.

I am pleading with you for one thing in this connection. I have stated that I feel it should not be considered in any political light, and I mean that for myself as well as for others. I will have no complaint with anyone who finds it in his conscience to vote against this bill. I do want to plead with you, and plead with you most earnestly, to let us face this issue, and face it squarely. Let us not have another situation of attempting to sweeten it up or make it a little more palatable; or being in a position where you vote to recommit, but do not vote against it. This matter has been pending here for years and years and years. I hope particularly that the House does not see fit to vote to recommit this bill for further study. If there has ever been

a proposition which has been studied, this is it. During the war we had a select committee under the late Clifton Woodrum on postwar military policy. We had hearings on this question for weeks and weeks, and we took thousands of pages of testimony. Later, shortly after the war, the former Committee on Military Affairs took thousands of pages of testimony on this very same proposition. Then the President appointed the Compton Commission, headed by Dr. Carl T. Compton, perhaps the highest class commission ever created for an Executive study. That Commission heard many thousands of words of testimony and made their report.

In the Eightieth Congress, the Republican Congress, the Committee on Armed Services took this matter up in a bill offered by our former colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Towe, and again we took thousands of words of testimony and favorably reported the bill. Last year, in Public Law 51, we again went through all of that study; and now on this bill. So let us not be in the ridiculous position of saying that, after all of this study, because this is an election year, we are going to send the bill back to committee for further study. Let us face it directly. Let us either pass it or kill it, and kill it for all time. Let us have this issue terminated. I say that for these reasons: We are attempting to maintain a military budget of between fifty and seventy billion dollars. Any man in his right mind knows that we cannot do that for any protracted period of time. Everybody knows we will wreck our country if we attempt to maintain that budget. Public Law 51 is on the books as an element of economy in the military budget, and if we are not to use it, if we are not to rely on it, let us get rid of it, because we must then look around for some other means of reducing this military budget. What those means would be, I do not know. It may be that we will just have to take a calculated risk and reduce the numbers of our Armed Forces, and hope to God that if a blow comes it will come where we are strongest. But let us do something with this issue. Let us either pass it or kill it. Let us not equivocate. Let us not delay. I plead with the Members of this House to terminate this issue.

I am not one of the oldest Members of the House, but still, along with others here, I have worked on this one proposition for 13 years. This is the time to decide it. We must decide it for the welfare of our country. Whichever way you want to vote, vote; but let us not equivocate. Let us not dodge the issue.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The issue is whether we will have UMT, or not, is it not?

Mr. KILDAY. I thought I had made myself clear.

Mr. VORYS. Well, the gentleman did not make himself clear, because he talked as if that issue was decided last summer; and, as I understand, that is the issue that is before the House now.

Mr. KILDAY. The issue before the House now is the approval of a plan of military training and the provision of the things that we required by law to be reported here, to provide for the security and for the moral welfare and for a code of conduct. That is all there is in this bill. Of course, it is true there is a condition precedent. Unless this is passed, you cannot induct anyone into the National Security and Training Corps.

Mr. VORYS. The issue is whether we have UMT or not. That is the issue in this bill. That is the issue, and if it is here now it was not settled last summer; and if it was settled last summer, it is not here now.

Mr. KILDAY. Well, the gentleman is a good lawyer. I know that when he was practicing in court he never followed that same idea of a rule of materiality with reference to an issue that was pending. The gentleman is a good lawyer, and if he had attempted to do so there is no judge who would have permitted any such idea on the rule of materiality.

Mr. VORYS. Will the gentleman yield for one other question on another phase?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Can the gentleman tell us how many of the present Reserves are nonveterans? I understand that General Walsh, president of the National Guard Association, said that 53 to 60 percent of the National Guard enlisted personnel are nonveterans.

Mr. KILDAY. I am sorry I cannot give you that figure. I think it is quite considerable but nowhere near that number, and I think it is a very unfortunate situation, but the Congress is responsible for it, because in attempting to duck and dodge UMT in the Eightieth Congress, the other body insisted on putting provisions into the extension of the Draft Act that exempted from the draft everybody who could rush into the National Guard or a Reserve organization prior to a given date. It was the idea that some people had of being able to dodge this issue. It has, of course, worked in reverse.

Mr. VORYS. Will not the same thing happen under the voluntary service under UMT? If you try to have UMT while the draft is going on and if the bill is passed as it is before us, a boy who serves 6 months in UMT is not liable for further service until Congress acts again?

Mr. KILDAY. Let me make the speech, please; the gentleman has asked the question; please let me make the speech.

Mr. VORYS. I want to make the question clear.

Mr. KILDAY. I understand the question thoroughly. The question involves the mechanism under which UMT can be placed in operation. You can take any provision of any law or any proposed law and come to an absurd conclusion or construction if you so desire and can generally construe it the way you think it suits your case the best. The proviso for the implementation of UMT is that the President shall find and so state by Executive order that it is possible within the security needs of the Nation either to reduce or eliminate the period of service for persons under 19 years of age. Of course, if you want to be absurd in statutory construction you can say that the President can reduce the period of service of those under 19 by 1 day and then activate UMT. Maybe that would be possible, but it is not at all probable and cannot possibly happen. This would have to be sustained by public opinion, and public opinion would not sustain any absurd construction of that kind. The order would most likely say that the service of those under 19 was no longer required and that those under 19 will be trained and those over 19 will be available for service just as they have been under the Selective Service and Training Act and just as they will remain.

Mr. VORYS. Does not this bill, and I am asking for information, does not this bill provide that the UMT alumni, those who have gone through the 6 months course, cannot be called into active service without further action of Congress?

Mr. KILDAY. Further action of Congress would be necessary, yes; because it provides that they shall not be called for service except in such numbers as may hereafter be determined by the Congress. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Am I correct in understanding that the gentleman said, not once but several times, that it was his hope hat we would vote upon the bill as introduced and against amendments?

Mr. KILDAY. I did not say that about amendments. The bill is here under an open rule and everybody is entitled to vote for or against amendments. The hope I expressed was that we would not attempt to take an easy way out, but that we would finally get a clear-cut vote on whether we want UMT or do not want UMT.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I may say to the gentleman that I hope those on this side will vote all amendments down including the motion to recommit and vote the bill itself either up or down.

Mr. KILDAY. For once I hope the gentleman prevails.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. During my 10 years in Congress I have been against universal military training, but I realize that we are faced with a situation in the world which has caused those who have taken that position in the past to reevaluate the necessity of building up these reserves. I want to pursue further the question asked by the gentleman from Ohio: If one of these boys who comes in at 18 and serves 6 months is released into the Reserves for the next 7½ years is not that discriminatory against the boy who went in at the same time under the draft for 2 years?

Mr. KILDAY. I cannot imagine a situation or a set of circumstances involving two boys of the same age, one of whom would be taken for training for 6 months and the other inducted for 2 years of service.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I mean to say that 6 months later they will take the other boy in at 18 under the draft.

Mr. KILDAY. They have the legal authority to do that now, but they have never reached down that far yet.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They have not gone below 20.

Mr. KILDAY. They have not gone below 20.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The point I want to have clarified is the discrimination between boys of the same age, one being taken for 6 months' training and 6 months later the other drafted for 2 years, leaving the first boy subject to 7½ years' service in the Reserves. Are you dependent upon the Congress to make available to the Armed Forces these boys who have been trained in UMT during that 7½ years?

Mr. KILDAY. That is a matter that would be up to the Congress because further legislation would be necessary. Now, on this matter of discrimination, may I say it is now discriminatory to draft a boy who is 18½ plus 1 day and not draft a boy 18½ less 1 day, or take a man who is 26 and not take the man who is 26 plus 1 day. Is that not discrimination? Probably it is just a matter of luck so far as the day upon which a particular boy might be born. Those are definite segments in separate group.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I followed the chairman's argument on this question of unfairness and I will say it was very informative. I realize we cannot have a system, apparently, that is absolutely fair to everyone's conception of fairness.

Mr. KILDAY. No.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I recognize the problem that is involved. I do want to say that the Congress should follow this act by not allowing these boys to remain out of service until they are 26 because they are in the Reserves. In other words, I think that Reserves should be used to take care of the unfair situation that now exists in reference to these boys who have fought for 4 years.

Mr. KILDAY. The point is to get started on building up the right kind of a Reserve. The greatest discrimination that we have ever been guilty of was to call back for the Korean war the boys who had fought through the entire World War II. Why did we have to do it? Because we had no adequate Reserve system. If this system had been in existence for a period of 5 years prior to the beginning of Korea, there would not have been any such thing as one man being called upon to serve twice when another was not called on to serve at all.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Along the line of the question raised by the gentleman from California with respect to preferential treatment it is alleged these trainees are going to get because they go into the Reserve and are not required to render any military service, as the gentleman from Texas has indicated, before they are brought back into the service additional legislation—an act of Congress—is necessary. It is inconceivable to me that a Congress which succeeds us, being confronted with the need of calling into active service its Reserves composed of men who have had military service, that that Congress would not say to boys who have had no military service: "Come into the service," and that those who are veterans will be a secondary consideration.

Mr. KILDAY. I thank the gentleman. Of course, we cannot take the position that this is the only Congress there is going to be or the only one with sufficient intelligence to handle this matter. As long as it is kept within the control of the Congress in the future we can be sure that the different groups are going to be treated justly. The American people will not stand for injustice from any Congress, I do not care at what time it may be in existence.

Mr. Chairman, I want to reiterate what I said before. This matter has been thoroughly studied, thoroughly discussed, and the issues are well understood. Let us face the issue when we reach it next week. Let us either vote UMT into existence and begin building our Reserves or let us do something to reduce this military budget that we have—something else. I do think it is our patriotic duty to settle the issue now. Let us begin a national-defense system on a long-term basis rather than living from day to day as we have been doing in the past.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, for 20 years it has been my pleasure and privilege to serve in this honorable and distinguished body. In all that time no issue has been more important or more far-reaching in its consequences than the legislation now before us. Universal military training or peacetime conscription is not a new problem but a rather old one. For over 30 years certain leaders of the American Legion and of the armed services have worked diligently, honestly, patriotically and ceaselessly propagandizing America in a determined effort to saddle upon this country a system that, in my opinion, is totally foreign and actually hostile to the best interests of the American Republic and its citizens. Much of the money that has been spent by the Defense Department has been illegally spent in propaganda for purposes other than that for which it was appropriated. That was clearly brought out by the Harness committee in the Eightieth Congress of which our present colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], was then chief counsel. But in spite of this determined drive to fasten peacetime military conscription upon us, each and every year that I have been here, and for 10 years prior to my coming here, the American Congress, regardless of its political complexion, has succeeded in preventing the enactment of this nefarious scheme.

Every red-blooded American knows that there is no more loyal or patriotic organization in this country than the American Legion, but certainly that organization does not possess a monopoly upon all wisdom, virtue, and patriotism, and certainly its judgment in all instances is not infallible. If anyone thought otherwise, I am sure his doubt would have been dispelled at the banquet given us night before last by the American Legion at the Hotel Statler in Washington. I do not think it is wise, and to say the least, it is poor taste for any host to invite a guest to a banquet, and then threaten him with political extinction if he does not carry out the mandate of the host. I am sure that every intelligent and patriotic Member of this House wears no man's collar and will not be coerced or compelled to follow the dictates of any minority pressure group in this country. We are sent here not to carry out the mandate of any labor group, any farm group, any old-age group, any racial group, or even a veterans' group. We are sent here to represent all the American people, and in voting on any piece of legislation we must look at it from all angles and for the welfare not only of our immediate and particular constituencies or States, but the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

I have no quarrel and I shall not have any quarrel with any Member of this body as to how he shall vote on this particular measure. Each one of us must search his own soul, look into his own conscience, and exercise his best judgment based upon long and serious study of facts, rather than being swayed by propaganda or threats from any source.

It is quite understandable, sir, why certain high-salaried men in the American Legion with liberal expense accounts want this bill passed. That is their business. That is their job. They do not speak, however, for the rank and file of the American Legion any more than the leader of any other group speaks for the rank and file of its members.

It is quite understandable why members of the armed services are interested in wanting to saddle upon us peacetime military conscription that will give them vast bodies of men to command. As I have often said, no preacher ever had a congregation large enough to talk to and no general ever had an army big enough to command.

In peacetime the military are chiefly interested in pay, promotion, retirement, and having their sons succeed them at West Point and Annapolis; and you know it. They know it. And I have appointed the sons of military and naval officers.

I have always tried to be a friend of members of the armed services. This is the one, big, fundamental issue on which we radically, violently, and irreconcilably differ.

Do you want this thing? I want to give you just some of the reasons why I am against it.

First, it is a radical departure from our American traditions and best interests. Every major power, every great nation that has ever had military training or peacetime conscription inevitably has been led down the road to war, defeat, and ruin. Germany, Italy, and Japan, today, are a shambles. All the way from Mannheim and Ludwigshaven along the Rhine to Darmstadt, Frankfort to Cologne, over to Bremen, Hamburg, down through Berlin, and Dresden on to far-off Stuttgart and Muenchen.

The result of Prussian militarism started under Bismarck, was carried out

by the Kaiser, and was lauded to the skies by Hitler, yet some people would like to Prussianize this country.

Oh, it is argued by some that Japan, Italy, and Germany failed, but just look at Sweden and Switzerland. They have not been overrun. No; but it is not because they have universal military training and service. Sweden, with a little more than 6,000,000 people, less than the city of New York, and Switzerland, with a little over 4,000,000 people, about the size of the city of Chicago, one on the right flank of Germany and the other on the left flank of Germany, Sweden furnishing iron ore and raw materials to the Reich while Switzerland furnished watches, precision instruments, and agricultural products, milk, cheese, and chocolate. It was to Germany's interest not to attack Sweden or Switzerland because so long as they remained neutral Germany did not have to defend them.

No intelligent, serious-minded person for one moment would honestly and candidly argue that we should adopt universal military training because it has happened to work in Sweden or Switzerland. That is puerile and ignorant thinking. History is on the side of the people who oppose this peacetime military conscription because it has been tried, and it has always failed. It will fail again.

If you force men against their will into military service the country is lulled into a false sense of security. Look at France. France built the Maginot line. They had universal military training and a huge standing army. France thought she was impregnable, but she was overrun in a few weeks' time. Peacetime military conscription did not save Poland. It was this peacetime conscription that bled the economy of France and rendered her weak and impotent. Let me say here that the battle front can never be stronger than the home front. Modern, mechanized wars are not won by mere masses of men, but by up-to-date weapons, scientific research, and technological development.

The quality of weapons has always prevailed against the mere masses of men. If we start to match man for man with the hordes in Russia, and on the continent of Asia, we are licked before we begin. Japan surrendered with 3,000,000 soldiers on Honshu, Hokkaido, and Kyushu Islands. She had 3,000,000 men under arms, and yet they surrendered. Why? Because our great and gallant Navy, our B–17's, and later our B–29's had literally burned up and blasted to bits all of the Yokohama area in Japan, and the Tokyo region, Nagoya, Nagasaki, Kobe, Osaka, and Hiroshima. Every city in Japan, with the exception of Kyoto, like every city in Germany, with the exception of Heidelberg, was blasted to bits and destroyed—not by mere numbers of men, but by modern, up-to-date weapons.

The chief reason we should defeat this bill is not alone on moral or social grounds, however valid those grounds might be, but the reason I am against this bill is because instead of adding to our national security, it imperils and weakens our defense. What we need now more than anything else are guns and bombs and planes and tanks. Already the Russians are outproducing us in planes. They are shooting more planes down today in Korea than we are manufacturing in this country. Are we going to build up a great reservoir of manpower here in this country at an enormous expense to bleed our economy white as France was bled white from 1870 to 1939? We need steel, aluminum, and machine tools. We need more than anything else scientists, technicians, and mechanics, and, gentlemen, you are not going to get them under universal military training. You are not going to produce any experts in the field of radio, radar, television, or electronics in any 6 months' time.

What a farce this bill is. How futile it is. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] when he said, "It is remarkable how little this bill does. I should say it is. It does nothing except to weaken and undermine our Nation and this great Republic. It takes a long time to develop experts. Offhand, I cannot just think of anyone in any branch of the armed services who ever gave us any great inventions. I know that Thomas Edison, Henry Ford, the Wright brothers, or Eli Whitney would never have been produced in any UMT or under the military, because the military is cast in a mold. They are put in a strait-jacket. They produce a rigidity of mind that closes the intellectual door to new ideas. In college classrooms you can talk back, but you do not in the Army. It is blind obedience and unquestioning following of commands. It closes the mind to new facts, to new weapons. No elasticity or freedom of the mind is left.

What has made America great? Her freedom, because in freedom is our strength. Oh, you say this will not Prussianize America. This bill will not militarize this country. Heaven knows we all hate war. The reason we are not Prussianized or militarized is because we have never had this European scheme, but once you adopt it you will find out that Americans, after all, are human beings, pretty much like the common clay in all people all over this world. We are not so different. We will become imbued with a spirit, we will be indoctrinated, particularly if you can take boys with fuzz on their cheeks and chins at an impressionable age. Just give us time and we will travel the same road to disaster that has been traveled by every other great power which has lived under this ruinous scheme.

They tell you how good this is going to be for the boys; for their health. A great Britisher said that the battles of the First World War were won on the hockey and cricket fields of England, at Eton, Harrow, Oxford, and Cambridge. As far as physical training on the baseball diamond and football field in our colleges and universities is concerned, these boys can remain in their own local environments, under the wholesome influences of church and home and school. That is the place to develop character; not by segregating men into large bodies. It is bad to segregate any group of men, particularly boys of 18 and 19, far from home, living in an abnormal and unnatural environment. I lived in barracks three decades ago with boys and I would not choose it as a particularly favorable spot to develop character. It stands to reason that free and independent men make the best army on earth, but the army is not the best place to make free and independent men.

Now, what about the cost? No one can accurately tell you what this is going to cost us. The commission has made its report. The commission is composed of five outstanding patriotic Americans, three civilians and two military leaders. In spite of their wisdom, virtue, and patriotism they have all favored UMT for many years. It was a lopsided commission that was set up to report to us, but a Missourian knows how to cut the cards and stack the deck.

I want to make this thing clear: Universal military training is not an established law of this land; it cannot become law until the Congress, both Houses, Senate and House, by affirmative, positive action passes legislation to make it so. That is what is before us, and I am glad the issue at long last has been divided. I argued last year—there is very little that I can add to the speech I made in the well here when I spoke for over an hour on April 3 of last year. I stood here and argued against the shotgun wedding, the illicit marriage of the extension of the draft with UMT. I did everything in the beginning of the hearings in the committee, and my good friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] agreed that the issues should have been separated then. But no; we all knew, and certainly the proponents of UMT knew we would have to extend the draft because of the Korean conflict and because of world conditions. We all voted for extension of the draft. I even voted in conference to give the President the power to call the Reserves whether Congress was in session or not. But the proponents of peacetime conscription knew that the only chance in the world they had of getting this thing saddled upon us was to tie it in to the draft. When we extended the draft, what we did in that bill, Public Law 51, was to set up the National Security Training Commission composed of Senator Wadsworth, Will Clayton, Dr. Compton, of MIT, Admiral Kincaid, and General McLain to make a study and report within 4 months time, which they did on October 29 to the Congress; and then each Committee on the Armed Services, the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate, could take up the measure, study legislation proposed, then report to the respective bodies the results of their findings.

Today we are not voting for the hybrid mongrel bill of last year; today we are voting on only a single issue and that is whether we are going to have not the draft, temporary legislation that is meeting all of the requirements of this hour, but whether we shall set up peacetime military conscription on a permanent basis. We are going now to adopt the very thing we have spent so much in blood and money in past years to destroy.

The virus and the disease of the vanquished has infected the victors. What a sad commentary.

We were told when that bill passed last year that UMT, if it were set up, would not go into effect until after the draft ended; that is what we were told. But now we sneak in, instead of postponing or waiting until the present crisis is over, which General MacArthur has advised, to which both Hanson Baldwin, the military expert of the New York Times, and Mrs. Anna Rosenberg herself have admitted cannot go effectively into operation until the present emergency or crisis is over; notwithstanding that promise we now sneak in and we are going to take—oh, just 60,000. The 800,000 will come later. "We will take 5,000 a month," a trifling number. We will get the camel's nose under the tent, then he will take over the whole circus later on. We just want to get the foot in the door, we just want to ease the needle into you now, then we will come along a little later and we will throw the harpoon into you. Indeed!

You know what is going to happen. You know the provisions in the Senate bill that after these boys have 6 months training they are put in the Reserves for 18 months and can be called up at any time. That same provision was in the House bill. But, oh, our astute, resourceful and clever chairman, that wise old owl who has a barrel of tricks, and you never know when he is going to pull one from the bottom, he who has been in this House twice as long as I have, and if I live to be as old as Methuselah I would not be as smart as he is, knew he could not even get that out of our committee. But he knows how to sugarcoat that bitter pill. He knows how to put lace and fringes on the garment to make it attractive. Sometimes I think he should have been a dress designer. He states that we are going to write a provision in here to protect these trainees. In his opening speech he came over and hammered that home: "Hear me, get this. He is called in for 6 months' training, then he goes into the Reserves. He cannot be called into service until the Congress, "until you and I," until we call him back in such manner and in such numbers as we might deem wise."

That is wonderful, is it not? How long do you think that provision would remain in the bill when it goes to conference? You know, I sit in conference and I have learned a few of his tricks. I have never had a higher honor or greater privilege than sitting by the side of CARL VINSON, one of the finest and best men I have ever known, a wise, able legislator. The trouble is sometimes he is too darned wise.

The trainee is going to serve 6 months. He will not be called back until the Congress orders him back. Now, you train this boy 6 months, then put him in the Reserves. When he goes back to Oshkosh, Kokomo, or wherever he came from, Tupelo or Galena, I do not know how these boys are going to get refresher courses or training in the armories in so many places where there are no armories and where there is no equipment. But you spend a lot of money on him giving the 6 months' training, you put him in the Reserves, then war comes on 2, 3, 4, or 10 years later. In the meantime he has grown soft and flabby, a lot of them have married and have dependents, they will be exempted for one reason or another, others will become disabled. But those who are able to pass the mental and physical test will have to be trained all over again. They have learned squads right, squads left, and setting up exercises. They can learn that at home now at their own expense with a little effort. More important they will have to learn how to use new and improved weapons of war.

But we are going to spend $4,000,000,000 the first year, and try to cut it down to $2,500,000,000 the following years. But, listen, no military man ever gave you an estimate of the cost of the program that got within gunshot or hearing range of the original estimate, and you know it. The methods and techniques of modern warfare rapidly and radically change. A boy trained today for 6 months will in all probability have to be trained many more months to operate any war machine in the future. Keep these American youths in our scientific, technical, medical, and engineering schools instead of wasting time, money, and talent on something to please the generalissimo.

They say they are going to reduce our standing Armed Forces. We cannot reduce them in the immediate future. There is no chance, and you cannot put UMT into effect as long as we have the draft, as long as we are at war. We simply do not have enough manpower to afford this luxury. We do not have enough manpower to have universal military training and the draft at the same time.

Here is the worst part of this bill. Ah, brother, before you vote for it, you think of this. This farmer has a son. He goes into UMT. He serves 6 months and then goes into the Reserve. But his cousin, his neighbor on the adjoining farm, or the fellow who lives across the street from your grocer, gets different treatment. One boy goes in for 6 months, but the other boy is drafted for 2 years in active service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

You are very kind and very gracious. Having lived with this problem for several years, I did have several points to bring out, but I do not want to be selfish with my time. I have been called every dirty name in the catalog in the past 2 days for not yielding every Member all the time he wanted, and put him on first. Oh, it is a wonderful honor and prestige to have control of the time, but I am not going to trespass on your time and patience. You have been very gracious. You are kind and I love you all.

This situation will become so intolerable, with one boy serving 6 months under UMT and another boy drafted to fight 2 years, perhaps in Korea, Indochina, the Near East or some other place, that none of us will be in the next Congress.

Members of the Committee, in closing, this may be my last year in this body, but if I do leave I want to leave saying that I stayed here long enough to see that this measure gets what it needs, not a doctor to dress it up, emasculate, and amend it, but an undertaker to bury it, as the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] wanted to do yesterday, without benefit of clergy, with no tombstone to mark the spot.

We all know that as long as there are brigands in the world and aggressors abroad we must, in sheer self-defense and for our own survival, remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. The opponents of UMT are not against adequate defense or national preparedness. We have got to continue for some time to vote these back-breaking appropriations, but let us see that the American taxpayer gets his dollar's worth and put an end to the waste, extravagance, and inefficiency of our Armed Forces instead of voting them more power to control not only our money but also human life, the young human life of this Nation.

And, as we go forward trying to keep America strong, let us not vote for a scheme, however nice it may sound, that would undermine our economy and render us weak. Let us center a little more attention on peace rather than war. Let us look forward to the distant future—perhaps it is not too distant—when we shall beat these swords into plowshares, where we will work for universal disarmament, and we will do it at the very moment that Russia and the nations she has reduced to serfdom will give us assurance and a guaranty of open and free international inspection and control of all armament.

Let us work for peace and not build up a military machine thinking only of war. War is not inevitable. We want to live and let live. But liberty is more precious than life itself and we shall die to preserve this liberty that is ours.

God bless you all.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I particularly invite the attention of the Committee and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri to the language in section 140 of the bill which provides that the Congress shall determine the numbers of reservists who may be ordered to active duty, after their training, and the manner in which such men shall be called into service. It is almost identical with the language and has the same purpose as that set out in the bill the House passed on October 15, 1951. In the bill that passed then, known as the Armed Forces Reserve Act, which applies to every reservist whether he is under UMT or not, it is stated:

> The Congress shall determine the number of members of the Reserve component necessary for the national security.

So every reservist, whether obtained under UMT or through any other method, can only be called in when Congress takes further action.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED]

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. Mr. Chairman, I know the task that confronts me in following my distinguished friend and colleague from Missouri, whom I love dearly. I do not believe I have ever heard a more able speaker, but sometimes, you know, there are facts which face us, evidence which is brought in before us which is so strong it cannot be overcome by all of the oratory in the world.

My friend made a statement with which I concur fully when he said that freedom is our strength. It certainly is. It is a thing that we love dearly. It is a thing that our ancestors fought for when they came to this country. It is the thing they have preserved for us until this day. Now we have an opportunity to continue to preserve that freedom that we love so dearly for our children and our children's children who are going to follow us in this great country.

And when I think of how narrowly sometimes in the past we have succeeded in protecting that freedom, it makes me realize all the more fully the responsibility we have here today. The gentleman said that universal military training did not prove successful in Germany. I am not in favor of any Prussianized America. I want to call your attention, however, to the fact that it so nearly succeeded in preparing Germany for war that, if it had not been for the efforts of other countries to hold them off until we could get ready, and if it had not been for some of our great leaders here at the time who were called warmongers, when they tried to get us ready, we would have lost that freedom then. We saved it, oh so narrowly. I want to tell you that this question, as has been said by my chairman, and as I believe, is the most important question that has been presented to the House in a long time. I do not believe that any question has been presented to this House, which is any more important than the question we have here today to decide. When the manpower bill was before the House, and when it was before our committee, I opposed the drafting of 18-year-old boys because I did not think it was necessary for them to go into service, and for the military to drop the age limit so low as to get these boys with fuzz on their cheeks, and although the other body passed that bill, we made the age 18½ years and fixed it so that no man could be sent into a combat area until he had reached the age of 19. But, that is not the question before us today. It is the training of these men for whatever they may have to face in the future that we are concerned with today. This is a training bill. Is there any man in the House of Representatives who wants to see any of our soldiers in the future, as they have sometimes in the past, go into combat when they are not thoroughly trained; when they do not have the training that they ought to have? How many soldiers do you think are buried somewhere today on foreign soil, mainly perhaps because they did not have sufficient training? Do you remember back during World War II when some of those antiaircraft units were quickly changed to infantry units because they had to have them, and they were sent right on over there? Do you think that the training that some of these boys had before they went to Korea was sufficient? We are trying to see that these boys get the training that they ought to have.

Universal military training cannot be effective without an effective Reserve system to follow it up. We have to have both. We have to have an equitable Reserve system, and we have to have a fair Reserve system. What happened this last time? They started calling in the inactive reservists, veterans and men with families. What we are trying to do now is to put in the Reserves a trained body of young men who, it is true, will go into the Reserves for 7½ years, but will really be in the ready Reserve only 3 years, if they actively participate in the drills. That means they will get through with the ready Reserve while they are just 22 or 23 years of age, before they have taken on many of the responsibilities and obligations of citizenship, such as marriage and children, but where they will still be able to go into the service, and yet they will not cost the Government as much. Speaking about the fairness of this thing, that is one of the things for which the bill provides. It corrects some of the inequities that have gone on heretofore. What this bill does is to put a trained body of men into the Reserves, none of whom are veterans so that if they have to be called the Congress can call in men who have been trained and who are ready although they will not have already seen service in the Second World War or in the Korean war. That has been one of the troubles heretofore. We have not had many men except veterans in the Reserves. Oh, they mention the National Guard, and the fact that 50 percent of them were not veterans. All of them have been well trained. I am proud of the Thirty-first Division from Alabama and Mississippi that was called in, but those men have had to go through months of training before they could be sent overseas.

What we need is a body of young men who have been trained to go into these Reserves, men who are not veterans, that Congress can call in.

It is said that it is unfair to take one man for 24 months' service and give another man 6 months' service and then put him into the Reserves. I grant you there is something to that statement, but let us look at it. When we had the manpower bill before the House, what happened? We had some of the same arguments then that are here now, by educational groups, to defer the college groups; by the farmers, to defer their group; by others, to defer their groups. What do you have in that system?

As I said when I spoke on this floor when we were considering that bill, I thought then that we might be giving the man in college an advantage of deferment that we were not giving to the boy who had not had an opportunity to go to college. Now we have so many deferments that we find these boys deferred, not at the end of one academic year but to the end of their college careers in many instances and after they have graduated and perhaps become married and have children being deferred, deferred, deferred, and not getting into service. This boy who comes in here for 6 months does not get these deferments. There are only about two statutory deferments. He has a right to be deferred until the end of his academic year if in college, or until graduation if he is in high school provided under 20 years of age. Whereas, the draft is getting only about 1 out of 8 or 9 or 10, this bill, it is estimated, will get approximately 8 out of 10. Even if it gets but 7 out of 10, it at least bears some semblance to the name "Universal Military Training."

Mr. HOLFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I want to compliment the gentleman on this particular part of his speech. I do not want to interrupt his trend of thought, but along that very line I know of a family that is very close to me where three boys have served: one in the North Atlantic on a destroyer for 4 years, one in the South Pacific for 4 years, and the other is back from Korea, now in Bethesda Hospital at the end of his fourth year. All of those boys are married. Some of them have children. They are all right now eligible to be called back into the service under the present law, while these 8 out of 10 are being deferred, young men who have not had military service. When you are talking about fairness, I ask you if there is anything fair about the present situation.

Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED. I do not think so. That is what this bill will, in some measure, remedy. Eight out of ten of them will have to get this training. Then they go into the Reserves. When they go into the Reserves they will be subject to the call of this Congress. It is inconceivable to me that when this Congress gets ready to call in the Reserves—and all of them will be subject to the action of Congress under the Reserve bill—the President can declare an emergency and call in the Ready Reserves, but only in such numbers as are fixed by Congress. So you will have the whole thing at your command. All of the Reserves will be at your command. It will be up to you to say whether these men who have seen service in Korea and in the Second World War will be called in first, or whether these young men will be called. What will you do? The only common sense thing for you to do would be to call in these boys first. In all probability that is what you will do. So it is not so unfair.

One other thing my distinguished friend said. He went on to say we want to do what is best for the American people. I agree with him on that. I have always felt friendly and tried to go along with these groups whenever I can—these educational groups, the farm groups, the labor groups, who come here and who think that these boys are going to be hit by this bill. Well, let us see.

This bill fixes it so that the boy on the farm will not have his occupation interfered with too much; the laboring

boy who is called in is given full reemployment rights; the boys in college, if they are called in June or the 1st of July, will be out and ready to start back in college the 1st of January. Any man who will let 6 months of basic military training interfere with his college education does not want an education very badly.

If you will pardon a personal allusion, I know boys myself who served 2, 3, and 4 years in the Second World War who came back, finished their education, and are following their professions today.

As I understand, when these boys go into training camps they will be assigned to the various branches of the service; Infantry, Air Force, Navy, and so forth, and given the basic training in that branch. If that is followed up when they go into the Reserves, by an effective Reserve training in that same branch of the Armed Forces it should not be too difficult to maintain a well-trained and efficient Reserve all over the United States. A man could get into a Reserve unit and follow the same type of training he received in the basic training camps. If we have an effective Reserve, if we give men the type of training that ought to be given them, then they would not need as long a refresher course when they are called into service as otherwise—some, perhaps, but not as long; and how much more efficient and effective soldiers, sailors, marines, and air men will they be on account of the training that they have had?

Now, about our country becoming Prussianized or militarized because of universal military training, it just depends sometimes on what you are thinking about and what you are arguing. A person was talking to me the other day. He first talked about the Presidential race and was talking about some five-star general he would like to see elected President. After a while the discussion got around to UMT and he told me that he was against UMT because he felt it would Prussianize and militarize the country. Rather inconsistent, don't you think? Is there any man here who is really seriously thinking that the passage of this bill is going to Prussianize America? Take all these veterans who have come back from the wars; many of you are veterans. Have you seen any effort on the part of any of the veterans to militarize or Prussianize this country? Do you think that 6 months' training of these boys will militarize America?

The only way this country can ever be militarized, dominated, or subjugated is not by ourselves becoming militarized but, through our helplessness and inadequacy of defense, have some other country take us over.

We cannot have a farm group in this country unless we have farms, and we cannot have farms if we do not keep them, if we do not protect them by adequate defense. We cannot have organized labor without laborers, and the laborers cannot have the operation and benefit of organization if, through our inadequacy of defense and failure to prepare our defense, we let Joe Stalin come over here and take us over; because then instead of having free organized labor we will have slave labor. When I think of the educational forces that are opposing this bill, may I ask, what kind of education will we have in this country if we lose our freedom by failure to prepare for defense?

They talk about these boys—18-year-olds—going out for 6 months basic training and not being under proper supervision or inspection. Well, we have in this bill a provision that in the first place the men who train the boys in these camps have to be good men, men who know how to treat boys, men who understand them, men of high moral character who in training these boys will recognize the fact they are dealing with young men, that they are coming in contact with boys who are just reaching their adolescence. The boys have the right to go to these inspectors when they come around to find out how things are being operated. We have to have some confidence in people that they will establish these camps in communities and localities where they should be established. We have provided every kind of legal safeguard in here by making it a violation of law to sell boys alcoholic beverages of more than 1 percent. We have provided for chaplains. We have other moral safeguards.

By the time a boy reaches 18 years of age, he has come up in an American community and he is old enough to be drafted for service at 18½ years of age. He has been brought up in a Christian community of the United States, he has been living in his home, he has been in his Sunday school, he has been in his church, he has been in his school, under the tutelage and teaching, as a rule, of fine American citizens. Usually by the time a boy becomes 18 years of age his fundamental character has already been established. After that time he is often sent off to universities, at least, most of them are. We all believe in our universities. There is one of the greatest universities in the United States in my home town, the University of Alabama, of which I am proud.

But, you know, no matter how careful they are in those universities, when the boys go there they join fraternities, they go off to other cities to football games, they have parties, and they do not have a guardian going around with them every moment to safeguard them. Surely, if a man is old enough to fight for his country by the time he is 18½ or 19, he is old enough to take 6 months of basic training by the time he is 18.

The training will be fine for them. It will develop them physically. It will teach them something even more about discipline than they have heretofore known, without destroying their self-reliance as citizens. It will make them become more careful of their personal appearance and form habits that will be valuable to them throughout life.

I trust this bill will be administered with common sense as far as the question of segregation is concerned. There is no provision in the bill either for segregation or against segregation, as in the manpower bill, and the administrators of this bill must use common sense in the administration of the bill in this regard, especially in the Southern States, if it is going to be a full success. I have been assured by the Department of Defense that this bill will be administered with common sense, and inasmuch as I know that the Thirty-first Division has been properly treated in this regard, I am willing to go on this assurance for the present, but I would like to see the bill changed in regard to training the young men in the same States or localities where they are inducted for training, as I believe it would be better to send them elsewhere to bring about a common-sense administration of the bill. If these young men are inducted in proportion to their respective races and trained in the State of their residence, without segregation, there would be an absolutely intolerable situation as far as the South is concerned.

As I stated in my opening remarks, I do not believe that any question has been presented to the House in a long time of any more importance than this measure. It is necessary to prepare America to defend herself from any aggression and I urge your support of this important legislation.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, one thing I am very happy about in this debate is that this bill does not go along any party lines. Every man will have to make up his own mind as to what is the right thing to do and whether this bill is the one that fits his ideas of securing America or not.

In order to illustrate my approach to the bill I would like to read a part of the testimony of Admiral Kinkaid when he was before our committee on this bill. This appears on page 2355:

> Mr. JOHNSON. One other question: Yesterday, when Mr. SHORT was mentioning that all of the Commissioners were predisposed to UMT, you shook your head.
>
> Now, will you explain briefly your attitude on UMT?
>
> Admiral KINKAID. Yes.
>
> I foresaw that question, and wrote out a little paragraph. If I had been asked 12 or 15 years ago if I favored universal military training, why, I would have replied in the negative, because I wanted to adhere to our historic traditions, and to our concept of the American way of life.
>
> Since then a great deal of water has gone over the dam. The whole world has changed, and our position in the world has become such that we have only the alternatives of maintaining an enormous military establishment of Regular forces or of maintaining a modest force backed by a trained Reserve, ready for call in time of emergency.

Mr. Chairman, that explains the evolution of my own thinking on this problem. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] talked to you a while ago on this problem, I was impressed by how curious the human mind can be. He and I have traveled over the entire world and seen every hell-hole where the war penetrated, all kinds of places from the Orient to the Near East, to Western Europe and the islands of the Pacific. We were trying to study and analyze what is the proper security program for the United States of America, and how the postwar problems of the displaced persons, surplus war property, and re-

habilitation of the vanquished countries could be solved. Yet on this bill, which I think does secure the United States of America, we differ radically.

The evolution of my thinking on this problem has come about by studying the cold facts the world presents to us today. Make no mistake, this may be one of the great, historic debates of the Congress of the United States. We are considering a new system of security that does change our traditional policy. That policy has been to rely on a small regular force and a voluntary system of reserves, who came to the support of the Regulars in time of war.

In the last 35 years we have seen two great wars come and go. In each case our might was the balance that won the war. But what is war for? To bring a just and honorable peace. Do we have peace today? After the first war we demobilized rapidly, and it was not 20 years until the shadows of war were again cast across the different countries of the world, finally reaching our own.

We had a second war, and we gave the impetus, the balance, the strength, the ingenuity and the scientific development that won that war. Do we have peace today? No. Seven years have gone by and the world is more chaotic, there are more threatening situations, there are more hot spots in the world where war can flare up than there were on the day the war ended.

From my 35 years of observation of what we have done and not done in the military field and what we have done and not done in peace, it is my considered conviction that we have to find some modern system of defense that will be continuous and permanent. We cannot play hot and cold after every war and expect America to lead us into the ways of peace. Such conduct merely invites aggression and may again lead to war.

Think of a few of these facts. As I said, 7 years ago the war ended, yet today we are still groping for peace and it is a long ways away. In the last war, just before the war ended American ingenuity and scientific development came into play. We had developed the atomic bomb, and just as a prelude of what the future held in store for the world in case another catastrophe should befall the earth, we dropped two atomic bombs. Any man who has seen the devastation those two bombs wrought, as I have, will think a long while about letting America become insecure.

Is there any doubt in the mind of any man or woman in this House that the Soviets are putting pressure upon the whole world? When you think of Trieste, for instance, and what the Kremlin did there; when you think of Iran and Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and so forth, and Korea, the most recent and glaring example, it is obvious, I believe to any thinking person that the Soviets are bent on dominating the free world. Perhaps only a little at a time but the books of Lenin and Stalin show they are aiming at the whole world. A Communist—godless—world and a free world, they say, cannot exist side by side.

During the 7 years since the capitulation of the three dictatorial powers, as we became more impotent militarily the pressure stepped up. First, it was in Greece, then in Iran, then in Korea. All over the world, they are putting on the heat. Do not all of you see, as I think I see, that all the Soviets wish to do is to isolate one free country after another until finally the great object of their maniacal delusion will be the United States of America? We have strained ourselves in offering policies of peace in the United Nations. We back the United Nations as the best implement we have for peace today. After all our efforts, we have gotten nowhere. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] mentioned, we offered a method of controlling atomic warfare. The Soviets would not agree to it. They would not concede that there should be a realistic right of inspection by representatives of the U. N. We offered many other proposals and during all the time that the United Nations, impotent as it is, has been in session, about the only one who has gotten anything of value out of it is Russia by making it a world sounding board for her propaganda. Of the 48 vetoes that have been invoked in the United Nations, Russia has given 47. Does anyone believe that after the exposé of the Hiss case, the Soviets do not have a desire to put pressure on and even to finally take over, if they think we are weak enough, the United States of America? What is the mission, I ask of you, of the United States in this curious, changing, explosive, and small world? In my humble opinion, the mission of the United States is to furnish the leadership to the free world which will bring about world stability and perhaps world peace. Can we do that by having a weak, impotent nation? History has shown that our strength to a certain extent in the diplomatic field and by negotiation rises and falls with our military strength.

Our traditional policy which we have carried out for a century and a half was based upon the theory that we would have time to prepare. In the first war, we had time to prepare, although we did not start to do so until after we had declared war. The first officers' training camp, which I attended, opened on May 12, 1917. We had time and a wide ocean, and two allies on our side. It was almost a year and a half after the declaration of the war before we made ourselves felt.

In the second war, although we saw it coming right at us, the Congress was so reluctant to do anything to get ready for the war that, when the House of Representatives considered the renewal of the selective service law in 1941, a little over a month before Pearl Harbor, it only passed by one vote. Does not Pearl Harbor and Korea mean a thing to American Congressmen? What is Korea and Pearl Harbor? They are the indication and the demonstration of the way any future war will come. There will be no declaration of war. There will be an overt attack on us right away. That is why, in my humble opinion, we must have men ready and able and skillful enough to repulse the attack and to turn it the other way.

I want to point out one thing to you, which I wish every one of you would remember, no matter what your views may be, and that is that this is a training bill. The thing I want to specifically point out to you in that connection is that the ones who win the wars of the world are the men—that little group of men who are on the fighting front, the men who meet the troops of the enemy in mortal combat. We can have all the production in the world. We can talk about all the ideals in the world, we can have the scientific skills and development; but if that little group of men facing the enemy in a crucial attack does not win, then we do not win. If they lose we go down in dust, a defeated Nation. I will give you a few illustrations as to how close the situation is at times. In the First World War, the Germans attacked west of Paris and almost engulfed Paris. Then they suddenly attacked to the east of Paris. What happened? At Belleau Woods near Chateau-Thierry the second American Division checked the Germans, repulsed them, pushed them back, turned the onrushing German tide, and that was the beginning of the end of the German drive. There were two regiments of marines and two regiments of doughboys. They were trained to the *n*th degree.

I will give you another example. In 1940 Britain was almost at the bottom of the barrel. They were hanging on the ropes. The Germans were driving England into the ground with their stuka dive bombers, raiding England at will. It shows how a small group, well trained, skillful and courageous, can win a victory. What happened? In the first place the Germans made the fatal mistake of not placing rear guns on the stuka dive bombers. They rolled at will over Coventry, Liverpool, Southampton, London, and swept destruction and ruin before them. Britain was holding on by a thread. Everthing looked lost. But the British forces developed a good plane, and a little handful of men flying Spitfires and other planes rose above the British Isles, and they knocked the dive bombers out of the air like sitting ducks. That little group of men who were fighting the enemy in mortal combat turned the tide that finally helped save the war for Great Britain and the other Allies.

As Winston Churchill so ably said: "Never did so many owe so much to so few."

Do not forget there are many similar cases in world history.

What does this training have to do with that? Here is what it has to do with it. In every kind of contest where skill is required there are certain fundamentals that combat troops must have. The infantry has one kind, the artillery man has another, the sailors have another, the fliers have another. If you have those fundamentals, then you can build skill, technique, and proficiency on that and win a victory that may mean life or death to your Nation.

Every flier knows the hours and hours pilots spend on acquiring the characteristics of their plane; on studying characteristics or performances and weaknesses of enemy planes; on all conceivable sorts of maneuvers and situations which they may encounter enemy planes; hours and hours in gunnery practice. Why? So when the supreme moment

comes to bring victory home or die in their tracks, they will bring victory home.

Remember that victory is not the victory alone of this little group of skillful and courageous men. It is your victory and mine. It is what saves us and our country and our institutions.

How does training contribute? With a fresh group of trainees coming in each year with the fundamentals necessary in all the various branches of modern war, we build on those, which are basic, the added skills and the poise and judgment so when the supreme test arrives it will be met and our men come out victorious.

It has been said over and over in this debate that we will train a few boys today and in 5 years they will be out of date. But that merely indicates that those critics do not understand the program.

We graduate a group of UMT trainees every year, train them for 6 months intensively in all the varied skills of modern warfare. I am only recommending this because I think it is the right thing to do that will bring us to peace. Train these boys in the arts of warfare so that they can handle themselves if a catastrophe comes, which we pray to God will not come.

Well, suppose they do get rusty; the war does not come until 4 years from then. You have a group of men trained that year. Every year you change the training. Every year you adapt it to the new situation, new techniques, new tactics, new developments so that the men may finally become the most skillful in their branch of the service in the world.

That is the thing I want to leave with you. It is that little group of people which finally clashes with the enemy in mortal combat that will save America. If we have that group and the enemy knows it, they will stop a long while before practicing aggression. I am not one of those who fear we will have a Russian attack tomorrow. I do not know what they are going to do. Nobody else does. I want the American home and American institutions secure by having an adequate force so that potential aggressors, who do not dare to lose, will not contemplate that sort of move.

That is where our efforts at peace and negotiation may start to become effective. When our adversary realizes we are strong enough to take care of ourselves, and we are continuing to keep our strength intact, our adversary will be willing to negotiate to find a common ground for settlement. Then the campaign for peace really can come into its own. That is the basis of our present build-up of our military. But the important thing is we are shifting our policy so we will continue to be strong, as a national policy, and are relying on continual replenishment of reserves to keep us in that position.

Everybody in the Chamber knows, they must know, that this talk about militarizing America—my colleague from Alabama [Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED] mentioned it—is sheer nonsense. It shows a lack of confidence in our youth. I want to tell you that as long as we have an American House of Representatives, elected by the people, from the grass roots of this Nation, you never can militarize America. If you believe in the training of our homes and our schools, you cannot militarize boys who have had that kind of training in the short space of 6 months. Of this I am positive.

Let me get clearly before you just exactly what this bill does: It provides for 6 months of intensive training. It will have very good byproducts in the way of making a boy realize the predicament America is in and his duty to help protect his own life as well as the life of the Republic. He will get 6 months of basic military training. That will not disturb anybody's education; every sensible person understands that thoroughly. It will not make the slightest difference; in fact, it will add to his education, because he will appreciate it all the more. Then he has 7½ years more in the Reserves. Some have called it slavery; some conscription; but, Mr. Chairman, there is no conscription to that; conscription is where you take a man and throw him into a war; that is conscription. Neither is that training slavery. He may if he wants to shorten that 7½ years—it is all in the law, and I will include the provision, in my remarks.

Here is what the law says:

The Reserve Act, H. R. 5426, which has passed the House and is now pending in the Senate, provides:

SEC. 208. (a) A member of the Reserve components required to serve therein pursuant to subsection (d) of section 4 or other section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, or by any other provision of law, shall be placed in the Ready Reserve of his armed force without his consent for the remainder of his required term of service.

Public Law 51, Eighty-second Congress, provides:

(3) Each person who, subsequent to the date of enactment of this paragraph, is inducted, enlisted, or appointed in the Armed Forces or in the National Security Training Corps prior to attaining the twenty-sixth anniversary of his birth shall be required to serve on active training and service in the Armed Forces or in training in the National Security Training Corps, and in a reserve component, for a total period of 8 years, unless sooner discharged on the grounds of personal hardship, in accordance with regulations and standards prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The Reserve bill provides that he may join the Ready Reserve and after 3 years of service wipe out all his obligation. What is wrong about that? Is there anything wrong about letting the trainee finish his obligation in 3½ years? Is there anything oppressive? Is there anything unfair? Is there anything prejudicial about that? I cannot see for the life of me how there is anything that is wrong about that situation. The 3 years in the Ready Reserves will not interfere with his education or his work, except for 15 days a year for which he is paid.

Let me show you that what we are trying to do today is only to bring the system of protection for America up to date, such as was envisioned by the founding fathers. Here is what Jefferson said in 1818:

We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens. We can never be safe until this is done.

George Washington in 1783 said:

It may be laid down as a primary position and the basis of our system that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a portion of his property but even of his personal services to the defense of it, and consequently that the citizens of America from 15 to 60 years of age should be borne on militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to them, that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice. They ought to be regularly mustered and trained and to have their arms inspected at certain times, and able-bodied men between the ages of 18 and 25 drafted to form a corps in every State to be employed whenever it may become necessary to the service of their country.

William Jennings Bryan said many years ago that if America were attacked a million men would rise to her defense. We want to bring that statement up to date. We have to have modern minute men, the men who are ready to give us protection. Today we have no waiting time, we have no geography in our favor any more, when they fly the oceans in 4 hours. All we are doing, Mr. Chairman, is to bring our military system up to the last minute. By passing this legislation we are guaranteeing that there will always be an available, trained-to-the-minute group that can help defend America if America is attacked. Through our strength we can get peace in the world. America has that mission to perform, to unite the free world; and, naturally, finally the Soviet world will say: "We had better bargain; we had better reason; we had better talk to these people and bring stability."

This bill is a step, a long step in that direction.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am a little embarrassed standing before these good men and these gentle ladies because I am a veteran of almost 4 years training in the last war and, according to some of the speeches made this afternoon, moral degeneration, Prussianized thinking is the end product of that training. But if these good folks will overlook my character analysis which was made this afternoon I will try and deal with the issues that are involved in the legislation pending before us.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could say in standing here before you that I am asking you to support a political issue on which the people of this Nation are united, but unfortunately, I cannot. Public opinion polls show that our people are almost equally divided on this grave and important issue.

It is an easy thing, as a Congressman, to demand the necessary sacrifices of our people to protect their liberties at the time of a Pearl Harbor, but the task of voting for these sacrifices of our people 4 months before Pearl Harbor, when the draft was extended by a vote of 202 to 203, is immensely difficult.

Then, we had the invasion of Czechoslovakia and other countries tolling their warning. Today, we have a nasty little war in Korea. If that war were the only war we could contemplate in the future, then universal military training would not be necessary for our country, but we know that if world war III comes, it will be sudden; it will be without warning. This Nation, as the arsenal of democracy, will be the primary target. We will have no allies to carry on and buy us time while we prepare. No one thinks we will have time to train forces after war is declared. We had years before in the other two world wars, but now we shall need to be able to effectuate an immediate switching to mobilization.

There will be no opportunity for those who vote against this bill to go down into the well and change their vote from "nay" to "yea."

My deepest concern in this bill is that some of my dear friends in the House who believe as strongly as I do in universal military training, will vote against it because it does not exactly fit the picture as they see it.

I must agree with them that had I been the author of this bill, there are some changes I would have made. I dare say that if each of us had our own individual way, we would have had 435 different versions of this bill.

I have yet to see a bill which has been passed by the Congress that I could not find something wrong with it, and find reason to vote against it—and so it will always be in a democratic country with so many different interests. It seems to me, in deciding whether to vote for or against this bill for universal military training, that the question posed is: "Do the good features of this bill for strengthening the defenses of our country outweigh the bad features as each Member sees them in this bill?"

I think the scales clearly read that this bill will be of great benefit to the people of our country; that it is in the public interest.

Veterans who have worn their country's uniform, who have sacrificed to preserve its freedom; who know what it means to be shoved into battle without adequate training—veterans who know the humiliation of Corregidor, because their country did not have adequately trained, large, ready pools of reserves, do not want their sons to go into battle as green shock troops.

They want their sons, and I want my sons, to be trained adequately to deal with the combat decisions of the battlefield.

I stand here this afternoon to speak on behalf of the veteran reservist.

I stand here to plead the cause of the nearly 800,000 veteran reservists recalled to active duty to serve in Korea.

We have heard a great deal here since these debates started about the inequalities and injustices and inconveniences which will accrue to a great number of individuals who have never yet served their country.

We have heard too little about the inequality, the unfairness, and tragedy which has occurred to those who have served their country in the past.

In the circle of confusion which has surrounded the debates on this subject, we have been inclined to forget the most fundamental and basic of all issues—that is, what are we going to do to prevent this injustice from occurring again?

I take my stand to speak for those veterans. I stand to defend them against the slander which has been hurled against them since these debates began that because they have served their country in our Armed Forces, they are now morally degraded, militarized, and brutalized, while those who have managed to avoid service are model citizens. I stand here to present the viewpoint of the courageous self-sacrificing men who fought in World War II only to be recalled again for Korea, in order to save this Nation of ours.

I take my stand and I take it firmly.

I call for the adoption of universal military training.

I do this in spite of the insinuations and implied threats of "You better watch out, boys, if you vote for UMT, you are going to be defeated in the next election."

That implication, that charge, has been used rather loosely in these debates and I say to those who make this charge.

What kind of people do you think we are?

Is Congress to adjourn and close its doors and consider no controversial legislation once every 2 years simply because there is a congressional election? Are we the type of people who are so timid and shy and frightened that we keep our eyes cocked on the next election rather than on the survival of this Nation?

If that is the kind of people we are, this Nation will not long survive.

I repeat, just what kind of people do you think we are?

Do we lack the courage to act for the best interest of our country?

Do we lack the courage to speak up for those Americans who are fighting in Korea, protecting our privilege to stand here today and debate?

Are we a league of frightened men, afraid to take action to save our Nation in this time of peril?

I say, "No." And I will take my stand on that issue.

I know full well that the American people on any future day of reckoning will look with favor and trust and admiration on a man who considers not "how many votes he will lose" by this action but "how he may best serve his country."

If the sad day has come when we think only of self-interest and our privilege to strut momentarily around the Halls of Congress, I say this Nation is lost.

I repeat, what kind of people do you think we are?

Let us consider the conspiracy of confusion which has been woven in these Halls and across the Nation in regard to universal military training. Let us contrast that with the indelible facts as presented by the Commission and by the Armed Services Committee. Let us quit talking about issues completely irrelevant to UMT and start talking about the program as presented. Let us not set up some bill, some program, that does not exist and make up fictional arguments against a fictional plan which no one has ever seen.

Let us consider H. R. 5904, the first step toward righting the inequalities heaped upon our veterans in the past.

We who believe in UMT are not grabbing for UMT in a vacuum.

We do not desire to take 18-year-olds into UMT merely for the sake of passing a pleasant afternoon in the Congress.

We desire to do so because we must do so.

Too long we have taken a hop, a skip, and a jump, grasping here, grabbing there, and frittering away our manpower like fat bacon in a hot skillet in an attempt to meet the manpower needs for the security of this Nation.

We have bounced along from crisis to crisis always hoping that this crisis would be the last one, and often wrong.

We have stood in this very Chamber and loudly voiced our opposition to Russia, our plans to stand fast against Communist aggression, our plans to do this and our plans to do that, apparently believing that the best defense for this Nation was a defense of hot words voiced in a heated atmosphere.

The words we utter here, brave and noble as they may sound, unfortunately will not stop a single Russian soldier or Russian tank; otherwise the Russians would have been stopped long ago. But what we do here in the way of constructive legislation will determine whether or not we survive.

We cannot stand here today and chop out the solid cornerstone upon which security rests—trained manpower—and accomplish what we must do for the sake of this Nation.

We stand in danger.

We must act.

We must act with courage and without fear of petty personal consequences.

I know we will do so.

When Korea burst upon us with all its horror in June of 1950 that Communist onslaught cruelly revealed to this Nation the heart-rending price that must be paid for military unpreparedness.

Immediately following World War II, we relied unduly upon the fictional doctrine that the atomic age had eliminated the need for large military forces. At the same time, we unjustly relied upon the thousands of seasoned veterans recently returned from Europe and the Pacific, and bravely asserted that we did not need UMT. We reasoned: "If we have another war, all we have to do is call up the veterans. Why, we won't need UMT for 10 years. Veterans will last that long"—completely ignoring the fact that veterans, like anyone else, have a birthday once each year.

Others advanced the argument: Why have UMT? If anyone attacks us we will be ready and, besides, the only way to keep from being hurt in a war by an enemy is not to be there when he strikes. These statements smack very much like the one made by William Jennings Bryan that if any foreign foe should attempt to invade this country, they would be met on the beaches by farmers with shotguns and pitchforks and roundly

trounced. I wonder how many of us here still follow that philosophy.

To those people who say the best way to avoid being a casualty is not to be there when a guided missile or an atom bomb explodes, I can say only that it is quite evident that those courageous people obviously do not intend to be there. But it is quite tragic that others will be there and they should be trained to know how to survive in such an eventuality.

When the attack came in Korea, we as a Nation, as a result of the arguments of these groups, were caught in a self-induced shortage of trained manpower. Our regular units were at half strength. There was no class of young and basically trained graduates of a UMT program ready to take their place in the battle line.

As a result, Reservists and National Guard men who had fought the Second World War were the only source of trained men.

Some 800,000 Reservists were called to fill the ranks. Among these, 67 percent of the enlisted men were veterans of World War II and 80 percent of the officers were veterans. These men had fought long and courageously through the most trying circumstances through World War II. Many of them had interrupted their home life and business in World War II and had done so gladly to serve their Nation. Others had taken up businesses and taken on families after their release from service. Now they were called again because this Nation had not had the foresight to look into the future and prepare Reserves, through a program of universal military training, who had not seen prior service.

Many of these men have died.

All are suffering disruptions of their lives and careers. This recall of veteran Reservists was not only tragic but wasteful.

Businesses were lost, careers interrupted, and hearts broken—all because we had stood here idle in face of the greatest threat to our national survival since this Republic was established.

Unfairness comes about in the development of circumstances. But we should not deliberately compound them by failure to provide initial equality for all alike. At the present time thousands of men are being brought into the military services. They will receive training extending into 2 years of service. On discharge they are moved into Reserve status, where they are liable for still further service for 6 years more, in case of emergency. At the same time there are nearly 2,000,000 men who are deferred, many of whom will receive no training, no service, no Reserve liability. In case of a future major emergency, many of the veterans who have served in Korea and even veterans of World War II would have to be called again to fill the gap while these others were being trained. The man who is selected now serves 2 years, including a hitch in Korea, and will have Reserve status requiring training for a period of years, while his neighbor who did not go will still have no Reserve status and will not have to turn out for a single drill. This situation is indefensible. Universal military training would give the men who did not go the training necessary to make them available in case of an emergency and would move them into a Reserve status so that they could be called ahead of the men who have already devoted 2 years or more of their time to the defense of this country. They would at least have to attend drill along with the Korean veterans. While it is difficult to call one man for service and another for training only, we are now calling one for training and the other goes scot free.

A universal military training law is necessary now for the reason that no one can foresee exactly when it will be possible to consider reduction in strength of the Armed Forces, nor what pattern of force could be followed in case of gradual demobilization. It can be done sooner with universal military training than without it. With universal military training established by statute, planning on reduction of forces can be done logically. Heretofore, we have demobilized into nothingness, while we pleaded for legislation prospective to a logical program. A Reserve program without it was devised and proved inadequate. It brought us to a situation on the occasion of the Korean hostilities which forced us to again call on veterans who had already performed their share of military duty, while other young men, who might have been in training 3 or 4 years ago, escaped entirely.

Some of the people claim that we cannot have UMT and the draft running simultaneously; that we cannot have UMT until we cease all draft for service; and, therefore, that we should not now act on this legislation. Others say they are in favor of UMT, but not this plan, and then fail to produce a plan of their own.

This is just another way of saying, "We are against UMT. We don't want to face facts."

UMT and the draft must run simultaneously. If they do not, we will be unable to build up a Reserve which has not seen service before in wartime.

Unless such a Reserve can be built up and gradually increased, we may never be able to take the risk of reducing the standing forces, due to the fact that we will not have large enough Reserves to permit it. Therefore, we may be faced with the necessity of maintaining the standing force at their present level for a period of 15 or 20 years. To those who fear militarism this should give pause, for in large standing forces lies that danger, not in UMT.

It is time we began to look to the fairness of this situation; it is time we started building up our Reserves and distributing the obligation of citizenship more widely.

Until we right the injustice heaped upon our veterans, we better not talk too much about fairness and justice.

But there are those good Americans who say, "Not now. Let's postpone this. Let's not start UMT for 3 years. Let's postpone decision upon the security of our Nation."

Are we to listen to this siren song, the easy way out?

Can this be justified?

Do we by these hollow words straddle the fence and say, "Yes, let's have UMT, but, no, not now." Let me tell you, you do not have to spend time mending political fences if you do not sit on them. If we do so, it means that we build no Reserve composed of nonveterans.

It means—

For three more years let us have inequity of service to our country.

For three more years let us have injustice.

For three more years let us have unfairness.

Can that be justified?

Three more years of heartbreak.

Three more years of suffering.

Three more years of broken homes.

Can this be justified?

For three more years let us build a Reserve composed of veterans and no one else.

For three more years let us continue to have a large standing force.

For three more years let us have high-priced preparedness.

Can that be justified?

No.

Well, what are we going to do about it?

What kind of people will they, the veterans, think we are?

Any system which permits the willing, the courageous, and the conscientious to volunteer their services for danger in the Reserve, while the unwilling, the unpatriotic, and the lazy accept the benefit of military security is basically unfair. This leads quickly to the liquidation of those courageous souls upon whom our Nation has always depended for victory in war. Citizens who are not willing to give at least 6 months of their time toward training themselves to be useful when their Nation is in danger, are not worthy of the freedom their fathers fought to make possible for them. The American conscience cannot condone a military policy which demands that in war we use veterans rather than men who have seen no prior service.

I challenge any Member on this floor to justify this inequity.

If we continue to foster and tolerate this attitude of evasion of equal responsibility for our national security and actually justify it by a congressional roll call, it will grow to proportions that will lead us into oblivion.

It will stifle both individual and national courage.

We will reap the consequences of indecision, of paying tribute, followed by dangerous compromises, followed by our collapse.

But some say that, "Now is not the time to take action. Let's wait and see what happens. Besides this is a ticklish year." I say this, "I'm glad this is an election year in the United States, for that's a sign the United States is still free." It is said here that you have to survive to serve. I say today you had better reverse that saying and serve if your Nation is to survive.

But, let us keep in mind at the same time that this is no election year in Russia and Russia will postpone no decision relating to their national survival in this year 1952.

What kind of people do you think we are?

There are those conscientious people, fine people, and good people representing

church groups and others who oppose UMT, because they oppose all violence.

I agree with them entirely. I oppose violence, but I also oppose heartbreak and inequity and unfairness. To those people, I say the only hope for a world in which Christianity, charity, and peace exists is a world in which the United States still survives.

If this Nation with its heritage of centuries, of culture, religion and high-minded ideals falls to Russian communism through military weakness there can be no hope for the fine people who voice those high ideals.

Certainly we, as Christians, oppose violence and death and war, but, unfortunately, the world has not yet come to abide by the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount.

This issue cannot be weighed by the depth of sincerity of its supporters or opponents, but must be determined by hard practicality, and not theory.

The world is today half slave and half free.

There is loose in the world the monster of tyranny intent on enslaving us all.

If we are to preserve these very people and the institutions that these people represent, we must preserve this Nation of ours. Otherwise, we will all perish together.

These people honestly and sincerely say, "Let's don't train our men—let's don't have universal military training for through UMT we train men to die on the battlefield."

This logic does not follow.

It is the blind logic of those who look for the best, failing to see the rattlesnake curled at their feet.

Until wars are no more—the untrained will be the first to die in battle—not the trained.

It must be made clear to all that there is no choice now between drafting men for service or not drafting them. In the foreseeable future all young men will go into the Armed Forces for 24 months, unless we have UMT. But if UMT can be obtained many of these same young men will not have to serve a 2-year period but rather will go into training for 6 months followed by their Reserve obligation. Many of these fine groups opposed to UMT are opposed to all military service. They forget that if we do not have UMT their sons must serve anyway but for a 24-month period.

To these fine, Christian people, I say this: I have known many men—brave, kind and courageous—who fought and sacrificed in World War II so that this Nation could survive. These men came back to their homes, their families, their parents, their businesses and settled down to enjoy the free world that they had won. After but a few short months of this American life, they were recalled and sent to Korea disrupting lives, families, homes, and all the things dear to them in order to defend this Nation once again.

Why? Because there were no other trained men available—because we had not adopted a program such as UMT.

As long as we live in a brutish world as we do, I say the fair thing to do is the Christian thing to do. We must spread the obligation of citizenship so that it does not hit the same men over and over and over with heartbreaking regularity.

Spread it in the American way so that each man does his duty once, so that no man has to do not only his own duty but the duty of others.

Certainly if all the peoples of the world, particularly the persons who control international communism accepted and practiced Christianity, there would be no need for UMT or an armed force of any nature. But to accept this doctrine on the theory that it would convince the Russian Government of our sincerity of desiring to maintain peace is a gamble of all that is important to Americans.

To permit an anti-Christian nation to destroy the bulwark of Christianity will not preserve Christianity. To say that UMT is anti-Christian is to infer that the defense of our Nation is unwarranted. If this is true, our Nation is not worth preserving.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come to act.

Our belief in the defense of our Nation here, is best demonstrated not by the hackneyed words of hot oratory, but through positive action.

The eyes of the veterans now serving in Korea are upon us.

The time has come to take a stand for a program which will place the obligation to serve this Nation on an equal basis, which will build a large Ready Reserve and prevent us from ever having to call upon men for double duty again.

Too many of us talk a great deal about the multitude of rights which we exercise as American citizens and forget the few courageous souls who sacrifice, fight and die that we may exercise those rights. I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that these rights are matched only by the duties of citizenship.

The rights are well known, the duties sometimes more obscure.

Do not be misled by the circle of confusion and quibbling which surrounds this debate.

There is no compromise with uncompromising facts.

To paraphrase Tom Paine:

> These are the times that try men's souls. The sunshine soldier and the air-conditioned patriot will, in this time of crisis, shrink from decision. But those who bear it now will deserve the love and praise of all mankind. * * *
>
> Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered. But we have this to comfort us: the more difficult the task—the more glorious the triumph.

We cannot defend this Nation by arguing here in these Halls about how much we dislike Russia, the Pentagon, the Legion, or any other particular group or individual.

We can defend it only by what we do here.

We can take our stand for fairness and equity only by what we do here. I stand here to vote for the veteran and to ask that you remember him in your decision and that you remember, no matter what kind of year this may be, that it may well be the last year for us to take positive action to defend the future of this Nation.

To those who say we are too cowardly to take this action, I repeat: "What kind of people do you think we are?"

Must we Members of Congress live only for today?

During this debate I have almost reached the conclusion that some Members think that UMT stands for universal mañana training. It cannot be put off until mañana. We must show the aggressors of the world that freemen are willing to pay the price of remaining eternally vigilant to protect our hard-won freedom.

We must show them that we have profited by our past mistakes, and not that one day we intend to go charging up the hill of sacrifice during a crisis, only to come coasting down into the morass of complacency when the dictators still their cannon fire.

Let us neglect our duties by forgetting yesterday's battles or tomorrow's threats, and you and I can be sure that our sons will be marching off to war unprepared, just as did their fathers and grandfathers before them.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENTSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman does not walk up the hill and down the hill on this issue. He meets it foursquare. I am proud of him and I am proud of the statement he has just made.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened to a most able presentation by our colleague [Mr. BENTSEN] in favor of universal military training.

One of the great things about our democracy is the fact that we can differ and have free speech. I come to present to you in the 20 minutes allowed me by our distinguished chairman the reasons why I am against universal military training.

I begin with a quotation:

> We stand for compulsory military service for every man. If a state is not worth that, then away with the state.

That quotation comes from Mein Kampf, and was written by Adolf Hitler. This is the philosophy back of universal military training, not here alone but throughout the world.

Unwittingly, the proponents of this measure have smeared themselves with the black brush of nazism. Many innocent Americans are found guilty by association. In the case of universal military training there is no guilt by association. It stems directly from Adolf Hitler's thesis.

On the other hand I give you a quotation from George Washington, the father of our country:

Avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which, under any form of government, are inauspicious to liberty.

At the Constitutional Convention James Madison said:

A standing military force, with an overgrown executive, will not long be safe companions to liberty. Throughout all Europe, the armies kept up under the pretext of defending, have enslaved the people.

Today, as we face this issue, outside of the professional militarists, there is not a single decent, self-respecting organization in the entire United States of America, farm, labor, education, civil liberty, youth, religious, including the United States Chamber of Commerce, that is in favor of universal military training. If I am wrong, I stand to be corrected.

The United States Chamber of Commerce began the fight in 1915 to bring about universal military training. On January 25 they went before the Armed Services Committee of our House and reversed their stand completely.

Many of the organizations, in fact the vast majority of them who were on record as being opposed to universal military training, are now in favor, and were in favor, of the draft.

Let not the issue of religious pacifism becloud this situation. The late great prince of the Catholic Church, Cardinal Dougherty said:

Compulsory military training in peacetime in the United States of America, if such a change in our American system is brought about, will be a windfall for military officials and a catastrophe to taxpayers. It will be the ruin of our young men.

Another venerable leader of catholicism, Archbishop Cushing, said:

Does anybody seriously think that the Army is the best place for the physical, religious, and moral training of Catholic youth? That is a strange doctrine for America. It is a new idea for America, but it is not a new idea in the world. This idea was tried in Italy. Mussolini said that universal military training would give the youth of Italy the stamp of nobility. I ask if our young people should envy the fate of Italian youth? Hitler said that compulsory military training would give each man a ground for pride in his citizenship. I ask you what ground for pride is left to the cheated youth of Germany?

The Commission appointed by our President, the National Security Training Commission, has reported to Congress a plan for universal military training. I do not want to impugn the motives of those concerned, but if you will examine the report of the National Security Training Commission you will see that it is chuck full of falsehoods and sheer hypocrisy. In the first place the Commission did not let anyone come before it who was opposed to universal military training. They heard 75 witnesses and only those who were in favor of UMT came before it. It was stacked from the beginning.

Let Congress, and our Nation, and the world know that we in this House did not pass universal military training last year. The vast majority of the Members of this House, such as myself, were in favor of the draft, and because a universal military training proviso was needlessly, if not purposely, tacked on to the draft bill, it went through. Thank God the issue is not clouded this year with the hot air of professional patriots; it is out in the open. There is not a single organization in the United States in favor of it except the American Legion.

General MacArthur, with whom a lot of us disagree politically, yet whom all of us applaud as a military leader, said at our congressional hearings last August:

I should advise most seriously if I were considering universal military training that I would wait and get through the emergency that faces us now; and then on what has resulted, and what exists then, I would sum up the facts, and make the decision.

That is good common sense.

I do not believe we should scrap 175 years of American heritage and the advice of the religious and civic leaders just in order to move the Capital from Washington, D. C., over to the Pentagon.

Yes, it is a hard thing to say, but I say that universal military training is a hoax, a tragic, costly hoax of defeatism. It could not have been conceived better by anyone in the high echelons of the Communist Party.

It is a harsh thing to say, but it is nevertheless a fact that most of the promises being made to the American people to induce them to adopt permanent universal military training are false. A careful examination of the universal military training report presented to Congress by the National Security Training Commission will show that these promises have no factual basis. UMT will not save lives. UMT will not save money. UMT will not save time in getting armies into action overseas if war breaks out. UMT will not do many of the other things the American public has been told it will do.

The truth is that if we pass UMT we would not even be able to put it into operation, UMT could not go into operation if we did pass it until after the present emergency is over, because you cannot take 800,000 of the 18-year-olds out of the manpower of the Nation without seriously disrupting the Selective Service System.

Hanson W. Baldwin, outstanding military editor of the New York Times, said:

It is unlikely the UMT would be invoked by the President for some time to come, for to start it now in the midst of our present emergency would greatly complicate our preparedness program.

Why is the Pentagon so anxious to have universal military training? We have the Reserves ready for Korea. Yes, we do.

I have before me an exchange that took place between Representative SHORT, Representative KILDAY, and Representative PHILBIN with General Evans on April 22, 1948, when we had 2,400,000 reserves in our Army. General Evans was the executive director of the Reserve Officers Association and he said in substance, as he talked to Representatives SHORT, KILDAY, and PHILBIN that General Marshall and the Army would not permit an effective Reserve and National Guard program because they wanted to force the Congress to adopt UMT.

Would men trained in universal military training be available for immediate service in the event of war? Absolutely not. After they were trained for 6 months and go back into the Reserves they would have to be retrained again. That is not me saying that. That is the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Collins, writing to a Member of the other body last March, when he said that an intensive refresher training course would be necessary to use any people from UMT who are called back into the service.

Would universal military training help to reduce casualties in case of a future war? Absolutely not.

Official Army studies, as the Infantry Journal reported in September 1949, show that the greatest number of casualties suffered in conflict are suffered by trained men because they are up in the front. In fact, the Infantry Journal summed up by saying:

No factual data exists to support the universally held opinion that the infantry replacement has initially a higher casualty rate than the veteran.

The Army and Navy Journal concludes by saying a man has more chance of being hurt in training at home than in combat overseas.

Would universal military training improve the national health? No. The same physically and mentally unfit who cannot pass the test now will not pass if this UMT goes into effect, since boys are to be drafted into UMT, if the Commission's recommendations are approved by Congress, on exactly the same physical basis as they are now drafted into the armed services.

Would universal military training save money for the Nation? No.

Here, my friend is where we get down to some facts. Anyone who says we are going to save money through UMT does not have the correct information. Universal military training at the end of 9 years would cost us at the least estimate $46,431,153,000 and every year thereafter $6,704,000,000. If you are going to try to balance this by taking out of the Army the Regular men, then you would have to remove from our standing Army 1,500,000 regulars to balance it. In other words, if you pass universal military training, and using the argument that it would save money, it means we would have to reduce our Regular Army by 1,500,000 men and it would still be costing us more than before. If we want to save money, let us get down and start saving money where corruption is still taking our money in the Army and elsewhere, but do not use the argument that we are taking our teen-agers to save billions when it is not true.

Would universal military training eliminate the need for a large standing Army? Absolutely not.

I pointed out it cannot go into effect until the present crisis is over and in the next place it would require 200,000 commissioned and noncommissioned officers as instructors. Where are you going to get 200,000 commissioned and noncom-

missioned officers from out of our Regular Army to serve as instructors? We have not enough today as we are fighting this war.

What kind of war are we fighting today? We are not fighting a war at Lexington or at Concord.

We are fighting a war with jet planes, guided missiles, and atom bombs and no teen-ager can fight in a war like that with 6 months' training. In a war fighting with such weapons the matter would quite possibly be decided before the UMT reserves could be called up, by the time Congress got around to calling up the UMT. By the time they would have returned from their homes, country or city, the atom bomb would have landed and blown up our various cities. That is the kind of war we are in.

UMT is old-fashioned. UMT originated with Napoleon, but it is not the kind of a program for today's war of jets and fighters and atomic bombs.

Finally, I want to point out that the basic, underlying philosophy of universal military training is the basic, underlying philosophy of Stalin. There are four things that Stalin believes in: Materialism over the spiritual; final loyalty to the militaristic state; destruction of individual conscience; and truth subordinated to the gospel of force. That is UMT. UMT puts materialism over spiritual values; it makes final allegiance to the brass hats; it destroys the individual conscience and it subordinates truth to falsehoods. Our Nation was founded by pioneers who came here to escape the arrogance of militarism in Europe. We will shatter the dream of our forefathers by the passage of UMT. Yes, Germany had UMT, and Italy and Japan. But who won the war? We never lost a war. We are the only nation in the world that has never been defeated, and we never had universal military training. Why should we have it now? Name for me any country in the world from whence our forefathers came that practiced conscription that won a war or won a victory. Shall we crucify our Nation on the cross of militarism? Shall we abandon the dream of freedom for the nightmare of servitude? Shall we abandon the God of our forefathers for the Mammon of brass hats? Do you think 800,000 teen-agers, doing setting-up exercises, can scare the 25,000,000 army of Soviet Russia? The thing that is going to scare Russia and the thing that is going to whip her is democracy, freedom of conscience, and freedom of speech, and freedom to serve, and freedom to die. That is what is going to do it. Let America go forth as a shining example; and to do it we will give our very best to preserve freedom here in America, even though my race, which walks through the shadow of second-class citizenship, when the time comes to answer Uncle Sam's call, we will answer it, and with freedom in our hearts we can destroy any army of conscripts raised by anyone anywhere in the world.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, two great forces are striving for mastery in this great land of ours. One is the stronger at present, judged by external appearances, and by the depths of its encroachment into the seats of the mighty. It has practically taken over the seat of our Government here at Washington. It has seized control of the means of communication in this country, and has infiltrated most of our social groups. It has deeply infected even the membership of this House. It has taken over our institutions of so-called learning and taught some of our pulpits to preach a spurious gospel.

It has even prostituted our language so that many words now have the very opposite connotation than the meaning ascribed to them by the venerable Noah Webster. The charge brought against the ancient philosopher Socrates might now, in very truth, be leveled against this group:

> That they have made the worse appear the better, and have turned the world upside down.

However, if it be true that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, the opposite force in our country is still the stronger.

The great heart of the true America, the America of the grass roots, still throbs as the life blood of patriotism courses through its veins. It still is the true source of governmental power in this country. It still speaks with a thunderous voice; and you had better listen to it.

Confused? Yes. Why not? The institutions of government, of learning, of social communications, of social intercourse, and of religious teaching, our founding fathers set up and endowed with certain rights, may have proved recreant to their trust; but the great heart of America still beats as faithfully at the grass roots as it did in 1789.

It speaks with no uncertain voice, either. The true voice of the America, which has sent hundreds of thousands, yes, perhaps, millions of letters to this House, demanding in categorical language that your constituents want none of this National Security Training Corps being considered through this week, means just what it says. And you had better listen, read, mark, and inwardly digest their message. The voice of America—the true voice of America, is speaking to you.

The forces of the spurious neo-Americanism have overshot their mark. Lulled by the clap-trap and schizophrenic vaporings of the United Nations, through their desires for peace at any price, the giant of the true America is now awakened from its troubled sleep. They have had enough of international messiahship.

Korea, and the near treason of the recent meeting of the top brass of the military commands of Britain, France, and the United States in the Pentagon, has taught them, and it should have taught you, the dangers inherent in the unbridled control of the military over the civil authorities of this country.

The State Department and the military brass have already plunged us into another undeclared war in Indochina, another police action.

The common folk of America want no more of it. Neither do I. And I think the vote in this House will register the fact in no unmistakable terms that neither does this House.

Gentlemen of the House, our greatest threat to the peace and well-being of America today is not Russia—great as that is.

It is the one-world United Nations, the State Department, and the top brass of the Pentagon, which has long ago ceased to take its orders from this body; its only supreme authority.

Had I a hundred votes, I should cast all of them against this measure.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest for some several weeks, morning and afternoon, to witnesses before the Armed Services Committee on the proposed universal military training legislation.

Certainly the testimony left one much confused. And as one listens to the debate here in the House, for and against, one becomes more confused.

Permit me to indulge for a moment in what has happened in the past. As I recall, after World War I we sunk our battleships, destroyed our fortifications, and went down the pathway of pacifistic peace, placing our trust in treaties with people we thought were as right-minded as ourselves. This was a war to end all wars and make the world safe for democracy. Nothing was accomplished. But it did pave the way for the Lenins, the Trotskys, the Stalins, the Hitlers, the Himmlers, the Goerings, the Mussolinis, and Cianos who followed in the wake of our attempts to restore a war-torn world to peace and stability.

So we moved along, hoping and praying and trusting that nothing would occur to disturb peace in the world. Then, suddenly on December 7, 1941, the Japanese dumped tons of dynamite on our battleships and fortifications, wiped out some 3,500 American lives and 50 percent of our fleet; and we found ourselves in another major war totally unprepared.

Certainly none of us want to find ourselves again in such a desperate position—totally unprepared in the event we should suddenly be catapulted into another world war, and we are frantically building up our defenses that may enble us to meet any emergency that may occur.

Back in 1949 the Armed Services Committee prepared a defense program of some $17,000,000,000 which was cut back, as I recall it, to some $10,000,000,000 or $12,000,000,000. We cut back the Air Force 70 groups to 48 groups. We canceled the carrier. We moth-balled the fleet. Admiral Denfeld was fired. We cut back the ground forces, the Navy Air, and the Marine Corps.

We were then precipitated into the Korean war and we were sending our

boys into Korea to fight tanks with carbines. Let no one tell you—with battle casualties around 110,000—that this is any police action. It is a war.

We now are trying to build up our national defense. Appropriating billions of dollars to meet the needs and demands that may be made upon us in world affairs. And this program may eventually wreck the economy of this country.

It is a very grave situation and one cannot tell what may happen, or when anything may happen, or whether anything will happen. So we are trying to develop programs to give this country strength in event we should need it, and, we come up with universal military training as one of the programs.

Even in the face of the dire situation existing in world affairs, we should approach this question cautiously before accepting any legislation without careful consideration and until it clearly defines exactly what it is intended to accomplish. In this instance, I am unable to determine whether it will accomplish its intended objective; and if so, how and when. The Department of Defense appears just a bit too anxious to get this legislation on the books. If needed immediately, certainly there would be no hesitancy to go along, but with selective service working most equitably and satisfactorily, it is my sincere belief that this universal military training proposal should be carefully thought out now and not muddled through with plans and programs that will keep the youth of America in such a frame of mind that he will be unable to determine what he can or cannot do. I believe a satisfactory program can be worked out and initiated at the proper time.

I am not satisfied with this proposed program. And it must be admitted that we won two wars without a universal military training program. Whether or not the time is propitious to attempt such a program is questionable in my mind. Selective service seems to be working in a most satisfactory manner in meeting our present requirements. This attempt to phase-in universal military training with the present Selective Service System is one that should be given very careful consideration.

Repeatedly I have asked witnesses who have come before the committee to present some sort of workable plan, but none have offered any plan which would be fair and equitable; to my way of thinking. And this proposed legislation, in my opinion, is most discriminatory. Until some plan is presented that would be fair and equitable to all the youth of America, I am not inclined to go along with universal military training legislation.

As originally planned, universal military training was to be initiated when selective service was discontinued, which would be in June 1955. But attempts are now being made by various suggestive plans, to phase it in with selective service. It is a bit premature in my way of thinking. How you will answer the folks back home will be a very difficult problem if this legislation is adopted.

For example, take two boys who live on the same street. Call them John Smith and John Brown. John Smith is called at 18½ years of age by selective service and gets some 6 months of basic training and 18 months actual service. Maybe he is sent to Korea where he might lose an arm or a leg, or be killed in action. John Brown comes along and goes into the universal military training program for 6 months of basic training, and then he is returned to civilian life to pursue his education, vocation, or whatever he may desire to do.

Now do you think the parents of John Smith are going to be satisfied to see their boy go to Korea or Europe or some other place to serve while John Brown comes back home to go to school? This, in my way of thinking, is discriminatory and not fair treatment for either boy.

Universal military training was conceived with the idea of making it universal—high or low, rich or poor. Everyone getting 6 months training, with no deferments, no exceptions, with every youth in America getting basic training.

However, attempts are being made by various methods, such as the volunteer plan, to phase it in with selective service, or whatever approach would be decided upon. But if this is a volunteer plan, how can it be universal, and how are all boys going to be treated fairly and equitably?

I asked witness after witness to come up with some plan that would be fair while selective service was still in effect. Nobody seems to know the answer, from General Hershey down, and nobody knows the answer now. Therefore, I cannot see how we can attempt universal military training until some program is developed which would treat all boys on the same basis.

Now it might be argued that if there is no necessity for the draft to maintain a standing army and garrisons overseas, that this universal military program would strengthen our Reserve and civilian components; that the Reserve components would take the young men when they complete their basic training and would be able to do more unit training.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understand the object of universal military training is to provide for a well-trained Reserve.

Mr. GAVIN. That is correct.

Mr. KEARNEY. Can the gentleman point out to me in this bill where provision has been made for an active, well-trained Reserve after these men have finished their 6 months military training?

Mr. GAVIN. That is exactly what I am talking about.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understand, when I asked that question day before yesterday on the floor of this House, that it had been taken care of by the passage of the Reserve bill which we passed sometime last October, but I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the other body has not yet touched that bill.

Mr. GAVIN. I understand it is still in the Senate and no action has been taken. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

However, let me remind the Members of the House that unless funds, facilities, and supplies for all training units are available, and the units kept up to full strength, they will not be ready to go.

This expansion of our civilian components or reserve training units and ROTC and NROTC will cost considerable money in addition to the immediate cost of universal military training. But, unless the Reserve units are kept up to full strength with full facilities and not permitted to deteriorate, as happened in the past, the benefits from universal military training will be lost as far as the individual is concerned.

I have yet to hear of any program for the ROTC that would meet the great and wide variety of demands that would be made if universal military training legislation is adopted.

My great concern about universal military training is not that it would ruin the youth of America or build up a great military caste, but, that a program be worked out that would be fair and equitable to all boys and a Reserve program that is well-defined and set up to meet our needs.

It is argued that building up the Reserve corps would reduce the size of our standing army and greatly reduce the cost of national defense. However, in reducing the size of our standing army, we are going to pick up a tremendous volume of expense in carrying on the Reserve programs if they are carried on as they should be in order to have a Reserve corps that would be ready at all times.

So it is questionable just how much would be conserved by reducing the size of our standing army.

Now, if we reduce the size of our standing army to merely a recruit training organization such as, I have been advised, the French operated from 1920 to 1939, using old equipment, old methods and having numbers but not quality, we certainly would not be much better off. France had the manpower, but not the equipment.

In periods of economy it has been the tendency to build up manpower, reduce research developments and maneuvers, and stop the procurement of equipment.

If universal military training is adopted, unless the Reserve corps is kept active, alerted, fully equipped and trained to the minute—plus modern equipment to meet any demands that may be made upon us in event of an emergency, it would not be of much value, in my opinion.

This whole matter should have more careful thought and attention so that a program that is fair to all boys; that is clear, concise, and readily understandable to the American people, can be developed and presented for consideration so the youth of America can determine their futures.

All I can see that this program will do is muddy up the waters, confuse the whole issue over selective service and universal military training to such an extent that nobody will know what it is all about.

I feel that with the unstabilized conditions now existing in world affairs that every thought and consideration must be given to building up our defenses; particularly as it applies to planes, tanks, guns, ships, jeeps, atomic weapons, and all other items necessary to fight a war. And then some program when necessary for the training of our boys and a well-defined Reserve program.

But to me, this proposal in its present state is not the answer. The program appears to me to have the cart before the horse.

It is a very grave matter. Our military leaders are charged with the responsibility of preparing this country for defense and certainly something better will have to be offered if we are to be set and ready to go.

It is my opinion that selective service is meeting our manpower requirements and whether or not it is good policy to phase in universal military training with Selective Service at this time is questionable in my mind. The whole question should have more careful thought. I do not have the answers, but I certainly do not think we should rush headlong into a program that will confuse the American people and the American youth, and muddy up the waters, to a greater extent than at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PENDING LEGISLATION

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, it is a pity that on this unusually bright day, surrounded by the countless blessings, conveniences, advantages, and opportunities, we, of necessity, must devote our time to the subject of war or efforts to prevent the recurrence of war more deadly than the human mind can conceive. As for me personally, I hate war. I would have no part of it. But the law of self-preservation impels me to raise my voice in support of one of the most important and far-reaching legislative proposals ever presented for consideration on the floor of this House—a plan for universal military training. With all the fervor and zeal at my command, I urge the passage of H. R. 5904, the proposed National Security Training Corps Act.

A great landmark in the history of this Nation was established by the Congress in 1951 with the passage of Public Law 51. By this act, the principle of universal military service in peacetime or during emergency was established as a national policy. H. R. 5904 now seeks to implement that policy.

Pursuant to Public Law 51, the President, with the approval of the Senate, appointed the National Security Training Commission, comprised of five distinguished and outstandingly able men. As provided by the act, this Commission submitted its legislative recommendations to the Congress on October 29, 1951. I wish to commend this report to your most earnest consideration. It is comprehensive and reflects a deep understanding on the part of its authors of the many implications and impacts the adoption of its recommendations will have upon our social, economic, and political structure. I wish also to commend the House Armed Services Committee and its able chairman for the careful scrutiny given to this proposal and for the results of their deliberation as evidenced by the bill and the accompanying report.

THE AMERICAN TRADITION

There is no gainsaying that the American tradition is opposed to universal military training in peacetime. That has been and will always remain a profoundly cherished national principle. And so, in contemplating my position on this important legislation, I have found it necessary to weigh all the problems posed by this bill as against that sacred tradition; and, too, I have found it necessary to examine every facet of the proposal as it reflects upon that way of life we call American.

The American tradition—no universal military training in peacetime. But are we today dwelling in an atmosphere of peace? A godless state is running rampant throughout the world. The authors of the fearful philosophy of the Kremlin seek to dominate the world. A nation of some 200,000,000 people before World War II now embraces some 800,000,000 peoples within its vassal borders. This was accomplished in part by force and in part by indoctrination. The repeated statements of Marx, Engle, Lenin, and Stalin that capitalistic nations must be subjugated, and if necessary, by force, constitute no idle threat. That force has been demonstrated beyond peradventure.

The sacred tenets of American life must be preserved. We have witnessed the bold, insiduous infiltration and indoctrination attempted by communism among our own people. By this all the rights and liberties we enjoy, including those guaranteed to us under the Bill of Rights, are placed in jeopardy. There are those who give violent lip-service support to the preservation of those rights and liberties, but, in contrast, there are those of us who would give our very lives to insure their preservation not only for this generation but for all posterity.

For these reasons, after long and careful deliberation, I know there is no other course for me to pursue than that which will afford for my beloved country the surest protection of its sacred ideals and institutions. And that course, gentlemen of the Congress, is to support the only feasible, long-ranged plan proffered by the bill under consideration. But I shall further amplify on my reasons for support of this measure and on the principles which it encompasses.

IS SELECTIVE SERVICE SUFFICIENT?

Most of the witnesses opposed to universal military training, who have appeared before the Armed Services Committees of both Houses, contend that the Selective Service System answers all of our defense requirements; that universal military training is impractical, colossally expensive, and that, in any event, it should not be implemented until after the present emergency has passed.

Of course the Selective Service System meets our immediate emergency needs. No one disputes that. But selective service is not designed to meet the long-range requirements in our plans for national defense. Authorities generally are agreed that the international tension which presently disturbs the world, will endure for 10 and perhaps 25 years. The burden of selective service over such a span of time would become intolerable. Of course, the financial burden of maintaining the universal military training corps will be great, but it will be far less than the burden of maintaining over that span of years a standing military force of from 3,500,000 to 5,000,000.

Let us see how the plan will work and how it will not only alleviate but eventually eliminate the necessity for a Selective Service System in peacetime. Eighteen-year-old boys will be called up through the Selective Service System for 6 months' training, following which the trainees will be assigned to one of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, there to continue their training, in a civilian-reserve capacity, for a period of 7½ years. The training in the corps of each of the services will include basic military training, specialized training, and leadership training.

Here, then, will be created a manpower pool of approximately 800,000 men annually—a trained manpower pool whose training will continue through the reserve years of service. This is the American concept: no large standing Army, Navy, or Air Force, but a Reserve, trained manpower civilian pool which must ever be the bulwark of defense of our beloved Nation.

All three services are agreed that the training plan can be inaugurated within 6 months after the enactment of this bill, and that it can be done concurrently with the operations now proceeding under the Selective Service System. The process necessarily would be gradual. Perhaps 60,000 in the training corps initially, the number to be increased concomitantly as the need for call-up through selective service diminishes. To me, it is only sensible to implement this program progressively. It can be done.

THE PRINCIPLE OF UNIVERSALITY

The paramount concern of those who would build the defense of this Nation is that that defense should be borne equally by all who share the blessings of a life under a free America. We cannot and must not tolerate a system which permits the willing, the courageous alone to volunteer to bear the burden of defending our way of life, while others accept the benefits of military security but yet offer no contribution to sustain it. Service, above all else, must be universal.

Having said this, I am not unmindful of the fact that all persons who contribute to our national defense need not be men who bear arms. I know, as you do, that men and women on the farms, in the factories, in our transportation facilities, in the sciences, professions, and elsewhere, play an indispensable role in any and all defense efforts. They are a

part of this universal service of which I speak. And in making this statement I do not advocate conscription of labor, agriculture, and industry, all having proven in the past their willingness and capacity to fulfill the defense demands made upon them.

WILL UINVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING PROMOTE MILITARY BUREAUCRACY?

Some opponents of universal military training express apprehension that the training contemplated will indoctrinate our youth with a militaristic philosophy and that a dangerous military bureaucracy will entrench itself on our Nation with its seat in the Pentagon.

No desire or evidence of love for military bureaucracy was ever displayed following the wars heretofore participated in by our country.

Let me say, that in World War II, 15,000,000 persons were called to the colors. These, at that time, with their families, constituted almost one-third of the population of these United States. Yes, these 15,000,000 persons returned to civilian life indoctrinated with a greater love, a greater understanding, and a greater appreciation of the American democratic way of life. To even suggest that these men and women were corrupted by military service is insulting to all the veterans of World War II and the veterans of Korea, and to all their families.

Educators unanimously concede that the World War II GI was the outstanding student in the history of advanced education. General Eisenhower, then president of Columbia University, testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1948, said:

The American generation that went into this war came out of it better men than they went in, and one of the things that I pose as evidence is this: Every university president that I have had the privilege of talking to, and nowadays I talk to a few of them, says that the veteran is doing better in school than any class now there or any classes have ever done, and that, habitually, the veterans are standing in the top half of the class, and they are simply walking away with academic honors, showing that they have gotten something they did not have before.

The school officials of my own district advised me that the highest scholastic records were made by the veterans who were privileged to pursue their education under the GI bill passed by this Congress.

And have these 15,000,000 patriots left an impress of militarism on this Nation of ours? Were they indoctrinated with notions, ideas, or philosophies that would endanger the future of our country? Let every Member of this House make his own answer to these questions.

MORAL CONSIDERATIONS

As American parents, we are concerned wth the moral welfare of our sons and daughters. I resent, as must every father, mother, wife, sister, or brother of these 15,000,000 men and women, the insinuation that the moral fiber of these defenders of our Nation were marred, weakened, or destroyed as a result of their military training and experience. Mrs. C. D. Wright, speaking before the Senate committee in behalf of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of America, answered this slanderous charge, as will most parents of service persons, when she stated that her three sons returned from World War II better and stronger men morally and spiritually than they were before they entered the services.

I personally know that from my experience in World War I, I gained training which has been most helpful to me. My sons who served and now serve in the Armed Forces too have gained strength and inspiration for better citizenship.

The type of training and the standards provided to protect the welfare and morals of the members of the corps is exemplified by the so-called Fort Knox experiment. In 1947 and 1948, under the command of Maj. Gen. John M. Devine, 3 classes of 664 17- and 18-year-old boys were trained for a period of 6 months. These boys were given a vigorous military training but not at the expense of their moral and spiritual welfare. General Devine told the Senate Armed Services Committee in 1948:

The other part of our program was this: We were particularly concerned in relieving the minds of the parents as to the moral welfare of their boys under military training. We set out to apply practically the idea which has been expressed so often that it is not enough to develop men physically and mentally, but we must also develop them morally and spiritually.

To accomplish this, we put the chaplain in our program. We made him an active member of the faculty. He has a class every week; once a week he comes in contact with everyone: Initially he interviews every boy that comes into the unit, the idea being to break down the barrier which does exist between the clergy and the soldier. It exists also between the clergy and the civilian.

To make the man feel at home with the chaplain and to make him a regular member of the family, he actually teaches a class every week. That particular course is called citizenship, for lack of a better name. It is designed, however, to teach higher standards, ethical standards, moral standards; to teach the fundamentals of human relations; to take religion out of the church and put it into the front yards of everyday life.

The topics which the chaplain discusses are, for example, the Citizens and Fair Play, Sportsmanship, the Citizen and Morality, the Citizen and Honesty, designed to teach higher standards to boys who need them, to help boys already having high standards to maintain them.

The National Security Training Commission has emphasized a program designed to protect the moral and spiritual welfare of trainees in the corps:

We have kept constantly before us the importance of incorporating into the program all the advantages to health, education, character development and training for citizenship that can be provided without surrendering the essential military objectives. Unless the training contributes in a meaningful way to a youth's readiness to defend himself and his country, it cannot be justified. But there is every warrant for confidence that this military preparation can be successfully fused with measures intended to make this a period of growth for our young men—mentally, physically and in their appreciation of moral values. Universal military training, involving as it does a sharing of the responsibility for safeguarding our democracy, can and should represent an historic step forward in the ability of Americans to live and work together for the common good.

Our report contains detailed legislative proposals to promote the safety, health, welfare, and morals of the corps. We are aware, however, that, as regards welfare and morals, the measures which can be spelled out in law are but a small part of the total measures required. Essentially they prohibit or restrict, whereas the greater need is to inspire and lead, to establish high standards of honorable conduct within the program. These would be manifest in the trainee's basic sense of responsibility, an understanding of his obligations to his country, a sense of pride in his unit, a desire to achieve excellence, moderation in his personal habits, and tolerance toward those about him.

We believe the achievement of standards which would produce such attributes is entirely within the reach of a UMT program and should constitute one of its chief goals. Our optimism on this score is bolstered by our review of the successful Fort Knox experiment. Its lesson is clear: The key to moral and responsible conduct on the part of trainees lies in the quality of their leaders. We therefore consider it a matter of first importance that all trainors involved in the UMT program be carefully selected and thoroughly indoctrinated in the working philosophy of the program. They must accept responsibility on a round-the-clock basis, and that applies to every level of leadership from top to bottom.

It is gratifying to me personally, as you my colleagues might well judge, that the pending bill has a strong provision against the sale, consumption, traffic in, or possession of alcoholic beverages.

THE ATTITUDE OF CHURCH AND EDUCATIONAL LEADERS

Some, but by no means all, religious and educational leaders are unalterably opposed to universal military training. Their reasons are many—contrary to Christian teachings, danger of military domination, corruption of our youth, and the inculcation of false values and philosophies.

It is with the greatest reluctance that I take issue with these leaders of thought in America. I consider myself a profoundly devout Christian.

I am as ardently for peace as the most extreme pacifist, but my love for peace will not admit of a policy of abandoning my country and all its ideals and institutions. And, so long as we live in an atmosphere of danger, I want my country prepared to defend these ideals and institutions. I can find no satisfactory substitute for universal military training to insure that defense.

It is a significant fact that veterans' organizations, almost unanimously, support the principle. And it is also deeply significant that the Gold Star Mothers of America have gone on record emphatically supporting universal military training.

CIVILIAN CONTROL

Public Law 51 assures that the over-all control of the training corps shall be civilian in character. This is as it should be. With this we are assured that no military domination of this Nation can ever result. Certainly a permanent, great standing army could well lead to military dominance. Universal military training is the only sure alternative that will preserve the great principle of civilian control.

CONCLUSION

One of the most often heard arguments against universal military training is that nations which had such training have lost wars, while the United States, without such training, has won its wars. This argument is fallacious. Germany had such training during the Napoleonic wars, and it was this training that contributed to the defeat of Napoleon at Waterloo. Again, in 1870, Germany, operating under its system of military training, defeated France. In 1940 Russia had a universal training system, and she won with that system in 1945. Switzerland has had the system for over 100 years, and it is generally conceded that the system accounts for the fact that she has had no wars, although she has been in the very cockpit of Europe. Sweden has had the system for over 100 years, and during that period of time she has had no wars.

It is true that we have won our wars, but it must be borne in mind that in both World Wars I and II our allies provided the necessary time in which we could build up our forces. In the future we will have no such time for preparation. Modern war can strike swiftly by an aggressor prepared to attack us.

I close with the earnest appeal to all of my colleagues that you give your support to this bill. I want my boys, and you surely want yours, to be well and efficiently trained. A trained soldier cannot only protect himself far better than an untrained soldier but he can also contribute to the protection of his fellow soldier or those who, perchance, might be under his command. There is no philosophy concerning conduct of war that can possibly be a substitute for trained manpower.

What is worth living for is worth defending. To me the adoption of universal military training will announce to the world our profound love for our liberties, our way of life, and our determination to defend these values.

I am for universal military training because it insures equality of service and because I find it to be the only answer to the defense of my country—a country which bases its philosophies on the Ten Commandments, upon the principles enunciated in the Magna Charta, our Constitution, and the noble Bill of Rights.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYSON. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have listened very carefully to the gentleman's statement. I want to compliment him on it. I do not know of any other Member of the House who is more interested in the moral and spiritual welfare of American youth than is the gentleman from South Carolina. The fact that he can see in this proposal no endangerment to the morals of our American youth is, I think, a great tribute to his judgment and a compliment to the work of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BRYSON. I am very much indebted to my friend.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, Members of this distinguished legislative body, I am one of the junior Members of this body and I have chosen to listen to the eloquent debates on various subjects for the past 2 months. However, when this legislation was offered I felt that because of its far-reaching effects and the extreme importance of this legislation, I wanted to express my views with the thought that I could offer my experience as a background. This is, I feel, the most important thing I have ever undertaken for my country. I want to compliment the members of the Armed Services Committee in their efforts to bring to the House of Representatives what in their sincere feeling is a workable plan of universal military training.

It is my humble opinion that this is the most important legislation affecting the people of our entire Nation that has been presented to this House of Representatives for a long time. Too, it is my opinion that even though there is a difference of thought among the Members as to the plan, that the desire to bring forth a workable and equitable plan transcends party lines. This is not Democratic or Republican legislation. It is American and should erase that aisle in this distinguished body of men and women.

These are some of the questions that will be debated: Compensation, disability benefits, death benefits.

Adoption of UMT would not provide more trained soldiers for the present emergency.

UMT is not emergency legislation at all. Its proponents are simply using emergency psychology to fasten permanent peacetime conscription on all American youth.

UMT-trained men would not be available for immediate service in the event of war.

Universal military training will not help to reduce casualties in a future war.

The existence of universal military training would not eliminate the need for a large standing army.

The adoption of UMT would not frighten Russia into behaving itself.

UMT would not improve the national health.

UMT would not have a harmful effect upon the morals of the men exposed to it.

These are all debatable questions and could be stated in the affirmative as well as the negative and probably all will be thoroughly discussed during this session.

That we need a strong defense for this country of ours is not debatable. That it takes men, money, and equipment to have a strong defense is not debatable. The question of how to produce the men, money, and equipment in time of an emergency is quite well established in our Selective Service Act and our plan which is in effect at the present time seems to be adequate.

It is our peacetime Army, if there is such a thing as peace, that we are most concerned about. It is quite generally accepted that our failure for defense in time of peace has been our weak spot. Because we have fumbled the ball in the past by letting our defense shrink below par and, too, not being aware of the outlying dangers, we are now going to saddle the burden of defense upon the youth of our country.

Adequate defense is only a relative term. Our country is stronger than any other country only when she has more men and equipment than any other country. It is not possible for any one country to have an adequate defense against all the other countries of the world if they were to pool their resources. With an honest, sincere, and forthright intelligence department and a Congress that would follow the dictates of the intelligence department, we can keep our defense at equal strength with any other country or possible enemy. Germany had an adequate defense during the Polish war but she did not have an adequate defense for what she got. We can only hope to develop our defense to that which is equal to any other country of the world.

I have not developed the philosophy that war is inevitable and that we are going to have to set up a machine to constantly grind our 18-year-olds into service year after year for a period of 6 months' training and 7½ years of servitude. This is a gloomy picture for him; a subject on which he has no voice. And I might add here, and if you can remember back that far you will agree, that life at the tender age of 18 and 19 is very sweet.

As for the kind of training that he is to receive during this 6 months at camp, I am not sure but if he is going to prepare for war, he will need something more than sex education and a training in the bonds of matrimony. If I were to prescribe, I would say first that he would be equipped with a pair of shoes that would fit his feet and that he would march and run day after day until there is not an ounce of fat left on him; that he would be rugged enough to carry a 40-pound pack 20 miles a day and double time the last mile. He is going to have the ruggedness to withstand the elements of cold and rain and mud, days and nights of hunger, sleepless nights, fatigue the kind of which he has never dreamed.

I put in almost 2 years of my life in the Army and for some of you who might have been in the Saint Mihiel sector around Nancy and Toul or in the Argonne sector in the vicinity of Varennes, Sheppy, Banthivell, the forces across the Meuse River to Stanay, you will agree with me on some of these hardships.

Probably at this point the 18-year-old will remember some of his religious training. When he is lying in a rain-soaked ditch seeking some protection from flying shrapnel and probably he has just lost his buddy, he will look up to the skies and say: "God help me. Is this the end? I pray for help."

This is the kind of world we are building up for our 18-year-olds. I want him to feel that this country of America is worth fighting for and be willing at all times to offer his life if necessary for its protection; but by the same token, I want him to feel that there is a liberty and freedom that he inherited from

the Father of our County, George Washington that is being denied him. He is willing to fight and die for freedom and liberty but not servitude from UMT. Cannot the intelligence and brilliance of this distinguished body of men and women bring about semblance of peace rather than building up a war machine for all time to come? I plead with you to continue the Selective Service Act as long as an emergency exists but to defeat anything that borders on universal military training. May God give us the courage to assess the risks of peace.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with extreme reluctance that I come into the well of the House as the freshest of freshmen members of the Committee on Armed Services to speak to you on this subject. I do so only because of a deep conviction on this subject, a conviction I have gained from 4 years in the service and from being a reservist ever since I came out of the service. I do so also out of a deep interest in the reservists who have had to go to Korea.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the pleasure on several occasions during the past few weeks of having breakfast in the House cafeteria with the genial and extremely able chairman of my Committee on Armed Services. During those most pleasant sessions I have swallowed with my scrambled eggs the varied and changing condiments of his universal military training plan as it developed. Though the condiments were served with exceeding charm and efficiency, unfortunately I found them all quite indigestible. Regretfully, when the committee voted, I had to withdraw from Mr. Vinson the proxy reputedly handed him by each member of the committee.

The merits or demerits of a UMT system have been discussed on this floor at length. Although I disagree with the chairman's present thesis that this House has accepted the principle of UMT, I will accept his invitation to discuss this particular proposal for UMT. I do so because I am convinced that those who have favored some form of UMT in the past could vote against this particular bill without any hesitation or compunction and without contradicting themselves.

We have a story up in my district which illustrates what I think this particular bill is. It is a story about a Franco-American farmer who went into a dealer's store to buy some fertilizer. He bought a load of fertilizer and took it on home. Early the next morning he appeared back at the dealer's, and the dealer said, "Pete, what's the matter with the fertilizer?" Pete said, "It don't smell on the inside like it reads on the label."

This bill, as reported to this House, is completely without gender as far as UMT is concerned, as far as building up an active reserve is concerned, and as far as any emergency is concerned. I understand from the many rumors of proposed amendments that I have heard that it is to be even further emasculated, if that is possible, in the interest of passing any old plan just so long as we pass it now. And why now? During the hearings on this plan it was continually reiterated by proponents of the bill that UMT was a peacetime measure unnecessary under wartime or emergency conditions. And I may say in all truthfulness that no one repeated it more often or more emphatically than did our fine chairman, the gentleman from Georgia. But he states on the floor of the House that even under present conditions of war and emergency UMT should be adopted as speedily as possible. Why, if not to take advantage of present fear and distrust to pass some legislation for a future Congress we consider not so wise as ourselves, or a future electorate that may have rid itself of the fear psychology engendered in recent years by those in power?

As this bill is reported and as it may well be put into execution, it is not UMT. This bill, if passed by the House and Senate, could be made effective the same day that the President signs it. He simply has to issue an executive order on recommendation of the Secretary of Defense reducing or eliminating the term of service for boys under 19. The Secretary of Defense testified before the committee—hearings, page 2400—that UMT "should be started as soon as possible" and it could be begun on a limited scale approximately 6 months after the enactment of the implementing legislation. The limited scale was later defined as 5,000 boys a month. In connection with their first proposal to take 60,000 volunteers for 6 months of UMT who would commit themselves to 18 months of additional service, they stated that it could be done without any additional appropriation. I am in no position to analyze the minds of the multitude of high-ranking officers now occupying the Pentagon. I am convinced that they want any old plan for UMT put in the statute books and now. I rather suspect that they would like to go further and make it an accomplished fact on a limited scale so that future Congresses might hesitate the more to alter or remove it.

What then happens to this thing called universal military training? No one here would question but what the draft must go on for years to come. If we pass this legislation, we create a privileged, draft-exempt class of 60,000 out of 800,000 boys who train for 6 months and then go into the Ready Reserve to be called for periods in excess of 30 days only in such number and manner as Congress may indicate. The other 740,000 remain subject to draft and to 2 years of active duty. One inequity does not cure another.

And let me remind each one of you that this bill contains a provision that persons eligible for induction into the National Security Training Corps may volunteer. Imagine the confusion in the Selective Service Boards. Imagine every mother and father of an 18-year-old boy down on your heads, and justly so, to get their boy into this select, preferred few. What a tale that would be, full of sound and fury—signifying much to you.

Where has the universality of service gone under such a system which could go on for years? The bill should more properly be termed "an act creating preferential draft exemptions." Mrs. Rosenberg has told us that any increase in the number of UMT trainees would depend on reductions in the size of the standing force—hearings, page 2417. And yet we are told that any reduction in the size of the standing force must depend on the output of trainees. Which circle are we running around now? Where are these thousands of trainees that will reduce the size and cost of the standing forces coming from in the near or distant future?

It has been often stated that the sole objective of UMT was to create a strong, well-trained Ready Reserve. No one pretends that 6 months training is of itself enough to create such a strong, well-trained reservist. That training must be continued, preferably in active units to keep him in that status. How does this bill contribute to that purpose?

It simply provides that trainees, after completion of their 6 months' training, shall be channeled into the Ready Reserve. The Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1951 passed by the House and now pending in the Senate does not compel membership in Reserve components. A trainee would have to remain in the Ready Reserve for 7½ years, but any one or all of them could do so as inactive reservists without joining any organized training unit. Their only obligation as such would be 15 days of training, if the particular branch of the service elected to call them. It is true that a so-called incentive is provided which reduces their Ready Reserve obligation to 3 years, if they participate satisfactorily in 3 years of Ready Reserve Training. Whether or not this would be an incentive is questionable. In the event of an emergency, it would be those who had fully participated in a training program who would be the most trained and most desirable to call up. On those trainees who became inactive reservists with little if any training UMT would be completely and utterly wasted, as they would have to be completely retrained. It has been said we could never again establish a voluntary reserve system. How does this help that situation? Any system of UMT would be futile unless the trainees went into active training units.

The cost of UMT is not alone reflected in the tentative estimates made by the Department of Defense. On top of this must be placed the millions, even billions, of dollars necessary for a tremendous expansion of the Reserve training program for each service. Any of you who may doubt this has but to look at the report of the committee and see listed from pages 32 to 41 the many new facilities and equipment which each of the services now lists as essential to an expanded Reserve program.

Of course, something must be done to prevent a repetition of injustices done reservists in the Korean crisis. Congress had provided adequate Reserve legislation. It is freely admitted that the very basis of our difficulties today is that the armed services neglected and botched

up their Reserve programs. Evidence in many cases would indicate a design to do this so that they could get UMT. This is the horse that should come before the cart.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to this House that it is completely unnecessary to pile the cost of this proposed UMT program on top of a necessary expense for the expansion of our Reserve training facilities. Let the armed services go ahead with their expansion programs to show that they are in earnest about Reserve training. Let the Reserves then train the Reserves. If compulsion be necessary to get our young boys into the various Reserves—as is not indicated by the Armed Forces Reserve Act which we passed—then we can simply pass a law providing that, if a boy of 18 joined an Active Reserve unit for 3 years, he would become a member of the Ready Reserve with the same privileges as are accorded the trainees in this bill.

You would not want for candidates under such a system.

Under such a system real universality of opportunity would be afforded from the very start.

Under such a system you would not disrupt American homes and the lives and education of American youths. You would not take annually from the productive capacity of this Nation thousands and thousands of man-hours.

Under such a system the armed services would be forced to devote their time and energy to really building a Reserve. They would not have UMT to play with or be able to come back to the Congress later to say that 6 months' training was not enough, that they needed the boys for 2 years.

Mr. Chairman, in my humble opinion as an ex-citizen-soldier of 4 years' service and a present reservist, the proposed plan represents antiquated, strait-jacket, military thinking unsuited to our present-day needs, and not only completely unnecessary but dangerous in the crisis we face. Its adoption would further hamstring and impede our productive economy in meeting the tremendous demands that must be increasingly made upon it in the perilous days that lie ahead.

A Government expert computed on the basis of the 1940 census that 65 percent of the boys over 18 were engaged in productive activity—on the farm, in industry. The bill before us could mean the taking of thousands of these boys a year completely out of productive activity.

General MacArthur has often been quoted during this debate, probably because in military matters he has been proved to be so often right. In opposing the passage of UMT now he said:

> I believe the fitting in of the manpower, of the expert efficiency of the country, is a very intricate problem that can't be settled in such a broad, general way as that. I believe the greatest possible consideration has got to be given to the demands of industry. I believe that if you are going to prepare the youth, that you have got to understand that modern warfare has as its basis—industry.

How true it is that in modern warfare victory has gone not to massed manpower but to superiority in quantity and quality of weapons and equipment. How true it is that today America's first line of attack and defense is in superiority in atomic weapons and the air and sea carriers necessary to deliver them. How long must we cling to the outmoded and fantastic theory that we can muster the manpower to lick the Soviet Union on the ground, and waste priceless defense dollars in maintaining a mass army-in-being, and then add to that a useless UMT program that channels 50 percent of its trainees to the Army.

The eminent and distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has forcefully pointed out on this floor how far Russia is outstripping us in production of weapons of war. The presence of 5 jets to our 1 over Korea does nothing but confirm his argument. And yet he concludes from his valid statement of facts that we must meet this challenge by passing a law that could take 800,000 boys a year out of productive labor or away from scientific, medical, and other studies so badly needed in a modern war economy. Is this to be done in a vain effort to match the manpower of the Soviet? I believe the masters of the Kremlin would laugh at UMT for 800,000 American boys; they would be delighted at the further immense drain we proposed to place upon an already overburdened economy.

If our production is lagging, it is because of administrative and military policies that have not utilized our manpower and resources to the best advantage. It is because of tax and inflationary policies of Government that are fast snuffing out the incentive to produce that has been the very basis of our productive system in the past—a system that has hitherto outproduced and consequently outfought any other nation in the world.

We now propose to add to the difficulties of industry by passing a bill which would take many boys out of their labor market.

Mr. Chairman, it is common knowledge that the armed services are not meeting their own target dates for this emergency. It is common knowledge that there is a vast amount of priceless tax dollars being lost not only through waste and inefficiency but even through corruption. We cannot cure this evil by closing our eyes to it. It is our main job. Let us get back to it and away from a premature, undesirable peacetime measure. Let us not give them another plaything to bobble around.

I do not profess to be a military expert. I am the rankest neophyte on the Armed Services Committee. But I believe that in this emergency, as has been the case so many times in the past, the common sense of the American people must lead the military into the right path. As a first step we should put an end to the stubborn, senseless rivalry of the three major branches of the Armed Forces which unification has seemed only to intensify. Then the great waste in building up Army manpower in the United States should be stopped. Our salvation must lie in the air and on the sea, in both our Navy and merchant marine to carry essential raw materials. The merchant marine must be modernized and improved without delay. The productive energies of this country should be directed to the production of planes and bombs and of the materials required for these arms. This program would call for a reduction in the present appropriations for the Army and large increases in the appropriations for the Air Force. We should give immediate consideration to whether or not procurement under a central agency headed by civilians would not save vast sums of money. These are our pressing problems—not peacetime legislation.

I call your attention to this issue—March 1952—of Air Force magazine. On the cover it has a picture of Stalin laughing, superimposed on a newspaper clipping, saying, "United States aircraft production slashed—Minimum defense date now set at 1956." That is almost 18 months after the critical target date originally set by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The editor has some truths to say that we should consider:

> WHY JOE STALIN IS LAUGHING
>
> He is laughing at our expense and at our military expenses; at the defense budget now before Congress; at the airpower scandal exposed in these pages; at our leaders of Government, because—
>
> We force unrealistic military decisions by making a fetish of politics-as-usual.
>
> We jam our military production machine with business-as-usual bottlenecks.
>
> We ignore our best estimate of Russia's approaching air-atomic superiority.
>
> We postpone target dates for preparedness beyond the point of calculated risk.
>
> We are not buying security with our projected $52,000,000,000 defense budget.
>
> We could buy survival insurance with this money if we spent it wisely.
>
> We live in a fool's paradise of atomic surplus and outmoded military strategy.
>
> We fail to establish strategic priorities for military tasks and military goods.
>
> We stretch out production and compromise the quality of our air weapons.
>
> We underestimate the threat of all-out attack and of atomic blackmail.
>
> We blind the taxpayer to his true alternatives with guns-and-butter thinking.
>
> We invite Russia to bleed our economy and grab world balance of power by our failure to practice selective mobilization geared to a first-things-first strategy.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat: If this bill is not needed until the end of the draft—and is there one of us but believes it must be extended beyond 1955?—then it comes to us as premature and ill-considered legislation under the guise of a nonexistent emergency. It is a full confession that, bad or good, those who propose it want universal-military-training legislation of any kind on the books to bind future Congresses to come, to bind them because we feel they may be more responsive to the people who may send them here at that future date.

Let us put first things first and get back on our main job.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, there is a world of difference between approving of preparedness, or recognizing the need for a long-term military policy and feeling compelled to vote for

H. R. 5904. Advocates of this National Security Training Commission plan, including the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, are inclined to oversimplify the whole matter by indicating that the Congress must choose this precise plan of UMT or nothing. In fact, in his stirring emotional appeal that opened this debate the gentleman from Georgia said, and I quote:

> The issue is clean cut. No one can fail to understand it. We can enact the legislation now before us and make it possible to implement universal military training with its resultant benefits—or we can tell the Nation that for years and years to come we must continue to draft their sons for service, maintain a large standing force with its staggering costs, and continue, again and again, to call out our veteran reservists.

This simply is not the whole story. We are not faced by a simple choice between black and white, only. There are other ways, traditional and accepted, to accomplish the only aim advanced by those who advocate the adoption of UMT exactly as outlined in H. R. 5904.

What is the reason the advocates of UMT claim that it is so necessary we accept the National Security Training Commission's recommendations? The gentleman from Georgia expressed it very concisely in the next paragraph of that same speech, and I quote:

> Let me emphasize again that the sole objective of universal military training is to create a strong, well-trained Ready Reserve, made up of nonveterans, which will permit us to stop drafting men for service, and will likewise permit us to reduce the size of our standing forces.

If you accept this premise, and I do, the problem then is clearly defined. It is obvious that any program which results in the creation of a strong, well-trained Ready Reserve will solve that problem and could have solved that problem in the past. It is equally obvious that the chairman's assertion that the Congress is faced with only two alternatives—this UMT plan or nothing—does not stand up under a calm, unemotional analysis. There are several methods which better fit in with the American pattern of life, which have in the past successfully provided us with trained Reserves. There is another method which has produced trained men who were wasted, to a great extent, because they were never integrated into a Reserve or National Guard program.

I am speaking of military training such as was given in high school and college ROTC and the National Guard as well as under the CMTC, or Citizens' Military Training Corps, which was never revived after World War II, in spite of the fact that it was the most democratic means of training officers ever devised. This year, 62,554 high-school students are voluntarily enrolled in junior ROTC units in 265 schools representing 95 different school systems. This year there are 129,000 college men enrolled in 271 senior ROTC units. Just as an example of the effectiveness of the senior ROTC program, one college, Texas A. & M., had more graduates serving as officers in the Armed Forces during World War II than did West Point.

What has been the reaction of the Pentagon to this program of voluntary training? Have they promoted it and encouraged it and expanded it as an American way to provide a pool of nonveteran reservists? Let me quote to you from page 59 of the Gray report to the Secretary of Defense, made by the Committee on Civilian Components, June 30, 1948:

> There are also applications for increased numbers of junior ROTC units in high schools. The committee recognizes the contribution junior ROTC programs have made to some schools and individuals. However, the direct participation of the services in these programs is not essential to their continuance. By assuming only limited sponsorship, the services could provide all the encouragement needed for the junior ROTC without having to furnish instructors and maintenance personnel or develop training programs for the schools. Those could be provided by the schools themselves with necessary equipment still being lent by the services.

In other words, the Gray report says, "Let's jerk the rug out from under the junior ROTC program by cutting off the funds."

Yet, less than 3 months before the Gray report was released, on April 5, 1948, when a Pentagon spokesman came to Capitol Hill to ask for money, he said, and I quote from the testimony of Brig. Gen. Wendall Westover before the House Committee on Appropriations:

> The junior division (of high school ROTC) is relatively inexpensive to maintain, and it provides a valuable source of men who have had some basic military training. During the recent war, a substantial percentage of the graduates of officer candidate schools and the aviation-cadet program consisted of men who received previous military training in the junior or basic ROTC. Many of the noncommissioned officers belonged to this category. * * * The State of California is so sold on the idea it is setting up comparable units of its own. I do not know the number of units or the percentage of their schools involved, but I understand the program is very substantial.

This was Brig. Gen. Wendall Westover, then executive for Reserve and ROTC affairs of the Department of the Army, testifying before the House Committee on Appropriations.

General Westover also said, on that same occasion, April 5, 1948:

> Although there are now on file in the Department of the Army 280 applications for junior units, it has not been practicable to establish any new ones in the continental United States since before the war.

I have been unable to determine how many high schools have applied for junior ROTC units since, whose requests have not yet been granted.

I have been unable to obtain from the Army or Navy figures as to the number of applications now on hand or rejected from colleges who wish to set up senior ROTC units including basic and advanced training. Some indication of the current situation is probably indicated in the information I have from the Air Forces in a letter dated June 13, 1951, which indicates that they recently rejected 388 requests for college Air Force ROTC units. They approved only 62 units out of a total of 450 colleges applying which brings their total up to 187 units at this time.

This, then is how the Department of Defense, which itself spent over $275,000,000 not including the Army service schools or the Central Intelligence Agency schools, fails to cooperate with existing educational institutions to fit a reserve training program into the traditional American pattern of life.

I might note, in passing, that it costs the Army $690 a year to train an advanced ROTC student, $65 a year to train a basic ROTC student, $10.74 a year to train a junior ROTC student and 90 cents a year to train a student in a type C unit organized under the National Defense Act. I am indebted to the staff of the Committee on Labor and Education for these figures.

The membership of this House is well aware of the shameful treatment accorded the Reserve components since the end of World War II. Some of the stanchest advocates of the Commission's UMT plan have stood here in the well and decried, rightly and courageously, again and again, the short-sighted policies of the Pentagon which have virtually sabotaged the effectiveness of the volunteer Reserve program.

In fact, the record clearly shows that the Pentagon has not been sincerely concerned, since the end of World War II, with the Reserve program. In January 1951, Brig. Gen. E. A. Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, was testifying before the House Committee on Armed Services. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] asked:

> What has the Department—
>
> Of Defense—
>
> done and is doing now to help the Reserves?

General Evans answered:

> Very little. All I am urging and begging and what I have been doing for 3 years is to have somebody do something with what we have now.

The record shows that the Reserve and National Guard were continually being cut back and hampered. An instance is the forced reduction of the National Guard, ordered in January 1950, to take effect by February 15, 1950, from a total strength of 356,515 officers and men to 350,000 officers and men.

In January 1951, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CLEMENTE] pointed out to the Committee on Armed Services that in October 1949, the number of Organized Reserve units was cut, by Pentagon directive, from 18,000 to 9,000. The Pentagon's position on Reserves was summed up last year by Col. A. B. McMullen, executive director of the Air Reserve Association, when he told the House Armed Services Committee:

> The lack of continuity in Reserve policies and programs that has been demonstrated over the past 5 years would indicate that there is some serious question in the minds of some highly placed National Defense Establishment personnel and high-ranking officers of the Regular Establishments, as to the desirability or necessity of maintaining Reserve or civilian-component organization.

To summarize for just a moment, up to this point we have found that the only

reason anyone wants UMT is in order to provide a reservoir of nonveteran reservists. I certainly agree with that objective even if I must disagree as to the means. We find also that the Pentagon has, directly and indirectly discouraged the growth of high school ROTC, the National Guard, and the Organized Reserve program ever since the end of World War II. Why?

I think that question is best answered by reading you a short colloquy that took place while General Evans, of the Reserve Officers Association, was testifying before the Armed Services Committee on April 1, 1948:

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] asked:

General, then you would say that our present defense situation—or rather, lack of defense—has been brought on by the failure to develop the Reserves?

General Evans' reply was, "Yes."

A little later, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] asked General Evans:

In other words, as you interpret the attitude, they felt they need not build up either the Organized Reserves or the National Guard because they were going to get UMT or the draft?

I have heard that statement made—

Said General Evans.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] also questioned General Evans on April 1, 1948, asking him:

My contention, General, is that if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves, having made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to build them up, we would not have this legislation here.

General Evans:

I agree with you completely.

The gentleman from Missouri, then chairman of the Armed Services Committee, asked:

There would be no need for a draft, UMT, or anything else.

General Evans replied:

I agree with you entirely.

In the light of this evidence, and my own experience as a Reserve officer during this period, I cannot help but be reminded of the now famous statement by Owen J. Lattimore:

The thing to do, therefore, is to let South Korea fall, but not to let it look as if we pushed it.

Substitute the words "voluntary reserve program" for the words "South Korea" and you have the Pentagon's postwar attitude. History may prove that it is as dangerous and as costly to the defense effort.

Why then, does the Pentagon insist on this exact plan of UMT? Could it be because they want to build an empire of training commands, training establishments, and trainers? Could it be because they want to reach into the life of every young man in America, to mold his thinking and determine the educational courses he would be allowed to take?

Earlier this afternoon, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], a distinguished colleague and fellow Reserve officer who favors H. R. 5904, said several times that he was going to discuss the plan and then, like so many advocates of this nebulous proposal, he discussed mostly foreign affairs and military tactics. I would like to tell you why I must oppose this plan and in doing so I will deal specifically with the provisions of the Commission's report to the Congress.

I oppose the plan implemented by H. R. 5904 because it goes far beyond the basic training authorized in Public Law 51 of the Eighty-second Congress. True, you will not find anything in the 35 pages of this bill, which defines exactly what training will be given our young men. That is left to the discretion of the training agencies. The bill in that respect is a blank check. However, if we assume that the pamphlet, Universal Military Training—Foundation of Enduring National Strength, represents the considered judgment of the Commission, we must also assume that the prescribed course of instruction will include training on many advanced subjects, most of which would be better taught in civilian educational institutions. We must also assume that, although Congress specifically provided that "the training carried out under the provisions of this act shall be of a military nature," the Commission intends to include in the curriculum such subjects as sex education, marriage and family life, religion, moral principles, and citizenship. These subjects are certainly more appropriate for instruction in the church, high school, or home.

The principal objections to the Commission plan for UMT, which is before us in the form of H. R. 5904, may be easily summarized.

The first objection is that 6 months is an unwieldy amount of time to take out of the average young man's life at 18. If he intends to continue his education, it means virtually the loss of an entire academic year. For the young man on the farm, it is almost impossible to pick 6 consecutive months in the year when he can be spared without affecting seriously the production of the farm. The young man who goes directly into industry will take his place in line, 6 months behind those of his contemporaries who did not receive military training and under the UMT plan of the Commission only 75 percent of the young men who graduate in any given year will be taken into UMT at once.

The second objection is that 18-year-old men, on the average, are undergoing physical and psychological changes from adolescence to adulthood. Removal from the security and restraining influences of their home, church, and community to a military camp can hardly be expected to have a beneficial effect on their morals and emotional well-being.

It is all right to pooh-pooh this argument, but right now a 19-year-old marine from my own district is under detention in Japan. He, without provocation and for reasons apparently unexplained, assaulted and killed a Japanese reserve policeman and wounded two Japanese civilians. When you say there is no emotional strain, when you say military training away from home does not in any way affect young men, you simply are not stating facts that are known, facts that are supported by recognized psychiatrists and proven by the number of young men who crack up emotionally and have to be released from the Military Establishments month after month.

The third objection is to the tremendous cost. The first year of full implementation of the Commission plan is estimated to cost more than $4,000,000,000, and succeeding years to cost more than $2,000,000,000. On an individual basis, training one man under UMT for 6 months would cost $289.76 more than it now costs to maintain one man for an entire year in the Regular Military Establishments, according to an estimate furnished the Honorable Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for September 5, 1951. Even after the first year the total annual cost of UMT would more than pay for the college education of all the students now in college, over three times the number there would be in UMT.

The fourth objection is to the Pentagon's insatiable craving for personnel "empire building." It is estimated by the Commission that there would be one trainer, including supply personnel, for each two men actually receiving training. This 1-for-2 ratio may be contrasted with the 1 instructor for each 12 students which is customary in colleges and universities. Does the military now have so much excess manpower on active duty that they can afford to absorb this "empire" as the distinguished chairman suggests? As a member of the Bonner subcommittee, I have just returned from a study trip around the world studying the Armed Forces waste, extravagance, and duplication in both supplies and personnel. I want no more opportunities offered them.

The fifth objection is to the acquisition of so much more real estate than was necessary during World War II, when the peak strength of United States Armed Forces was some 12,364,000. The Army, Navy, and Air Force propose to spend $1,699,567,000 for the acquisition and construction of real property in connection with the UMT on top of the nearly $5,000,000,000 appropriated this year by Congress for construction.

The sixth objection is to the scope of the training program, as revealed by the various services' plans for implementation of H. R. 5904. Public Law 51 specifically calls for only basic military training, but the tentative training schedules include many highly technical subjects, which could be better taught under civilian supervision and many controversial subjects better taught in home or church if we would avoid militaristic indoctrination of our youth.

The seventh and last major objection to the Commission's plan for UMT is to the proposal that the Commission have the authority to select the men who will receive medical, dental, and scientific training. Since men picked for this training would owe their first allegiance to the military, and presumably the military would select those best fitted for this type of work, this means the civilian

need for doctors, dentists, and scientists would be met by men who had been discarded as not fitted, and who had been further handicapped by not receiving the same training.

Thus far, I have attempted to show why there is a need for a program to provide nonveteran reservists because the Pentagon has deliberately sabotaged the historic American Volunteer Reserve program. I have shown you why the Pentagon's cunningly conceived scheme for UMT is unsatisfactory. Why, in my studied opinion the good features outweigh the bad.

However, in my opinion, Congress still has a grave responsibility which cannot be shirked; a responsibility to provide some means whereby this country may be defended and a vital part of that defense is and must be, a strong, ready, well-trained Reserve and National Guard. I do not believe we can trust the Pentagon to shoulder this responsibility in view of its past performance in Reserve matters. I believe that it is both practical and possible for Congress to evolve a compulsory type of training program which will, as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] said yesterday, "coordinate the military with education institutions" and, utilizing the workable, tested Reserve program come out with an adequate training plan which will meet all of the objections I have listed.

This plan which suggests a logical extension of high school ROTC was evolved in an attempt to answer the question: If it is possible to produce a good second lieutenant in 4 years of college ROTC and a 6-week summer camp, why is it not equally practical to produce a well-trained private as a result of intensified military training in high school for 2 years, followed by a 6-week summer training period?

On Tuesday, under the 5-minute rule, I plan to introduce this high school ROTC plan as a substitute amendment. In order that Members of this body may have a prior opportunity to examine the legislation implementing this plan in detail, I have introduced it as H. R. 6765. Several Members have made very helpful suggestions in regard to this plan and I will today introduce another bill which will contain very minor modifications in response to their suggestions.

My presentation of this plan before the House Armed Services Committee will be found on page 2957 of the hearings, and a statement outlining the plan appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, January 30, 1952, starting on page A539. I intend to ask unanimous consent of the House, later this afternoon, to include several letters from representatives from nationally recognized organizations who have commented favorably on this type of military training, in the body of the RECORD immediately following these remarks. I pay a special tribute to the Catholic War Veterans, who, over a year ago, suggested a modified high-school ROTC plan which is very similar to this as evidenced by their testimony before the Armed Services Committee reprinted in the booklet they mailed to all Members of Congress. I also acknowledge the support of Jack Kyle, chairman of the national legislative committee of the Philippine-Pacific War Veterans.

Under this citizens military-training plan the suggested course consists of 2 years of basic military training during the last 2 years of high school for virtually every young man in the country, plus 6 weeks at a summer camp for the physically qualified who would receive field training in the branch of service which he either elected or was assigned to. The ROTC-type portion included in the high-school phase would consist of classroom, gymnasium or drill hall, and field instruction.

The high-school instruction would include basic training as it was understood in the military prior to this concentrated sales drive on UMT. It would involve unified instruction, common to all services, including courses on orientation, military courtesy, customs and rules of conduct, hygiene and first aid, leadership drill and exercise of command, physical-development methods, weapons, marksmanship, map, chart, and aerial-photograph reading, supply discipline, organization and functions of the various branches of the Armed Forces, care and maintenance of equipment, and the military policy of the United States.

Men who drop out of school prior to completion of training would have several alternative methods of securing an equivalent military education. They may continue to attend the high-school military courses; they may enter a Ready Reserve or National Guard unit in their home community as a trainee; or they may substitute attendance at three, instead of one, 6-week summer camps.

It should be noted that it is entirely possible and practicable to operate this system of military training concurrently with the operation of the draft. This system would supplement, not supplant, the existing machinery, and thus could be instituted without creating the discrimination inherent in the proposed schemes to select some men for 24 months' service as draftees and other men for 6 months' service as universal military trainees.

The Committee on Armed Services has raised certain objections to this plan in their report. I will answer those objections Tuesday as I offer the substitute amendment to the committee.

As long as there is still a choice between an American way to secure nonveteran reservists and the administration's European Asiatic plan of UMT, I say, let us face our responsibility for national defense squarely, and, this time, let us buy the American way.

Grateful as I am to the American Legion and as much as I respect their gallant fight in behalf of the veteran, I cannot support this particular administration UMT plan. I am worried because it contains no termination date. I am alarmed by the statement on page 26 of the Commission's report, "We find ourselves in agreement with the military departments that these standards—physical and mental—are low, and we recommend against any further reduction so long as UMT is either principally or exclusively a military program." Please examine that last phrase—"either principally or exclusively a military program." What else might it develop into? Forced draft of labor? Compulsory Government political indoctrination? That revealing phrase certainly warns me that someone behind this program sees its ultimate extension into fields other than military training.

INDEPENDENCE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Independence, Mo., February 16, 1952.

Hon. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNSON: It has come to my attention that you are sponsoring legislation which would, in effect, make ROTC training compulsory at the high-school level.

That is one of the best proposals to come from a Congressman in a long while. We have had a ROTC department in our senior high school since 1937. In my opinion, it is a valuable training program and the townspeople seem to agree.

Every high-school boy in the country could have such a program made available since we now have transportation facilities which would permit small high schools to transport their boys to a central training site. I believe a boy with 2 years of high-school ROTC training and an intensive summer training would be trained as well as the average private in the Army today.

This plan of high-school ROTC training for practically all boys would have these distinct advantages:

1. The boys could stay at home while they were trained.

2. The normal secondary educational program would go on as usual.

3. The plan would be within the scope of our economic ability. It would be much, much less expensive than UMT.

4. They would be trained about 2 years younger and at a more formative stage of their development. Therefore, the training probably would be more effective and lasting.

In order for your plan to be accepted by public-school administrators, it will be necessary for them to be convinced that the Army will not come in roughshod and try to dictate all that happens around school. The ROTC personnel will have to consist of men who can work with school officials on a cooperative basis. Our experience with ROTC officers has been very pleasant and satisfactory.

I hope you continue your efforts in support of a high-school ROTC training program.

Yours very sincerely,

L. G. KEITH.

OFFICE OF THE
ROTC LIAISON OFFICER,
TEXAS STATE GUARD RESERVE CORPS,
Dallas, Tex., February 2, 1952.

Hon. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I was certainly pleased to read in the Denver Post of January 30, 1952, a report about your testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, wherein you proposed that compulsory high school ROTC training be instituted in lieu of the costly plan for universal military training. This is exactly my thinking on this subject, and I am certainly glad to learn that you are coming out for this program.

I have done a great deal of work with the junior and senior ROTC organizations here in Texas the last 3 years, and honestly feel that the junior program should be greatly

expanded. It is the best medium for the avoidance of juvenile delinquency and the best counteraction against the infiltration of communism among our high school age children. In fact, I cannot see how anyone with an ounce of common sense can fail to see the justification of every boy in high school taking this military training.

I have had several requests from high schools and junior colleges here in Texas to help them secure military training in their respective schools. However, the present policy, because of lack of funds appropriated by Congress, is to discourage the installation of any new junior ROTC units. I think this is absolutely a mistake and, while the senior units are very vital and necessary, greater emphasis should be placed upon the work in the high schools of our Nation. I have been up to Colorado recently and visited with the junior groups up there, and they need more support from parents, civic leaders, as well as from Congress.

If it would be at all possible to have copies of the testimony which has been and is being heard at the open hearings of the Armed Services Committee of the House, I certainly would like to have same. It would give me the information about who in the United States is interested in this subject, and perhaps we can stir up enough interest back home to let our Representatives in Congress know what the wishes of the people are in this regard.

I would certainly be glad to hear from you on this subject, and with best wishes, beg to remain

Sincerely yours,

JAMES B. BURLESON,
Major, Infantry TSGR,
ROTC Liaison Officer.

THE SCHOOL DISTRICT OF ST. JOSEPH,
St. Joseph, Mo., February 18, 1952.

Representative CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I note in the Educator's Washington dispatch a statement has been made that if the UMT bill fails you may present an alternate plan for extension of the high school ROTC services.

We have had ROTC in St. Joseph for many years. I have been favorably impressed with this program. As a matter of fact, during World War II a great many of our high school trained young men rapidly rose in the ranks to become lieutenants, captains, majors, and colonels. Some are still in the service in important military positions.

The plan as it now operates was apparently not designed for smaller schools. In considering an extension of the services to smaller areas, it occurred to me that perhaps a central headquarters could be maintained in a city similar to ours and other smaller communities would be serviced from the headquarters area. In our own area, for example, within a radius of 60 miles, I find there are approximately 7,000 students enrolled in the various high schools. We may assume that about one-half are boys. There are 19 high school districts. Some of the schools would be rather small, but perhaps as many as 60 to 75 could be enrolled at least in a compulsory program.

Although the present ROTC plans are on a voluntary basis, we have enjoyed an excellent enrollment over the many years. Our enrollment before World War II was twice as large as it is now. With so many competing units recruiting high school boys, it certainly speaks well of the present ROTC program to have as many in the program. If our own city were designated, for example, as a headquarters area, perhaps a sergeant could be assigned to a high school or two in the smaller schools. The officers could travel about like the circuit preacher in days gone by. The cost would be reduced considerably if such a plan were followed. I am convinced that more than just a well-trained private would come out of the high school program.

Sincerely,

G. L. BLACKWELL,
Superintendent of Schools.

(Deleted for protection of officer on active duty),
January 31, 1952.

Hon. CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
Member of Congress, Indiana,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BROWNSON: I am writing you relative to your proposed plan to bring universal military training to the high schools.

The idea closely parallels one which I have held for a great many years and I would appreciate it very much if you would give me what detailed information you might have readily available.

The general idea seems to be so sensible and logical that it is amazing that the Department of Defense has apparently not fully explored its possibilities.

Only one of the many advantages which seem apparent is that so many of the subjects which would be a necessary part of the UMT training could be profitably and painlessly included in the regular high-school curricula. For instance, lessons in citizenship, geopolitics, motor-vehicle operation and maintenance, communications, map reading could all be fitted into the normal high-school course. Computation of coordinates, artillery survey, etc., could be used as a practical means of arousing the youngster's interest in math.

Another great advantage it seems to me would be in providing physical checks and medical and dental attention—something which selective service figures indicate is badly needed. The AMA probably wouldn't object to this feature as the teen agers are not currently a profitable source of revenue.

The plan would eliminate the necessity for taking youngsters away from their homes at an impressionable age. It would be much more economical than the present Department of Army plan since it would eliminate camp overhead.

I am sure that you will realize that I am not writing you officially in my present capacity as executive of the (deleted) military district. The above are my personal views and I am immensely interested in this project.

Sincerely,

(Name deleted),
Colonel, Executive (deleted) Military District.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF
THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY
SCIENCE AND TACTICS,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1952.

Representative CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to express my appreciation of the plan for compulsory high-school ROTC, under your sponsorship, which the Associated Press reported on January 30. Not only would this plan be a palatable substitute for universal military training, but it would permit substantial savings in manpower, travel, camp operation, subsistence, clothing, pay, and trainee time, and particularly would not cause an interruption to the school life of the youths involved.

Both morale and morals would be protected, inasmuch as most of the training would be accomplished in the student's home community.

Please observe that two other possibilities may deserve consideration: (1) Toward the end of effecting further savings and making the program more acceptable to educational groups, training could be provided by Reserve officers who are members of the school faculties, as is done here in the District, except, of course, that these persons should be on active-duty status; and (2) with the program in the schools, girls could be trained toward the end of having personnel available to perform civil defense duties or to augment the Armed Forces in a national emergency.

Your attention is respectfully invited to the program we are conducting in the public schools here under the provisions of paragraph 55c of the National Defense Act of 1920. We offer the 2,000 cadets in our division a 3-year course which—with minor modification, more equipment, and a summer camp—would more than equal Army basic training and MOS training for such common specialties as rifleman, driver, and clerk.

Perhaps this existing program could be expanded under congressional authority to provide an experimental situation by which results could be compared with the Army's UMT experiment, and which, if successful, could serve as a pilot model.

Certainly your proposal has considerable merit and offers an economical and permanent solution for our major military problem.

Respectfully,

BENJAMIN L. HUNTON,
Major, Infantry, United States Army Reserve, Head of Department.

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN
PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS, INC.,
February 5, 1952.

The Honorable CHARLES B. BROWNSON,
United States Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BROWNSON: We are very pleased to learn from your letter of January 31, 1952 that you are opposed to the universal military training bill. Also, we appreciate very much your interest in calling your alternate plan to our consideration.

Although I cannot speak officially because the alternate plan has not been considered by our delegates, I can assure you, personally, that your proposal is far superior to the present UMT bill.

Our delegates meet in Chicago on April 18 and 19, 1952, and I will present your proposal for their consideration at that time, that is, if the final decision on UMT hasn't been made before that date.

Thank you again for your consideration and you have our best wishes for success in your efforts to protect this country from being taken into an era of militarism.

Sincerely,

DENTON KERR, M. D.,
President.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this universal military training bill, because it is wrong in principle and impractical. It has been well established both in hearings before the Armed Services Committee and on the floor of the House that it would serve no helpful purpose in bringing to an end the present Korean war, but it would detract from this effort because of the thousands of military men that would of necessity be assigned to conduct the training.

Universal military training has an unhappy history; it has neither prevented war, nor has it guaranteed victory for those nations that have practiced it. The plan is diametrically in opposition

to our American tradition of freedom-plus-patriotism. It induces a war psychology and conditions the minds of its impressionable young trainees to expect war and its brutalization and killing as a matter of course.

The American people have always been opposed to such training, and rightly so, because this country was settled by people escaping from the evils of militarism and conscription in Europe. They have always feared the rise of militarism and opposed the economic expenditure militarism entails.

We might well ask ourselves what this training is for. Naturally, we should all be interested in adequate training of our soldiers and the best equipment that can be obtained, but wherein will training under this bill be better than the training given today under the selective-service system. Universal military training does not even contemplate specialized training. Does anyone believe that a boy of 18 who receives 6 months training will be prepared for combat duty in a year or as long as 7½ years after he has completed his training. Even military leaders who generally favor such program admit that retraining would be necessary when and if recalled for active service. No war has ever been won by prewar training. Wars are won by death-dealing equipment. Germany, with the most elaborate training system in history, has lost two wars to countries without such training. It is true that she swept all before her with superior equipment until that equipment ran short.

Universal military training would not only be of little value, it would be detrimental to our security. The Russians have been outbuilding us in planes and as pointed out by more than one military expert, Russia could today destroy every city in Europe without sending a foot soldier outside of Russia. The Communist forces fighting us in Korea have many more planes there than we have. What we need is more planes and more ships and more bombs. There is need for more steel and more aluminum and more machine tools. Back of this is the need for more skilled mechanics and technically trained men, more engineers and scientists. Our hope of winning the next war is in our industrial centers. We need up-to-the-minute training in aviation flying and engineering.

If we have another world war in the near future, universal military training will not have had any effect. If we have no such war for 10 years, we will have taken 8,000,000 young men away from productive labor, from important training as mechanics, from vitally necessary training for engineering and science. This is equivalent to a full year's work for 4,000,000 men. At the end of that period what will we have? Probably 60 percent of the 8,000,000 men will be in essential civilian production; another 10 percent will be physically unfit, and another 5 percent will have family responsibilities that will exempt them. Of the remaining 2,000,000, about 1,000,000 will have had training 5 years back. And this tremendous waste of manpower will have cost somewhere from $30,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000.

As an instrument of national policy, UMT is ill-designed to achieve any of the military or educational objectives it is supposed to achieve. From a military point of view, it is increasingly meaningless in a day of mechanization and specialization. From an educational point of view, our homes, churches, schools, and colleges are better equipped than the Armed Forces to help our young men to develop into worthy American citizens.

To those who cite the father of our country as one who would favor such program, I quote in part from George Washington's Farewell Address, in which he said:

> The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith—here let us stop. Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FORRESTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

TODAY'S CHALLENGE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am pleased to insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech made by Mr. William M. Allen, president of the Boeing Airplane Co., of Seattle, Wash.

Bill Allen heads one of the great industrial organizations in the country, and does it exceedingly well. He is also one of Montana State University's most distinguished graduates, and we of Montana are proud of the success he has achieved.

It was a distinct honor to the student body of Montana State University to have the privilege of hearing the address, Today's Challenge, at its annual Charter Day ceremony on February 15, 1952.

I commend the speech to my colleagues and urge that they give careful consideration to the fine American message it contains.

The speech follows:

TODAY'S CHALLENGE

(By William M. Allen)

The fact that I am here to talk to you today is either a testimonial to the mellowing effect of the passage of time or to the extreme tolerance of the head of your programs committee. Professor Freeman was a member of the faculty when I was a student here 30 years ago. As a professor of mine, I know that he was quite familiar with my enthusiasm for the adage that "all work and no play makes Jack a dull boy." In fact, unless my memory fails me, I believe that he inquired on one occasion (and I should add, with some sarcasm) as to whether I was getting on well with my extracurricular activities. In any event, when the good professor invited me to come over for charter day, I was not only highly complimented but most grateful for his tolerance which was aided, I am sure, by the healing effect of the passage of 30 years.

I think that I should also add that these many years that have gone by since I was a student have not dimmed my memory to the point where I have forgotten my lack of interest as a student in charter day addresses, or in any other address for that matter. I don't recall whether or not they had such a thing as a charter day talk in my day. If they did have, you can be sure that I never attended one. I say this so that the students who are here today will realize that I view your presence with a feeling of mixed appreciation and wonderment.

As you will readily understand, it is a great pleasure for me to return to our university. Although quite naturally there have been changes, nevertheless some of the people and many of the landmarks, both so dear to our hearts, still remain. I am sure as each of you return here in later years that you will find it a moving experience. I know that I always do.

I have often thought as I looked back upon my 4 years here that it was too bad that I didn't take college more seriously. However, I know that whatever your attitude toward college may be, all of you will find as you move on in life and look back upon your college years that the impact upon yourself of the time that you spend here will have been very great indeed. It is, of course, a most important period in one's life. I wish that I could have the pleasure of doing it all over again and, although I hope that I would do it somewhat differently, I must admit that when I really got down to cases I'm not so sure that I would.

So, having pretty well disqualified myself as a person to be advising college students on how they should live their college lives, I now propose to do that very thing—at least talk a litle bit about the value of a college education as related to the American way of life.

The other day I was conversing with a young lad who is about to finish his senior year in high school and whose family has afforded him every inducement to continue his education. "I suppose you are planning to go on to college," I said.

"No, I don't think so," he replied. "I can make a good living driving a truck and not have to worry about any responsibilities. Why should I spend 4 years going to college?"

This hit me right in the middle of something or other. I had always thought that a position with responsibility was looked upon as something that people—at least Americans—should aspire to. Has something happened to our American incentives? What has become of the Yankee adage about build-

ing a better mouse trap and the world will beat a path to your door?

Have our incentives changed? Are we living in a society in which it is no longer desirable to aspire to positions of greater responsibility? Have the benefits which normally flow from a college education disappeared? Let's talk a little bit about these questions.

Of course there has been a change in incentives—at least in the degree of their importance. The most obvious change is in the opportunity for material reward. When I was in college certainly the best recognized incentive, if not inherently the most important, was that of money. I think that most boys went to college in those days for the principal reason of improving their earning potential. However, the old days when you got what you earned and when high income was a goal in itself are gone. The graduated income tax has sliced thinner and thinner the advantage of going to the next higher salary bracket, and the higher you go the more this is true. While money is still one of the principal incentives attracting a man to work for a bigger job, it has certainly lost ground. A high figure begins to lose its appeal when you don't get your hands on the dollar it represents.

Now if the old American incentive of working hard and making money doesn't pack quite the appeal that it used to, is it nevertheless still worth while to improve ourselves and aspire to a greater than average position of responsibility in this world of ours? We are living in a country that has built a tower of strength and prosperity on the principle of private enterprise and hard work because of the incentives that have existed. Our system has stood before the world as living proof that it is possible for one-fifteenth of the world's people, possessing one-fifteenth of the world's land and resources, to account for one-half of the world's industrial production. We have lived in an expanding economy and we know that our future lies in a continuing expanding economy. We are even to the point where we desire to help show the rest of the world how it too can expand its economy and raise standards of living by the same process. And then we find one of the main props being knocked out from under the system and we hear our youths saying: "Why should I go to college? Why should I work hard and carry greater responsibilities when I can drive a truck at $400 a month?"

I am sure that you will agree that there are many other incentives besides the material one. We need to consider them and call attention to them. One major form of reward which we all recognize is simply the satisfaction of accomplishment. Another aspiration worth working and studying for is to reach a position with freedom and opportunity to go ahead so that you don't feel "at the end of the road." There is also satisfaction in gaining the ability and a position which gives you an opportunity to contribute leadership where it is needed. Still another incentive is the desire that each of us has to build a good name to be thought well of, and in some degree to be an inspiration to others. These are all incentives—goals worth working for.

A famous British mountain climber and explorer, who for years endeavored to climb Mt. Everest and finally lost his life near the summit of that unconquered mountain, was once asked, "Why do you want to climb Mt. Everest?" His answer was a simple one, "Because it is there." To a mountain climber, the highest mountain stands as a challenge to his skill and ingenuity. I think it is the same kind of an incentive that makes us want to meet the challenges we have in business and in society. We have our Mt. Everests all over the place and we are conquering, or endeavoring to conquer, them one by one. Those who are meeting these challenges are exhilarated by the experience. The engineer who directs the wing design of a new swept wing bomber feels the glow of satisfaction for worthwhile effort when that wing proves a success. The college graduate may look forward to this certainty—that the reward of satisfaction for a job well done increases arithmetically with the difficulty and the importance of the job. You cannot be as happy pasting labels on bundles of wire, even though you do the job perfectly, as you would be working with associates in finding the solution to a knotty problem which, when solved, will make a contribution to the defense of your country or to the community in which you live. There is a great satisfaction to be gained in working on something worthwhile. A man now striking out upon a career, with a college degree in hand and with an urge to go ahead, can reap the rewards of this kind of satisfaction today just as he could have 25, 50, or 100 years ago. More so, because the jobs which must be tackled today are larger.

I mentioned freedom and opportunity. The desire to get into a position where you are free to think and act boldly, where you have the opportunity to venture along new paths, is or should be an incentive in itself. Although we abhor the idea of serfdom in this country, we do have regimentation of various sorts—regimentation in jobs, regimentation in unions, to mention a few examples. The farther a man can rise above his fellow men in position, the freer he stands. This is a basic incentive. One of the opportunities that comes to the man who works himself free of the general tide is the opportunity to contribute leadership, to help and inspire others. This is true not only within the affairs of a company or organization, but in various phases of community or national life. Many companies encourage their employees to take civic responsibility. Most companies now realize that not only do their firms have certain civic responsibilities, but that the men participating in such activities are broadened and benefited thereby. The company builds better men while building good will, and the individual gains the satisfaction of participating in things of consequence. Who gains these opportunities? Is it not the man who works to get ahead and who thus becomes available for other jobs of leadership?

This leads me to refer to another nonmonetary incentive. King Solomon recognized it 3,000 years ago when he penned the proverb, "A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches." Position and prestige are in themselves an incentive. But the proverb goes beyond this and emphasizes a good name as a goal worth striving for. Not just popularity, but being able to inspire the confidence and good will of others; being known for doing a good job and accomplishing things worth while.

Now this is beginning to sound like a sermon, and I can imagine more than one of you nudging your companion and saying, "Sounds like the old boy really believes in the American way of life." Well, I do most fervently. It has been dented a bit during the last decade or so, but the underlying soundness of our free enterprise system is as worthy of our support today as it has always been. I like to quote a statement which the House of Morgan made several years ago:

"In this country the great issue is whether we shall fall into the ways of those who expect to obtain better living for less effort and less enterprise."

You will recall that Walt Disney presented the issue in music when he had the grasshopper sing, "Oh, the world owes me a living."

It is my good fortune to be in a business where the importance of incentives provided by our way of life are constantly evident. The aircraft-manufacturing industry is highly competitive. Except in times of national emergency, there is never enough business to keep the industry going, and with the concepts of design and manufacture changing as rapidly as they have and are, it is obvious that a great premium is placed upon ingenuity, plus the ability to put new ideas into effect. I see in operation each day the healthy result that flows from competition between business adversaries where the margin of superiority in any given direction is not great. My chief engineer once expressed it in this way, "We never do as good a job as when we realize that our best may not be good enough." It is that very thing that has made our country great. If it is to remain great, that spirit of competition—the existence of a premium upon ability and enterprise—must be preserved. There must be plenty of incentive for the good old American drive of honest effort and hard work, and incentive for ingenuity as well. We have in our company an invention-incentive plan under which employees and the company share royalties from patentable ideas developed at work. We also have a suggestion system whereby employees making suggestions of nonpatentable ideas share in any savings the company is able to make from such suggestions. The suggestions made by Seattle division employees during 1951 resulted in savings to the company of approximately half a million dollars. The "better mouse trap" adage is a long way from worn out.

Theodore Roosevelt, at the break of this century, said, "I wish to preach not the doctrine of ignoble ease but the doctrine of the strenuous life." The editors of Fortune magazine recently commented as follows:

"The strenuous life is an American characteristic. It derives, on the one hand, from the practical necessities of a virginal continent on which there was much work to do. But it derives, on the other hand, from an ideal: The ideal of the perfectibility of man, of human improvement. Where this ideal came from is a matter for scholars to debate; but it has in any case been accepted in one form or another by Americans from the very beginning. It has given rise to many American faults, such as overoptimism and a superficial concept of progress. But above all, it has kept Americans working, risking, venturing, striving; it has sparked the strenuous life."

Suppose we return for a moment to the lad who did not care for responsibility—who was content to drive a truck—and please don't misunderstand me, I have nothing against truck drivers. They render a very necessary service. But where would we be as a Nation if our youth generally adopted such an attitude? Thus far, I have mentioned only the individual consequences of such a viewpoint, but let's look beyond the individual and consider our position as a Nation if our young citizens generally approached maturity with such a philosophy and proceeded to follow it throughout their lives.

I need hardly remind you that the American way of life, which places first the rights and freedom of the individual, is today engaged in a struggle for its existence with a rival way of life which places the state first and is not concerned with the rights and freedoms of the individual excepting, of course, those few individuals who control the state. The outcome of this struggle is dependent, in my opinion, in large measure, if not entirely, on the industrial strength of our Nation and the moral strength of our people. If, in this struggle, we reach outright war on an all-out basis, we cannot hope to match our enemy man for man. If we are to win, it must be through superior weapons which, in turn, stem from the ingenuity of our people and the economic strength of our Nation. And in this regard, let us not permit ourselves to discount the enemy. Korea has demonstrated that if we

are to be prepared, with superior weapons, to meet a full-scale aggression, we must devote a very great amount of effort and our best engineering and design brains to the task. Will we achieve this result if the youth of today are content to occupy positions of mediocrity? Will we survive in this struggle if our Nation consists of people who avoid rather than seek responsibility? Certainly not. Our very survival is dependent upon an adherence by the great bulk of our citizenry to the principles upon which this country was founded.

And, industrial might and ingenuity will not in themselves do the task. There must be a moral strength on the part of our people accompanying these other factors, for if we do not have this type of strength we will deteriorate from within. In my opinion, one of the greatest danger signals confronting us today is the lack of concern of the American people toward immorality in Government. The danger of destroying ourselves from within is perhaps as great as the danger of being destroyed from without.

May I say that I think these threats, whether from within or without, or both, should be to us the greatest incentive of all time to make our system of freedom work the better. We not only must prove ourselves stronger than the Communist states, but we must, through our conduct, let our light so shine that others will follow our example rather than the example of communism. To accomplish this will take the best efforts of each of us to improve our Government and our business and social relationships.

As a start in this direction, business management is spending much of its time these days in an effort to improve the people that constitute our industrial and business organizations. We are giving attention to the indoctrination of new employees. We are holding regular classroom-type discussions among foremen to demonstrate how they can help the men working for them to improve their abilities and, at the same time, produce a more efficient operation. We are arranging both on-the-job and off-the-job training opportunities for employees. We are making every effort to advance our employees through upgrading and to help deserving men to become good supervisors—members of management. All of these and many more that I could mention are indications of a solid trend of mutual interest between business organizations and their employees.

But we still have many unsolved problems. For example, the strikes that cripple industry, each one of which must be music to the ears of "Uncle Joe." I have also mentioned political immorality in government—and there is the prevalence of crime throughout the Nation—these are a few of the unconquered fields for free enterprise. In the hour of our greatest technical triumph, we stand in the midst of national and international confusion and apprehension. We stand challenged to demonstrate that our American free enterprise system with its incentives is the soundest basis for progress. And then we have the task of inspiring the peoples of other nations to follow this lead.

The scientists who are bringing about such phenomenal technical progress are the first to see the need for getting down to sound basic values in seeking the answers to our national and world problems. As president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Dr. Kirkley F. Mather, of Harvard, in answering criticism for the development of the atomic bomb, declared:

"It is war itself that is immoral—not the weapons used by the warriors." Said he, "If civilization is to be saved from catastrophe, the ethical consciousness of each person must be greatly strengthened, renewed, and improved."

I have talked to you about incentives for educated men and women of today to put forth greater effort to achieve positions of responsibility and to surmount some of the obstacles that are "Mount Everests" in our way. I have talked principally about the nonmonetary incentives that exist because the material incentive has had some of its edges chipped away. Certainly, the basic American principles of enterprise and reward still exist. It is our tradition to tackle and solve our problems rather than to steer around them. There are more challenges and opportunities for free enterprise ahead of us than there ever have been in our history. We have said that the bigger the problem to be solved, the greater the satisfaction that comes from solving it. The incentive to reap this reward of satisfaction in accomplishing something worth while looms big today.

Recently I read an advertisement entitled "This Is the Hour for Greatness." In a few words, it summarized the thoughts that I have endeavored to express to you:

"There are times that require greatness in men. This is such a time. Greatness in this hour is not beyond the reach of any man, nor is it reserved for those who make the headlines in world affairs. Its fuller measure is the willingness and capacity to rise to the urgency of the times whatever the job may be. Men with these elements of greatness are shaping this country's destiny today."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SHALL WE SUPPORT PUERTO RICO AT THE EXPENSE OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED STATES?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in the other body within the past 3 weeks, Democratic and Republican Members have questioned various phases of the Puerto Rican problem.

I have read with interest the remarks of the senior Member of the other body from New Hampshire on Tuesday last. He pointed out that the present policy of the administration of the government of Puerto Rico is to "lure industry away from the New England States and from the Southern States."

That "lure," Mr. Speaker, apparently is compounded of the sinister if subtle ingredients of tax exemption and low wages.

Tax exemption first, sweatshop wages next, financing subsidies after that and low transport-by-water rates on top of that. At the end of that pretty industrial story of probable profits comes a big question mark.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Members in the other body from Maryland, Maine, South Carolina, and New Hampshire have pointed out that something is wrong in Puerto Rico.

What is that something?

They have made no direct, no flagrant charges against Puerto Rico as such. But they have questioned the wisdom of our Government's encouragement through subsidy and Federal grants and the direct and indirect expenditure of the American taxpayer's money of a system which at best is suspect by the standards of our own economy.

In my district a majority of the people earn their living by the sweat of their brows. They are working people. For generations they have toiled in the coal mines.

My district, Mr. Speaker, is in the heart of the anthracite coal country. And my district today is one of the labor areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as "distressed," although I feel that the world "distressed" is an understatement of fact. Mine is a district, Mr. Speaker, which through no fault of its own has become an example of what happens when there is an industrial exodus—a district which today is deserving of every consideration by the Congress and by those of our executive branches of government who now are shaping the economic destines of our great country.

That is the reason I rise to suggest that when the good working people of my own district contribute tax money to Puerto Rico they be assured that this money is for purposes other than the promotion of sweat-shop conditions, no taxes at all on the industries themselves, and the maintenance of high-pressure, sharp promotional practices on the part of the present Puerto Rican administration. By high-pressure practices, I submit as typical examples the Puerto Rican Industrial Development Administration's $120,000 per year contract with a New York publicity company, and the tens of thousands of dollars it pays out to a so-called economic-planning concern in Boston.

Planning for what? Let us take a look.

Here I quote from the New York Times of January 3, 1950:

One million five hundred thousand dollars spent to promote rum.

Mr. Speaker, this expenditure may not be unusual for its purpose. I am advised that millions upon millions are expended annually in our own country for the promotion of one kind of rum or another. I do not take issue with the idea of promotion of rum, or of automobiles or soap or any other commodity.

American enterprise has been nurtured by promotion, and our standard of living has been raised by advertising and promotion and Yankee ingenuity.

I do take issue, however, with the methods and the regulations and the loosely interpreted laws that are supposed to pertain to Puerto Rico and I object to the irresponsible expenditure of American taxpayers' money by the administration of Puerto Rico and its myriad agencies.

Let me remind you here, Mr. Speaker, that as the junior Member of the other body from Maryland pointed out the other day, all of the tax revenues collected by our own Treasury Department from the sale of this Puerto Rican rum are given back to the Puerto Rican government. These monies are given back to be spent by the Puerto Ricans for whatsoever purpose they see fit and with no supervision whatsoever.

The junior Member of the other body from South Carolina has pointed out that in absolute defiance of a law passed

by Congress of the United States in 1947 there has been to this good hour no Federal coordinator assigned to Puerto Rico for the purpose of advising the Congress as to the expenditure of Federal grants and subsidies.

I do not wish at this time to examine the reasons, technical or otherwise, why this has not been done. Reasons pro and con have been read into the RECORD of this Congress.

But I do say, Mr. Speaker, that I personally am concerned about the disposition of the hard-earned dollars of my own people, my good friends—those to whom I must answer and to whom I must report on my stewardship and their tax dollars.

My constituents, Mr. Speaker, are glad to pay taxes when there is work to earn money. And when they do pay taxes they want their dollars spent to help them, not hurt them.

"Something is wrong in Puerto Rico." That, Mr. Speaker, has been the theme song in the remarks in the Congress of the United States these past weeks.

Is there fire where there is so much smoke? If so, Mr. Speaker, we should know about it through honest, open investigation as demanded by the Senators who have raised their voices on this issue.

Let us not condemn a people for a political and economic situation which may exist in spite of their apparent prerogatives to remedy it.

The ballot is only as good as its honest exercise and use.

We have too many examples the world over of the ballot's misuse and of its use by force and coercion to accomplish the aims of a dictator.

Charges have been hurled that we, the people of the United States, are fostering and supporting a dictatorship on our own doorstep, Puerto Rico. If this be true, we should know it now.

We are spending millions, Mr. Speaker—nay, billions—for the encouragement of democracy abroad, and for the extermination of dictatorship. Can we do less than examine our own political and economic responsibilities when it comes to such suggestions as to the conduct of Puerto Rico's affairs?

I speak today for the taxpayers of my own district. There are no more patriotic citizens in this great country. They pay taxes, they will continue to do so, but as their Representative in this Congress I insist today and shall continue to insist that they get their money's worth, whether their tax dollar's allocation is for Puerto Rico, or for battleships, or for airplanes, or what have you.

Word has come to me that in another district in my State there is great distress because of the threat of removal of one of its principal industries to Puerto Rico, where there will be no taxes, where the labor will be cheap, and where the industry will enjoy these extraordinary benefits at the expense of the very people left destitute by this economic piracy.

Mr. Speaker, that just does not make sense.

But it does mean that the American taxpayer is subsidizing Puerto Rico on the one hand and cutting his own throat with the other.

When and if this circumstance shall be visited upon my district, Mr. Speaker, I shall be heard from again.

Meanwhile, if this economic tendency and trend persists with respect to Puerto Rico, a tendency toward robbery of the workingman and taxpayer in the United States, I suggest that we as elected representatives of the people must reexamine our responsibilities to this island and be prepared to act positively when such grave issues arise that affect our mutual interests.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RAMSAY and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio in two instances, in one to include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio and to include an article from the February 25 issue of the Fairpoint Daily Herald, Fairpoint, Ohio.

Mr. COLE of Kansas and to include a speech by the Honorable Alfred M. Landon.

Mr. MCVEY and to include an editorial published in the South Pointer newspaper, Dolton, Ill.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include editorials and articles.

Mr. ARMSTRONG and to include resolutions adopted by a recent conference on psychological strategy.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a portion of a radio broadcast by Mr. Paul Harvey.

Mr. WEICHEL.

Mr. JAVITS and to include a series of articles from the New York World Telegram about the postal service, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $231.

Mr. KEOGH in two instances.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. BROWNSON to include pertinent correspondence in connection with his remarks made in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. AANDAHL.

Mr. KENNEDY.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 29, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. S. 2077. An act to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 6837. A bill to grant foster children dependency status for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 6838. A bill to amend section 122 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that a net operating loss for a taxable year shall be a net operating loss carry-back for the five preceding taxable years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6839. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 6840. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 6841. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment-compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 6842. A bill to amend section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to encourage the making of loans at low rates of interest to veterans, and to the widows of veterans, who wish to purchase or construct homes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6843. A bill to establish quotas on the importation of certain articles and products containing raw materials with respect to which priorities have been established or allocations made under the Defense Production Act of 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. R. 6844. A bill directing a survey, examination, and recommendation for flood control and drainage projects in the Ninth Congressional District of Michigan; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6845. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1953, the suspension of duties and import taxes on metal scrap, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 6846. A bill to amend title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, with respect to the authority of the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe certain fees and charges; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6847. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution to establish a Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 6848. A bill for the relief of Sharon Elaine Frankovich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 6849. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of William A. Burkett as a senior special agent, United States Treasury; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 6850. A bill for the relief of Martha Bridges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 6851. A bill for the relief of Salomon Salti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RADWAN:

H. R. 6852. A bill for the relief of William H. Marnon, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAIL:

H. R. 6853. A bill for the relief of David Hanan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the supreme source of all wisdom and strength, we are again turning unto Thee in prayer, compelled by our needs.

In these tangled and confused times there are so many problems to solve and so much that is basically and shamefully wrong.

Show us which of our proposals for a strong and adequate national defense are most reasonable and equitable and practical and whether they are in accordance with Thy divine will.

May we have the courage to search and reach out for those ways and means that are righteous and just and for the welfare of all mankind and for Thy glory.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) entitled "An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KILGORE, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. JENNER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. GARY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1450), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

Mr. CANFIELD reserved all points of order.

APPROPRIATION FOR MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION, 1952

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 396, making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, the following sum:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, Motor Carrier Claims Commission," $52,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall remain available until December 31, 1952, and the limitation on the amount available for personal services as set forth under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, is repealed.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the chairman of my subcommittee whether it is his intention to state briefly the reason this bill is brought up now.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Mr. Speaker, this is an item that needs immediate consideration. The Commission has been without sufficient funds now for some 3 or 4 weeks. We have had before the committee a budget estimate of $70,000 and the committee, after careful consideration of it, removed some of the limitations that had heretofore been put on the Commission and we also reduced the estimate by $18,000. The committee had hoped and wished and urged that this rather small Commission would wind up its affairs by June 30 of the present fiscal year, but by some mishap they have not been able to do so. However, they promised that they will make every effort and they, in conjunction with the Department of Justice, now tell us that it is their best judgment that they can wind up by the 31st of December, 1952.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The reason why the Commission has not been able to complete its work is because a test case was taken to the Supreme Court, and that was just recently filed.

Mr. THOMAS. That is one of the reasons, among others.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the reason given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I think my chairman should call attention to the fact that this came out of the subcommittee and also out of the full committee with a unanimous vote in each instance.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

Abbitt	Dollinger	James
Allen, Ill.	Durham	Javits
Anfuso	Eberharter	Johnson
Armstrong	Ellsworth	Jonas
Bakewell	Fallon	Kearns
Bates, Ky.	Feighan	King, Calif.
Bender	Fine	Klein
Blatnik	Fugate	Lanham
Boykin	Fulton	Larcade
Bray	Garmatz	Latham
Buchanan	Gore	McCulloch
Buckley	Granahan	McGrath
Burton	Green	McIntire
Camp	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Marshall
Case	Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Mass.
Celler	Hardy	Mason
Chatham	Harrison, Nebr.	Morgan
Chenoweth	Hart	Morrison, La.
Chiperfield	Hébert	Multer
Chudoff	Heffernan	Murphy
Clemente	Heller	Murray, Wis.
Combs	Herter	Nicholson
Cooley	Hess	O'Konski
Corbett	Hill	O'Neill
Coudert	Hoffman, Ill.	Osmers
Cox	Jackson, Calif.	O'Toole
Dempsey		Potter
Dingell		Powell

Prouty	St. George	Vail
Rains	Scott, Hardie	Velde
Redden	Secrest	Vursell
Rhodes	Sheehan	Weichel
Richards	Shelley	Wickersham
Rogers, Colo.	Sittler	Widnall
Rogers, Tex.	Staggers	Wilson, Tex.
Rooney	Stanley	Wolcott
Roosevelt	Stockman	Wood, Ga.
Sabath	Taylor	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 321 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order, may I ask the chairman, if we could extend general debate for 1 hour since there are so many requests? It is now 12:35, and if we could run until 5 o'clock, at least 4:45, I could take care of every urgent request over here.

Mr. VINSON. I regret to say to the gentleman from Missouri that the time on this side has been allotted, and I advised the Members that that was the end of the time, and I doubt whether they could be brought here. For that reason I ask the gentleman not to insist upon it.

Mr. SHORT. I shall not insist because our chairman has been most considerate and kind throughout all the hearings on this bill, and also in the debate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had 1 hour and 44 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] had 1 hour and 38 minutes remaining.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, as I listened to the debate on this bill and the arguments of the opponents, my mind went back to 1939, 1940, and 1941, when the same arguments were then made against legislation pending in this House to prepare our country for defense in case of attack by Hitler-Germany and its allies. Every bill which later proved vital to the winning of World War II was passed in this body by a margin of from 1 to 21 votes. I remember the bill to extend selective service, which came up in this branch in September 1941. I lived 200 years in a period of 30 minutes while the roll call was on. I was leader of the House then as I am now. I had three votes in reserve, on active pairs, and if there was a tie, the vote of the Speaker. That was what I was operating on, on a bill that we know now concerned the very vital interest of our country.

I can remember the arguments made then by those who are here today and who were here then and who opposed that bill, that we were warmongers. "Who are we going to fight?" they said, and this 3 months before Pearl Harbor happened.

I have often thought that if that bill had been defeated, instead of winning by one vote, and if as a result of the failure of that bill to pass our country had been seriously harmed, what would have been the conscience of those who voted against the bill? What would have been the conscience of an American who had voted against that bill and defeated it, if it had been defeated then instead of passing by one vote? Because not involved is the interest of an individual, involved is the national interest of the United States. That is what was involved then and that is what is involved now.

Those of us who recognize that imminent danger confronted our country and who had the courage to assume our responsibility were attacked, as I said, and vilified. We well know that most of those who served then in the House and who opposed defense legislation at that time are opposing this bill now. They have not learned anything from the dreadful experiences of World War II. They could see no danger from Hitler then. They opposed then, and they oppose now.

Following the line of least resistance or political opportunism is not the course that will save a country, and in this case our country, and save the civilization of which our country and each and every one of us is a part. Appealing to the hopes and emotions of a people rather than to reason and the realities of the world situation is a somewhat easy political course to take, but is it the safe course in the national interest of our country? That is the real issue.

The main issue involved in this bill is, "Is the passage of this bill in the national interest of our country? In the light of the existing world conditions, is its passage necessary or reasonably necessary for the probable future defense of our country?"

No one can look ahead and say definitely what is going to happen, but we can tell what the situation is now. We know who the potential enemy is. We could not look ahead in September 1941, but there were those of us who realized that imminent danger confronted our country and that something had to be done, and we had to vote on the side of strength rather than the side of weakness. Those of us who are Members of this body and of the United States Senate must remember that we are charged with direct responsibility for the preservation of our country. That duty rests squarely and directly upon our shoulders, 435 Members of the House and 96 Members of the Senate, not as Democrats or as Republicans but as Americans; not as individuals thinking primarily of the next election but as Members and Americans thinking of the years ahead and of the next generation. The fact is that we are Members of the Congress. We cannot dispute that fact. You and I are Members of the Congress, and by our election to this body, we are charged with the duty of preserving our country. It is our responsibility to preserve the inheritance we have received from past generations of Americans. We must preserve that inheritance not only for ourselves, but for future generations of our descendants. We must remember that the law of self-preservation applies to nations as well as to individuals. Is there any Member who will deny that a grave emergency exists? Is there any Member who feels that the danger facing our country is such that we should not develop our maximum strength to deter war, if that is possible, and, second, in the event of another world conflict so that we will win?

Is there any rational-minded Member who will challenge the statement that the present emergency is due to the Soviet Union and the conspiracy of international communism to dominate the world, and to enslave all peoples?

Is there any Member who will deny that we have been thrown into the situation and that through necessity and in our own national interest we should develop our strength not only for today, but for some years in the future?

Is there any Member who will challenge the fact that we are not living in a dream world, but in a disturbed world as a result of the plot of international communism, and that we should, and if we assume our congressional responsibilities, we must legislate in accordance with the realities of the world as they exist today? We cannot afford to take the chance of voting on the side of weakness.

As a Member of the Congress, with the direct responsibility on my shoulders, it is my duty to vote on the side of strength and not on the side of weakness. I have that direct responsibility on my shoulders. I am not back in Boston with the responsibility of an American citizen electing somebody else to assume his responsibility here in this representative body. No, I am here as that duly elected representative, and I have that direct responsibility. So have 434 other Members of this body, and 96 Members of the other body. As a Member of the Congress, with that direct responsibility resting upon me, I consider it my duty to vote on the side of strength and not on the side of weakness; to resolve any doubt in my mind on the side of strength, and not on the side of weakness.

Mr. Chairman, just as there were those who a decade or more ago took the position that no danger confronted our country, so are there such persons today. As they played with fire then, so are they now. But, Mr. Chairman, so far as

I am concerned, I am going to vote on the side of strength and security. No matter what may happen in the future—no matter what may happen on this bill in this branch of the Congress, I can then live with my conscience knowing that so far as I could, I did everything to protect and preserve my country.

Let me remind you that only 11 years ago there were Members of this body, some of whom are Members today, who charged that those who voted for defense legislation were "warmongers," and that Hitler's Germany and imperialistic Japan had no designs on our country. They claimed that we would not become involved in the war, which later developed into World War II. No one can deny that Pearl Harbor actually took place.

Mr. Chairman, the pending bill is a defense measure. We are considering it under conditions of serious world danger, and under conditions of grave emergency to the country. The emergency is great. This fact must be borne in mind—that we are considering this bill not during a period of peace or complacency, but during a period of grave emergency in our country. We should have the courage to rise to the occasion.

The provisions of this bill have been fully debated and explained. In the light of the Communist challenge of this period, the passage of such legislation is necessary. I base its passage on the ground of necessity in the national interest of our country. The national interest of our country is paramount to the personal interest of any Member or of any other American. The old saying, "In time of peace prepare for war," applies with special emphasis at this time. Our preparation in the light of the present danger may avert another world conflagration.

The pending bill is an important part of our defense preparation and of possible world war avoidance. Without again discussing in detail the various provisions of the pending bill, an important provision, in my mind, is that part which provides that after a 6 months' period of service, insofar as the Ready Reserves is concerned, they cannot be called back without concurrent act of Congress. Some Members are disturbed that there is no time limit to this bill, but it seems to me the answer to this is that through the power of appropriation the Congress has control of the situation from year to year. There are some Members who feel disturbed about military control of our country through the passage of this bill. That is a logical thought. It addressed itself to me as well as to others. If there are now those who entertain this thought, the provisions of the bill specifically prevent this. If enacted into law, there will be civilian control of its administration. At the present time there are sixteen to eighteen million Americans who are veterans; those of us who served in World War I and in World War II, and now those who are serving in Korea. Many of them who served in World War II have been called back into active service. A good number of those who served in World War II are now in Active Reserves. Many have been called to active service. If we had this legislation 4 or 5 years ago, they would not have had to be. They are citizen soldiers. They are civilian-minded. And so will be the young men who will serve in accordance with this bill, if it becomes law. But in case of the latter, the very provisions of the pending bill provide for civilian control. There is a prohibition against military control: (a) by civilian control of the Commission; (b) by action of the Congress before the Ready Reserves can be called into active service; and (c) by the power of the Congress to control appropriations from year to year. The power to appropriate carries with it the power not to appropriate.

I might also observe, which to me is very important, that the pending bill is a means of assuring in the near future maximum trained manpower with a minimum of cost. When put into operation it will save billions of dollars. The very fact that we are compelled from year to year to spend such a tremendous amount of money, no matter how we may differ on this or that amendment in relation to economy, cannot help but attract itself to the mind of every Member. We have to save our economic strength. This bill, as the committee said, will save $13,000,000,000 a year. If it even saves $6,000,000,000 in the next 3 or 4 years, it will be a mighty contribution, when at the same time it is bringing about a maximum of trained manpower.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the pre-Revolutionary days there was a brave man by the name of Patrick Henry who said: "Give me liberty, or give me death." Human beings, weak as we are, we need in these days the spirit of Patrick Henry, yes, the spirit of countless of thousands of men and women who won the independence of the Nation. They served and fought for independence; we must have the courage to serve and vote for its preservation. And in doing this we cannot be too technical by saying: "I am for this bill, but—I am for this bill but it weakens the defense of our country," when even the opponents of the bill will admit that it strengthens the country.

If you have any doubt I urge you to resolve that doubt in favor of this bill, on the side of strength, in the light of the necessity for it. What action should I take in the national interest of my country? That is the question having in mind the danger existing, having in mind the efforts and the contributions of past generations of Americans; and they are speaking to us from the great beyond. The heritage we have cannot be forgotten because of emotionalism. That is resting upon us, whether we assume it or not.

Having in mind the country that I inherited and that I love, with the unwritten mandate from past generations of Americans to preserve it and pass it on to the next generation, having in mind these and many other thoughts and influences, exercising my judgment and searching my conscience that I may faithfully live with my conscience in the future, it is my firm conviction that the only course I can take in the national interest of my country and in performing my direct trust and responsibility as a Member of the Congress of the United States is to vote for the passage of this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, during the course of his remarks, the distinguished majority leader has again referred to a bill passed in 1941 as an extension of the Draft Act.

If he would refresh his memory, he would find that the sole purpose of that measure was to extend the 1-year training period of men drafted under the Selective Service Act of 1940 to 18 months. The 1941 bill did not terminate the Draft Act of 1940 at all. In fact, the bill of 1940 was for 5 years. It was passed on September 16, 1940, but there were no inductions under it until the last week of November 1940. I am advised by the Selective Service Department that only a few men had been inducted by December 7, 1940, which was 1 year before Pearl Harbor. To be exact, only 20,000 men were inducted between the last week of November 1940 and the end of the year 1940. The public drawing of the first draftees did not take place until October 29, 1940.

Under the circumstances if the bill to which the majority leader refers had been defeated, inductions under the 1940 act would have continued without interruption and no inductee would have been eligible for discharge until the last week of November 1941. Moreover, the very few who would have been released by Pearl Harbor day would have been subject to recall to active duty when war was declared.

Bear in mind that the act of 1940 provided for only 1 year of service for those inducted under it. The extension of service provided for in the 1941 bill was requested by the military authorities on the representation that more than 1 year was required to properly train those who were inducted under the 1940 act. In this connection it should be pointed out that some of those who were contending in 1941 that a year's training was insufficient now insist that 6 months' training in the UMT program is sufficient.

In the light of these facts the conclusion is inescapable that those who claim that the passage of the Service Extension Act of 1941 by a margin of one vote saved the Nation from disaster are either endeavoring to mislead the members of the committee or they are wholly unaware of the true facts.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the very able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to pay tribute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr.

SHORT], who on yesterday gave such dynamic expression to his opposition to this measure. There has never been any doubt where DEWEY SHORT has stood on measures dealing with the whole of our citizenry in military matters. He would be the first, I am sure, to remind you that he has resisted all measures providing for the draft of American youth for military service during the 20 years he has been in the Congress, before, during, and after World War II, with one possible exception. That he should have this attitude is entirely understandable and I honor him for it.

A student of the ministry at colleges and seminaries both in this country and abroad, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] came to the Congress from the pulpit. It is to expected, therefore, that his judgment is dominated by the lessons of the Gospel.

However, in this modern day when the peace and security of the entire world is placed in jeopardy by a handful of powerful men in Moscow and a philosophy of life which operates on the very antithesis of the lessons of the Bible, a principle which not only is anti-God, and anti-Christ, but also one which has no respect whatever for human life itself, having no tinge of righteousness or idealism, I fear it would be a tragic error for us as a Nation to be blinded to these realities of the world and place our complete reliance in the consummate idealism and religious fervor expounded by the gentleman from Missouri.

I pay tribute to DEWEY SHORT and compliment him for his devoted loyalty to the ideals which he learned as a youth and preached as a minister. I pray that there may be more men in the world like DEWEY SHORT—but unhappily there are not.

This is the fourth and final day of debate upon a proposal which, depending upon the outcome, might well be the determining factor of our security as a Nation in the future. If decided in the affirmative the new program unquestionably will have an impact upon our young male citizens in the future but I am not ready to admit that will be an injurious and harmful effect. On the contrary, rather, I firmly believe the whole program of military training for all of our citizens as set forth in this bill will have a very wholesome and stimulating consequence.

I have endeavored to listen rather closely to all the arguments of the opposition but have failed to find anything new. The arguments today are the same as were used in the debate on the same subject a year ago when the House by a vote of 9 to 1 determined to adopt some system under which every American boy would have 6 months of basic military training, providing the plan and program of training was subseqently found by the Congress to be acceptable. I am unwilling to believe that those who voted in the affirmative last year were not aware of the provisions of the bill to which they gave their vote and that the only reason why they supported the measure then was because it provided for extension of the draft and for 24 months of military service.

Nor do I feel it is fair to accept the explanation that those who supported the bill a year ago did so with the belief that a training program would not operate at the same time as men were being drafted for service. As a matter of fact, the wording of that law specifically suggests the probability that both systems would be operative at the same time, for it explicitly states that persons might be inducted into the training corps when the period of service required of persons under 19 years of age has been reduced or eliminated by the President or the Congress. In other words, induction into the Training Corps of men under 19 might occur at the same time as men over 19 were being drafted for service.

If we are opposed to the principle of universal military training, let us have the courage to say so openly, frankly, and honestly as so many of our colleagues such as the two gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER and Mr. HOFFMAN], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]. Why must we be a "yes, but" man when actually all along we are a "no" man. Or, if we approve the principle of UMT are we justified in voting against this plan just because it does not square in all particulars with our own individual ideas?

We should allow this proposal to come to a clear-cut vote and those who are opposed to it vote accordingly rather than hide behind the disingenuous device of trying to ride both horses of the issue by supporting a motion to recommit the measure.

Let us take another brief look at Public Law 51 adopted last year dealing with the subject of military training. In the first place, the title of it was "Universal Military Training and Service Act," indicating that it covered programs for the training of some men and for the military service of others. It set forth who would be liable, the period of training, the manner in which a training program would be inaugurated, the reserve obligation following training, permissive and statutory deferments, rate of compensation, adoption of the Selective Service System for the induction process, the right to volunteer for induction, the creation of the corps itself, the creation of the commission, and the administration of the program under the supervision of the commission. In other words, we did everything short of actually adopting a training program and requiring induction into the corps. Today we are considering the recommendations submitted by the training commission. Are they adequate for the purposes of a general training program and are they fair to the boys to be inducted? Those are the issues we really should be discussing in our debate on this bill.

I find it difficult to resist the conclusion that a lack of complete understanding of what is now being proposed is responsible for the volume of protests we all have received and that the opponents look upon this proposal as the same one which has been before the Congress for the last three decades. In fact, it is as different from the original American Legion plan for military training and service as day is from night. Therefore, I urge the Members who do feel the necessity for some training program to keep their minds open until they have a full understanding of what is proposed before they make a decision.

Allow me to hurriedly run down through some of the arguments which have been advanced by various speakers in opposition.

It is charged that this is a radical departure from our historic practices, that it constitutes conscription and compulsion, both of which are repugnant to American ideals, that it represents a page torn from the book of the Old World, an involuntary service from which our ancestors fled, a virus of the disease of the vanquished which is now being infused into the bloodstream of the victor. Conscription is defined to be compulsory enrollment of men for military or naval service. There is not a single line in this bill as amended by the committee or any other law which requires a single day of military service for any members of the training corps and I defy any Member to show where that statement is in error. Those who refer to this bill as conscription just do not understand the bill.

With respect to compulsion and regimentation, this proposal is no more foreign to the American way than the requirement of every American youth, both boy and girl, from the age of 6 through the age of 16 to attend a public school for courses of education. Tune your ear to the voices of the past and you will hear those same outcries of compulsion, regimentation and invasion of liberty, as arguments against compulsory attendance at the public schools. Who here today would advocate repeal of those laws?

It is said that this proposal impinges upon the freedom of American youth; that it is servitude, bondage, and a mortgage upon their lives because they are given a Reserve status of 7½ years. Must I remind you that under the law today every boy who is drafted for service upon completion of his 24 months of duty goes into the Reserve arbitrarily and summarily for a period of 6 years? So far as requirements to serve in the Reserve, this bill treats trainees and service draftees exactly alike—a total of 8 years. In any event, a Reserve status constitutes no more of a mortgage upon the life of the American boy and is no more servitude or bondage than the liability to which he is otherwise exposed. No boy who is in the Reserve can be called to render military service without further action of Congress. His liability and his uncertainty for the future is no more burdensome than it would be if he were not in the Reserve. Right today, every male American from the age of 18 to 45 has constantly hanging over his head the sword of Damocles which upon resolution by the Congress might fall at any time and require him to bear arms for his country, whether he is in any Reserve or not. Do not talk about this being a slave bill unless you mean that the constitutional obligation to bear arms in defense of your Nation constitutes slavery.

Some have argued that inevitably in the course of military training American

youth would become debauched, demoralized, and Prussianized. In answer to this argument every American soldier or sailor who has ever served in any of our wars cries out in defiance. Fifteen million of them are living testimonials to the shallow depth of that argument. Except for those injured in combat, for every young man who you can show me has been harmed physically, morally, mentally, or spiritually by his military experience, I will show you 10,000 who have been transformed from boyhood into virile, vigorous, fearless, God-fearing men because of it.

The cry has gone out that these boys are going to be taught to kill. Our basic criminal jurisprudence from the earliest records have recognized the law of self-preservation—the right to kill in self-defense. All nature abounds with instances of a variety of methods by which her creatures defend themselves against predatory animals. Is it so wrong to learn to kill in order to prevent yourself from being killed? I prefer to look upon this training as lessons in which young men of America will be taught to protect themselves. If they are lessons in killing they are also lessons in living.

Furthermore, we must constantly remember that this program at all times is under the supervision of a civilian commission, composed at the moment and for many years to come of outstanding American citizens, with its system of inspection and its authority to pass upon rules and regulations governing the operation of the camps.

Someone has mentioned that this is simply a scheme for the social integration of American young manhood. The only agencies of government to which any boy might be sent for training is the Army, Navy, or the Air Force, no other; and certainly we can be sure that these three departments of government will not engage in any frivolous program of boondoggling or social experimentation.

With respect to criticism that this innovation will strip the farms of its labor and the colleges of their students, I would call to your attention an amendment offered by me which the committee adopted in principle but which does not appear in the bill itself because at the time it had not been reduced to writing, which would allow each boy to select the period of the year in which he would take the 6 months' training, making it possible for the farm boy to be trained in the winter and the college boy to be trained in the summer. That amendment will be offered next week and I am confident it will be adopted.

Probably the most persuasive argument against the bill is the alleged inequity of selecting one 18-year-old boy to go into training and his neighbor friend across the street, a 19-year-old, to go into service. That inequity exists today between the 19- and 20-year-olds, the 20- and 21-year-olds, the 21- and the 22-year-olds for the Congress has previously insisted that the older boys be taken for service before the younger ones. Actually, the inequality is more apparent than real. It is not an inequity, for the determination of those 18-year-olds who are to go into training will be determined by the local draft boards in whatever method they may determine but presumably some system of lottery. Certainly, if conditions require an element of selection where discretionary determination is allowed to work, a board composed of local citizens is the fairest and most equitable manner of dealing with it. If the boys to be trained are determined by lot, which I strongly feel should be the case, then there is no inequality whatever since all of the boys would be given the same chance. Depending upon the spin of the wheel, some might go into training with a subsequent Reserve status and the remainder be later called for active service. But it should always be borne in mind that if and when the reservists are called into action, I am certain the Congress of the future will require those without previous military duty to go first so that what appears to be a haven and refuge and preferential treatment today might well eventually turn out to be just the opposite.

Furthermore, I would remind you that this apparent inequality cannot endure for more than a few years at the most, during the period of transition while it is necessary to take some of the older boys for service at the same time as we are taking the younger ones for training. Eventually, if this program is adopted, it will be possible to eliminate the draft for service entirely. That is the purpose and the goal of the entire program.

The other and final argument against the program is its cost. Even the opponents, I think, will concede that as a reservoir of nonveteran civilians who have had military training is built up, the need for a standing army diminishes in an inverse ratio. The greater the Reserve, the lower a standing army to be required. The military specialists have given as their opinion that this ratio could safely be 3 to 1; that is, three reservists on an inactive status could relieve the need for one soldier on active duty.

Also, the opponents must admit that it does not cost as much to maintain a man in a Reserve status as it does to maintain one in active military service. Certainly it does not require a Pythagoras to come to the conclusion that it is cheaper to maintain three or four reservists, most of them engaged in their normal uninterrupted civilian pursuits, in the place of one active soldier whose service might be obviated because of the existence of reservists. Whether the saving is $13,000,000,000, thirteen million, or thirteen thousand, this method of providing the military manpower needed in any future emergency, when fully implemented, is immeasurably less costly than the practice we have followed in recent years. The potential eventual savings of this program may well run into several billions of dollars annually.

I find it extremely difficult, if not impossible, to accept or even understand the logic of the argument advanced by some that since we have the draft it is sufficient to meet our military needs and a program of military training not required. In other words, they would prefer to draft a boy and require him to serve in the military forces for 24 months than they would to draft a boy to receive military training for 6 months. For my part, I would much prefer to draft three boys each to have 6 months of training if by doing so I could avoid drafting one boy for 24 months of service.

The issue we have to decide today is really just that simple. It is either continue the draft and require all young America to be under a constant cloud of uncertainty with the probability that many of them will be called for 2 years of military duty or relieve them of that harassment by requiring all of them to have one-half year of military training. Frankly, I find the choice not at all difficult. Just ask yourself that question, Mr. Chairman. Would you rather draft a boy for 2 years of military service or draft three boys for one-half year of military training? Vote "no" on this bill and you vote both to keep all youth in a turmoil and to send many of them into really involuntary servitude for 2 years.

Earlier in this discussion I indicated my firm belief that most of the opposition to this measure, both from home and from those here in the House, was due to the fact that this particular proposal has not been fully understood. In proof of that conclusion, I want to relate to you an incident told me by Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, one of the military members of the National Security Training Commission. After he had concluded his statement on this bill before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, just recently, a spectator came to him and introduced himself as a minister from South Carolina. He said that on the previous Sunday he had preached a sermon against this bill, but now that he had heard the discussion and an explanation of it he had a much better understanding of its contents and that he was going back to South Carolina to preach many sermons in favor of it. I do urge once more that the Members keep an open mind until after the bill has been read next week and we have a better opportunity to understand it.

Mr. Chairman, I have never felt that a Member of Congress should be guided in his official judgment by the effect which his decision might have upon himself, his family, or his personal fortune—either political or financial. However, it might be charged by some person who does not know the fact that I am not qualified to speak or vote on this subject because I lack the attitude and experience of a parent and do not have the proper personal solicitude for the welfare of American youth. Lest this charge be made, I feel that the record should show the fact that I am a parent, that I have three children, that all of them are boys, and that all of the boys are of military age or soon will be of that age. I have taken my position on this matter not only from the standpoint of one whose oath and constitutional duty requires him to be responsible for maintaining our national defense, but also from the standpoint of a parent whose sons are subject to call. I want my sons, should they ever be summoned to render military service in the defense of their country, to be just as well

trained and equipped as is humanly possible, both in order that they may perform creditably in any assignment, even including the field of battle, and also to be more likely to survive in order to enjoy the blessings of the very thing they fight and kill in order to preserve.

These decisions are not easy ones for any of us to make. It is true that such a system as this providing for military training is completely new, but who is there who will deny that conditions in the world today are not also new and strange and foreign to us in the light of the past centuries? No one, of course, knows for a certainty what the future holds, but I have yet to find a single person from the highest to lowest position who does not contemplate an era of uncertainty, confusion, discouragement, and imminence of hostility.

Firm as I am in the belief that this system of training is not only fair to the boy, with ample safeguards for the protection of his spiritual and moral guidance, that it is needed by our Nation to provide us with a degree of security which the uncertainty of the times requires and through it to avoid the staggering, stupendous annual costs of an alternative program, I am ready to make my decision now with full confidence that even those who have previously written me with some heat and vehemence in opposition to this program, once they understand its full provisions and import will accept this program.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I should like to leave this one final thought or quotation. World conditions "prove more forcibly the necessity of obliging every citizen to be a soldier. This was the case with the Turks and Romans and must be that of every free state. We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens. We can never be safe until this is done."

These are not my words, Mr. Chairman. They are not the words of Hitler or Mussolini. They are not the words of one who would place the people in bondage or servitude. They are the words of Thomas Jefferson, himself the very spirit of freedom and democracy, uttered at the close of the War of 1812, when world conditions then appeared to be threatening.

Mr. Chairman, the course for me to follow is sharp and clear and unswerving. I take it without hesitancy or doubt, with full confidence that if our Nation follows that course, it will lead to a brighter day when the world can be shown the dawn of a lasting peace and be relieved of the cringing fear from the constant threat of war.

VOLUNTARY RESERVE PROGRAM, YES, COMPULSORY UMT, NO

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in opening the debate on the question before us stated that the fate of our country is involved in this problem. I agree with him, but for a different reason.

History is against this program and to commit our people to it is to condemn this great country to ultimate destruction. The unequivocal verdict of history is that improvement in military technique and the establishment of a gigantic military machine is invariably the symptom of a decline of its civilization. All around us today the signs are obvious. We are hell-bent for improving military techniques and building great land mass armies on the pretext that they will contain communism. Napoleon, Bismarck, Hitler, and Mussolini adopted that theory too, and where are they?

History further indicates that the warlike nation of today is the decadent nation of tomorrow. It has ever been so, and in the nature of things it must ever be so. The warrior state was always able to measure the values in art and literature and life itself, but it never suspected that the marching legions which protected it from attack at the time were the symbol of a destructive system of economics which had far greater forces at its command than all the organized armies in an organized world—forces which slowly but steadily undermined the walls and overthrew the defenses of all antique civilizations. The ancient world was not so much overthrown by invaders as devastated from within by the effects of its own war system, which had destroyed the vitality of both agricultural and industrial pursuits. We can never forget, Mr. Chairman, that it was Abraham Lincoln who said and who obviously had been reading history when he said it, that if our civilization is ever to be destroyed that it will be destroyed from within and not by the enemies from without.

Mr. Chairman, history also shows that the war system and the war methods have always been the chief foe of progress and that war is the chief obstacle to human advancement. Lands which today, thanks to the bounty of kindly mother nature and the toil of industrious men should blossom like the rose, lie buried in desert sands or starve from lack of cultivation in the midst of a seething cauldron of incessant war and preparations for more war.

In those early days wars seemed necessary to civilizations, yet it was war that destroyed those civilizations.

Mr. Chairman, we have the example of Arabia of old, when the Arabs, too, like so many other peoples, were given their chance to promote the welfare of humanity, but the ways of war were more pleasant and seemed more practical to them than the paths of peace. They took the sword and perished by the sword. For nearly 900 years they lived under the rule of the Turks.

In Assyria, there was presented the case of military overspecialization, and the overspecialization contained the immediate cause of her downfall. It involved not only the destruction of the Assyrian war machine but also the extinction of the Assyrian state and the extermination of the Assyrian people.

Ancient Greece, Rome, and Sparta traveled the same paths and reached the same end—destruction. Is that the verdict we shall impose upon future generations by approving the bill that is before us? As for me, I will have no part of it. I do not want my grandchildren to say someday that "grandpa voted us down the river."

Mr. Chairman, I again repeat that the verdict of history is against the objectives sought in the bill before us.

Mr. Chairman, I will support a real voluntary Army Reserve program. I have always supported that principle. The bill before us, however, is a far cry from the citizen-soldier plan advocated by the founders of our Government and followed in this country since it was established. The peacetime reservist is on a voluntary-service basis, and for many years our National Guard and the Organized Reserves have been the nucleus of our Armed Forces in times of international crisis.

This bill does not embody the universal military training plan long advocated by the American Legion. That organization, of which I have been a member since 1919, is supporting this measure in spite of the fact that it does not contain the principles or program of the Legion approved at national conventions. Its leaders today are grasping at the husk of UMT. They are chasing a will-o'-the-wisp.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of this committee what, if anything, has been done to establish a Voluntary Reserve system in this country with the National Guard and the Organized Reserve as the nucleus? Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that there are today in our Reserve forces at least 2,500,000 officers and men who are serving on a voluntary basis?

I agree with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that there is only one justification for UMT and that is to build a Reserve force but with the reservation that it be a voluntary Reserve. General Evans, executive director of the Reserve Officers Association, testified at the hearings:

> This Reserve force of ours is no small percentage of our total population, as we have today in the Reserve components of all the services over 2,500,000 men.

This Reserve force is serving strictly today on a voluntary basis. General Evans said further that these veterans who joined the Reserves did so because they wanted to be of service to their country in the event of war. These men are real patriots and to deny them this opportunity would be unjust and discriminatory as they are well-trained men prepared to answer a call to service upon short notice.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think it will be denied that the Pentagon, where policies are made, does not look very kindly at the National Guard or the Organized Reserve Corps. The treatment accorded the Reserves at the outbreak of the Korean war was nothing short of scandalous. Neither Congress nor the reservists will ever forget it.

As a junior officer in World War I, I served with the National Guard units

of the Thirty-second Division from Michigan and Wisconsin. The Regular Army officers at that time did not want any part of the National Guard nor do they want any part of it now. This is common knowledge, yet it was the National Guard units that made possible the building of the armies that were necessary to win World Wars I and II.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is incumbent upon the Armed Services Committee of this House to bring to Congress a plan incorporating the ideas of our founding fathers, to wit: A militia system based on voluntary service rather than the compulsory military training bill that is now before us.

There is one phase of this legislation that has not been touched upon, and I have listened to all of the debate. I would like to stress it at this moment.

The Department of Defense is an arm of foreign policy. Basically the thing we are considering in this legislation is an implementation of present foreign policy, which at this moment has involved us not only in an undeclared war but it now requires the expenditure of untold billions of dollars and no doubt of untold millions of lives, all over the world.

Mr. Chairman, my mail has been heavy with protests against this bill from church people, labor unions, farm groups, and others who have been supporting the foreign policies of this administration. I want to say to them, and to you, that if our present foreign policy is continued we must have a Reserve component and we must continue to draft our young men to serve in the Armed Forces of our country. I am humbly and respectfully suggesting that those who are so vehement in their opposition to the issue before us in this bill, give serious consideration to their endorsements of our present foreign policy.

Another point that I want to make is that this matter is also related to foreign policy.

On last Sunday the American people were jolted by reports from Lisbon, Portugal, that the cost of military defense for Western Europe will be $300,000,000,000. Who do you think is going to finance that scheme? It is perfectly obvious to me that the United States will be asked to underwrite and furnish the money, the men, and the material for most of it. Why build a military machine when this plan is sure to bankrupt the free world? Stalin does not have to fight a war to achieve his objective of world domination. All he has to do is to wait for the day when the people of this country will go broke, when our economic house caves in.

Mr. Chairman, why all this great military preparation when there is no evidence or sign of immediate war with the Communists? The Soviet does not need a war to defeat these United States because when defeat comes to us, it will be as a result of the bankruptcy of this Nation. High prices, inflation, and a military economy face our people—all because of a foreign policy which is attempting to fight a global war all over the world. We are trying to play the part of a world policeman when we do not have the wealth nor the manpower to do it. We are following a senseless policy.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us should be sent back to the committee for further study. I am opposed to the bill in its present form.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we are now engaged in a period of stress which may encompass the lifetime of most of us here today. Such a period will prove to be a tremendous drain upon the economy of our country if we are to maintain a huge standing army during these years of emergency. It is well, therefore, for us to evaluate the inadequacies of our present system and to devise, if we can, a suitable plan that will provide the same relative security of a large standing force by a less expensive means.

A year ago the Congress indicated its desire to entertain the consideration of some measure, to be later devised, and established a commission to formulate it. On that occasion in favoring that legislation, I stated to the House: "If we can devise a plan that will cut down on the standing army and lower the cost to the taxpayers and still have military security; if we can give some certainty to the plans of our youths; if we have the knowledge and assurance that we have trained reserves that can quickly augment our standing forces and make an enemy think twice before he attacks, I am in favor of such a plan." That was a year ago.

During the past 2 months, I have been constantly occupied with this problem, and day after day have listened to testimony pertaining to it. In fact, there has been no legislation yet presented to this Congress, while I have been a Member, to which I have devoted more attention and which has caused me greater concern.

At this hour, I can only report that to date no plan has been offered to the committee, or to the Congress, that has considered more than mere segments of the issue. The problem has not been thought through, and consequently no practicable solution has evolved.

Being an advocate of the general proposition, during the early stages of the hearing I became disturbed and uncomfortable as I watched proponents of the bill use a sledge hammer to get this particular bill enacted into law. Toy balloons of every description were floated, only to burst as they were examined. Claims for universal military training quite beyond the realm of clear logic did not appear to have the direct course to this problem which I had hoped would be pursued. As favorably disposed as I was at that time, I could not help but get the impression that square pegs would be forced to fit round holes and, good or bad, right or wrong, clearly or ill conceived, this bill must be enacted now.

I was surprised to read in the Commission report that the Congress had accepted the principle of universal military training before the mechanisms of that principle were even understood. I was at a loss to understand why the Pentagon was not satisfied with the draft, but was insistent upon a UMT scheme that would induct 60,000 18-year-olds into training and follow that training immediately with 18 months' active duty which would be identical with the draft except taking them at a younger age. I failed to see how that proposal would build up a reserve of nonveterans on a universal scale, which was the announced intent of the proposal under consideration. In fact, you never knew what proposal was the issue of the moment, there were so many.

At this stage, the proponents of Universal Military Training had about unsold me with their arguments, and it was only by the equally fantastic claims of some of its opponents that I managed to remain in a neutral zone.

I waited a few days for the plan to unfold before I read the report of the Commission. I could tell at first reading that the problem that concerned me had never been considered. The broad outline and the machinery of a program we expected had been narrowed in scope to a degree where the only matter considered was the rules, regulations and jurisdiction pertaining to a 6 months' training program. Did anyone really think this involved all the problems we had on this subject? The words of the Commission which expressed an assumption of a vigorous reserve program revealed the small aspect of the problem to which they addressed themselves. This is in no sense a criticism of the Commission because the breadth of their study was undoubtedly defined for them and within the area assigned to them their report, in most respects, was of outstanding character.

Nevertheless, I was still comforted at this time in the belief that this vast issue which has been studied for years had been analyzed thoroughly. I was confident that the answers to the problems that bothered me would be forthcoming. As time elapsed and nobody touched upon these matters in their testimony and inquiries brought only inadequate responses, I asked the Pentagon not only once, but several times, to provide me with the answers. I was assured that I would receive this information but that it required time to prepare it. To this day, I have received no information whatsoever. I can perhaps understand why an opponent of a universal military training program, advocated by the Pentagon, would encounter difficulty securing information that was intended to be used against it. It is quite another matter when one who realizes the inadequacies of the present system and is receptive and indeed eager to the idea of finding a better system, is denied such information. The conclusions are obvious. Either there are no answers, or perhaps the answers would jeopardize passage of the bill. If it was a question of time, I believe a full study should be made and explained to the Congress before this bill is enacted into law.

Now what are some of these problems which have caused me concern and which have never been discussed?

I shall not attempt to discuss the savings idea which was conceived after the

hearings were completed and without the consultation or knowledge of the committee. All of us know that savings would be effectuated if the size of the standing forces would be reduced. These savings would be even greater if no UMT program was in effect. Therefore, it is not cost and savings alone that must be considered, but cost and savings in relation to an equal measure of military security. Obviously, if cost and savings were the only considerations, we could automatically cut down the size of our forces, without any substitution—but not many would advocate such a policy at this time.

The real questions I raise start where the Commission stops. Other matters could be resolved by appropriate amendments. On page 10 of the Commission's report you will find this very significant statement:

On the vital assumption, therefore, that a vigorous and efficient Reserve program will emerge from the current congressional deliberations on this subject, the three military services have planned respective UMT programs.

On page 12 of the same report we find the following observation:

While 16 weeks' instruction in these basic subjects would not fully qualify these trainees as specialists, it would give them a firm foundation on which to build during their subsequent duty in a Reserve unit. Here, in our opinion, is an excellent example of the vital need for a vigorous Reserve program as a complement to UMT.

Let us now examine the value of that vital assumption and the vigorous reserve that will be established.

Although we are in an air age, no thought whatsoever is given in the Air Force courses that will even begin to train those who must pilot, navigate or bomb from a plane. This apparently will be accomplished in some other plan. Therefore, there will be no reserve created through this source for that vital aspect of our national security.

There are, however, many courses of a technical nature in all services that will be offered such as intricate equipment maintenance, utilities, photography, communications, radar and ordnance. The men selected for these courses will be assigned according to their aptitude and upon the completion of their training will be sent home. It is then that my problems and their problems really arise.

If there is no armory for all the services where they live, what becomes of that vital assumption upon which the commission rested its case?

If armories are to be built in nearly every community in the United States, what is to be the cost of construction of these buildings and for the tremendously expensive equipment on which they are to work, and what is to be the source and cost of instructors for such a program?

Even if armories, equipment and instructors are made available for the ensuing Reserve program, there is nothing to make an inidividual attend a single drill. These new reservists never asked to be associated with the service, as did the organized and volunteer men today. It is true that their names will remain on paper for 7½ years and be subject to active duty at any time. Is this the vigorous reserve program upon which the commission made its vital assumption? Are we going to risk the security of our country in a "paper" Reserve?

Is this the certainty to the youth of this country that we sought to correct, so that they could somewhat plan their lives? The commission's report on page 36 states "The maintenance of the present military force of 3,600,000 is requiring the extraction from the pool each year of more men than are entering it as they reach the age of 18½," and that "the prospect, then, is extended military service for all available young men." It is quite evident, therefore, that after the completion of their UMT training the inductees will be called for active duty and they know not when. The only certainty this bill gives to them is certain uncertainty.

This is no small program. It proposes to indoctrinate some 800,000 young men each year for a total obligation of 7½ years as Reserves, and, if the announced intent of the other Chamber is enacted, they can be called into active duty at any time that the President sees fit. If all the difficulties mentioned before were overcome, it would be possible to have over 6,000,000 men well trained and ready for action when the program is finally under way. Does this mean that this country will maintain on hand at all times sufficient modern equipment to equip these men immediately? If it does, is not the Congress entitled to know how it is to be done and what the costs will be? In the consideration of this matter we must not overlook the fact that the entire free world will look to America for its equipment, as was done during World War II and as is being done even today. If this equipment is not available, can we escape the conclusion of Winston Churchill, "In the first year of war production is nothing, in the second year a trickle, and in the third year a flood"? Men and equipment must be planned together. It is obvious why so many leaders in education, agriculture, production, labor, and church are opposed to enactment of this bill. They have never been really consulted. Everybody knows that a vigorous, efficient civilian economy is vital to success in any war. Regardless of how many lives a man's invention may save or how much needed technical equipment he can produce or the stomachs that his efforts must fill, the call is clear. Every man fights. The very thing that General Eisenhower said makes Russia hesitate to attack—our production—was never even considered. Is not this matter deserving of the scrutiny of the Congress before we adopt such a program?

Should we not also give some thought of how long it will take to transport these men overseas, since our real purpose is to save time? In the best year we could not transport much over 1,000,000 men, and in the first year it would be less. Should we not have some idea of this problem?

It would appear, then, that the training of these men in a 6 months' training camp is not the only issue that should be resolved before this bill should be enacted into law.

There have been times of emergency in the past when I have been prompted to vote hurriedly for legislation when all its factors were not completely understood, but I realized then the over-all need for its immediate adoption. Such is not the case today. Under the most favorable circumstances, the standing forces will not be reduced for 3 to 5 years.

My statement is not intended to approve or condemn UMT. Perhaps during this long period of stress, which may last 20 to 30 years, UMT may be the best solution—if somebody could only explain the plan or plans.

On page 7 of the Commission's report is a statement that should be understood by every Member before they vote on this bill, and I quote:

It—

The Commission—

does not pretend to have given complete consideration to all of the complex and difficult questions involved. A few of these require more thought than has been possible to give them in the relatively short period prescribed for completion of this first task.

Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with the Commission in this statement. The subject does require more thought, not only by the Commission but also by the Congress, and should be recommitted for further study of the important related subjects.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to have been qualified to serve my country in time of war as a member of the Armed Forces. I served in World War I and was commissioned first in the Reserve Corps on June 2, 1917, and then in the Regular Army on July 7, 1918, resigning as captain, Corps of Engineers, late in 1919. I am proud to be a member, and a long-time member, of the American Legion, just as I am proud to be a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and an honorary member of the Regular Veterans Association—so qualified because the membership of that association is composed exclusively of enlisted men. I am glad that I attended a military academy before going to college, and, in consequence thereof, I believe that some degree of advance military training hurts nobody but, in fact, does him a lot of good. I am in favor of a right program of military training for all youth qualified to serve in the Armed Forces in defense of their country in time of war. I have approved and support the type of universal military training that has long been advocated by the American Legion and other veterans organizations, and do today. I only wish that the pending measure, H. R. 5904, embodied that program, but it does not. It goes far and wide from it.

In the first place it has been stated by responsible members of the Armed Services Committee on the floor of this House during this debate that it is intended

that this measure and the Reserve forces supplied by it shall in the not distant future supplant the present selective-service system in respect to expansion of and procurement of replacements for the Armed Forces, and that hence it will do away with the present Selective Service System. In other words this UMT program involved in H. R. 5904 will obviate the need for the present Selective Service System by providing a Ready Reserve which, in effect, can graduate trainees from UMT directly into the Armed Forces. It is therefore not a peacetime universal military training bill as envisioned, I believe, by the American Legion but a substitute for the present Selective Service System. UMT, as envisioned by the veterans' organizations, and, as I have understood it, was for the purpose of providing some basic training to every qualified youth in the Nation in peacetime, in order to insure a condition of greater readiness in time of war or national emergency.

There is no provision contained in Public Law 51, of the Eighty-second Congress nor in this bill, H. R. 5904, which, in effect, separates UMT from selective service, but, in fact, the two are directly melded together in such a way that UMT can replace selective service by the gradual abandonment of it, and hence require the Congress to authorize calling into active duty members of the Ready Reserve who have graduated from UMT. Furthermore there are no provisions in H. R. 5904 or in Public Law 51 requiring that the deferment system set up under the Selective Service System shall be transferred to the Ready Reserve component and employed therein. Hence the great fear expressed by all of the technical and scientific manpower agencies in and out of the Government, except in the National Defense Establishment, that in a few years they will find a diminishing of available technical and scientific manpower to the point of extreme danger, not only to our Military Establishment directly but to the production agencies of the United States, both for defense and the civilian economy, and for the maintenance of essential civilian services, a condition which we have already suffered through lack of attention to the problem during World War II and a condition which, if not properly taken care of at this time and in the consideration of this measure and the Reserve Act, which now lies pending in the Senate, augurs evil for the future safety and welfare of our country.

Mr. Chairman, on Wednesday, February 27, I called attention to the fact that the pending bill referred to as the UMT bill, H. R. 5904, the Reserve Act, which passed the House on October 15, 1951, and now lies pending in the Senate, and several other acts, had not been properly considered as a unit although all of them should be integrated and considered as a whole in respect to the program for universal military training. Public Law 51 of the Eighty-second Congress, which was approved by the President on June 19, 1951, and is an amendment to the Selective Service Act, including among other things the authorization for the National Security Training Corps or UMT provides in its amendment to section 4 (d) in subparagraph (3):

> Each such person, on release from active training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps, shall, if physically and mentally qualified, be transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces, and shall serve therein for the remainder of the period which he is required to serve under this paragraph and shall be deemed to be a member of such component during such period.

And then says:

> Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent any person, while in a reserve component of the Armed Forces, from being ordered or called to active duty in such Armed Force.

It also provides in the amendment to section 5 (a) of the Selective Service Training Act, subparagraph (2):

> No local board shall order for induction for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States any person who has not attained the age of 19, if there is any person within the jurisdiction of such board who (i) is as much as 90 days older.

So it should be evident that while the UMT bill takes boys at 18 for 6 months of training, the Selective Service Act provides that selectees for the Armed Forces shall not be selected until they are 18½ and then not until all available persons 90 days older, or more, have been called into selective service.

Section 105 (b) of the UMT bill, H. R. 5904, provides:

> The Selective Service System shall administer the process of inductions into the corps in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

Here is a conflict because one can be inducted for what is called national security training, or UMT, at 18 but one cannot be ordered for induction for service in the Armed Forces until one is at least 18½ years old and perhaps older. I understand that thus far they have not gone below the 19-year-old group if they have gone that far. By simply inducting all 18-year-olds for UMT none will be left for selective service, and that system ends.

Then comes another serious peculiarity as between the two bills because no means for deferment, that is no regulations providing for deferment, have been set up for those who will take the UMT program at 18. I am speaking now of those who are not already in something, such as the regular Army, Navy, and so forth, and, of course, at the age of 18, there will be very few students enrolled in an officer procurement program at colleges where the curriculum has been approved by the Secretary of Defense, and so forth. I understand that under the UMT bill, the Selective Service System is to be set up for the induction of persons who are to receive the 6 months' training in the National Security Training Corps, but to the best of my knowledge and ability to find it in the RECORD or the hearings of the committee, no one knows what the regulations and rules may be for the induction of persons into the UMT program. Of course, everyone knows what the regulations are in respect to service in the Armed Forces. In consequence of this confusion, how is any young man to know whether or not he should at 18 volunteer directly for selection for service in the Armed Forces of the United States or volunteer for the 6 months' training program and thereafter go into the Reserves.

It is my understanding from the debate on the floor and particularly the remarks by the chairman of the committee [Mr. VINSON], that there are to be no deferments under the UMT program and particularly when it gets rolling and takes 800,000 young men a year. Now let us take a look at just what this may add up to in the long run for the young man. If he is inducted for UMT when he is 18 or thereabouts or for the reason that he wants to get his 6 months' training over with before he goes to college, he volunteers for UMT. Public Law 51, as I have quoted it above, transfers him after his 6 months' UMT into a Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and he shall serve therein for the remainder of the period of 7½ years which he is required to serve. That being the case, let us turn to the Reserve Act, which was passed in the House last October, and see what the provisions of that act may be as it passed the House. Turning to page 24 of H. R. 5426 Relating to the Reserve Components of the Armed Forces of the United States, we find chapter 3, section 234 (b), which reads as follows:

> In time of national emergency hereafter proclaimed by the President or when otherwise authorized by law, any unit and the members thereof, or any member not assigned to a unit organized for the purpose of serving as such, of the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component may, by competent authority, be ordered to and required to perform active duty involuntarily for a period not to exceed 24 consecutive months: *Provided*, That Congress shall determine the number of members of the Reserve components necessary for the national security to be ordered to active duty, pursuant to this subsection prior to the exercise of the authority contained in this subsection.

Note that Congress is to say only how many are to be called to active duty. No deferments are provided for.

Now that provides a real quandary for the youth. If he goes directly into the Armed Forces through the Selective Service and Training Act, he will serve only 2 years under section 4 (b), as amended by Public Law 51, but if he is inducted under UMT, he will have the 6 months' training followed by 2 full years or 24 consecutive months, a total of training and service of 2½ years under UMT provisions rather than the 2 years under the Selective Service and Training Act. It might be added that section 234 (a) just preceding the one I have quoted, provides that in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress—or when otherwise authorized by law—any unit and members thereof or any member not assigned to a unit may by competent authority be ordered to active duty involuntarily for the duration of the war or national emergency and for 6 months thereafter. But then turn back to section 208 (a) of the Reserve Act which says:

> A member of the Reserve components required to serve therein pursuant to subsec-

tion (d) of section 4 or other section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, or by any other provision of law, shall be placed in the Ready Reserve of his Armed Force without his consent for the remainder of his required term of service unless (1) he has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 4 years, or (2) he has served for not less than 12 months on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to section 21 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and, in addition thereto, has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 12 months between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive: *Provided*, That no person may be assigned or transferred to the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States unless he first enlists or is appointed, as the case may be, in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or District of Columbia. Except in time of war, or in time of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, any such member who has completed 36 months of satisfactory participation in an accredited training program in the Ready Reserve, as prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, shall upon his request be transferred to the Standby Reserve for the remainder of his required term of service.

Just figure that one out if you can.

It seems obvious to me that the boy who selects the UMT program at this time is most liable to be called to active duty immediately upon completing his UMT of 6 months and be required to serve for an additional 24 months in the Armed Forces. Of course I realize that an act of Congress must be passed to permit that, but on the other hand let us look at section 205 of the Reserve Act which I presume is somewhat in the nature of a definition but it also seems to be an authorization. It says:

The Ready Reserve consists of those units or members of the Reserve components, or both, available for prompt entry into the active military service of the United States in any expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States in time of war—

And that could very well mean that when we increase the Armed Forces from 3,600,000 to 3,700,000 for next year, the UMT graduates would thereupon be immediately available—

or in time of national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, or when otherwise authorized by law.

In other words Public Law 51, the currently considered UMT bill, and the Reserve Act which is still pending before the Senate, are terrifically confused and cause terrific confusion in the minds of anyone capable of reading the law who attempts to obtain the knowledge with which to advise young men. I can't see how it would be possible for the young man to himself understand what was to be expected of him.

But that is only a small part of the whole confusion.

Now let us consider for a moment what the effect is when a young man has completed his 6 months' UMT training at the age of 18½, let us say, and he is transferred to a Ready Reserve Component of the Armed Forces; and let us not forget that he is in the Ready Reserve. There is no provision whatever in the Reserve Act for deferment to finish college or to go on and take training to become a doctor, a dentist, a scientist, or a competent engineer, or any of those other vocations which require service beyond the normal 4-year college course. The young man is in the Ready Reserve at the age of, let us say 18½ or perhaps as late as 19 years. Let us not forget likewise that we are still in a state of national emergency and that the state of war between ourselves and certain other countries has not yet been proclaimed at an end, so we are still at war. There is no provision whatever that I can discover that will in any of the acts, in respect to those who stand in the Ready Reserve, permit their deferment to finish college or even to go on to finish the current year.

If the young man does not perchance get inducted under the UMT provision, he is of course exempt under the Selective Service System for active duty so long as he ably performs in his college course or is a member of the ROTC. So let us take a look at the ROTC. Everyone here knows, I trust, that no boy can qualify for ROTC unless he is physically perfect, in other words able to meet all of the physical standards required of cadets at West Point and midshipmen at Annapolis. Therefore the physically perfect who have not already been taken at 18 or 18½ under UMT may qualify for deferment under ROTC provisions; that is, if he does not get caught by UMT first, and, therefore, he will have a chance to become a Reserve officer. But what about the boy who is very smart but whose vision instead of being 20/20 is 19/20. He can pass the standards for UMT and can be drafted into the UMT even though he may be at the top of his class, and then immediately thereafter, of course, he is transferred to the Ready Reserve and can be called out for active duty in the Armed Forces almost without warning and at any time because, as I said before, no deferments are provided for those who stand in the Ready Reserve. If you do not believe it take a look at section 6 (a) as amended by Public Law 51. That is the exemption section. Those exempted from selective service include a long list of officers and members of the Regular Army, cadets, and students enrolled in ROTC programs, "and members of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces while on active duty." If I read that correctly, and I think I do, then after a person has completed his 6 months of UMT, is in the Ready Reserve, and has not been called to active duty, he is immediately available for selective service to be called in for another period of training and 2 years in the Armed Forces or a total of 2½ years of training and service.

Now for a moment, let us turn to a wholly different and quite peculiar subject. This is in connection with the ROTC program and comes under an amendment to section 6 (d) of the Selective Service Act contained in Public Law 51. That provides, in effect, that anyone who becomes a member of an ROTC unit and agrees in writing to accept a commission if tendered and serves not less than 2 years on active duty, on receipt of a commission, and agrees to remain a member of a Regular or Reserve component until the eighth anniversary of the receipt of his commission, is of course exempted from selective service and training so long as he remains in good standing. But under section 225 of the Reserve Act, which is still pending in the Senate, there appears on page 19 the following language:

After the effective date of this act, all appointments of Reserve officers shall be for an indefinite term.

And then it goes on to extend the term of every Reserve officer now holding such a commission to an indefinite term in the following language:

Each such officer shall hold his appointment for an indefinite term in lieu of the term of his current appointment unless he shall, within 6 months after written notification by competent authority which shall be given within 6 months from the effective date of this act, expressly decline to have his current appointment continued for an indefinite term, in which case the term of his current appointment shall not be affected by this section.

Now, of course, that is not going to affect the ROTC boys who are now juniors or below in college or who may join the ROTC later. They will have no opportunity to "expressly decline to have his current appointment continued," because the Reserve Act will then be in effect more than 6 months and his term shall then be for an indefinite term instead of the 8 years he bargained for.

I could go on at great length to point out the inconsistencies between the current UMT bill, Public Law 51, the Selective Service Act, and many other acts, to show that this legislation has not been adequately considered. The Reserve Act has passed the House; its consideration now lies exclusively in the United States Senate, and when the bill is ultimately returned to us, we will have an opportunity to vote up or down on a conference report and no amendments can be considered. As a Member of the Congress and representing a very large district in California, I assure you that if this UMT bill passes the House and the Reserve Act remains pending in the Senate and the ROTC Act is not amended and several other things are not changed, I could not competently advise any youth what course he should take. Thousands of boys, perhaps a small percentage of the total numbers now in college, are well qualified to go on and become professional men and scientists. Our Nation has a dire need for more professional men and young scientists. I can assure you that is the truth as that information comes to me as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Likewise it comes to me as a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and it comes to me from many other professional associations, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This is a scientific and technical age. If anyone can tell me how our Armed Forces of the future can hope to operate without competent technical and scientific personnel, both in and out of the Armed Forces, I would like to have him step

forth and speak. This is the atomic age, the age of guided missiles, the age of radar tracking guns, and all manner of equipment for the Armed Forces. We must have good soldiers, of course, along with truck drivers, tank drivers, and so forth, but without our technical and scientific personnel, I want to know where anyone in this hall expects our Armed Forces to be in the event of conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the confusion is not only in my mind; it is, in fact, confusion. As one of those who has done his utmost in the past to bring our National Defense Establishment to its topmost peak, and as one who is deeply interested in the proper protection of his country and its welfare, I am very anxious and earnest in my desire to have a proper system established for the defense of our country. I am perfectly agreeable that every young man in the United States receive at least basic training in some branch of the Armed Forces. That is along the line of the original American Legion program for universal military training. I believe that their original term of such training was 17 weeks, a term which could be completed in one summer. But there is complete confusion in this bill before us, when coupled with Public Law 51, and with the possibilities that may arise under the Reserve Act now pending in the Senate, coupled furthermore with the ROTC Act, and all of these other acts that affect our Armed Forces. While I recognize the serious difficulties encountered by our distinguished Committee on the Armed Services, I respectfully suggest that they take the bill back into their bosom, study it further in connection with all of these other things, and bring to us here a proper program which we can enact before the close of this Congress. I think it can be done. It should be done. But this measure now before us only confounds confusion further. I shall have to vote for its return to the committee in a vote for recommittal, unless, in the amendment period, it can be so amended as to bring some order out of the chaos which it now presents, I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the very difficult subject of universal military training is one of wide difference of opinion and a great deal of controversy. This is reflected not only in the divergence of views expressed here in this debate but also in the great volume of printed material and heavy mail. I think probably most Members will testify as I can, that this issue of universal military training has called forth a greater and perhaps a more vigorous public response than any other legislative subject in recent years.

I have deliberately waited until the closing hours of the debate to express myself. I have earnestly sought to consider all sides of the question and I have deliberately refrained from expressing or even adhering to a firm opinion. I believe such an attitude is the essence of representative government—to withhold judgment until the evidence and arguments have been heard. I have sought to follow this procedure.

Now, finally I have come to the conclusion that I must and will vote against the universal military training bill, H. R. 5904, now pending. My reasons are as follows:

In the first place, I dislike exceedingly the way this matter has been handled. Last year, despite the protest of a very substantial minority, the provisions for universal military training and the extension of the selective service were brought to the floor in one package. It seemed to a great many of the Members that this was an attempt to bludgeon the House into accepting the universal military training plan by connecting it with the necessity of extending the selective service. The reason for the extension of selective service was obvious, since otherwise we would afford no relief for the men fighting in Korea. But to attach the universal military training principle to that extension was an unfair use of the legislative process, in the opinion of many Members. It was deeply and sincerely resented.

This year, in following the report of the Commission set up by the last legislation, the committee held extensive hearings. As has already been pointed out in debate, it has been difficult if not impossible to follow the various bills which have been approved and then dumped into the discard by the majority of the Armed Services Committee. It was not until this legislation actually was reported that a Member of the House could know what was to be presented. Even yet, with the rumors flying around that severe and drastic amendments are to be offered and adopted, it is not at all sure what kind of legislation will finally eventuate from the Committee of the Whole. My complaint is, therefore, that I am highly critical of the manner in which this legislation has been handled, both this year and last.

My second reason for opposing this bill is that in my honest opinion it will destroy the Reserves and the National Guard. A fundamental concept in our law is that every able-bodied man is a member of the militia. It is embodied in the Constitution of the United States and also in the constitution of every state. However, the militia, until it is called into Federal service, is an arm of State government. That is the idea that is in the background of the National Guard and in my opinion should continue to be.

Universal military training as shown by the testimony of the Commanding Officer of the National Guard, General Walsh, would destroy that organization. Certainly it changes the fundamental and constitutional concept of the militia. It turns the National Guard into an arm of the Federal, rather than the State governments. It is claimed by the proponents of this legislation, that its enactment will strengthen the National Guard. I respectfully must differ with that opinion, since it is clear to me that under this universal military training bill, the National Guard will become an adjunct of the Federal military machine and will thus have its autonomy and State relationship completely destroyed.

It cannot be denied by any impartial observer that the National Guard has been one of the bulwarks of national defense in time of emergency. That has happened time and again. We in the State of Iowa are extremely proud of that organization in our State. I doubt that any thinking Iowan interested in national defense would wish the enactment of legislation which would destroy that powerful State institution.

Much the same observation can be applied to the Organized and Unorganized Reserves. This bill would channel every bit of American manpower into universal military training. The Reserve organization, despite recent legislation to strengthen it, would die. Like the National Guard, the Reserves have served capably, courageously and honorably in wars that the United States has engaged in. Certainly, it should not be destroyed.

I had hoped when this legislation came before the committee that consideration would be given to coordinating the program of universal military training with the Reserve Officers Training Corps and the National Guard. I introduced a bill to that end in the Congress. The Defense Department rendered an adverse report on it and so far as I know, the matter was not given serious consideration by the Committee on Armed Services.

In my judgment it would be a grave mistake to destroy the Reserves and the National Guard, which I am sure this bill will do.

My third question about this legislation is the basic concept of universal military training. Frankly, I believe that some discipline and training in the art of defense will do no harm to any boy. In fact, in the proper environment it could result in great benefit to many. This legislation, however, goes far beyond such a concept and shows a definite trend toward militarism in the United States of America. It does not end with training a young man to defend himself in a military organization, but goes far beyond that and would militarize our entire social order. It becomes the permanent policy of our country, for this bill has no termination date. With a war raging in Korea, and with selective service already providing all the manpower the Armed Forces can efficiently use, how can it be wise to superimpose universal military training at this time?

Having been active in the American Legion for many years, I have been extremely interested in its policy with respect to this bill. I am skeptical of the notion that this bill represents the true wish of the rank and file of the American Legion or any other service organization. This is not universal service. This is a compulsory militarization of the youth of America. There is a vast distinction between universal service and compulsory service.

Finally, my last reason for objecting to this legislation at this time is that I have no confidence in the effective ad-

ministration of such a law. Revelations of corruption and waste are rampant which extend through the civil and military organizations of the present executive department. The passage of this legislation would but open up new and more abundant opportunities for the continuation of such irregularities.

Without authority of Congress, the Executive has scattered American troops all over the world, Korea, Europe, Africa, and many other places of which we have no information. This apparently is a desperate final effort to shore up a bungling and incompetent and contradictory foreign policy. To now make possible such new and colossal power over the youth of America would be folly in the extreme. I shall vote against this legislation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, those with a lust for power know that there is no more potent instrument to gain dictatorial power than through compulsory military training.

As a part of my remarks, I am inserting an article, Universal Training: A Fraud, by Hoffman Nickerson, which appeared in the Freeman:

Compulsory universal military training without automatic liability for service is an absolute fraud. Universal military training and service are frauds as far as the present emergency is concerned because it is physically impossible to start such a system quickly. Universal liability for service and compulsory selective service are necessary evils in an emergency.

On the other hand, since compulsion is at best a necessary evil, and since one of the worst features of our time is the widespread enthusiasm for clubbing people into uniformity, lovers of liberty should do their level best to make certain that the present emergency shall not be used to put our country into a permanent strait-jacket. The iron logic of military necessity and military efficiency should be our sole guide, and the "mania for compulsion"—as a recent number of the Freeman aptly called it—should be shunned like the plague.

Of course, a minimum of compulsion is necessary in every organized society; there must be laws and policemen to enforce those laws. In war and in preparing for war this compulsion must take a harsh form; the members of the armed services must be protected against their natural weaknesses, such as dislike for hardships and fear of getting hurt, by knowing that they will be heavily punished in one way or another if they yield to those weaknesses. In other words, war is a communal thing, and the great wars of our time make huge doses of compulsion necessary. Thus, war has been the food on which the monstrous Leviathan states of today have grown so great. Historically, the longest single invasion of individual liberties was perpetrated when the Revolutionary French Republic proclaimed the levy in mass not merely for home defense but for general military service. Napoleon continued the system; after his fall Prussia added compulsory and universal peacetime training; and after 1870 all Europe more or less copied Prussia. Oddly enough, although sociologists are now as thick as flies in summertime, the relation between war and the social order has been little studied. If the statement that mass armies and great wars have been a chief factor in pushing Europe toward Marxism seems a little bold, at least they have not prevented most of Europe from going Marxist.

For years past an active propaganda has tried to blur the truth that compulsion is at best a necessary evil. The ink was hardly dry on the German and Japanese surrenders before the War Department began hollering for universal compulsion; not for any emergency then visible to the public or—apparently—to our leaders, but just for the hell of it. In the first place, a peacetime mass army is inappropriate to the geographical situation and therefore to the national strategy of the United States—a fundamental point to which we shall return later in this article. In the second place, the raising of a mass army would have flatly contradicted the wholesale demobilization of our Ground Forces then in progress, which demobilization was based upon the idea that the Soviets would honor their obligations. Nor is there the slightest reason to believe that the High Command of our Army was more foreseeing than our political leaders as to what the Soviets would actually do, for not one Army officer risked his career in order to protest publicly against the general demobilization of 1945, as various naval officers afterward protested against what now appears to have been a subsequent error in military policy, i. e., overemphasis upon that form of wholesale baby killing politely known as strategic bombing.

The high point of compulsion plus military inefficiency was reached in the 1947 Report of the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training. That military monstrosity would have forced all our young men into uniform for 6 months without adding a single recruit to any of the active services, and would have increased the civilian components only slowly and uncertainly by means of a complicated series of options, which in many cases could have been juggled around until the cows came home. This feat of now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't prestidigitation would have been accomplished by setting up an enormous training corps not under military law but only under a watered-down version thereof. The resulting need for a considerable army of instructors and caretakers from the Regular services would have seriously diminished the available striking power of those services. The scheme also sprouted a lush crop of political jokers, all calculated to increase centralized Federal power without even a pretense of genuine military advantage. Congress rightly refused to enact the absurd proposal, but its soul still goes marching on—or rather lurching on—as we shall see in a moment.

Instead, in 1948, Congress enacted a sensible selective service law under which the drafted men, after a necessary minimum of recruit training, go directly into organized, regular units where they can learn from their more experienced comrades as well as from their instructors. A notable merit of such a system is that it is flexible. Within wide limits it permits the speeding up or slowing down of recruitment according to the evident necessities of the near future.

So matters stood when our President took the doubtful step of scrapping the Defense Department War Plan which called for only the use of American Naval and Air Forces in case of an invasion of South Korea.

The hell which promptly broke loose after the landing of United States ground troops in Korea has at least had the melancholy merit of reminding us of realities.

Alas, our military age of innocence is not yet over. Only the other day Oscar Ewing proposed high school universal military training. That apostle of socialized medicine said that "if * * * necessary the high school period might be * * * 5 years instead of the present 4 in order to achieve the basic training goal," and that under his plan "the young would be kept out of Army camps almost until the time they were ready for field service." In other words, near-readiness for field service is to be developed on the athletic fields of high schools. Similarly, the senior high school students of a New York Times Youth Forum unanimously agreed that universal military training should be instituted now.

Disregarding these straws in the wind, a sinister symptom of the attempt rivet permanent compulsions under us under cover of the present emergency appears in the current circular of the Military Training Camps Association. That body is the successor of the so-called Plattsburg group which, in collaboration with the late Gen. Leonard Wood, did admirable work in training prospective officer candidates just before our entry into World War I. Today its letter paper is headed by the names of three civilian aides to the Secretary of the Army, and its executive committee includes a number of eminent and greatly respected men, most of them from the New York area and practically all of them of a conservative sort.

Unfortunately, however, they consider that permanent universal military training and service would strengthen our institutions and our social order, and seem blind to the social aspect of the matter as a step toward socialism by increasing the already excessive powers of our nominally Federal Government. Accordingly their circular recommends "a durable military manpower law suited as well for times of peace as for partial and for total mobilization." The first of their alternative proposals is "universal military training at 18 for 1 year with service only if called"; their second, "universal military service at 19 for 2 years," and only in third place do they speak of "selective service at ages 19 to 26 for 2 years."

Proposal No. 1 is unrealistic in itself and unrelated to the present emergency. As far as purely military policy is concerned, training without liability for service is only a complicated mumbo-jumbo which would produce a minimum of actual military results at a maximum cost in money and loss of manpower. No. 2, although not a sham like No. 1, is nevertheless unsatisfactory in point of age, and still more because it would be an inflexible, rigid method of raising a large army. The average company commander would much prefer to have a sprinkling of men in their early twenties and even in their late twenties as ballast for his 19-year-old recruits. The personnel section of any general staff would like to be able to regulate the flow of recruits according to the need for them instead of having to train an annual class of fixed numbers.

The same fault of rigidity characterizes the plan proposed by President Conant, of Harvard, who would like to see all valid young men drafted for 2 years or 27 months of military service at 18 or at the end of high school, whichever is later. He also suggests that those physically incapable of armed service should be drafted for such duties as they can perform. Those familiar with his political attitudes, his scandalous tolerance of fellow-traveling professors, his enthusiasm for raising the already confiscatory rates of the inheritance tax, his desire to put our universities under Federal control by grants of Federal tax monies, and his repetitions of the Communist slogan of a classless society, will not be astonished at his desire to regiment even those physically handicapped.

Fortunately the Conant plan has been promptly attacked by the executive committee of the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York, which committee has pointed out the educational and military unwisdom of calling up entire age groups at one time. General Hershey's Selective Service Scientific Advisory Service Committee has done even better. Under the leadership, so it is said, of President Charles

W. Cole, of Amherst, that body has opposed universal training altogether, and is advocating extended selective service instead.

When counsels are divided, it is wise to go back to first principles. First, where and for what purposes was universal training developed? Next, how does geography necessarily affect our national strategy? Finally, what is, so far, the nature of the present emergency?

Universal training originated in Europe among nations separated only by land frontiers across which men can walk, or by rivers across which bridges can be thrown. Under these conditions military efficiency meant the cheapest possible method of raising the largest possible trained army which could be hurled into action at the utmost possible speed. Before World War I every valid Frenchman was trained and kept with the colors for 3 years, while other countries followed the same pattern a little less strenuously. The essence of the system was the enormous mass of trained reserves, of which the younger classes in various countries were kept up to scratch by frequently recalling them for maneuvers. After about 20 years of universal training, a general mobilization would call up a tenth of the entire population, say roughly a fifth of all males. Every reservist knew the exact place at which he must report within a few hours, and at that place his entire equipment was waiting for him. Next to numbers, the prime necessity was speed. One day saved in mobilizing might well make all the difference between triumph and disaster. For instance, in 1914 it was the Germans' ability to use reserve divisions from the first days of mobilization which brought France to the ragged edge of immediate and total defeat. But note well that in order to get the full benefit from such a system you must have land frontiers, numbers rather than highly specialized equipment must be decisive, and the system must have been practiced continuously for the better part of a generation.

Now as far as all other great powers are concerned, the United States is strategically an island. Flying has indeed altered the applications of this truth, but the basic truth remains. If anyone thinks that airplanes have abolished the effect of distance and salt water upon strategy, he should get his head examined. In any great war we or our opponents must cross either vast oceans or almost uninhabitable Arctic wastes. Command of the sea, insofar as the sea and the air over it can be commanded, is vital.

Thus the bottleneck of military effort on either side cannot be merely the number of trained men available. It must be the fighting and carrying capacity of the available planes and ships. Since shipping and plane tonnage are the necessary foundation of all United States strategy, the ideal United States Army would be a sort of glorified Marine Corps, an elite body which strives for quality rather than quantity for the simple reason that one good shot makes at least as many hits on the enemy as two bad shots, and requires only half as much cargo-carrying tonnage to support him overseas. Of course there must also be a cadre of officers and noncoms to train replacements and reserves. But no United States mass army, even if complete to the last button, could ever be rushed into action like the continental European armed hordes. The reader may ponder the title of a book on the supply system for the Normandy campaign, Ten Million Tons to Eisenhower.

Finally, even the outlines of the present emergency are not clear. This is by no means a plea for sitting back and taking things easy—far from it. It is a mere statement of fact that our chief possible enemy, who is known to hold strong cards, has not yet fully shown his hand, and that there is grave doubt as to who would really be on our side in a showdown, and to what extent.

These uncertainties demand the utmost elasticity in our own military policy. In any case we must be strong at sea and in the air—the two are today inextricable. We must also be much stronger on the ground than we now are; the idea of getting a military decision by air alone against an enemy who holds a vast continental land mass is too doubtful to bother about. The real questions are: How much of our total resources should go into armed preparedness and how much into strengthening our own economy? Also, what proportion of our armed preparedness should go into a ground army?

The present emergency results from the clash between Communist expansion and Soviet imperialism on one side and the Truman doctrine of containing communism everywhere on the other side. Since the United States has only about 6 percent of the world's population, the Simon-pure Truman doctrine is bunk—if any sufficiently large local group of the remaining 94 percent choose or permit themselves to go Communist, we could not stop them with United States armed force alone. Even if we made ourselves a semi-Sovietized slave state, still our resources would be insufficient if we did not have strong non-American support.

If we do not limit our military commitments we should prepare our minds for a series of bigger and worse Koreas. In the Far East we have little choice except either to get off the Asiatic mainland or to use armies of Asiatics to do most of the fighting. In Europe General Eisenhower, as Hanson Baldwin truly says, commands only a "shadow force" of 19 western divisions, whereas the Soviets have 30 divisions in Eastern Germany, 60 in their European satellites and 145 in the U. S. S. R., a total of 235. Should the Red Army march we would be lucky if any European front forward of the Pyrenees could be held.

The proposition is up to the West Europeans. If they cannot begin promptly to do a great deal more for themselves than they have been doing, then our only logical moves will be: either back to Pan-Americanism or the holding of minimum footholds in the Old World, from which future offensives could be launched. For such strategies, sea and air power plus a moderate-sized army would suffice. The existing situation puts a premium on the flexibility which selective service can give, and universal service by classes cannot.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF].

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, many sound arguments have been advanced by sincere opponents of universal military training in urging us to vote against H. R. 5904. On the other hand, equally forceful arguments have been presented by the proponents of the measure. The persuasive arguments, both for and against universal military training, have many of this body in a dilemma. The distinguished chairman of the committee cites figures to prove that we can save $13,000,000,000 annually when the program is fully implemented. The opponents counter by saying that the program will mean added expense. Some argue that it is the only way we can build up a well-trained Reserve for any emergency; while others contend that these men would have to be retrained and that it has always been the shortage of weapons and not the shortage of trained manpower that has hindered our military build-up in the past. Eloquent speakers have argued that it is against American tradition, while others point out that universal military training was the original concept of preparedness in early America. Outstanding military leaders have voiced opinions both for and against such a program. The arguments then might well end in a virtual stalemate, were it not for one argument that, to me, is unanswerable. It is the argument that convinced me to vote for universal military training, not necessarily the plan proposed by the National Security Training Commission, because I have voiced objections to some features of that plan; but, ladies and gentlemen of the House, unless we take steps to initiate a program of basic military training in the immediate future, the bulk of our Reserve components will be made up almost entirely of the veterans of the Korean and present emergency. Without a program of universal military training, they will be the ones who will be called back to service in the event of future hostilities. It is a sad commentary upon our foresight to know that a system of universal military training placed in operation after World War II would have prevented our having had to call back to duty for the Korean war several hundred thousand reservists who were veterans of World War II.

I cannot, in good conscience, vote to recommit this measure, even though I hope it is amended in several respects, when I realize that, by so doing, I will have to look those veterans in the eye who fought through World War II and through Korea, and admit to them that, should another emergency arise, they will be the first to be called. It is therefore the duty of this Congress, in my opinion, to work out and adopt a sound program of universal military training; not merely to shirk the issue for political expediency by voting to recommit this measure.

During the course of the debate, I have heard many Members refer to the fact that the Armed Forces had scuttled the Reserve program for the purpose of forcing universal military training upon us. Having been a member of the Organized Reserve or of the National Guard for the past 18 years, I too can attest to the fact that the Reserve program has been neglected, abused and ignored by the armed services.

But that in itself has only been a part of the difficulty faced by the reserves. The weakness of any Reserve component program has always been the fact that basically trained men were not available for enlistment, plus the fact that the turn-over in enlisted personnel has been so great that it has been impossible to create truly effective units.

Testimony recently given to the House Armed Services Committee indicates that the turn-over in enlisted men in the National Guard runs as high as 30 percent per year. How can you expect to create an effective Reserve military organization with such a large yearly turn-over in personnel? As General Marshall said:

We started in June from a state of bankruptcy as to available trained reserves. Whatever Reserve organization we had were only 40 or 50 percent of strength and that

strength only partially trained. We had no resources, no established system for the creation of trained manpower.

Furthermore, the time spent in recruiting consumes a tremendously heavy portion of the time of the men and officers of any unit; and as a result, time that should be spent on the training of the unit as such is not available. It is only through some system of universal military training that we will ever have sufficient men in National Guard and Organized Reserve units to maintain an effective second line of defense. Therefore, if we refuse to adopt a sensible program of universal military training, we will not only be voting against the best interests of the World War II and the Korean veteran, but we will also be voting for the continuance of an inadequate, undermanned Reserve force not capable of immediate accomplishment of its assigned mission.

One of the defects that I believe exists in the legislation before us is the fact that, after a trainee completes his course of universal military training, he is then assigned to a theoretical paper Reserve, where he will stay for 7½ years unless he happens to be assigned to an active unit in the Reserve components whereby he can reduce his period of liability for service in the Ready Reserve to a period of 3 years. If the Armed Forces fail to create sufficient Reserve units, then most of these trainees will stay liable for service for 7½ years. But unless these trainees continue to keep pace with modern military developments and continue to receive military training of some type, the value of the training they receive under the universal military program will soon be of little significance.

Therefore, it seems imperative to me for us to insure that the maximum number of these trainees go into an organized unit in a Reserve component. Only in this manner, can maximum advantage be realized from the fact that they have received basic military training. Reserve units will be kept up to strength and trained as a unit. We can truly then have an effective, well-trained Reserve force.

In order to accomplish this, I will offer an amendment to the bill, amending section 105 (A) by providing that the number of persons inducted into the corps in any calendar year shall not exceed by more than 25 percent the number of spaces available in organized units of the reserve components for that calendar year. This will require the Armed Forces to either actively and energetically support a strong Reserve program, or else cut down on the number of men to be inducted into the corps each year.

It will also insure that the vast majority of the trainees are only liable for military service in the Ready Reserve for a period of 3 years, after which they will then revert to the Stand-by Reserve, as we provided in the Reserve legislation passed by the House last year.

If we adopt that concept which I believe is sound, it will mean that Reserve units will be organized to utilize to the maximum a trainee's skill, which he thereafter acquires through his vocation or the special knowledge which he acquires in pursuing an education.

There is another part of this program, which incidentally we approved last year, that we should most certainly amend. That is the provision that we wrote into Public Law 51 requiring these trainees to be inducted for a period of 6 months' training. If you will examine the training schedules which were presented to the Armed Services Committee by the three services, it can readily be seen that their concept of basic military training goes far beyond the scope that I think was authorized by Congress.

For example, the Army training cycle specifically sets forth that basic military training will be given in 15 weeks, whereas 8 weeks are to be used for technical training and the development of small battlefield teams. Time will be devoted, for example, to training signal-message clerks, telephone linemen, and radio-maintenance men.

The Marine program contemplates 14 weeks for recruit and advanced individual training, and then 8 weeks of specialist training.

The program proposed by the Navy includes 12 weeks for so-called basic training, followed by 9 weeks of specialized training in such highly technical fields as electronics.

The Air Force training cycle includes an 8-weeks' basic military training course, followed by technical training in such subjects as metal working, budgetary accounting and disbursing, fabric, leather, and rubber, statistical machine accounting, and the fundamentals of radar.

It will be noted that in each of the training programs submitted, basic military training is to be completed in from 8 to 15 weeks. The question then arises: Is this not what Congress had in mind, rather than to have the military attempt to train all types of specialists? Certainly this specialist training can best be acquired in private industry or in our colleges and universities.

Never before, at least since I have been connected with the armed services, has basic military training ever extended for such a period. During the last war, we gave basic military training in 13 weeks. As I recall it, when that war terminated we stepped the program up to 17 weeks. When Korea came along, the armed services went back to a basic military training program of 14 weeks; and then, under congressional pressure, again increased the amount of time devoted to basic military training to 16 weeks.

To determine whether or not that was not sufficient time, I secured a copy of some of the basic individual training programs of the Army. I have here before me the basic training program adopted by the Chief of the Army Field Forces for the Artillery. It is an exhaustive program of 16 weeks' duration and the training objective as set forth in that program cites that it is used (a): to train the enlisted men entering the Army without prior service in basic military subjects and fundamentals of basic infantry combat which will insure that he—

First. Adjusts himself to Army life, and learns to live, work with, and understand his fellow man.

Second. Develops pride in the Army, and in his arm, and desires to carry on its traditions.

Third. Understand why he is to fight.

Fourth. Develops a sense of individual responsibility and understands the fundamental moral principles and basic obligations of the soldier.

Fifth. Respond in a positive manner to Army discipline and observes the rules of military courtesy and customs.

Sixth. Realizes the value of and is able to care for his person, and is able to administer first aid to himself and to others.

Seventh. Understands supply economy and maintains his clothing and equipment in garrison and in the field.

Eighth. Is able to take individual precautions against biological, radiological, and chemical attack.

Ninth. Is able to perform duty as member of a guard or a combat security group.

Tenth. Is able to march varying distances—including cross-country marching; move in the field using only the compass to maintain direction; locate himself and common objects on a map.

Eleventh. Understands the meaning of and need for basic intelligence; detects and properly reports simple military information; recognizes classified material and properly safeguards it; develops a security consciousness that will assure detection and action against subversive activities; defense against infiltration, guerrilla warfare, and enemy partisan activities.

Twelfth. Attains and maintains a state of physical condition commensurate with requirements for dismounted ground combat and consistent with the maximum capabilities of the individual in each case.

Thirteenth. Understands and is able to apply, under simulated or actual combat conditions, the principles of concealment and camouflage, cover, and movement, and is able to take individual protective action against aircraft, armor, and dismounted ground attacks.

Fourteenth. Is able to participate as a member of a patrol or act as an individual scout or observer.

Fifteenth. Qualifies in firing the individual weapon with which he is armed in field and combat firing. Fires either the rifle or carbine for familiarization and other weapons to include grenades, light machine gun, and rocket launchers with an acceptable degree of accuracy.

Sixteenth. Recognizes the superiority of American infantry weapons over those of his enemy.

Seventeenth. Is proficient in the use of the bayonet or bayonet knife and in unarmed defense.

Eighteenth. Understands and practices organization and teamwork in combat to include squad tactics of the infantry rifle squad.

(b) Concurrently with the attainment of the foregoing objectives, to complete

the minimum of branch material instruction which will qualify the enlisted man as a loss replacement fire direction specialist specifically, and to enable him to—

First. Perform duties incident to preparation of artillery firing data or serve as an enlisted specialist in a field artillery fire direction center.

Second. Serve as horizontal and vertical control operator. Prepare a firing chart by plotting location of base points, battery positions, check points, and targets on a grid sheet, map, or photomap. Plot the location of supported units and no-fire lines. Determine and record altitudes of targets for plotting on firing chart. Interpolate ranges and elevations. Compute and announce range, deflection, and site.

Third. Serve as a computer in a field artillery fire-direction center. Convert measured and computed data to fire commands, apply corrections, and announce fire commands to firing battery. Compute meteorological and velocity error corrections; compute time and range corrections from registration and apply to graphical firing table. Compute and announce data for replot of observed fire targets. Prepare battery data sheets for prearranged fire missions.

Fourth. Serve as artillery recorder. Record firing battery data such as minimum elevation, safety limits, and deflection. Record fire commands, reports, messages, elevation, deflections, and ammunition receipts and expenditures. Keep record of prearranged fire missions. Act as a member of battery fire-direction center when battery is not under battalion control. Operate aiming circle to assist battery executive.

Fifth. Assist field artillery operations sergeant in the establishment and posting of an operations map; and in preparation of graphic sections of training and tactical plans. Issue maps to fire-direction personnel.

Sixth. Assist in the operation of fire-direction center. Coordinate with communications personnel in the installation of wire and radio communications. Assist in preparation of operational charts and data. Verify accuracy of all fire-direction computations and operations. Prepare and keep current ammunition records and reports. Maintenance of fire-direction equipment for condition and serviceability.

Seventh. To be fully acquainted with and be able to perform duties of fire-direction and liaison operator, MOS 5704.

Eighth. Be able to use and apply the mil relation formula. Be able to solve simple algebraic formulas with speed and accuracy. Be able to use all fire-direction equipment. Have elementary knowledge of tactics and technique of employing field artillery. Be familiar with the organization and employment of artillery and armor.

Now, if 16 weeks is sufficient time to train a raw recruit without any prior training in that manner, certainly we do not have to consume 6 months of a boy's life to give him basic military training for the Reserves.

Of interest in this connection is the testimony of Gen. James G. Christiansen, of the Office of the Chief of Engineers, before the House Appropriations Committee. It reads as follows:

Representative ENGEL. Now, how long does it take to train an infantry soldier, * * * a boy right off the farm or out of the gas station * * *?

General CHRISTIANSEN. We found 17 weeks * * * developed the man so that as an individual he could go into a combat organization and fight as a part of that combat organization effectively.

Representative ENGEL. What chance has that boy with an experienced man in the enemy forces in hand-to-hand combat with bayonets, rifle butts, and so forth?

General CHRISTIANSEN. He probably would have just as much chance as the other man, and possibly a little bit more, because he has not been tired out.

Representative ENGEL. Do you mean to tell me that a boy who has had only 17 weeks' training can learn how to fight with the bayonet in hand-to-hand combat and know all the tricks to go with it as well as an enemy who has been at it for a couple of years?

General CHRISTIANSEN. Yes; I think he can.

For these reasons I therefore hope to amend H. R. 5904 to provide that trainees will be inducted for a maximum period of 4 months rather than 6 months. Not only will we be able to give these trainees basic military training in that period, as we are now doing and as we have always done to train men as combat replacements, but we will enable the boy who gets out of high school to take his basic military training during that summer so that he can go on to college in the fall.

This will meet one of the most violent objections to the program presented to us for consideration. This is the program originally advocated by the American Legion. It carried the endorsement of the Reserve Officers' Association, and I am advised that such an amendment would meet with the full approval of the American Association of Colleges and Universities.

In closing let me urge you again to strive diligently to perfect a program of basic military training that will prevent the inequities of double service by some and no service by others, such as we have followed in the past. Let us not shirk our duties by recommitting this issue. If you are against the principle of UMT, then vote against this or any other similar measure. If you favor UMT but do not like some provisions of this plan, then let us obtain the best possible measure here on the floor. We owe our Korean veterans much more than political double talk that we favored UMT, but did not like this particular proposal.

In voting on this issue keep in mind that the boy fighting today in the frozen terrain of Korea, too busy to write you, perhaps, is the soldier you will again call away from his home, his job, and his family unless this Congress provides now a system of universal military training.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, the universal military training bill which has been under discussion in the House for the past week, I believe has attracted the membership to the floor in greater numbers than any bill which has come before the Congress during my tenure of office. The great concern among the Members develops from their keen sense of responsibility that we are here called to embark on a new and untried field as far as the United States of America is concerned. The step-by-step action taken regarding this legislation, has raised doubt in the minds of many as to whether or not this is a proper legislative process.

Last year, when it was necessary to extend the draft law, the authorization for a Commission to study universal military training and make a report to the Congress, was embodied in that legislation. This year we are called upon to put into effect a law establishing universal military training. The Commission, in its report to the Armed Services Committee, among other uncertain statements had this to say on page 7 of their October 1951 report, and I quote:

While the Commission believes it has developed the broad outline of a sound and workable program which should be adopted by the Congress, it does not pretend to have given complete consideration to all of the complex and difficult questions involved. A few of these require more thought than has been possible to give them in the relatively short period prescribed for completion of this first task.

The Armed Services Committee met for many weeks in an effort to develop a bill. Four committee prints of a proposed bill were issued before the final draft, which we are now considering, was brought to the floor of the House. Members of the committee, who were extremely friendly and espoused universal military training, have been diligent in their attendance at committee meetings and have felt that the bill now pending before us will not serve the purpose of establishing a proper reserve in compliance with our American ideals, and that the cost would be beyond our ability to pay and still retain our American way of life.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman WILLIAM BATES, a member of the committee and a World War II veteran with 9 years' service as a Regular Navy commander, made this very pertinent observation in his speech today which I believe is worthy of emphasizing, and I quote:

During the past 2 months, I have been constantly occupied with this problem, and day after day have listened to testimony to it. * * * To date no plan has been offered to the committee, or to the Congress, that has considered more than mere segments of this issue.

Many outstanding speeches have been made in favor of and in opposition to the present legislation. It is generally rumored that the proponents of the measure are willing to accept most any type of an amendment in order to secure passage of the bill.

I had hoped that the committee would come in with a bill which could be acceptable. However, there is a strong feeling among many of us that, once the bill has passed the House, a conference committee of the two Houses will rewrite the bill in accordance with the dictates of the administration and the Pentagon.

It is my firm belief that we should have a complete, well-thought-out proposal on which to vote. I believe there is a common meeting ground where there can be developed reasonable and proper legislation. I feel that there should be strong civilian influence in any permanent military program. I do not desire to see complete militarization. I believe that a law should be established whereby a young man, submitting himself to the service of his country, should be given some choice.

Congressman CHARLES P. NELSON, of Maine, a member of the Armed Services Committee and a reserve officer in our Army, made a significant statement in his speech yesterday, and I quote:

> If we pass this legislation, we create a privileged draft-exempt class of 60,000 out of 800,000 boys who train for 6 months and then go into the Ready Reserve to be called for periods in excess of 30 days only in such number and manner as Congress may indicate. The other 740,000 remain subject to draft and to 2 years of active duty. One inequity does not cure another.

An effective ROTC training program is operating successfully in numerous colleges throughout our country. If the ROTC has been adequate to train officers for our Army, it surely can train a buck private. Through this type of training, the young men would be permitted to continue their college education.

Others might desire to join the National Guard which no one can claim is not equal, or superior, to the present plan as far as training our young men.

Even those who might have religious scruples and are entirely pacifist could not complain if they were taught civilian defense, nursing, and the other requirements which would be necessary to have in case of atomic war and an invasion of our country.

These are some of the thoughts that many of us hold should be considered in a bill of this type. Furthermore, my very strong feeling is that the young men inducted under such a program should be kept as near home as possible. I believe that the Reserve officers and the reservists in our country could be available for teaching our young men the rudiments of war under better conditions, and more economically, than shipping the young men from one end of our country to the other.

During the coming week, we will be confronted with the political strategy of the proponents to water the bill down, in order to secure its passage. The question arises, Are we conscientiously able to enact just any bill, so long as it provides UMT in some form, or are we to insist upon a bill being drafted which is feasible, equitable, and as nonconflicting as possible with our American principles of individual freedom?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, as one whose forebears who sought the shore of America to avoid the very thing we are asked to support today, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD. I am against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMPULSORY MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 5904, now before the House for consideration, commonly called the UMT bill, proposes to establish in the United States, for the first time in our history, compulsory military training.

We are importing this idea from Europe. It kept that continent in turmoil and war for a thousand years. It never prevented a war nor saved a nation from the ravages of war. It is repugnant to every principle of freedom upon which our country was founded.

Must we surrender liberty by adopting compulsory military training? This bill proposes just that. I am opposed to the principle involved.

My own father was sent to America at the age of 15, and one of the reasons was to avoid 7 years of peacetime conscription in the Italian Army.

Hitler adopted it. It destroyed him. Oddly and ironically enough, the powers that destroyed him and his compulsory military training machine were mainly nations which never adopted that principle—England and our own country, in particular.

We are told that compulsory training over a period of 6 months, and liability to military service for a period of 7½ years thereafter, for every American boy of 18 years who is in reasonably good physical condition, is just because all are treated alike.

We are told that this bill will solve our military manpower problem once and for all.

We are told that such a tremendous reservoir of trained men would be created that all other nations in the world, including our present enemy, would not dare start a war of any kind; much less attack the United States.

This compulsory military training is presented in the guise of a guaranty of world peace now and forever.

We are told that the existence of a huge trained military reserve would enable this country to avoid the necessity of keeping up a large standing Army.

It is proposed that for every three men receiving military training and entering the Reserve, one man should be dropped from the ranks of the standing Army.

Thus they would have us believe that this program in the end would cost American taxpayers far less than maintenance of an adequate standing Army.

We are told also that such a program would almost at once eliminate the necessity of recalling into service veterans who presumably have done their share of fighting.

After telling us all these things, the supporters of universal military training tell us that compulsory service for every physically capable boy of 18 years would improve the health and morals of all our young people.

They enlarge upon the benefits accruing to every young man from a period under military discipline.

Taken altogether, it is a pretty convincing argument, on the surface at least. The only trouble with it is that the entire argument is based upon false assumptions.

Somewhere it has been said that an expert is one who avoids minor mistakes while sweeping on to the major fallacy.

This is exactly the case with respect to the argument for this peacetime conscription presented by experts in the Pentagon.

Its supporters assume that forcing a young man to do something against his will somehow becomes just, if all young men are forced to do the same thing.

Is slavery right, if a whole nation is enslaved? Are the conscripted legions of Russia proof that Russia is a republic?

It seems to me that our American form of government is built around the idea of voluntary participation. If a truly free nation finds itself compelled to demand military service of its young men, that nation does so unwillingly.

Suspension of civilian processes for those who serve, in order to make way for the complete regimentation and the ironclad caste system of the military, is limited strictly to the duration of the emergency.

The truth of this is totally unrelated to the fact that after both world wars the Federal administrations in power underestimated the extent of the emergency and demobilized too soon.

But those who support this measure would subject all our 18-year-old boys to this regimentation in times of peace as well as in times of emergency.

Not only would they subject every able-bodied boy to military discipline for 6 months, but they would render him liable momentarily for 7½ years to suspension of his civil rights.

The years, let me say, when a boy normally learns his trade or profession, and establishes a home.

I wish somebody would tell me where democracy lies in all this. Military training and liability to military service at the whim of some ambitious officeholder, or even of a professional military group, is an evil to be avoided.

It is an evil to be tolerated and endured in times of great emergency, but never to be embraced in times of peace.

Quite as fallacious as any other part of the argument for universal military training is the assertion that it would create a vast reservoir of trained military manpower.

Experience has shown that 6 months of military training is more than enough to make a good soldier, capable of fighting at top efficiency and of taking care of himself in the field.

But experience has shown, too, that weapons and equipment, and even military techniques, change so fast nowadays that only a few months after discharge a soldier's knowledge and skills become largely obsolete.

Not entirely obsolescent, perhaps, but enough so that after a short time in civilian life the individual has to be trained all over again.

Then what becomes of the vast reservoir of trained military manpower? How would compulsory military training

solve our military manpower problem once and for all?

The answer to this question of military manpower consists, I believe, of a comparatively small and highly trained standing army, a strong navy, and an even stronger air force.

On this basis, army, navy, and air force personnel could and should comprise largely volunteers, supplemented only as required by the draft.

Such striking forces, highly trained and well paid, would be the best guaranty of our national safety. And why is this so?

The art and science of warfare has changed, even since World War II. The terrific losses among massed Chinese Communist troops, in combat with a comparatively few Americans in Korea, has demonstrated that fire power is vastly more important than numbers.

Some military experts now are convinced that in future land warfare will consist almost entirely of so-called guerrilla-type operations, with small groups of men engaged.

The tendency toward this kind of mobile warfare became obvious early in World War II, and even before that in the Chino-Japanese war, and the civil war between Chinese Nationalists and Communists.

How was it, I may ask, that thin lines of American troops were able to take the heavily fortified islands of the Pacific? Was it not because of their tremendous fire power, as compared with the fire power of the Japanese defenders? That, and the heroism of American boys?

The notion that a huge armed force reserve would act as an effective deterrent of war is just as false as any of the other assumptions on which the case for universal military training is built.

The principle in this bill never prevented war among the majority of European nations which used this method of building up military reserves over many generations.

Instead, it is true that compulsory military training served only to build up tensions, and encourage armament races, which have kept Europe at war much of the time during the past centuries. Twice in a single generation the United States has been dragged into these general wars.

In this connection, it should be said that one of the first things done by Emperor Hirohito, when the Japanese Government was reconstructed, under the guidance of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, was to do away with compulsory military training.

The Japanese learned the hard way that such training merely strengthens a military caste, to the point finally when the military is strong enough to force the nation into aggressive adventures abroad.

Compulsory military training never has guaranteed victory for any nation in recent historical times. Germany suffered defeat in two world wars; Japan in one. Italy suffered disgraceful defeats in Ethiopia and Greece, as well as in World War II.

The nations which won, if any can be said to have won, in both World War I and World War II, were Great Britain and the United States. Neither has ever resorted to that type of military training.

Arguments that it would eliminate the necessity of keeping up a large standing army merely beg the question. We neither want nor need a large standing army.

The creation of a vast Reserve, which would have to be retrained periodically in any event, would not remove the necessity for that comparatively small and highly trained army of which I spoke; and, in fact, might easily prevent the maintenance of that small and efficient army.

This measure, now before the House, would make it impossible to draft boys taken for training.

Those who might otherwise have volunteered for the Army, Navy, and Air Force would be in universal military training camps. They would be ineligible for the draft. It is easy to imagine how many, who would avoid military service altogether, or would delay it as long as possible, would find a haven of refuge.

It has been stated in this debate that forced military training would save American taxpayers at least $13,000,000,000. I fear this is but a hope.

Pentagon estimates put the first year's cost at $4,187,983,600 for training an average class of 800,000 boys of 18 years, and the recurring annual cost at $2,158,746,200.

Possibly the $13,000,000,000 mentioned would be the cost of drafting and training a huge army on the eve of an emergency. I do not concede that such an army ever again will be necessary.

But if such an emergency should arise, and the need for a great army of foot soldiers should arise with it, would it not be better to spend the $13,000,000,000 than to spend $100,000,000,000 over the next 50 years for a largely useless armed reserve?

I say this because it has been the experience everywhere that, once established, compulsory military training becomes permanent, at least until it is destroyed through utter military defeat, as in the instance of Japan and Germany.

In conclusion, I am perfectly willing to agree that military training of any kind worthy of the name may harden and toughen a boy's physique. I doubt if it improves the general level of his health.

I am completely unwilling, however, to go along with those who say that military training improves the moral status of anyone at all. In spite of the utmost care by military authorities, the moral atmosphere of an Army camp never can compare with that of the average American home.

Anyone that ever has lived in or near an Army camp of any kind knows the truth about this. Let us defeat this bill and keep this European idea away from the shores of America.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, for many years I have been actively connected with the National Guard of the United States. I was a part of the guard back in the days when it was in every phase a State guard and later when it became a federalized guard. I have served as an enlisted man and as a commissioned officer. I have served actively in one campaign and in one war, being discharged during the Army maneuvers of 1940 for a physical disability, while commanding an infantry brigade. For many years I have lived, believed in, talked, and thought as a citizen soldier. I have seen them all, some well trained, some fairly trained, others whose state of training needs no mention here.

From the days of World War I, I have become convinced that some form of universal military training would, in a great measure, assist in an adequate military preparedness. I envisioned the time when, in addition to the forces of the Regular Establishment, we would have a strong reserve of citizen soldiers, consisting of the National Guard of the several States and the organized reserves. We hoped that the time would come when a system of training would be adopted which would channel into the guard and the Reserves sufficient numbers of men, by compulsory measures, to give to our defense an efficient, well-trained, and operating reserve; a guard and a Reserve in actuality and not a paper one. On this subject, from the end of World War I, I have spoken in favor all over our country.

For a whole week, many Members of the House have spoken on H. R. 5904, a bill to provide for the adminstration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps and for other purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to my colleagues, who have spoken either in favor of or against the bill now under consideration. I admire and respect each and every one of them for their views and opinions, whether they agree with mine or not. I hope that my colleagues in return, will give me the same consideration in my thoughts and I know they will.

I have talked with many Members of the House since the debate started and I find, as is usual, a great variety of answers. I am frank in saying not once have I talked with any Member who looked upon this bill and the debate, which naturally followed, as a political question. While I am on this subject, let me state here and now that I am not interested in the views of any group commonly known as a pressure group, which organize from time to time simply to be for or against certain legislation suiting their own selfish views. Neither am I interested in that organization or organizations which uses a club over a Member's head to be for or against this bill or the Member's political future will be at stake.

No, Mr. Chairman, this question is too all-enhancing and too important to heed the voices of those who, while urging either passage or defeat of the measure, know very little of the bill itself—outside of the title.

Personally, I have many objections to the bill in its present form. I have searched for the answers, but regardless of the assurances of some of my col-

leagues, I am not convinced that all is well.

Mr. Chairman, as I have already stated, in my opinion, the theory of universal military training is to provide the country with a well-trained reservoir of manpower ready at notice to take their places in the Armed Forces in the defense of our country.

In my humble opinion, the bill under consideration, will not do those things necessary for the establishment of a trained, efficient, and disciplined reserve, unless it be materially amended.

I am terribly concerned over the future of the National Guard under the terms of this bill, and, while I have been assured by some of my colleagues, that the enactment of this legislation will benefit the Guard as a whole, I bring to your attention the testimony of Maj. Gen. Ellard A. Walsh, president of the National Guard of the United States before the Armed Services Committee in the hearings on pages 2852 and 2853, and I quote the questions asked by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and the general's answers:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. General Walsh, as I understood the testimony, you believe that if the bill is passed that is now before us, without amendment, it would ultimately mean the end of the National Guard?

General WALSH. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Why?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would mean the end of the National Guard ultimately.

General WALSH. Exactly. If all the other reserve groups, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, are going to have this product channeled into those calls, and we are to get none, then it is the end.

Mr. Chairman, what the General meant, as I understand his testimony would mean the end of the National Guard. In passing, let me say to you, that I know of no citizen-soldier who has a more distinguished record or one who knows the subject of national defense as well as General Walsh, for years president of the National Guard Association of the United States and adjutant general of the State of Minnesota. I am proud to call him friend and to have served in the National Guard with him.

Following the above the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, asked General Walsh the following questions and again I quote:

The CHAIRMAN. Let me clear up one question that the General answered to Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. CUNNINGHAM said if this bill passes like it is, what effect it has on the National Guard, and the General answered that is the end of the National Guard.

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. What?

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. In what?

General WALSH. In due course.

The CHAIRMAN. In due course. Well, I would like to know—you have been getting along pretty well for the last 20 years when we didn't have any law like this on the statute books.

General WALSH. We didn't have any UMT during the past 20 years, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I believe after the colloquy between the Chairman and General Walsh, there should be no doubt in the minds of any Member as to what will happen to the National Guard. For your further information, let me say that the guard has been kept alive solely through the efforts of patriotic citizens all over our country who have sacrificed much in time and financial return to do their bit in the interests of national defense. The guard has been belittled by some professional soldiers and many have looked down their noses at it, but I do not know what might have happened in both World War I and World War II if it had not been for certain National Guard divisions, incompletely trained as they were. All one has to do to find the answer—is to consult the record.

Mr. Chairman, under the sections of the bill we are discussing, there is no compulsion to channel men into the guard of the several States. I have been advised by some Members that under the Constitution it could not be done, due to the fact that the guard is under control of the several States. Nonsense. From many lawyers well versed in constitutional law, I have been advised that it could be done. Perhaps some in the Military Establishment do not care to do so. Some would rather see the guard go out of existence. The answer to that thought is obvious. On this I would like to quote the questions and answers occurring on page 2854 and page 2855 of the hearings, which follow:

The CHAIRMAN. Then put it this way: You are advocating that to keep the National Guard up to the 399,500 that we write into this bill that a trainee can be ordered by the Department into the National Guard or any other unit?

General WALSH. If the Congress gives them the authority.

The CHAIRMAN. If Congress gives them the authority to order them in there.

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Notwithstanding the fact that it is a State organization.

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And the State controls it and it is under strict State control.

Mr. BLANDFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question there? General, isn't that implying, therefore, that a man who is inducted into the Armed Forces or into the National Security Training Corps can constitutionally be required to assume a dual status?

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANDFORD. In other words, you assume that the Constitution permits a man to be inducted into a State National Guard?

Colonel STEVENSON. Absolutely.

Mr. BLANDFORD. And to answer a State call for any service required of him by the Governor?

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes.

Mr. BLANDFORD. And at the same time the other man who goes into an Organized Reserve unit is only subject to serve the Federal Government. So the man who goes into the National Guard under your proposition is subject to two calls?

Colonel STEVENSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANDFORD. He can be called even in the event there is no emergency by the Governor of the State for as long a period as the Governor wants to call him. The man who goes into the Reserve unit can only be called in such numbers as the Congress may hereafter determine.

General WALSH. Absolutely right, Mr. Blandford.

Mr. BLANDFORD. Isn't that giving the man who goes into the National Guard a tremendous responsibility as compared with the man that goes in the Organized Reserve?

Mr. BROOKS. Gentlemen, that has always been the case with the National Guard under the volunteer system.

General WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROOKS. You always had that dual responsibility.

Mr. BLANDFORD. On a voluntary basis.

Mr. BROOKS. If you still give him the right to elect to go in the guard and you count that service, knowing their pride in Louisiana——

General WALSH. We are only talking about UMT. We are not talking about any other law.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

General WALSH. And our only concern is with the product of UMT.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. Let's follow that: With the product of the UMT. The trainee after he has had 6 months' training, then he goes into some Reserve organization. You want it written into the bill that the Department of Defense can order him into the National Guard if it so sees fit to?

Mr. JOHNSON. If the State agrees to it.

The CHAIRMAN. Wait. Is that correct?

General WALSH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Then do you want to put in there provided it is agreeable to the State?

General WALSH. With the consent of the governor, as you specified in the National Defense Act.

The CHAIRMAN. If you put that in there, then it is all right. We will take a recess——

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Just a moment, Mr. Chairman. General Walsh, shouldn't there be a definite percentage, however, so you will be sure you have your strength in the National Guard.

Mr. JOHNSON. Isn't that what it amounts to? They delegate him to serve the Reserve service in the National Guard.

General WALSH. And give him some incentive for accepting that dual obligation.

Mr. Chairman, I know the trials and tribulations of a company, regimental, and brigade commander of a National Guard division. I know how hard it is to get recruits and I know of the many hours, days, weeks, and months, year in and year out, spent in trying to keep an outfit up to authorized strength. It is hard enough to do the job when all work as a team and pulling for the same goal, but it is tough and heartbreaking when forces are at work to strangle one part of your Reserve components. If you intend to have an efficient, well-trained, up-to-strength National Guard, you must do this by compulsion, not volunteer methods. You cannot keep the guard or the Reserves up to strength after the completion of an individual's 6 months' training unless he is compelled to actually serve some portion of his reserve time. If you do not and the individual completes his 6 months' training and then returns to his home, simply waiting out his Reserve period, passage of this bill will be more than useless. It will be a fraud upon the boys who have served their 6 months and it certainly will be a fraud upon the taxpayers of our country.

It has been said on the floor of this House that amendments will be offered to take care of these omissions or deficiencies in the bill. May I respectfully ask why they were not put in this bill originally? Why was not a bill written which would remove the doubts many of us have. Why was this bill left for amendments to be added under the 5-minute rule? Was it to sweeten up the measure as reported from the committee? For me these things I have spoken

of must be in the bill. I will not leave anything to chance. Only a few days back, in answer to some of my questions, I was assured that these matters concerning the Reserves were all taken care of in a bill which passed the House, I believe, October 1951. In this connection may I call the attention of the membership to the fact that the other body up to the present moment has not as yet taken up this bill.

No, Mr. Chairman; there is much to be desired in this bill and its timing. Do not believe for 1 minute that all the commissioned personnel of the Armed Forces are for it at the present time. They are not. Do not believe for a minute that all veterans are for the bill. They are not. I know. I have talked with many in and out of the services. Many noted military experts also add their disapproval. One in particular, Hanson Baldwin, believes that UMT would be a definite handicap to the national defense. That is the view held by many high-ranking officers of the Army and Navy. Regardless of what people may say or think, regardless of what they say of our action in Korea, we are at war and make no mistake about it. That being so, we are going to have the continuation of the draft with us for some time to come. Today it is not so much the training of large masses of military manpower, but the immediate production of planes, tanks, guns, and the training of specialists.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take up the time of the committee in going over many of the same arguments used on preceding days. That has been well taken care of by others of my colleagues.

Suffice for me to say that I shall have to vote for recommittal and bring back a bill that many of us who want to can vote for.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], a member of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to a universal military training program in peacetime, provided its application is universal. The plan outlined in the bill now before us, however, is not to be deferred until we are at peace; neither is it universal. There was nothing in the bill passed last year that could possibly be construed as requiring the institution of a UMT program at this time.

If my recollection serves me correctly, the legislation we passed last year was adopted on the representation that it merely authorized the submission of a plan which should become effective when we were no longer at war. Universal military training is inherently a peacetime precaution. Until recently I cannot remember that anyone urged that it be put into operation during wartime or during the time when we are required to raise any part of our Armed Forces through selective service.

I submit that selective service and universal military training are wholly inconsistent. While we are engaged in hostilities they violently conflict with each other. The use of both systems simultaneously cannot help but impair our war effort rather than aid in its prosecution.

If you will examine the hearings, which were held before our committee, you will find that General Hershey and others indicated what I believe is obvious to all of us: that trainees in the National Security Training Corps and those men taken from selective service for military training and service come from the same pool. The fact that trainees in the corps are inducted before they reach the age of 19 while those inducted under the Selective Service Act are not called until later is a meaningless distinction as all are required to register under the Selective Service Act. If boys are channeled into UMT a few months before they might be drafted, it merely follows that fewer men are available under selective service. It is not much of an argument that persons may be inducted into UMT at the age of 18 but cannot be drafted under selective service until they reach 18½ years.

So, we face the situation of one boy being inducted under the universal military training program, whereas another boy with the same qualifications, with the same background, and virtually of the same age is inducted under selective service perhaps only a few days or weeks thereafter. In the former case the boy serves 6 months in a training camp within the United States. In the latter case the draftee would be required to serve for a period of 24 months, during which period he may be required to serve overseas and in combat. What is universal about that kind of system?

Let us go a step further and see how it works out. Does the boy who goes into the UMT program enter into the military service at the end of his 6 months of training? He does not. He is no longer in the selective service pool. He cannot be drafted. The selective service pool is necessarily reduced to the extent boys are inducted under UMT. To that degree the war effort is actually interfered with.

It will be claimed, of course, that the UMT trainee after his 6 months of training becomes a reservist subject to call for military service for 7½ years. The boy who is drafted also becomes a reservist at the end of his 24 months of service, the only difference being that he is subject to call as a reservist for 6 additional years instead of 7½. As neither can be recalled to active duty without action of Congress, it follows that the boy who goes into UMT is through in 6 months unless an emergency develops serious enough to warrant action by Congress.

It will be noted that the bill before us provides that a young man may enlist in the National Security Training Corps. Thus selective service may be circumvented by the simple process of being accepted for enlistment in the corps. What better proof is required that UMT cannot work during wartime or function while selective service is in operation? Universal military training cannot be successful so long as it can be made a haven for draft dodgers. Nor can it succeed if an agency of the Government can assign one man to 6 months of basic training within the United States and another to basic training and military service for 24 months.

I am sure you will agree with me that it has not been easy to sell compulsory military service to the American people. Only the gravest emergencies have made it possible to go as far as we have. Under selective service there is no favored class. Errors of judgment may be committed by draft boards, but so far as the law itself is concerned, exemptions and deferments apply equally to all who are entitled to be exempted or deferred. Not so with universal military training, however, as it is defined in this bill. Trainees as well as those drafted into the military service must be equally qualified for military service from the standpoint of physical fitness and otherwise. One boy, however, is taken out of the selective-service pool upon the completion of 6 months of training while another with exactly similar qualifications is drafted for 24 months and may be required to serve in combat. What do you suppose the reaction would be to this type of discrimination on the part of the draftees and their families?

This bill is strangely silent as to how selections are to be made—obviously because no fair method can be devised. The American people have demonstrated time and time again that they are willing to make any sacrifices in the interest of national defense and the preservation of our American institutions, but they are opposed—and they have the right to be opposed—to any law which would give special privileges and set up a favored class. This bill does exactly that, and so long as UMT and selective service are in force at the same time, I know of no amendment which would correct the situation.

This phase of the bill is not only unfair and discriminatory, but it fails to meet American standards. No principle of law is better settled than the one that laws must have universal application. Along with freedom itself our founding fathers sought to guarantee equal and exact justice for all persons.

I cannot agree with those who say that we are already discriminating against the young men of the country because we draft men of 19 but not those who are 18. The situation we face here is not comparable at all. Under the Selective Service Act all boys of 18 know that they will be subject to induction when they reach the age of 18 years and 6 months. Under the pending bill the 18-year-old boys who get into the UMT program cannot be drafted when they reach the age of 18½ years. Those who fail to get into the program can be drafted. What could be more unfair or more discriminatory?

Not a syllable of testimony was offered to the effect that this proposed legislation is necessary to win the Korean war or to meet the present crisis or any crisis foreseeable at this time. It is argued that the law is needed for the period when it is safe to reduce our Armed Forces. When that time will be nobody knows. Obviously it cannot be soon; probably not for a number of years to come. Pending the arrival of that time the

American people have been called upon for sacrifices bordering on the confiscation of their property and their income, to say nothing of the greater sacrifices made by those who have offered their all to preserve freedom in the world.

I do not believe it takes a mathematician to determine that the institution of universal military training at this time will burden the American taxpayer with additional billions per year. More than $4,000,000,000 for the first year and a recurring annual cost of more than $2,000,000,000 are conservative estimates.

In view of the comment already made in this debate on the subject, you are not likely to be deluded by the figures outlined by our distinguished chairman. Obviously, his calculations are based upon conditions which may never occur, or at least will not occur for a considerable number of years. Who can say when we will again be at peace? Who can say when it will be safe to reduce our Armed Forces or cease building for our defense? Who knows how long we shall be required to contribute to our military-aid programs throughout the world?

Needless to say we can ill afford to taken on an additional burden if we do not have to—particularly one the cost of which for the first year alone will exceed $4,000,000,000.

I submit that no logical reason has been given for instituting universal military training now. Dollars needlessly spent necessarily impair our national security. Some of the advocates of this bill have pointed out that the Communists are against universal military training. On the other hand it is a well known fact that it is the fervent hope of Communist leaders that this Nation founder on the rocks of national insolvency. Certainly the expenditure of billions of dollars necessary to institute and carry out this program will not improve our fiscal condition. The time has come when we must do without that which we can do without. We cannot do without the guns and tanks and planes and other things immediately necessary in the interest of national security. We can do without universal military training until international conditions change for the better. We did not undertake to build up our present armed strength with any dependence upon a universal military training program.

We are building it up because of the threat of communism which faces this Nation and the world. So long as that threat exists we cannot substitute a peacetime training program for the armed strength we need now and will need in the foreseeable future. Universal military training cannot be instituted at this time without seriously interfering with our preparedness program. It can be instituted when that program ceases. That is the time to do it; not now.

On this connection I see nothing inconsistent in the position of those who voted for the universal military training bill last year and those who might seek to recommit this measure or to vote against it. There is no inconsistency because there was nothing in the bill last year that indicated in any way, shape, or form when the program should be instituted. As a matter of fact the representation was made last year, and I believe many Members acted upon it, that the bill then before us was a peacetime measure and that no plan would be instituted until peacetime conditions justified it. How absurd it is, therefore, for anyone to contend that Congress would be shirking its duty if it does not pass this bill now.

I have no sympathy for the plea that if we do not act during wartime we will not act later on. I believe it is our duty to consider with great caution any peacetime proposal which requires war hysteria to put over.

I was one of the seven Members of the Armed Services Committee to vote against this bill in committee. I am still against it and I do not believe that it can be amended so as to make it acceptable at this time. The advisable course appears to be to recommit the bill so that the program may be taken up at a more appropriate time.

If we vote to recommit this bill, or if we vote against it, the Commission can later on submit another plan. There is no limitation upon the number of plans the Commission may submit. If this bill is recommitted the Commission, of course, will later on submit another plan. When that time comes either this Congress or some other Congress will have the opportunity to pass upon the merits of the plan in light of conditions as they exist at that time. At that time Congress will be in a far better condition to judge of future plans than we are at this time. So I submit the proper and appropriate course is to recommit this bill so that later on Congress may consider another plan.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentleman from Ohio to yield at this time, first of all, to congrautlate him on the very able statement and address that he just delivered; second, to say to the House that the gentleman from Ohio has announced he will not be a candidate for reelection, and that we are all very sorry to lose his services here in this body. I wish to compliment him upon the great work that he has done in rewriting the military justice code of the United States and the other contributions he has made to the welfare of his country.

Mr. ELSTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. May I say that not only is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] an outstanding lawyer but he is one of the most valuable members of the Committee on the Armed Services and we all regret having him leave us.

Mr. ARENDS. May I say a hearty amen to what the gentlemen have just said. I thoroughly agree with all they have said.

Mr. ELSTON. I am flattered and I thank the gentlemen.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, it was with regret that I received the information sometime ago that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] would not seek reelection. During the years I have served on the Committee on Armed Services, I know of no Member who has rendered more outstanding and distinguished service than has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]. The House will truly miss a great lawyer and a great legislator.

Mr. ELSTON. May I say in thanking the gentleman from Georgia that one of the most pleasant and profitable incidents of my service in the House has been the privilege of serving under his distinguished leadership as chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, in my considered judgment any program of the nature of universal military training which is not supported by mothers and fathers, religious leaders and educators of this country cannot long be successful.

From listening to the debate on the floor for the past 4 days, it is obvious that many Members of this House have reached a conclusion on this issue, and some are adamant in their opinions. All I ask at this time is that you reserve as much judgment as possible until there is opportunity for me to offer an amendment in the form of a substitute bill, which I think will remove many of the objections which have been voiced here and many of the objections of the people whom we represent.

I propose to substitute for this measure, a bill which would place the administration of the program in our senior and junior colleges. Now I know that there will be experienced a great many difficulties in such an experiment, but this entire idea is one of trial and error, although we are dealing with great fundamentals and deep philosophies. But if mistakes are made, they will be greatly mitigated, regardless of what they may be, if these boys who become subject to military training, are under the jurisdiction of school officials of our senior and junior colleges.

Of course, someone is going to raise the question immediately that every boy subject to such training will not be eligible for college work. Others will remind us that there will be those boys who are not desirous of becoming candidates for a college degree or who do not have the prerequisites for entering college. These boys will have the opportunity of taking vocational courses which can be provided by such schools. It will give educational opportunity to many who may not otherwise have them, and I think such a program can be inaugurated with a much less expenditure than under the present system proposed. Any program of this nature is going to be expensive.

The measure I wish to present will extend training for 9 months, or an entire school year, plus 3 months' field training in the summer. This is a compromise for those who believe that adequate and complete training cannot be fully received in the schools. From my

experience and observation, I doubt seriously that very much training could be had as provided in the present measure, and if we are going into such a program, I think we should go far enough to really accomplish a full measure rather than an exposure to military indoctrination.

I would leave rather wide discretion with the Commission provided in the Vinson bill to contract with the schools, and make sure that no Federal authority attach to them, but that the military end of it be supported by the Government, and that the instructors for all intents and purposes become a part of the faculty of such institutions.

This is a very sketchy explanation of what I shall suggest in my substitute bill, but I trust you will give consideration to these salient points prior to such time as you may be called upon to act on them.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, by Public Law No. 51, Eighty-second Congress, a National Security Training Corps was created. This was approved and became law June 19, 1951. In this present consideration of H. R. 5904 this body is merely seeking to provide a law for the problems of administration and discipline for the National Security Training Corps. This is as was promised at the time of the consideration of H. R. 2811 last summer. I am in favor of this National Security Training Corps as set up in Public Law 51 and for its full and immediate implementation substantially as provided in H. R. 5904.

This is no new idea with me. It has been a conviction since I was in high school and caused my choice of a college with a military department. Thomas Jefferson's often-quoted words, "We must train and classify the whole of our male citizens," had new and greater significance after I saw our raw recruits go into battle in World War I. The policy of unpreparedness in the years since has confirmed my early belief in the right and duty of every American youth to military training.

It may be unfortunate that the name "universal military training" has been given to this law and plan. An unfounded stigma in the minds of many sincere and religious people exists in that name. They express it in such phrases as "saddling the American people with a permanent military system." They quote out of context Washington's statement that we should "avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments." Why is this law any more permanent than any other passed by this or previous Congresses? Certainly George Washington was speaking of a large standing army and not a trained militia, which he strongly favored. If we had adopted this plan in 1946, we could have a classified and partially trained Reserve of from 3,500,000 to 5,000,000 men today. With this Reserve force, the battle-worn veteran of World War II would not have been called back to fight in Korea. With that kind of a Reserve a standing army of half the size of our present establishment would be adequate.

From these trainees there could have been drawn the specialists who are so essential in modern warfare and whom we seek for so frantically in our haphazard mobilization. When the men in the Kremlin know that we have a trained Reserve of three to five million men, and you may be sure they will know it, a new respect for our Government's diplomatic demands will arise.

I am sure that we cannot insure a world of law and order by arms alone. But without a consistent and definite plan on a long-time basis we cannot even be sure of the safety of our own country. This general plan offers the best chance of holding back Communist aggression over a period of years. During this time the United States, joined with other freedom-loving people, will have the greatest opportunity of all time to build a world of law and order.

It is unrealistic to believe that 13 men in the Kremlin can indefinitely continue to control the minds and bodies of 800,000,000 people against their will. If we can hold back the starting of world war III for a few years and match our military might with moral leadership we can have a new world of peace and law. Lacking either the element of strength or of moral leadership we will fail. The National Security Training Corps is in my judgment our best chance for the element of strength.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this bill and against all crippling amendments that may be offered to it. Unlike some of those that may have been in a state of indecision, I have no apologies to make, and I do not want to be in a position of passing the buck to future Congresses or to any of those who may have to do this job in the future, a problem which I think should be dealt with unequivocally here, now, at this time. I have no hesitation in the position I take and the decision I have made.

I am convinced that the passage of this bill will add to the strength and the security of the United States of America. I am further convinced that the adequacy of our preparedness may have a direct bearing upon the future peace of the world, upon the survival of our country, and perhaps of free nations everywhere, and, for that matter, upon the question of survival of civilization itself. Assuming that this bill does offer an opportunity to give us more strength militarily over the long pull in the future years, it seems to me that it may very well be a measure the outcome of which may have a lot to do with the future course of mankind and civilization itself on this earth. I think it is just that important, and I think it is one with which freemen must consult their consciences and deal with it effectively and forthrightly while it is before us at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I suppose that no question will be presented to the House during this session of the Congress, and perhaps for many Congresses to come, that will involve a more difficult choice for many Members of this great body to make.

There is not one Member among us, I am sure, who is opposed to preparedness, nor is there one Member among us who does not fervently hope that we can reduce by $13,000,000,000 the tremendous expenditures now involved in supporting our Armed Forces. Those who heard our distinguished chairman in his discussion of this bill on Tuesday were undoubtedly impressed by the cold facts which he presented, based upon an actual study of the tentative plan of the training program which would go into effect which, when fully effective, would bring about a saving to the American taxpayers of $13,000,000,000 per year. That would be accomplished, as has been fully explained, through a reduction in the size of the standing forces, the degree of preparedness being transferred from the standing forces to those in the Reserves who would be subject to call in case of an emergency. We have been told that it costs about $10,000 a year to keep a man in the armed services. Therefore, if 1,000,000 men could be taken off and the preparedness demands met through the Reserve program, which would be the program of universal military training then, of course, the saving of tremendous sums is obvious, and during this time when there is such a terrific burden being shouldered by the American taxpayers, perhaps the heaviest in peacetime history of the United States, I hardly see how anyone can blind himself to this opportunity to not only provide for more strength and security for America, but at the same time provide some tax relief for the overburdened American taxpayers.

All of us, as human beings, cannot help but respond sympathetically to the pitiful letters that each of us have received from the wives and mothers of the recalled reservists. Many Members have received scores of letters, and they know what I am talking about; the same wives and mothers who lived through the agony of World War II and are now living through the agony of Korea. The proposed bill will go far toward solving all of those problems.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] discussed that feature of it very well a little while ago when he pointed out that 800,000 reservists were called into the service after the Korean conflict began. Eight hundred thousand were called into service. Why? Because there were not enough men ready and prepared to meet an emergency that had to be met at that time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. We have been in this thing now for 2 years. We had a Selective Service Act in effect that the Army could have used when this thing started. We still have a Selective Service Act in effect that the Army can use to take care of their man-

power. Yet today, 2 years after we went into Korea, and after this war was started, we still find involuntary inactive reservists in Korea, yet they are dropping the draft quota over here. That is not the fault of Congress.

Mr. FISHER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Could it be possible that the Army adopted that policy with one thing in mind, forcing on the American people a universal military training program by using the World War II reservists as a pry pole?

Mr. FISHER. I am personally convinced the answer should be no. I do not think that has any relationship whatever. That is my own viewpoint. I regret, of course, that the replacement program in Korea has not been speedier, and I feel that it should have been.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Can the gentleman tell me why we still have World War II reservists in Korea when we have had 2 years to train a drafted Army?

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman realizes, surely, that has no direct relationship to the bill before us. I have very few minutes to discuss this matter. If the gentleman would like to go into that feature with the military, suppose he go over and talk to Mrs. Rosenberg about that, along with some other things he has been consulting her about, and try to figure this thing out.

Mr. Chairman, if universal military training had been put into effect in 1946, right after the war, there would have been somewhere in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 young men, nonveterans, with 6 months' training behind them, in the Ready Reserve at the time the Korean conflict was cast upon us. Then the 800,000 reservists would not have been called upon to leave their homes, their children, and their jobs, and go back into service to fight another war, many of them after already having served from 2 to 4 years in World War II. Do you want to continue that kind of thing? Do you want to have a Reserve program in the future of a type which will perpetuate that thing, where, if there is an immediate emergency where there are not enough men in the standing forces to meet it, and not enough time to train those who have not been trained, they must reach out and pull back those who are fighting in Korea today? That issue is involved in the vote on this bill, and it cannot be escaped.

It seems to me that any piece of legislation which carries with it the obvious promise of reduced Federal expenditures, and at the same time enhances our preparedness, and—any bill which will more nearly equalize the obligation to serve the Nation—is a good bill.

This is not a new concept. UMT is not the brainchild of the Pentagon. UMT is not some insidious plot of the military leaders of the country. UMT is not inspired by a group of self-seekers. UMT is a program of preparedness that has been advocated for the past 175 years here in the peace-loving United States of America. But it has only been in the past few years that the vast majority of American citizens have come to realize that we have no alternative but to adopt a program such as that envisioned in the bill now before us.

This is a bipartisan proposition. It is not advocated merely by the adherents of one political party. It is advocated by a majority of the American people and particularly by those who have served in the Nation's Armed Forces.

For those who would adhere to tradition, let me call your attention to a letter written by George Washington, who, while admonishing us to avoid unwieldy large standing military establishments, said at the same time to Alexander Hamilton, the chairman of a congressional committee in 1783:

> It may be laid down as a primary position, and the basis of our system, that every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a proportion of his property, but even his personal services to the defense of it, and consequently that the citizens of America (with a few legal and official exceptions) from 15 to 60 years of age should be borne on the militia rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice. * * * They ought to be regularly mustered and trained, and to have their arms and accouterments inspected at certain times * * * (and) able-bodied men, between the ages of 18 and 25 * * * drafted to form a corps in every State * * * to be employed whenever it may become necessary in the service of their country.

Those are the words of George Washington, the Father of his Country. Thomas Jefferson was quoted by one of the Members a few moments ago something along the same line. So, it is not something new that somebody has dragged out of nowhere. This idea of preparing America in this orderly manner and of creating a pool of manpower in the form of reserves; a civilian army under civilian control is nothing new. It has been advocated by the founders of our country, and those who had to do with the preservation of the whole structure of government all through the 175 years of our existence.

Let us be fair about this subject. There are some Members on this side of the aisle and many on the other side who are opposed to anything endorsed by the present administration. There are some on both sides of the aisle who take exception to practically everything recommended by the administration, and there are some who object to a majority of the things recommended by the present administration. But this is not an administration measure. This bill was written by the National Security Training Commission, headed by a Republican, the Honorable James W. Wadsworth, who served in this Congress faithfully for many years, and it was perfected by the House Committee on Armed Services.

Deep in the hearts of some military people there may be a tendency to oppose UMT. I think that the basis for that opposition was summed up very neatly by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, the ranking minority member of our committee, the Honorable DEWEY SHORT. Let me paraphrase a statement that he made last year, "I never saw a minister who had a large enough congregation; and I never saw a general who had too many men to command." I think there is a good deal in that statement because it must be obvious to anyone who has studied this subject that we cannot have UMT on a full scale and the drafting of men for service in the Armed Forces for an indefinite period.

Obviously we cannot have a large standing force and at the same time build up a Ready Reserve of nonveterans. Thus the inevitable result of UMT will be a reduction in the size of our standing forces. The inevitable result will be a reduction in our total Federal expenditures of our Armed Forces, a good break for the American taxpayers. And the great objective, the building up of a great Ready Reserve, must naturally follow if we are to have adequate preparedness.

Now I do not see how anyone can argue with those contentions. And I do not see how anyone who wants to treat our veterans fairly can oppose this measure. It has been stated on this floor several times, but I would like to repeat again, that the only people who have a reserve obligation are those who enter our Armed Forces. Those who do not enter our Armed Forces, under present law, have no Reserve obligation. The very purpose of the proposed bill is to build up a Reserve program made up not of veterans—but of recently trained young men who have not seen prior service in the Armed Forces.

Since we know what UMT is let me tell you a few things that UMT is not: You have heard and you will continue to hear throughout this debate that UMT is conscription of the youth of Amercia. That simply is not true. Conscription is the drafting of men for service in the Armed Forces for a period of years. UMT is a 6 months' period of training under a civilian commission.

And there are some who say that UMT will hand us over to the military. That, of course, is absurd. Who is "the military" that they are talking about. I do not know, nor do I believe the people who use that type of propaganda know. Is it the Commander in Chief? Well, he has been accused of many things but never, to my knowledge, has he harbored designs to sit in shining armor astride a white charger and be a great military hero and dictator.

Is it the Joint Chiefs of Staff? Well, their patriotism to the great ideals of our Nation has never been impeached, much less convicted of being false. And as to wanting to control the country, they certainly would not be advocating UMT under a civilian commission when they have got a draft law which gives them complete and total control over 3,500,000 young men now—and could be extended to 5,000,000 men.

Perhaps it is the Defense Department that wants to hand us over to this vague phrase, "the military." I do not know who it is in the Defense Establishment but if anybody has any facts I hope he will present them.

Perhaps these wicked military planners are people like Jim Wadsworth, the Chairman of the Commission, or Senator

RUSSELL, or Senator BYRD, or KARL LECOMPTE, or the distinguished and well-loved chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, CARL VINSON. Well, that's too fantastic to even discuss. Just who makes up this military monster that is supposed to devour us if this bill passes?

Now we are told by some opponents that UMT would bring havoc to our morals. I noted with interest the reaction of our veterans organizations to this slander. They are indignant at the clear implication that because they had military training while preparing to defend their country that they thereby became immoral. Let me ask the veterans who are sitting in the House today. Are your moral principles any different from others in your community? Do you think that your veteran constituents have weakened the moral fabric of the communities that you represent?

I am afraid that those who say that UMT will breed immorality are expressing the fear that American character is ripe for decay. Surely our churches, homes, and schools have not done such a sorry job of making our young men of 18 spiritually and morally strong. And I am convinced that these young men, under the guidance of chaplains and well-selected officers and noncommissioned officers, will continue their normal healthy development during the 6 months' training period.

We have put in the proposed measure adequate protection against the practice of prostitution. It is proper that we should do this. And we have provided adequate safeguards so that trainees will not be exposed to alcoholic beverages. These are wise precautions which, coupled with the personnel who will train these young men, will adequately protect the moral character of the men who take this training.

The men who complete this training program will return to their communities in just about the same moral state of mind as when they left—or perhaps a little better. If you don't think so—you have indicted the parents, the teachers, and the churches that nurtured their moral development before they attained 18.

During the hearings on this bill representatives of some of our American churches appeared before our committee to signal to Congress what they believe to be the virtual end of the American democratic tradition to which those same churches have contributed so much.

Those warnings must be heard and examined by all of us. The issue which called them forth was universal military training.

The first significant charge made by the religious groups against UMT was that the training program recommended by the National Security Training Commission challenges the Christian concept of citizenship. To my knowledge, the exact nature of that concept has not been stated by these church groups. It has always been my understanding that the words of Jesus—"Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's"—constitute part of the foundation for separation of church and State, and that political citizenship lies outside the domain of religious definition. Certainly there can be no doubt that the legal and political concept of citizenship includes the ultimate obligation of a citizen to defend his country. Their obligation most emphatically should carry with it the obligation to be prepared for that defense.

It is perhaps true that military indoctrination rules out sympathy for our enemies, as these religious groups say. However, when freedom of religion itself is threatened by the godless prophets and conquerors of communism, who would dare suggest that we not prepare to defend our churches? Universal military training would surely indoctrinate our young men less than conscription and service for 2 years or more and that is what we are faced with for all young men unless we have UMT so that we can begin to reduce out standing forces.

A second charge made by these churches against UMT was that such a program will discourage the creative approach to peace. They warn that the enactment of such legislation will convince the world of our war-like intent.

There is absolutely nothing in H. R. 5904 either to discourage our continued and earnest efforts in the United Nations' creative approach to peace, or to indicate our love of war to the rest of the world. The very opposite seems true.

No one has ever suggested that the U. N. with its present membership can rely on international law alone. A United Nations Army is now suffering through the indescribable winter of Korea because of the lawless acts of Russia. Unless that international organization is militarily strong, the creative effort of peace through law can never be achieved. In the absence of a truly world army, each member nation must be ready to carry out its duties under the charter, the whole spirit of which embodies this concept of readiness.

If we adopt UMT, we will be indicating to the world, not a war-like intent, but an intent to reduce our standing forces, remaining at the same time strong so that aggression and war will be discouraged.

A third major charge was that UMT will breed militarism and thereby destroy our democracy. Here again we turn to the veteran members of this body and to the veterans in our home communities and ask: Are these men militaristic? Are they unthinking robots? Has their integrity and dignity been blotted out by authoritarian military efficiency? The answers are surely obvious.

UMT adds other safeguards to the basic one of American aversion to militarism. UMT will be under civilian control. UMT means only 6 months of basic training while our present Selective Service means 2 years of service. If military training means the danger of militarizing the American mind, then surely 6 months is less of an evil than 2 or more years.

The church groups argue that UMT is not 6 months' training but 8 years of military control. This 8-year estimate includes 7½ years of Reserve service now required by law. During this Reserve service, our men will not be under military control. They will be full-fledged civilians who train briefly and periodically in order to maintain their knowledge of how to defend themselves, their homes, their great American heritage and, I might add, their churches, in the event they must go to war. This is clearly not full military control of every man's life for 8 years.

These, then, are the major charges made by the religious groups when they testified against universal military training. I have read and studied them with great respect, as all of you have.

And I am sure that the American people under religious guidance will always maintain a morally upright posture. But I also believe the American mind, alert and vigorous in its pursuit of constitutional government, will always remain free. Our love of peace will forever dictate against our taking an aggressor role in world affairs.

Our Nation does not seek war; we seek to avoid it. I know of no program that will give us greater assurance of preparedness than the one here proposed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the issue seems to me to be quite clear. This House either favors UMT or it opposes UMT. Each of us, I am sure, could individually write a better bill; a better report; propose a better program; and could devise a much better system. At least that has been my experience whenever the compulsory use of manpower has been in issue before the House. But I hope that the little minor objections that each of us may have, which are not shared by the other Members, will not destroy this great effort to bring better preparedness at far less cost. I hope that each Member will remember his duty to all of his constituents, and not try to avoid making a decision on this crucial matter.

This bill, this program, is the result of much study—study that started 175 years ago. I sincerely hope that those who favor UMT will not try to take both sides of the issue by saying that they advocate some kind of UMT—but not this kind.

There is not any alternative to this program. There is not any easy way out. We are not going to be able to depend upon high school students, or those who want military training, to take the place of our large standing forces.

The plain facts are cold and unrelenting. We can initiate UMT with 6 months of honest, unmitigated, nonsugar coated military training, or we can continue the drafting of men for 24 months of service in the Armed Forces.

There is no easy way out. You are either for it or against it. The Nation has a right to know where you stand.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are often ahead of the Congress, and this is no exception. Every Gallup poll in recent years has shown the vast majority of American people want UMT. I conducted a poll in my own district a year ago and one question was on UMT—whether they wanted every able-bodied young man trained for a period of 6 months. A questionnaire was sent to every voter on the rolls. I received a tremendous response—returns from 25 percent of the people. A total of 83 per-

cent answered "Yes" and only 13 percent answered in the negative.

The people have experienced unpreparedness on three occasions, and they do not want it to happen again. It is your job and mine to see to it that it does not happen again.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my vote will be against this bill. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY CONSCRIPTION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the proponents of universal military training rests upon fear. It was Mrs. Roosevelt who told us that fear of communism must be built up "in order to rearm." There is the false assumption that we are a nation of cowardly weaklings, continue to exist only because Stalin permits us to live.

There is the fear, created by false propaganda, that communism under Stalin, expressing itself either in the form of armed might or through subterfuge, seizing control of first one government and then another, will eventually destroy our Republic.

In truth and in fact, as President Franklin D. Roosevelt once said, "We have nothing to fear except fear itself."

As always, back of every effort to change our way of life, our form of government, there are behind this drive for universal military training, sincere, patriotic individuals and groups who believe that we must contain communism within an armed ring of surpassing military power.

To talk of containing communism by armed might, either in Korea or elsewhere, is inconsistent with the long-established policy here in Washington, of not only tolerating, but encouraging Communists to hold high policy-making positions in not only the State Department, but in other Federal departments and agencies.

There are also those who engage in the production of military equipment who, as always, make their millions while war furnishes the market for their wares and the common people provide the "cannon fodder."

Again, there are today, as always, international lawyers, bankers and financiers who become multimillionaires while thousands die and nations fall. They ignore the welfare of their fellow man, they owe allegiance to no government. Their god is the dollar and their sole purpose in life seems to be the accumulation of dollars. They forget that the profits of war are, as Roosevelt said on August 14, 1936, "but fools' gold."

There are others who have lost faith in the soundness of the principles laid down in the Constitution. They have lost faith in the ability, in the courage, in the endurance of our people. They have forgotten, or they ignore, the love of freedom, the determination, the willingness to sacrifice, which sustained our forefathers during the 8 years of the Revolutionary War.

They lack the spirit which, when Britain was mistress of the seas and we were without a Navy, inspired our seamen to win a glorious victory in the War of 1812.

They lack that devotion to principle which sustained our men of the South and those of the North during 4 years of bloody conflict when brother fought brother, each thinking he was right and which, at the end of a conflict that almost wrecked this Nation, gave us a united people. World War I saw the South and the North join in fighting a war which they then mistakenly believed would end all war.

Our forefathers came to this land to escape persecution, to escape being conscripted into the armies of their lords and masters. They knew the meaning, the results of, "taxation without representation"; of the slavery of military service imposed by those who live by war.

They went hungry and without clothing.

They walked barefoot at Valley Forge.

In winter's bitterest days they crossed the ice-clogged, dangerous Delaware under Washington.

They defeated, they captured, the militarily trained mercenary Hessians hired by King George to enslave them.

They suffered, they bled, and many of them died.

But they won for those who were left—for you and for me—the opportunity to attain the greatest degree of human liberty, prosperity, happiness, and contentment ever given to man anywhere.

Now the purpose of government is to give to the individual citizen the opportunity to obtain for himself, through work and thrift, the greatest possible degree of prosperity, happiness, contentment, freedom of thought and action—physical, mental, and spiritual development consistent with the welfare of the people as a whole.

A further necessary purpose of government is the adoption of a policy which will make certain its continued existence.

The proponents of universal military training, whatever may be their objective—and I question not the sincerity, the patriotism, nor the ability of anyone—would ignore the basic reasons which caused our forefathers to flee the Old World. They would impose upon this and future generations of America the burden of excessive, ruinous taxation necessary to support a military government.

Through involuntary military servitude they would enslave for 8 years every physically and mentally fit young American when he reached the age of 18.

They would slam shut in the face of the youth of our land the door of opportunity to a better life, ever-increasing security, which throughout the years, by adherence to the teachings of our forefathers, we have kept open.

This measure, whatever may be the purpose of its advocates, is certain to establish, to fix upon us permanently, control by the military—control not only over the manpower of our Nation but control over civil affairs, control over our natural resources, control over our industrial system, control over transportation.

You have but to read the unification bill as first written to learn that the end of the road for those who accept universal military training—and, let me repeat, I question not their motives—is dictatorship and, human nature being what it is, tyranny.

Correspondence[1] which has come to me—as it has to all of us—from constituents gives me sound reasons why this bill should be defeated.

Until yesterday, the overwhelming sentiment of the House, as indicated by Members on the floor, seemed to insure the defeat of the bill.

But the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], a master of political strategy, apparently with the consent of the House leadership, has changed the legislative program. Instead of the bill being read beginning Monday next, under the 5-minute rule, and a vote taken within a reasonable time, as we were led to believe it would be, we now learn that an appropriation bill will be taken up

---

[1] Some of the objections from constituents to UMT are as follows:

Cass County Holiness Association, Cassopolis, Mich.:

"1. Universal military training will rob the American people of their faith in God, upon which the American standard and her way of life has been built, and lift up before them a false god.

"2. Universal military training will pave the road to military control, which will open the door wide to dictatorship.

"3. Universal military training will be tremendously expensive and wasteful and will create an unbearable burden on the taxpayer that ultimately will break his back, his Government, and his country.

"4. Universal military training gives a false hope of raising the moral standard, for after every war our standard has been lowered."

Michigan State Grange, overseer's office, Mount Pleasant, Mich.:

"1. It would create a military bureaucracy.

"2. It would detract rather than contribute to national security.

"3. Contrary to claims, it would be an unnecessarily costly method of defense.

"4. The majority of the people, the Grange believes, oppose it.

"5. It would not make better citizens of our young men."

Mr. and Mrs. William Jacobs, of Holland, Mich., et al.:

"1. Universal military training will not give us stronger defense than is now being built through selective service.

"2. UMT will commit us to expenditures far beyond value received.

"3. UMT would produce serious international reactions.

"4. UMT will militarize America.

"5. UMT will weaken the moral and spiritual fiber of American manhood."

The Women's Guild of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, Cleveland, Ohio, felt that UMT was permanent conscription and expressed alarm at—

1. "The growing militarism in our country," since more and more dependence is placed upon the Pentagon.

2. "The threat to the American way of life, freedom of thought and inquiry, and

Monday and be given consideration until it is disposed of.

The very apparent purpose of that strategy is to enable the military propagandists, the Legion through its Washington leadership, and perhaps other organizations of veterans to "put the heat on" Members of Congress who have announced their determination to vote against the bill.

That strategy, insofar as "putting the heat on," is working. Prior to yesterday, I had received not more than 15 wires, cards, or letters favoring the bill; hundreds urging me to vote against it.

But yesterday, petitions came in bearing the names of dozens of Legionnaires, members of auxiliaries, and perhaps 50 post cards, all carrying in substance the same message. Typical was this language: "I am in favor of UMT and urge your support of this bill."

The petitions either requested or demanded that I support "this bill."

I doubt very much whether very many of those urging me to vote for "this bill" ever read it, know what is in it.

Because those who have participated in other wars rendered such outstanding service to our country, I have always endeavored to support proposed legislation introduced in their behalf.

But when I am satisfied, as I am in this case—as I long have been satisfied, that the proposal is neither in the interests of the veterans, this and future generations of my country, the welfare of our people, I cannot, however great my desire to please, support it.

Typical of the attitude of some who are not familiar with the proposal, who are unaware of its objective, who have not thought through its implication, is a letter which came to me from a grandmother yesterday morning. It reads as follows:

I am for universal military training. I have four grandsons whom I would rather be

---

moral strength." Military indoctrination of all men will increase this danger.

3. "The right to have an educated youth." Under UMT this is only possible to the extent the armed services permit.

4. "The desire for positive measure for peace." The women urged "Our Government adequately to support the United Nations, and—to persist in its efforts for disarmament," both of which will be jeopardized by UMT.

Petition signed by a number of voting citizens of the United States—

"1. Universal military training is a war-breeding influence. Nearly all of the countries of the world who have had UMT have been involved in acts of aggression.

"2. UMT would not insure this country that it would be better prepared in the event of further outbreaks of war. Our unpreparedness for Korea was due to the failure of the Army to use draft laws provided by the Congress long before the outbreak in Korea.

"3. UMT would not guarantee fewer combat casualties. Statistics show that in combat, death takes the veteran and recruit in equal numbers.

"4. The training proposed under a program of this type would not mean that the country could get ready to fight more readily. The combat unit required by modern warfare would not be achieved through UMT. Access to the materials required for modern warfare would be more effective in achieving a state of readiness.

"5. UMT would cause more deaths and injuries. To the casualties of war would be added the casualties of peacetime training. In 20 years of UMT we would cause as many peacetime training casualties as we have suffered in 2 years of war with Korea.

"6. UMT is a big step toward military control of our Nation. It is this type of control which would develop a fatalistic attitude in youth that not only destroys their possible future, but rots the moral base of democratic life.

"7. UMT is not the way to beat communism. The money used to support UMT could be put to use for the defeat of communism at its roots. UMT will convince many of our allies that we really are war-minded and warmongers."

A. F. Schersten, Rock Island, Ill., for Commission on Morals and Social Relations of the Illinois Conference of Augustana Lutheran Church:

"1. It is not necessary as a military measure. A future major war would very likely be decided before UMT reserves could be ready for service. Besides, UMT would remove the need for a large standing army, for UMT cannot go into effect while the Army wants men for the present crisis. Furthermore, selective service provides all the men needed besides Regulars.

"2. We induct 21.2 men for each 1,000 of the population. Europe conscripts only 12.6.

"3. Nations that have had permanent UMT have had aggressive and politically powerful war machines, and have had less peace than most other nations.

"4. Permanent military training will cause a large part of the world to think that our long-range plan is not peace but war.

"5. UMT would not reduce casualties in a future war. Trained men do not have less chance of getting hit than untrained soldiers.

"6. UMT would not improve the Nation's health. Men who are physically and mentally unfit would be rejected for UMT.

"7. This military program would be far too costly. Its cost the first year would be over $5,000,000,000, an amount equal to the present cost of all primary and secondary education in our country.

"8. UMT would mortgage several years of the lives of our youngest men. After 6 months of training they would be part of the Regular Armed Forces for over 7 years, a fact that is discreetly soft-pedaled by proponents of UMT.

"9. UMT is not necessary as a means of teaching democracy, civic consciousness, civic loyalty, manly fortitude, and self-control. We have adequate and much less expensive means of building these qualities.

"10. UMT would be morally hazardous for thousands of teen-age boys. There is no recommended legislation as to prostitution, liquor, gambling, and so forth. Thus, there is no guaranty either of sufficiently strong or of sufficiently uniform defenses against moral dangers."

A church organization writes: "No nation with UMT has ever won a war; no nation afflicted with it has ever survived. God grant that you and others who have the responsibility, will not desecrate and destroy our precious birthright for a mess of UMT pottage served up by the Military Junta in the Pentagon."

Another church wires as follows: "The Graafschap Christian Reformed Church, Route 6, Holland, Mich., representing 900 members, petitions you to oppose the proposed Universal Military Training Act. We urge you to stress that our Nation's security lies not primarily in arms, but in repentance of national sins, in the recognition of Holy God and in obedience to the principles of morality, civic righteousness, and justice set forth in Holy Scripture (Proverbs 14: 34)."

Many individuals, with pencil or pen, give the following or similar reasons:

"We are informed by the newspapers that Congress is now considering a universal military training bill. We are very much concerned about this as we still believe that our homes and our churches are the best places to train our 18-year-old boys. We still believe that America's hope lies in moral and spiritual strength and a firm belief that

---

God still is the Ruler of the Universe and not military might.

"Our young men have always rallied to the colors in time of need and we believe they will continue to do so in the future without universal military training.

"Therefore, we kindly urge you as our Member of Congress to oppose any form of universal military training."

"Against UMT. 'Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord'."

"We believe that UMT is un-Christian and un-American. Peace cannot be attained through military force. What we need is faith in Jesus Christ. Enough faith, as a nation, to live by the moral and spiritual principles which He set forth."

"As a mother of two young boys, I wish to strongly protest the idea of universal military training in our country.

"Please do not allow the United States to become another Germany."

"Because I believe with all my heart that the UMT program would be a tragic mistake for our country to adopt, may I urge you to do all in your power to defeat it."

"We wish to urge you to vote against universal military training. We feel that the necessary manpower can be mustered through selective service. We also believe that a boy of 18 needs the influence of his home."

"We would urgently request that you oppose any form of universal military training. We believe it to be un-American and against the principles on which this Nation was founded."

"We are against the militarization of America. We believe in what it says in the Bible, 'Not by might nor by power but by My spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts.'

"To you, our Christian spokesman, we are expressing our hope and desire that you will vigorously oppose any program of universal military training."

"I wish to voice my protest on the issue of universal military training. I believe it is a backward step away from world peace and a forward step toward war. How can we ever convince the peoples of the world, the oppressed as well as those opposed to our way of thinking, that we want peace with them and for them, if we step into high gear on a military program? Then, too, if we exhaust our energies in preparation for war what strength have we left to work for peace?"

"Just this line to appeal to you to do everything in your power to oppose the adoption of any program of universal military training for this country."

"We wish to express to you, our Congressman, our disapproval of universal military

trained in case of war, and I think it would be good for girls, too; two granddaughters that could use it.

My daughter has been an Army nurse 11 years March 1, of which I am very proud.

Yours respectfully.

——— ———.

My reply to this woman is too long, too personal, for quotation. I assumed, however, that she was motivated by the thought which I am sure we all entertain and which is that no one should be sent to war without training.

What she and many advocates of this measure overlook is the fact that adequate training depends, not upon law, but upon the will of those in authority in the armed services. That was demonstrated during the last war when the military authorities ignored—I repeat, ignored—the specific provisions written into law by the Congress.

This grandmother does not want her grandsons to be sent to war untrained. Neither does anyone else. But it does not follow that this proposal will prevent our untrained youth fighting or dying on foreign soil.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

A decision as to whether we should adopt universal military training as our present and future national policy rests upon the correct answers to the following questions:

First, is it necessary for the continued welfare of our people, the security of the Republic?

Second, is it the most efficient way in which to serve and protect the welfare of our people, the future security of the Republic?

Third, is it the most economical way to accomplish that purpose?

Fourth, if we adopt UMT and the necessary sustaining policies, will—

(a) The freedom of the individual be lessened;

(b) Our standard of living be lowered; and

(c) Our ability to make secure the future of our Republic be destroyed?

First. Is universal military training necessary for the continued welfare of our people, the security of our Republic?

Tuesday, February 26, the chairman of the committee which reported this bill, Mr. VINSON, opened the debate with these words:

Mr. Chairman, 175 years ago this Nation embarked on a course of action that has led it to the unchallenged position of the greatest world power in the history of mankind.

On November 23, 1944, Thanksgiving Day, Winston Churchill, addressing an Anglo-American audience including hundreds of American servicemen, in London, said:

Americans never had more justification for thanksgiving than today "When we see that in three or four years the United States has, in sober fact, become the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world."

If we are as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said, the greatest world power in the history of mankind, and if we have, as Mr. Churchill said, "in sober fact become the greatest military, naval, and air power in the world," and if we are, as the pouring out of billions of dollars and millions of tons of our resources and industrial products to other countries throughout the world would indicate, the richest and most productive Nation in all the world, we cannot be the weakest, the most defenseless, Nation in the world.

We do not lack military might; we do not lack productive ability; we do not lack resources. What is it that we lack that makes us fearful? Do we lack courage? Do we lack the spirit to sacrifice in defense of home, fireside, or country?

It is not possible to, at one time, be the greatest, the strongest, the richest, the most productive and, at the same time, the weakest, most defenseless nation in the world.

That we have not heretofore lacked courage, fighting ability, or the willingness to sacrifice, is shown by the further statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] which immediately followed the words which I have just quoted, referring to the fact that we now hold the unchallenged position of the greatest world power in the history of mankind. I quote:

This was achieved through sacrifice, bloodshed, and heartbreak. The war for independence, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the War Between the States, the Spanish-American War, World War I, World War II, and the current struggle in Korea, have all been challenges which our Nation has met through the common virtue of uncommon valor.

The wars to which the gentleman referred were all fought, and all were won, without universal military training. The gentleman's argument is that all might have been won sooner and with less loss had we had universal military training. There is no proof of that.

I repeat, there is no proof that, in any of those wars, victory would have come earlier or with less cost of either dollars or life had we had universal military training.

Nor should it be forgotten, as was pointed out day before yesterday by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] and others, that World War I and World War II were fought and won against nations which have had universal military training, as will be the current struggle in Korea if Dean Acheson gets his nose out of military strategy.

Then, for good measure, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr VINSON] adds:

To defend their freedom, every generation of Americans has had to fight. Our people, composed of every nationality in the world, have never failed in their obligation as citizens to preserve this great democracy.

Does the gentleman from Georgia, do his colleagues who advocate the adoption of this measure, contend—as their arguments would seem to indicate—that the present generation of Americans lack the "common virtue of uncommon valor"; that they will fail "in their obligation as citizens to preserve this great democracy"? That I do not believe.

The war for independence was fought to establish our independence.

The War of 1812 was fought to end conscription of our seamen on the high seas by Great Britain.

The Mexican War was fought to aid the Texans in establishing their independence.

The War between the States was fought because the men of the South and the men of the North believed they were fighting for a principle.

The Spanish-American War was fought because of the sinking of the *Maine*—an act of aggression.

We were tricked into World War I and World War II because we yielded to the propaganda that the first one would end all war. The Second War was to carry the four freedoms to the end of the earth.

We are in the current struggle in Korea, which apparently is not a war we are expected to win, because we were pushed in.

In the wars preceding the one in Korea, our people fought for what they believed to be the right. Let me repeat—those wars were fought and won under the flag of our Nation by men who, at the moment, thought they were necessary for the protection of our own people and our Republic.

Today, our people believe that they have been betrayed by our Department of State. They believe that this proposed legislation is an effort to conscript the youth of America to fight under an international flag to advance the interests of some nation other than our own.

What this Nation needs to promote the people's welfare and its own security is not universal military training and millions of soldiers, but a change in our foreign policy which will end the practice of the American taxpayer being called upon to pay the cost; American youth being forced to fight in an effort not to carry the four freedoms to all the world, but to aid Britain and France, and perhaps other nations, which are attempting to hold in bondage the people in their colonial possessions who, like our forefathers, are struggling for freedom.

Universal military training is not necessary. What this Nation needs is the ousting of Acheson and those of his school of thought; their replacement by clear-thinking, competent Americans, whose sole purpose will be to serve the interests of the United States of America.

Second. Is universal military training the most efficient way in which to serve and protect the welfare of our people, the future security of the Republic?

A negative answer to that question has repeatedly been given during previous debate and by what has just been said.

History records that the paid professional soldier—equipment being equal—who fights either for glory or for gain,

---

training. For the present, selective service is a satisfactory way to fill the needs of the Armed Forces. It is our belief also, that boys of 18 are too young to be drafted for service."

———

"The Congress is now considering a UMT bill. To us, the common people of America, this is a radical departure from the democratic American way of life to the military state which will lead to a moral, spiritual hazard and calamity, so we ask you to oppose this subtly, vicious bill."

is never the equal, when judged by the result of combat, of the independent soldier who fights for principle, who fights because of his convictions, who fights for home, fireside, and country. No need to belabor this subject. History and experience have given the answer.

A recent article in Collier's is enlightening on this subject.[2]

Third, is universal military training the most economical way to protect the welfare of our people, the security of the Republic?

War is destructive and wasteful of both men, munitions, and lives.

West Point, Annapolis, and the Coast Guard Academy train men to fight and win battles and wars. No commander can win a battle or a war if cost is to limit his supply of arms and men. To win, he must have an adequate supply of both. As he cannot accurately anticipate his needs, if he is not to be defeated he must err on the side of an abundance, not of a scarcity.

But, in addition to the natural and inevitable waste which follows war and preparation for war, great as it must be, recent congressional, nonpartisan, nonpolitical hearings have disclosed a shocking, shameful degree of disregard of the ability of the taxpayers to meet the armed services' demands. And more discouraging and exasperating—if that be possible—graft and corruption which, if continued, will make it impossible for our country to provide an adequate defense for the future.

Reluctantly, some of us supported a unification bill, because we were assured that it would give us economical purchasing by the armed services, a coordination of the Nation's natural resources and manpower which would lessen for the taxpayer the burden of our Military Establishment.

It was my contention at the time that all the objectives of that legislation could be attained without legislation by those in command if they so desired. But the legislation was adopted. Amendments

---

[2] SUMMARIZATION OF TYRANNIES MUST FAIL

(By Allan Nevins, Collier's, October 20, 1951)

Disraeli said, "I have ever been of the opinion that revolutions are not to be evaded."

Quoting the author, "Ours is as revolutionary an era as that which lasted from 1776 to 1821, overturning governments, institutions, and ideas throughout Europe and the two Americas.

* * * * *

"It would be an error to say that the two systems, Soviet dictatorship and western freedom, cannot coexist, for they have in fact coexisted for 33 years. But they cannot coexist indefinitely without radical change in one. We are in much the same position as that which Lincoln recognized when he said in 1858 that 'a house divided against itself could not stand—that the United States could not exist half slave and half free. * * *'

"We can say today that the world has existed half Communist, half democratic for more than a quarter of a century because each half expected its ideals and methods to conquer the other half. One side or the other must change. And we can echo Lincoln's further statement of 1858: 'A crisis must be reached and passed, giving the world confidence that it will regain a decent unity and harmony.'

"Either freedom will win, or dictatorship will win."

DIFFERENCES IN RIVAL BELIEFS *

"Between the two rival expectations, however, lies a vital difference. The Kremlin bases its belief in our early downfall upon the theories of Marx and Lenin as footnoted by Stalin. We base our confidence in a coming Russian revolution on plain historical facts and established historical principles.

"Every lesson of history does go to show that * * * such a system as is enthroned in Moscow, with its concentration of military, political, and economic power in a despotic oligarchy, with its police terror, with its suppression of free discussion, and with its fettering of seven or eight satellite states, must in no long time undergo a sharp transformation.

We should take a long-range view of the human situation.

In 1934, Jan Smuts, the Boer general who became Prime Minister of South Africa, in an address on freedom, looking at Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin, all then in full strut, remarked that people might well be gloomy if they thought only of the moment. Little more than a decade later, the dictatorships of Hitler and Mussolini were dead.

"As Smuts said, 'The denial of free human rights must in the long run lead to a cataclysm.' Why? Because the passionate desire of men to exercise their faculties freely is a basic trait that cannot permanently be repressed. Smuts quoted Pericles: 'Happiness is freedom, and freedom is courage.' He quoted the Arbroath Manifesto of the commons and nobles of Scotland in the year 1320: 'We fight not for glory, nor for wealth, nor for honor, but for that freedom which no good man will surrender but with his life.' The South African leader stated his own conviction: 'Dictatorship can only be tolerated as a temporary expedient, and can never be a permanent substitute for free self-government. Freedom is the most ineradicable craving of human nature.' "

HISTORY GIVES PROOF

"To begin with, we have a long and melancholy history to prove that no government and no system can subjugate all Europe, much less the whole globe. Every power that has tried it has not only failed, but has half or totally ruined itself in trying. Charles V, whose motto was 'Still further', attempted to establish an Austro-Spanish supremacy over half of mankind. It was a preposterous effort. In 1544, he seemed to have Europe and Spanish America at his feet; in 1556, worn out by failures, he abdicated. * * *

"Nor was Louis XIV a whit more fortunate. * * *. He enlarged the French domains along the Rhine, seizing Strasbourg. He took a slice of Flanders. He brought a great part of Italy under his influence. Placing his grandson on the throne of Spain, he boasted that he had erased the Pyrenees. Yet the tough little Dutch nation under William III held him at bay; and when Marlborough took the field, Louis XIV met a series of defeats which * * * closed his reign in humiliation and gloom."

Napoleon and Hitler "each believed he had European dominion within his grasp." Napoleon learned "that Wellington was more than a match for any of his marshals and in the end a match for himself. Hitler discovered that even conquered lands were always ready to rise against him in a desperate war of liberation.

"One important fact to be kept in mind is this: That Charles V, Louis XIV, Napoleon, and Hitler were all betrayed by their initial successes.

"An equally important fact to be kept in mind is that it was an aroused people who threw back first Napoleon and later Hitler.

"Stalin told Anthony Eden, as Sumner Welles has lately written, that he would not make Hitler's mistake: 'I will not go too far.' The question is whether he can avoid going too far. It is difficult for the competing chiefs of the Politburo, each ambitious, each fearful of his rivals, to stop.

"Moreover, the Soviet dictatorship is caught in a nasty dilemma. If it maintains its aggressive policies, it runs the risk of war—and disaster. If it comes to terms with the West, it will lose all excuse for the vast armies, the million or more secret police, the concentration camps, and the rest of the apparatus of crisis and terror by which its power is supported.

"The second reason for our confidence in a coming Russian revolution—or a rapid evolution with revolutionary incidents—is this: That no power has ever succeeded in holding in permanent subjection a chain of satellite countries as Russia is holding her neighbors. The situation in the East European chain of Soviet satrapies, however disguised, is essentially a revolutionary forcing-bed, which will some day blossom into widespread plots, demonstrations and uprisings.

"Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary in particular are, by a series of 5-year plans, being compelled to sacrifice culture, decent living standards and social freedom to the forced development of heavy industry, so that the Politburo can make them bear a great part of the burden of Communist armaments.

"Yet all history goes to show that such an attempt to handcuff long separate nations, no matter how seemingly helpless, must eventually break down." Examples are shown in histories of Belgium, Hungary, Poland, and Bohemia.

"In the eighteenth century the living body of Poland was torn into pieces, to be distributed among Russia, Austria, and Prussia; but its soul, as the Grand Duke Nicholas acknowledged in 1914, did not perish. So virile was the national spirit of this long dissevered people that when the First World War began, both Russia and the central powers had to promise to restore Polish unity and freedom.

"In that war the hatred of the Poles for their immemorial oppressors was so intense that one Polish force took up arms against Russia, and other Polish troops fought desperately against Germany and Austria. When the conflict ended, the reborn Polish Republic under Paderewski and Pilsudski was determined to maintain its liberty.

"Everywhere the story has been the same. Austria could not keep her grip on Venetia; England could not hold south Ireland under the crown; Turkey could not prevent the Balkan peoples from unriveting their gyves; Germany and Austria could not suppress Czech nationalism. * * *

"Among the most glorious moments in European history are those which found the Dutch 'Beggars' in revolt against mighty Spain, Kosciusko reanimating the spirit of the Poles, Kossuth appealing to the civilized world in behalf of Hungary, Garibaldi leading his Italian legion, and the Czechs bringing their national charter from Pittsburgh. Eastern Europe is certain of seeing a repetition of these historic scenes."

The author goes on to discussing rumblings of discontent—in Hungary—among the Communists themselves; writes about Communists dominating trade-unions in Poland, exploiting—economically—the satellite states.

The author writes: "The movement for liberation may come gradually, or suddenly and violently, but it will come. Then, too,

---

*"The Soviet Union is confident of the breakdown of the non-Communist world. * * * We of the free nations are equally confident that the tyrannical Communist dictatorship must yield to a better order."

have been made. Yet, today, we do not have either a unified cataloging or purchasing system. We have failed to get even a semblance of economy.

The Hébert subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee of the House, the Bonner subcommittee and the Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; a Senate committee, have all pointed to millions, even billions, of dollars of waste connected with the activities of the armed services.

Billions upon billions of dollars we have given to those services and much of that money has been deliberately wasted. Yet recently we were told by the commander of the Air Force that our planes were inferior in both number and efficiency to those of the enemy.

With the armed services record of waste of our dollars, there is no reason to believe that it would be less wasteful with the lives of our men. Lost dollars, even though they number billions, can be replaced.

But a lost generation cannot be replaced.

Military training in high schools, colleges, universities, ROTC, and the State militia, we must have.

Certainly until the armed services learn to use our dollars with some degree of efficiency, I will not vote to give them, for 8 years, absolute control over the lives of the youth of this and succeeding generations.

Let no one be deceived by the argument that this bill is only a measure to train our youth for 6 months.

Those who at the end of the last war signed up to go into the Reserves with the thought that they would not be called again to active service now know that, once the military gets control of the individual it is loath to relinquish its authority over him.

Men taken into this program for 6 months will find that, for an additional seven and a half long years, they are subject to the beck and call of the military.

The doctor, the scientist, may at any time, when the Executive and the military so will, be called to pick up cigarette butts on a parade ground, mop out a barracks.

---

the day will dawn when the misled people of Russia will realize that it does not pay to hold a ring of subjugated, sullen, unhappy people in bondage. History shows that it never has paid."

"Sir Thomas More wrote in his Utopia, 1516, that France ought to stop trying to dominate Italy and to enslave Flanders. He spoke of the example set by the imaginary nation he called the Achoriens: '* * * a people that lie on the southeast side of Utopia, who long ago engaged in war in order to add to the dominions of their prince another kingdom, to which he had some pretensions by an ancient alliance. This they conquered, but found the trouble of keeping it was equal to that by which it was gained; that the conquered people were always either in rebellion, or exposed to foreign invasion, while they were obliged to be incessantly at war, either for or against them, and consequently could never disband their army, that in the meantime they were oppressed with taxes, their money went out of the kingdom, their blood was spilt for the glory of the king, without procuring the least advantage for the people, who received not the smallest advantage from it in time of peace'."

"The third reason for our confidence in a coming Russian revolution, violent or peaceable, is that no power has ever yet been able to prevent the entry of ideas from other lands. The Soviet dictatorship could not exist without its iron curtain. General knowledge of the superior living conditions of the West, and of the blessings of freedom of movement, freedom of mind and freedom to choose work, would crumble its foundations. Hence the furious zeal of the Politburo to make the iron curtain impenetrable. * * * But history proves that an iron curtain always has chinks and rustholes; that a fabric which looks airtight always yields to the invisible osmosis of information.

"Dictatorships for centuries have used exile, death, prison, censorship, book burnings, control of schools and universities, and the systematic falsehoods of a propaganda machine—and always, in the long run, in vain. No doubt the Politburo has brought indoctrination to a new pitch of perfection. No doubt it has molded the minds of millions from infancy. But then modern science has also brought the power of ideas to ride the radio waves to a new pitch of perfection."

NEW IDEAS CAN'T BE STOPPED

"Philip II and the Spanish Inquisition tried to crush freedom of thought; but they failed. The French Bourbons were implacably hostile to ideas; but the enlightenment came in nonetheless—with revolution in its train. Napoleon III exiled Victor Hugo, chained the French press, and steam-rollered the universities * * *. Hitler burned a mountain of books, exiled thousands of intellectuals from Thomas Mann down, muzzled all editors, and filled the concentration camps with men who dared to think; but he could not stop the movement of ideas in Germany.

"The fact is that intellectual repression defeats itself by creating suspicion and skepticism, the parents of revolt."

MUST ADJUST TO CHANGES

"We have still another reason for believing that a drastic transformation is sooner or later inevitable in Russia. If history demonstrates anything, it is that any country which cannot adjust itself constantly and even radically to internal change—that is, any dictatorship which tries to keep a frozen political and social system—is certain to be overtaken by revolution. No regime has ever lasted unless it had the power of self-criticism and self-reform. That is precisely the power which Stalinism lacks."

A dictatorship always looks highly efficient—for a time—but always proves inefficient. The dictatorship cannot persuade public opinion, and so resorts to force.

"Inefficiency is, in the long run, one of the hallmarks of a dictatorship. It inevitably increases, for the simple reason that a dictatorship has no power of self-correction. In Soviet Russia minor criticisms are encouraged, for they help take men's minds off the major issues. But all fundamental policies are sacrosanct, and anyone who dares call in question a high decision or high official is summarily silenced. It was such a refusal to permit the discussion of fundamental change which played a large part in the downfall of divine-right monarchs like Charles I, of Napoleon III, of the Hohenzollerns, and of the Czarist regime.

"By contrast, the long-term efficiency of the democracies lies to a great extent in their seeming division and dissension on lines of major policy. The bitter debate of 1951 between President Truman and General MacArthur, and the ugly quarrel between Prime Minister Attlee and Aneurin Bevin, appeared hurtful. But in the end the constant publicity given to policy, the free criticism of errors, and the ceaselessly grinding machinery of self-correction are invaluable.

"Stability is the possession of only those nations which allow constant reform and change. Because one great wave of evolution after another has rolled over America—Jeffersonian, Jacksonian, Lincolnian, Wilsonian, Rooseveltian—we have avoided revolution. The same statement can be made of Great Britain, which ceaselessly debates change. Meanwhile, the Politburo sits on the safety valve.

RUSSIA'S GREAT WEAKNESSES

"1. It is ambitious to dominate Europe and the world.

"2. It is trying to enthrall and exploit a chain of vassal nations.

"3. It is attempting to cut Russia off from the flow of world ideas.

"4. It has established the worst repressions in history to punish internal criticism and block peaceable change.

"The pressures in the boiler will mount dangerously. Unless the policies are altered, what Jan Smuts called a 'cataclysm' is certain.

"When a dictatorship looks strongest to the gaze of the world, the props behind the facade are often cracking. Bonaparte appeared his strongest in 1811, but in 1813 he was overwhelmed. When 1848 began, the reactionary order in Europe under Metternich's system seemed solid as granite. Then a revolt began in Palermo. Within a few weeks the Germans in Austria, the Magyars in Hungary, the Poles in Russia, the south Slavs on the Adriatic, and the Czechs in Bohemia all rose. In 1865, Napolean III thought himself secure; in 1870 the debacle. Hitler and Mussolini bestrode Europe in 1939; but by 1943 doom was overtaking them.

"No nation ever stands still; it must move forward in some direction. * * * But we can say that unless all the lights of history are misleading, the Soviet dictatorship is now on the highroad to revolution and ruin. The vital question is whether it can alter its course with enough speed and thoroughness to avert another of the calamities of history. Several distinct possibilities exist:

1. "If the Politburo pursues its present aggressive policies unchanged, great danger exists that some reckless plunge, some miscalculation of chances, will precipitate the third world war. This would end with revolution inside Russia."

2. "A revolt in one of the satellites may spread to several or all of them and bring about a sharp modification of policy in the Kremlin. The Poles, the Chinese, and the Czechs in particular will not forever draw the Soviet chariot."

3. "If Russia abandons her aggressive foreign policy as too risky, but maintains her repressive, tyrannical system at home, a revolution must ultimately start from within. It might begin as a palace revolution on the death of Stalin or his successor. It might be a massive uprising of the Russian people to make their paper constitution a reality and put effective truth into its empty clauses. The new Russia would doubtless be very different from the western democracies, but it might well be progressive and cooperative."

HOPE FOR CHANGE

"Finally, a faint chance exists that a new leadership will emerge in Moscow, which * * * will gradually relax both the aggressive internal policy and the internal tyranny. The chances are that steps in this direction would be accelerated by revolutionary action.

"But whatever the outcome, a crisis must be reached and passed. And when the day

Fourth. If we adopt universal military training and the necessary sustaining policies, will—

(a) The freedom of the individual be lessened?

(b) Our standard of living be lowered? and

(c) Our ability to make secure the future of our Republic be destroyed?

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND THE SUSTAINING POLICIES WHICH WILL FOLLOW WILL LESSEN THE FREEDOM OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Universal military training does not, cannot, stand alone. If we adopt universal military training, to implement it, quarters must be built; equipment must be furnished and, with the present demands to carry on the war in Korea, maintain an armed force in Europe and ships or a fleet fully equipped with carriers and planes on most of the seven seas. Our resources and productivity are already overtaxed.

It will follow, then, that further allocation of material, of manpower, and of dollars, will be necessary for the training of these men.

We will have planning in an ever-increasing degree. We will have more and more regimentation. There will be no limit, no end, to the rules, regulations, and directives promulgated by those in charge of this program. Universal military training and its accompanying policies will, in the end, give us a dictatorship. Dictatorship means tyranny. Tyranny means the end of freedom for the individual.

There is no uncertainty about this program. It matters not at all what we are told by the advocates of this bill.

Some of us know from bitter experience that, while Congress may write a law, the military interprets and administers it.

There is not a Member of this House who does not know that men have been inducted into the service under the explicit agreement that they would be held for a stated limited period of time. That was a contract beween the United States Government, between Uncle Sam and the young man who enlisted, relying upon the promise that his service would be for a specified time.

The Constitution provides that no State shall impair the obligation of a contract.

The Constitution provides that no man's property—and time is property—shall be taken from him without adequate compensation. Common honesty and decency require that the Government keep faith with those with whom it deals.

But a dishonest Government, after inducing young men to enlist for a stated number of months, increased that term of service by adding 12 additional months.

Again, in World War II, Congress added the Tydings amendment to the Conscription Act. In brief, that amendment provided that those who were exclusively engaged in necessary agricultural pursuits should not be drafted. General Hershey, who interprets and administers the draft laws, not only misinterpreted that law, but deliberately disregarded it. Federal men were sent to the State of Michigan and they gave the State and local draft officials to understand that the Tydings amendment should be disregarded.

I know what I am talking about. The record is replete with specific instances of that conduct. Moreover, General Hershey told me in my office that, when the armed services needed men, it would take them. That statement was typical of altogether too many high in authority in the armed services.

The armed services, as was pointed out last Wednesday by our colleague from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] not only ignores the constitutional right to free speech and a free press, but punishes as it did Admiral Denfeld, those in the services who, when called before congressional committees to aid in writing legislation, exercise that right, state their honest convictions.

I have a distinct recollection of how, when a House committee was considering the writing of the unification bill, information which would have aided in drafting that legislation was denied us. Some 20 officers and individuals having first-hand information were gagged. That is an illustration of the way military men will, on occasion, impose their will upon the rest of us.

Just a few days ago, General Ridgway, speaking from Korea, condemned those who, here in America, questioned the objectives of the war where he is commander. He seemed to think that the American fathers and mothers who furnish the men to do the fighting under him, the taxpayers whose toil creates the dollars which enable his men to fight, must accept, without question, whatever the military mind chooses to put out.

He apparently—and I have no criticism of him except as he adopts an all-too-prevalent military idea—is convinced that military authorities are not to be questioned even though the issue is one of policy on the home front, the productive front, the civilian front. No one questions his decisions on military matters, but whether we shall fight in Korea or anywhere else is not for his decision.

Fourth. If we adopt UMT and the necessary sustaining policies, will (b) our standard of living be lowered?

Universal military training is something new, something added. It calls for the collection of additional sums from the taxpayers. Apparently, no one knows the cost. One thing we do know, and that is that it will each year take several hundred thousand young men, from productive civilian pursuits, make them nonproducers, and require, for their maintenance and training, millions, if not billions, of dollars.

Even the most visionary must realize that, with the public debt approaching $300,000,000,000 carrying an interest charge of something over $6,000,000,000 per year, with the obligation of maintaining an army in Europe, carrying on a war in Korea, distributing billions to other countries, our ability to continue our present standard of living cannot be continued; that each and every one of us will be forced to work longer hours and do with less. In brief, we will be forced to an austerity program similar to that under which the people of England are now suffering—now described as one of slow starvation.

Many have been surprised that our people did not long ago rebel because of the needless burdens which this and the preceding administrations have put upon them. One reason may be that they are essentially law abiding. It is also possible that they have not yet realized the falsity of the apparent prosperity which they think they have been enjoying. Some do not yet understand that the increase in the pay check is more than offset by the loss of the purchasing power of that check.

Few will deny that there is a limit to our ability to produce and spend. All, if they think, will reach the conclusion that only by longer hours of harder work, and living on less, can any further demands upon us be met.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING, IF ADOPTED, WILL LOWER OUR STANDARD OF LIVING

Fourth. If we adopt UMT and the necessary sustaining policies will (c) our ability to make secure the future of our Republic be destroyed?

In my judgment, it will, because we will destroy our ability to produce and, through the depletion of our manpower by our participation in foreign wars, render ourselves incapable of defense.

We are told that we must have universal military training in order to meet Stalin's threat to destroy the Republic.

Even the proponents of this plan will admit that Stalin has no navy to transport an army to our shores and here maintain it.

They will admit that his productive capacity is not as great as ours.

But they say, by taking possession of Europe, bringing the resources of Asia under his control, he will become powerful enough to destroy us.

This claim rests upon the assumption that he can unite the peoples of Western Europe and of Asia, and, with his own people, weld them into one united, overwhelming force.

History, however, discloses that no man, no nation, has ever been able to accomplish that purpose.

Stalin's conception of conquering the world—if he has such a conception, and, to date, so far as we know, not a single Russian soldier has lost his life fighting in any of the current theaters of war—is no more likely to succeed than have

---

comes that Russia, bowing either to revolution or irresistible forces of evolution, asks for the assistance of the free peoples of the world, we must have but one watchword—generosity."

The author goes on to say that in 1949 Emperor Hirohito, at the opening session of the Japanese Diet, thanked the Allied Powers for their good will and assistance in "the reconstruction of Japan into a democratic state"; and the author then says that such a transformation is by no means impossible in Russia, and that the day may not be too far off when they will join with the friendly peoples of the globe and seek our advice in reconstruction of the Russian republics; that they may then have much to teach us and we have much to teach them; and that we can then "push forward together to throw open the gates to the golden age."

the efforts of other would-be world conquerors. Stalin, like Genghis Khan, Alexander the Great, Napoleon, Charles of Sweden, the Kaiser, Hitler, may attempt to conquer the world, but will meet a similar fate.

Nor has any would-be world conqueror ever been able to conquer and bend to his will the Chinese Nation.

For centuries, efforts have been made to unite under one ruler the nations of central Europe. Every such attempt failed. In my humble judgment, whatever may be Stalin's purpose, he will never succeed, either by force of arms or by propaganda, in uniting the nations of eastern Europe or of the East in an effort to make war upon the Western Hemisphere.

If, however, we fall into Stalin's trap of fighting on every front wherever in the world there may be war instigated by him, then, surely, we will wreck ourselves.

The danger which threatens us today is, as Lincoln and so many have said, not from without, not from foreign foes, but from within—from those who have no faith either in our form of government or our people. Our danger comes from the Achesons, the Rosenbergs. Our present danger comes from those who seem to think and who act as though it is our duty to, by force of arms, compel all other peoples, all other nations, to discard their way of life, accept and submit to plans which some of our misguided do-gooders and some who have forgotten their allegiance to this country think they can impose upon, which would be better for, other peoples, other nations.

To me comes the thought that we may commit national suicide by the indiscriminate giving or using of our dollars, our resources, our manpower, for the benefit of other nations whose people apparently are not willing to submit to the things we would impose upon them.

UMT AS A CHARACTER BUILDER

Proponents of this bill contend that UMT will prove to be a great "good character" builder for our young men.

That argument is an indictment of the teachings and the practices advocated in every right-thinking family every church of every denomination, every religious group, and every educational institution.

Boiled down, it means that the Army is better qualified to and will better teach the youth of this land honesty, decency, respect for law and God, than will parents, schools, churches.

It would be absurd to charge the Armed Forces as a whole with any less degree of admirable characteristics than any other group.

In the old days, every army had its group of women camp followers. Every army had its group which disregarded the rights of the civilian population; sought, at times, to live off the country.

Who has forgotten the situation during the last World War when public sentiment finally forced the Navy in Japan to break up the houses of prostitution, outside of which long lines of men were waiting?

Oh, I know it is an unpleasant subject. But the young men of this country and the parents of those men, as well as future generations, demand that we should have before us, in considering a measure of this kind, some of the well-known facts of life.

Men engaged in war are, by nature and of necessity, brutal. Killing the enemy is no pastime; it is a business. Killing men is bound to harden the killer. Realizing that the coming dawn may bring death, there is always the temptation on the part of some of less religious faith to let down—do things which otherwise would be abhorrent.

That human nature, war and the destructive influence of war have not greatly changed; that good character-building by the military is no adequate substitute for home, school and church, permit me to read an editorial which appeared in the Times-Herald of Washington earlier this week:

THE ARMY AS MORAL PRECEPTOR

We refer two recent reports from Germany and Japan to those proponents of universal military training who say that this would be a great contribution to building the character of American youth:

1. The State department legal office in Munich reported that American soldiers had assumed legal responsibility for 5,000 infants born out of wedlock in occupied Germany. The average of such acknowledged cases is running at 30 a week.

2. The newspaper Yomiuri of Tokyo, Japan's largest, demands that the United States make provision for 200,000 half-Japanese waifs fathered by American occupation troops. An American public health officer terms the figure an exaggeration, but does not dispute that there are a large number of such illegitimates. Yomiuri suggests that the United States bring these orphans here.

We now turn to a recent report of the National Security committee of New York, the chairman of which is former Justice Owen J. Roberts of the Supreme Court, relating to the supposed beneficial effects of UMT. This is characterized as an "educational program," in which the chaplain corps will have a prominent role in inculcating religious and character traits. The report states that the "character guidance" part of the UMT program consists of "sex-education responsibility, marriage and family life, religion, moral principles, and citizenship."

The UMT program, according to this propaganda, will seek to maintain "fine atmosphere, attitudes, and spirit." The character training will be "transferable to civilian life."

The laboratory reports from Germany and Japan show the system in full flower. The conscripts must have slept through the army's classes in character building.

Unpleasant as is this subject, one has but to consult the press as to what happened right here in Washington in World World II—and no doubt Washington was no worse than other cities. The press of that day carried stories of groups of teen-aged girls who seemed to think it their patriotic duty to consort with servicemen going overseas, because, it was said, they might never return.

This legislation, if adopted, may utterly destroy the desire of our people to remain true to the teachings of our religion, the principles and practices of our forefathers, which have made us strong, charitable, and with at least some respect for decency and honesty.

God save the nation which follows a policy of taking into its innermost councils and permitting the creation and direction of its policies by those who either come from or adhere to the political philosophy which, in other lands, has destroyed freedom, initiative, and the opportunity for either material or spiritual advancement.

I do not criticize Anna Rosenberg, or anyone else who comes to this country to better his condition, or upon arrival, infiltrates into well-paying, policy-making, powerful positions in the Federal Government.

I do criticize them when they attempt to change our system of government. If they do not like, are not satisfied with, our way of life, why do they not stay in their own countries and work out their reforms there?

And I do criticize those of our own citizens who are so intent upon their own businesses, so absorbed in the pursuit of the almighty dollar, in taking their own ease, that they refuse to sacrifice any part of their time, devote their ability to the business of this Government.

It is their neglect of, their indifference to, their duty to participate in the affairs of their Government, which has opened the door to resourceful individuals with ability, but with un-American ideas, to take over, advocate policies which would destroy us.

Earlier in the debate, the Congressman from Mississippi, Mr. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS, put into the RECORD—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 26, pages 1445–1446—a letter written to Mrs. Anna Rosenberg and her reply.

Our colleague's third question was:

Is it contemplated that a trainee may have a free choice of serving with an all white, all Negro, or mixed unit?

Mrs. Rosenberg's answer—and remember she is Assistant Secretary of Defense and one of the advocates of this plan—was a clear, frank "No."

Lowell Mellett, a left-wing, New Deal columnist and an efficient chronic mudslinger, commenting said:

So there it is, the same old ugly issue. Probably others than Senator TAFT would like to see it deferred another 3 years.

Mr. Mellett and other of like ilk, as well as professional agitators who make a profit out of stirring up trouble, may consider the issue an "ugly" one; they may attempt to use it in their vilifying campaign to defeat Senator TAFT, but it is an issue which must some day be solved on its merits, rather than one to be used by conscienceless instigators of class feeling.

I believe in equality of opportunity, regardless of race, color, creed, sex, or state of origin.

To that end I introduced an FEPC bill, to be interpreted by and administered under our judicial system—not by a board or commission appointed to garner votes in some political campaign.

But individuals like Anna Rosenberg, Mellett and some financially minded

professional proponents who use segregation as a political issue, are not satisfied with, do not believe in equality of opportunity for all citizens.

If they would be satisfied with, if they did believe in equality of opportunity, they would not deny to the members of any race, any creed, or any nationality the opportunity—when it would not interfere with the welfare of the Nation—to select their own associates and as, in this instance, serve as they might choose with either an all white, all colored, or mixed unit.

I wish that sometime someone would clearly define, for those of us who are trying to solve the social problems which confront us, the clear line of demarcation between preference and discrimination. To make clear my meaning, when one marries, he or she exercises a preference, and, of necessity, discriminates against every other individual who might desire marriage with the one exercising the preference.

Another question—if there is to be no segregation under UMT because of race, creed, color, or country of origin, are we to segregate because of sex? Or, shortly, will we have the demand that, in the near future, the Waves, the Wacs, the Spars, and the women trainees be thrown into the same training unit with the young men?

In view of the letter from the grandmother, from which I quoted, this query is not absurd.

The grandmother wrote, in effect, that she thought UMT would be good for her two granddaughters. I doubt that she accurately expressed her real thought which, I assume, was that no one should be sent to war untrained and that some kind of discipline would be good, even for her own—again I entertain an assumption—lovely, well-behaved granddaughters.

Russia, Germany, Italy, France, and, no doubt other nations have tried compulsory universal military training.

In every country which has adopted it except two, it has neither brought peace nor victory. In every instance it has either brought or been followed by war, military defeat and economic bankruptcy.

True, Sweden and Switzerland have both had compulsory universal military training and both have remained at peace.

But either is a country which its more powerful neighbors might have, if they so desired, overrun and conquered. But both have followed a policy of avoiding entanglements in the affairs of their neighbors.

Both, by so doing, have been able to remain at peace, to produce and to sell food and munitions of war to neighbors who, notwithstanding their policies of compulsory universal military training, preferred and engaged in war.

We do not need, we will never need, universal military training, with its inevitable regimentation, dictatorship and tyranny, if we will discard our present foreign policy, oust those who follow the Acheson school of thought, adopt a policy similar to that advocated by Churchill for the British Empire.

Our policy should be one similar to that which is followed by the statesmen of every other nation. It should be a policy which will best serve the interest of our own country.

Self-preservation shapes the conduct of all other nations. It must, if the Republic is to continue, determine our policy. And that policy must be interpreted and administered by individuals who have faith in the principles of the Constitution, confidence in the ability, the courage, the determination of our people. It must be interpreted and administered by men whose sole purpose is the welfare, the security of our people and our country.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the subject matter which we are debating this week is the most important of the domestic questions which we may be called upon to consider during this term of Congress. This very debate could well be characterized as the "great debate." We are here considering a proposal which, if it becomes laws, will penetrate every cell of the social structure of the United States, which will affect directly or indirectly every family in the Nation. This is a decision which should cause us to hesitate and to consider carefully. Yet it is a decision which we must face. It will not benefit us or the Nation to turn away from the reality of the evil which faces us, to underestimate its power or fail to make adequate preparations to meet and overcome this evil. This is no time to deceive ourselves with the false optimism of the nineteenth century or that of the twenties of our own century. We must not forget the bitter lesson we have learned in this generation, that evil itself is a progressive force, and that through mass education and mass production, the modern world provides almost unlimited possibilities for its growth.

The question before us is not the pleasant one of proposing means and methods by which the horizons of freedom may be further extended. The question is not one of securing greater freedom for a people already possessing a large measure of freedom but rather one of securing the freedom which we still possess and of giving some assurance to other people, who still value freedom and who still seek it, that their cause is our cause.

It has been argued in the course of this debate that this is not the time to make this decision. I believe that this is a good time to make the basic decision to establish a program of military training which will supplement and complement the program now being carried out under the volunteer and selective service systems. I say it is a good time because we are now in a state between all-out war and an uncertain and precarious peace. At this time it is important that we recall the truth expressed by the historian, W. H. Gardiner, speaking for all people to whom political authority and political responsibility is entrusted:

> We are but the transient trustees of the heritages of all for which the past has lived, charged with administering it for a little while, but surcharged with responsibility of administering today our trust for the future, of our successors and of the world, in such manner that they will not look back upon us as false trustees, who took our present ease instead of performing our perhaps more painful duty as a sound link in the chain of generations.

It would not be becoming to us to avoid this responsibility, to make the easy decision in our own day and to leave the hard and the difficult to the future.

It is an unpleasant fact that persons in authority must always make decisions for a specific situation, the first responsibility of anyone in authority is to make his decision in conformity with conscience. This involves two considerations:

First. Consideration of the rightness or wrongness of the purpose of the action.

Second. Consideration of the justice or injustice and of the appropriateness of the means proposed.

No one to my knowledge, in this debate, has yet declared that a more comprehensive military training program would, in itself, be immoral. There have been general charges that military training in itself is necessarily debasing and demoralizing. This is a charge which cannot be readily supported. The testimony of the former members of the armed services who have spoken here on the floor of the House is in direct contradiction, as is also the fact that the veterans of both World War I and World War II have assumed full responsibility as citizens. I am sure that there is no Member of the House of Representatives who would assert or undertake to prove that the moral integrity of the veterans of these wars is of a lower order than that of other men who did not serve. It is strangely contradictory to find the Members of the Congress of the United States, a Nation which counts among its greatest and honored citizens its military heroes, denouncing military life as necessarily destructive of good character. I do not endorse the argument made by some of the proponents of this measure that military training necessarily perfects the character of those who are subjected to such training. The problem of human personality is much too complex and much too profound to be solved by either of these two simple proposals.

It is to be regretted that simply because we look upon war and military service as unpleasant that we have in a sense, quarantined and set it apart from our view of life. The charge was made on the floor of the House yesterday that military service was a manifestation of materialism. If this is true, then any human activity which has to do with the temporal improvement of man could be labeled materialistic. Actually what has happened is that the service of the soldier has been secularized. It

is a strange thing that we today call upon men to fight for Christianity, yet we deny that there can be a Christian soldier. We assert that Christianity makes good soldiers but deny that in fulfilling the responsibility of a soldier a man may even retain his Christian character, much less improve it.

The general assertion has been made that this proposal is contrary to the American tradition. Actually this is to use very carelessly and loosely the term, "tradition." There is no fixed pattern in the United States with regard to military service, but rather our program has been one of adjustment to the needs and demands of the situations.

At the time of the Revolution we adopted a system which was new in the history of the then modern world. Ours was the first modern attempt at a citizen's army. Our army was drawn directly from the people and it was assumed that all who were able-bodied and who could be spared, had a responsibility to serve. Since that time we have used a multitude of devices, ranging from the volunteer program, and the use of State militia, down to and including the draft and conscription of World War I and World War II, together with the recall of Reserves. The question today is not one of adherence to tradition, but rather one of making decisions based on the needs of the day.

Justice and the demands of the common good argue for the adoption of the program to supplement and complement the present selective-service program. I am sure there is no Member of this body who would openly attempt to justify the grave injustices which were suffered by the members of the various Reserve components who were called back into service as the result of the Korean conflict.

It is not my intention to discuss in any further detail the provisions and effects of this bill. It is my opinion that the committee members and others who have spoken in favor of the bill have established in a satisfactory manner that this legislation will provide a means of maintaining an adequate military establishment; that it will provide this at a smaller cost to the American people and with less serious interruption of the normal peacetime economy and private lives of our citizens.

There are certain technical details in the bill which I do believe should be more carefully drawn. I am hopeful that those perfecting and technical amendments which I understand will be offered will be accepted and that the membership of the House will then give support to this legislation, which, if not immediately necessary, will certainly become necessary if the course of history continues in the direction now indicated.

I do not advocate this program as a permanent institution in the United States, but rather as a temporary and transitional one which, in my opinion, will help us as a nation to meet more effectively the demands which history has imposed upon us, and which will help to establish more quickly and effectively the day of peace among nations.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, is it better to be a living pauper or a dead rich man? Is solvency or survival the issue?

In 1914 all the gold in the treasuries of England, Germany, and Austria did not prevent World War I.

Nor did flashing tomahawks spare the scalps of those who came to America to avoid conscription. Have not the bullets of Europe and Asia, and of those between the States, pierced and shattered with equal fury the bones of their offspring?

History, Mr. Chairman. Count our wars: 1776, 1812, 1846, 1864, 1898, 1914, 1941, 1950. Eight, or an average of one every 22 years.

The bill before this House says to our boys, in effect, "Son, to give you the life you cherish and the land you love, your countrymen have laid down their lives every 25 years. At 18 we want you to be ready to do the same but live to tell the story."

Communist aggressors rock the boat. In 1964, some say, other tyrants will, too.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand a copy of Public Law 51, Eighty-second Congress, the title of which reads:

> An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

Public Law No. 51 became a law during the first session of this Congress. The House on April 13, 1951, approved the bill by a vote of 372 to 44; while the Senate on March 9, 1951, did likewise by a vote of 79 to 5. Therefore, it is possible to say that this Congress, by an overwhelming majority approved the principle of universal military training.

While I am not denying any Member of this body the right to his opinion, in my estimation, when I voted for Public Law 51, I committed myself to the principle of universal military training with the understanding that the National Security Training Commission provided for in Public Law 51 would recommend to Congress a training program together with a set of general rules and regulations setting forth legal rights, disciplinary measures, welfare safeguards, and disability and death benefits for the UMT trainees.

In short, the bill that we have before us, H. R. 5904, is nothing more than a companion bill to the basic legislation passed by this Congress last year providing that before a UMT program could begin—under which youths of 18½ would be given 6 months of basic military training, and then be assigned to the Reserves for 7½ years—legislation would be required to establish a code of conduct for the trainees and to set forth their rights, benefits, and privileges.

When I voted for Public Law 51, last April, I joined 371 of my colleagues who felt as I did, that as a nation, we are confronted with a world situation of such gravity and such unpredictability that we must be prepared for effective action, whether the challenge comes with the speed of sound or is delayed for a lifetime.

If there are any skeptics who treat the international situation lightly, I am sure if they study events in Korea and elsewhere in the world, they will agree that there is no doubt that the Kremlin is determined to communize and dominate the globe, either by direct or indirect aggression, unless the threat of world communism is extinguished.

In my consideration of the necessity of Public Law 51 last year, my study was based principally on my knowledge and experience as a veteran of two world wars, supplemented by my active membership for several years on the House Committee on the Armed Services and on the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

I assure you that politics and my personal feelings were laid aside in considering this vital issue and that one factor alone dominated my thinking: A burning desire to be of service to my country and the American people by providing this Nation with an adequate national defense that would include a strong Reserve program.

Since last year, I am sure that no one present will deny the fact that world conditions have not improved. For 8 months we have been talking of a truce in Korea while Red China has wrested control of the air from us in that area.

As the days go by, we hear constant rumblings from other trouble spots in the world that could challenge the future security of our Nation.

In my opinion there is a greater need today for Public Law 51 than there was a year ago. I base my opinion on the fact that our very existence as a nation is at stake and that this crisis will not only be with us for months but may threaten us for many years if we can rely on Defense Secretary Lovett's statement that—

> This crisis may be with us for 10 or more years.

At the same time Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, said:

> The mobilization plans of this country have been revised to provide for a crisis that may last 50 or 60 years.

Taking Mr. Lovett and Mr. Wilson at their word—and if we cannot take the word of these two prominent Americans, I say in all sincerity, whose word can we take—the Communist threat will be with us for a long time, thus requiring us to keep our guard up, which means maintaining a large standing army at a terrific cost.

At this point I would like to quote United States Senator RICHARD RUSSELL of Georgia, when he said:

> I am an ardent advocate of universal military training because it will enable us to utilize a reserve system rather than maintain a large standing force. The issue is no

longer whether it is desirable to have UMT—it is whether we can exist and stay out of national bankruptcy—without such a system.

Senator RUSSELL continued by saying:

Because there has been no UMT the task of defending the country is not being equally shared. Under our present Reserve system, he points out, at least 85 percent of the trained men in our Armed Forces today are those who served in World War II, so that when trained men are sought, it is necessary to draw on those who have already fought in one or more wars.

In a few words, Senator RUSSELL hit the nail on the head by using two of the most convincing arguments in behalf of UMT. The first and most obvious one has to do with the cost of security, and the second concerns fair play or more equal sharing of the task of defending the Nation.

I believe that every Member of Congress is familiar with my interest in formulating a Reserve program designed to not only give our country a reservoir of trained manpower in the event of a national emergency, but to reduce the staggering cost of maintaining an adequate national defense.

In this connection I want to point to Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, a retirement act for the Reserves, and Public Law 783, Eighty-first Congress, providing for the utilization of joint training facilities such as armories, National Guard camps, and so forth. In addition, I call to your attention the Reserve bill that the House passed last year and which is now pending in the Senate that provides a complete program for Reserve personnel.

Then, too, the House Committee on Armed Services is scheduled to examine the over-all ROTC program and also consider bills that will provide promotion and an equalization of rights and benefits to the Reserves of the Nation. But most important of all is the fact that when this Congress passed Public Law 51 last year, establishing UMT, it was then recognized as being part of the new Reserve program and the bill that is now before us is necessary to put Public Law 51 in effect and to round out the over-all Reserve program.

Briefly, here is the new Reserve program that many of us have been working on for the past several years. First, Selective Service will act as a procurement agency of manpower, channeling annually into the Universal Military Training Corps 800,000 young men at the age of 18½ years and who, after 6 months of basic military training, will be further channeled into the various Reserve units located in the vicinity of their homes, where they will serve 7½ years. As a member of the Ready Reserves, they will participate in weekly drills and take 2 weeks of summer training for a period of 3 years, at the conclusion of which they will become members of the Stand-by Reserve, where they will only be required to take 15 days of summer training contingent on appropriations being made for that purpose. Weekly drills, however, will be optional. The necessary commissioned officers to supervise this over-all Reserve program will come from the pool of officers we have today, as well as from the graduates of ROTC and officer candidate schools in the future.

In other words, without UMT this over-all Reserve program will be lifeless because the manpower will not be available to make up the vast reservoir of trained reserves necessary to augment our Regular forces in times of national emergency. May I add, that these reserves cannot be called to active duty for periods of 30 days or more unless the Congress of the United States authorizes the President to do so.

From the standpoint of the cost of national defense—and I think my figures are just as good as anybody else's—to maintain either an officer or an enlisted man in active duty, including uniforms, training, pay, food, equipment and so-forth—it costs the American taxpayers about $11,000 annually. On the other hand, to maintain a reserve, it will cost for 1 year, an average expenditure of $434.

Therefore, with a strong Reserve force available, when world conditions permit, the personnel strength of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps can be reduced to the lowest possible number and thus reduce at the same time, the tremendous cost of maintaining an adequate national defense.

No doubt the thought arises as to the cost of the annual training for 800,000 UMT trainees. According to the best estimates available, the annual cost of the program will be two and one-half billion dollars. Even with this additional cost of the UMT program, you are going to drastically reduce the over-all cost of maintaining an adequate national defense by billions of dollars while at the same time having the assurance of a reservoir of trained reserves ready to meet any national emergency.

Getting away from the cost factor for the moment, one of the compelling reasons that caused me to support the principle of UMT was the shabby treatment accorded thousands upon thousands of reservists and members of the National Guard who served in World War II. Thousands of them are now suffering a second major disruption in their lives and careers, because of our short-sighted policy in not preparing younger men to answer the call to the defense of their country. The inequities and hardships resulting from the hit and miss policies of the Department of Defense is a disgrace, and I doubt whether any one of you will challenge that statement.

As Senator RUSSELL said, nearly 85 percent of the trained men in our armed services today are veterans of World War I and World War II, who were recalled to active duty and torn away from their loved ones and their jobs in civilian life.

Unless we provide a balanced UMT and a strong Reserve program, these same reserves who have already fought in two wars will, with their comrades in the Korean War, be called upon to defend this Nation again in the event of another national emergency.

Therefore, I ask you in all sincerity, is not the defense of this Nation to be shared equally by every mother's son—and not shouldered almost entirely by those who have defended our flag in previous wars?

For a few moments, let us talk about these reserves, the great majority of whom are veterans of World War I and World War II, and who are now on active duty, having been recalled as reservists.

Those who know of my interest in fair play for the reserves, have flooded me with letters in support of universal military training as a means of distributing the responsibility of fighting America's wars on the shoulders of all and not on just a few.

Before reading excerpts from these letters from reservists, I want to assure you that they are not propaganda letters, but come from the hearts of young men who are now fighting their second and third wars.

First. From an Army Reserve captain, now on active duty, I quote the following:

The general opinion among the Reserves is that the UMT bill would lessen the chances of being recalled again in the event of mobilization. Most of them are married, have families, and feel that they have done their part, and should be given a chance to build up their home life without interruption.

I personally think a little military training for all young men would greatly benefit not only the individual but also our country. I cannot agree with those people who feel that Army life would hurt the morals of our young men. On the contrary it would strengthen the morals, build up character and confidence, and make better citizens. Certainly a young man in college away from home and living in dormitories and boarding houses has a greater opportunity to go wild than those in the Army.

Second. From a Reserve first sergeant on active duty, I quote the following observation:

Universal military training will give this country the strength and power it has to maintain and to protect what so many lives were lost for during World War I and II. In time of a national emergency, 10 to 12 months time are wasted in preparing personnel for combat duty. This is lost time. UMT would reduce this to a period of 1 to 3 months and give us completely trained men at all times. Many a sacrifice was made during our last two wars and many unnecessary lives were lost. Let's don't be caught napping again.

Third. From another Reserve sergeant on active duty, I quote the following:

Being inducted into the Army at an age of 18 during World War II, I am a firm believer that 6 months of military training will greatly benefit our young men by strengthening their moral standards and ability to get along with people in the world.

Fourth. Here is another quotation from a letter written by a Reserve sergeant recalled to active duty:

UMT gives a young man at the age of high-school graduation a chance to be on his own and teach him how to handle money. It gives him the opportunity to adjust himself socially to other people. It gives him the added advantage of training at a pace that would not be possible in the event of war.

Furthermore, I would favor UMT for my own son because under proper guidance there will not be open trails to drunkenness and vice.

Fifth. The following quotation is from the letter of another reservist recalled to active duty:

The reasons why I favor UMT are because I am a veteran of World War II with a total of 39½ months' duty. I was recalled to active military service involuntarily and have served 18 months to this present date. I believe UMT will favor my early release because I have done my share and feel these boys with no service owe their country and us veterans a debt. Also, it will build a strong Reserve which we need in the world situation today. The boys who are affected by the UMT will pull a shorter tour of duty than if drafted.

Sixth. Another reservist recalled to active duty says:

I think that the UMT is a good thing. It will do the young men a lot of good, and, at the same time, they will be prepared to fight, if another war comes.

Seventh. The following observation is made by a reservist recalled to active duty after having served 39 months in World War II:

The UMT in my opinion would be the best thing that ever happened to this country due to the condition of the world, which, in detail, means that the United States must maintain a standing army and also have a considerable amount of trained men in reserve.

Eighth. Here are the views of a reservist with a long service record in World War II and now recalled to active duty:

I favor UMT because men could be prepared for foreign duty much faster if they had these 6 months prior basic training.

As long as people live on this earth there will be wars—so there has to be a means of keeping men trained to protect our country.

Ninth. Here are several reasons advanced by another reservist for approval of the UMT training program:

A. I have been a veteran of World War II, and have served 18 months in the present crisis, which in the UMT bill will relieve me of my duties. I am married and have two children.

B. It is good training and educating for the young man.

C. It will help the young man stand on his own two feet, and face the world in reality.

D. In the Army, religion is stressed and good clean living is urged.

E. It will help relieve juvenile delinquency among the younger generation.

F. It will make a good sturdy citizen of our young man.

G. It will help keep our young man from rowdiness and poolrooms.

Tenth. A master sergeant reservist, now recalled, has the following to say in support of UMT:

I favor UMT because I know that due to present world conditions we must maintain an Armed Force to meet any aggression. The cost of maintaining such a large standing Army would wreck the economy of the country, so a Ready Reserve is necessary. As fighting wars is everybody's business, I think that universal training is the only answer, that every young man receive the training that may save his life at some future time. From personal observation in World War II I saw such training pay off. I mean that those individuals who were lucky enough to receive long training survived. Those units who had people with very little training were soon wiped out in combat.

The main points that have been raised against UMT are by church groups protesting that vices are easily picked up by young soldiers. I agree that this is not desirable, but have found that only a very small minority of the draftees now in service drink or go to houses of prostitution.

However, I agree that all UM trainees be protected and guided away from such vices. I think that this will be done. From the military standpoint, it is only good sense, so I think that the church-group objections are unfounded.

One other point has been made against UMT—that is the one about militarism. In this country I feel that that can never happen. The citizens of this country have always fought the wars and have always had a foreign feeling for the military-caste system, have not liked it, and would have no desire to become part of it. They'd want to do the job and get out.

As far as the cost is concerned, it would be a hundred times less to maintain UMT than to maintain a standing army the same size, and either one or the other is a necessity.

Eleventh. A corporal in the Reserves now on active duty expresses his views as follows:

I favor UMT because first, I feel that a young man after leaving high school, once he enters the Armed Forces, learns the duty of a soldier and how to defend himself and his country. It also puts him in contact with other people so that he learns how to get along with other people. It puts him on his own, especially when away from home, and this way he depends more on himself and is able to do his own work or any extra duties that he is not trained for. By being on his own he is able to use his own reasoning and initiative.

In my case, I am 24 years old, married, no children, high-school graduate, and have found that I have improved mentally and physically since I have been in the service.

I heartily favor UMT because my experience has been something I would not exchange. I feel that such training as I have received would do all young men a lot of good and that UMT is necessary for the future security of this Nation.

In addition to the excerpts read to you from reservists' letters, let me quote from a letter I received from a teacher of the senior class in a high school in my congressional district. Keep in mind that if the UMT training program is put into operation, the young men of this class will be among the first trainees:

From a survey taken of the senior class, after a discussion of UMT, we find that about 60 percent are for universal military training and 40 percent against it.

Here is an interesting quotation from the letter I received from the parents of three teen-age boys:

My wife and I talked the military situation over a few weeks ago and we are in favor of universal military training—George, Jr., is in the advanced ROTC at State college; Wilbur will be 18 this April, and Bob will be 16 next month. As parents of three boys who no doubt will all see service, we feel the UMT program is the best.

It is only fair to say at this point that I have received a lot of mail in opposition to UMT and I have read every single communication, and appreciate and respect the viewpoints expressed. On the other hand, I have received more letters from constituents who favor UMT. Up until the time I left my office today, I have the signatures of 1,131 persons in support of UMT, with 321 persons recorded as opposed to it.

For an illustration, from the city of Altoona, Pa., 427 persons favor UMT and 8 have expressed opposition to it. From State College, Pa., 124 are for UMT with 9 against it. Eighty-six residents of Williamsburg, Pa., oppose UMT and there are no letters in favor of it. Roaring Springs, Pa., has a total of 145 in favor of UMT with 50 opposed to it. The same ratio for and against UMT applies generally to other communities in my congressional district.

I realize that in legislating, you should look with caution on organized campaigns that produce a flood of telegrams, letters, post cards, and petitions, all in identical language.

As I have said with respect to UMT, I have read every communication received on the subject and I appreciate the views of my constituents. But representing some 300,000 residents of the Twenty-second District of Pennsylvania, I have the responsibility of making decisions on legislative matters and must for the greater part, base such decisions on information I have at my fingertips regarding world conditions.

When I voted last year for Public Law 51, authorizing universal military training, I adhered strictly to this policy and I intend to do so with reference to H. R. 5904, the bill we are now considering.

At this time, I would like to comment on the position many opponents of UMT are taking, when they say it is unChristianlike and will destroy the morals of the youth of America. As a Christian and as a veteran of two world wars, I refuse to subscribe to such sentiments.

To a great extent, we owe our liberty and freedom that we boast of today to the sacrifices of over 19,000,000 American youths who fought America's two global wars. Many of them are back in uniform today, while a great number of them gave their lives in defense of our American ideals. The remainder of these 19,000,000 veterans who are still living, are respected citizens and as you know, reside in every hamlet, town, and city in this great Nation. To infer that the morals of these patriots have been debased by their military service, is an indictment against a segment of our population whose defense of this Nation has earned them gratitude and not slurs on their character.

Then too, the charge that UMT will create a militaristic state is ridiculous and the height of folly. We had over 15,000,000 men and women in uniform during World War II and we heard no cry of their patriotic service as being likely to lead us into a police state.

Despite the arguments advanced for and against UMT, the real issue in my opinion, is whether UMT as a peacetime measure, will preserve and defend the United States of America and distribute the responsibility of service to country in an equal manner and not saddle it on those who have previously been in uniform in one or two global wars or in Korea.

Last year when the House considered what is now Public Law 51, a bill authorizing universal military training,

many of you Members came to me and asked whether or not UMT was a peacetime program, and if it should become a law when would it be inaugurated. My reply to you gentlemen was that UMT as now provided for in Public Law 51 was definitely a peacetime program and that either the President or Congress could "pull the trigger" to inaugurate the program, but only after selective service had been terminated. That was my understanding and I am convinced that when 372 of us approved the legislation in the House, that was the general understanding that prevailed.

When H. R. 5904, the bill which is now before us and which provides the type of training program and establishes a code of conduct for the trainees and sets forth their rights, benefits, and privileges, was initially explained to the House Committee on the Armed Services in executive session, I challenged the provisions that were designed to permit the immediate inauguration of this UMT program while selective service was still in effect.

The chairman of the House Committee on the Armed Services and the members of that committee will recall that I said: "In my opinion the provisions of this bill, H. R. 5904, that will permit UMT to be put in operation alongside of selective service, by calling up 65,000 young men, will not only confuse Members of Congress, but in reality will sabotage the entire UMT program." Today it is apparent that my prophecy is likely to come true, because, in my opinion, the majority of the House will not vote for a UMT program while the draft is in progress.

As I have said before, my interest in UMT is not only from the standpoint of reducing the cost of maintaining an adequate national defense, but to make certain that in fighting future wars, the veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war will not be called upon again to don their uniforms. In addition, when the draft is stopped, I want a peacetime UMT program that will distribute equally and without favor the responsibility of every young man to defend his country.

When this bill is being read on the floor of the House next week, I will offer several amendments, but principally the following one, designed to make UMT a definite peacetime program. My proposed amendment reads as follows:

> Notwithstanding any provisions of law, no person shall be inducted into the corps until such time as all inductions for service in the Armed Forces shall have ceased.

If the majority of the Members of the House will support my amendment, it simply means that when the draft of manpower ends, a peacetime UMT program will be inaugurated, and the young men of the Nation, when reaching the age of 18½ years will be given 6 months of basic military training, after which they will be channeled into a Reserve unit nearest their homes, thus providing a huge reservoir of trained manpower, the only insurance policy this Nation has against world aggression.

In conclusion, I want to state again that my sole interest in Public Law 51 and in this bill, H. R. 5904, is in the overall Reserve program that many of us have been working on for the past several years. Despite my vote in favor of Public Law 51 last year, which authorized universal military training, my position on this bill, H. R. 5904, will be determined only when this bill has been finally perfected and if the bill contains a provision making it a peacetime UMT program which was the conception many of us had of the legislation when the basic law authorizing universal military training was passed last year.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, my eloquent colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], with whom I have served on the Armed Services Committee for a number of years, and other speakers have referred to the pending bill as a measure for peacetime conscription. If I could believe that there is a reasonable probability of a return to normal peacetimes in this unhappy world within the foreseeable future, I would join them now in opposition to this measure, as I have done in the past when similar measures were under consideration.

But Mr. Chairman, after a lifetime of opposition to any form of compulsory military service in America in peacetime, I have reluctantly reached the conclusion that so long as the present menacing condition of world affairs continues the safety of our Nation requires a stable military reserve force of sufficient strength to discourage any enemy attack. A review of our fluctuating national defense policies during the past half century has convinced me that the only practical program for achieving this sustained reserve military strength is the establishment of a system of training for all of the young men of America.

Since the beginning of the present century our national defense policies have been devoid of any semblance of stability. They have vacillated between extremes of strength and weakness so frequently that cynics have compared our military program to a political roller coaster which jittered from peaks of mobilization in periods of national crisis to dangerous depths of unpreparedness in times of fancied calm.

Shortly before the outbreak of World War I in June 1916 we had a total of 179,000 men in our Armed Forces. Under the spur of war this number skyrocketed upward until, by Armistice Day, November 11, 1918, the total had reached 4,282,000. Then the pendulum swung into reverse at a dizzying pace. In less than 2 years after the end of World War I the number of men under arms was back down to 344,000.

The downward trend continued for another 2 years. Then the size of our Armed Forces reached another low level which continued from 1922 to 1935. The number of men on duty during those years ranged between 243,845 and 270,027. By June 30, 1939, shortly before Hitler invaded Poland, the total climbed to 334,473. When France fell, a year later, our strength was still short of half a million. The exact figure was 458,297 on June 30, 1940.

It was not until the Selective Service Act was passed on September 16, 1940, that rapid increase of military manpower got under way. Even then our progress was far from assured. Continuation of selective service squeezed through Congress by the margin of a single vote the following year, only a few months before Pearl Harbor. When we entered into actual conflict, under conditions of total war, all restraints were dropped. We reached a peak strength of 12,124,418 on May 31, 1945.

After VJ-day we began the familiar process of casting away our strength with breakneck speed. By March 31, 1948, despite the evidences of Soviet duplicity in the United Nations, our strength had sunk to a postwar low of 1,398,726.

The facts of Soviet imperialism forced a new upswing. Selective Service was reactivated and our strength climbed to 1,668,492 on January 31, 1949. Emphasis on budget economies again reversed the trend. The number of men in service slipped off to 1,460,261 on June 30, 1950. Again an acute crisis forced us to swift action. The outbreak of hostilities in Korea started us on the road to a force adequate to provide genuine security. On March 21, 1951, General Marshall was able to inform the President that we had more than doubled the force we had when the Communists made their unprovoked attack across the thirty-eighth parallel on June 25, 1950. Our present strength is more than 3,500,000 and our immediate goal is a total of 3,700,000 to be attained as soon as possible.

The peak and valley concept of defense which has marked our past record has been extremely wasteful. It has provided no real security. On the contrary, during the past 3 decades this Nation has been involved in three wars, two of them among the greatest and most destructive in all history. Our vacillation has invited disregard and, indeed, contempt by other nations for our peaceful purposes. It has encouraged the belief among those aggressors who conspire to destroy us that we will always relax our vigilance if they delay any overt attack long enough.

Certain foreign writers have expressed the opinion that Russia's foreign policy might have been very different in recent years if the United States had not stripped itself of reserve military manpower after the end of World War II. But the Armed Services, for reasons which they have never explained, deliberately ignored the mandate of Congress, which was contained in the Selective Service Act of 1940 and was specifically extended by Congress when the old Selective Service Act expired, requiring that the veterans of World War II should be placed in a Reserve status for a period of 10 years after they were discharged from active service.

For a time it appeared that the Services might comply with these directives, but the Judge Advocate General of the War Department came to the conclusion that the President had authority to grant unconditional discharges under another Act of Congress. The Armed Services thereafter proceeded to discharge the millions of men who had

served in World War II without transferring them to any Reserve status, and the major purpose of Congress to create a large trained reserve was defeated.

It was then that Communist Russia started its program of promoting wars—cold and hot—in widely scattered sections of the world—wars which the men of the Kremlin have cunningly contrived to have fought by the people of other nations, while they artfully preserved their own manpower and military resources.

At the same time the American people, deluded by political programs of false economy, had permitted our other defenses to sink to a new low level, which encouraged our present enemies to believe, as Hitler and Mussolini had done before them, that the democratic form of government is essentially weak and vacillating, and easy to overthrow.

Of course it is true that modern wars cannot be won by manpower alone. But it is equally true that our enemies regard manpower as a vitally important factor in military preparedness and lean heavily upon it in actual warfare, as has been demonstrated in Korea. We know that the nations which are our potential enemies today have reserves of trained manpower which are numerically far greater than we can hope to muster. With this grim reality confronting us, it would be suicidal for the American people to fail to develop all of our military resources, including manpower, for any emergency which may occur in the future.

Scan the world horizons as you will, my colleagues, you can discern no sign of real and enduring peace.

Today we are confronted again with a spectacle of stark realism in far away areas of this blood-stained world—a spectacle of ruthless aggression which can only be resisted by military power. This hideous spectacle has convinced me that the only way to preserve the liberties and the freedoms of the American way of life is to make and keep all of our national defenses so strong that no foe will dare to attack us.

That is why I am supporting this bill.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the main issue of the controversy now before us has largely been obscured by the smoke of battle. That is, whether or not the passage of this measure, permitting the Congress or the President to put into effect universal military training at any time, will enhance the security of our country.

Our very able, distinguished, and much-beloved chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], said in the well of this House on Tuesday last, and I quote:

> War can be brought to our own shores in a matter of hours.

I accept that statement, because I recognize in our chairman one of the best-qualified men in the country to report to us whether our country is in immediate danger. He has so reported. Therefore, should we use our money, our matériel, and our manpower all in one direction, namely, the selective service, build it up quickly, as rapidly, and as strongly as we can to be able to meet this threat? Or should we divide our powers by setting up a universal military training program on one side and having selective service on the other, dividing our money, our matériel, and our manpower between the two? Which will strengthen America the most at the moment? And our chairman says the danger is imminent. I think the answer to that question is obvious: We should give everything we have now to selective service, because we have it. We will save money by so doing.

That brings up another question: Much talk has been had on the floor of this House about the cost, and the statement has been made many times that ultimately we will save upward of $13,000,000,000. Assuming that is true, what about the present situation? Will we save it this year, next year, 5 years from now, or 10 years from now? No one has told me when this saving will be effected. What about today? The testimony before our committee is to the effect that the first year it will cost $4,000,000,000 and $2,000,000,000 or more each year for some time to come. My experience with Army estimates as to what things will cost is generally that they are about 50 percent of the actual cost.

I am asking you, Will it strengthen the security of the country to burden our economy with additional expense now? Or will it weaken it? How can we pass a bill in this House that will make possible the expenditure of $4,000,000,000 or more the first year in addition to what we are now expending without at the same time voting another bill to increase the taxes on the American people?

Disregarding whether it may be a saving in the long run, are we not today interested with the concern of America now and the threat to our shores now? I am not an expert and I do not propose to be an expert on whether or not universal military training put into operation in the year 1952 will increase the security of our country, keep it as it is now, or decrease it; but I have some very good authority on pages 2454 and 2455 of the hearings. I quote. I am the interrogator:

> Mr. CUNNINGHAM. General Collins, do you feel, in your opinion, the security of America would be increased by putting UMT into effect in 1952?
>
> General COLLINS. Yes; I do.
>
> Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Well, when you say that are you not indicting the present Selective Service System?
>
> General COLLINS. No; I am not.
>
> Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Well, just why would it increase it and how?
>
> General COLLINS. Well, it would increase it not as of 1952, frankly, but as of 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960.

Then again on page 2455 this question directed to General Collins, Chief of Staff of the Army:

> Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In an emergency. I haven't yet seen how this program would increase the security of America at the present time.
>
> General COLLINS. At the present time, no. I would agree with you.

There is additional colloquy on the page but I have read the questions and the direct answer of General Collins that it would not increase the security of America now. Our chairman has said that the danger is now. Then why go to something that will not increase it? Why not put everything we have toward the instrumentality, the organization we already have built up to secure America that is working satisfactorily?

There is another part of this bill that bothers me and I have not had a very satisfactory answer, although it is answered in a way in the hearings, and that is what the effect on our National Guard will be. Remember that the Constitution of the United States says that each of the several States shall have an organized militia. A gentleman testified before our committee, General Walsh, president of the National Guard Association of the United States, and I quote from the hearings, pages 2852 and 2853 as follows:

> Mr. CUNNINGHAM. General Walsh, as I understood the testimony, you believe that if the bill is passed that is now before us without amendment, it would mean ultimately the end of the National Guard?
>
> General WALSH. Exactly.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. What?
>
> Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It would mean the end of the National Guard ultimately.
>
> General WALSH. Exactly. If all the other Reserve groups, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, are going to have this product channeled into those calls, and we are to get none, then it is the end.

Then on page 2853 our distinguished chairman went back to this question, and I quote the following:

> The CHAIRMAN. Let me clear up one question that the general answered to Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. CUNNINGHAM said if this bill passes like it is, what effect it has on the National Guard and the general answered that is the end of the National Guard.
>
> General WALSH. In due course.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. What?
>
> General WALSH. In due course.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. In what?
>
> General WALSH. In due course.
>
> The CHAIRMAN. In due course. Well, I would like to know—you have been getting along pretty well for the last 20 years when we didn't have any law like this on the statute books.
>
> General WALSH. We didn't have any UMT for the last 20 years, Mr. Chairman.

You may wonder why this bill in its present form would mean the end of the National Guard, as contemplated by General Walsh. I believe I can tell you. It would kill it by strangulation and suffocation. The armed services branches here in Washington and this Commission would have the sole power to determine what, if any, of these troops were channeled into the National Guard. As a former officer of the National Guard I know how difficult it is to get recruits. I know it would be more difficult once this bill is put into operation. Therefore, they would be wholly dependent upon a group in Washington as to whether or not the National Guard remains in existence. I say that is too much power to put into the hands of any man or any group of men.

This bill should have a provision making it mandatory that enough of these trainees be channeled into the National

Guard to keep it up to a definite or required strength.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I have this further question that bothers me about the bill before us and that is it is permanent. It has no limit. Just what does that mean? Let us say it goes into effect and after some years the people of the United States, or a sufficient number of them, do not want it. It is stated that it can come up for review and that the Congress can repeal it at any time. Oh, yes; but could the Congress get a two-thirds vote to pass it over a Presidential veto if it should be vetoed? I think there should be a time limit on this, a definite period, so that it could come up for reconsideration and review and if the people do not want it it might be wiped off the books by a simple majority vote and not have the necessity of getting a two-thirds majority.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I have in mind offering an amendment which will do the very thing the gentleman suggests should be done; that is, imposing a time limit on this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. I expect there will be amendments offered by the dozen to take care of objections made on the floor; but I ask the gentleman from New York, why was that not done in committee? I do not believe a bill of this controversial nature should be written on the floor of the House. It should be written in committee. I say right here and now as a member of that committee we could have done a better job.

Mr. COLE of New York. Let me answer the gentleman. The gentleman has been here for nearly if not more than a decade and he knows that every dollar the Government spends for universal military training each year must be appropriated by this Congress. If this Congress does not like the UMT it can refuse to appropriate a single dollar.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I know that, I have heard that statement a dozen times, but is it not ridiculous to pass the buck to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman does not deny that to be the fact?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No, I do not.

Mr. Chairman, an atmosphere of hysteria has been built up around this bill due to present world conditions. This is being used as a reason for action now rather than considering the issue coolly and calmly in light of the true facts and whether or not it will increase the security of America now. A bill that will not stand on its own feet in the light of day should never be passed in darkness.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, it is never pleasant for me to disagree with my esteemed colleagues on the committee. But it is necessary for me to follow my conscience and adhere to my own deep convictions on this crucial matter, and that is just what I propose to do.

Let me state, to begin with, that my opposition to this measure is not based upon the view that we do not presently need a strong, powerful national defense to protect the Nation in the grave crisis confronting us. I think that my views in favor of a great and overwhelming armed services establishment comprising air power, naval power, and a modernized army are generally well known to the Members of the House as they are to my own constituents.

It will be recalled that at a previous time when some high officials of this Government were engaged in cutting back our armed services in the name of a false, misguided economy, that I stood steadfastly and vigorously with those on the committee and in the House who were opposing such unwise curtailments, pointing to the dangers that would follow their adoption and urging the rebuilding and the material expansion and strengthening of all our Armed Forces.

It will be recalled, if I may make this statement with pardonable pride, that I was the very first one in this House to introduce legislation calling for the building up of our postwar Air Force to the point where it would constitute an overwhelming striking force capable of instantaneous action, not only to defend the country but to visit swift and terrible retaliation against any nation which dared to attack us or those parts of the free world essential to our security.

It was my thought at that time, as it is today, that we could not move too speedily to create a large fleet of supertranscontinental and intercontinental strategic bombers and other suitable fully modernized aircraft, capable of carrying atomic bombs and every other type of effective explosive weapons to the very heart land of the enemy.

I also urged at various times the speedy construction of appropriate radar screens, the expansion and implementation of the broadest kind of guided-missiles program, the assembling of a great fleet of modernized tanks, the revitalization of our naval forces, the expansion and reorganization of our Army based on modern concepts of warfare, fully mechanized, fully trained in scientific and technological techniques, and fully equipped with the latest and most modern military devices and weapons.

I also favored and worked for the building up of the National Guard and Reserve programs which have been to such amazing extent deliberately neglected and demoralized since the war so that some sort of a case could be made out here for UMT, which, of course, would utilize high-ranking Pentagon officers and officers of the Regular forces in contrast to the National Guard and Reserve programs which largely utilize non-Regular officers drawn largely from our home communities and from among our veterans.

In other words, my colleagues, I have been sincerely and persistently advocating for some time past measures designed to build the best and strongest possible armed strength for the United States so that we might have, not only a lever for our ofttimes hapless diplomacy, but also that we might hold in our hands the best possible answer to the challenge of the Soviets, the answer of freemen, not slaves, to the threats of Russian aggression and the defense of the United States and the other democracies should it become necessary at any time to protect our cherished freedom and to uphold the values of western civilization.

So I want it to be very distinctly understood that in vigorously opposing this UMT measure that I am at the same time an advocate and a supporter of an impregnable and most powerful armed strength for the Nation.

At this point I would also like to discuss my attitude toward the military. I have heard the military criticized on many occasions just as they are now being criticized on the floor of the House for the vast propaganda efforts and the great pressure machine that they have so materially helped to build in order to take maximum advantage of artificially created hysteria and a sense of crisis in order to put this ill-advised measure through the Congress. This is not the first time that such methods have been used. They were used even throughout the war to try to draft nurses and to try to pass a universal manpower bill which would draft into the national service every man and woman between the ages of 18 and 65. Some of these very ill-considered measures were actually passed by the House, only to die on the other side of the Capitol when the force of an aroused public opinion and maturity of national judgment were able to work upon them.

But I must make it clear that I desire to acknowledge, and I think this fact should be stressed here in this Congress, that the leaders of the armed services as a whole have made, and are making, tremendous contributions to the security and safety of the Nation and to the establishment and conduct of the great national defense so necessary at this time in our history.

The fact that I have disagreed with the military at various times and with respect to various policies has in no wise diminished the high regard which I hold and the admiration, respect, and esteem which I feel for the great ability, zeal, and patriotism of the large body of faithful men, and women too, who are serving the Nation in high military positions.

It is my desire and intention to debate this question just as I have endeavored to think it out, strictly on its merits, and strictly on the basis of whether it is practicable, feasible, necessary for the defense of the Nation, in agreement with our national patterns and traditions, and a proper way to try to build up our Armed Forces.

Many people who are supporting this measure forget that this is a democracy, not an autocracy; that this is a free Government, not a dictatorship; that the American people are a free people and not slaves.

We have historically recognized that in this Nation military power is always subordinate to the civilian authority, and that is a sound principle of American political philosophy and law.

What we have failed to recognize is that coercion, regimentation, enslavement of young American boys is not in accord with these principles and could be justified only by an extreme emergency, and then on only a temporary basis to last as long as the emergency should exist.

This is not Hitler's Germany. This is not Stalin's Russia. This is not even Attlee's England. No man has a vested interest in the Government of the United States, and no man or group of men have the right under color of law, or otherwise, to take away the basic liberties of the American people. The idea of taking 18-year-old boys in peacetime away from their homes, their schools, their churches, their spiritual advisers and leaders, their parents, and drafting them into the armed services is repugnant to American ideals, destructive to American morale, and in time would lead to a pattern of dictatorship in this country.

I know what many of the sponsors of UMT are saying, that it will be a good thing for these boys to be taken into the Army camps where some of them can be fully clothed, properly fed, medically served, and appropriately indoctrinated with American ideals. The patronizing argument runs something like this: "It is a good thing for these boys, so many of whom come from low-grade environments, to be given some discipline and to be compelled to submit to authority. It will make better men of them. Besides, it will feed and clothe them better than at home, and train and educate them better than their teachers and their parents. We will make better citizens out of them."

To my mind such arguments are not only specious, but they are surcharged with fallacy of the worst kind. For the most part, the parents of America know how to bring up their children. The schools and colleges of America know how to teach and instruct them, and religious leaders of America of every denomination, who are almost universal and active and outspoken in their opposition to this measure, can inculcate them with spiritual values and patriotic ideals better than any one in the Army can.

This argument is derived from a superior, supercilious attitude toward our young men and their parents and their teachers and their ministers, priests, and rabbis. It presupposes that certain people in this Nation, because of some self-impressed and self-designated superpatriotism, must, in the spirit of benevolent despotism, take over the training of young men and shape and mold them into good citizens after their own fashion.

How can we know into whose hands this great power of indoctrinating, of shaping, of modeling our young men, will ultimately fall? Will it be merely the militarists, or will it be Fascists, or even pro-Communists, who will indoctrinate and train them? These are questions that every Member of the House should pose for himself before he votes on this measure, because this proposal is not merely to deal with an emergency. This proposal is meant to deal with American youth of every future generation. This is regular peacetime conscription of the type practiced in the past to the sorrow and disaster of many of the great monarchial nations of Europe, who found in the long run that it furnished absolutely no guaranty against aggression, but in most cases brought the nations adopting it and practicing it down into the shambles of conquest, decadence, degeneration, and ruin.

Is it any wonder that great thoughtful patriotic spiritual leaders throughout the entire country are opposing this measure so wholeheartedly and almost unanimously? They well see the destruction of ideals and values of American life which is entailed in this measure.

The labor unions are almost unanimous in their opposition to UMT, because their leaders well know what dictatorship and dictatorial government hold for working men and women, and they well know that in the end, as all history proves, such measures can lead only to the chains of bondage and enslavement. The farm and agricultural organizations, the country over, are dismayed by this proposal, as they have been by the inequities of the operation of selective service, and they are largely opposing it.

Teachers and educational associations, and leaders in the schools and colleges have spoken out against this unwise measure, because they know it will do irreparable violence to the entire structure of American education—the best in the world.

But it is in the homes of America, among the fathers and mothers and sisters and brothers of the boys whom this measure would herd into totalitarian regimentation that the strongest, if not always articulate, opposition comes.

But, believe me, there will come a time next November when all these groups of people will have the chance to express themselves—the churches, the workers, and farmers of America, the educators, the relatives, the parents—all the vast company of loyal Americans who abhor dictatorship of any kind will have their opportunity to speak and to act. They will not be inarticulate then. They will amply demonstrate their resentment of efforts to regiment our boys into an unnecessary peacetime conscription, indenture, and serfdom. They will then record their determination to protect our freedom and our way of life on that day of all days when they can choose their representatives in this Capitol.

I would like to supplement somewhat my statements about the Reserve program. Everyone knows that the Reserve program has been shamefully neglected in order to justify UMT. Everyone knows that the Defense Department has not spent the money which various Congresses have appropriated since the end of the war to build up our Reserves.

Despite this failure, however, the fact is that we now have a sizable Reserve of over two and a half million men, including large numbers of veterans, who have voluntarily enlisted. The great leaders of the Reserves have been put in the position of mendicants begging the Department "to do something with what we have now," to quote General Evans who is in charge of the program.

The Volunteer Reserve should have been trained and compensated for drills, and screened to eliminate the unfit. There was nothing wrong with the procedure, but for five long years virtually nothing was done to interest these officers and men to keep themselves properly trained and ready for call. That is the testimony.

The National Guard had the same experience. As General Walsh, president of its association, testified, if all Army and Air National Guard units and organizations had been phased into the active military service in an orderly fashion in connection with the present emergency, many of our manpower difficulties would have been resolved, particularly where veterans were concerned.

We all know the terrible inequities and injustices that accompanied the recall of veterans who, in so many cases, were compelled to give up their little businesses, their plans for homemaking and family life, and jobs holding out the promise of a bright future, because they were "not properly phased," to use the language of General Walsh.

The evidence is that at a time when the Defense Department should have been planning to expand and build up the Reserves it was following the opposite course of cutting them back, removing incentives, slowing down the Reserve recruitment program, and generally putting the damper on both the Reserves and the National Guard.

The evidence is that if the Army had done its duty and supported the Guard and the Reserves and made a sincere, earnest, and determined effort to build them up, there would be no need of UMT.

To illustrate, in 1949 we had 18,000 units in the United States. By an order of October 1949, issued by the Chief of Staff, these Reserves were cut to 9,000 units. UMT will do nothing whatever to build up the Reserves, because under this proposal, apart from brief annual training for 7½ years, the trainee is subject to call only when the President, or rather the Congress, declares an emergency, and he cannot be compelled to join a drilling or training unit of the Reserves.

Moreover, it is clear that in the event trainees are called in an emergency they will to all intents and purposes have to be trained all over again. They will have to be physically reconditioned and brought up to date on the latest weapons and developments. That is the undisputed evidence.

Great military experts believe that UMT would be a definite handicap to the national defense. This view is set forth by the celebrated Hanson W. Baldwin in the New York Times, February 15, 1935.

Pointing to the discrimination in the UMT program—different pay, different training, and different privileges—he stated that—

There are many within the military service who have grave misgivings about the present legislation and are anxious to see any attempt to implement it deferred at least

for the duration of the present emergency. Some of these critics are men high in both civilian and military posts in Washington, but most of them, following the party line of policy, will not speak out publicly.

Mr. Baldwin, quoting General Wood, retired tank commander in World War II, as having informed Congress that—

From the standpoint of national security which should be the only basis of consideration—UMT as now planned will cost enormous sums of money without providing any security whatever, or in any way deterring possible aggressors.

On the other hand, the continuation of the draft or a requirement of universal military service for 18 months to 2 years seems inevitable for a long period ahead.

Another military official on a high echelon is quoted as stating:

As long as we have limited funds, UMT is a luxury we can't afford.

You don't stockpile a guy you can teach on the production line in 30 to 120 days.

As Mr. Baldwin states, the real problem of mobilization is not, and never has been, the training of large masses of military manpower, but the manufacture of arms and equipment and the organization of units.

He also posed three very disturbing problems UMT would give rise to—the huge cost; the deferment problem, that is, how to take some boys for 6 months' training and others for 2 years' service; and thirdly, the personnel problem, that is, the rapid exhaustion of presently available military manpower in the 18-to-26 age bracket, admittedly a problem that will always be with us. He and other well-informed and notable commentators have also voiced the view which I have held and expressed for some time past, namely, that UMT has little relation indeed to military reality in an atomic age.

It is my considered opinion that this bill not only has dangerous and alarming social and political implications, but, as Mr. Baldwin has said, its military features will inevitably complicate tremendously the already muddled and botched-up military manpower situation of the Nation, and should it be put into effect by any chance it will definitely impede and obstruct, rather than help and benefit, our military readiness and preparedness.

I would not lay all the blame for pressing this unwise measure at this time at the door of the Pentagon. I believe, in fact, that most of the pressure currently felt in and about Congress has been and is being exerted by certain civilian leaders who have long been working toward the objective of regimenting American life. Some of these leaders believe that by this means they can offset communism and perhaps install a sort of gracious Fascist regime; others believe, mistakenly I think, that military training is a good thing for an 18-year-old boy. Both groups would not hesitate to urge general compulsory service as a panacea for peacetime social ills or wartime manpower problems, military or industrial.

These civilian leaders have been able to swing great influence in high Government councils. They have been around for a long time, they know the ropes and how to pull them. I will not mention any names, but most Members of this House have an idea of the interest, efforts, and methods of these men. Of course, they are entitled to their views just as I am entitled to oppose them in their objective.

This bill is not necessarily pleasing to the proponents of the UMT principle. It is merely the best thing they could get now. They had worked and hoped for a stronger measure, but because of the political realities in election year they have had to settle for the present inept, multifarious, watered-down measure. They should have liked universal military service for a 2-year period, but, in their desperation to start the program, will take this bill. The present political conditions make such a prospect of 2 years' service utterly unthinkable, as the astute gentleman from Georgia knows perhaps better than any man in this House. In fact, I think the gentleman is willing to do some more watering down.

I am as much dissatisfied with the functioning of the draft as any other Member who has carefully observed it and watched its various maladjustments of our current manpower pools. Primary responsibility for this situation must rest with the Congress; we cannot escape it. There have been the gravest mistakes as well as the most asinine policies in the mobilization and assignment of manpower. But I submit that selective service can and should continue to handle these problems. I have more and greater faith in the essential wisdom, knowledge, and fairness of General Hershey than in many other administrators I have seen around Washington. At present Congress has vested him with complete and well-rounded powers. He can use them to secure as much manpower as is needed in this emergency. What many fail to remember is that, as compared with some other nations and their allies, we have limited manpower, and we therefore should carefully allocate it as between industry, agriculture, general productive services, and the armed services, with as little compulsion as possible.

I have had occasion before to urge the modernization of our Armed Forces to accord with our advanced technology. Current day fighters must not only fight, but they must understand a large number and variety of highly scientific weapons and gadgets. The problems presented by jet-propelled aircraft, radar, rockets, guided missiles, the atomic bomb, and other scientific innovations which have so radically changed warfare, require for their proper solution not a cumbersome, inept format like UMT, but a thoroughly professionalized, streamlined, highly trained personnel familiar with the special problems of the air, the sea and its subsurfaces, and ground fighting as well. If the Department of Defense had been on the job since the end of World War II, it could have used some of the more than $100,000,000,000 appropriated to it by the Congress to set up, mobilize and train, in local communities throughout the country, industrial reserves who would be thoroughly indoctrinated in all complicated industrial mechanisms, scientific inventions, and methods applicable to modern warfare. Working together with other Reserves and the National Guard, such units could have been of inestimable value in meeting our defense needs.

It is about time military leaders appreciated the fact that having paper pools in their files and records of young men trained for 6 months only under antiquated techniques will never provide the answer either to our manpower or defense needs. It is about time, as I have urged before, that our military and civilian leadership took sweeping actions to revise not only our thinking and our basic concepts, but our entire organization of the armed services, together with the industrial and economic production resources so vitally essential to their success in wartime.

There can be no question in my mind that UMT instead of facilitating and helping provide such a program, because it is so ponderously based on old-fashioned and discredited military notions, can serve only to complicate and encumber the draft process as well as to hinder and obstruct the proper solution of our manpower problems in a thoroughly American manner and in accordance with sound American principles.

Admittedly, there are elements of weakness in our present military status and position, as Korea has demonstrated. But that has not been the only thing we have learned from Korea. It has served to emphasize the serious weaknesses in our diplomacy and foreign policy and those responsible for conducting them.

But we must not live with our weaknesses. Rather must we move to eliminate them, to be in a position to meet any attack that might be made upon the Nation, not to waste what we have, whether it is money, resources, or manpower, or military strength.

Our potential enemy has the greatest of weaknesses which derive from an enslaved people, from a crackpot, unworkable economic system, and from Messianic leaders fanatically devoted to the devilish cause of human enslavement.

Such a system cannot be sustained for long. It has within itself the seeds of its own destruction. In time the unfortunate people held behind the iron curtain in a more cruel bondage than history has ever recorded will, through God's help, and through the help of enlightened inspired men, find liberation.

Until that time comes, we must be prepared for action at a moment's notice. We cannot tolerate softness, sappiness, sentimentalism, appeasement, or procrastination, either in diplomacy or preparation for war. We must mobilize all the resources of our great, rich, free country and have them ready if the brazen, impudent zealots of the Marxist world should decide to attack us, or to move further to threaten our security.

Everything is not in order in the Department of Defense, but it should be put in order, and this Congress can and must do its full share to this end. If there is corruption, waste, and extravagance in the armed services, certainly they should be sought out by our committee and ruthlessly expunged. If there is incompetence or radicalism anywhere in this

great system of defense, these, too, should be eradicated.

It is clear to me that the unification of the armed services has produced great, new problems which apparently never occurred to its sponsors. But we cannot tarry now in this crisis to reshape that basic organization. We must try to make it work, try to make it serve our needs for a modernized, streamlined, realistic defense of the United States, and a swift-moving, overpowering, striking force that can inflict frightful destruction and devastation upon our enemies.

If we forge and fashion such a powerful, efficient system, it will not only serve to deter aggression, as air power and the atomic bomb are now doing, but it will serve to deter aggression long after the Russians have fully implemented the atomic bomb, because the Russians will know that with our great productive forces fully mobilized and implemented by new weapons, united in spiritual strength, that the United States will be invincible in battle and unconquerable as a nation.

It may even serve to pave the way for peace in this troubled world by impressing the Soviets with the futility of ever gaining a conquest over us. In fact, I am convinced that the only way that nation, or any other nation, can gain a conquest over us will be through our own apathy, indifference, and inaction, through our own lack of vigilance in protecting the high ideals and great spiritual values which underlie the Nation, through our own ghastly error in yielding to the siren songs of social uplifters and reformers who would lure us on to the rocks of collectivism and ultimate doom.

I hope and urge that this measure will be voted down by my colleagues. It is contrary to American principles, it is unwise, it is inadequate, it is dictatorial, it is a violation of all the values we hold dear. I propose to vote against it for the reasons I have set forth, and I earnestly hope that the House will reject it.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, this proposal as presently drafted should be recommitted. It should be recommitted for several reasons:

First, in my judgment it will not bolster up, it will not shore up, it will not augment our military defense at the present time. In effect, as presently drafted, it will weaken our military preparedness in the current crisis. In my judgment, and I take the opposite point of view from the distinguished majority leader, a vote for recommittal is a vote for strength and a vote against recommittal is a vote for weakness.

Secondly, in my judgment, it should be recommitted because it seems to me in the last 20 months those in charge of the planning of our military establishment have failed miserably. I intend to and will vote for universal military training when the record of those in charge of our Military Establishment merits it, when on the record they can prove they can handle a job of this magnitude.

I would like to make several other comments before discussing the proposal. A properly drafted and well-run universal military training program will not militarize our youth. My own experiences in World War II for some 47 months did not militarize me; as a matter of fact, I think that I left the service more opinionated than ever against a military regime and military rules and regulations.

Secondly, percentagewise I believe there are as many God-fearing gentlemen, as many men of moral standing in the military as there are in civilian life.

Thirdly, I cannot help but believe to a degree that some military training for all youths is highly desirable, particularly at a time when we are faced with a great international crisis.

With those basic views on the record, I would like to discuss for just a few minutes this question: Does this bill as presently proposed answer the problem we face as a Nation today? In my judgment, it does not.

In the first place, H. R. 5904 is discriminatory. Let us take this example in order to show just what will or might happen. Suppose anyone of us in this Chamber had a pair of twins, and for illustrative purposes we will call one "selectee" and one "trainee." For illustration, both of them are 19 years old.

According to this legislation the selectee would serve 2 years on active duty and then go into the Reserve. His twin brother, the trainee, would go on active duty for 6 months and then spend the next 6½ years on inactive duty. I fail to see how one can say this particular proposal is not discriminatory. Under the bill, 5,000 young men each month will go into training under UMT, and 40,000 or thereabouts will go on active duty under selective service.

The second point is this: The name universal military training is a misnomer. This proposal provides for no more universal military training than the present Selective Service Act, and the evidence of that is clearly set forth in the committee report. The committee report says there will be just as many deferments, and just as many reasons for deferments under universal military training as provided under this act as there are in selective service. Several months ago I received a letter from a man who serves on an appeal board in my congressional district. He said, "Congressmen you have to vote for universal military training because it will truly provide for universal military training." The facts are this act does not provide for universal military training. It gives all the exemptions and all the deferments that we now have under Selective Service.

The third point is this: I take this from my own particular experience. Under H. R. 5904, the young men will be called in to military training service for 6 months. I can visualize those that are assigned to the Navy going to Great Lakes for boot training. They will probably spend 3 or 4 months in boot training, learning the rudiments and the fundamentals of naval service. From there they will then go to a service school to learn to become a radar man, a communications expert or yeoman. At the end of several months in a service school, they would then normally be eligible for active duty at sea. Under this bill, H. R. 5904, that would just about be their 6 months, and then they will go into the Inactive Reserves. In other words, they will never spend any time at sea where a sailor actually learns to become a competent and experienced member of the naval service. In contrast, those who go on active duty under selective service will spend some time in boot training, some time at a service school, and then the remaining months will be spent at sea where they will become a valuable part of our military defense. When they spend 18 months at sea, then they will retire to the Inactive Reserves, but they will be a far better reservist because they will have served at sea, and because they will know how to operate a ship, or part of it, whereas their brothers who went to boot training, and then to service school, and then into the Inactive Reserves, have had no real military experience. For example, the young man who was a trainee and who was in the Inactive Reserves for 2 or 3 years, and then is called up to active duty, I venture to say and I doubt if anyone can contradict this, that he will have to spend another 6-month period in boot training and in service school for refresher training. Then the trainee will serve as an apprentice at sea before he will be an important, experienced, and vital cog in our defense set-up.

The second point, and one of the basic reasons why I object to this legislation is this: I dislike to admit it, but there are good reasons, in my judgment, for the statement that the people in the Pentagon, the top planners, on the basis of performance in the last 20 months, have not merited the authority and far-reaching power in this proposal.

The best evidence is the numerous recent reports by the Hébert subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, the Hardy subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures, and the Johnson Subcommittee on Preparedness in the Senate. This pile of documents on the table on my right is a real condemnation of military procurement, planning, and manpower utilization in the last 20 months. It is difficult for me to give such far-reaching authority as sought by this proposal when the military leaders who will guide the program have been so soundly condemned by competent congressional committees.

In conclusion, let me emphasize my disapproval of the bill as brought to the floor of the House. Possibly certain amendments can be approved that will remedy the existing and substantial defects in H. R. 5904. I doubt, however, that my lack of confidence in the powers that be in the executive branch of the Government at this time can be overcome prior to the conclusion of House action on this bill. The last 20 months have produced much talk by the military, horrible waste in manpower and material, and unsound procurement policies of a serious nature. When such weaknesses are eradicated and the record merits it, I will have an open mind on UMT.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, first I want to pay my compliments to the chairman of the great Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. It was not my privilege to serve under him. I left the Committee on Military Affairs just as they merged it with the old Committee on Naval Affairs, but I am happy to join with him in his valiant effort to get some adequate national defense. I am for this bill, and I want to make that point most emphatic.

I also want to pay my compliments to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], with whom I served on the Committee on Military Affairs for 8 years. He knows where I go along with him and where I part with him. He has done valiant service also in accordance with his convictions.

Mr. Chairman, when the Eighty-second Congress enacted the Universal Military Training and Service Act—Public Law 51—last year, the matter of providing for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps was left for later development. H. R. 5904 now before us for consideration implements the Universal Military Training and Service Act on those points.

While it can be said that the principle of universal military training was adopted by Congress in the enactment of the Universal Military Training and Service Act last year, it is apparent, of course, that universal military training will not become an active part of our program of national defense until H. R. 5904 or some further legislation is enacted into law to carry out the general policy established by the enactment of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Most Members of the Eighty-second Congress have had an opportunity to study national defense policies very intensively because of our involvement in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Our constituents also have had national defense polices uppermost in their thinking much of the time in recent years because of these wars. The thinking of the American public on national defense problems is generally quite clear and is based upon widespread information and understanding. We must bend every effort to consult with our constituents on matters of this kind at all times.

Prior to the outbreak of World War I in 1914, few Americans then living had given much thought to problems of modern warfare, and few Americans foresaw our involvement in that war. With the outbreak of World War I, military leaders started to build up more activity and greater interest in preparedness but the beginning was quite slow because of our historic reliance upon the oceans as barriers between us and Europe, and between us and Asia. Because of the European war I turned my attention to the study of war and preparedness to a limited extent and I watched with great interest the development of our first legislation reorganizing the Armed Forces of the United States, effective July 1, 1916. That act gave greater emphasis than had previously been given to the development of the Organized Reserve and the National Guard, but we had not had time to go very far by April 1917, when we were plunged headlong into the war.

When I entered the first officers training camp of World War I, I was appalled by our defense impotency and the magnitude of the job before us to achieve adequate preparedness under the stress and strain of active warfare. We had exceedingly good fortune in having strong and experienced allies. Patriotic Americans rallied to the emergency with such vigor and enthusiasm that our Nation made a very creditable record notwithstanding our impotency at the outset of that war.

At the end of the war, however, we demobilized rapidly and put aside our defense problems. At the onset of World War II we were again in the depths of impotency in our national defense. Again we faced a serious handicap in having to build our defenses at great speed and under very trying conditions because of the rapid approach of World War II, and because of the greatly increased tempo in warfare. The response of patriotic Americans to the challenge of World War II was magnificent and our record in that war stands today as one of the greatest achievements of our age. But again at the end of that war we made such a dash for home and our rocking chairs that the whole world was deeply impressed with our determination to sink to complete defense impotency at the greatest possible speed. The appalling thing about this development is that we were on notice that Russia was exceedingly busy building her war power at utmost speed in the very years we were casting off so completely our armed strength.

I have been an advocate of defense self-sufficiency for our Nation ever since my first baptism of fire in the Mexican campaign, but my studies have been primarily directed to the matter of building our armed strength without building a gigantic standing armed force. To me it is exceedingly important that we have stockpiles of strategic and critical materials together with the best possible productive capacity of those materials, rather than an unnecessarily large stockpile of fabricated weapons and equipment that may become obsolete overnight. Still further, I have always advocated the greatest possible number of citizens trained in the basic principles of defense rather than maintenance of a large standing armed force.

Just what constitutes too large a reserve supply of arms and equipment and just what constitutes too large a standing Armed Force must necessarily be dependent upon world conditions, but generally speaking we must maintain our ability to produce new and more modern weapons quickly in any emergency, and that cannot be done unless we have reserve stocks of basic materials. Likewise, we must be able in any great emergency to expand our Armed Forces to numbers far beyond anything we can afford in permanent organization. If our citizens generally have basic training and knowledge of weapons and ammunition, our mobilization and our launching of combat team training can move ahead much faster. The tempo of modern warfare increases the importance of this factor. With modern weapons, the time for basic training may not be available after the first attack is made on us. We will need to bend every effort to build fighting teams of men already trained and skilled in the handling of their weapons.

In the field of sports, American colleges today would not think of placing prep school football stars on the gridiron in any intercollegiate game without giving those men thorough training as a team. Our American colleges seldom succeed in developing an outstanding football player during his 4-year college course unless he has learned and carried out basic football training before he enters college. Yet there are people today who think we can hurl untrained men into war and give them both basic training and team training after actual combat is under way and the lives of those men and the very existence of our Nation are in jeopardy.

Universal military training alone will not win a war. Six months of such training will not save 6 months of mobilization time, but it will save several months of time in getting to combat team training. Some review of basic training received years before a war, and practically all team training, will still be needed after such mobilization is started. It is my firm belief that the saving of 3 months time in launching team training for large numbers of combat units at the outset of any future world war may make the difference between our gaining superiority over the enemy and being rocked back on our heels even to the point of defeat.

I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on February 26 the final report on my questionnaire. It appears at page A1203 of the Appendix of the RECORD. I put it there because I thought it was important to bring to the House some better picture of the thinking in the State of Iowa than we are getting from our mail. The question on universal military training was right down in the middle of the questionnaire, so as not to emphasize it unduly, and I got a frank opinion from my constituents without emphasizing that question over the other 52 questions.

I tried to get the returns into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before any issue came up for consideration in this House. It happens that universal military training is the first one to come up for consideration, and therefore the returns on UMT are rather interesting at this time.

Notwithstanding the overwhelming mail I got against universal military training, my questionnaire from every fifth householder shows a far different story.

The principal difference between my sampling of opinion in my congressional district and other congressional questionnaires that have been brought to my attention is in the method of distri-

bution. I have described that method quite fully in my final report that appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so I will not review that point here except to say that I have made a special effort to make this distribution to the people of my district on a completely nonpartisan basis.

In my questionnaire universal military training was given no special emphasis. You will find it listed as the fifteenth of 17 special questions on war policies and defense policies. The answers to my question on universal military training are of special importance at this time because this issue happens to be the first major issue covered by my questionnaire to come before Congress after the distribution of my questionnaire.

I call your attention to the percentage return of the replies of my constituents on the question of universal military training; 53.79 percent voted in favor of universal military training and 46.21 percent were opposed. Because of the unusual interest of my colleagues in the returns by occupation we have taken the time to tabulate our returns on all questions by occupations. I will list here the total vote on universal military training by occupation:

Business:	
Yes	435
No	241
Labor:	
Yes	444
No	203
White collar:	
Yes	217
No	121
Professional:	
Yes	298
No	217
Farmer:	
Yes	316
No	662
Miscellaneous:	
Yes	268
No	255

That much for the general returns to the questionnaire. I think it is worth your while to study the returns by classifications. I have heard it said that the labor union leaders are unanimously opposed to UMT. My householders made returns by occupation. It happens that labor in my district voted 444 to 203 in favor of universal military training. That is better than 2 to 1; almost 2½ to 1. It is the strongest percentage of any classification in my district.

I sincerely hope that this information will be of some interest to Congress at this time as an indication of the basic thinking of the people of my district on the general question of universal military training.

Members of Congress who may be opposed to the legislation now before us can immediately challenge the application of my questionnaire to the pending legislation on the basis that they object to certain features of the bill now under consideration, even though they may favor universal military training as a general policy. My warning to those Members is that from 1919 to 1951 the matter of universal military training did not come to a vote in Congress, notwithstanding the lessons learned in World War I and World War II. The Members of Congress who believe in universal military training and who oppose the legislation now before Congress by their opposition to this bill have assumed a very serious responsibility. If this bill is enacted into law at this time they have a very real responsibility to do everything within their power to perfect the law after its enactment. If this bill is defeated their responsibility is even greater to bring forth and urge enactment of legislation for UMT at the earliest possible date. We dare not wait another 30 years as we have waited since 1919.

However, if we wait for 435 Members to come into unanimous accord on all the details of every piece of legislation, God save America. We do not have that much time.

In my study of universal military training I have given first consideration to the availability of an adequate number of trained troops for combat. I have given consideration also to the welfare of the individual citizen who is called upon to defend our Nation in war. Heretofore we have been able to train most of our men, but not all of them, before committing them to combat. As the tempo of war increases, however, we can be caught where greater numbers of untrained men must be hurled into combat with such inadequate training as to make their death in battle little short of murder. Some of us have had this lesson vividly brought home to us. I recall deploying a company of about 160 men and moving them forward into combat in the Mexican campaign when more than half of them had never fired a 30 caliber rifle because they had reported for duty only a few weeks before and we were in the midst of the early stages of our training when we were called upon to commit them to combat. No American soldier wants to experience more than once the feeling of insecurity that I experienced on that occasion.

I have today secured from the Armed Service Committee staff an estimate of the number of men now serving in the Armed Forces who are less than 26 years of age. Their estimate is 2,500,000 men in that age range. I requested also an estimate of the number of men in that age range who are no longer in the armed services but who have had sufficient service to be listed as veterans. Their estimate is 2,000,000 men.

I should add that the classification of veteran is given to any man who has had as much as 90 days active duty between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, or who has served for 1 year between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, or who has been discharged after June 24, 1948, with 3 years or more of service.

In our Armed Forces today we have a total strength of 3,500,000 men and women. Of this number more than 40,000 are women.

At the highest point in World War II our total Armed Forces reached a strength of 11,000,000. Some of you will recall that at the time of the Battle of the Bulge men were hurled into combat with shortened training in enough instances to cause considerable heat here in Congress. That occurred while we had an Armed Force of approximately 11,000,000. If you give credit to modern weapons speeding up the tempo of war, I believe you will agree with me that it is highly advisable to increase the number of our trainees in the age range 18 to 25, inclusive, beyond the number we have today. Furthermore, I believe you will agree with me that it is well nigh impossible for us to continue permanently a standing Armed Force of the size we have today, namely, 3,500,000. However, to the extent our reservoir of trained manpower fails to reach the number we will need for any emergency we will be faced with one of two choices. Either we must maintain a larger standing Armed Force than we can afford, or we must face the possibility of committing untrained troops to combat in any future war before they have had an opportunity to secure adequate training.

My son has just got back from Korea. He spent two winters in combat in Korea as an infantry reservist; and he tells me that we have need for more forces in Korea today, and they must be well trained. He also says the boys there want to win. God save America from ever going into war where you are willing to settle for a stalemate. Spending the lives of these fine boys for a stalemate! Let us finish the job; let us win this war.

Defeat could take us into the salt mines of Russia. Answer me. What has become of those German prisoners of war, civilian and military? Answer me. What has become of the Japanese soldiers that were taken prisoner on the Pacific side?

I have put in the RECORD from time to time excerpts of historic references to the nature of the Russians.

Well, you had warning. De Tocqueville told us in 1835 what to expect.

Referring to the United States and Russia, he told us:

> Their starting point is different, and their courses are not the same, yet each of them seems to be marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe.

Lord Palmerston told us about the methods of the Russians:

> The policy and practice of the Russian Government has always been to push forward its encroachments as fast and as far as the apathy or want or firmness of other governments would allow it, but always to stop and retire when it was met with decided resistance.

You know their characteristics. I will not quote further than this because I have not the time.

Commodore Perry gave us a very sound warning in 1856 from the Pacific side. Read your history. Figure out your adversary.

During his famous Asiatic cruise Commodore Perry not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned.

Commodore Perry presented a paper before the American Geographical and Statistical Society, at a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, from which I quote as follows:

> It requires no sage to predict events so strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way.

But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement—Russia—stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought.

It is my sincere hope that we can avoid this fierce and final encounter between Russia and America that was predicted so definitely by Commodore Perry in 1856. To do so we must know and understand our adversary and we must know our own strength and our own weaknesses. Then we must build a sound economy and develop to the utmost the sinews of our country. In doing this we must rely on the understanding and sound judgment of the American people themselves.

Let us get some adequate national defense before it is too late. I cannot be contented with all this tweedledee and tweedledum about "if's" and "and's" and "but's"; let us get together, let us get adequate defense, let us get this matter straightened out.

A lot has been said about costs. Of course it costs less to train a man part time than it does full time. It is a question of how many trainees you want.

In my judgment we should train all available and able-bodied young men so that they can defend themselves and their country with the least possible delay after shooting starts in any future war in which we may become involved.

Four and one-half million trained men out of the 8,000,000 between 18 and 25 years of age, inclusive, is not enough, and we most certainly cannot afford for long a standing Armed Force of the present size of 3,500,000 men.

I commend Chairman VINSON and the Committee on Armed Services for their excellent analysis in the committee report of the cost of maintaining our Armed Forces. They point out the very real saving that can be had by cutting down the size of our standing forces and placing greater reliance upon Ready Reserves who have received the training contemplated in our universal military training program. I am particularly impressed with the fact that we cannot permanently maintain an Armed Force in excess of 2,000,000 men. I am also convinced that we dare not place our entire reliance upon a standing Armed Force of 2,000,000 men and our historically small Reserve and National Guard force of less than 1,000,000 men. All of the discussion and predictions regarding push-button warfare do not convince me that we can afford to cut down our total available defense trained manpower to 3,000,000 men when we had more than 10,000,000 men under arms at the end of World War II.

On page 27 of the committee report—House Report No. 1376—the military personnel cost alone for food, clothing, pay, and shelter, is $2,100 for the first year of a member's service, and if all costs of service are considered, including departmental overhead, equipment, supplies, and so forth, each man costs the Government $11,000 for each year in service. By way of contrast, our Government can develop one trained man in the Ready Reserve at a total cost of $1,400 for 1 year of such training and service.

The committee report compares also the cost of training for the 6-month period contemplated in this legislation, and I quote the committee report as follows:

> Even in regard to the cost of training for the 6-month period, a savings will be effected. Six-month training for one draftee for service costs the Government $3,200, while 6-month UMT training after full implementation costs the Government $2,700, a saving of $500. These savings are not inconsequential.

I should add that the universal military trainee can pass back to civilian life and another trainee can be given his place immediately in the training program so that at the end of 2 years of service for the member of the standing armed force we would have four basically trained citizens at a much less cost than the cost to our Government for maintaining the one member of the Armed Forces continuously for 2 years. When this savings is multiplied by the number of basically trained men we need, I am impressed by three points, namely: First, in training enough men to meet our war needs the total savings to our Nation will be tremendous; second, our citizens will have a better knowledge and understanding of how to defend themselves effectively in combat; and, third, our Nation will have the number of basically trained men it needs for defense.

The cost of maintaining our defense bears directly on our economy and our fiscal stability, and full consideration of these factors argues strongly for universal military training rather than tremendous and costly standing Armed Forces.

I subscribed wholeheartedly to all the safeguards provided in this legislation for the physical, moral, and spiritual well-being of our young men during their training. The quality and extent of our defense preparedness and our reserve power are our best guaranties of peace and the maintenance of our rightful place in the family of nations.

One more factor deserves consideration, namely, the danger of a large standing Armed Force taking over the major portion of our governmental functioning and power.

Our complete dependence upon a large standing Armed Force could soon bring our Nation to the same situation that existed at the transition of the Roman Republic into the Roman Empire. You will recall Julius Caesar realized that the Roman Republic was at an end at the time he first became consul. Something had to be done, but Caesar knew he could not rely upon the votes of the people against the military power that had been built up in the machinery of civil government. In fact, military control threatened the very existence of Rome. In order to develop his own position, Caesar demanded appointment as Governor of Illyria and Gaul and was so appointed in 58 B. C. Caesar was successful and by senatorial action he was made dictator. Following the Battle of the Actium in 31 B. C. the Roman senate conferred the title of "August" on Augustus Octavius, nephew and adopted son of Julius Caesar, and that date is generally conceded to be the end of the Republic and the establishment of the Roman Empire.

I do not want to see our great Republic evolve into a central Federal Government dominated by a large, standing military organization, and to me the surest safeguard against that development is a policy of holding the size of our standing Armed Forces far below the number of men needed at the outset of any future world war and to have our standing Armed Forces supplemented by the Ready Reserve of citizen graduates of universal military training.

I vigorously support the enactment of this legislation although I am not opposed to some of the amendments which I understand will be given consideration. Other amendments may also be found desirable as the program is carried out, but the important thing, in my mind, is to base our national defense on a relatively small standing Armed Force together with the largest possible number of basically trained Ready Reserves.

Let us get busy and see if we cannot round out a training program that will satisfy our needs under an extreme emergency. We do not need a regular Army, Navy, and Air Force of three and a half million men. We cannot afford that many men. Let us train them in that age range of 18 to 26 and keep our Regular Armed Forces down as nearly as we can to 2,000,000. In the final analysis you can most decidedly have your over-all trained personnel at a lot less cost than we are paying out now for a standing Army of three and a half million men. Think it over. There is a difference of opinion on the Republican side but I place national defense far above partisanship.

Again let me say universal military training is the best possible insurance against war at a price that we can afford to pay.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I can contribute anything to the discussion of H. R. 5904 in 10 minutes, or not. So much has been said and so eloquently on both sides that I would be presumptuous to restate any arguments already advanced. I became convinced, if I had not already been convinced, of two

things, one thing from each side of the debate.

First, that universal military training is contrary to the ideals upon which this country was founded and is dangerous to the national character of future America.

Second, that it is necessary for this Republic to provide a corps of trained Reserves if it is to proceed without unbearable expense and yet adequately provide for the defense of the Republic.

Now, I am basically opposed to H. R. 5904 because I do not acept the philosophy of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, that there is no way to provide an adequately trained Reserve without resorting to the plan advanced by H. R. 5904, or a system of universal military training.

Indeed, I think it is with poor grace that the chairman of this committee states that there is no middle ground inasmuch as he was the main promulgator of the scheme which turned over the constitutional obligation of the legislative branch of Government to study and write the legislation on this subject to the executive branch of Government.

Nor am I impressed with the study of the Executive Commission and the legislation written by this Executive Commission on the subject. I note, first, that the Commission called only the witnesses they desired to call. I note, second, that the testimony of these witnesses is confidential and so unavailable to this body for consideration in determining our course of action. Third, I note that, though the subject under consideration was training of boys around the age of 18, only two of all the witnesses appearing before the Commission were in the field of general education. None were in the field of trade school, industrial school, or any of the multitudinous fields of technical training which exist in our civilian society.

I can hardly regard the studies made either by the committee of the House or the Executive Commission either detailed or comprehensive. In fact, the studies are so completely inadequate that nowhere is there a study of or an attempt to even define what basic military training is.

It was basic military training, incidentally, that was supposed to be provided for by the Commission. I asked last April in my speeches on the floor of the House what basic military training is and got no answer. There still is no answer. Well, if the committee or the Commission either one had attacked fundamental definitions and given the slightest consideration to the subject about which they were supposed to be concerned, I am satisfied that the middle course would be as apparent to them as it was apparent to former Secretary of Defense Forrestal, Admiral Ben Moreell, other military leaders and, yes, even a Congressman like myself.

In attacking the problem of any training or educational program, the very first matter that must be considered is what do you want to train or educate for.

So, I ask the simple question which remains unstudied and unanswered. What are the skills needed in the corps of trained reserves as of 1952 and as best we can project the needs into the immediate future?

Right off the bat anyone who knows the simplest thing about modern warfare as it appeared in World War II and as it appears even more so in 1952, knows that the great bulk of the personnel in the Armed Forces must perform specialized and technical jobs which in essence are noncombat in nature. Estimates may vary, but middle estimate is that 90 percent of those in uniform in the last war were engaged in noncombat activities. Only 10 percent were combat troops.

If this figure is anywhere near correct, we are immediately presented with the fact that only a very small portion of our reserves need combat training. So a great deal of the oratory spent in the debate to the effect that we must prepare our youth to defend themselves is largely beside the point. Of course, we must prepare the 10 percent who might be engaged in combat activity—and I might say, only the military establishments are qualified to train them in combat activity—not, I might state, a civilian commission.

But, the big question, Who is to train the 90 percent in the technical skills? Look at the list in the Commission report of the skills that the Army, Navy and Air Force intend to train this 90 percent under the guise that it is military training. With only two possible exceptions, every one of these skills are civilian skills which our civilian enterprises have been training personnel in for years. The military are not educators or trainers. Our civilian enterprise includes our professional educators and trainers. Obviously, the best ones to train personnel in technical fields are those who are professionally trained and equipped to do it.

Let the military do a job analysis of the technical skills they need and the number of each they need in the event of mobilization. Civilian enterprise can provide it for them.

In essence, this whole matter comes down to whether you believe General Hershey's expression of the military establishments' philosophy when he says—page 195 of last year's hearings:

> I would say that in the Armed Forces and in the Navy, as I have observed them, no matter how much they talk about skill, what they want is a young, smart boy, because they can teach him much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills but they generally have (a) a skill which is of doubtful value, unless modified, and, (b) a desire to participate only with the skill they have. If there is anything else to be done, they want somebody else to do it. I believe that you just about got to build armies and build navies and build air forces by taking people who have capacity and teaching them what you want them to know, because unfortunately, by and large, in our civilian life the type of man we need, and that is the fighter, is only there as an avocation and not as a vocation.

I do not believe it and when I consider that one of the sorriest jobs performed in World War II was by the Military Establishments in matching civilian skills with military skills. I am doubly unimpressed. The Seabees, incidentally, was the one branch that proceeded on the opposite of General Hershey's philosophy and what a performance they put on.

I have only been able to suggest a few of the basic matters which must be studied in order to provide the answer to what the chairman presents as an insoluble dilemma. It is hardly insoluble. As I said in April, there is plenty of time to do the job if the Armed Services Committee really has a will to do it. Let us first get our Reserve program set up. Then let us figure out how to keep it filled with trained personnel, utilizing the civilian institutions which are already available for this purpose.

I favor recommitting the bill; however, I believe that, under the circumstances of past performance, the matter should be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor instead of the Armed Services Committee. After all, we are talking about education and training and 90 percent of this training, or at least an extremely high percentage of this training, is not military—it is civilian.

Mr. Chairman, I now commence my extended remarks which the time allotted to me did not permit me to present on the floor.

I am opposed to H. R. 5904 which the Armed Services Committee has dubbed "a bill to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps." This is the bill which the Pentagon has been selling around the country as universal military training. Well, gentlemen, in my opinion it is neither universal, nor military, nor training, and I propose to briefly point out to you the basis for such opinion.

Before embarking upon this discussion, I want to take issue with a statement made by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the National Security Training Commission that the Congress has already approved of the idea of universal military training. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee knows full well that he deliberately dodged the issue of considering the approval of the idea of UMT last April when the matter was before the House by refusing to divorce the UMT principle from the extension of the draft. Congressman BARDEN sought to have a clear-cut decision on UMT and the chairman declined. He cannot now be heard to say with any truth or justification that the House did approve the principle of UMT. How many votes were obtained solely on the basis that it was necessary to extend the draft law? Certainly these were the plans used by the proponents to insure the passage of the legislation.

By the chairman's own admission the proposed bill, H. R. 5904, in any of the forms in which it has appeared to date and in any form the chairman's own amendments may change it to, is not universal. There are more exemptions than appear even in the present draft law. It is only to be started, he says, on a wee small basis. Well, any basis other than universality is selectivity.

So, this so-called universal military training bill is not universal.

It is not military. Supposedly it is under civilian control but a thorough reading of the Commission's report shows that it is under military control. To this extent then perhaps the plan is military. However, the training proposed, if training it be, is not military. Refer to page 42 of the Training Commission October 1951 report and tell me what is military in sex education, responsibility, marriage and family life, religion, moral principles, and citizenship. It sounds more like the beginning of Oscar Ewing's dream of national education than a military training program. As a matter of fact, if our family, churches, and schools have not done a job in these fields by the time our boys are 18 I am certain the Military Establishment or a National Security Training Commission is not going to be able to do anything about it. Personally, I will stick with our family, church, and educational institutions on this matter.

Or, if you prefer, turn to page 12 of this same report and see the technical courses offered by the Air Force as part of military training. There are 24 items, every one of which are taught throughout this broad land by civilian schools, trade, or industrial schools or on-the-job training, with the possible exception of "intelligence" and "armament systems." In other words, these skills are essentially civilian skills, not military skills. Certainly they have nothing to do with combat training which would assist our boys in preserving their own lives under combat conditions which seems to be the main plea of the advocates of this misnamed universal, which is not universal but highly selective, military, which is not military but essentially civilian, training.

So now we come to the question of whether the bill or the program outlined by the National Security Training Commission is training. It certainly is not universal. It certainly is not military. But perhaps it is training. Well, training requires a curriculum; it requires a teaching staff; and it requires the teaching facilities. The program is really five programs, one each under the control of the Army, the Navy, the Marines, the Air Force, and the Coast Guard. According to the statements of the chairman of the committee, no added personnel shall be used, no new facilities are to be built. Well, the Military Establishment is not composed of trained educators. It is supposed to be a military organization. I submit it is poor procedure to turn over to noneducators the job of setting up a curriculum and of providing the teaching staff, one for every two trainees—what a travesty; anyone with the minimum knowledge of education or training would treat this as so absurd as to properly draw the conclusion that anyone having anything to do with such a proposal knew nothing about education. Then, too, setting up the teaching facilities, the classrooms and laboratories is no small part of the art of teaching.

At one point it was said that this program was to be basic military training. But no one has troubled to define what basic military training is. I believe that I know what it is. It is best expressed in the high-school ROTC program. As a matter of fact, if it is really basic military training that we are after the bill suggested by Congressman BROWNSON, on which I did some work, which seeks to extend the high-school ROTC program and put it on a universal basis will really do the job. Obviously the House Armed Services Committee is completely unfamiliar with the high-school ROTC and for that matter it would seem that they are unfamiliar with what basic military training is, if we can judge by the answer they give in their committee print on pertinent questions and answers with respect to H. R. 5904, see page 9, question 26. There the committee makes an observation that "the training that they would receive" would be in no way comparable to the type envisioned in a true UMT program. There is more to military training than learning how to fire a rifle, perform the manual of arms, and drill. I would like to ask here and now, as I asked last April, just what the Armed Services Committee or what any of the armed services think basic military training is. I tried to find out and had the Library of Congress do some research on the matter and I was amazed to find out that no one has any definition. I submit again that the best personnel preparation for defense is the program advanced in high-school ROTC. In continuing the question that I stopped, the Armed Services Committee goes on to say:

> One of the biggest factors in this whole problem is the association with other men for a period of 6 months.

If this is the best that they have to offer as a reason for universal military training, I suggest that they start from scratch again.

No gentlemen, I think by any test we can properly state that the program presented to this Congress in H. R. 5904 based upon the National Security Training Commission's first report—and I hope the last—can hardly be called a training program. It is interesting to note that of the long list of witnesses who appeared before the Commission to testify—called by the Commission—only two could be said to be in the field of general education: Douglas Brown, dean of Princeton, and Dr. Leonard Carmichael, of the American Council of Education. No one appeared who was in the field of secondary education, in the field of trade-school training or industrial or institutional training. In fact, no one appeared who was a specialist in the field of training, which supposedly we are to give these boys of ours.

Even if more had appeared it would have availed this House little in our deliberations because as the Commission says in its report on the bottom of page 6:

> They met with the Commission in private session and were promised that their views would be held in confidence.

And to date their views still seem to be in confidence. Well, just in passing I would like to know just what is so confidential about this subject or about these witnesses' testimony that would not stand the light of day. Or better still, I would like to know how many, if any, and I repeat any, of these witnesses requested that their testimony be in confidence. What a shocking thing. This should be another object lesson to the Congress never again to forego its constitutional duty, its exclusive constitutional duty, to write legislation by transferring it to the executive branch of Government.

The amount of parliamentary chicanery the chairman of the Armed Services has indulged in since he first set his sights on slipping through this bill to turn over our 18-year-old boys to the Military Establishment is enough to set all Americans thinking. Ah, yes, I said, turn over to the Military Establishment. This National Security Training Commission did not make this study or write this bill. This bill was written and studied in the Pentagon. Anyone present to see the civilian commissioners testifying before the Armed Services Committee on this program would not long remain fooled. They were flanked at all times by high-ranking military officers who constantly prompted them with answers to the questions propounded.

Does anyone challenge that this is not the case? I am satisfied that James W. Wadsworth, chairman of this committee for whom I have great personal respect, but with whom I am in fundamental disagreement on not only this legislation but how it was prepared, will admit that this is the truth.

On April 3 and then later on April 12, 1951, I took the floor to urge the Armed Services Committee and the rest of the House to abide by the Constitution of the United States and write legislation concerning this important subject of military training in the Congress. I said then, we had plenty of time to do the job. I say today we still have plenty of time to do the job, if we really want to do it.

There is one point of agreement, and it is almost the only one, but it is basic, that I have with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and that is, for the defense of this country we must have our citizens sufficiently trained so that with a small standing military establishment we can mobilize quickly, efficiently, and adequately to meet any national emergency, or if it be extreme, war. Only a basic formula like this will keep the freedoms we enjoy and at the same time keep a tremendous expense off the shoulders of our taxpayers.

Now to do this job we have to first get the glamour of military uniform out of our eyes and do a job analysis of the work our citizens must perform in time of war or great emergency. As I stated in my April speeches we have four basic categories of work activity. Neither is more nor less important than the other. All are necessary to win a war or keep a peace.

First. Those working in defense industries, including farming.

Second. Those working in civil service as employees of the Armed Forces.

Third. Those working as technicians under military law as part of the Armed Forces.

Fourth. Those engaged in combat work for the Armed Forces.

When we make this job analysis we immediately perceive certain basic things:

First. You can use almost all our citizens regardless of age, sex, or physical ability with only extreme exceptions somewhere in the picture.

Second. Only a certain portion need to be in military uniform or subject to military law.

The second step we must take, then, after doing a job analysis is to determine what physical requirements are necessary for the various tasks. Actually, only category IV—troops engaged in combat need to be completely physically fit. Yet in the past with our failure to do this job analysis and reasoning we have been requiring persons in category III to meet the same physical standards. Incidentally, the German military organization had, I believe, nine physical categories, with which to determine the job requirements, only one category of which was combat fitness.

The third step, and this is equally important, What group of these persons need to be in uniform in order to perform their tasks? This is to a certain extent defined by the Geneva Convention which affords a code of protection for persons in uniform captured by the enemy. Certainly it is true that our past theory and our present theory of putting stenographers, store clerks, mechanics, and so forth, in uniform is both unnecessary and costly.

To illustrate this point and perhaps in an unusual way, but I hope in an effective way, I suggest that the so-called failure of military law in World War II was not the failure of the law, which, indeed, had grown up through centuries of battle custom and usage, but rather the stupidity of extending military law to cover those who, though in uniform, were engaged in noncombat activities. Of course, battle law will not fit what is essentially civilian occupation, particularly if the civilians are Americans. But I suggest to you, however, the Congress in its wisdom has changed military law, the law that grew up through custom and usage will come into its own again on the front lines of any battlefield. You cannot repeal this law any more than you can repeal the law of gravity or whip the waves of the sea into submission as Xerxes once endeavored to do.

I dwell on these points, because before you talk about training men you must know the jobs for which you need the trained men.

Surely if the Military Establishment is ready to embark upon a training program they should have some idea of the number needed and the skills needed. And yet apparently they have none.

Let us consider one basic question. How many combat troops are needed, as opposed to those who are needed for technical skills? I have seen several estimates and I have my own based upon the estimates I have studied and my own experience. I have never seen an estimate by the Military Establishment. What is their estimate? My estimate is that 90 percent of the personnel in uniform in World War II were engaged in activities noncombative and essentially civilian technical skills. In other words, only 10 percent of this Armed Force we hear talked about will ever be subjected to combat conditions and need to be trained in combat skills.

What is the number who need to be physically qualified for combat duty? What is the number that an Armed Force of three million under present military standards need trained in combat skills? Is there reason for secrecy about this? This is the figure that this Congress must know before it even begins to talk about universal military training. If it is only 300,000 men, then I suggest we have no real problem in getting combat troops. If we will place our medals and awards and flight pay and veteran benefits at their exclusive disposal the problem is easily answered through voluntary enlistment. And the Marines, that great fighting force, will tell you that a volunteer is worth five coerced men.

Let us get the facts. Then as to our radio operators, radio repairmen, truck drivers, cooks, aviation mechanics, stock clerks, pencil pushers, stenographers, photographers—yes, even the aerial photographer flying over enemy lines—aerologists, metal workers, budgetary, accounting, and disbursing personnel; statistical machine operators; vehicle mechanics; utility maintainers and operators; fabric, leather, and rubber maintenance men; transportation personnel; cooks and food-service personnel; supply personnel; administrative personnel; personnel for the personnel departments; medical attachés; security and law-enforcement personnel; firefighting personnel, and so forth, let our civilian schools—public, private, industrial, trade, and otherwise—along with our trade-unions and learning-on-the-job techniques, continue to train these people in their skills as they have before.

All we need do is what that great Secretary of Defense James Forrestal tried to do, set up a reserve force matching civilian skills already existent with skills that would be needed in time of war or emergency. If we are short some needed skills, it would be a great deal cheaper to ask that civilian enterprise, through proper incentives, to train such personnel.

Indeed, this was the success of the Seabees in World War II. If a man was fat and 40 and could run a bulldozer, Admiral Ben Moreell reasoned against Regular Establishment opposition he could be fat and 40 and run a bulldozer in the Seabees. He didn't need to come in as an apprentice seaman and go through boot camp. All he had to do was be given the rate commensurate with his skill and shake him down with his own unit for a month and send him off to do his job.

Now I am going to close by quoting the philosophy of those leaders in the Pentagon who want our 18-year-olds. They may be temporarily in power over in the Pentagon but I will wager their views are in the minority if we ever took the gag off so the others could talk. Here is their philosophy. It is the philosophy of any Federal bureau, even though these particular bureaus may be in uniform. It is the philosophy of empire building. It is not the philosophy of patriotism we have a right to expect from a military establishment in a republic such as ours.

It was stated by General Hershey before the House Armed Services Committee last spring and may be found on page 195 of the hearings on the extension of the Draft Act and UMT:

> I would say that in the Armed Forces and in the Navy, as I have observed them, no matter how much they talk about skill, what they want is a young, emart boy because they can teach him much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills but they generally have (a) a skill which is of doubtful value, unless modified, and (b) a desire to participate only with the skill they have. If there is anything else to be done, they want somebody else to do it. I believe that you just about got to build armies and build navies and build air forces by taking people who have capacity and teaching them what you want them to know, because unfortunately, by and large in our civilian life the type of man we need, and that is the fighter, is only there as an avocation and not as a vocation.

The real question before us is: Do you agree with General Hershey when he states that the military "can teach a young boy much easier than they can unteach many who come in with a lot of so-called skills but they generally have "(a) a skill which is of doubtful value, unless modified, and (b) a desire to participate only with the skill they have."

I basically disagree with General Hershey. I further state that the miserable job done by the Armed Forces in matching civilian skills with the skills needed for the prosecution of World War II was one of the poorest jobs done in the entire war. Furthermore, this was a job that could have had considerable planning with little cost and yet the military establishment at the time of Pearl Harbor was almost completely unprepared to mobilize the civilian population to meet the needs of a major war.

From the way the present leaders in the military establishment have handled the reserve program to date, almost deliberately it seems, from the way certain high officers deliberately sabotaged the Reserve program advanced by James Forrestal. From the way they have sabotaged the National Guard; from the way the disgraceful training program at Lackland Airbase was conducted as brought out by a subcommittee of this House; from the way true unification of the Armed Forces has been sabotaged; from the way unification of supply and procurement, the common cataloging program has been delayed; from the way that policy directives from the high civilian authorities, including the Congress, have been evaded by high ranking military officers—it is no wonder that this country was caught as unprepared in Korea as we were in spite of vast expenditures.

I can say this, that no amount of money can cover up incompetence and disobedience. We are not concerned just with a poorly conceived program of personnel preparedness, here presented in this bill and in the Commission report,

we are confronted with a subtle revolt of the present leaders in the military establishment against civilian control. I suggest that this Congress administer the rebuke needed and recommit this preparedness question back to the Armed Services Committee for real study. And that study should include calling in as witnesses a few personnel and training experts who are not following the party line established by the present leaders in the Pentagon. I would hope, too, that the executive department of our Government might regard such Congressional action as a rebuke and shake the military establishment from stem to stern so that real military leaders instead of bureaucrats in uniform take charge and we can begin to get the defense which the dollars we are spending entitle us to.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we have at last arrived at the sunset hour of the debate on this important issue. Before the smoke has settled on the horizon of debate and the words which have been said on this measure on this floor have sunk into forgetfulness and into the permanent archives of this Congress, I want future generations to know how one MENDEL RIVERS stood on this issue. I want it known now and in the future that I am for universal military training now regardless of what my political fortunes may be tomorrow or in any of the years to come. I want the RECORD to show where on this day, the last day of February 1952, I stood on this issue.

I would not be so vain as to think I had it within me to change any of you on this subject. I believe that as to most of us our minds are made up. I do not impugn your motives and I dare any of you to impugn mine.

Our committee has sat under the leadership of our great chairman for over 3 weeks, day and night, on this subject. We have taken the bill presented to us and carved it up and presented it to you as our own bill. We have written this bill, and no invisible hand any place has dictated our deliberations as we present to you what we conceive to be a program to preserve this country if there is still time.

I have heard all kinds of statements made on this floor about this bill. I wou'd like any of you to point out to me where this staggering, indecisive, stupendous, costly, uneconomic draft system is getting us anywhere. Who of you in your districts do not when you go home discuss with the young men the indecision in their minds as they wait for this unfair Draft Act to come and tap them on the shoulder, while so many sections of our Nation find so many of their youth drafted by the selective service and other sections are not sharing impartially and equally?

I tried one time to find out what was being done under this draft system. I found out that at least one State in this Union had one city in its boundaries where about 62 percent of the boys were classified, while in my State of South Carolina the number of those not classified had diminished almost to the point of hardly being seen on the horizon, 97 percent of the boys being classified for the draft.

What is fair about that, I ask you. We have fashioned this bill for you to the best of our ability. We do not claim to be perfect, but we do claim that we have our share of perfection.

I want to call your attention to another thing. Under the leadership of our distinguished chairman, the Navy Department has a reserve system which has done pretty well by itself. When this Korean thing came about, had it not been for the reserve system of the Navy and its component departments, we would have been kicked off the Korean Peninsula. Remember you that. And I am willing to gamble with CARL VINSON for the future on what is good for the future of this country. You know, and I know, under his leadership, no Navy since civilization began can compare with the one that he has with his own hands and his vision and his indefatigable energy given to the American people. And if you with us will follow him in this fight, we will deliver to the unborn generations a nation that is secure.

Mr. Chairman, before I finish my statement on this matter I am going to read to you the prophetic words of a marine combat officer written in 1945, where he pointed to this day in the year 1952. There are those of you who will remember also in 1946 when Mr. VINSON sent a number of us to the Pacific to try to find out what was going on over there. The boys were hollering that they had the points and they wanted to be brought home. We went there and we saw the magic carpets bringing the boys home. The magic carpets, as you know, were the aircraft carriers. Even the aircraft carriers were utilized to bring the boys home. I saw on the islands of the Marianas 100 acres of equipment, which were left there. They came home much too early. But we heeded the pleas of the mothers and the fathers and sweethearts and the teachers and the preachers—the same voices that are telling us that we do not need this universal military training. If we are to depend upon the draft system for meeting our needs, God help America. God saved us in the past and God will save us in the future. We will not have the luxury of time and of space when Russia gets ready to strike. You who live in Boston, you who live in Chicago, you who live in Detroit, you who live in New York, you who live in Pittsburgh, you will be the first to feel the Russian's atomic blow when she is ready to attack you in the silence of the night. You will be the first to feel the guided missiles of the submarines that can get off the Atlantic seaboard and pierce your slumbering curtain. But as long as our Nation is prepared and as long as we have an adequate Reserve, and as long as we have a system which is decisive, which is unequivocal, and which lets the young men know what is expected of them, do not you believe that Russia will ever dare attack us. In my own State of South Carolina we have a $2,000,000,000 H-bomb plant now under construction, hoping that down in that part of the United States safe from bombs that will come out of the poles we can build a plant that will deliver us, if that horrible day of all-out atomic and hydrogen warfare should come.

I say to you the whole concept and tradition of this democratic Government is toward equality of opportunity. There is no equality of burden under the present system. The true principles of democracy require that there should be equality of burden in every respect. Why should there not be equality under the law, and equality of service, and equality of burden? I point out to you the unfairness of any system which permits the willing, the courageous, the conscientious, the volunteer to volunteer his services in the hazardous duties of wartime while the unwilling accept the benefits of military security and yet volunteer nothing in the hazards of our national defense. This concept will quickly lead to the liquidation of our courageous and brave people. In wartime no man should be required to make this decision, of whether to go or not to go, on his own responsibility. A voluntary decision to make a career of the Army is one thing, but a voluntary service in wartime to protect our country should be decided by an impartial authority. That impartial authority is you and it is me and it is the Congress.

I call to your attention that the courageous, determined Napoleonic wars in France volunteered. The courageous were liquidated. What has happened to France? They do not have enough people to kick the wrinkles out a prune. What few they have left are liquidated in French Indochina.

What happened to Britain? Their intelligent and courageous have been liquidated. What happened? The Attlee government led them down the road toward socialism.

I am not going to cast my vote to liquidate the courageous and those who are willing to fight while others stay home in a cloak of security, gained by the blood of those who were willing to defend our Nation.

What do you think of Wainwright and Deane, the indignities that they endured because we, this Congress and this Nation, have not followed a program of giving to our people a policy decisive; as I said, decisive and unequivocal.

I want to tell you some of the values that this bill will give you when it is properly implemented. It will give you a training plant. We will have not 20 percent combat training but we will have 60 percent combat training. We will have a pool of basically trained men who can catch up easier if the time should come.

It will release the Regular forces to meet important combat missions, to seize and hold ground of critical and strategic value, which otherwise might have to be taken or recovered at great sacrifice of life. By this we can preserve our allies, together with their industrial and combat values, rather than to go through the costly procedure of liberating them at different times when their industrial potentials are gone and their wealth carried off, God knows where.

I want to read to you what one boy wrote when he came back in 1945. His name is Jim Lucas. He is with Scripps-Howard. I will tell you who he was. He had eight battle stars, earned at Guadalcanal, New Georgia, Russell Islands, Tarawa, Apamama, Saipan, Tinian, and Iwo Jima. I think he had a right to speak. Listen to what he was telling you and me in 1945, when we embarked on the road of indifference—indifference, and we have arrived at this point now where we are trying to buy our security:

Little people like to believe they don't make wars.

Dictators make wars. Kings make wars. Even Presidents and Congresses make wars. But not the common man. He merely fights them. And when war comes, he likes to believe he has been betrayed.

After 3 years in the Pacific, some of us reject that as rank escapism. We think you little people had a hand in making the war we just finished. We fear you may be making another.

General Marshall says we must have universal military training. So does Admiral King. So do General Vandegrift, General Eisenhower, General MacArthur. We've served under those men in a global war. We think they are competent to speak. We've followed them into battle on two continents and they haven't let us down. Moreover, we've seen, out there in the Pacific, what happened to our inadequate pre-Pearl Harbor forces at Guam, Wake, Manila, Pearl Harbor.

It's not that we like military life. Most of us don't. We've been scared, uncomfortable, unhappy, lonesome. We've wanted to come home. But—and this is important—we've always taken it for granted someone would take our place.

It comes as a shock that a segment of the public, mothers, preachers, educators—are campaigning noisily against universal training. We can't believe they know more about it than our leaders.

We aren't professional soldiers. We are civilians again, and happy to be. But we know we can maintain peace only by remaining strong. Strip our forces and we lose everything we've gained. We think we bought peace at too fearful a price for that.

Many ex-soldiers, ex-sailors, ex-Marines are frankly worried. We say something like this:

"You're doing it to us again. You're going to strip us of our basic weapons, our manpower. Then you'll begin taking away our guns and our ships. In a few years, you'll stick us, our kid brother or our sons, on an island with a beanshooter and a prayer. You haven't learned yet."

We are surprised to hear it seriously argued that we've always been able to train an army after we are attacked and, by golly, we can start flat-footed and whip 'em again. I'd be careful with that one. I wouldn't, for instance, recommend telling it to the boys who were on Wake or Bataan. We can't seriously believe that an aggressor nation is going to give us a third chance. We've played on luck too long.

The case for mother is stronger than for preacher or teacher. Mother thinks with her heart. She prefers to believe peace can be kept in some mysterious fashion; after all, she shouldn't be expected to know how, without her boy leaving home. But mother, bless her heart, is something less than a good American when she insists that her boy come home, even if he doesn't have enough points, or bullies the Government into scuttling the point system. That's not idle talk. Congressmen say that the bulk of their mail does not attack demobilization as a policy. Ninety percent of it, one Congressman estimates, is a plea for special privilege for specific individuals.

Teacher should think with his mind. But isn't he thinking in terms of fees and enrollments? The preacher talks doctrine. Their outcry against military training is the more damning. We don't think it can be justified.

Mother, teacher, preacher occupy unique positions in our national life. This is particularly true of mother. Other peoples told us that no nation on earth, certainly no bunch of fighting men, is more closely tied to the appron strings than we are.

You are the vocal voters. You are spokesmen for "the little people" who make wars and innocently disclaim all responsibility for them. You hold great power in our Government. You cannot escape responsibility the next time, if again you make war by tearing down our defenses and inviting another attack.

We don't doubt that you can frighten Congress into rejecting the considered opinions of the men who led us to victory. Congress scares easily.

O. K., mother. O. K., professor. O. K., parson. But are you willing to take the consequences if you lead us into world war III?

So said Jim Lucas in 1945. Are we following that road today? Is the tendency down that road? In time of danger he who travels the same road twice ought to have his head examined. For me there is no education in the second kick of a mule. For me, I choose this course regardless of consequences. Unborn generations can well say: "RIVERS tried to give us a chance."

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, the Members of this Congress who are being called upon to vote for or against universal military conscription, I am sure, are faced with the most momentous decision they have been called upon to make, at least during the almost 10 years of my service in this body.

It is one that must cause us to search our souls and conscience in the hope of making the right decision. I deem this problem so important that it compels us to disregard any thought of whether it may please any one group of the American people because, in fact, it will affect equally all groups of people whether they be members of patriotic organizations, farm groups, church groups, educators, laboring groups, or minority groups of any kind.

After making a study of this legislation and hearing the arguments of those who favor it, and of those who oppose it, after reviewing the effects of universal military training or conscription upon other nations throughout world history, and after considering the accomplishments of our Nation and other free nations who were our allies who have never adopted universal military conscription, but who won World War I and World War II with free men defeating all other nations which had builded their strength on universal military conscription, and after taking a great many other factors into consideration, I am compelled in good conscience to oppose this legislation.

It was an American statesman and philosopher in the founding days of our Republic who wisely said, in substance, "that in guiding the future of our country we should consider the experience of the past." Let us take a look at the past.

I should like to point out that history records all governments throughout the hundreds of years which adopted military conscription beginning with Rome, Greece, France under Napoleon, Germany under Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm, Hitler, and again Rome under Mussolini, have been defeated and practically destroyed by nations which did not have universal military conscription but by nations who kept their people free from military dictatorship.

Why adopt the age-old policies of universal military conscription that would oppress and limit the freedom of our young men, when history records their failure in every instance?

In World War I it was largely through the efforts of the United States, Canada, and the British Empire, not one of which had conscription, which brought defeat to the German Empire under Kaiser Wilhelm.

Then again, in World War II the free nations with free men bearing arms, backed by the industrial might of free nations, namely the United States, Canada, England, Australia, came into the fight and won World War II destroying the military conscription machines of Hitler, Mussolini of Italy, and Japan.

Russia, a Communist state with universal military conscription was the only nation left and Russia must continue to keep the people under conscription, regimentation, and control in order to keep them in slavery.

Now the administration and the military leaders of our country who hold high office by the appointment of the President, are demanding that the Congress pass universal military training or conscription which will give them the power to control the lives of every able-bodied man in our country from 18 years to his twenty-sixth birthday.

They would take him from his home environment at the age of 18 years and give him elementary military training for 6 months. Then he would be put into the Reserve for 7½ years until 26 years of age, subject to call into military training or service during any of the 7½ years. At the very age and time he would like to plan his future, he cannot do so. He is under bondage to his Government and subject to its call. Can you imagine his confusion and discouragement?

This, notwithstanding the fact that we now have a draft law which runs to 1955 through which all of the young men the military and the Government think they need, are being drafted into the military through selective service. We now have in the military service approximately 3,500,000 men.

I am opposed to this legislation because I think it would weaken the defense of our country, rather than strengthen it. Let us assume that 800,000 young men during the year 1953, 18 years

of age, would be called up under the universal military training bill for 6 months' military training. Can you imagine the billions of dollars it will cost to provide housing, medical care, transportation, salaries, Government insurance, and so forth. And when these 800,000 men have had their 6 months' training they will be held in the Reserve for 7½ years and doubtless the great majority of them will have no more training because there will not be sufficient armories, or places where they can meet and train.

Now suppose we get into a war 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, 5 years later. Anyone must know with the constant change of weapons and warfare due to science and research that the cost of training, and the loss of their time in such training would be of practically no value to them, because if they were called into war they would all have to be retained.

That would financially weaken the defense of our country because of the cost of training them, because of the loss of their labor on the farms and in the factories when they were in training, the cost of the equipment when training them, which would then be obsolete, and in addition to that to train these 800,000 men you would have to take out of the Army now from Korea or elsewhere from the military over 300,000 officers who would train these men as it will take about one officer to every three trainees.

Let us assume for the next 5 years that we train 800,000 boys coming 18 years of age each year for 6 months and hold them in the Reserve. Can anyone begin to figure the cost of such a continuing financial load? They will get little training other than the 6 months even though they are held in the Reserve for 7½ years. What a waste of manpower and what a waste of money.

That is not the worst feature of the problem. It will take the young men away from the farms, from their basketball teams, their sports in the little towns and cities throughout the Nation, away from the influence of the home, church, and civic environment. It will take him to Army camps where he is only a number among countless thousands. His instructors will be military instructors and his education will be along military lines, and his thinking will be fashioned to a great extent at this age to the military viewpoint. He will become accustomed to having his freedom and liberty limited. He will be weaned away to a certain extent from the freedom he enjoyed in his home and in the classroom. His thinking will be circumscribed and limited possibly for the rest of his life in most instances.

He could argue his viewpoint with his teachers in high school, with his parents at home, and with anyone; he cannot talk back or argue his views in the Army. He will take orders or else.

Mr. Chairman, Members of Congress time and again have tried to work out a better program with the military at very little cost compared with this program coordinated with the schools of the Nation. Such a program could and should be coordinated with our economic, educational, religious, and social way of life. But the military has always turned a deaf ear to such a proposal.

The military apparently wants to indoctrinate the young men of the future; they want to plan their education; they want to carry on every conceivable kind of a school and they have been doing that. If and when they get this universal military training fastened upon the young men of this Nation they will have the power to, and will tell the young men what schools they can enter, what courses they shall study, in the Reserve program, who can be doctors and dentists, who can study to be scientists, and who shall be cooks, garbage collectors, or what have you.

A program of coordinating military training is now in effect in some universities, colleges, and schools and has already proven the wisdom and value of such a plan, but the military does not want it.

There are 670 educational institutions in America now training Reserves. I understand there are approximately 160 applications from other schools now before those in the Pentagon that are anxious to train and could have been training Reserves for nothing except the United States Government furnish the equipment. In that group of 670 schools there were 328,480 students as of 1950 in the Reserves. There are a greater number now in training.

ADMINISTRATION AND MILITARY WANT MORE POWER

The President and his military appointees are asking for more and more power in this legislation that many believe is dangerous to the people of America. For years the people have been complaining that the Congress has surrendered too much of its power to the executive department. They are demanding that the Congress take back some of these powers; they are complaining, and I think justly so, that the military and the State Department, under the administration, now have too much power.

The people are fearful that the granting of more such powers will cause our country to be dominated, directed, and controlled by the military.

SOME PROVISIONS OF THIS BILL

First. The bill gives the President power to keep the inductee in active training for the entire 8 years whether or not a state of war exists, depending on the President's wishes.

Second. The wording is not clear, so that it may apply to women as well as men.

Third. Without check, it gives the President and Congress autocratic power to select and induct for training such number of persons as may be required, whether or not a state of war exists.

Fourth. The President has complete authority to make deferments from training and service for anyone engaged in study, research, or other endeavors necessary to the maintenance of health, safety, or interest.

Fifth. It will increase the cost of Government and this bill recommends one instructor for every three trainees.

Sixth. It could establish a total military dictatorship in the United States.

Seventh. Unless the trainees are kept in continuous service, they would not be ready for combat duty, refuting the well-trained-reserve argument of UMT.

Eighth. With whose ideals and concepts of ethics, and by what means will the trainees be indoctrinated?

We had better open our eyes before we take this long and fateful step.

WE MUST PROTECT OUR FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC POWER

We now have a military force of about 3,500,000 men. The Selective Service now has the power to draft every able-bodied young man from 18½ to 26 years of age. This gives them the power to build up the necessary reserve strength through selective service through which men are thoroughly trained in the military. Under the UMT bill, practically all men trained would have to be retrained if and when called through Selective Service. Their training under UMT would be practically worthless and would unnecessarily further drain off the manpower of our Nation which should be allowed to remain on the farms, in industry, and other pursuits to strengthen the economy of our Nation.

Past experience has proved that when Congress declared war there was plenty of time to give basic military training to inductees who, in every instance, in the past have been called into the service faster than military equipment can be produced with which to train them.

The power of our industrial might and our financial stability back of the lines on the home front made it possible for us to win World War I and World War II. We must increase this power and our financial strength to win world war III if it comes.

To keep our economy strong we must not through universal military training further drain off the young manpower of our country, slow down agriculture, scientific research, our industrial power, and weaken the financial solvency of our Nation.

Under Selective Service we have already greatly depleted our manpower on the farms. The universal military training bill will take more men from these farms. We should remember the part an abundance of food production plays in the winning of any long drawn out war. We may endanger the food supply of this Nation. In the same manner this universal military training bill would take more men out of industry slowing down the industrial power of our Nation which is absolutely necessary for the ultimate winning of any war that may come.

Our greatest contribution to the defense of our country and our allies, if war comes, lies in our ability to aid them with our air and naval power. To be in position to do this we need to rapidly build up our Air Force, to increase our production of tanks, guns, rockets, ammunitions of war generally. In such manner we can make our greatest contribution if a global war comes.

It would be unwise for us to try to match our manpower in numbers and spread them all over the world because we are so tremendously outnumbered by

the hordes of people in Asia and Eastern Europe.

We should continue to build up the industrial, economic, agricultural and scientific powers of our Nation through which we shall make our greatest contribution.

I think it is unfortunate that this bill has come before the House which has rocked and disturbed the thinking of the American people from coast to coast. It is unfortunate because in these critical times we need unity among our people as never before.

I have given only a few of the reasons why I think this legislation should not be enacted. I repeat it will unnecessarily limit the freedom of the young men of our country who are taken into the military service and I sincerely believe that it will greatly weaken the defense of our country rather than to give it greater strength.

In conclusion let me say the basic, immutable, fundamental reservoirs from which this Nation has drawn its strength and power since the founding of our Constitution have been in preserving the greatest individual freedom and opportunity for each of its citizens from the Christian environment of the homes of the Nation, and from the cultural and spiritual environment of our churches, schools, and educational institutions. I am opposed to this legislation because I believe it weakens the opportunity for these fundamental principles to make their greatest contribution to the youth of our land when they are taken away from such environment as the passage of this legislation would do.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I am in disagreement with the gentleman who preceded me. However, I know that all of the House is in agreement that our purpose is to make and keep America strong. The question to be voted upon is whether or not the proposed legislation accomplishes that purpose.

If the United States is threatened by an enemy, the security of the United States demands that two questions be answered. We must determine how we shall muster our men and matériel, and then, how shall they be deployed. If this Congress cannot be certain as to the intentions of our President in the deployment of our forces and in international meddling, then we are talking in riddles. If our administration is seeking to give freedom, as we know it, to over a billion people of the world who do not have our tradition, who are hostile to our way of life, who would not retain liberty as we know it if we gave it to them, then we are powerless. No law could be drafted by this Congress by which we could muster enough men and matériel from 150,000,000 people to police the world.

If we assume that in the future our State Department and our President will make sound and proper decisions in foreign policy, the time spent on debate of this bill is justified. However, if we believe that the foreign policy of our President is designed to give us a war economy to bolster a planned but collapsing peacetime economy, the time now being spent is not justified. If we are risking the security of this country beyond the capacity of its men and matériel in foreign fields through the exercise of powers usurped from this Congress, our first order of business should be the recapture of those powers and the impeachment of those illegally exercising power.

During the debate on this bill, I arranged the affairs of my office so that I might listen to every possible minute of the argument. The object of the bill is declared to be the establishment of a peacetime Reserve. Yet the proponents of the bill admit that it does not accomplish that purpose. We know that France not only slept behind a Maginot line, but it also slept behind an untrained reserve in which it had confidence. If we are agreed that we need a trained Reserve, then an untrained Reserve is of no value no matter what its cost.

This bill has taken on the characteristics of other administration proposals. The proponents do not want to discuss actual cost nor probable cost. They make reference to trivial sums of money. Yet, we know that America now has about 75,000,000 males. It is admitted that it would cost about $3,000 to train one youth for 6 months. It is admitted that our Reserves now cost us about $424 per year per man. If we are to assume that the program is what it purports to be and is universal, we know that when we have a new group of males in America numbering 75,000,000 we will have spent $225,000,000,000 to give them each 6 months' training, and we will have spent the additional sum of $244,000,000,000 for the time that they are in the Reserve; that is for the 7½-year period. This sum totals $469,000,000,000. This represents a figure of about $7,000 for each of those male citizens. It represents the cost of an average home. It is not to be paid for by this Government but it is to be collected from those citizens. In the first 156 years of our United States history, all of our Presidents collected only $248,000,000,000. This included two world wars. During the first 6 years under our present Executive, we have collected $260,000,000,000 in taxes, and by the end of this year he will have collected $320,000,000,000. I submit the proponents of this legislation should answer the question: Why should this Congress commit future generations to an estimated tax cost of $938,000,000,000 in 150 years, when all of our wars including two world wars and all of our other costs of government only total $248,000,000,000 in 156 years of our history. The proponents speaking for this administration bill, do not answer the question. They speak in generalities. They admit it does not accomplish our purpose and then demand its passage.

My colleague from California, in the course of his remarks, stated that he would support this proposed legislation because he saw no opportunity for peace in the near future. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that America will never know peace so long as our Chief Executive exercises the usurped power of this Congress to declare war and thus bolster a planned inflation at home with a war emergency economy abroad during election years.

I at one time thought favorably of universal military training. I am still of the opinion that beneficial military training and experience could be given to all of our young men through an expansion of the program now provided by our National Guard. This would require amendment of title 32 of the United States Code. This would require complete control of the manpower of our country at the State level until Congress declared war. Surely, there is no doubt in any one's mind who has heard the argument but what all of the training planned to be given to our young men under the proposed legislation could just as effectively and far more economically be given through the National Guard. Provision could there be made for the annual training of the reserves. Yet, the proposed legislation sent to us by the Pentagon does not permit discussion of this subject. The committee has not considered the alternative and the bill before us actually vests the power in the Pentagon to destroy the National Guard during peacetime.

Surely, each of the 435 Members of this House must wonder why the Congress is asked to pass this legislation for the only expressed reason that it is unreasonable and will not accomplish our purpose. We must wonder what forces are back of this measure. I have been in unusually close attendance on the debate because I have hoped that I might find some reason to soften my opinions as expressed on April 3 of last year in the well of this House. I have looked in vain and I respectfully request that the membership of this House read those remarks and their documentation before voting on the passage of this legislation. I believed then and I believe now, that there are those in our Military Establishment seeking to give America military socialism. I believed then and I believe now, that the security of America demanded an immediate cleaning out of the Pentagon by those who understood the Military Establishment and believed in the American way of life.

In the few minutes remaining to me, I want to recall certain facts to the attention of the House. While the proposed legislation gives 18-year-old boys the protection of a civilian court for his 6 months' period of training, he is subject in peacetime to military court martial if he violates an order of the Executive while he is in the military Reserve. Our Constitution provides that the Congress, and only the Congress, can declare war. It also provides that even after Congress declares war the President cannot raise armies. The provision in this regard is that only Congress can raise armies. Even then, there is the added precaution that Congress itself cannot finance an Army for longer than 2 years. It is understandable that our President was made Commander in Chief of our armies. However, many of our States would not have ratified our Constitution if the additional precaution

were not included that during peacetime our President would have no command over the Militia. Until this Congress declares war, the Militia of the respective States are under the command of the Governors of those States. It is true that our President in peacetime does have command of forces limited by this Congress. However, our Constitution wisely provided against centralized military control of our manpower during peacetime. This Congress has heretofore passed the National Guard Act and it has delegated its responsibility to determine emergencies sufficient to call up the National Guard to the President. He still has that power.

The proposed legislation will now destroy the protective provision of our Constitution which prohibits the President from having command of the Militia of America during peacetime. At great and unjustifiable cost, the President now asks us to pass this legislation which under the guise of giving our youths 6 months' military training will place them in the military Reserve of America subject to the military orders of the Executive. When and if this legislation is passed, he will also have the delegated power of this Congress to declare war and emergencies. When he exercises that delegated power, he will then have military command of all of the able-bodied males in America as a result of his universal proposal here under consideration to force all men into that command. Mr. Speaker, to ever repeal this legislation or to amend it will require a two-thirds vote over the veto of any future Executive. Casual conversation with other Members of this House indicates a lack of knowledge of why the framers of our Constitution insisted upon the provisions I have just referred to. The framers of our Constitution were well aware that the first Bill of Rights was won in England in 1689. Kings and Parliaments had raised armies and the peoples suffered. Until 1879 the British people were protected by the Mutiny Act. It was passed each year by the Parliament and always recited that the Bill of Rights made it illegal to maintain a standing army except with the consent of Parliament. Even then, Parliament had to make an express finding that a certain number of armed men were needed, and it had to make an appropriation of money. In 1879, the title of the Mutiny Act was changed to the Army Discipline and Regulation Act. Even then though, it was passed each year. I believe it is now known as the Army Annual Act. Civil war resulted in England when Charles I raised his own money to build a powerful navy. He was beheaded by the Parliamentary Party. England had gone through several hundred years of the development of the common law when it had the above referred to experience. Yet, there are those in our midst in this House who believe we cannot profit by that experience. They believe that experience was peculiar to England. They believe our checks and balances will save us. Yet, the practical effect of what they do here by this proposed legislation is to destroy the power of this Congress to check our Executive and we propose to pass the bill when we admit that it will not accomplish our desired purpose.

The profound students who drafted our Constitution knew that there was a serious weakness in our form of government when no provision was made for allegiance to a king, and our Constitution was made in writing. Our people owe allegiance to the meaning of a written Constitution. If its meaning is changed through incompetence or demagogs, the change is permanent, until 150,000,000 people are induced to make formal changes as provided in the Constitution. We now have two men on our Supreme Court bench who have said publicly that in constitutional matters they are free to redefine words and phrases in our Constitution. They can amend our Constitution by such redefinition. We have a legislature composed of two Houses of equal strength. They have equal strength in the passage of legislation and its repeal or amendment. If one of those Houses comes under the domination of a particular class or group during a period of economic change, such repeal or amendment may be impossible. If its repeal or amendment is necessary against the wishes of an empowered Executive where a two-thirds vote is required such action by the Congress would be virtually impossible. The legislation before us is offered by our Executive seeking more and additional powers. The report itself admits that it is not the result of a complete and final study. The proposed legislation carries with it the implied power of applying military law to picket lines and regulating the press and our whole economy, if our Chief Executive believes that is necessary in the national interest.

Mr. Chairman, wherever the vile furies of socialism have been accepted by free governments under the guise of transferring the responsibilities of free Christian family life to the soulless business of government, we have always found corruption in government and a miserable standard of living as the result. The new Queen of England still has the power to dismiss a Parliament dominated by one house and tell her people that her previous governments have not been complying with the unwritten constitution of England. She presumably will do that when her people are ready to support her at the end of their foolish experiment in socialism. Her people owe allegiance to their Queen. I put the very sincere question, however, What is left but civil war for the United States when the meaning of its written Constitution is changed through chicanery and redefinition in order to keep demagogs in public office? What are 150,000,000 people to do when the custodian of their allegiance no longer tolerates or speaks for individual freedom and competitive free enterprise, and they are hounded to death by carpetbaggers peddling regimentation and government by executive decree? I direct your attention to the fifth amendment of our Constitution, where our grand juries are made a bulwark against criminal prosecution except in the land and naval forces or in the militia, where the person to be charged is in the service in a time of war or public danger. I remind you again that we have heretofore delegated to the President the power to determine when national emergencies exist. The proposed legislation now before us will give our President the power of military justice over all men past the age of 18 years and 6 months. Where can 150,000,000 people look for relief when they are deprived of the sixth amendment and their speedy trial, right to be confronted with witnesses, trial in a local court, and a counsel if necessary to present his defense. Where will they look for an allegiance to bring back trial by jury and their right to bear arms as guaranteed to them in the second amendment. Will they be able to look to their sovereign 48 States for relief?

Can anyone answer the question, What does the word "sovereignty" mean in connection with our 48 States, if we centralize in Washington complete control of our able-bodied men and give Washington the power to destroy the National Guard in peacetime? All of us come from States whose constitutions have provisions in regard to the militia. I want to read you article 8, sections 1 and 2, of the California Constitution:

LEGISLATURE TO PROVIDE FOR MILITIA

SECTION 1. The legislature shall provide, by law, for organizing and disciplining the militia, in such manner as it may deem expedient, not incompatible with the Constitution and laws of the United States. Officers of the militia shall be elected or appointed in such manner as the legislature shall from time to time direct, and shall be commissioned by the governor. The governor shall have power to call for the militia to execute the laws of the State, to suppress insurrections, and repel invasions. (Constitution of 1849, art. VIII, secs. 1, 2, 3, revised 1879.)

MILITIA TO CARRY ONLY NATIONAL OR STATE FLAG

SEC. 2. All military organizations provided for by this constitution, or any law of this State, and receiving State support, shall, while under arms either for ceremony or duty, carry no device, banner, or flag of any state or nation, except that of the United States or the State of California.

If we pass the proposed legislation, where will our governors find their State police force to execute the laws of the State, to suppress insurrections and to repel invasions, which responsibilities and powers are placed on those governors under the Federal Constitution?

If we pass the proposed legislation and vest in our Executive all of the powers withheld from him by the wise framers of our Constitution, the only power this Congress will retain to control his action will be the right to refuse to finance armies that our Executive has put into the field. The last 18 months demonstrate that you will not take that action. He has usurped the power to declare war and has exercised it for 18 months. Yet the Congress has regimented the Nation without debate in connection with impeachment of the President because we all want to give every support to those who are dying in an undeclared war. I say to you that this Congress will never refuse to finance our sons in foreign fields who are dying in compliance with an unconstitutional order of their Commander in Chief.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress and all its membership have a grave responsibility they should seek to perform to their very death. That responsibility is the defense of and the proper exercise of the constitutional responsibilities placed upon us in that document which creates the American way of life.

The time that has elapsed since 13 States ratified our Constitution is but a moment compared to recorded history. Alexander Hamilton was a great student of government and history. When the State conventions were debating ratification, Alexander Hamilton said in the Federalist, and I quote:

> The Legislature of the United States will be obliged by this provision, once at least every 2 years, to deliberate upon the propriety of keeping a military force on foot; to come to a new resolution on the point; and to declare their sense of the matter by a formal vote in the face of their constituents. They are not at liberty to vest in the executive department permanent funds for the support of an army, if they were even incautious enough to be willing to repose in it so improper a confidence.

Mr. Hamilton was referring to that provision for congressional power in our Constitution which reads as follows:

> To raise and support armies, that no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years.

Twenty years ago, one of our greatest statesmen was Chief of Staff. He was Gen. Douglas MacArthur, and in his typically frank manner he reported to the Congress that there were those in the Military Establishment seeking to exercise illegal powers. He even pointed out, as the proponents here admit in regard to the proposed legislation, that they sought powers without a purpose. The January 1952 issue of the American Legion magazine carried an article by General MacArthur entitled "The Citizen." I want to read you two paragraphs from page 15 of the magazine:

> Now our military policy again requires revision. Under selective service and other statutes, we have called up large increments of our citizen soldiery with which to prosecute the Korean war and to bolster our own defense and the defense of many other lands. We have adopted the principle of universal military training, and the outlook is toward maintaining for many years—even in peace—an armed readiness for war.
>
> All this, while intended and designed to strengthen freedom's defense, carries within itself the very germs to freedom's destruction. For it etches the pattern to a military state which, historically under the control of professional military thinking in constant search for means toward efficiency, has found in freedom possibly its greatest single impediment, to brush it aside as inimicable to established military policy. To avoid this historic pitfall, it is essential that civilian control over the citizen army be extended and intensified. Particularly is this true in the administration of the program of universal military training, if the youth of our land is to avoid being corrupted into a legion of subserviency to the so-called military mind.

Mr. Chairman, it is generally believed that one Congress cannot bind its successor or other Congresses elected by the people of our country. Yet, the passage of this bill will transfer such powers to the President which by their very nature will make it virtually impossible for future Congresses to effectively exercise their obligation to declare war, to raise armies, to finance armies, and to guarantee to the individual States a republican form of government. I am not prepared to take that action.

THE PROPOSED UMT PROGRAM

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, the universal military training proposal submitted to Congress would place all young men 18 years of age into Army camps scattered all over the country for 6 months of basic training. Then each of them would continue serving in a Reserve component of our military forces for an additional 7½ years. This is a permanent peacetime military-conscription program.

THE LOCAL TRAINING PLAN

I will support a universal military training program that will provide military training of young men within the vicinity of their homes. This training could be carried on as a part of our school program or in military districts so established as not to remove these boys of a tender age from the environment and protection of their homes.

I cannot vote for a universal military training program which would take every high-school boy from the protection, guidance, and environment of his parents, church, and school, and place him in Army camps far removed from his locality.

For every two trainees brought to these Army camps there would be one military instructor, with whom these teen-agers would be constantly associated. Combat service for well-qualified and properly trained young men is not nearly so destructive as their living the Army life among older, carefree military instructors. I was in the Army long enough to know that the fast-living and irresponsible environment, which is encouraged and considered by most military officers as essential to the orientation of men for future combat, is certainly not a character-building program for our young boys.

REGIMENTATION OF OUR YOUTH

The universal military training program submitted to Congress would regiment every young man from his eighteenth through his twenty-sixth birthday, with no freedom for engagements and undertakings as has been our American heritage. No longer would the teen-agers be counting the days until they would become high-school graduates, but, instead, they would be counting the days until they would become a part of the national goose-stepping military machine.

MILITARIZATION

It is argued that we must adopt this type of universal military training because this is the system used by communistic Russia. That we must fight fire with fire. It could just as well be argued that we need to adopt communism in our efforts to combat communism.

History reveals that peacetime military conscription has led to the downfall of every major nation that has adopted it since the days of the Roman Empire. History further reveals that the people of every major nation who have adopted peacetime military conscription have lost complete control of their governments—Germany, Italy, and Japan are good recent examples.

The proponents of peacetime conscription cite Sweden, a country with no more people than the city of Chicago, and Switzerland, a country with no more people than the city of New York, as the only exceptions to military destruction by virtue of peacetime universal military training. It would not be argued that either one or both of these small nations could be overrun in a day by any major aggressor. Military efforts of those small countries do not make a lot of difference, and, certainly, their operations are no criterion for the United States of America, a country with more than 150,000,000 freedom-loving people, and the greatest power on earth. Russia's World War II forces were assembled by this same system. They lost millions of men and would have been completely annihilated but for the resources afforded them by free people.

Those insisting upon this foreign proposal suggest that we have 18,000,000 living veterans in the United States who were not militarized during their military services. They seem to forget that those 18,000,000 men were serving their country for a limited time during an emergency, and that every one of them was living for the day when he could leave the military service and return to his American freedom. The adoption of such military regimentation of our youth will lead to a military control of our Government.

Our free people entered World Wars I and II facing adversary countries of regimented people who had been preparing for decades under goose-step military doctrines and socialistic philosophies to take over rulership of the world. The correlated production and military efforts of our free people were sufficient to overnight surpass the concerted preparations of those regimented peoples who who knew nothing but public ownership, military dictatorship, and government domination. Certainly we should not replace our proven democratic principles and American heritage with a system which has brought destruction to every other nation who has adopted it.

AN EFFECTIVE RESERVE SYSTEM

Were the military geniuses of the Pentagon Building not purposely imposing upon and mistreating the veterans of the Reserves, and were they not intentionally refusing to use the draft system as a means of replacing veterans of World War II, as a despicable means of forcing peacetime military conscription upon our people, there would be some merit to the argument that this proposed program would prevent a recurrence of the situation which has resulted in a majority of the 800 reservists being called into the Korean conflict who were veterans of World War II. Those dictatorial military master minds have intentionally sabotaged the voluntary Reserve components of this country and

have refused to use the draft system for the sole purpose of destroying our American way of life.

No one person, not even the so-called military experts, will contend that this type of universal military training can become effective until after the present emergency. However, they insist upon its adoption during this emergency at a time when they can scare the people into believing it necessary because of the emergency, for the simple reason they well know that our people would never swallow such a bitter pill at a time when they were not all jittery with war nerves. Surely we have not drifted into that status whereby we need forget that this is a peace-loving nation, and that we need call upon the military forces of the Pentagon Building to operate the internal affairs of this country as a Gestapo.

Of course, it will be difficult to obtain voluntary reservists after the veterans of those components have been so discriminated against during the Korean war. Of course, the draft system is not furnishing enough replacements in Korea for World War II veterans for the simple reason that the draft system is not being properly used. Those intentional inequities and malicious derelictions could be immediately corrected by this Congress without the enactment of legislation foreign to our proven democratic principles. The military leaders have long ago been afforded plenty of time to replace World War II veterans in Korea by virtue of the draft system had they not been more interested in militarizing every child of this country. There were over 2,500,000 men left in the various Reserve components in January of last year, 6 months after the start of the Korean war. We have some of the greatest military leaders in the world, but they are not among those who are more interested in abolishing democracy than providing a strong military defense.

MERITORIOUS LEGISLATION NEEDS NO SUGAR-COATING

Knowing that our people have become very sensitive to excessive governmental expenditures, it was first contended by the proponents of this legislation in a loud, boastful, and challenging voice, led by the Chairman of the Congressional Armed Services Committee, that the enactment of this legislation would reduce the cost of our Armed Forces. As debate progressed on the floor of Congress and all concerned became aware of the true provisions of the legislation, and the basis for the money-saving argument, the proponents began ducking their former contentions that the program would reduce expenditures. Even though the Armed Services Committee chairman had challenged the world to refute his figures that the universal military training program would save our Government $13,000,000,000, when it became time to meet the challenge upon the floor of Congress, he refused to submit himself to questioning on this point. Various Armed Services Committee proponents have generally admitted in debate that there was little, if any, basis for the money-saving contention. There was never such a great effort put forth to mislead the people upon any issue before this Congress. Not even the committee chairman will now contend that a savings can be expected until there can be a reduction of the standing Armed Forces; and he admits that there can be no reduction until we are assured of peace and tranquillity. This is a peacetime military conscription bill that will cost additional billions to put into any type of operation.

There have been so many misleading figures used in an effort to sugar-coat the cost that it would be impossible to cover all of them in any reasonable time. In an effort to fool the people the proponents have contended that a reservist can be actively trained for 6 months $500 cheaper than training a draftee for the same length of time, while at the same time admit that for every two trainees there will be required one military instructor. Such a conclusion could only be reached by charging the universal military trainee equipment, instruction cost, and so forth, to the Armed Forces—just paper work at no savings. These military instructors would necessarily need to come from the Armed Forces. I do not know how the Armed Forces could spare this great number of instructors if we actually need the 3,700,000 men in our standing force. Now, this would be no few instructors, because there are an average of 3,330 boys becoming 18 years of age daily. Approximately 800,000 young men would be trained annually—4,000,000 trainees and 2,000,000 instructors in 5 years' time. Talk about saving money, this would add billions of dollars to our already staggering expenditures.

Remember, the military experts insist that the standing Armed Forces will not be reduced until we are at complete peace with the rest of the world. They admit that even during peacetime our present standing forces of 3,700,000 men should not be reduced below approximately 2,000,000 men, and that we should have at least three or four reserves for each man released from active duty. Following the figures advanced by the proponents of this legislation, the training and personnel cost to the Government of one active military man over a period of 8 years is $2,369, and the cost to the Government of one ready reserve for the same length of time is $744. Of course, there is no basis for this exaggerated difference in cost, but they are the figures of the proponents. Three ready reservists at a cost of $744 per man per year amounts to $2,230 to replace one active military man who costs the Government $2,366, a savings based upon their illogical figures of only $137 per year per man. Now, remember that even this small "paper" savings will completely vanish and additional expenditures will be required when the standing force has been reduced to a safe minimum and reservists keep pouring in under the permanent peacetime military conscription program.

Those insisting upon the adoption of this wild scheme have advanced no estimates for the billions of dollars' worth of armories and equipment that will necessarily need to be located in every community of this Nation in order to carry out the reserve program for these millions of Ready Reserves following their training period in order to keep them proficient. Otherwise, the limited training could serve no purpose. Those training planes for the Air Force Reserves, training ships for the Naval Reserves, and up-to-date land equipment—such as tanks, guns, rifles, trucks, jeeps, antiaircraft facilities, and the like—will cost billions.

When contending that UMT is a money-saving device, the proponents deliberately neglect to inform us that each dependent of the UMT trainees will cost the Government $40 more than for each dependent of the draftees. A draftee allots $40 from his pay for dependency purposes. The Government contributes $45 to the draftee's allotment for each dependent. The UMT trainee would only receive $30 per month. He will have no $40 for dependency allotment purposes. Therefore, the Government would contribute, under this proposal, the total $85 for each dependent of the UMT trainees.

This program, if carried to its ultimate conclusion on a permanent basis, as proposed by this legislation, would eventually bankrupt our Government, and further postpone the build-up of the Air Force and new technical weapons that we so desperately need for our survival in an all-out war, if, God forbid, we should ever have to face that terrible ordeal.

CIVILIAN CONTROL

This legislation provides for a commission of five members—three civilians and two military—to supervise the program in coordination with the Secretary of Defense. Of course, the civilian members of the commission will necessarily depend upon the Secretary of Defense and the military members of the commission to conduct this military program. Surely we have not forgotten that the same civilian-control argument was advanced when we created a Defense Department and provided that the Secretary of Defense must be a civilian. The first emergency afforded the military leaders an opportunity to insist upon a military man being authorized to serve as Secretary of Defense. Of course, it was then easy to change the law because of an emergency and thereby authorize military control of all defenses. Should such a so-called civilian-controlled UMT bill be adopted, it would not be long until some sort of an emergency would make available the opportunity to place complete military control into existence—that is the ultimate goal. We all know what the camel has in mind after he gets his nose under the tent.

If a democracy will not operate during an emergency, it will not operate at all. We always find ourselves in a state of an emergency. I do not look with favor upon the idea of abolishing democratic principles upon the excuse that an emergency warrants such action.

CONCLUSION

Military training for every physically and mentally qualified young man would be helpful to the individual and to the Nation. This training should be afforded in accordance with other proven systems of training and educating our youth. I

would like for every young man to know military tactics, and, certainly, be properly trained before called upon to serve his Nation during an emergency, but I do not believe it is necessary to militarize our boys in order to accomplish this benefit.

We could never match man for man the communistic armies of Russia. That is not our means for victory. We must maintain a great economic strength rather than create internal difficulties growing out of discontent, resulting from inflation, shortages, and governmental regulations. This UMT proposal will weaken rather than strengthen our Nation.

Finally, there seems to be nothing that UMT could add to our defense against communism as long as the present emergency exists. Then, it should be better to wait until we can consider the merits of universal military training calmly and not on an emotional basis arising out of the present emergency.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against this universal military training bill, H. R. 5904, which provides for the placing of every 18-year-old boy in the Armed Forces for 6 months, after which he will be placed in the Ready Reserve for 7½ years, subject to the call to active duty. I want to state categorically, and state it for the RECORD, that I am strongly opposed to its enactment and that I am going to vote against it. I call upon my colleagues to do likewise.

I am opposed to it because the facts show that UMT is neither necessary nor desirable. It is unnecessary because we already have a selective-service law which provides adequate authority to keep our Armed Forces at any desired strength to meet any emergency. UMT is undesirable because it is something alien to American principles and our democratic traditions—its purpose is to give the Pentagon permanent military control of our youth, and its effect will tend to militarize our country.

The military has been propagandizing for UMT for a long time—they like the idea of UMT because it will give the military clique a new and dominating position in the political life of our country. Taking advantage of the present emergency situation, they seek to secure congressional approval of UMT as a permanent program. They are seeking to sell to the country a fixed national policy of military conscription by making the dishonest claim that it is an emergency measure. Yet the facts show that the UMT program is a peacetime training program which cannot be put into effect during the present emergency except in a very limited and modified form. I resent this effort to stampede the public and the Congress into enacting a law that is to go into effect in the future, and a law which, if considered under more calm and sober days later on, would never be enacted by Congress.

Were this program a sound and constructive one, such as is in effect in Switzerland and Sweden, where trainees are under control of a civilian board, and where emphasis is upon the wholesome growth, education, and development of their young lads, then I would be prepared to consider the proposal. But I have lost all confidence in the ability of the Pentagon's fitness to take jurisdiction over the lives and future of kids just out of high school. The Military Establishment has, by its bungling and gross mismanagement of the Reserve and National Guard programs, invoked little confidence in its capacity to train and treat properly kids of 18.

During the last 2 years I have received innumerable letters from reservists and national guardists who have been recalled to active duty, and from their wives, fathers, and mothers, and have also talked with them personally. These letters and my personal investigation of the facts of each situation support one conclusion—the conclusion that the Pentagon has been inefficient and callous in their treatment of members of the Reserve and the National Guard. The Pentagon has been wholly indifferent to the personal problems of those who have been called to active duty and have given no consideration to their family and home problems. The Pentagon has had little respect for human values—no regard for the individual. All, it possesses, and this is its motive in advocating this bill, is an insatiable craving for power and a desire to build a military empire whereby they will be able to satisfy their personal ambitions.

I resent this concentrated drive by the Pentagon to impose a military system upon our country which is so completely contrary and alien to democratic principles. It has always been my understanding that the military should be subservient to civilian control, and that the task of the military was to carry out the policies determined by the Congress. Yet in recent months we have seen a well organized propaganda campaign on the part of the military to promote this UMT program. If it wasn't for this high-powered military propaganda, Congress would not be debating this bill today. Every national farm, religious, and labor organization is against this bill, as well as most educational associations and thinking people everywhere. The fact that this bill ever got out of committee indicates the growing political strength of the military oligarchy. The House should vote this bill down by a big majority and the Congress should tell the Pentagon brass in no uncertain terms to stay on their own side of the Potomac River—they have a big enough job to do as it is without trying to dictate policy to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, there are many, many objections to this bill, and these have been outlined in great detail by my colleagues who have spoken before me in this debate, so I will not take up time to discuss the matter further. I close by saying once again that universal military training has no place in a democratic society and I call upon the House to vote it down.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a healthy debate.

But the question still remains, Do the American people want UMT?

Public-opinion polls indicate that the people overwhelmingly support UMT. And, as always, there are organizations for it, and there are organizations against it.

As usual, the military and the Pentagon have been the whipping boys. The same men that you shower honors upon and applaud loudly when the destiny of the Nation is at stake are now accused of seeking to throttle the Nation.

UMT has been called impractical and expensive. No one has indicated why it is impractical, and no one has been able to show why it will not save money; so again the opponents have turned to generalities, and again they have attacked the military.

I find it strange to understand why some of the opponents of UMT now take the position that once a man has entered the Reserve as a result of his service in the Armed Forces, that he thereafter should be the one to be called in the event of further emergency.

No one has answered the point that we have reiterated again and again that UMT will equalize the obligation to serve the Nation.

No one who opposes UMT has yet suggested any plan that would protect our veterans from recall again and again. No one has offered any constructive alternative to the bill now before the House.

We have been told by some that—oh, yes; they favor UMT, always have; but not the way it is presented in this bill. Our freedoms, they say, require a different system. They offer no alternative; they just do not think this is the proper method. They say it is wrong to take a boy for 6 months and train him and then put him in the Reserve. But, in the same breath, they argue that they have always been for selective service, which takes a man for 24 months and then puts him in the Reserve.

We can have adequate national security and reduced costs if we adopt this legislation and initiate a program of universal military training.

We can have that adequate defense by building a Ready Reserve composed of men recently trained for a period of 6 months. We can also have adequate defense by maintaining an armed force of three and one-half to four million men for an indefinite period.

There is no easy way out of this. You cannot have your cake and eat it too.

There are some among you apparently who think it is perfectly proper to defer a young man in college—the rich man's son if you will—but draft the boy who cannot afford to go to college. And then if you need his services again, break up his home, destroy his business, and order him back to active duty.

We have tried to give you the best bill we know how to prepare. If we have failed it is because you have not offered any constructive suggestions as a substitute.

We have been criticized for bowing to the Pentagon, and yet the Pentagon had nothing to do with the writing of this bill. Even the Commission has been attacked as a hand-picked group of men who wish to impose this obligation upon every young man because they are supposedly the tools of the Pentagon.

Can you honestly and sincerely attack the patriotic motives of men like Jim Wadsworth, who served in the House and in the Senate of the United States for many years? Can you honestly argue that Karl Compton, one of the Nation's greatest educators and scientists, would recommend something that would destroy our educational system?

Can you honestly and in good conscience ridicule the men who support this program? Do you think DICK RUSSELL, HARRY BYRD, LYNDON JOHNSON, ESTES KEFAUVER, LESTER HUNT, JOHN STENNIS, RUSSELL LONG, STYLES BRIDGES, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, WAYNE MORSE, WILLIAM KNOWLAND, HARRY CAIN, and RALPH FLANDERS are seeking to put our American youth in bondage?

Do you think that men like STERLING COLE, TOM MARTIN, OVERTON BROOKS, JIMMY VAN ZANDT, FRANCK HAVENNER, LEROY JOHNSON, GENE COX, JOHN MCCORMACK, SAM RAYBURN, DICK RICHARDS, PAUL KILDAY, and many many others would approve a program that was not in the best interest of the American people?

There is been a lot of talk in the House about recommitting this bill. The talk goes something like that: "The bill needs further study." But what is meant is this: "It's an election year. This is a hot issue, let's not pass on it this year. Let's recommit the bill."

We all have a duty to perform as Congressmen. A duty that requires an honest forthright decision on our part. And this House has never failed to meet any issue that calls for a positive decision. The welfare of our Nation is always in our decisions. I am confident that a decision will be reached in the same manner in this bill.

If you have constructive suggestions on the type of program you want, offer your amendments and let the House pass on them. If you cannot suggest anything constructive and if you recognize the fact that we have presented the only reasonable plan for implementing universal military training, then I know you will have the courage of your convictions, and will support this measure.

We can reduce our Armed Forces with an adequate reserve. We can build up an adequate reserve with UMT. We can equalize the burden to serve the Nation through UMT. We can spend ourselves into bankruptcy through the maintenance of a large standing force for an indefinite period. Or we can adopt the alternative proposed in this bill.

How many Members of this House complained bitterly during World War II that our boys are being sent to the front without adequate training? How many of you have uttered that same complaint about the boys who were sent to Korea in the early stages of that war? Let us prevent that from ever happening again by providing our young men with adequate training while there is time to do so.

Take your stand on this measure.

Vote it up or vote it down.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point or in the Appendix of the RECORD on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered, and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

NEBRASKA FOUNDERS' DAY, 1952

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, 85 years ago—on March 1, 1867—Nebraska became a State.

The honoring of this event in 1952 is an occasion of double solemnity. The late Senator Wherry was born at Liberty, Nebr., on February 28, 1892—the day before the State he so ably served in the United States Senate was 25 years old. The late Karl Stefan, Member of the House of Representatives, whom I follow into the position of dean of the Nebraska delegation in Congress, was born in Bohemia—in what is now Czechoslovakia—on March 1, 1884, on the very day the State he so ably served became 17 years old.

I might add that during his 17 years in the House of Representatives, it was a tradition for Mr. Stefan to deliver a little tribute to Nebraska on her birthday. He did this because Nebraska's birthday was on the same day as his. Because I am a firm believer in tradition, I am today continuing this act of my late colleague in paying respects to the finest State in the Union.

What I could say to—and of—these patriotic, self-sacrificing Nebraskans, both of whom died in the service of their State and their Republic—would be not enough. It requires the depth of understanding, the power of expression of Abraham Lincoln to do them justice. The Great Emancipator said in his Gettysburg Address of November 19, 1863:

> It is for us the living, rather, to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to the cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

One of the great forces which moved both Ken and Karl—as so many of us knew them—was their genuine love for the State of Nebraska and the people in it. I share that real, that genuine love with them.

Nebraska—and the inhabitants of Nebraska—have been on the right side even before history.

The skeleton of the largest elephant yet discovered was found in Lincoln County, Nebr. That is symbolic.

The group of prehistoric farmers who lived in almost all of the valleys of Nebraska, except the eastern Missouri bluffs, have been given the name of the "Republican People."

The Nebraska Pawnee Nation is divided into four tribes—one of which is called the Kitke-hahk-i or Republican Tribe.

Maj. Stephen H. Long, in his 1819 account of his map-making expedition between the Platte and the Red River of Texas, wrote falsely of Nebraska, saying:

> It is almost wholly unfit for cultivation and, of course, uninhabitable for people depending upon agriculture for their existence.

Major Long's statement was disproved before it was made. Manuel Lisa, Omaha fur trader, had introduced and was doing a thriving business in cattle, hogs, fowl, squash, lima beans, potatoes, and turnips as early as 1807.

A trained observer, George Catlin, who painted Nebraska scenery and Nebraska Indians in 1832, gave the lie to the Long statement when he wrote:

> There is no more beautiful prairie country in the world than that which is to be seen here. * * * The surface of the country is gracefully and slightly undulating, like the swells of the ocean after a heavy storm, and everywhere covered with beautiful green turf, and with occasional patches and clusters of trees. The soil in this region is also rich and capable of making one of the most beautiful and productive countries of the world.

It remained for the Fair Deal, misnamed "Voice of America," to repeat the Long falsehood to the world, claiming that—in 1945—Nebraska was a part of the great American desert.

The man who was to be later the first Republican candidate for President—then Lt. John C. Frémont, known as "The Pathfinder"—gave Nebraska its name. In his 1844 report to the Secretary of War, William Wilkins, Lieutenant Frémont wrote:

> The Platte, or Nebraska, River being the center stream would very properly furnish a name to the Territory. Troops and supplies

from the Nebraska Territory would be able to contend for Oregon with any force coming from the sea.

Nebraskans came to our State to stay. On January 2, 1862—over 5 years before the Territory became a State—Daniel Freeman, first Nebraska homesteader, claimed 160 acres on Cub Creek, near Beatrice. Since that date over a million homesteaders have settled more than 120,000,000 acres—all over the Republic. Of this number, 100,000 homesteaders have claimed Nebraska land.

It was the homesteaders—the men, women, and children who had their parcel of land, hard won from the blizzard, the prairie fire, the drought, the deluge, and the Indian—who most wanted statehood for Nebraska. By accident of the times, since the Republic was engaged in the great Civil War at the very hour of the passage of the first Homestead Act—most of the early Nebraska landowners were Republicans.

The Democrats, unsuccessfully, opposed statehood.

Once Nebraska became a State, on March 1, 1867, its feet were firmly planted on the road to progress.

Southerner and northerner forgot their hatreds after the Civil War. The State's rights stand of the southerner merged with the thrifty virtues of the Yankee to bring forth the Nebraskan. The land know-how of the Swede, the orderly thought of the German, the mechanical ability of the Bohemian, the governing knack of the Irish, the drive of the French, the colonizing tradition of the English—mingled to make Nebraska great.

The motto on the great seal of the State of Nebraska in 1867 was "Equality before the law." Thank God, in the 85 years of our statehood, we have kept it that way.

We have never tolerated a corrupt government in our State.

We have never tolerated a spendthrift government in our State.

We have never tolerated a treacherous government in our State.

Nebraskans are, and always have been honest, solvent, and patriotic.

Nebraskans believe that the same standards of human conduct which have continued to apply to them should apply to the Republic as a whole.

It has cost Nebraska nothing in material progress or in governmental accomplishments to be known far and wide as the State in which Christianity is practiced as well as preached.

Although our cement, clay, and stone products are among the most widely known in the American building industry, it is the field of agriculture where we have won our highest awards.

We lead all States in the production of wild hay. We are front-rank producers of corn, oats, wheat, barley, rye, alfalfa, potatoes, sugar beets, sorghums, and soy beans. We are well above other States, greater in size or in population, in producing cattle, hogs, and sheep. Omaha has been, for some time, the first city in the world in butter manufacturing. Of our 77,237 square miles of area, approximately a million acres have been made to produce more and better farm products through irrigation.

We have the only unicameral State Legislature in the United States. A Nebraskan can progress from kindergarten to a doctor of philosophy degree without leaving his State. To me, and to most of my fellow citizens, the noblest product of Nebraska is and always will be the Nebraskan.

What is a Nebraskan?

Two years ago, on this very day, my late friend—Karl Stefan—defined a Nebraskan.

A Nebraskan—

Karl Stefan said—

is a forward-looking American, with a long, long memory.

That definition is good enough for me. I hope and pray that it is good enough for you.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, since my discharge as a private soldier in World War I, I have earnestly advocated universal military training and have fervently hoped such training would become a reality. My interest was not because of a militaristic temperament, for I hate war. I have every reason to hate war, a reason shared in common with my people and my section. Beginning with the Revolutionary War, my people have died and lived for our country. It would be informative for the public to learn how much of the Revolutionary War was fought on southern soil, and the wonderful contribution made by my people in behalf of our country in the wars that have followed.

My interest in universal military training is because I personally knew many fine boys who died for our country in World War I simply because of a lack of training, and who if they had been given an equal chance through training would now perhaps be living for our country, and would have had the satisfaction of making the enemy die for this country.

I did not foresee the fact that this year I would have the power to vote for or against this important bill, as I did not foresee that this issue would come before us at a time when it would or could be used as a means of carrying on a social revolution against a loyal people and a wonderful section of our great country, nor did my section foresee such. They join me in deep regret that such is unfortunately the case.

I come from a loyal and devoted constituency, and a religious God-fearing and enlightened people. This statement is so widely understood that in emergencies, such as we have been in for many years, I fear my people and my section are penalized and mistreated because it is known that we are loyal Americans, and can always be counted on to submerge our personal rights in the Nation's interest. I ask now, why are we so treated? Has this House forgotten that prior to Pearl Harbor and the draft that the South and West furnished 14 out of every 17 soldiers for our armed services? Has this House, and this Nation so speedily forgotten how southern Congressmen voting unanimously saved this country when lend-lease and the Draft Act were passed by a two-vote and a one-vote margin. These facts should be engraved on every human heart. Are not people like that entitled to be considered?

In this bill it will be proposed to write in an amendment by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD]. I declare to this body that this will be a test of the fairness my people can expect, for without hesitation I say that amendment is as fair a writing as has ever been penned, and is subject to no just criticism at the hands of any race or group whatever. It is a wonderful expression of democracy. It is an amendment which I can see no reason for anyone to complain of. The amendment will provide that any boy shall have the right to serve in a mixed unit if he desires, and anyone desiring to serve in a mixed unit will be accommodated, thereby completely wiping out the cry of discrimination. The amendment will also provide that a boy can express his desire to serve in a unit of his race, and the rank and file of my people want that right—both white and colored. I know the colored people as few here know them, having lived all of my life in a county where the colored people outnumber the white people about 3 to 1. The colored in my section almost unanimously would appreciate serving with their own race, for the reasons that they would find themselves in a more congenial atmosphere, would be happy, and would more easily attain a corporal's or sergeant's rating in competition with only members of their race. Frankly, and unfortunately for our country, if we stop there, there would be no objections raised from any quarter. The objections come with the realization that the white boy could express his preference and serve in a unit of his own race. I have to pinch myself to realize I am living in such an age, but it is true and cannot be disputed.

Congress has great power and, therefore, that power should be fairly and cautiously exercised. I do not believe Congress can escape condemnation if it fails to adopt the Winstead amendment, thereby saying to the boys of America: "We are taking you from your homes without consulting you. Doubtless, you will defend us on far-flung battlefields and many of you will become a sacrifice for our safety at a time when you are in the bloom of youth, and most in love with life, but not withstanding this, we are going to make you the guinea pig for a social experiment."

Regardless of what we Congressmen may say, not a Member of Congress has seen fit to practice such themselves. To fail to give an American boy, who we are placing in involuntary service, a freedom of choice provided in the Winstead amendment, and to make these boys the first group in this country to lose that freedom although they have committed no crime, but were simply unfortunate in being born when they were, will do violence to our concepts beyond repair.

This is plain talk, but it is true. It is now time for plain talk. My people resent this social revolution being waged under unfair terms and under a period of emergency. Why should they not resent it? Why should we be so dealt with because of our loyalty? Why should we be interested in kow-towing to Russia's views, and so completely determined to ignore the wishes of the South, both white and colored, and white and colored in every corner of the United States? In my section we have long recognized Russia and her satellites, the Communists and their fellow travelers in the United States, including Washington, to be exactly what they are. We want no part of Russia's philosophy and we want no part in appeasing Russia, if loyal citizens of this country lose any just right in so doing.

My people know that we have kow-towed to Russia and to Russia's disciples and un-American groups in this country entirely too long. My people insist and demand that those advocating the violent overthrow of our form of government be dealt with in the manner that they deserve—speedily. My people have never had the idea that if we bothered this vermin in America we would run them underground, but on the contrary, my people think that underground about 6 feet is exactly where they belong.

My people want peace, but not at any price. We would not consider bargaining away our form of government and our belief in God for anything Russia, or communism, can offer.

My people are a patient people. A people who maintain their equilibrium. They are people who can endure wrongs, and history proves we have endured many. My people will not let this country down in an emergency. Do not forget that. Do not believe that a defeat of this Winstead amendment would be a means to cause us to turn against that which our country must have. Take that amendment and deal with it on its merits. Consider the letter of Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, and while I deeply deplore the terrible wrongs that she says will be inflicted upon my people, I give her credit for being honest, and admit that she did not give us the run-around as is so often the case in Washington.

Consider our pleas for fair play. Whatever you do now will be remembered by my people. Some day, if my people have their way, this emergency will be brought to an end victoriously under the banner of God and freedom. Punish us now if you will, but the time will come perhaps when there is no emergency, and then the resentment of my people, so justly aroused, will be demonstrated in an intelligent way.

I deeply regret that the House Armed Services Committee did not make the Winstead amendment a part of this bill, for if it had, the amendment would have passed. I observe that not a member of that committee has done anything to demonstrate his willingness to live under conditions that will be inflicted upon these boys. I ask that committee now to accept the Winstead amendment. You cannot defend a contrary position by pointing to your lives or practices. I ask every Member of the House interested in giving these boys the privileges provided in the Winstead amendment to be on the floor and vote for that amendment. You will live to be proud of that kind of vote. I sincerely hope and pray that this amendment will pass, but whether it does or not, I will have the satisfaction of knowing I have placed before you the case of my people and yours. My people in Georgia, the South, the 48 States, and the boys who this bill is directed against, will know that they had a friend at court this day. I plead for all races and all groups that they shall have the rights the Winstead amendment gives.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WASTE BY THE MILITARY

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, day before yesterday during the general debate on the UMT bill the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] yielded to me and I made a statement about waste by the military and referred to $27,000 that had been spent under the supervision of Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks, commanding general, Second Army, at A. P. Hill Military Reservation in Virginia on a hunting lodge. I said it was taxpayers' money that is being wasted.

The United Press got a story from Fort Meade saying a spokesman of Brooks asserted:

> There is no hunting lodge at A. P. Hill. There has been no construction work there since the war. Brooks does not own a hunting lodge. He has not spent $27,000 or any taxpayers' money on a hunting lodge either for his own use or for the use of other officers or persons. He has a sergeant as driver for his official car which is used only for Government business.

Mr. Speaker, when I was informed of this $27,000 of the taxpayers' money being wasted, it came through a friend of mine, a boy whom I trust implicitly. I know his reputation for truth and veracity, and, as far as I was concerned, he did not have to be under oath for me to believe him. So I related the information he gave me here on the floor because I thought the American people, the taxpayers, who are suffering from high taxes, should know how General Brooks was wasting their money. The general came back, of course, through a spokesman, and denied it.

That afternoon I put in a long-distance call to my friend to verify the facts he told me. He said what he had told me was true; that he had been at the lodge. I cannot mention the boy's name. He is still in the Army. He would be railroaded right straight to Korea if I were to mention his name. A case like that happened this morning to a boy I defended in a court-martial case. He was shipped out of Fort Meade this morning, but he has just 25 days left in the Army, thank goodness, under General Brooks.

So not only to verify this boy's word and to try to find out the truth of the matter, yesterday morning I got in my car and drove the seventy-odd miles down to A. P. Hill to see for myself if there was a hunting lodge there, whether there had been any new construction since the war, whether there was a sargeant or anyone else down there and a house boy taking care of the place. Since General Brooks' spokesman said there was no lodge there or that any money had been spent, I wanted to find out; I thought we were entitled to know.

Mr. Speaker, when I got to Bowling Green, Va., I asked a civilian, "Where is the officers' club here on A. P. Hill Reservation?" He said, "There is no officers' club here. There are only three officers down here. But," he said "General Brooks has a private hunting lodge here," and he told me where it was. Then I drove on down the road, and stopped at Crabtree's, who run an Esso service station and a restaurant. I said, "Mr. Crabtree, you have been here a long time. Where is the officers' club down here?" He said, "There is no officers' club here. There are but two officers here, but General Brooks has a hunting lodge down here," and he showed me how to find the General's lodge. I noticed right at the entrance of A. P. Hill a sign, it said, "A. P. Hill Military Reservation—welcome." There were no MP's there. I drove on in. I had a taxpayer from my district with me. His name is Ernest Raspberry, from Lewis County, Tenn. Hohenwald is the name of the town, and I guess Ernest is one of the largest taxpayers there; I imagine he pays as much taxes as any man in Lewis County. So, I took him with me. I drove on and I came to a one-way road, winding through the wilderness—it was beautiful. I drove about 6 miles from the headquarters, then I spotted a beautiful lake. As I wound on around the little ravines, on top of a hill I saw the most magnificent lodge I had ever seen in my life. Well, I drove on up to the lodge. I heard music inside. I knocked on the door. It was locked. Finally, a sergeant opened the door. He looked at my license tag—my car had the congressional tag on—and then let me in. When I got inside, I said, "SUTTON is my name." He said, "Sergeant Summerfield is mine." There was a colored private there.

I said, "What are you doing around here, Sergeant?"

He said, "We are cleaning up the lodge."

I said, "What do you use this lodge for? Is it an officers' club?"

He said, "No." "It is for private parties. We had a big one a couple of weeks ago."

I said, "Sergeant, may I look through?"

He said, "I guess so."

I said, "When did you come down here?"

He said, "I just got here yesterday."

I said, "Why did you just come here yesterday?" That was the day that I made the statement of the $27,000 being expended there.

He said, "Well, Sergeant Graves has been the sergeant at the lodge down here, but Saturday night he had a wreck, so I was sent down here to replace him."

I went through that lodge, Mr. Speaker, from top to bottom. It has nine bathrooms in it. You can imagine the

size of it. Yet there is no hunting lodge down there. I asked the colored boy, "How many bedrooms do you have here? About eight?"

He said, "No, sir; I guess we have nine, because we have nine bathrooms."

And there was no money spent, no $27,000, or any part of the taxpayers' money, according to the spokesman for General Brooks.

In the kitchen there were two brand new electric stoves. One of them a Westinghouse. I do not remember what the other one was. There were so many of them down there I could not remember which one was in the kitchen. There were two brand new refrigerators. One of them was a Crosley, the other was an International Harvester. There was new formica all over the tops of the kitchen cabinets. New inlaid linoleum on the barroom floor.

I asked Sergeant Summerfield: "When were these refrigerators sent here?" He said, "I brought this International Harvester down from Fort Meade last Thursday."

I went on through this lodge. In the dining room there was beautiful walnut furniture, new. No money had been spent, though. I went on upstairs, into the attic. I thought maybe they had moved some of the furniture. I believe they had moved some of the furniture, because upstairs in the attic there were some new beds, rollaway beds that had been hidden or stored. There was no dust or cobwebs on them.

Mr. Speaker, I looked behind the chimney, and what do you think I found? I found a dice board. I wonder if the taxpayers have been paying for running a gambling device at the general's lodge—at this not-supposed-to-be lodge, on the A. P. Hill Reservation?

So I left his lodge, with regrets, because it is so beautiful. I would love to have a retreat like that myself. If that hunting lodge did not cost $50,000, I am not standing in the well of this House today. If I had $50,000, I would gladly give it for it, with its magnificent setting.

Then on another hill adjacent to the lodge was a beautiful bath house. I asked the colored boy, "When was that constructed?" He said, "I don't know, sir, but they tell me they built it last year." You can tell by the roof and the building itself that it had not been there 2 years, much less 10 years.

Then I went on down to another building, and there was another sergeant who drove up with a Mr. Ackerman. I asked what their jobs were. They were taking care of the forest, they said, and they were lowering the lake 2 feet so that they could kill weeds, so that when the general came down there with his fishing parties there would not be many weeds around.

I asked him about the garage. There was a new apartment over a double garage. I said, "When was that built?" He said, "About 6 months ago, I think." I said, "Who is it for?" "General Brooks' chauffeurs, when they are here." There was a new refrigerator and new stove in the garage apartment.

Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, I want you to know that this lodge is heated with oil. The heating system has been recently installed. But no money has been spent there.

Then I went over to another building which they were remodeling. Why do I say they were remodeling? Because they had recently sanded two floors and varnished them, and sanded another but had not yet varnished it. Apparently no one had walked on it.

I went outside, and going up the hill to the house were new concrete steps that obviously had not been built 2 weeks, because the forms had not even been removed. No construction since the war, though.

Mr. Speaker, to me General Brooks' statement is nothing but intentional misrepresentation, this statement here by the spokesman of General Brooks. In plain Tennessee language, that is lying. Sergeant Summerfield was cleaning the place with a colored private. He had taken Sergeant Graves' place. Do you think this was not using the taxpayers' money? And in this building, there was a sign—a group of signs—there—incidentally, all this section down there is in a game preserve—and there were signs all along the road, "Game preserve." Then there was a sign up on a tree, I would say it was 16 or 18 inches square "Off limits to all military personnel." I asked the sergeant, "Why is that sign there?" He said, "When the general is here, he does not want the troops that may be on maneuvers coming up and asking for a drink of water. He does not want to be bothered with them."

Whose lodge is it? Naturally, General Brooks does not own it. The Government owns it. It is on a 77,000-acre Government reservation. But, he is the commanding general of the Second Army.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the best generalship we have in this United States Army, I feel sorry for this country of ours. If he is the most capable officer we have to run the Second Army of the United States of America, we had better disband the Second Army and let them join in with the First or the Third Armies. It is men like Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks that make the people in the United States Congress fight the brass. It is men like Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks that make many of us doubt whether we should have universal military training because we would go militaristic under men like him.

Mr. Speaker, last evening a man came by my office by the name of John Hensley who lives in Arlington. He saw service with the Second Airborne in World War II. He trained down at A. P. Hill with the Rangers. He has a wonderful war record. He was shot six times, and made nine jumps behind the enemy lines as a Ranger. He trained at A. P. Hill from May 1941 until November 1941, he said, "We bivouacked right on that lake. There was no lodge there then." He said, "There was only one building there and that was the building that has been remodeled." He said, "We shot that up even with 75-millimeter guns and used it as a target and for practice booby traps." He said, "There was no bathhouse there. That is as late as November 1941." He said, "There was no lodge there." That is as late as November 1941. And yet they say there has been no construction since World War II.

I was talking with a man this morning who said that the lodge had been built since World War II. He is checking now on the exact date, and when I find out, I am going to let the Congress know exactly when it was built, and he thinks he will have the date and figure as to what it cost to build it, and I want Congress to know that too.

Mr. Speaker, I am preparing an hour's speech on wastefulness in the Second Army under leadership of Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks. Within about 2 weeks, I hope to have it ready and speak to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 1951, in the well of this House, I exposed the pastel mink coat. At that time you probably remember the byword and watchword of all American people was "Throw the rascals out." The American people believe in throwing the rascals out of the Government, and so do I, otherwise I would not have exposed the mink coat. We should extend that not only to this Government, but I say, "Throw the rascals out of the military too, and let us stop this waste."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

TELEVISING AND BROADCASTING OF LEGISLATIVE, INVESTIGATORY PROCEEDINGS, AND JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, some days ago the Chair, in the discharge of his responsibility, ruled that radio broadcasting and televising of hearings and proceedings before committees of the United States House of Representatives were not authorized by the present rules. The Chair did not, and was not in a position to, express an opinion as to the advisability of broadcasting and televising such proceedings. Nevertheless much has been said since that time concerning the problem which is obviously upon us.

I am pleased to insert at this point, a report by a committee of the American Bar Association to the board of governors of that association concerning its findings and recommendations with reference to the televising and broadcasting of legislative investigatory proceedings and judicial proceedings. This report was recently adopted by the house of delegates, the policymaking body of the American Bar Association, and it will be read with profit:

FEBRUARY 11, 1952.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
American Bar Association,
Chicago, Ill.

GENTLEMEN: At your meeting in May 1951 you adopted a report and recommendation to the following effect:

1. That the televising and broadcasting of judicial proceedings are clearly matters of

grave concern to the American Bar Association.

2. That, while the propriety of televising and broadcasting the debates in the Congress and other legislative assemblies ordinarily rests with those bodies, the televising and broadcasting of legislative investigatory proceedings set up for the ascertainment of facts as a basis for legislation, legal prosecutions and other judicial proceedings are matters of concern to this association.

3. That televising and broadcasting hearings and investigatory proceedings basic to or touching matters of law enforcement or for ultimate judicial consideration present questions of such grave implications to the cause of the administration of justice that the subject merits the serious attention of this association.

4. That a committee be appointed to make a full appraisal of this subject and to report its recommendations.

In pursuance of this recommendation the then president of the American Bar Association appointed the undersigned as a committee for the purpose outlined and this committee has been continued under the administration of the sitting president. We beg to submit the following report.

The questions are obviously of general interest and are being increasingly discussed in the public press and among the members of the bar.[1] Yet in view of the novelty of the inventions involved, particularly that of television, it is not surprising that there is little field of practical experience on which to draw. Nor have there been any controlling court decisions or statutes (other than the one in California) regarding television which have come to the attention of your committee.[2]

The subject, therefore, can be discussed only on the basis of guiding principles.

I

Broadcasting of proceedings before congressional committees has become a more or less familiar process. The use of television, however, as a necessary adjunct of congressional investigations is a phenomenon of recent occurrence. The full impact of such a televised investigation was felt in the widely publicized hearings before the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Organized Crime.

The propriety of televising and broadcasting debates in Congress and other legislative assemblies is a matter with which this association is probably not concerned. It is the membership of such bodies that must determine whether the practice is good or bad. But where the question has to do with the proceedings of legislative investigations, in which witnesses drawn from the general citizenship are presented, it is obvious that private rights are involved.

The use of television and broadcasting apparatus in such investigations is defended on the ground that it arouses public interest and more active scrutiny of governmental affairs; that this makes for better informed citizenry and for more efficient public servants. It is said, not without force, that television has become the greatest single educational arm available to congressional committees by which the public conscience may be reached.[3]

These are undoubtedly laudable ends. When they can be pursued without impinging on the rights of private citizens, no one could object. The committee notes with approval the pending efforts in Congress to frame a code of procedure for congressional investigating committees which will obviate some past criticisms.

Few are the witnesses who approach the witness stand, either before a legislative committee or, as we shall later remark, before a court, without some feeling of nervous embarrassment. When, in addition to the audience before them they are made aware that they are at one and the same time appearing before and being heard by an audience numbering millions, their psychological discomfort is inevitably increased. The self-confident who may escape this sensation are tempted by their voice, conduct and general bearing, even by the substance of their testimony, to play to this large gallery. To this temptation even legislators or counsel may not be entirely resistant.

The television camera is a force the power of which is only beginning to be appreciated. Granted that it greatly enhances the public interest in current events, it can also circulate with great speed baseless accusations which may be to the irreparable injury of the persons accused. It may often, perhaps usually, be the case that this public view of any proceeding is only intermittent. The result may well be a distorted impression of the facts and a consequent prejudgment of the witness by the viewers without regard to the legal presumption of innocence to which the witness is entitled.[4] Your committee is well aware that newspaper reports may also by their necessary brevity give a distorted impression of the facts, but this regrettable circumstance affords no justification for further distortion incident to the use of television and broadcasting.

Your committee is not prepared to say televising or broadcasting of an unwilling witness is such an infraction of his right to privacy as to be unlawful; yet even where the consent of the witness is invoked there would seem to be an element of unfairness in putting upon him the burden of consent or protest. His very unwillingness to consent might be treated in certain quarters as an unfavorable symptom. These unfavorable aspects become all the more true where the television or broadcasting is concentrated only on selected witnesses or incidents not calculated or intended to represent the proceedings as a whole.

II

Much that has been said in the preceding section on the subject of the televising and broadcasting of congressional investigations applies with increased emphasis to judicial proceedings.

Here the basic contention of the telecasters and broadcasters is that they have an equal right with the representatives of the press to attend and report trials of persons accused of crime or even of private litigation. They urge that since criminal trials are proceedings in their nature public, photographic portrayals of trial scenes are legally as permissible as verbal or written descriptions. It is, they assert, an integral part of the freedom of the press.[5]

Thus far there is no express decision supporting this right to televise or broadcast a trial nor on the other hand one declaring it to be unlawful.[6] The subject seems to your committee to lie at present within the sound discretion of the court. The judiciary as a coordinate branch of the Government has direct and exclusive control over the proper conduct of trials. It has authority to determine what conduct is compatible with the orderly administration of justice and to that extent it can regulate or prohibit the use of television cameras or broadcasting transmitters or similar devices in or about the courtroom.

The objections to televising or broadcasting congressional investigations, which we have set forth, are, in the main, applicable to the problem of televising or broadcasting trials but your committee believes that there are even more compelling adverse reasons where the courts are concerned. A trial of any kind in any court is a matter of serious importance to all concerned. It is and should be a sober and dispassionate effort to reach the truth concerning the matters in issue. Its primary function is not to entertain nor even to educate or edify the public but to ascertain and enforce the very rights involved. It is not an entertainment or show. To treat trials as more entertainment, educational or otherwise, is to deprive the court of the dignity which pertains to it and can only impede that serious quest for truth for which all judicial forums are established.

The intrusion into the courtroom of mechanisms which require the participants in a trial consciously to adapt themselves

---

[1] E. g., Gossett, Justice and TV, 38 ABAJ 15 (1952); Arnold, Mob Justice and Television, XII Fed. Com. B. J. 4 (1951); Taylor, The Issue Is Not TV, But Fair Play, XII Fed. Com. B. J. 10 (1951); Charnley, Should Courtroom Proceedings Be Broadcast? XI Fed. Com. B. J. 64 (1950); State Legislation Affecting Radio and Television in 1949, X Fed. Com. B. J. 208 (1949); 10 See Magazine 28 (November 1951); Klots, Trial By Television, 203 Harper's 90 (October 1951); Time, April 16, 1951, p. 57, column 1; U. S. News and World Report, March 30, 1951, p. 60, column 1; New York Times, January 27, 1952, p. 10E, column 3; New York Herald Tribune, January 26, 1952, p. 7, column 6; New York Herald Tribune, January 16, 1952, p. 12, column 3; New York Times magazine, January 13, 1952, p. 12; New York Times, January 12, 1952, p. 15, column 5; New York Herald Tribune, December 21, 1951, p. 21, column 1; New York Times, December 19, 1951, p. 48, column 1; New York Times, September 20, 1951, p. 28, column 7; New York Herald Tribune, September 12, 1951, p. 4, column 3; New York Herald Tribune, September 7, 1951, p. 17, column 3, New York Times, September 1, 1951, p. 7, column 2; New York Herald Tribune, August 12, 1951, p. 4, column 1; New York Times, August 11, 1951, p. 1, column 2; New York Times, June 24, 1951, a series of articles begun by Jack Gould; New York Times, June 19, 1951, p. 31, column 5; the Washington Post, June 9, 1951, p. 6, column 1; the Detroit News, April 1, 1951, p. 15, column 1; the New York Post, March 27, 1951, a series of articles begun by Max Lerner; the Association of the Bar of the City of New York: Report on Radio and Television Broadcasting of Hearings of Congressional Investigating Committees (1952) and Report on Congressional Investigations (1948); 62 reports of American Bar Association 851 (1937).

[2] Those of the States concerning themselves with television have dealt principally with the law of libel and slander and 25 of the States have adopted statutes forbidding a television screen to be exhibited in a motor car within the range of vision of the driver. It is to be expected that all the States will follow in this particular phase of the matter.

Both the Wisconsin and Georgia Legislatures have acted to prohibit the broadcasting of judicial proceedings.

[3] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 97, pt. 7, p. 9777.

[4] Klots, Trial by Television, 203 Harper's 90, 91 (October 1951).

[5] See, *Asbury Park Press, Inc.*, v. *City of Asbury Park* (20 U. S. L. Week 2154 (N. J. Oct. 23, 1951)); *United States* v. *Paramount Pictures* (334 U. S. 131, 166 (1948)); *Irwin* v. *Ashurst* (158 Ore. 61, 74 F. 2d 1127 (1938)); *Ex Parte Sturm* (152 Md. 114, 136 Atl. 312 (1927)).

[6] But rule 53 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure and rule 223 (b) of the rules of civil procedure of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania prohibit the taking of photographs or radio broadcasting during the progress of a trial.

to the demands of recording and reproducing devices, and to measure their time accordingly, distracts attention from the single object of promoting justice.[7] The attention of the court, the jury, lawyers, and witnesses should be concentrated upon the trial itself and ought not to be divided with the television or broadcast audience who, for the most part, have merely the interest of curiosity in the proceedings. It is not difficult to conceive that all participants may become overconcerned with the impression their actions, rulings, or testimony will make on the absent multitude.

The educational effect of a televised or broadcast trial on the general public can be but negligible; it may even be detrimental. The experience thus far with radio broadcasting and motion pictures of trials has shown that only the most sordid crimes are likely to be televised. In addition, the undue publicity from the telecasting of criminal trials may pander to the desire of abnormal criminal minds for mock heroics and resulting fame. To sensationalize such trials by television can have but an injurious effect on public morals.

To the accused a trial is an ordeal in itself to which he is commanded by society to submit. There is no necessity for imposing the additional hardship of requiring that the accused, at a time of great emotional distress, must submit to a telecast. There is no need that his humiliation be intensified by compulsory submission to a photographic portrayal for publicity purposes.[8]

The requirement of a public trial in criminal prosecutions is for the benefit of the accused. It is intended to insure that he is fairly dealt with and not unjustly condemned. This requirement of a public trial was created and satisfied long before television or broadcasting came into being. Public trials would not be less public in the constitutional sense today if these devices were never granted admission to the courts.

The dignity and efficiency of a court in conducting any trial and the right of the parties concerned are certainly entitled to first consideration. Any interest which might be aroused in the general public by televising or broadcasting a proceeding or any part of it is of secondary concern. In the opinion of your committee, the practice should be sternly condemned.

CONCLUSION

Your committee recommends the adoption of the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the American Bar Association condemns the practice of televising or broadcasting the testimony of witnesses when called before investigating committees of Congress and recommends that appropriate action be taken to restrict or prevent it.

Resolved, That the American Bar Association condemns the practice of televising or broadcasting judicial proceedings and recommends that Canon 35 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics be amended to read as follows:

"Proceedings in court should be conducted with fitting dignity and decorum. The taking of photographs in the court room, during sessions of the court or recesses between sessions, and the broadcasting [or telecasting][9] of court proceedings are calculated to detract from the essential dignity of the proceedings, degrade the court and create misconceptions with respect thereto in the mind of the public and should not be permitted."

Should this canon not be observed, we would favor buttressing it by legislation.

Respectfully submitted,

BRUCE BROMLEY.
JOHN A. DANAHER.
JOSEPH J. DANIELS.
JOSEPH W. HENDERSON.
MONTE M. LEMANN.
WILLIAM A. SCHNADER.
JOHN W. DAVIS,
Chairman.

[7] 62 Reports of American Bar Association, 851, 864 (1937).

[8] *Ex parte Sturm* (152 Mr. 114, 136 Atl. 312, 314 (1927)). But cf. *Elmhurst* v. *Pearson* (153 F. 2d 467 (D. C. Cir. 1945)).

[9] Words in brackets added.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WALTER.

Mr. SPENCE and to include an address by Fredy Perlman, of the Dixie Heights High School, Covington, Ky., a native of Czechoslovakia, on the subject of Democracy.

Mr. DORN and to include two articles.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an article appearing in Newsweek magazine.

Mr. PASSMAN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. YATES and to include an address delivered by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois.

Mrs. KEE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include a telegram.

Mr. BURNSIDE and to include an editorial.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. MCKINNON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD on the life of the late Representative Whitaker.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in four instances and to include in each extraneous material.

Mr. PATTERSON in six instances and to include in each a newspaper item.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin and to include a letter he received.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include an editorial.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LECOMPTE and to include editorial comment from the Mississippi Valley Lumberman.

Mr. HAND and to include collateral matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. SUTTON).

Mr. SUTTON.

Mr. BOYKIN and to include a speech.

Mr. MILLS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHAFER in three instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) each to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York to include in his remarks made earlier today an article relating to universal military training.

Mr. GWINN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. STEED and to include a newspaper article.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, March 3, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1202. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1203. A letter from the Vice Chairman, District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the Sixteenth Annual Report of the District Unemployment Compensation Board for the year 1951, pursuant to section 13 (c) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1204. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1205. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting report No. 21 of action taken pursuant to section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1206. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the final financial statement of the American Legion up to and including the period ending December 31, 1951, pursuant to the Act of Incorporation of the American Legion (Public Law 47, 66th Cong.); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1207. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated January 28, 1952, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Galien River, Berrien County, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

1208. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Federal Power Commission for the fiscal year July 1, 1950, to June 30, 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1209. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter relative to urging the Congress to complete action on legislation to authorize a United States contribution of $12,000,000 to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund for the fiscal year 1952 (H. Doc. No. 373); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

1210. A letter from the Chairman, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting the final report relating to the operations and liquidation of the

Home Owners' Loan Corporation, in accordance with section 20 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GARY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6854. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 396. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 1451). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5735. A bill to require all Federal officers in carrying out laws relating to water-resources development and utilization to comply with the laws of the affected States or Territories; with amendment (Rept. No. 1452). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union..

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming with1 the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report pursuant to House Resolution 28, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct thorough studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of such committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4323. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1457). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARDEN: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 1499. A bill to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; without amendment (Rept. No. 1458). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 6854. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana (by request):

H. R. 6855. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide a disability rating of 100 percent for the loss or loss of use of one hand or one foot together with blindness of one eye; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 6856. A bill to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6857. A bill to amend section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia", approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 6858. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 6859. A bill to amend section 704 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROWNSON:

H. R. 6860. A bill to establish a National Security Training Corps, to provide for its administration and discipline, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 6861. A bill to transfer the trawler *Delaware* from the United States Army Quartermaster Corps to the Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6862. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 6863. A bill to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution to declare the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics an aggressor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6864. A bill for the relief of Kimiko Fukuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6865. A bill for the relief of Midori Kagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6866. A bill for the relief of Yukiko Nerita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6867. A bill for the relief of Susumu Sasaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6868. A bill for the relief of Fumie Shimoko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 6869. A bill for the relief of Wong Yang Yee and Wong Sue Chee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 6870. A bill for the relief of Louie Bon Kong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6871. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gloria Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

598. By the SPEAKER: Petition of California State Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to certain resolutions passed by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the Forty-fourth State Conference on February 15, 1952, at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on House Administration.

599. Also, petition of Miss Bernice Kleinman and others, New York, N. Y., relative to bringing the murderers of Harry T. Moore and his wife Harriet, in Florida, to justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

600. Also, petition of chief clerk, City Council of Baltimore, Baltimore, Md., relative to opposing the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

601. Also, petition of Mr. J. K. Carr, and others, Daytona Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the committee on Ways and Means.

602. Also, petition of Pensacola Townsend Club, No. 2, Pensacola, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, in a world swept by violent forces with which, unaided, we cannot cope, Thou only art our help and our defense amid mortal woes prevailing.

Fronting the clamant duties of this new week, steady our spirits with a real-

ization of untapped power available to servants of Thy will, if only they go quietly and confidently about their appointed tasks. In this high hour of human destiny solemnized by the tangled tragedy in which all human life is caught, give us the strength and stamina in these trying days, rising above all that is base and small, to work together in glad and eager harmony for the honor, safety, and welfare of our Nation and of all the peoples of this stricken earth who unite in mutual good will, determined to open the gates of a new life for all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 28, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 396) making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE PUERTO RICAN NEWSPAPER, EL MUNDO—CORRECTION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak for 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to correct a statement I made on Thursday of last week in the course of a debate with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], on the subject of Puerto Rico.

In the course of those remarks, I made reference to the newspaper El Mundo, from whose columns the distinguished Senator from South Carolina was quoting in raising certain questions concerning Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, of Puerto Rico.

In all fairness, I must say that I was misinformed concerning the relationship between that newspaper and a certain mainland contractor whose controversy with the Government of Puerto Rico over the taxes he owes the government has figured in recent attacks on Governor Muñoz.

El Mundo, although it has been very critical of Governor Muñoz—and unfairly so, in my judgment—has also been critical of this contractor. In fact, this newspaper helped expose the activities of the contractor.

El Mundo has for many years, and on many occasions, been critical of incumbent governors of Puerto Rico. This newspaper is not, I am told, at all impartial in its judgment. It represents, itself, a great vested interest, and frequently speaks for the vested interests. However, it also, on many occasions, has performed important public services in the newspaper field. Not the least of those, I am advised, was in a series of articles it recently published about this contractor.

I do not like to be unfair. I regret being incorrect in my facts. I should like to set the RECORD straight in this regard.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CHAVEZ was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, RELATING TO PURCHASE BY RESERVE BANKS DIRECT FROM TREASURY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON PROVISION OF CERTAIN INSURANCE FOR AMERICAN PUBLIC

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the provision of war-risk insurance and certain marine and liability insurance for the American public, for the quarter ended December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SURVEY REPORT OF THE GRAND (NEOSHO) RIVER WATERSHED

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report dated April 1950, of the Grand (Neosho) River watershed in Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Violet Agatha Dickerson from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on October 1, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Special Assistants Employed by the Department of Justice, for the period July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF SENIOR CIRCUIT JUDGES AND OF DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF UNITED STATES COURTS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Judicial Conference of Senior Circuit Judges, together with his report of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, for the year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the State of Georgia has recently enacted a State sales tax; and

"Whereas all such sums paid for such tax are proper and allowable deductions in computing the taxable income under the Federal income tax laws; and

"Whereas the preparation and maintenance of an itemized account of the sales tax paid on each and every purchase imposes a laborious and time-consuming burden upon the citizens of this State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to grant a deduction to each citizen of Georgia according to the following table, graduated against annual income of the individual:

"Annual income:	*Percent of income deductible*
$1,000	1.8
$2,000	1.7
$3,000	1.4
$5,000	1.2
$10,000	1.1
$15,000	.9
$20,000	.7
$30,000	.6
$50,000	.5
$100,000	.4

"FRED HAND,
"Speaker of the House.
"JOE BOONE,
"Clerk of the House.
"S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE D. STEWART,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved this 15th day of February, 1952.
"HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing the President, the Congress of the United States, and the judiciary of the United States to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia (the Senate concurring), That—

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States requires the President 'before he enters on the execution of his office' to take

an oath to 'preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States,' and requires all Members of the Congress and the Federal judiciary as well as all legislative, executive, and judicial officers of the several States, to take an oath 'to support' the Constitution and thus preserve it from destruction or subversion; and

"Whereas the first act passed by the Congress and signed by George Washington in 1789 prescribed the form of a solemn oath as required by the Constitution; and

"Whereas the Constitution is short, requiring only 30 minutes to read, and is easily understood by any intelligent person honest enough to believe that it means what it says; and

"Whereas the Constitution vests limited and defined power to make laws in the Congress, the power to execute those laws in the President, and the power to judge those laws in the judiciary—granting certain well-defined supplemental powers to the President, and certain well-defined extended powers to the judiciary, reserving all other powers to the States and to the people; and

"Whereas the section 2 of article II of the Constitution gives the President the power, 'by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur,' thus constituting the Senate a council to the President and contemplating the actual presence of Senators (though not all of them) at the making of treaties in and at all stages. Yet, nevertheless, the Senate has abdicated its power and spurned its duty as a result of which so-called experts have surrounded the President at some of the most crucial meetings that have ever concerned the American people. Row upon row of new-made graves in Korea are daily reminders of the failures of the Senators to conform their actions to the oaths uttered by their mouths, which would have placed some of them at Yalta in the place of Hiss advising and not consenting; and

"Whereas the framers of the Constitution were so fearful of Executive usurpations and proclamations that they conferred upon the Congress the sole power 'to make all laws * * * necessary and proper for carrying into execution' the powers of the President, so that no President should ever assert the prerogative of a Stuart King to make laws 'necessary and proper for the execution of laws'; and

"Whereas in spite of the plain words of the Constitution, and the solemn oaths of the constitutional officers of government to defend and 'to support' the Constitution, the Congress has attempted to divest itself of, and delegate its own nondelegable legislative powers to the President and to agencies under his control; as well as to divest the judiciary of its vested and untouchable judicial powers, and to vest those powers in the President who, with the consent of a strange Supreme Court, has attempted to exercise such powers through his own servile tools, who make, execute, and judge laws affecting substantive rights of freemen and imposing duties upon freemen, in the name of the President; and

"Whereas the blending of all powers of government in the hands of one man to be exercisd by him or by his servile tools, is, as said by Thomas Jefferson, 'the very definition of tyranny,' and is a treasonable subversion of the Constitution resulting in a government of flesh rather than a government of laws; and

"Whereas a government untrammeled by a constitution is a despotism, and a society unprotected by constitutional laws is anarchy; and

"Whereas the specious pretense of necessity or expediency—the argument of every tyrant and every quisling that has ever stalked across the pages of history—is absolutely absurd, when we reflect for a moment that no executive laws, directives or proclamations (except possibly as relating to the office of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States) are ever so urgent as not to afford the Congress an opportunity to affix thereto a preamble and an enacting clause, so as to make them the law of the land. The pretense that Congress does not have time to read before it enacts is answered by the fact that the President does not have time to read before he proclaims. If we must have experts to do for Congress that which it is unable to do for itself, then Congress, with the power of the purse may employ such experts and make them directly responsive to legislative will in the drafting of legislation for enactment. Likewise, the exercise of judicial power is never so urgent as to require its exercise by some Presidential tool rather than some impartial man who has been emancipated from control by the President by nonprecarious tenure and from control by the Congress by undiminishable pay, as the Constitution requires; and,

"Whereas the Constitution provides that it may not be altered, changed or amended without the consent of three-fourths of the States acting through their legislatures—yet, nevertheless, in derogation of the plain words of the Constitution, it has been subverted, changed, tortured and altered by quislings who daily read out of it the philosophy of our forefathers, who made it, and who daily read into it the alien philosophies of those who would destroy it; and,

"Whereas the State of Georgia, having never forfeited its right to approve or disapprove of amendments read into the Constitution in any manner, now exercises that constitutional right and now disapproves of every such amendment except the 21 amendments constitutionally adopted: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That it is the sense of the Legislature of Georgia in general assembly that the President, and all Members of the the Congress and the judiciary of the United States should have the honor to obey their oaths to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and to at least obey or require obedience to its mandate to submit all proposed changes in its structure to the legislatures of the various States for approval or disapproval; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this general assembly that the people of America can in no more certain way rivet the chains of slavery on their children than to support candidates for Federal offices who do not have the courage and integrity to obey their oaths to support the Constitution as written and subsequently amended 21 times. Nor can the liberty of their children be preserved in any other way than by a government of laws made pursuant to a Constitution, supported by virtuous representatives—men who obey their oaths to their God and faithfully discharge their duties to their fellow men; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to proper authorities in the manner provided by law consistent with the Constitution, as a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia disapproving of all changes or amendments sought to be made a part of the Constitution by stealth and subterfuge.

"FRED HAND,
"Speaker of the House.
"JOE BOONE,
"Clerk of the House.
"S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE D. STEWART,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved this 6th day of February 1952.
"HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
"Governor."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Whereas at the present time veterans of the Armed Forces who are mentally sick are unable to be admitted to veterans' hospitals because of the lack of beds therein unless such mental illness is service-connected; and

"Whereas hundreds of Georgia mentally ill veterans are at the present time by necessity being lodged in county jails or the already overcrowded Milledgeville State Hospital; and

"Whereas this situation can be remedied: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the Congress of the United States be most earnestly urged to take steps to make available facilities to take care of these mentally ill veterans as soon as possible; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be immediately dispatched to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress and the Secretary of the Senate of the United States Congress and to each Member of the Georgia delegation of the United States Congress.

"FRED HAND,
"Speaker of the House.
"JOE BOONE,
"Clerk of the House.
"S. MARVIN GRIFFIN,
"President of the Senate.
"GEORGE D. STEWART,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved this 15th day of February 1952.
"HERMAN E. TALMADGE,
"Governor."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact laws which will lower the high cost of food.

"Whereas the laws which guarantee farmers high prices for their commodities were enacted to relieve an acute national economic emergency affecting the farm industry, which emergency no longer exists; and

"Whereas the new law is plainly designed to keep basic foods as high in price as they have been; and

"Whereas this is plainly inflation of a most painful nature; and

"Whereas it overlooks the fact that most of the income of the American family is used to pay for food; and

"Whereas according to laws of supply and demand in a free market food becomes cheaper the more it is produced, while under the law in question the taxpayers' money is used in ever greater amounts as food becomes more plentiful to prevent the consumer from taking advantage of the natural action of economic law which has made America the greatest nation in history; and

"Whereas the Government has under loan or has taken title to four-fifths of all the flaxseed produced last year; a third of all the cotton; nearly a third of all the wheat; more than half of all the peanuts; two-fifths of all the potatoes and dried edible beans; nearly half of the stored butter; and

"Whereas the present new farm price-support program will cost billions of dollars which will come from the same people who will pay the resulting high prices; and

"Whereas the farmers are becoming more and more dependent upon the Government: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact laws that will be in keeping with a peacetime economy; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted February 4, 1952.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In senate, adopted in concurrence February 11, 1952.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of supplementary unemployment compensation payments from Federal funds as provided in H. R. 6437

"Whereas mobilization of the Nation's productive resources for the defense of the United States and dislocations in the economy during the national emergency have caused, directly and indirectly, large numbers of persons in certain areas, notably the textile manufacturing centers of New England, and especially the city of Lawrence, to become unemployed; and

"Whereas such unemployment has occurred in large part among workers whose skills are and will be essential to the defense efforts of the Nation and its security; and

"Whereas the present benefits provided under the unemployment compensation laws of the Commonwealth are both inadequate and unfair to workers suffering such unemployment; and

"Whereas the alleviation of such unemployment is essential to mobilization for defense and must be considered to be part of the program of defense: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the house of representatives memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 6437 in order to provide the unemployed workers of Lawrence, Lowell, and other areas in the Commonwealth where unemployment is rife with supplementary payments from Federal funds in such amounts as to prevent the imposition upon such workers of an inequitable share of the burden of the defense program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of representatives, February 13, 1932, adopted.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE, *Clerk.*"

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to enact legislation authorizing a loan to alleviate hardship to certain persons in Italy

"Whereas the overflow of the Po River has caused great damage and hardship to many persons; and

"Whereas this Nation has been expending great sums abroad to preserve democratic ideals throughout the world: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing a loan to relieve the burden and hardship to certain persons in Italy; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwe..lth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted, February 4, 1952.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 13, 1952.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Lowell, Mass., relating to the exclusion of textiles from distressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Fresno (Calif.) Junior Chamber of Commerce, favoring a hearing on the Hoover Commission proposals pertaining to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A resolution adopted by the Pensacola Townsend Club No. 2, and the senior citizens of Escambia County, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by residents, friends, and neighbors of the Fellowship Center, Ormond Beach, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

Memorials of the members of the Hardinsburg Wesleyan Service Guild, of Hardinsburg; the Antioch Methodist Church, of Greenville; the Sacramento Methodist Church, of Sacramento, and the Missionary Society of the Demossville Baptist Church, of Demossville, all in the State of Kentucky, remonstrating against the appointment of an Ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Greenville, Tex., favoring the enactment of legislation to confirm and establish the rights of the States to lands beneath navigable waters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The petition of Orinthia A. Grant and sundry other citizens of The Bronx, New York City, N. Y., relating to civil rights in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Legion Auxiliary, unit of Courts Pussnecker Post, 367, Ripley, Ohio, signed by Mrs. Eleanor Serwna, secretary, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide universal military training; ordered to lie on the table.

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—RESOLUTION OF JAMESTOWN (N. DAK.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the resolutions committee on national affairs, of the Chamber of Commerce of Jamestown, N. Dak., relating to Federal expenditures for 1953.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our study of the budget reveals that a proposed peactime budget for 1953 is in excess of $85,000,000,000; and

Whereas Federal revenue for the same period are about $71,000,000,000;

We therefore earnestly believe that the spending for the year should be cut down to the seventy-one billion of expected revenue. This, we believe, can be accomplished without too serious curtailment of our own defense program and of necessary foreign aid to allied and other nations. It would seem possible that the budget asking of fifty-one and one-tenth billions for military service might well be curtailed five or six billions of dollars without seriously hampering our defense effort by a careful scrutinizing of unnecessary waste and overlapping in these services.

We further believe that another $5,000,000,000 could be cut from the foreign aid budget by restudy of the whole program and by an insistence that those nations receiving aid and loans be encouraged to rebuild their own economic structure to meet their vital needs.

We further believe that in our own domestic spending we must much more severely apply economy measures by the elimination of overhead and personnel, and by a curtailment of programs for national development projects insofar as they do not affect flood-control projects.

We therefore earnestly petition our Sentors and Representatives to be very insistent that our expenditures for 1953 be brought within range of our expected income, as we believe deficit spending would be one of the most serious threats to the stability of our Nation, and to the advancement of serious inflationary trends.

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL AFFAIRS,
DR. A. W. RATZ.
R. E. MEIDINGER.
B. W. SCHUBERT.

EMPLOYMENT OF VETERANS—RESOLUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution favoring the restoration of budget cuts to the Vetertans Employment Service, which was forwarded to me by the American Legion Department of Utah.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill) the United States Veterans Employment Service of the United States Department of Labor is charged with the direct responsibility of assisting veterans of all wars with problems affecting their employment and return of their rightful place in the civilian economy of the Nation, the counseling of veterans with respect to the settlement of their problems such as housing, veterans' preference and employment rights and with special service to the handicapped and disabled of this country, and

Whereas the present national emergency and the war in Korea has substantially increased the Employment Services' active file of veterans, disabled and otherwise, needing and requiring these services rather than resulting in any lessening of the workload, and

Whereas 81 percent of Korean veterans have not had established employment prior to military service, reemployment is especially difficult, and

Whereas for the past 3 years the budgetary allowance for the Veterans Employment Service has been reduced each year until the amount now appropriated for this fiscal year

and recommended for the ensuing year is insufficient for the personnel of this service to adequately and properly carry out the provisions of the GI bill with respect to service to veterans and has resulted in curtailment of such service at a time when the veterans of this Nation are entitled to the best service available for the ever increasing number of veterans: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this Area E Rehabilitation and Economic Conference of the American Legion assembled in Boise, Idaho, this 9th and 10th day of February 1952, recommend to the respective Commissions of the national organization that prompt steps be taken to bring this situation to the attention of the Congress to the end that an adequate and sufficient appropriation be made for the next fiscal year so as to enable this service to function properly under the law as originally contemplated.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—RESOLUTION OF FACULTY COUNCIL, UNIVERSITY OF UTAH, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution, sent to me by Dr. A. Ray Olpin, president of the University of Utah, at Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring support of amendments to the Federal Social Security Act regarding public institutions of higher education.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution favoring support of amendments to the Federal Social Security Act regarding public institutions of higher education

Whereas the Federal Social Security Act, as now constituted, does not permit the inclusion by membership of State institutions in which the State or a political subdivision thereof already contributes to a retirement system; and

Whereas the National Association of State Universities and the National Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities have gone on record as supporting legislation amending the Federal Social Security Act to make possible the inclusion of State institutions in which the State or a political subdivision thereof already contributes to a retirement system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the faculty council of the University of Utah on behalf of the faculty unanimously endorses and urges permissive amendments to the Federal Social Security Act supporting action authorizing the integration of Federal social security with the present retirement systems now in effect in the State of Utah and political subdivisions thereof.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of Baltimore, opposing any appropriations for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway.

The sentiments expressed therein deserve the attention of every taxpayer of the country. The project in question would cost a great deal and do much damage to the established transportation systems and port facilities throughout the eastern half of the country. Even if some small part of the advantages claimed by its proponents could be realized—and on this point there is much doubt and extreme confusion—the threat to the economy of the Atlantic seaboard and to the defense effort is huge. Under no circumstances should this dubious project be approved at any time, much less now when manpower and strategic materials are needed so badly elsewhere.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Whereas the Federal Government is again fostering the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project; and

Whereas it would cost over a billion dollars to complete said project and would divert such sums from much more pressing needs and projects directly connected with the defense effort, and would also require many years for completion; and

Whereas the records show that this seaway would be closed at least 5 months of each year due to ice conditions; and

Whereas the completion of such project would divert much traffic from Baltimore and be a serious threat to our economy as well as the plans now in progress for the development of the port of Baltimore; and

Whereas the income of labor engaged in port work will be greatly affected; and

Whereas many associated industries dependent upon the port may be required to lay off personnel; and

Whereas United States-flag steamship lines have indicated it will be uneconomical to use said seaway even if completed: Therefore be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to each of the Representatives from Maryland in the United States Congress.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a considerable number of resolutions from Wisconsin organizations supporting the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. I feel that these resolutions are indicative not simply of grass-roots sentiments in my own State of Wisconsin, but of the affiliated organizations of these Wisconsin groups, organizations, and memberships in all of the 48 States.

While we of Wisconsin have taken the lead in this respect, it is principally because the seaway is so well familiar to us—perhaps to a far greater extent than it is to the other States of the Union.

I ask unanimous consent that several of these splendid resolutions, letters, and telegrams be printed in the RECORD, at this point, and appropriately referred. It is my earnest hope that the objectives stressed in these resolutions, letters, and telegrams, will indeed be fulfilled by the Congress and that it will not be necessary for our good neighbor, Canada, to go ahead and build the seaway all by itself.

There being no objection, the resolutions, letters, and telegrams were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

At the 1951 Annual Meeting of Wisconsin Electric Cooperative the delegates voted unanimously to urge Congress to speedily authorize completion of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

It is a sad commentary upon our ability to function as a nation intelligently for the general welfare that this project, urged by every President for the past 35 years, has been blocked by selfish and narrow economics and regional interests.

The national need for this project is so great and the results to be obtained from its completion so beneficial to the general welfare that it should be apparent to all that narrow and selfish economic and regional considerations should no longer be permitted to obstruct national progress on this issue.

The time for the United States to act is short. It is imperative that Congress promote the general welfare by authorizing this project at this congressional session. We support President Truman in his request that Congress act on this matter now. We commend Senator WILEY for his stand and leadership in this fight and we endorse Governor Kohler's action in appointing a committee to spearhead Wisconsin's support of this project.

WISCONSIN ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE.

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence seaway is about to become a reality through the unilateral action of Canada; and

Whereas failure to participate in the construction and development of such seaway would seriously jeopardize the future industrial and commercial potential of this area through the imposition of tolls: Be it therefore

Resolved, That this Door County Board of Supervisors recommend immediate and complete cooperation in an effort to secure the joint development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Respectfully submitted.

Door County, Wis.: R. E. Burton, Floyd B. Knuth, Ivan Thorp, Laurence Larsen, Geo. Schmelzer, Tyrus Perry, Wendelin Rose, Norman Herlache, Chas. F. Martens, Byron Fehl, Clarence Mann, J. F. La Vassor, Lawrence F. Johnson, Cyril J. Virlee, Roger W. Gunnerson, Alphonse Bader, John R. Scoquest, Roy Knudson, Geo. Dufek, H. M. Schuyler.

HARTFORD, WIS., *February 20, 1952.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We, the people of Washington County, feel that the St. Lawrence waterway should be started at once, not only for the good of us, the Middle West, but also for the whole Nation, as a defense measure.

I feel this has been a political football long enough and urge that you do all in your power to see the bill put through at once.

I do not blame Canada for planning on building alone if we do not take the necessary steps at once.

Again I urge your utmost support and efforts.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR H. LICHTENWALNER,
President, Washington County Farm Bureau.

RESOLUTION ON GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Be it resolved by the Wisconsin Junior Chamber of Commerce in meeting assembled at Manitowoc, Wis., this 10th day of February 1952, That this organization renew and repledge its support for the vitally important Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project.

That the Wisconsin Jaycees call upon each and every Member of the Wisconsin delegation in Congress to give his immediate,

wholehearted, strong, and active support to the legislation now pending in Congress providing for immediate authorization of the joint United States-Canadian seaway project so important to the interests of Wisconsin, to the economic development of the Great Lakes heartland and the Middle West, and to the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

MILWAUKEE WOMAN'S SERVICE CLUB,
Milwaukee, Wis., February 26, 1952.

Senator TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of the Milwaukee Woman's Service Club of Milwaukee, Wis., urges that your committee support the St. Lawrence seaway project for the following reasons:

1. The seaway is important to the economy of all the country, not just the North Central States; first, because it will enable shippers to avoid the railroad bottleneck in Chicago; second, because shipping by boats will help to alleviate the chronic shortage of railroad cars, and third, because an inland route will speed up shipping to our vital steel plants, omitting the transfer of ore from boat to car.

2. Since Canada has courageously determined to build the seaway without our help, control of this waterway will go to them, together with the right to charge tolls, even after the project is paid for.

3. Even if the honorable members of the committee do not see any gain for their own constituents, it is unthinkable that this could be used as a reason for preventing the entire Congress from getting a chance to vote on such a vitally important matter.

Respectfully submitted.

MRS. JAMES S. KAIN,
Corresponding Secretary pro tempore.

EAU CLAIRE, WIS., *February 25, 1952.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
State Office Building:

Eau Claire Trades and Labor Council and 33 affiliated local unions strongly support joint participation of St. Lawrence seaway between Canada and the United States.

LA VINA CROWE,
Secretary Eau Clair Trades and Labor Union.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *February 17, 1952.*

Senator A. WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We urgently request that you support the St. Lawrence seaway project.

LOCAL UNION, NO. 1569, USA, CIO.

MADISON, WIS., *February 22, 1952.*

United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building:

The Madison Federation of Labor is in favor of joint participation of St. Lawrence deep-sea waterway between Canada and United States.

MADISON FEDERATION OF LABOR,
P. L. ROBERTS, *President*
MARVIN BRICKSON,
Recording Secretary.

WEST BEND, WIS., *February 23, 1952.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Members of Local 2283, Milwaukee Carpenters District Council, AFL, request your support and vote for the St. Lawrence waterway project, when the same comes up for consideration before your respective legislative body.

Respectfully submitted.

HAROLD FISCHER,
Recording Secretary.

SUPERIOR, WIS., *February 23, 1952.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: Please be advised that the Superior Federation of Labor is in favor of joint participation of the St. Lawrence deep-sea waterway between Canada and the United States.

WILLIAM FRITSCH,
Secretary, Superior Federation of Labor.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me together with a statement by Hon. Walter J. Kohler, Governor of Wisconsin, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Since the Canadian Parliament authorized the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway on Canadian soil, there has been a flood of propaganda by opponents saying "Let Canada do it."

Information comes to me that the reason why the opponents take this position is that they hope to take court action to try and stop the Canadian project by preventing the construction of the power dams. I mention this because we must beware of the glib argument of the opponents about letting Canada do it.

I am convinced that Canada is in earnest, and that they will build this project in spite of the delaying tactics of the opponents in Congress and perhaps in the courts.

The opposition to the seaway has already strained our relations with Canada. They threaten to jeopardize American commercial interests, too, by driving this country to accept an all-Canadian seaway.

The Governor of my State of Wisconsin, the Honorable Walter J. Kohler, gave the most cogent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee why an all-Canadian seaway, though more desirable than no seaway at all, might be discriminatory of United States interest. I commend his views to the attention of my colleagues.

STATEMENT OF GOV. WALTER J. KOHLER, OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 29, 1952

I am Walter J. Kohler, Governor of Wisconsin.

I appear here in my official capacity as chief executive of the State of Wisconsin to urge this committee, on behalf of my State, to report favorably the St. Lawrence seaway legislation.

Unquestionably, there is no other issue which enjoys the unanimity of support which the people of Wisconsin extend toward the seaway proposal.

The St. Lawrence seaway project has the active support of every veterans' organization in Wisconsin. It has the active support of both the Wisconsin State Federation of Labor and the Wisconsin State CIO.

It has the active support of the Wisconsin Farm Bureau Federation, the Wisconsin State Grange, the Farmers' Union, the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, and every other State-wide farm group.

In addition, it is supported by civic groups, by the Wisconsin Junior Chamber of Commerce, and by enlightened business and industrial leaders.

Nor can it be said that this support which the people of Wisconsin extend to the seaway project is either hasty or ill-considered.

The Wisconsin legislature in 1919 first memorialized Congress to cooperate with Canada in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway project.

Since that date the question has been discussed by 16 successive regular sessions and one special session of the Wisconsin Legislature, and in each instance a resolution has been adopted urging the Congress to approve the construction of the seaway project.

We have before us two alternative ways in which this project may be built. It may be built as a joint project—as a partnership undertaking between the United States and Canada, or alternatively, it will be built as a wholly Canadian waterway. I am here to urge United States participation, and I can perhaps be most useful to the committee if I outline briefly the reasons why construction of the seaway as an all-Canadian project is not an adequate alternative.

First, the Canadian proposal authorizes 27-foot navigation from Montreal only into Lake Erie, 27-foot navigation, therefore, would be available only as far as Toledo, would not even include Detroit, which is up the Detroit River, and would not carry this draft into Lake Superior and Lake Michigan. The channels through the Detroit, St. Clair, and St. Mary's Rivers have a project depth, at present, of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound. Although this is still an improvement over the 14-foot limitation in the St. Lawrence River, it does not give the Western States, such as mine and most of Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, Iowa, and the agricultural States which will utilize this waterway for export—it does not give them the full advantage of 27-foot navigation, as does the joint project before you.

Secondly, the Canadians would have exclusive control over tolls. It is true that the economics of competitive transportation will have a tempering effect upon the toll policies of the Canadian Government, and it is also true that, under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, there can be no discrimination in the application of tolls to the nationals of the two countries. Upon closer investigation, however, we find these three possibilities which may possibly be deterrent to United States commercial interests.

(a) In the first place, although rates on a commodity have to be the same in the case of the nationals of both countries, there can be differences in tolls as between commodities and it would be possible for the Canadian authorities to set higher tolls on commodities in which the producer and consumer interest in Canada is less than in the United States. Let me take one or two examples:

Canada is a large exporter of grain and, of ccurse, we, too, expect to use the waterway for large shipments of grain. It would be to the interest of Canada to set very low rates on grain and to make up the revenue requirements by substantially higher rates on products of American origin or consumption, such as newsprint, of which we are a large consumer, and machinery and iron and steel products, of which we are large exporters—the result of this would be that most of the toll revenues would be assessed against American pocketbooks.

(b) In the second place, a specific instance in which discrimination between commodities or types of traffic may have directly adverse effect upon the American taxpayer is in connection with Government traffic. The resolution before you contemplates that Government traffic may be excepted; but, in an all-Canadian seaway there is no reason to expect that military and foreign-aid traffic will be excepted from tolls. Although rates may be charged on Government traffic equally applicable to Canadian as well as United States Government traffic, the volume of American traffic will be so much larger than similar Canadian traffic that the total charge will fall more heavily on

American taxpayers. That this is not a hypothetical situation is evidenced by our contrasting experience at Panama and the Suez. United States Government traffic does not pay tolls through the Panama Canal, although other governments must pay. By contrast, all through the Second World War, military and lend-lease traffic through the Suez Canal, as well as American military personnel going through, had to pay the established tolls to the Suez Canal Co., controlled by the French and the British.

(c) In the third place, there would be no limitation on the duration of toll charges and over the trend of toll rates. The Canadian Government may decide to liquidate the investments through a shorter period of time by high rates and maintain those rates even after the liquidation of the investment.

In short it is very good business for the Canadian Government to invest Canadian dollars and secure American dollar revenues through tolls over as long a period as they desire. Eventually, United States citizens will have paid out of pocket for a good piece of property which will be owned in perpetuity by the Canadian Government. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Canadian people are anxious for this prospect and there is growing evidence that they would indeed prefer to build and own and manage the whole project.

As a realistic business proposition, it should be to our advantage, in exchange for an investment which will be repayable, to obtain control over a part of this waterway so that we participate in the determination of tolls with due regard to the interests of United States citizens, and to own and control in perpetuity, even after the investment is liquidated, a portion of this waterway.

Third, in the relations of nations, however friendly, control over commerce has been considered a vital factor in international relations—one that has led not only to diplomatic incidents but, too often in history, even to armed conflict. The history of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, which has been a bone of contention between empires throughout history; the experience of the Suez Canal; and even our long controversy and negotiation with the British over a 50-year period from 1850 to 1900 concerning the control of the Panama Canal, must give us some historical perspective upon the relative advantages of United States control over part of this waterway.

General Bradley recently stated that, in case of divergence between Canadian and United States interests in some future controversy, the control of this waterway may be important in carrying out American policy. It has been stated here that Canada controls the exit to this waterway in any event and therefore no weight should be given to the claim that joint control is significant. We must realize, however, that placing the canals and locks at the international rapids section on United States soil will give the United States the same exclusive control over traffic which the Canadians now enjoy at the Welland Canal and in the lower reaches of the St. Lawrence. In other words, for a repayable investment, we would be acquiring an equally potent control over this waterway. When we realize that this waterway opens up the longest coast line in the country to deep-water navigation and will become an artery of commerce for some of our most vital raw materials, we cannot lightly forfeit this advantage which the Canadians, as good neighbors, readily offer to us.

Let me therefore summarize the advantages of approving the legislation as it stands before you, including the amendment offered by Senator AIKEN with the joint sponsorship of a bipartisan group of Senators, for financing of the project through bond issues.

It gives us control over a vital waterway in perpetuity for a repayable investment; it gives us a voice in the setting and management of toll rates and the duration over which they shall apply; it gives us an opportunity for direct savings to taxpayers through exempting Government traffic; and it gives us an opportunity to manage the toll policy so that no American sectional or industrial interest will be unduly handicapped.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1630. A bill to amend the provision in the act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1235, 1253), authorizing the granting of easements for rights-of-way for electrical transmission, telephone, and telegraph lines and poles; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1224).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 603. A bill for the relief of Wanda Charwat and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat (Rept. No. 1226);

S. 1162. A bill for the relief of Pietro Meduri (Rept. No. 1227);

S. 1424. A bill for the relief of George Georgacopoulos (Rept. No. 1228);

S. 1565. A bill for the relief of Andy Duzsik (Rept. No. 1229);

S. 1812. A bill for the relief of Janice Justina King (Rept. No. 1230);

S. 1863. A bill to effect the entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national (Rept. No. 1231);

S. 2033. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa S. Boyd (Rept. No. 1232);

S. 2066. A bill for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly (Rept. No. 1233);

S. 2462. A bill for the relief of Teruo Uechi (Rept. No. 1234);

S. 2544. A bill to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief (Rept. No. 1235);

S. 2571. A bill for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr. (Rept. No. 1236);

S. 2593. A bill for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks (Rept. No. 1237);

H. R. 648. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of aliens Max Mayer Hirsch Winzelberg and Mrs. Jenty Fuss De Winzelberg (Rept. No. 1238);

H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Mering Bichara (Rept. No. 1239);

H. R. 1234. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl (Rept. No. 1240);

H. R. 3153. A bill for the relief of Signa Angela Maino Cristallo (Rept. No. 1241); and

H. R. 6065. A bill for the relief of Patrick J. Logan (Rept. No. 1242).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 148. A bill for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft (Rept. No. 1243);

S. 1050. A bill for the relief of Hisako Hanabata (Rept. No. 1244);

S. 1765. A bill for the relief of Harumi Kamiaka (Rept. No. 1245);

S. 2034. A bill for the relief of Charlotte Elizabeth Cason (Rept. No. 1246); and

S. 2643. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Cowley (Rept. No. 1247).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 1154. A bill for the relief of Edi Bertoli, Gino Guglielmi, Serafinio Ballerini, and Giuseppi Bigg (Rept. No. 1248); and

S. 2220. A bill for the relief of Michiko Ihara (Rept. No. 1249); and

S. Res. 270. Resolution creating the Special Committee To Investigate the Problem of Overpopulation in Western Europe and Programs of Assistance to Refugees From Communist Tyranny (Rept. No. 1250); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 643. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1252); and

H. R. 646. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1253).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1251) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-2797929, Adame-Ruiz, Pedro.

A-4844402, Alexander, Spiros, or Spiridon Alexandropolis.

A-5522028, Alho, John Oscar.

A-4762341, Alho, Hilja Maria.

A-3093032, Ali, Toymus, or Toimossoolia Fozoreulia or Toymus Ulah or Toymus Meah.

A-2451327, Alpermann, Hans Gustav.

A-6177123, Alvarez, Francisco, Espinosa, or Francisco Alvarez Espionosa.

A-9542102, Anderson, Paul Jacob.

A-1463208, Apostolou, Antonios Elias, or Anthony Elias Apostolou.

A-5987634, Arriola, Irma.

A-7203348, Ayala-Pacheco, Jose, or Luis Ayala-Pacheco or Jesus Navarro-Pacheco.

A-7198760, Banet, Rozsa Regina Lkein, or Rozsa Banet.

A-5438722, Banlin, Joy Isabelle.

A-6706726, Bellens, Eleni (nee Tsirigotis).

A-7287699, Below, Helga Ehrengard Magdalena.

A-3961628, Benintende, Antonina, or Lena (nee Martorana).

A-7483674, Beveridge, William.

A-7199696, Blanchard, Pacifico (formerly Medel).

A-3484710, Bliziotis, James John, or Demetrios Bliziotis.

A-7736534, Bowen, Claude Christopher.

A-3884373, Buhagiar, Joseph, or Giuseppe Buhagiar alias Antonio Sacco.

A-2723973, Bures, Eduard, or Edward Buresh.

A-2723976, Buresova, Ludmila, or Ludmila Buresh.

A-2723977, Buresova, Kristina, or Kristyna Buresova or Kristina Buresh.

A-2353267, Calderon, Bernardino or Bernardo or Bernard or Benny.

A-5156628, Calogrides, Michael.

A-5154086, Cameron, John Hilliard.

A-7469087, Campbell, Simeon.

A-5391517, Canova, Palmerina, or Rina Canova.

A-5367636, Carriles, John Solana, or Higinio Solana Carriles or John Solana.

A-7249859, Carrillo, Amalia vda. de Gamboa.

A-7039177, Carrothers, William George.

A-7039178, Carrothers, Marilyn Isabel.

A-4555965, Casares-Linares, Jose Pedro, or Jose Linares-Casares alias Pedro Casares.

A-5625015, Caselli, Maria.

A-1288323, Chagolla-Chavolla, Enrique.
A-1288321, Chagolla, Amalia Nunoz de.
A-7483960, Chakarian, Sarkis.
A-2468492, Chao, Yun Tsung, or Chao Yun Tsung.
A-7427281, Choy, Frank, or Fie Ling Choy.
A-7427282, Choy, Yu Chu, or Yu Chu Chun.
A-7427283, Choy, Martin, or Mo Din Choy.
A-3818687, Chun, Gin Foo, or Peter Chun.
A-5483889, Church, Edine (nee Radvansky) or Edine Ujejska.
A-3827973, Cochinsky, Benjamin Wolf, or Robert Koch.
A-2624232, Cordal, Olegario, Cubina.
A-6757481, Costley, Daniel James.
A-2580250, Crugeiras, Francisco, or Francisco Crugeiras Vidal.
A-7367902, Cugnin, Jane Pamela.
A-5149988, De Acebedo, Maria Luisa Orozco.
A-6884689, De Basurto, Maria Candelaria Cabral, or Maria Candelaria Cabral or Maria Candelaria C. Basurto or Candelaria C. Basurto or Candelaria C. De Basurto or Candelaria S. Basurto.
A-6924789, Basurto, Carmela.
A-6924790, Basurto, Juan Manuel.
A-2700975, De Benedettis, Vincenzo, or Vincenzo Benedictis.
A-5859052, De Clara, Giovanni De Peresin, or John De Clara.
A-5958558, De Fierro, Reynalda Dimas, or Reynalda Dimas.
A-1333544, De Gonzales, Elena Fernandez.
A-6888288, De Juarez, Consuelo Hilaria Adame, or Consuelo Hilaria Adame Garcia.
A-1834127, De Navarro, Guadalupe Emilia Del Valle.
A-7991850, Dennis Frederick (formerly Frederick Wuellner or Freddie Dennis).
A-4478881, De Perez, Miguelina Vasquez.
A-3837890, De Rivas, Elly Anna Soeborg Andersen.
A-7955659, De Sapota, Angeles, Yujuico, or Angeles Yujuico Villongco.
A-7841758, Diaz, Juan Manuel.
A-3509749, Drame, Joseph Discounda, or Joe Drame.
A-5698588, Dupuis, Wilda Hope (nee McKenzie).
A-5133242, Echeagaray, Leonor.
A-4497646, Economides, Constantinos Minas.
A-1239249, Enger, Sverre Andersen, or Sverre Andersen or Hans Anderson.
A-7264181, Engert, Peter Norman.
A-7117718, Espinoza, Jose Simon Marciso, or Espinosa or Jose Espinoza or Espinosa or Jose Espinoza-Cervantes.
A-7985417, Estrin, Poria (nee Lenczysky), or Porja or Polly or Paula.
A-1714432, Ewens, William Arthur.
A-6654250, Fernandez, Gumersindo Perez, or Gumersindo Perez.
A-2992811, Fick, Karl Christian Henry.
A-5088723, Flores-Arredondo, Eusebio.
A-7117527, Fong, Kai.
A-6161022, Chiu, Miguel Fong, or "Mickey" Fong Chiu.
A-4632538, Galicia, Rodolfo Hernandez.
A-5919245, Garganta, Joao Maria.
A-6936518, Garman, Patrician (nee Patrician Walpole, formerly Patrician O'Brien).
A-3817423, Garros, Pilar, or Miria Del Pilar Garros or Pilar Garros Recatalo.
A-7178250, Garson, Bruce Kane.
A-7117959, Garza-Campos, Agustin.
A-3471121, Gelpi, Francisca, or Amelia Landa (nee Lara).
A-1338687, Glasner, Leon, or Leo Glasner.
A-4066695, Gomez-Hernandez, Bartolo.
A-6837544, Gonzalez, Jan, or Juan Gonzalez-Garcia or Juan G. Gonzalez.
A-2185879, Gonzalez-Gallardo, Tomas.
A-1894533, Gonzales, Julia Gonzales de.
A-7041972, Gonzales, Manuel.
A-7529864, Gonzalez-Ybarra, Judith Lydia, or Judith Lydia Gonzalez De Sweatt.
A-6169092, Gore, Adella Eve (nee Wheatley), or Adella Eve Wheatley.
A-6288018, Goshgarian, Florence, or Sotenig or Sotenig Aramian.
A-3873714, Grandpere, Maurice.
A-6921199, Greene, Nora (nee Honor McCormack).
A-7927004, Grindel, Carin.
A-5299287, Grion, Andrew Joseph, or Antonio Grion.
A-7427869, Guerrini, Iola Wilma.
A-7079683, Gula, Lilly, or Lilly Beattie (nee Harper).
A-4011388, Gulliver, Mary Ann, or Marion Gulliver or Marion McLellan.
A-7145328, Hadeed, Youssef.
A-7145552, Hadeed, Emiline Tohme.
A-4350880, Hanatani, Masayasu, or Masseayasu Hanatani or T. Tana or Masayasu Hanaya or Masa Tani or John Hanatani.
A-7205853, Hauser, Armin.
A-6817832, Hausey, Maria, or Maria Kayata or Maria Kassir.
A-3257099, Hermosillo, Refugio Gonzalez.
A-5010790, Hester, Inez Anita (nee Wheeler).
A-4018214, Ho, Chin Kung, or Chin Hoe or Kung Hong.
A-5238751, Holmund, Segfried Jonatan, or Fred Holm.
A-6764852, Horvath, Gabriella Imrene.
A-6764853, Horvath, Imre.
A-5169248, Hustig, Willy Ewald.
A-4712722, Igawa, Kazuo, or Kazu Igawa.
A-3225807, Ingraldi, Angelina (formerly Angelina Genua, nee Buffa).
A-4624881, Jacobs, Aisic, or Aizie Leib or Aizic Lieb or Strul.
A-2548383, Jaramillo, David.
A-1917947, Juarez-Vanegas, Eduvigs or Eduvigis Juarez-Venegas or Eduviges Juarez-Venegas or Eduviges Juarez.
A-7427007, Kalsbeek, Jean Liu, or Jean Kalsbeek Liu.
A-7427008, Kalsbeek, Helen Liu, or Helen Kalsbeek Liu.
A-3007386, Karalis, Georgios Vasiliou, or George V. Karalis or George William Karalis or Georgis Vasiliou Karalis or George Caralis.
A-5043064, Karm, Robert.
A-3128952, Kim, Ruth Chew, or Ai Kyung Chew.
A-1091793, Kinney, Clifford.
A-3081681, Kirshenbaum, Anna, or Anna Rosenstock.
A-5391201, Kodani, Sadayo (nee Ono).
A-3507887, Kostas, Valsamakis, or Valsamakis Magoulas.
A-3278845, Koutsoudakis, Christ Nicholas, or Chris Dakis.
A-2853455, Kritchen, Dorothy Tanton.
A-7188919, Kwan, Yoen Wan, or Yoen Wan or Yin Wan Kon.
A-7991490, Lanter, Eveline Paulina (nee Eveline Pulina Nahar).
A-7849025, Ledee, Hypolite Leonard, or Lionel Ledee.
A-3466270, Lee, Dorothy, Woo (formerly Dorothy Lee Woo or Law Yee Dor or Dorothy Fong).
A-5282808, Lenetsky, Sonia, or Sonia Lenett or Sonia Dubravetsky.
A-7755525, Liao, Lin Tung-Mei or.
A-7755526, Liao, Tseng-Wu.
A-3875193, Lin, Pon Pack.
A-5070717, Lisser, Amy De.
A-6527184, Littleton, Yvette Julia, or Yvette Julia Dekkers or Yvette Julia Ervin.
A-5985818, Lizarrago-Salcido, Maximiliano, or Max Lizarraga.
A-5551755, Lona-Ramirez, Tomas, or Tomas Ramirez-Alonso.
A-1880267, Loughe, John A.
A-5840683, Loza, Leona Kondrat (nee Kondrat or Leona Struck).
A-3047234, Lycos, Harilaos.
A-6063598, MacFarlane, Tanya Konstantinova, or Tanya Guskaya.
A-4544195, Marciniak, Franciszek, or Frank Marciniak.
A-5876495, Marino, Giovanina, or Giovanna (see Nucci).
A-5346583, Marks, Ernest William Monroe.
A-5057511, Marold, Sandor H.
A-6746755, Martines, Felicitas Zermeno, or Felicitas Zermeno Garcia.
A-7222572, Martinez-Guerrero, Jose.
A-7054900, Martinez-Gutierrez, Luis, or Jose Jimenez-Gutierrez.
A-4842789, Mascarin, Giovanni Frederick.
A-5004010, Mavroudis, Andrew Nickalaou, or Andreas Mavroudis or Andrew N. Nicholas or Andrew Mikalaou or Nikalaou or Nicholas.
A-4411112, Medina-Alamos, Santiago, or Santiago Alamos Medina.
A-3449397, Melendres-Gomez, Manuel.
A-6855172, Melendrez-Alvarez, Jose Elias.
A-7457921, Dendez, Julio, Junior.
A-7112641, Mercado, Raul.
A-5414736, Meyer, Violet Annie (nee Hamad).
A-4632788, Mills, Joseph Edward, or Joseph Millis.
A-4608674, Mogk, Julius Johanas, or Hans Johanas Mogk or Harry Morton.
A-3196819, Molina, Lucinda Flores de.
A-7415671, Moree, Sybil Jutta Wrede.
A-6917624, Morgensztern, Mojsze Mendel, or Frank Morgens.
A-7542572, Muller, Leonore, or Leonore Mittler or Leonore Mueller Mittler.
A-3677063, Nakamura, Chieno, or Chiyeno Shohara.
A-1233042, Nakayama, Kazuo.
A-4425815, Nawrocki, Stefan, or Stephen Nawrocky.
A-5235709, Nemer, Regina, or Rifka or Berta Rosenhand.
A-4868503, Nohe, Richard Ernst, or Richard Nohe.
A-2118140, Okada, Ferdinand Eastlake.
A-7196345, Olivares, Antonio Arias.
A-2378910, Olmos, Cavarrubio, George, or George Cavabrubio-Olmos.
A-5328434, Oppenheim, Bertha Sara, or Klein or Suria Bayla-Klaynsinger.
A-5465949, O'Rourke, James Francis.
A-5287762, Ortega, Concepcion Martinez, or Concepcion Martinez or Concha Martinez.
A-7367210, Ortega-Hurtado, Jr., Rafael.
A-4992812, Otani, Heishiro.
A-7394701, Paserini, Emma Constancia.
A-2985312, Pavich, Anton.
A-3551554, Pecorella, Domenic.
A-6870246, Perez, Gilberto, or Gilberto Perez-Reyes.
A-6877605, Perez, Leonila Gonzalez De, or Leonila Gonzales.
A-1369572, Perez, Meliton.
A-2277896, Piese, Barbara Schmaltz, or Schmaltz.
A-4255708, Polselli, Pietrantonio.
A-5046664, Poy, Sui How, or Ah Shim or Leung Shi.
A-4512946, Quaglia, Domenicangelo, or Domenic Angelo Quaglia.
A-7809156, Ramirez, Aurelia Soto, or Aurelia Soto.
A-2773376, Rego, Ramon, or Ramon Rego Ageitas.
A-5947085, Rodriguez, Preciliano.
A-6921653, Rogers, Frederick William.
A-2834927, Rose, Isable Margaret.
A-5133242, Rosenzweig, Etheri Rose (nee Yettie Schatzberg), or Ethel Newman.
A-6371042, Rosilio, Alberto.
A-4380617, Roth, Katharina, or Katharina Ermack.
A-5303368, Schena, Egidio.
A-4086556, Schmidt, Hans George.
A-7418510, Schmidt, Horst Kort.
A-4517741, Schmidt, Martha Emely (nee Berrmans).
A-7240104, Schnur, Pinkas.
A-4645835, Seelenfreund, Erna (nee Manne), or Erna Freund.
A-5971011, Seki, Genzo.
A-2611606, Serrato-Borjas, Jesus, or Jesus B. Serrato or Jesus Borjas Serrato.
A-4274540, Shiroyama, Kansaku.
A-3581079, Shiroyama, Rui.

A-4646697, Sierra, Jesus, or Jesus Romero Sierra or Jesus Sierra Romero or Jesus R. Sierra or J. Jesus Sierra.
A-7130264, Sierra, Maria Elena, or Maria Elena Sierra Vega.
A-7130265, Sierra, Refugio, or Jose Refugio Sierra Vega.
A-2642249, Simon, Rita (nee Rita Mizzani).
A-3962316, Singh, Vir, or Fir Singh or Bur Singh.
A-1834612, Sisoian, Garabed, or Garabed Hagopian or Chalres Sisoian.
A-5182393, Small, Florence Fanny, or Fanny Simon.
A-5460583, Smart, James Deas, or James Dees Smart or James S. Smart.
A-1351483, Smolje, Anthony Luka, or Ante Smoje or Smoge.
A-5956797, Soria-Mendez, Febronia, or Febronia Mendez De Soria.
A-7070693, Soto, Juan, or Juan Soto-Arrieta.
A-7397882, Sparacino, Agatina (nee Lobianco).
A-7129795, Spence, Marie Olga (nee Zimmer).
A-5531383, Sproge, Harold Karl, or Harold Sproge or Harald Sproge.
A-3375605, Sproge, Elfriede Charlotte (nee Neyraw).
A-5462354, Strachan, Louise Barclay.
A-3364095, Stuart, Roslyn Muriel (nee Roslyn Muriel Boyd-Edkins).
A-4498521, Suren, Johann Heinrich.
A-4894170, Suzuki, Harue, or Haru Suzuki.
A-7026359, Sze, Yu-Min.
A-2536615, Szemraj, Anna, or Skowron.
A-6844930, Tamasy, Stephan Geza, or Stephan Tamasy Stout or Istvan Geza Tamasy.
A-4433744, Tani, Fusano.
A-2574302, Teijeiro, Edward, or Eduardo Teijeiro Vasquez.
A-5303283, Tennant, Rose Adline.
A-4520450, Terrones, Juan Bravo.
A-5692011, Tetrault, Roger.
A-7457018, Theodorakis, Themistoklis, or George Floras or Gloros or Georgios Athanasiou Floros.
A-5416550, Thomson, Noreen Margaret.
A-4256831, Todman, John Charles.
A-7174078, Touma, Elia.
A-7613590, Tsu, Tsung-Chi.
A-4644107, Ualat, Alfredo Sabbaluca, or Fred S. Walat.
A-7811754, Ulivi, Adolfo.
A-2074190, Ullah, Waz, or Kohaz Ullah or Jary Mohamed.
A-4859031, Valantasis, John Nicolaou.
A-7189797, Valdez, Bernarda Leal.
A-5471238, Valdez-Dorame, Ruben, or Ruben Valdez.
A-6961081, Valenzuela, Juanito, or Juanito (Juan) Valenzuela or Juan Valenzula-Alvarez or John Valenzuela or Juan V. Navarro or Juan Navarro or John Navarro.
A-6922740, Van Setters, Madelyn Estella or Madelyn Estella Titus.
A-2583761, Varvarigos, Nicholas, or Nikolas Varvas or Nick Varvas or Nick S. Varbas or Nicolaos Varvaribos or Yarvarigos.
A-5823450, Vasko, Bertha Doralee (nee Nicklon).
A-7450402, Vega-Ramirez, Jose Francisco, or Jose Vega-Francisco.
A-4794800, Verde, Joseph Lo.
A-7198754, Weinstein, Friedrich or Fritz.
A-7198753, Weinstein, Ingeborg.
A-7354827, Westcott, Annemarie.
A-7295673, Wiemann, Johann.
A-5274907, Wozna, Tatiana, or Tatiana Pelegnata.
A-3509283, Yamashita, Saichi, or Frank Yanashita.
A-4217236, Yue, Tang Wai Fong, or Tang Wai Fong.
A-7754172, Zargarpur, Rouholah.
A-4531750, Zasadny, Mary Ann (nee Grzondziel).
A-4687130, Zauczkowksi, Florence, or Frotunata or Florence Muraco or Muracco or Ariano or Ethel Ariano.
A-6218849, Soubry, Kenneth William Stephen.
A-7483641, Ingeborg-Bauer, Christine.
A-8091218, Smith, Nelia Maria.

PROPOSED REPEAL OF SECTION 104 OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on January 30, 1952, the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, was recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with instructions to report the bill back by March 3. From the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, that bill, and I submit a report (No. 1225) thereon. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the report. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the report will be printed as a report, and also will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (No. 1225) is as follows:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was recommitted the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, having given further study to the same, reports favorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the bill do pass.

EXPLANATION

On January 30, 1952, the Senate by a vote of 47 to 39 agreed to the amended motion offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] "that Senate bill 2104, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, be recommitted for further study to the Banking and Currency Committee, and reported back to the Senate not later than March 3, 1952."

Section 104 reads as follows:

"SEC. 104. Import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1952, which the Secretary of Agriculture determines would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price support program. The President shall exercise the authority and powers conferred by this action."

In explaining his motion, the Senator from Indiana stated that he thought the committee ought to "Go into the question of what is depressing the price of fats and oils in the United States, and to determine whether section 104 of the present law has had any effect on it, either pro or con."

Since recommittal of the bill, the committee has given further consideration to this particular matter. Your committee is of the opinion that neither section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, nor the effort to repeal that section is responsible for the generally lower market prices of many fats and oils as compared with the market prices for these same commodities prior to enactment of section 104 on July 31, 1951.

A tabular comparison of published cash prices for some representative commodities is given here as follows:

	July 30, 1951	Aug. 8, 1951	Feb 26, 1952
Cottonseed oil, crude, Southeast.....pound	[1] $0.15	$0.15¼	[1] $0.11⅞
Corn oil, crude, Chicago.....pound	[2] .15	.15½	[2] .13
Soybean oil, crude, Decatur, Ill.....pound	[2] .15	.14⅞	.10⅜
Peanut oil, crude, Southeast.....pound	[2] .17½	.17¾	[2] .14½
Lard, Chicago.....do	[2] .16¾	[1] .16¾	[1] .1187
Tallow, fancy, New York.....pound	[1] .09½	.09	[2] .06¼
Linseed oil, raw, New York.....round	.15½	.1480	.18½
Butter, fresh, A-92 score, New York.....pound	.67½	[3] .67½	.86½

[1] Nominal.
[2] Bid.
[3] Offered.

In all these items except lard, linseed oil, and butter, cash prices on February 26, 1952, were roughly half of the cash price for the same item a year earlier on February 26, 1951. Lard sold at $0.1930 per pound on February 26, 1951, as compared with the February 26, 1952, price of $0.1187 per pound. On February 1951 linseed oil sold at $0.2280 per pound and butter at $0.68½ per pound as compared with the prices set forth in the table above.

Effective August 9, 1951, the Department of Agriculture acted under the provisions of section 104 to control imports of certain fats and oils, namely, butter; butter oil; casein or lactarine, and mixtures in chief value thereof, n. s. p. f. (not specially provided for); cheese; flaxseed (linseed); flaxseed screenings, scalpings, chaff, or scourings; linseed oil, and combinations and mixtures, in chief value of such oil; milk, skimmed, dried (nonfat dried milk solids); peanuts, blanched, roasted, prepared, or preserved; peanut oil (ground nut oil); peanuts (shelled, not shelled); rice (paddy, uncleaned or brown rice, cleaned or milled rice, patna rice, cleaned, for use in canned soups, rice meal, flour, polish and bran, broken rice, including brewers' rice, rice starch).

Under the orders issued, import quotas were assigned to casein or lactarine, cheese, broken rice, and rice starch. In general, imports of the other commodities listed were barred through June 30, 1952. The Department did not deem it necesary to place import controls on the remaining commodities in the foregoing price table, apparently because in its opinion they did not require such controls under the criteria specified in section 104.

However, the lack of uniformity in price movements as between commodities controlled and those not controlled makes it difficult to argue that the movement of prices is due to the existence or threat of repeal of section 104. For example, the price of peanut oil, under strict import control, has declined, while the price of butter and linseed oil, under like strict import control, has risen. During the same period the price of lard and tallow, not placed under import control by the Department, has declined.

Your committee believes that other possible causes than the existence or proposed repeal of section 104 must be examined to determine the reason for the decline in price of many fats and oils. As to some of the items, prima facie evidence indicates the decline may be due to an increase in the domestic or world supply. Other of the commodities, such as tallow, encounter competition from synthetic detergents which

holds down the demand for such items. Yet a search for the causes of price fluctuations would involve a careful study, including examination into the operation of commodity markets, which your committee is of the opinion it does not have time to undertake and still report S. 2104 back to the Senate by March 3.

Your committee received requests from many who wished to testify at length if hearings were to be held on this matter. The prospective witnesses explained that they wanted a full opportunity to present their arguments with reference to S. 2104 if testimony was to be taken from those holding opposite views on the bill. Neither opponents nor proponents of S. 2104 were anxious to testify if your committee did not arrange to hold hearings for the purpose of receiving testimony from those differing with their views. Your committee had examined the basic problems involved in S. 2104 at public hearings held in August and September of 1951. Those hearings are recorded on page 2942 et seq. of part IV of hearings on the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951. It conducted further study of S. 2104 in accordance with the motion for recommittal of the bill. Your committee decided it would be impracticable to hold lengthy hearings and still report the bill back to the Senate by March 3, which is the mandate given your committee by the Senate. Its decision was also reached in the light of the fact that on March 4 your committee will commence hearings on bills to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, beyond June 30, 1952. Those hearings will serve as a forum for presenting the views of those who believe the provisions of section 104 of the act should be made effective after June 30, 1952, if any Member of this body sees fit to introduce in time an appropriate amendment for that purpose to the bills now pending before your committee which deal with extension of the act.

Under the circumstances, your committee has satisfied itself that there is no direct relationship between section 104 and the current decline in price of some fats and oils. Its reasons for favoring S. 2104 as set forth in Senate Report No. 70, Eighty-second Congress, first session, filed on September 20, 1951, still remain valid and persuasive. Therefore your committee is of the opinion that it ought to return S. 2104 to the Senate and urge its favorable consideration. This it now does and recommends immediate approval of the bill.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR STUDY AND INVESTIGATION OF EXPORT POLICIES AND CONTROL REGULATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 259, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The resolution involves no expense. It merely allows additional time for submitting the report.

There being no objection, the resolution, submitted by Mr. O'CONOR on January 21, 1952, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and subsequently to the Committee on Rules and Administration, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 365, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to December 21, 1950, and as extended by Senate Resolution 56, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to February 1, 1951 (providing for a study and investigation of export policies and control regulations), is hereby continued through March 31, 1952.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 278, to provide additional funds for the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This is the customary $10,000 allowed the committee for stenographic services in connection with hearings. I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is this an additional $10,000 in connection with the committee's regular work?

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee has exhausted its fund for the stenographic reporting of hearings before the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the resolution unanimously reported?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution, submitted by Mr. O'MAHONEY on February 14, 1952, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress for the purposes specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, $10,000 in addition to the amount authorized in such section.

PRINTING OF FIFTY-FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 105)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report an original resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. It deals with the printing as a Senate document of the fifty-fourth annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, which was chartered by Congress. It has been customary to print their annual report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 286) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the fifty-fourth annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ending April 1, 1951, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE REPORT 101, SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably an original resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of Senate Report No. 101, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 287) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be authorized to have printed for its use 1,000 copies of Senate Report No. 101, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, a report of the Special Committee To Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944.

Mr. HAYDEN. This is a report from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] at the time he was chairman. It contains a very fine compilation of election laws.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does this report go into contested elections in any way?

Mr. HAYDEN. This is a formal report of the committee, made at the time the Senator from Rhode Island was chairman. The report reviews the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, it has nothing to do with the 1950 elections.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

DESIGNATION OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AS THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment, Senate Resolution 280. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution, submitted by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. HOEY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. DWORSHAK, and Mr. NIXON) on February 19, 1952, was read as follows:

Resolved, That paragraphs (1) (g) and (4) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate are each amended by striking out "Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments" and inserting in lieu thereof "Committee on Government Operations."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this resolution was submitted unanimously on behalf of the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and unanimously reported by that committee. I am advised by the chairman of the committee that the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has

likewise requested that its name be changed to the Committee on Government Operations, a shorter and better title.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter addressed to me by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments [Mr. McCLELLAN] dated February 19, 1952.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES
IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
February 19, 1952.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: Attached hereto is a copy of Senate Resolution 280 which has for its purpose the changing of the name of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to the Committee on Government Operations. As will be noted, all members of this committee have joined in cosponsoring this resolution, the change being approved unanimously by the committee in executive session held on February 5, 1952.

As you may recall, this committee reported a bill in the Eightieth Congress, S. 2575, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, on May 3, 1948, proposing this change in the name of the committee. The bill was then referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration for further consideration but, due to other provisions contained in the bill to which members of your committee were opposed, no action was taken to report the bill or the provision which would have changed the name of the committee at that time, although I understand there was no opposition to that particular section of the bill.

This committee is proposing the indicated change in the present title, in view of the fact that it is misleading and the committee's functions and duties are generally misunderstood by the public. Some members of the committee indicated that they had refrained from using the committee letterhead because of this fact and that they had received a number of communications which indicated confusion in the minds of the public regarding the exact functions and purposes of the committee.

In suggesting the proposed change the committee based its decision on what it considers to be the major or primary function of the committee under the prescribed duties assigned to it to study "the operations of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency." It was the unanimous view of the members of the committee that the proposed new title would be more accurate in defining the purposes for which the committee was created and in clearly establishing the major purpose it serves.

At the direction of the committee the chairman has communicated with members of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments requesting a determination from that committee as to whether or not this proposed change would meet with its approval on the basis that it was not considered desirable to make such a change if the corresponding committee in the House, with identical duties and functions, desired to retain its present title. While the House committee has not as yet taken action a number of the members of that committee have already indicated approval of the proposal to introduce a companion House resolution which would bring about uniformity of committee structure in that body, should the Senate approve Senate Resolution 280.

It would be appreciated if you would bring this matter before your committee at its next meeting with a view to obtaining its approval and having the resolution reported to the Senate for action. Such final action by the Senate could be postponed until it was definitely determined that the House of Representatives would take similar action.

Thanking you for your cooperation in this matter, and with kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2765. A bill to permit certain persons to make application for courses of education or training under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 2766. A bill to increase the compensation of certain noncraft employees in the Government Printing Office and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for Mr. CHAVEZ):

S. 2767. A bill for the relief of Maria Messinesi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. 2768. A bill for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard; and

S. 2769. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary M. Mendenhall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Matheos Alafouzos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR (by request):

S. 2771. A bill to designate the Bureau of Mines of the Department of the Interior as the official agency for regulation of fireworks in interstate commerce and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 2772. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2773. A bill to provide that the clinical research center being constructed for the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., shall be named in honor of the late Frank B. Keefe; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 2774. A bill to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCHOEPPEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2775. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation by air of servicemen who have been ordered to duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2776. A bill to clarify certain provisions of law pertaining to the retirement of warrant officers of the Regular Army and Regular Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2777. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kamado Takara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the existing state of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

NAMING OF CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTER, BETHESDA, MD., IN HONOR OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE FRANK B. KEEFE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a companion bill to House bill 6530, the purpose of which is to name the new clinical research center being constructed for the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., in honor of one of Wisconsin's most distinguished sons, the late Frank B. Keefe, Representative of the Sixth District.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point, to be followed thereafter by a statement which I have prepared on the subject, together with an article from the Milwaukee Journal of January 24, 1952, entitled "UW Cancer Research Is Praised at Dedication," and a letter addressed to Representative REID F. MURRAY, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., by R. E. Dyer, M. D., director of research, Winship Clinic, Emory University, Georgia, former director, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, statement, article, and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2773) to provide that the clinical research center being constructed for the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., shall be named in honor of the late Frank B. Keefe, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the clinical research center being constructed for the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., shall be named in honor of the late Frank B. Keefe, in recognition of the great contributions which he made to medical research and to the health and welfare of the American people during his distinguished service as a Member of the House of Representatives.

The statement by Senator WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY—PIONEERING IN MENTAL AND PHYSICAL HEALTH

Mr. President, I have in my hands a clipping from the January 14, 1952, issue of the Milwaukee Journal.

It tells of the dedication of a new million dollar cancer wing of the hospital of the University of Wisconsin.

It was principally as a result of hard and patient work put in by the late Congressman of Wisconsin's Sixth District, the Honorable Frank B. Keefe, that this, like so many other health strides, was made. But a short few months have passed since that dedication, and unfortunately Frank Keefe himself has gone on ahead in the great journey which we all must take.

MURRAY BILL TO HONOR KEEFE

By way of a living memorial to Frank, my good friend, Congressman REID MURRAY, of the Wisconsin Seventh District, introduced early last month a bill, H. R. 6530, to name the new Clinical Research Center at Bethesda, Md., in his honor. It is indeed an appropriate gesture, and I trust that prompt and favorable action will be taken upon it.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN ENDORSED BILL

Not long ago, while our colleague, REID MURRAY, was himself unfortunately ill at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, President Harry S. Truman visited him and stated very emphatically, in response to an inquiry from REID, that he, the President, thought the idea of H. R. 6530 was a sound one indeed, in view of Frank Keefe's universally respected efforts for health research.

WISCONSIN NOTED FOR RESEARCH

We of Wisconsin have always prided ourselves in the pioneering advances made by Badger medics. The scientists at the University of Wisconsin and of other great research centers have contributed more than their proportionate share to discoveries designed to banish forever various scourges from humankind.

Obviously, it takes a great many hands, a great many hearts to succeed in this fight against disease. It takes money, it takes labor, it takes talent, it takes sincere devotion to an ideal.

SPIRITUAL FORCES PROMOTING MENTAL HEALTH

In countless laboratories throughout the Nation today, a great many unsung heroes are patiently working to prolong the life span of man, to enable men to realize their birthright as sound, healthy children of God. In particular, a great many sources are contributing to men's mental health, enabling them to banish the fears, the anxieties, the neuroses which have unfortunately become so prevalent in these troubled times.

There is fortunately, increased recognition of the role which spiritual forces are playing in this respect. And one of the most thrilling trends has been the developing unity between the physicians of the body and what might be called the "physicians of the soul." Why? Because a great many medical practitioners have seen that medical science must recognize the role of spiritual forces which shape men's destiny and health in ways that, for example, the Soviet Kremlinites could hardly comprehend. Man is indeed a spiritual being.

At the same time, the fight must go on to improve his physical health—a fight that can be helped by Government, but which must be conducted principally by private sources.

DAMON RUNYON FUND—AN INVALUABLE AID

For example, one of the very fine private sources which has done invaluable work is the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund—an organization which set the unique precedent of never deducting a dime for administrative expenses. Through the eager cooperation of leaders in the entertainment world, the world of journalism, of athletic competition, it has collected funds on a scale which might not have been dreamed of, but a few short years ago. The assignment of those funds to various great research centers like the University of Wisconsin will, in my judgment, pay human dividends in ways that we of this generation can only dimly perceive.

Already, great discoveries have been made thanks to this fund, and greater ones are still in the offing. Any American who contributes funds to the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund can feel a well-deserved sense of pride and satisfaction. Why? Because he is basically contributing to himself and to his loved ones as well as to others—to their health and well-being. So, too, a leading individual like Mr. Walter Winchell, (to whose efforts for its very creation and continuance, the Damon Runyon Cancer Fund is everlastingly indebted), such an individual can feel a well-deserved sense of pride and satisfaction in a job well done for humanity.

And so, it is really in the name of all the known and the unknown heroes of health research and progress, the famed and the obscure, all those who labor in the Lord's vineyard—working for their fellow man, that I submit these comments today.

FRANK KEEFE'S VISION

Our friend, Frank Keefe, was a man who knew the value of a dollar, particularly a dollar in the United States Treasury, held in trusteeship for one hundred fifty millions of people. He was a man of conservative, and yes, forward-looking faith, a man who knew the need for Federal economy, yet a man of stalwart connections who recognized that a dollar spent for health research multiplies itself a thousandfold.

Like Frank, we in this Nation recognize that we have many magnificent resources, our soil, our waters, but the greatest of all of our resources, of course, is the human resource—basically, the resource of the spirit.

There follows now the write-up from the Milwaukee Journal, and then the text of a commendatory letter received by Congressman REID MURRAY, sponsor of H. R. 6530, from the former Director of the National Institutes of Health, Dr. R. E. Dyer.

The newspaper article is as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 25, 1952]

UW CANCER RESEARCH IS PRAISED AT DEDICATION—MILLION-DOLLAR HOSPITAL WING WILL OPEN WAY TO NEW ADVANCES IN CLINICAL RESEARCH

MADISON, WIS.—Contributions made by the University of Wisconsin to the treatment of cancer were praised Wednesday at the dedication of the new million-dollar cancer wing of the university hospital.

Dr. Leonard T. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, said that "cancer is not the unsolvable mystery that investigators of 50 years ago seemed to think."

A $975,000 grant from the Public Health Service made possible the four-story-cancer-research wing, special laboratories and a million volt X-ray unit.

The new wing adjoins the McArdle memorial laboratory for cancer research, 1 of the 10 full-time cancer research centers in the Nation. The added space will enable the university to start a program of clinical research. Cancer patients will be treated with new methods developed in the laboratory.

Dr. Scheele said that the Government's program in cancer research had set the pattern for Federal contributions to research in other fields, all made under a system that "guarantees universities and scientists freedom of research."

KEEFE IS PRAISED

He called the research leadership at Wisconsin of "high order" and predicted that "citizens of Wisconsin can expect great rewards from this new cancer hospital."

Dr. Scheele also paid tribute to Frank B. Keefe, Oshkosh, former Sixth District Representative in Congress, who was instrumental in providing for Federal aid to research and obtaining the cancer-hospital grant. Of Keefe, the Federal chief said, "I don't believe the program would have gotten off the ground without him."

Keefe, who was present, told of the battles with the Bureau of the Budget and other Congressmen to get Federal research-aid programs approved.

"I had a vision," he declared, "of a medical center here at Wisconsin that would be one of the great medical centers of the United States and part of the greatest research team in the world.

"It is one of the greatest pleasures of my life to see the realization of a dream here today."

NOT YET IN SIGHT

A cancer cure "is not yet in sight," said Dean William S. Middleton of the university's medical school. "But only by consolidation of advances to this time may we anticipate that result."

In giving the money for the new research wing "the United States Public Health Service has given wings to the spirit," he said.

Other speakers who helped dedicate the building were Governor Kohler, President E. B. Fred, and F. J. Sensenbrenner, president of the board of regents.

"This cancer addition has been given to you in trust," the Governor said. "I am confident that you will carry out and maintain that trust with honor."

President Fred split the cancer battle into two sections when he said, "Our defense against cancer is treatment of its victims * * * our attack on cancer is based upon the accumulation of knowledge."

BUILDINGS COST $4,000,000

After the program, about 250 invited guests toured the cancer research wing and other new additions to the hospital. The new buildings will give the hospital a total of 600 beds, a net increase of 225. Remodeling and expansion of the 28-year-old hospital is costing $4,000,000.

The program increases the capacity of all university hospitals to 900 beds, including 50 in Bradley Memorial Hospital, 125 in Wisconsin Orthopedic Hospital for Children, and 125 in the student infirmary.

On the main floor of the cancer wing are centered the cancer out-patient clinic, a suite of rooms for chemosurgery, three rooms for patient examination, a surgery room and a laboratoy.

The second floor has seven clinical research laboratories and a diet kitchen. The third floor is devoted to cancer surgery, and the fourth to cancer medical patients.

Dr. H. M. Coon, superintendent of university hospitals, has set next summer as the goal for completion of the hospital expansion.

The letter is as follows:

EMORY UNIVERSITY,
Emory University, Ga.
February 19, 1952.

The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MURRAY: I have learned that you have introduced a bill in Congress (H. R. 6530) directing that the new Clinical Research Center Building of the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., be named in memory of former Congressman Frank B. Keefe. I was very much distressed to learn of Mr. Keefe's recent death, and I can think of no more suitable acknowledgment of his career than that proposed by H. R. 6530. I think that you are to be congratulated on your wisdom and your thoughtfulness.

During the many years while Mr. Keefe was in Congress, he showed an extraordinary interest in the problems of human health

and the development of research which might help solve these problems. His wholehearted efforts went far in arousing interest and support in the Congress without regard to political affiliations. It is to Frank Keefe that the leading part of the credit, with the support of his colleagues, for the construction of the new Clinical Research Center in Bethesda is due. I sincerely hope your bill will receive unanimous approval.

Very sincerely,

R. E. DYER, M. D.,
Director of Research, Winship Clinic, Emory University, Ga., Former Director, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

SALE OR LEASE OF CERTAIN LANDS BY STATE OF KANSAS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans. I have in my hand several pages of an explanatory statement by me of what the bill proposes to do, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2774) to authorize the sale or lease by the State of Kansas of certain lands situated near Garden City, Kans., introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The explanatory statement by Mr. SCHOEPPEL is as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR SCHOEPPEL TO ACCOMPANY LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO AUTHORIZE THE SALE OR LEASE BY THE STATE OF KANSAS OF CERTAIN LANDS SITUATED NEAR GARDEN CITY, KANS.

The Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission has possession and control of 3,021.20 acres of land located in Finney County, Kans., and lying just south of Garden City, Kans. This 3,021.20 acres of land was granted to the State of Kansas by act of Congress approved June 22, 1916 (39 Stat. 233), and title to the area was conveyed to the State of Kansas by patent dated October 5, 1916. The Kansas Legislature by chapter 202 of the Laws of 1917 accepted the grant of 3,021.20 acres in behalf of the State of Kansas, and placed the area under control of the State fish and game department. This department now being the forestry, fish and game commission.

By act of Congress of March 10, 1928 (45 Stat. 300), the State of Kansas was authorized to sell all or any part of the lands granted to the State under the June 1916 act and the reverter provision of the 1916 act was cut off and terminated by the 1928 act, giving the State the right to sell all or any part of the lands, however, the 1928 act provided, "That the proceeds of said sale shall be used to purchase lands in sections twenty-three and twenty-four in township twenty-four, range thirty-three and in sections nineteen and thirty in township twenty-four, range thirty-two all in Finney County, Kans., to be used as a State game preserve." It is this provision that we hope to amend.

The legislature of the State of Kansas, in 1929, accepted the authority relative to the sale of the area and authorized the State forestry, fish and game commission to sell said lands and invest the proceeds therefrom in accordance with the Federal act.

Because the Kansas Forestry, Fish and Game Commission determined they had the legal right, they leased the said 3,021.20 acres of land for gas development, and to a depth of 3,200 feet only, to the Skelly Oil Co. of Tulsa, Okla., on November 14, 1951, for a cash bonus of $244,717.20, plus a one-eighth royalty of the gas produced and marketed.

The Department of the Interior, by letter of August 14, 1951, acknowledged the right of the State commission to lease the property. However, they concluded that: "Of course, all the proceeds from such transactions must be used to purchase land within the area specified in the 1928 act, for addition to the game preserve."

It is, however, impossible, and the Department of the Interior recognizes this, for the Kansas Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission to spend "all the proceeds" in purchasing the land as specified in the 1928 act. In fact, the Kansas commission has already purchased with its own funds, several years ago, most of the acreage to be purchased under the 1928 act. The funds required to reimburse the State for the lands already purchased, and those to purchase the balance of the lands as provided in the 1928 act, would at the most only be a small part of the lease bonus of $244,717.20.

Because the Department of the Interior recognizes the fact that it is impossible to use all of the $244,717.20 for the purchase of acreage set out in the 1928 act, they suggested, by letter of November 13, 1951, that the State of Kansas might wish to correct this situation by the enactment of amendatory legislation in the Congress of the United States. They further stated that if such a proposal should be made there would appear to be no basis for any objection by Interior.

It is my desire that the Forestry, Fish, and Game Commission of Kansas be given permission to use the proceeds, derived from the leasing and developing of the said 3,021.20 acres for oil and gas, for the acquisition, development, and maintenance of game refuges and preserves in the State and in the general operation and conduct of its department in propagating, conserving, and protecting game animals, wild animals, game birds, and wild birds in the State of Kansas, and that this permission be clearly provided for by Federal law. This is the purpose of my amendment.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION, AND HOUSING AND RENT ACTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. THYE) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, Mr. BENTON, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FULBRIGHT, and Mr. CASE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 396) making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Watson B. Miller, of Maryland, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 3 years;

Percy C. Fountain, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama; and

Leland S. Finney, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Robert T. Bartley, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, vice Wayne Coy, resigned.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Address delivered by Senator MCFARLAND at a Jefferson-Jackson Day meeting, at Miami, Fla., December 8, 1951.

An editorial entitled "Do Americans Want Strength?—Here's Best Way for America," written by Thomas W. Hagan, editor of the Miami (Fla.) Daily News.

By Mr. BYRD:

Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by Senator SMITH of North Carolina at Richmond, Va., on February 23, 1952.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Address entitled "The Fight for Men's Minds," delivered by Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., at Boston University, Boston, Mass., on December 6, 1951.

By Mr. IVES:

Articles published in the supplement to the New York Times of February 24, 1952, discussing the advantages offered by the State of New York.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Two letters on the subject of intolerance in connection with cancer research, (1) a letter addressed to Mr. Paul Harvey, co-op programs, New York City, and (2) a letter addressed to J. T. Boone, vice admiral (M. C.), United States Navy, retired, Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration, both letters dated March 1, 1952, and both written by Robert E. Lincoln, M. D., of Medford, Mass.

By Mr. MARTIN:

An article from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of Thursday, Februray 28, 1952, entitled "A Vote of Thanks to Senator WATKINS."

Editorial entitled "An Unneeded Luxury," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 28, 1952, and an editorial entitled "Almost Pure Poppycock," published in the Washington (Pa.) Reporter of February 28, 1952; dealing with the proposed St. Lawrence Seaway.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Article from Baltimore Sun of March 1, 1952, dealing with television code of good practice.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Editorial entitled "Dishonest Is the Word," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 1, 1952.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article on the subject of tidelands written by Alfred Stedman in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, as reprinted in the Park Region (Alexandria, Minn.) Echo of December 6, 1951.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PHILIP NEVILLE, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 11, 1952, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Philip Neville, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota, vice Clarence U. Landrum, retiring. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

TWO HUNDRED AND FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statment which I prepared to commemorate the two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On this two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of a great hero of our American Revolution, Gen. Casimir Pulaski, it is fitting that we recall the contributions and sacrifice which he made that this Nation might be born in freedom. Today, when the nation which was his birthplace is suffering at the hands of a totalitarian dictatorship unequalled in human history, all Americans should remember our debt to this great man and to the brave Polish people.

General Pulaski first struck a blow for freedom when he led the heroic Polish patriots in their vain efforts to maintain their freedom as a nation against Russia and Prussia, just a few years before the outbreak of our own struggle for independence. As a consequence of this futile fight, he was forced to flee to France where he became acquainted with that most eminent representative of America of that day, Benjamin Franklin. Inspired by the tale of the Americans' attempt to establish self-government for themselves, General Pulaski in 1777 offered his services to General Washington.

Not only his talents as a great military leader, but also his substantial personal possessions were given over to the cause of liberty. Along with other great men who came to our shores to join our battle—along with Thaddeus Kosciusko, the Marquis de Lafayette, Baron von Steuben—he fought not as an American but as a believer in the great principle for which our Revolution was being fought.

One hundred and seventy-five years after General Pulaski helped us in our common cause, his own Poland suffers from an oppression far more tyrannical than that which he sought to defeat in our own land. All Americans, at this sad moment in the history of the Polish nation, hold out to the citizens of that nation their deep hope that the day is not far off when they will once again be free men. Tyrannies come and go but the faith of men in freedom has lasted throughout the ages. It is this faith in freedom, still burning strongly in the hearts of the brave Polish people, which will prove the greatest threat to their present masters and the best hope for their salvation as an independent nation.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks a statement relating to the two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PULÁSKI DAY STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Heroic deeds of outstanding patriots have added brilliant luster to the history of the great country. Tomorrow, March 4, marks the two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of one who is particularly deserving of acclaim in this respect because his gallant contribution was made to a cause and a country that were his own only because of his unquenchable thirst for freedom for all men.

Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski came from his native Poland as a volunteer to help the American colonies in their struggle for independence. His was the true hero's heart, a heart enflamed by love of liberty and willing to suffer hardships and death to achieve for others the freedom he so highly esteemed.

General Pulaski is revered in an especial way in Maryland, where he was authorized by legislation to recruit his famous Pulaski's Legion, but his unsurpassed services to this country span a territory extending from New York to Georgia, where finally at the siege of Savannah he received a mortal wound.

It is only fitting that tomorrow, on the anniversary of his birth, the people of America should mark with affection and esteem the deeds of him whose mother country now so tragically lacks the freedoms which it once cherished so highly and sought so nobly. In honoring this gallant Polish soldier, let us pay tribute likewise to the many residents of our country of Polish birth or descent who have made such a vast contribution to America's progress, as well as to the residents of their uphappy mother country, now suffering beneath Communist domination.

As Pulaski strove so resultfully to bring freedom to our struggling land may we be inspired anew to work for the restoration of freedom to his beloved land and to all the once free countries now reduced to Soviet slavery.

STATEHOOD FOR ALASKA—NOTICE OF MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Is my understanding correct that today is the last day on which a motion may be made to reconsider the vote taken last Wednesday on the motion to recommit the so-called Alaska statehood bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct in his understanding.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should also like to inquire whether I am eligible to make such a motion because of my absence last Wednesday due to illness, in spite of the fact that I was paired against the motion for recommittal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Only a Senator who voted on the prevailing side or one who did not vote may make that motion. Since the Senator from New Jersey was absent, he is therefore eligible to make the motion.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for a period not to exceed 2 minutes before presenting my motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, last summer, in connection with my trip to the Far East, I stopped in Hawaii, as I had done 2 years ago, and from my contacts with citizens there, I came to the conclusion that the long delay in admitting Hawaii into the Union as a State was most unfortunate. Hawaii today has a population in excess of 500,000 and is certainly more advanced in its political and economic life than were many of our States when they were admitted to the Union. I feel, therefore, from my observation of the Hawaiian situation, and the urging of the citizens in Hawaii with whom I talked, especially those connected with University of Hawaii, who have given earnest study to this matter, that I should make every effort to have Hawaii admitted as a State. While I was there, I said that I would do all I could to bring about that result. I understand that this raises the issue of noncontiguous Territory, but it seems to me this issue should not be controlling.

Mr. President, whether we desire to have it so or not, the Hawaiian situation is closely linked to that of Alaska. While I have never been in Alaska, from advices I have received from those who have been there and who have studied the situation, I feel, as in the case of Hawaii, that the citizens there are entitled to statehood. I am opposed to any continuing situation whereby United States citizens who desire statehood should be deprived of that status, if there are reasonable prospects that they can build a State comparable in importance and economic stability with the States which at present constitute the Union. I realize Alaska has a long way to go, but I am convinced it can never make suitable progress without statehood.

It is my purpose to make a motion to reconsider the vote taken last Wednesday on the motion to recommit the Alaska statehood bill, so that it may be on the table and before the Senate after we have taken the vote on the bill granting statehood to Hawaii. I intend to vote for statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should prefer to finish my statement; then I shall be glad to yield.

I feel confident that should statehood for Hawaii be voted upon favorably, Senators would wish to reconsider the vote on the bill to admit Alaska. As today is the last day for the making of a motion to reconsider the vote, I am making such motion at the present time, to the end that it may be before the Senate.

As I have said before, I hope the Hawaiian situation will be dealt with very soon.

I may also call attention to the fact that I feel a deep obligation in respect to this matter because my party at its last national convention advocated the admission of both Hawaii and Alaska as States, as did also the Democratic Party. I believe we must seriously consider that pledge as a moral obligation upon us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from New Jersey entering his motion at the present time?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I enter my motion at the present time. The motion is to reconsider the vote taken last Wednesday, February 27, to recommit to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with certain instructions, the bill, S. 50, the so-called Alaska statehood bill. I am entering the motion at the present time, to be dealt with, I hope, after we have considered the Hawaiian issue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state for the benefit of the Senator from New Jersey and other Senators that that cannot be done. The two matters cannot be tied together. The vote will have to come on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the Alaskan statehood bill was recommitted to the committee. That subject stands on its own bottom. It cannot be tied in with the other.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am simply entering the motion. I am not calling it up at this time. I am entering it at this time so that it may be entered prior to the expiration of the time limit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is entered, and will be called up at a later date.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Vice President said, "The motion is entered, and will be called up at a later date."

The VICE PRESIDENT. It may be called up at a later date. Any Senator may call it up at an appropriate time. However, it cannot be voted upon while the pending motion to proceed with the consideration of another bill is the unfinished business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understood that. The purpose of the parliamentary inquiry was to ascertain what was meant by the use of the word "will."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no power to call it up. It may be called up by any Senator.

BLOCKADE OF HOOVER COMMITTEE REFORMS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, yesterday the Philadelphia Inquirer issued a real challenge to the Senate of the United States and to the Congress as a whole in an editorial entitled "End the Blockade of Hoover Reforms." The able editor and publisher of the Inquirer, Mr. Annenberg, leaves no doubt as to what our responsibilities are in respect to the pending reorganization bills. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in question be inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END THE BLOCKADE OF HOOVER REFORMS

There is a war going on in Washington—and the taxpayer is in danger of losing it.

It is a silent, sniping, undercover war, waged by politicians and pressure groups to block measures which could put economy and efficiency into the vast, sprawling, costly Federal Government.

The chief weapons in this war are delay and inaction, and they have been employed by President Truman as well as by Members of Congress.

On the part of citizens and public officials whose first concern is the public good, there is one object in this war. It is to complete the job of reorganizing the Federal Government by putting through the rest of the reforms recommended by the Hoover Commission, a bipartisan group which surveyed the executive branch a few years ago and found it badly in need of overhauling.

Part of the reform program has been placed into effect. The Eighty-first Congress adopted 21 bills and 26 reorganization plans submitted by President Truman. The taxpayer won that battle to the tune of an estimated $2,000,000,000 savings a year.

But since then the reorganization program has bogged down. Last year Mr. Truman, after the scandalous disclosure in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, set up a plan to reorganize that agency. It was adopted. This year, after even more scandalous disclosures about the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the President has asked for reorganization of the tax collection system. That plan awaits approval—or disapproval.

The story on the rest of the Hoover reorganization program is one of delay and defeat. President Truman has not sent up any more reorganization plans, although the big-spending agencies, the ones that cost the taxpayers billions, still cry for reform. Congress could take matters into its own hands by passing reorganization bills, but the bills are locked up in committees.

What this has to do with the taxpayer is painfully clear. Big, wasteful, inefficient Government causes tax rates to rise. As the costs of necessary Government functions go up, the cost of Government inefficiency rises with it.

The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, of which Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, is chairman, has set six major targets in this war in behalf of the taxpayer. They call for adoption of the recommendations on better personnel management, a united medical administration, the Department of Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration, the postal service, and organization of natural resources.

Regardless of money, these reforms are vital, simply to enable the Government to function as it should. But there is a saving in dollars that is of great importance to every taxpayer now getting ready to pay the balance of the huge bite the Government has taken out of his 1951 earnings. Total savings if the Hoover reform program is adopted are estimated at upwards of $5,000,000,000—every year.

Taxpayers who want to help cut down the waste and inefficiency which is taking their money can do something about it by getting behind the rest of the reorganization program. They can let their Representatives in Congress know that they want the reorganization blockade broken without further delays or excuses.

Senators EDWARD MARTIN and JAMES H. DUFF, of Pennsylvania, H. ALEXANDER SMITH and ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey, JOHN J. WILLIAMS and J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., of Delaware, all can be reached at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C. They should be told, by the taxpayers themselves, how the taxpayers stand on the Hoover reforms.

This disgraceful blockade against Government reorganization is costing the taxpayers billions of dollars. It is denying the citizens the economical, efficient Government they are entitled to. It must be ended—at this session of Congress—with a resounding victory for the taxpayers.

OUR DWINDLING SOVEREIGNTY—ADDRESS BY HON. J. REUBEN CLARK, JR.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on February 13, 1952, Hon. J. Reuben Clark, Jr., now a member of the First Presidency of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, with headquarters in Salt Lake City, delivered the Fourth Annual Pi Sigma Alpha lecture at the University of Utah. Officials of the University of Utah Institute of Government sponsored the lecture.

Many of the senior Members of the Senate will remember Mr. Clark as an Undersecretary of State when Philander Knox was the Secretary. Mr. Clark had a distinguished career as a public official. He served as solicitor of the State Department, Undersecretary of State, and Ambassador to Mexico.

As Solicitor he prepared a memorandum on the war making powers of the President which has become a standing reference text in the Department and in congressional circles.

At the time he became Ambassador to Mexico our relations with that country were not of the best. Mr. Clark was able to bring about a very friendly solution to the outstanding problems between the two Nations and to make Mexico a firm friend of the United States.

Utahans of all shades of political opinions and religious belief have great respect for Mr. Clark.

In this lecture, delivered at the University of Utah, Mr. Clark makes a very cogent and eloquent statement of his personal political philosophy and his views in regard to foreign policy.

One may or may not agree with Mr. Clark's thesis, but I am sure that all those reading his remarks will agree that they are an eloquent, sincere and honest expression of the views of a veteran statesman. Mr. Clark is a man of great learning and vast experience. Even those who may not agree with his conclusions will nevertheless admit his

forthrightness and they will concede his sincerity of purpose.

Mr. President, Mr. Clark's point of view should be available to all the Congress and others in public life. In my opinion it is an important contribution to the current discussion on our foreign policy and the future of America.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it is always a matter of grateful embarrassment to hear one's self introduced, and too often one is under the necessity of using the question that was used by one man who had a fine introduction, who, as the time came for him to get up, turned to the one who sat next to him, and said, "Who are they talking about?"

This talk tonight will not, I am sure, be what I wanted it to be. I hope that you who are listening will go away with a better opinion of it when I get through, than I will have.

I started out to try to write out something and found it growing into such vast proportions that I had to give that up, and so tonight I shall speak part of the time from notes, and part of the time I shall read.

For what I shall say tonight I am alone and solely responsible.

It has seemed to me wise to tell, at the beginning, the level upon which this talk will proceed. I quite appreciate that what my views may be is of no particular importance to anyone but myself, but I do not wish to sail under false colors.

I am a confirmed isolationist, a political isolationist, first, I am sure, by political instinct, next, from experience, observation, and patriotism, and lastly, because, while isolated, we built the most powerful Nation in the world, a Nation that provided most of prosperity to all its citizens, with the full measure of resulting comfort, most of popular education, most of freedom, most of peace, most of blessing by example to other nations, even from the very beginning of our national existence, of any nation, past or present, on the face of this earth. I stand for the possession of, and exercise by, our Nation of a full, complete, and unimpaired sovereignty that will be consistent with our membership in the society of nations.

In so declaring I have no diffidence, no apology, no shame. On the contrary, I have a great pride in the fact that I stand where the revolutionary fathers stood, who fought for, and gained, our independence—Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Madison, Monroe—who, with their associates, set up our Government under the Constitution; I stand with Lincoln and Seward, who stood for the principle during the Civil War; with Cleveland and Olney, who voiced the principle during some international troubles in Venezuela, and with Theodore Roosevelt, in the beginning of this century.

It was during this first century and a quarter of our history, that America, our great America, was built—politically, industrially, economically—the America which has made possible the riot—domestic and foreign—which is now raging; the America which would never have been built under the policies—domestic and foreign—which now dominate us.

I am pro-Constitution, pro-Government, as it was established under the Constitution, profree institutions, as they have been developed under and through the Constitution, proliberty, profreedom, profull and complete independence and sovereignty, prolocal, self-government, and pro-everything else that has made us the free country we had grown to be in the first 130 years of our national existence.

It necessarily follows that I am anti-internationalist, anti-interventionist, and antimeddlesome-busybodiness in our international affairs. In the domestic field I am anti-Socialist, anti-Communist, anti-welfare state. I am what the kindlier ones of all these latter people with whom I am denying any association or sympathy, would call a rabid reactionary (I am not, in fact, that). Some of the unkindly ones will shrug their shoulders and say, "He is just a doddering old fogy." I admit the age, but deny the rest of the allegation—the doddering and fogyness. Some will join issue with me on this personal estimate and conclusion; but so be it.

As I proceed, some will say, "Oh, he is talking about the past; but this is a new world, new conditions, new problems," and so on: To this I will content myself with answering—human nature does not change; in its basic elements it now is as it was at the dawn of history, as our present tragic plight shows. Even savages inflict no greater inhumanities than are going on in the world today.

In the mad thrusting of ourselves, with a batch of curative political nostrums, into the turmoil and tragedy of today's world, we are like a physician called in to treat a virulent case of smallpox, and whose treatments consists in getting into bed with his patient. That is not the way to cure smallpox.

By way of qualifying for my task tonight, I think perhaps I may justly lay claim to some experience in the stark realities of international dealings, a kind of experience that is most effective in tearing off the wool which theorists pull over the eyes of the unknowing. Besides that experience to which I refer, I have had some opportunity to read and reflect. What follows will be aimed to be an explanation of why I am an isolationist.

THREE PERIODS IN OUR HISTORY

For our purpose tonight, I am going to divide the history of this country into three periods or epochs: the first, the period from the beginning up until 1800; the second, from 1800 until World War I; and the third, the period from World War I until now.

Our early concepts, philosophies, principles, were not just pulled out of the air by our founding fathers; they were the result of more than a century of experience. As you know, we began our lives as colonies of Great Britain. We had colonies of France on the north of us and a bit to the west. The result of that neighborhood interest was rather curious, though not to be unexpected.

INTERCOLONIAL WARS

Along in 1689 and from then until 1697, there was fought over here on this side, what was known as King William's War. In Europe it was known as the War of the Palatinate. It appears to have been a struggle between William and Louis XIV, each of them rather ambitious, each very determined. Who succeeded in that conflict was of no consequence whatever to us, it did not make any difference to us, but we went to war because England and France were at war over in Europe. When the war was over, we had shed blood, our own blood, and had spent our own money. The war ended with a treaty that left the conditions over in America just as they were when we began.

The next war that came along was in 1702, and lasted until 1713. That was known here as Queen Anne's War. It arose over the question as to the Spanish succession—who should be the ruler of Spain, should it be a member of the royal house of France or of the royal house of Austria. Because they were at war in Europe we went to war over here. It did not make any difference to us over here who was King of Spain. We fought merely because they were fighting. That war ended. England got some American territory out of it, but we got nothing. As I recall it, the English sent some troops over here to help us. When they arrived the troops had no food, and so three private American citizens, Schuyler, Livingston, and Cortlandt, fed the British troops. When that war was over we went back to the position in which we were before. While England secured more territory, the colonies got nothing.

The third war that came along was King George's War. That had to do with the question of the Austrian succession, the "Pragmatic Sanction" which made Maria Theresa Empress of Austria. That succession did not make any difference to us, either. We did not care anything about it. But they were at war over in Europe over their own dynastic differences. So, as they were fighting, we went to fighting. That war ended with us having gained, perhaps our greatest military victory during all these wars, when we took the fortress at Louisburg. But that was surrendered at the end of the war. But so far as the colonists were concerned, it ended for us where it began. We got nothing, though we suffered great loss of life and much money.

Then we had the French and Indian War, known in Europe as the Seven Year's War. That war arose in Europe because Maria Theresa wanted to regain Silesia. Some of the powers did not wish her to have it. But the mother countries were fighting, so we on this side again went at one another's throats. That war, however, ended with victory for England. France lost her American possessions at the end of this war. That war lasted from 1755 to 1763.

Each of these wars followed the pattern of Indian border warfare—surprise attacks in the dead of winter, in predaylight hours; then burning, plundering, indiscriminate slaughtering of men, women, and children; the taking of captives by the French raiders, and their swift return to bases, leaving along the trail tomahawked old people, sick children, infants, everyone unable to keep up on the march. There were Deerfield, Haverhill, the frontier villages of Maine, and various other places, in each and all of which there were mass massacres with shocking barbarity.

Thus in three-quarters of a century, we had fought four wars, merely because the mother countries were fighting. In none of them were we concerned as to their causes. They cost us a lot of lives and money. We fought only because we were entangled in European affairs.

When the Revolutionary War broke some 12 years later, these experiences were fresh in the minds of our founding fathers; they had to be. The French and Indian War saw the rather dramatic defeat of Braddock and it saw the taking of Quebec and the death of Wolfe up in Canada.

POST-REVOLUTIONARY PERIOD

It is not necessary that we discuss the Revolution at all. But during some hard days of the Revolution, it was in the winter that saw Washington at Valley Forge, following Burgoyne's defeat, we made two treaties between ourselves and France—one a treaty of amity and the other a treaty of alliance. The treaty of amity provided that in case of war each party had the right to take its prize into the ports of the other; they were not to be examined, they were to be free to

depart to their own port or otherwise. As there was peace in Europe, the treaties caused no trouble.

Then came the critical period, as we call it, in American history, from the close of the Revolution until the framing of the Constitution of the United States.

Washington, as you know, took his oath of office as first president of the United States on April 30, 1789. Within 2 months the Bastille fell and the French Revolution was on. Then trouble began to loom for us.

OUR NATIONAL INVENTORY

We might here profitably take stock of the position of the new Nation when Washington took over, which was set up to secure the blessings of its people. This will suggest how precarious was our national life.

1. The United States was a new nation, not a change of administration in an old one. By European standards, it was an illegitimate waif, because not possessed of a dynastic ancestry. It was founded upon principles that had never before been tried out as a governmental system. It began with an all-comprehensive, written plan that bound together great common law concepts and principles, in a relationship of operation theretofore unknown to the world. That it succeeded is one of the great political miracles of all time.

2. Territorially, we were a narrow strip, some 1,500 miles long, lying along the Atlantic seaboard, with an indefinite depth of perhaps not more than 300 miles at the wider parts—sea level plains ran back to the mountains. There was almost no intercommunication by land northward and southward. The roads were primitive, and, in winter and storm, largely impassable. Only three roads led over the Allegheny Mountains. Between 400,000 and 500,000 persons had crossed the Alleghenies.

3. The total population is given as a little under 4,000,000 (one-fifth black), with few large towns. In 1790, Philadelphia had 42,520; New York, 33,131; Boston, 13,503; Richmond, 3,761; Charleston, S. C., 16,359; Savannah, Ga., 5,166. These statistics show how militarily weak the Colonies were, and how difficult would be the mobilization of whatever armed force they had.

4. We had no Navy, our Army was virtually disbanded.

5. When Washington took the oath of office, there was no money in the Treasury and no tax legislation in operation to raise money.

6. The country owed large sums to foreign countries.

7. There were large quantities of Continental and Colonial paper money outstanding, much of which was next to worthless.

8. There were many people, who did not approve of the Constitution and the government set up under it.

9. There were jealousies, some of them serious, among the different States; problems of trade and commerce were numerous and trouble breeding.

10. The inland border perimeter of the States was the abiding place of hostile Indians. The Iroquois within their borders, though broken in strength, were pro-British and anticolonist.

11. There was no governmental machinery, there were no civil officers, no funds with which to pay them if they had them.

We were starting from scratch in government, in industry, in agriculture, in commerce, in national defense.

I would like here to recommend to all of you that you read the first two paragraphs and the last paragraph of the Declaration of Independence, for the purpose of getting a view as to why this Government was set up. It was not set up as an eleemosynary government to feed and clothe and nurture all the rest of the world. It was set up for the purpose of establishing a government which should bring peace and prosperity to the people of this Nation, and when you have read those paragraphs, read the preamble to the Constitution itself.

PRECONSTITUTION TREATIES

The French Revolution brought war in Europe. France, remembering that we had a treaty of alliance with her, began to take steps to realize upon it.

I might here say that up to the time that Washington became President, we had negotiated with foreign countries 14 treaties, 6 of them with France, 3 with Great Britain, 2 with the Netherlands, 1 with Prussia, 1 with Sweden, and 1 with Morocco. Incidentally, as I recall, Franklin signed 10 times, Adams 7, Jefferson 3, and Jay 2.

You will be interested, you students, in seeing how they described the negotiators. One of them particularly, I recall, which Adams was negotiating, recited, in order to make his personality compare with the royal negotiators on the other side, that he had been a judge of some court for a little while, here.

It is interesting to note in those treaties that they embodied some of the fundamental principles of our diplomacy and our national policy, as they were finally developed. They covered a wide range of subjects: Liberty of conscience, right of aliens to hold property and engage in business, stiuplations for the mitigation of the evils of war, fixed time for the withdrawal of aliens in case of war; the humane treatment of prisoners of war; right of visit and search; granting commissions for privateeering, limiting the scope of belligerent captures at sea, and other provisions, I repeat, which marked the fundamental principles upon which our country moved as we grew greater and stronger.

FRENCH REVOLUTION

The French Revolution continued, it grew worse. The French Revolutionery generals gained great victories, and then one day, Napoleon came. Thereafter, with some little interim while he grew a bit, he took over France.

As soon as the war broke it became necessary for Washington and his Cabinet to determine whether or not these two treaties which they had made with France, made us an ally of France so that we must join France in the war with the rest of Europe, or whether the treaty obligations were of a character that would permit us to be neutral. After a very careful consideration, Washington and his Cabinet decided that the treaties did not require us to join France in her war and that we would be neutrals.

Now, remember, we were going to be neutral in a war between the great powers of Europe, and with a treaty running against us, which the other party to the treaty, France, was going to consider binding up us and giving to them certain exceptional rights.

GENET

They sent to us a representative, Genet. All of you students of history remember about him. John Bassett Moore made a very clever observation about Genet. He says that Genet set out on his mission "gurgling with the fermentation of the new wine of the revolution." He landed at Charleston, some 2 weeks, I think it was, before we issued our declaration of neutrality. Reaching our shores, he began at once to fit out privateers, to commission them. He established courts, consular courts, to condemn prizes brought into our ports, he actually seized vessels within our own jurisdiction. He started from Charleston, S. C., to Philadelphia, and the whole journey was as if he were either a returning, victorious general, or some great royal personage. The sentiment of the people of the United States ran strongly in favor of France.

Miscalculating somewhat his popularity, Genet began openly to criticize Washington. He undertook to recruit a force of men, soldiers, here, to make war against our neighbors. He maligned Washington in a way that finally irritated Washington almost beyond endurance. But still we steered our course. Weak as we were, defenseless as we were, we went forward with our neutrality. The neutrality proclamation that was issued at that time has been characterized by Hall, a great international lawyer, a Britisher, as constituting an epoch in the development of the usages of neutrality and as representing the most advanced existing opinion as to what neutral obligations were. (And whenever you get any compliment for America from a British international lawyer, you have made an achievement.) With that neutrality proclamation as a basis of principle and policy, we went forward in our international relations for the next century and a quarter.

STRUGGLE TO PRESERVE NEUTRALITY

As we have noted, Napoleon took over France, and he and England began exchanging blows, not only on the field of battle, but also in the matter of issuing orders destructive of commerce. And speaking of commerce, I might observe to you that when we began our national existence, there was no port on the Western Hemisphere except our own, that was open to our commerce. We could not trade freely at all with Europe, we could not trade with the European colonies on this hemisphere. We were weak and friendless. The founding fathers had a hard battle to build up our commerce, but they did it by the sheer force of their skill in diplomacy.

The British, I repeat, and Napoleon began to issue, the one the Orders in Council, and the other the Decrees from Milan and Berlin. Russia and England are reported to have agreed, when they began seriously to undertake to overthrow Napoleon, "to ignore all the rules and usages of international law in this contest with France and to compel other nations to do likewise." They fairly succeeded as pertains to commerce against us. This was in 1793; we were only 4 years old; we had all Europe to contend with, yet we went forward, maintained our position, weak as we were, and made great progress.

Washington went all through this; he endured the harsh criticism that came to him But he never waivered or varied his course. He was as true to his course as the compass to the North Pole.

Before he became President, Washington had written to a friend:

"I hope the United States of America will be able to keep disengaged from the labyrinth of European politics and wars; and that before long they will, by the adoption of a good National Government, have become respectable in the eyes of the world, so that none of the maritime powers, especially none of those who hold possessions in the New World or the West Indies, shall presume to treat them with insult or contempt. It should be the policy of the United States to minister to their wants without being engaged in their quarrels. And it is not in the power of the proudest and most polite people on earth to prevent us from becoming a great, a respectable, and a commercial Nation if we shall continue united and faithful to ourselves."

What a vision and what a prophecy!

The same thought was in the minds of others. Jefferson, writing to Washington at about the same time, said:

"I am decidedly of the opinion we should take no part in European quarrels, but cultivate peace and commerce with all, yet who can avoid seeing the source of war, in the tyranny of those nations who deprive us of the natural right of trading with our neighbors? * * * If the new government wears the front which I hope it will, I see

no impossibility in the availing ourselves of the wars of others to open the other ports of America to our commerce, as the price of our neutrality."

Thus Jefferson, the political idealist, could see and espouse a cause that was intensely practical and earthy.

THE FAREWELL ADDRESS

There are other expressions of our statesmen of the time that show they were thinking along the same lines. It is, therefore, not surprising that in his farewell address (September 17, 1796), Washington should have incorporated in that benign document that well became a final message from the Father of his Country to his fellow countrymen, the following advice and counsel on this subject:

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence—I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens—the jealously of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealously, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people to surrender their interests * * *."

I am sure he had in mind there the vilification that came to him as the result of his stand in favor of neutrality as against France.

"The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is, in extending our commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far, as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop.

"Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial tie in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enable us to pursue a different course. * * *

"Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice?

"It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world, so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them."

Thus was the great and wise policy of isolation formally framed and announced.

Years later (October 24, 1823), Jefferson, writing to President Monroe about the proposed Monroe Doctrine, said:

"Our first and fundamental maxim should be, never to entangle ourselves in the broils of Europe; our second, never to suffer Europe to intermeddle with cis-Atlantic affairs."

At about this time, I am now over to the end of the century, there began to be talk about territorial transfers, and we, our statesmen, began to think about and discuss territorial transfers. We very early realized that it would not do for Europe to be shuffling the transfers of property among themselves, where the territories bordered us. As early as 1798, our Minister King, speaking to Lord Hawkesbury in the British Foreign Office, told him that we would not want to see any of these territories transferred to somebody else. And from then on, we took the same view. This was really the beginning glimmerings of what came to be the Monroe Doctrine.

Spain owned, what afterward became Louisiana, and there was talk about France acquiring that territory from Spain. We told them that that would not work. There was talk about transferring the Floridas from Spain to some other power, and we told them that that would not work. There was talk about Britain taking over some of these territories, and we told Britain that we would look on them just the same as we looked on everybody else, and we would not welcome that. And, weak as we were, we moved forward with such skilled diplomacy that we had our way during the next quarter of a century and since.

Finally, France did acquire from Spain, Louisiana, and then, as you know, in 1803, we purchased it. But before that time, in 1800, France had come to see that strong as she was and weak as we were, that she could not secure our cooperation under her treaties, and so in 1800 Napoleon made a treaty in which he gave up the idea that the treaties gave them any hold on our participation with them in their wars. That was the situation in 1800.

JEFFERSON TO CONGRESS

In advising Congress of the purchase of Louisiana, Jefferson, then President, commented as follows (October 17, 1803):

"Separated by a wide ocean from the nations of Europe and from the political interests which entangle them together, with productions and wants which render our commerce and friendship useful to them and theirs to us, it cannot be the interest of any to assail us, nor ours to disturb them. We should be most unwise, indeed, were we to cast away the singular blessings of the position in which nature has placed us, the opportunity she has endowed us with of pursuing, at a distance from foreign contentions, the paths of industry, peace, and happiness, of cultivating general friendship, and of bringing collisions of interest to the umpirage of reason rather than of force."

This ended the first period. We were now free from entangling alliances with Europe, and we moved forward, unhampered, under our own power. What glorious achievements we have attained.

SECOND PERIOD

At the beginning of the century after the 1800's, increasing discussions occurred in Europe with reference to the transfer of territories, to which I have just referred. I have also already referred to the position which we took on this subject, and that we maintained this position against strong pressure from overseas. The war in Europe was a life-and-death struggle, as they thought, between Napoleon and the dynasties of Europe. The dynastic countries used every means available to cripple France and build up their own resources.

Meanwhile, in 1812 we had our first foreign war after our revolution and independence. I regard that war as a sort of final series of actions in connection with the revolution. It is not necessary to go into the history of that war. The London Times made this comment in April of 1817: "Their first war with England made them independent; their second made them formidable."

We now come to the background period for the Monroe Doctrine. I call your attention again to the fact that we were yet a weak people, compared to the great dynasties of Europe, but we were gaining in strength all the time. The Monroe Doctrine rounded out our foreign policy, so far as exchange of territories on this hemisphere was concerned. I shall not undertake to discuss the Monroe Doctrine. You can read that and get from it all that is necessary.

POST-NAPOLEONIC CONFERENCES

Following the downfall of Napoleon, there were a whole series of conferences in Europe which involved this question of the transfer of territories. By this time the Latin American republics had rebelled and gained their independence, and there was a tremendous amount of talk, mostly under the table, as to what should become of them. There was some talk, and this was one of the things that led to the Monroe Doctrine, of using the forces of Europe to resubject these colonies to the dominion of Spain. We were against that. We were invited to participate in a mediation with Spain in order to compromise the difficulties between Spain and her colonies. We declined to have anything to do with that.

The temper of our representations at this time may be gaged from the following brief statements of some of our representatives in foreign courts.

Rumored possible transfer of the Louisiana Territory from Spain to France having reached the ears of King, our Minister in London, he made this statement to Lord Hawkesbury (September 22, 1798):

"We would be unwilling that Louisiana should pass into the hands of new proprietors."

I have already referred to this. As to a possible change of ownership of the Floridas, on June 1, 1801, King told Lord Hawkesbury:

"We are content that the Floridas remain in the hands of Spain, but should be unwilling to see them transferred except to ourselves."

Our Minister in Paris, informed by Madison, Secretary of State, about the proposed French acquisition of Louisiana, affirmed (May 1, 1802):

"A mere neighborhood could not be friendly to the harmony which both countries have so much an interest in cherishing."

The French were also told that acquisition by France of Louisiana would "convert a natural and warm ally into a jealous and suspicious neighbor, and perhaps, in the progress of events, into an open enemy."

Our Minister to Spain enlarged upon the dangers of neighborhood.

In 1803 King told an officer of the British Foreign Office that we would regard ownership of New Orleans by Great Britain as we would by France.

Later Henry Clay is reported to have told British officers in London that if Britain acquired Cuba we would fight.

These representations were constantly renewed during the following years, up until the Monroe Doctrine was announced.

Approaches were made to us in 1819–20 that we join the League of Peace that was proposed during the conference at Aix-la-Chapelle and the conferences that followed. Secretary Adams instructed Mr. Middleton, our Minister to Russia, that we could not participate. After commenting upon the detached situation of Persia and Turkey, Secretary Adams said:

"The political system of the United States is also essentially extra-European. To stand in firm and cautious independence of all entanglements in the European system has been a cardinal point of their policy under every administration of their Government from the peace of 1783 to this day. If at the original adoption of their system the

could have been any doubt of its justice or its wisdom, there can be none at this time. Every year's experience rivets it more deeply in the principles and opinions of the Nation."

After some further analysis, Secretary Adams makes these concluding observations:

"But independent of the prejudices which have been excited against this instrument in the public opinion, which time and an experience of its good effects will gradually wear away, it may be observed that for the repose of Europe as well as of America, the European and American political systems, should be kept as separate and distinct from each other as possible. If the United States, as members of the Holy Alliance, could acquire a right to ask the influence of its most powerful member in their controversies with other states, the other members must be entitled in return to ask the influence of the United States for themselves or against their opponents. In the deliberations of the league they would be entitled to a voice, and in exercising their right must occasionally appeal to principles, which might not harmonize with those of any European member of the bond. This consideration alone would be decisive for declining a participation in that league, which is the President's absolute and irrevocable determination, although he trusts that no occasion will present itself rendering it necessary to make that determination known by an explicit refusal."

How great is the wisdom of this repeatedly declared policy.

Now, the point I want again to make is that we were a young, weak nation, relatively, and yet we were speaking to the great European powers on terms of equality, telling what we would do and what we would not do, we were speaking to them as equals, and we were maintaining our complete independence of them. These were great days in our diplomacy. We were wholly free from entanglement in European problems. We kept so.

SOME NATIONAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Now, I wish there were time, as there is not, for me to trace, briefly even, what I regard as the greatest achievement of the United States in its international relations, and that is the actual implementation on our part of the peaceful adjustment of our international disputes.

We have only had three wars in all of our history, foreign wars, up until the time that we entered World War I, and those three wars were: The first, the War of 1812, to which I have already alluded; the next, the war with Mexico, and I never like to discuss that very much, I do not think that the war with Mexico shed any very great credit upon us; and the last, the war with Spain, and I have often thought of that as more or less of an accident, for if we had not had that incident in Habana Harbor, the explosion or the blowing up of the *Maine*, I think we might have gotten away without that one.

Every other dispute we have had with any nation, we have been able to settle by peaceful means.

By our aloofness during all these years, we escaped all the wars in Europe, we did not participate in any of them; we had no alliances; we moved along the course that we thought we should follow, unhampered by the dictation of anybody else.

As to arbitrations, and just to name two or three of the great arbitrations: Our first arbitration treaty was that made by Jay with Great Britain. The arbitration features were only a part of the treaty. It was made in 1794. In reporting upon the negotiations to Washington, Jay said: "I ought not to conceal from you that the confidence reposed in your personal character was visible throughout the negotiation." A great tribute from a defeated enemy.

Then we had, not in order, I am not naming them in order, we had the great Geneva arbitration with Great Britain, and I want to say to Britain's credit, that she came a long way in order to arbitrate the questions that arose out of her breaches of neutrality during the Civil War. She arbitrated questions that involved her honor. Some Britishers did not like the result, but they accepted the award and went forward under it.

There were other treaties of arbitration that we have made, I have not counted how many, but they number scores, in which we adjusted our differences. Every difference that has arisen between us and other nations, until World War I, we adjusted peacefully with the exception of those connected with the three wars that I have mentioned.

We took part in the two Hague Conferences, we tried to work out some plan there that would enable the nations of the world to settle their disputes peacefully, and to that end entered into conventions providing means and methods for such adjustments.

Then in bilateral treaties with England and France, we tried to put forward the cause of arbitration, by eliminating some of the things that prove most difficult in securing arbitration. Among these is, first, the securing of an agreement to arbitrate. Unfortunately, I think, in our development of that great principle of arbitration, too much attention in later years has been paid to the machinery of arbitration and not enough to the matter of reaching the agreement. There has never been any real difficulty in setting up a tribunal, once you have an agreement to arbitrate.

Our record in the peaceful adjustment of international disputes is a glorious one—one impossible of attainment if our interest had been bound up and intermingled with the problems of other nations.

We have been among the leaders in developing the great principles of the laws of war, that went to the humanizing of war, most of which went into the discard when we entered World War I, and most that were left went when we entered World War II. We had developed, since the time of Grotinus, the doctrines that tended to control and limit the destruction of noncombatants, old men, women, and children. All that went by the board at Hiroshima.

The doctrine of freedom of the seas is another great principle that we have developed during the time that we were our own masters. Mr. Moore says that our record here is one of the proudest records that we have made.

America, up to World War I, had nothing essential in her history that was not a step forward in her march of progress. And all of this was possible because our interests and our destiny was not entangled with those of any other country.

I want now to come, my time has nearly gone, to a few observations under the title of the talk. If I have made myself clear at all, up to this point, it is to the point that during the time that we were traveling on our own, unhampered by entangling alliances, we made the greatest growth that has ever been made by any nation at any time, in the whole history of the world.

THIRD PERIOD

I shall now say a few things about our dwindling sovereignty. I regret time has not permitted a fuller presentation of the great principles of policy we have developed and put into effect during our national life.

This will show you some consequences of our abandonment of our traditional policy and of our once more entering into entangling alliances with Europe.

DWINDLING SOVEREIGNTY

Every engagement with a foreign nation which, if met, deprives us of the power to determine our own course at the moment of implementation, impairs our sovereignty.

Every treaty of alliance, bipartite or multipartite (the United Nations Charter is of the latter class), impairs our sovereignty, because every alliance requires a surrender of rights, since mutual aid in strictly nonsovereign interests is the purpose of the alliance.

KINDS OF TREATIES OF ALLIANCE

Alliance treaties, for our purpose tonight, may be classed as:

1. Alliance arrangements made during a war and relating to its conduct; these normally end with the war. These are often called, in European parlance, coalitions. It took six of them to eliminate Napoleon. These alliances may meet disaster, but they are not usually permanently crippling.

2. Permanent military alliances providing for mutual aid in case of future international conflicts. The North Atlantic Treaty of 1949—April 4—is of this type. Normally, these may have little peacetime significance, but they bind the independent action of a nation, when the contemplated belligerency begins. They definitely impair sovereignty. Our alliance with France of 1778 was this kind of treaty, and it almost precipitated war with France under the treaty.

3. Permanent alliances, always with a strong, and sometimes with a predominant, military flavoring. These usually have some benign provisions—wise or unwise—to make them more palatable to the peoples involved, the majority of whom almost never understand their full significance and are rarely fully informed about them.

The Covenant of the League of Nations—one of this type—was rather fully explained to the people, and they rejected it. Since it never became operative for us, we shall not now trouble ourselves about its terms.

The United Nations Charter—of the same type—had practically no explanation made of it to the people, and they did not reject it. The chronology of its consideration is interesting.

The San Francisco Conference was almost exactly 2 months in framing it (April 25–June 26, 1945). Signed on June 26, 1945, it was submitted to the Senate on July 2. The Foreign Relations Committee began its consideration on July 9; it began formal hearings on July 11 and closed them on July 13; the Senate gave its advice and consent to ratification on July 28, 1945. A deliberate plan, carefully worked out, to adopt the Charter before the people could study and understand it, could not have worked more effectively to this end. We were so launched into a world organization, about which neither the peoples of the world, nor ourselves, had any adequate knowledge; they and we had less understanding.

MILITARY COALITIONS

With the impairment of sovereignty involved in the first class, military coalitions and alliances for the period of a belligerency, we shall not here concern ourselves. Normally, they cease with the end of hostilities.

We shall not take time to discuss a number of arrangements in major part of this type, which were made during World War II, they partook somewhat of the nature of both our first and second classes. I refer to the Atlantic Charter—August 14, 1941; the Moscow Conference—October 19–November 1, 1943; the Cairo Conference—November 22–26, 1943; the Tehran Conference—November 28–December 1, 1943; the Conference at Yalta—February 4–12, 1945; and the Potsdam Conference—July 17–26, 1945.

Under constitutional principles and procedures as understood in the past, parts or all of each of these documents should have been submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. They related both to belligerent activities and to postwar adjust-

ments. Under sound constitutional principle there is a limit to what a commander in chief has power to do, and some provisions of these arrangements exceeded those limits.

PERMANENT ALLIANCES

Concerning the impairment of sovereignty involved in the second class—we may note that by the North Atlantic Pact or treaty, we agree that, if any of the parties signatory are the victims of an armed attack we join them as an ally against the attacker. We have no right, under the treaty, to inquire as to the cause of the attack, nor as to who, in fact, was the aggressor. The one who strikes the first blow is not necessarily the aggressor, either in fact or law. So far as the treaty goes, we must come to the rescue even if our ally was the aggressor in the conflict. We may make no treaty in conflict with this treaty. The treaty remains in force for a definite period. The treaty is, obviously, in its effect, a defensive alliance against Russia. No matter what the cause, or how important or significant, if Russia strikes one of the allies, under the treaty, we must go to war, if we meet our treaty obligations.

One can easily perceive many, many trivial, more or less, matters that might produce a situation between some of the Western European powers and Russia that could cause a political explosion leading to war, and remembering Sarajevo, one knows how small a cap can set off a giant stick of dynamite. This treaty impairs our sovereignty in the matter of all North Atlantic problems, because they cease to be adjustable according to our interests and desires, if the other parties do not agree.

The Tripartite Security Treaty between ourselves, Australia, and New Zealand is of a somewhat different type. In that treaty we engage to maintain and develop our "individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack"; we promise to consult together if any of us are threatened in the Pacific; each party recognizes that an armed attack against either of the others, or both the others, would endanger its own peace and safety; a council consisting of the foreign ministers of the countries, or their deputies, is set up. There is no termination date.

We do not agree to go to war, only to consult, but we do set a minimum on our Military Establishment. We could hardly reduce that Establishment, under the treaty, to our old, prewar size. It thus far impairs the exercise of our free sovereignty in this matter of purely domestic concern.

There are other treaties of this sort that need not be considered here.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Now, as to the third class. We may note three important impairments of sovereignty that come to us through the United Nations set-up.

We should, in the first place, observe that what I will call the interior lines of communication among the various Charter provisions, are so numerous and so exceedingly intricate, some of the lines are so indistinct as to be traceable only with difficulty, the descriptions of the lines are often traced in language that conceal rather than clarify the thought, there are so many places in the lines where the drafters seem not to have dared to put down their true course—so many of all these that one cannot be too sure of his ground nor too certain of his conclusions. But the conclusions reached here are believed to be reasonably accurate.

IMPAIRMENT OF RIGHT TO MAKE TREATIES

We may observe, in the first place, that, under the United Nations Charter, we have lost the right to make the treaties we may wish. All treaties we make must conform to the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Existing treaty provisions that are out of harmony with the Charter must apparently fall. Having in mind the complicated provisions of the Charter touching international economic and social cooperation, and the intricate international trusteeship system, we may well find that we shall be greatly hampered in the development of our own international trade and commerce, when we surrender the Santa Claus role and seek to get some compensating advantage for ourselves. We have not yet plumbed the depth of this impairment of sovereignty in our treaty-making powers.

IMPAIRMENT OF RIGHT TO ADJUST OUR INTERNATIONAL DIFFICULTIES

Another impairment: We have lost the sovereign power to adjust our own international difficulties—a power which has enabled us to live as the most peace-loving Nation in the world, and to build up a record of achievement in the peaceful adjustment of international disputes unequalled by any other great nation in the world.

Under the Charter, we are under obligation to attempt a peaceful solution of our difficulties. This we have always done. By the Charter the Security Council, if it deems necessary, could call upon us to settle our troubles peacefully. Such a call would, under all the Charter machinery, amount to a virtual command, with penalties for failure to heed the call.

If our progress toward a pacific settlement did not satisfy the Security Council, they might at any stage of a dispute intervene and recommend what we should do, taking into consideration that, if the issues are legal, the matter should go to the International Court of Justice. The Security Council's recommendations do not fall far short of commands, with attaching sanctions.

If we failed to settle the dispute peacefully, and if the Security Council had not intervened, as just described, then we must refer it to the Security Council, which may either recommend the reference of a legal dispute to the International Court of Justice, or recommend other appropriate procedures, or it may recommend such terms of settlement as it may consider appropriate. That is, the Security Council may tell us what settlement we are to make.

If we did not choose to follow the recommendations of the Security Council, or if, following them in form, we did not in fact settle the difficulty, then, if the resulting situation was, in the opinion of the Security Council, a threat to peace, the Council might move to the imposition of sanctions to compel us to do its bidding. First, the Security Council would call upon us to comply with prescribed provisional measures, the council taking account of any failure by us to comply with these provisional measures. In case of noncompliance to this call, the security council would decide on what measures short of force—that is, economic sanctions provided in the treaty—it would use against us, including severance of diplomatic relations. If these measures failed, then it might use force against us—air, land, or sea forces, or all.

Thus our sovereignty is seriously impaired by depriving us of the right to manage our own foreign affairs, one of the highest attributes of sovereignty. The Security Council not the State Department, becomes, in the last analysis, the agency to direct our foreign relations.

It will not do for us to be so naive as to assume that the security council will have a near-divine sense of justice and be guided thereby in cases of international differences. If our dispute were with a small power, we shall not properly estimate our position if we do not visualize the possibility—almost probability—that most small nations in the world (which would include those on the security council itself) might be against us in sympathy at least, and would exert their influence against us in our difficulties. No fact in international relations is better evidenced than this disposition of small powers vis-a-vis great ones. Again, we must not be so naive as to assume that the Security Council will be sitting as a court of justice, untouchable by outside influence. The Security Council will be of the earth, earthy. Human experience proves this, also. Reports of the Council's present operations are a demonstration thereto. We may not quiet our fears with the thought—they can't or won't do anything to us.

If two great powers come to grips—say the United States and Russia—the rest of the world will either sit by and watch, or get in with their choice as to the winner.

We repeat, the conduct of our foreign affairs no longer rests, in the last analysis, with us.

To give point to our vulnerability as a party disputant, it may be observed that the Security Council need not wait either for ourselves or for the other disputant to invite the Council's intervention. The Council may act on its own motion. Futhermore, any member of the United Nations may bring a dispute to the attention of the Council or the General Assembly, which will then be under some obligation (as it would seem) to assume some jurisdiction of the matter.

IMPAIRMENT OF OUR WAR POWERS

One more impairment of sovereignty under the Charter—we have surrendered, by the Charter terms at least, those great attributes of sovereignty, upon which the very existence of sovereignty depends: The power to declare war (subject to the right to take temporary self-defense measures, pending action by the Security Council), the power to decide against whom we shall make war, the power to conduct war, and the power to make peace and to determine its terms. We apparently have not lost the power to raise and support armies or to provide and maintain a navy, subject, however, to the right of the Security Council and the Military Staff Committee to regulate armament and possible disarmament.

The Charter provides that the members must, under an agreement, or agreements, apparently entered into with the Security Council, make available to the Security Council armed forces—sea, land, and air, as well as other military facilities. The air force to be furnished by each member must be maintained in constant readiness for use.

When the Security Council decides upon the use of force, it calls upon the members for their quotas, which of course, the members are bound to provide.

But until such special agreement is made, the Security Council has no right to call upon a nation for armed forces, and then only as stipulated in the agreement.

The "plans for the application of armed force shall be made by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee." Thus the direction of the military operations are under the Security Council, which for "the strategic direction of any armed forces placed at the disposal of the Security Council," looks at the Military Staff Committee. This committee is to be made up of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Council.

Obviously, the end of hostilities and the terms thereof will be determined, mediately or immediately, by the Security Council.

Thus we raise and equip our forces, sea, land, and air, but the Security Council, with the military and staff committee, determines when and where the forces shall go, who commands them, how many go, for how long, in what cause, and against whom. So, subject to temporary measures of self-defense, pending Security Council action, our boys shall fight and die, and the Security

Council not ourselves will send them into that fight.

In saying these things we are not overlooking that the United States has a favored position as a permanent member of the Security Council, nor are we overlooking the provisions that, with the exceptions noted in the Charter, decisions of the Council are to be determined by the vote of seven members, including the concurring votes of the permanent members, of whom we are one, though it seems we may not vote on questions in a dispute to which we are parties and as to which the Security Council has assumed its Charter prerogatives to secure settlement.

How effectively protective of ourselves these provisions may be, one is hardly safe in venturing a definite opinion. But, having in mind what the United Nations has been and is apparently doing without the assenting vote of Russia, a permanent member of the Council, and seemingly against her so-called veto, we can see that if the concept, sympathy, and atmosphere of the United Nations organization should change and be against us, we might be placed in a desperate situation. We can rest assured that when we cease to be the big-brother Santa Claus, we shall lose much of our presently expressed popularity, and the hatred which many nations now have for us will be openly expressed and acted upon.

We might observe that there is practically no essential idea or principle in the United Nations Charter that was not found in the League of Nations Covenant, and that as a document embodying a constitution the Charter is inferior to the Covenant.

The Charter has these two basic defects: It has been too largely framed without a careful consideration of how it might affect us and our welfare, if our position suffers any essential international change; and, next, it has the fault which has been the curse of all similar plans heretofore framed, beginning with the grand design of Henry IV of France, namely, that it is aimed and framed with one power in mind and with a view to exercising a definite control thereover, to the point of its humiliation, if not extermination.

THE KOREAN OPERATION

One more observation: Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, in a carefully considered and well-documented article in the Western Political Quarterly, gives details regarding the steps taken at the time we ordered our troops into Korea. From this study by the Senator, it appears: (1) That we have never made with the United Nations the agreement which is to precede the furnishing of troops by us for use in these so-called police actions; (2) that apparently our troops were ordered in before any request by the Security Council was made therefor, and apparently without the Council's knowledge, though the Council did take, almost within hours, some confirmatory action, regular or otherwise it is not clear, after the order was given; (3) that under our constitutional procedure, as developed in connection with our entry into the United Nations (some phases of this planned procedure look a bit queer to us of the older generation), the operative existence of such an agreement was an absolute prerequisite to the right of the United Nations to ask for our troops, and, likewise, a prerequisite for the furnishing of such troops by the President; (4) that under these special agreements the Security Council, not the President of the United States, makes the call and sends our troops to the place it determines, after they are furnished by the President; (5) that apparently no other nation has, to this time, made any such special agreement for the furnishing of troops, so that, seemingly, the token forces sent by other nations are in the field by an equally irregular procedure to that covering our own; (6) that such action as was taken by the Security Council was a sort of nunc pro tunc procedure, was taken without the approval of Russia, one of the permanent members of the Security Council, and this fact leaves it open to Russia to contend, and with much cogency, that so far as the United Nations is concerned, this whole Korean operation is illegal, because not properly authorized by the United Nations.

At any rate, as it appears from Senator WATKINS analysis, the President's action in ordering our troops into Korea did not accord with his rights and powers under our Constitution. In saying this, I have in mind his constitutional powers to land troops on foreign soil for the emergency protection of American lives and property, a power and a right which will not cover this Korean operation. Moreover, by issuing his order, the President acted, as stated, without any authority derived from the United Nations Charter.

The Korean operation has cost us more than 100,000 casualties, and, it is said, more than $15,000,000,000.

WAR LOSSES AND COSTS TO THE UNITED STATES

Perhaps it may be observed here that our casualties in World War I were 333,000, of which 130,000 were deaths; that in World War II, our casualties were 1,068,000, of which 392,000 were deaths, and that in all the other wars in which the United States has been engaged in its entire history, including the Civil War, the total casualties were 699,000, of which 394,000 were deaths. Thus our casualties in World Wars I and II have been twice as many as our war casualties in all the rest of our 130 years of history.

It might be added that our losses, in other than in human lives taken and human bodies injured, these two being the great national loss, amounted, in money expenditures in World War I, to $25,807,000,000; and in World War II to $330,500,000,000; a total of $356,-307,000,000 of our national wealth; while in all the other wars since the beginning of the Nation, we spent but $7,500,000,000. These figures include neither interest nor pensions, which run the totals up to $41,755,000,000 for World War I; to $349,778,000,000 for World War II; and to $21,210,000,000 for all the rest of the wars.

It may here be added that up to September 30, 1945, we had advanced on lend-lease $46,040,000,000, and curiously more than $10,000,000,000 went to Russia.

Our adventure into world politics, contrary to the principles that were framed by the good sense and, I think, inspiration of our founding fathers, have levied upon us a tribute leading almost to the brink of disaster, and so far as ordinary human foresight can determine, we are by no means yet to the end of the road.

As pointed out, we face the balance of our journey with our sovereignty impaired in three great fundamental matters: The right to make treaties, to manage our foreign affairs, and to declare war (subject to our temporary right of self-defense), to choose our enemy, to direct and command our armies, and to make such terms of peace as we may desire, or be forced to accept.

FREEDOM FROM FEAR AND WANT

Not too many years ago there was coined a great phrase setting out the purpose of our then contemplated adventure,—"that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want." It was said that freedom from want meant "economic understandings which will secure to every nation a healthy peacetime life for its inhabitants," and that this meant that we were to do what never before had been done in all history, that is, "feed all the peoples of the world as we now know human beings should be fed."

The millions of hungry mouths in Europe and Asia and elsewhere testify to the wreckage of that aim and hope.

Freedom from fear, it was declared meant "a world-wide reduction of armaments to such a point and in such a thorough fashion that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor." As to reduction of armaments—the excessive burden of armament which is now bowing our backs to the breaking point, our backs not only, but also the backs of other nations of the world, show how far we have yet to go to realize this dream.

As to freedom from fear, we in this country—150,000,000 of us, the people of Russia—193,000,000, the people of Europe—392,000,000, of Latin America and Canada—170,000,000, of Oceania—12,000,000, of Africa—196,000,-000, and a good part of the 1,251,000,000 of Asia—all of us and of them are stricken with a fear which we have never before known in our generation. Furthermore, it would seem that no such fear-stricken humanity has been found in all preceding generations of the modern world—a fear of want, a fear of death, a fear of mass extermination, with all the horrors and savage barbarities of modern war.

I think I have shown you that we do have a dwindling sovereignty. One dare, I dare not, look over the edge and see where we may drop.

What is the cure? I do not know. One thing we might and should do, and this is very essential, make it absolutely sure that none but patriotic men and women are in places of responsibility. If we might believe the records of courts and articles in magazines and papers, it would seem that Benedict Arnold is not going to be lonely hereafter.

There is another course, and that is the nations have the power of amendment of the Charter, and I am quite sure that further study, further deliberation in a calm atmosphere, devoid of the urge to mete out military punishment, could result in our so amending this Charter, that it might be helpful.

God grant that it may be so.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the majority leader what his plans are for today, in order that Senators on this side of the aisle may be advised.

Mr. McFARLAND. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] asked me about an agreement for a time to vote on my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the submerged lands joint resolution. I have asked Senators who are interested in the joint resolution to consult and determine what may be done in that respect. I hope to be able to make a definite announcement in that connection a little later in the day. Several Senators wish to be heard on the motion to consider the submerged lands bill. I do not know how long it will be before I shall be able to make an announcement, but I shall try to make it a little later in the day.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is there a possibility—and I hope that there may be—of having a vote on the motion today?

Mr. McFARLAND. I hope we will reach a vote today. I cannot tell the

distinguished Senator from Massachusetts at the moment.

I will say to my good friend from Massachusetts that I shall be very happy to give all possible information on the subject to him and to the Senate. As he knows, I have always endeavored to do so.

I wish to state further that the distinguished Senator has been very helpful in working out unanimous-consent agreements. He served in the capacity of minority leader in the last session during the illness of our good friend, the late Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Wherry. I want to take this opportunity to thank him for his cooperation in helping expedite legislation.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. MCFARLAND that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

PROPOSED RENOMINATION OF GEN. HOYT S. VANDENBERG AS CHIEF OF STAFF OF AIR FORCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington read in the press of yesterday that the President of the United States intends to renominate Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg to serve an extra 14 months as Air Force Chief of Staff.

I know General Vandenberg to be a courageous, gallant, and intelligent Air Force officer, but, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have no intention of supporting the proposed extension of 14 months as Chief of Staff on the reasons of justification as offered by the President.

White House press secretary, Joseph Short, in announcing the President's intention, explained why General Vandenberg was getting the bob-tailed reappointment. "The President," Mr. Short said, "wants to make sure that General Vandenberg has an opportunity to round out his full 30 years of military service as Chief of Staff. The President does not wish General Vandenberg to be in a subordinate command before he reaches retirement."

The President's reason for nominating the present Chief of Staff to serve an additional 14 months, after his regular 4-year term expires on April 30, 1952, is about as meaningless and inconsequential as any reason I have ever heard.

There is but one of two reasons, or a combination of both reasons, which would justify the President's nominating General Vandenberg, or the Chief of Staff of any Service, for an additional term. If General Vandenberg is without any question of doubt the best qualified Air Force officer to be the Chief of Staff, he ought to remain as the Chief of Staff. If the Air Force is without other officers who are qualified to be the Air Force Chief of Staff, then General Vandenberg ought to remain as the Chief of Staff.

The Congress gave considered thought to the legislative provision that Chiefs of Staff for the several services should be appointed for stated periods of time. It was recognized that a limited period of service for a Chief of Staff was a good thing for the service concerned. It was thought unwise to provide an unlimited period of service. The mere limitation of the length of service for a Chief of Staff was an encouragement to excellence in the lower echelons from which future Chiefs of Staff are selected.

What the President has suggested is that any future Chief of Staff, for any service, will serve in that capacity from the time he is first appointed until the officer retires for age.

The President has said that he does not wish General Vandenberg to serve in a subordinate command before he reaches retirement. With one stroke of the pen, the President would violate and bypass a score of established and historic precedents. Not only have heads of services returned to so-called subordinate positions but they have done so with resulting benefit to the branch of their service.

It is not proper, in my view, the world being what it is today, to refer to other echelons of the Air Force as being subordinate commands. It would not be possible, for example, to fill a more important assignment than that of Commanding General of the Strategic Air Force.

I well remember when the administration prevailed upon the Congress to change the law so that a 5-star general officer might serve in the capacity intended for a civilian as Secretary of Defense by the National Security Act of 1947. This gentleman served but a limited period of time. Many of us felt that his work would have been more adequately performed had his successor, a civilian, been appointed when the Congress was told that an indispensable man was available.

I am among those who hold the military competence and intelligence of our general officers in high regard. If our services do not possess many general officers who are prepared and qualified to become Chiefs of Staff at a moment's notice, then the Nation faces the future without any real preparedness worthy of the name. But I am convinced, that however able a particular Chief of Staff may be today, he can be replaced by any of a number of others who will bring only progress and improvement to the branch of his service.

I am willing to consider the reappointment of General Vandenberg on the argument that the Air Force would suffer if it did not continue to benefit from his leadership. The President has said no such thing. If the President offers any valid reasons for the proposed reappointment of General Vandenberg to the Senate Armed Services Committee, I shall most willingly consider them. I shall remain, however, unalterably opposed to continuing the term of any Chief of Staff on the stated reason that such an extension will permit him to serve until he is required to retire for age.

If we adopt that course for one Chief of Staff, we are likely to do it for other Chiefs of Staff, and I can think of no course of action which would more certainly lead to military stagnation and national grief if not disaster if carried to its logical conclusions.

THE INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on several previous occasions, I brought the activities of the International Materials Conference to the attention of the Senate and I have requested that the State Department clarify its position and the position of our country with respect to this organization.

Now we have a detailed confirmation of all the statements I made about the International Materials Conference and a clearer insight into it as a result of a speech delivered by Mr. Edmund Getzin, nonferrous metals branch, Office of Materials Policy, of our State Department, before the American Institute of Mining and Metallurgical Engineers at their annual meeting in New York February 19, 1952.

I should like to analyze Mr. Getzin's remarks which were apparently written before my disclosures of the International Materials Conference on the floor of the Senate. His remarks, which he made as an official representative of the State Department are extremely revealing and deserve careful attention.

It will be recalled that I have said that the International Materials Conference was established by the joint action of our State Department, the Government of France, and the Government of the United Kingdom, and that this action was a result of Prime Minister Attlee's visit to the United States, during which he pleaded for an increased share of the world's materials at a price which Britain could afford to pay.

The State Department spokesman confirmed this fact when he told the mining engineers that—

> Prime Minister Attlee and President Truman, during the former's visit to Washington in December 1950, reached a tentative agreement upon plans for an ad hoc intergovernmental organization specifically designed to handle raw material problems. These plans were then discussed with the Government of France. On January 12, 1951, the three governments issued a joint statement reporting their agreement. * * * This was the start of the International Materials Conference.

So here we have it in black and white: Prime Minister Attlee and President Truman concocted the International Materials Conference.

I previously told the Senate that the International Materials Conference is a

super government and operates as a gigantic raw-materials cartel in restraint of international trade. In New York, the State Department said:

To date seven standing committees have been formed. They are virtually autonomous bodies free to consider any aspect of the problem of world shortages in the commodities concerned.

Again, this confirms my statement.

I have said that the powers of the Defense Production Act have been usurped in order to implement the so-called voluntary allocations of the International Materials Conference. The State Department expert had this to say on that subject:

The United States can adequately implement the allocations of commodities like copper and zinc through the administration of domestic allocations.

This statement leaves little doubt that the laws passed by the Congress to meet domestic defense problems have been used for a completely unauthorized purpose.

In my remarks to the Senate, I pointed out that there was nothing voluntary about the International Materials Conference so far as American users of these materials are concerned. The mining engineers heard the State Department expert declare:

In the case of the United States recommendations of the International Materials Conference are accepted or rejected by the Defense Production Administration upon recommendation of the agencies concerned.

Obviously after the Defense Production Administration has accepted an allocation, there is nothing left but the writing of the rules and regulations restricting the freedom of the American consumer.

The State Department representative also declared:

The basic conflict of interests between producers and consumers has harassed the efforts of most of the International Materials Conference committees.

Here we have a fantastic statement—a complaint that the fundamental economic law of supply and demand is hampering the work of the International Materials Conference. This is most damaging proof that the conference has operated as a giant cartel which influences markets and prices.

Mr. President, the International Materials Conference is a socialistic scheme for raising the living standard in other lands by lowering the living standard of Americans. The State Department apparently agrees with this statement because its spokesman said:

A fixed base for international allocations does not allow for new industries of expanding economies and is therefore usually unacceptable to certain countries undergoing rapid economic development. Usually the solution has been to adjust the base in favor of such countries upon the submission of acceptable evidence and in recognition of genuine need.

Here is conclusive proof that this plan aids other nations to expand their economies, while placing ceilings on our own producers. It will be noted also that expanding economies and genuine need, rather than contributions to the defense effort, are the basis of adjusting these allocations.

Defense of the Nation cannot be used to justify the International Materials Conference. In fact, the State Department statement to the mining engineers included the following quotation:

The problem of properly screening military requirements is one that has also been difficult to cope with. No standard method of calculating military requirements has been developed. Reliance must therefore be placed on other criteria such as the relative proportion of military requirements to total requirements and upon budgetary figures for military expenditure. These criteria, while not accurate, do serve as a rough check.

I have said that the International Materials Conference is socialistic; and I still think so. It adheres to the Marxist philosophy: From each according to his ability, and to each according to his need. Let me read a few random statements from that address, which was written by the State Department, to illustrate this socialistic thinking:

Without the International Materials Conference, acquisition of essential goods in a sellers' market would continue to be determined by the bargaining power of consumers, without regard to the end use served. Each committee has taken steps to protect the interests of nonmember governments.

When allocation systems are drawn up, supplies for both nonmember and member governments are provided on an equitable basis.

In a number of cases the facts revealed such a disparity between available supplies and the requirements of the free world that the committees recommended the establishment of international allocations to insure equitable distribution in accordance with need.

It is expected that the experience gained from the allocations of the fourth quarter of 1951 and the first quarter of 1952 will even more closely be in line with principles of basic equity and need.

I wish to emphasize the words "with principles of basic equity and need."

Mr. President, in the past, free markets have been the method of allocating materials and insuring their use in applications where they are most essential. I believe a fair and equitable distribution in accordance with need is produced by competitive markets. Apparently, the International Materials Conference, consisting entirely of appointed representatives of various governments, believes it can substitute its collective judgment for the free and open decisions of the market place. No one elected these gentlemen to determine the needs and basic equities for all the citizens of the free world. The decision of such a group can only be the decisions of a cartel.

It will be recalled that I stated that the International Materials Conference had attempted to fix world prices for tungsten. Here is the State Department's position confirming my charge:

So far only two committees, tungsten and wool, have endeavored to cope with the price problem.

Mr. President, the Senate has heard me state that the International Materials Conference is concerned with production, utilization, conservation and end-use controls of materials anywhere and everywhere outside of the U. S. S. R. and its satellites. I now read what the State Department says about end-use control:

Direct end-use control measures vary greatly according to the economic conditions of each country. In countries maintaining controls on foreign exchange or imports and exports, such controls tend to form a type of end-use control. Many countries, including the producing countries, introduced direct control measures covering specific commodities which are of concern to the International Materials Conference.

Here we have an international body which is undertaking in time of comparative peace, to determine what shall be made and how it shall be made all over the world. If that is not world planning then I do not know what a planned economy looks like.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the International Materials Conference has more ambitious plans for the future. Let me again quote from the State Department speech:

If the allocation work of the committees is judged successful by participating countries there is no reason why more ambitious programs relating to conservation, development and prices should not be considered.

(At this point Mr. FERGUSON yielded to Mr. MALONE and a colloquy ensued, which, on request of Mr. FERGUSON, and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed at the conclusion of Mr. FERGUSON'S remarks.)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me again quote from the State Department speech:

If the allocation work of the committees is judged successful by participating countries, there is no reason why more ambitious programs relating to consideration, development, and prices should not be considered.

Here, Mr. President, is the word-for-word confirmation of all my statements about the International Materials Conference: It is socialistic; it was never authorized by Congress; it is planning a world dictatorship over raw materials; the provisions of the Defense Production Act are being usurped to carry out these aims.

This conference is international socialism—no mere attempt to institute planned economy in one country or two countries, but a real effort to plan the economies of the entire free world.

I believe it is imperative that the United States withdraw from the conference and restore to American citizens their rights to the world markets.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Can we ever get rid of price controls and allocations in this country so long as we remain a part of that conference organization?

Mr. FERGUSON. We cannot, because as part and parcel of that conference we use price controls to operate the International Materials Conference.

Mr. BENNETT. Does not the existence of this conference become an argument for the elimination of price con-

trols as early as possible in this country as being the only way of getting them off our backs?

Mr. FERGUSON. It certainly does.

During the delivery of Mr. FERGUSON'S speech,

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S FREE TRADE PROGRAM—ONE ECONOMIC WORLD

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Michigan consider the proposals of the State Department to constitute a handicap, or an encouragement to American business?

Mr. FERGUSON. They constitute a severe handicap to private business in America, particularly the small businesses of America.

Mr. MALONE. If the Senator will yield further, how does the State Department then think it is furthering the interests of this Nation by promoting such controls?

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot answer for the State Department. I only know that in this statement it admits that it is in favor of such controls, which are in line with certain collectivist thinking in regard to this problem.

Mr. MALONE. Then, as a matter of fact, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator whether what the State Department is doing is not a promotion of the interests of the foreign countries and in derogation of our own? In other words, is it not a handicap to our business, and, a substitute for the International Trade Organization originally proposed by the State Department as the third and final part of their three-part free-trade program originally suggested to level this country's economic system with the nations of the world. The latest plan is to accomplish the same purpose as an encouragement to foreign nations, to the end that there may be a general leveling of living standards throughout the world.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. That is the meaning of the Marxist philosophy, "to each, according to his need; from each, according to his capacity." Of course, the ones who judge of the need are those who are in need, and the ones who judge the capacity are also those who are in need; therefore, the people who claim that they are in need are the ones who are going to do the judging, according to the Marxist philosophy.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

THE COMMUNIST DOCTRINE

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Then, we are now applying the Marxist philosophy, not merely to one nation, as was advocated in a great speech by the greatest Communist of all time—Karl Marx—some years ago, but we are not applying it to all nations as against the United States, by proposing a division of wealth, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need," between nations. Is that not true?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, and it will be recognized that, the greater the extent a nation becomes socialized, the more readily the international Marxist philosophy can be applied to the socialized nation.

DESTRUCTION OF THE FREE SYSTEM

Mr. MALONE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I think he is doing a great service to the Nation in bringing these matters into the open, because the situation has now developed to a point where everyone may see the socialistic trend of this administration. But, as a matter of fact, did not Marx, in the olden days, advocate two things to destroy the free system: First, free trade, because he said it hastened the revolution; and, second, progressive taxation, the income tax, "From each, according to his ability, to each, according to his need," because he said it would destroy the economic structure of a country?

Mr. FERGUSON. And he at that time thought it would destroy capitalism.

Mr. MALONE. That is entirely correct. We are applying the 100-year-old Marxist doctrine to the United States of America, our great Nation, to whose shores came many people in order to get away from that very philosophy in Europe and Asia, and to build a nation along the lines of a free system. A Socialist administration heading this great Nation is now advocating the same Marxist policy, with free trade and a progressive income tax, not only within the country itself but to divide with all of the European and Asiatic nations.

We now have a policy which is definitely established, of sending to the cheap labor European and Asiatic nations billions of dollars on the theory that we must level our living standards with their own. We make up their trade balance deficits in cash until such time as our markets are divided with them to the point that there are no more trade balance deficits.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. Let me put it this way: It is impossible to have international socialization without, to a degree, having socialization of each nation. The more each particular nation and its people become socialized the easier it becomes to operate an international cartel, which amounts to socialization, for the reason that under such a cartel individuals in America cannot trade with individuals or corporations in Great Britain, because the governments must step in to say, "We regulate all international trade; we determine the extent to which American goods may be shipped into other places of the world; we determine the amount of goods England may have."

This was brought about very easily. Cartels were allowed in Great Britain and other countries of Europe. They were fostered as being a part of what was called their capitalistic system, and they were carried to the point of bringing about a socialistic order. The further any particular country becomes socialized, the easier it is for international socialism to develop. Particularly is that true when, in the interest of collectivism, participation in international trade by corporations and individuals is forbidden, so that an international organization determines what shall leave this country and what shall come into this country.

We also go to the extent of saying to our manufacturers, "If you bring in more than that which we allow, you cannot use it; you must devote the money, the whole return, to your individual use." That is why I am talking about international socialization.

I hope that the people of America will soon come to the conclusion that there is such a thing as international socialization, which makes individual nations units under absolute control, so as to bring about socialization at home. This is the result of an international cartel.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator from Michigan is doing a great service to the people of America in bringing this matter into the open at this time. But let us go back a little way. This Nation for 19 years has under the guise of what is called reciprocal trade advocated free trade.

The Senator from Michigan on the Senate floor, Thursday, when the junior Senator from Nevada debated briefly with him, brought out the fact that the quota system, embargoes, and the manipulation of monetary systems including every known subterfuge is utilized to defeat any benefit that might accrue to this Nation. All imports into foreign nations were thoroughly controlled, through quotas, embargoes, and the manipulation of monetary systems in direct opposition to any benefits to the United States—all foreign trade is a manipulated one-way street.

STERLING BLOC SYSTEM—A FORM OF PIRACY

The sterling bloc system itself is a form of piracy throughout the nations affected by it. The entire sterling bloc system is nothing more or less than another method of cheating other nations, under which they manipulate the value of their money, based upon whether they want a certain product in the sterling bloc country. They fix the value of the pound sterling in accordance with such trade manipulation to $2.80. There is a black market and there is a so-called fixed price market with variations. Everyone knows it is rigged. In other words, when the pound was valued at $4.03, no one was paying more than $2.60 for it; and now, when the pound is further devalued to $2.80, no one is paying more than $2.25 or $2.15 for it. So, there is manipulation of the sterling bloc values throughout the world, in accordance with the trade needs of England. The word "bloc" itself indicates that sterling is blocked. A nation or individual might hold a large amount of sterling money, but when it is blocked, only a certain amount of it may be used at a time.

Basically, the sterling bloc program is one of the British schemes to exercise a cartel-like control throughout the world and to divide the wealth of this country with the nations of the Commonwealth. The junior Senator from Nevada mentioned the three-part free-trade program of the administration to level our standard of living with the European and

Asiatic nations as early as 1948 in March when the Marshall plan was first proposed. The three-part free-trade program was, first, the so-called reciprocal trade plan; second, the Marshall plan-ECA-point 4, or whatever system might currently be utilized to divide the wealth; and third, the International Trade Organization.

In 1950 we forced Secretary of State Acheson to abandon the International Trade Organization. Now he has come up with the International Materials Committee to do the job, while continuing the free trade and cash gifts to the foreign countries.

THE SO-CALLED BIPARTISAN POLICY

This 19-year-old program which includes the four horsemen of destruction of the United States of America was continually furthered by the so-called bipartisan policy and included, first free trade; second, deficit financing; third, progressive taxation—income tax; fourth, progressive education.

There has been only one change. The International Materials Committee has been substituted for the International Trade Organization, which we finally convinced the State Department it could not pass on the Senate floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I think the Senator from Michigan is doing a tremendous job for the United States of America, and it shows that the Senate has finally caught up with the phony so-called bipartisan administration program.

Mr. FERGUSON. The British have been able to use the sterling bloc to perfect their cartel system.

Mr. MALONE. That is correct. It is a form of piracy.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not want to use that particular term.

Mr. MALONE. I shall use it and take full responsibility.

Mr. FERGUSON. The sterling bloc has been used as a part and parcel of control to enable them to have a cartel, and to determine when goods will be shipped and whether a certain amount of goods will be shipped.

Mr. MALONE. And then they can fix the price of money exchange for imports; they can fix another exchange price for exports and even a different exchange price for each commodity.

They can completely control imports and exports in any sterling bloc member country not only from the sterling bloc areas but from any other country dealing in sterling currency. They can promote trade, or prevent trade, or regulate the amount of trade together with any profit or loss which they may wish to accompany such transactions.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is why I say it is a part of the cartel system.

Mr. MALONE. In other words, we, the great United States of America, has fallen under the spell of the sterling bloc.

GOVERNMENT EXPANSION

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in these days when Government expansion at the Federal level threatens the very existence of local government, the resolution which I send to the desk for appropriate reference should have strong appeal to many Senators whose State and local governments are suffering the loss of ratables without any compensatory relief. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Ocean, N. J., be printed in full in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks. Mr. President, I hope it will have the serious consideration of every Member of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS OF THE COUNTY OF OCEAN, STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Whereas it has been reported to this board that the War Department or some other agency of the Federal Government proposes to take, by condemnation, a very large and substantial part of Plumsted, Jackson, and Manchester Townships in this county; and

Whereas this board realizes the necessity of the Federal Government acquiring sufficient lands for defense purposes, it realizes that the Government purposes to take such substantial parts of said municipalities as will cause the townships to be weakened financially by the loss of substantial areas of territory and cause a great hardship to the persons residing in said areas proposed to be condemned; and

Whereas large portions of said lands are valuable farming lands, particularly in Plumsted Township, and are needed for agricultural purposes and further that there are other vacant and unimproved lands in this county which could be taken and used for the same purposes without damaging anyone or causing any undue hardship; and

Whereas the Federal Government and its War and Navy Departments have previously taken large areas of said municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Ocean as follows:

1. That the Federal Government, War Department, and all other interested Federal agencies, be, and they are hereby respectfully requested, to take as little land as possible in our county and to desist from taking valuable farm land and improved properties, particularly in Plumsted Township and Jackson Township, Ocean County, N. J.

2. That the clerk of this board shall forthwith send a certified copy of this resolution to the War Department and to Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, our Congressman, and to our United States Senators, the Honorable ALEXANDER SMITH and the Honorable ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, while we are on the subject of the expansion of our Federal Government at the expense of State and local governments, I should like to direct the attention of the Senate to a letter which I received last Friday from the Governor of New Jersey. I should like to read the letter, Mr. President, because it treats so forcibly with a matter which expanding agencies of our Federal Government completely disregard—local needs:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Trenton, February 27, 1952.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: In today's mail I received a report from the director of the division of fish and game in our department of conservation and economic development. Because I believe you will be interested in the report, I am sending a copy of it to you.

Over a period of many years, the Federal Government has acquired large real-estate holdings in our State. When we have asked for the cooperation of the Federal Government in our efforts to secure the release of some of these holdings, we have practically never been able to achieve our objectives. On the other hand, the Federal Government has occasionally established activities only to withdraw from those activities after our communities have come to rely upon them, despite the objections of our representatives. The removal of the Watson Laboratories may be cited as an example.

In the not-too-distant future, we may expect our State to be urbanized from the Hudson to the Delaware. If future generations are to have adequate playgrounds and opportunity for some hunting and fishing, we must reserve areas for this purpose now. In addition to the activities of the Army in the Fort Dix area, the Air Force is striving to obtain a very large parcel of land in the neighborhood of Hammonton. In fact, it is seeking to obtain a portion of a large tract of land that the State is also seeking to purchase as a water reserve as well as for recreational purposes.

Our administration wishes to cooperate with the Department of Defense in every possible way. We recognize the primary importance of this mission. In the absence of full information on the subject, however, we are inclined to question the need for the additional land that the Department is now seeking.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor.

Mr. President, the Governor's letter was accompanied by a copy of a memorandum from the director of the division of fish and game. Since this memorandum throws further light on the dangers of current trends in the acquisition of lands for public use at the Federal level. I ask that the memorandum be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
DIVISION OF FISH AND GAME,
February 26, 1952.

From A. H. Underhill, director.
To Governor Driscoll.
(Attention Russell E. Watson, Jr.)

As you know, both the Army and the Air Force are anxious to expand the holdings at Fort Dix and McGuire Air Base so that they will have more land available for training troops and for increasing the scope of the air fields at the air base.

At the recent hearing held at Fort Dix, farm representatives and others vigorously opposed any expansion which would remove agricultural land from production.

During the hearing, Mr. Thomas Young, representing Secretary of the Army Frank Pace, and some of the Army officers present, suggested the possibility of expanding the Dix holdings eastward through Archer's Corners and Cassville, thence south to the United States naval holdings at Lakehurst. This would take in the Colliers Mills public hunting and fishing grounds, the new Lake Success project, and the additional land downstream from Lake Success which the Division of Fish and Game has been negotiating to purchase.

The Division of Fish and Game has spent between $50,000 and $75,000 on the development and management of this area, and it is now being extensively utilized by fishermen, gunners, and other citizens of the State seeking recreation in the outdoors.

During the last hunting season, better than 10,000 man-days were spent by licensed gunners on the area, and during the fishing-picnicking season, four to five times this number utilized this tract.

In view of New Jersey's expanding industries, intensive farming, and increasing suburbanization, I feel it is imperative that the State maintain as much land as possible for outdoor recreation. The health and well-being of our citizens demands that, with the present pace of modern living, they have an opportunity for relaxation.

As a former infantry officer and as an American citizen I am vitally concerned that our soldiers be adequately trained for battle. However, I do not feel that the Army is at present utilizing to the fullest the acreage which they now control at Fort Dix, and I further feel that there are many States in the South and West which offer the Army better facilities for extensive field training than does little New Jersey, which is now the second most densely populated State in the Union.

If you share my views in this matter, I would appreciate your using any influence you can to prevent the expansion of Fort Dix in any direction, and certainly to prevent its swallowing up this outstanding conservation project.

A. H. UNDERHILL,
Director.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I shall not at this time dwell longer on this subject, but I wish to emphasize the fact that these trends are dangerous. The Government is becoming wasteful in the use of lands, as it is in the expenditure of the taxpayers' hard-earned money. Nothing could lead more quickly to complete socialism than to have our Government control an excess of public lands, or to put in "hock" lands necessary to a wholesome community life.

JAPANESE PEACE TREATY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished acting minority leader [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has asked me about a program for the Senate. The administration is anxious that the Japanese Peace Treaty be considered and acted upon as soon as possible. This is very important, because the Japanese have cooperated with us in the making of agreements for use of bases in Japan. It is important that the United States Senate manifest friendship for the people of Japan by voting upon this treaty at an early date.

Sometime ago I announced that before the Japanese and the other treaties were called up, at least 1 day's notice would be given. I have talked with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. CONNALLY], and it is agreeable with him that the Japanese treaty be brought up for consideration in the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have conferred with but a few Senators on this side of the aisle, but I do know there is a strong feeling on this side, as the Senator himself knows, that the Hawaiian statehood bill be considered.

I believe that if the Senator from Arizona moves to bring up the Japanese treaty tomorrow, there may be a very considerable feeling that its consideration should be postponed until after there has been a determination of the motion now pending to take up the tidelands oil bill instead of the Hawaiian statehood bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I may say that I am hopeful that we may be able to fix a time for a vote on my motion which will not entail any delay at all, and that the Senate may then proceed with the other matter.

I hope an agreement may be worked out sometime today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if there is not a faint possibility, or even a probability, that if tidelands legislation is not passed some time very soon, the Senate may not have a chance to act on that subject during this session.

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that I have yielded to those who are interested in the submerged lands bill in their desire to bring it before the Senate. I have felt that we could make more progress on the statehood bills by taking up something else, and then considering the situation which confronts the Senate. It was for that reason that I made the motion that the Senate consider the submerged lands bill.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has now entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Alaska statehood bill was recommitted.

I may say in all frankness that if a long debate on the question of Hawaiian statehood ensues, it may mean that the submerged lands bill may never be taken up. But that is nothing new. It has been pending for several years.

It is considered by many to be important to develop oil that lies off the coasts, and I am willing to have the bill brought before the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Arizona realizes, however, and there is evidence or testimony before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which the Senator is a member, to the effect that thousands of people are out of work, and many businesses have gone bankrupt, while waiting for something to be done about the tidelands oil question.

Furthermore, there is perhaps as much as a hundred million dollars' worth of equipment tied up, simply set aside, awaiting the time when Congress will act on this matter. Ocean-going ships which are designed for drilling, voyages, with supplies, equipment, and all types of things needed for drilling in the submerged oil lands, are simply tied up, lying idle at their docks.

People who have gone into the business of supplying these enterprises have had to close their businesses, seek employment elsewhere, or move away.

Congress should act upon this question at some time. I am sure the Senator from Arizona realizes the situation and would like to see Congress speak and act on the question, because, as the Senator knows, Congress must act before anything can be done.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, so far as I personally am concerned, that I am trying, in the Policy Committee, to work out a program which will result in these subjects being considered, but if my suggestions are opposed, here, and there is undue delay, some bills cannot be considered. We might as well face that prospect. I do not know which bills may not be taken up, because it will be for the Senate to decide which measures will be considered. But if we cannot make motions and bring up bills in an orderly manner or without being opposed, and if we have delays of 2 or 3 days when we could have debate upon them, naturally in the end that is going to be reflected in the amount of work the Senate does.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has just given notice that he intends to bring up the Japanese Treaty tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have had an opportunity to talk with the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and one or two other Senators within the last minute or two. I have a strong feeling, and a hope that is shared by other Senators on this side of the aisle, that there will be a definite understanding, which will be agreeable to all Senators, as to when there will be a vote on the pending motion.

Mr. McFARLAND. I share that hope.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Otherwise, I am confident there will be resistance to bringing up other measures before the pending question is decided.

Mr. McFARLAND. As I have said, I am trying to expedite the consideration of work to be done by the Senate, but I am not going to be held responsible if, because of delays and resistance, some of the legislation which has been planned is not enacted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say that the pending bill on the tidelands matter is not a bill in the interest of the three affected States alone. It is a bill in the interest of the entire United States. It is based upon the theory that tidelands production ought to go on and oil should be produced, processed, and manufactured, for that matter. So it is not necessarily a measure affecting only the three individual States which are involved.

If the bill comes before the Senate undoubtedly amendments will be offered. But the idea of refusing to take up the bill on the motion of the majority leader because of a desire to act on statehood for Hawaii is, to my mind, absolutely preposterous. Do we think more of Hawaii than we do of the interests of all the people of the United States? Do we think more of Hawaii than of the people of the three affected States?

It seems to me that the Senate should act on the motion of the Senator from

Arizona to take up the tidelands oil bill, and dispose of it. Then it can return to the Hawaiian statehood bill, if it so desires. It seeems to me that the regular and constitutional method of procedure in the Senate with regard to these measures is being impeded, obstructed, and hindered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to make a few remarks, in view of the statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Texas.

I happen to represent one of the States which is vitally interested in tidelands legislation. I do not happen to favor the bill which was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but I do favor substantially the legislation which we passed some years ago in connection with the quitclaim procedures. So there are many reasons why I should be pleased to see the tidelands legislation brought to the floor of the Senate where it could be acted upon. I believe that in reasonably short order we can get to the tidelands legislation.

I happen to be one of those on this side of the aisle who favor early action on the Japanese Treaty. I think it is important that it be considered. But I serve notice now that until the Hawaiian statehood bill can at least be acted upon by the Senate and until we can get a vote on the motion by the distinguished majority leader to take up the tidelands legislation, personally I shall resist taking up the Japanese Treaty or any other matters. I believe that there was a commitment made in the Senate that the Hawaiian statehood bill should come before us. We have had a vote on the Alaskan statehood bill. By vote of the Senate that bill was recommitted to the committee, and there is now pending a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was committed, which motion was entered today. But at least the Senate has had an opportunity to act on the subject.

I think it is equally important that the Senate have an opportunity to act on the Hawaiian statehood bill. The Senate may see fit, in its wisdom, to reject the bill. That is a part of our constitutional process. But certainly the Senate itself has the right to make the decision.

Frankly I disagree with the viewpoint that the Senate must be subservient to any policy committee, majority or minority. I think it is, of course, perfectly proper and a part of the orderly procedure of a legislative body, for the majority leader to make motions to bring business before the Senate. However, I do not believe that the Senate, with its 96 Members, representing 48 States of the Union, is supposed to, or necessarily does, abdicate its responsibility into the hands of the majority leadership or into the hands of the majority policy committee. I think that is a very fundamental proposition.

On the issue of statehood, I believe that the 96 Members of the Senate have the right to make known their views. The only thing I have been objecting to for several days is that this great body is apparently in a position where even the motion of the majority leader cannot reach a vote. I think that is a rather ludicrous situation. All we have asked for during the past several days, since the vote on the Alaskan statehood bill, has been that the Senate have the right and privilege to express itself. So far, because of the rules of the Senate and the procedures, we have not been able to reach a vote. As soon as we can reach a vote, I think the Senate can make its voice heard.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have the floor, have I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Chair recognized the Senator from Texas. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to bring on protracted debate.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator from California a question, if I may have unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. CONNALLY. That includes allowing the Senator from California to make a speech. However, I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Louisiana may ask a question of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. LONG. I am sure that the Senator from California realizes that individual Senators do not have control of the matters to come before the Senate. The tradition is that the majority leader is recognized to move to bring up legislation which it has been determined should be brought before the Senate. As for the rest of us, we may want many things in the way of legislation; but it has been the experience of the junior Senator from Louisiana that if a Senator wants the Senate to act on certain things, so long as the Senate is acting on something he would like to see legislated upon, it is desirable to go ahead and get it before the Senate. I fear that the position taken by those opposing the consideration of the tidelands legislation is that they refuse to allow the Senate to act on anything until it acts on one particular bill which they would like to have come before the Senate. It seems to me that that is too much to expect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator has asked a question, I believe that California is no less interested in proper tidelands legislation than is the great State of Texas or the great State of Louisiana. All I have maintained for several days is that the majority leader, representing the majority party, has made a motion to bring up the tidelands legislation. We were ready to vote on that motion on the afternoon when the Alaskan statehood bill was recommitted to the committee. We were ready to vote on it the following day. We were ready to hold a session on Friday, if that had been the determination of the majority leader. We are willing to vote on it today. All we ask is that the Senate have an opportunity to vote on that question.

It seems to me that if that question could be voted upon, then the able Senator from Louisiana—if the Senate desired to bring the tidelands legislation before it—would, of course, have ample time and opportunity to discuss the merits of the tidelands legislation.

But why not let the Senate function, instead of causing continuous delay, so that we cannot even reach a vote on the motion of the majority leader? That has been the only point raised by the Senator from California.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we have a very unusual situation before us. The majority leader, who is supposed to be in charge of the processes by which bills are brought before the Senate, has made a motion to take up the tidelands bill. A little group—perhaps a considerable group; I do not know—are saying to the Senate, "You shall not act on that question unless you give us what we want with respect to Hawaii."

I believe that the interests of all the people of the United States ought to appeal to Senators as being paramount to the interests of Hawaii.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That certainly is not the position of those of us who have favored statehood for Hawaii. We are ready right now to vote on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to take up the tidelands bill. All we are asking is that the Senate have an opportunity to vote. For 3 or 4 days we have not been able to reach a vote on the motion of the Senator from Arizona. There has been no obstruction on the part of supporters of statehood for Hawaii. Let us vote now. We are perfectly willing to vote now.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know the Senator is willing to vote now; and he will vote "No."

As I have said, it seems to me that the interests of all the people of the United States ought to appeal to Senators ahead of the interests of a little selfish group in Hawaii.

The Senator from California says, "Oh, yes; I am interested in the tidelands legislation." He is interested in it after we get through with Hawaii. His first objective is Hawaii.

Mr. President, we have an unusual situation. The majority leader has made a motion to take up, in the regular way, a bill relating to tidelands. The Senator from California says that he is interested in tidelands. He is interested in the subject not primarily, but secondarily. It is secondary to Hawaii. If he gets the Hawaiian bill up he will then consider the tidelands bill.

I want to say, Mr. President, in reply to some remarks the Senator from California has made, that I am not an advocate of the tidelands bill as it was reported to the Senate. I am for something that will restore to the States their title in the tidelands, which the Supreme Court has overruled and forcibly taken from those States. The matter of legislation in that respect is still up to Con-

gress. Congress has a right to say what will happen to the tidelands. If the tidelands bill is brought up for consideration amendments to it will be offered. I have a number of amendments I intend to offer to the tidelands bill. I shall offer them at the proper time.

Mr. President, it is astounding to me that Senators who profess to be in favor of tidelands legislation—Senators whose States are vitally interested in the subject—should subordinate the tidelands question to the interests of Hawaii. Whether for political reasons or otherwise, I cannot understand how patriotic Americans who say they want to do something for all the people of the United States can have a preference for Hawaii.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that I very much resent his statement. I am as interested in the problems of my State as the able Senator from Texas is interested in the problems of his State. My State has as vital an interest in tidelands as does the State of Texas. However, the people in Hawaii, if the Senator from Texas does not know it, are just as much American citizens as are the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California.

I am surprised that the Senator from Texas should get up on the floor of the Senate and question the American citizenship of the 500,000 voiceless people of Hawaii, or that he should question the motives of any Senator.

There is not a single vote in the whole Territory of Hawaii for the Senator from California, who, like the Senator from Texas, must stand for reelection this year. The fact that neither of the Territories has a vote in the Senate does not place any less obligation upon those of us who are interested in bringing up other matters before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from California shows by his heat his tender affection for Hawaii, over a bill that affects all the people of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not now. I shall be glad to yield in a minute.

The Senator from California says that the people of Hawaii are already citizens. If they are already citizens, we do not need a bill which will make them citizens. They are not voting citizens. Fifteen percent of them are not citizens. He says that every one of them is a good American; that the people of Hawaii are as good citizens as are the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California. If he wants to classify himself in that category, he may do so, but I do not want to classify myself in that category. I think I am a better American than a great many people who live in Hawaii. I have been to Hawaii. The majority of the people there are not of American ancestry or descent.

I very much regret that the eminent Senator from California should feel offended by anything that I have said. I have said the truth. I have said the truth in everything that I have uttered.

As I said a moment ago, I am not satisfied with the tidelands bill as it is presented now in the Senate. The Senate has the power to amend that bill. It has the power to modify that bill. It has the power to restore title to the tidelands to the people of California, Texas, Louisiana, and all the other States.

I believe that the interests of all the people of the United States ought to be superior to the claims of the people of Hawaii and its contiguous territories, including the State of California. California ought not to occupy a different position than any other State in the Union.

I am sorry that the eminent Senator from California cannot conduct debate on the floor of the Senate without getting heated and making remarks about the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas has as much right to the floor of the Senate as has the Senator from California. The Senator from Texas is trying to represent not only the people of Texas but all the people of the United States. I have no commission in my pocket in behalf of any foreign dependency or any foreign province or territory. I am representing the people of Texas and, in a large sense, all the people of the United States. I am not on the brief for Hawaii or any other province out in the Pacific Ocean. I have a brief for the people of my State and for all the people of the United States.

I am sorry that this language will not suit the eminent Senator from California. I have been in the Senate several years. I know what this procedure is. I know that the custom is to follow the majority leadership in the matter of bringing up bills, and not give it into the hands of a little clique which has a selfish motive at heart; some little clique which will not let us do anything else if we do not do what it says we must do. In effect it says, "You will either bring up the Hawaii bill and pass it or you will not get any other legislation on the statute books."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was about to conclude my remarks, but I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, the same group that wants to bring up the Hawaii bill just had their way in getting up the Alaska bill. The Alaska bill lost by one vote. Now they want to bring up Alaska again, and they are trying to keep us from taking up other matters that the Senate should act on; at least, that the Senator from Louisiana would like to see acted on.

Mr. CONNALLY. They hope to get up the Hawaii bill and then they will go out and try to recruit support for Alaska and bring the Alaska bill up again. I understand that there is a proposal to bring up the Hawaii bill; and if it can be brought up, the plan is to adopt an amendment which would add Alaska to the Hawaii bill, and thus bring them both up. It would bring Alaska in on the coattails of Hawaii.

Mr. President, those are my views, notwithstanding the remarks of other Senators.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to state that I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from California that the Senate does not have to vote on bringing up a bill merely because I make a motion to consider it. The responsibility of carrying forward the work of the Senate in an orderly manner must fall on someone, and on some group. That happens to be the responsibility of our side of the aisle at this time. In the Eightieth Congress I conceded that the responsibility was on the other side of the aisle. I was genuinely willing to go along with them on matters of procedure. The Hawaiian statehood bill was not even reported to the Senate at that time. It was partly with my vote that it has been reported now so that we might have an opportunity to discuss it on the floor.

I recognize the factual situation as it faces us in the Senate, and in view of it I have made a motion to take up the tidelands bill. I felt that that would expedite the work of the Senate. It would give us time to study the question of statehood for Hawaii and determine what should be done. I believe that the two statehood bills should go together. I do not know that I would be in favor voting for statehood for either of the Territories without voting it for the other as well, because the same questions are involved. While it is the privilege of the Senate to do whatever it wants to do, if Senators refuse to cooperate with me in bringing bills before the Senate I do not think they can expect me to help them very much when it comes to bringing up bills in which they are interested.

I have tried to be fair. I have tried to bring up bills on the floor, regardless of whether or not I favored them. But I am saying that those who wish to have the tidelands bill considered have that opportunity now. I do not say they will not have an opportunity to have that bill considered in the future. However, I am not going to take the responsibility of assuring that it will be taken up in the future, after having given them that opportunity once.

I have had to sacrifice some of my views in order to bring myself to move that the Senate consider the bill. In the committee I voted to report the bill, even though I myself was not entirely satisfied with it.

Now the motion to consider the bill has been made. The Senate can do as it pleases in regard to that motion. As has been stated, I have found that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was not able to prepare a bill which was entirely satisfactory to all concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The majority leader is not sufficiently optimistic to believe, is he, that if we were now to reject the motion to have the Senate proceed to consider the tidelands bill and if we were then to adopt a motion to have the Senate proceed to consider the

bill for Hawaiian statehood, we ever would proceed to consider the tidelands bill at this session?

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not know; I am not stating whether that would or would not happen. But I have been told that when the bill providing statehood for Hawaii is brought before the Senate, there will be considerable discussion. Of course, we never know what the Senate will do, but I feel that it would expedite consideration of the work of the Senate if at this time we were to proceed with consideration of the submerged-lands bill.

I do not know why the opposition has picked on this particular bill. Any Senator can move to have the Hawaiian statehood bill brought up at any time, just as any Senator can object at any time to the consideration of any bill. However, I must conclude that some Senators really do not want the submerged-lands bill to be considered by the Senate, or else they would be willing to let the Senate dispose of that bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the argument the Senator from Arizona has just made apply equally to Senators who are unwilling to permit the Hawaiian statehood bill to be brought up?

Mr. McFARLAND. The Hawaiian statehood bill is not before the Senate.

Mr. CORDON. The question is before the Senate, is it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, the question is not.

Mr. CORDON. Why is it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. The motion before the Senate is to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of the submerged-lands bill.

Of course, we may differ in regard to the order in which bills should be considered by the Senate. However, as I have stated, the responsibility to make these motions happens to rest upon me.

The Senate can vote as it pleases. I am not trying to persuade any Senator to vote against his convictions, but I am trying to obtain an opportunity to be fair to everyone. I have even tried to have the Senate consider bills to which I myself was opposed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So as to keep the RECORD straight, pursuant to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Arizona that he has always gone along with the majority leadership in the Senate in regard to procedural matters, I wish to call his attention to the fact that on July 15, 1947, when the Republicans were in control of the Senate, a motion to adjourn was made by the majority leadership, and that motion was carried by the contested vote of 35 yeas to 29 nays; and I find that the present distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], then voted against the motion to adjourn.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I know the matter to which the distinguished Senator from California is referring. At that time the Republicans were in the majority, and there was before the Senate the question of the consideration of a nomination to a position in the Department of Justice, as I recall. I do not now remember just what the position was, although I believe it was that of Solicitor General. A Senator moved that the Senate adjourn before action on that nomination had been concluded. The then chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] was opposed to the motion to adjourn.

I do not think the then majority leader made the motion that the Senate adjourn; if my memory serves me correctly, it was the distinguished Senator from Maine, not the majority leader, who made the motion to adjourn.

I could be wrong in my recollection of that incident, for a few years have elapsed since then. However, I think the RECORD will show that the statement I have made is correct. Under those circumstances, in connection with the consideration of a nomination, and when the work before the Senate had not been finished, the question then before the Senate was not what would be the next order of business or a motion to take up some other legislative proposal, but whether the Senate should then adjourn sine die without concluding the work before the Senate. I can understand why a Senator who is opposed to a bill might object to taking it up. If the Senators do not desire to consider the submerged-lands bill they may want to vote against my motion.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would it not be proper for the proponents of the bill proposing statehood for Hawaii to move that the Senate take up that bill after we conclude consideration of the tidelands bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly. Unless those Senators simply do not wish to have the Senate consider the submerged lands bill, they could make that motion in a week or 2 weeks or at any other time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Would it not save the time of the Senate if we were to proceed in that order?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think it would save the time of the Senate if we were to proceed in the order suggested by my motion; otherwise I would not have made the motion.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Arizona that we can dispose of the tidelands bill quicker than we can dispose of the bill proposing statehood for Hawaii?

Mr. McFARLAND. From what I have been told, I judge that there will be considerable discussion of the bill proposing statehood for Hawaii. Perhaps later on we can pass that bill without having so much debate, but at the present time I am told that there is likely to be considerable debate in the Senate on that measure.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is it not the opinion of the Senator from Arizona that more of the time of the Senate could be saved by having the Senate consider the tidelands bill at this time, rather than by having Senators try to prevent the consideration of that bill and try to have the Senate take up some other bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. That was my opinion; yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if it is not true that according to the question raised by the Senator from Florida, the reverse would also be in order, namely, that when the bill proposing statehood for Hawaii was disposed of, a motion could be made to have the Senate proceed to consider the tidelands bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is true. However, the Senate may find that it will take some time to dispose of that bill, and thereafter we may have to proceed with the consideration of other matters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for another question, because I am merely trying to throw some light on the subject.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would the majority leader be willing to agree that as soon as the tidelands bill is out of the way, he himself will move to have the Senate proceed to consider the Hawaiian statehood bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I have stated before that we were trying to work out some agreement on this matter, and I shall continue to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am simply trying to find out what the situation is. Certainly the Senator from Arizona could make a commitment for himself, even though I realize he could not bind the other Members of the Senate who belong to his party.

In view of the statements which have been made here today, I should like to know whether the able Senator from Arizona could give assurances that he personally would move to have the Senate take up the Hawaiian statehood bill when the tidelands bill is out of the way?

Mr. McFARLAND. I would not wish to make any commitment without consulting the majority policy committee.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Just what is the Senator's complaint now? I cannot follow him.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not making any complaint; I am doing just as all other Senators do—I am just talking. [Laughter.]

Mr. CORDON. I agree 100 percent with the majority leader.

What is the matter at issue? The majority leader has moved that a certain bill be made the order of business. It is altogether proper for a Senator to make a motion of that kind, is it not; and it is altogether proper to follow that motion with a vote. So what is wrong?

Mr. McFARLAND. Nothing is wrong, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. CORDON. Then why not try to get the Senate to vote on the motion?

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, I am willing to vote.

Mr. CASE subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the rules of the Senate provide that no Senator, in debate, may refer offensively to any State of the Union. The rules of the Senate do not include the word "Territory," but do include the word "State." Nevertheless, in view of certain remarks which have been made here this afternoon, it would appear to me that a few facts should be placed in the RECORD relative to the citizenship of the people who live in Hawaii.

My understanding is that Hawaiians have been citizens of the United States since 1900. In other words, they have been citizens of the United States for more than 50 years. They fought in the Spanish-American War, in World War I, and in World War II, and they are now fighting in Korea.

I have a little more than a passing interest in the patriotism of the Hawaiians, because Mr. President, it was my privilege to assist in the drafting of legislation which was responsible for the creation in Hawaii of the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific, at the time when the debate was going on in the Congress as to whether we should have several cemeteries throughout the Pacific as the final resting place for boys from the mainland of the United States who, for one reason or other, were not being returned to the United States.

The Congress decided that there should be one National Memorial Cemetery in the Pacific, and that is in what is known as the Punch Bowl Crater; and there it is that boys from every State of the Union are sleeping, Mr. President. There is a bit of the United States in Hawaii. Paraphrasing the words of the English poet who said that wherever he slept there would be a bit of England, there is a bit of the mainland of the United States in Hawaii, in the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific.

The Hawaiians themselves have written a record of which no State would need be ashamed. Hawaii's casualties in Korea are 1,097, of which 261 were killed. Until April 17, 1951, Korea's Hawaiian war casualties totaled 681. That was at the rate of 1.36 per thousand of Hawaii's population. At the same time, the percentage figure for the United States is 0.4 of 1 per thousand.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CASE. I will yield in a moment. The record which the Hawaiians have been writing in the Korean war is quite in keeping with the patriotism and the valor of the Hawaiian soldiers in World War II. In 1 month, in 1943, 10,000 Hawaiians volunteered, when there was needed a quota of 3,600 men.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield provided I do not thereby lose the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, of course, I have the floor, but certainly I would yield again to the Senator. I want the RECORD to be straight. I do not think the Senator from Texas was talking about the citizens of the United States who are in Hawaii, at all. I think he was talking about noncitizens who are in Hawaii. He spoke very highly of all the citizens of the United States, and I would not want it implied that any Senator had said anything derogatory of a citizen of the United States because of his place of residence. Certainly I would not undertake to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the RECORD will speak for itself, if it is not tampered with.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, of course, the RECORD will speak for itself.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the point which I should like to have the RECORD show clearly is that when we are speaking of Hawaiians we are not speaking of the citizens of a foreign dependency; we are speaking of citizens of the United States.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the Senator was clearly referring to people who reside in Hawaii, who are not citizens of the United States.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President——

Mr. CASE. In a moment.

I hope, Mr. President, that that charitable interpretation can be placed upon the words, but that was not the impression gained when I heard the words spoken. It seemed clear to me that the distinguished Senator from Texas was referring offensively to the people who live in Hawaii, and I think the form of his speech and what he said would be offensive to the people of Hawaii. Were Hawaii represented in the Senate of the United States by a Senator who had the right to object, the Senator from Texas might have been asked to take his seat, under my interpretation of the rules. Unfortunately, the rules do not apply to Territories.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. My recollection is that during World War II the Hawaiian troops who were represented in the recent moving picture which the Senator may have seen and which was based on historical facts of World War II, at considerable sacrifice to themselves, if I do not misinterpret the official figures, suffered approximately 400 casualties in order to rescue a part of a Texas division containing more than 200 Texans.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I should like, first, to comment upon the remarks of the Senator from California, and then I shall be glad to yield.

I do not happen to have seen the picture to which the distinguished Senator from California has referred. It is my understanding that the Hawaiian Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team did rescue the Thirty-sixth Division of Texas, and that the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Team from Hawaii received 10 unit awards, including 7 Presidential citations, and that there were 5,000 individual awards, including 3,600 Purple Hearts, with 500 Oak Leaf Clusters.

Mr. President, any group of people who produce boys who show their patriotism, their courage, and their valor in a war in which the United States is engaged, with any such record as that, need suffer no insults offered on the floor of the United States Senate.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I should like to say that I am certain the Senator from Texas needs no defense here and that he meant no insult whatsoever to the good citizens of Hawaii.

But I wanted to ask the Senator from South Dakota a question. He states that he believes the Hawaiians are entitled to consideration because of the fact that they served in World War II. I am sure the Senator from South Dakota realizes that the Puerto Ricans actually supplied more men to the armed services than did the Hawaiians. As a matter of fact, in Korea today there is a large battalion of Puerto Ricans. Is the Senator willing to give them the same consideration he is willing to give the Hawaiians?

Mr. CASE. I have previously stated on the floor, with respect to Puerto Rico, during the debate on the Alaskan statehood bill, that there was a vast difference between the heritage, the education, and the amount of time that the Puerto Ricans had been familiar with the institutions of the United States, as compared with Hawaii and Alaska. Puerto Rico does not have the status of a Territory as yet. It does not have the same percentage of people who have received education in the schools of the United States. There is a considerable difference. But, in any event, whatever may be said as to the merits or otherwise of Puerto Ricans, that question is not before the Senate in the form of a resolution or in any other way.

The immediate occasion for my taking the floor, as I think those who heard what happened this afternoon must be aware, was that I felt that when any Member of the Senate casts aspersions upon the people of Puerto Rico, Alaska, or Hawaii, then if the Senator has some facts with respect to the valor of Puerto Rican soldiers it would be incumbent upon him to say something for those people who are without a voice on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. That is the reason why I rose. I wanted to see if the Senator's consideration of the Puerto Ricans would be just as great and generous as for the Hawaiians.

Mr. CASE. If their honor had been similiarly sullied I would have spoken in their defense.

EXTENSION OF TERMINATION DATE OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not care to break into the continuity of the Senator's discussion.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, there is no continuity to the discussion.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no continuity to it?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, there is no continuity to it. It is just "one of those discussions."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on February 19, the President of the United States addressed to the President of the

Senate, a letter in which he requested the enactment of a joint resolution having the effect of extending the termination date of certain so-called emergency powers.

If enacted, the resolution would continue certain existing statutes in effect for the duration of the emergency proclaimed on December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, unless sooner terminated by the Congress or the President.

Without committing myself in any way with respect to the merits of such proposed legislation, I believe it is my duty, as chairman of the committee to which the letter and accompanying draft resolution was referred, to introduce the resolution in order that Senators may study the proposal and also because I believe that it may be better to have available some emergency legislation that has had the scrutiny and approbation of Congress rather than have the Executive assume authority to act under vague and indefinite powers, supposedly coexistent with the office of President and Commander in Chief.

In introducing this resolution, I wish to appeal to those of my colleagues who serve on committees which would ordinarily consider the respective substantive laws which are here proposed to be extended, to give this resolution their careful study, and let the Committee on the Judiciary have their best advice on whether any particular power should or should not be continued in effect.

One more thing I feel I should say in connection with this resolution. It seems to me to involve a substantial constitutional question, the question of whether the Congress can grant all of these powers merely on the basis of a Presidential declaration that an emergency exists; or whether some declaration by Congress itself is required, either a declaration of emergency or a recognition of the existence of an actual state of war. I incline somewhat to the thought that, if Congress is to grant all these special powers, it is up to Congress to declare the existence of the state of emergency, of whatever nature Congress may determine to exist, and which Congress deems to be the basis for its authority to grant these powers to the President.

This is a phase of the subject which I believe should have most careful consideration, and I want to assure the Senate that the Committee on the Judiciary will, indeed, attempt to give this question the consideration which it deserves. I hope that individual Senators will also give it consideration and that any Senator reaching a conclusion with regard to this matter, or any of the collateral questions which it involves, will give the Judiciary Committee the benefit of his views.

Mr. President, in that connection, I send to the desk a Senate joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) to continue in effect certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, notwithstanding the termination of the existing state of war, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I may say in conclusion that the Chief Executive today is assuming so many powers, some of which may finally be questioned, that I wonder whether Congress desires to surrender all of its powers and all of its prerogatives, to the Chief Executive, or whether it might not be well for the Congress to stand up once in a while to assert its powers and its rights in the premises.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the able Senator from Nevada have in mind the fact that the President is today waging war without the consent of the Congress?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have that in mind, and I have drawn it again to the attention of the Senate in the statement I have just made, that if we are to give these extraordinary powers to the Chief Executive, they should come by reason of a state of war. Perhaps it would be well for the Congress to declare that a state of war exists.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder;

S. 1710. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain road right-of-way easements in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee;

S. 2078. An act to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes;

S. 2394. An act to repeal the 10-percent surcharge on postal cards; and

S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary is trying to go forward with its work as rapidly as possible; and this involves holding hearings many days each week. I believe the Senate desires this committee to proceed with its work as expeditiously as possible. Accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary may meet, and hold hearings, during the sesssions of the Senate, during the remainder of this session

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Without ojection, it is so ordered.

SCALING OF GERMAN DEBTS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, last week I read into the RECORD a letter which I had addressed to the Department of State with reference to a contemplated meeting on February 28 dealing with the scaling down of German debts, both postwar debts owed the Government of the United States, and debts owed to private parties by Germany. I stated at that time that it was with regret that I read the letter into the RECORD before there had been an opportunity on the part of the executive agency to read the letter and reply to it. I also stated that as soon as I received a reply I would read it to the Senate. To complete the record which was partially made at that time, I should like to say that I have received a reply, and I shall read it at this time:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 27, 1952.

The Honorable GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 23, 1952, with regard to the International Conference on German Prewar External Debts which is to be held in London commencing February 28, 1952, and to the proposed settlement of the claim of the United States against the Federal Republic of Germany covering economic assistance extended to Germany by the United States up to June 30, 1951. You refer to the proposed settlement of the postwar aid claim and you inquire by what authority can the Department of State agree to a reduction of a debt owed to the United States Government by a foreign government unless the agreement is in the form of a treaty ratified by the United States Senate.

I am glad that you have given me the opportunity of discussing with you now the problems which have arisen in the German debt settlement program and particularly the proposed settlement of the claim of the United States against the Federal Republic on account of postwar economic assistance.

The Department on a number of occasions attempted to arrange for consultations with the appropriate subcommittees of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs concerning the subject of settlement of German debts. In letters dated January 16, 1952, the chairmen of the Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs Committees were informed of our desire to discuss this and a number of other problems with members of those committees. On January 18, 1952, we again communicated with the chairmen of the Committees on Foreign Relations and Foreign Affairs informing them that Ambassador Warren Lee Pierson, the United States representative on the Tripartite Commission on German Debts, was in the United States for a brief period prior to the convening of the London conference and suggesting the desirability of consultations between Ambassador Pierson and appropriate consultative subcommittee members regarding the German debt settlement program. As a result of these communications a meeting was arranged for 3 p. m. January 28 in the Foreign Relations Committee room. Ambassador Pierson, accompanied by Mr. Henry A. Byroade, Director of the Bureau of German Affairs, and myself attended the meeting on behalf of the Department. Unfortunately, however, it was possible only for Senator CONNALLY and Senator McMAHON to attend the meeting and we were unable to

discuss the problems with as many of the committee members as we would have liked.

The International Conference at London will consider the problem of the readjustment of the prewar external debts of Germany and it is hoped that this conference will achieve substantial agreement on the manner in which this will be accomplished. It is contemplated that the debt settlement plan developed at the conference will then be incorporated in an international agreement which will, of course, come before the United States Senate for consideration. It is to be noted that the proposed adjustment of the United States claim for postwar economic assistance is only to be finalized if and when the international agreement becomes effective by approval of the requisite number of governments. The two are part and parcel of the same over-all transaction. It is further contemplated that the international agreement will expressly refer to the terms of the proposed settlement of the claim of the United States against the Federal Republic on account of postwar economic assistance. The adjustment of the United States claim for postwar assistance is, therefore, a matter that will come before the United States Senate in connection with the international agreement.

In the light of the foregoing explanation, it is apparent that neither the Department of State nor Ambassador Pierson has assumed authority, without regard to constitutional procedures, to reduce the obligation of the Federal Republic to the United States Government on account of postwar economic assistance.

Determination of the terms of settlement of the United States claim against the Federal Republic on account of postwar economic assistance presents a problem which must be considered in the light of the over-all foreign policy of the United States as well as the economic situation of the Federal Republic and the special circumstances which exist in respect of the Federal Republic. Upon the surrender of Germany and its occupation following World War II, the German economy was found to be in a state of complete collapse. The people were on the point of starvation and it was necessary for the Allies, principally the United States, to make available large quantities of food and other civilian supplies to prevent disease and unrest and thereby protect the security of our troops. In later years aid to the Federal Republic was extended under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, and such aid also consisted largely of civilian supplies. To a great extent all of the aid has been of a type which was immediately consumed by the civilian population. In general, it did not increase the capital of the country and it cannot therefore be looked upon as an investment from which repayment can ultimately be effected. On the other hand, the aid extended by the United States was largely responsible for the progress which has been made in the revival of the German economy and the Federal Republic would be in no position today to consider the readjustment of its external debts had such aid not been extended. It should be borne in mind, however, that the Federal Republic is not yet on a completely self-sustaining basis and, although further economic recovery is expected, its capacity to service external debts will be limited for many years to come, particularly in view of the many internal financial problems with which the Federal Republic is faced and the contribution it is expected to make as a member of the European Defense Community, including the support of Allied troops stationed in the Federal Republic.

Aside from the claims of the Governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France for postwar economic assistance, which the Federal Republic acknowledges have a priority over all other external debts of Germany or German nationals, the Federal Republic is faced with large prewar obligations which have long been in default. If the Federal Republic is to normalize its trade and commercial relations and take its proper place among the free nations of the world, it is essential that these prewar debts be refunded and placed on a current basis within the Federal Republic's capacity to pay. It has not been possible to determine definitely the amount of these debts which are presently outstanding. A recent survey by the Central Bank of Germany places the debts at approximately $1,600,000,000 with accrued interest of $1,000,000,000. It is known, however, that this survey does not include certain types of obligations in substantial amounts with which it will be necessary to deal in the settlement program. According to the survey approximately 40 percent of the debts are held in the United States or are expressed in dollars. Of the balance, 18 percent is held in the United Kingdom; 15 percent is held in Switzerland; 11 percent is held in France; the residue by creditors in some 20 other countries. In taking an active part in the prewar debts settlement program, it is our intention to insure that the United States creditors receive fair and equitable treatment in relation to creditors located in other countries.

In view of the magnitude of the external debts, it is not believed that the Federal Republic has the capacity to liquidate all obligations, both prewar and postwar, in full within the foreseeable future. A substantial reduction in the amount of both prewar and postwar obligations must be anticipated, therefore, if we are to leave the Federal Republic with external debts which it can reasonably be expected to liquidate and avoid a repetition of the defaults which caused so many difficulties during the thirties.

Since a settlement of the claims of prewar creditors is necessary in order to restore normal commercial and trade relations between the Federal Republic and the free world, it was felt that the three Governments should be prepared to modify the priority of their postwar claims sufficiently to permit the Federal Republic to work out reasonable adjustments with prewar creditors and leave it with a total annual payments burden on both categories of debts within its reasonable capacity to pay. The problem was fully considered by the executive branch, and after consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems this Government joined with the Governments of the United Kingdom and France in tentatively offering to scale down the amounts of their claims as indicated in the press releases to which you referred. It is clearly understood, however, that the settlement of the postwar claims will be concluded only if the other German obligors are able to work out an equitable and reasonable settlement of their prewar obligations on payment terms which it can reasonably be expected will be met, taking into consideration the payments which will be required on the total postwar claims and other relevant factors.

It should be borne in mind also that due to the special situation of a divided Germany and the absence of a peace treaty, the total amount of the aid extended to Germany has been handled as a claim subject to final settlement of the amount due, rather than being extended on a grant basis, as was done to a substantial extent in the case of the other European countries. Of the economic aid extended by the United States to the other European countries since the end of the war, only about 35 percent has been on a repayment basis—including substantial postwar loans to the United Kingdom and France—the remainder being on an outright grant basis. Aside from other considerations involved, the Federal Republic's participation in western defense makes it desirable to accord it somewhat comparable treatment to that accorded the other European countries in respect of postwar economic assistance.

I trust that after consideration of the foregoing you will agree that the proposed settlement of the United States claim against the Federal Republic is not as you suggested in your letter for the purpose of benefiting the private holders of prewar claims against German obligors but rather an essential and equitable part of an over-all program to refinance the external obligations of the Federal Republic so as to bring them within its capacity to pay.

In the concluding paragraph of your letter you question the desirability of Herman J. Abs as head of the German delegation to the Debt Conference. You will appreciate that the selection of the head of the German delegation is a matter for the Government of the Federal Republic to decide. Moreover, as indicated in the Department's letter to you of December 15, 1949, we are in possession of no information which would warrant objection by this Government to the selection made by the Government of the Federal Republic.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. President, I have read this letter in full because I read into the RECORD in full the letter which I addressed to the State Department before it had an opportunity to reply.

There is one encouraging thing in the letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, and that is the positive assurance that the settlement terms, whatever they may be, will come before this body in the form of a treaty for consideration and such action as the Senate may see fit to take. My objection, which was voiced at the time of the letter, was that the reports which has been circulated, and which are verified to a large extent by the letter from Mr. McFall, were to the effect that priority was to be given to postwar debts, in the matter of economic assistance, after the amount had been scaled down from about three and one-half billion to one and one-half billion dollars.

In the first place, it was to be scaled down $2,000,000,000, and after that the Governments, including the United States, which were accorded this priority were understood to be ready to agree to subordinate or subrogate their priority position to some $1,500,000,000 or $2,000,000,000 owed to private investors from about 1920 on—people who had invested in prewar German bonds and are holding those obligations.

As verified by the statement of Mr. McFall, which I have just read, the agreement is to take into consideration Germany's financial position to meet the various demands made on her—prewar debts, postwar debts, and obligations for defense contributions. Taking those into consideration, it is thought just and proper to subordinate the claims of the Government of the United States to the claims of private investors, with respect to investments which were made at a time when it was anticipated that those buying the bonds were going to make a very substantial profit on the transaction.

It was for that reason that I asked two questions in the letter which I read to the Senate: First, by what authority did

the State Department assume, through this Commission, to cut down some $2,000,000,000 on the debts owing to the United States?

Second, under what authority was the procedure contemplated by which the claims of the United States would be subordinated to the claims of private investors, and private investors paid after $2,000,000,000 was loaded on the backs of American taxpayers?

I have read the letter in full, exactly as it was received. I repeat that I am greatly encouraged by the fact that it is stated that whatever agreement was reached last Friday, or whatever agreement comes out of the consultations, the whole matter of adjustment will come before the Senate in the form of a treaty so that the entire subject can be considered here.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I take it the distinguished Senator from Iowa is very well satisfied with the reply from the Department of State.

Mr. GILLETTE. No; the Senator from Iowa is not satisfied with the reply. The Senator from Iowa is very much pleased that the reply gives assurance that whatever adjustment is made, it will be presented to the Senate in the form of a treaty, rather than a fait accompli writing off of debts.

Mr. LANGER. In any event the Senator from Iowa is very much pleased at receiving the information from the Department of State.

Mr. GILLETTE. Definitely so.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Iowa think that the reply of the State Department is open, frank, and thorough?

Mr. GILLETTE. It is open, frank, and thorough.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. MCFARLAND that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because some question was raised on the floor of the Senate a while ago as to what had been said, I have before me the notes as they have just come from the Official Reporters, with no editing whatever on the part of either speaker. Appearing on folio 134–S of the reporter's notes is the following, picking up the reading in the remarks of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]:

Mr. President, it is astounding to me that Senators who profess to be in favor of tidelands legislation—Senators whose States are vitally interested in the subject—should subordinate the tidelands question to the interests of Hawaii. Whether for political reasons or otherwise, I cannot understand how patriotic Americans who say they want to do something for all the people of the United States can have a preference for Hawaii. I thought they were American citizens, not Hawaiian citizens.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say to the Senator from Texas that I very much resent his statement. I am as interested in the problems of my State as the able Senator from Texas is interested in the problems of his State. My State has as vital an interest in tidelands as does the State of Texas. However, the people in Hawaii, if the Senator from Texas does not know it, are just as much American citizens as are the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California.

I am surprised that the Senator from Texas should get up on the floor of the Senate and question the American citizenship of the 500,000 voiceless people of Hawaii, or that he should question the motives of any Senator.

There is not a single vote in the whole Territory of Hawaii for the Senator from California, who, like the Senator from Texas, must stand for reelection this year. The fact that neither of the Territories has a vote in the Senate does not place any less obligation upon those of us who are interested in bringing up other matters before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from California shows by his heat his tender affection for Hawaii, over a bill that affects all the people of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONNALLY Not now. I shall be glad to yield in a minute.

The Senator from California says that the people of Hawaii are already citizens. If they are already citizens, we do not need a bill which will make them citizens. He says that every one of them is a good American; that the people of Hawaii are as good citizens as are the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California. If he wants to classify himself in that category, he may do so, but I do not want to classify myself in that category. I think I am a better American than a great many people who live in Hawaii. I have been to Hawaii. The majority of the people there are not of American ancestry or descent.

I very much regret that the eminent Senator from California should feel offended by anything that I have said. I have said the truth. I have said the truth in everything that I have uttered.

As I said a moment ago, I am not satisfied with the tidelands bill as it is presented now in the Senate. The Senate has the power to amend that bill. It has the power to modify that bill. It has the power to restore title to the tidelands to the people of California, Texas, Louisiana, and all the other States.

I believe that the interests of all the people of the United States ought to be superior to the claims of the people of Hawaii and its contiguous territories, including the State of California. California ought not to occupy a different position than any other State in the Union.

I am sorry that the eminent Senator from California cannot conduct debate on the floor of the Senate without getting heated and making remarks about the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas has as much right to the floor of the Senate as has the Senator from California. The Senator from Texas is trying to represent not only the people of Texas, but all the people of the United States. I have no commission in my pocket in behalf of any foreign dependency or any foreign province or territory.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask not to be interrupted at this point so that there will be no misunderstanding about the fact that I am reading the remarks of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; and, therefore, I do not wish to get into a discussion of any extraneous matter.

I continue to read:

I am representing the people of Texas and, in a large sense, all the people of the United States. I am not on the brief for Hawaii or any other province out in the Pacific Ocean. I have a brief for the people of my State and for all the people of the United States.

I am sorry that this language will not suit the eminent Senator from California. I have been in the Senate several years. I know what this procedure is. I know that the custom is to follow the majority leadership in the matter of bringing up bills, and not give it into the hands of a little clique which has a selfish motive at heart; some little clique which will not let us do anything else if we do not do what it says we must do. In effect it says: "You will either bring up the Hawaii bill and pass it or you will not get any other legislation on the statute books."

Mr. President, I have concluded reading from the Official Reporters' transcript. I shall now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, at the point that I sought to interrogate the Senator from California I wished to call attention to the fact that the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had used the words "foreign dependency" and such phrases as "province in the Pacific Ocean."

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from California if it is not also true that he construed the words of the Senator from Texas as setting up two classes of citizens, those of the mainland and those of a foreign dependency or province?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not see any other interpretation that could be placed on the remarks of the Senator from Texas that I have just read into the RECORD, as they were uttered by the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CASE. Apparently the Senator from Texas did not know or chose to ignore the fact that the people of Hawaii are citizens today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. They are citizens; and, as the able Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, they have made their contribution to the Nation in three great wars and have even made heavier sacrifices in the Korean war, percentagewise, than have the other people of the United States.

Mr. CASE. By reason of those sacrifices and those contributions they are entitled to defense on the floor of the Senate when their honor or the quality of their citizenship seems to be impunged.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that there is at least a moral obligation upon a part of us who are here, when Hawaii is not represented in this Chamber.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Does not the Senator from California agree, however, that

despite the fact that technically they are the remarks which were made, what the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was trying to point out was that as between a bill which would grant statehood to Hawaii and the tidelands bill, because the tidelands bill had to do with oil and because oil is essential to our national defense, at this moment the Senator from Texas thought it was beneficial to all the people of the United States to consider the tidelands issue rather than to be debating the question of whether the Senate should take up the Hawaii statehood bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I have no intention of trying to interpret what the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had in mind. Let the RECORD speak for itself. Those of us who sat on the floor of the Senate heard what he said and we know what impression was made upon us.

Some question had been raised as to whether he had said what it was purported he had said. So that there would be no question about it I have on my own responsibility read the transcript of the remarks as it was furnished to me by the Official Reporters.

Mr. SMATHERS. I will say to the able Senator from California that I listened to the colloquy which transpired and I came to the conclusion that what the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] was trying to do and attempting to point out was that Senate Joint Resolution 20, which has for its purpose the development of oil in our country, was of vital interest to the defense of the Nation and to everybody in the Nation, and that it should be considered before the Hawaii statehood bill was considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think that could have been said by the Senator from Texas just as it has been said by the Senator from Florida, without casting any reflection upon the citizenship of the people of Hawaii. The Senator from Florida has made a very good point, which is entirely proper, that there may be honest differences of opinion as to any legislation which might be brought up in the Senate, but I have never found it necessary to place American citizens in a second-class category.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Dworshak	Hoey
Brewster	Eastland	Holland
Bricker	Ecton	Humphrey
Butler, Md.	Ellender	Hunt
Byrd	Ferguson	Ives
Cain	Flanders	Jenner
Carlson	Frear	Johnson, Colo.
Case	Fulbright	Johnson, Tex.
Clements	Gillette	Johnston, S. C.
Connally	Hayden	Kem
Cordon	Hendrickson	Kilgore
Douglas	Hennings	Knowland
Duff	Hill	Langer
Lehman	Moody	Smith, N. J.
Long	Mundt	Smith, N. C.
Magnuson	Murray	Sparkman
Malone	Nixon	Stennis
Martin	O'Conor	Thye
Maybank	O'Mahoney	Tobey
McCarran	Pastore	Underwood
McCarthy	Robertson	Watkins
McClellan	Russell	Wiley
McFarland	Saltonstall	Williams
McMahon	Schoeppel	Young
Millikin	Smathers	
Monroney	Smith, Maine	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because this debate has been going on for a number of days, and it has not been possible for the Senate to get a vote on the matter of whether to take up the tidelands legislation, or to get about the business which would have to be gotten out of the way first before any motions could be made regarding statehood for Hawaii, or any other legislation, for that matter, and because we have been discussing this situation for several days without being able to arrive at either a vote or the determination of a time for voting, I therefore move that the motion of the Senator from Arizona to take up Senate Joint Resolution 20 be tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. LANGER and Mr. KNOWLAND asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Case	Eastland
Bennett	Clements	Ecton
Bricker	Connally	Ellender
Butler, Md.	Cordon	Ferguson
Byrd	Douglas	Flanders
Cain	Duff	Frear
Carlson	Dworshak	Fulbright
Gillette	Long	Robertson
Hayden	Magnuson	Russell
Hendrickson	Malone	Saltonstall
Hennings	Martin	Schoeppel
Hill	Maybank	Smathers
Hoey	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Holland	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Humphrey	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hunt	McFarland	Sparkman
Ives	McMahon	Stennis
Jenner	Millikin	Thye
Johnson, Colo.	Monroney	Tobey
Johnson, Tex.	Moody	Underwood
Johnston, S. C.	Mundt	Watkins
Kem	Murray	Wiley
Kilgore	Nixon	Williams
Knowland	O'Conor	Young
Langer	O'Mahoney	
Lehman	Pastore	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to lay on the table the motion of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20. The question is not debatable. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KILGORE (when his name was called). A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KILGORE. What is the Senate voting on at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote is on the motion to lay on the table the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20, the so-called tidelands joint resolution. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The roll call was resumed and concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER and Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If

present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The vote was recapitulated.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. For what purpose does the Senator arise?

Mr. McFARLAND. How am I recorded as voting?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, how am I recorded as voting?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the negative.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how am I recorded as voting?

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the negative.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, how am I recorded as voting?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is recorded as voting in the negative.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TOBEY. Based upon the long experience of the Vice President as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, does it not seem to him astonishing that there are so many instances of mental aberration on the part of Senators on the other side of the aisle?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. It is very unparliamentary. [Laughter.]

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—39

Anderson	Hendrickson	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Nixon
Bricker	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Saltonstall
Cain	Ives	Schoeppel
Carlson	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Case	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Lehman	Thye
Douglas	Magnuson	Tobey
Dworshak	Martin	Watkins
Ecton	McCarthy	Wiley
Ferguson	Millikin	Williams
Flanders	Mundt	Young

NAYS—37

Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Monroney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Moody
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Duff	Kem	Pastore
Eastland	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Langer	Russell
Frear	Long	Smathers
Fulbright	Malone	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	Maybank	Sparkman
Hayden	McCarran	Stennis
Hill	McClellan	Underwood
Hoey	McFarland	
Holland	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken	Dirksen	McKellar
Benton	George	Morse
Brewster	Green	Neely
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Seaton
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Taft
Capehart	Kerr	Welker
Chavez	Lodge	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay on the table Mr. McFARLAND's motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20 was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hill	Monroney
Bennett	Hoey	Moody
Bricker	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	Nixon
Capehart	Jenner	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kem	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Douglas	Knowland	Schoeppel
Duff	Langer	Smathers
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Malone	Sparkman
Ferguson	Martin	Stennis
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Frear	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Underwood
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Hayden	McKellar	Williams
Hendrickson	McMahon	Young
Hennings	Millikin	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber a few moments ago when the Senate voted on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to reconsider the vote by which the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] was agreed to. Does the Senator from Tennessee wish to debate his motion?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not wish to debate it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—42

Byrd	Holland	McMahon
Capehart	Jenner	Monroney
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Mundt
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Ellender	Kem	O'Conor
Frear	Kilgore	Pastore
Fulbright	Long	Robertson
George	Malone	Russell
Gillette	Maybank	Smathers
Hayden	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Hennings	McClellan	Sparkman
Hill	McFarland	Stennis
Hoey	McKellar	Underwood

NAYS—38

Anderson	Flanders	Nixon
Bennett	Hendrickson	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Schoeppel
Cain	Ives	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Case	Langer	Thye
Cordon	Lehman	Tobey
Douglas	Magnuson	Watkins
Duff	Martin	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Murray	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Dirksen	Morse
Benton	Green	Seaton
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Taft
Bridges	Kefauver	Welker
Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	
Chavez	Lodge	

So Mr. McKELLAR's motion to reconsider the vote by which Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay Mr. McFARLAND's motion on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Joint Resolution 20. That motion is not debatable.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—37

Anderson	Hendrickson	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Humphrey	Saltonstall
Bricker	Hunt	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Ives	Smith, Maine
Cain	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Langer	Thye
Case	Lehman	Tobey
Cordon	Magnuson	Watkins
Douglas	Martin	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Murray	
Flanders	Nixon	

NAYS—43

Byrd	Holland	Monroney
Capehart	Jenner	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Duff	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Eastland	Kem	Pastore
Ellender	Kilgore	Robertson
Frear	Long	Russell
Fulbright	Malone	Smathers
George	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Gillette	McCarran	Sparkman
Hayden	McClellan	Stennis
Hennings	McFarland	Underwood
Hill	McKellar	
Hoey	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—16

Aiken	Dirksen	Morse
Benton	Green	Seaton
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Taft
Bridges	Kefauver	Welker
Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	
Chavez	Lodge	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay on the table Mr. MCFARLAND's motion was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now recurs on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope we may have a vote on the motion, in order that we may go ahead with the consideration of this bill. We could almost have had it finished, had it not been opposed the other day.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] would each vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is paired with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts wolud vote "yea" and the Senator from Ohio would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oregon would vote "nay" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—47

Anderson	Hill	McMahon
Byrd	Hoey	Monroney
Capehart	Holland	Moody
Case	Hunt	Mundt
Clements	Jenner	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Duff	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Ecton	Kem	Russell
Ellender	Kilgore	Smathers
Frear	Long	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	Malone	Sparkman
George	Maybank	Stennis
Gillette	McClellan	Underwood
Hayden	McFarland	Young
Hennings	McKellar	

NAYS—32

Bennett	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Ives	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Knowland	Schoeppel
Cain	Langer	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Magnuson	Thye
Douglas	Martin	Tobey
Dworshak	McCarthy	Watkins
Ferguson	Millikin	Wiley
Flanders	Murray	Williams
Hendrickson	Nixon	

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken	Dirksen	McCarran
Benton	Green	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Seaton
Bridges	Kefauver	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Kerr	Welker
Chavez	Lodge	

So the motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope that we may proceed with the consideration of the joint resolution and dispose of it very rapidly. I should like to work out a unanimous-consent agreement on limitation of debate upon this proposed legislation. When I first came to the Senate frequently unanimous-consent agreements were entered into whereby each Senator was limited to 30 minutes on each amendment and to 1 hour on the bill itself. If we may have that kind of a limitation, we can dispose of the pending joint resolution without much delay. I think it is very important that the Senate dispose of it and go on to something else. We have wasted several days because of the resistance to the motion to take up this proposed legislation. We have a responsibility here in the Senate. We should proceed with the consideration and disposal of measures.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I must say to the able majority leader that some of us have convictions, and we do not want to be pushed around like so many dominos or so many checkers. We had a conviction that the bill granting statehood to Hawaii should be given consideration in this legislative body, and we only expressed our conviction.

Mr. McFARLAND. Which, of course, Senators had a right to do. I am not complaining of that.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, when the Senator says that we have wasted time, I do not think that statement is in the best grace. Our conviction was that the Hawaiian statehood bill should be given consideration on the floor, and we were not given an opportunity. We were not wasting time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. With all due deference to my good friend from Minnesota, the sooner we dispose of the measure which is now before the Senate the sooner we shall get around to the consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill.

I suggest to the Senator from Arizona that he permit 2 or 3 days to expire before undertaking to limit debate, because some Senators may want to speak for more than half an hour on the joint resolution. If they are given a day or two, I believe Senators who want to discuss it at greater length will get their remarks made before the limitation goes into effect.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, when is a filibuster not a filbuster?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not think there is any inclination to filibuster the proposed legislation which is before the Senate. I know Senators have worked hard to bring out the joint resolution and they are very much interested in having it come to a vote. I know, from having served in the committee with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], that he is very much interested in the question, and I am sure he has no inclination to filibuster, because

he wants to get the joint resolution passed. I am willing to allow more time before I ask for a unanimous consent agreement, but if we can limit debate we will expedite the consideration of the resolution, and I think it is important that we do so.

Let me say to my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] that I meant no offense in what I said. I hope we may proceed to the consideration of this proposed legislation very rapidly, and I hope we can have a limitation on debate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the distinguished minority leader a question. At 12 o'clock today he said that tomorrow he hoped to take up the Japanese Treaty. Now that the tidelands bill is before the Senate, I should like to ask, in the interest of orderly procedure, whether he intends to displace it tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have since been told that the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], would like a little time. I should like to ask him now if he desires to go ahead with the Japanese Peace Treaty tomorrow. Someone told me he had been ill and would prefer a little extra time before its consideration.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I appreciate the question. I would prefer to speak on the Japanese Treaty next week.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning on Wednesday morning the debate on the pending measure be limited to one-half hour to each Senator on amendments and 1 hour on the resolution; that all amendments must be germane; that the time be controlled equally by the proponents of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in the event that he is against the amendment, and, if not, by the distinguished minority leader or any Senator whom he may designate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Arizona if it is his intention to include in the unanimous-consent agreement an amendment which might be offered to strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute what is known as the quitclaim bill, a bill which passed the House of Representatives, surrendering all Federal title to the Continental Shelf, because if it is his intention to have that included in the unanimous-consent agreement, I know from what has been told me by Members on this side of the aisle consent would not be given. If the Senator will draw his unanimous-consent request in such fashion as to exclude that amendment from the limitation on debate, I think there would be much greater chance of obtaining consent.

Mr. McFARLAND. With that suggestion, Mr. President, I do exclude it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall first yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say that as the acting minority leader today I have had no opportunity to take the matter up with Members on this side of the aisle.

The Senator from Wyoming raises a very deep and profound question, about which I know very little. I think there are many questions involved, and I would hope that the majority leader would not press his unanimous-consent request tonight. If he does, I shall feel it my responsibility to object. I think it should go over at least until tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield now to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, because there was a discussion in progress on this side of the aisle, I am not sure that I quite understand the issue raised by the Senator from Wyoming. Is it his point that the so-called quitclaim bill should be accepted as an amendment to the bill under consideration, or that it should be excluded from consideration under the unanimous consent agreement?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My statement to the Senator from Arizona was that, in my opinion, he would not be able to obtain a unanimous consent agreement if he was attempting to place a limitation on debate on that amendment. Therefore, I suggested to him that I thought it would be much easier to obtain a limitation upon debate if that amendment were excluded from the limitation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In other words, the quitclaim provision or amendment would be considered to be germane under the unanimous-consent agreement that is being requested by the Senator from Arizona; would it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be considered to be germane. It is germane. But it would not be subject to any limitation.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly hope the distinguished majority leader will not insist upon his suggestion at this time. So far as I am concerned, I shall have no objection to a reasonable limitation upon debate when the various points of view, of which there are several in respect to this matter, have been discussed at sufficient length to have the RECORD disclose what is really behind the proposed legislation.

At the same time, since the Senator from Wyoming has mentioned one of the so-called quitclaim bills, but not the other, I think the RECORD should affirmatively show at this time that there is another quitclaim bill, which does not extend to the Continental Shelf, but only to the constitutional limits of the several maritime States. The latter bill has been introduced by 35 Senators and is supported by other Senators, so I think this is a proper occasion for those 35 Senators to have their measure considered.

I certainly have full intention, as I believe it is equally the intention of other Senators who are associated with me, to see that the Senate has an opportunity to consider this particular measure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Before I yield to the Senator from Wyoming, I wish to make very clear the fact that I do not wish to preclude anybody from being heard at sufficient length to make his case in full, but I expect to be heard on S. 940, and I believe there are other Senators who feel as I do.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think the RECORD should show at this time that there is no oil within the States of a great many Senators who are supporting S. 940, or within the so-called submerged lands adjoining their States. Therefore, those Senators are not particularly concerned with the oil question. But they are very definitely and actively concerned with the idea of turning over to a Federal bureaucracy the question of deciding whether we shall build a pier, whether we shall take shells from the bottom of our offshore lands, whether we shall take sponges, or whether several hundred hotels and other expensive structures which have been built at various places upon filled land extending into the open Atlantic or open Gulf are going to have their titles affected or clouded by having untimely, unfair, and unwise legislation passed by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I merely wished to make it crystal clear at this time that I expect, and I think it is a reasonable expectation, to have a courteous hearing, a hearing at which there will be sufficient time to make clear the tremendous values which lie within the whole question at issue, and which have nothing at all to do with oil. I wish to make that clear, so that the Senate can pass intelligently upon this question.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, to make sure that the RECORD does not completely mislead the public with respect to this proposed legislation, as the press seems to have done, I should like to correct the erroneous statement made here that the bill which will be offered by some Senators as a substitute for the pending bill, would give away all title to the Continental Shelf.

I believe we should understand that the House bill provides that lands within the original boundaries of certain States should belong to those States. I have made some study of this matter, and have found that that would amount to 4 percent of the submerged land which would be subject to the paramount power of the Federal Government.

It was further suggested in the proposed legislation that as to lands in the

sea beyond that point, the States should have a 37½ percent interest in mineral royalties, just as inland States have received a 37½ percent royalty interest in the Federal lands within the jurisdiction of those States.

It seems to me that we should stop misleading the public about this question. So far as I can determine with respect to the matter in my State, the Federal Government would continue to receive the lion's share of revenue from oil and gas production in the Gulf of Mexico, even if the House bill were passed. So I think it is time we stopped misleading the public into thinking that all the revenue derived from submerged lands would be turned over to the Federal Government.

As a matter of fact, two-thirds of the submerged land belonging to the United States is located around Alaska. Nobody thought of mentioning that when the matter of submerged lands was first discussed. As a matter of fact, after the discovery of oil and gas in the submerged lands along the shores of California, some Federal advocates were so anxious to get that oil that they refused to think of the other factors involved.

So, Mr. President, I think we should not lose sight of the fact that the Federal Government would retain control over more than 90 percent of submerged lands, even if the so-called quitclaim bills were passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely desire to say to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] that when I spoke of the quitclaim bill, I had in mind the bill which he and 34 other Senators sponsored, as well as the bill which passed the House of Representatives. Perhaps my language was inadequate to convey that idea. I was merely advising the Senator from Arizona that, in my opinion, it would be possible to secure unanimous consent to limit debate reasonably upon S. J. Res. 20, with amendments relating thereto, but not upon amendments which would in effect substitute another measure for it. I believe we will make better speed in that way.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to suggest to the Senate that the Senator from Arizona has made a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. McFARLAND. Senators have a right to object. I think this colloquy is wholesome and may expedite the procedure.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to suggest that Senators can proceed only if the Senator from Arizona yields.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent to yield to Senators who wish to speak on the subject before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield in order that I may finish my statement?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to make clear to the Senator from Florida, and to all others who may wish to offer amendments to this bill which would change its nature, that I feel there should be a complete opportunity for them to explain the merits of such proposals, and there should be a complete opportunity for the opponents to explain their opposition. As to all other matters we can probably get a limitation of debate.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I think ample time should be allowed to discuss the all-important quitclaim amendment in whatever form it may take. Certainly there should be no disposition to shut off reasonable debate.

I wish to say one more word. In view of the allegations made by the distinguished majority leader to the effect that a great deal of time has been wasted upon the Alaska and Hawaii statehood bills, I wish to have the RECORD made clear.

The delay has not been the result of any efforts or any steps taken by the proponents of the measure. There has been no disposition whatsoever to delay action. The Alaskan and Hawaiian bills are the result of definite pledges contained in the platforms of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, pledges by which I consider myself bound, and by which I believe a great many of my associates in the Senate consider themselves bound.

The Alaskan statehood bill came up for consideration, but we were estopped from voting on it. We were estopped from registering our viewpoint and our desire to grant statehood to Alaska, in accordance with pledges made, and in accordance with the views of a very substantial portion of the membership of the Senate.

I do not believe that the delay has been the fault of the proponents of the bills. So far as I am concerned, I shall use every effort within my power to bring up those bills again just as promptly as possible, in order to redeem what I consider to be pledges by the two parties, pledges in which I participated, and on which I ran for election to the Senate on at least three occasions. I wish to have the RECORD show my feelings, which I believe are shared by a substantial number of my colleagues in the Senate. I do not believe that it is fair to say that the fault for any delay, if there was delay, is attributable to the effort of the proponents of the bills. Quite the opposite. We have tried in every way to expedite action on those two bills.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, so far as any delay is concerned, I was not trying to place responsibility for the delay at the door of anyone. However, the fact remains that there has been delay. I was merely trying to make an appeal to the Senate to go ahead and dispose of the legislation which is now pending before the Senate, so that we can proceed with something else.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I now yield to the Senator from Arkansas, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the majority leader if, in contemplating the making of a unanimous-consent agreement, he has taken into account the fact that we have a reorganization plan before us, with respect to which there is a deadline, and upon which the Senate must act before midnight on the 14th of this month. I am not sure, but I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In the event a unanimous consent agreement were entered into with respect to the pending measure, to vote at a certain time, or to begin voting on amendments at a certain time, with a limited time for discussion, would a privileged matter such as a reorganization plan, or a resolution disapproving a reorganization plan, be privileged to the extent that it might set aside the unanimous consent agreement?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The law and the rules provide that a reorganization plan is a privileged matter. It may be taken up at any time, without displacing the unfinished business, and when the consideration of the reorganization plan is concluded the unfinished business automatically comes back before the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thought that was correct; but in view of the fact that the time is limited and we are trying to process that plan and get it to the floor of the Senate, I thought that fact should be taken into account before any unanimous consent agreement is entered into.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will cooperate with the majority leader in any way I can. However, there is an amendment to the joint resolution which is sponsored by 19 Senators. It is the so-called oil-for-education amendment. We shall certainly want the time properly to present that amendment. I do not believe that it will require any great amount of time. Certainly we have no disposition unduly to delay consideration of this proposed legislation, but we shall wish time adequately and properly to present that amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to express to the Senator from Arizona the hope that if and when the unanimous consent agreement is propounded, it will include some kind of limitation on all

amendments. Otherwise we shall have no limitation on the joint resolution or any of the amendments. I think it would be futile to have a unanimous consent agreement with respect to the so-called quitclaim amendment, and then leave the situation wide open for filibuster or other purposes in connection with other amendments. I think there should be adequate time for debate on all amendments. Whatever time is agreed upon, I do not believe that one question should be left completely open while limitations are enforced with respect to everything else.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20 VALIDATES LEASES BUT GOVERNMENT RETAINS LANDS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the majority leader, that it seems to me to be a very inappropriate time to ask for a limitation of debate on something with respect to which I am sure the Senate as a whole is entirely ignorant, that is to say, ignorant of what the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has reported to the Senate.

I note that there are many Senators who would deed these lands outright to the States and many who would retain the lands in Government ownership.

This particular measure, Senate Joint Resolution 20, is neither fish nor fowl. It would retain the ownership of the lands in the Government, and validates the leases already made by the separate States to the companies, so that the oil would be gone, but the United States would retain the land.

I have never heard anyone argue for such a theory, except the committee which proposed it as an interim bill. Even most of the committeemen denied that they would vote for it on the floor of the Senate.

It seems to me that it might be advantageous to hear a little debate on the Senate joint resolution which validates all of the leases made by the State to the companies, but allows the Government to retain ownership of the lands.

Two members of the committee voted against reporting this masterpiece of contradiction to the Senate floor. The junior Senator from Nevada was one of those.

Why we should ask for a limitation of debate on the first day, before there has been any debate and before the Senate understands what is before it is entirely beyond me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in view of what has been said, I shall not at this time press the request for a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate. It is evident that it would be objected to. However, I wanted the Senate to begin thinking about the subject, because I wish to expedite consideration of it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. The Senator need have no fear that Senators have not been thinking about the subject.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Arizona has had to say about "reasonableness" in the conduct of the business of the Senate. I agree largely with what he has had to say. I think it is in the public interest that we proceed with due regard to the rights and interests of others.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I ask the Senator from Arizona if he does not feel that the same rules and principles should be applied to the conduct of the business of the Senate that is pending in the committees of the Senate?

Mr. McFARLAND. I think so. However, I do not control the committees.

Mr. KEM. I invite the attention of the Senator to a certain case which I have in mind. I am very glad that the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, is present today.

On December 6, 1950, at the time Prime Minister Attlee was in Washington for a conference with the President of the United States, a resolution was submitted to obtain a full report on the results of the conferences, with respect to any agreements which were made at that time by the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain. That resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and was promptly pigeonholed. It has not been heard from since.

On January 14, 1952, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] submitted a similar resolution, for the same purpose, at the time of the visit of Mr. Churchill to Washington, and during his conferences with the President of the United States. That resolution was also referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and was not heard from again.

On January 14, 1952, I submitted to the Senate a resolution calling for an investigation of certain phases of the policy of the State Department. That resolution was referred to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. It has not since been heard from. I have asked for an opportunity to appear before that committee to present my views in connection with those resolutions. That opportunity has not been accorded me. So, Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Arizona, as I have said to him on other occasions, that many of us on this side of the aisle feel that the Senator from Arizona and some of his colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to operate while we cooperate; in other words, he asks us on many occasions to extend to him cooperation in furthering the business of the Senate, but when we have some ideas which we think are for the good of the Nation or in the public interest, on which we would like to have some measure of cooperation on his side of the aisle, such as an opportunity to present ideas for consideration, we are not extended such cooperation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say to my good friend the Senator from Missouri that I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I regret that I am unable to help him in that regard, because I am not a member of the committee. I have wanted to be a member of the committee on a few occasions, but I have always yielded to other Senators. If I had been a member of the committee of course I might be quite willing to be helpful.

Mr. KEM. I notice that the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, is on the floor. I wonder if he would elucidate his view as to whether cooperation is a one-way street or a two-way street.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is a generality which the Senator from Texas does not care to deny or affirm. It depends on what one is trying to be cooperative about. If one is trying to cooperate in the consideration of a bill, that is one thing; if he wants to cooperate in the passing of a bill, that is another thing. I shall be glad to hear the Senator from Missouri at some time in the committee if he wants to come before it.

Mr. KEM. I am very glad to have the Senator's assurance. I thank him for his courtesy, which is not unusual. I should like to be heard at the earliest possibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. That will be a long time, I am afraid.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to defer to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, that statement of the Senator from Texas is an example of what I had in mind. When I make inquiry as to whether cooperation is a one-way street or a two-way street, the Senator from Texas assures me that I will be given an opportunity to be heard, but at the same time he adds that it will be a long time before I am heard.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arizona. First I wish to commend as strongly as I can the Senator from Arizona for insisting upon his motion. I believe that the responsibility of leadership which rests upon his shoulders fully justified his insisting upon it. I am glad that the motion has prevailed.

I think that a matter so momentous as the tidelands question, which many of us have been trying to get up for consideration for 5½ years, at least ever since I have been a Member of this body, justifies consideration by the Senate at this time.

With reference to the proposed unanimous-consent request, I may say to the distinguished majority leader that I hope he will not renew his request for a unanimous-consent agreement until

after each of the four or five major points of view have had a chance to be explained with reasonable clarity on the floor of the Senate.

Of course, there is pending Senate Joint Resolution 20 of which the Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, will be an able exponent. Undoubtedly there will also be other Senators who will wish to support the joint resolution.

There is the so-called Walters bill, which comes from the House of Representatives, and it has the impetus of passage there by a very heavy vote. I understand that both Senators from Texas and both Senators from Louisiana have a material interest in pressing that particular bill. I believe they are entitled to be heard on it.

With reference to the measure which I mentioned a while ago, the quitclaim bill, which goes out to the constitutional limits of the States, and which 35 Senators have sponsored, among whom I am one, I feel that those Senators are entitled to be heard also.

There is also the measure which was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in which he and other Senators propose to give away a very vital heritage of maritime States for a mess of educational pottage. I believe that they too are entitled to be heard to the length that it is necessary in order to be fully understood.

Mr. President, when those various measures and points of view have had a chance to be explained fully I want to assure the Senator from Arizona that I shall be happy to support any reasonable request he may make at that time by which the same kind of limitation will be applied to one proposal as will be applied to the others, and by means of which the Senate can expeditiously move to a decision.

I hope the Senator from Arizona will not make a request for such a limitation on debate without first suggesting the absence of a quorum, because there are some of us who should not be on the floor, as the Senator from Arizona well knows, but who are here at some risk. I believe we would be entitled to be given a little advance notice when there is to be a request made for a limitation of debate. Therefore, the Senator from Florida very respectfully requests the majority leader to suggest the absence of a quorum when such a unanimous-consent request for a limitation of debate on this subject is about to be presented.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall certainly discuss the matter with the Senator from Florida before I make such a request.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Arizona yields the floor, will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Arizona has not cleared up in my mind the question of when he intends to bring up the Japanese peace treaty.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] left his sickbed to come to the floor today. He is very much interested in the Japanese Peace Treaty. After I made the announcement, I understood that he felt he was not prepared to proceed today, and as a courtesy to him we should wait for a day or two until he can be here.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Arizona give us any assurance that he will not call up the Japanese Peace Treaty before Thursday, or perhaps Friday, of this week, so that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] may begin his discussion on Monday of next week.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, we cannot agree that the treaty go over until Monday. We do not know what will happen before Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall try to consult with the Senator from New Jersey and work out something satisfactory to everyone.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], I submit amendments in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by us jointly to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments, which are identical with House bill 4484, which was passed by the House by a vote of 265 to 109 on July 30 last, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and without objection the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments submitted by Mr. CONNALLY for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Texas are as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this joint resolution may be cited as the 'Submerged Lands Act.'

"TITLE I

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 2. When used in this joint resolution—

"(a) The term 'lands beneath navigable waters' includes (1) all lands within the boundaries of each of the respective States which were covered by waters navigable under the laws of the United States at the time such State became a member of the Union, and all lands permanently or periodically covered by tidal waters up to but not above the line of mean high tide and seaward to a line three geographical miles distant from the coast line of each such State and to the boundary line of each such State where in any case such boundary as it existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by Congress, extends seaward (or into the Great Lakes or Gulf of Mexico) beyond three geographical miles, and (2) all filled-in, made, or reclaimed lands which formerly were lands beneath navigable waters, as herein defined; the term 'boundaries' includes the seaward boundaries of a State or its boundaries in the Gulf of Mexico or any of the Great Lakes as they existed at the time such State became a member of the Union, or as heretofore or hereafter approved by the Congress, or as extended or confirmed pursuant to section 4 hereof;

"(b) The term 'coast line' means the line of ordinary low water along that portion of the coast which is in direct contact with the open sea and the line marking the seaward limit of inland waters, which include all estuaries, ports, harbors, bays, channels, straits, historic bays, and sounds, and all other bodies of water which join the open sea;

"(c) The terms 'grantees' and 'lessees' include (without limiting the generality thereof) all political subdivisions, municipalities, public and private corporations, and other persons holding grants or leases from a State, or its predecessor sovereign, to lands beneath navigable waters if such grants or leases were issued in accordance with the constitution, statutes, and decisions of the courts of the State in which such lands are situated, or of its predecessor sovereign: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall be construed as conferring upon said grantees or lessees any greater rights or interests other than are described herein and in their respective grants from the State, or its predecessor sovereign;

"(d) The term 'natural resources' shall include, without limiting the generality thereof, fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life but shall not include water power or the use of water for the production of power at any site where the United States now owns the water power;

"(e) The term 'lands beneath navigable waters' shall not include the beds of streams in lands now or heretofore constituting a part of the public lands of the United States if such streams were not meandered in connection with the public survey of such lands under the laws of the United States;

"(f) The term 'continental shelf' means all submerged lands (1) which lie outside and seaward of lands beneath navigable waters as defined hereinabove in section 2 (a), and (2) of which the subsoil and natural resources appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction and control;

"(g) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior;

"(h) The term 'State' means any State of the Union;

"(i) The term 'coastal States' shall mean those States any portion of which borders upon the Atlantic Ocean, the Gulf of Mexico, or the Pacific Ocean;

"(j) The term 'person' includes any citizen of the United States, an association of such citizens, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or a private, public, or municipal corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State;

"(k) The term 'lease' whenever used with reference to action by a State or its political subdivision or grantee prior to January 1, 1949, shall be regarded as including any form of authorization for the use, development, or production of lands beneath navigable waters and the natural resources therein and thereunder; and the term 'lessee' whenever used in such connection shall be regarded as including any person having the right to develop or produce natural resources and any person having the right to use or

develop lands beneath navigable waters under any such form of authorization;

"(l) The term 'Mineral Leasing Act' shall mean the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437; 30 U. S. C., sec. 181 and the following), and all acts heretofore enacted which are amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

"TITLE II

"LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS WITHIN STATE BOUNDARIES

"SEC. 3. Rights of the States: It is hereby determined and declared to be in the public interest that title to and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and the natural resources within such lands and waters, and the right and power to control, develop, and use the said natural resources all in accordance with applicable State law be, and they are hereby, subject to the provisions hereof, recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States or the persons who were on June 5, 1950, entitled thereto under the property law of the respective States in which the land is located, and the respective grantees, lessees, or successors in interest thereof; and the United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto said States and persons aforesaid all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all said lands, moneys, improvements, and natural resources, and releases and relinquishes all claims of the United States, if any it has, arising out of any operations of said States or persons pursuant to State authority upon or within said lands and navigable waters. The rights, powers, and titles hereby recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States and their grantees are subject to each lease executed by a State, or its grantee, which was in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease, and such rights, powers, and titles are further subject to the rights herein now granted to any person holding any such lease to continue to maintain the lease, and to conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions, for the full term thereof, and any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued such lease: *Provided, however,* That, if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on and before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease: *Provided, however,* That all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease and the laws of the State issuing or whose grantee issued such lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date hereof, which have not been paid to the State or its grantee issuing it or to the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, shall be paid to the State or its grantee issuing such lease within 90 days from the effective date hereof: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this joint resolution shall affect the use, development, improvement, or control by or under the constitutional authority of the United States of said lands and waters for the purposes of navigation or flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns or may hereafter acquire the water power or be construed as the release or relinquishment of any rights of the United States arising under the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate or improve navigation or to provide for flood control or the production of power at any site where the United States now owns the water power: *Provided further,* That nothing in this joint resolution shall be construed as affecting or intending to affect or in any way interfere with or modify the laws of the States which lie wholly or in part westward of the ninety-eighth meridian, relating to the ownership and control of ground and surface waters; and the control, appropriation, use, and distribution of such waters shall continue to be in accordance with the laws of such States.

"SEC. 4. Seaward boundaries: Any State which has not already done so may extend its seaward boundaries to a line three geographical miles distant from its coast line, or in the case of the Great Lakes, to the international boundary of the United States. Any claim heretofore or hereafter asserted either by constitutional provision, statute, or otherwise, indicating the intent of a State so to extend its boundaries is hereby approved and confirmed, without prejudice to its claim, if any it has, that its boundaries extend beyond that line. Nothing in this section is to be construed as questioning or in any manner prejudicing the existence of any State's seaward boundary beyond three geographical miles if it were so provided by its constitution or laws prior to or at the time such State became a member of the Union, or if it has been heretofore or is hereafter approved by Congress.

"SEC. 5. Exceptions from operation of section 3 of this joint resolution: There is excepted from the operation of section 3 of this joint resolution—

"(a) all specifically described tracts or parcels of land and resources therein or improvements thereon title to which has been lawfully and expressly acquired by the United States from any State or from any person in whom title had vested under the decisions of the courts of such State, or their respective grantees, or successors in interest, by cession, grant, quitclaim, or condemnation, or from any other owner or owners thereof by conveyance or by condemnation, provided such owner or owners had lawfully acquired the title to such lands and resources in accordance with the statutes or decisions of the courts of the State in which the lands are located; and

"(b) such lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States and such interests therein as are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

"SEC. 6. Powers retained by the United States: (a) The United States retains all its powers of regulation and control of said lands and navigable waters for the purposes of commerce, navigation, national defense, and international affairs, none of which includes any of the proprietary rights of ownership, or of use, development, and control of the lands and natural resources which are specifically recognized, confirmed, established, and vested in the respective States and others by section 3 of this joint resolution.

"(b) In time of war when necessary for national defense, and the Congress or the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price, all or any portion of the said natural resources, or to acquire and use any portion of said lands by proceeding in accordance with due process of law and paying just compensation therefor.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this joint resolution shall be deemed to amend, modify, or repeal the acts of July 26, 1866 (14 Stat. 251), July 9, 1870 (16 Stat. 217), March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. 377), June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

"TITLE III

"CONTINENTAL SHELF OUTSIDE STATE BOUNDARIES

"SEC. 8. Jurisdiction over Continental Shelf: (a) It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States that the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the Continental Shelf appertain to the United States and are subject to its jurisdiction, control, and power of disposition as provided in this joint resolution. Except to the extent that it is exercised in a manner inconsistent with applicable Federal laws, the police power of each coastal State may extend to that portion of the Continental Shelf which would be within the boundaries of such State if extended seaward to the outer margin of the Continental Shelf. The police power includes, but is not limited to, the power of taxation, conservation, and control of the manner of conducting geophysical explorations. This joint resolution shall be construed in such manner that the character as high seas of the waters above the Continental Shelf and the right to their free and unimpeded navigation shall not be affected.

"(b) Oil and gas deposits in the Continental Shelf shall be subject to control and disposal only in accordance with the provisions of this joint resolution and no rights in or claims to such deposits, whether based upon applications filed or other actions taken heretofore or hereafter, shall be recognized except in accordance with the provisions of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 9. Provisions for leasing of Continental Shelf: (a) When requested by any responsible and qualified person interested in purchasing oil and gas leases on any area of the Continental Shelf not then under lease issued by the abutting State or the Federal Government, or when in the Secretary's opinion there is a demand for the purchase of such leases, the Secretary shall offer for sale, on competitive sealed bidding, oil and gas leases on such area. Subject to the other terms and provisions hereof, sales of leases shall be made to the responsible and qualified bidder bidding the highest cash bonus per leasing unit. Notice of sale of oil and gas leases shall be published at least 30 days before the date of sale in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Secretary, which publication shall contain (i) a description of the tracts into which the area to be leased has been subdivided by the Secretary for leasing purposes, such tracts being herein called "leasing units"; (ii) the minimum bonus per acre which will be accepted by the Secretary on each leasing unit; (iii) the amount of royalty as specified hereinafter in section 9 (d); (iv) the amount of rental per acre per annum on each leasing unit as specified hereinafter in section 9 (d); and (v) the time and place at which all bids shall be opened in public.

"(b) The leasing units shall be in reasonably compact form of such area and dimensions as may be determined by the Secretary, but shall not be less than 640 acres nor more than 2,560 acres if within the known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field and shall not be less than 2,560 acres nor more than 7,680 acres if not within any known geologic structure of a producing oil or gas field.

"(c) Oil and gas leases sold under the provisions of this section shall be for the primary term of 5 years and shall continue so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced therefrom in paying quantities. Each lease shall contain provisions requiring the exercise of reasonable diligence, skill, and care in the operation of the lease, and requiring the lessee to conduct his operations thereon in accordance with sound and efficient oil-

field practices to prevent waste of oil or gas discovered under said lease or the entrance of water through wells drilled by him to the oil or gas sands or oil- and gas-bearing strata or the injury or destruction of the oil and gas deposits.

"(d) Each lease shall provide that, on or after the discovery of oil or gas, the lessee shall pay a royalty of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the leasing unit and, in any event, not less than $1 per acre per annum in lieu of rental for each lease year commencing after discovery. If after discovery of oil or gas the production thereof should cease from any cause, the lease shall not terminate if lessee commences additional drilling or reworking operations within 90 days thereafter or, if it be within the primary term, commences or resumes the payment or tender of rentals or commences operations for drilling or reworking on or before the rental paying date next ensuing after the expiration of 90 days from date of cessation of production. All leases issued hereunder shall be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a rental of $1 per acre per annum for the second and every lease year thereafter during the primary term and in lieu of drilling operations on or production from the leasing unit, all such rentals to be payable on or before the beginning of each lease year.

"(e) If, at the expiration of the primary term of any lease, oil or gas is not being produced in paying quantities on a leasing unit, but drilling operations are commenced not less than 180 days prior to the end of the primary term and such drilling operations or other drilling operations have been and are being diligently prosecuted and the lessee has otherwise performed his obligations under the lease, the lease shall remain in force so long as drilling operations are prosecuted with reasonable diligence and in a good and workmanlike manner, and if they result in the production of oil or gas so long thereafter as oil or gas is produced therefrom in paying quantities.

"(f) Should a lessee in a lease issued under the provisions of title III of this joint resolution fail to comply with any of the provisions of this joint resolution or of the lease, such lease may, upon proper showing, be canceled in an appropriate court proceeding because of such failure; but before the institution of such a court proceeding the Secretary shall allow the lessee 20 days in which to show cause in writing why the proceeding should not be instituted, and any submission made by the lessee during that period shall be given consideration by the Secretary in determining whether to recommend to the Attorney General that a court proceeding be instituted against the lessee. If a lease or any interest therein is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, in violation of any of the provisions of this joint resolution the lease may be canceled, or the interest so owned or controlled may be forfeited or the person so owning or controlling the interest may be compelled to dispose of the interest in an appropriate court proceeding.

"(g) The provisions of sections 17, 17 (b), 28, 30, 30 (a), 30 (b), 32, 36, and 39 of the Mineral Leasing Act to the extent that such provisions are not inconsistent with the terms of this joint resolution are made applicable to lands leased or subject to lease by the Secretary under title III of this joint resolution.

"(h) Each lease shall contain such other terms and provisions consistent with the provisions of this joint resolution as may be prescribed by the Secretary. The Secretary may delegate his authority under this joint resolution to officers or employees of the Department of the Interior and may authorize subdelegation to the extent that he may deem proper.

"(i) Citizens of another country, the laws, customs, or regulations of which deny similar or like privileges to citizens or corporations of this country, shall not directly or by stock ownership, stock holding, stock control, trusteeship, or otherwise, own or control any interest in any lease acquired under the provisions of this section. Any ownership or interest forbidden in this section which may be acquired by descent, will, judgment, or decree may be held for 2 years and not longer after its acquisition. No lands leased under the provisions of this section shall be subleased, trusteed, possessed, or controlled by any device or in any manner whatsoever so that they form a part of or are in anywise controlled by any combination in the form of an unlawful trust, with the consent of the lessee, or form the subject in whole or in part of any contract, agreement, understanding, or conspiracy, entered into by the lessee, to restrain trade or commerce in the production or sale of oil or gas or to control the price of oil or gas.

"(j) Any lease obtained through the exercise of fraud or misrepresentation, or which is not performed in accordance with its terms or with this law, may by appropriate court action be invalidated.

"SEC. 10. Exchange of existing State leases in Continental Shelf for Federal leases: (a) The Secretary is authorized and directed to issue a lease to any person in exchange for a lease covering lands in the continental shelf which (i) was issued by any State or its grantee prior to January 1, 1949, and which was in force and effect on June 5, 1950, in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease, or (ii) was issued with the approval of the Secretary subsequent to January 1, 1949, and prior to the effective date of this joint resolution and which on the effective date hereof was in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. Any lease issued pursuant to this section shall be for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the unexpired term of the old lease, or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, the same: *Provided, however*, That, if oil or gas was not being produced from such old lease on and before December 11, 1950, then any such new lease shall be for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of the old lease or any extensions, renewals or replacements authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing or whose grantee issued such lease, shall cover the same natural resources and the same portion of the continental shelf as the old lease, shall provide for payment to the United States of the same rentals, royalties, and other payments as are provided for in the old lease, and shall include such other terms and provisions, consistent with the provisions of this joint resolution, as may be prescribed by the Secretary. Operations under such old lease may be conducted as therein provided until the issuance of an exchange lease hereunder or until it is determined that no such exchange lease shall be issued. No lease which has been determined by appropriate court action to have been obtained by fraud or misrepresentation shall be accepted for exchange under this section.

"(b) No such exchange lease shall be issued unless, (i) an application therefor, accompanied by a copy of the lease from the State or its political subdivision or grantee offered in exchange, is filed with the Secretary within 6 months from the effective date of this joint resolution, or within such further period as provided in section 18 hereof, or as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary; (ii) the applicant states in his application that the lease applied for shall be subject to the same overriding royalty obligations as the lease issued by the State or its political subdivision or grantee; (iii) the applicant pays to the United States all rentals, royalties, and other sums due to the lessor under the old lease which have or may become payable after December 11, 1950, and which have not been paid to the lessor under the old lease; (iv) the applicant furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other reasonable requirements as the Secretary may deem necessary to protect the interests of the United States; and (v) the applicant files with the Secretary a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction showing that the old lease was in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the laws of the State issuing it on the applicable date provided for in paragraph (a) of this section; or, in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavit, receipts, canceled checks, and other documents showing such facts.

"(c) All rents, royalties, and other sums payable under any such lease after December 11, 1950, and before the issuance of an exchange lease as herein provided, may be paid to the United States, subject, however, to accounting to the State which issued such lease or under whose authority the same was issued, in accordance with the provisions of section 12 hereof.

"(d) In the event any lease covers lands of the Continental Shelf as well as other lands, the provisions of this section shall apply to such lease insofar only as it covers lands of the Continental Shelf.

"SEC. 11. Actions involving Continental Shelf: Any court proceeding involving the Continental Shelf may be instituted in the United States district court for the district in which the lessee, or the person owning or controlling the lease interest, may be found or for the district in which the leased property, or some part thereof, is located; or, if no part of the leased property is within any district, for the district nearest to the property involved.

"SEC. 12. Division of proceeds from the Continental Shelf: Each coastal State is hereby vested with the right to 37½ percent of all moneys received by the United States, after the effective date of this joint resolution, as bonus payments, rents, and royalties with respect to operations for oil, gas, or other minerals in lands in the Continental Shelf which would be within the boundaries of such State, if extended seaward to the outer margin of the Continental Shelf; and the Secretary of the Treasury within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year shall pay to each such State the moneys to which it is so entitled. All other moneys received by the United States from operations in the Continental Shelf, under the provisions of this joint resolution, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States and applied to the payment of the principal of the national debt. If and whenever the United States shall take and receive in kind all or any part of the royalties referred to in this section, the value of such royalties so taken in kind shall be deemed to be the prevailing market price thereof at the time and place of production, and there shall be paid to the State entitled thereto as provided in this section, 37½ percent of the value of such royalties.

"SEC. 13. Refunds: When it appears to the satisfaction of the Secretary that any person has made a payment to the United States in connection with any lease under this joint resolution in excess of the amount he was lawfully required to pay, such excess shall be repaid to such person or his legal representative, if a request for repayment of such excess is filed with the Secretary within 2 years

after the issuance of the lease or the making of the payment. The Secretary shall certify the amounts of all such repayments to the Secretary of the Treasury, who is authorized and directed to make such repayments out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated and to issue his warrant in settlement thereof.

"SEC. 14. Waiver of liability for past operations: (a) No State, or political subdivision or grantee thereof, shall be liable to or required to account to the United States in any way for entering upon, using, exploring for, developing, producing, or disposing of natural resources from lands covered by title II or title III of this joint resolution prior to the effective date of this joint resolution.

"(b) No lessee under any lease of submerged lands covered by this joint resolution and granted by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof prior to the effective date of this joint resolution shall be liable or required to account to the United States for the use of such lands or any natural resources produced, extracted, or removed under such lease or for the value thereof, nor shall any person who has purchased or otherwise acquired such lands or natural resources be liable to account to the United States therefor or for the value thereof.

"(c) If it shall be determined by appropriate court action that fraud has been practiced in the obtaining of any lease referred to herein or in the operations thereunder, the waivers provided in this section shall not be effective.

"SEC. 15. Powers reserved to the United States: The United States reserves and returns—

"(a) in time of war or when necessary for national defense, and when so prescribed by the Congress or the President, the right (i) of first refusal to purchase at the prevailing market price all or any portion of the oil or gas that may be produced from the Continental Shelf; (ii) to terminate any lease issued or authorized pursuant to or validated by title III of this joint resolution in which event the United States shall become the owner of wells, fixtures, and improvements located on the area of such lease and shall be liable to the lessee for just compensation for such leaseholds, wells, fixtures, and improvements, to be determined as in the case of condemnation; (iii) to suspend operations under any lease issued or authorized pursuant to or validated by title III of this joint resolution, in which event the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States; and payment of rentals, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease shall likewise be suspended during any period of suspension of operations, and the term of any suspended lease shall be extended by adding thereto any suspension period;

"(b) the right to designate by and through the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the President, as restricted, those areas of the Continental Shelf needed for navigational purposes or for national defense; and so long as such designation remains in effect no exploration or operations may be conducted on any part of the surface of such area except with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense; and if operations or production under any lease theretofore issued on lands within any such restricted area shall be suspended, any payment of rents, minimum royalty, and royalty prescribed by such lease likewise shall be suspended during such period of suspension of operation and production, and the term of such lease shall be extended by adding thereto any such suspension period, and the United States shall be liable to the lessee for such compensation as is required to be paid under the Constitution of the United States;

"(c) the ownership of and the right to extract helium from all gas produced from the Continental Shelf, subject to any lease issued pursuant to or validated by this joint resolution under such general rules and regulations as shall be prescribed by the Secretary, but in the extraction of helium from such gas it shall be so extracted as to cause no substantial delay in the delivery of gas produced to the purchaser of such gas.

"SEC. 16. Geological and geophysical explorations: The right of any person, subject to applicable provisions of law, and of any agency of the United States to conduct geological and geophysical explorations in the Continental Shelf, which do not interfere with or endanger actual operations under any lease issued pursuant to this joint resolution, is hereby recognized.

"SEC. 17. Rights of States not prejudiced: Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall operate to the prejudice of any State or of the United States in the determination by appropriate court action of any claim or claims of ownership or right of management, use, and disposition of the lands, minerals, or natural resources therein or thereunder within the Continental Shelf as these claims or rights may have existed prior to the passage of this joint resolution. Any State which is found by appropriate court action to have owned or possessed prior to the passage of this joint resolution, the rights of management, use, or disposition of the lands, minerals, or other natural resources within any part of the Continental Shelf shall not by this joint resolution be deprived of any such rights and powers.

"SEC. 18. Interpleader and interim arrangements: (a) Notwithstanding the other provisions of this joint resolution, if any lessee under any lease of submerged lands granted by any State, its political subdivisions, or grantees, prior to the effective date of this joint resolution, shall file with the Secretary a certificate executed by such lessee under oath and stating that doubt exists (i) as to whether an area covered by such lease lies within the Continental Shelf, or (ii) as to whom the rents, royalties, or other sums payable under such lease are lawfully payable, or (iii) as to the validity of the claims of the State which issued, or whose political subdivision or grantee issued, such lease to the area covered by the lease and that such claims have not been determined by a final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction—

"(1) the lessee may interplead the United States and, with their consent, the State or States concerned, in an action filed in the United States district court having jurisdiction of any part of the area, and, in the event of State consent to be interpleaded, deposit with the clerk of that court all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease after filing of such certificate, and such deposit shall be full performance of the lessee's obligation under such lease to make such payments; or

"(2) the lessee may continue to pay all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such lease to the State, its political subdivisions, or grantees, as in the lease provided, until it is determined by final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction that such rents, royalties, and other sums should be paid otherwise, and thereafter such rents, royalties, and other sums shall be paid by said lessee in accordance with the determination of such final judgment. In the event it shall be determined by such final judgment that the United States is entitled to any moneys theretofore paid to any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof, such State, its political subdivision, or grantee, as the case may be, shall promptly account to the United States therefore; or

"(3) the lessee of any such lease may file application for an exchange lease under section 10 hereof at any time prior to the expiration of 6 months after it is determined by final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction that the claims of the State which issued, or whose political subdivision or grantee issued, such lease to the area covered by the lease are invalid as against the United States and that the lands covered by such lease are within the Continental Shelf.

"(b) If any area of the Continental Shelf or other lands covered by this joint resolution included in any lease issued by a State or its political subdivision or grantee is involved in litigation between the United States and such State, its political subdivision, or grantee, the lessee in such lease shall have the right to intervene in such action and deposit with the clerk of the court in which such case is pending any rents, royalties, and other sums payable under the lease subsequent to the effective date of this joint resolution, and such deposit shall be full discharge and acquittance of the lessee for any payment so made.

"SEC. 19. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the joint resolution and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, my purpose in submitting the amendments is that if they are adopted and the bill is passed, there will be no dispute about a conference.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I appreciate the expression of cooperation which has been made by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] and his assurance that he will cooperate with Members on this side of the aisle. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if in his official capacity as majority leader he will use his good offices with the Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to secure within a reasonable time a hearing for the Senator from Missouri on the matters to which he has previously referred?

Mr. CONNALLY. What are the matters that the Senator from Missouri is talking about?

Mr. KEM. The resolution asking for a report from the President on his conferences with Mr. Attlee at the time Mr. Attlee was in Washington as Prime Minister of Great Britain; a resolution asking for a report from the President of the United States on his conferences with Mr. Churchill at the time Mr. Churchill was in Washington as Prime Minister of Great Britain; and a resolution, submitted by the Senator from Missouri, asking for an investigation of certain phases of State Department policy.

Mr. CONNALLY. That seems to be a very comprehensive program. How many resolutions does the Senator have? Does he have four resolutions?

Mr. KEM. Three resolutions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator from Missouri ask the President of the

United States or Mr. Churchill to let him sit in on their conferences?

Mr. KEM. Equity does not require one to perform a futile or useless act.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am asking the Senator from Missouri if he did. Did the Senator ask Mr. Churchill and Mr. Truman to let him sit in on their private conferences?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I decline to answer the question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then I decline to go any further with the Senator.

Mr. KEM. Very well.

Mr. President, I simply wish to say that the attitude of the Senator from Texas is apparent. If on some future occasion the cooperation from this side of the aisle is not exactly what the majority leader might expect or might have reason to expect, I think he need not be surprised.

Today I supported the position of the majority leader, and I was glad to do so because I thought he was right. But I must say that following such talk as we have just heard from the senior Senator from Texas, I will not be disposed to do so unless there is an entirely different attitude on the part of the majority leadership in the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation for the cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and I wish to express my hope that the Foreign Relations Committee will hear what he has to say. There are other members of the committee who can bring up the Senator's resolutions, and I hope he will have their cooperation.

Mr. KEM. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, regarding the remarks made by the Senator from Missouri, I advise him that his resolutions were brought up in the committee by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], but they were not acted upon because we did not have sufficient time.

So far as the Senator's threat is concerned, namely, that if we do not do what he wants us to do about his resolutions, we will not get any of his cooperation, the Senator implies that we will not get the cooperation of Senators on his side of the aisle. I am glad to know that he has charge of that side of the aisle. I am glad to know that whatever may be his attitude, the other Senators on his side of the aisle will take the same attitude. The Senator occupies a position of influence and strength which I did not realize, and I am glad to be advised of it.

I am not disposed to be unkind to the Senator from Missouri. However, these resolutions demand an investigation of what Mr. Truman said to Mr. Churchill and what Mr. Churchill said to Mr. Truman. Of course, neither this body nor any other legislative body will adopt such resolutions.

If the Senator from Missouri insists upon having his resolutions brought up, I can call them up in the committee for a vote, and can have the Senator from Missouri there and have him orate and storm and threaten and snort all he pleases.

However, even with the great strength he has as leader of the Republican side and the threat which he makes, namely, that if we do not do what he says, the Republican side will not cooperate, I doubt that his resolutions will prevail.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think the RECORD will show that the Senator from Texas has entirely misstated what I said. I did not undertake to represent anyone but myself. I said very plainly and explicitly that I myself had cooperated with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] in the proceedings in the Senate today. I think I was one of the few Senators on this side of the aisle who did so. I said further that if the position and the attitude of the Senator from Texas represented the attitude of the majority leadership in the Senate I should with reluctance cooperate again on a similar occasion.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. No, Mr. President; I do not yield quite yet.

I wish to say further that I am glad to know that the ideas of the Senator from Texas do not generally prevail on the majority side. If he spoke for the majority, I should tremble for the future of the Nation.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator can tremble all the time so far as I am concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I did not understand the comment of the Senator from Arizona to the Senator from Florida with respect to having a quorum call prior to the taking of a vote. May we have assurance that there will be a quorum call first?

Mr. McFARLAND. I told the Senator from Florida that I would consult him beforehand. If the distinguished Senator from New Mexico also wishes to be consulted, I shall also consult with him.

So far as a request for a quorum call is concerned, let me say that I do not like to make a commitment in advance, because there may come a time when all Members of the Senate will be on the floor, and to have a quorum call then would be a waste of time.

THE SUBMERGED LANDS BILL

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall speak for only a few minutes this evening on the pending bill.

At the outset I want it understood that the committee report on Senate Joint Resolution 20, although containing many things with which I agree, does not accurately reflect the views of the majority of the committee.

As a member of the committee, I, as well as others of the committee, felt that the Senate should have a chance to act on this vital question affecting the submerged lands along the Continental Shelf of the United States. For that reason, several of us who were not in agreement with Senate Joint Resolution 20 as reported, felt that we should report that measure in order that the Senate might have an opportunity to act upon the submerged lands question.

Several Senators who voted to report favorably the joint resolution from the committee, will vote, I am sure, to substitute what we call quit-claim legislation which will deal more liberally with this land, insofar as the States are concerned. We felt that if we had not supported that position, it would be entirely likely that the Senate would not have a chance to act at all on this measure.

As a matter of fact, the House of Representatives has acted several times on tidelands measures, but the Senate has acted only once on such a measure, and that was prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in the California case, which makes this proposed legislation necessary.

Mr. President, I believe we should make an effort to see that this issue is not misrepresented to the public. Invariably someone tries to give the public the impression that this measure constitutes some giant scheme of the major oil companies of the Nation to advance their own interests; and those who attempt to convey that impression to the public wish to lead the public to believe that the oil companies have some sinister purpose here. One of the best illustrations I can give of the misrepresentation which has been spread concerning the tidelands question, is a cartoon by Herblock which appeared today in the Washington Post. The caption of the cartoon is "Up for another try," as though the oil and gas interests of this Nation were trying to torpedo an American battleship. Nothing could be further from the truth.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the oil and gas industry of the United States, more than any other industry, has made it possible for both the United States Navy and the British Navy to maintain their superiority on the seas.

Furthermore, even those who advance the position of the Federal advocates, those who take the side of the present national administration, as well as those who oppose that side, for the most part—I would say 99 percent of them—agree that, regardless of who possesses this property or who administers it, the oil companies presently producing oil in that area will continue to produce it.

As a matter of fact, the President of the United States, as represented by the Attorney General of the United States, at the outset, when he undertook to seize this property for the Federal Government, stated that the oil companies that had developed this property had done so in good faith, under the honest impression that the property belonged to the States. Upon that basis the Attorney General, speaking for the President of the United States, stated that the title of the oil companies should be cured or at least their leases should be ratified to the extent that they would be permitted to continue to produce under the leases which they had acquired in good faith.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it is interesting to note that even after the decision of the United States Supreme Court, the prevailing view of the American Bar Association, contrary to the view of the

Supreme Court of the United States, was that this property had belonged to the States and should be restored to them. The National Conference of Governors, likewise the American Association of Attorneys General, all had that impression. So it seems only fair to say that this matter should be represented as exactly what it is, namely, a question between the States, on the one hand, and the Federal Government. It is a question of restoring the rights that the States had in their submerged lands and what revenues they should receive from properties which had been regarded by both the States and the Federal Government for more than 160 years as property of the States.

Mr. President, in order that on tomorrow, the information may be available to Senators, I desire at this time to present for the RECORD a resumé of Judicial Pronouncements of the Rule Governing the Ownership of Lands Beneath Navigable Waters, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point, because I believe that Senators, particularly Senators who are attorneys, by reading this memorandum may see why the States affected felt so bitterly about the decisions in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases; may better understand the rights which the States have had, and may see that there is every reason why the rights of the States should have been recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like very much to have a larger attendance of Senators when the distinguished Senator explains the pending legislation. I think it too late to suggest the absence of a quorum. As a matter of fact, Senators did not know that the Senator from Louisiana was going to speak at this time. Would the Senator be willing to yield the floor now, with the understanding that he will be recognized and will have the floor in the morning, following completion of the morning hour?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall not require that understanding at all. I will yield the floor as soon as I am able to place this memorandum in the RECORD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I believe that in reading this memorandum Senators will find that the cases have been briefed accurately, and that there is every reason why every attorney, prior to the time the Federal Government undertook to take this property from the States, had every reason to believe that the States owned this property and that it belonged to the States. Briefly the States take the position that this Nation was formed by 13 sovereign and independent States which joined to form a Central Government of the United States of America. Prior to that time, the States possessed all such rights as existed to this property, and when other States were admitted to the Union and entered upon an equal footing, they acquired the same rights.

The Supreme Court held many times in the past, and would, I believe, still hold that the right to possession of the beds of all navigable inland waters within the State boundaries belonged to the States on the theory that this was an attribute of State sovereignty, namely, the possession of the beds of all navigable waters within their boundaries. We feel that there was no basis whatever for a distinction that would prevent them from owning the submerged property along their shores, in the Atlantic Ocean, or in the Gulf of Mexico. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this memorandum of authority be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS OF THE RULE GOVERNING THE OWNERSHIP OF LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS

(By RUSSELL B. LONG, United States Senator from Louisiana)

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Underlying the many decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States in cases involving the ownership of lands beneath navigable waters are great historical events and circumstances. To relate them is to afford a clearer understanding of the landmark cases to be hereinafter cited and briefed.

Littoral nations have asserted dominion of the territorial seas adjacent to their coasts since medieval times. Those claims were extravagant at first [1] and brought various countries into conflict.[2] This conflict was of pen rather than arms. Publicists used their textbooks as weapons of debate, each striving to interpret the rather confusing concepts of international law on the subject.[3]

Phillip II limited Spain's maritime dominion in 1565 to the "visual horizon." Van Eyndershock suggested a width of one league from shore in 1702.[4] This suggestion came about as a result of the "range of cannon shot" theory. Except, perhaps, for fishing, the marginal sea had no great economic significance at the time. The need of a buffer zone, so to speak, was for protection of shores; therefore, it became a principle of international law that a littoral nation should assert full dominion over that part of the marginal sea which it could protect by coast artillery, that distance being fixed as a belt of one marine league, or about 3 miles.[5]

The point of emphasis here is that international law has been uniform in recognizing the dominion of littoral nations over the marginal sea; writers on such law have simply differed, down through the centuries, with respect to the proper width of the maritime belt extending from shores.

There can be no doubt but that ownership of the subsoil was asserted and recognized, as well as the dominion over the waters.

In 1598, Albertico Gentili, renowned publicist, wrote:

"The adjacent part of a sea belongs to one's dominion, and the term 'territory' (territorium) is used both of land and water." [6]

All prerevolutionary English text writers uniformly stressed the Crown's ownership of the bed of ocean surrounding the British Isles.[7]

II. THE ENGLISH CONCEPT

In England, the rule of sovereign dominion over lands beneath navigable waters originated with respect to the marginal sea and was later extended to apply to lands under navigable inland waters.

This is of high importance, for it will be shown hereinafter that the courts in the United States, at least prior to 1947, applied the common law rule of England, with no distinction being expressly drawn between submerged lands of navigable inland waters and the subsoil of the marginal sea within maritime boundaries.

The Privy Council of England made this significant pronouncement in 1610:

"The reason for which the King hath an interest in such navigable river, so far as the sea flows and ebbs in it, is because such river participates of the nature of the sea so far as it flows * * * and the King hath the same branches of the sea and navigable rivers, so high as the sea flows and ebbs in them, which he hath in the high sea." [8]

In commenting on the case of *Illinois Central Railroad Company* v. *Illinois*,[9] John Bassett Moore, an authority on international law, made the following statement: [10]

"So, also, by the common law, the dominion over the ownership by the Crown of lands within the realm under tidewaters is not founded upon the existence of the tide over the land, but upon the fact that the waters are navigable, tidewaters and navigable waters being used as synonymous terms in England."

In 1947, however, the Supreme Court of the United States referred to an "inland water" rule in deciding the case of *United States of America* v. *State of California*,[11] citing *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan*.[12] The Pollard case not only made no mention of any such rule, but the inseparability of the one and only rule, transplanted here from England by all courts, prior to 1947, was purportedly severed in twain for the first time in either English or American jurisprudence. Thus broken, the underlying attributes of the rule suffer loss of substance, logic, and weight.

III. MUNIMENTS OF THE TITLES OF STATES

The Declaration of Independence in 1776, whe the Thirteen Original Colonies became free and independent sovereign States, constitutes the first link in chain of title.

After the successful revolution came the second link in the title chain. A provisional treaty was made with the British Crown in 1782 and was ratified in 1783. In that treaty the British Crown relinquished all claims to the Government, including proprietary and territorial rights. The 13 original States were separately named in the treaty. Acknowledging such States to be "free, soverign and independent", the British Crown expressly proclaimed that he was treating "with them as such".

A strange view has been taken by a few that the treaty was not made with the several States at all, but with some governmental entity of union among the States. To submit to that view, one must read something into the treaty which is not there,

[1] Selden, Mare Clausum (1663); Hall, A Treatise on International Law, 8th ed. (1924).

[2] Vattel, Le Droit des Gens I (1758).

[3] Grotius, Mare Liberum, (17th century); Selden, Mare Clausum (supra); Hall, A Treatise on International Law (supra).

[4] De Domino Maris; Fulton, The Sovereignty of the Sea (1911); Bustamante, The Territorial Sea (1930).

[5] See note 4.

[6] De Jure Belli, Bk. III, ch. XVIII, 629, trans. of 1912 ed. in Classics of International Law, 1933, p. 384.

[7] Bracton, De Legibus et Consetudinibus Angliae (1569), lib. 2, ch. 2 folio 9b (1 Diviss ed. 71, 73); Selden, Dominion of the Sea (1652), g 2, Bk. II, pp. 251–274–275, 365); Callis on Sewers (2d ed. 1685), p. 39, 41–42, 44, 53; 2 Blackstone's Comm., 3d ed., 1768, pp. 261–2; Hall, Rights of the Crown in Seashores of the Realm (1830).

[8] The case of Royal Fishery of River Panne.

[9] 146 United States 387 (1882).

[10] Moore, Digest of International Law.

[11] 332 United States 19 (1947).

[12] 3 How. 212 (1845).

and it must be concluded that the United States of America created the several States, and not those States, the Union.

Even if there be persuasive argument of any character to support this imponderable view, it cannot be denied that each of the Original Thirteen States was a beneficiary of the quitclaim. If it did not act, the action was taken for its benefit through some kind of representation.

The United States of America could have received no territorial acquisitions under the treaty; first, because the Articles of Confederation, article IX, read that "no State shall be deprived of territory for the benefit of the United States," and, second, because article VI, clause 2, of the United States Constitution contains a covenant which can well be interpreted in part as assuring the States of their rights under the British Treaty of 1782 and 1783.

Then came the landmark case of *Harcourt* v. *Gaillard* [13] in which the United States Supreme Court said:

"There was no territory within the United States that was claimed in any other right than that of some one of the Confederate States; (therefore, there could be no acquisition of territory made by the United States distinct from, or independent) of some one of the States." [Parentheses supplied.]

This judicial concept was also expressed in *Rhode Island* v. *Massachusetts* [14] in which it was stated:

"It follows that when a place is within the boundary, it is part of the territory of a State; title, jurisdiction and sovereignty are inseparable incidents, and remain so 'til the State makes same cession."

There can be no question but that the British Crown asserted vast claims along the coasts of the Thirteen Original Colonies. And, under the British Treaty, those claims of a sovereign and proprietary nature inured to the Thirteen Original States.

To reflect both the nature and scope of those claims by the British Crown, there appears appendixes hereto, a rather full list and description of colonial charters or royal grants.

Perhaps the ascertainment of some acceptable maritime belt, as to length or width, is of some importance; however, the primary consideration is the extent of the territorial claims of former sovereigns as they passed to the several States.

Here we think not only in terms of what the Original Thirteen States received from England, but what Texas and California received from Mexico; Florida from Spain, and Louisiana from Spain and France.

IV. LANDMARK CASES OF THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

It would be repetitious and redundant to cite and brief some 50 cases; therefore, reference shall only be made to those more frequently mentioned.

(a) *The Original Thirteen States*

Martin v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367 (1842)): One claimant based his right to take oysters from the bed of Paritan Bay, an arm of the sea, in New Jersey waters, upon a royal grant from the British Crown, in 1674. The other contestant predicated his claim upon a license or grant from the State of New Jersey.

Title to the bed of the bay was at issue, and State ownership was upheld. Two classic statements were made in the Court's opinion:

"For when the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government."

"And when the people of New Jersey took possession of the reins of government, and took into their own hands the powers of sovereignty, the prerogatives and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or the Parliament, became immediately vested in the State."

McCready v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391 (1877)): The precise question to be determined in this case was whether the State of Virginia could prohibit the citizens of other States from planting oysters in Ware River, a stream in Virginia governed by the ebb and flow of the tide.

Citing a number of cases, the Court held: "The principle has long been settled in this Court, that each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction, unless they have been granted away."

This case is also significant, because we find express reference therein to the paramount right of the Federal Government and a brief interpretation of such right. It was translated not in terms of title or proprietorship, but as a constitutional power, i. e., to regulate navigation.

Smith v. *Maryland* (18 How. 74 (1855)): The primary issue in this case related to the ownership of certain subsoil in Chesapeake Bay, below low-water mark. In sustaining State title thereto, the Court stated the long-settled rule:

"Whatever soil below low water is the subject of exclusive propriety and ownership, belongs to the State on whose maritime border, and within whose territory, it lies, subject to any lawful grants of that soil by the State, or the sovereign power which governed its territory before the Declaration of Independence."

Manchester v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240 (1891)): This is one of the most important cases in the annals of American jurisprudence.

Therein, among other declarations of import, are the pronouncements that the extent of the territorial jurisdiction of each of the States of the United States over the sea adjacent to its coast is "that of an independent nation," and that "a State can fix its boundaries on the sea provided it does not exceed the limits that will be recognized by the law of nations."

In this case an appeal was taken from a conviction for violating a Massachusetts statute prohibiting the use of nets for menhaden fishing in Buzzards Bay, within the jurisdiction of Massachusetts. Buzzards Bay is an arm of the sea, and of crucial concern to the Court at the outset was whether or not the alleged fishing took place within the maritime limits of Massachusetts.

The following passages of the Court's opinion are of lasting significance:

"By the definitive treaty of peace of September 3, 1783, between the United States and Great Britain (8 Stat. 81), His Britannic Majesty acknowledged the United States, of which Massachusetts Bay was one, to be free, sovereign, and independent States, and declared that he treated with them as such, and, for himself, his heirs and successors, relinquished all claims to the Government, proprietary and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof. Therefore, if Massachusetts had continued to be an independent nation, her boundaries on the sea, as defined by her statutes, would unquestionably be acknowledged by all foreign nations, and her right to control the fisheries within those boundaries would be conceded."

"The title thus held is subject to the paramount rights of navigation, the regulation of which, in respect to foreign and interstate commerce, has been granted to the United States. There has been, however, no such grant over the fisheries. These remain under the exclusive control of the State, which has consequently the right, in its discretion, to appropriate its tide waters and their beds to be used by its people as a common for taking and cultivating fish, so far as it may be done without obstructing navigation. Such an appropriation is in effect nothing more than a regulation of the use by the people of their common property."

Johnson v. *McIntosh* (8 Wheat. 543 (1823)): This case does not involve title to submerged lands, but is important from one particular standpoint of relevant significance.

Plaintiff claimed land under a conveyance from the Indians in 1773. Defendants claimed under a grant from the United States. The lands in controversy were situated within the chartered limits of Virginia, and were ceded with the whole country northwest of the river Ohio by the Act of Cession from Virginia to the United States, on conditions expressed in the deed of cession.

Said the Court in the course of its opinion:

"By the treaty which concluded the war of our revolution, Great Britain relinquished all claim, not only to the Government, but to the property and territorial rights of the United States whose boundaries were fixed in the second article. (By this treaty, the powers of government, and the right to soil, which had previously been in Great Britain, passed definitely to these States.) [Parentheses supplied.]

Then the Court added, in never-to-be-forgotten language:

"(An absolute title to lands cannot exist, at the same time, in different persons, or in different governments.) An absolute, must be an exclusive title, or at least a title which excludes all others, not compatible with it." [Parentheses supplied.]

(b) *The new States (admitted on equal footing with the Original Thirteen)*

Pollard v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212 (1845)): Plaintiffs claimed a lot of ground below both high and low water mark in Mobile Bay, under United States patent, issued before Alabama was admitted to statehood. The defendant claimed under grant from the State.

The Court said that this was the first time it had been called upon to draw the line that separates the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Government of the Union and the State governments, over the subject in controversy, although many of the principles which entered into the question had been settled by previous decisions of the Court.

The Court held that when Alabama was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, it succeeded to all of the rights of sovereignty and jurisdiction which Georgia possessed, except so far as such right was diminished by the public lands remaining in the possession and under the control of the United States and that if an express stipulation had been inserted in the agreement for the admission of Alabama as a State, granting the municipal right of sovereignty to the United States, such stipulation would have been void and inoperative, "because the United States have no constitutional capacity to exercise municipal jurisdiction, sovereignty, or eminent domain, within the limits of a State or elsewhere, except in the cases in which it is expressly granted."

The Court said further that the surrender made by the States of their waste and unappropriated lands, public lands, to the United States under resolution of the old Congress, of September 6, 1780, to aid in paying the public debt of the Revolution, ended as soon as such purposes could be accomplished, and then the power of the United States over such lands was to cease.

To exercise rights not granted, the Court characterized as repugnant to the Constitution and inconsistent with the deeds of cession.

"Then to Alabama," the Court said, "belong the navigable waters, and soils under

[13] 12 Wheat. 523 (1827).
[14] 12 Peters 657, 733 (1828).

them * * * subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States" and that "no compact that might be made between her (Alabama) and the United States could diminish or enlarge these rights."

"For, although the territorial limits of Alabama," the Court added, "have extended all her sovereign power into the sea; it is there, as on the shore, but municipal power, subject to the Constitution of the United States, and the laws which shall be made in pursuance thereof."

This landmark case follows the prior jurisprudence and is important all the more for the enunciation therein made that the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction as to navigable waters and the subsoils thereof as the Original Thirteen States.

Louisiana v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1 (1905)): This suit involves the powers of two contesting States to control the oyster industry and the taking of oysters claimed by both States to be within the boundaries of each.

The Court held that under the Treaty of Cession in 1803 between France and the United States and the act of April 1812, admitting Louisiana into the Union, the waters in question were within the boundaries of the State of Louisiana.

In the course of its opinion, the Court said:

"The maritime belt is that part of the sea, in contradistinction to the open sea, is under the (sway) of the riparian States, which can exclusively reserve the fisheries within their respective maritime belts for their own citizens, whether fish, or pearls, or amber, or other products of the sea." [Parentheses supplied.]

(The term "sway" is defined in Webster's dictionary as synonymous with "power, empire, sovereignty.")

The Abby Dodge (223 U. S. 166 (1912)): The defendant was convicted under a Federal statute prohibiting the landing of sponges taken by means of diving apparatus from waters of the Gulf of Mexico and the straits of Florida.

The Court cited *McCready* v. *Virginia*, *Pollard* v. *Hagan*, *Smith* v. *Maryland*, and other cases herein briefed, as well as others, in saying that if the statute applied to sponges taken from land under water within the territorial limits of the State of Florida, or other States, the repugnancy of the statute to the Constitution would be plainly established. Referring to the case of *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (see pp. 11–12, herein), the Court pointed out that aquatic life "so far as they are capable of ownership while so running" belong to the States and are subject to their control, if found within the marginal waters of such States.

Borax Consolidated v. *City of Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10 (1935)): This action was brought by the city of Los Angeles (defendant in writ) claiming under a grant from the State of California, to quiet title to land in San Pedro Harbor, the other party claimed under a preemption patent from the United States.

Holding for plaintiff, under State grant, the Court held, among other things, that State ownership of tidelands extends to the mean high water mark; that such property, acquired by the United States from Mexico, had been held in trust for the State of California.

Knight v. *United Lands Association* (142 U. S. 161): Error to the Supreme Court of California to review a judgment in favor of plaintiff, in an action of ejectment for the recovery of a block of land in the city of San Francisco, below high water mark at the time of the conquest of California with Mexico.

The Court held:

"It is the settled rule of law in this Court that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the original States were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the Original 13 States possess within their respective borders."

Mumford v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423 (1867)): This was a contest over a lot of ground below high tide in California waters. Among other things, the Court held:

"It is the settled rule of law in this Court that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted, by the Constitution, to the United States; but were reserved to the several States; and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders" (quoting from *Pollard* v. *Hagan*, supra).

New Orleans v. *United States* (152 U. S. 1 (1894)): The United States sought in this action to enjoin the officials and inhabitants of New Orleans, La., from selling lots included in the vacant lands forming part of the common, or quay, by asserting the claim that such property inured to the United States by the Treaty of Cession in 1803.

The Court discussed the laws of France in much detail, and cited Domat for the following statement:

"There are two kinds of property destined to the common use of man, and of which everyone has the enjoyment. The first of those are so by nature—as rivers, the sea, and its shores. The second, which derive their character from the destination given them by man, such as streets, highways, churches, market houses, courthouses, and other public places."

Among other pronouncements, the Court said:

"The King of Spain, like the King of France, had the power to give permission to construct buildings on grounds dedicated to public use * * *; but this does not show that either sovereign had the power to alien such lands.

"This common (quay) having been dedicated to public use, was withdrawn from commerce, and from the power of the King rightfully to alien it."

"The State of Louisiana was admitted into the Union on the same footing as the original States. Her rights of sovereignty are the same, and by consequence no jurisdiction of the Federal Government, either for purposes of police or otherwise, can be exercised over this public ground."

"All powers which properly appertain to sovereignty, which have not been delegated to the Federal Government, belong to the States and the people."

This case is important in two main respects: (1) The sea and its shores were declared to be owned by the State, and (2) such property was referred to as being inalienable.

Shively v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1 (1894)): The land in controversy, located in Oregon, was submerged in waters beyond the high water mark. The plaintiff claimed under a State grant, the defendant under a United States patent. (Oregon tidelands at mouth of Columbia River in contest.)

In rendering judgment for plaintiff, the Court held:

"By the common law, both the title and the dominion of the sea, and of rivers and arms of the sea, where the tide ebbs and flows, and of all the lands below high water mark, within the jurisdiction of the Crown of England, are in the King. * * * The common law of England upon this subject, at the time of the emigration of our ancestors, is the law of this country, except as it has been modified, by the charters, constitutions, statutes or usages of the several colonies and States, or by the Constitution and laws of the United States."

There was also mentioned in the opinion the rights of new States as being equal to the original 13.

"Upon the admission of Oregon into the Union, the tidelands became the property of the State, and subject to its jurisdiction and disposal."

Skiriotes v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 313 (1941)): A case, in certain respects, similar to the *Abby Dodge*, supra. A Federal statute was under consideration, prohibiting the use of diving equipment in the taking of sponges from the Gulf of Mexico and the Florida Straits.

The Court sanctioned the right of the State to regulate the taking of sponges from its territorial waters, dismissing the contention that international law was involved.

United States v. *Mission Rock Co.* (189 U. S. 391 (1920)): Title to tidelands contiguous to and surrounding San Francisco Bay was at issue in this case. As against a grantee of the State to reclaim such lands, the opposing party claimed that the area had been reserved by order of the President of the United States for naval purposes.

The State grantee prevailed. Said the Court:

"Although the title to the soil under the tidewaters of the bay was acquired by the United States by cession from Mexico, equally with title to the upland, they held it in trust for the future State."

Illinois Central Railroad Co. v. *State of Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892)): A segment of the subsoil of Lake Michigan was in controversy herein.

The Court pointed out the settled law of the land as to State ownership of tidelands, citing *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212) and *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57) then it added, significantly:

"We hold, therefore, that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the navigable waters of the Great Lakes, applies, which obtains at the common law as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under tide waters on the borders of the sea, and that the lands are held by the same right in the one case as in the other, and subject to the same trusts and limitations."

Weber v. *Board of State Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. (85 U. S. 57) 57 (1873)): This suit involved lands under an arm of the sea in California waters.

The Court said in part in its opinion:

"The title to the shore of the sea, and of the arms of the sea, and in soils under the tidewaters, is, in England, in the King, and in this country, in the State."

There appears in the appendixes a full list of cases decided by the United States Supreme Court, showing the character of lands involved, and supporting the rule of sovereign State ownership of all lands under navigable waters within the boundaries of the several States.

V. CONCLUSIONS

1. The common law of England has been transplanted in American jurisprudence.

2. The rule is not divisible, but applies uniformly to lands under all navigable waters within the borders of the respective States.

3. There is, in fact, no inland-water title.

4. In one significant respect, the Court enunciated in the case of *United States of America* v. *State of California* (332 U. S. 19) an irrefutable fact:

"As previously stated, this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in so doing it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not."

VI. FACTS APPLIED TO THE LAW

Admittedly, none of the cases anteceding *United States of America* v. *State of California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947)) dealt with lands within the open waters of the sea, but embraced in the boundaries of a State. Yet, the rule of the common law, having taken roots here in this country, was inseparable and indivisible. No inland-water rule existed to follow, any more than a coastal-water principle.

The Supreme Court of the United States referred to the "settled law of this Court" in numerous decisions. And it stated a single principle of the common law of England, "firmly established in this country" (*Massachusetts* v. *New York* (U. S. 65, 89 (1926)).

The Court in all cases had no alternative except to state the one broad rule. To have repeated that rule in some 52 decisions, mere dicta was not pronounced. To say that this rule is irrelevant to the marginal sea is the same as to urge that the constitutional right of the Federal Government to control navigation applies only to certain cases in which specific navigable waters are involved.

The enunciation of the rule in such a vast number of cases was at least, judicial dictum.

In *Taylor* v. *Taylor* (40 S. W. 2d. 393, 395); 162 Tenn. 482, the court said:

"Statement in opinion on point even incidentally involved, where apparently made with consideration and purpose is at least 'judicial dictum' and is entitled to weight."

And in *Perfection Tire and Rubber Co.* v. *Kellogg-Mccay Equipment Co.* (187 N. W. 32, 35; 194 Iowa 573) and in *Chase* v. *American Cartage Company* (186 N. W. 598, 176 Wisc. 235) it was held that—

"The binding force of a decision is coextensive with the facts on which it is founded, and if correlated subject matter is under discussion and decided, such decision is not mere obiter dictum and is at least judicial dictum."

The great weight of judicial dictum is a factor that leads to the formulation of a principle of law; after the judicial dictum is reported over and over again in numerous decisions, it becomes a settled principle of law. The repetition formulates the principle.

It was held in *United States* v. *Guaranty Trust Company* (33 F. 2d 533, 537 (1929), affd., 280 U. S. 478 (1930)) that—

"Reannouncement of a doctrine repeatedly over a period of more than a hundred years serves to establish it, not only as to the consistent views of the Court but as a rule of property upon which practical transactions have been, and are being based."

In the case of *Screws* v. *United States* (325 U. S. 91 (1945)) the Court referred to "the governing rule of law in this important field" as transcending the particular point involved in the controversy:

"Dicta, while not binding in themselves, may become finally a part of the recognized law of the land" (Corpus Juris, vol. 15, p. 953).

In *United States* v. *Mission Rock Company* (189 U. S. 391 (1903)), involving tidelands ownership, the Court said:

"The decisions cover a period of many years and have become a rule of property and the foundation of many titles."

APPENDIXES

I. COLONIAL CHARITIES AND TREATIES

British Crown charters

1. First North Carolina Charter, March 25, 1534: "Conveying all the soils of such lands, with the rights, royalties, franchises, and jurisdictions as well marine as other, within the said lands, or countries, or the seas thereunto adjoining."

2. The Virginia Charter, March 9, 1611, annexing all islands within 300 leagues of the coast, conveying the soils, lands, grounds, minerals, etc., both within the said tract of land upon the main, and also within said islands and seas adjoining, etc.

3. The Plymouth Colonial Charter, November 16, 1620, granting all territories throughout the mainland with all the seas, rivers, islands, ports, both within the same tract of land upon the main; also within the said islands and seas adjoining.

4. Charter of Massachusetts Bay, 1691, defining the boundary "throughout all the main land from sea to sea, together also with all soils, royalties upon the main and also within the islands and seas adjoining."

5. Grant to the Council of Plymouth, confirmed April 1639, granting "all and singular prerogatives, royalties, as well by the sea as by land within the said province and coast of same and within the seas belonging or adjacent to them."

6. New Hampshire Grant, confirmed April 22, 1635, exception conveying "the seas and islands lying within any 100 miles of any part of said coast of country aforesaid, together with all the firm lands, soils, waters, fish, royalties, both within the said tracts of lands upon the main and also with the islands and seas adjoining."

7. Charter grant to Lord Baltimore for Province of Maryland, June 30, 1632, conveying "all that part of the peninsula lying between the ocean on the east and the Bay of Chesapeake on the west, from Watkins Point to the main ocean on the east, the islands which have been or shall be formed within the sea within 10 marine leagues from the shore; with all ports, harbors, bays, and straits belonging to the region or islands aforesaid (within 10 marine leagues from shore); and all soil, with the fishings in the sea, with all prerogatives, royalties, as well by sea as by land within the limits aforesaid."

8. Georgia Charter, June 9, 1732, conveying "all the precints of land within the said boundaries, with the islands on the sea lying opposite to the eastern coast of said lands, within 20 leagues of the same, together with all the soils, gulfs and bays, mines, waters, fishings, royalties, in any sod belonging or appertaining."

The Treaty of Independence with the British Crown, April 11, 1783, referred to in *Harcourt* v. *Gaillard* as "the most solemn of all international acts," acknowledged the United States, naming the Thirteen Original States by names, to be free, sovereign, and independent States; that he treated with them as such, and relinquished unto them all claims to the government, proprietary, and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof. And in article 2, agreed upon and declared the boundaries of the said United States, or the original Coastal States, on the east by a line to be drawn along the rivers that fall into the ocean, "comprehending all islands within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

II. UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CASES RECOGNIZING STATE OWNERSHIP OF LANDS BENEATH ALL NAVIGABLE WATERS WITHIN THE STATE'S BORDERS

1. Salt water and tidelands

Pollard's Lessee v. *Hagan* (3 How. (44 U. S.) 212, 229, 230) (Alabama—Mobile Bay); *Goodtitle* v. *Kibbe* (9 How. (50 U. S.) 471, 478) (Alabama—shore of a navigable river); *Smith* v. *Maryland* (18 How. (59 U. S.) 71, 74) (Maryland—soil beneath low water mark in Chesapeake Bay); *Numford* v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. (73 U. S. 423, 435, 436) (California—navigable waters and soils under same); *Weber* v. *Board of Harbor Commrs.* (18 Wall. (85 U. S.) 57, 65, 66) (California—shore and arms of the sea); *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391, 394, 395) (Virginia—oyster beds in tidewaters); *San Francisco* v. *Le Roy* (138 U. S. 656) (670–672) (California tidelands in San Francisco Bay).

Knight v. *U. S. Land Assn.* (142 U. S. 161) (183, 201) (California—San Francisco Bay); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1) (57, 58) (Oregon—Tidelands at mouth of Columbia River); *Mobile Transp. Co.* v. *Mobile* (187 U. S. 479, 482) (Alabama—Mobile River); *United States* v. *Mission Rock Co.* (189 U. S. 391, 404 (California—submerged lands and tidelands in San Francisco Bay).

Greenleaf Lbr. Co. v. *Garrison* (237 U. S. 251, 269) (Virginia—Elizabeth River); *The Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166) (Florida—Sponge beds in Gulf of Mexico); *Port of Seattle* v. *Oregon and Washington R. R. Co.* (255 U. S. 56, 63) (Washington—Port of Seattle); *Borax Consolidated* v. *City of Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 15, 16) (California—tidelands, San Pedro Bay); *United States* v. *O'Donnell* (303 U. S. 501, 519) (California—San Francisco Bay).

2. Navigable rivers

St. Clair v. *Lovingston* (90 U. S. 49) (Illinois—Mississippi River); *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324) (Iowa—Mississippi River); *Shivley* v. *Bowlby* (151 U. S. 1) (Oregon—Columbia River); *St. Anthony* v. *Board* (168 U. S. 349) (Minnesota—Mississippi River); *Scott* v. *Latlig* (227 U. S. 229) (Idaho—Snake River); *Donnelly* v. *United States* (228 U. S. 243) (California—Klamath River); *Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (258 U. S. 574) (Oklahoma—Red River); *United States* v. *Utah* (283 U. S. 54) (Utah—Colorado River).

3. Great Lakes

Illinois Central Railroad Co. v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387) (Illinois—shores and beds of Lake Michigan); *Massachusetts* v. *New York* (271 U. S. 65) (New York—submerged lands, Lake Onterio).

4. Inland lakes

Hardin v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371) (Illinois—inland lake); *McGilvra* v. *Ross* (215 U. S. 70) (Washington—nontidal lakes); *United States* v. *Holt State Bank* (270 U. S. 49) (Minnesota—inland lakes); *United States* v. *Oregon* (295 U. S. 1) (Oregon—inland lakes and channels).

5. Bays and sounds

Louisiana v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1) (Channel, Breton Sound, leading to Chandelier islands); *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240) (Massachusetts—Buzzard's Bay).

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that there may be certainty and so that there may be no misunderstanding, will the Senator say for the RECORD what he stated to me a moment ago, that no effort will be made to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement on the tidelands bill tomorrow? A number of Senators have asked me that question.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the expressions made on the Senate floor clearly showed that Senators want to have a little time to determine how much debate they think should be given to the pending legislation, and, in order to give them time, I shall wait at least 1 day, perhaps 2 days, before I renew my request.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

SHORTAGE OF FARM LABOR—APPEAL TO DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I desire to say to the distinguished majority leader that I appreciate this opportunity.

Mr. President, a few days ago the Senator from Kansas received a telegram from Merrill J. Langfitt, farm service director of radio station KMA, Shenandoah, Iowa. In the telegram he said:

I have sent the following telegram to Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service:

"We have watched the farm labor situation become increasingly critical in recent months. Midwestern boys skilled in operation farm equipment and caring for livestock are being drafted by the hundreds. There is no labor supply to replace them. Many farmers are being left alone with 240 to 400 acres of cropland and large livestock programs. It is physically impossible for them to continue their operations. We frequently assist in placing farm labor at our radio station, but there is none to place now. This situation is becoming absolutely critical in this area. It appears to be more serious than during World War II. We have no ax to grind. Just trying to give you fair appraisal of situation."

I would appreciate your comments.

Mr. President, I want to say to the Senate that the gentleman from Iowa is probably putting his finger on a very troublesome situation which is developing throughout all the agricultural areas. Radio station KMA has been pretty close to the agricultural interests of the State of Iowa; and Iowa, as we all know, is one of the great agricultural States. The complaint made by Mr. Langfitt is not confined to that State. The same situation exists with respect to the State of Kansas. I have received a number of letters from other States, and a large volume of mail from my own State on this subject.

I recognize that under the Selective Service System there is, through the local and State draft boards, an opportunity to present the necessity for deferment here and there, under certain conditions. At the same time I feel that somewhere down the line it is going to be up to the Director of the Selective Service System who, of course, is Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, to come to some kind of understanding, even if only in a temporary way, in order that this matter may receive serious consideration.

We are moving into the spring season in all sections of our country, and the situation in many instances is becoming quite acute. I have letters in my file, as I presume other Senators have letters from the agricultural sections of the States they represent, wherein we are being told of the sale of farms belonging to farmers, some of whom perhaps have sons in Korea. In some instances the farms which were sold belonged to men who had already contributed to the war effort, and who, because of their age, were no longer able to continue farming operations. If sales under such circumstances are multiplied a few thousand times throughout the great agricultural sections, the result will be very detrimental.

I feel that the radio editor of Station KMA, Shenandoah, Iowa, has put his finger on a very troublesome situation. I am hopeful that a satisfactory program may be worked out, perhaps even on a temporary basis, for the next entire crop year whereby Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, in charge of the selective-service quotas, working harmoniously, as he does, with the military authorities, may see his way clear to permit a greater flexibility in regard to the deferment of farm laborers. I thought this question of sufficient importance to bring it to the attention of the Senate.

I thank the majority leader for his courtesy in yielding to me so that I could make this statement.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 4, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 3, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, our shelter and strength, Thou art ever near to protect us in times of peril and always ready to guide when the way seems shadowy and irrevocably dark.

Grant that during this week we may bring our wills more completely into harmony with Thy divine spirit in order that our frail and finite lives may have unity and purpose, confidence, and courage.

May we daily give ourselves wholly and unreservedly to Thy leading. Cleanse us of all unrighteousness and make us worthy of our blessings.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 29, 1952, was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

VIEWS OF GENERAL EISENHOWER ON UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday at the end of the day's debate on UMT, my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and I were discussing the apparent apathetic attitude of the Members toward the military-training program. Accordingly, we determined to solicit the views of the one man in the world who more than any other has the individual and official responsibility of stemming the Kremlin in its westward aggression, General Eisenhower. That evening we sent a joint dispatch to the general inviting his comment and today have received the following response:

Congressman STERLING COLE:
Congressman LEROY JOHNSON:

In response to your request for my views on universal military training, there are of record many statements I have made in the past that emphasize the importance both to the country and to the youth of a thorough early training in modern military practices, organization, and techniques. While I basically believe that this kind of service is an obligation that every citizen owes the Nation, I also believe that in reverse the provision of training opportunity is an obligation that the Nation owes to the individual. Every one of our wars has, at its beginning, given us reason to regret the consequences of committing to emergency action units and individuals that have been denied opportunity for achieving complete competence.

Because of these convictions I regard the question as one of utmost gravity for all of our citizens; it is the problem of fitting together a scheme which will meet the vital requirements of nation and individual alike and doing it in such a way as to occasion the least possible damage to the Nation's productivity and general progress and the least impediment to the young man's personal career. So long as any major threat to peace remains in the world I earnestly support this principle.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

PAUL HOFFMAN ENDORSES UMT

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of a man in the United States who is more respected than Paul Hoffman, who now happens to reside in California. No man has a better grasp and understanding of the tension which the free world, and the United States in particular, is subjected to by the Soviets. He knows the imperative need for alertness in safeguarding our security situation today and in the years to come. He learned it the hard way in his job as ECA Director. He performed a masterful job in the rehabilitation of the devastated countries of Europe.

It is most gratifying to us who believe in universal military training as a means of making ourselves secure in the future that Mr. Hoffman has endorsed our efforts.

This is his statement:

As long as the threat of communism requires us to maintain a strong Defense Establishment, the soundest method for providing manpower for the national defense is through universal military training. It provides not only the equitable sharing of the responsibility for military service but also the means by which defense costs can be reduced to a point that will protect our economy against dangerous strain.

It is my hope that the present tension will disappear and, of course, when it does, the size of our Defense Establishment should be subjected to review by Congress.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PARTICIPATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN OLYMPIC GAMES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1184) to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in, Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COORDINATED STATE AND FEDERAL PROGRAM FOR PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 254) to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5490) relating to the compensation of certain employees of the Panama Canal.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDING COPYRIGHT CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

UNIFORM PENSIONS FOR INDIAN WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5717) to provide uniform rates of pension for veterans of the Indian wars.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the minimum monthly rate of pension payable to veterans of the Indian wars under the act of March 3, 1927 (44 Stat. 1361), as amended (38 U. S. C. 381), or the act of August 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 786), as amended (38 U. S. C. 381–1), shall be $90 unless such veteran is now or hereafter becomes on account of age or physical or mental disabilities, helpless or blind, or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person, in which event the monthly rate shall be $120.

SEC. 2. The rates provided by this act shall be effective the first day of the second calendar month following its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER PRESUMPTION OF SERVICE CONNECTION OF CERTAIN DISABILITIES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

UTILIZATION OF MINERAL RESOURCES ON PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 472) to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RENEGOTIATION AND RATIFICATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH CERTAIN INDIANS OF THE SIOUX TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6030) to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (a) of the act entitled "An act to authorize the negotiation and ratification of separate settlement contracts with the Sioux Indians of Cheyenne River Reservation in South Dakota and of Standing Rock Reservation in South Dakota and North Dakota for Indian lands and rights acquired by the United States for the Oahe Dam and Reservoir, Missouri River development, and for other related purposes," approved September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1093), is amended by striking out "eighteen months" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-seven months."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "twenty-seven" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty-eight."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSMISSION OF POISONS IN THE MAIL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5609) to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting after the paragraph reading:

"The transmission in the mails of poisonous drugs and medicines may be limited by the Postmaster General to shipments of such articles from the manufacturer thereof or dealer therein to licensed physicians, surgeons, dentists, pharmacists, druggists, cosmetologists, barbers, and veterinarians, under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe."

a new paragraph to read as follows:

"The transmission in the mails of poisons for scientific use, and which are not outwardly dangerous or of their own force dangerous or injurious to life, health, or property, may be limited by the Postmaster General to shipments of such articles between the manufacturers thereof, dealers therein, bona fide research or experimental scientific laboratories, and such other persons who are employees of the Federal, a State, or local government, whose official duties are comprised, in whole or in part, of the use of such poisons, and who are designated by the head of the agency in which they are employed to receive or send such articles, under such rules and regulations as the Postmaster General shall prescribe."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISING PROCEDURES FOR DUPLICATE CHECKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1411) to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder.

There being on objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in section 3646 (e) of the Revised Statutes of the United States (31 U. S. C. 528 (e)) is amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That when the Postmaster General is satisfied that such loss, theft, or destruction occurred without fault of the owner or holder or while any check was in the custody or control of the Post Office Department or in the mails, the Postmaster General may, in lieu of an indemnity bond, authorize the issuance of a substitute check or warrant upon such affidavit as he may prescribe, to be made by the payee or owner of an original check."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF POSTAL STATIONS AT ARMED FORCES INSTALLATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2078) to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, whenever the Postmaster General deems it necessary in serving camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and defense or other strategic installations he may establish postal stations or branch post offices at such camps, posts, stations, or installations notwithstanding the limitations imposed by the third proviso in the act of June 9, 1896 (39 U. S. C. 160). The authority granted by this section shall terminate 5 years after the date of enactment of this act, or any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

SEC. 2. Section (a) of the act entitled "An act to provide for clerical assistance at post offices, branches, or stations serving military and naval personnel, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1950 (Public Law 552, ch. 252, 81st Cong., 2d sess.), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever the Postmaster General deems it necessary in serving the camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and defense or other strategic installations, he is authorized to (1) detail postal employees from main post offices to postal units at such camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and defense or other strategic installations, without changing the official station of any such postal employee, and (2), without regard to the Travel Expense Act of 1949, pay each such postal employee an allowance, in lieu of actual expenses, of not more than $4 for each day while so detailed."

SEC. 3. This act shall apply to Guam and the other Territories and possessions of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RIO GRANDE, NEW DONNA, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1511) granting the consent of Congress to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if some member of the committee acquainted with this bill can advise why there are no adequate reports accompanying it?

In the absence of the explanation, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER, NEW ORLEANS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 108) providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

INTERSTATE COMPACT REGARDING WATERS OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2470) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact providing for the equitable division and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River, and all of its tributaries in the State entering into such compact and for matters incidental thereto, upon condition that one qualified person shall be appointed by the President of the United States who shall participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and shall make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into: *Provided*, That any such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by each of five or more of said States, including the four States having major interest, namely, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington, and approved by the Congress of the United States: *Provided further*, That subject to the provisions of such compact the use of waters for navigation and hydroelectric power production shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural, mining, municipal, and domestic purposes and shall not interfere with or prevent use for such dominant purposes: *Provided further*, That electric power generated from waters impounded must be so allocated as to meet the needs of each State.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 11, change the colon to a period and strike the balance of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF ROAD RIGHT-OF-WAY EASEMENTS TO TENNESSEE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1710) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain road right-of-way easements in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the State of Tennessee, without reimbursement, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to those certain road right-of-way easements over lands in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., acquired by the United States for use as an access road to the Center Hill Dam and Reservoir, all as set out on sheets 4 to 16, inclusive, of highway drawing dated March 1942, designated as "Right Bank Access Road—Dam Site to Silver Point" on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAL ESTATE CONVEYANCE TO THE CITY OF MACON, GA.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4444) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon, containing 2 acres, more or less.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., without charge therefor, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain parcel of land containing 2 acres, more or less, situated in said city of Macon, Bibb County, Ga., metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department, said parcel being a part of a tract of two hundred sixty-six and forty-nine one-hundredths acres, more or less, title to which was acquired by judgment on declaration of taking filed on April 15, 1941, in condemnation proceedings numbered 116 civil in the District Court of the United States for the Macon division of the middle district of Georgia, the said city of Macon having accepted the sum of $1 as compensation for said tract, subject to the condition that if it is not used for the manufacture or assembly of ordnance or for other military or naval purposes for 24 consecutive months it shall revert to the city of Macon or its assigns, said parcel not having at any time since its acquisition been used for any of said purposes.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KATMAI NATIONAL MONUMENT, ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4794) to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of aiding in the development of building materials essential to the growth of Alaska, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized, in his discretion, for a period of 15 years from the date of approval of this act, and under such conditions and for such consideration as he may prescribe, to permit the removal of deposits of siliceous volcanic ash, commonly known as pumicite, from such areas as he may designate along the shores of Shelikof Strait in Katmai National Monument, Alaska.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETROCESSION OF CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OVER A HIGHWAY AT FORT BRAGG, N. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4796) to retrocede to the State of North Carolina concurrent jurisdiction over a highway at Fort Bragg, N. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby granted to the State of North Carolina a retrocession of jurisdiction over the area within the Fort Bragg Military Reservation utilized by the State of North Carolina for Highway No. 87, the general location of which is shown on map designated: War Department, O. C. E., Construction Division, Real Estate, Fort Bragg Military Reservation, approved June 3, 1944, drawing numbered 569-6, on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, to the extent that all laws of the State, as well as all laws of the United States, shall be applicable thereon and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover.

SEC. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for in section 1 of this act shall take effect upon acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of North Carolina.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHELSEA STREET IN THE CITY OF BOSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4897) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain rights of access in and to Chelsea Street in the city of Boston, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to surrender and convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, without cost, all rights of access in and to Chelsea Street in the city of Boston, Charlestown District, Mass., which the United States of America may have or possess by virtue of its ownership of an abutting parcel of land on which the building known as Boston Naval Shipyard Garage Building 204 is located: *Provided*, That such conveyance shall not be executed until the Mystic River Bridge Authority, a body politic and corporate created under chapter 562 of the acts of 1946 of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, shall have conveyed to the United States of America without cost and subject only to such reservations as the Secretary of the Navy may approve, a parcel of land contiguous to and on the west side of said Garage Building 204 and containing approximately 7,103 square feet, on which substitute facilities shall be provided by the United States of America through the Secretary of the Navy to furnish access to Henley Street in said city of Boston, and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts shall have paid the United States the cost of such substitute facilities including the cost of constructing a ramp to the second-floor level of said Garage Building 204 and of any alterations to said garage building necessary in connection therewith. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into such preliminary contract or agreement as may be necessary and appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Massachusetts" and insert "Massachusetts,".

Page 1, line 5, after the word "cost", insert "to the Commonwealth except as hereinafter provided."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "America" and insert "America,".

Page 2, line 7, after the word "cost", insert "to the United States."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEAL BEACH, CALIF.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4965) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell and convey to Sam Arvanitis and George Arvanitis a parcel of land consisting of one-quarter acre, more or less, situated at the naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to sell at a price not less than its fair market value and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may deem proper, and convey to Sam Arvanitis and George Arvanitis a parcel of land consisting of one-quarter acre, more or less, situated at the naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif., adjacent to other lands owned by the said Sam Arvanitis and George Arvanitis, a description of which by metes and bounds is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOWN OF MILLS, WYO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5698) to amend the act of September 25, 1950, so as to provide that the liability of the town of Mills, Wyo., to furnish sewerage service under such act shall not extend to future construction by the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer to the town of Mills, Wyo., a sewerage system located in such town," approved September 25, 1950, is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That the liability of the town to furnish sewerage service to the United States hereunder shall be limited to the amount of such service being furnished by the town on the date of the enactment of this proviso and shall not be extended so as to require the town to furnish sewerage service to the United States with respect to any buildings or facilities constructed by the United States on or after such date."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 6, after the word "date", insert "and such service shall extend only for the useful life of said sewerage system."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4801) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, notwithstanding any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary, may authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of $1,000,000 for flood control and related purposes.

SEC. 2. The bonds issued under authority of this act may be either term or serial bonds, maturing, in the case of term bonds, not later than 30 years from the date of issue thereof, and, in the case of serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not less than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. Act 204 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, pertaining to the issuance of public improvement bonds, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4802) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain public improvement bonds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, notwithstanding any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary, may authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue bonds in the sum of $1,600,000 for the acquisition, construction, and improvement of public parks and playgrounds in the city and county of Honolulu.

SEC. 2. The bonds issued under authority of this act may be either term or serial bonds, maturing, in the case of term bonds, not later than 30 years from the date of issue thereof, and, in the case of serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not less than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. Act 255 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, pertaining to the issuance of public improvement bonds, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4923) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, notwithstanding any provision of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary, may authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of $3,000,000 for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads.

SEC. 2. The bonds issued under authority of this act may be either term or serial bonds, maturing, in the case of term bonds, not later than 30 years from the date of issue thereof, and, in the case of serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not less than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without the approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. Act 265 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, pertaining to the issuance of public improvement bonds, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTY OF MAUI, T. H.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5071) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvements bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, any provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act, or any laws of the Territory of Hawaii, or of any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, may authorize the county of Maui, Territory of Hawaii, to issue general-obligation bonds in the sum of $500,000 for the purpose of enabling it to construct flood-control projects on Iao stream in that county.

SEC. 2. The bonds issued under authority of this act shall be serial bonds maturing in substantially equal installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years from the date of the issue of such series and the last installment not later than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. That portion of Joint Resolution 20 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, pertaining to the issuance of public improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed subject to the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COUNTY OF MAUI, T. H.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5072) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, any provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act, or any laws of the Territory of Hawaii, or any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, may authorize the county of Maui, T. H. to issue general-obligation bonds in the sum of $1,000,000 for the purpose of enabling it to construct new public-school buildings in that county.

SEC. 2. The bonds issued under authority of this act shall be serial bonds maturing in substantially equal installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years from the date of the issue of such series and the last installment not later than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. That portion of Joint Resolution 20 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1951, pertaining to the issuance of public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed subject to the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5386) to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, any provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act, or any laws of the Territory of Hawaii, or any act of this Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, may authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue general obligation bonds in the sum of $5,000,000 for the purposes of acquiring real property for public-school purposes and of constructing and replacing buildings for public-school purposes in the city and county of Honolulu.

SEC. 2. The bonds issued under authority of this act shall be serial bonds maturing in substantially equal installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years from the date of the issue of such series and the last installment not later than 30 years from the date of such issue. Such bonds may be issued without approval of the President of the United States.

SEC. 3. Act 288 of the Session Laws of Hawaii 1951, pertaining to the issuance of school bonds, as authorized by this act, is hereby ratified and confirmed subject to the provisions of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN LAND AND OTHER PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4337) to authorize certain easement, land, and other property transactions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, on such terms and conditions as he determines to be in the public interest, to grant and convey to the following grantees the following easements in and over land:

(a) To the city of El Segundo, Calif., a permanent easement for public-highway purposes over a strip of land 20 feet wide for a distance of 530 feet and 30 feet wide for a distance of 761 feet across the southern end of the site of the naval industrial reserve plant and contiguous to El Segundo Avenue, El Segundo, Calif., a metes-and-bounds description of which strip is on file in the Department of the Navy.

(b) To Atchison Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., a corporation, a permanent easement for railway purposes over two strips of land within the site of Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, one strip being 50 feet in width and 1,279 feet in length and containing 1.469 acres, more or less, the other strip being of a width varying from 0 at each end to 15 feet at midpoint and 1,200 feet in length and containing two-tenths of an acre, more or less, metes-and-bounds descriptions of which are on file in the Department of the Navy, in consideration for the conveyance by said Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. to the United States of America of rights to occupy and use certain parcels of land within right-of-way in the vicinity of Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, Oceanside, Calif., for warehouse purposes and for transmission, water, sewage, telephone, and other utility lines incident to the operation and maintenance of Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, so long as the United States of America desires and without cost therefor, including part occupancy and use;

(c) To the city of Long Beach, Calif., a permanent easement for street purposes in and over a strip of land 50 feet wide and extending for a distance of 703.23 feet, being the northerly 50 feet of the Lexington housing project, commonly known as Lexington Gardens, Long Beach, Calif., a metes-and-bounds description of which strip of land is on file in the Department of the Navy;

(d) To El Paso Natural Gas Co., a corporation, a permanent easement for construction, operation, and maintenance of a gas pipeline within a strip of land 20 feet wide and 5,696 feet long, containing 2.61 acres, more or less, across land comprising the site of the naval air facility at Litchfield Park, Ariz., a metes-and-bounds description of which strip is on file in the Department of the Navy, the terms and conditions of the grant and conveyance to include the payment therefor of the fair market value thereof as determined by the Secretary of the Navy; and

(e) To the Ford City Sanitation District, Ford City, Calif., a permanent easement for the construction, operation, and maintenance of a trunk sanitary sewer line within a right-of-way 20 feet wide, lying 10 feet on either side of a line across land within section 12, township 32 south, range 24 east, Mount Diablo base and meridian, Kern County, Calif., as delineated on a drawing on file in the Department of the Navy, together with the permanent right to construct, operate, and maintain sewer lines in extension of alleys across reserved drilling sites in Ford City located in naval petroleum reserve No. 2, Kern County, Calif, within right-of-way areas delineated on a drawing on file in the Department of the Navy.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey to the State of Maryland, without cost to the State, the following parcels of land located within the cite of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., for so long as such parcels are used by the State for public street purposes:

(a) A strip of land on both sides of the existing State road, as delineated on a drawing on file in the Department of the Navy, for a distance of approximately 825 feet, more or less, extending easterly from the intersection of King George Street, and as re-

quired for a paved road of a width of 34.5 feet;

(b) A strip of land on the north and east side of existing State road, as delineated on a drawing on file in the Department of the Navy, for a distance of approximately 760 feet, more or less, extending westerly from the intersection of King George Street, and as required for a paved road of a width of 34 feet; and

(c) A strip of land on the west side of King George Street, as delineated on a drawing on file in the Department of the Navy, starting approximately 210 feet south of State road and extending southerly for approximately 290 feet, more or less, and as required for a paved road of a width of 31.6 feet between curbs.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States of America the donation by the State of Louisiana of a parcel of land lying along Lake Pontchartrain and adjacent to the industrial canal and Camp Leroy Johnson at New Orleans, La., containing 12.607 acres of land, more or less, upon which the United States Naval Reserve Training Center, New Orleans, La., is located.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the Administrator of General Services is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Navy, without reimbursement, custody and control over the following property: (a) Nine hundred and thirty-four one-thousandths of an acre of land with improvements consisting of one building and appurtenant facilities, known as Plancor 631-A, and located at 500 West Thirty-Sixth Street, Chicago, Ill.; (b) thirteen and five-tenths acres of land with improvements consisting of six buildings and appurtenant facilities, known as the remaining portion of former Maritime Commission barracks at Kaiser-Swan Island Shipyard and located at Portland, Oreg.; and (c) fifteen acres of land with improvements consisting of seven buildings, one outfitting pier and appurtenant facilities, known as a portion of former Walsh-Kaiser Shipyard, and located at Providence, R. I.

"SEC. 2. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to accept on behalf of the United States of America, at a cost not exceeding $1, the conveyance by the port of Portland, Oreg., of a building known as the Child Care Center Building and located on land leased from the port of Portland, at Portland, Oreg., and to transfer without reimbursement the custody and control over such building to the Department of the Navy.

"SEC. 3. The Administrator of General Services is authorized to convey, without cost and on behalf of Reconstruction Finance Corporation, to the United States of America, one and eighteen one-hundredths acres of land, known as the remaining portion of the former Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Plant, Plancor 1644, located at Allentown, Pa., and to transfer custody and control thereof to the Department of the Navy without reimbursement.

"SEC. 4. The transfers and acceptance of conveyances authorized by sections 1, 2, and 3 hereof shall not include any inventories of raw material or work in progress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize certain land and other property transactions."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINERAL LEASING LAWS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4752) to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

FURNISHING FREE BLANK AMMUNITION TO VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4949) to amend the act of February 10, 1920, so as to provide for the free distribution of blank ammunition to veterans' organizations for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of War to loan Army rifles to posts of the American Legion," approved February 10, 1920, as amended (50 U. S. C., sec. 62), is hereby amended to read as follows: That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized, under rules, limitations, and regulations to be prescribed by him, to loan obsolete or condemned Army rifles, slings, and cartridge belts to posts or camps of organizations composed of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines, for use by them in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines, and for other post or camp ceremonial purposes; and to issue and deliver to such posts and camps, free of charge, blank ammunition in suitable amounts for such rifles: *Provided, however,* That not to exceed 10 such rifles shall be issued to any one post or camp."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "organizations composed of honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, or marines", and insert: "national veterans' organizations recognized by the Veterans' Administration."

Page 2, line 7, after the word "charge", insert: "but without expense to the United States for packing, handling, and transportation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act of February 10, 1920, so as to provide for free blank ammunition for veterans' organizations for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans, and for other ceremonial purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPACT BETWEEN THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA AND THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4900) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

TO REPEAL THE 10-PERCENT SURCHARGE ON POSTAL CARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5900) to repeal the 10-percent surchage on postal cards.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for the House bill the Senate bill, S. 2394, to repeal the 10-percent surcharge on postal cards.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc, That the first sentence of section 1 (a) of the act entitled "An act to readjust postal rates," approved October 30, 1951 (Public Law 233, 82d Cong.), is amended by striking out the colon and the following: "*Provided*, That on all single and double post cards sold in quantities of 50 or more there shall be an additional charge of 10 percent."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act to such act of October 30, 1951, shall take effect on the 10th day following the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5900) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTING TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR IN PUBLIC LAW 204, EIGHTY-SECOND CONGRESS (THE POSTAL PAY BILL)

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2458) to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 (a) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong., as amended by sec. 8 of Public Law 204, 82d Cong.), is hereby further amended by changing the heading "Assistant superintendent" in the table therein to read "Assistant superintendents."

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective as of July 1, 1951.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESERVE CERTAIN LAND ON PUBLIC DOMAIN IN NEVADA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4285) to reserve certain land on the public

domain in Nevada for addition to the Summit Lake Indian Reservation.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

REPEAL CERTAIN LEGISLATION RELATING TO HIGHWAYS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4694) to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of June 7, 1924 (ch. 318, 43 Stat. 606), as amended by the act of May 28, 1941 (ch. 137, 55 Stat. 207), is hereby repealed, and the tribal funds of the Navajo Indians are hereby relieved of the reimbursable requirement imposed by said acts.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MALTA AND GLASGOW IRRIGATION DISTRICTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5489) to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask several questions with reference to this legislation. I notice in the committee report that the payoff period for the proposed new construction will last for a period of approximately 106 years. Is that not rather a lengthy pay-off period?

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. We agree that it is a rather lengthy payoff period; 116 in one instance and 106 in the other. It is not the kind of a thing our committee likes to see done. However, this agreement was reached under laws existing between the irrigators and the Bureau of Reclamation, and has been approved by the Congress, and provides for this repayment period as the only way that the Government can hope to get back the money that has been invested in this irrigation project; otherwise the only other alternative was to write off these amounts, because they are over and above the amounts the irrigators could pay annually.

Mr. FORD. The normal pay-off period is 40 years, is that not correct?

Mr. D'EWART. And 10 years ordinary construction period, making a total of 50.

Mr. FORD. And this new construction will run for 116 and 106 years.

Mr. D'EWART. That is correct. The reason for that is, as I have said, that this project was started in days when reclamation was new. Practically every mistake that could be made was made in the project, and the only hope that the Government has to get back even this amount of money is to extend this repayment period so that the amount that can be paid each year is within the ability of these irrigators to pay. We regret the long payment period, but we have either the choice of charging off these funds and never hoping to get them, or extending the period long enough so that the amount per year would be within the ability of these irrigators to pay.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman from Montana stated the same circumstances and facts in the committee when this bill was before us. It is my recollection that it was nearly unanimously reported out by the committee even after the statement, which has just been made here on the floor, was made in the committee. The committee certainly thought the bill had merit. It is a choice between writing off cost or making a new contract which will make it possible to pay out.

Mr. FORD. Is this an indication of a growing tendency in irrigation projects to extend these payoff periods?

Mr. MURDOCK. I hope it is probably growing out of existence. This is one of the oldest projects in the West, and as the gentleman has said, every mistake that was possible to be made was made on it. There may be a few others, but I hope not many more of this kind.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, you will find a statement in the report which makes an exception to this repayment period and asking that in the future careful consideration be given to charging off these amounts rather than extending payment for this length of time. We were not happy about it at all.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. The gentleman from Montana has correctly stated the case with reference not only to this bill, but the one that follows. We either have to write it off or extend the period, and the committee has decided the principle for the basic consideration which should govern in writing off contracts of this sort, and in the absence of arriving at this basis for consideration we have gone ahead and extended it such as we have in this instance.

As he has very correctly stated, we know of no other alternative at this time.

Mr. D'EWART. This is not true in the case of the next bill. In the next bill 38 years is the repayment period.

Mr. FORD. Can I be assured that the committee is going to make the Bureau of Reclamation be a little more realistic in the future in the contracts it makes with people who are seeking to obtain water from the irrigation project?

Mr. D'EWART. For my part, I will promise the gentleman I will do all I can to keep these repayment periods within the 50 years. I think this is an erroneous idea. I think it would be better to charge off some of these sums, but that is not the way it was done in this case.

Mr. FORD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following contracts which have been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) pursuant to subsection (a) of section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), are hereby approved and the Secretary is hereby authorized to execute them on behalf of the United States:

The contract with the Malta irrigation district which was executed by said district pursuant to the laws of the State of Montana and in conformity with the order of the District Court of the Seventeenth Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the county of Phillips, dated March 6, 1951, in the confirmation proceedings on said contract before said court.

A contract with the Glasgow irrigation district in substantially the form and terms approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on June 14, 1950, when proceedings for the authorization of the irrigation district's execution of such a contract shall have been confirmed by decree of a court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 2. The 1947 reclassification of the lands of the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district of the Milk River project, Montana, made in accordance with the provisions of section 8 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and approved by the Board of Commissioners of the Malta Irrigation District by resolution dated June 24, 1948, and by the Board of Commissioners of the Glasgow Irrigation District by resolution dated July 1, 1948, is approved.

SEC. 3. Contingent upon the execution of the contract with the Malta irrigation district, approved in section 1 of this act, there shall be deducted from the total costs of the project, as the Malta irrigation district's share thereof, the sum of $663,644 on account of 12,128 acres, within the Malta irrigation district, found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands.

SEC. 4. Contingent upon the execution of the contract with the Glasgow irrigation district, approved in section 1 of this act, there shall be deducted from the total costs of the project, as the Glasgow irrigation district's share thereof, the sum of $5,691 on account of 104 acres, within the Glasgow irrigation district, found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands.

SEC. 5. There shall be deducted from the total costs of the project on account of nondistrict lands found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands, which reclassification as to nondistrict lands is hereby approved, the sum of $7,661 on account of 140 acres formerly excluded from the Glasgow irrigation district and not intended to be included within said district.

SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to cancel and deduct from the total costs of the Glasgow division of the Milk River project, Montana, the construction charge obligation against any of the lands within said division of said project

which are not actually included within the Glasgow irrigation district. The amount of said cancellation and deduction shall be computed by the Secretary by multiplying the total number of acres of land formerly intended to be included within the irrigation district but not so included by the sum of $54.72 per acre.

SEC. 7. The Secretary, at any time subsequent to the execution of the contracts, hereinbefore approved, and not later than January 1, 1960, shall reclassify and designate as either class 1, 2, 3, 4, 4a, 4b, or 6, as provided in said contracts, all lands within the Malta and Glasgow irrigation districts designated as class 5 by the 1947 reclassification of lands, and the reclassification and designation as class 6 of any of said lands shall reduce the construction charge obligation of the district in which such class 6 lands are situated by the sum of $54.72 per acre.

SEC. 8. The amounts deducted from the construction charge obligation of either or both of said irrigation districts, and from the total costs of the projects as provided for herein and adjusted in the contracts approved herein, shall be charged off as a permanent loss to the reclamation fund, but no adjustment shall be made by the United States by reason thereof with any individual landowner by way of refund of or credit on account of sums heretofore paid, repaid, returned, or due and payable to the United States, by way of exchange of land, or by any other method.

SEC. 9. All costs and expenses incurred by the United States in negotiating and completing the contracts approved by this act and in making the investigations and land reclassifications in connection therewith are hereby declared to be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable.

SEC. 10. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws as these laws are defined by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRENCHTOWN IRRIGATION DISTRICT, MONTANA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5630) to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the contract dated September 6, 1951, with the Frenchtown irrigation district, the organization representing the water users of the Frenchtown Federal reclamation project in the State of Montana, which contract has been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior under authority of subsection (a) of section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, is approved, and the Secretary is hereby authorized to execute it on behalf of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RED LAKE BAND OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6133) to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to withdraw as much as may be necessary from the fund on deposit in the Treasury of the United States arising from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber within the Red Lake Reservation in Minnesota, according to the provisions of the act of May 18, 1916 (39 Stat. 137), to the credit of the Red Lake Indians in Minnesota, and to pay therefrom $100 to each member of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota who is living at the date of enactment of this act. Such installment payments shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe.

SEC. 2. No money paid to Indians under this act shall be subject to any lien or claim of attorneys or other persons. Before any payment is made under this act, the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians of Minnesota shall, in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, ratify and accept the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. Payments made under this act shall not be held to be "other income and resources" as that term is used in sections 2 (a) (7), 402 (a) (7), and 1002 (a) (8) of the Social Security Act, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 42, secs. 302 (a) (7), 602 (a) (7), and 1202 (a) (8)).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "installment payments" and insert "payment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6242) to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all that certain parcel of land, situate in Honolulu, City and County of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, ceded to the United States under Joint Resolution No. 55 of July 7, 1898 (30 Stat. 750), and heretofore set aside for military purposes by Executive Order No. 2335, dated March 6, 1916, as modified by Executive Order No. 9861, dated May 31, 1947, comprising an area of sixty-four thousand six hundred and twenty-seven square feet, more or less, is hereby restored to the possession, use, and control of the government of the Territory of Hawaii.

SEC. 2. The Territory of Hawaii, through its Governor and Commissioner of Public Lands, and with the approval of its Board of Public Lands, is hereby authorized to convey the whole or any portion of the land restored under section 1 above, to the Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., in exchange for land of equal value owned by said Hawaiian Electric Co., Ltd., situate in the City of Honolulu within the area bounded by Bishop, Halekauwila, and Alaska Streets and Ala Moana Boulevard.

SEC. 3. The land received in the exchange authorized by section 2 shall, except as otherwise provided, have the same status and be subject to the same laws as the ceded land given in the exchange.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, after "land", insert "together with improvements located thereon."

Page 2, line 1, strike "twenty-seven" and insert "twenty-five."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOOPA VALLEY INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6675) to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa Unified School District for use for school purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, convey by deed to the State of California or to the Hoopa Unified School District of the State of California not to exceed 30 acres of land located in the agency and school reserve on the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation for use as a site for the construction of a school for the education of both Indian and non-Indian pupils. The conveyance shall be made subject to such terms and conditions as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior, the Tribal Council of the Hoopa Valley Indians, and the State of California or the Hoopa Unified School District.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "thirty" and insert "forty-five."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISQUALIFICATION OF LEGISLATORS—HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4410) to amend section 16 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relative to disqualification of legislators.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 16 of the Hawaiian Organic Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 16. Disqualification of legislators: That no member of the legislature shall, during the term for which he is elected, be appointed or elected to any office of the Territory of Hawaii, except that he may be appointed a justice of the supreme court, a judge of a circuit court, a district magistrate, or attorney general."

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That any appointment made pursuant to this section shall not take effect until the member of the legislature so appointed shall resign from the legislature: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall prevent a member of the legislature from serving as a delegate to a constitutional convention."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6854) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

Anfuso	Fallon	Miller, Calif.
Armstrong	Feighan	Miller, Md.
Ayres	Fine	Morgan
Beall	Gore	Morrison
Blatnik	Hand	Murray, Wis.
Bow	Harrison, Nebr.	Osmers
Bray	Hart	Philbin
Brooks	Heffernan	Potter
Buchanan	Heller	Powell
Buckley	Herter	Redden
Buffett	Hoffman, Ill.	Regan
Bush	Hull	Ribicoff
Camp	Javits	Roosevelt
Case	Jones, Hamilton C.	Sabath
Celler	Judd	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Staggers
Chudoff	King, Calif.	Taylor
Combs	Lane	Vail
Dollinger	Larcade	Watts
Donohue	Latham	Weichel
Dorn	Lesinski	Wickersham
Durham	McCulloch	Widnall
Ellsworth		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be fixed at not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, but this bill carries an appropriation of over $3,000,000,000. That is a lot of money. It was reported to the House on last Friday, and the membership has now had only 3 days to read the hearings, to read the report, and to study the bill; that is, Friday afternoon, Saturday, and Sunday.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to say to the gentleman that although the report was not out Friday, the hearings have been printed and have been distributed for a week or 10 days.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Well, the bill was just reported, as I understand, Friday; so we would not expect it to come up for, I believe, 3 days. In my opinion, that does not give the House sufficient time to really study the bill, and I just want to make the statement that I think that is a bad practice and I hope it will not be continued in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6854, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important bills that will engage the attention of this body during this session.

Before discussing this bill I want to pay my respects to the members of the subcommittee which I have the privilege of heading. I think we have had one of the best subcommittees this year we have ever had on this bill. The members have been very faithful. We have had a full attendance at practically all of our meetings, and the members have given careful study to the problems presented.

The gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] was taken from us toward the latter part of our deliberations for service on the subcommittee on Armed Services, but he was with us most of the time. The gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. SIEMINSKI], who is a newcomer, has made a substantial contribution to the work of the committee.

My good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], the ranking minority member of the committee, served at one time as chairman. I had the privilege of serving with him then. He was always fair and made an excellent chairman. We have worked together for a number of years and there has always been a spirit of cooperation between us. I thank him for his cooperation in the consideration of this bill this year.

Then we have the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], who has contributed very materially to the deliberations of the committee, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. JAMES] who because of his business experiences is particularly familiar with the operations of several bureaus, especially the Bureau of Engraving and Printing and the mint.

The committee suffered the misfortune of losing its executive secretary while the hearings were in progress. Mr. Heinmiller went to the hospital for a major operation. However, prior to the time Mr. Heinmiller had taken over the work of the committee, Mr. Sprankle served as our executive assistant. He had been promoted to the position of assistant clerk of the entire committee. Mr. Robert Michaels was assigned to us under the able direction of Mr. Sprankle, and together they have served us admirably during Mr. Heinmiller's absence.

Mr. Chairman, the two departments we are considering today are key departments in the Government. I am happy to say that our committee has never approached its deliberations on this bill in a spirit of partisanship. We have recognized that the Treasury and Post Office Departments are two departments of the Government which should be free of politics. Therefore, the committee on all occasions has tried, and it has succeeded in eliminating any political considerations.

Once again, we come before the House with a unanimous report. The committee has agreed on every provision in the bill.

We held lengthy hearings. We started with the heads of the departments and went down through each division and heard the men who are to spend this money. But, even then, the committee was not satisfied. There were some requests for additional funds over last year, and the committee felt that in the face of the emergency which now exists, it should not approve any increases of appropriations unless they are absolutely necessary. To satisfy ourselves as to the need, after the hearings were completed, we visited various installations throughout the United States.

We went first to Philadelphia where we inspected the mint, because the mint was asking for an increase. From Philadelphia we went to New York, where we inspected Customs installations and the facilities established for the Coast Guard port security program. You will remember that the Congress has placed upon the Coast Guard the duty of defending our ports during the emergency. From New York, we went to Chicago where we inspected the Bureau of Public Debt, and also the post office. From Chicago we went to Denver and inspected the mint there, and from Denver we came back to St. Louis where we inspected the Coast Guard river installations.

This is the second largest appropriation bill which will be presented to this body. It is second only to the armed-services bill. Altogether the bill carries approximately $18,500,000,000. There are, however, $15,000,000,000 of expenditures which cannot be reduced. First, we have the permanent and definite appropriation of $6,250,000,000. That is made up almost entirely of interest on the public debt, which is estimated for

1953 at $6,150,000,000. Obviously, we have to pay the interest on the public debt, and try as you may, you cannot cut it 1 penny—whatever the interest is, it must be paid. There are approximately $6,000,000,000 in trust-funds expenditures which are paid out of the receipts taken in for old-age pensions and for unemployment compensation. Those payments are fixed by law, and they do not come out of the general fund of the Treasury, but are paid out by the Treasury Department. Those funds cannot be cut.

In addition to that we have refunds of taxes and customs, amounting to approximately three billion dollars. As a matter of fact, they do not even appear in the bill, because recently it was determined that instead of showing them as appropriations, the refunds that have to be paid back are deducted from the amount of the revenue receipts. They amount to approximately three billion dollars, which makes a total of $15,000,000,000. That leaves $3,515,000,000 in this bill, which is subject to review.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Will the gentleman yield briefly to inform the House what the total national debt is as of today?

Mr. GARY. It is $259,000,000,000, approximately.

Mr. SHORT. And the interest on that debt, as the gentleman just pointed out, is how much?

Mr. GARY. $6,150,000,000.

Mr. SHORT. Which cannot, of course, be reduced a dime.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

The estimates in this bill for 1953 are $3,553,000,000. This same appropriation last year was $2,960,000,000. The requests show a substantial increase over last year. The committee recommends $3,442,455,000, which is an actual increase over 1952 of $482,282,000. Of that amount $443,921,000 is directly attributable to statutory increases which the Congress voted during the last year for pay increases, for increases in annual leave in the Post Office Department, and the additional amounts that were determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission as increased payments to the railroads for transporting the mail. In other words, of the $482,000,000 increase which the committee has recommended, $423,000,000 represents increases over which the committee itself had no jurisdiction, but which had been determined by the Congress and by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Therefore, the committee increased the bill only $38,000,000.

It did, however, decrease the requests for these two departments $72,690,000, which is the largest cut that has been made in this bill in 5 years. In 1949 the cut was approximately $26,000,000; in 1950 it was $56,000,000; in 1951 it was $31,000,000; in 1952, $36,500,000; and this year we recommend cutting it $72,690,000.

The Treasury Department appropriation for 1952 was $619,373,000. The request for 1953 was $693,045,000. The committee recommends $648,655,600. That represents an increase of $29,282,000 over 1952, of which $22,000,000 is a statutory increase. The committee, therefore, recommends an increase of only $7,280,000 and a decrease in the budget estimate of $44,390,000.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out some increases which are absolutely necessary for 1953 if this Department is to function efficiently, because some of the divisions have had their workload increased tremendously.

Let us consider briefly the Office of the Treasurer of the United States. In 1951 governmental expenditures were $44,000,000,000; in 1952 it is estimated they will be $71,000,000,000; in 1953 they are estimated at $85,000,000,000. That means that the Treasurer of the United States is going to pay out nearly twice as much in 1953 as in 1951. Last year we reduced their appropriation, and at the present time they are faced with a cut of 200 of their trained employees.

In 1951 the number of checks they had to process was 268,000,000; for 1952 it will be 322,000,000; and in 1953 it will be 328,000,000.

On January first there was a backlog of 12,000,000 checks as compared with a normal backlog of 5,000,000; and there was an increase in that backlog of 3,000,000 in January. Unless we recognize that situation and allow them some additional funds, this backlog is going to increase and that office is going to cease to function efficiently.

The same is true of the Bureau of Disbursements. The same workload that affects the Treasury Department affects that bureau, because they have to process the checks which the Treasury pays. Their workload has also been tremendously increased.

The same is true of the Bureau of Public Debt. Our public debt, as you all know, is increasing under our present appropriations. The Bureau of Public Debt is trying to distribute the debt as much as possible among individuals, so that too much of it will not be owned by the banks and financial institutions.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. Will the gentleman tell us why so many more checks must be processed and paid out?

Mr. GARY. Because we are spending nearly twice as much money. A large portion of the checks are for defense purposes. The Air Force checks have tremendously increased. As you increase the defense forces you increase the number of checks which have to be paid by the Treasurer.

Mr. VURSELL. That is true, I presume, in almost every department of the Government.

Mr. GARY. It really is, and particularly in the Defense Department at the present time.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SCHENCK. I understood the gentleman to say that the interest on the public debt was over $6,000,000,000 a year.

Mr. GARY. $6,150,000,000.

Mr. SCHENCK. That is, roughly, $500,000,000 a month. That divided by 150,000,000 people would mean $3.30 per person in the United States; in other words, it is costing everyone in the United States about $40 a year just to carry the national debt. Is that correct?

Mr. GARY. I would not say because I am a very poor mathematician. I will not dispute the gentleman's figures if he says they are correct.

Mr. SCHENCK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GARY. The Bureau of Public Debt is planning this year a savings bond campaign designed to distribute the ownership of the debt among the people so that it will not be concentrated in our financial institutions. I think it has been generally recognized throughout the country by all parties that it is desirable to distribute the ownership of the public debt as much as possible.

The other division to which we have given some slight increase is the Secret Service. There is a lot of counterfeiting going on in the United States, and our citizens are suffering from their operations. The Secret Service is the branch charged with the duty of detecting counterfeiters. We have found out that the Secret Service is having difficulty with this proolem because of the light sentences that are provided for counterfeiters under our present law. We had testimony before us that one counterfeiter was arrested and sent to the penitentiary, where he practiced and perfected his art, and after being discharged returned to his old trade.

Our committee is recommending that the legislative committee give consideration to the question of increasing the penalties for counterfeiting. We did, as you know, enact the Boggs bill, at the last session of the Congress, which increased the penalties for narcotics violations, particularly for second and third offenses. It is the practice in some of the States, in my own State of Virginia, for instance, that if a person is convicted three times of a felony he automatically receives a life sentence. We feel there should be a substantial increase in the penalty for second and third convictions of counterfeiting so that we may remove these counterfeiters entirely as a threat to our people.

We also recommended some increase for the Bureau of Customs. May I say to you that if there is any agency of the Government that needs an increase it is the Bureau of Customs. Imports have tremendously increased within the last few years. If we do not have the proper number of agents to collect the duties on these imports we lose money. The worst feature of the situation is that they are now accumulating a backlog in the Bureau of Customs with the result that business transactions are being retarded. Importers cannot ascertain immediately the exact amount of the customs duty they are going to have to pay on goods; consequently they cannot fix their selling prices. Our committee had before it a number of letters from various importers and business organizations asking that we allow additional personnel to the Bureau of Customs so that this backlog could be cut down and so that

they could handle their activities on a current basis.

In addition, the customs officers have been doing a magnificent job recently in antismuggling activities. We are having a great many diamonds smuggled into this country at the present time. They have detected and confiscated diamonds amounting to millions of dollars.

In addition, there is a growing practice today to smuggle gold out of the country. Because of the value of gold on foreign exchanges we are having great difficulty from keeping people within the United States from smuggling gold to foreign countries.

Last, but by no means least, antismuggling activities in narcotics have not only resulted in the confiscation of millions of dollars' worth of narcotics, but have assisted tremendously in the enforcement of our narcotic laws.

The Bureau of Customs, frankly, is greatly in need of reorganization. They have many overlapping divisions within the Bureau, and our committee has insisted that they work out a plan of reorganiaztion. We have the assurance that if the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is approved by the Congress, it will be followed by recommendations from the Department for a reorganization of the Bureau of Customs.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue requested 7,439 additional employees. Those employees were requested largely for the enforcement of the new wagering tax. You will recall that at the last session, the Congress provided for a wagerer stamp tax and for a gross receipts tax on gamblers. The duty of enforcing that tax was placed on the Bureau of Internal Revenue. They want to set up a separate division for that purpose and they asked for 4,333 new employees to man that division. In addition, the Bureau has been very active in the last year or more in ferreting out the income of racketeers and they have transferred 2,865 of their regular agents to this activity. They requested 2,865 additional employees for the regular force to take the place of these agents that have been assigned to the antiracketeer activities. As all of you know, we have pending before the Congress at the present time a plan for the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

It has passed the House by a substantial majority and is now pending in the Senate for action.

Our committee did not feel that we should increase at this time the number of employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue by 7,439 in the face of this proposed reorganization program. The cost of the reorganization or the savings which might result from it were not included in the estimates which were before the committee. There will have to be a reestimate, if the reorganization plan is put into effect. We felt, therefore, that this large increase in personnel should not be authorized until after the reorganization plan has been acted upon. If it is adopted, then the personnel needs should be considered as a part of the reorganization plan.

We recognized the fact, however, that they do have to sell these new wagerer stamps and have other duties to perform in connection with the law. We felt that 700 additional employees would be ample to take care of any need until the reorganization of the Department is determined. Therefore, we have recommended a reduction of $35,000,000 in the budget estimates for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Frankly, that is a tremendous cut, and I cannot help but believe that any further cut in the amount would result in decreased efficiency in the Department.

There are two bureaus in which there are apparent increases, but which in fact are not increased at all. One of them is the Bureau of Narcotics. The Congress during the last session authorized an increase in personnel for the Bureau of Narcotics.

I want to say to the Congress that with the new law the Congress passed the last session, and with these new employees put on as a result of the action of the Congress, the Bureau of Narcotics has done a magnificent job during the present year. They are for once beginning to get ahead of the narcotic evil in this country.

We had a very serious situation particularly among the young people of the country. Young people were becoming addicts in a very alarming number. Many of you read of the raid that was staged throughout the entire United States by the Department just last month. In that raid the Bureau worked with the various State and local law-enforcement units, and rounded up some of the biggest dealers in dope in the entire United States. The arrests ran into the hundreds. With the new laws they have now, which will severely increase the penalties, they feel they are beginning to reach a point where they can actually handle this problem which is facing the American people.

They did not ask for any additional employees beyond those already authorized. The increase came about in projecting those employees into the next year; in other words, it will cost more in 1953 for the number of employees authorized because they were being recruited during 1952, and were employed only for a part of that year. When they are projected over into 1953 on a full year basis, it increases the appropriation, but there is no increase in the number.

The same is true of the Coast Guard. We authorized an increase in personnel of the Coast Guard to take care of the port-security program. They have asked for no additional personnel, but there has been some increase in their appropriation because we are projecting into the next year on a full year basis the additional personnel which is already authorized.

Now, we come to the Post Office Department. The appropriation for the Post Office in 1952 was $2,340,800,000. The estimates for 1953 were $2,822,100,000. The committee recommended $2,793,800,000, which is an increase over 1952 of $453,000,000. Of that amount, however, $422,000,000 represents statutory increases or increases resulting from the railroad rate decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission. So that the committee increased the amount over 1952 $31,000,000 and decreased the budget estimate $28,000,000.

Frankly, there is not very much that can be done about the Post Office Department appropriations. Only the Department deficit or the difference between expenditures and receipts is paid out of the general funds of the Treasury. The 1951 deficit was $551,000,000 and the estimates for 1952 is $768,000,000. The estimate for 1953 is $669,000,000. Here is what happened. You will recall that the Congress increased the postal rates last year. It is estimated that those postal rates increases will bring in $227,000,000 in additional revenue, but at the same time that we increased the postal rates we also increased the salaries of postal employees. We also increased the leave of postal employees. The situation as to leave was that the postal employees were on a different basis than the other civil-service employees of the Government. We put them both on the same basis, which decreased the leave of the civil-service employees and increased the leave of the Post Office employees. This resulted in increased expenditures of the Post Office Department to take care of the additional leave. Then, in addition, during this past year, the Interstate Commerce Commission decided the railroad mail pay case, which has been pending for several years. The railroads asked for and received a substantial increase in the pay for carrying the mail for the Post Office Department. That is something the Post Office Department has no control over—neither does this committee—because the Congress has designated the Interstate Commerce Commission as the agency to fix these rates. As a matter of fact, the Post Office Department is in a very peculiar position. It only controls about 3 percent of its expenditures, because 97 percent of its expenditures are made up of salaries, which are fixed by the Congress; of the railroad transportation pay, which is fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and the airmail transportation pay, which is fixed by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Increases in the salaries and mail pay for 1953 amounted to $422,000,000, which is $195,000,000 more than they took in, because of the increase in postal rates.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How much have we cut from the Postmaster General so that he cannot give us service? How much has he asked for and how much have you given him?

Mr. GARY. We have cut the appropriation $28,300,000. We do not think that will interfere with the service in any way. We think they can absorb that cut without interfering with the service. Further cuts we think would interfere with the postal service. What we have tried to do is to cut this bill as much as we possibly could without interfering with the service.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I have a request from a new development, where there are 40 families living 4 miles away from a post office, and we wrote to the Postmaster General and he says, "We will

be glad to give you this service when Congress gives us the money." Does that mean that these people will never get that service?

Mr. GARY. No, I do not think so. They are gradually extending those services. That is true all over the United States. We are having population changes caused by migration from the rural districts to the urban districts, which means that the additional people moving in must be served. At the same time the Post Office Department is also cutting out a great many fourth-class ofces throughout the United States. They have cut out a number in my district this last year.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. But they make rural free deliveries out of them, do they not?

Mr. GARY. Yes, but they save money by doing so. What they do is to put the patrons of a particular post office on a rural route that passes near by. They can be serviced by the rural routes at less cost. Consequently, they are cutting down expenses by reducing the number of post offices.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. We are all very much interested in good postal service. Of course, it is true that the Congress has increased the pay of postal workers. It was necessary to do so because the Post Office Department was losing a great many of their older and more efficient postal workers as the result of competition and the pay being higher outside than it was within the postal service. At the same time, I think the gentleman will agree that the quality of postal service has gone down rather sharply in the last few years. We have stopped the twice-a-day delivery of mail to residents throughout the Nation, and they have only one mail delivered a day. But almost everyone is complaining of the fact that the mail service is much slower than it has ever been before, and that there is a great deal of delay in the delivery of mail. Part of that is explained by the fact that some mail trains have been taken off; but in considering this legislation I wonder if the gentleman looked into the possibility of the Post Office Department, through administrative orders and otherwise, putting into effect some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Some of those recommendations have been made effective, but only a portion of them. Then there are other recommendations affecting the postal service that I think would bring greater economy and efficiency that cannot become effective until the Congress itself takes action on those recommendations.

But there is every evidence that we can get greater economy and efficiency in the handling of our postal business in this country if we either follow the recommendations of the Hoover Commission or perhaps substitute some better method than that recommended. The postal service certainly is archaic.

Mr. GARY. I want to say to the gentleman that I was going to speak of the modernization program of the Post Office Department, when I said there was very little you could do with the Post Office Department appropriations. I meant here on the floor of the House. If we cut the appropriation so they do not have enough to run the Department with, they come back for a supplemental appropriation.

The only way you can save any money in the Post Office Department is by a modernization program. I think the Hoover Commission did a good job, but I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio that this subcommittee was working on modernization of the postal service long before the Hoover Commission was appointed, but we have not had much success. We have been after the Department to modernize the service; and, frankly, this is the first time since I have been on the committee that we have had any real encouragement, and I want to point out some of the encouraging events that have taken place.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I interpose to say that I certainly do not want to take any credit away from the committee for any efforts it has made. But the fact remains that the postal service has not been modernized; the postal service has gradually and continually grown poorer rather than better. The thing is, what can we do, the gentleman's committee and the Congress, to improve conditions?

Mr. GARY. I can tell the gentleman what we have done. This committee accused the Postmaster General in its report last year of dragging his feet. When he was before us this year he said the charge was very unfair. We pointed out to him the manner in which we considered that he was dragging his feet, and I think we made out a pretty good case. Let me give the gentleman an illustration. In Chicago they have one of the largest automobile garages in the United States; they service 1,500 automobiles there, about a thousand of them within the Chicago area they service daily and about 500 outside they service periodically; and, would you believe it, they do not have a grease pit or a lift in the entire garage—one of the largest garages in the United States without a grease pit or a lift. We called this to the attention of the Postmaster General. He said that there were private garages without them. You will find some homes without bathtubs, but they are not modern homes. This committee visited the garage several years ago and complained about the old machinery that they were using. We visited it again this year, and there has been considerable improvement in the machinery.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the committee probably found a great many motor vehicles in use by the Post Office Department that were so old that it cost more to maintain them and keep them running than it would to buy new ones.

Mr. GARY. Exactly. We brought that to the attention of the Department and they have now adopted a policy of replacing motor vehicles periodically.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is exactly what the Hoover Commission tried its best to eliminate.

Mr. GARY. We are going to keep looking for these things and keep bringing them to the attention of the Department.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask the gentleman if he discussed with the Department the possibility of correcting the present method of requiring the postmaster in Anchorage, Alaska, to get his post cards: for instance, they have an order which prescribes that they get them from the main office in Washington rather than from the nearest large office like Seattle.

Mr. GARY. No; that question has not arisen.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Those are things that can be done to improve the service.

Mr. GARY. But we did find this: They have a new machine in Chicago for distributing the mail. It was designed by one of the postal employees; it is a very excellent machine. They built it themselves and they have made about three of them. They do a very good job. They have most of the bugs worked out of it now to the point where it is really effective. They have been building those machines in the Chicago post office, and it takes them about a year to build one. It is not a machine that can be used in every city in the United States, but there are from 50 to 75 cities where they could be used advantageously, but at the rate at which they are building these machines in Chicago it will take from 50 to 75 years to supply those offices. In the meantime you have lost the savings that would result from the machine.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would pay for itself eventually?

Mr. GARY. Yes. The committee has insisted that they bring in some machine manufacturers and let them look into it and help them perfect the machine; then let the manufacturers manufacture it. The Post Office Department is not in the machine-manufacturing business. Let the manufacturers build the machines in sufficient quantities to supply the demand for it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I congratulate the subcommittee on the effort it is making toward the end of getting greater efficiency and economy in the post office and may I suggest that you follow up those efforts.

Mr. GARY. I think we have reason for encouragement. Let me read to the gentleman an extract from the record of the hearings. Anyone who is interested in the Post Office Department will find a lot of information in the printed record of the hearings held by the committee this year. I want to read this statement from the Postmaster General's testimony to the committee:

> There are approximately 60 separate projects now under study and experimentation to conserve manpower, effect other economies, and expedite service through improvements in mechanical equipment, materials, and methods.
>
> A sample itemization of these projects involves light motor vehicles, elevating and

gravity loading conveyors; electric pedestrian-type tractors; coin-sorting, counting, and packaging machines; wire- and cord-tying machines; pallet containers and related equipment; improved types of payroll, addressograph, and graphotype machines; modernized garage equipment; power sweepers; counting machines for redeemed stock; light and color engineering; and numerous other projects of a similar nature.

I would like to add, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, that we were not able to utilize the services of the officials of the Research Unit of the Post Office Department to the fullest extent on many of these things in which we are interested, for the reason that their time has been taken up in the last year, or the previous year, by the work incident to the establishment of the new money-order system and the setting up of the 12 regional offices.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has that been partially accomplished in any proportion?

Mr. GARY. Yes; they are working on it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Or is that one they are projecting in the future?

Mr. GARY. A large part of it is in the experimental stage.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It has not been put into effect?

Mr. GARY. Some of it has.

Mr. BROWN or Ohio. What proportion, may I ask?

Mr. GARY. I would say probably 25 to 50 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Twenty-five to fifty percent of the modernizing work has been done?

Mr. GARY. No, not the amount that can be done; 25 to 50 percent of the work he has outlined here. They have modernized the garage at Chicago rather materially and have put in some new machines. They still have not put the pit or lift in which to me would have first priority. But they are making some progress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Would the gentleman estimate that they have done 10 percent of the modernizing job that is ahead of them?

Mr. GARY. No. I do not think they have scratched the surface.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This is all to be done in the future.

Mr. GARY. Yes, but they are working on it; at least they have recognized the need and are taking the matter seriously at the present time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Did the gentleman inquire as to whether they have done anything on breaking down the regional offices so that we can get better service?

Mr. GARY. We visited several of those regional offices. They have been established and are functioning.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is all of the accounting work of the Post Office Department still being done in Washington?

Mr. GARY. No. The accounting program is well on its way. I would say that that is progressing very satisfactorily. By next year we hope to have a cost accounting system whereby you can compare the expenses of a post office in one city with that of another. When we do that it will be much easier to detect defalcations such as those that were exposed in Boston sometime ago.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Did they correct their payroll technique?

Mr. GARY. Yes, they have corrected their payroll technique. The Post Office Department discovered that racket itself and corrected it. Really the only criticism that could be made of the Department in connection with that is that possibly they should have discovered it earlier.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And I suppose steps have been taken to see that that situation does not exist in other post offices.

Mr. GARY. Absolutely. This new accounting system will enable the Department to compare costs of one office against another, and, where there are excessive costs, to detect it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If my recollection is correct, the Hoover Commission task force found that all of the accounts of the various local officers over the country were being sent in to the central office in Washington for auditing, and that the audits were running as much as 17 months behind, and that some of the larger post offices were actually compelled to send in carloads of records to the central office in Washington, clear across the country, if the post office was on the west coast. Did I understand the gentleman correctly to say that that condition has been remedied and that these audits are now being made in the regional centers?

Mr. GARY. The regional offices have set up, and they are functioning.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it indicated that that will create a considerable saving?

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Is it not true that heretofore the accounting was done in the General Accounting Office, and the first thing to do was to take it out of the General Accounting Office, which was done less than 2 years ago? And with respect to some of this modernization that has been going on, I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact, with the gentleman's permission, that it was only 2 or 3 years ago that the first bill setting up within the Post Office Department and authorizing a branch for experimentation and investigation came into being. The gentleman's own committee mentioned that the year before in its report, if you will remember.

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of California. Then we put through a bill that made possible the work of which you have just spoken, for instance, this distribution machine. It is interesting to note that in the building of the first distribution machine, when they could not get the materials, they used tin cans; rolled out tin cans that contained fruit for the cafeteria in Chicago in order to make a pilot machine, and they are still working on that pilot machine, and that they have not yet reached the position where that machine is perfect.

Mr. GARY. May I say to the gentleman that I cannot go along with him that far. Of course, the machine is not perfect; neither is the automobile perfect. If 25 years ago, when we first had the automobile, the users in this country had said, "We will not buy an automobile until you perfect it," we would have been deprived of the automobile for all of these years, and probably for some years to come, because it will probably never be perfect. Our committee believes that they have now reached a point, insofar as this machine is concerned, where it can be manufactured to advantage and put into use. Then if subsequent improvements can be made, fine. But it is working very satisfactorily now, and we feel, and we so recommend in this report, that they should go ahead now and build those machines so that we can get the benefit of them.

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree with the gentleman that the machine has had the bugs worked out pretty well, but it is only within the last year that it has reached that degree of perfection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Does the gentleman recall whether or not the Hoover Commission recommended postal rate increases to wipe out the deficits for carrying magazines, newspapers, and other articles that they were losing money on?

Mr. GARY. My recollection is that they did not recommend any increase in postal rates whatever, and you will never eliminate the deficit in the Post Office Department until you recognize the fact that you have to make your rates sufficiently high to pay the cost of handling the mail.

Mr. PASSMAN. I have heard a lot about the Hoover Commission report. They were so interested in putting the Post Office Department on a business basis, and I wondered whether they had included that in the report.

Mr. GARY. There was no recommendation of that kind.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it the gentleman's understanding, when we were discussing two mail deliveries daily, that only 28 percent of the residential sections of America receive two mail deliveries daily and is it also the gentleman's understanding that this directive by the Postmaster General has saved the taxpayers of America approximately $159,000,000 annually?

Mr. GARY. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. The testimony before our committee that the curtailment of service, which was ordered by the Postmaster General, I think in 1949, is saving the taxpayers of the United States approximately $150,000,000 a year.

Mr. PASSMAN. I believe the gentleman stated in the beginning that the Postmaster General controlled only about 5 percent of the appropriations of the entire Department.

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. PASSMAN. Many of your mechanical devices and modernizations

would depend on funds from that 5 percent.

Mr. GARY. The rest of it they could not change.

Mr. PASSMAN. In many instances, amendments are offered on the floor to cut this bill and, in so doing, we are hampering modernization.

Mr. GARY. That is true.

Let me say this: If you thoroughly modernized the Department you will not save enough money to eliminate the deficit. All of this talk about saving hundreds of millions of dollars by modernization is an overestimate. You could unquestionably save money, but not to that extent.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it also the gentleman's understanding that there has been a larger percentage of rural extensions and residential extensions in the past 12 months than there were in the preceding 24 months?

Mr. GARY. That is unquestionably true.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Is it not also true the Post Office has stepped up its service about 3.8 percent because of additional patrons, and that we have the problem of increasing population to remember?

Mr. GARY. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman would like additional time, I suggest that he ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to proceed further notwithstanding the rule, and then yield himself further time.

Mr. GARY. As far as I am concerned, I think I have about covered the bill. I have no desire to consume further time. However, if Members of the House would like to ask me any additional questions, I will be very glad to continue if someone else will make that request. I will be glad to answer any questions the Members would like to propound.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia be permitted to proceed in the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed if he so desires.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. How much time does the gentleman yield himself?

Mr. GARY. I yield myself 10 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURNSIDE. If I may continue, because I think this will be very interesting to the Members of the House, I understand that in 1933 the rates were cut 25 to 40 percent. Let us take magazines, for instance. Under this new bill we would increase the rates only 10 percent for this last year and 10 percent for the next year, which would after 3 years run to 30 percent, which would be less than the rates in 1933.

Let me also bring to the attention of the Members that in 1939 those magazines received $170,000,000 in the way of advertising, in 1945, $500,000,000, and in 1950, $2,039,000,000, which is an increase of 450 percent. At the same time there was a decrease in 1933 for handling through the mails of 25 to 40 percent, which is only $12,000,000 to carry $2,039,000,000 through the mails. This is a bargain counter that we are handing out to certain groups in America, with the result that the taxpayers are being burdened with that type of service.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. With reference to the Export-Import Bank, that is not an appropriation. It is rather a limitation of expenditures. The Export-Import Bank is doing an excellent job, and it is operating at a profit. This appropriation merely authorizes them to expend out of their receipts a certain amount of money for their operating expenses. The amount allowed for 1952 was $950,000. The estimates for 1953 are $1,131,000. The committee recommends $1,125,000, which is an increase over 1952 of $175,000, most of which is the statutory pay increase. The committee decreased the estimates $6,000. This is one of the most frugal agencies which we have in the Government. They are making loans all over the world, and as a result they are required to examine very carefully into the merits of the project for which the loan is requested. We feel that they need the appropriation which has been allowed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If I understand the gentleman correctly, notwithstanding whatever position anyone might take on the question of making the Post Office Department self-supporting or whether it should or should not be self-supporting, the gentleman desires to see as much economy and efficiency as possible established within the Post Office Department, does he not?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I wonder if the gentleman could advise the House as to whether or not the House itself has not already passed on this question, which was dragged out here again today as to what the postal rate shall be. That action has been taken by the House so therefore the gentleman's committee is faced with just the problem of what is going to be done by way of appropriations.

Mr. GARY. Our committee has no jurisdiction whatsoever over the rates. We have in several of our reports recommended increased rates. We insisted 2 years ago that the Postmaster General use certain authority which the Congress had given him to increase the rates on parcel post with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission; that has been done. We can go no further.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Throughout the years, Congress itself in behalf of the American people has fixed a policy as to what the postal rates should be, and whether or not a subsidy as it is so-called should go on certain types of mail either for the benefit of the publishers, as some people say, and I am not in the magazine business, or for the benefit of the consumer and the reader who has to buy that magazine, and wants information.

May I ask the gentleman one concluding question? Does the gentleman believe the Post Office Department, the one Department which serves more citizens of the United States than any other agency or department of the Government should be the only self-supporting Department or agency of Government in our entire governmental structure? Do you believe it should be the only one to be self-supporting?

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman, I do not think the Post Office Department should be completely self-supporting, because it handles a good deal of free mail for the Government and performs other services for which it is not compensated. In addition to that, there are certain air-mail subsidies which have been approved by the Congress which, in my judgment, should not be charged to the Post Office Department. But I do think that when we are running a deficit of $669,000,000 that is entirely too much. I think it is generally conceded that a proper estimate of these free services and subsidies would amount to about $200,000,000. I would not object to seeing the Post Office Department operated at a deficit of $200,000,000, but $650,000,000 is too much to pass on to the taxpayers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What about the airmail subsidy? Does the gentleman have figures on what that is costing?

Mr. GARY. It is estimated that the entire amount is about $200,000,000, that is with the free mail, the penalty mail, and so forth. Of course, that is just an estimate. We do not know what the airmail subsidies are, but we are trying to separate them from the actual cost of handling the airmail and we are making progress in that direction.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the gentleman from Ohio, as well as the gentleman now addressing us, supported that attempt?

Mr. GARY. Yes. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. We had a postal rate increase in 1951. Can the gentleman tell the committee whether or not the statutory increases on leave salary and transportation of mails exceeds the amount of the postal rate increase as passed by the House last year?

Mr. GARY. Oh yes, I pointed that out.

Mr. PASSMAN. In other words, the deficit will be more in this fiscal year than in fiscal year 1951 prior to the passage of the postal rate increase bill?

Mr. GARY. Yes, by $195,000,000.

Mr. PASSMAN. In other words, the increased operating costs of the Post Office Department is far greater than before the rate increase was passed?

Mr. GARY. The additional amount for salaries, leave, and railroad transportation totals $422,000,000. The increased postal rates will yield $227,000,000, leaving a net increase in cost of $195,000,000.

Mr. PASSMAN. That will be about the amount of the deficit that the Post Office Department has been operating under heretofore?

Mr. GARY. That is right.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. I wish to compliment the gentleman upon the study he has given the problems which have been presented to him as a member of the committee. I have been checking the budget requests. I wish the gentleman, or some member of the committee, would discuss the request and your authorization for "Travel" for the Post Office Department. I think I have found in there an item of $13,349,692 for travel. Will the gentleman discuss that item of $14,000,000 for travel?

Mr. GARY. Of course, that includes the inspectors that have to go all over the country.

Mr. LYLE. I am certain it includes that, but I would like to find out why it is necessary for them to spend $14,000,000 in travel.

Mr. GARY. I think you will find that is a very little increase over last year.

Mr. LYLE. I am not asking whether it is an increase over last year or not. I am interested in whether it is justified at all or not.

Mr. GARY. Our committee thinks that it is.

Mr. LYLE. Will some member of the committee discuss what you found out about it? You only have 800 inspectors, I understand.

Mr. GARY. I do not have the figure before me just now.

Mr. LYLE. Then, there is another item of $2,167,837 for telegraph and telephone expense in the Post Office Department. Why do they not use air mail?

Mr. GARY. There are 41,000 post offices in the United States for which these services must be provided.

Mr. LYLE. I have been checking this budget, and I find in the first 10 pages of one of the agencies, which is not in your subcommittee, $1,467,000 for travel alone. You multiply that by the entire Government and it is quite a sum. Thirteen million dollars, of course, is not very much money considering the entire budget, but if we cannot do anything about salaries and various other things, we could cut down on telegraph and telephone and travel.

Mr. GARY. I will say to the gentleman there are a tremendous number of employees in the Post Office Department. Our committee has not felt that these costs were excessive, in consideration of the fact that the services are spread throughout the entire United States, and among a great number of employees.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 40 minutes.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I would rather proceed with my statement first.

Mr. LYLE. Will the gentleman discuss in his 40 minutes some of the questions that I have just indicated with the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CANFIELD. I will.

Mr. Chairman, I wish again to emphasize my pride in this committee—in its chairman, in its membership, in its staff, and in its product. I have never served on a committee more devoted to its assignment, more anxious to do a good job. It believes in on-the-spot investigations and when facts from the field are thought necessary, the committee goes to the field to get them.

Significantly, the biggest item in this bill is untouchable. Not one cent can be subtracted from the interest on the public debt which for 1953 is placed at $6,150,000,000. This item more than any other in any appropriation bill we are considering this year emphasizes the road on which we are traveling. It gives no comfort to Americans who wish our way of life, now so seriously threatened, to survive. It does give comfort to the followers of Lenin whose great dream was that the American system would be destroyed through insolvency.

When I came to Washington in January 1924 to work as a congressional secretary, the over-all cost of running every agency of our Federal Government was $3,048,000,000. Just about one-half of what the interest on our public indebtedness is today. That indebtedness now approximating an astronomical figure of $260,000,000,000 was in January 1924 slightly under $22,000,000,000. The President of the United States at that time was Calvin Coolidge, who rarely made an address in which he did not stress the importance of Federal economies. He had as Director of the Budget a rather rare military figure, General H. M. Lord, who also preached and practiced economy. It was General Lord who in those unusual days organized the Woodpecker Club of the United States. The membership of this organization was composed of all our Federal employees. They were banded together for one all-important purpose, namely, to peck here, peck there, saving a penny, save a dollar, wherever possible. They were cautioned not to throw away half-used pencils and paper not fully used. They competed in friendly rivalry saving moneys for the taxpayers in many ways.

The great congressional controversy of 1924-25, believe it or not, was how much to reduce the public indebtedness of the United States.

We are today considering appropriations for the two great service agencies of our Government which unfortunately do not lend themselves to the cuts that can be effected in other agencies. The major cut in the bill now before you is that in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and I desire to make a few comments thereon.

There is no good valid reason why this great collection agency of our Government should be so scandal ridden.

This subcommittee, of which I was chairman in the Eightieth Congress, took a look at the Bureau and its offices throughout the country in 1948 and found it in need of a drastic shake-up and reform. We pinpointed skulduggery, inefficiency, laxity, personal derelictions, and political chicanery in most of the offices now being scandalized and we submitted reports and voluminous testimony to the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, and the chairman of the Civil Service Commission for appropriate action. The reports made to us in the following years were to the effect that all the matters exposed had been or were being corrected. The truth is that the administration sat on these findings only to have the explosions occur in the fateful year of 1952. Our report in 1948 emphasized the need of immediate civil-service reform and the elimination of politics from this agency and it also strongly urged that the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Federal Government give its very first priority to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Included in the testimony our committee developed in 1948 were comments of the Bureau's own supervisors on things that went on inside their organization. In other words, the proof was complete and nonassailable.

These reports emphasized serious dissensions and conflicts among employees, terrible delinquency in the issuance of notices, demands, and warrants, lack of training, serious abuse of rest and lunch periods, general apathy on the part of collectors toward the taxpayers, credit violations permitting the statute of limitations to run in certain tax cases, and reports on embezzlements. Probably the most telling portion of the supervisors reports was that which related that more than 700 employees, a large percentage of them deputy collectors, were rated as unsatisfactory. And there was evidence that the organization known as the Internal Revenue Collectors Association of the United States was a political set-up. Its president in 1948, incidentally, was Dennis Delaney, Boston collector recently convicted on bribery charges, who did not even hesitate to write a White House secretary on behalf of a brother collector facing a grand-jury indictment for making a political football of his office. Delaney wrote Secretary Matt Connelly that his pal was only "doing what comes naturally."

How politics-ridden the Bureau has become was stressed by Chairman Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, when he recently pleaded for the President's reorganization program. He said:

> Under the present system the job of tax collectors is to play politics and that is what they do.

Our committee is today denying the bulk of the Bureau's request for 7,000 new agents and our action is premised largely on the belief that it is incumbent on the Bureau to clean house and regain public confidence before thousands are added to its payroll. When I asked Gen. John B. Dunlap, the new Commissioner, if he did not believe that was his first responsibility, his answer was "unquestionably." And I think that I should state right here and now that the new Commissioner is impressive and I believe that he is well equipped to do this clean-up job. I have personally looked into his record and I have found it

good from the very beginning. He was very forthright before our committee and I would appraise him as a hard-hitting Texan, who is mindful that he has about the toughest job in the United States and wants to do that job to the credit of himself, his sponsors, and the country.

Mr. Chairman, now I desire to comment briefly on the remarkable performance turned in this last year by the Bureau of Narcotics. Our Congress has not been slow in reacting to this subject which has been so much in the public eye. We increased the small band of narcotics agents from 189 to 275. When hearings produced substantial evidence that stiffer sentences for narcotic violations had been getting progressively lighter to the point where they were no deterrent, we passed the Boggs Act stiffening penalties all along the line.

Now let us review what the Bureau of Narcotics has done with the assistance of its new weapons.

Immediately following our action in providing additional funds and agents for narcotic enforcement, and enactment of the Boggs Act in November providing heavier penalties for narcotic traffickers, Commissioner Anslinger carefully planned and organized an undercover drive which resulted in the arrest of some 500 narcotic traffickers in raids conducted throughout the country the first week in January 1952. The raids took place in every major city of the United States and were concentrated on second and third offenders.

The Nation-wide clean-up of the illicit narcotic traffic represented a concentrated effort by the Bureau of Narcotics to check drug addiction particularly among teen-agers. A large number of peddlers engaged in supplying narcotics to teen-agers were caught. Numerous big-time dealers in heroin and marihuana were among those brought into the net in this conspicuously successful enforcement work of the Bureau.

Simultaneous with this dramatic crack-down on domestic narcotic traffickers, the Bureau of Narcotics had quietly moved in on some of the more important sources of supply in Europe. In Paris this month, in cooperation with French officials, United States narcotic agents have been instrumental in the arrests of 13 defendants. Three of these were conspirators in a case involving 20 pounds of opium which were seized before it could be successfully smuggled to our shores. Important cases were also made by our Federal narcotic agents in Rotterdam and Rome, and 18 heroin factories in Italy which had been supplying our illicit market were closed. Groundwork has been laid in Italy and New York City for other important cases, but these efforts must be constantly reinforced and kept alive. Narcotic agents in New York have recently succeeded in making a 60-ounce heroin seizure and a 92-ounce heroin seizure. It has not been possible to make cases involving such large amounts of drugs for many years.

As a combined result of all these efforts which were made possible by the increased funds we allowed the Bureau last year, Commissoner Anslinger is now able to report positive proof of a decrease in the availability of drugs. In many places where teen-age addiction is a problem, he believes the crest has been passed; in a few trouble spots he is not too sure. This is certainly ample justification that the increased appropriation has been put to the best possible use, but it is also evident that the same intensified efforts must be maintained until the teen-age addiction problem is completely whipped. Fifty percent of the persons who are addicts today are going to remain addicts as long as they can get supplies. If you are going to prevent them from making new addicts, available supplies must be cut to an irreducible minimum. It is too much to hope that this has so quickly been accomplished.

Not the least important work done by the Bureau of Narcotics, too, is the limitation and channeling of drugs for legitimate medical and scientific use; every grain must be accounted for from the pharmaceutical house to the ultimate legitimate user. This in itself is no small task and requires intelligent foresight and planning. Any loophole here could have disastrous consequences, but this control has remained close and effective.

It is frightening to think what might have happened to our youth if this teen-age drug addiction problem had been handled with ineptitude. We are fortunate indeed that this challenge has been met with efficient, relentless, incorruptible and forceful leadership. The Bureau of Narcotics has not let us down. We must give them the tools to finish the job.

The funds for the Coast Guard in this bill do not provide any increase of program or personnel over that already provided for by prior authorizations of the Congress. The program of operations is the normal, peacetime program, plus two emergency items. Regarding the peacetime duties, of search, rescue and law enforcement and operation of ocean stations for meteorological and other services; the bill does not include any increase over the personnel and activities authorized in 1949 which at that time had not reached a point where they could be considered fully adequate.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that at the direction of Congress in 1948 an independent survey of the Coast Guard's operations and administration was made to find out just what the Coast Guard should do and what personnel and facilities were required to do it. Based on a careful analysis of the findings and recommendations, Congress then passed necessary legislation to direct and authorize the Coast Guard's peacetime missions. Among the modern day requirements included in the authorizing legislation was a direction for the Coast Guard to maintain ocean weather station services and to operate loran stations as an indispensable aid to air and sea navigation. The Congress also authorized a gradual augmentation of the Coast Guard's units so that the service would have the tools to do the job as directed.

As an example of what we get for our money spent on the Coast Guard, you will vividly recall the recent instance in which the valiant Coast Guard men saved the crews of the two tankers, *Fort Mercer* and *Pendleton*, which broke in two off the New England coast during a violent winter storm. There is no need here to reiterate such examples, but it is obvious that they put severe demands on the service. The men and facilities as provided for in this bill are frequently stretched beyond reasonable limits.

For instance, when that train was caught in the snow in the mountains in the Midwest they called upon the Coast Guard of the United States to bring out medical supplies by planes and helicopters. Any further cuts at this time in these men and facilities would mean waste in what has already been accomplished.

One emergency item authorized since the Korean trouble is the port security program initiated in October 1950, under the authority of Public Law 679, Eighty-first Congress, second session, the so-called Magnuson Act. Money to initiate the port security program was provided in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1951, Public Law 911. The limited port security personnel and facilities approved by the committee are now operating effectively to prevent sabotage and guard certain of our major ports in this critical period.

Unfortunately today the Coast Guard does not have money sufficient to properly guard all the ports of the United States in this atomic age.

The second emergency item is a relatively small increase compared to other Armed Forces in personnel and facilities to improve the state of military readiness authorized under the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, Public Law 253, Eighty-first Congress, first session. This latter program provided more modern weapons for the Coast Guard cutters so that they may serve as required with the Navy; a few more aircraft and vessels to augment the ocean weather and rescue service in the Pacific where military air traffic is heavier; and the additional men required to man the weapons and equipment on a partial basis. As originally provided, the funds for this item were only to start the program and covered a gradual build-up during a portion of the present fiscal year. In the bill now before you the funds for this item provide for the full-year cost.

The fact that the Coast Guard has available for peacetime duties a number of ships, aircraft, and shore stations with a potential defense usefulness which will be immediately ready at strategic locations if they are adequately equipped, manned, and trained is of tremendous value to the Nation. We would be negligent and wasteful to fail to use these existing defense resources. They cannot be effectively used without the funds to carry out the program as already authorized and currently in process to make these units ready for defense emergencies.

The committee made a drastic cut in the funds requested for carrying out the Reserve program, but feels that the Coast Guard can, by using 17-year-olds and veterans, and by rigid economies

maintain an effective Reserve force. I opposed this cut. Any further reduction at this time would certainly prevent the minimum of Reserve training and recruitment sorely needed to provide the nucleus for an additional emergency force immediately required at Coast Guard units when disaster strikes.

The committee has carefully watched the improvements made by the Coast Guard in administering its affairs and is satisfied the service is becoming highly cost conscious. A sound accounting and matériel program is being carried on to prevent waste. These programs are being carried forward continually and any further budgetary reductions at this time would seriously disrupt the progress being made. In summary, I repeat that funds included in this bill for the fiscal year 1953 are based on no further increase in program but merely provide for carrying on the normal peacetime duties plus the cost on a full-year basis of the emergency programs already carefully considered by the Congress and previously approved.

Mr. Chairman, I desire now to say a word regarding Customs which in 1951 had a working force of 810 below the 1947 level of 8,787 employees. I do not believe we are treating Customs properly in the committee cut we have imposed and here is why:

Formal entries of merchandise have increased in 1951, 72 percent over 1947. The number of vessels, vehicles and aircraft arriving from foreign countries in 1951 shows an increase of 41.3 percent of 1947. Persons entering the United States from foreign countries reached an all-time high of approximately 93,000,000 in 1951, a 17.4 percent increase of 1947. This revenue-collection agency brought in more than $809,000,000 in 1951, the port of New York accounting for more than $1,000,000 per working day.

The net increase requested in this bill over last year's appropriation was $1,058,000. Our committee cut this $300,000 making the increase available to Customs for new positions only $258,000 above the gross amount available in fiscal 1952. While the committee report indicates that Customs will be provided with approximately 140 additional positions, the plain mathematics are this can not be done because $258,000 will not pay the salary of more than 70 additional Customs employees. Furthermore, and it is only fair to point this out here, no funds are included in this bill for within-grade promotions for employees which are required by law. These promotions, the Bureau insists will cost at least $300,000 during the fiscal year 1953. Honest analysis then establishes the fact that the present payrolls are really being decreased by at least $42,000 or by an estimated 10 to 15 employees.

When our subcommittee went to New York just a few weeks back we discovered that backlogs of liquidations presently total about 600,000. This backlog means that an importer's goods will probably have to be on the market for close to 1 year before he knows the amount of duty which will finally be assessed.

Customs also plays an important role in preventing the smuggling of contraband and narcotics into the United States Narcotics trafficking has increased by leaps and bounds during the past several years. The crime hearings of this Congress have indicated the close tie-up between crime in general and the drug addict. Congress must provide Customs with the manpower necessary to combat this traffic.

Along the same line, Customs is an important cog in the port-security program, so vital to the very survival of this country against a sneak attack by the enemy. The details of this program cannot be made available, but our committee questioned the Customs witnesses in some detail concerning these security measures and fully realizes the importance of customs duties in assisting the Coast Guard in this field.

Who were the men that went on the *Batory*, sent over here by a Russian satellite nation—the men who went on that ship to search it from top to bottom and all through its holds to find out whether it contained atomic bombs or other unorthodox weapons? They were the customs inspectors of the port of New York. The details of the program cannot be made available, but your committee questioned the customs witnesses in some detail concerning these security measures and fully realizes the importance of customs duties in assisting the Coast Guard in this field.

Mr. Chairman, the Post Office Department of the United States is still dragging its feet in mechanization and modernization. It is my hope that every Member will read the sharp exchange between the distinguished chairman of our committee, Mr. GARY, and the Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson. In that exchange, our chairman stuck to his guns and repeated the statement made in the subcommittee report last year that the Department was dragging its feet although he admitted that their showing on the 1953 requests indicated that they are beginning to march.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I find that the trouble with the efficiency of the Post Office Department is very largely due to the personnel of the postmasters. If you find a postmaster doing a fairly decent job, you get half-way reasonable service. If you find one that is not doing his job, you get no service at all, and you get no great reaction in the Post Office Department about those who are not doing a job. Is that about the picture?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is definitely a part of the picture. No one can deny that the postmasters of the United States are strictly political appointees. Nobody can deny that in the average office the assistant postmaster is the man who does the job, the postmaster looking after the political implications of his office.

But there is also faulty leadership, I am sorry to say, and today that leadership is right at the top. The Post Office Department is resistant to change. It is resistant to mechanization. It is resistant to modernization. The Postmaster General and his aids do not like ideas and suggestions, often made on the floor of this House and in the newspapers of our country, that outside engineers be called in to play, showing them perhaps where they can increase efficiency and save money. They hold that their particular job is a unique job and that there is no engineer in the United States who knows anything about it. In other words, "We know our job. We have been at it for years. Nobody can tell us."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman heard the colloquy between the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and myself earlier today. Has it been the gentleman's experience that the Post Office Department has been very attentive to the reforms and reorganization of the Department?

Mr. CANFIELD. No. I am reasonably sure that all the members of our subcommittee concur in that statement. As the chairman just pointed out, they have been dragging their feet for years. In this sharp exchange he had with Mr. Donaldson this year, he still accused the Department of doing that very thing. But they did make a presentation indicating that for the first time in many years they were beginning to tackle this problem of mechanization and modernization, but as suggested in your own colloquy with the chairman, plans are largely in the blueprint stage.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In the opinion of the gentleman from New Jersey, what percentage of the reorganization work that appears necessary in the Post Office Department is already actually under way?

Mr. CANFIELD. Speaking about mechanization and modernization, the chairman of the subcommittee says they have just scratched the surface. I concur in that statement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Has 1 percent of the task been accomplished, or is it still just a projected blueprint?

Mr. CANFIELD. I would say definitely less than 10 percent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the rest of it is simply a blueprint or projection which may or may not come to pass. Is that correct?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Do not the hearings disclose that the accounting system of the Post Office Department has been completely renovated?

Mr. CANFIELD. Not completely renovated. They have started the job, and we hope that by next year they will be able to show us it has been completely done.

Mr. YATES But that Department is certainly well along on its reorganization, is it not?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Since the gentleman is talking about this question of the Hoover Commission report, I would like to direct the gentleman's attention to a report of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and its recommendation filed with the House whereby it was recommended that this question of auditing be reexamined and that a competent, up-to-date system be installed; and on the question of mechanization, as we call it, it was reexamined and recommendations were made that we proceed immediately to provide up-to-date machines to handle our mails. I notice, giving due credit to all parties concerned, that the Hoover Commission report contains a considerable amount of the recommendations made by that committee; and I observe that this committee presently in charge of the appropriations is also giving attention to the same problem. The gentleman from New Jersey who now has the floor has given this matter a great deal of consideration and I hope these recommendations may be carried out.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate the statement just made by the gentleman from Kansas, formerly head of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I know that he is a keen student of the postal services and is familiar with its deficiencies. I wish he had been a member of the subcommittee this year when the Postmaster General showed us the new brochures that were going out to employees in the field asking them to make suggestions to improve the service.

Our committee report last year criticized the Postmaster General and his staff for not recognizing the postal worker in Chicago, a Mr. Sestak, who had developed a distributing machine which will undoubtedly save the Post Office Department hundreds of thousands of dollars. No recognition was given him until our report, and then they gave him the highest type of recognition allowed under the law, an award of $1,000.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The point has been made by the distinguished gentleman from New York and the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that one of the faults of the Post Office Department is the political activity on the part of postmasters. Applying that to the head of the Department, Mr. Donaldson, the gentleman must be aware of the fact that he is a career man and has been under civil service practically all of his life.

Mr. CANFIELD. He is a career man; and when he was named by President Truman I was chairman of this particular subcommittee and hailed his appointment as the greatest appointment, perhaps, that President Truman had ever made. Mr. Donaldson received encomiums up and down the line, but none greater than the one I directed his way; and yet I must say that today I am disappointed. He, as a career man, was familiar with these conditions but he has, as the chairman of our subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, pointed out last year, been dragging his feet with the others.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman suggest that Congress then take the postmasters out of the political field completely? Would that help the situation any?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes; I think in all fairness to the Postmaster General and in all fairness to the President of the United States I should state that both of them recommended just that step.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. The gentleman knows, of course, I am deeply interested in the Post Office Department; and I join very much in what my former chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], has said; because as a result of his leadership in the Eightieth Congress under House Joint Resolution 176 we made some investigations particularly in the post office in Chicago and I believe that my colleague on that committee [Mr. MILLER] submitted a plan whereby money would be appropriated and set aside for an investigation in engineering and research development. One result of that was to bring out the Sestak machine.

Aside from that I would like to ask the gentleman in view of the fact we have been invited to visit the Coast Guard cutter *Courier* tomorrow to see the first powerful mobile radio transmitter which is being placed there under the supervision, I believe, of the Voice of America—I would like to ask the gentleman whether an appropriation has been made to pay for that broadcast and the facilities within the category of the Coast Guard or whether the Voice of America will pay for that?

Mr. CANFIELD. That will be the Voice of America. The running of the ship will be by the Coast Guard, of course, but the broadcasting element involved will be chargeable against the Voice of America appropriations.

Mr. SADLAK. There is no provision for that in here?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. May I interrupt the gentleman for a moment to show a breakdown of the figure which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] questioned with reference to travel provided for in the Post Office budget? I have the breakdown of those figures showing that $3,180,000 represents the amounts paid for transportation of city delivery carriers. It is necessary in the cities for the carriers to ride the buses and the street cars or other public modes of transportation to get to and from the sections of the city which they serve. Those costs have increased recently because, as we all know, bus fares and street car fares have increased. The sum of $8,374,000 represents the per diem allowance for postal railway clerks while they are away from home. They travel on the trains handling the mails and the law allows them $6 a day while they are away from home. That takes up $11,544,000 of the total amount. Only $1,348,000 is used for general administration, of which approximately $1,200,000 is used for travel by inspectors who inspect the various postal operations.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. Would the gentleman also discuss the $2,167,837 for communication services in the Post Office Department at the proper time, and will he also explain the $615,514,000 with reference to transportation in foreign countries. That is about a half billion dollars. That is, if the gentleman has time. You gentlemen sit in these hearings for weeks and have an understanding of it, but we run across a half billion dollar figure, and it does not mean anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. LYLE. Can the gentleman give us any enlightenment on that?

Mr. CANFIELD. I will try to.

Mr. GARY. I will be glad to explain those figures subsequently.

Mr. CANFIELD. I would like to say to the gentleman from Connecticut, who was also a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, keenly interested in the proper development of this Department as a service agency for our people, that on page 70 of the hearings is some very interesting testimony. The Department is quite proud of the experiment it indulged in at Richmond, Va., which happens to be the home of our distinguished subcommittee chairman. I told the Postmaster General when he was before us that I had in my hand a letter from Leo E. George, president of the postal clerks organization, describing that renovation program at Richmond. Mr. George said among other things:

> A new era in post offices was ushered in on December 4 when high officials of the Post Office Department previewed new lighting, color, ventilation, and safety improvements which have been made in a test experiment at the Richmond, Va., post office.

This is in 1951 when they got around to making this test experiment in lighting and ventilation.

Furthermore, in his article, Mr. George said:

> A further safety and health improvement to which Landry and Leighton called the attention of the visitors are the large 48-inch ventilating fans.
>
> Aisle markings on the floor as shown in the photographs with this article add to safety by keeping a passageway clear—no longer do the clerks have to run an obstacle course in transporting mail within the workroom.

My comment on that statement was that that was an ingenious discovery. Furthermore, Mr. George reported:

> I talked with a number of the clerks, and in every case they all praised the improvements—"No more eyestrain, I've quit having those headaches"; "real pleasant place to work"; "looks like the Department is trying to do something for us" were only a few

of the comments I heard in a day's visit at Richmond.

"We're mighty proud of this," Postmaster McRee told the visitors, "we know that the changes are making a real difference in our work, and the comfort in which our people can work. If you notice, you don't see the old-fashioned eyeshades; you don't need them here. I'm particularly glad that the Department selected Richmond; we're glad to be the guinea pig."

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Of course, like the gentleman, I am glad to note that progress is being made. Would the gentleman surmise, inasmuch as they have perfected the lighting system and brought about safety standards in the Richmond Post Office, that in the course of about 10 or 15 years we might expect some of those improvements in Connecticut and New England?

Mr. CANFIELD. I hope so.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the Boston case which was described by the Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Burke, as the most aggravated fraud perpetrated in postal history, is an indictment of the whole Post Office Department. You will recall the testimony this year shows that approximately 1,300 employees of the Boston office resigned or were fired as the result of the clock-punching-clerks fraud, one, it is believed, that had been a continuing thing for years, possibly 7 or 8 years.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New Jersey first of all on his statement and also because of the fact that he brought out so much in the testimony, in the hearings that we have before us, on this Boston Post Office. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has not heard rumors of a very disturbing kind, which I have heard, about scandals in other large offices over the country? Now these stories may not be correct; I am not saying that they are, but I am saying that such rumors break down the morale of the Department, and especially of the employees, and for that reason I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not agree with me that a thorough investigation of the Department should be conducted very shortly so that at least we might assure our people in general and point out to them that by and large the postal employees are honest and are doing a fine, patriotic piece of work? On the other hand, where we do find malfeasance it should also be brought to light and a prompt end should be put to it. Does not the gentleman from New Jersey agree with me on that?

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentlewoman from New York that I heard those rumors, and I am inclined to believe there is some truth to them. I think that the first to welcome an all-out over-all investigation of the Post Office Department should be the Postmaster and his deputies here in Washington.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he feels that every rumor that is circulated in an election year requires an investigation by the Congress?

Mr. CANFIELD. No; I do not, and I am sorry to have my chairman make that statement, because when the gentlewoman from New York stood up to make her inquiry she had in fact heard more than a rumor. Charitably she used the word "rumor" but the Associated Press, a recognized newspaper syndicate, has carried stories within the last few days of skullduggery in other post offices. Such did not develop just because this is an election year. I am sorry my chairman made that statement.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I, too, am sorry because that is not the impression I want to give. On the contrary, I feel that rumors should be scuttled. May I say that I am very sure the gentleman himself would welcome an investigation that would show where the blame should be laid and where it should not be laid. I am very sure he above almost anyone else on the floor of the House would welcome such an investigation. If we have nothing to hide it is a good thing that fact should be revealed. If there are things that are going to sour that also should be known by the Congress. We have had one very shocking revelation, I think the chairman will agree with me. I am a little disappointed at the attitude taken about Boston, that it is just a small matter to have 1,300 employees dismissed or removed. And the Department did it themselves. Why did the Department do it themselves? They did it because they were jolly well forced into it.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I have not heard anybody make the statement that the Boston matter was a small matter. Any time you discharge 1,300 employees for fraud it is a very, very serious matter. I made the statement that the frauds were discovered by the Post Office Department, and that the Post Office Department itself cleaned up the situation. If there is any evidence of improper conduct in any other offices then by all means there ought to be an investigation, and it ought to be investigated from top to bottom, because no one in this House is more opposed to dishonesty in Government than I am. However, I do not think we can just go around chasing down every rumor that occurs, because we know that rumors are circulated during election years. Investigations cost money, and we should not waste the taxpayers' money investigating every rumor circulated in the United States. If there is any evidence, then I think the evidence should be presented.

My very distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from New York, for whom I have the highest regard, is a member of the legislative committee. If she has any evidence, I think by all means she should present that evidence to her legislative Committee on Civil Service and Post Office and have that committee initiate an investigation to find out whether there is misconduct in the other offices.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say that that is exactly what I intend to do. However, my point in saying this is that I think it will be far better to have an investigation than to have these rumors constantly floating about which are not scotched and which are very unfortunate for the postal employees. I have had several postal employees, because I number a great many of them among my friends, call my office and tell me that they would like to come to me, that they had heard this and they had heard that, and they were disturbed, and very properly so. I respect their feelings. That is the reason why I am going to go very thoroughly into this thing, may I say to the chairman of the subcommittee and my friend from New Jersey, both. Wherever I find evidence I shall certainly present it.

Mr. GARY. I hope the gentlewoman from New York will do so. Personally, I have not heard any of those rumors. The first I heard of them was from the speech the gentlewoman made on the floor of the House a day or two ago. If there are rumors with any foundation to them at all, I think the investigation should be made.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to the gentleman that there are.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to my chairman—I know that he has forgotten it—I mentioned those rumors in our subcommittee last week, and there was a discussion.

Mr. GARY. After the gentlewoman had spoken on the floor of the House. I did not hear of them until the gentlewoman spoke on the floor.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true. I discussed them further with the gentleman and other members of the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Was there any evidence taken before your committee with reference to these frauds in the post office in Boston?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, we had hearings there on that.

Mr. KEATING. Was there any evidence given to your committee as to whether these matters had been referred to the Justice Department for prosecution by the Post Office Department?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes, there had been a series of indictments totaling 124.

Mr. KEATING. One hundred and twenty-four persons had been indicted?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right. A few had been sent to jail. Twenty supervisors had been involved. No inspectors or any in the higher echelons.

Mr. KEATING. Were there 1,300 employees in one post office who were discharged?

Mr. CANFIELD. Two hundred and ninety-four regulars and 1,004 temporary employees.

I think that the Boston case which was described by the Deputy Postmaster General, Mr. Burke, is the most aggravated case of its kind in postal history and is an indictment of the whole Post Office Department. You will recall the testimony last year shows that approximately 1,300 employees of the Boston office resigned or were fired as the result of the clock-punching-clerks fraud; one, it is believed, that had been a continuing thing for years, possibly 7 or 8.

How did the Department finally catch up with this terrible thing? Over a considerable period of time they had noted excessive costs in the Boston post office and a squad of inspectors was sent out to find the reason. I am reliably informed that it became so open and notorious that it was almost a standing joke how the taxpayers of the United States were being fleeced. Only 20 supervisors were named, no inspectors. It is my contention that what happened in Boston is an indictment of the Post Office Department as a whole.

Headquarters here in Washington cannot escape its part of the blame. For years, our subcommittee has been trying to get the Post Office Department to establish a record of comparable costs of operations in the important cities of the United States. They have been reluctant to make up such a table and at times have contended it was not feasible and would not be of great assistance in any way. Now the Department is making it a prime endeavor and we are going to find out why one office can run economically and an office in a sister city can report repeatedly excessive costs.

When I questioned the Postmaster General this year about the cut-back in mail deliveries in 1950, he insisted that approval of his action from the patrons writing letters to the Department still run 100 to 1. For the life of me, I am at a loss to understand any statement of that kind and while I am not charging Mr. Donaldson with dishonesty, I would like to meet the chap who counts those letters. I have never received one letter of commendation. All my letters, and there are many, have been most critical and they get that way more and more as the service deteriorates.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think that is certainly my experience from my district where the complaints run 100 to 1 just exactly the other way. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to a series of articles in the World-Telegram and Sun of New York, which will be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They do not write long, elaborate stories like that unless there is a real public interest involved, and there is certainly a public interest in this question, and people feel generally that the postal service is extremely inadequate and that it is very largely attributable to the cut, and is based upon the fact that they are not getting their money's worth for postal service, and that we in Congress have not done all that we should about economy and efficiency in the post-office service, and the necessary increases in rates, where they still need to be increased, and in putting it into effect, the Hoover Commission recommendations. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing that to the attention of the House as the ranking minority member of his committee. I think he is rendering a great service to the people of his country.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate all that the gentleman has said.

Up in Canada, where a similar mail cutback was ordered, last spring the Postmaster General harking to the complaints of Canadians is planning a return to the two-a-day mail service. In this connection, I am going to read to you an interesting item from the Evening Citizen, of Ottawa, Canada, dated Thursday, February 21, 1952:

COTE SAID TO FAVOR RETURN OF TWO-A-DAY MAIL SERVICE

(By Frank Swanson)

Reconsideration may be given to two-a-day mail deliveries for urban centers throughout Canada, it was learned today.

The twice-daily mail service was discontinued last spring as an economy measure. Revenues in the postal department have been climbing steadily and the possibility now appears that the double deliveries each day could be brought back with the department still operating at a surplus.

It is understood that Canada's new postmaster general, Hon. Alcide Cote, is one of several cabinet ministers who favor a return to the two deliveries a day.

Officials said today that no action had been taken to restore the double deliveries but the matter probably will be raised in the near future.

MANY LOST JOBS

When the double service was cut to a single delivery each day, around 1,200 postmen lost their jobs or were transferred to other employment.

At the time the service was discontinued last March, the former postmaster general, Hon. Edouard Rinfret, estimated the saving annually would be around $3,500,000. In the past fiscal year, the post office department incurred its first deficit in 12 years, $1,327,000. The last deficit before that time was for 1938–39, $167,960.

At one time, during the war years, the surplus reached an all-time high of $12,586,000.

One of the main reasons the former service might come back is the fact the post office department is still grappling with complaints of slow and delayed deliveries of mail under the existing one-a-day system.

Other reasons favoring the return to two deliveries a day were said to be the fact that the present arrangement is out of step with Canada's business development and needs and that the post office department is a public service rather than a purely revenue-producing business.

The return to the former system would require a careful study of the labor market, it was pointed out, a complete review of postal routes and consideration of the added expense involved.

The subject was raised at the past two sessions of Parliament by members anxious to have the two daily deliveries restored and it is probable these demands will be heard once more, particularly when the post office estimates come before the Commons.

Before I close, I desire also to read a challenging editorial from the New York World-Telegram and Sun, dated February 21, 1952, captioned "Postal nightmare":

POSTAL NIGHTMARE

For a long time, this country's postal service has been under fire. Especially since that economy cut-back on mail deliveries in 1950 has it been a nightmare. Stories of letters traveling at snail's pace—and a lazy snail at that—are a dime a dozen.

That line on the facade of New York's Post Office about postmen defying the elements in the swift completion of their task may have been justified once. It's the bunk today.

The study make by this newspaper and reported in the series of articles by Edward Ellis shows how deplorable mail service here has become. And New York, we know, has no corner on the inefficiency, the red tape, the overtone of politics and the hampering regulations which this study revealed.

The comparison of conditions here and in London is especially enlightening. The London Daily Telegraph helped us out by mailing tests of the same type we used here. The slowest London letter was only 7 hours in transit. The slowest here took 96½ hours. London's fastest letter was 5½ hours en route. Our best time was 13 hours.

What is particularly griping about this differential is that the British post office operates at a profit. This country's postal deficit grows more staggering year by year.

That American postmasters, products of the spoils system, blatantly play politics doesn't help things. But the entire fault doesn't rest there. A lion's share of the blame rests on Congress for having tied the hands of the Postmaster General by blind orders for economies and by regulations forcing the hiring of temporary employees.

The Hoover Commission, discussing postal service, said a mouthful when it observed: "A maze of out-moded laws, regulations, and traditions freezes progress and stifles proper administration."

The tragedy of the situation is that ill-conceived restrictions are resulting in tremendous dollar and cents losses to the country's economy. Letters vital to business are hours and even days too long in transit.

What is needed is a drastic clean-up of the whole postal operation.

That editorial could have concluded: "What further is needed is approval of the recommendation made by the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] that the Post Office Department be now investigated from top to bottom."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, every 4 years the press and the mails are filled with political propaganda calculated to affect the fall elections, all from a partisan point of view and much of it deliberately erroneous and misleading.

As an instance, an organization distributed a tabulation to the press at the close of the last session of Congress listing 14 votes in the House purported to divide the sheep from the goats on the issue of "economy versus spending." On the basis of these 14 votes the proponents classified Members of the House as either "economizers" or "spenders." I was astonished to find myself labeled as a "spender" when as a matter of fact I

had actually contributed as much to the reduction of the estimates submitted to Congress as any Member of either House. I gave little thought to the matter at the time as all who understood the situation realized it was political and based on a misleading and illogical yardstick. But this week this same tabulation was made the basis of an article distributed to the newspapers devoting an entire column to an attack on me personally.

Now, there is a peculiar thing about this tabulation. When you check the records you find that all the economizers are Republican and, with the exception of a few southern Members, all the spenders are Democrats. The press called attention at the time to the fact that the 10 best economy records were by Republicans and the 10 best spenders were Democrats. So it is apparent at a glance that the votes were carefully selected with that in view and the real issue involved was not a simple question of economy but something much more significant. For example, the first vote listed was not a vote on expenditures per se. Ultimately it involved a possible appropriation but the primary question was whether Congress would give the proponents of defense housing their day in court. The House is a free and open forum for the discussion of any major issue before the American people. That is democratic Government. And that was the primary question before the House.

On the next vote listed in the tabulation, the proposed reduction of postal expenditures was purely political, as evidenced by the fact that the mails could not have been delivered for less and the bill now before the House increases even that amount. The amendment reducing funds for transmission lines bringing electricity up to Missouri would have deprived 40,000 farm families of REA light and power at a time when rural population is shrinking due to lack of elementary facilities on the farm. Furthermore the appropriation was not an outright expenditure but will be fully amortized from receipts. The amendments cutting appropriations for Bonneville construction and for reclamation construction were utterly futile for the reason that these projects were already under way and the stopping of funds would merely retard them and perhaps involve additional expenditures. The amendment cutting the President's emergency fund from $12,500,000 to $1,000,000 was for the purpose of taking a slap at the President and Congress subsequently appropriated far more than the amount of the reduction. The proposal to cut the Voice of America by $15,000,000 when the cold war was prolonged because Russia was getting her propaganda over on the air and we did not have money enough to get America's story to our allies, or the Russian people, is self-explanatory. Of course, the question of providing money for veterans' pensions speaks for itself.

On all these votes the real issue involved is pushed into the background and the impression is left that the sole question was one of economy. All of them are questions on which there could be a legitimate division of opinion but certainly they are not exclusively questions of economy.

Now let us get the true story—and all of it. In the session of Congress in which these votes were taken I participated in the subcommittees in the drafting of all the appropriation bills. They were reported out with reductions below estimates totaling $4,805,000,000, a reduction of 5 percent. When the bills reached the floor, the House made further reductions of only $162,000,000, less than two-tenths of 1 percent. The Senate increased these bills $3,100,000,000 above the House figures and I sat on every conference on every bill and helped force the elimination of $2,600,000,000 of the Senate increase thereby protecting 90 percent of the House reduction against determined opposition from the Senate.

I reported out of my own subcomittee the heaviest percentage reduction in estimates within the memory of any man now in the House. Estimates totaling $797,000,000 were reduced to $259,000,000 a reduction of more than 68 percent. Vigorous efforts were made to restore these cuts on the floor of the House but we successfully protected all of them.

When Japan surrendered, Congress was in recess and I was in Missouri. I reached Washington before the celebration was over and took immediate steps to sequester the vast amounts that had been appropriated for the continuation of the war. Hearings were started at the earliest moment and we rescinded approximately $70,000,000,000, the largest amount of appropriations ever recalled in human history. I initiated the single package appropriation bill 2 years ago and succeeded in reducing total appropriations by 6 percent below the estimates including a reduction of more than 9 percent in nondefense items. The following year, without the single package bill the total reduction on the annual bills was 2.7 percent and the reduction on nondefense annual items was 6.3 percent. If the Republican members of the Committee on Appropriations had cooperated to continue the single package bill we could undoubtedly have secured further economies. While the columnists and caluminators are trying to pin a spending tag on me why do they not tell these facts instead of attempting to distort the record?

The utter lack of effort on the part of the newspaper column issued this week, to stay within the facts, is shown by the statement that the Federal budget was balanced in the Eightieth Congress. There is no foundation whatever for such a statement. When the Eightieth Congress took over control in January 1947, the budget was not only in balance but it was in balance for the first time since it went into the red during the Hoover administration. If there is any doubt about that it is only necessary to consult the figures set forth in table 5, on page A–10 of the budget, submitted to the Congress on January 6, 1948. The Government was in the red when it was turned over to us in 1931. We received it in the red and we turned it back to the Eightieth Congress in the black. And it was in the red again when we got it back in the Eighty-first Congress. I am happy to report that we now have it once more in the black—the surplus for the fiscal year 1951 was $3,500,000,000; totals for the current year will be available June 30—and were it not for the necessities of national defense we could promise the country a balanced budget from now on.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, the American people undoubtedly would be interested in knowing exactly what the administration's social planners have in mind for them.

It is the business of the Congress to find out.

It is the business of the Congress to find out before any vote is taken on UMT because there has been repeated and unmistakable evidence that the schemes of the social planners are completely tied in with UMT, and that UMT is only the vestibule, the front hallway, leading into the larger plans for regimentation.

We were given a brief peek at some of the plans in store during last year's hearings on UMT. Perhaps we were given that peek unintentionally, prematurely. At least promises of further information have not been kept.

The partial disclosure which I was able to make last week of the meeting on February 14 to 16 at the Harriman estate affords another peek at the social-planners program of regimentation—a most unsatisfactory peek. Indeed about all that can be said for it is that, as a result, we know just enough about what is afoot to know that we have a very heavy obligation to know a great deal more before we take a single additional step along the road to permanent peacetime conscription under UMT.

If we act on UMT without this additional information—without all possible information regarding the activities and schemes of the social planners—then we in Congress will in truth be the blind leading the blind. And for such folly the American people will rightfully hold us to stern account.

I have already placed in the RECORD a reminder that during last year's UMT debate—on April 6, to be exact—I warned this House of administration plans for regimenting American youth for other than the purposes of military training and service.

Today I renew that warning, with even more extensive details from the records of last year's hearings. I add the further warning that all available information regarding the secret session at the Harriman estate indicates that this is one more step in the development of plans for the total regimentation of American young men and women.

I urge this House, prior to any action on UMT, to refer the matter of this Feb-

ruary 14 to 16 meeting, and the plans discussed there, to a special committee, and that this committee be given subpena power to summon known and reported participants at that conference to testify as to plans there presented and discussed in secret. I shall introduce legislation to provide such an investigation tomorrow.

I respectfully point out that the 435 Members of this House have a greater interest in, and a prior right to, the information reportedly divulged to a group of some 50 or 60 private citizens.

I propose that this special committee summon persons reported to have been present at this meeting or to have participated in it. I believe that Dr. Eli Ginzberg, of New York City, should be called. I believe that the former Assistant Secretary of War, Tracey S. Voorhees, who has confirmed the fact that he attended the meeting and voiced opposition to the plans outlined, should be called to reveal all that he knows about the meeting and the reported plans. So should Dean Wesley Sturges, of the Yale Law School, another reported participant. I believe Assistant Secretary Anna Rosenberg should be questioned as to the reported participation in the conference of an assistant on her New York staff. Other participants, as their identity becomes known, should also be questioned. Let us let the American people and the Congress know what is going on and what is being planned.

Meanwhile, I believe that Assistant Secretary Rosenberg should also be questioned on the alleged plans of the President of the United States for compulsory nonmilitary service for men who could not qualify for even limited-duty military service under UMT. Mrs. Rosenberg disclosed that there are such plans, during her testimony before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last year. She promised to produce more information. That promise was not kept. Let's find out if that information, demanded by Senator JOHNSON of Texas, last year, has been disclosed to the group which met last month at the Harriman estate.

I present here the chronological record of references to this plan for compulsory nonmilitary service made before the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee last year:

First intimation of a projected plan for compulsory nonmilitary service was given by Mrs. Rosenberg during her testimony on January 10, 1951. She disclosed that of the estimated 1,050,000 young men who would reach 18 in the fiscal year beginning July 1951, there would be some one hundred to one hundred and fifty thousand available for only nonmilitary service. Regarding this group, she said:

> You have left somewhere between a maximum of a hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand people, men of the age of 18, for whom we understand the President will submit a program later to the Senate for their approval on some sort of a national service. (Senate hearings, p. 52.)

Before citing this estimate as to the number, Mrs. Rosenberg had testified:

> Now, there are, of course, some men who will not be able to go into the Armed Forces on any practical basis because they are incapable of meeting the minimum physical, mental, and moral qualifications, and here we get away at this point from the universality of the plan. * * *
>
> At this moment the President has no plan which we want to submit—which he wants us to submit for these numbers—relatively small numbers—of men.
>
> It is his concept and that of the Department of Defense that this must be a universal program and that every man physically and mentally and morally capable of performing a service, either in the military or outside, must perform that service.
>
> We, however, want to make sure—and that is not the Department of Defense's program, but I know that those are the President's instructions—that when a program is submitted to you for these relatively small numbers of men—and I will give you the exact numbers—it will not be a made-work program but one of real usefulness in the national effort. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

Senator SALTONSTALL at the time pointed out that Mrs. Rosenberg's estimate represented 15 percent of the 18-year-olds, and he urged that the administration "give careful consideration to have a plan before this committee"—for this group—"before we are asked to pass the universal military service bill"—Senate hearings, page 53.

Mrs. Rosenberg replied:

> The reason we are not able to give you a plan at this time is because, if we did, we would have to ask you to so materially amend, for instance, the pension laws. * * *
>
> There are intricate civil-service regulations which would have to be worked out before that is done. * * *
>
> * * * I think that any department could come up with a plan that would look as if these men would be used. In your questions you purposely, carefully said: "Is this plan going to be new WPA?" I am not saying anything disparaging of WPA. It provided a useful service at the time. But, with full employment, you do not have to have that; and, therefore, what I think the President has in mind—and I feel I express it with some humility, as I am not here to speak for him—but I believe what he has in mind is that the proper agencies will in a very short time come up to you with a program for these 100,000 to 150,000. (Senate hearings, p. 53.)

Next reference to this "plan" occurred during the committee hearing on January 15. I quote the RECORD:

> Senator JOHNSON. Next question is: Under a USM act, what "nonmilitary" programs would be provided for individuals who are not physically or mentally qualified for military service?
>
> Mrs. ROSENBERG. That is a program that the military has nothing to do with. That is the program where there are men who are not qualified for military service. The President will have a program. We will not. We will have a program for the limited-service men in the military.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. But as you testified originally, there will be such a program although it will not be administered by your department; is that right?
>
> Mrs. ROSENBERG. I have been given to understand that the President is contemplating the formation of such a program. Just when, I cannot say. We have nothing to do with it in the military.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. I would like to suggest that the committee would like to have any information that can be obtained bearing on that general subject before it presents its bill to the full committee and to the Senate. What is or is not done by that group may have considerable bearing on the outcome of the whole picture.
>
> Mrs. ROSENBERG. Senator, there will be no more than about 150,000 men, as we showed you, in that class; and I will try to obtain the information for you as to when you can expect it. (Senate hearings, p. 148.)

Later that same day, Senator JOHNSON reemphasized the committee's interest in this plan:

> Senator JOHNSON. We may not need to go into the next question in view of your statement that you do not plan to operate this program under the Department of Defense. But, I should like for you to take judicial notice of it because it indicates some of the apprehensions that the people and members of the committee have about this group of 150,000. It might be advisable for whoever is formulating such a program to know that the committee is interested in the question.
>
> Mrs. ROSENBERG. If I may give one answer to that—the President gave General Marshall and me some ideas on that. He said the reason he was not ready to submit such a program was he wanted to be sure it is not made work and would be a legitimate occupation. (Senate hearings, p. 151.)

Mrs. Rosenberg made a passing reference to the subject again later that day, but the matter was not further developed. She commented:

> Then we said that there would probably be another 100,000 or 150,000—it may even go a little higher—who could be used for some type of national service, but could not be used by the military. (Senate hearings, p. 193.)

On January 16, in the course of summing up unfinished business in connection with Mrs. Rosenberg's testimony, Senator JOHNSON said:

> We have asked for any information available on the President's program for men not qualified for military service. Mrs. Rosenberg said that she would try to obtain the information as to when we can expect that program.
>
> I am glad to see the Assistant Secretary taking notes here, because we want to button this stuff up and get as much of it as we can. (Senate hearings, p. 240.)

I have carefully searched the balance of the record of the Senate subcommittee hearings and can find no evidence that this promise of more information was ever complied with by Mrs. Rosenberg.

The proposal was subsequently referred to, however, in connection with the appearance of other witnesses. The following colloquy occurred when Labor Secretary Tobin appeared before the committee on the same day, January 16:

> Senator JOHNSON. Do you agree with the proposed bill in its entirety, and if not, on what matters do you disagree?
>
> Secretary TOBIN. As I have stated, I agree with the bill in its entirety.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. Do you agree with the program for nonmilitary service for 18-year-olds asked for by the Department of Defense?
>
> Secretary TOBIN. It would be a very difficult program to administer, and I would want to have an opportunity to see a specific plan before me before I would want to commit myself. Such a plan will be exceedingly difficult to administer, and I want to be sure that it is a sound one.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. The committee has received various manpower charts from the Department of Defense.
>
> Secretary TOBIN. I might say, Senator, there is no definite recommendation in the

bill as to what kind of program is to be set up.

Senator JOHNSON. That is right. I understand the President is working out a program, and I thought maybe you would be in on that construction.

Secretary TOBIN. Well, as I have stated, I think it would be a most difficult program to administer, and I think it should be very thoroughly studied before any move is made in that direction. (Senate hearings, p. 340.)

A final reference to the proposal was made in the testimony of Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, on January 29:

We believe that a change in the title to Universal Military Training and Service will leave the door open to the drafting of individuals not qualified for military duty to perform functions normally carried on by civilians. To this, we are unalterably opposed. It smacks of national service legislation which not one of us would want to see replace the voluntary free labor which has so successfully served the Nation in previous periods of peace and war. (Senate hearings, p. 1051.)

I should like to know why the promised information was never forthcoming. I should like to know whether Mrs. Rosenberg "spilled the beans" by having mentioned it at all. I should like to know whether the administration became fearful that this audacious scheme of regimentation would defeat the first step in the over-all program—namely, UMT. I should like to know whether this particular scheme of conscription for civilian duty was for that reason tucked away in the White House deep freeze. I should also like to know whether it was part of the plan brought out of the deep freeze at the Harriman conference. And I should think the Members of this House would like to know the answers, too, before they vote to take the first step in these plans.

Of course, as I have reminded this House, both last year and last week, the program of regimentation already disclosed in House and Senate committee hearings included a plan for physical rehabilitation, at Government expense, of 18-year-olds with substandard physical conditions—House hearings, 1951, pages 88, 89, Senate hearings, 1951, page 52, 497. It included Government selection of students, and designation of their courses and vocations, with Federally financed tuition or scholarships—House hearings, 1951, pages 47–48, 115, 348–351, 664; Senate hearings, 1951, pages 84, 55, 56, 113, 158, 159, 556, 557.

I call your attention to the fact that the record of last year's Senate hearings on UMT also made reference to the fact that a Federal Security Agency program of child care for working mothers "is already in the mill"—Senate hearings, pages 307, 308.

I call your attention to the fact that the records of these same hearings also include the text of the Association of American Colleges Declaration on Manpower, adopted at the Atlantic City, N. J., meeting, January 10, 1951, which contained this provision with respect to women:

Since the shortage of trained personnel is becoming acute, and womanpower is an even more important source of leadership in civilian service and in the professions, we urge adequate and immediate comprehensive planning to insure the constructive utilization of the ability and training of all college women (Senate hearings, pp. 464–465).

In view of this public record, I refuse to be shocked or surprised or incredulous any more at any fantastic schemes for regimentation which roll out of the planning mills in Washington or at the Harriman estate workshop of the planners.

I refuse to be shocked or surprised or incredulous. But I also still refuse to believe that the American people want it that way. I still refuse to believe that the Members of this House and this Congress want it that way, or are yet prepared to abdicate to the secret planners. And I still refuse to believe that you are prepared to place your approval on UMT, admittedly the first step in this program of regimentation, at least until you know something more about the hitch-hiking social planners who see in UMT a quick lift to their dreamed of Utopia.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is the statement just made that we are in the black again correct?

Mr. TABER. Well, the daily Treasury statement indicates that we are about $7,000,000,000 in the red, as I remember it. I cannot give the exact figure on it. I will put it in the RECORD, however, exact.

Mr. Chairman, a little while ago, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] asked two or three questions with reference to the amount of money in this bill for telephones and telegrams and for travel. As I remember, there is something like $2,700,000 for travel in the Treasury Department, and something about the same figure for telephones and telegrams. In the Post Office Department there is a considerable figure, amounting to practically fourteen or fifteen million dollars for travel, and something like $2,000,000 for telephones. I am wondering if the chairman of the subcommittee could at this time give us those figures, because I feel that the House ought to have them.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I shall be very glad to do so. The situation with reference to travel in the Post Office is as follows: $3,180,000 of the travel amount represents the travel of city delivery carriers to and from their districts within the city. When the mail carriers have to go distances from the post office to the field in which they operate, their transportation is paid to and from that field, which is usually by bus. They formerly traveled by streetcar. Most of the bus rates in the cities have gone up, and that item has gone up considerably because of the increase in transportation costs.

Eight million three hundred and seventy-four thousand dollars of the amount represents per diem payments to the railway mail clerks who operate on the railroad trains. They are allowed $6 per diem while they are away from their homes, and that represents $8,374,000.

Those two items make $11,554,000 of the amount.

There is an item of $1,348,000 for general administration. One million two hundred thousand dollars of that represents travel by the inspectors in inspecting the various post offices.

With request to communications, telegrams, telephones, the general administration cost, departmental, is $36,600; the inspectors, $5,200, making a total of $41,800. In the postal operations, which includes telephone, telegram, teletype, and related instances in all of the post offices of the country, there is $2,126,000. There are at the present time 41,000 post offices in the United States, and divided between 41,000 post offices, that amount makes about $53 a year per post office, which includes the payment of their telephones and all of their communication costs.

The transportation of things, to which the gentleman referred, is nothing more than the transportation of mail. Under the items in the budget there is a breakdown, "transportation of things." In the case of the post office it is mail.

That represents transportation by water to the internal and Territorial possessions, $3,203,000,000. Foreign, $14,783,000,000. By truck for domestic mail, $521,191,000. By rail for domestic mail and Alaska and Puerto Rico, $394,459,000. By air for domestic mail, $65,000,000. By air for foreign mail, $69,654,000. Terminal charges for foreign mail, $171,310,000. This makes a total of $616,600,000.

Mr. TABER. Would the gentleman be able to tell us how many of those 41,000 post offices are first-class?

Mr. GARY. I can furnish those figures, but I do not have them offhand.

Mr. BURNSIDE. If the gentleman will yield, there are a little less than 2,000 first-class post offices.

Mr. GARY. There are 41,000 of all classes.

Mr. TABER. Yes, I had that; and about 2,000 are first-class. There would not be a requirement that there would be any substantial telephone or telegraph expense at much less than a first-class office, would there?

Mr. GARY. I agree that practically every post office ought to have a telephone at least.

Mr. TABER. Perhaps two-thirds of the post offices are third-class offices. I did not know. Maybe they do. I did not suppose they were equipped that way.

Mr. GARY. I think most of the first-, second-, and third-class offices would require telephone facilities. It may be that some of the fourth-class offices would not, but I think the first-, second-, and third-class offices unquestionably would require telephone facilities.

Mr. TABER. All right.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Chairman, Lowell Mellett in the Washington Star says about Senator RICHARD RUSSELL:

> He is respected for his exceptional ability and for his unquestioned integrity. He is recognized as one of the most powerful, if not the most powerful Member of the Senate. As a legislator he works hard and intelligently for what he conceives to be the national interest.

I quote this as typical of the glowing comments that came both from columnists and editors following the announcement of Senator RUSSELL for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. All of them testified to the excellent qualities of the Senator. But nearly all of them also ended virtually in the same vein—they say he cannot get elected. I wonder why? They all concede he has the ability and integrity so essential to good government, and which also is so conspicuous by its absence in so many places of authority today. Then, why? The Washington Post, that organ that is constantly crusading against alleged discrimination of all kinds gives us the answer in an editorial when it says, after also praising Senator RUSSELL personally and politically, that he cannot be elected because he is from the South, and goes on to say that no man from the South can be elected. Talk about discrimination. Talk about hypocrisy. Shades of the Pharisees. Here at a time when real leadership is so important and when it is admittedly available they say, "No. We won't have him." "He is from the South." May I refer them to the forty-sixth verse of the second chapter of the Gospel according to St. John—and if they persist in their position that "no good thing can come out of the South," I must answer as Philip answered Nathaniel, "Come and see."

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose is to comment on the proposal of the gentlewoman from New York that an investigation about the Post Office Department is essential. In connection with that proposal we ought to understand just exactly what the Congress can do about this widespread complaint about postal service and excessive loss in the operation of the post office. In addition restrictions, which the people feel have been put on the postal services by the order of the Postmaster General cutting service, are proving to be irksome.

We always want to examine what we ought to do before we complain about others. I think we here in the Congress have to resolve a number of points so that we may have done all we can do to put the post-office house in order as a necessary preliminary to an investigation. We should: First, put into effect the Hoover Commission recommendations respecting the post office. Second, consider necessary increases in rates in connection with costs, especially on those items on which we are still suffering a loss. Third, clean house on political influence in connection with post-office appointments harmful alike to the service the public gets and to postal workers. Fourth, give attention to the repeal of the Whitten rider, which makes for a large increase in the number of temporary employees in the post office with resultant alleged serious decreases in the efficiency of the post office.

I think it is a shock to most Americans that service in other countries with very serious economic difficulties, namely in France and Great Britain, is very much superior to our own service, as has been demonstrated by the series of articles which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune and Sun and which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, February 28. I think the suggestion of the gentlewoman from New York is very constructive provided it is coupled with our own action on measures which we can take to see that the people of the United States get the job done of improving the postal service that they want done.

I would like to point out to my colleagues on the Republican side that here is a business issue in which Republicans have a special opportunity—business operation of the Post Office at a profit instead of a loss. It is an area in which our suggestions and our ideas could count for a great deal in showing how to run the Government as efficiently as a business can be run. Again I say I am glad the gentlewoman from New York has come forward with the suggestion for a complete investigation into the Post Office Department to which I suggest we add a review of what we can do in the Congress to improve the postal service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I have five points, one point for each minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say when I returned from Korea to become a new member of this committee, I paid a compliment to the Post Office for the wonderful mail delivery that they had given the boys in the Far East. When I left Japan in December 1950, there were over 200,000 sacks of mail ready at Haneida Airport to be delivered to the boys for Christmas in Korea. The situation was such, of course, that they could not be delivered in the battle sector. That observation was published by a wire service in New Jersey, and the rest of the United States.

Believe it or not, I received complaints that the service was still bad; the inference was that I should have been ashamed of myself for making such an observation as to the efficiency of the postal service in the combat area. Had the critics realized that the Army was the one that had expedited the mail, perhaps I would not have received the criticism.

Secondly, we are talking of UMT. We know it alone is not going to end future wars. We have the Central Intelligence Agency, we have the FBI, and we have the G–2 in the Armed Forces and the Secret Service. It seems to me that we need in the Treasury Department a Coast Guard cargo intelligence unit to coordinate all shipments that go by waterways, through the skies, and across the lands, for possible economic and military evaluation for this House's benefit.

In Antwerp, when we were there in November, we saw a Soviet troopship; it had just been refurbished and sailed for Vladivostok. It will no doubt be used in the Pacific trade against us in the future; yet, no mention to my knowledge was made of it in the United States. If a shipyard would try to do business that way with the Soviets here, they would no doubt be brought before the Un-American Activities Committee. There are many things happening in Europe and Asia that make me feel many are following the trade winds and not their flags. I would ask this House to seriously consider setting up a Coast Guard cargo intelligence unit. Why is not the Coast Guard at Hong Kong, or Panamania?

Point 3: If the merchants of the United States would price many of their items in terms of nickels and dimes and round figures instead of odd figures we would probably alleviate the production shortage we are told exists in the manufacture of pennies.

Point 4: As far as defense bond sales are concerned, we still have the same price, $18.75 for a $25 bond. We set that price 10 years ago. Merchandisers generally do not repeat the same approaches for that much time. We ought to price the bond at $3.75; it would step up the volume sold, especially in weekly pay envelopes.

The last point, on commemorative stamps, I think the Congress should have something more to say about commemorative stamps than it does. We just had the Mutual Security Act passed last year. The ball is in the hands of industry, yet, the only industry commemorated this year was the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. It seems to me we could put out a brace of stamps in one issue covering industries in various parts of the United States to show the role they are playing in the mutual security effort. It will be a complement to the effort being waged by industry and its employees in the Mutual Security Act's success. There is still time for this, Postmaster Donaldson. Commemorative issues are profit producing.

In closing, I would like to see this Congress accept the challenge which Professor Golden, of the Harvard School of Business, gave Charlie Wilson and others at the Shoreham Hotel early in December when he said, "You have got to bring your costing techniques up to date." That applies to the Congress. It we would charge for postal service what we should charge, and let the tomahawk fall on inefficient operations; we would be doing a job, and we would lick this postal deficit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, in reading the hearings on the Treasury and Post Office Department appropriation bill, which we have under consideration today, I notice this quotation from the statement of the Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson:

> You see quite frequently statements made in the press and other places to the effect that these foreign postal administrations provide better postal service than our United States postal system, which is not factual at all. You see these statements made that they have multiple deliveries in certain cities in foreign countries, and that they provide better service than we have here.

Then, skipping a paragraph, he goes on:

> Now, the maximum salary of a postman in London, England—and I am not talking about the middle man or the average, but your maximum salary is a little over $17 a week. The maximum salary for postmen here is $85 a week.

Mr. Chairman, when I was in England last summer I made it a point to study the London postal system, and the postal system for the entire United Kingdom.

I do not believe Mr. Donaldson's statement quite measures up to the facts. I was informed that in the business districts of not only greater London but the other major cities of Great Britain the businessmen received from six to eight deliveries a day. I was informed that the residential sections received from three to four deliveries a day. I was also informed that if you post a letter in London at 9 o'clock in the morning that 99 chances out of 100 it would reach its destination in London by 11 o'clock that day; that if you should post a letter by 6:30 at night for Edinburgh or Glasgow, it would be delivered on the first delivery the following day. If you wanted it to be delivered on the first delivery in the morning in the northern part of Scotland, you would have to post it before 4:30 p. m.

What is the situation in Chicago, my home town? And anything I say here, I do not want to be considered as a reflection on our postmaster at Chicago, Mr. John Haderlein. I personally think he is doing as good a job as anyone could possibly do under the directives he has to work under from Washington. But in Chicago, at one of the branch stations, if we post a letter in the post box outside the office at 6:30 at night and the destination were in the first or second block from where it was posted, they would not receive it until the second day. Then they would not know what time on the second day it would be received, because there is only one delivery a day. That is liable to be any time from noon on to 3 or 4 o'clock in the afternoon if it is in some of the residential districts.

I do not begrudge the people of the British Isles this wonderful postal system they have, but I do think that if they can do it there, we in America ought to have equally as good a system.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That may be because the British Isles are under the Marshall plan and I do not believe Chicago is.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say that the money we have been giving Great Britain under the Marshall plan—and very few people in England know this—that the entire amount of the counterpart fund outside of the 5 percent for administrative purposes has gone directly to reduce the national debt of the British Empire.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. Has the gentleman any idea what the British people pay for postage and what they pay for their special services so as to get this rapid handling of their mail?

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say to my friend from Louisiana that I am only sorry that this appropriation bill has come on the floor so soon, because I intend to make a detailed report to the House of Representatives on the postal system of Great Britain at a very early date; but like the gentleman from Louisiana, I have been tied up in appropriation hearings from early morning until late at night.

Mr. PASSMAN. It will be very enlightening when the gentleman does assemble that information.

Mr. BUSBEY. Grover Cleveland was once credited with saying "We are confronted with a fact, not a theory." We are now confronted with a fact, and the fact is that they have this magnificent system and we do not.

The question of wage scales or rates does not enter into this entirely. Like many others in this House I am an advocate of increasing postal rates on second-class mail, magazines like Life, Collier's, Home and Garden, which are going through the mails for practically nothing. There are some men in this body who are afraid to take that stand. I am not. I think we ought to increase these rates and take care of this great deficit in the Post Office appropriation bill. The fact is, I still insist, that the American people are entitled to as good service as the people of London and Great Britain.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would advocate that we pay our postal employees the same amount that Britain pays hers?

Mr. BUSBEY. Now, that is a foolish question to ask.

Mr. GARY. It is not a foolish question at all. It enters into the cost of carrying the mail.

Mr. BUSBEY. If you go into that subject you will have to go into the entire cost of living in Great Britain.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman raised the question.

Mr. BUSBEY. No, I did not. In answer to the gentlemen's question, I will say no. I am not going to advocate that we pay our postal employees less because, frankly, I think the postal employees' wages when compared to Great Britain are not enough. That is particularly true in the industrial centers like Chicago and New York.

The postal employees in large cities like Chicago, where the cost of living is so much more than in rural areas, have a disadvantage. Some arrangement should be made whereby postal employees in large cities would not be penalized for the high cost of living. I think something should be done by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee to correct this differential so that the postal workers in Chicago may be brought up to and enjoy the same standard of living as those in the rural districts.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] a very able member of our committee.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we will all admit that in every election year something goes haywire with the Post Office Department. The 531 Members of the two bodies receive, no doubt, an average of 100 to 150 personal letters a day and two or three bushels of second-class mail. I do not know of any of my letters that have been lost.

There are 126 post offices in my district which serve an area of approximately 10,000 square miles, including 104 rural routes. To be perfectly honest with you, I have never had a complaint from a constituent or an employee with respect to mail delivery. Therefore it is confusing to find out now that something has gone wrong.

I think that we should take into account that the Post Office Department during the fiscal year 1953 will handle almost 50,000,000,000 pieces of mail and 1,000,000,000 special transactions. I contend it is the most efficient department that we have in Government and, barring the military, it is the largest department we have in the Nation.

I wish that the Members of the House who are having these complaints would bring that information to the attention of this subcommittee. If you will do that, maybe we can make some corrections.

I think it should be pointed out to this committee, as the chairman so ably stated earlier in the day, that only 5 percent of the total appropriation is really handled by the Postmaster General's Department. All the others are fixed by law, and this includes transportation, postal-employee salaries, and so forth. I repeat, only about 5 percent is handled by the Postmaster General. Almost every year, especially during election years, we have an attempt made to cut this bill after the committee has made drastic reductions. If you attempt to reduce the appropriation this time, the things that you are talking about, for instance, modernization of the postal service, must be postponed again, because these modernization costs will have to come out of the 5 percent that is appropriated to operate the postal service.

One word with reference to the mail delivery in Great Britain. I was there last October. The Postmaster General

in Great Britain can increase postal rates without approval of Britain's legislative body. You check into a hotel and you will find a dining room on every floor. You do not have to go down to a main dining room. They serve meals on every floor. Everything they do is a little different from what we do in this country. Maybe that has something to do with their trade deficit as at the present time. This is another example of how obsolete they are in their various customs and operations.

If the gentleman from Illinois will check into the postal salaries and postal rates in Great Britain he will find that we have a more efficient postal operation in this country, if you put them both on the same basis. Insofar as these special deliveries are concerned, if you will use special deliveries as they do in Great Britain, you can get four or five mail deliveries a day, you can get 20 or 25, as long as you put a special-delivery stamp on the letter. But if you will bring these complaints to the subcommittee and give us something specific, we would be very happy to take it up with the Post Office Department when we are interrogating witnesses from that Department. I want to defend them. I say that it is the most efficient Department that we have in Government. With the small amount of money that we give them for new equipment and modernization I think they are doing an excellent job, and until I have some concrete proof to the contrary I am still going to defend them.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Now, in view of the fact that the gentleman refers to the wage rate paid the employees of the postal department in Great Britain, and the postal rate, what explanation do you give for the fact that they operate their postal system at a profit and we operate ours at a great deficit?

Mr. PASSMAN. Simply because they get a higher postal rate. I am going to insert that information in the RECORD as soon as it is available.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. They not only charge higher postal rates, but they pay their postal employees very much less than we do. That is the reason I directed the question to the gentleman from Illinois just a few moments ago. We pay higher salaries to our postal employees, and they are entitled to it, and under the standards we have in this country we have to do it.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to assure the gentleman from Illinois that if we were permitted to charge the same postal rate in America that is charged in Great Britain, and give the Postmaster General the same laws to operate by as they do in Great Britain, that our Post Office Department would make Great Britain's look puny.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I must say to the gentleman that I think the comparison of wages between the United States and Great Britain is utterly ridiculous. We know that their wage scale all along the line is lower than ours, their cost of living is lower than ours, and therefore there is absolutely no comparison there. If you want to compare the rates, I think you have a fair thing to go on, and that is absolutely true. I know all about it, for I have a great many relatives in England. I know what their rates are and they are considerably higher than ours, and they no doubt do show a profit. But, as for comparing wages and living costs with ours, that is perfectly foolish. You could say the same thing about the miner, the butcher, the baker, or the candlestick maker. You might as well compare the Chinese or any other nation for that matter.

Mr. PASSMAN. I will be glad to yield to my chairman to answer that.

Mr. GARY. May I say in answer to the gentlewoman from New York that my information is that the maximum salary for postal employees in Great Britain is $17 a week. Now, when you compare that with the salaries that we pay, you must realize that it costs more to carry the mail. The greater the cost to carry the mail the greater the deficit, unless the rates are sufficiently high to cover the additional costs. I am not arguing against salaries. I voted for the salary increase, but I think you have to take that into consideration.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I think that is not an answer to what I stated. I would like to ask the gentleman what he thinks the average English coal miner gets as compared to our coal miner. I would like to ask him what the average steel worker gets compared to our steel worker.

Mr. GARY. A coal miner does not carry mail.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. That does not make any difference.

Mr. GARY. Therefore, the wages of a coal miner do not enter into the cost of the Post Office Department. The salary of a mail carrier does, and we were discussing the cost of the Post Office Department and the deficit resulting from its operations.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. How about Canada?

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, may I have the remainder of my time?

May I state to the lady that if you pay a postal employee in Great Britain $17 a week and you pay that same employee here $65 a week, do you not think you would be able to deliver mail much cheaper in Great Britain, and should not salary be taken into account in considering the cost?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Then you might as well compare the United States Government with the Government of Great Britain and you would come to exactly the same thing. Of course they pay less.

Mr. PASSMAN. Then you would have to consider the two.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am not arguing with the gentleman about the rates.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does not the fact still remain that we just do not get the service over here in the United States they get in Great Britain? Does not the gentleman believe the people of the United States are entitled to equally as good service as they have in Great Britain?

Mr. PASSMAN. As a Member of Congress and the owner of three retail businesses I have never had any reason to complain, and I do not know whether the gentleman has any just complaint. If he does, if he will bring it to the attention of this committee we will try to do something about it. I do not know of any serious complaint.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] who qualifies as an expert on the issues being discussed here today.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the statement of the distinguished ranking member of this subcommittee but I do not claim to qualify as an expert on any subject matter that has to do with legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct a few questions to the chairman of this subcommittee, if I may.

The investigation of the Postal Service has been mentioned. I am one of those who does not believe it makes any difference whether it is in an election year or not, if an investigation is in order it ought to be made.

Now may I ask the chairman of the committee two or three questions. The Boston situation that has been mentioned. According to the hearings, some 1,300 individuals have been charged. As I understand, of all those who have been convicted one has been given a light jail sentence. Is that correct?

Mr. GARY. Yes, that is correct, but certainly the gentleman from Kansas does not contend that the Post Office Department or the Congress can dictate to the courts of the land. All of these persons have not been tried, but indictments were presented. Neither the Post Office Department or our subcommittee or the Congress of the United States have authority to sentence people to jail. That is within the province of the courts. The matter has been brought to the attention of the court. As I recall, 114 indictments have been presented. Eighty-four pleaded guilty. Twenty-two pleaded not guilty. There are 36 presentation letters still pending.

The disposition of those cases and the imposition of sentences are matters for the Federal courts. Certainly our committee is not going to attempt to dictate to the Federal courts, and I doubt very seriously whether the committee of which the gentleman is a member will go quite that far.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No, I agree with what the gentleman has to say, but I

think it is rather significant that certain people have been charged with committing a crime against the Federal Government. Some have been fined $100 others $200, less money than some of them took from the Federal Government. I know this is a matter handled by the courts, but comparatively seems rather light.

Mr. GARY. The estimated amount that was taken from the Government was $30,000. Restitution has been made by the employees to the extent of $27,016, so that according to the estimates the Government has recovered all but a little less than $3,000, and it is expected that the rest of it will be recovered.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is it not rather a strange justification, though, that after the Government was defrauded of $27,000 these people were indicted and convicted and because they paid the money back they would not be punished except for a light fine of $100. I am just making that observation.

With reference to these subsidies which come out of the Federal Treasury to keep the post office going, I wonder if the chairman can tell us how much money in this bill is to subsidize the carrying of the mail? Does the gentleman have the figures as to how much money we are appropriating to subsidize, let us say, first-class mail?

Mr. GARY. No.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Or third-class?

Mr. GARY. Our committee did not attempt to appropriate according to the different classes of mail.

Mr. REES of Kansas. How much money are we subsidizing for all the mails?

Mr. GARY. I do not think anybody can tell exactly what the subsidies will be under the new rates and under the new salary and mail transportation costs. Our committee did ask for estimates, however, and a table showing the information that the gentleman is requesting appears on page 107 of the record. This table shows the actual deficit for each class of mail for 1950, the preliminary fiscal year 1951, and then the estimates for 1952 and 1953 for first-class, domestic, airmail, second-class, third-class, fourth-class, special services, and foreign mail. It should be understood that we had very great difficulty in getting this table out of the Post Office Department because they were afraid they would be held strictly accountable for the figures in it. They told us very frankly that the figures are purely estimates. But, they are the best estimates that can be made at the present time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There has been so much discussion, I will say to the chairman of this subcommittee with respect to the allocation of funds for the various classes of mail, I thought it would be helpful to the Members of the House to have an estimate in the RECORD as to approximately what the allocations are in the appropriations for the various classes of mail. It is claimed on the one hand, for instance that first-class mail pays its own way; that second-class mail shows a deficit of something like $200,000,000; and third-class mail a like amount; and fourth-class mail a considerable amount of money. I just thought, perhaps for the sake of the record, it would be well to include those figures in the RECORD. Will the gentleman put those figures in the RECORD?

Mr. GARY. I shall be very glad to include the table on page 108 in the RECORD. It is a rather long table, and I ask that it be included in the RECORD at this point because I agree with the gentleman and our committee felt that the House should have the benefit of those figures. That is the reason we asked them to give us an estimate although we knew it would be merely an estimate, and that we could not hold them to the exact figures.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The figures referred to are as follows:)

	Actual, fiscal year 1950	Preliminary, fiscal year 1951	Estimated [1]	
			Fiscal year 1952	Fiscal year 1953
First class:				
Obligations	$660, 728, 030	$684, 923, 681	$810, 366, 477	$837, 653, 516
Receipts	741, 151, 364	777, 529, 000	841, 950, 000	903, 686, 000
Excess of receipts	80, 423, 334	92, 605, 319	31, 583, 523	66, 032, 484
Domestic air mail:				
Obligations	109, 921, 905	121, 028, 603	137, 337, 489	141, 261, 844
Receipts	74, 120, 038	92, 940, 000	102, 819, 000	111, 943, 000
Deficit	35, 501, 867	28, 138, 603	34, 518, 489	29, 318, 844
Second-class domestic:				
Obligations	237, 677, 263	254, 202, 687	299, 637, 721	309, 452, 941
Receipts	45, 003, 555	46, 663, 000	48, 573, 000	53, 943, 000
Deficit	192, 673, 708	207, 629, 687	251, 064, 721	255, 509, 941
Third class:				
Obligations	289, 618, 283	288, 814, 672	355, 903, 878	367, 778, 147
Receipts	153, 745, 942	154, 0[illegible]0, 000	158, 721, 000	194, 407, 000
Deficit	135, 872, 341	134, 734, 672	197, 182, 878	173, 371, 147
Fourth class:				
Obligations	480, 907, 362	553, 442, 401	634, 260, 144	653, 747, 577
Receipts	403, 768, 375	432, 740, 000	519, 669, 000	569, 019, 000
Deficit	77, 138, 987	120, 702, 401	114, 591, 144	84, 728, 577
Special services:				
Obligations	217, 099, 711	222, 455, 656	266, 609, 342	275, 529, 501
Receipts	160, 551, 622	172, 105, 000	189, 363, 000	204, 253, 000
Deficit	56, 548, 089	50, 350, 656	77, 246, 342	71, 276, 501
Foreign:				
Obligations	151, 675, 057	135, 472, 267	146, 259, 825	150, 405, 508
Receipts	66, 990, 868	70, 175, 000	71, 890, 000	73, 368, 000
Deficit	84, 684, 189	65, 297, 267	74, 369, 825	77, 037, 508

[1] Figures for 1952 and 1953 are the best estimates available at this time based on preliminary 1951 cost ascertainment data.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in the remarks that have been made concerning economy in the postal service. Some of the references to economies that have been placed into effect have attributed this action to the Hoover Commission recommendations.

It is not my purpose to detract from the work of the Hoover Commission because I think that when we are talking about economy, it takes a persistent repetition of suggestions in order to bring about their ultimate adoption. I cannot let this opportunity pass, however, without reminding the House that during the Eightieth Congress, they approved a study of the postal service made by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I had the honor to serve as chairman.

The findings of this committee as expressed in our committee reports to the House were in a large measure endorsed and adopted by the Hoover Commission. For example, as a result of our studies, it was apparent that the Post Office Department needed the research and development program and our committee recommended such a research and development program in our report of investigation. In addition, we recommended legislation providing for a research and development program introduced by Congressman SADLAK of Connecticut. This legislation passed the House. Its final enactment, however, did not take place until the following year. As a result of the research and development program, we find, according to the committee report on the appropriation bill, that the Post Office Department has experiments under way with respect to light motor vehicles; elevating and gravity loading conveyors; electric pedestrian type tractors; coin sorting, counting, and packaging machines; wire- and cord-tying machines; pallett containers and related equipment; improved types of payroll, addressograph and graphotype machines; modernized garage equipment; power sweepers; and light and color engineering.

Also, I note that Mr. Sestak, who invented the sorting machine has finally been given recognition in an award of $1,000 for his work on this machine. It was our committee that saw this machine on one of our studies made at the Chicago post office. The original machine was made from pieces of tin cans. With cooperation of the Appropriation

Committees of both the House and Senate, we obtained $50,000 for the Post Office Department to pursue experimentations with this machine. I am pleased to learn that this machine has proved so successful and, of course, in doing so proved the value of our recommendation and action. I note, too, that the Department is now directed by the Appropriations Committee to place additional machines into use in other post offices.

In 1948, our committee recommended that money orders be key-punched for electrical accounting and in July of 1951, the Post Office Department placed such a system into effect.

It was the study made by our committee which established the collection of cost data by various post offices. I have noted by reading the hearings that the Appropriations Committee has directed the Department to collect this data in more detail and to actively pursue corrections where they are indicated. As I recall the hearings, a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee pointed out that had this cost data been evaluated and with a rapid follow-up of appropriate action, the situation at Boston where many clerks were not performing their duties but were drawing their salaries would have been detected.

We recommend, of course, the elimination of the air-mail subsidy from the Post Office Department appropriation. The bill on which we are acting today still contains that air-mail subsidy. I sincerely hope that the Congress will take final action on legislation separating the subsidy from air-mail pay in this session.

Time does not permit my discussing in detail the many recommendations which our committee made during our study of the postal service. I am happy to say that we had the cooperation of the Post Office Department in placing these into effect. I believe that the economies for which the Appropriations Committee commended the Department can be attributed to the development of the areas in which economies were practicable by our committee study, and translation of these recommendations and suggestions into action by the Department.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I am as greatly concerned about the growing deficit in the Post Office Department as any Member of the House. I do not believe any Member can be any stronger for economy and the elimination of waste and extravagance than I am. I think my record will show that I have voted in the interest of economy.

Today we have before us the budget for the Post Office Department for the next fiscal year. The budget estimate shows a deficit of $669,000,000. Of the $669,000,000 it is estimated that about $160,000,000 consists of free services—for penalty mail, for frank mail and for air-mail subsidies, and for the cost of mail for the blind, and so forth. So if you take off the $160,000,000 from the deficit of $669,000,000, you still have a deficit of about $500,000,000. The Appropriations Committee has reduced the budget estimate around $28,000,000 and this is a substantial reduction—certainly there should be no further reduction by the House.

Now, what are the facts about this deficit? Who is responsible for it? I say, in all fairness, the responsibility is largely that of Congress. Why? Because, since July 1, 1945, the Congress has increased the salaries of the postal service in an annual amount of $1,110,000,000. That is just the increase alone this year due to salary increases voted by Congress in 1945, 1946, 1948, and 1951. The total budget for the Post Office Department this year is a little over $2,800,000,000. Of that amount the increase for salaries since 1945 amounts to $1,100,000,000. Also, there is an increase in the cost of air mail transportation of $96,000,000 per year since 1946. There is an increase in the cost of railway mail transportation this year of $188,000,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Simply to make the point that the Post Office Department has absolutely no control over those three major items.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman is exactly right. The fact of the matter is that 97 percent of the total appropriation for the Post Office Department goes to salaries and to the cost of transportation of mail. The salaries are fixed by Congress. The mail transportation is fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board. So, in fact, the Postmaster General has control of only 3 percent of the entire budget of the Post Office Department.

There is a total increase in the mail transportation and salaries of $1,443,638,000 this year due to these past increases. Let us see what we have done to try to offset that increase, in the way of charging more for carrying the mail. Of course, every time you vote a salary increase it places the Department more and more in the red unless postal rates are increased accordingly. Although we have increased the total cost $1,443,000,000 since 1945, how much have we increased the cost for carrying the mail? The total increase since 1949—that was the first increase for years and years in postal rates. Since that time the total increase in charges for carrying the mail has been $390,038,000. So, while we have increased salaries and mail transportation costs by over $1,443,000,000, on the other hand Congress has raised the rates of postage sufficient to raise only $390,000,000. So therefore there is a deficit of $1,053,000,000 in those items alone.

Mr. Chairman, let us not blame the Post Office Department for this huge deficit. Let us take the responsibility ourselves since we voted these increases in salaries.

No one has fought more for a proper and substantial increase in mail rates than I have. Ever since I have been a member of the Post Office Committee I have, year in and year out, tried to raise the rates adequately on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail and on special services. If I had had my way with the committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, and if my views had prevailed in Congress, the rates today would be much higher on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail and the deficit would not be nearly so large as it is today.

Unfortunately I have been unsuccessful in getting the majority of my committee or a majority of this House to go along with me in a substantial and adequate increase in second-, third-, and fourth-class postal rates. I have made every effort possible; I have worked year in and year out trying to increase the rates to where they will fairly and adequately represent the cost of the services rendered, but each time I have failed.

I was very much interested in the statement of my good friend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and his criticism of the Postmaster General's order of April 30, 1950, curtailing mail-delivery service to residential areas to one delivery a day. What are the facts? Here is what the Postmaster General said in the hearings on this bill:

> I call attention to the fact that rural delivery and star routes supply one-quarter of our population, and that they receive, the patrons of rural delivery and star routes, receive only one delivery a day; some of them receive mail only every other day, or three times a week. There is one-quarter of your population right there.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Not now.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman mentioned my name.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I will yield later, but not now.

Further I call attention to the fact that out of 40,000 post offices only 4,600, about one-tenth of them have city delivery. Therefore you have 36,000 post offices that do not have any delivery at all where people go to post offices to get their mail and rent lock boxes and so forth.

The population of these 36,000 post offices is 35,000,000; so you have 35,000,000 people living in towns and villages that do not have city delivery and who are not getting any delivery at all and who have to go to the post office to get their mail; also, you have one-quarter of our people residing on rural and star routes, and they get delivery only once a day and on some rural routes only every other day. So there you have one-quarter of our population getting no delivery at all, who have to go to the post office to get their mail; you have another quarter in the rural communities who get mail only once a day and in some instances only three times a week.

Let us see what happened in World War II. During that time due to the scarcity of personnel, there was only one delivery a day in residential districts. Did you hear any great complaints or criticism then?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Here is my point, we have a deficit of $669,000,000. The Postmaster General says and I quote him:

I call your attention to the fact, today it would cost approximately $150,000,000 to restore the services that were readjusted in April 1950.

I ask my friend from New Jersey if he wants to propose an amendment for increasing this deficit by $150,000,000 by nullifying or rescinding the order of the Postmaster General of April 30, 1950?

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman want me to answer that question?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Does the gentleman know that the Postmaster General did not want to issue this order reducing deliveries from two a day to one?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Certainly I do.

Mr. CANFIELD. Because of the effect it would have on the morale of the people? Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I certainly do; and I know furthermore that this House, through the Appropriations Committee, directed the Postmaster General to reduce service. Is not that correct?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] if that is correct.

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. I reminded him how reluctant he was to cut the delivery service and his answer was "That is the way I felt about it." He came to the Congress and recommended the two-delivery system in 1949, and he issued this order most reluctantly.

He said the savings this year would be $40,000,000. There are some Members of Congress who feel he could absorb that amount and restore the two-a-day delivery system.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Will the gentleman deny that on page 85 of the hearings the Postmaster General said:

It will cost approximately $150,000,000 to restore the service.

Mr. CANFIELD. Oh, no.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Read page 85 of the hearings.

Mr. CANFIELD. All right; but he broke it down for me.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Read page 85.

Mr. CANFIELD. Let me call your attention to the fact that on page 87 this colloquy occurred between the Postmaster General and myself:

Mr. CANFIELD. What would that be in terms of today?

Postmaster General DONALDSON. Today I would have to figure it over again because, when I made the statement here a while back that it would cost $44,000,000, that was before your salary act.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is right.

Mr. CANFIELD. Two years ago it was $20,000,000, now it is $44,000,000. A number of us believe honestly that they can absorb the $44,000,000 and restore adequate service to the people of the United States.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I think the gentleman from New Jersey will find that the Postmaster General said it would cost $150,000,000 for all services eliminated or reduced by his order of April 30, 1950. There it is in black and white on page 85 of the hearings.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman is referring to the over-all effect, cutting the directory service and so forth.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Will the gentleman answer my question: Does he favor amending this bill so as to appropriate $150,000,000 to restore the service as it was cut by the Postmaster General's order of April 30?

Mr. CANFIELD. It is not necessary. It is $44,000,000 according to his statement on page 89. It is all broken down on page 89, I say. Out of a total appropriation of $2,400,000,000 I think he can absorb that $44,000,000 and restore the service to the people of the United States, and I am inclined to think that the gentleman does, too.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I do not agree with that at all. In view of the fact that this bill provides for a $669,000,000 deficit, would the gentleman still be in favor of increasing this deficit by adding a necessary appropriation to take care of the two mail deliveries a day to the residential districts?

Mr. CANFIELD. I differ with the gentleman. I say it is not necessary to put that $44,000,000 in there.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. How are you going to do it?

Mr. CANFIELD. When that cut was made at the request of the committee, the cost was only $28,000,000, and that was the year there was a Presidential cut of $44,000,000. The President cut the budget that year. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes, I know all about that.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. If the gentleman believes that $44,000,000 could be absorbed, then does it not appear logical that he would offer an amendment cutting $44,000,000 off the budget?

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman let me answer that?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Florida that I believe that in the days to come the Postmaster General is going to see the light and will restore the service by administrative act.

Mr. LANTAFF. I understand that, but if the gentleman believes that that could be done and $44,000,000 could be absorbed, why does not the committee in the House cut $44,000,000 off the budget?

Mr. CANFIELD. That may be done.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to inform the Committee that the Postmaster General in Great Britain, if he decides to increase the postal rates, does not have to get permission of Parliament. If he sees a deficit coming, he can automatically increase the postal rates and put them into effect at a certain time without the permission of any department in Great Britain. That information was given me just a moment ago.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I do not suppose any member of this committee knows the Postmaster General as well or any better than I do. I have known him intimately since 1933, and I think I know something about his qualifications, his integrity, and his honesty. I can assure you that there is no more faithful, efficient, capable official in our Government today than our Postmaster General, Jesse M. Donaldson. I know something about his work in the Post Office Department. It is easy enough to criticize, and I am not against constructive criticism, and, of course, there is always room for economy and improvement. However, Postmaster General Donaldson, during his tenure of office, has made more improvements and more progress toward making the Post Office Department a more efficient operation and a more economical operation than any Postmaster General, to my knowledge. So let us not place the blame on Postmaster General Donaldson. He is doing a wonderful job under the most trying circumstances and is entitled to our praise and commendation. He sincerely believes in economy. There should be no further reduction or cut in the appropriations for the Post Office Department, and the report of the Appropriations Committee, insofar as it relates to the Post Office Department, should be approved.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, when I requested this time I did not expect to speak about the postal service, but I am moved to make a few remarks about it.

When the last legislative bill dealing with the postal service was up, I offered an amendment to do away with all frank and penalty mail. It happened that that amendment was held out of order. I do not know why, but it was.

My recollection of the figures is that we are spending about $80,000,000 a year for penalty and frank mail. About $1,500,000 of that is the frank mail used by the Congress. The balance is used by the bureaus. In suggesting that all of this be done away with, I am not suggesting that the Government not answer its mail, but merely this: that the matter be under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, and that these departments come in and justify how much money they need to answer their mail, to pay the regular postage on it. I am thoroughly satisfied that the $80,000,000 could be cut down to $50,000,000 and save $30,000,000. I also believe that if our regular mailing privileges here in the Congress were handled in the same way that we handle our expenses for air mail, a few hundred thousand dollars could be saved for taxpayers in that manner.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak of something else.

The other day I obtained from the Office of Price Stabilization in Washington the payroll for the 73 employees of the Nebraska regional office of OPS. When I looked over the list of salaries, I could not believe my eyes. I discovered the payroll for employees of the Nebraska OPS office average per year, $5,249, while the average for all Federal workers in Washington is $4,100.

I have written Mr. Ellis Arnall, the new price boss, to explain to the citizens of Nebraska why his Nebraska OPS payroll is $383,190 for 73 people per year. If his answer is the same answer given by Mr. Edwin Moran, Nebraska district OPS director, then I am informing this House right now that the House Banking and Currency Committee is going to have to do a lot of explaining when the new OPS bill is brought in here for debate.

Mr. Moran told newsmen:

> This is a temporary agency. Usually in a temporary agency, they give a little higher grades to get the right kind of people for the jobs. The people in the OPS agency are of the caliber and integrity that entitles them to the pay they are getting.

Mr. Moran has left much to be desired in explaining away $383,190. He should explain if he thinks these 73 people drawing $383,190 are holding down prices in Nebraska. He should explain to the people of Nebraska if he thinks the caliber of his employees is higher than the calibet and integrity of the average Nebraskan, who, he knows as well as I do, does not make an average salary of $5,249 per year.

Now the major reason I am exposing this situation is because I have received numerous complaints from Nebraskans about the operation of OPS. I have received several complaints from some Nebraska editors regarding the tremendous amount of publicity being flooded across Nebraska to sway public opinion in favor of this agency. I wish Mr. Moran would tell the people of Nebraska, if the OPS program is so extremely popular, why is it necessary to flood the State with press releases and posters?

Regarding this subject of OPS publicity in Nebraska, I have been informed the Nebraska district office in Omaha has two press agents. They are called information specialists. One of these information specialists is Mrs. Elizabeth Flynn.

Her answer to newsmen as to why two press agents are needed in Nebraska is as follows:

> Nebraska is one of the most difficult districts in the United States because of the anti-OPS attitude and tactics of the Omaha World-Herald. Districts usually have one. Mr. DiSalle—

Former OPS chief—

> recognized the peculiar problem of this district and released a Washington position to us.

So there you are. Mrs. Flynn has given me one of the best arguments why there should not be any so-called information specialists at all in Nebraska. If these press agents are only on the payroll to argue with the Omaha World-Herald, then this great Government of ours is coming apart at the seams. Who in the world ever heard of a Government agency maintaining press agents to fight a newspaper at the taxpayers' expense? This is a shameful situation. It calls for a complete investigation of the Omaha office and the type of publicity it is distributing all over our great State. I hope the Banking and Currency Committee will look into this situation before it writes a new OPS bill.

I do not need to defend the Omaha World-Herald from this kind of attack. The World-Herald is a great independent newspaper. Two OPS press agents will not destroy this newspaper or any other newspaper's will to tell the truth to the American people.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, almost daily we hear advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway refer to those who oppose this proposed international skating rink as selfish vested interests.

In continuing their attack on critics of the St. Lawrence seaway, the proponents of such an economic monstrosity conveniently forget that some 250 labor, civic, business, and taxpayers' organizations comprise the St. Lawrence Project Conference, established to acquaint the American people with the selfish motives of those who are in favor of building this so-called international ditch that will be frozen over 5 months of every year and closed to navigation.

On the other hand, advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway have banded together in an organization known as the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association. It is interesting to note that this organization reported in 1950 that it collected $58,104 to support its lobbying activities and that $49,000 of the total amount collected came from the six Midwest steel companies which have invested in iron-ore deposits in the Labrador-Quebec area, and who desire the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway as a subsidized waterway to transport their ore at a lower cost and thereby give them an advantage over their competitors in the steel industry.

During the first 6 months of 1951 the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association reported receipts of $58,622.

Of this amount $26,968 came from four of these steel companies; $10,000 from the City Council of Detroit; $5,000 from the Board of County Commissioners of Wayne County, Detroit; $7,000 from three other Detroit companies; and $5,650 from the authorities of Ogdensburg, N. Y., and St. Lawrence County, N. Y.

The above contributions total $54,618 from special interests of the $58,622 collected by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association, organized for the purpose of trying to inject life into a legislative proposal that has been before Congress annually for the past 50 years.

So desperate are the advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway in their frenzy to have Congress approve such an international "ice follies" that they have the effrontery to insult the American people by trying to identify those who oppose their project as being members of selfish vested interests.

One glance at the lobby report filed by the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association will show who is really spending the money in a selfish manner. Then, too, if we will study the propaganda emanating from the Midwest advocates of the St. Lawrence seaway, we find that cities like Duluth, Minn.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Detroit, Mich.; and many other Great Lakes cities are bent upon developing new channels of direct trade with European countries.

In other words, you have certain Midwest steel companies, cities, and Great Lakes ports who favor the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway because of benefits they expect to enjoy at the expense of other segments of our economy.

Are we who oppose the St. Lawrence seaway selfishly inclined when we stand up here and protect the industries and the thousands of jobs to be destroyed by the proposed international waterway?

Are we representing the so-called vested special interests when we try to protect the pocketbook of the already overburdened American taxpayer?

Are we representing the so-called vested special interests when we oppose the construction of a project that would become a sitting duck for guided missiles in time of war?

Are we representing so-called vested special interests in trying to conserve the use of critical materials needed for defense purposes as well as for civilian needs, including the construction of badly needed schools and hospitals?

Are we representing so-called vested special interests in trying to stop the construction of a project that the Canadian Government is willing to build without our aid?

No, Mr. Chairman, we who oppose the St. Lawrence seaway are not spokesmen for so-called vested special interests, but in reality are striving to preserve the national economy by pointing out the disastrous effects that will follow the building of the proposed international skating rink.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, as long as I am a Member of Congress, I shall raise my voice against all spendthrift policies, because their ultimate effects will be the destruction of the economy of this great Republic.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct my remarks specifically to the operation of the Export-Import Bank as set forth in the hearings in the vicinity of pages 540 to 565. It might be well for us to bear in mind that when the United Nations organization was created, the position was taken that there must be brought forth what is now known as the Bretton Woods Agreement and the establishment of the International Stabilization Fund and the creation of the International Credit Bank. Those

two mechanisms, the fund and the bank, were created to facilitate the movement of goods across international boundary lines. About 1934, the Export-Import Bank was created to facilitate the movement of goods out of the United States to other countries. In reading the hearings as set forth here, it seems that the Export-Import Bank is rapidly taking over the work which was originally conceived to be done by the International Credit Bank. I can understand that some might dispute that general observation on the ground that the two banks have separate purposes. The point that I wish to make is that in my opinion the Export-Import Bank is muscling in in such a manner as to make unnecessary or to make inefficacious the International Credit Bank. On that proposition I disagree because I do not believe that the Export-Import Bank should be doing such a job. Mr. Gaston, who spoke for the bank, uses banker's language, and I understand it. I do not think the testimony is any too pleasing to one who thoroughly understands banking as it is carried on today. I wish I could interrogate Mr. Gaston myself. I had hoped to interrogate the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] on some of his testimony, but we will not have time for that. How far is the Export-Import Bank to go? When its present lending authority is used up, do we propose to give it another billion dollars or another one and a half billion or another $5,000,000,000 or another $20,000,000,000? Why are these loans not guaranteed by those governments? Why do we set up a banking system where the loans are not guaranteed by the interested government? What will we finally lose on the loans to the Chinese Nationalist Government, which are discussed in these hearings? Why do we go into Indonesia with loans through the Export-Import Bank? Indonesia has so many dollars in her possession that they are almost running out of the economic ears of Indonesia. Indonesia wants to spend those dollars in this country, and yet our State Department insists the Indonesia take more dollars from the Export-Import Bank and that Indonesia accept grants-in-aid from the United States to such an extent that the Indonesian Government had to resign a few days ago. Indonesia is rich in oil, rubber, and tin. We are the great users of those products. Indonesia can obtain from us all the trade dollars that she needs. Why do we insist that the Export-Import Bank go into Indonesia and makes these loans? Those are questions I would like Mr. Gaston or the members of this Appropriations Subcommittee to answer. Why not let Indonesia spend her trade dollars in this country, which the Indonesian Government desires to do?

Mr. GARY. I did not understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to yield to any member of the committee who would like to answer some of these questions. I was asking why the Export-Import Bank insists in going into countries like Indonesia, where that country has almost unlimited supplies of oil, tin, and rubber to sell us for dollars, and where we are continually pouring dollars into that country?

Mr. GARY. The only answer I can give the gentleman is that it was organized by the Congress for that purpose. If they did not do it, they would not be carrying out the purpose for which it was organized.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will have to disagree with the chairman. The Export-Import Bank was organized for the purpose of doing things other than what it is doing now, and the testimony shows that very clearly.

WORLD TRADE CONFERENCE

Mr. Chairman, in our study of plans for expanding international trade, I submit for the RECORD some interesting comments on a forthcoming move on the part of our diplomatic colleague, Russia.

RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC PROPAGANDA WILL BE LAUNCHED AT WORLD CONFERENCE AT MOSCOW ON APRIL 3 TO 7—PHILIPPINE ECONOMIST SHOWS ITS WEAKNESS AND ILLOGIC—SAYS IT SHOULD BE MET AND NEUTRALIZED

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article on the new Russian economic propaganda by Mr. Vicente Villamin, Philippine economist and writer, which appeared in the Washington Post.

Mr. Chairman, on April 3 to 7 this year the Russian Government will hold an economic conference to which prominent non-Communists from all over the world have been invited. It is expected that that Government will present a program of international trade calculated to attract unwary countries to establish trade relations with Russia. Mr. Villamin shows that this program is empty, impracticable, and illogical.

But, as Mr. Villamin points out, we must not ignore the Russian trade program, for it is a new approach to make communism acceptable to the free world. We should know it in all its details and refute and destroy it.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Villamin's article deserves to be studied and understood by everyone interested in stiffening our fight against Russian propaganda.

Mr. Villamin's article follows:

RUSSIA'S TRADE

(By Vicente Villamin)

(Russia's economic approach to sell communism to the free world—a thought-provoking article by Mr. Vicente Villamin, economist.)

Russia has a new approach to make communism acceptable to the world. It is the economic approach. She has called an economic conference at Moscow from April 3–10. It is not between governments, but between the Russian Government and private non-Communist individuals whom it is inviting from all parts of the world because of their influence on public opinion in their countries. About 100 Americans have been invited, but only a few of them are expected to accept. To date the Russians believe there will be at least 500 in attendance at the conference.

What story will Russia tell them? There is a preview of it at the economic conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations at Singapore last October and at Rangoon more recently. Simplified, the story is likely to be this: (1) That Russia of all nations believes in free trading among nations, (2) that she can buy the raw materials of other countries at the highest possible prices, and (3) that she can sell manufactured goods to those countries at prices lower than what they pay for them to countries like the United States and Great Britain. That is an appealing invitation to economic relations, which will be the beginning of other relations.

After announcing that remarkable formula of buying high and selling low, the Russians will explain how they could undersell other countries. They will extoll the merits of industries being controlled and operated by the government. They will say that no private capitalists will make profits, that there are no high-salaried executives, no expensive overhead, no taxes to pay, and no labor strikes.

They will condemn the tariff system and monopoly. They will claim that their industrial apparatus and their laborers are more efficient. They will emphasize that in Russia atomic energy is being used for peace and not for war purposes. With a grand flourish, they will announce that under the new leadership of Russia mankind will have a new era of peace and plenty.

The conference should be an excellent place to learn what Russia's economic plans for the world are. The Russian thesis should be known, answered, and destroyed. If that is not done, it would make an appeal to the world for Russia and communism more powerful than mere ideological propaganda could.

Let us advance a possible answer to Russia on her economic approach to world dominion and domination. Can she buy raw materials abroad in substantial quantities and pay for them? Unless the United States lends the money, she cannot. Has she the means essential to world trading like ocean bottoms, insurance facilities, and foreign banking? She has not. Is Russian industry and labor more efficient than the American or the British? They are not.

Does Russia have now or in any foreseeable future any surplus for export? She does not. She cannot even meet her minimum domestic needs. Her official statistics of production unwittingly reveal this fact. Some might be misled to believe the contrary to be true because she is selling to India and Pakistan, for example, textiles from a satellite country at prices even below those of the low-cost Japanese textiles. But that is a come-on business for promotional purposes. The seller loses as expected, but after the buyer is tied up with contracts, then the prices will rise to cost-plus-profit level, and there may become higher than competitive prices if there were such prices. Incidentally, such bilateral arrangement would be more restrictive and exclusive of other traders than the tariff system.

Not having the essential foreign trading facilities, Russia will talk of barter, the exchange of one commodity for another. Barter between a manufacturing and a raw-material country proves always disadvantageous to the latter, especially if it is a poor and weak country. It always comes out on the short end of the transaction, being obliged to sell to one buyer and buy from one seller. Barter is a backward step in the progress of trade between nations.

As an example of her economic approach to attract countries into her orbit, the recent Russian offer of service to Japan is illuminating. Following the new year greetings of Premier Stalin himself to the Japanese people, Russia assured Japan that she would help her resume and expand her trade with Communist China's 450,000,000 people. If Russia were generous enough in that way, then the Japanese would think that she could not be a too selfish and dangerous nation after all.

But is Russia that generous? Has she given proofs elsewhere of it? The answer is an emphatic no. In all schemes that she had concocted and let the outside world know, Russia has always stood to gain the

most while running the least risk and doing the minimum work. That is true also in the military field, as witness the case where Communist Koreans and Chinese fight and die for her in the Korean battlefields.

Russia could not be sincere in her offer of help to Japan; and the help could not be lasting if it were sincere. Why? Because it is against both the vital economic and political interests of Russia.

Japan and Russia are two industrial countries that want to sell goods and services to the Chinese customers. They are competitors. They both want China's raw materials and manpower. For one seller to give up his sales prospects of nearly half a billion people is either an act of sheer folly or an investment for greater gain.

The Russians are not fools. They are clever investors and operators. In the first place, they would like Japan to shun a close association with the United States so, finally, she could join a Russo-Sino-Japanese oriental bloc. And they hope, in the second place, after they have Japan in their orbit, to use the Japanese industrial potential in one great Russian-dominated economic unit that would reduce the cooperating countries to economic vassals and eventually make Russia the greatest industrial nation. That is not a visionary possibility but a practical probability based on the logic of the situation.

This Russian-Japanese case deserves stressing. How, indeed, could Russia be sincere in encouraging close Japanese-Chinese economic relations? She should know, and she doe know very clearly, that such relations logically lead to close political relations, which might become stronger than the existing Russian-Chinese relations.

Russia's illogical position has one immediate major objective, and that is to induce Japan to break away from the United States, knowing that after that has happened Japan would be weaker economically and strategically and that then Russia could bring Japan into her orbit as a satellite. Russia must believe that if she has been able to capture China with her 450,000,000 people she could repeat the performance with weakened Japan with only 83,000,000.

The coming economic conference in Moscow is important to the free world. It should not be ignored and dismissed glibly a. nothing but Russian propaganda. The best thinkers should attend. Russia should be met there with facts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when Mr. Gaston, the head of the Export-Import Bank was before our committee, I asked him this question:

How long has the Export-Import Bank been reporting a profit on its operations?

And Mr. Gaston replied:

I have not examined the old records as carefully as I might have, Mr. CANFIELD, but I think it has always reported a profit on its operations.

With reference to the World Bank, I called Mr. Gaston's attention to a story carried by the United Press, Washington, D. C., January 27, 1952, stating:

The World Bank announced today it made a profit of $8,000,000 in the last 6 months of 1951, compared with $7,500,000 in the last half of 1950. Since it was founded at Bretton Woods, N. H., in 1945, the 51-member international loan maker has earned more than $50,000,000 on its lending for world-wide postwar reconstruction and development projects.

I asked him this question:

Is there any conflict or overlapping between the activities of the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. GASTON. There is overlapping in this sense: We have the power to make loans of the same kind that they are making. They do not have quite as broad powers as we have. They are limited to loans to member countries, and they are limited to loans which are guaranteed by governments. We have the liberty to make loans—and many of our loans are of this type—for the development of backward countries, primitive countries which are not member countries. We are also making loans and have the power to make loans to private enterprises.

We prefer to make them to private enterprises if we get proper security. We prefer not to have the government guarantee the loan if the loan will be sound without such a guaranty.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Is it not true that most of the loans made by the Export-Import Bank in these foreign countries are for the purpose of enabling this Government to get strategic materials for our defense purposes?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the distinguished chairman of this committee contend that we have got to make loans to Indonesia in order to get rubber, tin, and oil? Of course we do not. Will you answer that "Yes" or "No"? You have so much oil in Indonesia that you can literally take the toe of your shoe or boot and scrape up the sand, and oil comes to the surface as water does near the beach. That is a fact.

Mr. GARY. My answer is that I am not operating the strategic-materials program of this country. It is under the control of the Munitions Board, and they regulate those activities.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is a different story.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I say to the gentleman regarding Indonesian loans that Mr. Gaston said:

We have financed the purchase of American automobiles and trucks, which we have mostly limited to the cheaper class of automobiles, jeeps, and Fords and Chevrolets, primarily pick-ups and trucks. We have financed the purchase of some airplanes, some Convairs for an interisland service by a jointly owned company, partly Dutch and partly Indonesian. We financed some improvements in the railroads. We financed a forestry project. We are financing some harbor-improvement work.

There is quite a wide variety and we have not completely allocated the funds as yet.

That is his story on Indonesia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, we have a bill before us carrying something like $15,000,000,000. I see a good many Members on the floor. The membership is intensely interested in this bill. The first thing we find is that we cannot make many reductions. It is the result of bad planning, reckless spending, that is catching up with the administration No. 1 and with the Congress No. 2. It appears that big Government and big spending is closing in on us now. We have a $259,000,000,000 public debt which requires a $6,500,000,000 interest charge to carry that debt; and we have this we cannot touch, and we have other huge fixed Government expenses we cannot reduce, and the people are concerned throughout the United States about the crushing tax load, and about the failure of this Congress to be able to balance the budget. I think that those of us who have generally fought for economy on the floor of this House for the past 10 years I have been here are not so much to blame for the situation that now faces the people who are the Government, the taxpayers, and their representatives, as those who have advocated reckless spending and putting off the day of paying from one session of Congress to the other. We must reduce appropriations at every opportunity if we are ever to reduce taxes and reduce the national debt.

Mr. Chairman, an article in Pathfinder, under date of February 20, 1952, quotes as follows:

Chief Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson foresees greatly inflated prices if the steel industry is compelled to grant current demands of 18½ cents an hour together with fringe benefits.

"Steel wages," Wilson explains, "sets the basic wage pattern in the United States. As steel wages go, so will go wages in most industries. As wages go up, prices follow and sometimes soar in advance to offset prospective wage increases."

"This chase-your-tail sequence," says Wilson, "is largely responsible for today's critical inflation spiral."

He is quoted in the article as saying "the economy can stand an annual 2-percent increase across the board based on higher production efficiency." Beyond that, he said, if greater rises are provided, lies "economic trouble."

Edwin G. Nourse, outstanding economist who resigned as head of the President's Council of Economic Advisers some months ago over an issue involving unsound Government financial practices, is quoted in the February 20 issue of Pathfinder at length with reference to inflation and the flight of the dollar. After a lengthy statement analyzing the causes and the dangers of inflation, particularly caused by the demand for an 18½-cent-an-hour increase for steel and other unions, he said "If inflation moves along in the way Chief Mobilizer Wilson foresees, he fears a breakdown of our economy with tragic results by 1960." Chief Mobilizer Wilson, in the same issue of Pathfinder, thought present inflation pressures, if successful, might reduce the 1940 dollar to 25 cents in purchasing power by 1960 if present trends continue.

Economist Nourse says:

The lack of response from the people has had tragic consequences. The President, as in his last budget message, continues to give strong leadership in the wrong direction, and Congress races on ahead of him with bigger

spending and bigger deficits at a time of business prosperity.

Continuing, he said:

Right now Congress should be taking apart and cutting back the President's reckless $85,400,000,000 budget. But, instead, the first action the House took was to pass a 10-percent salary increase for the military, a step-up in Government costs of hundreds of millions. And in this case the Congress went beyond the President because he advised against the increase.

This same attitude will pervade the present Congress unless the people let its Members know they want this rising spiral stopped and hold accountable those who do not vote to stop it.

It's time for a flood of urgent letters, telegrams, and telephone calls to your Congressman, and for rallies and mass meetings of protest throughout the land.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote a timely warning from the great founder of the Democratic Party, Thomas Jefferson, on economy in Government and the danger of public debt.

Jefferson said this:

I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and in our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects forbids it in the disposition of public money. We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of rigid economy, to avoid burdening the people, and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt the principles of our Government.

Mr. Chairman, may I close by saying that it is the responsibility under the two-party system of the majority party in power to try to stop these expenditures in committee where they have a majority and on the floor of the House where they have a majority, and it is equally incumbent upon the minority to do all within its power to bring about greater economy in Government, because we are reaching a point where disaster is closer than we may well anticipate.

We should cut every dollar possible out of this, the first appropriation bill, and out of every bill that comes before us in this session.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to make a few remarks on certain portions of this bill, but going into my third week of the flu I think I shall conclude by complimenting our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] and our distinguished ranking minority member the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD], as well as the other members of the subcommittee for a very thorough job in interrogating the witnesses and in trying to do a conscientious job in bringing before this Committee a bill trimmed about as nearly to the bone as one can be trimmed.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in the Office of the Secretary, including the operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Annex thereof; and the purchase of uniforms for elevator operators: $2,625,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 8, strike out "$2,625,000" and insert "$2,585,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] has just finished telling us what a serious situation we are in from a financial standpoint. Frankly, the amendment that I am offering at this time does not run into large dollars, but the principle of the thing runs into a lot more than large dollars.

For instance, the base of the estimate for this item, that is, taking last year's appropriation and add to it the amount required to keep on the payroll those who are already there, is $2,585,000, and yet the committee here proposes to give them $40,000 more. Now this is the meat of the question.

The committee itself said with reference to this particular outfit and with reference to the appropriation that we are here considering, on page 4 of the report, second paragraph:

The committee feels that the Department is not pressing its activities adequately in the field of coordination. This is particularly true with regard to coordinating the enforcement agencies of the Department, where cooperation should be a prime concern in the prevention of, detection of, and conviction for, offenses against those laws which it is the duty of the Department to enforce.

Could there be a more scathing indictment of that Department and its management? Yet, they propose to give them more employees. The very least that the committee could do would be to support this amendment without controversy, because there can be no possible excuse when the committee itself has to indict the Department and its management in the language that I have just read. There can be no possible excuse for giving them more employees. Let those that are there do a better job. Let us start off this bill with a cut that will serve notice on all of them down the line that we do not propose to hand out money where it is not necessary and where they have not justified it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment will be adopted. It should be adopted unanimously so that next year the Treasury Department may feel a responsibility to coordinate its activities and to do those things which it ought to do in managing the enforcement agencies of that Government for the protection of the Government against offenses against the laws of the United States. I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with my friend from New York that the language quoted by him is such an indictment of this Department. In my humble judgment, there is not a department in the entire Government that is better administered than the Treasury Department. We have had considerable difficulty in getting the Post Office Department to adopt modern methods. Secretary Snyder and the Department of the Treasury to the contrary have led the Federal agencies in this particular. Because of the improvements that have been installed in the Bureau of Internal Revenue alone they have saved 1,000,000 man-hours a year.

They have not only had supervision by Mr. Snyder's office but they have brought in outside management organizations to survey the Bureau of Customs, the Coast Guard, and other agencies of this Department. No department is perfect, and our committee did say that in some of the enforcement activities there is a lack of coordination.

Objection has been made that Secretary Snyder has not watched closely enough his own Department, yet every time he has come before the Congress in the last few years to ask sufficient personnel to do a good supervising job you have cut his appropriation. Our committee cut his request $83,000,000. If you cut off all of his additional appropriations, you cannot ask the supervisory job this Congress is now demanding. If we fail to provide adequate funds for supervision and something goes wrong in the Department, the blame is on the Congress and not on the Secretary. We did cut this item substantially last year and the year before.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that last year we cut out 62 positions and this year request is being made for 24 of those positions? The justification is that the workload is such in the Secretary's office now that nearly all the employees are working overtime, and for overtime they pay time and a half.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. Where is the economy, then?

Mr. GARY. There is no economy. Further, I think one of the most important jobs to be done in government is the supervisory job to see that the departments are functioning properly. You cannot expect a good supervisory job if you do not appropriate adequate funds. To decrease this appropriation any further, in my judgment, will seriously handicap the Secretary in supervising the work of the entire Treasury Department.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman point out exactly how deleting $40,000 here would seriously inconvenience the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. GARY. The gentleman from New Jersey has just pointed out the fact that their workload has increased, they do not now have sufficient employees to take care of the job, they are working overtime, and they are paying time and a half for overtime. We have tried to take that into consideration and allow them an adequate number of people to do the job. If you do not allow them that number, the job will not be done.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Do you not consider perhaps that you are starting a bad precedent here by permitting an increase in any appropriation in this particular fiscal year, unless that increase is absolutely necessary.

Mr. GARY. Yes, sir, I certainly do. Our committee considered it absolutely necessary because of the increased workload that has been put on the Secretary's office.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 98, noes 26.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DIVISION OF DISBURSEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Division of Disbursement, $12,450,000.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 2, line 17, strike "$12,450,000" and insert "$12,200,000."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment very similar to the one previously proposed. It affects the Bureau of Accounts, and it is simply designed to see that there is no increased employment in that particular Bureau. The Division of Disbursement was allowed $12,450,000, and that was a reduction from the request of $286,000. In 1952 the Division was allowed $11,500,000. However, after the adjustment for increased salaries voted in the last Congress it would require $12,181,000 to maintain the same activity in 1953 as was required in 1952. In 1951 the activity had an average employment of 3,135 at an average salary of $3,009. In 1952 the activity provided an average employment of 3,075 employees at an average salary of $3,377. In 1953 the request would provide 3,160 employees at an average salary of $3,390. These figures are taken from the appendix in the annual budget.

The suggestion I have in this amendment is to simply cut the 3,160 employees back to 3,075, which is their present employment. The actual saving would be $289,000, and I am only suggesting by this amendment that it be the round figure of $250,000. In other words, I am proceeding on the theory that if we are trying to cut down expenses, one thing we certainly want to do is to not put more people on the payroll. If anything, we should put on less. My amendment simply assures that there will not be more put on the payroll.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce further the appropriation for the Division of Disbursements. I pointed out in my opening statement that governmental expenditures will increase from $44,000,000,000 in 1951 to $85,000,000,000 in 1953. The number of checks processed will increase from 268,000,000 in 1951 to 328,000,000 in 1953. If the Congress wants a tie-up in the checks for the soldiers in the field, the members of the Air Force, the naval personnel, then vote for this amendment. The Bureau of Disbursements processes these checks.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did not know that this particular Bureau sent out checks to the Armed Forces. What does the Army Finance Center do?

Mr. GARY. The Bureau of Disbursements processes all Government checks.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. They do not issue these checks? Now, let us get this straight. Just what does this department have to do with checks?

Mr. GARY. They process all checks drawn on the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I have actually seen them processed and issued in the Finance Center in St. Louis, Mo. These are done not by this particular department.

Mr. GARY. They go through the Bureau of Disbursements.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. In other words, they are processed back but not issued. Let us get straight what they do. What they do is probably turn them back. They are not written. They are printed.

Mr. GARY. Surely, they are printed, but they are processed by the Bureau of Disbursements.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it true that this Division of Disbursements has absolutely no control over its workload, and if we do not provide proper funds today the Division will do just what it is doing this year, it will come back for a deficiency item and we will give them the money?

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CANFIELD. That must be done.

Mr. GARY. That must be done. The Bureau of Disbursements disburses the public revenue. The appropriations have increased from $44,000,000,000 to $85,000,000,000. The workload has been increased, and if you do not give them the proper personnel to handle this increased workload, then the work will not be performed. That is the situation.

Our committee has not given them all they ask for. As a matter of fact, we cut them $286,000. We felt that that was all we could cut off. The committee was unanimous in that opinion.

Frankly, in my judgment it would retard the work of the Bureau very considerably if this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For necessary expenses connected with any public-debt or currency issues of the United States, $52,500,000 to be expended as the Secretary of the Treasury may direct, and the Secretary is authorized to accept services without compensation: *Provided*, That Federal Reserve banks and branches may be reimbursed for expenditures as fiscal agents of the United States on account of public-debt transactions for the account of the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That the indefinite appropriation provided by section 10 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 760), shall not be available for obligation during the current fiscal year.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 2, line 21, strike out "$52,500,000" and insert "$51,000,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment actually leaves this department with $500,000 more than they got last year; it actually leaves them wtih approximately the same number of employees they have at the present time; in effect, it is a 2 percent reduction below that recomended by the committee.

For your information, the budget estimate on this particular department this year is $55,300,000. It is estimated that this department can absorb its increases in pay with a figure approximately what I have recommended, which is $51,000,000. The committee has recommended $52,500,000, and this amendment is a reduction of $1,500,000: Approximately 2 percent.

This particular department has charge principally of the handling of the Federal debt. Most of you will recall that last year we passed legislation in this Congress which provided for the extension of savings bonds at the time of maturity. The individuals who hold those bonds will get an increase, in effect, in interest. I think that was desirable legislation. It became effective March 26, 1951. The theory was that it would be an incentive to the citizen who held those bonds to keep them and obviate the necessity for redemption, which is costly to the Federal Government. The committee that reports this bill actually says in its report that because of that law this department will have considerably less work to do. I refer you to page 5 of the committee report which states in effect that the work of this department will be measurably less because of the legislation to which I have referred; consequently, I am convinced there is no doubt that we can well cut this part of the budget $1,500,000.

There is one final point: This morning as I was driving to the office I heard an announcement over one of the radio news programs that instead of having a $8,000,000,000 deficit at the end of this fiscal year we will have a $6,000,000,000 deficit; in other words, a 25 percent reduction in the anticipated deficit for the fiscal year 1952. I think all of us are glad to hear that news, but I want to say that the funds for the Bureau of Public Debt for fiscal year 1953 was set up on the basis of a $8,000,000,000 deficit. If the deficit is to be only $6,000,000,000 there will be that much less demand on that part of the Treasury Department for a certain workload. I strongly suggest that if we are going to have a reduction in the anticipated deficit for fiscal year 1952, this department which has charge of handling those fiscal affairs can well take a $1,500,000 reduction in the fiscal year 1953. For that reason and for the others I have given I hope the amendment will be approved.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], the able chairman of this subcommittee, and to his colleagues on the subcommittee, and also to compliment them for the effort which they have put forth in connection with this appropriation bill, and for the reductions which they have made from the original budget itself.

I believe, however, that the situation which we face calls for even greater cuts than those which are contained in this bill.

I do not see how it will be possible for us to add any more to the heavy tax burden which our people are now bearing. Our national debt is now $260,000,000,000, and it is of the utmost importance that we hold this national debt to its present figure, and that we do not increase it.

Yet I see from this, the first appropriation bill to come before us this year, instead of cutting down on spending, increases are asked over last year's appropriation.

I greatly fear that this will be the pattern to be followed by all the other appropriation bills which will come along later. This seems to be the pattern which is followed throughout all branches of the Government. There seems never to be any reduction curtailment, but always an expansion and increased demands for more money.

If appropriations are made this year for anything like the amounts called for in the budget requests, we will have a deficit of fourteen or fifteen billion dollars to add to our national debt of $260,000,000,000.

I do not believe there is any need whatever for the creation of such a deficit. My own belief is that every department in this Government could have its appropriation cut at least 10 percent, and still have enough money to pay good salaries to all the personnel needed to do the work of the department.

It is true that a change of attitude would be required. A good many employees who are now coasting along would have to go to work. But, if there ever was a time in the history of this country when every employee of the Government should be exerting himself to the utmost, that time is now.

It is my belief that these departments will not voluntarily economize. The best way to force economy is to cut off the money, and when that is done they will have to economize, and they will find a way to do it.

Under our Constitution and laws, this Congress is given the power to hold the purse strings. It is our duty to enforce economy wherever economy is possible. I approach this appropriation bill today in that spirit. I have offered an amendment here to cut $500,000 from the amount carried in this bill to pay for administering the public debt.

In the bill before us this item is $2,000,000 more than it was in the appropriation bill last year. Then it was $50,500,000.

Last year we passed Public Law 12 which authorized the extension for 10 more years of the maturity date of E bonds. Mr. Kilby, of this Department, testified before the committee, and his testimony is on page 356 of the hearings, as follows:

> From the limited experience of the first few months, which covers only a small volume of maturities, it is my thought that about 60 percent of these matured bonds will be retained by their owners, thereby making it unnecessary at this time for us to perform the various work tasks incident to their retirement.

Notwithstanding that, however, they are asking for 412.9 new positions for the coming year, which they say they estimate they will need because of their estimated increase of sales and redemptions of savings bonds.

I read with much interest the testimony of Mr. Kilby on page 370 of the hearings when Mr. CANFIELD, of the committee, asked him this question:

> Mr. CANFIELD. Were you prejudiced this last year when you were required to drop 340 employees because of the appropriations?
>
> Mr. KILBY. Fortunately, the volume of issues and redemptions did not come up to expectations, and for that reason we were not embarrassed by losing the 340 positions.

They overestimated their need last year so much that they were not embarrassed when Congress cut their appropriation and forced them to lose 340 positions. Yet they come back this year with another estimate which says they will need 412 new positions.

I think we can safely go on the assumption, especially in view of the enactment of Public Law 12, which materially cut down the workload, that they have again overestimated their needs like they did last year.

Mr. Chairman, I prepared an amendment to cut this item, which I rose to offer. The gentleman from Michigan, being a member of the Appropriations Committee, was recognized to offer his amendment. I am therefore supporting his amendment, and hope that it will be adopted.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this item has already been reduced by our committee $2,800,000. You are dealing here with the Bureau of Public Debt, a bureau that vitally affects the credit of this Nation. Their appropriation for 1952 was $50,500,000. Their estimates for 1953 were $55,300,000.

The committee recommended only $52,500,000. The statutory increase alone for the salaries of this agency is $1,231,000. So that the committee only increased it $769,000 over 1952. This amendment would reduce it $1,500,000, which would give the bureau less to operate with in 1953 than it had in 1952 notwithstanding a very large increase in workload.

This agency made a very effective presentation to the committee in support of its request. They are planning, as I stated earlier, a step-up in the drive to disperse the public debt among small owners. That entire program will have to be largely curtailed if this amendment is adopted.

I hope it will not be the pleasure of this committee to adopt the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 131, noes 51.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Treasurer, $21,000,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 3, line 10, strike out "$21,000,000" and insert "$20,500,000."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the amount requested in this item was $21,500,000. The committee has reduced it $500,000 to $21,000,000. The remains, however, as an increase over last year of $400,000.

The amendment which I have suggested reduces the $21,000,000 figure to $20,500,000, which is only $100,000 less than last year.

Now, this particular office of the Treasurer has been spiraling upward for the last 3 years. In 1951 there was provided an average employment of 1,343 people; in 1952, 1,262; and now, in this request, they ask for 1,529 employees, or an increase of 260, roughly, over last year.

It strikes me that in these times, instead of authorizing increase of personnel, we should be forcing a decrease, particularly in a clearly nondefense department or agency. The average salary which is estimated in here for those 1,529 employees, which they seek to have, is $3,554. If this amendment were adopted to cut this item $500,000, it would only require a reduction of 140, or would still leave 1,389 employees, which is 40-odd above 2 years ago, and it is 127 more than they had last year. This amendment should go farther than I have suggested. My only reason for suggesting such a conservative reduction is the practical one that a more drastic reduction might be defeated.

Now, they talk about an added work load. It was brought out in these hearings; and, in fact, the committee says in its report that the increase requested for the salaries and expenses item was based on workload figures which appear to be inflated to an unreasonable degree. They have reduced it, it is true, $500,000, but it can certainly stand another $500,000.

They point out here that the estimate of check volume for the Air Force is indicated to be—listen to this—330 percent of the actual experience of 1951. In other words, they are figuring on writing three and one-third times as many checks, and the committee feels, as it says, that it is not reasonable to believe that the expansion of the Air Force can be reflected in the issuance of so many checks.

On page 505 of these hearings is a very significant answer to a question. The gentleman representing the Treasurer, in testifying, says:

Recruitment has been frozen since July, 1951, to keep within funds available, exclusive of pay increases, and must necessarily continue to be frozen until March, at which time we will be compelled to initiate a positive reduction-in-force program unless additional funds are made available.

It is high time in some of these departments that they did institute a positive reduction-in-force program when we are confronted with the extraordinary and necessary expenditures that we face today to save our country.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. When they say that their Air Force check clearance will be increased 300 percent, they have not taken into account the budget cut of the Air Force.

Mr. KEATING. No, that is quite true.

Mr. TABER. In other words, the whole budget is not coordinated.

Mr. KEATING. The fact that they cite an increase of 3⅓ times in the amount of checkwriting for the Air Force is an indication of the inflation which is no doubt rampant throughout this figure as it has been given to us. There is no danger of any interference with the proper functioning of the Office of the Treasurer by adopting this amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman from New York did not read all of Mr. Funk's statement on the backlog. Mr. Funk also said:

On January 18, our carry-over in Federal Reserve half notes, presented for redemption, totaled 42,500,000 notes, while the normal carry-over is 4,500. This figure had increased 9,000,000 notes since the end of December, and will continue to increase proportionately.

Now, we feel that if we do get supplemental funds this year—

And they are asking for them right now—

we will only be able to put sufficient employees on the rolls to handle the current operations. If we get them in April we will handle them currently from there on, but this backlog which we will have accumulated up to April will make a carry-over into 1953, for which our 1953 estimate does not provide.

This, Mr. Chairman, is strictly a service agency. It controls in no way its service load. This office receives, keeps, and disburses moneys of the United States, receives, stores, issues transfers, and retires currency and coin, redeems Government securities, maintains fiscal accounts, and prepares related financial statements and reports.

In presenting her request, Mrs. Clark, the Treasurer of the United States, said in part:

While the volume of services required by this office have constantly shown an upward trend over the past year, we have been compelled, due to lack of funds, to continually reduce our personnel, with the result that already existing backlogs of work are ever mounting. This is an undesirable and unhealthy condition, due to the proven fact that the cost to the taxpayer of operating under these conditions is far in excess of the cost of maintaining operations on a current basis. * * * We cannot control the volume of services required of the Treasurer's office, but our operations must be performed if the Government itself is to fulfill the duties and responsibilities essential to the smooth operation of the Nation's economy.

Especially in these days.

During the years when Government operations assumed some aspect of normalcy following the last war the appropriations made the Treasurer consistently showed a substantial balance at the end of the year, due principally to improvements in operating procedures and increased operating standards.

It is felt that this fact in itself is most conclusive evidence of the position taken by the Treasurer's office with respect to effecting savings for the taxpayer and assuring him of full value of service for each and every dollar expended.

What does it avail the House today to vote these so-called economies and in only a few months to vote the necessary deficiencies? We have a deficiency item for this particular program before us right now, and we have to approve it. Otherwise, the defense establishments are prejudiced.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I do not see why the gentleman says we have to approve anything they send to us in the way of figures. I do not agree with the gentleman that we have to approve any supplemental appropriation that they send up here, but I do think that the gentleman should take into account that even if my amendment is adopted, it will still provide for 127 more employees in this department under the figures that have been given by the Treasurer than were these last year. It seems to me that is sufficiently generous.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman does not seem to realize that this backlog of work does not promote economy, it promotes a loss to the Government in money.

Mr. KEATING. The backlog of work is not necessarily connected with the number of personnel that are there, it is a matter of efficiency.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think both have a bearing on this particular office, which down through the years has rendered a very good account of itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 130, noes 51.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, including expenses, when specifically authorized by the Commissioner, of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with internal-revenue matters; purchase (not to exceed 125 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and of expert witnesses at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; ammunition; $270,000,000: *Provided*, That the amount for personal services in the District of Columbia shall not exceed $19,000,000.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNSON: On page 4, line 12, strike out "$270,000,000" and insert "$265,000,000."

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, the budget estimate submitted for the Bureau of Internal Revenue requested $305,000,000 for the fiscal year 1953. The hard working and distinguished subcommittee allowed them $270,000,000, a substantial cut resulting in a healthy reduction of $35,000,000. It will be noted, however, that while this reduction is substantial, this appropriation would still amount to $17,000,000 more than was provided last year when $253,000,000 was voted for fiscal year 1952.

This Bureau has been creeping upward in total strength for several years. In 1951 there was an average employment of 56,262 in the Bureau of Internal Revenue at an average salary of $3,904. In 1952 the average employment that was provided was for 56,447 employees at an average salary of $4,312. The original 1953 request was for 63,248 employees at an average salary of $4,373.

Notice the increase originally requested for this year. The Bureau asks for some 7,000 additional employees. This was disallowed by the efficient appropriations committee with the exception of some 700 employees.

There has been a definite and deliberate attempt to justify an increased appropriation throughout these hearings of the Committee on Appropriations, and throughout the hearings of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments at the time the Reorganization Act No. 1 of 1952 was considered. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue have indicated that there is a tremendously increased workload over there in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Yet, I am

perfectly willing to accept the Appropriation Committee's statement on page 7 of their report where they indicate that the workload caused by the recent enactment of the excise and occupational tax on wagering was fully explored. Let me quote:

> The matter of the recently enacted excise and occupational tax on wagering was fully explored. The limited experience to date indicates that the workload in applications for tax stamps and in tax returns is exceedingly low in relation to the maximum potential figures which formed the basis of the 1953 estimates. Testimony having disclosed that the racketeering drive had reached its peak, it is the opinion of the committee that persons can soon be spared from that activity to engage in the wagering tax field or other activities.
>
> The committee further feels that, under the circumstance of pending large scale reorganization, it would be unwise to provide other than a bare minimum staff to meet essential program needs. If the reorganization becomes a fact, it is assumed that subsequent budgets will reflect any savings that might accrue as a result.

This being the case, it seems to me it is not good judgment at this time to provide more funds for an agency which is presently and unfortunately in disrepute in the public mind.

The Bureau is allegedly reorganizing, and it is hard to understand why it should cost more money this year than it did last year when that reorganization, in the interests of efficiency and economy, will be effected for part of the period involved. Before any expansion is permitted, the Congress should insist that the Bureau of Internal Revenue have its house in order. As the subcommittee said in its report, "it would be unwise to provide other than a bare minimum staff to meet essential program needs."

Consequently, I want to suggest that the item be reduced an additional $5,000,000, which will provide for just about the 1952 level of activity. No increase—no decrease—just preserve the status quo. This is about a 1½ percent cut. Is there anyone here in the House today who maintains that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is so perfect right now that it cannot increase its efficiency 1½ percent and get along on the same amount of money which we gave the Bureau last year? We cannot economize by raising every appropriation even slightly over last year's level. This is not a crippling amendment. It still allows $12,000,000 more than last year's appropriation toward the salary increases voted by Congress. It may even result in greater efficiency as the Bureau is tightened up as a result.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman please refer to line 12 on page 4, to the word preceding "$270,000,000"?

Mr. BROWNSON. The word happens to be "ammunition," which I think has some interesting connotations. It is a cinch the money that goes to internal revenue above and beyond the "bare minimum staff" recommended by the subcommittee cannot be used to buy ammunition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am privileged by the consent of this House to know something during this past year about the Bureau of Internal Revenue. All I have learned it would be impossible to relate to you here, but not having heard the debate on this matter, and having heard only an utterance or two from the gentleman who preceded me on the subject, I have some very definite opinions.

Mr. Chairman, this Congress quite recently enacted law dealing directly and bringing burdens and duties, in addition to those already burdening the Bureau of Internal Revenue, upon that Bureau. The Congress, with full knowledge of what it was doing, enacted law concerning racketeers. With full knowledge also it enacted statute in connection with wagering. That law stands for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, whether or not it met with the sympathy or had the full support of a majority of the Congress of the United States.

To enact law that will take 4,000 men to enforce, and then reduce the wherewithal, not only to replace those men but to replace men the Bureau has long needed, is a very stupid thing indeed.

I believe the Bureau of Internal Revenue to be the very heart of the operating force of this or any other government, and to add duties, major in nature, to the already inadequate personnel, and at the same time reduce, deplete, or take away from them facilities for doing the job it had difficulty doing even before these additional duties were imposed, is something I am afraid the people of this country will have difficulty in understanding.

No one has disputed, to my knowledge, the short and inadequate facilities that the Bureau has had at its command during the past 5 years.

It has been only a short year since the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], a distinguished Member of this House, had to come to this floor hurriedly and advise in most serious fashion against a contemplated cut at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I could go into figures that I have in my mind that I believe would have a bearing. It has been said that a cut of $1 will lose the country $20 of revenue. I will not go quite that far, but it is a matter of record, and no one to date during my years on the Committee on Ways and Means has disputed it, that every dollar the Congress has appropriated for enforcement has brought $10 of revenue into the Treasury. We will not say that we are in business, for that statement might be misunderstood.

For the last 9 years the Bureau of Internal Revenue has had a more difficult job in obtaining competent personnel than I believe any other agency of this great Government. Disclosures have been brought forth in the past year that lead us to believe that even the general run of what was obtained during the lean years of 1942 and 1943 have not done the job they should do. But I can say in all sincerity and with not the slightest taint of partisanship that I do not know how you can explain to the people of the country a reduction in this Bureau under present circumstances.

Let me repeat just what has happened and what the situation is as I see it. We will go back just a short time to make it more simple for me to make the story clear. One year ago it was acknowledged generally by the Congress of the United States, and particularly this House, that the Bureau of Internal Revenue needed help, needed personnel, and needed a few other things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Since that period 1 year ago two very major duties have been put upon the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, namely: As I have previously stated the wagering law and another which I will mention in a moment. The wagering law emanated in the Committee on Ways and Means. Many people felt that it was not the proper thing to do; many Members felt it probably was unenforceable, but the fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is bound under the law to enforce it whether it is enforceable or not. At the same time an additional burden was placed upon the Bureau, a burden probably equal to all the burdens it has carried the last 5 years, that of running down and finding a pattern under which racketeers and people operating beyond the law can be handled. That is an enormous job; it has taxed the best brains in and out of Government that are available to the Congress today. Whether or not there was sympathy with the possibility of proper enforcement of that law makes no difference here; the Congress has enacted the law; the Bureau is duty bound to enforce the law.

Rather than reduce the budget of the Bureau by this $5,000,000 proposal—and I might say that rather than strike out the $35,000,000 that the committee took from the budget of this Bureau—and I am one who rarely criticizes the work of a committee, for it is not a pleasing matter to sit week in and week out, month in and month out, studying a situation, then having a Member take this floor who did not sit week in and week out studying the situation, tell you that you did not do a good job; I am not saying that at all, I am saying that with the knowledge I have gleaned because of the privilege you, the House, have voted on me as chairman of a committee, obliged to study and investigate this agency, that in my opinion a cut of $35,000,000 was ill-advised. I am speaking now about the five million. I say, give rather than take so far as this particular agency of Government is concerned.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As a matter of fact, the members of that subcommittee were fearful we were reducing too much when we cut them $35,000,000.

Mr. KING of California. I agree with that fear of some members of the committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I take it it is fair to assume that those who bring in this bill are interested in the sound financial condition of this country?

Mr. KING of California. Yes.

Mr. COLMER. Now, to cut this agency, which is an enforcement agency in its collecting of funds, regardless of the brickbats that might have gone its way, would be contributing to the unsoundness rather than the soundness of the fiscal policy of our Government, would it not?

Mr. KING of California. I can reach no other conclusion.

I believe that General Dunlap is perhaps the best man that could be found for this job. It is difficult to face a man given that responsibility at the same time the Congress is preparing to take away from him the very things all of us who are acquainted with his problems realize he must have.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING of California. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I want to say that I agree fully with the gentleman's appraisal of General Dunlap. He is a tough Texan and I believe he can do that job.

Mr. KING of California. I have every confidence in him.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has consistently supported economy, as one who through my work on the King committee has perhaps a greater knowledge of the evils of the Bureau of Internal Revenue than have most of you, I must oppose this amendment for I think it is false economy.

With the tremendous rise in taxes in the past few years rates have risen to such a level that the temptations and rewards for cheating on taxes are so substantial that the work of the Bureau in combatting these evils has greatly increased. Time and time again we of the subcommittee have found important returns which had never been audited. When we asked the Bureau why not, they said, because there were not enough agents to do the job.

I have not the figures before me, but every good agent collects many times the amount of salary which he is paid. We of the King committee are trying to see that in the future there will be nothing but good agents. We know that the great majority of agents are fine public servants. We should have more agents and the committee has been conservative in allowing only 700 additional ones.

I believe this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no one would be more anxious than I to provide sufficient funds for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. But I can remember when we had a similar situation to this in 1947 when a cut was made that great improvement in collections by the Bureau resulted. We have a situation now where before additional people are put on the Bureau of Internal Revenue payroll the agency should be cleaned up and some results accomplished. It is a great mistake for us to provide more funds for the Bureau of Internal Revenue than is absolutely necessary. The base, as appears in the hearings, for this organization, is $262,300,000; in other words, that is what is required to let them go on with the same personnel they have. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] has proposed an increase of $2,800,000 beyond that figure. To my mind, that allows them to put on some people; it allows them to put on enough until the reorganization and rehabilitation of that Bureau has been accomplished.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, may I say that I do not know where the gentleman from New York got his figures. I know the gentleman always intends to be accurate, but the figures that I have as to the base are $266,000,000 rather than $262,000,000. I think the figures used by the gentleman is in error. I would like for him to verify them, because I am certain he does not want to mislead the House.

I simply want to state here—and I am not going to make any further argument on this amendment—that the appropriation for 1952, for this Bureau, was $253,000,000. The estimates for 1953 are $305,000,000. The committee recommended $270,000,000.

The gentleman from Indiana says that the committee recommended an increase of $17,000,000. He is absolutely wrong. This House directed an increase of $15,575,000 last year when it passed the salary increase bill. The salary increases for this agency amount to $15,575,000. The committee has approved an increase of only $1,423,000, and we decreased the budget estimate $35,000,000.

I served as a member of this committee when the present minority party had control of this House, and I remember very distinctly that at that time, at the insistence of Mr. DIRKSEN, who was then a member of the committee, we cut this agency approximately $30,000,000. The effects were such that the following year Mr. DIRKSEN came to me after he had retired from the House and told me that we had made a great mistake and he thought that we ought to restore a part of the cut that had been made. I hope you do not make that mistake again. Here we are dealing with an agency that brings in revenue.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The RECORD will show that the largest revenue ever collected followed that operation.

Mr. GARY. That may be, because the revenue has been steadily going up.

Mr. TABER. It was because they were shaken to life.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman who engineered the cut admitted to me afterward that it was a mistake, and we have been gradually restoring each year since those employees that were cut off as a result of that reduction.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I understand the Bureau of Internal Revenue asked for 7,439 new employees, and that the gentleman's committee provided an increase sufficient to give only 700.

Mr. GARY. That is exactly correct.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I have voted for every amendment so far reducing the amount, but I cannot vote for this amendment. I think it is a question of false economy.

Mr. GARY. A large number of those were requested for the enforcement of the wager tax and for the drive on racketeers. They are the funds that we cut out because we did not feel we should add that many employees while the reorganization of the entire Bureau is being considered. However, we did feel we should allow a sufficient amount to operate the Department effectively. In my judgment, if these figures are cut more it will seriously affect the efficiency of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWNSON) there were—ayes 88, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY: On page 4, line 12, insert "and" before "ammunition."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this is an inconsequential amendment, simply to clarify the provision.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

COAST GUARD

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the operation and maintenance of the Coast Guard, not otherwise provided for, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of not to exceed 32 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; maintenance, operation, and repair of aircraft; recreation and welfare; and examination of estimates of appropriations in the field; $195,600,000: *Provided*, That the number of aircraft on hand at any one time shall not exceed 137 exclusive of planes and parts stored to meet future attrition: *Provided further*, That (a) the unobligated balance of appropriation to the Coast Guard for the fiscal year 1952 for "Operating expenses" shall be transferred on July 1, 1952, to the account established by the Surplus Fund-Certified Claims Act of 1949 for payment of certified claims; (b) amounts equal to the unliquidated obligations on July 1, 1952, against the appropriation "Operating expenses," fiscal year 1952, and the appropriation for "Operating expenses for the fiscal year 1951 which was

merged therewith pursuant to the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1952, shall be transferred to and merged with this appropriation, and such merged appropriation shall be available as one fund, except for accounting purposes of the Coast Guard, for the payment of obligations properly incurred against such prior year appropriations and against this appropriation, but on July 1, 1953, there shall be transferred from such merged appropriation to the appropriation for payment of certified claims (1) any remaining unexpended balance of the 1951 appropriation so transferred, and (2) any remaining unexpended balance of the 1952 appropriation so transferred which is in excess of the obligations then remaining unliquidated against such appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 6, line 17, strike out "$195,000,000" and insert "$194,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, like practically everybody else who offers an amendment to cut an appropriation bill, I want to compliment the committee for what I consider to be a splendid job in the interest of economy. And like everybody else who offers an amendment to cut an appropriation bill and who so compliments the committee, I feel that the bill can be improved even further.

I think it might be well to point out to the House that in 1949 Coast Guard expenditures under this head totaled $116,000,000, in 1950, $127,000,000, in 1951, $134,000,000; in the budget recently presented they are estimated for 1952 at $187,000,000, and for 1953 at $196,000,000.

The appropriation for 1952 was $190,700,000 and the request for next year was $196,250,000, an increase of $5,550,000. The Committee, in recommending $195,600,000 for 1953 has approved all but $650,000 of this increase.

It is appreciated that this increase is accounted for largely by a "military readiness" program which the Congress approved last year, which is gradually coming into full operation this year, and which must be provided for on the basis of a full year's operation at full strength for 1953. No criticism of that program, and no attempt to curtail it is to be implied from the amendment now proposed.

It is believed simply that, from the evidence at hand, the allowance recommended in the bill before us is unduly liberal, unnecessarily large.

To revert for a moment to the 1953 estimates and to the justification presented at the hearings, where—hearings, page 209—expenditures for 1952 are estimated at $187,350,000. Even if this estimate were firm, the increase in expenditures, under the Committee allowance, 1953 over 1952 would approximate $8,000,000.

Next, attention is directed to House Document No. 358, the 1952 Pay Act Supplemental, in which the Treasury Department itself proposes to scatter $5,000,000 of the 1952 appropriation "Coast Guard-Operating Expenses" among practically all units of the Department, except the Coast Guard, to cover this year's cost of the civil service pay raise enacted at the last session. This can be taken only as an admission that our 1952 appropriation under this head was at least $5,000,000 too high. It establishes as fact that Coast Guard expenditures this year under this title will approximate not $187,000,000 but probably $182,000,000. And it follows from this that the Committee allowance would really provide an increase for 1953 over 1952 of $13,000,000 or more.

It is submitted that a further reduction of $1,600,000 in this item as proposed in this amendment could not possibly interfere with or hamper the Coast Guard operation at the level which the Congress has approved.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. GARY. The gentleman made the statement that he realizes the increases in this bill were largely due to the increase authorized last year. I say to the gentleman they are entirely due to the program authorized last year, and that the Coast Guard is not asking any increases whatever beyond those already authorized. But by putting these additional employees on a full-year basis, it does require additional funds over last year's appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is absolutely correct. This does give the Coast Guard additional funds. It gives them $4,900,000 additional over what they had last year. My amendment would still allow them an additional $3,300,000.

I believe, in the interest of economy, that this could be absorbed by the Coast Guard without materially affecting or injuring their necessary services.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment concerns me more than any amendment proposed on this floor today. I know that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] does not mean to tinker with national defense, but he is doing it in this amendment. This is a dangerous approach.

Under the present make-up of operating expenses, any additional material cut above that already made by the committee would have to be applied against personnel costs. The figures included in operating expenses for repairs and depreciation are already reduced to a point where any further reductions would affect the operating efficiency of the Coast Guard. A cut against the personnel costs means a reduction in the average number of military personnel to be employed for fiscal 1953. The statement just made by the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], is correct. The Coast Guard is now before our committee with a deficiency item to maintain their present complement authorized by the Congress.

A cut of $1,600,000 would mean the average strength for the next fiscal year would have to be reduced by approximately 540 officers and men, assuming the reduction could be made either before the fiscal year or certainly not later than the first month of the year. Any delay in accomplishing the reduction in personnel increases the number that have to be reduced in order to operate within the funds available. Thus, reduction delayed to the 1st of January or for the first 6 months of the fiscal year would mean that the total reduction would have to be approximately 1,100 officers and men at the end of the fiscal year.

While 540 officers and men is not, on the face of it, a large number, it would constitute a considerable set-back if applied generally across the board to the military readiness program now being implemented. It represents an approximate 10 percent decrease in this program. In other words, the Congress having decided that the combat units of the Coast Guard should, for the purpose of national security and preparedness, be manned to 75 percent of wartime complement, accordingly would now be recommending action which would reduce this percentage of wartime complement. Congress would thus be changing the measure of preparedness that they wish the Coast Guard to attain, even before the program already approved is completely implemented. There appears nothing in the present international situation which would justify the belief that less preparedness is necessary today than was contemplated last year when the program was adopted.

The loss of personnel might be accommodated in one other manner than an across-the-board cut, and that would be to lay up operating units. The effect would be the same in that it would be a curtailment of the military readiness program. A loss of 540 officers and men would necessitate the laying up of 3 major floating units and more smaller units. Either action would curtail in considerable degree some operating program of the Coast Guard. Thus, the loss of two major units could necessitate the abandonment of two ocean stations.

Do not tell that to the Air Force of the United States that we are going to cut out two ocean stations, or the civilian personnel that has to travel on our planes across the vast Pacific and the vast Atlantic.

If the personnel were entirely taken off the tenders, then the aids to navigation program would of necessity suffer.

Any program or programs which would be affected if the cut were applied as indicated in this paragraph, are all programs authorized by Congress, and which have been approved in the current and previous fiscal years to the extent they are presently being operated.

That is, the degree of service in each program has been authorized, and any action as herein indicated represents a serious curtailment of that service.

I urge the committee, in the name of national defense, to turn back this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that handles appropriations for the Coast Guard. The Coast Guard is as much a part of our armed services as any other branch of the military services. On two or three occasions heretofore I offered amendments to reduce the money for the Coast Guard, But those of us who have served on this committee and have visited these Coast Guard stations are bound to admit that it is a very efficient branch of the armed services, and I certainly hope that the committee will consider the Coast Guard as a branch of the armed services. You will find the Coast Guard operating in places where other military branches are not required to operate. It is up to the Coast Guard to protect shipping. I hope the committee will consider the amendment on that basis and vote it down.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What the gentleman says as to the military nature of the Coast Guard is perfectly true. This might be considered the first national defense item to come to the floor. It is a very small item, comparatively speaking, and I have offered to cut the committee's recommendation by less than 1 percent in this amendment.

We all know and I think it is generally agreed that the military is of necessity one of the most wasteful branches of our Government, and we have all been seeking to cut some of that in these appropriations. I feel that if we find ourselves in a position where we cannot reasonably cut 1 percent from one of the smaller items we might as well give up trying to cut the future military budget.

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman admitted in his statement a few moments ago that the Coast Guard operates on an efficient basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is why I thought they could absorb a 1 percent cut.

Mr. PASSMAN. But the gentleman will find that this committee made a reduction and I do not believe we can reduce this bill further without being called upon to reinstate the cut later in a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. For the RECORD, if we call this a small operation, I think it is a most important and vital operation. The Coast Guard has the duty and the know-how of patrolling offshore and inshore, especially around sensitive harbors, rivers, and lakes. It does a security and sea-safety job in peace and war. It is the guiding eye of the Air Corps, the seeing dog of floundering ships, and the sheriff and bane of cross-water smugglers.

These are days of the great build-up; who is the Hawkshaw of cargo? FBI? CIA? G–2? Secret Service? Customs? We have none—none in the economic field (where all wars are spawned) to help us in the same way the FBI and other intelligence agencies help out in their fields.

The Coast Guard is going to come into its own. It is going to be called upon to perform duties all around the world. Don't sell it short. It is going to become the best friend Congress ever had in helping us avoid war by putting the finger on illicit, war-breeding cargoes. Give it your support. Vote down the amendment. If you don't, the other body will restore the cut, I am sure.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman.

The Coast Guard is really a military unit and I hope you vote down the amendment.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. If there is one branch of the service that deserves our support, this is it.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the gentleman and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to find the set of obligations that had been made, and this is the report I got: For the first 6 months the expenditures out of the $190,000,000 appropriated were $82,668,000; that the expenditures in the month of January, which, as I understood, included a transfer for the purpose of taking care of increases in pay in other units, were $17,000,000. In other words, there was a balance left of $108,000,000 at the end of the first 6 months, which would permit an expenditure at the rate of $18,000,000 a month if they are going to use up the whole of the appropriation.

On top of that, they have not maintained their figures allowed in the Coast Guard. The military personnel is supposed to be provided for in the bill on the basis of 35,115. This appears on page 208. With obligations in the first 6 months, which would if they were continued for the rest of the year make a total of $165,300,000, I wonder why there would be required $195,600,000 for next year? It does not look as if they were running on any such basis at all. That is the reason I feel that the Coast Guard has not justified their requested appropriation.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In connection with what the gentleman has just said, could he advise the committee as to the responsibilities that the Coast Guard has to meet in the final 6 months of the year, as compared with those responsibilities they had to meet in the first 6 months? Is it not true that the Coast Guard has started to do the job we required them to do and now their job is building up so that they would need more for the next 6 months than for the last 6 months?

Mr. TABER. I do not think there is any greater obligation for the next 6 months than for the first 6 months. There is a very considerable margin even with the adoption of this amendment. There is a margin of $30,000,000 for an increase even if the amendment is adopted.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one agency in which we could not be mistaken, it is this one, because this agency happens to be one which has the finest accounting system in the Government. This is one agency which adopted the Hoover Commission recommendations and implemented them. They have a good cost accounting system and they can show you the complete picture when presenting their estimates and requests.

I want to assure the gentleman from Mississippi that this particular agency certainly has no fat and when he begins cutting he cannot help but cut into muscle needed for preparedness.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I agree completely with the gentleman in the compliment he has paid the Coast Guard. It is a very efficiently operated unit, it is a great organization, and I am sure their accounting system is one of the best.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Our subcommittee is very proud of them, and the country is proud of them.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. When we speak of cutting, my amendment would still leave $3,300,000 in addition to what they had last year.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. But if the gentleman were familiar with the books and with what they had presented to us, the gentleman would feel, I am sure, we ought to add to what we gave them rather than take away from them. Our committee was very conscientious in trying to cut down the budget, but in some cases I think it went too far.

In this case we tried to cut where there was no place to cut. There is no place to cut here unless you cut into the muscle, and I know the gentleman would not knowingly try to do that. The gentleman is a consistent advocate of economy, and I congratulate him, but if he were as familiar with the facts here as the subcommittee is, he would not insist on this reduction.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take 5 minutes. I think that the gentleman from Mississippi ought to ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that we have not got enough money appropriated for the Coast Guard. I do not know whether the Members of Congress realize what this Coast Guard does for the country as a whole, both on the Atlantic and on the Pacific coasts. If you have read the papers, only last week these Coast Guardsmen went out and rescued 35 men on a tanker in a strong northeast storm. You should be proud that you have men that are willing to go out in a dory and pick people off of boats that are sinking. Mr. Chairman, there are very few Members of Congress that are as economy minded as I am, but this is not economy. You are appropriating

money to catch racketeers, and I am for it, and I am for appropriating money that will take care of the lives and the property of this country, and I think this does it.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall take only a moment to merely invite the attention of the committee to the fight we had about the Coast Guard last year. We did not do so well then. I would like to remind you what I told you then about the Texas City disaster when, through no sabotage, merely an accident, a ship blew up in the harbor with half of the force of an atomic bomb. That sort of thing could happen again, and it could happen due to sabotage or due to enemy action. Those of us who have studied national defense for all these years know perfectly well that the situation is becoming more desperate as time goes on.

Mr. Chairman, I leave with you this thought, that the Coast Guard is the first line of defense against subversive actions against our ports. To cut the force that would protect us against enemy action, be it subversive activities from within or perhaps an open attack from without, I think would be a terrible mistake.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the 5 minutes. I simply want to reply to the gentleman from New York who raised a good point in connection with this bill, and I merely want to give him the facts because I know he wants them. The facts are that the Coast Guard during this year has not been able to recruit up to the full strength that we authorized for the port-security program, because the recruiting for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force has been so large that it has impeded their efforts. But they have been increasing their force gradually and consequently the obligations for the last 6 months of the year will be higher than they were for the first 6 months, because as you increase the force you increase the cost. Our committee did take into consideration the obligations for the first 6 months.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am advised that the Coast Guard refused enlistment within the last month.

Mr. GARY. That may be, because they did not have the facilities to take care of the men at that particular time, or for some other reason. But, so far as I know, they have been and are now definitely engaged in a recruiting program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 117, noes 84.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi and Mr. GARY.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 118, noes 87.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS

For necessary expenses of acquisition, construction, rebuilding, and improvement of aids to navigation, shore facilities, vessels, and aircraft, including equipment related thereto; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $20,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 7, line 23, strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$19,000,000."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hope I will not be charged with injuring the defense program by offering this amendment. I do call your attention to the fact that even with this amendment you have a larger figure than you had last year.

In the case of this appropriation the committee has apparently allowed $750,000 to reengine a vessel which the Coast Guard acquired by transfer from the Navy equipped with experimental Diesels which are both inefficient and almost impossible to keep in repair; $4,985,000 for loran installations, $12,500,000 for aircraft, and $765,000 for miscellaneous unspecified projects.

The allowance, while $1,000,000 less than requested, is nevertheless $1,775,000 higher than the current year appropriation.

The Coast Guard will carry over from 1952 into 1953 unspent funds already appropriated under this title, to the estimated amount of $8,147,510—see Analysis of Expenditures, Budget, page 954, or the hearings, page 246. This sum is reported as unliquidated obligations, or in other words as fully obligated but not actually paid out as of July 1, 1952. Nothing is found in the record available to remove the rather natural question as to whether this balance will actually be fully obligated as of that date, or may not be in part at least actually unobligated money available until expended, and, therefore, freely available for use as the Coast Guard may see fit in 1953.

The question arises because in this same analysis of expenditures the 1953 expenditures are estimated at $22,000,000 and this figure seems quite unrealistic. With a carry-over of $8,148,000 and a new appropriation of even the full amount requested, $21,000,000, the total available for expenditure in 1953 would be $29,148,000. On page 249 of the hearings it is stated that $12,500,000 of the new money requested is for aircraft which would not be delivered until 1954. Consequently it would appear that this money would not be actually expended until 1954, and 1953 expenditures would not exceed $16,648,000.

In any event, there appears no urgent need to raise the level of this appropriation materially above that of the current year. The Coast Guard, never given funds for aircraft until 1950, now plans a sustained fleet of aircraft totaling 137 units—hearings, page 250. It will cost from $12,500,000 to $17,000,000 per year for the next 5 years to finance such a fleet. With all due recognition of the need for military readiness of the Coast Guard, surely no great risk would be incurred were we to hold this fleet to 135 or even 130 units.

Good progress is being made by the Coast Guard in every phase of its activities. It is an efficient, well-managed force, but, as in every operating agency, the expansionist tendency is strong.

This amendment would merely hold this program at a $19,000,000 level, still three-fourths of a million higher than the current year, and certainly would in no degree prevent continued steady increase in the general effectiveness of the Coast Guard operation.

Now, comparatively, this is a small amount. But let us hold this thing in line. Nobody will be injured thereby. If you need the money in 1954, or whenever it is in the future, then spend it at that time. However, in my judgment, we can cut this $1,000,000 and not injure the Coast Guard or anybody else.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield if my time has not expired.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I know the gentleman has put a lot of study on this, but I would like to know how he reached that $19,000,000 figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This amendment strikes at the safety of the Coast Guard personnel, the Navy, and those traveling on sea and in the air. Included in this item for acquisition is a substantial amount for replacement of airplanes. They are not asking for any additional planes, but they are asking to replace those that are old and worn out. Are we going to require these boys in the Coast Guard to fly planes that are unfit for use?

In the second place, it provides for loran equipment. We are establishing loran stations all over the world to ensure the safety of our ships and planes and those who travel on them. We have had to increase this program very materially since the war in Korea because of the tremendous increase in travel in that area. If you cut this amount, you are going to cut down the safety devices that the Coast Guard provides for the safety of those operating on the seas and in the air and for the safety of its own men.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The committee saw fit to cut $1,000,000 from the proposed $22,000,000.

Mr. GARY. We thought we could safely do that, but we did not feel we could cut any more with safety.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But this still leaves them with more than they had last year.

Mr. GARY. That was considered. We went through the estimates very carefully in the committee and I do not feel cuts should be made indiscriminately on the floor of the House. This is a very important item.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not true that the entire air-sea rescue is under the command of the Coast Guard?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. And is it not true that we are increasing flying in this country and accordingly the job that now rests on the Coast Guard is an ever-increasing load in this matter of air-sea rescue alone?

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely true; and these loran stations are used for that purpose.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not also correct that the new loran stations are ones which Congress itself insisted the Coast Guard install?

Mr. GARY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am just as earnestly seeking economy and trying to find ways to save money in appropriation bills that will come before this House as any Member of Congress. I refrained from making any remarks with reference to the last amendment reducing the Coast Guard's appropriation. In this case, however, I would not feel that I was honest with myself if I did not oppose this amendment, although I know that the gentleman who offered it did so in the utmost sincerity.

The reason I take the floor now is because as chairman of the Coast Guard Committee of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House I have been after the Coast Guard for 4 years about their air service. To my certain knowledge they are flying planes out over the ocean in this air-rescue work that were given to them by the other services after the last war. I have seen them repairing and patching up their planes, trying to make one good plane out of several others. That is taking place at their air base on the coast of North Carolina and elsewhere.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina. I was a member of the Coast Guard Board of Visitors last year, and I flew in one of those planes up to New London, Conn., and what he had to say about the planes being obsolete is absolutely true. I am opposed to the pending amendment.

Mr. BONNER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. If the Members only knew that the Coast Guard is flying planes in air rescue work today, landing on the ocean and taking men from ships who may be sick or crippled or injured, in planes that are really not up to standard for that purpose, they would not vote for this amendment. The planes are old and obsolete. I sincerely hope that the committee will consider this amendment conscientiously and will ask whether you are treating the men fair in the air arm of the Coast Guard by requiring them to fly planes that are not up to standard, that are not modernized, that are not as good as planes that can be had today to perform the service they are rendering.

The Coast Guard is rendering an outstanding service, and the feats they have accomplished from their three air bases on the Atlantic and the Pacific coast will bring admiration to that service for years to come and will bring praise from the Members of this House if they would just take the time to inform themselves.

As I said in the beginning, I am just as earnestly trying to do something about bringing about efficiency and economy in the armed services as any Member of this House, and I think I have demonstrated that, but I will tell you one thing: This service is operating equipment and carrying on with equipment that has been thrown away and discarded by certain other services in the national defense.

Mr. Chairman, this is a small item as we look at figures today, but sincerely I tell you that in this particular case the item should not be decreased, it should be increased. There are certain directives to the Coast Guard, and I do not think they can carry them out today, in their air-sea rescue work, which they cannot do because they do not have the equipment to perform as I think they should. This branch of the Coast Guard needs expanding and should not be crippled.

I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 402. Except for the automobiles officially assigned to the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General, respectively, and automobiles assigned for operation by the Secret Service Division, no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), unless such appropriation is specifically authorized to be used for paying the compensation of employees performing such duties.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: Page 15, line 11 insert a new section 403:

"SEC. 403. Money appropriated in this act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not raise total aggregate expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond the total sum of $7,060,000,000: *Provided further*, That this limitation shall not apply to expenditures from the postal revenues; to refunds of internal revenue collections; to refunds and draw-backs in the Customs Service, and to refunds of moneys erroneously received and covered."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, some time ago, on the opening day of this session, I introduced a resolution designed to reach not the new obligational authority alone contained in bills such as this one, but designed to impose a ceiling, an over-all ceiling, on total expenditures for 1953. That includes, of course, the appropriations authorized in the current bills and others like it at this session and the carry-over from prior appropriations.

The majority leadership of this House in its wisdom has made it perfectly clear that they do not intend to permit the Members of this House to express themselves upon the simple proposition as to whether or not the United States is going to have an opportunity to save itself from disastrous inflation by imposing an over-all limitation on spending.

The bill that I introduced, if passed, would impose a ceiling on spending in the amount of the actual take or receipts from taxation. It would produce a balanced budget on the basis of tax receipts. It would avoid additional taxation, and it would stem the perils of inflation.

I am attempting here, because of the unwillingness of the leadership of this House to permit the original bill to come up, to reach the same result by applying to each individual appropriation bill a limitation upon total expenditures, by limiting expenditure of the new money provided in this bill. This bill does not touch the new authorizations for these agencies for next year, but does limit the expenditure of such authorization in 1953. These agencies and nearly all agencies have large amounts unexpended from prior appropriations. If this kind of amendment should be ruled out of order, it would simply mean, Mr. Chairman, that Congress has completely lost control of the Frankenstein created by the appropriations of last year and the year before that hang over the economy and the life of the United States like a black thundercloud.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What was the amount of the limitation?

Mr. COUDERT. In the amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. COUDERT. The total amount of the limitation applied to the agencies in this bill was my estimate of their share of reduction of expenditures over all, including all sources, that would result in spending no more than $71,000,000,000 that we will get out of taxes. In other words, if this amendment should be adopted, and the same ratio of reduction of total expenditures were applied to all of our other agencies, we would balance the budget on the basis of tax receipts.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. Is the gentleman's amendment based on an across-the-board percentage?

Mr. COUDERT. No. The agencies would simply have less money to spend in 1953 from this and prior year appropriations, and they would have to adjust in their own way as they chose.

Mr. MORANO. Would they then have to coordinate their efforts to adjust themselves?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes; of course they would.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman enlighten us on the method by which he arrives at the figure, as to whether it is the proportion of Treasury and Post Office appropriations to the total requested by the Budget Bureau?

Mr. COUDERT. It is of necessity an approximation. The majority leadership will not permit us to vote on the over-all proposal of requiring the President to offer a new budget based upon receipts, so I have been compelled to estimate what is a proper share of reduction of over-all spending to apply to the authorized expenditures for these particular agencies.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. If this amendment should necessitate curtailing mail deliveries in rural and residential sections to possibly three deliveries a week, would the gentleman go along with that kind of arrangement?

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman does not have to go along with that kind of arrangement, because this amendment does not require it.

Mr. PASSMAN. They could under this amendment. This applies to the entire bill, does it not?

Mr. COUDERT. It applies to the bill to this extent, that the funds you are now voting may be used only up to the point where the total funds, including the addition of carry-over from last year, equal $7,000,000,000. The amendment in no way, shape, or form, purports to dictate to the Postmaster General how he shall readjust his operations to the smaller permissible expenditure.

Mr. PASSMAN. What if the Congress should pass additional laws making it mandatory on the Post Office Department to increase their expenditures? Then what would the gentleman do in that case?

Mr. COUDERT. There was a distinguished President of the United States from the gentleman's party who answered questions like that by saying, "That is an 'iffy' question." We will cross that bridge when we come to it.

Mr. MORANO. I agree with the objective of the gentleman's amendment and I am prepared to vote for it. I would like to hear it explained in more detail.

Mr. COUDERT. I should be very glad to explain it in more detail if I had more time. I can explain this to the gentleman. It actually reduces total expenditures for 1953 for all these agencies by $186,000,000, which is only about another $70,000,000 above what we have already reduced today, over all, taking everything. Then it assumes that if we eliminate the $14,000,000,000 estimated deficit we will save another $200,000,000 in interest charges.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order on the ground that this amendment goes beyond the scope of this bill and deals with expenditures which are not included in this bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment does not go beyond the scope of the bill in its limitation on expenditures. The limitation is that the total expended including the amounts in this bill shall not exceed the $7,060,000,000 over and above the total expenditures for the postal revenues, the refunds on internal revenue collection, and the refunds and drawbacks in the customs service, and the refunds of money erroneously received.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be heard further. I have stated my point of order, and I believe the point of order is properly taken.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE). The Chair is ready to rule. In the brief time the Chair has had to study the amendment, the Chair is of the opinion that the limitation which the gentleman from New York desires to place in the bill would operate to limit expenditures of appropriations which are not carried in the bill, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not wholly astonished by the ruling of the Chair although I do not concur. There was good reason for offering the amendment even if it were to be overruled. I think that the ruling makes it perfectly clear to the membership of the House and to the country that there is no conceivable way today under our conventional congressional appropriating process to recover control of the gigantic carry-over of appropriations from prior years, which if recklessly used by an administration, which heaven knows has been reckless in the past, would completely destroy the economy of the country. In offering this amendment we have shown that the door is closed, and that the only approach to the vital problem of recovering congressional control over over-all expenditures, which is what counts, and the only thing that counts, is by direct legislation designed to limit expenditures. This will be impossible unless an aroused public opinion compels the majority leadership to allow Members to vote upon House Joint Resolution 371 or some similar measure. Short of that, we must sadly confess that the Congress has lost control of the fiscal affairs of the Government of the United States.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in that connection, I would like to call the attention of the House to the report of the subcommittee on page 18 where it refers to estimates for 1953 of permanent, indefinite appropriations. It is not, therefore, quite true, as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY], chairman of the subcommittee stated when he says that we have involved before us in this bill only $3,500,000,000. Mr. Chairman, we have in addition to that on page 18 of the report $4,191,000,000 of old people's money in a trust fund which according to this report the Treasury has absolute power to expend. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. GARY] what that money is going to be spent for.

Mr. GARY. It is going to be spent to pay the benefits under the Social Security Act, which this Congress has provided for. It is paid out according to the act of Congress in the amounts that the Congress directs. Therefore, the Congress having acted on the matter, unless Congress repeals or changes the social security law, you cannot change that amount.

Mr. GWINN. It says that this is money received by the Treasury just as it receives all other taxes.

Mr. GARY. No. It is received as a trust fund, set up under the law for the particular purpose of paying benefits under the social security law. The Congress has decided what those benefits should be. The Treasury does not decide it.

Mr. GWINN. There is nothing in this report to indicate, and the practice seems to be to the contrary, that when $4,000,000,000 paid in by the old people, goes into the Treasury, it goes in just like any other tax money and is immediately paid out for the general bills of the Treasury. Is that not true?

Mr. GARY. No. They are trust funds. They are collected for the very purpose of paying benefits under the social security law, and they cannot be used for any other purpose. As a matter of fact, these receipts are greatly in excess of the expenditures, because they are accumulating a reserve. It is a trust fund reserve. It does not come out of the general Treasury at all. It is a trust fund that the Congress has required the Treasury Department to set up. It can be changed, but not in this bill. It must be changed by act of Congress.

Mr. GWINN. If the gentleman will respond to another question. Is it not a fact that these receipts from the old people, and from unemployment insurance premiums also, go right into the Treasury kitty? They are not earmarked in any sense; and they become the general funds of the Treasury and are used for the general purposes of the Treasury?

Mr. GARY. They are set up as trust funds, and the Treasury so regards them.

Mr. GWINN. But I wish the gentleman would respond to my question. The funds are not the funds themselves; the money that they receive is paid out like any other cash receipts.

Mr. GARY. Oh, they pay it out, but they pay it out of the trust fund, rather

than out of the general funds of the Treasury. These items have been handled this way since time immemorial—since the social-security law was set up.

Mr. GWINN. Well, since they are paid out like any other cash receipts, what control has the Congress over the purpose for which they may pay these funds out?

Mr. GARY. The Congress can at any time it sees fit change the social-security law, and change the amount of the payments that are made under it. We recently increased those payments, but it has to be done by a general law. It cannot be done in this appropriation bill.

Mr. GWINN. When we pay out this fund, what is put in place of this money that the old people and the unemployed pay in?

Mr. GARY. The receipts are constantly coming in and payments are constantly going out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I will take but 30 seconds.

The question that was asked from that side of the House was merely a continuation of the policy of that side of the House when they opposed social security for such a long period of time. Now that we have got social security, they are doing everything possible that they can to undermine the faith of the people in it.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. McCORMACK having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6854, the Treasury and Post Office Departments Appropriation Act, 1953, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Williams amendment, operating expenses of the Coast Guard, line 15 on page 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gross.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the Williams amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 6, line 17, strike out "$195,600,000" and insert "$194,000,000."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 191, nays 129, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—191

Abbitt	Fugate	Patman
Abernethy	Fulton	Patten
Adair	Gamble	Phillips
Allen, Calif.	Gathings	Pickett
Allen, Ill.	Gavin	Poage
Andersen, H. Carl	George	Polk
Anderson, Calif	Golden	Poulson
Andresen, August H.	Goodwin	Prouty
Andrews	Gore	Radwan
Angell	Gregory	Rankin
Arends	Gross	Reece, Tenn.
Bakewell	Gwinn	Reed, Ill.
Baring	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Reed, N. Y.
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Rees, Kans.
Battle	Harden	Richlman
Beamer	Harris	Robeson
Belcher	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Colo.
Bender	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Fla.
Bentsen	Harvey	Rogers Tex.
Berry	Herlong	Ross
Betts	Heselton	St. George
Bishop	Hill	Saylor
Blackney	Hillings	Schenck
Bramblett	Hinshaw	Schwabe
Brehm	Hoeven	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman, Mich.	Scrivner
Brownson	Holmes	Scudder
Budge	Horan	Secrest
Burdick	Hunter	Shafer
Burleson	Ikard	Sheehan
Burton	Jackson, Calif.	Short
Busbey	Jarman	Simpson, Ill.
Byrnes	Jenison	Simpson, Pa.
Chelf	Jenkins	Sittler
Chenoweth	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Church	Johnson	Smith, Miss.
Cleverger	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Cole, Kans.	Jones, Woodrow W.	Springer
Cole, N. Y.	Kean	Stanley
Colmer	Keating	Stockman
Cooper	Kilburn	Sutton
Corbett	King, Pa.	Taber
Cotton	Lantaff	Tackett
Coudert	LeCompte	Talle
Crawford	Lovre	Teague
Crumpacker	Lucas	Thomas
Cunningham	Lyle	Thompson, Mich.
Curtis, Mo.	McConnell	Thornberry
Curtis, Nebr.	McGregor	Vail
Dague	McVey	Velde
Davis, Ga.	Mack, Wash.	Vorys
Davis, Tenn.	Mahon	Vursell
Davis, Wis.	Martin, Iowa	Watts
Denny	Martin, Mass.	Werdel
Devereux	Mason	Wharton
D'Ewart	Meader	Wheeler
Dondero	Miller, Nebr.	Wigglesworth
Donovan	Miller, N. Y.	Williams, Miss.
Elston	Morton	Williams, N. Y.
Engle	Mumma	Willis
Fenton	Murray, Tenn.	Wilson, Tex.
Fisher	Norblad	Winstead
Ford	O'Hara	Wolverton
Forrester	Ostertag	

NAYS—129

Addonizio	Carlyle	Gary
Albert	Carnahan	Gordon
Aspinall	Celler	Graham
Auchincloss	Chudoff	Granahan
Bailey	Clemente	Granger
Barden	Cooley	Green
Bates, Ky.	Crosser	Greenwood
Beckworth	Dawson	Hale
Bennett, Fla.	DeGraffenried	Hardy
Boggs, Del.	Delaney	Havenner
Bolling	Dempsey	Hays, Ark.
Bonner	Denton	Hope
Bosone	Doyle	Howell
Boykin	Durham	Irving
Brown, Ga.	Fernandez	Jackson, Wash
Bryson	Flood	James
Burnside	Fogarty	Javits
Butler	Forand	Jones, Ala.
Canfield	Frazier	Karsten, Mo.
Cannon	Furcolo	Kearns
Kelley, Pa.	Merrow	Riley
Kelly, N. Y.	Mills	Rivers
Kennedy	Mitchell	Rodino
Kerr	Morano	Rogers, Mass.
Kersten, Wis.	Morris	Rooney
Kilday	Multer	Sadlak
King, Calif.	Murdock	Seely-Brown
Kirwan	Murphy	Shelley
Klein	Nelson	Sieminski
Lanham	Nicholson	Steed
Lind	O'Brien, Ill.	Stigler
McCarthy	O'Brien, Mich.	Thompson, Tex.
McCormack	O'Konski	Tollefson
McGuire	O'Neill	Trimble
McIntire	O'Toole	Van Pelt
McKinnon	Passman	Van Zandt
McMillan	Patterson	Welch
Machrowicz	Perkins	Wier
Mack, Ill.	Preston	Wilson, Ind.
Madden	Price	Withrow
Magee	Priest	Yates
Mansfield	Rabaut	Yorty
Marshall	Rhodes	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—112

Aandahl	Fallon	Miller, Md.
Allen, La.	Feighan	Morgan
Anfuso	Fine	Morrison
Armstrong	Garmatz	Moulder
Ayres	Grant	Murray, Wis.
Baker	Hagen	Norrell
Barrett	Hall, Leonard W.	Osmers
Beall	Hand	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Harrison, Nebr.	Potter
Blatnik	Hart	Powell
Boggs, La.	Hays, Ohio	Rains
Bolton	Hébert	Ramsay
Bow	Hedrick	Reams
Bray	Heffernan	Redden
Brooks	Heller	Regan
Buchanan	Herter	Ribicoff
Buckley	Hess	Richards
Buffett	Hoffman, Ill.	Roberts
Bush	Holifield	Roosevelt
Camp	Hull	Sabath
Carrigg	Jonas	Sasscer
Case	Jones, Hamilton C.	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Judd	Sheppard
Chiperfield	Kearney	Sikes
Combs	Kee	Smith Wis.
Cox	Keogh	Spence
Deane	Kluczynski	Staggers
Dingell	Lane	Taylor
Dollinger	Larcade	Vinson
Dolliver	Latham	Walter
Donohue	Lesinski	Weichel
Dorn	McCulloch	Whitten
Doughton	McDonough	Wickersham
Eaton	McGrath	Widnall
Eberharter	McMullen	Wolcott
Elliott	Miller, Calif.	Wood, Ga.
Ellsworth	Morrison	Wood, Idaho
Evins	Moulder	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to:

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bow for, with Mr. Hand against.

Mr. McCulloch for, with Mr. Vinson against.

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Garmatz against.

Mr. Armstrong for, with Mr. Fallon against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. Sasscer against.

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Buffet for, with Mr. Camp against.

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Walter against.

Mr. Hess for with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Taylor for with Mr. Anfuso against.

Mr. Wood of Idaho for, with Mr. Fine against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.

Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. McGrath against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Aandahl for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Whitten for, with Mr. Heller against.

Mr. Bray for, with Mr. Feighan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Walcott.

Mr. Brooks with Mr. Potter.

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Case.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Lane with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Hagen.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Kearney.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Philbin with Mrs. Bolton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed, and that I may have permission to include in the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole certain tables and information from the hearings and the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

WILL THE PENDING UMT PROVIDE EITHER SECURITY OR ECONOMY?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the issue before this Congress is not whether we stand ready to provide for the defense of America. If that were the issue every Member would be found voting in the affirmative.

The actual issue is: "Does the particular bill, H. R. 5904, present the best and most economical method of providing for our national defense?" On this question there is much honest difference of opinion.

I have sought to follow the debate rather carefully. I have noted that many of the proponents of this bill have assumed that this training would greatly strengthen our military position. There has, however, been little effort to show how it would do so. No one has denied that when the Forty-fifth Division—the Oklahoma National Guard—composed as it was very largely of combat veterans with far more training than this bill would provide, and having had at least some training as a division unit, a thing which trainees under this bill would lack entirely, was inducted into Federal service, the military authorities completely discounted its previous training. No one will deny that this division, and similar divisions, were required to undergo exactly the same training before being sent to Korea as was required of draftees. The explanation given me was that these men were rusty. They were not familiar with modern weapons or methods, and yet most of them had had actual service less than 5 years before. In the face of this experience, may we not raise a reasonable doubt as to the efficiency of a reserve force of men, some of whom were trained 7½ years before? If a combat veteran gets rusty in 4 years, should we expect a boy with 6 months' training to be a dependable soldier for 8 years?

If you answer that the Forty-fifth Division was actually not needed in Korea in 1950, then let us throw out all of the testimony of the military experts who have tried so studiously to prove that had we had UMT at the outbreak of the Korean war, or any other war, it would have been a deciding factor in reducing our casualties. If we could have reduced our casualties in Korea by sending these men over without the additional training they actually did receive, then the military is guilty of gross incompetence, or even worse, it is guilty of deliberate sacrifice of American troops.

I do not make either charge. In fact I believe our military leaders realized perfectly well that the addition of these National Guard divisions without a completely new training program would not have improved our military situation in Korea. But, if it would not, neither would the existence of 100 divisions of UMT reservists have been of any help. I do suggest that the military proponents of this bill could not be right in regard to their use or lack of use of these veterans in our National Guard, and at the same time be right in what they claim about the effectiveness of these trainees.

Much the same inconsistency exists in regard to cost. Nearly every person, military or civilian, who has approved this bill has laid great stress on the claimed monetary savings it is supposed to effect. Certainly we all want to save money, but do not let us undertake a program which will admittedly cost us $4,000,000,000 the first year without something more than mere unsubstantiated statements as to its savings. How are the proponents of this measure going to save any money unless they are going to reduce the size of the active Military Establishment by even greater numbers than they propose to train? Surely if the over-all size of the Armed Forces remains at its present size the tax burden will hardly be reduced by adding 800,000 trainees and 400,000 trainers. Yes, I said 400,000 trainers or instructors, because that is what the military people themselves say it will take. I know it sounds fantastic, but the military does lots of fantastic things. One thing, however, I never heard of their doing—that is to overestimate the cost. Their own figures indicate that it will cost $2,700 as a minimum to give a boy 6 months' training. Actually, it will probably cost twice that much, but even that figure would keep a boy in Texas A. & M., Baylor University, or the University of Texas, a full year, and give him a year of academic work in addition to a better military course than the UMT camp would provide.

I do not know whether the proponents of this bill have simply overlooked these facts of economic life or whether they are just opposed to academic education. I raise this question in all seriousness, because as I read the bill it would take a boy out of VMI or Texas A. & M., where he would be getting military training equal to the best—without expense to the Federal Government—and place him in some camp at an admitted cost of $2,700 for 6 months' training in exactly the same fundamentals which he had received, or was receiving, at his own expense. Maybe this is the way to save money and manpower, but not in my book.

Now, if we are willing to overlook the direct costs, let us see what this program will do over the long run. The proponents, almost to a man, admit that it will not work at this time. They admit that for the present it will neither save money nor provide security. They are just interested in establishing a principle. The principle of the subordination of the individual to the state. They do not mention it, but that same principle is the cornerstone of every totalitarian regime the world has ever known. Please understand, I do not object for one minute to the idea of calling on any American citizen to aid in the defense of his country, but I want to know that his service is going to actually contribute to the common defense, not that his life is to be interrupted simply to prove the power of the central government over the individual. In Texas we have had an adequate demonstration of the naked power of the central authority in the field of property rights in the confiscation of the tidelands which were reserved to us by the annexation resolution. We do not need any demonstration of power over the life of our citizens. We all acknowledge the right of the Government to require both the property and the service of the citizen, but we insist that it must be in behalf of the common defense.

But back to the long-time costs. Does any Member of this body sincerely believe that the graduates of this training program will not, within a few years, be

receiving all the benefits and emoluments of veterans status? If you cherish any such illusions, you are a political accident. Possibly there may be some honest citizens who have never watched political maneuverings, who might sincerely believe that it would be possible to avoid such a course, but I cannot conceive of any Member of Congress who is so naive.

You know, and I know, that before three more presidential elections roll around you and I, or our successors, will have granted veteran's preference to these boys. This will effectively wipe out all practical effects of veteran's preference in employment and simply establish male preference with the complete elimination of the physically handicapped in public service. The handicapped will be the only male citizens without preference.

Surely there will be very few who will even today, defend the provision of the bill to give these boys only workmen's compensation, based on an assumed salary of $150 per month which the trainee, as the bill is written will not receive. Probably the first change will be to raise his actual pay to equal that of the draftee under selective service. This will add materially to the expense, but the next move will almost certainly be to grant Government insurance to every trainee, and that it will be expanded to provide lifetime coverage. There will be a very limited field left to private firms. With this long step toward the nationalization of our largest private business institutions, we will have moved a long way from the free economy of private ownership which has given our country such a high standard of living.

Most of you have reflected the views of your constituents by professing undying opposition to socialized medicine. It will not be necessary for you to oppose it after this program has been in operation a few years. We will have socialized medicine. It would be unrealistic in the extreme to assume that we would not give these boys free medical treatment. Who of you would not now favor taking care of them while they are in training? Would any of you want to deny future medical and hospital service to any boy who is injured or who contracts disease as a result of his training? If you feel you can long maintain a sharp line between service-connected and nonservice-connected disabilities, I wonder if you want to lead a campaign to deny assistance to the large number of nonservice-connected veterans now drawing Government payments and receiving treatment in Government hospitals?

I am merely pointing out that we will proceed in the future as we have in the past. When the public pressure gets great enough, Congress is going to grant these boys all the medical benefits of present veterans. That pressure will build up very rapidly as more and more groups of boys go through the program. This is the way democracy works. As soon as we get the program well established all able-bodied male citizens will be entitled to socialized medicine. This just puts one-half our population under socialized medicine, but how many of you are going to get your broom and try to sweep back the tide of public clamor to extend to each trainee veteran's family the privileges of the veteran himself? Possibly there would be a few who would still have to pay their doctor's bills. They would be the ones who need treatment the most—the physically disabled who had had no opportunity to become trainees.

Possibly you will say this would all be true but for the natural jealousy which will exist between these trainees and the combat veterans. Possibly the veterans' organizations would indeed take such a position were it not for the fact that within a relatively short time these trainee veterans will outnumber combat veterans. The American Legion is going to have to take these men into its ranks or see a new rival organization of greater size and political strength challenge it. What do you think the leaders of the present veterans' organization are going to do? I think they are going to seize the opportunity to enlarge their own strength and influence; and again, I am not at all critical. I am only recognizing the facts of political and organizational life.

I feel that too much has already been said about organized support for and against this bill. Most veterans' organizations claim they not only speak for their entire membership, but also for all veterans in proclaiming their support of the measure. I am a member of a large veterans' organization. I do not question the sincerity of its national officers, but their views are not my views on this matter.

Most Protestant churches have announced their opposition to this bill. I am a member of a Protestant church but I reserve the right to speak for myself on the matter. The same goes for the farm organizations and the labor unions. I think it is good that our people should approach this problem primarily as American citizens. There will be differences between Americans as to the effectiveness of the plan proposed, but let those differences be on the merits of the proposal—not on membership in some organization, no matter how fine and noble that organization may be.

I might discuss at length the threat which this bill imposes to our system of higher education. I believe we all realize that more and more general education is becoming necessary if we are to maintain our military security. I do not contend that this bill would destroy all higher education, but I think its most ardent advocates must agree that it does nothing to encourage it.

Close order drill is doubtless still an essential element in basic military training, but the necessity for scientific and technical training is rapidly increasing in all branches of the Armed Forces. The Navy and the Air Force already devote a major portion of their training to their educational rather than drill-field activities. The Ground Forces must continually devote an increasing percentage of their training to this type of educational work.

I think it is extremely dangerous to take any step which would discourage boys from getting more than a high-school education without taking steps to counteract and offset the discouragement. I think any sound UMT program should offset this tendency by making provision for expanded, not reduced, educational opportunities. I fear that if we do not do this, not only will the individual citizen trainee suffer, but in addition the very security of the Nation, for which we are trying to make provision, will suffer.

I am advised that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], will offer a substitute for the committee's bill, which substitute will provide for military training of our youth in colleges and technical schools. I understand this substitute will give a year of training which will probably give a far better military foundation than will the camps proposed in the bill (H. R. 5904), and at the same time will give regular academic training to millions of boys who would not otherwise have ever received any higher education. It can all be done for less money than is proposed to be spent under this bill. It will keep the boys near home. It will avoid the bitter racial issue, because the boy can select his own school. If he wants to attend a mixed school he can do so, but if he wants to attend either a black or a white school he will be at liberty to do so. The problem of moral surroundings, which is recognized by proponents and opponents alike to be a most serious one, will surely be greatly relieved. And with all this, the record of the ROTC schools proves conclusively that the finest kind of military training can be supplied. If this is not so, how do you account for the fact that Texas A. & M. College supplied more officers in the last war than did West Point?

I shall, of course, support the Burleson amendment if given an opportunity. In addition, I shall seek an opportunity to offer an amendment of my own to reduce the demands on our own American boys for overseas duty, by authorizing the enlistment of foreign nationals in the Armed Forces of the United States for overseas service.

AGE OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today to make all persons 65 years of age or over eligible for minimum benefits under the social-security law.

It will also amend the Social Security Act to raise minimum benefits from $20 to $30 a month. The legislation would cost about one and three-fourths billion dollars. This legislation can be financed by closing a few of the tax loopholes

which amount to a loss in Federal tax revenues of about $5,000,000,000 annually.

Eight hundred million now paid to the States by the Federal Government for public assistance could be saved and would help to pay for about half of the cost of the legislation I am proposing. Furthermore, the cost of the program would go down each year as the number of those not insured dwindle.

The inadequacy of public assistance in many States is an indication of our lack of concern for our old people. There is no justification for the plight of deserving old folks when we are able to help the world and to pile up surpluses, even when so large a part of our material and human resources are being used for defense.

It is time to look at this problem realistically. Let us put an end to shame lists and embarrassment for our old people and put a little sunshine into their lives in their twilight years.

This kind of legislation builds effective barriers against communism. It is sound legislation to promote the general welfare and to strengthen the Nation morally and physically.

IS THERE A SURPLUS OF ALUMINUM?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, perhaps some of you have noticed the well-advertised sale of aluminum wrap foil in stores in the District of Columbia. There appears to be a very large supply of this product available on a special without-limit sale, which prompts me to ask "How come?"

Aluminum manufacturers in Wisconsin and elsewhere throughout the Nation have been cut back sharply on their supply of material. The airplane industry, neck-deep in defense production, is crying for aluminum. Our Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions has been bombarded with requests for more hydroelectric power in the Northwest to keep the aluminum industry going, yet, the aluminum wrap foil, a convenience but certainly not a necessity, is sold in Washington stores on a special unlimited-sale basis. Sold in cartons without a designation of the manufacturer, and not produced, according to the best information I have obtained so far, by any manufacturer who has an historic use right to make such a product on a limited basis.

It appears obvious that either the controlled-materials plan of the National Production Authority is not doing the job it was designed to do, or the controls plan for aluminum has been illegally avoided.

I have called this matter, perhaps small in and of itself, but significant as an illustration, to the attention of NPA authorities, and I shall hopefully await a reply that either:

First. CMP regulations have been tightened to prevent recurrence of such incidents in this or other defense materials; or

Second. Somebody, in or out of Government, is being prosecuted for illegally diverting such defense material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WASTE BY THE MILITARY

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday I made a statement on the floor of this House that someone informed me they were spending $27,000 at the A. P. Hill Military Reservation for a hunting lodge for General Brooks. Two days later I again spoke here in the House about the hunting lodge.

On last Saturday I returned to the A. P. Hill Military Reservation for another look at that magnificent lodge. I have learned that the lodge cost over $40,000 when it was built. It was built before the Army took over the lodge. I found that a large amount of money had been spent on the buildings that the colonel, who is commanding officer of the base, readily described to us.

After the Army takes over a base there is no new construction. It is all rehabilitation. So the $27,000 that was spent there was not for new construction, in Army language. It was for rehabilitation.

I have with me now pictures that were taken showing that in our language there is new construction.

In this picture that I show you now, that is blown up, you can see new concrete steps, up and down, the forms have just been removed. This house is where the sergeant, who is the caretaker, lives; it has been, shall we say, rehabilitated? No new construction.

Mr. RANKIN. You mean rebuilt?

Mr. SUTTON. Yes; it has been rebuilt because it was destroyed by a 75-millimeter during 1941. But that is not new construction. That is rehabilitation in Army language. The new refrigerator and the new stove in the sergeant's home here are rehabilitation also, but I am not complaining about some rehabilitation and improvement for the sergeants and the enlisted men.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the picture I took of the chauffeur's apartment did not turn out. But it is shown right there at the base, they have not reconstructed it but rebuilt it.

Last Saturday the United Press representatives, others, and I went down there again. The sign says, "To the Lodge" even though it has been called "Officers' Quarters," "Officers' Club." I cannot tell what they call it because they have called it so many names. I am reminded of the old saying that a rose by any other name, would smell just as sweet. But to me it is still a hunting lodge. To the civilians around A. P. Hill it is known as the hunting lodge. The sign says, "To the lodge." So I presume it is a hunting lodge.

So I went down there again last Saturday. When we got there the lodge was locked. We arrived a little after 2 o'clock. I am sure that my good friends, Congressmen VAN ZANDT and POTTER and others who were in the service in World War II can verify the fact that on Saturday afternoon and on Sunday an officers' club is always open, if it is an officers' club. The commanding officer came up. He could not find a key to the place. He said he did not have a key to it and did not know anyone who could produce a key on Saturday, or Sunday, to the officers' club as he called it. To me, to the press and to the photographers I am sure that was a story that kind of stunk because on those 2 days, Saturday and Sunday, your officers' clubs are always open.

I have a picture here where we are knocking on the door trying to get in, but we could not. I also have a picture here showing a beautiful view. This same picture shows the bedroom, and, according to the colored private there on the Thursday before, this is the view that would be seen from the general's bedroom. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, when I was there on Thursday there was a beautiful bedroom suite in the room I am showing you. When we were down there on Saturday the bedroom suite had been removed. But they left the Simmons innerspring mattress, a Simmons box spring, and the mahogany bed up near a window, where they stored it, but where a picture could be taken of it. Here is the picture of the bedroom suite that was in the general's bedroom when I first went down there.

Then, of course, after we started to leave, after we had seen what we wanted to see, the commanding officer of the base came up; he is a prince of a fellow. He got out of his car, but made it a point to block my car and the other car. And he said, "Can I help you?" I said, "No, sir." He said, "Which one is Mr. SUTTON?" I said, "I am." He said, "Did you get a permit?" And I said, "No, sir." Then he said, "It is nothing but common courtesy that you call on the base commander when you appear at a base." I told the colonel that he must have been informed that we would be up here, through the newspapers, and also that I had called the Army liaison the day before and advised them that I would be down here. I thought, Mr. Speaker, that I had done right in telling the Army liaison officer, because that is the man we are supposed to contact when we have problems here on the Hill, to get in touch with him; otherwise there is no use for the liaison office up here.

So, I informed the office that I was going down to A. P. Hill. Whether the Army liaison informed the post commander I do not know. He should have, and I am sure he did because they are most efficient. I know that they will keep the post commander advised when a Member of Congress is coming down to visit a post, or anyone else. Of course, I notified the Army liaison.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. A Member of Congress does not have to have a permit to go on Government property. You have a right

to go and look at it without asking anyone's permission.

Mr. SUTTON. I thought so, and there was not a restricted sign, except one that said "Welcome."

We are standing by the bathhouse—the photographers an newspapermen.

One of the newspaper men from the United Press said, "Colonel, when was this bathhouse built?" He said, "1929." He said, "Colonel, it looks newer than that to me." But the colonel, in typical army language, raised his voice and said, "I don't give a"—a four-letter word—"what you think; I am telling you it was built in 1929."

So it was built in 1929, according to the colonel.

Upon questioning the colonel, he said, "There has been no money spent down here since we took it from the Indians." Those were his exact words. I believe, and I am sure that I quote him; he said, "There has been no money spent down here since we took it from the Indians." That was in one breath, and about two breaths later he said, "Well, we got about $411,000 for rehabilitation down here."

I noticed that General Brooks on Saturday night said that they had spent $1,601, maybe more, on rehabilitating the lodge. But yet at first General Brooks said there was nothing ever spent here. Somebody is mistaken. Was it nothing? Was it $1,600? Was it $411,000? I still say it was $27,000, at least, and probably a lot more that was spent down there.

As I said the other day, it is a magnificent and beautiful lodge; nine bedrooms, nine bathrooms. It is used for an officers' club, they say, yet the colonel says they open it probably once every 5 or 6 weeks for private parties or dances.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can very easily find out; if the Armed Services Committee wants to, they will get the Inspector General to produce the books. We can find out who is running that club, who bought the furniture, where it came from, because the records of any officers' club are supposed to be kept and inspected by the Inspector General.

From information reaching me there has never been more than a component of nine officers on the club. How nine officers could operate an officers' club like that I cannot see.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. First, I would like to commend the gentleman upon what I regard as an outstanding job in the public interest, taken at the gentleman's own expense, and on his own time. As I understand, he had no investigative assistants. I think it is an illustration of what could be done if the Committee on Armed Services and some other committees of this House would provide themselves with investigative talent so that not just one example of this kind but many others of similar nature could be disclosed and exposed to the public to see just what their money is going for. I think the gentleman is entitled to the thanks of the entire House for the job he has done in this instance.

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the kind remarks of my good friend.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman will yield, let me say to him that this is bad enough, but if you wait until you investigate the waste that has taken place under the Marshall plan, you will really find something.

Mr. SUTTON. I would like to say this: Since there have been so many statements on what is down there, with such beautiful and magnificent buildings, and signs saying, "To the lodge," and some saying to the officers' club, some, officers' quarters, but whatever it is, we should check and find out. We should find out whether any of the taxpayers' money has been wasted there. That is the main point. I would say the taxpayers' money has been wasted.

They say they do not have private quarters there. I am going to refer this whole matter to General Brooks personally. If he, General Brooks, desires that I name the dates and men from the Pentagon, his friends, and their lady friends who were there on private parties, I will do so. I will leave it up to him.

Mr. RANKIN. How far out of the Army center is this?

Mr. SUTTON. Five and one-half miles from the post down to the officers' club down through a beautiful winding road.

It is a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, that since this hunting-lodge episode has come up, I have a little circular order here, which reads in part as follows:

HEADQUARTERS SECOND ARMY, OFFICE OF THE COMMANDING GENERAL,
Fort George G. Meade, Md., February 25, 1952.

Circular No. 30.

Sale of shell, shotgun, 16-gage, No. 1 buckshot.

The price down for 1,000 rounds, which is two whole cases, is $12.50. The packing and handling is 65 cents, total $13.15. Then it ends:

By command of Lieutenant General Brooks:

L. D. CARTER,
Brigadier General, General Staff, Chief of Staff.

Official:

W. G. CALDWELL,
Colonel, AGC, Adjutant General.

Distribution: B through K.

At the bottom it says:

Conserve supply dollars—they are your tax dollars.

I think this is rather cheap for buckshot. Of course, you use buckshot for deer hunting. I thought that was so cheap for buckshot No. 1 that I called down to a sport store here in Washington and gave them the specifications, the type of shell, and so forth, and said, "What would 1,000 rounds sell for?" The man said, "In case lots they give you 10-percent discount." So that would be a 10-percent discount in this instance. He said "For a thousand rounds, we will let you have them with a discount for $136.80." General Brooks is selling them for $13.15.

I just wonder—and I think this is a pertinent question—I wonder since the hunting lodge has been exposed, whether they have any more use for buckshot? Is that the reason they are selling out?

I hope that General Brooks and the Inspector General will produce the books and accounts relating to this club, disclosing where the furniture came from, where it was acquired, how much it cost, and whether there has been any appropriated funds spent for its purchase.

Sergeant Somerfield himself told me that he delivered a new International Harvester refrigerator there by Army truck. As anyone knows who has ever been in the service, you are not supposed to use Army vehicles or any appropriated funds for private quarters or clubs—and officers' clubs are considered private clubs. You are not supposed to use a vehicle to transport anything, otherwise you are using appropriated funds. Whether Sergeant Somerfield is right or not, I do not know; but I think he is. Then there is a violation of law. It is using appropriated funds to take this International Harvester refrigerator down to the club. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on Armed Services will check into things like this and cut out the waste, because the American taxpayers are tired of it. I am tired of it too. This is not the last exposure of waste that I will call to your attention. I have plenty more.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman from Tennessee has done a great job.

Mr. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHAFER. I am just wondering—are these refrigerators, or are they deep-freeze units?

Mr. SUTTON. These are refrigerators. General Vaughan, I do not think, has been down there.

Mr. SHAFER. That is, not yet. But he will be there, I warn you. But the gentleman from Tennessee is doing a good job. More power to you.

Mr. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman. I just hope that we can get some action to cut out things like this because the people are tired of it, and they have a genuine right to be.

WHEN THE NATIONAL COMMANDERS OF THE GREAT VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS AS WELL AS THE HEADS OF OTHER GROUPS SPEAK FOR UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING, OR FOR ANY OTHER LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL, THEY ARE CARRYING OUT A MANDATE FROM THEIR NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on universal military training, much has been said about the right of the national commanders of the American Legion, the Disabled American,

Veterans, the AMVETS, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Jewish War Vets, the American Veterans Committee, and other organizations to speak for their entire membership regarding universal military training.

Anyone who knows anything about organized veterandom, is aware that the national commanders of America's great veteran groups are mandated by convention resolutions and the only position they can take on UMT and other legislative proposals is the one that was adopted at the national convention assembled.

It is true that a certain percentage of the membership of any great organization may not follow the mandates of a national convention, but you will find that the greater percentage does, and especially those who are really active members.

Let us keep in mind that a mandate originates in the local post and works its way to the district and State conventions from where it proceeds to the national convention. Delegates representing the membership assembled at the national convention approve or disapprove the various mandates presented. Once a mandate has been approved, it then becomes part of the program of the national organization, and the national commander has the responsibility of carrying out the mandates.

Recently when the national commanders of the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Jewish War Veterans, the American Veterans Committee, and other organizations, including their ladies auxiliaries, appeared before the House Armed Services Committee in support of universal military training, they presented a united front, and in so doing, they were simply carrying out the mandates of their respective organizations.

I repeat again that it is true that a small percentage of any organization may disagree with its mandates, and this is not only true in organized veterandom, who is supporting UMT, but it applies also to church, civic, educational, and labor groups who are opposed to it.

First. Let us take labor for an illustration. By the following statement from Mr. Albert J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, AFL, he says his organization supports UMT:

> In the critical situation facing the free world today, our country must put its defenses on an enduring base calculated to keep us strong industrially and scientifically as well as militarily for as long as may be necessary. In order to preserve our long-term industrial strength and our free institutions, we must open the way for a cut in the large number of men we are now keeping under arms and for a cut in the vast sums we are spending on national defense. Universal military training is a practical road to that end.

Now let us talk about the educators. Dr. Howard W. Dodds, president of Princeton University, has the following to say in support of UMT:

> We cannot afford to continue the inequality of sacrifice and service that has characterized our procurement of military manpower. Some men have served once, twice, and even three times—others have never served at all. This is unsound, unfair, and undemocratic.
>
> The obligation and the privilege to serve one's country should rest equally on all physically fit young American men. If for no other reason than the fact that UMT as developed by the National Security Training Commission is a move toward that objective, it deserves the support of every American.

Another educator, Dr. Karl T. Compton, chairman, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, supports UMT in the following statement:

> I think we are all well aware of the adverse effects of our past failures to provide for trained manpower through UMT. First, there is the possibility that some of our past wars could have been averted entirely if we had had the strength and if our aggressors had known that we had the strength to triumph. Second, in two world wars we have had to rely on our allies to bear the brunt of the struggle and to provide a major part of our defense while we strove desperately to get ready to exert our latent strength. Third, it is fairly well conceded that many unnecessary battlefield deaths have resulted from the fact that many of our young men in time of war were inadequately and hastily trained. And, fourth, we have all seen the tragic injustice and inequity which resulted when Korea came upon us and the only trained men we had available were veterans of the last war. Of these men we demanded double service to the Nation since there were no other trained men to replace them. Many veterans of the last war were just beginning to get ahead in their careers, to contribute to critical industry, and to improve the status of their families. All of this vanished overnight when they were called upon once again to serve their country on the battlefield.

Now let us talk about the church groups. Rev. Dr. William F. Rosenblum, rabbi of Temple Israel, New York, supports UMT in the following language:

> We have a critical choice before us: either we must maintain a large army, navy, and air force for the indefinite future and require every young man to serve 2 years or more on active duty in the Armed Forces or we can begin now through UMT to build up a young, well-trained Reserve force of nonveterans and gradually reduce the size of the standing military establishment. The second choice is the sensible, economical, democratic one. UMT will save countless dollars, it will be least disruptive of family life and our democratic institutions and if, despite all our efforts, war should be thrust upon us, it will save the lives of our American men.

The Reverend J. B. Stokes, of St. Finbarr Catholic Church, Chicago, Ill., has the following to say in support of UMT:

> I think it is a good thing. It will help prepare us against the Russian threat, I don't think it will lower morals of youth and it will teach respect of people and country.

The Reverend Johnstone Beach, Episcopalian minister and chaplain of Gainesville, Tex., supports universal military training and expresses the following viewpoint before the House Committee on Armed Services:

> I have been a priest of the Episcopal Church for 25 years. I was a chaplain in the Army. * * * I think I know men. * * * I think I know how they feel. I was wounded in France and spent 3½ years in the hospital and have received the Purple Heart. * * * Now as a priest and a chaplain and as a man who knows men and soldiers and as a veteran and a citizen I am certainly fully and wholeheartedly in favor of this bill. The only objection is that it has come late, very, very late. I wish we had it several years ago.

Then we have the statement by Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, in support of universal military training. Mrs. Houghton is authorized to speak for the General Federal of Women's Clubs which is composed of thousands of American mothers and wives. Mrs. Houghton's statement is as follows:

> The General Federation of Women's Clubs overwhelmingly supported UMT at its last national convention. Our resolutions have favored UMT since 1947.
>
> Representing American mothers and wives we look at UMT not as a step toward war or even merely as a preparation for war. On the contrary, we are confident that UMT will increase our chances of preserving the peace. If we build our strength—economically, militarily, and spiritually—we can maintain the peace and deter aggressors.
>
> The injustice of asking our veterans to serve their country time and time again—to leave their families and their loved ones, to interrupt their careers—is a national disgrace. But unless we immediately begin to build up a young well-trained available reserve of nonveterans, that is what we would have to do whenever danger threatens. The men who have defended their country in World War II and who are defending us today in Korea have done their part. Unless UMT gets started now, we would have no place to turn except to our veterans in the unhappy event that war is thrust upon us.

When you realize the attitude taken in favor of universal military training by the major veterans organizations and by other groups of representative American citizens, it is difficult to understand the motives that prompted the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] to insult these organizations in his remarks on the floor on February 28, 1952, when he said, in opposing UMT:

> Today, as we face this issue, outside of the professional militarists, there is not a single decent, self-respecting organization in the entire United States of America—farm, labor, education, civil liberty, youth, religious, including the United States Chamber of Commerce—that is in favor of universal military training. If I am wrong, I stand to be corrected.

Many of the 19,000,000 Americans who have worn the uniform of their country and fought its wars and who are now members of our various veterans' organizations will resent, in no uncertain manner, this vicious slur against them.

In the opening of his remarks, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] said:

> One of the great things about our democracy is the fact that we can differ and have free speech.

Then in the next breath, he assumes the role of a hypocrite and slanders every organization that has taken a position against his views.

Mr. Speaker, organized veterandom in reality needs no defense for its position on the pending bill. Its viewpoint represents the thinking of an overwhelming

majority of Americans who gave more than mere lip service to the defense of this Nation. Yet in the absence of veteran leaders, I do not propose to let such insulting remarks go unchallenged.

It is ridiculous to hear many Members questioning the right of national commanders and heads of other organizations to speak in behalf of their respective organizations when these same critics on other occasions were glad to quote these leaders on various legislative proposals when they favored them.

As I have said on previous occasions, universal military training or any other legislative issue should be debated solely on its merits, with the welfare of the Nation as a whole the primary consideration. It is not a question of the number of pieces of mail received on a subject because, despite pressure campaigns, many who express their views, do so in a sincere manner and by no stretch of the imagination can it be said that they should be criticized because it happens that the mandate supports or opposes a legislative issue.

UMT AND MANPOWER

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman from Pennsylvania brought that up, as to the right of the National Commander to conduct us into the woodshed and try to tell us where to get off. I want everyone to read the speech which I have had inserted in the RECORD today, as to the conspiracy on UMT and manpower at their meeting held on the Harriman estate in New York from February 12 to 14. I will guarantee you, if you read that, that there will not be one vote for UMT when it comes up for a vote—that is, if you will absorb it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOWELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. PRESTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include an editorial.

Mr. JOHNSON.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. WITHROW) and to include a letter to Tony Martin, and also tables mentioned in the letter.

Mr. COLE of New York.

Mr. MORTON and to include an article by Dr. William Briney.

Mr. GROSS in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCGREGOR (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) on two separate instances.

Mr. VELDE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. TALLE (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCCARTHY.

Mr. BURLESON and to include a proposed substitute for the UMT bill.

Mr. CELLER in four separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGUIRE (at the request of Mr. SUTTON) and include an address by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. MCKINNON (at the request of Mr. SUTTON) in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GREEN and to include a speech made by Mr. James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO and president of the International Union or Radio and Machine Workers.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in two separate instances, in one to include a survey.

Mr. CRAWFORD to extend the remarks he made this afternoon and include a statement.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWNSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of New York and to include a resolution and an editorial.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an editorial from the Lowell Sun regarding UMT entitled "Decision Is Due."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix in five instances and also to express my great respect for the majority leader in the fine job he is doing in the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is deeply appreciated.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER and include an editorial from the front page of the Detroit News.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCCULLOCH (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of official business.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. BOW (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), indefinitely, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 4, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1211. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, transmitting the quarterly report of property acquisitions for the quarter ending December 31, 1951, pursuant to subsection 201 (h) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1212. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Croix and by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1213. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of an order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564), which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to adjust or eliminate reimbursable charges of the Government of the United States existing as debts against individual Indians or tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1214. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Alena Dolejs, file No. A-6848212 CR 29082, and requesting that it be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1215. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a survey of Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis., for deep-draft navigation improvements which would be most advantageous to the movement of iron ore. This interim report is submitted under the authority for a review of reports on Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on July 13, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 374); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1216. A letter from the Executive Officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, pursuant to Public Law 284, Seventy-first Congress (46 Stat. 482), approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSAY. Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4528. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to prohibit the transportation of fireworks into any State or political subdivision thereof in which the sale of such fireworks is prohibited; with amendment (Rept. No. 1459). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 6872. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6873. A bill to provide an increase of $5 in the maximum monthly expenditure for any individual which may be counted in determining the amount of the Federal payments to the States for old-age assistance and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6874. A bill to prohibit officers and employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue from engaging in other business, vocation, or employment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 6875. A bill for the relief of the county of Riverside, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 6876. A bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to extend to certain persons who served in the military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, the benefits of Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 6877. A bill to prohibit hunting, trapping, and fishing on public lands in violation of State or Territorial laws; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 6878. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6879. A bill to terminate Federal discriminations against the Indians of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 6880. A bill to amend the Social Security Act by increasing the old-age and survivors insurance benefits payable thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to safeguard the economic stability of the United States by imposing limitations on grants of new obligational authority for, and on expenditures during, the fiscal year 1953; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 544. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the hearings and report thereon relative to Consumers' Price Index; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. Res. 545. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives, so as to provide that no general appropriation bill shall be considered in the House until committee hearings and reports on such bill have been available for at least seven calendar days; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. Res. 546. Resolution providing funds for conducting studies and investigations created by House Resolution 158; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature requesting Congress to provide that the amount of steel to be allocated for school buildings be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature memorializing Congress to place a ceiling on the Federal Government's power to impose taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts requesting Congress to provide that the amount of steel to be allocated for school buildings be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to place a ceiling on the Federal Government's power to impose taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts requesting Congress to provide that the amount of steel to be allocated for school buildings be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to place a ceiling on the Federal Government's power to impose taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to amend the Constitution of the United States, relative to taxes on incomes, gifts, and inheritances, and providing limitations on taxes so levied, and repealing the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to uphold the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to make available facilities to take care of mentally ill veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to grant tax deduction to citizens of Georgia according to income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to provide that the amount of steel to be allocated for school buildings be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, to repeal all laws inhibiting free trade in gold in the open market; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of considering an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on income, inheritances, and gifts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUSBEY:

H. R. 6881. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vahram Uluhogian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 6882. A bill for the relief of Frank St. Charles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 6883. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Athanase Haberis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 6884. A bill for the relief of Yosiko Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

603. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Miss Alice B. Nicols, Clearwater, Minn., and others, in support of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

604. Also, petition of Rev. R. W. Selway, Buffalo, Minn., and others, in support of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

605. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Parents Committee, Atlantic Highlands, N. J., relative to requesting an investigation of the dismissal of 90 West Point cadets; to the Committee on Armed Services.

606. Also, petition of Mr. Roger Fleming, secretary, American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D. C., relative to transmitting copies of resolutions adopted at the thirty-third annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Convention, held in Chicago, Ill., December 10–13, 1951 to the Committee on Agriculture.

607. Also, petition of Mr. William H. Sullivan, Lowell, Mass., relative to denouncing the delaying action of a group of southern Congressmen in excluding textiles from distressed areas and demanding that action for a special hearing on the textile situation be expedited; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

608. Also, petition of Mrs. Susie Freeney, and others, Fellowship Center Townsend Club No. 1, Ormond Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

609. Also, petition of Harry Lamphere, and others, Winter Park, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, infinite in mercy, love, and power, we turn unfilled to Thee. For the beauty which gilds the earth, for the love which hallows our homes, for the joy which springs from work well done, we thank Thee, the source of all goodness and gladness.

At this altar of Thy grace we pause, with tasks waiting, lest with the light shining clear we turn our back upon it. If in our frantic seeking for satisfactions and solutions we find all except Thee,

we have nothing but vanity and our spirits remain still famished and athirst. To these Thy servants who, in the ministry of public service, have been called by their counsel to help lead the peoples of the earth in these perplexed days, give a right judgment in all things. Grant them the grace both to will and to do those things which are good and acceptable in Thy sight. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 3, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 29, 1952:

S. 56. An act for the relief of Francis Kueen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu;

S. 211. An act for the relief of Maria Enriquez;

S. 440. An act for the relief of Evangelos and Michael Dumas;

S. 544. An act for the relief of Joseph Rossabi, Corrine Rossabi, Mayer Rossabi, and Morris Rossabi;

S. 740. An act for the relief of Albert Walton;

S. 750. An act for the relief of Edward Chi-Kan Lam;

S. 759. An act to extend to screen vehicle contractors benefits accorded star-route contractors with respect to the renewal of contracts and adjustment of contract pay;

S. 811. An act for the relief of Mitsuko Sakata Lord;

S. 821. An act for the relief of Wong Woo, also known as William Curtis;

S. 904. An act for the relief of Roy Y. Shiomi;

S. 1133. An act for the relief of Sophie Strauss;

S. 1256. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Koppius;

S. 1359. An act for the relief of Virgine Zartarian (also known as Vergin Zartarian);

S. 1401. An act for the relief of Lore A. M. Hennessey;

S. 1462. An act for the relief of Joseph Boris Tchertkoff;

S. 1560. An act for the relief of Camilla Pintos;

S. 1683. An act for the relief of Carlos Tannoya;

S. 1844. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Carvelas;

S. 2054. An act for the relief of Tomino Naito;

S. 2172. An act for the relief of Mieko Takamine; and

S. 2271. An act for the relief of Carol Ann Hutchins (Sybille Schubert).

On March 3, 1952:

S. 607. An act for the relief of Adam Styka and Wanda Engeman Styka; and

S. 1839. An act for the relief of Willy Giroud.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CELLER, Mr. WALTER, and Mr. GRAHAM were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4337. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions;

H. R. 4410. An act to amend section 16 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relative to disqualification of legislators;

H. R. 4444. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon, containing 2 acres, more or less;

H. R. 4694. An act to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation;

H. R. 4794. An act to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4796. An act to retrocede to the State of North Carolina concurrent jurisdiction over a highway at Fort Bragg, N. C.;

H. R. 4801. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes;

H. R. 4802. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain public-improvement bonds;

H. R. 4897. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain rights of access in and to Chelsea Street in the city of Boston, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4923. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads;

H. R. 4949. An act to amend the act of February 10, 1920, so as to provide for free blank ammunition for veterans' organizations for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans, and for other ceremonial purposes;

H. R. 4965. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell and convey to Sam Arvanitis and George Arvanitis a parcel of land consisting of one-quarter acre, more or less, situated at the naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif.;

H. R. 5071. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the County of Maui, T. H., to issue public-improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream;

H. R. 5072. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public-improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings;

H. R. 5386. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes;

H. R. 5489. An act to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5609. An act to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5630. An act to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5698. An act to amend the act of September 25, 1950, so as to provide that the liability of the town of Mills, Wyo., to furnish sewerage service under such act shall not extend to future construction by the United States;

H. R. 5717. An act to provide uniform rates of pension for veterans of the Indian wars;

H. R. 6030. An act to amend the act authorizing the negotiation and ratification of certain contracts with certain Indians of the Sioux Tribe in order to extend the time for negotiation and approval of such contracts;

H. R. 6133. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6242. An act to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same;

H. R. 6675. An act to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa Unified School District for use for school purposes; and

H. R. 6854. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1710. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain right-of-way easements in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee;

S. 2078. An act to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes;

S. 2394. An act to repeal the 10 percent surcharge on postal cards; and

S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the motor-vehicle service of the Post Office Department.

UNITED NATIONS CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States,

which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 29, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
The President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I am writing to urge that the Congress complete action on legislation to authorize a United States contribution of $12,000,000 to the United Nations Children's Emergency Fund for fiscal year 1952. I ask also that the Congress take steps to authorize additional contributions of up to $12,000,000 in fiscal year 1953.

As you will recall, the General Assembly of the United Nations voted more than a year ago to extend the operation of the children's fund through December 1953. For that reason, when the authorization for United States contributions to the fund expired last June 30, I requested authorization of a contribution for the current fiscal year. Legislation for that purpose passed the Senate last session, but is still pending in the House. I earnestly hope that the House will join with the Senate in approving this authorization, so this Government may continue to support the children's fund. And since the pending legislation covers only the current fiscal year, ending next June 30, I hope the Congress will add authority for additional contributions in the coming fiscal year.

Only if the Congress takes these actions now will we be able to continue financial support for the children's fund. Only in this way can we honor the decision of the United Nations to keep this important program going until the end of 1953.

I know that the Congress recognizes the good work the children's fund has done in the past in helping to meet urgent needs of children in many countries around the world. The fund has directly reached at least 42,000,000 children in 64 countries and territories. Its work is closely coordinated with that of the World Health Organization and the Food and Agriculture Organization and has provided a vital supplement to their programs. The fund is now placing emphasis on work in the less developed countries, primarily to help them establish permanent programs to aid their children. At the same time, the fund is continuing direct aid to children caught in sudden emergencies like the recent flood in the Po Valley of Italy, or the recent typhoons in the Philippines.

The United States has supported the children's fund since it was first set up by the United Nations. At its recent meeting in Paris, the General Assembly of the United Nations urgently requested all countries to continue their support for the remainder of the fund's existence. This gives us a real opportunity—an opportunity to help children, in many concrete, practical ways. I am confident the people of this country will want to take full advantage of that opportunity. I urge the Congress to act on these authorizations without delay.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the session of the Senate tomorrow. I am flying to California tonight, and will fly back tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from California is excused.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Alena Dolejs from a report transmitted to the Senate on January 15, 1951, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of her immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSPORTATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF MAILS ON MOTOR-VEHICLE ROUTES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO UNLOADING OF MAIL FROM VESSELS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1699, title 18, United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN CHARGES DUE BY INDIVIDUAL INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Legislative Assembly and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, for the period October 1, 1951, through December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquired by that Administration, for the quarter ended December 31, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including the period ended December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITION

A letter from the executive officer, National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisition by the Commission, for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolutions requesting Congress to provide that the amount of steel to be allocated for school buildings be increased.

"Whereas the United States Office of Education is of the opinion that 600,000 new classrooms will be needed in the United States within the next 7 years; and

"Whereas the present classroom deficiency is resulting in serious overcrowding, detrimental to high educational standards; and

"Whereas our history from the earliest times has demonstrated that our strength as a free nation lies in a well-educated citizenry; and

"Whereas the National Production Authority has denied 63 percent of the construction applications submitted to it in the last quarter of 1951, and may deny a higher percentage of such applications in 1952: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts petitions Congress to direct the National Production Authority to increase greatly the amount of steel allocated for school buildings; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted February 7, 1952.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In Senate, adopted in concurrence February 20, 1952.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance.

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to place a ceiling on the Federal Government's power to impose taxes

"Whereas a limiting of the power of the Federal Government to impose taxes on the people would automatically curtail Government spending; and

"Whereas if we withhold our money our officials cannot carry us into socialism or communism; and

"Whereas a limiting of spending by our Government would enable our elected officials to resist requests from those who exert great pressure for bigger hand-outs; and

"Whereas most of our States and municipalities are subjected to limitations in their ability to tax, to the end that they are sound while the Federal Government is almost bankrupt; and

"Whereas we have ceilings on everything but taxes: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the Constitution of the United States to the end that all taxes levied and collected in any one year shall not exceed a certain and reasonable percentage of the national income for the nearest preceding calendar year for which figures are available, with a special provision to provide moneys for military emergencies; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, February 7, 1952.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"In Senate, adopted, in concurrence, February 20, 1952.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk."

A resolution adopted by the West Roxbury (Mass.) Citizens' Association, relating to Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter from Harrison G. Travis, chairman of the Parents' Committee on West Point Dismissals, Atlantic Highlands, N. J., transmitting a petition of that committee praying for an investigation of the dismissals of 90 West Point cadets (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Mothers' Club of Public School 91, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House bill 4544, to improve the enforcement of the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Lions Club of San German, Puerto Rico, favoring the appointment of Clemente Ruiz Nazario judge of the district court of the United States in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of North Detroit, Mich., relating to the conduct of certain holders of public office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Woman's Society of Christian Service, Methodist Church, Princeton, Ky., signed by Mrs. S. D. Catlett, Secretary, and Mrs. Frank K. Wylee, Christian Social Relations Chairman, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide universal military training, and so forth; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 2697) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1254) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 4, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1710. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain right-of-way easements in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee;

S. 2078. An act to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes;

S. 2394. An act to repeal the 10 percent surcharge on postal cards; and

S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the motor-vehicle service of the Post Office Office Department.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2778. A bill for the relief of Thomas Kominos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 2779. A bill for the relief of settlers on the International Strip at Nogales, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2780. A bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian Hospitals to the United States Public Health Service; to the Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2781. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to prohibit all carriers and freight forwarders subject to such act from using any undue or unreasonable discrimination in supplying transportation under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 2782. A bill to amend paragraph (4) of section 15 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2783. A bill for the relief of Francesco Palumbo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2784. A bill for the relief of certain Yugoslavs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2785. A bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES AND HOSPITALS TO PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the United States Public Health Service. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement with reference to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

The bill (S. 2780) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the United States Public Health Service, introduced by Mr. THYE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. THYE. The bill which I have introduced, and a companion bill to be introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, are based on the recommendations of the Association of State and Territorial Authorities, who urged this measure to improve the standards of Indian health services and hospitals, and to develop a more effective arrangement between Federal and State health agencies in public health programs. Dr. A. J. Chesley, secretary and executive officer of the Minnesota Department of Health, is chairman of the association's special committee on Indian health services, and the committee includes the State health officers of Arizona, California, Colorado, Idaho, Mississippi, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and South Dakota.

In addition to the health officers' group, the American Public Health Association, Governors' Interstate Conference on Indian Affairs, the Inter-Tribal Council of the Sioux Nations, and a number of State and interstate groups have endorsed the principle of the bill and have urged supplementary legislation to provide for Federal and State integration of health services to the Indians.

The basic purpose of these measures is to improve the health services to our Indian people. The introduction of the specific bills transferring the Indian health service and hospitals to the United States Public Health Service will permit the Government agencies to present their points of view as well as the various public health groups and State medical officials.

Bringing the health services for the Indians under the same agency that serves the public at large is a step in the direction of integration of our Indian people in our common life. It also is in keeping with recommendations of the Hoover Commission, although it does not go so far as to bring all health services under a single new Department of Health.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the Association of State and Territorial Authorities on November 28, 1951, with reference to the proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Bureau of Indian Affairs is responsible for the operation of 62 hospitals in continental United States and Alaska for the exclusive care of American Indians and is obligated to staff these hospitals with physicians and nurses to provide adequate public health services, medical and hospital care for the protection and promotion of the health of Indians; and

Whereas the low salaries paid physicians serving in Indian hospitals under civil service appointments; the isolation of Indian service stations where consultant service is unavailable; the lack of postgraduate training to prepare physician employees for specialty boards, and other factors have made it impossible for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to recruit professional personnel to adequately staff Indian hospitals at any time over a period of many years, and

Whereas none of the 62 hospitals now operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs is recognized by the American Medical Association for the training of internes or otherwise as teaching hospitals; and

Whereas the lack of adequate medical care and public health and hospital facilities and services for the care of Indians is contributing to unusually high disease and death rates among the American Indians as a racial group: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers endorses and recommends the transfer, by legislative action, of all health activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the United States Public Health Service, the public (field) health services to be made a responsibility of the respective States in which Indians reside, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs hospitals to be staffed and operated by the Public Health Service as United States Public Health Service hospitals; and be it further

Resolved, That the president, Association of State and Territorial Health Officers, appoint a special committee of the association to encourage, foster, promote, and secure implementation of the association's expressed policy on Indian health services and secure the introduction of necessary legislation in the January 1952 meeting of the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the conference of State Governors be advised of and requested to support the expressed policy of the association; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution, together with a supporting statement, be transmitted to the American Medical Association, National Health Council, National Tuberculosis Association, Governor's Interstate Conference on Indian Affairs, American Public Health Association, National Congress of American Indians, Association on American Indian Affairs, and governor of each State and Territory.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT, RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF BOARDS OF REVIEW—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2730) to amend section 301, Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to further limit the jurisdiction of boards of review established under that section, which I now send to the desk, and that it be referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

It is the sense of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare that this measure properly comes within the scope and jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2470. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the disposition, allocation, diversion, and apportionment of the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4410. An act to amend section 16 of the Hawaiian Organic Act relative to disqualification of legislators;

H. R. 4694. An act to repeal certain legislation relating to the Gallup-Durango Highway and the Gallup-Window Rock Highway at the Navajo Indian Reservation;

H. R. 4794. An act to facilitate the development of building materials in Alaska through the removal of volcanic ash from portions of Katmai National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4801. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the city and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for flood-control purposes;

H. R. 4802. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the city and County of Honolulu to issue certain public-improvement bonds;

H. R. 4923. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu to issue certain bonds for the construction of the Kalihi tunnel and its approach roads;

H. R. 5071. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of flood-control projects on Iao stream;

H. R. 5072. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the county of Maui, T. H., to issue public improvement bonds for the construction of new public-school buildings;

H. R. 5386. An act to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, to issue bonds for acquisition of real property for public-school purposes and for construction and replacement of buildings for public-school purposes;

H. R. 5489. An act to approve repayment contracts negotiated with the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district, to authorize their execution by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5630. An act to approve a repayment contract negotiated with the Frenchtown irrigation district, Montana, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6133. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 6242. An act to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same; and

H. R. 6675. An act to authorize the conveyance of lands in the Hoopa Valley Indian Reservation to the State of California or to the Hoopa Unified School District for use for school purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 4387. An act to authorize certain land and other property transactions; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. R. 4444. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., a parcel of land in the said city of Macon, containing 2 acres, more or less;

H. R. 4796. An act to retrocede to the State of North Carolina concurrent jurisdiction over a highway at Fort Bragg, N. C.;

H. R. 4897. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to surrender and convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts certain rights of access in and to Chelsea Street in the city of Boston, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4949. An act to amend the act of February 10, 1920, so as to provide for free blank ammunition for veterans' organizations for use in connection with the funeral ceremonies of deceased veterans, and for other ceremonial purposes; and

H. R. 4965. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell and convey to Sam Arvanitis and George Arvanitis a parcel of land consisting of one-quarter acre, more or less, situated at the naval ammunition and net depot, Seal Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 5609. An act to amend section 1716 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the transmission of poisons in the mails to persons or concerns having scientific use therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 5717. An act to provide uniform rates of pension for veterans of the Indian wars; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6854. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and funds available for the Export-Import Bank of Washington for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

A statement prepared by him regarding the two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

A statement prepared by him regarding the award to an American journalist of the second annual William the Silent prize.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:
Statement prepared by him in commemoration of the two hundred and fourth anniversary of the birth of Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:
Excerpts from an address delivered by the Honorable Len Jordan, Governor of Idaho, at the dinner of the Society of American Foresters, on November 29, 1951.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:
Address delivered by Eric Johnston at brotherhood dinner, Dallas, Tex., on March 3, 1952.

By Mr. MURRAY:
Article entitled "A National Health Program for a Stronger America," written by William Green, and published in the February 1952 issue of the American Federationist.

By Mr. THYE:
Letter addressed to him by Mr. Elmer V. Erickson, president of the Cambridge State Bank, Cambridge, Minn., on the subject of oleomargarine.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:
Editorial entitled "The GOP Share in Asia Policy," published in the Los Angeles Times of February 23, 1952.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
Editorial entitled "Scandal in Agriculture," published in the March 1952 issue of the Farm Journal.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:
Two editorials on compulsory military conscription appearing in the March issue of Progress magazine.

By Mr. WILEY:
Article from the Wisconsin Alumnus magazine on the spiritual role of American universities.

By Mr. ECTON:
Editorial entitled "Tidelands and the Senate," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 1, 1952.

By Mr. CAIN:
Two articles written by Paul Flowers in his column Greenhouse, published in the Memphis Commercial Appeal of February 15 and 16, 1952.

By Mr. ANDERSON:
Editorial entitled "We'll Take MONRONEY," published in the Steamboat Pilot, Steamboat Springs, Colo., February 21, 1952.

By Mr. LONG:
Article entitled "Alaska Upholds SMATHERS," written by Haines Colbert, and published in a recent issue of the Miami Daily News.

BRUTAL TREATMENT OF NUNS BY CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, one of the first principles of business and political undertakings is to understand and evaluate properly the person or persons with whom one is dealing. Certainly, with reference to the present world-wide dealings of the United States with the U. S. S. R. and the various Communist-dominated governments of the world, it is essential that our responsible officials and the citizens of our country recognize thoroughly the type of opponents with whom we have to contend.

Unless there is such understanding and appreciation of the character of our foes there is not only grave danger, but it is almost inevitable, that the United States will find itself in the position where honesty and sincerity are met with duplicity. The net result will be that our efforts for peace and for better understanding among the nations of the world will be turned to our own harm and possible ruin.

All this is suggested by occurrences of recent months in Communist China with regard to treatment of foreign religious personnel. The case is of the utmost significance in that it reflects not merely an isolated instance, but rather a concerted plan. The immediate inspiration for such occurrences, of course, is the Communist hatred of all who seek to stop their world aggression. The ultimate goal, however, clearly is the overthrow of all democratic processes both here and throughout the world, and the destruction of all religion as well.

Reports from China in late December told of brutal treatment accorded three members of a religious sisterhood, one of whom had been doing missionary work in China for more than three decades. As part of their dedicated task, these sisters had conducted an orphanage and homes for old men and old women, in addition to teaching in the schools.

In line with Communist efforts to discredit all foreigners, and particularly those associated with religious endeavors, these three sisters, one 76 years old, were confined to their quarters, along with other religious, for 3 months or more, part of the time without heat, in the bitter Manchurian winter, before they finally were ordered deported.

Before this order was carried out, however, the three sisters in question, according to reports, were forced to stand before a howling mob from 9 o'clock in the morning until 8 in the evening, alongside a wood fire, which they were told was for the purpose of burning them to death.

During these long hours the members of the Communist-incited crowd threatened the sisters, spat in their faces, and knocked down and trampled several friendly soldiers and villagers who tried to protect them.

At 7 in the evening a security police squad appeared. The officer in charge quickly dismissed the throng with a few words, a dispersal which unquestionably could have been effected at any time during the day had the authorities so desired.

In order to check the authenticity of the report I have just quoted, I have been in touch with the American Consul General at Hong Kong, Mr. Walter P. McConaughy. In a letter to me from Hong Kong Mr. McConaughy gives the names of the three sisters involved, and verifies the report that these religious were taken from the quarters to which they had been confined by a mob and forced to stand and endure the insults during the course of an entire day. All three of the nuns were later deported, Mr. McConaughy reported, and have arrived in Hong Kong.

I bring the matter to the attention of the Senate formally today in order that it may be made a part of the accumulating record of Communist brutality, to the end that we may thus be more fully apprized of the disposition and tactics of the officials of Red China, with whom we now are attempting to come to terms on a reasoned and just basis.

In all relations with such people, it must be kept in mind that any agreement reached, any point discussed, should be on the basis of a true appreciation of the nature of those who sit on the opposite side of the table, and without whose good faith any mutual compacts are the grossest mockeries.

Mr. President, I now desire to refer briefly to another subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland has the floor.

NOMINATION OF WATSON B. MILLER

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I applaud the nomination by the President of the United States of Watson B. Miller, former Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization and later Federal Security Administrator, to the Subversive Activities Control Board. This nomination will meet with general approval by all who are familiar with Mr. Miller's excellent record of Government service.

Now that the Senate Judiciary Committee has approved the nomination of Mr. Miller, I hope the Senate will give early and favorable consideration to this outstanding appointment. Because of his long experience in immigration and other activities, he is particularly well qualified to deal with various problems and questions in connection with subversive activities which he will undoubtedly be called upon to consider as a member of the Board.

Having been impressed with Mr. Miller's ability and integrity in my contacts with him, I am highly gratified at the committee's approval. The nomination is now on the Executive Calendar of the Senate, and I look forward to its early approval.

NINETEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST INAUGURATION OF FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is the nineteenth anniversary of the first inauguration of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt. I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to speak briefly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is March 4. Until 1937, it was inauguration day for Presidents of the United States, in every fourth year. But the twentieth amendment changed inauguration day to January 20.

We may note that 19 years ago today a new President took his oath of office, standing on the steps of this Capitol Building. On that day, that President said, among other things, words which will live as long as courage itself endures:

> The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance.

In those words, Franklin D. Roosevelt sounded the keynote of an administration which did, in fact, convert retreat

into advance, and which infused the entire Nation with a new vigor and vitality, with a new strength and dynamism, which made possible, in my judgment, the preservation to this day of western civilization against forces which were gathering then and still threaten today.

For 19 years the political philosophy which Franklin Roosevelt codified and vitalized has animated the Government of the United States.

That philosophy was and is based on the assumption that government must, within constitutional limits, act to encourage the natural forces of the people, both in work and in the enjoyment of the fruits of work.

The powers of government must be used to protect the inherent rights of the weak, and at the same time to encourage the enterprise of the strong.

It has been an axiom of this philosophy of government that this Nation, in all its sections and regions, in all its groups, classes, and institutions, is an integrated unit, and that the welfare of each depends upon the welfare of all.

It has further been the philosophy of the Democratic administrations that the greatest resource of this Nation is its people, their vigor, their well-being, their faith in their country, and their faith in themselves, as individuals, with inalienable rights and God-given dignity.

And, finally, the Democratic administrations comprehended the fact that the welfare and security and peace of the United States cannot be separated from the welfare, security, and peace of the world, and that if we are to remain free, and secure, and prosperous, we must devote our strength and energies to whatever degree necessary to help bring security, order, and justice to all the world—in a concert of free and equal nations, in a community of free and equal peoples.

Whatever some may think or say about the deeds of Franklin Roosevelt and of his administration, and of his successor, President Truman, and of his administration, certain truths are undeniable.

The Democratic administrations have held the confidence of the American people for 19 years, through five successive Presidential elections.

In these 19 years America has progressed from a nation of uncertain authority in world affairs to the acknowledged leader of the entire free world, in whom reposes the principal hope for the survival of freedom and of western civilization.

In those 19 years America has grown in productive strength almost threefold—an unprecedented expansion in all the history of nations.

In those 19 years, the average standard of living, the actual standard of consumption of food and goods, has been raised to a level more than twice what it was in 1933.

In those 19 years, the savings of the people have increased four times what they were in 1933.

In those 19 years, the national income has increased seven times what it was in 1933.

In those 19 years, starvation, as such, has been eliminated from our midst.

In those 19 years actual employment has almost doubled.

In those 19 years the production of steel has trebled, the production of foodstuffs has increased 60 percent, and the production of oil has tripled.

A body of laws has been enacted which, although violently attacked and bitterly criticized at the time of their original consideration, have passed beyond the realm of controversy, and are accepted today by all parties as essential parts of the institution of American law.

Such a law is the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation law.

Such a law is the Securities and Exchange Act.

Such a law is the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Such a law is the Utilities Holding Company Act.

Such a law is the Social Security Act.

Such a law is the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

Such a law is the Soil Conservation Act.

Such a law is the Robinson-Patman Act.

Such a law is the Commodities Exchange Act.

Such a law is the Federal Housing Act.

Such a law is the Hill-Burton Act.

I could name many similar laws, and some more recent than these.

I shall not here today undertake to summarize the actual and undeniable accomplishments of the past 19 years in the field of international relations.

Some of these developments were of lasting nature; some were aimed at particular situations, and successfully met those situations. The results of those policies and programs are apparent in our survival as a free Nation and in the survival of the free world, first against the aggressive assault of Fascist and militarist imperialism, and more recently against the assault and continuing threat of Communist imperialism.

I might refer only in passing to the Philippine Independence Act, which set a new pattern of freedom for dependent peoples, to the destroyer-for-bases agreement, under which we still have, and for 90 years to come, base rights in Atlantic islands and territories under the British flag, to the Lend-Lease Act, to the military assistance agreements with Greece and Turkey, to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, to the Point 4 program, to the United Nations, itself.

These are milestones or monuments, as the case may be. They point the way to peace and security in the future, as they made possible victory over aggression in the past.

Mr. President, 19 years have passed since the fearless man, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, bade his countrymen be without fear, and to march forward to the new goals that he outlined for them.

In 1936, the same President said:

> This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny.

And in 1945, on the eve of his death, he wrote:

> The only limit to our realizations of tomorrow will be our doubts of today. Let us move forward with strong and active faith.

This strong and active faith and this concept of a rendezvous with destiny have animated President Truman and the present administration in the years since the death of President Roosevelt.

There may have been times—there undoubtedly have been—when we have fallen short of the mark, when our deeds have been well below the lofty standards which we have set, and to which we adhere. But these have been and still are our standards and goals. And the record of achievement is available for all to read. It cannot be denied. It cannot be brushed away.

Nineteen years of the New Deal and the Fair Deal—19 years of progress for our people and our country—19 years of successful conflict against terrible forces of evil which, had we not been strong, had we lacked the faith and courage, would surely have overwhelmed us.

Indeed, today, as our great leader said 19 years ago, we have nothing to fear but fear itself. Our country is strong. Our country is great. But greater than strength, greater than greatness itself, is our faith in the worth of men and women, and in the freedom of mankind.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF REPUBLICAN PARTY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, this morning the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] made some very fine complimentary remarks in regard to the programs and developments under the recent Democratic administrations. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD following his remarks a record of some of the achievements of the Republican Party since 1861.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY TO NATIONAL WELFARE AND EXPANSION

I. THE REPUBLICAN RECORD: A SUMMARY

Republican principles

The Republican Party was originated in 1854 as the political group dedicated to the freedom of the individual and the safeguard of his inalienable rights. It has since remained steadfastly devoted to these basic American principles—free initiative, free enterprise, and the dignity of the average man. More than ever the deep significance of the Republican stand for constitutionalism, States' rights, encouragement of American enterprise, and a minimum of Government interference with freedom of opportunity, becomes apparent today when the extent to which these principles have been slyly whittled down by the Democratic Party is realized.

Republican progress

The Republican Party has a long and honorable history of majority control of this country during the most expansive period of its development. Between 1861 and 1933, Republican Presidents were in office three-fourths of the time. They shaped governmental policy which encouraged the development of the country's vast resources, built up its defenses, created its national banking system, established a currency which circulated throughout the world on a par with

gold, made the credit of the country the best in the world, formulated during the expansion period a protective tariff system which made this country the leader among all nations in agriculture, mining, and manufacturing—in short made the United States the No. 1 Nation of the world.

Republican achievements since 1933

Relegated to a minority position in the Federal Government since 1933, the Republican Party has remained true to its basic principles, cooperating in the development of constructive legislation and action to meet changing and new conditions, and opposing the trend of the New Deal and Democratic administration toward a regimented economy and collectivist state. Republicans have consistently opposed executive usurpation of power and fought for the retention or recapture of congressional powers and prerogatives and the maintenance of an independent judiciary. They have fought New Deal deficit spending and exposed Democratic mismanagement, waste and graft. Although Republicans opposed some of the foreign policy and so-called national-defense measures which the Democratic administration alleged would keep us out of war, when war came Republicans joined unstintingly in the war effort. With the end of the war the Republicans have assured a leading role in the move for international peace through the United Nations, and in the attempt to develop an aggressive foreign policy to protect American interests in accordance with American principles and ideals.

II. ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATIONS, 1854–1932

Labor and social welfare

1863: Emancipation Proclamation, freeing the slaves, signed by President Abraham Lincoln.

1865: Thirteenth amendment to the Constitution, abolishing slavery, declared ratified.

1868: Fourteenth amendment, providing that citizenship rights be not abridged, declared ratified.

1870: Fifteenth amendment, guaranteeing equal rights for white and colored citizens, declared ratified.

1884: Original Bureau of Labor established under the Interior Department.

1890: Sherman Anti-Trust Act passed, outlawing combinations in restraint of trade, thus protecting labor as consumers and affording greater job opportunity through increased competition.

1898: Erdman Act passed, providing for mediation and conciliation in the settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees, and prohibiting the discharge of railroad employees for trade-union membership.

1903: Department of Commerce and Labor established.

1903–8: Important prosecution commenced against trusts.

1907: First limitation-of-hours legislation for rail carriers.

1908: Workmen's Compensation Act passed for railroad employees and another for Government employees.

1911: Of 10 States passing valid workmen's compensation laws (three had previously been passed in other States, but declared unconstitutional) six were Republican States and four had Republican leadership in some branch.

1912: Children's Bureau established, following passage of child labor laws in many Republican States.

1913: Department of Commerce and Labor split into two separate units each with Cabinet status.

1923: Twelve years before the Federal Social Security Act, Republican Montana was the first State to enact a valid old-age assistance program.

1924: Child Labor Amendment passed by Republican Congress and submitted to the States for ratification.

1925: Arbitration Act of 1925 passed, making valid and enforceable all written agreements for arbitration of disputes arising out of contracts, maritime transactions or commerce among the States or Territories, or with foreign nations.

1926: Railway Labor Act of 1926 passed, establishing the United States Board of Mediation and Arbitration. Regarded as model for subsequent labor legislation.

1927: Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers Compensation Act of 1927 passed providing compensation for service-connected disability or death in certain maritime employments.

1928: Workmen's Compensation and Child Labor Acts for the District of Columbia passed.

1929: Convict Labor Act of 1929 passed, protecting workers from the competition of free prison labor.

1931: Bacon-Davis Act passed, providing for the payment of the prevailing rate of wages to all laborers employed on Government construction projects.

1932: Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act passed, restricting the use of injunctions against labor picketing and boycotts, also outlawing "yellow-dog" contracts.

1932: The State of Wisconsin, Republican-led, enacted the first State unemployment compensation law.

1932: Of the 19 States passing old-age assistance laws prior to 1932, 10 were completely controlled by Republicans and only 3 by Democrats; 5 had Republican legislatures and 1, a Republican Governor and nonpartisan legislature.

Civil service

1871: First civil-service law passed.

1883: Civil Service Act of 1883 established the merit system in the Federal Government.

1920: Republican Congress passed first Civil Service Retirement Act.

1923: Classification Act of 1923 greatly implemented the original act, equalizing pay levels for similar grades of jobs throughout the Government.

1924: Rogers Act unified the Foreign Service and gave impetus to career officials.

1930: Civil Service Retirement Act of 1920 amended and expanded.

Agriculture and conservation

1862: United States Department of Agriculture established.

1862: First Homestead Act passed, giving land to all who would develop it.

1862: First Morrill Act passed assigning to each State a share of the public lands for the support of agricultural and mechanical education.

1890: Weather Bureau established, then in the Department of Agriculture.

1891: National forest system begun, initiating a far-reaching program of conservation.

1902: Reclamation Act of 1902 passed.

1902: Federal regulation of oleomargarine established, to protect dairy farmers.

1905: Animal Quarantine Act passed.

1905: United States Forest Service established to promote the conservation and best use of the Nation's forest reserves.

1906: Pure Food and Drug Act passed, providing for the regulation of traffic in adulterated, misbranded or poisonous foods, medicines and liquors.

1907: Meat Inspection Act passed.

1910: Two important conservation measures signed, one separating the surface of agricultural lands on the public domain from the mineral rights beneath; the other withdrawing water power sites from entry.

1911: Weeks Act signed, requiring additional conservation of water and forest supplies.

1921: Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 enacted for the purpose of regulating interstate and foreign commerce in livestock and dairy products.

1922: Capper-Volstead Act signed, authorizing the association of producers of agricultural products.

1923: Agricultural Credits Act of 1923 passed, providing additional credit facilities for the agricultural and livestock industry.

1924: Dairy Bureau set up in the Department of Agriculture.

1926: McNary-Haugen bill enacted, creating a Division of Cooperative Marketing in the Department of Agriculture, and providing for the study and promotion of cooperative principles and practices among farmers.

1929: Agricultural Marketing Act established the Federal Farm Board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce on the basis of economic equality with other industries.

1930: Federal Farm Board converted into an emergency relief agency for farmers.

1932: Agricultural Credit Bankers created to make Federal funds available for farm production and livestock.

Tariffs and foreign trade

1890: Principle of true reciprocity originated in the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890, under which United States trade prospered.

1897: Dingley Tariff Act of 1897 gave further impetus to the American market in farm and manufactured goods.

1909: Payne-Aldrich Tariff Act reduced rates.

1921: Emergency Antidumping Act provided protection of American industry from cheap foreign goods.

1922: Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act readjusted protective tariff rates, so that in the decade from 1921–1930 both exports and imports soared to unprecedented peacetime levels.

1930: Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930 (much maligned and misrepresented by the Democrats), provided added protection for the American farmer in particular, and firmly established the flexible tariff provision fixing as the national standard of tariff the difference between the cost of production at home and abroad.

Interstate commerce and railroads

1906: Hepburn Act passed, amending the Interstate Commerce Act, to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission and authorize the Commissioners, on application, to pass upon the reasonableness of railway rates.

1920: Railroad Transportation Act of 1920 passed by a Republican Congress (signed by a Democratic President), to provide for the termination of Federal control over railroads, for settlement of disputes between carriers and their employees, and unification of railroad systems.

Finance and currency

1863: National Banking Act passed, authorizing the formation of local banking associations under Federal authority, to produce notes on the basis of United States bonds up to 90 percent of the par value.

1865: By 1865 the party of sound money had completed its program with passage of an act imposing a 10-percent tax on all State bank notes to wipe them out in a single stroke. Thus during the difficult days of a Civil War the Republican Party succeeded in completely revamping the tottering financial structure of the Nation, founding a sound national banking system.

1875: The act of 1875, providing for the resumption of specie payments on January 1, 1879, had the immediate effect of increasing the value of United States currency and of improving the credit of the Government.

1898: Bankruptcy Act of 1898 established uniform bankruptcy laws for the Nation.

1900: Gold Standard Act put the United States on the gold standard.

1909: Sixteenth amendment to the Constitution authorizing Federal income taxes submitted to the States; declared ratified in 1913.

1910: Postal savings system established.

1931: National Credit Association established to protect the savings of bank depositors.

1932: Reconstruction Finance Corporation created to protect savings and credit and provide relief loans.

1932: Federal system of home loan banks set up to encourage home building and save homes from foreclosure.

Women's suffrage

1919: Republican Congress passed and sent to the States for ratification the nineteenth, or women's suffrage amendment to the Constitution, declared in effect August 26, 1920. (Majority of the States ratifying were Republican States.)

Territorial expansion

1867: Alaska purchased from Russia for $7,200,000 in gold—an acquisition not only vital to United States defenses, but also rich in fish, furs, timber, coal, and precious metals.

1867: Midway Islands acquired, 1,300 miles west and north of Hawaii—another vital link in United States Pacific defenses. (The great sea battle of Midway, a turning point in World War II, was fought near these islands, used as a land base for United States planes.)

1898: Hawaiian Islands voluntarily joined the United States.

1898: Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippine Islands bought for $20,000,000 from the oppressive control of Spain.

1904: Unfinished Panama Canal purchased from its French operators for $40,000,000 subsequently opened in 1915.

Foreign relations

(NOTE.—Throughout its history, the Republican Party has stood for the Monroe Doctrine; for United States sovereignty without indifference to the rights of and needs of others; for cooperation without entangling alliances; for peace and trade with all powers, especially those of the Western Hemisphere; and for strong defenses, particularly an undefeatable Navy.)

1861–65: Open-door policy in the Orient initiated by Secretary of State Seward, crystalized by Secretary of State John Hay in 1899.

1871: Controversy between the United States and Great Britain over the claims arising out of the activities of the British-built steamship *Alabama* during the Civil War finally settled, with Britain agreeing to pay $15,500,000 damages.

1871: Treaty of Washington negotiated, providing for the Geneva arbitration tribunal and the settlement of the Northwest boundary and fishery disputes. This removed the most dangerous causes of friction between Great Britain and the United States and did much to cement friendly relations between the two nations.

1880: Until about 1880, Republican policy was to open the doors of immigration wide in order to build up the country. Beginning about 1880, restrictions were put in effect to prevent the influx of cheap oriental labor and the importation of alien contract labor, which was beginning to break down the high standard of living developed under United States industrial leadership of the world.

1881: Modern pan-American movement started by Secretary of State Blaine who issued invitations to all independent countries in North and South America to participate in a general congress in 1882 to discuss methods of preventing war between the nations of America. First conference actually materialized in 1889. The first six Inter-American Conferences 1899, 1901–02, 1906, 1910, 1923, and 1928, were held under Republican administrations.

1890: Pan-American Union established in Washington, at first known as the "Bureau of American Republics."

1898: Spanish-American War quickly terminated by well-prepared United States Navy kept at adequate strength at all times by Republican policy.

1899: United States party to the Hague Convention of 1899, which set up machinery (Permanent Court of Arbitration) for pacific settlement of international disputes.

1907: Secretary of State Elihu Root first used the phrase "good neighbor" in respect to our Latin-American policy.

1901–09: Foreign relations of United States materially strengthened by speak-softly-and-carry-a-big-stick policy of President Theodore Roosevelt.

1922: Washington Conference on Limitations of Armaments held. Looking back, in 1935 President Franklin Roosevelt said of this conference:

"The Washington Naval Conference of 1922 brought to the world the first important voluntary agreement for limitation and reduction of armament. It stands out as a milestone in civilization."

1923–30: Successful negotiations completed for an annual return on war debts owed to the United States.

1928: Kellogg-Briand Pact for outlawing war signed.

1930: Important London Naval Limitation Conference called, resulting in modifications of the Washington Conference agreements of 1922.

1931: One-year moratorium on intergovernmental debts established.

1932: World Economic Conference of 1933 proposed as a means of settling world problems which eventually swelled and festered into a Second World War. (The Conference was later torpedoed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who came to power just before the Conference was held in London.)

1933: "On the 4th of March 1933"—when the Democrat President took over—"the world picture was an image of substantial peace," in Roosevelt's own words of January 3, 1936. This was the condition of our foreign affairs as the Republican Party turned over control to the Democrats in 1933.

III. REPUBLICAN ACHIEVEMENTS SINCE 1933

1933: Principle of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, proposed by Republican Senator Arthur Vandenberg, embodied in the Banking Act of June 16, 1933, in face of the expressed opposition of President Roosevelt.

1937: Defeat of the President's February 5, 1937, attempt to pack the Supreme Court in one of the most intellectually dishonest proposals ever to issue from a Chief Executive.

1937: Defeat of the President's Reorganization Plan of January 12, 1937, which would have destroyed independent agencies of the Government and created virtual Presidential dictation over quasi-judicial units.

1939: Revision of the social-security program to liberalize benefits and to eliminate fraudulent full-reserve plan in favor of pay-as-you-go basis; freezing of payroll taxes at prevailing 1-percent level to save future taxes.

1939: Repeal of destructive taxes on undistributed profits, freeing private enterprise at least partially from New Deal shackles to recovery.

1939: Forcing of a congressional investigation into the notoriously biased National Labor Relations Board.

1939: Exposing and curbing of corruption and political racketeering in the administration of Federal relief, resulting in passage of the Hatch Act, making it illegal for Federal-office holders to take active part in any political campaign.

1939: Defeat of the gigantic $3,800,000,000 spend-lend program to prevent more of the taxpayers' funds from being poured into bottomless New Deal chutes.

1939: Defeat of the administration's efforts to discredit the work of the Dies committee and disband its organization, in spite of its success in tightening compulsory deportation laws and in calling attention to the widespread existence of alien sabotage.

1941: Impetus for the creation of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program (popularly known as the Truman or Mead committee) came originally from the revelations of waste produced by the efforts of Republican Representative Albert Engel, who in 1940 conducted a one-man whirlwind tour of Army camps and later defense plants, unearthing evidence of appalling scandals of waste in Government funds.

1942: Introduction by Republican Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS of bill establishing the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps.

1942: Free postage for servicemen proposed in Republican amendment to War Powers Act; killed by a parliamentary maneuver of Democrats and a Democrat measure substituted.

1942: War-contract renegotiation law resulting in savings of billions of dollars initiated by Republican Representative FRANCIS CASE.

1943: Economy drive resulted in liquidation of wasteful and unnecessary WPA, NYA, and NRPB (National Resources Planning Board), as well as paring down of nonessential civilian expenditures.

1943: Repeal of the President's unauthorized limitation on salaries to $25,000 after taxes.

1943: Enactment of wartime antistrike legislation demanded by the public over the President's veto. Blocked appointment of "Paving Block" Edward J. Flynn, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, as United States Minister to Australia.

1943: Sponsorship of the modified Ruml pay-as-you-go tax plan. Narrowly missed putting United States completely on a current tax basis, succeeded in accomplishing the change-over with a 25 percent penalty added by Democrats.

1943: Fulfillment of watchdog function through committees such as the Republican Food Study Committee which tried to prevent administration muddling of the food-supply program, helped to develop constructive legislation, and policies for handling war-food problems.

1943: Curb on the arbitrary powers of OPA by prohibiting grade labeling and by checking the bureaucratic administration of the agency by inexperienced college professors.

1943: Opposing buck passing of current food bills to future taxpayers by opposing subsidies to processors for food-price rollbacks.

1943: Led the movement for United States participation in an international organization by adoption of Mackinac declaration.

1944: Protection of States' rights and the full-voting privileges of absentee servicemen by modification of the soldier vote bill to provide full State ballots instead of a bobtailed Federal ballot.

1944: Unanimous effort to expedite the GI bill of rights of 1944.

1945: Obtained severance of the vast lending powers of the RFC and other lending agencies from the Department of Commerce to prevent Henry Wallace from obtaining control over them; and spearheaded successful move to reject former WPA Deputy Administrator Aubrey Williams as Rural Electrification Administrator.

1945: Opposed the President's work-or-fight manpower-control bill which was eventually killed.

1945: Whittling down the propaganda activities and expense of the Office of War Information.

1945: Obtained provision in lend-lease extension against use of the lend-lease program for postwar relief, rehabilitation, or reconstruction abroad.

1945: Dominated the enactment of the Tax Reduction Act which reduced taxes by nearly $6,000,000,000, exempted 12,000,000 low-income individuals from income-tax payments, reduced personal income taxes about 22 percent, lowered corporation taxes, and eliminated excess-profits taxes.

1945: Blocked the administration's demand for increased unemployment benefits and greater Federal control of the unemployment-compensation program which was largely based upon erroneous estimates of widespread unemployment and fear of deflation.

1945–46: Thoughtful and aggressive leadership and support in winning the peace and establishing the United Nations organizations. Outstanding among the many Republican activities are: Senator Vandenberg's foreign policy speech of January 10, 1945, in which he advocated that we join with our war allies in guaranteeing the disarmament of Germany and Japan; the service of Senator Vandenberg, Governor Stassen, Representative Eaton, and John Foster Dulles at the San Francisco Conference in April–June 1945; the service of Senator Vandenberg as representative and Representative Eaton, Mr. Dulles, and former Senator Townsend as alternate representatives at the first meeting of the United Nations Assembly in January–February 1946; Senator Vandenberg's assistance to Secretary of State Byrnes at the conferences of the Council of Foreign Ministers, 1946; and Senator Warren Austin's statesmanship at the Chapultepec Conference in March 1945, and in United Nations matters (recognized in 1946 by his appointment to the post of Security Council representative of the United States in the U. N. O.).

1945–46: Support of Fair Employment Practices Commission and anti-poll-tax legislation which was blocked by Democrats.

1945–46: Forced an investigation of the Pearl Harbor disaster by congressional committee which exposed dereliction of duty on part of highest Washington officials despite the Democratic majority's attempt to whitewash them.

1945–46: Twenty-three Republican States led all the others in development of State aids to veterans in education, housing, rehabilitation, etc.

1946: Blocked the appointment of Edwin "Oil" Pauley as Under Secretary of the Navy.

1946: Produced a workable permanent labor bill (the Case bill) setting up arbitration procedure to reduce industrial strife, as desired by 70 percent of the American public. (Bill vetoed by President Truman on June 10 following his fraudulent requests for labor curbs in his dramatic address of May 25, 1946.)

1946: Republican Senators led move to defeat President Truman's drastic request to draft into the armed services strikers in plants and facilities seized by the Government.

1946: Obtained return of United States Employment Service Offices to the States by November 1946, in the face of the administration's demand that they be kept under Federal control for a longer period, if not permanently.

1946: Fought for reduction of nonessential expenditures called for by the Truman administrative program and the elimination of unnecessary bureaucrats from the Federal payroll.

1946: Led the fight to expose communistic and other un-American influences in the Government and to eliminate subversive employees from the Federal payroll.

1946: Forced investigation and exposure of waste, corruption, and graft in war construction and contracts, ship purchases, rentals and sales and disposal of surplus goods.

1946: Led the attack for elimination of wartime controls of our economy and the movement for limited extension of price control with reforms in OPA policies to secure maximum production and the elimination of black markets. (President Truman's irresponsible veto of the first price-control extension act, subsequently threw the Nation into confusion and promoted inflation.)

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE COOLIDGE ADMINISTRATION (AUGUST 3, 1923, TO MARCH 3, 1929)

April 28, 1924: Bill authorizing American delegates to Pan-American Sanitary Conference approved.

April 26, 1924: Bill providing relief for farmers of drought-stricken areas of New Mexico approved.

February 12, 1925: Arbitration Act of 1925 approved.

February 27, 1925: Bill to complete topographical survey of United States approved.

February 26, 1926: Bill to reduce and equalize taxation approved.

April 3, 1926: Invitation to attend International Conference on Soil Science approved.

April 19, 1926: President Coolidge warns against failure of citizens to exercise franchise, in address to the DAR.

April 30, 1926: National Capital Park and Planning Commission created.

May 20, 1926: Railway Labor Act establishing United States Board of Mediation approved.

June 22, 1926: Bill to provide home care for dependent children in District of Columbia approved.

July 2, 1926: Cooperative Marketing Act approved.

January 18, 1927: Food, Drug, and Insecticide Administration created.

January 21, 1927: River and Harbor Act approved.

February 8, 1927: Bill permitting loans on growing crops approved.

February 15, 1927: Bill to regulate importation of milk and cream into United States to protect dairy industry and public health, approved.

February 23, 1927: Federal Radio Commission created.

March 3, 1927: Foreign Commerce Service established.

March 4, 1927: Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Compensation Act approved.

January 16, 1928: President Coolidge opened sixth Pan American Conference at Habana.

May 4, 1928: Joint resolution for assistance in construction of Inter-American Highway.

May 15, 1928: Mississippi River Flood Control Act approved.

May 22, 1928: Merchant marine bill approved.

August 27, 1928: Kellogg-Briand Pact outlawing war, signed.

January 19, 1929: Convict Labor Act passed protecting workers from competition of prison labor.

February 5, 1929: Vocational education bill approved.

February 12, 1929: Flood Control Act approved.

ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE HOOVER ADMINISTRATION (MARCH 4, 1929, TO MARCH 3, 1933)

1929: Agricultural Marketing Act to promote effective merchandising of farm commodities in interstate commerce and place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries passed.

May 2, 1929: Act providing funds for eradication, control, and prevention of spread of Mediterranean fruitfly approved.

December 20, 1929: Act to provide for construction of Supreme Court Building approved.

February 7, 1930: Authority for erection of permanent building for headquarters of American National Red Cross in Washington, D. C., granted.

April 7, 1930: International Conference for Codification of International Law approved.

April 23, 1930: Bill for uniform retirement date for retirement of Federal personnel approved.

April 29, 1930: Air Mail Act approved.

May 13, 1930: Bill authorizing Public Health Service to provide medical service in Federal prisons approved.

May 26, 1930: National Institutes of Health established.

June 23, 1930: Federal Power Commission organized.

July 21, 1930: Veterans' Administration created by Executive order.

December 20, 1930: Bill for relief of farmers in drought and storm-stricken areas of United States approved.

January 15, 1931: Bill providing funds for relief of farmers in drought and storm areas of United States approved.

February 10, 1931: Employment Stabilization Act.

February 17, 1931: Bill to provide shorter week for postal employees approved.

January 22, 1932: Reconstruction Finance Corporation created to protect savings and credit and provide relief loans.

March 23, 1932: Anti-Labor-Injunction Act (Norris-LaGuardia) approved.

July 5, 1932: Bill passed authorizing distribution of Government wheat and cotton to National American Red Cross for relief.

July 21, 1932: Emergency Relief and Construction Act approved.

July 22, 1932: Federal Home Loan Bank System created.

February 4, 1933: Crop production loan bill approved.

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS HAD A FINE RECORD

The Eightieth Congress launched the European recovery program, the first constructive step taken since the war to rebuild Europe, to strengthen world peace, and to block the Communist drive for world domination.

The Eightieth Congress strengthened the drive for world peace. It provided funds without stint for foreign relief, supported the Greek-Turkish aid program, gave official sanction to and improved the Voice of America broadcasts, approved the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance for Defense of the Americas, approved four treaties of peace with defeated European nations, established a United States trusteeship over Pacific islands formerly under Japanese rule, helped thousands of displaced persons in Europe to find a haven in this country, entered the World Health Organization, and extended the reciprocal trade-agreements program while safeguarding domestic interests. The Eightieth Congress also adopted the highly significant Vandenberg resolution to strengthen the U. N. machinery for peace, paving the way for the North Atlantic Pact and military-assistance program.

The Eightieth Congress enacted a national service law providing the manpower to strengthen the armed services.

The Eightieth Congress unified the armed services, which at long last put the Army and Navy under a single civilian head. There will be no more Democrat Pearl Harbors. Democrats talked about unification for years; Republicans in the Eightieth Congress achieved it.

The Eightieth Congress cut over $6,000,000,000 off the padded budget of the Truman New Deal, which made possible a balanced budget and reduction of the national debt for the first time in 16 years. The Republican economy drive was the most effective action that could be taken to curb Federal spending, reduce wartime taxes, and to put the brakes on inflation and high prices.

The Eightieth Congress removed the controls which were stifling the productive energies of American industry, labor, agriculture, and business. Freedom from bureaucratic regimentation has stimulated the greatest output of goods and services in the Nation's peacetime history.

The Eightieth Congress reduced the outrageous wartime income taxes. It gave over 70 percent of the tax savings to those with incomes under $5,000; freed 7,400,000 wage earners in the lower brackets from having to pay any further income tax at all; allowed married couples to divide their incomes for tax purposes; and granted an additional $600 exemption to those over 65 years of age and to the blind.

The Eightieth Congress exposed the destructive tactics of Communists in America and compelled President Truman to oust Communists from the Government. A Republican President and Congress will be needed to complete the job because of Democratic secrecy and censorship of records which would reveal Communist infiltration in Government.

The Eightieth Congress passed the Taft-Hartley Act, which has reduced crippling Nation-wide strikes, driven Communists out of positions of power in labor unions, stabilized and improved relations between labor and management and strengthened the rights and privileges of individual workers.

The Eightieth Congress enacted housing legislation which has promoted the greatest home-building boom of all time. In 1946, under New Deal regimentation and confusion, only 437,800 dwelling units were completed; in 1947, under the Republican program of sound Government aid, 835,100 units were completed.

The Eightieth Congress passed 188 bills to meet the needs of war veterans, including the cashing of GI terminal-leave bonds, increased allowances for GI's attending colleges and universities and those receiving on-the-job training, increased compensation for disabled veterans and for dependent survivors of war dead, increases in pensions, and financial assistance to certain disabled veterans to help them get specially designed homes and specially equipped automobiles.

The Eightieth Congress enacted a long-range agriculture program pledging price support for maximum production of food. It provided twice as much money for rural electrification as any previous Congress; appropriated more than $500,000,000 for soil conservation; launched the greatest rural road-building program in history; established a new, workable crop-insurance program, gave a Federal charter to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and greatly expanded Government aid in campaigns against livestock foot-and-mouth disease and crop deterrents such as weeds, insects, and other pests. The Hope-Aiken formula became the basis for the Anderson bill of the Eighty-first Congress, first session.

The Eightieth Congress appropriated more money for reclamation and western development than any previous Congress. It made record-breaking appropriations for river and harbor improvements and flood control, all being essential to expansion and protection of our national economy.

The Eightieth Congress voted increases in social-security payments amounting to $184,000,000 annually for 3,500 needy dependent children, the aged, and the blind.

The Eightieth Congress voted large sums for the extension of research on cancer, heart disease and mental diseases, and for construction of new hospitals.

The Eightieth Congress reorganized the law-making machinery, reduced the number of congressional committees and provided them with professional staff assistants, and streamlined and improved legislative operations in the interests of efficiency and better performance.

The Eightieth Congress established a bipartisan Government reorganization commission headed by former President Hoover, which later submitted to the Eighty-first Congress a comprehensive plan for reorganization of the administrative branch of the Government to make it more efficient and economical—a major operation on the sprawling, tax-eating, patchwork bureaucracy bequeathed to us by the New Deal. The Republican Party has made it a matter of policy to lend full support to efforts to carry out Hoover Commission proposals.

It was the Republicans who built up pensions for World War I widows, orphans and disabled men, hospitals for injured veterans, vocational training, etc., who provided $3,500,000,000 soldiers' bonus to be paid at the end of 20 years and loans in the meantime. It was a Republican Administration that extended Federal allowances to every needy and sick veteran, from whatever cause. The Roosevelt administration unmercifully cut Republican pensions and disability allowances; 340,000 sick veterans were turned out to seek relief and $350,000,000 per annum was taken from veterans.

The Republican Party for 60 years protected the farmer from the import of farm products from peasant countries. It was the Democratic Party who opened the door to Argentine and Canadian beef. The Republican administration created the Federal Farm Board which stopped the panic in farm prices and held domestic prices above world levels during the depression; increased the loan capacity of the Federal Land Banks by a billion dollars to protect farm mortgages, provided loan capital from the RFC for seed for farmers and loans for farm exports to foreign countries; created the Agricultural Loan Banks to provide production and livestock loans.

The Republicans founded the flood-control, conservation, reclamation, and irrigation policies in the United States. They established the Bureau of Fisheries, Forests, Oil Conservation, Public Parks, Irrigation, and Reclamation with their regulatory powers; harnessed the flood control of the Mississippi, the Missouri, the Sacramento, the Colorado and the Arkansas Rivers.

The Republican Party inaugurated the Sherman antitrust laws to prevent monopolies, bank regulation laws, Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Power Commission, Railway Mediation Board, created the Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Department of Labor, intermediate credit banks, Federal Farm Board, RFC, agriculture credit banks, and the home loan banks. And it was Herbert Hoover as Secretary of Commerce or as President who inspired the creation of 10 of those instrumentalities of progressive government. It was the Republicans who first inaugurated old-age and children's pensions, prohibited child labor, restricted hours for women and a hundred other progressive advances.

THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, in the near future we shall consider on the floor of the Senate the question of the ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the accompanying security treaties. There are so many factors relevant to that treaty in the background of its preparation, in the months it took to arrive at the final text, and in the action at San Francisco in bringing together the various nations of the world for their signatures, that it seems to me important before we actually start the debate to present some of that background.

I have had called to my attention a very important speech made in Des Moines, Iowa, before the National Farm Institute, on February 16, by Hon. John Foster Dulles on the subject of Foreign Policy and the National Welfare. Mr. Dulles, as we all know, was the so-called architect of the Japanese Peace Treaty, and he has always approached the problems of Japan in the spirit of the world picture and all that we must do to meet the threats of an advancing communism. I feel that this speech is so important because of its bearing on our later debate on the Japanese Peace Treaty itself, that I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted in the body of the RECORD at the close of these remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

THE PROBLEM

Never before has it been so hard to find foreign policies that will promote the national welfare. We are not strangers to danger, but in the past the danger has always been of a particular kind, at a particular place and for a particular time. Today, the plotters in the Kremlin have all kinds of weapons, ranging from subtle propaganda to massive armed attack; they can, by one method or another, menace each and every part of the free world, and they are not bound to any short or fixed time schedule. In sum, they have a choice of weapons, a choice of places and a choice of timing. They have determination, as shown by the fact that they are today still holding precisely to the encirclement strategy they announced over 25 years ago. They have skill, as shown by the fact that their encirclement program is now about one-half completed.

In the face of this threat, what should our foreign policies be?

MILITARY CONTAINMENT?

Some think that the great danger is military and that we can check further encirclement by building a defensive military wall around the Soviet world; a wall so strong that the Red armies could not break through.

That would be a self-defeating policy. The Soviet leaders control interior lines from which they could strike suddenly east, south or west, anywhere along a line of 25,000 miles. They can strike with massive power. In Russia the standing army amounts to about 3,000,000, amply equipped with planes, tanks and artillery and there are another 3,000,000 Chinese Red Army soldiers. It is impossible to build up enough military strength to check on the spot any ground attack which the Soviet rulers might launch at any point of their choosing. To attempt that kind of containment would not promote our national welfare. The French tried in that way to contain Nazi armies along a short front. They built what they hoped was the impregnable Maginot line of under 250 miles. If we tried to build a defensive system of 25,000 miles, we would merely compound the French stupidity 100 times. The money cost of such a program would ruin the economies of the free nations, and the psychological dedication to the defensive would destroy hope of victory if war came.

We can write off military containment as a foreign policy.

CONTAINMENT BY SOCIAL WELFARE?

Some think that the great danger is not from direct military aggression, but from Communist ability to exploit social unrest within the free countries. They would have us try to meet this threat of indirect aggression by providing so much economic aid to all the countries which are seriously endangered that mass discontents will be turned into mass happiness.

It is, of course, true that communism could have little chance in a world where everyone is happy. It wins control by appealing to those who are unhappy and who are attracted by the Communist prospectus of a world made into paradise by violent revolution. But to rely on mass American economic aid to meet mass discontent is not a policy that would promote our national welfare. Our agricultural and industrial workers could not support such a burden. There are so many hundreds of millions of people throughout the world who barely exist at a pitifully low economic standard that, even if we were willing to reduce greatly our own standards of living, and if this could be done without reducing our productivity, the amount which we could give away would not appreciably change the situation. It is wrong in principle and practically unworkable for one country to undertake permanently to raise the living standards of the rest of the world by charity, and others are not, in fact, happy for long if they live in dependence upon charity.

RETREAT?

Because we cannot check growing encirclement either by building a vast military defense or by obliterating human discontent, some conclude that sound foreign policy requires us to retreat into our own shell.

That would be to cooperate 100 percent with the Kremlin policy of encirclement. The Politburo has calculated that if they can closely encircle us and organize against us the power of Europe, Asia, and Africa, then we would probably succumb even without a struggle. Stalin, in 1924, said and he still teaches that under these circumstances the capitalists might surrender without a fight. He is probably right. The economic consequences of such a retreat would shake our economy to its foundations. The military odds against us would be overwhelming. Vast unemployment and unrest would create disloyalty at home and our morale would have crumbled in the face of a voluntary retreat which abandoned our free world allies.

THE DETERRENTS TO ARMED AGGRESSION

There are foreign policies which do not involve the disastrous consequences of any one of the three policies we have considered.

When we analyze the Soviet military threat, we can find many reasons to believe that it may not be more than an unused threat, designed partly for defense but chiefly to throw the free world into panic. Those who think that the Soviet leaders rely on open military attack as their means of conquest should answer this question: Why have they not done so already, when they could move anywhere in Europe or Asia without appreciable opposition? Also, why should they wait to attack until we can complete a defense?

We are not engaged in a sort of gigantic Olympic game where it is not sporting to try to win until the opponent has his first team in the field.

As I have often pointed out, there are reasons why the Soviet leaders have not used, and may not now plan to use, open military conquest as the means of completing our encirclement.

One reason is that the Communist leaders of Russia are almost as afraid of the Red army as we are. It is not Communist, either in its leadership or in its ranks, and, if called on to wage aggressive war to spread communism, it might take the opportunity to overthrow communism.

A second reason is the supreme skill of the political leaders of Russia in the art of political warfare, so that they do not feel dependent on military warfare.

A third reason may be that which Mr. Churchill has several times suggested, namely, that they fear the striking power of our atomic weapons. This is certainly a plausible hypothesis. Accordingly, it would be sound policy to maintain atomic supremacy. This, while costly, would not involve anything like the cost of trying to build up a great defensive military barrier all around the Soviet orbit. Striking power, if effective to protect one nation, can protect others without added cost. If, for example, the United States has enough striking power so that the Soviet leaders do not want to bring it into play by attacking Alaska, they would equally not want to bring it into play by an attack upon Norway or Turkey or Japan.

Thus, there are policies which will probably prevent open armed attack upon us or any of our friends and which do not involve a cost, in terms of money or of militarism, that would endanger our national welfare.

I say "probably" because I recognize that in these matters there is no such thing as certainty. Despots occasionally take action which is totally unpredictable and which seems irrational. It is never possible to eliminate altogether the risks and the uncertainties. To try to do that is so costly as to create other dangers even more menacing and certain than those we would avoid.

DETERRENTS TO COMMUNIST POLITICAL AGGRESSION

If we can get reasonable insurance against direct military aggression, by paying premiums that we can afford, how do we overcome the threat of our being ever more closely encircled by methods of indirect political aggression?

There is much that can be done, at reasonable cost, to invigorate the free world. We can help countries to help themselves by special purpose aid, which differs from relief which does not cure. We can give others the benefit of our technical knowledge. This is something which Americans have been doing for a long time. We have shown how to combat yellow fever and malaria; how to build and use machines which multiply the productivity of human labor; how, through use of fertilizer and the development of new rust resistant and drought resistant grains, to increase agricultural productivity; how to irrigate and to control the floods. Our people have always been rich in their inventiveness and their resourcefulness and they have always been generous in sharing that richness with others. Now the Government is helping by what is known as point 4. That is a good program. It is in line with American tradition. It is not costly, because it makes ideas and skills, primary; and money, secondary; which is as it always should be.

We should, of course, encourage the flow of our capital to less developed countries and we should encourage the flow of goods in trade and commerce. The richest country in the world cannot be a miser, and the most productive country cannot bottle itself up. We would quickly stifle under those conditions, and we would not have the healthy environment which is necessary for our own safety and well-being.

If we and other free countries pursue enlightened economic policies, that will enable the free peoples, by orderly methods, gradually and peacefully to improve their domestic conditions and to end any threat of violence that is genuinely domestic. But the task is complicated and made almost insoluble by the measures taken under the direction of the Soviet Communist Party and backed by its moral and material support. For example, the party is estimated to be spending about $1,500,000,000 annually in propaganda alone. That external effort to embarrass the free governments and to foment mass discontent and mass violence makes the struggle an unequal one for many governments and it is an inequality that we cannot redress by grants-in-aid, for one dollar of destruction takes many dollars of construction. We need to find policies which will lead the Politburo to discontinue its indirect aggression.

The solution is to carry on a political offensive against the despots themselves.

A POLITICAL OFFENSIVE

We feel, with reason, that many governments within the free countries are vulnerable because there are many unhappy and hopeless people who are susceptible to Communist propaganda.

That is one way to look at the problem and, if we do look at it that way, it is easy to become discouraged and to be defeatist.

There is, however, another way to look at the problem.

A dozen people in the Kremlin are attempting to exert absolute dictatorial power over increasing numbers of mankind. They now have the number up to 800,000,000. All except a privileged few are required to work under conditions which deny them what we call "the pursuit of happiness." They work as virtual slaves, with no choice as to kind of work or as to hours. Almost all that they produce, except the pittance needed to keep them alive, is taken from them. The denial of spiritual sustenance is even more complete. The system is materialistic; religion is suppressed except in limited ritualistic form, and there is no freedom of expression.

Within Russia itself, after 35 years of Communist rule, there is vast discontent. About 15,000,000 Russians are in forced-labor camps. That is twice the membership of the Soviet Communist Party. As between the Soviet leaders there is suspicion and fear, because political survival or advancement depends largely upon the outcome of periodic purges.

In satellite countries such as Poland and Czechoslovakia, the situation is worse because there it is also necessary to repress the patriotic love of country which burns unquenchably in the breasts of many. Terrorism is increasingly the dependence of the rulers. We read daily of the liquidation of one after another of those who have held high position in the Czech Communist Party. In China the masses are sought to be frightened into subjection by the spectacle of wholesale public executions conducted at the population centers.

All of this is evidence not of strength but of desperation. It may permit the rulers to present a formidable exterior. Absolute dictatorships often do that. But within they are full of rottenness. They "are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness."

Soviet despotism, overextended and precariously placed at home, is carrying on a vast political offensive against the free world. But, if the free world intelligently dedicated itself to a political offensive against the misery, terrorism, and hopelessness of the now captive peoples, if we kept alive their love of God, their love of country, their love of family, and their sense of personal dignity, then the despotic rulers of these 800,000,000 people would have plenty of trouble at home. They would no longer be thinking about how to increase the number of their captives. Rather they would be thinking of how to keep what they have. Once that stage is reached, then Soviet despotism nears its end. Like all the other despotisms that have preceded it, it will collapse once it fails to conquer.

AMERICA'S TRADITIONAL MISSION

It is nothing new for America to lead a psychological and political offensive for freedom and against despotism. Indeed, that was the basic conception of our founders.

Our Nation was dedicated, at birth, to serve not only its own welfare but the welfare of mankind. The founders said that "it seemed to be reserved to the people of this country, by their conduct and example" to show mankind the way of freedom. Our Declaration of Independence, as Abraham Lincoln pointed out, meant "liberty, not alone to the people of this country but hope for the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all should have an equal chance."

Under the impact of that faith we developed here an area of spiritual, intellectual, and economic vigor, the like of which the world had never seen. Seeking first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, many material things were added unto us. Our free society was a menace to every despot because we generated ideas and gave them practical application in ways that caught the imagination of all the subject peoples of the world. Our missionaries, educators, doctors, merchants, and diplomats carried abroad knowledge of what we were and we welcomed here many from other lands who sent back home the story of the fabulous fruits of our practice of human liberty.

While our Nation was yet young, a group of despots headed by the Tsar Alexander of Russia, dominated much of the world, as do the present rulers of the Kremlin. But under the force of our example the subject peoples became restive and sought more liberty for themselves. The despots found that home work took more and more of their time and effort, and was checked and, in the end, it was rolled back.

If we get back into that mood, then we would not tremble before the menace of Soviet despotism. It would be the despots that would do the trembling.

THE JAPANESE PEACE OF FREEDOM

The Japanese Peace Conference showed how great a force is love of freedom. That was a force on which we largely relied. The problem was whether Japan should be kept in bondage to the Allied occupation long after her full compliance with the surrender terms had won her the right to freedom. General MacArthur urged that we should move invincibly to grant that freedom. "Thereby," he said, "Japan and all of Asia will witness the resurgence of our moral leadership and renewal of our initiative in the conduct of Asian affairs."

We sought to do this. At the San Francisco Conference, speaking on behalf of the United States delegation, I said:

"There are, in Japan, newborn institutions of freedom, but they will not flourish if military rule continues indefinitely to be supreme.

"Dignity cannot be developed by those who are subject to alien control, however benign.

"Self-respect is not felt by those who have no rights of their own in the world, who live on charity and who trade on sufferance.

"Regard for justice rarely animates those who are subjected to such grave injustice as would be the denial of freedom.

"Fellowship is not the mood of peoples who are denied fellowship."

I concluded that to continue the occupation would be imperialism and colonialism. The United States, I said "wants none of that."

These sentiments became the central theme of the Conference. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan said they would "resound around the world." We achieved a success and we gained an initiative at a critical time and at a critical place because we again demonstrated our faith in freedom and our determination to extend it in the world.

That positive program won unity here at home. There was cordial cooperation between the Executive and the Congress, and nonpartisan support which drew together not only those of different parties but those in each of our great parties who often differ on matters of foreign policy. That unity was demonstrated by the vote of 13 to nothing, whereby the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last week recommended the Japanese Peace Treaty to the Senate.

Similarly, we achieved an international unity. Never before has the world seen such unity for peace and it was the more significant because it was born out of a world disunity and despite widespread sentiments of hatred, vengefulness, fear, greed, and distrust toward Japan. Out of 50 non-Communist allies which had been invited to the Peace Conference 48 came and signed the treaty. What we proposed caught men's imagination and won their good will so that peoples of all the continents, of all the civilizations and of all the races—the great and the weak, the rich and the poor—were for this moment united in an act of fellowship.

That unity at home and with the free allies was the instrument which inflicted on the Soviet Union its worst defeat in postwar conference history. Its delegates had come boldly in the blustering mood of treaty wreckers. But as delegate after delegate expressed the noble sentiments that had inspired the treaty, the Soviet delegation shrank almost visibly. At the beginning they had demanded indefinite time in which to talk. At the end they were offered time they dared not use, preferring to slip silently from the scene.

The unity we achieved behind a program of freedom calmed the troubled atmosphere in and about Japan. Before the San Francisco Conference there was Communist talk of possible air raids on Japan from Soviet bases in Sakhalin and possible attempts to overthrow the Japanese Government by violence through arming and sending back many thousands of indoctrinated Japanese war prisoners whom the Soviet illegally holds. It was said that if the free allies made a Japanese peace which the Soviet Union and Communist China did not join, that act might touch off a revival by these two countries of active war against Japan.

That was a risk which the President and his responsible advisers weighed. He took a solemn and necessary decision which required high courage. That decision has now been rewarded. The Soviet leaders did not make the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty the pretext for open war. On the contrary, they have now dropped their bluster and threats against Japan. The character of the Soviet mission in Tokyo has been changed from being predominantly military to being predominantly civilian and the Soviet Union is seeking to woo Japan with honeyed words such as those contained in Stalin's New Year's message to the Japanese people and by offering what, at least on paper, seems attractive economic bait. The Soviet theme now is peace, not war.

CONCLUSION

What was accomplished through the Japanese Peace Treaty is, in itself, no final solution of the great problems that confront us in Asia and elsewhere. Indeed, what was there done is pitifully little in relation to what needs to be done. But what was there done may be significant if it reminds us of the vast possibilities that lie before us if we forget our fears, if we stop thinking in defensive terms and take an initiative for freedom.

That is the way we won safety when we were still a small nation, economically weak and almost without any military force.

There comes a time in the life of any great people when their work of creation ends. They lose their sense of purpose and of mission in the world, seeking only to conserve what they have. Material things begin to seem more important than spiritual things and security seems more a matter of military defense than of a spiritual offense.

Surely, that hour has not struck for us. We have, to be sure, become rich and in worldly terms we are reckoned among the great. That places on us some new material responsibilities. But it does not require any radical change in the character of our foreign policies and our primary dependence upon moral rather than material power. I am confident that the American people want to hold fast to that aspect of our great tradition. Also I am confident that it is possible to fashion foreign policies which will give us safety and at the same time preserve our spiritual heritage.

A NEW APPROACH TO PEACE IN KOREA

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to read a short editorial into the RECORD and to make some brief explanatory remarks with regard thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, during the week of Lincoln's Birthday anniversary I made a number of addresses, one of which was before the Young Republicans Club of Muskegon, Mich.

The address was very fully reported in the Muskegon Chronicle, which is a Democratic newspaper. When the president of the Young Republicans Club wrote to the editor of the Chronicle expressing his pleasure at the full report, the editor wrote an editorial which he entitled "Oratory in Print." It is that brief editorial which I wish to read into the RECORD. It reads:

ORATORY IN PRINT

Naturally it was a pleasure to be congratulated on the level of political reporting in the Chronicle, as was done a few days ago in a letter appearing in the As the Public Sees It from the president of the Muskegon County Young Republicans.

The reference was specifically to an account of a speech by Senator FLANDERS, of Vermont, at the annual Lincoln Day banquet here. It was a speech with much substance.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I am not reading the editorial for the purpose of having any bouquets thrown at the junior Senator from Vermont, but because it contains a lesson which Senators will observe as I proceed. I continue to read from the editorial:

There is no doubt that the Senator's plea for greater emphasis on moral containment, instead of overreliance on military containment alone, is a subject with which all of us are actively concerned.

The point to be made is that the Senator's speech did have substance, and was far from the usual run of "pink, mink, and stink" political oratory.

Let me again make a personal observation. I am antipink, antimink, and antistink. I do not wish to be involved in any association with these three great

political issues. I continue to read from the editorial:

The wonder is not that the Flanders speech was well reported, but that the opportunity for such reporting so seldom comes at political gatherings.

The average political rally is a pretty meager offering, in terms of honest issues, honestly discussed. Party workers could well work harder at the job of putting more sense in them, and they wouldn't have to lose any of their enthusiasm in the process.

The "pink, mink, and stink" approach to politics may please some of the partisans already in camp, but it makes few converts. Strictly from a reporting point of view, nothing could be worse. The all-too-usual sloganeering just doesn't come off well in print.

Mr. President, I wish now to tell the Senate what the main point of my talk was and what aroused the greatest interest. It was a subject which I have already discussed on the floor of the Senate, particularly in a speech on July 9, 1951, and again in the Appendix of the RECORD in the reprinting of a speech which I made in Dallas, Tex., on January 23, 1959.

The subject was the possibility of an entirely new approach to peace in Korea. It is an approach which has not aroused interest in the Senate. It is an approach in which neither the President nor the Secretary of State is particularly interested, although I have talked with them about it. However, I have discussed the subject in Vermont, I have discussed it in Texas, I have discussed it in Chicago, I have discussed it in Minnesota, and I have discussed it in Michigan. I wish to say that the people of the country are anxious for something of this sort. Therefore, I shall again bring up the subject on the floor of the Senate at an appropriate time within the next few days, and I shall ask the Senators to pay some attention to it, at least in the RECORD, even though there may be but a corporal's guard on the floor.

ADDITIONAL ALLOCATIONS OF COPPER AND ALUMINUM

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter which I have today received from the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration, Mr. Manly Fleischmann. His letter reached me today by special messenger, and is in reply to a letter which I wrote to the Administrator of the Defense Production Administration on the 21st of February of this year. In my letter I urged that additional allocations of copper and aluminum be made available for the automobile industry and other industries.

I am happy to report to the Senate, through this means, that today Mr. Fleischmann is announcing that approximately 30,000,000 pounds of aluminum and from 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 pounds of various copper products will be made available for distribution in the second quarter.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, unanimous consent is required for that purpose, and I am seeking recognition in that connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not hear the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator from Michigan insist on having the letter printed in the body of the RECORD? That is not the place for it, is it?

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to have the letter printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks. I shall be glad to read the letter into the RECORD, if that is desired.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator from Michigan had other matters in his hand.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do have some other matters before me, but I am now referring to the letter itself.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not object, but I insist that the body of the RECORD should not be filled with extraneous matter. It is a bad custom to do so. The Senate should insist that the RECORD show what happens in the Senate Chamber, and not include letters, circulars, propaganda, and similar material.

However, I shall not object.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION,
WASHINGTON, *March 3, 1952.*

Hon. HOMER FERGUSON,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FERGUSON: This is in reply to your letter of February 21, 1952 in which you urge that additional allocations of copper and aluminum be made available to the automotive industry.

I am announcing today that approximately 30,000,000 pounds of aluminum and from twenty to twenty-five million pounds of various copper products will be made available immediately for redistribution in the second quarter. In this connection, we will carefully review the present situation of the automotive industry, and as soon as the actual amounts to be distributed as allotments to claimant agencies have been determined I will inform you. I am enclosing with this letter a copy of today's press release regarding this additional material.

I assure you that we will continue through the year in our effort to alleviate unemployment in the automotive industry to the extent permitted by availability of copper and aluminum after direct defense and defense-supporting requirements have been met. We have asked the automotive manufacturers to keep us informed of their practical material requirements for full employment beyond the amounts of steel, copper, and aluminum which have already been allotted to them, and the Defense Production Administration will continue to check available supply sources in order to distribute additional materials whenever possible. At the same time the defense distressed areas task force is trying to take every possible step to create a balance between the Detroit labor force and a supply of work in the Detroit area.

I appreciate your interest in this situation and agree with you that the maintenance of a healthy national economy is essential to the defense effort.

Sincerely yours,
MANLY FLEISCHMANN,
Administrator.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Benton	Hill	Moody
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Murray
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Neely
Byrd	Hunt	Nixon
Cain	Ives	O'Conor
Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Duff	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lehman	Sparkman
Ecton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Magnuson	Taft
Ferguson	Malone	Thye
Flanders	Martin	Tobey
Frear	Maybank	Watkins
Fulbright	McCarran	Wiley
George	McCarthy	Williams
Gillette	McClellan	Young
Green	McFarland	
Hayden	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is necessarily absent.

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER and Mr. SEATON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE and Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT UPON THE OCCASION OF THE THIRTY-NINTH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS SERVICE IN THE CONGRESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I arise to pay tribute to one of this Nation's most distinguished citizens on the thirty-ninth anniversary of his service in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, this man stands as a living example of what can be accomplished in this great democracy of ours by a poor boy who is willing to put forth the proper effort in work and service for others. After working his way through college, he became the prosecuting attorney of his county, and later the county judge.

When he was elected to the Congress of the United States and took his oath of office, 39 years ago, he was recognized as one of the outstanding lawyers of his State. Since he became a Member of

Congress he has performed many important functions for his Government and for his party. Because of his leadership and ability he has been called upon to deliver many important addresses through the Nation, including the keynote address for the 1948 convention.

He made his mark in the House of Representatives, and was then elected to the Senate of the United States where he took the oath of office in the year 1927.

He served as minority leader during the Eightieth Congress and was so effective he helped to return the Democrats to power in the Eighty-first Congress and the people in recognition of his great ability elected him Vice President of the United States.

He has at all times been willing to help new Members of the Senate. I am proud to have been one of those Members. All of us are honored to be able to be counted among his friends. In the Senate he was a fearless leader, willing to fight for the principles he thought to be right. He was respected by all the Members of the United States Senate. I know of no man who has a better understanding of the problems of our country or a deeper interest in the welfare of the mass of the people.

He has served as Vice President with the same high degree of excellence and fairness that characterized all his previous work. I refer, of course, to our own beloved Vice President, ALBEN W. BARKLEY. It gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to him today, and to congratulate him upon his 39 years of service.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the entirely appropriate remarks which have just been made by the majority leader. Kentucky has produced many great men since it became a State of the Union, and even when it was in the Territorial status. I venture to say without any reservation that Kentucky has never produced a greater man than the present Vice President of the United States.

It was my pleasure to serve in the Senate throughout the period of his service as majority leader, and his very brief period of service as minority leader. In both capacities he earned and held the devotion and friendship of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. Because of his eminent fairness, and because of his ability, he made no enemies in this body. He was a Member of the Senate concerning whom no criticisms were ever uttered, to my knowledge, by Members, with respect to the manner in which he conducted his great responsibility as majority leader.

I think it ought to be said, Mr. President, that the period of that service of leadership was, without question, the most critical in the history of our country, up to that time. There were more difficult problems to be settled. The activities of the Government of the United States had to be extended all around the world, and there was presented upon this floor bill after bill of the most momentous character, dealing not only with the welfare of the people of the United States but with the welfare of the people of the entire world.

It would be a wonderful thing, Mr. President, for any man during the course of his career to have gained one-tenth of the distinction which was won upon the floor of the United States Senate by this great man, the present Vice President of the United States, who, on the fourth of March, 39 years ago, became a Member of the Congress of the United States. He has shed credit upon himself, upon his people in Kentucky, and upon the great democratic system of government, by the manner in which he has discharged, and continues to discharge, the responsibilities of every task placed upon him.

I am happy to have had the opportunity of joining in the tribute pronounced by the majority leader.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in 1939, when it was my good fortune to become a Member of the Senate, I was privileged to become acquainted with you. I agree fully with the fine things which have been said about your life, which has been truly an American odyssey, going through the school of county attorney, county judge, a Member of the House of Representatives, and then coming to the Senate.

While I agree fully with what has been said about your great accomplishments in both Houses, I should like to speak to another phase of your life with which I became acquainted. You are, Mr. President, a very human fellow. You are one of the best story tellers in the country. You have a distinct sense of humor which is your own; and I have often thought it was that faculty which gave you the strength and the ability to live through the challenging years which have confronted you.

There is another thing about you, Mr. President: You are so human. I have often thought that you expressed in your life what has been called the milk of human kindness. You could see, even in the years when others could not, that Republicans were good people.

Then you possess another characteristic for which the Democrats of the country owe you a great debt. I think you are one of the best speakers in the Nation. I have heard you on the air. During campaigns I have heard you provide the best campaign material the Democrats could have.

Mr. President, you are a friendly sort of fellow, and you have presided with judgment and fairness.

So I join not only with Members of this distinguished body, but with your friends in Kentucky and your numerous friends in my own State and all other States, in congratulating you and the Nation on your 39 years of wonderful patriotic service, and in wishing for you many more years of good health and service to your country.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I approach this subject with genuine enthusiasm, as I associate myself with the words which have been said about the great accomplishments of our beloved Vice President.

Because of his great skill as majority leader, the present occupant of the Chair was in a position in which he could cause great pain and anguish to those of us on this side of the aisle. However, he so exercised his responsibility that our suffering was always assuaged by a unique faculty; namely that of being able to manipulate and turn the little political jigger in such a way as to indicate that, after all, there was nothing but affection in the admonition he was giving us.

So, Mr. President, I am grateful to you for our personal acquaintance and friendship, even though we are on different sides of the aisle. You have demonstrated that it is possible for men to remain close together as common Americans in a common cause, for the good of our country, even though we may differ at times politically.

I thank you for what you have contributed to my happiness in the Senate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I, too, rise for the purpose of associating myself with the fine expressions of my colleagues in paying proper tribute to you, sir. I am young in years of service in the Senate as compared with the time you have served, but prior to my becoming a Member of this body I had the privilege of reading of you in the RECORD and in the daily accounts of your service in the United States Senate.

I learned to admire and to respect the integrity which you possess. While I have been privileged to serve in the Senate I have learned the fullness of your character and your fine personal qualities, the fairness with which you administer the duties and responsibilities of the office which you hold, and as a member of the minority party I respect them. That is why you have won the friendship of both political parties. If anyone other than a Republican is to sit in the chair as Presiding Officer over this legislative body, may it be you, sir, who will sit as Presiding Officer.

I wish to join with my distinguished colleagues in paying this tribute to you, sir. It comes from my heart.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure and I consider it a high privilege to join in the tributes to the Vice President on the thirty-ninth anniversary of his entrance to the Congress. Few men, if any, have enjoyed so long and continuous service. Certainly no man has had more distinguished service or has contributed more to our country than has our Vice President.

Because of his industry, his courage, his fine ability, and his commanding personality he rapidly rose to a position of leadership in the House of Representatives. Promoted by the people of Kentucky to the Senate, as has been well said by our majority leader, he served as majority leader of the Senate more than twice as long as has any other man in the long history of the Senate.

The tributes paid to him this morning demonstrate that he enjoys the warm affection of every Member of the Senate, regardless of party membership. He is honored, beloved, and acclaimed as leader by millions of his fellow countrymen across this broad land.

ALBEN BARKLEY is not only a great statesman and a great American, but he is a great institution in our American life.

So, on this thirty-ninth anniversary, we hail and salute him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am indeed gratified to be able to take part in this observance of the thirty-ninth anniversary of the Vice President's entry into the public life of Washington.

During my first term in the House of Representatives, in 1917, the present Vice President, was a Member of the House. He was my senior in service by approximately 4 years. He had already attained a position of influence and strength as a member of the House Committee on Interstate Commerce. He took a prominent part in the deliberations of the House and attracted wide support and influence. Since we have been Members of the Senate, where he antedated me by 2 years, we have been intimately associated throughout the years.

He is an unusually able debater and discharged the functions of Democratic leader on the floor in connection with many very difficult and perplexing questions. Of course, we have not agreed on every detail of legislation, but I have always held him in high esteem. I have had great respect for his views and for his forensic powers. He has had an active career. At the moment I do not recall anyone who has served in either branch of the Congress for a great many years who has had a more distinguished career than has our great Vice President.

I am happy to salute him on the thirty-ninth anniversary of the beginning of his service in the Congress. I hope he may enjoy many more anniversaries of this character. He has made a very valuable contribution to American political and legislative life. He has been a great citizen of the State of Kentucky. He has reflected credit and honor upon that old Commonwealth which was represented in this body by Henry Clay and many other great men.

So, Mr. President, it is a source of the highest gratification to me to be able to say these few words respecting my personal friend, a great former Member of the House of Representatives, a great Senator, a great Senate leader, and a great Vice President of the United States.

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I regard it a great privilege and honor to associate myself with the words of admiration and respect which have been uttered in tribute to you as Vice President of the United States and Presiding Officer of this great body.

It gives me exceptional personal pleasure, and, in my present capacity of acting minority leader, I know I express the sentiments of the Members of the minority party in the Senate to congratulate you on your great attainment. Thirty-nine years is a long time. We congratulate you upon the service you have rendered your country.

Since becoming a Member of the Senate, I have learned to respect and admire you for your ability, your kindliness, and your very sympathetic understanding in all matters. You have presided over the Senate honestly and fairly. I may say, Mr. President, that the only regret some of us at times have had was that you did not belong to the minority instead of to the majority party.

We wish you the best of health and happiness in the future. Again, on behalf of the minority party in the Senate, I wish to congratulate you upon your having reached this anniversary, when you can look back upon a long period of service to your country in public life.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am honored to identify myself with all the beautiful and well-deserved statements which have been made in recognition of your entry into congressional life 39 years ago.

When I came to the Senate, your position in the House of Representatives had, of course, already been well established. Indeed, you had been identified with much important legislation. I recall very well that I had the distinct pleasure to support the Railway Retirement Act, with which you were prominently identified, if indeed you were not its author.

Throughout the years I have marveled at your robust character and your sturdiness in high position. I did not quite understand it, Mr. President, until I learned that a part of your scholastic education had taken place in my good State of Georgia.

Certainly Kentucky has produced many able leaders in every phase of our life, beginning in the pioneer days of Daniel Boone whose name became known to every schoolboy in America, and continuing down through the years, when men from Kentucky in field and in forum made glorious many pages in American history.

You, Mr. President, have taken an honorable place in the history of your State and of your country. Your services here have been distinguished. Often they have been performed under great difficulties, not only when Senators on the other side of the aisle took a different position from the position which you, as leader of your party and as a Senator from the State of Kentucky, felt compelled to assume, but also when Senators on your own side differed sharply from the point of view which you held. But never throughout my experience or recollection has any Senator, whether on the Democratic side or the Republican side, been offended by the honest position taken by the distinguished gentleman who now honors the Senate in the position of Vice President.

You have always had and have always manifested the greatest respect for the honest and sincere views of your colleagues, although you have differed sharply and effectively from the views which from time to time many of us have held.

So I am especially happy, Mr. President, to identify myself with all the good things that have been said about you, and I assure you that the words spoken of you were not uttered lightly by colleagues who have served with you throughout the years. You will recall, I feel quite sure, that stirring old poem by Rudyard Kipling which had in it a line like this:

> God be thanked! Whate'er come after, I have lived and toiled with Men!

Mr. President, you can say that, and the men who have served here with you can in all sincerity reecho that statement as applying to you.

I am particularly pleased, Mr. President, to say not the things that should be said, because I would not undertake to do so, but to speak just this word on this occasion because of my warm personal attachment for you, and because of the friendship which you have shown to me throughout the years.

Likes do beget likes, Mr. President. I think there can be no doubt of that. You have loved your fellow men, and your fellow men have held you in sincere respect and have loved you. Whatever the future may hold, you will always have the abiding confidence and respect which you so richly deserve by reason of a life which has reflected honor and glory upon your native State and upon the United States, and which has added so much to the encouragement of good men throughout the free world.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the life and public services of the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, afford a treasure trove of material for lengthy paeans of praise. I shall not undertake to indulge in any lengthy eulogy, though I yield to no Member of this body in my affection for the Vice President.

I shall content myself by saying that my adult life has been spent in the public service. Over the past three decades it has been my privilege to know most of the great and outstanding Americans of that period, as well as many statesmen from foreign lands.

I have never known an abler, truer, or purer American, or a more selfless public servant than ALBEN W. BARKLEY. It is a source of great pride to me that I can claim him as a personal friend. I welcome this opportunity to give this brief and inadequate expression to my personal affection and high regard for him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, there is little that I can add to the tribute which has been paid the Vice President, but I should like to associate myself with the remarks of other Senators.

Two years ago I discovered that the Presiding Officer of the Senate had been a Member of Congress 6 years before the junior Senator from Louisiana was born. It has been a source of great inspiration, as a young man, to come here and make the acquaintance of our Presiding Officer. Being 6 years younger in life than the Presiding Officer is in service in the Congress of the United States, I have constantly marveled at his stamina. I recall that in one instance the Vice President extended me an invitation to accompany him on a trip of approximately 2,000 miles, during which he made three speeches or more a day. I could not help being impressed by the great stamina which made it possible for a man many years my senior to do an amount of work which would put to shame many a younger man.

We appreciated his recent personal trip halfway around the world to the Korean battlegrounds, encountering many dangers to make sure that those young men of ours would know that this Nation appreciated the efforts and sacrifices they were making to preserve human liberty.

The Vice President has presided over the Senate with impartiality and fairness; yet, on occasion, he has relieved

with his wit and candor what might otherwise have been boredom. We are extremely fortunate. It is the opinion of many of us that we have never had, and will never have, a greater Vice President of the United States than the man who now occupies the chair of Presiding Officer of the Senate.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, as a fellow-Kentuckian, a lifelong friend and admirer, and an unswerving supporter of ALBEN W. BARKLEY, I rejoice in the privilege of being present today in the Senate Chamber to hear the sincere and spontaneous outpouring of heartfelt and richly merited tribute paid to a great Kentuckian—the distinguished Vice President of the United States. His sterling qualities of mind and heart, his forthright stability, his sound judgment—indeed, his great and good common sense—long have been recognized and appreciated by the people of Kentucky, but to hear his virtues extolled and unanimously acclaimed here in this national forum of the United States Senate, where he has so well and ably served and presently so justly and wisely presides, is most gratifying to me and to every other Kentuckian, as well as to his legion of friends and admirers throughout the entire Nation.

In his splendid record of courageous, unselfish, and devoted public service, every Kentuckian feels a justifiable pride, as can every American, because the life and achievements of ALBEN W. BARKLEY are so truly representative of everything that is American; indeed, his record embodies both the inspiration and exemplification of the opportunity that clearly spells out the heritage which belongs to and is within the grasp of every youngster in the Nation.

ALBEN WILLIAM BARKLEY was born in a log cabin on the outskirts of a rural community in western Kentucky; in addition to the assets that are inherent in an ancestry of sturdy, God-fearing, respectable, hardworking people, even though he came into the world without the proverbial silver spoon in his mouth, he was endowed with more precious gifts—a song in his heart and a twinkle in his eye. Under the circumstances, it largely was his lot to pull himself up, step by step, by his own boot-straps, and he did it cheerfully, purposefully, and hopefully, gradually preparing himself, and at the same time building the good will and creating the opportunities out of which he has carved the notable career of highly constructive public service he has to his credit.

A lawyer by profession, ALBEN BARKLEY began his public service as prosecuting attorney of McCracken County, subsequently serving as judge of the court of that same county, which service led to his election to Congress and, eventually, to the exalted position of Vice President of the United States.

The most detailed scrutiny and exhaustive examination of the long, uninterrupted record of ALBEN BARKLEY will disclose on every count an unflinching and steadfast interest in the advancement of the great body of the American people. Before the time when so-called reactionaries and would-be liberals were identified and classified as extremists of the right or left. ALBEN BARKLEY stanchly took his stand in behalf of the American people as a whole, consistently, patiently, and effectively working year in and year out to the best possible advantage in their interests, regardless of political climate, circumstances, or the temporary trends that engulfed and obliterated men of narrower vision and smaller understanding of the basic needs and aspirations of the great mass of the American people. In retrospect, the first twenty years of his congressional service loom as the training period which equipped him to become the co-architect of the legislative structure which during these past twenty years has brought the greatest benefits to the greatest number of people in the entire history of our country. His is the record of a great Democrat in action in behalf of democracy in fact and in operation.

And so today we have paused here to mark the completion of the 39 years that Kentucky's favorite son has served his State and Nation in the Halls of Congress, and to avail ourselves of this opportunity to renew our expressions of respect, admiration, and affection for him. On behalf of the people of Kentucky, I salute the Vice President of the United States on this memorable occasion, and extend to him sincere good wishes for many more years of useful public service.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to make a very few brief and very cautious remarks about a good Democrat and great American. I would not go so far as to urge his reelection. I do wish him the best of health, happiness, and success in the many years that I hope he has remaining.

The Vice President has been most fair in presiding over the Senate. His sense of humor has carried him over many rough spots. As majority floor leader his eloquence as a speaker is well remembered. Sometimes his speeches were almost too persuasive.

I again wish to compliment the Vice President on many years of fine service as a great American and as possessing in high degree human qualities which endear him to his fellows.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly indeed. I am glad to join in these testimonials to your character and your ability, and I should like particularly to pay respect to your good humor and your statesmanlike qualities as I have seen them manifested, first as floor leader and then as Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate.

I am refreshing my own memory on a little incident in which you participated in the ordinary course of a day's work, but which I remember very clearly. In my make-up, Mr. President, I have a great deal of levity. The older I get, the more it tends to get hold of me. I remember on one occasion when I had been in the Senate a year or two there was a passage of amenities between myself and another Senator. I was conscious of Senatorial courtesy in action, and I began humorously to exaggerate it.

You stepped up to me a little later and—in what words I forget—in some way conveyed to me the idea that Senatorial courtesy was a very real thing and that it was a very useful thing, and that perhaps levity on that particular subject ought not to be pursued too far.

While I retain my levity, I trust the little lesson you gave me will keep me from extending it into that particular field. I thank you for that little lesson. I am glad that you are with us. I hope that you will be with us a long time.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I shall add only a few words to what has been said. Although one great Democrat, at least, was honored because of the enemies he had made, those of us who know the present distinguished occupant of the chair are happy that he is honored because of the friends that he has made in this Chamber and across the country. I think it is very appropriate that Republicans should join in praising his fine qualities. It is also significant, I believe that wherever he goes throughout the country people come out to see him because they recognize the type of person he is, the type of statesman he is, and, most of all, the type of friend he is.

I wish to say that one of the finest memories I shall take with me will be the happy association I have enjoyed with the distinguished personage who now occupies the chair in the Senate, the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I know that the people of Delaware think most highly of the Vice President of the United States. I am confident, Mr. President, that you have heard the saying "double or nothing." I think that all I might say might add up to nothing, but I want to double all of the other good things that have been said about you.

I have almost unlimited affection for you, sir, and the only limitation on that affection is the affection I have for Mrs. Barkley.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, an endeavor to add anything of value to the glowing tributes, which have been most eloquently paid in the Senate this afternoon to the greatest of all Vice Presidents, would be as futile as an attempt—

To paint the lily,
Throw a perfume on the violet,
Or add another hue unto the rainbow.

To eulogize you, Mr. President BARKLEY, in accordance with your merits would be an undertaking as impossible of performance as the task of the vestal virgin who, in order to prove her innocence, was required to carry water in a sieve from the banks of the Tiber to the top of the Capitoline Hill. Nevertheles I am irresistibly tempted to borrow a few memorable expressions from certain immortals and, subject to slight change, apply them to you simply as a token of affection and esteem. Please be assured that those over whom you rule in the Senate as wisely, justly, and beneficently as Solomon ruled in Jerusalem, today rejoice in the realization that in your long,

diversified and dazzling public career, you have, among many other things,

Won the great world's envied prize,
And grand you look in people's eyes,
With Hon. and LL.D.,
In big, brave letters fair to see.

* * * * *

You've worn the judge's ermined robe;
You've taught your name to all the globe;
You've sung mankind a deathless strain;
You've made the dead past live again.

In anticipation of what you were to be, the world's greatest dramatist said of you, Mr. President, long ago, and one of your most devoted friends says to you now:

When, in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes,
I all alone beweep my outcast state,
And trouble deaf Heaven with my bootless cries,
And look upon myself, and curse my fate,
Wishing me like to one more rich in hope,
Featured like him, like him with friends possess'd,
Desiring this man's art and that man's scope,
With what I most enjoy contented least;
Yet in these thoughts myself almost despising,
(President BARKLEY) Haply I think on thee, and then my state,
Like to the lark at break of day arising
From sullen earth, sings hymns at Heaven's gate;
For thy sweet love remember'd such wealth brings
That then I scorn to change my state with kings.

Mr. President, you first came to the House of Representatives on the fourth of March 1913. As the result of a special election, it was my honor and privilege to become your colleague and gain your acquaintance in that great legislative Chamber on the first day of the following November. Our warm friendship for each other which then and there leaped into life has never lost a single jot of its vigor or a single tittle of its value.

During the intervening years, by virtue of unsurpassable public service as a Congressman, a United States Senator, majority leader of the Senate, and Vice President of the United States, you have won international fame, bestowed countless blessings upon humanity and inscribed your name in the golden book of immortality. For your meticulous patriotism we extol you, for your matchless eloquence we laud you, for your unfailing humanitarian service we love you.

Kentucky—one of the Nation's most prolific progenitors of immortality—has given the world none nobler, greater, or grander than you. To the hosts who intimately know you and the millions who dearly love you, you are—

A spring of ice-cold water to the parched and burning lips of thirst;
A palm that lifts its coronet of leaves above the desert sand;
An isle of green in some far sea;
The purple light of dawn above the eastern hills;
A cloud of gold beneath the setting sun;
A fragrance wafted from an unseen shore;
A silvery strain of music heard within some palace wrought of dreams.

Mr. President, we sincerely wish you very much longer life, perfect health, and unlimited success, prosperity, happiness, and peace. Our fond recollections of you and of the inspiration, the friendship, and the kindness with which you have infinitely enriched our lives will be to the end of our days:

The rainbow to our storms of life,
The evening beam that smiles the clouds away,
And tints tomorrow with prophetic ray.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I cannot speak as eloquently as have my colleagues, but I can speak as sincerely and as earnestly in paying humble tribute to the great man who now occupies the high office of Vice President of these United States.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] expressed my sentiments exactly when he spoke of the great friendships which exist throughout this country and the love the people have for the Vice President of the United States.

In my own State of Colorado there is no man in public life who is held in higher regard and deeper affection than is the Vice President.

I wish to congratulate the people of the United States and the Congress of the United States upon these 39 years of superior service, magnificent service, which we have been privileged to enjoy because of ALBEN BARKLEY.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think it is very appropriate for these remarks to be made at this time, when the Vice President is still living and in good health. He has served 39 years in the Congress, and with the health that he enjoys at the present time, we may expect many more useful years of service from him.

Remarks such as those we have been hearing for the last few minutes are usually made about a man after he has passed on. In my opinion we are speaking about a person who is very active and will mean much to the Nation in the years to come. I say that because of the fact that love for ALBEN BARKLEY knows no North, no South, no East, no West; it is not confined to the capitalists of America, and certainly it is not confined to labor alone. All classes of people in America love our Vice President and Presiding Officer.

There is a reason for that. If we but look back upon his record in the Congress, we find that always he has been honest and forthright in all his actions and in every vote he has cast. The people of America are satisfied with him because he has done much to build up America and make it the great Nation it is today.

So, Mr. President, I hope that our Presiding Officer and Vice President will have many more years of service to the Nation.

I am confident also that after he has departed from this life, the influence for good he has exerted in the Senate and also in the House of Representatives will be felt for generations to come. That is something to be proud of.

May we look to you, Mr. President, as an example to follow. If we do that, America will continue to be great and to grow and to be sufficiently strong to meet any foe that may confront her.

(The following remarks made by Mr. UNDERWOOD on March 7 were, on his request, and by unanimous consent, ordered to be printed in the permanent RECORD at this point:)

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, it is a matter of genuine regret to me that I was absent last Tuesday when deserved tributes were paid to one of Kentucky's most illustrious sons, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States. After the proceedings on Tuesday I wrote an editorial entitled "Mr. Vice President," which was published in the Lexington (Ky.) Herald. The editorial inadequately expresses my feelings toward our beloved Presiding Officer, but, such as it is, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

I also ask unanimous consent that in the permanent RECORD this statement and the editorial be printed at the appropriate place in the proceedings of Tuesday, March 4.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorial is as follows:

MR. VICE PRESIDENT

A proposal was made 4 years ago to strengthen the Vice Presidency, to increase its responsibilities by legislative enactments and to create new duties for the Vice President. At that time the Herald said editorially that the way to add to the prestige of the Vice Presidency was to elect ALBEN W. BARKLEY to that office. The way in which this prediction has been confirmed by the logic of events and written into the RECORD of our times could not be demonstrated better than in the tributes that were paid to Vice President BARKLEY in the United States Senate on March 4. This was the anniversary of the day when 39 years ago, Mr. BARKLEY took the oath as a Member of the House of Representatives.

He and SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, who presides over the House of Representatives, became Members of Congress on the same day. Members of Congress have enjoyed the references made by Mr. RAYBURN when he has said that while he is Speaker of the House, Vice President BARKLEY presides over the Senate, "a body of equal dignity."

There is no man in public life in America who today is more widely known, beloved, and respected than the Vice President. Spending Christmas with the boys in Korea was typical of the sentiment which has endeared him to the American people.

The circumstances attending the tributes that were paid to him were such that he did not take time to reminisce about the very remarkable scenes and events to which he has been a witness and of which he has been a part. More is the pity because if there was anything omitted in the tributes paid the Vice President, it was the absence of the famous Barkley stories that have enriched so many other occasions.

These tributes, however, were from Members of the United States Senate in honor of his services as a presiding officer. The praise that was heaped upon him came from both sides of the aisle and from all sections of the United States.

All Kentuckians will take just pride in this recognition of the service to his country of the Commonwealth's honored son in the Vice Presidency, an office he has filled so well that it seems as if it were created for him and he for it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair finds it difficult to respond adequately to the very gracious tributes which have been paid to him by his colleagues in the

Senate, without regard to political affiliations. I shall attempt to do so only briefly.

As was said by the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], 39 years constitute quite a long period out of any man's life, no matter what his calling or occupation may be; and, of course, under the present circumstances, the temptation is strong to reminisce somewhat concerning the events which have transpired during that period of 39 years.

I am grateful, of course, to the people of my State and to the people of the Nation for the opportunity they have given me to serve them in a long and critical period of their history. Whether that service has been good or bad is not for me to say. If I had it to do over, I would try to make it better; but, such as it has been, I am proud of it and thankful for the opportunity to render it.

We all know here that there are no financial compensations that accrue to public servants, here or elsewhere, commensurate with those attainable in private life by the exercise of the same industry, the same devotion, and the same honesty and sincerity which we devote to our public duties in this body and in the other body, and in almost all public stations, whether they are National, State, or local. But there are compensations which come to men in public life that are priceless. They cannot be sold for money, they cannot be bought with money. One of those compensations is the feeling, which sometimes may be an illusion, though it is a delightful illusion if it is one, that we are rendering public service to those who have honored and trusted us with brief and temporary public authority. Another compensation which comes is the sincere friendship, understanding, and admiration that develop among men who serve with one another in public life, as they do among those who serve in private life in any capacity which may appeal to their ambitions, their desires, or their inclinations.

The Senate of the United States is frequently referred to as the greatest club in the United States. It is not that, although there is a spirit of camaraderie which exists here among Members who become acquainted with one another, who understand one another's strength and one another's weaknesses. There is such a thing as that comradeship, but, since I have been acquainted with the Senate, it has never gone to the extent of inducing any Senator to justify or condone wrongdoing, unethical conduct, violation of the courtesies and amenities of life which prevail here, and which ought to prevail in all bodies constituted of human beings.

I am happy beyond my powers of expression to have been the recipient here today of these beautiful tributes from my friends. Whatever may be in store for me, or for you, I shall always carry with me in the years to come, this priceless thing beyond the frontiers of financial consideration, which is the friendship, the respect, and the affection of those with whom I now serve and with whom I have served in both Houses of the Congress over this 39-year period.

Many changes have taken place in our Government during those 39 years. Many changes have taken place among our people in those 39 years. Profound changes have occurred in our relationship to the world and the relationship of the world to us in those 39 years. It is gratifying not only to have witnessed these changes, but to have been permitted to participate in them and in some small degree, to guide them in the channels which they have taken and which they have formed in the flow of human society and of human aspirations.

When I came to Congress 39 years ago, no President had delivered a message to a joint session of the two Houses since the days of George Washington, who delivered one and was so heckled by the Members that he swore he would never go to the Capitol again—and he did not. Jefferson, who was not an orator but a very shy and modest man, discontinued the practice of delivering his messages to joint sessions of the Congress. When Woodrow Wilson became President he reestablished that custom, and I shall never forget his opening remark, as a sort of justification for the President's coming to the joint session, because there had been some criticism that it seemed more like the king going to Parliament to deliver his message from the throne. Having in mind that criticism, President Wilson suggested that he did not think either the Congress or the Chief Executive should occupy an island of isolation at either end of Pennsylvania Avenue, when they were required to work together so closely in behalf of the American people. Since that time the custom, regardless of political party, of the President's coming to the Capitol to deliver his message in person, to look the representatives of the people in the face and let them look him in the face, standing before the entire Nation, has become so well established that I doubt whether it will ever again be discontinued in the years to come. I mention that only as one of the changes which have taken place in the relationship of our Government to the people, and in the relationship of the different branches of the Government to one another.

Let me thank you, my friends, from the depths of my heart, for these gracious tributes. Let me wish for all of you—each of you and all of you, regardless of your political affiliation—not only long life and happiness, in all that those terms mean, but that profound contentment which comes to men who in their consciences feel that they have served their day, their generation, and their fellow men. Thank you again. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say, first, that I think this will be a memorable day for every Member of the Senate, both for those who have participated in the proceedings which constituted a marvelous tribute to the Vice President of the United States, and to all who read the proceedings in the RECORD.

I regret that it becomes necessary for me to change the subject somewhat, but in changing the subject, Mr. President, I want to say that I have never seen a greater demonstration of nonpartisanship than that which has just now taken place upon the floor of the Senate. I was reminded, as these tributes were being paid to you, Mr. President, by Senators on both sides of the aisle, that only a few days ago we heard the Farewell Address of George Washington read from the rostrum, and I was reminded of the declaration which he made in that address and which we emphasize, that the progress of this Nation and of its people depend in large measure upon their capacity to rise above the spirit of faction. That was done in a very notable way today.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, approximately 14 years ago the controversy began with which Senate Joint Resolution 20, the measure now before the Senate, attempts to deal. This controversy is over the manner in which the mineral resources of the lands submerged by the open ocean adjacent to the coasts of the United States shall be administered and developed. I desire as briefly as may be possible to outline some of the aspects of this controversy by inviting the attention of the Members of the Senate to a few charts which I have brought to the floor.

The first chart is one outlining the Continental Shelf. The area shown on the chart in white, surrounding the coastal boundaries of continental United States, represents the submerged area which is within the reach of modern drilling machinery at least theoretically. In some places this area extends 100 miles or more into the open sea. In other places it is comparatively narrow, but in most places it extends beyond what is known as the 3-mile limit.

CLAIM FIRST ASSERTED BY PRESIDENT

The existence of this Continental Shelf was not recognized by the people of the United States for many years, and no claim was made to it on behalf of the people until on the 28th of September, 1945, the present President of the United States issued a Proclamation asserting the jurisdiction of the United States over this area. He did that for the purpose of enabling the Congress to pass the necessary legislation to determine how the mineral resources of these submerged lands should be administered.

The area is sometimes referred to as "the tidelands." This name is a complete misnomer. Senate Joint Resolution 20 and the controversy do not involve tidelands at all. Tidelands consist of those lands which are covered by the ebb and flow of the tides. Areas landward of the low-water mark are the

property of the coastal States. The The Federal Government has not asserted any claim of any kind or character to the tidelands.

In the three Supreme Court cases on the issue, those against the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas, the Government makes it clear that no attempt was being made to assert any right, title, or interest on behalf of the people and the Federal Government to the tidelands.

HARBORS AND BAYS NOT INVOLVED

There is another area seaward of the low-water mark that is not in issue. Lands beneath true bays, harbors or inlets likewise are not claimed by the United States. The lands below the low-tide mark which are within a known harbor, port, inlet or bay or which are known as inland navigable waters, such as that beneath navigable streams and lakes are acknowledged by the Federal Government to be the property of the coastal States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator, being a very able attorney, realizes that the Government of the United States could change its position if it wanted to and claim the inland waters. What the outcome would then be, no one would know. But at this time I agree with the Senator that the Solicitor General does not claim that land.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the United States could claim the moon. I do not think there is any more possibility, however, of any such claim being asserted to the lands submerged by inland navigable waters or bays, harbors, and inlets than to any of the celestial bodies.

Mr. LONG. The Senator also knows that Harold Ickes, when Secretary of the Interior, signed letters clearly stating that the submerged lands to which reference has been made actually belonged to the States. He was an attorney. Yet he changed his mind and decided that the lands should be claimed by the Federal Government. If that was done once, how can the Senator be sure that history will not repeat itself?

ICKES' OPINION NOT BINDING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. While I have a great deal of respect for the former Secretary of the Interior, the late Harold L. Ickes, and I regarded him as a friend for whom I had a great deal of affection, still I must say that his judgment at that time, although he later changed it, was not the judgment of a court. It was not the judgment of Congress. It did not shape a policy for the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would not the senior Senator from Wyoming at this point desire to call attention to a bill which he has introduced on behalf of himself and the junior Senator from New Mexico, Senate bill 1540, which would unequivocally assert the ownership of the States in the areas about which apparently they are so much concerned? That bill could be passed and settle the matter very quickly, could it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. I am glad the Senator from New Mexico has called attention to that bill.

I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that somehow or other I cannot stand upon this floor with a chart before me and a pointer in my hand without inviting many questions from Senators. Ordinarily I should like to yield to every request that may come, but today, as it happens, I have an engagement of some standing which I must meet, and I must be on a train by 3 o'clock.

So I should like to be able to present briefly this picture before the RECORD becomes clouded by the very acute questions that will be asked by the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators. Later I shall be very glad to indulge the Senator from Louisiana in any questions he may wish to ask with regard to this matter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The House report on similar legislation, at page 36, has a chart that shows there are 60,000 square miles of submerged lands in the Great Lakes as against only 26,000 square miles in the marginal sea along the States.

With twice as much acreage in the Great Lakes, would it not seem somewhat unreasonable for the States which border the Great Lakes to claim submerged property along the States' boundaries for the Federal Government, and to say, on the other hand, that we should help them protect the title of their States?

STATE OWNERSHIP TO INLAND WATERS ESTABLISHED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I entertain no fear whatsoever on that score, because the Supreme Court for many, many years has held, particularly in one notable case, which, as I recall, was the Pollard case, that the States are the owners of lands submerged by inland navigable waters. For myself, and for those who have been associated with me in supporting this proposed legislation, I here reassert that no claim whatsoever is made to lands submerged by inland navigable waters—lakes, rivers, or streams—just as no claim is asserted to lands which are submerged by the water of harbors, bays, or inlets.

States which border on the Great Lakes need entertain no fear whatsoever. Under controlling decisions by the Supreme Court, the United States has no claim to lands submerged by such inland waters. We are here dealing solely with the problem of what is to be done about waters under the open sea.

For the benefit of Senators who have not had an opportunity to read the record of our hearings, or who have not seen the exhibits, I should like to point to the chart before me, which is a cross section of a typical continental shelf.

The area to which I now point is sometimes called the uplands; that is, land which is landward of the high-water mark.

The next area is terra firma, without any waters of the ocean or any bay, inlet, harbor, or river.

Coming to the coast line, we have the tidelands, the area between high-water mark and low-water mark, covered by the ebb and flow of the tides. These areas belong to the coastal States.

JEFFERSON CLAIMED MARGINAL SEA

Then there is what is known as the marginal sea. That is the area which is seaward of the low-water mark, and extends to the 3-mile limit.

The 3-mile limit was not established by action of any State. It was established by international law. I believe Thomas Jefferson, as Secretary of State in 1793, was the first to assert jurisdiction of the United States over waters of the open sea within 3 miles of low-water mark. That action was taken, Mr. President, solely for the purpose of protecting the sovereignty of the United States.

The 3-mile limit was established years ago, at a time when the science of military weapons had developed only to a degree which enabled a cannon to shoot a projectile about 3 miles. So, on the theory that fortifications upon the shore could protect the area 3 miles distant, the 3-mile doctrine was asserted.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for one last question? Then I shall not interrupt him further, because I know he wants to keep an appointment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. We have been discussing on the floor the question whether the Federal Government might or might not claim the beds of navigable rivers. I hold in my hand the brief of the Federal Government in the case of United States of America against State of California. At page 72 the representative of the Federal Government stated:

> Finally, the Government submits that ownership of submerged lands is not an attribute of sovereignty at all within the meaning of the equal footing clause. The contrary rule with respect to the tidelands and inland waters is believed to be erroneous, but the Government does not ask that it be overruled; the Government suggests merely that the unsound rule be not extended to the marginal sea. See Infra, pages 143–153."

The Government won that case. The Government now comes forward and says, "Although we said we thought this rule unsound, but did not then ask that it be overruled, since we were upheld, we now ask that it be overruled."

The Government has done exactly that with regard to the old civil-rights cases, dealing with the "separate but equal" doctrine. It would be just as easy for the Solicitor General, Mr. Perlman, to ask the Supreme Court to overrule itself on the equal-rights doctrine.

MARGINAL SEA IN CONTROVERSY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana and my other colleagues on the floor will understand why I do not want this simple introductory statement of mine to be complicated by technical, legal arguments taken from legal briefs. I want to make a simple, understandable statement, as

I would were I the newspaperman I was before I studied law. So I suggest, Mr. President, that we indulge a little later in the complexities of legal discussion, and allow me to proceed with my statement.

At the point I now indicate on the map are the uplands—terra firma. The uplands, terra firma, the tidelands, and the area covered by the ebb and flow of the tide all belong to the States. The area beyond the seaward side of the low-water mark, which is within a harbor, bay, inlet, or such a body of water, also belongs to the coastal States.

The area within the 3-mile limit under the open ocean is the area concerning which this controversy began. When the President of the United States, in September 1945, asserted for the first time a claim on behalf of the United States beyond the three-mile limit he was making a proclamation effective in international law, and was asserting a claim on behalf of all of the people of the United States to the mineral resources of the entire Continental Shelf adjacent to our coasts.

What is the Continental Shelf?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, having in mind the Senator's request, I shall not take much of his time, because he must catch a train. However, I should like to make one comment, for the sake of clarity.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At this point it should be shown that under its constitution of 1849, by which California entered the Union, it was clearly established that the State boundary extended three English miles into the Pacific Ocean.

Furthermore, I wonder if the Senator intends to discuss in the course of his remarks the case of coastal islands like Santa Barbara and Catalina, over which the State of California has jurisdiction. They are a part of the county governments of California. Under the doctrine which the Senator has enunciated, that once we get beyond the actual tide line, where the tide flows over the land, all else belongs to the Federal Government, what becomes of the coastal islands?

TOPOGRAPHY OF CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not "all else". I shall come to the coastal islands later in the discussion, but probably not this afternoon, because time is fleeting, and my train will be leaving soon.

I point out that the Continental Shelf is a geological formation which is covered, not by the deep ocean, but by the shallow part of the ocean. However, occasionally there is an island. That is to say, an eminence from the Continental Shelf, rising above the surface, becomes an island. The line which I now indicate on the chart, where a sharp declivity appears, represents the outward or seaward edge of the Continental Shelf. Beyond that there is the deep body of the ocean; and even beyond that, there are oceanic islands rising from the deep bed of the ocean itself.

Let me say in passing that the Government of the United States, the National Government, has the paramount right over the ocean within the 3-mile limit, to the edge of the Continental Shelf. But when the edge of the Continental Shelf is reached, and we are sailing upon the deep ocean, we are then sailing upon the international domain. The freedom of the seas, an ancient doctrine to which the Government of the United States has adhered, is a principle based upon the idea that the open ocean is not the property of any nation, but that it may be sailed upon by the peoples of the world.

The chart which I now exhibit dramatically shows the situation which exists in the Gulf of Mexico. It is a relief map of the land under the Gulf of Mexico. There was drawn upon this map a white line, extending diagonally down from Sabine Pass, which is the boundary between Texas and Louisiana, to the edge of the chart, over the Continental Shelf.

THE CONTINENTAL SHELF IN THE GULF

The second line is designed to show the depth of the water beneath the sea level in the Gulf of Mexico. The point on which I now place the pointer is 140 miles into the Gulf of Mexico. The depth of the sea at that point is 600 feet. Twenty-five miles farther into the open Gulf, far beyond the 3-mile limit, far beyond the limit that was attempted to be declared by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana and by the Legislature of the State of Texas, both of which States sought to extend their boundaries into the open ocean, we have a point 165 miles into the Gulf, where the depth is 3,000 feet. Two hundred seventy-five miles out the depth is 6,000 feet, to the ocean bed. Two hundred ninety miles out it is 9,000 feet.

Senators will observe the heavy coloring of green water. That is to indicate the drop of the Continental Shelf, and the great canyons which appear.

I remember well, back in 1940 or thereabouts, when the greatest United States liner that had been built up to that date was launched at Norfolk, took its trial trip up to the city of New York. Officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey were on board also, and some of us who had the privilege of going up to the captain's quarters upon the top deck saw these maps.

There for the first time I learned and saw how in ancient days the Hudson River must have flowed out far beyond the present coastline, because the soundings of the Coast and Geodetic Survey showed a deep canyon, like that of the Colorado River Canyon in our West, which had been worn by the flowing river water before the ocean came as far inland as it now is.

CONTROVERSY UNSETTLED AFTER 14 YEARS

This, then, is a picture of the Continental Shelf, and it illustrates the point which I am trying to make. The controversy here is over the determination of what governmental authority has the responsibility and duty of administering this area and developing its mineral resources.

As the sponsor of this bill, together with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], let me say that we were motivated by the feeling that since an effort has been made for some 14 years to induce the Congress of the United States to quitclaim to the States the land under the open ocean, and since it is essential that we develop the petroleum resources of the United States, the time has come for the enactment by Congress of interim legislation which would, as I stated on a previous occasion, postpone the controversy and produce the oil. We took this action because of our knowledge that the one quitclaim bill which has passed the Congress was vetoed by the present President of the United States. It was not passed over his veto. I have no reason to believe that a quitclaim bill could be passed over a veto now.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to correct one inference which might be made from the Senator's statement. He stated that bills had been introduced to cause the Federal Government to quitclaim all of this property. The Senator has drawn a base line which indicates the possibility of oil production 140 miles out in the open ocean. The line is an extension of the border between Louisiana and Texas. It should be remembered that no one proposes that the Federal Government should quitclaim more than ten miles out to sea. The Senator from Wyoming heard experts testify before his committee with regard to this problem, and they stated that acre for acre there was just as good a chance of finding oil further out as there was closer in with respect to the Continental Shelf.

CLAIM TO ENTIRE CONTINENTAL SHELF

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am reasonably convinced that at least one of the quitclaim bills, the one which passed the House and which is now before this body, would do precisely that, in substance. It would open the door to claim by the coastal States to the entire Continental Shelf.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wyoming knows that that bill provides that it would be quitclaimed to the States' original boundaries, which would be 10 miles, not the additional 130 miles of the 140 miles, as indicated as the base line.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it sets up a color of claim in that it calls for a percentage of royalties which may be derived from the whole area, as well as providing for undefined and hence possibly broad police and administrative powers by the State out to the edge on the shelf.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Louisiana to indulge me. We will get to that point later on, after I have come back from my trip. I shall not be gone long.

I have another chart of the Gulf of Mexico which I now exhibit to the Senate. It is a map of the Continental Shelf both with respect to Texas and Louisiana, and it attempts to show the location of oil fields, gas fields, and leases which have been granted since 1946 and outstanding on August 1, 1950.

The oil fields are marked in green. They are not very large, it will be noticed. The gas fields are marked in red. They are mostly in the uplands.

The leases of the submerged lands are shown in brown. It will be observed that a line is carried from the mouth of the river 10 miles out into the Gulf of Mexico. That line was intended to show the original 3-marine-league boundary of the Republic of Texas. It will be observed that a line on the Louisiana side shows a 3-mile boundary out to sea.

MAJORITY OF LEASES BEYOND MARGINAL SEA

With respect to both Texas and Louisiana, by far the largest number of leases which have been granted upon submerged lands are beyond the 3-mile limit of Louisiana and beyond the 3-marine-league boundary which Texas claimed when it was an independent republic.

However, the point I should like to make to the Senators who have gathered before this chart is that this area, constituting the shore of Louisiana, is a part of the Louisiana Purchase. The State of Louisiana, the State of Arkansas, and the other States, including even a part of the State of Wyoming, were all within the boundaries of the Louisiana Purchase. They were bought with the tax money of all of the people of all the States.

This entire area afterward was divided into the present States. It was bought years before the State of Louisiana came into existence. There was an international commitment in existence then. When Jefferson purchased that land from France he was buying all the sovereign rights of France. Those sovereign rights included the control of the open ocean within the marginal seas.

RESOURCES CLAIMED BY THREE STATES

How then does it come about that a claim to the mineral resources of the lands beneath this open ocean can be asserted on behalf of the people of one State or two States or, when we come to California, by the people of three States; and how can the claim of the people whose dollars were used in making the purchase be disregarded?

What are we to say to the people of Arkansas, the people of Oklahoma, the people of Colorado, the people of Wyoming, and the people of the other States formed from this area which was purchased by money taken from the Federal Treasury? Did they not obtain an interest and a right in the mineral resources beneath this open ocean?

The answer of the Supreme Court is that they did. In the California case the Supreme Court said, as it also said in the Louisiana case, that when California was admitted to the Union it did not obtain and never had any rights over the mineral resources of the lands beneath the open ocean. When the Thirteen Colonies were separate they had no international rights. They were colonies of Great Britain, and the international power was controlled by the British Government.

AUTHORITY WON BY NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

After the Revolutionary War the treaty of peace was written, not with the Thirteen Colonies, but with the Confederation, the United States of America. By that treaty of peace, as the fruit of the Revolutionary War, which was fought by the Continental Army and Continental Navy—not by the army of any State—the United States became the inheritor of all the sovereign power that Britain had under the open ocean.

The Supreme Court said in the California case, and repeated it in the Louisiana case, that when California came into the Union, it came in without any sovereignty, because the United States had the sovereignty before the State was created. It was the United States as a Nation that had obtained from Mexico the territory that became California.

CHAIN OF TITLE IN NATION

So the chain of title to sovereignty is clearly one from the Government of Great Britain in the first place, and the Government of Mexico in the second place. Perhaps I should demote the other two States, and say to my good friend from Louisiana that, in the first place, in the case of Louisiana, the purchase was made from France. Therefore, sovereignty lies in the United States. The quit-claim bills are an attempt to take away a part of the sovereignty of the Nation. To that I am unwilling to consent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Although I know there are some Senators who agree with the Senator from Wyoming, I am sure he realizes that many of us disagree with him on his theory that the Thirteen Original States were never independent, each in its own right. Those of us who differ with the Senator from Wyoming feel that if he were correct, there would never been any necessity for the several States to ratify and sign the treaty of peace. The Senator's theory was first written into the Curtiss Wright Export Co. case, but we feel that it was a distortion of history. I am prepared to argue that that is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator from Louisiana is well prepared to argue it.

EQUIPMENT AND MEN IDLE

However, the point I wish to emphasize is, again, that we have before us a bill which in the present critical state of international affairs will permit the Secretary of the Interior to authorize the development of these lands. Under the present unfortunate system, there are tied up in the Gulf ports of Louisiana the boats and equipment of a number of companies which are anxious and willing to go into this area and drill for oil. Additional exploration is needed. The area in brown on the chart, as compared with the Continental Shelf, shows how small a proportion has been developed.

Why cannot we proceed to develop it, Mr. President? Then if our friends wish to take some part of the sovereign power of the Government of the United States and attach it to their States, let them try to do so; but the bill will be vetoed and will fail. Let us proceed now to make it possible for drilling for oil to proceed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield again to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was trying to close my own speech, let me say to the Senator; but I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Senators are observing the chart; and I should like to point out, in connection with what the Senator from Wyoming has said, that the brown areas on the chart include what purport to be the areas subject to leases issued by the States. However, it would be a mistake for Senators to proceed under the impression that all those areas are producing. Only one or two or perhaps a few of the leases are actually producing. However, it is presumed that oil production could be obtained from many of those leases.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana is quite correct.

OIL ESSENTIAL IN PEACE OR WAR

Mr. President, I tried to make it clear that the chart purports to show oil fields in green, gas fields in red, and the leases in brown. The productive capacity of this area may be beyond imagination. The geologists who testified before our committee, as I recall the testimony, expressed the opinion that from 200,000 to 300,000 additional barrels of oil a day can be produced from this area. Petroleum is the most precious material in modern industry and in modern war, and already the United States of America is on an import basis. The drillers are ready and willing to proceed.

In this bill the Secretary of the Interior is allowed to confirm existing good-faith leases, under certain restrictions and provisions. That is done because in the presentation of the case before the Supreme Court, the Attorney General and the Solicitor General made it clear that they had no purpose to make any attack upon good-faith leases.

Mr. President, this afternoon I shall not attempt to discuss the details of the bill, because I must catch the 3 o'clock train, but let me say to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that tomorrow or the next day I shall attempt to resume the discussion.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

PROGRESS REPORT ON FEDERAL MANPOWER POLICIES

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it is my privilege today to report on the progress and certain findings to date of our subcommittee on Federal manpower policies.

Mr. President, the investigation by the subcommittee reveals that a number of personnel policies and practices currently in effect are causing unnecessary waste of both manpower and money in the Federal Government. By careful examination, we have found in the Government's personnel structure the loss of thousands of man-hours and millions of dollars each year though duplication of effort, poor utilization of manpower, and the use of cumbersome, obsolete, and time-consuming procedures.

Mr. President, within the last few days we have all heard widely publicized statements to the effect that the improvement of the Federal personnel system is of especial urgency at this time. There can be real doubt of that. Numerous personnel policies and practices are seriously hampering the full utilization of our Federal working force during the present emergency. From a long-range view, our subcommittee is convinced that maximum economy and efficiency in our Government can never be achieved until major alterations are made in the basic personnel structure.

I am convinced that we have an untapped reservoir of energy and efficiency in our Federal workers. The vast majority of Government employees are reliable, conscientious, and hardworking people who want to do a good job. That is one of the reasons why I have insisted that we look into causes of poor utilization of manpower, for if we can rid the Federal structure of red tape and antiquated practices, Government workers will be able to make their finest contribution to the public service.

Mr. President, by its adoption of Senate resolution 53 on February 19, 1951, the Senate fully recognized the need for an appraisal of and substantial improvements in the Government's personnel system. That resolution directed the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct a full and complete study and investigation into the personnel needs and practices of the Government departments and agencies. The aim set forth was the formulation of policies for the most effective utilization of civilian personnel during the period of the national emergency.

As authorized by the resolution, a subcommittee was appointed. In addition to myself as chairman, it is composed of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

That resolution—Senate resolution 53—launched what is now the most comprehensive examination of the Government's personnel system ever undertaken by a committee of Congress. There have been other investigations, but they have never attempted to examine critically the whole framework of the Federal personnel structure with a view to increasing substantially the utilization of Federal manpower.

In order to give the Senate some idea as to the magnitude of the job we have under way, I wish to cite at this time a number of the problem areas in personnel administration which currently are under study.

First of all, we are carefully examing such basic areas as recruitment and employment practices, transfer procedures within governments, methods for selecting and developing supervisors, incentive awards programs, grievance and appeals procedures, classifications and pay plans, absenteeism and turnover, and reduction-in-force procedures. We are appraising the effectiveness of both the Whitten and the Jensen amendments. The utilization of civilian personnel in the Department of Defense is the subject of a special study by itself. We are studying the effects of manpower ceilings, and the practice of hiring contractor employees. The relative benefits and costs of hiring consultants and management-consultant firms are under study. We are examining and spotlighting cases of overstaffing and duplication. And finally, we are interested in the possibility of the executive branch developing a plan for the budgeting of its manpower needs.

Mr. President, each of these problem areas is concerned with policies and practices which have a direct bearing on the utilization of our Federal manpower during the emergency. In every case two bedrock tests have been applied.

First. Does the policy or practice result in the waste of Federal manpower and money during the current emergency?

Second. Does the policy or practice involved promote the long-range efficiency and economy in the use of Federal personnel?

With these two tests as our principal measurement, Mr. President, we have discovered that the shortcomings found in the Federal personnel system stem from three main causes. These causes may be identified as: obsolete and cumbersome procedures, lack of sufficient incentives for administrators and supervisors to economize, and the failure of the executive branch to develop and plan a comprehensive manpower budget.

Mr. President, with these brief remarks as a background, I should like to summarize certain of the findings of the subcommittee to date. The basic materials from which these summaries are drawn are contained in the files of the subcommittee, and as each project is completed the findings and a report will be printed. As I remarked in my preliminary report to the Senate a few days ago, every statement in our report is factual and well documented. We have not, and we shall not, resort to loose generalizations in the course of this investigation.

I should like to begin my summary of specific findings by discussing the procedures for laying off civilian employees during a reduction in force. In terms of spotlighting instances of waste of Government manpower and money, the examination of this area is of major importance.

A reduction in force, as Senators know, is the action taken to lay off workers when there is a lack of work, cut in appropriations, or ceilings on the number of employees.

In general, the findings of the subcommittee reveal that the costs of laying off Government workers are excessive. They also reveal that the Government is losing many of its most efficient and highly skilled workers. In addition, supervisors resist economy in the use of manpower, due to the adverse effect of the lay-off procedures on the operating efficiency of their units. We have found that the bumping process entailed in lay-off procedures often amounts to the restaffing of an agency by reassigning employees to new jobs. A final result is that the Government often cannot attract new employees, or rehire former workers, as a result of its reduction-in-force policies.

I should like to consider each of these findings briefly:

The subcommittee has found that the costs of administering the detailed regulations and complex procedures in a reduction in force are excessive. We have found, in fact, that the costs often nullify the money savings intended by the action.

One agency informed the subcommittee that it cost an estimated $10,000 to lay off 32 of its employees in a routine reduction in force. Ten thousand dollars to lay off 32 employees amounts to more than $312 per employee. This figure, I might add, includes only the salaries of the people handling the reduction in force procedures in the personnel division. It does not include the time employees spend with supervisors, discussing their displacement, nor does it include the costs involved in the expensive bumping process. Neither does it include the training and retraining of employees who take new jobs within the agency as a result of reassignment. This cost of $10,000 to lay off 32 employees does not even include the cost of the paper involved.

In another agency our staff investigators worked side by side with agency personnel people in conducting a reduction in force in which 164 employees were to be separated. The statistics gathered during this reduction in force reflect in bold relief the costs and complexities of lay-off procedures in government. We found that the personnel office was required to take 1,553 personnel actions over a period of 4½ months. These 1,553 actions included such paper work as reduction-in-force notices, reassignments at the same grade, offers of lower grade, reduction-in-force extensions, cancelations of reassignments, reassignments extended, reduction-in-force notices rescinded, employees transferring out, and employees retiring because of reduction in force.

Mr. President, the end result of these 1,553 personnel actions, and the restaffing and confusion they created was not that 164 people were involuntarily separated as planned, but only 25 people in the lower grades were involuntarily separated. Not 164 as planned, but only 25 workers were laid off. Why? Because during the 4½-month period in which reduction in force was taking place, 399 employees left the agency voluntarily. We cannot say that all of the 399 left because of the confusion and reshuffling incident to the reduction in force. But the agency itself says that 97 workers definitely left because of the reduction in force, and that 200 other employees left the agency because they had received, or thought they were in danger of receiving, reduction-in-force notices.

The ironical fact is that many of those who left would not have received separation notices. But their leaving, as a result of the hurly-burly of current reduction-in-force practices, forced the

agency into the position of having to conduct an intensive recruiting campaign on top of a reduction in force. This is a waste of manpower we can ill afford during this period of national emergency.

The direct administrative costs of conducting that particular reduction in force amounted to a total of 13,000 man-hours, or $33,500. When we consider that the objective of laying off 164 people was never reached, due to the fact that many employees left the agency voluntarily, and that the end result was the involuntary separation of only 25 employees, the direct cost of laying off those 25 workers amounted to more than $1,300 per employee. This does not include the cost of recruiting new employees to fill the vacancies which occurred by voluntary separations.

Mr. President, on top of these direct administrative costs the indirect costs of this reduction in force is even greater. These may be measured in terms of the estimated time that branch officials spent in solving the problems that arose, the loss in working effectiveness of its employees, and time spent in training employees who were shifted into new jobs. Officials of that agency estimated the indirect costs of conducting that reduction in force to be $125,000. Add this to the costs of $33,500, and the total is $159,000 to carry out that reduction in force. If we want to measure the costs in terms of the 164 people who were to be separated originally, it amounts to more than $900 per individual employee. If, on the other hand, we want to measure the costs in terms of the 25 employees who were actually separated by reduction in force, Mr. President, the costs are more than $6,000 per individual employee.

It really does not matter how we measure the man-hours and costs. The truth of the matter is that either $900 or $6,000 is too much money to spend laying off a single worker from the Federal payroll.

Measured Government-wide, these costs mean that the Federal Government is wasting thousands of man-hours and spending millions of dollars every year laying off employees. The costs of laying off people are so outstanding that one experienced personnel official in a letter to the subcommittee stated:

> Based on our experience, it is believed that the cost in man-hours and money of reduction in force as now administered in addition to the loss of morale of employees of the agency, is far greater than the actual money saved by legislative action requiring a reduction in force.

Mr. President, I doubt that a stronger statement could be made on the costs of reduction in force.

Aside from the costs, the subcommittee has found that the Government is losing many of its most efficient and highly skilled workers as a direct result of lay-off practices. As Senators will recall, Congress established in the Veterans' Preference Act four factors to control the order of lay-offs in a reduction in force. These factors are efficiency rating, length of service, tenure of employment, and military preference.

Mr. President, our examination reveals that the weight given each of these four factors varies considerably. The result is that they do not insure the utilization of the most efficient working force to carry on the complex duties of government.

Efficiency or individual merit is given virtually no weight in determining which employees will remain and which will go in the event of a reduction in force. It is true that each employee with a satisfactory-performance rating gets one retention credit for reduction-in-force purposes. But what can that mean when more than 99 percent of all Federal employees have a satisfactory rating? It can mean that it is only window dressing. There is little real incentive for an employee to strive for individual efficiency in his job when his efficiency, good or bad, is given virtually no weight when a lay-off occurs in his unit. I do not mean to imply, of course, that the fault lies in the provisions of the Performance Rating Act. The purpose of that act was to measure individual performance and it was not framed primarily for reduction-in-force purposes. But I do mean, Mr. President, that one major weakness in the current reduction-in-force structure is the absence of individual efficiency or merit as a controlling factor.

Even length of service, as another factor in determining which employees will remain and which will be separated, is of limited weight. Length of service, or the seniority principle, operates within the sharp restrictions of tenure of employment—that is, groups of employees by type of appointment held: Permanent, indefinite, or temporary.

Mr. President, the controlling factor for determining which employees are to be retained on the job in the event of a reduction in force is the tenure of employment or type of appointment held. The way tenure has worked in practice is that the type of appointment held has come to be the most important factor of all in determining the order of lay-offs. We have serious doubt as to whether individual efficiency and length of service should be minimized and whether the technicality of the type of appointment should be so important. It is a long step away from the merit system, and the objective of retaining the most efficient and experienced employees to perform the functions of government.

What does the effect of tenure mean? Mr. President, it means that during this period of national emergency, an employee holding an indefinite appointment with an outstanding-performance rating and 4, 5, or 10 years of Government service can be laid off in a reduction in force by an individual holding a permanent status with only 6 months' service and only a satisfactory rating.

Another illustration may be cited where an agency reported the loss in a reduction in force of a competent status employee with 25 years of service—25 year of know-how—displaced by an employee with less than 3 years of service. Mr. President, the staff of the subcommittee is currently making a detailed study of the tenure structure in an effort to find a way for employees to compete on the basis of efficiency and length of service and not have our entire reduction-in-force system tied to tenure of employment.

Aside from this aspect of tenure, I feel that I should point out that the tenure structure itself is far more cumbersome than any enactment of legislation required. At the present time, tenure has been divided into 26 categories and subgroups. Such a division has caused untold work and complexity in effecting reductions in force on the part of personnel offices throughout Government. It is another example of a personnel practice, which could have remained relatively simple in operation, having been made unnecessarily cumbersome and complex.

Mr. President, the final factor controlling the retention of employees in a reduction in force is that of veterans' preference. Veterans have priority for retention over nonveterans within the same tenure groups, regardless of length of service or efficiency.

As a result of these complexities, the agency head or supervisor in Government fears any reduction in force which can, and often does, deprive him of the services of his most efficient employees. This view was expressed almost unanimously by responsible agency heads and supervisors who were interviewed. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot expect economy in the use of Federal manpower until a supervisor can recommend a reduction in the number of people in his unit with some real assurance that his most efficient and experienced workers will not be the ones to be laid off.

Mr. President, the Government frequently cannot attract new employees and cannot rehire its former workers, as a consequence of its basic reduction-in-force policies. Many employees skilled in their trades, who formerly worked for the Government, refuse to reenter the Federal service because of the lack of security caused by present reduction-in-force policies. The Naval Gun Factory in Washington, the Boston Navy Yard, and the Charleston Navy Yard all report that they cannot rehire the majority of their former skilled employees due to the lay-off policies currently in effect.

Personnel directors also report that it is almost as difficult to hire new personnel for these same reasons. Potential employees recognize that they would be among the first to be discharged. The Institute of Training for Public Service, a unit of Indiana University, reports that a large number of graduates and students using its facilities since June of 1950 have expressed reluctance at taking an indefinite appointment, particularly since private enterprise offers employment without regard to tenure distinctions.

Mr. President, the last of the major problems in reduction in force deals with the bumping process. The bumping process in reductions in force often amounts to a restaffing of an organization as a result of the extensive reassignments. The bumping and retreat processes form a chain of displacement actions which shift employees from job to job, division to division, and even bureau to bureau, until the actual effect is

a near restaffing of an organization by transferring employees into new jobs. The process is costly in terms of man-hours and money, for it necessitates training, retraining, preparation of current personnel actions, changing of records, and individual and unit adjustment. In one case, approximately six times as many people as were finally separated were moved, causing considerable confusion and lowered morale, reacting again on the operating efficiency of the agency concerned. The confusion and insecurity of lay-off procedures is often so intense as to cause the resignation and transfer rate of the agency to go up as much as 100 percent. This often results, as I pointed out in a case example, in new recruiting programs at the conclusion of a reduction in force in order to fill vacancies which otherwise would not have occurred.

Mr. President, this brings to a conclusion my report on the problems and costs involved in reduction-in-force procedures. The subcommittee is planning open hearings to begin at an early date and it will call representatives of the executive agencies, military service organizations, employee groups, businessmen, and experts in the field of personnel management to determine the best methods for improving the reduction-in-force procedures and reducing their costs. After these hearings, specific recommendations will be made to the Senate.

Mr. President, another major undertaking by the subcommittee is the examination we are making of the utilization of manpower and the application of effective manpower policies in the Department of Defense. We recognize that effective military and civilian manpower utilization in the Department of Defense is an absolute must in the present emergency. The Department of Defense, employing over 1,200,000 civilian employees, is confronted with severe problems in this respect. As I pointed out to the Senate a few days ago, the subcommittee is making efforts to determine realistic criteria for discovering what jobs are civilian positions and what jobs are, because of their nature, military positions. We are also examining the effects of the manpower ceiling which is currently imposed on the Defense Establishment.

In the course of our inquiry into utilization of civilian employees in the Defense Department, a problem came to light which has to do with the expenditure of large sums of money for educating military personnel in civilian law schools. We feel it should be brought to the attention of the Senate. It was found that 87 commissioned officers are attending civilian law schools at Government expense for the purpose of obtaining law degrees. The Army has 40 officers enrolled in law schools. There are in excess of 2,200 officers currently on active duty who have law degrees but who are not being used in legal work. The Navy Department has 800 active-duty officers with degrees in law, but who are not being used in legal work. Nevertheless, the Navy Department has 18 officers taking law courses leading to a degree. The Marine Corps has 25 officers enrolled in law schools and plans to send 43 next year, and the Corps has 120 qualified lawyers on active duty not engaged in legal work.

Officials in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Navy have stated that it costs $15,000 a year to maintain an officer and send him to law school, and that it has been necessary to call Reserve officers to active duty to replace officers who are going to law school. Even if conservatively estimated on the basis of $10,000 per officer, the cost of sending 87 officers to school is $870,000 a year, and over a normal 3-year course would cost the Government $2,610,000. The Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies feels that this is an item of expense that can and should be readily pared from our Federal budget.

Mr. President, another project undertaken by the subcommittee has been its appraisal of the methods in Government for selecting supervisors. Effective supervision is recognized as a keystone in proper manpower utilization. Our findings reveal that the Federal Government is not obtaining the best available personnel for supervisory positions because the factors emphasized in selection are such that supervisory potential is often overlooked.

Specifically, we have found that technical ability of supervisory candidates is stressed to the detriment of leadership qualities and ability to get along with people. An official report of the Federal Personnel Council had this to say: "The practice of promoting the best workers to supervisory positions has proved disastrous in many instances. The experience of both private business and governmental organizations has demonstrated that technical skill in many supervisory positions is less important than the ability to lead employees." The established fact that the best work producer need not be the best supervisor has been disregarded.

We have found that seniority in the selection of supervisors has been unduly emphasized. This limits the number of candidates with high supervisory potentiality and deters men of ability from remaining in the organization.

Our study reveals that supervisors are often selected without full and adequate consideration, due to the fact that there is no reservoir of potential supervisors to choose from when a vacancy occurs. The result is that all too often there is a lag in production and efficiency.

There is also a strong tendency to fill supervisory vacancies from within the particular section in which the vacancies occur. Organization lines are seldom crossed. The area of competition is thus substantially narrowed. This, in turn, narrows the field of applicants in which selection can be made.

Mr. President, finally we have found that undue emphasis has been placed on the personal knowledge of a candidate by the selectors to the detriment of those less well known. There is a lack of method throughout Government to determine the ability of candidates not personally known.

Mr. President, solutions to these problems are being considered by the subcommittee at the present time.

Another area which has been under study, is the incentive awards program. Congress has long recognized that there has been failure throughout Government to promote and properly utilize the potentialities of the Government's incentive-awards program. Our study to date confirms this fact. The incentive program, as Senators know, provides employees and groups of employees monetary awards for suggestions or work performance which furthers efficiency and economy in governmental operations. Past experience, both in Government and industry, proves that such programs, if properly conducted, are capable of producing impressive savings.

The subcommittee's survey shows that there are at least three major statutes involved in the incentive-awards program. The result is considerable misunderstanding and confusion in administering these programs, as well as duplicating provisions. Our survey also shows that the responsibility for the various phases of the incentive-awards program is now jointly held by the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission. As a consequence, the subcommittee is considering at the present time one piece of legislation which would cover the entire Government awards program and place the responsibility for the program in one single agency.

The effectiveness of the Whitten amendment has been the subject of a detailed examination by the subcommittee. We have found that the law in its application has only partly achieved its objective, and this partial success has greatly complicated the personnel process.

Our study to date shows that the provisions of the Whitten rider are subject to many interpretations. The rider has certainly created many administrative problems which were not anticipated by Congress. Administrative operations are hampered by the law and its attempt to solve by legislation a whole series of problems which the existing administrative machinery can and should solve.

The Whitten rider, which results in temporary appointments, has made it difficult to recruit personnel, especially in those skills which are in short supply. In a highly competitive labor market reasonable security of tenure is a necessary sales point in recruiting. Temporary appointments, which must be offered to former permanent Federal employees are also a detriment to recruiting; they make it difficult to recruit experienced persons who may want to return to Government but who feel entitled to the status they formerly enjoyed.

As for the unrealistic and inflexible time-in-grade requirements, we have found that they result in a number of inequities and have caused a serious lowering of morale. There can be no doubt that the Whitten rider restrictions in promotion adversely affect the maximum utilization of the skills already in the Government service.

As I explained in connection with the reduction in force, the complexity of the separation process has been greatly increased by the operation of the Whitten rider. In operation the Whitten rider

has made it possible for long-time career employees to be displaced by employees with relatively little service.

Finally, the Whitten rider has greatly increased the amount of paper work necessary to administer a personnel program.

Mr. President, the preponderance of opinion expressed by Federal personnel officials and union officials is that the Whitten rider should be repealed. If it were repealed, of course, it would be necessary to revise standards for promotions. The classification surveys required by section 1310 (d) of the Whitten amendment are felt to be essential, but should be required by administrative regulation by the Civil Service Commission.

Our inquiry to date convinces us that a real question has been raised as to whether the Whitten amendment has provided a barrier to the effective utilization of personnel.

Mr. President, I should like to report now on the subcommittee's examination of the policies and procedures for recruiting and selecting personnel for positions in the Federal Government. As Senators know, the defense program has sharply increased the Government's need for new employees. Since June 1950, the Federal working force has expanded from 1,966,448 to 2,508,190. This net increase of 541,742 in total Federal employment includes an increase of 515,987 in the Defense Department alone. All but 321,337 of the current jobs are in the competitive service where appointments are subject to Civil Service Commission control. In addition to this expansion, turnover has left more vacancies to be filled. As a net result, 1,084,000 placements had to be made in fiscal year 1951, compared with 406,000 in fiscal year 1950.

Mr. President, the expansion in Government employment is now slowing. Because of predicted turn-over, however, the Civil Service Commission estimates that 981,000 placements will be required in fiscal year 1952 and 825,000 in fiscal year 1953. This means that the task of recruiting to fill Government jobs will continue to be a large one.

The established channels of recruitment—the Civil Service Commission, its regional offices, and agency boards of examiners—have not been able to fulfill this demand for personnel. As of June 1951, these customary sources were unable to fill 67 percent of the departmental vacancies in Washington and 46 percent of the vacancies in the field, where 90 percent of all Government jobs are located. Consequently, these jobs had to be filled through direct recruiting by the operating agencies.

It seems clear that, at least during the current emergency, the operating agencies must continue to do the bulk of the recruiting for Government positions. The Civil Service Commission itself had readily acknowledged that central recruiting by the Commission and its regional offices cannot handle the entire job.

In the field, a large share of the direct responsibility for recruitment has formally been shifted to the operating agencies through the establishment of agency boards of examiners, staffed and operated by agency personnel. Subject to Commission supervision, these boards recruit to fill various types of positions in their own agency offices, following procedures parallel to those employed by the Commission in its recruiting. S. 1135, passed last session by the Senate, provides for an expansion of the board of examiner system. In addition, the Commission has recently announced a plan to extend that system in the Washington area. But experience in the field indicates that boards of examiners do not provide the whole answer to the problem of supplying the large numbers of personnel required by the Government during the emergency. When board of examiner registers are inadequate to supply needed personnel, just as when Commission or regional office registers are inadequate, requesting agencies are given direct-hiring authority, permitting them to recruit and hire without regard to many of the normally required procedures. Resort to this more informal recruiting method will probably continue to be necessary so long as the demand for personnel remains at its present high level.

This study to date has identified various problems arising from the methods by which the Government is presently recruiting new employees. The most important of these problems will be considered briefly.

Mr. President, one of the first problems that arises is that of field recruiting. Many departmental offices in Washington have employed traveling recruiting teams to procure needed personnel. Between October 1, 1951, and January 3, 1952, departmental offices in Washington conducted 83 known field recruiting trips. During this same period, at least 158 trips were carried out by agency offices in the field. One department has 24 recruiters in the field permanently and another department has one or more two-man teams in the field most of the time. Field recruiting is expensive. The Navy Department spends an average of $127 in recruiting each typist and stenographer by this method. This compares with an average cost of $48 in recruiting each new employee in the local Washington area. Furthermore, it is estimated that from 60 percent to 90 percent of the field recruiting effort has been aimed at obtaining stenographers and typists.

There has been overlapping coverage of the same areas by various traveling recruiting teams. For example, within a 2-month period in 1951 four different teams recruited typists and stenographers in Uniontown, Pa., a city of 20,000 people. In 1 month, four teams canvassed the city of Buffalo, N. Y., for this same type of personnel. This indicates a substantial duplication of effort, Mr. President, and reveals Government agencies competing among themselves. The subcommittee's study of this practice is aiming to determine whether the Commission should take over part of the field recruiting task, or whether the agencies should pool some of their field recruiting efforts.

Another aspect of the recruitment program is that of personalized recruiting. The subcommittee has found that much of the recruitment for higher grade positions has been done by operating supervisors. It is estimated that 50 to 60 percent of jobs at grade 12 and above in certain new defense agencies have been filled by people brought in by their supervisors.

Supervisors rely heavily on their personal contracts in other agencies, in industry, and in colleges as a means of locating the people they need. Agencies often do not give broad publicity to these vacancies, preferring to rely on this personalized form of recruitment. They thereby avoid the administrative burden of handling the large number of applications which might be attracted by wide publicity. This recruiting practice restricts competition to a chosen few and brings with it the danger of personal patronage. Reasonable equality of opportunity to learn of Government job openings and apply for them is an essential requirement of the merit system. Personalized recruitment, without giving others who might be interested a fair opportunity to compete, is a departure from the merit system. It can also mean that many well-qualified potential employees will be overlooked. The subcommittee will ask the Civil Service Commission to establish and enforce minimum standards for publicizing vacancies to be filled by direct agency recruiting.

The use of Commission registers has been of special interest to the subcommittee. We have found that a number of agencies have indicated reluctance to rely upon Commission registers as their source of new personnel. One objection is that Commission qualification standards and examinations are too broad and unselective, so that special qualities, skills, and experience vital to many jobs are overlooked or are given inadequate weight. Another agency criticism is that Commission registers are not kept current, making it necessary for the agencies to spend considerable time in checking the availability of candidates on certificates and in bringing qualification information up to date. A third complaint by agencies is that the rule of three is too severe a restriction on the discretion of appointing officers in selecting qualified candidates. Further inquiry is necessary to assess the validity of these criticisms.

These and other problems being studied bear directly on the effectiveness of present recruiting methods. The subcommittee is gaging the extent of these problems and their causes to determine how they can best be rectified to achieve better methods for recruitment of personnel for jobs in the Federal service.

The effectiveness of position classification and pay-fixing plans is another matter of foremost concern to the subcommittee. The classification system covers more than 1,000,000 positions at the present time—more than are covered by any other single civilian system. The classification system was changed materially by the Classification Act of 1949. The departments and agencies of the executive branch were given much more authority and responsibility for administration of the classification system, and the Civil Service Commission

was directed to post-audit the actions of the agencies. The subcommittee is now determining, Mr. President, how this decentralization of authority and responsibility is working out, whether the changes have improved the system, and whether additional changes in the law or in its administration are needed.

Mr. President, the subcommittee is also studying the number, provisions, and administration of other job-evaluation and pay plans. There are more than 40 systems, other than the Classification Act, for compensating employees in the executive branch. The Civil Service Commission has jurisdiction over only the Classification Act system, with limited controls over one or more of the others. All the rest are subject only to administrative discretion of the departments and agencies, in carrying out specific statutes, or, in many cases, in establishing the whole system and carrying it out. Some of these systems differ only slightly from each other, but some are completely different in their philosophy and character. There is evidence that the Government still is competing with itself in the same localities, offering considerably different rates of pay for the identical level of work or type of job.

The subcommittee feels that it is essential that position classification and pay-fixing plans be thoroughly examined in order to determine that the existing systems do not act as a deterrent to the proper utilization of manpower, and that the Government receives dollar value for dollar expended for personal services.

Mr. President, as I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, the subcommittee is making examination of a number of other problems which bear upon the Government's manpower utilization. As the other projects develop, I shall report their progress and findings to the Senate, and shall initiate through the subcommittee the necessary action to deal with these problems.

The subcommittee has given considerable attention to the problems of scheduling its future work. It believes that the very nature of the projects undertaken precludes hasty analysis and ill-considered conclusions. The problems being dealt with are fundamental to the whole structure of Federal manpower policies.

Ill-advised actions on the part of this group can be extremely costly, can result in creating certain conditions of unrest, and can cause employees to lose confidence in the good faith of the United States Government as an employer who is truly interested in efficiency and economy.

On the other hand, well-planned solutions to the problems that have been outlined can, if properly applied, bring about an essential change in the attitude of Government supervisors and employees to their jobs.

The immediate cash savings alone, if improvements are made where they are urgently needed, would more than justify the inquiry, to say the least.

At all times we have been frugal with our funds; but in no case have we attempted to rush our studies through to hasty conclusions. Our job, Mr. President, is to formulate recommendations sufficiently authoritative to justify serious consideration by the Senate in its objective to insure the proper utilization of Federal personnel during the current emergency.

Mr. President, we shall continue this study, and from time to time we shall report.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to express to the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service my appreciation for his bringing to the Senate this timely, factual, and splendid report in regard to the progress being made by the subcommittee created under Senate Resolution 53.

As the distinguished Senator from South Carolina knows, that subcommittee, under the direction of Mr. Melvin Purvis and his staff, now has gathered a group of persons who are obtaining reports which are of real value to the Senate and to the Nation, when it comes to recommending, at least, efficient use of our manpower and the saving of the funds of the Federal Government.

I should like to suggest to the distinguished chairman of the committee that every effort be made to continue the subcommittee. I am confident that it will more than pay for itself many, many times over.

At several times during the splendid statement the Senator from South Carolina has made, I was tempted to interrupt him, but I did not like to do so because I did not wish to interfere with the continuity of the speech he was making. However, I was much interested in the matter of the tremendous cost to the United States Government when an effort is made to reduce the number of the Government employees, one of the things which I think all of us are eager to have done, especially in the case of departments or other agencies which are overstaffed.

I was interested to learn, if I correctly understood the Senator's statement, that at the present time, despite the great number of lawyers and legal-staff members presently employed in the various agencies, especially in the Department of Defense, we are still sending a large number of civilians—I believe the Senator stated that there were 87—to law school, at a cost of approximately $15,000 per annum per student. There may be justification for some of those things; I do not know. However, they are some of the things about which we are concerned. I am confident that calling attention to that phase of the program, as well as to others, will be most helpful.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I certainly thank the Senator from Kansas for his remarks. The Senator from Kansas has been very helpful in the study we are making of this subject. He has in fact been very helpful in connection with every undertaking of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He is always present at the hearings. He is always endeavoring to add some thought which would be of assistance, and I want to thank him for his eagerness always to be of help.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator whether the reports on Senate Joint Resolution 53 must not, or should not, be completed by March 31. Is that correct or not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to take a great deal of time this afternoon, but had hoped to point the spots in the hearings on submerged lands which I think would be of interest to the Members of the Senate who desire to acquaint themselves with some of this material.

MATERIAL ON SUBMERGED LANDS VOLUMINOUS

The question of the control of the submerged lands has been before the Congress a great many years. People who want to become acquainted with this subject, if they started to read all the literature available in Government publications, would find themselves occupied for a long time to come.

I desire to insert in the RECORD at this point a list of some 13 hearings which have been held, covering more than 6,000 pages of testimony and exhibits, regarding the submerged lands issue since first proposed legislation respecting the matter came before the Seventy-fifth Congress in 1937, when Senate Joint Resolution 208 passed the Senate. Only one other measure, House Joint Resolution 225, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, a quitclaim bill, was passed by both Houses of Congress, and this was vetoed on August 1, 1946. The veto was sustained.

I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point, Mr. President, the list of the 13 hearings which have been held on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There have been 13 hearings (totaling more than 6,000 pages of testimony and exhibits) on the submerged lands issue since the first legislation respecting the matter came before the Seventy-fifth Congress in 1937 when Senate Joint Resolution 208 passed the Senate. Only one measure, House

Joint Resolution 225, Seventy-ninth Congress, a quitclaim bill, was passed by both Houses of Congress, and this was vetoed on August 1, 1946. This veto was sustained.

The hearings are:

1. Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, 1938: House Judiciary Committee; February 1938; on Senate Joint Resolution 208 (this was the Nye resolution to assert Federal claim). Favorably reported, May 19, 1938. Page 262.

2. Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, 1939: House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 4; March 1939; on House Joint Resolutions 178 and 181. Page 290.

3. Seventy-sixth Congress, 1939: Senate Public Lands Committee; March 1939; on Senate Joint Resolutions 83 and 92. Page 515.

4. Seventy-ninth Congress: Senate and House (Joint) Judiciary Committees; Senate Joint Resolution 118 et al. Page 161.

5. Seventy-ninth Congress, second session: Senate Joint Resolution 48, House Joint Resolution 225. (This is the quitclaim bill that was vetoed.) Page 315.

6. Eightieth Congress: Senate and House (Joint) Judiciary Committees. Page 1703.

7. Senate Judiciary supplemental hearings on S. 1988. S. Rept. 1592. (NOTE.—This bill, as amended, is identical to S. 940, 82d Cong., on which executive hearings were held by the Senate Interior Committee.) Page 335.

8. Eighty-first Congress, first session: Senate Interior Committee hearings on S. 923; October 1949. Page 530.

9. Eighty-first Congress, first session: House Judiciary Committee; hearings on H. R. 5991, 5992; August 1949. Page 221.

10. Eighty-first Congress, second session: Senate Interior Committee hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 195, August 1950. Page 377.

11. Eighty-second Congress, first session: Senate Interior Committee hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 20; February 1951. Page 335.

12. Eighty-second Congress, first session: Senate Interior Committee hearings on S. 940; March 28, 1951. Page 235.

13. Eighty-second Congress, second session: Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on Hill amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20; February 7, 1952. Page 84.

NOTE.—It will be seen that some 6,000 pages of testimony and exhibits have been submitted to Congress on this matter. Three formal hearings have been held by the Senate Interior Committee in the Eighty-second Congress.

S. 1540 PROTECTS STATES RIGHTS TO INLAND WATERS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was happy that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming had associated himself some time ago with Senate bill 1540, which is a bill relating to rights of the several States to the land beneath the inland navigable waters and the recognition of equities in submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes. I do not desire to read any great quantity of material into the RECORD, but the Eighty-second Congress, first session, published a committee print entitled The Submerged Lands Controversy. On page 9 of this study, the Solicitor General of the United States, in referring to a booklet issued by the National Association of States Attorneys General, makes the following comment:

As to inland waters, the attorneys general's pamphlet makes the amazing contention that Senate bill 1540—the bill to dispose of, forever, the phony claim that inland waters are involved—was prepared by the Attorney General [of the United States] in an attempt to split the ranks of the States.

The pamphlet says that—and I am quoting now, from the pamphlet of the attorneys general—

State officials opposed this (1) as an effort to divide their forces, (2) as unfair to the coastal and Great Lakes States, and (3) because S. 1540 would recognize State titles only to the beds of the streams with no mention of waters and minerals but with specific reservation of all rights relating to the national defense.

I say it is somewhat interesting that, as soon as someone shows up with a bill which would settle any question regarding the title to the lands under inland navigable waters, immediately the States' attorneys general find it necessary to charge that that is an attempt on the part of the Attorney General of the United States to split the ranks of the States. As a matter of fact, the history of this matter is reasonably well known.

TITLE OF STATES PROTECTED

While we were conducting hearings on the bill to control the submerged lands, it was pointed out over and over again that no one had done anything to confirm title in the various States of the land beneath inland waters. It was because of that that I suggested it would be well to introduce the bill which had originally been prepared to cover that subject, and so the senior Senator from Wyoming and I introduced it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Although the Senator from New Mexico differs fundamentally with the point of view of the Senator from Louisiana, I believe we should salute the Senator for his desire to see that this controversy between the Federal Government and the States shall not endlessly prevent the development of good-faith leases by those who had made every effort to develop wells and produce oil, which certainly can contribute to the national prosperity and the national defense.

The Senator from New Mexico, certainly as much as and probably more than any other Senator, has made every effort to see that some solution of this difficult problem be reached. I believe we should all recognize the effort he has made and attempt to work with him, at least to the extent that if we cannot finally solve this problem, we at least should see that Congress fulfills its obligation to legislate, as the Senator from New Mexico has so well recognized and pointed out to the members of the committee on previous occasions.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the junior Senator from Louisiana. I should like to say that my interest in this question has been prompted solely by a desire to see the production of oil started along the coasts of Texas and Louisiana, and the production of oil continued along the coast of California. Every interest I have in Senate Joint Resolution 20 is to see that such production continues. I am not attempting, and my part in this resolution certainly is no effort to attempt, to settle the underlying controversy.

INTERIM BILL NOT PERMANENT SOLUTION

If anyone thinks Senate Joint Resolution 20 settles the question, in my opinion, he is completely wrong. I am glad the junior Senator from Louisiana, when the matter was before the committee, tried to write into the proposed legislation safeguards which, if provided, will be of value to the people of his State and to the other States involved, and make it easier for them to give up some things for which they have been contending for so long.

The junior Senator from Louisiana will remember that he proposed at one stage that the revenues should be paid into the State treasuries instead of specifying that it all be paid into the Federal Treasury, and that the State treasuries could impound it just as well as the Treasury of the United States might do. While I differ with him very deeply on the fundamental issue involved, I recognize that proposal as a sensible one, as many of his requests have been.

We must see to it that an attempt to make final settlement will not postpone production of the oil. In the meantime, while working out such a settlement, we can start development along the coasts of Texas and Louisiana and can continue production along the coast of California.

I do not want to turn this into a mutual admiration society. The Senator's attitude has been that he will not surrender the faintest shred of title, as he conceives it to belong to the State of Louisiana. I think that at some time in his life he must have encountered that definition of tolerance which says that tolerance is "an agreement among people who have disagreed that they will continue to disagree, but that in their disagreement they will not become disagreeable."

I congratulate the Senator on the fact that in attempting to work this problem out he has tried to deal with it purely on an interim basis.

TIDELANDS NOT INVOLVED

I was happy that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] pointed out that all of the area involved is beyond the "tidelands." I think it is unfortunate that every time the matter comes up the phrase "tidelands" is used over and over again.

I could, if I desired, read from one paragraph of the statement which was made yesterday that the States merely wanted to get control of their tidelands. There is no possibility that the Federal Government is going to claim one foot of ground in the tidelands. Everyone who has studied the question knows that the proposal has nothing to do with tidelands.

The Federal Government has recognized consistently and recognizes now the right of the States to their tidelands. Of course, the reason that the term "tidelands" is used is that it would be something quite different if the States

should say, "We do not want tidelands; we want lands seaward of our tidelands."

Therefore, I am glad the Senator from Wyoming pointed out that tidelands are not involved.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course the Senator from New Mexico realizes that there have been other phrases used in the past. Previous decisions of courts announced that the States owned lands beneath the tidewaters, which is an entirely different thing. Land beneath tidewaters might be construed to include lands beneath bays, harbors, rivers, and lands along the shore, bordering on the ocean. I agree that sometimes the word "tidelands" has been used improperly and is a misnomer, although the courts, in referring to lands beneath tidewaters, had used language broad enough to include inland as well as outside waters.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree that the Senator is correct. I agree that there is involved a great deal of controversy which is unnecessary. I recognize that a great many comments were made by the Secretary of the Interior when he referred to the tidelands dispute. I will say to the junior Senator from Louisiana that I was a member of the President's Cabinet when it was decided to bring some suits, and the term used was "tidelands." I use that merely to illustrate the fact that as we study the matter we are impressed with the fact that a great many changes have taken place with reference to what is actually involved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the decision of the Supreme Court in the California-Louisiana and Texas cases it was affirmed that the land between the high-water mark and the low-water mark specifically belonged to the States?

PARAMOUNT RIGHTS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. ANDERSON. I may say to the senior Senator from Illinois that I am not a lawyer. I read the decision of the Supreme Court in the three cases, and while I think what he says is close to being correct, I do not wish to say what the Supreme Court held in those cases. I think it dealt with terms of paramount interest, but I do not recall exactly the decision which was reached with reference to title to the tidelands proper.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to read a short statement with reference to the decision of the Supreme Court denying California ownership. It reads, in part, as follows:

> The United States of America is now, and has been at all times pertinent hereto, possessed of paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California, and outside of the inland waters, extending seaward three nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California. The State of California has no title thereto or property interest therein.

I thought that should be a matter of record.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

A great deal of work will have to be done by Congress before final disposition may be made of the question. I have indicated several times that I did not believe that all the oil lying adjacent to the coast lines of Texas, Louisiana, and California, even if it should be proved to be completely under the full domination and control of the Federal Government, will be kept away from those States. I happen to live in a public-lands State, where there is a good deal of public land remaining, and when an oil well is brought in on public land the State of which I am a citizen acquires some benefit from the discovery.

QUITCLAIM BILLS WILL TAKE MUCH TIME

So I think we should postpone final decision until some later date and should try to get a settlement now that will permit oil operations on these lands.

The only reason why I desired to speak at all was because there are pending before the Senate at this time at least two other proposals which would settle the matter. One of them is Senate bill 940; the other is a bill passed by the House and known as the Walters bill, H. R. 4484.

If those two bills are to be adequately considered, I see no possibility of the prediction of the majority leader of 2 or 3 days' discussion proving correct. For instance, Senate bill 2104 was the first bill brought up, and it was rather a minor bill which had to do with tariff matters and the importation of dairy products. It was of rather keen interest in the agricultural areas, but it was not of extreme importance, as many of us saw it. That bill was reported on September 20, 1951.

It was called up for debate on January 22, 1952, and was recommitted on the legislative day of January 30, but actually on February 25, with instructions to report it back. I think that if a bill of rather minor importance should take 2 weeks, it would seem to me that a bill which deals with billions of dollars' worth of oil might receive lengthy consideration.

So I say that if these matters are to be considered at this time—and I am not anxious to have them considered, because I should like to see interim legislation passed and the Senate then return to the questions we have been discussing—ample time should be allowed for careful consideration of them.

STATES NEVER OWNED SUBMERGED LANDS

The question naturally arises whether the States owned the land lying seaward of the low-water mark prior to the Ickes suit. I shall be merely a sort of guide to the hearings. I do not intend to read many passages, but I wish to invite the attention of Senators to page 350 of the hearings which were held in 1951 on Senate Joint Resolution 20, and particularly to the executive hearing which was held on S. 940, and point out merely a clause or two. I read from the hearings:

> Proponents of the proposed legislation say to the Congress—and section 1 (a) of S. 940 would in effect recite—that the several coastal States of the Union have always owned the lands out under the ocean within their respecive jurisdiction boundaries, that such ownership has been exercised in accordance with many pronouncements of the Supreme Court, and that this bill would do no more than to restore to those States that which has always belonged to them. This is not an accurate statement, and the Supreme Court has held that it is not accurate. Prior to the decision in *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), in 1947, no one knew for certain the exact status of the lands under the ocean adjacent to our shores, and it was to obtain an answer to this very question that the Supreme Court case against California was instituted. In its opinion in that case the Court held (332 U. S. at 37) that the question was presented to it for the first time.

ISSUE FIRST PRESENTED IN CALIFORNIA CASE

Eight Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States participated in that case, and all eight subscribed to the theory that the question of the title to this land had been presented to the Supreme Court for the first time in the California case.

> Even Mr. Justice Reed, who was the only one of the eight members of the Court participating in the California case, who believed that California was the owner of the lands involved, observed in his dissenting opinion that—
>
> "No square ruling of this Court has determined the ownership of those marginal lands."

That is why many Senators believe it is not correct to say that the question has been settled time after time by the Supreme Court of the United States. I think Congress is going to have to act upon the matter. I do not know whether I am constitutionally right about this, but I believe that if title is in the United States, or at least if paramount rights are in the United States, Congress will make some disposition of the question later.

I may say that I listened very earnestly to the long discussion between the Solicitor General of the United States and members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the question whether Congress could give away what the Federal Government holds by virtue of international law and comity. I can only say that to a person not trained in the law, the discussion was somewhat confusing.

CONGRESS' AUTHORITY IN DOUBT

Congress may have power to dispose of whatever has been obtained by the Federal Government through its sovereignty in international relations to the individual States. The Solicitor General said he was uncertain as to this power.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator realizes perhaps that in the opinion of the Supreme Court in the California case Mr. Justice Black stated that there was language

in previous cases sufficiently strong to indicate that the court then thought that title not only inland, but outside of inland waters, as well, was in the States. It was further held that even though the court then appeared to be of that opinion, the issue was not before the court on that occasion, if I correctly understand the opinion. I shall try to find the exact language in a few minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have heard the Senator from Louisiana refer to that opinion by the Supreme Court. I believe he has quoted the language with reasonable accuracy, because he has quoted it before.

Mr. LONG. I am looking for the exact language at this moment.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only say to the Senator from Louisiana that the Court itself stated that the question was then being presented to it for the first time, and that was the first time the Court had passed squarely on it. That being true, I think that we should not be confused and led to think that the Supreme Court had passed on this same issue time after time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to quote the exact language as it appears on page 478 of the hearings. I believe the Senator from New Mexico has it before him. In the majority opinion the Court said:

As previously stated, this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times.

As I recall, the Pollard case held, with regard to a river, that the bed of a navigable stream belongs to the State.

And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana if he will not continue by reading the next sentence.

Mr. LONG. I shall be glad to do so:

All of these statements were, however, merely paraphrases or offshoots of the Pollard inland-water rule, and were used, not as enunciation of a new ocean rule, but in explanation of the old inland-water principle.

I may say again that the court in that case held that that was not the first time the matter had been before it, but stated clearly that the court had previously used language strong enough to indicate that on previous occasions the court believed the beds of navigable waters belonged to the States, whether they were inland waters or not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield so that I may reply?

RETRIAL OF SUPREME COURT CASE INADVISABLE

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I shall be glad to. But as I started to say a while ago, I am merely trying to point out that if we are going to retry the Supreme Court case, I am of the opinion, after the hearings I sat through in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, that very few other legislative matters will be handled during this session of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have referred to the Pollard case merely because it is considered to have been the leading case having to do with ownership of submerged lands prior to the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases.

I should like to point out that in its decision in the California case, which is reprinted at page 475 of the hearings, the Supreme Court said:

In the Pollard case it was held, in effect, that the Original States owned in trust for their people the navigable tidewaters between high- and low-water marks within each State's boundaries, and the soil under them, as an inseparable attribute of State sovereignty.

The Pollard case referred to the title to lands between the high-water mark and the low-water mark. It did not refer to land beyond the low-water mark, but rather to filled land, over which tides had formerly flowed and receded.

Later in its decision, in the first paragraph on page 478 of the hearings, the Supreme Court is quoted as saying:

Consequently, we are not persuaded to transplant the Pollard rule of ownership as an incident of State sovereignty in relation to inland waters out into the soil beneath the ocean, so much more a matter of national concern.

This again is a statement that the Pollard case referred to inland waters, and referred to tidelands—that is, the lands between low- and high-water marks—as being under State ownership, but that this principle should not be extended beyond the low-water mark.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am merely trying to say that we discovered or at least I thought I did, in the hearings held in 1949, in 1950, and 1951, and at other times, that if we should try to review this matter and decide whether the Supreme Court was wise or foolish, we shall be here forever. In the hope that we might be able to have some oil production started from Texas and Louisiana lands and lands that lie offshore in California, it might be wiser to pass Senate Joint Resolution 20 and postpone until a later date final review of the question whether the Senate of the United States shall or shall not review the action of the Supreme Court of the United States.

POLLARD CASE AN INLAND WATERS QUESTION

The Pollard case, of course, dealt with lands in Mobile, Ala. They were lands which were marked by the ebb and flow of the tide. Since the decision in the Pollard case in 1845, the States have owned their tidelands, and tidelands, as I say, are not an issue here and now. The only matter under consideration is control over the mineral resources of land that lies seaward of the tidelands.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from New Mexico does not think for a moment, does he, that if we do not pass the interim bill, any quitclaim bill will become a law at this session of Congress?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; I do not.

Mr. McFARLAND. Therefore, it becomes very important to pass some kind of a bill other than a quitclaim bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I completely agree with the majority leader. It is important to pass some kind of bill. We have lost production which we should have at the present time on the coasts of Texas and Louisiana, and probably in some of the areas of California. Production in California has been somewhat more sustained, but it is unfortunate that that is not the case along the coasts of the other two States, although equipment has been moved in and is ready, and people who paid large sums of money for leases are ready to go ahead and drill. When they produced the oil they would be producing a commodity which this country apparently needs. Under those circumstances I think it would be too bad if we failed to pass some type of interim legislation. Then if the Senate wants to take up the quitclaim bill and see what it can do with it, well and good. I shall not try to keep it off the floor. But I say that when and if a quitclaim bill is passed there are those of us who believe that it will encounter a veto, and that the veto will be sustained.

VETO WAS SUSTAINED

The figures of the vote show the great popularity of the bill in the House of Representatives, and I am reminded that once before a bill passed the House of Representatives with a fairly large vote. It passed the Senate with a fairly close vote—as I recall, something like 45 to 34. I cannot say that that is correct, but the vote was in that neighborhood. When the bill was vetoed it went back to the House of Representatives, and the veto was sustained in the House which had passed the bill by a tremendous majority. What chance would there have been for passage in the Senate of such a bill over the President's veto, when it had passed the Senate by a relatively close vote? So if we are to do anything to have operations conducted on lands lying seaward of the tidelands area we must pass interim legislation and postpone the final settlement to a more agreeable date.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] was kind enough to cite certain references. I must say many of us believe that when the final settlement is made we shall find ourselves voting for more liberal treatment for the States of Louisiana, Texas, California and any other State which may have lands lying seaward of its tidelands area, than many people now contemplate. I hope they can be dealt with justly and generously, and they should be so dealt with.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Personally, I would naturally like to see permanent legislation agreed upon which the President would sign. But if that cannot be done, for the sake of the development which is needed, we should pass interim legislation. I have tried to be friendly to the States concerned, but at the same time I have taken the position that I could not vote for a quitclaim bill. Somewhere between those two positions it seems to me that we ought to get together. But if we cannot, we ought to have an interim bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. I appreciate that statement from the majority leader.

CONGRESS DID NOT GRANT TITLE TO STATES

Mr. President, let me run through two or three things. I said I would refer to them as a sort of guide.

Mr. Philip B. Perlman, Solicitor General of the United States, appeared before the committee and made certain statements which I think are important to us. One of them was that Congress cannot take away from the States title to the beds of navigable rivers and inland waters. His exact language is as follows:

> Congress did not give them to the States, and the Congress cannot take them away from the States.

I think that is good, sound doctrine. If all the Members of this assembly had listened to the entire discussion, I think they would have been convinced that Congress could not take away from States the right to their beds of navigable rivers and their inland waters.

Secondly, Congress cannot take away the tidelands. The testimony we received was to that effect. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], in referring to this matter, turned to the Solicitor General, and said:

> You have stated that the States are entitled to the land between high and low tide; correct?
>
> Mr. PERLMAN. Yes.
>
> Senator MILLIKIN. And the Congress cannot deal with that subject—I mean the Congress is precluded from taking it away from the States.
>
> Mr. PERLMAN. That is right.

Congress is prevented from taking away the tidelands. Congress cannot give to the State, however, what is under the oceans.

OUTRIGHT OWNERSHIP NOT ASSERTED

I am not going into the entire argument in that connection, but on page 360 of the hearings the argument will be found stated. It points out that the President of the United States, when he made his claim of paramount power in the Continental Shelf, was careful not to attempt to assert outright ownership there, but he was careful to recognize the fact that the ocean is international domain and does not belong to any nation, and that international law, from the earliest times, has held that the sea is an open highway to all nations and to all people.

But, as a matter of protection of the rights of maritime nations, international law has always recognized a certain jurisdiction in the national sovereignty over a part of the ocean bed. What the extent of the sovereignty is has never been clearly determined in international law. It was fixed at 3 miles only because at the time it was discussed the extreme limit of a cannon shot was 3 miles, and so the theory was that a maritime sovereignty could defend an area of the ocean 3 miles from shore, because it could extend its military power that far from shore.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the 3-mile limit from low-water mark, over which a nation was supposed to have sovereignty, was first enunciated by Hugo Grotius in the seventeenth century? Grotius was really the father of international law, and since Grotius had put this theory in his textbook, entitled "De Juris Belli et Pacis," it was copied by all the other writers on international law.

As the Senator from New Mexico hinted, this standard may have been rendered obsolete by the increased range of modern gunfire. Therefore, applying the principle which Grotius used, we would get a longer or wider zone of the ocean in which national sovereignty would exist.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I was only trying to point out that in the hearings a good many of these questions were discussed.

The Supreme Court, in its decision in the California case, referred to the fact that Secretary of State Jefferson, in a note to the British Minister in 1793, pointed out the nebulous character of a nation's assertions of territorial rights in the marginal belt, and put forward the first official American claim for a 3-mile zone, which has since won general international acceptance.

CLAIMS NOT FOR BENEFIT OF ANY ONE STATE

Let me again refer to the testimony before the committee. The testimony before the committee was to the effect that the first claim of a 3-mile limit was not made on behalf of any State. It was made by Thomas Jefferson, when he was Secretary of State, on behalf of all of the people of the entire United States. It never was made by any State or for any State. The truth is that the States never claimed any 3-mile area whatever. Some of the States today have not claimed any rights in any marginal sea.

The Supreme Court, in the case of *Toomer* v. *Witsell*, which deals with fishing rights off the Carolinas, repeated that the original 13 States did not have any propriety rights in the marginal sea. Such rights were never claimed by those States. The rights of the Federal Government were claimed in the first instance by Thomas Jefferson, and the record shows that there was uncertainty as to what area outside the coast should be claimed by the United States. Thomas Jefferson said:

> Make it 3 miles, because that is the maximum distance of a cannon shot between shore and ship.

I say that if we get into a discussion of these questions, it will be an endless process. That is why I hope the Senate will pass some interim legislation and get the problem out of the road. If later on it wishes to return to the long process of studying what ought to be done with the land eventually, I am perfectly willing that it do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico with a great deal of interest. I have been particularly hopeful that he would come to the point which he anticipated a few minutes ago, when he stated, if I understood him correctly, that the Solicitor General of the United States had testified that Congress did not have the authority to grant to the States anything found on the sea bottoms of offshore lands. I have not been able to find any such statement of the Solicitor General.

To the contrary, I have found the exact opposite in the testimony of the Solicitor General, which makes it clear that Congress does have complete authority, and that the question, being one of policy rather than of authority, is for Congress to decide.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I will say only that I listened very carefully to the very fine discussion between the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who, as everyone recognizes, is a very fine lawyer and is fully familiar with many of the subjects which would have to be dealt with in such a case, and the Solicitor General of the United States. What I tried to say—and if I said something else, I should like to withdraw it—was that I was a little confused when they had concluded their discussion.

It is easy to demonstrate the fact by a reading of page 365. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] said that "jurisdiction is in the Congress, and the Congress can legislate as it pleases about it."

Mr. Perlman, the Solicitor General replied:

> I had already said that.

He continued:

> For all practical purposes, the United States owns the 3-mile belt, and nobody can dispose of it or do anything with it without the authority of Congress.

The Senator from Colorado started to break in, and Mr. Perlman went on to say:

> Mr. PERLMAN. I want to make an exception there so that I will not be misunderstood: any action that Congress might authorize in that connection would have to be in accordance with the maintenance of the national external sovereignty of the United States, no part of which could be surrendered by the Congress of the United States.

If that line of reasoning were followed through, it would have to be pointed out that when we try to make such grant to a State, we surrender a part of the national sovereignty. I merely wish to say that, not being a lawyer, I was a little confused.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator will pursue his reading and will come to the precise words, if any there be, in which any such statement was made by the Solicitor General. The Senator from Florida was unable to find any such statement. To the contrary, he found repeated statements—and, the Senator from Florida contends, accurate statements—that it was a question for Congress to decide, and over which Congress had ample authority; indeed, that it was a question of policy, which Congress alone could decide.

The only thing Congress could not do was to take those sea bottoms out from under the protection and jurisdiction of the United States of America in connection with its foreign affairs. No one has ever been so foolish as to maintain that the Federal Government, in its control of foreign affairs, could ever surrender any such control.

If the Senator from New Mexico can find any words which indicate that the learned Solicitor General took the position that Congress was devoid of authority to authorize a State to take the minerals in the bottom of the ocean within the 3-mile belt, the Senator from Florida would be surprised, because he could not find any such statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is the Senator from Florida looking at page 365?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] says:

Senator MILLIKIN (continuing). If it wanted to, could deed—

Referring to Congress—

to the States all land out to the limit of the Continental Shelf.

Mr. PERLMAN. I am not certain about that.

Senator MILLIKIN. Then what is the qualification in your mind that makes you uncertain?

Mr. PERLMAN. The only thing that makes me uncertain, Senator, is that the rights of the United States are derived from its relationship with other sovereign nations, and there may be some question as to whether Congress could deed away and give fee simple title to an area over which it has jurisdiction by reason of its relationship with the other sovereign nations.

When Mr. Perlman says he is uncertain it means to me that he is doubtful. I am not a lawyer, and I am not a student of international law. I merely say that when I listen to words like that I have the feeling that I am not convinced that a fee simple title can be given.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the Senator from New Mexico be gracious enough to read the next question and answer?

Mr. ANDERSON. If time permitted, I would be glad to read on to page 600. However, the next question is:

The CHAIRMAN. Would you not accept the qualification that it could do this, but only so far as it would not impair the constitutional sovereignty of the United States, as a whole?

Mr. PERLMAN. That is right; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. That, I think, is the qualification.

Mr. PERLMAN. Here is the practical thing: If this controversy is resolved, as the administration has suggested—for instance, the United States would undertake to ratify, and the Congress would be ratifying, leases already made by the States; and the Congress would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make new leases to private parties under which they would take out the minerals.

Now, if Congress can provide that the Secretary of the Interior can make leases, certainly it can authorize the States to make leases, and the power of Congress to dispose of the minerals or dispose of the revenues of the minerals is absolute.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Can there be a stronger statement than the words which the Senator from New Mexico has just read, as bearing out the position of the Senator from Florida, that the power of Congress is absolute to dispose of either minerals or the revenues from minerals?

Mr. ANDERSON. I merely suggest that if we keep reading on and on and on there will be found items that leave us a little bit in doubt.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that no matter who in fact owns the land beneath the water beyond the 3-mile limit, or beyond the naval-gunfire limit, whatever that may be, certainly it is not the States? If anyone owns the submerged land beyond the 3-mile limit, it is certainly not the State governments.

Mr. ANDERSON. It seems to be the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Supreme Court settled it in three suits. Unless there is some other authority, I think the Supreme Court has settled the question probably for some time to come.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I invite attention to what the Supreme Court stated in the Louisiana case, as quoted in the middle of the last paragraph at page 485 of the hearings:

If, as we held in the California case, the 3-mile belt is in the domain of the Nation rather than that of the separate States, it follows a fortiori that the ocean beyond that limit also is. The ocean seaward of the marginal belt is perhaps even more directly related to the national defense, the conduct of foreign affairs, and the world commerce than is the marginal sea.

So that, while it is impossible to have anything stronger than a completely strong case, if the Federal Government does own the land between the low-water mark and the 3-mile limit, or the naval-gunfire limit, certainly beyond that point there can be no case for State ownership or State possession. Is that not what the Supreme Court said?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think so, but I shall not try to interpret a Supreme Court decision. I wish only to point out that that has been the testimony before the committee.

FULL DISCUSSION WOULD BE LONG

When we bring this matter to the floor of the Senate and undertake to explore it completely, Senators will find that a long, long time will be spent on it.

Mr. Perlman also said:

The Federal Government holds its power over this area, as the Supreme Court has stated, by reason of its relationship to other sovereign nations in the family of nations. It can do a lot of things in that area, but it is somewhat doubtful, Senator, in fact it is highly doubtful, whether the United States Government can divest itself of something that the Supreme Court has held it holds by reason of national external sovereignty. There is that question in it.

I admit that we had statements back and forth and back and forth; but when we got all through, I had the feeling that there was a little doubt in Mr. Perlman's mind.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. In order that we may better understand the legal situation in this case, let me say that I believe all of us realize that Congress has the right of disposition of all production of oil and gas coming from the lands outside the coastal waters, and the Court said as much in its decision.

The Senator will notice that, although some persons say the Federal Government owns this property, the Court never has made that statement. It never has said that the Federal Government has title to it. The Court has said that the Federal Government has paramount right and that the paramount right of the Federal Government was such that the States did not own it and did not have title to it. The Court further said that the Federal Government has dominion over that property. But the Court never has said that the Federal Government had title to it. That is a vague, new concept in the law, namely, when is there dominion and paramount power, but not title? The word "title" has never been used there, so far as I have been able to determine.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I have said, there was a case involving lands in Alaska in which the Supreme Court held—again I say that a person who is not a lawyer should not attempt to quote court cases, and I apologize in advance if I am incorrect regarding them—that where there is a paramount right, such paramount right is equivalent to full title and ownership. I do not know where paramount right ends.

All I say is that if we are going to begin to review the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, we shall be here forever and ever on it. I had been hopeful that we might enact some interim legislation by which we would permit the oil derricks off the coasts of Louisiana and Texas to begin their operations and permit those off the coast of California to begin their operations.

I hope that in connection with such interim legislation we can pass Senate bill 1540, which would dispose of a part of the title, and then can proceed in an orderly fashion to do the thing the

Senator from Louisiana has been talking about.

HISTORY SHOULD NOT BE REWRITTEN

Let me read again from Mr. Perlman's testimony, this time at page 383:

Senator, one of the things I think is unfortunate about the bill that is before this committee—

There he was referring to Senate bill 940—

is this: Congress may decide to convey away the resources of the United States so far as it can—and it probably can do it, for all practical purposes. It may decide to convey them to Louisiana or Texas or California. It may decide to do that. But I think it is particularly unfortunate, if Congress does so decide, to attempt to rewrite the history of the United States and to rewrite the Constitution of the United States when it does it. It is not necessary to do that, and this bill that is before you is based on false history and false premises all the way through. If you want to do it, do it, but do not do it on some premise that has been rejected by history and by the Supreme Court of the United States.

That is why a few minutes ago, in replying to the junior Senator from Louisiana, I said that many of us realized that there had to be some disposition of this matter. However, I never will believe that the disposition is to claim every bit of it for the United States and none of it for the States which border it. How much we shall do is a matter which some day we shall have to work out.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from New Mexico has been quoting very good law, and I know he will be pleased with a quotation from the decision of the Supreme Court in the Texas case, as given on page 492 of the hearings, in the first major paragraph, the third sentence:

Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign. Today the controversy is over oil. Tomorrow it may be over some other substance or mineral or perhaps the bed of the ocean itself. If the property, whatever it may be, lies seaward of low-water mark, its use, disposition, management, and control involve national interests and national responsibilities. That is the source of national rights in it. Such is the relationale of the California decision, which we have applied to Louisiana's case. The same result must be reached here if equal footing with the various States is to be achieved.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is very important, because there is pending before one of the congressional committees at this time a matter dealing with some certain rare minerals which are being found in the bed of the ocean near another country. I think we are very much interested in what disposition is made of them. Similar materials may be found in this country, some day. I say that if we are trying to determine how these matters shall be handled and what we shall do about them, we shall be here for endless discussion.

As I have said, I have been hopeful that we might be able to pass some type of interim legislation, and thus proceed. I see that the Senator from Illinois holds very strong views on the question of whether the property in question will be taken away from the Federal Government. Other Senators also hold very strong views on that question.

INTERIM BILL WOULD PERMIT OTHER LEGISLATION

If we were to bring the House bill before the Senate for discussion and full examination, we could easily spend 3 weeks or a month in doing so, and then reach no resolution other than perhaps to send the bill back to the committee, because there never have been Senate committee hearings on it since the first session of this Congress adjourned. Therefore, I assume there would be a motion to recommit the House bill, so that we might have Senate committee hearings on it. But if we do that sort of thing, we shall be here forever and forever.

Why not pass a measure which can be enacted, so as to dispose of that much of the problem, and then proceed with our other business?

Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the senior Senator from Illinois and the junior Senator from Louisiana in withholding certain questions. I only say again, I recognize that those who have been called upon to present the points of view of certain States have in my opinion done a fine job, as they are required to do by virtue of their representation of those States.

I have tried to indicate that the junior Senator from Louisiana has been militant and vigorous. He has argued with us in committee, in season and out. Representatives from other States have been there. That is their proper function, and when we come to a final discussion of this question, we shall spend a long time before reaching the ultimate solution of it.

I desire to point out, as I started to do a moment ago, that House Joint Resolution 225, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which was passed by both Houses of Congress and was then vetoed, was passed by a 3-to-1 margin in the House but the veto was sustained nevertheless. The present quitclaim bill passed the House by a margin of only 2 to 1. I think we could spend much time on quitclaim legislation, and get absolutely nowhere, at a time when the oil which lies off the coasts of the respective States ought to be in production. I hope that Senate Joint Resolution 20, substantially in its present form, may finally be passed by this Congress.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO FORMER OFFICIALS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to former officials of the Internal Revenue.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2785) to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERGUSON. The principal part of this amendment to section 284 has to do with the right of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Under Secretary of the Treasury, or the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the General Counsel, the Assistant General Counsel, or Tax Legislative Counsel for the Treasury Department, or the Commissioners, Assistant Commissioners, or Deputy Commissioners of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or an Assistant General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or any head of any section or any division of the office of the assistant general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, to practice before the Treasury or before the Bureau of Internal Revenue, for a period of 2 years.

I introduce the bill because there is a conflict of opinion within the Treasury itself as to what constitutes a case against the Government. It appears that they have interpreted a tax case before the Department as not being a case against the Government, and as not constituting a claim against the Government. My bill would remedy that by prohibiting those who are at the top of the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Bureau from practicing before the Department or the Bureau. The bill also amends other parts of the same section.

According to what we read in the press and hear in the committees, I think it is well established that there has been a relaxation of the rule of governing practice before Government departments and bureaus, and the purpose of this bill is to plug that loophole. We have discovered in America that the only way one can make real money any more is to have some loophole in the tax law, or be able to get a rebate of taxes.

I think if there is one loophole which ought to be plugged, it is that whereby a person after he has been in the Bureau, or indeed a person who had control of the whole Bureau, is able to practice before the Bureau.

Government-by-crony has become increasingly commonplace in the past several years and this amendment would prevent that type of operation in the Treasury Department.

There is a natural human tendency to listen more favorably to the arguments of a friend and colleague than to the pleadings of a stranger but this kind of favoritism certainly must not be permitted or tolerated in Government agencies.

In many cases, a knowledge of the Government side of a tax case is no more valuable to the defendant and his attorney than a close friendship with the officials handling the case. My amendment will eliminate that kind of operation.

I contend that every one of the officers mentioned in the bill are directly connected with every tax case within the Bureau, and therefore they should not

be permitted to practice before the Bureau for a period of 2 years after they leave the service.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the nomination of Robert T. Bartley to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask that the nomination be confirmed, and that the President be notified immediately.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I supported the nomination of Robert T. Bartley to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, when it was before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I shall vote to confirm his nomination today.

During the hearings on February 29, 1952, before the Senate committee on Mr. Bartley's nomination, I submitted to him a number of questions in regard to his position on a matter of concern to the people of Missouri, the so-called television freeze.

At the present time only two television channels have been authorized by the Federal Communications Commission for use in Missouri, one in Kansas City and one in St. Louis. A long-standing freeze order has prevented other stations being put into operation.

I have received literally thousands of letters, particularly from the St. Louis area, from people who say in effect, "What is the use of having a dial on our television set? We have only one channel." Substantial portions of our State are without television, and have never been able to enjoy its benefits. Many of our people cannot understand why the FCC has delayed allocating more channels from month to month, year to year.

When former FCC Chairman Wayne Coy appeared before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 18, 1951, he led the committee to believe that the situation might be brought to a head by September 1951. Later he wrote the chairman a letter saying in effect that he thought he had been a little brash about this date. He indicated then that the situation could be corrected by the first of the year. That dead line, too, is past, and still there is no official word from the Commission as to when people may expect any measure of relief from the freeze order.

During the committee hearing on Mr. Bartley's nomination, Mr. Bartley assured our committee that, if confirmed as a member of the Federal Communications Commission, he will work for an extension of television as rapidly as possible.

Mr. President, in order that the RECORD will indicate clearly Mr. Bartley's position on this matter, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point excerpts from the discussion with Mr. Bartley when he was before the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator KEM. Mr. Bartley, I understand you have had considerable radio experience. Have you had any television experience?

Mr. BARTLEY. No, sir.

Senator KEM. You have considered and studied the problems confronting the television industry to some extent, haven't you?

Mr. BARTLEY. Perhaps a little more than the average person, but not much, because I haven't had opportunity to do it. I don't have any facts that aren't in the newspapers, for example, to go on.

Senator KEM. Did you read about the hearing that was held by this committee on July 18, 1951, when Chairman Wayne Coy was a witness here?

Mr. BARTLEY. I have never read those hearings.

Senator KEM. Did you read the newspapers about them?

Mr. BARTLEY. I may have. I don't remember.

Senator KEM. The question involved was, when the so-called freeze on television would be lifted. I am particularly interested in that situation because in our State of some 3,500,000 people and hundreds of thousands of television sets, we have two television stations, one in St. Louis, an urban community of over a million people, and one in Kansas City. The result is I have gotten literally thousands of letters from citizens who say the dial on their sets do not mean anything because there is one station they can get and they cannot understand why this thing goes on from month to month. These letters have come particularly from St. Louis and vicinity.

When Mr. Coy was a witness here on July 18, 1951, he led the committee to believe that the situation might be brought to a head by next September. That appears on page 25 of the hearings. And after he left the committee he wrote the chairman a letter saying that he thought he had been a little brash about that and he indicated that the matter would be brought to a head by the first of the present year. Well, that is past. Still no official word from the Commission when people may expect some relief from this freeze order.

Would you tell the committee in general your views of that problem.

Mr. BARTLEY. You heard the chairman say a moment ago, speaking of Chairman Walker's call to him, that apparently they are working on the thing as hard as they can. I will pitch in the minute I get there and do all I can to help.

Senator KEM. Please give us your views briefly, that is the background from which you will approach the problem.

Mr. BARTLEY. I would have to know what the particular issue was that they were possibly hung up on. If they are hung up on an issue, I would just have to go to the bottom of it. I don't know. It might take me a good while, but I do want to have the right answer if I came up with an answer.

Senator KEM. You mean if you became a member of the Commission, the matter would be postponed indefinitely again?

Mr. BARTLEY. It might have the reverse effect if they are hung up 3 to 3 on some things and they can't get off that.

Senator KEM. Would you be inclined to assist them to get off this dead center?

Mr. BARTLEY. I certainly would.

Senator KEM. Have you any sympathy with the position of the television set owner who writes to Members of Congress complaining bitterly about the existing situation?

Mr. BARTLEY. Very much.

Senator KEM. You think there is any reason for that thing being continued from month to month and year to year?

Mr. BARTLEY. I wouldn't have the vaguest notion, Senator. I do not know how involved some of those problems are. By that I mean that the technical features of television are so much more involved than the technical features of, say, standard broadcasting.

Senator KEM. To get right down to brass tacks, Mr. Bartley, many, many people are interested in seeing a member of the Commission appointed confirmed who will assist in solving this problem with reasonable expedition. Do you feel you can do that?

Mr. BARTLEY. I believe so.

Senator KEM. And you will, if you are confirmed, honestly address yourself to the problem and make a conscientious effort to solve it within a reasonable time?

Mr. BARTLEY. I will do my very best.

Senator TOBEY. Quite along that line, I might comment, Mr. Chairman, that because of the fact that in my State of New Hampshire three-fourths of the State cannot get any television. When my friend on our right here, Senator CAPEHART, appeared last night with great aplomb on the television with Faye Emerson on the program, The Author Meets the Critic, he did a splendid job, and I want the country as a whole to have the opportunity of seeing him.

Senator CAPEHART. Senator TOBEY, you exaggerate my part in it.

Senator JOHNSON of Texas. I want to echo what Senator KEM said. While we may be in a slightly better situation than they are in Missouri, three-fourths of the people in our State have television unavailable to them. The freeze caught them and they keep postponing it and move it up continually. I certainly hope these seven men can get together and take some action. Sometimes "No" would be a relief compared to what we have.

The CHAIRMAN. I want to echo what you say, Jim, because Colorado and our part of the West represented by Senator HUNT—and Senator MCFARLAND, I think, too, because I don't know whether they may have some television in his State—but in Colorado, at least, and in Wyoming they have no television whatever. These target dates have been set up first as September, then January 1, 1952, then February 1, 1952, then February 15, 1952, then March 15, 1952, and now March 25.

I don't know whether I would dare go home because my people naturally think what is Congress doing about this problem. They know they are not getting television. They know that everybody else or great parts of the country are getting television. They don't like to be considered second-class citizens in a country such as this. They are

really very angry. Their patience is exhausted and they want something done about it.

So I echo what Senator KEM has said. I urge Mr. Bartley, if he is confirmed, that he get his coat off and his shirt off, too, if necessary, and get that job done down there some way somehow, because its is really coming to a head.

I do want to say this: I have been after the Commission, as Senator KEM has and as many others have, and this is what they have told me. This is what Chairman Coy had told me before he left, the former Chairman Wayne Coy. He said, "We are preparing a 600-page document. Lifting the freeze is not as simple as it may sound. When we lift the freeze then we have to have an outline of how to go about getting television. We have a 600-page document that comes out simultaneously with the lifting of the freeze, which is a bill of particulars and is really a catalog and an instruction book on how persons wanting a license may proceed to get a license."

In that connection, there are a great many problems. There is the problem of what channels are to be turned over to the educational institutions and facilities of the country. There are a great many other fundamental questions involved. Those questions haven't been completely resolved at the present time and they need the attention of the Commission.

As Chairman Walker pointed out, on many of them there is a split of 3 to 3 and unless that is broken by the appointment of a seventh member, the thing might drag on and drag on.

That is the whole thing in a nutshell. But I am in complete harmony and sympathy with the remarks made by Senator KEM, of Missouri. The situation is intolerable. (Recorded hearings, pp. 10–15).

* * * * *

Senator KEM. I am not interested in it from the standpoint of any particular applicant for a television station in our State, but I am interested in it from the standpoint of the plain people the owners of sets who have been given a go-around. There has been, somehow, an apparent lack of attention to the public interest. I think that ought to be brought to a head and brought to an end.

My quesion to you is: Do you feel that you can, and you have the ability and the training, and the desire to go in and grapple with that important public problem?

Mr. BARTLEY. I do, sir.

Senator KEM. And you will devote your best interests and efforts to trying to get it done?

Mr. BARTLEY. Yes, sir. (Recorded hearings, pp. 18–19).

* * * * *

Senator KEM. The delay in lifting the freeze has resulted in a limited use of television in connection with the election in 1952. I am asking you if you regard that as an undesirable or as a desirable result?

Mr. BARTLEY. I think we ought to have an extension of television as rapidly as possible.

Senator KEM. Are you pleased or displeased that there will be less television than there would otherwise be in the election of 1952?

Mr. BARTLEY. I don't have any views at all. The faster we get it, the better.

Senator KEM. You don't have any view as to whether it would be desirable to have widespread television in that connection?

Mr. BARTLEY. I would like to see widespread television as soon as possible, without respect to any date.

Senator TOBEY. Television would be a great saving on the candidates, less travel.

Senator KEM. It would be of great importance to the people that they may be informed. Are you interested in that?

Mr. BARTLEY. I told you that, sir. I am very much interested.

Senator KEM. Your efforts will be devoted, as far as possible, to getting this freeze dissolved, so there may be widespread use of the television medium in connection with the elections in this country?

Mr. BARTLEY. I will do the best I can to get it on the air just as soon as possible without respect to anybody else except the public interest.

Senator KEM. Do you regard additional legislation as necessary in order that the Commission may cope with the problems it is confronted with?

Mr. BARTLEY. I don't know any amendment that would be helpful right now. There may be some when I get down there.

Senator KEM. Will you undertake to inform this committee promptly of such additional legislation that you may consider necessary or advisable?

Mr. BARTLEY. As a matter of fact, I think the Act requires that, sir.

Senator KEM. Since I have been a member of this committee we have not been informed that any additional legislation is desired, yet the Commission has just gone on from day to day and has continued a situation that many thoughtful people regard as unfortunate (recorded hearings, pp. 24–26).

Mr. KEM. It was intimated in the hearing before our committee, that the FCC is now split 3 to 3 on some important questions. I voted in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Bartley's nomination in the committee and shall vote for it in the Senate upon his express assurance that he will do what he can to end the television freeze without further delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

The legislative clerk read the name of Watson B. Miller, of Maryland, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Percy C. Fountain, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leland S. Finney, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified in each case.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 5, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

UNITED NATIONS

William H. Draper, Jr., of New York, special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to be also the representative of the United States of America to the seventh session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Frederick C. Oechsner, of Louisiana, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Jack R. Johnstone, of Washington.
Joseph W. Schutz, of California.
Hugh N. Whitaker, of Louisiana.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Robert W. Bradbury, of Florida.
Gillespie S. Evans, of New York.
F. Taylor Gurney, of Oklahoma.
Henry L. Taylor, of Washington.

Dudley C. Bostwick, of Virginia, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Leonard Unger, of Maryland, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Richard S. Leach, of Connecticut.
James H. Roberton, of Maryland.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1951, vice James Joseph Reynolds, Jr., resigned.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Ernest A. Tolin, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Walter S. Farley, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice Joseph C. Reing, term expired.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 4 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert T. Bartley, of Texas, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1951.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Watson B. Miller, of Maryland, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 3 years.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Percy C. Fountain, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Alabama.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Leland S. Finney, of Virginia, to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 4, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of eternal wisdom, justice, and righteousness, there has been placed upon us the inescapable responsibility of deciding which is the best way to defend our beloved country and preserve the peace of the world.

We humbly and penitently confess that we are confused. We are greatly perplexed and disturbed. There is an honest difference of opinion among us. We are crediting one another with sincerity. Many of our constituents and those whose judgment we value have voiced their views but we are not yet sure how to vote wisely and rightly.

Grant that we may now in all faith and humility submit our proposals and disputes and differences to the high court of heaven and the Supreme Judge of all mankind, beseeching Thee to illumine and inspire and direct us by Thy divine spirit.

Help us to believe that when statesmanship and human ingenuity have done their utmost and their very best that then we must still hold our decision in abeyance until Thou has declared Thy will.

We pray that the day may be hastened when all our decisions are made with Thy divine approval, and shall appeal to the best judgment of our fellow citizens. Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

TO ASSIST IN PREVENTING ALIENS FROM ENTERING OR REMAINING IN THE UNITED STATES ILLEGALLY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, insist on the House amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. CELLER, WALTER, and GRAHAM.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, March 17, St. Patrick's Day, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MASTER SGT. ROBERT A. ESPE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1796) for the relief of Master Sgt. Robert A. Espe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert A. Espe, master sergeant, United States Air Force, the sum of $15,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert A. Espe against the United States on account of the death of his wife, Joyce Merlyn Espe, and his infant son, Victor Robert Espe, on January 26, 1950, while passengers in an Air Force plane which disappeared after leaving Elmendorf Air Base at Anchorage, Alaska: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARY OSADCHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3561) for the relief of Mary Osadchy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mary Osadchy, of Max, N. Dak., mother of the late Staff Sgt. Vincent V. Osadchy, the sum of $2,161, representing the difference between the amount of death-compensation benefits she would have received had application been filed therefor on November 30, 1944, the presumed date of death of her son, and the balance retained by her of amounts improperly paid through error of the Finance Department, United States Army, in connection with family allowance payments.

SEC. 2. Any liability to the United States arising out of payments erroneously made to the said Mary Osadchy is hereby canceled.

SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out beginning with "$2,161" down to and including the word "payments" on page 2, line 2, and insert "$1,426, which represents a like amount refunded by her to the United States on account of erroneous family allowance overpayments made to her by the Finance Department, United States Army."

Page 2, strike out lines 7, 8, and 9 and insert:

"SEC. 2. Any liability to the United States arising out of payments of family allowance erroneously made to the said Mary Osadchy is hereby canceled."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS R. CHADBOURNE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6264) for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis R. Chadbourne, of Medford, Mass., the difference between the amount of retired pay to which he would have been entitled during the period in question and the amount of the disability compensation benefits he received during the same period. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Louis R. Chadbourne against the United States for retroactive retirement pay from November 19, 1945, the date of his separation from active service, to March 1, 1949, the date on which he was actually placed on the retired list of the Navy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER NEWMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of Alexander Newman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. D'EWART objected; and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SAMUEL THOMAS WONG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4067) for the relief of Samuel Thomas Wong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien, Samuel Thomas Wong, the minor, unmarried child of Samuel Eugene Wong, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANN TOBAK AND JOHN TOBAK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4152) for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children Ann Tobak and John Tobak, of Livno, Bosna, Sedevice, Yugoslavia, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Philip Tobak, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAZEL SAU FONG HEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4220) for the relief of Hazel Sau Fong Hee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Hazel Sau Fong Hee, the minor unmarried child of Alexander Chong Hee and Isabelle Wong Hee, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINGLAN HAMMERLIND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4397) for the relief of Minglan Hammerlind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Minglan Hammerlind, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Miss Elsa Hammerlind, citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAGAKUBO (ALSO KNOWN AS ROY MERVIN NELSON)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4691) for the relief of Nagakubo (also known as Roy Mervin Nelson).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Nagakubo (also known as Roy Mervin Nelson), the minor child of Roy M. Nelson, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PATRICIA ANN HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4772) for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that Act, the minor child, Patricia Ann Harris, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Crystal C. Harris, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YOKO TAKEUCHI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4788) for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, the alien Yoko Takeuchi, a minor half-Japanese child under the care of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Tokomura, both citizens of the United States residing temporarily in Japan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of the said Mr. and Mrs. Harry Tokomura.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert: "That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Yoko Takeuchi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Harry Tokomura, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RODNEY DREW LAWRENCE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5187) for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Rodney Drew Lawrence, adopted Japanese minor child, and the said Rodney Drew Lawrence shall be held and considered to be the alien natural-born child of Sgt. (1c) and Mrs. W. A. Lawrence, United States citizens.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN MICHAEL JURECEK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5297) for the relief of John Michael Jurecek.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of race ineligible to citizenship, John Michael Jurecek, a minor child under the care of Tech. Sgt. and Mrs. Forrest C. Jurecek, both citizens of the United States residing temporarily in Japan, shall be held and considered for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, to be the natural-born alien child of the said Tech. Sgt. and Mrs. Forrest C. Jurecek.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9, of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, John Michael Jurecek, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Tech. Sgt. and Mrs. Forrest C. Jurecek."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KAZUMI YAMASHITO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5322) for the relief of Kazumi Yamashito.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and, notwithstanding the provision of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Kazumi Yamashito, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Tech. Sgt. and Mrs. Edward W. Gentry, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTOKO SAKURADA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5437) for the relief of Motoko Sakurada.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Motoko Sakurada, the minor child of Shizue Sakurada, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANS WERNER BRISCO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5460) for the relief of Hans Werner Brisco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Hans Werner Brisco, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. and Mrs. A. S. Brisco, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENE KLINE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5551) for the relief of Eugene Kline.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Eugene Kline, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Kline, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARC STEFEN ALEXENKO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5590) for the relief of Marc Stefen Alexenko.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Marc Stefen Alexenko, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Charles J. McCabe, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUMI TAKEMURA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5685) for the relief of Rumi Takemura.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of such act, the minor child, Rumi Takemura, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sgt. Juan M. Valdez, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KARIN RICCARDO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5922) for the relief of Karin Riccardo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Karin Riccardo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. James J. Riccardo, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOLLY PRINDLE GOODMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5931) for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Holly Prindle Goodman, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Joseph N. Goodman, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KUNIO ITOH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5936) for the relief of Kunio Itoh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, shall not apply to Kunio Itoh, Japanese minor child in the care of Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Herman W. Robertson, citizens of the United States. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Kunio Itoh shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of the said Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Herman W. Robertson.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Kunio Itoh, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Herman W. Robertson, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GYLDA RAYDEL WAGNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6012) for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Gylda Raydel Wagner, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Tech. Sgt. George F. Wagner and his wife, Lloyce P. Wagner, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH YUKIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6026) for the relief of Joseph Yukio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Joseph Yukio, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Tech. Sgt. and Mrs. Eugene Sanders, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANAMI TAGO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6172) to effect entry of Manami Tago to be adopted by a United States citizen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible for citizenship, the minor child, Manami Tago, half Japanese and half American, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corp. Robert J. McAllen, a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all language following the enacting clause and substitute the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Manami Tago, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corp. Robert J. McAllen, a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Manami Tago."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HARUMI CHINA CAIRNS AND GEORGE THOMAS CAIRNS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 836) for the relief of Mrs. Harumi China Cairns and George Thomas Cairns.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, excluding from the United States aliens ineligible to citizenship, shall not apply to Mrs. Harumi China Cairns and George Thomas Cairns, wife and minor son of Thomas L. Cairns, a United States citizen.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all language following the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof, the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Harumi China Cairns, the wife of Thomas L. Cairns, a

United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Harumi China Cairns."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GABRIELLA RUBIDO ZICHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3534) for the relief of Gabriella Rubido Zichy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gabriella Rubido Zichy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERIKA BAMMES (PATRICIA ANN COX)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4343) for the relief of Erika Bammes (Patricia Ann Cox).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Erika Bammes (Patricia Ann Cox), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. Clayton T. and Mrs. Martha N. Cox, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIMBERLY ANN CIBULSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5920) for the relief of Kimberly Ann Cibulski, also known as Belle Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that Act, the minor child, Kimberly Ann Cibulski, also known as Belle Lee, shall be held and considered to be the natural born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Fred C. Cibulski, citizens of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all language following the enacting clause and substitute the following: "That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Kimberly Ann Cibulski, also known as Belle Lee, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Fred C. Cibulski, citizens of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Kimberly Ann Cibulski, also known as Belle Lee, shall be considered to be the natural-born child of Mr. and Mrs. Fred C. Cibulski, citizens of the United States."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNE DE BAILLET-LATOUR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6055) for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the citizenship of Anne de Baillet-Latour, which she acquired at birth, shall not be subject to the retention provisions of section 201 (g) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HISAKO SUZUKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6088) for the relief of Hisako Suzuki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Hisako Suzuki, Japanese minor child in the care of Sgt. and Mrs. James Jenkins, citizens of the United States. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Hisako Suzuki shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of the said Sgt. and Mrs. James Jenkins.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DELIANA MEULENKAMP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6117) for the relief of Deliana Meulenkamp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Deliana Meulenkamp shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on June 26, 1947, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the language following the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 307 and 331 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, and if otherwise eligible under all other provisions of the said act, regardless of age, Deliana Meulenkamp may, within 6 months immediately following the date of enactment of this act, file the petition for naturalization prescribed by law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "That notwithstanding the provisions of sections 307 and 331 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, and if otherwise eligible under all other provisions of the said act, regardless of age, Deliana Meulenkamp may within 6 months immediatley following the date of enactment of this act, file the petition for naturalization prescribed by law."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELAINE IRVING HEDLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6480) for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Imigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Elaine Irving Hedley, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. William Hedley, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MONIKA WALTRAUD FECHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6561) for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Monika Waltraud Fecht, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. Col. and Mrs. Samuel Hope Sandifer, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 15]

Armstrong	Harrison, Nebr.	Regan
Brooks	Hedrick	Sabath
Buchanan	Herlong	Sittler
Buffett	Hull	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Larcade	Staggers
Combs	Latham	Weichel
Dorn	Morgan	Wickersham
Ellsworth	Murray, Wis.	
Feighan	Potter	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 407 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING CORPS ACT

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5904, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, February 29, 1952, all time for general debate on the bill had expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this act may be cited as the "National Security Training Corps Act."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer a privileged motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman from Massachusetts is entitled to 5 minutes in support of his motion, and the opposition is entitled to 5 minutes to speak against the motion; is that not correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. That must be done in the House, and not in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, let me make clear at the outset that this motion I offer to strike out the enacting clause is purely a matter of mechanics of House procedure. It is the only way at this time to get a vote in the House on a motion to recommit this measure to the Armed Services Committee for further study which it so desperately needs. This motion is wholly preliminary to the motion to recommit, which motion I shall offer immediately when we go back into the House after adoption of this pending motion in the Committee of the Whole.

The vote will then come, not on this motion, but on the motion to recommit. The proponents are seeking to drive this bill through at this time, little thought out and ill considered as it is, with promises of amendments never accepted or considered by the committee. I can think of nothing that would be so damaging or so far reaching.

In as clear and as emphatic language as I have at my command, I want to reiterate my position on this measure.

If a well thought out program was labeled universal military training or any other name and accomplished the purposes of giving some certainty to the youth of this country so they could plan their lives; of reducing the burdens of our taxpayers while maintaining an equal measure of security; and of giving us the knowledge and assurance that we have trained reserves that can quickly augment our standing forces in combat, I could support such a bill.

This bill will not accomplish these objectives.

The broad outline and the machinery of the program we expected was confined only to a 6-month training program. Even here, no consideration was given to pilots, navigators, or bombardiers who will be so vital if war should come. That will be another program. There are, however, mandatory courses in sex education, responsibility, marriage and family life, religion, moral principles and citizenship. As valuable as these may be, cannot they be accomplished better at home?

The Commission stated that their case was based on the assumption of a vigorous reserve program. Let us examine that assumption.

If there is no armory near their homes upon completion of their training, how can a vigorous Reserve be established? If armories are to be built what is to be the cost of construction for these buildings and for the tremendously expensive equipment on which they are to work, and the source and cost of instructors?

On August 15, 1950, the Chairman of the Subcommittee for Reserves in the Armed Services Committee in arguing for an authorization of $400,000,000 to build armories at that time said: "I repeat, the most serious obstacle at this time to the creation and maintenance of reserve units is the nonavailability of armories and other facilities." However, because of defense needs no money was appropriated.

That was on a small scale compared to a plan that would require universal training and universal armories. Are our defense needs less urgent today? Shall we put these young men in the armories that were never built?

If we build all these armories with equipment and instructors, there is nothing to make an individual attend a single drill, although their names will remain on paper for 7½ years. Are we going to risk the security of our country in a "paper" reserve?

Does it make sense to disrupt a life twice when it is a certainty a young man would be called again and soon after his training? Surely, this is not the certainty I hoped would be offered.

If we are to train 5,000,000 men, are we to maintain a level of modern equipment for that many men? Shall we also be required to furnish it to the rest of the free world? Should we not plan men and equipment together? If we cannot produce the equipment for 2 or 3 years, trained men are of no avail.

Should not this program be tied in with our civilian life and economy? Should not leaders in agriculture, production, education, labor, and church be a part of a panel that decides these far-reaching proposals? To neglect our production is to neglect our real strength.

Mrs. Rosenberg told the Armed Services Committee she hoped the civilian advisers will "explore the practicability of national scholarships." Now what is that phase of the program all about?

I have never seen any bill that promises so much and says so little.

This bill has not been thought through. My views are perhaps best expressed by the Commission when it stated:

It does not pretend to have given complete consideration to all of the complex and difficult questions involved. A few of these require more thought than has been possible to give them in the relatively short period prescribed for completion of this first task.

The Commission expresses my sentiments. Let us send it back for full study.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] for 5 minutes in opposition to the motion.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I trust that you will not think I am speaking out of turn because I am trying to bring you the counsel of a very old friend. Thirty-nine years ago today I became a Member of the House of Representatives. Forty-one years ago today our great friend from North Carolina, BOB DOUGHTON, became a Member of this House. Forty-five years ago today the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] became a Member of this House. So I, along with them, crave your indulgence for a moment, because I love the House

of Representatives, its traditions, and have always pleaded for orderly procedure. That is what I plead for now.

Recommit this bill for further study. How many years of study have we had on this subject? I think I appointed Mr. Cliff Woodrum, of Virginia, some years ago to begin the study of this matter. The present Committee on Armed Services has taken thousands of pages of testimony and heard everybody pro and con who wanted to be heard. Why send this back for further study? Do we not have the fortitude, do we not have the courage to meet the issue today? Now is the time to meet this issue, because probably we shall never have an opportunity this year or maybe in several years to come.

Strike the enacting clause out. Of course, as the gentleman from Massachusetts said, it is a parliamentary move to get back into the House of Representatives and then to make a motion to recommit.

Are we not willing, do we not have judgment enough, do we doubt our ability to pass on amendments and pass on the fundamental issues here presented? If we are not ready today, when will we be ready?

This question has been discussed all over the United States and all over the world. I am jealous of our reputation throughout the length and breadth of this earth. I am afraid that those who stand with us will misundersand. When I speak of a terrible world, I do not speak of a time remote. I speak of now. If the United States of America in the kind of a world in which we live is not foremost, does not remain foremost, does not accept the challenge of leadership on this earth as we have been challenged, then this world will not be a fit place in which decent people upon this round world may live.

So let us vote down the motion in committee. Let us proceed in an orderly way and try to amend this bill. Let us not escape our responsibility, and that is what we would be doing, and whether it is amended or not, when it is adopted and the final outcome is before us, then is the time for men of judgment, men of reason, men of capacity to vote on this bill and not until that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. BATES of Massachusetts.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 167, noes 196.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 1, line 5, strike out the period after the words "National Security Training Corps Act," insert a comma, and add the following: "which act shall terminate on 1 July 1958 and shall not take effect until such time as all inductions for service in the Armed Forces shall have ceased."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is fair, clean-cut, and precise. Every Member of the House can understand exactly what it means. It means that the termination date, the length, the life of this present bill is fixed as of July 1, 1958. It means that approximately 6 years from the date this bill is enacted it will go off the statute books, unless the Congress reenacts it. Those are the two things the amendment is to accomplish.

This also answers a criticism which was pointed out by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], that probably some injustice would be done by requiring some boys to be subject to call for 6 months and some for 24 months. This fixes it so that no man can be inducted into the training corps while the draft is in operation. That is what the amendment does. It is clean-cut, it is positive. It says that no man can be drafted into the training corps as long as you are drafting men for service. It means the length of this act is 6 years. That meets every criticism of major importance that has been lodged against this bill.

The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is entitled to credit for being the sponsor, the father of this amendment, and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS] is entitled to the credit of being the sponsor of the amendment putting a termination date in the act.

I ask the committee now to go on record and say that no man can be drafted into the training corps while you are operating the draft, that no man can be put into the Training Corps as long as the draft is taking your neighbor's son. And the termination date is fixed positively. Everybody understands it. It is clean-cut. I certainly trust that the House will agree to this constructive amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, we have just witnessed a complete somersault, a total handspring and an absolute about face by the chairman of this distinguished committee. A termination date was offered in the committee. Opposition to that termination date was led by the disinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. The termination date was offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HESS] and as I recall, was defeated by a vote of 18 to 7. We were told all during the hearings, by the proponents of this measure, that we must get UMT started now in order to be able to build up this reserve, and as we built up this reserve gradually, then we would reduce gradually the number in the active service under the draft. Do you know what is proposed for us to do here now? It is proposed that we pass a law which will not take effect or go into operation until expiration of Selective Service on July 1, 1955, or at an earlier date if the military decides the draft is no longer needed. Why pass a law now which will not become operative until some future date? How can this Congress bind some future Congress?

Mr. VINSON. That date, as proposed in my amendment is the termination date.

Mr. SHORT. Yes, July 1, 1958. It only goes to show the position taken by the chairman, and proves that I have been absolutely right all the time in the argument, both last year and in the recent debate that we do not have a sufficient pool of manpower in this country to afford this luxury. You cannot have the draft and the UMT at the same time. I do not know why the chairman led the fight against such an amendment, or a similar amendment in committee, and why he now accepts it hook, line, and sinker; lock, stock, and barrel, and swallows it whole unless it is a sop—just a sop to get a few votes for the bill which without the amendment it would not get. I dare say that some of the gentlemen who walked down the aisle today and voted against striking out the enacting clause, when their names are called and they are put on record, will vote either to recommit or vote against the measure itself.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Will the gentleman advise the committee whether or not he opposes a termination date.

Mr. SHORT. I oppose the bill completely and absolutely. I would not waste even 5 seconds debating this issue which will undermine the strength of this Nation, and which will weaken rather than strengthen our national defense. If we never begin UMT we will not have to end it. The 6 months training that you get under this particular measure is practically worthless. The changes in the methods and the techniques of modern warfare are radical and rapid. After getting 6 months basic training, the trainee goes into the Reserve; then, if war should break out a little later on, everyone here knows that training will have to be taken over again, and that the men will have to learn to use new weapons.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The Speaker said that we should follow orderly procedure. As I understood it, the Selective Service Act goes to 1955, and all the prognostications are that it will be extended beyond that. If that is true, then this act would expire before it could ever take effect. I think that leads to the very logical inquiry as to just what we are trying to accomplish.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the selective service is meeting all the requirements in the present emergency, and if we were sensible, we would follow the sound advice of General MacArthur and wait until this emergency is over, and then consider legislation in the light of world events at that time.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I must yield to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I just want to ask the gentleman whether his attitude was just

the same just before Pearl Harbor—in that emergency and on the same question. The gentleman can answer that.

Mr. SHORT. No. UMT was not even considered.

Mr. DINGELL. You voted against it, did you not?

Mr. SHORT. I voted against peacetime conscription at all times.

Mr. DINGELL. You certainly did vote against it.

Mr. SHORT. Well, let me take just a minute to answer the gentleman.

Mr. DINGELL. Yes, you did.

Mr. SHORT. You who were in the vast majority——

Mr. DINGELL. You did not vote for it then, and you will not vote for it now.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I refuse to yield to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 1, line 5, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add "which act shall terminate on July 1, 1955, and shall not take effect until such time as all inductions for service in the Armed Forces shall have ceased."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The purport of the gentleman's amendment is that it does not commence until the draft ceases in July 1955: is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly, it is my purpose to make both this act and the Selective Service Act coterminous. I feel the chairman of the committee has distinctly improved the bill and its prospects by his amendment, and I am proposing further improvement.

The purpose of my amendment is to make this act, if it passes, and the Selective Service Act end on exactly the same date, and these are my reasons.

We have adopted a manpower policy for military defense in the Selective Service Act. We are now asked by the advocates of universal military training to substitute another manpower policy. There may be merit in that substitution. I think the vote here a while ago not to strike out the enacting clause was a determination to keep an open mind on the subject and see if this bill could be put in shape as a manpower policy to fit in with selective service which the House could approve. I have an amendment against segregation and discrimination in the Reserve components which I will propose at the proper time, for instance, and I am sure there are other amendments. But I do not conceive it to be the purpose of a good many—certainly it is not my purpose—to adopt a totally different military manpower policy extending beyond the period upon which we have already decided as a proper terminal date for the manpower policy of military defense generally, to wit, 1955.

I happen to feel myself that the path of peace means that we are in for a long period of strain with the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc. But if we are going to have a total and complete military mobilization, a drafting of everybody, and a calling in of all reserves as we did during World War II, then, obviously, we are looking forward to a war.

What we want is a manpower policy which is designed for impregnable defense and for the performance of our security commitments abroad under present conditions of what is generally "cold war" not major "hot war" which we perforce consider to be peace.

There is undoubtedly considerable merit to the manpower system proposed by this bill for universal training at 18 in a special corps and building up of a powerful Ready Reserve, but if we put it in effect beyond the period for which we have already adopted a manpower policy in selective service which is 1955, we deprive Congress of the opportunity to review the military manpower system as a unit at that time and to determine its continuance as a unit. I think the Congress has the best chance to deal with it in that way, without just being against it because it is labeled "UMT," and that we are doing the best job as far as the country is concerned by trying to put the bill in proper shape.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Does the gentleman's amendment mean that after the expiratiof of UMT and Selective Service, 1955, if we were to continue to have UMT we would be required at that time to enact legislation affirming it?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly so.

Mr. HALLECK. Let me ask the gentleman this question: If that is the purpose of the gentleman's amendment, and it is quite evident it is, then why should we be acting on UMT now?

Mr. JAVITS. We must act on this bill now. I thought I had made this point clear, because this can be the occasion for perfecting our military manpower policy in terms of what we now see our Government's policy to be, which is defense for peace over a long period while we seek to reverse the Communist tide, rather than preparation for a preventive war. It may not be clear to the gentleman, but to me it makes sense. Making the expiration date of both this bill and the Selective Service Act co-terminous makes it possible to have a complete military manpower policy within the general foreign policy and makes this bill much more agreeable to me and probably to others.

For the information of the Members I append two letters addressed to me at my request on the question of segregation in the training units contemplated by the bill. Further, in order to prevent discrimination or segregation in the Reserve component I expect to propose a suitable amendment at the proper time.

The text of Acting Secretary of Defense William C. Foster's letter, dated February 18, 1952, follows:

Thank you for your letter of February 5 expressing your interest in the pending universal military training measure. The contemplated universal military training in the National Security Training Corps will be basic military training conducted by the several military departments. At the present time there is no segregation on the grounds of race, creed, color, or national origin in the training establishments of the Armed Forces, nor is any such segregation contemplated for the training establishments of the National Security Training Corps.

Consequently it would appear that the inclusion of an amendment to the pending bill would be unnecessary in view of this policy which will be carried out by all of the armed services.

Your interest in the plans for this activity is appreciated.

The text of National Security Training Commission Chairman James W. Wadsworth's letter, dated February 11, 1952, follows:

Permit me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February 5 together with a copy of your letter addressed to Secretary Lovett on the same date.

Referring to your suggestion concerning nonsegregation in the National Security Training Corps, let me say this. The matter was discussed by the members of our Commission with responsible representatives of the Armed Forces and we were assured that nonsegregation policies now pursued in training camps of the Armed Forces will be followed in the administration of the Training Corps. Given this assurance our Commission did not consider it necessary to touch upon the matter in the legislation which we proposed to Congress.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take much of my 5 minutes in replying to the substitute. Of course, as the gentleman from Indiana has indicated, it would be an idle ceremony to pass anything here that would terminate at the same time the present law terminates. I do want to say this, and I think the gentleman from Missouri will agree, that I have consistently favored one portion of the amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services; I have always taken the position that you could not efficiently and properly operate UMT while you were carrying on the Selective Service and Training Act; that has always been my position on this matter. I think that a great deal of our difficulty and a great deal of the fear that has up to now existed in the House has been because of the inconsistent position the Department took on this matter.

I voted to report the bill out and I have been supporting the bill from the time it reached the floor. Of course, on many occasions persons supporting legislation do not agree with every provision of the bill, but I have consistently, along with other members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, taken the position that you can operate UMT only after you have ceased to draft for service.

The provision that the chairman has offered today is not the idle thing which the gentleman from Missouri would have it appear to be, because it provides that you cannot induct for UMT until you quit drafting under the Selective Service Act. You can quit drafting under the Selective Service Act tomorrow morning

if you want to; if the executive branch of the Government sees fit to levy no further calls or make no further requisitions under selective service for men, then, of course, the inductions terminate and then you can set up your UMT.

This is a provision that has been advocated by many, many Members of Congress during our 12 hours of general debate and in much private conversation from the time that we undertook the consideration of this bill. If it was right during the debate, if it was right and contended for by many in the committee, why does it suddenly become wrong when the chairman of the committee offers it here to be considered in the legislative processes?

The argument was made that we should not strike out the enacting clause so that we could go through the legislative processes, and that is exactly what we are doing here.

Now, as to the other phase of the matter in reference to termination, last year when we had Public Law 51 before the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] offered an amendment which would have terminated it within a given number of years from the date of its enactment. In committee he offered practically this amendment, which would terminate it at a given time after your inductions had begun. I think this is in accordance with the viewpoint of the majority of the Members of the House on both sides of the aisle. It constitutes a real improvement to the bill and it eliminates many of these things that some have feared since we began discussion of the proposal.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Do I understand correctly that this amendment on the morning after the bill was signed by the President could provide for the termination of selective service and the substitution of the universal military training program for selective service by providing our armed services with troops?

Mr. KILDAY. Not providing them with troops, because there is another provision in here that they can only go into the Reserve when Congress hereafter passes a law. It could not be used as a substitute for selective service. It would go immediately into the production of members for the Reserve. It would accomplish the thing I argued for under general debate that we must find some way to cut down the budget. We cannot maintain 3,700,000 men under arms. We have to find some solution for that, and this maintains the Reserve feature under which we propose to save some of that budget.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman not believe that if we stop the selective service at any time—tomorrow or the next day or next year—it would be necessary then for the Congress to enact a law calling the Reserves to active duty?

Mr. KILDAY. It might be. At that time we would have to consider that matter under our responsibility at the time. It would depend, of course, upon the situation existing in the world as to whether that would have to be done.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The Reserve bill now in the Senate has the same restriction in it as is contained in this bill restricting the call of Reserves unless the Congress of the United States authorizes the President to do so?

Mr. KILDAY. It contains the identical provision.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the substitute will be defeated and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has been very honest with the committee. He has told the members this is what can be done and what is intended to be done. In testimony before the Armed Services Committee, Assistant Secretary Rosenberg—Mrs. Rosenberg—told us very frankly—I am sorry I do not have the hearings so that I could quote from them—that this is exactly what she intends to have—an immediate UMT to take the place of the draft. Now, that is in her testimony and let any member of the committee deny it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to make certain that everybody understands the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. As I understand the situation, if this bill becomes law with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, and if thereafter the President and the military people decide it is no longer necessary to select the boys for service in our Military Establishment, they may discontinue the selection of men for service and at that time begin to select men for induction for training, but that every boy who is selected for training is required to be trained for only 6 months, and thereafter he cannot be ordered to duty or selected for service at any time unless the Congress hereafter says so.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. May I ask the gentleman if it is his understanding that the whole UMT set-up will be definitely terminated in the year 1958?

Mr. COLE of New York. Yes, under this proposed amendment.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. So that the argument that we are turning this country into a militaristic Nation can be effectively answered by this amendment?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is one of the effects of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, that no inductees shall be taken into military training after July 1958.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is there any difference between my substitute and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on that? In other words, the same thing would happen except it could happen within a shorter time?

Mr. COLE of New York. I think that may be so, but the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, I think, is the more practical way of handling this situation.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. When the gentleman speaks of the termination of selective service, is he referring to the whole program or to that part of it in which boys under 19 are concerned?

Mr. COLE of New York. The amendment refers to the whole selective service program; the selection of men for service, irrespective of age—19, 20, or 21, or whatever their age may be.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. What substitute is there for selective service if the executive authority has power to do away with selective service? Do I understand, then, that this amendment will provide the sinews of war to supply what has been done away with through selective service? What becomes of the boy who has been taken into UMT, if you do away with selective service?

Mr. COLE of New York. From my notion, I cannot see the logic of this amendment if we expect to be placed in a position at an early date of no longer requiring to be drafted for service.

Mr. JONAS. I cannot either.

Mr. COLE of New York. I believe there must necessarily be an interval of a couple of years in which it is necessary to select young men for training who will go into the Reserve, and at the same time select men for service. However, that is a military question, and if the military people feel they can afford to stop selecting boys for service and rely entirely on voluntary enlistments, if by doing that they can start a whole volume of men who have been trained, then they might conclude that that is the better course.

Mr. JONAS. It is a matter of common knowledge, is it not, that the military authorities have to get more power to conjure up something that is not a part of the legislation than anybody else has?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is right.

Mr. JONAS. If this is left to guesswork, we are left in a bad state; if we are left to protect ourselves and all the rest of the world.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Suppose in the event that the draft is resumed before the termination date of this amendment, what then? Could I address the chairman of the committee through you, then, and ask for an answer to that?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman from New York has asked what would happen if selective service is terminated, military training inaugurated,

and then selective service reinstated at some later date.

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. If that develops, I fancy that there would be some resolution offered in the Congress for impeachment of the persons who might undertake to do that sort of thing, because it certainly would be in violation of the apparent intent and purpose of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. POWELL. That is true, but does not the gentleman think we ought to have some protection in this amendment?

Mr. COLE of New York. That may be so; I will not dispute that.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the demands in the Far East and in Europe will mean the drafting of men for some considerable time? If that is true, and we will not take men in UMT, what is the solution?

Mr. COLE of New York. As I indicated to the gentleman from Illinois, that is a military question which I do not feel qualified to answer. I do agree that it is going to be necessary for us to maintain a large standing Army for some time to come unless we are able to develop a sizable body of trained citizens in the Reserve. Whether we can get the size necessary for our standing Army through voluntary enlistment or not, I do not know.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, if the President should see fit to discontinue drafting men into the service and start the UMT program, what happens to these boys who are already in the service, particularly Korea?

Mr. COLE of New York. Well, the same thing that would happen to them if nothing is done on this bill, I suppose.

Mr. BUSBEY. Where are they going to get these men to rotate them in Korea and replace them?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would not take the time to speak on this amendment except for one reason. The fact is that many many Members in committee advocated this amendment from the beginning as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] pointed out. I have been of the definite opinion that these two measures should not operate concurrently, from the beginning. I did not see how, under the present manpower pool at the present time, which was pointed out to us by General Hershey, that the Defense Establishment could demand both these to be put into operation. I never could find out where this came from or who proposed it. It came to the committee all of a sudden that we should put into operation UMT, with some 60,000 individuals. Now, it would be very unfair, in my opinion, to operate the two together on the basis of taking a boy and giving him 6 months' training and then placing him in the Reserve, subject to the call of Congress, and only subject to the call of Congress, for a 7½-year period. That certainly does not make sense to me. So I proposed the same thing, as the chairman knows and every other member of the committee, and advocated it at all times. I think the amendment is sound. I do not think the other part of the amendment is sound, and I take this position. You are trying to build up a long-range Defense Establishment, and practically all Members of this House have voted for the armory bill, which we have under way, and a very good start, and Congress is supporting it, in my opinion, and will continue to support it. On top of that we have enacted a good, sound Reserve program in the House. Now, we have got to necessarily feed those two things if we expect to lower the cost of this Defense Establishment in this country.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman has, I know, voted for this amendment in the committee. All the proponents of UMT, including General Hershey, the Pentagon, and all the rest of them, wanted it today because they could not start it yesterday, and none of them wanted it later than 6 months. All of them testified that this program would have to run concurrently for a year or two with selective service. What happened to all of this good advice and all of this confusion we received before the committee?

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman has been on the committee long enough to know that I do not always take the advice of the Pentagon.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. In the event that this amendment should be accepted, I wonder what assurance the chairman can give the House that when it goes to conference it will be retained in conference.

Mr. DURHAM. The whole theory of this act, as I see it, is to keep in continual operation a reserve manpower pool. Today we know that 800,000 reserves are serving in this conflict in Korea. It is not right, it is not fair, it is not just to require a man who has served 2, 3, 4 or 5, or 6 years in the last conflict to serve in this one.

Mr. GAVIN. Why do we not step up Selective Service now to give relief immediately to those combat veterans who are now serving, rather than wait until this becomes effective? That can be done.

Mr. DURHAM. We should do it as far as possible, and I am for it.

Mr. GAVIN. That is right; do it now.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he insists that the training program should not become effective until after selective service is ended.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand it, the best indications are that selective service will be with us for 3, 4, 5 or 10 years. If that is true, here is the thing that bothers me: Why are we legislating now for a circumstance that is going to come to pass, we think, possibly a number of years from now? Why not let the matter go to determination at that time, when we know what the condition of the world is and what we have confronting us?

Mr. DURHAM. On that point, I think we have to think of some way to reduce this tremendous expense of the Defense Establishment—we must work out some plan that will lower the cost.

I know the gentleman hopes, as I do, that this continuation of the draft is not going to be with us forever and ever and ever. It requires 2 years of a man's time at the present time where this thing requires but 6 months only and 30 days each year for 7½ years.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON. To answer the question of the gentleman from Indiana, it will enable the Department to plan in an orderly manner over a period of time, so that they can get rid of the induction for service of the draft, and can inaugurate the universal military training program.

Mr. DURHAM. If the amendment prevails, only up to 1958, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. VINSON. That is right; of course, we all understand there is a time limit on the life of the law. The wisdom of putting a time limit on it is this: In all laws of this character, the draft and everything else, there has been a time limit so Congress could constantly review it as to whether or not to extend it. For instance, there is a time limit on the synthetic-rubber program. It will be before the House in a few days.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman you do plan your defense establishment on the basis of a long-range basis, and not on a political basis?

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In truth and in fact, are you not by this amendment endeavoring to avoid the tragic psychological effect of casting this bill down insofar as the rest of the world, who look to us for leadership, are concerned?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. HOFFMAN and Mr. GROSS objected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the Vinson amendment because it makes this UMT program a peacetime measure.

Despite the arguments advanced for and against UMT, the real issue in my opinion, is whether UMT as a peacetime measure, will preserve and defend the United States of America and distribute the responsibility of service to country in an equal manner and not saddle it on those who have previously been in uniform in one or two global wars or in Korea.

Last year when the House considered what is now Public Law 51, a bill authorizing universal military training, many of you Members came to me and asked whether or not UMT was a peacetime program, and if it should become a law when would it be inaugurated. My reply to you gentlemen was that UMT as now provided for in Public Law 51 was definitely a peacetime program and that either the President or Congress could pull the trigger to inaugurate the program, but only after selective service had been terminated. That was my understanding and I am convinced that when 372 of us approved the legislation in the House, that was the general understanding that prevailed.

When H. R. 5904, the bill which is now before us and which provides the type of training program and establishes a code of conduct for the trainees and sets forth their rights, benefits, and privileges, was initially explained to the House Committee on Armed Services in executive session, I challenged the provisions that were designed to permit the immediate inauguration of this UMT program while selective service was still in effect.

The chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and the members of that committee will recall that I said: "In my opinion the provisions of this bill, H. R. 5904, that will permit UMT to be put in operation alongside of selective service, by calling up 65,000 young men, and will not only confuse Members of Congress, but in reality will sabotage the entire UMT program." Today it is apparent that my prophecy is likely to come true, because, in my opinion, the majority of the House will not vote for a UMT program while the draft is in progress.

As I have said before, my interest in UMT is not only from the standpoint of reducing the cost of maintaining an adequate national defense but to make certain that in fighting future wars the veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean war will not be called upon again to don their uniforms. In addition, when the draft is stopped, I want a peacetime UMT program that will distribute equally and without favor the responsibility of every young man to defend his country.

If the majority of the Members of the House will support this amendment, it simply means that when the draft of manpower ends a peacetime UMT program will be inaugurated, and the young men of the Nation, when reaching the age of 18½ years, will be given 6 months of basic military training, after which they will be channeled into a Reserve unit nearest their homes, thus providing a huge reservoir of trained manpower, the only insurance policy this Nation has against world aggression.

In conclusion I want to state again that my sole interest in Public Law 51 and in this bill, H. R. 5904, is in the overall Reserve program that many of us have been working on for the past several years. Despite my vote in favor of Public Law 51 last year, which authorized universal military training, my position on this bill, H. R. 5904, will be determined only when this bill has been finally perfected and if the bill contains a provision making it a peacetime UMT program, which was the conception many of us had of the legislation, when the basic law authorizing universal military training was passed last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am astonished that you are debating this question—trying to perfect or remedy any of the imperfections in this bill.

I assume that you have all received your orders in the spirit of the Pentagon. I have a telegram here which I wish to read into the RECORD. I hope you will all listen to it. This is from the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the small village of Gowanda which I have had the honor to represent along with the rest of my district for the last 34 years. I have always been told at home that I was a friend of the veteran, but here is this telegram. It is addressed to me:

> Gowanda veterans and their families representing a large segment of electors in your district favor passage of UMT. We promise active participation against you at election if you vote against it.

Gentlemen, I am not terrified! I shall vote against it. I merely want to say in reply to this telegram:

> Lay on, MacDuff,
> And damned be he that first cries, "Hold, enough!"

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Vinson amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: At the end of the Vinson amendment add the following: "If drafting of men under the selective service law should be discontinued and this law go into effect and thereafter the drafting of men under Selective Service be resumed no further inductions will be made under this act so long as inductions under the Selective Service law continue."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, let me explain my amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The fear the gentleman has is that men may be drafted under selective service while they are being drafted under UMT.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. Is not that taken care of by the language expressed in my amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; I do not think it is.

Mr. VINSON. The Vinson amendment reads:

> And shall not take effect until such time as all induction for service in the Armed Forces shall have ceased.

Does not that accomplish the purpose of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; it does not. It takes care of the situation up to the time that induction of men under the Selective Service Act ceases; but, as has been stated here by one of the Members just a few moments ago, there is nothing to prevent an Executive order being issued 30 days or 6 months after that event takes place again beginning the drafting of men under the Selective Service Act.

I do not want to buy a pig in a poke on this thing. One of the strong objections I have had to the bill as it came out of the committee was that it was designed to permit the induction of men under the Selective Service Act and the induction of men under the Universal Military Training Act at one and the same time. Now the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the committee, this morning undertakes to remedy that situation and to give us a bill which will not permit the inauguration of the National Training Corps Act so long as men are being inducted under the Selective Service Act, but it does not make any provision against the contingency that I have just mentioned. If they are in earnest about this thing and want to carry on active induction under only one of the systems at one time, then I cannot see why there would be any objection to the adoption of the amendment which I offer to the Vinson amendment. That is one of the strong objections I have had to the bill as it came out of the committee. My amendment will remedy that objection, together with the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I think it is a sound and sensible amendment and I submit it for your consideration.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. So that I may understand the gentleman's amendment clearly it is that in the event an executive order is issued terminating selective service, UMT can be initiated, and then 6 months later—if selective service is still on the books because it does not terminate until June 1955—an executive order could again issue to reinstate selective-service inductions alongside of UMT, so both might be operating at the same time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is right, and my amendment would not permit it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. So the gentleman from Pennsylvania may clearly understand the gentleman's amendment, it simply means that when the UMT is inaugurated under the first part of my amendment all inductions, all drafting into the service stops.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is what I understood the Vinson amendment to be.

Mr. VINSON. But the gentleman is apprehensive that after the drafting for UMT has been in operation 5 or 6 months they will stop drafting for UMT but start drafting under selective service.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. They might have both in operation at the same time under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. VINSON. No; they could not.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I disagree with the gentleman. I do not see how the gentleman can say anything else.

Mr. VINSON. There is no complaint about the difference between the gentleman and I in reference to intent, but my amendment makes it just as certain that you cannot run both at the same time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman goes one step further and says that after UMT has been inaugurated, then in the course of time they might abandon UMT altogether.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; not abandon it. I say under the gentleman's amendment it is possible for them to abandon UMT but to bring back selective service into play again. My amendment is designed to prevent that. If the gentleman has no objection to it——

Mr. VINSON. I have serious objection to it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to know what the objections are.

Mr. VINSON. I will tell the gentleman now. It merely beclouds the issue.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It clarifies the issue. It is beclouded now and this amendment will clarify it.

Mr. VINSON. Not at all, because this says all inductions into the armed services shall have precedence.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. What is to prevent those inductions from being started up again? Will the gentleman answer what is to prevent the inductions from starting up again under the Selective Service Act?

Mr. VINSON. The words are "shall have ceased," which means you are through with the draft and the draft is over.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Until it is started again. What is there to prevent it from being started again?

Mr. VINSON. You would have to get authority from the Congress to start it again.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Well, I disagree with the gentleman's construction of his amendment.

I have advocated universal military training for 15 years. I have spoken for it here in Congress and in many other places throughout the years.

However, the universal military training which I have advocated is different in many particulars from the provisions of this bill now before us. The program of universal military training which I have supported, and in which I believe, is that program which throughout the years has been sponsored by the American Legion.

I have advocated a system of universal military training which calls for a period of basic training of 4 months. This bill now before us calls for 6 months.

I have advocated a system of training which, when the basic training had been completed, would give the trainee the option of continuing his training in one of four ways, namely, ROTC training, training in the Reserves, training in the National Guard, or enlisting in one of the branches of the armed services.

There are a number of inconsistencies in this bill before us. In the first place, it is not universal. Neither is it fair. It does not apply universally to all boys 18 years of age. The committee members who brought the bill out tell us that they can only take in 60,000 boys the first year. That will leave 750,000 boys the first year who will have no chance at universal military training at all, but will be left in the draft pool subject to being drafted for 24 months' service instead of the 6 months which this bill provides. So that at the outset this bill is misnamed when it is called a universal military training bill.

It is unfair, because it creates a small favored group. By its terms, it makes the 60,000 who will be inducted the first year into military training exempt from induction under the draft. If this bill should be passed, the first year of its operation 60,000 boys would be called on to serve 6 months, which would exempt them from being drafted. There are something like 800,000 boys becoming 18 years old this year, and this would leave 750,000 of them subject to the draft, where they would be required to serve 24 months, and then be in the Reserves for approximately six more years. This bill is therefore not a fair bill. It is discriminatory. It not only would let the 60,000 off with 6 months' service but also would prevent their being drafted into any branch of the armed services.

In that respect it is utterly and completely inconsistent. The sponsors of this bill say they want it passed so that they can create a Ready Reserve to relieve the reservists now serving in Korea who have already served in one war prior to the Korean war. How can this bill provide a group of Ready Reserves to relieve the reservists now in Korea when the bill by its very terms makes the trainees under this act exempt from the draft?

Great claims have been made that this bill will save the taxpayers money. The figure $13,000,000,000 has been pulled out of the air as the amount which this bill would save the taxpayers at some unnamed time in the future. I doubt that it will ever save $13,000,000,000 to the taxpayers. On the contrary, it will start another tremendous expense immediately which would have to be paid for by the taxpayers.

There is another feature of this plan which I dislike to the depths of my soul, and that is that the military are planning to place white and colored together in the same barracks and train them on a nonsegregated basis. Mrs. Anna Rosenberg so stated in a letter written last week to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. He placed her letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with a letter from a member of the National Training Corps Commission, Mr. James W. Wadsworth, formerly a Member of this body, and formerly a Member of the United States Senate.

I have never advocated a system of universal military training which called for mixing white and colored together in the same quarters, in the same barracks, in the same mess hall, in the same bathrooms, and on a completely nonsegregated basis.

Mrs. Rosenberg stated to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that no trainee would be permitted to express his preference for an all-white unit, an all-colored unit, or a mixed unit. She flatly stated they would be inducted and trained on a nonsegregated basis.

I cannot see the logic in a system under which the taxpayers of Georgia, to prevent white and colored children studying together, pay their taxes to maintain a dual system of schools, one system for whites and one system for colored, and send white boys to white schools and colored boys to colored schools until they are 18 years old, and when they reach 18 years, then put them in training under a program which not only would require them under all the penalties of the law to study together, but also to eat together and live together.

I have never supported a system of universal military training which contemplated that action, and I do not now support that system. I am opposed to it.

I believe that our security requires that our military strength be built up as rapidly as possible to the standards we set last year, namely, 3,700,000 men in the various branches of the armed services, properly equipped with munitions, weapons, and equipment.

The bill now before us would not aid in that effort. On the contrary, it would detract from it, because every boy inducted into the National Training Corps under this law would have to be taken from the pool from which draftees are now being inducted into the armed services. Not only would they be taken from that pool, but they would be made draft-exempt by the terms of this bill.

Now I want to see a sensible, practical, reasonable, effective, universal military training bill adopted. However, this is not such a bill. It needs to be widely revised and amended.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, on the point we were discussing, let us understand what the Executive can do. Here is the law:

(k) Decrease in period of service: Operation of National Security Training Commission and Corps: (1) Upon a finding by him that such action is justified by the strength of the Armed Forces in the light of international conditions, the President, upon recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, is authorized, by Executive order, which shall be uniform in its application to all persons inducted under this title but which may vary as to age groups, to provide for (A) decreasing periods of service under this title but in no case to a lesser period of time than can be economically utilized, or (B) eliminating periods of service required under this title.

So I am of the opinion that the gentleman's amendment is in order because if decreasing periods of service occur and the Executive order is issued to discontinue temporarily selective service, then UMT could be initiated or inaugurated, and then there may again be a period of increased need for selective service and the executive branch determines that we again must pick up selective service. So an order could be issued to start again.

The selective-service law is on the books until June 1955; therefore until repealed discontinued in 1955, I am of the opinion that the executive branch of the Government will have the authority to discontinue selective service, initiate UMT and, 6 months later, if he so desired, move in again with selective service.

I will, therefore, support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW to the substitute offered by Mr. JAVITS: Strike out all after "July" and insert "1958."

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, this presents to the Committee of the Whole all of the possible viewpoints that one can have on this subject with an original amendment offered by the Chairman of the Committee, an amendment to that amendment, a substitute and an amendment to the substitute.

Personally, I was quite impressed by the statements of the Chairman of the Committee and other members of the Committee that, if we are to start the universal military training program as such, then, for a while, it should run concurrently with the Selective Service Act until it is in full implementation. That statement was made by the Commission and it is carried in the Committee report. That was told to us by many members of the Committee and that was one thing that impressed me about the bill before us. But, now, under the amendment offered by my distinguished friend from Georgia, the Chairman of the Committee [Mr. VINSON] and the one offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] even the amendment offered to Mr. Vinson's amendment, we have a most complicated situation. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has said, UMT under this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] would then become a complete substitute for what we know as Selective Service. At that point all of the safeguards we have written into the Selective Service Act go out the window. This is a most amazing turn.

I realize that under Public Law 51 some provisions of the Selective Service Act may be applied to the universal military training act, but there is nothing in this bill to provide such an assurance. All is permissive. New and entirely different regulations may be promulgated by the President and up to this time we here are in the dark as to what they may be, yet such regulations will, when promulgated, have a vital effect upon every young man in the land.

But here is something that is definite. After a young man has finished 6 months' training he then is placed in the Ready Reserve, in organized units, if you will read the Reserve Act. I have it right here in front of me. It is section 208 (a) of H. R. 5426 now pending in the Senate. It reads as follows:

SEC. 208. (a) A member of the Reserve components required to serve therein pursuant to subsection (d) of section 4 or other section of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, or by any other provision of law, shall be placed in the Ready Reserve of his Armed Force without his consent for the remainder of his required term of service unless (1) he has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 4 years, or (2) he has served for not less than 12 months on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States pursuant to section 21 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and, in addition thereto, has served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States for not less than 12 months between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, inclusive: *Provided*, That no person may be assigned or transferred to the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States unless he first enlists or is appointed, as the case may be, in the National Guard or Air National Guard of the appropriate State, Territory, or District of Columbia. Except in time of war, or in time of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, any such member who has completed 36 months of satisfactory participation in an accredited training program in the Ready Reserve, as prescribed by the appropriate Secretary, shall upon his request be transferred to the Standby Reserve for the remainder of his required term of service: *Provided*, That no such member of the National Guard of the United States or Air National Guard of the United States may be so transferred without the consent of the Governor or other appropriate authority of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia concerned.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. In one place it says he is placed in the reserve, and in another paragraph it says that the appropriate secretary of the branch he is in can place him in the Ready Reserve. There is quite a distinction.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let us say he is in the Ready Reserve, because that is where he will be if you understand section 208 (a) of the Reserve Act. If you accept this UMT bill as a substitute for Selective Service, he surely will be in the Ready Reserve, and then the Congress must pass an act calling these people, these reserve units, into active service. The Congress, of course, will prescribe by numbers of persons as to just how many are to be called to active duty and when you prescribe the calling in by numbers they that adds up to so many of reserve units, then the Military Establishment will say, "We will call out Regiment No. 242," or "Battalion No. 647" or "Air Group No. so and so," to make the numbers in those units add up to the authorization and then where is Selective Service? There is no such thing as selective service when you call men up by regiments or air groups. If you abandon selective service, you are ordered by units, and while provision is made in Public Law 51 for some substitution for the present deferment system, to the best of my knowledge no such deferment system has been ever proposed to be established. You would be ordered like the Germany Army was in 1914, and I assume again in 1939, to report to your armory, don your helmets and march out with no regard for any humane deferment right whatever.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not quite follow the reasoning of the gentleman, and he knows I admire him very much.

Mr. HINSHAW. All the gentleman has to do is to read the act that is still pending in the Senate H. R. 5426, the Reserve Act, and then you will understand what I mean. I have read it and have read it with the greatest of care, and the Reserves are to be called into service by units; there is no question about that. Section 205 of H. R. 5426 settles that question. It reads as follows:

SEC. 205. The Ready Reserve consists of those units or members of the Reserve components, or both, available for prompt entry into the active military service of the United States in any expansion of the active Armed Forces of the United States in time of war, or in time of national emergency declared by the Congress or proclaimed by the President, or when otherwise authorized by law.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, by units, but the Congress determines the number of people to be called.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, but they do not determine who, among that number, should be called; merely units are to be called, and we can not know which unit or units are to be called, and at all events the question of deferment is no longer involved; and hardships are going to enter, I fear, for many of your constituents and mine, something that our mail will tell when it happens, even as our mail has shown since Korea.

Now, I have offered this amendment merely to strike out everything except "1958," because that puts the termination date on it without making UMT a substitute for Selective Service as does Mr. Vinson's amendment.

You who have read the full-page advertisement in the Washington Post this morning will recall seeing the name of that distinguished constituent of mine, Paul Hoffman, listed. I have his wire asking me to support the legislation:

To the Honorable CARL HINSHAW: Tried to reach you by phone, urge you to support legislation authorizing military service but with the provision that it should terminate within 5 or 7 years, the hope being that by that time conditions will make such service unnecessary.

Six years hits Mr. Hoffman's suggestion right square in the middle and that is what my amendment does. It would put a 6-year time limit on this legislation.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss these amendments and this bill.

Mr. Chairman, now we have seen everything. The House proponents of permanent peacetime military conscrip-

tion have marched up the hill, down the hill, sideways, and zigzag.

After a week of persuading us what a splendid bill his committee has brought before us, the chairman has proceeded to tear it apart today with amendments, and we now have a series of proposals for temporary, permanent UMT, with and without the draft, concurrent with and exclusive of, selective service! The last hour of amendments and substitutes has constituted the finest argument I can think of for recommitting this bill to this great Committee on Armed Services and saying, "Brethren, try it again." The idea that we should consider any of these amendments without knowing how the departments are to administer them; the idea that we should go ahead, as one Member said here, and leave it all to the military to administer without even hearing from them, strikes me as a very bad way to legislate. But do not forget this: If we do not recommit this bill, if any bill is passed, it will go out to the country that UMT still marches on. As a matter of fact, those letters, those words "universal military training," are not even contained in this bill, but this bill is the symbol for that idea.

After long and careful deliberation, I am ready, if the bill is not recommitted, to go on record as to where I stand on permanent peacetime conscription. I am against it.

I realize that there are sincere and intelligent people on both sides of this issue. I am for an effective national defense. I have voted for the draft and for defense appropriations, and will do so as long as the threat to our security continues. But UMT will eventually result in a system of permanent peacetime conscription which is unnecessary and unwise.

This present bill is different from UMT as understood by both proponents and opponents who write me. UMT stands for universal military training. This bill, however, does not provide it.

This bill is not universal. It has the same selection, deferments, and exemptions provided in the draft law.

This bill does not provide military training adequate for service in modern warfare. Such technical training would be impossible in 6 months. Flight training, navigation, jet engines, radar, electronics, atomic warfare—these are a few of the skills needed—skills that cannot be learned in 6 months. Why must we always be preparing for the last war, instead of the next one?

Last year the proponents of UMT said it would not and could not be put into effect while we were drafting men for service. Now they have changed, and this bill provides for both at once, and Defense Department witnesses testified that UMT will start 6 months after the bill becomes law, with 5,000 a month and 60,000 the first year. Now the chairman of the committee is changing his mind again on this.

Furthermore, this bill provides for volunteering for UMT training.

Here is the bait to draw volunteers: This bill provides that after 6 months of UMT, a boy goes into the Reserve and cannot be recalled to active duty except by a new act of Congress. Meanwhile, his twin brother, or the boy across the street the same age, may miss being called into UMT, but be drafted 6 months later, and after 2 years service, he goes into the Reserve and can again be recalled to active duty by the President. This discrimination in favor of UMT and against the draft is so outrageously unfair that it will not last. If this bill ever becomes law, and this discrimination goes into effect, the country will demand that favoritism for UMT alumni be wiped out.

I do not believe the real backers of UMT want this special treatment of UMT trainees. They were willing to leave in this provision to help sugar it in the House. Then in the Senate, or perhaps in the next Congress, this provision will be removed and we will have what they want—permanent conscription, for service in war, for training in peace, with 8 years in the Reserve, subject to recall by the Commander in Chief.

This permanent peacetime conscription is what I do not want. This is what our country is not going to need. Here is why.

Almost every speaker on both sides of this debate has talked about lasting peace some day. Their hopes are earnest, but vague and uncertain. I think we ought to examine the possibilities. How is peace going to come about? All are agreed that we face, at best, a long period of tension, during which we must rearm and stay armed. During this period it is inconceivable to me that our forces under arms will drop below about 3,000,000; the chances are that we will need more; in fact, I understand we will be asked to raise our limit to 3,700,000 this year. In any case, during this period of tension we will need the draft; we will need all the young men our manpower pool can furnish. Of course, most of the Navy and Air Force are volunteers, but we cannot get enough volunteers for the Army, and we learned back in 1947 that when the draft stops, volunteering falls off. Therefore, during a long period ahead, we will simply not have enough manpower for the draft and a separate UMT.

How will this period of tension end? The pessimists think we will have all-out war, and peace will only come after that. If they are right, and we win the war with communism, we will not be needing UMT at that time. At least, we can safely put off deciding now what those who are still left alive will need then.

The optimists foresee a period of tension followed by peace, without fighting world war III. General Eisenhower, ex-President Hoover, and French Foreign Minister Schuman, all optimists, say this period might last as long as 10 years. How will it end?

I believe the only way it can end is with an international agreement for reduction of armament. I do not think there is any chance for a general all-round easing-up and softening-up, with the Communists getting so friendly that we will feel our country can safely cut down on armament, regardless of what any other nation does. There must be an agreement to disarm and it must include Russia. The agreement must include not only atomic weapons and means of mass destruction but reduction of Armed Forces, of conscription, of universal military training. We dare not eliminate weapons in which we excel and continue to compete with weapons in which we are weak. If we eliminate the new weapons and go back to mass army, conscript warfare, we are bound to lose to the Soviets and their satellites. They know this. We must understand it. When the time comes for us to reduce armaments and enter into international agreements for inspection and control of atom bombs, we can do away with the draft; we will not need UMT because universal military training will be on the way out all over the world.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is known as one of the best students and scholars of our foreign affairs in our membership here in the House. I heard the argument advanced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and the source of it surprised me a little, that if this UMT were to be defeated it would be a sign of weakness in the world. May I ask the gentleman this question: If the enactment of UMT were to mean that in the very near future the size of our regular establishment were to be diminished, would that not, in the gentleman's mind, be great evidence of weakness?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. The only thing that will impress Russia is forces in being. We will have to continue such forces during a long period of tension. The only way the tension can end without war is international agreement. We have started toward this goal. It seems a long way off, but I believe it is our only chance for lasting peace without intervening war. The intent of Congress is written into the mutual defense assistance law:

> In furnishing such military assistance, it remains the policy of the United States to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion.

I offered this amendment and although the words were redrafted in committee and in conference, those words "including armed forces" were my own. They go back to 1946, when I was fearful that the Acheson plan for international atomic control might be adopted without limiting mass armies and wrote Mr. Baruch about it. He answered me on August 2, 1946:

> DEAR MR. VORYS: You are so right about the matter of disarmament. I have been trying to get the President and the Secretary of State to let me say something about disarmament, but they are preparing a plan of their own. In the meantime, however, we may have lost the opportunity. Just outlawing the atomic bomb will not get us anywhere.

Since then our policy changed and, in accordance with the above policy stated by Congress in the MDAP law, the United States sponsored a plan in the sixth U. N. Assembly in Paris last fall for the balanced reduction of armament. The plan was adopted, over the resistance of Russia, and a commission has been set up. The plans are not complete, but our delegation is acting with the advice of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, working toward a plan for reduction that will protect a complying nation at every step; that will allow each nation arms adequate for defense but insufficient for aggression; and that will apply to both atomic and conventional armament. Of course, the plan cannot be put in operation without Russia's agreement, but remember, there is no hope for lasting peace until the Government of Russia, either the present one or a new one set up by their people, makes this revolutionary change in policy, and agrees to disarm, instead of merely talking about it.

When that day comes, we can stop the draft, and we will not need UMT.

Some have said we should start UMT now so as to have it for bargaining purposes when we come to talk about reduction of armament. There are two answers: One, Russia does not bargain very much; two, our reserve in men will in any case be so small compared with the reserve in the 800,000,000 population of Russia and her satellites that it will not even be a talking point.

The basis for lasting peace and security for us is not our adoption of universal military training, but its elimination all over the teeming world.

For the next few years we will have a Reserve, as we have now. We can increase our Reserve by shortening the draft period and reducing deferments under existing law. I hope some day we arrive at a sensible Reserve policy, for operation during this period of tension. You would think that, out of the 2,000,000 men who have come into the manpower pool since Korea, the brass could have trained enough to relieve all of the World War II Reserves who were recalled involuntarily, but that is not the way they do things. UMT is not the answer; it is for training, not for service, and there are not enough young men to do both now.

Some will say, however, that compulsory military training is, in and of itself, so beneficial to youth that we should have it, and never give it up, regardless of the rest of the world. I disagree with this. I think compulsory military training is not good, net. I will admit that many boys have benefited from it. Obviously the millions of veterans were not ruined by it. I am willing that parents should be permitted to send their boys to military schools, or to let them volunteer for training and service. I do not think such enthusiasts should thrust their views on the rest of the people. The virtues and the vices of military training have been exaggerated during this debate. As I see it, going away from home, to live and work with other young men, is not morally wrong. In peacetime, boys go away to college and to work, and have temptations. But the training to kill, and the discipline, the regimentation, so necessary in preparation for service in war, are at best a ghastly waste of time, if service does not follow. The only excuse for compulsory military training is preparation for military service needed by the country. We must plan for days when our young men will no longer have to fight the young men of other nations. We must plan so that there is no possibility of a military dictatorship here at home, through peacetime conscription.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee will vote down all of these substitutes and meet this issue fairly. I will repeat, the amendment seeks to put a termination date of 6 years on it beyond the date it is enacted. The other phase of the amendment is to the effect that you cannot have drafting for service and UMT at the same time. Drafting for service must stop before UMT can go into effect, and under my amendment, and according to the language of my amendment, when they stop drafting for service, and inaugurate UMT, in order to get drafting back for service Congress must take action again.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand from that statement then that the gentleman is going to accept the amendment offered by his colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. VINSON. No, there is no need for it because under the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], we would be in this kind of a fix, that one day they can draft for service, and the next day they can stop and go back to drafting for training. Under my amendment, there cannot be any possible doubt about it—no man could be drafted for service while they are drafting for training, and to go back to drafting for service, we in the Congress must act.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I listened very carefully to the argument of my distinguished chairman. What concerns me now is when, if this amendment is adopted, and this legislation goes to conference with the other body, what assurance can the chairman give us that it will be accepted?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, if I may answer that, I knew that this was going to come up, let me assure this House that when this bill passes, and this bill is going to pass because the membership is going to work its will, I will ask the Speaker of the House to designate Mr. KILDAY, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. DURHAM, of North Carolina, Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. COLE, and myself as conferees, and when we go to conference, if there is any material change made in this bill, for instance, in reference to these two matters, I will ask the conferees on the part of the House to come back to the House and to ask for instructions before we deviate from the position taken by the House. There must be a free conference, but there will not be any change until the House authorizes it.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. SHAFER. I am confused on the figures that the gentleman has been giving us. These boys, as I understand it, will be inducted for 6 months training under this act, and then placed in the reserves for 7½ years.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. SHAFER. Then what are you going to do with these boys under this act which will, under your amendment, expire 2 years before they complete their reserve period.

Mr. VINSON. That has no relation to this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if there is no further debate, I ask for a vote on all the amendments to the amendment, and the substitute amendment, particularly the one offered by the illustrious and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I ask that they be voted down.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that each amendment and the substitute be read for the information of the committee before a vote is taken on them.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia, this is for information and not for the sake of argument or debate, if this amendment is adopted and then the bill is passed, when do those affected by it begin universal military training?

Mr. VINSON. That is purely a military question. It may not be possible to start for some time. No man can tell. It is a military question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you not know when they are going to be taken in?

Mr. VINSON. I do not and you do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I do not, and that is why I was asking you, the fount of all wisdom on this matter.

Mr. VINSON. I cannot tell you when it starts. It is purely a military question. Let me say this in all seriousness.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under unanimous consent previously granted, the Clerk will report the several amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]: Add to end of Vinson amendment the following language: "If drafting of men under the selective-service law should be discontinued and this law go into effect, and thereafter the drafting of men under selective service be resumed, no further inductions will be made under t 's act so long as inductions under the selective-service law continue."

Amendment offered by Mr. HINSHAW to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS: Strike out all after "July" and insert "1958."

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 1, line 5, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add "which act shall terminate on July 1, 1955, and shall not take effect until such time as all inductions for service in the Armed Forces shall have ceased."

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 1, line 5, strike out the period after the words "National Security Training Act", insert a comma, and add the following: "which act shall terminate on July 1, 1958, and shall not take effect until such time as all inductions for service in the Armed Forces shall have ceased."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 104, noes 61.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD to the Vinson amendment as amended: Page 1, line 5, insert "This act shall be effective on the same day that a tax bill becomes effective which will tax all corporations 100 percent of all profits and earnings of such corporation engaged in the manufacture of war materials."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman reserve the point of order or make it now?

Mr. VINSON. I reserve it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I would just as soon have the matter settled now because I think we are considering a very important issue today, so important that it is causing a great deal of consideration, I am quite sure, in the minds of a good many of the Members here.

We are now considering a measure to permanently conscript young men into the armed services of the United States. If this bill becomes law, then I believe we should conscript excess profits as well. If the emergency confronting us demands that we enact UMT, we should go all the way and make equality of sacrifice a fact and not a fiction. Nothing is more important than a man's life, and I feel very strongly that we have just as much right to conscript dollars as well as men.

As one who has served as an enlisted man in the Army, Navy, and marines, I have a pretty good idea of just what these boys will be up against. I have been disturbed by the fact that in all our wars and emergencies, we have consistently refused to take the profit out of war. We have seen this country spend the blood of its best young men, and at the same time we have noted how our great corporations made tremendous profits out of every war in which we have been engaged. The cost of World War II was $336,000,000,000 plus a million casualties in killed, wounded, and missing. At the same time these enormous sacrifices were being made the corporations of this country made the huge profit of $56,000,000,000. That profit-taking spree has been accelerated and continued down to the present.

No democracy has a right to conscript men on a permanent basis for an immediate danger which is not great enough to justify and compel conscripting dollars at the same time. Corporations should be satisfied with normal, peacetime profits in time of war or national emergency. No one should complain about their dollars being conscripted if this measure to conscript our young men passes. What we do in this House on the measure now before us may well decide our future for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, as the House knows, I have offered my excess-profits amendment on three previous occasions, and each time it has been ruled out of order. I will indeed be sorry if the House is not able to vote on it today. There are other drawbacks to this bill in addition to its lack of equality of sacrifice, and, as I see them, they can be summed up as follows:

First. Both UMT and selective service would operate at the same time. Enactment of UMT would not mean the termination of selective service which, under law, is in effect until 1955. Furthermore, every man in selective service must serve 6 years in the Reserve after his 2 years of active duty are completed. This means that a Reserve has been provided for 9 years from 1952. UMT will, therefore, not be a substitute for but a supplement to selective service. The cost and the manpower ceiling would, therefore, be raised considerably.

Second. The deferment problem: how to pick some boys for 6 months' training under UMT and others for 2 years under selective service.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all the debate on UMT with an open mind and have studied every available bit of material I could find on this matter. On the basis of what I have been able to learn about UMT in that it does not call for equality of sacrifice and that both UMT and selective service would be in operation at the same time I have come to the conclusion that I will vote against the measure as it now stands.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order that the amendment is not germane and has no relation to universal military training or to the bill under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Montana has offered an amendment which has been reported. The gentleman from Georgia makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane to the pending amendment or the bill.

The Chair has examined the amendment with some degree of care and invites attention to the fact that it provides:

This act shall be effective on the same day that a tax bill becomes effective, which will tax all corporations 100 percent of all profits and earnings of such corporations engaged in the manufacture of war materials or any other service connected with the defense effort and/or the National Security Training Corps Act of 1952.

The Chair invites attention to the fact that this amendment provides for the effective date of the pending bill to be contingent upon an entirely unrelated subject, a subject which would not be under the jurisdiction of the committee that reported the pending bill, but would be under the jurisdiction of another standing committee of the House.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is clearly not germane to the pending amendment or the bill and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The question was taken; and on a division [demanded by Mr. JAVITS], there were—ayes 28, noes 106.

So the substitute was rejected.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARRISON of Virginia to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, as amended: After the numeral "1958", insert "or sooner by concurrent resolution of the Congress."

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to provide a termination date, not only in 1958, as provided in the Vinson amendment, but sooner, if the Congress by concurrent resolution so decides.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I thoroughly agree with the objective of the gentleman, but to write the law and make it more orderly in its contents, why would it not be preferable to have it apply to another section of the bill? I will support the proposition that this act can be repealed by concurrent resolution, and that is what the gentleman means.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VINSON. Why not insert it in the proper place? I shall support the amendment and ask the committee to adopt it. I am for it 100 percent.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. With that assurance, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VINSON) there were—ayes 126, noes 19.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 4, strike out "SECTION 1" and insert "SEC. 101."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, we have had 4 days of debate, and apparently we will have another one. Debate is not always too burdensome. I, for one, enjoyed very, very much the remarks of our Speaker today.

Under the rules, as I read them, very seldom, though it is his right, does the Speaker take the floor to advise us, to participate in debate, as he is so capable of doing. He is always eloquent; always persuasive, usually convincing.

He is not only a very wise, able, competent, but, I might add for the benefit of our Michigan colleagues, an impartial speaker and a skilled debater. Usually he favors us with his views only when the administration is threatened with defeat on the floor.

His dramatic ability is equal, I am sure, to the very great similar ability of the daughter of a former distinguished Speaker of the House William Bankhead. Our beloved Speaker is usually equally logical, though due to my own lack of mental agility I have difficulty in following him today. Even though he is our Speaker, when he descends to the well of the House, his remarks are to be judged in the same manner as are those of the other Members. This morning he told us, as I understood him, that we should vote the legislation up or down. That has been my opinion from the beginning. I would vote it down and out.

He then said he was against the motion to strike the enacting clause. He advised that we vote against the motion, defeat it. That if we did the House might have an opportunity by amendment to perfect the bill.

Had the motion to strike prevailed it would have been followed without delay by a motion to recommit and that motion prevailing would have given the quick decision which the Speaker insisted we should have. The vote was in accord with the Speaker's desire. I assume that had the argument been the other way, he would have said that if the bill did not suit us we should vote against the motion to strike, submit it to the House, and perfect it on the floor, as we are now attempting to do. But that procedure is not the quick, decisive way. There will be amendments. The bill if adopted will go to conference. No one knows what will come back. I cannot go along with the Speaker in the thought that a bill dealing with this subject can be successfully written on the floor. I cannot follow the logic of the Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN] when he argues that the way to get a quick, decisive vote on a good bill, and he evidently thinks the pending bill a good one, is to kill the motion to strike the enacting clause, then says that if we do that we can perfect it by amendment. Obviously that is the way to delay—an admission the bill is bad—needs fixing—means delay—and in the end defeat. I would kill the bill here and now instead of hours from now. The Speaker's appeal may, because of personal popularity, defeat the motion, it should not save the bill.

I have very little faith, I am sorry to say, in the effectiveness of the acts of Congress. There was a time years ago when if a law was passed by a legislative body and signed by the Executive, that was the law. That was it. That no longer is true. When we put this terminal date in, that does not impress me very much. You say, Why? Well, because I recall that the Congress induced young men to enlist for a definite, stated period, and then, unless I am mistaken, the Congress extended that term of service for something like 12 months. Maybe that was honest, maybe that was fair, maybe that was square, but in private life it would not have been so considered.

Then I recall, too, that some have advocated here that if we write provisions in the law that will again be the law. You remember in World War II we had the Tydings amendment. Remember that one? Yes, the Tydings amendment, which in effect provided that those who were engaged in agricultural pursuits to a certain extent, that it had been their life work and their services were necessary on the farm, should be exempt. Remember that? I do. And I remember General Hershey, the same general who is around here now, was in charge of selective service then as he is today. I remember what he did then. From Washington there went out instructions to the draft boards in Michigan, the State board and the local boards, to disregard the Tydings amendment. I know what I am talking about. If you will look back, the RECORD is filled with statements from Michigan Members who described that situation. There was no doubt about what was then done. The Tydings amendment was disregarded. Men were conscripted who were exempt.

Not only that, but I remember General Hershey coming to my office one time, because I had criticized that conduct, that violation, that disregard of the law of the land, the disregard of the Tydings amendment, and he stated in terms that no one could misunderstand that if the armed services wanted men they would take them.

That is one reason why I am against this bill and intend to vote against it. No matter what you do by way of amendment to catch votes, when the military services, the man at the head of Selective Service, General Hershey, administer of this law, will do again as he did before. It will be interpreted and administered to fit the thought and desire of the armed services. I have no reason to think General Hershey would have had any more regard for the law written today or tomorrow than he had before. I do not intend to turn over every mentally and physically competent young man to the armed services, to those who believe in, apparently, or adhere to the same school of thought as does Gen. George C. Marshall, Dean Acheson, and Anna Rosenberg.

What this country needs is a change in our foreign policy.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any doubt but that the House will vote down this motion.

I want to say one thing to my colleague from Michigan, that I was on an appeal board of the Selective Service in California and we did invoke the Tydings amendment. The Tydings amendment had some broad language, so we had to determine that the man that we were taking for the armed services was not in fact needed on the farm. That is exactly the way we invoked the law in California.

Let me read part of a letter addressed to me by the Reserve Officers' Association of the United States:

The Reserve Officers Association is heartily in favor of H. R. 5904, the UMT bill now before the House. We are convinced it will provide a thorough and permanent program for building up the Reserves of all services. The Armed Forces Reserve Act (H. R. 5426), passed by the House last session, is now before the Senate Armed Services Committee and it is my considered opinion that the Senate will pass this bill substantially as it came from the House. That bill is an excellent one, but UMT is needed to supply enlisted men in order to allow the Reserve program to move ahead.

It is our considered judgment that a system of universal military training is the only effective means whereby the Reserves of this Nation may be brought to a desired security level. Furthermore, it is the only means so far proposed which would create a Reserve which might be used without the necessity of calling on veterans of World Wars I and II and the Korean war to once again accept active duty in the event of a future outbreak.

The letter is signed by E. A. Evans, executive director, Reserve Officers' Association of the United States.

As I said at the outset, I do not think there is any need to discuss whether or not this motion should be agreed to, because I do not think the House will take it seriously.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. SUTTON. The distinguished gentleman is a Reserve officer just the same as I am. I wonder if the Reserve Officers Association ever contacted him about his views on whether or not the Reserve Officers Association should write a letter like this.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not happen to be a Reserve officer because, I will have to admit, I am too old. But the ROA did contact the men in Stockton, Calif., and I am very familiar with the activities of that chapter.

Mr. SUTTON. I was just wondering if the Reserve officers have been contacted for his opinion and I was under the impression that the gentleman from California might be in the Reserves. I wonder too whether they asked any of the Reserve officers in the House how they feel about it. I am in the Reserves, but they did not ask me.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman knows that these national organizations hold national conventions, and the mandate of the national convention governs what the national commander has to say.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is correct and at all the conventions it has gone on record in favor of UMT.

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman has read the letter from General Evans, has he not?

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes.

Mr. SHAFER. I wonder if he recalls some of the general's testimony before our committee. This bill was very unsatisfactory to him in many ways.

Mr. JOHNSON. That is exactly why he wrote me a letter. He says he and his entire organization favor the entire bill heartily exactly the way it is written.

Mr. SHAFER. But he did not say so before our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON. I must differ with the gentleman. He just said that there has been neglect by the armed services in the activities of the Reserves. He is correct, and you know it and I know it. But we cannot build for the future by talking about the mistakes of the past.

Mr. SHAFER. Is he in favor of this new bill which we have up for consideration today?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think he is.

Mr. SHAFER. Would the gentleman from California be authorized to speak for the general?

Mr. SUTTON. They were in favor of the bill as it came out of committee perhaps, but since the Vinson amendment does not make UMT permanent, would he be in favor of that?

Mr. JOHNSON. I think the General would be in favor of it, but frankly, he did not write concerning his stand on the bill with that particular amendment in mind. He wrote on the bill as it was yesterday. I think Mr. VINSON's amendment helps the bill, and I think the General would think the same thing.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman realize that every witness from the Pentagon and also General Hershey, and all of those experts, wanted this bill to start immediately or certainly within 6 months?

Mr. JOHNSON. Some of them wanted it, and I am one of those, and I think we were right. If the gentleman will remember, I discussed the matter with him. I think we should start UMT on a small scale. There is a difference of opinion as to when it should be started.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That has not been accomplished under the Vinson amendment.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman last week saw an issue of the Daily Worker—he knows where that newspaper stands on this issue, does he not?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlemen has expired.

All time on the motion has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON in the nature of a substitute to the bill H. R. 5904 as reported: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 101. That this act may be cited as the 'National Security Training Corps Act.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 102. When used in this act—

"(a) 'Commission' means the National Security Training Commission, established pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

"(b) 'Corps' means the National Security Training Corps, established pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

"(c) 'Trainee' means a male person inducted for training in the National Security Training Corps pursuant to the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

"(d) 'Training agency' means any military department designated to conduct training.

"OATH FOR TRAINEES

"SEC. 103. After having been assigned to a training agency trainees will subscribe to the following oath or affirmation:

"'As a member of the National Security Training Corps, I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America, that I will uphold the Constitution of the United States, and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States of America and that I will obey the orders of the officers appointed over me. So help me God.'

"In case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration shall be omitted.

"STATUS OF CORPS AND TRAINEES

"SEC. 104. The corps shall be a component of the land and naval forces: *Provided*, That trainees shall be deemed members of the Armed Forces only as expressly provided in this act or in the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

"INDUCTION INTO CORPS

"SEC. 105. (a) Male persons shall be inducted into the corps as provided in the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 U. S. C. App. 451): *Provided*, That such persons liable for induction into the corps may volunteer for induction into the corps.

"(b) The Selective Service System shall administer the process of inductions into the corps in accordance with the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

"(c) Each trainee inducted into the corps shall be assigned to a training agency and placed in a unit of the corps established pursuant to section 106 of this act at a university, college, or junior college. Each trainee shall, except as otherwise provided in this act, serve in the unit of the corps in which he is originally placed for one full academic year, and shall, in addition, receive summer field training for a period of 3 months as provided in section 110 of this act. Insofar as may be practicable, each trainee shall be placed in a unit of the corps at the university, college, or junior college which is nearest the place of his residence and within the State, district, or Territory in which he resides.

"(d) Any trainee who is unable to satisfy the regular entrance requirements and academic standards of an educational institution, or who does not desire to receive his training in the corps as a student at a university, college, or junior college, shall be placed by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Commission, in a unit of the corps especially established to provide vocational instruction and training. Such special units of the corps shall be established at educational institutions pursuant to separate contracts or arrangements entered into in conformity with section 106.

"ARRANGEMENTS WITH EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

"SEC. 106. (a) As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of Defense shall initiate negotiations with each accredited university, college, and junior college in the United States for the purpose of entering into a contract or other arrangement for the establishment of a unit of the corps at such institution. The Secretary of Defense may in addition, with the approval of the Commission, enter into such a contract or other arrangement with any universiay, college, or junior college which has not been accredited.

"(b) Each contract or other arrangement entered into pursuant to subsection (a) shall be approved by the Commission and shall—

"(1) contain appropriate provisions with respect to the coordination of the military training and the academic training which will be furnished trainees in attendance at the institution concerned;

'(2) provide that the institution concerned shall utilize its existing buildings, plant, and facilities in furnishing academic training, meals, lodging, and related services to trainees in attendance at such institution;

"(3) provide that the Secretary of Defense shall construct additional buildings and facilities at such institution, or expand any of the existing buildings and facilities of such institution, whenever the Commission determines that such construction or expansion is necessary in order to insure that the training furnished under this act to trainees in attendance at such institution, and the accommodations and facilities available to such trainees, will be adequate and effective;

"(4) specify (A) the compensation which will be paid to the institution for the use of its buildings, plant, and facilities, and (B the approximate cost (which shall be borne by the United States) of any construction or expansion undertaken pursuant to the preceding clause; and

"(5) contain such other provisions as the Commission deems appropriate to insure that the training furnished under this act to trainees in attendance at such institution, and the accommodations and facilities available to such trainees, will be adequate and effective.

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), no contract or other arrangement shall be entered into with any institution which is determined by the Secretary of Defense to be incapable, because of its small size or lack of facilities or for any

other reason, of supporting a unit of the corps.

"(d) No contract or other arrangement entered into under this section shall require an educational institution to accept, for training in a unit of the corps established at such institution, any trainee who is unable to satisfy its entrance requirements and standards. Trainees in attendance at an educational institution shall be required during the course of their training to maintain the academic standards prescribed by such institution for other students, and any trainee who fails to maintain such standards (or who elects to be transferred) shall be transferred for the duration of his required period of training under this act to a unit of the corps especially established under section 105 (d) to provide vocational instruction and training. Any trainee who fails to maintain the standards prescribed for students at the educational institution where such special unit of the corps is established shall be liable for training and service in the Armed Forces of the United States in the same manner as persons inducted into the Armed Forces under section 4 (a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"REGULATIONS: SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

"SEC. 107. In accordance with the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe rules and regulations not inconsistent with law or with the policies and standards established by the Commission, with respect to the conduct of training in the corps.

"REGULATIONS: TRAINING AGENCIES

"SEC. 108. (a) The head of each training agency may prescribe rules and regulations not inconsistent with law or with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, with respect to the conduct of training in the respective training agencies.

"(b) The training agency, through the commanding officer of each unit of the corps established at a university, college, or junior college, shall have complete supervision over the military training of trainees; but no officer or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, nonmilitary curriculum, operation or policies of any educational institution.

"(c) The heads of the training agencies shall prescribe ratings of efficiency and other qualifications for trainees which shall, to the extent practicable, be uniform among the training agencies, and shall assure by appropriate regulation that trainees receive an appropriate rating upon completion of their training. A record of such rating shall be maintained by the training agency and later by the armed force of the Reserve component to which a trainee is transferred upon completion of his training in the corps: *Provided*, That when a trainee becomes a member of a unit of a Reserve component a copy of such record shall be transmitted to the commanding officer of such unit.

"INSTRUCTION OF TRAINEES

"SEC. 109. The Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Commission, shall prescribe standard courses of theoretical and practical training for units of the corps established at educational institutions under this act, and shall detail such numbers of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the uniformed services, either active or retired, as may be necessary for duty as instructors with units of the corps. Subject to regulations of the Commission, personnel of the uniformed services so detailed to any educational institution shall, for the purpose of providing military training to members of the corps under this act, assume the status of members of the faculty or staff of such institution.

"FIELD TRAINING

"SEC. 110. In addition to the courses of training prescribed under section 109, each trainee shall be required to participate in summer field training for a period of 3 months. Such field training shall be designed to provide trainees with advanced and more intensified practical training, and shall be carried out by the respective training agencies under the direction of the Secretary of Defense.

"SEC. 111. The Secretary of Defense shall utilize existing bases, lands, and facilities owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the training agencies to the fullest extent practicable in carrying out the preceding section, and shall lease or otherwise acquire the use of such additional lands and facilities as may be necessary for such field training. The Secretary of Defense shall detail such personnel of the uniformed services, and utilize such property and facilities of the United States as he deems necessary in providing such field training.

"BUDGET FOR THE CORPS

"SEC. 112. (a) The Department of Defense shall prepare the proposed annual budget estimates for the corps and shall submit them to the Commission for its approval prior to the submission of such budget estimates to the President. It shall be the duty of the Commission to assure itself as to the adequacy and reasonableness of the annual budget estimates for the corps.

"(b) The proposed annual budget estimates for the administrative expenses of the Commission shall be prepared by it and submitted by it directly to the President.

"CERTIFICATES AND DISCHARGES

"SEC. 113. (a) Upon the satisfactory completion of the training required under section 105 (c), trainees shall be furnished with a certificate of training.

"(b) Upon the completion of the training required under section 105 (c), unless discharged under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Commission, each trainee shall be transferred to a Reserve component and shall serve in such Reserve component for a period of 7 years, as provided by the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

"(c) The Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Commission shall make provision for the conditions under which the several types of discharges shall be executed. Discharges shall be honorable, general, undesirable, bad-conduct, and dishonorable. Trainees shall be given a dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge only pursuant to sentence of a court martial: *Provided*, That trainees who are convicted by any civil court of any of the crimes enumerated in section 202 (a) of title II of this act may be discharged administratively if the head of the training agency concerned deems it appropriate.

"MAINTENANCE BENEFITS

"SEC. 114. (a) Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, the training agency shall furnish each trainee with—

"(1) necessary transportation, including transportation from his home to the place of induction and training and return, when not furnished by the Selective Service System;

"(2) quarters and subsistence;

"(3) clothing and equipment;

"(4) hospitalization, medical, surgical, and dental care; and

"(5) other necessary supplies and services.

"(b) The training agency may, where appropriate and under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, furnish monetary allowances to trainees in lieu of transportation, quarters, subsistence, clothing, or equipment, at rates not to exceed the rates provided for members of the Armed Forces in pay grade E–1.

"UNIFORMS

"SEC. 115. (a) The uniform for trainees shall be the uniform prescribed for enlisted men in the training agency to which trainees are assigned for training. The head of the training agency concerned shall prescribe the conditions under which trainees shall wear the uniform. The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe distinctive insignia to be worn by trainees, which insignia shall be the same for all members of the corps, except that devices may be prescribed to denote different grade or rank.

"(b) Subject to regulations issued by the Secretary of Defense, which regulations shall be uniform for all of the training agencies concerned, trainees may, upon satisfactory completion of training, be authorized to retain personal issue clothing for use in subsequent performance of duty and training in a Reserve status. Trainees discharged from the corps prior to the satisfactory completion of such training may be authorized to retain underclothing and nondistinctive articles of outer clothing and may be furnished such civilian outer clothing as may be necessary.

"CIVIL RELIEF

"SEC. 116. Trainees shall be entitled to the benefits of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C. 501). The terms 'persons in military service' and 'period of military service' in section 101 of that act shall be deemed to include trainees and periods of training.

"BURIAL

"SEC. 117. In case of the death of a trainee during his period of training, the cost of recovery of the body, preparation for burial, including a suitable casket, flag, transportation (including escort) to the city or town designated by the deceased's next of kin or proper authority, and transportation of personal effects shall be paid by the training agency to which he was last assigned in the same manner as prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the Armed Forces. Trainees shall not, solely by reason of their period of training, be eligible for burial in a national cemetery. The person incurring expenses for interment shall be entitled to reimbursement for such expenses in the same manner as prescribed by regulations applicable to a member of an armed force.

"INDEMNITY BENEFITS

"SEC. 118. (a) Section 2 of the Servicemen's Indemnity Act of 1951 (Public Law 23, Eighty-second Congress) is amended by inserting the words 'persons inducted into the National Security Training Corps;' immediately following the words 'for 14 days or more;' and by inserting the words 'or into the National Security Training Corps' immediately following the words 'induction into the Armed Forces' in the third proviso thereof.

"(b) Section 621 (a) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (38 U. S. C. 801), is further amended by inserting the words 'other than a person inducted into the National Security Training Corps' immediately following the word 'person' where first appearing therein.

"PAYMENT, UPON DEATH, OF ACCRUED COMPENSATION AND ALLOWANCES

"SEC. 119. The accrued or undisbursed compensation owing the trainee at time of his death, including any dependency allowance, shall be paid by the training agency to which he was last assigned in the same manner as prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the Armed Forces.

"DISABILITY COMPENSATION

"SEC. 120. (a) Except as modified by this section, the provisions of the act entitled 'Federal Employees' Compensation Act,' ap-

proved September 7, 1916, as amended (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 751), and as may be hereafter amended, shall apply with respect to the disability or death of a trainee. Except as modified by this section, the said act shall also apply in respect to the disability of any person who, in response to an order to report for induction into the corps and who, after reporting to a local Selective Service Board, but before being accepted and enrolled for active duty with the corps, becomes disabled as a result of disease contracted, injury suffered, or aggravation of an existing disease or injury while en route from such Selective Service Board to a designated induction station.

"(b) The provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, shall apply to a trainee only with respect to disability from a personal injury incurred in line of duty, or from disease proximately caused by such duty, and with respect to death resulting from such injury or disease: *Provided*, That the death benefits payable under said act, other than funeral and burial expenses, shall be payable only where death occurs subsequent to 120 days after the date of the trainee's release from the corps.

"(c) For the purpose of determining the compensation payable under this section, the total compensation received by a trainee in cash and in kind shall be deemed to be $150 per month, which sum shall be applied in lieu of any monthly pay determined to be required or authorized under sections 6, 10, or 12 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended.

"(d) The periods of time within which notice of injury, claims for compensation, or any report or notice is required under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, shall not begin to run in cases of disability until after release of the trainee from the corps. The benefits provided under such act shall not accrue to the trainee until after such release.

"(e) Nothing in this section shall be construed to hinder the prompt action authorized by sections 26 and 27 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act in any case involving the legal liability of a third party other than the United States, and the head of the training agency concerned shall cooperate fully with the Department of Labor in respect to the prompt investigation and prosecution of such cases.

"(f) In case of death the funeral and burial costs and other related expenses shall not be paid under the authority of section 11 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act if such expenses may be defrayed under the authority of section 113 of this act.

"(g) All determinations as to line of duty shall be made by the training agency concerned, and review of all such determinations shall be made by the head of the training agency concerned, under applicable regulations of that agency. All such final determinations shall be conclusive upon the Department of Labor whether made before or after the filing of a claim.

"(h) Any person receiving disability benefits under this title shall cease to receive such benefits at such time as he enters upon active duty with the Armed Forces: *Provided*, That such benefits may be reinstated upon such person's release from active duty in the Armed Forces.

"(i) No person may receive disability benefits under this title if such person has received a discharge from the corps under dishonorable conditions.

"LIABILITY OF TRAINEE FOR LOSS OF OR DAMAGE TO GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

"SEC. 121. A trainee shall be pecuniarily liable for the loss of or damage to Government property as a result of his fault or neglect, and the amount of liability as determined by the training agency may be collected by stoppage against the authorized compensation not to exceed $15 in any one month, or by civil suit, or both. Where circumstances so warrant in his judgment, the head of the training agency concerned or his designee may remit any such liability in whole or in part.

"LIABILITY OF TRAINEE FOR EXPENSES INCIDENT TO ABSENCE WITHOUT LEAVE

"SEC. 122. (a) A trainee shall be pecuniarily liable for costs incident to his apprehension and return in the case of absence without leave or desertion, and the amount of liability as determined by the training agency may be collected by stoppage against the authorized compensation not to exceed $15 in any one month. Where circumstances so warrant in his judgment, the head of the training agency concerned or his designee may remit any such liability in whole or in part.

"(b) The head of the training agency concerned is authorized to pay such amounts as he may by regulation prescribe to civilian officers and other persons as compensation for services, reimbursement of expenses, and rewards for the apprehension and return of a trainee to military jurisdiction in case of absence without leave or desertion.

"RECEIPT OF OTHER COMPENSATION

"SEC. 123. Nothing contained in this title or any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment to trainees of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation during their period of training.

"REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

"SEC. 124. Section 9 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is amended by inserting the words 'or the National Security Training Corps' immediately following the words 'armed forces' or 'Armed Forces' wherever appearing therein, and by inserting the words 'or for training' immediately following the words 'training and service' wherever appearing therein.

"CLAIMS

"SEC. 125. (a) Trainees—

"(1) shall be considered to be members 'of the military or naval forces of the United States' within the meaning of section 2671, title 28, United States Code;

"(2) shall be considered to be 'military personnel' within the meaning of section 1 of the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662, 31 U. S. C. 223d), and section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372, 31 U. S. C. 223b), as amended.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Air Force and their designees are authorized to exercise with respect to claims of trainees for damages to or loss, destruction, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their training, the respective powers conferred upon the Secretary of War and his designees by the act of May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 225, 31 U. S. C. 222c), and the Secretary of the Navy or his designees by section 2 of the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662, 31 U. S. C. 222e).

"LIMITATION OF BENEFITS

"SEC. 126. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, trainees shall not, solely by reason of their membership in the corps, be entitled to any rights, privileges, gratuities, or benefits provided by law or regulations for personnel or former personnel of the Armed Forces.

"MORAL WELFARE OF TRAINEES

"SEC. 127. (a) The provisions of title 18, section 1384, of the United States Code shall be applicable within and around any area, place, camp, post station, or educational institution where training in the corps is being given. The head of each training agency is authorized to exercise the same powers with respect to the efficiency, health, and welfare of the trainees as he is now authorized to exercise with regard to his respective armed force.

"(b) It shall be unlawful knowingly to permit members of the corps to enter places of ill-fame, brothels, bawdy houses, and other like facilities. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 12 months, or both.

"(c) Section 6 of the 1952 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. The National Security Training Commission shall make such regulations as it deems to be appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in beer, wine, or any other beverage containing alcohol to or by members of the National Security Training Corps at or near any educational institution, camp, station, post, or other place exclusively used for the training of members of the National Security Training Corps, which regulations shall include a prohibition against the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in any beverage containing alcohol to or by members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the National Security Training Commission, shall make such regulations as he deems to be appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of or traffic in beer, wine, or any other beverage containing alcohol to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any educational institution, camp, station, post, or other place jointly occupied by members of the Armed Forces and the National Security Training Corps, which regulations shall include a prohibition against the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in any beverage containing alcohol by or to members of the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association who knowingly violates the regulations which may be made hereunder shall unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 12 months, or both.'

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed as conferring upon the personnel of the training agencies any authority to make criminal investigations, searches, seizures, or arrests of civilians charged with violations of this section.

"TRAINING AGENCIES AND PERSONNEL

"SEC. 128. (a) Training agencies shall have direct responsibility for all training operations and may utilize, with their consent, the services of other agencies with or without reimbursement, including non-Federal agencies and institutions, in the conduct thereof: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this section shall authorize the training agencies to delegate any authority to any agency, other than a training agency, for the conduct of the basic military training to be conducted under this act and the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended.

"(b) Except as to medical and dental personnel and specialists allied to either, and chaplains, no military or civilian personnel shall be authorized or employed by the training agencies for duty with the corps in excess of the strengths otherwise prescribed for the training agencies concerned.

"TRAINEES UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

"SEC. 129. Section 217 (d) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (1) and adding the following: 'and includes any period

of service by an individual as a trainee in the National Security Training Corps.'

"FORBIDDING BOUNTIES, SUBSTITUTES, OR PURCHASE OF RELEASE

"SEC. 130. Section 8 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting the words 'or into the National Security Training Corps' immediately following the words 'United States' wherever appearing therein; by inserting the words 'or training' immediately following the words 'training and service' wherever appearing therein; and by inserting the words 'or the National Security Training Corps' immediately following the words 'such forces' wherever appearing therein.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 131. Section 12 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by inserting the words 'or in the National Security Training Corps' immediately following the words 'Armed Forces' wherever appearing therein.

"LEAVE

"SEC. 132. Under rules and regulations promulgated by the heads of the appropriate training agencies, trainees may be granted leaves of absence during their period of training without loss of compensation or allowances to which otherwise entitled. No trainee shall be entitled to any payment upon discharge or termination of training in lieu of leave.

"MISSING PERSONS ACT

"SEC. 133. A trainee shall be considered to be a 'person' within the meaning of section 1 (a) of the act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143, 50 U. S. C. 1001), as amended.

"CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

"SEC. 134. The provisions of section 6 (j) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, shall apply to persons liable for induction into the corps: *Provided*, That if the objector is found to be conscientiously opposed to participation in noncombatant training in the corps, the civilian training or work which he shall be required to perform, in lieu of induction into the corps, shall be for a period equal to the period of training in the corps.

"EFFECT OF PREVIOUS FELONY

"SEC. 135. No person who, prior to the time of his call for induction into the corps, shall have been convicted of a felony shall be inducted into the corps.

"EFFECT OF DISHONORABLE, BAD-CONDUCT, OR UNDESIRABLE DISCHARGE

"SEC. 136. The execution of a dishonorable, bad-conduct, or undesirable discharge from the corps shall forfeit any right to credit by the trainee for time serving in training, and shall not prevent the trainee from being inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service, or, except where the award of such discharge is the direct result of conviction for a felony, shall not prevent the trainee from being reinducted into the corps for all or part of the training prescribed for the corps.

"EXTENSION OF TRAINING PERIOD

"SEC. 137. Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the period of training with full pay and allowances may be extended by the training agency beyond the period of training required under section 105 (c)—

"(1) with the consent of the trainee, or his parents or legal guardian if he is incompetent, for the purpose of furnishing hospitalization, medical, dental, or surgical care: *Provided*, That the trainee shall be transferred to the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor, for the purposes of section 116 of this act, at the earliest time consistent with the health and well-being of the trainee, as the head of the training agency concerned shall determine.

"(2) for the purpose of requiring a trainee to make good any time lost from training, including time lost due to leave granted him, or his own wrongful act or neglect, time lost in desertion or absence without leave, and time lost by the trainee due to restraint prior to a trial resulting in conviction or confinement imposed as a result of a sentence by a court martial or a civil court.

"INSPECTION BY COMMISSION

"SEC. 138. (a) In order effectively to discharge its responsibility for exercising general supervision over the training of the corps, to analyze and report upon the cost and the personnel of the training agencies, and to assure compliance with such policies and standards as it shall establish, as provided in section 4 (k) (5) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, the Commission shall establish a system of training inspection. The Commission, or its designated agents, is hereby authorized to make inspections of any type at any time, upon the initiative of the Commission, at or near all educational institutions, camps, stations, or vessels where members of the corps are in training; except that such inspections may be made at an educational institution only in the manner and to the extent authorized by the contract or other arrangement entered into with such institution under section 106. The Commission, or its designated agents, is further authorized to have full access to all records and statistics maintained by the training agencies in connection with the corps. No training agency shall deny to any trainee direct access to any member of such inspection system, while such member is present at the institution or installation where such trainee is receiving training.

"(b) In order effectively to discharge its responsibility for exercising general supervision over the training of the corps and to assure compliance with such policies and standards as it shall establish, as provided in section 4 (k) (5) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, the Commission shall be authorized, without regard to civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such professional employees, including inspectors, as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

"SEC. 139. (a) Subsection 4 (k) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the word 'judically' in paragraph (3) thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'judicially.'

"(b) Subsection 17 (b) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, is further amended by striking out the words 'designated by the Commission.'

"EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND PRINCIPAL STAFF ASSISTANTS

"SEC. 140. (a) The Commission shall have an executive director who shall be the principal executive officer thereof. The executive director shall be appointed from civilian life by the Commission. No member of the Commission shall be eligible to serve as executive director. The executive director shall supervise the employees of the Commission and shall perform such other duties in connection with executing the functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct.

"(b) The President, to the extent he deems it necessary, is authorized to place not to exceed four positions of the National Security Training Commission in grades above GS–15 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Such positions shall be additional to the number authorized by section 505 of that act.

"VALIDITY OF THE ACT

"SEC. 141. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 142. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission, and all additional funds necessary to pay expenses of the corps under this act shall be appropriated directly to each of the training agencies concerned and shall be used for the purposes of this act.

"COMMUNICATION WITH CONGRESS

"SEC. 143. No member of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States.

"LIMITATION ON RECALL OF RESERVISTS

"SEC. 144. No person who completes basic military training in the corps as required by this act and thereafter is appointed in or transferred to a Reserve component of the Armed Forces shall be ordered to active duty in the Armed Forces without his consent for a period in excess of 30 days of continuous duty, except in such manner and in such numbers as the Congress may hereafter determine.

"AMENDMENTS TO THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

"SEC. 145. (a) Section 4 (k) (2) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by striking out 'for a period of 6 months' and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'as provided in the National Security Training Corps Act.'

"(b) The second sentence of section 4 (k) (5) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: 'and of the National Security Training Corps Act.'

"(c) The fourth sentence of section 4 (k) (5) of such act is amended to read as follows: 'The Secretary of Defense shall designate the military departments to carry out such training at universities, colleges, and junior colleges as provided by the National Security Training Corps Act.'

"(d) The first sentence of section 4 (k) (9) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended to read as follows: 'Six months following the commencement of induction of persons into the National Security Training Corps, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons inducted therein, a description of the manner in which training is being provided in the various universities, colleges, and junior colleges, a list of the camps and stations at which field training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons inducted therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems and the cost of training during the preceding 6 months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission, and the administrative costs of the Commission.'

"TITLE II—CODE OF CONDUCT

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 201. This title shall be known as 'The Code of Conduct of the National Security Training Corps.'

"SEC. 202. (a) Applicability of uniform code of military justice: All persons actually inducted into the National Security Training Corps are subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice and regulations issued pursuant thereto. However, any trainee charged with the offense of murder, voluntary manslaughter, rape, robbery, maiming, arson, or aggravated assault, or charged with attempts, solicitations, or conspiracies to commit such offenses, shall be tried by a district court of the United States unless within 20 days after the trainee has been served with a copy of the court martial charges, the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command to which the trainee is assigned shall have received a written request by the trainee that he be tried before a general court martial under the provisions of the Uniform Code of Military Justice and the regulations issued pursuant thereto.

"(b) Status of corps and trainees for purposes of Uniform Code of Military Justice: For the purpose of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and regulations issued pursuant thereto, the National Security Training Corps shall be considered an armed force, and, except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, trainees shall be considered enlisted members of the Armed Force to which assigned for training. For the purposes of article 15 (a) (2) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice, trainees shall be considered military p rsonnel.

"(c) Composition of court: The request concerning the composition of the court which an accused trainee is authorized to make pursuant to article 25 (c) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice shall be deemed satisfied if one-third of the court is made up of enlisted men selected in accordance with that article.

"(d) Power to quell disorders and make arrests: Under regulations prescribed by the secretary of the military department designated to conduct his training, a trainee may be vested with the authority of a petty officer or noncommissioned officer, for the purposes of articles 7 (c) and 9 (b) of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

"CONSIDERATION FOR YOUTH AND INEXPERIENCE OF TRAINEES

"SEC. 203. Commanding officers, courts martial, and reviewing authorities shall give full regard to the youth and inexperience of any trainee in awarding him punishment or in approving or affirming such punishment.

"JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

"SEC. 204. (a) The several district courts of the United States, its Territories, and possessions shall have jurisdiction to try and punish trainees for the offenses denounced by the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The procedure in and before these courts in cases under authority of this section, including pretrial and appellate procedure, shall be controlled by the procedural provisions of title 18, United States Code, and other laws and rules of procedure otherwise applicable to those courts.

"(b) Permissible punishments: The punishment which may be imposed upon conviction of any offense under subsection (a) of this section shall not exceed the limits of punishment for that offense which the President has now prescribed or may hereafter prescribe, under authority of article 56 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice. However, forfeiture of pay, detention of pay, or dishonorable or bad-conduct discharge shall not be adjudged by such courts, but a fine may be adjudged in any case. If an offense punishable under this subsection also constitutes an offense under any other applicable law of the United States, the punishment which may be imposed shall not exceed the limits prescribed by such law if those limits are lower than the limits prescribed by the President under authority of the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

"(c) Where trainee fails to elect trial by general court martial: Whenever a written request for trial by general court martial is not received under section 202 (a) of this title, the officer exercising general court-martial jurisdiction over the command to which a trainee is assigned shall report the facts and circumstances concerning the offense to the United States Attorney for the district in which the offense was committed.

"ADMINISTRATIVE DISCHARGES

"SEC. 205. When a trainee is convicted by a civil court of any offense involving moral turpitude, he may be given a general or undesirable discharge, as appropriate.

"EXPLANATION OF CODE TO TRAINEES

"SEC. 206. This title and those articles enumerated in article 137 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice shall be carefully explained to every trainee at the time of his induction or within 6 days thereafter. The complete text of this title and of the Uniform Code of Military Justice shall be made available to any trainee, upon his request, for his personal examination."

Mr. BURLESON (interrupting the reading of the amendment). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman insist on his substitute amendment? The committee does not know what the substitute amendment is.

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly, I will insist on the substitute amendment. If the gentleman from Georgia would like to have it read, I can sit here while it is being read, may I say that it is all your bill, but if you want it read, we can have the Clerk read it.

Mr. VINSON. This is the first information I have, I will say to the distinguished gentleman that a substitute would be offered. Will the gentleman explain the substitute?

Mr. BURLESON. It was in the RECORD of yesterday.

Mr. VINSON. I have no objection then, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that the further reading of the substitute amendment be dispensed with, and that it be printed at this point in the RECORD?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, of course they do not call it universal military training, because they know that the American people would never support peacetime military conscription. So they had to "doctor" it.

The Pentagon planners could not be bothered with eliminating waste from procurement, administration, or training, and they had no time for applying the hard lessons learned by others in Korea.

Did you ever try to fight your way through the 30,000 who serve on the general staff over there, where top brass is a dime a dozen? I never saw so many people looking for something to command.

At last their grand strategy has taken form and gone into action. It is a classic in military deception. The only fault I find is that it has picked the wrong target. An enveloping movement designed to capture all fit 18-year-olds in the United States so that the inflated military hierarchy may be guaranteed permanent employment, at the expense of American youth, will only succeed in becoming known as "operation backfire."

It is true that many of our young men, when they get out of high school or reach this employable age, are anxious to make a start in life, but they do not relish the prospect of being impressed into military service as a routine matter. In time of peace, they would much rather graduate from any other institution than UMT.

Knowing this, the Pentagon has tried to sugar-coat the whole deal so that we will swallow this bad pill and bad bill before we realize its consequences.

To start off, it has such an innocent label.

When I first heard of the National Security Training Corps I associated it with the unification of the Boy Scouts, the 4–H Clubs, and all the summer camps that are conducted for the benefit of our young men.

I soon learned that the project under wraps that is vaguely outlined in H. R. 5904, bears no resemblance to the fine, voluntary organizations I have just mentioned.

The fact that the military bureaucrats are trying to slip this one over, in disguise, is a confession that they are being somewhat less than honest with the American public.

They try to water down its drastic break with our nonmilitary tradition by avoiding any specific date for UMT to begin. But H. R. 5904 would permit what is called a small, experimental program, just to get a foot inside the door that protects the United States at large from the exponents of a garrison state.

I think that we have done pretty well, according to the record, with our present system. In two World Wars, one of them global in its problems and demands, we were able to field large and effective armies after a period of training, because we had a good professional core to build upon.

But now, even with a much, much larger standing army than we ever had, we are being asked to approve of a total military influence over the lives of our young men in perpetuity.

And after they are placed in a Reserve status, what then? They will still require refresher training to make them combat ready.

I believe that a volunteer-based Military Establishment of sufficient size and always ready is the best answer to our military needs, and one that does not establish as a national policy the regimentation of this Nation's youth.

A striking force in being is our best defense.

And on the alert.

Not in a mothball civilian reserve.

Without this ever-ready front-line of professionals, 20,000,000 Reserves might never get the chance to be called up, for the first blow will be the deciding one, if there ever is another major war. Complete and overwhelming surprise is the one great danger. With jets and guided missiles on the way, the leisurely methods based on the nineteenth century military experience of Europe will not be of much help. It seems to me that the Department of Defense, which should be prepared to intercept and defeat the swift-moving dangers of today and tomorrow, could do better than to offer us this souped-up version of an old and discredited theory. A backlog of 5,000,000 French soldiers was no match for the blitzkrieg of a few well-trained Panzer divisions.

The Pentagon tries to alibi our early reverses in Korea by deploring the lack of reserves. It almost broke their hearts to call the National Guard units and veterans of World War II back to active duty, according to the Pentagon. Now, and this is the booby trap, if we only had UMT at the time, this would not have happened.

In fact, this is but a shabby cover-up. We had Reserve units, but the military failed to give them proper training. They were not brought up to date in the handling of weapons, or in the experience that comes from working out problems in the field.

Even Regular Army service troops, scraped together for shipment to Korea, were as green as recruits, because they had never been trained to fire a mortar.

I submit that the old standby of "getting there fustest, with the mostest men," which has dominated military thinking, belongs in the ashcan.

For the first few precious months or weeks after a war, or, as they say, a "police action," occurs, I would rather depend on a dozen best-trained and hard-hitting divisions than a horde of militia. What protection would we have with an Air Force of 15,000 obsolete planes in mothballs if we did not have fleets of bombers and fighters ready for the take-off?

It is a wonder they have not learned something from the tested program of the United States Marines, who prove that quantity is never a substitute for quality. Desk soldiers and paper training will never deter an aggressor.

And a home guard will not do it.

The military defense of this Nation is a full-time job, and it is getting to be a highly technical one. We cannot rely on amateurs.

The central core of our military organization is good.

It simply needs some professional expansion.

I have every respect for our military leaders in their field, but when they step out of line and try to extend and perpetuate their influence over the lives of all American youth, I say it is time to call a halt.

Why, why was this measure proposed in the first place, when it will not give us any real military security? Six months would be inadequate training and, in event of war, it would still take time to retrain reserves and form them into units, judged by the past performance of the Pentagon.

We already have several million Americans serving in the Armed Forces.

The Selective Service System can provide for replacements as needed.

And both can be scaled up or down, depending upon future developments in the world situation. The people through Congress, will still maintain civilian control over the power-complex from which many generals and admirals suffer.

But if universal military training ever gets a compulsory toe-hold on this Nation, it will never let go, even in principle.

Our forefathers thought they had put 3,000 miles and more between themselves and this hated form of regimentation which is symbolic of old world tyranny.

Here it is, breathing down our necks again, and there is no welcome wilderness to which we can escape.

We can understand, up to a point, the ambitions of the high brass, but we do not intend to satisfy them by handing over American youth on a platter, with all the trimmings.

The chain of command has its place, but not all over the place.

This Government is founded on a system of checks and balances and it is time we put a limit on military demands.

Universal and compulsory military training, pardon me, but the soft-pedaling nomenclature of this is the National Security Training Corps, should be apprehended and put back in Pentagon mothballs for keeps by a decisive congressional rejection of this monstrosity.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, as a matter of fact, I repeat, my substitute bill was printed in the RECORD yesterday. I am sorry there was not opportunity to have it printed several days beforehand. It is not entirely a new idea by any means because there are Members on the floor and members of the armed services, who, I think, have brought this matter before the committee on other occasions, perhaps when it was the Committee on Military Affairs. I believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] at one time had a bill which was recommended by the American Legion to administer this program through our higher institutions of education.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that any bill, or any law, is going to be long successful if it is not supported by the mothers and fathers and educators and religious leaders of the country. You know very well that the measure now before us is not supported by those people, and even if it were put into effect, I predict that it would not be too long before we would be looking for other alternatives. It is too expensive to conduct more than one experiment and that is what this measure is, regardless of its form. Furthermore, it is going to be expensive and there is no need for anyone to pretend otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, the substance of my amendment, if you care to refer to the RECORD, is found on page A1329 of the Appendix, and the substantive portion is found in the early part of the bill, which provides the operation of this proposal. The Vinson bill is retained very well throughout the entire text, but the principal change is that boys may be sent to our higher educational institutions—universities, senior and junior colleges. Immediately someone is going to say that every boy will not be a candidate for a college degree or eligible for entrance in a university or a higher educational institution. Of course, he would not be. We then provide vocational training for the boys not eligible for entrance in colleges, not candidates for college degrees, if we carry out this universal military training, if you please to call it that, in our schools, very similar to the ROTC program with the "O" knocked out.

Now, that is oversimplifying; but, Mr. Chairman, one point I certainly want to emphasize is that the Federal Government will certainly take no control over our institutions. We retain the provision that the Commission which is provided in the Vinson bill shall contract with these various schools for the training of these boys, but that the Federal Government, regardless of the subsidy—that has come to be a mean word—that the Federal Government would take no jurisdiction over our schools; that is expressly stated in this proviso; that the commanding officer of each unit of the corps established at the university, and so forth, shall have complete charge of the training, but with no supervision or control over the personnel of the institution or control over the curriculum or policies of any educational institution which may contract to administer such training. I have tried to make it plain and most certain that there can be no possible attachment of authority over the educational institution.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield. I hope the gentleman will get me a little more time.

Mr. VINSON. Yes; I will. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may proceed for five additional minutes beyond his original time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. From the statement the gentleman from Texas has just made I gather that this commission of five men would contract with the schools or universities to carry on the training. Is that correct?

Mr. BURLESON. They would do that, Mr. Chairman. That is one of the major changes from the bill of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. VINSON. Who would give the military training?

Mr. BURLESON. The military would give the military training, and instruc-

tors in military training would be attached to these institutions. They would assume the status of a member of the faculty of such school undertaking the training.

Mr. VINSON. I have not read the gentleman's bill, but do I understand that the commission enters into a contract under which they will pay the schools to train the boys in the school? Is that correct?

Mr. BURLESON. That is correct.

Mr. VINSON. What about the boys who do not go to school?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman was not listening. The boys who are not eligible for regular college work would be provided vocational courses in the same institution, and the Government would pay for it.

Mr. VINSON. Then the Government would send such boys to vocational schools?

Mr. BURLESON. Either to vocational schools or to a school which would provide vocational training as part of its curriculum.

Mr. VINSON. And is it to be administered by the draft boards?

Mr. BURLESON. We retain the very same provision in that respect as is in the gentleman's bill.

Mr. VINSON. Then the draft boards would send one boy to a vocational school, another to high school, and a third to college, and the Government would pay for it; then the Government would send its military personnel in there to do the military training; is that the scheme?

Mr. BURLESON. No, Mr. Chairman, that is not the proposition. I know the gentleman has studied these matters long and thoroughly.

Mr. VINSON. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that for over a month the committee held hearings. I do not recall the gentleman's writing or asking to present any views.

Mr. BURLESON. Yes. I have appeared before the committee in the past.

Mr. VINSON. Not on this matter.

Mr. BURLESON. I have appeared before the gentleman's committee before. I am forced into saying this, but whether it is the gentleman's committee, my committee, or any other committee of this House, we are inclined to sit up there with a sort of supercilious attitude and say: "Now, look, I know something about these things; but you do not know too much about this, my boy." Mr. Chairman, we are very familiar with that sort of conduct. I have been before the gentleman's committee; I did not go before his committee on this question. Please do not think me the least disrespectful but I try to recognize a brick wall when I see one and I am certain there is a firm one around the gentleman, chairman of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I take it that the gentleman's bill has the earmarks of the old ROTC program?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it voluntary or compulsory?

Mr. BURLESON. It will be compulsory, but let me add something.

Mr. DONDERO. I am interested in that feature.

Mr. BURLESON. Under this system here I think you will get all the volunteers you will ever want in this program. I do not think your induction boards will need to take any action at all because there is always going to be applicants for this sort of training. Think of the opportunity it will give to those boys to enter school who may not otherwise be privileged to do so.

Mr. DONDERO. Let me comment that the voluntary enlistment of the men in that kind of program would simply be carrying out the fundamentals of this Nation.

Mr. BURLESON. I think so. It must, however, carry the compulsory feature but I repeat, I do not believe it will be necessary to exercise such power.

Mr. DONDERO. Voluntary and not compulsory.

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I appreciate the gentleman's raising that point. I venture to say that the induction part of this program would never be used because you are going to have a lot of boys seeking this opportunity to get into the schools. Incidentally, it gives 9 months of training in school, and I am sorry I did not mention this point before. It also provides 3 months field training in the summer after school is over. It interrupts no boy's education. The opportunity that would come to many boys would be beneficial. Whether they are forced into it or not, is beside the point. I do not think a boy is going to have to be forced into it unless they develop a need to go out and get a few boys from different educational levels.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not true that under the proposal the gentleman is making you can send a boy to school for a full year and give him both academic and military training at less cost than under that system proposed in this bill which would give him nothing but military training?

Mr. BURLESON. I thank the gentleman very much. It is my understanding that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the report has estimated that it would cost approximately $2,700 per annum to train each boy under this program. Now, I am no expert on this matter, not at all, but I think I am entitled to make a few speculations along this line. I think you can send a boy to school on $1,500; then you can spend half that much, or half of $2,700, giving him 3 months training in the field and you would still be ahead, even in dollars and cents and much further ahead in numerous other advantages such as education in a much more protected moral environment. This advantage is immeasurable.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] did not give the Armed Services Committee during the months that we were holding public hearings the benefit of his proposed suggestion. I want to say that ordinarily I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD every day, but I do not go back into the Appendix; therefore, I knew nothing about his proposal and I venture to say that not another member of the committee is familiar with it, either.

But to sum up from what the gentleman has said, it looks as if his proposal is nothing more than a glorified form of Federal aid to education. He said that the commission would have to send these boys to school; he said if they were not going to school they would go to some vocational institution. All that time they would be going there at Federal expense.

Mr. Chairman, this matter is very important; it is highly important. For months and months and years and years we have been working on this proposition. I think the line that we are proceeding on now is proper. The whole objective of UMT is to build up a reserve so that we can get rid of this large standing force of 3,500,000 men. That is our objective and that is the whole purpose of this bill. I do not think the gentleman's substitute would be in accord with the objectives of UMT.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWNSON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BURLESON: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That this act may be cited as the 'Citizens' Military Training Act.'

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. Section 4 (k) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"'(k) (1) There is hereby established a National Security Training Corps. Every male person who is a student at a high school in the United States on or after the date of the enactment of the Citizens' Military Training Act shall become a member of the National Security Training Corps, and shall receive initial military training (including training at a summer encampment) while attending such high school, in accordance with the provisions of title II of the Citizens' Military Training Act.

"'(2) The National Security Training Commission established under the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act (hereinafter in this subsection called the "Commission") shall be composed of five members, three of whom shall be civilians and two of whom shall be active or retired members of the Regular components of any of the Armed Forces. Of the three civilian members, not more than two shall be of the same political party. Members of the Commission shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among persons of outstanding national reputation. The President shall select the Chairman of the Commission from among its civilian members. No person who has been

on active duty as a commissioned officer in a Regular component of the Armed Forces shall be eligible for appointment as a civilian member of the Commission. The Commission shall have a seal which shall be judicially noted.

"'(3) The term of office of each member of the Commission shall be 5 years, except that (A) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, two at the end of 2 years, one at the end of 3 years, one at the end of 4 years, and one at the end of 5 years, after the date of the enactment of this paragraph; and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Members of the Commission, other than active members of the Regular components of the Armed Forces, while actually serving with the Commission, shall receive a per diem of not to exceed $50 for each day engaged in the business of the Commission, and shall be allowed transportation and a per diem in lieu of subsistence of $9 while away from their homes or places of business pursuant to such business.

"'(4) The Commission shall, subject to the direction of the President, exercise general supervision over the training of the National Security Training Corps, which training shall be basic military training. The Commisson shall establish such policies and standards with respect to the conduct of the training of members of the National Security Training Corps as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. The Commission shall make adequate provision for the moral and spiritual welfare of members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense shall designate one or more of the military departments to carry out such training at summer encampments, and to participate in the instruction of persons receiving such training at high schools. Each military department so designated shall carry out such military training in accordance with the policies and standards of the Commission. The military department or departments so designated to carry out such military training shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Defense and subject to the policies and standards established by the Commission, determine the type or types of basic military training to be given to members of the National Security Training Corps.

"'(5) The Commission is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"'(6) On the first day of the sixth month following the month in which the Citizens' Military Training Act is enacted, and semiannually thereafter, the Commission shall submit to the Congress a comprehensive report describing in detail the operation of the National Security Training Corps, including the number of persons serving therein, a description of the manner in which training is being provided in the various types of schools and school districts, a list of camps and stations at which summer encampment training is being conducted, a report on the number of deaths and injuries occurring during such training and the causes thereof, an estimate of the performance of the persons serving therein, including an analysis of the disciplinary problems encountered during the preceding 6 months, the number of civilian employees of the Commission and the administrative costs of the Commission. Simultaneously, there shall be submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth an estimate of the value of the training conducted during the preceding 6 months, the cost of the training program chargeable to the appropriations made to the Department of Defense, and the number of personnel of the Armed Forces directly engaged in the conduct of such training.'

"TITLE I

"SEC. 201. As used in this title—

"(a) the term 'Corps' means the National Security Training Corps.

"(b) the term 'Commission' means the National Security Training Commission.

"(c) the term 'trainee' means a person serving in the National Security Training Corps.

"(d) the term 'training agency' means any military department designated by the Secretary of Defense to conduct training for members of the National Security Training Corps.

"SEC. 202. The Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Commission, shall take such action as may be necessary to establish units of the Corps at high schools in the United States, and shall make appropriate arrangements with State and local school authorities respecting the utilization of school property and facilities (and the payment of compensation therefor) in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 203. (a) Each male student attending a high school in the United States shall become a member of the Corps and shall serve in a unit of the Corps for not less than two academic years, and in addition shall receive training at a summer encampment as provided in section 208.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense may, with the approval of the Commission, make such special provision as he deems necessary and practicable to enable persons who are not attending high school, and who have not yet registered under section 3 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, to volunteer for service in the Corps, or to receive training at summer encampments under section 208, or both.

"(c) Upon becoming a member of the Corps, each trainee shall subscribe to the following oath or affirmation:

"'As a member of the National Security Training Corps, I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America, that I will uphold the Constitution of the United States, and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States of America and the orders of the officers appointed over me. So help me God.'

"In case of affirmation the closing sentence of adjuration shall be omitted.

"SEC. 204. The Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Commission, shall prescribe standard courses of theoretical and practical training, comprising a minimum of 5 hours a week throughout each academic year, for units of the corps; and each high school at which a unit of the corps has been established (hereinafter referred to as a participating high school) shall make available such facilities as may be necessary for such courses of training. Such prescribed courses shall, insofar as may be practicable, be designed to serve as a basis for future service in any branch of the Armed Forces, and may include the following subjects: Orientation; courtesies, customs, and rules of conduct; hygiene and first aid; leadership drill and exercise of command; physical development methods, weapons, and marksmanship; supply discipline; Army, its organizations and functions; Navy, its organizations and functions; Air Force, its organizations and functions; care and maintenance of equipment; and military policy of the United States.

"SEC. 205. In order to promote efficiency and to insure that adequate training will be provided for members of the corps in rural areas and other areas in which the average male enrollment of the individual high schools is not sufficiently large to render feasible the establishment of a unit of the Corps at each such high school, the Secretary of Defense may, with the approval of the Commission, provide for the establishment of units of the Corps embracing two or more high schools, designate certain of the officers and enlisted men detailed as instructors under section 207 to serve simultaneously as instructors at two or more participating high schools, or designate a centrally located participating high school to which members of the Corps shall be transported for training at regular intervals.

"SEC. 206. (a) The Secretary of Defense, under regulations prescribed by him and approved by the Commission, shall issue to each participating high school, for use by the units or units of the corps established at such high school, such equipment, supplies, and uniforms as he may deem advisable, and shall authorize such expenditures from funds available therefor as he may deem necessary for the effective maintenance of the unit or units of the corps established at such school.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe the uniform for trainees and the conditions under which such uniform shall be worn. The insignia to be worn by trainees shall be the same for all members of the corps, except that devices may be prescribed to denote differences in grade or rank.

"SEC. 207. The Secretary of Defense shall detail such numbers of commissioned officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the uniformed services, either active or retired, including members of Reserve components and members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps who are taking advanced training, as may be necessary for duty as instructors with units of the corps.

"SEC. 208. In addition to the courses of training prescribed and required under section 204, each member of the corps shall be required to participate in an encampment of 6 weeks during the summer immediately preceding or immediately following his final year of high school. Each trainee shall be permitted to select the summer encampment program of the branch of service of his choice, within the limits of established quotas. Each trainee at a summer encampment shall be classified and assigned to a military occupation specialty. The purpose of such encampments shall be to provide trainees with further and more intensified practical training, including small-unit tactics, survival, and basic-training subjects peculiar to the branch of service of the trainees' choice. Training at summer encampments shall be carried out by the respective training agencies under the direction of the Secretary of Defense.

"SEC. 209. The Secretary of Defense shall utilize existing bases, lands, and facilities owned by the United States and under the jurisdiction of the training agencies to the fullest extent practicable in carrying out the preceding section, and shall lease or otherwise acquire the use of such additional lands and facilities as may be necessary for such summer encampments. The Secretary of Defense shall detail such personnel of the uniformed services, and utilize such property and facilities of the United States, as he deems necessary for the instruction and training of members of the corps in attendance at summer encampments.

"SEC. 210. Under such regulations as the Secretary of Defense may prescribe, each member of the corps in attendance at a summer encampment shall be furnished with—

"(1) necessary transportation to and from the summer encampment;

"(2) quarters and subsistence;

"(3) clothing and equipment;

"(4) hospitalization, medical, and dental care; and

"(5) other necessary supplies and services. Members of the Corps may, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, receive monetary allowances in lieu of trans-

portation, quarters, subsistence, clothing, or equipment, at rates not to exceed the rates provided for members of the Armed Forces in pay grade E–1.

"SEC. 211. Members of the Corps shall receive compensation while in attendance at summer encampments at the lowest rate provided for members of the Armed Forces in pay grade E–1.

"SEC. 212. (a) Except as modified by this section, the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall apply with respect to the disability of a trainee from personal injury incurred in line of duty while at a summer encampment or from disease proximately caused by such duty, and with respect to death resulting from such injury or disease; except that the death benefits payable under such act, other than funeral and burial expenses, shall be payable only where death occurs more than 120 days after the termination of the trainee's training at such summer encampment. All determinations as to line of duty shall be made by the Secretary of Defense, and shall be conclusive upon the Department of Labor whether made before or after the filing of a claim.

"(b) For the purpose of determining the compensation payable under this section, the total compensation received by a trainee in cash and in kind for attendance at a summer encampment shall be deemed to be $150 per month, which sum shall be applied in lieu of any monthly pay determined to be required or authorized under section 6, 10, or 12 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act.

"(c) The periods of time within which notice of injury, claim for compensation, or any report or notice is required under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not begin to run in cases of disability until after the termination of the trainee's summer encampment training. The benefits provided under such act shall not accrue to the trainee until after the termination of such training.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to hinder the prompt action authorized by sections 26 and 27 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act in any case involving the legal liability of a third party other than the United States, and the Secretary of Defense shall cooperate fully with the Department of Labor in connection with the prompt investigation and prosecution of such cases.

"(e) Any person receiving disability benefits under this title shall cease to receive such benefits at such time as he enters upon active duty with the Armed Forces; but such benefits may be reinstated upon such person's release from active duty in the Armed Forces.

"(f) No person may receive disability benefits under this title if such person has received a discharge from the Corps under dishonorable conditions.

"SEC. 213. (a) In the case of the death of a trainee during his period of summer encampment training, the cost of recovery of the body and preparation for burial (including a suitable casket, flag, transportation to the city or town designated by the deceased's next of kin or proper authority, and transportation of personal effects) shall be paid by the training agency in the same manner as is prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the Armed Forces. Trainees shall not, solely by reason of their membership in the Corps, be eligible for burial in a national cemetery. The person or persons incurring expenses for interment shall be entitled to reimbursement for such expenses in the same manner as is prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the Armed Forces.

"(b) Any accrued or undisbursed compensation owing the trainee at the time of his death shall be paid by the training agency in the same manner as is prescribed by law or regulations in the case of a member of the Armed Forces.

"SEC. 214. (a) Upon the satisfactory completion of two academic years of service in the Corps as required under section 203 (a), and upon the satisfactory completion of training at a summer encampment as required under section 208, each member of the Corps (including each person who volunteered for service in the Corps pursuant to section 203 (b)) shall be furnished with a certificate attesting the satisfactory completion of such service, or such training, or both.

"(b) Each member of the Corps shall, upon the satisfactory completion of all service and training required under this title and after the issuance of the certificates provided for in subsection (a), be transferred to a reserve component; and each such member shall be required to serve in a unit of such reserve component for a period of 8 years unless sooner discharged under conditions to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Commission.

"(c) Each person who has satisfactorily completed service and training under this title shall, at the time he is required to register under section 3 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, present to the local board the certificates furnished him under subsection (a), and such person shall not thereafter be subject to induction into the Armed Forces under such act or liable to serve on active duty in the Armed Forces except when called to active duty as a member of the reserve component to which he was transferred under subsection (b).

"(d) If any member of the Corps is required to register under section 3 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act prior to the completion of his service and training under this Act, he shall be furnished with a certificate stating that he is satisfactorily undergoing such service and training; and such person shall not thereafter be subject to induction into the Armed Forces if, at the completion of such service or training, he presents to the local board the certificates furnished him under subsection (a).

"(e) Any person who, at the time he is required to register under section 3 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, is unable to present the certificates provided for under subsection (a), shall, unless he has received equivalent recruit basic training with a unit of the Ready Reserve or the National Guard, or training at three summer encampments, be subject to induction into the Armed Forces for training and service; except that if at such time inductions under such act are suspended, he shall in lieu of induction be required to receive training equivalent (as determined by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Commission) to the service and training required under this title.

"(f) The penalties prescribed by section 12 (a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act for evading or refusing registration or service in the Armed Forces shall apply with respect to any person who evades or refuses to undergo the equivalent training in lieu of induction required of him under the preceding subsection.

"SEC. 215. The Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Commission, shall make provision for the conditions under which discharges shall be executed. Discharges shall be divided into the following classes: Honorable, general, undesirable, bad-conduct, and dishonorable. The execution of a dishonorable, bad-conduct, or undesirable discharge from the Corps shall forfeit any right to credit by the trainee for time served in training, and the time so served shall not prevent the trainee from being inducted into the Armed Forces for training and service. The execution of any dishonorable, bad-conduct, or undesirable discharge shall, upon application by the trainee, be subject to review by the Commission.

"SEC. 216. The Corps shall be a component of the land and naval forces; but trainees shall be deemed members of the Armed Forces only as expressly provided in this act or in the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended. Except as otherwise specifically provided in this act, trainees shall not, solely by reason of their membership in the Corps, be entitled to any rights, privileges, gratuities, or benefits provided by law or regulation for personnel or former personnel of the Armed Forces.

"SEC. 217. Nothing contained in this title or in any other act shall be construed as forbidding the payment to trainees of compensation by any person, firm, or corporation during their period of training under this title.

"SEC. 218. A trainee shall be pecuniarily liable for the loss of or damage to Government property as a result of his fault or neglect, and the amount of such liability, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, may be collected by deduction from his compensation authorized by section 211, or by civil suit, or both. Where circumstances so warrant in his judgment, the Secretary of Defense may remit any such liability in whole or in part.

"SEC. 219. No person shall be required to serve in the corps if, by reason of his religious training and belief, he is conscientiously opposed to all service (both combatant and noncombatant) in the Armed Forces. In passing upon the claim of any person to be exempted from service in the corps under this section, the Secretary of Defense shall be guided by the standards and criteria set forth in section 6 (j) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

"SEC. 220. (a) The provisions of section 1384 of title 18 of the United States Code shall be applicable within and around any area, place, camp, post, or station where summer-encampment training is being given trainees. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to exercise the same powers with respect to the efficiency, health, and welfare of trainees as he (or the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force) is now authorized to exercise with respect to members of the Armed Forces.

"(b) It shall be unlawful knowingly to permit members of the corps to enter places of ill fame, brothels, bawdy houses, and other like facilities. Any person violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

"(c) Section 6 of the 1951 amendments to the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 6. The National Security Training Commission shall make such regulations as it deems to be appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in beer, wine, or any other beverage containing alcohol to or by members of the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place exclusively used for the training of members of the National Security Training Corps, which regulations shall include a prohibition against the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in any beverage containing in excess of 1 percent of alcohol by volume to or by members of the National Security Training Corps. The Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the National Security Training Commission, shall make such regulations as he deems to be appropriate governing the sale, consumption, possession of, or traffic in beer, wine, or any other beverage containing alcohol to or by members of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps at or near any camp, station, post, or other place jointly occupied by members of the Armed Forces

and the National Security Training Corps, which regulations shall include a prohibition against the sale, consumption, posession of, or traffic in any beverage containing in excess of 1 percent alcohol by volume by or to members of the National Security Training Corps. Any person, corporation, partnership, or association who knowingly violates the regulations which may be made hereunder shall, unless otherwise punishable under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment of not more than 12 months, or both.'

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed as conferring upon the personnel of the training agencies any authority to make criminal investigations, searches, seizures, or arrests of civilians charged with violations of this section.

"SEC. 221. All members of the corps shall be subject to the Uniform Code of Military Justice and regulations issued pursuant thereto in the same manner as are enlisted persons in the Armed Forces, except as the application of such code and regulations to members of the corps may be modified by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the Commission.

"SEC. 222. (a) In order effectively to discharge its responsibility for exercising general supervision over the training of the corps, to analyze and report upon the cost and personnel of the training agencies, and to assure compliance with such policies and standards as it may establish, as provided in section 4 (k) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, the Commission shall establish an independent system of training inspection. The Commission, or any agent designated by it, is authorized to make inspections of any type at any time at or near any camp, station, or other place where members of the corps are in training. The Commission, or its designated agents, shall have full access to all records and statistics maintained by the Department of Defense in connection with the corps. No member of such inspection system shall be a person serving on active duty in the Armed Forces. No training agency shall deny to any trainee direct access to any member of such inspection system, while such member is present at the installation where such trainee is assigned.

"(b) In order effectively to discharge its responsibility for exercising general supervision over the training of the corps and to assure compliance with such policies and standards as it shall establish, as provided in section 4 (k) (5) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, the Commission shall be authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws but subject to the Classification Act of 1949, to employ and fix the compensation of such professional employees, including inspectors, as it deems necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"SEC. 223. (a) The Commission shall have an executive director, who shall be the principal officer thereof. The executive director shall be appointed from civilian life by the Commission. No member of the Commission shall be eligible to serve as executive director. The executive director shall supervise the employees of the Commission and shall perform such other duties in connection with the functions of the Commission as the Commission may direct.

"(b) The President, to the extent he deems it necessary, is authorized to place not to exceed four positions of the National Security Training Commission in grades above GS–15 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949 in accordance with the procedures and standards of that act. Such positions shall be in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of such act.

"SEC. 224. The Department of Defense shall prepare the proposed annual budget estimates for the corps and shall submit them to the Commission for its approval prior to the submission of such budget estimates to the Bureau of the Budget. It shall be the duty of the Commission to assure itself as to the adequacy and reasonableness of the annual budget estimates for the corps.

"SEC. 225. The Secretary of Defense shall prescribe ratings of efficiency and other qualifications for trainees which shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be uniform among all units of the corps. The Secretary of Defense shall assure by appropriate regulation that trainees receive an appropriate rating upon completion of their service and training in the corps. A record of such rating shall be maintained by the training agency, and at such time as a trainee is transferred to a unit of a reserve component upon completion of his service and training in the corps, as provided by section 214 (b), copies of such record shall be transmitted to the armed force to which he is transferred and to the commanding officer of such unit.

"SEC. 226. In accordance with the provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, the Secretary of Defense shall prescribe rules and regulations not inconsistent with law or with the policies and standards established by the Commission, with respect to the conduct of training in the corps.

"SEC. 227. If any provision of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and of the application of such provision to other persons and circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 228. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act. All funds appropriated for the administrative expenses of the National Security Training Commission shall be appropriated directly to the Commission, and all additional funds necessary to pay expenses of the corps under this act shall be appropriated directly to each of the training agencies concerned and shall be used for the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 229. No member of the Armed Forces or the National Security Training Corps shall be restricted or prevented from communicating directly or indirectly with any Member or Members of Congress concerning any subject unless such communication is in violation of law, or in violation of regulations necessary to the security and safety of the United States.

"SEC. 230. No person who completes service and training under this title and thereafter is appointed in or transferred to a reserve component of the Armed Forces shall be ordered to active duty in the Armed Forces without his consent for a period in excess of 30 days of continuous duty, except in such manner and in such numbers as the Congress may hereafter determine.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. (a) Section 4 (a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended (1) by striking out the second paragraph thereof, (2) by striking out 'or shall be inducted for training in the National Security Training Corps' where it appears in the third paragraph thereof, and (3) by striking out 'or for training in the National Security Training Corps' where it appears in the seventh paragraph thereof.

"(b) Section 4 (c) of such act is amended by striking out paragraph (5) thereof.

"(c) Section 4 (d) (3) of such act is amended by striking out 'or in the National Security Training Corps,' 'or in training in the National Security Training Corps,' and 'or from training in the National Security Training Corps.'

"(d) Section 6 (h) of such act is amended by striking out 'or training in the National Security Training Corps,' 'or for training in the National Security Training Corps,' 'or from training in the National Security Training Corps,' and 'or undergoing training in the National Security Training Corps' wherever they appear therein.

"(e) Section 6 (l) (2) of such act is amended by striking out 'or training in the National Security Training Corps.'

"SEC. 302. So much of section 40 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (10 U. S. C., sec. 381), as precedes the first proviso is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 40. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps. The President is authorized to establish and maintain in civil educational institutions a Reserve Officers' Training Corps, one or more units in number. Such units may be organized at universities and colleges granting degrees, including State universities and those State institutions that are required to provide instruction in military tactics under the provisions of the act of July 2, 1862, as amended (7 U. S. C., secs. 301–305, 307, 308), donating lands for the establishment of colleges where the leading objects shall be practical instruction in agriculture and the mechanic arts, including military tactics, and at those essentially military schools not conferring academic degrees specially designated by the Secretary of the Army as qualified. The Reserve Officers' Training Corps shall consist of units of the several arms, corps, or services in such number and strength as the President may prescribe:'.

"SEC. 303. Section 47c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended (10 U. S. C., secs. 385a, 387), is amended (1) by striking out 'the senior division of' wherever it appears and (2) by striking out 'in that division' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'in such corps.'

"SEC. 304. The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution interpreting section 50 of the act of June 3, 1916, for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes,' approved September 8, 1916 (10 U. S. C., sec. 388), is amended (1) by striking out 'the senior division of' and 'senior division,' and (2) by striking out 'of that division' and inserting in lieu thereof 'of such corps.'

"SEC. 305. Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this act, all units of the junior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (established under section 40 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916), and all units of the corresponding division of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps (established under sec. 22 of the act of March 4, 1925), shall, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the National Security Training Commission, be integrated into and become a part of the National Security Training Corps."

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to proceed for five additional minutes, 10 altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim no originality for this plan. This plan was evolved out of a true and tried American method of training young men for military service; it developed out of the plan which is now used in the high school ROTC program made compulsory and supplemented with a six weeks' summer camp. The first time this plan was brought to the attention of the present Committee on Armed Services was by an organization known as the Catholic War Veterans of the United

States of America. I did not know of this history until we had gone well into the development of this present plan, when I found it was presented originally over a year ago. I offered this plan to the Armed Services Committee in a hearing a little over a month ago, presented it because it seemed to me that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee was right when he said that our big problem today is to find some way to replenish our reserve forces without drawing on the veteran reservists.

The Armed Services Committee very generously gave to me, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LANTAFF] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] approximately 1 hour to discuss this high school ROTC plan of citizens military training. I was called to testify on January 30, the next to last day public hearings were held by the Committee on Armed Services.

I cannot agree that the distinguished gentleman from Georgia is right in saying that his UMT plan is the only possible UMT proposal. Some of us who were interested in the American Legion and its attitudes have looked back into the files of the American Legion, before the Legion came under the Pentagon's influence on UMT. And we found that from 1921 until 1948 the American Legion proposed a plan which I say has much more in common with this type of universal military training than that proposed in the pending bill. I have talked with many men who have worked on the legislative committee of the American Legion, and I think they feel that this present UMT plan we are considering does not embody many of the ideals and many of the ideas for which the American Legion strove for years; but, rather, is an adoption of the three simple letters UMT and a substitution of other content to back them up.

The Armed Services Committee on pages 19, 20, and 21 of their report, discussed certain objections to this plan of mine.

First let me outline the plan. This proposal consists of a high school ROTC course which includes the junior and senior years of a young man's high school career, involving classroom gymnasium, or field instruction for 5 hours a week. That would be 160 hours a year. Those who pass the physical and mental standards for acceptance in the Armed Forces or as members of the Training Corps go into a summer training program in the Army, Navy, Air Force, or Marine Corps, depending on the young man's choice of service and the availability of that choice. That is the whole program: Six weeks of summer camp, 2 years of high school ROTC.

Now let me deal with some of the objections raised by the Armed Services Committee. In the first place they say that in 1947 there were 22,684 public high schools, including some very small ones. That is correct.

According to the latest Office of Education survey approximately 21,700 public high schools existed in 1951. In 4 years we have lost well over a thousand schools through consolidation and abandonment. In addition, most of the closing schools were small and many of the new ones were large.

Furthermore, section 205 of my amendment provides for the establishment of units embracing two or more high schools where instructors would rotate somewhat in the manner of circuit-riding ministers. Subparagraph (b) of section 205 provides for the designation of centrally located schools to which members of the corps shall be transported at regular intervals using normal school transportation.

These are two simple, workable methods of dealing with the problem of small schools. In the first, the instructors would come to the students and in the second, the students would come to the instructor. Since less than 6 percent of the total number of male students attend schools with fewer than 50 male students, it is obvious that this objection, met as it is by provisions of the amendment is nothing more than an administrative road block.

The committee has also stated that—

> The central administration of as many separate command units as there are high schools in the United States would require a military superstructure in each of the services of a magnitude which defies description.

Now, that is good rhetoric, but it is not supported by facts of the existing ROTC program. The total enrollment in 237 senior—college—units is 135,471, not a small number, in this academic year. The total overhead personnel, both civilian and military who did not themselves devote time to instruction is about 30 on the top level, or 5 in each of the 6 armies in the continental United States, and 105 in units, 135 top-level personnel administering the program which is training 135,471 future officers. The overhead and instruction personnel in units, total 4,059, which makes a grand total of not quite 4,500 people administering instruction and administering the overhead necessary for teaching basic and advanced military science and tactics to 135,471. Obviously an extension of this type of an eminently satisfactory program would require administrative personnel in roughly the same percentage of overhead to trainees.

They state that our plan would not achieve the primary objective desired from military training, to produce basically trained soldiers for our Reserve forces, ready to take their places in organized units and ready for immediate employment after very short refresher training in the event of an emergency.

The answer to that is, of course, that no plan of training has ever done this. To cite an actual experience, the Fifth Marine Division was first activated on Armistice Day, November 11, 1943, and was composed of men who came from combat units, specialist training schools, and recruit training, as well as other veteran marines. The unit was at approximately full strength by July, 1944, but the first units finally were committed for combat in February, 1945, in the battle of Iwo Jima.

You cannot get more than basic training under a universal training program. Training a man to be a member of a team involves setting up a team. They say you cannot train, under this system, a finished combat team. However, my military experience as well as common sense leads me to believe that the high school ROTC—summer camp plan comes closest to this ideal. Under it residents of the same community would attend military education classes in school together, they would go to summer camp together and when they returned home from that summer camp and reached the age of 18 they would be assigned to Reserve units together. They thus would be familiar with each other's characteristics, idiosyncrasies, and capabilities. Certainly it would be easier to weld an effective combat team from such young men than it would be to produce such a team from men trained under the plan proposed by the Committee on Armed Services.

Then they say that, moreover, the training under the high-school plan is completely devoid of one of the most important aspects of military education—harmonious living in groups—which is absorbed by individuals undergoing training in regular military training camps simply by going through the experience of routine living 24 hours a day.

This substitute plan, of course, is not completely devoid of this aspect of military education, since the men would be brought together for a concentrated training period of 6 months after they completed the preliminary work in their high-school classrooms. It is difficult to assess the value of this phase of education which is received in 6 months which is lacking after 6 weeks.

The committee report delves almost facetiously into the kind and amounts of equipment which would be required in the various schools, where the preliminary training would be given:

> Rifle ranges would have to be constructed, and in order to approach some semblance of military training, artillery, tanks, trucks, airplanes, and other types of heavy equipment would have to be distributed throughout the United States in many thousands of high schools. This would require warehouses and many other facilities. These facilities do not exist.

As anyone remotely familiar with the essentials of basic military training is aware, the use of "artillery, tanks, trucks, airplanes, and other types of heavy equipment" is not necessary. Trainees would have access to training involving prototypes of this matériel during their 6 weeks summer camp, and if absolutely essential during the academic year to have limited varieties of this matériel on hand for instructional purposes, it would be possible to work out a system whereby the equipment was in use for a short period at each of a number of different schools or units of the corps. This is a common educational practice and involves a small amount of transportation, but virtually no warehousing as the committee erroneously feared.

So far as rifle ranges at each school are concerned, those Members who have ever fired the rifle in the service well know that the most important part of marksmanship training does not involve

the use of ammunition. I refer to the "snapping in" phase, with which all shooters are familiar. If shooters have a sufficiency of "dry firing," they will be expert marksmen when they begin using shells.

Rifle instruction in the Marine Corps, which produces the best marksmen of any of our services, consists of two phases. First, there is the preliminary training away from the range. No ammunition is used. Embryo marine riflemen devote hour upon hour to learning the various positions, the nomenclature of their weapons, and to learning how to "squeeze off" each shot without jerking. In the 3 weeks at the range, the first week is devoted to "dry firing" and bore sighting, the second to small-bore work, and only the third and last week to actual firing of the .30-caliber rifle.

The Armed Services Committee report raises another absurd objection when it says:

> The military services would have to maintain, on a year-round basis, camps, training facilities, and equipment to handle a load of over 800,000 trainees for the summer training period. This is double the size of the training plant required for the contemplated program of UMT. Thus, this plan has all the disadvantages, costwise, of the split-training-period proposal which was rejected because of its prohibitive cost.

The camps' training facilities and equipment necessary under this modification would not have to be of the fantastically elaborate nature envisaged under the committee bill. Since the 6-week camp phase would be carried on during the summer, it would be possible to house the trainees adequately under tentage, since heated barracks are not as essential in the summer as they are in the winter. It would be possible to have at least two, and perhaps three, training periods of this duration during the summer, and thus the camps and training facilities could be used by two or three different sets of trainees. So far as training personnel are concerned, they could be drawn from the Active Reserves or from the ranks of advanced ROTC students, as well as from the Regular military services and thus they would not have to stand by, drawing pay, during the period in which no field training was given.

Another committee objection was:

> If any attempt were made to meet the differing requirements of the military services in the program offered in the high schools, or if the trainees were to be given any option in the choice of service, the administrative overhead in the average high school would be burdensome.

The basic requirements for all the services are the same. We now have unification of the Armed Forces in theory, so why not have as much as possible in practice.

This objection is similar to another raised by the committee:

> Certain basic principles of training are common to all services. However, the personnel of each service live, eat, and fight under entirely different circumstances. In training men for any service, the methods used must necessarily be those best adapted for producing trained personnel who possess knowledge peculiar to the service concerned.

These objections are, of course, refuted by the experience of the Marine Corps, which trains its men for many different missions. Marines serve aboard ship, with infantry divisions, do guard duty at navy yards, and serve in aviation units of all descriptions, as well as perform other duties too numerous to list. However, all enlisted marines, as their first step, go to one of two training bases. And, no matter what their eventual assignment is to be, they receive identical training at both Parris Island and San Diego.

The committee, evidently looking more to the grammatical aspect of its analysis than to a factual basis, said "not even if we were preparing our youth to defend our Nation in a war comparable to the Revolutionary War, or the War Between the States, would the high-school program be adequate; and it is certainly not sufficient preparation of our young men to meet the requirements of modern warfare."

The requirements of modern warfare is a nebulous phrase that is subject to expansion with every new development. The Army has, with a program almost identical with this trained one type of reserve personnel very satisfactorily. I refer to the reserve officers training program which produced more than 5,000 officers a year for nearly 20 years before World War II, and in the current year will produce more than 15,000 second lieutenants, most of whom will be called for 2 years active duty in that grade immediately upon their graduation. The prewar ROTC-trained officers comprised the vast majority of the 104,575 reserve officers who were eligible for active duty, when needed most, in 1939. If this type of program is adequate to produce officers to meet the requirements of modern warfare and that fact is amply demonstrated by the vast expansion, it seems to follow that the same type of program can produce privates.

The report goes on to explain and complain, training for modern warfare involves a certain degree of specialist or technical training to fit men to become members of military teams. While we think that such instruction can be successfully absorbed by an 18-year-old, to expect reasonable comprehension from a 15- or 16-year-old boy seems unrealistic.

As all of the Members are aware, the training specified in Public Law 51 is basic training. Specialized training can better be given in civilian institutions already equipped to do so, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] so eloquently pointed out to the House last Friday, February 29. Reasonable comprehension is expected from high-school students in the course of their regular schooling. What type of basic training will be more difficult than subjects already in the normal high school junior and senior curricula?

The committee points out, "only about half of the male youths of the Nation graduate from high school. Thus, the high-school program would never be capable of universal application."

When we drafted this substitute plan we considered this fact. Men who do not finish high school will have several optional methods of qualifying. So far as universality is concerned, the committee bill itself presumably would train only about 80 percent, or 8 out of 10 of the young men in this age bracket. It can hardly be called universal.

The committee holds, "that by bringing together young men from every part of the country, from every walk of life, to share in a common experience and to fulfill a common obligation to their country, we will contribute to the development of national unity, the bedrock of our security."

The substitute plan brings the young men together in the same manner, although admittedly for 6 weeks instead of 6 months. Six months, must indeed be a magical period of time, because so much can be accomplished in it that cannot be approached in 6 weeks.

The committee objects that "the system of issuing certificates of training to insure full participation appears to entail administrative problems so involved as to render it impractical of application."

The thousands of draft boards throughout the country now maintain a separate file on each young man who reaches registration age. That system has functioned efficiently for nearly a dozen years and this plan would not require much more detailed record keeping.

The committee says "such a program would not achieve the objective desired from UMT—to produce trained men for our Reserve forces."

Such a system is producing more than 10,000 officers annually for our Armed Forces. Are these inferior products? If so, the committee owes it to the taxpayers to recommend that the ROTC program be abolished and another method of training officers be found.

The committee sums up its objections, "it would be administratively impractical of implementation, it would not be a universal program, and it would be excessively expensive."

The first two of these points have been answered earlier. So far as "excessive expense" is concerned, I would like to ask if it is cheaper to feed, clothe, pay, and house a man for 6 months than it is to do all of those things for him for 6 weeks? The answer is obvious.

The committee's final objection was "it would place in Reserve units, as potential first-line defenders of the Nation inadequately trained young boys, some of whom would be well under 18 years of age."

This plan would provide the 14 essentials of basic military training recognized by authorities on military education. How much further the committee proposal would go is not indicated in the pending bill. Certainly, considering the mandate in Public Law 51, these are the only subjects which can be reasonably construed as comprising basic military training.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for his exposition of the problems involved in his proposal, then

I would like to ask this question: As I understand the parliamentary situation, the gentleman's amendment is a substitute for the pending Burleson substitute?

Mr. BROWNSON. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman's proposal would deal with military training in high schools which approximates the age involved in the training bill before us as distinguished from military training in colleges which would be contemplated in the Burleson amendment?

Mr. BROWNSON. That is true. We have adopted that because the high schools are teaching more people in this age group than do the colleges.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWSNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. I may say to both the distinguished gentlemen from Indiana that the two amendments are nothing but Federal aid to education.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know about that.

Mr. BROWNSON. I would say, Mr. Chairman, in answer, that at the present time you are training approximately 65,000 young men in high schools through ROTC programs. Would you say we had Federal aid to education today?

Mr. HALLECK. It is not Federal aid to education, and I am sorry that the gentleman from Georgia would try to so indicate. The high schools would continue to be run for educational purposes, as they are presently. The cost of the military instruction, of course, would be paid by the Federal Government. It certainly could not be considered by any stretch of the imagination to be Federal aid to education.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. I do not want to be in the position of opposing the gentleman's idea in connection with the same ideas that I have tried to advance, and he may have explained this. As I understand the figures in the hearing before the committee, this would require about 800,000 high-school students to be trained all at one time.

Mr. BROWNSON. Going through their normal high-school courses, that is exactly the number you would train under UMT.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LANTAFF. I want to commend the gentleman for the exhaustive effort he has made in connection with this problem. I think it is demonstrative of the type of congressional action that I think this House should take on this important measure. I know from personal knowledge that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] has stayed up many nights and gone far beyond the line of duty as a Member of Congress in drafting this bill. I think all of us in Congress owe him the consideration of listening carefully to the proposal he has made, because I think there is ample merit to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be permitted to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman's proposal contemplate that the public and private high schools be included in this plan?

Mr. BROWNSON. That is right.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I wish to commend the gentleman for his approach and for his work in this matter.

Mr. BROWNSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. As a schoolman of some 35 years' experience, and knowing that the schools of the Nation are supposed to train the youth for life, if universal military training is to be a part of their future life, then the logical thing, it seems to me, is for the schools to do the job.

Mr. BROWNSON. I commend the gentleman on his viewpoint, which agrees with our research.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I understand the gentleman's proposal, it is a type of training for students in the high school. Now, what training, if any, is to be given to those who are not in high school?

Mr. BROWNSON. We have three alternative proposals: He may attend three additional summer camps, which would make up his training. He could attend training with the National Guard or Organized Reserve in the community one night a week in lieu thereof, or he could take the high-school training without being a regularly matriculated student in the high school.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Do I understand that the gentleman's proposal conforms to the original proposal of the American Legion?

Mr. BROWNSON. I would say that it comes closer to the original proposal of the American Legion than the present plan does. I will not say it conforms in every detail.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Would the gentleman explain further how the boys trained under his program would fit into the Reserve program after he has completed his training?

Mr. BROWNSON. The young man trained in this program will have 2 years of high-school training in the classroom and he will have 6 weeks of summer camp training. After this, and when he attains 18, he will be assigned to a Reserve unit of his choice, so far as it is possible to satisfy the individual desires of the trainees. Otherwise, he will be assigned to the Reserve unit indicated by the requirements of the services. There is no difference between this plan and the committee proposal so far as the disposition of the men, after basic training, is concerned. Both are predicated upon the assumption that there will be a real, effective Ready Reserve program.

Our whole premise has been this: If you can train a Reserve second lieutenant, ready to step in and accept responsibility in the Officers Reserve Corps, with 4 years of college ROTC and 6 weeks of summer camp, we maintain that you can train a private in similar fashion. Consider this the nub of this whole UMT problem, because if the man is wasted after UMT, you have squandered your money. We believe we can produce a better man, who will have had his basic training, equal or equivalent to the training given by the armed services, in the proper subjects, and he will be better fit to join his Reserve unit and become a commendable part of that unit for further training.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is this training suggested in this amendment very similar to that, for instance, now going on in all the public schools of Chicago?

Mr. BROWNSON. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. How many high schools throughout the country are using this exact plan, roughly?

Mr. BROWNSON. This exact plan at the present time is being used by high schools in 24 out of the 48 States, training 62,554 students in 265 schools, representing 95 different high school systems. That, as I said, together with the number of men being trained in the college senior ROTC program, encompasses a total of young men today who are being trained under essentially this type of program which nearly aggregates about 25 percent of the whole number which will be carried at any one time by the UMT program. Under this plan it can be done at a cost which is only about 15 percent of what the UMT program would cost as proposed by the Commission.

Mr. SPRINGER. The cost is roughly about $385,000,000, as against $5,500,000,000.

Mr. BROWNSON. That is as close as we have been able to estimate the cost with the information we could develop from the Pentagon, which has been somewhat reluctant to supply us with figures freely.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. When would the gentleman's amendment take effect? When will the training begin—at the conclusion of the present draft law or immediately?

Mr. BROWNSON. Training under this bill could take place immediately, because this training works concurrently with the draft or after the draft is done away with.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Then it benefits the juniors and seniors in high school?

Mr. BROWNSON. It definitely does. The juniors and seniors in high school right now would be the ones that would start under this program.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Has the gentleman set a minimum age to apply to those not in high school?

Mr. BROWNSON. I have set no minimum age. The present ROTC high-school program takes the young man for the last 3 years of high school. By taking him the last 2 years, we will be taking him when he has reached more maturity than he has under the present program, which has been so highly lauded by the Department of Defense.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If he is not in high school, then must not the gentleman necessarily amend his bill and put a minimum age in it?

Mr. BROWNSON. We have that taken care of in our bill so that when he reports to his draft board at 18, he presents certification that he has completed his universal military training. If he does not present that certification, he is immediately drafted until he has completed an equivalent period of training.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. As I understand, the gentleman's bill would permit training of boys below 17, boys of 15 and 16, when they are in high school, and when they have had this training they automatically go in the Reserve. Therefore, the gentleman will spell out boys in the armed services in the Reserve that are not even 18 years of age.

Mr. BROWNSON. I would like to make the point to the gentleman that under the supervision of this great committee the high schools have been training boys in the high school ROTC much younger than that age level for several years.

Mr. VINSON. But they are not placed in the Reserves.

Mr. BROWNSON. But young men are allowed to qualify as potential Reserve officers who have not reached 21. At the time they reach 21, their officers' commissions are made effective, the same thing we do for the young man when he reaches 18.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has offered this amendment has offered it in good faith, to be sure, because when he came before the committee the chairman invited him to go back and write a bill and bring it before the House for consideration. That is exactly what he has done.

This type of training program at first glance has some public appeal, but the more you look at it the more ridiculous it becomes, because you are trying to set up here and should set up basic military training, but if you go out to the number of high schools the gentleman reported and set up military offices, rifle ranges, training equipment, and everything else in the 22,684 high schools of this country, you are going to face the most colossal task that has ever been dreamed of in the way of a training program. It just simply cannot be done.

The type of service you have to render here to produce somebody that is worth something from the standpoint of military service, in my opinion, cannot be put into a high school program. You have today a little over 2,000,000 students in the high schools. It is estimated that you will get out of this 18-year-old group probably about 1,000,000 a year for a training program; that is, of course, after taking out those exempted for physical defects and all other exemptions you will have. In my opinion, it would be fallacious on the part of us or anybody else to start out with a program here that will place every high school in this country under the heel and dictatorship of some Army officer, and that is exactly what you would do with such a program if this amendment is adopted.

Further, the schools of this country in every State are administered in a different way, and the Federal Government has no control whatever over the high schools of this country. And we want to keep it that way. It would be entirely up to the local boards or the State boards of education as to whether or not they would accept it. You might have it accepted in one community and right across in the other county you would not have it accepted, and there would be nothing you could do about it, because I do not believe the people of the communities and the people of the States would let this thing be forced on them if they did not want it.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. As far as the number of schools is concerned, we have a very definite program there. They can be consolidated within the county. There are already some 1,000 fewer high schools than shown in these statistics.

Mr. DURHAM. Has the gentleman ever served on a school board? I have served on a school board for 20 years, and it is one of the most difficult tasks I have ever performed.

Mr. BROWNSON. Is it any more difficult or costly to use the existing school facilities for this instruction than it is to spend $1,700,000,000 building new Armed Forces facilities, which are not going to do anybody any good?

Mr. DURHAM. What do you think will happen where the instructor will say that I have to have those students in at a certain hour today, and the high-school principal says, that is the time they should be studying arithmetic or English or something else? You are going to have all kinds of conflict, and in my opinion, it is simply not going to work out.

Mr. BROWNSON. We apparently have solved that very well in 265 high schools, and so far as 62,554 students are concerned, and in over 300 colleges.

Mr. DURHAM. That is a different program from this. The ROTC program is an educational program to begin with.

Mr. BROWNSON. What is this program supposed to be?

Mr. DURHAM. A basic military training program period.

Mr. BROWNSON. My understanding of that phrase is predicated on the assumption that training and education have something in common, although perhaps they are not synonymous. The ROTC program is workable in the high schools.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes, they have to go from there to the colleges.

Mr. BROWNSON. It has no bearing on a man taking a basic course in college, as to whether or not he had high school ROTC training.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes, he is given credit for it.

Mr. BROWNSON. I have a very fine letter from the man in charge of the cadet corps right here in the District of Columbia, which is under the direct supervision of the Congress of the United States, saying that the program is working well and that he endorses this.

Mr. DURHAM. There is no doubt but that it is working well. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is large enough to disturb the country very much, but if you put this in every school in the United States you are going to have a disturbance.

Mr. BROWNSON. The problem is whether you are going to take a million young men out from all kinds of educational institutions or leave them in. You are going to have a disturbance, no matter what plan is adopted. It is a matter of degree. Which plan will disturb the least is at issue, and I think the RECORD shows clearly that this modification qualifies far better than the committee proposal.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNSON. As far as I am concerned, it seems to me better to have these men receive their military training as military training and their essentially civilian training in civilian institutions. Because there are many skills in which the military wants to train them which are not directly military skills, I frankly suspect someone of fostering empire building. Under a civilian educational institution, with military training as a byproduct rather than as the sole goal, you would not drag the training out for 6 months and interrupt the

civilian training, and thus delay civilian education as a byproduct.

Mr. DURHAM. Is the gentleman seriously disturbed that this will disturb the education of the boys throughout the country very much?

Mr. BROWNSON. I certainly am disturbed about that.

Mr. DURHAM. Will you give me an example.

Mr. BROWNSON. I will give you an example of that. Suppose a young man graduates and wants to go to medical school. He comes out of high school this year. Suppose he can be fitted into the UMT program at a date which is most propitious for him. Suppose he is mustered in on June 10. He has June, July, August, September, October, November and a part of December. Then he comes out on December 10. Already he has lost 6 months from his educational program. Then from there he has December and January until a new semester starts. If we want to disturb the whole set-up in the American educational system so far as the division of the work by semesters is concerned, this is the way to do it.

Mr. DURHAM. I have had some experience with colleges and college students. I have raised five children, but I do not want to get personal about it, but it has been my good fortune to have them. One went into the service in the last war. He stayed in 2½ years or something like that in the Pacific. He had just graduated from high school. We signed up for him to go in when he was 17. He was 26 years of age on February 19, and he has his master's degree. It is entirely up to the boy. I do not say that because he is my son, but just because this is a personal experience of mine, and I think it is. We have to do something.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. There is one thing that disturbs me about the gentleman's bill. I confess I have been intrigued and very much interested in it. Here is what disturbs me about it. As I understand this bill, it would force a type of military training upon a city- or county-supported school whether or not that school wanted to carry on such a training or not; is that correct?

Mr. BROWNSON. If the gentleman will yield to me so that I may answer that question, may I say "No, that is not right." This prescribes that the individual will take that type of training. We assume that the schools will want to provide it when the individuals are required to take it. We do not reach down into any State and order that they must give this course in a prescribed fashion. If the school locally does not give this course, the obligation then is on the young man to take one or the other of the three alternatives in his own community.

Mr. ABERNETHY. If I may ask the gentleman a little further along that line. Take a school in my own town. I live in a small town and we have only one school. Suppose the board of trustees of that particular institution says that they do not want this kind of training in our schools. What would happen, would they have to take it?

Mr. BROWNSON. The lad would have to go down to the National Guard or Reserve unit and he would have to take his drill down at that unit until he had accumulated a sufficient number of hours of equivalent instruction. Or, he could attend three summer camps.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Suppose there is no ROTC unit?

Mr. BROWNSON. In that case you might as well throw the whole UMT bill out of the window because I find that the reserve training in everybody's proposals for UMT depends on there being local reserve units in existence to administer that training. If there are not going to be those units in existence, we are all just talking about a 6-months vacation because then there will never be any ultimate result from the whole UMT program.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. The opponents of the whole UMT program have made much of one idea that this committee by imposing military training on the country would Prussianize the country. Would not this system of requiring the military to be in our public schools do far more toward militarizing and Prussianizing our country?

Mr. DURHAM. To me it would be one of the most dangerous precedents ever allowed or permitted in America.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice in the committee report that out of a total of 22,684 high schools, 975 have a male enrollment of fewer than 12.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that 2,686 have a male enrollment of between 12 and 25.

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Two thousand five hundred and forty-eight have a male enrollment of between 25 and 50. Thus, 6,209 high schools, or practically one-third of all the senior high schools of the United States have a male enrollment of less than 50 each.

Mr. DURHAM. And they would have to have all the expensive equipment and trained personnel required to train boys at the small schools as well as the large ones.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. Those schools which the distinguished majority leader has enumerated constitute a male student population of less than 6 percent of the total number of male high-school students involved. They impose exactly the same problem of consolidation that is reflected by the size of the community. There will have to be consolidation of the schools for military training and they can just as well use the school busses for their military training that they do for their scholastic training.

Mr. DURHAM. Has the gentleman gone so far as to explore this with the educational authorities of his own State as to whether or not it is acceptable?

Mr. BROWNSON. Yes; I certainly have; and I have even gone so far as to contact members of the Board of Regents in New York State. They have expressed keen interest in the matter even to the extent of asking me if I would like to have them write a testimonial letter. I said, No, that I did not want to have them do that, but that I was interested in how they felt about the matter.

Officials of the Oklahoma school system endorse the plan. I have kept in touch with school authorities on every phase of the plan's development.

Mr. DURHAM. I ask and hope that the Committee will vote down both amendments.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana has just told us he has submitted this proposal to the Board of Regents of the State of New York and that certain members of the board have indicated their approval of the plan. I would remind him, however, that the State Board of Regents of New York does not control the school buildings and physical properties in the various localities in the State of New York; those are controlled by the respective local boards of education.

This plan sounds very good; it appears to be the easy way out of a most difficult dilemma, but it requires two to make a bargain. What assurance have we that the local boards of education in each community are ready to have the military people come in and supervise this kind of military-training program? Furthermore, it is amazing to me to hear this proposal emanating from my side of this Chamber composed of men who for years have taken a strong position against the Federal invasion of State jurisdiction and responsibility in the field of education, yet today we find them proposing the very thing which they historically have opposed.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. Not for the moment.

To the extent that this new proposal provides for military training in the public schools it means Federal intervention in the field of State responsibility for the education of our youth.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman knows I have already indicated that I do not care to yield at this moment.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has previously stated the

impractical phases of this new proposal. It sounds good; it is fine if we could cause as little disruption of the life of our youth as this proposal seems to indicate. I would warn you, Mr. Chairman, that there is no cheap or painless way in which we can prepare ourselves for the security of our country.

Let me emphasize what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] has already pointed out to you. If this new plan is adopted it would be necessary for Uncle Sam to equip every high school in the country fully with military equipment—guns, tanks, artillery, aircraft, and all the electronics of this modern age that a trained military man requires. In addition he would have to maintain a series of camps throughout the country in which the boys would be given their summer training. It would mean that the Government would have to bear the transportation expense of each one of these high-school boys from their homes to the training camp and back again four times, to say nothing of the skilled military personnel that would be necessary to do the training in the schools, and the plant, physical properties, and real estate that would be necessary at each school to make such a training program possible.

In the end it would cost far more to the Federal Government and be far more disruptive of the general public education system than the proposal of the pending bill.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has hit on the head the main objection to this proposal, when he indicated that he envisions the possibility of Uncle Sam eventually coming into every public school system in this country and telling them what they shall teach and how they shall teach it. The man who pays the fiddler usually calls the tune. That may appeal to some Members of this body, but it certainly has no appeal to me and that is one of the reasons why I resist the plan which the gentleman from Indiana has advanced, I am sure, in all sincerity.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from New York that the remarks I have to make to the gentleman will also apply to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services who used the expression, in referring to this substitute, that it was a glorified Federal aid to schools program. You are using political intolerance and prejudice. Now, if we have come to the place that it is necessary to go into the field of intolerance and into the field of creeping socialism to get this UMT over, I am ready to vote to recommit it now.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. DEVEREUX. Was it not under such a philosophy as that which is now propcsed that made Prussianism and militarism actually a fact in Germany and in Italy?

Mr. COLE of New York. I am sure that a study of history will support the gentleman's statement that in Germany the youth were given military training in the public-school system and eventually a militaristic system developed. That is the very thing which we are trying to avoid.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman feel that you can give a high-school youngster 6 months of basic military training while he is going to high school?

Mr. COLE of New York. Not and permit him to do a good job with his other courses of learning in the school. I do not think it would be possible.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Is it not true that military training requires training in climate as well as terrain, in addition to just textbooks and field training at a particular high school?

Mr. COLE of New York. In view of the gentleman's splendid military record in Korea, he is a far better expert on that subject than I and I am ready to rely on his judgment.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it is most unfortunate that we should have two meritorious proposals in the form of substitutes before us in competition between themselves. I had hoped that we might have a direct vote on the Burlesen substitute and should that not be agreed to a direct vote on the Brownsen substitute. With the limited opportunity which we have had to study these proposals it is my feeling that the Burlesen substitute is preferable but personally, I will support either of these measures because either one gives us a fundamentally sound system; either one gives us an economic system, either one of these programs gives us both academic and military training of our youth at far less cost than is involved in the present bill for a less amount of purely military training.

Do not let anyone fool you by making the arguments that have been made as between the Burleson and the Brownson substitutes. Most all of the representatives of the committee who have opposed this principle of training in our schools have either attacked training in colleges and said it ought to be in high schools or they turn around and state that it is a mistake to put it in high schools because it ought to be in the colleges. It does not make any difference which place you put it. Let us put it where we will give the boys some academic training as well as military training. Let us not commit ourselves to spend $5,500,000,000 a year and not buy any more than this Vinson bill is going to buy.

The Vinson bill is not going to buy security because it is not going to give anybody any training which will enable him to engage in combat. If you say it will, just look at the Oklahoma National Guard with all of the training it had, one of the best in the country and composed very largely of wartime veterans. Did the Army send them to Korea when it was stated we were desperately in need of troops over there? No. They gave them all the training they gave to any of the recruits. They said their previous training was useless. It was obsolete and yet it was real war training and it was had only a few years before.

No, the committee bill does not buy security. What it does is to spend a lot of money, $2,700 for 6 months' training for each man. It does not give one single boy, one single bit of academic training, and the Government needs boys with academic training just as it needs boys with military training. Why not get both? We are going to be paying for both.

They say you cannot get military training under the ROTC. But it so happens that we have an institution in my State of Texas, the Texas A. and M., which supplied this Nation with more officers during World War II than any institution in America, including West Point. Many of those officers did not have anything except this so-called ROTC and academic training. They got all the military training they had on the campus of that institution. They went out and they led men. They were not simply the enlisted men; they were the officers in charge of your boys. It is possible that we can give all the military training an officer needs in a college ROTC but that we can't give enough military training on that same campus to meet the needs of the men those officers are going to lead? Do not tell me you cannot get effective training in our schools. We have given effective military training in our schools, and we have given it for far less money than we could possibly have done in a straight military training program.

Have you got some prejudice against having an educated Army? Have you got any prejudice against any boy who knows how to read and write?

Do not tell me that this bill will keep the school system of Mississippi from deciding for itself whether it wants to have this military training or not. There is not one thing in either the Brownson bill or the Burleson bill that requires any school system to accept this ROTC or RTC. These substitutes simply allow the local school authorities to make a deal with the United States Government if they want to whereby they can give military training in addition to their other subjects to their boys if they want to. No school system or college is required to install a training program. If they do not do it, then the boys in their area have to go and qualify in some other way—through service in the Guard or elsewhere. I predict that most of the school systems of this country that are large enough would make every effort to provide this training for their boys and give them the opportunity to secure military as well as academic training. But if some locality did not want to do it, or if the school was too small to make it practicable, there is not one thing in either bill that prohibits that school

from saying "We will just go on, just as we are today, and this boy can go some place else to get his military training."

It is not every school in the United States that gives training in geology today or that gives courses in calculus, and yet you need not say that a school cannot be run because it does not teach those things. Each school will give what it feels it is able to give, and if it feels it is not equipped to give this military training, it will have to let its boys go some place else. But let us here in Congress give the school an opportunity to offer the boy a chance to get every cent of training that our dollars will buy. Let us not say that although we are paying for a full, well-rounded education including both academic and military, that we will deny the boys a chance to get the academic part, or that we will wait until he has spent his time on a one-track course and then turn around and pay that same boy to go back to school and get the very academic work he could have had along with his military training without extra cost to the Government or extra loss of time to the boy.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to question some of the statements made by the gentleman from New York, and in these few minutes I would like to answer them.

In the first place, it seems from all the mail I am getting on this subject, and in my talks with other Members of this body, that the fathers and mothers of this country regard the recommendations of the committee that prepared the report in this manner, that these boys are going to leave home at an age which is considered, in their minds, to be still tender years. They are to be sent to army camps where they are largely to be dominated by the military itself. Now, that is a fundamental thing. I think all of you who are fathers and mothers realize how they feel about it. Here is a plan that in my opinion will give you a chance to avoid all the pitfalls that are presented by that kind of a bill. Here you have your training at home, in the schools. The boy goes home at night. He lives at home. He receives his training just as does ROTC in college, where the boy is entirely under civilian control of the university itself. Military training is merely an adjunct to education itself.

In the second place, I would like to say this. The gentleman from New York says that actually what you are doing is putting these schools under the military. If you will examine the proposal made by the gentleman from Indiana, it is not that at all. Actually this military program that is going into the schools is to be controlled by the civilians locally, by the school board. It is true the military are going to teach their courses, but at the same time they can be taught in the local school building or any other building that is adjacent to your local school. That is the thing I like about it, because I think that is democracy. We have been talking about decentralizing this Government. This is the best way to decentralize it that I know of, to put this program back under civilian control. When you are talking about civilian control at the top level, you are not getting it under the Vinson bill, but you are getting it under the Brownson amendment because it will be under local school boards. There will not be the military telling those school boards how to conduct those courses in those local schools.

In the third place, I like the Brownson substitute. It has a history that goes back 30 years. This plan of ROTC program, the Reserve training program in the high schools, began over 30 years ago. I defy anybody to find any school where it has been in operation for any number of years, where it has had any adverse effect, and where the people of the community have not approved the program.

I say that once you put this plan in operation in your local schools, within a very short time it will receive approval, just the same as you had with physical-education programs. I remember my early teaching days back home when that kind of program was opposed by some people. And I say whenever an ROTC program has a good history, a history like it has had in the public schools in Chicago, that it will work well. People of all nationalities in that community have been satisfied with the democratic way in which the ROTC program has been administered in the city of Chicago.

In the fourth place, it seems to me that here is a program that we can afford. We have been talking here for days about getting a program that we can afford. Let me say to you, we do have to find some way to reduce the cost of this program. The only way you can reduce it is to keep that boy in the local community. If you do, you do not have to feed him, you do not have to house him, or you do not have to pay his transportation to and from.

Mr. Chairman, I think those are four good recommendations for this bill which meets many of the objections of people opposed. I would say the Brownson amendment meets 80 percent of the objections that you will find against the original bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I have been interested in military training since the first time I heard about it, but I am now for the Brownson substitute bill. This is it. The thing we all fear is control by the military. This will give the proponents of universal military service just what they want. It will give those of us who are against military training because of fear of the military just what America should have; the continuance of the civilian over the military.

It would satisfy the parents' organizations, it would keep the child in the home. It would satisfy our trade-union groups such as the CIO, which now is on record against universal military training. It would satisfy our church groups, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish. It would even satisfy the United States Chamber of Commerce, because it would save money. Further, it should satisfy the American Legion because this Brownson bill was originally their own idea. They first brought forward this idea of training in the high schools.

It would also take care of a keg of dynamite that we are sitting on in this House. This is going to blow up some time this afternoon or tomorrow if we do not vote for this substitute. We might as well face the issue right now honestly. The issue of segregation and discrimination in universal military training is going to come up on this floor. If I do not bring it up, somebody is going to bring it up. I am not going to let any bill pass here without fighting to make it spell out equality.

The Pentagon is trying to play "footsie" with both sides of the aisle. I know it and you know it. I know of letters to some members from the Pentagon saying, "If you pass universal military training, you are not going to have discrimination and segregation." On the other hand, some of the top men of our Defense Department have called up some of you gentleman from below the Mason and Dixon's line and told you, "We will see there will be segregation." That is what they have done, and you know it. The military is trying to get votes from you by promising everything to all of us. But we are not going to swallow that. The issue will be faced this afternoon, and you are going to be on the spot.

If you believe in democracy you are going to have to vote in favor of no segregation in universal military training. If you do that, UMT will lose 40 or 50 votes from the South, possibly all of them, and then it will be completely killed.

If you adopt this substitute bill, what will happen? Just you will have children going to schools that they are now going to. They will be going to white schools in some sections. I do not approve of this; nevertheless it is a fact. You will have students going to some schools that are all Negro. I do not approve of that. Then there are mixed schools which I approve and will fight for all my life. But, above all, there will be no control by the military of teaching, of subjects, or of policy.

As I said in debate last week, and, I repeat, shall we crucify America on a cross of brass? Shall we give up the exciting dream of freedom for the ugly nightmare of servitude? Shall we abandon the Gods of our fathers for the mammon of militarism?

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have never lived through 10 days of such confusion; such obvious attempts to confuse; such lax integrity in the presentation of arguments. It makes me more than a little ashamed, to witness such procedure in this historic body. When I think of the issue on which we are making our decision, I know that we ought to be on our knees, and not depending on the exercise of our wits.

In my early school days, I learned the wisdom behind those ancient lines: "Timeo Danaos dona ferentes," which there is no need to translate to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. It means, "I fear Greeks bringing gifts."

If the Committee on Armed Services and the distinguished chairman had such faith in these amendments proposed today, why were such amendments not brought into the House as part of the committee bill? Are they, as we suspect, a gentle sop to win support here and support there; to force forbearance of a conviction here; or to persuade a man or a woman to twist an opinion there? If so, I think that the charge lies heavy upon those who attempt to change the basic living in this country by means of subterfuge. So much for that.

Last year I was one of four Republican Members from Illinois who voted for the bill S. 1. I believe in adequate preparedness in peacetime, and even more do I believe in it in our present wartime.

I voted for the bill, however, with full faith in the word of the Committee on Armed Services that they would bring in such a bill this year as would mean that there would be no universal military training until after the selective-service process was out of being. But I know this: I am tired of mandates. I dislike even the word as essentially un-American. I am tired of spurious arguments for which gentlemen later apologize to me in the cloakroom. I am weary almost unto death of having Members tell me that they wish that they could vote against this bill. Why do we not vote against it, if we believe that we should?

I have been sure in the midst of all this discussion that if we went on long enough, "murder would out." It did for me when my friend from New Jersey said that you needed not only a system for military training, but a "climate." I rise in protest. If we have reached the stage in this country where in order to give our boys basic defense, and I believe in that, we have to admit that we must remove them per se from the influence of home and school and church and the ordinary American intercourse of freedom, in order to indoctrinate them under a solely militaristic "climate," then, I ask of you, what have we left to defend?

There is much perhaps to be still ironed out in the Brownson bill. But I give you this. It is based upon the fundamental fact that in this country men have fought best because they fought free, and also because they came fresh from those influences of home, school, and church, which are so fundamental and so close that defense of them is endemically compelling. I hope therefore that you will give close study to this bill. Above all else—oh, I hope you will do this as I pray that I may do so—I ask that you will vote this bill and those amendments up or down, not from any compunction—not for fear of any mandate but on your conviction. I ask you: What will it mean to you or to me to come back here for 2 years or 4 years or 6 years or 8 years, if we have to live with the dishonest knowledge in our souls that we refused to vote our conviction. I would ask you once more, in a land grown great on the essence of freedom, have we lost our faith in that? During the last year I have been appalled by the fact that the Congress no longer seems to be concerned over the profligacy with which we spend money. I am beginning to think that we are in danger of permitting a similar profligacy in the spending of human American life. Let me be frank. As long as we have a war in Korea; as long as the first thing on my desk almost every morning is a casualty list of members of the Armed Forces from my area; and as long as we have Selective Service, I think that this whole discussion might well have been postponed. But, if we do have to face the problem now, at least let us not make the argument that in order to provide the only "climate" under which we can build defense for freedom we have actually to move our boys—I say again—out of home and school and church, and away from all those very freedoms without which we would not want to live; and without which, I remind you, this country could never survive.

As a Nation, we seem indeed to have lost our way; our sense of direction; our power of initiative. Let us not also lose our faith in ourselves, nor in those enduring principles in which we have as a great country so far continued to "live and move and have our being."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SIEMINSKI].

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentlewoman from Illinois for whom I have the greatest respect, misunderstood my remarks. When I said military training—efficient military training, requiring exposure to climate and to terrain, my remarks were based upon what I saw in World War II, and particularly in Korea when boys from the Volunteer State of Tennessee and the plains of the West did not know quite how to handle themselves against frostbite, or mountain fighting. They hugged the roads.

I look at this issue with relation to those who have gone before us, and who now lie dead as a result of war, or who will die in future wars. Since 1776, eight generations of Americans have answered the call to arms—once every 22 years. Count the wars and count the bullets, when were they fired—1776, 1812, 1845, 1864, 1898, 1914, 1941, and 1950, and if history runs true to form, one is due in Europe in 1964—or sooner; we have already had our generation of war in the Orient; in 1931 the Japanese crossed the Yalu; in 1951, U. N. in Korea.

Economics spawn wars, and you know it.

In deference to those who have died and to those who say their forefathers came to this country to avoid conscription, I ask, Did tomahawks spare the pioneers? Have wars spared those who came after them? May I say to the committee that my family too came to this country to avoid domination. I served in World War II. I was in Korea. Since I have been in Congress, I have been on active duty. I dare say if I am not successful for reelection, I will be called again, because I am a member of the Reserve. I do not mind. This country has been grand. Our family knows what it has. Mother and dad are alive, grateful, as am I, for the freedom of America, and the opportunities it gives.

I say 1, 2, 5 hours of freedom as against what you might have over there under European or Asiatic tyrants is a precious thing to have and to hold; those who have not experienced it cannot know the contrast.

It is to the dead, the living, and the unborn that I rose. I saw those kids; I was with a group, Mr. Chairman; we were in California going over to the Far East; and as these boys were there in good humor, one morning, I said: "Who are you, son? Where are you from?" And he said: "I am from the Volunteer State of Tennessee; I am Truman's policeman and MacArthur's raider." Great humor, but the day I was elected, I happened to go forward with a group of 18-year-olds. They looked scared—like rabbits. And do you say they were trained? Yes, but not for primitive warfare with its considerations of climate, terrain, and deception in day-and-night fighting which our boys cannot get in high school classrooms or gymnasiums.

These boys have yet to tell of the viciousness they saw in Korea and of the viciousness we are going to go up against if we go against the Mongolians. Remember, Mongolians spearheaded Russia's assault into Vienna in World War II.

Mongolians know the elements; they stay alive because they have learned to adapt themselves to the forces of nature. That is what we may yet have to face here in America. The forces of nature and the forces of war. Our boys must be prepared. Adequate training is essential. Gold will not spare us.

The treasuries of England, Germany, and France were loaded with gold in 1914, but it failed them; it did not prevent World War I; it alone is not going to prevent a war in 1964 if it comes.

This Nation may yet have to raise its 300,000,000 clenched fists to the sky and say, "With these we will fight. With these will we repel Mongolians streaming across the Bering Sea, through Alaska, into America, if need be."

And so, in memory of those who have passed on and who gave their lives so that we might live, and to those who may yet lay down their lives that we and others might live, I hope that if you do battle you will be prepared to defend yourself against all combat conditions, and that you will judge this Eighty-second Congress as having met and discharged its responsibility to you squarely.

The world is having forced upon it the most awful organized slaughter of human beings since Genghis Khan. If it is God's will that we must fight, let us be ready.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as my time has been fully taken as a member of the Military Appropriations Subcommittee and we have been meeting continuously since this bill was under debate, I have not heard the debate, but have followed

most of it in the RECORD. I did come in just in time to hear the greater portion of the explanation of the substitute presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON].

Mr. Chairman, I became a member of the American Legion in 1919; I have been post adjutant, post commander, State chairman of Americanization, and so on. In 1939-40 I was commander of the American Legion of the State of Kansas, and I feel certain I know something about the peacetime preparedness program that was advocated over a quarter of a century by the American Legion.

The substitute as presented by the gentleman from Indiana does not in all of its provisions coincide with the main elements of the program advocated by the American Legion. However, it more closely approaches the Legion program than any plan yet presented to us. I can remember going out before groups all over the State of Kansas telling them about the Legion's peacetime preparedness program, based upon sad and costly lessons of World War I where we learned the price of unpreparedness. We knew how terrific and deadly it was for youngsters with slight training to go up against a terrifically military foe. I can remember telling how the American Legion wanted to give these youngsters in America preparedness and training with the least possible interference with their life while getting that training; how we wanted to give them 3 or 4 months of basic training near home. That is all we ever intended; it was never intended to go into the finished product or anything like that, but it was purely basic training to get the rough edges off so they would be able to more readily take up advanced training if called into service. The Legion then advocated that the basic training be given in a camp near home 3 or 4 months, which was the longest period I ever heard discussed. Three months was generally recommended, so that training could be given in the summer, then for the remainder of the year any specialized training could be given in institutions near their home at the man's option.

I remember telling how this advanced training could be done in schools, how that further training could be given in the National Guard, or as a member of the Organized Reserves, and how they could also get this training in technical schools because we do have to have technicians in this modern-day war, or possibly, if they wanted to get all of it behind them and get it out of the way, and get more training, they could enlist for a short time in the Army, Navy, or Air Force.

There are some differences in this substitute and the Legion proposals. In all of those years the Legion never advocated any compulsory Reserve service after the expiration of that year. The Legion proposed basic training after high school, with other training to follow. The Legion fixed the age at 18. This Brownson amendment, as I understand it, requires 3 years' service in an organized unit, either National Guard or Reserve, which may be well and good. As far as expense is concerned, there will be very little difference between this and any of the propositions that have been made, because you are going to have the question of transportation to and from camp, no matter where these men are trained, if it is in a camp.

There is going to be cost in this program or any program of preparedness this Nation puts into effect, and what it is going to cost, nobody at this time can possibly tell you.

As far as having to put a lot of advance training equipment into your schools is concerned, I doubt that that is involved in the program offered by the gentleman from Indiana, because all he is now talking about is purely basic, fundamental training. There is nothing in his proposal about advanced courses in schools, nothing about advanced training in the technique of maintaining and operating technological and electronic equipment other than in the 3 years' Reserve training. Even if the man is in training for 6 months, he is not going to get very far beyond that basic program so far as today's war is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana, more than others presented, closely parallels the program that has been advocated for over a quarter of a century by the American Legion, I shall vote for the substitute, despite the fact there are some differences.

Mr. Chairman, I was gratified to hear the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], offering the time limitation and the one barring training only while selective service was in effect. For, Mr. Chairman, what is needed now is training and service.

As of now we do not have camps or facilities needed for our present program of training and service under the draft act. Requests are presently pending for hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of troop housing and billions are requested for much needed equipment and clothing.

There is now a shortage of officer personnel for our training and service program, so acute that 6,000 more Army reserve officers face recall to service in the immediate future.

In the next year or so, over half of today's Army—700,000 will be discharged. They must be replaced, and most, if not all, will need training before service. Many of the Navy will have finished their 24 months' service soon. They, too, must be replaced.

Because of this administration's foreign policy and commitments we need soldiers for service now. They are needed in Korea; they are needed in Japan; they are needed in many far eastern spots; they are needed in Alaska; they are needed in Europe; they may be needed in the Middle East, and elsewhere. No one knows where or for how long. No one knows what some of the commitments are.

As long as these conditions of war and possible war exist, service and training are what the welfare and security of this Nation requires.

Mr. Chairman, you recall that we were told from the floor of the House of Representatives last year that our shortage of manpower was so great that to maintain our Armed Forces we had to drop the draft age to 18—it was dropped to 18½—that lower mental and physical requirements were needed to meet the demands. That manpower pool has not grown and will be hard pushed to get the hundreds of thousands of soldiers we are going to need in the immediate future.

We were told a year ago that there was not sufficient manpower for UMT and selective service to operate at the same time and that UMT would not go into operation simultaneously with selective service. Also, that it would not be put into effect until training and service under selective service were no longer needed. That statement was verified today by the amendments offered by the gentleman from Georgia, Chairman VINSON, himself.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment adopted today would eliminate an unbearable inequity. Now that young men will not be called for training only, when at the same time a much larger number, neighbors of the boy called for training only, are called upon to train for 6 months and go into active military service for at least 18 months and then be in the inactive reserve for 6 years. These latter men are tapped to fight and perhaps die for Uncle Sam. That was not fair.

When, and if, peace finally reigns, the Nation's needs will be different. Then the active military forces can be cut. Then, to avoid the necessity of recalling men who have put in time in active service in Korea, and perhaps World War II, it is our duty to prepare a reserve available for active service if another war threatens or comes upon us.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object to propound a parliamentary inquiry. Does the gentleman mean that if the Brownson amendment to the substitute which I have offered, or if either should be accepted by the House, it would not be open to amendment?

Mr. VINSON. I am speaking only about the amendments that are pending at this time.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, if either of the substitutes were accepted those would be subject to amendment later on?

Mr. VINSON. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is mistaken. They would not be subject to amendment after they are adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think there are enough Members to require the full half hour he has indicated. We all want to expedite consideration as much as we can and I do not want to shut anyone off. Maybe if he would survey the situation he could cut down a bit.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I see Members standing which would take up 25 minutes of the time. I renew my request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I will have to object unless I can get recognition.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I know a little something about UMT, because I can conservatively say that I have probably made more speeches in the State of Illinois in favor of UMT than any individual. I have followed this program for many years. I am very familiar with the work of the ROTC.

Back in 1927, one of the years that I had the honor of being the State Director of Americanism for the American Legion, Department of Illinois, I wrote letters to every high school and every university in the United States that had an ROTC program asking their opinion as to the value of ROTC training. Every answer was favorable. Everyone knows that the ROTC played a most important part in expanding our Army in World War II.

I am acquainted with all the arguments that have been presented in favor of not sending our boys into battle without being sufficiently prepared. During World War I a young man reported to me in the Argonne Forest, near Romagne, where our largest cemetery is located in Europe, within 3 weeks from the time he was drafted into the service. I am unalterably opposed to sending any boy into combat without proper training. Notwithstanding the reflections of those days in my mind, I want to concur with my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], when he said that the Brownson amendment more correctly approximates the UMT program that the American Legion has been advocating all down through the years than anything represented in the Vinson bill.

I do not believe the Congress should consider a national permanent conscription bill that gives the military control of our youth for 8 years. After all, a universal military training bill is a peacetime measure and, in my judgment, should be considered during times of peace. Not while we are at war and drafting boys into active service.

In order to bring about a complete regimentation or dictatorship of the people of a country two fundamental things must take place. First, those in power must obtain control over the monetary and fiscal policies of a country. I doubt if anyone would question the fact that the Truman administration has almost reached its objective under the first step. Secondly, those in power must gain control over the military. After observing what happened to Admiral Denfeld, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, and others who refused to buckle under the dictates of President Truman and his commissars in the State Department, I cannot help but fear what might happen if the Vinson bill should become law.

It is a well-known fact that many of our higher ranking officers in our armed services today are afraid to express their honest views regarding military strategy, in the event they should not coincide with the thinking of those in the White House and the State Department.

In conclusion, I wish to again emphasize that the Vinson bill, as reported to the House of Representatives, does not in any way approximate the universal military training program which the veterans' organizations of the United States have been sponsoring for years.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the bill has not been amended since the last time that motion was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The motion is out of order. There has been no change made in the bill since that motion was last made.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the committee has taken a week to debate this bill, and we have only 4 minutes each. In the 4 minutes that I have, I would like to say that none of us have a monopoly on military service. Quite a few Members of this body have served. I would like to remind my good friend that if the records were disclosed here today we would find many more of the German youth who were under UMT and lots more of the Japanese youths under UMT that are buried under their soils, than you will free-born American youth that were civilians and were killed over in Korea, Japan, the Pacific isles, and in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I am skeptical of the military. I am actually scared of them, and that is a broad statement coming from a volunteer Tennessean. But they have gotten such a hold on this country of ours that we are practically working for the military. I am afraid that some of these days we are going to be like the South American countries, with a military dictator. I am afraid that if we give them the UMT they want under the Vinson bill we will have a military dictatorship in this country, and that heaven forbid.

For that reason I am going to support the Brownson plan, which brings about as much training as the Vinson bill, but puts training where it belongs—in the schools and under civilian control. In that way we will not have to be afraid that the military will take over this great country of ours.

Once again I say I hope that every man will speak his own convictions. I do not want to see the military run this country. I want to see the average American citizen continue in control. By bringing about UMT under civilian control, with the military authorities backing us up, we will have a free America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, when things look a little bit better, when the world situation appears a little more calm, we are inclined to feel that the military is not necessary. We have to be afraid, it seems, before we do things in America at all. We were that way in 1917 and 1918. We were that way in 1939 and 1940 and 1941. We were that way in 1950 in the beginning of Korea. We have to be afraid before we really ever do anything. Then we rush into the job that has to be done. The result being waste and extravagance. It is inevitable. That is the thing we are hearing about today. So we get up on the floor when things appear reasonably calm and give support to the idea of censorship of the military and these forces which we think are necessary to make this country safe. I would like to remind you of the speech made by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] in furthering my substitute bill. I think my proposal will offer an adequate and a well-rounded military program. Remember that after 9 months of indoctrination into the military, along with educational benefits, there will be 3 months field training. Those boys who are not eligible for college work or desirous of it, will have an opportunity to receive vocational training in those schools, and under the jurisdiction of the schools. I think at the completion of that period of time we will have some results of which we can be justly proud. I do not offer this substitute as a subterfuge for anything. I have been sold on it, and have been campaigning for it since 1945. This is not a new idea, and that is why I did not go before the committee. I am fully convinced that it is a practical and workable system. Remember, in this bill, which I have presented, it is expressly provided that there shall be no Federal control over our institutions, and if they thought they were being controlled, they would not have to contract for the purpose intended. I can just imagine in my little town, as in the case of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], and in the case of many other Members, the military coming into a small community and trying to impose any sort of a system or authority upon them. I can imagine the dissension and probable community disruption which could result. I just do not think it is workable. I just do not think it is practical. I do not think they have a definite and certainly not a conclusive figure as to the cost. Whereas in the other operation, I think you can tell fairly well what the cost will be. At least as nearly as the committee can determine, what it will cost to train a boy under its bill. I think it is just as definite in the proposal which I have offered. I hope the Brownson substitute will be defeated, and that you will support the proposition which I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the outset as an educator, I have always favored the principle of approaching some type of military program. I would also like to pay tribute to this committee, who has done a good job in trying to arrive at something. I would especially like to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] for their approach to this educational program. Possibly I am as well qualified to pass on the status of what schools can do as any man in the House, having left the desk of superintendent of schools before coming to Congress. The school boards, which are elected by the people, and the superintendent, the principals, and the teachers who are also elected by the school board, and the officials who in turn elect them could have control of this program back home where the boys could still stay at home, go to their own churches, have their own community friends and the influences of people at home. Then we would have much better citizens in the future than under the proposed bill before the House.

The floor is not the place to write this bill. What we should do is send the Burleson bill and the Brownson bill back to the committee and correlate those programs with the bill already presented. Then possibly we shall have legislation that might mean something.

Let me say further at this time that the people back home would rather have the military sitting across the desk from the superintendent of schools than to send their boys to Army camps.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] is recognized.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, my inclination has been to support this bill as a means for assuring ready strength for any contingency. But as I have studied the hearings, analyzed the statements of proponents, and listened and reviewed the debate here, it is my conclusion that the case for UMT has not been made. I cannot convince myself, on the basis of all available information, that the National Service Training Act will provide what proponents claim. I cannot convince myself that the 6 months' training will, in truth, prepare boys for war.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that the plan proposed by the Commission is 20 or 30 years behind the times. This is the type of program that might possibly have warranted debate had not both the United States and Russia invented an atomic bomb. The billions of dollars invested in teaching recruits the fine art of close-order drill should instead be invested in science scholarships and technical training, and would thus contribute much more to the defense of the Nation. Universal military training reflects an unwillingness to face up to the problems of defense in an atomic age.

Mr. Chairman, even in its own objectives, the bill remains inadequate. The proposal's main purpose, as again and again defined by Chairman VINSON, is to establish a well-trained, qualified reserve force ready at all times for immediate call to active duty. Yet the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], the ranking Democratic member of the Armed Services Committee, during debate admitted that more than 6 months' refresher training was required to qualify men long trained in the National Guard before they could be used in World War II service. He said:

> The National Guard required 12 months' training before it was considered efficient and ready for major combat operations.

Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, told members of the Armed Services Committee that organized National Guard units have required as long as 18 months training and refresher duty prior to being qualified for battle.

How long, before they can qualify for active duty, will it then require to retrain young men who have, some years previously, been given only 6 months UMT training?

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that the Commission, beset by pressures from every side, has recommended a program overburdened with amendments, overextended in its responsibilities to train men in duties outside military duties and overrated in regard to its possible accomplishments.

Unfortunately, it is exceedingly difficult through a selective-service program to guarantee every able-bodied citizen an equal share of the defense burden. The perfect solution would provide that every boy in the Nation be given exactly an equal responsibility in any program for the Nation's defense. The UMT proposal attempts to do this, but in the process divides and redivides the responsibility to the point that all participants will serve so little that the Nation will never reach a state of preparedness. Millions will be slightly trained, partially equipped, limitedly available, and nominally qualified while the number of active, technically qualified, and trained troops making up the standing army will be reduced by almost 2,000,000. As the late Mr. Robert Patterson, former Secretary of the Army, as quoted in the New York Times, stated:

> UMT is of dubious value now. If put into operation it will not provide military strength but will actually reduce it by reason of the assignment of a large number of the professional military to handle the training program. The plan is also unfortunate in that it will inevitably lead to coddling, the exact opposite of what is needed.

What does the program actually provide?

Eighteen-year-old boys will be given 6 months—180 days—training in a selected branch of the service. This training will not be comparable to that given men serving in World War II because time must be taken to give extensive instruction in "character guidance" consisting of lectures on, first, sex education; second, responsibility; third, marriage and family life; fourth, religion; fifth, moral principle; and sixth, citizenship. These are not fields in which the military reflects its greatest knowledge.

As expressed by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins:

> It stands to reason though free and independent citizens make the best army, the army is not the best place to make free and independent citizens.

At the completion of this short-training period, the recruit will be assigned service in the Ready Reserve for a period of 7½ years during which time he must be prepared for recall at any moment. He must spend 1 night each week at an armory—either in his home town or some miles away—training in order to remain thoroughly qualified. The fact that he will be training with obsolete equipment, probably in the art of close-order drill rather than in today's technical-war sciences, must be recognized.

When members of the committee expressed a concern that local armories were neither available in sufficient number nor properly equipped to provide for this Ready Reserve, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Commandant of the Marine Corps, stated:

> I don't personally see how we can overcome that difficulty.

The reservist must also stand by for 15 days' active duty each year. At that time he will be directed to a ship or camp or flight squadron for service. This is not a new plan. National Guard units have always operated on such a schedule. But under UMT these recruits, with only 6 months actual training, will soon number so high that the personnel and facilities of the armed services will not be adequate for their training. In referring to the very limited trial run proposed by Chairman VINSON as a means by which UMT might be gotten underway, Admiral L. T. DuBose, Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel admitted:

> Even with this 14,000, were we to give every man 1 month at sea, it would take 10 destroyers full time to do it, sir, and when you get to 183,000 it is going to require a very large training squadron.

Mr. Chairman, if this is the case with the regular 6-month-training period, consider the obligation the Navy will have toward its Ready Reservists who will number 915,000 in a period of 5 years. To provide them each with 15 days' active sea duty would require—using the Admiral's own figures—a squadron of 327 destroyers, operating full time for this purpose alone.

The same relative condition exists in the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps. The Air Force cannot supply each armory with anything even closely similar to the technical electronics and ordnance equipment used in current warfare. Not only cost would block such a program, but the sheer impossibility of manufacturing sufficient radar sets,

bomb sights, radio equipment, and ordnance equipment for both the Reserve and Regular services is an equally apparent obstacle.

According to military authorities, it now requires 36 weeks—8 months—to train a man in the introductory basic course of electronics, and then it requires many, many more months before he can reach real technical qualification for genuine usefulness in the service. To remain qualified he must follow closely every new development in his field. The UMT recruit, with his short 6 months' general training and his inadequate Reserve training, will never be a fully qualified technician. He will thus be relegated forever to the role of "manpower": never really qualified, although compelled to serve.

Mr. Chairman, I can now understand the singular lack of enthusiasm reflected by some of the military leaders testifying in support of the bill. The program actually might be dangerous, for it leads people to believe that with it the Nation will stand prepared when actually the Nation, after expending vast sums of money, will be far less prepared than it is today. Never will so many be qualified to give so little at so great a cost.

In addition, the bill before us fails to meet other requirements basic to any armed services proposal. No provision will insure that segregation will not be condoned in the Reserve programs of the States of the South or in the National Guard programs of many of the States of the Union. We cannot again and again come before the bar of world opinion as sponsors of Jim Crow.

The Selective Service Act is far from perfect. Inequities have existed under the program. But with the Selective Service Act the Nation knows full well where it stands. We know exactly how many men are in training, how many men are available at any given time for training, how many technicians and technically qualified members of the armed services are on active duty and we have a reasonably good idea as to how able they are for they are on duty for 24 months—not 6. Some say this is a luxury which we can no longer afford. I maintain it is a necessity which we cannot afford to be without.

Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt but that the free and democratic nations of the world must continue to prepare their defenses against the militant expansionism of communism. The United States must be prepared adequately to meet and repel any military attack; we must be willing and determined to bear the financial and economic burden of such preparedness.

But the burden must be justified. Already thinking people are worried deeply over the rapid growth of military bureaucracy and are suspicious that militarism is gaining an ever more important position in our daily lives. I have voted for the extension of selective service and voted for appropriations required to finance the armed services program and I have supported the North Atlantic Pact and other programs designed to promote the collective security of free nations. But I cannot conscientiously support the UMT proposal because I believe it remains unjustified.

In opposing this bill it is my privilege and obligation to take my stand with such able and qualified men as the late Robert Patterson, with such military authorities as Maj. Gen. John S. Wood, with such fair and thoughtful journals as the Christian Science Monitor, with such educators as Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, with such writers as the New York Times' Hanson Baldwin, with nearly every major church, farm, and labor organization in this Nation, and with such groups as the NAACP which has protested against the bill or its provisions. I am forced to note that many of the organizations supporting the proposal do so with a marked lack of enthusiasm and with qualms and qualifications.

Mr. Chairman, to insure the protection of our Nation, to assist in maintaining the strength of the free countries of the world and because the freedom of our people must be guaranteed, I shall cast my vote in opposition to this proposal.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] made a very revealing statement while he was addressing the committee just a few minutes ago. I believe I can quote his exact words, or substantially so. I am sure he said:

> I have been opposed to UMT ever since I first heard of it, and I am for the Brownson substitute.

I believe those were his exact words.

I served as one of the tellers when we voted on the motion to strike out the enacting clause today before we ever reached the bill for consideration, amendment, or debate; and I have noticed quite a coincidence in the number of people who passed through the tellers voting to refuse to consider this proposal at all who have spoken in favor of one or the other or both of the substitutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. What greater substitute have we had than the one offered by the chairman of the committee? It was a complete departure from the bill with which we started.

Mr. KILDAY. It contains a limitation.

The point I make is that we have here today those who do not want any program of universal military training, who voted against considering it now, attempting to redraft the bill; that is the point I am making here at this time. As to the situation which may have existed in the Oklahoma National Guard, I think those who are familiar with this subject know that had there been a system of universal military training where men adequately trained had been channeled into the Guard Reserve they would have been in a state of readiness. I would like to inform my colleague from Texas as to what happened to the National Guard of Oklahoma and practically every other State. During the Eightieth Congress when we had under consideration a bill to extend the Selective Service Act, the then chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the other body who was opposed to universal military training, in an attempt to avoid it insisted on a provision in the bill—and the gentleman from Missouri sat on the conference committee with me when this transpired—insisted upon a provision in the bill under which those persons who enlisted in the National Guard or the Reserve by a certain date were exempt from draft under the Selective Training and Service Act. What happened? Instead of having trained units in our Reserve components they were filled up with men of no training of any kind, men who wanted to avoid the draft, if you please; and every National Guard unit in the United States found itself in that position. And until we reach the point where we are going to give these men training so they can take their place you are going to have to require a long period of training before you can use them.

I wish to propound this question: Are you going to feel content if you have a trained Reserve because some high-school boys have taken training while they were in high school or in college? Or are you going to feel content that you have men who have had basic military training and are ready to take to the field with a minimum of additional training or of refresher training?

Do not attempt to confuse the question of Texas A. & M. with what you are going to get out of the Brownson bill of high-school trainees or of junior or senior colleges. There are six military colleges in the United States, of which Texas A. & M. is one. There are six designated as military colleges. The training the boys get there is highly intensive; it is as intensive as it is at West Point or Annapolis. It is true that those land-grant colleges and others which are recognized as military colleges have turned out the finest military leaders we have ever had in the United States.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not also true that Texas A. & M. gives them academic training along with military training?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true, but let us face the issue, let us not try to get away from it by going off and voting for something like these two amendments that have been proposed here. If you are going to do that vote against the bill. Be frank and forthright about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] stated that if you are against the bill vote it down. That is the only courageous thing to do. Do not fool yourselves with any such proposition as these two substitutes.

For about several hours the Armed Services Committee listened to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana present his bill to the committee and we devoted three whole pages in our report

to explaining the facts about it. If you are against the bill do not fool yourself by saying: "I have adopted some program," the Burleson or this other proposition, because it will not work.

Just think. Would you in all seriousness turn the defense of your country over to boys from 14 to 18 years of age? Those are the ones who would be trained. That is exactly who would be trained and that is the reason the committee in its report was so apprehensive about this plan. We would be standing on a broken reed if we permitted the reserves of this country to be made up of immature boys from 14 to 18 years of age.

When they get into the Reserve, whether the Congress could order them to duty or not, what would you have? You would have boys serving in the Armed Forces who had barely reached 18 years of age.

We went into this matter carefully, and, as I stated, if you are against this bill do the courageous thing, stand up here and vote against it and offer no apologies to any man for having voted against it, but do not fool yourself on a proposition like this. It is deceptive; you will not get anything, you have deceived yourself, you have deceived your country, and you are subjecting boys 14 to 18 years of age to be placed in the Reserves and subject to call by the Congress itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON].

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. KILDAY and Mr. BROWNSON.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 133, noes 128.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] as amended by the Brownson amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. BURLESON and Mr. CLEMENTE.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 150, noes 145.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5904) to provide for the administration and discipline of the National Security Training Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 528, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 155, nays 235, answering "present" 2, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 16]

YEAS—155

Aandahl	Curtis, Nebr.	Mason
Adair	Dague	Meader
Allen, Calif.	Davis, Ga.	Miller, Md.
Allen, Ill.	Denny	Miller, Nebr.
Andersen, H. Carl	D'Ewart	Morris
	Dolliver	Mumma
Andresen, August H.	Dondero	Nelson
	Dorn	Norblad
Angell	Elston	O'Hara
Arends	Fenton	Phillips
Aspinall	Gavin	Poage
Ayres	George	Poulson
Bailey	Golden	Powell
Baker	Goodwin	Rankin
Barden	Graham	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Ky.	Granger	Reed, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Reed, N. Y.
Beamer	Gwinn	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Hagen	Rogers, Colo.
Bender	Halleck	Sadlak
Bennett, Mich.	Harden	St. George
Berry	Harrison, Wyo.	Schenck
Betts	Harvey	Schwabe
Bishop	Hill	Scrivner
Blackney	Hoeven	Scudder
Blatnik	Hoffman, Ill.	Secrest
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Shafer
Bosone	Holmes	Short
Bow	Hope	Simpson, Ill.
Bramblett	Horan	Simpson, Pa.
Bray	Hunter	Sittler
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	Smith, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	James	Springer
Brownson	Jenison	Taber
Budge	Jenkins	Tackett
Burdick	Jensen	Talle
Burleson	Jonas	Teague
Busbey	Judd	Thompson, Mich.
Bush	Kearns	
Butler	Kersten, Wis.	Vail
Carlyle	King, Pa.	Velde
Carrigg	Lantaff	Vursell
Chenoweth	LeCompte	Werdel
Chiperfield	Lovre	Wharton
Church	Lucas	Wheeler
Clevenger	McCulloch	Wier
Cole, Kans.	McDonough	Williams, Miss.
Corbett	McGregor	Williams, N. Y.
Cotton	McIntire	Withrow
Crawford	McMullen	Wolcott
Crumpacker	McVey	Wolverton
Cunningham	Marshall	Wood, Idaho
Curtis, Mo.	Martin, Mass.	

NAYS—235

Abbitt	Carnahan	Evins
Abernethy	Case	Fernandez
Addonizio	Celler	Fine
Albert	Chelf	Fisher
Allen, La.	Chudoff	Flood
Anderson, Calif.	Clemente	Forand
Andrews	Cole, N. Y.	Ford
Anfuso	Colmer	Forrester
Auchincloss	Cooley	Frazier
Bakewell	Cooper	Fugate
Baring	Cox	Furcolo
Barrett	Crosser	Gamble
Battle	Davis, Tenn.	Gary
Beckworth	Davis, Wis.	Gathings
Bennett, Fla.	Dawson	Gordon
Bentsen	Deane	Gore
Boggs, Del.	DeGraffenried	Granahan
Boggs, La.	Delaney	Grant
Bolling	Dempsey	Green
Bonner	Denton	Greenwood
Boykin	Devereux	Gregory
Brown, Ga.	Dollinger	Hale
Bryson	Donohue	Hall,
Buckley	Donovan	Edwin Arthur
Burnside	Doughton	Hall,
Burton	Doyle	Leonard W.
Byrnes	Durham	Hand
Camp	Eberharter	Hardy
Canfield	Elliott	Harris
Cannon	Engle	Harrison, Va.
Havenner	McGrath	Ribicoff
Hays, Ark.	McGuire	Richards
Hays, Ohio	McKinnon	Riehlman
Hébert	McMillan	Riley
Hedrick	Machrowicz	Rivers
Heffernan	Mack, Ill.	Roberts
Heller	Mack, Wash.	Robeson
Herter	Magee	Rodino
Heselton	Mansfield	Rogers, Fla.
Hillings	Martin, Iowa	Rogers, Mass.
Hinshaw	Merrow	Rogers, Tex.
Holifield	Miller, Calif.	Rooney
Howell	Miller, N. Y.	Roosevelt
Ikard	Mills	Ross
Irving	Mitchell	Sasscer
Jackson, Wash.	Morano	Saylor
Jarman	Morgan	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Javits	Morton	
Johnson	Moulder	Seely-Brown
Jones, Ala.	Multer	Shelley
Jones, Mo.	Murdock	Sieminski
Jones, Hamilton C.	Murphy	Smith, Miss.
	Murray, Tenn.	Smith, Va.
Jones, Woodrow W.	Nicholson	Spence
	Norrell	Stanley
Karsten, Mo.	O'Brien, Ill.	Steed
Kean	O'Brien, Mich.	Sutton
Kearney	O'Konski	Taylor
Keating	O'Neill	Thomas
Kee	Osmers	Thompson, Tex.
Kelley, Pa.	Ostertag	Thornberry
Kelly, N. Y.	O'Toole	Tollefson
Kennedy	Passman	Trimble
Keogh	Patman	Van Pelt
Kerr	Patten	Van Zandt
Kilburn	Patterson	Vinson
Kilday	Perkins	Vorys
King, Calif.	Philbin	Walter
Kirwan	Pickett	Watts
Klein	Polk	Welch
Kluczynski	Preston	Whitten
Lane	Price	Widnall
Lanham	Priest	Wigglesworth
Latham	Prouty	Willis
Lesinski	Rabaut	Wilson, Tex.
Lind	Rains	Winstead
Lyle	Ramsay	Wood, Ga.
McCarthy	Reams	Yates
McConnell	Redden	Yorty
McCormack	Rhodes	Zablocki

ANSWERING "PRESENT"—2

Coudert Sheehan

NOT VOTING—40

Armstrong	Garmatz	Sabath
Beall	Harrison, Nebr.	Scott, Hardie
Brooks	Hart	Sheppard
Buchanan	Herlong	Sikes
Buffett	Hess	Smith, Wis.
Chatham	Hull	Staggers
Combs	Larcade	Stigler
Dingell	Madden	Stockman
Eaton	Mahon	Weichel
Ellsworth	Morrison	Wickersham
Fallon	Murray, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Feighan	Potter	Woodruff
Fogarty	Radwan	
Fulton	Regan	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Regan against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. Larcade against.

Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Brooks against.

Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Armstrong for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Stockman for, with Mr. Morrison against.

Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Beall.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Mahon with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Stigler with Mr. Harrison of Nebraska.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. O'KONSKI, and Mr. FORD changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HARDIE SCOTT. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand the rules properly that since this amendment which was adopted in the committee, and which was a complete substitute for the bill which was before us, has now been defeated in the House and the next question is on the bill as originally introduced by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] without either the committee amendments as recommended, or the so-called Vinson amendments as adopted in the Committee of the Whole today?

The SPEAKER. The bill, as presented to the House, is before the House at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. And do I properly understand that a motion to recommit will be in order against that bill?

The SPEAKER. After the third reading.

Mr. HALLECK. And the motion to recommit would be against the bill as originally introduced without any amendments?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has already made the statement about the parliamentary situation. Of course, at the proper time, the Chair would always be glad to hear the gentleman from Indiana make a speech.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SHORT. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHORT moves to recommit the bill H. R. 5904 to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If this motion to recommit is voted down will the bill then be sent back to the Committee of the Whole for further consideration?

The SPEAKER. No; the question then will be on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do I understand that this vote occurs on the bill as it was introduced without committee amendments?

The SPEAKER. Not as introduced, but as reported to the House from the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do I understand, then, that the vote to follow will occur on the bill as reported to the House, including the committee amendment?

The SPEAKER. It does not have any committee amendments.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 162, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—236

Aandahl	Dondero	McConnell
Abbitt	Donohue	McCulloch
Abernethy	Dorn	McDonough
Adair	Doughton	McGregor
Albert	Elston	McGuire
Allen, Calif.	Fenton	McIntire
Allen, Ill.	Fernandez	McMillan
Andersen, H. Carl	Flood	McMullen
	Ford	McVey
Andresen, August H.	Forrester	Machrowicz
	Fugate	Madden
Angell	Furcolo	Mansfield
Arends	Gavin	Marshall
Aspinall	George	Martin, Mass.
Ayres	Golden	Mason
Bailey	Goodwin	Meader
Baker	Graham	Miller, Md.
Barden	Granahan	Miller, Nebr.
Barrett	Granger	Miller, N. Y.
Bates, Ky.	Green	Morgan
Bates, Mass.	Gross	Morris
Beamer	Gwinn	Moulder
Belcher	Hagen	Mumma
Bender	Hale	Murdock
Bennett, Mich.	Halleck	Nelson
Berry	Hand	Nicholson
Betts	Harden	O'Brien, Ill.
Bishop	Hardy	O'Hara
Blackney	Harrison, Va.	O'Konski
Blatnik	Harrison, Wyo.	O'Neill
Boggs, Del.	Harvey	Ostertag
Bolton	Hays, Ark.	Passman
Bow	Hays, Ohio	Perkins
Bramblett	Hedrick	Philbin
Bray	Herter	Phillips
Brehm	Hill	Poage
Brown, Ohio	Hillings	Poulson
Brownson	Hinshaw	Powell
Budge	Hoeven	Prouty
Burdick	Hoffman, Ill.	Rankin
Burton	Hoffman, Mich.	Redden
Busbey	Holmes	Reece, Tenn.
Bush	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Butler	Horan	Reed, N. Y.
Carlyle	Hunter	Rees, Kans.
Carrigg	Ikard	Rhodes
Chenoweth	Irving	Riehlman
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Robeson
Chudoff	James	Rogers, Colo.
Church	Javits	Rogers, Tex.
Clevenger	Jenison	Ross
Cole, Kans.	Jenkins	Sadlak
Colmer	Jensen	St. George
Cooley	Jonas	Saylor
Corbett	Jones, Mo.	Schenck
Cotton	Jones, Woodrow W.	Schwabe
Coudert		Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Crawford	Judd	
Crosser	Kearney	Scrivner
Crumpacker	Kearns	Scudder
Cunningham	Keating	Secrest
Curtis, Mo.	Kee	Shafer
Curtis, Nebr.	Kelley, Pa.	Shelley
Dague	Kerr	Sheehan
Davis, Ga.	King, Pa.	Short
Dempsey	Klein	Simpson, Ill.
Denny	Lane	Simpson, Pa.
Denton	Latham	Sittler
D'Ewart	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Dolliver	Lovre	Springer
Staggers	Van Pelt	Wigglesworth
Stanley	Van Zandt	Williams, Miss.
Steed	Velde	Williams, N. Y.
Sutton	Vorys	Wilson, Ind.
Taber	Vursell	Withrow
Tackett	Watts	Wolcott
Talle	Welch	Wolverton
Taylor	Werdel	Wood, Idaho
Thompson, Mich.	Wheeler	Yates
	Whitten	
Vail	Wier	

NAYS—162

Addonizio	Gary	Morton
Allen, La.	Gathings	Multer
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Murphy
Andrews	Gore	Murray, Tenn.
Anfuso	Grant	Norblad
Auchincloss	Greenwood	Norrell
Bakewell	Gregory	O'Brien, Mich.
Baring	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Osmers
Battle		O'Toole
Beckworth	Hall, Leonard W.	Patman
Bennett, Fla.		Patten
Bentsen	Harris	Patterson
Boggs, La.	Havenner	Pickett
Bolling	Hébert	Polk
Bonner	Heffernan	Preston
Bosone	Heller	Price
Boykin	Heselton	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Holifield	Rabaut
Bryson	Howell	Rains
Buckley	Jackson, Wash.	Ramsay
Burleson	Jarman	Reams
Burnside	Johnson	Ribicoff
Byrnes	Jones, Ala.	Richards
Camp	Jones, Hamilton C.	Riley
Canfield		Rivers
Cannon	Karsten, Mo.	Roberts
Carnahan	Kean	Rodino
Case	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Kennedy	Rogers, Mass.
Chelf	Keogh	Rooney
Clemente	Kersten, Wis.	Roosevelt
Cole, N. Y.	Kilburn	Sasscer
Cooper	Kilday	Seely-Brown
Cox	King, Calif.	Sieminski
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Sikes
Davis, Wis.	Kluczynski	Smith, Miss.
Dawson	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Deane	Lantaff	Spence
DeGraffenried	Lesinski	Stigler
Delaney	Lind	Teague
Devereux	Lucas	Thomas
Dingell	Lyle	Thompson, Tex.
Dollinger	McCarthy	Thornberry
Donovan	McCormack	Tollefson
Doyle	McGrath	Trimble
Durham	McKinnon	Vinson
Eberharter	Mack, Ill.	Walter
Elliott	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Engle	Magee	Widnall
Evins	Martin, Iowa	Willis
Fine	Merrow	Wilson, Tex.
Fisher	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
Forand	Mills	Wood, Ga.
Frazier	Mitchell	Yorty
Gamble	Morano	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—34

Armstrong	Fulton	Radwan
Beall	Garmatz	Regan
Brooks	Harrison, Nebr.	Sabath
Buchanan	Hart	Scott, Hardie
Buffett	Herlong	Sheppard
Chatham	Hess	Smith, Wis.
Combs	Hull	Stockman
Eaton	Larcade	Weichel
Ellsworth	Mahon	Wickersham
Fallon	Morrison	Woodruff
Feighan	Murray, Wis.	
Fogarty	Potter	

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

In answering a parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], the Chair was mistaken as to the import of the inquiry. The Chair thought the gentleman was asking whether, if the motion to recommit was voted down, we would then vote on the bill as amended by the Committee of the Whole. Of course, the Chair's answer was correct on that understanding, because the Burleson amendment took out all the amendments that were adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

However, the Chair should have gone one step further, if he had understood

the gentleman entirely, and said that the bill that would be voted on at that time was the bill as originally introduced and referred to the Committee on Armed Services without the amendments adopted by the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee of the Whole, because those amendments of the committee to the bill as originally introduced were not reported to the House by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

The Chair wanted to make that statement before the final vote was announced so that all Members could understand the exact situation and be allowed to change their votes if they so desired. The bill is now before the House as originally introduced.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Regan against.
Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. Chatham against.
Mr. Smith of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Larcade against.
Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Herlong against.
Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Brooks against.
Mr. Sabath for, with Mr. Fogarty against.
Mr. Wickersham for, with Mr. Morrison against.
Mr. Buffett for, with Mr. Mahon against.
Mr. Harrison of Nebraska for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Hess for, with Mr. Stockman against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Coombs with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. MILLER of New York changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CHELF changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, so that I may inquire as to the program for the rest of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my friend, the distinguished majority leader, what the program is?

Mr. McCORMACK. In answer to the inquiry of my distinguished friend, there is no further legislative program for the remainder of the week. All rules have been caught up with. If there is no objection, I will ask unanimous consent now that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday I shall ask unanimous consent, I think it is best to wait until Thursday, that when the House adjourns then it adjourn to meet on Monday next because there is no further legislative program for this week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that one of the appropriation bills is ready. I see the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations present.

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that there will be a bill for next week.

Mr. CANNON. We are reporting the deficiency appropriation bill for consideration next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Missouri states that the deficiency appropriation bill will be reported next week. Can he give us an idea of the day?

Mr. CANNON. On the day the gentleman considers most convenient.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is perfectly agreeable to me for any day next week—whichever is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Will Tuesday be all right?

Mr. CANNON. That will be all right with me.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, Mr. Speaker, without considering it as an announcement now of the program for next week, it will be my intention to put the deficiency appropriation on next Tuesday. Of course, there may be a further program announced for next week.

THE ALL-AMERICAN CANAL CONTRACT SIGNED

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, the board of directors of the Imperial irrigation district has just authorized President Evan T. Hewes to sign the supplemental All-American Canal contract.

This follows approval of the contract as to form by Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

This settles favorably the question whether the Imperial irrigation district shall operate the canal and build the Pilot Knob power plant, as the Boulder Canyon Project Act specifically authorized in 1928 and the district's government contract provided in 1932, or whether the Mexican Water Treaty required that contract to be broken. The supplemental contract signed today provides that the district shall operate the canal and build and operate the Pilot Knob power plant, subject to the control required by the Mexican Water Treaty. No water interest in any other State is affected at all.

This matter came to a head last year when I made a point of order on the House floor against an appropriation for operation of the canal by the Reclamation Bureau. The appropriation was deleted. I said then that the proposal of the district for this contract made in 1947 and accepted then in principle by the State Department, ought to be accepted by the Interior Department.

I wish to congratulate President Evan T. Hewes, of the Imperial irrigation district, and M. J. Dowd, the district consulting engineer, on this result, assisted by Northcutt Ely, their counsel. I want to commend Secretary Chapman, former Assistant Secretary William E. Warne, Acting Commissioner Goodrich W. Lineweaver, and their attorneys and engineers, on their good judgment in working out this solution for a matter that otherwise was certainly headed for litigation.

UMT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I hope that if another UMT is reported to the House, it will include a provision to limit the time it will be in effect and to prevent men from being trained under the program while men are still being drafted.

These amendments are essential to the satisfactory working of the legislation.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House on Wednesday and Thursday for 15 minutes each day, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

PRIVATE CALENDAR—H. R. 6414

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of Alexander Newman was stricken from the calendar today upon objection of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. D'EWART] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. Both gentleman have authorized me to say that they do not object, nor do the committee of objectors on the majority side object to the restoration of the bill (H. R. 6414) to the Private Calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that it be so restored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM C. REED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2858) for the relief of William C. Reed, with a Senate amendment and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,710.20" and insert: "$4,810.20."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM P. NOVOTNY ET AL.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2212) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "the" where it occurs the second time and insert "a."

Page 1 line 4, strike out "for the Southern District of New York."

Page 2, line 9, strike out all after "That" down to and including "act" in line 11 and insert "this suit is instituted in the United States district court for the district wherein the plaintiffs are resident or wherein the act complained of occurred."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act conferring jurisdiction upon a United States district court to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT E. VIGUS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3219) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus, with Senate amendments and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That for the purposes of the administration of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 751), as amended, Robert E. Vigus, of Wichita Falls, Tex., shall be held and considered to have been an employee of the United States on the 2d day of June 1950 within the meaning of section 40 of that act.

"SEC. 2. Claim for compensation under this act may be filed any time within 1 year after date of enactment of this act."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARGUERITE A. BRUMELL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4645) for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LANE, FINE, and MILLER of New York.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order of 60 minutes today, in which to pay tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski. Instead of taking the time I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and that all Members who wish to join in paying tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, on this the two hundred and fourth anniversary of his birth, may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE BIRTH OF CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the 4th of March is to all Americans of Polish descent a day sacred to the memory of Casimir Pulaski. Today marks the two hundred and fourth anniversary of his birth. In a short life of but 31 years, Gen. Casimir Pulaski attained the stature of a hero and, when he died, far from the land of his birth, he left behind a reputation as one of the greatest patriots of his time and a tradition of courage which is an inspiration to this very day.

The people of this great Nation owe a profound debt of gratitude to the distinguished son of Poland who gave his life in defense of the principles which the founding fathers wrote into our Constitution and Bill of Rights. When, at the suggestion of Benjamin Franklin, General Pulaski offered his services in the cause of our liberty, his offer was made not to a great and powerful Nation from whose leaders he might expect to receive power and recognition in return for his generosity, but to a small and struggling Nation as yet without recognition among the powerful nations of the world.

Casimir Pulaski's contribution to the cause of our liberty in the year 1777 came at a time when the morale of our straggling military forces was at a low ebb. In their depleted ranks they were fighting against great odds. He came to our support with valuable experience gained in the fight for freedom in his own gallant little nation. The commander of the celebrated Pulaski Legion was a veteran at the age of 24 years, and he was able to deal our enemy many telling blows. His discovery of the enemy army when Washington and Hamilton were halted at Warren Tavern in Pennsylvania resulted in saving Washington's Army from almost inevitable destruction.

Well-born of a long line of distinguished forebears, the handsome and dashing Pulaski was a source of inspiration to the colonists. His ability, determination, and firmness of character provided for them a spiritual beacon and the extensive material aid which he was willing and able to contribute helped immeasurably in the cause of independence.

The name of this noble Pole has been honored throughout the world. Following his death, splendid funeral honors were accorded him and a tribute of respect was offered to his memory by Congress. In the Capital City of Washington an equestrian statue, erected many years ago, stands between Thirteenth and Fourteenth Streets on Pennsylvania Avenue. These tributes have already manifested the gratitude of our Nation. We count it an honor to pause in the midst of our labors to record once again our appreciation of the gallant son of Poland, who served the cause of America with such zeal, ardor, and fidelity.

GEN. CASIMIR PULASKI

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, today, Americans all over the country join their fellow citizens of Polish descent, in paying tribute to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, whose name became a symbol of the deeply rooted ties which unite the American and the Polish people. Today, we pause during these brief moments to do honor to a valiant gentleman, a hero of another day, Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski. It is indeed fitting that we should dwell upon the illustrious deeds of this patriot of two worlds.

Each year this celebrated Chamber resounds with the expression of a people full of gratitude remembering the formative years of an infant republic and paying the profoundest tribute to a man who espoused a cause for which he paid the last and highest price. We have heard recounted again and again the story of his brief, but active life devoted exclusively to the cause of his native land, Poland, and to the independence of our Nation.

March 4 marks the anniversary of the birth of Casimir Pulaski, born of nobility and who sacrificed his honor, his fortune, and his life for the cause of American freedom. His sacrifice was complete. He gave unstintingly of time, of heart, and of devotion to principle.

When our young Nation was struggling to gain independence, engaged in the task of ridding its shores of an oppressor, it found in Pulaski a passionate supporter of its aspirations and a zealous warrior for its liberty. He came offering all, asking for nothing in return.

The summer of 1777 found him a volunteer in the American Army, winning the commendation of the Commander in Chief for his military skill and his gallant conduct. His heroism, his earnest effort, and his constant desire to see the fortunes of a new nation unfold and gather strength for the future; his love of freedom was equally intense and steadfast in the land of his adoption; and the battlefields of America witnessed no lessening of his intrepidity.

Congress commissioned him brigadier general in command of cavalry, and he accomplished much to bring distinction to this branch of service. An experienced officer and a daring horseman, he was the first to hold this rank in the American Cavalry.

Every engagement saw him with that impatient zest for action and every minute that was not given to the cause of liberty irked him.

Came his final day of action at Savannah, and he was then but 32. He found his resting place in a land for whose freedom he fought, but never was to see glorified and great.

To the day of his death, General Pulaski hoped the opportunity would arrive when his hand would strike the blow for the resurrection of his beloved Poland. His expatriation was a bitter experience to him, and it was only the utter futility of resistance in a Poland torn by the vicious enemies along her borders which prompted this course for him.

Were he among the living today, General Pulaski would be welcomed by the ever-mounting number of oppressed peoples who are being shorn of their privileges of liberty. He would be accepted as a leader in a righteous fight against all despots who would deny that freedom is the universal property and the fundamental need of man.

Those who cry out from the deepening dark where the light of liberty is all but extinguished would find in Pulaski a resolute and stalwart champion unflinchingly standing his ground in the fact of the engulfing monster we know as communism.

What a fierce and uncompromising opponent for the ruthless horde from Moscow. What a bulwark against the threats of the would-be world masters who are even at this moment engaged in their diabolical game of herding free peoples into one camp under one whip.

Today is only the past brought up-to-date. It is the same story and the characters new, but no less vicious. In the time of Pulaski it was Catherine II and the victim Poland. This land whose people long oppressed knew little freedom is again the stage where is played the all-too-realistic drama involving the battle of right and wrong.

In that day Poland was the vanguard of civilization and time and time again repulsed the onslaughts directed against Europe.

Today, whether we realize it or not, the United States of America has inherited the unenviable position of standing guard over the destinies of all freedom-loving nations.

What has happened to Poland can also be the fate of America. We must ever be reminded to remain alert. We must never permit the complacent feeling that it cannot happen to us.

History and the exploits of such martyrs of freedom as General Pulaski should serve as beacons for our guidance with the issues of the future.

In paying homage to the memory of Pulaski, who gave his all for this country at the Battle of Savannah, Ga., on October 11, 1779, I should like at this time to pay tribute to one of our current Pulaskis, namely, Sgt. Leon Sarnowski, Jr., of New Britain, Conn., and other American members of a flying fortress who were shot down during a bombing mission over Germany in April 1944.

The remains of Sergeant Sarnowski and those of 12 airmen were interred at a mass burial in the Arlington Memorial Cemetery on February 27, 1952, at which I was present. Just as Pulaski made the supreme sacrifice in the late 1700's, these noble heroes gave their lives for our country in one of the most critical periods of modern-day history. World War II, the greatest in history—brutal, savage, and worse than any war that one could read of in the Dark Ages. Freedom of liberty-loving people everywhere was threatened by the domination of the dictators. Men and women of the United States were called into the Armed Forces to serve in the uttermost parts of the earth, on the sea, under the sea, on land, and in the air.

When our large Army, Navy, and Air Force went into action on many fields of battle, victory came. These victories, magnificent and glorious as they are, were not won without loss of many lives. Even today Korean casualty lists are seen by each Member. These lives that are lost, and the sacrifices that are made, cannot but leave scars upon the mind of each of us. Mindful of the sacrifice of Sergeant Sarnowski and these 12 airmen upon the Nation's altar, I hope and pray that a just and lasting peace may be brought about so that they may not have fought for a lost cause. We highly appreciate the services these men rendered our country and the great sacrifice Pulaski made in our cause. It is hoped that year after year as the Representatives of Congress gather here to memorialize the greatness of Pulaski and bear testimony to a Nation's appreciation, that we dedicate ourselves to the preservation of the freedom for which he fought and died. We are indebted to Pulaski, and we can help repay this debt by helping his native Poland in her desperation today. May the name of Gen. Casimir Pulaski inspire this Nation to positive action in liberating the Poland that Pulaski loved and is now under the Russian yoke.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NEONAZISM IN WESTERN GERMANY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain letters and documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, deeply concerned over the reports that have been coming out of Europe relative to the emergence of neonazism in Western Germany, I wrote both the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, and the High Commissioner of Western Germany, Hon. John J. McCloy, on February 6, asking them for information on this gravely important matter. I include my letters herewith:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1952.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The people in my district are deeply disturbed over the increasing rumor which, in many instances, reaches the point of information that there is an upsurge of neonazism in Germany. I have, therefore, written to Mr. McCloy, High Commissioner in Germany, per the enclosed copy.

I am exceedingly anxious to know what the Department here in Washington has relative to these matters. I shall deeply appreciate it if you would have me fully informed. No one is more conscious than I of the significance and importance of the integration of Western Germany into our Atlantic community defenses. It seems to me, therefore, particularly important that no situation or occasion arise under which that policy would be jeopardized. Even more than this, I would consider a serious revival of nazism in Germany as an unthinkable defeat of all that we Americans hold dear. It would set at naught all the sacrifices made during the past war by so many for the survival of freedom.

Trusting I may have an early reply, and always with best wishes to you, I am

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. MCCLOY,
United States High Commissioner
for Germany,
Frankfort on the Main,
Germany.

MY DEAR MR. MCCLOY: Prior to my recent trip to France, my office received inquiries concerning what is described as the reemergence of the Nazis in social and political life in Western Germany. I am writing you, confident in the knowledge that you share, as I do, the widespread and popular reluctance here at home that any such development should occur.

First, let me inquire as to what is described as a new Nazi Party, the Socialist Reich Party. My information is that in one state alone, Lower Saxony, this party polled 367,000 votes in May of last year—11 percent of the total vote. I am eager to know how your office regards this party, whether it is actually a neo-Nazi party and whether you regard its development as a threat of any consequence to the present Bonn Government and to the policies which that government has been following.

Second, in a dispatch from Germany, New York Times, October 17, 1951, Mr. Drew Middleton states that Chancellor Adenauer admitted that of the 383 high ranking members of the West German Foreign Office, 134 were former Nazis and 130 of them had served in the foreign office under the Nazis. Is this information, as reported by Mr. Drew Middleton, accurate?

Third, if such information on former Nazi Party affiliations is available for the employees of other departments of the Bonn Government, I would be grateful to receive it.

Fourth, the allegation has been made that encouragement to antidemocratic developments in Western Germany has resulted from various acts of clemency to convicted Nazi war criminals by the occupation authorities. I would like to request as thorough and complete answers to the questions listed below as is possible.

(a) Step-by-step, chronological history of the occupation policy toward members of the Nazi Party and toward convicted Nazi war criminals.

(b) Step-by-step, chronological history of all acts of clemency to convicted Nazi war criminals and commutation of sentences imposed by Allied courts, whether such clemency and commutation was extended by German courts or by occupation authorities.

(c) Step-by-step, chronological history of the imposition of restrictions on public activities by, and official employment of, former Nazi officials and, step-by-step, chronological

history of the lifting of such restrictions by the occupation authorities or by the Bonn Government.

(d) When and by whom was permission granted to former Nazis to reenter government service.

(e) How many classified Nazis are now in the teaching profession, in the judiciary, in the federal and provincial police forces.

Trusting that this is not a too formidable request, and anticipating an early reply, I am, with kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES P. BOLTON,
Member of Congress.

As if in answer, the High Commissioner's office has just released its ninth quarterly report on the work of his office in Western Germany. It warns us of the potential danger in a Western Germany in which Nazism is being allowed to thrive again. I herewith include certain relevant sections of the ninth quarterly report as part of my remarks:

EXCERPTS FROM THE NINTH QUARTERLY REPORT ON GERMANY FROM THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR GERMANY, DATED OCTOBER 1–DECEMBER 31, 1951

(Pp. 45–47)

With Western Germany's swift economic recovery after mid-1948, with the progressive lifting of Allied controls, and with the establishment of the Federal Republic, a situation was created which promoted the revival of national consciousness and an opportunity for freer political activity. These positive results were accompanied by the emergency of an increased number of extreme rightist and ultranationalist organizations.[1] Among these were the German Reich Party (Deutsche Reichspartei), the German Rightist Party (Deutsche Rechtspartei), the National Rightists (Nationale Rechte), the Socialist Reich Party (Sozialistische Reichspartei—SRP), the German bloc (Deutscher block—DB), the Bavarian branch of the German Association (Deutsche Gemeinschaft), and many others. These parties do not differ materially in their beliefs, although there may be a few variations over the role of capitalism and a few differences in other matters. Basically, however, they are in accord in their proclivity for fascism, their theories about a governing elite, their use of mysticism, their contempt for democracy, their preoccupation with war-guilt theories, and their desire for Germany to play the role of a bystander in the East-West struggle, doing nothing to help defend herself from the menace of another totalitarianism. There is no doubt that their ultimate aim is to discredit and destroy parliamentary democracy in Germany. They invent scandals and rumors about the democratic parties and parliamentary leaders, and dub anyone who opposed Hitler a traitor. They vilify the Allies and seek to distort Allied policy and the genuine desire of the Western Powers to bring Germany back into the community of nations as a democratic partner.

Within the past year the SRP—the Socialist Reich Party—has emerged as the strongest of these wayward groups. Having garnered 11 percent of the total vote in the state election in Lower Saxony on May 6, 1951, the SRP has become the No. 1 extremist party in Germany and the one chiefly deserving of consideration. No one seriously denies that the SRP has Nazi characteristics; at times its espousal of totalitarian ideas has been quite open and at other times only thinly veiled. SRP leaders have a Nazi past: the chief of the party, Dr. Fritz Dorls, was a Nazi Party member from 1929, and the second in command, Otto Ernst Remer, was partially responsible for the foiling of the anti-Hitler plot of July 20, 1944. Early in 1951 the Federal Ministry of the Interior recommended that the Interior Ministry of Lower Saxony take measures against the SRP because of highly provocative statements made by Remer and by former Reich Labor Service Leader von Bathmer. Lower Saxony did not comply with this recommendation on the grounds of constitutional difficulties arising from article 21, section 2, of the basic law. The Lower Saxony government later prohibited public speeches by SRP speakers, but this ban was not effective since the SRP men merely declared meetings to be private gatherings to which this ruling would not apply. On other occasions the SRP speaker appeared before his audience and put a finger across his mouth, thus indicating that he was not permitted to talk. This gesture often provoked sympathetic laughter from the assembled enthusiasts.

In May 1951 the Federal Cabinet took a firm stand against the SRP by ordering the dissolution of the Reichsfront, an SRP affiliated organization that had functioned as a Partei Ordnungsdienst (maintenance of party order). The Reichsfront was a replica of the old SA of the Hitler days.

Following a Cabinet session on November 17, 1951, the Federal Government presented formal charges to the constitutional court in an effort to have the party declared unconstitutional. The official charges, as summarized by Federal Minister of Interior Dr. Robert Lehr, are as follows:

1. The SRP has proved itself to be a successor organization of the NSDAP by the SRP's origin, its leaders, its internal organization, its program, its propaganda, and the conduct of its followers. One of the party's leading speakers has declared that the SRP was of the same blood group as the NSDAP.

2. According to its character as the successor organization of the NSDAP, its purposes, and the conduct of its followers, the SRP aims to impair the liberal democratic system of the Federal Republic.

(a) The SRP objects to the basic political laws of the Federal Republic and acknowledges the government of Admiral Karl Doenitz.

(b) The activities of the democratic parties are systematically defamed. Rumors are spread that the democratic parties originally obtained their licenses only through the denunciation of former Nazi Party members.

(c) The democratic deputies of the lower house, the Federal Government, and other democratic politicians are accused of treason. It is said that they have no sense of honor and they are characterized as political frauds.

3. A political legend has been invented and circulated in connection with the events of July 20, 1944.

4. Everyone who has negotiated with the Allies has been warned that he may have to face future court action.

5. On the other hand, legal or constitutional measures taken against excesses of SRP activities are described as terrorism, which must be answered with terror.

6. The entire political situation of the Federal Republic has suffered a severe setback through the behavior of the SRP. Wide circles of the German population are profoundly alarmed at the appearance of a political party with such authoritarian character, while in foreign countries confidence in the steady democratic development of the German people has suffered a heavy blow. The whole situation forces the Federal Government to take constitutional steps against the SRP.

(Pp. 48–49)

Another current in German nationalism that needs careful watching by the responsible authorities has been obvious in the development of German veterans' organizations during the past few months. Veterans' societies have expanded both their membership and their aims during 1951, and have attempted to form a unified front. Recently, certain incidents have created a near crisis in the movement.

The largest veterans' association to develop was the Association of Former Soldiers Entitled to Pensions (Bund der versorgungsberechtigten Wehrmachtsangehorigen — BVW) with something less than 100,000 members. This association, like most of the others, was originally founded to lobby for pensions and other benefits for former professional soldiers as well as widows and orphans of the ex-military. The BVW has chapters in most of the states of the Republic. About the same time, another veterans' organization developed, the Protective Association of German Soldiers (Schutzbund Deutscher Soldaten—BDS), primarily in Bavaria where it has perhaps 10,000 members. The BDS has been generally composed of younger professionals and was the first veterans' group to champion the cause of the Waffen-SS.

Representatives of the BVW and the BDS, together with leaders of several regimental and divisional associations, finally established the Association of German Soldiers (Verband Deutscher Soldaten—VDS) on September 8, 1951, in an effort to create a unified veterans' movement.

During 1951, the veterans' organizations, whose original pension claims have been partially satisfied, turned their attention more toward political and military policies. Veterans' leaders have made a series of demands of a nationalist character as a condition for support of a German contribution to European defense. Among these were rehabilitation of the honor of the German soldier, release of German war criminals in Allied custody, and military and political equality of Germany with other nations. The highest officials of the Federal Government, as well as Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, have indicated that the only dishonor which exists is that which individuals, by their own actions, brought upon themselves. Despite these assurances, there are some speakers who are still dissatisfied and evidently feel that in this matter, so fraught with emotion, further assurances are required.

Men who have been at the top of the former military hierarchy took positions of leadership in the veterans' movement. A general with the prestige of his former rank was expected to attract men to the organization and to supervise the organizational activities of members and to represent the association. The highest ranking officers of the former German Wehrmacht felt it their duty to assume leadership of veterans' societies practically at all levels. The temporary governing board of the VDS, for example, which was constituted on September 8, consisted of 27 members, of whom 15 had held the rank of general officer. Moreover, it is reported that the 12 nongenerals on the board were strongly influenced by the views and opinions of their former superiors in rank.

Although these ranking leaders profess to speak for all former German soldiers, it is obvious that they represent only the professionals and that the great mass of the citizen soldiers has not found the present veterans' societies very attractive.

(Pp. 50–51)

The nationalist danger in Germany, then, can be summarized briefly as follows: The forces of the radical right have slowly increased as national consciousness has grown among the population. The extremists, who vary little in belief or technique, are still disunited, although the SRP has emerged as a potential rallying point and as the only body of any substantial potency. Ultranationalist strength has been somewhat enhanced by some extremist leaders in vet-

[1] See The Radical Right, Seventh Quarterly Report, p. 30 ff.

erans' organizations. Some of these elements are so embittered and so imbued with the desire to justify every action of the past that they tend to lend aid and comfort to the radical cause. The danger on the extreme right is not of a critical nature and—at least in the form of the SRP—does not constitute an immediate threat to the Federal Republic, but there is a potential danger whose nature and importance warrant continued vigilance by all who value democratic principles. The SRP organizational nuclei, which are dotted all over the country, might at a later date expand and grow, should the political climate become suitable for their development.

Unhappily, most of the established political parties have also been stocking the merchandise of nationalism. Individuals or circles, and in a few cases even the controlling elements of an entire state political organization, have expressed highly nationalistic sentiments, either out of conviction or as a vote-getting device. Even some federal ministers have not been above such actions. They seek to draw the followers of the extreme rightist forces, or to prevent losses of their own, by attempting to appear as nationalistic as the extremists. While this technique is understandable, it should be clear by now that in the long run it constitutes no solution, since in the course of time the pandering to extreme nationalism becomes a vicious circle. The use of the extreme nationalist narcotic creates the need for larger doses. Worse, the users must ultimately find that they cannot subsist on talk alone but must resort to some action to avoid decline. The consequence of such a course, if long continued, must be general disaster.

The true antidote to a parochial nationalism is a saner perspective which envisages Germany's proper position and role in Europe. There is abundant evidence that a majority of the German people are not likely again to be beguiled by a reactionary philosophy which exalts the State above all. They recognize that there is an honorable place for the new Germany among the nations and full outlet for its national energies in the creation of a European community. They realize that the new nationalism must reject completely the discredited Nazi past and build toward a future in which Germans, together with other free peoples, may hope to satisfy their legitimate national aspirations in equal, cooperative fellowship.

Mr. Speaker, I should be untrue to my own innermost feelings if I did not voice to you and to my fellow Members here in the House the anxiety that I feel for the success of our European policies in the light of developments in Western Germany.

I am convinced that the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House should institute immediately a review of these Western Germany developments. I am, therefore, introducing a resolution to this end, the text of which reads as follows:

Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate and study the resurgence of Nazism in Western Germany

Whereas the potential resurgence of Nazism in Western Germany, described in the ninth quarterly report of the High Commissioner's Office, is a matter of profound concern; and

Whereas a Nazi Western Germany would unquestionably endanger for a third time the future of Europe, and so of the world: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct an immediate and comprehensive review of the course of events in Western Germany in order to determine the steps which must be taken to forestall the growth and spread of neonazism in Western Germany.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) not later than July 30, 1952, the results of its review, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution, the committee or subcommittee is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PRICE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania in two instances.

Mr. MCMULLEN and to include a letter from a constituent, J. E. "Doc" Webb, of St. Petersburg, Fla.

Mr. KLEIN in four instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER and to include a copy of a bill.

Mr. DOLLINGER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GREEN and to include an article from the magazine America.

Mr. MURPHY (at the request of Mr. ANFUSO) in two instances.

Mr. SIKES and to include a speech on chemical warfare which is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $196.

Mr. RODINO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. WITHROW) in two instances and to include several letters and other data.

Mr. HESS and to include a resolution.

Mr. JONAS and to include an editorial.

Mr. BEAMER and to include a broadcast of March 3 by himself.

Mr. GROSS and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. KING of Pennsylvania and to include an editorial from the March 8 issue of Collier's magazine.

Mr. D'EWART and to include a quotation.

Mr. JOHNSON and to include an editorial.

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include excerpts from weekly news letters he has issued.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include an article from the New York Times in reference to conditions in hospitals and public-health organizations.

Mr. BENDER in three instances.

Mr. SHEEHAN.

Mr. JACKSON of California in two instances and to include a newspaper article and a speech.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include two resolutions and an editorial.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois and to include an editorial from the Quincy (Ill.) Herald Whig.

Mr. DAWSON and to include a speech.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include a recent radio address by Secretary of State Acheson.

Mr. RAINS and to include an address made by Hon. James J. Mayfield.

Mr. SHELLEY and to include three statements by William Green.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BEALL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. SHAFER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD and to include a statement.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOOD in two instances.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

Mr. HAGEN in four instances, in each to include newspaper articles and other extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in four instances, and to include miscellaneous material in each case.

Mr. ELLIOTT in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS to revise and extend remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and to include certain letters which are extraneous material, and also to extend his remarks in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder;

S. 1710. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain right-of-way easements in De Kalb and Putman Counties, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee;

S. 2078. An act to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes;

S. 2394. An act to repeal the 10 percent surcharge on postal cards; and

S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 5, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

MARCH 1, 1952.

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

I, S. B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the Eighty-second Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948: ROBERT TRIPP ROSS, Fifth District, New York.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1217. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce on the activities and transactions of the Administration under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1, 1951, through December 31, 1951, pursuant to section 13 of that act; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1218. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes,'" approved July 11, 1940; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 6885. A bill to assist the large cities of the United States in establishing and maintaining more adequate systems for the provision of efficient ambulance service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6886. A bill to indemnify drivers of motor vehicles of the postal service against liability for damages arising out of the operation of such vehicles in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 6887. A bill to amend section 302 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 and section 2 of the act of February 19, 1943; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 6888. A bill to exempt certain parcels containing educational reading matter, articles, objects, and materials from the reduced size and weight limitations imposed by the act of October 24, 1951, on fourth-class (parcel post) mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 6889. A bill to raise income-tax exemptions from $600 to $800 on each dependent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 6890. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to transfer, without reimbursement, to the Department of the Army the Birmingham General Hospital, Van Nuys, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6891. A bill to provide for the acquisition, restoration, and maintenance of the burial ground of 256 Maryland heroes of the American Revolution and erection of a suitable memorial; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 6892. A bill to provide for an independent Consumers' Counsel to represent the consuming public before Government agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 6893. A bill to provide for a minimum price support for the 1952 crop of peanuts at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6894. A bill to increase the minimum level of price support for the 1952 cotton crop; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6895. A bill to provide readjustment benefits to certain persons who served in the Armed Forces on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to such date as shall be fixed by the President or the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. Res. 547. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate and study the resurgence of nazism in Western Germany; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Res. 548. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the operations and activities of the American Assembly and the National Manpower Council and of certain plans and proposals with respect to the utilization of manpower; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 549. Resolution to amend rules X and XI to change the name of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 550. Resolution providing for the election of the members of the Committee on Government Operations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 551. Resolution to amend House Resolution 124, Eighty-second Congress, providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a single purchasing and surplus property disposal department for the armed services and to provide that supervisory personnel employed by the Federal Government be not awarded extra compensation or additional rating principally by the reason of a large number of employees under supervision; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to place a ceiling on the Federal Government's power to impose taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6896. A bill for the relief of Matteo Crupi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 6897. A bill for the relief of Richard E. Rughaase; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6898. A bill for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6899. A bill for the relief of Benedetto Campo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 6900. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aikler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 6901. A bill for the relief of Henry Kraemer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 6902. A bill for the relief of Dr. Bryant David Virmani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 6903. A bill for the relief of Rose Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6904. A bill for the relief of Kiyoshi Nabeshima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 6905. A bill for the relief of Hidemi Nakano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

610. By Mr. LESINSKI: Petition of the president and trustees of the village of Trenton, Mich., urging the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway power project; to the Committee on Public Works.

611. Also, petition of the council of the city of Dearborn, Mich., urging the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway power project; to the Committee on Public Works.

612. By Mr. POTTER: Petition of Thirteenth District, Veterans of Foreign Wars meeting at Gaylord, Mich., praying for passage of H. R. 4947, pertaining to pensions for aged and disabled veterans of World Wars I and II, signed by district commander and district president of the ladies auxiliary and other members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

613. By the SPEAKER: Petition of parents' committee, Atlantic Highlands, N. J., relative to requesting an investigation of the dismissal of 90 West Point cadets; to the Committee on Armed Services.

614. Also, petition of Mr. L. E. Stark, city manager, Garland, Tex., relative to requesting passage of S. 940 or H. R. 4484, pertaining to lands beneath navigable waters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

615. Also, petition of Mr. I. C. Ellis, and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, early in the morning our song of faith shall rise to Thee. Grant us the vision splendid, that we may toil in these fields of time in the sense of the eternal.

In this national forum, with all its divergent human interests, we would rear an altar where a constant sense of eternal values may save us from spiritual decay, from moral cowardice, and from any betrayal of the highest public good. Only when our outlook is cleansed and corrected by far horizons can we see the transient in the light of the everlasting. And so like tillers of the soil who stand reverently, with bowed heads, listening to the music of holy bells, we, too, would be strengthened with might in the inner man. Send us forth with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world with a tranquillity that is strength and an inner candor which is the courage of the soul. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 4, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 5, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 529. An act for the relief of Humayag Dildilian and his daughter Lucy Dildilian; and

S. 1244. An act to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Territory of Alaska from certain restrictions upon the making of Federal contributions, and to amend the provisions thereof relating to the taking of oaths by certain civil defense personnel.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2858) for the relief of William C. Reed.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2212. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others; and

H. R. 3219. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Robert E. Vigus.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4645) for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. LANE, Mr. FINE, and Mr. MILLER of New York were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 836. An act for the relief of Harumi China Cairns;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Master Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

H. R. 3534. An act for the relief of Gabriella Rubido Zichy;

H. R. 3561. An act for the relief of Mary Osadchy;

H. R. 4067. An act for the relief of Samuel Thomas Wong;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak;

H. R. 4220. An act for the relief of Hazel Sau Fong Hee;

H. R. 4343. An act for the relief of Erika Bammes (Patricia Ann Cox);

H. R. 4397. An act for the relief of Minglan Hammerlind;

H. R. 4691. An act for the relief of Nagakubo (also known as Roy Mervin Nelson);

H. R. 4772. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris;

H. R. 4788. An act for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi;

H. R. 5187. An act for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence;

H. R. 5297. An act for the relief of John Michael Jurecek;

H. R. 5322. An act for the relief of Kazumi Yamashito;

H. R. 5437. An act for the relief of Motoko Sakurada;

H. R. 5460. An act for the relief of Hans Werner Brisco;

H. R. 5551. An act for the relief of Eugene Kline;

H. R. 5590. An act for the relief of Marc Stefen Alexenko;

H. R. 5665. An act for the relief of Rumi Takemura;

H. R. 5920. An act for the relief of Kimberly Ann Cibulski, also known as Belle Lee;

H. R. 5922. An act for the relief of Karin Riccardo;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman;

H. R. 5936. An act for the relief of Kunio Itoh;

H. R. 6012. An act for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner;

H. R. 6026. An act for the relief of Joseph Yukio;

H. R. 6055. An act for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour;

H. R. 6088. An act for the relief of Hisako Suzuki;

H. R. 6117. An act for the relief of Deliana Meulenkamp;

H. R. 6172. An act for the relief of Manami Tago;

H. R. 6264. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 6480. An act for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley; and

H. R. 6561. An act for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder;

H. R. 2212. An act conferring jurisdiction upon a United States district court to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others;

H. R. 2858. An act for the relief of William C. Reed; and

H. R. 3219. An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus.

PROPOSED VOCATIONAL TRAINING OF ADULTS—RECOMMENDATION BY INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 381)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, p. 1897.)

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HOEY, and by unanimous consent, the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations was authorized to meet this afternoon and other afternoons this week during the sessions of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter in the nature of a petition from Howard L. Minker, of Washington, D. C., praying for an amendment to the Constitution to relieve the distress of the people and the Nation, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPORT CONTROLS ON FATS AND OILS—RESOLUTION OF CALUMET COUNTY (WIS.) FARM BUREAU COOPERATIVE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, March 3, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee reported Senate bill 2104, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, relative to import controls on fats, oil, and related products. Thus, the Senate is once more confronted with the issue of whether the American market shall receive reasonable protection in relation to cheaply

produced foreign competitive dairy and other products.

I had previously spoken and voted in opposition to repeal of section 104, and of course, I shall continue in this position.

I now send to the desk a resolution which I have received from one of the farm bureau cooperatives in my State, that for Calumet County in this instance, conveying grassroots views of Wisconsin farmers on this issue. I ask unanimous consent that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD at this point together with a table as published in the February 1952 issue of the bulletin "The Cheese Trier," published by the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers Association, at Monroe, Wis. This table shows the tremendous share which Wisconsin dairying contributes to American dairying, as a whole, particularly in the production of foreign-type cheeses.

There being no objection, the resolution and table were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE CALUMET COUNTY FARM BUREAU COOPERATIVE, JANUARY 10, 1952

We, the Calumet County Farm Bureau Cooperative, acting in defense of the interests of dairy farmers protest the proposed repeal of section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended by the Defense Production Act amendments of 1951. The above section 104 provides for import controls on manufactured dairy products whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that such imports would "(a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program."

During 1951 the production of milk and manufactured dairy products in the United States was approximately in balance with domestic demand. The surplus created in World War II has disappeared partly by decreased production and partly through increased requirement due to population increase. Greater production may be needed in 1952 and the producers who have been forced to liquidate their herds should now be permitted to replace them. The tax cost of price support in 1951 was small. In 1952 it may be nil. We protest an action which will create a new domestic problem out of one which has been solved.

Section 104 is fair, flexible, and practical. It would admit the maximum of imports without destroying the domestic supply. The legislation should remain in full force and effect in the temporary Defense Production Act until it can be made a permanent part of some appropriate and continuing legislation.

O. H. LEVERENZ,
President.
ED. A. RUSCH,
Secretary, Route 1, Forest Junction, Wis.
ALLEN LEVERENZ,
Director.
EDMUND FEDERWITZ,
Director.
C. E. MOEHRKE,
Director.
WALTER MERBACH,
Director.
IRA LOEFER,
Director.
ROY WENZEL,
Director.

The table presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

Wisconsin's share of United States dairying, 1950

Product	Percent	Rank	Production
			Pounds
Munster cheese	91.5	1	9,655,000
Brick cheese	88.9	1	17,422,000
Malted milk powder	86.7	1	26,635,000
Limburger cheese	58.0	1	3,479,000
Swiss cheese	52.5	1	52,260,000
Italian cheese	50.7	1	31,334,000
American cheese	46.8	1	418,289,000
Powdered whey	39.4	1	60,523,000
Powdered whole milk	31.9	1	39,860,000
Powdered skim milk	29.2	1	262,070,000
Cream cheese	23.8	2	15,677,000
Evaporated whole milk	21.9	1	631,344,000
Condensed whole milk (sweetened)	17.1	1	17,249,000
Condensed skim milk (unsweetened)	14.1	1	74,028,000
Condensed skim milk (sweetened)	15.4	1	32,489,000
Butter	11.7	3	161,644,000
Condensed whole milk (unsweetened)	7.9	5	17,615,000
Ice cream (gallons)	2.9	11	16,145,000
Milk production	13.0	1	15,612,000,000

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (f), 302 (g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1255) thereon.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 5, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1411) to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

S. 2786. A bill to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. IVES, when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2787. A bill to provide for payment of overtime to postal employees during the month of December; and

S. 2788. A bill to amend section 1 (d) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for employees engaged in law enforcement work who because of disability or other reasons are unable to complete 20 years of service in such work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 2789. A bill to amend section 284 of title 18 of the United States Code so as further to prohibit former officers and employees of the United States from acting as counsel, attorney, or agent in matters connected with their former office or employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2790. A bill to provide for the abandonment of a certain part of the Federal project for the Broadkill River in Delaware; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2791. A bill to establish quotas on the importation of certain articles and products containing raw materials with respect to which priorities have been established, or allocations made, under the Defense Production Act of 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2792. A bill for the relief of Robert O. Overton, Marjorie C. Overton, and the legal guardian of Sally Eitel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2793. A bill for the relief of Esteban Boadilla Dalao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 106 (C) OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

In this connection, and at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement I have prepared concerning the bill, the text of an editorial appearing in the New York Times of March 4, and the text of a letter I have received from Harry Taylor, Director of the Office of Committee on Slum Clearance Plans of the City of New York, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, statement, editorial, and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2786) to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is hereby amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (6); by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(8) make advance or progress payments on account of any capital grant contracted to be made pursuant to this title, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, or any other provisions of this title."

The statement, editorial, and letter presented by Mr. IVES are as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES SENATOR IVES CONCERNING FEDERAL PROGRESS PAYMENTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, the Housing and Home Finance Agency is authorized to extend capital grants to local public agencies for urban redevelopment projects. These Federal capital grants, which may constitute as much as two-thirds of the net cost of the projects, constitute a principal source of funds with which a local public agency expects to repay amounts borrowed to finance the projects.

The present method of payment on a lump-sum basis after development is completed imposes undue burdens upon the local public agencies and results in unnecessary expenditures by the Federal Government and the local community. My amendment to the Housing Act of 1949 permitting capital

grants on a progress-payment basis, clarifies and eases the present situation.

A report by the staff of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in support of this change explains the current operations under the law as follows:

"If the local agency must await until every phase of a project is completed and the exact net project cost computed before receiving any capital grant under its Federal contract, the local agency will generally be prevented from paying back the borrowed funds until that time and, therefore, will have to pay accumulating interest and carrying charges for an extended period after a substantial portion of the project has been completed, for all practical purposes, and a portion of the Federal capital grant has been earned. The disposition of the land in the project, the settlement claims for demolition and site improvement work, and pending condemnation cases may extend this period for a considerable time.

"As a Federal capital grant is based on net project cost, any losses due to extended interest and carrying charges must be borne by the Federal Government as well as the community furnishing local grants-in-aid. To the extent that funds available for capital grants under title I are used to pay such losses, they are, of course, not available for other slum clearance, and urban redevelopment projects and the effectiveness of the title I program is reduced accordingly.

"Unless progress payments of Federal capital grants are authorized, a burden will result to some communities in addition to their share of extra project costs. These communities are furnishing financing for title I projects through municipal bond issues and are subject, in this regard, to statutory or constitutional debt limitations. The inability of the municipality or other local public agency to obtain any Federal capital grant for a project until its completion in all respects will delay the repayment of the municipality's outstanding slum-clearance obligations, which may be quite substantial in the aggregate. This extended depletion of the municipality's borrowing authority will prevent or seriously restrict the undertaking of title I programs in accordance with carefully worked out schedules the municipality would otherwise adopt.

"For these reasons we believe that title I of the Housing Act of 1949 should be amended to authorize partial payments of capital grants as they are earned by local agencies. Such payments would be analogous to partial payments customarily made under other types of contracts for work performed which are designed to relieve contractors from the costs and other burdens of having their credit resources tied up until all contractual obligations have been fulfilled.

"The nature of this proposed amendment has been discussed with representatives of the Housing and Home Finance Agency who have expressed general agreement with it. In this connection they point out that it will be necessary for the amendment to waive section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, which places general restrictions on progress payments by the United States."

The amendment permitting progress payments is important to all sections of the country. In New York City, the committee on slum clearance plans headed by Commissioner Robert Moses is doing admirable work in meeting the need for low-cost housing. The editorial from the New York Times which I have inserted in the RECORD discusses the slum-clearance plans of the committee.

Commissioner Moses and Mr. Harry Taylor, director of the office of committee on slum-clearance plans of the city of New York, have expressed their strongest support for this amendment. I have inserted in the RECORD a copy of Mr. Taylor's letter outlining their views.

I can foresee no objection to this technical amendment to the Housing Act of 1949, which benefits all sections of the country.

[From the New York Times of March 4, 1952]

MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

The first four housing projects—totaling in cost $83,992,000—proposed by Robert Moses' Committee on Slum Clearance Plans for construction by private capital with Federal and local aid have now been approved by the city planning commission. This is the first major step under a new program for the redevelopment of substandard housing areas to accommodate middle-income families at rentals within their income range.

As Planning Commission Chairman Bennett has pointed out, in interpreting his agency's action, the city will soon be in the business of seeking to improve the housing situation at two different economic levels. On the one level, public housing—financed exclusively by public funds—is clearing vast slum areas and erecting modern homes for lower-income groups. On the other level, private capital, with Federal, State, and local aid, will take over substandard housing and erect slightly more expensive housing for moderate-income families.

Under procedures set up in the National Housing Act the city will acquire sites needed here for the moderate-income families and sell the land to approved private builders for development by Mr. Moses' slum clearance committee. The Federal Government will reimburse the city for any loss it incurs in acquiring the sites. The public will watch with interest this new scheme for solving the housing problems of middle-income families.

OFFICE OF COMMITTEE ON
SLUM CLEARANCE PLANS,
New York, N. Y., February 29, 1952.

Hon. IRVING M. IVES,
The United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR IVES: It has come to my attention that you have been requested to enter in the Senate a technical amendment to title I of the National Housing Act of 1949 to clear up the question of the Federal Government making progress payments on capital grants during the construction of projects under this title. Thursday, I talked to Mr. Shugrue about this and he requested me, in the absence of Commissioner Moses, who heads this program in New York City, to write to you.

While this is in the nature of a technical amendment, it is nevertheless of tremendous importance to the city of New York and, for that matter, the rest of the country, particularly New York State. In New York State the municipalities have to work directly in organizing projects such as this as there is no redevelopment agency law, and in any event New York City would elect to do this. The importance comes in the fact that under our laws any money we borrow to progress projects of this nature is charged against our debt limit, even if borrowed from the Federal Government.

New York City over a period of years could be holding not only its own share of the cost of these projects against the debt limits, but also possibly as much as $40,000,000 of the Federal Government's share of the capital grant. As you know, under our present financial circumstances this would cause a serious delay in the progression of other vitally needed facilities such as schools and hospitals.

The technical amendment would merely make clear what we believe is already in the law: that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency could contract to make progress payments as the work and the city's commitments became actualities.

The Administrator thinks that this right under the present law is not clear and wishes to have it clarified by the above-mentioned amendment.

I am sure Commissioner Moses would greatly appreciate it if this matter could be advanced expeditiously through Congress with your sponsorship. So far as we know, there is no agency or official, local or Federal, who has objected to this and, therefore, no particular obstacle is anticipated in Congress.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY TAYLOR,
Director.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. BRICKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION AND HOUSING AND RENT ACTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and request that they be printed.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendments and a joint statement we have prepared in support of the amendments, which would insure more equitable allocations of critical building materials for the New York construction industry, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, and printed, and will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, without objection, the amendments and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. LEHMAN) to the bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended,

and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, viz: At the proper place insert the following new sections:

"SEC. —. Section 2 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding an additional sentence to the second paragraph thereof reading as follows: 'In preventing such strains and dislocations upon the distribution of materials for civilian use in different parts of the United States, adjustments shall be made, wherever practicable, in favor of areas where a labor surplus develops in any industry because of a lack of defense work or material shortages, so that the development of normal civilian activities in such industry may offset economic dislocation.'

"SEC. —. Section 404 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 404. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the President, shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with, and establish and utilize committees of, representatives of persons substantially affected by regulations or orders issued hereunder and, wherever practicable, particularly with respect to industries which are regional in character, such as the building-construction industry, such committees shall be established on a regional basis, and whenever there is a delegation of powers under this act to a regional administrator, such administrator shall consult with the appropriate regional committee in carrying out the provisions of this act. Such committees shall be selected so as to give representation to every industry substantially affected by such regulations and orders, and no such industry shall be eliminated from representation on the ground that it is a service agency.'

"SEC. —. (a) Subsection (c) of section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding an additional sentence thereto reading as follows: 'Whenever such powers are invoked, the regulations or orders employed by the President shall include his determination of the appropriate representative period to be the base period for determining the fair shares allocable to the various segments of business, and the percentages used in fixing each segment's share, and the reasons why, in any particular case, it was found impracticable to allocate in accordance with the base and percentage of the segment or segments of business involved.'

"(b) Section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding an additional subsection (d) to read as follows:

"'(d) Whenever power to control building construction is invoked, and the President shall find that land values, density of population, or high construction costs, or any combination thereof, in any geographical area render it impracticable by regulation or rules of national application, to maintain such area's fair share of construction volume at 1950 levels, he shall designate such areas as "special construction areas" and shall make separate allocations for each such area sufficient to maintain construction levels therein at a fair share of its volume in the appropriate base period determined pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.'

"(c) Section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding an additional subsection (e) to read as follows:

"'(e) Whenever the power to control building construction is invoked, and the President shall find that land values, density of population and high costs of construction or any combination of those factors in any geographical area render it impracticable in such area to provide its fair share of necessary housing by allocations for the construction of single-family homes, the President shall designate such areas as "special housing areas," and shall make separate allocations for each such area sufficient to provide for multiunit housing construction therein at a fair share of its volume in the appropriate base period determined pursuant to subsection (c) of this section.'

"(d) Section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is further amended by adding an additional subsection (f) to read as follows:

"'(f) Whenever power to control building construction is invoked, the President may, by regulation or order, require every person having possession of any building material or equipment found by the President to be in short supply, to file within a designated time, a sworn report of the amount, description, and location of such material.'

"SEC. —. Section 709 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby repealed."

The joint statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATORS IVES AND LEHMAN IN SUPPORT OF AMENDMENTS TO THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT TO PROVIDE MORE EQUITABLE ALLOCATIONS OF CRITICAL BUILDING MATERIALS FOR THE NEW YORK CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

These amendments are introduced at the request of the New York Building Congress and have been drafted by that organization to complement the efforts which it and the members of the New York congressional delegation have been making to combat increasing unemployment in the New York construction industry.

In the past several months, the members of the New York congressional delegation, both House and Senate, have held a series of meetings with officials of the National Production Authority, the Defense Production Administration, and the Office of Defense Mobilization. These meetings, held both in New York and in Washington, have demonstrated the degree to which the construction industry in New York has been affected by a lack of defense work, on one hand, and inability to obtain scarce materials for needed construction, on the other.

Only recently a liberalization of NPA's allocation procedures has indicated that some relief may be in sight and that some steel and other scarce materials may be made available for commercial construction in New York.

In addition, the Office of Defense Mobilization has issued Defense Manpower Policy No. 4, which may eventually channel some defense contracts into the New York area. The amendments being introduced today would complement the efforts we have already made and the results already achieved. The legislation is designed chiefly to provide a fair share of scarce building materials in areas where a labor surplus develops, to insure adequate representation of industries affected by controls, and to maintain construction levels at a volume sufficient to prevent the destruction of an industry.

The chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has asked that amendments to the Defense Production Act be introduced and referred to his committee as soon as possible. The members of the New York Building Congress will doubtless request an opportunity to testify upon these proposals. These amendments are, therefore, being introduced at the present time in order to bring the matter before the committee, and in order to provide an opportunity for the members of the New York Building Congress to testify upon specific proposals.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 836. An act for the relief of Harumi China Cairns;

H. R. 1796. An act for the relief of Master Sgt. Robert A. Espe;

H. R. 3534. An act for the relief of Gabriella Rubido Zichy;

H. R. 3561. An act for the relief of Mary Osadchy;

H. R. 4067. An act for the relief of Samuel Thomas Wong;

H. R. 4152. An act for the relief of Ann Tobak and John Tobak;

H. R. 4220. An act for the relief of Hazel Sau Fong Hee;

H. R. 4343. An act for the relief of Erika Bammes (Patricia Ann Cox);

H. R. 4397. An act for the relief of Minglan Hammerlind;

H. R. 4691. An act for the relief of Nagakubo (also known as Roy Mervin Nelson);

H. R. 4772. An act for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris;

H. R. 4788. An act for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi;

H. R. 5187. An act for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence;

H. R. 5297. An act for the relief of John Michael Jurecek;

H. R. 5322. An act for the relief of Kazumi Yamashito;

H. R. 5437. An act for the relief of Motoko Sakurada;

H. R. 5460. An act for the relief of Hans Werner Brisco;

H. R. 5551. An act for the relief of Eugene Kline;

H. R. 5590. An act for the relief of Marc Stefen Alexenko;

H. R. 5685. An act for the relief of Rumi Takemura;

H. R. 5920. An act for the relief of Kimberly Ann Cibulski (also known as Belle Lee);

H. R. 5922. An act for the relief of Karin Riccardo;

H. R. 5931. An act for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman;

H. R. 5936. An act for the relief of Kunio Itoh;

H. R. 6012. An act for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner;

H. R. 6026. An act for the relief of Joseph Yukio;

H. R. 6055. An act for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour;

H. R. 6088. An act for the relief of Hisako Suzuki;

H. R. 6117. An act for the relief of Deliana Meulenkamp;

H. R. 6172. An act for the relief of Manami Tago;

H. R. 6264. An act for the relief of Louis R. Chadbourne;

H. R. 6480. An act for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley; and

H. R. 6561. An act for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be a member of the Public Advisory Board, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. McFARLAND:

Address by the President at the dedication of the *Courier*, the Voice of America ship, published in the New York Times of March 5, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Broadcast," published in the New York Times of March 5, 1952.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Address on the subject Lincoln and 1952, delivered by him at a Lincoln Day dinner at Nashua, N. H., on March 1, 1952, under the auspices of the Hillsboro County Republican organization.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Address delivered by him before Scott County, Ky., Farm Bureau, at Georgetown, Ky., on March 4, 1952.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Excerpts from an address delivered by Senator TAFT before the National Milk Producers, at Dayton, Ohio, in November 1951, and published under the headline "Maintain farm freedom," in the February 1952 issue of the Breeder's Gazette.

A poem entitled "We Humbly Bow" by Irvin E. Perigo, Indiana poet.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Farewell to a Man Who Held a Dream," written by Lester B. Granger, and published in the New York Amsterdam News of January 19, 1952, relating to the death of Dr. William H. Dean.

By Mr. IVES:

Newspaper articles relating to the manifold resources of the State of New York.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Are Red Chinese Poised for Big Indochina Blow?" written by Carroll Binder, and published in the Minneapolis Tribune of March 2, 1952.

Article entitled "March 15 Blues," by Kenneth Crouse, dealing with Federal income taxes, published in the March 2, 1952, issue of the St. Paul Pioneer Press and Dispatch.

By Mr. MOODY:

Article entitled "Put Away the Tears and Fears," from the Grocers' Spotlight for February 15, 1952.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Article from New York Times headed "Shift in income distribution is reducing poverty in United States," by Will Lissner.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hill	Mundt
Benton	Hoey	Murray
Brewster	Holland	Neely
Bricker	Humphrey	Nixon
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Byrd	Ives	O'Mahoney
Cain	Jenner	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kem	Schoeppel
Connally	Kerr	Seaton
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Long	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ecton	Malone	Stennis
Ellender	Martin	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Tobey
Flanders	McCarthy	Watkins
Frear	McClellan	Welker
George	McFarland	Wiley
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	Millikin	Young
Hayden	Monroney	
Hendrickson	Moody	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Has the morning business been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT FOR DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Republican Party hopes this year to elect its first President in 20 years. However, even though its candidate polls a clear-cut majority of the total popular vote and wins the election in more than two-thirds of the States, he may never become President. Instead, a Democratic opponent could be declared the victor and could be sworn in for a 4-year term, and the Republicans would be helpless to do anything about it. It may be said that for such a thing to happen would be a rank miscarriage of justice and a violation of the principles of democratic government. Very true, Mr. President; but it has happened before, and it can happen again. Twelve of our 32 Presidents have been elected to that high office without the benefit of a majority of the popular vote, all because we have neglected to make a very necessary change in the Constitution and to replace a worn-out part of the election machinery which it established.

I believe that the people of the United States will make such a change if they are given an opportunity to do so. To afford them the opportunity, I have introduced in the Senate a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to abolish the electoral college and to provide for the election of the President and the Vice President by the direct popular vote of the people.

I may say that this joint resolution was introduced by me a year ago, and similar ones 2 years ago, 3 years ago, 4 years ago, 5 years ago, and 6 years ago. Before I introduced it, the late Senator George Norris, of Nebraska, introduced a joint resolution also providing for the direct election of the President by the people of the United States.

Only a short time ago President Truman announced that he was going to appoint a commission to ascertain what was wrong about our national elections and why approximately one-half of the people did not go to the polls. I submit that one reason why the pepole do not go to the polls is that they have no chance to vote directly for the President of the United States. In a few moments I shall elucidate that point.

My joint resolution on this subject has never been reported by the Judiciary Committee. In spite of all I have been able to do year after year during all the 11 years I have been a member of that committee, never once have we been able to obtain in the committee a vote as a result of which the joint resolution would be reported favorably from the committee.

However, another joint resolution was reported, namely, the so-called Lodge resolution. It was reported on February 1, 1950. As every Senator knows, that joint resolution provided for a proportional vote. If in the State of New York, for example, 60 percent of the people voted for the Republican candidate and 40 percent voted for the Democratic candidate, the presidential electors for New York State would divide in that proportion.

When the Lodge joint resolution proposing that constitutional amendment came before the Senate, I offered my joint resolution as a substitute for it. It is interesting to note that for the first time in the history of the United States Senate, one-third of all the Senators were in favor of such a constitutional amendment. It was ridiculed in the Judiciary Committee; some members of that committee said the people of the United States did not want the President to be elected directly by the people. Yet,

31 Senators voted for my joint resolution, and a sufficient number of Senators who were absent were announced as being in favor of the joint resolution to constitute exactly one-third of the membership of the Senate.

The Senators who, on the first day of February 1950, voted in favor of that joint resolution calling for the direct action of the President by the people of the United States, were as follows: Benton, Brewster, Bricker, Butler, Cain, Chavez, Darby, Donnell, Douglas, Downey, Ferguson, Gillette, Gurney, Hendrickson, Humphrey, Ives, Jenner, Kilgore, Knowland, Langer, Lodge, McCarthy, Morse, Neely, Pepper, Schoeppel, Smith of Maine, Taylor, Wherry, Withers, and Young.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who were absent at that time, were announced as being in favor of the direct election of the President by the people of the United States.

Therefore, such a constitutional amendment was favored at that time by exactly one-third of all the Members of the Senate—far more Senators than even the late Senator George Norris was able to have vote in favor of such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Although I was absent on the occasion to which the Senator from North Dakota has just referred, on a previous occasion I was present and voted in favor of the Senator's measure proposing such a constitutional amendment, which I believe contains much merit in connection with the nomination of the President.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, my resolution would make one other very important change—it would take the job of nominating the candidates for President and Vice President out of the hands of the politicians and place that solemn responsibility where it belongs—squarely on the shoulders of the American people. I think we ought to take the selection of our highest executive officers out of the atmosphere of smoke-filled back rooms and political horse-trading.

I want to make absolutely certain that the man sworn into the Presidency of the United States is the man that the majority of the people want.

We certainly have no guaranty of that now, under the electoral college system. In most States the people never have a chance to vote directly for either President or Vice President. They vote for electors who in turn are pledged, but not legally bound, to cast their ballots for the respective candidates of the Republican or Democratic Party.

Each State has the same number of electoral votes for President as it has representatives in Congress.

Under the unit or bloc voting system of the electoral college, each State is required to cast all its electoral votes for one candidate, the candidate having the highest popular vote. If the Republican candidate carries New York, he gets all 47 of the State's electoral votes, even though his margin over the Democratic candidate in the popular vote may be only a single ballot.

To illustrate what a threat to democracy the electoral college system is, and how easily the will of the people can be thwarted, let us take a look at what might conceivably happen in the Presidential election this year.

A bitter battle is now raging in Congress over various legislative matters. Regardless of the outcome of these battles, the labor question is going to be one of the burning issues of the 1952 campaign. The election could very well turn on that one issue.

In the heat of that congressional battle, one is likely to see the two great labor organizations, the AFL and CIO, welded together in a solid front for the next campaign. In that union, it is obvious that neither love nor votes will be wasted on the Republican Party.

Suppose that labor, solidly united behind the Democratic candidate, concentrates its vote drive on 12 pivotal States, in which it swings the balance of power—Pennsylvania, Illinois, California, Missouri, Kentucky, Indiana, New York, New Jersey, Ohio, Massachusetts, Texas, and Wisconsin.

Assume that this "revenge" campaign of labor is successful, and that the Democratic candidate for President carries these 12 States, and that he gets a total popular vote of more than 25,000,000.

To offset this Democratic victory in 12 States, suppose the Republican candidate carries all the other 36 States and rolls up a thumping total of 60,000,000 in the popular vote.

After counting up the respective votes, the logical assumption would be that the final curtain had come down on the New Deal or the Fair Deal and that the Republicans would be moving into the White House next January.

Such would not be the case. An election is never won until the last vote is counted, and in this instance the electoral college casts the last vote—and the only vote that counts. We would have a Democratic President for another 4-year term.

The 12 States carried by the Democratic candidate would have 268 electoral votes; the 36 States carried by the Republicans would have 263.

The fact that the Republicans had piled up a 35,000,000-vote majority in the popular vote would have no bearing whatsoever on the final outcome. Thus we see that the electoral college system, instead of protecting democracy, could actually become the instrument for its destruction.

There are many other reasons why this obsolete, dangerous, and completely illogical method of electing the President should be abolished. It concentrates too much political power in too few States. It lends itself too easily to the machinations of crooked politicians, and has helped to spawn the big-city bosses and their political machines. It is a constant threat to majority rule of the people, and could very readily provide the back-door entrance for the rise of a dictator in this country.

The electoral college is a relic of the stage-coach era. In fact, one of the primary reasons for its adoption in the first place was the lack of facilities for rapid communication and transportation. It took months to complete the count of the popular vote. Electors, on the other hand, could be readily determined in most States, on the basis of voting trends. The rise of political parties and the emergence of the two-party system, developments which the founding fathers did not foresee, have further eliminated the need for continuing the electoral college system.

Let me point out also that if my resolution is passed, and the proposed constitutional amendment adopted, it will not be the first change we have made in the manner of electing the President. Originally, the Constitution provided that the candidate who received the highest electoral vote should be the President, and the one receiving the next highest vote should become Vice President. The twelfth amendment to the Constitution, adopted in 1804 changed that to provide for separate ballots for each office.

I hope that the people of the United States will rise up in their might and demand the abolition of the electoral college, and will insist upon their fundamental right to nominate and elect the President and the Vice President by direct popular vote.

The people can have that right if they want it, and as soon as they want it. But they will never get it if they wait for the politicians to give it to them on a silver platter. They must fight for it. They must prod Congress into action. The all-important first step is to get the joint resolution passed by the Senate, and I hope that an aroused public opinion will bring that about at the present session.

Mr. President, there was a time when the people did not even elect their own State governors. Later that was changed. In the beginning the people were not allowed to elect their own Members of this body, but they had to leave it to the legislature to do so, with the result that in a great many instances, through a system of back scratching and log rolling, men were sent to the Senate who did not in any way represent the people of the States from which they came. The people elect their mayors by direct vote. As I said before, they elect their governors, and they elect their Members of Congress. They now elect their Senators, and certainly there is no good reason, in my judgment, why the people should not be allowed to elect the President of the United States.

Every Senator will remember that, at the time of the nomination of Wendell Willkie, the senior Senator from North Dakota submitted a resolution to investigate the Republican National Convention. I have before me a copy of that resolution, and I merely desire to read the first portion of it.

From the resolution I submitted on November 18, 1943, 9 years ago, Senate Resolution 217, I read:

> Whereas there have appeared in the public press charges to the effect that attempts were made at the Republican National Convention

in 1940 to purchase the support of the Arizona delegation for the nomination of Wendell Willkie; and

Whereas such sources further allege that the nomination of Mr. Willkie was influenced by assurances privately given by him concerning his support of a foreign policy contrary to the principles of the Republican Party platform; and

Whereas the serious nature of such charges demands an inquiry into their accuracy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation of (1) the conduct of the 1940 National Convention of the Republican Party with a view to ascertaining whether there were irregularities in the selection of the candidate of such party for the office of President, and whether Harry Hopkins had a corrupt connection therewith—

I may say, Mr. President, then when I submitted that resolution we had proof that Harry Hopkins, at that time a Democrat, and at that time very close to the then occupant of the White House, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, as a matter of fact dictated the choice of Mr. Wendell Willkie and was instrumental in getting Wendell Willkie nominated at the Republican convention.

My resolution continued—

and (2) of the conduct of the 1940 national convention of any other political party if in the opinion of the committee, such investigation is desirable. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of such study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

The resolution concluded with the usual language. It provided that the subcommittee could hold hearings and sit wherever it chose, and it also provided for stenographers and for their pay.

I would say, Mr. President, that there is no doubt at all that at that time we could have shown, if the investigation could have been made, that the galleries at the Republican National Convention were packed with persons who received as much as $25 a day to sit in the galleries and shout, "We want Willkie." At that time it could have been shown, as I alleged, that counterfeit tickets of admission were handed out to hundreds of persons who were able to get into the galleries and sit there all day long shouting for Mr. Willkie.

Mr. President, I was unable to secure the adoption of that resolution. I suppose our friends on the other side of the aisle refused to vote for it for the reason that the testimony showed that in the Democratic National Convention in Chicago there was a man in the basement who had connection with a loudspeaker. He was almost in the sewer, but his voice came to the floor of the Democratic National Convention shouting, "We want Roosevelt."

The net result was that I could not secure an investigation, but I am happy to say that after I offered my amendment to the Lodge resolution, one-third of the Senate supported the direct election of President by the people.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, the Senator knows there can be a complete dislocation if the majority of the people feel that the person who received the majority vote should be the President of the United States. It is difficult for the average citizen to understand why a man should not be the President if he received the majority vote for that office.

Alaska has a population of approximately 125,000 persons. On a proportionate basis that would be only approximately a third of one electoral vote, and yet Alaska would have three electorial votes, as I understand, if it should come into the Union.

Similarly, Hawaii would have one electoral vote, or possibly two, but Hawaii would actually have three electoral votes by virtue of the fact that it would have two Senators and one Representative. So it resolves itself into a question that makes for additional dislocation as small Territories are brought into the Union.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana is absolutely correct in what he has said. The vote of Alaska and the vote of Hawaii would be almost negligible as compared to the total vote cast.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is most fair in his statement, because his own State would have a little more weight in the electoral college than it would have if there were a direct vote. But, nevertheless, I believe the people of any smaller State would be willing to recognize that the fair and right thing is that the man who receives the majority of the votes should be the President.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. President, I am particularly heartened by the fact that the present occupant of the White House, Mr. Truman, at a press conference a month ago, advocated the direct election of the President by popular vote.

He said—and he was absolutely right—that the present primary system in connection with presidential nominations is, as he said, "eyewash."

Within a few weeks the people of Illinois are going to nominate someone for the office of President. Everyone knows that no matter for whom the people vote, their judgment will be ignored. State after State has the same kind of a presidential primary. No one pays much attention to it. Some of the candidates become active early so as to have the psychological effect of having a large vote.

The best exposition I have seen of the entire subject is an article which was written by Woodrow Wilson when he was President of the United States, urging a constitutional amendment which would enable the people of the United States to go to the polls and really, as the Senator from Louisiana just said, feel that they could determine by their votes who should be the President of the United States.

If the Governor of a State is elected by direct vote of the people, and if Representatives and Senators are elected by direct vote of the people, there is no reason, in my judgment, why there should not be a direct vote of the people for the office of President. To show the absurdity of the present system, Mr. President, Wendell Willkie did not enter a single primary in the United States, yet 3 days before the Republican National Convention it was stated by a London newspaper that the man who was going to be the Republican nominee for President of the United States was Wendell Willkie. Why should a newspaper in London have the information before the rank and file of the people of the United States of America had it?

I noticed that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who unfortunately is not present today, was speaking in Illinois a couple of nights ago. He is consistent. He voted against my constitutional amendment. He said it was impossible, because a man could not travel all over the country; it would be too much of a burden and a strain for a candidate to canvass the entire United States of America.

Well, Mr. President, there are 4 years between one presidential election and the next one. Certainly in 4 years any man desiring to become a candidate for President, under the primary law, would have a chance to go to every State of the Union and give the people an opportunity to look at him and decide whether they wanted him to become their President.

My constitutional amendment provides that in the month of June all the Republican candidates who want to be on the Republican ticket will be voted upon by the people of the United States. The same thing is true of the Democratic Party. In other words, at the present time Mr. Taft, Mr. Stassen, Mr. Warren, General Eisenhower, and all other candidates can run in the primaries. The same thing is true of those who are candidates in the Democratic Party. The ones who received the highest number of votes would be the two candidates for whom the American people would vote in November.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will agree that the two highest candidates nominated by the people might not in every instance be the ones the convention would name, unless there were such a primary system.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is correct. Most certainly Wendell Willkie never would have been nominated by the people in 1940. He was totally unknown until he was put over by the politicians at the Republican national convention.

If he had become a candidate in 1940 and had gone into the various States there would have been an opportunity on the part of the American people to protest against him and to bring forth whatever facts they wanted to bring against him, as they did later, which, as a matter of fact, resulted in his defeat.

Mr. President, my constitutional amendment is still pending in the Judiciary Committee. I have no hope of getting it out of the committee, but I serve notice now that if any proposed constitutional amendment comes to the

floor of the Senate, the senior Senator from North Dakota is once again going to offer his joint resolution as a substitute, because, sooner or later, we shall have the direct election of Presidents by the people of the United States. It may take us some time to reach that point, but, in my opinion, it is coming just as certainly as that 2 and 2 make 4.

I intend to keep on battling, as long as I am a Member of this body, until the people of the country have a right to choose by direct vote the man whom they want as President of the United States of America.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Green	Murray
Capehart	Hendrickson	Neely
Carlson	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Robertson
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Kilgore	Seaton
Ecton	Long	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	McFarland	Stennis
Frear	Monroney	Thye
Gillette	Morse	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEM, Mr. KERR, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this morning there appeared in the Washington Post an editorial in regard to the controversy over submerged lands. The situation now presented to us is so accurately described in the editorial, that I should like to read it into the RECORD.

I may say that yesterday the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON] inserted in the RECORD an editorial on this subject which appeared in the Washington Star. Both these newspapers seem to have a very clear understanding of the issue that is involved here.

Mr. President, because the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I, who sponsored Senate Joint Resolution 20, have made many concessions to the coastal States in order to bring about an agreement upon which a vote can be had, I think it important that we understand precisely where the matter now rests; and it is well described, it seems to me, in the editorial entitled "Offshore Compromise," which appears in today's issue of the Washington Post, for the joint resolution is a compromise.

I now read the editorial:

OFFSHORE COMPROMISE

Senator O'MAHONEY'S bill governing the management of the marginal sea—now before the Senate—makes great concessions to those who would like Congress to give away this tremendous national inheritance to the coastal States. Perhaps these concessions, despite the violence they do to vital principles, are justified for the sake of securing at least temporary settlement of a controversy which may do serious injury to the Nation's security. But they ought to be recognized as the outer limit of legitimate compromise on the part of the Federal Government. Attempts to give away even more in the name of "States' Rights" ought to be firmly rejected.

Ever since the Supreme Court ruled in 1947 that California had no title to the marginal sea—the strip commonly miscalled "tidelands" lying off its coast between the low-water mark and the traditional 3-mile limit of national sovereignty—and that the Federal Government had "paramount rights and full dominion" over the area, the Interior Department has been trying to get Congress to pass rational legislation for the management of this national resource. Congress has not only failed to do so; goaded by coastal State zealots, it has threatened again to override the Supreme Court by enacting the same sort of quitclaim legislation which the President, as trustee of the Nation, vetoed 5 years ago.

Mr. President, let me say that in reading the editorial I do not assume responsibility for the adjectives or the argumentum ad hominem which so frequently find their way into editorial discussions and even into speeches on the floor of deliberative bodies.

The editorial continues, as follows:

The O'Mahoney bill would give the Secretary of the Interior power to issue leases in the marginal sea with the consent of the adjacent States during the next 5 years and unrestricted power to issue leases in the submerged zone beyond the marginal sea, where the States do not possess even the color of a claim. All the existing leases in the marginal sea, made by the States, would be regularized and confirmed—despite the fact that some of them were made after the Supreme Court's ruling, when the States had no right to make them. And for 5 years, the States would receive 37½ percent of all revenue realized from the marginal sea, the balance to be held in escrow and distributed eventually in conformity with a formula to be determined by Congress. After 5 years, the Interior Department would have sole authority to lease.

This is, of course, an extraordinarily advantageous arrangement from the point of view of the coastal States; it gives them a good deal more than they are entitled to. It has the virtue from the national point of view, however, of ending an unfortunate deadlock and enabling the Interior Department to go forward, through leases to private oil companies, with the development and exploitation of the marginal sea and the production of oil needed for the national defense. It would make possible, besides, an accumulation of royalties which could well be used, as Senator HILL has proposed, for a great program of Federal grants-in-aid to the States—all the States of the Union—for aid to education, the education of all the country's children.

There is involved in the marginal sea, according to the estimates of geologists, oil worth something like $40,000,000,000. This vast fortune could be a boom to the American people; it belongs to them as a people by virtue of their nationhood. But of even greater importance than the $40,000,000,000 is the value of this national resource to national defense. The conservation and utilization of the offshore oil for the protection of the United States ought to be the first consideration of a Congress which considers itself a national legislature.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana has heard the $40,000,000,000 figure used loosely so many times that he wonders. Does the Senator have any information, himself, which supports the claim that $40,000,000,000 is involved?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe there is something in the record about it. I will have it looked up and will discuss it later. In considerable part, of course, the figures are based upon estimates as to what the possibilities are of the future discovery of oil.

Mr. LONG. I ask the question, because, of course, even if there was $40,000,000,000 worth of oil in the submerged lands, when there is estimated the cost of extracting the oil—and it will be necessary to employ someone and to pay him for the work—in the final analysis there would be only about a one-sixth or one-eighth royalty, which would cut the $40,000,000,000 down to about $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000.

VALUE FIGURE BASED ON AMOUNT OF OIL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure that the author of this editorial and those who have made this statement are not referring to the monetary return; they are referring to the total amount of oil to be discovered. Of course, a part of the sales value of the oil will be used to pay for machinery, and will be used to pay for labor—machinery and labor which are now idle—and a part of it will be used to pay royalties. But all the oil will be recovered, and all of the oil will be used; so I think a valid estimate may be made of the value of the oil to be discovered, when it is made by a competent geologist.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I believe that, as

a matter of fact, he once used figures given by the Secretary of the Interior, who estimated that this land might be developed to the extent that possibly revenue of about $100,000,000 per annum could be derived from the submerged lands. That would seem to be much more in line with the figure which the junior Senator from Louisiana has been able to arrive at on this subject. I doubt that the $40,000,000,000 figure can be supported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will get the facts for the Senator later in the afternoon. What I should like to present to the attention of the Senate now is a map of the United States which shows how various areas have been acquired by the United States. This is the Department of the Interior map of continental United States, showing in detail how various acquisitions of territory were made.

In the first instance, of course, we have the great area which was the property of the Thirteen Original Colonies. That area extended not only over the Thirteen Original Colonies, and their presently formed States, but over what was known as the Northwest Territory. It did not include Florida, which was acquired by a cession from Spain. It did not include the Louisiana Purchase. It did not include the area which was ceded to the United States by Mexico in 1848.

TERRITORY ACQUIRED BY NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

The importance of this map lies in the fact that, as I was saying yesterday with respect to the Louisiana Purchase, when these areas were acquired by the United States, in consideration of money payments taken from the Federal Treasury, as in the case of Louisiana, it was a purchase on behalf of all of the people of the United States, not that of the people of any particular area or of any particular State.

From the Louisiana Purchase area there have been made by act of Congress certain States, namely, a large part of the State of Louisiana, which was in the Louisiana Purchase; the States of Arkansas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, a portion of Minnesota, practically all of South Dakota, more than half of North Dakota, a portion of Colorado, two-thirds of the State of Wyoming, and practically all of the State of Montana. I cite this, Mr. President, because it has been represented to the Members of this body and to the Members of the House that the Federal Government should give to the coastal States the property which was acquired by purchase, and that the States which were carved out of areas included in the purchase should cooperate with the coastal States and should surrender the claim of their people to the rich deposits of the submerged land.

A former attorney general of the State of Nebraska has been heading for years an organization known as the National Association of Attorneys General, urging the quitclaiming of the submerged lands to the coastal States. The meaning of this action is that, speaking on behalf of the people of Nebraska, the gentleman was asking Nebraska and its people to surrender property rights acquired for them by Thomas Jefferson when he took $15,000,000 of the public money and purchased the Louisiana Territory from France.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, when Nebraska entered the Union, did not Nebraska acquire certain elements of sovereignty which the Court has held caused Nebraska to own the beds of all the navigable rivers and lakes within that State?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed; and representation was made on behalf of the proposal for a quitclaim to the coastal States that ownership by the United States of the land submerged by the open ocean would somehow or other surrender the gravel beds of Nebraska and Kansas; but there is not a line in the proposed legislation to sustain that point of view.

GOVERNMENT NOT CLAIMING INLAND WATERS

I desire, Mr. President, to point out that the joint resolution which the Senate is considering contains original language which has not been amended and which makes it clear that the Federal Government is not seeking to obtain the lands submerged by inland navigable waters. Section 2 of the joint resolution, as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I introduced it, read as follows:

> The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any person holding a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, on tidelands or submerged lands beneath the navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter—

And so forth. The point I am making is that the joint resolution specifically states that the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to certify that the United States does not claim any proprietary interest in lands beneath tidelands or inland navigable waters. After full discussion with the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior we adopted an amendment by striking cut the word "proprietary," so it would read, "does not claim any interest"; thereby making it clear that the Government was not asserting any title or paramount right of any kind to lands submerged by inland navigable waters.

Again, on page 11, amendment (d) added to section 4 reads as follows:

> (d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section 4 of this joint resolution, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 2 of this joint resolution, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters.

The purpose of that amendment was to make it clear that if there should be a dispute between the Federal Government and any State as to the seaward boundary of a bay, an inlet, or a harbor, the refusal of the Secretary of the Interior to agree as to a particular boundary would not deprive the State of its rights.

BOUNDARIES OF BAYS BEFORE COURT

Members of the Senate should know that the problem of drawing the boundary line of a bay is a most difficult one. It is involved in the California case; in fact, it is involved in all these cases. The question was referred to a master by the Supreme Court. Hearings have been held, voluminous testimony has been submitted, but no final determination has yet been reached.

The Congress, of course, could itself fix those boundaries if it had the time and the desire to do so. I should be very glad indeed to cooperate in trying to fix the boundaries of the harbors and bays, but it is perfectly obvious—every Member of the Senate knows it—that the burden of work upon the various committees of the Senate is such that it is practically impossible to find the time for members of the various committees to visit the various harbors, bays, and inlets around the coast of the United States and attempt to settle the boundaries. That is one of the reasons why we have an interim bill, hoping that the decision of the master will be such as to satisfy all sides, the Federal Government and the States, with respect to boundaries.

But, in order to make it clear that there is no disposition upon the part of the Government of the United States to claim inland waters, it should be pointed out that in the California case the Government of the United States, in the trial of that case, entered into a stipulation with the State of California by which a tentative boundary line was fixed. On the landward side of this boundary is every producing well that has been drilled in the harbor of the city of Long Beach. This clearly demonstrates that all the statements which have been disseminated throughout the country that the Federal Government was planning a raid upon the gravel beds of interior States and therefore that their Representatives in Congress should quitclaim to the coastal States lands under the open ocean, are without foundation.

The very reverse is the case, Mr. President; the raid that is being made is upon the property rights of the people of the interior States from the Canadian border down to the Gulf of Mexico, and from the east to the west across the continent of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wyoming was speaking of the State of Nebraska. I am sure he knows that the theory that the sovereign owns the beds of all tidewaters was the theory that was applied to Nebraska.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. That was the ruling of the Court in the famous Pollard case.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. From that case down to the Texas, California, and Louisiana cases the Supreme Court has reaffirmed that point.

GOVERNMENT CANNOT CLAIM INLAND WATERS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely. It is the law as interpreted by the Supreme Court. The only way the Government of the United States could assert any title to the lands submerged by inland waters would be to try to do what the opponents of this resolution are trying to do, namely, to overturn the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This may be an elemental question, but it is one which I should like to clear up in my own mind, in view of the fact that the able Senator from Wyoming has repeatedly used the term "inland waters" and has used it in connection with bays. I have in mind, for instance, a bay in my own State—Mobile Bay. Is that within the terminology of the Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely. The State of Alabama has absolute dominion and proprietary interest over lands submerged by Mobile Bay. If the State of Alabama sought to extend the bay 27 miles into the Gulf of Mexico, that would be another thing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was the next question I was going to ask, because the able Senator made reference to the difficulty in drawing a line at the starting point of the bay, and he also used the term "harbor." So I want to get it clear that even in the case of a bay, what the Senator refers to is the line dividing the bay from the sea or from the ocean or from the Gulf.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And it has no reference to the harbor, which in this case is 50 miles north.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The reason why I asked the question is because the Senator used the word "harbor."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A harbor or an inlet——

Mr. SPARKMAN. They may be synonymous?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did not say synonymous, but they are definitions of the category we are describing of lands which are not under the open ocean.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator another question. I do so for the reason that at various times people concerned with the Mobile Bay situation have raised the point—and I have even had letters from people at the Savannah Port Authority and various other port authorities about it—that under legislation of this type the Federal Government could even take over the docks which have been built out into Mobile Bay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is that true or not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it is not true.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the Federal Government has no right to follow tidewater up into rivers inside a State?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, certainly not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is also my understanding, but I wanted to have such a statement in the RECORD, because from time to time we have heard these ridiculous claims made. I wanted to be certain that the RECORD had the situation portrayed correctly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy the Senator asked the questions, and I am glad to have had the opportunity to respond to them.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator realizes that the decision relies upon the use of the language that the sovereign owns the beds of lands beneath tidewaters. I am sure the Senator understands there is a difference between tidelands and lands beneath tide waters. The word "tidelands" is something of a misnomer and has often been applied to lands between the high- and low-water marks. But lands beneath tide water have been regarded as being a much broader area of land.

Would the Senator from Wyoming explain his understanding of the phrase "lands beneath tide waters"?

TIDELANDS BELONG TO STATES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My judgment is that the term "tidewaters," as it has been used, is practically synonymous with "tidelands." The tide moves over the whole ocean, and any water that has anything to do with creating a tide could perhaps be called a tidewater. But that would not be so in the present instance.

All the rulings—the British rulings and the rulings of our own Supreme Court—recognize, and have recognized from time immemorial, that land between low tide and high tide belongs to the state and is not a part of the open ocean.

Mr. LONG. When the Court had before it a case involving the bed of Chesapeake Bay, which is affected by the rise and fall of the tide and is constantly covered by water, the Court spoke of that land as land covered by tidewater.

Can the Senator from Wyoming tell us whether the conception of land covered by tidewaters is limited merely to inland waters?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Chesapeake Bay is a true bay, and the Federal Government does not lay claim to the lands submerged by that bay. I believe that will be made clear later in my remarks.

SOVEREIGNTY ACQUIRED BY NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

As I pointed out yesterday, the significance of the acquisition of such areas as the Louisiana Purchase, the Florida Purchase, and the area ceded by Mexico, lies in the fact that they were acquisitions from sovereign nations, and therefore there was acquired from sovereign nations, such as France, from which the Louisiana Purchase was made, title to all the attributes of sovereignty, and one of the attributes of sovereignty is the paramount power over the open ocean and lands thereunder.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the question which was decided by the Supreme Court. When the State of Louisiana was admitted to the Union, there was nothing in the act of admission, and there could not have been, by which the Government of the United States conveyed to the State any part of the Government's sovereign power, which is the power to deal with foreign nations.

Did the Senator from Alabama wish to ask me a question?

Mr. HILL. Yes. I was about to suggest that, as the Court well said, so far as Louisiana and the other States were concerned, power carried with it the dominium as well as the imperium.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Which meant the ownership and possession of the soil and any oil or minerals in the soil, or anything else that might have been contained in the soil, as well as political rights over the soil. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. In the California case the Supreme Court pointed out that the Thirteen Original Colonies never had this sovereign right, and that the State of California, when it came into the Union, did not acquire a greater right than the right which the Thirteen Original Colonies had.

The sovereign right, which is now within the jurisdiction of the United States Government, was the sovereign right which was conveyed by treaty between Great Britain and the Confederation, which had won the Revolution, and by which there was established a new Nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator recalls that in the preamble of the Constitution there are found the words "in order to form a more perfect Union."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HILL. The people already had a Union; they had a Union under the Articles of Confederation. It was that Union which succeeded to the rights of ownership which had been held by the British Government, from which Government we won our independence. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In 1787, before the Constitution of the United States was adopted, the famous Ordinance of 1787 was adopted by the Continental Congress.

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That ordinance undertook to express the action of the Union of that time with respect to property which belonged to it. Of course, when the Constitution of the United States was adopted, it was the expression of the structure of the more perfect Union which the founders of this Government desired.

Mr. HILL. Certainly, so far as the States of California and Louisiana are concerned, there has never been in them any title, there has never been any ownership, so far as the submerged lands are concerned. So the only argument they have been able to resort to was to say, "If the Federal Government gets the

ownership of these submerged lands, it will come inland, away from the ocean, and take something in some navigable stream." Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true, and I think the RECORD should be made clear that at the time I originally introduced Senate Joint Resolution 20, to provide for the administration of these waters, I also introduced another bill to make it quite clear that the Government was not claiming these rights by specifically surrendering any right, title, or claim to the inland waters. I introduced a similar bill, Senate bill 1540, with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], as he stated yesterday, to accomplish the same purpose, and make the situation crystal clear.

ATTEMPT TO OVERTURN SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

It may be that we should have reported both bills together, or should have merged them, but I say unequivocally and without reservation that the Federal Government does not and cannot lay any claim to the beds of inland streams without passing a law to overturn the Supreme Court decision, just as those who are advocating the quitclaim bill are trying to overturn the decisions in the other cases.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is expressing a theory of government to the effect that the Original Thirteen States never had external sovereignty, but ony a different type of sovereignty.

I have in my hand a veto message of President Monroe, the fifth President, who, at the time the Constitution was adopted, was a member of the Continental Congress. The Senator will recall that President Monroe, as a member of the convention in his State, even opposed the ratification of the Constitution, with which, of course, he had some personal familiarity. He stated in this veto message that the sovereignty passed directly from the King to the people, not the people of the United States as an aggregate, but the people of the Colonies. I wish to quote what he said about this question of sovereignty from page 150 of volume II of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents:

By passing to the people of each colony the opposition to Great Britain, the prosecution of the war, the Declaration of Independence, the adoption of the confederation and of this Constitution are all imputable to them. Had it passed to the aggregate, every measure would be traced to that source; even the State governments might be said to have emanated from it, and amendments of their constitutions on that principle be proposed by the same authority.

In other words, the States of the United States would have been more or less municipalities of a greater government.

Going further, he said:

In short it is not easy to perceive all the consequences into which such a doctrine might lead.

In the same paragraph he made the following statement:

Thus the most effectual guards were provided against abuses and dangers of every kind which human ingenuity could devise, and the whole people rendered more competent to the self-government which by an heroic exertion they had acquired.

So apparently the fifth President of the United States thought that was not the way this Nation was formed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What was the veto message? I did not get the citation.

Mr. LONG. I was reading from page 150, volume 2, Messages and Papers of the Presidents.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What did the President veto?

Mr. LONG. He was vetoing a turnpike bill at that time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought it was something irrelevant.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. There is no doubt that the Federal Government has never had all the sovereignty within the United States. We speak today, do we not, of the sovereign States? They have very specific and definite sovereignty within certain fields.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are speaking now of the national sovereignty. So far as this particular issue is concerned, the Supreme Court in the California case made this very clear.

I read from the Senate hearings the following statement found in the California decision, found on page 476:

From all the wealth of material supplied, however, we cannot say that the 13 original colonies separately acquired ownership to the 3-mile belt or the soil under it, even if they did acquire elements of the sovereignty of the English Crown by their resolution against it.

While we have the map before us, I think it is only proper that I should complete the citation of the various acquisitions which affect the submerged land. There was the Oregon Territory, which was acquired by treaty with Great Britain. In other words, it was an acquisition by the Federal Government, a national sovereign, from another national sovereign; and that acquisition transferred to United States sovereignty all the international rights which Great Britain had to the sea and to the lands thereunder.

CASE OF TEXAS DIFFERS HISTORICALLY

We must acknowledge that there is a difference in the case of Texas, because when Texas gained its independence in 1836, its boundary extended for three marine leagues to sea. In other words, it extended 10½ miles into the Gulf of Mexico. When Texas entered the Union in 1845, after 9 years of independence as a republic, accordance to the Texas case, it surrendered to the Federal Government the attributes of sovereignty. That is why the Supreme Court has held, in the case of Texas, that the 3-mile limit applies in that case as it does elsewhere, in spite of the fact that before Texas entered the Union it had a boundary which extended for 10½ miles into the Gulf.

That, I think, covers the necessary reference at this time to the map of the United States.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does not the Senator really think that in the Louisiana case the Supreme Court summed up the question to which he has been addressing himself? I quote from the language of the Supreme Court in the Louisiana case:

As we pointed out in *United States* v. *California*, the issue in this class of litigation does not turn on title or ownership in the conventional sense. California, like the Thirteen Original Colonies, never acquired ownership in the marginal sea. The claim to our 3-mile belt was first asserted by the National Government. Protection and control of the area are indeed functions of national external sovereignty (332 United States, pp. 31–34). The marginal sea is a national, not a State concern. National interests, national responsibilities, national concerns are involved. The problems of commerce, national defense, relations with other powers, war and peace focus there. National rights must therefore be paramount in that area.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It seems to me that is so crystal clear that no one can controvert it.

Mr. HILL. Is it not the logic of the Supreme Court decision that the States have the paramount proprietary rights, interests, and dominion with respect to the inland navigable waters, because there the paramount interests, the paramount responsibilities, and the paramount concerns are those of the States, and not of the Federal sovereignty? Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right.

Yesterday we read in the press a report to the effect that some submarines of a foreign power were supposed to be ranging the Caribbean Sea. During World War II we had reports of the presence of Nazi submarines in the Gulf of Mexico. There were reports also of Japanese submarines off the coast of California.

HUGE NATIONAL DEBT

The Government of the United States piled up a debt which was $256,000,000,000 when the shooting stopped, to build a Navy, an Army, and an Air Force to protect these international areas. Where is the coastal State Navy to protect the open ocean?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In 1943 I was visiting in Florida, and I saw there the oil which had been washed in on the Florida coast from American tankers which had been sunk by German submarines. It was the Government of the United States and the Navy of the United States, and certainly not the government of Florida which destroyed those submarines and drove them, with all their dangers to our commerce and to our people, away from the Florida coast.

NATIONAL DEBT PROPOSAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will recall that one of the first proposals I made when I began to work upon the drafting of this measure was a provision that the proceeds from the development of these lands should be applied upon the national debt. I did that because I knew, as we all know, that the taxpayers of the entire United States are

carrying upon their shoulders the burden of the great war debt—indeed, the war debts of two world wars. Every person in the United States, from coast to coast and from border to border, is carrying that debt. The coastal States now say, "Let us have the proceeds."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. My question is this: What would be the status of the minerals or the oil deposits under lake bodies?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are not covered at all. The Federal Government asserts no claim to the mineral deposits beneath the waters of navigable lakes. I pointed out, I believe just before the Senator from Minnesota entered the Chamber, that at the same time the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 20, we also introduced Senate bill 1540, which makes it explicit that the United States lays no claim to any navigable lakes, such as the Great Lakes, which naturally are of considerable concern to the bordering States.

Mr. THYE. We have lake bodies beneath which there are known deposits of iron ore, which are of considerable concern to the State of Minnesota.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. I am familiar with the beautiful lakes of Minnesota. I am also familiar with the beautiful lakes of Wisconsin, I will say to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Everyone knows there is a possibility of some deposits being there.

BILL PROTECTS INLAND WATERS

However, in the trial of this case the representatives of the Federal Government explicitly asserted that they were not laying claim to inland navigable waters or to the lands submerged by them. They have represented that to me. There are two expressions in the bill which carry out that theory. I have another bill pending before the Senate which does it for every gravel bed and mineral deposit under inland waters.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator used the argument that was advanced by the Supreme Court that the duty of the Federal Government to defend the submerged lands had to do with the Government's owning them. During the last war there was a radio broadcast made by a German submarine commander in which he said that he had sailed 120 miles up the Mississippi River into New Orleans Harbor. Would that have the effect of conveying title to all that land to the Federal Government?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator from Louisiana has not properly stated my argument at all. I have not said that there was any ownership. The Supreme Court referred to "paramount rights." I am frank to say that I do not get the significance of the question of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Would it have the effect of extending the paramount rights of the Federal Government to the bed of the Mississippi River, at least so far as the Federal Government has the duty of defending that bed?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. The obligation of the Federal Government is definite, just as there is written into the Constitution the express obligation of the Federal Government to guarantee to every State——

Mr. LANGER. A republican form of government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A republican form of government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The word "republican" is written with a small "r," I will say to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. My State, probably, has more coast line than any other State in the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not more than the State of California.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; I believe it has more coast line if one considers Puget Sound.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not yield to California in that respect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or in any other respect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Some concern has been expressed with respect to the legal status of filled-in tidelands lying between high and low tides if Senate Joint Resolution 20 or a similar measure should be passed. I believe the State of New Jersey has a great deal of filled-in tidelands.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Massachusetts, also.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What would be the status of that land?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would be the property of the State, without any question whatever.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Or of any individuals who had purchased it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Or of any individuals who had purchased it. Certainly there is no Federal claim of any kind in that regard.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The same statement applies to the islands off the coast of California.

COASTAL ISLANDS INCLUDED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The same is true in the case of Louisiana, or any other State. An island may be part and parcel of the soil of a coastal State and yet be in the middle of the open ocean, around which the Federal Government has a constitutional and proper national sovereignty.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for one more question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand that the Secretary of the Interior has either formally or informally notified certain States that the Department is about to put a claim upon them for certain lands. The Department has not actually taken action yet. What would be the effect of the passage of the measure before the Senate on that particular request of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Without knowing what particular lands were being mentioned, I would not be in a position to answer the question of the Senator from Washington. For example, I have on my desk the decision in a California water-rights case. For months some of the newspapers of California were claiming that the Government of the United States was seizing and trying to secure through court action water rights which belong to the State.

As a matter of fact, the United States, having established a military camp, was seeking to obtain water rights as a proprietor in order to supply the needed water for the soldiers from all the States of the Union who happened to be in the camp. It had nothing whatever to do with this controversy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the general effect of Senate Joint Resolution 20 would be to hold in abeyance any disputed titles. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is express language in it to save the rights of the States in such cases. I read one of those sections a little while ago.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I was not in the Chamber until a moment ago.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. Was that not the case in which the Federal Government had bought and paid for land with riparian rights, for the establishment of a Marine Corps base?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. HILL. The Federal Government bought and paid for those rights just as an individual would buy and pay for such rights?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. It has nothing whatever to do with any question of submerged lands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Alabama is correct. Since the matter was brought up I consider it to be so important that the material dealing with it should be inserted in the RECORD.

THE SANTA MARGARITA RIVER CASE

The case is known as the Santa Margarita River case, in which the Federal Government sought to obtain water rights for a military reservation, not as a sovereign but as a proprietor. A stipulation was recently entered in this case making it clear that the Santa Margarita River case has no relation whatever to the controversy over submerged lands.

I ask unanimous consent that the papers be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the papers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 4, 1952.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: As requested by Mr. Stewart French, staff counsel of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, there are enclosed five copies of a stipulation entered into between the United States and the State of California. That stipulation relates to the case entitled *United States* v. *Fallbrook Public Utility District et al.*, in the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of California, Southern Division. By it the two sovereigns have resolved the character and extent of the rights to the use of water claimed by the United States in the Santa Margarita River and have defined the word "paramount" as used in that litigation.

Of interest to you in connection with the case in question is the recent decision of Chief Judge Yankwich of the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, reported in 101 F. Supp. 298. That decision and the stipulation in question, it is believed, should render obvious the error in seeking to connect the Santa Margarita River case with the so-called Tidelands Oil case. Should you desire further information in regard to the litigation referred to in this letter, please feel free to call on this Department at any time.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. VEEDER,
Special Assistant to the Attorney General.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IN AND FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, *v.* FALLBROOK PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT, A PUBLIC SERVICE CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ET AL., DEFENDANTS, PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEFENDANTS IN INTERVENTION—CIVIL NO. 1247—STIPULATION

On the 15th day of August 1951 the people of the State of California, in accordance with invitation of the United States of America, petitioned this court to intervene in this litigation. On that date an order was allowed and entered by this court granting the petition.

For the clarification of the issues in this litigation, and for the benefit of all of the parties to this cause, it is hereby stipulated:

I

That in paragraphs VIII and IX of plaintiff's complaint herein, and in paragraphs 2 and 3 of the prayer of said complaint, the word "paramount" is used in the same sense in which that word is used in the second paragraph, on page 374 of the opinion of the Supreme Court of California in the case of *Peabody* v. *Vallejo* (2 Cal. 2d 351 (fourth paragraph on p. 494, 40 Pac. 2d 486)).

II

That in this cause, the United States of America claims only such rights to the use of water as it acquired when it purchased the Rancho Santa Margarita, together with any rights to the use of water which it may have gained by prescription or use, or both, since its acquisition of the Rancho Santa Margarita.

III

That the United States of America claims by reason of its sovereign status no right to the use of a greater quantity of water than is stated in paragraph II, hereof.

IV

That the rights of the United States of America to the use of water herein are to be measured in accordance with the laws of the State of California.

V

That the parties to this stipulation will request the entry of a pretrial order by this court defining the issues in this cause, in conformity with the statements contained in this stipulation.

VI

That there will be a full, complete and mutual exchange of data and information as to the subject matter of this cause collected by the respective parties to this stipulation, including data respecting the issuance of any permits or licenses issued by the State of California in connection with the rights to the use of water of the Santa Margarita River. Such exchange of information by the United States, will be subject to clearance by the commanding officer, Camp Joseph H. Pendleton, in respect to military security, as determined by said officer.

Dated November 29, 1951.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Gladly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I noted with interest the inclusion in the RECORD, as a portion of the Senator's argument, of the editorial from today's issue of the Washington Post entitled "Off Shore Compromise." I had read the editorial and I noted with a great deal of interest that it did not make use of the word "interim," which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has used so frequently in describing his joint resolution.

I note that not only was no use made of the word "interim," but the editorial describes the Senator's resolution accurately in at least many respects, and in one respect so accurately as to make it very clear that in my judgment the term "interim" can never be properly used with reference to the Senator's proposal. I refer to the last sentence in the third paragraph of the editorial, which reads:

After 5 years the Interior Department would have sole authority to lease.

Is it not correct to say, I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, that the pending measure is not an interim measure, but, to the contrary, gives complete authority by which up to 5 years from date of passage leases can be made by the Department of the Interior after consultation with the States, but that afer 5 years and until the areas involved have been covered by leases, and until the leases have been completely worked and the oil that may be found completely removed, does not his resolution give authority for the complete removal of the oil which may be in the offshore lands which are covered by the resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My answer to the Senator should be clearly conditioned upon the basic understanding that this joint resolution has been introduced as an interim measure to provide the possibility for immediate operation while Congress in its wisdom, as we like to say, goes through the long struggle of trying to determine whether the land is to be quitclaimed.

STATES HAVE 5 YEARS IN WHICH TO ACT

It should be understood in everything I have said, and I have supposed that it was understood by the author of the editorial, that the sentence referred to implicitly means that after 5 years the Department of the Interior would have sole authority to lease, unless the Congress of the United States took action to the contrary. Those words do not appear in the joint resolution, but I think that is implicit.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the distinguished Senator from Wyoming will permit me to ask another question, I should like to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. My question is this: Is it not true that there is no time limitation under the terms of Senator's joint resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Florida is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not also true that the joint resolution permits the complete leasing of all the lands covered by it and the complete extraction of all oil included in all the lands covered by the joint resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Senate Joint Resolution 20 retains for the Federal Government complete authority over the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit and it makes to the Coastal States the concession that they shall have 37½ percent of the royalties from the production on the landward side of the 3-mile limit.

The Senator from Florida, who is one of the ablest lawyers I have ever known, will readily acknowledge that under the Supreme Court's decision there was absolutely no requirement to make any such concession, because the Supreme Court held that the title of the United States extends, except for inland navigable waters, from the low-water mark outward to the limits of the Continental Shelf.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the candor of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. In order that the RECORD may be crystal clear, I wish he would say again—as I understood he has already said—first, that there is no limitation at all in time upon his joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. The joint resolution begins to operate immediately upon its enactment, and its operations do not come to an end until the time when all lands covered by the waters offshore of the various States have been leased and the oil completely extracted from all such lands. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the Senator from Florida is making a statement of the extreme case. I think he is correct.

My own judgment is that a quitclaim measure will never become law; that we shall never elect a President who will sign a measure surrendering the paramount rights of the Federal Government; and that we shall never have a Congress which will pass such a bill over a veto of a President of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is entitled to his opinion upon that point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and I must act upon my opinion.

Mr. HOLLAND. However, I think it must be clear to the Senator that good

men differ upon that point, because in the Texas decision——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope that principle applies now. I know the Senator from Florida is an exceedingly good man, and I hope to be included in the same category.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly I include the Senator from Wyoming in it.

The record of the Supreme Court's handling and disposition of the Texas case shows that the decision of the Court in that case was made by four out of the seven members of the Court who participated—in other words, that four members of the United States Supreme Court found that the lands in question were a part of the dominion of the Federal Government, whereas three of the Justices refused to accede to that finding.

Therefore, I should like to have my friend, the Senator from Wyoming, always have in his mind knowledge of the possibility that the personnel of the Court and the philosophy of the personnel of the Court are, of course, subject to change, and that there are many persons who feel that even if the question never goes again to a President, there is a distinct possibility that the Court will return to the paths of accuracy and correctness, rather than to remain in the path of inaccuracy into which it strayed by a bare majority of four out of seven participating Justices.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I certainly hope that illusory vision of the Senator from Florida will not operate to prevent us from obtaining the production of oil from these submerged lands.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask one more question, Mr. President, after having made it clear, I believe, that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming admits that there is no limitation of time or any limitation less than the full amount of the lands involved and the full production and use of the oil involved, which applies to his joint resolution, so that it cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called an interim measure or a temporary measure.

BILL'S PURPOSE IS TO GET PRODUCTION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me amend the word used by the Senator from Florida, by moving to strike out the word "admits" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "acknowledges," because I am not under cross-examination, and I am not making an admission against interest. I am merely acknowledging that in the exercise of what I regard as very good sense, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I felt it would be desirable to provide a method by which, in the national interest, continuous production of this oil could be carried on while discussion of technical details was in progress and hair-splitting arguments were being made in behalf of those who desired to bring about a surrender of the national sovereignty, which in my judgment will never prevail.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the graciousness of the Senator from Wyoming. I simply wished to make it clear—as I think it now is in the RECORD—that under any dictionary meaning or under any other proper meaning of the word "interim," that word is inappropriately, inaccurately, and incorrectly applied to the pending joint resolution, which is not limited in time of operation, and is not limited in scope of operation, but, instead, applies to the full subject matter in such an unrestricted way as to allow and to encourage the complete use of all the oil which might be discovered under all the lands covered by the joint resolution.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his courtesy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am always very happy indeed to yield to the Senator from Florida, whose ability, integrity, and great skill are known to all his colleagues.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me, to permit me to ask several questions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator from Wyoming explain his proposal in regard to 37½ percent of the royalties and income from these oil operations?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. What puzzles me is that the joint resolution provides, in part:

(1) Thirty-seven and one-half percent of all moneys received as bonus payments, rents, royalties other sums payable with respect to operations in submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year.

I was wondering how the Federal Government happened to be conducting operations "within the seaward boundary of any State." Perhaps my interpretation of "seaward boundary" is incorrect. That is why I am asking for an explanation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason for that provision is that the Supreme Court has held that the seaward boundary of a State is the 3-mile limit, which is in fact a national boundary; and the Supreme Court has held that the Federal Government has paramount rights to all the area submerged by the open ocean within the 3-mile limit and outside of the 3-mile limit, except for harbors, bays, inlets, and the like, including other navigable inland waters.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Wyoming says the Court has held that the United States has title to the oil within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That it has paramount right; yes.

Mr. AIKEN. What is paramount—the first claim?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It has the first claim on the oil.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct; the Federal Government has the paramount right, and the States have no right.

Mr. AIKEN. Why does the Senator propose to pay the States 37½ percent of the royalty, then, if the oil belongs to the United States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The reason for that is that the Senator from Wyoming is proposing a compromise, which is substantially less than the quitclaiming of all the Government rights, which he is fighting.

Mr. AIKEN. But if it does not belong to the States, why should we give them 37½ percent? And if it does belong to them, why should they not have 100 percent? That is what puzzles an amateur at a game of this sort.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us be quite frank. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that the State of California began issuing leases on lands beneath the ocean of the coast of California, many years ago—I think as long ago perhaps as 1935 or 1936. Certainly prior to 1938, a number of leases were issued, and the Federal Government did not interfere with those leases. It is a fact that in 1938 the Senate of the United States passed a resolution authorizing the Federal Government to bring suit to end the State activity and assert the Federal right. It was not done at the time, however.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me first answer the question of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Wyoming said the Government passed something. It did not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator misunderstood me. I said the Senate passed a resolution. The Senate passed the Nye resolution. The resolution did not pass the House, but the Senate passed it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought it was killed in the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, no; the Senate passed the Nye resolution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. It was passed unanimously. Furthermore, it had been reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In any event, what I am pointing out to the Senator from Vermont is that the action of the Federal Government in bringing the California suit did not come until after there had been substantial development; and in the prosecution of the suit before the Supreme Court, spokesmen for the Federal Government asserted that the equities of the holders of good-faith leases which had been made by the State should be recognized; that is all the pending joint resolution proposes.

PRECEDENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT

With respect to the 37½ percent royalty, that is a concession in this respect. The States are now collecting all the royalties, or were, until the decision was rendered. So instead of their receiving 100 percent, they receive only 37½ percent; and that figure was reached because, under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, which applies to public lands in the upland areas of the continental United States, the royalty to the States within which such federally owned lands lie was fixed at 37½ percent. In other words, it is in conformity, first, with the fact that the Federal Government did not move in at the very beginning; second, with the fact that in the Supreme Court the

spokesmen for the Government said these good-faith leases would not be disturbed; and third, because the policy of the Government with respect to public lands since the passage of the act of 1920 has been to pay to the States 37½ percent of the royalties.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont still does not understand why, if the oil belongs to the States, they should not have 100 percent of it; or why, if it belongs to the Federal Government, the Federal Government should pay 37½ percent of it to the States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I may say, with a smile, I do not believe that even a Vermonter would fail to make a good compromise.

I have heard the story about the Vermonter who went into a new town, the people of which were looking rather askance at him. A stranger passing by wanted to find out what the trouble was. The response was that the Vermonter was spending some of his principal. That is why he was somewhat in bad repute—he was spending some of his principal instead of living on his interest. But do we not all make compromises for the public good?

Mr. AIKEN. A good deal depends upon how the word "principal" is spelled. [Laughter.] I would rather not spend too much of one kind, anyway.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We confine this to "p-a-l," principal.

Mr. AIKEN. However, if a horse had been stolen from a Vermonter, and someone later tried to sell him the horse, the Vermonter would not offer the thief 37½ percent—and I am not by any means alluding to the States as thieves, of course——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; I understand.

Mr. AIKEN. And he would not offer the thief 37½ percent of what the "borrower" got for the horse, provided he gave the owner the other 62½ percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the point of the remark of the Senator from Vermont is that we are being very generous with the coastal States. With that, I completely agree.

Mr. AIKEN. It appeared to me to be a pretty strenuous effort to buy them off. I doubt that they would settle for 37½ percent, if they thought they could get 100 percent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I do not know that they are ready to sell.

Mr. AIKEN. I have seen no such indications.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LONG. With regard to the Supreme Court decision in the California case and other cases the Senator from Wyoming said that the statement had been made that the Federal Government had paramount rights, and that the States had no rights. I believe the Senator will find, that the Court said the States did not have title; it did not say that they had no rights.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept that amendment, of course. I meant they had no title, certainly.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota has been rather intrigued by the document which has been placed on our desks today, dealing with the pact between the Republic of Mexico and the United States, at the time Texas was admitted into the Union. As between the background and the facts as to the rights to certain lands does the Senator from Wyoming make any differentiation between Texas and other States of the Union?

TEXAS ENTERED WITH THREE-LEAGUE BOUNDARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes. Had the Senator been on the floor at the time I was discussing the Texas case yesterday, and again today, he would have heard me point out that when Texas won its independence from Mexico it was established as an independent republic, with a boundary extending three marine leagues into the Gulf. It had all the sovereign rights of an independent republic. It exercised those rights during the entire period of its independence, from 1839 to 1845. In the Texas case, those who appeared on behalf of the State of Texas contended that those rights were not surrendered to the Federal Government when Texas was admitted to the Union. The Federal Government, on the other hand, argued that those rights were surrendered.

Briefly stated, it was simply upon the ground that when Texas entered the Union, according to the argument of the Solicitor General and the Attorney General, and according to the decision of the Supreme Court, then, at that moment, Texas necessarily surrendered the sovereign rights involved in international affairs. So the boundary of Texas is 3 miles, as in the case of the other States; not 10 miles. That was a very narrow question. Two members of the Court did not participate in the decision, two members dissented. Justice Reed and Justice Minton, in very explicit statements, dissented. Justice Frankfurter said that the argument was not clear to him, but that he was bound by the California case.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the language which has disturbed me is that which reserves to the Republic of Texas "all the vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits." As a sovereign, for the time between its separation from Mexico and the time of its annexation, and with reference to the distance which the distinguished Senator has mentioned, it is difficult for me to see where the Republic of Texas acceded to a cession of any land other than that which might be involved in "ceding to the United States all public edifices, fortifications, barracks, ports and harbors, navy and navy-yards, docks, magazines, arms, and armaments, and all other property and means pertaining to the public defense belonging to said Republic of Texas."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That precise question bothered some of the Justices of the Supreme Court. If the Senator will turn to page 490 of the hearings he will find there the following quotation from the Texas case in which the Supreme Court quoted the very provision of the joint resolution annexing Texas which the Senator has read and as recited in brief in the arguments pro and con of those who represented Texas and those who represented the Federal Government. I read:

> We conclude, however, that no such hearing is required in this case. We are of the view that the "equal footing" clause of the joint resolution admitting Texas to the Union disposes of the present phase of the controversy.

In other words, the Court was saying that under the equal-footing clause Texas came into the Union on an equal footing with all the other States.

Mr. CASE. Does the language of the pending joint resolution as reported from the Senator's committee make any differentiation between the rights of Texas and the rights of other States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it does not.

Mr. CASE. It seems to me that in the opinion of Mr. Justice Frankfurter and in the language cited, there is a difference, and that the Senate should have an opportunity to consider that difference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is why we printed the entire opinion and dissents in all three cases in the committee hearings. As I said a moment ago, Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Minton explicitly dissented from the view of the majority, and Mr. Justice Frankfurter said:

> Time has not made the reasoning of *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), more persuasive but the issue there decided is no longer open for me. It is relevant, however, to note that in rejecting California's claim of ownership in the off-shore oil the Court carefully abstained from recognizing such claim of ownership by the United States. This was emphasized when the Court struck out the proprietary claim of the United States from the terms of the decree proposed by the United States in the California case.
>
> I must leave it to those who deem the reasoning of that decision right to define its scope and apply it, particularly to the historically very different situation of Texas. As is made clear in the opinion of Mr. Justice Reed, the submerged lands now in controversy were part of the domain of Texas when she was on her own. The Court now decides that when Texas entered the Union she lost what she had and the United States acquired it. How that shift came to pass remains for me a puzzle.

We wanted to be utterly frank with all Members of the Senate, and that is why we printed the text of all three decisions in the hearings. But, as Mr. Justice Frankfurter said, the decision of the Supreme Court apparently settled the question for him. The question is not without its problems, and for that reason the committee, in considering the joint resolution, has gone quite a distance in making concessions.

The 37½ percent grant of royalty rights is a grant which is not required under the Supreme Court's decision, but it is made in the hope that it will settle the controversy.

Mr. CASE. I recognize the fact that that feature is in the nature of a concession, but at the same time, where there is an explicit or a firm basis for holding a point of view, it seems to me it must be recognized. The reading I have

done on the subject, suggests to me, as some argue, that the so-called equal-footing principle has wiped out the land right of Texas. I had always understood that the State of Texas had a right which no other State ever had, namely, on its own motion it could at any time divide itself into four States in addition to the State of Texas. If the equal-footing principle can be construed to wipe out the reservation of lands——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It does not wipe out the reservation of lands. The argument, of course, was that the vacant lands referred to in the resolution were the unappropriated lands which were within the meaning of the law of contracts at that time, namely, lands which were above the sea, not lands which were under the sea. All I can say to the Senator is that there is no question that an argument can be made. It was made in the Supreme Court——

Mr. CASE. If I may ask one further question, How can it be maintained that Texas came into the Union on an equal footing with other States, in view of the fact that there is an express reservation of the right to provide four additional States? No other State has that right. So it seems to me that Texas did not come into the Union on the same basis on which the average States came into the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Texas was the only free Republic that came into the Union, with the exception of the Territory of Hawaii.

Mr. CASE. How can we apply the equal footing argument to Texas?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because it applies to everything that was not otherwise stated or reserved, and because it was a declaration that every State which enters on an equal footing comes into the Union with the same political rights the other States have and with the same relationship to the Federal Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator believe that the agreement which admitted Texas into the Union has been strictly adhered to by the United States?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know of no deviation from it.

Mr. AIKEN. I am reading from the joint resolution providing for the annexation of Texas to the United States:

> New States of convenient size, not exceeding four in number, in addition to said State of Texas, and having sufficient population, may hereafter, by the consent of said State, be formed out of the territory thereof, which shall be entitled to admission under the provisions of the Federal Constitution. And such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of 36°30′ north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire.

Does the Senator from Wyoming contend that that provision of the agreement is still in force?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would say that the State of Texas has never consented to be subdivided.

Mr. AIKEN. I mean that part of the agreement which permits Texas to hold slaves.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Since slavery had been abolished the people of no part of Texas could claim that right.

Mr. AIKEN. Then the agreement was kept by the United States for only 17 or 18 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would not say that. This portion of it has never been brought into play.

Mr. AIKEN. Why should one portion of it be held to be so much more sacred than is some other portion of it? I have never read this agreement until this time. It seems to me it was broken 17 years after being signed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the correct way to state the matter the Senator brings up is that if the State of Texas were to consent to the creation of a new State within its boundaries, and the people of that area wanted to have slavery, they would not be permitted to have slavery in spite of the annexation resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is quite correct.

Mr. AIKEN. What I was attempting to say was that the agreement admitting Texas to the Union was apparently broken by the United States 17 or 18 years after Texas was admitted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In the sense that the United States abolished slavery.

Mr. AIKEN. I was wondering why some persons think the agreement should be kept to the letter of the law in regard to one provision but not as to others.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator has made a good point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that I completely approve of the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming, to the effect that the 37½-percent allowance to States out of royalties is undoubtedly offered as a compromise, but certain statements have been made in the RECORD which I think might tend to create the impression that the compromise is offered with peculiar reference to the State of Texas.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming if it is not true that the 37½-percent participation to be allowed to the States is to be applied only to royalties derived from oil produced within the 3-mile limit.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It applies only to revenues from submerged lands within the 3-mile limit, but it applies equally to all coastal States.

Mr. HOLLAND. To all coastal States, but only within the 3-mile limit?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Therefore, instead of being favorable to Texas, as compared with other States, it might be construed as being unfavorable, because Texas probably had the three-league limit as her boundary when she came into the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let us not call this provision in the resolution unfavorable. It was the decision of the Supreme Court which was unfavorable. The Supreme Court granted judgment to the Federal Government and against the State of Texas in connection with the contention by Texas that it had a 10-mile boundary.

SUPREME COURT DEALT WITH CLAIM

I am glad the Senator from Florida has raised this question, because it brings to my mind one of the interesting arguments in this debate. The Supreme Court in its opinion summarized the claims. I read from page 489 of the Senate hearings, beginning with the last line:

> Texas also claims that under international law, as it had evolved by the 1840's the Republic of Texas as a sovereign nation became the owner of the bed and subsoil of the marginal sea vis-à-vis other nations.

In other words, here Texas, as a sovereign nation, was saying that she was the owner of the bed and the subsoil. But Senators from other States, such as Florida, Louisiana, and California, which were never sovereign States, have argued that when those States came into the Union the Federal Government somehow or other surrendered a part of its sovereignty to them.

Texas says, "We did not surrender our sovereignty; therefore it should not be taken away from us."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The sole purpose of my rising at this time is to negative any impression which may have been created by the record that this compromise, as has been so ably stated by the Senator from Wyoming, was to give any particular recognition to the claims of Texas, because, as a matter of fact, Texas very probably had three leagues of salt water attached to her, with the land that lay under them, prior to and at the time she came into the Union, whereas no such claim is made, for instance, in the case of the State of California, where the maximum distance claimed is 3 miles.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. They are developing some such claim now, I am told.

Mr. HOLLAND. So in spite of the fact that Texas was in a different situation, and, as shown by the division of opinion in the Supreme Court, was recognized as having a much stronger claim than that of some other States, the compromise in this joint resolution applying the 3-mile limit to all States, certainly does not give any advantage to Texas as compared with other States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. But, to the contrary, it recognizes that Texas is on an equal footing with the other States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It recognizes Texas as the other States are recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for another question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I quote from the middle of page 2 of the majority report on the joint resolution:

> A new section added by amendment gives the statutory consent of the Federal Government for State regulation and management of fish, shellfish, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. On the same page, preceding what I have just read, the report says:

> Lands beneath inland navigable waters, including bays, harbors, and inlets are not claimed by the Federal Government and therefore are left to the States and are not subject to leasing by the Secretary.

Considering the two statements together I would assume that in the case of Puget Sound, to be specific, the regulation of shellfish, oyster beds, clam beds, crab beds, and similar things, would, under the committee's interpretation of the joint resolution, be left to the State.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In the middle of page 3 of the committee report, there is the following statement:

> As stated, lands beneath navigable inland waters are not affected—such as navigable rivers and lakes, and beds of true bays, harbors, and inlets. Such lands remain State property.

There are hundreds of miles of such lands in the Pacific Northwest, especially in the State of Washington, and I assume that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming would wish the RECORD to show that the intent of the joint resolution was not to include such inland bays.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Federal Government lays no claim to the submerged lands of those areas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To inland bays?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To no lands beneath such categories of waters.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think we shall be able to make progress if the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the committee amendments. The Senator from Louisiana. [Mr. LONG] spoke to me this morning about a possibility that later he might desire to offer perfecting amendments to some of the committee amendments, and he wished to know if I would agree that the amendments may hereafter be changed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that such amendments as may now be agreed to may be reconsidered by any Senator at any time before final disposition of the joint resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am very reluctantly obliged to object, because I promised the distinguished minority leader that I would object if a unanimous-consent request were submitted. Therefore, I am forced to object.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then, Mr. President, I shall attempt to secure a unanimous-consent agreement later.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the distinguished Senator from Wyoming mean that if adopted, either individually or en bloc, the committee amendments would be held to become part of a clear joint resolution, all of which would be subject to amendment exactly as if it had not been amended?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In effect, yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall have no objection to that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to be perfectly frank in order that we may have the best judgment of every Member of the Senate in arriving at the best method of acting upon the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. With that understanding, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Objection has been made by the Senator from North Dakota. The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Benton	Holland	Monroney
Brewster	Humphrey	Morse
Bridges	Jenner	Murray
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Kilgore	Pastore
Case	Langer	Russell
Connally	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Long	Stennis
Dworshak	Magnuson	Thye
Hendrickson	Martin	Wiley
Hill	McFarland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. AIKEN, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEM, Mr. KERR, Mr. MALONE, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SEATON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we have come to that position in the consideration of the bill where I think it perfectly appropriate to consider the various committee amendments. From the discussion which took place before the quorum was called, I think it was evident that we could dispose of the amendments en bloc, with the exception perhaps of one, which I shall not ask to have considered at this time.

I proposed a unanimous-consent agreement to this effect:

> *Ordered*, That the committee amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 20, with the exception of the amendment on page 10, lines 18 to 25, inclusive, be agreed to en bloc: *Provided, however*, That such action with respect to any specific amendment shall, upon the request of a Senator, be deemed to be rescinded, and the consideration of such amendment shall then be proceeded with in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Suppose we adopted all the amendments en bloc, and later on a Senator had amendments he wanted to offer, which amendments conflicted with some of the committee amendments, what would the situation be then?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The action on the committee amendment would then be rescinded, upon the request of the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Under the agreement, the Senator would have the right to have action rescinded on any amendment which was in conflict with his amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct. The effect would be to make a clean resolution of it, and then leave it entirely open to amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator explain why he wants to adopt the committee amendments en bloc?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Most of them are technical amendments, to which there will be no objection. It is merely a time-saving device. I may say to the Senator that I have been on the floor since noon, discussing the bill, answering every question which was propounded. As the Senator from New Hampshire well knows, we did not get back from Philadelphia from another debate until approximately 2 o'clock this morning. The unanimous-consent request is so couched that any one of the amendments agreed to en bloc can be reconsidered upon the request of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. CORDON. Reserving the right to object, I inquire of the Senator from Wyoming whether it is his view that by the adoption of the committee amendments with the reservations he has indicated, action on the resolution can be expedited and that the basic differences among the Members of the Senate can be brought into the open and resolved?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is precisely the object which I have in mind.

Mr. CORDON. As the Senator from Oregon understands, the basic differences go not to any of the amendments which the committee has suggested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. CORDON. But to the proposition of whether there is to be interim legislation or whether we are to settle the matter by a quitclaim of any interests which the Federal Government has in submerged lands in the several States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Texas has already given notice of his desire to offer a substitute, and the Senator from Florida has done the same thing. The general purpose of both substitutes is the same, namely, a quitclaim.

AMENDMENTS TO BE OFFERED

If either of the substitutes is agreed to, it disposes of Senate Joint Resolution 20 as reported by the committee, together with all the amendments.

If they should be defeated, I understand the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may desire to present some other amendments, and other Senators may desire to present amendments. In either case, if any one of the amendments to be proposed conflicts with any that are adopted today, the action will be rescinded and the matter will be considered de novo.

Mr. CORDON. So that the effect of the request of the Senator from Wyoming is that the resolution be considered as though the committee amendments were a part of it as it was originally introduced.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. CORDON. Subject to any amendment which may be offered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is precisely correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Every Senator on the floor is protected, not only in offering further amendments, but on the reconsideration of any of the committee amendments, without prejudice?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Absolutely. I do not know how it could be made more clear.

Mr. BRIDGES. I wanted to have it clear on the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LONG. Reserving the right to object, will the Senator from Wyoming explain the purpose he has in mind in excluding the amendment on page 10 of the resolution?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to explain it. I drafted that amendment in consultation with representatives of the Department of Justice, the Department of the Interior, and with the Senator from Louisiana. It was one of the numerous attempts we have made to induce the Senator from Louisiana to join in support of the resolution. That was the sole purpose. Since the Senator from Louisiana may desire to offer some additional amendments, I thought it would be well to allow it to wait until that time for consideration.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object, if we agree to the amendments en bloc, a Senator who wants to bring about the exclusion of one of the amendments has to carry the load and make the case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite wrong.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to know why?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the specific language which has been written into this request is as follows:

Provided, however, That such action with respect to any specific amendment shall, upon the request of a Senator, be deemed to be rescinded, and the consideration of such amendment shall then be proceeded with in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

The burden of proof will be upon the committee and its chairman with respect to such an amendment, not upon the Senator who asks that action on an amendment be rescinded.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Wyoming reread the language of his proposal.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It reads as follows:

Ordered, That the committee amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 20, with the exception of the amendment on page 10, lines 18 to 25, inclusive, be agreed to en bloc: *Provided, however,* That such action with respect to any specific amendment shall, upon the request of a Senator, be deemed to be rescinded, and the consideration of such amendment shall then be proceeded with in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

In other words, the committee would have to present its case all over again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That the committee amendments, with the exception of the amendment on page 10, lines 18 to 25, inclusive, to the pending measure be agreed to en bloc: *Provided, however,* That such action with respect to any specific amendment shall, upon the request of a Senator, be deemed to be rescinded, and the consideration of such amendment shall then be proceeded with in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 5, line 21, after the word "lease", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease."

On page 6, line 19, after the word "any", to strike out "person holding" and insert "lessor or lessee of"; in line 20, after the word "State", to insert "its political subdivision or grantee"; in line 24, after the word "any", to strike out "proprietary"; on page 7, line 20, after "(c)", to insert "of"; in line 22, after the word "into", to strike out "an agreement" and insert "agreements"; in line 23, after the word "State", to insert "its political subdivision or grantee"; in the same line, after the word "lessee", to strike out "of the State, its political subdivision or grantee" and insert "thereof"; on page 8, line 2, after the word "State", to insert "its political subdivision or grantee"; in line 3, after the word "issuance", to insert "or nonissuance"; in line 18, after the word "lease.", to insert "The following stipulations and authorizations are hereby approved and confirmed: (i) The stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to certain bays and harbors in the State of California; (ii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to the continuance of oil and gas operations in the submerged lands within the boundaries of the State of California and herein referred to as the operating stipulation; (iii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 28, 1948, extending the term of said operating stipulation; (iv) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated August 2, 1949, further extending the term of said operating stipulation; (v) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated August 21, 1950, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vi) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated September 24, 1951, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vii) the notice concerning "Oil and Gas Operations in the Submerged Coastal Lands of the Gulf of Mexico," issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 11, 1950 (15 F. R. 8835), as amended by the notice dated January 26, 1951 (16 F. R. 953), and as supplemented by the notices dated February 2, 1951 (16 F. R. 1203), March 5, 1951 (16 F. R. 2195), April 23, 1951 (16 F. R. 3623), June 25, 1951 (16 F. R. 6404), August 22, 1951 (16 F. R. 8720), October 24, 1951 (16 F. R. 10998), and December 21, 1951 (17 F. R. 43), respectively."

On page 11, line 2, after the word "cover", to strike out "such" and insert "an"; in the same line, after the word "area", to insert "of such size and dimensions"; in line 5, after the word "quantities", to insert "or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon"; after line 13, to insert:

"(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section 4 of this joint resolution, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 2 of this joint resolution, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters."

On page 13, line 21, after the word "payment", to insert "of just compensation"; in line 23, after the word "terminated", to strike out "of an amount determined by due process of law"; on page 14, line 1, after the word "affect", to strike out "any" and insert "such"; in line 2, after the word "rights", to insert "if any"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "that" and insert "as"; in line 4, after the word "and", to strike out "any"; in the same line, after the word "rights", to insert

"if any"; in line 6, after the word "acquired", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this joint resolution or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained."

After line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 9. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law."

And in line 21, to change the section number from "9" to "10"; so as to make the joint resolution read:

"Resolved, etc., That (a) the provisions of this section shall apply to all mineral leases covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf issued by any State or political subdivision or grantee thereof (including any extension, renewal, or replacement thereof heretofore granted pursuant to such lease or under the laws of such State): *Provided*—

"(1) That such lease, or a true copy thereof, shall have been filed with the Secretary by the lessee or his duly authorized agent within 90 days from the effective date of this joint resolution, or within such further period or periods as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary;

"(2) That such lease was issued (i) prior to December 21, 1948, and was on June 5, 1950, in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it, or (ii) with the approval of the Secretary and was on the effective date of this joint resolution in force and effect in accordance with its terms and provisions and the law of the State issuing it;

"(3) That within the time specified in paragraph (1) of this subsection, there shall have been filed with the Secretary (i) a certificate issued by the State official or agency having jurisdiction and stating that the lease was in force and effect as required by the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection or (ii) in the absence of such certificate, evidence in the form of affidavits, receipts, canceled checks, or other documents, and the Secretary shall determine whether such lease was so in force and effect;

"(4) That except as otherwise provided in section 3 hereof, all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease between June 5, 1950, and the effective date of this joint resolution, which have not been paid in accordance with the provisions thereof, and all rents, royalties, and other sums payable under such a lease after the effective date of this resolution shall be paid to the Secretary, who shall deposit them in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided;

"(5) That the holder of such lease certifies that such lease shall continue to be subject to the overriding royalty obligations existing on the effective date of this joint resolution;

"(6) That such lease was not obtained by fraud or misrepresentation;

"(7) That such lease, if issued on or after June 23, 1947, was issued upon the basis of competitive bidding;

"(8) That such lease provides for a royalty to the lessor of not less than 12½ percent in amount or value of the production saved, removed, or sold from the lease: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a lesser royalty, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the increase of the royalty to the minimum herein specified;

"(9) That such lease will terminate within a period of not more than 5 years from the effective date of this joint resolution in the absence of production or operations for drilling: *Provided, however,* That if the lease provides for a longer period, the holder thereof may bring it within the provisions of this paragraph by consenting in writing, filed with the Secretary, to the reduction of such period, so that it will not exceed the maximum period herein specified; and

"(10) That the holder of such lease furnishes such surety bond, if any, as the Secretary may require and complies with such other requirements as the Secretary may deem to be reasonable and necessary to protect the interests of the United States.

"(b) Any person holding a mineral lease which comes within the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, as determined by the Secretary, may continue to maintain such lease, and may conduct operations thereunder, in accordance with its provisions for the full term thereof and of any extension, renewal or replacement authorized therein or heretofore authorized by the law of the State issuing such lease: *Provided, however,* That if oil or gas was not being produced from such lease on or before December 11, 1950, then for a term from the effective date hereof equal to the term remaining unexpired on December 11, 1950, under the provisions of such lease or any extensions, renewals, or replacements authorized therein, or heretofore authorized by the laws of the State issuing, or whose grantee issued, such lease. A negative determination under this subsection may be made by the Secretary only after giving to the holder of the lease notice and an opportunity to be heard.

"(c) With respect to any mineral lease that is within the scope of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall exercise such powers of supervision and control as may be vested in the lessor by law or the terms and provisions of the lease.

"(d) The permission granted in subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to be a waiver of such claims, if any, as the United States may have against the lessor or the lessee or any other person respecting sums payable or paid for or under the lease, or respecting activities conducted under the lease, prior to the effective date of this resolution.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary is authorized, with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States and upon the application of any lessor or lessee of a mineral lease issued by or under the authority of a State, its political subdivision or grantee, on tidelands or submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of such State, to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in such lands or in the mineral deposits within them. The authority granted in this section shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (a) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (b) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (c) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (d) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians.

"SEC. 3. In the event of a controversy between the United States and a State as to whether or not lands are submerged lands beneath navigable inland waters, the Secretary is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of subsections (a) and (c) of section 1 of this joint resolution, and with the concurrence of the Attorney General of the United States, to negotiate and enter into agreements with the State, its political subdivision or grantee or a lessee thereof, respecting operations under existing mineral leases and payment and impounding of rents, royalties, and other sums payable thereunder, or with the State, its political subdivision or grantee, respecting the issuance or nonissuance of new mineral leases pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy: *Provided, however,* That the authorization contained in this section shall not be construed to be a limitation upon the authority conferred on the Secretary in other sections of this joint resolution. Payments made pursuant to such agreement, or pursuant to any stipulation between the United States and a State, shall be considered as compliance with section 1 (a) (4) hereof. Upon the termination of such agreement or stipulation by reason of the final settlement or adjudication of such controversy, if the lands subject to any mineral lease are determined to be in whole or in part submerged land of the Continental Shelf, the lessee, if he has not already done so, shall comply with the requirements of section 1 (a), and thereupon the provisions of section 1 (b) shall govern such lease. The following stipulations and authorizations are hereby approved and confirmed: (i) The stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to certain bays and harbors in the State of California; (ii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 26, 1947, relating to the continuance of oil and gas operations in the submerged lands within the boundaries of the State of California and herein referred to as the operating stipulation; (iii) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated July 28, 1948, extending the term of said operating stipulation; (iv) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated August 2, 1949, further extending the term of said operating stipulation; (v) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated August 21, 1950, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vi) the stipulation entered into in the case of United States against State of California, between the Attorney General of the United States and the Attorney General of California, dated Septmeber 24, 1951, further extending and revising said operating stipulation; (vii) the notice concerning 'Oil and Gas Operations in the Submerged Coastal Lands of the Gulf of Mexico' issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 11, 1950 (15 F. R. 8835), as amended by the notice dated January 26, 1951 (16 F. R. 953), and as supplemented by the notices dated February 2, 1951 (16 F. R. 1203), March 5, 1951 (16 F. R. 2195), April 23, 1951 (16 F. R. 3623), June 25, 1951 (16 F. R. 6404), August

22, 1951 (16 F. R. 8720), October 24, 1951 (16 F. R. 10998), and December 21, 1951 (17 F. R. 43), respectively.

"SEC. 4. (a) In order to meet the urgent need during the present emergency for further exploration and development of the oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, the Secretary is authorized, pending the enactment of further legislation on the subject, to grant to the qualified persons offering the highest bonuses on a basis of competitive bidding oil and gas leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf which are not covered by leases within the scope of subsection (a) of section 1 of this joint resolution: *Provided, however,* That, for a period of 5 years after the effective date of this joint resolution, such authority of the Secretary may be exercised within the seaward boundaries of a State only with the prior approval of the agency or official of the State, its political subdivision or grantee which under applicable law of the State or its political subdivision would have had authority to lease the area.

"(b) A lease issued by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall cover an area of such size and dimensions as the Secretary may determine, shall be for a period of 5 years and as long thereafter as oil or gas may be produced from the area in paying quantities, or drilling or well reworking operations as approved by the Secretary are conducted thereon, shall require the payment of a royalty of not less than 12½ percent, and shall contain such rental provisions and such other terms and provisions as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in advance of offering the area for lease.

"(c) All moneys paid to the Secretary for or under leases granted pursuant to this section shall be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury to be disposed of as hereinafter provided.

"(d) The issuance of any lease by the Secretary pursuant to this section 4 of this joint resolution, or the refusal of the Secretary to certify that the United States does not claim any interest in any submerged lands pursuant to section 2 of this joint resolution, shall not prejudice the ultimate settlement or adjudication of the question as to whether or not the area involved is submerged land beneath navigable inland waters.

"SEC. 5. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section—

"(1) thirty-seven and one-half percent of all moneys received as bonus payments, rents, royalties, and other sums payable with respect to operations in submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year; and

"(2) all other moneys received under the provisions of this joint resolution shall be held in a special account in the Treasury pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress concerning the disposition thereof.

"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to moneys received and held pursuant to any stipulation or agreement referred to in section 3 of this joint resolution pending the settlement or adjudication of the controversy.

"(c) If and whenever the United States shall take and receive in kind all or any part of the royalty under a lease maintained or issued under the provisions of this joint resolution and covering submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State, the value of such royalty so taken in kind shall, for the purpose of subsection (a) (1) of this section, be deemed to be the prevailing market price thereof at the time and place of production, and there shall be paid to the State entitled thereto 37½ percent of the value of such royalty.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as he may deem to be necessary or advisable in performing his functions under this joint resolution.

"SEC. 7. (a) The President may, from time to time, withdraw from disposition any of the unleased lands of the Continental Shelf and reserve them for the use of the United States in the interest of national security.

"(b) In time of war, or when the President shall so prescribe, the United States shall have the right of first refusal to purchase at the market price all or any portion of the oil and gas produced from the submerged lands covered by this joint resolution.

"(c) All leases issued under this joint resolution, and leases, the maintenance and operation of which are authorized under this joint resolution, shall contain or be construed to contain a provision whereby authority is vested in the Secretary, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, during a state of war or national emergency declared by the Congress or the President after the effective date of this joint resolution, to suspend operations under, or to terminate any lease; and all such leases shall contain or be construed to contain provisions for the payment of just compensation to the lessee whose operations are thus suspended or whose lease is thus terminated.

"SEC. 8. Nothing herein contained shall affect such rights, if any, as may have been acquired under any law of the United States by any person on lands subject to this joint resolution and such rights, if any, shall be governed by the law in effect at the time they may have been acquired: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained is intended or shall be construed as a finding, interpretation or construction by the Congress that the law under which such rights may be claimed in fact applies to the lands subject to this joint resolution or authorizes or compels the granting of such rights of such lands, and that the determination of the applicability or effect of such law shall be unaffected by anything herein contained.

"SEC. 9. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

"SEC. 10. When used in this joint resolution, (a) the term 'submerged lands of the Continental Shelf' means the lands (including the oil, gas, and other minerals therein) underlying the sea and situated outside the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside the inland waters and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf; (b) the term 'seaward boundary of a State' shall mean a line 3 miles distant from the points at which the paramount rights of the Federal Government in the submerged lands begin; (c) the term 'mineral lease' means any form of authorization for the exploration, development, or production of oil, gas, or other minerals; (d) the term 'tidelands' means lands regularly covered and uncovered by the flow and the ebb of the tides; and (e) the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish at this time to take up the amendment which was excluded?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in question will be passed over.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBMERGED LANDS ON THE COAST OF WASHINGTON STATE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington has in hand a document which is truly remarkable. It may become, as I think it will, historic. I know its substance to be outrageous, unscrupulous and a prime demonstration of the willingness and determination of power-mad and grasping bureaucrats to destroy, bypass, and usurp functions which belong to, and must remain with, the Congress.

The letter to which I make such bold and pointed reference was written under date of February 15, 1952, by the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the State of Washington. I have been given to understand that this letter was actually received by the Governor of Washington State on last Friday, February 29. A copy of the letter was received by me this morning.

It is highly appropriate that I call the attention of the Senate to this letter while the pending business of the Senate deals with the submerged lands and resources of the States of the Union.

In his letter, which I shall shortly read in its entirety, the Secretary of the Interior maintains that the Federal Government, through the Interior Department, has and asserts "paramount rights, full dominion and power" over the coastal submerged lands of the sovereign State of Washington.

The letter in question, Mr. President, is on the stationery of the Interior Department, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR GOVERNOR LANGLIE: On June 23, 1947, the Supreme Court decided *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), and on June 5, 1950, the Court decided *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699), and *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707). Under the doctrine of those cases, the United States believes and asserts that the submerged area along the coast of the State of Washington lying seaward of the following line is subject to the paramount rights, full dominion, and power of the United States, and that such area is not now and never has been owned by the State of Washington.

Mr. President, the description of this line continues for approximately three pages, and I ask unanimous consent that the description be printed as a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the description was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Beginning at Point No. 12, the terminus of the International Boundry Line, United States and Canada, in Juan de Fuca Strait, midway between Bonilla Point on Voncouver Island, and Tatoosh Island Lighthouse in the State of Washington, said point being in latitude 48°29'38.11" and longitude 124°43'34.69";

Thence by a straight line in a southerly direction crossing the Strait of Juan de Fuca, to the point of ordinary low water at the westernmost extremity of Duncan Rock, near latitude 48°24'28" and longitude 124°44'27";

Thence by a straight line in a southerly direction to the westernmost point of the westernmost island of the Tatoosh Island group, near latitude 48°23'31" and longitude 124°44'41";

Thence southerly and southeasterly along the line of ordinary low water, to the southernmost extremity of said island, near latitude 48°23'30" and longitude 124°44'40";

Thence by a series of straight lines in a general easterly direction, connecting the southernmost extremities of two larger islands of the Tatoosh group, to the southernmost extremity of a third small island of said group, near latitude 48°23'22" and longitude 124°44'04";

Thence by a straight line crossing "Hole in the Wall," in a southeasterly direction, to the point of ordinary low water at the westernmost extremity of Cape Flattery near latitude 48°22'55" and longitude 124°43'50";

Thence in a general southeasterly direction along the line of ordinary low water of the Pacific Ocean to the point of ordinary low water at the southernmost extremity of Waatch Point, the northern headland of Mukkaw Bay, near latitude 48°20'13", and longitude 124°40'47";

Thence by a straight line in a southeasterly direction crossing Mukkaw Bay, to the point of ordinary low water on the northernmost extremity of the southern headland of said bay; near latitude 48°19'26" and longitude 124°40'10";

Thence in a general southerly direction along the line of ordinary low water of the Pacific Ocean to the point of ordinarily low water on the western side of the west jetty at the mouth of Quillayute River near latitude 47°54'23", and longitude 124°38'35", except where said line of the ordinary low water is interrupted by streams or other tributary waterways entering the Pacific Ocean between said points, at which places the boundary is a straight line across the mouth of said waterways;

Thence in a straight line in an easterly direction across the mouth of Quillayute River and across both jetties at the mouth of said river to the point of ordinary low water of the ocean on the eastern side of the east jetty near latitude 47°54'30", and longitude 124°38'19";

Thence in a general southerly direction along the line of the ordinary low water of the Pacific Ocean to the point of ordinary low water on the north side of the north jetty at the entrance to Grays Harbor near latitude 46°55'36" and longitude 124°10'39", except where said line of ordinary low water is interrupted by streams, river, or other tributary waterways entering said ocean between said points, at which places the boundary is a straight line across the mouth of such waterways.

Thence by a straight line in a southerly direction crossing the entrance to Grays Harbor and both jetties at said entrance, to the point of the ordinary low water of the ocean on the south side of the south jetty, near latitude 46°54'21" and longitude 124°09'10";

Thence in a southerly direction along the line of ordinary low water of the Pacific Ocean to the point of said low water at the northern headland of the entrance of Willapa Bay near latitude 46°43'13", and longitude 124°05'00";

Thence by a straight line across the entrance of Willapa Bay to the point of ordinary low water on the northwesternmost extremity of Leadbetter Point, the southern headland of said bay, near latitude 46°38'40" and longitude 124°03'32";

Thence in a southerly direction along the line of the ordinary low water of the Pacific Ocean to the point of low water on the north side of the north jetty at the mouth of the Columbia River, near latitude 46°15'52" and longitude 124°05'10", except where such line of low water is interrupted by streams, river, or other tributary waterways entering the Pacific Ocean between said points, at which place the boundary is a straight line across the mouth of such waterways;

Thence on a straight line in a southeasterly direction toward the point of ordinary low water of the Pacific Ocean on the south side of the south jetty at the mouth of the Columbia River, crossing the north jetty, to the boundary between the States of Oregon and Washington which, for the purpose of this description, is considered to be the middle of the main ship channel entering Columbia River, near latitude 46°15'21", and longitude 124°04'13".

(The geographic features and positions referred to in this description are as shown on United States Coast and Geodetic Survey Charts No. 6002, edition of July 1942 corrected to July 23, 1951; No. 6102 edition of April 1946 corrected to September 17, 1951; supplemented by data from Chart No. 6151 edition of November 1949 corrected to July 9, 1951; No. 6185 edition of December 1948 corrected to March 12, 1951; No. 6195 edition of July 1945 corrected to October 2, 1950; and No. 6265 edition of July 1934 corrected to January 22, 1951.)

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I would say to the uninitiated and to the lay person that the description as laid down by the Secretary of the Interior merely means that the Federal Government lays claim to all the property in the State of Washington seaward from low water.

The letter continues, on its third page:

We understand that the State of Washington has issued oil and gas permits and leases to private parties on submerged lands situated seaward of the line described above. Under the doctrine of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, any such permits or leases are void, since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the leasing power of the State of Washington or its agencies.

Therefore, the State of Washington is requested to take no further action inconsistent with the rights of the United States in the submerged lands of the continental shelf lying seaward of the line described above, and to regard any oil and gas permits or leases issued by it as ineffective to confer any rights respecting such lands.

With respect to any such oil and gas permits or leases, we would appreciate being advised of the names of the permittees or lessees, their addresses, the dates of issuance, and the areas covered.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, a copy of this letter was sent by the Secretary of the Interior to Mr. George R. Stuntz, Special Assistant to the Attorney General, 1052 Olympia National Building, Seattle 4, Wash.

Now, Mr. President, let us get down to business, if we may, for a minute or two.

In this letter the Secretary of Interior expresses himself as believing that he can impose his will and dictate his wishes to the State of Washington by drawing an arbitrary line along the coast of the State of Washington delimiting its historically recognized rights and powers. The Secretary assumes the confiscatory power to strip the State of Washington of its submerged lands and resources seaward from the ordinary point of low water-mark. It ought to be unnecessary for me to advise the Secretary of Interior that the citizens of Washington State will never voluntarily submit to this fantastic attempt to confiscate rights and property which belong to them.

Mr. President, it must be common knowledge that, with reference to the question of submerged lands, the Federal Government has not filed any suit against the State of Washington, nor has the Congress of the United States conferred any such power to sue on the Secretary of Interior.

The Secretary has employed audacity sufficient to enable him to demand that the State of Washington void leases it has already issued on its submerged coastal lands and cease the issuance of any further leases. The Secretary has demanded that the State of Washington immediately furnish him with every detail covering every lease which has already been issued.

I urge every one of my colleagues, whether they represent an inland or a coastal State, to bear this warning fact in mind. Every State in the Union is equally subject to the strange and dangerous doctrine of paramount power which the Federal Government believes that it has. I trust that each of my colleagues, particularly from all of the States along the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific coasts, such as Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, Rhode Island, Delaware, Alabama, and Oregon will study this alarming letter by the Secretary of the Interior for every Member of the Senate ought to recognize and realize that the people of their States, and the States themselves, may too easily in the future suffer from a comparable disregard for and invasion of their rights.

This doctrine of paramount power which the Secretary of the Interior seeks to impose on the sovereignty of the State of Washington violates the guaranties provided by our Constitution which protect private property and the rights of States and unless this doctrine is stopped by the Congress can lead to the nationalization of the natural resources of our Nation regardless of the State in which they may be located. If the Federal Government, allegedly in the interest of national defense has this right of paramount power over the submerged lands and resources of Washington, California, Texas, and Louisiana, it has the same power over every farm, river, mine, and factory in every State in the Nation. Supreme Court Justice Reed is but one of many thoughtful students who hold this assertion I make to be true.

The letter of the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of Washington State is unwarranted, without force of law, and ridiculous on its face. The Secretary publicly demands a greater production of oil for national defense, yet he arbitrarily orders the State of Washington to cease any further development of whatever tideland oil resources that great State may possess.

There is one redeeming feature about the letter written by the Secretary of

the Interior. It comes to us at the moment when submerged tidelands legislation is the pending business. Though the Secretary had no authority to impose any order or make any request of the State of Washington, his letter advises us most clearly what the Department of the Interior proposes to do with or without any authority from the Congress of the United States. I take it to be undeniably true that the Congress will prevent the Secretary of the Interior from dictating to any sovereign State until the Congress has by legislation adopted a course of action which it will require the Secretary of the Interior or any other Federal agent to follow literally.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The contention that the paramount rights of the Federal Government are such that a State has no control over submerged lands arises from the theory that the Federal Government existed prior to the States, and that the Federal Government is really not one of limited powers—a theory which might lead to all sorts of strange interpretations of the law.

Mr. CAIN. I could not agree with my colleague from Louisiana more strongly.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator was not in the Chamber when I read this passage from a message of President James Monroe in 1822, discussing that fallacy, which could conceivably be argued, and stating that the Federal Government had no such rights. He said, on page 159 of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents:

> In short, it is not easy to perceive all the consequences into which such a doctrine might lead.

Mr. CAIN. I am sorry I was not present in the Chamber earlier this afternoon. However, because of my respect for the Senator's views on this question, I expect to read every word of what has been offered for the RECORD by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am hopeful that tomorrow we can keep the Senate in session at least until 5 o'clock. We are very anxious to complete consideration of the pending joint resolution. I know that there is a great deal of interest in the proposed legislation. There are a number of amendments to be disposed of. However, we also have a great deal of other proposed legislation to dispose of during this session. It is necessary that we proceed expeditiously. I hope Senators will be ready to speak upon the unfinished business tomorrow, so that we shall not have to adjourn earlier than 5 o'clock.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I know of several Senators who have been working on this subject. It is a very difficult and technical question in some respects. They wanted a little more time to prepare the speeches which they intend to deliver on the subject. I believe they will not disappoint the Senator from Arizona in the future.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 6, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 5 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be a member of the Public Advisory Board established under title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Donald L. Crocker, First Methodist Church, Champaign, Ill., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who art the Father of all mankind, we thank Thee for Thy graciousness to us. Especially we thank Thee for the great heritage which is ours as Americans, for the idealism and the purposes of the founding fathers.

We pray, our Father, that in all these troubled days of the world's history the principles of justice and freedom and concern for the oppressed may be lifted high in our land and that we may lead the nations of the earth in the paths of democracy and peace.

We pray, our Father, Thy blessing upon this House, and we pray that the Members here may seek to know Thy will and to build Thy Kingdom to the instrumentality of this great Nation.

In the spirit of Jesus Christ, we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 29, 1952:

H. R. 6273. An act to amend the act relating to the incorporation of Trinity College of Washington, D. C., in order to make the archbishop of the Roman Catholic archdiocese of Washington an ex officio member and chairman of the board of trustees of such college; and

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution designating September 17 of each year as Citizenship Day.

On March 3, 1952:

H. R. 3981. An act to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control";

H. R. 5235. An act to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make such studies and investigations deemed necessary concerning the location and construction of a bridge over the Potomac River, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4419. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1947.

On March 4, 1952:

H. R. 4749. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the Police Jury of Caddo Parish, La.

On March 5, 1952:

H. R. 2672. An act for the relief of the law firm of Harrington & Graham;

H. R. 3569. An act for the relief of Louis Campbell Boyd;

H. R. 4130. An act for the relief of Caroline Wu;

H. R. 4224. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Hartley;

H. R. 4877. An act for the relief of Mrs. Margherita Caroli; and

H. R. 5256. An act to secure the attendance of witnesses from without the District of Columbia in criminal proceedings.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE (H. DOC. NO. 378)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Secretary of State, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., March 4, 1952.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have been directed by the President to acknowledge receipt of House Resolution 514, and to call attention to his statement of February 20, when, at his press conference, he responded to the question, "Have any commitments been made to Great Britain on sending troops anywhere?" by a categorical "No."

Sincerely yours,

DEAN ACHESON.

PRESIDENT'S AIRPORT COMMISSION

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, with the hope of obtaining immediate remedial action, I forwarded certain facts and data to the President's Airport Commission, which, I feel, illustrate certain hazards to safety now prevailing at Washington National Airport.

As you know, the President, aware of widespread public reaction following the three tragic air accidents at Elizabeth, N. J., named a temporary commission to explore what can be done to protect "the safety, welfare, and peace of mind" of persons living near airports and, meanwhile, recognize "the importance of a progressive and efficient aviation industry."

The President's action was most timely. A prompt, realistic study of safety conditions at this time not only will help remove unsafe facilities or situations where they do exist, but also will nip in the bud a developing lack of confidence in air passenger transportation.

In my letter, addressed to Gen. James H. Doolittle, Chairman of the President's Commission, I voiced my concern toward such a trend. I think all Americans can point with just pride to the phenomenal strides made in aviation in this country, and all during a short period observed by each of us.

Just in the 13 years I have been a Member of the House, and studied more closely the national aspects of the aviation industry, the total number of passengers carried in domestic airlines grew from 1,197,100 in 1939 to 17,346,913 in 1950. Though final figures are not yet available for 1951, the airlines report a still higher traffic load for that year.

This growth, over such a short period, can be attributed directly to a strengthening of confidence in aviation. If this growth is to be continued, all interested parties—the Congress, the appropriate Government agencies, and the airlines—must tenderly nurture the seed of confidence in aviation now fairly well established in the American mind.

Prompt action is required to remove at once any hazardous conditions which could cost more lives and seriously retard a young and virile industry.

And, on this point, I feel that there is no better place to start than right here in the Nation's Capital.

In my letter to General Doolittle, I pointed up these two evident facts:

First. Members of the aviation transportation industry are concerned with the heavy traffic load now moving in and out of Washington National Airport, and have so expressed themselves.

Second. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has balked at taking remedial action, although its own records show that a critical situation prevails—far more serious than in 1949 when the CAA did act to cut traffic at Washington National following two fatal plane crashes within 6 weeks of each other.

On this first point, I should like to bring to your attention a letter sent on February 4, 1952, by Merrill F. Redfern, executive secretary of the Air Traffic Conference of America, a division of the Air Transport Association.

Mr. Redfern, in this letter addressed to member representatives throughout the United States, described conditions at Washington National as constituting an extremely tight situation.

Mr. Redfern suggested, as a step to ease this extremely tight situation, that air traffic men throughout the United States should take steps to route more traffic into Friendship International Airport, an ultra-modern air facility located 40 minutes to the northeast of Washington.

The second point mentioned in the letter to General Doolittle confirms Mr. Redfern's apprehensions. It consists of a few cold statistics, but, when properly evaluated, they illustrate how critical the situation now is at Washington National.

Allow me to read to you some figures concerning operations at Washington National for the past 3 years:

1949: 165,033 movements, carrying 1,386,887 passengers.

1950: 148,748 movements, carrying 1,629,723 passengers.

1951: 186,747 movements, carrying 2,458,787 passengers.

Now just what do these figures represent? Why was there such a large drop in movements in 1950? Why was the figure so high in 1951?

First, we must remind ourselves again of those two unfortunate accidents in 1949. One of them, on November 2, resulted in the death of our fellow colleague, Representative Bates, and 54 other persons. The other, on December 12, resulted in 4 deaths and 19 seriously injured.

Also, at that time, we should remember, the Civil Aeronautics Administration had already foreseen the fact that Washington National, in less than a decade since its completion, was being heavily taxed to adequately serve the large amount of air traffic moving to and from Washington. With this view in mind, the CAA recognized that it shortly might be put out of the airport business.

Washington National Airport is maintained and operated by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, a situation unique within the continental limits of the United States. Apparently the CAA did not want to be put out of the airport business, a mission entirely incidental to its principal function, so it then asked Congress to authorize funds so it could build a bigger and more adequate airport in the State of Virginia.

Following the 1949 crashes, the CAA explained that traffic was too heavy at Washington National and announced that it would take steps to cut the load. It did, principally by cutting military flights from 23,317 in 1949, to 6,325 in 1950.

Meanwhile, we find by looking at the records for 1951 that traffic movements at Washington National totaled 186,747, or 21,000 more than in 1949 when the CAA decreed that traffic was too heavy and diverted military flights to other airports.

Represented within these figures is the fact that scheduled carrier flights increased from 121,136 in 1949, to 143,021 in 1951.

That means if any additional diversions are to be made they must be made with domestic passenger and freight flights.

And, that is exactly what Mr. Redfern had in mind when he proposed that more traffic be channeled into Friendship International Airport.

But, why has the CAA refused to act. The statistics cited here today are well known to top CAA personnel. Known also to these same officials is the very evident—and practical fact that a transfer of some domestic traffic, particularly long-distance flights or peak-load traffic, will conclusively demonstrate that Friendship International can adequately serve as a supplemental airport to Washington National.

And here is why the CAA realizes this undeniable reality.

Spokesmen for the Administration have stated that the travel time between Friendship and Washington is too long—45 minutes—and, therefore, Congress should keep the CAA in the airport business and spend millions of dollars and huge quantities of scarce materials to build them a "new and bigger toy" at Burke, Va.

That argument just does not hold water.

It takes 20 minutes to travel from Washington National to the same point in Washington which is 45 minutes ground travel time from Friendship.

We all agree on that.

But, should you ask the CAA what is the average stacking time at Washington National they will tell you 17 minutes.

Add the 17 to 20 minutes and you come up with 37 minutes, or on the average only 8 minutes different from using Friendship.

Yet, that is only part of the picture.

Not all passengers flying into Washington are fortunate enough to strike the average figure. Sometimes stacking time amounts to as much as an hour and a half.

And, on other occasions, some flights approaching Washington are told to cut down on their air speed, perhaps adding 30 minutes or more on a flight from Chicago to Washington, before the plane even stacks up for his average 17 minutes.

Further, if we look back at the figures given above we will note that Washington National processed 2,458,787 passengers in 1950, as compared to 1,386,887 in 1949.

And what does this mean? Simply that it takes each passenger a little bit longer, maybe another 10 minutes, to move from his plane to the outside door of Washington National.

Add this time to the stacking time and the ground travel time and you will find that it will all add up to a figure less than required to reach Washington by arriving at Friendship International.

This is the type of vital information which the officials of the Civil Aeronautics Administration keep back in the deep recesses of their minds, but do not express, when they are asked to take immediate action to relieve the critical traffic situation at Washington National.

And, unfortunately, it is just this sort of situation which can lead to tragic consequences.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has been charged with the primary function of fostering the development of civil aeronautics and air commerce.

Running an airport is just something extra which they have taken on as an expanding Federal bureau.

And running an airport is the type of business it would be best for the CAA to discontinue.

In Airport Design, a publication issued by the CAA in 1949, the CAA makes this recommendation:

> Safety of aircraft operations is of primary importance in the selection of an airport site. On this point there can be no compromise in favor of other considerations.

I thoroughly agree with this CAA pronouncement.

To extend it just a trifle I am convinced that on the entire question "safety of aircraft operations is of primary importance," and "on this point there can be no compromise in favor of other considerations."

I am convinced that the CAA would stick to its knitting much better and take a realistic view of the critical situation now existing in Washington, if the CAA, itself, were not operating Washington National Airport.

So, therefore, I propose to introduce legislation that the CAA and other Government agencies charged with regulatory powers to assure safety in the field of aviation be prohibited from operating airports, or other facilities subject to their own regulations.

And, there's a further and, indeed, more fundamental point at stake in this entire situation.

In its effort to hold on to and expand its airport operating activities, the CAA has taken certain steps against the fundamental principles of the sovereignty of our several States.

Over the protests of our neighbors in Virginia, the CAA has brought strong Federal influence to bear to condemn and obtain land so they may have a site for their new project.

We have long recognized the authority of the Federal Government to legally acquire land by condemnation when such land is required for military, defense, or other uses in the national interest.

However, this situation is quite different, if not unique, from precedent.

Actually, what CAA will set up will be a commercial operation just as they have here in Washington—an airport to serve commercial airlines.

This situation can best be brought into its true perspective, if we could imagine, for a moment, what the courts would say if the transportation division of the Department of Commerce should ask for the condemnation of land in any of the States so it could build a bigger and better railroad station.

I invite each of you to look deeply into the facts and intrigue involved in the Washington National Airport situation. I ask you to join with me in promulgating these facts and taking prompt action to assure the future safety of Washingtonians, air travelers, and the air-carrier industry.

THE KATYN MASSACRE COMMITTEE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Katyn Massacre Committee has obtained two moving picture films relating to the murder of Polish officers and intelligentsia in the Katyn Forest during the early part of World War II. One film is the German version and the other is the Russian version. Members of this committee and the House Foreign Affairs Committee have already seen this film and agree that all Members of Congress should be accorded this same privilege.

The Speaker has granted permission for these films to be shown to Members of Congress on Thursday, March 6. The picture will be shown in the Banking and Currency Committee room, room 1301, New House Office Building.

Running time of these films is approximately 20 minutes. The films will be shown at 10 a. m., 11 a. m., 2 p. m., 3 p. m., and 4 p. m.

On behalf of the entire committee, I extend to you an invitation to be present at your convenience.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman had a conference recently with the Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and myself regarding authority at a later date for the members of the special committee to go abroad to complete the investigation. The resolution has been introduced, I understand.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that that is vitally important, because I cannot see how the special committee, of which the distinguished gentleman from Indiana is the chairman, and doing such an outstanding job, can complete this investigation without going abroad. I make these remarks in the hope that the Committee on Rules will give an early hearing and report the resolution out; and, if so, I shall program it immediately.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to thank the gentleman. I might say, since the committee has started hearings, we have learned, there are possibly 40 or 50 witnesses abroad that are very important witnesses.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it would be well to include in your remarks the fact, so that the American people will know it, and the world will know it, that these graves were found on Russian territory.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. Has the committee already obtained permission to visit these graves? Can they obtain such permission?

Mr. MADDEN. We have not obtained permission to visit the graves, but there are a great number of witnesses in England and in France, and some in Western Germany who want to testify at hearings, if they could be held over there.

Mr. SADLAK. Does the committee also intend to go to Smolensk?

Mr. MADDEN. We have no permission from the Soviet as the graves are now behind the iron curtain. I do not know if we can get permission.

Mr. DONDERO. That would have to be received from the Russian Government?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Has the testimony before the committee indicated that Germans were tried by the Nuremberg court for these murders?

Mr. MADDEN. Not yet, but that testimony will come out before the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that subcommittee No. 3 of the Small Business Committee be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I think that the proceedings of yesterday disclose a very serious weakness in the rules of the House of Representatives. The House was not permitted to work its will on a bill reported by one of its standing committees. The situation was presented in this fashion:

One of our standing committees brought to the House of Representatives a bill for the consideration of the House. The bill was accompanied by many committee amendments, possibly as many as a hundred. We proceeded to consider the bill in the Committee of the Whole, and after the first section was read a substitute for the entire bill was offered and tentatively adopted. Then we went back into the House.

Thereupon another vote on the substitute occurred and it was voted down. But the House was, under its present rules, denied the privilege of returning to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the purpose of further considering the committee bill. The House was finally required to vote on the bill in the form in which it was originally introduced. Not even the members of the standing committee approved of the bill in that form because they had, as I said, reported it with possibly a hundred amendments.

I think possibly the rules of the House ought to be amended so as to prevent the recurrence of such a situation. I think possibly that when a substitute is

finally voted down, as it was yesterday, the House should be permitted to go back into the Committee of the Whole to further consider and work its will on the legislation which was reported by the standing committee.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I fully subscribe to the remarks of the gentleman. I hope the Committee on Armed Services will undertake to bring out a new bill, especially with the Vinson amendment included.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has missed my point. That would not cure the rule to which I have addressed my remarks. It is on the rules only that I am addressing my remarks and not on the merits or demerits of the legislation pending on yesterday.

In the interest of sound and orderly procedure I think this matter should be looked into. I do not profess to be an authority on House rules or good parliamentary procedure. But I do know that terrific confusion existed here yesterday and many Members were amazed when they found the House in such an unusual parliamentary snarl from which there was no relief.

KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of Congress the fact that the work of the Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre is having a tremendous effect on the people behind the iron curtain and has proven its effectiveness from the standpoint of our psychological warfare with Communist ideology.

According to an Associated Press dispatch from Moscow dated March 3, the Russian paper Pravda devoted two and one-half of its four pages to republishing the text of the conclusions reached by the hand-picked Russian committee which reported on the Katyn massacre in January 1944.

Another Associated Press dispatch from Warsaw, Poland, dated March 4, stated that the entire Polish press republished this same statement.

Evidently the Russian cause is being harmed by the disclosures which the Katyn committee has brought to the attention of the American public and to the world which are opening the eyes of the American people and the world to the true nature of communism.

In my judgment and in the judgment of the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. RAY MADDEN, chairman of the committee, the work of this group will do more to bolster the spirits of the captive people behind the iron curtain than any other previous disclosures regarding the nature of communism.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEEHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Just how far has the gentleman's committee gotten in this investigation? It has been called to my attention that there is a raft of people abroad whose testimony the committee very badly needs to make a complete record. Is that a fact?

Mr. SHEEHAN. Yes, the gentleman is perfectly right. In order to complete the work of the investigation we have to go abroad.

Mr. COX. The suggestion has been made that the House should give the gentleman's committee permission to visit one or two points in Europe in order to take this testimony. Very frankly, I have never been too enthusiastic about the granting of this authority, but in the instant case I am convinced that from the psychological and propaganda standpoint Congress could not spend the money necessary for making the trip for anything else that would pay so great a dividend as would be derived if it were to grant permission to the gentleman's committee to make this investigation.

Mr. SHEEHAN. The gentleman is very correct in his statement.

THE LATE HOWARD CHANDLER CHRISTY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker. In the passing of Howard Chandler Christy yesterday our country lost one of its most loyal citizens and without a doubt its finest magazine illustrator and portrait painter.

It was my good fortune to have known Mr. Christy for many years. He stood for all that was fine and right in our American way of living.

All about us here in the halls of Congress are evidences of his marvelous ability as an artist. Few paintings in the Capitol attract more attention than his Signing of the Constitution, that hangs over the stairs leading to the Chamber floor. His fidelity of expression, his wonderful colorings, and his extraordinary attention to detail bring to life the subjects he portrayed.

Several years ago he was delegated by the American Legion to paint my portrait, which now hangs in the hearing room of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. While sitting for this portrait I learned to respect Mr. Christy's keen insight into our national problems. He understood so well the difficulties facing our disabled veterans, and he was helpful to many of them. His painting of servicemen covered three wars. Even as far back as the Spanish-American War his drawings of the Rough Riders were an inspiration. During World War I he painted posters for the Army, Navy, and the Liberty Loan. Many will remember his famous Fight or Buy Bonds. During World War II he turned out countless paintings for service organizations and others.

Howard Chandler Christy will not be forgotten. His loss is a sad one and I know that many of you will join with me in expressing deepest sympathy to his bereaved widow and daughter.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for today, and to address the House for 25 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], our distinguished chairman of the Katyn Massacre Committee of the House say that the Russian and German films will be made available to anyone who cares to see them.

I want to add to the record what our committee has done in regard to this subject. We have prepared and sent to the Russian Government an invitation to come before our committee if it has any witnesses it desires to present, any evidence it cares to present or any documents it cares to present, in order that it may know and the world may know that American justice is exactly what we say it is, a desire to be fair to both sides.

We received a reply from the Russian Government to the effect that it had already submitted a report to this Government and to the world in 1944; that it had made an investigation of this matter. However, that investigation or commission was made up entirely of Russians, not by representatives from neutral countries. Another investigation was made by the Germans in which neutral governments were asked to participate, and the International Red Cross, and that Commission, as we are informed, although we do not know all the facts yet, came to an entirely different conclusion from the Russian commission that investigated the matter in 1944.

THE OATIS CASE

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Speaker, in one of today's newspapers, we see a new headline which says Czechs demand steel mill for Oatis freedom. I, for one, am hoping that some day we can see a headline which says that the United States

demands something. I wonder whether or not our dignity has dropped to such a low ebb that we succumb to a satellite of the Soviet bloc. In the early days of this Republic, tribute and ransom were paid to the pirates of the Barbary Coast and other places, but certainly, my friends, and friends of William Oatis, that day has passed. Even then the President of the United States sent Decatur with ships to put a stop to this type of brigandage.

A ransom of $120,000 was paid to free four American fliers forced down in Hungary.

Is it not time that we should take a firm stand to demand strict adherence to the principles on which we have built this foundation of our country? Vogeler was ransomed. A proposal even was reported to trade a runaway Czechoslovakian train for Oatis, and now comes the report of a trade of a steel mill for Oatis—and the steel mill can make war supplies to be used against our fighting boys.

I hope you will join me in a request to the State Department and to the executive department to press the demands that have been made by the resolution in behalf of William Oatis, which was passed by both Houses.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this occasion to agree with my friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] about the frustration which faced this House yesterday on the UMT bill, and the need for amending the rules. I would like to go one step further and point out that the committee has it within its power to bring back a bill, and submit that bill to the will of the House as well as submit to the House the merits of the amendments made by the committee itself, which were contained in the bill, which were adopted in Committee of the Whole yesterday but were not before us on the motion to recommit due to the parliamentary situation. I believe that if the committee feels as keenly as it obviously does about the need for a measure of this kind for the total military manpower preparation of the country, then its duty is not to lick its wounds but to come back here with a measure which, I think, a majority of the House really wants.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CLINICAL RESEARCH CENTER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a letter from Dr. R. E. Dyer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is to call attention to H. R. 6530 introduced by my distinguished colleague, Hon. REID F. MURRAY, of Wisconsin, providing that the Clinical Research Center of the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., shall be named in honor of the late Frank Bateman Keefe.

Frank Keefe served with great distinction in this House for 12 years and was largely responsible for the great medical research institution now nearing completion. Members of this House who served with him on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-Federal Security, have publicly acknowledged that he conceived the idea for this center and through great personal effort won the necessary financial support for its construction. His tremendous ability and vast knowledge of the field of medicine and its problems were also responsible for much of the health legislation enacted by this Congress in recent years. As his stanch supporter while he represented the Sixth Congressional District of Wisconsin in this Congress, and now, as successor to his seat in this body, I have personal knowledge of his work and feel that the honor which would be bestowed upon his memory by enactment of H. R. 6530 would be most fitting and appropriate. I hope that expeditious action will be taken on Congressman MURRAY's bill. In my hand I have a splendid letter from Dr. R. E. Dyer, former director of the National Institutes of Health, endorsing this bill as an appropriate acknowledgment of the contribution Frank Keefe made to this institution and to health in general. Under unanimous consent, I include Dr. Dyer's letter as a part of my remarks:

EMORY UNIVERSITY,
Emory University, Ga., February 19, 1952.
The Honorable REID F. MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MURRAY: I have learned that you have introduced a bill in Congress (H. R. 6530) directing that the new Clinical Research Center Building of the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., be named in memory of former Congressman Frank B. Keefe. I was very much distressed to learn of Mr. Keefe's recent death, and I can think of no more suitable acknowledgment of his career than that proposed by H. R. 6530. I think that you are to be congratulated on your wisdom and your thoughtfulness.

During the many years while Mr. Keefe was in Congress he showed an extraordinary interest in the problems of human health and the development of research which might help solve these problems. His wholehearted efforts went far in arousing interest and support in the Congress without regard to political affiliations. It is to Frank Keefe that the leading part of the credit, with the support of his colleagues, for the construction of the new Clinical Research Center in Bethesda is due. I sincerely hope your bill will receive unanimous approval.

Very sincerely,

R. E. DYER, M. D.,
Director of Research, Winship Clinic, Emory University, Ga.; Former Director, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Speaker, the action taken by this body yesterday is not indicative of the feelings of many Members toward the principle of universal military training. During the debate, it was brought out that it was the duty of the Congress to take some action on universal military training in order to provide for a strong Reserve and to cut down on the amount of our military expenditures.

The Brownson plan was sound in many respects and would have provided us with a reservoir of trained reservists. It is unfortunate that because of the parliamentary situation, the Members of this body were prevented from perfecting a sound plan of universal military training. We owe it to our veterans of World War II who have been called back to duty to bring again to the floor a sound bill incorporating the amendments heretofore agreed to by the Armed Services Committee.

My purpose in rising today is to urge the Committee on Armed Services to bring back that bill to the floor of the House so we can discharge our duty to the veterans of Korea.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, if I thought that the menace of communism had passed never to return, if I thought that Russia had abandoned her campaign to overrun the world, if I thought that reason had been restored to its seat of authority in the Kremlin, if I thought that Russia was bringing the Korean struggle to an end, if I thought that Russia was in the act of liberating the people of the rest of the world whom she has enslaved, I would not be disturbed over what happened on yesterday. But, Mr. Speaker, I know these things are not true, for I still hear the roar of the cannon in Korea, I see the skies aflame with fires of war, and I see Russia still on the march, so my heart is full of sorrow and my mind is disturbed. I fear that from a psychological standpoint what we did to the UMT bill may largely cancel out

the beneficial effect of the billions on top of billions that we have spent in foreign aid. What was done yesterday is no tribute to the realism and the courage of anybody.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], I have no apologies for my vote on UMT. I doubt whether many of those who urged or demanded that I vote for UMT know what was in the bill or realized the extent of the program which President Truman, Secretary of Defense Marshall, and his assistant, Anna Rosenberg, were trying to put over on the American people. I did not realize until I read the RECORD, page 1760, excerpts from the testimony of Anna Rosenberg inserted by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Speaking generally, the Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, members of the auxiliaries and of other veterans' organizations, as well as the American people, are opposed to regimentation and socialization of our Government. Yet these same organizations and many of their members vigorously urged, and some demanded, that we go along with this present program.

The hearings held by a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee disclose that Mrs. Rosenberg estimated that, of the 1,050,000 young men who would reach 18 in the fiscal year which began July 1951, there would be around 100,000 or 150,000 who would not be qualified because of either mental or physical defects to be taken into the program.

Nevertheless, according to her testimony, those who could not qualify for military training were to be taken in as wards of the Government. She said:

> Now, there are, of course, some men who will not be able to go into the Armed Forces on any practical basis because they are incapable of meeting the minimum physical, mental, and moral qualifications. * * *
>
> At this moment the President has no plan * * * which he wants us to submit for these * * * relatively small numbers * * * of men.
>
> It is his concept and that of the Department of Defense that this must be a universal program and that every man physically and mentally and morally capable of performing a service, either in the military or outside, must perform that service.

Note that statement. Young men who cannot meet the physical, mental, and moral qualifications of the military service are to be put into some sort of a program to render the service which the President, his advisers, or subordinates may hereafter direct.

To show that Anna Rosenberg, in disclosing the administration's plans for the youth of America, did not speak inadvertently, permit me to quote from her testimony before the Senate Committee.

Here is the record:

> Senator JOHNSON. Next question is: Under USM act, what "nonmilitary" programs would be provided for individuals who are not physically or mentally qualified for military service?
>
> Mrs. ROSENBERG. That is a program that the military has nothing to do with. That is the program where there are men who are not qualified for military service. The President will have a program. We will not. We will have a program for the limited-service men in the military.
>
> Senator JOHNSON. But, as you testified originally, there will be such a program although it will not be administered by your Department; is that right?
>
> Mrs. ROSENBERG. I have been given to understand that the President is contemplating the formation of such a program. Just when, I cannot say. We have nothing to do with it in the military.

Now, there you have it. If UMT goes through today, it will be followed by the rest of the program—this conscription of youth, not for military training, but for serivce for 8 years, when, where, and in the performance of whatever duties the President may assign.

Why talk about free nations, free people? Why worry about communism, when President Truman and his advisers are now, and for almost a year have been, seeking authority to force every young man in this country to accept orders not only for military service, but for any other service which the President or some of his crackpot advisers may have in mind?

I most respectfully and humbly call the attention of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] to Mrs. Rosenberg's testimony. What the lady said was that she wanted all the bill provided—and of course the bill provided for taking all the young men into this system who are physically and mentally qualified, but, in addition to that, she said the President proposed to take about 150,000 more who are neither physically nor mentally qualified for military service and tell them what to do: In other words, complete socialization, taking all of the youths as they reached the age of 18 into and under the Federal Government.

Could a Hitler, a Mussolini, or a Stalin ask for more?

It is my hope that hereafter those who seek to advise the Members of Congress as to their duties will, each for himself, before he takes his pen in hand to tell us what to do, learn a little more about the proposal which he is advising us to accept.

To my colleague, Mr. SHAFER, I extend my sincere appreciation for his insertion in the RECORD.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING OF ADULTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 381)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the obligations of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization I transmit herewith, for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the Congress may consider appropriate, an authentic text of a recommendation (No. 88) concerning the vocational training of adults including disabled persons, which was adopted at the thirty-third session of the International Labor Conference, held at Geneva from June 7 to July 1, 1950.

For the information of the Congress in its consideration of the recommendation, I transmit also the report of the Secretary of State with regard thereto, together with a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State expressing the coordinated view of the interested departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government with respect to the recommendation. It will be noted that those departments and agencies recommend that no Federal legislative action be taken.

For action and advice with respect to American Samoa and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for transmission to the governments of Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands in order that those governments may give consideration to the enactment of legislation or other action, I am sending texts of the recommendation to the Secretary of the Interior.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 5, 1952.*

(Enclosures: 1. Authentic text of recommendation. 2. Report of the Secretary of State. 3. Letter from the Secretary of Labor (copy).)

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I present a resolution (H. Res. 552) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved*, That ROBERT TRIPP ROSS, of New York, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 1 minute.

WILLIAM N. OATIS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of anger in the newspapers this morning of the impertinence of the Czechs in demanding a steel mill for the return to the United States of William Oatis.

Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I introduced in the House a resolution which would require severance of diplomatic relations with that country if William Oatis were not freed. This resolution should have been passed and if it had been passed William Oatis today would be a free man. There is only one way to treat countries that imprison our Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the massacre of our boys by certain Koreans will be thoroughly investigated. I understand the names of many of these Koreans are known, I understand it has been established which Koreans are responsible for these massacres. I hope those Koreans who have been guilty of these atrocities will be punished.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WE MUST HALT THE WASTE, INEFFICIENCY, AND EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT—MY VOTING RECORD ON TAXES AND ECONOMY

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, in a few days it will be March 15, the last day for filing our 1951 income tax returns. Those who have not filed their returns yet are in for a rude awakening. And those who have already filed their returns need not be reminded of how much of their income has been confiscated through excessive income taxes. The real blow, however, will come a year from now when the full force of the last tax increase voted by this Congress will be brought to bear on the American taxpayer.

Since the close of the last session I have had the opportunity to talk with hundreds of my constituents while circulating through my district. I feel that I know them very well. They are thoroughly disgusted and distraught over the manner in which their Federal Government is operating.

The campaign issues in Illinois this year have already been cast in daily reminders of: Graft and corruption in the Federal Government; the high cost of living; the stalemated war in Korea with its ever-lengthening casualty lists; the continued influence of Communist sympathizers and socialistic planners in the Truman hierarchy; the Dean Acheson brand of foreign policy; and the continued doling out of billions of dollars to foreign nations, not to mention the confiscatory tax burden and the failure of the Truman Administration to eliminate the waste, inefficiency and extravagance in the Federal Government.

It is to these latter two issues that I should like to confine my remarks today for the Congress will soon be in the midst of what I choose to call the appropriating season. We have the opportunity during this season to really cut the Truman budget down to proper proportion and effect some real economies. Much has been said on both sides of the aisle of how much money is being spent by the executive branch of the Government, but let us not forget that the executive branch can spend only what the Congress appropriates. During this appropriating season we will have the opportunity to show our true color on a number of occasions. What kind of record on taxes and spending will you as an individual Member of this House have at the close of this session?

I must say that I am quite proud of my own voting record on these vital issues. I have voted against every one of the three tax increases sponsored by the administration since becoming a Member of this distinguished body.

I would just like to review very briefly my own voting record during the last session on measures which bore significantly on the issues of governmental economy versus bigger Federal spending.

When the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill was considered, I voted for the Wigglesworth amendment to reduce funds for postal operations by $22,000,000.

On the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation, I supported the Jensen amendment to reduce personnel by permitting the filling of only 25 percent of vacancies occurring in 1952.

I voted for the Gary amendment eliminating an expenditure of $3,400,000 for the Southeastern Power Administration construction item embodied in the Interior appropriations bill. On this same bill I supported and voted for the Harris amendment, cutting Bonneville Power Administration construction funds by $5,500,000; the Taber amendment reducing Bureau of Reclamation construction funds by $10,000,000; and the Keating amendment blocking certain Federal power outlays.

Then when the independent offices appropriation bill was being considered, I voted for the Gathings-Phillips amendment to cut the President's emergency fund from $12,500,000 to $1,000,000.

On the State-Justice-Commerce appropriation I supported the Clevenger motion to recommit to effect a $15,000,000 reduction in State Department funds.

I also supported the Taber motion to recommit to effect a 10-percent reduction in all funds except for the Defense Department, and the Reece motion effecting a $350,000,000 cut in funds for economic aid abroad.

The day before yesterday when the first of this session's appropriation bills was considered I was glad to support the Williams amendment to the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill cutting $1,600,000 off this appropriation.

Gentlemen, the appropriating season is upon us and the time is ripe to do some serious pruning. I intend to go right along as I have in the past session in voting for every amendment designed to cut down Federal spending. Here in the House we have the power to control the purse, but we must use that power. As one of my good constituents has said in a letter just recently received:

> When an individual contemplates spending more money than his income will permit, he very sensibly either cuts deeply many of the proposed items he has in mind or cancels them entirely. Government is going to have to follow this same pattern because we are rapidly getting to the bottom of the sock.

There was a time, I am told, when the heads of the Government departments vied with each other in their attempts to keep their requests for appropriations at a bare minimum. And if, by cutting corners, a department chief could finish the year with a surplus, that was a feather in his cap. Those were the days when Government really was the servant of the people, when economy was the yardstick by which we measured a Government official's worth.

But those days are gone. Today the heads of Government bureaus are still vying with each other, but in a different way. Each one is trying to see how large an appropriation he can wheedle out of the Congress; he purposely makes his request larger than he needs in order that he may be sure to get as much as he wants. And if he ends the year with a deficit, it indicates to him that the work of his department is important and growing, and gives him an excuse to raise the ante by a few billions the following year. Each Government bureau, agency, or department is an empire, and that empire depends on the number of jobholders and the mushrooming size of the appropriations. It is a vicious spiral of inefficiency and maladministration, a profligate policy of spend and waste, that will drive us all to the poorhouse unless it is halted now.

Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, has said that—

> If we are to strive for the solvency and the financial stability of our Nation, we must recognize economy in Government as our patriotic duty, otherwise we may learn the tragic lesson that a bankrupt Nation cannot defend its own freedom—much less protect other nations against Communist enslavement.

The people in my district and all the rest of the American people cannot be blamed for growing restive about the present state of the Nation when it is obvious to them that the administration's only policy is to spend and spend, waste and waste, tax and tax.

If we continue this reckless policy of deficit spending, if we continue this orgy of socialistic experimentation and scandalous waste, the resulting economic catastrophe will be more decisive and more crushing than a defeat on the battlefield.

We can do something about it, however, by simply pulling taut the purse strings during this appropriating season.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PRIEST and to include a newspaper article by John D. Morris, of the New York Times.

Mr. SASSCER.

Mrs. KEE and to include an address delivered by Donald L. Wilson, national commander, American Legion.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. SAYLOR in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BURDICK.

Mr. SADLAK in two instances and to include newspaper extracts.

Mr. RIEHLMAN.

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include a newspaper story.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an article from the Hammond Times, of Hammond, Ind.

Mr. BENTSEN and to include a statement by the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN.

Mr. YATES and to include an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. HOLIFIELD.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include extraneous material.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2212. An act conferring jurisdiction upon a United States district court to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others;

H. R. 2958. An act for the relief of William C. Reed; and

H. R. 3219. An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WELCH, for an indefinite period, on account of business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 6, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1219. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $36,000 for the American Battle Monuments Commission (H. Doc. No. 377); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1220. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the information that he has been directed by the President to acknowledge receipt of House Resolution 514, and to call attention to his statement of February 20 (H. Doc. No. 378); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

1221. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $15,000 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 379); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1222. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of $75,000 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 380); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1223. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the seventeenth annual report of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to section 23 (b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, approved June 6, 1934; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1224. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 1699, title 18, United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1225. A letter from the Chairman, Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, transmitting a report on Federal grants-in-aid to States, including direct payments to States under cooperative arrangements and Federal expenditures within States for relief and other aid, pursuant to subsection (b), section 601, title 6, of the Revenue Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 726) (S. Doc. No. 101, 82d Cong., 2d sess.); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1226. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Frederick Ernest Pokorny or Bedrich Pokorny, file No. A-6973881 CR 32575, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1227. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Kam Chuen or Kum Choon Lew, file No. A-9687814 CR 34145, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1228. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Manuel Rivera Mendoza or Manuel Mendoza Rivera, file No. A-747.930 CR 37391, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 5990. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1460). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6319. A bill to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1461). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FARRINGTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4511. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1462). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6336. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; with amendment (Rept. No. 1463). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1464). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 465. An act for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris; without amendment (Rept. No. 1465). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 560. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1466). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 589. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi; without amendment (Rept. No. 1468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 828. An act for the relief of Berta Comes Leite; without amendment (Rept. No. 1469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 914. An act for the relief of Masako Mivazaki; without amendment (Rept. No. 1470). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1255. An act for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok; without amendment (Rept. No. 1472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1620. An act for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1782. An act for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos; without amendment (Rept. No. 1474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1925. An act for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles; without amendment (Rept. No. 1475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 825. A bill for the relief of Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann; without amendment (Rept. No. 1476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1261. A bill for the relief of Alexander L. Wiesiolowski; with amendment (Rept. No. 1477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Senta Ziegler; with amendment (Rept. No. 1479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1969. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic; with

amendment (Rept. No. 1480). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2222. A bill for the relief of Margaret Celikcan; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie; with amendment (Rept. No. 1482). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2832. A bill for the relief of Leszek Kazimierz Pawlowicz; with amendment (Rept. No. 1483). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3155. A bill for the relief of Sebastiano Belló, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenzo Dall' Alda, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Montini; without amendment (Rept. No. 1484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3598. A bill for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene; without amendment (Rept. No. 1485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3953. A bill for the relief of Chan Toy Har; without amendment (Rept. No. 1486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5238. A bill for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 6906. A bill to place the Federal budget on a biennial basis, to require that general appropriation acts provide funds for a period of two fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 6907. A bill providing for distribution of certain funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation in North Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 6908. A bill to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 6909. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 6910. A bill to establish a temporary commission to investigate the costs and effects of watershed programs for flood control in agricultural watersheds; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 6911. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. J. Res. 398. Joint resolution to create a Joint Committee on Fiscal Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6912. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Board of Home Missions and Church Extension of the Methodist Church; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 6913. A bill for the relief of Harry Ray Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 6914. A bill for the relief of Harry Singer, also known as Andre Rossa Ciechomska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6915. A bill for the relief of Raymond Scott Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 6916. A bill for the relief of Julianna Mamczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all grace and glory, with contrite hearts turning from earth's vain pomp and show, trusting only in Thy mercy would we seek Thy face. Replenish us, we beseech Thee, with Thy sustaining and restraining grace as our judgments weigh vast issues and our minds face tangled problems.

We are conscious of a listening world, hopeful in its agony, as in these Halls of State is being so largely designed the global shape of things to come. In all the deliberations begun this day, keep our motives clean, our vision clear, our patriotism undefiled, our speech guarded, our appraisals fair, and our consciences unbetrayed. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 5, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

INVITATION TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO INSPECT THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a statement not exceeding 1 minute in length.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Pennsylvania may proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. The Commission on Renovation of the White House is issuing an invitation to the Members of Congress and their wives to inspect the White House on Sunday afternoon, March 23, from 3 to 5 p. m.

This invitation will be limited to Members of Congress and their wives only.

We are hoping that the President and his family may be back in the White House by the end of March.

Mr. President, this statement is being made in behalf of the chairman of the Commission on Renovation of the White House, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Charlotte Harbor Townsend Club, No. 1, the citizens of Punta Gorda and Charlotte County, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTIONS OF GENERAL COURT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD certain resolutions from the General Court of Massachusetts.

First. Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact laws which will lower the high cost of food.

Second. Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of supplementary unemployment-compensation payments from Federal funds, as provided in H. R. 6437.

Third. Resolutions memorializing the Congress to enact legislation authorizing a loan to alleviate hardships to certain persons in Italy.

Fourth. Resolutions requesting Congress to provide that the amount of steel to be allocated for school buildings be increased.

Fifth. Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to place a ceiling on the Federal Government's power to impose taxes.

Sixth. Resolutions relative to the importation of rubber through the port of Boston.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, can the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts tell us how much of a loan it is proposed to give to Italy?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will reply to my colleague from North Dakota by saying that the resolution states as follows:

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts—

Which is our legislature—

petition the Congress of the United States to enact legislation authorizing a loan to relieve the burden and hardship to certain persons in Italy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be appropriately referred and, under the rule, printed in the RECORD.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to lower the high cost of food; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on March 3, 1952, p. 1694, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring supplemental unemployment-compensation payments from Federal funds; to the Committee on Finance.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on March 3, 1952, p. 1695, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize a loan to alleviate hardship to certain persons in Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on March 3, 1952, p. 1695, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring an increased allocation of steel for school buildings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on March 4, 1952, p. 1792, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, favoring the placing of a ceiling on the Federal Government's power to impose taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on March 4, 1952, p. 1793, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolutions relative to the importation of rubber through the port of Boston

"Whereas the Massachusetts House of Representatives has been informed that large quantities of rubber are to be imported into the United States; and

"Whereas the port of Boston has all the modern facilities to properly handle any such importation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives request that the General Services Administration of the Federal Government use the port of Boston for that port of entry for the importation of this rubber; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth, and to the Administrator of the General Services Administration."

EXPANSION OF GRIFFIS AIR FORCE BASE, ROME, N. Y.—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF UTICA, N. Y.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Common Council of the City of Utica, N. Y., has adopted a resolution urging approval of a proposed expansion of Griffis Air Force Base in Rome, N. Y. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Utica, N. Y., hereby goes on record in favor of the proposed expansion of Griffis Air Force Base as a northeastern depot for the following reasons:

1. The Government can save $40,000,000;
2. Government land will be available for buildings;
3. All necessary labor in immediate area is available to meet needs and requirements of such a depot; further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senator Lehman and Senator Ives, Congressman Williams, Maj. Gen. P. W. Timberlake, Director of Air Force Installations, and Hon. Thomas K. Finletter, Secretary of Air Force, Washington, D. C.

NATURAL INLAND WATERWAY, NEW YORK—RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK ASSEMBLY

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Assembly of the State of New York has recently approved a resolution memorializing Congress to take all necessary and appropriate steps for the development and construction of a natural inland waterway, linking the United States and Canada via the Richelieu River, Lake Champlain, and the Barge Canal.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution introduced in the New York Assembly by Assemblyman James A. Fitzpatrick be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it is believed that a direct natural inland waterway, linking the United States and Canada via the Richelieu River, Lake Champlain, and the Barge Canal would be of great benefit to the economy, industry, and safety of both nations; and

Whereas international surveys have indicated that such a route is both feasible and practical from an engineering point of view; and

Whereas the deepening of a 66-mile section of the waterway from St. Ours in Canada to Rouses Point in the United States by an additional 6 feet would provide a waterway not less than 12 feet deep over the entire distance from Montreal to New York City; and

Whereas the availability of such a waterway would reduce the water distance for vessels traveling from Montreal to New York City by 1,218 miles; and

Whereas both the United States and Canada have spent millions of dollars to insure navigation at a minimum 12-foot depth along 386 miles of the existing 452-mile waterway; and

Whereas the present condition of the waterway limits commercial travel between Canada and the United States to barges of approximately 200-ton capacity with a draft of less than 6½ feet; and

Whereas a waterway of minimum 12-foot depth would increase the individual barge capacity over this route to not less than 2,500 tons; and

Whereas canal shipment on the New York State Barge Canal during the year 1951 reached an all-record high of 5,211,472 tons, indicating the value and importance of travel of this type; and

Whereas the expanding development of Canadian iron ore, particularly in Labrador, has reemphasized the desirability of providing inexpensive water transportation through the Champlain waterway to the United States and has highlighted the potentiality of expanding the steel output of the United States by the creation of additional facilities along the shores of Lake Champlain and/or in the municipalities served by this waterway; and

Whereas it now appears that Labrador may soon become the principal source of iron ore for the steel industries of both the United States and Canada and that this ore is so situated as to lend itself most readily to water transportation; and

Whereas the said waterway would facilitate the exportation of iron ore, newsprint, paper, pulp, pulpwood, hay, bricks, and miscellaneous products from Canada and the importation from the United States of coal, clay, petroleum, bauxite, marble, agricultural, and other machinery, slate, and similar products; and

Whereas the aforesaid waterway would provide a safe and secure means of inland transportation for numerous types of vital commodities between the United States and Canada in time of war or national emergency, and greatly add to the joint defense of Canada and the United States; and

Whereas the aforesaid waterway would stimulate industry, benefit recreational interests in Canada and in the States of Vermont and New York and stimulate boating activity in the area; and

Whereas Congressman W. L. PROUTY of Vermont has introduced in the Congress of the United States a bill (H. R. 5219) calling upon the Congress to provide for the development of a deep waterway over the area herein specified; now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the senate concurs*), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to approve of the aforesaid Prouty bill, or in the alternative, to seek the cooperation and assistance of the Canadian Government in surveying the desirability of expanding and increasing the present facilities of the Champlain waterway to provide not less than a 12-foot-deep inland waterway between Canada and the United States; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That Congress is further memorialized to take all necessary and appropriate steps to accomplish this purpose; and be it further

Resolved (*if the senate concur*), That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each United States Senator and Member of the House of Representatives elected from the State of New York. (Identical resolution by Senator Neddo—S. 66.)

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO CLOTURE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS (S. REPT NO. 1256)

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, with an amendment, the resolution (S. Res. 203) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion, and I submit a report thereon.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I rise to submit the minority views on amending rule XXII, the Senate rule on cloture, which was considered by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

As I have often stated, I am strongly opposed to the existing Senate rule XXII. I am also opposed to the proposed new rule, Senate Resolution 203, which has been approved by the majority of the Senate Rules Committee. I can see very little improvement in substituting Senate Resolution 203 for the present rule XXII. It is a false hope.

There is no real attempt in this change of rule XXII to curb the evils of the filibuster. There is no attempt here to wipe out one of the most unfair and undemocratic provisions in the history of the United States Senate—the so-called compromise of 1949. I refer to subsection 3 of rule XXII, which prevents limitation of debate upon any move to change a Senate rule. As Vice President BARKLEY pointed out at the time this rule was adopted in 1949, this subsection in effect binds the Senate to "freeze its own rules in perpetuity."

In submitting my minority views opposing the majority of the committee's endorsement of Senate Resolution 203, I reaffirm my support of Senate Resolution 105, the resolution sponsored by Senator LEHMAN, by me, and nine other Senators.

I shall continue to do all I can to press for adoption of this resolution instead of the one voted by the committee.

I request that these views be incorporated with the report of the majority and the separate views of individual members of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Connecticut? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to assure the Senate that I do not in any way agree with the minority views which the Senator from Connecticut has submitted.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2794. A bill to amend section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, to provide more adequate pensions for individuals who rendered service prior to January 1, 1937, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2795. A bill to further encourage the distribution of fishery products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2796. A bill to assist in the provision of facilities for free public education required in connection with the national defense; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARRAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 2797. A bill to provide certain benefits for members of Reserve components of the Army and Air Force who suffer disability or death from disease while engaged in inactive duty training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2798. A bill providing that the title to certain lands within the Stockbridge-Munsee Indian Reservation, Wis., shall be held in trust for the use of the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2799. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Pecatonica flood area, and to appropriate $25,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 2800. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions; to in the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 2801. A bill for the relief of Evangelos Vasiliou; and

S. 2802. A bill for the relief of Michael Solomonides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2803. A bill to provide for the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by training of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 2804. A bill to extend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act to certain air carriers engaged in foreign commerce and certain air-carrier employees located outside of the United States, its Territories or possessions; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 2805. A bill for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 2806. A bill to provide that equipment for use in third- and fourth-class post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2807. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT OF 1937

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill (S. 1308) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to permit retirement with full annuity after 30 years' service; to provide annuities thereunder equal to 50 percent of salaries, based upon the 5 years of highest earnings; and for other purposes, introduced by me on April 11, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The method by which a bill may be withdrawn is to have the committee to which it was referred, discharged from its further consideration, and that the bill be indefinitely postponed. Without objection, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and the bill will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now introduce a bill to replace the bill which has just been indefinitely postponed.

The bill (S. 2794) to amend section 3 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, to provide more adequate pensions for individuals who rendered service prior to January 1, 1937, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its ttile and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Walfare.

CONTINUATION OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN CRITICAL DEFENSE AREAS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the continuation of Federal assistance for school construction in critical defense areas. I hope that the committee to which the bill is referred will report it back to the Senate as expeditiously as possible.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, and an explanatory statement by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2796) to assist in the provision of facilities for free public education required in connection with the national defense, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That if the Commissioner of Education (hereafter referred to as the "Commissioner") determines, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1951, or the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1952, with respect to any local educational agency the school district of which includes part or all of a critical defense housing area, that—

(a) such agency is, or in the succeeding fiscal year will be, providing free public education to substantial numbers of children whose presence in the area is attributable to national defense activities; and

(b) the funds available to such agency for such purpose from other Federal, State, and local sources, is less than the amount necessary to provide the minimum school facilities required for free public education in such school district for the year for which the determination is made or for the succeeding fiscal year; and

(c) provision of such facilities is required in connection with national defense activities in the area; and

(d) such agency is making a reasonable tax effort and is exercising due diligence in availing itself of State and other financial assistance available for the purpose, he may provide the additional financial assistance necessary to enable such agency to provide the minimum school facilities required for free public education in such school district, upon such terms and in such amounts (subject to the provisions of this act) as the Commissioner may consider in the public

interest, but such additional assistance may not exceed the portion of the cost of such facilities which the Commissioner estimates is attributable to the national defense activities in the area and not to be recovered by the local educational agency from other sources, including payments by the United States under the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.) or any other law. If the Commissioner determines that even with such additional assistance such local educational agency is demonstrably unable to provide such minimum school facilities, he may make arrangements for constructing or otherwise providing the minimum school facilities required for free public education in such school district, but only to the extent required in connection with the national defense activities in the area.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including the administration thereof; except that after June 30, 1953, no agreement may be made to extend assistance under this act and no construction of facilities by the United States may be begun or arrangements for the provision of facilities made. Sums so appropriated other than sums appropriated for administration, shall remain available until expended.

APPLICATIONS

SEC. 3. No payment may be made to any local educational agency under subsection (a) except upon application therefor filed in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner. Each such application shall contain or be supported by—

(a) a description of the project and the site therefor, preliminary drawings of the school facilities to be constructed thereon, and such other information relating to the project as may reasonably be required by the Commissioner;

(b) assurance that such agency has or will have title to the site, or the right to construct upon such site, school facilities as specified in the application and to maintain such school facilities on such site for a period of not less than 20 years after the completion of the construction;

(c) assurance that such agency has legal authority to undertake the construction of the project and to finance any non-Federal share of the cost thereof as proposed, and assurance that adequate funds to defray any such non-Federal share will be available when needed;

(d) assurance that such agency will cause work on the project to be commenced within a reasonable time and prosecuted to completion with reasonable diligence;

(e) assurance that the rates of pay for laborers and mechanics engaged in the construction will be not less than the prevailing local wage rates for similar work as determined in accordance with Public Law 403 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 30, 1935, as amended;

(f) assurance that the school facilities of such agency will be available to the children for whose education contributions are provided in this act on the same terms as they are available to other children in such school district, except that this provision shall not be construed to require any local educational agency, in providing free public education to children for whose education contributions are provided in this act, to do so in a manner inconsistent with the laws of the State in which the school district of such agency is situated; and

(g) assurance that such agency will from time to time prior to the completion of the project submit such reports relating to the project as the Commissioner may reasonably require.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 4. The Commissioner shall from time to time pay to local educational agencies the amounts to be paid to them under this act. Such amounts may be paid in advance of, or by way of reimbursement for, work performed or purchases made, and may be paid in such installments as the Commissioner may determine. All such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Department of the Treasury and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office. Any funds paid to a local educational agency and not expended or otherwise used for the purposes for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasury of the United States.

ADJUSTMENTS AGAINST ENTITLEMENTS

SEC. 5. In the case of any local educational agency to which payments are made under this act, or to which facilities provided under this act are made available with reasonable assurance, as determined by the Commissioner, that such agency will have the right to use such facilities for the remainder of the estimated usable life of such facilities, that portion of the maximum amount which such agency would otherwise be entitled to receive under section 202 of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815, 81st Cong.), which has not been expended or obligated under section 205 of such act, as of the time such payments are made or facilities made available, shall be reduced by the amount of such payment, or by the cost to the United States of such facilities, as the case may be.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 6. (a) In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system of any local or State educational agency.

(b) The Commissioner of Education shall administer this act, and he may make such regulations and perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(c) The Commissioner shall include in his annual report to the Congress a full report of the administration of his functions under this act, including a detailed statement of receipts and disbursements.

(d) With respect to compliance with and enforcement of the prevailing wage provisions of section 3 (e), the Secretary of Labor shall prescribe appropriate standards, regulations, and procedures, which shall be observed by the agencies administering such provisions, and shall cause to be made by the Department of Labor such investigations as he deems desirable.

(e) In carrying out his functions under this act, the Commissioner of Education may utilize the facilities and services of any Federal department or agency and may delegate the performance of any of his functions to any officer or employee of any Federal department or agency. The Commissioner of Education shall exercise the authority contained in the preceding sentence whenever such exercise will avoid the creation within Office of Education of a staff and facilities which duplicate existing available staffs and facilities. Any such utilization or delegation shall be pursuant to proper agreement with the Federal department or agency concerned; and payment to cover the cost thereof shall be made either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in such agreement.

(f) In carrying out his function under the last sentence of section 1 of this act the Commissioner shall have all the authority given the Housing and Home Finance Administrator (and be subject to the restrictions imposed on him thereby) by sections 305, 306, 307, 309, and 310 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951. No facilities provided under such sentence shall be made available for operation by a local educational agency except upon assurance by such agency that the school facilities of such agency will be available to children for whose education contributions are provided under this act on the same terms as they are available to other children in such school district, except that this provision shall not be construed to require any local educational agency, in providing free public education to children for whose education contributions are provided in this act, to do so in a manner inconsistent with the laws of the State in which the school district of such agency is situated. Any facility provided under such sentence which is not made available for operation by a local educational agency, and which is situated in a community in which the laws of a State are generally applicable, shall, to the maximum extent practicable, be made available to the children for whose education it shall have been provided in accordance with the laws of such State. All determinations by the Commissioner under this act shall be made only after consultation with the State educational agency and the local educational agency.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 7. (a) For purposes of this act the term "critical defense housing area" means (A) any area determined to be such pursuant to section 101 of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951 (Public Law 139, 82d Cong.), and (B) any area which the President declares would be determined to be such if the term "community services" (as used in such sec. 101) including free public education and the term "community facilities" (as used in such sec. 101) included facilities required for free public education;

(b) the term "national defense activities" shall have the same meaning as when used in title III of the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951.

(c) The term "local educational agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of free public education in a county, township, independent, or other school district located within a State. Such term includes any State agency which directly operates and maintains facilities for providing free public education.

(d) The term "State educational agency" means the officer or agency primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools.

(e) The term "free public education" means education which is provided at public expense and under public supervision and direction, and which is provided as elementary or secondary school education in the applicable State.

(f) The term "children" means children who are within the age limits for which the applicable State provides free public education.

(g) The term "State" means a State, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

(h) The term "school facilities" includes classrooms and related facilities; and initial equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes. Such term does not include athletic stadia, or structures or facilities intended primarily for athletic exhibitions, contests, or games or other events for which admission is to be charged to the general public. Except as used in the last sentence of section 1, such term does not include interests in land and off-site improvements.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN IN CONNECTION WITH THE INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO CONTINUE FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION IN CRITICAL DEFENSE AREAS

My bill will provide for a continuation of Federal assistance for school construction in those areas that have been declared a critical defense housing area. Further, it will allow a local school district to anticipate up to 2 years that there will be a lack of school facilities to take care of increased enrollments resulting from defense activity in a particular area.

Public Law 815, which was passed in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, and which expires on July 1, 1952, requires that before a local school can secure Federal assistance for the construction of additional facilities, students must be actually enrolled, for whom no facilities are available. Public Law 815 does not permit a school to anticipate increases in the future, although they can prove with certainty that such increases will occur and that their facilities, without expansion, will be inadequate to meet the demand.

It occurs to me, as it has to others who are familiar with this problem, that it is just good common sense in a situation of this kind to allow the local school to anticipate such increases in enrollment so as to qualify for Federal assistance. If this is not done, then there will keep occurring what is occurring under the present law. A defense activity moves into an area and everyone agrees that when construction starts on the activity and when such activity starts operating the local schools will have a known number of additional children applying for admission. The local school authorities immediately start planning an expansion of the local school facility so that such will be ready when the additional children show up at the school for instruction. Under the present law, Mr. President, no Federal assistance can be given in the situation I have just described, because these additional children are not yet actually enrolled. The school must wait until they are enrolled and then apply for Federal aid. This means that for a year to 2 years after the enrollment jumps, the local school in the defense area does not have adequate facilities to take care of the instructional demands placed upon it by virtue of the defense activity moving into the local area.

In the remarks I made up to this point, I have not meant to be critical of the Congress in passing Public Law 815. The main purpose of that law was primarily to take care of a backlog arising out of World War II. It was passed before the present emergency became manifest, otherwise Congress would have made provision for allowing the anticipation of enrollments.

Last session the Congress passed Public Law 139. This act as originally introduced authorized the construction of housing and community facilities, including schools, in critical defense areas. The original bill would have permitted anticipating school enrollment 2 years in advance, and the start of school construction when housing for the in-migrant workers was started. However, since the program being carried under the provisions of Public Law 815 was already in operation, this feature of the original bill was deleted and the law was passed without it.

Public Law 139 authorizes the construction, within the next 2 or 3 years of approximately 500,000 housing units in critical defense areas. In the main, these will be placed in areas already suffering an acute shortage of school facilities. Mr. President, it is most important that we take cognizance of this situation and that something be done so as to meet this critical problem. It is highly appropriate for us to take action at the present time to permit the local schools to anticipate enrollment resulting from defense activities in applying for Federal assistance for construction.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT FROM CERTAIN LAWS—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (S. 1828) to exempt certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense from the laws governing the employment, removal, classification, pay, retirement, leave, and disability and death compensations of Federal officers and employees, be taken from the Calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The committee wishes to hold further hearings on the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SUPERVISION OF OPERATIONS OF CONTRACT CARRIERS BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION—AMENDMENT

Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2361) to require the supervision by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the operations of contract carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT RELATING TO FRYINGPAN-ARKANSAS PROJECT, COLORADO (S. DOC. NO. 106)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and printed as a Senate document certain reports, manuscripts, and material respecting the Fryingpan-Arkansas project in Colorado with an illustration. The cost is within the permissible range without having the approval of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report, favorably, the nominations of sundry individuals in the military service to general and flag officer rank, and ask that the names of the nominees be added to the Executive Calendar. These nominations have remained in the Committee on Armed Services a sufficient length of time. They were unanimously ordered reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Brig. Gen. Delbert Ervin Schultz, Ohio National Guard, for appointment as brigadier general of the line, National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Hobart Raymond Gay, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. George Winfered Smythe, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Lt. Gen. John Kenneth Cannon, 3A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Tactical Air Command, with rank of general with date of rank from October 29, 1951.

Lt. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, 26A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Strategic Air Command, with rank of general with date of rank from October 29, 1951.

Lt. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw, 23A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Air Defense Command, with rank of general with date of rank from October 29, 1951.

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general with date of rank from April 11, 1951;

Brig. Gen. Arthur Thomas, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force;

Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as naval representative of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Military Staff Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations.

Vice Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander;

Vice Adm. Frank G. Fahrion, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet;

Vice Adm. Jerauld Wright, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, United States Naval Forces, eastern Atlantic, and deputy commander in chief, Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean;

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as deputy United States representative to the Standing Group of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

Vice Adm. Harold M. Martin, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances for a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, United States Pacific Fleet;

Rear Adm. Joseph J. Clark, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances for a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander;

For temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the Navy, Herman P. Riebe, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law;

Edward A. Solomons, and sundry other officers for permanent appointment in the Navy;

Winfred P. Dana, for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps of the Navy;

Maj. Gen. Gerald C. Thomas, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps;

Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., United States Marine Corps, to be the Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general, for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1952;

Lt. Gen. Clifton B. Cates, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as Commandant of the Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.;

Lt. Gen. Franklin A. Hart, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and alowances of lieutenant general while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific;

Walter W. Wensinger and Edwin A. Pollock, for temporary appointment to the grade of major general in the Marine Corps;

James H. Strother, and several other officers for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps; and

Raymond A. Anderson, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. McCARTHY:

Radio address delivered by him entitled "Justice for Poland."

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Memorandum presented to the President on March 5, 1952, by representatives of Czechoslovak origin.

By Mr. BENTON:

Letter addressed by him to Mr. Dwight Palmer, chairman of the board, General Cable Corp., dated March 5, 1952, and advertisement entitled "In the American Tradition," by General Cable Corp., published in the New York Times of March 4, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement prepared by him entitled "UNICEF—Building for the Future," referring to an editorial entitled "Congress and the Children," published in the New York Times of January 27, 1952; an editorial entitled "UNICEF—Good Will Ambassador," published in the Ottawa (Canada) Evening Citizen, of February 4, 1952; and excerpts from report by a field inspector to the chief, UNICEF Philippine Mission, describing the milk-feeding program.

By Mr. KEM:

An appraisal of the year 1951, by Walter D. Head, past president of Rotary International, delivered before the Newark (N. J.) Rotary Club on January 8, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article entitled "Loyalty Oath Ceremony Inspiring and Impressive," written by John M. Cummings and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 5, 1952, relating to the loyalty oath taken by employees of the State of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. WELKER:

Letter addressed to him by Mrs. Dale Laird, of Weiser, Idaho, in opposition to universal military training.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

Editorial from the Lexington (Ky.) Herald with reference to strengthening the Vice Presidency.

FORMATION OF ATOMIC PLANT EXPANSION ADVISORY PANEL TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a release announcing the formation of the Atomic Plant Expansion Advisory Panel to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BRIEN McMAHON today announced formation of the Atomic Plant Expansion Advisory Panel to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Chairman of the Panel will be Lewis L. Strauss, a former Atomic Energy Commissioner, and at present a consultant to the Joint Committee.

"The basic mission of the Panel," Senator McMAHON said, "is to advise and consult with the Joint Committee concerning various phases of the present and planned atomic construction program. Matériel priorities, labor relations, contract administration, organizational problems, the extent to which the plants are going forward with maximum speed and economy—these are some of the areas in which the Panel will assist the Chairman and members of the Joint Committee."

In addition to Mr. Strauss, the Panel will consist of Mr. Ralph A. Bard, former Under Secretary of the Navy; Mr. James B. Carey, of the CIO; Dr. Karl Compton, former Chairman of the Research and Development Board; Mr. Roy T. Hurley, president of the Curtiss-Wright Corp.; Mr. Ralph E. McGill, editor of the Atlanta Constitution; and Mr. Boris B. Shishkin, of the A. F. of L.

Senator McMAHON stated that he has been in consultation with Mr. Strauss for many weeks concerning formation of this important advisory group. The Panel will require the preliminary assistance of qualified architect-engineer-construction specialists, whose task it will be to examine certain of the atomic plants now being built, and to submit detailed technical reports for the use of Panel members. Arrangements for specialized assistance to the Panel are still under way but are expected to be concluded shortly. Members of the Joint Committee staff will also be detailed to assist the Panel.

The McMahon Act empowers the Joint Committee to appoint such experts and consultants as it deems necessary and advisable.

"I anticipate," Senator McMAHON said, "that the Joint Committee will meet soon with Mr. Strauss to discuss in detail the ways in which the Panel can be most immediately effective and helpful. I am deeply grateful to Panel members for agreeing to give the Joint Committee the benefit of their time and experience, and I believe that the Panel will be a major factor in enabling me and my committee colleagues to monitor and evaluate critical phases of the atomic plant construction program.

"It is vital to the United States that this program go forward with maximum smoothness, economy, efficiency, and speed."

NONBATTLE CASUALTIES IN KOREA—LETTER FROM THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, some time ago I had some correspondence with the Secretary of Defense relative to figures of nonbattle casualties in Korea. At that time the information had not been furnished to me, but under date of March 6, after a subsequent telephone conversation with the Secretary of Defense, he has supplied the figures as to nonbattle casualties, and I ask that they be made a part of my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: With further reference to your inquiry of February 23, 1952, the Department of the Army, some months ago, found that the designation nonbattle casualties was inadequate and misleading and ceased to use the term. Therefore, to be fully responsive to your inquiry, I am giving you below cumulative total admissions for the period July 1, 1950–December 31, 1951, of United States military personnel reported by medical treatment facilities for disease and nonbattle injury conditions. These figures do not include the battle casualty data which I sent you in my letter of February 28.

In dealing with these medical figures, I am sure that you will realize that they cover admissions of personnel excused from duty for everything from a simple head-cold or headache to a major surgical operation and range from a minor bruise to a serious injury caused by an automobile accident. In thousands of cases, these figures include the repeated admissions of the same individual.

To put the Japan-Korea area medical treatment data in the proper perspective, similar world-wide, United States, and all other area data are provided for comparative purposes.

You will readily understand that such comprehensive cumulative figures can be quite misleading unless they are related to the number or percentage of those returning to duty. World-wide, 94.7 percent of these admissions returned to duty and you will note that in the Korea-Japan area, 94.3 percent returned to duty—a higher percentage than the 88.9 percent reported for Europe.

Admissions of United States military personnel reported by medical treatment facilities for disease and nonbattle injury conditions, and number returned to duty, July 1, 1950–Dec. 31, 1951

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Area	Number of admissions	Returned to duty [1]	
		Number	Percent of admissions
World wide	1,853,910	1,755,887	94.7
United States	1,050,741	1,008,626	95.9
Korea-Japan	401,628	378,914	94.3
Europe	145,091	129,097	88.9
All other areas	256,450	239,250	93.3

[1] These figures for areas other than the United States represent those returned to duty in the area specified. Others were returned to duty after being evacuated to another area.

You will recall that in my letter of February 28, I advised you that of a world-wide United States service personnel total of 8,935 deaths during the same period from all causes other than battle, only some 1,600 were in the Japan-Korea area. The estimated world-wide total of United States service personnel missing from all causes other than battle and unauthorized leave was 105 on December 31, 1951, including 65 in the Japan-Korea area.

It is interesting to note that of the 401,628 Japan-Korea admissions, there were only some 9,900 cases of cold injury. These cold-injury cases cover all types of cold injury, including frostbite and trench and immersion foot. Some of these cold injuries were superimposed upon battle wounds previously sustained. Late last month, less than 700 cases of cold injury had been reported during the current winter among our troops in Korea. This compares with a total of approximately 7,500 cold-injury cases up to this time a year ago.

Our medical people tell us that this year's improved record may be attributed to the stabilized tactical situation which contrasts sharply with that of last winter, the enormously increased cold-injury consciousness among officers and men, and preventive measures such as better winter protective clothing and the new casualty-evacuation bag.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

GEORGE WASHINGTON HONORED AT NEW DELHI

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, some 2,500 people in New Delhi, representing many areas of Indian life, had the unique experience last month of formally honoring the memory of our own great patriot, George Washington.

The occasion was a Washington's birthday party given by Ambassador Bowles on the American Embassy grounds. But instead of inviting merely the diplomatic and top-level Indian Government guests, as is customary, Ambassador Bowles also invited a great variety of ordinary people including members of India's House of the People, professors, teachers, social workers, and both foreign and Indian employees of all the embassies in New Delhi.

Mr. President, this was the kind of party which in the past has been given only by the Communists, both Russian and Chinese. "The rest of us," said Ambassador Bowles in his letter to me, "not only in Delhi but, I am afraid, in our posts in other parts of the world, are inclined to invite only the top-level diplomatic and governmental circles."

From all accounts the party was a great success in demonstrating to our Indian friends that we like them and that our representatives there like to be with them. But the party also gave the Americans present an opportunity to remind the Indian people that our country, too, was born in revolution and that we have that in common.

Ambassador Bowles provided this reminder through the device of issuing a proclamation similar to the kind he issued as Governor of Connecticut—a practice in my State, incidentally, which is as old as the State itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, the text of this proclamation issued by our Ambassador in far-off India—to honor the memory of our first President.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN HONOR OF GEORGE WASHINGTON, LEADER OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Today, in gratitude and honor, we celebrate the birthday of a great revolutionist, a man who with only a few ragged troops behind him led the American people in their victorious revolt against colonial power.

George Washington was not a man of war or fiery rebellion. But in him, as in the heart of every American colonist, burned an intense conviction in man's right to revolt against oppression and secure his freedom. Through 6 years of defeat, discouragement, and privation he carried forward the uneven struggle. Often, to the 13 young impoverished Colonies, to their half-starved armies barely clad against the cold, their cause seemed lost. Yet, again and again, with Washington's magnificent courage to refresh them, they rallied once more to their own high purpose—the founding of a new Nation conceived in liberty.

When war was done, Washington's calm wisdom spurred the framers of America's Constitution to agree on great democratic principles rare among governments of his time—freedom, equality, and justice for all men. Beloved, honored as first President of the new Nation, he set America firmly on her course, her independence won, her democracy established, her future securely in her own hands to be shaped freely by freemen.

Today, as we celebrate his birthday, we look with deep fellow feeling upon India, whose freedom like our own was won in bitter struggle. We watch with respect and admiration as she, too, builds a great new democratic nation and plans her future with high hope.

The bond between us is strong. Dedicated to the same great principles, we today share a common cause—to bring to all our people the full benefits of the freedom each of us so dearly won and so proudly cherish.

CHESTER BOWLES,
United States Ambassador to India.
FEBRUARY 22, 1952.

STATEMENT BY ELLIS GIBBS ARNALL ON TAKING OATH AS DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I would like to share with Members of Congress the brief but moving statement made by the Honorable Ellis Gibbs Arnall when he took the oath of office as Director of the Office of Price Stabilization, in Atlanta, Ga., on February 21. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ELLIS GIBBS ARNALL ON TAKING OATH OF OFFICE AS DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION IN ATLANTA, GA., ON FEBRUARY 21, 1952

I am most appreciative of the confidence reposed in me by President Truman and the United States Senate, by Charles E. Wilson and Roger L. Putnam. I am grateful to my friend, Judge Frank Hooper, for administering to me the oath of office here in Georgia. I appreciate those of my friends who have come here today.

Last night I reread the inaugural address which I delivered upon my induction into office on January 12, 1943, as the seventy-first governor of our beloved State.

The last paragraphs of that address might well be paraphrased today:

Frequently, I have told the people that I am no extraordinary man. I have no great capacity or great ability. I pose as no genius. I am just an ordinary fellow who wants to do a good job for our country and our people. These critical times require a good job by us all.

In my heart, "I said to a man who stood at the gate of the years, 'Give me a light, that I may tread safely into the unknown,' and he replied, 'Go out into the darkness and put your hand in the hand of Him who guides the destiny of mankind; that shall be to you better than a light and safer than a known way.'"

And so, with God's help, we will do our best.

Mr. BENTON. Further, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Arnall be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. Mr. Arnall is entering upon one of the toughest jobs in the Government. He has told us that "with God's help" he will do his best, and no man can offer to his associates and colleagues a greater assurance than this.

He made a deep impression on the Banking and Currency Committee when he appeared while his nomination was under consideration.

Mr. Arnall has a long record of success and achievement. Few men have come to Washington with a greater breadth of experience. I am glad to take this opportunity to congratulate him on accepting this call to public service, in this highly difficult assignment, in this time of great crisis. The President is to be congratulated on his selection, and the people of the United States on the experience and the wisdom he brings to his important role.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELLIS ARNALL, A BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Ellis Gibbs Arnall was born March 20, 1907, at Newnan, Ga. He attended the public schools in Newnan and then studied at Mercer University, the University of the South, and the University of Georgia, where he was graduated from law school with first honors after serving as class president and president of the fraternity council.

He was elected to the Georgia General Assembly in 1932 and was chosen as presiding officer of the house of representatives. He served two terms in the legislature, until 1937. Then he was appointed assistant attorney general. In 1939 he became attorney general of Georgia, at the age of 32, the youngest man at that time to have held this office. He was reelected attorney general in 1940.

Mr. Arnall was elected governor in 1942. When he took office in 1943 he was, at 35, the youngest governor in the country. He served a 4-year term, ending in 1947; the State constitution prohibited him from seeking reelection. Accomplishments of his administration include: reduction of the voting age to 18, elimination of the poll tax, establishment of a teacher retirement system, reorganization of the university system on a nonpolitical basis, reformation of the State's penal system, granting of full voting privileges for men and women in the armed services, and the adoption of a new State constitution. During his administration a revision of the State budget was projected

and for the first time the State became debt free.

In order to eliminate freight rate discrimination against southern industry, Governor Arnall successfully instituted suit in the United States Supreme Court in the name of the State against the major railroad companies of the Nation charging monopolistic practices and discrimination. This was the first suit of its kind in the Nation's history.

He is author of two books, The Shore Dimly Seen (1946) and What the People Want (1947). He has contributed articles to such publications as the Atlantic Monthly, the Nation, the Yale Review, the Virginia Quarterly, and the Southwest Review, and has frequently appeared on national network radio and television programs.

After his governorship he engaged in the general practice of law in Atlanta. He also served as president of the Society of Independent Motion Picture Producers, with headquarters in Beverly Hills, Calif., and as president of the Dixie Insurance Co. He is a trustee of the University of the South. He was a member of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, and was a member of the United States Delegation of the 1949 General Conference of UNESCO in Paris.

Mr. Arnall was married in 1935 to Mildred Delaney Siemons and they have two children, Alvan and Alice.

President Truman nominated Mr. Arnall as Director of Price Stabilization on February 7, 1952. He was confirmed by the United States Senate on February 18, and took the oath of office on February 21 in Atlanta. Then he took up his new duties in Washington on February 25.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Bennett	Hoey	Mundt
Benton	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	Nixon
Byrd	Ives	O'Conor
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Seaton
Dirksen	Langer	Smathers
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Duff	Long	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Malone	Sparkman
Ellender	Martin	Stennis
Ferguson	Maybank	Thye
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McCarthy	Underwood
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Welker
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young
Hennings	Monroney	
Hickenlooper	Moody	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

CONTINUATION OF MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 382)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For the President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, pp. 1941–1946.)

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Morse
Bennett	Hoey	Mundt
Benton	Holland	Murray
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	Nixon
Byrd	Ives	O'Conor
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kem	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Seaton
Dirksen	Langer	Smathers
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Duff	Long	Smith N. J.
Dworshak	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Malone	Sparkman
Ellender	Martin	Stennis
Ferguson	Maybank	Thye
Flanders	McCarran	Tobey
Frear	McCarthy	Underwood
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Welker
Green	McKellar	Wiley
Hayden	McMahon	Williams
Hendrickson	Millikin	Young
Hennings	Monroney	
Hickenlooper	Moody	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). A quorum is present.

TALE OF A SHIRT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is good to see my colleague the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] presiding over the session of the Senate at this time, because to him I wish to make reference very briefly.

The junior Senator from Washington holds in hand half a shirt. The shirt came to me in the mail today from a resident of Bellingham, in the great State of Washington. Enclosed with this pitiful shred of raiment was a short note, factual and tragic. This is what the note said:

HONORABLE SENATOR: Your colleague, WARREN MAGNUSON, is sharing with you this shirt off my back.

The collector of infernal revenue got the rest.

Respectfully,

IRA REAVIS.

To the Senate I would say that my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington, has, I assume, the other half of this shirt from the back of our common constituent, Ira Reavis, who we must believe is suffering from the rigors of the whistling winds of the March climate in Bellingham, close to the Canadian border, his blue, quivering flesh exposed for all to see. Our constituent does not feel that this shirt will be of any help to him in his present extremity. He concludes he is past hoping for that.

Half of a shirt is no shirt, so far as I am concerned, and is completely useless to me, as half a shirt must be to my colleague. Therefore, with some measure of candor and reality, as well, I would say only that the collector of internal revenue, now having in his possession everything that Mr. Reavis once called his own, I shall present this half of what is left of a once self-respecting shirt to my colleague from the State of Washington, so that everything our poor friend once claimed as his own will at long last be in the hands of those who have sought so graspingly to get it there—the administration and those who are devoted to its appetite.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, at the outset, I believe I should explain that Senate Joint Resolution 20 does not by any means represent the views of the majority of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; nor does the committee report accurately reflect the views of the majority of that committee. The junior Senator from Louisiana, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] as well as the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], and the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], all feel that this measure does not properly protect the interests of the States and that other legislation more

favorable to the States should be enacted. Nevertheless, in order to get some proposed legislation before the Senate, we finally agreed to vote to report favorably Senate Joint Resolution 20, reserving the right to support any amendments or even a complete substitute. The junior Senator from Louisiana will support substitute legislation which will be designed to restore to the States their rights in the submerged lands within their boundaries.

In the last session of Congress the House of Representatives passed a bill to restore to the States the submerged lands within their boundaries and to permit the States to share in oil production beyond State boundaries to the extent of 37½ percent of all rentals, royalties, and bonuses which may be derived from present and future leases on the Continental Shelf.

Personally, I shall support the House bill if it is offered. If it is not offered, then I shall support a substitute similar to Senate Joint Resolution 940, which was introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], together with more than 30 other Senators.

Mr. President, we are seeking to restore to the individual States the rights and property within their boundaries which always belonged to them prior to the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the California case in 1947.

In a broader sense we are seeking to protect the title and the rights of every American citizen who owns private property in this country. With very few exceptions, everyone who has made a study of the rights of the States to their submerged lands, has come to the conclusion that this property had always belonged to the States, that it has always been regarded as property of the States, that they have been improperly deprived of it, and that the title to this property should be restored to the States.

Of course, I realize that in these days it is popular in some circles to attempt to vest all powers in a great Central Government at Washington and to besmirch the name of local and State government. We are led to believe that it would be shameful, dishonest, and even reactionary to permit the people of the States to handle their own property, to finance their own education, and to administer their own local affairs for themselves. An effort has been made to create the impression that there would be something wrongful or shameful about restoring to the States property which has almost unanimously been regarded as theirs for 160 years, property over which the Federal Government has never in anywise been authorized by the Constitution or by the Congress to exercise powers of ownership.

Why this smear attack? Mr. President, the reason is that the people making it cannot possibly succeed in their scheme if the public finds them out for what they are. There is a scheme afoot to misinform and mislead the public, to make the legitimate operators appear to be criminals, in order that certain soldiers of fortune may have some chance to obtain hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of valuable property for practically nothing by succeeding in the most fantastic claim-jumping scheme ever devised by the minds of men.

Mr. President, I believe the junior Senator from Louisiana can speak with reasonable grace insofar as the large oil companies are concerned. I have fought amendments which would have favored the oil interests, when I considered them to be wrong. Two years ago I opposed an amendment which would have permitted oil and gas sales to be treated as capital-gains transactions for tax purposes. I fought against treating coal royalties as capital-gains transactions. I fought vigorously the basing-point pricing bill, which most of the large business concern supported. As a member of the Committee on Small Business, I have done everything within my power to slow down the trend toward monopoly and to encourage the development of small, independent concerns. Nevertheless, I believe it is time that those of us who believe in our form of government should stop aiding the Communists by spreading the false propaganda that first one segment and next another major division of American business is composed of vicious, selfish, unpatriotic individuals.

The oil and gas industry, large and small alike, has done a magnificent job of discovering and producing the fuel to make this Nation great and to preserve our liberties in time of war. I am confident that there are other portions of the globe that possess just as much mineral wealth as does the continental United States of America. The enormous natural resources which we have developed are ours because of the initiative and the diligence of our businessmen in finding and developing our resources. They should not be penalized, but should be rewarded and recognized for their part in making this the greatest Nation in the history of the world. What is more, it is time we realized that unless those who favor Federal ownership are to be much more socialistic in their views than they claim to be, then the same oil and gas industry, the selfsame businessmen, are going to have to produce the oil and gas and other mineral resources, even if the Federal Government takes exclusively to itself every square foot of submerged land on the Continental Shelf.

Mr. President, I pause here a moment to recall an incident which occurred in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. A former Senator and very able attorney was appearing before our committee, in behalf of a group of persons whom he described as "little fellows" whom he would like to see possess the enormously valuable leases at Long Beach and Huntington Beach, Calif. When the point was made that, after all, great amounts of money are required in order to develop those resources, and when we asked how the so-called little fellows whom he represented, if they were really persons of small means, could have sufficient money to be able to develop those resources, it was suggested that if those persons acquired the leases, they could do business with the large oil and gas concerns, so as to have them develop the leases. This suggestion would lead one to believe that in some instances, at least, the same persons who now are attempting to acquire the State leases have already proposed to the companies which are producing under the State leases that the same companies should continue to produce oil and gas there, even if the Federal applicants get title to those lands. In other words, the Federal applicants are saying that the State leases are dishonest; yet, the Federal applicants are proposing that the same persons who now are producing oil and gas from those leases should continue to produce oil and gas from the leases even if the present applicants get title to the land. Even the Truman administration has declared that the leases issued to the oil companies by the State governments should be ratified and that these companies should be permitted to develop those leases.

Therefore we should hear no more of this hue and cry against big business. It is an extremely costly undertaking for anyone to produce oil from the submerged land on the Continental Shelf. In some cases an individual oil well costs as much as $1,000,000. Sometimes it is necessary to erect huge steel structures in the open sea, in 75 or 100 feet of water, in order to have a platform from which to drill. I am informed that some of the drilling platforms in the open sea are almost the equivalent of the steel framework of a 10-story office building. This is simply not the kind of undertaking that a small, independent concern can handle. The cost is too great, and the risk to capital almost defies imagination. A well of the same depth drilled on dry land might cost only $15,000 or $20,000, as compared with the cost of possibly $1,000,000 for drilling the same well in the open sea. Therefore it should be easy to see why most of the companies producing oil from submerged lands are the major companies and the large independents rather than what may be called shoe-string operators.

Although this type of venture requires a large amount of capital, it is nevertheless extremely competitive. Thus we see in the State of Texas that the more recent leases have brought an average of $20 per acre in contrast with the 50 cents per acre the same lease would bring under the terms of the present Federal Leasing Act. So let us have no more of this smokescreen; let us have an end to some of these fake issues; and let us decide for the people the only basic issues that should be involved, namely, the administration of the property and the disposition of revenue as between the Federal Government and the State governments.

In passing, Mr. President, let me say that I find that many of the major oil companies are today supporting legislation contrary to what the junior Senator from Louisiana believes should be enacted and contrary to the views of those of us who have been accused of going along with the oil companies on occasion. I understand that they are supporting in some respects Senate Joint Resolution 20, on the theory that

at least it protects their interests. I can only say that, so far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Alabama, and other Senators are welcome to have the support of the oil companies in their advocacy of Senate Joint Resolution 20 in its present form. The oil companies did not make it possible for those of us who favored State ownership to succeed in enacting legislation, and I do not believe they will be able to do much more in aiding those who would like to pass Senate Joint Resolution 20 in its present form.

Now, Mr. President, let us briefly consider the actual question involved, namely, the title to the submerged land within State boundaries. I realize that when I argue that the States actually own their submerged lands, the Federal advocates will immediately say that I am attempting to argue with the Supreme Court and that this matter has been settled. They do not wish to look at the actual legal merits of the case for the States. Because the case for the States is so strong and the case against the States has been so weak, our ultra-liberal friends, who argue for Federal ownership of many things and Federal aid to everything, sometimes almost advocating Federal control of everything, dislike very much to be confronted with the actual facts of American history.

Before going into the legal merits of the case for the States I should like to make very clear that even if we accept as gospel and grant beyond question every word of the majority opinions in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, we must nevertheless realize that even the Supreme Court, which decided this case against the States, has recognized and has practically said that there were equities and considerations due the States which should not be ignored. The language of the Court in the California case has suggested that Congress would have to make final disposition of the submerged lands and that Congress would undoubtedly have occasion to consider the rights, the equities, and other considerations in favor of the States within whose boundaries much of the submerged land is located.

As an attorney I consider it to be my duty to respect the Court, and to uphold it, in order that it may properly function; yet, as a legislator and as a representative of one of the sovereign States of the Nation—and there are some of us who still believe that the States possess some degree of sovereignty—I do not believe that any person can properly present the cause of the States without criticizing the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I think I have understood the Senator from Louisiana to say that with reference to the California case the Supreme Court indicated that the Congress must pass upon and approve legislation to determine the final disposition of submerged land. Is that a correct interpretation?

Mr. LONG. Yes. I do not have the exact language at this moment, but as I recall, with reference to the State's argument, it was indicated that the Federal Government always recognized this land as being State property, that the States had done much to develop it, that the States had been conceded in many respects certain rights in this property, and that the Federal Government had acknowledged the States' rights in many cases. The Court, in holding this property to be subject to the paramount rights of the Federal Government, made a statement to the effect that it could not be presumed that Congress would not be fair to the States in disposing of this question. I do not have the exact language before me. I shall attempt to supply it during the course of the debate.

Mr. CAIN. I desire to ask a question, if I may, in regard to the Senator's interpretation of the Supreme Court's finding in the California case. How, against that interpretation, could it have been possible, though it was, as of date of February 15, for the Secretary of the Interior to write to the Governor of the sovereign State of Washington, advising him that, as of the moment he received the Secretary's letter, every gas and oil lease written by the State of Washington with reference to its tidelands was void? Can the Senator from Louisiana give me any valid reason why the Secretary of the Interior, or any other Federal agent, should take such an arbitrary action, in the absence of legislation to be finally approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LONG. I have not made a study of that particular letter, but, from what the Senator tells me, it is my judgment that the Secretary of the Interior had no authority to do that. Incidentally, the Senator may notice that the Interior Department and the Justice Department frequently during the many years of the history of this controversy have informed the Congress, to the best of my understanding, that they had no authority to institute proceedings to claim this property, unless the Congress authorized it. Attempts were made in Congress to authorize that sort of procedure, but Congress always refused to do so. As a matter of fact, on one occasion the Nye resolution slipped through on the Unanimous Consent Calendar without an understanding on the part of Senators of what was involved. It was, however, ignominiously defeated in the House.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator's understanding is one I have shared for quite a long time; but I may say that the Secretary of the Interior, in his letter to the Governor of the State of Washington, said it was from the California decision that the Interior Department derived power sufficient to enable it to claim successfully that all of the outstanding leases between the State of Washington and private parties were void. The Senator does not know why the California decision gave to the Interior Department any such authority, implied or direct, does he?

Mr. LONG. I believe, as the Senator properly suspects, that this was merely one more example of a Federal agency claiming powers which were never given to it by the Constitution or the laws of the country. Congress has not given such powers, and the agency is simply attempting to assert a claim, to grasp things to which, under the laws of the United States, it had no right, hoping that the appointees presently sitting on the Supreme Court bench would uphold them, in the event these matters were brought to the Court.

Mr. CAIN. I associate myself with the observations just made by my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Washington referred to the question of existing equities. Reading from the California case, he will find, on page 479 of the hearings, in the last paragraph, this statement:

> We have not overlooked California's argument, buttressed by earnest briefs on behalf of other States, that improvements have been made along and near the shores at great expense to public and private agencies. And we note the Government's suggestion that the aggregate value of all these improvements are small in comparison with the tremendous value of the entire 3-mile belt here in controversy. But, however this may be, we are faced with the issue as to whether State or Nation has paramount rights in and power over this ocean belt, and that great national question is not dependent upon what expenses may have been incurred upon mistaken assumptions. Furthermore, we cannot know how many of these improvements are within and how many without the boundary of the marginal sea which can later be accurately defined. But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission.

That would imply that at least Congress would expect to be fair about this matter and take into consideration the history of the Federal attempt to possess this property.

Mr. CAIN. That decision also indicates that an accurate line of demarcation between State and Federal jurisdictions will be determined at a subsequent date. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana who determines what properly belongs to the Federal and State jurisdictions, respectively?

Mr. LONG. The Senator will notice in the proceeding pending in California at this time a master is attempting to fix some line, which will be submitted to the Supreme Court. I notice in that connection that the Department of Justice of the United States is attempting to disclaim, insofar as the Government is concerned, as much as it possibly can disclaim, any right to inland waters of the United States. Of course, I believe that jeopardizes the defense of this Nation, because, as the Senator knows, we are entitled to the exclusive possession of our inland waters against enemy or hostile ships or aircraft.

Furthermore, the Government is at this time attempting to restrict our maritime zone as much as possible in an effort to deprive the States of oil without regard to the ultimate effect on national defense. The Department of Justice, I believe, represented by the Solicitor

General, attempted to argue this question insofar as the case between Norway and Great Britain was concerned, setting forth what they deemed to be the rule on the borderline between inside and outside water, and claiming that Norway should be bound; but the Court of International Justice simply said that that was not the established law, and it more or less cast it aside as having very little weight. The result was that Norway was permitted to claim on a much more broad theory, including those areas which this Nation attempts to disclaim for the other nations of the world.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I asked my last question because the Secretary of the Interior said in his letter that all the lands lying seaward of a particular line belonged to the Federal Government, and as I understand the Senator from Louisiana, he has said that is not a determination to be made by any one of our many executive agencies, but must be determined through evidence acted on in a judicial proceeding. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG. That is correct. The Senator will keep in mind that the Federal Government has a vague concept of paramount rights which would give it the power to take all the resources under submerged lands, excluding the States from them. It is argued that there are international questions involved. It is entirely possible that one of these days we shall find the United Nations making a demand that all the submerged land be shared with all the other nations of the world, on the theory that our Federal advocates are today laying down the principle that it is subject to the paramount rights of the Government.

Mr. CAIN. If that principle is agreed to without action by the Congress, does it not necessarily follow that if the Secretary of the Interior wishes so to do he can claim title to and act accordingly with reference to any of the resources or waters of the United States?

Mr. LONG. There is no doubt in the mind of the junior Senator from Louisiana that these two executive departments are usurping much authority which is not properly authorized, and in my opinion they will continue to do so, so long as they can get away with it. Congress is the only body which has any power whatsoever to call them to a halt.

Mr. CAIN. That is to say that a curtailment of that usurpation must be determined within the Halls of Congress.

Mr. LONG. That is correct. It has been claimed for many years that Congress authorized them to claim this property. When they received no such authorization they went ahead and claimed it anyway, and they were successful. I believe that if their right to do this had been tested before the Supreme Court which was sitting on the bench when Franklin D. Roosevelt became President of the United States, there would have been an entirely different result.

Mr. CAIN. I was reluctant to interrupt the Senator, but I think his observations have not only been helpful to the junior Senator from Washington, but are exceedingly so to the RECORD as well.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. On the matter of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, I think it would be timely at this point to have the RECORD show that in the California case the decision was split 6 to 2, with two Justices dissenting, and one Justice abstaining, the two Justices who dissented being Justice Reed and Justice Frankfurter, and that in the Texas case the Court was split 4 to 3, with two Justices abstaining, four ruling in behalf of the United States and three adversely thereto.

On the same point, Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from Louisiana will permit me to do so, I should like to comment for the RECORD that not only is the Senator from Washington completely correct in his statement to the effect that the Department of the Interior has been highly arbitrary in its delineation of what property it says belongs to the Federal Government and what is the line beyond which the State of Washington dare not go, but that representatives of the Department of Justice have been equally arbitrary in their effort to delimit the inland waters in the pending Long Beach case. As authority for that statement I should like to read into the RECORD at this time the observations made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, the chairman of the committee [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who, after having heard the ridiculous claims made by the attorneys of the Department of Justice, made this statement which appears on page 155 of the hearings:

> I will say again, so that it may be clear in the record, that my own opinion is from the examination of the photograph which was presented to this committee last year and from the examination of this map that the so-called Government-proposed line is too narrow in the sense that it is too far landward.
>
> In my judgment, it does not accurately define the exterior boundaries of the inland navigable waters of this bay. In my judgment, the line should be very much farther seaward, and unless there is information of which I am not aware, which has not yet been presented to me, I am ready to say now that so far as I am concerned, it seems to me to be clear that the boundary of the inland navigable waters must of necessity under all of the facts of the case include all of the area within the city limits of the city of Long Beach.

I wanted to put that into the RECORD at this time because even the distinguished chairman of the committee who sponsored and is so ably handling the pending measure upon the Senate floor has, himself, by the comments which I have just read into the RECORD, excoriated the agencies of the Federal Government and the attorneys of the Department of Justice in their efforts in the pending court proceeding having to do with the Long Beach case, to deprive the State of the oil-bearing lands which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming says by all means belong to the State of California or to the city of Long Beach.

I think that makes even clearer than heretofore the practice which lies behind the complete impropriety and exaggerated arbitrariness of the position taken by the Department of the Interior in the communication which was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Would the Senator permit me to place in the RECORD excerpts which I think are pertinent to the doctrine of paramount rights, found in two paragraphs of the Secretary's letter of the 15th of last month to the Governor of the State of Washington?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAIN. The Secretary said:

> We understand that the State of Washington has issued oil and gas permits and leases to private parties on submerged lands situated seaward of the line described above. Under the doctrine of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, any such permits or leases are void, since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the leasing power of the State of Washington or its agencies.
>
> Therefore, the State of Washington is requested to take no further action inconsistent with the rights of the United States in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying seaward of the line described above, and to regard any oil and gas permits or leases issued by it as ineffective to confer any rights respecting such lands.

It seems to me that unless the Congress of the United States, and preferably in the near future by amending the proposed legislation now before the Senate, makes it very clear to the Secretary of the Interior that it is not for him arbitarily to determine what does and does not belong to the States and to the Federal Government, respectively, the Secretary of the Interior would be on reasonably sound ground in inferring that he might assume powers with reference to the States to which we are satisfied he is not entitled.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. It seems to me that the argument of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is the very exception that proves the rule, when he talks about Long Beach, and it seems to me a strong argument in favor the passage of the pending measure rather than an argument against it.

So far as the argument by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is concerned, certainly somebody must have the power to decide where the line is under the law. There is no question in my mind that the Secretary of the Interior had a perfect right to write such a letter, and it was his duty to write it, in order to protect the interests of all the people of the United States, as I believe he did by writing the letter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if I may comment on this colloquy. I should like to express the opinion that Congress itself should determine the line which is to be drawn between the States and the Federal Government with respect to ju-

risdiction. I believe Congress should assert the right of the Government to inland waters, if we desire to assert such a right, and that Congress, not the Justice Department, not Mr. Acheson, not Mr. Chapman, but the Congress of the United States, acting on behalf of the sovereignty of the Nation, should determine what it considers to be the protective belt along the coast, and what it considers to be inland waters of the United States.

Senators will find that there is no precedent which can be a guide in determining what are inland waters of the United States, except that Mr. Boggs, a very fine gentleman, a very scholarly gentleman, and a very minor official of the State Department, who once went to The Hague, drew a formula which he called a basis for discussion. He asked other gentlemen to agree with him that they would begin as a group of internationalists and discuss what inland water limits should be, and he submitted his formula as a basis.

Nobody agreed with him. Mr. Philip Perlman, acting on behalf of the United States of America, now claims that formula has settled international law affecting inland waters, and he has argued that before the World Court. Of course, that contention was completely dismissed as not at all representing the law of any country. It was pretty well established that such a formula could not in any way be accepted.

But I say that that is the situation in which we will find ourselves if Congress relinquishes its duty, and passes the determination on to someone else, which will ultimately mean that some minor official in an executive department will say what shall be done.

Mr. Boggs, who drew up this formula, is a geographer and a very fine gentleman. At the time he drew up his formula, he found that Chesapeake Bay was an inland water, according to his own formula.

When that fine gentleman was before our committee, I asked him about that, and he immediately recognized his mistake and said he supposed he would have to add to that formula bays which had been regarded as historic bays. On that basis, Chesapeake Bay would still be considered an inland water, although bays in other States, which we regard as just as historic, would not be regarded as inland waters.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the very brilliant, able, and distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Illinois begin to exchange compliments, both sincere, the superlatives of the language are taxed to the utmost.

I wondered if the very able Senator from Louisiana was aware of the fact that there was submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a bill, S. 1540, which specifically granted to the States title to all tidelands, so-called—namely, the lands between the low water mark and the high water mark, all subsurface rights underneath inland waterways, and bays and other enclosures. I wondered if the Senator was aware of S. 1540, a copy of which I hold in my hand.

Mr. LONG. That raises a very interesting question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am asking the Senator if he is aware of that bill?

Mr. LONG. I am aware of it. Does the Senator from Illinois care to ask a further question about it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Is the Senator from Louisiana aware of the fact that a group of Senators intend to offer to the so-called O'Mahoney bill, an amendment embodying the substance of S. 1540, so that there can be made explicit by statute what the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases declared to be the law, namely, that the submerged lands under inland waters belong now and always have belonged to the States?

In other words, the intention is to offer a proposal which will have the effect of renouncing any and all Federal claims to submerged lands beneath inland navigable waters within State boundaries, by affirming title to them in the States. Lands lawfully acquired by the United States are naturally excepted. S. 1540, as a proposed amendment, also will recognize any rights already granted by States to structures such as docks, piers, wharves, and so forth, jutting off into the off-coast sea.

The Supreme Court has specifically held that lands under inland waters belong to the States. The Government makes no claim to them. But it has been pointed out that future Government officials could conceivably make such a claim.

The amendment which we intend to offer will make sure that title to the lands under the lakes, including the Great Lakes, inland rivers, and harbors, lies now, and shall permanently lie, in the respective States, and not in the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I hope, therefore, in view of this assurance——

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will finally conclude his question. I am very much interested in this subject, but I hope he will conclude his question after a while, so that I may advert to it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, in view of the assurance I have given them, why he continues to talk about something that is not involved in the submerged lands dispute. The issue is, Who is to control submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark, as the Senator from Wyoming pointed out in his initial address 2 days ago.

It is proposed, in the amendment which we intend to offer, to affirm title in all other submerged lands in the States. Does not that really remove a major portion of the objection of the amiable, estimable, and eloquent Senator from Louisiana, namely, the objection that the Federal Government will one day extend its claims to the inland submerged lands?

Mr. LONG. I somewhat regret that the Senator from Illinois has asked that question at this time, because I expect to deal with it rather thoroughly later.

Briefly, at this point, I should like to say that the basis upon which the Senator's State was considered as possessor and owner of lands beneath rivers and beneath the Great Lakes was a rule that was developed in England, namely, that the sovereign, the King, owned the beds under all tidewaters. It was said, "He owns the bed of the ocean and the branches of the ocean, so far as the sea doth flow," which means that as far as the tide runs or affects the current of the stream, the King owned the bed of the ocean and the arms of the ocean.

That was the rule prescribed before the United States ever became an independent nation. Thereafter it was determined in all cases which involved inland waters that that doctrine applied to the inland States where there was no ebb and flow of the tide, the real test being whether the water was navigable. Upon that basis the State sovereignty was considered to include ownership of the beds of navigable waters.

The theory upon which Michigan owns its share of the Great Lakes is exactly the same theory upon which the State of Louisiana owns its marginal sea. In the marginal sea Louisiana has 2,668,160 acres involved. On the other hand, in the Great Lakes Michigan has 24,613,760 acres. A quick comparison will show that Michigan has 10 times as much submerged lands in the Great Lakes as Louisiana has in the marginal sea.

So it is certainly very gracious for the Senators from Michigan to say, "Gentlemen, let us be sure that we quitclaim all the inland waters and protect our title to the Great Lakes, which, after all, are an international boundary. On the other hand, you should be willing to give up your title to the marginal gulf along your coast, while we are protected in our title to the Great Lakes."

That is ridiculous. In my opinion it is completely unfair; yet, of course, that is the proposal which is made by the Senator from Illinois. All title, so far as the State of Illinois is concerned, to the bed of Lake Michigan, and to all the inland waters, would be protected if we adopted the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois. Louisiana would simply lose her tidelands and lose the submerged lands in her marginal belt, with respect to which her people had been exercising just as many elements of ownership and sovereignty over the past 100 years as had the people of Michigan. So I say it is very gracious of the Senator from Illinois to protect everything in his State, and not protect the rights of other States.

As I view it, the great danger of socialism, if it ever comes to this country in its truest sense, is the down-hill proposition by which the majority of people get together and socialize a minority. Then a new majority is formed, and the next minority is socialized. Then another majority is formed, and another minority is socialized. The doctors, in fighting socialized medicine, asked other people to join with them in opposing such a proposal, on the theory that if their profession were socialized, some other profession would come next.

That is about the way the coastal States of Louisiana, California, and Texas feel when they find their tidelands or submerged lands in the marginal sea being taken by the Federal Government. They feel that other States which have inland waters, the possession of which is based upon the same rule upon which certain States claim their marginal seas, should support the same theory which gives the other States their inland waters.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I know that the Senator wishes to proceed with his speech, and I do not desire to interrupt him; but, of course, Louisiana's rights and titles to her inland waters are exactly the same as the rights and titles of other States to their inland waters. However, as the Senator knows, the claim to paramount rights of the Federal Government in the submerged lands is not based upon the same proposition as rights in inland waters. The Supreme Court decisions made it very clear that beyond the low-water mark there come into being national interests, national responsibilities, and national concerns, and that the rights of national governments are really derived from international relations.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will read the Federal brief in the California case he will find that the Justice Department said that the whole theory under which the States control and own the beds of their navigable streams is unsound. The Department says that it does not ask that that doctrine be overruled. It simply asks that the same theory be not extended to the marginal sea. The basis on which the States own their inland waters originated in the right of the King in England to the marginal sea, which right was extended to rivers, streams, and bays, on the theory that they were arms of the sea. So, in a way, if the sovereignty had never claimed the bed of the sea, it would not have been claiming the beds of the rivers, harbors, and bays. Therefore, we would never have had the question of the State of Alabama owning the bed of Mobile Bay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. LONG. I yield to my dear friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the brief of an attorney govern in these matters, or is it the decision of the Court which governs?

Mr. LONG. It is entirely true that the brief is not governing, but let me point out what has been done.

As the Senator knows, every time the Federal Government wanted property underlying the tidewaters—if I may use that term—of the States, it asked to purchase it, or asked for a State grant, and the State would either sell or grant the property. Federal applicants asked for Federal leases in California. State applicants were undertaking to drill and to purchase oil in California. Under the strange Federal Leasing Act it was possible for a Federal applicant to pay a $10 application fee and ask for lands worth millions of dollars, at 50 cents an acre.

At the time this was done, Harold Ickes, the then Secretary of the Interior, signed many letters—17 or more—telling those people that the States owned that property. Mr. Ickes was an attorney of note. As the Secretary of the Interior he wrote in no uncertain terms that the State owned that property, and, therefore, he was powerless to grant any leases over it. After signing such letters Mr. Ickes changed his mind and developed a doubt in this matter. After he developed the doubt he decided to claim that property, and he did claim it. Later he stated that at one time he thought differently, but he was wrong and he had changed his mind. Later he stated that the Supreme Court was right.

Furthermore, the Senator from Illinois will find that the Supreme Court of the United States had time and time again made the statement that the sovereign, which was the State in this case, owned the beds of all tide waters, a rule derived from the old English rule that the sovereign owns the bed of the sea and all branches thereof, so far as the tide doth run. The Supreme Court often announced that rule, using the term "tide waters," not "tidelands." It held that the State owned the beds of all tidewaters. The rule having been announced about 52 times, Mr. Justice Black now says that there is language in those decisions strong enough to make us believe that for 160 years the Supreme Court thought that that property belonged to the States, until Mr. Ickes changed his mind, and until we had a court which did not think quite that way, and tended to be more liberal than some of its predecessors.

I know the Senator would probably suggest——

Mr. DOUGLAS. How does the Senator know what I am going to suggest, until he gives me an opportunity to ask a question?

Mr. LONG. Let me make this statement, and then I shall be glad to answer the Senator's next question. If it is a different question, I shall be glad to hear it.

I know that the Senator would probably feel that there is no way we can be sure that any Federal agent will never attempt to claim this property, indeed, I invite attention to the fact that on previous occasions the Federal Government, acting through the same agents, has asked the Court to overrule itself. The Philip Perlman who appeared before our committee and asked us to pass bills taking the Federal side, as opposed to State ownership, was the same Philip Perlman who, as I understand, asked the Supreme Court to overrule many prior decisions involving the famous "separate but equal" doctrine dealing with racial matters. I know that perhaps it met the approval of the senior Senator from Illinois when the Solicitor General asked the Supreme Court to overrule its prior decisions. If it did not, I should be curious to know why not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator will permit, I should like to make a brief prefatory statement as a basis for the question which I intend to ask.

The Senator from Louisiana has implied that there is great danger that the Federal Government will take the land between low-water mark and high-water mark, and the submerged land beneath inland bays and rivers. He has quoted in support of that argument the brief of the Government in one of the cases before the Supreme Court, and some of the early opinions of Secretary of the Interior Ickes.

I ask the Senator from Louisiana if a brief makes law, or if an administrative ruling makes law? Does not the Senator from Louisiana know that they do not make law? It is the decisions of the Supreme Court and the laws of Congress which make the law.

Again I wish to point out to the Senator from Louisiana that the Supreme Court in the three decisions affecting marginal belt noted apparently with approval, previous holdings of the Court that inland waters, submerged lands beneath rivers and bays, and land between the low-water mark and the high-water mark are the properties of the States. I again wish to assure the Senator from Louisiana that S. 1540, which for some reason or other apparently was not reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, will be presented to the Senate by a group of Senators who oppose the quitclaim amendment, so as to make certain that the States will not lose their inland water rights.

The Senator from Louisiana need not fear the right of Louisiana to the submerged portion of the Mississippi River—Old Man River will still roll along—or the right of Louisiana to the land in the bayous and in the bays. We will not discriminate against the State of Louisiana. She will have the same rights Michigan and Illinois have.

What we do say is that the land beyond the low-water mark, seaward from the low-water mark, which has been declared on three separate occasions to be the property of the Federal Government, should remain in the hands of the Federal Government.

Does not what I have stated change the reasoning and the opinions of my very dear friend from Louisiana?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Illinois that certainly I would be willing to agree that we should protect the title to inland waters in behalf of the States. But I should like to ask Senators whose inland waters are being protected to be fair to us who come from coastal States and go along with us in protecting the title to our tidewaters.

I may say to my good friend from Illinois that he comes from a State which is located on one of the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes area happens to be in a different category from ordinary inland waters. It is on an international boundary line. The courts have adjudicated it to be in a different category from the ordinary bays, lakes, and other inland waters.

I will say to the distinguished and able Senator from Illinois, insofar as the

Great Lakes question is concerned, that if he is able to prevent the State of Louisiana from protecting what it views to be its vital interests in the Gulf of Mexico, the junior Senator from Louisiana will be constrained to believe that he should treat the Great Lakes in the same manner that the Senator from Illinois would like to treat the marginal land off the coast of Louisiana.

Mr. President, we all know that one of the distinguishing characteristics of a tiger is that he eats raw meat. He is also known by his stripes. All I wish to say is that we all know how Government agents act. All of us have seen them acquire property which for 160 years they have been saying they did not own and which the courts for 160 years have said the Federal Government did not own.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Louisiana says that the Federal Government has stated that it does not own the submerged lands in the marginal sea. Can the Senator cite a statement to that effect from any authoritative source? The truth of the matter is that the claim to this land was made by Thomas Jefferson, as Secretary of State, speaking for the Government of the United States. This was noted in a footnote to the Supreme Court's opinion in the California case, which appears at page 477 of the hearings.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Alabama cite one statement in which the Secretary of State has stated that the Government owned the submerged lands?

Mr. HILL. He did not say that specifically, but that was the embodiment of what he did say.

The Senator from Louisiana cannot put his hand on one statement in which a representative of the Federal Government has done what the Senator from Louisiana has suggested. Mr. Ickes, it is true, at first followed the policy which had been laid down before he came into office, but after he had studied the question he decided that the policy was wrong and he carried the case to the Supreme Court.

Mr. LONG. I have here a copy of the letter which Mr. Ickes wrote. I believe he was the representative of the Federal Government who initiated the controversy.

Mr. Ickes wrote a letter under date of December 22, 1933. In passing, I may say that I asked Mr. Ickes if he had entertained such an opinion, and he said he had entertained it, but that later he had changed his mind. I am quoting from the letter Mr. Ickes wrote on December 22, 1933.

In the letter Mr. Ickes quotes from the Supreme Court decision:

> With regard to grants of the Government for land bordering on tidewater, it has been definitely settled that it only extends to the high-water marks.

Mr. Ickes writes:

> The foregoing is a statement of the settled law, and therefore no right can be granted to you either under the Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), or under any public-land law to the bed of the Pacific Ocean, whether within or without the 3-mile limit. Title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California, and the land may not be appropriated except by authority of the State. A permit would be necessary to be obtained from the War Department as a prerequisite to the maintenance of structures on navigable waters of the United States, but such a permit would not confer any rights to the ocean bed. I find no authority of law under which any right can be granted to you to establish proposed structures in the ocean outside the 3-mile limit of the jurisdiction of the State of California, nor am I advised that any other branch of the Federal Government has any such authority.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> HAROLD L. ICKES,
> *Secretary of the Interior.*

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Louisiana is correct. He asked the Secretary about that letter when the Secretary appeared before the committee.

Mr. LONG. I asked him whether he entertained that opinion.

Mr. HILL. No; the Senator from Louisiana read from the letter, just as he read from it today on the floor. Mr. Ickes stated that it was the policy which he had inherited. He said that he examined the policy and he thought that perhaps the policy was wrong. He was the one who, as the agent of the Government, insisted that the matter be taken to court for adjudication. The court adjudicated the question.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama read the words of Mr. Ickes?

Mr. HILL. He says:

> That was policy that I inherited and it was policy when I wrote the letter. It continued to be policy until this doubt came into my mind, and then I wanted the whole thing reviewed by the court.
>
> Senator, I never hesitated to reverse myself when I found that I was wrong.

Later on, in answer to a question by the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], Mr. Ickes said:

> I was not the Supreme Court. It was not argued before me as a court. It was not argued before me even as Secretary of the Interior. I did follow the policy that I found in the Interior until I came to doubt it. Then I saw to it that it went before the proper tribunal, the Supreme Court of the United States.
>
> The Supreme Court has clarified the whole thing. It has said the paramount interest is in the United States and not in the State of California.

Unless we want to overrule the Supreme Court, as the Senator from Louisiana so eloquently urges us to do, we must recognize that fact.

Mr. LONG. I am happy to say that that is what the former Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Ickes, said before the committee. I should like to say that in reading those words he himself says, until he decided to change his mind, that that was the policy of the Government of the United States of America so far as the Department of the Interior was concerned. That is what the Senator from Alabama said was not the case.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. What the Secretary of the Interior said on this point, whether he be the present Secretary of the Interior or a former Secretary of the Interior, does not make the permanent policy of the Government of the United States, and even if it makes the policy of the Government, it does not decide the law of the land. The Supreme Court has declared the policy, through its interpretation of the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. If the Secretary of the Interior does not determine the policy insofar as submerged lands or public lands or any other lands owned by the Federal Government are concerned, I would be curious to know who determines that policy.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I merely wish to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and also of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that by letter introduced into the RECORD yesterday by the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] it appears that not so long ago as when Mr. Ickes was Secretary of the Interior but within the past few days the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, was presuming to do exactly what the Senator from Alabama says he should not do, namely, to decree and declare where the line of limitation existed between inland waters and those outside and to put up trespassing signs which give clear notice to the sovereign State of Washington that here was the line because the Secretary said so and that the State of Washington had better beware of going beyond that line. I simply wanted the RECORD to show at this time that the Secretary of the Interior now serving is doing exactly what the Senator from Alabama suggested a few minutes ago should never be done, and contrary to what is the sound policy of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LONG. I do not yield at this moment, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I do not yield at this moment.

Mr. President, in line with what the Senator from Florida has stated, I should like to say that some persons seem to think that the Secretary of the Interior is determining the policy of the Federal Government and is acting in compliance with his official duties and requirements when he attempts to take property from the States and undertakes to say that

the Federal Government owns the property, and that whenever he does not attempt to do so he is not faithfully representing the United States of America and its Government.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me at this time?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. First of all, I should like to commend the able Senator from Louisiana on the presentation he is making. I wish to say to him that so far as California is concerned, for a period of more than 100 years the people of California have felt that they had title out to the 3-mile limit in the Pacific Ocean. That boundary was set by the Constitution of 1849 under which California came into the Union in 1850.

It is the general belief of the citizens of California, as represented officially by their State legislature and by their various harbor districts and port commissions, that the sound solution of this problem is substantially the so-called Holland substitute or the quitclaim bill which was passed once before by Congress.

In some of the statements the able Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has made on the floor of the Senate he has hinted that there may be a presidential veto of such a measure. It seems to me that we should discharge our legislative responsibilities by doing all we can to have the Senate pass the most equitable and the soundest measure. Certainly that is our responsibility. If thereafter the President determines to veto it, then we shall have a chance to override the veto.

It seems to me that is the sound procedure, rather than for this legislative body to be intimidated by the thought that the President may veto the measure we regard as best, and that therefore we must pass a measure which fits into his general ideas.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, my liberal friends are much more liberal in some other respects than they are in this particular case. For instance, I recall how liberal they wanted to be in connection with the proposal to admit Alaska as a State of the Union. Of course, I believe that at this time Alaska is not ready for admission as a State of the Union. However, in that instance my liberal friends wanted to set aside 20,000,000 acres of land in Alaska and to permit the new State of Alaska to select the 20,000,000 acres from a total of 376,000,000 acres, if I correctly recall the figure—an area far larger than that involved in the tidelands controversy—and to have the right for a period of 5 years to make that selection, thus taking what Alaska wanted for her own use. Furthermore, the proposal by my liberal friends was that in the case of the remaining acres, those not owned by anyone, Alaska should be permitted to receive 37½ percent of all revenues received from oil, gas, and mineral production.

Mr. President, we should compare that proposed allowance by my liberal friends, insofar as the proposed new State of Alaska is concerned, with the proposal in the pending measure insofar as the existing States are concerned, in the case of property which they always have regarded as their own, property which the Supreme Court in the past has always said the States regarded as their own, even though the present liberal Supreme Court today says that only the old, conservative Courts took that view.

My liberal friends have proposed that Alaska be given outright 20,000,000 acres of land. Yet, all the land of the marginal sea along the coasts of the United States amounts to a total of only a little more than 17,000,000 acres. The marginal sea acreage off the coast of California constitutes a total of 2,540,800. In the case of Louisiana, only approximately 2,600,000 acres are involved. In the case of Florida, a somewhat larger total acreage is involved, although no production at all is obtained from it. However, the grand total of all the acreage of the marginal sea, according to a table which I have before me, which I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, is, as I have said, 17,029,120 acres.

Mind you, Mr. President, the States are not asking that they be permitted to select every oil dome on the marginal shelf, even though a similar proposal is made for Alaska by the gentlemen who are willing to give her so many opportunities. Furthermore, the land which my liberal friends are willing to have the Federal Government quitclaim in favor of Alaska is land which up until now the Federal Government has owned outright, whereas Mr. Justice Black of the Supreme Court has gone so far as to say that in the case of the land in the marginal sea, the States thought they owned that land all during their existence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table to which I have referred, showing the acreage in the marginal sea, printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States' submerged lands

[Expressed in acres]

State	Inland waters	Great Lakes	Marginal sea
Alabama	339,840		101,760
Arizona	210,560		
Arkansas	241,280		
California	1,209,600		2,540,800
Colorado	179,200		
Connecticut	70,400		384,000
Delaware	50,560		53,760
Florida	2,750,720		4,697,600
Georgia	229,120		192,000
Idaho	479,360		
Illinois	289,920	976,640	
Indiana	55,040	145,920	
Iowa	188,160		
Kansas	104,320		
Kentucky	183,040		
Louisiana	2,141,440		2,668,160
Maine	1,392,000		759,680
Maryland	441,600		59,520
Massachusetts	224,000		368,640
Michigan	764,160	24,613,760	
Minnesota	2,597,760	1,415,680	
Mississippi	189,440		136,320
Missouri	258,560		
Montana	526,080		
Nebraska	373,760		
Nevada	472,320		
New Hampshire	179,200		8,960
New Jersey	200,960		249,600
New Mexico	99,200		
New York	1,054,080	2,321,280	243,840
North Carolina	2,284,800		577,920
North Dakota	391,040		

States' submerged lands—Continued

[Expressed in acres]

State	Inland waters	Great Lakes	Marginal sea
Ohio	64,000	2,212,480	
Oklahoma	470,040		
Oregon	403,840		568,320
Pennsylvania	184,320	470,400	
Rhode Island	99,840		76,800
South Carolina	295,040		359,040
South Dakota	327,040		
Tennessee	182,400		
Texas	2,364,800		2,466,560
Utah	1,644,800		
Vermont	211,840		
Virginia	586,240		215,040
Washington	777,600		300,800
West Virginia	58,240		
Wisconsin	920,960	6,439,680	
Wyoming	261,120		
Total	28,960,640	38,595,840	17,029,120

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as my colleague can gather from my remarks, I consider the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases to be entirely wrong. When I differ with the position taken by the Supreme Court in those three recent cases, I think it is proper that I should say that not only is my view supported by the American Bar Association, but it is also supported by the National Association of Attorneys General. At one time that organization was unanimous, I believe, in taking that view. I believe that possibly one or two ultraliberal members of that organization would take a different view at this time, but I believe that is still the view of 90 percent of its members, a majority of whom represent States that do not have any submerged lands.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me at this time?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Louisiana say that the American Bar Association constitutes the Supreme Court of the United States? If so, we might as well close the building across the park from the Capitol Building, and let the American Bar Association decide these issues.

Mr. LONG. I did not say that. However, when I say that I believe the Supreme Court is wrong in these cases, I am pleased to see that the American Bar Association agrees with me.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Louisiana believe that the real policy-determining body of the United States is composed of the representatives of the people who now are trying to pass on what is a proper policy?

Mr. LONG. Certainly. Of course we are entitled to receive advice from persons who are able to give advice, either persons in the field of law or persons in other fields.

I feel sure that if the American Bar Association agreed with the position taken by the senior Senator from Illinois, he would consider that worth calling to our attention. So I am pleased to call to his attention the fact that the American Bar Association agrees with the position which I have announced here.

Mr. President, I should also like to note that the Conference of Governors also agrees with this position, and that this position is also supported by the National Association of Secretaries of States. Furthermore, it is supported by three of the seven Justices who participated in the Texas case, and by two of the nine Justices who participated in the California case. My view was also supported by the actions of the Federal departments over the years in seeking and accepting from the States from time to time grants of some of the same property the Federal advocates now claim they own.

The legal argument for the States starts with the premise that at one time there were 13 independent States which joined together to form the United States of America.

It is strange, Mr. President, that we should ever find ourselves arguing over the question of whether the States of this Nation were ever independent and sovereign, individually and in their own right. If we concede that point, which is a basic point in American history, in regard to the founding of this Government, I believe the entire case for the claim of the Federal Government to own this property falls.

All of us recall from our lessons in history that the United States of America is a government of limited powers and that the powers of the Central Government are derived from the Constitution which was written by delegates from each State and was not effective or binding upon those States until each of them had ratified it. We know that this is a government of limited powers and that all powers of a central government are considered to be derived from the Constitution; and, if there is any doubt of that fact, we have only to look at the tenth amendment. The last of the original Bill of Rights clearly states that all powers not delegated to the Central Government by this Constitution are reserved to the States or to the people. The Constitution was not binding to any State until that State had ratified it.

Yet, Mr. President, the advocates of Federal ownership, although some of their arguments were inconsistent, were ultimately upheld by the present Supreme Court on its argument that the States never had independence in their own right. Here we can see the danger of the so-called tidelands decisions. We find that in the Curtiss-Wright Export Case in 1935, Mr. Justice Sutherland, as a matter of obiter dicta, had expressed a theory which he had held as a Senator of the United States. This strange reasoning was to the effect that, inasmuch as the States had fought for their independence as a group, and inasmuch as they had acted as a group in foreign affairs, some form of a nebulous central government existed even before the States won their independence. Thus it was argued that in this vague manner all power to deal with foreign affairs originated in a central government, completely separate and independent of the States. Here we can see what damage can come from loose and unnecessary language in a court decision, because, in the California tidelands case, this language was seized upon by the court to deny the States title to valuable property which had been regarded as belonging to them for 150 years. Let me quote from three documents of American history, which in my mind confirm that the history which we learned in our grammar schools and high schools is correct. Quoting from the Declaration of Independence, the concluding lines state:

> That these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent States they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do.

Mr. President, if there was any doubt of their independence, why would Thomas Jefferson, in writing the Declaration of Independence, clearly state that these colonies are and of a right ought to be free and independent States? If they were not independent, then why was the word "independent" used in the sentence?

Notice that the Declaration of Independence, wherever it refers to the United States of America, always refers to the States in the plural. Nowhere does it refer to them as a state or a nation. At the same time the document refers to the state of Great Britain, which included England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, as a state. Certainly, if the framers of the Declaration of Independence had not clearly recognized that there were 13 sovereign and independent nations—and again I repeat "independent"—in all respects, then they could have used language which would have indicated that this Nation as an entity was declaring its independence. They could have said, for example, that these United States are a free and independent nation, or language to a similar effect that would have made clear their intention to declare the freedom and independence of one nation rather than that of 13 nations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana now speaking beside the point?

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will find it is fundamental to the question of Federal ownership.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is, of the offshore lands?

Mr. LONG. Offshore, or along the coasts of the United States. It is fundamental that a Federal Government existed, other than that which was formed by the Constitution, acting through the States and their delegates, who were authorized to write such a constitution and to ratify it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana, Is not the real question, not whether the Original Thirteen Colonies were separate, or independent, but whether they owned the marginal sea beyond the low-water mark? In the California case, which is cited at page 476 of the report, the Court specifically addressed itself to that question, and I should like to have the Senator from Louisiana deal with the issue involved in the quotation there set forth.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator would ask that question in his own time, I would prefer it. I understand the question he is asking is, Does the question of whether the Federal Government ever had this international sovereignty prior to the time it was given by the States have anything to do with this question? I would say that if this is a United States Government of limited powers, spelled out in the Constitution, I challenge my good friend from Illinois to find in the Constitution where the States ever gave the Federal Government that property or the right to claim it. It was not stated in the Supreme Court decision that this power was so delegated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Louisiana is well aware of the fact, is he not, that the Supreme Court said:

> Those who settled in this country were interested in lands upon which to live, and waters upon which to fish and sail. There is no substantial support in history for the idea that they wanted or claimed a right to block off the ocean's bottom for private ownership and use in the extraction of its wealth.

The Court went on to say:

> Not only has acquisition, as it were, of the 3-mile belt been accomplished by the National Government but protection and control of it has been and is a function of national external sovereignty. See *Jones* v. *United States* (137 U. S. 202); *In re Cooper* (143 U. S. 472, 502). The belief that local interests are so predominant as constitutionally to require State dominion over lands under its land-locked navigable waters finds some argument for its support. But such can hardly be said in favor of State control over any part of the ocean or the ocean's bottom. This country, throughout its existence has stood for freedom of the seas, a principle whose breach has precipitated wars among nations.

Mr. LONG. I would say to the Senator that the charters of the Thirteen Original Colonies clearly included the lands along their borders, within their territorial limits. I would say further that if the Senator will read the decision in the California case again, as I know he has done many times, that being the original case setting forth this doctrine, he will find that throughout this case there is reference to the Curtiss-Wright Export case and that the Federal Government is claiming under its paramount rights. He will further find the theory expressed that the doctrine of paramount rights is not found in the Constitution, but is derived from the theory that the United States of America existed in some nebulous form, as an aggregate of all the Colonies, prior to the time they became members of the United States of America. I believe the Senator will find that situation to be intimately and inextricably interwoven with the theory of the paramount rights of the Federal Government. No such right was

delegated, and no one claims any such right was delegated.

That argument has been made and expressed very ably and at length by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and insofar as it can be argued and supported, I think the Senator from Wyoming has done an excellent job of it. Certainly he considered it relevant to this case, as he developed his case based on that argument.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield to permit an inquiry of the Senator from Illinois, I should like to ask whether he would agree with me, relatively, that if the States ever owned the land, then, of course, they own it now. If he would agree that they at any time owned the land or that they once had it, then they could not be dispossessed of it. Would he not then agree that, Texas having been a republic, obviously it today owns its marginal lands?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, American colonies, prior to the creation of the United States of America, were colonies of Great Britain, and as colonies of Great Britain they were controlled by the common law of England. The English courts held that the King owns the bed of the sea, insofar as it is capable of possession. There has been argument, time and time again, as to how far the sovereign could exercise his ownership or control of such property. The entire argument related to delimitation, as to exactly how far out the sovereign may claim. If the States ever possessed that sovereignty in their own right and ever delegated that power to the Federal Government, I should like to find out when it was. I do not find that the Federal Government argued in its brief that that power was delegated, and I do not find that it was made the basis of the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Could it not be said that the very able Senator from Louisiana is now enunciating the doctrine of constitutional apostolic succession?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, my very able friend from Illinois expresses himself so beautifully that some of us who are given to more simple expressions find ourselves unable to answer him. If I could use four-bit words instead of two-bit words. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a reply by the attorney general of Texas to the very able Senator from Illinois which I think would call forth some four-bit words on the part of the Senator from Illinois. I read from the letter:

> Your radio broadcast charging that only Texas, Louisiana, and California would benefit from pending legislation confirming State ownership of submerged lands ignores and distorts the facts.
>
> The truth is that the State bills confirm ownership of lands beneath navigable waters within their respective boundaries to each of the 48 States, including nearly 1,000,000 acres of Lake Michigan to your own State of Illinois.
>
> If you doubt that the Federal Government can take your Lake Michigan lands and shoreline improvements in Chicago, please read the Supreme Court case of *Illinois Central R. R. Co.* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387), in which it was held that the Great Lakes are "open seas" and that your State holds title to the bed of Lake Michigan under the same rule of law that the coastal States hold title to "lands under the tidewaters on the borders of the sea."
>
> If you lend your aid to destroying the title of the 21 coastal States you will be destroying the title of your own and neighboring Great Lakes States. The eight Great Lakes States have more than twice as much land under the Lakes as the combined 21 coastal States have within their marginal sea boundaries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for calling my attention to a letter which I have not yet received. The Senator seems to have more information about my correspondence than I possess.

But let me say to my good friend from Florida and to my good friend from Louisiana that the issue is not on inland waters, land beneath rivers, or land beneath tidewaters. All that area belongs to the States, according to decisions of the Supreme Court, and it is not proposed to take it from the States. In fact, there was a bill, Senate bill 1540, specifically presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, upon which the committee did not act, and which it is the intention of a large number of Senators to offer as an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20 in order to settle this issue.

While I am not of a suspicious nature, I sometimes think that this false issue is injected into the situation in order to frighten inland States and get their support for a measure depriving the other 45 States of their legitimate interests in the oil from the submerged lands seaward from the low-water mark.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois started this argument about inland waters long before I intended to get around to it. Since he started this controversy, I venture the assertion that he has spent more time talking during the past 2 hours than I have on my own time. I am pleased to yield, but I should like to continue with my speech, and I should like to say that insofar as the inland-water question is concerned, I am firmly of the opinion that those who are seeking to destroy the title of coastal States to submerged lands are the same persons who would claim anything they could for the Federal Government so long as it did not affect their States. I know that the very able Senator from Illinois has no worry until oil is discovered in the bed of Lake Michigan. Then he will find that the question has taken on some complications about which he had not thought hitherto.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As my distinguished colleague has pointed out, it has been the law from time immemorial, and recognized by the Supreme Court, that tidal lands belong to the States. As a matter of fact, the Federal Government itself had to get permission whenever it desired to build facilities along the coasts.

What assurance can the distinguished Senator from Illinois give to the Senate that after the Government puts its foot in the door by claiming these coastal waters it will not go a step further and assert title to inland tidal waters? I should like to point out to my good friend from Illinois that there is a case now pending in the State of California, the Santa Margarita case, in which the Army, no doubt being stimulated by the decision of the Supreme Court, is now claiming the bed of the river. That question no doubt will come before the Supreme Court, possibly earlier than we expect, and the probabilities are that the Supreme Court, if it is composed of the same justices as are now sitting on that Court, may take the same position as was taken in the California case.

Does my colleague agree with that statement?

Mr. LONG. I am not too sure about the Santa Margarita case, because I have not had an opportunity to read it. My colleague, being a very able attorney, who was a member of the constitutional Convention of the State of Louisiana, has very profound judgment on these legal questions, and I should be willing to accept his appraisal of that case.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. HILL addressed the Chair.

Mr. LONG. I believe I should yield to my distinguished friend from Illinois, because he was referred to in the statement of my colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appreciate the characteristic courtesy of the junior Senator from Louisiana. Since the senior Senator from Louisiana has asked me a question, I wonder if I may be permitted to reply to it?

Mr. LONG. I wish the Senator would withhold his request.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the question was asked of me and is now part of the parliamentary record, I am sure the Senator from Louisiana, with his customary kindness, will permit me to reply.

Mr. LONG. Could the Senator from Illinois confine his reply to perhaps 2 minutes?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall limit my reply to matters germane to the question.

Mr. LONG. As one who has spoken on germane questions at some length, on occasions. [Laughter.]

Mr. DOUGLAS. I assure the Senator that I do not intend to carry on a filibuster.

Mr. LONG. I yield 3 minutes to my distinguished friend.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator; I appreciate his yielding.

The senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] rattled the old skeleton, namely, that what we are trying to do is to take the tidelands from the States, to take the river beds, the rivers, and the inland waterways. I am sure that the senior Senator from Louisiana was not in the Chamber when I announced that a group of us who are opposed to the quitclaim bill have an amendment which will specifically renounce any pos-

sible claim of the Federal Government to lands under the lakes, river beds, inlets, or harbors, or land between low-water mark and high-water mark. That issue is going to be made clear. So please do not bring King Charles' head into the discussion, because King Charles does not exist.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I can only appeal to my distinguished friend from Illinois to consider what the position of the State of Illinois would be if oil had been discovered first in the Great Lakes rather than along the marginal sea of California, and to consider what the position of Illinois would be if it were here urging that its traditional title be recognized rather than that of the States of California, Texas, and Louisiana. I will say, Mr. President, that I believe if that were the case the Senator would then be more inclined, at least, to be of the opinion that if the Federal Government were successful in isolating the State of Illinois and taking the resources belonging to Illinois, other people might some day suffer from the same treatment which the Senator would propose for the States bordering the Gulf of Mexico, and the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield for one question?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the very able Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator was discussing the Santa Margarita case. Is not that a case in which the Government as a bona fide purchaser bought certain land with natural riparian rights, purchasing it for a Marine Corps base? That had nothing to do with tidelands.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LONG. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was about to suggest that the Senator yield to the Senator from California, because he is very familiar with the details of the case referred to.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Alabama that the Santa Margarita case involves the Camp Pendleton area, in San Diego County, where there is a Marine base. It is true that the Federal Government purchased the land area with certain water rights. However, the Government has taken a position which at least the people of the local area, as well as the people of California, generally feel is an arbitrary position in regard to the State water law, because there is involved the question not only of riparian rights, but of prior use. As a result the Government has sued a large number of local residents, and has asserted the doctrine of paramount rights, which it claims is slightly different from the paramount-rights idea in the tidelands case, but which at least the citizens in that area believe has some relation to it. I expect to discuss the question in more detail, but I thought at least we should clear the RECORD at this point.

It is not the Army that is involved. It is the Marine Corps and the Navy which are interested, and the suit is being filed by the Department of Justice.

Mr. HILL. The Government was a bona fide purchaser of land with riparian rights.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But the water law of California is not based on riparian rights alone. There is the whole question of prior usage of water, and the Federal Government has asserted a doctrine which is contrary to the State water law.

I think the point in the mind of the Senator from Louisiana is that when there is this encroachment of Federal power, we have begun to ignore the basic laws of the States involved, and are attempting to write a new theory of law from the Federal point of view which is not in accordance with State statutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is exactly why I cited that case.

Mr. HILL. In this case, since the land was purchased for a Marine Corps reservation, there might be involved some question of defense.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes: but the mere fact that the land was purchased does not give the Federal Government, under the State law, the right to preempt water of the whole area when there are other people who have water rights to which they are entitled under the laws of the State of California.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I was discussing the theory of paramount rights of the Federal Government. The theory connected with the paramount rights doctrine is that the Federal Government derived some of its powers from a nebulous form of government which resided in the Thirteen Colonies prior to the time when the States joined together to draft the Articles of Confederation and later to frame the Constitution of the United States. So, in effect, these paramount rights are supposed to have been derived by the Federal Government in some way not from the Constitution, but from the authority in foreign affairs possessed by the representatives of the Colonies during the period of the Revolution.

I consider this to be a very dangerous doctrine, because if it is upheld in this instance, it will deprive the States of their rights in property comprising almost 29,000 square miles along the shore line.

Again I address myself to the question of whether a Federal Government ever existed other than that which was created by the States, and whether the Federal Government today has power other than that granted to it by the Constitution. That should have been a simple question, but I have heard the contrary argued by the chairman of our committee, I have heard it argued by a very able member of our committee, a former member of the President's Cabinet, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I have heard it argued by Philip Perlman, Solicitor General of the United States, representing the Department of Justice, I have heard it urged by Mr. Mastin G. White, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, and I have heard it argued on the floor by distinguished Senators. I believe we should attempt to determine one of these days, and perhaps in this debate, whether the Federal Government existed or had powers other than those which are reposed in it by virtue of the Constitution of the United States, through the delegates of the States, and ratified by the States themselves acting through their conventions.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. When the Senator speaks of paramount rights, that does not mean paramount rights as to everything. It means paramount rights within the functions of the Federal Government, such as defense, foreign relations, navigation and things of that kind. "Paramount rights" does not include the right to take away one's property. If that were the case, we could say the Government had paramount rights in everything in the United States, because in time of war, if the Federal Government wanted one's property, it could be taken without compensation.

Mr. LONG. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Federal Government could take anything it needed, and justify its action by saying it had paramount rights. "Paramount rights" is a very elastic sort of device that has been created by the Supreme Court decision in the California case.

I, too, have paramount rights; but I do not have any paramount rights that do not belong to me. If the Federal Government has such rights, they are paramount to those of anyone else; and yet the Federal Government does not have any right to take the property of the people of the United States or of any State without just compensation, under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Some of the cases decided by the fine old Supreme Court, back in the days when constitutional law seemed to mean something different from what it does today, spelled out the paramount rights of the Federal Government and defined them, as I recall, just as the Senator from Texas has so ably explained. The paramount rights of the Federal Government in coastal waters and inland waters meant that it had rights over navigation.

For instance, if one wanted to operate an oyster bed, he would have to get permission from the Federal Government and give assurance that navigation would not be impeded. If he wanted to build a structure in the sea, he would have to get a navigation permit and keep lights upon the structure so that ships plying those waters would not collide with it.

Certainly there were paramount rights involving interstate commerce, and connected with the war-making power, so that the Government could protect the interests of the United States. But that did not give them the right to take property.

I hope the very distinguished Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and who has spent so much time dealing with the preservation of the defense of the United

States, was present yesterday when the argument was made that the Federal Government has the duty of defending the shores of the States, and that, therefore, the Federal Government owns the soils under the waters along those shores because it has a duty to defend them.

I asked the question whether, merely because a German submarine during the war came as far north as 125 miles up the Mississippi River, to New Orleans, the Federal Government owned the bed of the Mississippi for 125 miles. That is just how ridiculous the argument seems to me to be.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LONG. I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Federal Government owes to all citizens the duty to defend them against foreign invasion. It has the paramount right to defend against foreign invasion. That does not mean it has the right to take the Senator's farm, his house, his other property, or anything else which he possesses, on the theory that the Government has paramount rights. The Federal Government has a paramount right to defend all its citizens, but it does not have any other paramount right under the clause of the Constitution involved.

Mr. LONG. I may say the position taken by the very able Senator from Texas, whom all of us so much admire, is the very position taken by Roscoe Pound, former dean of the Harvard Law School, who recognizes the paramount rights of the Federal Government as being political rights, but the existence of those rights does not mean that the Federal Government owns our property, merely because it has the right to defend it. That is a strange new concept which seems to be developing. There seem to be attorneys who are adopting that strange doctrine.

Whether it concerns some of my distinguished liberal friends on the floor, it does concern others, who seem to feel that today the submerged lands off Louisiana, Texas, and California are being taken because of the paramount rights of the Federal Government, a doctrine which they cannot completely understand. At some future date the Federal Government may claim Pike's Peak, because it has something to do with defending the Nation since a great radar station may be erected there.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Louisiana has just referred to some of his liberal friends on the floor of the Senate. I would deeply appreciate it if the Senator would define what is a liberal. I have been searching for a proper and satisfactory definition of that term for a number of years. Can the Senator enlighten me and define for the RECORD what is a liberal? If he can do so, I shall appreciate it very much.

Mr. LONG. I believe I can define it by illustration. I knew of a case of a colored man who came before the district judge of our State charged with grand larceny. The judge looked at the record and saw that the man was an habitual criminal. Even though the amount which had been stolen in the particular case was only approximately $300, the judge looked sternly into the man's eye and said, "I sentence you to 10 years at hard labor in the State penitentiary." The young man stood there flabbergasted. The judge said, "Have you any comment you would like to make?" The young man replied, "Yes, Judge. It appears to me that you are doggone liberal with somebody else's time." [Laughter.]

It seems to me that in this instance our liberal friends are extremely liberal with the other fellow's property.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG. I yield to my able and amiable friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I appreciate the excellent story of my good colleague from Louisiana in giving a definition of a liberal. I thought he was going to say that a liberal was a man with a forward looking mind. That definition, I think, would be more appropriate.

Mr. LONG. Perhaps so. However, Mr. President, since my distinguished friend from Iowa has asked me a question, I should like to point out an inconsistency.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator for his very pointed illustration of what is a liberal. I believe that in many ways I agree with him. The definition of the usual self-anointed or self-appointed liberal resolves itself into the fact that not only is he very liberal with someone else's property, but the so-called liberals are becoming increasingly liberal with the power of the Federal Government over the inherent rights of the individual, which we always regarded as sacred, consideration for which, we thought, really constituted liberal attitudes and liberal positions. I feel that the rights of individuals, as well as of the States, are being seriously restricted under the guise of liberalism.

Mr. LONG. Since I have been using the term "liberal" I believe I should attempt to define it for the purposes for which I am using it.

My liberal friends, of whom I am thinking at the moment, are those who advocate additional Federal ownership, additional Federal control, and additional Federal aid to various and sundry projects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know whether my good friend from Louisiana is referring to me or not; but let me say that so far as I am concerned, I am merely saying that the Federal Government should hold on to the property which the Supreme Court, in three separate decisions, has said belongs to it, namely, the land seaward of the low-water mark. We are not trying to add anything to the Federal Government. We are merely trying to hold on to what the Supreme Court says it already owns.

If the definition of the Senator from Louisiana is correct, namely, that a liberal is one who wants to take something from someone else for himself, or who wants to be generous with the resources of the Federal Government, then I should say that the Senator from Louisiana and his colleagues are among the most liberal Members of this body, because they want to take property from 48 States and confer it upon three States. So I welcome the Senator into the ranks of liberals. I include also the Senators from Texas and California—that is, if the Senator uses the word "liberal" in the Pickwickian sense.

Mr. LONG. I regret that my definition of "liberal" may in some sense have offended my able friends, whom I regard as liberals. I was speaking of a liberal in the domestic sense. Certainly my liberal friends do not take exactly the same attitude toward overseas areas that they take toward certain States. They have been extremely generous in their program for Europe and in their attitude toward Asia, and they have been extremely generous toward the proposed new State of Alaska.

They propose that over an area of 500,000 square miles, more than twice the size of Texas, the new State shall be able to select for itself more acreage and more area than exists in the entire coastal belt subject to the original boundaries of the States.

The State of Alaska would be able to select the best prospects, and pick out exactly the property it wanted. If it so desired, every time a mineral prospect was found during the next 5 years it could be included in the 20,000,000 acres selected by the State. So far as the State of Louisiana is concerned, if such a provision were applied to my State with respect to the submerged lands, from the shores to the limits of the Continental Shelf, we would be happy to settle for 1 percent of the area of land proposed to be given to Alaska.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought that one of the great complaints during the discussion of the Alaska statehood bill was that it did not give enough to Alaska. Certainly if we compare the proportion of land within the boundaries of Louisiana which became the property of Louisiana with the proportion of land within the boundaries of the proposed State of Alaska, which we were going to make the property of the proposed State of Alaska, Louisiana would have all the better of it.

Mr. LONG. The Senator very well knows that when the State of Louisiana came into the Union most of the property was subject to private ownership. On that basis it was not vacant and unappropriated land of the Government. It was not dealt with and disposed of in the same fashion as vacant and unappropriated public land in the State of Wyoming when that State came into the Union.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HILL I do not want to impose upon the Senator.

Mr. LONG. I yield to my able, distinguished, and principled friend, though at this moment I do not agree with the principle which he advocates.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator. Most of the time we are in accord, and I am always happy and proud when I am side by side with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

With regard to the Santa Margarita case, to which reference was made, and with respect to which some discussion took place, I should like to read about three sentences from the decision of the lower court in that case, because I think they make clear exactly what that case is all about:

> Some years ago, the Government of the United States filed a claim to water rights in Death Valley, under the laws of the State of California. Then one of the old-time residents diverted the spring at the source. And the Government of the United States came into court and asserted its rights under its appropriation, just as it is asserting its rights here as a riparian owner, and not by reason of any sovereignty.
>
> I find nothing in this complaint which asserts any right to this water in the United States because it is the Government of the United States. It is asserting its right merely as owner of the Santa Margarita Rancho.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Alabama. I have scant knowledge of the particular case to which the Senator refers. I can only accept the judgment of others as to what that case means.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Would the Senator accept in this case the decision of the Court?

Mr. LONG. Before stating whether I agree with that decision or not, I should have to reserve judgment until I had more carefully examined that case.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I merely wish to say, without having an intimate knowledge of the case, that that case has aroused the fears of all the arid and semi-arid States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I represent, in part, a State which has very few problems so far as having too little water is concerned. Rather, its problem is that of trying to control far too much water, which flows through our State at floodtime. I am not too familiar with the question of water rights, and I must leave that question to Senators who are more expert in that field.

I was discussing the question whether or not the Federal Government had powers other than those granted by the Constitution, and whether the Federal Government, at the time the Constitution was drawn or, indeed, at the time the Articles of Confederation were drawn, had powers other than those contained in those documents.

In the treaty of peace with the King of England, article 1 reads:

> His Britannic Majesty acknowledges the said United States, viz (which in layman's language means "namely"), New Hampshire, Massachusetts Bay, Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, to be free, sovereign, and independent States: that he treats with them as such, and for himself, his heirs, and successors relinquishes all claim to the government, proprietary, and territorial rights of the same, and every part thereof.

Further in that treaty, in article 2, the King surrenders the territorial limits of the 13 States; and, speaking of the border on the Atlantic Ocean, the treaty uses the terms, "comprehending all islands within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

We hear the argument that the States never claimed or had any interest in the beds of the waters off their shores. Yet, the King of England surrendered to the States all of his sovereign and territorial rights, "comprehending all islands within 20 leagues of any part of the shores of the United States."

Thus, clearly, the King at that time intended to surrender to the several States all rights of the British crown within 20 leagues, or 60 miles, of the shores of the original 13 States. Insofar as the original sovereignty of the States is concerned, it is interesting to note that in article 5 of that treaty it was agreed that the Congress, and I quote, "shall earnestly recommend it to the Legislatures of the respective States, to provide for the restitution of all estates, rights, and properties, which have been confiscated, belonging to real British subjects." And thereafter follow many other undertakings that the Congress also should "earnestly recommend" to the sovereign States. The treaty was signed by Richard Oswald, John Adams, B. Franklin, John Hay, Henry Laurens.

I find it interesting, Mr. President, to notice that the resolving clause of the Declaration of Independence fails to use the word "free" every time it refers to "States." However, in every instance, the word "States" is preceded by the word "independent." We all know that the Declaration of Independence was carefully drawn and well considered by those great American patriots, and it was written by the one American who, above all, had the ability to state clearly what he intended as probably no other American in history has been able to do. Likewise we know that the King of England dealt with the States of this Nation as free and independent States; and in the treaty of peace with those 13 States he not only referred to them in the plural as independent States, but he expressly enumerated them, mentioning each by name.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Louisiana feel, under the doctrine of paramount rights, which has come up so very late in our history, and under which we, at least, feel an attempt is being made to seize a part of the areas belonging to the coastal States, that either this administration or some future administration may finally come to the point of view that all subsurface minerals belong to the Federal Government, under some theory of paramount rights, and that such an administration may extend the doctrine not only to include oil beneath the land of inland States but to include all minerals within inland States? In other words, it is the old theory of the camel getting its nose under the tent flap. Once having used this doctrine to break down what for more than 100 years has been the established process of recognizing what belonged to the States, the present administration or future administrations could extend it and gain control of minerals in the interior of the country.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from California is correct in his statement. In the course of my dissertation on this subject I intend to develop these theories, particularly the theory of paramount rights. The doctrine that because the Government has a duty to defend an area it is thereby given ownership of that area is very dangerous. If the doctrine is extended, or similar theories are put into effect, which operate against the property of the people of the Nation and of the individual States, we shall find that we have a Government which our forefathers did not contemplate, and that the Government which they founded has been worn away by the kind of attrition which we see operating in this instance.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does not the Constitution provide specifically that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation?

Mr. LONG. Of course it does.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is that not fundamental law?

Mr. LONG. It is.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does it not apply to every piece of property and every bit of land in the country?

Mr. LONG. Of course it does. As the Senator from Texas so well knows, Texas and Louisiana would not be complaining if the Federal Government of necessity took some State property by first coming to the State and saying, "We will pay you fair compensation for it." That is not what is being done in this instance.

Having discussed the treaty with the King of England, I should now like to discuss briefly the Articles of Confederation.

We know that prior to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States the Colonies joined together under certain Articles of Confederation. Article II made this statement:

> Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States, in Congress assembled.

Article III reads as follows:

> The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretence whatever.

Mr. President, in some respects the Articles of Confederation were hardly more binding than the North Atlantic Pact is today binding upon the North Atlantic community.

I recommend the reading of these Articles of Confederation in their entirety to anyone who entertains the idea of our present Federal bureaucrats that the States never possessed complete sovereignty each in its own right. By reading the Articles of Confederation anyone can see that prior to the signing of the American Constitution the Central Government had little more authority over the individual States than the United Nations have today over the nations of the world.

Thus, when the Constitution of the United States was adopted in 1787, we had the first instance in which the Congress actually acquired true and effective power and when the Central Government obtained substantial elements of sovereignty which had previously existed in the States. But here let me again stress that the Constitution of the United States expressly limited the elements of sovereignty transferred to the National Government to those that were included within that document. As we know, the ratification by the State of Virginia, then the largest in the Nation, was conditioned upon the understanding that a Bill of Rights would be agreed to; and the last article of that Bill of Rights—article X—makes this significant statement, lest there be any misunderstanding by power-seeking agents of the Federal Government:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Therefore, Mr. President, in 1787 it should have been clear that this was a government of limited powers, which powers were expressly spelled out in the Constitution. Yet, during the past 20 years we have seen such tremendous drives, such inconceivable pressure, for vast additional powers in the hands of the Executive and his agents, that today we are told that these great events of American history, the adoption and ratification of the American Constitution, were idle and useless things. We are told that the Central Government existed long before its creators established it, long before its powers were given to it by the consent of the people acting through their State Governments, and that these vast implied powers existed where heretofore men had never suspected their existence.

If any Senator yet remains in doubt that the Thirteen Original States of this Nation were individually independent and that those States possessed elements of sovereignty, I can only say that their doubts would be removed if only they would read and carefully study the American Declaration of Independence, the American Articles of Confederation, and the American Constitution. Particularly would I like to call attention to the particular excerpts from those great historic documents, which I now ask unanimous consent, to make a part of this RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

AMENDMENT X

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

EXCERPTS FROM THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

We, therefore, the Representatives of the United States of America in general Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the name, and by authority of the good people of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the state of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do. And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

EXCERPTS FROM ACT OF CONFEDERATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION AND PERPETUAL UNION, BETWEEN THE STATES OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, MASSACHUSETTS-BAY, RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS, CONNECTICUT, NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, PENNSYLVANIA, DELAWARE, MARYLAND, VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND GEORGIA

ARTICLE I. The style of this confederacy shall be "The United States of America."

ART. II. Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom and independence, and every power, jurisdiction and right, which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

ART. III. The said States hereby severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other, for their common defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other, against all force offered to, or attacks made upon them, or any of them, on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, or any other pretense whatever.

ART. VIII. All charges of war, and all other expenses that shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare, and allowed by the United States in Congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several States, in proportion to the value of all land within each State, granted to or surveyed for any person, as such land and the buildings and improvements thereon shall be estimated according to such mode as the United States in Congress assembled shall from time to time direct and appoint.

The taxes for paying that proportion shall be laid and levied by the authority and direction of the legislatures of the several States within the time agreed upon by the United States in Congress assembled.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, this understanding of the formation of the American Government, contrary to the views of certain liberal Democrats in public life today, had been proclaimed and followed by the Supreme Court of the United States down through the years in certain Supreme Court decisions, excerpts from which I now ask consent to insert in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Martin v. *Waddell* (16 Peters 367 (1842)):

"For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government.

"And when the people of New Jersey took possession of the reins of government and took into their own hands the powers of sovereignty, the prerogatives and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or the Parliament became immediately vested in the State."

Smith v. *Maryland* (18 How. 74 (1855)):

"Whatever soil below low water is the subject of exclusive propriety and ownership belongs to the State on whose maritime border and within whose territory it lies, subject to any lawful grants of that soil by the State, or the sovereign power which governed its territory before the Declaration of Independence."

Manchester v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240 (1891)):

"By the definitive Treaty of Peace of September 3, 1783, between the United States and Great Britain (8 Stat. 81), His Britannic Majesty acknowledged the United States, of which Massachusetts Bay was one, to be free, sovereign, and independent States, and declared that he treated with them as such, and, for himself, his heirs and successors, relinquished all claims to the government, proprietary, and territorial rights of the same and every part thereof. Therefore, if Massachusetts had continued to be an independent nation, her boundaries on the sea, as defined by her statutes, would unquestionably be acknowledged by all foreign nations, and her right to control the fisheries within those boundaries would be conceded.

"The title thus held is subject to the paramount rights of navigation, the regulation of which, in respect to foreign and interstate commerce, has been granted to the United States. There has been, however, no such grant over the fisheries. These remain under the exclusive control of the State, which has consequently the right, in its discretion, to appropriate its tidewaters and their beds to be used by its people as a common for taking and cultivating fish, so far as it may be done without obstructing navigation. Such an appropriation is in effect nothing more than a regulation of the use by the people of their common property."

Johnson v. *McIntosh* (8 Wheat. 543 (1823)):

"By the treaty which concluded the war of our Revolution, Great Britain relinquished all claim, not only to the government, but to the 'property' and territorial rights of the United States whose boundaries were fixed in the second article. By this treaty, the powers of government, and the right to soil, which had previously been in Great Britain, passed definitely to these States."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I hold in my hand volume II of The Message and Papers of the Presidents, in which is contained a document which, although referred to a day or so ago as irrelevant by the senior Senator from Wyoming, has great bearing on the peculiar doctrine advanced by the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, as well as great bearing on the doctrine advanced today by representatives of the Federal Government.

In 1822 the Congress had passed by a rather overwhelming vote "An act for the preservation and repair of the Cumberland Road." On May 4, 1822, our President, James Monroe, addressed to the House of Representatives a veto message withholding his approval of the act "with deep regret." The gist of the veto message was to the effect that the Congress did not possess the power under the Constitution to pass such a law.

The veto message was rather brief. In its concluding moment, the President said:

Having at the commencement of my service in this high trust considered it a duty to express the opinion that the United States do not possess the power in question, and to suggest for the consideration of Congress the propriety of recommending to the States an amendment to the Constitution to vest the power in the United States, my attention has been often drawn to the subject since, in consequence whereof I have occasionally committed my sentiments to paper respecting it. The form which this exposition has assumed is not such as I should have given it had it been intended for Congress, nor is it concluded. Nevertheless, as it contains my views on this subject, being one which I deem of very high importance, and which in many of its bearings has now become peculiarly urgent, I will communicate it to Congress, if in my power, in the course of the day, or certainly on Monday next.

As it happened, it was on the same day that President Monroe submitted the paper alluded to in the veto message. It begins on page 144 of this volume and is entitled, "Views of the President of the United States on the Subject of Internal Improvements," which in reality is a misnomer, since in the third paragraph he states that in order to do justice to the subject "it will be necessary to mount to the source of power in these States and to pursue this power in its gradations and distribute among the several departments in which it is now vested. The great division is between the State governments and the general government."

That, in reality would have been more nearly a proper title for the treatise to bear, since it is a very exhausting study of that question, consuming nearly 40 pages of the volume. It explores the question from the time of the colonial charters through the final establishment of a central government under the Constitution.

Before calling attention to certain pertinent points in the message, it would be well for us to remember that President Monroe was expertly qualified to address himself to this subject. He was, as we recall, our fifth President, having been elected to that high office after a distinguished public career. He had served in the Army during the Revolution, and was wounded at the Battle of Trenton. Subsequently, he studied law under Thomas Jefferson. During the life of the Government under the Articles of Confederation, he was a Member of the Congress. When the question of the ratification of the Constitution was before the Convention in Virginia, he was among those leading the opposition to its ratification. He was Minister to France under President Washington, and participated in the negotiations leading to the Louisiana Purchase. He also had other diplomatic missions during the Jefferson administration. He was Secretary of State under President Madison from 1811 to 1817, and served a brief period as Secretary of War. In addition to his own participation in the great affairs of his day, it is worthy to note that he was a friend and confidante of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, who had even more prominent parts in the erection of our Government. It is altogether reasonable to assume that he was well-acquainted with their views and the views of other participants in that great drama.

It is significant to emphasize the fact that his own prominence was largely in the field of foreign affairs and international relationships, which gives additional weight to his views on sovereignty, in that our international relationships were used as a peg upon which to hang the untenable position assumed by the Supreme Court in the cases at issue here. To President Monroe sovereignty was sovereignty. It was not something to be broken into little bits and parcels to be used at the whim or caprice of the moment.

Now having qualified my witness, Mr. President, I should like to refer to President Monroe's message dated May 4, 1822. In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed as an exhibit to my remarks, and at the end thereof, the first several pages of this message. Since the message is very lengthy, I shall not ask to have all of it printed in the RECORD, but only the parts pertinent to the present discussion. I make that request in order that Senators may understand that although at this time I shall read only certain excerpts from the message, I shall not intentionally omit any important part as regards the subject under consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I think it is proper for Senators to consider this message in connection with the point of whether the United States derived its powers from the States, and only from the States, or whether the Nation had powers prior to the adoption of the Constitution and the establishment of the Government of the United States, and whether the Federal Government today has any powers other than those granted to it by the States under the Constitution.

I read now from the message of President Monroe, beginning at about the fourth paragraph:

Before the Revolution the present States, then colonies, were separate communities, unconnected with each other except in their common relation to the Crown. Their governments were instituted by grants from the Crown, which operated, according to the conditions of each grant, in the nature of a compact between the settlers in each colony and the Crown. All power not retained in the Crown was vested exclusively in the colonies, each having a government consisting of an executive, a judiciary, and a legislative assembly, one branch of which was, in every instance, elected by the people.

Mr. President, I now skip one sentence, and then resume the reading:

In resisting the encroachments of the parent country and abrogating the power of the Crown the authority which had been held by it vested exclusively in the people of the colonies. By them was a Congress appointed, composed of delegates from each colony, who managed the war, declared independence, treated with foreign powers, and acted in all things according to the sense of their constituents. The Declaration of Independence confirmed in form what had before existed in substance. It announced to the world new States, possessing and exercising—

Mr. President, I stress the next word—

complete sovereignty, which they were resolved to maintain. They were soon after recognized by France and other powers, and, finally, by Great Britain herself in 1783.

Soon after the power of the Crown was annulled the people of each colony established a constitution or frame of government for themselves, in which these separate branches—legislative, executive, and judiciary—were instituted, each independent of the others. To these branches, each having its appropriate portion, the whole power of the people not delegated to Congress was communicated, to be exercised for their advantage on the representative principle by persons of their appointment, or otherwise deriving their authority immediately from them, and holding their offices for stated terms.

Mr. President, I now skip to page 147 of this volume, where the fifth President inserted the Articles of Confederation, and commented upon them. Speaking of the Articles of Confederation, he said:

This bond of union was soon found to be utterly incompetent to the purposes intended by it. It was defective in its powers; it was defective also in the means of executing the powers actually granted by it. Being a league of sovereign and independent States, its acts, like those of all other leagues, required the interposition of the States composing it to give them effect within their respective jurisdictions. The acts of Congress without the aid of State laws to enforce them were altogether nugatory. The refusal or omission of one State to pass such laws was urged as a reason to justify like conduct in others, and thus the Government was soon at a stand.

The experience of a few years demonstrated that the Confederation could not be relied on for the security of the blessings which had been derived from the Revolution. The interests of the Nation required a more efficient Government, which the good sense and virtue of the people provided by the adoption of the present Constitution.

Mr. President, I now skip about two sentences, and I read:

Conscious of their incompetency to secure to the Union the blessings of the Revolution, they promoted the diminution of their own powers and the enlargement of those of the general Government in the way in which they might be most adequate and efficient.

I now skip to page 148:

The Confederation was a compact between separate and independent States, the execution of whose articles in the powers which operated internally depended on the State governments.

Mr. President, I skip now to page 149. This is very significant:

In thus tracing our institutions to their origin and pursuing them in their progress and modifications down to the adoption of this Constitution two important facts have been disclosed, on which it may not be improper in this stage to make a few observations. The first is that in wresting the power, or what is called the sovereignty, from the Crown as it passed directly to the people. The second, that it passed directly to the people of each Colony and not to the people of all the Colonies in the aggregate; to 13 distinct communities and not to one.

I now skip to the end of that page:

And that the power wrested from the British Crown passed to the people of each colony the whole history of our political movement from the emigration of our ancestors to the present day clearly demonstrates. What produced the Revolution? The violation of our rights. What rights? Our chartered rights. To whom were the charters granted, to the people of each colony or to the people of all the Colonies as a single community? We know that no such community as the aggregate existed, and of course that no such rights could be violated. It may be added that the nature of the powers which were given to the delegates by each colony and the manner in which they were executed show that the sovereignty was in the people of each and not in the aggregate. They respectively presented credentials such as are usual between ministers of separate powers, which were examined and approved before they entered on the discharge of the important duties committed to them. They voted also by colonies and not individually, all the members from one colony being entitled to one vote only. This fact alone, the first of our political association and at the period of our greatest peril, fixes beyond all controversy the source from whence the power which has directed and secured success to all our measures has proceeded.

Had the sovereignty passed to the aggregate, consequences might have ensued, admitting the success of our Revolution, which might even yet seriously affect our system. By passing to the people of each colony the opposition to Great Britain, the prosecution of the war, the Declaration of Independence, the adoption of the Confederation and of this Constitution are all imputable to them. Had it passed to the aggregate, every measure would be traced to that source; even the State governments might be said to have emanated from it, and amendments of their constitutions on that principle be proposed by the same authority. In short it is not easy to perceive all the consequences into which such a doctrine might lead.

How true, O, Mr. President, how true!

It is obvious that the people in mass would have had much less agency in all the great measures of the Revolution and in those which followed than they actually had, and proportionably less credit for their patriotism and services than they are now entitled to and enjoy. By passing to the people of each colony the whole body in each were kept in constant and active deliberation on subjects of the highest national importance and in the supervision of the conduct of all the public servants in the discharge of their respective duties. Thus the most effectual guards were provided against abuses and dangers of every kind which human ingenuity could devise, and the whole people rendered more competent to the self-government which by an heroic exertion they had acquired.

Mr. President, it may be that Mr. Philip Perlman, Mr. Mastin White, and the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are correct in their view of history, but I can at least produce testimony of an eyewitness who felt that that was not the way it happened. That reminds me of a story which was told by a Confederate veteran about the Battle of Shiloh. The veteran, somewhat aged, and having been a sometime private in the Confederate Army, told of the great victory which the Confederates had achieved at Shiloh—how, when the Yankees crossed the river, the Confederates routed them and sent the Union forces back in wild retreat. It so happened that in the back of the audience there was another Confederate veteran, who also had been at Shiloh. At this point he interjected, "Well, John, if you will pardon me for saying so, that is not the way it happened. The way I recall it, the battle started out all right, but about the second day, those fellows just whipped the daylights out of us." The man who was telling the story replied, "Well, there you go. That is just one more great event of history which has been ruined by a doggone eyewitness."

Mr. President, I believe the story of the formation of this Government as told by Mr. Perlman, by Mr. White, and by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], is in the category of one more great event of history spoiled by an eyewitness.

I have read the great dissertation of President Monroe on the formation of this Government, which is completely different from the point of view of modern Federal advocates of additional Federal power.

What do we see here?

We see the Executive exercise powers that no one ever dreamed he possessed in the field of foreign affairs; and we saw him upheld by the Supreme Court, on a more or less unheard-of theory of American history, that no high school history teacher could explain to her class. In pursuance of such vast implied powers the Attorney General of the United States since 1947 has taken unto the United States 29,000 square miles of submerged lands, greater in area than the State of Texas, based on a theory that the States of this Nation never formed a union at all, but that, rather, the Nation existed before the States.

Where do we go from here? How long will it be, if this trend continues, before we will be told that those beautiful words of the American Creed are meaningless when they speak of the United States of America deriving its powers from the just consent of the governed? How long will it be before we will be told that that was also a foolish misconception and that the Central Government always had vast powers which no one ever heard of or dreamed of until a powerful and ambitious agent needed those powers to take unto the Federal Government property or rights which we had always thought belonged to the individual citizens?

The junior Senator from Louisiana is an attorney of sorts, having practiced only a few years; yet I am compelled to say that it never occurred to me that I would have to argue in any forum that the States of this Nation were at one time sovereign and that the Central Government of the United States is one of limited powers which were carefully spelled out in the American Constitution and the amendments thereto. And yet, since I am compelled to make this argument, I feel that I should document it by quoting from some of the Supreme Court decisions, prior to the New Deal or Fair Deal Supreme Court decisions, but the same Court nevertheless. At a time when its membership was composed of men, some of whom lived at the inception of this Nation, let me quote from the old case of Martin against Wadell, which dealt with the title to submerged lands. In that case, reported in 16 Peters 367 in the year 1842, we had a controversy involving the right of the claimant to take oysters from the bed of Raritan Bay, an arm of the sea, within the tidal limits of the State of New Jersey. One claimant claimed his rights based upon a royal grant from the British Crown dating back to the year 1674. The other contestant claimed by virtue of a grant from the then young State of New Jersey. The Court held that the bed of the bay belonged to the State and State ownership was upheld. Let me read from the language of the Court 110 years ago:

For when the Revolution took place, the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government. And when the people of New Jersey took possession of the reins of government and took into their own hands the powers of sovereignty, the prerogatives and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or the Parliament, became immediately vested in the State.

My, how much better it makes me feel, Mr. President, to find that at least the men who lived in the day when our Government was formed looked upon the formation of this Government, the original sovereignty of the individual States, and the limited powers of the Federal Government, exactly as it was taught to me by a dear old lady in grammar school.

In passing, I am somewhat amused that the advocates of Federal ownership of submerged lands have joined themselves together in a bloc to foster Federal aid to education as a part of their double-barreled proposal to expand Federal powers. Might I suggest to them that, if they ever succeed in achieving their objectives of depriving States of property and acquiring Federal powers in the field of education all in one measure, they should immediately recall all history books authorized by the State governments in the public schools and rewrite the history of the formation of this Government in accord with the theory expressed by Mr. Justice Clark and our Solicitor General, Mr. Philip Perlman. It would be entirely appropriate since it was this theory of the formation of the American Government, unheard of a generation ago, which gave rise to their proposal.

Now I propose to develop further the previous declarations of that dear old-fashioned court prior to the days of the New Deal and Fair Deal theories of constitutional government and prior to the new look that our constitutional law has acquired since the days when the Executive began to appoint justices whom he would expect to entertain views that the Federal Government should have vast powers which prior justices of that Court had denied to exist. Let us take the case of McCready against Virginia, decided by the dear old-fashioned justices in the early days of 1877, reported in 94 United States 391. There the question involved was whether the State of Virginia could prohibit the citizens of other States from planting oysters in the Ware River, a stream that is governed by the ebb and flow of the tide. Citing a number of previous cases the Court held:

> The principle has long been settled in this Court, that each State owns the beds of all tidewaters within its jurisdiction unless they have been granted away.

You know, Mr. President, the term "tidewaters" is not a difficult term to understand. In the law it refers to all water affected by the rise and fall of the tide. We are told that the nation of England, from which we derive our common law, has much use for the tidewater test. In that country, different in its geography from the United States, as Senators are well aware, almost all waters which are subject to navigation are affected by the rise and fall of the tide. Their current is greater when the tide falls, and the direction of the current changes as the tide rises, in some instances as much as 20 feet. By reference to England, it would readily be seen that very little navigation would exist on streams not subject to the rise and fall of the tide. Therefore England never had to concern itself with the problems of determining whether or not a stream would be regarded as navigable in the same respect as the United States, because it was convenient for that great nation to adopt the tidewater test and regard a stream as one over which the King exercised jurisdiction and one of which the King owned the beds because it was affected by the rise and fall of the tide. The prevailing view in England was that the King owned and possessed the bed of the sea and that, since a river or bay was affected by the rise and fall of the tide, it was an arm of the sea and thus its bed was also owned and possessed by the sovereign. The only waters which could not be regarded as tidewater would be those which were so far inland that the rise and fall of the tide would not affect them. Therefore, when the court in 1877 stated that the State of Virginia owned the beds of all tidewater, it was using a term which refers to the open sea where the tide operates without modification as well as those streams which are merely affected by the rise and fall of the tide on the open sea. Those words from the McCready against Virginia case gave these young attorneys of the Department of Justice much difficulty when they undertook to acquire the submerged lands within State boundaries. They found it necessary to persuade the Supreme Court that words do not mean what they say and that the reference to tidewater by the Supreme Court in 1877 did not mean land beneath the open sea as well as land under rivers, bays, and harbors.

But I am inclined to guess, Mr. President, that the Court in 1877, at a time when the Justices were not as much harried by the hurly-burly of modern-day living, probably chose its words even more carefully than Justices find the time to use today.

In the case of Smith against Maryland, reported in 18 Howard 74 in 1855, the Court was dealing with the submerged lands in the Chesapeake Bay. In sustaining State title thereto of the State of Maryland, the Court stated the long-settled rule:

> Whatever soil below low water is the subject of exclusive propriety and ownership, belongs to the State on whose maritime border, and within whose territory, it lies, subject to any lawful grants of that soil by the State or the sovereign power which governed its territory before the Declaration of Independence.

Of course, Mr. President, we all recognize that power to regulate navigation was granted to the Federal Government under the commerce clause of the Constitution. We all recognize that the power which enables warships to enter into the coastal waters was granted under the theory that the Congress had a right to provide for the national defense. But the courts on various occasions have spelled out that those powers did not grant authority over the bed of the sea, that they did not deprive States of their property. As a matter of fact, one of the Articles of Confederation expressly spelled out that the Federal Government should not take State property, and that State property was not thereby conveyed to the Government.

At least I believe that Senators should get this much straight in their minds, based on the many Supreme Court decisions which have discussed the initial sovereignty of the States of this Nation, that each State was sovereign in its own right prior to the formation of this Government by the signing of the United States Constitution.

I know that some Senators will doubt that the question of the original sovereignty of the independent States of this Nation has anything to do with the tidelands controversy. I know that Senators find it difficult to believe that Federal title to the lands within State boundaries is based upon this ridiculous distortion of American history. But it is, Mr. President; and, if Senators will read the committee hearings, copies of which are on their desks, they will see this theory of government expounded by the very able and brilliant chairman of our committee, the Senator from Wyoming. They will see it there urged by the able Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], whom we all admire, and who has attained a distinction that few of us will ever achieve, namely, that of having been a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States. They will see that theory of government argued and supported by Mr. Philip Perlman, the Solicitor General of the United States, and they will see it there urged by Mr. Mastin G. White, Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. They will see the same theory of government, which I regard as extremely dangerous, expressed, I regret to say, in the California tidelands case as a necessary link of the logic upon which Mr. Justice Black wrote the majority opinion and held that things are not what they seem to be, and that the States do not own the submerged lands along their shores.

Mr. President, sometimes we fail to see the forest for the trees. The President of the United States, together with his executive departments, has vast powers and authorities over the day-to-day life and business of every American citizen, such power as our forefathers, in their most fantastic dreams, could never have foreseen. Much of this power has been conferred by acts of Congress and has been upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Constitution of the United States has been construed as permitting the Executive powers which no one thought existed 50 or 75 years ago. It has been done in many instances without amending the Constitution.

How has this been accomplished? It has been accomplished by naming justices to the Supreme Court whose writings and whose speeches gave clear evidence that they would find some way of reading between the lines of the Constitution to find new powers which no one had dreamed to be there. They have found the Federal power to regulate commerce between the States to be susceptible of an interpretation that would permit the Federal Government to control every movement, every action, and almost every thought of an ordinary shoeshine boy because he was in competition with a bootblack who once polished the shoes of a traveling salesman. They have found the power of the Federal Government to enter the field of power and electricity without ever amending the Constitution because the right to regulate commerce had a relationship to navigation which permitted the Federal Government to build dams for navigation purposes which incidentally generated power. They have found the power to build electricity lines because the right to facilitate navigation made possible the right to construct the dams, causing the incidental creation of electric power, leading to the inevitable conclusion that the Federal Government had the right to market that which it found on its hands. And so on, ad infinitum.

When is all of this going to stop? Will we ever reach a turning point when we begin to turn the Government back to the people themselves in their own communities, where each individual may make his voice effectively heard in deciding how much he should pay his school teacher, how much he should pay for roads, how much he should pay for garbage collection, how late he will permit his neighbors to stay up at night, and how much noise he will permit as disturbance of his peace of mind, what time he will go to work in the morning,

and what time he will quit in the evening?

We have a dangerous thing in these vast new powers of the Federal Government if our Government continues to take from the States and the local governments their functions and their rights. It will injure the ordinary American citizen in ways that I cannot at this moment anticipate. As a Member of the Senate I have had occasion to observe how laws are passed, and how decisions are sometimes made in compliance with pressure groups who could not possibly have forced the enactment of similar legislation through their local town council. Those pressure groups sometimes were interested in only one vote, only one measure during one particular Congress; and the votes of their members would be for or against a Member of the Congress based entirely upon that one part of his record; while the general public, paying the bill for many of the enactments of Congress, has an enormous number of details to consider when confronted with the record of a Senator or a Representative in a political campaign and any one vote is seldom significant. Their votes are seldom based on how a candidate has voted on any particular measure.

So much for the fact that sovereignty once existed in the independent States of this Nation. Having established that the 13 States of this Nation were once sovereign in their own rights, the second premise is that as sovereign States they possessed the beds of all navigable waters, whether inland or not. So the court stated in Martin against Waddell, in 1843, and 2 years later, in the Pollard case, and so the court stated in the cases that followed the Pollard case. It is true that those cases did not deal with the open sea, but they announced a rule which had its origin in the open sea. In other words, the original rule was that the King possessed the bed of the sea, and that bays, estuaries, rivers, and harbors were arms of the sea, and that he possessed the beds of those arms of the sea by virtue of the fact that he possessed the beds of the sea itself. This was a rule derived from English law and, as Senators know, the common law of England was early adopted as the law of the United States. For example, in the year 1610, in the case of Royal Fishery of the River Bane, the Privy Council of England made this statement:

> The reason for which the King hath an interest in such navigable river, so far as the sea flows and ebbs in it, is because such river participates of the nature of the sea so far as it flows * * * and the King hath the same branches of the sea and navigable rivers, so high as the sea flows and ebbs in them, which he hath in the high sea.

Mr. President, that is how the inland States have the right to claim sovereignty over the beds of rivers. It was decided that the sovereign possessed the bed of the sea; and because he possessed the bed of the sea, he possessed the beds of the arms of the sea which were covered by tidewaters.

Some Senators today would tell us that when reference is made to tidewaters it relates to a little strip between high water and low water on the beach. That is not what the court had in mind, for true tidewater, so far as English law is concerned, refers to the water of the sea.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Possibly the Senator has covered the point I have in mind. I am sorry I have not heard all of his argument.

Along the line of the subject the Senator has been discussing, about half the city of Boston, which is the principal city of Massachusetts, is built on made land, that is, filled-in land, which was originally covered by tidewaters. Some of it was swamp, much of it tidewater land, where the tide would ebb and flow.

If this doctrine, which is advocated by the Supreme Court, were carried to its full extent, would it not becloud title to all the land which is now made land? Houses, churches, hotels, and places of business are built on piles. Would there not be a tendency to becloud the title to all such land?

Mr. LONG. Of course, there would. I believe that I have seen somewhere a case—perhaps it is the case of the city of Long Beach—in which the Federal Government even now claims that there is some question as to whether the city can remove certain soil from within the harbor. I will check that case. Certainly when the Federal Government contends that it owns, so far as it is capable of ownership, the beds of all water from low watermark out into the sea, it may well assert its right to claim the land against anyone who proceeds to reclaim some of that soil.

Representatives of the Federal Government who today claim the oil belonging to the coastal States might be willing to go along with a proposal to grant away what they consider to be Federal rights to reclaimed property, although they have not offered to do so up to this time. They might be willing to go along with some such proposal, if they were able to do what they would like to do to the States of Louisiana, California, and Texas, where they find oil to exist below the surface of the marginal belt.

Nevertheless, the title which exists in those who have reclaimed land along the Atlantic Ocean is in exactly the same category as the title of the person who erects an oil derrick offshore in the Gulf of Mexico. The two titles lie in the same position, as I shall try to develop.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Unless a quitclaim bill or something similar is finally enacted by Congress, it is entirely within the realm of possibility that a claimant could dispute the title to any property consisting of filled-in land.

Mr. LONG. Of course, it is possible. There can be absolutely no doubt about it. As a matter of fact, our committee, so far as the State of Florida is concerned, has already had occasion to consider the title and discuss the question whether or not we could appropriately recommend that certain land be turned over to individuals, because we felt that the tidelands question might be involved in a case in which there might be an accretion from the sea. I am certain that the question will arise as to whether man-made islands can belong to the States. It would be a simple matter, in the Gulf of Mexico, where oil has been found off Louisiana, for a person to pump in a few feet of sand and make an island. If the State owned the island, it would have the right to produce the oil under it. If an attempt were made to do so, the Federal Government would come forward and say, "No; you cannot reclaim that land, because we want the oil under it."

That is the sort of problem which arises. It is my opinion—and I believe that any able attorney would so advise the Senator from Massachusetts—that this claim by the Federal Government places in jeopardy the rights with respect to every harbor where a breakwater has been built in the sea, and the rights with respect to every port. It places in doubt the rights with respect to man-made construction within the sea as well as land reclaimed from it.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] knows, there is a question with respect to land which has been reclaimed, and upon which expensive hotels have been built in Florida. There is a question as to whether the title to the property on which those hotels were constructed is clear.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The distinguished Senator made reference to the particular situation which exists at several points on the coast of Florida. The case is particularly clear at Miami Beach. The original site of Miami Beach was a mangrove bar—a bit of sand with a great many mangrove trees growing on it or in the water near it. From that small beginning, by pumping sand from the bay behind and from the Atlantic in front, Miami Beach as it now exists began to be constructed and to take shape. As it is now, some of the most valuable property in Miami Beach, over a course of many miles north and south along the beach, lies upon what are extensions of the original beach, that is, built-up land, or made land, constructed into the open waters of the Atlantic. There can be no question as to whether or not the waters involved might have been inland waters, because they are not inland. They are on the exposed frontage on the Atlantic Ocean. So much is that the case that in order to retain physical permanence after the sand is pumped in, it is necessary to have an elaborate and very expensive set of groins, bulkheads, and other construction objects built into the Atlantic Ocean to prevent the erosion of the soil as it has been thrown up there to become the location of expensive buildings.

So, as the Senator from Florida hopes to show to the Senate at the proper time, by means of a picture which he has, there are literally hundreds of such groins built of concrete and steel, extending out into the open waters of the Atlantic, holding together lands which

have been built up, and upon which lands hotels and apartments of an aggregate value of many millions of dollars have been erected.

The State of Florida thinks that those who pretend that the question of oil is the sole substantial question involved in the pending legislation must be completely blind to the fact that an enormous development has taken place along the lines just indicated by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LONG. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator from Florida agree with me with relation to what I tried to point out regarding the city of Boston in connection with title to all the made land, such as the Senator has been describing. The title to such land would be thrown in doubt, would it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to say so, the Senator from Florida made some study of that very question. He knew that the distinguished Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Perlman, had that subject brought to his attention as he was testifying before the Senate committee. He had stated that, in addition to other inland waters, there were certain exceptions which were held to be inland waters, which exceptions were historic bays, which might have a width of more than 10 miles across the mouth, 10 miles being the maximum limit, generally speaking. He cited Massachusetts Bay as one of the historic exceptions. He also stated that in his opinion Chesapeake Bay was a historic exception. The distinguished Solicitor General comes from the State of Maryland. But when it came to San Pedro Bay, in California, he was asked the question as to whether San Pedro Bay, which is a historic bay, was also an exception, and he said no, that it was not, that in his judgment part of it was a bay, and part of it would lie in the open sea.

Then the remark was made, I believe, by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], very appropriately, as I thought, that, after all, it was a question of opinion on the part of the able Solicitor General as to what was inland water and what was not, under present rulings.

The Solicitor General then answered, very lamely, in substance that "of course in each instance the question will depend upon what the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States is in the particular case."

So I say that the Senator from Massachusetts is certainly within his rights in feeling a real degree of apprehension as to what might happen with reference to the valuable properties in the city of Boston which are erected upon made land in Back Bay or Massachusetts Bay. The same question creates grave apprehension in the minds of both Senators from Florida, and numerous other Senators. I note the presence of one of the distinguished Senators from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON]. He understands that there are some such questions applicable to New Jersey, which are of great concern to the Senators from that State, which, like the State of Massachusetts, is one of the Original Thirteen States. The Senator from Florida will gladly yield at this time for any expression which the Senator from New Jersey cares to make, if he secures the permission of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], who has the floor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Jersey would like to say that we have in the State of New Jersey along the coastline many of precisely the same problems which confront the people of the State of Florida and the people of other States. We are deeply concerned about this problem.

I should like to compliment and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana on the splendid presentation of a very difficult subject which he is making this afternoon.

I heard him refer a few minutes ago to the case of Martin against Waddell. It has been some years since the junior Senator from New Jersey had occasion to consult that case, but he has a general knowledge of it. I believe it applies very specifically to many of the problems which confront us on the floor today.

In that connection I should like to say that since our country was founded the State of New Jersey and its people have contributed a great deal to the basic law of America. It is the sincere hope of the junior Senator from New Jersey that on the very vital issue now confronting us the two Senators from New Jersey will make another contribution to the solution of a very difficult legal problem.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am very much indebted to the able and learned Senator from New Jersey. All of us admire him for his ability and his legal knowledge, as well as for the fairness and leadership which he has demonstrated on the floor. The State of Louisiana came into the Union as one of the earlier States to be admitted after the Original Thirteen States had formed this Nation. It was our understanding that we had acquired statehood on an equal footing with all other States.

I am pleased to see that the right which I asserted on the floor for the State of Louisiana was originally decided by the Supreme Court in a New Jersey case involving New Jersey waters.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I recall, the case was decided in the New Jersey courts before it reached the United States Supreme Court.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Jersey for adding to my knowledge of the law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish to add my strong praise to the encomiums which have already been voiced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], as well as by other Senators, to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] for his very able and scholarly discussion of these vital questions.

I may say, too, that I am glad that the question has taken the exact turn which it has in the last few minutes of the debate, because it is now beginning to be completely apparent that Senators who want to discuss this whole question from the standpoint of oil are missing the principal point involved in this vital question.

It must be remembered that oil is expendable. The measure before us is designed to expend all of the oil in the so-called offshore lands. After the oil is gone within a few years—perhaps 15, 20, or 25 years, or whatever the time may be—problems such as those suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], by the Senator from Florida, and by other Senators, will still be vital to the continued development and growth and prosperity of the twenty-odd maritime States, as well as similarly to all of the States which are located on the Great Lakes.

The Senator from Florida would like to invite attention to the fact that in addition to the dozens if not hundreds of hotels and apartment houses and the many other structures, such as the great bulkheads which make possible these structures, which have been built on built-up land along the Atlantic shore, there are a very large number of important and highly expensive piers which have been built into the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific, all of which are affected by the theory of the decisions of the Supreme Court in the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, under which such structures now exist by sufferance on Federal land.

For example, such piers exist in the State of New Jersey, so ably represented by the Senator who preceded me. They are to be found in Atlantic City. I believe the Steel Pier in Atlantic City juts out into the Atlantic Ocean a quarter of a mile, or perhaps a half mile. It is built of steel and concrete and has in its spacious area a theater, dining rooms, many stores, and many places of recreation. Certainly it cost many millions of dollars to build. The Heinz Pier is another illustration of the same type of investment which will be jeopardized unless Congress meets this challenge and enacts such legislation as to give legal standing again to such structures as the ones just mentioned. Illustrations can be repeated by the dozens.

I see on the floor the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. In his State I know there are such structures as there are in the Carolinas and Maryland. In my own State of Florida there are similar structures at Jacksonville Beach, Daytona Beach, Palm Beach, and Miami Beach. Such a structure at Miami Beach has a great theater located at the end of it.

It is simply ridiculous for Senators sponsoring the pending joint resolution to give the impression to the general public that the principal interest in this

field has to do with a temporary problem, namely, the recovery and utilization of the oil, when the permanent problem is whether or not the States are going to be deprived of the right to control the lands immediately adjoining them, which do relate so vitally to their continued growth, expansion, and development, and to the people and industries of those States.

Mr. President, I am extremely glad that the Senator from Louisiana has delved into this particular field and that the other Senators who joined in this discussion have shown that the long-range problem which so vitally affects the future growth and the future development of every maritime State and every Great Lakes State far transcends both in money value and in importance to those States and to the Nation as a whole the mere question of what we are to do about the oil.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator from Florida for his contribution. I know that he has made a study of the question and I know that he is very much interested in the rights of all States as well as in the national welfare.

I now yield to the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Louisiana in what he said to the Senator from Florida, and I appreciate what the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Louisiana have said with relation to the title of lands, because it seems to me that that is very fundamental and far-reaching. It is not merely a question of today or tomorrow, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out.

I should like to ask the Senator one more question on a slightly different phase of the same subject. This issue arose because of the greater importance of oil. Until that time it had never been discussed in the way it is now being discussed. As I understand, the joint resolution as reported by the committee makes certain exceptions; for instance it makes an exception of the iron ore under the Great Lakes and of the shellfish along the seacoast and of fishing within the 3-mile limit, and so forth. Those are exceptions which will be made by this measure if it becomes law.

However, let us assume that following the enactment of this measure a discovery is made within the 3-mile limit. In that event, would not an exception have to be made regarding that discovery, if the State concerned were going to license the taking of the mineral or the shellfish or whatever the discovery might be? In short, if we pass this measure, thus making exceptions of certain things which are known today, a future discovery will have to be the subject of further legislation, will it not?

Mr. LONG. Certainly that is true; the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely correct.

Furthermore, so far as concerns the quitclaim provision, as it is called, the version I have read contains a provision to the effect that the Federal Government passes on to the States its administration of sponges and fish. I point out that such a provision is never in any way irrevocable; for if an administration at a later time felt that it had a majority of Congress and it then wished to change its mind about the matter, I believe it would have a right to do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further to me?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, ownership means preservation of all the rights to the property concerned. Therefore, if the Federal Government owns all this land, there should be no exceptions at all, whether in the case of shellfish, oil, or anything else. On the other hand, if the States own all this land, the present situation would continue, and there would be no exceptions. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. LONG. Certainly the Senator from Massachusetts is correct in regard to that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me at this point?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am exceedingly happy that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has brought out the point that the committee did, in its grace and generosity, but at the insistence of the Senator from Louisiana, place in the pending measure one exception, which is to be found in section 9. I think it appropriate to read that into the RECORD at this point. Section 9 is a committee amendment which was inserted, as I have said, at the direct insistence of the Senator from Louisiana, although not in his words:

SEC. 9. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to the fact that that provision applies only, and is carefully limited to, "marine animal and plant life." It does not include shells or sand or gravel or rare minerals, which in my State have from time to time been produced. That provision does not include the questions of the bottoms that are used for piers or for filling to build hotels and the like. That provision does not include many, many other property uses of the permanent lands beneath the off-shore water, but is limited only to marine animal and plant life, and is limited to an expression that is permissive only so long as it is permitted to continue by fiat of Congress, because no permanent right is given and no property right is conveyed. The provision simply is that the United States consents that the respective States may "regulate, manage, administer," and so forth, under their State law.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to me, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Florida, who is a distinguished lawyer, agrees that these rights are those which ordinarily come from ownership; and that in giving up these rights, the Federal Government makes specific exemptions; and therefore any discoveries would have to go through the process of Congressional action before they would be accepted and would be available to the States, so that they could issue licenses and obtain advantage of ownership and of the business which could be derived from such ownership?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Massachusetts is entirely correct. The point goes even further than that. Section 9, the only generous, gracious restoration of any part of the States' former rights, is a permissive section, to operate only so long as the grace of Congress permits, and to relate only to the marine, animal and plant life to be found there, but never to relate to the more permanent things found in the bottoms or adjoining the shores of the respective States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the point made by the Senator from Florida is very well taken, namely, that insofar as this proposed legislation would confer upon the States some right with respect to sponges, fish, and other animal life in the sea, it is given in a form by which it can be taken back.

Let me say that I had nothing to do with drafting that provision. It was drafted in the hope that, as a result, the States would not fight so vigorously for what they have all along insisted is one of their rights.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield at this point?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Louisiana take the position that this position is a sop designed to persuade the States to yield without much struggle—a point which otherwise they would not yield without a great struggle?

Mr. LONG. Yes. The Senator from Florida has stated the point much better than I would have been able to state it.

Mr. President, I have stressed to some degree that the very basis upon which the States own the beds of the inland waters is the doctrine derived from the theory that the king owns the bed of the sea. The same doctrine would apply to the bed of the Great Lakes.

In commenting on the case of *Illinois Central Railroad Company* v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892)) Mr. John Bassett Moore, one of the most famous writers on international law, made the following statement:

So, also, by the common law, the dominion over and ownership by the Crown of lands within the realm under tidewaters is not founded upon the existence of the tide over the land, but upon the fact that the waters are navigable, tidewaters and navigable waters being used as synonymous terms in England.

Mr. President, it should be reasonably apparent that the very basis upon which the State of Illinois owns and claims the bed of the Great Lakes is exactly the same basis and exactly the same doctrine and exactly the same theory upon which the coastal States own the bed of their marginal belts.

It is very gracious of the Senator from Illinois to propose that Illinois' title to the land lying under the Great Lakes should be confirmed, while title to the land under the belts of the coastal States should not be confirmed. Certainly that would solve all the problems so far as the State of Illinois is concerned, but I regret to say that it would not solve all the problems of the coastal States.

Thus, Mr. President, the rule laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States in 52 decisions prior to the distinction laid down by the New Deal Court was not an inland-water rule at all. It was anything but an inland rule; it was a rule of the ownership of the open sea and the submerged lands covered by waters which partook of the nature of the sea, which had been applied to inland waters by the Supreme Court. Is it any wonder that when Mr. Justice Black read such language and decided contrary to it, he made this significant statement:

> This Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times and in so doing it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that the States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters—

I emphasize the next few words, Mr. President:

> but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not.

The next sentence of that paragraph by Mr. Justice Black is simply mistaken. That is why, in my judgment, the American Bar Association, the National Association of Attorneys General, and most reputable attorneys who have made a study of this question seem to agree that something should be done about the California decision. Mr. President, here is the statement with which I disagree:

> All of these statements were—

Meaning the previous statements of the Court—

> however, merely paraphrases or off-shoots of the Pollard inland-water rule, and were used, not as annunciation of a new ocean rule, but in explanation of the old inland-water principle.

As a matter of fact, the Pollard case followed the case of Martin against Waddell, of 3 years before, which dealt with Raritan Bay, New Jersey, an arm of the sea. Mr. President, that statement by Mr. Justice Black, in my opinion, merely happens to be wrong. The Pollard case and other cases involving the beds of the rivers amounted to applying the tidewaters rule to inland waters, just the reverse of what Mr. Justice Black was urging. It is true that the tidewater rule had never been decided in an American case involving the open sea but only with regard to arms of the sea, such as bays, sounds, and estuaries. Nevertheless, it was a rule derived from the law of England, in which that was clearly recognized to be the case.

As Senators know, the common law of England was transplanted to the United States and the Supreme Court of the United States recognized and pursued the common law of England. Therefore, Mr. President, we should reach the conclusion that the States were once sovereign, each in its own right. In that capacity, each State owns the beds of its navigable waters, the beds of its tidewaters, if you please, as an attribute of its complete sovereignty.

Interpolating, Mr. President, I am pleased to note the presence on the Senate floor, while I have been speaking, of the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia. I hope that our distinguished colleague, who certainly, in my judgment, is one of the most learned attorneys in this country, will have opportunity to read my comment upon the novel theory which we have heard expressed here, that the United States Government existed prior to its formation under the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution of the United States; and that, having existed, either contemporaneously with or prior to the existence of the independent States, it therefore had paramount powers, other than those granted in the Constitution. That doctrine is being argued today. The junior Senator from Louisiana has heard it argued by Members of this body, as well as by the Solicitor General of the United States and the Solicitor of the Interior Department. The junior Senator from Louisiana has made every effort to document his statement that that theory of the formation of the American Government is untrue, and that it is a very dangerous theory when used as the basis of an argument that the Federal Government possesses vast powers which no one ever thought it possessed. I certainly hope, and I shall be flattered if my hope is fulfilled, that the senior Senator from Georgia, when he has the RECORD before him tomorrow, will find time to examine my effort to answer that argument.

I continue. Having reached that conclusion, we can read to our hearts' content those two great documents, the Articles of Confederation and the Constitution, but nowhere do we find that the States surrendered any of their rights to the beds of their navigable streams, nor the submerged lands beneath their tidewaters to the Central Government. Quite the contrary, we find that the Articles of Confederation, in article I, said:

> The stile of this confederacy shall be "The United States of America."

Article II then said:

> Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power, jurisdiction, and right which is not by this confederation expressly delegated to the United States in Congress assembled.

It is strange, in a way, that the Articles of Confederation began by reserving all rights to the States not expressly granted. There were no implied powers under the Articles of Confederation. The Constitution of the United States in amendment X declares that—

> The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Unfortunately, it did not employ the phrase "all powers not expressly given are reserved," which has led to the vast implied powers which we have seen develop since that time.

Quite the contrary, we observe that the States reserved all of their powers. The tenth amendment to the American Constitution, the last article of the Bill of Rights, as I have previously stated, set forth that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

Mr. President, I have labored perhaps at length to explain this point, but I hope it is by this time crystal clear that the States once possessed the beds of all navigable waters prior to the formation of the Government under the American Constitution. Nowhere in the Constitution nor the Articles of Confederation did they surrender that element of their sovereignty.

There is a novel and questionable argument, Mr. President——

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator referred to the statement in the California case with reference to the Pollard case, and he read correctly a part of what the Court said. I wish he would read the remainder of the paragraph from which he read.

Mr. LONG. I read it, and said I did not agree with it.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator read the entire paragraph?

Mr. LONG. I read that paragraph and said I did not agree with it. I presume the Senator agrees with what follows. I do not agree with what follows.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator read what follows?

Mr. LONG. I read a part of what follows.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator read the entire paragraph?

Mr. LONG. I read the part that follows, in which Mr. Justice Black said that the Pollard case was merely announcing the old inland-water rule, and he did not propose to apply it to the open sea.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to read the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. LONG. Go right ahead.

Mr. HILL. It reads:

> All of these statements were, however, merely paraphrases or offshoots of the Pollard inland-water rule, and were used, not as enunciation of a new ocean rule, but in explanation of the old inland-water principle. Notwithstanding the fact that none of these cases either involved or decided the State-Federal conflict presented here, we are urged to say that the language used and

repeated in those cases forecloses the Government from the right to have this Court decide that question now that it is squarely presented for the first time.

I thank the Senator. I wanted that in the RECORD.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is perfectly welcome. I should merely like to say with reference to that statement, that I believe the explanation of my difference with that opinion has already been stated for the RECORD, although I should perhaps further say that what Mr. Justice Black referred to as an old inland-water rule, in my judgment, and in the judgment of some of the best legal authorities in this country, was never an old inland-water rule. It was and had been the rule, before it was ever applied to the arms of the sea, which were the beds of rivers which were subject to the ebb and flow of the tide. It was adopted and applied in this country to inland waters which, of course, being navigable, were regarded as having some of the same elements, although they were not subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

Mr. President, I should now like to direct my attention to the novel and questionable argument of the Solicitor General of the United States, that the beds of the ocean along the shores of a State are not susceptible of ownership. Why should such a thing be true as long as the coastal State can prevent other people from trespassing on that property by force of arms or any other method? Why cannot they posses the bed of the shallow water along the ocean shore just as easily as the bed of the Chesapeake Bay. It is true that the United States Government has the duty and obligation to defend the shores of this Nation. But so what. The United States Government also has the duty to defend the Chesapeake Bay and Long Island Sound. It has the duty to defend the rivers.

As a matter of fact, I asked the question yesterday, whether we were going to pin Federal ownership of the marginal belt on the defense power of the Government. If so, then I would assume that if a submarine entered Mobile Bay, the Federal Government would have the duty to chase it out, and that would give it title to Mobile Bay. That, Mr. President, simply does not make sense to the junior Senator from Louisiana. The Federal Government has the duty to defend the Great Lakes, and, for that matter, the United States Government has the duty to defend Pike's Peak, or the Empire State Building. Does that obligation of the Federal Government prevent all that property from being separately owned either by States or by individuals? The argument is absolutely ridiculous, and, just as pointed out by Mr. Justice Reed, of the Supreme Court, itself, the argument could be just as well used to excuse and justify the seizure of all the natural resources of the United States.

Mr. President, when we look at the California case we can say that it would make just as much sense for the United States Supreme Court to say that the paramount right of our Federal Government with its duties to defend this Nation and all property located within this country is so great as to exclude the rights of individual property ownership. In other words, it would make just as much sense for the Supreme Court to say that the Federal Government owns every farm, home, or factory in America because of the paramount rights of the Federal Government as it does to say that the Federal Government owns the beds of navigable waters within State boundaries.

I am not alone in my concern regarding this decision. The American Title Association feels that a decision such as that in the California case is potentally a threat to the title of the individual American to his home or his farm. Former Dean Roscoe Pound of the Harvard Law School said:

> It is a startling proposition to tell Americans that sovereignty, which we have thought of as political, must be proprietary as well, must include ownership of the soil.

The Supreme Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Black, said that the paramount rights of the Federal Government were such as to transcend that of a mere property owner. I would like to quote the words of the Saturday Evening Post in its recent editorial on this subject: "What do they mean 'mere'?"

Now, Mr. President, I come to the States which were not members of the Original Thirteen States of this Nation. They were admitted to this Nation on an equal footing with all the other States. Thus in *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212 (1845)), it was held that inasmuch as the State of Alabama came into the Nation on an equal footing with other States that it had the same rights of sovereignty and jurisdiction as to navigable waters and subsoils thereof as the original 13 States. In *The Abby Dodge* case (223 U. S. 166 (1912)), the effect of the equal-footing clause conveyed to the State of Florida the ownership of the sponges in its tidal waters so far as they are capable of ownership while in the sea. Such was the effect to convey title to the land in San Pedro Harbor to the State of California in the case *Borax Consolidated* v. *City of Los Angeles* (296 U. S. (1935)).

I ask unanimous consent at this point to make a part of this RECORD a brief with pertinent quotations from other Supreme Court decisions holding the same thing, namely, that it was the effect of the equal-footing clause in the admission of the new States of the Union, to convey to its new States the same attributes of sovereignty possessed by the Original Thirteen States.

There being no objection, the brief was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW STATES (ADMITTED ON EQUAL FOOTING WITH THE ORIGINAL THIRTEEN)

Pollard v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212 (1845)): Plaintiffs claimed a lot of ground below both high- and low-water mark in Mobile Bay, under United States patent, issued before Alabama was admitted to statehood. The defendant claimed under grant from the State.

The Court said that this was the first time it had been called upon to draw the line that separates the sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Government of the Union and the State governments, over the subject in controversy, although many of the principles which entered into the question had been settled by previous decisions of the Court.

The Court held that when Alabama was admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States, it succeeded to all of the rights of sovereignty and jurisdiction which Georgia possessed, except so far as such right was diminished by the public lands remaining in the possession and under the control of the United States and that if an express stipulation had been inserted in the agreement for the admission of Alabama as a State, granting the municipal right of sovereignty to the United States, such stipulation would have been void and inoperative, "because the United States have no constitutional capacity to exercise municipal jurisdiction, sovereignty, or eminent domain, within the limits of a State or elsewhere, except in the cases in which it is expressly granted."

The Court said further that the surrender made by the States of their waste and unappropriated lands, public lands, to the United States under resolution of the old Congress, of September 6, 1780, to aid in paying the public debt of the Revolution, ended as soon as such purposes could be accomplished, and then the power of the United States over such lands was to cease.

To exercise rights not granted, the Court characterized as repugnant to the Constitution and inconsistent with the deeds of cession.

"Then to Alabama," the Court said, "belong the navigable waters, and soils under them * * * subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States" and that "no compact that might be made between her (Alabama) and the United States could diminish or enlarge these rights."

"For, although the territorial limits of Alabama," the Court added, "have extended all her sovereign power into the sea; it is there, as on the shore, but municipal power, subject to the Constitution of the United States, and the laws which shall be made in pursuance thereof."

This landmark case follows the prior jurisprudence and is important all the more for the enunciation therein made that the new States have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction as to navigable waters and the subsoils thereof as the Original Thirteen States.

Louisiana v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1 (1905)): This suit involves the powers of two contesting States to control the oyster industry and the taking of oysters claimed by both States to be within the boundaries of each.

The Court held that under the Treaty of Cession in 1803 between France and the United States and the act of April 1812, admitting Louisiana into the Union, the waters in question were within the boundaries of the State of Louisiana.

In the course of its opinion, the Court said:

"The maritime belt is that part of the sea, in contradistinction to the open sea, is under the sway of the riparian States, which can exclusively reserve the fisheries within their respective maritime belts for their own citizens, whether fish, or pearls, or amber, or other products of the sea."

(The term "sway" is defined in Webster's dictionary as synonymous with "power, empire, sovereignty.")

The Abby Dodge (223 U. S. 166 (1912)): The defendant was convicted under a Federal statute prohibiting the landing of sponges taken by means of diving apparatus from waters of the Gulf of Mexico and the straits of Florida.

The Court cited *McCready* v. *Virginia*, *Pollard* v. *Hagan*, *Smith* v. *Maryland*, and other cases herein briefed, as well as others, in saying that if the statute applied to sponges taken from land under water within the territorial limits of the State of Florida, or other States, the repugnancy of the statute to the

Constitution would be plainly established. Referring to the case of *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (see pp. 11–12, herein), the Court pointed out that aquatic life "so far as they are capable of ownership while so running" belong to the States and are subject to their control, if found within the marginal waters of such States.

Borax Consolidated v. *City of Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10 (1935)): This action was brought by the city of Los Angeles (defendant in writ) claiming under a grant from the State of California, to quiet title to land in San Pedro Harbor, the other party claimed under a preemption patent from the United States.

Holding for plaintiff, under State grant, the Court held, among other things, that State ownership of tidelands extends to the mean high-water mark; that such property, acquired by the United States from Mexico, had been held in trust for the State of California.

Knight v. *United Lands Association* (142 U. S. 161): Error to the Supreme Court of California to review a judgment in favor of plaintiff, in an action of ejectment for the recovery of a block of land in the city of San Francisco, below high-water mark at the time of the conquest of California with Mexico.

The Court held:

"It is the settled rule of law in this Court that absolute property in, and dominion and sovereignty over, the soils under the tidewaters in the original States were reserved to the several States, and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the Original Thirteen States possess within their respective borders."

Mumford v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. 423 (1867)): This was a contest over a lot of ground below high tide in California waters. Among other things, the Court held:

"It is the settled rule of law in this Court that the shores of navigable waters and the soils under the same in the original States were not granted, by the Constitution, to the United States; but were reserved to the several States; and that the new States since admitted have the same rights, sovereignty, and jurisdiction in that behalf as the original States possess within their respective borders" (quoting from *Pollard* v. *Hagan*, supra).

New Orleans v. *United States* (152 U. S. 1 (1894)): The United States sought in this action to enjoin the officials and inhabitants of New Orleans, La., from selling lots included in the vacant lands forming part of the common, or quay, by asserting the claim that such property inured to the United States by the Treaty of Cession in 1803.

The Court discussed the laws of France in much detail, and cited Domat for the following statement:

"There are two kinds of property destined to the common use of man, and of which everyone has the enjoyment. The first of those are so by nature—as rivers, the sea, and its shores. The second, which derive their character from the destination given by man, such as streets, highways, churches, market houses, courthouses, and other public places."

Among other pronouncements, the Court said:

"The King of Spain, like the King of France, had the power to give permission to construct buildings on grounds dedicated to public use * * *; but this does not show that either sovereign had the power to alien such lands.

"This common (quay) having been dedicated to public use, was withdrawn from commerce, and from the power of the King rightfully to alien it."

"The State of Louisiana was admitted into the Union on the same footing as the original States. Her rights of sovereignty are the same, and by consequence no jurisdiction of the Federal Government, either for purposes of police or otherwise, can be exercised over this public ground."

"All powers which properly appertain to sovereignty, which have not been delegated to the Federal Government, belong to the States and the people."

This case is important in two main respects: (1) The sea and its shores were declared to be owned by the State, and (2) such property was referred to as being inalienable.

Shively v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1 (1894)): The land in controversy, located in Oregon, was submerged in waters beyond the high-water mark. The plaintiff claimed under a State grant, the defendant under a United States patent. (Oregon tidelands at mouth of Columbia River in contest.)

In rendering judgment for plaintiff, the Court held:

"By the common law, both the title and the dominion of the sea, and of rivers and arms of the sea, where the tide ebbs and flows, and of all the lands below high-water mark, within the jurisdiction of the Crown of England, are in the King. * * * The common law of England upon this subject, at the time of the emigration of our ancestors, is the law of this country, except as it has been modified, by the charters, constitutions, statutes or usages of the several colonies and States, or by the Constitution and laws of the United States."

There was also mentioned in the opinion the rights of new States as being equal to the Original Thirteen.

"Upon the admission of Oregon into the Union, the tidelands became the property of the State, and subject to its jurisdiction and disposal."

Skiriotes v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 313 (1941)): A case, in certain respects, similar to the *Abby Dodge*, supra. A Federal statute was under consideration, prohibiting the use of diving equipment in the taking of sponges from the Gulf of Mexico and the Florida Straits.

The Court sanctioned the right of the State to regulate the taking of sponges from its territorial waters, dismissing the contention that international law was involved.

United States v. *Mission Rock Co.* (189 U. S. 391 (1920)): Title to tidelands contiguous to and surrounding San Francisco Bay was at issue in this case. As against a grantee of the State to reclaim such lands, the opposing party claimed that the area had been reserved by order of the President of the United States for naval purposes.

The State-grantee prevailed. Said the Court:

"Although the title to the soil under the tidewaters of the bay was acquired by the United States by cession from Mexico, equally with title to the upland, they held it in trust for the future State."

Illinois Central Railroad Co. v. *State of Illinois* (146 U. S. 387 (1892)): A segment of the subsoil of Lake Michigan was in controversy herein.

The Court pointed out the settled law of the land as to State ownership of tidelands, citing *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212) and *Weber* v. *Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. 57) then it added significantly:

"We hold, therefore, that the same doctrine as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under the navigable waters of the Great Lakes, applies, which obtains at the common law as to the dominion and sovereignty over and ownership of lands under tidewaters on the borders of the sea, and that the lands are held by the same right in the one case as in the other, and subject to the same trusts and limitations."

Weber v. *Board of State Harbor Commissioners* (18 Wall. (85 U. S. 57) 57 (1873)): This suit involved lands under an arm of the sea in California waters.

The Court said in part in its opinion:

"The title to the shore of the sea, and of the arms of the sea, and in soils under the tidewaters, is, in England, in the King, and in this country, in the State."

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT CASES RECOGNIZING STATE OWNERSHIP OF LANDS BENEATH ALL NAVIGABLE WATERS WITHIN THE STATE'S BORDERS

1. Salt water and tidelands

Pollard's Lessee v. *Hagan* (3 How. (44 U. S.) 212, 229, 230) (Alabama—Mobile Bay); *Goodtitle* v. *Kibbe* (9 How. (50 U. S.) 471, 478) (Alabama—shore of a navigable river); *Smith* v. *Maryland* (18 How. (59 U. S.) 71, 74) (Maryland—soil beneath low watermark in Chesapeake Bay); *Numford* v. *Wardwell* (6 Wall. (73 U. S. 423, 435, 436) (California—navigable waters and soils under same); *Weber* v. *Board of Harbor Comm'rs.* (18 Wall. (85 U. S.) 57, 65, 66) (California—shore and arms of the sea); *McCready* v. *Virginia* (94 U. S. 391, 394, 395) (Virginia—oyster beds in tidewaters); *San Francisco* v. *Le Roy* (138 U. S. 656) (670–672) (California tidelands in San Francisco Bay).

Knight v. *U. S. Land Assn.* (142 U. S. 161) (183, 201) (California—San Francisco Bay); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1) (57, 58) (Oregon—tidelands at mouth of Columbia River); *Mobile Transp. Co.* v. *Mobile* (187 U. S. 479, 482) (Alabama—Mobile River); *United States* v. *Mission Rock Co.* (189 U. S. 391, 404) (California—submerged lands and tidelands in San Francisco Bay).

Greenleaf Lbr. Co. v. *Garrison* (237 U. S. 251, 269) (Virginia—Elizabeth River); The *Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166) (Florida—sponge beds in Gulf of Mexico); *Port of Seattle* v. *Oregon and Washington R. R. Co.* (255 U. S. 56, 63) (Washington—port of Seattle); *Borax Consolidated* v. *City of Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 15, 16) (California—tidelands, San Pedro Bay); *United States* v. *O'Donnell* (303 U. S. 501, 519) (California—San Francisco Bay).

2. Navigable rivers

St. Clair v. *Lovingston* (90 U. S. 49) (Illinois—Mississippi River); *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324) (Iowa—Mississippi River); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (151 U. S. 1) (Oregon—Columbia River); *St. Anthony* v. *Board* (168 U. S. 349) (Minnesota—Mississippi River); *Scott* v. *Lattig* (227 U. S. 229) (Idaho—Snake River); *Donnelly* v. *United States* (228 U. S. 243) (California—Klamath River); *Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (258 U. S. 574) (Oklahoma—Red River); *United States* v. *Utah* (283 U. S. 64) (Utah—Colorado River).

3. Great Lakes

Illinois Central Railroad Co. v. *Illinois* (146 U. S. 387) (Illinois—shores and beds of Lake Michigan); *Massachusetts* v. *New York* (271 U. S. 65) (New York—submerged lands, Lake Ontario).

4. Inland lakes

Hardin v. *Jordan* (140 U. S. 371) (Illinois—inland lake); *McGilvra* v. *Ross* (215 U. S. 70) (Washington—nontidal lakes); *United States* v. *Holt State Bank* (270 U. S. 49) (Minnesota—inland lakes); *United States* v. *Oregon* (295 U. S. 1) (Oregon—inland lakes and channels).

5. Bays and sounds

Louisiana v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1) (Channel, Breton Sound, leading to Chandelier Islands); *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240) (Massachusetts—Buzzard's Bay).

Mr. LONG. Thus once the Federal proponents are compelled to concede the sovereignty of the Original Thirteen States, there is such a mass of Supreme Court holdings supporting the meaning of the equal-footing clause that the new

States possess those same attributes of sovereignty which included the ownership of the beds of navigable waters, that there is then no escaping the conclusion that new States, such as Louisiana and California, acquired the same rights as the Original States.

Of course, it has been contended by the Federal Government that the States never owned and never claimed the property along their coasts. Of course, Mr. President, it is not necessary to prove that the property had been claimed in order to prove that it was owned, but nevertheless there is ample evidence that the tidewaters and the land beneath those waters, both inland and on the open sea, were regarded as belonging to the adjacent State.

The colonial charters of the Original States show that these colonies were regarded as including the sea adjoining their coasts.

In addition, Mr. President, there are many instances of the Federal Government having recognized the title of the States by acquiring certain property in the submerged lands and in the open sea by purchase or grant from the States. Furthermore, we have the pronounced declarations and letters of Federal officials expressly conceding that this property belonged to the States. Likewise, we know by practice that the citizens of many of the States have made their living in the marginal sea catching shrimp and fish, extracting shells, oysters, and clams. Some of them have reclaimed land upon the sea to build hotels and other modern structures. In all these things they were regulated by the States. They were subject to the laws of the States and, insofar as they acquired property rights in the marginal sea, they always acquired them from the States. States and municipalities thereof have constructed breakwaters and harbors. Likewise they have dredged channels, making use of submerged lands which everyone regarded as belonging to them. Now we are told that all of these things are to be changed by this new concept of paramount power in the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I prefer the kind of law that had been laid down and expressed time and again by the courts throughout the last 150 years. I fear that the Fair Deal decisions, if the California case is any example, will be far more destructive to the fabric of our constitutional and private law than the New Deal decisions. I believe it is time we turned back this down-hill rush of Federal agents for vast additional powers. It is time we restored to the States that thin band of property that surrounds the United States within the boundaries of the several States of this Nation. That property comprehends less than 10 percent of the submerged lands on the Continental Shelf. Our geologists tell us that there is an equal chance to find oil in the remaining 90 percent of the lands on the Continental Shelf as there is in that area, close to shore.

Why do they have to have the last drop of oil in order to enhance the powers of the Federal Government?

The need for Federal revenues is not so great that we must upset our form of government, that we must distort and do violence to the history of our country and jeopardize the rights of our people by the adoption of a new and revolutionary doctrine and new theories of the origin of the American Government which may tend fundamentally to alter the nature of this American Government.

EXHIBIT A

WASHINGTON, *May 4, 1822.*

To the House of Representatives:

I transmit the paper alluded to in the message of this day, on the subject of internal improvements.

JAMES MONROE.

VIEWS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE SUBJECT OF INTERNAL IMPROVEMENTS

It may be presumed that the proposition relating to internal improvements by roads and canals, which has been several times before Congress, will be taken into consideration again either for the purpose of recommending to the States the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to vest the necessary power in the General Government or to carry the system into effect on the principle that the power has already been granted. It seems to be the prevailing opinion that great advantage would be derived from the exercise of such a power by Congress. Respecting the right there is much diversity of sentiment. It is of the highest importance that this question should be settled. If the right exist, it ought forthwith to be exercised. If it does not exist, surely those who are friends to the power ought to unite in recommending an amendment to the Constitution to obtain it. I propose to examine this question.

The inquiry confined to its proper objects and within the most limited scale is extensive. Our Government is unlike other governments both in its origin and form. In analyzing it the differences in certain respects between it and those of other nations, ancient and modern, necessarily come into view. I propose to notice these differences so far as they are connected with the object of inquiry, and the consequences likely to result from them, varying in equal degree from those which have attended other governments. The digression, if it may be so called, will in every instance be short and the transition to the main object immediate and direct.

To do justice to the subject it will be necessary to mount to the source of power in these States and to pursue this power in its gradations and distribution among the several departments in which it is now vested. The great division is between the State governments and the General Government. If there was a perfect accord in every instance as to the precise extent of the powers granted to the General Government, we should then know with equal certainty what were the powers which remained to the State governments, since it would follow that those which were not granted to the one would remain to the other. But it is on this point, and particularly respecting the construction of these powers and their incidents, that a difference of opinion exists, and hence it is necessary to trace distinctly the origin of each government, the purposes intended by it, and the means adopted to accomplish them. By having the interior of both governments fully before us we shall have all the means which can be afforded to enable us to form a correct opinion of the endowments of each.

Before the Revolution the present States, then colonies, were separate communities, unconnected with each other except in their common relation to the Crown. Their governments were instituted by grants from the Crown, which operated, according to the conditions of each grant, in the nature of a compact between the settlers in each colony and the Crown. All power not retained in the Crown was vested exclusively in the Colonies, each having a government consisting of an executive, a judiciary, and a legislative assembly, one branch of which was in every instance elected by the people. No office was hereditary, nor did any title under the Crown give rank or office in any of the Colonies. In resisting the encroachments of the parent country and abrogating the power of the Crown the authority which had been held by it vested exclusively in the people of the Colonies. By them was a Congress appointed, composed of delegates from each colony, who managed the war, declared independence, treated with foreign powers, and acted in all things according to the sense of their constituents. The Declaration of Independence confirmed in form what had before existed in substance. It announced to the world new States, possessing and exercising complete sovereignty, which they were resolved to maintain. They were soon after recognized by France and other powers, and finally by Great Britain herself in 1783.

Soon after the power of the Crown was annulled the people of each colony established a constitution or frame of government for themselves, in which these separate branches—legislative, executive, and judiciary—were instituted, each independent of the others. To these branches, each having its appropriate portion, the whole power of the people not delegated to Congress was communicated, to be exercised for their advantage on the representative principle by persons of their appointment, or otherwise deriving the authority immediately from them, and holding their offices for stated terms. All the powers necessary for useful purposes held by any of the strongest governments of the Old World not vested in Congress were imparted to these State governments without other checks than such as are necessary to prevent abuse, in the form of fundamental declarations or bills of right. The great difference between our governments and those of the Old World consists in this, that the former, being representative, the persons who exercise their powers do it not for themselves or in their own right, but for the people, and therefore while they are in the highest degree efficient they can never become oppressive. It is this transfer of the power of the people to representative and responsible bodies in every branch which constitutes the great improvement in the science of government and forms the boast of our system. It combines all the advantages of every known government without any of their disadvantages. It retains the sovereignty in the people, while it avoids the tumult and disorder incident to the exercise of that power by the people themselves. It possesses all the energy and efficiency of the most despotic governments, while it avoids all the oppressions and abuses inseparable from those governments.

In every stage of the conflict from its commencement until March 1781, the powers of Congress were undefined, but of vast extent. The assemblies or conventions of the several colonies being formed by representatives from every county in each colony and the Congress by delegates from each colonial assembly; the powers of the latter for general purposes resembled those of the former for local. They rested on the same basis, the people, and were complete for all the purposes contemplated. Never was a movement so spontaneous, so patriotic, so efficient. The Nation exerted its whole faculties in support of its rights, and of its independence after the contest took that direction, and it succeeded. It was, however, foreseen at a very early stage that although the patriotism of the country might be relied on in the struggle for its independence, a well-digested compact would be necessary to pre-

serve it after obtained. A plan of confederation was in consequence proposed and taken into consideration by Congress even at the moment when the other great act which severed them from Great Britain and declared their independence was proclaimed to the world. This compact was ratified on March 21, 1781, by the last State, and thereupon carried into immediate effect.

The following powers were vested in the United States by the Articles of Confederation. As this, the first bond of union, was in operation nearly 8 years, during which time a practical construction was given to many of its powers, all of which were adopted in the Constitution with important additions, it is thought that a correct view of those powers and of the manner in which they are executed may shed light on the subject under consideration. It may fairly be presumed that where certain powers were transferred from one instrument to the other and in the same terms, or terms descriptive only of the same powers, that it was intended that they should be construed in the same sense in the latter that they were in the former.

Article I declares that the style of the Confederacy shall be "The United States of America."

Article II: Each State retains its sovereignty, freedom, and independence, and every power and right which is not expressly delegated to the United States.

Article III: The States severally enter into a firm league of friendship with each other for their commen defense, the security of their liberties, and their mutual and general welfare, binding themselves to assist each other against all force offered to or attacks made upon them on account of religion, sovereignty, trade, etc.

Article IV: The free inhabitants of each State, paupers, vagabonds, and fugitives from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of free citizens in the several States, etc. Fugitives from justice into any of the States shall be delivered up on the demand of the executive of the State from which they fled. Full faith and credit shall be given in each State to the records and acts of every other State.

Article V: Delegates shall be annually appointed by the legislature of each State to meet in Congress on the first Monday in November, with a power to recall, etc. No State shall appoint less than two nor more than seven, nor shall any delegate hold his office for more than three in six years. Each State shall maintain its own delegates. Each State shall have one vote. Freedom of speech shall not be impeached, and the members shall be protected from arrests, except for treason, etc.

Article VI: No State shall send or receive an embassy or enter into a treaty with a foreign power. Nor shall any person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States or any State accept any present, emolument, office, or title from a foreign power. Nor shall the United States or any State grant any title of nobility. No two States shall enter into any treaty without the consent of Congress. No State shall lay any imposts or duties which may interfere with any treaties entered into by the United States. No State shall engage in war unless it be invaded or menaced with invasion by some Indian tribe, nor grant letters of marque or reprisal unless it be against pirates, nor keep up vessels of war nor any body of troops in time of peace without the consent of Congress; but every State shall keep up a well-regulated militia, etc.

Article VII: When land forces are raised by any State for the common defense, all officers of and under the rank of colonel shall be appointed by the legislature of each State.

Article VIII: All charges of war and all other expenses which shall be incurred for the common defense or general welfare shall be defrayed out of a common treasury, which shall be supplied by the several States in proportion to the value of all the land in each State granted to individuals. The taxes for paying each proportion shall be levied by the several States.

Article IX: Congress shall have the sole and exclusive right and power of determining on peace and war, except in the cases mentioned in the sixth article; of sending and receiving Ambassadors; entering into alliances, except, etc.; of establishing rules for deciding what captures on land and water shall be legal; of granting letters of marque and reprisal in time of peace; appointing courts for the trial of piracies and felonies on the high seas; for deciding controversies between the States and between individuals claiming lands under two or more States whose jurisdiction has been adjusted; of regulating the alloy and value of coin struck by their authority and of foreign coin; fixing the standard of weights and measures; regulating the trade with the Indians; establishing and regulating post offices from one State to another and throughout all the States, and exacting such postage as may be requisite to defray the expenses of the office; of appointing all officers of the land forces except the regimental; appointing all the offices of the naval forces; to ascertain the necessary sums of money to be raised for the service of the United States and appropriate the same; to borrow money and emit bills of credit; to build and equip a Navy; to agree on the number of land forces and to make requisitions on each State for its quota; that the assent of nine States shall be requisite to these great acts.

Article X regulates the powers of the committee of the States to sit in the recess of Congress.

Article XI provides for the admission of Canada into the Confederation.

Article XII pledges the faith of the United States for the payment of all bills of credit issued and money borrowed on their account.

Article XIII: Every State shall abide by the determination of the United States on all questions submitted to them by the Confederation, the Articles of the Confederation to be perpetual and not to be altered without the consent of every State.

This bond of union was soon found to be utterly incompetent to the purposes intended by it. It was defective in its powers; it was defective also in the means of executing the powers actually granted by it. Being a league of sovereign and independent States, its acts, like those of all other leagues, required the interposition of the States composing it to give them effect within their respective jurisdictions. The acts of Congress without the aid of State laws to enforce them were altogether nugatory. The refusal or omission of one State to pass such laws was urged as a reason to justify like conduct in others, and thus the Government was soon at a stand.

The experience of a few years demonstrated that the Confederation could not be relied on for the security of the blessings which had been derived from the Revolution. The interests of the Nation required a more efficient Government, which the good sense and virtue of the people provided by the adoption of the present Constitution.

The Constitution of the United States was formed by a convention of delegates from the several States, who met in Philadelphia, duly authorized for the purpose, and it was ratified by a convention in each State which was especially called to consider and decide on the same. In this progress the State governments were never suspended in their functions. On the contrary, they took the lead in it. Conscious of their incompetency to secure to the Union the blessings of the Revolution, they promoted the diminution of their own powers and the enlargement of those of the general Government in the way in which they might be most adequate and efficient. It is believed that no other example can be found of a Government exerting its influence to lessen its own powers, of a policy so enlightened, of a patriotism so pure and disinterested. The credit, however, is more especially due to the people of each State, in obedience to whose will and under whose control the State governments acted.

The Constitution of the United States, being ratified by the people of the several States, became of necessity to the extent of its powers the paramount authority of the Union. On sound principles it can be viewed in no other light. The people, the highest authority known to our system, from whom all our institutions spring and on whom they depend, formed it. Had the people of the several States thought proper to incorporate themselves into one community, under one government, they might have done it. They had the power, and there was nothing then nor is there anything now, should they be so disposed, to prevent it. They wisely stopped, however, at a certain point, extending the incorporation to that point, making the National Government thus far a consolidated Government, and preserving the State governments without that limit perfectly sovereign and independent of the National Government. Had the people of the several States incorporated themselves into one community, they must have remained such, their Constitution becoming then, like the constitution of the several States, incapable of change until altered by the will of the majority. In the institution of a State government by the citizens of a State a compact is formed to which all and every citizen are equal parties. They are also the sole parties and may amend it at pleasure. In the institution of the Government of the United States by the citizens of every State a compact was formed between the whole American people which has the same force and partakes of all the qualities to the extent of its powers as a compact between the citizens of a State in the formation of their own constitution. It cannot be altered except by those who formed it or in the mode prescribed by the parties to the compact itself.

This Constitution was adopted for the purpose of remedying all defects of the Confederation, and in this it has succeeded beyond any calculation that could have been formed of any human institution. By binding the States together the Constitution performs the great office of the Confederation; but it is in that sense only that it has any of the properties of that compact, and in that it is more effectual to the purpose, as it holds them together by a much stronger bond; and in all other respects in which the Confederation failed the Constitution has been blessed with complete success. The Confederation was a compact between separate and independent States, the execution of whose articles in the powers which operated internally depended on the State governments. But the great office of the Constitution, by incorporating the people of the several States to the extent of its powers into one community and enabling it to act directly on the people, was to annul the powers of the State governments to that extent, except in cases where they were concurrent, and to preclude their agency in giving effect to those of the General Government. The Government of the United States relies on its own means for the execution of its powers, as the State governments do for the execution of theirs, both governments having a common origin or sovereign, the people—the State governments the people of each State, the National Government the people of every State—and being amenable to the power which created it. It is by executing its functions as a Government thus originating and thus acting that the Constitution of the United States holds the States together and performs the office of a league. It is owing to the nature of its

powers and the high source from whence they are derived—the people—that it performs that office better than the Confederation or any league which ever existed, being a compact which the State governments did not form, to which they are not parties, and which executes its own powers independently of them.

There were two separate and independent governments established over our Union, one for local purposes over each State by the people of the State, the other for national purposes over all the States by the people of the United States. The whole power of the people, on the representative principle, is divided between them. The State governments are independent of each other, and to the extent of their powers are complete sovereignties. The National Government begins where the State governments terminate, except in some instances where there is a concurrent jurisdiction between them. This Government is also, according to the extent of its powers, a complete sovereignty. I speak here, as repeatedly mentioned before, altogether of representative sovereignties, for the real sovereignty is in the people alone.

The history of the world affords no such example of two separate and independent governments established over the same people, nor can it exist except in governments founded on the sovereignty of the people. In monarchies and other governments not representative there can be no such division of power. The government is inherent in the possessor; it is his, and cannot be taken from him without a revolution. In such governments alliances and leagues alone are practicable. But with us individuals count for nothing in the offices which they hold; that is, they have no right to them. They hold them as representatives, by appointment from the people, in whom the sovereignty is exclusively vested. It is impossible to speak too highly of this system taken in its twofold character and in all its great principles of two governments, completely distinct from and independent of each other, each constitutional, founded by and acting directly on the people, each competent to all its purposes, administering all the blessings for which it was instituted, without even the most remote danger of exercising any of its powers in a way to oppress the people. A system capable of expansion over a vast territory not only without weakening either government, but enjoying the peculiar advantage of adding thereby new strength and vigor to the faculties of both; possessing also this additional advantage, that while the several States enjoy all the rights reserved to them of separate and independent governments, and each is secured by the nature of the Federal Government, which acts directly on the people, against the failure of the others to bear their equal share of the public burdens, and thereby enjoys in a more perfect degree all the advantages of a league, it holds them together by a bond altogether different and much stronger than the late confederation or any league that was ever known before—a bond beyond their control, and which cannot even be amended except in the mode prescribed by it. So great an effort in favor of human happiness was never made before; but it became those who made it. Established in the new hemisphere, descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, having the same religion and universal toleration, born equal and educated in the same principles of free government, made independent by a common struggle and menaced by the same dangers, ties existed between them which never applied before to separate communities. They had every motive to bind them together which could operate on the interests and affections of a generous, enlightened, and virtuous people, and it affords inexpressible consolation to find that these motives had their merited influence.

In thus tracing our institutions to their origin and pursuing them in their progress and modifications down to the adoption of this Constitution two important facts have been disclosed, on which it may not be improper in this stage to make a few observations. The first is that in wresting the power, or what is called the sovereignty, from the Crown it passed directly to the people. The second, that it passed directly to the people of each Colony and not to the people of all the Colonies in the aggregate; to 13 distinct communities and not to one. To these two facts, each contributing its equal proportion, I am inclined to think that we are in an eminent degree indebted for the success of our Revolution. By passing to the people it vested in a community every individual of which had equal rights and a common interest. There was no family dethroned among us, no banished pretender in a foreign country looking back to his connections and adherents here in the hope of a recall; no order of nobility whose hereditary rights in the Government had been violated; no hierarchy which had been degraded and oppressed. There was but one order, that of the people, by whom everything was gained by the change. I mention it also as a circumstance of peculiar felicity that the great body of the people had been born and educated under these equal and original institutions. Their habits, their principles, and their prejudices were therefore all on the side of the Revolution and of free republican government.

Had distinct orders existed, our fortune might and probably would have been different. It would scarcely have been possible to have united so completely the whole force of the country against a common enemy. A contest would probably have arisen in the outset between the orders for the control. Had the aristocracy prevailed, the people would have been heartless. Had the people prevailed, the nobility would probably have left the country, or, remaining behind, internal divisions would have taken place in every State and a civil war broken out more destructive even than the foreign, which might have defeated the whole movement. Ancient and modern history is replete with examples proceeding from conflicts between distinct orders, of revolutions attempted which proved abortive, of republics which have terminated in despotism. It is owing to the simplicity of the elements of which our system is composed that the attraction of all the parts has been to a common center, that every change has tended to cement the union, and, in short, that we have been blessed with such glorious and happy success.

And that the power wrested from the British Crown passed to the people of each colony the whole history of our political movement from the emigration of our ancestors to the present day clearly demonstrates. What produced the Revolution? The violation of our rights. What rights? Our chartered rights. To whom were the charters granted, to the people of each colony or to the people of all the colonies as a single community? We know that no such community as the aggregate existed, and of course that no such rights could be violated. It may be added that the nature of the powers which were given to the delegates by each colony and the manner in which they were executed show that the sovereignty was in the people of each and not in the aggregate. They respectively presented credentials such as are usual between ministers of separate powers, which were examined and approved before they entered on the discharge of the important duties committed to them. They voted also by colonies and not individually, all the members from one colony being entitled to one vote only. This fact alone, the first of our political association and at the period of our greatest peril, fixes beyond all controversy the source from whence the power which has directed and secured success to all our measures has proceeded.

Had the sovereignty passed to the aggregate, consequences might have ensued, admitting the success of our Revolution, which might even yet seriously affect our system. By passing to the people of each colony the opposition to Great Britain, the prosecution of the war, the Declaration of Independence, the adoption of the Confederation and of this Constitution are all imputable to them. Had it passed to the aggregate, every measure would be traced to that source; even the State governments might be said to have emanated from it, and amendments of their constitutions on that principle be proposed by the same authority. In short it is not easy to perceive all the consequences into which such a doctrine might lead. It is obvious that the people in mass would have had much less agency in all the great measures of the Revolution and in those which followed than they actually had, and proportionably less credit for their patriotism and services than they are now entitled to and enjoy. By passing to the people of each colony the whole body in each were kept in constant and active deliberation on subjects of the highest national importance and in the supervision of the conduct of all the public servants in the discharge of their respective duties. Thus the most effectual guards were provided against abuses and dangers of every kind which human ingenuity could devise, and the whole people rendered more competent to the self-government which by an heroic exertion they had acquired.

OPINION OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN RE FEDERAL TRIAL EXAMINERS CONFERENCE ET AL. v. ROBERT RAMSPECK ET AL.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I hold in my hand the opinion of Chief Judge Bolitha J. Laws of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, in the case of Federal Trial Examiners Conference and Others against Robert Ramspeck and Others.

This was an action brought by the trial examiners against the Civil Service Commission for the purpose of getting a judicial determination with respect to the Commission's administration of section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

This is a matter in which, as Senators may remember, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary has been much interested. His correspondence with Mr. Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, with regard to this matter has been printed as a Senate document—Senate Document No. 82—and I think most of my colleagues are familiar with it.

I do not want to go into detail with regard to Judge Laws' opinion; but I do want to say that I think it an extremely able opinion, and I hope that Senators who are interested in administrative procedure, and particularly in the status of trial examiners, may find time to read this opinion.

It is interesting to note that the opinion quotes, at some points, the views of the senior Senator from Nevada; and that the court's decision supports fully the position he has taken in the past.

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of this opinion may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TRIAL EXAMINERS CONFERENCE ET AL., PLAINTIFFS V. ROBERT RAMSPECK ET AL., DEFENDANTS—CIVIL ACTION NO. 5171–51—MARCH 4, 1952

Charles S. Rhyne, Eugene J. Bradley, Eugene F. Mullin, Jr., Attorneys for Plaintiffs.

Charles M. Irelan, United States Attorney; Ross O'Donoghue, Assistant United States Attorney; William R. Glendon, Assistant United States Attorney; John J. McCarthy, Attorney, Civil Service Commission, Attorneys for Defendants.

Richard S. Doyle, Attorney for Bar Association of the District of Columbia, amicus curiae.

MEMORANDUM OPINION OF JUSTICE BOLITHA J. LAWS ON MOTIONS OF PLAINTIFF AND DEFENDANT FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

This is an action against the Civil Service Commission and others brought by a group of hearing examiners appointed pursuant to section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act. Plaintiffs seek to have declared invalid certain regulations pertaining to their appointment, promotion, tenure, and compensation. The case has been submitted on motions for summary judgment filed by both plaintiffs and defendants.

Section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act, referred to in this opinion as the act, provides in pertinent substance as follows:

(a) Subject to the civil service and other laws to the extent not inconsistent with the act, each agency shall appoint as many qualified and competent hearing examiners as may be necessary for proceedings under the act.

(b) Cases shall be assigned to hearing examiners in rotation, so far as practicable.

(c) Examiners are removable by their employing agency only for good cause determined by the Civil Service Commission.

(d) The Civil Service Commission shall prescribe compensation for examiners independently of agency recommendations or ratings, and in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, except the provisions thereof pertaining to performance ratings.

(e) Agencies temporarily insufficiently staffed may use examiners selected by the Civil Service Commission from other agencies.

(f) The Civil Service Commission is authorized to promulgate rules to implement this section of the act.

The Civil Service regulations under attack were promulgated pursuant to the rule-making authority granted the Commission by section 11 of the act. They provide in substance as follows:

(a) When a vacancy occurs in a hearing examiner position, the agency in which the vacancy exists may choose the means by which it is filled, by promotion of one of the agency's hearing examiners, or by appointment, promotion, transfer, or reassignment of a non-hearing examiner. If the agency elects to fill the vacancy by promoting a hearing examiner, the Civil Service Commission selects the man to be promoted on the basis of competition among all the agency's hearing examiners whom the Commission has determined to be eligible for promotion. To be eligible for promotion an examiner must have performed for at least 1 year work of a level of difficulty of the grade next below that which is to be filled by promotion. If the agency elects to fill the vacancy with a non-hearing examiner, it submits to the Civil Service Commission the name of the person with whom it desires to fill the position, and if the Commission finds such person qualified, it approves the agency's choice. Vacancies, as the term is used in these regulations, may come about when the Commission reclassifies a position upward or downward. Civil Service Regulations, section 34.4.

(b) All hearing examiners are classified into civil-service salary grades GS–11 through GS–15. Insofar as practicable, examiners are to be assigned in rotation to cases of the level of difficulty and importance that are normally assigned to positions of the salary grades they hold. The Civil Service Commission has published a manual of criteria to aid the agencies in determining which cases are of a level of difficulty and importance appropriate to each of the above five grades. Civil Service Regulations, section 34.10, 34.12; Class Specifications, Hearing Examiner Series, P–935–0.

(c) Agencies are authorized to separate hearing examiners by way of reduction in force in much the same manner as other employees, except that agency performance ratings are not to be considered in determining a hearing examiner's retention preference (Civil Service Regulations, sec. 34.15).

(d) In emergency situations where the needs of the service require it, agencies may make conditional appointments of hearing examiners pending final decision on their eligibility for absolute appointment (Civil Service Regulations, sec. 34.3 (c)).

Plaintiffs' basic contention is that the regulations are in conflict with their parent statute because they destroy the independent status given hearing examiners by section 11 of the act. Defendants urge, first, that plaintiffs have not presented a case or controversy of which the court can take jurisdiction, because section 11 of the act confers no private rights on hearing examiners and because it is not claimed that any agency has in fact jeopardized their independence of judgment or has made imminent threats to do so. On the merits, defendants argue that the challenged regulations are not contrary to their parent statute.

There can be no doubt that one of the major purposes of the act was to make hearing examiners independent of pressure from agencies whose cases they pass upon. Lack of such independence was one of the main problems to which the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure addressed itself in its final report of 1941. In an opinion holding that agencies have no authority under section 11 of the act to select hearing examiners for promotion, the Acting Attorney General said the following: "One of the principal purposes of the Administrative Procedure Act was to render examining officers in administrative agencies separate, and genuinely independent of pressure, from the prosecuting officers or others in their agencies who might, directly or indirectly, influence their determinations." (Citing S. Rept. 572, 79th Cong. 1st sess., p. 29; H. Rept. 1980, 79th Cong. 2d sess., p. 46; *Wong Yang Sung* v. *McGrath* (339 U. S. 33, 41–45); S. Doc. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess., p. 56.) In a letter from Senator PAT MCCARRAN, to the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, discussing many of the matters which subsequently became the subject of this litigation, the distinguished author of the act said the following concerning the status of hearing examiners: "It was intended that they be very nearly the equivalent of judges even though operating within the system of Federal administrative justice" (S. Doc. 82, 82d Cong., 1st sess., p. 9).

Bearing in mind the distinctively independent status which section 11 of the act was intended to confer on hearing examiners, the first question is the standing in court, if any, of such examiners in their personal capacity to object to action by the Civil Service Commission which allegedly impairs that status. The Court is of opinion that the examiners have such standing. While it may be conceded that the dominant purpose of the act was to guarantee even-handed administrative justice and not to confer benefits upon hearing examiners, it appears that Congress, as a means of attaining this dominant purpose, clothed examiners with the distinctive professional status mentioned above. Such status would not only assure impartiality at the hands of incumbent examiners, but would serve as strong inducement for persons of character and ability to become examiners, and the right to be assured this professional status is not to be disregarded because it is subordinate to another purpose. The Court, therefore, is of opinion that the hearing examiners became vested with a property interest in maintaining a distinctive professional status and have standing to seek legal redress against steps which will relegate them to an inferior status.

The next question to be decided is whether the alleged threats to that status are merely conjectural, speculative, or remote, as is said by defendants, or whether, as urged by plaintiffs, a genuine controversy over their rights presently exists. In support of their claim that the alleged injury to plaintiffs is conjectural and hypothetical, and consequently that no justiciable controversy exists, defendants rely principally on *Ashwander* v. *Tennessee Valley Authority* (297 U. S. 288); *Eccles* v. *Peoples Bank* (333 U. S. 426) and *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell* (330 U. S. 75). Although those cases clearly support the proposition for which defendants cite them, the Court believes the proposition to be inapplicable to the case at bar. In the Ashwander case, it was held that a justiciable controversy could not be founded on announcements of programs, plans, and policies. This is conceded. In the case at bar an affirmative step has been taken beyond that stage. Announcements of programs and policies have matured into official regulations which defendants assert are presently in effect. In the Eccles case, defendant in open court expressly disclaimed any present intention to take the action complained of, whereas in the case at bar the action complained of has occurred and is continuing daily. Plaintiffs challenge the Civil Service Commission's authority to classify them into grades GS–11 through GS–15 and to direct that cases be assigned to them according to an advance estimate of the difficulty and importance of the case as compared with the examiner's grade. Defendant Civil Service Commission has not disavowed any present intent so to classify hearing examiners nor to direct that cases be so assigned to them. On the contrary, plaintiffs are presently in those classifications and there is nothing to indicate that cases are not presently being assigned to them in the manner to which they object. In *United Public Workers* v. *Mitchell, supra*, the action which plaintiffs sought to prevent defendants from taking was conditioned upon plaintiffs' first taking action which they had not taken at the time suit was brought. As indicated above, the action complained of in the case at bar is not contingent on future events, but is an accomplished fact. Where regulations have been adopted and are about to be put into effect, one whose rights may be adversely affected may proceed to protect himself before suffering actual damage. The Court is of opinion that a present justiciable controversy exists in favor of plaintiffs.

The legislative plan of section 11 of the act contemplates no distinctions between hearing examiners in any given agency based on the difficulty and importance of the work they perform. Counsel for defendants claims that such classification of hearing examiners is necessitated by the Classification Act of 1949, which section 11 makes applicable to hearing examiners' compensation, and that this requirement of the Classification Act is recognized by the provision of section 11 directing rotation of cases insofar as practicable. The Court is of opinion, however, that the Classification Act simply fixed

the formula for determining examiners' compensation if the work assigned to examiners of a particular agency varies in difficulty and importance from that assigned to examiners in another agency. Bearing in mind the purposes of the act, the Court is of opinion that the provision requiring rotation "insofar as practicable" relates to exigencies arising in the administration of business, such as illness of examiners, disqualification, unavailability by reason of unforeseen length of hearings, or for other reasons. Senator McCARRAN in discussing the rotation provision of section 11, said: "it required assignment by rotation, not by classification." (Letter to Chairman Ramspeck, S. Doc. No. 82, 82d Cong., 1st sess. (p. 9)). It follows the Commission is without authority to classify hearing examiners within any given agency into grades GS–11 through GS–15, and lacking such authority, it is without authority to promulgate regulations governing promotions within an agency from one such grade to another. It also follows that the Commission lacks authority to require rotation of cases within an agency only among examiners of the same grade in accordance with a prior estimate of the difficulty and importance of each case.

The regulations provide for assignment of cases to examiners on the basis of an advance estimate of whether the case to be assigned is "moderately difficult and important," "difficult and important," "unusually difficult and important," "exceedingly difficult and important," or "exceptionally difficult and important." "Moderately difficult and important" cases are said to be characterized largely by following elements:

(a) No controverted facts or relatively simple contested facts.

(b) No objections to proposals made, authority sought or actions proposed (except in contested proceedings).

(c) Moderately complex legal, economic, financial, or technical questions or matters.

(d) Simple contentions or issues.

(e) Small records.

(f) Narrow effect of decisions.

"Difficult and important" cases are said to be characterized largely by the following elements:

(a) Few controverted or complicated facts.

(b) No or few protestations against proposals made, authority sought, existing rates, practices, or violations.

(c) Fairly complex legal, economic, financial, or technical questions or matters.

(d) Normal contentions or issues.

(e) Relatively small records.

(f) Narrow effect of decisions.

"Unusually difficult and important" cases are said to contain three or more of the following elements:

(a) Many complicated or controverted facts.

(b) Strong protestations against proposals made, authority sought, existing rates, practices, or violations.

(c) Complex legal, technical, economic, or financial questions or matters.

(d) Normal contentions or issues.

(e) Large records.

(f) Fairly wide effect of decisions.

The characteristics of "exceedingly difficult and important" cases are said to be three or more of the following:

(a) Numerous complicated or controverted facts.

(b) Vigorous protestations against proposals made, authority sought, existing rates, practices, or violations.

(c) Extremely complex legal, economic, financial, or technical questions or matters.

(d) Novel contentions or issues.

(e) Extremely large records.

(f) Wide effect of decisions.

Three or more of the following elements are said to characterize "exceptionally difficult and important" cases:

(a) Many highly complicated or controverted facts.

(b) Many vigorous protestations against proposals made, authority sought, existing rules or practices, or violations.

(c) Exceptionally complex legal, economic, financial or technical questions or matters.

(d) Many novel contentions or issues.

(e) Voluminous records.

(f) Very broad effect of decisions.

These general criteria are supplemented with brief summaries of actual cases which are deemed by the Commission to illustrate the difficulty and importance of the class of cases involved.

The vagueness and lack of objectivity in these criteria is apparent from a reading of them. What rational distinction can be drawn between "extremely" complex legal questions and "exceptionally" complex legal questions? How can one measure the vehemence of protestations so as to distinguish "strong" protestations from "vigorous" protestations, especially in advance of the hearing at which the protestations are to be urged? The regulations leave these and many similar questions unanswered. A practical illustration of the uncertainty of these criteria is found in an affidavit of plaintiff Curtis C. Henderson in which he deposes that an audit by the Civil Service Commission of work being performed by examiners in his agency disclosed that four GS–11 examiners were doing work of a level of difficulty and importance equal to GS–13 examiners, and that a GS–12 examiner was doing work of a level of difficulty and importance equal to GS–14 examiners. Although portions of this affidavit are controverted by defendants, the above assertions are not controverted and in at least one instance are corroborated by the affidavit of Paul Pfeiffer, filed on behalf of defendants.

Another grave flaw in the regulations is their failure to specify who shall apply these criteria in assigning cases. There can be no question that if the regulations make possible the participation of a litigating agency in selecting or avoiding any trial examiner, they offend the act. It is equally without question that the nebulous and subjective character of the criteria makes it possible for the one who assigns cases to select and avoid particular examiners in making assignments, and that the failure to specify who shall apply the criteria makes possible the participation of litigating agencies in such selection and avoidance.

Defendants have argued that the practice in most of the large agencies is to have the assignments made by chief trial examiners independently of the litigating agency. Plaintiffs dispute this assertion and have filed affidavits specifying agencies which have exercised and now exercise a part in making assignments. But whatever the true facts may be, defendants do not meet the objection by asserting that most agencies do not offend. The regulations themselves must be clear and definite in putting the power of assignment beyond the control or suggestion of litigating agencies.

The court does not now pass upon the validity of assigning administrative work to chief examiners. It is sufficient for the purpose of this case to note that neither the act nor the regulations makes provision for a chief examiner who is granted discretion as to assignment of business of agencies.

As to the provisions of the regulations authorizing separation of hearing examiners by reductions in force, the court is of opinion that these, too, are contrary to section 11 of the act. The importance of security of tenure to independence of judgment needs no argument, and was clearly recognized by the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure in their final report of 1941, which recommended fixed terms of 7 years for examiners. (Final report of Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, pp. 46–47). The court finds it significant that reduction in force provisions in earlier drafts of legislation governing administrative procedure were omitted from the Administrative Procedure Act as passed, which provides in section 11 that examiners shall be removed only for good cause established after hearing and upon the record thereof. See H. R. 184, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, section 302 (5) (c); H. R. 1206, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, section 308 (c) (3) (a). Both sides appear to agree that this provision of the act does not comprehend separation by way of reduction in force. But counsel for defendants argues that the status given hearing examiners by section 11 of the act is made subject to the other laws governing Federal employment to the extent not inconsistent therewith, and that reduction in force procedures are thereby made applicable to hearing examiners. Counsel for defendants has also urged the absurdity of having to retain hearing examiners on the payroll with no work for them to do. In view of the provisions of section 11 which authorizes interagency borrowing of hearing examiners, however, the court cannot say that Congress did not contemplate such possibility and undertake to meet it accordingly.

The remaining provision of the regulations under attack is that which relates to conditional appointments. Plaintiffs claim that the provision enables agencies to hold a club over the heads of new examiners by keeping them in a conditional status if their decisions are unsatisfactory. The court is not impressed by this argument, since it appears that such conditional status is intended chiefly to meet emergency situations where the services of extra hearing examiners are immediately needed, and that an examiner's transfer from conditional to unconditional status is determined upon independent inquiry by the Civil Service Commission. The court also notes that the final report of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, which contains abundant evidence of that body's awareness of the dangers of agency influence, recommended conditional appointments of hearing examiners in certain situations. Final report of Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, page 48.

Plaintiff's motion for summary judgment will be granted as to section 34.4, 34.10, 34.12, and 34.15 of the regulations, and denied as to section 34.3 (c), concerning conditional appointments. Defendant's motion for summary judgment will be denied except as to section 34.3 (c) of the regulations.

BOLITHA J. LAWS,
Chief Judge.

MATERIAL FOR CIVILIAN INDUSTRY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on a number of occasions recently I have spoken on the question of materials for civilian industry. I am reliably informed that authorities of the Federal Government now believe more aluminum and more copper may be used for civilian production, and I understand that within a short time there will be an announcement that instead of a production quota of 930,000 automobiles in the next, or second, quarter, with a limitation of 800,000, so far as copper is concerned, the figure will be changed to 1,000,000 automobiles and 250,000 trucks, with the right of the industry to make another 50,000 automobiles, which would make a total of 1,050,000. While that, of course, will not result in adding to the great number of people who are unemployed in the automobile industry, yet it will hardly hold employment where it is today.

The unemployed at present number 100,000, and it is not disputed that for

every 100,000 cars taken from the normal quota, half that many people would be unemployed. So taking a figure of 1,050,000, there are sufficient stocks of material to make an extra 50,000 cars, it would seem that another 25,000 people would be employed.

The facts seem to indicate that it would take only the 4 percent of the aluminum which it has been discovered can be used in civilian industry to enable the manufacturers to produce 1,100,000 cars and 275,000 trucks in the next quarter.

Nine percent of the amount of copper which it has been discovered can be used in private industry, if it were used, would make possible the manufacture of the full 1,100,000 automobiles and 275,000 trucks.

To those who are familiar with the facts and know what is going on, there appears to be some prejudice and some discrimination against the automobile industry. It has been too long felt that the automobile industry is in the same class with the manufacture of toys and similar nonessential items. As a matter of fact, automobiles are an essential item of transportation in any preparedness program which America may undertake.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

MANUFACTURE OF WHITE SIDEWALL TIRES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in connection with an article published by the International News Service in Washington on February 29, 1952, entitled "Substitute Whitewall Tires Banned by United States."

Last Thursday I said many Government officials seemed to believe in controls for the sake of controls and not for the sake of the defense effort. I pointed out that the National Production Authority had banned the manufacture of white sidewall tires about a year ago in order to conserve natural rubber. I demanded that, inasmuch as ample natural rubber is now available, the ban on white sidewall tires be lifted immediately. I pointed out also that white sidewall tires are being produced in Canada and other countries, and are being sold at black-market prices in the United States.

It may seem strange that the American people are willing to pay an exorbitant price or a black-market price for white sidewall tires. But, after all, we live in a republic, where we believe that the right of choice is fundamental, vital, and important to all of us, and if it is taken away, even in such a matter as white sidewall tires, the result will be to add impetus to a species of a creeping paralysis which would finally deny to the American people the right to choose or select what they want. The situation would be different if the ban on white sidewall tires affected a material which interfered with war production or defense production.

My assertion that the National Production Authority is interested in controls for the sake of controls is borne out by the following news item which appeared in the Detroit Times of February 29, 1952. I wish to read it to the Senate:

SUBSTITUTE WHITEWALL TIRES BANNED BY UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, February 29.—The Government today ordered rubber manufacturers to stop producing a substitute white sidewall automobile tire.

D. D. Kelly, National Production Authority Rubber Director, said firms are violating the law when they slap strips of white repair gum or other materials on otherwise black sidewall tires. Kelly declared these tires have been advertised and sold as all-rubber white sidewall tires.

Mr. President, although I have just learned that yesterday there was issued an order allowing tires to be painted white; nevertheless, so that there can be no confusion as to the practice which the National Production Authority Rubber Director has banned, I desire to tell the Senate exactly what is involved in such a restriction. Some manufacturers have devised ways of painting the walls of black tires white, or of permanently attaching other white material to the black sidewall tires so that they look white, and then are apparently acceptable to purchasers as white sidewall tires. None of the materials concerned are critical or are needed for defense. Before the new order was issued yesterday, this was an out-and-out case of the NPA Rubber Director arbitrarily—and I used the word "arbitrarily" advisedly—saying, "You can't produce white tires, no matter how you make them white. All tires must be black because the Government says so."

I repeat what I have said before, namely, that the function of the defense authorities is to promote defense, not to control the taste and preference of the American people, or their right to select what they want. If the materials involved are not needed for defense, then the National Production Authority has no business telling rubber manufacturers not to make white sidewall tires. If there is any question of misleading advertising in the sale to the public of such tires as all-rubber white sidewall tires, then that is a problem for the Federal Trade Commission and not the National Production Authority. I have heard no complaint from the Federal Trade Commission.

I am glad the new order was issued yesterday because the ban on white sidewall tires had become completely ridiculous in view of the abundance of natural rubber. Its retention could be justified only as a psychological measure to create an atmosphere of austerity in this country. There is no place for such a program in our defense effort, which is designed to preserve the freedom of the individual.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 7, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 6 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg, 4A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for reappointment as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with rank of general, for the period ending June 30, 1953, under the provisions of section 202 of the Air Force Organization Act of 1951.

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be general

Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining, 10A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Strategic Air Command, with rank of general.

Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, 26A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with rank of general.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 6, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose blessings cannot be numbered and whose treasury of goodness is inexhaustible, we thank Thee for the assurance that there are many reserves and resources of divine wisdom and strength at our command which we have not yet drawn upon.

Grant that daily we may have the unmistakable and joyous testimony of our conscience that, in seeking to solve our problems and meet our responsibilities, we are eagerly availing ourselves of every revelation of Thy holy will which Thou hast placed at our disposal.

May it be the goal of all our aspirations to do that which is well pleasing unto Thee for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On March 5, 1952:

H. R. 800. An act for the relief of Cindy Eberhardt;

H. R. 1962. An act for the relief of Wanda R. Barnett;

H. R. 2205. An act for the relief of Mary Alice Floyd;

H. R. 2398. An act to amend Public Law 848, Eighty-first Congress, second session;

H. R. 2669. An act for the relief of Maria Sarandrea;

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 3985. An act for the relief of Hai Soon Lee; and

H. R. 4703. An act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

On March 6, 1952:

H. R. 3660. An act to amend the act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 5097. An act to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, how much is a billion dollars? We, here in the House of Representatives, have today received the request of the President of the United States for foreign aid in the amount of about $8,000,000,000.

Such fantastic sums of money are glibly spoken about today and yet few people realize the tremendous size of a billion dollars, which is a thousand million dollars.

If it would have been possible for a person to have begun spending $1,000 per day at the beginning of the Christian era in the year 1 and to have spent a thousand dollars each and every day up to and including this date, this total would be only a little more than $700,000,000.

This morning I received a card from the Ace Janitor Supply Co., in Dayton, Ohio, and they have approached this matter a little differently. They learned from the Bureau of Printing Information in the Department of the Treasury that a new $1 bill is .0043 of an inch thick. By simple arithmetic it is easily apparent that 1,000,000,000 dollar bills stacked on top of each other would make a stack 67.86 miles high. This is 243 times as high as the Empire State Building, the tallest building in the world. It is also 645 times as high as the Washington Monument.

Thus you can see that the amount requested by the President for foreign aid is equal to a stack of new $1 bills more than 542 miles high, which is farther than the distance by air from Washington to my home in Dayton, Ohio.

RENOVATION OF THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in the House this morning, as a member of the Commission on the Renovation of the Executive Mansion, to invite, in the name of the Commission, Members of the House and Senate and their wives to make an official inspection of the work the Commission has done in the renovation of the Executive Mansion.

The date for this vist to the White House will be Sunday, March 23, between the hours of 3 and 5 in the afternoon.

Admission to the White House will be by card only. I hope everybody will note this fact, and I hope those who read this in the RECORD will avoid embarrassment because admittance will be allowed only after identification by proper security officers. So do not be embarrassed at the door by inviting guests who cannot be admitted no matter how close they may be to you. The invitation is extended to Members of the Congress and their wives.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to my colleague on the Commission.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to concur in the statement made by my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan. We have given a great deal of study to this, and we hope the Members will not attempt t bring others than those designated by my colleague, and I might say to the lady Members that they are entitled to bring their husbands.

Mr. RABAUT. That is right, we certainly do include the husbands of the lady Members. .

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. Yes.

Mr. MORTON. Do we have to go?

Mr. RABAUT. No, there is no necessity. No one has to go, but most of America, and I think the House itself and the other body, are very much interested in the first residence of the land, which is the home of the President.

MINE SAFETY

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Education and Labor is presently considering a bill to establish Federal supervision over mine safety in the United States. As a Representative from a district in Ohio which has 75 percent of all the coal mined in Ohio produced in that district, I would like to say that I am heartily in favor of Federal mine inspection, and by that I mean Federal mine inspection with teeth to enforce the findings of the inspectors. In recent years, there have been three major disasters in my district which led directly to the strengthening of the Ohio Mine Safety Code. I think I may be pardoned if I say with some pride that I was a member of the Ohio Senate when the Ohio mine-safety law was passed. This was in 1941, however, and with the rapid advancements in the field of mechanical mining, much of the Ohio law needs revision and strengthening.

It has been testified before the Congress by both representatives of the United Mine Workers of America and members of the Ohio Operators Association that the disasters in Ohio could have been prevented if there had been an adequate mine-safety law at that time, and if it had been adequately enforced. I believe that both the operators and the union representatives agree that if the mines in my district had been properly and adequately safeguarded and thoroughly rock-dusted, none of the tragic explosions which took the lives of nearly 200 coal miners would have occurred.

While Ohio has a safety law which approximates that that we would like to have federally, I cannot be derelict in my duty and rest on the Ohio law. As I said before, it needs improvement and strengthening, and I certainly am concerned about the needless slaughter of human beings that is going on in other States of the Union, whose legislatures have not seen fit or have failed to write nearly as adequate safety legislation.

May I say right here, Mr. Speaker, that those people who oppose a Federal law can avoid Federal inspection if they enact necessary legislation or write a stronger law and enforce it, because no Federal inspector will interfere in any mine where adequate safety provisions are already in effect.

I think it is a tribute to the people of Ohio that both the United Mine Workers' representatives and the operators' representatives agree that there should be a Federal law. I realize that they disagree about some of the basic provisions of such a law, but they do agree that there should be Federal supervision to stop this needless slaughter of coal miners.

I want to go on record as definitely favoring a Federal inspection law and to announce to the people of my district and of the United States that I am going to work, as I have been working, vigorously and as hard as I know how, to see that this Congress comes forth with a Federal inspection law.

It is not sufficient, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress write a law permitting Federal inspection, such as we have on the books now, and then not give any power to anyone to enforce it. After all, what good is the power of suggestion if the people who should make the necessary changes fail to heed the suggestion? What we must have, Mr. Speaker, are adequate police powers for these Federal inspectors either to enforce their decisions for safety or to close the mines, if those people operating them refuse to make them safe for the men to work in.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the third supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my understanding is that this bill will not be brought up before Tuesday.

Mr. CANNON. It will be brought up on Wednesday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the understanding that the vote on the supplemental appropriation bill will come on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am going to announce the program a little later on, but in connection with the colloquy which is now going on, I wish to announce that this bill will come up on Wednesday. I previously indicated that it would be brought up on Tuesday, which, of course, was not binding, but an indication as to when it might be brought up. I do now definitely program this bill for Wednesday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There has been some discussion about the appropriation bills being reported on Friday, and then brought to the floor for vote on Monday when Members were away. Members should have an opportunity to study each appropriation bill. I am very happy that the majority leader is announcing that this supplemental bill will not come up until Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order against the bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Friday to file sundry reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

KOREA

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a speech by Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, on February 21 Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, speaking before the far eastern department of the Reserve Officers Association in Tokyo, delivered an address which should be read and studied by every American. In this address General Ridgway pointed out clearly the part that Korea is playing in world affairs and tells in language which no one can misunderstand just why we are in Korea when he bluntly says, "The question discredits him who asks it." Pointing out also that the former concept of a Reserve Corps was predicated on the sudden transition from all-out peace to all-out war, the General succinctly says, "Korea outmoded that concept."

Mr. Speaker, because I consider the remarks by General Ridgway so vital, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the entire speech:

My remarks, ladies and gentlemen, deal with two topics: The Reserve components, with emphasis on the Reserve rather than the National Guard component, because of the nature of this meeting, and, second, pertinent points relating to United States objectives in this region.

Under daily pressures to find solutions to many of our most perplexing problems, we tend, I think, to overlook the rich recordings of what our predecessors thought and did in their efforts to solve problems which differed from those confronting us only in contemporary circumstances and scope. As a military man I am particularly interested in such of those problems as relate to the military policy of the United States. Problems in this category are basic. Our military policy derives from basic United States policy, and that in turn derives from our basic law, the Constitution, and our national characteristics. Both have implicitly and explicitly throughout our history insisted upon complete subordination of the military to the civil power in the political structure of our Republic.

Now, you cannot deal intelligently with problems of United States military policy without coming at once to grips with United States military organization. Determination of military policy made by our civil authorities permits a statement of the mission of the United States Military Establishment. From that mission we can draft a statement of the functions, or tasks, or jobs, which the Military Establishment must be capable of performing. Then, having understood what these functions or tasks are, we can determine the organization, composition, and strength of the various components required for a military establishment which can reasonably be expected to discharge the responsibilities which the civil Government will look to it to meet.

Our policy has always been to maintain relatively small permanent forces on a full-time career basis. Consequently, our officer corps of professionals has been small, and our several corps of Reserves proportionately large. In World War II, if my memory is accurate, approximately 97 percent of the officer corps of our Army, which then, of course, included the Air Force, was Reserves. Today in the Far East Command the percentages of Reserves in the officer corps are 88 for the Army including the National Guard, 85 for the Air Force, and 52 for the Navy shore establishment. I do not have the figures on Navy personnel afloat. In the event of a national emergency, these percentages will obviously all rise.

It is unnecessary, therefore, to emphasize to you gentlemen the importance of these Reserve groups to the Nation. But it is very necessary to do so to many of our fellow citizens—and you, yourselves, are the best ones to perform that service.

I feel there is an urgent and continuing need for American citizens to appreciate fully the vital role played in times of crisis by our Reserve components, for in any military establishment concepts of honor, standards of conduct, and hence performance in battle will be determined by the concepts, the standards, and the performance of its officer corps.

There is likewise an urgent and continuing need for the members of the several Officer Reserve Corps themselves to recognize that individual contribution to collective national defense is not a mere matter either of something due the Nation, or of a privilege due the individual. There is an urgent and continuing need for balancing all these individual obligations to the Nation with the Nation's responsibility toward the Reserve components and their individual members.

We have lately made great progress, I think, in recognizing a necessity for this balance and to a measurable degree in attaining it. Our former concept of the obligation of our Reserves was predicated upon a sudden or at least a prompt transition from all-out peace to all-out war. Korea outmoded that concept. Now we are engaged in solving the many major problems which the urgent need for readjusting this balance demands in a different world situation.

Here, too, your understanding, patient cooperation is needed, very greatly needed; first, to appreciate the true nature of the conflicting interests which must be brought into balance, and second, to bring to bear in such manner as your conscience dictates your very great influence as members of the Reserves.

Now let me pass to the second of my two topics for this evening.

We could not meet tonight without noting the profound significance to us, and I think to the world, of the birth 220 years ago tomorrow of George Washington. Recently the eminent historian, Douglas Southall Freeman, has brought forth two more volumes of the life of this great man. They carry an historically accurate objective analysis of his character and the manner in which he discharged his great responsibilities through the winter which included Valley Forge.

These volumes provide absorbing reading. As the full stature of Washington is revealed, they bring to you a realization of the almost incredible fortitude, courage, and loyal subordination to civil authority revealed by his every act.

I want to read you brief quotations from personal letters written within the Valley Forge Camp during December of 1777 and early 1778.

Freeman writes: "Early on the morning of the 22d (December 1777), Washington was aroused by news that a British force of some size had left Philadelphia and was moving toward Darby on what appeared to by a foraging expedition. When he ordered the Army made ready to march against this column, he received a report the like of which never had come to him in the two and a half years of his command: the troops could not stir from their camps. Even if a sufficient number of men could be found with clothing and shoes fit for outdoor use in December weather, they could not be provisioned for even brief field operations. The sole commissary officer in camp reported that he had no animals for slaughter, could count only 25 barrels of flour, and did not know when to expect more. Washington was compelled to send this alarming dispatch to Congress: '* * * unless some great and capital change suddenly takes place * * * this Army must inevitably be reduced to one or other of these three things: Starve, dissolve, or disperse in order to obtain subsistence in the best manner they can.'

"Maj. Gen. John Sullivan probably was speaking from sympathetic observation when he told his chief: 'The situation of your Army will be scarcely tolerable if placed in the warmest houses during the winter. The whole of them without watch coats, one-half without blankets, and more than one-third without shoes, stockings, or breeches, and many of them without jackets. Indeed, there are some without coats and not a few without shirts. Even the officers in sundry instances are destitute of proper clothing, some of them being almost naked.'

"As Gouverneur Morris put it, 'The skeleton of an army presents itself to our eyes in a naked, starving condition, out of health, out of spirits.'

"Washington continued to watch and to warn. 'A prospect now opens,' he said February 17, 'of absolute want such as will make

it impossible to keep the Army much longer from dissolution unless the most vigorous and effectual measures are pursued to prevent it.' He had been inclined for a day or two to suspect that mutiny was near; thereafter it looked as if the alternative would prevail—that the Army simply would fall apart as the men left their huts and scattered in quest of food. They would have to walk because, even if they were disposed to steal the horses, the animals that had survived the lack of forage were too few and too feeble to carry them far.

"Nathanael Greene was privileged to pay tribute and to relate the climax of the story as it concerned part of his command: 'Such patience and moderation as they manifested under their sufferings does the highest honor to the magnanimity of the American soldiers. The seventh day (without rations) they came before their superior officers and told their sufferings in as respectful terms as if they had been humble petitioners for special favors; they added that it would be impossible to continue in camp any longer without support'."

The quotations are all taken from Freeman's George Washington, volume IV.

Valley Forge remains a living symbol of the strivings of men for freedom during that epochal period of history when one by one people on both sides of the Atlantic rose against intolerable despotisms to begin a struggle for freedom which continues unabated.

Korea is but one more revelation of the continuance of that struggle. The lessons learned through General Washington along the Schuylkill River at Valley Forge have been taught again to us along the Rhine, the Elbe, the Naktong, and the Han. If the United Nations is to be effective; if collective decency is to triumph over group brutality; if we are to build indestructible strength into a world union of free peoples; if the divine will made manifest in man is ultimately to dominate and control group despotism; then we'd best read those lessons again and see that our generation and each succeeding generation learns them—learns and lives them.

The spirit of America has never been more brightly illuminated than when groups of starving, almost naked men, found through a shared and unshakable belief in the rights of man, the courage and fortitude to follow the light of Washington's noble courageous leadership.

In one respect the problem differs little in 1952 from the one Washington saw in 1775 when he wrote to Richard Henry Lee, "It is among the most difficult tasks I ever undertook in my life to induce these people to believe there is, or can be, danger until the bayonet is pushed at their breasts."

Our country still has today many people whose intelligence level offers no slightest excuse for a similar mental outlook on this problem. With the pattern of Communist intentions now spread across the world where even the blind can see, neither the seeming insulation of distance, nor the naivete born of a sheltered life, can plead the slightest excuse, nor abate one iota of our individual responsibility. It seems to me deplorable that with all we cherish ultimately at stake, with enslavement of the body and mind instead of freedom for both as the eventual issue, there should still be questioning at home as to why we are in Korea.

For my part, there is not now, nor can there be in the future, any question of the validity and purpose of the American stand against that deliberately planned, unprovoked aggression. To have done otherwise would have been a repudiation of every principle we had previously professed. To do otherwise than oppose aggression in the future, within our capabilities, will be to acknowledge as sterile every sacrifice America has made since it obtained independence. We have heard and we still hear at times, and I regret to say from Americans referring to Korea, "Why are we there?" I think the question discredits him who asks it.

Do you suppose there were not those at Valley Forge who asked, "Why are we here?" Do you think that in every crisis of man's evolving social organizations there have not been others of faint heart and little faith who asked that question?

Do you think that at Valley Forge, at Chancellorsville, at Gettysburg, at every mile of the bitter withdrawals in Korea, and at every crisis on every American field of battle, the issue was decided by those timid few whose fears overrode their courage, whose doubts beclouded their vision, who questioned why they were there? Well, I don't.

There is no possible doubt, through the record of history, that those issues were decided then as they always will be, by the stout-hearted, clear-thinking, God-fearing few who had the vision to see, the integrity to choose, and the courage to follow the right path.

The declaration of faith made by the first President of the United States as he took office in 1789 is as profoundly true today as it was a century and a half ago:

"The preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered as deeply, as finally, staked on the experiment entrusted to the hands of the American people."

REPORTING OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, apropos of the discussion that took place here a few moments ago with the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I want to state that there has been considerable complaint among Members of the House as to the brief time being given to consider these appropriation bills. The bill last week was reported on Friday in the afternoon, and was taken up and passed on Monday, which did not give the Members enough opportunity to consider it.

What I want to say is that the Rules Committee this morning reported out the Williams resolution with an amendment which would require 5 days instead of 3 as at present before an appropriation bill could be taken up after it was reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

That rule was reported out with the understanding that the matter would be discussed with the leadership before we undertook to call it up.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had, of course, no knowledge of the fact that the Rules Committee was going to consider the resolution, and no knowledge of the action of the committee—and no criticism. I am merely mentioning my own state of mind. Until I was informed it had been reported out I had no knowledge of it; the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations had no knowledge of it. It is, of course, a matter which is of serious concern to the members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle, because no matter what party is in control there is a practical question which addresses itself to the serious consideration of the membership, no matter which party is in control of the House.

Now, so far as the last of the week is concerned, it is difficult for me to remember when a bill was reported out on Friday and put down for consideration on Monday. Last week if any Member had come to me and indicated a desire to the contrary, I certainly would have given profound consideration to that, as I do to the request of any Member on ether side of the aisle in connection with any legislation. The appropriation bill was put down for Monday of this week in order to try to get the appropriation bill through which is a matter of vital importance. We had the UMT bill under consideration. Had it not been for that I would have put the appropriation bill down for Tuesday, but under the circumstances Monday was the day for it to be considered. So I think in connection with an appropriation bill's being reported out Friday and brought up Monday that it is not the general rule, and that the Treasury-Post Office Department bill which was called up last Monday should not be considered as a precedent or action in connection with the changing of the rules. There were other reasons, as I said, and it happens very rarely; as I remember, that is the only time it has happened I programed a bill that way in all the years I have been majority leader, and there were extenuating reasons, compelling reasons, why it was done. I say that had any Member come to me and objected I would have given his objections very serious consideration in connection with programing the bill. In programing a bill it is important to know that the date fixed is agreeable to the chairman of the committee and to the committee. In that connection we consulted the chairman of the committee. Had anybody indicated any objection to the contrary at the time the program was announced it certainly would have been given consideration.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. With the Chair's permission, I wish to make one additional statement—this minute is getting right long, but I would like to say that if there is objection to the changing of the rule, I am sure the Committee on Rules will not report it in until there is an opportunity for further hearing.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that if that can be done it should, for members on both sides of the Committee on Appropriations should have an opportunity to discuss it. It is a matter of concern to them as much as it is to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked for this time to say that the action taken by the Rules Committee was entirely bipartisan, nonpartisan. I think I am correct in also stating that it was unanimous. There is a feeling among many Members of the House on both sides of the aisle, and many of them have discussed the matter with members of the Committee on Rules, that more time should elapse between the reporting of an appropriation bill and its being called up on the floor. As it is, when an appropriation bill is reported on Friday and called up on Monday, or reported one day and called up the next day, Members are not given sufficient time in which to study the bill. While the Committee on Appropriations has a primary responsibility in connection with these bills, yet every individual Member of the House also has a responsibility to know something about each money bill, if he can, and certainly is at least entitled to an opportunity to read and study it. In many, many instances in the past, I may say to the gentleman, these appropriation bills have been brought up so rapidly and so quickly that the House membership has not had an opportunity to study them. I hope we will adopt this rule promptly.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may meet this afternoon even though the House may be in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

INEQUITIES OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act, to provide that the $50 work clause shall not apply with respect to widows. The present act, I fear, contains an injustice in regard to certain widows who are unable to live on the payments provided for them as beneficiaries of their departed husbands' social-security coverage. The Congress in amending the present law in the Eighty-first Congress was rightfully concerned with the actuarial soundness of the program. For that reason, the injustice which my bill is designed to correct has developed perhaps unwittingly in the application of the present law.

I think a few examples will illustrate my point and also provide the best argument for the enactment of the bill which is being introduced today. First, let us take the case of the widow who has ample independent means but whose husband was also covered by social security as a business executive. This widow rightfully draws a monthly payment which is hers by virtue of the fact that a certain deduction was taken from her husband's salary for this very purpose. This monthly payment represents only a small portion of her income. I do not believe that this woman should be denied that which is hers because she happens to have independent means.

Now let us take the case of a widow over 65 who was receiving a social security benefit payment because her husband was covered by the program, but who has no other source of income. She finds that she cannot live on this modest payment in view of the high cost of living prevalent today. She must work for a living and she secures a job as cook for the wealthy woman mentioned in the first example. As soon as her earnings exceed $50 per month, she loses her social security benefit, while her employer continues to draw hers. The husband of this old woman, who is obliged to work for a living, made the same proportionate payment through the years that was made by the husband of the wealthy woman. Yet because he was not so fortunate as to accumulate any wealth during his lifetime, his widow is penalized.

The bill which I have offered is a very simple one to correct this obvious injustice. It merely provides that these widows may continue to draw their monthly benefit payments provided for them by their husbands without regard to their own earnings. If a woman is drawing $45 per month, she will continue to do so although she may earn $25 per week as cook or laundress or in any other capacity.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Ways and Means will see fit to consider this proposal. I realize that there is little disposition to open up the Social Security Act for extensive amendment during this Congress. I do believe that this obvious unfairness can be easily and simply corrected without rewriting or revising the whole complex structure.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I think I am in a position now where I can give the House information on that.

Monday is District day and I am informed there are 10 bills that the District Committee will call up for consideration. Does the gentleman want me to state what they are?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think it might be well to do that. I know there is a daylight-saving bill to be considered which will probably bring a roll call and there might be some interest in the other bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know if this is the order in which they will be called up, but this is the order in which I have them before me. They are as follows:

S. 1345, to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court of the District of Columbia.

S. 1368, to amend subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code.

If anyone wants information on these bills the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia is available and any Member of the House may get all the information he desires. I notice there is this bill, S. 1368, to amend subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code on the calendar. What is that?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I understand that is a technical matter.

Mr. McMILLAN. There is no objection to that bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then there is H. R. 1758, to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia. That has something to do with entering or attempting to enter any public or private dwelling, building or other property. It relates to the Criminal Code.

S. 2667, daylight-saving time for the District of Columbia.

H. R. 6805, to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia.

House Joint Resolution 393, authorizing the granting of permits to Committee on Inauguration of President, 1953. That is very important. Of course, we are going to have another Democratic President, but no matter who it may be it is important.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would not be too sure of that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would not expect the gentleman to agree to that, but we have had years of experience.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But all experience has to have a change.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a great teacher, though.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I hope so.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then there is House Joint Resolution 394, providing for the quartering of troops during inaugural ceremonies.

House Joint Resolution 395, to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in Presidential inauguration.

H. R. 3906, amending Alcohol Beverage Control Act to restrict sale, and so forth.

S. 664, to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia.

On Tuesday there will be called up for consideration the bill S. 2077. I think there is a rule out on that. This is a bill to take away from the Federal Bureau of Investigation certain investigations in connection with applications.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These are some of the minor cases, they are now investigating. Relieving them of this duty I understand would give them a greater opportunity to investigate major security risks.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I have just been informed there is a resolution authorizing the Katyn Special Committee to go abroad in connection with the investigation that has been reported. I will put that down for Tuesday as the first order of business. The other bill, S. 2077, will be the second order of business.

On Wednesday, the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1952, will be taken up for consideration.

On Thursday and Friday the bill H. R. 5678, relating to the Immigration and Naturalization Code, will be called up. I understand there are 3 hours debate on that. Then a rule has been reported out on H. R. 3098, relating to jurisdiction of the United States Code in certain cases. I think that applies to the ad damnum of actions. Of course, there is the usual reservation. Any further program will be announced later. If any conference reports should come in, I will give the usual notice. I think there is one bill in conference, the Mexican labor wetback bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FILING OF RESOLUTIONS

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file reports on the bills mentioned by the majority leader.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

HORSE MEAT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago the always delightful gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] gave us the glad news that we would be welcome at some future time to visit the White House, and that we may bring our wives along.

That reminded me and brought me back to the time when just a few weeks ago he was telling us—and I think it was right after the CIO in Detroit complained that the Congress was a horsemeat Congress. The gentleman called attention to the song entitled "The Old Gray Mare She Ain't What She Used To Be." Remember.

I hope he will dwell on this subject, which at the moment is of considerable importance to the people of Chicago and Illinois where, under a Democratic administration, it appears they have been having large servings of horse meat in that city and State.

For several weeks some of the daily papers of Chicago have been complaining that the Democratic administration of the State and city has been lax in the enforcement of those laws which, if enforced, would enable the people to know what they were purchasing when they bought meat.

It is my understanding from the press that the situation has become so bad that the use of hamburger has fallen off because the people are uncertain as to the ingredients which go into it. They are not able to learn from a casual examination whether, when they buy hamburger, they get ground beef or a mixture of mule, horse, beef, and pork.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT], following the CIO line as carried in the CIO News, seemed to think that Republicans in Michigan—he forgot that the people have a Democratic Governor—were responsible for the sale of horse meat in Detroit.

Remembering that the Democratic Governor, Mr. Williams, affectionately known as "Soapy," recently pardoned a CIO man who was convicted and sentenced to prison for a felony growing out of violence on a picket line, some local officials charged with the enforcement of the law may be somewhat lenient. Some of them seem to argue "what's the use of prosecuting and convicting a man, even of a felony, if the Governor will pardon him at the request of CIO politicians?"

It is my hope that the gentleman will lend his influence to the conviction—if they are guilty—of those who, in Chicago, have been deceptively putting horse meat on the market.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 8 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 539, Rept. No. 1488), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of House Resolution 390, Eighty-second Congress, are amended to read as follows:

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances both before and after the massacre of thousands of Polish officers buried in mass graves in the Katyn Forest on the banks of the Dnieper River in the vicinity of Smolensk, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which was then a Nazi-occupied territory formerly having been occupied and under the control of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"Upon completing the necessary hearings, the committee shall report to the House of Representatives (or the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) before January 3, 1953, the results of its investigation and study, together with any recommendations which the committee shall deem advisable.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

AMENDING TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 553, Rept. No. 1489), which was reported to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3098) to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to amount in controversy. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

REVISING LAWS RELATING TO IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 554, Rept. No. 1490), which was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5678) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous ques-

tion shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INVESTIGATIONS BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. MITCHELL (at the request of Mr. LYLE), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 555, Rept. No. 1491), which was referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ROBERT E. VIGUS

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 203, for the relief of Robert E. Vigus.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 3219), for the relief of Robert E. Vigus; that if and when such bill is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such bill is hereby rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of such bill, to strike out the text of the first paragraph thereof and insert in lieu thereof "That in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742; U. S. C. 751), as amended, Robert E. Vigus, of Wichita Falls, Tex., shall be held and considered to have been an employee of the United States on the second day of June 1950 within the meaning of section 40 of that act and that injury sustained by him on such date shall be deemed to have been sustained in the performance of his duty in accordance with section 1 of that act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the reason for this action?

Mr. FRAZIER. There was some error in the bill passed by the Senate and by the House and sent to the White House. The Committee on the Judiciary has been requested to ask for the return of that bill in order to make some corrections in the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman know what the error is? I understood the resolution would make the correction without further action on the part of Congress. For that reason, I should like to know what the error is and the proposed correction.

Mr. FRAZIER. I am not advised just what the error is, I am sorry to say. It was just presented to me when I came over here. I was advised there was an error in it, and they wanted the bill returned. I will read the amendment that was offered in the Senate, which they say will not carry out the purpose of the act:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That for the purposes of the administration of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 751), as amended, Robert E. Vigus, of Wichita Falls, Tex., shall be held and considered to have been an employee of the United States on the second day of June 1950 within the meaning of section 40 of that act.

"SEC. 2 Claim for compensation under this act may be filed any time within 1 year after date of enactment of this act."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What is the change the gentleman wants to make?

Mr. FRAZIER. I believe the change was embodied in the concurrent resolution. I do not have that before me at the present time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I noted in the Senate amendment, which was concurred in, and which was the bill sent to the President, that the person concerned was considered to be an employee as of some day in July.

Mr. FRAZIER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the proposed change is to make it some day in June, the 2d day of June.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why does that make any material difference?

Mr. McCORMACK. I wanted to advise my friend of the difference I noted between the bill as it went to the President and the suggested change.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe I have any objection to this action, but I should like to know what it is all about—just what changes we want to make.

Mr. FRAZIER. The bill that went to the President did not carry out the intention of the bill. It carried a different date.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, unless there is some urgency about this matter, I think the gentleman from Tennessee should withdraw the request, and we can decide upon the action later.

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for the time being.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 382)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that the Congress authorize the continuance of the mutual security program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953. Such action is essential to advance our program for world peace and to protect the security of the United States.

The mutual security program provides equipment, supplies, and technical cooperation to enable friendly countries to carry out military and economic programs that will bring very great returns in increasing their security and our own. In each case, the countries concerned are driving to accomplish objectives which will bring closer to full realization our mutual goals of freedom and peace under the great principles of the Charter of the United Nations. Without some resources from us to add to their own, these objectives cannot be accomplished.

My support for this program rests on four propositions:

First, the plain fact is that we cannot achieve lasting security for ourselves except in association with other nations.

Second, the funds provided by the United States under the mutual security program are essential to the success of the common efforts we are making with other free nations for peace.

Third, the funds thus invested by the United States will yield far larger returns, in terms of our own security, than if the same amount were used for our own defense establishment.

Fourth, the cost of the mutual security program, together with the much larger costs of our military services and other defense measures, are well within our economic capacity.

I do not need to review here the tragic circumstances which have compelled this Nation to undertake massive programs for national defense and for mutual security. Most of us fully understand today the grimness of the threat which Soviet aggression carries for the survival of civilization.

Neither do I need to dwell upon the fact that all our military preparations are defensive preparations. We are seeking to create strength in the world sufficient to prevent aggression. We do not contemplate expenditures in the magnitude or of the character necessary to launch aggression. These facts underline the statement which cannot be too often repeated: our objective is peace, not war.

The point I do want to emphasize, for there still appear to be some people who do not recognize it, is that to achieve peace we must work together with other nations.

Some people would have us withdraw to our own shores and gamble our national safety on air and naval power. A glance at some of the vital materials

that go into air and naval power illustrates how self-defeating this would be. Four-fifths or more of the manganese, the tin, and the chrome in a United States destroyer or jet fighter comes from outside the Western Hemisphere. Should we turn our back on the rest of the world, these and other precious resources, so vital to our own security, would not only be lost to us, but in all probability would be added to the military strength of the Soviet Empire.

Without our friends abroad, the threat of aggression would move close to our own shores. Without their armed forces, and the bases on their soil, and the raw materials from their mines and forests, our military power would be gravely hampered in its defense of the United States, and our whole economy would be seriously weakened. Our support and assistance for other nations, therefore, are not in the nature of charity. These are not hand-outs which we can carelessly offer or withdraw without regard to the effect on our own safety. The problems of American survival would be multiplied to an incalculable extent if we had to face the Soviet threat without the support and assistance of other nations.

The mutual security program is justified not only by these hard strategic and military realities. It is, in addition, the only course which fulfills our position as a world leader in the battle for freedom and the rights of man. That is the reason so many nations freely join with us in a common faith in democracy and a common desire for peace. These nations are our friends, and not our satellites. As friends, they contribute to the shared wisdom and faith of the free world—a wisdom and faith on which no single nation can claim a monopoly. We must accordingly take care to treat them as friends. We must not act as though we wished to degrade them to the rank of satellites by exacting a rigid and humiliating subservience which no free nation could with dignity accept. We will never be defeated as long as we truly stand for a free partnership of free peoples. The unconquerable power of the free world lies in the fact that loyalties are not coerced.

The concrete requirements of American security compel us to a policy of international cooperation. But it would be, I believe, a misrepresentation of the American people to suppose that self-interest—even wise and enlightened self-interest—is the only cause for our concern with the outside world. As a nation, we have been dedicated through our history to the belief that responsible men deserve a democratic government and a free society. This belief is the essence of our way of life. We would betray our innermost convictions if today we were to flee the cause of the free peoples. If through inaction we desert the cause of democracy, the democratic hope may be exterminated in broad areas of this earth. If we rise to our historic traditions, we can add powerful momentum to the democratic counter-offensive which inspires in the people of the world a sense of their own destiny as free men—and which will in the end burst the bonds of tyranny everywhere on earth.

The pursuit of mutual security through mutual strength is thus the keystone of the broad foreign policy which the United States and other free nations have adopted as the surest road to lasting peace.

The American people have steadfastly supported this foreign policy since the Second World War. Its pattern today is sharp and clear. If I were to make a brief definition of our policy, I would call it the policy of peace through collective strength. We are joined with other countries in the patient and systematic building in the free world of enough military strength to deter external Communist aggression; and of economic and political and moral strength to remove internal threats of Communist subversion and point the way toward democratic progress.

I wish to emphasize very strongly that all these forms of strength are necessary if we are to achieve freedom and peace. The plain and inescapable fact is that they are indivisible. Neither military strength nor economic strength nor political strength nor moral strength can do the job alone.

Military strength is the first necessity, for without a shield against aggression the free world would be helpless before the enemy. Military strength must be built, and we must help build it, in Europe and in other critical areas of the world. But military strength is not just a matter of delivering arms to our allies. It is also a matter of defense support to enable our allies to do more to expand and equip their own defense forces.

And even arms and defense support together do not provide a full answer to the Soviet threat; to believe that they do is dangerously to misunderstand the nature of the foe. The gun is but one weapon in the Soviet arsenal of aggression. If we ignored the necessity for building moral and political and economic strength, we would expose ourselves to the danger of Communist gains which could be at least as damaging as outright aggression. Since the Soviet Union does not rely exclusively on military attack, we would be foolish, indeed, to rely exclusively on military defense.

OUTLINE OF THE PROGRAM

The funds required under the mutual security program fall into two broad categories.

The first of these, which is by far the larger, is for assistance in building up the military strength of friendly nations. This aid is of two types: (1) Direct military aid, primarily in the form of military equipment and components thereof, and (2) defense support—primarily in the form of raw materials, commodities, and machinery—to enable other countries to sustain and increase their military efforts, where that type of support produces greater returns in military strength than would an equal amount of direct military aid. The bulk of the direct military aid and of the defense support will go to strengthen the defenses of the free nations in Europe. Amounts for direct military aid and defense support make up about 90 percent of the total funds recommended for the mutual security program for the fiscal year 1953.

The second broad category is for economic and technical assistance, primarily for the underdeveloped areas of the world, where economic progress is the first essential in the battle for freedom. Some of these funds will in fact also support defense efforts in certain countries in Southeast Asia, where Communist aggression is an immediate menace. Amounts recommended for economic and technical assistance are about 10 percent of the total.

The distribution of the amounts recommended is shown in more detail in the following table:

Mutual security program, 1953

[In millions]

	Direct military	Defense support	Economic and technical	Administration	Area total
Europe	4,070	[1] 1,819	------	------	5,889
Near East and Africa	606	------	196	------	802
Asia and the Pacific	611	------	[2] 408	------	1,019
American Republics	62	------	22	------	84
Multilateral technical assistance, migration, and relief package freight	------	------	30	------	30
Administration	------	------	------	75	75
Total	[3] 5,350	1,819	656	75	[3] 7,900

[1] Includes economic assistance for Austria.
[2] Includes assistance to support military efforts in southeast Asia and the Pacific.
[3] Columns do not add to totals because of rounding.

In the Mutual Security Act of 1951 the Congress provided for an integrated program, administered by appropriate operating agencies under the general direction of the Director for Mutual Security. These arrangements are working well, and I recommend that they be continued. Under them, direct military aid will be administered by the Department of Defense. The Mutual Security Agency will administer defense support in Europe, together with technical and economic assistance in southeast Asia and the Pacific. In south Asia, the Near East, Latin America, and the independent states of Africa economic and technical assistance will be administered by the Technical Cooperation Administration of the Department of State.

We shall continue our policy of closely coordinating the mutual-security program with the technical-assistance programs of the Organization of American States and the United Nations and its agencies, such as the Food and Agricultural Organization and the World Health Organization. In addition, we shall continue to encourage, to the maximum extent possible, the investment of private capital for economic development abroad, and we shall continue to relate outlays under the mutual-security program to the loans being made by the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Europe

Today, the problem of achieving security and strength in free Europe, in my judgment, is on the way to solution. The

last 5 years have recorded remarkable gains as a result of actions we have taken under our policy of peace through collective strength—first in Greece and Turkey; then, in 1948, through the European recovery program, and since 1949 through the growing defensive power of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The American contribution did not of itself create these gains; but it did supply the essential margin without which the Europeans could not have fought their way out of their postwar slough of despond.

Five years ago, many European nations were on the verge of economic or political collapse. A divided and despairing continent—next to our own, the most productive and industrially powerful in the world—lay open for Soviet conquest.

How different the picture is today. Europe has made immense advances—in economic output, in military strength, in political self-confidence, in progress toward unity. Today, the Soviet Union knows that it cannot achieve its purposes in Europe so long as the policy of collective strength continues.

Europe still has far to go. Economic health and vitality in Europe require a series of specific actions—varying from country to country—to raise industrial and agricultural productivity, to knock-down trade barriers and exchange restrictions, and to encourage the vigorous forces of competition in European and world markets. They require further progress toward the democratic goals of a fair distribution of income, strong and free trade-unions, fair and effective tax systems, and programs of land reform.

Above all, we in the United States do not believe that Western Europe can achieve its full strength without accelerated progress toward unity. Only this unity can release the great potential energy of free Europe. We will continue in every way we can to encourage its attainment.

The difficulties are very great. It is only candid to report that progress in this direction has not always been as fast as we hoped. Yet, in many respects the progress has been most impressive.

A revolution has been taking place in European thinking. The Organization for European Economic Cooperation and the European Payments Union have laid foundations for joint action in the economic and financial fields. In the Schuman plan, six countries are creating an international authority for the production and distribution of coal and steel. Under the European Defense Community, the same six countries are planning to establish common armed forces, a common defense ministry, and a common military budget.

Europe has moved faster toward integration in the last 5 years than it did in the previous 500. At every stage in this movement the United States has provided encouragement and support. If this progress continues in the next 5 years—and I am confident it will—a new Europe will emerge as a great and creative partner in the defense of freedom.

It is this progress toward European economic recovery and political unity which makes possible a growing defense effort in Western Europe. The build-up of military strength there since the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty has been most encouraging. In the coming fiscal year European military expenditures will be considerably more than twice as large as they were in the year preceding the Communist aggression in Korea. Production of military matériel in Western Europe has multiplied about four times in that period. The European nations have lengthened the training periods under their compulsory military service programs and have substantially enlarged and improved their armed forces. The pace of the military build-up has given many millions of Europeans new confidence in their capacity to resist aggression.

This is an impressive record of progress. Of course, the record is far from perfect—especially in view of the urgency of the threat posed by aggressive Soviet imperialism. We can find many specific weaknesses and shortcomings to criticize—and some people in our country fasten their attention so exclusively on such things as to advocate that the defense of Europe be abandoned. I do not wish to minimize the shortcomings, but the fundamental question to ask is, "Are we moving at a substantial rate in the right direction? Is real progress being made?" The answer is obvious. So is the conclusion to be drawn. The record abundantly warrants confidence in our European allies and our continued steadfast support for them.

Two weeks ago at Lisbon the member nations took the most far-reaching strides in European defense since the adoption of the North Atlantic Treaty itself in 1949. The North Atlantic Council at Lisbon endorsed the specific means through which the forces of the European defense community, including German contingents, will be organized and tied into General Eisenhower's command. After months of planning by the special committee under the chairmanship of Mr. Harriman the council made specific and concrete decisions providing for the more rapid build-up of forces and for the provision of the necessary equipment and construction to support them.

By the end of this calendar year, General Eisenhower's command is expected to have at its disposal a formidable force—including some 50 army divisions, about half of them on active duty, and some 4,000 military planes—and a sound base for further build-up in 1953 and 1954. These forces, joined by those of Greece and Turkey, will bring within measurable distance the time when even the most foolhardy man in the Kremlin will not dare risk open attack.

In order to equip the forces being raised by our allies under the Lisbon agreements, we as well as they must step up our efforts. There have been delays in our own production and delivery of arms. And combat requirements for Korea have, of course, received top priority for deliveries from our current output. I am assured that production is now being accelerated substantially, and I have consequently directed that deliveries to the North Atlantic Treaty defense forces be greatly speeded up.

The rearmament effort has also created problems in Europe. The European economy, after its extraordinary comeback in the years of the European recovery program, has now been subjected to new and severe pressures. The Marshall plan was designed to help restore minimum economic health, not to produce a surplus capable of creating military forces adequate for European defense. Today, not only has rearmament imposed a heavy direct burden, but the global consequences of rearmament—including rises in the prices both of raw materials generally and of finished goods from the United States—have drastically upset the European balance of payments. Substantial and sustained efforts will be necessary to meet these problems, even with our help.

However, the European countries have a sizable capacity to increase their armed forces, to construct military bases and facilities, and to produce military equipment and supplies if we provide the crucial margin of raw materials and other support for their defense efforts. If we provide this margin of resources, the European countries will be able to produce far more military equipment than they otherwise could, and to maintain far larger armed forces than would otherwise be possible. Our defense support will allow them to use plants, machinery, materials, and manpower which exist in Europe, but which otherwise could not be devoted to defense purposes. For this reason, our defense support is an extremely economical way to achieve military strength for our mutual security. The funds included in the mutual security program for defense support will yield, according to the best estimates, more than twice as much military strength in Europe as would the same funds spent for the direct transfer of military equipment from the United States.

Accordingly, the mutual security program for Europe is planned so that the United States will provide both weapons and defense support. The form of assistance, whether military equipment or assistance in financing imports of raw materials and other items where required to make possible the necessary level of European defense efforts, has been decided in each case on the basis of which form produces the most results in defensive strength at the least cost.

In addition to the funds for the North Atlantic Treaty countries and Western Germany, limited amounts are included in the mutual security program for Yugoslavia, whose defiance of the Soviet Union is giving heart to untold millions behind the iron curtain; for Austria, where continued economic assistance is necessary to maintain economic stability in the face of occupation of part of the country by Soviet forces; and for facilitating emigration from Europe under international arrangements. We expect soon to complete arrangements with Spain which will assist in the defense of the Mediterranean area; our part in these arrangements will be carried forward with funds already made available by the Congress.

Asia, Africa, and Latin America

Outside of Europe, our policy of building collective strength for peace must meet and overcome a very different range of problems. The most serious problems of Asia, Africa, and Latin America occur in the underdeveloped areas—the areas which have not yet shared in the benefits of the burst of scientific and technical advance of the last two centuries.

The people of many of these areas confront the legacy of centuries of neglect—they are in many cases desperately poor, defenseless before famine and disease, disabled by illiteracy. At the same time, they have a new and burning determination to improve their living standards, to fulfill their desire for self-government, to control their own futures. As old social structures have failed to meet the basic needs of their peoples, the popular energy, so long pent up, is bursting forth in fierce nationalism and in fierce demands for real economic change.

These conditions would exist even if there were no Soviet threat to world peace. But the pressure of Soviet communism, working overtime to exploit the turbulence of the underdeveloped areas, greatly increases the necessity for speed in meeting these conditions—speed in the interest, not alone of orderly and democratic development, but of the security of the whole free world.

As a nation born in a struggle for individual freedom, we cordially welcome the aspirations of people to free themselves from oppression and misery. To place ourselves wholeheartedly at their side, we must work with them in their struggle against poverty and famine and illiteracy and disease. In the point 4 concept, we have a means of joining hands with the constructive forces of these areas before bitterness and frustration drive them into a fatal alliance with Soviet communism.

Point 4 means making our scientific advances and technical know-how available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. Point 4 means technical missionaries at work, and it also means the supplies and equipment that are needed to put new techniques into effect.

No one should think that point 4 involves some single formula or program which is to be applied everywhere, in equal measure, throughout the underdeveloped regions of the world. The kinds of aid we plan must be tailored both to what we can afford at any given time and to the specific situation in each country. Our experience in Latin America has demonstrated that point 4 operations, to be successful, must be supported by adequate supplies and equipment. The supplies and equipment can be financed in various ways.

Some countries can attract private investment capital and loans to finance most of their outlays for economic development. Other countries can earn enough dollars from their own exports to finance most of the equipment and supplies they need. In still other countries, where neither loans nor private capital can meet the need, this Government must provide substantial quantities of supplies and equipment to assure real progress on vital programs for development. That is the direction we are taking in India today, and in other places where the need is particularly urgent and where the local plans are firm enough to produce a sound result.

Today, we have technical and economic missions in 40 countries. The shirtsleeve diplomats of point 4 are carrying the American revolution to the villages and farms of the world. They are providing farmers with better seed and better fertilizer, better methods of plowing and sowing and better means of harvesting and saving the crops. They are helping to fight malaria and dysentery, trachoma and rinderpest. They are providing training in the techniques of modern government. They are helping to build roads and canals and dams, schools and hospitals. They are teaching people to read, to revitalize the soil, to irrigate it, to drain it. In short, they are teaching people by methods of peace to change their own world without bloodshed.

The funds we invest in point 4 will yield direct and immediate results in terms of larger food production, better communications, more agricultural and health specialists, engineers, and other technicians. But even more important are the longer term results. For the magic of this work is its multiplying effect: if we can help train 10 teachers, they can train hundreds of children; if we can help set up 10 demonstration farms, hundreds of farmers can come and learn to use new methods; if we can help drill a hundred new wells or build a new irrigation dam, thousands of farmers can increase their yields and plow back their earnings into further improvements. In this way, a relatively small investment can bring immense results.

In one district in India, the production of food has already been increased 46 percent. Repeat this across the continents of Asia and Africa and Latin America, and we enter a new era in the history of man.

The Near East and Africa

The Near East presents a sharp challenge to American statesmanship. The countries of these areas are of vital importance to the security of the free world, but the problems of achieving constructive and orderly development are extremely difficult.

Living standards are generally very low. Transportation and land tenure systems are often archaic. Political and religious controversies simmer throughout the region. Nationalism is sometimes misdirected into fanatical outbursts which ignore the benefits to be gained from international cooperation. The Communists are doing their best to stir up confusion and trouble.

Most of these problems can only be solved by the people of these countries finding ways to make solid progress in developing economic strength and effective free institutions. But we can and must help them.

We can help dig wells for irrigation and clean water in Iran and Iraq. We can help set up farm-credit institutions and agricultural extensoin services in Lebanon and Liberia. We can help build roads and establish public-health services in Israel. We can help build up school and hospital services in countries throughout the area. For projects of this type I recommend economic and technical assistance in this area (including help for the Arab refugees) of 196 million dollars.

Military assistance for nations in this area is recommended in the amount of 606 million dollars. Most of these funds are for Greece and Turkey, whose military-assistance programs are carried under the heading of the Near East; defense-support funds for those countries are included with those for Europe.

To help in maintaining security in the Near East, the United States has joined with Turkey, France, Great Britain, and three commonwealth countries in proposing the establishment of a Middle East command. We hope this command will become the center of cooperative efforts by all countries concerned for the defense of the region as a whole from outside aggression.

Asia and the Pacific

Much of Asia at this moment is under Communist attack. The free nations are holding the line against aggression in Korea and Indochina, and are battling Communist-inspired disorders in Burma, Malaya, and the Philippines. The loss of any of these countries would mean the loss of freedom for millions of people, the loss of vital raw materials, the loss of points of critical strategic importance to the free world.

The mutual security program for this area includes military assistance in the amount of 611 million dollars, and economic and technical assistance of 408 million dollars, some of which will contribute directly to the defense programs of certain countries of Southeast Asia.

Of our military assistance, a large part will go to Indochina where the troops of the French Union and of the Associated States are battling valiantly against the Communist-led forces, and another large part will go to continue to help prepare the Chinese armies on Formosa to resist Communist aggression. The rest will go to the Philippines and Thailand, to help build forces strong enough to insure internal security.

As in the Near East and Africa, however, security in Asia is far more than a military problem. Our military assistance is essential to check the encroachments of Communist imperialism. But the long-run promise of stability and progress lies, not alone in arms, but in the provision of sufficient economic and technical support to enable the peoples of Asia to conquer their old, deep-seated and agonizing economic problems and to share in the benefits of an expanding world economy.

In India, for example, the key to economic progress lies in boosting food production. This is the only way to remove the constant threat of famine and ease the desperate struggle for a daily livelihood. It is the only way of freeing funds now spent to import food, so they can be used instead for productive in-

vestment in developing natural resources, transportation, and industry.

The whole future of India as a free nation may well lie in her ability to raise her food production and do it quickly.

We must support India's own efforts to get this done. The Indian Government has already set in motion a plan under which, in a very few years, she will be able to grow the food needed by her people, and will have established a sound basis for further economic development. It is a good plan, practical and definite. India itself is financing most of it. And we are greatly stepping up our aid for this plan with confidence that the sums we spend will bring concrete results.

This is an example of how our aid can produce large-scale results by supporting the efforts of the people of the Asian countries. In the same way, we are helping to expand irrigation in Pakistan, to eliminate malaria in Thailand, to increase rice yields in Burma.

It is vital that this work be carried forward rapidly. For in this region, there is still time to set in motion programs which will tap the energies of the people and give them solid hope for advancement under governments determined to resist Communist expansion. We must not let this opportunity go by default. Let it never be said of the American people that our eyes are focused only on what might have been—that we grow concerned about the countries of Asia only after they have been lost to the enemy. The bold and wise investment of American funds in this region in the next few years can make a vital difference to the future of freedom.

Special note should be taken of the contribution that the new, free Japan can make to the growth of economic strength in Asia. A growing trade partnership of Japan with southeast and south Asia can benefit everyone concerned. Such a partnership in free Asia can result in a self-supporting, expanding regional economy, free of permanent dependence on United States economic aid and free from the danger of satellite slavery under the Soviet orbit.

Latin America

I do not need to restate here the inestimable importance of Latin America. Its governments and its peoples are joined with us in the Organization of American States and the Rio Treaty to bolster the security of the free world. It is a most important source of vital raw materials; and it carries on with us a large and mutually advantageous trade. In case of emergency, its military forces can partially relieve ours of some of the important tasks connected with hemisphere defense.

In order to assist hemisphere defense, I am recommending military assistance of 62 million dollars for the Latin-American countries. In addition, I recommend 23 million dollars to carry forward the remarkable technical cooperation work now under way in 19 Latin American states to develop agriculture and natural resources, education, health, transportation, and other fundamental services. This includes 1 million dollars for our share of the technical cooperation work of the organization of American States. This assistance—supplemented as it is by substantial amounts of private loans and investments and public loans through the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank—has already helped materially to raise living standards, speed economic development, and reduce vulnerability to undemocratic movements of the extreme right or the extreme left.

The policy of the good neighbor has been one of our most successful policies; we must not falter in our loyalty to that policy today.

The major national security programs I am recommending for the fiscal year 1953, including the mutual security program, total about 64 billion dollars. This request raises once again the question whether the American nation can afford so much money for national security. This is a serious question. It requires a serious answer.

Certainly the total security program—of which the mutual security program is a relatively small part—is by any standard a large one. It has resulted in some unavoidable economic dislocations and inflationary pressures. Yet, the burden has been carried with remarkably little strain.

The fundamental reason for this is that our national production has been expanding rapidly, and will continue to rise. Security expenditures, measured in 1951 prices, rose about 18 billion dollars from 1950 to 1951; but the increase in our national output was even larger—totaling about 26 billion dollars. During the next 2 years, we can continue to raise output by not less than 5 percent annually, increasing the gross national product (at 1951 prices) to about 340–345 billion dollars in 1952, and to about 355–360 billion in 1953, compared with 327 billion in 1951 and 301 billion in 1950. If output rises at this rate, we will have increased our total annual production about one-fifth in 3 years. Even with the immense diversion to security purposes, production should be high enough, by the beginning of 1953, to permit total civilian consumption and capital investment at least 50 percent higher than during World War II.

There will certainly be cut-backs in some things. Yet, even if automobile production should drop to around 4 million units this year, it must be remembered that this is only slightly less than the average production of 1948 and 1949. If housing should dip below one million units, it must be remembered that we have succeeded in producing more than one million units per year in only 3 years of our history. And as we expand our output of vital materials such as steel and aluminum, we can again increase the output of such civilian items.

All in all, our present security expenditures are clearly within our economic capacity. And as our basic productive strength continues to increase in the years ahead, we should be able to carry more easily the substantial security costs which may continue to be necessary.

Let us consider for a moment the costs of possible alternatives to our present policy.

The alternative of premeditated and deliberate war is one which no democratic or God-fearing people can for a moment entertain. Even if we were insane enough to consider it, however, it would obviously entail expenditures immensely greater than our present ones, not to speak of the terrible waste and destruction of human life, property, and natural resources.

Another alternative—of contracting our commitments and retreating to the Western Hemisphere—has a momentary seductiveness, because it would seem to relieve us of the contributions we are now making to collective defense. But, in fact, if we followed the policy of retreat, we would have to try to replace the contributions to our security which now come from the cooperation of our allies. We could not replace some of those contributions at any cost; others only at very high cost, not just in money, resources and military manpower, but in the precious political and economic freedoms we are mobilizing to defend.

The policy of retreat would deprive us of armed forces which, if called upon to fight for the defense of their own countries, would at the same time be fighting for the defense of ours. It would deprive us of essential raw materials. It would impose upon us a much higher level of mobilization than we have today. It would require a stringent and comprehensive system of allocation and rationing in order to husband our smaller resources. It would require us to become a garrison state, and to impose upon ourselves a system of centralized regimentation unlike anything we have ever known.

In the end, when the enemy, encouraged by our retreat, began to organize the rest of the world against us, we would face the prospect of bloody battle—and on our own shores. The ultimate costs of such a policy would be incalculable. Its adoption would be a mandate for national suicide.

I am asking the Congress for 7.9 billion dollars for the mutual security program—an amount which will bring returns no other policy could hope to produce so economically.

I am deeply convinced, after studying the matter carefully, that if there is any question about this amount, it is not whether it is too large but whether it is too small.

These funds are needed, all of them, to pay for essential parts of the total undertaking to help free nations build adequate combined defenses. If the military-assistance funds are reduced, this will mean a corresponding reduction in the effective combat forces which can be created in Europe and Asia and a serious disruption of the timetable for achieving adequate defenses. If the defense-support funds are reduced, it will mean that our partners in this endeavor will be unable to raise and train the scheduled forces or unable to expand their own military production as planned. If economic and technical funds are reduced, there will be a corresponding reduction in what we can do to help countries in Asia, the Near East, Africa, and Latin America to

strengthen themselves, and a correspondingly greater danger of these areas falling to Communist aggression or subversion.

I would not counsel the Congress to spend one dollar more than is necessary to support our policy of peace. But there is no economy more false than that which is summed up in the tragic phrase "too little and too late." Such a policy risks the loss of our investment as well as our objective. It would be foolish and dangerous to withhold a dollar now at the risk of expending, not just many times as many dollars, but human lives as well, a few years later.

The question is frequently—and properly—asked: How long are we going to have to continue this type of program? I cannot—no one can—give an answer in terms of a specific month and year. But I can say that one of the central purposes in everything we are doing under the mutual security program is to build strength which will eliminate the need for assistance from the United States.

This is not a program for carrying the rest of the world on our backs. This is a program for getting the other free nations on their own feet, so they can move ahead without special help from us or anyone else.

As the mutual security program moves ahead—as larger military forces become equipped and trained, as economic strength continues to increase—we can expect the costs to the United States to decline. This is not only our own desire; it is also the natural hope and objective of the people of other countries. Free people do not relish dependence on other nations. They wish to achieve as rapidly as possible the economic health and vigor which will enable them to sustain their own programs of defense and economic progress. The mutual security program will hasten the day when this will become possible.

History has thrust a fearful responsibility upon the United States. Today, the survival of freedom and civilization on this earth may depend on the initiative and decisions taken in our own Nation's Capital. The free peoples look to us for leadership. Leadership implies more than a recognition of the problem. It implies also a capacity to work out a joint solution with our partners, and to stay with it till the end; it implies resolution and fortitude. We have shown that we understand the threat. But some are doubtful whether we will stay the course until we achieve peace in a free world.

I am not in doubt. I know that we shall succeed. It is perhaps true that our history has been characterized by impatience, by a passion for quick results. It is equally true, however, that it has also been characterized by perseverance and determination—the perseverance of the pioneer, making his steadfast way into the unknown West; the determination of the farmer and worker, transforming a savage wilderness into the strongest and most productive Nation known to history. Perseverance and determination, steadfastness and dependability—it was these qualities, and not recklessness or imprudence, which built America. It is our obligation to turn these qualities outward. We must show the world that we can meet any crisis, and that temporary frustration will not drive us to panicky aggression or to ignominious retreat. This is the challenge of free world leadership.

In the last analysis, our leadership must stand or fall on the moral power behind it. No nation, of course, can undertake policies which are not squarely and solidly based on national self-interest. But world leadership in these perilous times calls for policies which, while springing from self-interest, transcend it—policies which serve as a bridge between our own national objectives and the needs and aspirations of other free people.

I deeply believe that the mutual security program is an expression of a new spirit in the world—a spirit based on faith in democracy and human decency, and looking to a new collaboration among nations and peoples. It expresses the deep reality of our friendship for other peoples—the sincerity of our determination to join with them in building a world where freedom, justice, and security will exist for all.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 6, 1952.*

MILITARY PREPAREDNESS

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Armed Services Committee will now do something constructive about the preparedness program of this Nation.

The present preparedness program we have is not adequate. I believe it is imperative that it be changed. I suggest the changes that I outlined in the Eighty-first Congress and also in this Congress.

The Armed Services Committee has not yet considered the program I suggested. This House has never had a chance to vote for or against the program I suggested.

I urge the Armed Services Committee to immediately hold hearings on the program I have suggested.

I am satisfied it will give this Nation better preparedness than we now have. At the same time, it will save the country many, many billions of dollars a year. That is every year, not just one year.

I do not know of any objection to my program by anyone who has studied it. Why not at least hold hearings on it?

The Armed Services Committee has stated that the present preparedness program is not adequate. What are they going to do about it?

The House has turned down the Vinson bill and the Burleson and Brownson amendments. To the best of my knowledge, the only other program that has been suggested is my own, which has never been considered by the Armed Services Committee. Why not hold immediate hearings on it?

If my plan has merit, it should be considered by the Armed Services Committee. If it has no merit, what harm has been done by considering it?

I respectfully urge the Armed Services Committee to hold immediate hearings on my plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to outline my views on the St. Lawrence seaway project which is currently being considered by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In announcing that I favor the St. Lawrence seaway, I have thought it wise to specify the type of project I believe should be built and the reasons and principles which govern my decision.

First, I regard the St. Lawrence seaway as an investment, not an expenditure. In essence, it is the development and harnessing of natural resources which should enrich the two nations through which this great river flows.

The electrical energy which can be developed from the falling waters can perform work which otherwise will have to be done at the expense of exhaustible resources, such as coal, oil, or other fuels. Seen in this light, the question is not whether there presently is a power shortage in the transmission area which could be served by the St. Lawrence dams, but rather whether it is intelligent and businesslike for us to utilize an inexhaustible resource rather than exhaustible ones as a matter of conserving and utilizing intelligently our natural resources.

Likewise, the transportation aspects of the St. Lawrence seaway hold immense possibilities for the development of the great agricultural and industrial interior.

Engineering and economic studies have been made, perhaps colored to some degree by the objectives and views of those who sponsored such studies. Estimates are made of the benefits to the region and our countries as a whole. The economic effects of the establishment of an additional transportation artery cannot be forecast with precision. Without question, however, it will invigorate, strengthen, and enrich our continent.

I do not pose as an expert familiar with the economic and engineering facts and figures. The committees having responsibility for this legislation have had a great deal of detailed evidence on construction costs, revenues from power and shipping, and other economic and engineering data which I am confident they will consider thoroughly, and, I hope, dispassionately. If such data is insufficient or confused, it is the responsibility of such committees to assemble accurate and reliable information, calling upon the assistance of able and loyal investigative staffs.

Second, this is an appropriate undertaking for the United States and Cana-

dian Governments. The nature of the project, both as an artery of transportation and as a power project on an international stream, indicates the propriety of governmental leadership and direction in conjunction with private enterprise.

I doubt that anyone would suggest that a navigational system should be undertaken by private interests.

The development of the power as distinguished from its transmission is likewise appropriate for governmental action, particularly because the St. Lawrence is an international river.

Third, the St. Lawrence seaway presents an opportunity for international cooperation in a public work of common benefit. This aspect of the St. Lawrence seaway is especially intriguing to me because of my belief that progress toward order and stability in world affairs will be promoted most effectively by nations working together for the common good of their citizens.

I referred to this principle in remarks made upon the floor of the House of Representatives on April 23, 1951, which I entitled "An Affirmative American Foreign Policy." In recommending the creation of a commission to ease the way for the American people in their private endeavors to aid in the development of underdeveloped areas, I suggested that one of the functions of such a commission might be to stimulate the construction of self-liquidating international public works. I listed as item six of a possible agenda of the proposed commission the following:

> Sixth. Formulation of self-liquidating international public works projects, to be jointly financed and managed, calculated to aid international trade and commerce. An international commission proposed the construction of the inter-American highway in central America on such a basis, but its plan has not been followed.

The advantage in further promoting the excellent relations between our country and our neighbor to the north through jointly engaging in a major undertaking to develop and utilize effectively the wealth of this continent on a sensible, businesslike basis cannot be measured in dollars and cents. But we know it would have tremendous value in fostering good will and in promoting a community spirit and objective between the Governments of the United States and Canada and the citizens of our respective countries. It seems to me that one instance of concrete action of this type is far more valuable than volumes of oratory, generalities and kind words, however significant these may be.

Fourth, the power and navigational functions of the St. Lawrence seaway are inextricably linked together. Of course, it is true that power dams could be built without taking advantage for navigational purposes of the deeper water created by those dams. Canals and locks and dams could be built and still permit the water which has been falling for centuries to continue to fall without extracting electrical energy from it. But such a program would be the height of folly and the ne plus ultra of extravagant wastefulness. Unless we have lost all desire to use common sense and reason in our public undertakings, we should extract the maximum benefit per dollar invested.

Fifth, I am not an advocate of public power. I propose to examine carefully specific projects presented for my vote which may link a desirable undertaking with an undesirable one. I am aware that there are elements in this administration which seek to utilize a worthwhile and beneficial project in which the Government must play an appropriate part as a lever to extend unnecessary Government ownership, control and direction, be more appropriately handled by private enterprise, subject to governmental regulation in the public interest.

I do not pose as an expert on electrical power. I can, however, state the general character of a power project which I think would be appropriate in connection with the St. Lawrence seaway. I favor the type of cooperative undertaking which is exemplified by the erection of the Hoover Dam on the Colorado River. There, conflicting State, national and private interests were resolved by agreement in a predetermined arrangement for the development of the power through an agency of the Federal Government and its sale at the bus bar to non-Federal agencies.

Sixth, plans now call for a self-liquidating project not requiring the investment of Federal funds. This renders the argument against the seaway on a basis of huge Federal expenditure completely without validity.

However, there may still be those who fear that revenues from power and shipping tolls will be insufficient to retire indebtedness and that somehow sooner or later Federal tax funds will have to foot the bill for the seaway, at least in part.

Those who object to the seaway on this basis should find interesting an article by Richard Frost, of the Detroit Board of Commerce, which appears in the current issue of Inside Michigan. Mr. Frost's article, entitled "Congress Spends Billions for French Seaways—But Not One Cent for Our Own St. Lawrence Project," describes huge power and navigational projects on the Rhone and Rhine Rivers. Machinery provided by foreign-aid funds and counterpart money generated from American generosity make these expensive public works in France and Switzerland possible. The Swiss, high in the Alps, are to be connected by the Genissiat project with the Mediterranean at the expense of our taxpayers. Now the Swiss can have a navy.

Little seems to be known in Washington about the Genissiat project. I checked with the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, the Appropriations Committees, and the ECA. So far I have been able to turn up practically no concrete information this side of the Atlantic. This apparently proceeds from the fact that what is done with counterpart funds, of which there are more than $2,000,000,000 in France, is largely decided in France. Little detailed information is furnished the American people or the United States Congress.

For this reason the article by Mr. Frost should prove interesting to the Congress. I shall ask leave to include the text of the article at the conclusion of my remarks. I shall also send reprints, which include illustrations, to each Member of the Congress.

I do not care to engage in extensive discussion of the motives of the very powerful opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway. There is no question that a transportation development of this magnitude would have repercussions upon the entire area it serves. Undoubtedly, present investments in railroads, coal mining and ports would be affected at least temporarily through some diversion of traffic. At the same time, industrial, agricultural, and commercial activities in a wide area would be stimulated and enhanced.

What concerns me most about this aspect of the problem is whether this country has lost the pioneering spirit through which this continent was developed. Are we becoming an old Nation? Are we developing the philosophy of scarcity rather than preserving and promoting the philosophy of abundance? Are we static or kinetic? What has become of the courage and enterprise of the American people?

I have faith that we still dare to undertake in the true American spirit of our forefathers a difficult, perhaps even a heartbreaking task of harnessing the forces of nature for the benefit of our people.

The St. Lawrence seaway project is not unlike the great westward thrust of the last century which produced immense wealth out of the wilderness.

I hope this Congress will display the fortitude, the determination, and the enterprise to make the St. Lawrence seaway—which has long been a dream—a reality. I hope this Congress will shape that project in the true pattern of the American system where our Government and our citizens, each in their appropriate sphere, can join with the Government and the citizens of our neighboring nation to the north and capture the benefits and advantages which the St. Lawrence seaway will make possible.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the text of the article to which I refer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(The article referred to follows:)

CONGRESS SPENDS BILLIONS FOR FRENCH SEAWAYS BUT NOT ONE CENT FOR OUR OWN ST. LAWRENCE PROJECT

(By Richard B. Frost)

The fate of the St. Lawrence seaway is to be decided at this session of Congress. Here is something that not only all the taxpayers of the United States should know, but that every Member of Congress should know and think about before taking definite action against the pending seaway legislation.

The taxpayers of the United States are building two vast inland waterways and power projects in the rugged, submarginal French Alps which will cost untold billions (billions, not millions) of dollars before they are completed.

Not one cent of this cost will ever be returned to this country. Yet our own St. Lawrence waterway and power project, to be built on a share-the-cost basis with our best friend and neighbor, Canada, and which ultimately would not cost the taxpayers one penny, goes begging.

Financing of these two tremendous projects in France was agreed upon without ever holding so much as a congressional hearing. There were no interminable debates regarding the costs involved nor whether the project might be self-supporting or self-liquidating. The entire cost of the program is a gift, a gift to be paid for by the already overburdened United States taxpayers.

Lobbyists for the railway, power, coal, and other industries have not been scurrying through the Halls of Congress, buttonholing Senators and Representatives to expound upon this tragic waste of the public's tax money. Such groups, so vigorous in opposing our own St. Lawrence waterway and power project, have not issued even a single bulletin objecting to giving millions for the overseas seaway and power development.

What has been described above is an actual documented case in point. Our Nation is now financing this French duplicate of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project which, though of lesser importance and potentialities, is of far greater cost and scope. To make the matter even worse, there is no limit to our commitments to carry out the French project, now that we have started. Some idea of its vastness and expense can be obtained from these facts:

Twice the French voters refused to authorize it because of the tremendous burden of taxation it would place upon that nation's people, whose present rate of taxation is far less than that paid by the people of the United States.

The project in France is so tremendous that to date, no one has been able to venture even an accurate estimate of its cost. Some idea of its extensiveness can be gathered from this scanty information which has been extracted from ECA headquarters in Washington after more than a year's insistent questioning and over almost indescribable opposition:

There are 22 dams and 46 power stations for development in the French project—three are now under construction or completed. The total cost for just these three phases of the work is $685,500,000.

No amount of interrogation or investigating at ECA could turn up even a guess as to what the second Alps power and waterways projects on the upper reaches of the Rhine River would cost. While this project is not quite as large as the Rhone, seven power plants, to produce 6,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity are planned, with 9 miles of canals and many locks.

The French Rhone program is, in general, absolutely parallel to the long proposed and too-long debated St. Lawrence power and waterway.

The Rhone River and a number of its tributaries in southeastern France comprise the site of the French seaway and power project. The Rhone has its origin in Switzerland not far from another famous European River, the Rhine, where the other United States financed waterway and power program is being built. This discussion for the present will, however, be confined to the Rhone River plan. Later we will see what has been proposed for the United States tax money to construct on the Rhine.

From its sources, the Rhone flows into Lake Geneva in Switzerland and from the lake west toward a meeting with the French border high in the craggy peaks of the Alps Mountains, an area virtually devoid of heavy industry or large-scale agriculture, hence a poor prospect for freight cargoes. From the border the river smashes its way west past precipitous slopes and through time-chiseled gorges to the French city of Lyon. From Lyon it turns south through a valley to its outlet in the Mediterranean Sea a little west of the famous port city of Marseilles. In all it covers a distance of some 345 miles in its journey from Lake Geneva to the Mediterranean.

As mentioned previously, the French plan is not confined alone to the Rhone River. A number of tributaries, including the Arve, the Fier, the Arc, and the Isere Rivers, all flowing in a westerly direction from the Italian-French border to a connection with the Rhone, are likewise sites of the great over-all development of the Rhone.

The potentialities of the Rhone River for power development and navigation were first recognized sometime prior to World War I. The St. Lawrence seaway and power project in the United States and Canada was first considered during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Thus, both have long been contemplated, with St. Lawrence having a decided edge on its French counterpart for longevity without action.

Progress on plans for the development of the Rhone was hampered in the 1920's by a controversy waged in France over the issue of private versus public programs. Oddly enough, the same question was likewise debated during the 1920's in the United States and Canada with regard to the St. Lawrence. It was during this period that the du Pont, General Electric, and Alcoa firms offered to place $1,300,000,000 in escrow to guarantee construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and development of the power. Their plan provided for an outright gift of the waterway to the two nations in return for sole rights to the power. In both the case of the United States and France, it was decided that private development was not in the best interests of the nations involved.

Unlike the case of the St. Lawrence, the Rhone plan did not then subside into fruitless intermittent debates. In 1934 a semi-private company, Compagne Nationale Du Rhone (CNR) was formed for the purpose of undertaking at least a partial development of the river's power potential. The CNR stock was subscribed to by cities, towns, and chambers of commerce located in the river valley and railway companies, private manufacturers, chemical firms, and public utilities. In 1937, when the French Government nationalized the railway system, the CNR for all practical purposes became a state corporation, comparable in many ways to our own TVA.

Work was begun shortly thereafter on the upper portion of the Rhone between the little town of Genissiat, France, and the Swiss border. Although World War II interrupted, delayed, and obstructed their efforts, the CNR managed to continue operations on the upper Rhone and its tributaries throughout the war. Without unlimited resources, the work progressed slowly.

Then in 1946, France began considering the causes underlying its tragic defeat by the German Army in 1939. The investigations showed that one of the major weaknesses apparent in France was a critical lack of electric power. The study pointed out that in 1947 French power production on a per capita basis was a little less than 650 kilowatt-hours as compared to over 2,000 kilowatt-hours in the United States, Sweden, Switzerland, and many other nations. As a result the French Government appointed a committee headed by a M. Jean Monnet for the purpose of seeking a solution of the power shortage. It was this committee that formulated the present staggering plan for the over-all navigation and power development of the Rhone River system.

The proposal was then presented to the French people for action, but the probable cost was so high that the French taxpayers twice rejected it. French taxes, incidentally, either private or corporate, are much less than those imposed on taxpayers in the United States. Perhaps it was the fear of the possible imposition of French taxes comparable to those in the United States that made the French people reluctant to approve the Monnet plan. Or, perhaps they had guessed what the future might hold. Whatever their thoughts might have been, the United States taxpayer, through the intermediation of the European Recovery Program, came to the rescue. While our own seaway and power project was still bogged down in a debate over its high cost, a wealthy chivalrous United States offered the necessary finances to make a French seaway and power project a reality.

With the able assistance of American tax moneys, the Monnet plan really began in earnest. This is what is contemplated for the Rhone:

Between Arles, France, not too distant from the Mediterranean Sea, and Lake Geneva in Switzerland, a system of eight canals and locks will be constructed to provide for shipping from the Mediterranean Sea to Lake Geneva in the heart of the Alps. To illustrate what great ambitions can be accomplished outside the United States with liberal doses of American dollars, one of the locks, when completed, will be the greatest lock in the world, with a height of over 82 feet.

In addition to the canals and locks there will be constructed 22 dams and 46 power stations. Together these dams and power stations are expected to produce somewhere between 13,000,000,000 and 14,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

What will be the total cost of the Rhone River Valley project? Your guess is as good as any Frenchman's. In fact, no Frenchman to date has had the courage to hazard even a calculated guess. No one knows. There are, however, some estimates as to the cost of only 3 of 46 sites for development. These three are now under construction or completed. The previously mentioned Genissiat portion is expected to cost $314,200,000. The Donzere-Mondragon section will be completed at a cost of $228,500,000, while the third project known as Montelimar will cost but a petty $142,800,000. The total comes to some $685,500,000. In 1950, 90 percent of the funds expended on the Rhone River Valley development were supplied by the Marshall plan. It is obvious that the total cost of the entire program will run well over $1,000,000,000.

To obtain a clearer idea of the enormity of the Rhone River seaway power program, only the Genissiat portion, now completed, required the excavation of over 850,000 cubic yards of rock, gravel, and earth; and consumed over 780,000 cubic yards of cement. The dam has a height of over 340 feet and at the top it is 30 feet thick. It has a width of slightly more than 328 feet. The dam forms a lake some 15 miles long containing 12,992,000,000 gallons of water.

Now let us make a few simple comparisons between what we can easily undertake in France but cannot afford in the United States.

The French project will open 354 miles of navigable waters linking Switzerland and a small portion of France with the Mediterranean Sea. Little heavy industry is located in the area so opened to navigation. The shipping on the Rhone will be carried in barges and river boats such as are utilized on the Erie Canal and other inland waterways in this country. Our St. Lawrence seaway would open 2,400 miles of navigable waters linking with the Atlantic Ocean the midcontinent regions of the United States and Canada, in which is concentrated the greatest industrial-agricultural area in the world. Instead of barges and river boats, nearly all of the world's ocean-going vessels would be able to traverse with a pay load the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence waters to the Atlantic Ocean and then to all the ports of the world.

The French project will require a system of eight canals and locks, including what will be the largest lock in the world. The St. Lawrence seaway needs only five systems of locks and canals of the rather ordinary type. None of the St. Lawrence locks or canals will shatter any world records.

The Rhone system, when completely developed with 22 dams and 46 power-producing plants, is expected to produce between thirteen and fourteen billion kilowatt-hours. The St. Lawrence with its two dams and one power station will produce 12,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours, just a trifle less than its sister in France.

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project would cost the United States a total of $566,800,000 to complete. Of this sum, $192,500,000 will be paid by the State of New York for the rights to the power development. This leaves only $374,300,000 to be absorbed by the American taxpayer. However, even this sum would be ultimately returned as a result of the tolls charged on vessels plying the waterway. Thus, in the final analysis, the St. Lawrence seaway would not cost the United States taxpayer a single penny. In fact, a profit might well be realized on the investment.

The French Rhone River Valley project will cost the United States unknown billions. None of this money will ever be returned to the American taxpayer. It is an outright gift of ECA funds from the United States to France.

There are also some additional interesting comparisons. Both projects are troubled by rocks. In the case of the St. Lawrence, there are some 46 miles of rocks underlying and protruding from the St. Lawrence River in the 183-mile stretch between Lake Ontario and Montreal, Canada. It is around these portions of the river that the system of five locks will be constructed and two dams to raise the water level of the river itself.

In the case of the French Rhone River valley waterway and power project, the rocks with which they are concerned are commonly known as the Alps Mountains. A few pebbles can stop us at home, but not even the Alps can stop us in France.

As was previously mentioned, the Rhone River is not the only site of a navigation and power project in which this Nation is offering financial assistance. The Rhine River between Basle and Strasbourg is the area in which a second project is under way. While not as vast in scope as the Rhone, plans for the Rhine are a sizable undertaking.

Seven power plants are to be constructed and a tremendous canal has already been nearly completed. The seven power plants are expected to produce about 6,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power and the canal has a length of some 9 miles, including several locks.

The magnitude of the Rhine project is indicated by the plans for excavating over 24,000,000 cubic yards of earth. Before the canal has been completed it is expected that some 871,000 cubic yards of concrete will be poured.

How many millions of tons of American steel have been diverted to France for use in the project, thereby causing material cutbacks in this country which have helped bring about mass unemployment in many manufacturing areas, is something no one ever will be able to find out.

While there are no figures available as to the cost of the Rhine program it certainly will run into the hundreds of millions of dollars. It may, in fact, cost as much if not more than our own initial investment in the St. Lawrence. Again, as in the case of the Rhone, our investment in the Rhine will be a gift.

In criticizing these two vast European programs, we have not meant to be unjustly critical of the projects themselves. It is possible that ultimately, power from the Rhone and the Rhine may aid France both economically and militarily, thereby making that nation a more potent ally of the Western World.

What we do want to argue is this:

If we continue to squander our resources on overseas projects, continue to neglect equally important, if not more important ventures in this Nation, all democracy will ultimately pay the price of our neglect and lack of foresight.

The St. Lawrence seaway and power project is vital to the United States and Canada both from the standpoint of economical development and for military strength. It is time our Congress and administration leaders realized that the economic well being and military strength of this hemisphere is equally as important to the forces of democracy as strength in Europe.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I wish to commend the gentleman from Michigan for his very informative address and for the logic of the arguments which he has presented. As the gentleman from Michigan very well knows, the St. Lawrence seaway project is now before the Public Works Committee of the House; it has been there for a very long time, and many of us for an equally long time have been trying to get it out of the committee.

It was admitted in testimony before the committee by Mr. Prince, a representative of the railroads, that more than 82 percent of the funds used to combat the St. Lawrence seaway have been put up by railroad interests. But the fact of the matter is that every canal that has ever been built has in the long run benefited the railroads. That was true in the case of the Panama Canal and has been true in the case of every other canal built in this country.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I cannot agree with the opponents of this project. It would be of such major benefit not only to the great interior, the great midwestern part of the country but to the country as a whole, that indirectly it will benefit even those who are opposing it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to commend the gentleman also for his effort in regard to this project and I should like to make one further statement. So far as I have been able to determine, never in the history of the world did a government which once held control of an important waterway ever relinquish that control to another nation; yet, that is exactly what faces the United States if we permit Canada to go ahead and do this work alone and we just stand idly by and look at it. If we do, we are going to pay for the entire waterway in tolls and, what is more, Canada will probably borrow the money from Americans to build the seaway. I understand its effort in that direction is now under way. I want to commend the gentleman for his effort.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] for his contribution. I am fully aware of the long and hard fight he has made for this project and his familiarity with it.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to compliment my colleague from Michigan because he certainly has brought this matter forcibly to the attention of the House today. It is a matter, of course, in which he knows we are all vitally interested, and it is well that he include the articles to which he referred.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TELEVISING COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, during the course of the past 10 days a violent controversy has raged throughout the country as the result of instructions issued by the Speaker, which in effect placed a ban on television broadcasts of the sessions of the committees of the House of Representatives. One great center of debate developed in Detroit, Mich., last week, when, on the eve of hearings into the nature and extent of Communist infiltration into industry and labor, the committee members were informed by the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD], that, acting upon instructions he had received previous to his departure from Washington, no television was to be authorized. The ban was also understood to extend to moving-picture coverage and direct radio broadcasts of House committee hearings.

It is not with the intention of urging specific action on any one of several resolutions that have been introduced into the House that I have asked for time today. It is rather in the hope that the pros and cons of the television debate may be brought into clearer focus for the millions of Americans who have a constitutional stake in the proceedings of this House and of its committees. Thousands of citizens have already protested the television black-out, Mr. Speaker, and it is reasonable to assume that other thousands will lend their voices to swell the chorus of protest before the month is out.

In the instance of the Detroit hearings, I think that several facts should be made crystal clear. Charges have been rampant in Michigan that the ban was imposed out of partisan considerations. It is alleged in many quarters that the rule against television broadcasts of the Detroit hearings was imposed because of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities, might become a candidate for the United States Senate from Michigan, and in

light of this rumor certain powerful individuals did not want him to have an opportunity to appear day after day before the cameras in Detroit. I do not imply that any such consideration influenced our distinguished and able Speaker in his action banning television of the hearings, but simply to report that such a public response to the banning of TV did evidence itself in the press and on the radio in Michigan.

I have a high regard for my distinguished colleague [Mr. POTTER] and I feel that I should emphatically repudiate any suggestion that the gentleman from Michigan was seeking any end but the discharge of his clear and patent duty as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the Detroit hearings. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Michigan suggested to the other members of the committee that in light of the controversy which has sprung up as a result of the television ban, he was prepared to return to Washington forthwith if such action on his part would insure that the people of Detroit and Michigan might view the proceedings of the committee on television. As the senior minority member present at the hearings, I asked him to remain for the important job at hand, that of attempting to ferret out the extent of the Communist conspiracy in the great industrial area of Michigan. He not only remained, but performed splendid public service during the course of the hearings.

There is much to be said on both sides of the television controversy, and my desire is to be as fair and objective in assessing the claims and counterclaims of advocates and opponents of the televising of House committee sessions as my personal feelings on the subject will permit. It has been said that to permit television within the hearing rooms of the several committees is to create a Roman holiday atmosphere.

It has been charged that the constitutional rights of witnesses may be infringed by requiring their appearance in front of television and moving-picture cameras during the course of committee hearings.

It has been stated that the rules of the House, failing to extend positive and specific authorization for the great new medium of public information, television, serves to ban it from the deliberative sessions of the committees of the House.

To the support of these various propositions, the opponents of television broadcasts bring the added weight of legal opinion as indicated by recent action of the American Bar Association, which group, by resolution, has condemned the practice.

Perhaps in summing up contrary opinion I have failed to mention all of the objections which have been voiced. However, I believe that the principal ones have been covered in the foregoing.

On the pro side of the controversial ledger, there is also weighty evidence which should be considered by the membership of the House in attempting to resolve a problem which is far from being settled at this moment. To the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the issue will be labored by the public from now on until the House membership is forced to take positive action in its own defense.

The most cogent argument in favor of congressional television is that the people of this country want it. It will not suffice to tell the citizens of this country who are today bearing the tremendous cost of Government, that they are not to sit in on the deliberative and investigative committees charged with the conduct of public business and the expenditure of public funds.

The widespread protest in Michigan is but a forerunner of things to come in this respect. In the case of the Michigan hearings, some millions of interested citizens were overnight denied an opportunity to watch a committee of the Congress in action, a committee whose Los Angeles hearings last September were applauded by press and public alike after a series of televised hearings.

The business of Congress is public business, except where the national welfare or the security of vital information requires executive hearings. On those occasions the doors are closed and none but committee members, witnesses, and staff are allowed within the room. No one questions the necessity for such secret sessions, but there is a serious question as to the propriety of admitting to any public session only those who are fortunate enough to find a seat in the hearing room. Hundreds of citizens milled through the hallways of the Federal Building in Detroit, seeking in vain to gain admission to a courtroom with a total capacity of 75. By the time the security and loyalty agencies had exercised a rightful priority on seats available in the room, a total of 25 seats were available to the general public.

If a witness' constitutional rights are violated by the use of television, which carries his face, his mannerisms, and his conduct to an audience of millions, it is the contention of many that his constitutional rights are equally violated when he is required to testify before an audience of 75. If the transmission of the voice of a witness over television channels prejudices his appearance, it would appear logically that the same is true when a tape recording of his testimony is made for later broadcast over radio networks.

The present procedures are neither fish nor fowl. Public testimony is public testimony. The admitted media of public information, plus the millions of words of testimony issued annually by the committees of the House in the form of published hearings, indicates the public nature of testimony beyond any question of a doubt. Acknowledging the fact that the public has a right to know what transpires in open hearings brings one to a series of logical questions, to wit:

(a) What constitutes the public?

(b) How many individuals comprise "the public"?

(c) What rights to hear and view public testimony extend to those citizens who are unable to run fast enough or shove someone else out of one of a limited number of seats available in a committee room?

(d) Is physical incapacity to reach a hearing room to deprive the aged, the infirm, the hospitalized, or the average man in the street and his wife in the living room of an opportunity to witness the committees of the Congress deliberating matters of tremendous importance to each of them?

The oft-repeated statement that Members of Congress will make fools of themselves in front of the television camera is as weak as it is untrue. Since time immemorial men in all walks of life have succeeded in making fools of themselves, and television is not going to speed or deter the process. I think that it is safe to say that the 435 Members of the House of Representatives will contribute no more than a minute share of fools to the final round-up. If a man is indeed injudicious, unwise, publicity-seeking or arrogant, television offers a splendid opportunity to advertise the fact, whether he be a Member of Congress or a flagpole sitter, and his constituents may be presumed to have enough sense to take care of the situation in their own way.

It is my opinion that the question of television or no television should be left to the discretion of the individual committees of the House. In the case of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] has used judgment and good taste as the guiding principle in connection with television. His regard for the constitutional privileges of witnesses has extended to the issuance of a prohibition on the televising of witnesses who protest the use of the cameras during the course of their testimony. The same injunction has been invoked against the taking of still pictures during the course of testimony when such a request has been made by the witness.

In the Los Angeles hearings, all television companies were required to pool their equipment and use the same picture output. No special lighting was permitted and no more than three cameras were allowed in the hearing room. Camera equipment was required to be maintained at a reasonable distance from the committee, counsel, and the witness and his attorney. The entire hearings were marked by the judicial manner and the fairness of Judge WOOD, and the television of the hearings was universally acclaimed throughout southern California as an excellent example of the new medium in public service use.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. MARTIN], stated on the floor several days ago, television is here to stay. To ban it in the instance of committee hearings which are of vital concern to the American people, is to discard an informative and valuable aid to public understanding of the vital issues and tremendous problems confronting our country. To ban television because no legal approval for its use is to be found in the rules of the House, is to cast a cloud over the continued use by Members of the telephone, the electric lights, and the elevators. We should still be communicating with the Senate by smoke signals or messenger had Alexander Graham Bell's great discovery needed the affirmative approval of the rules before telephones could be installed.

Perhaps the most important function of a House committee, after that of taking pertinent testimony on vital issues, is the dissemination of the information to the people we all have the honor to represent in the Congress of the United States. We are under a continuing obligation to insure that the information is speedily and factually transmitted to the citizens of this country. Already, concessions have been made to television here in the House, and several Members have narrowly escaped injury as loose items of radio and television equipment have dropped to the floor of the House from the galleries. It is important and right that the messages of the President and of distinguished visitors to the Congress should be televised in this Chamber, but it is not equally important that the deliberations of the several committees be accorded equal importance? Some committees of this House are in this time engaged in the formulation of legislation dealing with the appropriation and expenditure of a tremendous sum of public money. Other committees will continue to probe the nature and extent of Communist infiltration of labor, education, and of other important segments of our population. Still others are intent upon the disclosure of alleged corruption and graft in Government. Is it not the part of fairness to bring on-the-spot reports of the committee activities to the American people?

Partisan politics should certainly play no role in the decisions which must be made by this House. Public information is of transcendent importance and should not be clouded by considerations which have to do with fear of political disclosures, whether that concern is voiced by majority or minority. If there are grounds for the charges of corruption in Government, every Member of this body should exert every effort to prove the truth or falsity of those allegations. To resist a thorough airing of the charges will only serve to convince the American people that there are agencies in Government which cannot stand the light of day.

Before what greater forum of the public can these allegations be explored than that of television, which brings not only words but deeds to the personal attention of a vast and unseen audience.

Nor is the use of the television medium or the advocacy of that facility in any way inimical to the full coverage of committee hearings by other proven media of information. Those who witness tragedy are among the first to compare their own reactions with those of press and radio observers. In my opinion, television is complementary to, and not in competition with, the other agencies whose job it is to collect news and pass it on to the reading and listening audience.

The House of Representatives can ban TV and deny to America the right of viewing the proceedings of the committees of that body, but it will be much more difficult to justify the ban in light of continuing progress and greater public interest in the field of public information.

It will have been noted, Mr. Speaker, that I have distinguished between television of committee activities and television of the proceedings in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The situation in the House presents an entirely different problem, and one which poses difficulties not encountered in the several committees. With the necessity for frequent calls of the House, with a complex and sometimes extremely dull routine, the advantages of television on the floor are minimized. I cannot agree with some of the Members who endorse all-out television of the activities of the Congress. It seems to me quite proper that television should not, except on occasions of State, be permitted within the Chamber.

The committees of this body are under the direction and nominal control of able men. A majority of them are attorneys, familiar with the Constitution and judicial conduct. The same condition may be said to exist generally so far as the membership of the several committees are concerned. To allege that these members might go outside the Constitution in the conduct of televised hearings is to unjustly stigmatize their motives and general conduct. I have confidence in the honesty and integrity of the Members of the House of Representatives. I feel that they are men and women of unusual ability and common sense. Their presence here in the Nation's Capital indicates that this opinion is shared in every instance by those whom they have the honor to represent in greatest legislative forum in the world.

What is required to meet the present situation with respect to television is confidence in the American people and in their collective ability to distinguish right from wrong, justice from injustice, and equity from inequity. I believe that Americans can make those distinctions and that they will themselves deal adequately and promptly with those who violate those concepts of American justice and of constitutional rights.

One of the principal and most difficult tasks confronting the House Committee on Un-American Activities is the disclosure of the Communist conspiracy and of those who are the tools of the world-wide aggression which has gobbled up half a world in its undeterred march to political, economic, and military domination of the earth. Lack of information on the conspiracy has rendered extremely difficult the work of those who are charged by the Congress with investigations and disclosure of the Communists and their objectives. Given the facts regarding communism, its goals, its methods, its tactical deployment and its sinister nature, and the American public will meet the challenge head-on. Failure to bring the story to the people in every way possible and on every occasion will serve the ends of apathy and inertia.

The Los Angeles hearings last September, which were televised for an audience of several million citizens in southern California, produced startling results. The first response to the broadcasts was one of sheer incredulity; the second, indignation; the third, a burning anger and a full realization of what communism is, and the lengths to which Communists will go to achieve their goals. For the first time, millions of Americans saw a Communist; saw the depth of fanatic devotion to Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin; saw with their own eyes the absolute dedication of Communists to the principle of world revolution and of violent action against the Government of the United States. If the back of communism has been cracked in southern California, and I distinguish between "cracked" and "broken", it is due largely to the tremendous impact of television during the Los Angeles hearings, hearings which were directed with decorum and dignity by a great and fine American, Judge WOOD, chairman of the committee.

We are under continuing attack today by those who would destroy constitutional government throughout the world. In their attack they utilize every known device available to their hands, whether the weapon be constitutional or illegal.

It is within our power to bring to the battle a weapon in defense of human freedom. To ignore it or ban it is to do a service to those who travel in darkness, and whose greatest fear is that of public disclosure.

Fortunately for the work of the Un-American Activities Committee in the Detroit hearings, press and radio coverage was unusually good, and the essential elements of the story were brought to the public attention. Yet, I am forced to question whether many thousands of citizens in Wayne County and throughout Michigan generally know to this day that the committee held week-long hearings in their midst, and succeeded in uncovering the existence of almost 100 clubs and branches of the Communist Party in the American arsenal of democracy.

It is to be hoped fervently that the House will permit the utilization of television in the work of its committees within the very near future, to the end that all of America may be enlisted in the struggle against human slavery and made aware of the other complex work of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentlemen has made a very splendid statement and I hope it will be carried far and wide.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I wish to commend the gentleman from California on this very timely and very able discussion on the rules of the House of Representatives, particularly in view of the fact that he just returned from Detroit where this problem is exceedingly acute.

Last week I inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Detroit News urging that the public be admitted to the public business. I have received a great number of communications from irate citizens in the State of Michigan who feel that they have been excluded from a place they had a right to be.

I was particularly interested in the gentleman's comment, with which I completely agree, that, contrary to the general impression that some sections of the press seek to convey, Members of Congress are responsible persons with reliable judgment and can be trusted to use discretion in the matter of the publicity concerning the hearings conducted by them. I think the Members of Congress have been doing altogether too little to defend themselves against unjust attacks charging that they are irresponsible persons.

I believe the gentleman is absolutely correct when he says that the committees should determine and control the media of communications which cover their proceedings. As the gentleman may know, I have a resolution pending before the Rules Committee, House Resolution 540, on which I hope action will be taken, which will clarify that matter. I hope the rules of the House will be changed to permit television coverage of hearings.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. We are, of course, in full accord on the subject.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has made a very fair, accurate, and complete statement about the situation. When were the committee hearings held in Detroit?

Mr. JACKSON of California. All of last week, and the committee goes to Detroit for further hearings beginning on next Monday.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This question of Communists in labor unions is a rather old one. I hand the gentleman a photograph which was an exhibit in the court of Judge Tuttle, Federal judge for the eastern district of Michigan. That photograph was used there as an exhibit. It shows a man being beaten by a group of strikers. The facts in connection with that incident are well known.

On April 3, 1941, at the Ford River Rouge plant in Dearborn, Wayne County, Mich., as he attempted to enter gate 4 on Miller Road, to aid in making out the payroll for strikers, Melvin Bartling, timekeeper, timekeeper, mind you, making up the payroll for the strikers, was beaten until he was unconscious by the four men shown in the picture. About 15 members of the Michigan State police, who are not shown in the picture, stood within 50 feet of him, but gave no assistance—this despite the fact that section 17 of the Act 176 of the Public Acts of the State of Michigan for the year 1939 makes it a criminal offense for anyone to interfere with any employee on his way to work.

These men are identified. The men who are shown beating Bartling are: No. 1, the man with the club, Roy Snowden; No. 2, the man to the left of Bartling is Eugene Torrence; the man to the right rear, swinging his right, and the man in front, are the Ferraza brothers, numbered 3 and 4. None of these men was an employee of the Ford Motor Co. All were members of Briggs local, UAW-CIO. Snowden and Torrence are members of the Communist Party.

That is what the gentleman's committee is investigating now, is it not?

Mr. JACKSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman find that in those unions there are still men who have Communist connections?

Mr. JACKSON of California. The committee found that there is scarcely a plant or industry within the entire area of Detroit that has not had one or more Communist branches in operation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I hope the committee will continue its hearings. I am sure the good union men in Detroit will welcome the help that committee is giving them.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I should say that two members who were identified as members of the Communist Party reported back to work and were escorted off the premises by their fellow workers, which I think is a very healthy indication of what will happen when the facts become known. That is the big we have to do.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing to the House a very forthright and clear statement as to what happened in Detroit. I am particularly interested because it so happens that I have the honor to represent a part of the city of Detroit in this body. I want to say that from the report that the gentleman has made to the House it will become necessary for the House of Representatives to take some action either clarifying the atmosphere as to whether television should be permitted or should not be permitted. In view of the fact I have received some 1,500 protests as to what happened in Detroit, many from my own district, all were in favor of wanting television. Everybody wanted to see what is going on. So I say to the gentleman he has rendered a public service by giving us information as to what happened which I think is valuable to the entire membership of the House of Representatives.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 25 minutes.

FOREIGN POLICY AND WAR

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, three paramount issues now are before the American people in this presidential election year. It is hard to say which is most important. Hard because upon each and all of them depends the fate of our country and the world in the perilous days to come.

Broadly stated, these issues involve, first, foreign policy and the Korean war; second, Government spending and inflation; and third, Communist infiltration and official corruption in the conduct of Government affairs.

In my own mind, the issue of foreign policy and war is at the head of the list. Nearly all of our other difficulties, as a Nation and as individuals, stem from the tragic mistakes already made in this field.

Had Roosevelt refrained from recognizing the Soviet Government in 1933, thus bolstering the faltering Communist regime;

Had there been no Yalta agreement, giving Manchuria and hence all China to the Kremlin;

Had there been no mysterious order, calling General Patton's victorious army 100 miles back from the Balkans; and

Had there been no Potsdam agreement, putting West Berlin at the mercy of the Communists, then Americans would not be facing their present troubles at home and abroad.

Why else are we spending approximately $131,000,000,000 this year and next to rearm ourselves and our allies?

Why else are we dissipating our substance to help European nations which display an inadequate willingness to help themselves?

Why else are we paying taxes beyond all reason?

Why else does inflation threaten our national and individual solvency?

Why else have more than 105,000 American boys been killed or wounded in Korea?

We all know that this country must accept its responsibility of world leadership. But let us do it on some basis of sound common sense, of fiscal acumen, and of political wisdom. Above all, as the British do, let us put our own country first. Let us stop setting Uncle Sam up before all the world in the role of "Uncle Sap."

We cannot lead unless first we win the respect as well as the liking of all the free world.

The Korean war is an unnecessary war. But unnecessary only in the sense that it could have been avoided. Who can deny now that it is a direct result of the Yalta betrayal of our Chinese Nationalist allies? That and a combination of senseless error and even worse with respect to our policy in China.

How can the President and the Secretary of State now justify their statements, made early in 1950 and only a few weeks before the outbreak of hostilities, that the United States would not defend either South Korea or Formosa?

The public disclaimer of interest in Korea and Formosa was in effect a direct invitation for Communist invasion.

If the administration had armed and trained the South Koreans, as Congress intended, or if the administration even had warned that we would return to Korea in the event of aggression, would there now be a war in that unfortunate country?

Would we now have a casualty list of more than 105,000 boys from American farms, and towns, and cities?

On whose heads is the blood of these boys? On the heads of the American people, who want only peace in the world? On the collective head of the

Congress, which was not consulted? Or on the heads of those tragically mistaken men whose selfishness and weakness brought this war into being?

Is not the blood of these American boys on the heads of those who now tell us there is peace in the offing, when there is no peace and no visible prospect of peace?

Men who tell us that now the country is prosperous, that Americans never had it so good, when that prosperity, like the flush on the cheeks of a man fatally ill with a fever, is the warning signal only of economic and political ills which might easily end in an early destruction of the Republic.

If we are prosperous today, it is a prosperity bought and paid for with progressive reduction of our wealth and our national resources, and with the lives of thousands of our young men.

Do the American people want that kind of prosperity, begotten of blood and destruction of all the things we hold dear?

In view of these things, I believe that everyone now agrees with Gen. Douglas MacArthur's war-policy recommendations. They were just about 100 percent correct at the time they were made. The gradual and unwilling turns of the administration toward his policies offer proof of the fact.

In spite of their politically expedient testimony at the congressional hearings on MacArthur's dismissal, now it is revealed that all along the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as military experts, recognized the validity of MacArthur's contentions.

Recently Gen. Albert Wedemeyer, who qualifies as a top expert on the Far East, told the American people that MacArthur would have won the Korean war long ago, if his plans had been followed.

MacArthur wanted to bomb Communist arms depots, railways, and troop-concentration points beyond the Yalu River, in Manchuria. He wanted to do it while we still controlled the air over Korea.

MacArthur wanted to blockade the coast of China; a thing easily accomplished by American sea power.

MacArthur wanted to rearm Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalists on Formosa and help them gain a foothold on the Chinese mainland.

MacArthur wanted to send food and arms to the Nationalist guerrillas, more than 2,000,000 strong, in South and Central China.

MacArthur wanted to fight the Korean war to win. Presumably he would have won it. But we know what happened.

MacArthur was forbidden to bomb the Communist Manchurian bases. Little has been done to rearm Chiang's troops, and nothing for the Nationalist guerrillas.

The true status of the whole unsavory mess is revealed by a statement, issued a few days ago by an American Army officer, who was sent to advise Chiang Kai-shek during the civil war between Chinese Nationalists and Chinese Communists.

This officer said his orders were to give Chiang strategical advice, but in such a way as to give no aid against the Communists. He said his orders were to withhold tactical information and advice altogether.

Furthermore, he declared his orders were to refrain from showing the Chinese Nationalists how to operate the few tanks and field guns supplied by the United States.

When asked where these orders originated, he said they came from the Pentagon, but he had reason to believe they originated in the State Department.

The man who made these statements is a man of honor and of unquestioned veracity. Nobody has attempted to challenge the truth of all he said.

Who was it, then, that wanted the Communists to defeat our Nationalist friends? Who wanted to turn China over to the Kremlin?

Was it not the same people in the administration who withheld almost all of the aid to Chiang Kai-shek ordered by the Congress of the United States?

They sent mostly mismatched, rusty, and useless arms and equipment. Then they told the American people about the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of material sent to Chiang.

They claimed that Chiang and his men abandoned this material to the Communists. It was worthless. No man can fight with a gun that is rusty or lacks proper ammunition.

Now the American forces in Korea mark time, while seemingly endless and futile truce negotiations are carried on at Panmunjom. Meanwhile the Communists build up tremendous supplies and troop concentrations north of the Yalu, and even in North Korea.

What is the meaning of all this? What is the Kremlin up to? We know that Stalin dictates the actions of Mao Tse-tung and his Chinese Communists.

Here is the picture I have reason to believe is in the minds of many, if not all, of our best military experts.

To consolidate her hold on East Asia's teeming millions, Soviet Russia must have Japan's huge industrial plant. Japan was and still is one of the most heavily industrialized nations on earth. That plant, to replace the plants dismantled in Manchuria, is what Russia really wants.

South Korea, in Russian hands, would be a sword aimed at the heart of Japan. A few miles to the north of Japan, Russia maintains one of the world's greatest military installations on Sakhalin Island. Formosa and Sakhalin could form two pincerlike knives to be closed in on Japan.

Russia already has indicated a willingness to make a deal whereby the Kremlin would promise to end all satellite wars around the world if Formosa is turned over to the Red Chinese Government. That is why Soviet Russia seeks a high level diplomatic discussion of the far-eastern situation.

But with Formosa once in Communist hands, how long would a truce in Korea be honored? We know the Kremlin keeps none of its promises. The next step would be a reinforced attack in Korea, and invasion of Japan from Sakhalin and Formosa.

With all Asia at stake, Russia would not hesitate. Why should we expect anything else? Only a few days ago the Peiping radio told the world of Mao Tse-tung's intention eventually to invade and, as the Communists say, "liberate" Formosa.

A third world war as the result of all this? From the Russian viewpoint, that would be something for the nations of the west to determine. Probably our weakness in the Korean truce negotiations has persuaded the Kremlin that public opinion in the west would not support another war of such proportions.

Not long ago the American Joint Chiefs of Staff indicated in the public press a belief that a blockade of the Asiatic coast, from Port Arthur in Manchuria to Singapore in Malaya, and bombing of the Manchurian and trans-Siberian railways, would effectively cut Red China off from all important sources of arms supplies.

Then Chinese communism would die, so to speak, on the vine. Chiang Kai-shek's forces and the Nationalist guerrilla forces on the mainland could take over. Because of these things, Japan now proposes to recognize Chiang Kai-shek's government on Formosa as the rightful government of all China.

It is quite possible that the statement by the Joint Chiefs of Staff constituted the shadow of things to come. If so, it is the same shadow long since cast by General MacArthur's earlier proposals for fighting the Korean war to win, and possibly thus to start the downfall of that strangle hold over numerous disaffected peoples, which men call the Soviet Empire.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I should like to ask the gentleman a question because, unfortunately, I did not have the time to ask the preceding speaker this question. I ask this in view of certain inference that were made by some relative to the question of televising the hearings in Detroit. The inference has been made that the Speaker never invoked that rule prior to the Detroit situation. The gentleman will concur with me when I say that the fact is that several days before the Speaker invoked the same rule with regard to the Katyn Committee, of which the gentleman and I are members, at which time the Speaker had no knowledge of the existence or pendency of the proceedings in Detroit.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. I know that members of our committee appealed to the Speaker as to whether or not we would be permitted to hold hearings and allow the televising of witnesses before our committee.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I want to clear the RECORD. I understood the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MACHROWICZ] to ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr.

DONDERO] if he knew whether or not the Speaker had received any communications with regard to televising the Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Detroit prior to the time that the Katyn Massacre Committee had its conference with the Speaker.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not recall that that was discussed.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman does not know one way or the other whether the Speaker had any such communication?

Mr. RAYBURN. I can clear that up. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WOOD] 5 days before the hearings were to be opened at Detroit announced that the hearings would not be televised.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the RECORD should also show that the Speaker's ruling was made in response to a parliamentary inquiry and that the Speaker made his ruling as to what the present rules of the House prescribed, according to his interpretation, is that correct?

Mr. DONDERO. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The question of whether or not there should be television is a matter for separate and distinct ruling because that is a matter which would have to be taken up by the proper committee and if anything is reported in the way of a change of the rules, by the House itself.

Mr. DONDERO. I have already stated that is a question the House will have to determine one way or the other.

Mr. McCORMACK. Any impression going around that the Speaker put censorship on from a personal standpoint is completely inconsistent with the truth. His ruling simply had to do with the interpretation of the rules.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the way I understood the ruling by the Speaker to be.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, insomuch as my colleague the gentleman from Michigan talked today concerning the St. Lawrence seaway, I wanted to bring forcibly to the attention of the Members of this body the great contribution that the automobile business has made to America and to the world.

Mr. Speaker, the automotive business is accountable for the good roads: it is accountable for American highways: it is accountable for the signal system; it is accountable for real-estate values in this country, and in every section of it; it is accountable for certain types of new buildings, the private garage and the public garage. It has been the greatest contributor to education, because there is hardly anything that compares to travel. But, over and above that, it has been a tremendous help in recreation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think it can fairly be said, and honestly be said, and should be said, in view of the gentleman's remarks, that the automotive industry was probably the leader in connection with our present economic system of mass production, which has been such a tremendous success.

Mr. RABAUT. That is correct. The genius of the industry's leadership and the know-how of its workers are recognized the world over. It is estimated that one in every seven employed persons in the United States draws his livelihood from the automobile industry or a related activity.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want to commend the gentleman for making that statement. I would like to add one other accountable item, and that is the privilege of a great many people to live in the open air country and still be able to get to their work.

Mr. RABAUT. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say further that we could not live in the very places where our homes are located today without the automobile. The automobile is the greatest purchaser of materials in this country; it is the greatest purchaser of steel; it is the greatest purchaser of rubber; and it is the greatest purchaser of glass. It goes through a whole array of fabrics and materials, even down to the wax from the honey bee. The Secretary of Commerce at one time talked to me and said, "If we could find another product that would so take the imagination of the American people and then walk in and affirm its necessity, we would not have a thing to worry about in this country for 100 years."

The automobile industry is located in the Great Lakes area. The automobile iron ore has come from the Mesabi Range, but the Mesabi Range is being depleted of its splendid quality of ore. We are looking for new fields of iron ore for the automobile, and we have found it on the inland areas in Labrador.

If you bring us the excuse regarding the St. Lawrence seaway that these waters will be frozen over certain times of the year, we are honest and fair with you, we admit it, but so are the locks at Sault Ste. Marie, and through these locks we have successfully and for years amply supplied the needs of industries in the market.

Mr. Speaker, there are many cities of some size in the United States today that are serviced only by motortruck. I wonder what the railroad people would have done if they had ever looked ahead and seen the possibility of the automobile truck. The first one going down the line would have been lassoed off the highway.

Now, there were seven boats operating between Venezuela and the coast of the United States carrying ore during World War II, perfect targets for the submarines. When five of them were sent to Davey Jones' locker they took the other two off the route. We want to be strong when we are in trouble, and if war is not trouble no one knows what trouble is. So we are pleading for some place on inland waters to get this ore, a place shielded in time of war so that the boats can carry the traffic.

We are not jealous of anybody who wishes to establish steel mills any place in the United States, the east coast, down South, out West, or up any rivers that are traversible, but do not penalize the very industry that is first and foremost in America and say, "We have to uproot you now, after you have helped us in every community of the United States." If for no other reason, do it for that industry which helped to make you, the automotive industry located on the Great Lakes of this country.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I commend my colleague from Michigan on his very excellent statement on the authomobile and also on the St. Lawrence seaway. We have several bills before our Committee on Public Works looking toward the the amount of money that will be allocated to the building of roads in this country for the next 2 years. One bill is even less than we appropriated 4 years ago, in spite of the fact that we are now collecting from the people of the United States a fund of $2,000,000,000 annually out of the gas and oil tax, and in spite of the further fact that the number of cars on the roads has increased from some 40,000,000 to 52,217,000, or one automobile for every three people in the country.

May I commend this one step further in regard to the seaway, and say that anyone who says that the ore of this country is not being depleted should be asked this one question: "Why is it that every steel company in this country is searching this earth for new deposits of ore?"

Mr. RABAUT. I was very glad the gentleman from Michigan made known the tremendous revenue the automobile business pays to the States and the subdivisions of Government. It is so far reaching. I took a trip recently down the Mississippi River, and saw those oil barges coming up from the great Texas oil fields and realized what we have done. Just imagine; compare the oil industry of today with the oat business that fed old Dobbin years ago.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 8 minutes.

THE MEANING OF U. N. ACTION IN KOREA

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the forthcoming political campaign is apt, unfortunately, to produce some very heated discussion about our action in Korea. Before this occurs the Nation

should assess, calmly and coolly, the meaning and results of what we have done in that far and unhappy land.

I believe most Americans—including those still fighting so bravely under General Ridgway—understand that we went into Korea as we did in order to prevent world war III. I believe most Americans appreciate the great things our fighting men have already won for us there. I think most of us know the value to world peace of this first great and successful effort in collective security.

Let us examine the matter more closely:

WE ARE FIGHTING IN KOREA TO PREVENT WORLD WAR III

A reporter in Wichita asked Capt. James Jabara, the Air Force ace on leave from Korean combat, why we are fighting in Korea.

"So that we won't have to fight in Wichita," said Jabara. And that is the truth.

If this ever is to be a decent world, we, with the U. N., had to halt the brutal Communist aggression, June 25, 1950, against the Republic of Korea. For American safety alone we had to douse in Korea a live fuse leading to world war III.

Who among us can forget Pearl Harbor? The Japanese lit the fuse that led to Pearl Harbor when they invaded Manchuria in 1931. No one cut that fuse. No one cut the spluttering fuses Hitler laid. The big blast came.

But thanks to President Truman's quick, courageous leadership—thanks, above all, to men like Captain Jabara—the Korean fuse is being put out. And our homes are thereby safer from Soviet atom bombs.

KOREA TAUGHT THE REDS A STIFF LESSON AND GAVE US TIME TO ARM

Our response in Korea gave the Reds a stiff lesson. The Communists know now finally—by blood, not words—that we will not let them knock over our side one by one. So the Chinese Reds have already lessened their pressure on southeast Asia. And the Kremlin, too, has had to change its strategy.

U. N. action in Korea, by throwing the Red juggernaut out of gear, gave us and our allies time to rearm. We have used that time well—in Europe, in Asia, and here at home. We have also now in Korea a fighting coalition of free nations that is of incalculable value to American security.

WE HAVE ALREADY WON A LOT IN KOREA

We have stopped the Reds in Korea. When the Chinese rushed in, that grim November of 1950, they thought they would push us into the sea. But General Ridgway rallied our men, who then rolled the aggressors back into North Korea, behind where they had first started the war.

So no matter how the truce talks end, we have already won in Korea one of the prime things we have been fighting for. We have taught the Reds that aggression's price comes dreadfully high.

We have not a complete victory, of course. And our action in Korea has succeeded just because it is limited. You do not fight world war III in order to prevent world war III.

The Reds know they have been losing, whatever they may say for morale's sake. The fate of the North Koreans—territorial gains wiped out, army wrecked, cities in a shambles—serves already as a fearful example to any other Communist satellites tempted to aggress.

And the Chinese Reds as well have taken great punishment. Obviously, China has plenty of manpower. But their trained and equipped manpower is sharply limited. The best of the Red Chinese troops were sent to Korea, where 838,000 have become casualties. This is in addition to 740,000 North Korean casualties.

ACTION, NOT WORDS, TOWARD WORLD RULE OF PEACE

The majority of the U. N. saw the basic issue in Korea as we did: That peace for all means peace for each.

With dramatic and unprecedented speed the U. N. acted on the day after the North Koreans' aggression first occurred. Within a fortnight the U. N. had not only called on the aggressors to stop but had set up a unified command to make them stop. Despite heavy defense commitments elsewhere, and limited resources, 17 members sent combat units to Korea. Forty-three sent material aid.

So the U. N., thanks to American leadership, became the first world organization ever to face successfully such a crisis. It has thus lifted the hopes of us all for that day when the world will be ruled by enforceable laws for peace. It has especially revived despairing spirits in Asian lands, faced by the tremendous and threatening bulk of Red China.

Joint action in Korea has emphasized, too, that this is a new kind of war. This war is just as bloody, just as savage, just as inhuman as the other wars we have seen. But most wars carry in them the seeds of future conflicts. Korea carries in it the seeds of peace. We must continue our efforts, in Korea and throughout the world, to make sure those seeds bear fruit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CLEVENGER and to include an address by Ralph W. McDonald, president of Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio.

Mr. HOPE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware (at the request of Mr. NICHOLSON) and to include a magazine article and a copy of a bill.

Mr. MCGREGOR and to include news releases.

Mr. VELDE and to include an article by Glen McClain, of Boston, Mass.

Mr. PATTERSON and to include a resolution from the Waterbury Lithuanian-American Council.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL in four instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD and to include a statement.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. ROOSEVELT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENKINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON of California and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS and to include an article.

Mr. RADWAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGUIRE (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKEWELL (at the request of Mr. GOODWIN) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG and to include a speech by the Honorable John Foster Dulles.

Mr. MCCULLOCH and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BROOKS (at the request of Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana), for a period from March 3 to March 10, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 10, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1229. A letter from the Manager, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, United States Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's 1951 Report which summarizes their 1951 experience and the progress under the new program started in 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1230. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 1 of title 18 of the United States Code"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1231. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend certain acts and parts of acts which require the submission of document to the Post Office Department under oath, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 539. Resolution amending House Resolution 390, which provides for an investigation and study of the Katyn Forest massacre; without amendment (Rept. No. 1488). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 553. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 3098, a bill to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to amount in controversy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1489). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 554. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5678, a bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1490). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MITCHELL: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 555. Resolution for consideration of S. 2077, an act to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. 1491). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1492). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1368. An act to amend subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended by section 2 of the act of December 20, 1944 (D. C. Code, sec. 15–403 (a)), and to amend section 467 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 16–323); with amendment (Rept. No. 1494). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2667. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; with amendment (Rept. No. 1495). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 359. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Wolf Creek Dam in the State of Kentucky as Lake Cumberland; without amendment (Rept. No. 1496). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 1498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. House Joint Resolution 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953; without amendment (Rept. No. 1499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 1758. A bill to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1500). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3906. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to restrict the sale on credit of beverages, except beer and light wines, not consumed on the premises where sold; without amendment (Rept. No. 1501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6805. A bill to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6917. A bill relating to short-cycle vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 6918. A bill relating to short-cycle vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 6919. A bill relating to short-cycle vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 6920. A bill to provide for assistance to State agencies administering labor laws in their efforts to promote, establish, and maintain safe work places and practices in industry, thereby reducing human suffering and financial loss and increasing production through safeguarding available manpower; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 6921. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6922. A bill to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 6923. A bill to revise the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KEE:

H. R. 6924. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full retirement annuities for employees who retire after 30 years of service (regardless of age) or at age 60, to reduce the age requirement for an annuity for a spouse or a surviving widow, widower or parent from age 65 to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6925. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6926. A bill to amend section 107 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide relief in a case where all or a portion of employee's gain upon the sale of stock in his corporate employer is deemed to be compensatory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 6927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 6928. A bill to authorize appropriations to assist the States and their political subdivisions in the salvage of railway and streetcar rails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 6929. A bill to amend section 203 of the Social Security Act to provide that the $50 work-clause shall not apply with respect to widows; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6930. A bill to provide that equipment for use in third- and fourth-class post offices shall be furnished by the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. J. Res. 399. Joint resolution to provide for an Agricultural Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution requesting the return of the enrollment of H. R. 3219 and the reenrollment thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 556. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 390, as amended; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 557. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 38; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 558. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature relative to the importation of rubber through the port of Boston; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts relative to the importation of rubber through the port of Boston; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the Massachusetts House of Representatives relative to the importation of rub-

ber through the port of Boston; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts requesting Congress to provide that the amount of steel to be allocated for school buildings be increased; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts to place a ceiling on the Federal Government's power to impose taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts relative to the importation of rubber through the port of Boston; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the importation of rubber through the port of Boston; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 6931. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Favuzza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 6932. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret K. Suprenant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 6933. A bill for the relief of Dyonisios Christ Paviatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 6934. A bill for the relief of Irene Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6935. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg Niebuhr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 6936. A bill for the relief of Fedele Bavaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6937. A bill for the relief of Coleen Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 6938. A bill for the relief of Wong Gook Ying; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6939. A bill for the relief of Helen Khoobyarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6940. A bill for the relief of Sayoko Uchida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 6941. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Valerie M. Schmiedeke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6942. A bill for the relief of Junko Arima and Yuri Arima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 6943. A bill to fix the seniority rights and service of Albert O. Raeder as sergeant in the District of Columbia Fire Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 6944. A bill to authorize Col. John M. Welch, United States Army Reserve, to accept a decoration tendered by a foreign government; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 6945. A bill for the relief of Katharina Hoffman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 6946. A bill to reimburse the Stebbins Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 559. Resolution for the relief of Frank C. Torti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

616. By Mr. THORNBERRY: Petition of W. E. Wetterman, C. R. Lehmann, J. H. Fischer, Louis Baack, T. F. Moerbe, L. R. Richter, Q. R. Wenke, Roy Durrenberger, Alvin Hannes, Arnold Krause, A. E. Reuther, G. A. Driessner, Charles Boriack, E. H. Melcher, Howard Boriack, Herbert Exner, Martin Beisert, E. J. Proske, Willie Prellop, Fred Melcher, Gerhard, Killian, Clarence Durrenberger, Rudolph Lorenz, Elvas Roensch, Clarence Wilson, Maetin H. Schmidt, R. B. Martin, H. C. Krause, H. C. Spitzenberger, J. E. Krenek, Garland Stanley, Clarence Humphrey, R. E. House, Joe Milburn, Fritz George, and F. B. Curry, all of Lee County, Tex.; and W. E. Fricke, Jim Meuth, Leon Kalina and August Hajdik, all of Bastrop County, Tex., protesting the proposed straight-loan program on peanuts by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

617. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Flora C. Goss, secretary, Charlotte Harbor Townsend Club No. 1, Punta Gorda, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God our Father, we thank Thee for the unquenchable impulse toward Thee Thou hast planted within us. As in the heat and burden of this epochal day we are called to serve the Nation, and all humanity, lead us, for Thy name's sake, to the abiding springs of fresh hope and confidence for a better tomorrow, a new faith in Thy goodness, and in the unrealized possibilities of Thy erring children, in spite of the stupid folly by which they have devastated the good earth Thou hast given, and marred the costly works of their own hands.

We pray for fidelity not to shirk the issues of these momentous days. Where our deeds can help to make this a fairer world, where our words can keep despondent men on their feet, where our prayers can hasten the coming of the social order, in which Thy will shall be done among men, let us speak and act and pray. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 6, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement in reference to the legislative program.

Senators who are interested in the resolution in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1 have indicated their desire to take that resolution up next Wednesday morning, and that seems to be the time most satisfactory for all concerned. That will mean that if the Senate does not conclude the consideration of the bill now pending it will have to be temporarily laid aside, because the resolution relating to the reorganization plan has priority under the law.

I have also been asked in regard to the Japanese Peace Treaty. Owing to the fact that more than 2 days may be required to dispose of that treaty, it will not be taken up until after the resolution relating to the reorganization plan has been disposed of.

I hope we may make progress on the measure now pending. I realize that that will involve the consideration of several amendments which are bills in themselves.

Mr. President, I desire to make this announcement to the Senate in order that Senators might know what the program would be.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate until next Thursday. We have important work to do in New Hampshire next Tuesday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. YOUNG was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate for all of next week.

REPORT ON MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 371)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the first report on the mutual security program, covering operations in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong.). The report reviews the steps we are taking with other nations to build up the strength of the free world, in support of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Although the mutual security program requires us to spend large amounts for troops and weapons, it is a program for peace. Its ultimate success will come

when the troops and weapons are no longer needed, and the money now required for defense can be used to raise the living standards of our own and other nations who are truly devoted to peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 7, 1952.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, 1952, RELATING TO BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 7, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to urge favorable Senate action on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The plan already has been overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives. It will become law on March 14 unless disapproved by the Senate by that date.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 provides the basis for a thorough reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Its essential feature is abolition of the offices of the 64 collectors of internal revenue and other statutory offices requiring Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation. Under the plan, all positions below the Commissioner of Internal Revenue are filled through the civil-service merit system.

This reorganization plan is an essential part of a program to assure honesty, integrity, and efficiency in Government. Unfortunately, those who find it to their advantage to preserve the present system, or to play politics with the integrity of the public service, have raised specious arguments against the plan that obscure the real issue.

The plain fact is that the plan must stand or fall on one issue—whether we want to take the necessary steps to assure efficient, honest, and impartial administration of the internal-revenue laws.

It has been called to my attention that a bill was offered to the Senate last week as a so-called substitute for my reorganization plan. Its language is almost the same as the language of plan No. 1—with two differences. One difference purports to safeguard existing rights and remedies of taxpayers. Legal officers of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department have assured me this provision is not necessary, since all existing rights and remedies of the taxpayers are preserved. The second difference is the fundamental one. It would require Senate confirmation of appointment to 99 revenue offices—more political appointments than at present—while my plan would place all these positions under civil service. Since that is the only real difference, it is clear that those who support the "substitute" bill also support all of my reorganization plan except the part which eliminates political patronage in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This presents squarely the one vital question: Is the business of tax collection to be taken out of politics?

Those who have studied this question say that the answer is clear—that internal-revenue officers must be divorced from political obligations and influences. The Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government has taken that position. In its report on the Treasury Department, the Commission said the political appointment of collectors of internal revenue and certain other officials is one of the chief handicaps to effective organization of the Department. The Commission said these appointments are regarded by some as sinecures and that, in any event, they form a bar to orderly development of an experienced staff. Mr. Robert Ramspeck, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in answering the question, has said that a civil-service employee's allegiance is to all the people, while a collector of internal revenue must give first allegiance to the people who got him his political job. Because of the political-patronage system, Mr. Ramspeck says, collectors believe it is more important for them to play politics than to be efficient tax collectors.

Civil-service status is certainly not an absolute guaranty of honesty and integrity. But the record shows a far smaller proportion of misconduct among employees with civil-service status than among those selected on a patronage basis. In the past year it has been necessary to separate from the service 7 out of the 47 internal revenue collectors not having civil-service status. That is 1 out of 7—nearly 15 percent. In the case of civil-service employees, on the other hand, the number accused of improper conduct connected with tax collections is only a small fraction of 1 percent.

I have been interested to note that 26 Senators have sponsored bills to require civil-service appointment of collectors of internal revenue. Those bills are S. 2412 and S. 2484, both introduced this year. It is also interesting to note that 7 of these 26 Senators are members and constitute a majority of the committee which voted against my reorganization plan. It seems obvious that a vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1 is inconsistent with the sponsorship of these bills.

Approval of plan No. 1 will be a major step toward good organization and better management in the Government. Disapproval of the plan, on the other hand, would be a step in the opposite direction involving serious consequences. Disapproval of the plan would be a blow to our efforts to assure efficiency and prevent improper conduct in government. Its disapproval would mean continuance of a revenue system which is not adapted to present-day requirements for sound and efficient administration. Disapproval of the plan would be a defeat for civil-service reform—and a victory for proponents of a political patronage system. We must not let these things happen.

The action of the Senate on plan No. 1 will have a significance far beyond administrative improvement in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Our citizens are entitled to a tax-collecting agency of thorough efficiency and unquestioned integrity. They are entitled to a revenue service with an organization and management which justifies their complete confidence. Plan No. 1 provides a concrete test of our willingness and ability to take positive action to promote such a service.

Millions of American taxpayers will be watching the Senate action on the reorganization plan. They have been hearing a lot lately about corruption in government, and they are concerned about what is being done to strengthen the Federal service against it. These taxpayers will be greatly interested in seeing whether Senators are more interested in their political patronage than in good public service. They will be greatly interested in seeing whether some Senators are more interested in using corruption as a vehicle to attack the administration than they are in actually taking steps to assure clean government.

I would hate to think that the Senate will consider this matter on a partisan basis. However, I have noticed that five of the six Republican Senators on the committee voted against this reorganization plan to provide increased efficiency and integrity in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Those five Senators—like many of their Republican colleagues—have made a great cry about cleaning up any graft and corruption in government. I think it is fair to ask whether they really want to do something to assure clean, efficient government or whether all their talk is pure politics.

The vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1 will show who it is that is just talking about corruption and who it is that really wants to do something about it. I hope the Senate—Republicans as well as Democrats—will keep faith with our taxpayers by voting for this important reorganization plan.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Committee on Government Operations has voted to report to the Senate the resolution with respect to Reorganization Plan No. 1. However, it has not yet reached the Senate. Therefore, the communication from the President will lie on the table unless there is objection.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the Dis-

trict of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District, covering the period July 1 to December 31, 1951, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTIONS, LETTERS, AND TELEGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am glad to say that a continuing number of fine public and private organizations are constantly writing to me from my own and other States on behalf of prompt Senate approval of the Senate Joint Resolution 27, providing for construction of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

I present for appropriate reference several such resolutions, letters, and a telegram, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions, letters, and telegram were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Detroit's great mass production machinery supplied a major portion of the implements of war during the last world conflict to force the principle of democracy into submission and the city earned the title of "the Arsenal of Democracy"; and

Whereas for the third time within a generation, Detroit is being called upon to convert her factories into producing arms in a preparedness program to preserve the liberties and security of free-thinking people; and

Whereas the entire Nation, and all freedom-loving peoples of the world, having a common interest in stopping an aggressor Nation that is presently challenging the security of the world, has a stake in Detroit's ability to produce the necessary goods; and

Whereas Detroit, the largest steel consuming area in the country, is gravely concerned about there being an adequate source of iron ore available to produce the necessary steel at a reasonable cost; and

Whereas a sizable portion of the steel industry that must find a new source of ore in the near future is developing areas in Labrador and Quebec and the Department of Defense has stated the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is now essential to our national defense because it would provide greater access to these additional sources of high grade iron ore; and

Whereas there are grave doubts whether the required Labrador and Quebec ore can be secured by existing transportation facilities in view of the perennial freight car shortage every fall that disrupts the free flow of goods; and

Whereas the Department of Defense has also stated the seaway would be of distinct advantage in the event of a national emergency because it would make available additional shipbuilding and repairing facilities; and

Whereas the Department of Defense claims the inland route from Labrador, free from enemy submarines, would require less protective measures than open-sea routes, because of the high defense priority already accorded the area; and

Whereas the National Security Resources Board points out even greater amounts of foreign ores must be imported if the demands for steel are to be met and that only as a last resort would any attempt be made to bring this ore in over the open-sea routes and concludes that the power and navigation produced by the project is extremely important to the national security; and

Whereas the President of the United States has decreed the St. Lawrence seaway project to be vital to the defense needs of this country and other democracies of the world; and

Whereas the immediate and active participation on the part of the United States will materially speed up the project, not only in the best interest of the defense of his Nation but also in the interest of the security of free people in all parts of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That in the interest of the defense of this Nation and in the interest of the security of free people here and in other countries, that the Common Council of the City of Detroit wholeheartedly supports the St. Lawrence seaway project and urges the Congress of the United States to give immediate approval of the agreement with Canada calling for the construction of the project; and be it further

Resolved, That this common council urges the Michigan State Legislature to pass a concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States to give immediate approval to this important defense project and to call upon other State legislatures to take similar positive action; and further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Governor of the State of Michigan; to the Michigan Senators and Representatives in the Congress, and to all members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

ALLIED VETERANS COUNCIL
OF MILWAUKEE COUNTY,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 4, 1952.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: On February 29, 1952, the Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee County, which represents 13 major veterans organizations in this community, assembled for the purpose of studying the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects, with a view to determining whether it should favor or reject the current proposed program.

I am enclosing herewith a resolution passed by the Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee County, favoring the immediate approval and ratification of the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects as being in the best interests of the United States.

We ask you to study the enclosed resolution and to implement the same in Washington, D. C.

Respectfully yours,
MAURICE WOLKOMIR,
Judge Advocate.

(Affiliated veteran organizations: Grand Army of the Republic, active to the last survivor; United Spanish War Veterans; Army and Navy Union; Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; Disabled American Veterans; Military Order of the Purple Heart; Marine Corps League; Jewish War Veterans of United States; Navy Club of the United States of America; Catholic War Veterans; AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II.)

RESOLUTION ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Whereas hearings on legislation for American participation in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects are currently being conducted in Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas as veterans, we believe that the projected seaway will give us an alternate transportation link to the Midwest of tremendous industrial and logistic value; and

Whereas in time of war, the project would relieve the heavy rail traffic toward east coast ports and some of the Atlantic port congestion; and

Whereas the power project will furnish large quantities of additional cheap and dependable electric power; and

Whereas the seaway and power projects would permit a good spread in the buildup of our heavy industry such as defense plants and shipyards; and

Whereas the construction of these projects at this time would require so small a fraction of the available supply of such materials as steel, copper, and cement, as well as manpower, so as to make it desirable to make this investment in additional productive capacity and industrial strength; and

Whereas the construction of the seaway would greatly enhance the value of Quebec and Labrador as sources of iron ore supply, since ore in those places can be transported directly to the presently existing Great Lakes steel producing areas, and its transportation can be achieved with much greater safety in time of war than otherwise would be the case: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Allied Veterans Council of Milwaukee County, representing many thousands of veterans in this city and county, commend to the Congress of the United States the immediate approval and ratification of the St. Lawrence seaway and power projects, as being in the best interests of the United States; and further be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives representing Wisconsin, and the President of the United States.

ALLIED VETERANS COUNCIL OF
MILWAUKEE COUNTY,
By MAURICE WOLKOMIR,
Judge Advocate.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF
CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
LOCAL UNION, No. 2073,
Milwaukee, Wis., March 1, 1952.

Mr. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senator.

DEAR SIR: I have been directed by the members of local No. 2073, to request you to use your efforts in favor of the St. Lawrence waterway project.

Thanking you in advance, we are,
CARPENTERS UNION, LOCAL NO. 2073,
P. L. PRIVATT, *Recording Secretary.*

RURAL CO-OP SERVICES,
Hales Corners, Wis.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Washington, D. C.:

For the benefit of the Nation as a whole and as special benefit for large sections of the country much in need of added transportation and power, we the board of directors of Rural Cooperative Services petition Congress to ratify the proposed joint completion of the St. Lawrence seaway in cooperation with Canada.

This project has been delayed a century. In view of the fact that the United States Congress has for 10 years delayed Canada's proposal for joint development, we feel that action at this time is imperative.

It is further recognized that special interests such as coal, utilities, railroads, and eastern steel corporations have spearheaded the fight against this project and have been successful in influencing Members of Congress to delay this much needed development to the detriment of the country as a whole.

The Nation would benefit by this project in the following ways: It would provide cheap transportation for the entire Midwest and the grain areas east of the Rockies; it would provide relatively short hauls for recently discovered Quebec and Labrador iron ore to the existing steel mills; open large areas of the Nation's most important industries to sea

transportation to the east coast and the world; provide power in our vast industrial area and allow America to use every great natural resource for its development and progress. It is also very ugent for our national defense.

We believe that the benefits to Canada and the United States far outweigh the cost as it is for the most part self-liquidating and should be undertaken at the earliest possible moment.

We, urge our Congress to take immediate steps to ratify this joint development with Canada.

RURAL COOPERATIVE SERVICES
(Representing 700 Families).

SHAWANO COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Shawano, Wis.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILEY: In regard to the St. Lawrence seaway project, which is a very important subject at the present time:

We are very much in favor of this project getting the utmost consideration as a great help to our transportation of different commodities from the North and also as a very important waterway for the defense of our country.

Hoping to hear from you on this important matter.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,
SHAWANO COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
FLOYD OTTO,
Organization Director.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS,
CIO, LOCAL 1131,
Milwaukee, Wis., January 29, 1952.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At our last membership meeting the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway was thoroughly discussed. Our membership, incidentally, is approximately 1,400. It is their desire and feeling that you convey their wishes to other Members of the Senate and vote in favor of this project. They realize the importance of this project to the Middle West States as well as to the country itself.

Sincerely yours,
STANLEY RACHOWICZ,
Recording Secretary.

WASHBURN, WIS., *March 4, 1952.*

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The city council has asked me to bring the following resolution to your attention:

"Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway is closer to passage than it has been in the past 20 years; and

"Whereas the building of the seaway would be of untold benefit to the city of Washburn as well as to the country in general: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the City Council of the City of Washburn in regular session assembled this 3d day of March 1952 go on record as favoring the immediate passage of St. Lawrence seaway legislation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That two United States Senators and the Congressman from this district be informed of the council's action."

ROBERT M. SPEARS,
City Attorney.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 645. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 1257).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2808. A bill for the relief of James Holkup; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. NIXON):

S. 2809. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain certain facilities to provide water for irrigation and domestic use from the Santa Margarita River, Calif., and the joint utilization of a dam and reservoir and other waterwork facilities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2810. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Winona Yellowtail; and

S. 2811. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Fern Spotted Horse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HILL, and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 2812. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the initial phase of the Snake River reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 2813. A bill for the relief of Felix H. Ettish and Gerda Ettish; and

S. 2814. A bill for the relief of Mariko Murata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2815. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act in order to extend the time during which requests may be made for reimbursement for damages to public airports resulting from military operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 2816. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of Oregon civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO JURISDICTION OVER OFFENSES COMMITTED BY OR AGAINST INDIANS IN OREGON

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior to the President of the Senate requesting the introduction of legislation having the objective of conferring on the State of Oregon civil jurisdiction over Indians in that State.

This request was referred in due course to the Committee on the Judiciary. I have studied the matter, and have arrived at the conclusion that legislation of this type, where practical, is most desirable. It is time, and past time, that consideration be given to placing the American Indian, in all respects, on a par with other citizens. There may be places in which or circumstances under which the carrying out of this theory might not be feasible; but I think on the whole more good would come out of it than harm.

Therefore, while this legislation is restricted to the State of Oregon, it impresses me as a step in the right direction; and I am therefore introducing the bill, as requested by the Interior Department.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the letter to which I have referred, from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill which I now send forward, and a brief summary of the sections of law proposed to be repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter, bill, and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a proposed bill to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of Oregon civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State."

I request that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and I recommend that it be enacted.

The proposed bill would extend the criminal laws of the State of Oregon to all Indian country within that State, except the Warm Springs Indian Reservation. Concurrently, it would withdraw the entire State, except the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, from the operation of the Federal Indian liquor law. Finally, it would permit the courts of the State of Oregon to adjudicate civil controversies of any nature affecting Indians within the State, except with respect to the Warm Springs Indian Reservation and except where trust or restricted property is involved. The jurisdiction conferred on the State would be qualified by provisions designed to preserve the concurrent jurisdiction of the United States over certain crimes, to safeguard Indian hunting, trapping and fishing rights and other rights, privileges and immunities of Indians under Federal law or treaty, and to preserve the restrictions against alienation, encumbrance or taxation of Indian trust property.

Approximately 6,000 Indians live in the State of Oregon. They are located principally on the Grand Ronde-Siletz Reserva-

tions, the Klamath Reservation, the Umatilla Reservation, and the Warm Springs Reservation. The Warm Springs Indians have both a tribal law and order code and a tribal court, and they employ policemen to maintain law and order. The Klamath Indians employ law enforcement officers, but they have no code of tribal laws and no tribal court for dispensing justice to tribal members. The other reservations in the State have no law and order codes and no tribal police or judges. Except for the tribal court on the Warm Springs Reservation, which functions reasonably well, the United States district court is the only tribunal that has jurisdiction over offenses committed on Indian reservations by or against Indians, and in cases of offenses by Indians against Indians that jurisdiction is limited to the ten major crimes, as listed in section 1153 of title 18, United States Code. Consequently, there is a serious hiatus in law enforcement authority. Offenses other than the ten major crimes usually go unpunished, and in some areas lawlessness presents an increasingly serious problem.

At the direction of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the area director of the Portland, Oreg., area office conferred with the various Indian groups in Oregon regarding proposed legislation similar to the enclosed draft of bill. The Indians of the Grand Ronde-Siletz Reservations and the Klamath Reservation have indicated their approval of the proposed legislation. The Indians of the War Springs Reservation and the Umatilla Reservation have expressed opposition to the proposed legislation. As the Warm Springs Indians are doing a reasonably good job of maintaining law and order on their reservation through their tribal court, I believe their desire to be excluded from the provisions of the bill should be granted. The Umatilla Indians, however, have no tribal law enforcement machinery and have shown no inclination to establish such machinery, and I believe that they should not be excluded from the provisions of the bill.

Proposed legislation similar to the enclosed draft has also been discussed with some of the State and local officials, and there has been a general willingness on their part to enforce State law if the necessary Federal legislation is enacted.

The Klamath Indians have conditioned their approval of the proposed legislation on the inclusion of provisions repealing the Federal Indian liquor laws, conferring on the State jurisdiction over the so-called ten major crimes as well as other crimes, protecting the fishing, hunting, and other rights of the Indians under Federal law, agreement or treaty, and protecting their trust property from alienation, encumbrance or taxation. The enclosed draft of bill contains such provisions.

An important feature of the proposed bill is the exclusion of the entire State of Oregon, except the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, from the operation of the Federal Indian liquor law. One of the foremost objectives of the proposed legislation is to place the Indian citizens of the State, where they so desire, on an equal footing with the non-Indian citizens by making them both subject to the same law. That objective would be partially defeated if the Federal Indian liquor law, which discriminates against Indians, remains applicable to these Indians and their reservations. There is no doubt but that these Indians, with the one exception already noted, are as prepared to be subjected to State laws regarding intoxicants as they are to be subjected to other laws of the State.

The provisions relating to civil jurisdiction are designed to give the courts of the State of Oregon jurisdiction over civil controversies involving Indians to the fullest extent consistent with the discharge of Federal responsibilities for the protection of trust or restricted property. The State courts could not take any action that would affect the status of this property in any way or deprive the Indians of any of the benefits therefrom. However, once the trust or restriction was terminated by the United States, the jurisdiction of the State courts would automatically attach. The civil jurisdiction provisions are so drafted as to permit the State courts to give effect to relevant Indian customs or tribal ordinances where these are of such a nature that they would be entitled to recognition under applicable Federal or State laws.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this propcsed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

MASTIN G. WHITE,
Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The bill (S. 2816) to amend title 18, United States Code, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," with respect to State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country, and to confer on the State of Oregon civil jurisdiction over Indians in the State, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 53 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 1151 of such title the following new item:

"1161. State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country."

SEC. 2. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by inserting in chapter 53 thereof immediately after section 1160 a new section, to be designated as section 1161, as follows:

"§ 1161. State jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the Indian country.

"(a) Each of the States listed in the following table shall have jurisdiction over offenses committed by or against Indians in the areas of Indian country listed opposite the name of the State to the same extent that such State has jurisdiction over offenses committed elsewhere within the State, and the criminal laws of such State shall have the same force and effect within such Indian country as they have elsewhere within the State:

"State of—	
Oregon	Indian country affected: All Indian country within the State except the Warm Springs Indian Reservation.

"(b) Nothing in this section shall deprive the courts of the United States of jurisdiction over offenses defined by the laws of the United States committed by or against Indians within the areas of Indian country listed in this section.

"(c) Nothing in this section shall deprive any Indian or any Indian tribe, band, community, or group of any right, privilege, or immunity afforded under Federal law, treaty, or agreement with respect to the ownership or taxation of trust or restricted Indian property, or with respect to hunting, trapping, or fishing or the control, licensing, or regulation thereof."

SEC. 3. Chapter 53 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby further amended by inserting at the end of the chapter analysis preceding section 1161 of such title the following new item:

"1162. Application of Indian liquor laws."

SEC. 4. Title 18, United States Code, is hereby further amended by inserting in chapter 53 thereof immediately after section 1161 a new section, to be designated as section 1162, as follows:

"§ 1162. Application of Indian liquor laws.

"The provisions of sections 1154, 1155, 1156, 3113, 3488, and 3618 of this title, and the provisions of section 2141 of the Revised Statutes (25 U. S. C., sec. 251) shall not apply within those areas of Indian country that are subject to the provisions of section 1161 of this title, nor within those areas of the States named in said section 1161 that are not Indian country."

SEC. 5. The courts of the State of Oregon shall have jurisdiction, under the laws of the State, in civil actions and proceedings between Indians or between one or more Indians and any other person or persons to the same extent that the courts of such State have jurisdiction in other civil actions and proceedings: *Provided*, That as long as the title to any real or personal property, including water rights, belonging to any Indian or Indian tribe, band, group, or community is held in trust by the United States or is subject to restrictions against alienation under any law, treaty, or agreement of the United States, nothing in this section shall authorize the alienation, encumbrance, or taxation of such property or the adjudication or regulation of its use, or shall confer jurisdiction upon the State courts in any civil action, probate, or other proceeding affecting the ownership, title, possession, or any other interest in such property.

This section shall not apply to the Indians of the Warm Springs Tribe.

The summary is as follows:

SECTIONS OF LAW PROPOSED TO BE REPEALED BY S. 2816

1. Section 1154, title 18, is a dual section which (a) prohibits selling, giving away, or disposing of intoxicating liquor to an Indian who is a ward of the Government or to an Indian to whom an allotment has been issued, said allotment being held in trust by the Government; and (b) the introduction of any intoxicating liquor into the Indian country.

2. Section 1155, title 18, prohibits and makes a criminal offense the manufacture, sale, or giving away of any intoxicating liquor on any tract of land in a former Indian country upon which is located an Indian school.

3. Section 1156, title 18, prohibits and provides a penalty for any person to possess intoxicating liquors in the Indian country.

4. Section 3113, title 18, allows the Superintendent of Indian Affairs and others the right of search and seizure with respect to places, conveyances, and packages where there has been probable cause to believe that a person is about to violate sections 1154 and 1156 heretofore mentioned.

5. Section 3488, title 18, provides that the possession of intoxicating liquors in an Indian country shall be prima facie evidence of unlawful introduction.

6. Section 3618, title 18, provides for the seizure, libel, and forfeiture of any conveyance introducing intoxicants into the Indian country.

7. Section 251, title 25, provides a penalty for the setting up of a distillery for the manufacture of liquors within an Indian country.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY AND ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 288), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service under

Senate Resolution 53, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to February 19, 1951, as amended (authorizing an investigation of the personnel needs and practices of the various governmental departments and agencies), and the time for reporting the results of its study and investigation thereunder is hereby extended to January 31, 1953.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out its duties under such resolution, the committee is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman, the sum of $50,000, in addition to any sums heretofore authorized for such purpose.

PRINTING OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "MAKING ENDS MEET ON LESS THAN $2,000 A YEAR"

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 289), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the committee print entitled "Making Ends Meet on Less Than $2,000 a Year" be printed as a Senate document; and that 2,000 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

PRINTING OF JOINT COMMITTEE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "MONETARY POLICY AND MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT"

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 290), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the joint committee print entitled "Monetary Policy and Management of the Public Debt," compiled for the use of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, be printed with illustrations, as a Senate document; and that 600 additional copies shall be printed for the use of the said joint committee.

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT OF 1917, RELATING TO RETURN OF CERTAIN PROPERTY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 172) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, so as to permit the return under such section of property which an alien acquired, by gift, devise, bequest, or inheritance, from an American citizen, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCFARLAND, and Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, which were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

The amendment could well be called a States' rights amendment. It asserts for all time the legitimate right of each of the 48 States to inland navigable waters.

Its principal purpose—section 11—is to renounce any and all Federal claim to submerged lands beneath inland navigable waters within State boundaries. Lands lawfully acquired by the United States are naturally excepted. It also recognizes any rights already granted by States to structures—docks, piers, wharfs, and so forth—jutting into the offcoast sea. This amendment contains the text of S. 1540.

The Supreme Court has specifically held that lands under inland waters belong to the States. The Government makes no claim to them, but it has been pointed out that future Government officials could conceivably make such a claim. This amendment assures that title to the lands under the lakes—including the Great Lakes—rivers, inlets, and harbors—lie now and shall permanently lie with the respective States, not the Federal Government.

If the so-called quitclaim legislation should be enacted, 45 States will lose part ownership to a $40,000,000,000 resource, and part claim to revenues which could reach $5,000,000,000. Despite this, many attorneys general and other State officials of these 45 States have been persuaded to support quitclaim bills, partly based on a supposed danger that the Federal Government will one day lay claim to lands beneath their inland water.

This amendment is an added safeguard to assure that this will never be the case. It should help make it clear that the rights of all States, both inland and coastal, will in no way be prejudiced by the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received, and printed, and will lie on the table.

INCLUSION OF ESCALATOR CLAUSE IN CERTAIN CONTRACTS RELATING TO PRICE AND WAGE INCREASES—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, on January 16, 1952, there was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary the bill (S. 2433) to encourage the making of contracts with the United States by requiring the inclusion of an escalator clause to provide adjustments for approved price and wage increases.

At a recent meeting of the committee this bill was considered, and I was authorized to seek the discharge of the bill from the Judiciary Committee for the reason that it amends the Defense Production Act of 1950 and is more properly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2433) and that it be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Address delivered by Senator MAYBANK before the fiftieth anniversary savings and mortgage conference of the savings and mortgage division of the American Bankers Association, held in New York City on March 5, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Address delivered by Dr. S. K. Stevens, Pennsylvania State historian, at Lancaster, Pa., on the occasion of the birthday of James Buchanan.

By Mr. HUNT:

Résumé of an address entitled "Proper Organization of Natural Resources," delivered by the Honorable Leslie A. Miller, former Governor of Wyoming, at the second national reorganization conference, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, at Washington, D. C., February 18, 1952.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

Ten-Point Bill of Citizenship Responsibilities, prepared by the American citizenship committee of the State Bar of Texas.

By Mr. KEM:

Editorial entitled "Thank You, Senators," published in the Daily Alaska Empire, of Juneau, Alaska, on March 3, 1952, expressing opposition to the Alaska statehood bill.

INVESTIGATION OF COMMUNISM IN HAWAII—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, recently the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary was asked so insistently about the prospects for an investigation of communism in Hawaii by the Subcommittee on Internal Security

that he felt compelled to issue a statement answering that question. The statement resulted in news stories in Hawaiian papers, and on February 9 was the subject of an editorial printed in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

Because this matter is of considerable interest to the Senate, and because some of my colleagues have also asked me about it, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the statement which I issued, as well as the text of the editorial to which I have referred, may be printed in the record at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will send staff members to Hawaii later this year to investigate communism in the Islands, Senator PAT MCCARRAN said today. MCCARRAN is chairman of both the full Judiciary Committee and the Internal Security Subcommittee.

"I have long known that the Communist Party is well entrenched in Hawaii, and that it has been active there over a period of years," Senator MCCARRAN said. "I believe this is a matter which definitely merits the attention of the Internal Security Subcommittee, and it will have our attention."

A definite date for dispatching investigators or other staff members to Hawaii has not been set, Senator MCCARRAN said. They will go "as soon as they can be spared from other work," he declared.

The question of holding hearings in Hawaii will be considered by the Internal Security Subcommittee after it has received a report on the situation from its staff, MCCARRAN said.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of February 9, 1952]

THEY HAVE DONE A DISSERVICE TO HAWAII

Looking at what some of our public officials are doing, it's small wonder that United States Senator PAT MCCARRAN is preparing for another investigation of communism in Hawaii.

Last Saturday evening the ILWU's new building was dedicated.

The ILWU has been kicked out of the national CIO for alleged communistic policies and actions.

Its president, Harry Bridges, has been convicted of perjury. With two fellow officers in the union, Henry Schmidt and J. R. Robertson, a Federal jury found him guilty on two counts of conspiracy. The Government said, and proved to the jury's satisfaction, that Bridges swore falsely he was not a Communist, and the other two supported him.

His case is on appeal. Meanwhile, the conviction stands. That's the record.

Its regional representative in Hawaii, Jack Hall, is under indictment charged with being one of the leaders of the Communist Party in Hawaii, among those who formed the organizational nucleus of the Communist Party in the Territory of Hawaii in 1937.

His trial, with that of six other alleged Communists, is set to begin February 26.

Harry Bridges and Jack Hall and a lot of the other brass and rank of the ILWU were at the dedication of the ILWU building.

Present also—and present as speakers—were Frank G. Serrao, Acting Governor of the Territory of Hawaii; and Willard K. Bassett, administrative assistant to the mayor.

These men cannot be dissociated from their offices. They were present because of those offices.

The Acting Governor of Hawaii not merely represents the Governor, and acts as the Governor when the Governor himself is out of the Territory—he represents the Department of the Interior and the President of the United States.

He is a Presidential appointee, approved and confirmed by the United States Senate, of which PAT MCCARRAN, chairman of the Senate's Internal Security Subcommittee, is a member.

At the ILWU dedication they were in company with one man who has been convicted on charges by the United States Government and of another man who is under charges by the United States Government.

And the effect of their presence, as public officials, at such an affair is to give at least implied aid, comfort, and support to the ILWU and its doctrines and policies.

Willard K. Bassett went beyond any implications or imputations of support.

Representing Mayor John H. Wilson, the municipal chief executive, he warmly praised Harry Bridges. He said that the new ILWU building "is a monument not only to labor's coming into its own here, but a monument to Harry Bridges, too."

And so the administrative assistant to the mayor of this city and county, in a position and a capacity that cannot be dissociated from the mayor of the city, spoke up to laud a man under conviction of perjury and conspiracy.

A clumsy effort has been made to dissociate Acting Governor Serrao from the company of these two men on this occasion by saying that he was there to represent Governor Long, and he spoke only to praise the ILWU building as a symbolism of the stability of labor in Hawaii.

No such dissociation can truly be made. Nor will any attempt to make it satisfy the suspicions of Members of Congress, who say that the attitude of Hawaii is that of appeasement of Communists and communism.

These two public officials have done Hawaii a signal disservice.

They do not represent the sentiment of Hawaii as a whole.

Hawaii is overwhelmingly anticommunistic.

But by their presence—and they were invited to the ILWU dedication not as individuals but as public officials, representing the two highest public offices in the Territory and the city—they have played directly into the hands of those who say that communism has a sinister hold on Hawaii.

ONE HUNDRED AND SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today is the anniversary of the birth of the great Czech patriot, Thomas G. Masaryk. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not more than 2 or 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, today, March 7, is a notable anniversary in the history of man's struggle for freedom. It is the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of that great world statesman and patriot of Central Europe, Thomas G. Masaryk. On this occasion I am pleased to join with thousands of Americans of Czech and Slovak descent who are today honoring the memory of this great fighter for freedom.

I had the privilege of knowing Thomas Masaryk, as I also knew his great martyr son. The recollection of my association with those two great men is among my most prized treasures.

Free Czechoslovakia was, in part, the handiwork of Thomas Masaryk as the leader of Czechoslovaks all over the world, as well as in Czechoslovakia itself. His statesmanship was so well recognized by the leaders of other nations that Czechoslovakia, as a new nation in 1918, started immediately with great prestige.

Between 1918 and 1937, when he died, Masaryk helped to strengthen the taproots of democracy and to broaden the meaning of freedom in his native land. He worked also, in the councils of nations, to bring into being the concept known as collective security. For those accomplishments, all free men, and all those who love freedom, must be grateful to the memory of Thomas Masaryk.

Thomas Masaryk died before his land, and much of the world, was assaulted by the evil forces of Fascist imperialism. Thomas Masaryk knew the nature of those forces and fought against them all the days of his life. They are not dead yet. They are indistinguishable, in their basic nature, from the forces of Communist imperialism which, in 1947, swept over Czechoslovakia. We must guard and struggle against both these evils, if we would be true to the ideals of Thomas Masaryk.

Of all the tragedies of recent history, none is more heartrending than the loss of freedom in this great freedom-loving land, Czechoslovakia. The handiwork of Masaryk and of the many other patriotic and liberty-loving Czechs and Slovaks has been temporarily destroyed by the intrigues and pressures of the Soviet tyrants. Freedom is temporarily banished from Czechoslovakia. But the work of Thomas Masaryk cannot die. Czechoslovakia will rise again, and freedom there will live again. Czechoslovakia will one day be restored to the ranks of free nations. I hope that day will be soon. It cannot be long delayed. I know that the people of Czechslovakia are observing this day, just as we are, with proud recollections of the greatness of Thomas Masaryk and with determined resolution to reestablish in Czechoslovakia the values for which Masaryk labored so long, so unselfishly, and so successfully.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, joining in the tributes which have been paid to Thomas G. Masaryk, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in recognition of the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of that great Czech leader.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES ON THE OCCASION OF THE ONE HUNDRED AND SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

March 7, 1952, marks the one hundred and second anniversary of the birth of one of the noblest men of this or any other century. The memory of Thomas G. Masaryk, the great Czech leader and patriot, is forever enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen and in the hearts of all people who value freedom above servitude.

It is fitting on this occasion, when we pause to pay our respects to this esteemed humanitarian, that we take heart from his

deeds and pronouncements. In a world still torn by strife, the democratic faith and ideals of Masaryk give courage and inspiration to the brave people of Czechoslovakia, now suffering under the tyrant's yoke, and to all who are engaged in the struggle to overcome Soviet aggression.

Thomas Masaryk was a patriot who saw his dreams and his labors to establish the nation of Czechoslovakia brought to fruition. Thomas Masaryk was not only the liberator of his people. He was truly a world leader, a sincere practitioner of democracy stressing the love and respect for his fellow man. Among his many accomplishments were his statesmanship, his humanitarianism, and his scholarship.

Thomas Masaryk did not live to see his beloved land overrun, first by the Nazis, and then by the Communist hordes. But the memory of Masaryk will never be obliterated by the tyrannical occupation of Czechoslovakia. It will continue to sustain the gallant Czech people until the day the invader is finally driven from their land.

On this anniversary of Masaryk's birth, I pray that this day of liberation is close at hand.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I join in the sentiments expressed by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in relation to Mr. Masaryk. When lights go out—and his was a great light—the world sustains a loss. Yet, we feel that the light shed by such men during their lifetime carries on in the souls and minds of men, enabling them to live in accordance with the principles of liberty.

THE HISTORY OF POTATO LEGISLATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on February 24, in the State of Maine, in Aroostook County, where the potato industry centers, I delivered an address before the St. John Valley Republican Club at Madawaska, Maine. This was a major effort on my part to tell the story of potato legislation in the Congress since I have been here. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, as the history of potato legislation.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HISTORY OF POTATO LEGISLATION

Since the potato started its long journey from Peru to Europe and thence back to America it has experienced many difficulties but none perhaps comparable to the vicissitudes of the last 20 years.

The hazards of wind and weather and planting programs in other areas have always been factors with which Maine growers have been compelled to reckon.

The added hazards of Washington bureaucrats and their strange gyrations are something else again.

In 1934 when I went to Washington, Maine potatoes were selling for 60 cents a barrel with several million barrels being dumped at the expence of the producer.

THE WARREN POTATO ACT

The first job in Washington at that time was to get potatoes recognized as a basic commodity and eligible for the stabilization programs that were then in process of development.

Enlisting with Congressman Lindsay Warren, of North Carolina—then a Democratic leader in the House and now for some years Comptroller General of the United States—I assisted as a Republican Congressman in drafting and promoting the so-called Warren Potato Act.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE HENRY WALLACE OPPOSES

We ran into militant opposition from the administration forces under the leadership of Henry Wallace, who was then Secretary of Agriculture.

Republicans were in a negligible minority, with only one-fifth of the membership of the House at that time.

Congressman Warren was able to mobilize somewhat over half the Democrats in support of his bill and Maine was able to furnish and influence enough votes on the Republican side of the aisle to pass the Warren bill by the scant margin of seven votes in the House.

Senator Bailey, of North Carolina, then joined with the two Maine Senators and Senator Borah, of Idaho, to put the bill through the Senate and it became law.

This measure was built upon the idea of putting the cost of the support program upon the producers of potatoes upon the sound principle that this would effectively control production without penalizing the consumer or the taxpayer and would give potatoes their normal and natural place as a basic food product in a competitive agricultural economy.

The act also declared potatoes to be a basic agricultural commodity—a declaration amply warranted by the fact that potatoes are one of the major items so far as food value is concerned in the American market-basket and represent to the farmer an annual production of approximately 400,000,000 bushels a year and an income of $500,000,000 to $700,000,000 a year according to the market.

PEANUTS AND POTATOES

Peanuts in 1935 had an annual production of a billion pounds and a value of approximately $36,000,000 and had already been declared a basic commodity.

There is no other so-called perishable commodity which approaches in any way the value of potatoes and potatoes are produced in every State in the Union.

With the Warren Act on the statute books in the fall of 1935, 8 months after I arrived in Washington, potatoes seemed to be assured of proper consideration on a parity with other major crops.

SECRETARY WALLACE DEFIES THE LAW

Suddenly to our amazement, within a short time after the bill became law, Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace proclaimed that he would not enforce the law—apparently like an irresponsible child angered by its passage.

A mass meeting was called in Washington for potato producers from all over the country and Lindsay Warren read the Wallace statement to an outraged assembly with Secretary Wallace present in the auditorium of the Department of Agriculture and uttered the memorable denouncement that I can still hear ringing through that hall: "What kind of stuff is that for a member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States?"

Secretary Wallace promised to retract his defiance of the law, but a few weeks later the entire agricultural program as thus far developed was thrown on the scrap heap by the decision of the Supreme Court and the Warren Act was ended before it had really begun.

Alternative programs for support of other basic commodities were gradually added with potatoes excluded under administration opposition, but with the interesting effect of drawing production away from potatoes in all the marginal areas and gradually improving the lot of potato producers as an unintended but incidental result.

WAR ECONOMY SUPPORTS POTATOES

Then came the war, the Democratic remedy for all economic problems.

The American farmer once again was asked to feed the world and even the Agriculture Department now began to look with favor upon potatoes to feed America while wheat and corn were shipped abroad to feed the world along with some potatoes.

Potatoes were, accordingly, placed under the support program at 90 percent of parity with a guaranty that this support would continue for 2 years after the end of hostilities.

With the end of the war a potato surplus began to accumulate and disposition became difficult as recovery progressed abroad.

The Commodity Credit Corporation began to accumulate an enormous surplus of agricultural products of many kinds and potatoes became a target for Department attack because of their perishable character.

POTATOES AGAIN UNDER ATTACK

Ralph Trigg, the head of the Commodity Credit Corporation, came to the Maine potato festival at Fort Fairfield August 15, 1949, and attacked the potato program.

Maine growers were somewhat nonplused and irritated by the fact that Canadian potatoes were pouring into our market just under the level of support prices, absorbing the reduced duties on certain quantities that were provided under the reciprocal trade agreement with Canada and absorbing the normal tariff on any surplus.

MAINE POTATOES DUMPED

This resulted in Maine potatoes losing their normal markets in the eastern United States to Canadian potatoes and meanwhile Maine potatoes were purchased by the Government and dumped with great fanfare. Alternative programs to divert potatoes to various other uses and for shipment abroad were not enthusiastically cultivated by the authorities, to put it mildly.

Under pressure from the Maine delegation, the President finally notified Canada that unless they would discontinue the shipment of potatoes to our markets, except to a limited extent for seed purposes, he would be obliged to exercise his indisputable power under existing legislation to bar Canadian potatoes.

This resulted in an agreement under which Canada restricted the shipment of potatoes, although the agreement was widely violated by the use of seed potatoes for table stock. The Maine delegation found that they were shuttled about from the Agriculture Department to the Treasury Department to the State Department and back again without results in their endeavor to secure enforcement of this agreement. The departments never would determine who was responsible for policing the agreement.

However, the agreement did have some effect and did some good.

REDUCTION OF SUPPORT PRICES

The potato producers were the first to recognize that some more effective measures of control must be instituted, and came to Washington with the revolutionary proposal that support prices should be fixed at 50 percent of parity with a view to climinating the marginal producers.

Under the leadership of Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, the greatest and most intelligent leader of agriculture in the Congress, it was provided in the so-called Aiken Act that potatoes would be supported at 60 to 90 percent of parity, instead of the 90 percent provided for basic commodities.

This proposal was supported by the potato producers of America, who realized that it was a practical and effective solution of the problem in saving them from the disasters of other years, and the bankruptcy that ensued, while at the same time requiring them to share to some extent their losses with the Government. This provision removed the premium upon potato production by reason of the profits reculting from a support figure of 90 percent of parity.

With the exercise of other controls provided in legislation, and the support price at 60 percent of parity, the surplus for 1949

was very materially reduced, and it was evident that we were on the way to a sound solution of the potato problem, with justice both to the producer and consumer and the taxpayer.

SURPLUS REDUCED; FOREIGN POTATOES POUR IN

The surplus was reduced from something over 100,000,000 bushels to under 50,000,000 bushels, and the cost was rapidly coming within measurable bounds.

Then a very curious thing happened. Canadian potatoes were still continuing to come in under the reductions provided in the reciprocal trade agreement, although this meant adding some $15,000,000 to the cost of eliminating the surplus in the United States.

The President, under the advice and urging of the Department of Agriculture, refused to extend the Canadian agreement for another year, which would have meant the exclusion of Canadian potatoes except for seed stock, and reduced the cost of this potato support program by $15,000,000.

LUCAS REPUDIATES PLEDGE

The reason for this was soon obvious when Senator Lucas, then Democratic floor leader, in February 1949 proposed to eliminate entirely and immediately the support program on potatoes for the current year as of December 31, 1949.

This would have meant that most of the Maine crop marketed between January and April 1950 would be cut from under support unless the Maine producers dumped their entire production on the Government before December 31, which would have been the inevitable result.

This amendment was defeated after a bitter floor fight in the Senate, since it was a clear repudiation of the wartime pledge as to support, and obviously aimed at dumping the entire potato program.

PROPAGANDA PROCEEDS; WHY?

Meanwhile a tremendous propaganda against potatoes was being carried on by the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with certain propaganda agencies, public and private, with clear evidence of collusion between the Department and these private agencies to produce any details designed to heap ridicule on potatoes.

It became evident that the Department of Agriculture was fully awake to the menace of a support program for potatoes at 60 percent of parity as threatening their whole dream of the Brannan plan, and all it represented.

If the 60 percent parity program succeeded in controlling the potato surplus with a minimum cost to both the consumer and the Government, it was possible the entire design of those who stood for programs of 100 percent of parity would be discredited.

The sound common sense of the American farmer would rebel at what was obviously becoming a program for socialized agriculture with the producer regimented under complete Government control as the inevitable result of 100-percent support.

SUPPORTS REPEALED

As a result of all the forces that were brought to bear, after the Presidential refusal to exclude Canadian potatoes, the support program was made sufficiently expensive in this transitional year, coupled with various arbitrary rulings against the possibility of diversion and foreign shipments to accomplish repeal of support prices after 1950.

MAINE MEETS THE CHALLENGE

Maine potato producers along with the rest of the potato growers of the country went into the 1951 crop season as free agents and planned their production without any provision for Government support.

The pattern of the thirties now appeared again and the marginal producer shifted to other more attractive crops and suddenly a firm market developed and potatoes were resuming their proper place in their attraction for the American consumer.

CEILINGS ARE SUDDENLY IMPOSED

With prices approaching parity, as a reward for the ingenuity and courage of the potato growers who remained, the Government very hurriedly and with apparently complete ignorance of trade practices instituted controls on potato prices.

Here was a clear case of heads you win and tails we lose.

Potato growers were not to receive Government aid but neither were they to be permitted rewards of a free economy.

It was urged that if the potato market were left alone the situation would promptly adjust itself with the new crop of potatoes beginning to come in within a few weeks and the inevitable easing that would result if potato growers responded to the improved prospects. This, however, would not do. The planners in Washington must immediately demonstrate their power and proceed with the issuance of regulations which have been revised each week as a result of the utter impracticability of many of the provisions and the resultant black markets that have already developed in various centers.

One may well remember the French maxim regarding the Bourbons that they "learn nothing and they forget nothing."

Theodore Roosevelt used to say that he would take his chances under any kind of an economic system if they did not change the rules in the middle of the game.

The potato growers of Maine may well insist that their Government at least give them a chance to function for some period of time without constantly recurring changes in Government attitudes.

KEY TO ADMINISTRATION ATTITUDE

The attitude of the administration in refusing to exclude Canadian potatoes in 1948 in order to permit Maine potatoes to be distributed in their normal markets and reduce the Maine surplus that must otherwise be dumped, clearly reveals the entire conspiracy against potato producers by the administration and is typical of the attitude that prevailed from the days when Henry Wallace, as Secretary of Agriculture, proclaimed that he would not enforce the Warren Act.

How any Maine citizen and particularly anyone interested in the Maine potato industry can support by their votes conduct of this character is beyond human understanding.

CONGRESSMAN CLIFFORD M'INTIRE

Maine is fortunate, indeed, at this critical time in having CLIFFORD MCINTIRE in Congress as one of the best-informed men in the State on all phases of the potato problem.

The Maine delegation feels very fortunate in having a Representative of the character and competence of CLIFF MCINTIRE to assist in the varied problems with which we will be faced in the coming critical years.

With a Republican victory this fall in State and Nation the Maine delegation has been assured that Congressman MCINTIRE will be assigned as a Member of the House Committee on Agriculture where he will be able to make a major contribution in a field for which he is uniquely qualified.

Maine people in general and Aroostook County in particular may well ponder this possibility as they take their part in turning out a record vote in the coming campaign.

The confusion and corruption and communistic influences that have been all too prevalent in Washington must be ended if America is to survive.

Integrity and intelligence must be restored to Government.

It is no disparagement of the many honest men in Government to suggest that the time is long overdue for a housecleaning that shall remove the inevitable litter of too long a lease of power.

Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely as we have been learning to our sorrow.

ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND MAJORITY IN MAINE

A Republican majority of 100,000 in Maine this fall will give inspiration and impetus to a Republican victory in the Nation in November.

Maine once again has the opportunity to lead the Nation in restoring sanity and sound principles to Government. Only in this way can confidence in America and its future be restored at home and abroad.

POEMS BY CORDELIA MURPHY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on February 14 I offered for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two poems written by Miss Cordelia Murphy, of Portland, Oreg. The titles of these poems are "For Home Is Best" and "Truce Eternal." I also offered explanatory remarks by the author of these poems in respect to each poem.

Although the author's explanation of each poem was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, unfortunately only one of the poems, Truce Eternal, was printed. As Miss Murphy, the author, explains in a letter to me, under date of February 13, 1952, her poem, Truce Eternal, is a complement to her poem, For Home Is Best. Both poems should be read together if one is to comprehend fully the beautiful poetic tribute which Miss Murphy has paid to our soldier dead.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Miss Murphy's poem, For Home Is Best, be printed in the body of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks, to be following immediately in the RECORD by a reprinting of her short poem, Truce Eternal.

May the beauty and solemnity of these two poetic tributes to American boys who have made the supreme sacrifice for our security and freedom bring not only some comfort to their loved ones but a renewed determination on our part to follow a course of action in foreign policy which in our time will bring an end to war.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR HOME IS BEST

Here on this hill, beneath the sky I love,
At last I rest;
For lonely hearts, nostalgic ever, know
That home is best.

Winds of my boyhood days will play for me
The harp o' trees;
While sun, or rain, or snow—in cadenced theme—
Accompanies.

Flowers, as native born as I, will blend
Their fragrance here
With memories of those who ever make
Such blossoms dear.

Those I hold dear will pause to pray, "God-speed!"
Where now I lie;
And friendly folk of many years will say,
"We're standing by!"

Here on this hill, beneath the Flag I served,
Each year I'll be—
Repaid for what I gave, by endless love
And fealty.

—*Cordelia Murphy.*

TRUCE ETERNAL

All who have loved some other lad,
Be good to mine
As, in the lands afar, his grave
You make a shrine:
For he, who has with friendly folk
A haven found,
Knows—in this bit of home—an ever
Hallowed ground.
Still seas, whose depths may lave a youth
With gentleness,
Give sanctuary where he met
Swift death's caress.
Or, greensward on a mountain slope,
More verdant be
As shroud for him to wear
Through all eternity.

* * *

Her love, our lad, their dear one,
Where'er you are today,
Let your gift be truce eternal—
For this, O Lord, we pray.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 20, the so-called submerged-lands bill.

FOR DEFENSE AND THE NATION'S STRENGTH BUILD HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in behalf of myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], I have introduced today a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the initial phase of the Snake River reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior.

The bill deals primarily with the construction of a proposed dam to be known as the Hells Canyon Dam. The project is of such great importance to the defense of the country and to the national economy that I propose today, for the purpose of the RECORD, to discuss and explain the bill in considerable detail.

In the interest of complete continuity of exposition, I announce now, at the beginning of my speech that I shall not yield until I have completed it. From the standpoint of future use of this speech by the proponents of the bill, it is desired to have it in such form that it may be reprinted and used as a reference work in connection with the proposed Hells Canyon Dam.

I think my colleagues know that I am always happy to yield whenever I have finished an argument on a subject. In this instance it will require the entire speech for the finishing of the argument, and I shall be happy to yield at the end of the speech.

Mr. President, if I were to give a title to my exposition of the proposed bill for the construction of Hells Canyon Dam, I would entitle it: "For Defense and the Nation's Strength Build Hells Canyon Dam."

On rare occasions in the life of a Member of Congress comes the opportunity to introduce legislation which if enacted will result in the attainment of an objective that will forever serve the people of his region and the Nation.

Such was the legislation which some 50 years ago gave birth to the Federal Reclamation Act signed by President Theodore Roosevelt, opening up vast domains of arid but fertile land in the West to irrigation and development, and creating bustling cities and towns now so important to the national economy. Such was the legislation introduced by Senator Hiram Johnson, of California, which authorized the construction of the great Hoover Dam in the Southwest—the dynamo that through power development and irrigation has helped make California the fastest growing State in the Union. And such was the legislation introduced by Senator Charles McNary from my State of Oregon that led to the construction of the Bonneville Dam and created the Federal Power Marketing Agency in the Pacific Northwest and initiated the development of the vast hydroelectric potential of the Columbia River system which has provided such tremendous benefits to the Nation and the defense program in the past 10 years.

Such is the legislation I propose to offer to this body today. Here again is an opportunity to take another bold stroke toward strengthening the Nation and permanently enriching our people by wise use of a natural resource.

I am recommending to the Senate today the authorization and construction of a large multiple-purpose, economically sound dam in the Hells Canyon area of the Snake River in the Pacific Northwest, which will, in 50 years, repay 100 percent of the reimbursable costs to the Federal Treasury with interest. The great bulk of the entire cost will be returned; only 12 percent is allocated to nonreimbursable purposes of flood control, recreation and navigation. Although this is a relatively small allocation, dollarwise, these purposes are highly important.

I urge the Senate to support this authorizing legislation as forward-looking action on the part of the Congress in assuring orderly resource development in our great Columbia River Basin for the benefit of the people not only of Oregon but of those in neighboring States and for the Nation at large, in time of war and in time of peace. Like the Senators and Representatives who fought for the mighty Grand Coulee Dam, the Hoover Dam, the Shasta Dam, and the Bonneville Dam, those of us who now announce our support of the great Hells Canyon Dam and those who join us by working for our proposal will one day, years from now, when the huge development has been completed and its benefits have been felt in every corner of these United States, warm with honest pride at the part we have played in bringing it about. It is in the light of this genuine enthusiasm for building on one of America's greatest remaining dam sites, one of the finest dams ever conceived by man, and it is in the sincere belief that its construction is in the best interests of the American people, to be attested to in decades ahead, as it has in the case of Grand Coulee and Hoover, that I present today the case for the Hells Canyon Dam.

I present the case today, because the dam is needed today.

Inability to provide for the immediate expansion of industry on a firm power basis in the Pacific Northwest is holding back not only the economic growth and development of this region but the defense of the Nation. The electro-process industries, using large amounts of Columbia River energy, are of prime importance to the defense program. They include industries such as aluminum, magnesium, chlorine and caustic soda, chlorates, ferro-alloys, calcium carbide, and hydrogen peroxide. In peacetime, electro-process industries have been among the fastest growing industries of the Nation. In wartime, as a result of the needs for war production, electro-process industries in the United States used about four times as much electric energy as in 1939, while electric energy requirements for all other manufacturing industries had not even doubled during the same period of time.

During the next year, 1952–53, the Pacific Northwest will be short an average of about 650,000 kilowatts if minimum water-year conditions prevail. Despite the construction under way on the main stem of the Columbia and elsewhere, not until 1958 can any substantial amount of new industrial load be served.

The Northwest country, in which we seek to build this concrete giant, is a region of vast natural resources. The Nation's second largest stream, the Columbia, and its many tributaries, course through the four States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho, of which our Northwest is comprised. They also draw upon portions of the great States of Wyoming, Utah, and Nevada. The Northwest is an area of abundant water supply, rivers flowing into the valleys from steep mountains, an area possessed of some of the world's finest natural dam sites, but limited by the number of unpopulated canyons where great reservoirs may be created with minimum disturbance to existing economy. Its land is fertile, and, where now arid or semiarid, needs only water to make it productive. Vast deposits of minerals await development. One-third of the Nation's hydroelectric potential exists in the Columbia Basin.

The domain of this mighty river and that of its principal tributaries, such as the Snake, is vast and rich. But the Columbia River system is a giant working only part time. One of our most valuable water resources is going to waste. True economy calls for orderly development of these waters. We must utilize them to irrigate our dry but fertile land, to reduce their flows to below damaging flood stages, and finally to pass them through power plants in their journey to the sea, so that the wheels of industry and the motors on the farms can create new wealth for the Nation. True economy calls for the building of the Hells Canyon Dam.

The people of the Northwest know the value of water. They knew it long before New York City had its bathless Thursdays. They know that without the run-off in the streams stored behind man-made barriers, many of its residents could scarcely maintain them-

selves, let alone prosper. Water is the area's most precious resource, and our people are attempting to see to it that not a drop is wasted.

The deep understanding of the close relationship between their economic life and use of water that exists in our area has in recent years caused us to look at development from a basin-wide viewpoint, rather than proceeding on a project-by-project basis. Our people know that what happens on the headwaters of a stream many hundreds of miles long has a bearing on what can happen at the mouth. What is done on the lower reaches may hinder, or assist, full use of the latent resources of the upper reaches, depending on how well man has planned.

As a result, there came into being a comprehensive plan for resource development prepared by the Department of the Interior, and also an over-all program prepared by the Department of the Army. Both were extensive in scope and covered all potential phases of development: flood control, irrigation, recreation, navigation, power production, fish and wildlife conservation, and so forth, with varying emphasis on each.

These two plans were then consolidated into a coordinated, comprehensive, or so-called master plan for the development of the land and water resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries. This plan offers us the guide posts for step-by-step, orderly utilization of stream flows for the greatest good.

To bring the giant Columbia under control for full-time work is not a matter of days or months. It will take years, many years, perhaps decades. So the plan outlines progress by stages, for the present, for the next few years, and for the final development. Nor is this a one-man or one-agency task. It is of such nature that many groups, Federal, State, and local, must take part, each performing its own particular function, each mindful of and working toward the common goal.

The Hells Canyon Dam is a key unit of the master plan for the Northwest, now coordinated, as I previously explained. It is more than that. It is a structure that both the Army and the Interior Department recommend for early authorization to meet early needs of the region.

As an integrated element of the early development program for the region, a main control plan was prepared, which has as its purpose the control of the most destructive floods in the Columbia River. In 1948 the flood damage on the Columbia totaled some $100,000,000. The Hells Canyon Dam is a major structure of the main control plan. What is of greatest significance, it is the only project recommended for authorization as a part of this plan which has not yet been authorized by Congress.

The Senate and this Congress have shown full faith in the coordinated Army-Interior plan and have authorized development of all the recommended features of the main control plan, with the exception of Hells Canyon. It alone, of the specifically recommended projects, remains to be approved.

In every way, Hells Canyon Dam fits into the pattern for maximum use of valuable water resources of the Northwest. Hells Canyon represents orderly development from both the short-term and the long-range point of view—a wise, prudent investment, without waste in water.

The undertaking is of concern to many States. Of the water passing the dam site, more than 37 percent originates in Wyoming, about 5 percent each originates in Oregon and Nevada, and somewhat more than half in Idaho. One abutment of the dam is in Oregon, the other in Idaho. Water from these several States stored in the Hells Canyon Reservoir will reduce flood damages in Oregon and Washington. Releases of water from the reservoir will greatly augment prime power production at downstream plants in those States and will deepen the water in navigable channels. The development's contribution to the production of power from the Columbia River power system will benefit all States of the Pacific Northwest.

Up to now, I have been talking more or less generally about the key features of the proposal and the Hells Canyon Dam. Now let us get this proposal in true focus and examine it more carefully.

The bill we are proposing authorizes the construction of power facilities in two separate developments as the first phase of an undertaking designated as the Snake River project. Arrangements are provided in the bill for the subsequent addition of other divisions to the Snake River project and for the provision of financial assistance in the return of construction costs of irrigation divisions, as this may be found necessary and may specifically be approved by the Congress, but the authorization now sought is limited to that for the Scriver Creek power facilities of the Mountain Home Division and the Hells Canyon Division.

Of these two power developments, the Hells Canyon Division is much the larger and will make much the greater contribution to the economy of the Nation and of the region. The Scriver Creek power facilities, however, can make their smaller contribution to national defense requirements at an earlier date, and help meet urgent local needs of southern Idaho. Located in the Payette River Basin of Idaho, these facilities, consisting of a diversion dam, tunnels, two power plants, and related transmission, fish protection, and recreational facilities, will provide for initial power installations of 97,500-kilowatt capacity. The construction costs of these facilities, at October 1950 price levels, total $43,703,000, of which $43,591,400 is allocated to power. Power revenues from the plants will return this investment in 50 years, with interest. These Scriver Creek power facilities can later serve also as the upper portion of the water-conveyance system which will be required in connection with the use of Payette River waters for development of the Mountain Home irrigation development, but authorization for the irrigation features of that development is not sought through the bill now presented for consideration.

The Hells Canyon Dam would be a concrete structure rivaling or exceeding any existing dam in the world in total height. It will rise farther above the stream bed than any existing dam. At the foot of the dam would rest a 900,000-kilowatt power plant, and behind the dam would be impounded a reservoir having a total capacity of 4,400,000 acre-feet. The reservoir area is largely undeveloped and sparsely settled, one of the few remaining large potential reservoir areas in our country so blessed.

Besides power production, the project would provide benefits in flood control, navigation, and recreation, and through surplus revenues it would, under the proposed legislation, make available substantial financial assistance to irrigation projects in the parts of Oregon, Idaho, Wyoming, and Nevada lying in the Middle and Upper Snake Basin which may hereafter be authorized by the Congress, but which, except for such assistance, although economically sound and possessing engineering feasibility, could not meet the test of financial pay-out imposed by Federal reclamation laws. Under present standards, few irrigation projects in the Snake River Basin can be constructed unless power revenues are available to help the settlers repay the cost of bringing water to the land. For this reason I firmly believe that the Hells Canyon project should be authorized under Federal reclamation law.

Situated as it is, upstream from several major dams on the Columbia River, Hells Canyon will make a major contribution to the prime, year-around output of the Columbia River power system, of which it will be an integral part. If one were looking at a power-production chart, one could see that production from run-of-river plants alone falls into a low depression when natural stream flows decline during the fall and winter months. By helping to fill up this seasonal depression, particularly during a critical low-flow year, such as occurred in 1936–37, the power produced at Hells Canyon Dam, and at downstream power plants with stored water released from the reservoir during fall and winter, will add greatly to the amount of power which can be continuously produced by the system as a whole. With all projects currently authorized considered as being in operation, Hells Canyon would add 1,124,000 kilowatts of prime-power capability to that system. If attempts to guess at an order of construction are not made, and the contributions of all existing authorized and recommended storage projects are placed on a parity by allocating to each a part of the increased system production which is proportional to active storage capacity, the allocation of system prime power to Hells Canyon amounts to 1,430,500 kilowatts, according to Department of the Interior estimates. By either of the procedures used to establish Hells Canyon's contribution to the system, its prime-power output would be large, and its cost per kilowatt would be less than the average cost per kilowatt of prime power to be obtained from plants now under construction and authorized, or in prospect, for addition to the present low-cost Bonneville and Grand Coulee system.

These great multiple-purpose benefits, which I shall dwell on in greater detail later, will be made available through the legislation my colleagues and I are introducing today. It is a sound proposal, as sound a proposal as we now know the authorization of Grand Coulee and Hoover Dams to have been. And, Mr. President, it is timely.

The proposed legislation will authorize construction of the Hells Canyon Dam plus smaller power plants at Scriver Creek, a feature of the Mountain Home irrigation project. The bill does not include authorization of the irrigation of the desert-land area south and east of the city of Boise, but it does include the use of power revenues from Hells Canyon Dam and the Scriver Creek plants to help repay the construction costs of the irrigation works when their construction is later authorized by Congress. Repayment of the reimbursable power investment, which comprises most of the project costs, is assured.

A water right is a precious thing in the great West. Provision fully protecting existing water rights upstream from Hells Canyon is contained in the bill, and full protection of future irrigation developments by subordinating the Government's power rights at Hells Canyon to future upstream consumptive uses is also specifically guaranteed. The ultimate effect upon power production is minor and has been taken into account in determining the power capabilities and pay-out of the project.

In the interest of assuring the State of Idaho the stimulation for industrial development which Hells Canyon will afford, we are recommending in the proposed legislation that 300,000 kilowatts of power and associated energy be reserved to that State for use within the State. That is a reservation for Idaho as a State; but it is not a limitation upon the amount of power which can be made available for use there, for still more could be obtained from the Federal system, as is the case in other parts of the Columbia Basin. This will enable Idaho to take major strides in developing her industrial base. And this is in addition to the growth it will give to irrigation, in Idaho as well as other States. As I shall suggest later, the availability of power from Hells Canyon to other parts of the contributing basin above the site should also be assured to the extent that loads develop in those areas.

Aside from the urgency of providing new power for the national defense, introduction of legislation which would authorize Hells Canyon is timely because of a conflicting plan for development of that stretch of the river. There is now pending before the Federal Power Commission a request for a permit to build a low dam at Oxbow, situated within the proposed reservoir area for Hells Canyon. The granting of such a permit would destroy the opportunity for fully harnessing that stretch of the Snake and would produce only about one-tenth of the power which Hells Canyon will produce. It is, therefore, important that the Congress understand the real impact which Hells Canyon will have on the economy of the Northwest. Hearings on this bill will provide us with the full story and the true story.

The physical features of the proposed development are intriguing, and I invite those who hear or read this statement to ponder them carefully.

Flowing northward through the uplands of the Wallowa Mountains of Oregon and the Seven Devils Mountains of Idaho, the Snake River has entrenched itself deeply in what is known as the Grand Canyon of the Snake River, one of the deeper canyons of the world. It is a region of wild, rugged beauty and desolation. Through it the Snake forms the boundary between Oregon and Idaho. A part of the southern or upstream end of the Snake Canyon is called Box Canyon. It is steep-walled and constitutes the 30-mile-long inaccessible portion of the Grand Canyon. At the upstream end of this box gorge would rest the Hells Canyon Dam.

The site is about 60 miles northeast of Baker, Oreg., as the crow flies. By river from Huntington, Oreg., near the mouth of the Burnt River, the site is approximately 80 miles downstream and about 100 miles upstream from Lewiston, Idaho. At the site of the dam the canyon is more than a mile deep, and the canyon floor is only about 280 feet wide.

The new dam would be a concrete arch-gravity type structure. It would contain in the neighborhood of 6,200,000 cubic yards of concrete, making it the world's third largest dam. The elevation of the crest would be 2,082 feet above sea level. The power plant would ultimately hold nine 100,000-kilowatt generators.

The reservoir will have a maximum capacity of 4,400,000 acre-feet, of which 3,880,000 will be active or usable storage. It will extend approximately 93 miles along the Idaho-Oregon State line to a point about 11 miles downstream from Weiser.

The physical quality of the rock at the dam site is excellent and is suitable for a dam of any height.

The project will cost about $356,810,000 at current price levels. The entire cost, plus interest, will be returned to the Federal Treasury, with the exception of allocations to flood control, navigation, and other possible nonreimbursable purposes. The fact that all power costs will be returned and the fact that the economic value of power developed to reflect conditions in the Northwest as they existed about 4 years ago considerably exceeds the cost of power creditable to Hells Canyon demonstrate that the project enjoys a favorable relationship of benefits to cost.

These, in general terms, are the basic features of the Hells Canyon project and of the proposed legislation. I should now like to discuss certain of these features in greater detail.

In evaluating the significance of Hells Canyon from the broad viewpoint of assuring ultimate full-scale development of our important river system we must realize that the opportunities for constructing large projects in the Northwest are constantly dwindling as the growing population and economy inexorably reduce the availability of once isolated areas suitable and needed for reservoirs.

From the standpoint of making the greatest possible use of the Columbia's water resources for irrigation, domestic and municipal use, and pollution abatement, as well as for power, flood control, and navigation, it would be ideal to have storage capacity which would give complete control of the river. With full control, flows could be held back or released as required to meet the specific seasonal needs of all kinds, and above-average run-off of one year could be held to supplement the lower-than-average run-off of another year. That would be ideal. But lacking the ideal, we should do that which is feasible and possible, and at least authorize these basic structures in the main control plan.

The average annual run-off of the Columbia River is in excess of 150,000,000 acre-feet, which is exceeded in the United States only by the Ohio and the lower Mississippi. To provide storage for years of above average run-off and to permit full regulation of the river would require space to hold more than three times the average run-off, or about 500,000,000 acre-feet of storage space.

Storage of this magnitude could have been obtained at a very early stage in the settlement of the Northwest, but developments which have since taken place in the large, potential storage basins have eliminated the possibility of such large-scale storage at several sites on the Columbia River and on tributaries at each of which from 5,000,000 to 50,000,000 acre-feet of storage could have been developed.

The large natural lakes in the Northwest are natural places to seek large amounts of storage at low cost by further development. But these storage sites have been largely eliminated from consideration by the strongly expressed will of the people, and in some cases by State legislative action.

Very real problems thus exist in the Northwest when we come to consider the development of even a nominal part of the total desirable storage. An objective of only 27,000,000 acre-feet was set up by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers, after exhaustive study, to meet immediately prospective needs of flood control and power in connection with the main control plan, previously mentioned. Of the effective storage capacity in that plan required to reduce destructive floods to controllable discharges, about one-fifth must be provided in projects which are as yet unauthorized by the Congress. Hells Canyon Dam is a major structure of the main control plan, and what is of greatest significance, it is the more important of the two projects which although included in the main control plan, are not as yet authorized by the Congress. The other site required to provide the initial flood control for major floods on the Columbia is Glacier View, or an alternate. This site and each of the alternates which have been seriously considered have met with such intense opposition in the planning stages of the investigation as to defer recommendation of their development.

Even if all the storage were to be developed at Hells Canyon and elsewhere, we would have only 9 percent of that required for full control of the river. If all additional storage in prospect in the entire Columbia River system, much of it at very high cost, were provided, the total storage still would not be much more than 25 percent of the amount required for full control of the river.

In the light of this serious inadequacy of storage possibilities in the Northwest, it is urgent that we do not sacrifice even one of the reservoirs that is economically feasible. Hells Canyon is such a reservoir.

The greatest direct contributions of the Hells Canyon development will come from use of the storage capacity to be provided in its great reservoir. Floodwaters of the Snake River at the Hells Canyon site, which would otherwise damage lands and communities along the lower Snake and Columbia Rivers, will be safely impounded in its 3,880,000 acre-feet of usable storage capacity. Held in the reservoir until that time in each year when it is necessary to augment diminishing natural flows, these floodwaters will then be released for productive purposes to increase power production and to increase the depth of navigable channels over those which would prevail under natural conditions.

The annual pattern of weather and runoff in the Columbia and Snake River Basins makes possible the harmonious relationship of power, flood control and other benefits. Each year sees a great outpouring of waters from the mountains as the winter's accumulation of snow melts. Spring floods attending the quick snow melt from the extensive mountain areas are followed by diminishing flows during the later summer and by a long season of low water which extends throughout the fall and the winter months due to general freeze-up in the mountainous areas and precipitation largely in the form of snow. Measurements of the snow pack indicate each year what the volume of the spring and summer outpouring is likely to be.

Thus, starting with a reservoir filled from the spring flood of the Snake River, that water will be conserved during the summer, with minimum use of inflow during that season for power production at the Hells Canyon plant. With the advent of the fall low-water period, stored water will be released for increased power production at the Hells Canyon plant and at other plants downstream and will incidentally but substantially benefit navigation by increasing the depth of water in navigable channels. Continued through the winter, the draw-down of the reservoir can be closely adjusted, using forecasts of the next spring's runoff provided by snow surveys, to create storage space in which to store the floodwaters of the following spring, and start the succeeding fall and winter operation with the reservoir at the maximum elevation possible. Thus, power, flood-control, and other purposes will be served without conflict through use of the Hells Canyon storage reservoir. The same kind and the same degree of benefits, it is clear, could not be achieved by any development of this reach of the Snake River which did not involve storage.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that building for storage is an essential part of this program.

I have said before that new power in Northwest, over and above that which will be provided by plants under construction and authorized, is needed at the earliest possible date.

The Scriver Creek power development can be at work in defense of the Nation in 4 years, and the much larger contribution by Hells Canyon can start a year later. Present Bureau of Reclamation construction schedules show that initial generation from Hells Canyon would be available in a little over 5 years after the start of construction, with additional generators coming on the line at 3-month intervals, the last coming into service less than 2 years after the first unit went on the line. This represents a very rapid, though thoroughly realistic schedule for so large a structure.

The Pacific Northwest depends almost entirely on hydro for its electric energy requirements. Nearly half of these requirements are supplied from the large multipurpose projects of the Federal Government.

Power has been short in the region during the past few years and will continue to be short for several more years. A rapid population growth, extension of lines to serve nearly all farm and rural consumers, and industrial growth account for the rapid increase in electric energy requirements in the region.

Last September interruptible industrial loads were curtailed when stream flows receded rapidly after a very dry summer. Better than average stream flows enabled restoration of these loads in October. Favorable water conditions during the rest of the winter enabled the region to squeeze by without further curtailment, but only with the use of old inefficient fuel-fired electric generating plants, and by importing electric energy from British Columbia and Montana, were we able to get through the emergency of great electric power shortage.

During next year, 1952–53, the region will be short an average of about 650,000 kilowatts if minimum water-year conditions prevail. This shortage represents just a little more than the extent of power that is expected to be sold to industry next year on an interruptible basis. About one-fourth of the requirements of all industry in the region will be on an interruptible basis, subject to being cut off in case of critical water conditions.

The power situation will improve only slightly in 1953, when power from the great McNary project becomes available. Additional improvement will be noted when power is produced at Chief Joseph in 1955. However, normal load growth of existing customers will leave little additional power for new industry.

Not until power becomes available from The Dalles Dam in 1957 and then from additional projects on which construction has not yet started can any substantial amount of new industrial loads be served.

A moment ago I pointed out that expansion of industries producing critical weapons for our Armed Forces is being choked off by lack of firm power in the Pacific Northwest. These establishments are vital to the defense of the country and also to the economy of the area. The Federal projects on the Columbia River and its tributaries provide an important part of the electric energy needed to supply the Nation with vital products and to sustain our industrial strength.

Industries using electric energy in electrolytic processes or in electric furnaces have been among the fastest growing industries in the Nation. In times of war and preparation for defense, these industries which produce aluminum, magnesium, copper, zinc, chlorine, phosphorus, electric steel, ferro-alloys, calcium carbide, and abrasives expand very rapidly. Electro-process industries consumed about 15 percent of all electric energy used by manufactures in 1939. With the large demands of a war economy, the electro-chemical and electro-thermal processes accounted for about 27 percent of all electric energy used in manufactures in 1943. In 1950 these industries accounted for 22 percent of the electric energy used in manufactures. Consumption of electric energy in electro-chemical and electro-thermal processes would be larger today but for the shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest.

Power costs in these electro-process industries range from 10 to 50 percent of the total production cost. That is why these industries seek locations where low-cost power is available and why they are concentrated at such locations. Their earliest growth, from 1895 to 1924, was in the Buffalo-Niagara Falls area. Today this area supports about 1,000,000 people, most of whom depend directly or indirectly upon these large power-consuming industries.

In the 1930's the electro-process industries expanded into the Tennessee Valley. Low-cost power was available from federally constructed dams in the area. Since 1950 these industries have looked to the Columbia River for their expansion locations.

During the past 11 years a considerable expansion has taken place, but it has been slowed because new dams have not been built fast enough to take care of the expansion needs of these industries.

As I have said so many times, Mr. President, the great hope for the American economy is to be found in expanding it. The great strength of the capitalistic system is to be found in the fact that we have only scratched the surface of its expanding potentialities. We must always be on guard against anything that tends to restrict our economy. We must do the things which are necessary to expand our economy, and we must have a coordinated cooperative private-enterprise government program which will make possible the building of great dams, such as Hells Canyon, from the power of which private industry can expand.

By way of digression at this point, let me refer to one of the fundamental principles of Lincoln republicanism. Cogently and with great vision Lincoln pointed out to the American people, in a discussion of his political philosophy and of the objectives of our republican form of government, that—

> The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves.

I have always buttressed my support of great public works, such as the Hells Canyon Dam, upon the principle of self-liquidation, save and except for those nonreimbursable items which are necessary from the standpoint of carrying out a great national public function, such as flood control and navigation. I have done this not only on the basis of the great principle manifested in the political philosophy of Abraham Lincoln, but also upon my own conviction that we as a people must do through government the things which are necessary to give us the resources and the sinews for an ever-expanding economy, because perpetuation of the private enterprise system itself is dependent upon those resources.

Some expansion has been taking place in spite of the power shortage. This expansion is based on the purchase by industry of interruptible power. Industry is taking the calculated risk of having to close down part of its operations during periods when there is not sufficient water in the river to generate the power necessary to meet industrial requirement.

The electro-process industries fit well into the economy of the Pacific Northwest and will help give this area the industrial diversity and stability it so badly needs. The chief attracting force to these operations is low-cost power. Without the low-cost power from the multipurpose projects on the Columbia River and its tributaries, the size of these electro-process industries in the Nation would be substantially smaller. For these industries there is no substitute for the low-cost electric energy.

Aluminum reduction plants locate where they can secure large amounts of low-cost power. Anyone familiar with the power requirements of this rapidly expanding and vital industry knows that about 9 kilowatt-hours are required to produce a pound of aluminum. In 1951 the five aluminum reduction mills in Oregon and Washington used about one-fourth of all the electric energy consumed in the Pacific Northwest.

That is such a vital statistic that I think it important to repeat it. In 1951 the five aluminum reduction mills in Oregon and Washington used about one-fourth of all the electric energy consumed in the Pacific Northwest.

Last year the five aluminum reduction mills in Oregon and Washington accounted for 44 percent of the Nation's primary aluminum output. Ten percent of the United States aluminum production in 1951 was produced in the Northwest with interruptible power. This gives some indication of the threat of power shortage.

Let me put it this way: It is an understatement to say that the production of aluminum through low-cost power in the Pacific Northwest is vital to the defense program of the United States. The security of our Nation, in a very real sense, is dependent upon the production of aluminum, because we have no hope of gaining superiority in the air, which superiority is essential to the defense and security of our Nation, unless we have an adequate supply of aluminum to build the air fleets we need for air superiority. Hence, when I speak today about the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam and the enlargement of the power resources of the Nation, I am speaking about a project which is vital to the building of the defenses of the United States.

The rolling mill at Spokane, the rod, wire, and cable plant at Vancouver, and about 60 foundries located throughout the region, utilize nearly half the primary aluminum produced in the region. In 1951 over 20 percent of the Nation's output of aluminum plate, sheet, and other rolled products was manufactured in the region.

Magnesium is again being produced at Spokane, Wash. This war plant will soon reach full capacity output. Furthermore, over one-fourth of the Nation's lead and zinc comes from the area near Spokane, principally in the Idaho Panhandle, embraced in the Kellogg-Wallace region. Due to the complex ores, the zinc is recovered by an electrolytic process, the efficiency of which has been fully proved by the constructive work of the Bunker Hill & Sullivan Mining & Milling Co. at Kellogg.

Ferro-alloys, including ferromanganese, ferrochrome, and high silicon content ferrosilicon, are produced in the region, the output last year being about 4 percent of the national production. Part of the ferrosilicon is used in the production of magnesium, but most of these ferroalloys are used in the manufacture of steel.

Two plants in the region produce calcium carbide, and one plant manufactures silicon carbide for abrasives. Three plants produce chlorine and caustic soda, and one of these factories also produces chlorates, perchlorates, insecticides, weed killers, and industrial cleaners. Chlorine and caustic soda are used by the local and British Columbia pulp and paper industry. Caustic soda is also used in the region for the manufacture of glue for the plywood and laminated wood industry and for soap and chemicals.

Pulp and paper mills in the region account for more than 20 percent of the Nation's pulp and over 5 percent of the paper products. Nearly all of the rayon grade pulp produced in the Nation is manufactured in western Washington. The pulp and paper industry in the region, as a result of technical improvements and expansion, is now purchasing more than twice as much power as it did at the end of World War II.

The lumber industry is the principal industry in terms of employment. Last year, Pacific Northwest mills sawed about one-third of the Nation's lumber. Nearly all of the United States output of shingles and softwood plywood comes from the Pacific Northwest.

Availability of additional power will enable expansion and continued technological improvements in the forest-products industries and the electro-process industries. These electro-process industries look to the low-cost power of the Pacific Northwest which can be made available in large quantities for their expansion if large projects such as Hells Canyon are constructed. Expansion of these industries is essential to continue to build up the Nation's defense.

Aside from its contribution to national defense, low-cost power from Hells Canyon could develop a large but relatively untapped Northwest resource, namely, phosphate rock. Southeastern Idaho and adjacent areas in Montana, Wyoming, and Utah contain approximately 60 percent of the United States reserves of this rock. About three-fourths of these reserves are in Idaho. In spite of the extent of these western reserves, very little has been done to develop them until recently. Small amounts of fertilizer have been produced, but they have not been sufficient to supply the market in the Western States.

The need for fertilizer in the Western States far exceeds both production and consumption in that area. Increased removal of phosphorous from the soil is affecting the food value of many of our crops today. The only known source of phosphorus to replenish what is being withdrawn from the soil is phosphate rock. In addition, newly irrigated areas in the Pacific Northwest will require large amounts of phosphorous fertilizer. Production of the fertilizer in the West will not only help to maintain our food supply and conserve our resources of sulfur and phosphate rock, but will provide a new industry to an area whose manufactures are now relatively small.

Recently the two Westvaco plants have been built in the western phosphate rock area at Pocatello for the production, by the electric-furnace method, of elemental phosphorous for chemical uses, not for fertilizer; and a third, a Monsanto plant, is under construction near Soda Springs. Fertilizer is produced in small amounts in this area by the sulfuric-acid method. No fertilizer is as yet produced in the West by the electric-furnace method because of the relatively high cost of electric power in the southeastern Idaho area, where much of the phosphate-rock deposit is located. For production of fertilizer, power must be available at about 3 mills a kilowatt-hour. One of the causes of the present shortage of phosphate fertilizers is the lack of sufficient supplies of sulfuric acid. Available electric power at low cost in the phosphate-rock area could be used for the production of elemental phosphorous and fertilizer and help alleviate the present fertilizer shortage.

The western rock reserves are of mixed quality. Only the high-grade rock can be used for the production of fertilizers by the sulfuric-acid method, while both the high- and low-grade rock, or a mixture of high- and low-grade

rock, can be used in the electric-furnace method of producing elemental phosphorus. Since the greater part of the western phosphate reserves are low-grade rock, the electric-furnace method of fertilizer production would conserve, or make available for other purposes, both the phosphate rock and sulfuric acid. The amount of commercially recoverable phosphorus would be multiplied manyfold if the electric-furnace method rather than the sulfuric-acid method were utilized.

It is unlikely that electric energy could be made available in southeastern Idaho at the low-rate level required for the development of an electric-furnace fertilizer industry without the construction of Hells Canyon Dam.

In addition to power development, flood control is an important benefit to be derived from the Hells Canyon Dam. Like power, the flood control to be contributed by the dam is an integral part of a minimum-essential program for the Northwest. To provide minimum needed protection for developments along the lower Columbia River, where the great bulk of flood damage occurs, an immediate goal was established in the comprehensive plan to limit flows at The Dalles to 800,000 cubic feet per second. Strategically located reservoirs were selected, which, in conjunction with those already in existence or authorized, would provide about 27,000,000 acre-feet of storage, and would reduce the maximum flood flow of record, 1,200,000 second-feet at The Dalles to 800,000 second-feet. The Hells Canyon Reservoir is one of the storage developments selected and recommended for this purpose. And again I say, it is the only one specifically recommended to meet the immediate goal which has not been authorized for construction since formulation of the main-control plan.

This flood-control plan, of which Hells Canyon is also an integral part, represents only a partial stop-gap phase of the ultimate storage plan which will be needed for full flood control. Ultimate use of storage sites on the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers, to the current use of which strong objections have been raised by Idaho and by commercial salmon-fishery interests, would be required for control of the Snake and fuller control of flows on the lower Columbia. Floods following the pattern of those of the past will be relatively higher in some years on the Snake and in other years on its lower tributaries. Taking one year with another, the storage on the Snake at Hells Canyon will contribute as much, for example, as storage proposed for future development on the Clearwater River, and both would be required for the most effective control and use of our water resources.

The total benefits of the 27,000,000 acre-feet of storage and the related levee system on the lower Columbia River system for flood control have been estimated by the Corps of Engineers at $16,191,800 annually. Of this amount, $1,459,800, or about 9 percent, has been assigned by the corps to the Hells Canyon Reservoir. The present worth of this amount as an annuity over a 50-year period, using an interest rate of 3 percent per annum, is $37,561,000, which is the proposed allocation of the capital cost of Hells Canyon to flood control.

Another multiple-purpose benefit of Hells Canyon is improvement of navigation. Contributions to inland water transportation will be made by the development in two ways. Releases from the reservoir for increased power production during the period of low flow on the Snake and Columbia will increase the depth of water in those downstream navigable reaches for which slack water navigation has not been provided. In addition, it will create a navigable lake leading from the dam to the Union Pacific main line near Hunting, Oreg.

Benefits from increasing low water flows on the Snake River will accrue in the reach between the mouth of the Grande Ronde River and Lewiston, Idaho, and on the Columbia River from Bonneville Dam to Vancouver, Wash. The value of these downstream navigation benefits has been estimated by the Corps of Engineers to be $91,000 annually. There would be additional, temporary benefits of this kind should the Hells Canyon Reservoir be placed in operation before completion of projects authorized but not yet started which would create slack water pools on the lower Snake and on the middle lower Columbia.

The availability of a navigable lake behind the Hells Canyon Dam, coupled with large blocks of power, will help unlock valuable mineral deposits of the Snake Canyon, which have been little developed in the absence of these advantages. The annual value of the lake for commercial navigation purposes has been estimated by the Corps of Engineers at $98,000. The total, continuing benefit of the project to navigation—taking account of both downstream and reservoir benefits, both of which are obtained incidentally to its primary use for power production—thus is placed at $189,000, the present worth of which as an annuity over a 50-year period, with interest at 3 percent per annum, is $4,863,000. This is the proposed allocation of the capital cost of the Hells Canyon development to navigation.

Furthermore, construction of Hells Canyon Dam, highest in the world, will provide the Pacific Northwest with one of the country's greatest tourist attractions. It will open up the currently inaccessible Hells Canyon area, known the world over for its spectacular ruggedness. With the access highways contemplated, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the influx will match or exceed that of the Grand Coulee Dam—300,000 yearly. Nearly 2,000,000 people last year visited Hoover Dam and Reservoir, situated in an area not nearly as spectacular.

The recreation and tourist attractions which the project will create, though difficult to evaluate, will attain very large and economically significant proportions, judging from experience at other similar developments which lack the spectacular setting of Hells Canyon.

The recreational opportunities and tourist attractions offered by a continuous body of water reaching into the now almost inaccessible depths of the Nation's deepest canyon are evident. The reservation of land and the provision of facilities to insure full public enjoyment of the recreational possibilities are part of the project plan. Heavy draw-downs of the reservoir will be made during winter months, and, in general, the reservoir surface will be at or near maximum elevation during the summer season.

While discussing the benefits to recreation, it is not amiss to point out that it is planned, pending the establishment of policy by the Congress on this matter, to limit the allocation of project construction cost to the construction cost of needed public recreation facilities in the immediate vicinity of the reservoir. This cost, estimated at $1,000,000, is appropriately proposed to be treated as nonreimbursable in view of the widespread public benefits to be created.

The bill being introduced today also lays the basis for assistance to future irrigation developments in the Snake River Basin down to and including the Grand Ronde River, some 73 miles by river from the dam site. It establishes the basic statutory foundation for the authorization, by the Congress, of new irrigation developments in that basin as divisions of the Snake River project, thereby permitting the use of Hells Canyon Dam and Scriver Creek power revenues to assist in the repayment of irrigation construction costs of such developments. Such use of power revenues is in keeping with the terms of existing Federal reclamation law, and the provision in this bill is but a sound application of this policy to the proposed power developments. However, revision of that policy, after reexamination by the Congress, would in no way be precluded by enactment of this bill.

It is a fact that thousands of acres of potentially productive farm land in the Northwest exist as barren waste land today, while water that could transform them into rich agricultural areas flows unused into the Pacific Ocean. Use of other farm-lands, although now irrigated, is restricted by supplies of irrigation water which are inadequate to permit maximum crop production.

Construction of facilities to supply these lands with needed irrigation water would have far-reaching effects on the regional and national economy. Benefits from these developments would compare favorably with those that have attended irrigation in presently established farming areas. The production of food and fiber would help feed and clothe our expanding population; new communities would be established; existing centers of population would grow; new markets would be created; and the economic pulse of the area would be quickened.

While the benefits attendant upon these potential irrigation developments would be great, the prospective costs for many of them exceed the amounts which the farmers alone could repay. Some of these new developments would include power installations from which power revenues could be applied, under provisions of the reclamation law, toward repayment of reimbursable irrigation

costs that are beyond the ability of the water users to repay. Many of these potential irrigation projects, however, either would not have power features directly associated with them, or the power installations would be of insufficient size to provide the full amount of financial assistance needed by the terms of existing law.

Mr. President, permit me to digress from the manuscript for a moment, to call the attention of those who read my remarks to what I think is a great obligation resting upon Members of Congress these days, namely, the obligation to raise our sights into the next century, far beyond the immediate present. I say that because what we do in our generation of service in this body will determine in large measure the destiny of our great country throughout the centuries to come.

I always deprecate the short-sightedness of those who so frequently are heard to say, "Why reclaim arid land? We are dealing constantly with the problem of food surpluses, not food shortages."

Mr. President, even in our time such surpluses have not been very large; and even in our time the turning of the hand of Nature against us in any one season, such as happened a few years ago when large portions of a certain area of our country became a Dust Bowl, brings with it a convincing warning that food surpluses are a great blessing and that we should always be on guard against the danger of food shortages which is ever present in the background. If one will only study the history of civilization, he cannot escape the dramatic story that the supply of food for any people determines in large measure the height its civilization reaches.

Thus, in the pages of history we read of the decline of great civilizations because the people of that time in the country concerned did not have sufficient foresight to raise their eyes far enough beyond their then present into the great beyond of the future through which their country, in terms of history, was certain to travel. They did not have sufficient foresight and statesmanship to see the importance of sound soil conservation, of preserving for future generations the great natural resources of their country. They did not see in time the importance of a sound reclamation program. Most sad of all, Mr. President, they did not see the importance of keeping their land in such a condition that they could have the blessing which presently is the blessing of the American people, namely, an agricultural economy producing a surplus of food.

Today I would say to my fellow Americans that we need to think about the food problems of the United States decades away, and we need to plan now so as to prepare for our posterity a rich heritage in the form of sound conservation and soil-reclamation programs.

Let me also suggest to them a very disturbing fact—and I emphasize the word "fact," Mr. President, because I think our students of population growth and our authorities in the field of population studies already have brought forth in their researches and writings very convincing proof of it—that inevitably, as the standard of living of the backward areas of the world rises to ever greater heights, the question of the world's food supply will be one of the great problems facing mankind.

With a higher standard of living, which the people in the so-called backward areas of the world today are bound to attain eventually, or at least their posterity, for not many of them will enjoy a much higher standard of living within their lifetime, there will be more food consumed, and a greater need for food; and woe to America at that time if we shall not have planned for that eventuality.

Oh, Mr. President, on the entire question of America's future economic problems in the century ahead I think there is much short-sightedness manifested in our land today. There is a failure to realize the economic meanings as well as the political meanings of the great economic revolution which is going on in the backward areas of the world. One of the most enlightening articles I have read within recent weeks dealing somewhat with this subject was an article which I read in last month's Harper's, entitled "Africa Is Next." The author of the article developed in clear and convincing form the thesis that tremendous economic changes are going to take place in Africa within the decades immediately ahead.

The same can be said, in my judgment, Mr. President, of many other areas of the world, such as Asia, particularly the free parts of Asia, of South America, and yes, of every area of the world where human beings, all the creatures of the Almighty, are today living under conditions which we Americans describe as subnormal standards of living.

The great "stomach revolution," which is to continue for the next century, will undoubtedly, in my opinion, result in an economy for those people which will greatly raise their standard of living, and which in turn will create serious population problems and great drains upon the food supplies of the world.

Mr. President, if during that century we follow a course of action by which we seek to live unto ourselves alone, by which we wrap our economic cloak about us and say, "It will warm only our bodies, and you cannot come within its folds," we are likely then to discover what certain civilizations have discovered in generations and centuries gone by, namely, that whenever a powerful nation, placing itself in an isolated position as being an outstanding possessing nation, seeks either to hold itself aloof from the have-not nations, or to dictate to them economically, be it through some form of economic imperialism or colonialism, or any other type of economic exploitation, the end result is the fall of that nation. That is amply demonstrated by the pages of history.

Oh, yes, Mr. President; I know that, when enjoying comfort, it is easy to ward off any suggestion that we should now plan for a continuation of the kind of great economy which is ours by taking, from decade to decade the steps which are necessary in order to keep it an ever-expanding economy; I know that in periods such as this, when each one of us is troubled with his own personal economic problems, we derive some psychological satisfaction from a head-in-the-sand attitude, from a resort to a psychological escape mechanism, which is all too prevalent in American thinking today; but there is no justification for me, as a representative of a free people on the floor of the United States Senate, to yield and to become a party to that kind of fallacious, short-sighted thinking. Rather, looking upon my job as that of a student of government which places upon me the obligation of taking the facts as I see them to the people of my country, willing at all times to stand up against a public opinion which may be wrong on the fact, I plead today, in discussing this Hells Canyon project, that it be thought of and considered in terms of the Nations future economic needs, and in terms not only of its relationship to our people in connection with their domestic problems, but also, in terms of the relationship of our people to their international problems in the century ahead. To the extent—and it is a great extent—that a great project such as this will further reclamation, will assist in preserving the precious topsoil of America, and will help reduce the danger of any part of our country becoming another arid, eroded China; to the extent that this project will give us a large potential for increased food production, which I think we are going to need sorely toward the end of the century—to those extents, Mr. President, I ask the people of my country to pay attention to the international significance of such projects as this one, because I want my country to remain strong in this century of revolution. I want my country to continue to have a surplus of food, not a break-even food program, not a scarcity of food. I want my country to continue to be able to support a population known the world around for its great physical strength and for its good health, and when all is said and done, food is the fuel which produces the elements of the strength and good health.

I say again that, from this angle, there is a close relationship between the soil of America and what we do with the soil, and the position of America in world affairs for the century to come. That is why I say, Mr. President, that even in connection with such projects as this one, it is important that we think beyond the present into the future, and a long way into the future. This is an economically sound plan for the present. It is a great investment for the American people in the future.

Thus I say, Mr. President, that while the benefits attendant upon these potential irrigation developments would be great, the prospective costs for many of them exceed the amounts which the farmer alone could repay.

The location of the Hells Canyon Reservoir at the lower end of the valley, and down in a deep gorge, makes it impossible to deliver water directly from it to all irrigable land in the area. However, it has been a part of the plan from

the outset to obtain for irrigation projects the same kind of financial assistance from the Hells Canyon development which is available where irrigation and power are physically combined in a single project.

Twelve representative projects which lie in the States of Wyoming, Idaho, and Oregon illustrate the problem. Eleven of them, lying within the upper and middle Snake River Basin as defined in the bill, include the Star Valley project in Wyoming, the upper unit of the Baker project and the Grande Ronde project in Oregon; the Mountain Home and Bruneau projects in Idaho; and a number of lesser potential developments in Oregon and Idaho. In addition, there is included the Crooked River project of Oregon, which lies outside the area where irrigation assistance would be afforded under existing provision of the bill. The 12 projects embrace some 987,000 acres, principally lands now dry, and the increased annual crop return to be expected from them as a result of irrigation is estimated to be twice the annual costs of the projects to the Nation. As of 1948, the estimated irrigation construction cost of these undertakings was $490,000,000, of which it was estimated that about $222,000,000 could be returned from project sources. Assistance from other sources in the amount of $268,000,000 will be necessary to return to the Treasury the full capital costs of these developments. Without a source for the provision of such assistance, which it is proposed might be made available from power revenues of the Hells Canyon development—but subject to later action by the Congress—there is little prospect that such worthy projects can be undertaken and the important contributions which they could make to the economy of the Northwest and of the Nation can be realized.

In developing any storage reservoir of the magnitude of Hells Canyon, some dislocation of people, their lands, and improvements unavoidably takes place, which is regrettable despite the payment to those people of the full value of their lands and improvements. The relatively minor displacement which the Hells Canyon development will necessitate, however, and the many opportunities which it will add to the local economy, make clear, even without consideration of the regional and national benefits to be conferred, that advantages of the development vastly offset any local disadvantages.

The very sparse population of the reservoir area is supported in part by its meager agricultural resources and in part by the small-scale mining activities. Livestock grazing on the sides of the canyon coupled with winter feed production at ranch headquarters scattered along the canyon floor and in some of the larger tributaries constitute the chief agricultural use of the area. Of the somewhat more than 19,000 acres which would be inundated by the Hells Canyon Reservoir, about 90 percent is grazing and waste land. Approximately 1,800 acres of cultivated land would be flooded, of which 1,400 are irrigated.

The character and location of mineral deposits in the canyon have not encouraged the maintenance of a mining industry of any great importance. Gravels in the river bed and in terraces are known to contain small quantities of gold, but the volumes have not been regarded heretofore as sufficient to support their removal on a commercial basis. It is my understanding that interest in the exploitation of these gravels has recently been revived. It is my understanding also that efficient, large-scale methods of working such placer deposits are now available which will permit completion of the operation during the period the dam is under construction, in the event any placer operations there should prove economically attractive. The relatively small, sporadic mining operations of the past have been largely based on lode deposits of copper, silver, and gold ores. The known ore reserves of mining properties which would be made inaccessible by creation of the reservoir are small, much the largest being the approximately 110,000 tons revealed by exploratory drilling during the last period when the largest of the old mines was operated, 1942–43. No commercial production of significance has been undertaken during the past 3 years, and current activities are confined to exploratory and developmental work.

Offsetting the displacement of such ore bodies in whole or in part, the availability of transportation on the lake leading to the main line of the Union Pacific near Huntington, Oreg., in addition to large blocks of low-cost project power, would greatly enhance the prospects for economic development of ore bodies now adversely affected. Illustrative of such opportunities which the Hells Canyon project should open is the Red Ledge property near the Hells Canyon Dam site where sporadic explorations during the past 30 years have indicated the existence of substantial reserves, including more than 1,000,000 tons of low-grade copper ore and more than 100,000 tons of medium-grade zinc-copper ores; all of these known reserves lie above reservoir level.

The mining developments gave rise to the extension of a branch railroad from Huntington to Homestead, now operated only to Robinette at the mouth of the Powder River, and to the establishment of several communities which have dwindled to insignificant proportions. The two larger communities in the reservoir area, Robinette and Homestead, both of which would be flooded by the Hells Canyon Reservoir, are estimated to have a combined population not exceeding 50 persons. I doubt if there is another reservoir area anywhere in the country, even half this size, where so little personal disruption would take place. This is due, of course, to the wildness of the area. Replacement of all transportation and communication facilities required for the area would, of course, be provided as a part of the development, and roads required for project purposes would vastly improve access to the reservoir area.

In considering the construction of many dams in the Northwest there immediately arises the question, "Will it interfere with the Columbia River salmon run?" I am happy to be able to say that the Hells Canyon Dam is not numbered among potential developments in the Columbia River Basin over which fishery interests have objected because of adverse effects upon salmon runs. Preliminary studies by the Fish and Wildlife Service indicate that the magnitude of runs into the Snake above the dam site are relatively small and that the problem can probably be handled by facilities costing not more than $5,000,000. The costs of needed facilities, when more definitely established, would more than be encompassed within the contingency item in the estimated project costs and would be nonreimbursable under provisions of the act of August 14, 1946—Sixtieth Statute, page 1080.

Let me quote an authority on this subject, Mr. J. T. Barnaby, regional staff biologist, Fish and Wildlife Service. At the meeting of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee on April 18, 1951, he said:

> I feel quite positive that if the status quo were to be maintained, that if there were to be no increase in population or any increase in the industrial development of the region, that the salmon runs could not only be maintained but that they could be considerably increased in abundance. However, we all know that there is going to be an increasing growth of the population and the industrial development of the area. We know that we are going to have more dams and more diversions and more flood-control projects. McNary Dam is under construction on the main stem of the Columbia at the present time, and other main-stem dams are proposed for early construction, such as the lower Snake River dams, and dams at Hells Canyon, John Day, The Dalles, and Priest Rapids.
>
> We must first have a proper scheduling of projects. Those projects which would do little or no harm to the fishery resources should be constructed first and those projects which would do the greatest harm should be delayed for as long a period as possible. The fisheries people realize that some projects are necessary even though they may result in damage to the fish runs. In this category is the Hells Canyon project on the Snake River.

Mr. President, one of the finest things I can say about the Hells Canyon project, with all of its fine features, is that it is economically sound. The great bulk—88 percent—of the cost I have noted, is allocated to power and is reimbursable and is interest-bearing. The comparatively small remainder, totaling $43,424,000, is allocated on the traditional nonreimbursable basis to flood control in the amount of $37,561,000 and to navigation in the amount of $4,863,000, whereas only the $1,000,000 estimated construction cost of recreational facilities is allocated on a nonreimbursable basis to the important public recreation purposes the development will serve. Actually, the recreation benefits are many times this amount, but for the purposes here, only the cost of direct recreation facilities has been included.

Assurance of the full return of the power investment with interest is evident when we compare the cost of Hells Canyon power with the rates which it has been estimated by the Bonneville

Power Administration will quite probably be required to return the costs of the Federal power developments that are now under construction, authorized, and recommended.

The estimated annual costs associated with the reimbursable project cost of $313,386,000, at current price levels, which will be repaid from power revenues amount to $14,330,000 and consist of operation and maintenance expenses of $1,065,000, an annual replacement provision of $1,085,000, and interest and amortization on the $313,386,000 amounting to $12,180,000. The interest and amortization is computed on the basis of a 50-year period and 3 percent interest, a rate higher than the 2½ percent interest currently used as the cost of money to the Government in determining the costs for the Columbia River power system. Furthermore, the use of 3 percent interest in the amortization period of 50 years results in an annual requirement of 3.89 percent which is nearly 30 percent higher than the 3 percent return required by reclamation law for rate-making purposes.

While the cost data thus exceed the rate and repayment requirements of the reclamation law and accordingly may not be controlling ultimately in fixing the required rate level, the use of such higher costs provides a conservative demonstration of the financial soundness of the project.

In addition to the $14,330,000 annual cost for power production at the Hells Canyon Dam, there must be taken into account costs associated with the production of power at other plants in the system which is credited to Hells Canyon. Such costs have been established in connection with both approaches to the determination of the prime power capability added by or attributable to Hells Canyon, made by the Department of the Interior. It has been previously pointed out that Hells Canyon will add 1,124,000 kilowatts of prime power to the system of plants existing, under construction, authorized, and recommended. The total cost for the contribution by Hells Canyon, calculated in this way, thus represents the difference between the annual costs for the system with and without Hells Canyon. The amount of this difference, which includes the $14,330,000 annual cost at the Hells Canyon development, is $17,417,000, which results in an annual cost of $15.49 per prime kilowatt for the 1,124,000 kilowatts. Inasmuch as not all customers use power on a continuous around-the-clock basis throughout the entire year and not all customers make their maximum rate of use of power at the same time, the 1,124,000 kilowatts of prime or continuous power is sufficient to permit the Bonneville Power Administration to sell and deliver to customers as firm power a total of 1,463,000 kilowatts.

This latter amount is known as salable firm power, a concept generally recognized and used to distinguish it from continuous power capability at the hydroelectric plants. The annual cost per salable firm kilowatt thus becomes $11.90. The total cost to deliver the firm power added by Hells Canyon under the assumptions used in this case becomes $20.40 per kilowatt.

If the increase in prime capability at each run-of-river plant and at subbasin plants resulting from the electrical and hydraulic coordination and integration of the storage projects with the other plants is prorated to the several storage projects in proportion to the acre-feet of usable storage in reservoirs contributing to the run-of-river plants, the total prime power capability assignable to Hells Canyon becomes 1,430,500 kilowatts, consisting of 688,000 kilowatts at the Hells Canyon plant and 742,500 kilowatts allocated to Hells Canyon from the increased prime capability at downstream and subbasin plants resulting from such integration of operations.

The annual costs to be associated with the 1,430,500 kilowatts capability total $24,728,000. This includes the $14,330,000 annual costs at Hells Canyon, plus a proportionate share of the total power costs of projects producing the 742,500 kilowatts allocated to Hells Canyon. On this basis the cost, at current price levels, per prime kilowatt attributable to Hells Canyon is $17.28, which is obtained by dividing the total annual cost of $24,728,000 by the capability of 1,430,500 kilowatts. The latter figure is in terms of prime or continuous capability and is therefore equivalent, for reasons explained a moment ago, to 1,862,500 kilowatts of salable firm power that can be delivered to customers by the Bonneville Power Administration. The cost per kilowatt of salable firm power thus becomes $13.27. The total cost of salable firm power becomes $21.78 per kilowatt.

Therefore, each of the above two approaches to the evaluation of the Hells Canyon project results in a total annual cost per kilowatt of salable firm power which is less than the $22.50 average rate which the Bonneville Power Administration contemplates may be necessary by December 1959, in view of the fact that the costs of all new dams under construction, authorized, or recommended, are naturally higher than Grand Coulee or Bonneville, which were started during the depression, and therefore enjoyed low construction costs.

These costs per kilowatt for power attributable to the Hells Canyon project, together with the costs of generation at all the new projects under construction or authorized for construction and the costs of the transmission system requires to market the power from all the projects, will be averaged with the costs of the existing projects at Bonneville and Grand Coulee and with the costs of the present transmission system in order to obtain the over-all system costs that will be repaid to the Treasury. Accordingly, the rate level will have to be that required to meet the costs, which include interest, of the integrated Federal power system in the Pacific Northwest. The Bonneville Power Administration anticipates that at some time in the future an increase in its present basic rate level of $17.50 per kilowatt-year for firm power will be required. The Administration's wholesale power contracts contain provisions permitting increases in rates necessary to cover these costs. Such increases may be made at 5-year intervals, the next rate adjustment date being December 1954, and the following one December 1959. The Administration anticipates that a comparatively small increase, if any, will be required to cover the costs during the 5-year period from 1954 to 1959, and that in 1959 it will still be able to sell power at the lowest wholesale rate in the United States for large blocks of power.

I now turn to the specific provisions of the bill. Briefly, they are summarized as follows:

Section 1 would authorize the so-called Hells Canyon division of the Snake River project and the Scriver Creek power facilities of the Payette unit of the Mountain Home division. The Hells Canyon division comprises these principal engineering features: Hells Canyon Dam and Reservoir and power plant. The Scriver Creek power facilities are power facilities that ultimately could be operated in connection with the irrigation features of the Mountain Home division, but I again point out that the present bill does not authorize the building of the irrigation features of the Mountain Home project, nor does it in any way commit the Congress to authorize those features at any future time.

All the works authorized to be built under this bill would be under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, who, in the construction and in the operation and maintenance of the project, would, except as otherwise specifically provided in the bill, be governed by the Federal reclamation laws—act of June 17, 1902, Thirty-second Statute, page 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

The bill of itself does not authorize the construction of transmission lines. Whatever transmission lines would be required to interconnect the proposed power plants with other Federal plants in the Northwest would have to be constructed either under such authority as is already granted under the provisions of the basic statutes relating to the marketing of power by the Bonneville Power Administration, or under authority separately to be granted by the Congress.

Section 2 of the bill relates to the subordination of the operations of the Hells Canyon Dam and power plant to existing and prospective rights to the use of water for consumptive purposes, such as irrigation. Existing rights to the beneficial consumptive use of water, which rights are valid under State law, appear to be unmistakably protected. There is a requirement in the Federal reclamation laws—section 8, act of June 17, 1902, Thirty-second Statute, page 390—as it has recently been construed by the Supreme Court in the case *Gerlach Livestock Company* v. *United States* (339 U. S. 725 (1950)), that all existing rights must be recognized, making it unnecessary to have such a specific provision in the bill. However, the principle of affording full protection to existing water rights is such an important one in the West that the inclusion of the specific provision is warranted.

Let me say that that conclusion conforms to the long-established commitment of the junior Senator from Oregon,

in his many discussions of water-right problems in the Pacific Northwest, always to do what he could as a Member of the Senate to see to it that existing water rights are protected under legislation proposed for passage in the Senate.

The greater need is for a provision that will subordinate operations of the dam and power plant to the yet-to-be-established rights for future irrigation developments in amounts that are reasonable and equitable, considering the rights of both upstream and downstream areas. The United States, in connection with this project, would, in the normal course of events, establish rights under State law in conformity with the provisions of section 8 of the 1902 act.

Were rights to be so established, there would, however, be no protection to rights to be established in the future for consumptive use, for the United States would have established a priority for the use of water at Hells Canyon Dam. To meet this problem there has been written into section 2 a specific provision to afford a definite yardstick which will furnish adequate protection for future irrigation and other consumptive uses. The provision would require the Hells Canyon Dam division to be operated so as not to conflict with future beneficial consumptive uses, established under State law, based on a total amount of water that is reasonable and equitable for the irrigation of all the land that, using highly optimistic forecasts, is likely to be developed in the forseeable future.

The measure of this protection is indicated by the material appearing in chapter IV of the substantiating materials of the Hells Canyon project report as set forth in volume 2 of House Document No. 473, Eighty-first Congress. The measure of the protection is in terms of the quantity of water reasonably required for the development of a quantity of land, but stated so as not to be limited to specific lands. The quantities of lands are stated in terms of areas of lands yet to be developed under irrigation, 1,113,000 acres, and of lands requiring supplemental water, 1,233,000 acres. These are lands in the Snake River Basin above the dam. The reservation is stated in terms of an amount which would be reasonable and equitable for the irrigation of new lands and supplemental lands of like magnitude, rather than being tied to specific areas that are identified in the report to which reference is made.

The objective of the provision as to future water rights seems clear to me, and the provision proposed, I am confident, will meet this objective. If it should develop that the amount of protection is not adequate or that the provision can be stated in better fashion, I certainly will entertain proposals to this end.

As the principal sponsor of this bill, let me make it perfectly clear at this time for the record that the junior Senator from Oregon will give open-minded consideration to any proposal for an amendment to the bill which, in the opinion of the sponsor of the proposal, will make it a better bill and help the bill better to serve the national interest.

A third principal feature of the bill is the provision, set out in section 3, for the reservation for sale to the State of Idaho of 300,000 kilowatts of power and associated energy. Elsewhere in this statement I have pointed out that there may be need for assuring the areas in the vicinity of the dam and upstream therefrom that there will be substantial blocks of power available from the project for marketing within those areas. Whether the provisions of section 3 are best suited to meet this problem is a matter needing careful consideration, and I am sure the subject will receive such careful consideration during the hearings, as well as during the debate on the floor of the Senate, if and when the bill comes to the floor for action.

I am confident that my good friends the Senators from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK and Mr. WELKER], who have given extremely close attention to this important aspect of the bill, will cooperate with the committee in seeing to it that objective and factual information on this point is presented in the hearings to the end that the legitimate interests of the States concerned may be protected and the best interests of the Nation as a whole may be furthered.

The Secretary of the Interior advises in his letter of October 8, 1951, reporting on an identical bill, that the provision as it was drafted appears in the bill to meet views advanced by local groups in the State of Idaho. That reservation is in terms of blocks of power for sale to the State of Idaho. It would appear to me that, in order to take advantage of the proposed reservation, the State of Idaho would have to create a new agency for the purchase of the reserved power. The bill has a number of provisions with respect to the terms on which power will be made available to that State agency. However, in recognition of the fact that a principal justification for the authorization of the project is the role that it would play in supplying power for the defense program, it is provided, also, that the reserved power can be used on an interim basis notwithstanding the reservation to the State if the power is needed to meet certified defense loads. Moreover, the bill provides that the reservation to Idaho would not preclude the Secretary of the Interior from marketing power available, under the general authority he would have under the Federal reclamation laws, directly to power purchasers within the State, without such sales being charged against the State's reservation.

If the committee and the Congress should conclude that the State of Idaho, as a State, is not interested in having this particular type of reservation, this provision of the bill ought to be examined quite carefully to determine whether some other type of reservation would be better suited to assuring existing and potential power users in the Central and Upper Snake River Basins that blocks of power made available from the development of the water resources of those areas will be available for use in those areas. For example, there might be a kind of area reservation which would operate to require the Secretary of the Interior, in the exercise of his general marketing power under the Federal reclamation laws, to continue to make available blocks of power for that general area subject, of course, to a suitable provision to permit the Secretary, on an interim basis, to meet certified defense loads if the total demands are such that he could not serve both the certified defense loads and meet the area reservation.

Section 4 of the bill is intended to provide the means whereby various irrigation projects might subsequently be authorized as divisions of the Snake River project, looking toward the participation of those projects in whatever power revenues will be realized from the Snake River project to the extent that participation is necessary to meet the payout requirements established by the Federal reclamation laws. It has long been the policy of the Congress to provide for assistance to irrigation from power revenues on a project-by-project basis. This is sound policy, in my judgment, in relation to irrigation developments that are economically sound in terms of excess of benefits over costs, even though in particular developments it would be unreasonable to look to the water users to pay the full capital investment in irrigation under existing statutory requirements. The policy involves the use of the revenues from one regional asset—hydroelectric power—for the further development of closely related regional assets—water for irrigation of otherwise unproductive lands.

There are outstanding examples of the application of that principle in the Pacific Northwest. The obvious and outstanding example at the moment is the Columbia Basin project in the State of Washington. Another example of considerable moment is the Anderson Ranch Dam and power plant in the State of Idaho. This bill would limit the application of this principle to the area defined as the Central and Upper Snake River Basin, which includes the Snake River and its tributaries down to and including the Grande Ronde River. The principal project that could so be authorized and which perhaps could be undertaken under the Federal reclamation laws—but only if specifically authorized by Congress—is the Mountain Home project in Idaho.

None of these projects would be authorized by the bill which I have introduced, and, considering the present budgetary situation, I am of the view that they should be examined carefully before being undertaken now even if it were to be proposed that they be authorized by the bill.

To digress for a moment, I should like to answer an argument which certainly will be made by critics of mine and by opponents of the bill. It will be said that my advocacy of the expenditure of money for Hells Canyon Dam is difficult to reconcile with my strong advocacy for the maximum of economy in the budget. I have heretofore stated on the floor, and I now repeat, that I think the $85,000,000,000 budget must be cut, and cut drastically. Yet today I am proposing on the floor of the Senate a bill which

calls for the expenditure of a good many million dollars. It will be asked how can I reconcile my advocacy of the greatest amount of budget cuts consistent with maintaining a sound economy and adequate defense for my country, and yet at the same time propose this expenditure?

I point out again, as I have pointed out on other occasions with respect to the whole program of the budget, that we cannot justify false economy. We cannot justify refusing to appropriate such sums as will enhance the productive power, the income, and the wealth of the Nation. I believe that too frequently a clear line is not drawn between true economy and false economy. To deny money for the construction of such a great wealth-producing project as the Hells Canyon Dam would be an argument based on false economy, not on sound economy. Furthermore, I would repeat briefly this afternoon an argument I have made over the years in the Senate, namely, that of course the budget which comes to the floor of the Senate from the administration is not a sound budget from an accounting standpoint. From an accounting standpoint, it is not the kind of budget that any businessman in the United States would build for himself. No corporation adopts what I consider to be the very unsound structure of the Federal budget, because the Federal budget includes within it self-liquidating capital investments as though they were operating costs of the Government. I plead again, today, as I have done so many times in the past, that we in the Senate take a course of action which will require the building of a budget on a sound accounting basis.

Mr. President, until we do that, let us who serve in the Senate not make the mistake, in our thinking upon the budget, of confusing self-liquidating capital investments with operating costs. When we talk about the budget, let us keep in mind the importance of putting off by themselves the great self-liquidating capital investments built with the taxpayers' dollars, out of which over the years will flow into the United States Treasury many times their original cost, out of which will flow into the Treasury of the United States interest payments on their cost. Let us keep those great self-creating investments to one side; and then let us give our maximum attention to the job of cutting into the administrative costs of the Government, where the great savings can be made, because that is where we find the waste and the nonessential services, and that is where the economic surgeon's knife must be used to bring about a reduction in the $85,000,000,000 budget.

I make that argument only briefly today, Mr. President, because I know full well the devices which will be resorted to in an attempt to confuse the public regarding a project such as the one I am now discussing. As I said earlier in these remarks, and I repeat now for emphasis, this project is economically sound. It is a great self-liquidating project. Over the decades ahead, it will return to the taxpayers of the United States many times the expenditures which will go into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOBEY in the chair). If the Chair may interrupt, the Chair would like to say that from an asset point of view, these projects really constitute accounts receivable; do they not?

Mr. MORSE. That is entirely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to my friend, the Senator from Washington, that earlier in my remarks I announced that I would decline to yield because it is desired to have complete continuity in this presentation, for reprint purposes. Therefore, I wish to set forth without interruption the arguments which will constitute a handbook for use in the consideration and discussion of this problem at the grass roots.

Thus, Mr. President, returning to my manuscript, a few moments ago I said that none of these projects would be authorized by the bill introduced today, and, considering the present budgetary situation, I am of the view that they should be examined carefully before being undertaken now, even if it were to be proposed that they be authorized by the bill. However, this section of the bill is important because it will provide the basis for the subsequent authorization by the Congress of such projects, if on a weighing of their merits the Congress should so decide. In that event, the present bill, if enacted into law, would insure that the future development will proceed on a basis consistent with the Federal reclamation laws.

There is one matter I particularly want to discuss; that is the making of power from the big Federal dams of the Pacific Northwest available on relatively long-term bases to private power companies.

In connection with section 3 of the bill, relating to the resale of power by the State of Idaho, it is provided that contracts shall be made on terms and conditions that are not inconsistent with the Federal reclamation laws, as supplemented by the provisions of the bill. The Federal reclamation laws require, among other things, that in the sale of power on a Federal reclamation project by the Secretary of the Interior, preference shall be given to municipalities and other public corporations or agencies and to cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations that had been financed under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as it may have been amended. There are somewhat similar preference provisions in section 5 of the 1944 Flood Control Act and in the act of August 20, 1937, the latter being the act creating the Bonneville Power Administration. However, the latter act has, in addition, specific provisions to implement the administration of the preference policy.

Mr. President, let me say here, by way of brief digression again, that I desire to insert here a reference to a long-standing position I have taken on the question of the sale of power to the private utilities.

I have never been a so-called bus-bar man; that is to say, I have never supported the theory that the taxpayers of the United States should pay for the building of great multiple-purpose dams, and then should turn over to private utilities, at the dam sites, the power coming from the generators. To the contrary, I have held to the point of view—expressed time and time again to the voters of my State, so that they have had adequate opportunity to pass judgment on my point of view—that when there are built with the money of the taxpayers of the United States great multiple-purpose dams, which never would have been built of such magnitude and for such multiple-purpose uses by any private utility or by any combination of private capital, then the Government should see to it that so-called grid-back transmission lines are built from such dams to the load centers; and off those Government-built grid-back transmission lines to the load centers the private utilities should be entitled to a fair contract for power with which to serve their consumers.

In other words, Mr. President, insofar as distribution is concerned, the source of power, in my opinion, should be subject to the freedom of choice of the consumers in the area served. If the consumers in the area prefer to be served by a private utility, I take the position that the private utility is entitled to a fair contract from the grid-back transmission system for sufficient power to serve such consumers. I do not take the position that private utilities and public-utility districts cannot live together in harmonious relationship in the great Pacific Northwest, both groups being served by the multiple-purpose dams, such as the dam I am advocating here today. In fact, I am satisfied that having both private utility districts and public utility districts operate in the same area has been good for the economy of the Pacific Northwest.

In case anyone doubts it, Mr. President, let me get the record straight. I have a good many friends among the officials of private utility companies. Honesty compels me to say that I do not know of very many of them who publicly agree with me in opposition to the bus-bar theory. However, I am pleased to say that some of them privately have told me that if they sat in the United States Senate, representing the interests of the people of my State, they, too, would vote against the bus-bar theory. They tell me that they would follow exactly the course of action I have followed in regard to supporting, on every occasion when the question has arisen on the floor of the Senate—whether it involved an area in the South, in the Southeast, in the Southwest, in the great Pacific Northwest, or anywhere else in the United States—the grid-back transmission-line theory under which the major transmission lines are to be built by the Government, and then the private utilities are to receive off those transmission lines fair contracts for the power they need to serve their consumers.

I wanted to put that statement into the RECORD today, because here again I am afraid that without its being in the RECORD some may attempt to spread confusion about the position of the junior

Senator from Oregon in connection with the relationship of private utilities to the Hells Canyon Dam. As the files in my office show, in relation to correspondence with the Bonneville Administration, with the Department of the Interior, with public power utility districts, and with private utility companies, I shall continue to hold to the position that, irrespective of whether the service company is a public utility district or a private utility, the consumers have a right to exercise their freedom of choice in determining the medium through which they are to be served and if they select the private utility, it is entitled to equal and fair treatment in getting power for its service.

Mr. President, I think we may as well face the facts very realistically in connection with this problem. I think all those interested in power resource development in the Northwest should frankly recognize that Hells Canyon is being opposed by a powerful private utility, the Idaho Power Co. In part, this opposition is based on a professed fear that these preference provisions will preclude the disposal of power to it for distribution under reasonably long-range commitments. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am reliably advised that this utility has already been asked to open negotiations for the sale to it, on a reasonably long-term basis, of sufficient power from the Federal system, including Hells Canyon, to meet its anticipated load growth. Of course, if there were any merit to the claim that the preference provisions would deny access to power from the Columbia River system to this or any other private utility, the solution would lie in full public development of our hydroelectric resources so as to provide generating capacity well in advance of load growth. With plenty of power for all, no problem of preference will arise. However, no private utility, in order to preserve what it conceives to be a desirable local monopoly, should be heard to complain that it is being denied access to publicly generated power because of the preference provision, while at the same time it opposes developments like Hells Canyon, which will provide sufficient power for all, wholly without regard to and irrespective of preference provisions in existing law. Our system of free enterprise is not fostered by such tactics, and I have reason to believe that responsible individuals associated with the Idaho Power Co. are becoming increasingly aware of the tenuous and short-sighted basis for this present point of view.

I am a firm believer in the system of competitive free enterprise. But the term "free enterprise" is not a synonym for monopoly, nor are the principles of that system satisfied by an artificial limitation on the demand for power that is fostered by keeping its price relatively high and its uses relatively limited. I stand for increasing the opportunities for free enterprise to flourish in the great Pacific Northwest and elsewhere in the Nation. I want a system which will create more wealth, more job opportunities, more stable farms, more comfortable homes. To the end of fostering that kind of a free-enterprise economy, let me outline what I believe to be a proper program of power development in the Pacific Northwest.

First, we must provide the maximum development of our hydroelectric power potential which is consistent with the preservation of the essentials of our fisheries industry, and with the balanced use of water for consumptive uses, including irrigation. Such a program will automatically insure the successful completion of the main flood-control plan and optimum provisions for navigation. Such a program, in my judgment, requires the authorization of Hells Canyon now.

Second, the provisions of law governing the marketing of this power should be such that the power cannot be monopolized by limited groups of power distributors.

Third, in order to assure that power will not be monopolized, it seems obvious to me that sound policy requires the building of a Federal grid system which will interconnect the various Federal plants in the Pacific Northwest and thus bring the available power to load centers.

Fourth, I firmly believe that every reasonable opportunity must be afforded private utilities to purchase equitable amounts of the available power from Federal projects on reasonably long terms, so as to afford not only the private power distributors but also the ultimate consumers served by such utilities the benefits from Federal power which are available in the area. I am also convinced that this can be done within the general policy underlying the existing preference provisions of law, and that these provisions are sound and should be continued. The Federal Government's good faith in making a reasonable reconciliation of the preference clauses with the needs of the private companies is evidenced by the newly established pattern of 5-year private-utility contracts, under which the Bonneville Power Administrator has voluntarily given the private companies first call on all power available for disposition by him in any contract year, in excess of his prior power commitments, as defined in the contracts.

The offer to negotiate for the sale, on a reasonably long-term basis, of a substantial block of power from the Federal system to the utility now spearheading the opposition to Hells Canyon offers that utility a signal opportunity to demonstrate whether it is interested in cooperating in a basic resource-development program that will foster the cause of competitive free enterprise or whether, instead, its sole concern is to preserve the area in which it operates as a kind of satrapy for its own purely selfish purposes. I think that the cards should be laid on the table on this issue, and I know of no place where this can be done than in the public forum, the hearing room of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, over which my good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] presides so capably.

There are, no doubt, some features of the bill that need careful analysis with the thought of developing, clarifying, and improving amendments. I have suggested several in my preceding remarks. If there are other aspects of the bill that can be so improved, I will welcome the opportunity to consider specific proposals. For example, it may well be that a better legislative treatment can be evolved for the problem of assuring upstream areas a fair share of the power to be available. And it may be that a sound case could be made for some sort of qualified or conditioned authorization of an irrigation development, such as the irrigation features of the Mountain Home division.

I wish to emphasize, however, that it is my objective to press for full consideration of a bill in keeping with the major purposes of the bill as I have introduced it today. The works to be authorized by this bill should be built as Federal works, and I now serve notice that amendments which are offered primarily for the purpose of delay or obfuscation will receive no support from me.

With that I conclude the explanation of the legislation that would authorize this great dam. While I do not want to lay myself open to any suggestion that my motivation is provincial, I cannot let this occasion pass without some reference to the benefits that will accrue to certain sections of my State, as well as to southern Idaho.

Apart from its great regional and national advantages, the Hells Canyon project would provide an important new stimulus to economic development in eastern Oregon and southern Idaho. Many resources of this area remain undeveloped and it is plain that without the benefits of large blocks of low-cost power and assistance in the return of irrigation projects which remain to be built, the economy of the area is likely to remain dormant and at least a part of the natural increase in population of the area will continue to leave it to seek employment and opportunity downstream where river development has brought greater prosperity.

The present economy of the area is based largely on agriculture and stock raising. Although large desert areas still await irrigation water, means needed to assist water users in returning the costs of these developments, which power revenues from the Hells Canyon development would provide, are not now available. Mining has been of importance in the past and is currently expanding, but full realization of the area's mining potential requires larger blocks of low-cost power. The local significance of the tourist business to be attracted by the development must not be underestimated in view of the experience at Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams. The important addition to the area's road net to be made by the highway which is planned to lead down to the dam, across it, and up the canyon wall on the other side will open to tourist traffic, drawn to see the Nation's highest dam, a new wonderland of primitive mountain and canyon scenery, and will assuredly lead to an important new Idaho-Oregon link between major transcontinental highways through each of those two great States.

Power from the project assured for use in the local area will open opportunities for large-scale industry now unknown. There can be no assurance, of course, that construction of Hells Canyon will be attended by development of large-scale industry in eastern Oregon or southern Idaho, or within any particular county or city of that area. With current emphasis on strategic decentralization of industry and with the availability of large blocks of power, however, there is a real prospect for such development. The recent establishment of an aluminum industry in western Montana near the Hungry Horse project, still under construction, provides a good example. In short, the opportunity for large-scale industrial development, which does not now exist, would be created and nourished by the Hells Canyon project.

What such development can mean is exemplified in the development in the area near Spokane, Wash. A large rolling mill, a large aluminum reduction plant, and a magnesium plant were built there during World War II. In 1947, these plants accounted for 8 percent of the assessed valuation in Spokane County. They were the largest taxpayers in the county, and although Spokane is one of the large railroad centers in the Pacific Northwest, the valuation of these plants exceeds that of the six railroads serving the county.

A million kilowatts of power from Hells Canyon and benefiting plants sold to a variety of electro-process industries in the same proportion as the present supply from the Columbia River system as used by industrial customers would yield local taxes amounting to about $1,500,000 a year and Federal income taxes of $18,000,000 annually.

In addition to the above taxes, there would be both local and Federal taxes on the alumina and other raw materials used in these plants and the products produced from the ingots. The workers employed in such reduction plants would pay about $2,700,000 a year in Federal income taxes and about $1,000,000 in local property taxes on the homes in which they would live.

The question has been raised as to the advisability of constructing a dam some 60 miles downstream from Hells Canyon Dam so that the reach of the river above that dam site would be open for development by private capital. Such a proposal would have merit, however, only if it could be concluded beyond question that there would result as complete a development of the resources involved. Let us look at this matter objectively.

There are three dam sites in the vicinity of the lower part of the Snake River area. The Nez Perce site, with a potential usable storage capacity of 4,800,000 acre-feet, is on the Snake River downstream from the mouth of the Salmon River, and, valuable as it would be as a dam site, it would, nevertheless, block off the important salmon spawning areas on the Salmon River. Its construction is not contemplated unless and until some satisfactory solution of the salmon fisheries' problem can be developed.

The middle one of the three dam sites, called Mountain Sheep, with a potential usable storage capacity of 2,780,000 acre-feet is located on the Snake River just upstream from the mouth of the Salmon River, and downstream from the Hells Canyon site. A dam at that location would be substantially smaller than one that could be located at the Hells Canyon site. Further, if the Mountain Sheep dam were built, it would destroy the economic justification of the larger Nez Perce site, for it would, in effect, cut off and use the upstream half of the same reservoir area, letting the lower half go to waste. Also, a dam at this site would adversely affect the salmon runs by blocking off the Imnaha River, a tributary which enters the Snake downstream from the Hells Canyon site, but upstream from the Mountain Sheep site.

The Hells Canyon site, with a potential usable storage capacity at 3,880,000 acre-feet, is the upstream one of the three, being strategically located in the canyon near its upper end where it can store and release water to pass not only through its own power plant, but also through the plants at all of the dams downstream. Its physical characteristics plus its location make it one of the greatest remaining dam sites in the entire United States.

All three of these sites have been given very careful examination by engineers who have built the world's largest as well as many of the world's smallest dams.

In summary, the best and only way to accomplish full development of the power resource of the Snake River would require the combined outputs of major dams at the Nez Perce and Hells Canyon sites, but, as I have said, this is impracticable at this time, because of the adverse effects which a dam located at the Nez Perce site would have upon the salmon industry.

Of these three sites, therefore, the Hells Canyon definitely and Mountain Sheep possibly are the only sites which may be considered to be available for use in the immediate future. They cannot, however, be considered as interchangeable alternates. Hells Canyon is needed in any event, and it will ultimately need to be supplemented by either Mountain Sheep or Nez Perce.

It has been proposed by some that a medium-sized dam be constructed now at the Mountain Sheep site, together with one or more of the five small run-of-the-river plants which might be constructed in the Hells Canyon Reservoir area. Physically this would be possible, but it would be a great waste, an irrecoverable waste of a valuable natural resource. I think it would be a tragic economic mistake.

Even if all five of the run-of-the-river plants were constructed in lieu of Hells Canyon—and I point out that application has been made by a private utility for license to construct only one of those five small dams, the one at the Oxbow site—and if in addition the Mountain Sheep Dam were also constructed, the combined prime power would be at least half a million kilowatts less than the prime power made possible by developing both the Hells Canyon and Mountain Sheep sites. That is the measure of the effect of such a decision upon power. Such an unwise decision would also adversely affect the flood control and navigation plans, because the 2,780,000 acre-feet of usable storage capacity at the Mountain Sheep site would be inadequate for those purposes.

Mr. President, I repeat, a dam site such as Hells Canyon is a very valuable and an altogether too rare natural resource to be wasted. It must not be wasted.

Even if it were economically possible to find adequate storage elsewhere in the basin than at these sites, and if it were thus possible to obviate the ultimate need for developing both Hells Canyon and Mountain Sheep, the important thing is, and this must be recognized and not forgotten, that the development by private utilities of run-of-the-river plants in the Hells Canyon Reservoir area would result in a loss to the region, and to the Nation, forever.

Low dams should not be built in that area. They would merely occupy the site and forestall really competent development. For example, if the Oxbow license were granted and that small plant were to be built, it would stop construction of the really valuable Hells Canyon Dam, and what would we get? Less than 10 percent as much power, and no flood control and no navigation benefits.

I shall repeat that, Mr. President, because we come to one of the vital points in the argument of this case which people at the grass roots must never forget and which we must drive home to them because it raises the question whether the waters of the rivers of the Pacific Northwest, owned by the people and not by any private utility, are to be used in a manner which will redound to the maximum benefit of the people, or are to be turned over by license to a private utility primarily for its profit benefit, and in a manner which will deny to the people the maximum development of the use of the waters of those rivers for the benefit of future generations of Americans.

The junior Senator from Oregon proposes to carry that issue to every crossroads of the area as this problem is developed, because we must have settled now, once and for all, the question whether we are going to turn over these waters to a private utility for purposes of its profit exploitation, or are going to keep faith with that great principle of Lincoln's, to which I called attention earlier in my speech, namely, of having the Government do for all the people that which needs to be done to promote their welfare and which they cannot do for themselves, or which they cannot so well do for themselves.

That is an important issue, Mr. President, which the junior Senator from Oregon does not propose to lose sight of in connection with the question whether Hells Canyon Dam should be built. So I repeat a sentence from my prepared remarks.

Even if it were economically possible to find adequate storage elsewhere in the basin than at these sites, and if it were thus possible to obviate the ultimate need for developing both Hells Canyon and Mountain Sheep, the important thing is,

and this must be recognized and not forgotten, that the development by private utilities of run-of-the-river plants in the Hells Canyon Reservoir area would result in a loss to the region, and to the Nation, forever.

Low dams, I repeat, should not be built in that area. They would merely occupy the site and forestall really competent development. For example, if the Oxbow license were granted and that small plant were to be built, it would stop construction of the really valuable Hells Canyon Dam, and what would we get? Less than 10 percent as much power, and no flood control and no navigation benefits.

What would we get even if all five run-of-the-river plants were built? I may say that no one has applied for a license to build them; there has only been talk and the holding out of what some people think is economic bait of the possibility of some day building them. But if they were built we would get less than half the prime power which would be obtained from the Hells Canyon Dam, with no real flood control or navigation benefits.

Here, as elsewhere, waste would beget waste, for if the Hells Canyon Reservoir area is consumed by the small run-of-the-river plants, that course of action would force us into the additional economic waste of having to look elsewhere for and develop storage at higher costs than is the case at the Hells Canyon Dam site.

It follows from this analysis that no plan for the development of the reach of the river above Hells Canyon Dam site by run-of-the-river plants, whether publicly or privately financed, should be permitted. There is no alternate for Hells Canyon. To simplify the question, all we need to do is compare the use of the Hells Canyon Reservoir area under the three conditions in a table I have compiled.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, and without reading it, a table which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Incremental prime power added to system	Flood-control benefits	Navigation benefits	Usable storage
	Kilowatts			
Oxbow alone (this is the only run-of-the-river plant for which application has been made).	106,000	None	None	None
All 5 run-of-the-river plants, if ever built	530,000	do	do	None
Hells Canyon	1,124,000	Yes	Yes	[1] 3,880,000

[1] Acre-feet.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, no one who has the best interests of the Nation and the region at heart would propose the lesser and inadequate use of this famous canyon reservoir area. On the face of it, it is clearly evident that the proposal is only a diversionary tactic, and I have little patience with proposals that waste our precious natural resources. On the contrary, I do have complete confidence in the wisdom of the Congress in deciding such matters, for this is an old problem to the Congress. When Hoover Dam was built, many suggestions were made for a smaller dam. The same thing happened with regard to Grand Coulee. It is a godsend, and a tribute to the Congress, that in each case it voted in favor of the larger and more adequate plans. The contributions of those two dams to the last war effort, and to the sustaining and expanding civilian economy, are immeasurable. I have every reason to feel assured that the Congress will again, in this case, demonstrate its wisdom by full support of the best development—Hells Canyon.

Such is the case for Hells Canyon Dam—America's next monolithic giant, symbol of sound conservation.

It will not surprise me if some Members of Congress who do not understand the underlying facts will say that the authorization of this new dam will be another step on the road that leads to "creeping socialism." As one who is a firm believer in our capitalistic economy and the free enterprise system, I deny the validity of any such characterization.

In our Pacific Northwest, where we have seen Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams create an aluminum empire from which we now obtain nearly half of our output of this vital metal; where we know that the hydroelectric output made possible the atomic bomb; where millions of dollars have been invested by private enterprise in primary and secondary industry dependent on blocks of low-cost energy; where the population of the two States has grown by 38 percent during the past decade; where people are prosperous and cities and towns are thriving; where farmers are finding enlarged markets for their products among the new workers and businessmen, and where farmers will be able to mechanize and light their farms the same as in the East; and where new school buildings, new hotels, service stations, and professional offices are being constructed—out in the Pacific Northwest where we have seen all this, and where we look ahead for years of continued growth based on power development, we know better than to take seriously those who seek to fasten the socialistic label on those of us who urge the authorization and prompt construction of the Hells Canyon Dam.

As I have said before in this speech, the water of those rivers belongs to the people and should be developed to provide a broad, sound, economic base for the enterprises of a free people. The Pacific Northwest depends on the Federal power program as the foundation for its free-enterprise system. More and more competitive free enterprise is being born as the result of the power development in which every Congress invests the people's money; and from that investment, more tax returns flow back to the Treasury. No freedoms have been lost in Washington or Oregon because huge Federal dams have been constructed within their borders. There are no more restraints on private initiative in these two States than in nearby Idaho, where no large Federal power plants now operate. Instead, and in contrast to Idaho, wide new fields for every type of business, big and small, have been opened up in Oregon and Washington. It is timely that Idaho should have a chance to share with us, from this dam that will abut both of our States, the great benefits that it will contribute to the well-being of the region as well as to all the people of the Nation.

Construction of Hells Canyon Dam is sound Americanism. It is sound constitutional liberalism in the best Lincoln tradition. It will establish a healthy economic climate for private enterprise—the same sort of enterprises as are run by businessmen in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Florida, Texas, or in any other State in the Union. Mighty Federal power dams are but giant hubs in the center of the wheels of American commerce and enterprise.

Construction of Hells Canyon Dam is sound Americanism—sound in the sense that the Reclamation Act passed at the instigation of Theodore Roosevelt was sound; sound in the sense that the policies of conservation fostered by Gifford Pinchot were wise and farseeing; sound in the sense of the words of ex-President Hoover, who said that "every drop of water that runs to the sea without rendering a commercial return is a public waste"; sound in the sense that Charles McNary, my esteemed predecessor in this body, and Senator Hiram Johnson, and dozens of other stalwart Republicans and Democrats alike supported a policy of wise utilization of our natural resources that would harbor no waste, despite pressures of all kinds from those motivated by short-term selfish interests.

I call upon members of both parties today to support the authorization of the Hells Canyon Dam as a basic step in strengthening the defenses of our country, and as a necessary project to harness one of America's big rivers so that we may prevent the waste of a vital resource through partial utilization.

This bill is a nonpartisan proposal. Rivers are not Democratic or Republican. Power responds to the switch of the Republican and the Democrat alike; nature does not discriminate on the basis of party, and whether Republican or Democrat, the one at the switch may drown in a flood. Development of our resources is of direct concern to us all.

In supporting Hells Canyon Dam we will be in step with the thinking of wise peoples from all States in the matter of full development of our rivers. No Republican or Democrat in the State of Washington, to my knowledge, utters a word against the Grand Coulee Dam. No one there calls Grand Coulee Dam socialistic. I hope that we may have from both sides of this Chamber full support

of the doctrine, widely accepted in the West and particularly in the Northwest, that construction of large dams for multiple-purpose use of our rivers is the business of the United States. In my view, such a policy is sound business for the United States.

We cannot and must not tolerate mutilation of our rivers. There is no quarrel with the broad and sound generalization that private enterprise should be free to do all jobs that it can do as well or better. But this generalization should not become the basis for giving clearance to plans for either public or private financing of developments that would preclude the fullest economic use by all the people. This is most germane to a discussion of Hells Canyon, because certain interests that have failed to see and to understand that they, as well as the rest of us, would be better off with full use of this valuable site have heaped much abuse on the many who perceive the wisdom and the untold benefits which would come from this project. False charges are being hurled by certain interests that the bill will rob Idaho farmers of their water rights, and that Hells Canyon project will prevent future irrigation development in upstream areas by appropriating all the water. Efforts to mislead the people are being made by saying that Hells Canyon is CVA in disguise.

Let me digress to say that as an opponent of CVA on the record, and as one of the few Members of this body who has made a major argument on the floor of the Senate against CVA, I deny the charge that the building of Hells Canyon Dam has any cause-to-effect relationship whatsoever with the CVA issue. I shall continue to support the Hells Canyon Dam, and I shall continue to oppose CVA, which is but a matter of procedure for the administration of the power development of the Pacific Northwest.

Those who are unfairly, in my opinion, criticizing the advocates of Hells Canyon Dam argue that it offers no flood control, that it would wipe out vast mining properties, and that Idaho would be deprived of power to meet its growing demands. I do not think anyone can hide behind these accusations when all the facts are presented at the committee hearings.

In closing, I am proud to introduce this bill. I am proud to have the opportunity to share, with the cosponsors of the bill, the honor of having a part in the initiation of this essential project. We invite the most searching examination of the merits of this project and solicit support from those who on further study become convinced of its worth. We feel confident that the full development of this resource—Hells Canyon—the Snake River project—will add new strength, industry, and opportunity to our Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am in full accord with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with reference to the development of the Hells Canyon Dam site.

Development of the Hells Canyon Dam site on the Snake River as a part of the integrated Columbia River Basin system is such an obvious and natural procedure that I am astonished at the opposition which has been expressed to it.

That opposition obviously is generated by representatives of the private power lobby who cannot see anything good in any project which they do not develop or control themselves and yet refuse to act until the lights dim and a shortage of kilowatts develops.

Every major public power development the Federal Government has ever proposed has been denounced by the private power lobby with dolorous comments about wasting the taxpayers' money and creating a surplus of kilowatts. Yet, when the water started to pour through the turbines and the kilowatts went on the line, the private power companies are first in line, attempting to grab all the power for their own exclusive and profitable resale.

We ran into the same kind of opposition in seeking authorization for the construction of Hungry Horse Dam, on the South Fork of the Flathead River. This is another important upstream storage dam, similar to Hells Canyon. It is now under construction and the first power will be generated there this fall. At the same time, the water which is being stored there this spring will be released downstream to help turn the generators at Grand Coulee, Rock Island, and Bonneville Dams and all the rest of them as they are completed.

At the same time, the Bonneville Power Administration transmission lines will interconnect Hungry Horse with the other great dams and thus increase the efficiency of each by an interchange of power. I am not afraid of Montana losing any power by this interconnection. If anything, we stand to gain because of the added power which will be available all over the system as a result of this integration.

I am here endorsing Hells Canyon Dam today because, in addition to knowing that it is an entirely feasible project in its own right, it is much more of one when made a part of the Columbia River Basin system through an interconnection with the Bonneville Power Administration network. I am interested in strengthening that system and building it up as much as possible because every new plant that goes on the line will benefit Montana just that much.

The private power lobby has confused the issue by arousing in Idaho, the spectre of losing their birthright of power from the river to downstream interests. That is a red herring if ever I saw one or smelled one. Let me turn again to our experiences with Hungry Horse.

We had no assurance that the power from this project would be used in Montana, other than an explanation that a tie line with the Bonneville Power Administration transmission grid would serve western Montana. Yet, today, we have an aluminum plant going up in the State to utilize this new source of power and thus a new industry has been brought within our borders as a result of the construction of Hungry Horse Dam.

This pending legislation gives Idaho a positive assurance that 300,000 kilowatts of the prime power from Hells Canyon Dam will be available for use within the State. It is my firm conviction, again based on our own experience in Montana, that the State of Idaho will be able to receive even more than this if and when there is a demand for it.

But let me caution the people of Idaho that there will be no such demand, there will be no such industrial growth there if they wait for the private power utility to create it. The private investors in power utilities always insist on waiting for a demand before they create a supply. On the other hand, our foresighted public-power policy has demonstrated again and again that an additional supply of kilowatts almost automatically creates a demand. That was the experience of Hoover Dam, at Shasta, Grand Coulee, and at Hungry Horse, and it will be the same at Hells Canyon.

There is another important factor which should be brought before the attention of this committee and that is that the Hells Canyon project is not an entirely new proposal. It has always been considered as a part of the Columbia Basin comprehensive plan and as such, was approved by a Senate committee in a hearing 2 years ago.

Unfortunately, a jurisdictional argument arose in the Senate and because Hells Canyon Dam was proposed for construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, it was eliminated from the bill which authorized the entire downstream Columbia Basin system for development by the Army Corps of Engineers. The upstream development should not be penalized by such maneuvers.

If Hells Canyon Dam had been authorized at that time, it would be under way now and power would be available in another 5 years or so. Since that time, the Army Corps of Engineers has initiated construction on Chief Joseph and The Dalles Dams and McNary Dam is also progressing rapidly under their direction. All are major construction works on the main stem of the Columbia River downstream from Grand Coulee. Two of them, McNary and The Dalles, will both be directly and beneficially affected by the construction of Hells Canyon Dam because of the controlled river flow.

Mr. President, I submit that it is utterly absurd to proceed with the construction of these downstream dams and power plants unless the upstream storage space is provided for their efficient operation as contemplated in the Columbia Basin comprehensive plan, as explained by the Senator from Oregon. The minimum upstream storage to meet immediate needs for flood control and power in connection with the main control plan is estimated at 27,000,000 acre-feet. About 6,000,000 acre-feet of this storage must be taken care of in projects not yet authorized. Hells Canyon would take care of more than half of this deficiency in its 3,880,000 acre-feet of usable storage capacity.

Thus one can see how important Hells Canyon Dam is to the over-all program of river development. The Federal investment in construction of this facility will bring multiple returns not only from the dam itself but from its integration into a system of multiple-purpose works. The Federal Government is already fully committed to this over-all program and the early returns from Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams have already demonstrated the wisdom of that investment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I desired to say much more than time now will permit me to say. I am glad the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has invited the attention of the Senate to the subject. As a cosponsor of the bill I want to compliment him on his very fine presentation, and, of course, I join him in what he has had to say.

I wish to point out that I was pleased to hear him invite the attention of the Senate to what he calls false economy in our bookkeeping insofar as appropriations for developments are concerned. I am sure that, like all of us who are familiar with the problem, he realizes that all the projects which were criticized, beginning with the Grand Coulee Dam, as being white elephants and involving waste, have not only paid back all interest due but that they are far ahead of their repayment schedules. I have no doubt that the Snake River project will be in the same position.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, in my capacity as acting minority leader, I have purposely not interrogated the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with respect to his discourse on Hells Canyon Dam. I wish the Senate to be advised, however, that my silence on the subject does not mean that I acquiesce in the statements made by the junior Senator from Oregon, who seems to have the able assistance of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I shall be heard at a later time, after hearings have been completed, and in the process of the hearings I shall ask the junior Senator from Oregon many pertinent questions. I hope he will be ready to answer for the benefit of the people I, in part, represent, many questions to which they demand answers. I am interested to note that these Senators take such an interest in the economy of the people and the State of Idaho. I want them to know that I share their interest in my people. I am very proud of the people I represent and I am sure they are wondering why these Senators are so concerned about a matter which is 100 percent an affair of Idaho.

There are a great many questions to be asked on the subject of Hells Canyon, which is probably the No. 1 issue concerning the people of Idaho at this moment. I shall say to the Senate at this time, however, that I am not certain that the question of the Columbia Valley Authority has been completely forgotten, notwithstanding what the junior Senator from Oregon has said. I remember a statement made in Oregon not many months ago by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Chapman, to the effect that the CVA has not been forgotten and would be an issue. I will want to know if Mr. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, and CVA are not still lurking behind this bill.

I wish to advise the junior Senator from Oregon that I shall insist on a full and complete disclosure from him of what he knows about the statement made by the Secretary of the Interior that CVA would still be an issue in the Northwest before I approve of the bill he has so wholeheartedly endorsed this afternoon. Therefore, let not Senators even consider this bill until all the hearings have been had and all the evidence has been adduced. I assure the Senate that the people of Idaho will be heard. Have no fear, Idaho will ask questions and demand that satisfactory answers be made.

Mr. President, I am sure my distinguished colleague the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and I will ask many pertinent questions about this matter in the days and weeks ahead.

While in this great body I want only to do the best I can. I desire no Senator to feel that I think I know all of the answers, but let me remind my colleagues that I represent a great State and a great people who are just as well off, as happy, as intelligent, and as vigorous as are the people of Oregon, Washington, Montana, or any other State where Senators have sponsored this bill, even though Hells Canyon is in Idaho and Oregon. My people are great Americans who established their State upon the American concept of vigorous free enterprise and thrift; and unless this bill meets those exacting standards, practiced by my people, the Senator from Oregon will be called upon by me to answer many, many questions.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague, the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the 3-hour speech delivered by my colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

First of all, I compliment him upon the thoroughness of his presentation. However, I must point out that some inaccuracies crept into his comments, and undoubtedly those inaccuracies were inspired by the Bureau of Reclamation.

I should also like to point out that while I can agree wholeheartedly with my colleague's contention that a proposed development of this magnitude is of profound interest not only to the people of the State of Idaho—which will furnish most of the water for that storage project—but likewise to the people of the United States as a whole, I question whether it is necessary at this particular time to insist upon the consideration and the initiation of construction of the project.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that too much propaganda has been disseminated both by those who oppose this project and by those who support it. I am sure that at the proper time hearings will be held on this project to develop all the facts. At that time ample opportunity will be afforded to both sides to participate and to determine not only what is best for the State of Idaho and the State of Oregon, which are directly interested in this project, but also what is best for our national preparedness and for the security and welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, let me say in full sincerity that so far as I am concerned, I shall be glad to await the hearings, which already are scheduled for late this month by a subcommittee of one of the committees of the House of Representatives, and subsequently by a committee or a subcommittee of this body. At that time I think opportunity will be afforded to determine just what is best in connection with this project, and in the meantime there is little justification for either the proponents or opponents to become intolerant of those with whom they may disagree.

Mr. President, let me also point out that I do not think it is entirely in order for my colleague from Oregon, or my colleagues from Montana or Washington, to lecture the Senators from Idaho in regard to what course should be followed by the representatives of our State in the House of Representatives and in this body. So far as I am concerned, I reserve the constitutional right to reflect the thinking of the people of my State and thus I resent any encroachments or any lecturing or any inferences by other Senators in appraising our views on the Hells Canyon project.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield briefly, but I wish to proceed with discussion of the unfinished business, the submerged lands joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to assure my good friend, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], that I have no motivation to lecture him in any way about this matter. He is perfectly free to follow any course of action he wants to follow in the Senate. I wish to say, in all good humor, however, that I do not know of a better lecturer in the Senate than the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield briefly to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to proceed with the discussion of the proposed tidelands legislation, which is the unfinished business. However, if the Senator from New York has a brief comment to make at this time, I am willing to yield to him.

Mr. LEHMAN. My comment will be very brief.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well; I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, in the first place I wish to congratulate my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for his very clear presentation of this project.

Even though this proposed development is a long way removed from my

State, I am very happy indeed to be a cosponsor of the proposed legislation, because I believe that the development of this power will be of great benefit to the entire country.

I feel about the development of this power the same as I feel regarding the development of power on the Niagara River and on the St. Lawrence River. Here we have great potential power going to waste. We are not making any attempt to harness it. We are not making any attempt to give the people of the area affected and the people of the Nation as a whole the benefit of low-cost power which will be available in great quantities if the project is developed and operated in the public interest.

Mr. President, Canada understands the situation. Canada is going ahead with the development of the power of the Niagara River and of the St. Lawrence River. However, we stand idly by and allow that power to run to waste. The same thing holds true of the power project in Hells Canyon.

I very much hope the Senate will approve and authorize the project, in the interest not only of Oregon and Idaho, but also of the entire Nation.

JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT AS CHARACTER WITNESSES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me a moment or two?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in the press of yesterday I read an item with respect to a bill which is being considered by the House, forbidding Supreme Court Justices—and I believe it includes also judges of other courts of record of the United States—from appearing as character witnesses in the trial of cases.

I believe it would be of interest to everyone to know that at the time of the Hiss trial Mr. Justice Stanley Reed, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, was subpenaed as a character witness. I have before me a photostatic copy of the subpena, and I should like to read it into the RECORD at this point:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

To Mr. Justice STANLEY F. REED, *United States Supreme Court, Greeting:*

We command you that all and singular business and excuses being laid aside you and each of you appear and attend before the judge of the district court of the United States of America for the Southern District of New York, at a stated term of said court to be held at the United States Courthouse, room No. 318, in the borough of Manhattan, city of New York, in and for the Southern District of New York, on the 6th day of June 1949, at 10:30 o'clock in the forenoon, to testify and give evidence in a certain cause pending in the said court and then and there to be tried between United States of America against Alger Hiss, defendant, on the part of the defendant.

And this you or any of you are not to omit, under the penalty upon you and every of you of $250.

Witness the Honorable John C. Knox, judge of the district court of the United States for the Southern District of New York, in the city of New York, on the 31st day of May 1949.

WILLIAM V. CONNELL, *Clerk.*

(Debevoise, Plimpton, and McLean, attorneys for defendant.)

Mr. President, I am informed from reliable sources that no return on this subpena was ever made in court. Therefore it has never been an official document. I have read the subpena into the RECORD so that the Members of the House may have the benefit of the fact that the subpena was issued and served on Mr. Justice Reed.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR MUNDT AND MR. NEWBOLD MORRIS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, on February 5, 1952, I addressed an open letter to Mr. Newbold Morris, Special Assistant Attorney General, Justice Department, Washington, D. C., in connection with a statement published by Representative CHARLES POTTER, of Michigan, and Mr. Morris' reply thereto. I am happy to inform the Senate that as of March 3, 1952, I received a reply from Mr. Newbold Morris. Inasmuch as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] inserted the text of my original letter to Mr. Morris in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that in the Appendix of the RECORD for Monday next there may appear the reply that I received from Mr. Newbold Morris, together with a copy of a letter I have addressed to him in reply thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOBEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like now to proceed with my remarks.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Wednesday of this week I read to the Senate a copy of a letter which the Secretary of the Interior had written under date of February 15, 1952, to the Governor of the State of Washington.

At this moment I wish to reread three paragraphs of that letter:

We understand that the State of Washington has issued oil and gas permits and leases to private parties on submerged lands situated seaward of the line described above. Under the doctrine of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, any such permits or leases are void, since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the leasing power of the State of Washington or its agencies.

Therefore, the State of Washington is requested to take no further action inconsistent with the rights of the United States in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying seaward of the line described above, and to regard any oil and gas permits or leases issued by it as ineffective to confer any rights respecting such lands.

With respect to any such oil and gas permits or leases, we would appreciate being advised of the names of the permittees or lessees, their addresses, the dates of issuance, and the areas covered.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. President, against that background I wish to read a letter which I addressed this morning to the Honorable Gordon Persons, Governor of the State of Alabama, and to every other Governor in the United States:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1952.

The Honorable GORDON PERSONS,
Governor of the State of Alabama,
Montgomery, Ala.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR PERSONS: Your State could be the next to feel the lash of the "paramount power" whip being so recklessly wielded by Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

My State of Washington has just been stung. I am enclosing a copy of a dictatorial action Mr. Chapman has arbitrarily taken, telling the citizens of Washington, in effect, to get out and stay out of lands which historically have belonged to them—the submerged coastal lands within the State's boundaries. Also enclosed is a copy of my statement on this matter to the United States Senate.

Mr. Chapman's letter came without warning, without the formality of a lawsuit or court decision involving Washington, and without any authority whatsoever from Congress. A similar letter to you and your citizens could even now be in process in the back offices of the Interior Department.

Legislation dealing with the submerged lands of all the States is pending in Congress. Efforts are being made to put over legislation (S. J. Res. 20) which would establish Federal Government control of these lands.

Do not be misled by proponents of this legislation that only Washington, California, Texas, and Louisiana are affected. The doctrine of "paramount rights, full dominion, and power" has equal force and application to natural resources in all States.

With this subject currently before the Senate, it is highly important that you and the people of your State make your views known as soon as possible to your congressional representatives. Senate bill 940, introduced by Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida, and 34 other Senators, including myself, would stop this dangerous doctrine in its tracks.

Your subscriber is addressing an identical letter today to the Governor of every other State in the Union and to the attorney general of each State.

I would appreciate your comments, and hope we can count on your active support.

Sincerely,

HARRY P. CAIN,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, I am most grateful to the Senator from California for his indulgence.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Washington that I think he has made a very fine con-

tribution to the tidelands discussion. Certainly, as we have pointed out on the floor on several occasions, it is the old story of the camel getting his nose under the tent. The Senator from Washington has performed a useful service in calling to the attention of the governors of all 48 of the States the fact that once this doctrine is supported, some other administration, some other government in power, might extend the doctrine to other natural resources, to the detriment of the respective States and their people.

Mr. MAGNUSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I merely want to say to my colleague from the State of Washington that I am in entire accord with his remarks. I, too, have telegraphed the interested people in my State to the effect that I thought the letter of the Secretary of the Interior was not only premature, but clearly without authority, particularly in view of the fact that there is pending on the floor of the Senate proposed legislation which is intended to clear up some of the questions involved. Why the letter was sent at this time I do not know, but again I say it was premature, and, in my opinion, completely without legal authority until the Congress of the United States settles the matter by legislation.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, my colleague and I are then in complete agreement that the Secretary of the Interior, in the absence of legislative authority, had no right of any kind to address the Governor of the State of Washington as he recently did.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly. As a matter of discretion, he should at least have waited until Congress had a chance to settle the question.

Mr. CAIN. Although the two Senators from Washington often disagree on questions, we are associated on this particular question.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I commend the Senators from the State of Washington and the senior Senator from the State of California on their observations with respect to the Secretary of the Interior and his attempt to usurp the rights of the State of Washington and other States. It having been developed by the able junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], assisted by his quarterbacks from outlying States, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], all of whom are Democrats, I want to say to the Senate that the people of my State of Idaho are worried just as is the junior Senator from Washington when the shadow of Oscar Chapman, that so-called free-enterprise boy, hovers over the State of Idaho. When that happens, Idahoans run for cover. They are worried just like the Senators from Washington and California are worried. In Idaho we are concerned about Hells Canyon just as is the junior Senator from Washington, the senior Senator from California, and the senior Senator from Washington. At the appropriate time I want to discuss this free enterprise boy, Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, and what he intends to do with the people in the State of Idaho in connection with the Hells Canyon project.

I thank the distinguished senior Senator from California for yielding.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reading the bulletin board on which press dispatches are published is always an interesting pastime, usually informative, and occasionally revealing as to the confusion and conflicts and inconsistencies which plague our Government at the present time. I noticed a moment ago in the marble room that a dispatch came in from the press services at 12:28 today, in which President Truman is quoted as follows:

> President Truman demanded that the Senate approve his proposed reorganization of the Internal Revenue Bureau if it really wants to do something about cleaning up corruption in Government.

At 1:57, on the same page, from the same wire service, another dispatch comes from the White House, which reads:

> President Truman instructed all Federal agencies today to refuse to turn over to House investigators information on cases the Justice Department has failed to prosecute in the past 6 years.

Since delinquent taxes and corruption are clearly involved as subject matter in both of those dispatches, I think it would take either a Philadelphia lawyer or a man from Missouri to find any consistency between those two dispatches which came in such quick succession.

If I may, I now quote a few sentences from the letter which the President sent to the Senate today, dealing with the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Department, in which, near the end, he says:

> I would hate to think that the Senate will consider this matter on a partisan basis. However, I have noticed that five of the six Republican Senators on the committee voted against this reorganization plan to provide increased efficiency and integrity in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Those five Senators—like many of their Republican colleagues—have made a great cry about cleaning up any graft and corruption in government. I think it is fair to ask whether they really want to do something to assure clean, efficient government or whether all their talk is pure politics.

As one of the five Republican Senators referred to in the President's billet-doux I may say that certainly I had no partisan reasons for having voted against the President's reorganization plan in the committee, because I have not had any patronage in the nearly 14 years during which I have served in Congress; so surely I am not trying to continue into the future something which I have not had in the past.

I may point out also, Mr. President, that the sudden speed with which the President is now urging the reorganization plan comes in the twilight of his administration, when he is nearing the end of 7 years, following 13 years in the Presidency by his close political friend and predecessor, Franklin Roosevelt. Hence this deathbed repentance, politically speaking, is not very persuasive.

There has been a long time of 20 years during which these reforms could have been brought about. The reorganization proposal discussed in this letter is one which would increase rather than decrease the authority of exactly the same officials who have been in charge of the Internal Revenue Bureau in the blackest hour of its history, during which in well over 10 percent of the offices involved public officials have been either indicted or convicted, or have publicly confessed to malfeasance, to dishonesty, and to corruption.

So I am not very much impressed either by the consistency of the press dispatches emanating from the White House today, or by this belated effort to rush through a plan which might becloud the issue as to what needs to be done to bring about honesty in government, which is, to infuse honesty in the top-level officials and to place in charge of Government bureaus and departments people who consider public office a public trust.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MUNDT. Surely.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Do I correctly understand that, according to the second dispatch, the President has authorized the Attorney General to defy the request of a committee of the House of Representatives to get information which they feel is necessary in the discharge of their constitutional duties?

Mr. MUNDT. Even worse than that, he not only has authorized it, but he has instructed all Federal agencies to defy the authority of Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a fact that in the performance of its constitutional duties, if the facts should warrant, the power of impeachment rests first in the House of Representatives, to vote articles of impeachment?

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely; and it is the House of Representatives that is defied in this rather arrogant announcement from the White House today.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the American people will be very much disturbed by this additional indication on the part of the President of the United States and the executive branch of the Government to cover up something, which I am sure has been shocking to all Americans, regardless of their partisan affiliations. As the able Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, I believe Americans generally subscribe to the statement quoted by a great Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, that "Public office is a public trust," and that certainly when the House of Representatives or the Senate is seeking to carry out its constitutional obligation, the President should be cooperating with the legislative branch of the Government in cleaning up corruption wherever it exists, and should not be throwing obstacles in the way

of the elected representatives of the people, either in the Senate or in the House of Representatives.

Mr. MUNDT. I quite agree.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I will yield in a moment. It seems to me that, in view of this order from the White House to the Government agencies to cover up, rather than to clean up, the President's new clean-up man, Mr. Newbold Morris, who is about to send out thousands of questionnaires asking for information from employees in the Government, might as well keep his letters at home and save his franking privilege; because now the employees have been ordered not to report, unless the President, of course would use a double standard of morality, one which applies differently to individual employees reporting to the President than it does to public officials reporting to Congress and the country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the able Senator from South Dakota think that the Congress of the United States does not have to sit back and take this kind of Executive obstruction because, under the Constitution, the Congress has control of the purse strings? The founders of the Republic recognized the dangers inherent in an Executive who would seek to gather unto himself too much power, and therefore deliberately placed control of the purse strings in the hands of the elected representatives of the people. By the use of this power the Congress of the United States may be able to force a showdown with the President of the United States. I refer to the control of appropriations.

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly join the Senator from California in his hope in that connection, and I trust that the House of Representatives, which has been pushed around so much and so long by this administration, this time will stand up and fight back.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I desire to say to the Senator from South Dakota that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, I shall be very glad to join with both those on our side of the aisle and those on the other side of the aisle who believe that the Congress of the United States should not be foreclosed from getting information which is necessary in order to carry out our constitutional obligations. I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from California in yielding. I wanted to call the attention of my distinguished friend from South Dakota to the fact—the obvious fact—that the President's remarkable letter of this date, which is about the fourth letter which he has submitted upon his plan No. 1 while it was being considered in a due and orderly manner by a committee of this Congress, is intended not to bring clean, fair, decent administration in Government, but is intended to remove the issue of corruption from the 1952 campaign; and I do not think that fact ought to be overlooked. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to make a further statement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield further to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. A trial is now in progress in the President's own State of Missouri, the trial of a former collector of internal revenue for that State. Assuredly the President's letter is a plain confession that he is not capable of appointing clean, decent, and honorable men to fill high public office in that State, because it is known that when Mr. Finnegan, who is now on trial, was named, the two Senators from Missouri were Republicans, and they had no voice whatever in naming Mr. Finnegan to that office. Surely the President was not embarrassed by senatorial considerations in that case.

One of the most glaring cases going through the courts is the case of the collector of internal revenue at Boston. When that gentleman was appointed as collector of internal revenue at Boston the two Senators from Massachusetts were and are now Republicans. So the President was wholly unembarrassed by any senatorial interference with his prerogative.

The letter of the President is manifestly intended to remove the issue of corruption from the campaign of 1952, and it is an ineffective effort. That is the interest of the President, and in that light only can his remarkable letter of today be read and interpreted. That is the interpretation which the American people will place upon the letter.

I hope my distinguished friend will not think that the President is concerned that some Member of the Senate is about to corrupt him by retaining a patronage system, when one instance is already established in the courts, at least prima facie, and in another instance the trial is proceeding, in connection with appointments for which the President himself should be held directly responsible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has made a very important statement on the floor of the United States Senate. While it may well be that the effort of the President in his letter may have been to remove the issue of corruption from the campaign, I do not believe the American people will permit it to be removed in such a cavalier fashion.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there have been suggestions made on the floor of the Senate that since the President vetoed the previous tidelands legislation on August 1, 1946, that he is likely to do so again unless an acceptable bill such as the pending measure, Senate Joint Resolution 20, is passed by the Senate.

I am unimpressed by such arguments, and point out that should the Senate yield to such subtle intimidations we will be abdicating our legislative responsibility.

As I view our constitutional duty, it is to pass legislation which in our judgment best meets the issue. When by the normal legislative procedures the two Houses of Congress have acted, then the President of the United States, under the Constitution, may either approve or veto such a proposal.

If vetoed by the President, the Congress again has the opportunity of acting by repassing the bill by a two-thirds vote.

During the past 20 years there has been a constant encroachment by the executive on powers which do not belong in that branch of the Government.

There are some who are losing sight of the fact that the Congress is a coequal branch of the Government. If we are not to abdicate our constitutional responsibilities, I think that it is important that we constantly remind both the executive branch of the Government and ourselves of this fact.

The State of California, for the period of almost a century following its admission to statehood in this Nation, in 1850, was led to believe, and proceeded upon the assurance, that it was the owner of all lands beneath navigable waters within its boundaries. Under its constitution, article XXI, section 1, these boundaries extend seaward from the coast three English miles, and include all the islands, harbors, and bays along and adjacent to the coast. In the Government code of our State it is prescribed that this boundary extends three English nautical miles seaward of lines drawn along the outer sides of the outermost of the islands, reefs, and rocks along and adjacent to the coast and across intervening waters.

This is not a partisan matter so far as California is concerned. Our legislature, by overwhelming vote of both Republicans and Democrats, our congressional delegation, without regard to partisan affiliations, and our State officials, Governor Warren, a Republican, and Attorney General Brown, a Democrat, all agree on this point, and as indicated in my prior statement, that area is as much a part and parcel of the State of California as are the great inland valleys of the Sacramento and the San Joaquin.

California's ownership of the submerged lands within its boundaries was recognized by all agencies of the Federal Government during the entire period of its statehood, up until a little over a decade ago. During this time the Federal Government purchased from the State or its grantees many parcels of these lands for its use. Others it condemned, under the power of eminent domain, paying just compensation therefor in accordance with the fifth amendment to the United States Constitution. In numerous instances, the State and its grantees have, in a spirit of helpful cooperation, by gift deed, conveyed many parcels of these lands to the Federal Government. But in every instance that

Government always required a formal conveyance to it before any of its funds were expended upon any such lands.

The State's title was never disputed, and no question as to its validity ever arose until, under leases made by it in accordance with State law, exploration for hydrocarbon substances was made, wells were drilled, and petroleum products were discovered and produced therefrom. Following this, applications were filed for leases with the Department of the Interior of the Federal Government covering the same areas under lease by the State. While these applications were denied by the Secretary of the Interior, with the express statement of the Secretary that "title to the soil under the ocean within the 3-mile limit is in the State of California and the land may not be appropriated except by the authority of the State," the Secretary later changed his mind and at his instance a suit was commenced in the United States Supreme Court by the Federal Government seeking to establish Federal ownership of these submerged lands.

While that Court announced that California was not the owner of these lands, it declined to hold that the United States was the owner, and set up the doctrine of so-called paramount rights, under which it held the United States to be possessor of full dominion and power over all these lands and their resources. Since that time title to and jurisdiction over an area in excess of 2,000,000 acres of such lands within California's boundaries have been cast into a state of confusion and uncertainty.

What we desire to emphasize at this time is the matter of high principle here involved. This principle is something which transcends considerations of disputed boundaries, of controversies over divergent legal concepts, or of differences of opinion as to the disposition of financial returns. It strikes at the very roots of the basic principles of our accepted form of government.

We believe that the time is long overdue when this situation should and must be remedied by definite, conclusive action on the part of the Congress, which possesses complete authority in this field, and which, in effect, has been invited to act by the Supreme Court's decision.

It is our view that the so-called interim measure now under consideration by the Senate is inadequate to bring about the desired and necessary result, and that this can only be achieved by the enactment of a statute which will restore to the States, and firmly establish and vest in them, title to all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries. This, we believe, constitutes the only method of bringing about a sound, a fair, and a righteous sclution of the existing controversy, so fraught with complexity, confusion, and uncertainty, and to properly protect the matters of high principle here involved.

As I have previously pointed out, the Court, while asserting the paramount rights of the Federal Government, did not claim Federal ownership—and I underscore the word "ownership"—though it did divest California of ownership.

Mr. President, I think it would be of some interest at this time to place in the RECORD the remarks of two of the Justices who dissented from the decision in the California case.

The first extract I shall read is from page 480 of the hearings before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Eighty-second Congress, first session, on Senate Joint Resolution 20, which were held from March 28 to April 10, 1951.

Mr. Justice Reed, dissenting, said, in part:

> If the original States did claim, as I think they did, sovereignty and ownership to the 3-mile limit, California has the same rights in the lands bordering its littoral.
>
> This ownership in California would not interfere in any way with the needs or rights of the United States in war or peace. The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation. While no square ruling of this Court has determined the ownership of those marginal lands, to me the tone of the decisions dealing with similar problems indicates that, without discussion, State ownership has been assumed. *Pollard* v. *Hagan*, supra; *Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1, 52); *The Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166); *New Jersey* v. *Delaware* (291 U. S. 361; 295 U. S. 694).

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in his dissent, said:

> The Court, however, grants the prayer but does not do so by finding that the United States has proprietary interests in the area. To be sure, it denies such proprietary rights in California. But even if we assume an absence of ownership or possessory interest on the part of California, that does not establish a proprietary interest in the United States. It is significant that the Court does not adopt the Government's elaborate argument, based on dubious and tenuous writings of publicists. See Schwarzenberger, Inductive Approach to International Law (60 Harv. L. Rev. 539, 559), that this part of the open sea belongs, in a proprietary sense, to the United States. See *American Banana Co.* v. *United Fruit Co.* (213 U. S. 347, 351). Instead, the Court finds trespass against the United States on the basis of what it calls the national dominion by the United States over this area.

Further on in his dissent, Mr. Justice Frankfurter said:

> To declare that the Government has national dominion is merely a way of saying that vis-à-vis all other nations the Government is the sovereign. If that is what the Court's decree means, it needs no pronouncement by this Court to confer or declare such sovereignty. If it means more than that, it implies that the Government has some proprietary interest. That has not been remotely established except by sliding from absence of ownership by California to ownership by the United States.

In view of those two extracts from the dissents by Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Frankfurter, I wish to read from the opinion of the Court itself. I now read from page 479 of the hearings. The Court said:

> We have not overlooked California's argument, buttressed by earnest briefs on behalf of other States, that improvements have been made along and near the shores at great expense to public and private agencies. And we note the Government's suggestion that the aggregate value of all these improvements are small in comparison with the tremendous value of the entire 3-mile belt here in controversy. But, however this may be, we are faced with the issue as to whether State or Nation has paramount rights—

I underscore "paramount rights"—

> in and power over this ocean belt, and that great national question is not dependent upon what expenses may have been incurred upon mistaken assumptions. Furthermore, we cannot know how many of these improvements are within and how many without the boundary of the marginal sea which can later be accurately defined. But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission. See *United States* v. *Texas* (162 U. S. 1, 89, 90); *Lee Wilson & Co.* v. *United States* (245 U. S. 24, 32.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Our liberal friends put those of us who represent coastal States in a position of trying to rob the Federal Government or to deprive the Federal Government of something that properly belongs to the Federal Government.

As a matter of fact, granting everything in these court decisions—which I believe to be wrong, in improperly depriving the States of their property—is it not true that based upon the language of the Court, the Court itself, speaking through Mr. Justice Black, who decided the case in favor of the Federal Government, said that Congress was expected to pass upon this question, and deal fairly with the States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Louisiana is absolutely correct.

Mr. LONG. History affords some evidence of the manner in which the Federal Government has handled Federal property in interior States. Let us consider the State of Wyoming, represented in part very ably by its senior Senator [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The Federal Government had much vacant and unappropriated land in that State, but under the Federal Leasing Act, when minerals are found there on Federal lands, 37½ percent goes to the State and the other 62½ percent is divided, 10 percent going to administrative expenses and 52½ percent, as I understand, to the reclamation fund, most of which would be used in the same State to develop it. It is more than the junior Senator from Louisiana can understand, when Senators from those States have worked out such a favorable arrangement for the use of such funds for the benefit of their States, why they should take a completely contrary attitude toward the coastal States, even if this property be viewed entirely as Federal property.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I agree with the Senator. I think there is great misconception regarding the tidelands legislation, and the point of view of not only the coastal States, but many other States which are rightfully concerned, as they well should be. The able junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] pointed that out in connection with his remarks concerning the recent letter from Secretary Chapman to Governor Langlie, of Washington.

In some quarters there seems to be a failure to understand that if we once embark down this path, we open up new vistas to some future government which might be in power, particularly when, over a period of 150 years in some cases, and in the case of California for almost 100 years, the proposition was unchallenged that the tidal areas, out to the 3-mile limit, were part and parcel of the State. To have a Supreme Court decision upset that principle and take an entirely contrary position, and then to assert that the Congress of the United States, representing the several States, has not the power or duty or responsibility to act, simply does not make sense to me.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will consider the reasoning of the Supreme Court opinion in the California case, he will find the court saying, in substance, "It is true that previous courts have used language to the effect that this property belongs to the States, but that language was used in cases involving bays, harbors, and inland waters. The facts involving outside waters were not precisely before the Court at that point. Therefore, notwithstanding the fact that in 52 previous cases the courts had decided that this property belongs to the States, we have the facts before us for the first time, and we are going to decide that this property belongs to the Federal Government."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the able Senator from Louisiana that it has been my privilege in part to represent California in the Senate for 7 years. During that period of 7 years I have seen the constant encroachment by the Federal Government, not only on the powers of the legislative branch of the Government, but also on the rights of the States. I think I am becoming as ardent a States'-righter as are the able Senator from Louisiana and some of his colleagues from the South.

I think there is no more important issue before the American people today than that of the constant encroachment of the executive upon the legislative functions of the Government, and by the Federal Government upon the rights of the States. It seems to me that here and now is the time and place for the Congress of the United States to face up to this very vital issue.

Mr. LONG. I very much appreciate the Senator's statement. He is making an excellent speech, as he always does. I should like to add one point.

In my opinion, these properties belong to the States. The best illustration I can think of is that, although the Federal Government seeks to claim all the oil under submerged lands along the shores of our States, at the same time it well recognizes that the local people should control everything except the oil. For example, until oil was discovered, there was the problem of regulating the taking of oysters and shrimp off Louisiana. Everyone recognizes that the local people are more interested in conserving the supply of shrimp and oysters than would be some bureaucrat in Washington, who would not be particularly concerned if all the shrimp and oysters were exhausted. So the local people were recognized as the ones who should control the taking of shrimp, oysters, clam shells, and things of that kind, because it vitally affects their livelihood from day to day, and if the supply were not properly conserved, and if proper conservation methods were not followed, the people would lose their livelihood.

What regard do we see for the livelihood of those people on the part of Federal bureaucrats? One hundred million dollars' worth of equipment is tied up, and people are going out of business right and left, without the least concern on the part of officials in Washington, unless they can obtain laws which will extend their control over the lives and conditions of the people, as a price for permitting legislation which would allow them to operate in the coastal waters.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator is correct.

Another thing which is misunderstood, particularly on the part of some sections of the press and some columnists, is this:

So far as the oil companies themselves are concerned, it makes little difference to them whether they lease from the Federal Government or from the State government. Those who are concerned with this question are not members of the industry. They are the people of my State, represented, as I pointed out previously, without regard to partisanship, by the elected representatives in the State legislature, by the boards of port commissioners, by the State elected officials without regard to partisanship, by the Representatives in the House of Representatives, without regard to partisanship, and by two Members of this body. All of us feel that this question affects the people of California, and not the oil industry, because, from the industry point of view, oil companies could lease either from the Federal Government or from the State government.

We feel that there is as great an encroachment upon California as though the Federal Government were to extend the doctrine of paramount rights and come into the great Sacramento Valley or the San Joaquin Valley and begin to seize property for Federal use.

Though some may say that the idea is far-fetched, there might come a time when, through inadvertence or otherwise, a President of the United States with socialistic tendencies might be elected, and he might be surrounded by a socialistic administration, which would finally pack the Supreme Court with those who felt the same way. It would not be much of a step to move from the doctrine of paramount rights, under which a part of our State is seized, into the seizure of other rights, such as subsurface rights, surface rights, or, even stepping beyond that, if we once set off the chain reaction, industry and business which might exist above the surface.

That is why we are so vitally concerned in what we feel is a fundamental principle. Some of our friends on the other side say, "Why can you not compromise and take this interim bill, or why can you not accept a little compensation, since some of the money would come back to the States? Why can you not accept a part of the donation as a grant for education?"

The reason is that we cannot compromise with principle. This is such a vital issue that we are going to fight it out, and we are not going to yield to the effort to take from the States that which, for more than 100 years, has rightfully belonged to them.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I do not subscribe to the "Robin Hood" theory which some advance, that because fairly recently oil has been discovered, and other minerals may be discovered under the borders of the State, which extend out to the 3-mile limit in the case of California, and in the case of Texas, extend out some 10 or 10½ miles, and in varying degrees in other States, the Federal Government is entitled, under the "Robin Hood" theory, to take from those who have to give to those who have not.

I think that is a very dangerous doctrine for the Senate to give endorsement to either directly or indirectly. It so happens that there are other resources which are important to the States, resources which have nothing to do with petroleum or petroleum products. I say to our friends in the interior that if they want to go along with this "Robin Hood" theory that the Federal Government, because it has the power, can come in and seize that which has not belonged to it and use it for any purpose, they are opening the door to a future government's use of the same power to take from them that which they have a right to consider belongs to them.

In the New York Times of February 21 there appeared an article, written by William L. Laurence, who I believe is a writer on scientific subjects for the Times. The article is entitled "New Process Desalts Sea Water; Promises Vast Help to Arid Areas."

I shall not read the whole article. It says, in part:

> A revolutionary new process for desalting sea water, promising to open vast and new reservoirs of fresh water for use in agriculture, industry, and the home, wherever water is now scarce, was demonstrated here today at the national meeting of the American Research and Development Corp.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PROCESS DESALTS SEA WATER; PROMISES VAST HELP TO ARID AREAS

(By William L. Laurence)

BOSTON, February 20.—A revolutionary new process for desalting sea water, promising to open vast new reservoirs of fresh water for use in agriculture, industry, and the home, wherever water is now scarce, was demonstrated here today at the national meeting of the American Research and Development Corp.

The process is based on the use of electrical energy in conjunction with new synthetic membranes that, according to scientists, makes possible for the first time the continuous economical desalting of sea water, brackish water, and industrial solutions.

The membranes do their work by a chemical process known as "ion exchange," in which positive and negative electrical charges

are interchanged, leading to the separation of certain minerals and salts according to the electrical charges they carry.

A stream of sea water fed to a unit using the membranes emerges split into two streams—a fresh water stream, two-thirds of the volume of the feed and containing practically none of the salt, and a brine stream, one-third the volume of the feed and containing all the salt.

The fresh water may be used for drinking or for industrial or agricultural purposes. The brine may be further treated to yield salt, magnesium, or other chemicals derived from sea water.

Announcement of the new process was made by Prof. Edwin R. Gilliland, of the Department of Chemical Engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and president of Ionics, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., an affiliate of the American Research and Development Corp.

Dr. Karl T. Compton, former president of MIT and a member of the board of advisors of the development corporation, hailed the new process as offering great promise in many fields of application.

Dr. Arthur B. Lamb, professor emeritus of chemistry at Harvard, now a director of the Ionics Co. said the process opened a new era in the desalting of sea water with much greater economy than by other methods.

The process was developed by a group headed by Dr. Walter Juda, vice president and technical director of Ionics. Dr. Juda is research associate at the Harvard Medical School and a consultant at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

The new process comes at a time when the expansion of vital industries, agriculture, and urban populations is limited by the lack of fresh water supplies in important areas of New York and Texas and States of the far West, including California. It is expected to provide relief to key areas in a relatively short time and it holds out the long-range promise of opening up arid lands in the United States, Australia, and the Middle East and other parts of the world for settlement and cultivation.

ELECTRICAL POWER IS USED

The energy required for the process is furnished in the form of electrical power. The flows are continuous and the apparatus has no moving parts other than the water stream. The process uses no heat or chemicals.

A membrane unit of a given size, it was pointed out, will purify sea water over a wide range of flow rates if the amount of electrical power is increased as the sea water flow is increased.

"However," it was added, "the faster the flow the more expensive the fresh-water production becomes in terms of electrical energy used per gallon.

"At relatively low flow rates energy consumption can be as low as 20 kilowatt-hours per 1,000 gallons. In many areas of the West where the water problem is acute, electrical energy is available for as little as 3 mills per kilowatt-hour. Therefore, the membranes make possible production of fresh water from the sea in such areas for a power cost of only 6 cents per 1,000 gallons, to which must be added the cost of the equipment.

"By comparison industrial water supplies from fresh-water sources may cost up to 10 cents or more per 1,000 gallons. Irrigation water is sold in the West for from 2 to 20 cents per 1,000 gallons."

The membranes are continuous films of synthetic plastic materials, usually from ten to forty thousandths of an inch thick. They are made largely of cheap coal-tar and petroleum chemicals and are said to be "amenable to continuous production owing to their sheet-like character."

"The membranes and equipment," it was announced, "will be mass-produced at sufficiently low cost so that the total cost of sea-water purification with cheap power can be brought to the range of 10 to 20 cents per 1,000 gallons."

By the use of the new membranes, it was stated at the demonstration, "the electrical energy consumed in the purification of many common brackish waters may be as little as 1 cent per 1,000 gallons."

In addition to its use in the purification of natural waters, the membranes promise to find wide uses in many industrial applications, such as the purification of sugar, glycerine, milk, and organic products and the recovery of valuable chemicals and metals from waste streams.

One of the most important long-range aspects of the development of ion-exchange membranes is their potential use in biological and medical research. The body contains hundreds of different ion-selective membranes of various functions, including those in the kidney, the nerves, the lungs, the blood vessels, and the testinal tract. The synthetic membranes may serve as media for studying the behavior and properties of these membranes in the living body and thus shed light on some of life's most fundamental mechanisms.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there are a number of problems which will have to be solved before that process can be put to practicable use. I believe that even at the lower price which is mentioned in the article the water would still be far too expensive to be used for irrigation purposes, although possibly it might be used for domestic purposes at places where the water rates are high.

Most of the agricultural people in my State and in other States with whom I have discussed the subject believe that even at the lowest price which is indicated it would still not be practicable to use the process in bringing large quantities of water to arid lands for irrigation purposes, though the time may come ultimately, if we get a cheap enough source of power, such as in the atomic field—and I am a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy—when the use of sea water may become feasible.

Mr. President, that process may be of great concern to the coastal States of the Union. Is it to be used by the Federal Government? Is some great Government bureau, whether it be the Department of the Interior or the Bureau of Reclamation, going to assert its right to salt water and to the processing of salt water for the purposes of irrigation? If so, it might give to the Federal Government a paramount right over the water supplies of the Nation, and with it the power of life and death over the agricultural economies and indeed the industrial economies of several States.

I merely mention the matter at this time. I do not believe that it is something which is immediately coming to pass. Certainly when we are legislating we must look into the future, and we must remember that we are legislating for those who will succeed us in the next 50 and perhaps even 100 years. Consequently we must be very vitally concerned with anything which would set up a vast Federal power which could gradually, step by step or point by point, gather into its own hands control over the life and well being of the Nation's entire economy.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The way in which many of us had understood the idea of the rights of the Federal Government to navigable waters, whether they are called paramount rights or other rights, was that the Federal Government, of course, had the right to regulate commerce; that it had the right to require that if anyone built a structure in the sea he would have to build it at a place where it would not endanger or impede shipping, or would perhaps have to place buoys around it so that in the event of fog there would be some warning to ships sailing those waters; and that it was the duty of the Federal Government to defend the shoreline, and therefore the activities of our Navy must not be impeded in defending the country.

However, no one ever had the idea that because the Government could regulate navigation or had the duty of defending coastal areas that it owned the property beneath the water. Then we saw advanced the strange theory to the effect that under the Government's duty to defend and its duty to regulate commerce those rights all coalesce. When they get through coalescing we will just be out of the property. That is the basis of the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Louisiana that I recognize the Government has certain powers to regulate interstate commerce, but that does not give the Government a paramount right to take over the railroad business, as a general proposition, although the power of the Federal Government is gradually expanding in that general direction; or, in the case of prescribing certain requirements for aviation, that the Government should therefore take a step beyond that and take over all aviation companies.

As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, and as I have tried to point out today, the precedents which are established are often used in the future to carry the power further and further, until we get away from our normal American constitutional system and our system of competitive free enterprise.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. LONG. It would make just about as much sense to the junior Senator from Louisiana as if we were to hire a man to guard a fine cake and to have the guard say that since he had been responsible for protecting the cake it was his right to eat it. That is just about what is being attempted with the submerged lands.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I heard the Senator from California speak about salt water. I am sure he would not go so far as to say that Arizona could not have even salt water, would he?

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California have discussed that issue on other

occasions, and I do not wish to interrupt this debate to carry on that discussion.

Mr. McFARLAND. We would be willing to have California keep the salt if we in Arizona could just have the water.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no doubt that that is the general policy of Arizona, to give California the salt, if it could.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Does it impress the Senator from California that the Senator from Arizona is saying, in effect: "I will let you have your pants back, provided you give me your coat"?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wanted to ask the Senator from California the question with respect to salt water, because apparently he does not want us to have any other kind of water, either.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Arizona knows that is not correct. We have honest differences of opinion in regard to the rights and general obligations and legislation dealing with the Colorado. There is an honest difference of opinion between our States. It certainly does not indicate any animosity to the distinguished majority leader or to the senior Senator from California, because on many issues we have worked very closely together, and I hope we shall do so in the future.

Mr. McFARLAND. I concede that point, but I did not want to establish a right in California to all the salt water in the ocean. I wanted to reserve something.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I assure the Senator from Arizona that we do not want all the salt or all the salt water.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point, because I think it is very pertinent to the discussion now under way, and so that it will be available for Senators to study, the decision of the International Court of Justice of December 18, 1951, in the Fisheries case, between the United Kingdom and Norway.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE, DECEMBER 18, 1951—FISHERIES CASE (UNITED KINGDOM V. NORWAY)

JUDGMENT

(Present: President Basdevant; Vice-President Guerrero; Judges Alvarez, Hackworth, Winiarski, Zoricic, De Visscher, Sir Arnold McNair, Klaestad, Badawi Pasha, Read, Hsu Mo; Registrar Hambro.)

The Court delivers the following judgment:

On September 28, 1949, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland filed in the registry an application instituting proceedings before the Court against the Kingdom of Norway, the subject of the proceedings being the validity or otherwise, under international law, of the lines of delimitation of the Norwegian fisheries zone laid down by the royal decree of July 12, 1935, as amended by a decree of December 10, 1937, for that part of Norway which is situated northward of 66°28.8′ (or 66°28′48″) north latitude. The application refers to the declarations by which the United Kingdom and Norway have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the statute.

This application asked the Court (a) to declare the principles of international law to be applied in defining the base-lines, by reference to which the Norwegian Government is entitled to delimit a fisheries zone, extending to seaward 4 sea miles from those lines and exclusively reserved for its own nationals, and to define the said base-lines insofar as it appears necessary, in the light of the arguments of the parties, in order to avoid further legal differences between them; (b) to award damages to the Government of the United Kingdom in respect of all interferences by the Norwegian authorities which British fishing vessels outside the zone which, in accordance with the Court's decision under (a), the Norwegian Government is entitled to reserve for its nationals.

Pursuant to article 40, paragraph 3, of the statute, the application was notified to the States entitled to appear before the Court. It was also transmitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The pleadings were filed within the time limits prescribed by order of November 9, 1949, and later extended by orders of March 29 and October 4, 1950, and January 10, 1951. By application of article 44, paragraph 2, of the Rules of Court, they were communicated to the governments of Belgium, Canada, Cuba, Iceland, Sweden, the United States of America, and Venezuela, at their request and with the authorization of the Court. On September 24, 1951, the Court, by application of article 44, paragraph 3, of the rules, at the instance of the Government of Norway, and with the agreement of the United Kingdom Government, authorized the pleadings to be made accessible to the public.

The case was ready for hearing on April 30, 1951, and the opening of the oral proceedings was fixed for September 25, 1951. Public hearings were held on September 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29, October 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 29. In the course of the hearings, the Court heard Sir Eric Beckett, agent, Sir Frank Soskice, Mr. Wilberforce and Professor Waldock, counsel, on behalf of the United Kingdom Government; and M. Artzen, agent and counsel, and Professor Bourquin, counsel, on behalf of the Government of Norway. In addition, technical explanations were given on behalf of the United Kingdom Government by Commander Kennedy.

At the end of his argument, the agent of the United Kingdom Government presented the following submissions:

"The United Kingdom submits that the Court should decide that the maritime limits which Norway is entitled to enforce as against the United Kingdom should be drawn in accordance with the following principles:

"1. That Norway is entitled to a belt of territorial waters of fixed breadth—the breadth cannot, as a maximum, exceed 4 sea miles.

"2. That, in consequence, the outer limit of Norway's territorial waters must never be more than 4 sea miles from some point on the base-line.

"3. That, subject to (4), (9), and (10) below, the base-line must be low-water mark on permanently dry land (which is part of Norwegian territory) or the proper closing line (see (7) below) of Norwegian internal waters.

"4. That where there is a low-tide elevation situated within 4 sea miles of permanently dry land, or of the proper closing line of Norwegian internal waters, the outer limit of territorial waters may be 4 sea miles from the outer edge (at low tide) of this low-tide elevation. In no other case may a low-tide elevation be taken into account.

"5. That Norway is entitled to claim as Norwegian internal waters, on historic grounds, all fjords and sunds which fall within the conception of a bay as defined in international law, whether the proper entrance to the indentation is more or less than 10 sea miles wide.

"6. That the definition of a bay in international law is a well-marked indentation, whose penetration inland is in such proportion to the width of its mouth as to constitute the indentation more than a mere curvature of the coast.

"7. That where an area of water is a bay the principle which determines where the closing line should be drawn is that the closing line should be drawn between the natural geographical entrance points where the indentation ceases to have the configuration of a bay.

"8. That a legal strait is any geographical strait which connects two portions of the high seas.

"9. That Norway is entitled to claim as Norwegian territorial waters, on historic grounds, all the waters of the fjords and sunds which have the character of a legal strait. Where the maritime belts, drawn from each shore, overlap at each end of the strait, the limit of territorial waters is formed by the outer rims of these two maritime belts. Where, however, the maritime belts so drawn do not overlap, the limit follows the outer rims of each of these two maritime belts until they intersect with the straight line, joining the natural entrance points of the strait, after which intersection the limit follows that straight line.

"10. That, in the case of the Vestfjord, the outer limit of Norwegian territorial waters, at the south-westerly end of the fjord, is the pecked green line shown on charts Nos. 8 and 9 of annex 35 of the reply.

"11. That Norway, by reason of her historic title to fiords and sunds, is entitled to claim, either as territorial or as internal waters, the areas of water lying beween the island fringe and the mainland of Norway. In order to determine what areas must be deemed to lie between the islands and the mainland, and whether these areas are territorial or internal waters, recourse must be had to Nos. 6 and 8 above, being the definitions of a bay and of a legal strait.

"12. That Norway is not entitled, as against the United Kingdom, to enforce any claim to waters not covered by the preceding principles. As between Norway and the United Kingdom, waters off the coast of Norway north of parallel 66° 28.8′ N., which are not Norwegian by virtue of the abovementioned principles, are high seas.

"13. That Norway is under an international obligation to pay to the United Kingdom compensation in respect of all the arrests since September 16, 1948, of British fishing vessels in waters, which are high seas by virtue of the application of the preceding principles."

Later, the agent of the United Kingdom Government presented the following conclusions, at the end of his oral reply:

"The United Kingdom submits that the Court should decide that the maritime limits which Norway is entitled to enforce as against the United Kingdom should be drawn in accordance with the following principles:

"1. That Norway is entitled to a belt of territorial waters of fixed breadth—the breadth cannot, as a maximum, exceed four sea miles.

"2. That, in consequence, the outer limit of Norway's territorial waters must never be more than four sea miles from some point on the base line.

"3. That, subject to Nos. (4), (9), and (10) below, the base line must be low-water mark on permanently dry land (which is part of Norwegian territory) or the proper closing

line (see No. (7) below) of Norwegian internal waters.

"4. That, where there is a low-tide elevation situated within four sea miles of permanently dry land, or of the proper closing line of Norwegian internal waters, the outer limit of Norwegian territorial waters may be four sea miles from the outer edge (at low tide) of this low-tide elevation. In no other case may a low-tide elevation be taken into account.

"5. That Norway is entitled to claim as Norwegian internal waters, on historic grounds, all fjords and sunds which fall within the conception of a bay as defined in international law (see No. 6 below), whether the proper closing line of the indentation is more or less than 10 sea miles long.

"6. That the definition of a bay in international law is a well-marked indentation, whose penetration inland is in such proportion to the width of its mouth as to constitute the indentation more than a mere curvature of the coast.

"7. That, where an area of water is a bay, the principle which determines where the closing line should be drawn, is that the closing line should be drawn between the natural geographical entrance points where the indentation ceases to have the configuration of a bay.

"8. That a legal strait is any geographical strait which connects two portions of the high seas.

"9. (a) That Norway is entitled to claim as Norwegian territorial waters, on historic grounds, all the waters of the fjords and sunds which have the character of legal straits.

"(b) Where the maritime belts drawn from each shore overlap at each end of the strait, the limit of territorial waters is formed by the outer rims of these two maritime belts. Where, however, the maritime belts so drawn do not overlap, the limit follows the outer rims of each of these two maritime belts, until they intersect with the straight line, joining the natural entrance points of the strait, after which intersection the limit follows that straight line.

"10. That, in the case of the Vestfjord, the outer limit of Norwegian territorial waters, at the southwesterly end of the fjord, is the pecked green line shown on Charts Nos. 8 and 9 of annex 35 of the reply.

"11. That Norway, by reason of her historic title to fjords and sunds (see Nos. 5 and 9 (a) above), is entitled to claim either as internal or as territorial waters, the areas of water lying between the island fringe and the mainland of Norway. In order to determine what areas must be deemed to lie between the island fringe and the mainland, and whether these areas are internal or territorial waters, the principles of Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 (b) must be applied to indentations in the island fringe and to indentations between the island fringe and the mainland—those areas which lie in indentations having the character of bays, and within the proper closing lines thereof, being deemed to be internal waters; and those areas which lie in indentations having the character of legal straits, and within the proper limits thereof, being deemed to be territorial waters.

"12. That Norway is not entitled, as against the United Kingdom, to enforce any claims to waters not covered by the preceding principles. As between Norway and the United Kingdom, waters off the coast of Norway north of parallel 66°28.8′ N., which are not Norwegian by virtue of the above-mentioned principles, are high seas.

"13. That the Norwegian Royal Decree of July 12, 1935, is not enforceable against the United Kingdom to the extent that it claims as Norwegian waters (internal or territorial waters) areas of water not covered by Nos. 1-11.

"14. That Norway is under an international obligation to pay to the United Kingdom compensation in respect of all the arrests since September 16, 1948, of British fishing vessels in waters which are high seas by virtue of the application of the preceding principles.

"Alternatively to Nos. 1 to 13 (if the Court should decide to determine by its judgment the exact limits of the territorial waters which Norway is entitled to enforce against the United Kingdom), that Norway is not entitled as against the United Kingdom to claim as Norwegian waters any areas of water off the Norwegian coasts north of parallel 63°28.8′ N., which are outside the pecked green line drawn on the charts which form annex 35 of the reply.

"Alternatively to Nos. 8 to 11 (if the Court should hold that the waters of the Indreleia are Norwegian internal waters), the following are substituted for Nos. 8 to 11:

"I. That, in the case of the Vestfjord, the outer limit of Norwegian territorial waters at the southwesterly end of the fjord is a line drawn four sea miles seaward of a line joining the Skomvaer Lighthouse at Rost to Kalsholmen Lighthouse in Tennholmerne until the intersection of the former line with the arcs of circles in the pecked green line shown on charts 8 and 9 of annex 35 of the reply.

"II. That Norway, by reason of her historic title to fjords and sunds, is entitled to claim as internal waters the areas of water lying between the island fringe and the mainland of Norway. In order to determine what areas must be deemed to lie between the island fringe and the mainland, the principles of Nos. 6 and 7, above must be applied to the indentations in the island fringe and to the indentations between the island fringe and the mainland—those areas which lie in indentations having the character of bays, and within the proper closing lines thereof, being deemed to lie between the island fringe and the mainland."

At the end of his argument the Norwegian agent presented, on behalf of his Government, the following submissions, which he did not modify in his oral rejoinder:

"Having regard to the fact that the Norwegian royal decree of July 12, 1935, is not inconsistent with the rules of international law binding upon Norway, and having regard to the fact that Norway possesses, in any event, an historic title to all the waters included within the limits laid down by that decree, may it please the court, in one single judgment, rejecting all submissions to the contrary, to adjudge and declare that the delimitation of the fisheries zone fixed by the Norwegian royal decree of July 12, 1935, is not contrary to international law."

The facts which led the United Kingdom to bring the case before the court are briefly as follows:

The historical facts laid before the Court establish that as the result of complaints from the King of Denmark and of Norway, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, British fishermen refrained from fishing in Norwegian coastal waters for a long period, from 1616-18 until 1906.

In 1906 a few British fishing vessels appeared off the coasts of Eastern Finnmark. From 1908 onward they returned in greater numbers. These were trawlers equipped with improved and powerful gear. The local population became perturbed, and measures were taken by the Norwegian Government with a view to specifying the limits within which fishing was prohibited to foreigners.

The first incident occurred in 1911 when a British trawler was seized and condemned for having violated these measures. Negotiations ensued between the two Governments. These were interrupted by the war in 1914. From 1922 onward incidents recurred. Further conversations were initiated in 1924. In 1932, British trawlers, extending the range of their activities, appeared in the sectors off the Norwegian coast west of the North Cape, and the number of warnings and arrests increased. On July 27, 1933, the United Kingdom Government sent a memorandum to the Norwegian Government complaining that in delimiting the territorial sea the Norwegian authorities had made use of unjustifiable base lines. On July 12, 1935, a Norwegian royal decree was enacted delimiting the Norwegian fisheries zone north of 66°28.8′ north latitude.

The United Kingdom made urgent representations in Oslo in the course of which the question of referring the dispute to the Permanent Court of International Justice was raised. Pending the result of the negotiations, the Norwegian Government made it known that Norwegian fishery patrol vessels would deal leniently with foreign vessels fishing a certain distance within the fishing limits. In 1948, since no agreement had been reached, the Norwegian Government abandoned its lenient enforcement of the 1935 decree; incidents then became more and more frequent. A considerable number of British trawlers were arrested and condemned. It was then that the United Kingdom Government instituted the present proceedings.

The Norwegian royal decree of July 12, 1935, concerning the delimitation of the Norwegian fisheries zone sets out in the preamble the considerations on which its provisions are based. In this connection it refers to "well-established national titles of right," "the geographical conditions prevailing on the Norwegian coasts," "the safeguard of the vital interests of the inhabitants of the northernmost parts of the country"; it further relies on the royal decrees of February 22, 1812, October 16, 1869, January 5, 1881, and September 9, 1889.

The decree provides that "lines of delimitation toward the high sea of the Norwegian fisheries zone as regards that part of Norway which is situated northward of 66°28.8′ north latitude * * * shall run parallel with straight base lines drawn between fixed points on the mainland, on islands or rocks, starting from the final point of the boundary line of the realm in the easternmost part of the Varangerfjord and going as far as Traena in the county of Nordland." An appended schedule indicates the fixed points between which the base lines are drawn.

The subject of the dispute is clearly indicated under point 8 of the application instituting proceedings: "The subject of the dispute is the validity or otherwise under international law of the lines of delimitation of the Norwegian fisheries zone laid down by the royal decree of 1935 for that part of Norway which is situated northward of 66°28.8′ north latitude." And further on: "* * * the question at issue between the two Governments is whether the lines prescribed by the royal decree of 1935 as the base lines for the delimitation of the fisheries zone have or have not been drawn in accordance with the applicable rules of international law."

Although the decree of July 12, 1935, refers to the Norwegian fisheries zone and does not specifically mention the territorial sea, there can be no doubt that the zone delimited by this decree is none other than the sea area which Norway considers to be her territorial sea. That is how the parties argued the question and that is the way in which they submitted it to the court for decision.

The submissions presented by the agent of the Norwegian Government correspond to the subject of the dispute as indicated in the application.

The propositions formulated by the agent of the United Kingdom Government at the end of his first speech and revised by him at the end of his oral reply under the heading of "Conclusions" are more complex in character and must be dealt with in detail.

Points 1 and 2 of these conclusions refer to the extent of Norway's territorial sea. This question is not the subject of the present dispute. In fact, the 4-mile limit claimed by Norway was acknowledged by the United Kingdom in the course of the proceedings.

Points 12 and 13 appear to be real submissions which accord with the United Kingdom's conception of international law as set out under points 3 to 11.

Points 3 to 11 appear to be a set of propositions which, in the form of definitions, principles or rules, purport to justify certain contentions and do not constitute a precise and direct statement of a claim. The subject of the dispute being quite concrete, the Court cannot entertain the suggestion made by the agent of the United Kingdom Government at the sitting of October 1, 1951, that the Court should deliver a judgment which for the moment would confine itself to adjudicating on the definitions, principles or rules stated, a suggestion which, moreover, was objected to by the agent of the Norwegian Government at the sitting of October 5, 1951. These are elements which might furnish reasons in support of the judgment, but cannot constitute the decision. It further follows that even understood in this way, these elements may be taken into account only insofar as they would appear to be relevant for deciding the sole question in dispute, namely, the validity or otherwise under international law of the lines of delimitation laid down by the 1935 decree.

Point 14, which seeks to secure a decision of principle concerning Norway's obligation to pay to the United Kingdom compensation in respect of all arrests since September 16, 1948, of British fishing vessels in waters found to be high seas, need not be considered, since the parties had agreed to leave this question to subsequent settlement if it should arise.

The claim of the United Kingdom Government is founded on what it regards as the general international law applicable to the delimitation of the Norwegian fisheries zone.

The Norwegian Government does not deny that there exists rules of international law to which this delimitation must conform. It contends that the propositions formulated by the United Kingdom Government in its "Conclusions" do not possess the character attributed to them by that Government. It further relies on its own system of delimitation which it asserts to be in every respect in conformity with the requirements of international law.

The Court will examine in turn these various aspects of the claim of the United Kingdom and of the defense of the Norwegian Government.

The coastal zone concerned in the dispute is of considerable length. It lies north of latitude 66°28.8′ N., that is to say, north of the Arctic Circle, and it includes the coast of the mainland of Norway and all the islands, islets, rocks, and reefs, known by the name of the "skjaergaard" (literally, rock rampart), together with all Norwegian internal and territorial waters. The coast of the mainland, which, without taking any account of fjords, bays, and minor indentations, is over 1,500 kilometers in length, is of a very distinctive configuration. Very broken along its whole length, it constantly opens out into indentations often penetrating for great distances inland: The Porsangerfjord, for instance, penetrates 75 sea miles inland. To the west, the land configuration stretches out into the sea; the large and small islands, mountainous in character, the islets, rocks, and reefs, some always above water, others emerging only at low tide, are in truth but an extension of the Norwegian mainland. The number of insular formations, large and small, which make up the "skjaergaard" is estimated by the Norwegian Government to be 120,000. From the southern extremity of the disputed area to the North Cape, the "skjaergaard" lies along the whole of the coast of the mainland; east of the North Cape, the "skjaergaard" ends, but the coast line continues to be broken by large and deeply indented fiords.

Within the "skjaergaard," almost every island has its large and its small bays; countless arms of the sea, straits, channel, and mere waterways serve as a means of communication for the local population which inhabit the islands as it does the mainland. The coast of the mainland does not constitute, as it does in practically all other countries, a clear dividing line between land and sea. What matters, what really constitutes the Norwegian coast line, is the outer line of the "skjaergaard."

The whole of this region is mountainous. The North Cape, a sheer rock little more than 300 meters high, can be seen from a considerable distance; there are other summits rising to over a thousand meters, so that the Norwegian coast mainland and "skjaergaard," is visible from far off.

Along the coast are situated comparatively shallow banks, veritable underwater terraces which constitute fishing grounds where fish are particularly abundant; these grounds were known to Norwegian fishermen and exploited by them from time immemorial. Since these banks lay within the range of vision, the most desirable fishing grounds were always located and identified by means of the method of alinements ("meds"), at points where two lines drawn between points selected on the coast or on islands intersected.

In these barren regions the inhabitants of the coastal zone derive their livelihood essentially from fishing.

Such are the realities which must be borne in mind in appraising the validity of the United Kingdom contention that the limits of the Norwegian fisheries zone laid down in the 1935 decree are contrary to international law.

The parties being in agreement on the figure of 4 miles for the breadth of the territorial sea, the problem which arises is from what base line this breadth is to be reckoned. The conclusions of the United Kingdom are explicit on this point: the base-line must be low-water mark on permanently dry land which is a part of Norwegian territory, or the proper closing line of Norwegian internal waters.

The Court has no difficulty in finding that, for the purpose of measuring the breadth of the territorial sea, it is the low-water mark as opposed to the high-water mark, or the mean between the two tides, which has generally been adopted in the practice of states. This criterion is the most favorable to the coastal state and clearly shows the character of territorial waters as appurtenant to the land territory. The Court notes that the parties agree as to this criterion, but that they differ as to its application.

The parties also agree that in the case of a low-tide elevation (drying rock) the outer edge at low water of this low-tide elevation may be taken into account as a base-point for calculating the breadth of the territorial sea. The conclusions of the United Kingdom Government add a condition which is not admitted by Norway, namely, that, in order to be taken into account, a drying rock must be situated within 4 miles of permanently dry land. However, the Court does not consider it necessary to deal with this question, inasmuch as Norway has succeeded in proving, after both Parties had given their interpretation of the charts, that in fact none of the drying rocks used by her as base points is more than 4 miles from permanently dry land.

The Court finds itself obliged to decide whether the relevant low-water mark is that of the mainland or of the "skjaergaard," Since the mainland is bordered in its western sector by the "skjaergaard," which constitutes a whole with the mainland, it is the outer line of the "skjaergaard" which must be taken into account in delimiting the belt of Norwegian territorial waters. This solution is dictated by geographic realities.

Three methods have been contemplated to effect the application of the low-water mark rule. The simplest would appear to be the method of the trace parallèle, which consists of drawing the outer limit of the belt of territorial waters by following the coast in all its sinuosities. This method may be applied without difficulty to an ordinary coast, which is not too broken. Where a coast is deeply indented and cut into, as is that of eastern Finnmark, or where it is bordered by an archipelago such as the "skjaergaard" along the western sector of the coast here in question, the base-line becomes independent of the low-water mark, and can only be determined by means of a geometric construction. In such circumstances the line of the low-water mark can no longer be put forward as a rule requiring the coast line to be followed in all its sinuosities; nor can one speak of exceptions, when contemplating so rugged a coast in detail. Such a coast, viewed as a whole, calls for the application of a different method. Nor can one characterize as exceptions to the rule the very many derogations which would be necessitated by such a rugged coast. The rule would disappear under the exceptions.

It is true that the experts of the second subcommittee of the second committee of the 1930 conference for the codification of international law formulated the low-water-mark rule somewhat strictly (following all the sinuosities of the coast). But they were at the same time obliged to admit many exceptions relating to bays, islands near the coast, groups of islands. In the present case this method of the trace parallèle, which was invoked against Norway in the memorial, was abandoned in the written reply and later in the oral argument of the agent of the United Kingdom Government. Consequently, it is no longer relevant to the case. "On the other hand," it is said in the reply, "the courbe tangent—or, in English, 'envelopes of arcs of circles'—method is the method which the United Kingdom considers to be the correct one."

The arcs-of-circles method which is constantly used for determining the position of a point or object at sea, is a new technique insofar as it is a method for delimiting the territorial sea. This technique was proposed by the United States delegation at the 1930 conference for the codification of international law. Its purpose is to secure the application of the principle that the belt of territorial waters must follow the line of the coast. It is not obligatory by law as was admitted by counsel for the United Kingdom Government in his oral reply. In these circumstances, and although certain of the conclusions of the United Kingdom are founded on the application of the arcs-of-circles method, the Court considers that it need not deal with these conclusions insofar as they are based upon this method.

The principle that the belt of territorial waters must follow the general direction of the coast makes it possible to fix certain criteria valid for any delimitation of the territorial sea; these criteria will be elucidated later. The Court will confine itself at this stage to noting that, in order to apply this principle, several States have deemed it necessary to follow the straight-base-lines method and that they have not encountered objections of principle by other States. This method consists of selecting appropriate points on the low-water mark and drawing straight lines between them. This has been done, not only in the case of well-defined bays, but also in cases of minor curvatures of the coast line where

it was solely a question of giving a simpler form to the belt of territorial waters.

It has been contended on behalf of the United Kingdom, that Norway may draw straight lines only across bays. The Court is unable to share this view. If the belt of territorial waters must follow the outer line of the "skjaergaard", and if the method of straight base-lines must be admitted in certain cases, there is no valid reason to draw them only across bays, as in eastern Finnmark, and not also to draw them between islands, islets and rocks, across the sea areas separating them, even when such areas do not fall within the conception of a bay. It is sufficient that they should be situated between the island formations of the "skjaergaard", inter fauces terrarum.

The United Kingdom Government concedes that straight lines, regardless of their length, may be used only subject to the conditions set out in point 5 of its conclusions, as follows:

"Norway is entitled to claim Norwegian internal waters, on historic grounds, all fjords and sunds which fall within the conception of a bay as defined in international law (see No. (6) below), whether the proper closing line of the indentation is more or less than 10 sea miles long."

A preliminary remark must be made in respect of this point.

In the opinion of the United Kingdom Government, Norway is entitled, on historic grounds, to claim as internal waters all fjords and sunds which have the character of a bay. She is also entitled on historic grounds to claim as Norwegian territorial waters all the waters of the fjords and sunds which have the character of legal straits (conclusions, point 9), and, either as internal or as territorial waters, the areas of water lying between the island fringe and the mainland (point II and second alternative conclusion II).

By "historic waters" are usually meant waters which are treated as internal waters but which would not have that character were it not for the existence of an historic title. The United Kingdom Government refers to the notion of historic titles both in respect of territorial waters and internal waters, considering such titles, in both cases, as derogations from general international law. In its opinion Norway can justify the claim that these waters are territorial or internal on the ground that she has exercised the necessary jurisdiction over them for a long period without opposition from other States, a kind of possessio longi temporis, with the result that her jurisdiction over these waters must now be recognized although it constitutes a derogation from the rules in force. Norwegian sovereignty over these waters would constitute an exception, historic titles justifying situations which would otherwise be in conflict with international law.

As has been said, the United Kingdom Government concedes that Norway is entitled to claim as internal waters all the waters of fjords and sunds which fall within the conception of a bay as defined in international law whether the closing line of the indentation is more or less than 10 sea-miles long. But the United Kingdom Government concedes this only on the basis of historic title; it must therefore be taken that that Government has not abandoned its contention that the 10-mile rule is to be regarded as a rule of international law.

In these circumstances the court deems it necessary to point out that although the 10-mile rule has been adopted by certain States both in their national law and in their treaties and conventions, and although certain arbitral decisions have applied it as between these States, other States have adopted a different limit. Consequently, the 10-mile rule has not acquired the authority of a general rule of international law.

In any event the 10-mile rule would appear to be inapplicable as against Norway inasmuch as she has always opposed any attempt to apply it to the Norwegian coast.

The Court now comes to the question of the length of the base lines drawn across the waters lying between the various formations of the skjaergaard. Basing itself on the analogy with the alleged general rule of 10 miles relating to bays, the United Kingdom Government still maintains on this point that the length of straight lines must not exceed 10 miles.

In this connection, the practice of States does not justify the formulation of any general rule of law. The attempts that have been made to subject groups of islands or coastal archipelagoes to conditions analogous to the limitations concerning bays (distance between the islands not exceeding twice the breadth of the territorial waters, or 10 or 12 sea-miles), have not got beyond the stage of proposals.

Furthermore, apart from any question of limiting the lines to 10 miles, it may be that several lines can be envisaged. In such cases the coastal State would seem to be in the best position to appraise the local conditions dictating the selection.

Consequently, the Court is unable to share the view of the United Kingdom Government that "Norway, in the matter of base lines, now claims recognition of an exceptional system." As will be shown later, all that the Court can see therein is the application of general international law to a specific case.

The conclusions of the United Kingdom, points 5 and 9 to 11, refer to waters situated between the base lines and the Norwegian mainland. The Court is asked to hold that on historic grounds these waters belong to Norway, but that they are divided into two categories: territorial and internal waters, in accordance with two criteria which the conclusions regard as well founded in international law, the waters falling within the conception of a bay being deemed to be internal waters, and those having the character of legal straits being deemed to be territorial waters.

As has been conceded by the United Kingdom, the "skjaergaard" constitutes a whole with the Norwegian mainland; the waters between the base lines of the belt of territorial waters and the mainland are internal waters. However, according to the argument of the United Kingdom a portion of these waters constitutes territorial waters. These are inter alia the waters followed by the navigational route known as the Indreleia. It is contended that since these waters have this character, certain consequences arise with regard to the determination of the territorial waters at the end of this water-way considered as a maritime strait.

The Court is bound to observe that the Indreleia is not a strait at all, but rather a navigational route prepared as such by means of artificial aids to navigation provided by Norway. In these circumstances the Court is unable to accept the view that the Indreleia, for the purposes of the present case, has a status different from that of the other waters included in the "skjaergaard."

Thus the Court, confining itself for the moment to the conclusions of the United Kingdom, finds that the Norwegian Government in fixing the base lines for the delimitation of the Norwegian fisheries zone by the 1935 decree has not violated international law.

It does not at all follow that, in the absence of rules having the technically precise character alleged by the United Kingdom Government, the delimitation undertaken by the Norwegian Government in 1935 is not subject to certain principles which make it possible to judge as to its validity under international law. The delimitation of sea areas has always an international aspect; it cannot be dependent merely upon the will of the coastal state as expressed in its municipal law. Although it is true that the act of delimitation is necessarily a unilateral act, because only the coastal state is competent to undertake it, the validity of the delimitation with regard to other states depends upon international law.

In this connection, certain basic considerations inherent in the nature of the territorial sea, bring to light certain criteria which, though not entirely precise, can provide courts with an adequate basis for their decisions, which can be adapted to the diverse facts in question.

Among these considerations, some reference must be made to the close dependence of the territorial sea upon the land domain. It is the land which confers upon the coastal State a right to the waters of its coasts. It follows that while such a State must be allowed the latitude necessary in order to be able to adapt its delimitation to practical needs and local requirements, the drawing of base lines must not depart to any appreciable extent from the general direction of the coast.

Another fundamental consideration, of particular importance in this case, is the more or less close relationship existing between certain sea areas and the land formations which divide or surround them. The real question raised in the choice of baselines is in effect whether certain sea areas lying within these lines are sufficiently closely linked to the land domain to be subject to the regime of internal waters. This idea, which is at the basis of the determination of the rules relating to bays, should be liberally applied in the case of a coast, the geographical configuration of which is as unusual as that of Norway.

Finally, there is one consideration not to be overlooked, the scope of which extends beyond purely geographical factors: That of certain economic interests peculiar to a region, the reality and importance of which are clearly evidenced by a long usage.

Norway puts forward the 1935 decree as the application of a traditional system of delimitation, a system which she claims to be in complete conformity with international law. The Norwegian Government has referred in this connection to an historic title, the meaning of which was made clear by counsel for Norway at the sitting on October 12, 1951: "The Norwegian Government does not rely upon history to justify exceptional rights, to claim areas of sea which the general law would deny; it invokes history, together with other factors, to justify the way in which it applies the general law." This conception of an historic title is in consonance with the Norwegian Government's understanding of the general rules of international law. In its view, these rules of international law take into account the diversity of facts and, therefore, concede that the drawing of base lines must be adapted to the special conditions obtaining in different regions. In its view, the system of delimitation applied in 1935, a system characterized by the use of straight lines, does not therefore infringe the general law; it is an adaptation rendered necessary by local conditions.

The Court must ascertain precisely what this alleged system of delimitation consists of, what is its effect in law as against the United Kingdom, and whether it was applied by the 1935 decree in a manner which conformed to international law.

It is common ground between the parties that on the question of the existence of a Norwegian system the royal decree of February 22, 1812, is of cardinal importance. This decree is in the following terms: "We wish to lay down as a rule that, in all cases when there is a question of determining the limit of our territorial sovereignty at sea,

that limit shall be reckoned at the distance of one ordinary sea league from the island or islet farthest from the mainland not covered by the sea, of which all proper authorities shall be informed by rescript."

This text does not clearly indicate how the base lines between the islands or islets farthest from the mainland were to be drawn. In particular, it does not say in express terms that the lines must take the form of straight lines drawn between these points. But it may be noted that it was in this way that the 1812 decree was invariably construed in Norway in the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The decree of October 16, 1869, relating to the delimitation of Sunnmore, and the statement of reasons for this decree, are particularly revealing as to the traditional Norwegian conception and the Norwegian construction of the decree of 1812. It was by reference to the 1812 decree, and specifically relying upon the conception adopted by that decree, that the Ministry of the Interior justified the drawing of a straight line 26 miles in length between the two outermost points of the "skjaergaard." The decree of September 9, 1889, relating to the delimitation of Romsdal and Nordmore, applied the same method, drawing four straight lines, respectively 14.7 miles, 7 miles, 23.6 miles, and 11.6 miles in length.

The 1812 decree was similarly construed by the Territorial Waters Boundary Commission (report of February 29, 1912, pp. 48–49), as it was in the memorandum of January 3, 1929, sent by the Norwegian Government to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, in which it was said: "The direction laid down by this decree should be interpreted in the sense that the starting point for calculating the breadth of the territorial waters should be a line drawn along the 'skjaergaard' between the furthest rocks and where there is no 'skjaergaard,' between the extreme points." The judgment delivered by the Norwegian Supreme Court in 1934, in the St. Just case, provided final authority for this interpretation. This conception accords with the geographical characteristics of the Norwegian coast and is not contrary to the principles of international law.

It should, however, be pointed out that whereas the 1812 decree designated as base points "the island or islet farthest from the mainland not covered by the sea," Norwegian governmental practice subsequently interpreted this provision as meaning that the limit was to be reckoned from the outermost islands and islets not continuously covered by the sea.

The 1812 decree, although quite general in its terms, had as its immediate object the fixing of the limit applicable for the purposes of maritime neutrality. However, as soon as the Norwegian Government found itself impelled by circumstances to delimit its fisheries zone, it regarded that decree as laying down principles to be applied for purposes other than neutrality. The Statements of Reasons of October 1, 1869, December 20, 1880, and May 24, 1889, are conclusive on this point. They also show that the delimitation effected in 1869 and in 1889 constituted a reasoned application of a definite system applicable to the whole of the Norwegian coast line, and was not merely legislation of local interest called for by any special requirements. The following passage from the Statement of Reasons of the 1869 Decree may in particular be referred to: "My ministry assumes that the general rule mentioned above (namely, the 4-mile rule), which is recognized by international law for the determination of the extent of a country's territorial waters, must be applied here in such a way that the sea area inside a line drawn parallel to a straight line between the two outermost islands or rocks not covered by the sea, Svinoy to the south and Storholmen to the north, and one geographical league northwest of that straight line, should be considered Norwegian maritime territory."

The 1869 Statement of Reasons brings out all the elements which go to make up what the Norwegian Government describes as its traditional system of delimitation; base points provided by the islands or islets farthest from the mainland, the use of straight lines joining up these points, the lack of any maximum length for such lines. The judgment of the Norwegian supreme court in the St. Just case upheld this interpretation and added that the 1812 decree had never been understood or applied in such a way as to make the boundary follow the sinuosities of the coast or to cause its position to be determined by means of circles drawn round the points of the "skjaergaard" or of the mainland farthest out to sea—a method which it would be very difficult to adopt or to enforce in practice, having regard to the special configuration of this coast." Finally, it is established that, according to the Norwegian system, the base lines must follow the general direction of the coast, which is in conformity with international law.

Equally significant in this connection is the correspondence which passed between Norway and France between 1869 and 1870. On December 21, 1869, only 2 months after the promulgation of the decree of October 16 relating to the delimitation of Sunnmore, the French Government asked the Norwegian Government for an explanation of this enactment. It did so basing itself upon "the principles of international law." In a second note dated December 30 of the same year, it pointed out that the distance between the base points was greater than 10 sea miles, and that the line joining up these points should have been a broken line following the configuration of the coast. In a note of February 8, 1870, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, also dealing with the question from the point of view of international law, replied as follows:

"By the same note of December 30, Your Excellency drew my attention to the fixing of the fishery limit in the Sunnmore Archipelago by a straight line instead of a broken line. According to the view held by your government, as the distance between the islets of Svinoy and Storholmen is more than 10 sea miles, the fishery limit between these two points should have been a broken line following the configuration of the coast line and nearer to it than the present limit. In spite of the adoption in some treaties of the quite arbitrary distance of 10 sea miles, this distance would not appear to me to have acquired the force of an international law. Still less would it appear to have any foundation in reality: One bay, by reason of the varying formations of the coast and sea bed, may have an entirely different character from that of another bay of the same width. It seems to me rather that local conditions and considerations of what is practicable and equitable should be decisive in specific cases. The configuration of our coasts in noway resembles that of the coasts of other European countries, and that fact alone makes the adoption of any absolute rule of universal application impossible in this case.

"I venture to claim that all these reasons militate in favor of the line laid down by the decree of October 16. A broken line, conforming closely to the indentations of the coast line between Svinoy and Storholmen, would have resulted in a boundary so involved and so indistinct that it would have been impossible to exercise any supervision over it."

Language of this kind can only be construed as the considerad expression of a legal conception regarded by the Norwegian Government as compatible with the international law. And indeed, the French Government did not pursue the matter. In a note of July 27, 1870, it is said that, while maintainging its standpoint with regard to principle, it was prepared to accept the delimitation laid down by the decree of October 16, 1869, as resting upon "a practical study of the configuration of the coast line and of the conditions of the inhabitants."

The Court, having thus established the existence and the constituent elements of the Norwegian system of delimitation, further finds that this system was consistently applied by Norwegian authorities and that it encountered no opposition on the part of other states.

The United Kingdom Government has however sought to show that the Norwegian Government has not consistently followed the principles of delimitation which, it claims, form its system, and that it has admitted by implication that some other method would be necessary to comply with international law. The documents to which the agent of the Government of the United Kingdom principally referred at the hearing on October 20, 1951, relate to the period between 1906 and 1908, the period in which British trawlers made their first appearance off the Norwegian coast, and which, therefore, merits particular attention.

The United Kingdom Government pointed out that the law of June 2, 1906, which prohibited fishing by foreigners, merely forbade fishing in Norwegian territorial waters, and it deduced from the very general character of this reference that no definite system existed. The court is unable to accept this interpretation, as the object of the law was to renew the prohibition against fishing and not to undertake a precise delimitation of the territorial sea.

The second document relied upon by the United Kingdom Government is a letter dated March 24, 1908, from the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Minister of National Defense. The United Kingdom Government thought that this letter indicated an adherence by Norway to the low-water mark rule contrary to the present Norwegian position. This interpretation cannot be accepted; it rests upon a confusion between the low-water mark rule as understood by the United Kingdom, which requires that all the sinuosites of the coast line at low tide should be followed, and the general practice of selecting the low-tide mark rather than that of the high tide for measuring the extent of the territorial sea.

The third document referred to is a note, dated November 11, 1908, from the Norwegian Minister for Foreign Affairs to the French chargé d'affaires at Christiania, in reply to a request for information as to whether Norway had modified the limits of her territorial waters. In it the Minister said: "Interpreting Norwegian regulations in this matter, whilst at the same time conforming to the general rule of the Law of Nations, this Ministery gave its opinion that the distance from the coast should be measured from the low-water mark and that every islet not continuously covered by the sea should be reckoned as a starting point." The United Kingdom Government argued that by the reference to the general rule of the Law of Nations, instead of to its own system of delimitation entailing the use of straight lines, and, furthermore, by its statement that "every islet not continuously covered by the sea should be reckoned as a starting point," the Norwegian Government had completely departed from what it today describes as its system.

It must be remembered that the request for information to which the Norwegian Government was replying related not to the use of straight lines, but to the breadth of Norwegian territorial waters. The point of the Norwegian Government's reply was that there had been no modification in the Norwegian legislation. Moreover, it is impossible to rely upon a few words taken from a single note to draw the conclusion that the Nor-

wegian Government had abandoned a position which its earlier official documents had clearly indicated.

The Court considers that too much importance need not be attached to the few uncertainties or contradictions, real or apparent, which the United Kingdom Government claims to have discovered in Norwegian practice. They may be easily understood in the light of the variety of the facts and conditions prevailing in the long period which has elapsed since 1812, and are not such as to modify the conclusions reached by the Court.

In the light of these considerations, and in the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the Court is bound to hold that the Norwegian authorities applied their system of delimitation consistently and uninterruptedly from 1869 until the time when the dispute arose.

From the standpoint of international law, it is now necessary to consider whether the application of the Norwegian system encountered any opposition from foreign states.

Norway has been in a position to argue without any contradiction that neither the promulgation of her delimitation Decrees in 1869 and in 1889, nor their application, gave rise to any opposition on the part of foreign states. Since, moreover, these decrees constitute, as has been shown above, the application of a well-defined and uniform system, it is indeed this system itself which would reap the benefit of general toleration, the basis of an historical consolidation which would make it enforceable as against all states.

The general toleration of foreign states with regard to the Norwegian practice is an unchallenged fact. For a period of more than 60 years the United Kingdom Government itself in no way contested it. One cannot indeed consider as raising objections the discussions to which the Lord Roberts incident gave rise in 1911, for the controversy which arose in this connection related to two questions, that of the 4-mile limit, and that of Norwegian sovereignty over the Varangerfjord, both of which were unconnected with the position of base lines. It would appear that it was only in its memorandum of July 27, 1933, that the United Kingdom made a formal and definite protest on this point.

The United Kingdom Government has argued that the Norwegian system of delimitation was not known to it and that the system therefore lacked the notoriety essential to provide the basis of an historic title enforceable against it. The Court is unable to accept this view. As a coastal state on the North Sea, greatly interested in the fisheries in this area, as a maritime power traditionally concerned with the law of the sea and concerned particularly to defend the freedom of the seas, the United Kingdom could not have been ignorant of the Decree of 1869 which had at once provoked a request for explanations by the French Government. Nor, knowing of it, could it have been under any misapprehension as to the significance of its terms, which clearly described it as constituting the application of a system. The same observation applies a fortiori to the decree of 1889 relating to the delimitation of Romsdal and Nordmore which must have appeared to the United Kingdom as a reiterated manifestation of the Norwegian practice.

Norway's attitude with regard to the North Sea Fisheries (police) Convention of 1882 is a further fact which must at once have attracted the attention of Great Britain. There is scarcely any fisheries convention of greater importance to the coastal states of the North Sea or of greater interest to Great Britain. Norway's refusal to adhere to this convention clearly raised the question of the delimitation of her maritime domain, especially with regard to bays, the question of their delimitation by means of straight lines of which Norway challenged the maximum length adopted in the convention. Having regard to the fact that a few years before, the delimitation of Sunnmore by the 1869 decree had been presented as an application of the Norwegian system, one cannot avoid the conclusion that, from that time on, all the elements of the problem of Norwegian coastal waters had been clearly stated. The steps subsequently taken by Great Britain to secure Norway's adherence to the convention clearly show that she was aware of and interested in the question.

The Court notes that in respect of a situation which could only be strengthened with the passage of time, the United Kingdom Government refrained from formulating reservations.

The notoriety of the facts, the general toleration of the international community, Great Britain's position in the North Sea, her own interest in the question, and her prolonged abstention would in any case warrant Norway's enforcement of her system against the United Kingdom.

The Court is thus led to conclude that the method of straight lines established in the Norwegian system, was imposed by the peculiar geography of the Norwegian coast; that even before the dispute arose, this method had been consolidated by a constant and sufficiently long practice, in the face of which the attitude of governments bears witness to the fact that they did not consider it to be contrary to international law.

The question now arises whether the decree of July 12, 1935, which in its preamble is expressed to be an application of this method, conforms to it in its drawing of the base-lines, or whether, at certain points, it departs from this method to any considerable extent.

The schedule appended to the decree of July 12, 1935, indicates the fixed points between which the straight base lines are drawn. The Court notes that these lines were the result of a careful study initiated by the Norwegian authorities as far back as 1911. The base lines recommended by the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Storting for the delimitation of the fisheries zone and adopted and made public for the first time by the decree of July 12, 1935, are the same as those which the so-called Territorial Waters Boundary Commissions, successively appointed on July 29, 1911, and July 12, 1912, had drawn in 1912 for Finnmark and in 1913 for Nordland and Troms. The Court further notes that the 1911 and 1912 Commissions advocated these lines and in so doing constantly referred, as the 1935 decree itself did, to the traditional system of delimitation adopted by earlier acts and more particularly by the decrees of 1812, 1869, and 1889.

In the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, the Court cannot readily find that the lines adopted in these circumstances by the 1935 decree are not in accordance with the traditional Norwegian system. However, a purely factual difference arose between the parties concerning the three following base points: No. 21 (Vesterfallet i Gaasan), No. 27 (Tokkebaaen), and No. 39 (Norboen). This difference is now devoid of object. A telegram dated October 19, 1951, from the Hydrographic Service of Norway to the agent of the Norwegian Government, which was communicated to the agent of the United Kingdom Government, has confirmed that these three points are rocks which are not continuously submerged. Since this assertion has not been further disputed by the United Kingdom Government, it may be considered that the use of these rocks as base points is in conformity with the traditional Norwegian system.

Finally, it has been contended by the United Kingdom Government that certain, at least, of the base lines adopted by the decree are, irrespective of whether or not they conform to the Norwegian system, contrary to the principles stated above by the Court as governing any delimitation of the territorial sea. The Court will consider whether, from the point of view of these principles, certain of the base lines which have been criticized in some detail really are without justification.

The Norwegian Government admits that the baselines must be drawn in such a way as to respect the general direction of the coast and that they must be drawn in a reasonable manner. The United Kingdom Government contends that certain lines do not follow the general direction of the coast, or do not follow it sufficiently closely, or that they do not respect the natural connection existing between certain sea areas and the land formations separating or surrounding them. For these reasons, it is alleged that the line drawn is contrary to the principles which govern the delimitation of the maritime domain.

The Court observes that these complaints, which assumed a very general scope in the written proceedings, have subsequently been reduced.

The United Kingdom Government has directed its criticism more particularly against two sectors, the delimitation of which they represented as extreme cases of deviation from the general direction of the coast: The sector of Svaerholthavet (between basepoints 11 and 12) and that of Lopphavet (between base points 20 and 21). The Court will deal with the delimitation of these two sectors from this point of view.

The base line between points 11 and 12, which is 38.6 sea miles in length, delimits the waters of the Svaerholt lying between Cape Nordkyn and the North Cape. The United Kingdom Government denies that the basin so delimited has the character of a bay. Its argument is founded on a geographical consideration. In its opinion, the calculation of the basin's penetration inland must stop at the tip of the Svaerholt Peninsula (Svaerholtklubben). The penetration inland thus obtained being only 11.5 sea miles, as against 38.6 miles of breadth at the entrance, it is alleged that the basin in question does not have the character of a bay. The Court is unable to share this view. It considers that the basin in question must be contemplated in the light of all the geographical factors involved. The fact that a peninsula juts out and forms two wide fjords, the Laksefjord and the Porsangerfjord, cannot deprive the basis of the character of a bay. It is the distances between the disputed baseline and the most inland point of these fjords, 50 and 75 sea miles respectively, which must be taken into account in appreciating the proportion between the penetration inland and the width at the mouth. The Court concludes that Svaerholthavet has the character of a bay.

The delimitation of the Lopphavet basin has also been criticized by the United Kingdom. As has been pointed out above, its criticism of the selection of base point No. 21 may be regarded as abandoned. The Lopphavet basin constitutes an ill-defined geographic whole. It cannot be regarded as having the character of a bay. It is made up of an extensive area of water dotted with large islands which are separated by inlets that terminate in the various fjords. The base line has been challenged on the ground that it does not respect the general direction of the coast. It should be observed that, however justified the rule in question may be, it is devoid of any mathematical precision. In order properly to apply the rule, regard must be had for the relation between the deviation complained of and what, according to the terms of the rule, must be regarded as the general direction of

the coast. Therefore, one cannot confine oneself to examining one sector of the coast alone, except in a case of manifest abuse; nor can one rely on the impression that may be gathered from a large-scale chart of this sector alone. In the case in point, the divergence between the base line and the land formations is not such that it is a distortion of the general direction of the Norwegian coast.

Even if it were considered that in the sector under review the deviation was too pronounced, it must be pointed out that the Norwegian Government has relied upon an historic title clearly referable to the waters of Lopphavet, namely, the exclusive privilege to fish and hunt whales granted at the end of the seventeenth century to Lt. Comdr. Erich Lorch under a number of licenses which show, inter alia, that the water situated in the vicinity of the sunken rock of Gjesbaaen or Gjesboene and the fishing grounds pertaining thereto were regarded as falling exclusively within Norwegian sovereignty. But it may be observed that the fishing grounds here referred to are made up of two banks, one of which, the Indre Gjesboene, is situated between the base line and the limit reserved for fishing, whereas the other, the Ytre Gjesboene, is situated further to seaward and beyond the fishing limit laid down in the 1935 decree.

These ancient concessions tend to confirm the Norwegian Government's contention that the fisheries zone reserved before 1812 was in fact much more extensive than the one delimited in 1935. It is suggested that it included all fishing banks from which land was visible, the range of vision being, as is recognized by the United Kingdom Government, the principle of delimitation in force at that time. The Court considers that, although it is not always clear to what specific areas they apply, the historical data produced in support of this contention by the Norwegian Government lend some weight to the idea of the survival of traditional rights reserved to the inhabitants of the kingdom over fishing grounds included in the 1935 delimitation, particularly in the case of Lopphavet. Such rights, founded on the vital needs of the population and attested by very ancient and peaceful usage, may legitimately be taken into account in drawing a line which, moreover, appears to the Court to have been kept within the bounds of what is moderate and reasonable.

As to the Bestfjord, after the oral argument, its delimitation no longer presents the importance it had in the early stages of the proceedings. Since the Court has found that the waters of the Indreleia are internal waters, the waters of the Vestfjord, as indeed the waters of all other Norwegian fjords, can only be regarded as internal waters. In these circumstances, whatever difference may still exist between the views of the United Kingdom Government and those of the Norwegian Government on this point, is negligible. It is reduced to the question whether the base line should be drawn between points 45 and 46 as fixed by the 1935 decree, or whether the line should terminate at the Kalsholmen Lighthouse on Tenholmerne. The Court considers that this question is purely local in character and of secondary importance, and that its settlement should be left to the coastal state.

For these reasons, the Court, rejecting all submissions to the contrary, finds by 10 votes to 2, that the method employed for the delimitation of the fisheries zone by the Royal Norwegian decree of July 12, 1935, is not contrary to international law; and, by 8 votes to 4, that the base lines fixed by the said decree in application of this method are not contrary to international law.

Done in French and English, the French text being authoritative, at the Peace Palace, The Hague, this eighteenth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and fifty-one, in three copies, one of which will be placed in the archives of the Court and the others transmitted to the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and to the Government of the Kingdom of Norway, respectively.

BASDEVANT, *President.*
E. HAMBRO, *Registrar.*

Judge Hackworth declares that he concurs in the operative part of the judgment but desires to emphasize that he does so for the reason that he considers that the Norwegian Government has proved the existence of an historic title to the disputed areas of water.

Judges Alvarez and Hsu Mo, availing themselves of the right conferred on them by article 57 of the statute, append to the judgment of the Court statements of their separate opinions.

Judges Sir Arnold McNair and Read, availing themselves of the right conferred on them by article 57 of the statute, append to the judgment statements of their dissenting opinions.

J. B.
E. H.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, relative to Fisheries case, there appeared in the Los Angeles Times of Thursday, February 14, 1952, an article written by Mr. Ed Ainsworth. The article is entitled "Hague Ruling Puts McGrath on Spot." The subhead reads:

United States official faces tidelands case deadline in parallel decision.

I shall not read the entire article at this time, but I wish to point out that both the Fisheries decision, which is now a part of my remarks, and this article are very pertinent to the consideration of the legislation which is now pending before the Senate, although the Attorney General has tried to say in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that it is not pertinent. I believe the record will speak for itself.

It so happens that in the area between Point Conception and Point Loma, Calif., there are a series of islands, all of which have been and are part and parcel of California, and have been so considered and have been included in the county governments of California. Going south from Point Conception, we find Richardson Rock, Bee Rock, Santa Rosa Island, Santa Cruz Island, Begg Rock, San Nicolas Island, San Clemente Island, and then Point Loma. Inside the general line formed by those islands is found Santa Catalina Island. So this matter becomes very pertinent.

Mr. Ainsworth said, in part, in his article:

The United States Justice Department, under Attorney General McGrath, is squirming today on the horns of a seagoing dilemma.

It concerns national defense, international law, the seaward boundary of the United States, the Channel Islands of California, pygmy elephants, geology—and $40,000,000,000 in oil.

It's a terrible problem to decide.

And Attorney General McGrath faces a deadline.

RECENT DECISION

The whole matter revolves around the recent decision of the International Court of Justice at The Hague concerning coastal islands in determining national boundary lines. The decision in a case between Great Britain and Norway was decided overwhelmingly in favor of Norway in such a manner as to upset all the prior contentions of the United States Justice Department in its attempt to take over the rich oil-bearing submerged lands of California, Texas, and Louisiana in the so-called tidelands case.

Now, in Washington on February 20 a crucial hearing will start on the issue.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT STEP

What is the Justice Department going to do?

Will it swallow its pride and recognize, for example, the United States boundary along the outer rim of the Channel Islands of California, as it should do under the World Court decision, thus insuring the maximum national defense for this country?

Or will it try to ignore the World Court ruling and cling to a narrow definition of the national boundary as low-tide mark along the mainland, thus hanging on to its alleged ownership of submerged oil lands at Santa Barbara, Long Beach, Huntington Beach, and elsewhere?

That, Mr. President, I may say, is a very dangerous doctrine, because it is some 28 miles from the mainland to Santa Catalina Island, and it is a somewhat shorter distance to Santa Cruz Island, and a somewhat greater distance to some of the other islands in the chain. Suppose a Soviet submarine shows up in this island chain? Is it inside or outside our territorial waters?

As the article by Mr. Ainsworth points out, and as some of my colleagues in the House of Representatives have also pointed out, the Department of Justice may be sacrificing the national defense interests of our Nation in order to deprive the States of some of their own area, to which they have had claim for 100 years or more in the history of our country.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Since, at the moment, the Senator from California is discussing international law, I do not know whether he has before him certain facts which I have in mind. Certainly, he is more familiar with them than I am. However, let me say that it is my impression that on the northern shores of Russia, along the Arctic Sea, there is a bay which is extremely wide and which Russia claims as being entirely inland water; so that if an American ship of war entered that water, unless it went there with the permission of Russia, undoubtedly the ship would be sunk.

On the other hand, in this case the United States is upholding a concept which would permit a Russian submarine to come practically inside every American harbor. The United States Government is advancing that concept in an effort to squeeze a few barrels of oil out of a State.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Louisiana that it is hard for me to understand the doctrine the Federal Government is attempting to follow. Apparently there are some "liberal"—and I use the word in quotation marks—friends in the Chamber who think there is a great virtue in the Federal Government's having this control, even though for more than 100 years it had been recognized that the States had it. Yet by that implication they would take all virtue from the

same citizens who are citizens of California or Louisiana or Florida. I say that as citizens of our respective States these people are no different than they are as citizens of the United States. Why the advocates of that doctrine think there is such great virtue in playing Robin Hood and snatching away that which belongs to the States and giving it to the Federal Government, I cannot understand.

Again let me say that I think this issue is one which we must fight out on the floor of the Senate, and also in the House of Representatives, which already has passed some proposed legislation on the subject.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from California is undoubtedly correct as to the fact that the Federal Government found that it must disclaim for purposes of national defense vast segments of inland water and territorial sea in order to acquire the oil along the shores of Louisiana, Texas, and California, in an attempt to get every last drop of it, one might say.

Let me ask the Senator from California to restate the amount which he said was involved, insofar as the Santa Barbara, Long Beach, and Huntington Beach phase of the problem is concerned. Did the Senator refer to approximately $40,000,000,000?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; that figure, which I believe was included in Mr. Ainsworth's article, was the reported value of all the resources along all the coasts.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from California see what figure is stated in the article?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It was $40,000,000,000, which I think is the estimate made by Mr. Ainsworth, and the figure proposed in the committee hearings as representing the total value of all the resources.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from California will find that to be a tremendous exaggeration. However, even if that figure is regarded as being the correct one, in view of the fact that those who have been advocating Federal ownership have wanted to find an enormous figure with which to scare someone——

Mr. KNOWLAND. We used to think $40,000,000,000 was a vast sum. I still think it is a great deal of money. However, it is only sufficient to operate the Government of the United States for less than half a year, based on the budget which has been presented to the Congress by the President of the United States. So what is involved in that estimate could be squandered by the Federal Government in 6 months or less, under the present budgetary figures.

Mr. LONG. I do not believe there is $40,000,000,000 worth of oil in the submerged lands. However, if we concede that there is $40,000,000,000 worth of oil under the submerged lands, it is necessary to divide that amount, in order to arrive at the amount the States would get.

For example, under the Federal Leasing Act the Government cannot ask for more than one-eighth, unless oil production already has been commenced on the property. Therefore, if the figure cited in the article is divided by 8 we get, not $40,000,000,000, but $5,000,000,000, which is a great deal different.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the $5,000,000,000 would not pay for 1 year the interest on the Federal Government's debt of $259,000,000,000 because the interest on the debt now amounts to more than $6,000,000,000.

Mr. LONG. Of course, when in contemplating that amount, we have to realize that when the Federal Government starts to obtain the money, it will come in over a long period of time. The best estimate the Secretary of the Interior could give our committee was that he hopes that ultimately the production might be built up sufficiently to yield $100,000,000 a year. That sounds like a great deal of money to be taken away from the States. However, we must realize that in that case the citizens would be deprived of the services they need for themselves throughout the coastal areas.

If the Senator would do a little figuring, he might be able to ascertain for what portion of a day that $100,000,000 would permit the Federal Government to operate. I believe it would permit the Federal Government to operate for approximately 6 or 8 hours of 1 day, at the rate at which the Government presently is spending money.

The same persons are willing to provide $7,900,000,000 in 1 year for the welfare and the protection of lands overseas—in other words, 79 times as much for foreign nations, to aid in national defense, whereas they are willing to jeopardize our defense—if the Senator from California is correct, and I believe he is—and to take chances with our defense, in an effort to acquire $100,000,000, which properly belongs to the States.

Of course, at this time the amount is not $100,000,000; actually, $30,000,000 is involved, which is about as much production as we have been able to obtain up to this point from the submerged areas lying along the coasts of California, Louisiana, and Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana very much.

I now ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "More Oil, or Better Defense?" The article appeared in the Los Angeles Examiner on February 17 of this year, and relates to the problem we have just been discussing.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE OIL, OR BETTER DEFENSE?

In its greedy haste to take over California's tidelands, the Federal Government is making it possible for foreign vessels and aircraft to operate in deep high-seas pockets in American coastal harbors.

At Los Angeles Harbor, for instance, where the United States Fleet is based, and in the stretch of water between San Pedro and the Channel Islands, pockets of what is technically high seas would be free for foreign war craft to operate—with impunity and immunity, entirely within international law.

The Government's case rests on the narrowest possible definition of inland waters, so narrow as to define away all inland coastal waters.

Normally, between inland waters and the high seas 3 miles off, lies the marginal waters or tidelands, which the Government wants to exploit for their oil-bearing deposits.

Thus, by keeping inland waters as close to shore as possible, the Government brings closer to shore the 3-mile limit beyond which the sea and the air above it are open to the unrestricted use of any nation.

And by thus bringing the ocean frontier as close as possible by narrowing the inland waters, the Government places within easy observation, by foreign craft, the defense installations in American bays, ports, and harbors.

A joint resolution introduced in Congress by Representative YORTY, of Los Angeles, points out, however, that the Government's idea of what are inland waters is not adequate for defense nor demanded by international law.

It was so decided by the International Court of Justice in the case of Great Britain against Norway.

The Norwegians claimed that their true frontier was 3 miles beyond what they considered their inland waters, and the Court agreed.

America, however, has not been as jealous of its rights nor as zealous in maintaining them as the Norwegians.

On the contrary, the American Government is willing to surrender large areas of sea and air to which it is entitled and which it should control for the country's safety, merely to get a cut of California's oil.

Certainly the time is at hand, and the need urgent, to place our ocean frontier where it should be to insure safety.

The State Department has consistently neglected the matter.

The Justice Department has ignored it in pushing the Government's tideland case.

Congress should pass Representative YORTY'S resolution. A wide belt of protective ocean is more to the national interest than any amount of oil the Government hopes to draw out of California's tidelands.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, House Joint Resolution 373, which was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative YORTY, of California, for the purpose of declaring the boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the United States to be as far seaward as is permissible under international law, and providing for a survey of such boundaries to be made by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey in the light of the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case. The joint resolution raises certain issues which I think all Members of the Senate will find of interest.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the United States have never been accurately and definitely established, and the methods previously proposed by the United States for the fixing of said boundaries were based upon an incomplete understanding of the area of inland or internal waters over which a nation may exercise exclusive jurisdiction under international law; and

Whereas the International Court of Justice, in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case on December 18, 1951, held that it was permissible under international law for Norway to establish as the seaward boundaries of its inland or internal waters a series of straight lines running between fixed points

on the mainland and around the outer edge of the off-lying islands, islets, and rocks; and

Whereas the International Court of Justice, in such case, held that the validity of a nation's claim relative to the extent of its inland or internal waters would in case of an international dispute, be governed by the following basic considerations: (1) The boundary of the inland or internal waters must not depart to any appreciable extent from the general direction of the coastline; (2) the sea areas brought within such boundaries must be sufficiently closely linked to the land domain to be subject to the regime of inland or internal waters; and (3) the economic interests peculiar to a region, evidenced by long usage, should be taken into account; and

Whereas it is especially imperative at this time, in order to avoid international incidents and increase the national security, to definitely establish the boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the United States as far seaward as may be permissible under international law, and to give clear and unmistakable notice of such action, to all other nations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That (a) the United States declares its exclusive right and jurisdiction, as against all other nations, with respect to all inland or internal waters within boundaries established as far seaward along the coasts of the continental United States (including Alaska) as is permissible under the rules of international law set forth in the judgment rendered by the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case on December 18, 1951.

(b) The United States accordingly establishes, as the seaward boundary of its inland or internal waters, a series of straight lines running between the headlands of all indentations on the mainland and, where there are off-lying islands, rocks, or reefs, a series of straight lines running around the outer edges of the farthest off-lying islands, rocks, and reefs. In establishing this seaward boundary the United States has taken cognizance of the basic considerations of international law as set forth in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case.

SEC. 2. (a) the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey shall survey the seacoasts of the continental United States (including Alaska, and including all off-lying islands, rocks, and reefs) and prepare charts showing the precise location of the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the United States as provided for in the preceding section.

(b) In surveying the seacoast of any coastal State, the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey shall consult with the State lands commission or other appropriate body or official of such State.

SEC. 3. The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey shall submit to the Congress, within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, a report setting forth the results of the survey made by it under the preceding section. Such report shall show the alternative proposed boundaries where there is lack of concurrence between the Coast and Geodetic Survey and officials of the respective States relative to the seaward boundaries fixed by this resolution. With respect to any portion of the seaward boundary of the inland or internal waters of the United States, where there is such lack of concurrence, the survey shall not be final and effective until the Congress by concurrent resolution or otherwise shall have fixed the boundary in question.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me at this time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to correct a statement I made a moment ago. It has just occurred to me that it should be remembered that the States do not expect to receive all revenues from their submerged lands. The most favorable legislative proposal for the States is represented by the Connally amendment in the Senate or the Walter's bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives. In those measures it is provided that the States shall receive the revenue on production within 3 miles of their shores, but that 90 percent of the acreage of the submerged lands subject to production, which is beyond their 3-mile belt, shall be subject to having two-thirds of the production go to the Federal Government and only one-third of the production go to the States.

So, actually, those who wish to squeeze every last nickel from the States would probably feel that if it became possible to increase production to a point where the revenue would amount to $100,000,000 for the Federal Government or the States, even those who take the States' position would be in the position of saying that the States should receive approximately $42,000,000 out of the $100,000,000.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, two resolutions which were passed by the two houses of the California Legislature. Those resolutions relate to the tidelands matter, and are in opposition to the interim joint resolution which now is before us.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Assembly Joint Resolution 3

Joint resolution relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coastal States

Whereas until recently it was generally recognized that all of the coastal States owned a belt of land beneath navigable waters adjacent to their coast; and

Whereas in 1947 the Supreme Court of the United States held that those lands were not owned by the States and that the Federal Government rather than the States has paramount rights in and power over the 3-mile belt of land; and

Whereas the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court was to divest the States of valuable oil rights; and

Whereas State ownership of the 3-mile belt of land is not inconsistent with the Federal control necessary in the conduct of international affairs and Coast Guard activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully memorialized to enact such legislation as will be necessary to restore the ownership of the 3-mile belt of land beneath navigable water adjacent to the coasts of the coastal States; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative of a coastal State in the Congress of the United States.

Assembly Joint Resolution 4

Joint resolution relative to lands beneath the navigable waters adjacent to the coasts of coastal States

Whereas a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States refutes a long recognized claim of the coastal States to the 3-mile belt of land beneath the navigable waters adjacent to their coasts; and

Whereas the effect of this decision was to divest those States of valuable oil rights; and

Whereas ownership of such land by the coastal States would in no way interfere with Federal control necessary in the conduct of international affairs and Coast Guard activities; and

Whereas if it is possible for the Federal Government to secure the ownership of such lands on the basis of its contentions before the Supreme Court, there is a danger that the ownership of all State lands in other States as well as in the coastal States will be jeopardized; and

Whereas the legislature of the State of California, has, by resolution, memorialized the Congress of the United States to enact legislation necessary to restore this land to the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the legislatures of each of the States are urged to adopt a resolution similar to that of the California Legislature; and be it further

Resolved, That the legislature of each of the States is requested to transmit to the Legislature of California copies of any resolutions adopted or notice of any taken relative to the subject matter of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to each of the legislative bodies of each of the States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, some people have discussed this as an interim bill. I want to say that in my judgment it is no such thing. As a matter of fact, it is permanent legislation which gives the State, under certain limited conditions, only a sort of veto power on the issuance of leases within its territorial boundaries, for a period of 5 years; and at that point, even that small right of the States ceases. The legislation is permanent.

It is my judgement that if this miscalled interim bill were passed by the Congress it would destroy for the future the possibility of getting legislation which would restore to the States that which was theirs until the decision by the Supreme Court of the United States, which has been mentioned. Therefore, I want to say, Mr. President, it is my intention to join with the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in the proposal of an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which would carry out the provisions of the bill which he formerly introduced, sometimes called quitclaim legislation, but which, rather than quitclaim, I prefer to regard as a bill in the nature of a restoration to the States of that which historically has belonged to them.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Leonard A. Scheele, of Michigan, to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service; and

Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board, vice James Joseph Reynolds, resigned.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive Q, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a report by the Acting Secretary of State, setting forth the texts of a proposal by the Government of Canada and a proposal by the Government of Australia relating to changes in the delimitation of certain of the seasonal zones established in Annex II of the International Load Line Convention, signed at London on July 5, 1930 (Ex. Rept. No. 4).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

IN THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Army are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Air Force.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the nominations in the United States Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the United States Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon, on Monday, next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., the Senate took a recess until Monday, March 10, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 7 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Orval E. Faubus, Huntsville, Ark., in place of Hugh Murphy, transferred.

ILLINOIS

William H. Watson, Prospect Heights, Ill., in place of H. L. Galbraith, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Stanton W. Johnson, Richton, Miss., in place of A. A. Edwards, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 7 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Hobart Raymond Gay, O7323.
Lt. Gen. Maxwell Davenport Taylor, O14898.
Maj. Gen. William Oliver Reeder, O8564.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. Charles Ernest Loucks, O6949.
Brig. Gen. Charles Frost Craig, 07231.
Brig. Gen. Cornelius Edward Ryan, O7375.
Brig. Gen. Frank Albert Allen, Jr., O7415.
Brig. Gen. Bryan Lee Milburn, O7469.
Brig. Gen. John Alexander Klein, O7536.
Brig. Gen. John Charles Macdonald, O8402.
Brig. Gen. Laurin Lyman Williams, O8425.
Brig. Gen. Samuel Tankersley Williams, O8472.
Brig. Gen. Albert Carl Lieber, O8884.
Brig. Gen. Boniface Campbell, O9788.
Brig. Gen. John Max Lentz, O10343.
Brig. Gen. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, O10384.
Brig. Gen. Leslie Dillon Carter, O10663.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. George Winfered Smythe, O15816.
Brig. Gen. Stanley Raymond Mickelsen, O7042.
Brig. Gen. William Edward Shambora, O16540.
Brig. Gen. Bryan Lee Milburn, O7469.
Brig. Gen. Bernice Musgrove McFadyen, O10384.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Joseph Cross, O11431.
Brig. Gen. George Windle Read, Jr., O12603.
Brig. Gen. Orlando Clarendon Mood, O14781.
Brig. Gen. Edwin Kennedy Wright, O15475.
Brig. Gen. Ridgely Gaither, O15970.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Oliver Perry Newman, O15016.
Col. Douglas Valentine Johnson, O15072.
Col. Stuart Gross Smith, O16369.
Col. Martin Frank Hass, O15889.
Col. Harry Purnell Storke, O16468.
Col. Herbert Butler Powell, O16684.
Col. Leander LaChance Doan, O16839
Col. John Honeycutt Hinrichs, O17174.
Col. John Southworth Upham, Jr. O17178.
Col. Louis Edward Cotulla, O29069.
Col. Robert William Ward, O17637.
Col. Kenneth E. Fields, O18957.

The officer named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Army of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act as amended:

To be brigadier general of the line

Brig. Gen. Delbert Ervin Schultz, O309296, Ohio National Guard, to date from November 20, 1951.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Lt. Gen. John Kenneth Cannon, 3A, to be commanding general, Tactical Air Command, with rank of general with date of rank from October 29, 1951.

Lt. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, 26A, to be commanding general, Strategic Air Command with rank of general with date of rank from October 29, 1951.

Lt. Gen. Benjamin Wiley Chidlaw, 23A, to be commanding general, Air Defense Command, with rank of general with date of rank from October 29, 1951.

Lt. Gen. Laurence Sherman Kuter, 89A, to be Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general with date of rank from April 11, 1951.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the United States Air Force under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Arthur Thomas, 68A.
Brig. Gen. Kenneth Eugene Webber, 117A.
Brig. Gen. Byron Elihu Gates, 186A.
Brig. Gen. Colby Maxwell Myers, 246A.
Brig. Gen. John Stewart Mills, 357A.
Brig. Gen. Howard Graham Bunker, 376A.
Brig. Gen. Roger James Browne, 449A.
Brig. Gen. Roy Henry Lynn, 492A.
Brig. Gen. Oliver Stanton Picher, 540A.
Brig. Gen. Donald Norton Yates, 584A.
Brig. Gen. Ernest Moore, 586A.
Brig. Gen. Robert Broussard Landry, 635A.
Brig. Gen. William Oscar Senter, 648A.
Brig. Gen. Thomas Oates Hardin, AO170727.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Clarence Prescott Talbot, 172A.
Col. Robert William Calvert Wimsatt, 214A.
Col. Herbert William Ehrgott, 266A.
Col. Samuel Russ Harris, Jr., 272A.
Col. James Bell Burwell, 279A.
Col. Edward Pont Mechling, 327A.
Col. Orrin Leigh Grover, 329A.
Col. Albert George Hewett, 396A.
Col. John Williams Persons, 418A.
Col. James Herbert Wallace, 442A.
Col. John Jackson O'Hara, 463A.
Col. John Hubert Davies, 537A.
Col. John Hiett Ives, 544A.
Col. Kenneth Burton Hobson, 616A.
Col. Eugene Porter Musett, 632A.
Col. John Burroughs Cary, 1055A.
Col. William Thomas Hudnell, 1171A.
Col. Richard Henry Carmichael, 1214A.
Col. George William Goddard, AO11514.
Col. Kern Delos Metzger, AO914698.
Col. Walter Irwin Miller, AO913582.
Col. Alonzo Maning Drake, 129A.
Col. Frank Arthur Bogart, 585A.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Jerauld Wright, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, United States Naval Forces, Eastern Atlantic, and deputy commander in chief, Naval Force, eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean.

Rear Adm. Arthur C. Davis, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as deputy United States representative to the standing group of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Vice Adm. Harold M. Martin, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances for a vice admiral while serving as commander, Air Force, United States Pacific Fleet.

Rear Adm. Joseph J. Clark, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances for a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Arthur D. Struble, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as naval representative of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the Military Staff Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations.

Vice Adm. Robert P. Briscoe, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as a fleet commander.

Vice Adm. Frank G. Fahrion, United States Navy, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving as commander, Amphibious Force, Atlantic Fleet.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be rear admirals, line

Edward A. Solomons	Albert K. Morehouse
Herbert S. Duckworth	Kenmore M. McManes
George R. Cooper	Frank T. Ward, Jr.
Frank Akers	Frederic S. Withington
Harry B. Jarrett	William V. O'Regan
Delbert S. Cornwell	Arleigh A. Burke

To be rear admiral, Dental Corps

Daniel W. Ryan

To be rear admiral, temporary promotion, in the Dental Corps of the Navy

Herman P. Riebe, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officer of the Navy for temporary appointment in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

To be rear admiral, temporary appointment, in the Medical Corps of the Navy

Winfred P. Dana

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. Gerald C. Thomas, United States Marine Corps, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as assistant to the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general, for a period of 4 years from January 1, 1952.

Lt. Gen. Clifton B. Cates, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as Commandant of the Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Va.

Lt. Gen. Franklin A. Hart, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while serving as commanding general, Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment:

To be major generals

Walter W. Wensinger
Edwin A. Pollock

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade indicated:

To be brigadier generals

James H. Strother	Merrill B. Twining
George F. Good, Jr.	James P. Riseley

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade indicated:

To be brigadier generals

Raymond A. Anderson	Verne J. McCaul
	Matthew C. Horner
Robert E. Hogaboom	Edward W. Snedeker
Joseph C. Burger	

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as noontide marks the hurrying day and our words are hushed to silence as we bow in Thy presence, our hearts and minds are strengthened and cheered by the glorious thought that midst all life's changing scenes we are with Thee.

We beseech Thee, purge us of low desire. Lift us to high resolve. May we hush earth's strident noises that we may hear Thee and, hearing, go forth with obedient hearts to this anguished generation as living echoes of Thy voice. In these times that are trying men's souls, preserve us from minding and magnifying little slights and stings, or giving them. Keep us calm in temper, clear in mind, forgiving and forbearing in spite of ingratitude or even treachery. In this solemn hour of human destiny enable us to perform faithfully and well what Thou dost require, even to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with Thee our God. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 7, 1952, was dispensed with.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in the nature of a personal-privilege statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Georgia may proceed.

Mr. GEORGE. On Friday last, interrupting the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who was then addressing the Senate, I made some remarks, and in the course of those remarks attributed responsibility for the appointment of Mr. Finnegan as collector of internal revenue in Missouri in part to Mr. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury.

In the same connection, on reading my statement, I find that I also attributed certain responsibility to the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, for the appointment of the collector of internal revenue at Boston, Mr. Delaney.

Mr. President, I find that I was wholly in error. As a matter of fact, Mr. Finnegan and Mr. Delaney were both appointed before the present Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, was appointed and assumed his duties as Secretary of the Treasury.

I also find that, according to the record, as soon as any information reached Mr. Snyder personally concerning any irregularities in the St. Louis office, he took steps to do something about it, to rid the collector's office of Mr. Finnegan.

I, of course, have served too long in the courts to express any views regarding the guilt or innocence of Mr. Finnegan, who is now on trial; but I sincerely regret that my statement involved in any way the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, because actually these appointments were made before he went into office. Moreover, according to the record, and to my knowledge—a matter which I had overlooked—the Secretary of the Treasury did take immediate steps, when certain information reached him, to do what he could to eliminate Mr. Finnegan from the office of collector of internal revenue in Missouri.

Regarding Mr. Delaney in Boston, I knew nothing of those charges until they were actually published in the press.

I am pleased to make this statement in behalf of Mr. Snyder, because when I studied the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 and reached the conclusion that I could not support it, I advised Mr. Snyder personally. In appearance before the committee having jurisdiction of the matter I stated that I regarded Mr. Snyder as a good Secretary of the Treasury, and that he had my full confidence. I am pleased to make this statement, and I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD of last Friday be corrected agreeable to the statement which I have just made to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the permanent RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF LAWS REQUIRING SUBMISSION OF DOCUMENTS UNDER OATH TO POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain acts and parts of acts which require the submission of documents to the Post Office Department under oath, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Kam Chuen or Kum Choon Lew, and Manuel Rivera Mendoza or Manuel Mendoza Rivera from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on

July 2, 1951, and January 15, 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Frederick Ernest Pokorny or Bedrich Pokorny from a report transmitted to the Senate on June 15, 1951, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO DEFINITION OF A FELONY

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend paragraph (1) of section 1 of title 18 of the United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT CONCERNING PAYMENT OF STATION PER DIEM ALLOWANCES TO CERTAIN OFFICERS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report concerning payment of station per diem allowances in the amount of $1,365,100.25 to officer personnel assigned to permanent duty at Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson, Alaska, for the period February 1, 1949, to October 12, 1950 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

FINAL REPORT OF HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final report of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Board for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the New York State Civil Defense Commission, New York, N. Y., relating to Federal contributions to State and local civil defense expenditures; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Orlo Vista Townsend Club No. 1, and senior citizens of eastern Orange County, Orlo Vista, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions adopted by the Ripon Grange, of Ripon, Calif., and the Brotherhood of the Augustana Church of the Willmar district in Minnesota, Murdock, Minn., protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide universal military training; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide universal military training; ordered to lie on the table.

Two cablegrams in the nature of petitions from William E. Belt, president, Hawaii Education Association, and George M. Gilmore, chairman, Council on Veterans Affairs, both of Honolulu, T. H., relating to statehood for Hawaii; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2380. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 1258).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952; with amendments (Rept. No. 1260).

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1, 1952—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS—MINORITY VIEWS (REPT. NO. 1259)

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Government Operations, I ask unanimous consent that, at any time before midnight tonight, I may report Senate Resolution 285, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and submit a report thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Subsequently, Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations reported the above resolution (S. Res. 285), supra, and submitted a report (No. 1259) thereon.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], members of the Committee on Government Operations, I submit minority views on Senate Resolution 285, relating to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed as part 2 of Senate Report No. 1259. This is agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The minority views will be received, and without objection, printed as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2817. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mary K. Reynolds, as successor in interest to the Colonial Realty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2818. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940;

S. 2819. A bill to provide that salaries of rural carriers serving heavily patronized routes shall not be reduced by reason of increases in the length of such routes;

S. 2820. A bill to amend section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; and

S. 2821. A bill to amend section 1699, title 18, United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2822. A bill for the relief of Miss Anna Josephine Vigo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 2823. A bill to provide for grants to State unemployment funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. IVES):

S. 2824. A bill to provide for an appropriate medal to be awarded to individuals for the performance of certain acts in behalf of the United States requiring valor and great personal sacrifice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BRIDGES when he introduced the above bill (for Mr. IVES), which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 2825. A bill for the relief of Rei Ishikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 2826. A bill for the relief of Jan E. Tomczycki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2827. A bill for the relief of Michiko Nakashima; and

S. 2828. A bill for the relief of William Kipf and Darold D. Selk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 2829. A bill to amend section 1 (17) (a), section 13 (3) and section 13 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to extend to the Interstate Commerce Commission power to prescribe the discontinuance of certain railroad services in intrastate commerce when found to be unreasonably discriminatory against interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2830. A bill to require the payment of prevailing wage rates to employees of contractors under contracts with the Post Office Department for transportation of mail by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2831. A bill for the relief of Irene Ezitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 2832. A bill for the relief of Gowerk Bunderiyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2833. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AWARD OF MEDAL FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN ACTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for an appropriate medal to be awarded to individuals for the performance of certain acts in behalf of the United States requiring valor and great personal sacrifice. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from New York concerning the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2824) to provide for an appropriate medal to be awarded to individuals for the performance of certain acts in behalf of the United States requiring valor and great personal sacrifice, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES (for Mr. IVES), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES CONCERNING THE BILL PROVIDING FOR THE AWARD OF A MEDAL TO INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING UNDERCOVER WORK WITHIN COMMUNIST ORGANIZATIONS FOR THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Many patriotic Americans have performed and are performing, unusual deeds of valor for the Government in the battle against communism. These individuals, at great personal sacrifice, have helped the Federal Bureau of Investigation bring to light the Communist conspiracy in the United States.

I refer specifically to those private citizens who voluntarily joined the Communist Party and other subversive groups and reported their activities to the FBI. They were not paid for this dangerous work. In fact, these patriots were told they could not claim any help from the Government, if discovered. These individuals, however, devoted themselves unselfishly to the protection and security of the people of this country.

At a time when we are engaged in a worldwide struggle with Soviet communism, the services of these people cannot be overestimated. They have shown us the means and the methods the Communist Party has devised to attain its miserable ends. Their testimony has helped to convict the leaders of this conspiracy to overthrow our form of government.

These individuals were not in the official employ of the Government, yet they risked their livelihood, their friendships, and their lives to protect our country from the infamous Communist menace. They were, without a doubt, in the front line of fire.

The list of names is truly illustrious. To name a few—Herbert A. Philbrick, Mary Stalcup Markward, Berenice Baldwin, Matthew Cvetic, and Angela Calomiris. I am sure there are others who have served and are still serving their country in these risky undertakings.

As an example of the rigors undergone by these individuals, I quote the following excerpt from a newspaper dispatch of February 18, 1950:

"For 9 years Matt Cvetic's family and friends believed he was a deeply loyal member of the Communist Party. His two motherless sons shrugged their shoulders and kept the family secret to themselves. His mother died, believing in her heart she had been unable to reform her wayward son. His sister, a nun, prayed for his salvation. His fiancée's father kicked him out of the house, saying: 'I'll not have any Communists around here.'

"Today Cvetic told the truth. For 9 years he has been an undercover man in the Communist Party for the FBI.

"As a confidant of top Communist figures, Cvetic was a leader in many organizations set up here by the party. But now he is revealing the strategy of the party and its aims."

The people of the United States are grateful to these fine Americans for their patriotic service. Unofficially they have expressed their admiration and appreciation.

To provide official recognition for these people, I am proposing that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation be authorized to award an appropriate medal to those, not in the employ of the Government, who assisted the FBI through acts of valor and great personal sacrifice, in its work of protecting the United States from the threat of communism.

In grateful appreciation for their sacrifices, an official honor should be bestowed on these patriotic Americans. It is small payment in return for the services they have rendered.

I am sure the people of this country join with me in this expression of gratitude and commendation.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution calling for an investigation of the disposal of billions of dollars of surplus Government property by the now defunct War Assets Administration and its successor, the General Services Administration.

I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to make a short statement in connection with the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Missouri may proceed.

The resolution (S. Res. 291) submitted by Mr. KEM, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Whereas it has been reported that a St. Louis, Mo., business firm attempted to purchase in 1949 certain real property comprising a part of the old Jefferson Barracks Reservation from the War Assets Administration, and its successor agency, the General Services Administration, but was unsuccessful in making such purchase at the price asked by the disposal agency until it had obtained at a fee of $25,000 the services of an attorney with a friend described as having "good political connections in Washington,"; and

Whereas the experience of this St. Louis business firm, if accurately reported, reflects seriously on the administration of an agency, and former agency, of the Government charged with functions relating to the disposition of properties surplus to the needs of the Government; and

Whereas any substantial allegations tending to show corruption, favoritism, or wrongdealing in any agency of the Government should be thoroughly investigated to determine whether the laws are being fairly and honestly administered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Government Operations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the manner in which the War Assets Administration carried out, and its successor agency, the General Services Administration, is carrying out, functions relating to the disposition of properties surplus to the needs of the Government with a view to determining whether such functions have been administered, and are being administered, faithfully, fairly and with a proper sense of public trust. Such study and investigation shall include a full inquiry into the circumstances surrounding the reported purchase by a St. Louis business firm for $90,000 in 1949 from the War Assets Administration, and its successor agency, the General Services Administration, of a 30 acre tract with improvements thereon, located on the old Jefferson Barracks Reservation, with a view to determining whether there exist in the facts surrounding such purchase any evidence of wrong-dealing on the part of any past or present officials of the Government. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the investigation called for by the resolution is long overdue. It will probably hook at least one big fish and a lot of small fry.

My information is that the big fish appears in connection with the disposal of a part of the Old Jefferson Barracks Reservation in my own State of Missouri.

The business firm which attempted to purchase a Jefferson Barracks tract and two buildings located in St. Louis from the War Assets Administration is reported to have been unsuccessful in making the purchase at the price asked by the disposal agency until the firm had obtained, for a fee of $25,000, a Democrat attorney described as having a friend with "good political connections in Washington."

The attorney, James A. Waechter, is a former chairman of the St. Louis Board of Election Commissioners and a former law partner of James P. Finnegan, former collector of internal revenue at St. Louis whose case is now on trial in the United States district court in that city. Waechter was fired as chairman of the board of election commissioners by the late Gov. Guy B. Park for "betterment of the public service," following disclosure of registration frauds in connection with a 1935 bond-issue election in St. Louis.

Kenneth Baker, president of J. D. Street & Co., the St. Louis firm involved, has stated that he didn't know what Waechter did for his fee. Waechter has acknowledged he did little for the firm as far as legal services are concerned.

I believe the Senate will be particularly interested in learning the name of Waechter's friend who has "good political connections in Washington," and just what these connections are. It should also be enlightening to determine if, and to what extent, the "friend" and his "connections" shared the $25,000 plum.

I am convinced that this is not an isolated case. There have been frequent hints in the past that scandal is involved in the disposal of billions of dollars of Government surplus property by the War Assets Administration. Its operations and the operations of its successor, the General Services Administration, should be thoroughly aired by the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point an article concerning the Jefferson Barracks case which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 22, 1952.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAMES A. WAECHTER GOT $25,000 FEE TO SPEED $90,000 BUY OF UNITED STATES LAND—CLIENT SAYS HE'S "SOMEWHAT ASHAMED," DOESN'T KNOW WHAT LAWYER DID—LATTER HAD FRIEND WITH CONNECTIONS

A St. Louis firm, unsuccessful for months in trying to buy plant property from a Federal Government agency, was able to close the $90,000 deal after retaining James A. Waech-

ter, former election board chairman, who received a $25,000 attorney's fee, the Post-Dispatch was informed today.

Kenneth Baker, president of J. D. Streett & Co., 4067 Park Avenue, told a reporter he never knew what, if anything, the attorney did for his fee.

"We had tried in every way possible to buy the property, and were willing at all times to pay the price asked, but we had no luck until informed this man could grease the way for us," Baker related.

IN DANGER OF LOSING CONTRACT

"Time was running out. It was an emergency since, if we didn't get the plant soon, we would lose a big contract for manufacture of automobile antifreeze.

"Frankly, we're somewhat ashamed of the whole thing. To this day I don't know what the lawyer did for his fee.

"If we had to do it over, I don't believe we would have gone along on an arrangement like this. We were simply in a spot."

Waechter acknowledge he did little for the firm, as far as legal services were concerned. He said he did find out, by getting in touch with a friend here, that the company's application was receiving favorable consideration—"barking up the right tree," as he put it.

His friend was described by Waechter as "a man with good political connections in Washington—a fellow who can find out what's going on."

TWO VERSIONS OF FEE

The attorney and Baker gave different versions on major aspects of their arrangement. Baker said the $25,000 was put in escrow. Waechter said it was not.

The company president said he had never heard of Waechter until his name was suggested "as the man who could get the job done." The attorney claimed he had talked to Baker on several occasions previously on the firm's legal matters, although no fees were paid.

Baker maintained his firm's only contacts with the lawyer were a telephone call in which Waechter was retained and a luncheon meeting of the two men on the day the fee was paid.

Waechter said he continually kept the firm advised "that it was on the right track," and he said he "seems to recall two luncheons" with Baker.

However, Waechter added: "I don't want to dispute anything Mr. Baker says. My memory might be a little hazy on all the details."

FRIEND'S IDENTITY KEPT SECRET

The attorney declined to identify his "friend with the Washington political connections" who found out Streett & Co. was "barking up the right tree." He said the man "has been in politics but is not now."

Starting in April 1949, the St. Louis firm, wholesale petroleum dealers, at 4067 Park Avenue, began attempts to purchase from the War Assets Administration, later succeeded by General Services Administration, a section of property on the old Jefferson Barracks Reservation.

Jess Larson was then Administartor of WAA and later became head of General Services Administration when it was formed, July 1, 1949.

Streett & Co. wanted a 30-acre brarracks tract and the two buildings on it for use in connection with a contract under which it would make antifreeze for E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. Proximity of the tract to the Mississippi River and the Missouri Pacific's main line made it desirable from a transportation standpoint.

TWO APPRAISALS; LONG DELAY

"There was never a dispute over price," Baker said. "We were willing from the start to pay the amount fixed by the Government's appraiser sent here from Kansas City.

"Finally, after a long delay, we were told the property would have to be appraised at the Washington level. The man came here from Washington, looked over the area and arrived at exactly the same figure as the fellow from Kansas City."

Asked how the St. Louis attorney was brought into the deal, Baker said:

"A man—a friend of mine who makes trips to Washington on his own business—was trying to find out for us what was holding up things on the Jefferson Barracks property.

"Finally, he saw what we were up against. He then advised us that we would have to work through this attorney if we wanted to get anywhere."

TWENTY-FIVE-THOUSAND-DOLLAR FIGURE SET, HE SAID

"Contact with the lawyer was made. We were told the fee would be $25,000. The money was put in escrow and when the deal was completed the attorney got his money."

Baker said he had no information on how his friend obtained Waechter's name.

"I don't exactly recall how I got into the case," Waechter said. "Either a friend of mine—now dead—called me and then I may have called Baker, or else Baker called me first.

"I remember that when I was asked about the amount of the fee I said, in a half joking manner: 'Oh, it will be something substantial.'

"When the company mailed me a check for $25,000, after the deal was completed, I was very pleased to get it, I can tell you that."

SAYS CLIENT WAS SATISFIED

Waechter recalled that the time of payment he asked Baker: "Now are you entirely satisfied?" He quoted Baker as replying: "Yes, I am, in every respect."

The attorney said he felt his chief value to the company was being able to give assurance that its efforts to get the Jefferson Barracks property were moving forward without a hitch.

"I told them they couldn't get it for a song—that they should be prepared to pay a good price for the property," Waechter said.

He acknowledged, however, that Streett & Co. apparently was the only party interested in getting the tract and that price was never an issue.

NOT ATTORNEY OF RECORD

Waechter thought he looked over some papers in connection with the purchase but he was not certain about this point. He said his name did not appear as attorney of record in the transaction.

The attorney said he gave no part of the $25,000 to his friend who helped him or to anyone else.

Streett & Co. has an attorney who ordinarily handles the firm's legal business, but this man took no part in the Jefferson Barracks negotiations. He said he knew nothing of the transaction.

Property bought by the St. Louis firm included one large building and a smaller one. It then constructed additional facilities, including large storage tanks on an adjoining tract which it had leased, at a cost of about $1,400,000. The plant is in full operation.

FIRED BY GOVERNOR PARK IN 1936

Waechter, a Democrat, served as chairman of the St. Louis Board of Election Commissioners from 1933 to September 18, 1936, when he and the other three board members were summarily fired by Gov. Guy B. Park, who had appointed them.

The Governor's action, announced for "betterment of the public service," followed a disclosure by the Post-Dispatch of wholesale registration frauds in connection with the bond issue election of September 10, 1935.

Waechter lives at 6214 Pershing Avenue.

ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HOEY RELATING TO REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I desire to call to the attention of the Members of the Senate a committee report which has been released by the Committee on Government Operations on the Organization of Federal Executive Departments and Agencies. Copies are being sent to each Member of the Congress, as I believe it will be of special interest to them.

With the report, the committee has released a wall chart covering the complete organization of the executive branch of the Government with personnel assignments to each unit down to the division level as of January 1, 1952. The report also shows comparative totals of employees assigned to each of the departs and independent agencies of the Government during the last 5 years, for comparative purposes.

The report incorporates information furnished directly to the committee by all the agencies of the Federal Government, which shows a total of 2,484,412 employees in the executive branch, assigned to 2,055 operating components, consisting of 12 departments and 48 independent agencies under which 1,995 components operate. This total of 2,484,412 employees does not include 22,463 employees under the legislative branch and 3,931 employees in the judicial branch of the Government. When these are added the total of all Federal employees aggregates 2,510,806.

The report and the chart reflect increases or decreases in personnel by agencies and all organization changes effectuated during the calendar year 1951 or since the last chart was issued on January 1, 1951. It also lists all agencies abolished during the year and those that have been newly established.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Excerpt from the address delivered by him before the League of Republican Women of the District of Columbia at Washington, D. C., March 3, 1952.

Editorial entitled "Those Smoke Filled Rooms," published in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Bulletin.

By Mr. MURRAY:

Address delivered by the Secretary of Labor, Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, before a joint luncheon of the Farm Labor Conference and the Kiwanis Club at Fort Worth, Tex., on February 14, 1952.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

Article with reference to Senator RUSSELL written by Miss Eleanor Nance, Washington correspondent for a group of Southern newspapers, and published in the Anderson Independent, of Anderson, S. C., March 9, 1952.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address regarding United States world leadership, delivered by Benjamin V. Cohen at American Association For United Nations Conference, in Chicago, Ill., February 18, 1952.

By Mr. CASE:

Address on Inspection and Testing in United States Buying, delivered by W. O.

Techemeyer, Chief, Inspection Branch, General Services Administration, before Southwestern Men of Science and Industry, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, Inc., at Dallas, Tex., November 16, 1951.

Sermon entitled "Why the Church Opposes Universal Military Training," delivered by Rev. Robert E. Wagner, minister, Methodist Church, Mitchell, S. Dak., February 3, 1952.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Resolutions adopted at a meeting held in Nebraska on Nebraska Founders' Day honoring the pioneers of Nebraska and of the Republican Party.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Open letter to Members of Congress from D. A. Hulcy, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Editorial entitled "It's Too Much Money," published in the Washington Daily News of March 7, 1952, on the subject of the mutual security program.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Article entitled "A Seaway by 1959: Canada Means Business," published in United States News and World Report for March 14, 1952.

By Mr. WILEY:

Editorial from Milwaukee Journal of March 7, 1952, relating to the St. Lawrence seaway.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Letter from Mrs. A. B. Fedunyak, president, Ukranian National Women's League of America, relating to the opposition of the women of America to communism.

My Mr. KEM:

Excerpt from letter written by Dr. Walter U. Kennedy, of New Castle, Ind., dated December 27, 1951, to the worshipful master of Pyramid Lodge of St. Louis, Mo., relating to conditions in Europe.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

Editorial entitled "Why the Bandwagon's Still Waiting," published in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News of March 1-2, 1952.

By Mr. MORSE:

Memorandum by Mike Jenney, general manager, Pioneer Service Co., Inc., Eugene, Oreg., on the subject The Times and Conditions and the Way I Find Them.

Excerpts from memorandum by Mike Jenney, general manager, Pioneer Service Co., Inc., Eugene, Oreg., on the subject What 1952 Means to You.

Memorandum from board of consultants to the Food, Agriculture, and Resources Development Staff, Technical Cooperation Administration, Department of State, to Clayton E. Whipple, Director, Food, Agriculture, and Resources Development Staff, Technical Cooperation Administration.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Article entitled "A Literary Letter From India," published in the New York Times of January 6, 1952.

By Mr. MOODY:

Article by Russell Barnes, of the Detroit (Mich.) News, on the subject the Choice for United States—Foreign Aid or Permanent War Economy.

By Mr. BENTON:

Letter from Arthur Deakin, general secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union, London, England, with relation to control of monopolies and cartels.

Article entitled "India's Views Changing With Regard to the United States," written by Robert Trumbull and published in the New York Times of March 9, 1952.

Article entitled "An American in Cartel Land," written by Michael L. Hoffman and published in the New York Times magazine of March 9, 1952.

1952 NATIONAL ELECTION

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for about 2 minutes so that I may read a brief editorial.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CASE. This is an editorial entitled "Let's Start Drawing the Issue," written by Robert C. Lusk, editor of the Huronite and Daily Plainsman, of Huron, S. Dak., and published March 6, 1952. The editorial reads as follows:

LET'S START DRAWING THE ISSUE

Republicans and independents are fooling themselves if they persist in believing that the 1952 national election will be decided on personalities.

If they give up attacking the "bipartisan foreign policy" fiction which the Truman administration has attempted to foist upon the Nation (with considerable success on the internationalist eastern seaboard) in an effort to share culpability, they are throwing away the principal issue of the 1952 election which must be clearly pictured for the people.

This newspaper believes that the people are gradually beginning to understand that the Truman administration budget of $85,000,000,000 is simply preposterous, that taxes are too high and incentive-destroying, and that the Truman-Acheson program of spending all our wealth to support the rest of the world is an impossible and foolish task to even attempt.

But it also believes that the voters still do not understand that the Truman administration and its key planners have so handled foreign policy that virtually everything done since 1944 has been to the disadvantage of the United States and to the advantage of Russia.

A foreign policy is obviously a failure when:

1. A nation that was the strongest, mightiest ever to arm in 1945 became so weak by comparison with Russia and China and North Korea 5 years later that it couldn't win a "police action."

2. More than 100,000 American boys become casualties in an indecisive "police action."

3. The United States public finds itself struggling under a fantastic $61,000,000,000 military and foreign-aid budget to support a Europe it "liberated" and a Japan it conquered.

4. A world war fought to "free" enslaved nations winds up with more nations in slavery after the war than before and more millions under the Communist totalitarian yoke than before the war.

5. It can't get its so-called allies and friendly nations to contribute more than 5 percent to a United Nations police action, or integrate their economy or rearmament, or, in short, do anything that isn't paid for by Uncle Sam.

It is those foreign-policy failures which have made taxes so high and will make them higher. The people who, and party which, administered that foreign policy must be kicked out of office, but before that can be done the campaigning minority party must make a fighting campaign to picture that issue and those fatal errors clearly to the people. Running on personality won't do the job.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE BUREAU

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared in relation to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, which proposes to reorganize the Internal Revenue Bureau. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

It states my own philosophy in relation to the various reorganization plans. I may say that the very basis of my thought is that it is the function of the president of a corporation to see to it that the business of the corporation is conducted effectively, efficiently, and honestly. Under our division of functions of Government, it is the business of the Executive to see to it that the administrative branch of the Government is conducted honestly, effectively, and economically. The mere passage of resolutions or delegations of power to the Executive to do certain things does not ipso facto bring about honesty.

Just as I have said that it is the business of the president of a corporation to look after the business of the corporation, so it is the business of the President to see to it that the various administrative branches of the Government are headed by men who understand how to manage a Government agency and know how to bring about efficiency and honesty in Government. Over-all is the Executive, who under the Constitution has the obligation to execute the laws and to see to it that they are administered and that honesty and efficiency become a practice in Government. The statement I send to the desk speaks my philosophy on that subject.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

WHY I WILL VOTE FOR PLAN NO. 1

The resolution (S. Res. 285) which has come out of the Senate Committee on Government Operation would disapprove the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I shall vote against the committee resolution disapproving this plan. In other words, I am in favor of said plan as a helpful beginning toward better administration. What I have to say now relates to my reasons for approving the President's plan.

CRIME COMMITTEE EXPOSED WEST COAST SITUATION

1. As a former member of the Senate Crime Committee, in September 1950, my colleagues and I first came across corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau in the west coast region. I stated at the time that this was the worst single situation that the Crime Committee had uncovered because it affected the organization which is collecting $50,000,000,000 in taxes.

PRESIDENT NEGLECTED HIS RESPONSIBILITY

2. I stated that it was the responsibility of the Chief Executive of the United States to clean out this corruption. It is the business of the administration to administer; of the legislative branch to legislate, and of the judicial branch to interpret.

When the President learned of the Crime Committee's disclosure, he should have immediately ordered a clean-up. That was his responsibility as a part of the tripartite system of Government. But what happened? A full year passed and still there was no clean-up. It remained for the House Ways and Means Subcommittee to carry on the clean-up efforts. Only recently in the last month has this reorganization plan come up. It is by no means a cure-all. But, used wisely, it can be helpful in getting better public servants into the top jobs of the Bureau.

CIVIL SERVICE VERSUS PATRONAGE

3. In 13 years in the Senate, I have always felt that appointments to any office should be based on:

A. Ability, merit.

B. Integrity and honesty.

C. Devotion to the American way of life

CIVIL SERVICE RED TAPE CAN BE HANDICAP

4. These were the standards I set for nominees to the Federal judiciary when I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eightieth Congress.

These are the standards which should be set throughout the administrative and judiciary branches of Government. Whether or not a man is under civil service does not make him honest, if deep down he is basically dishonest. As a matter of fact, if he is dishonest, civil service may mortice him to his job and make it so difficult to displace him, so costly, so long, so bound up with red tape that civil service can actually be a handicap instead of a boon to honesty in Government.

Nevertheless, it is a fact that some of the collectors of internal revenue who have been appointed by patronage have had no qualifications, no interest in the job but to get out of it for themselves and for their friends whatever they could. There is a good chance that under civil service, men of merit may indeed be appointed and tax evasion and delinquency more vigorously and fairly dealt with.

POST OFFICE CIVIL SERVICE

5. Let me point out, however, that in a great many instances in the United States Post Office Department, the so-called civil-service system of appointing postmasters on the merit system is one in name only. Politics often determines the choice from among the three highest competitors in the civil-service examination. Many times when the three highest candidates haven't been acceptable, new examinations have been ordered in order to get in someone who was politically acceptable.

SPIRIT OF HOOVER COMMISSION ESSENTIAL

6. I have again and again emphasized that what we basically need is the spirit of the Hoover Commission, a spirit founded on the idea that real reorganization is that which will achieve true economy and efficiency. Reorganization does not mean mere shifting of units or of personnel. It does not mean giving new titles to people.

It means saving money, consolidating units, streamlining. Above everything else, it means placing at the head of any division or department in Government, men who sense that their job is a trust job which calls for their devotion to the task so that merit is regarded and honesty and efficiency are breathed into the operations of the department.

CITIZENS' RIGHTS PRESERVED

7. Let me point out that some concern has been voiced to the effect that if the statutory office of Collector of Internal Revenue is abolished a question may arise as to the right of taxpayers to maintain suit against collectors with right to trial by jury.

I should like to point out however that the House of Representatives has considered this and other objections but it unanimously approved plan No. 1, thus evidencing its faith that under no circumstances no statutory right now enjoyed by American citizens is endangered.

The proponents of plan No. 1 believe, as I do, in the rights of taxpayers to file suit, etc., and as the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report has pointed out in a research analysis, if Congress has any doubts as to the statutory rights it can approve another statute. Such a new statute could state that nothing contained in Reorganization Plan No. 1 shall abridge the citizen's right to sue including the right to trial by jury.

I do not believe however that such an additional statute would be necessary nor that any confusion or uncertainty will develop from this plan provided of course that its spirit is faithfully adhered to.

Like all other mechanisms that do not work in and of themselves, they require honest and competent hands and hearts to fulfill them in accordance with the mandate laid down by the Congress.

PLAN 1 JUST A FIRST STEP

8. I agree with what many of my colleagues have stated that the public should not be misled into thinking that Reorganization Plan No. 1 fulfills the President's responsibility to clean up the Internal Revenue Bureau. It's no cure-all.

On the contrary, this plan must not divert the people's attention from the fact that the over-all clean-up job is still before the President and his responsibility.

I want to reiterate so that the matter can become doubly plain that it is the job of the executive department of the Government to see to it that the departments are administered honestly and efficiently. Thus, when a President who is like the executive of a great corporation takes over, it is his business to get men in Cabinet position and at bureau level who have the ability to see to it that efficiency and honesty are followed in their department. Thus the Cabinet overseer who has charge of a great department of Government must see to it that under him in the divisions of the department, men operate these divisions in complete accord with that approach.

CONCLUSION

Unfortunately, it is evident that many members of the public have failed to realize where the responsibility lies for efficiency and honesty in Government. It lies in the executive branch. Is it up to the Congress to legislate policy; it is up to the executive branch to administer it.

With plan No. 1, we have given the Executive a tool which can be helpful toward better and more honest administration. I trust that tool will be used wisely—not politically.

That was the hope of the Hoover Commission. That is the hope of the five men and women who have worked in and with the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report. That is my hope and I believe the hope of the American people.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 203) requesting the President to return to the House of Representatives the bill (H. R. 3219) for the relief of Robert E. Vigus, for correction and reenrollment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ROBERT E. VIGUS—REENROLLMENT OF H. R. 3219

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 203, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 3219), for the relief of Robert E. Vigus; that, if and when such bill is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such bill is hereby rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of such bill, to strike out the text of the first paragraph thereof and insert in lieu thereof: "That in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 751), as amended, Robert E. Vigus, of Wichita Falls, Tex., shall be held and considered to have been an employee of the United States on the 2d day of June 1950 within the meaning of section 40 of that act and that injury sustained by him on such date shall be deemed to have been sustained in the performance of his duty in accordance with section 1 of that act."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that we concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which is Senate Joint Resolution 20.

VISITORS IN THE GALLERIES FROM HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is present in the gallery today a delegation from the Territory of Hawaii. The members of the delegation are interested in statehood legislation. The delegation includes:

Mrs. Marian H. Kaito, widowed Gold Star mother of Pvt. Herbert Hussey.

He is one of two Hawaiians who lost their lives as United States marines during the Pacific War.

Mr. Matsuo Takabuki, president, Four Hundred and Forty-second Veterans Club. He is an ex-sergeant.

Mr. Daniel K. Meheula, former first lieutenant of the Ninety-sixth Division.

Mr. Buck Buchwach, city editor of wartime Stars and Stripes.

Col. Robert Louis Stevenson, commanding Officer, Two Hundred and Ninety-eighth Regimental Combat Team, Hawaii National Guard, and veteran of the Pacific War.

They are in the gallery today as guests of Delegate FARRINGTON, of Hawaii. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may allow them to stand and be recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless there is objection the Chair suggests that the group rise so that Senators may see and greet them.

[The group rose in their places in the gallery, and were greeted by applause.]

DEVELOPMENT OF PUERTO RICO AT THE EXPENSE OF INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself briefly, as usual, to a matter which has been referred to on the floor of the Senate at various times. It is the subject of Puerto Rico. Several Senators, including the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] have made reference to the subject on the floor of the Senate. Some

question has been raised as to the force of our remarks. My own interest in the subject arises, not because of any lack of concern for our friends in Puerto Rico. I served on the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs before the congressional reorganization went into effect. I visited Puerto Rico several times. I have a most profound sympathy for the plight of our friends in Puerto Rico. I was with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], on visits to the island. Anyone who has seen the fruits of our 50 years of control of Puerto Rico cannot be proud of the results.

Mr. President, I have traveled around the world, and in my travels I have not seen any conditions which are worse than those to be found in the slums which are built over the water within sight of the Governor's residence in Puerto Rico.

What I have to say is not concerned with any doubt in my mind about the fact that after 50 years of our occupation the misery of Puerto Rico has been doubled by a doubling of the population from the 1,000,000 it had when we took over Puerto Rico, to the 2,000,000 it now has. Certainly everyone must be concerned that under our occupation Puerto Rico has not progressed much more rapidly than it has.

There has been some controversy about language, namely, whether the people of Puerto Rico should be taught the English language. There have been controversies about economic and social policies.

The people of Puerto Rico have now completed a draft of a constitution concerning which I have heard very laudable reports. It is said to be a very modern and a very worthwhile contribution to the development of government, not only in Puerto Rico, but as an example to be followed by countries elsewhere in the world.

I say all this so that it may be made perfectly clear that I have no question as to our very great responsibilities for and interest in conditions in Puerto Rico.

On the other hand, Mr. President, I represent in part the State of Maine, and I am responsible to the citizens of Maine, to make certain that the citizens of Maine also have the fair deal about which we hear so much; and that they are not prejudiced by steps which we may take to assist other States and our Territories. On that score I feel there is some occasion for concern.

The Young Republicans of Maine met the other day and adopted a very interesting resolution, suggesting that we should show at least as much concern for the people of this country as we do for the people of other countries. It is a very mild statement, which I am certain no fair man can challenge. It indicates that their feeling is that in our preoccupation with attempts to save the world we should not forget our responsibilities to our own people.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with the last statement of the Senator from Maine. I believe that our first responsibility is to the people of this country. I also feel that when we are dealing with Puerto Rico we are dealing with people of this country.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. I agree completely with the Senator from New Mexico. I believe also that when it comes to giving special privileges for a Territory as against the State of New Mexico or the State of Maine, consideration should be given to the States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree. I hope that the Senator from Maine, as he proceeds to discuss the problems of Puerto Rico and its people will not only refer to the terrible slums—and I know that it is almost impossible to express how terrible they are, but also will try to discuss the improvements which have been made in many lines in Puerto Rico. They are most impressive, considering the economic position of the island. For instance, I refer to the numerous hospitals and schools and housing projects which have been constructed. All that has been done on an island which depends on a sugarcane economy. Actually, Mr. President, any county of my State is larger than the island of Puerto Rico. As the Senator from Maine knows, the whole island of Puerto Rico comprises only 3,435 square miles. No matter how hard one tries to develop an economy which will actually be self-sufficient, it is a rather difficult problem when the area concerned is small and has a population of 2,500,000.

I hope the Senator from Maine will be fair to Puerto Rico, as he always has been.

A few years ago the Senator from Maine, the Senator from Louisiana, and former Senator Bone, of Washington, now Judge Bone, went to Puerto Rico and observed the conditions. I can assure the Senator from Maine that since that time Puerto Rico has made tremendous progress both politically and economically. Within the past 3 years more than 100 businesses from the United States have established factories or branches in Puerto Rico.

Three or four days ago, when I was in my home city of Albuquerque, at the Franciscan Hotel, where I was staying, I was surprised to notice a number of boxes which, upon inquiry, I found contained tableware, dishes, plates, cups, and so forth, coming from Puerto Rico and being sold in this country. That shows the progress which is being made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; it shows the progress and it also shows our problem. The Senator from New Mexico has very kindly and very generously laid the cornerstone for the remarks I wish to make on the matter of the promotion of industry in Puerto Rico.

We in New England have been increasingly concerned about this problem. We have keen competition from the South, and for a very long time we have been concerned about it.

I hold in my hand an article regarding the question of the transfer of industry from the North to the South. The article refers to a statement by Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union, CIO, and appears in this morning's New York Times.

Now we are confronted with the transfer of industry, not only from the North to the South, but also from continental United States to Puerto Rico. To the extent that that represents a healthy and normal growth, all of us may be profoundly gratified that one of our Territories is exhibiting such zeal, progress, and development. However, if we find that the transfer is not primarily a healthy and normal development, but is one which is stimulated by various measures which for one reason or another are not available to the States we represent, then I think it is a proper subject of inquiry and comment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me, to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator from Maine have any objection if we in New Mexico should decide to process our own wool and our own hides and our own cotton, instead of selling them to New England and thereafter buying the finished products, such as suits, from New England? Would the Senator from Maine object to having New Mexico make an attempt to do that?

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not see any grounds on which I could possibly object, so long as that process was carried on under the principles and practices of free competition and a free field for all. That is the point.

However, when there are limitations on the working conditions which we in New England have sought to develop in our area, and which those in the South have also sought to develop, and when there are also limitations on wages, the competitive situation becomes a very difficult one.

For instance, in New England the average wage in the textile industry is approximately $1.20 an hour. In the South the wage in the textile industry is approximately 90 cents an hour. On the other hand, in Puerto Rico the wage in the textile industry is approximately 25 cents an hour. That situation raises the question whether the Puerto Rican differential is entirely within the bounds of fair competition.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not think it is fair competition, and I would join the Senator from Maine in seeing to it that Puerto Ricans are paid the same wages which are paid to persons who do similar work in other areas. After all, today in Korea, Puerto Ricans, as well as soldiers from New Mexico and soldiers from Maine, are fighting in our Armed Forces. I do not like to see any of our people starve.

Mr. BREWSTER. There is the point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article referring to the statement by Mr. Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union, CIO, which appeared in this morning's New York Times, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXTILE-JOB LOSS LAID TO TAX LAWS—UNION HEAD SAYS CLOSED MILLS ENRICH COMPANIES THROUGH CAPITAL-GAINS LOOPHOLE

WASHINGTON, March 9.—Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union, CIO, asserted today that by a misuse of the lower tax rate on capital gains, textile and other

companies were finding it more lucrative to liquidate mills, throwing workers out of jobs, than to continue normally profitable operations and pay regular income taxes.

In the higher brackets, capital gains are taxed at a lower rate than income taxes.

Mr. Rieve, in a letter to Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, urged an investigation of "disruption in the textile industry" stemming from "loopholes in our tax laws and from the short-sighted fiscal policies being pursued by certain States and municipalities."

Senator HUMPHREY is chairman of a subcommittee on labor-management relations.

In support of his charges, Mr. Rieve stated:

"On an investment of $7,000,000 in cash in 1943, Albert A. List and associates have received more than $24,000,000 in cash and securities as a result of dividends and liquidations. Of the $24,000,000, $16,000,000 was received in cash."

The union named Cyrus Eaton, William Daley of Otis & Co., and a Mr. Canning as associates of Mr. List in a limited partnership formed in 1943 to buy all the outstanding stock of National Refining Co.

This company, directly or indirectly, the union said, controlled a group of textile mills, among them the Nonquitt Mills, employing 1,000 workers in New Bedford, Mass., which was liquidated in 1949. The union asserted this mill reported earnings of $395,000 in the year before its liquidation.

Another List company, the William Whitman Co., Inc., has just closed a division of the main Whitman plant, the wool-combing division of Arlington Mills, Lawrence, Mass., and is reported to be preparing to liquidate the entire plant, normally employing 6,000 workers, the union added.

Mr. Rieve also cited what he called "the growing tendency of States, counties and municipalities to use their credit to issue tax exempt bonds for the construction of factories, subsequently leased, loaned or given to private, profit-making enterprises.

"In the opinion of our union," the union president added, "these practices are unsound in themselves and unfair to legitimate business enterprises. They exploit established businesses for the benefit of new ones; they cause severe economic dislocations; they waste human and material resources to no good end."

Mr. Rieve continued: "No doubt you remember the somewhat similar use of 'charitable foundations' with similar results prior to 1948. You also recall, I am sure, that it was the request of the Textile Workers Union of America which led to a Senate investigation of this problem as it arose in Nashua, N. H., and eventually resulted in closing this tax loophole in 1950.

"In our opinion, the practices I have cited are the present-day successors to 'charitable foundations'; they have the same purpose and much the same effects. We believe that the misuse of the lower tax rate on capital gains has been a factor in many textile mills sales and liquidations since World War II; and we believe this also applies to liquidations in other fields, such as leather, tobacco and retail establishments."

Much United States unemployment was ascribed today to the operations of the International Materials Conference, set up to allocate the free world's supply of scarce commodities. Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., of Massachusetts, House Republican leader, denounced the conference and called a meeting of 70 Republican Representatives tomorrow to examine its operations.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the article incorporates the substance of a letter which was sent by Mr. Rieve to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who had been urging an investigation of the disruption of the textile industry stemming from loopholes in our tax laws and from the shortsighted fiscal policies being pursued by certain States and municipalities. In the article Territories are not referred to, but I think they should also be included.

Mr. Rieve points out certain instances of industries in certain areas having been very adversely affected by developments of this kind, and suggests that it seems to be high time for a thorough exploration of what is happening and how it occurs.

We in New England are concerned because we have suffered increasingly severe competition from the South. We are having a friendly argument about this matter with our southern friends. They have a wage differential of approximately 30 cents. Of course, we claim that our Yankees are a little more efficient than are the southern workers. However, that situation does not always seem to answer the question completely. Of course, the development has occurred within the bounds of our customary procedures. The matter is being considered at this time by the executive departments, particularly from the point of view of whether the wage differentials should be modified either by an increase in the wage paid in the South or by equalizing the two wage rates.

There also remain the tax allocations which have been allowed rather generally in the South. Formerly they were rather frequent in the North, but in the course of time we apparently tended to the conclusion that tax exemptions were uneconomic in the long run and would not be a healthy thing. The South is still trying them out, and that matter is still one subject to development within very local lines.

However, the developments in Puerto Rico have been considerably broader and are, I believe, of increasing concern not only to the North but also to the South. As I pointed out, the wage differential between the North and the South amounts to 30 cents an hour; but the wage differential between the North and Puerto Rico amounts to approximately 60 cents an hour, or an advantage of almost 66⅔ percent.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Maine has been speaking of the wage differential. I am curious to know precisely what figures he has in mind. Perhaps he has in mind that, strangely enough, in the South there are some industries which today actually pay a higher wage scale than that paid elsewhere in the country. It is my impression, for instance, that the Standard Oil Co.'s plants in Louisiana, with the largest refinery in the State of Louisiana, pays wages higher than, or at least just as high as, those paid in the North.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think that is true. I was speaking of the textile industry, the one which is of concern in this case.

Mr. LONG. I understand.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think our friends from Florida have been a little concerned about the transfer of gambling concerns to Puerto Rico, where they have been engaging in wide-open practices which we have understood in some instances in the past prevailed in Florida. However, I shall not attempt to enter the debate on that score as between Florida and Puerto Rico.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield to me?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I dislike to see the Senator from Maine grieved about a situation which does not exist. I am glad to tell him that so far as legal wagering under the parimutuel system are concerned, the operations this year in Florida have been greater than in any former year.

As to the illegal gamblers, we are very happy that they have gone, and we hope they will remain away. We are constantly alert on both local and other levels in the endeavor to see that that occurs.

However, as to the legal wagering operations under the parimutuel law, I am sure the Senator from Maine will be glad to know that this year Florida is well out in front of any former year.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am gratified to have that information, and it accords entirely with what I would expect of the splendid administration the Senator from Florida gave to his State when he was Governor.

Returning to the wage issue, let me say that it might well be argued that conditions in Puerto Rico are less onerous and that it is cheaper to live there, and that there might be some justification for a wage differential.

However, the things which concern those of us who live in New England—and I think Mr. Rieve points them out very clearly in his statement—are certain other practices which have developed.

For instance, we have allowed the Puerto Ricans to retain much of their tax revenues, in a manner peculiar to Puerto Rico, in order to assist them. We allow them to retain many of the taxes which are levied in that island, but which in the case of all the States and the other Territories go into the Federal Treasury. We have done that as a means of assisting a Territory as to which we recognize a very great responsibility. We have also spent in Puerto Rico within the past 10 years in excess of $1,000,000,000 of Federal funds on various projects which, of course, have been of very great assistance to the economy of the island.

But when it comes to the transfer of industries to that island, frankly, we in New England have been concerned. I am quite aware that Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, who is a very able man and very much interested, quite naturally, in the prosperity and progress of his island, insists that Puerto Rico never takes an industry away from any other community, that the enterprises to which the Senator from New Mexico referred are all new ones. Mr. President, whether they are new enterprises, whether machinery is taken from New England or the South to the island, the fact remains that in increasing measure textile operations in New England have been closed down, and in increasing number they have been transferred to Puerto Rico.

Two of the outstanding examples were referred to here by our colleague the senior Senator from New Hampshire

[Mr. BRIDGES] and were developed even more fully by the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], in a masterly report which he made of an investigation into the closing of the New Hampshire mills operated by Textron, Inc. In this report, which was made under date of March 9, 1949, it appears very clearly that Textron, Inc., which has a very great textile operation in various towns in New England, had closed down mills in Nashua, N. H., in Manville, R. I., in Taunton, Mass., in Esmond, R. I., in Dover, N. H., and in Waynesboro, Va., destroying the jobs of approximately 5,500 workers.

On September 15, 1948, Harold Daoust, the regional director of the Textile Workers Union of America, wrote to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], pointing out that these closings were not merely temporary, but that in each case the machinery had been sold for export or for junk, and the real estate disposed of separately. He charged that Textron was closing profitable mills to prop up a vast and complicated corporate structure. He requested a congressional investigation to determine the effect on our national economy of Textron's manipulations of mill properties, its use of charitable trusts, and acceptance of Puerto Rican subsidies. I commend this report by the Senator from New Hampshire, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to the reading of any of my colleagues, or of those in the country who are interested, and particularly the commentators and columnists who are exhibiting concern as to the discussion of this matter on the floor of the Senate.

Two of the operations have given us concern: First, the matter of the building of textile and other plants in Puerto Rico, with Government funds, and their leasing at very reasonable terms for extended periods of perhaps 10 years to enterprises coming in from the United States. That constitutes direct subsidy of these enterprises, and a relief of the enterprises from the necessity of furnishing the capital for investment in buildings and plant for their operations; second, they are given tax exemption for a period of 15 years. These two devices, together with the low wage cost, are very effective.

I was quite surprised to have comments made here in previous days challenged on the ground that these were not transfers of enterprises. I am sure that must appear as entirely a quibble. Governor Marín has made the point that "we never close down any enterprise in the United States, we merely start enterprises down here." With the watering and fertilizing of the soil by the building of the plants with the many, many millions of dollars which this Government allows Puerto Rico to retain and keep in its treasury, which otherwise would come into the Federal Treasury and assist the American taxpayers to that extent, the people of my own State of Maine to that extent say that we have almost the grotesque spectacle of the unemployed workers in Lewiston, Maine, being taxed in order to supply the funds with which to build the structures in Puerto Rico, which are taking away their livelihood. I am sure that will not be recognized as disseminated business.

While we have had a quarrel with our southern friends about the transfer of mills to the South, I am sure that on this score we can perhaps unite, because as time goes on, they will experience this competition in increasing measure with the same impact as we in the North do.

I think it time for an examination of the whole situation as to how long American taxpayers should supply the funds with which to build factories to take employment away from workers in either the North or the South, in either New England or the Southern States. I believe it high time that there should be an exploration of this matter by the competent committee of the Senate, to determine to what extent this is being done, what its impact is, and whether it does invite reconsideration of our present law, as to the grants we shall make to Puerto Rico in connection with their taxes. If they have more than what is required for the normal purposes of their government, why should the American taxpayers continue to grant them special privileges? Furthermore, the wage scale should be similarly considered, and the question investigated whether the Puerto Ricans should operate with some of the same limitations which are applied both to the North and to the South in the United States. Those are the points which we feel should have consideration.

We were challenged first when it was said that Puerto Rico had not taken any industries from this country. Mr. President, to dispel any illusions upon that score I have here a very interesting and very sympathetic report made by Representative CRAWFORD, as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House, under the title of "Operation Bootstrap," dated March 20, 1951. It is a very sympathetic report. Representative CRAWFORD is most sympathetic toward this entire program. He details what the Puerto Ricans are doing and how they are doing it, and, on pages 7 and 8, to answer the suggestion that they are not getting any enterprises down there, he has a list of 100 enterprises, which under this policy, have been established there within the past 3 years. I shall ask that this list of new industries in Puerto Rico, as contained on pages 7 and 8, be incorporated in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Name of industry	Location	Product
1. American Cushion Co.	Rio Piedras	Canvas products.
2. American Syntex	Hato Rey	Synthetic hormones.
3. Asserradero Industrial, Inc.	Carolina	Lumber and furniture.
4. Atlas Pen Corp.	Bayamon	Fountain pens.
5. Atlas Products Corp.	Toa Alta	Leather gloves.
6. Acorn Mills	Fajardo	Ladies' underwear.
7. Bell-Flex	Bayamon	Watch bands.
8. Borinquen Art Flowers, Inc.	Naranjito	Artificial flowers.
9. Borinquen Foods Corp.	Toa Baja	Candied fruit; preserved coconut.
10. Caribbean Clothing Corp.	Mayaguez	Men's outerwear.
11. Caribbean Fluorescent Co.	Hato Rey	Fluorescent lamps.
12. Caribbean Hair & Bristle Manufacturing Corp.	do	Hair and bristles.
13. Caribbean Optical Co.	Carolina	Sunglasses and eyeglass frames.
14. Caribbean Pearl Corp.	Ponce	Pearl jewelry.
15. Caribbean Tanning Co., Inc.	do	Tannery.
16. Caribbean Zipper Co.	Fajardo	Zippers.
17. Caribe Electro, Inc.	Hato Rey	Electric outlet boxes.
18. Caribe Flower Co.	Cayey	Artificial flowers.
19. Caribe Hilton Hotel	San Juan	Hotel.
20. Caribe Plastics Export Corp.	Gurabo	Plastic jewelry.
21. Caribe Skyland	Isabela	Vegetable canning and freezing.
22. Consolidated International Industries, Inc.	Arecibo	Men's and children's hose.
23. Continental Packing Corp.	Ponce	Fruit canning.
24. Cordé Bonnaz Embroidery Corp.	Arecibo	Cordé handbags.
25. Crane China Corp.	Vega Baja	Institutional and domestic.
26. Danielle Co., Inc.	Barranquitas	Christmas ornaments.
27. De Luxe Dye Works, Inc.	Barrio Obrero	Industrial dyeing.
28. Dick Will, Inc.	Fajardo	Crochet shoes and slippers.
29. Dorado Handcraft	Dorado	Handbags (cordé).
30. Elizabeth Kuzelman Co.	Guaynabo	Hand embroidery and naval insignias.
31. Ferre of Puerto Rico, Inc.	Caguas	Leather products.
32. Ford Gum & Machine Co.	Ponce	Chewing gum.
33. Frederick Lee, Inc.	Mayagues	Sanitary belts and surgical supports.
34. Frozen Foods Concentrate, Inc.	Bayamon	Frozen foods.
35. George Berger, Inc.	Santurce	Ladies' dresses and blouses.
36. Gili Leather Co.	Caguas	Tannery.
37. Gosch Laboratories Corp.	Santurce	Cough mixture.
38. Graichen Fabrics, Inc.	Carolina	Worsted fabrics.
39. H. E. Curry, Inc.	Hato Rey	Adrenalin.
40. Haskins Plastic Corp.	Gurabo	Plastic products.
41. Industrial Rizadores, Inc.	Juncos	Hair curlers, barrettes, and bobby pins.
42. Interland Manufacturing Co.	Barrio Obrero	Fur coats.
43. International Glove Corp.	do	Fabric gloves.
44. Jem Manufacturing Co.	Santurce	Brassieres.
45. Joyce of Puerto Rico, Inc.	Ponce	Men's shoes.
46. Koro Products	Bayamon	Cordé handbags.
47. La Plata Industries Corp.	Aibonito	Wool processing cotton and rayon.
48. Lamparas Quesada	Santurce	Lamps.
49. Lymbert, Inc.	do	Crochet slippers.
50. Manati Metal Novelty Co.	Manati	Metal findings.
51. Manati Pearl Works	do	Pearl buttons.
52. My Lady, Inc.	Hato Rey	Costume jewelry.
53. Miriam Gates of Puerto Rico, Inc.	Santurce	Brassieres.
54. Morro Castle Corp.	Arecibo	Artists' brushes.
55. Nash Bayamon Corp.	Bayamon	Leather articles.
56. Nevarez Manufacturing Corp.	Rio Piedras	Aluminum jalousies.
57. Olympic Corp.	Toa Alta	Men's undershirts and polo shirts.
58. Pan American Embroidery	Santurce	Crochet beading.
59. Peerless Products Co.	do	Artificial pearls.
60. Playmaster, Inc.	Cayey	Baseballs.
61. Ponce Candy Industries	Ponce	Hard candies.
62. Ponce Manufacturing Corp.	do	Women's outerwear.
63. Primo Knit Mills	Humacao	Veils.
64. Puerto Rican Brassieres, Inc.	Santurce	Brassieres.
65. Puerto Rico Cement Corp.	San Juan	Portland cement.
66. Puerto Rico Clay Products Corp.	Carolina	Clay blocks and tiles, toilets, and allied products.
67. Puerto Rico Fabrics, Inc.	Naguabo	Infants' hose.
68. Puerto Rico Glass Corp.	San Juan	Glass containers.
69. Puerto Rico Hosiery Mills, Inc.	Arecibo	Hosiery.
70. Puerto Rico Pulp & Paper Corp.	San Juan	Containers, paper and carton.
71. Puerto Rico Rayon Mills, Inc.	Vega Alta	Rayon fabrics.
72. Puerto Rico Stamping Co.	Carolina	Kerosene stoves.

Name of industry	Location	Product
73. Puerto Rico Underwear Corp.	Hato Rey	Women's pajamas.
74. Puerto Rico Woolen Textiles Corp.	Juncos	Woolen yarns, mops.
75. Raymo Zipper, Inc.	Santurce	Zippers.
76. Red Cape Leather Product Corp.	Cabo Rojo	Leather wallets.
77. Renee of Puerto Rico	Santurce	Crochet beading.
78. Rico Television Co.	Hato Rey	Radios.
79. Rio Grande Artificial Flowers	Rio Grande	Artificial flowers.
80. Rodriquez Bros.	Hato Rey	Jewelry.
81. Rugcrofters of Puerto Rico, Inc.	Carolina	Rugs and floor coverings.
82. San Juan Glove Corp.	Hato Rey	Fabric gloves.
83. Sentinel-Hill Co.	Santurce	Furniture.
84. Senorita Hosiery Mills	Gurabo	Hosiery.
85. Shawy Handbags Co.	Caguas	Cordé handbags.
86. Sportswear Inc.	Mayaguez	Polo shirts.
87. St. Regis Paper & Bag Corp. of Puerto Rico.	Ponce	Paper bags.
88. Textron pilot plant	do	Ladies' slips.
89. Textron Puerto Rico, Inc.	do	Cotton textiles.
90. Triangle Manufacturing Corp.	Santurce	Refrigeration equipment.
91. Tycoon Tackle, Inc.	Mayaguez	Fishing rods and tackles.
92. Ultimax	Vega Alta	Drafting equipment.
93. Fiber Textiles	Hato Rey	Fiber products.
94. Yeast pilot plant	do	Yeast.
95. San Juan Studios, Inc.	Santurce	Neckties.
96. U. S. Bearing Co.	Bayamon	Sapphire bearings.
97. Gloria Handbags Manufacturing Co.	Arecibo	Cordé handbags.
98. Albert Godde Beding of Puerto Rico, Inc.	Aguadilla	Silk bolting cloth.
99. Ever-Sole Co. of Puerto Rico	Fajardo	Cordage.
100. Beacon Textiles, Inc.	Palmer	Rayon cloth, blankets.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a considerable display has been made of this development. The Hamilton-Wright organization apparently is promoting this sort of development for the Government of Puerto Rico, for what I understand is a fee of $120,000 or so a year. They boasted about the one hundredth new industry put into operation under the so-called operation bootstrap, and there was a great celebration regarding it. As to whether these industries had any effect upon employment in this country, I think the very statement of the Senator from New Mexico as to the products of Puerto Rico which he saw in New Mexico indicates with entire clarity that whoever were making these products in this country heretofore were to that extent now unemployed.

We have seen Textron close six plants in New England and open two plants in Puerto Rico. By what means can it possibly be argued that they are not making in Puerto Rico the products they were formerly making in New England or which they might temporarily have manufactured in the South?

So the argument that they are not affecting the industry of our country seems to me to be obviously fallacious.

I think we should also bring home to the people of this Nation the fact that a scheme does not always work out as planned, and that we should give a little warning to our friends who are considering moving to Puerto Rico that it is not always as attractive as it would appear to be. This was brought home to me 2 or 3 years ago by three textile industries in the communities in which I have lived all my life. The owner of the industries was approached by officials in Puerto Rico to move there. He came to me with reference to the matter, and I gave him a letter of introduction to Governor Marín, because I thought it would be well for him to explore the situation. He went to Puerto Rico and was very hospitably entertained. He had considerable discussion and was very much impressed. I regret to say that if it had not been for his untimely death, some enterprises of a similar character in the textile industry which had been operating in central Maine for many years might have moved to Puerto Rico under the blandishments which were presented. That was what first aroused my interest and concern, and since that time I have heard many Members of Congress, both from the North and the South, discuss the problem.

The Economic Development Administration, formerly called the Industrial Development Company, of the Puerto Rican Government, celebrated 3 weeks ago the establishment of the one hundred and fiftieth new plant brought to Puerto Rico under the tax-exemption, cheap-labor enticement program.

They failed to mention on that occasion, however, that a number of plants had found the idea unworkable and had moved out of Puerto Rico at considerable financial loss, or had abandoned plans to operate in Puerto Rico before actually getting them under way.

Official reports from the Puerto Rican Government giving the whole picture do not exist, but we have seen one mimeographed report from the Puerto Rican office of Industrial Tax Exemption, which purports to cover the period up to December 31, 1950. The development program known as "operation bootstrap," was begun in May 1947. This report lists 20 "grantees of tax exemption who abandoned plans to operate in Puerto Rico," and 15 "grantees of exemption who discontinued operation temporarily or permanently." Presumably these "grantees" are included in the 150; the attainment of which figure was celebrated 3 weeks ago. Undoubtedly there have been others who have given up the ghost since December 31, 1950.

The Government of Puerto Rico has pursued a high-pressure propaganda line aimed at luring industry away from continental America. This propaganda has been misleading if not downright dishonest in its false pretenses. We are told that industries which have taken the bait and moved to Puerto Rico have been uniformly disappointed. Promises have been great, but performance by the Government has been questionable. Sometimes there is quibbling over the tax exemption. Cheapness of labor is offset by its inferior quality; low-production rate, carelessness, breakage, and so forth. One economist estimates that it would take 10 years for the average industrial concern to train workers to perform in comparable style to workers in continental America.

Forbes Magazine, in its issue of March 15, 1951, pointed out:

> The kind of industry that smells a profit in Puerto Rico is not the basic, self-contained kind around which industrial areas grow.

The same magazine, in an editorial on October 15, 1951, said:

> It is possible for any kind of regime to make enough noise about public works, climate, and lures for gringo businessmen to obscure its avoidance of basic problems.

Here are some of the companies listed in the report referred to above:

> Grantees of tax exemption who abandoned plans to operate in Puerto Rico: Affiliate of Gluckin Corp.; Cargill, Campbell Fabrics Corp.; Bartfield Manufacturing Co.; McKay Products; Diamond Braiding Mills; Consolidated Castings Corp.; Continental Chemical Corp.; and others to total of 20. Grantees of exemption who discontinued operation temporarily or permanently: Caribe Crafts Corp.; Jonathan Logan, Ltd.; Nash Bayamon Corp.; Jewelers Products Corp.; International Mat and Matting; Sun Glass Corp. of America; Bartfield Manufacturing Co.; Delta Manufacturing Co.; Graichen Fabrics, Inc.; and others to total 15.

A basic fallacy in the whole Puerto Rican industrialization program is the fantastic cost per job. In other words, the program of luring business to Puerto Rico costs millions of dollars in United States taxpayers' money and produces relatively few jobs for Puerto Rican workers.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have in my hand a committee report called Operation Boot Strap, which purports to be a report of the activities of the Government of Puerto Rico in its efforts to provide full employment to members of the manpower task force, prepared by Representative FRED L. CRAWFORD, of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BREWSTER. Let me say that I have referred to that, and I have shown the list to the Senator from New Hampshire. He spoke to me about the list of industries which have transferred. I was very happy to find it, and I have asked that it be incorporated in the RECORD. I thought it would be of particular interest to both Senators from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator this question, if I may: Is he familiar with the statements made by Puerto Rico officials and by certain persons in this country, after I recently made some remarks in the Senate, who say it was not true that we had lost industries to Puerto Rico?

Mr. BREWSTER. I heard those statements, and I was considerably concerned, because I thought I knew of a number of industries which had actually made the move. There was one from Portland, Oreg., a bathing suit manufacturing concern.

Mr. BRIDGES. Would the Senator consider this list of 100 industries which have moved to Puerto Rico a complete

answer to the statements which have been made that no industries had moved there and that this program was not in force?

Mr. BREWSTER. The Governor argues, very speciously, that Puerto Rico has never taken any industries from this country; that they simply established new industries there. But to the unemployed textile worker in Nashua or any other point in New England, it does not matter what the argument or the theory may be. He knows that the production of textiles formerly going on in New England is now being performed in Puerto Rico.

Mr. BRIDGES. And the corporation in Puerto Rico is essentially the same. It may bear a different name, but it is controlled by the same interests.

Mr. BREWSTER. As the Senator will see, they use the same name—Textron, for example, which is one of the conspicuous ones. In almost every instance they are branches of stores operating in the United States.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator realize that when he or the Senator from New Hampshire stands on the floor of the Senate, and tells about the United States Government spending $190,000,000 a year of the taxpayers' money for Puerto Rico, and then protests against industries in Puerto Rico being offered tax exemptions not granted to American industries on the mainland, which means taking bread out of the mouths of the people who are paying the taxes to enable us to appropriate $190,000,000, he may be accused of not being liberal? Such an accusation was leveled at me a few days ago because I raised this question. If that is antiliberal I am certainly a conservative, and I compliment myself upon that fact.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have already had placed in the RECORD an article by Emil Rieve, president of the Textile Workers Union, attacking very bitterly the matter of taxes and other subsidies which would have the effect of taking industries out of New England.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator will agree with me that when a Senator takes the oath of office as an elected United States Senator from a State, he becomes a Senator of the United States, and his first interest should be what is best for the welfare of our country. There may come a time when a section of the State which he represents may be affected by some imports into the country. Then I think that he has a duty and an obligation to intervene and protect the State or section he represents, bearing in mind, of course, that his over-all obligation is to the welfare of the country as a whole.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from New Hampshire will be concerned to know that the figure of 100 of which they boasted a year ago is now increased to 150. I wish to read the latest release from the Puerto Rico News Service issued under a very recent date, in February 1952, by the Hamilton-Wright organization, which is handling the publicity. It is only a short paragraph:

TEN MILLION DOLLARS FOR NEW FACTORIES IN PUERTO RICO

Puerto Rico is building an "industrial cart" first, then looking around for the horsepower to pull it into operation. Government plans call for spending around $10,000,000 a year for the next 10 years for new factories—

That is, a hundred million dollars of our money—

then finding tenants for the buildings. Thirty-six are now under construction but will not be vacant very long. More than half have already been committed to manufacturers seeking sites for expansion in the growing United States economy of which Puerto Rico is a part. It's part of the island's economic development administration program that has already seen 150 new industries launched in Puerto Rico in less than 4 years.

That $100,000,000 which they are to put into it in the next 10 years is from the tax concessions we allow them which are allowed to no other area under the control of the United States. Yet they are going to use that money to take industries away from New England, or from the South or elsewhere. I believe it is time that the people of this country are entitled to look the situation over.

I ask that an article from the New York Times of February 16 entitled "Puerto Rico Hails a New Industry Era" be incorporated in my remarks at this point. It shows for the record how they are going about the matter of developing their industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUERTO RICO HAILS NEW INDUSTRY ERA—DEDICATION OF ONE-HUNDREDTH FACTORY IN ISLAND'S EXPANSION PLAN OBSERVED IN CEREMONY

(By Lee E. Cooper)

SAN JUAN, February 16.—Puerto Rico, long impoverished under a one-crop economy, celebrated today its arrival at a major milestone in its program of industrial development.

This insular possession of the United States, traditionally dependent on sugar and rum for income, dedicated its one-hundredth new factory as a significant step in its long-range plan to replace oxen with tractors and machetes with modern machines.

Nearly 2,000 persons, including Federal Government officials, New York bankers, and business guests from many parts of the mainland attended the dedication ceremonies, marking the completion of the $1,500,000 plant of Beacon Textiles, Inc., in the town of Palmer near here.

An Army band from Fort Brooke took part in the exercises and Antonio Lucchetti, director of Puerto Rico's Water Resources Authority, descended on the scene in a helicopter just to show how modern this region was getting.

The opening of the Beacon factory, with its estimated annual payroll of $300,000 and potential $5,000,000 yearly output of rayon goods and blankets, marked a new chapter in the Puerto Rican government's effort to provide jobs for its people and bring about a closer balance between imports and exports.

The transition to industry and mechanization here is taking placed under the impetus of insular legislation granting a 12-year tax holiday for companies sponsoring acceptable new types of manufacturing or expansion of certain established lines.

EXPERIMENT CALLED SUCCESS

The experiment, which has attracted wide attention elsewhere, was hailed at the ceremonies as having reached a point where it can be declared a success.

In connection with the dedication, Gov. Luiz Muñoz-Marín noted that since the tax holiday plan was approved in 1947 and got going in 1948 the 100 new industries had been drawn here largely through investment of private capital and would give employment to more than 15,000 workers. He estimated that capacity production by these factories would amount to about $68,000,000 in goods annually and might contribute substantially to the national defense effort in contrast to the situation in 1942, when the island could contribute little more than manpower, sugar and cement.

The Governor said he was convinced that Puerto Rico's industrial progress was of both political and economic importance to the nation, because this tropical area had become "a showcase in Latin America for United States techniques and methods."

Outlining measures taken here to aid defense production, Teodoro Moscoco, Jr., Administrator of Economic Development of Puerto Rice, told the audience that a full survey of the island's factories, equipment and personnel had been completed and presented to the Office of Defense Mobilization in Washington. He said that the production authority had established a San Juan office to help plant owners obtain contracts.

One factory already is producing Army insignia and another is about to manufacture for the Navy.

AMPLE MANPOWER IS SEEN

With $33,000,000 already invested in new plants and equipment, the industralization venture has proved that the right kind of factories have a bright future on the island, Mr. Moscoco asserted. Manpower for additional production, he said, is available, with 174,000 workers listed as employed only 30 hours a week or less and 80,000 without jobs.

To improve earning power and provide adequate skilled help for future growth, the island's trade schools are being expanded to turn out 15,000 graduates annually instead of 7,500, Mr. Moscoco said.

The promise of growing efficiency for workers was indicated in an inspection today of the Crane China Co.'s plant at Vega Baja, where 500 employees, most of whom had never seen a factory before, now are turning out an average of 30 dozen pieces a week as compared with 15 dozen less than a year ago. The average wage there for all workers, including beginners, is now 47 cents an hour.

Most of the island's production, including new lines ranging from acids and artificial flowers to zippers but predominantly textiles and clothing, finds an outlet in the United States. Shipments to outside markets in the last fiscal year included $11,083,000 in gloves, $1,335,000 in radio receiving sets and $1,789,000 in cement.

Some initial caution on the part of manufacturers to take advantage of tax benefits here has subsided with the appearance of successful ventures, and early skepticism over the insular Government's intentions with respect to four large pump-priming plants built several years ago and operated directly by the Government has been relieved by the recent sale of the plants to the Ferre banking interests of Ponce at what was described as a favorable price, yet keeping the businesses in native hands.

A controversial tax-saving plan is in effect until June 1959 and involves remission of all customary insular property, and plant income levies for 1960 taxes will be 25 percent of normal. In 1961 they will be on a

50 percent basis and in 1962 at the rate of 75 percent of normal. After that they may be back to prevailing rates. If necessary, the Government may help finance and build plants for approved industries on a lease-sale basis.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator knows, of course, that a great many of these industries will not affect New England at all, does he not?

Mr. BREWSTER. If they affect North Dakota I am equally concerned, as I am if they affect Louisiana or Nevada.

Mr. LANGER. As a matter of fact, the development of the coffee industry, and the processing of coffee, certainly is not going to affect any part of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER. No; and that is fine.

Mr. LANGER. It is of benefit to Puerto Rico. Take the item of cement. The Puerto Ricans have a fine cement plant.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am delighted to know that.

Mr. LANGER. I believe that most of the cement they manufacture will be needed in Puerto Rico.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator will find that a great many of the industries are used for the benefit of the inhabitants of Puerto Rico.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is correct. I shall start at the top of the list given in this pamphlet entitled "Operation Bootstrap," and read down. The first is:

Canvas products.

Certainly canvas products are produced in New England.

Synthetic hormones.

I shall not talk about that item. I do not know where they are produced.

Lumber and furniture.

That is local, and I know they make furniture locally there.

The list continues:

Fountain pens.
Leather gloves.
Ladies' underwear.
Watchbands.
Artificial flowers.
Candied fruit; preserved coconut.
Men's outerwear.
Fluorescent lamps.
Hair and bristles.
Sunglasses and eyeglass frames.
Pearl jewelry.

That item affects us in New England very much.

The list continues:

Tannery.
Zippers.
Electric outlet boxes.
Artificial flowers.
Hotel.

They spent $7,000,000 on a hotel which they are paying for by the wide-open gambling casino being operated there. I do not know whether that is of concern to us or not, but it is a part of something that does not compete with us, because people come to Maine in the summer and not in the winter. It competes with the people of Nevada and Florida, I believe. The list continues:

Plastic jewelry.
Men's and children's hose.
Cordé handbags.
Institutional and domestic.
Christmas ornaments.
Industrial dyeing.
Crocheted shoes and slippers.
Handbags.
Hand embroidery.
Leather products.
Chewing gum.
Sanitary belts and surgical supports.
Ladies' dresses and blouses.
Worsted fabrics.
Plastic products.
Hair curlers, barrettes, and bobby pins.
Fur coats.

That is a strange one. I do not know what they do with fur in Puerto Rico, but that is what they are engaged in.

Fabric gloves.
Brassieres.
Men's shoes.
Lamps—

And so on. I think the Senator will see that the products are not of the character of which he has spoken. I do not see a cement plant mentioned, but I know they did develop an excellent cement plant, and in my opinion that was a very wise procedure.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I suppose the distinguished Senator knows that the Puerto Ricans have a terrific unemployment problem.

Mr. BREWSTER. I spoke of that. I referred to the fact that there is twice as much misery in that island as when we took it over 50 years ago, because they have twice the population.

Mr. LANGER. I agree with the Senator, and I am afraid it is getting worse.

Mr. BREWSTER. I hope it is getting better. We allowed them these tax refunds to help them out, and I hope they will use them for their development.

Mr. LANGER. The number of so-called poor people, under-privileged people, has increased.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LANGER. The situation is desperate. As a matter of fact, in order to insure that those people have work, they will have to have factories along the lines the distinguished Senator has indicated.

Mr. BREWSTER. The only question is whether their development is to be at the expense of the people of my State and other States because it will cost much more to feed a man in Maine or North Dakota than in Puerto Rico. If it is necessary that somebody must be unemployed, from the practical angle of cost, it must be recalled that people can live in Puerto Rico more cheaply than in Lewiston, Maine.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator believe that if we are going to send money all over the world, as we are doing under the point 4 program which we have started, it would be preferable to send it to Puerto Rico, one of our own Territories, rather than to send it to Europe or Asia?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I pointed out, before the Senator came into the Chamber, that the Young Republicans of Maine had adopted a certain resolution. Young Republicans, as well as young people generally, are supposed to be very liberal. The Young Republicans of Maine adopted a resolution last week in which they suggested that the American Government should show at least as much concern for the economic problems of the people of America as for those of people in other sections of the world. That certainly applies to our Territories. I have been to Puerto Rico several times. I have been profoundly concerned that we were pouring money out all over the world, when we had at least as bad conditions in Puerto Rico. The question is, how to cure them.

Mr. LANGER. I fully agree with the distinguished Senator from Maine. I think he knows that the report of Dewey Anderson, secretary of the Institute of Public Affairs, shows that in the United States there are 10,000,000 families trying to live on less than $2,000 a year. That organization is controlled entirely by gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. Jimmy Roosevelt is a director, as is the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. After all these years of pouring out money, the last report shows that there are 10,000,000 families in the United States trying to live on less than $2,000 a year. I fully agree with what the Young Republicans of Maine did. I think they are right.

Mr. BREWSTER. My point is—and I am sure the Senator from North Dakota will agree with me—that we certainly need to help the people of Puerto Rico. But to transfer a job from Lewiston, Maine, or Fargo, N. Dak., to San Juan, Puerto Rico, does not advance in any way the economy of the United States or of the world. That is my point. I think we must give consideration to the problems of our own area, not at the expense of any other. However, at the same time, the money is taken out of our pockets. When we allow Puerto Rico to retain tax refunds from the Federal Treasury, and they use $10,000,000 a year to get our industries down there, that is a matter, I think, for which we ourselves must be accountable.

Mr. LANGER. Would not the Senator say that those remarks would apply to the entire point 4 program?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes; even to a greater extent, because we are responsible in some degree for Puerto Rico. Our responsibility with respect to the other areas is certainly more remote.

I have just arrived at the point where I am coming to the question which the Senator has raised.

The program of luring business to Puerto Rico costs millions of dollars in money of the United States taxpayers, and produces relatively few jobs for Puerto Rican workers. Its aim is to bring prosperity to the island through more employment; but actually the birth rate is producing something like five new individuals for each new job created by

the bootstrap operation. Every time there is one new job there are four more prospects for it. The same thing applies to India. We give them $50,000,000, and they simply get 5,000,000 more population, so we have to give them $50,000,000 more. Mr. Bowles, the Ambassador, admitted that to me when I was there. That is the net result of any change we make in the economic level, unless there is some way of bringing under control this endless operation. We are trying to defy the law of Malthus, who pointed out some time ago what would happen, and what has been happening in many areas of the world.

Thus it would seem that the operation is costly, inefficient, puny in results, and very injurious to continental American communities. It is all supported by tax funds to which these United States communities and their citizens contribute.

As pointed out, the Government propaganda is false in its claim. For example, in the report of the Industrial Tax Exemption Office referred to above, the number of new jobs created as of the end of 1950 was placed at 5,659. This report was not made public. Public utterances of the Development Administration set the figure as high as 18,000. No one knows the real facts, because of obfuscation by the Government.

I note the presence of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN]. I find that an industry from Portland, Oreg., had opened up in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as a result of these allurements. How it is working out I do not know; but it shows to what extent this is a continental movement. The industry to which I refer is a great bathing-suit manufacturing concern.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator probably has reference to the Jantzen Manufacturing Co.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. It is well known throughout the world, and with very good reason, as being the producer of perhaps the finest swimming garments made.

Mr. BREWSTER. Two outstanding examples of how the program has flopped are the cases of Beacon Textiles, Inc., and the Crane China Corp. Beacon's establishment in Puerto Rico was celebrated with fanfare by the propagandists as the one hundredth tax-free operation. It is in the list which I have before me. There has been a cloak of secrecy around this operation. The Beacon representatives will not talk, and the Government representatives will not talk. The plant, which was set up to make blankets, is now operated on a slipshod scale by a group of local people in Puerto Rico.

Crane left about the same time as did Beacon. They found that inferior labor could not produce their product on a profitable basis.

Textron, another big operation, is still there, although on a losing basis, we are told. The low ability of labor accounts for the production of an alarming percentage of seconds and a resultant loss in revenue.

Attached is a press release, distributed last month, from the Puerto Rico News Service, operated for the Government by the Hamilton-Wright organization of New York, at a fee of $120,000 plus a year. Our Government is paying them to take away our industries. The original exhibit A is attached. This is what it says:

TEN MILLION DOLLARS FOR NEW FACTORIES IN PUERTO RICO

SAN JUAN, P. R., February 1952.—Puerto Rico is building an industrial cart first, then looking around for the horsepower to put it into operation. Government plans call for spending around $10,000,000 a year for the next 10 years for new factories, then finding tenants for the buildings. Thirty-six are now under construction but will not be vacant very long. More than half already have been committed to manufacturers seeking sites for expansion in the growing United States economy of which Puerto Rico is a part. It's part of the island's economic development administration program that has already seen 150 new industries launched in Puerto Rico in less than 4 years.

That is the item which I read earlier in my remarks, about the 150 new industries which it is claimed have been secured in the past 4 years. This shows that they propose to spend taxpayers' money at the rate of $10,000,000 a year for the next 10 years. One hundred million dollars of the American taxpayers' money is to be used in what seems to me to be very questionable practices in getting industries away from other sections of the United States.

Exhibit B, which I have before me, is a committee print of the House Interior Committee, prepared by Representative FRED CRAWFORD, an ardent partisan and friend of Governor Muñoz. On pages 7 and 8 of this document are listed the names of the first hundred industries established in Puerto Rico under the development program.

Exhibit C is a press release of February 14, 1951, of the Hamilton-Wright organization, which, on page 3, gives the figure of 15,000 new jobs, while we know the figure to be less than half that many. This bears on the question of what results are being obtained for the expenditures which are being made.

The Resident Commissioner's office gave a reporter friend a partial breakdown of industrial categories of plants now operating under the plan. This list, which follows, shows the broad scope, and how the American mainland economy has been hit. This bears on the question asked me by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]:

Fabrics, 7; outerwear, 5; underwear, 8; hosiery, 5; other textiles and fabrics, 11; gloves and handbags, 8; crochet and beading, 5; leather products, 9; jewelry, notions, and allied products, 10; metal and plastic products, 8; clay products, 5; food and tobacco products, 6; paper products, 4; electrical items, 6; pharmaceuticals, 3.

This report illustrates the extent to which these matters necessarily have had their impact upon the economy of our country. The Commissioner's office claims that few industries have been transplanted, and that new industries, within their interpretation, means outfits with new equipment.

In other words, if the bathing suit concern puts new textile equipment in Puerto Rico, then it is said to be a new outfit. If it moves machinery from Portland, Oreg., then it is said to be a transfer. Of course, this is a perfectly fatuous distinction, because if they are able to produce their product more cheaply in San Juan, under the operation of our free enterprise system, naturally they are going to do so; and they are going to throw out of employment American citizens, whether it be in Oregon, Maine, or wherever else in the country such industries may be located. The definition to which I have referred sounds like a quibble. Take Textron, for example. Perhaps it did not move machinery down to Puerto Rico. However, it did set up a new plant there, and closed plants in New England. It continued to manufacture under the same famous brand names which had been established on the basis of superior workmanship by New England labor.

Mr. President, I have taken the time of the Senate because we have been urging that there be an exploration of what is going on.

There will be an opportunity for it, and we have been assured by the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the committee will look into the subject when it holds hearings on the proposed constitution of Puerto Rico and other matters concerned with the island.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BREWSTER. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the distinguished Senator from Maine know anything about the amount of money which is annually being provided by our Government for the purpose of subsidizing the construction of public housing in Puerto Rico?

Mr. BREWSTER. I believe the point has been covered. I have before me clippings from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD through the past month dealing with discussions of the subject by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. In their discussions they go into various phases of the subject, and reference is made to the amount of money which has been poured out. In the past 10 years more than $1,000,000,000 has been spent in Puerto Rico on various Federal projects entirely apart from the Federal refunds which we allow to Puerto Rico.

Mr. CAIN. I asked my question of the Senator from Maine because several private builders have advised me that private builders are being discouraged in Puerto Rico, because the desire there on the part of the authorities is to rely almost entirely upon public housing for satisfaction of their housing needs.

Mr. BREWSTER. From my study of the subject as a member of the former committee, it is my understanding that the National Federal Housing Development was grossly excessive. It made provisions which would have been better calculated for housing in Maine, Washington, North Dakota, or Idaho, rather than in Puerto Rico. It was fantastic. They built units costing $3,000 to $4,000

apiece. Everyone recognized the fact that they were entirely unnecessary on the basis of living conditions in Puerto Rico. It would have been much better to have built three times as many units. Subsequently that situation was corrected. Some years ago I dedicated a housing project at the other end of the island, opposite San Juan. They were beginning to modify their approach. However, there still seems to be a tendency, let us say, to socialize the economy, perhaps as a result of some of their problems, but also as the result of the great source of Federal funds that seem to be so readily available.

ACCEPT THE INEVITABLE NOW

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to address the Senate briefly on the point that we should now accept the inevitable.

In the last session when the Congress gave its half-hearted blessing to the principle of UMT with strings attached, it took a feeble first step toward the "garrison state." Now we know that Congress did not think the proposal through carefully. In the Senate, passage was achieved with a minimum of debate and an utter lack of consideration. As I recall, the Senate debated the staggering proposal of UMT less than 3 hours. We had before us at the time the extension of selective service, which was "must" legislation. With a full-scale war in Korea on our hands, selective service simply had to be extended. There were only five votes cast in this body against its extension, and most of the five were against nonrelated provisions; not against selective service in principle. By a clever and adroit maneuver by the military in a time of uncertainty and hysteria and grave military danger, a gesture toward UMT with a minimum of debate was adopted as a rider on the extension of selective service. Had we given the attention to UMT which this dangerous and loaded subject required, it would have taken 3 weeks of strenuous debate. There was not that much time, so the Senate spent less than 3 hours debating the UMT provisions of the Universal Training Act of 1951. That is legislative history.

Soon, for the first time, if it is brought up—and I hope most sincerely it will not be brought up—we will have before the Senate, either for adoption or rejection, UMT spelled out in some detail and in a single package. However, there is this difference: This time in the Senate it will be debated fully. Senators will not be asked again to buy a pig in a poke. This time every facet in this momentous proposal will be explored and examined, not in an atmosphere of hysteria, but in the cold, calm climate of logic and reason. I plead with every Senator to keep his mind open and weigh every word of the debate for and against a proposal which would strike at the heart of the free-enterprise system and would destroy at one fell swoop the freedom of choice in these United States.

But I hope most sincerely its proponents will have the wisdom and devotion to the people's views to drop UMT now. This is a democracy where the people rule, and the people are against UMT.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I am completely intrigued by what my distinguished friend from Colorado has just said. He said this is a democracy in which the people rule. It has been my understanding that we are privileged to live in a republic. I would appreciate it deeply if the Senator from Colorado would care to pursue that subject for a little while longer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course the United States is a republic, but we proceed in this Republic, as I hope we will always continue to do, under a democratic form of Government. I do not care to get into a technical argument with respect to a republic versus a democracy. When I speak of democracy and the rule of the people I refer to rule of the people, by the people, for the people. I repeat, Mr. President, while this is a republic it is also a democracy, where the people rule, and the people are against UMT.

Every farm organization is opposed to UMT: the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and the Farmers Union. The A. F. of L. and the CIO are opposed. The churches of America, with their multiplied millions of adherents, are opposed. Many, many thoughtful educators of the country are opposed. And judging by the stacks and stacks of letters from the little people back home, the people at the grass roots are against UMT. They are not apt to change their minds either. That being the case, the chances of the United States ever adopting UMT is nil. The vote of 236 to 162 in the House should open the eyes and the minds of UMT supporters. What will it take to convince them of their folly? Only Mother Goose is equal to an accurate analysis of the situation we face with respect to UMT:

Humpty Dumpty sat on a wall,
Humpty Dumpty had a great fall;
All the king's horses and all the king's men
Cannot put Humpty Dumpty together again.

No more time or thought should be wasted on this fool idea. But our defenses in the dangerous world in which we live need to be planned, and carefully planned. We have wasted too many years chasing the rainbow of UMT. It is time for the Pentagon and the Congress to wake up and plan our defenses on the realities and not on General Marshall's pipedream of UMT. The "Pentagon Brass" is said to despise the National Guard, and a well-trained voluntary military Reserve, and ROTC training in high schools and colleges. But these are the only paths to a well-trained civilian military personnel which the people, who are the bosses of these United States, will stand for. Accordingly, and with humility and earnestness, I plead with the Pentagon to abandon its hopeless campaign for UMT and beat a strategic retreat to better and nobler things. Let us stop our unproductive flirtation with this UMT fetish and be on with the job of defending America.

Progress in this world is attained through the process of trial and error. That is the way the scientist arrives at the truth. That is the way the artist reaches perfection. That is the way governments ought to function.

But here we have the contrary approach. Senate bill 2441 is based, not upon trial and error, but upon a proposal to abandon what has been proved to be surprisingly successful and in keeping with the best traditions of democracy, to adopt a tyrannical military system which has never worked out satisfactorily in any country, and which is violently repugnant to democracy and is the instrument of fascism and tyranny.

Selective service was a very crude draft law in the Civil War. Draftees were permitted to hire substitutes, and the evils of favoritism and privilege were notorious and rampant. In World War I, many of these wrongs were corrected, but the draft was still a rather crude arrangement. However, in World War II, the draft, at least in theory, became selective and discriminating. It undertook to select men for the type of service for which by training, experience, and aptitude they were best fitted. But it was selective in theory only, because the military brass did not choose to make it selective in fact. They seemed to enjoy assigning an engineer to picking up cigarette butts from an officer's lawn, a cook to driving a truck, and a truck driver to digging ditches. In private life a cook enters a kitchen of his own accord because that is the kind of work which he can do and which he likes to do. That is precisely why a truck driver drives a truck and a tailor sews on buttons. Because America fosters and encourages the freedom of choice, Americans have developed into a happy, contented, and strong society. Economists and historians call such a system free enterprise. A system of free enterprise can be based only on the freedom of choice. If freedom of choice is denied to persons, how can we demand that it be preserved for industry? Make no mistake, if the freedom of choice is denied to American youth, it will not be retained very long by business generally.

Selective service is basically sound and equitable, and it will function perfectly whenever the military brass forego their sadistic impulse to be arbitrary about it, and begin assigning men drafted under it on the basis of studied fitness and aptitude for the job. However, in spite of a disheartening lack of full cooperation by the military brass, selective service must be acknowledged as a huge success. In World War II, it placed 12,000,000 men in the field without destroying our economy and with a high degree of efficiency, equality, and satisfaction. One section of the country was treated as was every other section. Every county in the Nation, east, west, north, and south, contributed its share of manpower to the military on an equal basis and with a minimum of complaint from anywhere. Furthermore, selective service in the Korean war has

performed well. But, in all of our wars men have been ready long before their equipment was ready. That will always be the case in a democracy. The truth is that it is easier to mobilize and train men than it is to procure and manufacture the very best and most modern equipment which will be required by these trained men.

The point I make is that now the Senate Armed Services Committee wants to junk selective service, which has been a proven success, for a discredited military system called universal military training. Common sense dictates that when there is discovered and developed a plan or system which works well, it should be retained and perfected. We should stay with selective service because it has worked well and because with a more understanding attitude by the military it can be made to work even better.

The Senate Armed Services Committee says that selective service is only temporary, that in 1955 the law expires. It has been extended before, and it can be extended again if world conditions worsen and if Congress wants to extend that law. The trouble seems to be that the Senate Armed Services Committee does not trust the Armed Services Committee of 1955 or the Eighty-fourth Congress to do what is wise or necessary. I do not mean to be critical of any Senate committee, but this Congress ought to have more confidence in future Congresses. The present Armed Services Committee is one of the really great Senate committees of all times. Its chairman, the junior Senator from Georgia, RICHARD RUSSELL, is recognized nationally as perhaps the ablest Senator in the Eighty-second Congress. I could call the roll of that great committee and could pay a well-deserved tribute to every member as an outstanding and patriotic American. I think the United States is fortunate in having so many able men at this time serving on the Senate Armed Services Committee. However, I have a feeling that in 1955 the same thing may be said as truthfully with respect to the membership of the Armed Services Committee of 1955. I have been in the Senate quite a while now, and it is my observation that the committees of Congress grow stronger, rather than weaker, with the passage of time.

Let me express my personal hope and belief that the present very able and very wise chairman of the Armed Services Committee will be either its chairman or the President of these United States in 1955. America and its Congress are going forward, not backward. For us to pretend that only this Congress has the courage and the intelligence to act for future Congresses is ludicrous, stupid, and slightly on the insolent side.

Mr. President, please do not overlook these obvious facts: In 1955 the Armed Services Committee will have a distinct advantage over the present very able committee. Many things about world conditions which now are very puzzling and in a highly speculative status will be common knowledge. Russia's hot war intentions, Western European defense performance, United Nations' strength or weakness, the onward march of science toward new, different, and more lethal weapons, political developments in the Orient, stabilization or lack of stabilization in the Near East, the status of German and Japanese cooperation, progress in the unification of our armed services, and many, many other fundamental and basic developments will be known to the membership of the Armed Services Committee and the Congress in 1955. If we do our job of this day, and stop trying to legislate for the Eighty-fourth Congress, all will be much happier.

In this debate those of us who oppose UMT will undertake to prove—

First. That UMT vetoes the freedom of choice and is contrary to the free-enterprise system, the system which has made America great and powerful;

Second. That UMT is tyrannical and promotes totalitarianism;

Third. That UMT would lead to social, moral, financial, educational, political, scientific, and military weakness;

Fourth. That the 6 months boot-training period in UMT will not give the country a trained military personnel, but will merely provide "cannon fodder" for overseas adventures;

Fifth. That UMT will encourage extravagant and wasteful use of men and money and will squander, instead of save, the taxpayers' money;

Sixth. That UMT will not equalize the sacrifices of war, but will increase those sacrifices;

Seventh. That UMT is incompatible with selective service and cannot do one thing to strengthen the military forces which cannot be done under selective service;

Eighth. That UMT is a long step toward military fascism, which is as great a danger as communism;

Ninth. That UMT will impose 7½ years of bondage upon American youths from age 18 through age 26;

Tenth. That while a trained military reserve is essential to our defense, it should be and can be set up on a volunteer basis, and not made compulsory;

Eleventh. That while UMT may be in the private interest of the men in the Pentagon, it is not in the public interest of the American people;

Twelfth. That in this democracy public support for UMT is utterly lacking;

Thirteenth. That UMT will destroy the National Guard;

Fourteenth. That to regiment the youth of America will create a powerful Federal bureaucracy;

Fifteenth. That strategically UMT is a grave mistake;

Sixteenth. That UMT does not harmonize with our responsibilities in NATO;

Seventeenth. That UMT is the road to war and follows the false philosophy that perpetual peace can be attained through perpetual war;

Eighteenth. That arms, weapons, machines of war, and not men, are, have been, and will continue to be the bottleneck in preparedness;

Nineteenth. That UMT is a false hope, a Maginot line, and a destroyer of nations;

Twentieth. That we must look to history for a correct appraisal of the destructive elements in UMT;

Twenty-first. That regimentation is the antithesis of democracy; and in the opposition to UMT, freedom is the issue;

Twenty-second. That adoption of UMT now would impair and confuse defense efforts and hinder mobilization generally; and

Twenty-third. That the Reserve components created pursuant to the 6 months of training can be used in work battalions and can be subjected to indoctrination in whatever political theories are deemed advisable by the military and the President.

On each of these 23 points full and complete arguments will be made in the Senate if UMT, now pigeonholed in the House, is revived and reconsidered by the Eighty-second Congress.

If any one of these contentions is proven—and all of them will be proven, in my opinion, if this debate is forced on us—how can any Senator in good conscience vote for the adoption of UMT? At least every Senator should keep his mind open until the evidence is presented and should give the opponents of this very drastic and discredited proposal the chance to submit their arguments for what they may be worth before reaching a firm decision. If the question must be debated now, I plead with every Senator to follow it closely and decide the issue on the basis of merit and on the facts. UMT is the most important issue which has faced the American people since the abolition of slavery. Had the House adopted it, it might very well have destroyed the most successful Government which history has yet witnessed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington has a very high regard and respect for his distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Colorado; but, even so, I think it proper to offer some objections to the substance of what the Senator has just said to the Senate. I have always thought and now believe the Senator from Colorado to be an exceedingly fair-minded man; but, for reasons unknown to me, I think this morning he has been, though unintentionally, unfair. The Senator from Colorado has expressed it as his considered hope that the issue of UMT should not be debated on the floor of the Senate at its present session; yet the Senator from Colorado has just finished offering 23 considered reasons, which would lead him to vote against UMT if it came before us for debate. I think fairness would dictate that anyone who wished to attack the bill before it came to this floor should encourage the bringing of the bill to the floor, in order that others who desired to do so might defend it.

I need not point out to the Senator from Colorado that 13 Members of the Senate of the United States, 7 Democrats and 6 Republicans, following weeks, months, and, in some instances, years of consideration have recommended to the Senate of the United States that the committee's version of a system of universal military training is in the best interest of our Nation. The Senator from

Colorado has said that common sense would, in his opinion, impel anyone to vote against UMT. I do not believe for an instant that he sought to indict the collective and individual intelligence and common sense of 13 of his conferees.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure the Senator from Colorado did not make any such statement as the able Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has attributed to him. At any rate, if there is anything in my statement which would lead to any such conclusion, I want to say it is a mistaken conclusion, because I believe that Senators should have every opportunity to express their beliefs and to cast their votes freely. Certainly I would be the last person in the Senate to want to restrict in any way or to limit in any way the expression of opinion or the vote of any Senator.

Mr. CAIN. I could not more fully agree with what I know the intention of my friend from Colorado to have been. I commented as I did because the Senator from Colorado, after attacking the UMT bill, expressed the hope that the bill, which was reported to the Senate Calendar by 13 of his colleagues, for reasons which appeared to them to be strongly sufficient, would not be debated.

The Senator from Colorado, however, said one thing which I believe to be true and important. He said that if the Senate Armed Services Committee's UMT bill comes before the Senate it will be debated in an atmosphere of logic and reason. Because such an atmosphere is going to be practically certain, it appears to me that it would be in the public interest for the Senate of the United States at the earliest possible moment to debate thoroughly, fully, and conclusively an issue which the Senator from Colorado has characterized as being the most important since the abolition of slavery in the United States.

I rose only to present a contrary view to that presently held by the Senator from Colorado. I am speaking for other members of the Armed Services Committee who are not present at the moment. I am by no means indicating that the Senator from Colorado is not completely entitled to his own view on this or any other question, but I have sought to point out that because the issue of UMT is pregnantly important, it ought to benefit as the result of debate, in which the collective and individual attitudes of all Senators will be expressed.

Early in the remarks of the Senator from Colorado, I inquired whether he would indicate to me the differences between the United States as a democracy—for that was his definition of it—and as a Republic, which, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington, the United States is.

I understood the Senator from Colorado to imply very strongly that if it was the opinion of many of those who write to a Member of the Congress that a particular proposal is not a desirable or popular one it should not be debated by the Congress of the United States.

My view, in conclusion, is simply this, that since the United States is a Republic, an obligation is imposed upon every Member of the Congress to represent the interests of the Nation as the individual Member thinks best. Against that definition, in which I believe so strongly, I think it is for the Senate of the United States, through its debate on the issue of universal military training, to represent and speak for the people of the Nation as individually and collectively the Members think is best for the people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I subscribe to the statement the Senator from Washington has just made. Of course I believe his statement to be correct, and that has always been my attitude. I was not saying that the bill should not be considered. Quite to the contrary, I want it considered in all of its ramifications in the Senate. The point I was trying to make was that since universal military training is not going to be adopted by the United States Congress, since the people of the country are strongly against it, we ought to quit thinking of it as the foundation of our military defenses. That is the point I was attempting to make. I know, and I think the hearings before the Senator's committee will show, that universal military training is considered by some persons to be the foundation of the Reserve system. If universal military training is not going to be adopted, we had better take another look at the Reserve problem and base it on a reality—something which we are going to have, and not on something we are merely going to talk about endlessly.

Mr. CAIN. I understand thoroughly, I think, the point which the Senator sought to establish, but I conceive it to be based on several false premises. The Senator stated that universal military training would not be approved by the Congress at this session. I think that remains as an assumption which may be destroyed by future action. The Senator also said it was his opinion, to which most obviously he is entitled, that the people of this country do not believe in universal military training. My own feeling is that such an impression is an assumption which will not be borne out by the facts.

Permit me, please, to make this comment with reference to the reserve question. The Senate Armed Services Committee, through its 13 members representing both parties, are looking for a way, and perhaps we have not yet found the proper way, to make certain that citizens will serve their great Nation by fighting only in one war. The tragedy of the day in which we live, and it must be very apparent to the distinguished Senator from Colorado and to every other thinking and patriotic American, is that tens of thousands of young Americans are engaged in bloody warfare in Korea who have previously made a contribution to their Nation in terms of blood, injury, and suffering, in World War II, while tens and tens of thousands of young Americans of this generation are not committed to action who, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington, ought to be in Korea.

What the Senate Armed Services Committee seeks urgently to find is a solution for what is admittedly one of the most difficult questions before our generation. If on the floor of the Senate it can be proved to us that our recommended version of a system of universal military training is inadequate to the consummation of our great objective, then I think I speak rightly in saying that every member of that committee, Democrat or Republican, should summarily and rapidly drop universal military training in favor of what others can prove to us is a better alternative. The Senator from Colorado offers no alternative. No reasonable alternative is in sight. But for as long a time as we permit our concept of a system of universal military training to stagnate in pigeonholes of committees of the Congress, just as long will we avoid our great responsibility for finding a way by which, if there must be war, we can permit those who have once served in the Armed Forces to contribute to our civilian life in time of armed conflict, while those who in the past have not served in the military forces will carry the major portion of the burdens of whatever war there may be in the generation in which they live.

ALLEGED CORRUPTION IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article by James E. Roper which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., on March 8, 1952, with reference to charges of corruption in the Department of Agriculture.

In this article Mr. Brannan takes exception to certain remarks I had made in the Senate regarding their handling of the Camp Crowder leases.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAMS PUTS CRITICAL EDITORIAL IN RECORD AFTER BRANNAN HITS IT—SECRETARY BLAMES SENATOR FOR DISTORTIONS AND RECKLESS CHARGES IN MAGAZINE PIECE

(By James E. Roper)

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan paused in a political fight with Senator WILLIAMS today and cried, "Foul."

The circumstances were unusual.

Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, has been shouting that corruption abounds in the Agriculture Department's crop-storage program.

So when Secretary Brannan recently ran across a Farm Journal editorial denouncing the Agriculture Department, he blamed it all on Senator WILLIAMS.

Secretary Brannan clipped out the editorial and mailed it to Senator WILLIAMS along with a blistering letter.

He told the Senator that the editorial is "an illustration of the distortion and misinformation which you are circulating."

"I should think," the Secretary wrote, "that a United States Senator would feel an

obligation to speak with responsibility, rather than to make reckless charges."

Senator WILLIAMS in due course received Secretary Brannan's missive, but was more impressed by the editorial than by the letter. In fact, Senator WILLIAMS thought the editorial denouncing the Agriculture Department was so fine he promptly put it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With that, Senator WILLIAMS relaxed presumably happy that Secretary Brannan personally furnished him such a fine anti-Brannan statement.

Agriculture Department officials angrily claimed it was unfair for Senator WILLIAMS to put the editorial in the RECORD without also inserting Secretary Brannan's letter.

When the matter reached Secretary Brannan's desk, he joined the painful cries of "foul" and ordered his letter made public.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I shall this afternoon set the record straight for Mr. Brannan by documenting my previous remarks in reference to Camp Crowder. First, I read into the RECORD the letter referred to in the above article which letter was released by the Secretary to the press last Friday:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 3, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I am enclosing a copy of the editorial in the March issue of the Farm Journal as an illustration of the distortion and misinformation about the Department of Agriculture which you are circulating. I should think that a United States Senator would feel an obligation to speak with responsibility, rather than to make reckless charges which the very nature of his position circulates widely. It is impossible to estimate the damage that has been done to the farm programs because of the grossly false statements you have made about the Camp Crowder case.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the excellent editorial to which Mr. Brannan referred and which he forwarded with his letter. This editorial appeared in the March 1952 issue of the Farm Journal.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SCANDAL IN AGRICULTURE

Farmers have watched with rising apprehension the growing series of disclosures that all has not been honest in the grain-storage program.

Secretary Brannan's immense agro-political machine has ground out some unearned profits for a number of people who knew how to make deals with the right people at the right time. The profits were extracted, of course, from the pockets of taxpayers.

These revelations inevitably associate the Department of Agriculture with the odorous corruption in other branches of Government—corruption which the Truman administration has tolerated until disclosures have forced belated action.

Farmers themselves will be the first to condemn the kinds of dishonesty which have been coming to light. Moreover, farmers who want the loan programs continued will recognize that an indignant public, already somewhat persuaded that farmers are specially favored, will react violently to the exposure of dishonest dealings.

The shadiest episodes so far revealed are those in which persons with political contacts have gained quick fortunes. Military structures—warehouses, airplane hangars, and other large buildings—have been leased at cheap rates to newly formed corporations. These outfits, in turn, have leased space to the Commodity Credit Corporation for grain storage at much higher rates.

According to Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who brought to light the Internal Revenue scandals, five men set up the Midwest Storage & Realty Co. in Kansas City, and for less than $1,000 a month leased surplus buildings at Camp Crowder, Mo. They then rented the buildings to the CCC, and in 20 months collected $382,201. One of the five men was formerly a Democratic candidate for Governor of Missouri.

Senator WILLIAMS on the floor of the Senate February 5 presented a list of 29 Government properties, all former defense facilities, which had been leased to private parties, and then rented to the CCC for storage.

There is, of course, no reason why the CCC should not rent such storage direct from other Government agencies at the same bargain rates or less. In fact, it does have four such deals.

Then there is the lengthening series of shortages. In these instances, companies and individuals have signed contracts to store CCC grain, and have accepted the grain, but have not had it on hand when directed to ship it out. How much collusion with officials may be involved no one knows. Several department employees have been fired, and proceedings have been instituted against some. Taxpayers will make up the lost millions.

These are depressing developments. No scandal has touched the valuable research and educational activities of the Department of Agriculture. But the handling of billions inevitably offers strong temptations to men whose greed exceeds their principles.

The temptations are stronger when tolerance of wrongdoing has existed at the very center of the administration. The cure can come only with a new administration whose top leadership, itself honest, demands the utmost integrity in all its departments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. For the information of the Senate, I shall read into the RECORD my letter to Mr. Brannan in reply, dated March 4, 1952:

MARCH 4, 1952.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thanks very much for forwarding to me the copy of the editorial which appeared in the Farm Journal of March 1952.

I had overlooked this editorial, and thinking perhaps that others might have overlooked it, in line with your suggestions, I am incorporating it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. President, I call particular attention to the section of this editorial to which Mr. Brannan took exception. I read it for the information of the Senate:

According to Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, who brought to light the Internal Revenue scandals, five men set up the Midwest Storage & Realty Co. in Kansas City, and for less than $1,000 a month leased surplus buildings at Camp Crowder, Mo. They then rented the buildings to the CCC and in 20 months collected $382,201.

I am glad to note that he apparently agrees to the rest of the editorial regarding his "Agro-political machine."

I shall now proceed to document and prove the figures contained in my speech of October 8, 1952, to which the Secretary objected.

Mr. President, under date of August 10, 1951, I wrote a letter to Ralph S. Trigg, President, Commodity Credit Corporation, which reads as follows:

AUGUST 10, 1951.

Mr. RALPH S. TRIGG,
President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TRIGG: Will you please advise me of the total amount which has been paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Midwest Storage & Realty Co., of Kansas City, for the use of their storage facilities at Camp Crowder, Mo., also the period for which this property was rented.

Will you also please furnish me with similar information as to dates and amounts paid to the V. M. Harris Grain Co., of Scott City, Kans., for the use of warehouses at Camp Crowder which were under their jurisdiction.

Other than officials of the companies, who interceded on behalf of these leasing transactions?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. President, under date of September 19, 1951, I received from the Department of Agriculture a letter, accompanied by three tables, addressed to myself, signed by G. H. Geissler, Administrator, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point. This letter itemizes the payments on the Camp Crowder project by the CCC.

There being no objection, the letter and tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., September 19, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is again made to your letter of August 10, and our acknowledgment of August 24, regarding amounts paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Midwest Storge & Realty Co., of Kansas City, Mo., and the V. M. Harris Grain Co., of Scott City, Kans., for the use of warehouses at Camp Crowder, Mo.

Regarding these transactions, our Kansas PMA commodity office at Kansas City informs us as follows:

"We are enclosing a list of the total amount of storage paid to each of the warehousemen included in your request. In case reference is made to the lease made between the War Assets Administration, now General Services Administration, and the companies, it will be necessary that you contact those parties since there may have been extensions of leases involved regarding which we would have no information. We entered into a uniform grain storage agreement with Midwest Storage & Realty Co. on September 19, 1949, and although all of the grain has been shipped, this storage contract is still in force.

"We executed a uniform grain storage agreement with V. M. Harris Grain Co. on June 24, 1949. This contract was canceled by legal notice on June 30, 1951, however, we have not released bonds in connection with this agreement since complete settlement has not been made.

"The period of storage of grain in these warehouses was as follows:

"V. M. Harris Grain Co., Camp Crowder, Mo.: First shipment received July 4, 1949; final shipment, April 13, 1951.

"Midwest Storage & Realty Co., Camp Crowder, Mo.: First shipment received, October 24, 1949; final shipment, May 18, 1951.

"With reference to your last paragraph, it is not clear as to whether or not the information is desired regarding the leasing or in executing the uniform grain storage agreement. We would have no knowledge regarding the leasing of the facilities and wish to state that in connection with the execution of the uniform grain storage agreement, no one interceded in behalf of the interested parties."

Enclosed is a schedule of loading orders covering grain stored by these warehouses and the respective amounts paid, which we hope will give you the desired information.

Sincerely yours,

G. F. GEISSLER,
Administrator.

Midwest Storage & Realty, Inc., Camp Crowder, Mo., 9–8785

CORN

Loading order No.	Amount paid	Date
C–O–50595	$3,444.00	May 21, 1951
C–O–50592	2,772.12	May 9, 1951
C–O–50670	3,727.42	June 11, 1951
C–O–50671	3,989.41	June 12, 1951
C–O–50685	4,955.12	June 14, 1951
C–O–50683	4,778.30	June 12, 1951
C–O–50684	4,851.67	Do.
C–O–50672	4,309.09	Do.
C–O–50734	5,320.49	June 14, 1951
C–O–50735	5,532.49	Do.
C–O–50736	5,771.76	Do.
C–O–50737	5,978.59	June 19, 1951
C–O–50738	6,154.73	Do.
C–O–50739	6,784.51	Do.
C–O–50740	6,344.33	Do.
C–O–50741	6,607.51	Do.
C–O–50742	6,957.36	Do.
C–O–50743	7,187.25	June 29, 1951
C–O–50744	7,294.81	June 19, 1951
C–O–50745	9,057.17	June 29, 1951
June 30, 1950, periodic listing—corn	75,796.83	July 18, 1950
December 31, 1950, periodic listing—corn	36,502.34	Jan. 12, 1951
March 31, 1950, periodic listing—corn	158,083.81	Apr. 19, 1950
Total	382,201.11	

V. M. Harris Grain Co., 9–8768

GRAIN SORGHUMS

Loading order No.	Amount paid	Date
GS–0–50418	$2,944.99	June 5, 1951
GS–0–50417	983.65	May 10, 1951
GS–0–50419	3,163.79	June 5, 1951
GS–0–50460	4,589.75	Do.
GS–0–50461	4,055.53	June 15, 1951
GS–0–50462	5,083.80	June 5, 1951
GS–0–50463	4,736.07	Do.
GS–0–50464	5,148.30	June 12, 1951
GS–0–50465	4,944.53	June 5, 1951
GS–0–50466	4,456.87	June 12, 1951
GS–0–50467	4,578.36	June 5, 1951
GS–0–50416	4,384.75	June 18, 1951
W–H–K–0–50469	3,636.26	June 5, 1951
GS–0–50468	2,602.52	June 12, 1951
GS–9–73664	1,804.45	June 13, 1951
GS–9–73665	1,985.04	Do.
GS–9–73666	2,186.98	Do.
GS–9–73667	2,309.07	Do.
GS–9–73668	2,445.05	Do.
GS–9–73669	2,596.69	Do.
GS–9–73670	2,807.39	Do.
GS–9–73671	916.56	Do.
GS–9–73682	723.38	Do.
GS–9–73664–07		Do.
June 30, 1950, periodic payment—grain sorghums	19,032.79	Aug. 4, 1950
Do		
Do	6,022.55	Aug. 11, 1950
Do	53,763.61	Oct. 23, 1950
Dec. 31, 1949, periodic payment—grain sorghums	52,005.28	Jan. 30, 1950
Total	203,908.01	

V. M. Harris Grain Co., 9–8768—Continued

WHEAT

Loading order No.	Amount paid	Date
W–O–50687	$3,195.94	June 12, 1951
W–O–50686	2,883.65	Do.
W–O–8768–01	3,193.60	Do.
W–O–8768–02	3,647.14	Do.
W–O–8768–03	3,720.03	June 19, 1951
W–O–8768–04	3,455.86	June 15, 1951
W–O–8768–05	2,933.02	June 19, 1951
W–O–8768–07	2,979.13	June 22, 1951
W–O–8768–06	2,961.90	June 29, 1951
June 30, 1950, periodic payment—wheat	2,843.84	Aug. 4, 1950
Do	628.12	Aug. 11, 1950
Do	45.55	Aug. 4, 1950
Sept. 30, 1950, periodic payment—wheat	17,398.41	Nov. 2, 1950
Dec. 31, 1950, periodic payment—wheat	31,938.96	Feb. 12, 1951
Dec. 31, 1949, periodic payment—wheat	61,661.54	Jan. 30, 1950
Dec. 31, 1949, periodic payment—wheat (supplemental)	71.42	June 8, 1950
Mar. 31, 1950, periodic payment—wheat	24,901.87	May 9, 1950
	168,549.68	

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to read the last sentence of Mr. Brannan's letter, as follows:

It is impossible to estimate the damage that has been done to the farm programs because of the grossly false statements you have made about the Camp Crowder case.

Yet here is the first part of his objections proved by records from his own department.

The letter of the Department of Agriculture, dated September 19, 1951, signed by Mr. G. F. Geissler, and the accompanying tables, show the Department of Agriculture, through the Commodity Credit Corporation, paid Midwest Storage & Realty Co., $382,201.11 in rentals for the period for which they leased this property, which is exactly the same amount to which I referred, except that I omitted the 11 cents.

It is also interesting to note, Mr. President, that the Department of Agriculture paid to the V. M. Harris Grain Co., which had leased the other portion of the Camp Crowder grain facility, $203,903.01 for grain sorghums, and paid to the same company, V. M. Harris Grain Co., $168,549.68 for the storage of wheat.

Mr. President, one other statement to which Mr. Brannan took exception was a statement I made that the five men who had set up the Midwest Storage & Realty Co. at Kansas City had leased these buildings for less than $1,000 a month.

Specifically what I had said was that they leased these facilities from the General Services a Goverment agency for $11,270 per annum.

I mention at this point that the Government was represented in this deal by Quirk J. Bernard, Chief Administrator of War Assets Administration, Kansas City, Mo., a business associate of Dan M. Nee, who was one of the partners of the Midwest Realty Co.

Mr. Nee was formerly collector of internal revenue.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated September 26, 1951, to the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, Secretary of Defense, in which I asked for a breakdown of the amount that had been collected by the Department of Defense for those facilities.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 26, 1951.

Hon. ROBERT A. LOVETT,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am enclosing a list of former national defense facilities which have been utilized for varying periods of time for the storage of Commodity Credit Corporation commodities.

With reference to this list, will you please furnish the following information for each facility:

1. The name of the national defense agency which originally leased the facility. If not a national defense agency, could you indicate the Government agency which did?

2. The date of the original lease. Is it still in effect? If not, the date of expiration or cancellation.

3. The amount collected by the Federal Government as rental.

4. The name and official position of the representative who handled the leases on behalf of the Government.

Your attention to this request is sincerely appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

P. S.—Will you please return the enclosed list with your reply.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I next ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter dated October 3, 1951, signed by Mr. William C. Foster, Acting Secretary of Defense, in which he said that the facilities had been turned over to the Munitions Board who would make reply.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., October 3, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have your letter of September 26, requesting information about former defense facilities that have been utilized for varying periods of time for the storage of Commodity Credit Corporation commodities.

I am referring your letter to the Chairman of the Munitions Board, with the request that he furnish you with a responsive answer to your request. You should hear from the Chairman of the Munitions Board or his representative in the near future.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. FOSTER,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent that this reply of the Munitions Board be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., November 30, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Further reference is made to your letter of September 26, 1951, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, requesting information relative to former or present defense facilities that have been utilized for the storage of Commodity Credit Corporation commodities.

In our reply to your letter of September 26, 1951, dated October 31, 1951, footnote [1] to Enclosure B indicates that information concerning Camp Crowder, Neosha, Mo., was

not presently available and would be furnished at a later date. The information has now been secured, and is set forth herein.

The lease of the Harris Grain Co., executed by the General Services Administration, was transferred to the Department of the Army at the time custody of this property was assumed by that Department on February 2, 1951. The lessee completed vacation of the property on May 17, 1951. Rental for the entire term of the lease, in the amount of $33,181.91, was collected by the General Services Administration to June 30, 1951. The Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, estimates that the liability of the lessee for restoration costs under the terms of the lease is $24,767, and that in addition, the lessee has an estimated liability of $15,000 for deferred maintenance under the terms of the lease. A settlement of these two items of liability is in the process of negotiation.

The lease of the Midwest Storage Realty Co., executed by the General Services Administration, was also transferred to the Department of the Army on February 2, 1951. The lessee completed vacation of the property on June 10, 1951. Rental in the amount of $14,475.47 was collected by the General Services Administration to March 15, 1951. Rental in the amount of $2,100.32 was collected by the Division Engineer, Corps of Engineers, for the period March 15 to June 10, 1951. The Division Engineer estimates that the liability of the lessee for restoration costs under the terms of the lease is $59,953.25. A settlement of this item of liability is in the process of negotiation.

General Services Administration has informally advised this office that the amount of rental collected in connection with the Hemp Mill Plancor, New Richmond, Minn., should be indicated on enclosure B as $15,000 instead of $1,500.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS H. GRISWOLD,
Major General, USAF,
Military Director.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, both this letter and the letter from the Department of Agriculture confirm the fact that the property had been rented for $11,270 a year, and they also point out the total rentals collected from Midwest Storage & Realty Co. for the period involved were $16,575.79, of which $14,435.47 was collected from the General Services Administration, and $2,100.32 from the division engineer.

In that letter it is also pointed out that the V. M. Harris Grain Co., which had likewise rented its part of the facilities to the Commodity Credit Corporation for around $380,000, had paid to the General Services Administration $33,181.91.

In each instance subsequent payments for liability of tenant were in process of negotiation. However, both the Department of Agriculture and the Munitions Board records confirm my statement in regard to the annual rental involved.

Mr. President, on October 8, 1951, speaking in connection with the Camp Crowder transaction, I made the following statement in reference to their profits:

Their report shows that at the end of August 1950, 11 months after its forming, the company had realized a profit, after all expenses, of $94,226.55. This is represented by $57,350.57, being carried as surplus, and $36,875.98 being paid to officers and stockholders.

Mr. President, on August 29, 1951, I asked the Honorable Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, if he would furnish me a copy of a report which his agency had assembled showing the profits of this group. I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Mr. Warren be incorporated at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 29, 1951.

Hon. LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: Will you please furnish me at the earliest possible moment with a copy of the General Accounting Office's report No. I-17038, dated January 11, 1951, complete with exhibits, concerning the Government's leasing of the buildings at Camp Crowder, Mo.

Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On August 31, 1951, I received a reply from the Comptroller General, in which he said:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, August 31, 1951.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: In accordance with your request of August 29, 1951, I am pleased to furnish you a copy of a report of investigation conducted by the General Accounting Office, complete with exhibits, concerning the leasing of Government-owned buildings at Camp Crowder, Mo.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. President, I shall offer this document as an official record of the Senate but first I shall quote from this report, as the source of my information and to prove the accuracy of my previous remarks. In the original statement I said that the company had as of that date realized profits of $94,226.55, of which $36,875.98 had been paid in salaries to the officers and stockholders. To prove that statement I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report—page 14—under the heading "Administrative payroll," be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Of the total amount of $40,052.41 reflected by the administrative payroll account, the amount of $36,875.98 had been paid to the officers and stockholders, and the balance had been paid to Messrs. Ebright, Everett, and Mosely, who have served in supervisory capacities at Camp Crowder. Records and correspondence disclosed it was decided to pay the officers and Mr. Edwards during the latter part of June 1950 for their services up to that time, and the officers monthly thereafter. It may be noted that salaries paid in June, after deduction of withholding tax, equaled or exceeded the amounts of each of the individuals had invested in the company.

	Through June 30, 1950		July and August 1950		Total
	Net	W/H	Net	W/H	
A. H. Myers	$5,000	$1,033.34	$727.32	$172.22	$6,932.88
John Stark	5,000	1,033.34	727.32	172.22	6,932.88
Dan M. Nee	5,000	988.10	743.92	164.68	6,896.70
Paul R. Edwards	5,000	1,033.34	-------	-------	6,033.34
Harry Easley	7,500	1,193.47	1,187.80	198.91	10,080.18
Total	27,500	5,281.59	3,386.36	708.03	36,875.98

Mr. WILLIAMS. The report shows that A. H. Meyers was paid $6,932.88; John Stark, $6,932.88; Dan M. Nee, the former collector of internal revenue, $6,896.70; Paul R. Edwards, $6,033.34; Harry Easley, $10,080.18, or a total of $36,875.98, which, again, is exactly, to the penny, in accordance with the statement which I placed in the RECORD on October 8, 1951.

I also said that in addition to the salaries paid out, the records, according to the Comptroller General, showed a profit of $57,357.57. That information was taken from page 13 of the report of the Comptroller General, under the title "Statement of Operations." I ask unanimous consent that the entire page 13 of the report be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the page referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Statement of operations from commencement of operations to Aug. 31, 1950

INCOME

Income from Commodity Credit Corporation grain contracts	$234,807.32
Loss on sale of equipment	2,193.32
Net incomes	232,614.00

EXPENSES

Administrative payroll (principally to officers) [1]	40,052.41
Payroll (labor)	37,572.82
Insurance (principally on grain)	38,069.09
Subcontracts (principally trucking)	11,662.16
Demurrage	13,429.14
Rent (to liquidator, war assets)	9,689.17
Lumber (repair of buildings)	4,584.15
Depreciation	3,053.04
Corn salvage	2,835.27
Repairs, parts, etc	1,848.64
Supplies, printing, and office expense	1,818.51
Grain-handling charges	1,354.48
Gas and oil	1,315.39
Surety bond	1,250.00
Missouri wholesale grain department (weighing)	1,152.19
Plant security—guards	715.00
Telephone and telegraph	716.92
Travel expenses	721.89
Maintain trucks	677.27
Interest expense	653.40
Legal and professional	434.00
Express and freight	645.23
Contract trucks	403.97
Miscellaneous	294.86
Power	255.18
Taxes	59.25
Total	175,263.43
Profit	[2] 57,350.57

[1] Gross, includes W/H tax.
[2] To balance sheet:

Accrued income tax	$4,734.63
Surplus	52,615.94
Total	57,350.57

Mr. WILLIAMS. I may say again that the figures tally, to the penny, with the statement which I placed in the RECORD on October 8, 1951.

I also made the statement in my speech that—

The General Accounting Office further pointed out that the profit in subsequent months would be at a substantially higher percentage basis due to the fact that in the first few months all expenses of getting the property ready were charged off as current expenses.

In order to determine the accuracy of that statement, I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report of the Comptroller General on page 15, under the heading "Profit (Surplus) $57,350.57," showing a breakdown of that figure, and how it was arrived at, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFIT (SURPLUS) $57,350.57

For the reasons noted under the preceding caption, profits appear to have been stated as nearly accurate as the variable conditions of the operations will permit. It further appears that if the corn is left in storage through June 1951, earnings for the ensuing year will be much greater than those reflected for the 10-month period ending August 31, 1950, for the reason that repair and rehabilitation of buildings in preparation for storing, and excessive unloading charges (which greatly exceeded the contract rate of 1½ cents per bushel), will not be recurrent items. Almost all of the $37,572.82 payroll expense represented hiring of day laborers during the unloading period, none of whom were said to have been familiar with the work. In addition, almost all of the subcontract expense ($11,662.16); demurrage ($13,429.14); lumber ($4,584.15); and parts of many other classes of expenses occurred during the 4-month period November 1949 to February 1950. While no accounts had been provided to segregate expenses in connection with the preparation of the buildings and unloading, they would appear to exceed $75,000. The amount of $30,627.05 was received from the Commodity Credit Corporation for unloading.

As an offset to the prospective earnings for storage, Mr. Easley estimated that loading-out expense will approximate $30,000. At the contract rate of three-fourths cent per bushel only about one-half such amount will be received from the Commodity Credit Corporation for such service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also made the statement that 3 days after the corporation was set up on September 15, 1949, the company leased from the War Assets Administration, under lease No. R. P. 24–1349, 113 buildings at Camp Crowder at an annual rental of $11,270, which lease was negotiated just 3 days after the corporation had been formed. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the report on page 9, under the heading "Leases—Liquidator of War Assets," be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, to confirm the statements to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEASES—LIQUIDATOR OF WAR ASSETS

Three leases have been made between the Liquidator of War Assets and the Midwest Company; the original, an amendment thereto, and a supplement which cancels the first two. Expiration dates for all three were September 15, 1950. A lease covering the ensuing year was in process at time of this examination.

Lease RP–24–1349, executed and effective September 15, 1949, designated 113 buildings, for which lessee shall pay $1 per building at time of execution, and 2 cents per annum per square foot of usable floor space from date the buildings are occupied except for three buildings for which space rental shall be 4 and 5 cents per square foot.

Mr. WILLIAMS. On page 4 of the same report we are told that this corporation was chartered September 12, 1949, with an authorized capitalization of $50,000 of which only $25,000 was paid in and that this was not paid in until October 18, 1949, or after all leases had been signed.

On September 19, 1949—quoting further from my speech of October 8—I said:

The Midwest Storage and Realty Company leased this same property to the Commodity Credit Corporation (lease T44–2–CCC–399) for the storage of grain. Mr. W. B. Walton, Director of CCC, signed this lease on behalf of CCC.

I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a paragraph from the report on page 9, entitled "Emergency Grain Storage Contracts With Commodity Credit Corporation," which confirms that portion of the statement to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMERGENCY GRAIN STORAGE CONTRACTS WITH COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Appended as exhibit No. 4 is a copy of Uniform Grain Storage Agreement T–44–2–CCC–399, and supplement thereto, both signed by W. R. Walton, Director, Commodity Credit Corporation, Kansas City, and A. H. Myers, president of Midwest Storage & Realty Co., which cover the period September 19, 1949, to December 19, 1950. The uniform grain storage agreement was changed by deletions and by supplement in the following particulars:

Mr. WILLIAMS. On the same date I made the statement that on October 18, 1949—

One month after the company was incorporated and leases had been signed with both War Assets and the CCC, the five stockholders of the Midwest Storage & Realty Co. issued checks to the company for $5,000 each, representing the $25,000 paid in capital stock. This means that at the time the leases were signed with the two Government agencies the net worth of the company was exactly zero.

That statement is confirmed on page 14 of the report of the Comptroller General, under the subsection entitled "Capital Stock, Cash on Hand, and Notes Payable." I ask unanimous consent that that portion of the report be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL STOCK, CASH ON HAND, AND NOTES PAYABLE

On October 18, 1949, each of the four officers of the Midwest company and Paul R. Edwards, a general contractor, made cash purchases of $5,000 worth of capital stock. During November 1949 each of the above loaned the corporation $5,000. Expenses for rehabilitation of the buildings, unloading, and demurrage proved to be exceptionally large. During December 1949 and the first 3 months of 1950, $55,000 was borrowed from banks; Mr. Easley advanced $10,000 from personal funds; and $4,500 was received from sale of equipment, providing working funds in total amount of $119,500. As of March 31, 1950, cash on hand and in banks was $812.87. On April 13, 1950, check in the amount of $158,063.81 was received from the Commodity Credit Corporation covering unloading charges and storage earned from commencement of operations to March 31, 1950. From the proceeds of such checks, all loans from stockholders and banks were repaid except $4,533.40, which was repaid in August 1950, after receipt of check from the Commodity Credit Corporation in amount of $75,796.83, covering storage charges for the period April 1 to June 30, 1950.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the letter of September 19, 1951, which I received from the Department of Agriculture the following statement is made:

Regarding these transactions, our Kansas PMA Commodity Office at Kansas City informed us as follows:

"We would have no knowledge regarding the leacing of the facilities and wish to state that in connection with the execution of the Uniform Grain Storage agreement, no one interceded in behalf of the interested parties."

In other words, they deny that they had any knowledge of these facilities being available prior to the time that this lease was negotiated. I have already pointed out how the company was formed on the 12th of September, 1949. Three days after it was organized a lease was negotiated with the War Assets Administration for the property at $11,270 a year. Four days later it was leased back to the Commodity Credit Corporation, another Government agency, at a rental for which $382,000 was collected during the succeeding months, with around $90,000 carried to profit.

I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter dated August 24, 1949, signed by A. H. Myers and addressed to Mr. John Cowan, Assistant Director of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Kansas City, Mo.

I point out that this letter is dated about 3 weeks before any of the negotiations officially were entered into. The property was not leased from the War Assets Administration until September 15, 1949, but yet there is in the files of the Department of Agriculture the letter of August 24, 1949, to which I have referred. In this letter Mr. Myers writes to the Commodity Credit Corporation that they already had available these facilities at Camp Crowder, and they began the negotiations for this lease, which clearly indicates that the entire transaction had been arranged prior to anyone signing on the dotted line.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MYERS & CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., August 24, 1949.

Mr. JOHN COWAN,
Assistant Director, Commodity Credit Corporation,
Kansas City, Mo.

DEAR MR. COWAN: With further regard to our conversation, concerning storage of corn, wheat, and milo, I wish to advise that we

have ample space at Camp Crowder for 5,000,000 to 8,000,000 bushels. We are attaching hereto a schedule of available buildings we propose to use. We prefer to handle all corn; however, we would store either corn, wheat, milo or the quantity of each, which would serve you best.

Should you be able to use this space, it would be handled under a separate corporation, formed by myself and partners.

We can meet your qualifications, and we are in a position to start taking 10 cars per day, within 3 days from the completion of a contract. At the end of 10 days, we can unload at the rate of 30 cars every 24 hours. If necessary, we can handle up to 40 cars.

The buildings we would use would be in excellent shape, to prevent waste and they would be weatherproof. We are equipped to use above-average methods to protect grain from varmints.

Trusting this gives you the desired information, I await your further command.

Cordially yours,

A. H. MYERS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, so far as I can see, that covers the various phases of the Camp Crowder operation which were referred to in the speech of October 8, 1951, and I think answers Mr. Brannan's charge that my statement regarding the Camp Crowder leases were grossly false or misleading.

I will send a copy of today's RECORD to Mr. Brannan and ask him, if he still objects to the facts as shown by the Comptroller General's report, to then point out specifically wherein he objects.

The fact that Mr. Myers, one of the individual partners, was himself a tax dodger and at that time owed $675,000 in taxes, and that he was defended by Mr. Dan Nee, a former collector of internal revenue, one of the officials of this same corporation, is confirmed as a matter of record. There is now pending in the courts his tax case which was started 6 or 7 days after I exposed the situation on the floor of the Senate.

Perhaps Mr. Brannan's statement is an indication that at long last he is so ashamed of what is going on in his own Department that he is now taking some notice of it. I regret very much to note that he is not bringing his energies to bear in an effort to help uncover the corruption to the same extent that he is diligent in helping to cover it up.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Comptroller General, No. 1-17038, be referred to the appropriate committee of the Senate so that it will be available to the public. I suggest Mr. Brannan read this document before he speaks again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, during the past few days, the Senate has been engaged in a debate which has engendered some heat, shed a certain amount of light, and kicked up a good-sized cloud of dust.

The issue before us is one which would appear to be simple. It is merely the determination of who—by right—owns certain lands. It is merely the question of who—by right—holds certain legal titles.

The fact that those lands may be valuable should not affect the outcome of our deliberations. The fact that those titles have become the subject of angry controversy should not influence our judgment.

We are here to decide matters of justice—of fairness—of integrity. Our sole standards of judgment should be the just—the fair—the honorable. Nothing less will suffice.

It is to those standards that I am addressing myself today.

For nearly a century, the people of my native State of Texas believed they held title to the submerged lands on their shore line. For nearly a century, they conducted their affairs, serenely confident that their ownership would not be challenged.

There was a secure foundation for their belief—solid reasons for their confidence. They were backed by treaty, by law, by precedent. They were strengthened by the very resolution of annexation under which Texas entered the United States.

Above all, they thought they were confirmed in their ownership by the fact that in almost a hundred years no one challenged their title.

Mr. President, despite the heat and the light and the dust that I remarked upon earlier, there is nothing complicated about the Texas situation. The facts are clear and are all in the record. There is no confusion here other than the confusion created by those who decided just a few short years ago to seize the lands in the name of the Federal Government.

I am sure that every Senator has read the language of the annexation agreement which brought Texas into the Union. I am sure that every Senator knows that it specifically granted to Texas "all vacant and unappropriated lands lying within its limits."

I am also sure that every Senator knows that the seaward limits of Texas were set at three marine leagues—10½ miles—from the mean low-tide mark by international agreement.

These facts are not in dispute. They are conceded even by the leading proponents of Federal control over the submerged lands. They are facts which have to be conceded simply because there is nothing in any record to contradict them.

In conceding these facts, however, those who favor Federal control advance the startling thesis that Texas surrendered its rights to the submerged lands when it entered the United States. I have studied this theory carefully and, frankly, I am puzzled.

Where and when did this surrender take place? In what treaty or by what action did the people of Texas surrender their rights?

I have consulted history and examined the available documents and nowhere do I find an indication of such a surrender. Could it be that a people can surrender without knowing about it?

Let me assure the Senate right now that surrender is not a Texas habit—whether knowingly or unknowingly.

Could it be that somebody has interpreted the annexation resolution as a surrender? Mr. President, I distributed copies of that resolution to every Senator just the other day.

I challenge anyone to read that document and declare that it is a document of "surrender" in any way, shape, or form. That is an argument that just cannot stand.

To be sure, Mr. President, we have heard heavy stress placed upon the phrase "equal footing" that was written into the annexation agreement. We are told that this is the phrase through which Texas ceded its rights to the marginal seas.

I have before me the annexation resolution which is under dispute. I have read it over and over again. I am no lawyer but I believe the language used in this document is clear. Let me read to the Senate the significant phrase.

The resolution says Texas "shall be admitted into the Union, by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the existing States, as soon as the terms and conditions of such admissions and the cession of the remaining Texan territory to the United States shall be agreed upon by the Governments of Texas and the United States."

Mr. President, it is very clear to me that the phrase "equal footing" refers to political rights. The term meant simply that Texas would enter the Union with the same rights as any other State as soon as the terms of annexation had been worked out.

I challenge anyone to demonstrate to me or to anyone else that those terms of annexation included surrender of the title to the lands under marginal sea.

Where, then, are the arguments of those who propose to take the submerged lands from Texas and other coastal States and give them to the Federal Government? The answer to that question is not hard to find. The arguments simply do not exist; that is, they do not exist if we hold to our standards of the just, the fair, the honorable.

We are told that the Federal Government must take the submerged lands because it needs the oil revenues to pay off the national debt.

We are told that the Federal Government must take the submerged lands to aid the schools of the Nation.

We are told that the Federal Government must take the submerged lands because it is responsible for defending them.

We are told that the Federal Government must take the submerged lands so it can develop the oil resources for the Armed Forces.

Mr. President, these are not arguments—they are excuses. These are not reasons based upon principle—they are alibis based upon expediency. And like most excuses—like most alibis—they cannot stand the test of the just—the fair—the honorable.

Let us apply that test and determine the implications of these so-called arguments.

Are we to seize the property of three States to pay off the debts of the many?

Are we to deprive the school children of three States to dole out an extra pittance to the many?

Are we going to defend only that property which the Federal Government owns?

Are we going to order the seizure without compensation of any resources which must be developed for the Armed Forces?

These are questions which to my mind answer themselves.

It is time to be realistic about this issue. The proponents of Federal control over the submerged lands have only two effective arguments:

First, they want the oil revenues to go into the Federal treasury.

Second, they are promising everybody that nobody will be affected except the coastal States and that even they have nothing to worry about except oil.

I strongly suspect that the second argument is more effective than the first.

There was a most interesting colloquy the other day in the Senate. In that colloquy, State after State was assured that the Federal Government will assert no claim on its property.

We were told that no effort would be made to seize the iron ore deposits beneath the northern lakes. We were promised that Mobile Bay would remain the property of Alabama. We were pledged that the filled-in tidelands of New Jersey and Massachusetts would not be taken from these States.

It is comforting to those who have such assurances. But let me say this to my colleagues. Who is there that can give such assurances?

The assurances of a treaty apparently are not valid. The assurance of 100 years of possession has proven to be empty. It is obvious that we can rely on nothing if we cannot rely on what is right and hope that those who are in power will determine the issues by what is right.

Who is there who can say that the day will not soon arrive when some bureaucrat will come down the road and will say: "We need the iron under the Northern lakes." Who is there to say that bureaucrat will not justify the need for that iron ore by saying that the proceeds will go to the cancer fund, and that, therefore, everyone who is against cancer should vote for seizure of that ore?

Of course, that suggestion will come from a bureaucrat. Of course, it will be sponsored in Congress by those whose States do not contain any iron ore, those who think it is all right to take iron ore belonging to someone else as long as it is used for a good cause.

It is time for each Senator to ask himself whether the bureaucrats who assure us that they will take nothing but oil are eliminating from that assurance the one key word "now."

After all, the people of Texas, of Louisiana, and of California, once felt quite secure in their ownership of the submerged lands. They read the law, and the law was with them. They believed that no one would ever contest that law; or that if it was contested, the contest would be thrown out of court and would not stand.

Well, Mr. President, the law was contested; and by the decision of four men who overruled the decision of three other men, the people of Texas were told that they should be deprived of their property.

Could it be that some day five justices would decide that Mobile Bay belongs to the Federal Government, despite the feelings of the other four? Could it be that four justices would decide that the filled-in tidelands of New Jersey and Massachusetts are the property of Washington, despite an opposite ruling from another three? Could it be that such a decision could cover inland waters into the Federal domain?

I am told that this reasoning is farfetched and fantastic. But, Mr. President and my colleagues, let me assure you that a mere 20 years ago any Texan would have snorted "farfetched—fantastic" had you tried to tell him that the Federal Government could take the submerged lands. Perhaps a lesson is to be drawn from the experience of Texas, California, and Louisiana.

I know that those who back the proposed interim legislation believe they have drawn up adequate legislative safeguards. But, Mr. President, legislative safeguards can always be repealed. The only safeguards that are worth anything are the elementary standards of justice. Once they are abandoned, no man or no property is safe.

The bitter truth is that the so-called tidelands decision has endangered every land title in the United States.

If the Federal Government can go 10½ miles out to sea to take land belonging to Texas, it can 10½ miles inland. If a man can go north, he can go south, and there is no limit other than his physical capacity for traveling.

If the Federal Government can take the oil that may be under the marginal sea, it can certainly take the iron ore that may be under the northern lakes. If there is a distinction between the two, it is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. President, all these considerations compel me to urge the rejection of the so-called interim measure now pending before the Senate. I believe we are dealing here with fundamental issues, and this measure does not meet those issues squarely.

At the very best, the interim joint resolution is merely a temporary expedient to get oil into production while Congress decides the basic questions. At worst, it represents an end-run play whereby the Federal Government will wind up with all the property without a congressional determination.

I was particularly struck by one aspect of the arguments advanced in this Chamber in the past few days, namely, the attitude that the interim joint resolution is very generous toward the States that have been deprived of their property. Frankly, I do not believe that the people of Texas or California, or Louisiana will consider this a generous attitude. I do not believe they will consider 37½ percent of the oil royalties for 5 years sufficient compensation for the loss of their property. It bears too close a resemblance to buying absolution from sin with a part of the loot from a burglary.

Mr. President, we in Congress have been fighting for many years over this issue of the submerged lands. Every conceivable aspect of the question has been threshed out by the best legal minds on both sides of the Capitol.

I am convinced that a majority of the Members of the Congress believe justice, fairness, and integrity are on the side of the States. That conviction has been demonstrated over and over again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I shall be glad to yield. I have only a few remarks remaining, and I should like to complete them before I yield.

Nevertheless, I yield now if the Senator from Wyoming asks that I do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let me say that I have been listening to the Senator from Texas, and I am fearful that there is an inaccuracy in his statement, if I have correctly understood him. I may have heard him incorrectly.

Did the Senator from Texas say that the pending joint resolution grants to the coastal States 37½ percent for a period of 5 years?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I said that I do not believe they will consider 37½ percent of the oil royalties for 5 years sufficient compensation for the loss of their property.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the mistake which I think the Senator from Texas has made. The pending joint resolution gives a complete grant of 37½ percent within the 3-mile limit; there is no time limitation upon that grant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Let me say that the statement made by the Senator from Wyoming does not impress me with or convince me of his generosity any more than I was impressed with it or convinced of it when I made the statement in the first place. Thirty-seven and one-half percent is very small compensation for the 100 percent of value which is proposed to be taken.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, when Texas entered the Union, she was annexed after she had been an independent nation with a boundary 10 marine miles into the sea. However, the pending proposal would permit Texas to have 37½ percent of the royalties from the oil from the submerged land within 3 miles of her shores, although it is possible for oil to be

produced from lands for as great a distance as 150 miles off the shores of Texas. Does not the Senator from Texas agree?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, the Senator from Louisiana is eminently correct.

I know that he feels as I do, namely, that there is no abler or fairer Member of the Senate than the Senator from Wyoming. However, the Senator from Wyoming cannot establish the undisputed right to being the most generous Member of this body by saying that he is going to give someone 37½ percent or about one-third of what he already owns, and that the remaining 62½ percent will be distributed throughout the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield again to me, let me say that I rose merely for the purpose of making it clear that if the Senator from Texas is proceeding under the assumption, as apparently his statement would indicate he was, that the pending measure grants for only 5 years 37½ percent of the royalties collected from the submerged lands within the 3-mile limit, he is mistaken about that. This measure proposes a grant in perpetuity, so long as the joint resolution remains the law.

Of course, a discussion of the seaward boundaries of Texas is another matter. I merely desire to clear up the other point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say that I am clear regarding it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield, to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It seems that perhaps the Senator arrives at that mistaken impression because the joint resolution provides that for 5 years, and within a 3-mile zone, the States would have a right to prevent leasing, if they desired to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I understand that the joint resolution now pending makes that provision for a period of 5 years. I do not mean to imply that the Senator from Wyoming proposed that 37½ percent be taken away from us for that time. I was merely pointing out that the proposal was to take away 100 percent now, and then to say, "I am very, very generous with you, and I will give back to you 37½ percent of the revenues from a certain limited area."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, Mr. President, the Senator from Texas realizes that the Supreme Court has held that the States never owned it at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Supreme Court has rendered a decision which I have discussed. That decision was rendered by a 4-to-3 vote, and by that vote the Court has made it necessary that this body now consider the substitutes which have been proposed to the pending measure. In due time I think the Congress will determine once and for all who owned those lands and who now owns them.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield further to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, in order to put the case in its proper light, it should be pointed out that the Court held that Texas did own the submerged lands, but surrendered them when she entered the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me at this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I have appreciated very much the statement being made by the distinguished Senator from Texas, and I have listened with great interest to the speeches made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on Senate Joint Resolution 20. As I have been studying this measure and listening to the debate, I have wondered whether, so far as the courts are concerned, Senate Joint Resolution 20, if enacted, would eventually prejudice the interests of the States in their rights to this land, when the 5-year period is over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I think it would.

Mr. President, in my judgment the pending so-called interim measure does not meet the issues or the wishes of the Congress or the desires of the people of this Nation who are directly affected. As the Senator from Kansas has suggested, I think that by means of the pending measure we can do little other than protract the argument for another 5 years.

The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and I are urging the Senate to vote for a substitute—the House bill—which would give to the States that which is rightfully theirs. Thus, and only thus, can we guarantee a continuation of the constitutional relationship between the Federal and the State Governments. If our substitute does not prevail, I hope the Holland substitute will be accepted.

Thus—and only thus—can we head off this Federal power grab before it opens the way to engulfment of the whole Nation.

Mr. President, the wise course—the prudent course—is to confirm for all time that which belongs to the States. It is also the course that meets the basic test of the just—the fair—the honorable.

In closing, I should like to pose this proposition for the consideration of the Senate.

We Texans believed when we signed the Treaty with Mexico—a treaty of independence for which men had fought and died—that we had won this 10½ miles of territory.

We believed when we came into the Union that we kept that 10½ miles—that 10½ miles which we had not given up in any way, shape, or manner.

We believed for more than 100 years that we owned that territory by undisputed right.

We believed that we had done a laudable thing when we devoted the proceeds of these lands to our public schools.

It may be somewhat easier for the people who did not participate in the war with Mexico to take a different approach. It may be somewhat easier for those who have not held possession of this land for more than 100 years to take a different approach.

But let us reduce this to terms that all can understand.

Mr. President, let us assume that your ancestors more than 100 years ago came into possession of a specified number of acres of land. Let us assume that they and their descendants down to your generation held undisputed control over this land. Let us assume that you devoted the revenues from that land to the education of your family.

How would you feel if someone came in and said that these acres were needed for national defense?

How would you feel if that someone said he had paramount rights over those acres?

How would you feel if that claim were upheld and that land was taken from you without compensation?

Mr. President, that is the situation with which we are confronted here today. All we of Texas are asking the Congress to do is to live up to the solemn obligations of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to respond to the gentle comments of my friend from Texas.

I think the concluding remarks of the Senator from Texas have revealed very clearly the basic reason for the conflict and the misunderstanding involved in the consideration of this problem. The Senator compares the rights of an individual owning property with the rights of a state or a nation. The two are not identical. They have been regarded as identical by many who have discussed this bill.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL AND SOVEREIGN RIGHTS

In the California case and again in the Texas case, the Supreme Court has been at great pains to point out the difference. It is the difference between proprietary rights and the rights of government. The Supreme Court has used the Latin words "dominium" and "imperium," and in these days when Latin has fallen into great disuse, even by lawyers, it is not surprising that the use of these words by the Supreme Court has led to the misunderstanding.

What the Supreme Court has said is that none of the 13 Colonies, and no State, neither California, Texas, nor Louisiana, ever had property rights in the submerged lands, though they might have had certain rights of government over them. As a matter of fact, the States do have certain rights of government or control.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, I want to make this as clear as I can, although I readily confess my own inability to state the complexity of this question in simple language.

Mr. DIRKSEN rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Illinois will indulge me, I am going to read a few words from Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will my friend yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to take about 10 minutes and then rush off to a committee meeting this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that is one of our great troubles—we take 10 minutes, and we rush off to committee meetings, and the pending business is neglected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like very much to have the Senator from Illinois remain here for a few moments, and then I shall surrender the floor, which I have only by his indulgence, and I shall not delay him from his committee meeting, because the Jefferson quotation is very brief.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the length of one of these Wyoming moments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. About the length of Thomas Jefferson's pronouncement of November 8, 1793.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well; I yield.

ASSERTION OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY BY JEFFERSON

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this pronouncement by Mr. Jefferson, then the Secretary of State in the first administration under the United States Constitution, was written by him to the British Minister. There was a discussion proceeding between the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain with respect to the offshore area over which the Government of the United States had jurisdiction.

The declaration was dated at Germantown, November 8, 1793, and reads as follows:

SIR: The President of the United States, thinking that, before it shall be finally decided to what distance from our seashores the territorial protection of the United States shall be exercised, it will be proper to enter into friendly conferences and explanations with the powers chiefly interested in the navigation of the seas on our coasts, and relying that convenient occasions may be taken for these hereafter, finds it necessary in the meantime to fix provisionally on some distance for the present government of these questions. You are sensible that very different opinions and claims have been heretofore advanced on this subject.

In other words, Mr. Jefferson, the Secretary of State, was engaging in an effort to secure an interim settlement of a controversy which had been raging for a long time. He goes on as follows:

The greatest distance to which any respectable assent among nations has been at any time given has been the extent of the human sight, estimated at upward of 20 miles, and the smallest distance, I believe, claimed by any nation whatever is the utmost range of a cannonball, usually stated at one sea league. Some intermediate distances have also been insisted on, and that of three sea leagues has some authority in its favor. The character of our coast, remarkable in considerable parts of it for admitting no vessels of size to pass near the shores, would entitle us, in reason, to as broad a margin of protected navigation as any nation whatever. Reserving, however, the ultimate extent of this for future deliberation, the President—

Meaning George Washington—

gives instructions to the officers acting under his authority, to consider those heretofore given them as restrained for the present to the distance of one sea league or three geographical miles from the seashores.

This, Mr. President, was the first declaration in our history by any Government authority that the jurisdiction of the Federal Government of the United States extended 3 miles from the shore, meaning from the low-water mark. No such declaration had ever before been made on behalf of any of the Original Thirteen Colonies nor on behalf of any State. But the National Government, by direction of George Washington, through the pen of Thomas Jefferson, laid down that rule of three geographical miles. Mr. Jefferson went on as follows:

This distance can admit no opposition, as it is recognized by treaties between some of the powers with whom we are connected in commerce and navigation, and is as little, or less, than is claimed by any of them on their own coasts.

Let me now invite attention to the next sentence:

For the jurisdiction of the rivers and bays of the United States, the laws of the several States are understood to have made provision, and they are, moreover, as being landlocked, within the body of the United States.

Here was a declaration on the authority of George Washington, by the pen of Thomas Jefferson, setting forth what we have asserted in presenting Senate Joint Resolution 20, namely, that rivers and harbors and inland waters are not within the jurisdiction of the United States, that the Federal Government does not claim them, that there is nothing in the resolution to sustain the charge which has been made over and over again that the passage of the resolution will mean that some day in the not too distant future the Federal Government will seize inland waters. I say, Mr. President, that we stand as firmly as did Thomas Jefferson upon the principle that—

For the jurisdiction of the rivers and bays of the United States, the laws of the several States are understood to have made provision, and they are, moreover, as being landlocked within the body of the United States.

That is to say, under the laws of the several States the National Government recognizes State jurisdiction over such waters.

Then Jefferson goes on as follows:

Examining, by this rule, the case of the British brig *Fanny*, taken on the 8th of May last, it appears from the evidence that the capture was made 4 or 5 miles from the land, and consequently without the line provisionally adopted by the President, as aforementioned.

That is signed by Thomas Jefferson.

RAID BY STATES ON FEDERAL AREA

So, here, Mr. President, I recite that the historic record of our country shows that it was a Secretary of State who laid down the 3-mile limit and gave jurisdiction of the United States over the area within that 3-mile limit. Instead of the United States making a raid upon the submerged lands of the States, the coastal States are making a raid on the submerged lands of the United States.

I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I should like to say, in answer to the argument of the Senator from Wyoming, that anyone who reads the argument will see that Thomas Jefferson was stating the distance to which the jurisdiction of the United States could be exercised. It again relates to the same argument we have already heard, that because the United States has the duty of defending the shores of the Nation, it owns everything that is beneath the soil there, with which, of course, we disagree. It is no more true than that the United States owns Long Island Sound or the Great Lakes because it has the responsibility of defending their shores.

The States, it is claimed, never had complete sovereignty, and it is stated that there are vast powers possessed by the Federal Government which were not given to it by the people acting through the States. I think that one of these days we ought to test that theory to see whether anyone seriously believes that the United States possesses vast powers which were never given to it under the Constitution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will this take a long moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It will be a brief moment. I want to read from the Texas case:

But there is a difference in this case which, Texas says, requires a different result. That difference is largely in the preadmission history of Texas.

The sum of the argument is that prior to annexation Texas had both dominium—

That is to say, ownership—

and imperium—

That is to say, government powers of regulation and control—

as respects the lands, minerals, and other products underlying the marginal sea.

In the case of California we found that she, like the Original Thirteen Colonies, never had dominium—

That is to say, ownership—

over that area. The first claim to the marginal sea was asserted by the National Government. We held that protection and control over it were, indeed, a function of national external sovereignty. The status of Texas, it is said, is different: Texas, when she came into the Union, retained the dominium over the marginal sea which she had previously acquired and transferred to the National Government only her powers of sovereignty—her imperium—over the marginal sea.

STATES NEVER OWNED SUBMERGED LANDS

Then the court goes into a discussion of the history, and ends up with the clear distinction that the ownership beyond the 3-mile limit to the land submerged by the open sea does not belong to the coastal States, and that the paramount right is in the National Government.

This illustrates what I pointed out a moment ago that our friends err when they say that the States ever owned the submerged lands or that the Supreme Court held that the Federal Government owned them. The argument is wholly upon the question of paramount right.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is particularly intrigued to note the complete confusion which apparently exists in the mind of the Senator from Wyoming in relation to imperium and dominium, and in citing in support of the strange doctrine he is now defending upon the floor of the Senate the statement made by Thomas Jefferson for the United States of America, having to do with no part at all of the question of dominium, much less with the question of ownership, but wholly with the question of imperium, the right among the family of nations to control navigation as an incident of imperium within the coastal belt mentioned in the document.

If I may just touch upon portions of the letter of Mr. Thomas Jefferson of November 8, 1793, I should like to call attention to these words. First, in the first sentence the Secretary of State recites that—

> The President of the United States, thinking that, before it shall be finally decided to what distance from our seashores the territorial protection of the United States—

That is what they are talking about—

> shall be exercised, it will be proper to enter into friendly conferences and explanations with the powers chiefly interested in the navigation of the seas on our coasts.

I shall not continue to read at that point, reserving the final question, but pointing out it was temporary in nature and set forth that insofar as questions of navigation alone were concerned, the young Government of the United States was asserting its right to exercise its imperium, not its dominium, within the 3-mile belt, until further discussions could be had.

About the middle of the letter I read this portion:

> The character of our coast, remarkable in considerable parts of it for admitting no vessels of size to pass near the shores, would entitle us, in reason, to as broad a margin of protected navigation as any nation whatever.

What he is talking about is navigation. He is not talking about the ownership of the waters, the ownership of what is in or under the waters, or on the shores which extend out into the waters, but simply the navigation on the waters.

I think one more quotation will make it abundantly clear that the senior Senator from Wyoming is completely confusing the question of imperium, which relates in this instance solely to navigation, and is confined to that, and the question of dominium, property ownership, and control, which are, of course, the subject matter of the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court.

I quote this last portion from the letter:

> This distance can admit no opposition, as it is recognized by treaties between some of the powers with whom we are connected in commerce and navigation, and is as little, or less, than is claimed by any of them on their own coasts.

That relates again solely and exclusively to the field of commerce and navigation.

Mr. President, this debate relates to important matters of property rights pertaining to States, and is of tremendous importance to the community life along the coasts of all the maritime States, and possibly along the coasts of the Great Lakes States, and surely we have not come to the stage where we have to decide this question upon an ancient declaration which had nothing whatever to do with the question that is involved in the issue which is before the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I could not have stated my own interpretation of Thomas Jefferson's letter nearly so well as it has been stated by the Senator from Florida. I was talking only about the imperium, and not about the dominium.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I had intended to read for the benefit of the Senate a sentence from the minority decision of the Supreme Court in the tidelands case. I quote briefly:

> In my view, Texas owned the marginal area by virtue of its original proprietorship; it has not been shown to my satisfaction that it lost it by the terms of the Resolution of Annexation.

In that statement Mr. Justice Minton joined.

From another opinion, written by Mr. Justice Frankfurter, I quote the following:

> As is made clear in the opinion of Mr. Justice Reed, the submerged lands now in controversy were part of the domain of Texas when she was on her own. The Court now decides that when Texas entered the Union she lost what she had and the United States acquired it. How that shift came to pass remains for me a puzzle.

Mr. President, for all the people of Texas it remains a puzzle; and I believe it remans a puzzle to a large majority of my colleagues in this body.

THE MOON CREATES AN ISSUE, OR WHO OWNS THE TIDELANDS AND THEIR RESOURCES?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, perhaps it is the moon that raised the issue before the Senate.

Its gravitational pull on the earth accounts for the tides. Shorelands are submerged when the moon pulls the waters up and are laid bare when the pull ceases and the waters ebb. It is these land areas surrounding our country—the tidelands—and their resources, which are in issue. In addition, there is the well fortified opinion that the lands under the navigable lakes and water courses might also be involved.

Their ownership is important. These land areas are cluttered with oil wells, industries, facilities, improvements placed on them because they yield oil, minerals, materials, and many conceivably contain important resources not yet discovered.

Who owns and controls these areas, at least out to that elusive line known as the 3-mile limit?

There seems to have been an almost unanimous belief, fortified by court decisions and expert legal opinion, and running back to the time when our country was founded, that the States owned these areas. Was that a legal delusion, or a fact?

In at least one case four members of the Supreme Court thought it was a delusion. When Federal officials raised the issue in the case brought against California in 1947, the Court held that the United States had paramount rights in and full dominion over the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific within the 3-mile limit. The decision of the Court in the cases involving Louisiana and Texas had about the same effect.

Here then is proof that the ceaseless pull of the moon and the never-ending ebb and flow of the tides may be immutable, but the beliefs and decisions of men are not.

While the Court decisions involved only coastal States, many well-informed persons including a substantial number of attorneys general from the various States, believe that the decision casts some doubt on the title of the inland States to the land and resources beneath the navigable rivers and lakes. If so, it would involve title to an area of some 106,000 square miles, which is four times as large as the whole tidelands area which lies within the 3-mile belt around the Nation.

Of course we know that neither the moon nor the ancient bootlegger who in other days found sanctuary beyond the 3-mile limit raised this issue. It was raised by oil. The fields already being worked and the new fields discovered in the last few years are estimated to contain hundreds of millions of barrels. Oil is black gold. Oil is the stuff of peace and war. Oil is wealth. Oil and other resources raise the issue. If there were no oil in the tidelands, there would today be no bills before the Senate dealing with this issue.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. If there had been no oil, no claim would have been made in the first place. When the claim was made, the argument was that because oil was found, the claim was justified.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is true.

I do not deem it very important whether former Secretary Ickes or any other person changed his mind within the space of six short months as to whether the States or the Federal Government owns these areas.

The important questions are these: Should the disposition of the revenues which might be derived from these tideland areas obscure the real issue? What is the real issue? Does Congress have power to deal with it?

On the first of these questions, it should be observed that bills are now before us to validate the claim of the Federal Government to these areas and to earmark some part of the revenues for education. I am not insensible of the fact that that proposal has great appeal. They start with an assumption. In the

March issue of Harper's the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] puts it very naively. He says:

> I do not believe the American people want the Congress to overrule the Supreme Court and give away their $50,000,000,000.

That statement completely begs the question. If, in fact, the Federal Government has no valid claim to these areas, does he contend that Uncle Sam should still play Robin Hood and despoil the States of their rights, because the enrichment, no matter how wrong or unjust, will be devoted to a noble and laudable purpose? If this is the philosophy of the new day, America is in a bad way, indeed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. These scare figures have been used to much that I believe it would be well for the Senate to note that in the course of the hearings the Secretary developed the point that ultimately it might be possible to increase the production from the submerged lands to a point where there would be as much as $100,000,000 a year in revenue. That is what the Secretary of the Interior, based upon the best advice of geologists available to him, estimated might ultimately be developed in the submerged lands off the shores of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was merely using a figure which has been advanced.

Mr. LONG. Since even the bill most favorable to the States would result in the States receiving about 42 percent of the revenues, the actual amount in controversy based upon that assumption would be about $42,000,000 a year, which is just about enough to operate the Government for 6 hours.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So transparent a proposal, no matter how noble in purpose, should not obscure the real issue, which is simply this: Do these land areas belong to the States or to the Federal Government? Four men on the Court joined in the decision which asserted the power and dominion of the Federal Government over the ownership of areas within the 3-mile limit. Three Justices dissented.

But the dissenters are in good and substantial company. Since 1948, all the Governors, virtually all of the attorneys general of the States, and a substantial number of individuals, legal experts, and organizations have endorsed legislation by Congress to quitclaim ownership of these lands to the States. A host of Court decisions asserting the rights of the States in and to these lands goes back for 90 years or more. A number of legislatures, including New York, Massachusetts, Virginia, have memorialized Congress to enact legislation to secure the title in these lands. Not until 1937 did Federal officials challenge the rights of the States to these land areas, and the challenge sprang from applications for the issuance of Federal oil leases by persons who insisted that the Federal Government owned these land areas. Not only the record but the equities in this controversy are in my judgment on the side of the States. To despoil them of that right and to obscure the issue by coupling it with a laudable purpose such as the allocation of all or a part of the revenues to the States for educational purposes would be unjustifiable.

Whether Congress has authority to deal with this problem is abundantly clear from the decision of the Supreme Court and also from the Constitution, because section 3 of article IV clearly empowers Congress to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States. Under this authority, the Congress should act to secure to the States the rights which they have uninterruptedly enjoyed so long.

The State of Illinois is not without an interest in this matter. Underlying the inland waters are nearly 300,000 acres, together with nearly 1,000,000 acres under Lake Michigan. In 1892 in the case of the Illinois Central Railroad Co. against The State of Illinois, the Supreme Court of the United States held that the State exercises dominion, sovereignty, and ownership over the submerged lands of the Great Lakes by the same doctrine by which other States hold dominion, sovereignty, and ownership over tidewater lands. I feel certain that the people of Illinois would not want me to alien away those rights nor to permit a decision of the Supreme Court to stand under which those rights, would be usurped by the Federal Government.

There remains one question, and that is whether Congress should reverse a doctrine laid down by the Supreme Court can I think best be answered by one observation from history. It is fortunate that Lincoln did not accept the doctrine laid down by that court in the Dred Scott case many decades ago. I wonder where we would have been if he had done so.

So, Mr. President, notwithstanding all the constitutional and legal prolixities which have been uttered, and which somehow surround the issue before, us the equities seem abundantly clear to me. I intend fully to support the bill which had been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], Senate bill 904, because I think it not only represents the thinking of the people of my State, but reveals my own conviction in the matter. I think it would be a resolution on the side of right in this issue.

I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Assistant Parliamentarian, Mr. Floyd M. Riddick, proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the further proceedings incident to the call of the roll will be dispensed with.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona having arrived on the floor, I should like to make a record with respect to the possibilities of our proceeding to a vote on the pending measure.

As matters now stand, it is my information that the opponents of Senate Joint resolution 20 as reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have rather come to a general understanding in regard to concentrating upon support of Senate bill 940, the bill introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and approximately 30 other Senators.

However, the Senator from Florida is not as yet prepared to take the floor with respect to that measure; as all of us know, he was ill last week, and came to the floor, at great personal sacrifice, to participate in the voting on the statehood bill.

AMENDMENTS TO BE DISPOSED OF

Today the Senator from Texas told me that he is not yet ready to talk on the substitute measure which he may offer; namely, the bill which was passed by the House of Representatives.

If those two amendments can be disposed of—and I think they can be disposed of very quickly, once they are brought to a vote, or I should say, once they are before the Senate——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to the fact that one committee amendment is yet undisposed of.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, Mr. President; I am aware of that. I think that amendment also can readily be disposed of. It is only a matter of having the proponents of these amendments or substitutes come before the Senate and present them. I shall do everything I can to bring about a vote on these amendments as soon as possible.

Adverting to the committee amendment to which the Presiding Officer just referred, I may say that I did not call it up on the day when the other committee amendments were adopted, because the Senator from Louisiana had indicated the possibility that he might desire to offer additional amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 20, provided the substitutes were rejected. Inasmuch as that amendment dealt with the general problem of the amendments which he was likely to propose, the chairman of the committee withheld the amendment at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that all the committee amendments must be disposed of before any amendment in the nature of a substitute would be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then it may be necessary for the Chair to have some action taken with regard to that amendment. At any rate, it can be disposed of very readily.

I am trying now to see whether we can lay any basis for an understanding in regard to when we may dispose of the pending measure.

On Wednesday we have a privileged matter for discussion, and debate for 10 hours and for a vote.

The majority leader has indicated a desire to bring up the Japanese Peace Treaty, the importance of which is very clear.

I doubt very much that tomorrow we can do anything by way of completing the discussion of the amendment in the

nature of a substitute, which amendment is to be offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. However, certainly on Thursday, if we do not proceed on that day to a discussion of the Japanese Treaty, it should be possible for us to dispose of this measure. I think that Members of the Senate generally would welcome an opportunity to dispose of it completely on either Thursday or Friday.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding that a substitute must be offered after the pending measure has been perfected and after other amendments to it have been offered. Two or possibly three amendments in the nature of a substitute already are on the desk.

The amendment for aid to education, which amendment has been offered by the Senator from Alabama, would have to be disposed of, I believe, before an amendment in the nature of a substitute could be offered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe that is the rule. Committee amendments have to be disposed of first, but not amendments offered from the floor. After the amendments in the nature of a substitute are rejected, if that is done, amendments to perfect the original measure would be in order, to be offered from the floor.

I believe I have correctly stated the parliamentary rule, have I not, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that amendments to perfect the original joint resolution would take precedence, even though other amendments by way of substitute were pending.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. I had received the impression, as stated by the Senator from Louisiana, and now apparently borne out by the Chair's ruling, that all perfecting amendments to the original joint resolution would be proffered and should be considered and passed upon before any amendments in the nature of a substitute could be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am not altogether clear that the parliamentary question has been properly presented. I have been lacking in a clear presentation of the matter.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now make the following parliamentary inquiry: Is it not within the rules of the Senate to present perfecting amendments to a bill reported by a committee, after a substitute has been offered and defeated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So, under this ruling it would not be necessary, for example, for the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his associates to present his education amendment until after it was clear that the substitutes had been voted down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, he has mentioned the contingency whereby the substitute might be offered and defeated; but, of course, it is possible that the substitute may be offered and adopted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, of course; and if so, all amendments to the bill reported by the committee would be of no value at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not also the case that no amendments could be offered to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, after it had been adopted as a substitute for the original measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After a substitute amendment has been adopted, no further amendment is in order.

Mr. HOLLAND. With that thought in mind, it seems completely necessary that the distinguished Senator from Alabama and those who with him sponsor his so-called education amendment should so understand the parliamentary situation; because, in the light of that ruling, which the Senator from Florida believes to be completely correct, there would be no opportunity for the Senator from Alabama and his associates to offer his so-called education amendment, if either of the substitute amendments should be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. So, unless the Senator from Alabama states that he does not care to offer his amendment to the original joint resolution, as a perfecting amendment, the Senator from Florida at least assumes as a possibility that the Senator from Alabama will want to offer it, and will want to be sure, therefore, that it will be considered. The Senator from Florida has heard no statement from the Senator from Alabama indicating that he did not wish his amendment considered under all conditions. On the contrary, he understood the Senator from Alabama to state quite aggressively to the Senate, on the first day this joint resolution was under discussion, that his amendment had been printed and ordered to lie on the table a long while ago, and that he would expect to call it up at the proper time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as the Senator from Wyoming knows, I have been very anxious to have the Senate proceed as rapidly as possible with the consideration of the pending legislation. At the time we took up the joint resolution there were quite a number of objections to limiting the debate; but I had hoped that after the debate had proceeded for a few days we might get a limitation. As I see it, the impediment is that each Senator is waiting on another Senator; so the only thing I know of that we can do at this time is to go ahead, vote on something and dispose of it. We ought at least to get one vote by tomorrow evening on something. Then we will have to lay the joint resolution aside temporarily, in order to consider the reorganization plan which is a privileged matter, and has to be considered. So I hope we can dispose of some of the amendments, and not merely keep the joint resolution pending indefinitely. I am willing that every Senator shall have all the opportunity he may desire to discuss the measure. When I proposed the unanimous-consent agreement it was evident that quite a number of Senators who were present were opposed to it, that is, those who seemed to favor the bill of the Senator from Wyoming as he reported it. For that reason I have not insisted on the unanimous-consent agreement, and I do not know that one will be necessary, because, if no Senator desires to speak, we may perhaps vote.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Since these questions were brought up, the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Alabama have come upon the floor. I venture to ask the Senator from Alabama whether he is prepared to present, or whether he desires to present his amendment, today or tomorrow. In the effort to expedite the consideration of the joint resolution, I said in opening this discussion that it was my understanding from what I had gathered around the Chamber—it was nothing definite, of course—that there was a general feeling that those who are supporting the quitclaim bill would probable join in support of Senate bill 940, although the Senator from Texas has advised us that he intends to offer a substitute measure, which has already passed the House, namely, the Walter bill.

EDUCATION AMENDMENT TO BE OFFERED

Under the parliamentary rule as it has been laid down here, if either one of these substitutes were adopted, then the amendment of the Senator from Alabama to Senate Joint Resolution 20 would no longer be in order. It could not be added to a substitute already perfected.

It therefore occurred to me that perhaps the Senator from Alabama might desire to offer that amendment now and have the Senate proceed to its consideration, in the hope that we may finish tomorrow; because on Wednesday we shall begin the consideration of the proposal to reorganize the Internal Revenue Bureau. The Senator from Texas, however, had indicated to me today that he might want to offer his amendment tomorrow; and in that event, too, it will be seen that the Senator from Alabama might desire to move first his amendment to the pending joint resolution.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I may say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming that I do not apprehend there is a chance to finish this measure tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; but we might dispose of some of the pending proposals.

Mr. HILL. Yes; but I would prefer, if the Senator from Texas is going to offer his substitute, that he proceed to present his case for the substitute, and than I would consider offering my amendment as a perfecting amendment

to the pending joint resolution. The offering of a substitute would in no way preclude the offering of what is commonly called a perfecting amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Unless the substitute has been adopted.

Mr. HILL. Oh, of course, if the vote had come on the substitute, and it had been adopted, that would then settle the whole matter. I appreciate that; but at any time before the vote comes on the substitute, and the substitute is agreed to, a perfecting amendment, as I call it, would be in order.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. HILL. It would seem to me that Senators who have substitutes might offer them, having in mind that we are not going to finish this measure tomorrow. I do not see how it could possibly be finished by tomorrow. We will then proceed, I believe, to a consideration of the reorganization resolution, which will perhaps take 1 or 2 days; and then after that is concluded, I understand that serious consideration may be given to taking up the Japanese treaty.

Frankly, I thought we would save time on the amendment which I propose to offer for myself and the cosponsors, if we might offer it nearer the time when we were ready to vote on it, instead of debating it all day tomorrow, let us say, and then having to wait a week or so to come back to it and debate it all over again.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wonder whether I might ask the Senator from Texas whether he is prepared to proceed tomorrow with the discussion of the proposed substitute, namely, the House bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say to the Senator I will try to be ready tomorrow to offer my substitute and to make a speech. I think I can; but I do not want to promise that absolutely. I shall endeavor to be ready tomorrow to offer my amendment and to make certain remarks on it, if that is agreeable. I may say to the Senator that I could not very well proceed with it today, because I have been surrounded by a delegation from Hawaii and have been trying to explain my position. I am glad to say they left, apparently in good humor, though the position of the Senator from Texas had not been entirely satisfactory to them. That is all I have to say.

THE INLAND WATERS AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the present situation, I desire to call up the amendment which I presented and had printed, and which is lying on the table, to make clear that Senate Joint Resolution 20 does not hold any threat to State control over inland waters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming desire that the amendment be read in full?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It will be sufficient, Mr. President, if it is stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 15, after line 10, to insert a new section 11.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, during the course of the debate there has been considerable discussion of the stake which each of the directly affected States has in the issue by reason of the number of miles of coast line of the several maritime States, and also the number of miles of shore line of the States which border upon the Great Lakes. The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce, published under date of July 1948, a paper giving the length in statute miles of the coasts of the States under three classifications, as described in the print, namely, general coast line, tidal shore line, general and tidal shore line, detailed.

I think the description of what is involved in those three classifications is set forth with complete clarity in the publication of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey.

I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the publication which relates wholly to the States of the Union may appear in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Coast line of the United States, July 1948

Locality	Lengths in statute miles		
	General coast line	Tidal shore line, general	Tidal shore line, detailed
Maine	228	676	3,478
New Hampshire	13	14	131
Massachusetts	192	453	1,519
Rhode Island	40	156	384
Connecticut		96	618
New York	127	470	1,850
New Jersey	130	398	1,792
Pennsylvania			89
Delaware	28	79	381
Maryland	31	452	3,190
Virginia	112	567	3,315
North Carolina	301	1,030	3,375
South Carolina	187	758	2,876
Georgia	100	603	2,344
Florida:			
Atlantic	399	618	3,035
Gulf	798	1,658	5,391
Total	1,197	2,276	8,426
Alabama	53	199	607
Mississippi	44	155	359
Louisiana	397	985	7,721
Texas	367	1,100	3,359
California	840	1,190	3,427
Oregon	296	312	1,410
Washington	157	908	3,026
Atlantic coast	1,888	6,370	28,377
Gulf coast	1,659	4,097	17,437
Pacific coast	1,293	2,410	7,863
United States	4,840	12,877	53,677

The Coast and Geodetic Survey receives numerous requests for data on lengths of coast line and tidal shore line of the United States and its Territories and possessions. As a result, graphic measurements have been made from time to time on maps of various scales and in units of various lengths. The three types of measurement selected for publication at this time are explained in the following paragraphs.

GENERAL COAST LINE

The figures under this heading are lengths of the general outline of the seacoast. The measurements were made with a unit measure of 30 minutes of latitude on charts as near the scale of 1:1,200,000 as possible. The shore line of bays and sounds is included to a point where such waters narrow to the width of the unit measure, and the distance across at such point is included.

TIDAL SHORE LINE, GENERAL

Measurements under this heading were made with a unit measure of three statute miles on charts of 1: 200,000 and 1: 400,000 scale when available. The shore line of bays, sounds, and other bodies of water is included to a point where such waters narrow to a width of 3 statute miles, and the distance across at such point is included.

TIDAL SHORE LINE, DETAILED

The figures under this heading were obtained in 1939–40 with a recording measure on the largest scale maps and charts then available. Shore line of bays, sounds, and other bodies of water is included to the head of tidewater, or to a point where such waters narrow to a width of 100 feet.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say, Mr. President, that I am excluding for the purposes of brevity the same calculations stated in the same listings of mileage of various offshore possessions of the United States which I do not think are involved in the present issue.

The United States Coast and Geodetic Survey has also supplied a table showing shore line, general, on the Great Lakes, the United States side, only, which gives exactly the same information as was given in the other listing which has already been incorporated in my remarks. In the second table, namely, Tidal Shore Line, General I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in my remarks as a part thereof that portion of the information furnished by the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey which shows the general shore line of the States of the United States upon the Great Lakes.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Shore line, general, Great Lakes, United States side only

By States:	
Minnesota	165
Wisconsin	645
Illinois	57
Indiana	42
Michigan	2,302
Ohio	198
New York	351
Pennsylvania	45
Total	3,805
By Lakes:	
Ontario	255
Niagara River	27
Lake Erie	336
Lake St. Clair–St. Clair River and Detroit River	144
Lake Huron	678
Lake Michigan	1,309
Lake Superior	1,056
Total	3,805

These measurements are on the same basis as the center column of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey coast line table, July 1948

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the material which the Senator from Florida has just inserted in the RECORD is altogether appropriate at this point, because, as I attempted to say just after the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] had spoken, there seems to be a great deal of misapprehension as to the intentions of the Federal Government and of the proponents of the pending legislation with respect to inland waters. I have stated during meetings of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and on the floor of the Senate, that there has never been

the slightest doubt in my mind that the Federal Government does not have any title whatever to submerged lands beneath inland navigable waters, and that inland navigable waters include not only rivers and lakes, but true bays, harbors, inlets, and waters of that type, as well as lands covered by the ebb and flow of the tides.

During today's session of the Senate, earlier in the afternoon, I read a declaration which Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson, in November 1783, sent to the British Ambassador, making it clear that the separate States of the Union had already asserted, by legislation, jurisdiction over inland waters. I read that statement also because it was the first declaration on behalf of the Federal Government asserting jurisdiction by the Government of the United States over what is known as the 3-mile belt.

EXTERNAL JURISDICTION AN ATTRIBUTE OF NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY

I venture to assert, in addition, that there never was any declaration on the part of any of the States nor any of the Thirteen Original Colonies of external sovereignty over the 3-mile belt. This jurisdiction over an area beyond the coast line has from time immemorial been an attribute of national sovereignty. It was an attribute of national sovereignty when the United States of America became free, and has remained an attribute of national sovereignty down to this hour.

But in order to make it quite clear that the Federal Government has not asserted title to inland waters, I have brought to the floor of the Senate today an exhibit which was presented to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs by city officials of Long Beach, Calif. It is a photograph which shows the city of Long Beach and the line which was stipulated in the California case on the landward side of which the Federal Government asserts no title.

Mr. President, no one can look upon this photograph and entertain for a single moment any apprehension that the Federal Government in the California case has at any time claimed true inland waters. Senators who can see on the easel before me the photograph of the city of Long Beach will observe that the Pacific Ocean comes directly into the beach after which the city of Long Beach is named. Every single oil well which was drilled by the lessees holding from the city of Long Beach, under authority of the State of California, under the waters of this asserted bay, or harbor, or whatever it may be called, was drilled upon the landward side of the first line which appears upon this photograph, and that line represents a limit which was stipulated by the representatives of the Federal Department of Justice and attorneys for the State of California in the California case.

PRODUCTION OF OIL FURTHERED

In other words, for the purpose of furthering the production of oil, and of making it clear that the Federal Government was not asserting any claim to the oil then being produced, and was not asserting a claim to a true harbor, the Federal Government, through its attorneys, the Solicitor General and the Attorney General of the United States, stipulated that this was the minimum line which should be regarded as the boundary between the claims of the city and the Federal Government. In other words, this was a declaration in the stipulation that all the waters on the landward side of the nearest line were inland waters to which the Federal Government laid no claim.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does not that proposed Government line actually go inside the breakwater?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it may.

Mr. LONG. In fact, the Federal Government claims a part of the harbor, does it not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This was a minimum line. That is all it was. This was a declaration by the Federal Government to the effect that "We are not in a position now to say where the outward boundary of this harbor is, but this much we will say, that we will not claim any of the area, any of the water, any of the submerged lands, on the landward side of this minimum line." So here was a declaration, in words which were not capable of misunderstanding, that the Federal Government was not laying any claim to the part of the Pacific Ocean landward of this line.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, when the Federal Government says it will agree that it will not claim beyond this line——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is, on the landward side.

Mr. LONG. On the landward side—that line goes inside the harbor at Long Beach, and it would give a layman the impression, it would give a lawyer like myself the impression, that if they refuse to say that they do not claim the property, then in effect they are claiming it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will look at the exhibit as I point out the other lines, the situation will become perfectly clear.

The Federal Government, for example, does not deny that the line to which I now call attention is seaward by a considerable distance of the line of the stipulation. This photograph, of course, distorts the situation, because it is a photograph. The stipulated line which appears in this photograph to be much longer than the other line is actually but 6 miles in length, while the other line, which appears shorter in the photograph, is 13 miles in length. This line is the limit of the bay as fixed by the United States Court in the case of *United States* v. *Carillo* (13 Fed. Suppl. 121). It became necessary to fix that line in a case which involved some rum running or gambling ship operation. It was during prohibition days, according to my recollection.

SUPREME COURT DRAWING BOUNDARIES

I should like to have Senators see that the State of California claims that this exterior line is at least the outermost boundary of the asserted bay. As I pointed out, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs did not attempt to draw the exterior lines of the harbors all around the coast, because it was a physical impossibility, and since that problem was being worked out in the California case, it seemed to be the judgment of the committee that there was no particular need of following the problem in committee at this time.

During the debate a few days ago the Senator from Florida quoted a statement which the chairman of the committee made during the hearings on the joint resolution by the committee. My statement was made while the city attorney for the city of Long Beach was appearing before the committee. I am about to read from page 154 of the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 20, including the conferences with the executive departments on S. 940. I was questioning Mr. Irving Smith. I read:

The CHAIRMAN. Then it is your testimony to this committee that, so far as the city of Long Beach is concerned, it will be perfectly content to have its title confirmed first to all lands landward, all areas landward, of the Government-proposed line—

That is, the stipulated line.

And, secondly, all areas landward of the exterior seaward limits of the city of Long Beach.

I was referring there to the fact that the line of the stipulation intersects the beach of the city of Long Beach right in the midst of the inhabited section. It seemed to me to be perfectly clear that a line of that kind was, indeed, a minimum line. I continue to read from the testimony:

Mr. SMITH. The city of Long Beach has no interest other than the general interest as a city of the State and as citizens of the State, of course, but aside from that the city has no interest other than that in this 13,000 acres that the State conveyed to us within our corporate limits, as shown upon this map. Of course, we have no claim to any deposits or anything else outside those boundaries.

The CHAIRMAN. I am very glad to have that testimony; I think it is explicit, it is direct, it is clear, and nobody can have the slightest doubt of what the position of the city of Long Beach is.

I will say again, so that it may be clear in the record, that my own opinion is from the examination of the photograph which was presented to this committee last year and from the examination of this map that the so-called Government-proposed line is too narrow in the sense that it is too far landward.

In my judgment, it does not accurately define the exterior boundaries of the inland navigable waters of this bay. In my judgment, the line should be very much farther seaward, and unless there is information of which I am not aware, which has not yet been presented to me, I am ready to say now that so far as I am concerned, it seems to me to be clear that the boundary of the inland navigable waters must of necessity under all of the facts of the case include all of the area within the city limits of the city of Long Beach.

I was pointing to the limits of the city, and I felt that clearly they should be within the harbor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think what the Senator is talking about ought to be made clear for the RECORD. He has made it clear, but some Senators may have entered the Chamber since he began. The Senator is talking about the delineation of the harbor area.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But not as to the area claimed by the State of California as a part of its boundaries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is a vast difference between the two things, as the Senator well knows, because we have a number of coastal islands which have always been considered to be a part of California, but which are considerably seaward of the Long Beach harbor. We have as yet been unable to reach an agreement upon what we feel is an equitable line so far as the harbor itself is concerned.

Secondly, I should like to say to the able Senator that my information is that the statement by the representative of Long Beach as to what the position of the city might be in regard to a proper line for the harbor itself does not mean that the city government of Long Beach or the people of Long Beach are satisfied with Senate Joint Resolution 20, even with the amendment of the able Senator from Wyoming. To the contrary, they feel that the so-called quitclaim legislation, or what we more properly term the restoration provisions of the so-called Holland bill should be passed. So I do not think there should be any implication that if such an amendment were adopted the people of Long Beach would be satisfied with Senate Joint Resolution 20.

ALL OIL PRODUCTION LANDWARD OF LINE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was not giving that impression. I think the Senator recognizes that. I am discussing now merely one fact, and that is that the Federal Government does not claim inland waters. To prove that I am pointing out, by an exhibit which was presented on behalf of the city of Long Beach, that the exhibit shows a line stipulated in the California case, a line through the water of this harbor, on the landward side of which the Federal Government says it asserts no claim whatsoever.

If the Federal Government were asserting title to inland waters in bays it never would have agreed to that stipulation, particularly since on the landward side of that line we have all the oil, and all the oil wells which have been drilled on behalf of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It may well be that within that stipulated line are the existing and producing wells, but the Senator does not maintain that there is no potential development outside that area, does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not.

Mr. KNOWLAND. When one is holding a gun at the head of someone, and says, "Here are all your assets. If you agree, we shall temporarily concede to you at least a third of the assets while we are prepared to take away the other two-thirds of your assets, by reason of the gun being held at your head," the person who is being held up might finally stipulate that he would be glad to get at least a third back. But I point out that none of the people there are satisfied with the stipulated line.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator misunderstands the identity of the person holding the gun. I am not holding any gun, nor is the Federal Government holding a gun in this matter.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I ask the distinguished Senator to refer to the plat which is incorporated in the record of the hearings at page 150, which sets forth in very clear form the claims with reference to Long Beach harbor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me interrupt the Senator at that point to point out that the words "Government proposed line" do not correctly represent the situation. That is the stipulated line. It is not a proposed line, as I understand the evidence. Evidence is now being taken to determine what is the natural boundary. My only point is that since the Government has stipulated even as to this minimum line, it proves by that stipulation that it is not attempting to seize lands submerged in an asserted harbor on the coast of the State of California.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall certainly not debate with the Senator the terminology to be used with reference to this land, but I do invite his attention to the fact that it is shown upon the plat filed before the committee as the Government proposed line.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I also invite the attention of the distinguished Senator to the fact that not once, but several times in his own references to that line, in his statements and in his questions, as shown on pages 154 and 155 of the record, the distinguished Senator himself referred to it as the Government proposed line.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is true, because those were the words before me on the chart. One naturally identifies a line by the language which is used to designate the line.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Wyoming will further yield, I note that he was gracious enough to say, as quoted on page 155 of the record, that the so-called Government proposed line, or stipulated line, or whatever it may have been called—he referred to it as the Government proposed line—was too narrow, in the sense that it was too far landward, and that in his judgment—and I now quote from the distinguished Senator:

> It seems to me to be clear that the boundary of the inland navigable waters must of necessity under all of the facts of the case include all of the area within the city limits of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; and I have just read that with approval. I still stand precisely on that statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will ask the distinguished Senator, while looking at the plat to which I have referred, if it is not true that that area of the city of Long Beach, the submerged lands in the city of Long Beach shown within the so-called Government proposed line as appearing upon that map, constitutes only about one-sixth of the area within the whole Long Beach city limits, which extend out for 3 miles from the shore, across the entire front of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator that, looking at the exhibit to which he has directed attention, it is clear that the so-called Government proposed line includes almost half of the entire beach length of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; but adverting to the amount of submerged lands within the entire city limits of the city of Long Beach, such limits extending out for 3 miles from the coast, is it not true that the area back of the so-called Government proposed line is about one-sixth of the total submerged land within the area?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is not material. It is only a fraction of the water which is included within the city limits. I think it would be nearer one-fourth than one-sixth. However, I agree that it does not include all the water within the city limits of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him whether his statement, quoted at page 155 of the hearings, states precisely that in his opinion, insofar as the case of Long Beach is concerned, the proper boundary should go out to the 3-mile limit, which is the limit of Long Beach throughout its entire frontage?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was referring to the fact that the line comes right into the inhabited area of the city of Long Beach. I was not referring to the 3-mile boundary.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is a fact, is it not, as shown by the very plat to which the Senator from Wyoming has been referring——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To which the Senator has referred; yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. As shown on page 150 of the printed hearings.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. That that plat shows that the limits of the city of Long Beach extend out 3 miles from the shore line along the whole frontage of the city of Long Beach, and that the area to which the Senator from Wyoming stated he felt the city of Long Beach was entitled does include the entire submerged land area out to 3 miles.

JURISDICTION OVER OPEN OCEAN

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But of course the Senator from Florida acknowledges, I am sure—he has been attending the debate and he knows what I have been trying to say—that I have taken the position that lands which are under the open sea and which are not within the boundaries of a harbor, whether they are within the

boundaries of a State, are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government, because the open ocean and the land submerged by the open ocean are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for one more question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then his statement, as already quoted with reference to Long Beach, was simply to the effect that in the case of Long Beach, because of the peculiar configuration of the coast, he felt that the city of Long Beach should be awarded its full submerged land holdings out to the 3-mile limit, clear across the whole frontage of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will say to the Senator from Florida that that was not my intention. As I have just stated, I was pointing to the fact, which is clearly evident here, if the Senator will look at the photograph——

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Florida will look at the photograph he will observe that the stipulated line strikes the beach of the city of Long Beach at a point almost in the center of the inhabited portion of the city. If we go out toward the sea at the place to which I am now pointing, we find an area which is utterly and completely uninhabited. I was thinking of the city limits of the city of Long Beach as the landward limits as shown by this map.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Wyoming acknowledges, of course, that the map which he had before him at the time he made the statement and which is incorporated——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have before me now what I had before me then. I had before me the photograph which is presented here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Wyoming to state again to what he referred when he stated:

> It seems to me to be clear that the boundary of the inland navigable waters must of necessity under all of the facts of the case include all of the area within the city limits of the city of Long Beach.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let us read the first part of the sentence also.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said:

> In my judgment, it does not accurately define the exterior boundaries of the inland navigable waters of this bay. In my judgment, the line should be very much farther seaward, and unless there is information of which I am not aware, which has not yet been presented to me, I am ready to say now that so far as I am concerned, it seems to me to be clear that the boundary of the inland navigable waters must of necessity under all of the facts of the case include all of the area within the city limits of the city of Long Beach.

As I have stated to the Senator from Florida on several occasions, when I made that statement I was thinking of the photograph before me and of the line which hits the beach at an inhabited portion. I was trying to say that in my judgment all of the inhabited portion of the city of Long Beach on the land should be on the landward side, not upon the seaward side of the boundary of the harbor.

It must be borne in mind that what I am trying to discuss is not what the final boundary shall be, because that is under consideration now in the courts. If the courts should hand down a decision which would carry that line closer to the land than on the evidence shown by these figures, it would seem to me to be desirable that that should be the boundary.

ISSUE RAISED AS TO STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. President, I should like to show a map which affects the State of Washington. Some question was raised last week about a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. In dealing with the question of inland waters, insofar as we try to fix the boundary line, it becomes a very perplexing problem. Does the Senator from Wyoming know offhand of any formula or rule which can be laid down as to what is and what is not inland water, for the guidance of the court or anyone else?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have not found a formula as yet. I am talking now, of course, of the oceanward formula. So far as inland waters in the interior are concerned, I believe there is no problem at all.

After the letter from Secretary Chapman to Governor Langlie, of the State of Washington, was submitted and printed in the RECORD by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], he called it to my attention on the following day. I was unable to determine from the boundary set forth in the letter precisely what area it delimited. I was eager to ascertain to what the boundary descriptions referred, as is the Senator from Washington.

PUGET SOUND UNDER STATE JURISDICTION

I was questioned by the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] during the debate the other day as to whether or not in my opinion the joint resolution which the committee had reported was intended to apply to Puget Sound; that is to say, whether it could be acknowledged that the waters of Puget Sound were inland navigable waters, over which the State of Washington had complete jurisdiction. I told the Senator that that was correct, and that that was my understanding.

The Solicitor of the Department of the Interior has sent me a map of the State of Washington. I am glad that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is in the Chamber. He will find marked on it in red, on the oceanside of the State, the line delineated in the boundary descriptions set forth in the letter of Secretary Chapman to the Governor of Washington. That description runs from the southernmost point of the State on the Pacific Ocean to the middle of the Strait of Juan de Fuca at the northern end of the State. No land east of the Strait of Juan de Fuca is claimed by the Federal Government. Puget Sound, which is far inland with respect to the Pacific Ocean, not the line of the strait, is roughly indicated in blue. The entire area of the sound is described as inland navigable waters to which the Federal Government asserts no title.

Under the pending joint resolution the Congress would be asked to make that declaration.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. LONG. Is that line drawn by attempting to follow the so-called Boggs formula?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not know.

Mr. LONG. From what the Senator from Wyoming has said, I do not gain the impression that that is necessarily so. If that is the case, it would seem rather inconsistent for the Federal Government to seek to follow the Boggs formula where it suits the Government, but not to seek to follow or apply that formula where it does not suit the Federal Government at the moment to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe this follows the formula of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator from Wyoming tell us what formula has been prescribed by the Supreme Court of the United States for determining what is inland water and what is not inland water?

LINE ALONG OCEAN SHORE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; but this map clearly shows a line which is along the open ocean as the line delimiting Federal jurisdiction. It is not along inland water and does not include any harbor or any bay in the area of Federal jurisdiction. The line purports to set forth the mean low-tide mark on the ocean shore. There is no bay or harbor or inlet which may properly be described as an inland water within it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CAIN. Whence did the Secretary of the Interior derive authority to draw any line of any character with respect to the shore line of the State of Washington? Let me say that I could not be more serious than I am when I ask this question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that.

When the Secretary of the Interior wrote this letter, I knew nothing about it until——

Mr. CAIN. I think that is obvious, because the Senator from Wyoming never would have permitted the Secretary of the Interior to write it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I was saying, I knew nothing of the letter until the Senator from Washington called it to my attention. I assume that the Secretary of the Interior acted on the basis of the Supreme Court's decisions.

Mr. CAIN. Let me ask what Supreme Court decisions the Senator refers to in this case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Supreme Court's decisions in the Texas, Louisiana, and California cases, not a State of Washington case.

Mr. CAIN. As a lay person I wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming, because he is well known as an authority in legal matters——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Washington; and I hope my other friends will remember what the Senator from Washington has said.

Mr. CAIN. I shall endeavor to remind them, should the Senator from Wyoming ever need their assistance.

However, permit me as a lay person to ask the Senator what authority is derived from Supreme Court decisions affecting Louisiana, Texas, and California which would permit an executive agent, who in this case happens to be the Secretary of the Interior, to write such a letter as the one he recently addressed to the Governor of the sovereign State of Washington.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I would assume that the Secretary of the Interior would be justified in making the assumption that the decision of the Supreme Court in those three cases represents the ruling which will be followed by the Supreme Court and by the Congress with respect to the ocean areas over which, as an attribute of its external sovereignty, the Government of the United States has jurisdiction.

Mr. CAIN. Yet if I correctly understand the verdict reached in the California case, the Supreme Court said that implementation could be secured only through action by the Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not understand the question.

Mr. CAIN. As I understand the situation, the Supreme Court indicated that the Congress must pass enabling legislation before the Federal Government could begin to operate gas and oil facilities on the submerged lands in question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. The legislative situation is simply that for some 14 years certain coastal States and others have been seeking to secure a quitclaim to the lands beneath the ocean from the Congress of the United States. They have never been able to obtain such a quitclaim law. Therefore, until these States can get Congress to override the Supreme Court, the construction of the law as laid down by the Supreme Court is binding upon all of us.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20 PROVIDES FOR ADMINISTRATION OF AREAS

In the present case the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and I, having seen this battle go on for 14 years, and realizing how important it is to have oil produced, decided to offer what we called an interim joint resolution, which would allow the Secretary of the Interior to confirm good-faith leases issued by the States, and to administer the Continental Shelf until Congress at some distant future time may decide to do otherwise. I do not think Congress ever will.

Mr. CAIN. My distinguished friend, the Senator from Wyoming, does not amaze me; but the Department of the Interior certainly amazes me. The Senator from Wyoming has just mentioned the imperative need for developing the oil resources of this country.

On the 15th day of February, only several short weeks ago, the Secretary of the Interior, without authority of any kind—and the Senator from Wyoming has given rise to this question relating to Washington State—ordered, if you please, the Governor of the State of Washington summarily to void every lease that had previously been signed between the State of Washington and private parties. That means only that the Secretary of the Interior assumedly believes that until such time as the Federal Government can get these developments under way, there shall be no development of any kind.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Washington tell his colleagues now that the State of Washington has issued leases on the Pacific Ocean side of the State of Washington? It is my understanding that all the leases are in Puget Sound, to which the Federal Government makes no claim.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator from Wyoming is correct in saying that the leases are——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not pretend to know.

Mr. CAIN. Very well; but if the Senator from Wyoming is correct in saying that the outstanding leases are on territory not claimed by the Federal Government, how does he reconcile the demand of the Secretary of the Interior that all the leases on submerged lands be summarily voided? That is what the Secretary of the Interior stated in his letter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; the Senator from Washington misunderstands——

Mr. CAIN. I do not wish to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure of that.

As I pointed out on this map, which came from the Solicitor for the Department of Interior, the boundary line to which the Secretary of the Interior referred deals solely with lands beneath the open ocean, and does not deal with submerged areas in Puget Sound. It does not deal with lands under the Strait of Juan de Fuca, and, therefore, the line does not apply to any leases which the State of Washington already has issued, if I am correctly informed.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Wyoming is not so informed by the letter which the Secretary of the Interior wrote to the Governor of the State of Washington.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. For in that letter, which has caused this excitement—and justly so, I think—the Secretary of the Interior has demanded of the State of Washington that it cancel its outstanding leases.

The Senator from Wyoming has just indicated that, in his view, the State of Washington has issued no leases on the portion of Washington State's coast to which the Federal Government claims title.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think I may say to the Senator from Washington that in all fairness to the Secretary of the Interior, we should base the interpretation of his letter upon what he said, not upon the fears which have been written into what he said.

Now let me read the letter.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Wyoming has the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, and I wish the Senator would read it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. I now read the letter:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1952.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR LANGLIE: On June 23, 1947, the Supreme Court decided *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), and on June 5, 1950, the Court decided *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699) and *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707). Under the doctrine of those cases, the United States believes and asserts that the submerged area along the coast of the State of Washington lying seaward of the following line is subject to the paramount rights, full dominion, and power of the United States, and that such area is not now and never has been owned by the State of Washington:

Then follows the description. That description, as this map clearly shows, is an ocean-line description, and it does not assert jurisdiction over any of the inland navigable waters of the State of Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Permit me to interrupt one moment further. Will the Senator now read the last paragraph on the third page, and the first two and concluding paragraphs on the fourth page? I think a reading of those will permit all of us to understand what the Secretary of the Interior has actually said with reference to the State of Washington.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. The Secretary has said here——

Mr. CAIN. It is important that we be aware of that in its context.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; the Senator is entirely correct. There is a parenthetical paragraph, to which I do not think he refers.

Mr. CAIN. No; I do not.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It defines geographical features and positions referred to in this description.

Mr. CAIN. It is the substance of the next paragraph.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The next paragraph begins:

We understand that the State of Washington has issued oil and gas permits and leases to private parties on submerged lands situated seaward of the line described above.

Mr. CAIN. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I see to what the Senator is referring.

Mr. CAIN. It takes time, but we are now in agreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The paragraph continues:

Under the doctrine of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, any such permits or leases are void, since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the leasing power of the State of Washington or its agencies.

It will be noted that he says, "Under the doctrine" of those cases.

Mr. CAIN. Indeed, sir.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The letter continues:

Therefore, the State of Washington is requested—

"Requested" is a polite word.

Mr. CAIN. It is an interesting distinction.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Continuing—

to take no further action inconsistent with the rights of the United States in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying seaward of the line described above, and to regard any oil and gas permits or leases issued by it as ineffective to confer any rights respecting such lands.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; and the last paragraph, if the Senator will please read it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. CAIN. I think it is very illuminating also.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The last paragraph of the letter reads:

With respect to any such oil and gas permits or leases, we would appreciate being advised of the names of the permittees or lessees, their addresses, the dates of issuance, and the areas covered.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that it is an eminently polite and diplomatic letter.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not also entirely in accord with the decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in three cases?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It goes no further than that.

Mr. CAIN. I do not know whether my friend from New York is a lawyer——

Mr. LEHMAN. No, I am not.

Mr. CAIN. But is it not logical to say that no authority derives per se from the Supreme Court cases in those three States, unless the State of Washington itself is sued by the Federal Government. Does the Senator think it would be proper for the State of New York to have its course of action determined by a Supreme Court decision in a case involving a State 3,000 miles away?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should very much feel that the decision of the Supreme Court was binding, on New York as on any other State, if the decisions were as in this case, equally applicable as to subject matters and circumstances. The implementation of the decisions need not, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Washington, require further action by the Congress, the decisions would, in my judgment, be binding until the Congress of the United States directly overruled the decision of the Supreme Court by specific legislation; and that, of course, has not been done. Those Supreme Court decisions would lose their binding effect if the resolution submitted by my colleague from Louisiana were adopted by the Congress of the United States and approved by the President of the United States; but, pending such a development, which I hope will never come, it would seem to me that the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States is binding.

Mr. LONG rose.

SECRETARY CHAPMAN'S LETTER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say briefly, that the whole text of this letter of Secretary Chapman's, as we have just reread it, clearly shows that the Secretary of the Interior was pointing out a doctrine laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States. He was making a request; he was not issuing an order. The line described in the letter is quite obviously a description of the ocean boundary of the State of Washington. It does not include Puget Sound.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator from Wyoming yield for one last question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. It does not appear to me to be a request, charitable, courteous, or otherwise, where the Secretary of the Interior states:

Under the doctrine of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases, any such permits or leases are void, since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the leasing power of the State of Washington or its agencies.

The only construction I can place on that sentence is that the Secretary of the Interior has decided what is and what is not the law with respect to the State of Washington.

STATE COULD IGNORE DECISIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; he said, "Under the doctrine" of the Supreme Court. Of course, it is perfectly correct to say that the State of Washington, not having been before the Court in any of the three cases, could, if its officials were so inclined, ignore the rulings of the Supreme Court in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases in connection with leasing areas submerged by the open ocean.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in an effort to be helpful, I may advise the Senator that those in authority in the State of Washington are so minded that, in the absence of a court test to determine rights, the State of Washington has no intention of any kind of agreeing to the substance of the letter written by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is a matter a little bit out of the jurisdiction of the Senate of the United States at the moment.

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida very timorously enters the field of discussion between his two colleagues, because he knows so little about the situation in the State of Washington; but he felt, and still feels, that the letter of the Secretary of the Interior is decidedly unsound, arbitrary, and completely beyond the reasonable length of his jurisdiction, for this reason: The agencies of the Government, including the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice, know full well that, for the past 4 years, the United States Supreme Court by direction, has been taking evidence as to what are the proper limits under the decision in the California case, on three restricted segments of the coast of California; and they know perfectly well that there is great dispute and great difference of opinion as to what are the proper limits. They know also perfectly well that the distinguished chairman of the committee of the Senate which heard this matter found occasion to disapprove completely by a very clear statement made by him in the course of the hearing, the so-called Federal proposed line for the settlement of the controversy in the one limited area lying off Long Beach, Calif.

With that thought in mind, it seemed to the Senator from Florida, and still seems to him, that for the Secretary of the Interior, by metes and bounds describing an arbitrary line, to say to the Governor of a State which has not been brought into court, and which has a coastline of many hundreds of miles, none of which has been brought into court, "Here is the line, beyond that you trespass," is an arbitrary position of the most arrogant sort. The Senator from Florida very strongly joins with his colleagues from Washington, both of whom on the floor of the Senate the other day interposed their strong objection to any such arbitrary approach.

It seemed to the Senator from Florida, and still seems so, that the letter itself indicates louder than any words which can be spoken on the floor of the Senate, the kind of arbitrary, bureaucratic treatment which may be expected on the part of States in general, communities in general, and industries in general, which are affected, if a Federal Bureau situated in Washington be given this overwhelming and strangling power to control offshore areas around all the maritime States and perhaps surrounding all the Great Lakes States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I must be content for myself with the fact that the Senator from Florida has referred to some statements of mine in the hearing, and I am therefore sure that he does not——

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say that I referred with approval, and with high approval, to the Senator's statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; so he does not attribute to the Senator now speaking any of the adjectives which he has applied to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to this letter.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. I submit that the Secretary of the Interior may be personally as blameless as is the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. That is one of the difficulties of the whole situation—the tremendous responsibility of Federal bureaucratic control—and it may be expected that just such arbitrary treatment as is shown by this letter will be given to States, localities, and industries all over the Nation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am compelled to say that, in my opinion, there is really nothing arbitrary about the matter. I am compelled to point out that the State of Washington, like some other States, was admitted to the Union without any reference whatsoever to any seaward boundaries; that the State of Washing-

ton, like several other States which are bounded by the ocean, was admitted on an equal footing with all other States within the Union.

FOURTEEN-YEAR QUITCLAIM EFFORT

Furthermore, it is incontrovertibly clear from our national history that the Colonies never asserted or claimed jurisdiction over the open ocean; that the States of the United States never claimed it; that the first claim to the marginal seas was made by the Secretary of State in the administration of President George Washington; that the first claim to the Continental Shelf was made no longer ago than the 28th of September 1945, by the present President of the United States, and that the record in this controversy clearly shows that a fruitless effort on behalf of numerous coastal States has been carried on for 14 years to gain control over an area which is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Wyoming think it is a fair interpretation of the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, because of his reference in the letter to the cited cases, that he is apparently of the opinion that the Supreme Court has decided the ownership of the submerged lands seaward beyond the low-water mark?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I think that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. The Secretary of the Interior would not have jurisdiction over those lands if they in fact belonged to the United States——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The jurisdiction is in the Federal Government now. There is no present specific statutory authority for the Secretary of the Interior to administer the submerged lands except that under the laws which established the Department of the Interior, the Secretary has jurisdiction over certain areas of responsibility of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Let me restate my question. I think the Senator's answer shows that he knows what I sought to imply in my question, but I did not state it specifically enough.

If the Federal Government does have ownership of these lands referred to by the Supreme Court in its decision——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I interrupt the Senator to say that the Supreme Court's decision gives the Federal Government paramount rights, but not proprietary rights. So the word "ownership" is not strictly accurate.

Mr. MORSE. I am speaking of the interest which the Federal Government has under the terms of the decision.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. If the Federal Government has those paramount rights, then what department of the Government has administrative jurisdiction or authority in respect to protecting the national interest?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Department of the Interior, under an Executive order issued by the President of the United States at the same time he issued his order asserting Federal jurisdiction, on behalf of the people of the United States, to the mineral resources of the Continental Shelf adjacent to our shores.

Mr. MORSE. Then, is it not true that the Secretary of the Interior owed a duty to the Government and to the people of the Nation, as Secretary of the Interior, to exercise vigilance over the use that might be made of these lands presently or prospectively?

DUTY OF SECRETARY TO ACT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Secretary of the Interior had had notice, if any information had been given him that any attempt was being made by any other sovereignty to assert jurisdiction over the Continental Shelf which had been claimed by the President of the United States and entrusted to the Secretary's care by Executive order, he might have been charged with failure to perform his duty.

Mr. MORSE. Although the doctrine of laches does not apply in such matters against the Government, nevertheless the Secretary's failure to exercise vigilance and serve notice on the Washington State government, if he as Secretary of the Interior in good faith believed that there was a danger of Washington's following a course of action with respect to the submerged lands contrary to the Federal interest as set forth in the decisions referred to by the Secretary, then he would be subject, would he not, to criticism for his failure to serve such notice?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am inclined to think that the Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. There has been some discussion as to the validity, as precedents, of the decisions in the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases. Does the Senator from Wyoming agree with me that we still, in most instances, follow the doctrine in our courts of stare decisis, that in most instances we apply the doctrine of precedent, and follow the theory that a precedent already established should be applied to similar facts in another case?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true, as we read the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, that he refers to the ruling of the Supreme Court and that on the basis of that ruling he served notice on the Washington State government as to the position of the Department of the Interior in carrying out the administrative duties which the Secretary feels, under the President's Executive order, are binding upon him?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the situation as I understand.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Wyoming find in the language used by the Secretary of the Interior anything which would justify the charge that he acted arbitrarily or capriciously or with improper discretion when he, in effect, says to the Governor of Washington, "Under the doctrine laid down by the Supreme Court establishing what I think is the rule of the Federal Government's interest in these lands, I serve notice on you as to what my position is as Secretary of the Interior, as one charged with the administrative duty of protecting the Federal interest in these lands under the decision of the courts?"

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I pointed out when the questions were first brought up by the Senator from Washington, I feel that the letter of the Secretary of the Interior was a correct reference to the present state of the law, although it must be acknowledged that the State of Washington is a different entity from the State of California. But it seems to me to be clear that no coastal State would undertake to violate the ruling of the Supreme Court in these cases unless the Congress of the United States should undertake to surrender the authority and jurisdiction which the Federal Government has had, from the very beginning of our history down to this hour, over the marginal sea and which now has been claimed for it over the Continental Shelf beyond the 3-mile limit.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Wyoming will let us make a few assumptions against the Secretary of the Interior in regard to every alleged fact that he sets forth in his letter, let us assume, first, that the Secretary clearly misinterpreted the Supreme Court decision.

Let us assume, secondly, that the Secretary is completely wrong in his determination of what the line of demarcation is, as set forth in the decison.

Let us assume, in the third place, that even the Court is wrong in its findings of fact.

Does there still not rest upon the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the duties of his office in keeping with the Executive order under which he functions in respect to this particular problem, the clear administrative duty of notifying the Governor of the State of Washington as to what his opinion is, as to what he thinks his duties as Secretary of the Interior are in respect to these lands, and does the letter that he sent to the Governor of Washington do any more than that?

If the matter is considered in even the most negative way, from the standpoint of the Secretary of the Interior, does it mean anything more than saying, in effect, "Mr. Governor, I believe the Federal Government has the paramount rights in these lands. I believe these lands are as follows"—and the Secretary thereupon proceeds to identify them—"and, therefore, as Secretary of the Interior, and as part of my administrative duties, I notify you that I intend and propose to proceed to protect the Federal interests"? That draws the issue; and if the Governor wants to dispute with the Secretary of the Interior in regard to it, the courts are open to him.

SECRETARY DISCHARGING DUTY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oregon is saying—and I agree with him—that there was nothing arbitrary or arrogant in the letter of the Secretary of the Interior; that he was merely advising the government of the State of Washington of the position he would take by virtue of the responsibilities laid upon him under three separate decisions of the Supreme Court and the Executive order of the President.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that the Senator from Wyoming and the junior

Senator from Oregon, if we had sat in the same position as the Secretary of the Interior, might have written a different letter in form—and I do not know whether I would have; I was not in the position and did not have all the facts—and is it not true that we would have considered it our duty, under the Executive order under which the Secretary of the Interior must function, to take some steps to make the situation clear, if leases were being granted, or we thought leases were being granted, to lands which the Federal Government, under the Court decision, has paramount rights, and to notify the Governor of Washington or of any other State that either of us, as the Secretary of the Interior, would take steps to protect the interests of the Federal Government? Does the letter mean more than that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not believe that it does.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to permit a very brief observation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. As is always the case, I find the comments offered by my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to be most interesting. I think it was last week when I sat here and enjoyed the Senator from Oregon discussing at some length the needs of the State of Idaho. This afternoon I have listened with some interest and no little concern to the Senator from Oregon discussing the needs of the State of Washington.

I was particularly struck by his opinion concerning the need for vigilance on the part of the Secretary of the Interior, and that the Secretary should obviously carry out, as best he could, any decision reached by the Supreme Court.

May I ask the Senator from Wyoming what was the year in which the Supreme Court decided the California tidelands case?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In June 1947.

Mr. CAIN. Is that to say that it has taken the Secretary of the Interior approximately 5 years to study that decision and make up his mind as to what it meant?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator's question answers itself.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Washington that I have not the slightest idea when the Secretary of the Interior may have been notified, if he was notified, of information, right or wrong, about any attempt on the part of the State of Washington to let leases for oil drilling, oil production, or oil activity on land which the Secretary of the Interior may be of the opinion involve a Federal interest. However, I wish to assure the Senator from Washington that the only interest I have in such matter as that now before the Senate is to try to find the answer to what is the paramount question, namely, the question of paramount legal rights to this land. Who owns them? That is the only question to which I have been trying to find an answer, and before this debate is finished I think the situation will have been so crystallized that I shall be ready to express myself on the floor of the Senate.

For about 2 years I have repeatedly stated that when I was satisfied that I knew the answer to that question, I would be in a position to vote on this issue. I think everything else in this debate has been irrelevant, immaterial, and inconsequential as it concerns the fundamental issue involved, namely, who in fact, as a matter of law, has the paramount legal interest in these paramount rights?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be finished in one sentence more.

If it is true—and I underline the word "if"—if it is true that all the people of the United States have the paramount interest in these lands, then I shall vote to protect the interest of all the people of the United States. On the other hand, if I become convinced that the people of the individual States have the paramount interest, I shall vote to see to it that they get it.

That is the position I took in my campaign, when the tremendous oil lobbies thought they were going to retire the junior Senator from Oregon because they could not get him to commit himself on the tidelands bill.

I said to the people of my State, "I am not going to vote to steal them for you if you do not own them. When I reach my conclusion as to who, as a matter of law, owns them, I shall vote."

That is why for many months I have sat here silent while this legal argument has been going on. This is the first comment I have made on it, but I have listened to this discussion about the letter from the Secretary of the Interior, and I respectfully say that I do not find it such an arbitrary, capricious, highly indiscretionary letter as some of my good colleagues in the Senate find it. It illustrates how reasonable men can differ with respect to cold print.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I would like to add an additional fact. While it is true that the California case was decided in 1947, the Texas and Louisiana cases were not decided until July 5, 1950, so at least the Secretary of the Interior did not act precipitously upon the basis of the California case alone.

Mr. CAIN. Let us take the Senator's argument as being valid. That still admits that the Secretary of the Interior has taken more time than he should have, anyway we look at the situation, to make up his mind as to what those three decisions mean.

SECRETARY TRYING TO DO DUTY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I still believe, and I think the Senator from Washington also believes, that the Secretary of the Interior is an estimable gentleman, who is not arrogant and really not arbitrary. Perhaps the Senator will also join me in giving the Secretary the benefit of the doubt in his thinking that he was merely trying to carry out his duty as he saw it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

I invite the attention of the junior Senator from Oregon. I merely wish to say to my distinguished friend from Oregon that I regret to find that we are not in accord on a matter of important public business, but I wish him to understand clearly what my reason is for stating that, in my considered judgment, the approach used in the letter forwarded by the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of Washington was arbitrary and arrogant, and went far beyond the limits of the law as determined in the three cases which have been mentioned. The fact is that the cases produced only general findings, general rulings of law, and that for the past 4 years, in the California case, under the supervision of a very able master named by the United States Supreme Court, there has been going forward an effort to try to discover and to name, as a matter of judicial decision, what the boundaries of the inland waters are opposite the city of Long Beach, and in two or three other places. There were several other places which were explored. The master reported to the Court that there was too much to be done at one time, so some of the questions were laid aside and the issues narrowed to either three or four places, as I recall. During all that period of time there has not come either a judicial declaration on what the proper limits are in those particular areas, or what the proper limits are in any general area dividing the inland waters from the outside waters, under many different sets of facts. During all this time, as the hearings show, the Department of the Interior has been one of the very active agencies in insisting upon very narrow limits. The Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, Mr. Mastin G. White, testified at each of the hearings, and his testimony appears in the printed hearings. The Department of the Interior knows perfectly well that the Court has not yet come to a conclusion as to what is the proper measure of the delimitation as between local waters, as defined by it, and Federal waters, as defined by it. Yet, notwithstanding that fact—and this is the point upon which the Senator from Florida feels that the Secretary of the Interior went very far astray in his letter—he proceeds, by metes and bounds, to lay down a definite, fixed, determined line, across all the seaward side of the State of Washington, and to say, with reference to that line as laid down by metes and bounds, to the Governor of that State, in effect, that he, the Governor, has no jurisdiction beyond that line in certain fields, and that he had better be governed by this letter.

I think that is an arrogant thing for a bureau head to say, particularly when he has no specific authority to do so, and more particularly when he knows better than almost anyone else that the United States Supreme Court has not yet determined the facts upon which he would have to rely, even to state what the boundaries were down at Long Beach, and at the various other places in that area which are at issue, much

less to try to transfer any line of reasoning that is adopted with respect to that area to the several-hundred-mile coastline of the State of Washington.

It is in that regard, having in mind that the Governor of the State of Washington has many duties, some of which pertain to law enforcement and the conservation and preservation of the properties and interests of his State and of its communities and industries, that the letter may be considered as arrogant. An agent for the United States Government—self-appointed in this particular task—sends to the government of a sovereign State, clothed with daily duties affecting these various properties, a message in which he says, "This is the deadline. Cross that and you are a trespasser." The Senator from Florida used his words in a measured way when he said he thought the letter was, in that regard, arbitrary and arrogant in the highest degree; and he still so regards it.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will pardon me, I wish to complete my statement.

Mr. MORSE. I shall require only a moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has been trying to obtain the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I think, as a matter of courtesy, I ought to be allowed to clear up the question raised by the Senator from Florida. I think I can complete my observation in a couple of sentences, and in fairness to the Senator from Florida he is entitled to have my comment on his observation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to my friend from Florida that when he forms an opinion in a matter such as this, I know it to be a sincere and honest opinion. He has made an interpretation of the Secretary's motivation which he considers preferably proper. He and I have just reached opposite conclusions as to what that motivation is. I do not think the Secretary of the Interior is arrogant, or intends to be arrogant, but his letter, once publicized, is certainly susceptible to whatever interpretation the Senator from Florida, in good faith, wishes to give to it. He acts in good faith. I have no personal quarrel with the Senator from Florida, yet I think I have the right and duty to express my view as to the motivation of the Secretary of the Interior.

I think it is clear from the letter that he thought the time had come, in carrying out his duties under the Executive order, to serve notice on the Governor of Washington as to what his interpretation of the Supreme Court ruling was.

The Governor of Washington has ample redress if he feels that the Secretary of the Interior is following a mistaken interpretation. In my opinion, it is just that simple. The letter joins the issue between the Secretary and the Governor of Washington. I think we ought to let them now proceed in carrying out what they consider to be their respective duties, in one instance as Secretary of the Interior, and in the other as the great Governor of a great State.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to conclude my statement. I wish at this point to offer an amendment and to have it printed in the RECORD.

INLAND WATERS AMENDMENT

On behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment was, on page 15, after line 10, to insert the following:

SEC. 11. The United States hereby asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, but that all such right, title, and interest are vested in the several States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, or the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority.

SEC. 12. As used in sections 11 through 19 of this joint resolution, the term "navigable" means navigable at the time of the admission of a State into the Union under the laws of the United States; the term "inland waters" includes the waters of lakes (including Lakes Superior, Michigan, Huron, Erie, and Ontario to the extent that they are within the boundaries of a State of the United States), bays, rivers, ports, and harbors which are landward of the open sea, as well as the area covered and uncovered by the tides; and lands beneath navigable inland waters include filled-in or reclaimed lands which formerly were within that category; the term "submerged coastal lands" means submerged lands lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside of the inland waters and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf.

SEC. 13. Section 11 of this joint resolution shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (1) which have been lawfully accrued by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (2) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (3) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (4) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians. This joint resolution shall not apply to water power, or to the use of water for the production of power, or to any right to develop water power which has been or may be expressly reserved by the United States for its own benefit or for the benefit of its licensees or permittees under any law of the United States.

SEC. 14. Any right granted prior to the enactment of this joint resolution by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged coastal lands, or any such right to the surface of filled-in or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to the enactment of this joint resolution.

SEC. 15. Nothing in section 14 of this joint resolution shall be construed as confirming or recognizing any right with respect to oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged coastal lands; or as confirming or recognizing any interest in submerged coastal lands other than that essential to the right to construct, maintain, use, and occupy the structures enumerated in that section, or to the use and occupancy of the surface of filled-in or reclaimed land.

SEC. 16. The structures enumerated in section 14, above, shall not be construed as including derricks, wells, or other installations in submerged coastal lands employed in the exploration, development, extraction, and production of oil and gas or other minerals, or as including necessary structures for the development of water power.

SEC. 17. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to repeal, limit, or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, the control of navigation, or the improvement, protection, and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; or to repeal, limit, or affect any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted pursuant to the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

SEC. 18. Any person seeking the authorization of the United States to use or occupy any submerged coastal lands for the construction of, or additions to, installations of the type enumerated in section 14 of this joint resolution, shall apply therefor to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, who shall have authority to issue such authorization, upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion may seem appropriate.

SEC. 19. Within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the use and occupancy of submerged coastal lands for installations of the type enumerated in section 14 of this joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to affirm the declarations and holdings of the Supreme Court, to the effect that the Federal Government asserts no title to inland navigable waters. The amendment which we are offering is in effect an adaptation of Senate bill 1540, which was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself in this Congress.

I wish to read a paragraph from the favorable report from the Department of Justice. This report is dated June

15, 1951, and is signed by Hon. Peyton Ford, at that time Deputy Attorney General:

The enactment of the proposed legislation would accomplish two very desirable objectives. It would provide congressional confirmation of the assurances repeatedly made by representatives of the executive branch that the United States makes no claim of ownership to lands underlying inland navigable waters and would grant the requisite statutory authority for the maintenance and operation of piers, wharves, filled lands, and other structures extending beyond low-water mark into the open ocean. This is a matter of great importance to coastal States and municipalities, and to all persons who have erected or desire to erect improvements on lands underlying the ocean.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that the position which the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has taken, which the sponsors of this amendment take, and which the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior take, is that the Federal Government lays no claim to inland navigable waters in the interior States, or in the coastal States. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the administrative agencies, and those who are supporting this measure are asserting no such claim in Senate Joint Resolution 20, but, on the contrary, wish to write into the proposed law an affirmation of the declarations already made by the Supreme Court and by the spokesman for the Department of Justice.

With that statement, I submit the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on behalf of himself and other Senators.

BUDGET, TAXES, ECONOMY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me on budget, taxes, economy be inserted at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY ON BUDGET, TAXES, ECONOMY

Every citizen is justly concerned with the size of the Federal Budget and the heavy tax load which is being carried by the American economy. It is the purpose of this statement to discuss this budget in objective terms and also to present basic economic facts pertaining to taxes and the general condition of the economy. In the charges and countercharges which are made on the high cost of government and the burden of taxation, opinion frequently takes over where facts are necessary. The Federal budget must be studied by taking into consideration such factors as the international situation, the cost of inflation, the production of the economy, and the impact of Federal spending and taxation upon the economic life of our country.

BREAKDOWN OF TOTAL BUDGET EXPENDITURES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1953

The cost of national defense is high. Out of every dollar in the proposed budget, 85 cents will go for the cost of national security. That total includes 73 cents for our current defense and foreign assistance programs; 7 cents for interest on the national debt; and 5 cents for veterans' payments of various kinds. Only 15 cents of the budget dollar goes for general government and welfare activities.

Let's take a look at the President's budget request and recommendation for fiscal year 1953:

TABLE 1.—*Breakdown of total budget expenditures, fiscal year 1953*

Category	Billions	Percent of total
Grand total	$85.4	100.0
Total national security expenditures	72.5	85.1
Present security programs	62.0	72.8
Army	16.8	19.7
Navy	12.3	14.4
Air	18.9	22.2
Other military	3.2	3.8
Foreign aid and international	10.8	12.7
Expenditures for past wars	10.5	12.3
Veterans	4.2	4.9
Debt service	6.3	7.4
All other expenditures	12.8	14.9
Social security, welfare, and health	2.7	3.2
Housing and community development	.7	.8
Education and general research	.6	.7
Agriculture and agriculture resources	1.5	1.8
Natural resources	3.2	3.6
Transportation and communication	1.6	1.9
Finance, commerce, and industry	.8	.9
Labor	.2	.2
General Government	1.5	1.8

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONGRESS FOR THE BUDGET

The President's budget is but a recommendation. It is prepared after many months of study by the departments of Government, the Bureau of the Budget, and finally the President and his Cabinet. It takes not less than 10 months for the preparation of a budget. This within itself reveals that many of these budget items are estimates subject to careful review and scrutiny.

It is to be expected that there will be a good deal of criticism of the budget estimates as recommended by the President. However, let it be crystal clear that the Constitution places the responsibility for all appropriations and taxes entirely on the Congress.

The President's budget serves a recommendation. All too often these recommendations have been controlling simply because the Congress of the United States has refused to modernize its legislative machinery and to equip itself to handle present day budgets.

The Congress is its own worst enemy when it comes to modernizing its legislative machinery. The rules are the same as they were a hundred years ago. The practice of unlimited debate, the log-rolling that goes on where there are unrecorded roll-call votes on appropriation items—all these add to the confusion and extravagance.

Let me document my criticisms of the congressional procedure. Both the Senate and the House have standing committees on appropriations. Both Houses of Congress have standing committees for the purpose of post-audit or investigation of all budget items. These committees are known as the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It is the responsibility of the Appropriations Committees to examine the President's budget request and ultimately to make its own decision on the basis of the facts as revealed by investigation and testimony. But here is the problem, and it is a problem that the Congress has done nothing about.

In the early days, when budgets were in the millions of dollars instead of the billions, Members of the Congress themselves had time to check the budget requests. But Members of the Congress today are loaded with correspondence, a host of committee and subcommittee meetings, long sessions of the Congress and innumerable details that no one could have dreamed possible 50 years ago. The Congress, therefore, must depend a great deal on professional, trained staff assigned to the congressional committees.

The Appropriations Committees have staffs totally inadequate to scrutinize the budget of even one department, much less the entire Government. Let me be specific. In considering the appropriations for fiscal year 1952 for the military department, the Subcommittee on the Military Budget had but one professional staff member. Yet the budget submitted for approval totaled more than $50,000,000,000. A small retail esablishment would have at least one professional bookkeeper. Yet, here was a subcommittee of the Congress with the full responsibility for analyzing a budget request of the Department of Defense with no more staff than a filling station, grocery store, or a fourth-class post office.

Now whose fault is this? It rests squarely upon the antiquated, old-fashioned habits of the Congress. Yet, many of the very Members of the Congress who cry out for economy and offer budget cuts of 10, 20, and 50 percent have blocked efforts to equip the committees of the Congress with the professional technicians, trained accountants, and investigators necessary honestly and objectively to analyze a budget and thereby reduce the cost of government.

The Federal Budget affects the lives of every American. It may well determine the future economic condition of this Nation. Therefore, it is not enough just to give speeches on economy or to criticize the President. Nor is it fair or sensible just to cut the budget by a flat percentage of, let's say, 20 percent, as some have recommended. To do this might cripple essential services of Government, damage our defense program and jeopardize our national security. The way to eliminate waste in the Government is to improve efficiency in the departments of Government by an item by item, bureau by bureau, department by department study and examination. This requires that the Appropriations and Expenditures Committees have a staff of competent experts who can be assigned to the preparation of a budget from the day that budget begins in a department, up through the Bureau of the Budget hearings, up to the Congress. This means that if the Congress is going to protect the public interest, eliminate waste and promote efficiency, its review of appropriation requests and budget items must start when the budget is in its early and initial stages of preparation. It is a year-around job.

WHAT CAN WE DO?

In the drive to secure economy without swinging the meat ax and thereby jeopardizing our national security, 11 Members of the Senate have joined together in sponsoring a bill, S. 913. This bill has been reported favorably to the Senate by the Senate Committee on Expenditures. I am a cosponsor of S. 913—a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget with adequate staff to scrutinize every appropriation item.

Our Joint Committee on the Budget would have representatives from the appropriations committees and from the expenditures committees jointly serving with the purpose of bringing economy in appropriations and efficiency in administration. The committee, representing both the House and the Senate, would have a staff of some 80 to 100 able, professional, experienced accountants, lawyers, economists, and investigators. The staff would be made available to both the Senate and the House Appropriations Committees. It would be divided into specialized sections, one section to work on the military budget, another on the foreign-aid programs, another on the services of the civilian aspects of government, and so forth.

It may cost a million dollars to equip the Congress with the tools and the personnel necessary for modern budget preparation, but it would save perhaps billions of dollars.

WHAT ELSE CAN WE DO?

As a result of extensive hearings and study, I have introduced a bill entitled "The Economy Act of 1952," S. 2602. This bill is cosponsored by five Senators, and was introduced in the House by Congressman ROOSEVELT. It would do several important things that need doing if we are to accomplish honest budgetting:

1. It requires the President to submit a consolidated cash budget. This would necessitate a full and detailed accounting of the flow of cash payments between the public and the Federal Government. In other words, it would be an up-to-date actual listing of expenditures or items paid for year by year. This proposal carries out a recommendation of the Committee for Economic Development.

2. Our bill would also modernize the budget by separating capital from operating expenditures. Without this separation, as every businessman knows, it is impossible to obtain any accurate and realistic picture of our Government's assets and liabilities. We have the support of the Hoover Commission for this proposal.

3. Our bill requires a roll-call vote—the yeas and nays—on all appropriation measures and on all amendments to appropriations bills. This would compel every Member of the Congress to stand up and be counted. Frequently, under present practice, appropriation items are added to the budget by the simple device of the voice vote where no one is recorded. This permits those who talk economy to vote expenditures.

4. Our bill, S. 2602, has a provision for an item veto. This would allow the President to veto specific items which he believes unnecessary. It would permit a veto of logrolling projects that are slipped into appropriation measures again and again. The item veto is vital if we are to prevent padded appropriation bills by special interests.

WHAT ELSE TO DO FOR ECONOMY

The recommendations of the Hoover Commission serve the interests of economy and efficiency. I have supported these measures with all the vigor at my command. The Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments recently estimated that the Hoover Commission recommendations which have already been put into effect are saving the Government more than $2,000,000,000 per year. About 60 percent of these recommendations are now in effect by regulation or public law. The balance of them should be acted upon quickly.

It is my belief that the budget prepared by the President will be reduced. There are many items in this budget which the President feels the Congress should adopt, such as a Federal-aid-to-education program, but I am sure the Congress will not now support them.

At the present time there is an extensive investigation being made into the whole procurement and purchasing operation of the Military Establishment. I believe it is possible to reduce our military budget without reducing fire power. I shall vote to attain this objective.

In all fairness, it should be said that expenditures for the civilian aspect of our Government have been reduced. Nonmilitary expenditures have been cut 9 percent since 1950 in a period when the costs of goods and services have been rising. Actually, the total expenditures for many so-called welfare programs are less today in terms of their purchasing power than they were in 1940.

Effective cuts, if they are to be made, will have to be made all through the budget. It is deceiving to assert that a "welfare cut" would solve our budgetary problems. If we cut out all the welfare programs, if we curtail all of the civilian aspects of Government—which would be inconceivable—we would still have a deficit under the present budget recommendation.

Let us not deceive ourselves with the false economy of across-the-board budget slashes. It is not my idea of economy to say to the Navy Department, "Well, you have asked for $12,000,000,000. We will give you $9,000,000,000. Take it or leave it and make the best of it." Such a policy could do serious damage to our national security. We must solve this national budget problem by adding up what is needed and accepting that total. We cannot solve a problem by first selecting a total that pleases us and then trying to fit our needs to it. This would be like trying to do algebra by first looking up the answer then working backwards. Such a policy is considered both dishonest and unsound.

TAXES

Now, let us talk about taxes. All of us would like to reduce the budget and avoid a further tax increase. The big question is, how? I would be very reluctant to vote for any further tax increase in view of the inequities that now exist in our tax laws. I have fought long and hard to eliminate the obvious and glaring loopholes in our revenue laws. I have based my entire argument on the sound principles of the ability to pay and equality of sacrifice.

The whole question of taxes must be related to the general economic condition of the country and the requirements of Federal spending. In a period of inflation a substantial Federal deficit can and will increase the inflationary pressures. To be quite frank about it, there are two ways to pay our bills. One is the honest and open way of taxation; the other is the dishonest and inequitable way of inflation. Inflation falls most heavily upon those who live on pensions and annuities, the wage earner, and particularly, that vast group of Americans who make up more than 80 percent of our taxpayers, namely, those with incomes under $5,000 a year—those who have the least ability to pay.

It is not easy to discuss taxes in a few paragraphs. But there are some facts which need to be brought out:

First, many of those who complain the most about taxes are those who, according to all the records in the possession of our Government and the banking institutions of the country, are doing the best in terms of profits and income. This is not to say that taxes are not high. They are very high. But taxes must be related to individual income, corporate income, and gross national income. Let us see what the facts are:

First I present the estimated sources of revenue for the fiscal year 1953:

TABLE 2.—*Estimated sources of revenue, fiscal year 1953*

Category	Billions	Percent
Direct taxes on individuals	33.0	46.5
Direct taxes on corporations	27.8	39.2
Excise taxes	9.7	13.7
Employment taxes	5.0	7.0
Customs	.6	.8
Miscellaneous receipts	1.6	2.2
Deduct: Appropriation for Federal old-age and survivors insurance:		
Trust fund	−4.0	−5.6
Refund of receipts	−2.7	−3.8
Total estimated revenue	71.0	100.0
Total estimated expenditures	85.4	
Total estimated revenue	71.0	
Deficit	14.4	

It is apparent that the estimated revenue of $71,000,000,000 as compared with the estimated expenditures of $85,400,000,000 would leave a deficit of $14,400,000,000. This gap between revenue and expenditures is far too big. It could seriously damage the economy.

Now, what to do about it.

First, every effort must be made to reduce expenditures. I think some progress can be made in this area.

Second. Estimated revenues must be increased by plugging the loopholes in the tax laws.

What loopholes, and how much can be produced?

1. Reduce percentage depletion allowances on gas and oil and mining interests. Here a minimum of $350,000,000 can be obtained.

2. Revise the estate- and gift-tax schedule. It was reduced in 1948 and has not been increased even though personal income taxes and corporate taxes have gone up substantially. My proposal would yield $500,000,000.

3. Increase the capital gains tax rate and lengthen the holding period to 1 year. This proposal would yield a minimum of $400,000,000. It is shocking and shameful that the capital gains tax rate has gone up only 1 percent in a period when other taxes have been substantially increased three times in the past 2 years. The capital gains tax rate is the major loophole in our tax laws. It benefits only those with incomes over $14,000 if single, and $28,000 if married. This is indeed special privilege tax legislation. It should be corrected.

4. Enact a tax withholding plan on corporate bond interest and stock dividend payments. The Treasury Department estimates that the Government loses a minimum of $300,000,000 per year because of unreported bond interest and stock dividend receipts. The wage earner has a tax withholding plan on his weekly pay envelope; why can't the corporate bond holder have a withholding plan on his income.

5. We should enact legislation to correct the abuses of family partnerships. In World War II family partnerships shot up by over 300 percent. In the present defense period they have gone up over 200 percent. Why? To avoid payment of proper taxes. I am not talking about a legitimate family partnership of father and son, husband and wife, or brother and brother, where all parties directly contribute to the business either in the form of capital, management or labor. That is an honest, honorable method of business. I am talking about family partnerships which include a 6-week-old second cousin, a 90-year-old granduncle, none of

whom make any contribution, either financially or by labor or management skill. A minimum of $250,000,000 could be raised merely by making the family partnership laws enforceable and fair.

6. There are other loopholes that need to be plugged. For example, tightening up the so-called corporate split-up laws. This is a favorite tax gimmick of corporations that wish to avoid proper tax payments. Then there should be fair restrictions on stock options—a tightening of the laws on corporate spin-offs. These are but a few of the loopholes which are widely publicized and well known and yet provide an escape hatch for the wealthy at a time when they ought to be paying taxes commensurate with their profits.

Finally, there is the item known as income splitting. I recommended during the debate on the recent tax act that income splitting be eliminated. My amendment to eliminate income splitting was offered as a substitute for the 12 percent earned income tax increase which finally was put in the tax bill. Income splitting offers little or no advantage to any married couple with an income under $10,000 per year. For those with incomes of, $500,000 per year, it offers tax relief to the tune of $25,000 per year. It is clear that this provision benefits the upper 10 percent of the taxpayers. This statement was substantiated during the debate by Senator MILLIKIN, of Clorado, the tax leader for the Republican Party. I therefore urged the Congress to repeal this provision, and proved that by doing so we could completely drop the then proposed income-tax increase and still raise more money. My facts were not refuted; in fact, they were agreed to, but we did not have the votes to win.

WHAT ARE THE FACTS ABOUT THE AMERICAN ECONOMY?

Recognizing the burden of high taxes, let's see just what has been happening in the American economy. Can the economy bear the tax load? I think so, and I believe the facts bear me out. The following table entitled "the strength of the economy" gives comparative data on certain economic factors for the years 1929, 1939, 1950, and 1951 and tells the story of what is happening in the American economy. I present this table as a factual analysis obtained from the records of the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury and the Council of Economic Advisers:

TABLE 3.—*The strength of the economy*

[Comparative date on selected items, 1929, 1939, 1950, 1951]

Category	Billions of dollars				Percentage change		
	1929	1939	1950	1951	1929–1951	1939–1951	1950–1951
Gross national product	103.8	91.3	282.6	326.8	215	258	15.6
Same in 1939 prices	85.9	91.3	154.3	166.5	95	82	8.5
Same in 1951 prices	167.2	179.3	301.2	326.8	95	82	8.5
Personal consumption expenditures	78.8	67.5	193.6	204.4	159	203	5.6
Gross private domestic investment	15.8	9.9	48.9	58.8	272	494	20.2
Government purchases of goods and services	8.5	13.1	42.5	63.5	647	385	49.4
National income	87.4	72.5	239.0	276.0	216	281	15.5
Disposable personal income (income after taxes)	82.5	70.2	204.3	222.8	170	217	9.1
Same in 1951 prices	123.7	134.5	219.0	222.8	80	66	1.7
Personal net saving	3.7	2.7	10.7	18.5	400	585	72.9
Corporate profits before tax	9.8	6.5	41.4	44.8	353	589	8.2
Corporate profits after taxes	8.4	5.0	22.8	18.1	115	262	−20.6
Business expenditures for new plant and equipment	9.2	5.2	17.8	23.1	151	344	29.7
Total new construction	10.8	8.1	27.9	29.9	177	269	7.0
Deposits and currency	54.7	64.7	180.6	189.5	246	193	4.9
Consumer credit	6.2	7.0	20.1	20.4	229	191	1.5

AN EXPLANATION

The above chart is in cold figures. It can be supplemented, however, by a few words of explanation and bringing in other important data that should be shown. First, let us take a look at taxes as percentage of national income.

TABLE 4.—*Taxes as percentage of national income*

	National income (billions)	Total taxes (billions)	Taxes as percent of national income
1939	72.5	15.4	21.2
1940	81.3	17.8	21.9
1941	103.8	25.2	24.3
1942	137.1	32.9	24.0
1943	169.7	49.5	29.2
1944	183.8	51.8	28.2
1945	182.7	53.7	29.4
1946	180.3	51.7	28.7
1947	198.7	57.8	29.1
1948	223.5	59.8	26.8
1949	216.7	57.0	26.3
1950	239.0	69.8	29.2
1951	276.0	81.0	29.8

NOTE.—Figures based on official statistic of Department of Commerce (National Income Supplement, Survey of Current Business, 1951). This includes all taxes Federal, State, and local.

You will note that in 1939 all taxes, Federal, State, and local represented 21.2 percent of the national income. In 1951 all taxes represented 29.8 percent of the national income. It is estimated that in 1952 the taxes will represent slightly more than 30 percent of the national income. The interesting point, however, is that as total percentage of taxes has increased, the national income has almost quadrupled. Again, taxes must be related to income. They cannot be discussed in a vacuum.

Per capita disposable income

Per capita disposition of income, which is the average income per person in the United States after payment of income taxes, has risen by 41 percent since 1939. This figure takes into account the reduced purchasing power of the dollar. This is a true increase of 41 percent. In 1951 the per capita disposable income was $1,443, the highest ever in our history.

Weekly wages in current dollars

These figures do not take into consideration the reduced purchasing power of the dollar.

TABLE 5.—*Average weekly earnings in current dollars*

	All manufacturing	Durable goods	Nondurable goods	Building construction	Retail trade
1948	$54.14	$57.11	$50.61	$68.85	$43.85
1949	54.92	58.03	51.41	70.95	45.93
1950	59.33	63.32	54.71	73.73	47.63
1951	64.93	69.90	58.53	81.96	50.19

Industrial production is 83 percent higher than in 1939. Over-all industrial production was 9.5 percent higher in 1951 than in 1950. Durable manufacturers production, 15.2 percent higher. Nondurable manufacturers production, 3.7 percent higher. Minerals production, 11.5 percent higher. Agricultural production is 0.7 percent higher than 1950.

Corporate profits

With corporate profits after taxes in 1951 running at an average of better than $18,000,000,000 per year, it appears that taxes have not placed an unbearable burden on corporate industry.

TABLE 6.—*Corporate profits*

[Annual rates, seasonably adjusted]

[In billions]

	Corporate profits before tax	Corporate tax liability	Total profits after tax	Dividend payments	Undistributed profits
1950					
First quarter	$31.9	$14.4	$17.5	$7.8	$9.7
Second quarter	37.5	16.9	20.6	8.4	12.2
Third quarter	45.7	20.5	25.2	9.4	15.8
Fourth quarter	50.3	22.5	27.8	11.1	16.7
1951					
First quarter	51.8	31.1	20.7	8.8	11.9
Second quarter	45.4	27.0	18.4	9.6	8.8
Third quarter	40.0	23.8	16.2	9.6	6.6
Fourth quarter	42.0	25.0	17.0	10.1	6.9

Effect of high taxes on risk taking

The argument is made that high taxes check incentive—put a block in the way of risk capital—but the facts speak for themselves. Here are the facts:

Business has never taken more risks than in the past 5 years. A good index is expenditures on new plant and equipment. Here are the facts:

TABLE 7.—*Effect of high taxes of risk taking*

	Billion
1947	$17.4
1948	20.0
1949	18.0
1950	17.8
1951	23.1
Total	98.3

Total is almost a cool $100,000,000,000. Believe it or not, it is larger than the total expenditures made during the 17-year period from 1930 to 1946. This doesn't look like people had stopped taking risks.

Stock market

Another indicator is the stock market. In the past year the stock market has reached a 20-year high and has stayed close to that level. Since 1940 stock-market prices have more than doubled. This doesn't spell stagnation. On the contrary, it indicates a faith in the American progress which is a fact that cannot be denied.

Personal savings

One means of measuring the health of the American economy is in the amount of personal savings accrued each year. Here again are the facts, and they speak for themselves.

TABLE 8.—*Savings*

Figures	Billions of dollars			Net saving as percent of disposable income
	Personal income	Disposable personal income	Net saving	
1939	72.6	70.2	2.7	3.8
1944 (highest)	165.9	147.0	35.4	24.1
1948	209.5	188.4	10.5	5.6
1949	205.1	186.4	6.3	3.4
1950	224.7	204.3	10.7	5.2
1951	251.3	222.8	18.5	8.3
Quarterly rates for 1951:				
First quarter	244.1	216.8	8.5	3.9
Second quarter	249.9	221.8	20.1	9.1
Third quarter	253.2	224.7	22.2	9.9
Fourth quarter	258.0	228.0	23.0	10.1

Personal net savings were 72.9 percent higher in 1951 than in 1950 and was approaching its wartime heights. Rose constantly during 1951.

Total in 1951 was $18.5 billion, or 8.3 percent of disposable personal income.

Employment and unemployment

The total labor force in the United States has increased by 7,000,000 since 1939. Total civilian labor force now 62,884,000, of which 61,005,000 were gainfully employed in 1951. Unemployment only 3 percent of labor force last year.

The second half of 1951 figures show an even better picture of economic health: Unemployment was only 2.7 percent. Total labor force was 63,513,000, of which 61,820,000 were gainfully employed.

Today there is a slight increase in unemployment due to a temporary curtailment of some civilian production, shortages of critical materials, and priority allocations, but our experts tell us that very shortly we will have a maximum utilization of our manpower supply and may even face a manpower shortage if international tensions grow.

Gross national product

This figure includes all expenditures on investment of Government, business and individuals for goods and services. Nineteen hundred fifty-one was a banner year, with a total gross national product of $326 billion.

TABLE 9.—*Gross national product*

[Figures in billions of dollars]

	1948	1949	1950	1951
Total	259.0	257.3	282.6	326.8
Personal consumption expenditures	177.9	180.2	193.6	204.4
Gross private domestic expenditures	42.7	33.0	48.9	58.8
Government purchases of goods and services	36.6	43.6	42.5	63.5

Record high in 1951 of $326.8 billion.

This was 15.6 percent increase over previous record in 1950 and, measured in constant 1951 prices, a 68-percent rise since 1939.

Finally, the facts prove that our economy has made enormous strides during the last 12 years. Yet, we have paid the highest taxes in history. The American public is better clothed, better housed, and better fed than ever before. Employment is at an all-time high. Business is at near record levels of prosperity. Farm production is at an all-time peak and farm income is high. Those who face serious difficulties are the small farm producers, the pensioners, those on fixed wages, such as teachers and other public servants, and those in the industrial system who are semiskilled or unorganized. Their difficulty is primarily due to inflation.

No one should underestimate the danger of inflation. It is everyone's job to see that the demon inflation is properly controlled and checked. In a period of defense production, it is imperative that public policy take into consideration the dislocation that comes to industry, to labor, and to the farmers.

Despite high employment and general economic prosperity, there is in some areas of the country real economic distress. For example, in Detroit, where there are more than 100,000 workers unemployed, and in New England States where defense production has stopped civilian production in such items as jewelry and household appliances. There are 2,000,000 American citizens known as migratory labor who are living under intolerable conditions. There are old people trying to eke out an existence under pitifully small pensions and limited incomes. It is the job of the American Government and the American public to see to it that these victims of inflation and dislocation are protected and given a chance for a decent standard of living.

We in America are confronted with a powerful and sinister force in the world—imperialistic, aggressive communism. We must maintain strong defenses, and this costs money. We must have allies—worthy, strong allies. They need our help. We must maintain a strong and healthy American economy. This means expanding production, and above all it means equality of sacrifice. I think it is fair to say that the recent exposé of corruption in Government is but an indication of the kind of attitude that all too often prevails in some sections of American economic life. There are still chiselers and profiteers and speculators. They not only do not want high tax rates and fair tax laws; they even bribe those who administer the tax laws.

CONCLUSIONS

I strongly believe in our economic system. I believe it is the most dynamic, generous, and equitable system that the world has known. This system of economic production and enterprise can be wrecked and damaged by foolish Government policies, to be sure. But it can also be wrecked and damaged by the unlimited greed and selfishness of a handful of unscrupulous people who operate in the market place. Fair tax laws, honestly administered, are essential for the preservation of this country. Fair prices and reasonable profits are a minimum requirement in a period of great emergency. Equality of sacrifice should be accepted by everyone.

Our way of life is being tested; our system of Government and enterprise is being assaulted by a brutal, powerful force. We must be prepared to meet this threat to our institutions, not only today and tomorrow, but for many years to come. We will do much better if we accept this fact and guide our actions in the light of this very critical international situation. At a time when over 60 percent of the population of the world is living on a subsistence diet and poverty stalks the lands of the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Europe, we Americans ought to be grateful for the abundance and prosperity that is ours. We ought to thank God that we are privileged to support a Government and a program which is directed toward the securing of peace and freedom in the world.

REPLY TO STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAFT, IN TEXAS, RELATING TO NORTH KOREAN AGGRESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as all who read the newspapers know, there is a campaign on in the Republican Party for nomination to the presidency.

It has been my observation that whenever the Presidential bee stings a candidate he is very often wholly irresponsible and full of misstatements until he is defeated.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a report from the news ticker. It reads:

HOUSTON, TEX.—

That is far away from New Hampshire. It is far away from Ohio. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is in Texas campaigning—

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, uncorked a bitter attack on foreign policy today and charged that the administration, with an assist from Senator TOM CONNALLY, invited the Communists into Korea.

Mr. President, any statement by the Senator from Ohio or anyone else to the effect that the Senator from Texas was willing to invite or invited any Communists to go into Korea is absolutely untrue and absolutely false. It is something which is being used by a candidate in a frantic effort to get a nomination for which he has run three separate times.

That is the truth about that. The idea of inviting them into Korea! Why, Mr. President, the United States Government aided in training the South Korean armies. It gave them arms and ammunition and funds. Members of the Senate were in South Korea only a short time before the invasion. They testified to having seen a review of the Korean army. Why was it created? It was created for defense against North Korea.

Now we have the Senator from Ohio defiling his own seat in this body by making a statement that we invited the Communists into Korea. What could be further from the truth? I believe that Governor Sherman Adams, of New Hampshire, very aptly pointed out in his statement in this morning's press the ridiculous attitude of the Senator from Ohio in regard to our foreign policy. Not having done this and not having done the other, he is against the North Atlantic Treaty, he is against aid to Western Europe, and he is against a great many other things for the protection and defense of the free world.

What else does the Senator do? The news story states:

TAFT, starting his 3-day tour through Texas, spoke at a luncheon attended by 850 at the Rice Hotel.

It states that most of them were Republicans, of course.

What is he saying there? Why is he uttering these things? In his efforts as a candidate for the Presidency he is willing to subordinate his integrity and his truthfulness, in order to grasp a few slimy, filthy votes, which is what they are when they are purchased by untruths and misrepresentation.

What else does he say? He says that more than token military aid was refused to the South Koreans for fear they would attack the Communists.

Mr. President, it is an outrageous and preposterous and untrue statement to say that somebody was afraid they would attack the Communists. Who made the attack in Korea? It was not the South Koreans. It was the North Koreans and the Communists from Red China who made the attack. Oh, but the Senator from Ohio now is against war in Korea. He is against everything that has happened. What did he say in the Senate when these questions were fresher than they are now? Then he had not gotten so far in his campaign for the Republican nomination as he has now. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1950, shows what he said. He has mulled it over for 2 years, and after 2 years he comes out with this fraudulent statement—a copy of which I hold in my hand. What did he say in 1950? He made a speech in the Senate entitled: "The Korean War Situation." What did he say? Let us see about being afraid that they were going to attack the Communists. This is what he said:

Early on Sunday morning, June 25, the Communist-dominated Republic of North Korea launched an unprovoked aggressive military attack on the Republic of Korea, recognized as an independent nation by the United Nations.

But today he uttered the statement that American authorities would not give more than token military aid to South Korea because they were afraid the South Koreans would attack the Communists.

Here he was saying, on his responsibility as a Senator on the floor of the Senate, that the North Koreans did the attacking.

He said it was unprovoked.

He said:

> Early on Sunday morning, June 25, the Communist-dominated Republic of North Korea—

Is that South Korea?

He said it was North Korea then.

Now he is talking about South Korea. He is down in the South now trying to get a few votes.

He said:

> The Republic of North Korea launched an unprovoked aggressive military attack on the Republic of Korea, recognized as an independent nation by the United Nations.

He goes to the South and attacks the Senator from Texas because, he says, the Senator from Texas is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. What else does he say? I suppose that he was against the Korean war. Here is what he said in another place in his speech on the floor of the Senate; not on the hustings, not cravenly going around and begging a few dirty, filthy votes. It was on the floor of the Senate, standing up like he was an American Senator. Here is what he said.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I call the Senator from Texas to order. I submit that he has called the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] craven in his action.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said "craven votes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Under the rule of the Senate, the Senator from Texas will take his seat.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the senior Senator from Texas be allowed to proceed in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas. [Putting the question.] The ayes have it, and the senior Senator from Texas will proceed in order.

Mr. CONNALLY. This is the first unanimous vote I have seen in the Senate in a long time. It is a much larger vote than the Senator from Ohio will get in the Republican convention after his opponents get through with him.

What else did the Senator from Ohio say on his responsibility as a Senator—not as a carpetbagger going into the South to gather a few votes, but as a Senator of the United States from the good old Commonwealth of Ohio, and speaking here on the floor of the Senate.

In Texas he speaks with the mouth of the politician, the mouth of the demagog, the mouth of the persuasive politician trying to get some votes. But here is what he said in the Senate—this Senate, not the senate of South Korea, not the senate of North Korea, but the Senate of the United States—this is what the Senator from Ohio said—although I hate to quote so much of what he said. His statement was made in the Senate on the same day, June 28, 1950:

> Furthermore, it should be noted that there has been no pretense of consulting the Congress.

So he was anxious to have someone consult him. However, whenever the Democratic President or any other Democratic high official consults the Senator from Ohio, what does that official get? He gets a kick in the ribs or in that vicinity. [Laughter.]

As I was saying, on that occasion the Senator from Ohio said:

> Furthermore, it should be noted that there has been no pretense of consulting the Congress.

To Mr. Republican, "the Congress" means all the Republican Members of the Congress, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives; they, including "Mr. Republican," must be consulted.

On June 28, 1950, the Senator from Ohio also said:

> There has been no pretense of any bipartisan foreign policy about this action.

In other words, he was referring to the action of going into Korea, or resisting the North Koreans, rather. The North Koreans invaded South Korea and almost drove all the South Korean forces into the sea; they were driven as far as Pusan.

The Senator from Ohio also said:

> The leaders of the Republican Party in Congress have never been consulted on the Chinese policy or Formosa or Korea or Indochina.

That is not true; that is an incorrect statement. As I recall, a great number of Republicans and Democrats, both, were called to the White House and conferred there about the whole Korean situation; but the Senator from Ohio says they never were consulted. Unless he is consulted, no one is consulted.

Yet he also said:

> Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee and of the Armed Forces Committee were called to the White House—

So first he said they never were consulted, but in the next breath he said they were called to the White House—

> at 10:30 a. m. on June 27, and were informed with regard to the President's statement, but, of course, they had no opportunity to change it or to consult Republican policy committees in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

He was thinking about the policy committees, the patronage committee or the political committee. They were what he was thinking about then, and now he has a relapse and is thinking about them again.

He said:

> They had no opportunity to change it or to consult Republican policy committees in either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

I see no reason why they could not consult them. They have taxi fare from the White House to the Capitol or to the Senate Office Building or the House Office Building, and they could consult them.

The Senator from Ohio also said at that time:

> I hope at a later time to put into the RECORD a historical statement of the position of various Republican leaders on the general question of China policy, showing that it is very different, indeed, from what the President has heretofore advocated, and that, in general, it is more in accord with what he is now proposing.

Let us see what he said about 2 minutes later:

> Furthermore, it should be noted that there has been no pretense of consulting the Congress. No resolution has ever been introduced asking for the approval of Congress for the use of American forces in Korea. I shall discuss later the question of whether the President is usurping his powers as Commander in Chief. My own opinion is that he is doing so; that there is no legal authority for what he has done. But—

Listen now, Mr. President. Let the newspapers hear this. The voice of the Senator from Ohio is very loud; it reaches a long way; it makes many newspapermen's pencils move in bragging of the great "Mr. Republican." Let us see what they say now.

At that time the Senator from Ohio also said:

> My own opinion is that he is doing so; that there is no legal authority for what he has done. But—
>
> "But," Mr. President—
>
> I may say that if a joint resolution were introduced asking for approval of the use of our Armed Forces already sent to Korea and full support of them in their present venture, I would vote in favor of it.

That is the Senator from Ohio speaking in 1950. Then he would have voted for it; he would have voted to drive the North Koreans out of South Korea. He would have voted to stand by our soldiers in Korea. But now, 2 years later, in his desperate pursuit of the elusive voter, he has changed his mind; he is opposed to the whole thing.

He has been "cussing" and criticizing what has happened in Korea ever since 1950, although he said then that he would have voted for a joint resolution to have our Armed Forces support the United Nations forces there, and so on.

Mr. President, if I had time, I could locate and could quote to the Senate many other contradictory and misleading statements of the Senator from Ohio.

Here is what he says in paying his respects to me—although this is not his language, but the language of the article:

> CONNALLY, Texas Democrat and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has furthered the invitation—

What invitation, Mr. President? The invitation to the Communists to invade Korea.

Mr. President, that statement has no basis whatever in fact, and whoever said it knew it had no basis when he said it.

But it is said that some of the leading Democrats—the President and others, and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—invited the Com-

munists to attack. Does anyone believe the Senator from Texas would do that? If so, I invite him to jump out the window.

This report says:

CONNALLY, Texas Democrat and chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had furthered the invitation, TAFT said, by saying, one month before the Red invasion of Korea, that the United States "would do nothing" should the North Koreans attack.

Mr. President, that is ridiculous and silly.

Here is what the Senator from Ohio said almost 2 years ago:

Early on Sunday morning, June 25, the Communist-dominated Republic of North Korea launched an unprovoked attack—

It was in 1950 that the Senator from Ohio said this.

He now says we were inviting them to attack South Korea, but in 1950 he said:

They made an unprovoked aggressive military attack on the Republic of Korea, recognized as an independent nation by the United Nations. The attack did not cease, and on Tuesday, June 27, the President issued a statement announcing that he had "ordered United States air and sea forces to give the Korean Government, troops, cover, and support."

What else would the Senator from Ohio have us do under the United Nations, when we had agreed that we would resist aggression, and he said that the North Koreans made an unprovoked attack. Because the President sent troops there to resist that unprovoked attack, the Senator from Ohio in 1950 was criticizing him for doing that; but he also said that, had there been a resolution offered, he would have voted for it.

Ah, Mr. President, here is what he says today:

The movement of United States troops into the Korean fighting was done "to bury" mistakes made by the administration.

Is there any Senator on this floor who will rise to confirm that statement as his view?

The idea of making charges that the movement of United States troops into the Korean fighting was done to bury mistakes made by the administration!

If he believes that in 1952, why did he say in 1950 that, had there been a resolution submitted supporting the fighting in Korea and standing by our own forces there, he would have voted for it? Why would he have done that? Did he want to bury the mistakes of the administration, or the mistakes of others connected with the Government? Oh, Mr. President, there is no consistency in it.

He said:

The movement of United States troops into the Korean fighting was done "to bury" mistakes made by the administration.

Yet he said in 1950 that, had there been a resolution directing the fighting in Korea, he would have voted for it, and he would have supported the United Nations troops in Korea.

He was not then actively campaigning for the delegates to the Republican National Convention.

Mr. President, there is a small lizard called a chameleon, which changes his color according to the necessities of the occasion. There are chameleon politicians. I know one chameleon Senator who changes his color according to his surroundings and his necessities. He was against the North Koreans in 1950. Had there been a resolution offered to send the troops into Korea, and to maintain our troops in Korea, he would have voted for it. But in 2 years' time—after 2 years' exposure to the temptation of those who want to make him believe that he has a chance to be President, the chameleon changes its color, and now he is against it. He always has been against it, notwithstanding his statement in 1950 that he was for it.

I read again from the news story:

TAFT told the luncheon crowd, most of them Taft backers—

He had a sympathetic audience, did he not? I can imagine he was applauded by a crowd of that sort—

that the campaign, not the individual, was the important factor in the coming election, and said the only way to win was to "present all the issues, each and every one."

I might add, and a number that are not issues, a number that he has tried to make issues.

Mr. President, it is growing late. I wish I had time to search this out. He is not going to mislead many Texans. He has some support in Texas, I grant you, Mr. President, there are a good many good Republicans in Texas, a great many of them, some of them for him and some of them for other candidates for the presidency. But they will not be deceived, they will not be fooled by any such political claptrap as appears in that statement in the press. They know the motives behind it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not just now, but in a moment.

Words are one thing, but after all, the motive behind the words is more important than the words themselves. They hear his words, but they know what is behind those words, and the people of Texas will not be deceived, they will not be misled by all this political hokum which the senior Senator from Ohio is seeking to spread.

He is trying to make the bait tempting, he is trying to make it attractive, he is trying to lure the voters along, in line with the spider and the fly operation. Those are the tactics of the Senator from Ohio. I wish he would consider the accuracy of his statements. I wish he would go off into his closet, as every good Christian does now and then, and get down on his knees and examine the statements he has made and the sentiments he has entertained, and then conscientiously tell the people of the United States the results of his cogitations and meditations concerning his lacerations of accuracy and of truth. As I said a little while ago, I am sorry for the Senator from Ohio. It is said that whenever the presidential bug bites or stings a man, as a Senator he is not much of a Senator any more. If he is a Member of the House, he is not much of a Representative any more. He is pursuing that little will-o'-the-wisp which leads him out into the bogs of misstatement and exaggeration and incorrectness, and all the implications which go with those words.

I accept the challenge of the Senator from Ohio. I will get some more of his record, since he has opened it up. Mr. President, you will find his position in a good many different places, one time on the right, the next time on the left, and if three voters make a noise where he can hear them, he will change it again, to get those voters, if possible. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I deeply regret the conduct and the utterances of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LONG and Mr. WELKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield for a moment, but I must rush along. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Certainly many of us who have served with the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, know that he has patriotically and accurately supported every measure which in his judgment would contribute to the defeat of communism and the preservation of democracy. Much has been done, not only under the leadership of our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, but also under the leadership of outstanding Republicans, who have joined in the fight to hold back communism. I believe the record will show that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas has been in the forefront of the fight for every measure to defeat communism and to preserve democracy and the free way of life which Americans have known.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. Let me say that communism has been a serious threat, but the Senator from Ohio is also a big threat.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I join the junior Senator from Louisiana in what he has said. Everyone knows how the senior Senator from Texas cooperated with the late Senator Vandenberg, and how the late Senator Vandenberg, when he was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, cooperated with the senior Senator from Texas, to bring about the nonpartisan program which has meant so much in the effort to establish peace in this troubled world. The senior Senator from Texas is to be commended rather than condemned, and I want to be one of those who commend him.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to say in connection with the comment as to the Senator from Texas being one who would invite Communist attack that it is completely denied by his record as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I should like to ask whether a record of having voted against the North Atlantic Pact, a record of having tried again and again to reduce appriations for economic aid, a record of resistance to adequate military assistance to our allies, and a record of opposition to the point-4 program cannot be regarded as taking a rather unrealistic view as to the threat of Communist aggression and Communist invasion. I am referring, in citing that record, to the voting record on the floor of the Senate of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. In contrast, the Senator from Texas has championed measures for building a great defense for western civilization, for which I commend him.

Mr. CONNALLY. Permit me to say, to add to what the Senator from Minnesota has said, that the Senator from Ohio led the debate against the admission of Greece and Turkey into the North Atlantic Pact, and then finally voted in favor of admitting them. That shows the inconsistency of the Senator from Ohio. Whenever he sees a chance to gather three votes he will exert himself five times to get them.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas that the overwhelming majority of the Senate knows that from the beginning of the efforts of this country to rebuild the free world and to contain communism and to prevent its spread, from the Greco-Turkish pact on to the present time, no one has been in the forefront of the fight to the extent the Senator from Texas has been there. We know that any efforts of any politician in making a political speech to insinuate in any way that Communist forces were invited into South Korea, is the rankest kind of political claptrap. It is certainly known by every thinking Senator that the leadership of the Senator from Texas has been outstanding. He agreed with the late Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, that politics should stop at the shore line. He has insisted on that, and has not allowed in protecting the future of our great Nation, foreign policy to be mingled with political expediency.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma very much.

I do not have the power or the facility properly to define what the Senator from Ohio had in his mind and what he meant when he said we invited Communists into Korea.

The rules of the Senate will not permit me to denounce such a statement in the terms it deserves. The rules of the Senate prevent me from expressing my sentiments regarding such a baseless and ridiculous assertion.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has referred to the leadership of the able Senator from Texas, as have other Senators in their remarks. I should like to recall that during the Eightieth Congress the Republicans were in control, and at that time the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee was a very distinguished and able Republican, the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan, and the able Senator from Texas was at that time the ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. As I recall, Senator Vandenberg boasted, and justifiably so, of the great number of measures which had been reported by the Foreign Relations Committee by unanimous vote; certainly showing that the able Senator from Texas, when he was not chairman, but was sitting in the seat of the opposition, was in complete agreement and unanimity with the Republicans in taking measures to repel communism and to do whatever was necessary to make our country stronger.

If the Senator will yield further, I should like to remind him that in connection with the Mutual Defense Assistance Pact in 1949, the President asked for funds for South Korea. That is the only measure which came before the Senate asking for funds for South Korea. The record will show that the Senator from Ohio voted against providing funds for that purpose right on the eve of the invasion of South Korea by the Communist hordes from North Korea.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I wonder if the able Senator from Texas will yield further.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Did the able Senator from Texas see the comment made by the Governor of New Hampshire and published in this morning's Washington Post regarding the Senator from Ohio and what he was doing to the Republican Party? He made reference to the late Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan. I should like to quote Governor Adams who, a few years ago, was a Member of the House of Representatives——

Mr. CONNALLY. A Republican.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. In his statement regarding the Senator from Ohio and his campaign tactics, the Governor of New Hampshire said:

> Were he President, he makes it clear that he would follow the same isolationist philosophy which turned Vandenberg (the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg) against him. In following this course he would rob America of friends we simply must not lose.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

CONFERENCE BETWEEN SENATOR CONNALLY AND A DELEGATION FROM HAWAII

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, today Mr. Joseph R. Farrington, Delegate of Hawaii to the House of Representatives, requested that I see a delegation from Hawaii regarding remarks which I made and to which the delegation objected. I readily agreed to see them, and they were welcomed to my office. Their complaints were levelled at some remarks which I made on the Senate floor in debate on the motion of Majority Leader MCFARLAND for the Senate to proceed to consider the so-called tidelands bill. It is customary in the Senate to take up a bill when the majority leader makes a motion to do so. That is the normal method of procedure. A bill to admit Hawaii to statehood was also on the Senate Calendar. Those who were supporting Hawaiian statehood were opposed to taking up the tidelands measure. In the course of the debate the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] said:

> However, the people in Hawaii, if the Senator from Texas does not know it, are just as much American citizens as are the Senator from Texas and the Senator from California.

In reply to the Senator from California, the Senator from Texas said:

> I think I am a better American, than a great many people who live in Hawaii. I have been to Hawaii. The majority of the people there are not of American ancestry or descent.

In connection with this comment I might recall that 15 percent of the people of Hawaii are aliens.

The remarks which I made and which have been quoted caused all the excitement and protestation in Hawaii. There was no valid reason for the people in Hawaii getting excited or sending a delegation to Washington to see me. One member of the party gave out a statement in Dallas saying:

> We hope Senator CONNALLY will eat his words. He impugned our Americanism, and he can't do that.

He had a vain hope when he said that.

The delegation was quite calm and respectful, and I gave them a cordial reception and willingly heard all they had to say. I assured them I had no dislike for the people of Hawaii, and that I wanted to be just and fair to them. I assured them that they had no valid cause for all the disturbance they had created because of my words in the Senate.

The misunderstanding which has arisen in Hawaii is due entirely to a misinterpretation of my remarks on the Senate floor. What I intended by my remarks was that the people of Hawaii are technically citizens but they are nonvoting citizens of the United States. They are not yet citizens of a State. They elect only a Delegate to the House of Representatives. They do not elect their governors or their judges or any of their officials. Therefore, they are largely inexperienced in the affairs of American government. I brought no charge

or indictment against the Hawaiian people as a whole, and I have nothing for which to apologize, and I have not eaten my remarks. There are, of course, many good Americans in Hawaii.

In my view, the visit of the delegation from Hawaii was a propaganda effort to secure votes for the Hawaiian statehood bill, and their stopping in Dallas and Austin, Tex., was motivated by political considerations, interests, and efforts.

At no time did I even mention or in any wise reflect upon Hawaiians who served in the Armed Forces in Italy and who were in contact with the Thirty-sixth Division, the major part of whose troops were from the State of Texas. It was ridiculous and preposterous for anyone to assume that I reflected upon Hawaiian soldiers. I respect them for their gallant service to our country, as I respect all other American soldiers. As members of the Army they obeyed the orders of their generals and went where their generals directed. That is a symbol of a good soldier.

After all the noise and shouting in Hawaii about the supposed implication of my remarks, there is nothing further to be said or done about the matter. The delegation left me apparently entirely satisfied with the conference in my office. I see no occasion for any other comment or action respecting the matter.

One final word, Mr. President. I am opposed to Hawaiian statehood. I voted against statehood for Alaska.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAFT, IN TEXAS, RELATING TO NORTH KOREAN AGGRESSION

Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. WELKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho, who rose first.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, one of the difficult positions in which I have been placed since coming to the Senate a little more than a year ago has been in the role of assisting the minority leader in the conduct of minority business.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that it is not easy for me to answer the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, who has leveled a tirade of abuse upon a respected fellow Member of this great body, but, Mr. President, I will say that I do not fear to perform my duty. In my remarks about the senior Senator from Texas, I shall not engage in rancor or bitterness or sarcasm, or anything of that sort.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is not here to defend himself. He is several thousand miles away. It falls upon me, as acting minority leader, to say a few words about my distinguished colleague from Ohio, who needs no defense on the floor of the United States Senate or anywhere else in America.

I have listened to a tirade that has come from a man many years my senior and who has served his State for many, many years. I hope I shall not seem abusive toward the senior Senator from Texas in saying a word about the senior Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, sometimes it seems to me that I am dreaming when I hear in this august body a tirade against a fellow Senator such as that uttered here this afternoon. The senior Senator from Texas has accused the senior Senator from Ohio of doing something about the League of Nations. Men simply are not thinking when they say we are now operating under the League of Nations, when in reality they mean the United Nations. But I can apologize and temper these remarks, because I know the senior Senator from Texas is under a terrific handicap today, and perhaps in the heated passion of his speech he was not too mindful of details.

He has just closed his remarks by saying that he met with a delegation from the Territory of Hawaii, whom we all cheered in the gallery a few moments ago. Among the delegation was a gold-star mother. These people were insulted, ridiculed, and embarrassed by the tirade of the senior Senator from Texas, which brought embarrassment to every Member of this great body.

I can understand why; perhaps the Senator from Texas is not feeling very well.

Mr. President, I wish to speak about a matter which has impressed me very much. I am wondering why all the New Dealers have come in at this late hour today to malign BOB TAFT, who is 3,000 miles away. Certainly nothing new happened when Senator TAFT this afternoon in Houston discussed the record of the senior Senator from Texas, for on the 28th day of June 1950, upon the very floor of the Senate from which I am now speaking, the Senator from Ohio said to the United States Senate and to the world exactly what he said in Houston, Tex., today. If Senators have not already read it, I will invite the attention of the Senator from Texas, and the attention of all other New Dealers who have defended him so ably this afternoon, to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 7, page 9321.

I am quoting Senator BOB TAFT in debate:

> Furthermore, our general position about Korea I think was reasonably expressed by the distinguished Senator from Texas in an interview appearing in the May 5 report of the United States News. The Senator was asked:
>
> "Question. Do you think the suggestion that we abandon South Korea is going to be seriously considered?
>
> "Answer. I am afraid that it is going to be seriously considered because I'm afraid it's going to happen, whether we want it or not. I'm for Korea. We're trying to help her—we're appropriating money now to help her. But South Korea is cut right across by this line—north of it are the Communists, with access to the mainland—and Russia is over there on the mainland. So that whenever she takes a notion she can overrun Korea just like she probably will overun Formosa when she gets ready to do it. I hope not, of course.
>
> "Question. But isn't Korea an essential part of the defense strategy?
>
> "Answer. No. Of course, any position like that is of some strategic importance. But I don't think it is very greatly important. It has been testified before us that Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines make the chain of defense which is absolutely necessary. And, of course, any additional territory along in that area would be that much more, but it's not absolutely essential."

So we have the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of the United States announcing to North Koreans that we are not going to bother with South Korea, they can go ahead, and that we have no policy which in anyway involves an effort to prevent their occupation of South Korea.

Mr. President, the attitude of the administration with regard to the defense of Formosa emphasized clearly the policy of nonintervention in Asia beyond the line laid by Secretary Acheson.

Mr. President, to conclude my brief remarks today, I may say that I have searched the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1950, to see whether the distinguished senior Senator from Texas got his blood pressure up so high on that day. I have not heard one utterance from him, and I have not found one utterance, in which he attempted to answer those words used today in Houston, Tex., the same words as were used on June 28, 1950, by the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the Senate Chamber. Why this sudden influx of Senators who are so close to the administration, and why all this coddling and building up of the distinguished Senator from Texas, who is the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations? I am wondering if the primary in New Hampshire tomorrow morning does not have a little effect on the size of the tribute which has been rendered the Senator from Texas. I am wondering if Senators are not a little concerned whether the Senator from Ohio is really hitting home, not only to the people of New Hampshire, but people all over the world, and especially in the United States, with his discussion of this administration's foreign policy, which has led us down the road to disaster.

Mr. President, I am embarrassed to say that I must apologize on behalf of the senior Senator from Texas when he makes reference to the Senator from Ohio as being in Houston, seeking slimy Texas votes. I came through Texas only a few days ago on my return from the West coast. The people of Texas are fine, fighting, vigorous Americans, whether they be Democrats or Republicans. I should dislike to think that I would ever refer to one of them as being slimy or filthy, or as being one who would cast a slimy, filthy vote.

I say to my distinguished colleague from Texas that perhaps he had better be paying a little attention to how he is going to campaign in the State of Texas. I suggest that he make his peace with Texans, and explain why he called some of them slimy people.

I think the Senator from Texas has been hauling a little political hay this afternoon, not only for the battle which is coming up, a battle for his very political life in 1952 in the great State of Texas, but political hay for the New Deal philosophy in New Hampshire, where balloting starts tomorrow.

I am sorry that I have had to do this. I would much prefer being somewhere else. I hope I may never again sit in this Chamber and hear anyone, whether he be a Democrat, a New Dealer, a Fair

Dealer, or a Republican, assailed in language such as I have heard this afternoon.

Personally I am proud to know that I sit in a body with a man of such stature, ability, integrity, honesty, and fairness as the Senator from Ohio. I will always be at his side when he is right, and I will differ with him when I cannot go along with him, just as I will do with respect to the senior Senator from Texas. But, oh, it was not becoming today to use such language as we have heard. Where was the avalanche of words in June of 1950, when the Senator from Ohio disclosed to the world the activity of the Senator from Texas with respect to Korea, and his activity on the Foreign Relations Committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator from Idaho aware of the exact words with which the Senator from Texas maligned the Senator from Ohio this afternoon, and questioned his integrity? Would the Senator like to have me read the exact record, so that it cannot be altered, changed, or distorted in any way?

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I should like to have that done, with this observation: I want to say to my distinguished colleague the senior Senator from Iowa that I am well familiar with rule XIX, subsection 2, which permits me, as the acting minority leader, to cause any Senator to take his seat when he personally attacks or impugns the character of another Senator. I did not do that to my friend this afternoon, because the only bitter debate I have had since I have been a Member of the United States Senate was had with my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Texas. I did not want it to appear that we had a little feud. I do not want that to happen, because we do not have any feud. But I would like to have the Senator from Iowa read the language into the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am quoting from the record of the Official Reporter, which I have just obtained from the Reporters. Certain statements were being made as I came into the Chamber. The Senator from Texas is talking about the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. Let me say that I am neither defending, disagreeing with, or agreeing with the Senator from Ohio. He is perfectly able to defend himself. However, I want the RECORD to show some things which were said this afternoon, for which I think the Senate can well stand ashamed. I want the RECORD to show the degree to which these matters can go in thoughtless moments.

This is what the Official Reporters furnished me as the statement of the Senator from Texas about the Senator from Ohio:

What is he saying there?—

Referring to the Senator from Ohio—

Why is he uttering these things? In his efforts as a candidate for the Presidency he is willing to subordinate his integrity and his truthfulness, in order to grasp a few slimy, filthy votes, which is what they are when they are purchased by untruths and misrepresentations.

I may say that the Senator from Texas was talking about the activities of the Senator from Ohio in Texas.

Is the Senator aware of the exact words which the Senator from Texas used, to which I objected a moment ago on the floor?

Mr. WELKER. I should like to have them read into the RECORD.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I objected, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio, a Member of this body, to this language—and I want the language exact for the RECORD. Therefore I am reading again from the record of the Official Reporters, which has just been handed to me. I am quoting the Senator from Texas, according to the Official Reporters' record. Speaking about the Senator from Ohio, he said:

Here is what he said in another place in his speech on the floor of the Senate; not on the hustings, not cravenly—

I call the attention of the Senator from Idaho to this language—

not cravenly going around and begging a few dirty, filthy votes. It was on the floor of the Senate, standing up like he was an American Senator—

Then I objected to the language, and the imputations of the language of the Senator from Texas.

The Senator from Texas then said:

Mr. CONNALLY. I said "craven votes."

I suggest that my objection was based on a valid interpretation when I said that he was accusing the Senator from Ohio of cravenly going around and begging a few dirty, filthy votes. I thought the Senator from Idaho would like to have the exact words in the RECORD.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I am grateful to my distinguished friend from Iowa for bringing those facts, and the official record, to the attention of the United States Senate and of the American people.

In conclusion, I wish to ask the senior Senator from Texas whether he is going to fish or cut bait. If he is going to stand upon the tirade he has made against the Senator from Ohio this afternoon, then, by virtue of that stand, he will have to repudiate and give the lie to the interview printed in the May 5, 1950, issue of the United States News and World Report, inserted by the senior Senator from Ohio in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1950. Either he must get on or get off. By his actions today, the Senator from Texas has given us an excellent example of what he meant a few moments ago when he was discussing chameleons.

Mr. President, I do not expect anyone to listen to my philosophy upon foreign policy, but I say that if HERMAN WELKER were running in 1952, or the Senator from Texas, or BOB TAFT, or anyone else who had anything to do with the formation of the foreign policy, which has ruined the lives of more than 108,000 precious American boys, and which is endangering the lives of many hundreds of thousands of American boys freezing in the fox holes and on the barren hills of Korea today in a war which we cannot win, and apparently cannot go ahead with because of the stumbling and fumbling of this administration, in which the distinguished senior Senator from Texas has played a vital part, it is up to every candidate to justify to the American people the part he has played in this terrible reign of disaster, which has ruined the lives of so many American youths in Korea.

It is about time that we quit the petty business of assailing each other upon political grounds and go to the people of Texas, Idaho, Ohio, and the other States and say to them: "This is the foreign policy that I think is so wonderful."

I say that because I know that the mothers and fathers of this Nation today are thinking about this foreign policy more than they are thinking about votes in Texas, Idaho, or New Hampshire, or any place else. The mothers and fathers of the youths of this Nation who have had their limbs blown off and their lives taken will determine whether our foreign policy is so wonderful, and whether it is deserving of such tributes as Secretary Acheson and his clique like to pay it, but which I say the American people will refute in November of 1952.

I am sorry that I had to delay the Senate for this length of time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not care to take up any more time of the Senate. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] has made a great noise about my speaking of the Senator from Ohio when he was down in Texas, 3,000 miles away. I did not send him to Texas. He is elected to sit in the Senate and attend to the business of the Senate. I am not responsible for his being 3,000 miles away. What did he do? He went to my State and handed out this political slush, this political "bunkum." How about doing that when I am not present? I am not present at Houston.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, was the Senator from Texas present when the Senator from Ohio made his speech on the floor of the Senate on the 28th of June 1950, from which I have read to the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not recall. I do not recall the date. He makes so many speeches on so many different occasions that I cannot be expected to remember all of them.

Mr. WELKER. Did the Senator from Texas object to what was said on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will look it up.

Mr. WELKER. I am informed that the Senator from Texas was present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does not the Senator from Idaho ask the man who told him that?

Mr. WELKER. Did the Senator from Texas deny it then?

Mr. CONNALLY. If I was not present and did not hear it, I could not deny it.

Mr. WELKER. I say the Senator from Texas was present.

Mr. CONNALLY. I say I do not know. I will look it up. The Senator from Idaho seems to be superheated for some reason. I have no ill feeling toward the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Of course the Senator from Texas does not have any ill feeling

toward me. I have none toward him, either.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. That is satisfactory. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, here is the Senator from Ohio leaving his exalted position in the Senate, he is Mr. Republican, and he stands on a high pedestal, going to Texas and assaulting me and uttering statements which are not true. He says I participated in inviting——

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not now. In a few moments I shall yield. He says I participated in inviting the Communists to invade South Korea. The Senator from Ohio knows that that is not correct.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas where the President of the United States is today.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is not my business to find out. The Senator from Maryland can go ahead and hunt him up. If the Senator from Maryland does not read the newspapers and if he does not have sufficient information about what is going on in the world to answer that question, he has no business to ask anybody else about it. I would suggest that the Senator from Maryland read the newspapers.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to very much.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would suggest that the Senator from Maryland read his newspaper.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Has the Senator from Texas read his newspaper?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would say to the Senator from Maryland, "Go ahead and read your paper this afternoon."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Where is the President of the United States? I have read the paper.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is exactly it. The Senator from Maryland ought to read it. God gave him eyes to read with. Why does he not use his eyes?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will tell the Senator where the President is. I would say, "He is in a h—l of a fix."

Mr. CONNALLY. According to the Senator from Colorado, he is in the same sort of fix that the Republican Party has been in since 1933, if that is any comfort to him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. There are many indications that the Republican Party is no longer in that fix.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That seems to be a point of worry with the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no; it is not.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I have lived under a Republican administration.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Texas has lived under all sorts of administrations, and he seems to thrive, no matter what kind of administration it is. Before long he is going to have the pleasure of living under a Republican administration again.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am taking a lot of vitamins, and I will have to take a lot more if the Republicans get into power. I may survive. I do not know. They are not in yet. They are in, according to their imagination. They are in, according to their little cliques.

However, Mr. President, I did not finish speaking about the Senator from Idaho. The Senator from Ohio goes into my State and makes a bitter political attack on me, and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] complains that I speak here in my place in the Senate, where the Senator from Ohio ought to be, if he wants to be here. I do not say that he should not be away. Probably I will be away a little myself. However, I should not be charged with attacking the Senator from Ohio. I suppose the Senator from Idaho wants me to hire an airplane and fly down to Houston and say, "Good morning, Mr. Republican. I want to approve of everything that you have done and said here." Well, I am not going to do it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I think discussions of foreign policy are all right, and, indeed helpful; but any statement which would impugn the patriotism of the Senator from Texas is not all right. I know many persons in Texas, and I know well the senior Senator from Texas. Whenever anyone questions his patriotism there is likely to be a fight, as there would be if the patriotism of any of the people of Texas should be questioned. It is one thing to have a discussion of foreign relations and another thing to impugn a Senator's patriotism.

I hope that when the senior Senator from Ohio returns to the Senate he will say that his speech was not correctly reported.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I was somewhat amazed in trying to analyze the thinking of my distinguished friend and colleague, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], in characterizing as he did the answer of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to an attack made on him in Houston, Tex., in which the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] accused an American citizen and a Member of this great body of inviting the attack on South Korea by the Communists of North Korea. If I have ever heard careless or destructive language, provided the Senator from Ohio is quoted correctly, it appears to me it is contained in the statement which in affect virtually accuses a Member of the United States Senate of encouraging an action, if I correctly interpret the meaning of the word "inviting," which has cost the lives of thousands of Americans and has resulted in more than 100,000 American casualties.

I do not know much about the Marquis of Queensberry rules of this great institution—and perhaps it is because I am a new Member—but I do know something about decent, sound American sportsmanship. I think it ill behooves any Member of this body, be he a Republican or a Democrat, to stand up in a Member's home State and level an accusation to the effect that he invited an action which has cost the lives of tens of thousands of American boys.

I think the Senator from Texas was entirely within his rights in making answer. In fact, he was compelled by the type of attack made upon his integrity, his patriotism, and his loyalty to his country, to stand on the floor of the Senate and give answer to that type of attack.

I cannot understand how my distinguished friend from Idaho can yell "foul" and say that the Senator from Ohio had been unfairly dealt with because the senior Senator from Texas chose to defend his patriotism and his loyalty to his country.

I cannot understand that kind of thinking. However, some funny situations develop as we approach election day. Believing that all Members of the Senate are patriotic and honest Americans, I do not attribute to any Member a desire to invite the destruction of American lives. I think it is hitting below the belt for any Member of this body to stand up in any State of the Union and to point a finger at any American, whether he is a Member of the Senate or the House, or a voting American or nonvoting American, and to say that he invited a war which has cost the lives of thousands of American boys.

So far as my distinguished friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] is concerned, he read a statement about the defense perimeter. I am no expert on defense perimeters. Perhaps testimony was given before the Committee on Foreign Relations which spelled out what our defense perimeter was. Perhaps, my good friend the Senator from Idaho overlooks the fact that one of the real purposes of our trying to contain communism was not to break our defense perimeter necessarily, but it was to try to give life and body and sinew and bone to the United Nations and to make realistic and true the dream of mankind for a world in which there would be peace for years to come.

In my book if we had not gone into Korea when we did, almost on the hour when we did, the United Nations would today be a dead issue and a dead instrument to the peoples of this world who for centuries have dreamed about collective security; and no longer would they have even a hope to which they could look forward.

Mr. President, I cannot quite understand the thinking that seems to pervade the minds of some men who would have us believe that the United Nations is of no avail, that instead of trying to contain communism, and to punish military aggression when it started, we should have turned our back upon Korea until it was too late, and that there is not left in South Korea any territory upon which to base a military stand to try to drive back that military aggression. I cannot understand it.

Neither can I understand why, when a Senator undertakes to defend his patriotism and his very honor itself when an attack is levelled against him and he is accused of "inviting a war," he should be charged with making an incorrect

statement or of taking unfair advantage of the very Senator who made the attack in the first place.

Mr. President, I now wish to turn to another subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma has the floor.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, on Wednesday we shall take up a very important issue, President Truman's Reorganization Plan No. 1. I believe that the action we take on it will be the test of whether the Senate believes what it says when it says it is in favor of a real, genuine, nonpolitical merit system, one that will put the internal revenue offices under genuine, blue-ribbon civil service.

In connection with this matter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by James R. Watson, executive Director of the National Civil Service League.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JAMES R. WATSON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE, MARCH 9, 1952

It is utterly inconceivable that 49 Senators would directly flout public will by voting against the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Bureau. I am certain that conscientious Senators will not throw the already-confused citizen into even greater depths of doubt and suspicion. As the question now stands, the Senators must vote on a straight question of patronage. The only basic question is, "Shall we continue the selfish patronage system which has brought corruption, or do we have confidence in Mr. Ramspeck's civil service?" No other question is of basic importance.

No Senator has raised any specific or technical objection to the civil-service system. The statement of two distinguished Senators that senatorial confirmation of Collectors of Internal Revenue serves as "a protection to maintain the integrity of the service," must be analyzed sharply.

The public has a right to ask, "What integrity?"

The fact is that the Senators have not and indeed cannot run a system of personnel management. Political clubhouse control of jobs approved by Senate confirmation has been one of the greatest barriers to the development of more efficient, honest, businesslike personnel methods in Government.

Every Senator who votes against the plan is voting in favor of patronage and helping protect those that have a selfish interest in keeping things as they are now—those who have a vested interest in the status quo.

The league, aware of the implications of this important public issue has, following its own investigation of Reorganization Plan No. 1, further affirmed by consulting top congressional leaders in the anti-corruption drive, decided that it is acting in the public interest.

In consultations with Senator WILLIAMS (Republican), of Delaware, the man who first disclosed corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau, and with Representative KING (Democrat), of California, who has so zealously uncovered and prosecuted the tax frauds, the league was assured that the plan must be adopted in the interest of the public and as an important first step toward the pox of patronage that plagues the civil-service system.

Senator WILLIAMS reiterated to me, as league executive director, his support of the plan as a first step toward cleansing the Internal Revenue Bureau of patronage and corruption.

Representative KING told Mr. Watson that, as a leading House exponent of cleaning up the bureau and the attendant tax scandals, he hopes fervently for Senate adoption of the plan.

Senator MONRONEY (Democrat), of Oklahoma, and leading exponent of civil service reform also, in conferences with the league director reaffirmed his support of the plan.

In an interview with Mr. Watson, Senator MONRONEY said that the exposes of corruption have brought indirect benefit to the public by starting the wheels rolling toward reform.

The League, speaking as a non-partisan civic organization on behalf of the public conscience, is certain that the public does not want this patronage system continued. The newspapers and public spirited citizens across the Nation are firm in the belief that the patronage system, which hides under the guise of Senate confirmation, has contributed to the present corruption.

Hearings on the plan to date have shown:

1. Control of appointments by club-house politicians has led to corruption, special influence, and payoffs in tax cases.

2. The present system makes it impossible to use modern, proven methods for developing personnel efficiency.

3. Political appointees cannot be properly supervised; they are beholden to local political bosses.

4. Units run by political appointees are limited in efficiency, morale, and willingness to accept public responsibility.

5. The present system discourages high-caliber people from entering service of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

A bottom-to-top career system, rather than Senate patronage-ridden confirmation, is the answer to the question of integrity.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAFT IN TEXAS RELATING TO NORTH KOREAN AGGRESSION

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks on some of the observations which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. I was not here during the development of the remarks of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] having to do with the observations of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in Texas, but I have heard the observations of the Senator from Oklahoma and of other Senators in the Chamber.

First of all, I am willing to say on my own responsibility that we did invite the Communist attack in South Korea. We did that in 1950 when the Secretary of State let it be known to the world that we had no further military interest in Korea and Formosa.

We did invite the Communist attack in southern Korea when we pulled out of there, leaving the southern Koreans with nothing but pea shooters with which to meet the aggression by the armed forces of North Korea.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator from Colorado favor the Senate by having placed in the RECORD the complete statement to which he refers, and also the complete statement with reference to the joint withdrawal urged by the United Nations of both forces then in North Korea and in South Korea?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The statement to which I refer was the subject of considerable interrogation and is fully in the record of the hearings that were held under the chairmanship of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. There is not the slightest question about that.

The Secretary of State advised the world by saying that in effect that we had no military interest in South Korea or in Korea or in Formosa. I say that was an invitation, in effect, to move in; and they did.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield again?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. MONRONEY. Surely the Senator from Colorado would not deny the request to have incorporated in his remarks the complete statement, so we can be informed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I will put in the RECORD that which is so well known.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But I do not wish to be diverted by suggestions that perhaps the record will show something different, for the record will not show it.

Mr. MONRONEY. I was only endeavoring to keep the record straight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I gladly yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am very sorry if I am interrupting the Senator from Colorado. I merely wished to express my appreciation to the Senator for complying with my request that that matter be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall be very glad to place it in the RECORD. I do not know whether I will have time to place it in the RECORD in connection with these remarks, but I will place it in the RECORD; the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma can be assured of that.

Mr. President, no one will rise to challenge the end-point of what I have said, namely, that there came from the Secretary of State a communication to the effect that we had no military interest in Korea or in Formosa. I say that was the same, in effect, as inviting the Communists in; and adding to the culpability of the thing was our departure from South Korea before we had fully armed the South Koreans and prepared them for resistance against their enemy, poised to attack on their northern border.

I have heard it said here, "How could a man possibly make such a charge? How could he be such a villain as to say such a thing?"

I am not whispering it; I am saying it out loud with full accountability and responsibility.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that a month before the troops were withdrawn from South Korea, General MacArthur had urged their withdrawal?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That I do not know; but I do know that the operations in southern Korea, before General MacArthur took them over, were under the direction of the State Department.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator challenge that, or shall I put that into the RECORD?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to our defense obligations to South Korea, does not the Senator from Colorado agree that the Secretary of State at the time pointed out that it was the primary responsibility of the United States to defend the Aleutians; Japan, which we were occupying; the Ryukyu Islands, which we were occupying; and the Philippines, with which we had a special defense agreement; and then he said that no one could guarantee against attack all the other areas of the Pacific, but that if anyone should be attacked, initial reliance to resist the attack must be on the people attacked, and then upon the commitments of the entire civilized world under the Charter of the United Nations.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let us assume that that is correct. I do not have the manuscript before me. That does not disparage in one iota the statement which I have attributed to the Secretary of State—not in one iota.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But I believe the Senator from Colorado will agree, in all fairness, that in considering this question, which has been raised so many times, we ought to treat all of it as one. In other words, what the Secretary of State said was that it was a responsibility of the United States of America to defend the Aleutians, to defend Japan, to defend the Japanese islands we are occupying, and to defend the Philippines, but that it was not our primary responsibility to defend the other parts of the Far East; yet, if any nation dared to attack any one of them, while it would be expected that the initial responsibility to resist would rest with the peoples who were attacked, yet the entire civilized world under and through the United Nations would rally to the defense of those areas and to the repulsion of the Communis. aggression.

That is exactly what we did in South Korea, and our action there served notice to all the world that we would do it elsewhere; and General MacArthur himself was the one who paid the finest tribute that has ever been paid to our action in going into South Korea.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, a very strong argument can be made that as chief occupying power, in the Orient, of the areas taken away from Japan, we had the military obligation to defend those occupied lands until they were disposed of by treaty.

How did we do it? We did it by leaving South Korea stripped of all important power, when she was directly menaced by aggressive and well-equipped North Korea. We left South Korea some pea shooters; we left her a few bazookas whose shots bounced like hail on a tin roof when they hit the Russian tanks. But we gave the South Koreans no real preparation at all. We pulled out on them. That is the way we met our responsibility as chief occupying power of the occupied countries; and the way we proposed to meet that obligation to Formosa was to do the same thing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield, of course.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Colorado familiar with the fact that the testimony before the Appropriations Committee of this body showed that in the period before the outbreak of aggression on June 25, 1950, of the supplies which were supposed to be sent to the Republic of Korea forces, the only things that had actually gotten aboard ship was some $200 worth of excess signal equipment, barbed wire, and material of that kind?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am very grateful to the Senator from California for bringing up that point, because another remark which has been made here is that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] voted against supplying the South Koreans.

I do not know how he voted, but it would have been a futile thing to vote for further supplies when the supplies already voted had not been delivered there, just as it was a futile thing for us to vote supplies for the Nationalist Chinese when the supplies we had voted were withheld, so that the Nationalist Chinese could not defend themselves against encroaching Communist forces.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, the evidence was very clear that in the matter of intelligence prior to the outbreak of hostilities, the executive branch of the Government had been advised of the build-up of the Communist forces in North Korea, had been advised of their artillery, and had been advised that they had vacated a zone of several kilometers immediately north of the line, which is always an indication of impending invasion; and that, despite that fact, the supplies were not rushed to the Republic of Korea, but the South Koreans were left on the eve of invasion with merely a shipment of signal equipment?

I should like to say to the Senator, if he will further yield to me, that in 1950, when I was in Korea, I was told by our own military mission there, and by representatives of the Government of the Republic of Korea, that they had had knowledge of the build-up of forces in North Korea, that the Soviet Union was reported to have supplied tanks, heavy artillery, and modern implements of war, including planes, and that at the time the invasion took place we had not supplied the Republic of Korea with a single fighting plane; the only things they had were some small liaison planes. We had supplied them with very little artillery, and even that we knew was much less effective than what the Soviets had supplied to North Korea. In fact, we had left them as a lightly armed constabulary force, in the face of overwhelming evidence that the Soviet Union was building up the North Koreans into a major striking force.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is my impression from having attended a large number of hearings of the two committees sitting jointly, and from my reading of other records and history.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator that that can all be amply documented.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, yes; if anyone wants documentation, we will give him all he wants, including the request for documentation about the invitation to the Commies to move into South Korea. We will give them so much documentation that they will sicken of it.

There was some reference to the United Nations and Korea. In the first place, we dumped on the United Nations a job which may yet break its back. When we went into Korea, we did not consult with the United Nations in advance, and we paid no attention to the fact that our principal allies in the United Nations were in favor of the recognition of the enemy whom we proposed to fight. To this day they have not contributed over 10 or 15 percent of the manpower and material, and to this day they have not abandoned their intention to recognize Red China. They are standing outside embassy doors of Red China, supplicating that government to please accept their offer of recognition. They have not yet, to this day, abandoned their intentions of seating Communist China in the United Nations; so I do not think that bringing up the relation of the United Nations to this business offers any comforting balm.

Of course, it has been pointed out, and everyone knows it, that one of the basic reasons for these recommendations for the proposed seating of Red China on the Council of the United Nations is the trade which our so-called allies are having with our enemies, who are killing our boys. Oh, no; it would be better for the defenders of our policies in Korea not to get too deeply into the United Nations business and our relations with the United Nations in respect to Korea.

Well, Mr. President, the Eightieth Congress in this vast partisan dragnet which has been going on here this afternoon, has been brought in.

Mr. CONNALLY. And it is still going on.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes, still going on.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. Keep on.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will keep going; do not worry about that. We are going ahead.

Mr. CONNALLY. Go ahead.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will go ahead whether the Senator from Texas does or does not.

Mr. CONNALLY. That does not mean anything to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Nor to the Senator from Texas, either.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is getting into a good company.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Very well. We are all in good company here. We all call each other honorable men.

Mr. President, this horrible Eightieth Congress was brought into the discussion by one of the Senators. I would remind this distinguished body that the Eightieth Congress initiated the Marshall plan, and that the Senator from Ohio voted for it. I would remind this distinguished gathering that the Eightieth Congress advocated the 70-group Air Force, and that the Senator from Ohio voted for it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And the President scuttled it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Everyone knows who scuttled it. Of course, it was the President who scuttled it.

One reference has been made, that there is something reprehensible in the fact that the Senator from Ohio is willing to stop to talk to any three people whom he can find. That is one of the reasons why I believe he is going to be our next President. There has been too much pleasant organ music from the stratosphere. The Senator from Ohio is out, meeting the people—and he meets them, come storms, floods and no matter or how high the snows are piled. He goes where they are, and he will stop for three people, or for one person; or for thousands and he will make them a speech, too, and there will be people who do not like the speech because they do not like Senator TAFT, but he will make those speeches. He is gaining in popularity all the time. Great masses of public support are coming every day. That is going to continue. It is going to go right on, because, at long last, I respectfully suggest the American people want a fighting campaign and have found the man to give it to them. They are tired of these fellows who want to do a soft-shoe dance into the Presidency. They want someone to get out and call the issues. Even if they do not agree with him in all respects they will prefer that kind of man to one of those cunning fellows, one of these political soft-shoe dancers. They want a fight, and BOB TAFT is giving them a fight. He is giving them such a fight that many persons opposed to him are in nervous and apprehensive hysterics.

Well, Mr. President, somebody attacked the Senator from Ohio for asking for a reduction in appropriations in our grants-in-aid to Europe, as though that were prima facie some kind of horrible crime. Let me remind my colleagues that there will be very few votes, I venture to predict, in this Chamber, the next time the subject comes up, that will not support reductions from the amounts requested.

I might say that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas has made it known publicly that he is in favor of a reduction in some of those programs. The Senator from Ohio voted to reduce, I voted to reduce. I am ashamed that in some particulars I did not vote for a greater reduction than I did. I shall vote to reduce this next time. So will the distinguished Senator from Texas, because he said he would, and he keeps his word.

Mr. President, I think that is about enough.

Mr. MILLIKIN subsequently said: Mr. President, as part of the remarks I have just made, it was requested that I place in the RECORD some documentation. I should like to place in the RECORD an address made by the Secretary of State before the National Press Club on January 12, 1950. It will be found commencing on page 672 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 1. I should like to have the whole address made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, members and guests of the National Press Club, I stand before you in the tattered remains of my reputation as a lawyer. (The president of the National Press Club, Mr. John O'Brien, in his introduction referred to a biographical sketch of Mr. Acheson at the time of his appointment as Assistant Secretary of State, which stated, "He came to this position with the reputation of a first-rate lawyer, a reputation he still has.") I think anybody who permits me to speak with them on the subject of foreign affairs has their courage in their hands.

The president (again referring to Mr. O'Brien's introduction) has perhaps given a wrong impression of the proceedings in the last few days. I think it is unfair to my friends and colleagues on the Hill to believe that they kept me. The question as to who kept whom is one which is still open.

In talking with you today, I shall try to avoid the sin of dogmatism, and if I do not avoid it I shall leave myself fairly open to your chastisement. I have been in this business of foreign relations too long to believe that anyone can be sure about results. I have been dealing with the subject matter that I am going to talk with you about today too short a time to believe that my judgments are infallible. In fact, I don't believe that anybody's judgments are infallible. And so when I read, as I read in the press this morning, the words of the distinguished statesman who said that there was no doubt that if there had been sincere aid given to the Government of China some years ago, there would have been no difficulty, I was interested to observe the introduction of the word "sincere" which, of course, raises all possibilities of argument: Was the aid given with tongue in cheek? Was it sincere? But the interesting point was that there was no doubt if some kind of aid had been given an inevitable result would have happened.

He then moved from the area of no doubt to the area of possible doubt and he said as time went on to be sure there was doubt whether aid could be successful. But with that slight concession to fallibility, he then moved back to the area of no doubt and he said, but now there is no doubt whatever that aid, and very small aid, can solve the problem of Formosa. I was interested at the courage of a person who can allocate to the area of doubt and no doubt with such assurance, and my mind went back to a man whom you all know, one of the most beloved characters who has ever lived in Washington, Mr. Justice Hitz, who practiced law here for many years and was on our district court and on our court of appeals. I remember Justice Hitz from the bench one day replying to a lawyer who was arguing some dogmatism before him and the old justice said: "My friend, this court is often in error but never in doubt."

This afternoon I should like to discuss with you the relations between the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Asia, and I used the words "relations of the peoples of the United States and the peoples of Asia" advisedly. I am not talking about governments or nations because it seems to me what I want to discuss with you is this feeling of mind that the relations depend upon the attitudes of the peoples; that there are fundamental attitudes, fundamental interests, fundamental purposes of the people of the United States, 150,000,000 of them, and of the peoples of Asia, unnumbered millions, which determine and out of which grow the relations of our countries and the policies of our governments. Out of these attitudes and interests and purposes grow what we do from day to day.

Now, let's dispose of one idea right at the start and not bother with it any more. That is that the policies of the United States are determined out of abstract in the Department of State or in the White House or in the Congress. That is not the case. If these policies are going to be good, they must grow out of the fundamental attitudes of our people on both sides. If they are to be effective they must become articulate through all the institutions of our national life, of which this is one of the greatest—through the press, through the radio, through the churches, through the labor unions, through the business organizations, through all the groupings of our national life, there must become articulate the attitudes of our people and the policies which we propose to follow. It seems to me that understanding is the beginning of wisdom and, therefore, we shall begin by trying to understand before we announce what we are going to do, and that is a proposition so heretical in this town that I advance it with some hesitation.

Now, let's consider some of the basic factors which go into the making of the attitudes of the peoples on both sides. I am frequently asked: Has the State Department got an Asian policy? And it seems to me that that discloses such a depth of ignorance that it is very hard to begin to deal with it. The people of Asia are so incredibly diverse and their problems are so incredibly diverse that how could anyone, even the most utter charlatan, believe that he had a uniform policy which would deal with all of them. On the other hand, there are very important similarities in ideas and in problems among the peoples of Asia, and so what we come to, after we understand these diversities and these common attitudes of mind, is the fact that there must be certain similarities of approach and there must be very great dissimilarities in action.

To illustrate this only a moment: If you will consider as an example of the differences in Asia the subcontinent of India and Pakistan you will find there an area which is roughly comparable in size and population to Europe. You will find that the different states and provinces of that subcontinent are roughly comparable in size to the nations of Europe, and yet you will find such differences in race, in ideas, in languages and religion and culture that, compared to that subcontinent, Europe is almost one homogeneous people.

Or take the difference, for instance, between the people and problems of Japan and

Indonesia, both in the same Asian area. In Japan, you have a people far advanced in the complexities of industrial civilization, a people whose problems grow out of overpopulation on small islands and the necessity of finding raw materials to bring in and finding markets for the finished goods which they produce. In Indonesia, you find something wholly different—a people on the very threshold of their experience with these complexities and a people who live in an area which possesses vast resources which are awaiting development. Now, those are illustrations of complexities.

Let's come now to the matters which Asia has in common. There is in this vast area what we might call a developing Asian consciousness, and a developing pattern, and this, I think, is based upon two factors which are pretty nearly common to the entire experience of all these Asian people.

One of these factors is a revulsion against the acceptance of misery and poverty as the normal condition of life. Throughout all of this vast area, you have that fundamental revolutionary aspect in mind and belief. The other common aspect that they have is the revulsion against foreign domination. Whether that foreign domination takes the form of colonialism or whether it takes the form of imperialism, they are through with it. They have had enough of it and they want no more.

These two basic ideas which are held so broadly and commonly in Asia tend to fuse in the minds of many Asian peoples, and many of them tend to believe that if you could get rid of foreign domination, if you could gain independence, then the relief from poverty and misery would follow almost in course. It is easy to point out that that is not true, and, of course, they are discovering that it is not true. But underneath that belief there was a very profound understanding of a basic truth, and it is the basic truth which underlies all our democratic belief and all our democratic concept. That truth is that just as no man and no government is wise enough or disinterested enough to direct the thinking and the action of another individual, so no nation and no people are wise enough and disinterested enough very long to assume the responsibility for another people or to control another people's opportunities.

That great truth they have sensed, and on that great truth they are acting. They say and they believe that from now on they are on their own. They will make their own decisions. They will attempt to better their own lot, and on occasion they will make their own mistakes. But it will be their mistakes, and they are not going to have their mistakes dictated to them by anybody else.

The symbol of these concepts has become nationalism. National independence has become the symbol both of freedom from foreign domination and freedom from the tyranny of poverty and misery.

Since the end of the war in Asia, we have seen over 500,000,000 people gain their independence and over seven new nations come into existence in this area.

We have the Philippines with 20,000,000 citizens. We have Pakistan, India, Ceylon, and Burma with 400,000,000 citizens, southern Korea with 20,000,000, and within the last few weeks, the United States of Indonesia with 75,000,000.

This is the outward and visible sign of the internal ferment of Asia. But this ferment and change is not restricted to these countries which are just gaining their independence. It is the common idea and the common pattern of Asia, and as I tried to suggest a moment ago, it is not based on purely political conceptions. It is not based purely on ideological conceptions. It is based on a fundamental and an earthy and a deeply individual realization of the problems of their own daily lives. This new sense of nationalism means that they are going to deal with those daily problems—the problems of the relation of man to the soil, the problem of how much can be exacted from them by the tax collectors of the state. It is rooted in those ideas. With those ideas they are going forward. Resignation is no longer the typical emotion of Asia. It has given way to hope, to a sense of effort, and, in many cases, to a real sense of anger.

Now, may I suggest to you that much of the bewilderment which has seized the minds of many of us about recent developments in China comes from a failure to understand this basic revolutionary force which is loose in Asia. The reasons for the fall of the Nationalist Government in China are preoccupying many people. All sorts of reasons have been attributed to it. Most commonly it is said in various speeches and publications that it is the result of American bungling, that we are incompetent, that we did not understand, that American aid was too little, that we did the wrong things at the wrong time. Other people go on and say: "No, it is not quite that, but that an American general did not like Chiang Kai-shek and out of all that relationship grows the real trouble." And they say: "Well, you have to add to that there are a lot of women fooling around in politics in China."

Nobody, I think, says that the Nationalist Government fell because it was confronted by overwhelming military force which it could not resist. Certainly no one in his right mind suggests that. Now, what I ask you to do is to stop looking for a moment under the bed and under the chair and under the rug to find out these reasons, but rather to look at the broad picture and see whether something doesn't suggest itself.

The broad picture is that after the war, Chiang Kai-shek emerged as the undisputed leader of the Chinese people. Only one faction, the Communists, up in the hills, ill-equipped, ragged, a very small military force, was determinedly opposed to his position. He had overwhelming military power, greater military power than any ruler had ever had in the entire history of China. He had tremendous economic and military support and backing from the United States. He had the acceptance of all other foreign countries, whether sincerely or insincerely in the case of the Soviet Union is not really material to this matter. Here he was in this position and 4 years later what do we find? We find that his armies have melted away. His support in the country has melted away. His support largely outside the country has melted away and he is a refugee on a small island off the coast of China with the remnants of his forces.

As I said, no one says that vast armies moved out of the hills and defeated him. To attribute this to the inadequacy of American aid is only to point out the depth and power of the forces which were miscalculated or ignored. What has happened, in my judgment, is that the almost inexhaustible patience of the Chinese people in their misery ended. They did not bother to overthrow this government. There was really nothing to overthrow. They simply ignored it throughout the country. They took the solution of their immediate village problems into their own hands. If there was any trouble or interference with the representatives of the government, they simply brushed them aside. They completely withdrew their support from this government and when that support was withdrawn, the whole military establishment disintegrated. Added to the grossest incompetence ever experienced by any military command was this total lack of support both in the armies and in the country, and so the whole matter just simply disintegrated.

The Communists did not create this. The Communists did not create this condition. They did not create this revolutionary spirit. They did not create a great force which moved out from under Chiang Kai-shek. But they were shrewd and cunning to mount it, to ride this thing into victory and into power.

That, I suggest to you, is an explanation which has certain roots and realism and which does not require all this examination of intricate and perhaps irrelevant details. So much for the attitude of the peoples of Asia.

Let's consider for a moment another important factor in this relationship. That is the attitude of our own people to Asia. What is that fundamental attitude out of which our policy has grown? What is the history of it? Because history is very important and history furnishes the belief on the one side in the reality and truth of the attitude.

What has our attitude been toward the people of Asia? It has been, I submit to you, that we are interested—that Americans as individuals are interested in the peoples of Asia. We are not interested in them as pawns or as subjects for exploitation but just as people.

For 100 years some Americans have gone to Asia to bring in what they thought was the most valuable thing they had—their faith. They wanted to tell them what they thought about the nature and relationship of man to God. Others went to them to bring to them what they knew of learning. Others went to them to bring them healing for their bodies. Others and perhaps fewer went to them to learn the depth and beauty of their own culture and some went to them to trade and they traded with them. But this trade was a very small part of American interest in the Far East and it was a very small part of American interest in trade. It was a valid interest, it was a good interest. There was nothing wrong about it, but out of the total sum of the interests of the American people in Asia, it was a comparatively small part.

Through all this period of time, also, we had, and still have, great interests in Asia. But let me point out to you one very important factor about our interests in Asia. That is that our intereats have been parallel to the interests of the people of Asia. For 50 years it has been the fundamental belief of the American people—and I am not talking about announcements of government, but I mean a belief of people in little towns and villages and churches and missionary forces and labor unions throughout the United States—it has been their profound belief that the control of China by a foreign power was contrary to American interests. The interesting part about that is it was not contrary to the interests of the people of China. There was not conflict but parallelism in that interest. And so from the time of the annouucement of the open-door policy through the nine-power treaty to the very latest resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, we have stated that principle and we believe it. And similarly in all the rest of Asia—in the Philippines, in India, in Pakistan, and Indonesia, and in Korea—for years and years and years the interests of Americans throughout this country have been in favor of their independence. This is where their independence societies and their patriotic groups have come for funds and sympathy. The whole policy of our Government insofar as we have responsibility in the Philippines was to bring about the accomplishment of this independence and our sympathy and help. The very real help which we have given other nations in Asia has been in that direction and it is still in that direction.

Now, I stress this, which you may think is a platitude, because of a very important fact: I hear almost everyday someone say that the real interest of the United States is to stop the spread of communism. Nothing seems to me to put the cart before the horse more completely than that. Of course

we are interested in stopping the spread of communism. But we are interested for a far deeper reason than any conflict between the Soviet Union and the United States. We are interested in stopping the spread of communism because communism is a doctrine that we do not happen to like. Communism is the most subtle instrument of Soviet foreign policy that has ever been devised and it is really the spearhead of Russian imperialism which would, if it could, take from these people what they have won, what we want them to keep and develop which is their own national independence, their own individual independence, their own development of their own resources for their own good and not as mere tributary states to this great Soviet Union.

Now, it is fortunate that this point that I made does not represent any real conflict. It is an important point because people will do more damage and create more misrepresentation in the Far East by saying our interest is merely to stop the spread of communism than any other way. Our real interest is in those people as people. It is because communism is hostile to that interest that we want to stop it. But it happens that the best way of doing both things is to do just exactly what the peoples of Asia want to do and what we want to help them to do, which is to develop a soundness and administration of these new governments and to develop their resources and their technical skills so that they are not subject to penetration either through ignorance or because they believe these false promises, or because there is real distress in their areas. If we can help that development, if we can go forward with it, then we have brought about the best way that anyone knows of stopping this spread of communism.

It is important to take this attitude not as a mere negative reaction to communism but as the most positive affirmation of the most affirmative truth that we hold, which is in the dignity and right of every nation, of every people, and of every individual to develop in their own way, making their own mistakes, reaching their own triumphs, but acting under their own responsibility. That is what we are pressing for in the Far East and that is what we must affirm and not get mixed up with purely negative and inconsequential statements.

Now, let me come to another underlying and important factor which determines our relations and, in turn, our policy with the peoples of Asia. That is the attitude of the Soviet Union toward Asia and particularly toward those parts of Asia which are contiguous to the Soviet Union, and with great particularity this afternoon, to north China.

The attitude and interest of the Russians in north China, and in these other areas as well, long antedates communism. This is not something that has come out of communism at all. It long antedates it. But the Communist regime has added new methods, new skills, and new concepts to the thrust of Russian imperialism. These communistic concepts and techniques have armed Russian imperialism with a new and most insidious weapon of penetration. Armed with these new powers, what is happening in China is that the Soviet Union is detaching the northern provinces [areas] of China from China and is attaching them to the Soviet Union. This process is complete in Outer Mongolia. It is nearly complete in Manchuria and I am sure that in Inner Mongolia and in Sinkiang, there are very happy reports coming from Soviet agents to Moscow. This is what is going on. It is the detachment of these whole areas, vast areas—populated by Chinese—the detachment of these areas from China and their attachment to the Soviet Union.

I wish to state this and perhaps sin against my doctrine of nondogmatism, but I should like to suggest at any rate that this fact that the Soviet Union is taking the four northern provinces of China is the single most significant, most important fact in the relation of any foreign power with Asia.

What does that mean for us? It means something very, very significant. It means that nothing that we do and nothing that we say must be allowed to obscure the reality of this fact. All the efforts of propaganda will not be able to obscure it. The only thing that can obscure it is the folly of ill-conceived adventures on our part which easily could do so and I urge all who are thinking about these foolish adventures to remember that we must not seize the unenviable position which the Russians have carved out for themselves. We must not undertake to deflect from the Russians to ourselves the righteous anger and the wrath and the hatred of the Chinese people which must develop. It would be folly to deflect it to ourselves. We must take the position we have always taken that anyone who violates the integrity of China is the enemy of China and is acting contrary to our own interest. That, I suggest to you this afternoon, is the first and the greatest rule in regard to the formulation of American policy toward Asia.

I suggest that the second rule is very like the first. That is to keep our own purposes perfectly straight, perfectly pure and perfectly aboveboard and do not get them mixed up with legal quibbles or the attempt to do one thing and really achieve another.

The consequences of this Russian attitude and this Russian action in China are perfectly enormous. They are saddling all those in China who are proclaiming their loyalty to Moscow, and who are allowing themselves to be used as puppets of Moscow, with the most awful responsibility which they must pay for. Furthermore, these actions of the Russians are making plainer than any speech or any utterance or any legislation can make throughout all of Asia what the true purposes of the Soviet Union are and what the true function of communism as an agent of Russian imperialism is. These I suggest to you are the fundamental factors, fundamental realities of attitude out of which our relations and policies must grow.

Now, let's, in the light of that, consider some of these policies. First of all, let's deal with the question of military security. I deal with it first because it is important and because, having stated our policy in that regard, we must clearly understand that the military menace is not the most immediate.

What is the situation in regard to the military security of the Pacific area and what is our policy in regard to it?

In the first place, the defeat and the disarmament of Japan has placed upon the United States the necessity of assuming the military defense of Japan so long as that is required, both in the interest of our security and in the interests of the security of the entire Pacific area and in all honor in the interect of Japanese security. We have American and there are Australian troops in Japan. I am not in a position to speak for the Australians, but I can assure you that there is no intention of any sort of abandoning or weakening the defenses of Japan and that whatever arrangements are to be made, either through permanent settlement or otherwise, that defense must, and shall be, maintained.

This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyu Islands and those we will continue to hold. In the interest of the population of the Ryukyu Islands, we will at an appropriate time offer to hold these islands under trusteeship of the United Nations. But they are essential parts of the defensive perimeter of the Pacific and they must, and will be, held.

The defensive perimeter runs from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands. Our relations, our defensive relations with the Philippines, are contained in agreements between us. Those agreements are being loyally carried out and will be loyally carried out. Both peoples have learned by bitter experience the vital connections between our mutual defense requirements. We are in no doubt about that and it is hardly necessary for me to say an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States. But I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack.

So far as the military security of other areas in the Pacific is concerned, it must be clear that no person can guarantee these areas against military attack. But it must also be clear that such a guaranty is hardly sensible or necessary within the realm of practical relationship. Should such an attack occur—one hesitates to say where such an armed attack could come from—the initial reliance must be on the people attacked to resist it and then upon the commitments of the entire civilized world under the Charter of the United Nations which so far has not proved a weak reed to lean on by any people who are determined to protect their independence against outside aggression. But it is a mistake, I think, in considering Pacific and far-eastern problems to become obsessed with military considerations. Important as they are, there are other problems that press and these other problems are not capable of solution through military means. These other problems arise out of the susceptibility of many areas and many countries in the Pacific area to subversion and penetration. That cannot be stopped by military means.

The susceptibility to penetration arises because in many areas there are new governments which have little experience in governmental administration and have not become firmly established or perhaps firmly accepted in their countries. They grow in part from very serious economic problems, some of them growing out directly from the last war, others growing indirectly out of the last war because of the disruptions of trade with other parts of the world, with the disruption of arrangements which furnished credit and management to these areas for many years. That has resulted in dislocation of economic effort and in a good deal of suffering among the peoples concerned. In part this susceptibility to penetration comes from the great social upheaval about which I have been speaking, an upheaval which was carried on and confused a great deal by the Japanese occupation and by the propaganda which has gone on from Soviet sources since the war.

Here then are the problems in these other areas which require some policy on our part, and I should like to point out two facts to you and then discuss in more detail some of these areas.

The first fact is the great difference between our responsibility and our opportunities in the northern part of the Pacific area and in the southern part of the Pacific area. In the north, we have direct responsibility in Japan and we have direct opportunity to act. The same thing to a lesser degree is true in Korea. There we had direct responsibility and there we did act and there we have a greater opportunity to be effective than we have in the more southerly part.

In the southerly part of the area, we are one of many nations who can do no more than help. The direct responsibility lies with the peoples concerned. They are proud of their new national responsibility. You cannot sit around in Washington or London or Paris or The Hague and determine what the policies are going to be in those areas. You can be willing to help and you can help only when the conditions are right for help to be effective.

That leads me to the other thing that I wanted to point out and that is the limitation of effective American assistance. American assistance can be effective when it is the

missing component in a situation which might otherwise be solved. The United States cannot furnish all these components to solve the question. It cannot furnish determination, it cannot furnish the will and it cannot furnish the loyalty of a people to its Government. But if the will and if the determination exist and if the people are behind their Government, then, and not always then, is there a very good chance. In that situation American help can be effective and it can lead to an accomplishment which could not otherwise be achieved.

Now, with that statement, let's deal very briefly—because the time is going on and I am almost equaling my performance in the Senate and House—let's deal very briefly with some of the problems. Let's take the situation in Japan for a moment. There there are three great factors to be faced. The security matter I have dealt with. Aside from that, there are the economic questions and the political questions. In the political field, General MacArthur has been very successful and the Japanese are hammering out with some effort and with some backsliding and regaining and backsliding again of progress a political system which is based on nonmilitaristic institutions.

In the economic field, we have not been so successful. That is in very large part due to the inherent difficulty of the problem. The problem arises with the necessity of Japan being able to buy raw materials and sell goods. The former connections of Japan with the mainland and with some of the islands have been disrupted. That has produced difficulties. The willingness of other countries to receive Japanese goods has very much contracted since the war.

Difficulties of currency have added to those problems. But those matters have got to be faced and have got to be solved. Whether they are solved under a treaty or if the procedural difficulties of that are too great, under some other mechanism, they must be solved along lines which permit the Japanese greater freedom—complete freedom if possible—to buy what they need in the world and to sell what they have to offer on the mainland of Asia, in southeast Asia, and in other parts of the world. That is the nature of the problem and it is a very tough one. It is one on which the occupation authorities, the Japanese Government, ourselves, and others are working. There can be no magic solution to it.

In Korea, we have taken great steps which have ended our military occupation and in cooperation with the United Nations have established an independent and sovereign country recognized by nearly all the rest of the world. We have given that nation great help in getting itself established. We are asking the Congress to continue that help until it is firmly established, and that legislation is now pending before the Congress. The idea that we should scrap all of that, that we should stop halfway through the achievement of the establishment of this country, seems to me to be the most utter defeatism and utter madness in our interests in Asia. But there our responsibilities are more direct and our opportunities more clear. When you move to the south, you find that our opportunity is much slighter and that our responsibilities, except in the Philippines and there indirectly, are very small. Those problems are very confusing.

In the Philippines we acted with vigor and speed to set up an independent sovereign nation, which we have done. We have given the Philippines a billion dollars of direct economic aid since the war. We have spent another billion dollars in such matters as veterans' benefits and other payments in the Philippines. Much of that money has not been used as wisely as we wish it had been used, but here again we come up against the matter of responsibility. It is the Philippine Government which is responsible. It is the Philippine Government which must make its own mistakes. What we can do is advise and urge, and, if help continues to be misused, to stop giving the help. We cannot direct; we should not direct; we have not the slightest desire to direct. I believe that there are indications that the Philippines may be facing serious economic difficulties. With energetic, determined action, they can perhaps be avoided or certainly minimized. Whether that will be true or not, I cannot say, but it does not rest within the power of the American Government to determine that. We are always ready to help and to advise. That is all we can and all we should do.

Elsewhere in southeast Asia, the limits of what we can do are to help where we are wanted. We are organizing the machinery through which we can make effective help possible. The western powers are all interested. We all know the techniques. We have all had experiences which can be useful to those governments which are newly starting out if they want it. It cannot be useful if they don't want it. We know techniques of administration. We know techniques of organizing school districts and road districts and taxation districts. We know agricultural and industrial techniques, all of which can be helpful, and those we are preparing to make available if they are wanted, where they are wanted and under circumstances where they have a fighting chance to be successful. We will not do these things for the mere purpose of being active. They will not be done for the mere purpose of running around and doing good, but for the purpose of moving in where we are wanted; to a situation where we have the missing component which, if put into the rest of the pictures, will spell success.

The situation in the different countries of southeast Asia is difficult. It is highly confused in Burma where five different factions have utterly disrupted the immediate government of the country. Progress is being made in Indochina, where the French, although moving slowly, are moving. There are noticeable signs of progress in transferring responsibility to a local administration and getting the adherence of the population to this local administration. We hope that the situation will be such that the French can make further progress and make it quickly but I know full well the difficulties which are faced by the Foreign Minister of France and my admiration and respect for him are so great that I would not want one word I say to add a feather to the burden that he carries.

In Malaya, the British have and are discharging their responsibility harmoniously with the people of Malaya and are making progress.

In Indonesia, a great success has been achieved within the last few weeks and over a period of months. The round-table conferences at The Hague in which great statesmanship and restraint were displayed, both on the Dutch and the Indonesian side, have resulted in this new government being formed. Relations of this government with the Dutch will be very good and the Dutch can furnish them great help and advice and we will be willing to stand by to give whatever help we can rightly and profitably give. That situation is one which is full of encouragement although it is full of difficulty also.

As one goes to the end of this semicircle and comes to India and Pakistan, we find really grave troubles facing the world and facing these two countries there, both with respect to Kashmir, and to the utter difficulties—economic difficulties growing out of the differences in devaluation, settlement of monetary plans back and forth, et cetera. We know that they have assured one another and they have assured the world that as stubborn as these difficulties may be and difficult as they may be of solution, they are not going to resort to war to solve them. We are glad to hear those assurances and the whole world is glad to hear it but we know also that the problems are in such a situation and in such an area that they are most inflammable, and we believe that in addition to these most desirable assurances there should be some accommodation of wills to bring about a result as soon as possible.

In India and in Pakistan we are willing to be of such help as we can be. Again, the responsibility is not ours. Again we can only be helpful friends. Again the responsibility lies with people who have won their freedom and who are very proud of it.

So after this survey, what we conclude, I believe, is that there is a new day which has dawned in Asia. It is a day in which the Asian peoples are on their own and know it and intend to continue on their own. It is a day in which the old relationships between East and West are gone, relationships which at their worst were exploitation and which at their best were paternalism. That relationship is over and the relationship of East and West must now be in the Far East one of mutual respect and mutual helpfulness. We are their friends. Others are their friends. We and those others are willing to help but we can help only where we are wanted and only where the conditions of help are really sensible and possible. So what we can see is that this new day in Asia, this new day which is dawning, may go or to a glorious noon or it may darken and it may drizzle out. But that decision lies within the countries of Asia and within the power of the Asian people. It is not a decision which a friend or even an enemy from the outside can decide for them.

Thank you very much.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to call particular attention to a portion of the address which appears on page 674 of the same RECORD, as follows:

> This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyu Islands and those we will continue to hold. In the interest of the population of the Ryukyu Islands, we will at an appropriate time offer to hold these islands under trusteeship of the United Nations. But they are essential parts of the defensive perimeter of the Pacific and they must, and will, be held.
>
> The defensive perimeter runs from the Ryukyus to the Philippine Islands.

That lets out Korea and Formosa.

POST-OFFICE FACILITIES LEASED, NOT PURCHASED

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, several months ago it was called to my attention that a large percentage of the post-office facilities in this country were being leased instead of being owned outright. Desirous of ascertaining how the Government was faring under this arrangement, whereby it is becoming one of the world's largest tenants, I asked Mr. Donaldson, the Postmaster General, to conduct a survey of New York City, as an example.

I have the results of this survey before me, and in order that it may be available to every Member of the Senate for a study of what our long-range policy should be, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the letter of the Postmaster General, Mr. Donaldson, in reply to one written by me, and the report of this survey in the form of a tabulation.

The report speaks for itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., February 29, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in further reference to your letter of December 26, 1951, requesting certain information regarding property used for postal purposes in New York City.

As of December 31, 1951, the Department was operating 108 postal units in New York City, including the main post office, three garage units, and the postal concentration center, but exclusive of contract stations and Army post offices. Of this total, 28 are located in Government-owned buildings.

There is enclosed a tabulation covering the units located in leased quarters showing the name of the unit; the name and address of the present owner; date the present quarters were originally leased; total amount of rental paid through December 31, 1951, on each unit since the date the present quarters were leased; the present annual rental of each unit; the value of each property as of the time the current lease was negotiated; and the items included in the rental in each case.

The lessors are required in all instances to pay all taxes and to keep the premises in proper repair and tenantable condition during the continuance of the lease, except in case of damage arising from the act of negligence of the Government's agents or employees.

It will be noted that some of these buildings have been occupied for extended periods, ranging back to 1910. In these long-occupied buildings it will be further noted in some instances that the total rent paid as shown on the tabulation substantially exceeds the indicated value of the property. It will be appreciated, of course, that the lessors are subject to expenses such as taxes, maintenance, insurance, the other items which must be deducted from the aggregate rental they receive. It is nonetheless evident, however, that in making leases for larger postal units the contract is, and necessarily must be, on the basis of compensating the owner for a substantial part of the cost of the building during the term of the lease. At the end of the lease term, however, the Government has acquired no equity in the property and must renegotiate for a new contract on the basis of economic conditions then existing.

The Department has given much thought and study to its leasing operations, especially since they have expanded with the growth of the postal service and because there has been no authorization for Government construction for post-office purposes in some 14 years.

As a means of improving its leasing procedure, the Department on May 31, 1951, submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the President of the Senate proposed legislation to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes. This legislation was introduced in the Senate as S. 1649 and in the House as H. R. 4333. Essentially the proposed legislation would give the Postmaster General authority to make leases for space for postal purposes at rentals which would amortize the lessor's investment during the term of the lease at a reasonable rate of interest. Such leases would contain a stipulation that the title to the property would vest in the United States Government at the expiration of the lease term.

In submitting this legislation for consideration, the Department expressed the belief that it would be in the interests of economy since its present leases amortize some substantial part of the owner's investment yet the Government acquires no equity in the property whatever. With the authority contained in the proposed legislation, the Department could negotiate contracts under which title would vest in the Government at the end of the lease term permitting the acquisition of larger and more satisfactory post-office quarters where needed, without large initial capital investment by the Government.

The Department appreciates your interest in its leasing operations and will be glad to furnish additional information on this subject at any time.

Sincerely yours,

J. M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General.

New York, N. Y., post office—Leased branches and stations

Name of unit	Name and address of present lessors	Date of original lease for present quarters	Total rental paid for present quarters through Dec. 31, 1951	Present annual rental	Value of property	Items included in rental
BRANCH POST OFFICE						
Pelham	Albert Sarnoff, William Sarnoff, Alan H. Posner, 15 West 81st St., New York, N. Y.	Nov. 1, 1936	$98,666.67	$7,000.00	$49,550	Heat, water.
STATIONS						
Allerton	Mildred Real Estate Corp., Suite 319, 19 West 44th St., New York, N. Y.	Oct. 15, 1951	637.09	2,950.00	25,008	Water.
Ansonia	Christine Realty Corp., 740 West End Ave., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 1, 1923	776,250.00	20,000.00	181,568	Equipment, water.
Baychester	Michael and Raphaela Gogliardi, 696 East 241st St., New York, N. Y.	Nov. 16, 1949	6,375.00	3,000.00	35,464	Heat, water.
Botanical	Pauline Bonder, Jacob Berman, and Miriam Berman, care of S. Saltzman, 1630 Grand Ave., Bronx, New York, N. Y.	Apr. 5, 1949	9,038.32	3,300.00	26,125	Water.
Bryant	Shelton Holding Corp., 25 West 43d St., New York, N. Y.	Feb. 1, 1921	805,984.00	29,063.90	252,910	Equipment, heat, water.
Castle Hill	Albert D. Phelp, Jr., 4500 Fieldston Rd., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 6, 1946	13,180.71	2,600.00	20,469	Heat, water.
Cherokee	Irving Savings Bank, 115 Chambers St., New York, N. Y.	May 16, 1949	11,030.64	4,200.00	39,255	Do.
City Island	Amla Realty Corp., 168 East 66th St., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 18, 1931	52,638.57	3,350.00	22,957	Equipment heat, water.
Claremont Park	Mildred Greenspan, 1413 Fulton Ave., New York, N. Y.	Nov. 26, 1951	374.00	3,375.00	27,780	Heat, water, bank-type screen line.
Colonial Park	Certified Corent, Inc., 1860 East Tremont Ave., New York, N. Y.	Feb. 13, 1951	30,569.05	34,700.00	334,563	None.
Columbia University	Trustees of Columbia University, 75 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y.	Jan. 6, 1940	49,648.92	5,000.00	65,798	Heat, water.
Columbus Circle	Edgar T. Appleby et al., 630 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	Sept. 30, 1939	75,525.00	6,900.00	121,612	Do.
Crotona Park	Saul Berman and Bella Berman, 1680 Crotona Park East, New York, N. Y.	May 3, 1949	6,377.74	2,400.00	21,720	Do.
Eastchester	Dolphin Realty Corp., 2 Lafayette St., New York, N. Y.	June 25, 1951	14,983.33	29,000.00	250,000	Water.
Empire State	Empire State, Inc., Room 3220, Empire State Building, 350 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 3, 1934	294,926.59	16,964.30	154,967	Equipment, heat, light, power, water.
Esplanade	Furmbilt Realty Corp., 411 West End Ave., New York, N. Y.	Sept. 1, 1949	9,333.34	4,000.00	38,132	Water.
Fieldston	Ossining Associates, Inc., 64 East 46th St., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 11, 1950	4,650.00	2,700.00	24,645	Do.
Fordham	Markoe Realty Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.	Jan. 7, 1923	317,200.00	10,800.00	94,149	Equipment, water.
Fort Washington	G. & S. Realty, Inc., 370 Fort Washington Ave., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 3, 1950	6,803.32	3,900.00	37,252	Heat, water.
Gracie	87th Street Realty Corp., 522 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	July 25, 1926	504,150.15	21,000.00	145,215	Equipment, water.
Grand Central (Graybar Building).	Eastern Offices, Inc., 420 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.	May 1, 1926	693,974.09	51,000.00	406,644	None.
Greeley Square	Arena Building Corp., 38 West 32d St., New York, N. Y.	Feb. 1, 1930	440,274.74	60,000.00	417,215	Equipment, heat, water.
Hamilton Grange	Robert Bausch and Wilhelmina Bausch, 2825 Sedgwick Ave., New York, N. Y.	May 1, 1910	334,041.65	6,500.00	50,827	Equipment, water.
Hell Gate	Briarwood Hall, Inc., 80 Lefferts Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.	Oct. 15, 1924	468,695.47	15,000.00	99,947	Equipment.
High Bridge	High Bridge Postal Building Corp., 8020 Forsythe Blvd., Clayton, Mo.	Mar. 11, 1929	340,349.37	18,900.00	200,540	Equipment, water.

New York, N. Y., post office—Leased branches and stations—Continued

Name of unit	Name and address of present lessors	Date of original lease for present quarters	Total rental paid for present quarters through Dec. 31, 1951	Present annual rental	Value of property	Items included in rental
STATIONS—Continued						
Hillside	Meyer Halpern, 170 Broadway, New York, N. Y.	May 28, 1951	$1,366.39	$2,300.00	$18,194	Water.
Howard	Valentine Estates, Inc., 910 Sheridan Ave., New York, N. Y.	May 1, 1914	499,875.00	17,500.00	113,630	Equipment, heat, water.
Hub	Nathan Weinberg, 911 Ave. "N", Brooklyn, N. Y.; Irving Fishman, 7 Peter Cooper Rd., New York, N. Y.; Jack Sonneblick, 1700 Grand Concourse, New York, N. Y.	Nov. 2, 1919	405,055.00	16,200.00	128,738	Equipment, water.
Jerome Ave	A. Paul Loshan and Janet Loshan, 155-10 Jamaica Ave., Jamaica, N. Y.	Mar. 2, 1951	19,168.53	23,100.00	290,626	Water, banktype, screenline.
Kings Bridge	Lillian M. Cronin, 5270 Independence Ave., New York 71, N. Y.	Sept. 3, 1951	8,686.11	26,500.00	316,136	Do.
Lincolnton	Lincolnton Properties, Inc., 38-40 West 32d St., New York, N. Y.	Aug. 24, 1951	17,387.10	49,000.00	388,000	None.
London Terrace	London Terrace, Inc., 405 West 23d St., New York, N. Y.	Oct. 1, 1942	28,500.00	4,000.00	33,574	Heat, water.
Longwood	Commerce Realty Corp., 1799 West 3d St., Brooklyn, N. Y.	June 27, 1951	1,942.22	3,800.00	42,487	Heat, water, screenline.
Manhattanville	Gilson Realty Co., Inc., care of Geo. Garfunkel, 130 West 42d St., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 1, 1927	770,500.00	30,000.00	358,988	Equipment, water
Melcourt	Petra Realty Corp., 694 Melrose Ave., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 29, 1949	7,831.45	3,900.00	36,078	Heat, water.
Morningside	A. B. & L. N. Realty Corp., 118 West 79th St., New York, N. Y.	Apr. 1, 1912	419,333.34	11,000.00	88,590	Equipment, water.
Morris Park	Eugene J. and Etta R. Greenbaum, 2324 Morgan Ave., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 8, 1949	4,954.84	2,400.00	19,148	Water.
Mosholu	Jeroad Realty Corp., 2488 Grand Concourse, Suite 414, New York, N. Y.	Nov. 1, 1944	6,450.00	900.00	(1)	Heat, water.
Murray Hill	Postal Facilities, Inc., 55 East Washington St., Chicago, Ill.	Nov. 3, 1927	1,384,327.64	68,500.00	627,174	Equipment, water.
Oak Point	Sol Langer and Rose Langer, 253 East 181st St., New York, N. Y.	Nov. 28, 1949	7,111.66	3,400.00	28,439	Heat, water.
Ogden	Matrix Realty Corp., 270 Broadway, New York, N. Y.	Nov. 16, 1948	5,812.50	1,860.00	15,497	Do.
Parkchester	Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 1, 1940	45,254.00	4,488.00	63,122	Do.
Parkway	Solomon N. Petchers, 100 West 72d St., New York, N. Y.	Sept. 5, 1945	15,173.72	2,400.00	149,660	Do.
Patchin	Ace Associates, Inc., 12 East 41st St., New York, N. Y.	Aug. 9, 1938	56,315.84	5,100.00	42,508	Do.
Peck Slip	Pat-Bee Hotel Corp., 38 West 32d St., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 1, 1950	135,416.67	125,000.00	950,000	None.
Perry Ave	Monruth Realty Corp., 1450 Broadway, New York N. Y.	Dec. 1, 1944	13,987.50	2,250.00	25,667	Heat, water.
Peter Stuyvesant	1140 Leasing Corp., 475 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	Oct. 1, 1951	21,250.00	85,000.00	866,381	Water, banktype, screenline.
Pilgrim	Ralph and Concetta Giordano, 1725 Crosby Ave., New York, N. Y.	Jan. 9, 1950	5,935.47	3,000.00	33,806	Heat, water.
Port Authority	Port of New York Authority, 111 8th Ave., New York, N. Y.	Nov. 16, 1940	84,973.00	9,480.00	148,266	Heat, light, power, water.
Prince	103 Prince Street Corp., 50 Broadway, New York, N. Y.	July 16, 1926	700,089.50	27,500.00	219,728	Equipment, water.
Radio City	52d Street Realty Corp., 22 William St., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 12, 1926	1,926,580.65	66,600.00	511,910	Do.
Riverdale	Deville Tower, Inc., room 516, 220 West 42d St., New York, N. Y.	June 12, 1950	27,950.00	18,000.00	176,000	Water.
Rockefeller Center	Rockefeller Center, Inc., 50 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.	Dec. 4, 1950	61,290.32	57,000.00	464,137	Equipment, heat, light, power, water.
Seamen's Church Institute	Seamen's Church Institute of New York, 25 South St., New York, N. Y.	Oct. 1, 1927	24.25	1.00	(1)	Do.
Soundview	I. W. J. Realty Corp., 31-16 Steinway St., Long Island City, N. Y.	Aug. 20, 1951	10,602.14	29,000.00	246,998	None.
Stadium	Bruges Realty Corp., 349 East 149th St., New York	Dec. 1, 1950	3,791.66	3,500.00	42,342	Heat, water.
Sutton	James H. and Virginia L. Coghill, care of Bank of New York and Fifth Avenue Bank, 48 Wall St., New York, N. Y.	Feb. 1, 1928	150,253.34	6,320.00	46,106	Equipment, heat, water.
Throgg's Neck	Mrs. Helene E. M. Aram, 2901 Scott Pl., New York, N. Y.	Dec. 8, 1945	10,512.29	1,732.90	12,675	Heat, water.
Times Square (to be changed to Midtown, effective Feb. 1, 1952).	Charles B. Benenson, Lawrence A. Benenson, and Raymond E. Benenson, 475 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	June 12, 1921	3,671,334.00	85,135.00	855,825	Equipment, water.
Tremont	Miriam Yavitz, care of Jules Mayer, 52 West 72d St., New York, N. Y.	May 20, 1923	280,537.00	6,650.00	89,280	Do.
Triborough	Jack Resnick and Phillip P. Zipes, 391 East 149th St., New York, N. Y.	Nov. 1, 1920	484,307.02	15,000.00	121,416	Do.
Tudor	Tudor City Ninth Unit, Inc., 551 5th Ave., New York N. Y.	Aug. 23, 1937	1,234.27	900.00	5,516	Equipment, heat, light, power, water.
United Nations	United Nations Organization, New York, N. Y.	Jan. 1, 1951	----------	Free	(1)	Do.
University Heights	University Enterprises, Inc., 140 Featherbed Lane, New York, N. Y.	Mar. 22, 1948	9,744.35	{ 2,580.00 [2] 1,780.00 }	17,073	Heat, water.
Van Nest	Sanrene Realty Co., Inc., care of Charles S. Friedman, 10 Fisk Pl., Mount Vernon, N. Y.	Nov. 14, 1945	10,862.63	1,935.00	20,050	Do.
Wall Street	Seamen's Bank for Savings in the City of New York, 74 Wall St., New York, N. Y.	May 1, 1915	1,709,029.56	48,000.00	484,615	Equipment, water.
Welfare Island	City of New York	Feb. 1, 1931	20.92	1.00	(1)	Equipment, heat, light.
Westchester	Simbar Williamsbridge Corp., 24 West 40th St., New York, N. Y.	Oct. 1, 1925	188,975.00	7,100.00	64,972	Equipment, water.
Williams Bridge	Samuel L. and Henry Kahn, 262 Central Park West, New York, N. Y.	Apr. 1, 1923	178,000.00	6,800.00	51,049	Equipment, heat, water.
Woodlawn	Anton Janota, 3165 Decatur Ave., New York, N. Y.; William Janota, 1855 Grand Concourse, New York, N. Y.	May 15, 1950	9,250.55	15,500.00	129,000	Water.
No. 5	Hearn Department Stores, Inc., 20 West 14th St., New York, N. Y.	Oct. 22, 1934	17.25	1.00 R	(1)	Equipment, heat, light, water.
No. 18	B. Altman & Co., 5th Ave. and East 34th St., New York, N. Y.	Sept. 26, 1945	6.09	1.00 R	(1)	Equipment, heat, light, power, water.
No. 40	Gimbel Bros., Inc., 32d St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y.	Sept. 1, 1926	21.12	1.00 R	(1)	Do.
No. 82	Bloomingdale Bros., Inc., Bloomingdale Department Store, New York, N. Y.	Nov. 4, 1935	16.17	1.00 R	(1)	Equipment, heat, light.
No. 138	R. H. Macy & Co., Inc., 34th St. and Broadway, New York, N. Y.	July 1, 1930	21.50	1.00 R	(1)	Do.
Garage (Main)	Newpostal Service Corp., 522 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	Feb. 1, 1928	4,667,471.94	198,420.00	2,060,500	Equipment, water.
Garage (Bronx Central)	Abejean Estates, Inc., Room 1128, 200 5th Ave., New York, N. Y.	May 15, 1950	63,532.28	39,000.00	359,603	Equipment, heat, light, power, water.
Garage No. 2	Globe Estates, Inc., 122 East 42d St., New York, N. Y.	Sept. 5, 1950	175,194.57	132,500.00	1,147,000	Equipment.

[1] Valuation data not obtained in view of low rental.

[2] Rental, $2,580 first 5 years; $1,780 last 5 years.

New York (N. Y.) Post Office—Proposals have been accepted covering new leases for existing stations or new stations as listed below, but no rental has been paid under these contracts as of the close of business Dec. 31, 1951

Name of unit	Name and address of lessor	Date proposal accepted	Annual rental	Value of property	Items included in rental
STATION					
Columbus Circle	Savoy Estates, Inc., 295 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y	May 18, 1951	$32,000	$260,097	Heat, water.
Grand Central (Graybar Building)	Eastern Offices, Inc., 420 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y	July 9, 1951	55,000	439,656	None.
New Times Square	Webb & Knapp, Inc., 383 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y	Sept. 25, 1950	240,000	2,016,532	Water.
Parkchester	Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 1 Madison Ave., New York, N. Y.	Aug. 22, 1951	60,000	516,192	Heat, water, banktype, screenline.
Tompkins Square	20 Realty Corp., 475 5th Ave., New York, N. Y	Sept. 7, 1951	12,425	104,129	Water, banktype, screenline.

The Post Office Department states that there are 108 properties operated in New York City, and that 28 are located in Government-owned buildings. This would mean that 80 properties should be listed; there are 79.

Totals for the 79 are as follows:

Total rental paid for present quarters through December 31, 1951, $23,672,858.11.

Present annual rental (78 plus one free property), $1,637,061.10.

Value of property (71 properties only; value not listed for 8 properties because of the very low rental), $15,054,786.

Discounting those properties for which value of property is not listed, we have the following picture for the 71 properties. This, of course, would present a truer picture.

Total rental paid for present quarters through December 31, 1951, $23,672,666.31.

Present annual rental, $1,637,054.10.

Value of property, $15,054,786.

Following are for five properties. Proposals have been accepted covering new leases for existing stations or new stations, but no rental has been paid under these contracts as of the close of business December 31, 1951.

Annual rental, $399.425.

Value of property, $3,336,606.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). If there are no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Mr. Peterson be passed over until the next legislative day.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President, until the next call of the executive calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over to the next call of the executive calendar.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I deem it quite appropriate that the acting minority leader should make the request he has made. I have had a conversation with him in regard to the request he has made in behalf of another Member of this body, and I am very happy to cooperate.

I want to take a minute or two, however, to put a few things into the RECORD in regard to Mr. Peterson because I hope that at an early date action can be taken on his nomination. He happens to be my administrative assistant, and I am sure I do not have to tell my colleagues in the Senate that it is very desirable that one who is going to lose his administrative assistant should know it at the earliest possible date so that he can negotiate for replacement. In the midst of a session such as this, I am particularly desirous of appointing a new administrative assistant as soon as that may be possible. However, I think I should place in the RECORD some biographical data on Mr. Peterson because I have been advised that the colleague who has asked to have the nomination go over so that he may have time to study the particular nomination has received a letter of criticism of Mr. Peterson, and I am very happy to have the charges in that letter looked into by my colleague. The same charges were filed at the White House. A very thorough examination of them was made, and a sworn affidavit was filed in answer to the charges and a complete rebuttal of them was made. I regret to say that the charges were made by an individual who has for several years entertained a strong dislike for Mr. Peterson. Those things do happen sometimes in personal relationships. I think it is to be regretted, however, that that situation is being used to try to slow up the process of the confirmation—not by any colleague in the Senate, but by the person who has filed the charges.

I happen to be in a very good position to testify in regard to Mr. Peterson. As the biographical data will show, Mr. Peterson is a naturalized citizen who was born in Nykarleby, Finland, July 15, 1911, of Swedish parentage. He came to the United States in July 1917.

He attended grade schools in Duluth and Hibbing, Minn., from 1918 to 1920 and in Ferry County, Washington, 1920–24. He graduated from high school in Kettle Falls, Wash., in 1929, as valedictorian of his class; he was active in various high school activities, dramatics, athletics, and was president of the student body for two years, and served as editor of the school paper. He worked his own way through high school, on a farm, in a hotel, and during summers beginning in 1927 by laboring in a mine at Kellogg, Idaho.

Mr. Peterson attended the State College of Washington, 1929–33; he graduated with a bachelor of arts in political science, with highest honors. He was elected to Phi Beta Kappa and Phi Kappa Phi. He worked his own way through college at various jobs.

He attended Duke University Law School, Durham, N. C., 1933–36, on a scholarship basis each year, and received a bachelor of laws degree in June 1936. He was active in student bar association affairs and served as assistant editor and coeditor of the Duke Bar Association Journal. He worked his own way through law school, as library assistant and research assistant to various law-school professors.

Mr. Peterson was admitted to the Washington State bar in March 1938, and is a member of the United States Supreme Court bar and is also admitted to various United States courts of appeal, and is a member of the American Bar Association.

He engaged in the active practice of law before appellate courts in representing the National Labor Relations Board on various occasions. He served as assistant editor and associate editor of the Attorney General's Survey of Release Procedures, Department of Justice, from November 1936 to July 1, 1938, under me, during which time I served as editor in chief. At that time I was dean of the University of Oregon Law School. In fact, may I say, Mr. President, that I was at that time called to Washington to take over the work of Justin Miller who was special assistant to the Attorney General and former dean of the Law School of Duke University. When he was appointed as judge on the Board of Tax Appeals I was selected to continue the direction of the research work he was doing in the Department of Justice. Mr. Peterson was on the staff of that research study, having been appointed by Mr. Miller who knew him when he was at Duke University Law School.

May I say that he did a brilliant piece of work on my staff for the 2 years he served on it.

In 1937 I had him come out to Eugene, Oreg., and work with me in the law school there, where a good deal of the final writing and editing that appears in the five volumes we wrote and published on release procedures was done at the University of Oregon law school.

When he finished his work on the survey, he was employed by the National Labor Relations Board on July 1, 1938, and continued with that agency until January 25, 1946, when he resigned. He served in the following capacities: At-

torney in review section until May 1940; associate attorney in Trial Examining Division, May 1940 to May 1941; legal assistant to Chairman Harry A. Millis, May 1941 to September 1941; supervising attorney, review section, September 1941 to September 1943; assistant general counsel in charge of review section, September 1943 to date of resignation, January 25, 1946. In addition to administrative and supervisory duties, he argued various cases in the United States circuit courts of appeal on behalf of board.

He resigned from the National Labor Relations Board on January 25, 1946, to accept a position as assistant director, employee-employer relations department, with the National Association of Broadcasters. He later served as attorney with that association.

He resigned from the National Association of Broadcasters, in October 1948, to accept a position as my executive assistant. When Mrs. Helen Kiefer, my administrative assistant, retired from Government service after serving approximately 20 years in a secretarial capacity to the late Charles McNary, Senator from Oregon, and me. I appointed Mr. Peterson on January 1, 1951, as my administrative assistant. In that capacity he has performed his services with exceptional ability.

He married Elizabeth T. Lupton, of Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 31, 1936. They have no children. He is a resident of Arlington, Va., and has been since April 1945. He is an Episcopalian and a very active member of St. John's Parish, Georgetown, D. C.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the Senator on being able to get his administrative assistant appointed to an important position such as the one involved.

Mr. MORSE. I want to make it very clear that I did not get this appointment for him.

That is a very interesting comment, Mr. President. I was notified by the White House——

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator's administrative assistant upon being recognized.

Mr. MORSE. I think the administrative assistant is to be congratulated upon being recognized. I hope Senators will have a little sympathy for me in the predicament in which I find myself in losing such a very able assistant.

I shall be brief in my statement, Mr. President, but I think I should say for the RECORD that I did not obtain this appointment for my administrative assistant. His record was recognized by others within the administration, who apparently recommended him to the White House, and then the White House—and I do not mean the President, but I mean assistants to the President. I was called in regard to the appointment and asked if I would have any objection to their giving consideration to Mr. Peterson, apparently thinking, as a matter of courtesy, at least, that they ought to ask me if I would protest too much at losing my administrative assistant.

I told them that I had always followed the policy of employing able young men, and of then never standing in the way of their advancement. During the many years of my deanship, I employed young lawyers as teachers. Incidentally, I found that usually they were very good teachers, and worked exceptionally hard in trying to make their records. Then I always sought to promote them, or help them receive promotions to higher positions.

In closing my comments on Mr. Peterson, prior to making a parliamentary inquiry, I wish to say that last Friday the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with a quorum present, met to consider this nomination, and unanimously voted to report it to the floor of the Senate.

As far as I know, Mr. President, there is not a member of that committee who does not favor this nomination. Members of the committee on both sides of the table, so to speak, have had ample opportunity, since Mr. Peterson has been my administrative assistant, to observe his work and recognize that he possesses a judicial mind; that he is neither prounion nor proemployer; that, in fact, he does not believe the composition of a quasi-judicial body should be such that members are either pro one side or pro the other; but that the solemn duty of a member of a quasi-judicial body is to render his decisions on the basis of the preponderance of the evidence on the record that comes before the board in a specific case, in accordance with the letter and spirit of the law.

That is the kind of man Peterson is. I am satisfied that my colleagues on the committee know that to be a fact. Incidentally, Peterson was a classmate of the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] at Duke University Law School. The junior Senator from California, who is also a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, is certainly familiar with the fine work Peterson did as a student, and knows the type of fellow he was as a student.

Mr. President, I shall certainly cooperate with my colleagues in any reasonable way in regard to this nomination. I simply ask this afternoon that early consideration be given to the nomination because I think that would be fair not only to Mr. Peterson but to me.

I have checked this today and I understand that subsequent to the meeting of the committee last Friday a letter was received by the chairman similar in content to the letters that have been received by some of my colleagues in the Senate from an individual who apparently has a strong personal dislike for Mr. Peterson, and who is asking to have his objections to Mr. Peterson considered.

Mr. President, I believe the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is sufficiently well informed about the individual raising the objection and about Mr. Peterson so that it is justified in asking that his nomination, which has reached the calendar, be considered. Therefore, I make the following parliamentary inquiry:

After reasonable time has been given to my colleagues to consider this nomination, would the junior Senator from Oregon then be in order, some afternoon when the Executive Calendar is called, to move that we proceed to the consideration of the nomination, or does such action require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the nomination will be on the Executive Calendar, and when it is reached, unless there is some objection, it will be considered by the Senate at that time.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad that I submitted the statement I have made this afternoon in regard to this matter, Mr. President, because when Mr. Peterson's name is next called on the Executive Calendar, unless it can be shown that there is good reason for further postponement—and I shall certainly be cooperative in regard to that matter, if there is good reason—I shall respectfully request, when the name is next reached on the Executive Calendar, that it be considered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish it understood that I have no reason to delay consideration of this nomination. In agreeing that it go over, I am only agreeing to what is customary when some Senator asks that a nomination go over. That is a courtesy which is generally extended.

Mr. MORSE. With that I am in hearty accord.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, we always try to set these matters down for a reasonable time, giving notice if there is prospect of a contest, in order that those who may wish to object may be present and be heard before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will go over to the next call of the Executive Calendar.

The clerk will state the next nomination.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leonard A. Scheele of Michigan, to be Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 11, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 10 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Leonard A. Scheele, of Michigan, to be the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 10, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all majesty and mercy before whom the angels bow and veil their faces, may our moments of prayer bring us into a blessed communion with Thee and inspire us to live nobly and faithfully.

Grant that we may have a vivid sense of Thy presence and power as we accept the challenge of those imperative duties and demands which we know are far beyond our own wisdom and strength.

Make us so sensitive and responsive to Thy divine leading that we may always seek to do that which will be for the glory and honor of Thy great and holy name.

Hear us for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 6, 1952, was read and approved.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 371)

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1952.

The Honorable The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a sealed envelope addressed to the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the President of the United States, received in the office of the Clerk at 12:10 p. m. on March 7, 1952, said to contain the first report to Congress on the mutual security program.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am transmitting herewith the first report on the mutual security program, covering operations in furtherance of the purposes of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (Public Law 165, 82d Cong.). The report reviews the steps we are taking with other nations to build up the strength of the free world, in support of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Although the mutual security program requires us to spend large amounts for troops and weapons, it is a program for peace. Its ultimate success will come when the troops and weapons are no longer needed, and the moneys now required for defense can be used to raise the living standards of our own and other nations who are truly devoted to peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 7, 1952.*

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department is continuously seeking to improve methods of handling the mail. The old must give way to the new.

In sections where populations are heavy but spread over large areas it has been found that the motortruck is a more economical vehicle to use than the more conventional railroad. The day is not too far distant, for instance, when all of the mail between areas such as Washington and Baltimore will be handled by motortruck.

Innovations bring dislocations; that is why many of us, particularly from the west coast, where the Post Office Department is contemplating abandoning the old service for the new, have received communications protesting either the change or conditions under which the trucks will operate.

The authority to make the changeover is under the star-route provisions of the law. The original statutes, while adequate, did not contemplate mass movement of bulk mail. They need revising.

No restrictions requiring the payment of the recognized wage by truck contractors appear in the postal laws and regulations though there is a question as to whether or not the Bacon-Davis or the Walsh-Healey Acts do not govern these operations.

To clarify the matter and to avoid the inequities that would arise unless those who offer to contract this service know just where they stand with respect to wages, I have requested the preparation of legislation that will establish a firm policy.

This is a complicated subject but with the help of the very competent counsel of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Mr. Fred Belen, and that Mr. C. Breck Parkman, legislative counsel, working with the people in the Post Office Department, I hope to have the bill prepared and in the hopper by the end of the week.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday the Appropriations Committee reported to the House a deficiency appropriation bill which will be taken up on next Wednesday.

The subcommittee handling emergency agencies completely eliminated all funds for the Small Defense Plants Administration. Even though 261 Members of this House, 24 members of the Committee on Appropriations itself sponsored that legislation, the full committee agreed last Friday morning to eliminate all funds and to liquidate the Small Defense Plants Administration.

Those of you who had experience during the last World War know very well that small business was given no attention and no relief whatsoever until the Smaller War Plants Administration was established by the Congress. We are running into the same experience this year. So the Congress last year unanimously established this agency. They are now in a position to help small business throughout the country.

I served notice on the full committee last Friday that on Wednesday next I will offer an amendment to the appropriation bill restoring those funds so that small business in this country will have someone to bring their problems to.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the address of President Truman to the Nation in regard to the mutual-security program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S SPEECH TO NATION

I want to talk to you tonight about a message I sent to the Congress today. I hope you will read that message. It's about the mutual-security program and it is very important to you.

The mutual-security program is just what its name says. It is a way to get security—security against aggression and war—through mutual effort, through the effort of many nations helping one another. This program is already in effect and it is working successfully.

The present authority for the mutual-security program will expire on June 30 of this year. Today, I asked the Congress for authority to continue the program for another year.

The action of the Congress takes on that request has a great deal to do with our chances of avoiding another world war. It may make the difference between life and death for many of you who are listening to me tonight.

That is because the best insurance we can take out against another world war is to stick together with our friends. Together, we cannot be conquered. The Soviet Union cannot achieve its dream of world conquest unless it picks off the free nations one by one. The Soviet policy is the old one: Divide and conquer. Our policy is an old one, too: In unity there is strength.

SOME STILL BLIND

There are still some people in this country who are so blind they won't see this. They try to tell us we ought to confine ourselves to building up our own defenses here at home so we can retreat behind them if trouble comes. That's the way to be safe, they say, and save money at the same time.

Well, they're wrong on both counts. They are not presenting a low-cost plan for national security. They are trying to sell a high-cost plan for national insecurity. And I don't think the people of this country are going to buy it.

Why, it's as plain as the car in front of your door that we cannot cut ourselves off from the rest of the world. It takes a lot of things to make an automobile. It takes steel and chrome and copper and aluminum and lead. We cannot produce all of those things ourselves of our own resources. We have to import every bit of our chrome, two-thirds of our aluminum ore, over half of our lead, and more than a third of our copper and zinc.

It takes about 18 pounds of manganese to make the steel that goes into the average automobile. Do you know how much of that 18 pounds we produce in this country? We produce just about one pound. And it works the same way when it comes to making a tank, or an airplane, or an aircraft carrier. We have to have materials from abroad.

Now, these are facts. And in the light of these facts, I challenge anyone to tell me how this country is going to defend itself if we abandon our allies and hole up on this continent. It just plain can't be done. And if we tried to do it—we would have to cut our civilian requirements to the bone, we would have to raise huge armed forces to try to protect our shores against all comers, and we would have to clamp on controls that would make anything we've seen so far look pale.

Instead of saving money, we would have to spend many times more than we do now, to make up for the loss of materials and armed forces we now get from our allies. What is worse, we would still not be secure.

Now, nobody is saying that we must take over the defense of the free world all by ourselves. That would be just as foolish as trying to get along without any friends at all. We can't defend the whole world by ourselves. We shouldn't try, and we aren't trying. But surely it is to our own self-interest to help our friends defend themselves, because by defending themselves they are also defending us.

PLAN IS SUCCESSFUL

That is what we have been doing ever since 1947. That is the way we have been blockading the Kremlin's conspiracy to undermine and take over the free countries around the world. And we have had a lot of success in this great effort.

We have put a lot into this struggle. It has called for American troops and arms in Europe, and American fleets on the seas, and American bases in foreign lands, and a hard, bitter conflict in Korea.

Our allies are putting a lot into this struggle, too. We and they together have made a great deal of headway in building a solid system for our mutual defense.

Just in this last year we have made great strides in setting up this system of defense, both in the Atlantic and the Pacific areas. The agreement that was made 2 weeks ago at Lisbon to establish an European army represents one of the greatest advances toward European unity that was ever made.

This great defense system—on both sides of the globe—will work if the nations in it have the armed forces to fill it out. And those armed forces have to have the weapons and the equipment they need to be effective.

These are the purposes of this mutual security program—to get weapons and equipment into the hands of our allies, and to help our friends build up their economic strength so they can stand on their own two feet as full partners in the cause of freedom.

Our contributions will take different forms, depending on the nature of the need and the nature of the threat. The mutual security program, as I presented it to the Congress today, combines three types of contributions.

THE ARMS PROGRAM

To begin with, there is the contribution of straight military equipment and arms to help other nations defend themselves—and thereby to help defend us. Of the funds I have asked for—over $5,000,000,000—more than two-thirds of the total will go for these military items, because the largest gaps in the free world's strength at present are in the actual weapons needed for defense.

The second type of contribution consists of raw materials, commodities, and machinery needed to support the military effort. For example, we might send steel to help another country make its own guns instead of sending it the finished weapons.

This is one example of what we call defense support, for which I am asking $1,700,000,000. These funds will enable our friends in Western Europe to produce more military equipment and maintain larger armed forces. Our support for their defense efforts will hasten the day when they can maintain their defenses without our help.

Some people say we should not send our partners such things as raw materials and machinery. They make a great point of saying this is where we can economize. They claim we can save money by sending our partners only things that shoot. What these people don't realize is that this would not be saving money at all. On the contrary, it would cost us more money.

Because if we don't make it possible for other nations to increase their own defense efforts, we would have to send more arms from our own production. And that would cost us a great deal more.

There is a third kind of contribution we are making to attain mutual security. There are parts of the world where plow can do a better job in maintaining stability and democracy than tanks and war planes and machine guns. There the Communist makes his bid for power not as a conqueror but in the guise of a friend offering an end to the torments of famine and disease.

STOMACH COMMUNISM

We know the Communist promises are false, but it would be ridiculous to go to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and the Near East and say, "Here are guns, use them to drive away the men who are promising you what you have always wanted." Stomach communism cannot be halted with weapons of war. We must meet the challenge with more appropriate means. That is what the point 4 program does.

The people of the underdeveloped countries are hungry. We can show them how to grow more food. They are sick. We can show them how they may be healed. Their countries are rich in resources, but their people are very poor. We can show them how to use their resources in a way that will raise their standards of living. This is the first line of defense against communism in those areas of the world.

I have therefore included in my message to Congress a request for some $600,000,000 in economic and technical assistance. It is only a fraction of the amount I have asked for military purposes, but who can say that in the long run it may not have a greater effect?

The victories that can be won in this battle with a relatively small amount of assistance on our part are fantastic. I'd like to give you some examples of what we have done to show what we can do.

Over in Indochina, the rice bowl of that unhappy land is the Red River Valley. Since the war in Indochina, the Red River Valley hasn't been able to produce the rice it should because the irrigation of the district depends on electricity to operate its pumps, and the power lines run through territory held by the Communists who, of course, cut them.

So, Harold E. Schwartz, one of our technical advisers from South Dakota, had some Diesel engines brought in to pump the water. Today 15,000 farm families have 25,000 acres of rice they didn't have last year. This project only cost us $75,000. But one rice crop from this area will be worth $2,000,000. Now there's an example of how a little ingenuity and a small outlay of funds can produce results on a big scale.

STORY IN TURKEY

Another example is in Turkey, where a veritable agricultural revolution is being brought about with the help of a team of nine American experts led by Elmer Starch of Lincoln. In 3 years Turkey has raised its grain production by over 50 percent and has tripled its cotton production.

Now let us look for a minute at India. Since the shadow of Communist control has darkened China, India stands as the largest democratic nation in all Asia. But India is faced with the same kind of threat which overpowered the Chinese. We have a chance to help stop that threat in India. Not by sending guns and planes, but by doing just the kind of thing I've been telling you about.

The first essential step in India is to boost food output so there won't be any more famines, and daily living won't be so hard for people as it is now. The Indian Government has a concrete plan to get this done. They are moving right ahead on it. And we are backing them up with technical assistance and fertilizer and supplies for irrigation projects, tube wells, and the like.

Already projects have been set up to bring point 4 help to 15,000 villages. These projects will bring modern methods to 3,000,000 farms. They will make available on a large scale the marvelous results that have been achieved by one of our agricultural experts, Horace Holmes, of Tennessee, in working with the Indian farmers. They will attack disease, illiteracy, and poverty where they must be attacked, at the village grassroots.

All these things I've been telling you about are part of the mutual-security program. These are its three interrelated parts: First, direct military assistance, which is the biggest part right now; second, the contributions we make to support the defense efforts of other nations; and, third, our programs of economic and technical assistance.

This is not a program to carry the world on our shoulders. It is a program to make it possible for the world to stand on its own feet.

I think our money is well spent on a program like this. It's the cheapest and most effective way to achieve security. But there are those among us who say we can't afford it. We've heard that one before. They are the same people who have been saying, "We can't afford it" to every worth-while thing this Nation has undertaken in the last 20 years. If they had been right, we would be bankrupt now. But they weren't right and we aren't bankrupt.

AMOUNT TO SPEND

Then there are others, both in Congress and out, who are saying, "Sure, I'm all for the mutual-security program. It's a fine

thing, and we must support it. But we'll have to cut it by several billion dollars."

Now I know this is a very popular point of view, especially in an election year—just as popular as a campaign pledge to reduce taxes. But I think most of you will agree with me that we'd be better off to win the fight against communism than to win any particular election.

The figure of $7,900,000,000 that I am recommending was not just taken out of the air. It is the result of many months of careful study. I would not recommend that the Congress spend a single dollar more than our national security requires. Neither would I recommend spending a single dollar less than our security requires. I am convinced that we cannot afford the policy of "too little and too late." The risks in such a policy are too great.

The cost of the entire mutual security program I have recommended is less than 2½ percent of our national output. And this country is raising its output by something like 5 percent a year. We can afford this program.

No; the real threat to our security isn't the danger of bankruptcy. It's the danger of Communist aggression. If communism is allowed to absorb the free nations one by one, then we would be isolated from our sources of supply and detached from our friends. Then we would have to take defense measures that might really bankrupt our economy and change our way of life so that we wouldn't recognize it as American any longer. That's the very thing we're trying to keep from happening. It doesn't have to happen. It won't happen if we stand together with our friends.

IT'S A JOINT EFFORT

The essence of this whole effort is that it's a joint effort. We do our part, others do theirs. You may hear the critics saying that we are doing more than our share and that our allies are not doing theirs. It is no secret that we are continually urging our allies to do more. But that does not mean they are not already doing a great deal. They are. And they're making real sacrifices.

Take the British. They're down to 16 cents' worth of meat a week. That makes a mighty small package when the butcher wraps it up. They would have more if it weren't for their defense effort. Do you think we ought to ask them to cut that 16 cents' worth of meat a week down to a dime's worth—or a nickel's worth? Do they have to do that to do their share? Would you want to tell them that they ought to spend less than 16 cents a week on meat?

The real questions we ought to ask about our allies are these: Do they work hard in the common cause and are they moving in the right direction? I think we can say "Yes" to both questions. During the last 2 years our European allies have doubled their defense budgets. They have more than tripled their military production. They have lengthened their periods of compulsory military service. The number of European divisions available to General Eisenhower has already more than doubled.

We have good allies, and they have not failed us. Some people ask: "Will they fight?" Look at the Greeks and the Turks. They fight. The French are spending their blood and their treasure in Indochina. The British are fighting communism in the jungles of Malaya. And in Korea itself, where we bear the major burden, our allies have joined us with what they can provide. We have good and gallant friends at our side, and they will be there if the test comes.

BEST AND CHEAPEST

What I have been trying to say to you tonight is this: We and the other nations who are ranged beside us have set our feet upon the right road. The mutual security program, in conjunction with our efforts to build up our own forces, is the best and cheapest way to insure our security. It is a carefully thought-out plan of action to meet the challenge—not only the challenge of Soviet Russia but the challenge of the times.

The mutual security program has already made solid achievements. We are not losing, we are winning our fight. We would be foolish from our own point of view and guilty in the eyes of history if we were to stop now.

The program I recommend to the Congress today is a necessity if we are going to block the plans of the Soviet rulers to dominate the world. Make no mistake about it—this is the way we can strike the hardest blows against Russian communism.

That is why the action the Congress takes on my recommendations is going to mean so much to you and to me—to every American. I want you to understand this well, so you will know who it is that just talks against the Communists and who it is that actually votes against them when the roll is called in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

It is awfully easy "to demagog" in favor of economy and against what is scornfully referred to as foreign aid. Congressional action on our mutual security program will be a real test of statesmanship.

If the Congress meets this test, it is in our power to leave our children the most priceless legacy of all—a peaceful world and a better life. History has given us this responsibility and this opportunity.

God grant that we may have the courage and the strength to do our duty.

UNJUST CRITICISM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post is a publication which originated that vile conspiracy several years ago, and carried it on for something like 3 years, to persecute a group of people here in Washington because it was said they were seditious. The Post finally, seeing the error of its way, apologized. In this morning's issue of the Post I find an article by Stewart "All Slop" which criticizes some of the backers of one of the Republican candidates because he says they are throwing mud. If anybody ever was an expert at throwing dirty mud it is this Aesop fellow. I hope you will all read it to see just how far a fellow can go with his mudslinging. Candidate TAFT has not been throwing mud. When another candidate's spokesman said he could not win he just pointed to the record. It remained for Governor Adams, of New Hampshire, to make the statement that TAFT had disqualified himself as a candidate—that he had been hitting below the belt. Adams evidently wants his candidate nominated so much that if he cannot get him on the ticket he prefers a Democrat.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PAN-AMERICAN DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON], chairman of the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and having cleared the matter with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], I offer a resolution (H. Res. 560) relating to Pan-American Day.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby designates Thursday, April 10, 1952, for the celebration of Pan-American Day on which day remarks appropriate to such occasion may occur.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN MAKES A TERRIBLE BLUNDER

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's attempt to prevent committees of Congress from investigating misconduct in the various departments of the Government was a terrible blunder.

If we cannot investigate corruption in the various branches of this Government, expose and drive from power those Communists, or their tools and fellow travelers, who are trying to undermine and destroy this Republic, then the average American is justified in feeling that we are approaching the end of free government.

The President did the same thing when he had the letter the Federal Bureau of Investigation wrote condemning U. E. Condon, head of the Bureau of Standards, sent to the White House and kept there in order to prevent the Committee on Un-American Activities from getting it.

Facts are now being disclosed showing what a terrible mistake the Chief Executive made in the Condon case.

I do not believe the Congress of the United States will sit idly by and permit our Government to be destroyed from within without exposing the facts to the American people and doing everything possible to clean out those elements that are dedicated to the destruction of our form of government and our American way of life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

DISTRICT DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day.

CREATION OF CORPORATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (S. 664) to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law" (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 29–216), be amended to read as follows:

"It shall not be lawful for any corporation, except a charitable, educational, or religious corporation incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia or under any act of Congress, to use its funds to purchase stock in any other corporation."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to allow charitable, educational, and religious corporations to invest their funds in the purchase of common or preferred corporate stocks. Under the present law of the District of Columbia, no corporation may invest in the stock of another corporation. Eleemosynary corporations have been denied the right to invest in common stocks of corporations, thereby seriously limiting their investment portfolios with consequent loss of revenue.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALE ON CREDIT OF BEVERAGES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 3906) to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to restrict the sale on credit of beverges, except beer and light wines, not consumed on the premises where sold, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act is hereby amended so as to provide the following additional section:

"SEC. 35a. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 35 of this act, any holder of a class C license may apply to the Board for a special permit authorizing such licensee to sell on credit and the Board may, in its discretion, and upon such terms and conditions as it may prescribe, issue such a special permit.

"The annual fee for such special permit which shall run concurrently with the annual term of the license shall be $250.

"When application for such special permit is made after the commencement of the license year, the fee therefor shall be prorated, except that in no case shall it be for less than one-half year."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia to issue permits to holders of class C licenses to extend credit upon payment of an annual fee of $250. It would be necessary for the licensee to apply to the Board for this license, and it would in turn be issued in the discretion of the Board, upon the terms and conditions the said Board might prescribe. A class C license is defined by law as a license issued to a bona fide restaurant, hotel, or club, or a passenger-carrying marine vessel serving meals, or a club car or a dining car on a railroad.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to find out what this legislation is all about. I would like to have someone explain what is in this bill. I do not know anything about it and I am asking for this time to have it explained.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the gentleman from Kansas that the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board of the District of Columbia to issue certain permits upon the payment of an annual fee of $250 to any restaurant that serves beer or wine or any kind of alcoholic beverage with meals, and the total bill is to be placed on charge accounts or put on your hotel bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What are the present regulations with respect to the sale of liquor in the District that may be changed by this bill?

Mr. McMILLAN. They have been in effect for some time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And we are letting the restaurants sell liquor now? I mean when food is sold. As I understand it—if they do sell liquor, it must be for cash.

Mr. McMILLAN. They are selling whiskey at the present time. You can go into a hotel and order a meal but you cannot have a drink of wine with your meal and put the wine charge on the bill covering that meal. You cannot sign a meal check if a drink is on there.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Here is the situation now: In such places as the Statler Hotel, the Occidental Restaurant, and a number of other places in town where people such as salesmen who are on expense accounts go in to entertain a guest at a meal they must now get a statement first that involves a charge for the meal, then secondly the restaurant must present a second statement which requires cash under the present regulations for any beverages sold with the meal. It apparently makes no difference to anyone except the customer and the restaurant, although it does cause additional bookkeeping and the necessity of having cash always to meet that second expense.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In other words the salesman presently charges his meals to his constituent and that in turn may be deducted from his income taxes, that is right, is it not? Under this measure he can put the liquor on the same bill and make it that much more; is that it?

Mr. ALLEN of California. No; that is not it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. It seems that would really be the way it would work out.

Mr. ALLEN of California. The way it is now he pays the check and pays cash for whatever beverage he has consumed. That goes as a deduction. He charges the meals, and that goes as a deduction.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Is the liquor a deduction too?

Mr. ALLEN of California. Yes; expense for entertainment. But the difficulty is, I think, instead of having the liquor confined to the service with the meals, he has cash in his pocket and he spends it all over town, which might not be quite as good.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I still think it is better not to include it as part of the food bill. If spent for liquor it ought to be shown in separate accounts.

Mr. ALLEN of California. No; I think it is good for the accounting. The added cost of the accounting is an inconvenience, and the fact that nobody benefits by this operation.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to say that it will give the ABC Board some control also.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman to yield in order to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Are any of these class B licenses to be issued to retail-liquor dealers, in the liquor stores, or are they confined solely to restaurants?

Mr. McMILLAN. Confined to the restaurants.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to say to my distinguished and beloved friend from Kansas that nobody has been able to understand the decision of the ABC Board on this peculiar ruling which they have made. This is to sort of straighten it out and make it just to everyone. I am sure the gentleman, as an exponent of justice, would be for that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am for justice, all right, but not for liberalizing these liquor laws around the District of Columbia or anywhere else.

Mr. O'HARA. This will not keep them from getting liquor, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The fact is more money is spent per capita for liquor

in Washington than in any city of comparative size in the United States. As I understand this bill, it permits the purchase of drinks on credit. That is no good. It ought not to be permitted.

Mr. O'HARA. I know the sincerity of the gentleman and the constant war he has waged on liquor. But let me say to the gentleman, in all seriousness, that this is a ridiculous ruling by the ABC Board, and it is necessary to pass this act to correct that decision, in my opinion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will this legislation make it easier during more hours of the day to get more liquor at a cheaper price?

Mr. O'HARA. Not less. It just means that they get it during the same hours.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The same money?

Mr. O'HARA. The same money. It just eliminates some of this duplicate bookkeeping system.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. So that they will not have to pay any income tax?

Mr. O'HARA. Well, they will have to pay on it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Even so?

Mr. O'HARA. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation of the efforts of our good friend from Kansas, who not only is opposed to liquor and its indiscriminate sale and the disgraceful or harmful effects of the excessive sale and use of it, not only in the District of Columbia, but elsewhere. He always opposes, as I recall, the appropriation for the State Department, which sometimes amounts to millions of dollars, to buy liquor, and what they claim is the finest liquor ever made, for consumption by guests of the State Department.

I have known for a long, long time that there was something wrong with the State Department. I do not know whether it is because of the quality or the quantity of the liquor that they drink. I do realize that the State Department over recent years has followed the policy which has kept us in trouble all this time—followed the policy which apparently some people thought—our good and gifted colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. EATES] did not think so—but some people thought made necessary UMT.

I want to go along with those who think as does our colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], who recently advocated the impeachment or the firing of Secretary of State Acheson. The Secretary seems to be at the bottom of most of our troubles, and if we could get rid of him—why some of my Republican friends would not go along when we had an opportunity on the Phillips amendment to the appropriation bill to cut off his pay, I do not know. I mean the pay he gets from the United States taxpayers. I do not mean any incidental fees or anything of that kind or any satisfaction that he might get because formerly he belonged to a firm of lawyers which represented so many international interests. I am not referring to that. I mean he should be cut off from pay which we were giving him. I cannot understand. There is my good friend from Michigan—I saw him around here a moment ago—Mr. MEADER, who said it was not constitutional to cut off a fellow's pay in that manner. I cannot figure how it can be wrong, unethical, or unconstitutional to cut off the pay of an unwanted employee or a Cabinet member when the Congress created the job which he is holding and has to provide money if it is to continue. Can you figure that one out?

Perhaps I was not quite correct in my reference to the argument of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. He did not actually say that the effort was in contravention of the Constitution. What he said was that he opposed the argument because, "First, its constitutionality is doubtful" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 26, 1951). From that I assumed, perhaps unjustifiably, that he believed the proposal to be unconstitutional; otherwise, great constitutional lawyer that he is, he would not have expressed a doubt.

Previously, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] had said on May 25, 1951:

> Congress is powerless to remove an official in the executive branch of the Government, and it seems to me to be an idle act to make a solemn pronouncement of a program which those who urge such a course of action are without any power to accomplish.

Much as I dislike to disagree with my colleague, I must do so. The Department of State exists because, and only because, the Congress created it. Certainly, that which the Congress created, it can abolish. The Department of State and Mr. Acheson operate because, and only because, the Congress furnishes the money. So far as I know, no court has yet held that it can order the Congress to appropriate money to continue a department. Does it not follow that the job of being a Secretary of State exists because, and only because, of congressional action? The Congress can abolish that job, refuse to appropriate money to continue it.

Let me repeat, I have the greatest possible respect for the learning and the judgment of my colleague, but I think he is in error in this instance.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I certainly will.

Mr. MASON. Getting back to this liquor business, I understood from the gentleman from Minnesota that the necessity for this bill is the fact that the ABC Board of the District has issued a ruling that needs clarification.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We have a liquor store every few doors on the street now.

Mr. MASON. In order to clarify that ruling, they want to collect a license of $250.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That may just raise the price of liquor.

Mr. MASON. Is that the situation we have here, that in order to eliminate that ruling we have to permit them to collect $250 of extra license fee in order to sell on time?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am sorry; I cannot answer that. I would like to know whether whoever gets that $250 will pay an income tax on it. I would like to have our colleague from Minnesota, or the other gentleman, or someone who has this legislation in charge, clarify that for our friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], who understands tax legislation so well that he in fact is an expert on that subject.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of California. The $250 is an additional license which would go with the application for the special license which would give permission to a well-considered application coming from a responsible, bona fide restaurant or a hotel. The ABC Board would get an additional $250 on each such license it granted.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They are going to add that to the price of liquor.

Mr. ALLEN of California. The ABC Board does not sell liquor, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I know the ABC does not sell it. I did not say they did. Maybe they just drink it; maybe they do not, but they do not sell it. I can understand that situation. Somebody else gets the license to sell.

Mr. MASON. Then this special license is to cost $250 more in order to correct the ruling the ABC Board has made?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Could you not get them to reverse that rule?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand this, presently you have to pay cash for liquor wherever you go in the District. You cannot charge it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman means the Government does not make a loan so they can purchase it wholesale?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does this mean a person can go into one of these drinking places, a hotel or whatever it may be, and charge his drinks? Can he do that under this bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know. I do not buy it, cash or credit.

Mr. MASON. Yes, he can under this bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is what we do not want.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Kansas should have an answer to his question. It is an important one, and I think the RECORD should clarify just what this proposed legislation does.

It applies only to holders of class C licenses. That means restaurants and such retail establishments as were indicated by one of the gentlemen a moment

ago when he referred to the Occidental. What this would do is to permit such holders of a class C license to go to the Alcoholic Beverage Board, make an application for and pay $250 for a license. He would qualify as to character in the conduct of his business to avoid the type of credit which would be extended promiscuously. It would be permissive with the retail business. In other words, the license would be for the purpose of determining the responsibility of the holder of that particular class C license in extending credit. That briefly is what this legislation will do. The ABC Board holds that under the law they cannot permit such credit in such retail establishments.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does this not mean in substance that the holders, or the sellers or dispensers of liquors under this particular license, class C license, can permit those who buy liquor to buy drinks on credit—which they cannot have now?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the purpose of it. That is one purpose. The other purpose is to provide for or assure responsibility for extension of such credit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Presently, the customer is required to pay cash when he buys liquor in these places, but under this bill, which you are proposing today, you are saying that an individual who goes there and buys drinks can charge them on his account if his credit is acceptable. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. REES of Kansas. So now the individual can obtain credit, and at the end of the month, or other period, when he pays his bills, he can pay his liquor bill. What I am trying to say is this legislation in a way may injure the fellow, and his family, who waits until the end of the month, and does not have enough money left to take care of his family expenses because he has to go down and pay his liquor bill. Under the present law, he would have at least to pay as he goes along, but under this bill he can charge the bill up and wait until the end of the month and settle then. Is that not the situation?

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. McMILLAN. The objections to present procedure do not come from anyone who desires credit. The objections are coming from the hotels and restaurant people who say that it imposes the burden of double bookkeeping on account of the provisions of the law as to credit.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, yes, I understand that. But what you are saying behind it all is that the individual can charge up the drinks when he buys at the places you have described. What I want to know is if the man could go in and buy liquor at one of these places, and charge it until the end of the month, if he wants to.

Mr. HARRIS. Only in regular services in such establishments or businesses. He could not go in there and buy package liquor because these establishments are not authorized to sell packaged liquor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. But he can go to a hotel, or to whoever is permitted to sell liquor under this particular section, and have them charge it?

Mr. HARRIS. It is for the purpose of extending credit. That is the purpose of it, and nothing else.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his forthright statement. They can give him credit. He does not have to pay cash. That is correct, is it not? That is the thing I do not like about it. This legislation is not good.

Mr. HARRIS. That is the purpose of it, and I think the gentleman is entitled to know that.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield.

Mr. BRYSON. In other words, this makes liquor more easily available?

Mr. HARRIS. That is questionable.

Mr. BRYSON. In other words, a man can get liquor even though he does not have the money to pay for it, but if he expects to have the money at the end of the week or at the end of the month.

Mr. HARRIS. It could be construed that way, I suppose.

Mr. BRYSON. When a person is extended credit, he is more likely to purchase something that he does not really need as against the situation where he has to pull out the filthy lucre, and pays it over at the time.

Mr. HARRIS. That may be true.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REES of Kansas), there were—ayes 34, noes 30.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, is it too late to withdraw this bill?

The SPEAKER. It can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this bill from further consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC ORDER AND PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY IN CONNECTION WITH PRESIDENTIAL INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. J. Res. 395) to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953, and I ask unanimous consent that the same be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That $55,100, or so much thereof as may be necessary, payable in like manner as other appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia, is hereby authorized to be appropriated to enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to maintain public order and protect life and property in said District of Columbia from January 15 to January 26, 1953, both inclusive, including the employment of personal services, payment of allowances, traveling expenses, hire of means of transportation, cost of removing and relocating streetcar-loading platforms; for the construction, rent, maintenance, and expenses incident to the operation of temporary public comfort stations, first-aid stations, and information booths, during the period aforesaid, and other incidental expenses in the discretion of the Commissioners. Said Commissioners are hereby authorized and directed to make all reasonable regulations necessary to secure such preservation of public order and protection of life and property, and to make special regulations respecting the standing, movements, and operating of vehicles of whatever character or kind during said period; and to grant, under such conditions as they may impose, special licenses to peddlers and vendors to sell goods, wares, and merchandise on the streets, avenues, and sidewalks in the District of Columbia, and to charge for such privilege such fees as they may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The regulations and licenses authorized by this act shall be in full force and effect only during the period January 15 to January 26, 1953, both inclusive. Such regulations shall be published in one or more of the daily newspapers published in the District of Columbia and no penalty prescribed for the violation of any such regulation shall be enforced until 5 days after such publication. Any person violating any regulation promulgated by the Commissioners under the authority of and in accordance with the provisions of this act, shall upon conviction thereof in the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia be fined not more than $100 or imprisoned for not more than 30 days. Each and every day a violation of any such regulation exists shall constitute a separate offense, and the penalty prescribed herein shall be applicable to each such separate offense.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the appropriation of $55,100 for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the inaugural ceremonies of 1953. When inaugurations were held on March 4, it was possible to obtain the enactment of necessary legislation during the session of Congress beginning in January, and have ample time for the inaugural committee and the Metropolitan Police Department to accomplish their respective duties prior to the inauguration. However, with the date changed to January 20, it is necessary for the proposed resolution to be enacted during the current session of Congress in order to assure the completion of essential preliminaries.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I

ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives this year did a very constructive job when it took action which, as far as this body is concerned, would put into operation the reorganization plan recommended by the President in relation to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The opposition in this body was very slight, and Members of the House on both sides of the aisle strongly evidenced their support of the plan submitted and recommended by the President by overwhelmingly defeating the disapproval resolution. The Hoover Commission has made a number of very fine recommendations, and from a legislative point of view about 50 percent of these recommendations have been enacted into law. By this I mean those portions of the Hoover recommendations which require legislation. The plan submitted by the President was consistent with the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission. The various Hoover committees throughout the country have manifested their approval of this particular reorganization plan when hearings were held before the House Committee on Expenditures and in connection with the hearings held in the other coequal branch of the Congress.

And while I am talking about the coequal branch of the Congress, may I say that it is amusing to me to note the reckless writings made by some newspapermen—and I say this impersonally—carelessly if not through ignorance of the constitutional set-up of the Congress—when I read frequently of their references to the House of Representatives as "the lower branch of Congress." The House and the Senate are coequal branches. It happened that when the Congress met in Philadelphia in the early days of our constitutional history the Senate was on the floor above the House of Representatives. Naturally, in referring to the other body the House would refer to "The Upper Body" as far as location in the building was concerned, and the Senate would refer to "The Lower Body" as far as location in the building was concerned. This is no admonition, just a casual observation, that the thinking newspaperman and columnist might be guided by in the future, because there are some people in the United States, particularly Washingtonians, who know that the House of Representatives and the Senate are coequal bodies and that one is not superior to the other.

But coming back to the particular reorganization plan to which I was referring, that plan is a very good one. It passed this House, and I use the word "passed" because it was a negative action in order to have it adopted and go into operation. So far as this branch is concerned it passed this House with an overwhelming vote, so much so that not even one-fifth of the Members present at the time supported the demand for a roll call. The plan has not yet gone into operation. The question as to whether it will go into operation will be determined between now and March 14. If the other body negatives the disapproving resolution it goes into effect, or if no action is taken it goes into effect on March 14; and it looks as though the matter will be brought up. If it is defeated, it will be defeated by the votes of the other body, a constitutional majority being necessary. If this particular plan, which has received such unanimous support of those who constitute the Hoover Commission, of interested persons throughout the country, is defeated, then the remainder of the Hoover recommendations will encounter serious difficulty.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The recommendations of the Hoover Commission will be in serious difficulty, because if this plan to which there is very little opposition is defeated it simply shows that some Members of Congress speak one way and vote another; in other words, the people of the country should awaken to the realization of what might happen this week, and that that section of this reorganization plan is vitally important in connection with the adoption of the further recommendations of the Hoover Commission which have not yet either been put into operation through reorganization plans or through enactment by law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the majority leader would tell us what plans there might be of getting some of these reorganization plans out of committee and before the Congress? I understand there are 12 or 15 such plans.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand, the Committee on the Civil Service either is holding or soon will hold hearings on one of the plans; and the Committee on Expenditures is holding hearings through some of its subcommittees. I think the key to the situation is the present reorganization plan, because it is so consistent with the Hoover recommendations that if it is defeated then the people of the country might just as well realize that many Members are talking one way and voting another.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUARTERING OF TROOPS PARTICIPATING IN INAUGURAL CEREMONIES OF 1953

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up House Joint Resolution 394, to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of General Services and the respective heads of executive departments and establishments are authorized to allocate such space in any public building under their care and supervision as they deem necessary for the purposes of quartering troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies to be held on January 20, 1953, but such use shall not continue after January 22, 1953. Authority granted by this joint resolution may be exercised notwithstanding the provisions of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, approved April 28, 1902 (32 Stat. 152; 40 U. S. C. 31), prohibiting the use of public buildings in connection with inaugural ceremonies.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to provide quartering in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

When inaugurations were held on March 4, it was possible to obtain the enactment of necessary legislation during the session of Congress beginning in January, and have ample time for the inaugural committee and the Metropolitan Police Department to accomplish their respective duties prior to the inauguration. However, with the date changed to January 20, it is necessary for the proposed resolution to be enacted during the current session of Congress in order to assure the completion of essential preliminaries.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up House Joint Resolution 393, authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the House joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of General Services, and such other officers of the District of Columbia and the United States as control any public lands in the District of Columbia, are hereby authorized to grant permits, under such restrictions as they may deem necessary, to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies to be appointed with the approval of the President-elect for the use of any reservations or other public spaces in the District of Columbia under their control on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953: *Provided,* That in their opinion no serious or permanent injuries will be thereby inflicted upon such reservations or public spaces or statuary thereon; and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may designate for such and other purposes, on the occasion aforesaid, such streets, avenues, and sidewalks in said District of Columbia under their control as they may deem proper and necessary: *Provided further,* That all stands or platforms that may be erected on the public space, as aforesaid, including such as may be erected in connection with the display of fireworks, shall be under the said supervision of the said inaugural committee, and no stand shall be built on the sidewalks, streets, parks, and public grounds of the District of Columbia, not including the area on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue directly in front of the White House, except such as are approved by the inaugural committee, the director of inspection of the District of Columbia, and the Administrator of General Services: *And provided further,* That the reservations or public spaces occupied by the stands or other structures shall, after the inauguration, be promptly restored to their condition before such occupation, and that the inaugural committee shall indemnify the appropriate agency of the Government for any damages of any kind whatsoever upon such reservations or spaces by reason of such use.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the committee on illumination of the inaugural committee for said inaugural ceremonies to stretch suitable overhead conductors, with sufficient supports wherever necessary, for the purpose of connecting with the present supply of light for the purpose of effecting the said illumination: *Provided,* That if it shall be necessary to erect wires for illuminating or other purposes over any park or reservation in the District of Columbia, the work of erection and removal of said wires shall be under the supervision of the official in charge of said park or reservation: *Provided further,* That the said conductors shall not be used for conveying electrical currents after January 24, 1953, and shall, with their supports, be fully and entirely removed from the streets and avenues of the said District of Columbia on or before January 31, 1953; *Provided further,* That the stretching and removing of the said wires shall be under the supervision of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, or such other officials as may have jurisdiction in the premises, who shall see that the provisions of this joint resolution are enforced, that all needful precautions are taken for the protection of the public, and that the pavement of any street, avenue, or alley disturbed is replaced in as good condition as before entering upon the work herein authorized: *And provided further,* That no expense or damage on account of or due to the stretching, operation, or removal of the said temporary overhead conductors shall be incurred by the United States or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense be, and he is hereby, authorized to loan to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies such hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, ensigns, flags, signal numbers, and so forth, belonging to the Government of the United States (except battle flags), that are not now in use and may be suitable and proper for decoration, and which may, in their judgment, be spared without detriment to the public service, such flags to be used in connection with said ceremonies by said committee under such regulations and restrictions as may be prescribed by the said Secretary in decorating the fronts of public buildings and other places on the line of march between the Capitol and the Executive Mansion, and the interior of the reception hall: *Provided,* That the loan of the said hospital tents, smaller tents, camp appliances, ensigns, flags, signal numbers, and so forth, to the said committee shall not take place prior to the 11th of January, and they shall be returned by the 26th day of January 1953: *Provided further,* That the said committee shall indemnify the said Government for any loss or damage to such flags not necessarily incident to such use. That the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized to loan to the inaugural committee for the purpose of caring for the sick, injured, and infirm on the occasion of said inauguration such hospital tents and camp appliances, and other necessaries, hospital furniture, and utensils of all descriptions, ambulances, drivers, stretchers, and Red Cross flags and poles belonging to the Government of the United States as in his judgment may be spared and are not in use by the Government at the time of the inauguration: *And provided further,* That the inaugural committee shall indemnify the Government for any loss or damage to such hospital tents and appliances, as aforesaid, not necessarily incident to such use.

SEC. 4. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Administrator of General Services be, and they are hereby, authorized to permit telegraph, telephone, radiobroadcasting, and television companies to extend overhead wires to such points along the line of parade as shall be deemed by the chief marshal convenient for use in connection with the parade and other inaugural purposes, the said wires to be taken down within 10 days after the conclusion of the ceremonies.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the granting of certain permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies of 1953.

When inaugurations were held on March 4, it was possible to obtain the enactment of necessary legislation during the session of Congress beginning in January, and have ample time for the inaugural committee and the Metropolitan Police Department to acomplish their respective duties prior to the inauguration. However, with the date changed to January 20, it is necessary for the proposed resolution to be enacted during the current session of Congress in order to assure the completion of essential preliminaries.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE IN SALARY OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL (DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 6805) to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the third sentence of section 6 of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951 (Public Law 63, 82d Cong.) is amended by striking out "salary at the rate of $11,200 per annum" and inserting in lieu thereof "salary at the rate of $12,000 per annum."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act to the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951 shall take effect as of July 1, 1951.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to correct an inequity under Public Law 201 of the Eighty-second Congress whereby the Rent Administrator of the District of Columbia was denied an increase in salary at the same time all other District and Federal employees received an increase.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in an opinion on February 15, 1952, held that the salary of the Rent Administrator for the District of Columbia was fixed specifically by statute and may not be increased under Public Law 201, approved October 24, 1951.

This legislation would assure the Rent Administrator for the District of Columbia the same salary increase as that of all other District and Federal employees and would be retroactive to July 1, 1951.

Part of the opinion of the Comptroller General of February 15, 1952, is herewith made a part of this report:

The only other authority of law under which retroactive increases in compensation may be granted, generally, to employees of the District of Columbia, is that contained in the act of October 24, 1951, Public Law 201, with respect to Classification Act positions. However, in the absence of any indication in the Emergency Rent Act of 1951 or in its legislative history, that the Congress intended to make the compensation of the position involved subject to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, it must be concluded that Public Law 201 likewise has no application in this case. In other words, unless it otherwise is provided by law, a salary rate specifically prescribed by statute is not subject to the Classification Act merely because the prescribed rate coincides with a rate established for a Classification Act grade.

The legislation has the approval of the Commissioners for the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 824 OF THE CODE OF LAWS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I call up the bill (H. R. 1758) to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 824. Unlawful entry on public or private property: Any person who, without lawful authority, shall enter, or attempt to enter, any public or private dwelling, building or other property, or part of such dwelling, building, or other property, against the will of the lawful occupant or of the person lawfully in charge thereof, or being therein or thereon, without lawful authority to remain therein or thereon shall refuse to quit the same on the demand of the lawful occupant, or of the person lawfully in charge thereof, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $50 or imprisonment in the jail for not more than 6 months, or both, in the discretion of the court."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 5, strike out "$50" and insert "$100."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to supply deficiencies in existing law relating to unlawful entry of real property.

Under existing law—District of Columbia Code, pages 23–3102, 1940 edition—it is a violation of law for any person without lawful authority to enter or attempt to enter any private dwelling or building against the will of the lawful occupant or to enter or attempt to enter an unoccupied private dwelling or building against the will of the lawful owner or his authorized agent or for any person without lawful authority to remain in such dwelling or building against the demand of the owner or his agent to leave. Under existing law there is no provision whereby it is unlawful to enter or to remain without lawful right on property owned by either the United States or the District of Columbia. Existing law relates only to private buildings or dwellings.

Under this proposed legislation it would make it unlawful for any person without lawful authority to enter or attempt to enter any building, dwelling, or other property, whether public or private, or to enter or attempt to enter any part of such building, dwelling, or other property against the will of the lawful occupant or the persons lawfully in charge thereof, or for any person, without lawful authority, to remain in any such building, dwelling, or property, to refuse to leave such building, dwelling, or property on the demand of the lawful occupant or the person lawfully in charge thereof.

By broadening the coverage of the section to property other than dwellings and buildings, it is felt that the need for creating the offense of trespass on open areas, such as yards, gardens, and automobile parking lots, is met.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have recommended the enactment of this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I will ask some member of the committee why this bill is necessary.

Mr. McMILLAN. I would like to say to the gentleman from Michigan the reason for this bill is, the Commissioners felt that since we have private buildings on the statute books, that is, a law preventing entrance, that Federal buildings should also be placed on the statute books.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I notice in the bill here, on line 7, you say "any public or private dwelling." Now, is there not a law at the present time that punishes unlawful entry into a private building?

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why then do you have it in this bill? Why do you add "private dwelling, building, or other property"?

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. The reason the bill is so worded is because it is an amendment to existing law. Existing law states only that the unlawful entry is punishable if it is in a private building. The words "any public" are added.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean section 824 repeals some section of the present law?

Mr. ALLEN of California. It rewrites it; it adds some words to it. I believe if the gentleman will look at the report which he has in his hands, the Ramseyer rule, the second page, he will see the change in the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You would leave the old law as it is?

Mr. ALLEN of California. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why, then, is this not just confined to public buildings? Why is there written in a provision against entering of private buildings or dwellings?

Mr. ALLEN of California. Because otherwise, if we struck out "private," there would be no amendment to existing law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thought you said there was a section now that punishes entry in a private building.

Mr. ALLEN of California. That is correct, and the amendment is to add to existing law a prohibition against entry in public buildings.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why is not the law written that way, then, just a provision against unlawful entry into public buildings? Why do you repeat "private"?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I believe it was because the drafter of the amendment was endeavoring to make the offense apply to both instead of just one type of property.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, then, does this mean if, for example, I go to the Congressional Library, and I do not get out of there as fast as the fellow in charge tells me to, they can fine me $100 and send me to jail for 6 months?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I suppose that type of case would come before the court. The type of case upon which the legislation was based, however, came out of the fact that there were people around the schools who were molesting the children, and there was no law under which they could prohibit the people from entering who were not properly authorized to be on school grounds or in schoolrooms.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. This applies to all public buildings, and if I do not get out of there when the janitor, or whoever he happens to be, comes around and tells me to, or I do not move fast enough, he can take me down before the court. Do you think that is good legislation?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I think it is necessary legislation to have someone in control of the buildings who can bring action or initiate action against the improper use of them by those who are making an improper use.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But this legislation leaves it up to the will of the fellow who happens to be in charge there, a janitor or anybody else. If I have not quite finished or if I do not move fast enough to suit him, he can get me into court.

Mr. ALLEN of California. That is quite true, but the court would have to determine the sentence.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GARNISHMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1368) to amend subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended by section 2 of the act of December 20, 1944—District of Columbia Code, section 15–403 (a)—and to amend section 467 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901—District of Columbia Code, section 16–323—and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended by section 2 of the act

of December 20, 1944 (D. C. Code, sec. 15-405 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, not otherwise exempted, not to exceed $200 each month, of any person residing in the District of Columbia, or of any person who earns the major portions of his or her livelihood in the District of Columbia, regardless of place of residence, who provides the principal support of a family, for 2 months next preceding the issuing of any writ or process against him, from any court or officer of and in said District shall be exempt from attachment, levy, seizure, or sale upon such process, and the same shall not be seized, levied on, taken, reached, or sold by attachment, execution, or any other process or proceedings of any court, judge, or other officer of and in said District: *Provided, however,* That where husband and wife are living together, the aggregate of the earnings, salaries, insurance, annuities, and pension or retirement payments of the husband and wife shall be the amount which shall be determinative of the exemption of either in cases arising ex contractu: *Provided further,* That food, shelter, or clothing received as part of earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments, shall not be included in computing income for the purposes of this section."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 17, strike out the colon and the following: "*Provided further,* That food, shelter, or clothing received as part of earnings, salary, insurance, annuities, or pension or retirement payments shall not be included in computing income for the purposes of this section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to increase from $100 to $200 per month the exemption from garnishment in the District of Columbia of the earnings of a family head. The exemption of $100 was fixed in the year 1901, and increases in the cost of living since that time make this amendment appropriate.

It is hoped that this change will alleviate some of the undesirable features of the extension of easy credit. With a summary remedy available in the Small Claims Court of the District of Columbia, and garnishment proceedings, many unscrupulous merchants have high-pressured persons of low income into purchases, which are unwise or unnecessary, to the detriment of the family of the debtor. By increasing the difficulty of collection where credit is improvidently granted, it is hoped that these abuses will be checked.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Bar Association of the District of Columbia and Hon. Bolitha James Laws, Chief Judge, United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEES PAYABLE TO THE CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 1345) to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Mar. 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1363, ch. 854, sec. 1101), and the act of Apr. 6, 1928 (45 Stat. 410, ch. 325), otherwise known as part of section 11-1509 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1940 edition, are amended by striking from them and, thereby, from section 11-1509 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia the following provisions:

"For receiving, keeping, and disbursing money in pursuance of any statute or order of court, including cash bail or bond or securities authorized by law or order of court to be deposited in lieu of other security, 1 percent of the amount so received, kept, and disbursed, or of the face value of such bonds or securities."

SEC. 2. From and after the approval of this act no fee shall be charged or collected by the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for any of the services enumerated in the provision stricken by section 1 hereof, regardless of whether such services were rendered prior to or after approval of this act.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to amend the statute relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia by eliminating the charge of 1 percent for receiving, keeping, and disbursing money in pursuance of any statute or order of the court.

Under existing law the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia may charge and collect certain fees, including the following:

For receiving, keeping, and disbursing money in pursuance of any statute or order of court, including cash bail or bond or securities authorized by law or order of court to be deposited in lieu of other security, 1 percent of the amount so received, kept, and disbursed, or of the face value of such bonds or securities.

This bill would effect the repeal of the provision quoted above, and further provides that from and after the approval of this repealing act no fee shall be charged or collected by the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia for any of the services enumerated in said provision regardless of whether such services were rendered prior to or after the approval of this act.

The provision which would be repealed by this proposed bill is identical with the preexisting provision applicable to clerks of the other district courts of the United States—Twenty-eighth United States Code, section 555, paragraph 8, 1940 edition—which was repealed by section 2 of an act approved March 3, 1942—Fifty-sixth Statutes, page 122. Hearings held prior to the enactment of the last-mentioned act disclosed that the services rendered by the clerks in the cases involving application of this fee provision were purely nominal, generally speaking, and disproportionate to the fee charged. However, this same fee provision as it applies to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia was not repealed at that time, and the present bill would have the identical effect of removing this discrepancy.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT E. VIGUS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 203) for the relief of Robert E. Vigus.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 3219), for the relief of Robert E. Vigus; that if and when such bill is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such bill is hereby rescinded; and that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed, in the reenrollment of such bill, to strike out the text of the first paragraph thereof and insert in lieu thereof "That in the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 751), as amended, Robert E. Vigus, of Wichita Falls, Tex., shall be held and considered to have been an employee of the United States on the 2d day of June 1950 within the meaning of section 40 of that act and that injury sustained by him on such date shall be deemed to have been sustained in the performance of his duty in accordance with section 1 of that act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the action requested?

Mr. LANE. I will be glad to.

A bill (H. R. 3219) for the relief of Robert E. Vigus was introduced and passed the House, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to hear, determine, and render judgment upon his claim for alleged personal injuries sustained as the result of an injection of silver nitrate of 25 percent instead of one-fourth of 1 percent in the One Hundred and Seventy-second Station Hospital, Sendai, Japan, on June 2, 1950.

The Senate amended this bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting:

That, for the purposes of the administration of the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916 (39 Stat. 742; 5 U. S. C. 751), as amended, Robert E. Vigus, of Wichita Falls, Tex., shall be held and considered to have been an employee of the United States on the second day of June 1950, within the meaning of section 40 of that act.

SEC. 2. Claim for compensation under this act may be filed any time within 1 year after date of enactment of this act.

When this bill was enrolled and reached the White House, the United States Bureau of Employees' Compensation was contacted and the White House was informed that the bill as it had passed the House and Senate would not benefit Mr. Vigus and therefore, in view of the fact that the Bureau was of the opinion that he was entitled to receive proper consideration, suggested that the bill be recalled and amended so as to give him proper relief.

This resolution is merely to carry out the suggestions of the United States Bureau of Employees' Compensation and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill provides for a review by the court anyway?

Mr. LANE. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT DAY—DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 2667) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for a period of each year commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April and ending not later than the last Sunday of September. Any such time established by the Commissioners under authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for the period commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April 1952 and ending not later than the last Sunday of September 1952. Any such time established by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, be the standard time for the District of Columbia."

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, for the period commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April 1952 and ending not later than the last Sunday of September 1952.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee, or some member of the committee, a question or two about this bill—the golfers' special.

Mr. McMILLAN. The golfers did not ask me to pass this. The general public in the District of Columbia are the only ones who have requested me to take up this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me the necessity for this legislation coming in here year after year?

Mr. McMILLAN. I could not tell you. I happened to vote against it before, but it seems that the majority of the people in the District of Columbia want this daylight-saving bill, and I reported the bill out trying to give the people what they want.

Mr. GROSS. Can some other member of the committee give me some information as to the necessity for this legislation, which comes in here year after year?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. This is a bill which was reported by the other body, and passed by the other body, and which came to the House. As the bill was adopted in the other body, it was for an indefinite period of time, authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia each year to establish daylight-saving time within certain limitations. The House District Committee considered it, and reported the bill with an amendment, which would limit the authority to 1 year.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman explain the necessity for it?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the bill which we have before us—the committee amendment. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have made a request for this legislation, and base it on the fact that the people, or the public, of the District of Columbia according to their opinion, are requesting the legislation.

Mr. GROSS. Were any mass meetings held in the District of Columbia at any time or any place of public record asking for this kind of legislation?

Mr. HARRIS. I could not say, because the District Commissioners have their conferences without notifying the committee whether they are holding public meetings or not.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Arkansas likes to sleep in the cool hours of the morning as well as anyone, and if he has children he likes to get them in off the street at a reasonable hour in the evening, but the gentleman from Arkansas knows that neither is possible with daylight-saving time in the District of Columbia in the summer.

I would like to hear someone explain the necessity for this legislation, and who is demanding it, other than the golfers and mint-julep-patio squatters who like to preen themselves in the Washington, D. C., midnight sun. I am opposed to it and I intend to seek a roll-call vote on final passage, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Would the gentleman agree, if it meets with the approval of the Speaker and the majority leader, that if he does demand a roll call that the roll call go over until tomorrow, because a number of the Members are away on official business, including several members of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. No. I could not agree to that. I agreed to one of those propositions last year and I was euchred out of a roll-call vote. I do not intend to get trapped in that kind of a deal.

Mr. HARRIS. I assure the gentleman I did not make the suggestion with the purpose of trying to impose on him or to do anything that would catch him in a snare.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as this debate will show, no one has given the slightest reason for the necessity of this legislation. It is another of those so-called war measures which ought to have been junked long ago. It only adds to the confusion of those Members of Congress from the Midwest who are trying to serve their business and farmer constituents.

If this is good legislation then why is it that railroad companies, airlines, and other operators of transportation facilities refuse to adopt it?

And I am intrigued by the fact that not a single member of the committee, which has brought this bill to the floor of the House, will stand here and say he voted to bring it out. If there were so many committee members opposed to it how and why was the bill reported out?

As I have previously stated, this attempt to make the sun stand still in the heavens is a golfer's-mint-julep-squatters deal and I am opposed to it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES of Missouri: On page 2, line 7, amend the committee amendment by striking out the period at the end of line 7, inserting a comma, and by adding the following: "except it shall not apply to and shall have no effect upon the operation of any offices or agencies of the Federal Government, which shall continue to operate on standard time."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I raise a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES]. As I understood the amendment, it would amend the general statute with reference to standard time throughout the United States. This bill applies only to the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman form Missouri desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like to ask the gentleman to reserve his point of order.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state his point of order again.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understood from listening to the amendment as it was read, it would propose to amend the national law with reference to standard time. This legislation applies only to the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I should like to be heard on that.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman from Arkansas understood the amendment. We are not trying to affect the general statute at all. This amendment only seeks to prevent time within the District of Columbia interfering with the operation of the Government's business in the District of Columbia. This would permit daylight saving to take place all over the District as long as it did not interfere and would not have any effect on the Government offices. They would continue to operate on standard time. The stores could close; the schools could do anything they wanted to. We would like them to continue to do that, but we do not want to affect the Federal offices. This amendment does not affect the general statute at all. It only places a limitation on what you are trying to do in the committee amendment to the bill which was passed in the other body.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I might say to the gentleman that of course the railroads and busses and the air lines pay no attention to this daylight saving time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. O'HARA. And consequently, when our constituents come in, they are confused from the time they arrive until they leave, because there is 1 hour difference in time.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to know more about the purpose of the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman, of course, is one of the distinguished members of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No; I deny the charge.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is too modest, entirely so; we all know he is an outstanding Member of Congress. I do not like this daylight time any more than the gentleman does.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Then the gentleman should not vote for it.

Mr. HARRIS. It is one of the problems we have to meet, nevertheless. I should like to know something about the intent and purpose of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. It is to remove uncertainty.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment would restrict it to certain offices?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No.

Mr. HARRIS. And to certain businesses?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No.

Mr. HARRIS. Does it not apply to certain buildings and the operation of Government offices?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. My amendment would keep it from applying; my amendment would not restrict it but would just keep it from applying to the Government's business.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, it would not apply in the District of Columbia to Government employees or offices.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No; that is the second time the gentleman is wrong. All agencies of Government, and Congress is an agency of Government, would continue to operate on standard time; every department and bureau of Government would continue to operate on standard time.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the gentleman mean to say, then, that the District Building, for instance, would by law operate under standard time?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Why, certainly.

Mr. HARRIS. Yet private business by law would operate on daylight time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the Commissioners want to put it into effect.

Mr. HARRIS. Then the gentleman's amendment would apply to national standard time insofar as it affected Government offices.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No; it just keeps daylight-saving time from becoming effective in any Government agency or department of any kind of the Federal Government.

Mr. HARRIS. And the effect would be that employees of the District of Columbia or the Federal Government would by law be prevented from working under daylight-saving time, yet the people in business in the District of Columbia would operate under daylight-saving time.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They could operate under standard time or daylight time if they wanted it. There is nothing to keep them from going to work an hour earlier, at 7 o'clock instead of 8, and if they do that, leave an hour earlier in the afternoon at 3 o'clock instead of 4. It would keep the people of the United States from becoming confused over this business as they have been every year we have had it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If I have the floor, I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I wish to ask the gentleman if he would also apply to congressional offices so that instead of the tail wagging the dog, we would operate on standard time; is that correct?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We could operate our offices on standard time. As is well known there is no regular time for keeping the offices of Members of Congress open but as a matter of fact they are usually open many more hours on the average than the ordinary office. We could still regulate our affairs on standard time so that our constituents if they wanted to call us would know what time it was and also would expect that we would be in our offices working on standard time and would not be confused.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question. Does the gentleman from Missouri intend for his amendment to apply only to Federal offices in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The bill, Mr. Speaker, applies to the District of Columbia. The amendment reads, "except it shall not apply to and shall have no effect upon the operation of any offices or agencies of the Federal Government which shall continue to operate on standard time."

The SPEAKER. Does that mean in the District of Columbia?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In the District of Columbia, yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to hold the gentleman's amendment germane and in order.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill and submit it again at a later date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the distinguished chairman of our committee what his intentions would be about later consideration. This is the first of March. The next District day, I believe, would be the first Monday in April.

Mr. McMILLAN. This bill does not become effective until the last part of April, and I thought we would have time to study it further.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been scheduled for today. Let us have a vote on it today and get it over with. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES of Missouri) there were—ayes 30, noes 67.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 48, nays 240, not voting 144, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—48

Abbitt	Doughton	O'Brien, Mich.
Abernethy	Elliott	O'Hara
Albert	Gregory	Passman
Allen, Ill.	Gross	Phillips
Andersen, H. Carl	Harrison, Nebr.	Pickett
	Harrison, Va.	Rankin
Andresen, August H.	Hoeven	Reams
	Hoffman, Mich.	Rees, Kans.
Angell	Johnson	Robeson
Armstrong	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Va.
Beamer	Jones, Woodrow W.	Talle
Bonner	LeCompte	Thompson, Mich.
Bray	Lovre	Vursell
Brooks	Magee	Williams, N. Y.
Cannon	Miller, Nebr.	Wood, Idaho
Crawford	Morris	
Davis, Ga.	Norrell	
Dolliver		

NAYS—240

Adair	Bates, Ky.	Boggs, Del.
Allen, Calif.	Bates, Mass.	Boggs, La.
Allen, La.	Beall	Bolling
Anderson, Calif.	Belcher	Bolton
Andrews	Bennett, Fla.	Bosone
Arends	Bennett, Mich.	Bow
Aspinall	Bentsen	Bramblett
Auchincloss	Berry	Brehm
Baker	Betts	Brown, Ga.
Bakewell	Bishop	Bryson
Baring	Blackney	Budge

Buffett	Harris	O'Brien, Ill.
Burdick	Harrison, Wyo.	Ostertag
Burleson	Havenner	Patman
Burnside	Hays, Ark.	Patten
Burton	Hays, Ohio	Patterson
Busbey	Hébert	Perkins
Bush	Herlong	Poage
Butler	Heselton	Polk
Byrnes	Hess	Poulson
Carrigg	Hill	Preston
Chelf	Hillings	Price
Chenoweth	Hoffman, Ill.	Priest
Chiperfield	Holifield	Prouty
Church	Holmes	Rabaut
Cole, N. Y.	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Colmer	Howell	Reed, N. Y.
Cooley	Ikard	Richards
Cooper	Irving	Riley
Corbett	Jackson, Wash.	Rogers, Colo.
Cotton	James	Rogers, Fla.
Cox	Jarman	Rogers, Tex.
Crosser	Jenkins	Rooney
Crumpacker	Jensen	Saylor
Cunningham	Jonas	Schenck
Curtis, Mo.	Jones, Ala.	Schwabe
Curtis, Nebr.	Jones, Hamilton C.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Davis, Tenn.	Karsten, Mo.	Scrivner
Davis, Wis.	Kean	Scudder
Deane	Kearns	Seely-Brown
DeGraffenried	Keating	Short
Dempsey	Kerr	Sieminski
Denny	Kilburn	Simpson, Ill.
Denton	Kilday	Simpson, Pa.
Devereux	King, Pa.	Sittler
D'Ewart	Kirwan	Smith, Kans.
Dondero	Lane	Smith, Miss.
Dorn	Lanham	Smith, Wis.
Eberharter	Lantaff	Springer
Ellsworth	Lesinski	Steed
Elston	Lind	Stigler
Engle	Lucas	Taber
Fallon	Lyle	Teague
Feighan	McCarthy	Thomas
Fenton	McConnell	Thompson, Tex.
Fernandes	McCormack	Thornberry
Fisher	McCulloch	Tollefson
Fogarty	McDonough	Trimble
Forand	McGregor	Vail
Ford	McIntire	Van Pelt
Forrester	McMillan	Van Zandt
Frazier	McMullen	Velde
Fugate	McVey	Vorys
Fulton	Machrowicz	Watts
Furcolo	Mack, Wash.	Wharton
Garmatz	Madden	Wheeler
Gathings	Mahon	Whitten
Gavin	Mansfield	Wickersham
George	Martin, Mass.	Wier
Golden	Mason	Wigglesworth
Goodwin	Meader	Willis
Gordon	Miller, Calif.	Wilson, Ind.
Graham	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Tex.
Granger	Mills	Winstead
Grant	Mitchell	Withrow
Green	Mumma	Wolcott
Greenwood	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff
Hagen	Nelson	Yates
Hale	Nicholson	Zablocki
Hand	Norblad	
Hardy		

NOT VOTING—144

Aandahl	Dollinger	Judd
Addonizio	Donohue	Kearney
Anfuso	Donovan	Kee
Ayres	Doyle	Kelley, Pa.
Bailey	Durham	Kelly, N. Y.
Barden	Eaton	Kennedy
Barrett	Evins	Keogh
Battle	Fine	Kersten, Wis.
Beckworth	Flood	King, Calif.
Bender	Gamble	Klein
Blatnik	Gary	Kluczynski
Boykin	Gore	Larcade
Brown, Ohio	Granahan	Latham
Brownson	Gwinn	McGrath
Buchanan	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGuire
Buckley	Hall, Leonard W.	McKinnon
Camp	Halleck	Mack, Ill.
Canfield	Harden	Marshall
Carlyle	Hart	Martin, Iowa
Carnahan	Harvey	Merrow
Case	Hedrick	Miller, Md.
Celler	Heffernan	Morano
Chatham	Heller	Morgan
Chudoff	Herter	Morrison
Clemente	Hinshaw	Morton
Clevenger	Horan	Moulder
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Multer
Combs	Hunter	Murdock
Coudert	Jackson, Calif.	Murphy
Dague	Javits	Murray, Wis.
Dawson	Jenison	O'Konski
Delaney	Kilburn	O'Neill
Dingell	Kilday	Osmers
O'Toole	Rogers, Mass.	Stanley
Philbin	Roosevelt	Stockman
Potter	Ross	Sutton
Powell	Sabath	Tackett
Radwan	Sadlak	Taylor
Rains	St. George	Vinson
Ramsay	Sasscer	Walter
Redden	Scott, Hardie	Weichel
Reece, Tenn.	Secrest	Welch
Regan	Shafer	Werdel
Rhodes	Sheehan	Widnall
Ribicoff	Shelley	Williams, Miss.
Richlman	Sheppard	Wolverton
Rivers	Sikes	Wood, Ga.
Roberts	Spence	Yorty
Rodino	Staggers	

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Dague against.
Mr. Moulder for, with Mr. Widnall against.
Mr. Miller of Maryland for, with Mr. Wolverton against.
Mr. Aandahl for, with Mr. Canfield against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Case.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Donohue with Mrs. Hardin.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Barrett with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Sheppard with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Fine with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Ross.
Mr. Clemente with Mr. Jenison.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Yorty with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Hull.

Messrs. GATHINGS, KEATING, SCHWABE, CHIPERFIELD, BAKER, CUNNINGHAM, and BUTLER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. MAGEE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 127, noes 59.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOOT AND MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the outbreak of foot and mouth disease in the Canadian Province of Saskatchewan, in an area only 50 to 100 miles north of important stock-raising counties of Montana, gives all of us cause for concern.

Members who have followed the campaign against this disease in Mexico are familiar with the dangers it holds for our country. It is one of the most highly contagious diseases known. It can be carried from place to place not only by the animals susceptible to it, but also by other animals, on clothing, trucks, hay, straw, and, according to some belief, by birds. Canadian authorities are now investigating the possibility that the current outbreak was brought on by infection from the clothes of an immigrant dairyman who came to Canada recently from Germany and who had worked in Germany with a herd of infected cattle.

Foot and mouth disease can be controlled only by the slaughter and burial of the diseased animals and by the disinfection of the premises where they have been kept. Even so, the virus may live in the ground for months or even years, awaiting a favorable opportunity to strike again. The last outbreak in the United States cost us more than half a billion dollars before it was brought under control. There is no end to the hardship and dislocation of the economy that could result from the introduction of the disease into this country at this time.

Canadian authorities have quarantined a large area in the vicinity of Regina, and have slaughtered and buried all the infected animals found to date. These include nearly 1,000 cattle, 140 sheep and about 200 hogs. At least 25 ranches have been found to harbor the disease. It has been a terrific shock to Canada's $2,000,000,000 livestock industry, and Canadian and Provincial authorities are taking drastic steps to eradicate the disease before it reaches the scale of the Mexican outbreak in which more than a million animals were killed.

Immediately after the outbreak was announced, I talked with Dr. Cloyde L. Gooding, Chief of the Inspection and Quarantine Division, Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture, to acquaint him with the concern expressed by Montana stockmen, and with my own desire to do whatever is possible to help him and his bureau in their efforts to keep the disease out of this country.

Dr. Gooding stated that his officers have been in Canada cooperating with Canadian officials, and that all the facilities of the Department are available to help in this campaign. Under the Secretary's authority, the border was immediately closed to shipments of livestock, meat, hay and straw. The Canadian officials already had instituted a strict quarantine of the area concerned and were engaged in disinfecting any trucks that were permitted to enter or leave. Some time later the Governor of Montana announced that he, too, was issuing orders to close the border and to hold for disinfection at the border any trucks from the infected area.

The State of Montana also is operating an air patrol of the border to spot any possible carriers of the disease, and the Montana highway patrol and employees of the Montana livestock commission are patrolling roads that cross the border. The deep snow and subzero weather have helped not only in discouraging traffic but also in revealing the tracks of antelope or other possible carriers crossing the line.

It has been suggested that a boundary fence be built, high enough and of tight woven wire so as to prevent the entrance of coyotes, antelopes or stray livestock. This device was used with success on the Mexican border. I suggest that the proper authorities investigate the feasibility of such a fence on part of the Montana-Saskatchewan boundary, and if it appears that it would be helpful, that funds be made available at once to start the project. Anyone familiar with the terrain will recognize, however, the almost insurmountable difficulty involved in building and maintaining a fence tight enough to be of value.

I feel confident that the Federal and State Governments and the Dominion and Provincial governments are cooperating to the best of their knowledge and ability to protect the people of the United States from the great hardship that would ensue should this disease be introduced into our herds, and to stamp it out where it has occurred in Canada. I think it should be made clear that this body stands ready, as was the case with the Mexican outbreak, to support them in every necesssary program.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, two subcommittees of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce are holding hearings in New York. The Aviation Subcommittee consists of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CARLYLE], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], and the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

The SEC Subcommittee sitting in New York today consists of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRANAHAN], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MCGUIRE], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, for almost a year now I have been the chairman of a subcommittee investigating the enforcement of our Federal tax laws. Our investigation has disclosed inefficiency, dishonesty, and corruption. I want to relate some of the things that have come to light about the people who collect our taxes. I refer to the collectors of internal revenue. My purpose is not to rehash scandals of the past year. My object is to give you a summary of the experience of our committee so that you may judge for yourselves the reasons why I support the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952.

The events I am going to relate involve seven collectors of internal revenue removed from office in the past year. Some were flagrantly dishonest, others were men of mediocre ability—some with a lack of scruples, some possessed of good will—but all without the talent and skill demanded by their offices. They achieved their positions because of political activity in the past, but even after the positions were earned political considerations were not cast aside. In short, the one thing that stamped these men was their disregard, their lack of understanding of what it means to be an official of the United States Government.

Let me call the roll:

We begin with Denis W. Delaney, who, until last year, was the collector of internal revenue in Boston. With the help of a New York insurance salesman, Delaney succeeded in obtaining substantial sums of money for his personal use from taxpayers in his district who were behind in their tax payments. This was done by holding out the hope that such payments would serve to relieve these delinquent taxpayers of their troubles. Delaney also pressured two automobile dealers under tax-fraud investigation into delivering automobiles to him at small cost over a period of several years. Another taxpayer contributed a summer cottage with all expenses paid. There were other shocking aspects of this case, but those I have mentioned will give you an idea of how this collector of internal revenue abused his public trust. He has since been removed from office and indicted and convicted on charges of accepting bribes.

Next comes James P. Finnegan, the collector of internal revenue in St. Louis. Mr. Finnegan, it appears, furnished names of delinquent taxpayers to an insurance salesman who might, by mentioning Finnegan, interest these taxpayers in the purchase of insurance. Finnegan is also charged with obtaining payments in money and furniture from a company which was delinquent in payment of its taxes. Mr. Finnegan also conducted a lucrative law practice while he was collector and is charged with receiving illegal fees for representing firms before Government agencies such as the RFC. So engrossed was he in his private activities that he was able to spend only 2 or 3 hours a day on his Government job. Incidentally, he also received payments from the same New York insurance organization that shared in Collector Delaney's activities in Boston. There is also evidence that Finnegan and Delaney tried to extend their improper activities by putting these same insurance salesmen in touch with other collectors. As further evidence of how widespread and insidious Finnegan's activities were becoming, it is worth noting that he succeeded in getting James B. E. Olson, the recently removed alcohol tax supervisor in New York City, to enter into an arrangement with former Commissioner of Internal Revenue Joseph D. Nunan for the sale of printing contracts to liquor firms in Olson's district. Mr. Finnegan has been removed from office and has been indicted for a variety of offenses for which he is now being tried.

Next in our investigation was the collector of internal revenue in Brooklyn, Joseph P. Marcelle. Mr. Marcelle viewed his job as a convenient stepping stone to elevate him from ward politics in Brooklyn to the Supreme Court of the State of New York. In the meantime, he, like Finnegan, devoted perhaps 2 or 3 hours a day to his Government job. The rest of his time was spent in public speaking engagements, a lucrative law practice, and business activities including vending machines and race-track interests. He, too, was removed from office and his rosy dreams of a $28,000 a year job on the Supreme Court of New York disappeared. An investigation of his income-tax returns is still in progress.

Next is the office of the collector of internal revenue in the upper district of Manhattan. Here Collector of Internal Revenue James W. Johnson, himself an honest man, found himself embroiled in an office rife with corruption and dominated by a group that had no use for the political faction from which Johnson came. Johnson, faced with a strife-ridden, politically dominated office,

found the problem beyond his administrative competence. While one scandal after another hit the office, its efficiency dropped to a low point. Years passed before anything much was done about it. Finally, last year, a successor was found and Mr. Johnson was replaced. The long, slow process of restoring this important collection district to anything like efficient operation is not yet completed.

Next, let me mention San Francisco where our committee held hearings last month. There we found that the collector of internal revenues, James G. Smyth, and a small group of political associates, had taken over control of the office to the exclusion of other key personnel. The administration of the office was characterized by gross incompetence, political favoritism, and a variety of manipulations, some of them criminal. The tax returns of political friends that were filed late were dated back to make them appear as though they were filed on time, thus avoiding penalties and interest. Checks in large amounts were never cashed, but were stuffed away in desk drawers and boxes where they stayed for as many as 5 or 6 years. A supervisor who reported the conditions in the office was told that he had better be diplomatic and get along with the collector's personnel instead of criticizing them. We found that conditions in this office had been bad and allowed to remain so over a period of 15 years. Now Smyth and several of his top assistants have been removed from office. He and three others have been indicted on a variety of criminal charges and at present are awaiting trial.

Within the past few weeks Collector of Internal Revenue Scofield in Austin, Tex., has resigned his position at the request of the Government and for the good of the Internal Revenue service. Investigation of his case is still continuing. Prior to that the collector of internal revenue in Nashville, Lipe Henslee, had also been requested to resign for the good of the service.

Thus, in less than a year these seven collectors of internal revenue, out of a total of 64, have been removed from office for reasons ranging from gross incompetence to criminal activities.

The most important factor about all this is that all of these collectors, despite the variety of their offenses, have had one thing in common. They all received their jobs as a result of political patronage. None of these men charged with the top leadership in Federal tax collection in their districts was appointed in the career service of the Internal Revenue Bureau. Each was appointed on the basis of political obligations rather than on the basis of competence and experience.

During the period in which these seven collectors, comprising over 10 percent of the total, were being removed from office, not a single field official holding a position of comparable importance in the career service of the Bureau of Internal Revenue was found to have violated his public trust. And this despite the fact that the opportunities and temptations for corruption in the top career positions, such as internal revenue agent-in-charge or special agent-in-charge, are at least as great, and probably greater, than in the case of the collectors.

Once this situation was clear, the President and the Secretary of the Treasury moved to correct it. In January of this year the President transmitted to the Congress, a proposed plan of reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The salient feature of this plan is the elimination of the position of collector of internal revenue and the transfer of this important function to the civil service career system.

There could be no doubt of the urgency of this reform. The House of Representatives swiftly approved the plan. The committee which considered it favored the plan, without a single dissenting vote—Democratic or Republican. The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report has endorsed the plan as carrying out the objectives of the Hoover Commission. Former President Hoover wrote to me that he personally endorses the reorganization. Prominent professional groups have also approved the plan, including the tax section of the American Bar Association, the American Institute of Accountants, and such prominent local bar groups as the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. This overwhelming endorsement rose above partisanship.

With the tremendous growth of the Federal tax system in the past 10 years, it is imperative that the men responsible for collecting the billions of dollars of taxes shall be experienced and competent people of undoubted integrity. The job of collecting taxes can no longer be made a reward for political loyalty. It must no longer be used as a stepping stone to some higher political appointment. It must no longer be used as a means of enhancing private professional and business interests. It must no longer be used as a means of exerting improper influence for private gain. The only way to prevent these things effectively is to stop the patronage appointment of collectors and put them under civil service.

I do not say that civil service is a cure-all, nor that civil-service appointments will guarantee honesty. I do say that every taxing system presents opportunities and temptations for corruption and the problem of preventing corruption in our taxing system is only complicated and impeded by the addition of political pressures. The truth of this is made completely apparent when it is seen that while the system of patronage appointments has been failing miserably, the civil-service system has successfully met the test of providing honest leadership in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I am a politician and I know the important and valuable role of politics in preserving and protecting our democratic system. However, the high role of politics, in the best sense of the term, is debased when patronage is used to fill technical and administrative jobs in Government.

UNIT COSTS AT BAYONNE NAVAL BASE A CHALLENGE TO ALL

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr Speaker, I should like to point out to the military people in the House, the unit cost at the Bayonne Naval Base of receiving, storing, and moving items for shipment.

The naval base at Bayonne, N. J., in my district, is the largest supplier and mover of ECA goods to Europe on the East coast. It is a model of efficiency which might well be duplicated in all Federal institutions.

I recommend to the Secretary of Defense, and to the Congress of the United States, that the base's commanding officer, Captain Boundy, and his staff, be suitably cited and decorated for their outstanding performance in supply and cost economy. Their performance is a matter of record. I trust the Department of Defense will see fit to make public the figures.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANZ in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANHAM and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGUIRE (at the request of Mr. HAYS of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FORAND.

Mr. FURCOLO in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LYLE and to include a speech delivered by the president of the Texas Bar Association.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ENGLE and to include an editorial.

Mr. DORN and to include a resolution.

Mr. LANTAFF and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. CARNAHAN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include the ceremony on the Coast Guard Cutter in connection with the inauguration of the radio transmitter for the Voice of America, notwithstanding the fact that the additional cost will be $189.

Mr. REAMS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL and to include an article on the maximum use of forests, notwithstanding the additional cost will amount to $273.

Mr. O'HARA and to include an address by Hon. Oswald Ryan, Vice Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, delivered

before a meeting of the Aero Club in Washington.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska and to include an editorial.

Mr. MASON on the subject of the present-day Federal tax picture and to include an editorial.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHENCK and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming in four separate instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCGREGOR in two instances, in one to include a press release relative to a speech he made recently, and in the other to include an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon News.

Mr. SCUDDER and to include an editorial.

Mr. FINE (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER) and to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. HAVENNER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include several articles.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include an editorial by Robert C. Ruark.

Mr. BRAY and to include an editorial appearing in the Washington (Ind.) Herald.

Mr. BETTS and to include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ).

Mr. SHORT and to include an address by George Stringfellow.

Mr. TOLLEFSON in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include newspaper excerpts.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an address by Governor Fine.

Mr. SCHWABE in three instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. DAGUE (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), for Monday and Tuesday, on account of death in his immediate family.

Mr. SADLAK (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN), for 1 week, on account of illness.

Mr. RAINS (at the request of Mr. WILSON of Texas), for the remainder of the week, on account of committee business.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 11, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1232. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1953 in the amount of $100,000 for the legislative branch (H. Doc. No. 387); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1233. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated April 1950, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, of the Grand (Neosho) River watershed in Arkansas, Kansas, Missouri, and Oklahoma, made under the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 388); to the committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1234. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1950, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on Belhaven Harbor, N. C., particularly with a view to determining whether the existing project for the timber breakwaters at the mouth of Pantego Creek should be modified. This investigation was requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on September 25, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 389) to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

1235. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report concerning payment of station per diem allowances in the amount of $1,365,100.25 to officer personnel assigned to permanent duty at Elmendorf Air Force Base and Fort Richardson, Alaska, covering the period February 1, 1949, to October 1, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1236. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend the act of May 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 223), as amended"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1237. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the annual report of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the fiscal year 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 6, 1952, the following bill was introduced and reported on March 7, 1952:

Mr. CANNON: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 6947. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted March 10, 1952]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows.

Mr. PATMAN: Select Committee on Small Business. Report pursuant to House Resolution 33, Eighty-second Congress, first session. Report on problems of small business under the controlled-materials plan—allocation of oil-country tubular goods; without amendment (Rept. No. 1504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 6, 1952, the following bill was introduced and reported on March 7, 1952:

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 6947. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Introduced and referred March 10, 1952]

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 6948. A bill to extend the Federal Declaratory Judgments Act, as amended, to the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 6949. A bill to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 to except the Virgin Islands from certain limitations upon the making of Federal contributions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 6950. A bill to provide for adjustment in the salary of certain rural carriers attached to post offices of the first class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 6951. A bill to amend section 3412 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on gasoline); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEWART:

H. R. 6952. A bill to exempt Blackfeet tribal loans from certain restrictions applicable to Federal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 6953. A bill to establish the Trinity Atomic National Monument at Trinity in the State of New Mexico and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 6954. A bill to provide for payments to State unemployment funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 6955. A bill to amend section 113 (a) (5) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 6956. A bill to permit the Sanitary District of Chicago to divert and withdraw additional water from Lake Michigan; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 6957. A bill to provide for the establishment of certain priorities in the awarding of military procurement contracts within regions suffering economic distress through unemployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6958. A bill to amend the act of May 31, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes," so as to require the inclusion of certain stipulations in contracts for carrying the mails by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 6959. A bill to amend section 1699, title 18, United States Code, relating to the unloading of mail from vessels; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6960. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the transportation and distribution of mails on motor-vehicle routes," approved July 11, 1940; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 6961. A bill to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 6962. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to alleviate shortages in railroad freight cars and other vehicles during periods of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 6963. A bill to provide that in certain cases education and facilities on Federal property shall continue to be available to children residing in adjacent areas until June 30, 1954; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6964. A bill to prevent the infiltration of subversive persons into Government employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6965. A bill to amend subsection (e) of section 753 of title 28, United States Code so as to fix the salary for reporters in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 6966. A bill to provide for adjustment in the salary of certain rural carriers attached to post offices of the first class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COX:

H. Res. 561. Creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of foundations and other comparable organizations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 6967. A bill authorizing the issuance of patent in fee to Paul Afraid of His Horses; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 6968. A bill for the relief of Maria Buffoni and Emma Botta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 6969. A bill to effect entry of a minor child adopted by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6970. A bill for the relief of Araxi Nazarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6971. A bill for the relief of Francesca (or Frances) Romeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 6972. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence D. Grimshaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6973. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Phyllis Jackson Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6974. A bill for the relief of the Wilbraham Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 6975. A bill for the relief of Ellen Sonja Sadlowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6976. A bill for the relief of Henryk Blaszkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 6977. A bill for the relief of William L. Gleeson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 6978. A bill for the relief of Gerald A. and Lynn W. Roehm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE (by request):

H. R. 6979. A bill for the relief of Jose Pineiro Gonzales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 6980. A bill for the relief of Cha Dong Bok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 6981. A bill for the relief of Betty and Irene Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHENCK:

H. R. 6982. A bill for the relief of Panagiotes G. Karras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 6983. A bill for the relief of Gevork Zohrab Bandarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

618. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Petition of P. W. Goss, 518 Division Park Hill, North Little Rock, Ark., and others relative to the passage of H. R. 4411; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

619. By the SPEAKER: Petition of C. C. Fergerson, president, Jackson Townsend Club, No. 18, Jacksonville, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 1679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

620. Also, petition of Mrs. A. P. Marshall, secretary Orlo Vista Townsend Club, No. 1, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

621. Also, petition of L. O. Robertson, and others, Everett, Mass., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

622. Also, petition of Miss Irene B. Whetstone, Chicago, Ill., relative to renewal of demand for impeachment stated in petition No. 314, dated June 12, 1951, and referred to the House Judiciary Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, in whom alone is the strength of our hearts and the hope of our world, we come in our noontide fellowship of prayer, not so much to seek Thee as to open our fallible lives in penitence and need to Thy waiting strength. Make our own lives, we pray Thee, quarries out of which stones for the new temple of humanity may be fashioned.

In these days of great peril and critical decisions, as against the powers of darkness Thou art unloosing the fateful lightning of Thy terrible, swift sword; save us from all policies whose reaping will be another harvest of horror for our children's children. Give us to know clearly and to follow faithfully the things that belong to our peace and to the peace of the whole world. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 10, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1368. An act to amend subsection (a) of section 1107 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901, as amended by section 2 of the act of December 20, 1944 (D. C. Code, sec. 15-403 (a)), and to amend section 467 of the District of Columbia Code of 1901 (D. C. Code, sec. 16-323); and

S. 2667. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1758. An act to amend section 824 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6805. An act to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the Presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] may be excused from attending the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow so that he may make an address at the Army War College at Carlisle, Pa.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENDORSEMENT OF CANDIDACY OF SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of South Carolina has adopted a concurrent resolution endorsing the candidacy of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL and commending him to the people of the Nation for nomination and election as President of the United States.

I am honored to deliver this resolution to the Senate of the United States, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The South Carolina Legislature, in adopting this resolution, has put into words the deep, sincere feelings of all the people of this land who have had the opportunity to observe and know Senator RUSSELL. To all the people who have come to know him as a lawyer, a governor, a legislator, a statesman, and above all, a great humanitarian, his announcement has come as a refreshing breeze on a troubled and sordid political picture.

It is a pleasure to be able to present this resolution, adopted by my own people, to the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and, under the rule, to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution endorsing the candidacy of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, and commending him to the peoples of our Nation for nomination and election as President of the United States

Whereas the Honorable RICHARD B. RUSSELL, United States Senator from Georgia, has finally consented to become a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President of these United States; and

Whereas he stands for constitutional government, the American way of life, the rights of the States, and his honesty, integrity, and knowledge of the workings of our Government are unquestioned; and

Whereas Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL is eminently qualified for that high honor, and is a true American Democrat of the finest type who will make a great President and leader for our Nation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Carolina (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do hereby endorse the candidacy of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, and commend him to the peoples of our Nation for nomination and election as President of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF CITIZENS OF NEWPORT, VT., PROTESTING AGAINST HIGH INCOME TAXES

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by citizens of Newport, Vt., assembled at the annual city meeting, which reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the meeting that a stop must be put to the squandering of our tax money by the Federal Government; that relief must be granted to the taxpayers; that our Senators and Congressman be informed that we object to the continued high rate of Federal income taxes imposed upon us;

"*Resolved*, That our Senators and Congressman be informed that their support in Congress of any laws, resolutions or proposals, for the unwarranted spending of our tax money will be condemned by us; that our Senators and Congressman are requested to join with any and all other Senators and Members of Congress in a joint effort to reduce the spending of our tax money; that all bills, resolutions or appropriations be carefully examined to determine if the amounts of money can be reduced or if the projects calling for appropriations can be postponed to later years;

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be certified by the mayor and city clerk and forwarded to each Senator and Congressman from Vermont."

This is to certify that the above resolution was presented to and adopted by the legal voters of the city of Newport at the annual city meeting held at Newport, Vt., on March 4, 1952.

FRED B. CRAWFORD,
Mayor of the City of Newport, Vt.

AUSTIN J. BEEBE,
City Clerk of the City of Newport, Vt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CHICAGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE URGING GREATER INTEREST IN REGISTRATION AND VOTING IN PRIMARIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, recently the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce selected Gen. J. W. Hilton as its president for the next year and one of the first actions taken by the chamber under his direction was the adoption of a resolution directing the Americanism committee of the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce to urge a greater interest in registration, voting and the selection of good candidates for public office.

The chairman of this Americanism committee is Vincent L. Knaus, a Chicago attorney, who has done a great deal of work in this field and who has also directed the Americanism activities of the religious liberty committee of the Knights of Columbus. I have known Vincent Knaus a great many years and can testify to the spirited and unselfish public service which he has rendered in the field of Americanism and in arousing the electorate to its responsibilities at the polls.

In this connection I present the resolution which was adopted by the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce on February 20, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO SOUTH CHICAGO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Whereas in the State of Illinois a primary election is to take place April 8, 1952, at which time both parties will nominate candidates for the various offices in the gift of the State, county, city, and other subdivisions thereof, and it is important that citizens vote in the primary and disclose their political affiliations without fear or favor; and

Whereas the first duty of a citizen in a Republic such as ours is voting, which is an expression of party choice at the primary, of certain candidates, and the election of these candidates so selected in the election in November; and

Whereas people have shown a lack of interest to participate actively in politics—which is the science of government—and feel that government should function automatically like a machine, and that participation in politics is too time-consuming and refuse to become acquainted with the functioning of government of the State, county, and National, that it is too complicated and requires a high degree of intelligence and choices are difficult to make and can only be made by carefully going over the records of the candidates and that takes too much effort; and

Whereas politics and government has been now associated with hoodlums, racketeers, and fixers in the public mind, and in no time the worst elements of our population will have control of legislatures (both State and city councils) and of candidates for office who will run our governments, both State and local, so that it is time to be alarmed and steps must be taken to stem the deterioration of moral standards in this field of social science—we have paid dearly for our laziness in the past—because it may seal our doom; and

Whereas a neglected vote, or badly given vote, is a social sin because it gravely harms the community and the very State itself and the same makes the voter automatically responsible for all the harm that follows not only to conscience but to the very soul itself: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Americanism committee of the South Chicago Chamber of Commerce urge all citizens to register and to vote regardless of their party politics at the coming primary, April 8, 1952, and to make a

proper choice of the candidates submitted by both political parties after due deliberation thereon.

Respectfully submitted.

VINCENT L. KNAUS,
Chairman.
Col. HORACE F. WULF,
FELIX V. MENCLEWICZ,
Members.

FEBRUARY 20, 1952.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Pielecki Kennedy (Rept. No. 1261);

S. 569. A bill for the relief of May Hosken (Rept. No. 1262);

S. 762. A bill for the relief of Alexander Urszu (Rept. No. 1263);

S. 779. A bill for the relief of Ziemowit Z. Karpinski (Rept. No. 1264);

S. 794. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shuting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia (Rept. No. 1265);

S. 1420. A bill for the relief of Pinfang Hsia (Rept. No. 1266);

S. 1469. A bill for the relief of Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch (Rept. No. 1267);

S. 1527. A bill for the relief of Sisters Dolores Ilia Martori, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals (Rept. No. 1268);

S. 1555. A bill for the relief of Rosarina Garofalo (Rept. No. 1269);

S. 1855. A bill for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano (Rept. No. 1271);

S. 1891. A bill for the relief of Lubo Paskalovic (Rept. No. 1272);

S. 2102. A bill for the relief of Alcide Orazio Marselli and Angelo Bardelli (Rept. No. 1273);

S. 2266. A bill to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the period of March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948 (Rept. No. 1274);

S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Matheos Alafouzos (Rept. No. 1275);

H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris (Rept. No. 1276);

H. R. 1416. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Valdengo and Albertina Gioglio Valdengo (Rept. No. 1277);

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Yamashita, the Japanese fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II, and her son Takashi Yamashita (Rept. No. 1278);

H. R. 2775. A bill for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath (Rept. No. 1279); and

H. R. 2833. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Bing and Nina Bing (Rept. No. 1280).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 992. A bill for the relief of Daniel Walkonsky, and his wife, Xenia Walkonsky (Rept. No. 1281);

S. 1189. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lombardo (Rept. No. 1282);

S. 1766. A bill for the relief of Frederic James Mercado (Rept. No. 1270);

S. 1843. A bill for the relief of John Kintzig and Tatiana A. Kintzig (Rept. No. 1283);

S. 2051. A bill for the relief of Naomi Saito (Rept. No. 1284);

S. 2307. A bill for the relief of Holger Kubishke (Rept. No. 1285);

S. 2635. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller (Rept. No. 1286); and

H. R. 3668. A bill for the relief of David Yeh (Rept. No. 1287).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 365. A bill for the relief of Anna Krueger, Jean Krueger, and Edith Krueger (Rept. No. 1288); and

H. R. 899. A bill for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron (Rept. No. 1289).

By Mr. UNDERWOOD, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 2677. A bill to restore to 70 pounds and 100 inches in girth and length combined the maximum weight and size limitations for appliances, or parts thereof, for the blind sent through the mails; without amendment (Rept. No. 1292).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. Res. 288. Resolution extending the authority of, and providing additional funds for, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under Senate Resolution 58, to investigate personnel needs and practices of the various governmental agencies; without amendment (Rept. No. 1293); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1290) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-5629724, Abramowitz, William, or Velvel Abramovitch.

A-4741333, Abramowitz, Fanny, or Abramovitch (nee Feigel Nadler).

A-6428354, Aguilar, Maria Asuncion Juarez.

A-4670033, Alanis-Carrillo, Joaquin.

A-5173334, Allbut, Ena Joyce, or Joyce Allbut (nee Nisen).

A-1334800, Allie Abraham.

A-5814065, Anderson, Paul Bruno.

A-2831444, Argyropoulos, Lukas.

A-5694214, Anemaet, Johannes Franciscus.

A-4008206, Arellano, Irene Reyes, or Irene Arellano or Irene Emilia Reyes.

A-7189824, Arias-Aguilar, Aurelio, or Aurelio Arias.

A-7189825, Arias, Juana.

A-1404789, Aronis, Antonios Nicholas.

A-3980499, Balita, Miti Ndina, or Peet Ndina Balita.

A-5738784, Bank, Adolf Christoph Frederich, or Frederich Bank or Adolf Bank.

A-2934803, Baranoff, Constantin Alexandrovich, or John Bean.

A-7450586, Baumann, Geargе Francis, Jr., or Georg Franz Barron.

A-5728296, Beaven, Richard.

A-7416244, Becker, Frauke-Virginia.

A-4625757, Bendjy, David.

A-4446964, Bendjy, Jennie Promnan.

A-5803486, Benjamin, Claire, or Claire Cox.

A-6864688, Biernacki, Vera.

A-2236306, Bjelik, Karos, alias Carl Bjelik.

A-4848382, Borg, Spiro Charles.

A-2486091, Borriello, Guiseppe, or Joseph Borriello.

A-3712375, Bouchard, Joseph Adelard, or Joseph Adelard Viateur Douchard.

A-7138247, Brachler, Therese, alias Therese Pichler.

A-2965616, Branoff, Endria Eloff, or Alex Eloff.

A-1679683, Bratta, Vittorio Galiano.

A-7859026, Brennan, Cecile Marie (nee Fortin).

A-2092062, Brenzinger, Eric Gustav, or Erich Brazinger.

A-7394773, Brock-Jones, Sieglinde Elfriede, formerly Sieglinde Elfriede Liebl.

A-7394772, Brock-Jones, Marold (formerly Harold Liebl).

A-388597, Byker, Marie Hooyer, or Marie Cornelia Byker.

A-6462787, Caleca, Louise Elena, or Bastianon.

A-7115185, Caliboso, Diana E., or Fabiana Hstoista Caliboso.

A-7115184, Caliboso, Archangel Estoista.

A-4271523, Campa de Mendez, Estella, alias Estella Campa-Lopez or Estella Mendoza.

A-3841543, Campbell, Vera Myrtle (nee Goodwin).

A-5523477, Capozza, Giuseppe, or Joseph or Tommaso Appolini.

A-7031930, Castaneda, Martin, Jr.

A-6022953, Castaneda-Palomares, Sarah, or Sara Castaneda.

A-2585741, Charchian, Jean (nee Boyajian or Johan).

A-2244261, Chavez, Juan, or Juan M. Chavez.

A-7140386, Chin, Leung Toy, or Jobco Chin.

A-5057016, Choy, Tommy, or Lap Hing Choy or Choy Back.

A-7241521, Cimino, Pasquale.

A-4999873, Cohen, Bessie.

A-1862779, Cohen, Joseph Louis.

A-5716993, Cohen, Rose, alias Rose Les Cohen or Rose Kuhowski.

A-4704289, Coburn, Wellington Bates.

A-6937578, Corvi, Pier Luigi.

A-2155174, Christiani, Pietro.

A-5120959, Cromwell, Harold Cecil.

A-4945744, Dalech, Bernard John.

A-1996475, Damonte, Antonio.

A-7463526, Daniel, Sylvia Constantia.

A-5473207, De Aguilar, Mercedes Beltran Vda.

A-7903766, De Canto, Adela Matta.

A-4247797, Defever, Lucienne Mary Rose (nee Bessette).

A-5493174, DeGomez, Conception Avalos.

A-7182581, DeLa Pena, Waldemar, formerly Morgenweg.

A-5785408, Delatto, Giacomo Giovanni.

A-6057198, DeMunoz, Carolina Sotelo, or Carolina Sotelo or Carolina Sotelo Munoz.

A-2628934, DeOlachea, Juana Vasquez-Jiminez, or Jennie Vasquez.

A-2082231, DePerez, Nicolasa Vela, or Nicolasa Vela Perez.

A-5431395, DeRamirez, Petra Montanez Vda, or Petra Montanez.

A-5727307, DeVejarano, Maria Dolores Del Real.

A-3693229, Devletian, Reginald Hratchia.

A-3784699, Dewart, Allan.

A-3696793, DeYarak, Rosina Cota.

A-5448431, DeZaragoza, Esperanza Mora.

A-6673660, Diamond, Lillian.

A-5715917, Diaz, Bernardo Fernandez, or Bernaldo Diaz or Bernardo Diaz.

A-5155812, Dicken, Arnold.

A-5050242, DiPinto, Donato.

A-5611179, DiRosa, Rosalia, or Rosalia Cataudella Di Rosa, or Rasalia Cataudella.

A-3483753, Dragotto, Natale.

A-3331316, Durando, Pasquale, or Patsey or Patsy Durante.

A-3112282, Eckson, Eleodoro Gregory.

A-1264162, Eglesias, Teodoro Rey, or Teodor Rey Eglesias or Rey Teodore or Teodoro Rey.

A-1642794, Englefield, Rupert Harold.

A-5977548, Feher, Istvan, or Stephen Feher.

A-4750778, Feloukajis, George Nicholas.

A-7131950, Figueroa-Ruiz, Francisco Humberto.

A-3491400, Finkelstein, Laura Ann (nee Annie Laura Fields).

A-2816057, Flores, Franciso Banda (alias Francisco Banda alias Francisco Banda Y Flores.
A-5935539, Foote, Marie Elizabeth (nee Labby).
A-5931615, Foote, Howard Eugene.
A-5272863, Foy, Henry Lawrence.
A-6861976, Friedrych, Elza or Elsa (Elza or Elsa Shatzkin).
A-1781392, Frontera, Francesco, or Francesco Frontero.
A-4855806, Fujinami, Hirokichi, or Shodo Kubota or Hirokichi Mochida.
A-4116335, Gaon, Abrahani, or Abraham Gaonoff or Abraham Rayim Gaon.
A-5703614, Ganino, Victoria (nee Maione).
A-5352191, Georgeff, Kiril, or Karl Georgoff.
A-7414939, Gibbs, Penelope Georgina.
A-6918380, Glazek, Judith Agnes, or Judith Agnes Heller or Keller.
A-2373538, Glidewell, Dorothy Maud (nee Clark).
A-5245953, Golias, Dimitrios Ioanou, or James John Golias or Lampros Lampropulos.
A-3901981, Goodman, Ethel.
A-7287900, Gonzalez, Miguel.
A-2996135, Gonzalez, Eduardo Lopez.
A-5752823, Gottschalk, Caroline, or Caroline Specht (nee Caroline Maurer) or Carla or Karla Gottschalk.
A-5328575, Green, Harry.
A-5328573, Green, Lily.
A-7375503, Guarnes, Rosa Miller, or Rosa Manjares Miller.
A-4526659, Gutteridge, Albert Edward (Gutheridge).
A-4526676, Gutteridge, Harriett (Gutheridge).
A-7059960, Hahnel, Karl Josef.
A-7268078, Hanson, Bella Elizabeth, or Bella Hanson (nee Della Elizabeth Percs Campbell).
A-4663927, Harris, Raymond Lloyd.
A-7855708, Harris, Johanna (nee Matiskainen), or Johanna Matson.
A-4619771, Hassenfuss, John Herbert, or Herbert Gorit.
A-1375936, Hauke, Ferdinand, or Fred Hauke or Fred Henke.
A-3592503, Heller, Veronica (nee Kramer).
A-7287771, Henley, Alma Zelda.
A-5697055, Higashio, Shoichi.
A-4475775, Hirdes, Arnoldus, or Arnold Hirdes.
A-4911480, Hirdes, Helena (nee Van Der Stroom).
A-5137174, Hoffman, Pauline.
A-7174619, Hopkins, Bridie (nee Morrison).
A-5147450, Hornshuh, Jeanne Elizabeth (nee Moran).
A-2706175, Hwang, David Nien-Tzu, or Nien Tzu Hwang.
A-6843463, Hwang, Rose Roo-Ma (nee Rose Roo-Ma Hsi).
A-5999940, Ibanez, Feliz, or Felix Recopuerto Ibanez or Felix R. Ibanez or Felix Ibanes.
A-5994049, Ide, Hiroko, alias Riro Ide or Kathleen Ide.
A-5994050, Ide, Sada Abe.
A-6000682, Ide, Tatsuro, alias Thomas Ide.
A-7551545, Ikeda, Kenjiro.
A-7079811, Jimenez-Ramirez, Jesus.
A-7054891, De Jimenez, Josefina Perez.
A-4608065, Jimenez-Solorio, Justo.
A-4451158, Johns, Mary Ellen, or Mary Ellen Jackson, or Mary Ellen Kraskin.
A-7841189, Johnson, Sonia Marie Angele, or Sonia Marie Angele Jeziorski.
A-7273956, Jordan, Helen W. (nee Eleni Char. Fotopulo or Fotopoulos).
A-5502991, Kadrovach, Leoma Beatrice.
A-4330388, Kaid, Arthur.
A-4263049, Kaye, Marilyn Lucille (nee Fitzgerald).
A-5294966, Keller, Max, or Matei Keller.
A-4753428, Keller, Katharina, or Katherina Keller (nee Wagner).
A-4680924, Kelley, Madeleine Ethel (nee Madeline Ethel Lowrie).
A-4352750, Kessner, Philip F. Keschner or Solomon Kessner or Solomon P. Kessner.
A-4760290, Kielczewski, Peter Paul, or Frank Zuk.
A-7551533, Kim, Young Whee (nee Chung), or Moe Ja Chung Kim.
A-5944129, Kim, Kwang Won, or Yong Duk Kim or Kim Kwang Won.
A-4781009, Kjolier, Ejner Viggo Gedeson, or Harry Koller.
A-4963336, Kleitsch, Benedick, or Benny Klein.
A-7869862, Koenig, Gertrude Irmgard (nee Brender), or Thude Keoneg.
A-5409958, Kolitsos, Gust, or Kostas Socrates Kolitsos.
A-4433091, Kollias, Anastsios Theodorou, or Tom Poulos.
A-5677297, Koretzky, Ernst, or Ernest Albert or Ernst or Ernest Koretsky or Koretski or Ernest Mally.
A-4749177, Kostelic, Jakob, or Jacob Costello.
A-4407050, Kurtz, Sam, or Samuel Balin.
A-6077887, Lee, Sidney Ernest.
A-1412054, Latokaw, Marof Din, or Marof D. Latokaw or Gani.
A-4864734, Lazarides, Lazarus Nicholas, or Lazarus Lazarides.
A 5153149, Lessard, Hector Michael.
A-7182802, Lessman, Helene (nee Scheider).
A-7264241, Lessman, Klaus J., or Klaus Scheider.
A-3833567, Leyba-Munos, Galvarino Carlos, or Charles G. Leyba alias Galvarino or Carlos Leyba-Munos.
A-5420632, Lieb:, Rosalie Adelheit.
A-4415125, Lo, Shih Ching.
A-4316069, Longo, Teodosio, or Frank T. Longo.
A-4170158, Longo, Esther (nee Vela), or Esther Velas.
A-3222153, Lopez de Lara, Guadalupe.
A-7841032, Lubian, Christa Helene Elfrieda.
A-7859905, Lugo-Oquita, Jesus.
A-3631463, Lu, Yi-Chuang.
A-6542250, Lyons, Roderick J.
A-7035288, Mabuchi, Kenneth Kent.
A-7118253, Malischnigg, Roland Lothar, or Roland Lothar Crosby.
A-7290818, Manzo, Antoinetta or Antonietta.
A-5890643, Marcotte, Parfait Albert Joseph,, or Albert Joseph Marcotte.
A-5999034, Martin, Roger Milton Napoleon Joseph.
A-2277895, Martinelli, Margaret Schmaltz, or Margaret Schmaltz or Margaret Martinelli.
A-2009066, Matsumoto, Tsuta, or Tsuta Kubo.
A-1796262, McDonald, Andrew Joseph.
A-2868743, Meloch, Johannes Ernst.
A-5976927, Micka, Peter Boldika, or Ernest D. Thessinger.
A-1991112, Miller, Walter Otto (Mueller).
A-5067976, Mione, Vincenzo, or Vincent Mione.
A-6261595, Mitrakas, Despina.
A-3308244, Mitchell, William Blair.
A-4938534, Miyagishing, Yoshi Saburo, or Yoshi Saburo Miyo.
A-5153067, Montour, William Feliz, alias Provencal or Provencher.
A-4881629, Moore, Caroline Elnora (nee McInnes).
A-5823090, Moore, William Elmyn.
A-4063548, Moreno, Pedro Pablo.
A-7420865, Morgan, Herta (nee Gartner).
A-7423173, Mori, Tarao, or Torao Noma.
A-7174722, Moses, Gatha, Abu-Nader (nee Gatha Abu-Nader).
A-2653881, Motoyoshi, Masara, or Paul Motoyoshi.
A-3759334, Mueller, Edward.
A-7863440, Murray, Louis Victor, formerly Louis Victor La Place.
A-6620619, Nachameczyk, Susanne.
A-4508566, Nakawatase, Masoyoshi.
A-7377267, Nasser, Evelyn Fegaly.
A-2994833, Nerio, Yutaka Toya.
A-6561461, Nesmith, Darlene Catherine, or Darlene Catherine Robertson.
A-3425161, Nickoloff, Sterio, or Steve Nickaleff or Sterio Nicoloff.
A-4250801, Nishiyama, Fusako.
A-1529975, Okrepki, Stefan Perkoski.
A-4925121, Olesen, Alexander Herman Juul Friis, alias Alex Olson or Olesen.
A-2859253, Olsen, Olaf Trygve, or Teddy Olsen.
A-4410043, Orlando, Andrea, or Andrea Giunta.
A-4059490, Ortega-Hernandez, Felipe.
A-1923107, Pappas, John, or John Steve Pappas or John Sparks.
A-2703842, Peko, Stefan, alias Steve Peko.
A-7504493, Peters, Ruth Hahn, or Heung Fox Hahn.
A-1568666, Pineiro, Maria (nee Loriz).
A-6448592, Pistolis, Kleomenis, or Constantinos Kappelias.
A-7394537, Placencia-Haro, Maria.
A-1046573, Psychoyos, Apostole, or Apostolos Sinogias.
A-7418505, Purdy, Myrtle Jean Latimer.
A-6853347, Rabsatt, Lubin Edsmond.
A-1603047, Raia, Giovanni, or John or John Rira alias John Lattauzio.
A-6924972, Raney, Mary Elizabeth (nee Ferris), or Mary Elizabeth Reeves.
A-6920215, Raney, William Franklin.
A-5011668, Reeps, Salley, or Sarah Reeps Wee Schwaine.
A-4799661, Regolino, Giuseppe.
A-4777659, Renda, Carmine Stefona, alias Graetna Passaquindici.
A-7862042, Richards, John Purnell.
A-3256023, Riddlebaugh, Louise Hulda Frieda (nee Mitsching), formerly Anderson alias Steinfurth alias Lundt.
A-3249110, Romero, Eduardo.
A-1015670, Rossel, Wilhalmina, formerly Raes and Seedeker (nee Rottier).
A-2523053, Rotner, Jean (nee Szajndli Fuks or Jean Fox).
A-3077881, Rotondo, Sebastiano.
A-4858782, Rugo, John, or Giovanni Rugo.
A-7389303, Sabatino, Colomba (nee Candro).
A-7886174, Salafia, Maria (nee Carnevalini).
A-2608045, Salas-Davila, Jose Gabriel.
A-4224045, De Salas, Vita Siller.
A-6989676, Salmeron-Carillo, Nicolas, or Nicolas Salmeron or Silvestre Acero Aquallo or Joaquin Salmeron.
A-1494610, Sanchez-Perez, Victoriano.
A-6794153, Sasati, Iskender.
A-7360879, Scholl, Gert Michael, or Michael Scholl.
A-7469222, Schlichting, Peter Bernd, or Peter Bernd Irlenborn.
A-6897624, Schon, Czilla Zsu-Zsanna.
A-6897622, Schon, Erika Maria.
A-5440978, Schwartz, Clarence Graham.
A-1978516, Scibetta, Michael Joseph, or Michael Scibetta alias Andrew Iacuzzo alias Thomas Burgio.
A-5862901, Scott, Lucia Joan (nee Vasquez).
A-6635330, Shamey, Mary, formerly Abraham formerly Unis (nee Torini) alias Mary Allie.
A-4804418, Shee, Chin (Chin Toy Ling).
A-4931028, Shirai, Naboru.
A-6385600, Shun, Wong Fung, or Frank Wong.
A-7178414, Sieu, Louis.
A-5653526, Sineiro, Manuel Freire, or Manuel Freire Sin or Louis or Lucio Costa.
A-5603323, Singh, Sher, or Pheru or Pherco Singh.
A-5152398, Sinko, Jozef, or Joe Sinko.
A-6166191, Skaljac, Branko.
A-5614576, Skarzynska, Marie Therese.
A-6794981, Sogikoglu, Penyamin Benny.
A-4061523, Somers, Lorna Jean Salisburg.
A-3568068, Soper, Annie Aranel (nee Ball).

A-7043998, Sotelo, Rachel Frias, or Raquel Sotelo.
A-1870475, Soucek, Anna, or Anna Souchek or Anna Waltz.
A-7886520, Spencer, Peter, or Jean Pierre Lievin Marie Van Swae.
A-6534324, Srour, Farid Tannous.
A-3041657, Smith, Atelina Ericksson Hermens.
A-7890789, Smith, Christian Raymond, or Raymond Empt.
A-6504556, Stein, Abram, or Alex Stein.
A-5388203, Sternshein, Bessie.
A-4514372, Stokov, Nikola Martin, or Nick or Nik Stokov.
A-2312785, Stover, Heinrich Dietrich.
A-1619722, Struck, Nellie (nee Gerych or Gerecz), formerly Nellie Kondrat.
A-3316456, Sugawara, Shuji Richard.
A-3829310, Sugawara, Haru Hazel (nee Uyehara).
A-3316924, Sugawara, Albert Moduyuki.
A-3316458, Sugawara, Katherine Meiko.
A-4746797, Szittner, William John.
A-7520922, Szewczyk, Irene, alias Irena Rogizinski.
A-5725389, Takata, Saburo.
A-2530880, Takei, Rikizo, or Sakae Take.
A-4382301, Tamm, Bernhard Karl, or Bernard Tamm.
A-3576481, Tanaka, Harukichi.
A-3489287, Tanaka, Takeshi.
A-2444881, Tcheou, Han Ming.
A-7608918, Tcheou, Pao Tan (nee Chu).
A-4835873, Tesari, Rosalia or Rozolis.
A-4742530, Tesari, Ernest.
A-4081670, Tokar, John Gerald.
A-7274238, Torres-Chavez, Eva Elena.
A-3035861, Tsardis, Stelios.
A-5366553, Tseng, Nancy Ngai Chen (nee Shih).
A-2395361, Usman, Mohammed.
A-7247766, Valdivia, Roberto Padilla.
A-2079870, Varga, Sandor, alias Alexander Varga.
A-4499106, Vasquez-Medina, Epifania.
A-4734406, Vega, Amada Silva (nee Silva), formerly Lopez.
A-5152314, Villegas de Daher, Amalia (nee Amalia Villegas-Esparza), alias Molly Villegas or Molly Daher.
A-4696508, Walton, Ernest.
A-5801428, Watanabe, Tomi.
A-5281685, Watanabe, Masataro.
A-5385044, Wolfson, Phyllis Regina (nee Wittels).
A-5385010, Wolfson, Harry David.
A-4776355, Yasuda, Himi (nee Himi Kuwahara).
A-3933438, Yong, Chung, or Yong Chung.
A-5252907, Yong, Soon Yai, or Hannah Park.
A-3493171, You, Mar Ging.
A-1039748, Yousef, Abouker, or Ali Yousef.
A-3026872, Yribar, John, or Juan Yribar.
A-3614892, Zabala, Mary (nee Toth) alias Mary Sabala.
A-6357999, Zandes, Anna.
A-4080686, Zarcone, Anna.
A-3791657, Zarcone, Nicolo.
A-3319096, Zarocostas, Nicholas Louis, or Nickolas Louis Zarokostas.
A-5275706, Zimmermann, Eitel Otto, or Fred Baker.
A-2173327, Zukar, Nicholas, or Nicholas Sukar.
A-2288566, Angulo-Moreno, Vincent Louis.
A-9782760, Balzano, Ciro.
A-4551812, Barsalini, Leonetto.
A-5925106, Bruhn, Hans Friedrich.
A-1803809, Caragis, Costa Stathes.
A-2826629, Carlot, John.
A-7366702, Cechovic, Winfried Dalhoefer, or Winifried Dalhoefer.
A-2927262, Cherevkoff, Theodore Dimitry, or Theodore Tcherewkoff.
A-3798733, Chiu, Yee Mee, or Lee Yee Mee Chiu.
A-6075423, Christie, Luis De Amechazurra.
A-2385263, De Benedittis, Anibale.
A-2615669, De Dampremy, Charles Andre, or Charles Andre.
A-5728718, DeRodriquiz, Maria Senovia Claudia Hernandez, or Carmen Rodriquez.
A-5562944, Dintchos, Constantinos Demetrious or Constantine Dintcho or Konstantinos Dintsos.
A-7269651, Dirscherl, Charles Karl.
A-7399113, Dyballa, Jean Alexander.
A-7915183, Ebert, Franklin.
A-7035808, Edwards, Thelma.
A-7035811, Edwards, Joyce.
A-5693056, Ehrhart, Henrietta Lavada, formerly Davis or Crawford or Haines.
A-7125346, Ekiert, Tadeusz Zbignien Josef, or Theodore Ekiert.
A-2475917, Enge, Hans Werner.
A-5681587, Franz, Gladys.
A-3664188, Gaglione, Vincenzo.
A-8021644, Garcia-Contreras, Felipe.
A-2691574, Grasso, Luigi, or Luigi Leonardo.
A-6199268, Groke, Florrie, or Florence Mary Grocock or Florrie Milloy or Florrie Imler.
A-2314798, Hohner, Harvey Patrick.
A-7189844, Jessee, Elizabeth Eileen (nee Wight).
A-7457079, Jones, Evelyn Ivera.
A-5577456, Kame, Kameniro.
A-5260591, Kame, Mitsuko (nee Yamanoto).
A-7079615, Kan, Ho Chao.
A-6964630, Kang, Chunghai Yoon (nee Chung Hai Yoon).
A-6042910, Kelly, Theresa Mae Clarke, or Theresa Mae Clarke.
A-6501670, Klein, Jacques Paul Joseph.
A-5445861, Kusumoto, Kotaro.
A-5606733, Lindquist, Gustav Johann Emil.
A-1348997, Lira, Louis, or Luigi Lira.
A-7427882, Listfeldt, Hans Guenther.
A-3790370, Lombardi, Guglielmo, or William Lombardi.
A-7421909, Luchinski, Isabella Trea (nee Stackl).
A-7445465, Manis, Alice (nee Kotterou).
A-4273402, Masuda, Tadao.
A-4898370, Mayeda, Shizue, or Shizue Mayemura.
A-7031979, Mayeda, Atsuko, or Atsjko Maeda or Betty Atsuko Mayemura or Atsuko Mayemura.
A-5445652, Moore, Lena, formerly Higgins (nee Edwards).
A-1503543, Moreno, Margarito.
A-5448351, Nakamura, Kokichi, alias Joji or George Hanazono alias Tong Som.
A-3114409, Nielsen, Svend Odderskjar.
A-5163059, Oderkirk, Vern Ray.
A-7392158, Perez-Calvillo, Angelo Joseph.
A-3547646, Preston, Fay Caro.
A-1558033, Rafee, Elias Ben, or Elias Ben Dollah or Elias Ben Dollah Rafee.
A-5473328, Ramirez-Soto, Jose Apolonio.
A-5394642, Rivera-Machado, Felipe, or Phillip Rivera-Machado.
A-3972575, Ryono, Katsuhiko, or Kaijiro, Higo.
A-7387698, Schlittenbauer, Klaus.
A-7250222, Schroeder, Mary Joanne, or Maria Johanna Hechtbauer.
A-5212198, Scorza, Mario Scorza, or Oreste Mario Scorza.
A-1920512, Semenuk, Semeon Peter, or Samuel Peter Semenuk.
A-7586574, Shee, Lee, or Lee (Sue Fong) Shee or Lee Sue Fong or Mrs. Gin Shue.
A-7586576, Jean, Gin Bak, or Jean Gin.
A-6887117, Fung, Gin Ben, or Ben Gin.
A-3220233, Shibata, Ichiro.
A-3220230, Shibata, Shimako.
A-1165651, Shida, Tokuzo.
A-3751586, Shida, Haruko.
A-4527987, Shinomiya, Tsuneshici.
A-5085280, Shinomiya, Misae (nee Misae Mukai).
A-3205564, Siew, George Hing, or Daniel Goerge Hing Siew or Daniel Shaw.
A-6438990, Simpson, Adela Lim, or Quejadow Nee Lim.
A-7013106, Sisevich, Anthony Joseph Krivickas, or Anthony Joseph Krivickas.
A-6261266, Smilovici, Silvio.
A-7991339, Sotelo, Agripina Dosouto Velasco (nee Velasco), formerly Gonde.
A-5251403, Tanabe, Takeo, or Takeo Tanax.
A-3240692, Tardif, Joseph Patrice, or Patrick Tardif or Joseph P. Tardis or Pat Tardif.
A-3407862, Teque, Jose Maria D'Oliveira, or Joe Mailand.
A-4294622, Velthuis, Petrus, or Pete Velthuis.
A-5620039, Veres, Augustin, or Alez Rosu or Alec or Alex Veres or Gus Rosu or Gus Veres.
A-4773800, Voutsinas, Panagis.
A-5106424, Wadosky, Nickolas, or William Anderson or William Alexander Anderson.
A-7483977, Watson, Barbara Monica, formerly Koechel.
A-5884970, Williams, Vivana.
A-7199106, Wu, Ming Bin.
A-6589977, Yang, Herman Sen-Deh.
A-5884233, Young, Harry Hong, or Harry Young or Jew Hong Young.
A-1310814, Zarraga, Louis or Luis, or Luis Zarraga Camiruaga or Luis Zarraga y Camyvuaga or Luis Cirello or Luis Cirrelo or Luis Cirella or Louis Corega.
A-7841750, Alonso, Alfonso Francisco.
A-7469157, Ballesteros, Alicia Soto, or Alicia Soto.
A-3534208, Bilardi, Gennaro, or Gennaro Biraldi or Billardi or Giovanni Boccardi.
A-6374790, Borrego, Felipe.
A-6374789, Borrego, Enrique Onesimo.
A-4424941, Brandes, Abraham (Abe).
A-5227191, Bresaz, Giuseppe or Joseph, or Joe or Giuseppe Breez.
A-6877609, Chalwill, Luther Leopold.
A-5863624, Corcacas, Manoussos Iannis, or Manoussos Corcacas.
A-5370812, Dagnino, John.
A-5010261, Damian, Bernice.
A-3908919, Danyluk, Peter.
A-6533461, De Moreno, Andrea Maria Castro.
A-1892435, De Saldivar, Concepcion Godinez.
A-5267202, De Vargas, Maria Martina Rico, or Maria Martina Vargas or Maria Frias Rico or Maria Martina Rico.
A-3724929, Drapaniotes, Theodore, alias Toddy Drapatos or Drepanics.
A-2843316, Escarsega, Esteban or Esteban Escarsega-Rios or Esteban Escarciga.
A-7054531, Eskildsen, Lucile Maria.
A-4603415, Faine, Leo Alphonsus.
A-3703978, Fattorini, Giuseppe or Joseph.
A-5255609, Fernandes, Jose, alias Jose Fernandes De Barros.
A-7377173, Fiddickow, Anita Sophie.
A-7377172, Fiddickow, Gernot.
A-6905383, Garbis, Achimidis Spiridon.
A-7000678, Ceddes, John.
A-5824441, Godfrey, Rosezella Glenn.
A-4093725, Gomez, Jesus or Gomez.
A-2378732, Gorin, Lionel Frederick.
A-4148434, Gutchkoff, Alexander.
A-7469740, Haas-Heye, Anna Victoria.
A-1094261, Hahn, Dominik, or Dominik Koch alias Fred Berger.
A-2905582, Hajipetry, Vasilios, alias Bill George alias William H. George alias H. Petry alias William G. Petres.
A-7036146, Hazzard, Joyce Ellen Mariam, alias Joyce Ellen Marian Mesnard.
A-4356334, Heber, Joseph, alias Joseph Huber.
A-4443425, Heber, Eva, alias Eva Huber (nee Wertschek).
A-4574571, Hernandez-Lira, Julia, alias Luz Perez.
A-6934606, Hinkson, Oliver Mowat.
A-6686829, Hinsey, Elena, or Elena Volpe.
A-7033540, Hirai, Tayeko, or Taeko Hirai.
A-5983252, Huerta-Navarro, Francisco.
A-3590939, Ioannou, Pandelis Efstratios, or Paul Yoannou.

A-4734899, Ikemoto, Tokiko (nee Nakamura).
A-3767480, Iovine, Salvatore.
A-5316324, Jewett, Mary Barbara.
A-5112097, Joanou, Michael George.
A-7476443, Kailama, Satu Marja Leena, or Maria Lena Mortti.
A-1223776, Kruschak, Rudolf Stephanus, or Rudolph Stephanus Kurschak.
A-6142565, Lane, Ceferina Lopez Calderon.
A-6202421, Lerma, Emeterio.
A-6198902, De Lerma, Guadalupe Gonzalez, or Guadalupe Gonzalez.
A-5656830, Lopez-Ysias, Mateo.
A-4645207, Lourenco, Jose, or Joseph Gardoso.
A-7046052, MacCalla, Sandra Edith (Olga Pavloff).
A-5440972, Mackin, Blanche Emalie, or Blanche Emelie Gregoire.
A-1939699, Maruyama, Yoshiko (nee Acki).
A-4133783, Masel, Herman.
A-5367775, Matheosz, Adrian Israel, or Andrew Mathews or Bin Ali Odin or Odin Ben Ali.
A-4881209, Miller, Sol, alias Chaim Bzaja Perelout.
A-5403812, Miller, Fannie, alias Fajga Perelout.
A-7295990, Moran, Robert Davis.
A-7241701, Moy, Robert, alias Moy Han Goon.
A-7362995, Norcross, Agnes Carola, Spanier.
A-7362993, Norcross, Muse Anatol, formerly Spanier (nee Kotenev).
A-7362994, Norcross, Regina Gertrude Spanier.
A-6326131, O'Barr, Ivy Ruth (nee).
A-3889600, Ouchakoff, Robert Michael, or Robert A. Mitchell.
A-2577232, Paganos, Nick, or Nicholaos Pagonis.
A-7050139, Perez-Romer, Silvano.
A-4058976, Place, Suzanne.
A-7999556, Poliadis, Alexander, alias Alexander Paul Southgate.
A-4789407, Richmond, Ralph Henry, or Harold Jones or Herbert Jones.
A-7087830, Rigot, Marcel Robert Roger or Marcel Rigot.
A-5227521, Rubin, Nathan.
A-5081325, Rumpf, Zillah Violet Adelaide, or Joyner or Mitchell (nee Beaney).
A-5730736, Santucci, Antonio.
A-7367117, Scavetta, Vanda (nee Maletesta).
A-7587392, Schapira, Albert.
A-7945140, Schiller, Suzana, or Suzanne Schiller.
A-7381271, Sediakin, Victor, or Victor Dewitt.
A-7381270, Sediakin, Barbara, or Barbara Dewitt or Varvara Sediakin.
A-6422076, Serna-Melendez, Ignacio.
A-3124831, Shee, Wong Ham, or Fay King.
A-4595661, Shields, Thomas.
A-7112124, Simor, Frances or Francesca.
A-7802748, Sorens, Anna Linsboth (nee Linsboth).
A-9746984, Sotelo, George.
A-3746141, Taseff, Caroline Charlotte (nee Paruch).
A-3450242, Tatakis, Steve John, or Stamateos Tatakis.
A-6741917, Terriguez, Enrique Ruben, or Henry Boetcker Miller.
A-7043883, Turnbull, Muriel Elaine.
A-5050784, Uriarti, Adrian.
A-7131129, Vergara, Tamosa.
A-7222347, Von Spreti, Alexander Wilhelm Graf, or Alexander Allwine.
A-4391929, Zalunardo, Alesnardro.
A-6148197, Chang, Chuan, alias John G. Chang.
A-6859114, Gluck, Gizella.
A-6866957, Gluck, Eugene.
A-7185305, Alferieff, Nicholas.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original concurrent resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1291) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-7423303, Aban, Anthony Jelito.
A-4353841, Abe, Shinzaburo.
A-3449823, Abelson, Daniel, or Daniel Abkevitz or Daniel Abkiewitz.
A-1497075, Ali, Askar, alias Asod Ali.
A-5380342, Antolini, Carmen Santiaga, or Carmen Antolini Franklin.
A-1079236, Antunes, Antonio.
A-6323175, Arreola, Eduvino Garcia.
A-5987631, Arron, Fage, or Bernice Arron or Bernice Faye Lewis.
A-5988164, Arron, Leonard Herbert, or Leonard Harvey Arron or Jack Lewis or Raymond Jack Lewis or Jack Lewis.
A-5505875, Atwell, Kathleen Marie (nee Mackenzie).
A-2724020, Balluch, Franz or Mike.
A-3019639, Balluch, Josephine.
A-5660205, Bernardi, Guiseppe, alias Giuseppe Barnardi or Joe Bernardi.
A-6214542, Blake, George Vincent.
A-7381173, Biovin, Pauline Juliette (Drinkwine).
A-7381174, Boivin, Dorothy Blanche (Drinkwine).
A-7350615, Bouquet, Jean Louis Alexander.
A-5054577, Bourkas, Peter Stolias Bourkas.
A-7991129, Brandauer, Hannalore.
A-2209324, Briels, Mary Frances, or Mary Frances Beech.
A-5358190, Brozeika, Simanas, alias Simon Brozeika.
A-4962937, Burham, Fabiola Justine, alias Fabiola Justine Desrochers.
A-5647702, Burham, Thomas Bert, alias Thomas Bert Kafulski.
A-3252116, Cano, Luis Zanronino, or Luis Salmeron Plaza.
A-7270791, Cantarel, Pierre Leon.
A-5227180, Carannante, Vincenzo.
A-7056327, Cassita, Theresa.
A-7375497, Cerniglia, Nicolina (nee Zaffiro).
A-7001012, Chapman, Reginald Standfield.
A-1921907, Chavez-Rojas, Manuel, or Manuel Rojas Chavez.
A-7978306, Chinnery, Walter Ecidro.
A-2222179, Chogyoli, Hatsu.
A-6240243, Ciocia, Pantaleo.
A-9825216, Cipriano, Romero-Garcia, or Romero Cipriano.
A-5074597, Cowell, John Edward, or Jack Cowell.
A-4015949, Decker, Joseph Sabaloo Thomas.
A-4464856, DeDominguez, Maria Gutierrez.
A-4465061, Dominguez-Molina, Fausto.
A-5372507, DeFlores, Julia Arredono Vda, or Juliana Arrendondo or Julia Arrendondo.
A-4066158, DaGrassa, Martin.
A-3887216, Deguchi, Hina.
A-7131886, Demas, Esther Adeline (nee Emery).
A-7522453, DeQuionnes, Jennie Chavez vda.
A-5620259, DeRodriguez, Beatriz Lopez.
A-7073891, Dery, Gerard Albert.
A-7240817, Diehl, Frieda Katharina, or Frieda Katharine Werner (maiden name).
A-5040210, DiPaola, Salvatore.
A-5532579, Duran-Corrales, Angel, or Angel Corrales-Duran or Angel Duran.
A-7809240, Enrizuez, Jose Vasquez, or Jose Enriquez.
A-481298, Eversley, Ethel, alias Ethel Cornelius.
A-6752351, Fah, Nee Ting, or Ding Fat.
A-4198870, Fau, Alexander, or Alexander Wou or Alexander Vou.
A-7138222, Fischer-Stern, Gyorgy.
A-7138223, Fischer-Stern, Marianne.
A-5862691, Fisher, Janet Grahm-Forbes Sutherland, formerly Janet Grahm-Forbes Farrell (nee Janet Grahm-Forbes Sutherland).
A-7525007, Fivel, Oscar Henry.
A-3605301, Fruitier, Marius Jacques, or Marius J. Fruitier.
A-3038900, Fujiwara, Hatsuighi, or Jack Fujiwara or Hatsuichi Jack Fujiwara.
A-3171924, Garetti, Dario.
A-7991590, Gebauer, Dietmar Karl.
A-5529529, Glassman, Jennie (nee Jennie Polikoff), alias Gertrude Polikoff.
A-7503091, Godfrey, Joan Heather.
A-7049725, Gonzalez, Eusebio.
A-7178710, Gonzalez-Vega, Priscilliano.
A-5582315, Gonzalez, Rafael Castro, or Ralph Castro Gonzalez.
A-3144809, Goomis, Fara, or Fara Gomis.
A-6924782, Granados, Rosa.
A-4278923, Gross, Rose (nee Brandes).
A-5982806, Guajardo, Jesus Maria, or A. E. Nelson, Jr.
A-1734345, Hanson, John Henry.
A-3156693, Helberg, Edward.
A-5061609, Held, Werner Carl.
A-1277726, Hemelberg, Madolan Pansy (nee Rogers).
A-6361990, Hernandez, Catarino, or Catarino Hernandez-Gallegos.
A-3171171, Hjertaker, Samuel Olaisen.
A-2481858, Hohnsbein, Elizabeth Dora Grunspan, or Elizabeth Grunspan Hohnsbein (nee Elizabeth Dora Grunspan).
A-5684698, Hoyos-Rosas, Alicia, or Alicia Hoyos.
A-9022800, Hrynkiewcz, Anthony, or Antonio or Anton Hrynkiewicz.
A-3060059, Hrzich, Thomas.
A-7125271, Iacobucci, Anna Cesidia Lucia (nee DiPietro), or Anna Lucy DiPietro or Iacobucci.
A-7192472, Jasinskas, Jonas.
A-7192471, Jasinskas, Danute Marija Vailokaitis.
A-7286101, Jesolva, Jerced Duque, or Merced Duque Y Santos.
A-7991486, Jiluma, Abdul.
A-6989542, Justus, George Robert.
A-6991612, Kalmanowicz, Chaim Aron.
A-6991613, Kalmanowicz, Gerda (nee Diamant).
A-6665494, Kamii, Akira Arthur.
A-6665495, Kamii, Mieko.
A-6771733, Kanafani, Kamal Hasan.
A-7362991, Kaplan, Libuse Beker, formerly Libuse Beker (nee Svoboda).
A-4451589, Kawaguchi, Masao, or Masao Kawaguti.
A-5686339, Kiss, Mary Magdalene.
A-1243042, Kleinberg, Magda Morvay.
A-5380198, Klingstet, Natalia.
A-3451428, Kordis, Stavros Christophoros, or Steve Kordis.
A-9571544, Korte, Hendrik Albert.
A-6752077, Kruk, Aron Mordko (Krug).
A-1529914, Kudor, Ignac Kovolick.
A-1898932, Lamanna, Giuseppe, or Joseph Lamanna or Joe Lamanna.
A-7136936, Langheim, Janet Regina, formerly Loth.
A-1718143, Lear, Norman, or Nechemia Lerman.
A-7023633, Lindsay, Mary Isabel (nee McNevin).
A-1198694, Lopez-Salas, Manuel, or Manuel S. Lopez or Manuel L. Salas or Manuel Lopez or Manuel Lopes.
A-5158030, Lorentzen, Olav.
A-4775066, Loya-Verduzco, Margarita A., or Margarita Alva Loya.
A-7298460, Luchyshin, Devaunna Ginger.
A-7298459, Luchyshin, Ronald Marion.
A-2381090, Ma, May Ho, alias Ma May Ho.
A-6575063, Martin, Annie Christiane, or Annie Christiane Kissack.

A-5523308, Martinez, Armando, or Armando Valdes Martinez.
A-7354882, Martinez, Lazaro, or Lazano Martinez-Garcia.
A-7354881, Martinez, Apolonio, or Apolonio Rzequiel Martinez.
A-4188726, Martinez-Cortez, Monico.
A-2754462, Martinez, Elena Originales de.
A-1014386, Mata, Fabiana (nee Fabina Orona).
A-3712586, Matsukawa, Teruko (nee Teruko Nagai).
A-7131189, Maybury, Patrick Joseph.
A-6803674, McArthur, Bertie Alfred.
A-4364821, McKenzie, William Horne.
A-4070419, Meredith, Constance Lydia.
A-4542743, Miyagishima, Shinichi, or Tom Satsuki Nakamura or Tom Shinichi Nakamura.
A-1739105, Moesoff, Leo Teodor, or Leo Teodore Moisoff.
A-9782719, Monteiro, Artur Da Assuncao.
A-5822409, Morales-Machuca, Arthur.
A-5566751, Morrison, Sylvia Avalon Pichette.
A-4566689, Moussin-Poushkin, Basil.
A-5517650, Moussin-Poushkin, Eugenia, or Musin-Pushdin or Moussine-Pouchdine.
A-3702971, Murata, Yoshinori.
A-4921856, Nakashima, Kunisuke.
A-7211922, Nakayama, Keizo, alias Kaye Downs.
A-1569708, Navarro, Ramon, or Ramon Navarro-Ochoa.
A-1114934, Neigi, Seid, or Said Nagi.
A-1709371, Nou, Gustav.
A-7286445, Oguich, Hubertina Hokanna (nee Meurissen).
A-4628263, Okuno, Ringoro, or Ringoro Matsui.
A-4855960, Okuno, Hari (nee Hamano).
A-4241819, Olessoff, Maria (nee Maruszyk).
A-6371783, Olson, Ed Olivus, or Edward Olson or Eddie Olson, or Eddie Oliver Olson.
A-3465648, Osland, Irene Gloria.
A-5687593, Ota, Toshio, or Henry Ota.
A-3668390, Ozawa, Shigeru.
A-3668365, Ozawa, Takaki.
A-7020063, Ozawa, Kazuo.
A-7020065, Ozawa, Tikako, or Chikako Ozawa.
A-6929712, Pacheco, Rosa Emma.
A-6929713, Pacheco, Elijio.
A-6929714, Pacheco, Ignacio.
A-6929715, Pacheco, Manuel.
A-5800720, Paolone, Ferdinando, or Ferdinand or Fred Paolone.
A-7941645, Paul, Roswitha Hannelore Rose Marie.
A-3463714, Peck, John L., also known as John Laszlo Peck or Ladislau Pek.
A-6972156, Pedroza-Avelar, Guillermo, or Ruben Hioes-Rogelio.
A-2593845, Pellegri, Fortunato.
A-5027845, Pelletier, Esdras Joseph, or Harry Pelletier or Esdras Josef Pelletier.
A-1720639, Pence, Margaret Janet.
A-1426518, Perea, Ercilia Quezada, or Ercilia Quezada Vda De Perea.
A-1426531, Perea De Rivera, Aurora, or Aurora Perea Rivera.
A-7270924, Perez-Perez, Alejo.
A-1056415, Pittakides, Michel Kosta.
A-7899499, Pollock, Annie Greenwood (nee Brown).
A-7899499, Pollock, Jack Proctor Patterson.
A-4653391, Ramirez, Ana Rosa.
A-4515254, Randall, Babe May.
A-6948109, Ray, Marvin Hell, formerly Marvin Escobar Hess.
A-6948110, Ray, Leopold Hess, formerly Leopold Escobar Hess.
A-7290865, Riccitelli, Giuseppa, or Giuseppa Ciarleglio or Josephine Riccitelli.
A-7384843, Rice, Marjorie Margaret (nee Marjorie Margaret Joy).
A-3348470, Romano, Giovanni, or John Romano.
A-6448913, Rosenberg, Johanna (nee Tauber).
A-6443030, Rosenberg, Josef.
A-4912576, Sakai, Sei.
A-3490436, Sakuma, Goro.
A-1776351, Salse-Quellar, Pascual.
A-4911827, Sandani, Libia, formerly Proietta (nee Rossetti).
A-1106433, Scarvelis, Michael Emmanuel.
A-2771282, Schacht, Wilhelm Alfred Max, or William Schact or Henry Schacht.
A-1963615, Schmaltz, Andrew, or Andres Schmaltz.
A-1963614, Schmaltz, Mary, or Marie Schmaltz.
A-1553631, Schumburg, Hans Detlef Niels.
A-6978137, Sebald, Margaret Elizabeth (nee Miller).
A-2162857, Seiciuc, Zaharia, or Zaharia Grigori Seiciuc.
A-4284030, Seifert, Hermann.
A-5910948, Serrano, Aniceto, or Aniceto Serrano-Tercero.
A-4847994, Singerman, Cecilia (Lillian) (nee Newman).
A-6046839, Smith, Ovin Elliott.
A-5970962, Smith, Joyce Elaine.
A-5916214, Smith, Rosalia Eglantine, or Rosalia Eglantine Knight or Rosalia Eglantine Wells.
A-5022973, Stevoff, Kime, or Kime Steve Stavroff.
A-8015418, Sterr, Horst Otto.
A-7397884, Streck, Hella.
A-4953395, Strelkute, Agnes, or Agota or Agota Strielkute or Agota Strielkus or Agota Strelkus.
A-6592621, Sullivan, Rudolph.
A-6869448, Tada, Kimiko Sano, or Kimiko Sano.
A-2678822, Teramoto, Gitaro.
A-4191753, Theodore, John, or Ioannis Pandelis Theodorou or Yovan Pandoff Todoroffsky.
A-8015792, Thomanek, Franz Rainer.
A-5000948, Thompson, George Carr.
A-7418267, Tong, Chan, or Chan Hong or David Chan or Lim Leong.
A-7483337, Torzewska, Barbara Emelia.
A-1403239, Tow, Elizabeth (nee Harrison), formerly Price.
A-1331591, Tressider, Dora Caroline (nee Williams).
A-4529169, Treulieb, Gustav Gunther.
A-7792930, Truglia, Maria (nee Sica).
A-4874066, Tsavalas, Soterios Konstantine, or Soter Tsavalas or Charles Savalas.
A-6258625, Turkkan, Nevzat Ekrem Attila.
A-6873937, Salvanera, Antonia Vaca de, or Antonia Vaca-Zaragoza.
A-1886545, Vafiades, George Konstantinos.
A-5585829, Vasques, Frank, or Francisco Vasquez-Ray or Frank Vasquez or Francisco Vasquez or Francisco Basquez or Frank Ray Vasquez.
A-5118361, Vecchio, Giuseppe, or Lo Vecchio.
A-5160402, Vlahos, Evangelos, or Evangelos Vlakos.
A-2746679, Vlamis, Platon, or Platon Vlannis or Platon Antonios Vlamis.
A-6027133, Wang, Yuan.
A-6905400, Wang, Ming Hung, alias Mary Wang (nee Ming Hung Ling).
A-7297225, Woo, Meng I., or Anglea Meng I. Woo or Meng I. Tung.
A-2826061, Yamashita, Tsurumatsu.
A-3702992, Ying, Wu Tieh.
A-7560741, Hsin, Wu Lung.
A-5937408, Yoshida, Hisao James, or James Hisai Yoshida.
A-4258957, Zoda, Salvatore.
A-2285659, Zuber, Herman Joseph.
A-7082584, Carmalis, Mary, or Mary Carmali or Maria Caramali.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 11, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States, the following enrolled bills:

S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2834. A bill to provide for the payment of lump-sum death benefits to the survivors of certain employees of contractors with the United States during World War II; and

S. 2835. A bill for the relief of Teodoro Egues Munagorri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2836. A bill for the relief of Kristine Lea Kimball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2837. A bill for the relief of Samuel Chalut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2838. A bill to authorize appropriations to assist the States and their political subdivisions in the salvage of railway and streetcar rails, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2839. A bill to continue beyond June 30, 1953, authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2840. A bill to authorize the establishment of an Inventions Awards Board within the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6805. An act to increase the salary of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia;

H. J. Res. 393. Joint resolution authorizing the granting of permits to the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1953, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 394. Joint resolution to provide for the quartering, in certain public buildings in the District of Columbia, of troops participating in the inaugural ceremonies of 1953; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance of public order and the protection of life and property in connection with the presidential inaugural ceremonies of 1953.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Clemente Ruiz Nazario, of Puerto Rico, to be United States judge for the district of Puerto Rico, vice Thomas H. Roberts, resigned;

Harry E. Pratt, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 4, district of Alaska;

William W. Hart, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois; and

Howard L. Doyle, of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Eighty-nine postmasters.

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be a member of the Public Advisory Board;

W. John Kenney, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security, vice Richard M. Bissell, Jr., resigned.

William H. Draper, Jr., of New York, special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to be also the representative of the United States to the seventh session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations;

Frederick L. Anderson, of California, to be deputy special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plentipotentiary;

James Clement Dunn, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to France, vice David K. E. Bruce;

Ellsworth Bunker, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Italy, vice James Clement Dunn;

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Syria, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal, vice Lincoln MacVeagh; and

Frederick C. Oechsner, of Louisiana, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the diplomatic service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive G, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a supplementary convention between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on October 26, 1951 (Ex. Rept. No. 5).

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

Address by Gov. James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, before the Georgia General Assembly, in Atlanta, Ga., February 6, 1952.

By Mr. MORSE:

Four editorials dealing with the existing strike on certain railroads in the United States: (1) An editorial entitled "Government's Strike," published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1952; (2) editorial entitled "The Railroad Strike," published in the Wall Street Journal of March 11, 1952; (3) editorial entitled "The Long Dispute," published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 11, 1952; and (4) editorial entitled "Behind the Rail Crisis," published in the New York Times of March 11, 1952.

Article entitled "Willingness To Pay Taxes," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post of March 11, 1952.

By Mr. HUNT:

Editorial entitled "Capt. Rhoda Milliken," published in the Washington Daily News of March 6, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Thinking It Over," written by Austin V. Wood, and published in the Martinsburg (W. Va.) Journal of March 1, 1952, discussing the 1952 election.

By Mr. WILEY:

Material relating to the rehabilitation of physically handicapped Americans.

RULING OF TREASURY DEPARTMENT ON GRANTS BY THE RED CROSS TO FLOOD SUFFERERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to speak for not to exceed 2 minutes with reference to a letter I have received from the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Kansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the past few weeks I have received a number of letters from citizens in our State who are disturbed by the recent Treasury Department ruling to the effect that the taxpayer must reduce his flood losses by the amount of grants received from the American Red Cross.

The citizens of Kansas, together with the citizens of Oklahoma and Missouri, suffered severe flood losses last year. It was a national disaster and was so recognized by our Federal Government.

The Red Cross, in its usual prompt and efficient manner, stepped in immediately to relieve temporary hardships, and later spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the rehabilitation of the citizens who suffered these severe losses.

Millions of our citizens in this Nation contributed to the flood-disaster relief fund, which was used by the American Red Cross for the purpose of assisting those who suffered so disastrously.

Now it develops that when these taxpayers file their income taxes, they must reduce their flood losses by the amount of the grants received from the American Red Cross.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue advises me that this decision on their part is based on a ruling made in 1948, which states, in part, as follows:

It is the opinion of this office that since the American Red Cross is a national organization having a tax-exempt status, contributions made by it are not to be considered in the same light as gifts by individuals or private enterprises and that the awards in question are not gifts as contemplated by section 113 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code. This conclusion is based on the fact that the purpose of the American Red Cross in making the awards for fire losses was not to enrich the recipients but merely to alleviate the losses which they, by reason of their circumstances, are unable to bear and the further fact that the award is received on a performance basis, i. e., the recipient is required to use the amount thereof for the specific purpose intended.

Mr. President, it seems to me that this ruling and requirement on the part of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is grossly unjust and unfair to thousands of our citizens who suffered irreparable losses.

For instance, if I make a direct contribution as a gift to assist an individual who has suffered a disastrous loss, it would not be a taxable item, but on the other hand, when I contribute directly through the Red Cross for the same purpose, it becomes taxable, or at least not a deductible item.

I am certain that millions of our citizens who contributed so generously through the American Red Cross did not contemplate that this gift, although given through the American Red Cross, would be treated any differently than a direct contribution to an individual.

When the Senate again considers tax legislation, I expect to call this matter to its attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks a letter I received from Mr. Fred S. Martin, Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 5, 1952.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to our telephone conversation today in which you inquired relative to the position of the Bureau as to the effect of Red Cross awards to owners of property damaged by the 1951 flood of the Kansas River.

This letter is not intended as a ruling in the case you mentioned but it may be stated in general that the Bureau has been following a ruling made in 1948 reading in part as follows:

"* * * You request to be advised whether such awards should be taken into consideration in determining (1) the casualty loss; (2) basis for future sale, that is, the actual cost or only amount contributed by the owner, and (3) the basis for depreciation, actual cost or only the amount contributed by the owner.

"It is the opinion of this office that since the American Red Cross is a national organization having a tax-exempt status, contributions made by it are not to be considered in the same light as gifts by individuals or private enterprises and that the awards in question are not gifts as contemplated by section 113 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code. This conclusion is based on the fact that the purpose of the American Red Cross in making the awards for fire losses was not to enrich the recipients but merely to alleviate the losses which they, by reason of their circumstances, are unable to bear and the further fact that the award is received on a performance basis, i. e., the recipient is required to use the amount thereof for the specific purpose intended.

"The conclusion of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Edwards* v. *Cuba Railroad Company* (268 U. S. 628; T. D. 3728, C. B. IV-2, 122) may be applied to the situation in the instant case insofar as the treatment of the amount of the award, for Federal income-tax purposes is concerned. Applying the principle laid down in that case and other cases involving similar circumstances, the awards made by the American Red Cross are neither taxable income nor a gift to the recipient but merely a reimbursement for his capital expenditure. It follows, therefore, that to the extent that the amount of the award is in excess of the recipient's basis in the property prior to the fire loss such excess may not serve to increase the basis of the property for the purposes of subsequent disposition or depreciation allowances.

"The same results as above with respect to the limitation of the recipient's original basis in the property and the nonrecognition of any amount received in excess thereof are obtained by treating the transaction as an involuntary conversion of property within the meaning of section 112 (f) of the

code. Support to this treatment is given in the discussion contained in G. C. M. 21171, C. B. 1939-1 (pt. 1), page 169, involving an award to a railroad company of new facilities, the cost of which was borne by the State out of unemployment relief funds allotted by the Federal Government. The award in that case is similar to the instant case in that it was not made by way of compensation for the old facilities discarded or retired. In rejecting the application of section 112 (f) on the ground that the discarding or retirement by the railroad of its old roadway property did not constitute an involuntary conversion, the memorandum inferred that if there has been a destruction of the property, such as a fire loss, a contrary conclusion would have been reached.

"In view of the foregoing it is held that the recipient of the American Red Cross award is entitled to a loss only to the extent that the basis of the destroyed property, prior to its damage or destruction, is in excess of the amount expended for its restoration under the award. If the amount of the award is greater than such basis, the excess thereof may not be added to the recipient's basis for Federal income-tax purposes."

Very truly yours,

FRED S. MARTIN,
Assistant Commissioner.

MRS. MARGUERITE A. BRUMELL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4645) for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. HENDRICKSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	McFarland
Anderson	Gillette	McKellar
Bennett	Green	McMahon
Benton	Hayden	Millikin
Bricker	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bridges	Hennings	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Mundt
Byrd	Hoey	Murray
Cain	Holland	Neely
Capehart	Humphrey	Nixon
Carlson	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Case	Ives	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Seaton
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Sparkman
Eastland	Long	Stennis
Ecton	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Underwood
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	McCarran	Welker
Frear	McCarthy	Wiley
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business for the purpose of addressing the Army War College at Carlisle, Pa.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 20.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in behalf of himself and other Senators. I read section 11 of the amendment:

SEC. 11. The United States hereby asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, but that all such right, title, and interest are vested in the several States or the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, or the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority.

Mr. President, it is my judgment that this amendment is not needed, because there has never been any assertion made that the Federal Government had any right, title, or interest in or authority over land beneath the navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States.

On the other hand, there has been a great deal of misunderstanding and misrepresentation with regard to the subject. I do not wish to imply even for a moment that any such misrepresentations have been made on the part of any Member of the Senate; but there can be no question that misrepresentations have been made, and that they have influenced the thinking of a great many people who are not so familiar with the subject before the Senate as are some of us.

In support of the statement that there is widespread misunderstanding with regard to the effect of Senate Joint Resolution 20, an effect which it is claimed may possibly jeopardize the title of the respective States to lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States, I wish to read from a letter which I received some time ago from the mayor of the city of New York, the greatest city in our Nation. The letter shows definitely that Mayor Impellitteri has completely misunderstood the effect of the legislation which is now pending before the Senate. The letter is brief, and I read it, as follows:

CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
New York, N. Y., February 1, 1952.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The above resolution, H. R. 4484, has been passed by the House of Representatives and resolution S. 940 is still pending before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I strongly urge your support of resolution S. 940.

The purpose of the resolutions is to reaffirm that title to lands under tidewaters and navigable waters has always been vested in the States and their grantees, such as the city of New York.

The city of New York has a vital interest in retaining title to its water front and harbor lands and lands under water. This city's water front and harbor, developed and maintained under municipal control, is an invaluable asset not only to the people of New York, but to the entire Nation. The city's title to its foreshore and lands under water, as granted to it by ancient charters and by the State of New York, has never been challenged. It is of paramount importance to the development of this city that New York retain full and complete control over these lands and improvements. Recent assertions of title to lands under water by the Government of the United States are contrary to all historical precedents and to judicial determinations. Such claims might becloud the city's title to one of its most valuable assets and cause serious repercussions in maintaining and continuing the constant development and improvement of New York Harbor.

I firmly believe that the city's title is beyond question, but the resolutions would constitute a final recognition of that title and a disclaimer by the United States that it ever had any title to these lands.

Very truly yours,

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor.

Mr. President, I fully agree with the mayor of New York that the city of New York has a vital interest in retaining title to its water front, harbor lands, and lands under water. I go further and say that I fully agree with him with regard to the value of the water front and harbor lands as an asset to the people of New York and to the people of the entire Nation.

However, there has never been the slightest question with regard to the ownership and control of the harbor of New York. It has always been recognized as an inland waterway. It is many miles removed from the open sea. There cannot possibly be any question with regard to the manner in which the land is to be controlled. Nevertheless, the mayor of the greatest city in the Nation

is so much in doubt with regard to the question that he wrote me the letter which I have just read into the RECORD. Of course, the letter was written under a misapprehension of the facts.

I have taken pleasure in writing to the mayor as follows:

FEBRUARY 15, 1952.

Hon. VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor, City of New York,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MAYOR IMPELLITTERI: Thank you for your letter. As you know, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, of which I am a member, after considering the tideland matter, voted to report favorably the interim bill, Senate Joint Resolution 20, which, without deciding the fundamental issue of State versus Federal control over the lands beneath the open ocean, would permit immediate resumption of exploration and development work on the oil-bearing lands off Texas and Louisiana.

The Federal Government has never claimed, and does not now claim, any rights in the lands beneath navigable waters including true harbors and bays. You will note that Senate Joint Resolution 20, a copy of which is enclosed, refers only to the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf.

In the course of the hearings, the question of whether this legislation in any way affected inland waters was asked in specific reference to New York City's water front and harbor lands. The committee was assured by the Department of Justice and the Department of the Interior that inland waters and New York's water front and harbors are in no way affected by Senate Joint Resolution 20. In fact, they are specifically excluded.

As I am sure you appreciate, I would be among the first to oppose this legislation, or any legislation which dealt unfairly with New York's interests, or which sought to deprive New York State of equities which properly belong to us. In the case of tidelands oil, the situation is quite the reverse.

By agreeing to S. 940, we in New York State would be ceding our interest in one of our Nation's most valuable assets. In these underocean lands are oil deposits which can bring to the Federal Treasury vast amounts of revenue which can help relieve New York of heavy tax burdens which we might otherwise bear. Our State, as you know, bears a heavy share of the tax burden of the Nation. If the revenue from these oil deposits were given to the States which now unfairly claim these rights, it would place an unjustifiable burden upon our own State.

The allegation made to you that the Federal Government seeks title to lands under the bay and in New York Harbor are an example of the confusion which is being intentionally introduced into this situation with the purpose of beclouding the real issues and the real intent of those seeking the rights referred to above.

The Supreme Court has ruled that these rights are vested in all the people in all the States. We in New York should certainly not lend ourselves to an abandonment of these rights which mean so much to us.

I certainly thank you for writing to me and giving me the opportunity of setting forth my views on this very important matter. I would be glad to hear from you further after you have had an opportunity to study the views I have expressed.

With kind personal regards.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

Mr. President, I have read that correspondence to show how completely misinformed even intelligent men in high governmental positions are regarding the question of title to the lands under the navigable waters within the boundaries of the States.

Mr. President, I favor this amendment simply because it will reaffirm the declaration that the Federal Government claims no title to any of these lands. The Federal Government does not do so. The effect of Senate Joint Resolution 20 is incontrovertible, when it says that the United States asserts that it has no right, title, or interest in or to the lands beneath the navigable waters in the respective States.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to support this amendment, not because I think its adoption is necessary—for I think the issue has been clearly defined time and time and time again—but in order that those who may have any fears on this subject, like the mayor of the city of New York, will be better satisfied regarding the validity of the claims of the States to the lands beneath the navigable waters within the boundaries of the States. If there are such fears, certainly I think it is wise to give that assurance. I am particularly anxious to correct the false impression which unfortunately has gained ground.

Again I wish to say that I do not impute to any of my colleagues a desire to misrepresent. They have not misrepresented. However, that there has been misrepresentation on a wide scale in regard to this matter, I think is an undoubted fact.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Let me ask the distinguished Senator whether he knows of any formula or standard which ever has been adopted or agreed to for determining whether Long Island Sound, for example, is inland water or is it external water?

Mr. LEHMAN. I think there has been no formula regarding such questions; but certainly it is clear that Long Island Sound is inland water, for it is abutted by two land areas of the State of New York.

Similarly I think there can be no question that title vests in the State of New York in the case of the lands under New York Harbor or under the part of the seaward reaches of the harbor, running between the States of New York and New Jersey.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield further to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course the Senator from New York knows that Mr. BOGGS has originated a theory of arcs in regard to establishing seaward boundaries. So far as I know, that is the only theory which has been presented to us. That theory was not accepted by the World Court in the Norwegian fisheries case. Mr. Perlman, Solicitor General of the United States, went there and urged that theory in international law, but it was rejected.

On that theory, if a bay is more than 10 miles across its mouth, it would not be an inland water.

On the other hand, Russia claims the White Sea, which is 89 miles across its mouth, as being inland water.

Would the Senator from New York be willing to agree to an amendment to the amendment he has supported, which would reserve to the Congress the right to determine by law what are the internal waters of the United States?

Mr. LEHMAN. I would have to answer that by saying that in view of the fact that the amendment has been submitted on behalf of 18 or 20 Senators, I would wish to consult with them first; I am not authorized to speak for them.

However, certainly the Senator who submitted the amendment and those of us who are cosponsors of the amendment would, I am sure, be glad to consider any amendment to it which would not lessen its effectiveness.

Mr. LONG. I should like to propose this amendment at the end of the amendment, namely, to add the following language:

Provided, That the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the several States shall be established by the Congress of the United States by legislative enactment.

I send forward that amendment to the amendment, feeling that unless the Congress establishes this boundary, we then shall be confronted with the situation which has arisen in California. In that situation there has been appointed a master who is supposed to try to determine what is the boundary between the inland waters and the outside waters; but, in considering that problem, he has nothing whatever to guide him; there is no court decision on that question, except perhaps a decision by a district court which was trying to fix a line in connection with enforcing a smuggling law or a liquor law. Otherwise, the master has nothing for a guide.

Personally, I fear that unless Congress itself establishes this line, some minor official in one of the departments—not the head of the department or a policy-making branch of the Government—will try to establish a formula for determining this question, whereas actually it is a matter of international law involving Congress and the entire Nation. So it seems to me that the Congress should accept that responsibility.

If the amendment the Senator from New York has been discussing is offered, I hope my amendment to it will be accepted by the sponsors of the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Wyoming and his cosponsors will give consideration to any request of that sort.

However, let me say that I cannot see why anyone should object to this amendment. Regardless of whether it does or does not satisfy in all particulars the wishes of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the fact remains that the amendment certainly very greatly strengthens the protections—if any are needed, although I doubt that any are needed—available to the States in respect to the lands under their inland waters.

Mr. President, no question about these matters has ever been raised with me. To my amazement, the other day I heard raised in the Senate a question in regard to the rights of the Federal Government in connection with the lands beneath the Great Lakes or in connection with the lands beneath other large bodies of water within the confines of the United States or the States.

This amendment certainly should go a long way to reassuring the States that there is no desire or intention on the part of the Federal Government to claim anything to which it is not entitled.

Mr. LONG. Of course, as the Senator from New York knows, those of us who take the States' side feel that the doctrine of English law that the sovereign possesses the beds of all navigable waters would, if accepted here, actually be established as a rule governing tidewaters along the coast, and would merely apply to bays and harbors. The case in which that doctrine was first announced was Martin against Waddell. Someone mistakenly stated that the Pollard case first laid down that doctrine. The Pollard case was the first case that decided that new States had the same rights as the original 13 States, insofar as their State sovereignty was concerned; but the case of Martin against Waddell decided that the States were sovereign when they won their independence from the Crown, and that on the theory that they possessed sovereignty, they owned the beds of tidewaters. That was the language which was used at the time, and the tidewater rule was then applied in later decisions to waters which were not at all affected by the tide, waters such as rivers and streams and lakes inside the United States. Therefore, the junior Senator from Louisiana feels that the rule of law and the theory that the States originally possessed sovereignty was what placed them in the ownership of the beds of their streams and and their tidewaters.

I realize that the argument is made by my very able friend from Wyoming that the States never claimed this property, though that is a matter of opinion, and that the citizens were fishing on that property, which had been included in their colonial charters. The States, by my theory, might never have fixed the exact delineation as to how far out they claimed beds of navigable waters; but nevertheless, they claim that they always owned the beds of navigable waters. Of course, the Senator concedes that there is a fair argument about it.

Mr. LEHMAN. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, I am not a constitutional lawyer; I am not a lawyer at all. I can approach this question only from the standpoint of a layman; but when he refers to the use of the word "tidewaters" in a decision, it would seem to me that in all probability the courts were considering the waters between high tide and low tide; and to that extent there is no question. We are all willing to acknowledge that that is the law.

Mr. LONG. I suggest to the Senator that I doubt whether he could find a dictionary which would define "tidewaters" as the waters which are between low tide and high tide. I believe he will find that the definition in almost any dictionary, legal or otherwise, indicates that the term "tidewaters" is far broader than that, and includes waters affected by the ebb and flow of the tide, which generally affects the seacoast or the seaboard, rather than merely the beach between high-water and low-water mark.

Mr. LEHMAN. Of course, I realize that the definition contained in any dictionary would be much broader than that which I have given. But I think we must consider the language in the text. I am not familiar with the case, but if this was a case which was considered in determining the riparian rights——

Mr. LONG. I do not believe it was.

Mr. LEHMAN. I believe my definition would probably be accurate.

Mr. LONG. I must dispute that point with the Senator. The first case announcing the doctrine, to the knowledge of the junior Senator from Louisiana, was the case of Martin against Waddell, decided with regard to Raritan Bay in the State of New Jersey, which set forth the doctrine that the sovereign owns the beds of all tidewaters, and that Raritan Bay is an arm of the sea, and certainly is tidewater. The facts of that case were not related to a dispute over a beach. That was a dispute over rights to an oyster bed, I believe.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the remarks of the junior Senator from Louisiana clarify, somewhat, the issue which is before the Senate at this moment, and certainly it needs clarification. The case to which he has just referred was, as he said, a case affecting Raritan Bay. It was not a case affecting lands submerged by the open ocean. The Senator from Louisiana nods his head affirmatively.

KING'S POWER ACQUIRED BY UNITED STATES

The confusion with respect to interpretation arises from the fact that in Great Britain in the early days, the King exercised certain dominant rights over waters and over minerals. The fact that we today refer to payments which are made to certain owners, including, sometimes, a State or the Federal Government, as royalties, comes from this early procedure. The British King claimed a right in everything. It is true, as the Senator from Louisiana has said, that in Great Britain the King claimed the right to the tidewaters; and that would mean, of course, that wherever the ebb and the flow of the tide showed their effects, then the King could put his heavy foot down upon the people.

Mr. President, we had a revolution in the United States of America by which we denied certain rights which the King claimed. One of those rights had to do with the external sovereignty of the united Thirteen Colonies, acting together as a unit. When the United States of America was established, the national power which had been claimed by the King of England went to the National Government of the United States, so far as external sovereignty is concerned. I think there can be no doubt about that.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator is expressing an argument with which many of us disagree. I call President Monroe as my witness, and as an eyewitness for my side of that case. I doubt whether the Senator can mention anyone who had anything to do with drafting the Constitution who ever argued that the Federal Government actually had powers over and beyond those given by the people, acting through their State governments, in the Constitution. In that document they gave certain powers which were expressly limited. Therefore, those of us who take the States' side at this time feel that, if the States surrendered that element of their sovereignty, someone should show us where in the Constitution it was surrendered.

I know the argument will be made here the Federal Government existed prior to the Constitution, and had powers which were not granted by the Constitution. Personally, I should like to see that argument documented.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me, then, to resume?

Mr. LONG. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is true that the Senator from Louisiana has cited the memorandum of President James Monroe in support of his point of view, but, as I have remarked to the Senator, the memorandum of President James Monroe was filed with the Congress of the United States, in connection with a veto which President Monroe had sent to the Congress with respect to a bill authorizing the expenditure of Federal funds for the purpose of building the Cumberland Road into Maryland. The distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] is sitting beside the Senator from Louisiana as I speak of the Cumberland Road, for which the President of the United States said the Government of the United States did not have the constitutional power to spend a dollar out of the Federal Treasury.

VETO OVERRIDDEN BY LATER CONGRESSES

In his veto message President Monroe said, "The only way we can build these internal improvements, such as the Cumberland Road, and I am for them"—I am paraphrasing his words, of course—"is by a constitutional amendment." That battle over internal improvements raged through several years and decades, perhaps, in the early history of the United States.

President Monroe was against them, because of what he termed a lack of constitutional power. His successor, President John Quincy Adams, was for them, and John Quincy Adams signed bill after bill providing for the expenditure of Federal funds for the building of turnpikes and roads of the kind President Monroe vetoed.

So the veto of President Monroe—the witness whom the Senator from Louisiana has cited—has been overridden by the Congress of the United States, decade after decade, without a constitutional amendment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The particular message which was put into the RECORD was not the President's veto message, but his analysis of the formation of the Government and the independence of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Senator will recall that the veto message referred directly to the memorandum in which President Monroe expressed his own views of the Constitution and stated that he was sending it down the next day.

Mr. LONG. That is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So it was, in effect, a part of the message. But my point now is——

Mr. LONG. May I quote from that message?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. The President said:

To do justice to the subject it would be necessary to mount to the source of power in these States and to pursue the power in its gradations and distribution among the several departments in which it is now vested.

President Monroe was there speaking of how the power was derived. He was present at the drafting of the Constitution and had something to say with reference to its ratification and he carefully spelled out the fact that the States had this power and that only limited power was derived under the Constitution. I know the present Supreme Court considers the powers to be a hundred times stronger and broader than President Monroe considered them to be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Louisiana is changing the subject a little bit. If he will permit me to do so, I will say, with a smile, that his argument can be best described by the witticism of a distinguished citizen of Kentucky who, a few years ago, early in 1948, when what was known as the Dixiecrat movement was beginning before the conventions of 1948 were held, remarked to me, "If at first you don't secede, try, try, again."

The arguments which President Monroe cited in the document to which the Senator from Louisiana refers were the arguments which were cited by those who sought to expand the principle that a State could secede from the Union. I cite a witness whose views have not been overriden by an act of Congress, whose views have not been overriden by the developments of years and who lived in the early days.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator permit me to cite this witness so that I can get the statement into the RECORD without interruption, and then I shall be very happy to yield.

JUSTICE STORY'S VIEWS

I am citing Mr. Justice Story who wrote the very famous Commentaries on the Constitution. I think every lawyer and every student of the Constitution will acknowledge that there is no greater authority upon the meaning and intent and the history of the Constitution of the United States than was Justice Story. In his commentaries Justice Story was giving his views as to the powers possessed by the Colonies. It will be recalled that the Supreme Court, in the California case, said that the Thirteen Colonies had none of this external power, which is the only subject with which we are dealing—the external sovereignty of the Nation.

I should like to read sections 211 to 216 of Justice Story's commentaries:

The Colonies did not severally act for themselves, and proclaim their own independence. * * * It was not an act done by the State governments then organized, nor by persons chosen by them. * * * It was an act of original, inherent sovereignty by the people themselves. * * * So the Declaration of Independence treats it. * * * Whatever, then, may be the theories of ingenious men on the subject, it is historically true that before the Declaration of Independence these Colonies were not, in any absolute sense, sovereign States; that that event did not find them or make them such; but that at the moment of their separation they were under the dominion of a superior controlling National Government whose powers were vested in and exercised by the general Congress with the consent of the people of all the States. * * * From the moment of the Declaration of Independence, if not for most purposes at an antecedent period, the United Colonies must be considered as being a nation de facto, having a general government over it, created and acting by the general consent of the people of all the Colonies. * * * In respect to foreign governments, we were politically known as the United States only; and it was in our national capacity, as such, that we sent and received Ambassadors, entered into treaties and alliances, and were admitted into the general community of nations, who might exercise the right of belligerents, and claim an equality of sovereign powers and prerogatives.

The truth is that the States, individually, were not known nor recognized as sovereign by foreign nations, nor are they now.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell me from what he is reading?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These are quotations from sections 211 to 216 of the Commentaries on the Constitution written by Justice Story.

Mr. LONG. It is not a court decision, is it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator tell me whether Justice Story was alive at the time this Nation began, and whether he was an eye witness.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No. That is, he was not an adult at the time.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator permit me to read the views of the court in 1842, in the case of Martin against Waddell? I read from page 1920 of the RECORD:

For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government.

And when the people of New Jersey took possession of the reins of government and took into their own hands the powers of sovereignty, the prerogatives and regalities which before belonged either to the Crown or the Parliament became immediately vested in the State.

That is what the court said, speaking officially in a court decision in 1842. That is completely in line with the views of President Monroe, who had something to do with the writing and ratification of the Constitution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Louisiana read an extract from the case which he put into the RECORD in his very thorough and scholarly speech of March 6. He read the whole paragraph, but I want to emphasize a portion of it. I am reading precisely the same words the Senator quoted on the 6th of March and which he has now requoted.

Mr. LONG. From where is the Senator about to read?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. From page 1920 of the RECORD of March 6, 1952, in the second column on that page.

For when the Revolution took place the people of each State became themselves the sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters and the soils under them for their own common use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government.

Whatever advantage the Senator from Louisiana may wish to take of the beginning of that sentence, however much he may wish to forget for the moment that the court was dealing solely with the waters of the bay and not with the waters of the ocean, he cannot forget, nor can the Senate forget, the concluding, qualifying clause: "Subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution to the General Government."

EXTERNAL SOVEREIGNTY ELEGATED TO FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

I say it is historically true that in the Constitution of the United States the States delegated to the United States, and to the Government of the United States, all the attributes of external sovereignty. I need only mention the fact that there was delegated to Congress complete control over interstate and foreign commerce, and there was delegated also in the Constitution the power, whatever it might be, necessary to carry out any of the powers which were granted to the National Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In a moment I shall be very happy to yield.

Not only is that true, but in the cases which it is now sought to overturn, the Court has said specifically that the Waddell case, like the Pollard case, and all the other cases cited, referred to waters to which the Federal Government is asserting no title, namely, waters which are covered by the ebb and flow of the tide. These are not the tidewaters which were formerly claimed by the King of England when he asserted, and properly and legally so under the laws of Great Britain at that time, and probably at the present time as well, power over the external sovereignty of Great Britain. The British King had control over lands submerged by the open ocean, by inlets, by bays, and by navigable rivers.

JUSTICE MARSHALL'S CONCEPT

But the United States of America rebelled from the control of the King, and

set up a dual system of government unlike any other in the world by establishing States with local jurisdiction, and the Federal Government with national jurisdiction. So when John Marshall, as Chief Justice of the United States, came to interpret this question in the case of Gibbons against Ogden, he said in words which are not capable of being misunderstood, which have never been attacked or overturned, and which remain the law of the land, that the powers granted under the commerce clause of the Constitution are plenary powers and affect other powers, even those of the States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator tell us what property was involved in the case of Gibbons against Ogden? Was it not the Hudson River?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Hudson River, yes.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator argue that because the Federal Government had a right to regulate a ferry on the Hudson River, the Federal Government therefore owned the Hudson River? The Senator just said power was delegated under the Constitution. In the case he was speaking of, respecting the Government's right to regulate commerce, it was held that the Federal Government had a right to regulate commerce, but the case did not hold that the Government owned the bed of the river.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say again to the Senator that when he cites a veto message from the President of the United States which turned out to be in error, which turned out not to be the view of the Congress of the United States, then I may be permitted to cite the views of the Chief Justice of the United States, merely to bring up another eye witness to combat the eye witness the Senator from Louisiana presents.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Inasmuch as the power to regulate commerce has been held to apply just as much to inland waters as to external waters as properly it should, can the Senator from Wyoming demonstrate to me why, if when the States delegated the right to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, that they thereby surrendered the beds of the marginal sea, then how did they fail to surrender, if he claims they have failed to surrender, jurisdiction over external waters? Can the Senator show me how they have failed to surrender jurisdiction over the Mississippi River, Chesapeake Bay, Long Island Sound, or any other navigable waters?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. As was pointed out in the other cases, and by Thomas Jefferson in the matter I spoke of yesterday, the original States, or some of them, at least, had passed laws governing their inland navigable waters. But the Senator will seek in vain for the citation of a single case in which any of the Thirteen Colonies ever attempted to exercise any external jurisdiction over the ocean.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator show me how a State is going to exercise external jurisdiction over the ocean before it comes into existence, before its rights are created? How were they going to exercise external jurisdiction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is the whole point of my argument. The States did not come into existence as political entities until they won their freedom from Great Britain. Prior to that time external jurisdiction was exercised by the King and the Government of Great Britain. We, acting as a united people, escaped from that control. We set up a new nation, and to that new nation we gave all the external jurisdiction there is.

The Senator from Louisiana is now leading a battle here to assert some of the sovereignty for his State which the American Revolution took away from the British King who had exercised it over the Thirteen Colonies. I say the time has not arrived for the surrender of that sovereignty which was won by all of the people of the new Nation for the Nation.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the Senator is arguing in two directions. I believe he is arguing in the alternative. I should like to get this matter straight. I believe he is arguing, on the one hand, that the States never actually possessed sovereignty.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has just acknowledged that.

Mr. LONG. On the other hand, I believe the Senator from Wyoming is arguing that the States possessed sovereignty but then surrendered it under the Constitution. It seems to me the facts are that the States possessed it and have never surrendered it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. The Senator is mistaking the argument of the Supreme Court in the Waddell case for my argument. I was merely pointing out that in the case the Senator cited, the Supreme Court said the power of the States was subject to the rights which were surrendered. So I am saying that the rights which were surrendered by the Constitution were all the power and jurisdiction which are attached to external sovereignty.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Wyoming point out any other provision of the Constitution to support his contention, other than the provision in section 7, the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is section 8.

Mr. ELLENDER. Section 8; yes. In other words, are we to understand that the Senator is contending that the provision "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and with the Indiar tribes" gives rise to property rights?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I am not talking about that at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is what the Senator is arguing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no; the Senator from Wyoming is not saying that, and neither is the Senator from Louisiana, nor are any other opponents of the bill making any contention with respect to property rights per se. All this controversy is about one simple problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. As to who owns the bottom of the ocean?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; as to who has jurisdiction over lands which are submerged by the open sea --the sea, the ocean, the highway of commerce and of navigation, which is governed by national authority and not by State authority.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is so far as navigation is concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The problem was clearly set forth in the Supreme Court decision, and again it is set forth in every one of the cases which the junior Senator from Louisiana has cited. We have them here. They were gathered for the committee by the Library of Congress, and they include cases from Martin against Waddell, decided in 1842, Pollard's Lessee against Hagen, decided in 1845, down through United States against O'Donnell, decided in 1938. Every one of those cases refers specifically to lands under inland navigable waters of the coastal States, which are not affected by this bill. We seek to affirm these Supreme Court decisons by the amendment which has now been offered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wyoming, the distinguished chairman of our committee, has given some thought to this problem. As he knows, we did call witnesses, some of whom he summoned on his own motion, to help give us advice on the inland water problem. Would the Senator be willing to accept my amendment, that Congress should determine by law—which means, of course, that it would have to be by an act of Congress subject to the President's veto, like any other act of Congress—the boundaries of inland waters?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say to the Senator that I think his amendment is a little premature, for this reason: There is no doubt in my mind—and I do not hesitate to say it—that the Congress does have the power to fix the external boundaries. As the Senator knows, as a member of our committee, we have not attempted to study the complexities of the coast and geodetic surveys, which necessarily would be involved in fixing such boundaries.

SUPREME COURT INQUIRY AS TO BOUNDARIES

We know that in the California case the Court is seeking to find out what the formula should be for fixing such boundaries. It seems to me that it is better policy to await the determination of the

Supreme Court in that case, since it will be the affirmation or modification of a report by the special master who is now holding hearings on this very matter. It is better to await that than to attempt now merely to reassert a power which Congress already has. I do not think we ought to deprive ourselves, as this amendment might do, of the benefit of the report which will be made by the master. That is the only question I have in mind in that connection.

If the Senator would change the word "shall" to the word "may" I should be very much disposed to accept his amendment. My suggestion is made solely for the reason that I do not want to deprive the committee and the Congress of the benefit of whatever studies and conclusions may be derived by the special master and the Supreme Court on this very complex question.

But again I say, as I said during the hearings, that I have no hesitation whatever in affirming the principle which has been cited by the Supreme Court in decision after decision, that inland navigable waters, including bays, harbors, inlets, sounds, and the like, are within the jurisdiction of the States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Actually the master has been trying to decide what the boundary line should be between inland waters and outside waters. As developed in our hearings in the brief time we had to go into this subject, he has absolutely nothing to go on. The nearest this country has ever come, so far as we can determine, to having anything at all to go on in deciding upon a boundary was when Mr. BOGGS went to a conference in Geneva and proposed a formula as a basis for study or discussion. No one ever agreed that that should be the basis for discussion. He said, "Why do we not use this as a starting point?" It was not even agreed that the suggested formula should be made use of as a starting point.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is quite right.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Perlman urged such a formula upon the World Court in the fisheries case, involving Norway. He contended that such formula should be regarded as settled international law. The World Court spent one paragraph in rejecting it, saying that the so-called standard could not be regarded as meaning very much. The American delegate stated that in his opinion that formula could not be regarded as being accepted.

When we have nothing at all to go on, unless Congress undertakes to decide the question and reserves to itself the decision, again we shall have Mr. Perlman, Mr. White, and the other Federal officials injecting themselves into the issue. I should be pleased to hear their advice, but I believe that Congress should perform its function. This is not a judicial function. It happens to be a legislative function.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the Senator is quite right. However, because of the difficulties to which he has alluded, and which I have already mentioned, and knowing the numberless problems which our committee has to deal with, I am frank to say that I should like to see the special master appointed by the Supreme Court gather and correlate this material.

CONGRESS' POWER TO FIX BOUNDARIES

I acknowledge the power of Congress to fix these boundaries, and I say that if they are not promptly fixed I shall be very happy, when we have a little more time to give to this subject, if I am chairman of the committee, to appoint a subcommittee of which the Senator from Louisiana would be a member, to travel all around the coast of the United States and try to find out what the boundary is. As I say, if the Senator will modify his amendment so as to substitute the word "may" for the word "shall," I shall be very happy indeed to accept it.

Mr. LONG. Would it make the amendment acceptable if, rather than changing that word, we should leave it as it stands, with the word "shall," but provide that the master should present his recommendations to our committee?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very happy to go along with that suggestion.

Mr. LONG. I shall offer such language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will let me see it after it has been drafted, I think we can agree on language which will accomplish the desired purpose, because we want to get along in a practical manner.

DOCUMENTATION AS TO CERTAIN PHASE OF KOREAN WAR

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Wyoming yield to me for a few moments?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Despite the formidable appearance of all the material before me, I wish to take only a few minutes to place certain very limited parts in the RECORD.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When I saw the books which the Senator brought in, I thought perhaps I would have a little opportunity for rest.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon, in connection with the debate in the Senate, I was requested to provide some documentation for a claim which I made, that the State Department had invited the Communist armed forces into South Korea.

Yesterday, as soon as I could obtain the material, I placed in the RECORD a copy of an address delivered by Secretary of State Acheson to the National Press Club in January of 1950. I invited the special attention of the Senate to the following language in Secretary Acheson's speech. He said, as appears on page 2049 of the RECORD of March 10:

> This defensive perimeter runs along the Aleutians to Japan and then goes to the Ryukyus. We hold important defense positions in the Ryukyu Islands and those we will continue to hold. In the interest of the population of the Ryukyu Islands, we will at an appropriate time offer to hold these islands under trusteeship of the United Nations. But they are essential parts of the defensive perimeter of the Pacific and they must, and will, be held.

I pointed out that the line thus drawn excluded Korea and Formosa.

I wish now to read an excerpt from a copy of a letter from Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I do not know the exact date of it, but the fact of the letter will not be disputed. It appeared in the September 1, 1950, issue of the United States News. It took quite a while to pry it loose. The President, you will recall, tried to suppress it. In the letter General MacArthur said:

> From 1942 through 1944 Formosa was a vital link in the transportation and communications chain which stretched from Japan through Okinawa and the Philippines to southeast Asia. As the United States carrier forces advanced into the western Pacific the bases on Formosa assumed an increasingly greater role in the Japanese defense scheme. Should Formosa fall into the hands of a hostile power, history would repeat itself. Its military potential would again be fully exploited as the means to breach and neutralize our western Pacific defense system and mount a war of conquest against the free nations of the Pacific Basin.

I skip a paragraph and continue to read from General MacArthur's letter:

> Nothing in the last 5 years has so inspired the Far East as the American determination to preserve the bulwarks of our Pacific Ocean strategic position from future encroachment, for few of its peoples fail accurately to appraise the safeguard such determination brings to their free institutions.
>
> To pursue any other course would be to turn over the fruits of our Pacific victory to a potential enemy. It would shift any future battle area 5,000 miles eastward to the coasts of the American Continents, our own home coasts; it would completely expose our friends in the Philippines, our friends in Australia and New Zealand, our friends in Indonesia, our friends in Japan and other areas to the lustful thrusts of those who stand for slavery as against liberty, for atheism as against God.

Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the current impression of the press at the time of Secretary Acheson's speech at the National Press Club, in which he excluded Formosa and Korea from our defense perimeter. I am looking at a copy of the Baltimore Sun of January 13, 1950. I observe on page 6 a map which shows the communistic-dominated areas, and the free areas: Korea, Japan, the Philippines, Okinawa, and other islands and areas, and Formosa and Southern Korea.

The caption of the map states: "State Department view of China."

The description reads:

> Map locates Outer Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, Manchuria, and Sinkiang, which Secretary of State Acheson has accused Russia of being in the process of taking over.

I pause to say that at the very moment Secretary Acheson is emphasizing the encroachments of Communist Russia in China he excludes Korea and Formosa from the areas which deserve our military interest and despite the fact that we had definite duties to help preserve those areas for unembarrassed disposition under later peace treaties.

The caption under the map to which I have referred continues:

Tannu Tuva was annexed by the Soviets in March 1948. The black area in China is that controlled by the Chinese Communists.

The sawtooth line is the United States' western Pacific defense perimeter as outlined by Acheson.

I add that the sawtooth line does not include Korea or Formosa.

Now we turn to the Washington Evening Star of Friday, January 13, 1950. The Evening Star of that date carries the same map. It is labeled AP Wirephoto. Under the map, which is exactly the same as the map to which I have referred, as printed in the Baltimore Sun, appears almost the identical editorial comment. It reads:

China—A State Department outline. This map locates Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, Sinkiang, and Inner Mongolia: North China areas which Secretary of State Acheson yesterday accused Russia of taking over. He said the process of attaching the areas to the Soviet Union is complete in Outer Mongolia and nearly complete in Manchuria.

Mr. President, I again interpolate that this was at the very time when the State Department put out maps and issued statements that Korea and Formosa were beyond the sphere of our military interest.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the map indicate that it is a map which was released by the State Department?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It so indicates to me, although I am not prepared to affirm it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask whether it would make any difference who actually released the map, when all one needed to do was to take the speech of the Secretary of State and mark a map according to the limits placed in his speech?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Washington is entirely correct. The only reason I refer to these maps is to show that the statement I made yesterday was the general opinion with respect to Mr. Acheson's statement at the time it was made, as it appeared in the newspapers of the country.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Colorado know of anyone who could safely maintain that the Secretary of State in his Press Club speech did not exclude both Korea and Formosa from America's sphere of military interest?

Mr. MILLIKIN. So far as I know, nothing of that kind has ever been maintained, with the exception of an implication which came in a question addressed to me on the floor of the Senate yesterday, asking me to document what I had stated. That is why I have been doing some documentation.

O, Mr. President, I could stand for an entire month on the floor of the Senate reading all the comments which have been made on the subject. I could go on endlessly with that subject. I am not particularly interested in proving the opinion. I merely wished to comply, I hope graciously, with the request which was made of me by a Senator from the other side of the aisle that I document what I was saying.

Mr. CAIN. I know that the Senator from Colorado, or any other Senator, would have no difficulty whatever in destroying completely the implication involved in the question asked yesterday.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agree completely. I hope that there may be people foolish enough to continue to press requests for documentation and requests for proof. It would merely help to emphasize a subject which cannot be forgotten by the fathers and mothers of those who are being killed and wounded and lost in Korea.

I continue to quote from the Evening Star:

The black area in China is that controlled by Chinese Communists. The saw-toothed line is the United States western Pacific defense perimeter, as outlined by Mr. Acheson. It excludes Formosa.

Mr. President, I shall not ask that a copy of the map be printed in the RECORD. It can be found in the newspapers by anyone especially interested I have identified its presence. It is on page A–15 of the Washington Evening Star of Friday, January 13, 1950. My memory is that the same map was printed all over the United States. I do not know of any newspaper which in commenting on the subject did not agree with the plain language of Acheson's speech, namely, that he had excluded Formosa and Korea.

That is all I care to say at the present time in pursuit of the question of documentation. I thank the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] for extending me this courtesy.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to comment briefly and cordially upon the amendment offered yesterday afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, for himself and other Senators, about which the Senator from Wyoming said:

The amendment which we are offering is, in effect, an adaptation of Senate bill 1540, which was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself in this Congress.

Mr. President, my reason for commenting cordially and favorably upon the amendment offered yesterday afternoon by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is not that I think the amendment by itself makes the pending joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 20, anywhere near sufficient in its recognition of the rights of the States, but that it does show that the Senator from Wyoming and his associates are beginning to see that the States do have a very definite and vital interest in this subject matter, and are beginning to make concessions, which I hope they may continue to make in even greater measure, so that the final legislative enactment on this subject, if any there be, will conform to the views of the advocates of Senate bill 940, introduced by approximately 35 Senators.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield at this point, to permit me to make a comment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I rise because the Senator from Florida has referred to the amendment as a concession. I wish to have the RECORD perfectly clear that, as I interpret the amendment, it is not a concession at all; it is merely an affirmation of a position which we have taken from the very beginning.

Those of us who have opposed the quitclaiming of the bed of the open ocean have done so on the theory that the open ocean is one thing and the inland navigable waters are another thing, and that the rule which applies to the open ocean is the rule of national sovereignty, and the rule which applies to the inland navigable waters is the rule of State sovereignty. We are willing and anxious to make that affirmation a matter of law.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, in order that it may be completely clear why I state that the new amendment, as offered yesterday afternoon, for the first time comes nearer to protecting the rights of the States than has the earlier proposal, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have Senate bill 1540, which the Senator from Wyoming said was the measure of which his amendment of yesterday is an adaptation, printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently decided the cases of *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19), *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699), and *United States* v. *Texas* (339 U. S. 707), holding that the United States has paramount rights in, and full dominion and power over, the lands, minerals, and other things underlying the Pacific Ocean and the Gulf of Mexico adjacent to those States, seaward of the ordinary low-water mark and outside of inland waters; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States had previously held that the States own the beds of inland navigable waters within their respective boundaries; and

Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has declared, both before and since the aforesaid decisions, that the United States makes no claim of title to lands beneath inland navigable waters; and

Whereas, despite the reiteration of this disavowal with respect to title to lands beneath inland navigable waters, some concern

has been expressed that such claim might nevertheless be made; and

Whereas there is no intention to claim, on behalf of the United States, title to any lands beneath inland navigable waters; and

Whereas it is in the public interest that additional assurance be given by the Congress that the United States does not claim title to lands beneath inland navigable waters: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I

SECTION 1. That the United States hereby releases and relinquishes unto the several States and the persons lawfully entitled thereto under the laws of such States, and unto the respective lawful grantees, lessees, or possessors in interest thereof under State authority, all right, title, and interest of the United States, if any it has, in and to all lands beneath navigable inland waters within the boundaries of the respective States.

SEC. 2. As used in this act, the term "navigable" means navigable at the time of the admission of a State into the Union under the laws of the United States; the term "inland waters" includes the waters of bays, rivers, ports, and harbors which are landward of the open sea, as well as the area covered and uncovered by the tides; and lands beneath navigable inland waters include filled in or reclaimed lands which formerly were within that category; the term "submerged coastal lands" means submerged lands lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of the United States and outside of the inland waters and extending seaward to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf.

SEC. 3. Section 1 of this act shall not apply to rights of the United States in lands (1) which have been lawfully acquired by the United States from any State, either at the time of its admission into the Union or thereafter, or from any person in whom such rights had vested under the law of a State or under a treaty or other arrangement between the United States and a foreign power, or otherwise, or from a grantee or successor in interest of a State or such person; or (2) which were owned by the United States at the time of the admission of a State into the Union and which were expressly retained by the United States; or (3) which the United States lawfully holds under the law of the State in which the lands are situated; or (4) which are held by the United States in trust for the benefit of any person or persons, including any tribe, band, or group of Indians or for individual Indians. This act shall not apply to water power, or to the use of water for the production of power, or to any right to develop water power which has been or may be expressly reserved by the United States for its own benefit or for the benefit of its licensees or permittees under any law of the United States.

TITLE II

SEC. 101. Any right granted prior to January 1, 1951, by any State, political subdivision thereof, municipality, agency, or person holding thereunder to construct, maintain, use, or occupy any dock, pier, wharf, jetty, or any other structure in submerged coastal lands, or any such right to the surface of filled in or reclaimed land in such areas, is hereby recognized and confirmed by the United States for such term as was granted prior to January 1, 1951.

SEC. 102. Nothing in section 101 of this title shall be construed as confirming or recognizing any right with respect to oil, gas, or other minerals in submerged coastal lands; or as confirming or recognizing any interest in submerged coastal lands other than that essential to the right to construct, maintain, use, and occupy the structures enumerated in that section, or to the use and occupancy of the surface of filled in or reclaimed land.

SEC. 103. The structures enumerated in section 101 shall not be construed as including derricks, wells, or other installations in submerged coastal lands employed in the exploration, development, extraction, and production of oil and gas or other minerals, or as including necessary structures for the development of water power.

SEC. 104. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to repeal, limit, or affect in any way any provision of law relating to the national defense, fisheries, the control of navigation, or the improvement, protection, and preservation of the navigable waters of the United States; or to repeal, limit, or affect any provision of law heretofore or hereafter enacted pursuant to the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

TITLE III

SEC. 201. Any person seeking the authorization of the United States to use or occupy any submerged coastal lands for the construction of, or additions to, installations of the type enumerated in section 101 of title II of this act, shall apply therefor to the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, who shall have authority to issue such authorization, upon such terms and conditions as in his discretion may seem appropriate.

SEC. 202. Within 2 years of the date of the enactment of this act, the Chief of Engineers shall submit to the Congress his recommendations with respect to the use and occupancy of submerged coastal lands for installations of the type enumerated in section 101 of title II of this act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, from an examination of Senate bill 1540, and after comparing it even casually with the amendment submitted yesterday, it appears that the determined fight which those who believe in States rights have made in the course of this debate, in defending the rights of the several States, is beginning to show results and is beginning to pay off in a greater recognition than has heretofore been given by those who have been so insistently urging the enactment of what they call interim legislation, but what was admitted by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, on the floor the other afternoon, to be a measure sufficient in its terms to provide for the complete exhaustion of the oil and gas in all the submerged lands lying off-shore of all the States of the Nation.

Senate bill 1540 was a repetition of a bill introduced by the same Senators or some of the same group in an earlier Congress.

By comparing Senate bill 1540 with the earlier bill and with the amendment of yesterday afternoon, it will appear that the distinguished Senators who sponsor the amendment, headed by the Senator from Wyoming, are, as I have just stated, evidencing greater and greater appreciation for the claims of the States and the position of the States. Let me express the fervent hope that that attitude will continue and will ripen into an even greater showing of understanding of the rights and positions of the States.

Mr. President, in the first instance I wish to show, by a comparison between Senate bill 1540 and the amendment of yesterday, that the amendment of yesterday for the first time brings into the field the complete quitclaiming to the affected States of their submerged lands lying within the areas of the so-called Great Lakes, whose names are well known.

I think the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and the other Senators who were associated with him in connection with the introduction of Senate bill 1540, and who have been taking the position which they have been maintaining, were rather shocked to find, in the course of the hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 20, that the distinguished Solicitor General of the United States, Mr. Perlman, who stated that under his direction Senate bill 1540 and its predecessor had been drawn up, had deliberately excluded any reference to the Great Lakes because, as stated by Mr. Perlman and as shown in the hearings, he felt that it was not timely for that particular portion of the subject matter to be covered by the legislation. He felt there was at least one real point of difference and differentiation between the beds of the Great Lakes and the beds of other waters which might be regarded as inland waters, which point was that international boundaries are involved in all the Great Lakes except one, and that even though we now have a friendly neighbor adjoining us there, and we hope we may always have a friendly neighbor there, namely, the present one, Canada, at the same time international boundaries are involved, so that the Solicitor General and those entrusted by him with the drafting of this particular piece of proposed legislation had felt it would be unwise to include the Great Lakes and the quitclaiming of the submerged lands within the Great Lakes States, lands which lie under the waters of the Great Lakes.

So I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming and his associates for finally recognizing the fact that there are States which are tremendously affected by the fact that large bodies of their areas, within their constitutional limits, lie under and are submerged by the waters of the Great Lakes.

Therefore, Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Wyoming and his associates for recognizing that fact for the first time and for including in their amendment of yesterday appropriate recitals under which, if their amendment should be adopted and if the joint resolution as thus amended should be enacted, for the first time provision would be made for the quitclaiming of the Great Lakes submerged lands to the States which are vitally affected.

In order that there may be no possible misunderstanding, at this time I identify as sections 1 and 2 the sections of Senate bill 1540 which pertain to the inland waters; and I identify as sections 11 and 12, as proposed yesterday, the similar sections of the amendment submitted yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The Senate will see by a comparison of those sections, and I wish the RECORD to show, that as a result of the determined effort made by those who on the floor of the Senate, in committee, and elsewhere have insisted that the States do have vital rights and interests which should be protected, for the first time

the advocates of this proposed legislation have recognized that there is here a vital question affecting several of our finest States, and those Senators have included in their amendment of yesterday a provision which is designed to quitclaim to those States their submerged lands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me at this time?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask the Senator from Florida to allow me to say at this point that sections 11 and 12 were introduced in the form in which they appear in the amendment in order to make it clear that the purpose of Senate bill 1540 and of Senate bill 923 of the previous Congress and of the Congress before that, I believe, was merely to affirm a position which the Supreme Court has taken with respect to inland navigable waters, a position which the Government of the United States took with respect to inland navigable waters in the presentation of the California, Texas, and Louisiana cases, and a position which the sponsors of the pending joint resolution have taken from the very beginning. The amendment does not represent any change of view at all, but represents a positive affirmation of the position which it seems to us runs through the entire argument in this case. We base our position upon the argument that the open ocean is one thing, and that inland waters are another; and upon the argument that they were divided because the National Government received all the attributes of external sovereignty, and the States, of course, the attributes of State or local sovereignty.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator; and yet reiterate what I just said, namely, that the Solicitor General of the United States, in his appearance before the committee, made it completely clear that in the drafting of this particular legislation he specifically excluded reference to the Great Lakes, because he thought they involved a different question which it was not timely to solve by this particular legislation. So, I think a great step forward has been made by the Senators sponsoring this so-called, but miscalled, interim legislation, by their inclusion in the amendment of yesterday of specific provisions which for the first time recognized that there are serious questions in this field, affecting the Great Lakes States of the Union.

The next point I want to mention is the fact that, as shown by this amendment of yesterday and by comparing it with the provisions of Senate bill 1540, more and more are the advocates of this miscalled interim legislation beginning to realize that the States have very vital rights in connection with piers and docks and reclaimed lands which project into the ocean, and structures which have been erected upon such reclaimed lands and groins and bulkheads and jetties and other structures of that kind, which have been built freely up to this time, under the belief that the States had jurisdiction, with affirmative action taken by the States to give the right to individuals or to local units of government to use those portions of the bottom lands which were needed for these particular developments.

Mr. President, the view of our friends of the opposition has become increasingly one of recognition of the fact that there are tremendous and vital property interests which are included in this phase of the question; because, instead of limiting the quitclaiming of those parts of the beds of the ocean which are involved in these particular questions, as of the date of the California decision, which was the date involved in the earlier legislation, in earlier Congresses, and instead of quitclaiming it as of January 1, 1951, as is shown by a reading of section 101 of Senate bill 1540 to have been their intent, the distinguished Senators who offered this particular latest amendment have instead brought the date up to the time of the actual passage of this proposed legislation, if it passes, and up to the time it becomes law. Those Senators who are interested in this question can see that the date is thus brought forward a period of several years from the date stated in the original draft of this legislation by Mr. Perlman and those serving him, from 1947 to the date when this legislation shall be enacted, if it shall be enacted. They will see that point more clearly made, if they will compare section 14 of the amendment offered yesterday with section 101 of Senate bill 1540, and with the similar section of the earlier bills, which were pending in the Eighty-first Congress and in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, I shall not labor this question further. I am merely pointing out the fact that the continued insistence by those who believe in States' rights upon the fact that the States have vital rights involved in this question is beginning to pay off and is beginning to receive some recognition in the minds of those who are seeking to pass this so-called interim legislation. It is beginning to be realized by them that there are questions involved which do not pertain to oil, and which are entitled to very complete consideration by the Senate and by the Congress as a whole.

Mr. President, to conclude, briefly, I simply desire to state that while these showings of increase in the understanding on the part of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming and his associates of the problems of the States are appreciated, yet they still fall far short of the recognition which I think must ultimately be given to the rights of the States in this vital field.

I invite attention to the fact that the permanent provision contained in Senate bill 1540, and which is an exceedingly objectionable provision to the States, is retained in the amendment offered yesterday. I refer to the provision which is to the effect that anyone who wishes to construct a dock, a pier, a wharf, a jetty, or any other structure on submerged coastal land, or to fill in or reclaim any land or to exercise any right in connection therewith, must subject himself to the jurisdiction of the bureaucracy of Washington. That fact is clearly shown by the sections of the amendment offered yesterday and numbered 18 and 19, and the Senate will find that they are identical with sections 201 and 202 contained in Senate bill 1540.

The States feel, and, I think, properly so, that it is an intolerable diminution of their sovereignty and an intolerable handicap on them, their activities, their cities, and their industries, to have to come to Washington with hat in hand every time they want to build a pier, a dock, or a jetty, or wish to fill a small area of the shallow land adjoining their coastlines in order that developments worth millions upon millions of dollars may be constructed thereon, as is the case in my own State of Florida, and in the State so ably represented by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], who is now sitting in the seat of the minority leader. It is felt that it is not only a substantial diminution of the sovereignty of our States to have a bureau in Washington handle matters of that kind, but that it imposes an intolerable handicap and barrier to their normal development in fields which touch them locally in the most vital way, for them to have to come to Washington in connection with every little detail of their own development to gain consent before they can use even a foot of their submerged lands.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Florida with respect to the phase of the issue which is presently before the Senate. We in New Jersey are greatly concerned. I am trying to obtain from the New Jersey Department of Conservation and Economic Development, as of this afternoon, a complete record of New Jersey investments involved in this aspect of the debate. I hope to be able, for the benefit of the Senator from Florida and other Senators, to obtain before the debate is concluded statistics which I think will be amazing to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. I know full well that some of the piers which have been erected at the expense of millions of dollars at the coast resort cities of his State, for instance, the Steel pier and the Heinz pier at Atlantic City, involve vital questions arising under the particular phase of the field now being explored in connection with the proposed legislation. While the amendment offered yesterday by the Senator from Wyoming and other Senators would perhaps clear up questions which are presented by structures already built, there still remains the fact that States are growing and developing and that the right to continue to develop their littoral and the shallow waters adjoining their shores constitutes one of the most important fields of their development. The States must insist upon their complete right to continue to exercise sovereignty over the lands adjoining their communities which mean so much in

connection with their development and continued prosperity.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I assume the Senator is referring to amendment 3–7–52–g; is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is 3–7–52–c, and it appears on page 2033 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday.

The point I am making is that no permanent concessions to the States are made by this amendment in the vital field of continued development of our coastal areas.

We know the strength of the effort being made by those who, like the Senator from New Jersey and myself, feel that the amendment falls far short of giving to the States the recognition of the freedom of action and the restoration of their vital sovereignty which are required if the States are to continue to develop and prosper as we hope they will.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I share completely the views of the Senator from Florida, and I hope that every Member of the Senate will give very serious consideration to the aspect which we are now discussing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from New Jersey, and I yield the floor.

PEANUT MARKETING QUOTAS

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech,

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2697, Calendar Order No. 1185, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. I merely wish to say that I have conferred with the Senator from New Hampshire, on the opposite side of the aisle, and that he has no objection to having the bill considered at this time. It simply repeals certain provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which gave to the peanut growers certain additional acreage to be used for oil purposes only. It is a repealer; it reduces the quantity rather than increases it.

Among my cosponsors of the bill are the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who opposed the bill when I introduced it in the Senate, and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who also opposed it; but they are now glad to join with me in the repealer. I am very glad that is so, since it would seem wise to take action at this time, inasmuch as those in charge of PMA inform me that, unless the bill is passed this week, they will not know how to advise the planters.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Did I correctly understand that the distinguished Senator from Georgia said that the Senator from Vermont joins in the bill with the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. He is one of the authors.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. So he favors it, of course.

Mr. GEORGE. He favors it. I spoke to the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is on the floor at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to state that I also joined in the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee was unanimous in reporting the bill to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2697) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i). Repeal of these subsections shall not affect rights or obligations arising under marketing-quota or price support operations with respect to 1951 or prior crops of peanuts.

M. JEAN PAUL DAVID

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks in relation to the effort which is being put forth in France to combat Communist infiltration in that country. Recently I was privileged to converse with a member of the Chamber of Deputies of France, M. Jean Paul David, who became a member of the French Parliament in 1946 and was reelected in 1951.

M. David studied very closely the methods of propaganda employed by the Communists as well as their political activity in France. He also made a special study of the counterpropaganda used by the other French political parties to fight communism. He arrived at the conclusion that the struggle against communism must be waged by entirely different methods in order to obtain worth while results. He decided that the fight against communism had to be conducted on a nonpartisan level and by using the same tactics which the Communists used to further their ends.

In 1950, he created a new movement whose sole aim is to fight the French Communist party, which he considers to be the agent of Soviet imperialism in France. The movement which is called Peace and Freedom is designed to rouse and unite all those who are determined to fight for truth and against Communist lies.

It matters little what our political persuasions are or to what party we belong as long as we unite and have one aim, namely, to fight communism. All Frenchmen who wish to remain free must concentrate all their efforts and energies to fight for the defense of their freedom—

Says Jean Paul David.

In its campaign Peace and Freedom makes use of posters, pamphlets, weekly bulletins, and radio broadcasts. All these are designed to place before the public objective information which deflates Communist propaganda and exposes its lies.

The Peace and Freedom movement has already obtained most satisfactory results. In the 1951 elections, Communist candidates and their fellow travelers lost 500,000 votes, whereas it was expected that they would gain votes.

Membership in the French Communist Party declined by 30 percent in 1951. The circulation of the main Communist newspaper, L'Humanite, has fallen off from 500,000 daily to 160,000 daily.

So we can see, Mr. President, that the campaign of "Peace and Freedom" was really effective.

The violent attacks launched by the Communists against "Peace and Freedom" are without doubt the best proof that this movement has become a great danger to communism in France.

One example which proves how effective Peace and Freedom is in its fight against communism is that ever since 1917 the Communist Party in France was accustomed to organize parades to celebrate the anniversary of the October revolution in Russia. That revolution was extolled as the greatest achievement for the liberation of mankind. Peace and Freedom devised a poster which showed the balance sheet of that "great revolution," and the bloody and sinister character of a political upheaval which has brought death to all its initiators except four: Stalin, Andreyer, Molotov, Vorochilov. Other posters were pasted all over French cities and villages showing the roster of the names of Lenin's companions and coworkers, and the fate that had befallen them.

Mr. President, on that poster, which is in French and a copy of which I have here, are posted the names of persons who were members of the Politburo. The list begins with the name of Leon Trotsky, who was murdered by the GPU.

Six more names appear as members of the Politburo. All six were executed. The list ends with the name of M. Tomski, who it is noted committed suicide by persuasion.

There is another list containing the names of members of the diplomatic and consular corps who were executed. I notice alongside the names the information that some of them were imprisoned, some disappeared, some were poisoned, some were executed, and some were jailed and then disappeared.

The next list contains names of marshals and generals who were executed. Another list contains names of admirals and vice admirals who were executed. The next list is of NKVD men who were executed. Another list is of members of the diplomatic and consular corps who were executed. The next list is of leaders of the Comintern who were executed, liquidated, and disappeared. There is also a list of writers, historians, and artists who were executed, committed suicide, were liquidated, or disappeared. There is a long list of such persons.

Mr. President, instead of reading all these names into the RECORD, and since I believe this is a worth-while publication of names to show what really happened to those who were the founders

of this so-called liberation movement, this great humanitarian movement, I ask unanimous consent that the names be taken from the poster and printed in the RECORD following the various titles.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Members of the Politburo: Léon Trotsky, murdered by the GPU; G. Zinoviev, executed; L. Kamenev, executed; N. Boukharine, executed; A. Rykov, executed; G. Sokolnikov, executed; M. Tomski, committed suicide by persuasion.

Members of diplomatic and consular corps executed: I. Smirnov, executed; I. Smilca, executed; L. Serebriakov, executed; G. Evdokimov, executed; M. Bogoulavski, executed; N. Ouglanov, executed; A. Beloborodov, executed; I. Roudzoutak, executed; V. Lominadze, committed suicide; N. Skrypnik, committed suicide; A. Khandjian, committed suicide; I. Camarnik, committed suicide; H. Iagoda, executed; F. Khodjaiev, executed; V. Kouibychev, poisoned; V. Ossinski, executed; G. Petrovski, executed; K. Soukhomline, executed; V. Zatonski, executed; L. Kavtaradze, executed; V. Kossior, executed; G. Lomov, executed; N. Krylenko, executed; K. Radek, imprisoned, disappeared; S. Ordjonikidze, poisoned; T. Tcherviakov, committed suicide; I. Khodjaiev, committed suicide; P. Lioubtchenko, committed suicide; A. Enoukidze, executed; L. Karakhan, executed; B. Mdivani, executed; G. Safarov, executed; A. Rosengoltz, executed; G. Grinko, executed; I. Reingold, executed; M. Tchernov, executed; Preobrajenski, executed; Chr. Racovski, jailed, disappeared; Postychev, executed; Tchoubar, executed; Boubnov, executed; Eikhe, executed; Antipov, executed; Mejlaouk, executed; Soulimov, executed; Milioutine, executed; Soltz, executed; Arbouzov, executed; Iakoviev, executed; Unchlikht, executed.

Marshals and generals who were executed; Toukatchevski, Kork, Eideman, Primakov, Levandovski, Iakir, Ouborevitch, Feldman, Putna, Schmidt, Kouzmitchov, Kachirine, Dybenko, Blucher, Smoline, Ozoline, Hekker, Kouibychev, Khripine, Mezis, Bokis, Alksnis, Bielov, Egorov, Savitski, Velikanov, Corbatchoc, Soukhoroukov, Tkatchev, Pomerantzev, Apse, etc.

Admirals and vice admirals executed: Orlov, Sivkov, Loudri, Kojanov, Ivanov, Victorov, Mouklevitch, Kireiev, Douchenov, Smirnov-Sverdlovski.

NKVD men executed: Agranov, Balitski, Pauker, Zakosvski, Deribas, Mironov, Peters, Prokofiev, Messing, Trilisser, Sloutski, Moltchanov, Leplevski, Latsis.

Members of diplomatic and consular corps executed: Iouriniev, Davtian, Antonov-Ovseinko, Iakoubovitch, Arens, Podolski, Asmus, Arossiev, Rosenberg, Tikhmeniev, Bekjadian, Erodovski, Ostrovski.

Leaders of the Comintern executed, liquidated, and disappeared: Hélène Stassova, Bela Kun, Remmele, Waletski, Brandt, Borodine, Neuman, Piatnitski, Eberlein, Warski, Dombal, Max Hoeltz.

Writers, historians, artists executed, having committed suicide, liquidated, and disappeared: N. Goumilev, Averbach, B. Pilniak, Libedinski, B. Jasenski, N. Kliouiev, Selvinski, Vorovski, Krotki, Stieklov, Friedland, Anichev, S. Daline, Rojkov, Lapinski, Kirchon, Ermilov, I. Babel, Parrassov-Rodionov, Mandelstamm, Tretiatkov, Erdman, Nevski, Zeidel, Piontkovski, Gronski, Loudianov, M. Koltsov, P. Vassiliev, Bezymenski, I. Kataiev, I. Makarov, Maznine, G. Serebriakova, Amaglobeli, Rafalski, Meyerhold, Selivanovski, Liadov, Arcadine, N. Satz, Malakovski, Kousnietzov, A. Sobol, Essenine, Y. Piast, etc.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the impact of this poster campaign was so tremendous that last October, for the first time in 34 years, the Communists did not dare to organize any celebration for the bloody October revolution.

Peace and Freedom, which is a movement sponsored and spearheaded by a member of the Deputies, M. Jean Paul David, was determined to step up the fight. It has now taken the form of a universal movement. Peace and Freedom committees have been created in Germany, Belgium, Italy, The Netherlands, and Vietnam. Peace and Freedom has only one aim, namely, to destroy communism.

Mr. President, in our own country we have the same problem. The Saturday Evening Post recently published an editorial along the same line, entitled "Erudite Radicals Cannot Forgive an Anti-Communist." I shall read a portion of it:

From a recent letter by a New York man who, were it not for the horrid implications which have attached themselves to the word, might be described as an "intellectual":

"Even now, most of the college people I talk to react with shock and horror at the idea of a book by Whittaker Chambers. This includes many who have never been fellow travelers."

Mr. President, I should like to read another quotation from this editorial. Near the end it says:

So, ever since the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through a series of lucky chances and solid researches, took the lid off the Communist underground in America, we have had the discouraging phenomenon of the anti-anti-Communists. They have sneered and sniped at anybody whose testimony helped destroy the myth that there was no Communist espionage in this country and that, if there was, it did not involve nice people. And, of course, the man they hated most was the man who supplied the evidence and made it stick—Whittaker Chambers. Oh, no; they didn't want the Communist plot to succeed, if there was a Communist plot, but Chambers wasn't the man to expose it.

The story now comes around to the time when liberals, radicals, and Park Avenue Pinkos will have to make up their minds: Do they want the Communist conspiracy to succeed, or don't they? The day is at hand when they must admit that the gold brick they bought 20 years ago was a phony. It's time to stop trying to hawk it about the streets and upper-class cocktail bars as a genuine article. Chambers has contributed that much to history, and it is no good standing around and waiting for a nicer man to tell the story. The "nice men" have turned up in distressing numbers on the other side.

Lost causes are usually futile, but there are lost causes that can be defended in good faith and dignity. But what can be said of a lost cause like the belief that Russian-Communist dictatorship is "liberal," and that its spies and propagandists are proper subjects for "tolerance"? Not very much.

Mr. President, I should like to have the entire editorial placed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks, so that no part of it will be considered as having been taken out of context.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ERUDITE RADICALS CANNOT FORGIVE AN ANTI-COMMUNIST

From a recent letter by a New York man who, were it not for the horrid implications which have attached themselves to the word, might be described as an intellectual:

"Even now most of the college people I talk to react with shock and horror at the idea of a book by Whittaker Chambers. This includes many who have never been fellow travelers."

Now that Mr. Chambers has swung into his epic story, it may be that the intelligentsia will get some intelligence, but there is no reason to expect a mass conversion. The black-out of the supposedly responsible class on the issue of communism is an extraordinary historical phenomenon in mass emotionalism. Go back to 1937, when Stalin was staging the so-called trials of formerly trusted Bolsheviks and murdering thousands of dissidents and suspected dissidents with no trial at all. We are remembering one man; a scholar of deep conviction and conscience; a man who had joined in protest against what he believed to be the unjust convictions of Tom Mooney, Sacco and Vanzetti, the Scottsboro boys, and others. But when this man was asked how he explained the confessions of the old Bolsheviks and the murder of so many others, he replied, "There is no rational explanation except guilt."

Judge Webster Thayer was pilloried for his part in the trial of two Italian anarchists in a Massachusetts court, but if there were any American intellectuals who held Stalin to the rigorous standards which they expected of Judge Thayer, or the Governors of California and Alabama, they could be counted on the fingers of one hand.

Having accepted Russian communism as "good"—or at any rate as a system which was trying to do something for the ordinary man—American intellectuals were already equipped with blinkers which kept them from being critical of native Communists or receptive to the revelation that a Soviet fifth column had infiltrated our Government far toward the top. The American intellectual, who is usually also a liberal, had permitted himself to become messed up in his confused conception of tolerance and fair play. As Leslie A. Fiedler, writing on the Hiss-Chambers case in the August 1951 issue of Commentary, put it: "Lest the New Dealers seem 'Red-baiters' they preferred to be fools."

If the American intelligentsia hate Whittaker Chambers, it is because he tossed the bucket of cold water that shocked them out of the pleasant dream about Soviet Russia as a land where liberals skip about like carefree gazelles, improving man's hard lot by social engineering. Chambers squeezed communism down to the terrifying proportions of a vast military-and-political plot against the freedom of man. He also exposed the intellectual left wing as a herd of supercilious cream puffs. People who had believed that (1) the left was good and the right was bad, and that (2) the left was very, very good when embraced by college graduates in $100 suits, were out on a limb. It is always irritating to be exposed as a credulous idiot, particularly when you have been intolerably smug toward the Fascist beasts who saw the light before you did.

So, ever since the House Committee on Un-American Activities, through a series of lucky chances and solid researches, took the lid off the Communist underground in America, we have had the discouraging phenomenon of the anti-anti-Communists. They have sneered and sniped at anybody whose testimony help destroy the myth that there was no Communist espionage in this country and that, if there was, it didn't involve nice people. And, of course, the man they hated most was the man who supplied the evidence and made it stick—Whittaker Chambers. Oh, no, they didn't want the Communist plot to succeed, if there was a Communist plot, but Chambers wasn't the man to expose it.

The story now comes around to the time when liberals, radicals, and Park Avenue pinkos will have to make up their minds: Do they want the Communist conspiracy to

succeed, or don't they? The day is at hand when they must admit that the gold brick they bought 20 years ago was a phony. It's time to stop trying to hawk it about the streets and upper-class cocktail bars as a genuine article. Chambers has contributed that much to history, and it is no good standing around and waiting for a nicer man to tell the story. The "nice men" have turned up in distressing numbers on the other side.

Lost causes are usually futile, but there are lost causes that can be defended in good faith and dignity. But what can be said of a lost cause like the belief that Russian-Communist dictatorship is liberal, and that its spies and propagandists are proper subjects for tolerance? Not very much.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7 discloses that when the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] was discussing the matter of submerged lands he referred to a ruling which had been made by the Hague Tribunal. The Senator quoted from a subhead which reads:

United States official faces Tidelands case deadline in parallel decision.

There then appeared what I thought was some rather unusual language in the news story, as follows:

RECENT DECISION

The whole matter revolves around the recent decision of the International Court of Justice at The Hague concerning coastal islands in determining national boundary lines. The decision in the case between Great Britain and Norway was decided overwhelmingly in favor of Norway in such a manner as to upset all the prior contentions of the United States Justice Department in its attempt to take over the rich oil-bearing submerged lands of California, Texas, and Louisiana in the so-called Tidelands case.

This is what I think is unusual to be in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 7, 1952:

Now, in Washington on February 20 a crucial hearing will start on the issue.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT STEP

What is the Justice Department going to do?

Will it swallow its pride and recognize, for example, the United States boundary along the outer rim of the Channel Islands of California, as it should do under the World Court decision, thus insuring the maximum national defense for this country?

Or will it try to ignore the World Court ruling and cling to a narrow definition of the national boundary as low-tide mark along the mainland, thus hanging on to its alleged ownership of submerged oil lands at Santa Barbara, Long Beach, Huntington Beach, and elsewhere?

As I say, it is unusual to ask the question on March 7 as to what the Government was going to do on February 20, some time before. Therefore, I thought it might be of interest to place in the RECORD what the Government had done, and what was a matter of public record, and what anyone could have found out long ago as a matter of public record.

I wish to refer to the opening statement of the Government in the case of United States against the State of California. When the special master begins to draw the lines which will decide what will be inland waters and what will be outside those waters in the open sea, that opening statement will be of extreme interest to a great many persons. It should serve to call attention to the fact that if we do not pass some type of interim legislation, and pass it fairly quickly, the special master soon will be drawing the lines along the coasts of California, Texas, and Louisiana, and then, by virtue of those lines being drawn, areas outside those lines will be appropriately ready for Federal leasing, and then we shall be in some conflicts.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I heard the Senator say that the land would be appropriately ready for Federal leasing. Of course, the Senator knows that no less than 6 months ago the Secretary of the Interior issued opinions to the effect that the Federal Leasing Act does not apply to any such land as that, and that he has no authority to lease it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I grant that, but I say that it would then be available, and it would be appropriate to proceed to lease it. If the Federal Government owns the land seaward of the line drawn by the special master, it is the responsibility of the Congress immediately to pass legislation which will permit that land to be leased.

There are those who think it was very poor law——

Mr. LONG. The Senator is not arguing that any department of the Government has the right to lease such land, is he?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I think it would be correct to say that. I say that there are lawyers who believe that the Federal Government does have the right. There are lawyers who believe that it was very poor law when it was held that the Leasing Act did not apply to this area of the public domain. I am not able to pass on the wisdom of that decision. I prefer to take the point of view which the Senator from Louisiana has just now expressed. I prefer to take the position that the Federal Government does not now have the power to lease this land under the present leasing law, and that the Congress of the United States, in furtherance of its obligations, should proceed to pass such legislation very promptly.

I did not intend to go into that question. I was only trying to illustrate that there is merit in the hard work which the junior Senator from Louisiana and some of the others of us have been trying to do in having a tidelands bill, a submerged-lands bill, and interim legislation considered by the Senate.

I do not care to clutter up the RECORD with all the things which were in the opening statement before the special master, because I do not think they are all of particular interest to us. While it might be of considerable interest to all of us, I do not think it is worth while, perhaps, to read the entire statement. However, I wish to read a little from what the representatives of the Government of the United States said on February 20, to which reference was made in a definite way on March 7. I quote now from the opening statement of the United States in the case of United States against the State of California:

Everyone recognizes, of course, that the criteria adopted by any nation in fixing its territorial waters must be consistent with the controlling principles of international law. We do not anticipate, however, that California will dispute that the position of the United States, on which the "boundary" we claim is predicated, is in all respects within the permissible limits announced by the International Court of Justice in the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case, the judgment in which was issued on December 18, 1951. There can be no doubt whatever that the general principles and criteria adopted by this country are fully consistent with the controlling principles of international law, as announced and applied by the International Court.

I am going further, but I wish to digress at this juncture to point out that what the Department of Justice did was to say very plainly to the Court that there was nothing in the fisheries case which restricted in any way what the Government had tried to do with respect to the submerged lands. All the fisheries case said was that in reference to Norway, which has a rocky coast, and the rocks extend out into the sea, the areas claimed could be expanded beyond the 3-mile limit. If that is true, then the United States Government has the same permission, but there is nothing that would say that within the 3-mile limit the United States Government could not claim the land.

Quoting further from the opening statement of the United States:

In this connection, it is important to note that it is entirely irrelevant to the present proceeding that the United States could have made a more extensive claim to territorial waters than it has in fact chosen to claim. The Anglo-Norwegian fisheries decision makes it clear that each nation is free to choose for itself, within the limits permitted by international law, the base line for its marginal belt.

I stop there to say that if that can bring any comfort to the State of California, I do not know what it is. If the decision does make it clear that each nation is free, within the limits permitted by international law, to choose for itself the base line for its marginal belt, then the United States is free to start with a marginal belt at low-water mark. How that can bring any comfort to those who think we ought to start at a point 3 miles out to sea, I do not know.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course, the Senator knows that the United States is probably the only Nation whose sovereignty does not extend both to inland waters and outside waters. The argument which we have heard on the floor of the

Senate is that the States own the beds of their navigable streams and their bays, rivers, and lakes, but that the Federal Government owns everything beginning at the boundary between inland waters and outside waters and extending from that point on out into the sea. Therefore we have a somewhat different question here when we approach the problem as to where the base line shall be so far as the marginal belt is concerned. In other words, where should we draw the line between inland waters and outside waters? If we were to apply the basis of international law, as accepted in the Norwegian fisheries case, naturally it would be much more favorable to the States than the Federal Government would want to concede. On the other hand, the Senator very well knows that the Government has more rights with regard to its internal waters, as against foreign nations, than it has with respect to the marginal sea.

Mr. ANDERSON. All I am trying to say is that the controversy over whether or not the Fisheries case has any bearing on the submerged lands cases seems to me to be a little far-fetched. I quite agree with the position taken by the United States Government in the California case when it argued, on February 20, 1952, that it is completely irrelevant whether the Government took all the land it could take, or took only a part of the area. Apparently that is all that can be drawn from the Fisheries case. From the Fisheries case it can be concluded that the United States Government, instead of claiming a 3-mile area, could go from the 3-mile area clear out to Santa Catalina Island, and perhaps beyond that to other islands.

It seems to me that whether the Government has taken all the area that could be taken is another question.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. As a matter of fact, the Senator from New Mexico knows, does he not, that the Solicitor General of the United States presented a brief before the International Court of Justice, urging that the problem off the coast of California was similar to that involved in drawing the inland-waters line off Norway?

In that connection, Mr. President, he had already told our committee that problems of international law were involved in this question. If the International Court of Justice had held that Norway had no right to extend its line around the outward islands off the coast of Norway, of course the Federal Government would have been able to say that, according to international law, the States had no rights in the Santa Barbara Channel.

That argument of Mr. Perlman's was brushed aside, and the Court said that a nation could claim all that area. So, in the Fisheries case, at least, the Federal Government lost in one of its efforts to expand its influence, as against the States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not a lawyer, and I shall let the lawyers argue that point. The opinion of the United States was quite clearly announced. It was that under the decision in the Norwegian case we could expand our territorial waters farther than we had. However, the decision did not state that we must start out from any particular point in the marginal sea.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator from New Mexico agree that if the International Court had accepted the argument of Mr. Perlman and laid it down as a delimitating factor, the Federal Government would have found it to be important, but that since the Court decided the case against the contention of Mr. Perlman, the Federal Government finds it makes no difference?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know about that.

I read further from the opening statement:

> The decision plainly does not hold that international law requires the adoption of base lines comparable to those claimed by Norway for its own unique coastal areas. The case is rested entirely upon the irrefutable fact that the United States has fixed its base line in accordance with the principles and criteria I have described. Its policy is based on its traditional recognition of the freedom of the seas.
>
> Counsel for California propose to introduce expert testimony with respect to international law and the usages of nations; other expert testimony with respect to the geologic, oceanographic, and other physical aspects of the segments of the coast in question; and testimony concerning the use and occupancy, both historic and current, of those segments of the coast. We believe—and at the proper time we shall raise the issue by timely objection—that all of this evidence is irrelevant because it deals not with the marginal belt actually claimed by the United States, but with an expanded marginal belt which California believes the United States could, and should, claim as against foreign nations. If the United States were presently claiming the external marginal belt advocated by California, the proposed testimony might be relevant. But the United States does not make such a claim, and we submit that California's proposed testimony has, therefore, no real place in this proceeding. Certainly, the Anglo-Norwegian Fisheries case does not stand for the proposition that a nation must draw its base line from rock to rock and include all large indentations and all areas of water between the coast and off-lying islands. The Court found only that it was permissible for Norway to draw its line in the way in which it had done, on the basis of the peculiarities of the Norwegian coast and the fact that Norway had asserted the right with the acquiescence of other nations over a long period of time. But neither Norway nor California can draw the line for the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator please tell us who does have the power to draw the line between the inland waters of the United States and the external waters of the marginal sea?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will answer the question to the best of my knowledge, realizing that it is dangerous to make a statement and then to have someone else come along and say something different. My guess is that since certain States are involved in litigation with the Nation, and a special master has been designated by the Supreme Court to draw the line, if the Supreme Court adopts the line drawn by the special master it will be the end of it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Would the Senator from New Mexico agree with some of us that it is the function of Congress to determine by law what shall be claimed as the territorial waters of the United States, rather than the function of a special master, who has no standards whatever to guide him, except the views of some officials of the executive department; and that actually the Congress of the United States should determine what should be regarded as the boundary between inland waters and external waters?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; these States are in court, and Congress has failed to take the opportunity to make disposition of the subject. I feel about it somewhat as I feel about the question of who owns the water that is running down the Colorado River. My State is a party to the Colorado compact. California and Arizona cannot agree. Because they cannot agree, even though all the other States are perfectly willing to make disposition of the question, the matter should go to the Supreme Court for adjudication.

We tried to pass a bill which would have created a justiciable issue and therefore would have let the issue come before the Supreme Court. I think that if the Supreme Court acted on it and thus disposed of the water of the Colorado River we would find ourselves bound by the decision.

Similarly, the States of California, Louisiana, and Texas are involved in a legal dispute with the Government of the United States. The issue has been decided three times by the Supreme Court. The decisions are uniform. They are the only decisions which deal specifically with the question. In furtherance of a decision of the issue a special master has been appointed, and he is drawing lines. Some persons may not like the lines; and it seems to me the best way to avoid an early and unfortunate disposition of the question would be to pass an interim bill, thus allowing production to continue, and keeping alive the hope that in the 5 years provided in the interim bill it may be possible to reach a decision as to how much of the oil should be given to the States—whether all of it or none of it. I would perhaps be in favor of a substantial part of it going to the States. However, that will not satisfy the situation if the special master finishes his report and if the report is adopted by the Supreme Court, when no legislation is upon the books.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield further.

Mr. LONG. Is not the problem of determining what the base line should be—just as Norway determined this vast area as being its inland waters and therefore not open to English fishing boats—really a policy decision, which should be determined by the Congress of the United

States, rather than by the courts, inasmuch as the courts have no standards to go by?

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe it would have been better if the question had been determined by the Congress of the United States. But, in the absence of a decision by the Congress of the United States and in the presence of an issue over which there may be a jurisdictional dispute, I believe the case comes properly to the Supreme Court; and I believe that the decision of the Supreme Court will bind us, regardless of whether it would have been better for Congress to determine the question in the first place.

I still believe that it would have been better for Congress to determine it, and I would have preferred that course; but Congress has not demonstrated its ability to agree. That being true, I believe the question will have to go into court.

Some persons are greatly worried about the outcome of the issue before the Supreme Court. I should think that they would be able to see the tide of events marching steadily against them, and realize that when a special master draws the line along Long Beach, he may take the recommendation of the Justice Department that the extreme line farthest landward should be selected. There is another limiting line, as fixed in the Carillo case, which is far seaward of that line. There is an intermediate line which many feel might have been agreed to. However, the people of Long Beach were not satisfied with the intermediate line. I have predicted that in the end they may have a very limited area. That is the hazard of litigation.

Mr. LONG. What I had in mind was that, from the statement the Solicitor General made to us, he seemed to feel that it was his duty to claim as much as he could for the United States Government.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think that is generally a fairly good principle for a Solicitor General to follow. In a lawsuit, one begins by putting his best possible foot forward.

Mr. LONG. Accordingly the Government drew a line which actually came inside the breakwater and included half the area inside the breakwater at Long Beach. In that instance the Government's attorneys did not really claim that the Government owned all the area up to that point, but they said they would not concede that the Government did not own it, thus leaving the matter to be determined by the court.

So I understand that a possible explanation is that the Government of the United States does not really claim that it owns all the area up to that line.

Nevertheless, it seems to me this matter calls for a policy to be decided by the Congress, rather than by one Government agent or another who might be willing to claim this land for the United States Government. It seems to me the Congress should fulfill its constitutional obligation by legislating in this case, and in doing so should prescribe a standard by which it will be possible to determine what are inland waters.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I have offered my amendment to the amendment which has been submitted by several other Senators. My amendment to that amendment provides that the Congress shall determine the boundary between the inland waters and the external waters.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Louisiana will recognize that at the hearing it was suggested that the limits of Long Beach might be at a point very substantially seaward of that line, and that Long Beach thought it owned the area clear out to Huntington Beach.

Of course, if there is no compromise in such contests, unfortunate results sometimes follow.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER of Maryland in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Although this line is only what might be called a temporary one, is it not true that even in drawing the line the Government agreed that all the oil wells now in that harbor or that bay belong to and are a part of the Long Beach holdings? Is not that true? In drawing the line, the Government included every oil well in Long Beach Bay, and all those wells were admitted to be the property of and in the ownership of the city of Long Beach. Is not that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe I should comment briefly on my understanding of the Fisheries case: It is my understanding that in that instance Mr. Perlman, the Solicitor General of the United States, filed with the special master a brief in which Mr. Perlman said the California case presented a situation very similar to that in the Anglo-Norwegian controversy. I believe he said that California's claims and Norway's claims were similar, but Mr. Perlman placed great emphasis on the position taken by Great Britain.

After Great Britain lost that case, Mr. Perlman said the decision was not at all important and not at all relevant.

THE SITUATION IN KOREA

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield for that purpose?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, let me suggest to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that before he presses his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, I should like to proceed for about 5 minutes to discuss a question not related to the unfinished business.

Mr. LONG. Very well; then I withhold my suggestion.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, at this time I wish to read an editorial which appeared last night in the Evening Star of Washington, D. C. The reading of the editorial will take only a few minutes.

There is nothing in the editorial which thoughtful or informed persons will consider to be new. I believe the editorial simply restates the existence of a situation which has confronted our Nation and our allies for more than a year. The editorial states that the Allied forces are not to be given the encouragement or the authority or the weapons required to reach a military decision in Korea.

Certainly there is nothing new in that declaration, Mr. President. The fact is that in late December 1950—approximately 14 months ago—the Allies decided that the seeking of an armistice was to be imposed on the fighting forces in Korea.

The only purpose I have in reading the editorial is to remind others throughout the Nation of a sad situation which has existed for many dreary and uninspiring months.

The editorial reads as follows:

DEAD END IN KOREA

It may be that Gen. Van Fleet is correct in his opinion that the Chinese Communists, despite numerical superiority in men, weapons and planes, will not launch a major offensive in Korea this spring. From the point of view of saving lives, it may be hoped that this estimate of the situation proves to be right. But if the Chinese do not attack, and if—as has been authoritatively stated—we lack the strength to carry the fighting to them, how do we propose to get any kind of a decision in Korea?

As long as the talks at Panmunjom continue, there is presumably some hope of a negotiated settlement. It is a slim hope, however, and it seems to be getting slimmer every day. Certainly the Chinese and their North Korean associates have given little indication that they really want an armistice.

There was, perhaps, implicit recognition of this in a speech prepared last week for delivery to a Philadelphia audience by John M. Allison, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs. Most of the address was devoted to the diplomatic business of looking for silver linings and putting the best possible face on a very bad situation throughout the Far East. But tucked away in the speech was one seemingly significant paragraph.

Mr. Allison said that we do not propose to widen the scope of the war. "It is up to the Communists," he declared. "If they want to widen the conflict and engulf the world in a terrible war, then they must be the ones to do it."

It is not at all likely that, in saying this, Mr. Allison was speaking only for Mr. Allison. Presumably it was a considered statement of policy, and if so, it means that we do not propose to carry the war to China even if the truce negotiations fail.

Some influential members of the administration have believed and have said privately, that we ought to enlarge the war if the truce talks collapse. They had in mind an attack on China's internal communications with a view to crippling and perhaps destroying the ability of the Chinese to wage war. But this view evidently has been overruled. Whether because of doubt as to our capabilities, in deference to our allies, or for some other reason, the advocates of restraint seem once again to have prevailed.

There are arguments to be made for this policy. But whatever the arguments, it is a policy which leads to a dead end in Korea. We cannot win the war there. Neither can we withdraw. The truce negotiations are getting nowhere and we are not willing even to try to coerce the enemy into accepting a reasonable settlement. And now the Communists have been officially notified that if

the talks break down we do not propose to do anything about it.

That, as a policy, is little better than no policy at all. For in the best of circumstances, it means that the Eighth Army is to be stranded in Korea for the indefinite future. That, to be sure, does not widen the conflict. But it does result in a situation which public opinion in this country is not apt to tolerate for long.

The editorial ends, Mr. President, with a statement of opinion that the dead end in Korea represents a situation which public opinion in this country is not apt to tolerate for long. I wonder what the editorial writer meant. The Nation has already tolerated for months and months the purposeless situation in Korea. The situation there is basically no different today from what it was more than a year ago. Our political conduct in Korea gives one reason to believe that the administration will tolerate the existing situation for months to come. I share the editorial writer's concern. Persons like myself, in and out of Congress and the Government, have expressed and re-expressed that concern since 1950. I wonder how long it will be before public opinion demands that freedom find a street which is not barricaded by a dead end. Until freedom finds this street and fights to keep it clear, the dead end in Korea will grow ever higher with the bodies of the dead from many lands.

Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana wishes at this time to press his suggestion of the absence of a quorum, I yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. LONG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on Wednesday of last week the junior Senator from Washington advised the Senate of the United States of a letter which the Secretary of the Interior had written to the Governor of the State of Washington, under date of February 15, 1952. In this letter the Secretary assumed the authority and power to strip the State of Washington of its coastal submerged lands and resources. The Secretary of the Interior attempted to exercise this power against my State without benefit of any authority from the Congress of the United States and in the absence of a Supreme Court decision.

Before proceeding further, Mr. President, I wish to emphasize one point. Everyone appears to be in agreement that no final or lasting line of demarkation as between Federal and State rights has been established in the State of California. There is no doubt about this. In the California tidelands case the Supreme Court reached a decision in 1947, some 5 years ago, and the Court admitted, as I understand, its inability to determine a final line of demarkation as between the rights of the parties involved. The Court appointed a master whose responsibility it would be to study and then to recommend a final line of demarkation in California. No recommendations that I know of have yet been submitted by the master to the Supreme Court. Does it not, therefore, seem not only amazing, but actually preposterous, that the Secretary of the Interior has decided, on his own responsibility, on a line of demarkation in the State of Washington, when that State's rights have not yet been adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction? When we bear in mind, Mr. President, that no line of demarkation has yet been established in either of the States of California or Louisiana, it will make more illuminating several paragraphs which I wish to reread from the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the Sovereign State of Washington. In those several paragraphs, Mr. President, the Secretary of the Interior, who must know that no lines have been agreed on in those States which have been adjudged by the Supreme Court of the United States, says, certainly by strong implication, that no court decision is now or will be needed in the State of Washington, "for I, the Secretary of the Interior, will determine what rights, if any, are to be vested in the citizens of the State of Washington."

The paragraphs to which I make reference today, Mr. President, and which I have read on several occasions during the past week, are these. Said the Secretary to the Governor:

> We understand that the State of Washington has issued oil and gas permits and leases to private parties on submerged lands situated seaward of the line described above. Under the doctrine of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases any such permits or leases are void, since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the leasing power of the State of Washington or its agencies.
>
> With respect to any such oil and gas permits or leases, we would appreciate being advised of the names of the permittees or lessees, their addresses, the dates of issuance, and the areas covered.

Mr. President, in all fairness I ask, What does the Secretary mean when he says that any such permits or leases are void since that area has always been and is now outside the scope of the jurisdiction of the State of Washington?

The point I seek to establish, so that every Member of the Senate may be keenly aware of it, is that no line of any character to differentiate between the rights belonging to the State of Washington and the Federal Government has ever been established by anyone other than the Secretary of the Interior. If by way of argument the Secretary of the Interior were permitted to determine the rights of the State of Washington, does it not logically follow that he could do precisely the same thing with reference to the sovereign State of Maryland, which is so well represented in this body by the Senator who is now presiding over the Senate [Mr. BUTLER]? It is not alone what the Secretary of the Interior could do, were he permitted so to do, to the State of Washington and the State of Maryland, but common sense and logic dictate that he could do precisely equal things to all the rights of all the sovereign States which go to make up our Union.

Mr. President, I have suggested to my colleagues that this doctrine of paramount rights, full dominion, and power, claimed by the Federal Government applies to every State in the Union and not alone to the States of Washington, California, Texas, and Louisiana.

Today, for a few minutes, I wish to spell out in greater detail the seriousness of the danger which this paramount-power doctrine threatens to the sovereignty and natural resources of each and every State.

We have all heard the wailing which pours out of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice to the effect that quitclaim tidelands legislation would be an unjustified gift to three selfish States at the expense of the other 45 States. I suppose that with the State of Washington now on the firing line, as the Secretary of the Interior attempted on the 15th day of February, 1952, to place it, along with California, Texas, and Louisiana, there are now four selfish States, instead of three selfish States, including my own State of Washington.

Mr. President, I hope that before the debates are concluded, there will be 48 such selfish States rising in righteous wrath to protect their sovereignty and constitutional rights. If they do not rise now and wipe out this vicious paramount-power doctrine, future discussions about States' rights are likely to be completely academic.

I urge each of my colleagues to look carefully at the slow and relentless growth of this paramount right doctrine. The States are being picked off just one or two at a time. In 1947 it was California. In 1950 it was Texas. Then it was Louisiana, and now, in 1952, it is the State of Washington.

How well I remember the doctrine applied and pursued so relentlessly and so successfully over too long a period of time by the late Herr Hitler of Germany. He pursued a philosophy easy to understand and tremendously dangerous in its implications. It was, "Separate and divide." On the basis of the record up to this minute, the application of that doctrine has sought to separate, first California, then Texas and Louisiana, and now the State of Washington, from the rest of the Union.

Mr. President, which State will it be tomorrow? Will it be Colorado, with her uranium ore? Or perhaps Utah or Idaho or Wyoming, with their metals, so essential to national defense? Whose turn

will it then be next year? Will it be Maine, perhaps, with her famous fisheries, or Florida, with her fabulous hotels built on reclaimed coastal submerged land?

I believe it proper this afternoon to endeavor to arouse a reasonable amount of interest among those representing inland States who heretofore have thought this tidelands issue was something which had nothing to do with their States.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. Of course, I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I note the Senator is speaking with respect to the Continental Shelf lands off the coast of his sovereign State. Does the Senator from Washington have anything to say about the bill introduced by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] which would erect the giant Hells Canyon Dam within the State of Idaho, and touching the State of Oregon, which dam would do away, in my opinion, with the private power industry of the State of Idaho, and in effect permit the Secretary of the Interior to be the czar of all electric power, at least a great portion of the electric power, in the Northwest? I should like to have the Senator's observation.

Mr. CAIN. I was on the floor of the Senate on a recent day when the junior Senator from Oregon addressed himself to the question of Hells Canyon Dam. Until the Senator from Oregon made his statement I was not aware that it was his intention to speak.

I may say that I do not know to what extent the Senator from Idaho is correct in his present contention, but the Senator from Oregon did arouse my natural curiosity, and I look forward to the coming hearing at which the question of Hells Canyon Dam in all its fullness will be thoughtfully explored by a committee of the Congress.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. It has been my observation that the remarks of the junior Senator from Washington in effect would suggest to the Senate and to the people of the United States that by his action the Secretary of the Interior is getting his foot in the door with respect to the oil and anything else there may be in submerged lands off the coast of Washington. If the Secretary of the Interior could open the door to controlling, even in a slight detail, the very essential public domain which the junior Senator from Washington feels, I think justly, belongs to the sovereign State of Washington, then, in the opinion of the Senator from Washington, would it not be just a little bit more dangerous, just a little bit more down the road toward socialization of the essential business and productive capacity of the great United States, to have the Secretary of the Interior get his foot in the door to a CVA or to a public power policy in the vast Pacific Northwest?

Mr. CAIN. There are two things I should like to say in response to the Senator from Idaho. The first is that he indicated that he thought the Secretary of the Interior had gotten his foot in the door in the State of Washington. I wish to make it very clear that what the Secretary of the Initerior did was to attempt to get his foot in the door, but his foot is presently not there, and, to the extent that I can prevent it, the Secretary's foot will remain where it belongs—on the outside.

With reference to the other portion of the observation made by the Senator, I should like to say that the question of public power in the State of Washington has been before that State for many, many years. It has been decided in that Commonwealth that private and public power interests can live, expand, and develop together harmoniously. Therefore, I have a double interest in protecting respectively the rights of both private and public power.

If the Senator from Idaho, with reference to his expression about Hells Canyon, was correct or could establish with me his feeling as being correct, I would strongly oppose any project by the Federal Government within the State of Idaho, if the Secretary had such authority, the purpose and result of which would be to destroy the legitimate right to an opportunity for private power. I would be against any group or any individuals who sought to destroy the respective rights of either private or public power as they prevail throughout the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. I am sure the junior Senator from Washington appreciates that I desire to render the best service possible to the people of the State of Idaho and, through them, to the Nation.

Mr. CAIN. I am highly conscious of that being a fact.

Mr. WELKER. I am very much alarmed by the trend toward socialization of the power industry, and, now, it appears, of at least a portion of the oil industry. From a beginning with those industries, I should like to know why the Secretary of the Interior could not, then, go into the lead and zinc mines of the wonderful Coeur d'Alene district in the northern part of the State of Idaho. Then where would he go? Would he not be traveling down the road toward state socialism, as Great Britain has done, with the tragic results with which we are familiar? I am unable to see the line of demarcation or foretell where all this is going to lead us. I should like the advice and help of the distinguished Senator from Washington on that matter.

Mr. CAIN. In the remainder of my statement, I shall seek to establish as being true that if the Secretary of the Interior, without authority, is permitted to determine who is entitled to gas and oil rights within the State of Washington, he could most logically exercise a comparable degree of unwarranted authority and power in each and every other State of the Union. I think I am on sound ground, but one cannot be positive about it. I shall try to explain what a logical extension of the doctrine of paramount rights would accomplish, not only with respect to the oil and gas interests, which are the issues at stake in Washington, California, Texas, and Louisiana, but also with respect to the natural resources of the other 44 States.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, may I interrupt for one further question?

Mr. CAIN. I am most pleased to yield to my friend whenever he requests it.

Mr. WELKER. I am somewhat familiar with the problems of my neighboring State of Washington. I am wondering whether or not, if the Secretary of the Interior is permitted the broad authority which I feel he might have under the terms of the bill, he could then go into the fisheries industry and into the oyster beds of the State of Washington, and ultimately go into the whole economy, or at least a portion of the economy, of the sovereign State of Washington. Can the Senator from Washington enlighten me on that feature?

Mr. CAIN. I shall try, because I share the Senator's concern. I have, as best I could, committed to paper my reasons in support of the Senator's contention that an extension of the doctrine of paramount power would violate the rights of States with respect to all the natural resources within their geographical boundaries.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of the interchange between the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Idaho, first with respect to the effect upon fisheries of the pending legislation, I desire to ask the indulgence of the Senator from Washington to make it clear that the measure which is before the Senate contains a specific provision, section 9 of Senate Joint Resolution 20, as amended, which protects the rights of the coastal States with respect to fisheries. There is no attempt on the part of the sponsors of this proposed legislation to take anything away from the States.

SUPREME COURT RULING ON FISHERIES

I may add that the Supreme Court decided in 1948, in the case of Toomer against Witsell, that, as between the State and an individual, with respect to the fisheries, the State has unquestioned jurisdiction.

The sponsors of this joint resolution and the Federal Government, the Department of the Interior and the Department of Justice, insofar as they have been consulted with respect to the measure, are of exactly the same mind. There is nothing in Senate Joint Resolution 20, and nothing in the philosophy which underlies it, which in my opinion invades any rights to which the States can now lay claim. I wish to make that point clear.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Washington will yield to me, I shall endeavor to reply to the Senator from Wyoming, inasmuch as I interjected the controversial matter.

Mr. CAIN. Permit me first to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that my quarrel runs not to the chairman of the committee or to his

associates on the committee. My present quarrel runs to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that.

Mr. CAIN. I have no reason at all to doubt the sincerity of a single word which the Senator from Wyoming says now or at any other time, because I shall always be convinced that he means precisely what he says.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I always endeavor to be candid and factual in whatever I say.

Mr. CAIN. But the point before us, in part, at any rate, is this: If a Secretary of the Interior, representing the administration, is so impatient and careless as to endeavor to determine a line of demarcation when such a line has not yet been established in those cases which have benefited from Supreme Court decisions, then there is simply nothing which that Secretary of the Interior and all others of like mind would not attempt to do. It is for that reason that the junior Senator from Washington seeks, as best he may, to give a logical interpretation of what an extension of the doctrine of paramount rights means to the average layman throughout the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate what the Senator from Washington has said. He talked with me on the floor of the Senate the day after he first inserted in the RECORD the letter from the Secretary of the Interior. I knew of his deep concern, and I felt that he was perfectly justified in expressing concern about the letter at that time. I have sought to obtain some explanation as to what brought about the letter. I expect presently to have a formal letter from the Secretary of the Interior to present upon the floor of the Senate.

SECRETARY ACTED TO PROTECT FEDERAL INTERESTS

In the meantime, let me say to the Senator that this is what I discovered: There is land in the State of Washington which belongs to certain Indians. Some of that land extends to the shore of the sea. I am advised that there came to the Secretary of the Interior only within the past couple of months or so information that an oil well had been drilled, or a lease for that purpose was sought, upon the Indian reservation. It became apparent that other wells had been drilled in tidewater areas on the open Pacific coast of Washington. There was danger that there might possibly be some drainage from the submerged lands which, under the Supreme Court decision, are held to be within the paramount jurisdiction of the Federal Government. It was for the purpose of protecting Federal interests in the lands beneath the open ocean, I understand, that the Secretary acted, and not at all for the purpose of putting his foot in the door, or asserting any extra jurisdiction.

Mr. CAIN. It is a very difficult and complicated problem, although there are several touches of lightness about it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If we could not put in a touch of lightness occasionally it would be a dreary world indeed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am beginning to be impressed with what appears to be a fact. Each time the junior Senator from Washington makes reference to the letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the State of Washington, or reads excerpts from it, the chairman of the committee offers another explanation as to why the letter was written in the first place.

I say in all good humor to my friend, the chairman of the committee, that on yesterday the Department of the Interior had not advised the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that the line of demarcation, as laid down in the Secretary's letter, was landward of certain oil leases now in operation on the shores of Washington State. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming, as of yesterday, read that letter in my presence, and did so most willingly, and it for the first time to the Senator's knowledge—not because the Department of the Interior had thoughtfully called up the Senator from Wyoming and had said so—indicated that the line of demarcation, which line I hold to be illegitimate, would without argument or discussion completely void rights which the State of Washington had assumed it has possessed for a great many years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think it should be clear in the RECORD that the Senator from Wyoming, like the Senator from Washington, has a great many things to do. I had no opportunity, after reading the letter into the RECORD, of calling upon the Secretary of the Interior.

I telephoned to the Secretary of the Interior and I asked him to look at the letter and to be good enough to write me about it. I am now advised that a letter from him is coming. What has been said about it, so far ar I am concerned, has been based upon the facts as they seem to appear.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor this very unusual situation, but it does seem extraordinarily strange to me that, in full knowledge of the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 20 was to come before the Senate, after it had benefited from long weeks of hearings and thought and study by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior did not take the chairman of the committee into his confidence and explain to him, so that the chairman could answer questions on the floor of the Senate, what action the Secretary of the Interior intended to take against the sovereign State of Washington. I am completely puzzled by that situation. I wage this attack from my point of view because, although I have all the trust that is required for the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], I take it to be that the Secretary of the Interior would as ruthlessly run over the rights of the Senator from Wyoming as the Secretary of the Interior presently seeks to destroy what I believe to be rights of the State of Washington. I have no intention of permitting the Secretary of the Interior to do that to my good friend the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Washington for his concern.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for one more observation?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to clarify matters for my distinguished friend the Senator from Wyoming. As the Senator has observed, I was the one who injected into the debate the question of the fisheries and oyster beds. I did it because of my concern with respect to the pyramiding of big government, and the tendency, whether it be a bureau or a department, to go so far afield that private enterprise might well be usurped and done away with. I wanted to make that observation to my friend from Wyoming because I think it should be discussed in this debate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Idaho, and I share his concern about the expansion of big government. I have stated for years without number that unless we find a way to stake out the responsibilities and powers of great corporations with respect to their activities it will be difficult indeed to prevent the continued growth of big government. I am against big government. By every vote and every argument I have made on the floor and in committee I have sought to put restraints upon its expansion.

INABILITY TO CONTROL GIANT CORPORATIONS

However, I believe we must all recognize the fact that some private organizations are of a collectivist character, in that they are collective organizations of stockholders and workers. They operate throughout the length and breadth of the land. They operate in a stratosphere which is far above that in which we walk, breathe, and have our being, and which neither State legislatures nor the Congress itself frequently is able to control.

I seek only to have regulation in the public interest, so that private enterprise and individual enterprise may continue undisturbed.

STATE CONTROL OF FISHERIES

Section 9, which we wrote into the joint resolution, reads as follows:

SEC. 9. The United States consents that the respective States may regulate, manage, and administer the taking, conservation, and development of all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges, kelp, and other marine animal and plant life within the area of the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf lying within the seaward boundary of any State, in accordance with applicable State law.

In that section we feel that we were giving complete recognition to the power of a State within the State's boundaries.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have listened with respect to the comments of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming which he has made against private groups that have collectivist tendencies. The Senator from Wyoming is against such groups. The Senator from Washington wishes to associate himself with his conferee in that respect. However, the Senator from Washington goes one step further. He is equally antagonistic to public groups which are possessed of what he conceives to be collectivist tendencies.

With all seriousness, I must return again and again to the letter of the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the State of Washington, and say that it evidences collectivist tendencies, because the Secretary of the Interior was undeterred by the absence of a court decision, and not the least interested in what a court was finally to determine with regard to the rights of the sovereign State of Washington.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Washington will yield I shall make only one additional comment.

Mr. CAIN. I shall be very pleased to yield to the Senator from Wyoming. In what remains of my remarks at any time that the Senator from Wyoming sees fit to interject an observation I shall welcome his doing so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Washington is very kind. I was merely going to observe that I really see nothing in the Secretary's letter that opens it to a charge of collectivist tendencies. The situation in which we find ourselves is that certain coastal States have been exercising governmental authority to lease lands submerged by the open ocean which the States claim.

Mr. CAIN. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And the Federal Government, under the decision of the Supreme Court in these three cases, has been held to have paramount power in those areas.

I have seen, and indeed have received, letters which asserted that the granting of leases by the Federal Government was somehow or other an aspect of creeping socialism; and in some instances those letters came from officials of States which themselves were granting leases.

NO CREEPING SOCIALISM

I confess that I see no difference between a State government's claiming ownership and granting leases and the Federal Government's doing the same thing. There is no creeping socialism in either one or the other.

With respect to the comment which has been provoked upon this floor by reason of the Hells Canyon Dam bill, members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will assure the Senator from Washington, I am confident, that the chairman of that committee on repeated occasions has stated that in his belief the time has come when the appropriate committees of Congress—and I think the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is one—should make a study of this very intricate and complex problem, so that we may preserve to individuals who desire it the opportunity to enter the field of power, and we should be very careful to see to it that that door of opportunity is not closed either by combinations of big power companies or by public power operations.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I thought I had made myself clear in saying to the Senator from Idaho, who gave rise to the question, that I was not properly informed regarding all the facets of the Hells Canyon Dam question, but that I, as the Senator from Wyoming has just expressed himself, am in complete opposition to either private or public groups which seek without justification to drive either one of the parties out of business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, we are getting down to agreement that we are opposed to either private or public monopoly in any field of endeavor where such monopoly is not essential.

Mr. CAIN. We have said that on repeated occasions.

Mr. President, I have no desire to badger, if that is the correct word, the distinguished chairman of the committee. However, I am reminded that a minute ago he said that, in his opinion, in the letter the Secretary of the Department of the Interior wrote to the Governor of the State of Washington, there was no evidence of a collectivist tendency.

My feeling about that matter is that if the Governor of the State of Washington and others in authority were so lax as to permit the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the intentions which he expressed so clearly in his letter of mid-February, the result would undeniably be collectivism.

Mr. President, the nationalization zealots in the Department of the Interior are, in my opinion, far too clever to tip their hand all at once. By slowly chewing up one State at a time, they are avoiding the explosion of public indignation that would logically follow any attempt to swallow in one giant gulp the natural resources of all 48 States.

These persons are playing a cautious and skillful game for tremendous stakes—control of the natural resources and wealth of the Nation. Their patience and skill would do credit to the masters of political corruption in the Kremlin, who also believe that the national government should own all natural resources everywhere.

What is this "paramount power" that the Interior Department claims to possess? We must not look for it in the Constitution or in laws passed by Congress. We shall not find it in either source.

Instead, we must look at the Supreme Court's tidelands decision against California. Perhaps others would be disturbed and moved to action if the doctrine created there were now being directly applied to their State and were undermining its constitutional foundation.

Under the Constitution, Mr. President, the Federal Government used to be required to condemn property it could not acquire otherwise for national purposes. That was fair, for the fifth amendment guaranteed the owners of such property due process of law and just compensation.

Under the strange and dangerous "paramount power" doctrine, this constitutional procedure is no longer required. All the Federal Government has to do is what the Secretary of the Interior is attempting to do right now to Washington, namely, merely to assert—that is all he has done; he has asserted—a claim of "paramount rights, full dominion and power."

At the moment the Secretary of the Interior has said that the right shall run to only two natural resources, gas and oil. What that Secretary may say tomorrow, I am not qualified to judge.

Using the State of Washington as an example, there has been no due process of law in the form of direct court action and there has been no offer of just compensation. Mr. President, just by the mere assertion of "paramount power," your State, too, might be stripped of any lands and natural resources for which the Interior Department happens to lust.

If you find this hard to believe, Mr. President, analyze the Supreme Court's decision. Minus the legal frills, it runs like this:

First. Fighting wars is the paramount responsibility of the Federal Government. States cannot fight wars alone.

Second. It is the Federal Government's paramount responsibility to protect the Nation from dangers incident to its location and from wars raged on or too near its coasts.

Third. To do this, it must have powers of dominion and regulation.

From this, the Court slides mysteriously into this amazing conclusion:

> Whatever of value may be discovered in the seas next to its shores and within its protective belt, will most naturally be appropriated for its use.

In this age of air power and guided missiles, our military authorities tell us that no area in the United States is safe from attack. Our common sense concurs. No one would seriously contend that the Nation's protective belt is confined just to Washington, California, Texas, and Louisiana, or just to the coastal States alone.

Obviously, the Federal Government's paramount responsibility to protect the Nation applies to every square foot of land in the Nation; and going hand-in-hand with this paramount responsibility are the Federal Government's paramount rights, full dominion and power, which, according to the Supreme Court, enable it to appropriate whatever of value may be discovered within its protective belt.

Is it any wonder that dissenting Justice Frankfurter thinks this paramount power applies to uranium whether located in Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, Kentucky, or Tennessee? Is it any wonder that dissenting Justice Reed thinks this confiscatory power extends to every river, farm, mine, and factory in the Nation?

Mr. President, I am not possessed of a legal background or a legal mind. These two Justices, Justice Frankfurter and Justice Reed, are. Before we make haste to take action on Senate Joint Resolution 20, I think we had better give considered thought to the dissents to the doctrine of paramount rights as written and expressed by Justice Frankfurter and Justice Reed.

Between the two, they have said and have restated that the confiscatory power inherent in the doctrine of paramount rights extends to every river, farm, mine, and factory, as well as to every square foot of land, whatever its character, throughout our Nation.

What other States have natural resources which the Interior Department might consider necessary, in the Court's

words, "to preserve that peace" which is the "paramount responsibility" of the Federal Government? To make sure that the rich oil deposits in California's submerged coastal lands would be taken over under this definition, the Supreme Court specifically mentioned that they might be the subject of a war.

I trust that my colleagues will share my concern when they learn what natural resources in their States the Secretary of the Interior believes are subject to his "paramount power." I hope the information I am about to offer will arouse the citizens of all 48 States to demand that the Interior Department's plan to confiscate their properties be stopped, and stopped fast, at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks at this point a list of some minerals in all of the States which has been compiled from official Interior Department records. These minerals are officially described by the Interior Department as "necessary for the welfare and security of the United States and a free world." Thus, they come within the scope of the Federal Government's "paramount rights, full dominion, and power" and are subject to Federal confiscation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAJOR MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES BY STATES

WYOMING

Oil in these fields: Big Sand Draw, Byron-Garland, Elk Basin, Hamilton Dome, Lost Soldier-Wertz, Frannie, Lance Creek, Oregon Basin, and Salt Creek.

Coal in these counties: Campbell, Carbon, Converse, and Sheridan.

NEW MEXICO

Oil in these fields: Eunice, Monument, Hobbs, Arrowhead, Vacuum, and Maljamar.

Copper ores in these districts: Central (including Santa Rita), Lordsburg, and Burro Mountain.

ALABAMA

Oil in all coastal submerged lands and the counties of Mobile, Baldwin, and Escambia.

Coal in these counties: Bibb, Blount, Jefferson, St. Clair, Tuscaloosa, and Walker.

ARIZONA

Copper and zinc ores in these districts: Copper Mountain (Morenci), Globe-Miami, Ajo, Pioneer (Superior), Mineral Creek (Ray), Verde (Jerome), Warren (Bisbee), Eureka (Bagdad), Big Bug, Pima, Old Hat, Cochise, and Aravaipa.

Copper and zinc ores in these mines: Copper Queen, Iron Cornelia, Inspiration, Miami, Castle Dome, Magma, Ray Mines, and Bagdad.

ARKANSAS

Oil in these fields: Atlanta, Schuler, Smackover, Magnolia, Midway, Stephens, McKamie, and Dorcheat-Macedonia.

Coal in these counties: Franklin, Johnson, Logan, Pope, Scott, and Sebastian.

COLORADO

Oil in these fields: Rangely, Wilson Creek, and Iles.

Zinc ores in the Eagle and Kokomo Unit mines and in these districts: Red Cliff, Ten Mile, California (Leadville), Upper San Miguel, Tomichi, Sneffels, and Animas.

CONNECTICUT

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Sand and gravel deposits.

DELAWARE

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Sand and gravel deposits.

FLORIDA

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Phosphate rock.

GEORGIA

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.
Cement.

IDAHO

Lead and zinc ores in these mines: Bunker Hill and Sullivan, Page, Star, Morning, and Sherman.

Lead and zinc ores in these districts: Yreka, Hunter, and Lelande.

ILLINOIS

Oil in these fields: Clay City, Louden, New Harmony-Keensburg, Sailor Springs, Salem and East Inman.

Coal in these counties: Fulton, Knox, Perry, Randolph, Williamson, Grundy and Will.

INDIANA

Coal and oil in these counties: Pike, Warrick, Clay, Sullivan, Knox, Daviess, Posey and Gibson.

IOWA

Coal in these counties: Marion, Mahaska, Wapello, Van Buren, Jasper and Monroe.
Cement.

KANSAS

Oil in these counties: Wabaunsee, Phillips, Rooks, Barton, Ellis, Stafford and Butler. The entire scope of these fields should be included: Trapp, Silica-Raymond, Kraft-Prusa, Bemis-Shutts, Burnett and Bloomer.
Cement.

KENTUCKY

Coal in these counties: Hopkins, Muhlenberg, Ohio, Webster, Daviess, Boyd and Clay.

Fluorspar in the counties of Crittenden and Livingston and including these mines: Blue, Commodore, Delhi-Babb, Keystone, Pigmy, Tabb No. 1 and Yandell No. 22.

MAINE

Marine life in all coastal waters and submerged lands including all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges and kelp.
Cement.

MARYLAND

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.

Marine life in all coastal waters and submerged lands including all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges and kelp.

MASSACHUSETTS

Oil in all coastal submerged lands.

Marine life in all coastal waters and submerged lands including all fish, shrimp, oysters, clams, crabs, lobsters, sponges and kelp.

MICHIGAN

Iron ore in the Marquette and Gogebic ranges and including these mines: Mather, Maas, Geneve, Anvil - Palms - Keweenaw, Athens and Penokee.

Copper in these mines: Calumet and Hecla Consolidated, Quincy and Champion.

MINNESOTA

Iron ore in the Mesabi and Cuyuna ranges and including these mines: Hull Rust, Rouchleau, Mahoning, Monoroe-Tener, Sherman, Mountain Iron, Gross Marble, Walker, Kevin, Hill-Trumbell, Gilbert, Hill Annex, Pillsbury, Mississippi, Hawkins and Canton.

Manganese ore in the Cuyuna range.

MISSISSIPPI

Oil in all coastal submerged lands and in these fields: Tinsley, Mallalieu, Brookhaven, Cranfield, La Grange, Baxterville, and Heidelberg.

Natural gas in these fields: Gwinville, Baxterville, Carthage, Soso, Sandy Hook, Hub, Jackson, and Fayette.

MISSOURI

Lead ores in these mines: Federal, Leadwood, Mine La Motte, Bonne Terre, Madison, and Desloge.

Coal in these counties: Macon, Henry, Callaway, Bates, Barton, Vernon, Randolph, St. Clair, and Monroe.

MONTANA

Oil in these fields: Elk Basin, Cutbank, Big Wall, Kevin-Sunburst, Pondera, Ragged Point, and Regan.

Copper ores in these counties: Silver Bow, Park, Madison, Lewis and Clark, Cascade, Beaverhead, and Sanders.

NEBRASKA

Cement.
Sand and gravel.

NEVADA

Copper ore in these districts: Yellow Pine, Delano, Mountain City, Battle Mountain, Jack Rabbit, Pioche, and Robinson.

Zinc ores in these districts: Yellow Pine, Railroad, Ruby Range, Spruce Mountain, Eureka, Battle Mountain, Comet, Jack Rabbit, Pioche, and Tem Piute.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Sand and gravel.
Beryllium ore.

NEW JERSEY

Zinc ore throughout the State and including the Franklin and Sterling Hill mine.
Sand and gravel.

NEW YORK

Iron ore in these areas: Mineville, Lyon Mountain, Degrasse, Star Lake, and Oneida County.
Oil in all fields.

NORTH CAROLINA

Sand and gravel.
Talc and pyrophyllite.

NORTH DAKOTA

Coal.
Sand and gravel.

OHIO

Coal particularly in these counties: Belmont, Columbiana, Harrison, Jefferson, Muskingum, Noble, Perry, Stark, and Athens.
Lime.

OKLAHOMA

Oil in all fields, including Velma, Sholem-Alchem, Oklahoma City, Cement, Burbank, Cumberland, Cushing, and Seminole.

Coal in all counties, including Rogers, Okmulgee, Muskogee, Latimer, Coal, Haskell, and Tulsa.

OREGON

Sand and gravel.

Gold in the counties of Baker, Curry, Grant, Jackson, Josephine, Lane, and Union and including these districts: Canyon, Bohemia, Cracker Creek, and Green Mountain.

PENNSYLVANIA

Coal and oil.

RHODE ISLAND

Sand and gravel.
Graphite.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Cement.
Vermiculite.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Gold in St. Lawrence County and including these mines: Homestake, Portland, Dakota, Clinton, Two Johns, and Trojan.
Sand and gravel.

TENNESSEE

Coal in these counties: Marion, Grundy, Campbell, Claiborne, Van Buren, Sequatchie, and Scott.
Cement.

UTAH

Copper and zinc in these counties: Salt Lake, Juab, Tooele, Wasatch, Utah, Beaver, Summit, Washington, and Piute.

VERMONT

Asbestos in the Lowell area.
Copper in the Orange County area.

VIRGINIA

Coal in these counties: Buchanan, Russell, Tazewell, and Wise.
Cement.

WEST VIRGINIA

Coal in all counties, including: Harrison, Fayette, Barbour, Brooke, Mingo, Mercer, and Raleigh.
Oil in all fields, including Silverton field.

WISCONSIN

Sand and gravel.
Iron ore in the Gogebic district and including the Montreal Mine.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it will be noted that I have listed only two of the major minerals being produced in each State. In every case there are others importantly essential to national defense.

However, since the Federal Government has established a pattern of trying to confiscate only two resources—oil and gas—in the four States presently under attack, I assume the same pattern will carry through to the other States as they are attacked. If so, the Secretary of the Interior could argue with some logic that national defense is a burden common to all 48 States and should be shared equally by them.

Senate Joint Resolution 20, now before the Senate as a national defense matter, certainly does not distribute this common burden equitably. It singles out two resources—oil and gas—in only four States for permanent Federal control. It is discriminatory on its face.

Senate Joint Resolution 20 also would give congressional recognition to the strange and dangerous doctrine of "paramount rights, full dominion and power." Such congressional approval would give the Interior Department encouragement to proceed immediately with a Nation-wide program of collectivization and nationalization of all basic natural resources of all 48 States.

Because Senate Joint Resolution 20 appears to me to be discriminatory and dangerous, I oppose it as vigorously as I can. I hope my colleagues, in the interest of preserving constitutional guaranties protecting private property and States' rights, will also oppose it.

Senate bill 940, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and 34 other Senators, including myself, would restore the law to what it was before this deliberate attempt to destroy States' rights began. It also would immediately clear the way for the full resumption of oil development and production in the States' submerged coastal lands—something the States have demonstrated they can do more quickly, efficiently, and profitably than the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to enact Senate bill 940 into law quickly, as a substitute, and over a Presidential veto, if that action becomes necessary. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE HELLS CANYON PROJECT

During the delivery of Mr. CAIN's speech,

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I have heretofore addressed myself to the Senator from Washington with respect to certain features of the Hells Canyon bill. I want the Senate to know that I am trying to study that bill with particular interest, without partisan politics, and without a desire to be pressurized by any person, regardless of which side of the controversy he may take.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and following the remarks of the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], a letter from Mr. Carl H. Swanstrom, attorney and counsellor at law, of Council, Idaho, dated March 8, 1952, and addressed to me. It sets forth the writer's philosophy with respect to the Hells Canyon project.

I may say to the Senate that Mr. Swanstrom is known to me to be a lifelong Democrat, a man who has taken an active part in the work of the Democratic Party within the State of Idaho. I appreciate his remarks to me as contained in this letter. They are the profound observations of a very learned man, who is thinking of the welfare of his country, rather than in terms of political or pressure philosophy. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, and at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Washington.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNCIL, IDAHO, *March 8, 1952.*

DEAR HERMAN: I note by today's paper that Senator MORSE has introduced the Hells Canyon Act and accompanied it with an impassioned plea for its approval.

My notion about this project has not altered and I feel there are quite a number of folks here who were favorable to it when first proposed but now feel entirely different about it. That is something from a group of people living alongside such a gigantic project and who, reasonably, might be expected to profit most by it.

If there should come a time and place when the voice of a very small pebble from the folks back home might be heard to advantage, I would be glad to speak up. Before the high-powered public power advocates I might make a sorry witness but somehow I have always felt that sincerity of belief overcomes a lot of deficiencies in coping with that sort of stuff.

As I remarked in my former letter, we must start at home on projects of this sort, otherwise there can be no real merit in our roar about other follies committed farther away. Hells Canyon looks awfully attractive to people in certain businesses at nearby points and the immediate benefits during construction, or, possibly, from resulting tourist trade, blind them to the long-term picture of impossible Federal debt, to still further Government controls and to a one-man dictatorship of 90 percent of the electric power of the Northwest.

We have a very-small-business man here who has been red hot for the Hells Canyon project—(he bought up every lot in town he could get tied up)—and when I asked him if Federal control of power was such a wonderful thing for this area, why wouldn't it be even better to have Uncle Sam run the railroad, the sawmill, the bank and take over our farm and livestock industry as well, he had no answer except to say "Well, that's different," which is about as good an explanation as we can get from the boys who are leading the pack.

Best regards,

CARL.

PURCHASES OF SURPLUS WAR MATERIALS BY DES MOINES UNIVERSITY OF LAWSONOMY

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated January 31, 1952, addressed to Mr. Jess Larson, in which I requested information regarding a certain transaction in which his agency has been engaged.

I have been advised that the reply to my letter was prepared last Tuesday and was available for Mr. Larson's signature. I understand that a copy of the letter was submitted to a Democratic Member of the Senate on last Friday, and has been awaiting clearance in order that I might receive a reply to my letter.

I most respectfully ask Mr. Larson to expedite the clearance of the reply to my letter with the Democratic National Committee if he thinks that is necessary.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1952.

Mr. JESS LARSON,
Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LARSON: I understand that the Des Moines University of Lawsonomy, Des Moines, Iowa, has purchased a substantial amount of surplus war materials at the usual educational institution discount.

Please furnish me with a list of the sales which have been made to this institution, including a list of the materials, the total cost to the Government, the sales price, and the percentage discounts allowed, along with the net amount received by the Government.

Who are the operators of this university, and is the material being used by the university strictly for education purposes?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I inserted in the RECORD a letter dated January 31, which I addressed to Mr. Jess Larson, whom I criticized for not forwarding more directly to me his reply.

Since that time I have received the reply, which was sent to me by special messenger.

I wish to express to Mr. Larson my appreciation and at the same time to express the hope that in the future replies will come more promptly.

I request that this statement be printed in the RECORD following the statement I made earlier this afternoon regarding this matter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington D. C., March 7, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: As I advised you by letter of February 6, 1952, I directed my Compliance Division to obtain the information you requested concerning surplus property acquired by the Des Moines University of Lawsonomy, Des Moines, Iowa.

The Compliance Division has completed a check of the records of War Assets Administration and has determined that disposals were made to this institution on 7 documents numbered 3106355, 3106356, 3106357, 3106358, and 4780865, 4780920, 4780928. Photostat copies of these documents are enclosed, and it is believed they reflect all the data you requested, with the exception of the acquisition costs and the net amounts received by the Government. This information is furnished you in an additional enclosure.

You will observe that discounts of 40 percent and 95 percent were granted this institution on its purchases. These discounts were allowed as the result of the assignment of certification symbol 13–F–28 to this institution by the Educational Agency for Surplus and Excess Property of the State of Iowa, indicating that the Des Moines University of Lawsonomy was eligible to purchase surplus property at a discount.

In December 1948 the War Assets Administration was advised by the county attorney of Polk County, Iowa, that this school had been denied tax exemption as a nonprofit educational institution by the local authorities, although it had been exempt from Federal income tax by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Inquiries were then initiated to determine the qualifications of the university to purchase surplus property at discounts allowed educational institutions.

During the course of this inquiry Public Law 152 was enacted transferring compliance responsibility in such cases to the Federal Security Agency which, I am informed, has been conducting an investigation to determine the manner in which the university utilized the surplus property. It is my understanding that the Federal Security Agency has referred its findings to the Department of Justice for such action as may be necessary to protect the interest of the Government.

I trust this information is sufficient for your purposes.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON,
Administrator.

Breakdown of purchases made by Des Moines University of Lawsonomy, Des Moines, Iowa, from War Assets Administration

Sales Document	Item	Acquisition cost	Total acquisition cost	Net amount received by Government
3106355	1	$12,454.00		
	2	1,275.00		
	3	280.32		
	4	280.32		
	5	485.70		
	6	735.00		
	7	6,790.00		
	8	7,993.00		
	9	217.80		
	10	6,827.50		
	11	1,300.00		
	12	581.38		
	13	7,720.00		
	14	8,864.01		
	15	1,023.40		
	16	16,358.44		
	17	7,398.57		
	18	$7,398.57		
	19	7,067.54		
	20	2,280.00		
	21	8,218.00		
	22	2,905.00		
	23	4,955.00		
	24	6,982.00		
	25	4,701.54		
	26	14,379.10		
	27	8,562.10	$147,959.29	$1,764.76
3106356	1	2,900.00		
	2	484.02	3,384.02	83.69
3106357	1	2,903.00		
	2	2,903.00	5,806.00	38.86
3106358	1	1,500.00	1,500.00	48.90
4780920	1	25,135.00		
	2	2,445.00		
	3	2,445.00	30,025.00	340.38
4780928	1	445.00		
	2	6,798.00	7,243.00	74.10
4780865	1	8,500.00	8,500.00	2,129.40
		Grand total acquisition cost.	204,417.31	4,480.09

AMENDMENT OF HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce a bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the appropriate committee.

The bill (S. 2839) to continue beyond June 30, 1953, authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1, the Housing Act of 1949, approved July 15, 1949, is hereby amended as follows: (a) In the first sentence of section 511 immediately following the phrase "July 1, 1951" strike the word "and" and insert at the end of the sentence just before the period a comma and the language "and such additional sums on and after July 1, 1953, as the Congress may from time to time determine." (b) At the end of section 512 just before the period insert a comma and the language "and to make additional commitments on and after July 1, 1953, for additional contributions aggregating not more than $2,000,000 per annum." (c) In section 513 just before the last semicolon insert a comma and the language "and such further amounts on and after July 1, 1953, as the Congress may from time to time determine."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced proposes to amend and extend certain sections of Public Law 171 of the Eighty-first Congress. That law for the first time provided a housing program for farmers. The program was established on a rather experimental basis, for only three fiscal years, and we provided that appropriations might be made to carry out the commitments during those three fiscal years. That has but one more fiscal year to run. Therefore, I have felt it essential that this Congress take action to extend it, in order that proper authorizations may be made, so the purpose of the bill which I have introduced is to extend that law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an explanation of exactly what the bill I have introduced seeks to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTIONS 511, 512, AND 513 OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Section 511 of the Public Law 171, Eighty-first Congress, approved July 15, 1949, authorized the Secretary of Agriculture to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as the Congress might determine for the purpose of making loans under Farm Housing Title of certain specified amounts on and after July 1, 1949, July 1, 1950, July 1, 1951, and July 1, 1952. These provisions constituted the basic authority for annual appropriations. There is no provision constituting such authority for appropriations after the fiscal year 1953 for additional loans for farm housing and other farm buildings.

It is the purpose of the amendment to section 511 to provide the necessary basic authority for annual appropriations for the continuation of the loans for farm housing and other farm buildings under this act.

In connection with loans made under section 503 of the act, the Secretary is authorized to make commitments for contributions, in the form of credits on borrowers' notes, under certain specified conditions. This authority is described in terms of authority to execute contribution agreements aggregating not to exceed certain specified amounts on and after July 1, 1949, and July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively. There is no authorization to enter into agreements after the fiscal year 1953 for contributions in connection with section 503 loans. The proposed amendment would make the authority for contribution agreements permanent legislation.

Section 513 of the act constitutes the basic authority for appropriations to the Secretary of Agriculture when necessary to match the credits made on borrowers notes under section 503 so that the Secretary of Agriculture will be in a position to repay his obligation to the Secretary of the Treasury on borrowings under section 511. Section 513 also authorizes the appropriations of certain specified sums for grants under section 504 (a) and for loans for temporary improvements and for enlargement and development of farms under section 504 (b). This authorization is limited to specific amounts for the fiscal years 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953. There is no authority for appropriations for the purposes of section 513 after the fiscal year 1953. The proposed amendment would provide such basic authority.

The provision in section 513c, for such further appropriations as may be necessary, covers only administrative expenses, technical services, and research, but it is in the nature of permanent authorization for annual appropriations for such purposes and needs no extension.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the

Senate to the fact that in 2 years of successful operation farmers have obtained under this law approximately 11,750 loans, aggregating $53,115,000. In my State of Alabama, 580 loans have been made, totaling $2,650,000. It has not only been good for the farmers, but it has also proved a sound financial operation.

Speaking again of the experience within my State of Alabama, 98 percent of the farmers in that State who have obtained these loans have met their payments, and the other 2 percent are, on an average, less than $200 in arrears. I believe that any businessman will agree that this is a very fine financial record.

The program is intended for farmers who cannot obtain loans from banks and other lending institutions. With a 4 percent loan for a period as long as 33 years, a farmer is able to build a new home or to modernize his old one, and to construct new farm buildings, in order to make his farm more profitable.

We have long had an effective housing program for urban areas. The farmer ought to have the same privileges under Federal housing legislation as the city dweller. The first farm home loan in the United States under this law was made to a young man, a veteran of World War II, living in Jackson County, Ala. It was my pleasure to be present at the closing of that loan. Veterans, especially, have benefited under the program. They are receiving nearly 40 percent of all the loans which are being made.

Mr. President, according to the 1950 census, there is a critical need for the farm-housing program. The census reported that more than one-fifth of America's 6,500,000 farm dwellings are in a dilapidated condition. More than three-fourths of all farm houses lack hot water, private bath, and toilet facilities.

I could go on and enumerate many other deficiencies in housing on the farms. In speaking of slum areas we nearly always think of them as applying only to urban areas, but we have but to look at the census figures to realize that some of the most critical housing needs are in farm areas.

Mr. President, the law has been in operation nearly 2 years, and it has operated well; it has been highly successful. I believe it should be extended as a permanent part of our over-all housing program, and it is for that purpose that I have introduced the bill, S. 2839.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20), to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Wyoming if he accepts the amendment which I offered?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. As I stated to the Senator earlier in the day, I should be very glad to accept the amendment with the modification which the Senator suggested.

Mr. LONG. We were unable to agree on that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thought the Senator and I had agreed that it would be a very helpful thing, in view of the accumulation of work upon all Members of Congress, if we had the benefit of the work which has been done by the special master appointed by the Supreme Court to take evidence. I should be very happy to accept the amendment if it were preceded by a statement to the effect that when the special master's report shall have been received by the Supreme Court and his recommendations shall have been made, Congress shall then act, adopting the language of the Senator's amendment. I should be very happy to accept it in that form.

Mr. LONG. I would be willing, provided we can anticipate the master's recommendations being made some time soon. The master has been 4 years hearing the case.

CONGRESS' POWERS TO DELIMIT BOUNDARIES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We can make a legislative record here, indicating with absolute clarity that the amendment should not be interpreted as inhibiting the right of Congress to act whenever it pleases. It is a legislative matter, and I have no hesitation in saying that even without the Senator's amendment the Congress has the power and can delimit the seaward boundaries.

Mr. LONG. Congress has the right to determine the marginal limits and where the lines are by which those limits can be determined. If any branch of the Federal Government has a right to determine what the boundaries should be, it is the Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator, but the trouble is that the determination of these boundaries involves a great deal of technical knowledge, engineering surveys, coast and geodetic surveys, and all that sort of complex, technical knowledge which it is impossible for Congress to have before it and consider at this time. If the special master is doing that, we might as well have the advantage of his work. I shall certainly be very glad to accept the amendment with that slight modification.

Mr. LONG. The matter would be in conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I shall be glad to modify my amendment in accordance with the Senator's idea. The only point I had in mind was that I do not believe that Congress should necessarily wait in the event that years of additional work are necessary on the part of the master.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think there is nothing in the proposed amendment which the Senator proposes to offer to the amendment I have offered which would prevent Congress from acting any time within its judgment.

Mr. President, the amendment which the Senator from Louisiana sent forward to the desk reads as follows:

> In the appropriate place, insert the following language: "*Provided*, That the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the several States shall be established by the Congress of the United States by legislative enactment."

If we can modify it to this effect:

> *Provided*, That when the special master's report in the case of the *United States* v. *California* shall have been received and his recommendations shall have been made to the Supreme Court, then the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the several States shall be established by the Congress of the United States by legislative enactment.

Perhaps that should be changed just a little, to say:

> *Provided*, That when the report of the special master in the case of *United States* v. *California*, with respect to the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of California, shall have been received and his recommendations made to the Supreme Court of the United States, then the seaward boundaries of the inland or internal waters of the several States shall be established by the Congress of the United States by legislative enactment.

Mr. LONG. An amendment in that form would prevent Congress from acting until the special master had concluded his work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then let us add the following words:

> But this provision shall not be construed as a limitation upon the legislative power of the Congress.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I shall withdraw my amendment, to avoid further confusion.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let it not be said that the Senator from Wyoming was unwilling to compromise.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I withdraw the call for a quorum.

Senators who have come to the floor of the Senate have discussed with me the proposal which I desire to make, namely, that the pending amendment may now be adopted by the Senate subject to the order that if any Member of the Senate on Wednesday or Thursday desires to ask for its reconsideration it may be so ordered, and the matter will be treated de novo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the withdrawal of the quorum call? The Chair hears none, and the order for a quorum call is rescinded, and further proceedings under the call will be suspended.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, has the Senator from Wyoming accepted the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have told the Senator from Louisiana that I shall be very happy to accept that amendment in the form in which I last dictated it to the reporter.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. For the information of the Senate, may we have the reporter read the amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will ask that the reporter come to the floor and read the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana withdrew his amendment, did he not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Chair is correct. The Senator from Louisiana withdrew his amendment, but while the quorum call was proceeding I discussed the matter with him and told him that I would be very happy to accept the amendment, and he agreed to it. So, on behalf of the Senator from Louisiana and myself, I offer the amendment as I have dictated it to the reporter.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As amended by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland request the reading of the amendment?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As I understand, tomorrow we are to have a special order of business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is why I specified Wednesday or Thursday in my proposal. On either day the matter may be reopened.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. In other words, under the rules of the Senate, the matter may be reopened on either of the next 2 days of actual session following the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. LONG. Will the Chair have the amendment, as modified, read?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not have the modification at hand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I ask unanimous consent that since the reporter who took the dictation is not now on the floor and the transcription is not available, it may be possible for the Senator from Louisiana and myself to agree to any modification of the language as dictated which may appear to be essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming to be permitted, as the Chair understands, to confer with the Senator from Louisiana——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe the request is included in the original unanimous-consent request, anyway.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I withdraw any objection I may have had to the amendment as dictated by the Senator from Wyoming? I did not hear it at the moment, but I am sure the Senator dictated it in substance as we agreed on it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to with the modification he has specified. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment, as modified, is agreed to.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming that the amendment be open to reconsideration on request of any Senator?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that request is not necessary now, since the rule is that the amendment may be reopened at any time within the next 2 days. If the language is not satisfactory, if it does not express the thought of the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Wyoming, we shall have no difficulty in modifying it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that it would require unanimous consent for the amendment to be reconsidered.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is agreed to under those considerations.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, when a Senator introduces a piece of proposed legislation he never can be sure what the response will be. On the 25th of February I introduced a bill, Senate bill 2723, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act.

On February 28, 1952, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, in its report No. 631, commented on that legislative suggestion. It commented, I think, a little unfairly. It commented certainly in a spirit which prompts me to say a few words about it. It referred to the fact that the bill had been introduced, and said:

> The bill also proposes to repeal the provisions of the present law waiving the second- and third-year rentals.

Those who are familiar with the procedure realize that an applicant, when he makes his application, pays 50 cents, which is supposed to cover the first and second-year rental. He was never billed for the third-year rental by virtue of provisions now in the law. That, to be sure, is changed in the proposed legislative suggestion which was made to the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Congress of the United States. That change was made at the suggestion of many people who think it is time to take a look at the situation and decide whether there should be 2 years in which rental is not paid.

I have no private opinion about it one way or the other. It is included solely for the purpose of permitting the committee considering it to see if conditions have changed in recent years. The reason for that is that in the beginning, when people made application for oil and gas prospecting permits, sometimes as much as a year or a year and half was required before the permit was acted upon.

Naturally it was unfair to require a person to pay rental while the Government was delaying approval of his lease or prospecting permit.

Now it takes but 6 weeks. Therefore it seemed logical to me to ask the question whether or not that provision should be reviewed.

The report of the Independent Petroleum Association of America stated further:

> It is understandable that some resentment is felt at the recent New Mexico lottery held by the Interior Department. The bill does not prevent such lottery; on the other hand, it legalizes such procedure at the election of the Secretary.

I suggest, Mr. President, that that is a pretty bad distortion, which an honest man would not make. The bill does not legalize any such thing. It permits the Secretary to continue what he is now doing, but it is no new grant of power to the Secretary.

My interest in this matter arose when I tried to point out to the Department of the Interior officials that I did not think the lottery which they conducted in New Mexico was the best example in the world of how well the Department of the Interior could administer the submerged lands off the coast of the United States if they ever acquired them. I suggested that it might be better if the Department of the Interior would give those of us who had been trying to support the Department a little ground for support, instead of conducting that type of lottery.

The answer of the Department of the Interior, and a truthful answer it was, was that under the law it had no option; that if they had had a law which would have permitted them to sell these leases at competitive bidding, they could have used it, but under the law they could do nothing else than what they did.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator's bill provide that the royalties which the Government can obtain shall be limited to 12½ percent, as the law stands at the present time, for prospects which have not been at all developed or proven?

Mr. ANDERSON. It provides that it shall be not less than 12½ percent.

Mr. LONG. It might then be possible for the Secretary to obtain more for the Government, might it not?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; and I think there may be instances in which the Secretary should obtain more for the Government. After all, the lands he was leasing had been regarded as oil lands. It is true that there had never actually been any oil found there, because potash was being developed, and this country badly needed the production of potash. Therefore, as a measure of protection to potash the oil companies were not permitted to come in and sink their drill holes and destroy the potash fields. An agreement has been worked out under which we feel sure that those who are prospecting for oil will so conduct their operations that they will not destroy the potash.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe that the Senator's bill is a very much needed improvement to the Mineral Leasing Act. Off the State of Louisiana we have found that when companies are able to bid competitively, a company which might not be able to put up as much money will offer to give the State a much higher percentage of the return from oil. I believe that in the long run it would be found that a smaller cash consideration, but a larger percentage of the minerals to be derived from production, would be in the interest of the Government and would bring the Government substantially more money.

It is urged by some that such a policy could be carried to such an extreme that perhaps a person might give the Government 75 percent of any oil or gas or other minerals produced, and keep only 25 percent for himself. Perhaps it might be carried too far, but certainly, within reasonable limits, I believe that the Government should look into the possibility of receiving a better return, in the interest of the Government, by receiving a higher percentage royalty than the one-eighth which has been the limit up to this time.

Mr. ANDERSON. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana that while it was contemplated in this legislation to continue the 12½ percent on leases with respect to lands which were not known to be oil lands, it was the expectation that when we entered the hearing before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs this suggestion, which has been made previously several times in the committee by the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators, could be afforded an opportunity for examination. If there is no reason to change the law, if conditions have not changed, we should not alter it. But some of us have noted that the potentates of some of the lands lying to the east are getting half the profits from oil. I do not know whether that is right or wrong, but I believe that it would be well to take a look at the situation. That was the sole purpose which I had in mind. However, I do not think it is right to say that the bill legalizes a lottery, when the Secretary of the Interior had to have a lottery under the present law, and himself said that he could do nothing else.

I am a little surprised that this sort of a statement should be made by the Independent Petroleum Association of America:

> This proposal has implications of serious consequences. It changes the concept of the Federal Government as the trustee for public lands for the benefit of the citizens to that of landlord.

I should like to have the man who wrote that tell me where, in the few simple words of the bill, he finds anything which "changes the concept of the Federal Government as the trustee for public lands for the benefit of the citizens to that of landlord."

The report continues:

> It tends to remove the competitive element for oil exploration of oil on the public lands heretofore furnished by the thousands of individual citizens of the United States and leaves such activities to be enjoyed only by large collections of wealth such as is possible only in large corporations.

I submit that that is as farfetched as it could be. It so happens that I have always believed, and always will believe, in affording opportunity for small individuals and small independent operators to prospect for oil. The strange thing is that the man who signs this report knows that to be a fact. He says:

> It makes possible the gradual closing down of operations for oil on the public lands such as was done in the late twenties by withdrawing the public lands from leasing.

I say that it is regrettable that an institution which considers itself to be reputable should have anyone in its employ who will say that that is the purpose of a piece of legislation which clearly is not within its intendment at all.

I stated at the time the bill was introduced that my primary purpose was to make it possible for the Secretary of the Interior, in cases in which lands had been withdrawn and held a long time, until the development of oil was relatively sure, to lease such lands by some method other than by the type of lottery conducted in Santa Fe, N. Mex., several months ago. Nearly everyone agreed that that lottery was a bad thing. Yet when someone tries to correct the situation the Independent Petroleum Association of America indulges in that sort of propaganda.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. During the past several years while I have been a Member of this body both the junior Senator from Louisiana and other members of the Louisiana congressional delegation have put a considerable number of insertions in the RECORD which indicated that the State of Louisiana had been able to get far more in leasing State lands than the Federal Government had been able to obtain in leasing Federal lands. All that the Federal Government could get was 50 cents an acre and one-eighth of the royalty interest, whereas with competitive bidding the State of Louisiana has been getting twice that much. It has been getting as much as $10 and $20 an acre and one-sixth of the royalty interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Louisiana knows that when that was done by the State of Louisiana it did not close down oil operations all over the United States.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from New Mexico will find that in some cases it even accelerated production.

Mr. ANDERSON. The report of the Independent Petroleum Association goes on further and says that this bill, S. 2723, which I introduced—

> would enable the few large oil companies now holding great concessions in foreign countries to use the benefits from these concessions to out-bid the American individual citizen and withhold from development our own lands while we would be forced to buy our needed oil supplies from those few companies at terms dictated by them.

Mr. President, sometimes I wonder how far the decency of men will let them go, when they put out filth of that nature reflecting on an individual who is not trying to destroy the oil industry but is trying to help it in every way he can.

The report goes on to say:

> Through the provisions of this bill we would make possible a world monopoly of oil where a few companies could determine the future of our defense program as well as our domestic economy.

Mr. President, when I read that I realized that I was apparently doing things which the eminent lawyers for the great oil companies had never been able to do. In other words, apparently, I had been setting up a world monopoly for oil. We know that under decisions of the Supreme Court oil companies have been broken up under the antimonopoly section of the law. Yet here, by a few words which give the Secretary of the Interior authority to require competitive bidding, in instances which I had clearly explained, it is charged that I was doing something that no one else had ever been able to accomplish. I am deeply appreciative of the compliment, but I do not care about the type of publication in which it was made.

The report goes on to say:

> The changes in the operation of our public lands made possible by this bill are so great as to be of concern to every American citizen.

Then the report proceeds to list the names of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, such as my colleague the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], with the hope that people may write to the members of the committee and acquaint them with the dastardly provisions of this proposed legislation.

Further on the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] comes into his own. I am happy to be associated in such distinguished company. It says:

> An organization, operating under the name of "Public Affairs Institute," of Washington, D. C., has just released a booklet for distribution entitled "Tax Loopholes," by HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, United States Senator from Minnesota.

It tells how bad his material is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; but I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that he is under some suspicion, because this document says:

> The illustrations are full of half-truths and misconceptions of facts on which the conclusions are based.

I want the Senator from Minnesota to know that anything he says I will take with full knowledge of this statement in Mr. Brown's report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was not exactly moved by the passage which the Senator from New Mexico has read. It appears that the editor of the report is, with reference to proposed legislation, perhaps the best expert at half-truths of anyone I have ever met. So perhaps I should reexamine my argument on depletion allowance.

However, the reason I rose was to say that copies of the little booklet which has been referred to are available. It should

be made a matter of public notice that the Public Affairs Institute has been kind enough to supply me with several copies of the pamphlet, and that they are available to my colleagues and their relatives and constituents.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point I was getting to was the last sentence of this document. It says:

> The unfortunate effect of such articles is to foul with prejudice and malice the atmosphere in which these problems of an essential industry must be studied.

I suggest that when the general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America says what he has said about a bill which I have introduced, knowing my general attitude toward the industry, knowing how I have stood on the question of leases for a long time, knowing of his own personal knowledge that I could hardly have recommended the type of legislation to which he refers, I realize that the unfortunate effect of such statements is to foul with prejudice and malice the atmosphere in which these problems of an essential industry must be studied.

Mr. President, I have had some convictions on the question of depletion allowance. I think I understand how it operates. I must say that I believe that in this report which the general counsel for the Independent Petroleum Association of America has written, he has made more difficult the task which Senators have in defending the depletion allowance.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I believe that the Senator from New Mexico will find that very few members of the Independent Petroleum Association will seriously argue that it will in anyway injure the independent oil or gas industry if everyone were to bid on a competitive basis for Federal leases. I believe that members of the association who will sit down with the Senator from New Mexico will concede privately to him that it would not hurt them to bid on leases competitively instead of acquiring them in an easy way by means of which they get leases for a small fraction of their actual value.

Mr. ANDERSON. In this bill it was not my intent to require competitive bidding on these leases. I recognize that there are a great many men who feel that it is extremely unwise to do so, but there was no other way that I could find to get before Congress this question which the Secretary of the Interior had dealt with. He said he could not do anything but hold a raffle or a lottery in the case of known oil lands, which did not actually constitute a developed field, and that he would welcome some legislation which would permit him to use his discretion.

I recognize the bill goes further than that. I am not unable to read it. However, it goes further than that, so that when we hold hearings on it we can decide how we want to limit it, what we want to do, and what restrictions we want to impose.

If the representative of the Independent Petroleum Association had come before the committee he would have been treated with more decency and courtesy than he has accorded to me, and I would have given him a chance to make his opinion known.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Of course the distinguished Senator from New Mexico knows very well that seismographic and other equipment now being used in exploration have been so developed that it is now much easier to predict where oil may be found than when the Mineral Leasing Act was passed, and that prospecting for oil is not so speculative as it once was.

Mr. ANDERSON. I not only want to agree with my friend the Senator from Louisiana, but I want to say that Congress has recognized that fact. The original leasing act was passed in 1920. It was sponsored largely by a former United States Senator from my State, A. A. Jones, who had been an Assistant Secretary of the Interior prior to his coming to the Senate. He knew a great deal about the public lands of the West. He was recognized as a lawyer familiar with the public land problems, and he wrote into the law provision for a prospecting permit.

As a result, it was not necessary to obtain a lease; by paying a very small sum of money, one could obtain a prospecting permit on 2,560 acres of land which he thought contained coal, oil, or other materials. I recall that because in the year 1921 I filed a prospecting permit on 2,560 acres of what I thought was coal land, and which subsequently proved to be coal land. I recognize that the investigations which developed that it was coal land would not have been made but for the provisions written into the act in 1920.

However, times move along. In 1935 and in 1946 we again changed the law in those two instances, and eliminated the provision for prospecting permits. We did so because of the very things to which the junior Senator from Louisiana has referred, namely, the use of the seismograph and the many other scientific instruments and the use of aerial photographs, many of which are fitted together, and all of which make it possible to have an opportunity to judge whether oil may lie beneath a certain geological formation.

All those things have made it more possible for people to do well with leases at this time. I have said repeatedly that I do not wish to stop that leasing process.

I believe that when the Federal Government has withdrawn an area, and when, because of other developments—for instance, a search for a mineral or some other material—there is positive indication that oil exists beneath that land, even though there is not an oil well in that part of the country, the Secretary of the Interior should be allowed to take competitive bids on it for the benefit of the Nation. I am amazed that the Independent Petroleum Association of America, or at least one of its officials, thinks differently regarding that matter.

PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, tomorrow the Senate will consider the reorganization plan for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a recent editorial entitled "The Senate's Big Opportunity." The editorial appeared in the Washington Evening Star, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE'S BIG OPPORTUNITY

After all the shouting at the Capitol over the scandals in the Internal Revenue Bureau, there is something incongruous in the hedging that has been taking place on the Senate side over the administration's plan for cleaning up the Bureau. The demands for Executive reform brought, among other actions, a Presidential proposal for a sweeping reorganization of the tax-collection agency in line with recommendations of the Hoover Commission. But that proposal had as one of its main provisions the freeing of the collection system from the pressures and temptations of political patronage. That was the hitch. Senators have never been enthusiastic, as a group, about relinquishing any patronage rights. It is not surprising that the reorganization plan, after House approval, has met with trouble in the Senate Executive Expenditures Committee.

President Truman's urgent request to the Senate for approval of the plan followed indications that the bill might be held up for further study by the committee. A refusal of the Senate to accept the reorganization plan now would kill it for this session. If there is no adverse vote in the Senate before March 14, the plan automatically will become operative. To reject the proposal now in favor of further study would be a delaying action that would be inconsistent with senatorial cries for prompt revenue reforms. If the critics of the President's plan had something better to offer, their warnings against too much haste in reorganization could be justified. But no better plan than that calling for removal of collectors from politics has yet been produced.

The pending plan, as Revenue Commissioner Dunlap has pointed out to the committee, embraces the main points of the Hoover Commission's programs and of other groups which have studied the Bureau's defects. Mr. Dunlap has answered effectively a number of questions raised by opponents of the plan—but it is an open secret that the main bone of contention is the proposed substitution of civil-service selection of collectors for political appointments.

The President's latest message in support of the legislation has the effect of placing responsibility for effective house cleaning at the Internal Revenue Bureau on the Senate. If the Senate blocks this chance to place the tax-collection agency on a merit basis, its outcries over corruption and inefficiency in the Government will take on a very hollow ring.

RACIAL EQUALITY—EDITORIAL FROM LIFE MAGAZINE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently there was published in Life magazine—I believe it appeared in its most recent issue—an editorial entitled "The Shengs and Democracy." The editorial refers to a gentleman of Chinese ancestry who, while living in the United States, encountered a great deal of diffi-

culty in the exercise of what he considered to be natural rights and legal rights as a resident of this country.

I commend a reading of the editorial to every Member of this body. I think it will provoke a reawakening in regard to some of the difficulties existing in sections of the country other than the South, where similar difficulties are all too often referred to. The editorial discusses the situation in the West, in my section of the country, and in the East, where persons of various nationalities and of various racial origins have done much to advance the welfare and progress of the Republic.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SHENGS AND DEMOCRACY

Mr. Sing Sheng placed a bet on American democracy and lost it. In Asia they will, therefore, be asking whether American democracy is worth betting on. It still is.

Sheng, a United States college graduate and a former Nationalist Chinese intelligence officer, is an airline mechanic in south San Francisco. He wanted to buy a small house for his growing family in Southwood, a suburb near the airport where he works. When he learned that some of the all-Caucasian residents of Southwood did not want a Chinese neighbor, he proposed that the question be put to a vote. To all residents he wrote: "We think so highly of democracy because it offers freedom and equality. America's forefathers fought for these principles and won the independence of 1776. * * * Do not make us the victims of false democracy. Please vote for us." The other side was summed up by a builder who said, "People must stick together to protect their property rights." Sheng lost, 174 to 28, with 14 abstentions. Said he bitterly, when the votes were counted, "I hope your property values will go up every 3 days."

The response to the Sheng case has been strong and Nation-wide. Other cities have offered him a job and a home. There is a move in south San Francisco itself to make amends. Since Sheng's original purpose was not to put democracy on the spot but simply to find a better place to live, the outcome for him is likely to be satisfactory. That is one minor count for American democracy.

Another is the fact that Sheng could have moved into the Southwood house if he had wanted to make an issue of it. The restrictive covenant is legally unenforceable; so says the Supreme Court. But Sheng made what he calls a "gentleman's agreement" to abide by the outcome of the balloting. In other words he tactfully asks more of our democracy than law can provide. He asks what the United States at present merely aspires to, namely complete absence of prejudice between man and man.

In fact the people of Southwood were less prejudiced against Sheng than against losing money. The market value of group prejudice is the key to the segregation problem in the United States. During the last 10 years the United States has made revolutionary progress toward racial equality. If this progress continues, prejudice should eventually even lose its market value. It had better, for the national costs of discrimination are exceedingly high. Segregated slums yield only about 6 percent of the typical city's taxes, but use a third of its fire and almost a half of its police protection. The underemployment of Negro talents and skills is even more wasteful. According to the Urban League the total economic cost of discrimination in a city like New York is at least $1,000,000,000 a year.

This loss is at least as real as the one the calculating householders of Southwood think they have avoided. When we outgrow group prejudice in this country, the Southwood type of property loss would be inconceivable, and the present cost of discrimination will be turned into a big gain for all.

RECESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we beseech Thee to guide, sustain, and encourage us in all the noble and worthy undertakings of this day.

May each new day be better than yesterday and prophetic of a radiant tomorrow as we strive to be coworkers with Thee and with one another in the great moral and spiritual enterprise of achieving blessedness for all mankind.

We penitently confess that there are times when the ideals which we cherish seem so visionary, the outlook for a finer social order appears so gloomy, our loftiest impulses are frustrated, and our hearts are filled with fear and foreboding.

Forgive us for allowing doubt and cynicism to find lodgment in our souls and for permitting any sinister thoughts and feelings to eclipse our faith, blur our hope, and extinguish our love.

May we be confident that we have not been created for failure but for victory and that in Thine own good time all Thy gracious promises shall be gloriously fulfilled.

In Christ's name we offer our prayers. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4645) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Marguerite A. Brumell," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. HENDRICKSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CLAIM OF ROBERT E. VIGUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MARCH 10, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on March 10, 1952, the Clerk received today from the Secretary of the Senate the following message:

That the Senate has passed without amendment House Concurrent Resolution 203, entitled "Concurrent resolution requesting the return of the enrollment of H. R. 3219 and the reenrollment thereof."

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

PREVENTING ILLEGAL ENTRY OF ALIENS

Mr. CELLER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

PROTEST AGAINST HIGH TAXES IN VIEW OF WASTE AND EXTRAVAGANCE

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I, too, have a letter from one of my constituents about taxes. This letter could have been written by any constituent in any part of the United States to any Congressman. I will read it:

THE ASHLAND GAZETTE,
Ashland, Nebr., March 8, 1952.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Treasury Department,
United States Government.

GENTLEMEN: Even though I am required by law to pay income tax for 1951 and make a declaration of tax for 1952, I wish to hereby declare that I do so under protest.

This protest is registered because of glaring Federal Government corruption and immorality, which has resulted in waste and extravagance such as the world has never known before. There are thousands of examples of waste of my money and that of all other American taxpayers. They stem directly from the scandals and investigations of Government bureaus, Armed Forces procurement and foreign aid, but to try and list them is not the purpose of this letter. It is enough to know that they exist.

However, I do wish to go on record that, under the present circumstances, I protest the payment of this money which means so much to me and my family, but apparently means nothing to the Government of which I am supposed to be an integral part.

According to instructions from your department a social-security tax has now been imposed upon practically all self-employed persons. Webster's Dictionary gives the full meaning of the word "impose" and as a free American citizen I do not appreciate being imposed upon.

In closing, please understand that all of us are willing to support by taxes the normal functions of government.

Yours very truly,

M. C. HOWE,
Owner and Publisher.

ARMY PROCUREMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PATTERSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FORMULA FOR PRICE DECONTROL

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a measure which proposes to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 by providing legislative standards for the suspension of price controls. When the test of the standards is met, decontrol would be mandatory.

Two basic requirements shall be determining: First, the material or commodity is by its nature not susceptible to speculative buying; second, not more than 10 percent of the total national output of the material or commodity is purchased with Federal funds for defense purposes.

Mr. Speaker, an example of the purposes of this amendment is the removal of price ceilings on crude petroleum. An unrealistic price ceiling has been imposed upon crude-oil production, with the result that the industry has been depressed. It has only been through outstanding and unparalleled expansion that the industry has been able to overcome threatened shortages and meet all requirements for civilian needs as well as for defense efforts. The need for further expansion of oil-producing facilities of this Nation is recognized by those in responsible positions. Because of the extreme essentiality of oil to the modern military machine, the accomplishment of the required expansion program is of utmost importance to the Congress and the American people and is entitled to the greatest consideration.

In contrast with the sharp increases which have occurred in the price of almost every other commodity of our economy during the past 4 years, crude-oil prices have not advanced since 1947, even after Korea.

It is peculiar to the oil industry that controls have a depressing effect upon expansion and discovery of new reserves, and only by the minimum exercise of Government controls and regulations can the oil industry be encouraged to meet the demands made upon it for national defense and civilian use called for by the Petroleum Administration for Defense.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a more complete statement on this subject in the Appendix of the RECORD.

APPROPRIATION FOR SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, several Members have called my office this morning to inquire about the action taken by the Committee on Appropriations in deleting all funds for the Small Defense Plants Administration which is the only independent agency in Government that can be of any help to small-business firms of this country.

I have advised each and every one of them who called me this morning that yesterday I made the statement that when the supplemental appropriation bill is before the House tomorrow, I will offer an amendment restoring the funds so that the Small Defense Plants Administration can do something for small business. I think it is about time that the membership of this House decide one way or the other whether or not they want to help small business. We have been doing a lot of talking about it for the past 2 or 3 years. We will have a chance now to live up to our promise to small business tomorrow when we vote for continuation of the Small Defense Plants Administration.

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY OF THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee I call up House Resolution 539.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the second, third, and fourth paragraphs of House Resolution 390, Eighty-second Congress, are amended to read as follows:

"The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the facts, evidence, and extenuating circumstances both before and after the massacre of thousands of Polish officers buried in mass graves in the Katyn Forest on the banks of the Dnieper River in the vicinity of Smolensk, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which was then a Nazi-occupied territory formerly having been occupied and under the control of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"Upon completing the necessary hearings, the committee shall report to the House of Representatives (or the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session) before January 3, 1953, the results of its investigation and study, together with any recommendations which the committee shall deem advisable.

"For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member."

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 539 amends the original resolution creating the Katyn Investigating Committee House Resolution 390. This amendment gives permission to the Congress to conduct hearings outside of the United States.

Since the Katyn committee was authorized by Congress, a great deal of testimony and essential evidence has come to the attention of the committee from both within and without the borders of the United States. Before Congress adjourned last September, the committee heard the testimony of Lt. Col. Donald B. Stewart. It was unanimously agreed at that time by the members of the committee that further hearings would be resumed after Congress reconvened in January. In the meantime, the counsel and office force of the committee were busy preparing for the hearings.

On Monday, February 4, the committee held hearings for several days of the following witnesses: Father Leopold Braun, A. A., New York, N. Y.; Henry Clarence Cassidy; John Doe; Marion (Mike) Gawiak, Port Colborne, Canada; George Grobicki; Tadeusz Romer, former Polish Ambassador to Russia, Montreal, Quebec, Canada; Col. John H. Van Vliet, Jr.; Col. J. B. Gielgud.

The publicity given in this country and abroad to the testimony presented by these witnesses has brought forth a great number of potential witnesses from abroad in addition to the witnesses and testimony that the committee had already obtained. It is plainly evident that the results of the work of our committee has created a great reaction both behind the iron curtain and outside the iron curtain. For a considerable period of time the newspapers in Russia and the satellite countries refused to print any news regarding the Select Committee to Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre. This policy of silence on the Katyn massacre proceedings by the iron-curtain newspapers has changed radically. According to the Associated Press dispatch from Moscow on March 3, 1952, the Russian paper, Pravda, devoted 2½ columns to republishing the text of the conclusions reached by the hand-picked Russian committee which reported on the Katyn massacre in January 1944. Another Associated Press dispatch on the same date stated that the entire Polish press reprinted the same statement. The News Week magazine in its edition 2 weeks ago in the column entitled "The Periscope" made the following statement:

SCORE ONE

Insiders say the House inquiry into the Katyn massacre—the mass murder of Polish soldiers by either Russians or Germans—has scored a propaganda coup in satellite countries. The point is that the United States is probing a crime in which no Americans were affected—the best antidote to Red propaganda that the West has forgotten its former supporters behind the iron curtain.

In the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A1539, is reprinted an article from the New York Herald Tribune of last Sunday, setting out the fact that "the inquiry into the death of the Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest worries the Russians."

I hope that all Members of Congress read this article by Robert L. Moora in Sunday's Herald Tribune.

Without taking up the time of the Congress reviewing the testimony which has already been presented at committee hearings and the fact that all Members

are familiar with the remarks made on the floor of the House during the last month concerning Katyn, I believe that the adoption of this amendment giving authority to our committee to record the great amount of testimony from this international crime which is available in London, Paris, and Berlin is highly essential and very necessary to combat the psychological warfare which the Soviets are so experienced in waging.

The Rules Committee reported out House Resolution 539 unanimously.

I wish at this time to call the attention of the Congress to a press release which was issued by the Embassy representing the present Polish Government in Washington.

At this point I incorporate in my remarks the exact press release issued by the Polish Embassy on March 3, 1952, at 6 p. m.:

POLISH STATEMENT ON MADDEN COMMITTEE

The Polish Government issued on February 29, 1952, a statement on the Madden committee of the United States House of Representatives. The text, translated from the Polish, follows:

"For several months American propaganda has made an effort to publicize the spectacular sessions of the so-called special committee of the House of Representatives in the Katyn case. The staging of this farce and the unleashing of a campaign based upon it, the provocative aim of which is evident, are links in a general United States Government propaganda plan which in turn is part of aggressive preparations for war.

"Behind the scenes of this campaign stand the notorious protectors of neo-Hitlerite revenge aims, the enemies of peace, democracy and the Polish people, such as Mr. Arthur Bliss Lane, who while holding the position of Ambassador of the United States in Warsaw, did not hesitate to take a personal part in the organization of actions directed against the Polish State and its independence and who, since his return to the United States, has specialized in vile slanders against Poland and the U. S. S. R.; such as, also, a member of the special committee, Mr. O'KONSKI, who during World War II was connected with nazi agencies in the United States.

"The appointment of the special committee coincides with the appropriation by the United States Congress of $100,000,000 for diversionist-espionage activities in other countries, among them Poland. It is a component part of that criminal action aimed against the peace of the world.

"The extermination in Katyn of thousands of Polish officers and soldiers was the work of Nazi criminals who, in addition to the Katyn crime, committed hundreds of similar crimes on Polish and Soviet soil. The Katyn crime was one link in the Nazi campaign aimed at the physical extermination of the Polish people and consistently carried out during the occupation. The Katyn crime was the work of those Nazi genocidal criminals whom American authorities today are releasing from prison and whose services they engage for the preparation of new crimes against the Polish people and against all peace-loving nations.

"From the start the Polish people, who have had first-hand experience with Nazi methods of slaughter as applied to Oswiecim, Majdanek, and many other death camps in Poland, never had any doubt whatever but that the monstrous Katyn crime was the work of Nazi gangsters. The lies of Nazi propaganda were ultimately exposed as such by evidence accumulated and incontestably established in the presence of Polish representatives by a special Soviet commission for the establishment and investigation of circumstances surrounding the shooting by Facist German invaders of Polish officers who were prisoners of war.

"The whole world passed judgment on the Nazi murders of Katyn, just as it judged all their monstrous crimes in concentration camps and in thousands of cities and villages of occupied Europe.

"Genocide goes hand in hand with provocation. In 1943 Goebbels tried to make use of the bodies of Nazi victims for a monstrous provocation against the Soviet Union, whose army at that time was smashing the Nazi war machine.

"In 1952 those involved in the mass murder of war prisoners in Korea, much like those Nazis who prepare for a new criminal world war, try to revive the Goebbels trick. By renewing the Katyn provocation, they seek to divert the attention of the nations of the world from the reconstruction of a neo-Hitlerite Wehrmacht as an American tool against world peace.

"As far back as 1943 Nazi propaganda, obediently supported by the reactionary London clique of Polish émigrés, was unsuccessful in misleading world opinion or the opinion of the Polish people. Even the very authors of this provocation, Goebbels and Frank, could not help admitting that their provocation had found no echo in the Polish nation. So much less does the new version of this provocation in an American edition find an echo now. Those who suppose that this provocation will attain any of its aims are deluding themselves. The murderers of Korean children and women will not succeed in concealing the guilt of the Nazi murders of Katyn, nor in rehabilitating them for the purpose of exploiting them for new crimes.

"The Polish people look with loathing upon the attempts of American ruling circles to use poisoned weapons inherited from Goebbels, attempts aimed at obliterating the traces of Nazi crimes and at base incitement against the peoples of the Soviet Union, who bore the main burden of the fight to rout nazism. Every Pole regards with outrage and contempt these calumnies and provocations, these cynical attempts to prey upon the tragic death of thousands of Polish citizens suffered at the hands of Nazi murderers.

"The Government and the people of Poland condemn most sharply this provocative action of the United States aimed against peace-loving nations, against those nations which suffered most from Nazi invasion and Nazi crimes."

This propaganda release from the Polish Embassy breaks all precedent as far as flagrant violations of diplomatic rules and time honored Embassy procedure is concerned. This release is nothing more than brazen communistic propaganda issued almost under the shadow of the Capitol dome. The insulting text of the Polish Embassy press release proves conclusively that the Katyn investigation is exposing and damaging the Soviet imposed regime in Poland. The preliminary Communist attempts to silence all news and comment about the investigation have failed. This press release propaganda is not only an insult to the Katyn committee, but an insult to this Congress and the Government of the United States. It has been chosen as the weapon for counteracting the effect of the investigation on the enslaved Polish people.

We know that millions from various nations and races have been massacred, murdered and burned in ovens during the last 15 years by both Stalin and Hitler. We know now that both savage dictators and their henchmen have been guilty of tortures, mass murders, genocide and other international crimes. Hitler and most of his henchmen have paid the penalty for their deeds. The hearings on the Katyn Forest murders are unfolding the fact slowly but surely that the Katyn massacres were but a small part of the well-organized effort of mass human extermination. Mass murder and genocide is part of the felonious process used by Communist dictators to subjugate nations and races in their mad drive for world conquest.

Communist propaganda emitting from the Polish Embassy in Washington is a brazen example of the Communist influence in bankrupting the moral fiber and respectability of human beings.

At the Polish Embassy in Washington, we have men who no doubt are descendants of valiant and heroic Polish ancestors. Their ancestors have fought for the freedom of Poland back through the centuries. What would their ancestors say if they knew their sons were conniving to cover up the facts of the massacre of 14,000 Polish soldiers in the Katyn Forest?

If the Poles at the Embassy in Washington had not sold the honor of their Polish ancestry for a mess of communistic pottage, they would be aiding our committee to uncover the true facts of the Katyn massacres instead of operating as a Kremlin tool to conceal the real murderers.

When our committee meets next week, I am going to recommend that we ask the State Department to demand an apology from the Polish Ambassador to the Congress of the United States for the insults contained in the above press release. If the apology is not forthcoming and the Polish Embassy in Washington does not cease from being a communistic propaganda outpost of the Kremlin, the State Department should insist that the present Polish Ambassador be recalled at once.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman referred to a press release issued by the Polish Embassy here in Washington. That is the present Communist regime in Poland?

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Indiana that at the Nuremberg trials the Communists, representing Soviet Russia, blocked the investigation of the Katyn murders. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The committee is going into the procedure of the Nuremberg trials.

Mr. RANKIN. Some months ago the Michigan delegation invited me down to hear a very distinguished man who, I believe, is now president of a great military academy in the United States. He had just come back from Poland. His statement was to the effect that the people of Poland were reduced to slavery of the most beastly character, and that

a little gang of Yids at the top were in complete control.

The Polish are not running the Polish Embassy in America. That same element of Yiddish Communists has control in Russia, in Czechoslovakia, and in every other Communist country in Europe.

I hope when you go over there you will not only investigate all the angles of these atrocious Katyn outrages but that you will investigate the so-called Nuremberg trials.

Let us not leave this question to embarrass the American people for a hundred years to come.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there a reasonable doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Indiana or any other members of the committee, based on the testimony of former Ambassador Lane and others, that the Russians are not guilty of this massacre?

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The testimony so far taken before our committee preponderantly reveals that the Soviets committed these mass murders at Katyn.

I may say further that a formal invitation was sent by the committee to the Russian Embassy here to come and testify and present before the committee whatever evidence the Russians had. They very abruptly and insultingly rejected our invitation. However, I will say that our invitation is still open if they have anything to offer in regard to these mass murders.

Mr. GROSS. Why this trip to Europe to hold further hearings?

Mr. MADDEN. The Soviet propaganda behind the iron curtain states that the Nazis committed the murders. I have a list of about fifty very important witnesses in the London and Paris and Berlin areas.

Mr. GROSS. Well, what does the committee propose? What can be done about it? If it is clearly demonstrated that the Russians carried out this massacre, what do we do about it then?

Mr. MADDEN. I think we have accomplished a great deal in overcoming Russian propaganda behind the iron curtain. The enslaved people are learning the true facts, misrepresentation in Communist propaganda is being exposed. I have broadcasted regarding the evidence presented to this committee on four different occasions over the Voice of America. I know other members of the committee have also talked on the Voice of America. I think this committee has contributed an avalanche of material already in overcoming Communist propaganda.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I inquire of the gentleman from Indiana what has been done to broadcast the facts through the Voice of America, and over Radio Free Europe.

Mr. MADDEN. I have spoken four times on the Voice of America. I know other members of the committee have spoken over the Voice of America and on Radio Free Europe. In fact, yesterday the gentleman now addressing you from the well talked for 10 minutes on the Voice of America.

Mr. BUSBEY. Are the transcripts of those broadcasts available for Members of the Congress to read?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, certainly.

Mr. BUSBEY. Where would we obtain copies of them?

Mr. MADDEN. At the Voice of America offices.

Mr. BUSBEY. When does the committee contemplate going to Europe to hold these hearings?

Mr. MADDEN. We talked to the Speaker of the House in regard to that, and the Speaker suggested that we should go during the Easter time when there will be a 10-day Easter recess. So we aim to go at that time.

Mr. BUSBEY. I notice on page 2 of the resolution, it states "upon completing the necessary hearings, the committee shall report to the House of Representatives or the Clerk of the House, if the House is not in session, before January 3, 1953." Is there not a possibility that the committee could report to the Clerk of the House, or the House itself before January 3 of next year?

Mr. MADDEN. We have a great deal of testimony to take not only across the water, but here in this country after we come back—if the committee cannot make a full report, we aim to make a partial report before the Congress adjourns in July. The complete report will be made before this Congress expires January 3, 1953.

Mr. BUSBEY. May I ask when that partial report is contemplated, if the gentleman from Indiana can give us any indication?

Mr. MADDEN. I could not say right now, but we aim to make a partial report before the Congress adjourns which may be possibly July or sometime thereabouts.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the House should understand that no member of this committee desires to express an opinion of guilt or innocence before all of the evidence which is available to us, has been heard. While what the gentleman has said is true, nevertheless we are willing to hear both sides, if they wish to be heard, and for that reason the invitation was sent to the Russian Government here in Washington.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and in accordance with permission granted me, I include the following letters:

LOS ANGELES TIMES,
WASHINGTON BUREAU,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1952.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MADDEN: When I read the enclosed insulting press release from the Polish Embassy I wondered whether freedom of speech and freedom of the press ought not be curtailed for some of the Red embassies.

Of course, I have fought, and will continue to fight, censorship, whether in our own Federal agencies or in foreign countries.

I am sending this letter and the Embassy statement to you because it makes me so angry that the Communists are taking such an advantage of American hospitality that I want to be certain you don't miss it.

On several occasions I have been on the verge of notifying the Polish Embassy to stop sending me their propaganda, most of which I put in the wastebasket in its virginal condition, but I have reconsidered because I realize their stuff shows the Commie party line and a reverse iron curtain won't benefit this country.

This latest defamation of your committee seems to me, however, to be so offensive that the State Department might be asked to move. I wonder if the Secretary should not call the Ambassador to his office and ask why, how come, is this your attitude, etc., and possibly suggest that some retaliative steps might be taken.

Having grown up in a New England mill town, I have many Polish acquaintances dating back to grade school. I am sure they would resent this attack on the Congress of the United States. I have informed Mr. Einhorn in the Embassy's press office that I, as an American citizen, resent such insulting use of their diplomatic privileges.

I hope you will call this press release to the attention of the House, if not to the State Department. While I may not agree with your political views, I surely think that a congressional committee chairman should be allowed to proceed with a duly authorized inquiry (whether or not I think it justified) without being attacked in this fashion. If you think I could be of help, I'll be glad to write some comments for you.

Very truly yours,

WARREN FRANCIS.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESS GALLERY,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1952.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Member of Congress From Indiana.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As an accredited newspaper correspondent to the Congress I am the recipient of unsolicited literature from many different sources. However, I have never received such insulting trash as the enclosed press release.

I am sending it to you because it refers to the committee bearing your name.

I am a veteran newspaperman, rather hard boiled, and during my forty-odd years as a professional observer of political events I have seen a great deal. My epidermis, therefore, has lost much of its sensitiveness.

However, the enclosed press release got my goat and I decided to pass it on to you, though you probably have seen a copy of it.

For the life of me I cannot understand how we can tolerate in our midst, to be so grossly insulted by representatives of a foreign power?

Have we grown so cowardly as to allow an Embassy to issue insulting communications against the elected representatives of our people?

I cannot imagine—and I am convinced—that our diplomatic agents abroad would never stoop to such violations of common decency, expectorating insults against their hosts?

I call upon you to take up the challenge of the Polish Embassy and since you have been the target of their insults I count upon you to take up this matter with the State Department.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN L. DEBALTA,
Senate Press Gallery.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I can confirm everything the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] has said in his opening statement on this resolution. We have taken considerable testimony. One thing that might be added to what has been said is that the two American officers he mentioned were two American officers captured by the Germans in Africa and held as prisoners of war. They were taken by the Germans under guard to see these graves in the Katyn Forest in Russia. Both of those men have reported to our Government and testified before our committee. Naturally, they were not very friendly to the German Government after having been prisoners of the Germans for 2 years and 2 months before they were taken to these graves. I am satisfied the report they made was not a colored one in any sense favorable to the Germans. They simply reported what they saw. One thing more should be added to what the gentleman from Indiana has said in regard to this matter, and that is that when this committee was set up under the resolution passed last year, you conferred upon this committee, I mean the House of Representatives, a responsibility which, in my judgment, is a very important one. It is our duty to return to our Government a report of what we find from the evidence, which will be submitted, and which has already been submitted. I certainly would not care to sign my name to a document of such importance, and which may have far-reaching effects, without having the privilege of hearing all the evidence available either for or against the question presented. The subject of the massacre in the Katyn Forest was taken up at the Nuremberg trial, but no conclusion was reached. I understand that both sides, the Germans and the Russians, submitted three witnesses, then the entire matter was dropped. No conclusion whatever was reached. Nothing further has been done. Here we have a subject from what little we now know about it, which has shocked the civilized world.

I cannot conceive of any more atrocious or inhuman act being committed by any government, whether German or Russian, than the massacre in cold blood of these 15,000 or thereabouts, Polish officers. They were many of the leaders of an entire army of a nation of 30,000,000 or 35,000,000 people. Certainly civilization does not want to let pass without anything being said or any protest being made to such a crime. We cannot simply shrug our shoulders and let it pass by as if it did not concern us. Let the civilized world know who is responsible for this act and let the chips fall where they may. For the reasons stated, I feel that this resolution should be adopted. I am ready and willing to do my duty. I know it will not be a pleasant task. It is a gruesome matter.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I think the gentleman will probably remember the despatch that came from Europe only a week or ten days ago which proved the tremendous impact the work of this committee has had upon people behind the iron curtain. Every newspaper in Poland behind the iron curtain, and Pravda and other Russian papers, devoted several pages of their paper last week to answering the charges made before our committee. This proves the tremendous impact the work of this committee has already had on the iron curtain countries. Am I correct?

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan that there is another matter that needs investigation by Congress very badly, and that is the so-called Nuremberg trials.

We are today divided in this House because of the persecution of the Southern States, not during the Civil War, but during the dark days of reconstruction, such as the trial of Dr. Mudd, and the trial and execution of Captain Wirtz, who was in charge of a Confederate prison.

An ex-Federal soldier from the State of Michigan who faced the firing line of Pickett's charge at Gettysburg, and who was in that prison, James Madison Page, in his book called The Truth About Andersonville, a Defense of Captain Wirtz, says that the hanging of Captain Wirtz was one of the greatest outrages in all history.

The Nuremberg trials, which are charged up to the United States, and which were participated in by Russia, are going to rise up to haunt the American people for generations to come, unless they are investigated and cleared up.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the ranking member of this committee, and other members for the task they have assumed. I hope this resolution will be unanimously approved and that this important committee may go abroad on this most important mission. It is important because they are going to seek the truth, as the gentleman from Michigan has stated.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Can the gentleman advise this House whether any other nation in the world is going to go into this inquiry? Or will this be just an inquiry by a committee of this Congress?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sorry I cannot answer the gentleman, because I cannot speak for any other government. I only hope that once we have taken the lead in this important matter others of our allies will follow our path.

Mr. ABERNETHY. May I ask one further question: When the findings of the committee have been printed and announced what do we do then?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I will be glad to answer that question in just a moment.

Mr. ABERNETHY. It is a very important question.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I agree with the gentleman, and I will deal with it perhaps in an extension if I do not have time to do it now.

I first became interested in the gruesome matter of this Katyn massacre in 1949 in the city of Berlin. At that time I was investigating our propaganda efforts over the radio and otherwise to the people behind the iron curtain. I was told by American officers time and again that there could be no doubt whatever that this atrocious affair was committed by the Soviets. Every indication, every evidence, pointed to that conclusion. It is quite understandable that the Communist leaders would try to shift the blame to the Nazis. I have no brief for the Nazis whatever, but I am sure this committee representing this body will endeavor to find the truth so that it can be used to indict the guilty parties.

The films showing the exhuming of the bodies leave no doubt that it was the Soviets who perpetrated this outrage.

Why is it important to determine this truth? Because we have in our hands a weapon as powerful as the atomic bomb, and that weapon is the truth. In using the truth of this Katyn massacre of these 12,000 or more brave Polish officers we will be wielding a weapon that will literally pulverize the propaganda of the Soviets. I firmly believe that Stalin and the Politburo are more fearful of being exposed by such investigations as this and their propaganda branded for the falsity that it is, than they are of all our armies, navies, and air corps that we are building up. For the results of this investigation will drive a wedge between them and the people they have enslaved.

Now, to answer the gentleman who asked the question, what do we do, what use can we make of this material? May I say that we can make the best possible use of it by broadcasting the facts, by asking our allies to broadcast the facts, in regard to a regime so merciless as to murder in cold blood 12,000 Polish officers, who had been told that if they would surrender their lives would be preserved to permit them to fight for their freedom.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Suppose this committee finds that the Germans did it?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the committee finds that the Germans did it, they should so report.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Where do we go from there?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, we could use the same propaganda. But I am not disturbed in regard to who did it. All the facts that have been turned up so far indicate the Soviets did it.

According to the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Michigan, they and the other Members are going there with open minds. I think it is time to continue by every means possible to drive this wedge between the people behind the iron curtain in Poland, Czechoslovakia and all of these other enslaved countries, and those who have enslaved them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] said he was convinced that the Russians perpetrated this crime. The gentleman says they are going over there with an open mind.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am convinced they are, too, but I dare say that the gentleman from Indiana would change his mind if the evidence warranted it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Can the gentleman advise the House what this is going to cost the taxpayers of the United States?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot. I will have to leave that to the committee.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. One other question, if the gentleman will permit. Reference was made by the gentleman from Indiana to a number of witnesses who are in Great Britain and Europe. Am I correct in my assumption that other nations of the United Nations are also interested in this investigation?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes; I am quite sure they are. I personally talked to some from behind the iron curtain in the fall of 1949 that I hope this committee will call in and talk to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Are these witnesses nationals of nations belonging to the United Nations?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have not consulted with the members of the committee on that one point.

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I may say to the gentleman that some of the witnesses are in a group of international experts who had the opportunity to examine the graves and who did make a report at one time. Some of them are nationals of various countries in Europe that have never had the opportunity to present their findings before a committee of this sort.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Has any effort been made to get the governments to which those witnesses belong to send them over to this country at their expense rather than call on the American taxpayers to spend the money of this country for a committee to go over there?

Mr. MACHROWICZ. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. A question was asked about the request of funds for this investigation. As I recall, the original request was made to the Committee on House Administration, which handles the contingent funds of the House, and of which I am a member, for $20,000 when this committee was authorized. I believe the request now is for an additional $100,000 to continue the investigation. Does the gentleman know whether that is true or not?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I may say to the gentleman that I made this request in the resolution but I had not consulted the committee at the time because the Speaker informed me that if the committee went it would be during the Easter recess. So I hurriedly drew the resolution and made that request, but upon consulting the members of the committee I find it would be far less than $100,000.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution providing for an investigation of the Katyn massacre in Poland contemplated an expenditure of not to exceed $20,000 for a thorough investigation by a committee appointed by the Speaker and such investigation to be made here in Washington. The terrible massacre is an event that occurred about 10 years ago, and the investigation was ordered or authorized last September. Now the resolution provides for enlarging that investigation, permitting it to be made any place in the world, so far as I can determine, both inside and outside of the United States, and at a cost not to exceed $100,000. One hundred thousand dollars is what this committee now wants. House Resolution 556 asks for $100,000 from the contingent fund for enlarging this investigation. Already there has been spent as much or more money by the Eighty-second Congress for investigations as any Congress in the history of the United States. Not since the adoption of the Constitution, I think, has any Congress spent more for investigations than this Congress has spent, and the resolution comes before us to enlarge this investigation of a massacre that occurred in a foreign country 10 years ago, to the extent of $100,000. I have not heard any of the speakers say what is to be accomplished by this investigation, even if the guilt is fixed on some individual or upon some country.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I do not know whether the gentleman heard me or not, but I am going to appear before the Committee on House Administration next week, and the cost of this investigation will be far less than $100,000. I had not previously informed the committee of the details of the expenses in connection with a trip of this kind.

Mr. LECOMPTE. In reply to that I will read the resolution. The resolution calls for $100,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, but when I appear before the Committee on House Administration I will inform them that the cost will be less.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman willing to have the Committee on House Administration determine how much they think you should have?

Mr. MADDEN. No; then it comes up before the House.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman willing to have the Committee on House Administration amend his resolution?

Mr. MADDEN. No; that will come up before the House after the Committee on House Administration handles it. This does not deal with money at all.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But your resolution was referred to the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. MADDEN. This resolution just deals with the authority to go abroad.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I understand that, but House Resolution 556 is before the Committee on House Administration, and asks for a maximum of $100,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Is the gentleman willing to have the Committee on House Administration investigate and determine what, in the judgment of that committee, is enough for that investigation?

Mr. MADDEN. And then recommend that to the House? Yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It has to pass the House, of course.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but it will not be $100,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. But the resolution asks for that.

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; but it will be less.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If the committee reduces it, but your resolution calls for $100,000.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. STANLEY. As I understand, the gentleman is addressing himself to House Resolution 539 at the moment.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman note that this resolution provides for investigation within and without the United States?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes. Originally it was just within.

Mr. STANLEY. Does the gentleman recall that the original resolution for investigation confined such investigation solely to the United States?

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is what I am trying to make clear, and the original resolution was practically unanimously approved.

Mr. STANLEY. Was it the gentleman's understanding that with the amount of money authorized by the Committee on House Administration in the original resolution, that that would be a sufficient fund for the complete investigation?

Mr. LECOMPTE. That was the understanding, that $20,000 would take care of the whole investigation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not know how much money should be spent on this investigation, but I am certain the gentleman recalls that in the recent testimony before the committee in regard to appropriation bills, there was appropriated approximately $100,000,000 to be used for refugees from behind the iron curtain, or people residing in the iron curtain countries. That was a propaganda move on our part. To my mind of thinking that $100,000,000 has made Uncle Joe Stalin squeal louder and longer than the millions and billions of dollars that we have spent for military expenditures.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman has had his time, and I cannot yield any more. We have spent fabulous amounts of money for propaganda, European aid, the Voice of America, Marshall plan, and other efforts to help Europe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wish my colleague from Iowa would pursue the question of what is expected to be accomplished by the spending of $100,000 in a continuation of this investigation.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thought we were going to have a full report on the investigation for $20,000. That was the original estimate. Now it appears we will not get any report from the committee for the time being.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. The gentleman, I am sure, could not make an analysis of the ultimate results of such an investigation, because the chairman has not been able to explain clearly the purposes and the real objectives to be accomplished by it.

I would like to also say, if I may, that some of those refugees, to which the gentleman from Missouri has referred, coming from behind the iron curtain out into Western Europe and into the United States are undesirable, and I am wondering if in the future we may wish they were back from whence they came. The damage they may do in the free world where they have the greatest possible advantages may cause a regret on the part of those who supported that proposition.

I wish the gentlemen of this committee would make a complete and full report on their investigations as originally authorized within the United States, and then perhaps they can make a case for further investigation. As it is, I cannot believe that another $100,000 should be spent for the purposes which have been presented in this debate.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. An investigation in Europe by a committee of Congress occupying a considerable period of time, could go far afield and could excite some international feelings.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, it just happens that, as the committee knows, I am not planning to make the trip abroad, if such a trip is made.

I have taken the floor because some Members have asked what is the purpose of the committee and what can be done, assuming it comes to some conclusion.

I did not hear all of the talk of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] but I assume he pointed out that, first of all, there has never been any definite conclusion by any impartial body as to who perpetrated this crime. At the time the crime was discovered it was known that either Russia or Germany had done it. Germany had investigated and made certain conclusions. Russia had its investigation and it made certain conclusions.

I am satisfied that no one in this body would want to have any action taken on the basis of conclusions that were made by the two countries that were accused of having perpetrated this crime. I think that is one of the reasons why this committee was established, so that at least as far as the people in the United States are concerned, and as far as history is concerned, there will have been a determination by some body that would be considered to be fair and impartial and objective in its approach. So historically there certainly is good reason to try to establish that.

Secondly, as I think the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out, and I do not know about this because I have never been behind the iron curtain, but those people in our Government who are entrusted with the responsibility of seeing what establishing the truth may do to help spread democracy and to help defeat communism, tell us that the work of this committee already has had tremendous effect in a moral sense. It is proof, as one witness said, that the United States has not forgotten this dreadful crime but is doing its best to expose the criminals.

There are other reasons. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] asked a question to which I should like to give one additional answer, at least. Again, this is on my own in the sense that I took this step without the knowledge of the committee. I do not know whether the committee happens to approve or disapprove of this. However, some weeks ago when the committee was formed I got in touch with President Truman. I pointed out what the committee was going to do and that there never had been any impartial investigation.

I said that I believed that after the committee turned in its report, whatever it might be, there would then be a good basis for this country to ask the United Nations to determine finally in an over-all sense, in a United Nations sense, who had perpetrated this crime and what action should be taken, because after all this was a crime against humanity. It was not simply a crime against the United States or one nation. It was a crime against humanity. I felt that this country should take the leadership in asking the United Nations to do that.

I also felt the President would be on much more reasonable ground if, in making his move, he could state that this country had not gone off half-cocked in any way but, on the other hand, had made a careful and impartial investigation and, as a result of that, there was ground for the United Nations to take further action if the United Nations saw fit to do it.

There are many other reasons, but time will not permit me to go into them at this time.

In view of one question that was asked of some other speaker, I want to say this, too. Many weeks ago I wrote to every single doctor who had appeared on a commission that was established by Germany in its investigation of this crime. Those doctors are abroad; they are not in this country. I have received letters from two or three of those doctors, pointing out what their conclusions might be.

As you may know, at least those Members who have studied the matter, the Russians claim the German commission doctors were forced and coerced into their findings, and there was duress and undue compulsion. The Germans claim the same thing about the Russian commission.

It was for that reason that I wrote to these doctors, pointing out that if that might have been true at one time, either when Germany had control of them or when Russia had control of them, that was not true at the present time, apparently. No doctor is now under the control of Germany or subject to coercion by the Nazis. I wanted to know if their opinion now was the same as it had been in any document or report they had filed or they had signed.

I received answers from two or three of those doctors, but there are still a great many more doctors over there who for one reason or another have not seen fit to engage in correspondence and give their views that way. Perhaps they will later but, although several weeks have elapsed since I wrote to them, they still have not answered.

I have mentioned this because, as I have pointed out, what I say may be considered somewhat unbiased, because I do not plan to go to Europe.

I only have time to mention one other reason. Certainly this last reason is of vital importance and, as far as at least this reason is concerned, it should be a committee from this Congress that conducts this phase of the Katyn investigation.

It is this: At least two reports about the massacre were turned into the Government by American officers. At least one of those reports disappeared and charges have been made about the reason for its disappearance. Those charges directly concern this Congress because they may involve personnel and departments or agencies of the United States Government. They must be investigated fully, and the facts brought to light. This committee is going to do that regardless of where the trail may lead.

It has been charged that the Government of the United States tried to cover up certain features of the Katyn massacre. Is there not a duty on the part of this Congress to investigate such charges? Certainly the truth of that matter has never been established by any official body. It is imperative that that be done.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the Katyn massacre should be thoroughly investigated. It is one of the most important questions that has yet come before the Congress of the United States in this world-wide contest between Yiddish communism and Christian civilization.

It was one of the most beastly atrocities in all of the history of mankind. Every report shows that the murder of those thousands of helpless Poles was committed by Communist Russia; and that later when the so-called Nuremberg trials were going on, the Russian member, or members, blocked any investigation by that court of the outrageous murder of those ten or fifteen thousand helpless Polish victims.

The same element that controls Russia also controls Poland. They have reduced the Polish people to abject slavery, and this outfit down here, that calls itself the Polish Embassy, does not represent the Christian people of Poland.

Kosciusko would turn over in his grave if he could press back the veil that hides us from that mysterious realm where he has "taken his chamber in the silent halls of death," and see the way that gang of Yiddish Communists are treating the people of Poland, his own country, for which he so valiantly fought, and for which he gave his life, and realize that they have lost entirely that freedom that "shrieked when Kosciusko fell."

Permit me to call your attention to an atrocity committed by Communist Russia against the Christian people of the Ukraine that is more beastly, if that is possible, than the Katyn massacre.

When the Communists took over the Ukraine they reduced those people to a condition of abject slavery, the like of which humanity had never seen. They not only took their land and their homes away from them, but they allotted them small plots to cultivate and levied rental tributes that barely left them enough to sustain life.

In 1933 they had a crop failure in the Ukraine, and that Communist gang in Moscow went down and took away all they made. That left the people of the Ukraine without anything at all on which to survive, and millions of them, men, women, and children, among the best Christian people in Europe, starved to death in their own homes.

Hon. W. C. Bullitt was Ambassador to Moscow in 1933, and when he appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities a few years ago, I asked him about this horrible incident. I am going to quote a small portion of his testimony in order that you may have first-hand information of the greatest outrage ever perpetrated against the people of any country. Here are some of the questions and answers:

Mr. RANKIN. The people in the Ukraine are among the best people in Europe?

Mr. BULLITT. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. Yet they went in there and took everything they made and starved, you say, five or six million of them to death?

Mr. BULLITT. Three to five million.

Mr. RANKIN. Men, women, and children starved to death, eating, in their frantic misery, the bodies of their own children, of their own families; that is correct, isn't it?

Mr. BULLITT. I am extremely sorry to say that I actually have two photographs of a father and mother and the skeleton of the child they had eaten, which were taken down there in the Ukraine.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is what I am trying to bring out.

Mr. BULLITT. I still have two photographs of that. There is nothing more horrible.

Mr. Speaker, can anybody who reads that testimony of the ruthless starvation of from three to five million Christian men, women, and children be surprised at the beastly murder of these ten or fifteen thousand helpless Polish victims in the Katyn Forest?

Remember that the same Communist government that perpetrated the ruthless starvation of these helpless people also had at least one representative on the Nuremberg court, who blocked the investigation of this horrible outrage.

I am supporting this resolution for the reason that I want this committee to make a thorough investigation, not only of the Katyn massacre but of the Nuremberg court that probably perpetrated more outrages than any other organization of its kind that ever sat.

We people in the South have for almost 90 years protested against the trial, execution, or imprisonment of ex-Confederate soldiers by tribunals that have long been condemned by the people of the entire Nation. Yet, here we have an instance in the Nuremberg trials where the losers only were tried and where representatives of the government that perpetrated one of the greatest crimes in history sat in judgment, condemned, and hanged German soldiers, civilians and doctors, 5 or 6 years after the war closed.

As has been pointed out, some of them were convicted and executed under ex post facto laws, or laws that had been passed, or regulations that had been adopted, after the alleged offenses had been committed.

Lord Maurice P. Hankey, a member of the upper house of the British Parliament, in his recent book on Politics, Trials and Errors condemns in no uncertain terms those Nuremberg trials. He says that while Germans were tried and convicted for the invasion of Norway, that the British invaded first. It seems to have been a race, as General Forrest once said, of who could "get there first with the most men."

Lord Hankey points out the fact that the precedents set by these Nuremberg trials are likely to plague the civilized world for generations to come with the doctrine that "only a lost war is a crime." Lord Hankey quotes Field Marshal Montgomery, who commanded the British forces during World War II, as saying that "the Nuremberg trials made the waging of unsuccessful war a crime, for the generals of the defeated side would be tried and then hanged."

If this country should ever lose a war—which she is likely to do some day, if she continues to fight other people's battles all over the world—then God save America. A Nuremberg court would probably hang the President, every member of his cabinet, as well as the Members of both Houses of Congress, to say nothing of the generals, admirals, and others on down to the buck privates, as well as the officials in the various States, probably including every member of the State legislatures, doctors, and other civilians.

As I said, they would not stop at the generals, but they might make their executions so sweeping as to destroy the people of the entire country, or starve them to death, as was done in the Ukraine.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this resolution, in the hope that the committee will not only complete the investigation of the Katyn massacre but will also investigate the Nuremberg court, in order that we may correct, as far as possible, the terrible errors that were committed by that tribunal, under the pressure of Communist influences, and charged up to the United States.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I made the inquiry a few moments ago as to what we would do when this committee reported its findings. I made it in all seriousness and was not being facetious in the slightest.

This matter worries me. I am tremendously concerned about the advisability of sending a committee of the American Congress to another continent to be trekking around acting as judge and jury over an offense with which we had nothing to do whatsoever and over which we really have no authority. Such a mission is unprecedented and is fraught with danger. We had better go slow.

We had better consider most carefully what our objective is and which no one seems to really know before we vote to send a committee of this Congress to another land to be inquiring into something in which we had no part whatsoever.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER].

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur in what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] said. As a representative of four southwestern counties in Pennsylvania, I represent many thousands of American people of Polish descent. They are a great people, and they are known for their integrity, their love of freedom, and their love of truth. I speak for them when I offer this suggestion: That if we are interested in the truth with regard to this Katyn massacre I wonder if it might not be a better idea for us to finance an independent investigation rather than to attempt to conduct one of our own. As

the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] said, we do not accept the investigation of the Germans, we do not accept the investigation of the Russians in this matter, because we consider them prejudiced. I would hate to go over and make an investigation of my own and consider myself entirely unprejudiced in this matter. I therefore suggest that it might be a reasonable conclusion that if we are interested, as I know everyone is interested in this matter, should we not finance an independent investigation rather than attempt to conduct it with our own personnel?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not the gentleman feel that the free peoples of the world everywhere would be glad to accept the word of Members of the American Congress in regard to this matter and give full faith to their findings?

Mr. SITTLER. I may say to the gentleman that I believe the free peoples of the world are inclined to accept the word of Members of the American Congress but it is not the free peoples of the world we have to convince; it is the people behind the iron curtain to whom the gentleman referred in his speech.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the peoples of the earth are willing to accept our leadership and our statement on these numerous things why are we making such slow progress in holding old friends and gaining new friends through all this evidence we have produced?

Mr. SITTLER. I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has answered the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG] far better than I did.

(Mr. RANKIN and Mr. SITTLER asked and were given permission to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I may say in answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that already the work of this committee had done more to combat and to expose insidious Communist propaganda not only behind the iron curtain but beyond the iron curtain than any move that has been made so far to my knowledge. We must bear this fact in mind, that the Soviets have already during the years intervening since these massacres, sent propaganda to the satellite countries that this Katyn massacre was the work of the Nazis. Since this committee started holding hearings, through radio broadcasts, conversations, whisperings, and so forth, the underground behind the iron curtain, and especially in Poland, has already become active in finding out what evidence has been produced regarding the real perpetrators of the killing of the 14,000 Polish officers at Katyn. That in itself has done more to stifle and curtail Communist propaganda than any one thing, I believe, that has been done.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. SITTLER. I do not disagree; I did not say that the investigation should not be made; I asked only whether the results of the investigation might not be better presented with a great deal more force by a neutral group than by representatives of the one agency which stands between Russia and the domination of the world.

Mr. MADDEN. In answer to that let me say that the Katyn committee was created by this Congress last September and is the first and only so-called neutral group or committee that has ever investigated this massacre.

In answer to the gentleman who spoke a while ago regarding the original request of the committee, when this committee was created last September we did not have any idea of the avalanche of evidence that would be presented to this committee in its consideration of the Katyn massacre. I hold in my hand the names of dozens of essential witnesses across the water who can cast factual light upon these Katyn killings. By permitting this committee to gather this evidence, more will be done to expose the fallacies and the insidious, false propaganda that is going on behind the iron curtain and also outside the iron curtain than any one thing that can be done. It will expose all these lies, insinuations, and false propaganda that have been going out of Moscow about the Katyn massacres for the last 12 years.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Did I understand the gentleman in his remarks to say that the committee had concluded in their own mind that the Soviet people were responsible?

Mr. MADDEN. No, no; I said the preponderance of the evidence presented to the committee so far indicated that the Soviets had committed these massacres.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Now, then, the gentleman says that the Soviets have propagandized the satellite nations to impress upon them that the Nazis did this?

Mr. MADDEN. And other nations, too.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Why has not this country propagandized those satellite nations with information that the Russians did it based upon the findings that you have already made?

Mr. MADDEN. That is what we are doing. As I stated in my opening remarks, we have spoken over the Voice of America on a number of different occasions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to see why there should be any opposition to this particular resolution. It seems to me it is a natural one to follow the original resolution creating this special committee.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania refers to an independent means of investigation. Certainly I do not know of any more objective opportunity for investigation than by a committee of this body and the Members who comprise the special committee.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SITTLER. I believe the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] responded to the inquiry of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ROGERS] by saying that the report they now have has already been used as a basis for speeches on the Voice of America programs.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Will the gentleman ask a question? I only have 3 minutes.

Mr. SITTLER. I only want to ask this question: In view of the gentleman's answer to the gentleman from Texas that we are already propagandizing the governments behind the iron curtain, stating that the Russians are responsible for this atrocity, how can Members of this House be in the position of going over to Poland seeking "the truth." Supposing they discover the Nazis are to blame. Where does that leave our Voice of America which the gentleman from Indiana has just said is now blaming Russia on the basis of the committee's preliminary report?

Mr. MCCORMACK. It seems to me that in order to complete the investigation this committee should be given the authority to go abroad. There are many witnesses abroad, undoubtedly, who can give pertinent evidence to the investigation. Unfortunately, it is a matter that occurred some years ago in another land, Poland, and there are undoubtedly many witnesses over there, or a number of witnesses at least, that it would be important for this committee to make inquiry of in order to ascertain the information which will enable the special committee to make its final report to this House.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], chairman of the special committee, has said that the evidence is preponderantly in the direction of the Soviet Union being responsible for this terrible crime against humanity. That is not their finding now and they cannot make their finding until all the evidence that is available is obtained. It seems to me that this resolution is a natural follow-up of the resolution which created the committee originally.

As I stated, it is rather difficult for me to understand why there is any objection to the adoption of the pending resolution at this time. The position taken by my distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] would have applied to the original resolution rather than the resolution which is before the House at the present time. This special committee should be given the opportunity and should be empowered by the House to go abroad to complete its investigation in order to make a definite, complete report to the House.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this time simply to inquire of the chairman of the special committee what possible authority this Congress has to vote to authorize the chairman to issue subpenas outside the United States, which is clearly provided in this resolution?

Mr. MADDEN. We do not intend to issue subpenas because the testimony that will come in before the committee will be voluntary testimony.

Mr. NELSON. We are, however, voting authority to subpena in this bill?

Mr. MADDEN. Only within this country.

Mr. NELSON. According to the bill, it is for authority to subpena outside the United States also.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, there may be an American citizen that we might want to subpena, but we do not at this time plan to do that.

The SPEAKER. The answer to that is that it is in the original resolution.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 164, nays 156, not voting 112, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—164

Allen, Calif.	Ford	Miller, Calif.
Anfuso	Fulton	Miller, N. Y.
Angell	Furcolo	Morano
Armstrong	Garmatz	Morgan
Aspinall	Gavin	Morris
Auchincloss	Gordon	Multer
Ayres	Gore	Norrell
Bailey	Graham	O'Brien, Ill.
Bakewell	Granahan	O'Hara
Baring	Granger	O'Neill
Barrett	Green	O'Toole
Bates, Ky.	Greenwood	Patterson
Bates, Mass.	Hagen	Perkins
Bennett, Fla.	Hale	Philbin
Bennett, Mich.	Hart	Polk
Bentsen	Havenner	Poulson
Blackney	Hays, Ark.	Preston
Boggs, Del.	Hays, Ohio	Price
Bolling	Heselton	Priest
Bray	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Brehm	Holifield	Rankin
Brooks	Holmes	Reams
Burnside	Howell	Rhodes
Bush	Irving	Ribicoff
Canfield	Jackson, Wash.	Richards
Carrigg	James	Riley
Clemente	Jenkins	Rodino
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Ala.	Rogers, Colo.
Corbett	Jones, Mo.	Rooney
Cotton	Karsten, Mo.	Saylor
Crosser	Kearns	Scott,
Curtis, Mo.	Kelley, Pa.	Hugh D., Jr.
Dague	Kelly, N. Y.	Seely-Brown
Davis, Wis.	Kerr	Shelley
Dawson	King, Calif.	Sheppard
Dempsey	King, Pa.	Sieminski
Denny	Kirwan	Springer
Denton	Klein	Steed
Devereux	Lane	Stigler
Dondero	Lanham	Thompson, Tex.
Donohue	Lesinski	Tollefson
Dorn	Lind	Trimble
Eaton	Lyle	Van Zandt
Eberharter	McConnell	Vinson
Elliott	McCormack	Vorys
Ellsworth	McCulloch	Vursell
Evins	McDonough	Watts
Fallon	McGregor	Wickersham
Feighan	McGuire	Wier
Fenton	Machrowicz	Wigglesworth
Fine	Mack, Ill.	Withrow
Fisher	Mack, Wash.	Wolverton
Flood	Madden	Yates
Fogarty	Mansfield	Yorty
Forand	Meader	Zablocki

NAYS—156

Abbitt	Fugate	Nelson
Abernethy	Gary	Nicholson
Adair	Gathings	Norblad
Albert	George	Ostertag
Allen, La.	Golden	Passman
Andersen, H. Carl	Goodwin	Patman
Anderson, Calif.	Grant	Patten
Andresen, August H.	Gregory	Pickett
Andrews	Gross	Poage
Arends	Hand	Redden
Baker	Hardy	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Harris	Reed, N. Y.
Beamer	Harrison, Nebr.	Rees, Kans.
Beckworth	Harrison, Va.	Robeson
Belcher	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Fla.
Berry	Hébert	Rogers, Tex.
Betts	Herlong	Ross
Bishop	Hess	St. George
Boggs, La.	Hill	Schenck
Bolton	Hoeven	Schwabe
Bonner	Hoffman, Ill.	Scrivner
Bosone	Hoffman, Mich.	Scudder
Bow	Ikard	Shafer
Bramblett	Jarman	Simpson, Ill.
Brown, Ga.	Jenison	Sittler
Bryson	Jensen	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	Johnson	Smith, Miss.
Burdick	Jonas	Smith, Va.
Burleson	Jones, Hamilton C.	Smith, Wis.
Busbey	Jones, Woodrow W.	Spence
Butler	Kearney	Stanley
Byrnes	Keating	Taber
Carlyle	Kilburn	Talle
Chelf	Kilday	Teague
Chenoweth	Lantaff	Thomas
Chiperfield	LeCompte	Thompson, Mich.
Church	Lovre	Thornberry
Colmer	Lucas	Vail
Cooper	McCarthy	Van Pelt
Crawford	McIntire	Velde
Crumpacker	McMillan	Wharton
Cunningham	McMullen	Wheeler
Curtis, Nebr.	McVey	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	Mahon	Williams, Miss.
Deane	Martin, Mass	Williams, N. Y.
DeGraffenried	Mason	Willis
D'Ewart	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Dolliver	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Tex.
Elston	Mills	Winstead
Engle	Morton	Wolcott
Forrester	Mumma	Wood, Idaho
Frazier	Murray, Tenn.	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—112

Aandahl	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.
Addonizio	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Brien, Mich.
Allen, Ill.	Halleck	O'Konski
Barden	Harden	Osmers
Battle	Harvey	Phillips
Bender	Hedrick	Potter
Blatnik	Heffernan	Powell
Boykin	Heller	Prouty
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Radwan
Brownson	Hillings	Rains
Buchanan	Hope	Ramsay
Buckley	Horan	Reece, Tenn.
Budge	Hull	Regan
Burton	Hunter	Riehlman
Camp	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Cannon	Javits	Roberts
Carnahan	Judd	Rogers, Mass.
Case	Kean	Roosevelt
Celler	Kee	Sabath
Chatham	Kennedy	Sadlak
Chudoff	Keogh	Sasscer
Clevenger	Kersten, Wis.	Scott, Hardie
Cole, Kans.	Kluczynski	Secrest
Combs	Larcade	Sheehan
Cooley	Latham	Short
Coudert	Lesinski	Sikes
Cox	McGrath	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	McKinnon	Staggers
Delaney	Magee	Stockman
Dingell	Marshall	Sutton
Dollinger	Martin, Iowa	Tackett
Donovan	Merrow	Taylor
Doughton	Mitchell	Walter
Doyle	Morrison	Weichel
Durham	Moulder	Welch
Fernandez	Murdock	Werdel
Gamble	Murphy	Widnall
Gwinn		Wood, Ga.

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burton with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Sheehan.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Mitchell with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Battle with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Case.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Magee with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Short.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Chudoff with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Budge.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Stockman
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr Cox with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Phillips.
Mr Moulder with Mr. Potter.
Mr O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Riehlman.

Messrs. HOLIFIELD, MILLER of New York, and ANGELL changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN and ENGLE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 206, nays 115, not voting 111, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—206

Adair	Bentsen	Crumpacker
Allen, Calif.	Bishop	Curtis, Mo.
Anderson, Calif.	Blackney	Dague
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, Del.	Davis, Wis.
Anfuso	Bolling	Dawson
Angell	Bolton	Deane
Arends	Bramblett	Dempsey
Armstrong	Bray	Denny
Aspinall	Budge	Denton
Auchincloss	Burdick	Devereux
Ayres	Burnside	D'Ewart
Bailey	Busbey	Dondero
Bakewell	Canfield	Donohue
Baring	Carrigg	Dorn
Barrett	Chelf	Eaton
Bates, Ky.	Chenoweth	Eberharter
Bates, Mass.	Chiperfield	Elliott
Beall	Church	Ellsworth
Beamer	Clemente	Evins
Belcher	Cole, N. Y.	Fallon
Bennett, Fla.	Corbett	Feighan
Bennett, Mich.	Cotton	Fenton
	Crosser	Fine

Fisher	King, Pa.	Rankin
Flood	Kirwan	Reams
Fogarty	Klein	Reece, Tenn.
Forand	Lane	Reed, N. Y.
Ford	Lanham	Rees, Kans.
Fulton	Lesinski	Rhodes
Furcolo	Lind	Ribicoff
Garmatz	Lyle	Rodino
Gavin	McCarthy	Rogers, Colo.
George	McConnell	Rooney
Goodwin	McCormack	Ross
Gordon	McCulloch	St. George
Graham	McDonough	Saylor
Granahan	McGregor	Schenck
Granger	McGuire	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Green	McVey	Scudder
Greenwood	Machrowicz	Secrest
Hagen	Mack, Ill.	Seely-Brown
Hale	Mack, Wash.	Shelley
Harrison, Wyo.	Madden	Sheppard
Hart	Mansfield	Sieminski
Havenner	Martin, Mass.	Simpson, Ill.
Hays, Ohio	Mason	Smith, Kans.
Heselton	Meader	Smith, Wis.
Hess	Miller, Calif.	Springer
Hinshaw	Miller, N. Y.	Stigler
Hoffman, Ill.	Morano	Thompson, Mich.
Holifield	Morgan	Tollefson
Holmes	Multer	Trimble
Howell	Nicholson	Vail
Irving	O'Brien, Ill.	Van Pelt
Jackson, Wash.	O'Hara	Van Zandt
James	O'Neill	Velde
Jenkins	Ostertag	Vorys
Johnson	O'Toole	Vursell
Jonas	Patman	Wickersham
Jones, Ala.	Patterson	Wier
Karsten, Mo.	Perkins	Wigglesworth
Kearney	Philbin	Wilson, Ind.
Kearns	Phillips	Withrow
Keating	Poage	Wolverton
Kelley, Pa.	Polk	Yates
Kelly, N. Y.	Poulson	Yorty
Kerr	Preston	Zablocki
Kilburn	Price	
Kilday	Priest	
King, Calif.	Rabaut	

NAYS—115

Abbitt	Gathings	Norrell
Abernethy	Golden	Passman
Albert	Gore	Patten
Allen, La.	Grant	Pickett
Andersen, H. Carl	Gregory	Redden
Andrews	Gross	Reed, Ill.
Baker	Hand	Riley
Barden	Hardy	Robeson
Beckworth	Harris	Rogers, Fla.
Berry	Harrison, Nebr.	Rogers, Tex.
Betts	Harrison, Va.	Schwabe
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Scrivner
Bonner	Herlong	Shafer
Bosone	Hill	Sittler
Bow	Hoeven	Smith, Miss.
Brehm	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Va.
Brooks	Ikard	Spence
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Stanley
Bryson	Jenison	Steed
Buffett	Jensen	Taber
Burleson	Jones, Mo.	Talle
Bush	Jones, Hamilton C.	Teague
Butler	Jones, Woodrow W.	Thomas
Byrnes	Kearney	Thompson, Tex.
Carlyle	Lantaff	Thornberry
Colmer	LeCompte	Vinson
Cooper	Lovre	Watts
Crawford	Lucas	Wharton
Cunningham	McIntire	Wheeler
Curtis, Nebr.	McMillan	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	McMullen	Williams, Miss.
DeGraffenried	Mahon	Williams, N. Y.
Dolliver	Miller, Md.	Willis
Elston	Mills	Wilson, Tex.
Engle	Morris	Winstead
Forrester	Mumma	Wolcott
Frazier	Murray, Tenn.	Wood, Idaho
Fugate	Nelson	Woodruff
Gary	Norblad	

NOT VOTING—111

Aandahl	Carnahan	Dollinger
Addonizio	Case	Donovan
Allen, Ill.	Celler	Doughton
Battle	Chatham	Doyle
Bender	Chudoff	Durham
Blatnik	Clevenger	Fernandez
Boykin	Cole, Kans.	Gamble
Brown, Ohio	Combs	Gwinn
Brownson	Cooley	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Buchanan	Coudert	Hall, Leonard W.
Buckley	Cox	Halleck
Burton	Davis, Tenn.	Harden
Camp	Delaney	Harvey
Cannon	Dingell	Hays, Ark.
Hedrick	Martin, Iowa	Roberts
Heffernan	Merrow	Rogers, Mass.
Heller	Miller, Nebr.	Roosevelt
Herter	Mitchell	Sabath
Hillings	Morrison	Sadlak
Hope	Morton	Sasscer
Horan	Moulder	Scott, Hardie
Hull	Murdock	Sheehan
Hunter	Murphy	Short
Jackson, Calif.	Murray, Wis.	Sikes
Javits	O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson, Pa.
Judd	O'Konski	Staggers
Kean	Osmers	Stockman
Kee	Potter	Sutton
Kennedy	Powell	Tackett
Keogh	Prouty	Taylor
Kersten, Wis.	Radwan	Walter
Kluczynski	Rains	Weichel
Larcade	Ramsay	Welch
Latham	Regan	Werdel
McGrath	Richards	Widnall
McKinnon	Riehlman	Wood, Ga.

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burton with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Doyle with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Heller with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Short.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Hedrick with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts
Mr. Battle with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Case.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Magee with Mr. Horan.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Brownson.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. McGrath with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. IKARD changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be allowed to extend their remarks on the resolution just passed, and I also ask unanimous consent that two letters, one from one of the attorneys of the Los Angeles Times, and one from a member of the Senate Press Gallery, Mr. Stephen L. Debalta, may be incorporated in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 562), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That EARL CHUDOFF, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

PREVENTING ILLEGAL ENTRY OF ALIENS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the conference report on the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, has been filed in the House and will be called up Thursday next.

I make this announcement to give as much advance notice as possible so the Members will be advised and may govern themselves accordingly.

TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR CONDUCTING CERTAIN PERSONNEL INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 555, providing for the consideration of S. 2077, a bill to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on

the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half of my time, 30 minutes, to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, the bill made in order by this resolution is a Senate bill, S. 2077. It provides that the Civil Service Commission shall conduct the original personnel investigations, investigations that heretofore and presently have been and are being made by the FBI. Mr. Hoover, Director of the FBI, has recommended this legislation. However, if anything derogatory is uncovered the FBI will then take over the investigation.

The bill provides further that the FBI shall continue to check its files on fingerprints of all applicants; further, that when the Atomic Energy Commission, the Mutual Security Administration, or the State Department certifies certain positions as having high sensitivity, then the FBI will make a complete investigation in all instances.

Mr. Speaker, so far as I know there is no opposition to this measure.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution makes in order consideration of the bill S. 2077.

I think it would be worth while at this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact, which was considered by the Rules Committee in bringing the bill to the floor for consideration, that the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, has advised us of his approval of this legislation. He said in his statement to the committee that the trend toward piling more minor investigation work on the Bureau has been accelerated during recent Congresses and the enlargement of the Bureau's activities in this respect has necessarily resulted in a diversion of much of its energies and facilities from the pursuit of its primary responsibilities of detecting and apprehending violators of Federal laws, discharging its assignments with respect to espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities, and rendering such other vital services as may be required of it by congressional and Executive directives.

It seemed to the Rules Committee that it was quite in order for the Congress, in light of the statement by the Director, to have an opportunity to reconsider the actions taken in the enactment of previous laws and change our directive so that the personnel investigations called for in several acts may be transferred to the Civil Service Commission. The pending rule making in order the consideration of S. 2077 was therefore brought to the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's statement in connection with Mr. Hoover is absolutely correct. On several occasions one of his assistants has been up to see me, Mr. Hoover having sent him, urging the passage of legislation of this type because it was taking up so much time of the FBI that the work of their special agents was being diverted from the essential work of the FBI to investigations that could be taken care of elsewhere, as Mr. Hoover's assistant said, could be well taken care of by the Civil Service Commission.

I have in my hand a letter addressed to me, dated March 6, in relation to S. 2077. The bill is designed to transfer routine personnel-type investigations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission. I quote as follows:

> I was very much heartened by the action of the Rules Committee today and I know that you will do all within your power to bring the bill before the House of Representatives.

That is a letter from J. Edgar Hoover himself showing clearly that he supports the bill now before the House.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

(Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to proceed out of order.)

BOOST MINIMUM WAGE ON UNITED STATES TEXTILE CONTRACTS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the United States Government is partly responsible for the widespread unemployment in New England textiles.

How?

By failing to push up wage rates to conform with those prevailing in this industry as it can and must do under the terms of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act.

When the Government buys woolen and worsted goods for the Armed Forces or for any Federal use it is not supposed to let out such contracts to those companies which pay their workers less than the current minimum wage. This level is determined by the Secretary of Labor.

But this has not been brought up to date to reflect actual and improved wage rates.

No one can possibly maintain that the prevailing rate is to be measured by a few mills paying substandard wages.

The average should follow the pattern set in the North, where the majority of the mills in this industry are located. Only 13 percent of woolen-worsted products are manufactured in the South, 21 percent in the Middle Atlantic States, and the majority or 58 percent, are made in New England.

Therefore, the minimum should be jacked up to meet northern standards.

The average hourly earnings of workers in the American Woolen Co., are $1.607. The CIO and AFL are seeking a minimum of $1.26 throughout the industry. In southern mills, hourly earnings range from 98 cents to $1.35 per hour.

These figures do not reflect differences in work assignments. Southern competitors have an advantage that totals more than 40 cents per hour in wages and fringe benefits.

Obviously, when the Government lets out contracts to the southern mills, on the basis of the lowest bid, and by neglecting to raise the floor of wages paid by those mills so that they will correspond to the higher minimum paid in the North where most of the industry is located, it is violating the prevailing rate requirements of the Walsh-Healey Act.

The Government, therefore, by ignoring present realities, is falling down on its job of redetermining the minimum, which means scaling it upward, and then complying with the law as it is required to do.

The fact that southern mills are operating according to the letter but not the spirit of the law, because the minimum is outmoded and economically unjust, is no excuse. They are taking advantage of a technical loophole that is dead wrong. It is a shabby practice when this Government is guided in its present procurement policy by the lowest common denominator, set not by the average, but by a definite minority of this basic industry.

We have seen how the Office of Defense Mobilization changes its position as capriciously as a weather vane on the issue of channeling contracts to distressed areas, directed neither by equity nor a regard for economic necessities, but pushed from pillar to post by political pressures.

The city of Lawrence, in Massachusetts, which is the heart of the woolen-worsted manufacturing industry, is suffering from wholesale and critical unemployment, which the United States Government cannot seem to comprehend.

Lawrence, it has been decided, is a distressed area, and entitled to get Government contracts on a negotiated basis, except for textiles.

Which is like saying, "We are going to give you first aid for your pernicious anemia by draining off some more blood."

The issue of an upward adjustment in minimum wages for textiles on Government contracts to meet 1952 actualities is a happy change from the on-again, off-again indecision of the ODM.

We are dealing here with a law. One whose intent and mandate is clear.

The Secretary of Labor has indicated his awareness of the situation.

It is for us to make certain that this law and its implementation is not relegated to the side lines to gather gray dust.

The Walsh-Healey Act has hiked wage rates on drugs, paints, and varnishes.

Woolen-worsted textiles next.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the finest men I have ever met, respected by countless thousands throughout the country who knew him, and who had a wide circle of friends in the city of Washington, August C. Backus, Jr., of Milwaukee, Wis., died on March 6, 1952.

The life of my late friend, who was very close to me, was not only a noble

one, but a constructive one in the interests and progress of his city, his State, and our Nation.

After his admission to practice law in 1900, he was appointed by the then Gov. Robert M. La Follette, Sr., to brief labor laws for the Department of Labor and Industrial Statistics of the State of Wisconsin.

He continued thereafter in the service of the State of Wisconsin by prosecuting a large number of cases of child labor law violations.

He quickly gained experience which with his unusual ability and knowledge of the law constituted the foundation for the outstanding career that laid ahead for him.

From 1901 to 1905 Judge Backus was chairman of the International Child Labor Commission, in 1904 representing Wisconsin at the International Congress on Child Labor at the St. Louis Fair.

He later became assistant district attorney of Milwaukee County, and in 1909 district attorney. In 1910 he was named judge of the municipal court, serving in this judicial position until 1924.

In the performance of his judicial duties, Judge Backus made an outstanding name for himself.

It was while serving in this judicial position that he presided over the celebrated case of John Flammang Schrank, who shot in an attempt to kill President Theodore Roosevelt on October 22, 1912.

His greatest contribution while judge was his humane consideration of juvenile delinquency, and the important part he played in the establishment of the probation system in Wisconsin which spread throughout the country.

He served as a judge until 1924, after which he was publisher of the newspaper the Sentinel in Milwaukee, serving in this capacity until 1930. Thereafter, until his death, Judge Backus was general counsel of the Schlitz Brewing Co., of Milwaukee.

In this capacity he visited Washington many times during the past 20 years, during which period we came to know each other, and from which meetings a close friendship developed between us.

Judge Backus was deeply interested in education, and for many years taught criminal law at Marquette University, and also served as chairman of the advisory board and trustee of the medical school.

Throughout his life he took a deep interest in the welfare of boys and girls, as well as being a leader in charitable, educational, and patriotic activities in State and Nation.

As has well been said of Judge Backus, the achievement for which perhaps he was best known was the fathering of the adult probation system, which has been the means of saving many thousands of first—and even later—offenders from prison and giving them a chance for rehabilitation.

He developed this system when he was municipal court judge. Nearly all, if not all, of the States have since followed his original idea. For some years Judge Backus spoke in various States advocating the establishment of this humanitarian and progressive system which has brought a new life and happiness to countless of thousands of persons and their immediate relatives.

Judge Backus was truly one of God's noblemen.

His passing on is a great loss to his family and his many friends. His death is a personal loss to Mrs. McCormack and myself.

Wisconsin loses one of its finest sons; America, one of its substantial, constructive, and outstanding citizens.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time on the rule because I realize that during the general debate which follows the time available will be short, and I deem this is a very important matter.

The proponents say that all they are going to do under the bill S. 2077 is transfer certain preliminary examinations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission. Those preliminary investigations are in reality security investigations. I quote from testimony given by Mr. Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission:

> These facts, however, should not lead to the erroneous conclusion that the security investigations which this bill proposes to transfer are unimportant or in any sense routine.

I have explicit confidence in Mr. Hoover and the FBI. It is because I have that confidence in them that I desire that they retain the authority to perform these initial security investigations because I deem them very important.

In addition, the extra cost that will be shouldered onto the Federal Government by reason of this transfer is quite a considerable sum of money, according to the testimony given before our committee. The FBI at the present time have 1,700 investigators doing this work. If they continue this load, by 1953 this number will be increased to a little over 2,000. However, we find that, if the load is transferred to the Civil Service Commission, there will be an increase in 1953 to 3,600 employees.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman mentioned the fact that the FBI are now devoting 1,700 agents to the work of investigating the applicants.

Mr. WITHROW. Of making these preliminary security investigations; yes.

Mr. VELDE. Was there any testimony to the effect that any of the agents would be fired if this bill passes, and thus reduce the appropriation necessary for the FBI?

Mr. WITHROW. I do not recall all the testimony, but to my knowledge they probably would be absorbed by those retired or filling vacancies. I do not think there would be any substantial reduction in the FBI force of investigators by reason of this transfer.

Mr. VELDE. I am sure there would not. I would hate to see such a thing. I want to say this, too, to the gentleman, that I agree with a great majority of the Members here that the FBI is a very efficient, probably the most efficient agency of our Federal Government, and I believe they are more qualified to continue the investigations as they have in the past, having the machinery already set up, and it would be much more efficient than to transfer to the civil-service agency. I believe Mr. Hoover, with his great administrative capacity and ability, could arrange a separate department in his own Bureau to take care of these investigations, and do the work a great deal more efficiently and much more cheaply than by transferring the work.

Mr. WITHROW. I think that would be very desirable.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think the RECORD ought to show at this point the gentleman who has just engaged in colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE], is a former FBI agent with considerable experience.

Mr. WITHROW. I did not know that. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for referring to that. I want to say I have made a number of these investigations myself while I was in the Bureau. I do not know how they are being handled now, but none of the agents particularly cared for a loyalty check of a Government employee or of a prospective employee. I must say I think possibly that is the reason Mr. Hoover is anxious at the present time to get rid of these investigations. As I said before, I think he is more qualified, and the FBI is more qualified than any other agency of the Government, to handle this, and I think they should continue to handle it if it is at all possible.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, as to the additional cost, it is quite considerable because I do not believe you can figure in terms of 1952 because the full load will not be transferred to the Civil Service Commission until 1953. So, I believe, that we should figure in terms of the amount of additional money we will spend in 1953 to get the proper yardstick. Then, what does it cost the FBI? What is the per unit cost for one of these security investigations at the present time? Mr. Nichols, when he testified before the Civil Service Committee on this bill, and Mr. Nichols is the representative of the FBI, testified that the unit cost ranges from $150 to $222 a case, or a probable average of about $200 a case. We turn to the testimony of Mr. Ramspeck, who is Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He said it is estimated that it will cost between $225 and $250 to process a case. In other words, according to Mr. Ramspeck's own testimony, it will cost at least $25 more to process every case under the Civil Service Commission, if those duties are transferred to them. In the light of the additional testimony

that there will be a case load of 82,000 in 1953—82,000 multiplied by $25 makes almost $1,250,000. Then, when you figure in addition to what Mr. Ramspeck says that he is going to charge the several departments not $225, which is the cost of the per unit investigation, but is going to charge the departments $250, which is $25 more than the actual cost of the investigation, it makes an additional load for 1953 of about $2,500,000, and that is the saving if we keep it under the FBI where it is at the present time.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether or not particularly in a loyalty investigation, it is of any use to the FBI that they already have extensive files on Communist activities, and therefore are in a position to check personnel loyalty matters much more efficiently than some agency that does not have all the information right within their own bureau.

Mr. WITHROW. I think it would be of distinct advantage. Let me say there that the FBI at the present time has organizations all over the United States. The Civil Service Commission has regional offices less extensively spread throughout the country with the result that these investigations may be carried on by the FBI much better than they can be by the Civil Service Commission. It might be well to add at this time that Mr. Hoover, when he sent his letter to the Commission in nowise dealt with the cost of this transfer. The testimony clearly shows that not only would it be more efficient to have it in the FBI, but it would be very, very much less expensive.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman, of course, knows that because of the high regard this Congress and the American people hold for J. Edgar Hoover and his Federal Bureau of Investigation, this Congress has been very liberal in furnishing the funds requested by the FBI for additional personnel to do the important job which they have to do. If this bill is made law, it will cost millions of dollars just to make this transfer, the transfer of the books, the accounts, and all the things that go with such a change in administration in addition to the additional personnel costs involved.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time to take matters pertaining to the security of our Nation out of the hands of an organization such as the FBI in which the American people have complete confidence and turn it over to another agency of Government in which the American people do not have as great confidence as they do in the FBI. I think the bill should be sent back to committee for further study of the whole matter. This is a question concerning the security of our Nation. If the FBI needs more investigators, this Congress will furnish them, I am sure of that, and I am sure the American people would feel more secure if the job of loyalty and security checks are made by the FBI than if made by any other agency of Government.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman. Let me say in conclusion that there is a divided opinion in the committee on this. If my memory is correct, the vote was something like 12 for reporting it out and 7 against, so there is an honest difference of opinion as to whether or not this should be transferred in view of the additional cost that will be incurred by reason of the transfer.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], earlier in the day was talking, as I understood him, about requiring the Civil Service Commission to discharge employees unless they paid what he said were their honest debts. The reason I take this time is to ask the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service if civil service employees are not subject to garnishment, attachment, and execution?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. They are not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I can see, then, what is bothering the gentleman from Texas. Can the gentleman from Tennessee tell me why that is so, why the civil-service employees should be placed in a special class, why they should be exempt from civil process? Why should not their pay be subject to garnishment and other writs the same as that of an employee in private industry?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Because the States do not have the right to attach or impound Federal funds; for that reason the wages of Federal employees are not subject to garnishment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that is so unless the Federal Government consents, but why should not the Congress permit creditors to have the same remedy against civil service employees that they have against employees in private industry?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. If the statement of the chairman of the Civil Service Committee is correct, I wonder why we took the time of the House on yesterday to raise the exemption from garnishment on civil-service employees from $100 to to $200 a month?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; will the gentleman tell us the answer to that very pertinent question?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. That is a local situation entirely within the District.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then why should not creditors who reside in the State of Michigan, for instance, have the same right to garnishee the wages of civil-service employees as do creditors in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yesterday we were legislating for all the people of the District of Columbia and not for the Federal employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why did we legislate yesterday for creditors in the District of Columbia? Why should not creditors in the States have the same consideration?

Mr. MILLER of California. We were acting yesterday in our capacity as the administrators or lawmakers for the District of Columbia and doing just what the Legislature of Michigan or the Legislature of California or any other State has done with respect to the citizens of those States. We were not speaking, and we did not change in any way by what we did yesterday the matter of garnishments against Federal employees in the District of Columbia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. With all due respect to the gentleman may I say: The gentleman says we were acting yesterday for the District of Columbia. The Congress was acting yesterday, as I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Is it not generally against public policy to make the salary or wages of any governmental employee, whether State, municipal, or Federal, subject to garnishment? I know that in my own State the State employees are not subject to garnishment. There seems to be a long history of public policy not to make those employees subject to garnishment, probably because of the time that would be involved in filing answers and in trying to keep up with the legal processes that would be served. As I recall it, that is generally true.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That may be a public policy, but to me it does not seem fair to legislate in favor of the creditors of the District of Columbia, then shut out the creditors in the States. I cannot see why we should create a special haven or heaven or city of refuge, or whatever you want to call it, for people who are under civil service and get their checks from the Government here in Washington but do not have to pay their grocery bills, even a funeral bill. They would not have to pay the undertaker if they did not have any other property except a Government check. I cannot justify that. Why extend a special remedy to creditors of the District and deny it to creditors of the States? Maybe it is all right, maybe it is some New Deal policy that you just should not pay your debts if one lives some place outside of Washington.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the

consideration of the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 2077, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, S. 2077, was unanimously approved by the other body on last January 24. Your Committee on Post Office and Civil Service recommends favorable action upon the measure without any amendments.

The purpose of the legislation is to transfer from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the Civil Service Commission the responsibility of conducting initial personnel investigations of applicants for employment in certain agencies pursuant to the following statutes:

An act for the development and control of atomic energy, an act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, a joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, an act to provide for the reincorporation to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, an act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations, an act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures, a joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization, a joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, an act to promote the progress of science, an act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense.

In those agencies affected or covered by these statutes which I have just enumerated there are about 13,000 employees. The majority of the employees are in the Atomic Energy Commission.

This legislation was sent to the Congress by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation through the Department of Justice. The legislation has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, the Civil Service Commission, and the Atomic Energy Commission.

The bill provides that if there is any derogatory information uncovered by the Civil Service Commission, involving the loyalty of anyone being investigated, immediately the Civil Service Commission shall turn the investigation over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a full field investigation. Here is how the bill reads on that subject:

Provided, That in the event an investigation made pursuant to any of the above statutes as herein amended develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty, the Civil Service Commission shall refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation,

The bill provides further:

That, if the President deems it to be in the national interest, he may from time to time cause investigations of any group or class which are required by any of the above statutes, to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission:

The bill also provides that—

A majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, shall certify those specific positions which are of a high degree of importance or sensitivity, and upon such certification the investigation and reports required by such provision or by any other laws shall be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission.

So, in the case of the Atomic Energy Commission, all the applicants for employment in positions which are highly sensitive or classified will be certified, I am sure, by the Atomic Energy Commission to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for a full field investigation, just as the provisions of this legislation require.

This bill will relieve the Federal Bureau of Investigation of a tremendous amount of workload now attached to these personnel investigations of applicants for employment under these statutes and will permit the FBI agents to concentrate and devote more time to law-enforcement activities, and espionage, sabotage, and subversive activities. It is estimated that there will be around 88,000 personnel investigations of applicants for employment under this bill made each year. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is very eager that this legislation be passed. I think you will agree with me that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is the greatest and most effective investigative body in the world, and I think you will further agree that there is no greater or finer American than the Director, J. Edgar Hoover. All of us are justly proud of the wonderful work of Director Hoover and his FBI agents.

It was the gentleman from Iowa, I believe, who said, "Well, it might be or could be that the Department of Justice prompted J. Edgar Hoover to request this legislation."

Here is a personal letter to me from Director Hoover:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I deeply appreciate the sentiments expressed in your kind letter of February 7, 1952, and the consideration which the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is presently giving to the passage of legislation which would transfer the responsibility for making personnel types of investigation to the Civil Service Commission.

Unfortunately, I will not be in Washington on the occasion of the next meeting of the committee on February 26; otherwise, I would be most happy to appear before the committee. In view of the urgent necessity from our standpoint to secure the relief which S. 2077 would give us, I would like to urge that the committee take the matter up on February 26 as scheduled even though it will not be possible for me to attend your session on that date since I will be out of the city.

Faced with a mounting case load in December 1950, I urged the Attorney General to seek legislation which would relieve us from making personnel types of investigation. At the same time we discontinued making such investigations for several other agencies of Government which we had been making as a matter of cooperation on a reimbursable basis for some period of time.

In view of the growing international tension, the prosecutions which have been initiated against Communist Party leaders which, for practical purposes have forced the Communist Party underground, and the potential threat of the Communist Party to the security of the United States, it has been necessary for us to detail more and more manpower to handle internal security investigations.

Experience has demonstrated that an agency such as the FBI is at its highest peak of efficiency when it is kept mobile and does not become too large.

I do not believe that an organization such as the FBI should have the function of making so-called personnel types of investigation although, under the proposed legislation, the FBI will continue to make name checks, loyalty investigations and, in the event any information is obtained by the Civil Service Commission in its investigation reflecting disloyal activities, the matter will then be referred to the FBI to make a full field investigation. In addition, the act as enacted by the Senate authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, whichever the case may be, to call upon the FBI to investigate highly sensitive positions.

I was also compelled by another consideration to urge the Attorney General to seek this legislation—

So you can see that Director Hoover is the one that urged the Department of Justice to present this legislation to the Congress. I call your attention especially to what follows, because this is highly important and significant—

namely, should the present emergency become more tense or should the underground organization of the Communist Party embark upon an active program of sabotage, I am sure you can appreciate that all of our energies would of necessity have to be directed to meeting this threat. While there is still time, it is my considered judgment that the best interest of the United States can be served by equipping the Civil Service Commission to handle personnel types of investigation. As a practical consideration, the Civil Service Commission is already handling personnel types of investigation for other equally sensitive agencies and it would appear that in the interest of uniformity and good administration, the Civil Service Commission should be empowered to handle this type of investigation.

I sincerely hope that the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee will give favorable consideration to S. 2077 at their meeting on February 26 in order that the matter may be put before the House of Representatives at the earliest possible date.

My time has expired, and I am sorry that I cannot yield for questions. This is deserving legislation in the interest of our national security, and I hope that it will be speedily passed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I was one of the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service who was thoroughly against this bill for reasons which have been more or less brought out in this afternoon's discussion; that is, I have always been a profound admirer of the work of the FBI under J. Edgar Hoover. I therefore felt that it was unfortunate that the investigations of personnel matters should be turned over from this great organization, this great branch of our Government, in which we all have such confidence, to the Civil Service Commission. I therefore spoke against the bill in these terms in committee.

Afterward, when I returned to my office, I received a letter from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover himself. In this letter he thanked me for my remarks, and said that he was glad to know that I had such confidence in the Bureau. However, he pointed out to me that it was important in his own eyes that this bill should pass, that routine checks should not have to be made by the specialists of the FBI. There are not many of them, they are highly trained, and they should be reserved and kept for the loyalty check-ups.

As the chairman has told you briefly, those loyalty check-ups will still be left to the FBI when it is necessary for them to go into them.

I then brought up the question which seemed to me very obvious, why not increase the personnel of the FBI so that they can take care of these routine check-ups, which they admitted they can do in a more economical and I believe more efficient way. Mr. Hoover's reply was that he does not want the Bureau to get any larger.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield with pleasure to the expert on these matters.

Mr. VELDE. I thank the gentlewoman.

The gentlewoman mentioned the increase in size of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and I believe Mr. Hoover in his letter to Mr. MURRAY mentioned the fact that he did not want his organization to become any larger.

We as Members of Congress must look to the over-all Government organization. Can the gentlewoman deny that this will increase the over-all bureaucracy of our Federal Government, while it does decrease, of course, the necessity for increase of personnel in the FBI?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I quite agree with the gentleman on that. That is true, and it is perhaps deplorable. On the other hand, I would hate, and I know the gentleman would hate, to see the FBI in any way brought down to a lower point of efficiency than it is at the present time. We want to keep the FBI a little bit above, and a little bit more on a pedestal than other agencies of the Government. The FBI is an elite corps, if you will. Perhaps you do not like to hear that term used on the floor of the House of Representatives, but that is exactly what it is, and I am very much afraid that if we do increase its size, the same thing will happen to the FBI that has happened with every other agency of the Government, and that is it will become a great, big, sprawling bureaucracy over which Mr. Hoover will not have the control that he now has, and the personnel will not be able to do the high type of work, and high-type loyalty investigations for which they are primarily needed.

Mr. VELDE. Of course, the FBI has over the past 10 years gained a reputation due to the fact that it has been making these investigations. They have installed the procedure. They have the personnel to do it. As a general practice beginning FBI agents are first sent out in the field, and they handle these routine, or more or less routine, applicant investigation. I can see no reason why they should not continue to handle them in the same manner, and, if possible, as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] said, increase the appropriations for them so that they may hire more agents to handle this matter. I personally feel it is a great deal more important to investigate an applicant for Government employment before he becomes an employee, and to find out whether or not he is subversive, than to investigate him after he gets into the Government.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Of course, may I say to the gentleman, he is repeating all the arguments which I have brought out. On the other hand, and I am sure that there again the gentleman will agree with me, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, himself, has probably forgotten more on this subject than any of us will ever know. I think we have to depend on certain experts, and on their advice in all these matters. I would certainly want to do what Mr. J. Edgar Hoover thinks best for his department.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that these investigations did not start until 1946, so the Bureau has not had them too long, and also that the Bureau would still continue to make the checks against its files. They would still continue to make the routine checks against its files, and against its files of fingerprints on all of these people so we are not decreasing that part of the work.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The gentleman is completely right on that. Any difficult case or any loyalty case would be brought to the FBI.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman mentioned that these applicant investigations started in 1946. When I entered the FBI in 1942, we were making applicant investigations at that time. They had been made prior to that time also. Of course, as the years have gone by the load has increased with regard to that, but they started a long time ago.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman knows that we are talking about these investigations which were transferred to the FBI under the several appropriation bills as they were brought in here.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that the Civil Service Commission has on several occasions at least cleared individuals as security risks, and after they had cleared them, we learned that they were not good security risks? Also is it not true that any person who has been investigated and cleared by the FBI has stood the test as to being a good security risk, and none of them have been questioned? So why should we take a chance now to change that?

These young FBI agents are starting in on the job, and are learning their job by investigating these applicants. As they continue their work, they advance and become more qualified. So, we have an opportunity here as we leave this work with the FBI for the young FBI agent to start in where they should, and that is at the bottom, and to learn their business from the bottom up. If J. Edgar Hoover wants more money, and needs more personnel, certainly this Congress will give it to him.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am sure they will. I agree to a certain extent, but I must also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Mr. Hoover does not want more money, and does not want to enlarge the force that he already has and controls. He wants to keep it a small, very perfect, and very compact force, on which he can rely for the truly important things. A great many of these personnel checks, frankly, are very unimportant, the gentleman must realize that. There are hundreds of them. We will have 3,000,000 Federal employees on the Federal payroll in the executive branch very soon.

Mr. JENSEN. Why should we change and scrap the old system, and start off on a system of which you are not sure?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Well, only for the reason that we have a great expert in the matter, Mr. Hoover, himself who is in favor of this.

Mr. JENSEN. I know, but we have the American people to satisfy; and they will not be satisfied, I am sure, by taking these responsibilities away from this great man and this great organization and handing them over to another agency of the Government, and especially some agency that has had a questionable reputation in several instances.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But does not the gentleman believe that the American people have the greatest confidence in Mr. Hoover?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. And would certainly take his word over and against that of even the distinguished Congressman himself.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes, indeed; indeed the American people have great respect for J. Edgar Hoover. No one has greater respect for him than I.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I know that, I am sure of that; and that is the feeling of most Americans.

Mr. JENSEN. But one of his men called at my office and asked me to be for this bill. That does not mean that I am going to be for the bill, because as I see it, the bill is wrong.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I have the utmost sympathy for the gentleman, but I still think that Mr. Hoover must have had some good reason for writing the letter he did to our committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like at the inception of my remarks to pay my respects to and state my esteem for the FBI and for Mr. Hoover personally. As a matter of fact, the high esteem in which I hold the organization and his administration is another reason why I am against the bill that we have before us; why I believe the FBI should continue to handle this tremendous responsibility as a part of the investigation program of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, S. 2077, which would transfer certain personnel investigations from the Federal Bureau of Investigation to the United States Civil Service Commission, passed the Senate on January 24, 1952, and has now been reported to the House from its Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. There was practically no debate in the Senate and only very brief hearings were held by the House Committee. Before I discuss the reasons why I oppose this bill, it would be well to make sure that we are all talking about the same thing.

Between 1946 and 1951, the Congress gave to the Federal Bureau of Investigation the statutory responsibility for personnel investigations in what are called sensitive agencies. The specific statutes involved are:

Atomic Energy Act of 1946, Sixtieth Statutes, page 755.

Greece-Turkey aid, Sixty-first Statutes, page 103.

Relief assistance to war-devastated countries, Sixty-first Statutes, page 125.

Institute of Inter-American Affairs Act, Sixty-first Statutes, page 780.

United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, Sixty-second Statutes, page 6.

Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Sixty-second Statutes, page 137.

World Health Organization, Sixty-second Statutes, page 441.

International Labor Organization, Sixty-second Statutes, page 1151.

National Science Foundation Act of 1950, Sixty-fourth Statutes, page 149.

Office of Civil Defense, District of Columbia, Sixty-fourth Statutes, page 438.

Section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, Public Law 165, Eighty-second Congress, approved October 10, 1951.

Under the terms of these acts, the FBI is responsible for conducting the investigation of all personnel of the agencies concerned, including all applicants for employment. The President's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty recommended that these investigations be carried on by the FBI rather than through the regular channels established in connection with the Federal employees' loyalty program. Their reason, which was accepted by the Congress and which I believe was valid, was that the FBI was set up all over the United States to develop more efficiently and quickly cases involving loyalty or security.

S. 2077 as reported to this House would give to the Civil Service Commission full responsibility for the conduct of personnel investigations in the agencies covered, but with the following very important exceptions. First of all, whenever the Commission's investigations developed any information reflecting questionable loyalty, the case would be transferred to the FBI for a full field investigation. Secondly, if the President deems it to be in the national interest, he may cause investigations of any group or class to be made by the FBI rather than the Civil Service Commission. Thirdly, a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State would certify those specific positions which are of a high degree of importance or sensitivity and the investigation of them would then be undertaken by the FBI instead of the Civil Service Commission.

There are three important questions which must be asked about every proposed reorganization in the Government. Will the proposed change result in greater efficiency in operations or in improvement of the service to the people of the country? Will the change bring about a decrease in costs? And finally, we must ask how the proposed set-up will fit into the over-all organization of the Government and how it will affect other units of the Government. I find that S. 2077 fails to provide an affirmative response to any of these questions.

EFFICIENCY AND IMPROVED SERVICE

Let us ask, first of all, whether S. 2077 would result in greater efficiency or in improved service to the agencies involved or to those persons who are seeking employment in the agencies. As I noted a minute ago, this transfer proposed by S. 2077 is only a partial matter. The FBI would continue to check all applications for employment through its fingerprint and other files. It would add the fingerprints of the applicants to its own files. In case the Civil Service Commission turned up any derogatory information, the FBI would have to make a full field investigation, anyway. There would be certain positions in the Atomic Energy Commission, the Mutual Security Agency, and the State Department which would be handled by the FBI. I have heard no estimate of how many positions this will involve, only that the number would be decided by the heads of those three agencies. In addition, the President would be authorized to add certain groups to those to be investigated by the FBI rather than by the Commission.

The FBI would not be able to eliminate completely the staff which it now has to handle these personnel investigations. The representatives of the FBI failed to indicate at the hearings before our committee just how much of their present staff they intended to retain on the same duties they are now performing. As a matter of fact, the impression was given that all 1,700 FBI employees now assigned to this particular type of investigation would no longer be needed and could be transferred to other functions within the Bureau. I must challenge any statement of this nature. It is my belief that a substantial proportion of the present staff of the FBI now assigned to the type of personnel investigations under discussion would have to be retained. In addition, there would be the time-consuming and unnecessary transfer back and forth between the Bureau and the Civil Service Commission of all these cases. Some of the cases, of course, might go back and forth several times. In the meantime, the agency and the applicant would be forced to sit and wait as patiently as they could.

There are a number of other factors to be considered in connection with the efficiency of this investigative function. First of all, the FBI has been doing that sort of thing for many, many years, and I am sure that every Member of the House will agree that they have been doing a fine job. They have an experienced, smoothly operating staff. They have developed over the years many sources of information, some of them of a confidential nature. The Civil Service Commission has not in the past enjoyed the general reputation for efficiency which the FBI has earned. We all hope that under the chairmanship of Robert Ramspeck the Commission will reach that level, but I fear that throwing this burden on the Civil Service Commission at the present time would have a paralytic effect. At the present time, the Commission has approximately 4,000 employees. Chairman Ramspeck has estimated that nearly 3,000 additional employees would be necessary to put the provisions of S. 2077 into effect. In other words, the staff of the Commission would be almost doubled within a period of 6 months, a process which would put a tremendous strain upon the administrative machinery of the Commission. There is a very real danger that the other functions of the Civil Service Commission would be overshadowed and would suffer as a result. If that happened, the whole executive branch would feel the adverse results.

One factor of some significance in regard to efficiency is that the Federal Bureau of Investigation has 52 field offices scattered all over the United States while the Civil Service Commission has only 14 regional offices. More travel would be required if the Civil Service Commission took over and more time would be lost in traveling. More investigators per thousand cases would be required as a result. Securing adequate office space and equipment for the greatly expanded staff would also pose a problem for the Commission and the General Services Administration.

The bill provides that the Commission would have 180 days in which to take over from the FBI. Mr. Ramspeck in his

testimony before the committee stated that it would take from 14 to 16 weeks before a new investigator could get into production and it would be another 8 weeks before he could be expected to really earn his salary. In other words, the Commission would require 6 months to develop a staff at all comparable to that of the FBI. Of course, as a practical matter, the Commission will not be able to recruit all its new investigators immediately, so that it would be probably at least a year before the Commission's staff could be recruited, trained, and in full production. It would be quite understandable if the job performed by the Commission during the first few months was somewhat less than satisfactory. The question then becomes whether or not we can afford to take the risk of allowing some disloyal persons to slip into the agencies concerned, even though the jobs to which they were appointed might not be in the supersensitive category. In my own mind, the answer is clear—we should not take any such risk.

Were S. 2077 to be adopted, there would be unavoidable duplication of administrative and staff functions between the FBI and the Commission. There would be the question of who is to decide when a case is to be returned to the FBI for a full field investigation. Would not the FBI then have to go back over all the ground already covered by the Commission?

It is my understanding that the Commission would set up the investigator positions at grades GS–7 and GS–9, with salaries ranging from $4,000 to $5,000 at the entrance level. Presumably, at this salary level many of the applicants for the job would be young men recently out of college or law school. There is then the problem of either getting exemption from the draft or UMT, or else facing a tremendous rate of turn-over.

COST

The failure of S. 2077 on the grounds of efficiency alone is sufficient reason for its rejection. But there are other equally valid reasons why we should not transfer these investigations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission. One of the best of these reasons is the fact that it would be more expensive. According to Chairman Ramspeck, the Commission would require 2,970 additional employees, of whom 1,980 would be investigators and 990 would be clerical employees. Contrast this with the FBI which employs 975 investigators and 737 clerks to do the same job. Even if all the present employees of the FBI who are assigned to this type of investigation were to be transferred to the Commission, 1,200 additional employees would still be required. But, the FBI has no intention of transferring its employees to the Commission. As I have already pointed out, many of them will be needed in their present jobs, since the FBI would continue to do a lot of the work even if S. 2077 were passed. The rest are needed on other investigations being conducted by the FBI. I do not dispute the Bureau's need for these employees. In all probability, strengthening the FBI's staff for investigation of espionage and subversive activities is one of the wisest moves we could make at this time. The fact remains, however, that there will be 2,970 more people on the Federal payroll as a result of the passage of this bill. Proponents of the measure argue that there will be no additional cost since, under the terms of the bill, the agency which requests the investigation will be required to pay for it. But, I ask you, do not the funds with which the agencies will make payment also come out of the Federal Treasury? Any way you look at it, there will be 3,000 additional Federal employees, receiving salaries amounting to some $13,000,000 a year.

The Civil Service Commission has estimated that its operation of the program would cost the American taxpayers $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1953. Of this sum, $7,000,000 would be spent for training and other costs. Examinations for the investigators would have to be administered to an estimated 4,000 people all over the country. Additional office space and equipment would have to be secured. As I have already noted, the cost for travel would be greatly increased since the Commission has only 14 field offices as compared with 52 for the FBI. Compare the $20,000,000 the Commission says it would require for fiscal year 1953 with the $10,000,000 the FBI is spending on the program for fiscal year 1952. Even were FBI costs to increase for fiscal year 1953, they certainly would not come anywhere near $20,000,000. The Civil Service Commission readily admits that its unit cost, especially during the early months or years of operating this investigatory program, would be higher than that of the FBI. The Commission would charge the agencies at the rate of $250 a case, while the FBI handles some cases for only $150 apiece.

EFFECT ON OTHER UNITS

Having noted that S. 2077 would cost us double what we are presently paying, I would like to make a few observations about the effect the bill would have on the Federal Government as a whole. First of all, it would further scatter and disintegrate the investigative function which is already so widely scattered throughout the Federal Service. This measure would require us to set up a new organization on a Nation-wide scale when we already have an outstanding organization set up on a national scale for all types of investigative cases. If the FBI were inefficient or inept in the performance of its duties, there might be some reason for establishing a rival national organization. But the FBI has carefully and painstakingly built for itself a reputation for efficient operation in the best interests of the Nation.

There are thousands of investigators in the various agencies of the Federal Government which handle their own cases. I wish I could be more specific, but so far as I have been able to determine no one knows just how many persons are concerned with investigatory functions. For instance, every agency has persons concerned with the Federal employees' loyalty program. Many of these persons give only a part of their time to this work and it is extremely difficult to determine just how many persons we should say are connected with the loyalty program. Personnel investigations of one sort or another are carried on by all other agencies, and major investigatory programs are carried on by such units as the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the Central Intelligence Agency. In any event, the investigative function is widely scattered. S. 2077 only adds to the confusion already existing.

Earlier in my remarks I noted that there was a very real danger that the Civil Service Commission would be overwhelmed if this new load were thrust upon it. I want to make it plain that I have every confidence in Chairman Robert Ramspeck, the other members of the Commission, and the staff of the Commission. I am sure that they are making every effort to give us an improved system of Federal personnel administration. But I do not want to have them smothered by a tremendous new program which they are not equipped to handle. Should that happen there could be deleterious effects in every agency of the Federal Government. We would do far better to assist and encourage the Commission in improving the programs for which it is already responsible than to give to it new responsibilities which it is not eager to assume.

SUMMARY

Let me sum up for you in just a few words my reasons for opposing the adoption of S. 2077 which would transfer personnel investigations from the FBI to the Civil Service Commission. In the first place, I do not think we should change an established organization unless it can be proved that the new arrangement leads to increased efficiency, provides better service to the interested public, reduces costs, or is in the interest of other units of the Government. The measure which we are now considering fails on all these counts. It does not lead to increased efficiency. On the contrary, it splits between two agencies a function which is now being satisfactorily conducted by one of those agencies. It does not reduce the time lapse during which the applicant and the agency must wait for clearance. It would put a tremendous administrative burden on the Civil Service Commission which might result in damage to the other most important programs of the Commission. Due to the field office organization, transfer of functions would make necessary more travel and thus require more investigators per thousand cases. It would be well over a year before the Commission could even approach the level of efficiency now attained by the FBI. The cost of operating the program in the Civil Service Commission would be double the cost in the FBI for fiscal year 1953. Federal employment would be increased by nearly 3,000. The costs of recruiting, training, and equipping these new people would be large. The unit cost per case would rise were this bill to be adopted. Finally, there is no advantage to other units in the Federal Government, and there is a very real danger that all of them will be adversely affected should the Civil Service Commission be required to assume this bur-

den, thus necessarily neglecting its other functions to some extent. For these reasons, I urge that you reject S. 2077.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there anything in the RECORD to show that the FBI will discharge 2,000 of their personnel when the additional 3,000 are employed by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. JARMAN. No; it is my understanding, and I quote from memory of the hearings before our House committee, that there would be no saving on that basis. We asked specifically if the FBI investigators who are now doing this work would be cut off the payroll. They stated that in all probability most of the investigators would be used by working them into the over-all program of the FBI.

Mr. DONDERO. That means we would add 3,000 immediately to the Federal payroll.

Mr. JARMAN. That is correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Am I right, however, in this, that representatives of the Bureau of Investigation gave us to understand that these men who are now doing this routine work are needed in other places for security reasons? In other words, they are going to need most of them to take care of security problems of the country rather than having them continue these routine cases; is not that about right?

Mr. JARMAN. Yes; that is right.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think that is the reason they are not being discharged.

Mr. JARMAN. I certainly would favor adding to the personnel of the FBI whatever is necessary to do the job.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement because he is one of those who himself was an investigator, and a very important one, during the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. WITHROW. I think there is a misunderstanding. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] spoke in terms of the FBI having 3,000 men doing this work at the present time, when, as a matter of fact, they have 1,700 men doing this work at the present time.

Mr. JARMAN. Well, I have in that connection 2,191 employees, which includes both investigators and clerical help doing the work.

Mr. WITHROW. But the gentleman from Michigan had in mind that the FBI at the present time has 3,000 men doing this work. They have not.

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman made the point it would certainly add to the Federal payroll, which I think is substantiated by every bit of the testimony of Chairman Ramspeck. I am sorry I do not have the opportunity to read it in full.

Mr. DONDERO. That is what I have in mind, we would be increasing the payroll.

Mr. JARMAN. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I sincerely hope you will consider this bill in terms of the millions of dollars of unnecessary expenditure to set up this new investigation agency, with less effectiveness and less efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has again expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-five Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 21]

Aandahl	Gwinn	Murdock
Addonizio	Hall,	Murray, Wis.
Albert	Edwin Arthur	Norblad
Allen, Ill.	Hall,	O'Brien, Mich.
Anderson, Calif.	Leonard W.	O'Konski
Auchincloss	Halleck	Patman
Barden	Harden	Patterson
Battle	Harris	Potter
Beall	Harvey	Poulson
Blatnik	Hébert	Powell
Bolling	Hedrick	Radwan
Boykin	Heffernan	Rains
Brooks	Heller	Regan
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Riehlman
Brownson	Hillings	Rivers
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Roberts
Buckley	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Burton	Horan	Roosevelt
Camp	Hull	Sabath
Cannon	Hunter	Sadlak
Carnahan	Jackson, Calif.	Scott, Hardie
Case	Javits	Sheehan
Celler	Judd	Short
Chatham	Kean	Sikes
Chudoff	Kee	Spence
Clevenger	Kennedy	Springer
Cole, Kans.	Kersten, Wis.	Steed
Combs	Kluczynski	Stigler
Cooley	Lantaff	Stockman
Coudert	Larcade	Sutton
Cox	Latham	Tackett
Crosser	McCarthy	Taylor
Curtis, Mo.	McGrath	Walter
Dawson	McKinnon	Welchel
Deane	Marshall	Welch
Dempsey	Martin, Iowa	Werdel
Dingell	Merrow	Whitten
Dollinger	Miller, Nebr.	Wickersham
Donovan	Mitchell	Widnall
Doyle	Morris	Wood, Ga.
Durham	Morrison	Woodruff
Fernandez	Morton	Yates
Gamble	Moulder	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 306 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 16 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have encountered so much misunderstanding with reference to a piece of legislation as I have in the last couple of hours in respect to this particular bill now before us. I would like to direct your attention to the fact that this legislation does not deal with all of the employees in the Federal Government. It affects only a small percent. They are not all the most important at that. When you get the matter all sifted down you are dealing with only 15,000 out of over 2,500,000 jobs.

This matter of the FBI conducting complete examinations of Government employees was enacted into law under amendments to appropriation bills. This is one reason that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, is disturbed about this matter.

At the outset perhaps this may be regarded as a question of policy. I am not one of those who would want to relieve J. Edgar Hoover of responsibilities that he ought to assume, but the FBI, as I understand it, was established not for the purpose of making investigations of Government employees excepting with respect to security and loyalty.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have only a few minutes, but because the very distinguished gentleman from Illinois, a former official and member of the FBI organization wants to ask me a question, I yield to him.

Mr. VELDE. I just wonder if the gentleman knows whether or not the change of FBI personnel over to the Civil Service Commission is in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report? Was anything mentioned in the Hoover Commission report on that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not to my knowledge. I do not know of any recommendation in the Hoover report with respect to this particular matter. We are not relieving the FBI of its responsibility of examining into these cases with respect to loyalty or security. But may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that if we are going to adopt the policy of going into details with respect to the general qualifications of those in the Voice of America, foreign assistance, internal and world health organizations, Greece-Turkey aid, civil defense and so forth, then to be consistent the FBI should examine all of the qualifications of employees in our big defense agencies where people by the hundreds of thousands are employed.

Mr. VELDE. Will the gentleman agree this will increase the number of personnel involved in investigations instead of decreasing them?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman asked that question a while ago. That may be possible because J. Edgar Hoover and his assistants insist they need these agents who have been selected, trained, and qualified to conduct security investigations. They are going to be needed for much more important jobs than going out and making these preliminary and detailed investigations of those who are employed in the smaller jobs in the Government. According to testimony

submitted to the Committee the situation in this country has become such that almost every one of these men who are now trained and employed with the FBI, distinguished and qualified men, as is the gentleman from Illinois who is now asking questions, are needed for more important services than going along and examining detail that are not related to loyalty or our security. Do not forget that under this bill the FBI will continue to conduct loyalty and security investigations as they are doing now.

This Congress has over and over again expressed its confidence in J. Edgar Hoover and his work. Someone has intimated, and it was only an intimation, that J. Edgar Hoover may not have asked for this legislation. You may be assured the legislation would not be here if he were not, himself, supporting it. His personal letter on this point should settle that question.

I think the opposition is making a mountain out of a mole hill when you consider the comparatively small number of employees affected by this legislation. I agree that many examinations and investigations made by the Civil Service Commission or other agencies are not as good as they ought to be, but they are not affected by this legislation. If you want legislation to provide the FBI is to take over completely the examination of all these agencies, that is something else. That is a question of policy. But these have come in one at a time since 1948. They are not all the most important agencies in Government, but they do require time and effort and energy of men who are qualified to do more important things than make these preliminary investigations. Under this bill the FBI will continue to handle the investigations insofar as loyalty and security are concerned.

Mr. VELDE. I think the gentleman has very well stated his case and agrees with me that the general investigative staff of the Federal Government will be increased. Does the gentleman not agree with me that it would be better to have this increase in the investigative staff be under J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI, whom we all trust and admire and respect, than under any other Federal agency that is untried and untested?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Again I will answer the question by using almost the words of Mr. Hoover himself, who says that this is really outside of his area, that it is outside of his general field of investigation and he does not feel that his agency ought to be doing this kind of work when they have more than they can do in handling the thing for which they were originally assigned and for which their men are trained.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, who has given this matter a great deal of thought and study.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover is very emphatic on what he wants.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I definitely agree with the gentleman.

Mr. CANFIELD. May I read from his letter?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Because of lack of time I would rather he would ask a question, however I yield for his comment.

Mr. CANFIELD. In his letter does not Mr. Hoover stress the point that as this communistic threat develops he and his department will have to be devoting themselves to other directions, and he wants this job done by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is eminently correct in his statement. That is exactly what I tried to say a moment ago, that he has so much to do, and things of so much greater importance, and that responsibility is likely to grow even more important than it is this afternoon. He should not be using his time and energy and his assistants making little and detailed preliminary investigations. Let him devote his attention to the loyalty and security problems.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, who was also in a very responsible position dealing with security matters during his time in the military service. I am informed he rendered outstanding service to his country in investigatory work. I know too he would do a good job if he were now with J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. JARMAN. I will ask the gentleman why the FBI cannot set up a special personnel branch in the FBI, with perhaps FBI agents who are less trained, lesser specialists than the regular FBI agents to handle the personnel investigations which are routine, and perhaps even pay them less?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I would say to the gentleman, if you are going to adopt that policy, then do it for other agencies but not pick out these smaller agencies we have listed here. Let us do it for the whole Government while we are about it, if that is the policy. I have gone into this as carefully as I could. I agree that I am supporting this bill to a considerable degree because of the views of the man who heads the FBI and in whom this House has great confidence. I feel that it is for the good of the country that this legislation be adopted. Do not misunderstand me. I find just as much fault, or criticism as many of the Members of the House with respect to the manner in which the investigations are being conducted by the agencies of our Government. They are not complete nor thorough in many cases. I hope to discuss that matter rather fully and completely later on. But they are not under this legislation. You are not saving money for taxpayers by opposing this bill.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I do not know what the reaction is in regard to other Members of the House, but I have followed the work of J. Edgar Hoover over many years. I have talked to so many people in regard to him, and their faith seems to be practically unlimited in J. Edgar Hoover, and because of that I would be inclined to follow his suggestions here in regard to placing this rather trivial load upon his shoulders as compared to the larger work which he has to do. I think if there is any objection here on the floor it is because of their confidence in J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for his comment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, one of the important members of our committee.

Mr. GROSS. What is trivial about a loyalty check, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is nothing trivial about it, of course not. Nobody, neither the FBI nor anybody else, is being relieved of his responsibility on loyalty checks. I think the gentleman well knows or should know that the FBI will continue to check the question of loyalty and security in these agencies which are comparatively small and employ only 15,000 persons out of 2,500,000 jobs.

Mr. GROSS. That is one of the reasons I am opposed to this bill, the duplication in it, which the gentleman is admitting here.

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman is opposed to duplication, he certainly ought to support this bill. That is one reason why he ought to be in favor of this legislation. Over in Agriculture and Commerce, the War Department, the Navy Department, and others, they are checking their own employees, but over here, you say, J. Edgar Hoover's group is supposed to do all investigations. Of course the FBI will continue to.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I note the gentleman emphasizes some of the other agencies that are transferred by this act. However, the chairman of the committee stated that the one that was influenced the most by this legislation was the Atomic Energy Commission. In a commission whose activities are so secret that not even the Members of Congress are permitted to ask how they spend the money, why are we taking the check away from the FBI and giving it to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman will examine the bill, he will find there an amendment whereby they check 30,000 of them completely for the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. BUDGE. The people of this Nation will feel that if it is not important enough for the FBI to do it, it is not important enough to be done.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I repeat that the FBI will continue not only to examine the question of loyalty and security of the 30,000, and make complete investigations, also applicants for approximately 5,000 other positions.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. With respect to the Atomic Energy Commission, if that Commission certifies that such positions are of an important nature, the FBI will carry on an investigation under that provision?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is right.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the Commission may from time to time certify such positions?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. COLE of New York. To whom does the Commission certify?

Mr. REES of Kansas. To the FBI.

Mr. COLE of New York. Or to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. REES of Kansas. No; to the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to loyalty.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then I can understand that if the Commission feels that all of its positions are of such critical importance that an investigation by the FBI must be had in the national interest, the Commission can accomplish that by certifying those positions?

Mr. REES of Kansas. It may do so.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting this legislation primarily because it has the recommendation of the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. I am one of those who has approved, in the past, the transfer of responsibilities of Govenment personnel investigations to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I did so with the belief that the efficient way in which the Bureau was administered was our best assurance that this important function of exploring the background of Government employees could thus be done most effectively and economically.

In the Eightieth Congress I introduced legislation, which passed the House, which would have provided by legislation procedures for loyalty investigations of Federal employees. As the Members know, the present loyalty program of the Government is carried out pursuant to an Executive order. It was my view and it subsequently has been proved wise and expedient, that questions of Federal employees' loyalty must be resolved in favor of the Government.

At the time my bill was introduced and approved by the House, this was one of the basic differences between my bill and the policy of the Government with respect to loyalty investigations as it was carried out under the Executive order.

Recently, a firmer and more realistic policy has been adopted whereby the Loyalty Board has been directed to resolve questions of doubt with regard to Federal employees' loyalty in favor of the Government. I have always felt, and still do, that procedures relating to this important program should be spelled out in legislation.

The responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with regard to the Federal employees' loyalty program remains unchanged under this bill. In fact, the bill provides some legislative authority and guidance for the policy whereby a Federal Government agency conducting personnel-type investigations shall refer these investigations to the Federal Bureau of Investigation where there is derogatory information indicating questionable loyalty.

This bill spells out the requirement now made by Executive order that in the investigations which will be transferred by this bill, whenever there is developed any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty, the Civil Service Commission refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation. Further, in the conduct of these investigations, the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation will be searched to determine if there is any derogatory information. I have been informed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that in the event derogatory information is developed at that point, the Bureau will retain jurisdiction of the case and immediately conduct a full field investigation.

I should like to point out to the Members the fact that there is a much wider area in our Federal Government in its conduct of personnel type of investigations where we should develop a similar legislative directive and that is in the thousands of personnel-type investigations conducted by the various departments and agencies.

I want to emphasize that we are here dealing with only a very small group of Federal employees—a group wherein Congress, in the past, has made investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation mandatory by statute. The total employment of the agencies covered by transfer represents only about 8 percent of the total Federal employees. In the remaining 92 percent the investigations are being conducted on a wholly unrelated pattern.

Recently there has been a trend toward farming out these personnel-type investigations by contract to credit agencies similar to a procedure carried on during the war. In my judgment, and I raised this question in the hearing, the whole field of personnel type of investigations should be explored so that Congress may be informed as to exactly what the situation is so that a policy can be stated.

I urge the House to approve this legislation, first, because prompt action is needed to relieve the Federal Bureau of Investigation from a burdensome case load of investigations of a type somewhat unrelated to their primary mission, which is to safeguard the internal security of the United States. The record will show that the internal security work of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has increased 531 percent since 1947.

Secondly, consistent with my policy of following the recommendations of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover with regard to legislative requirements concerning the work of his agency, I concur in his recommendation favoring this bill.

Third, I cannot help but appreciate that we are here spelling out, at least in one area, the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in the field of Federal employees loyalty.

Fourth, we are making a start, at least, in a program which I hope eventually will result in uniform procedures for the personnel type of investigation being conducted throughout the Government. There will also be opportunity to save a great deal of manpower and also save a substantial sum of money for the taxpayers of this country.

This will result in an improvement not only by uniformity but also will avoid a duplication of investigations and an undue harassment of persons who are being contacted from many Federal sources where someone has given their names as references on applications filed with a number of different agencies.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably absent from the House in the voting on House Resolution 539, to investigate the Katyn Forest massacre. Had I been here I would have voted for the investigation.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, all of us here appreciate the excellent work Mr. Hoover has done. He is asking us to help him so that his organization will not be bogged down with the type of investigation of which he is asking to be relieved. He does not want to be a part of a retail credit investigating organization.

No other agency of the Government is equipped with the facilities and trained personnel required for the fulfillment of the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to the detention and apprehension of criminals and the control of espionage, sabotage, and other subversive activities. Mr. Hoover is just asking us to relieve his men of the type of investigation covered by this bill, so his men may have the time to attend to the work the Congress of the United States assigned to him and his men. He has done his best, and we are proud of the record he has made. He wishes very much to be relieved of these other activities that he thinks are trivial or nearly so, trivial as compared with the major work that has to be done.

These times are so very important in the history of the world that he needs his men to be used to do the type of job his bureau was established to do. In view of present world conditions, then, it is likely that the responsibilities of the Bureau of Investigation in the field of internal security will continue to increase tremendously, requiring the assignment of additional personnel to this type of work and resulting in a reduced number of persons and facilities being available for applicant-type investigations.

Actually, it was never intended that the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be utilized for such personnel or applicant-type investigations. Such investigations more properly fall within the jurisdiction of the Civil Service Commission.

I wish you would note these increasing case loads that I am giving you. This

will show you very clearly in statistical form why Mr. Hoover is asking for this relief.

On July 1, 1950, there were 58,671 cases. On January 1, 1951—notice this is just a short time, a half year—indicative of the urgent need for this legislation is the fact that on July 1, 1950, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had a total of 58,671 pending investigative matters, while on January 1, 1951, only 6 months later, it had 114,595 pending investigative matters, an increase of over 95 percent.

You can see the reason why this is so important. No good executive wants to constantly get further and further behind in his investigations where he has these men out investigating trivial matters, and here are major matters that have to be investigated. No good executive wants that type of thing to happen.

On July 1, 1951, again 6 months later, the Federal Bureau of Investigation had a total of 125,276 pending investigative matters. Moreover, of 344,599 investigative matters received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation during the 6 months from July 1, 1950, to December 31, 1950, 139,022, 40 percent were applicant-type investigations directed by acts of Congress such as those to which reference has been made above.

Notice 40 percent of the work. You have changed the whole idea of the FBI, and changed it so much until 40 percent of a new type of work was dumped into it, and allowed to interfere with the work that the Congress of the United States has established for Mr. Hoover, and his excellent FBI to perform.

From January 1, 1951, to July 1, 1951, 431,061 investigative matters were received by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, of which 200,951, or 46.6 percent, were applicant-type investigations. It should be noted that the figures for applicant-type investigations do not include investigations conducted under the loyalty program.

It is, therefore, urged that legislation be enacted relieving the Federal Bureau of Investigation of its responsibilities for conducting applicant-type investigations by transferring those responsibilities to the Civil Service Commission. The Federal Bureau of Investigation, of course, would continue to check against its files the names and fingerprints of applicants for Federal appointment, and furnish any pertinent information thus discovered. The Bureau would also receive for its files the fingerprints of all persons applying for positions in the executive branch of the Government. Under this plan the Federal employee loyalty program would be uniformly applied to all agencies, and the Bureau would continue to perform all of the functions, including the making of full field investigations, required of it by that program.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything on this bill, but there have been so many FBI experts talking about it, that I thought I would like to give my version of it. When we passed the McCarran bill, a great many Republicans thought I had lost my head entirely because I voted against it. But I told you then in a speech I made that you were going to drive these Communists underground, and when you did, it would take twice the amount of energy to find out what is going on than it would if you left them out. That is what the Congress did. It drove the Communists, every Communist in the United States underground, and Mr. Hoover is trying to find out where they are. Everyone of these 900 people who are now working on this preliminary work are needed in the FBI to ferret out the activities of the Communists in this country. You know very well my views on that—that I think the first line of defense in America is right here in the United States. It is not in England or across the seven seas. It is right here. When conditions get bad enough in the United States, the Communists will be here without coming by boat. They are potentially here now. This is important work to find out what this underground organization is doing in America. Do you want to take Mr. Hoover's energy away from him? These 900 men he says he is now using on this preliminary work are trained men. I see them sitting around here in this Congress. They are trained. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is a trained investigator. If he is not in the Congress, he is in the FBI, and if he is not in the FBI, he is in Congress. Do you want the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] sitting in his office, putting out preliminary reports on these employees of the Government like I do in North Dakota? We have a few of them who have passed examinations from North Dakota. The FBI comes to me and asks about their loyalty. Well, all I give them is the background, and I am giving the truth.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I mentioned the gentleman, and of course I have to take care of him.

Mr. VELDE. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. Does not the gentleman agree that if these investigations are necessary, and I think we will all concede they are, even though it might be considered by some to be trivial investigations, J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI are just as qualified to handle them and to administer the handling of these functions as any other department of the Government?

Mr. BURDICK. I knew the gentleman would ask a question that would have to be answered "Yes."

If you want to get the FBI so top-heavy, so lopsided that it will be the biggest agency in the Government and be incompetent in all things, you can do that; but if you want it to be a special agency of highly trained personnel to do what is necessary to be done at this time in the history of our country, do not load them up with so many unnecessary burdens.

When I certify any one of these Federal employees they need go no further, for I would not certify anyone whom I did not know or who I did not know was worthy. I know him, I know his father, I know his mother; and that is as far back as we need to go. That should be the end of it. What is the use of running to the FBI and having them do the same thing? For they will not find anything different than I reported. Why not let some other agency of the Government do 97 percent of this preliminary work?

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. Certainly.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman know that the Civil Service Commission says it will take about 3,000 more employees in the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. BURDICK. That is right; I think so.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman also know that the FBI clearance has always been 100 percent perfect and that the Civil Service Commission clearance has been bad in many instances? If the FBI needs more help we will give them more help.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield.

Mr. VELDE. That might be very true. The gentleman mentioned the McCarran-Wood bill as being responsible for driving the Communists underground in this country. The gentleman might be right on that.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, am I right or not?

Mr. VELDE. Will the gentleman agree with me that it is more important that the FBI check these applications for employment and thus weed them out before they get into Government than to have to investigate them as security cases after they get in?

Mr. BURDICK. But about 97 percent of them do not need any investigation, and the 3 percent that get in will still be investigated by the FBI and can be investigated before they are employed.

Mr. VELDE. But some would never get there.

Mr. GROSS. Could not that be ascertained by the Civil Service Commission by using a 3-cent stamp?

Mr. BURDICK. You can let the FBI do this if you want to but if they use their force of trained men on this then we will have to give them more men; that is all.

Mr. JENSEN. I am in favor of it.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am 100 percent in favor of the bill. I think that in voting for it we should keep in mind the fact that there are two different types of investigation about which we are talking: One type of investigation is nonsensitive; the other is the sensitive type. Regardless of what agency is concerned, the sensitive type of job to be filled will be investigated by the FBI; the nonsensitive will be investigated by the Civil Service Commission. We all know that it is rather ridiculous for us to have to give a full FBI investigation to a mailman who delivers mail on a city beat, or to a county agent out in some agricultural district, to give

him a full FBI investigation the same as you would to a person that is going to handle highly restricted data in a sensitive agency such as the CIA or the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I prefer not to; I have only 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I want to speak particularly with reference to the Atomic Energy Commission and say that the bill retains all the safeguards that are necessary for the Atomic Energy Commission to obtain full FBI investigation of all those people who are in sensitive work or who have access to restricted data of the Atomic Energy Commission. It will however be relieved of the obligation to require a full FBI investigation of those people who are working for contractors, building these immense projects such as the one at Savannah, Ga., which have nothing at all to do with secret construction. That work is merely putting in the streets, building the houses for personnel, building the buildings wherein secret machinery will later on be installed. The employees who install the secret machinery and who operate secret type of machinery will have the full FBI investigation. But at the present time some sixty or seventy thousand construction workers and other types of low-grade labor—and in speaking of low-grade labor I mean low-grade from the standpoint of being low in the wage scale or low from the standpoint of having access to security data—the FBI will be relieved of spending their valuable time and their valuable trained personnel in investigating these people who are no loyalty risk to our country.

I think all of us appreciate the tremendous prestige and the high qualifications of the men in the FBI. We should leave them free to do the work of that Bureau, where their work will do most for the security of the United States. We should relieve them of a lot of this routine work concerning the labor type of employees or the lower class of employees in the Government who do not have access to secret data or restricted data, and let them do the job which is the most valuable for them to do for the security of our Nation. I am heartily in favor of this bill and I hope it will be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from California does not want the House to believe that every applicant for a mail carrier's job is investigated by the FBI? Surely the gentleman does not want that to stand.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Practically every Government employee is now investigated, and I can give you plenty of instances of people who are in no more security work than a mail carrier being given a full time investigation by the FBI. It is silly and ridiculous. We are not so scared in this country of communism that we are going to hide under the bed and require ditch diggers to have a full FBI investigation.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very sensible bill and I certainly commend the committee for bringing it to the attention of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, has the rule been adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. A long while ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the bill open to amendment now?

The CHAIRMAN. We are considering it under general debate.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time on this side to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, a great deal of confusion has crept into this discussion. There has been a lot of apprehension expressed here as to what this bill is going to do. I have listened to the debate very closely and in my opinion I have wondered what I could tell the membership that has not been said. So I thought I would go back to part of the "bible" of the hearing and read from the letter of the man who all have paid great tribute to this afternoon, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Hear his words and on that I think we can rest our case.

I read from a letter to the chairman of this committee by J. Edgar Hoover in which he expressed regret that he could not appear personally before the committee. Starting with the third paragraph Mr. Hoover states, and I ask your attention to these words:

> Faced with a mounting case load in December 1950, I urged the Attorney General to seek legislation which would relieve us from making personnel types of investigation. At the same time we discontinued making such investigations for several other agencies of government which we had been making as a matter of cooperation on a reimbursable basis for some period of time.

I call your attention to and want to underline the words "I urged the Attorney General" to do this.

Further quoting from Mr. Hoover's letter:

> In view of the growing international tension, the prosecutions which have been initiated against Communist Party leaders which, for practical purposes have forced the Communist Party underground, and the potential threat of the Communist Party to the security of the United States, it has been necessary for us to detail more and more manpower to handle internal security investigations.

I would like to call attention to his next sentence, and remember this is J. Edgar Hoover speaking:

> Experience has demonstrated that an agency such as the FBI is at its highest peak of efficiency when it is kept mobile and does not become too large.
>
> I do not believe that an organization such as the FBI should have the function of making so-called personnel types of investigation although, under the proposed legislation, the FBI will continue to make name checks, loyalty investigations and, in the event any information is obtained by the Civil Service Commission in its investigation reflecting disloyal activities, the matter will then be referred to the FBI to make a full field investigation. In addition, the act as enacted by the Senate authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, whichever the case may be, to call upon the FBI to investigate highly sensitive positions.

We surrender nothing.

Further quoting:

> I was also compelled by another consideration to urge the Attorney General to seek this legislation; namely, should the present emergency become more tense or should the underground organization of the Communist Party embark upon an active program of sabotage, I am sure you can appreciate that all of our energies would of necessity have to be directed to meeting this threat. While there is still time, it is my considered judgment that the best interest of the United States can be served by equipping the Civil Service Commission to handle personnel types of investigation. As a practical consideration, the Civil Service Commission is already handling personnel types of investigation for other equally sensitive agencies and it would appear that in the interest of uniformity and good administration the Civil Service Commission should be empowered to handle this type of investigation.

Mr. Chairman, I join you in paying tribute to J. Edgar Hoover, and I call your attention again to the fact that the words that I have read are his and not mine. They come directly from and express the considered judgment of J. Edgar Hoover.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That sections 10 (b) (5) (B) (i) and (B) (ii) of the act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 755), entitled "An act for the development and control of atomic energy"; section 1 (2) of the act of May 22, 1947 (61 Stat. 103), entitled "An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey"; section 1 of the joint resolution of May 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 125), entitled "Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war"; section 3 (e) of the act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 780), entitled "An act to provide for the reincorporation to the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes"; section 1001 of the act of January 27, 1948 (62 Stat. 6), entitled "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations"; section 110 (c) of the act of April 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 137), entitled "An act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures necessary to the maintenance of conditions abroad in which free institutions may survive and consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States"; section 2 of the act of June 14, 1948 (62 Stat. 441), entitled "Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor"; section 3 of the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1151), entitled "Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the constitution of the International Labor Organization instrument of

amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States"; subsection (c) of section 15 of the act of May 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 149), entitled "An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes"; section 3 (e) of the act of August 11, 1950 (64 Stat. 438), entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an office of civil defense, and for other purposes"; and section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, are amended by striking therefrom, wherever they appear, the words "Federal Bureau of Investigation" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Civil Service Commission": *Provided*, That in the event an investigation made pursuant to any of the above statutes as herein amended develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty, the Civil Service Commission shall refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation, the results of which shall be furnished to the Civil Service Commission for its information and appropriate action: *Provided further*, That, if the President deems it to be in the national interest, he may from time to time cause investigations of any group or class which are required by any of the above statutes, to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 (b) (5) (B) (i) and (ii) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended by this act, a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, shall certify those specific positions which are of a high degree of importance or sensitivity, and upon such certification the investigation and reports required by such provisions or by any other laws, amended by the first section of this act shall, in the case of such positions, be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 2. The transfer of investigative functions hereinbefore provided for shall be effectuated during the period commencing with the date of the approval of this act and terminating 180 days thereafter, it being the intent of the Congress that the said transfer be effectuated as expeditiously within that period of time as the Civil Service Commission shall consider the facilities of that Commission adequate to undertake all or any part of the functions herein transferred: *Provided, however*, That investigations pending with the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the expiration of the 180 days shall be completed in due course by that Bureau and reports thereof furnished to the Civil Service Commission for its information and appropriate action.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any way the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for investigations of espionage, sabotage, or subversive acts.

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act, appropriations available to the departments or agencies, on whose account investigations are made pursuant to the statutes amended by section 1 of this act, shall be available for advances or reimbursements directly to the applicable appropriations of the Civil Service Commission, or of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the cost of investigations made for such departments or agencies.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since I made reference to the remarks of Chairman Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, when I spoke under general debate, I would like, without yielding, because of the time element, to continue with what I think the House should hear and consider before casting a final vote on this important bill.

Bear in mind that this is the agency that will assume the investigation load if we pass this bill. It will take it over from the FBI.

Chairman Ramspeck, in part, says this:

It is estimated that the Civil Service Commission will assume a workload of approximately 82,000 cases. A workload of this magnitude will require that the Commission employ approximately 1,980 additional investigators and 990 additional clerical personnel, or a total of 2,970 additional employees. Mr. Chairman, as an indication of the magnitude of the job being transferred to the Commission under S. 2077, if it is passed, I would like to point out that the Commission now employs a total of approximately 4,000 employees to carry out all of its functions. * * *

The investigation of the large number of applicants necessary to provide for the selection of 1,980 new investigators will greatly tax the resources of our present investigative staff. Our present staff of 275 investigators must absorb this work in addition to their present heavy load. Besides carrying on our current investigative work this staff will be called upon to investigate perhaps as many as 4,000 candidates for investigator positions and assist in the training of the 1,980 selected.

Bear in mind this paragraph that I read you on the money involved in making this change. Chairman Ramspeck says this as to the financing of the program:

We estimate that it will cost between $225 and $250 to process a case. Assuming a workload of approximately 82,000 cases for the fiscal year 1953, the total cost of making the investigations will be about $20,000,000.

I interpose at that point just this comment: That the FBI has allocated the sum of $14,000,000 to do exactly the same amount of work, a difference of $6,000,000.

I continue Chairman Ramspeck's statement:

It is estimated that we will incur expenses of $7,000,000 for training and costs of actual production prior to the time we can expect to start recovering these costs from the various agencies. * * *

On the basis of the best information we have at this time we believe that the initial amount of the revolving fund should be established at $8,000,000. We think that we can finance the security investigation program, including organization costs, with that amount.

He says that the program can be financed with a revolving fund of approximately $5,000,000, once it has been established as a going operation.

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, bear in mind the increased cost per case of investigation and the over-all tremendous increase, not in thousands but in several millions of dollars that this change would entail. I sincerely hope that you will keep this in mind when you cast your vote on this bill. I had the distinct impression when I heard Mr. Ramspeck testify before our committee that he was not sold himself, and his statement to the committee did not sell me on the justification for making this change at greater expense and less efficiency.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the crux of the matter on this proposition that I oppose comes from the fact that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission has asked for a revolving fund that he estimates may be $8,000,000 and can eventually be reduced to about $5,000,000. That is about the difference in the cost of making these investigations. The thing they do not tell you is that if you leave this with the FBI, with the new duties imposed on it by the conditions Mr. J. Edgar Hoover anticipates in his letter, that his organization will have to expand to pick up the load. There will be some increased cost because of the expanding of FBI, of course; there will be an increased initial cost to the Civil Service Commission in picking up this load.

If you read the testimony in the hearings you will see that Mr. Joseph Winslow—and those of you who know personnel work respect Mr. Winslow, as a former member of the Bureau of the Budget and now Assistant Executive Director of the Civil Service Commission, for his fine knowledge of this subject—tells you that this cited cost of $250 will decrease with time. That is about the maximum to shoot at with a new agency. As they become more proficient that will go down. He tells you also in here that there have been cases where the FBI has charged far less or far more, depending on the type of case that is investigated.

Mr. Chairman, I think again the whole crux of the matter is this: It reverts back to where you are going to have the work done, whether you are going to keep the FBI mobile and small enough to be efficient or whether under the guise of false economy you are going to demagogically wish upon Mr. J. Edgar Hoover work that he tells you he does not want and work the very nature of which will impede the proper functioning of his agency.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, certainly there are two questions that are not in dispute. One is our admiration for the efficiency and integrity of J. Edgar Hoover. The other is the same feeling for our former colleague, Mr. Ramspeck, who heads the Civil Service Commission at this time.

Apparently this legislation is proposed because Mr. Hoover does not want to extend his activities, and I gather, too, from the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN] that Mr. Ramspeck is not anxious for the job. It will cost something like $6,000,000 more money if the task is given to Civil Service. Of course, Civil Service will not always be under Mr. Ramspeck, so just as an illustration of what has happened before, permit me to give you a little information from a hearing, not that I know

anything about it—I am just reading it—that was held in 1947, when Mr. Mitchell was President of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Flemming was on the Commission, Miss Frances Perkins was the other member of the Commission. At that time they were on the Commission, and appeared as witnesses. The Civil Service Commission at that time had a file of 750,000 cards about civil-service employees; and others who were not Federal employees. You will be surprised to know, they had on those cards the names of Congressmen, of Senators and of Senator's wives.

Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY] that his name was not one of them, but my name was, as were the names of other Members of the House and Senate.

Permit a repetition: They had the names of Congressmen, Senators, and Senators' wives who were not Federal employees. They had all kinds of reported information about them. They were about to make a sound recording so that some politicians who had access to that special secret file could use the gossip to get some of the Members in the next election.

So we had the Commissioners up, or they came up, before a committee; and do you know where they got the information they had on those cards? It is in the record here. Here it is. Note, they got it from a law firm in New York named Mintzer & Levy, 39 Broadway, New York City.

Some of those cards had on them the word "Nazi"; some the word "Communist"; both referring to Senators and Congressmen. That is what they had at that time. The Commissioners all said that they did not know that file was in existence. They testified the investigations were made by individual investigators. Somebody who had a job apparently because there was nothing else to do had gone out and somewhere got some more names and then collected a lot of information or, more accurately, gossip and rumors, about those individuals whose names they picked up either from the press or anywhere and everywhere. After some Members of a House committee had seen some of the cards, the committee asked that the cards be produced or committee members be permitted to examine the file.

The Commission said, "We will not let you look at those files." The congressional committee asked again if they could have a look at what was in them. Then the President took a hand, and, under date of October 21, 1947, denied the committee the right to examine the file.

Do not forget, the Civil Service Commission's investigators got many of these names and this information from this New York firm of attorneys which was working for the Anti-Defamation League and other organizations.

Permit me to quote from the report—page 2:

> It appeared from some of the index cards that considerable material had been transcribed from the private files of Mintzer & Levy, a firm of lawyers having offices at 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (hearings, p. 4).
>
> Material transcribed from this source by the Civil Service Commission was cataloged under a special warning as follows:
>
> "The above was copied from the marine loyalty suspect list of the subversive files in possession of Attorneys Mintzer & Levy, 39 Broadway, New York City, room 3305. Their files were made up in cooperation with the American-Jewish Committee and the Anti-Defamation League. The source of this information must not be disclosed under any circumstances or be quoted. However, further information concerning the above may be obtained by contacting the offices of Mintzer & Levy."
>
> There is no evidence to indicate that such material was checked, verified, or in any way tested before being transferred to the official files of the Civil Service Commission.
>
> Quotations on some of the cards relating to various Members of the House and Senate were in these words (hearings, pp. 17–25):
>
> "Nazi.
>
> "See files at Friends of Democracy, Inc.
>
> "Addressed the first convention of the National Lawyers' Guild, February 20–22, 1937.
>
> "Various issues in organization file."
>
> It was the purpose of the committee's investigation to ascertain, first, by what authority hearsay information—which might reflect upon the reputation of Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, and persons who were not applicants for Federal jobs—was collected and maintained, not only in the office of the Commission in Washington but in its several regional offices as well.

You see what had happened? These individual employees of the Civil Service Commission, without the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission or anyone else in authority, just grabbed a lot of names, collected some rumors, some gossip, put it on cards, and then when Congressmen wanted to find out what was in that file, the House committee was told by the President that it could not examine the file even though it carried the names of some Members of Congress as either Nazis or Communists.

A letter reading as follows was sent to the President:

> OCTOBER 8, 1947.
>
> The PRESIDENT,
> *The White House.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Hearings held by a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments disclosed that there was in the possession of the Civil Service Commission a file containing statements bearing upon the views, opinions, and activities of certain-named Senators, Senators' wives, and Congressmen.
>
> Members of the Civil Service Commission appeared before the subcommittee and stated the Commission had no authority to obtain such information, nor to maintain such a file. The members of the Commission voluntarily stated the information would be removed from the files. They also stated that prior to the matter being called to their attention on Friday, October 3, they had no knowledge that such a file existed, and that they had no knowledge of its contents.
>
> Reliable information has come to the subcommittee that a permanent, sound record was to be made of this information which statements, in the file disclosed, were obtained from various organizations, some of which are admittedly subversive, and a number of which are unreliable.
>
> The subcommittee asked for a subpena to be issued calling for the production of this file insofar as it contains statements relating to Members of Congress. The request contained in the subpena was refused by the Commission on the ground that the file was confidential and its disclosure could only be obtained by an Executive order.
>
> The subcommittee also asked that a member of the committee, or its representative, or a representative of Congress, be permitted to go through that portion of the file which carried statements as to Members of Congress. This request was refused on the grounds above stated.
>
> Will you kindly issue an order authorizing the Commission to open this file to the inspection of a committee member or their representative.
>
> Faithfully yours,
> CLARE E. HOFFMAN, *Chairman.*

The President replied:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, October 21, 1947.*
>
> Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
> *The House of Representatives,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have your letter of October 8, 1947, with respect to a certain file of the Civil Service Commission. Your letter states that the Commission has refused to make this file available to your committee.
>
> I am advised that these records were maintained by the Civil Service Commission on a confidential basis. There is nothing in your letter which would indicate that the Commission was not justified in classifying them as confidential nor am I justified in overruling the Commission on the facts presented by your letter.
>
> I believe that it is in the public interest to keep Civil Service Commission records confidential, in the absence of a compelling reason to the contrary in a particular case. In the circumstances presented, I do not believe that I should interfere with the Commission's refusal to make these records public.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
> HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Transfer this power to the Commission and the investigators of the Civil Service Commission can go out and rake up all the rumors and charges they can find or imagine, put them on the record, dish them out for political purposes, and then when a congressional committee comes along and attempts to stop the use of that false, vilifying report, recording, or the circulation of that kind of information, the President may say, as he said before, that it was none of a congressional committee's business. They can vilify us, they can slander us, they can, as they did, misuse us and abuse us, make a record of vilification for political purposes, use their slanderous, libelous rumors and gossip.

They can put it in their files down there as official and turn it over to the political supporters of the administration and we are not permitted to show its falsity. We learn what it is when it is printed. I am not telling you what may, might, or could happen under civil service. I am telling you what did happen. For myself, I want no more of it. Moreover, you should know what happens when an agency investigates itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOW: After line 2 on page 5, add a new section to read as follows:

"All findings, records, and reports made or compiled by the Civil Service Commission under this act shall be made available to the committees of the Congress upon the request of such committee."

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is germane. In checking the bill itself, we find we are considering acts having to do with the control of atomic energy, assistance to Greece, the joint resolution providing for relief and assistance to people of countries devastated by war, and the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and many other such items. It seems to me from the bill itself in setting up this agency, Congress has a right at the same time to say that the records and findings of the committee that is being set up now should be made available to the committees of the Congress when the committee so requests.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FORAND). The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment to the bill S. 2077. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] makes a point of order against the amendment on the grounds that it is not germane. The Chair has examined both the bill and the amendment, and can see no good reason for the claim that the amendment is not germane, and for that reason overrules the point of order.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who has just preceded me, I think, has made a splendid argument as to the reason why this amendment should be adopted. Those of us who have in the past been associated with committees of the Congress in attempting to carry out the will of the Congress in their mandates to us to secure information and to file proper reports in Congress, have run across a denial many times of the agencies to permit us to use material which the Congress is entitled to have.

Mr. Chairman, I shall not take my full time to discuss this matter, for I feel every Member of the Congress is familiar with the difficulties we have in trying to carry out the duties that we have imposed upon us. Therefore, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always felt that there is a very sharp line of demarcation between the legislative and administrative branches of Government, and I think it is well to keep that line of demarcation. This to me is an encroachment on the administrative branch of the Government. We have heard all about the people whose names are on these lists. They might be there, and I assume they are. I think other names have been bandied about by people in Congress and out of Congress; that also is deplorable, and I know that you agree with me. But let me point out to you that it is going to be costly to set up the necessary facilities and personnel to supply the data to the Congress when, as, and if it might be requested. It would always have to be kept up to date or an agency would be subject to a great deal of criticism. I believe the tendency has been away from demanding participation in the executive branch of Government by the legislative. I think this is poor legislation, and I hope it is voted down.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the people throughout the breadth and length of the United States will be glad to learn that there is one agency of Government and a man heading that agency here in Washington in whom every Member of Congress has confidence: I refer to the FBI and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. But I think there are some things that need a little clarification, some statements that have been made during debate on this bill.

Under this bill, if it passes, everyone seeking employment in any agency of the Federal Government will be checked; the FBI will check their files to see if there is a card with derogatory information on the individual; they will check fingerprints; and if they find anything derogatory in their file they will make a full field investigation on the individual. The purpose of the bill is to relieve the FBI of this tremendous load of checking the thousands and thousands of employees on whom it is not necessary to have loyalty or security checks, letting that be done by another agency of Government.

I am glad to hear some of the Members arguing against this bill on the ground of economy. I think I am as economy-minded as any man in the House; at least I was one of a few who was given a hundred percent voting record for economy last year by the survey of State councils of the chambers of commerce. It has been pointed out that additional expense will be put on the Civil Service Commission if this bill passes; that is probably true. But the way to get economy is not to put this additional load on the Civil Service Commission, but to eliminate some of the agencies of Government altogether or at least cut them down by 50 percent, get rid of unnecessary personnel, get rid of a part of this bureaucracy that has been built up in the Federal Government.

As to the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], I think there are many reasons why this amendment should be adopted. There are thousands and thousands of individuals in hundreds of agencies of the Government who have access to the loyalty and security files of individuals, while not a single Member or a single committee of Congress, the duly elected representatives of the people, have access to them. You have heard a lot from constituents and from colleagues here on the floor about directives of the President keeping this information from the regularly constituted committees of Congress and from Members of Congress. If you mean what you say in the cloakrooms, if you concur with the constituents who have written you on the subject, and if you want to retrieve some of the powers to yourself that have over the years been given to the executive branch of the Government, you will support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Yes, I am as familiar as any of the others with this whole Civil Service Commission set-up. We went into the matter in the Eightieth Congress when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] was chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the loyalty boards in the various departments of the Government and the Loyalty Review Board in the Civil Service Commission were set up. If the Civil Service Commission had carried out its responsibilities as it should have, we would not have had so many Communists, fellow travelers, and disloyal people in Government. If we are going to let President Truman and Dean Acheson make decisions on loyalty and security of individuals after the various agencies, including the FBI, have spent millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money on this work, then we had better eliminate the entire program.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson and President Truman are making a mockery and fraud out of the so-called loyalty program set up to rid the Government of employees who are of questionable loyalty and security risk. With every passing day I am becoming more convinced that they are more interested in saving face than they are in dismissing these questionable characters. Either the Secretary of State and the President are unwilling or unable to purge the Government service of persons of questionable loyalty.

The newspapers of Wednesday, March 5, 1952, carried a story to the effect that Secretary of State Dean Acheson announced he had overruled the findings of the State Department Loyalty and Security Board that Oliver Edmund Clubb was a security risk. If this were the complete story, Secretary Acheson's statement would hardly be worthy of comment, but the admission of Mr. Acheson was apparently made from fear that the State Department's appropriations for the coming fiscal year might meet some opposition.

The State Department on February 11, 1952, announced:

> After Mr. Clubb's case was processed through the loyalty and security channel of the Department he was cleared on both loyalty and security and restored to active duty on February 8.

Let us start at the beginning. Last June Mr. Clubb was suspended by the State Department pending a decision as to his loyalty to the very Government that had employed him since July 1, 1928. Mr. Clubb appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities on March 14, 1951, August 20, 1951, and again on August 23, 1951, and was questioned about his visits to the office of New Masses in New York City, and his association with Agnes Smedley, Philip Jaffee, Frederick V. Field, Owen Lattimore, and others.

On February 12, 1952, the State Department announced that Mr. Clubb was "absolutely cleared" on all loyalty and security grounds and restored to duty the previous Friday—February 8. Mr. Clubb resigned February 11, 1952.

In an appearance before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee on Feb-

ruary 27, 1952, Owen Lattimore, longtime friend of Clubb, proclaimed that he, John Carter Vincent, John Stewart Service, and Oliver Edmund Clubb had been made the victims of hysteria. This outburst from Mr. Lattimore prompted Senator FERGUSON to charge that Clubb had been cleared by Secretary of State Acheson after the State Department Loyalty and Security Board had found against him.

On February 28, 1952 Secretary Acheson told a reporter, "I won't talk about the case."

Several days later Deputy Under Secretary of State Carlisle Humelsine appeared before the Senate Appropriations Committee. When asked about the Clubb case Mr. Humelsine was evasive. When requested to produce the documents in the Clubb case Mr. Humelsine excused himself on the grounds that an executive order forbade him to give the Senate access to loyalty files. Mr. Humelsine was warned that unless he complied with the request the Appropriations Committee might have to refuse to consider the Department's appropriation. Mr. Humelsine then referred the matter to the Secretary of State with the result that Mr. Acheson admitted that he had reversed his loyalty and security board and cleared Mr. Clubb.

What is the result of Mr. Acheson's unusual action? Mr. Clubb was suspended in June of last year and restored on order of the Secretary of State in February of this year. During that time he rendered no service to the Government, yet the result of Mr. Acheson's action in overruling his loyalty and security board means that Mr. Clubb collects his full salary for all the time he was suspended and for which he rendered no service.

That is but one point worthy of comment. Another is the manner in which the Clubb case was handled by the State Department. On February 11 the State Department announced that Mr. Clubb had been fully cleared. Such an announcement could only be interpreted as meaning that Mr. Clubb had been cleared by the State Department Loyalty and Security Board.

The State Department announcement was nothing more than a calculated attempt to deceive the public, an announcement tainted with dishonesty. What could have been the reason for Secretary's Acheson's refusal to reveal the true facts? Could it have been that he made a deal with Mr. Clubb to reinstate him on condition that he immediately resign, having in mind that the loyalty review board might consider the Clubb case in the same light as the John Stewart Service case? Or could it have been that Mr. Acheson felt duty bound to reverse his loyalty and security board for fear that the decision of the board would lend support to the oft-repeated allegations of the junior Senator from Wisconsin that the State Department was infiltrated with pinkos of all shades?

Whatever the reason, the word for it is dishonesty. One thing Mr. Acheson has evidently not learned and that is he must deal honestly and candidly with the public. It took the courage of a Member of the United States Senate to expose what apparently is the answer to the question as to why the State Department has not released a single employee under the present Government employee loyalty program.

On December 12, 1951, the Loyalty Review Board reversed the decision of the findings of the Loyalty and Security Board of the State Department in the case of John Stewart Service, and dismissed him on the grounds of questionable loyalty. After which, Mr. Service appealed to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, to reverse the findings of the Loyalty Review Board. This appeal to the President by Mr. Service has been on Mr. Truman's desk for 2 months. Why does the President hesitate to back up his Loyalty Review Board which he set up to pass on just such cases as John Stewart Service, especially after spending millions and millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money to establish these procedures?

If the President is sincere in what he has been telling the people regarding his intentions to rid the agencies of Government of people of questionable loyalty and security risk, why should he have to hestitate a single day in refusing to consider Mr. Service's appeal to him?

I have, on many occasions over a long period of years, called attention of the Members of Congress to my doubt of the sincerity of both the President and Secretary of State regarding many cases. The way the Service and Clubb cases have been handled only tends to substantiate my opinion. If we are going to let the Secretary of State or the President overrule boards which have been set up to pass on these matters, I, for one, do not believe we should squander the taxpayers' money any longer on these programs unless they get the cooperation they deserve from the executive branch of the Government.

From my own personal investigations I am satisfied that panels sitting in judgment on loyalty cases, in most instances, where individuals who have been named by Senator JOE MCCARTHY are involved do not arrive at their conclusions on the evidence in the files, but rather by throwing every possible road block in the way of Senator MCCARTHY'S charges being substantiated. It is my opinion that the members of the panels are not resolving the cases in favor of the Government but against Senator MCCARTHY. Is it any wonder that I say that by the record I still insist that the way the President and the Secretary of State are permitting the loyalty investigations to be conducted and determined is a fraud and hoax upon the public.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak on the bill which I think is an undesirable one and I will make some remarks about that a little later. For a few minutes I desire to speak upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Personally, I do not believe an amendment of this character is necessary. The Congress has through its subpena power and its investigative function the right to obtain documents from the executive branch of the Government at all times without passing any law. The President has raised the question with respect to various committees by instructing subordinates in the executive branch of the Government not to give papers and documents to committees of the Congress and sometimes has ordered those documents to be transferred to his own personal possession. The Congress up to this point has not pressed the issue.

This question is not a new one. It is a question of extreme delicacy involving the separation of governmental powers under our constitutional system. Some time the question will have to be faced. I hope it will be faced squarely by the Congress and that we will not back away from it. Up to the present time the question has been avoided by both the executive branch of the Government and the Congress, but at some time it will have to be presented to the courts for decision.

May I remind the House again that when President Truman was chairman of the Truman committee of the Senate I served as assistant counsel to that committee. He caused subpenas to be served on the Attorney General of the United States at least twice, and I believe three times. At that time he was forthrightly upholding the power of the Congress. On both occasions he got results from the Attorney General of the United States and secured possession of the documents that the Truman committee desired. I would like to see the Congress have the same courage and regard for its own powers today as the present President of the United States had when he was a Member of the Senate.

With respect to the bill itself, let me say that I was rather surprised to hear the comments of those who have said that the only reason they are voting for this bill is because J. Edgar Hoover has asked them to do so.

No one admires J. Edgar Hoover more than I do. I have had personal contact with his investigators and former investigators in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have high regard for their excellence in investigative work.

I say to you that the greatest compliment this Congress could pay J. Edgar Hoover would be to say, "Good and faithful servant, you have done this job well. Keep on doing it."

I disagree with those who regard this as a trivial matter and argue that these routine personnel checks are of no importance. It is far more important to check before you put someone on the payroll than to make all kinds of checks afterward, then remove an employee because of disloyalty.

Some time ago it was reported in the press that it cost the Government Printing Office $500,000 to get rid of a civil service employee, in litigation through the various courts.

The time to check applicants for employment is before they have ever been

put on the Federal payroll. I tell you that is extremely important. Their tendencies toward subversion and disloyalty can be checked as well as their competence and qualifications to perform the job they seek. That investigation should be performed by competent investigators. We have passed laws to require it.

The officials who handle the extremely broad powers that we have been turning over to the executive branch of the Government in the past few years need to be checked for their competence and their loyalty to this Government. We should keep them out in the first place rather than checking them afterward and finding them disloyal. I regard these personnel checks as extremely important.

Now, on the matter of cost, the FBI is doing this with 1,700 employees, including some 900 investigators, at a cost of $10,000,000. Chairman Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, very clearly indicates in his testimony he is not prepared or equipped to do this job. That Commission has only 275 investigators. It will be required to nearly double its present force of employees of 4,000 by adding 3,600 more. Mr. Ramspeck estimates it will cost the Civil Service Commission $20,000,000 a year. That Commission will do the personnel checks out of 14 branch offices, whereas the FBI has at present in its employment over 15,000 employees working out of 52 branch offices.

It is apparent why the cost is going up.

The Civil Service investigators are going to have to travel all over the country, whereas the FBI can use its branch offices in existence today.

This job is an investigative job. The FBI has proved its competence in this field. Let us not disturb the situation. If we do, we will not only increase the cost to the American taxpayer, but we will run the risk of getting a lot of disloyal and incompetent employees in the Federal Government in these very critical positions, in the Atomic Energy Commission, foreign aid agencies, and other important Federal activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee), there were—ayes 96, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FORAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 555, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 91, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WITHROW. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WITHROW moves to recommit the bill S. 2077 to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the grounds that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirteen Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 86, nays 233, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 22]

YEAS—86

Adair	Cunningham	Nicholson
Albert	Curtis, Mo.	O'Hara
Andersen, H. Carl	Curtis, Nebr.	Osmers
	Davis, Wis.	Phillips
Andresen, August H.	Dolliver	Poulson
	Dondero	Prouty
Angell	Ford	Reed, Ill.
Auchincloss	George	Schenck
Ayres	Golden	Schwabe
Baker	Gross	Scrivner
Bakewell	Hill	Scudder
Beamer	Hoeven	Shafer
Belcher	Hoffman, Ill.	Smith, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Hoffman, Mich.	Smith, Wis.
Berry	Jarman	Steed
Betts	Jenison	Taber
Bishop	Jensen	Talle
Blackney	Kearns	Thompson, Mich.
Boggs, Del.	King, Pa.	
Bolton	LeCompte	Vail
Bray	Lovre	Velde
Budge	McDonough	Vorys
Buffett	McGregor	Vursell
Bush	McIntire	Wharton
Butler	McVey	Wickersham
Byrnes	Mack, Wash.	Williams, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Church	Meader	Withrow
Cotton	Morris	Wood, Idaho
Crawford	Nelson	

NAYS—233

Abbitt	Aspinall	Bentsen
Abernethy	Bailey	Boggs, La.
Allen, Calif.	Baring	Bolling
Allen, La.	Barrett	Bonner
Anderson, Calif.	Bates, Ky.	Bosone
Andrews	Bates, Mass.	Bow
Anfuso	Beckworth	Bramblett
Arends	Bender	Brehm
Armstrong	Bennett, Fla.	Brooks
Brown, Ga.	Hart	Ostertag
Brownson	Havenner	O'Toole
Bryson	Hays, Ark.	Passman
Burdick	Hays, Ohio	Patman
Burleson	Hébert	Patten
Burnside	Heriong	Patterson
Busbey	Heselton	Perkins
Canfield	Hess	Philbin
Carlyle	Hinshaw	Pickett
Carrigg	Holifield	Poage
Chelf	Holmes	Polk
Chiperfield	Howell	Preston
Clemente	Ikard	Price
Cole, N. Y.	Irving	Priest
Colmer	Jackson, Wash.	Rabaut
Cooper	James	Ramsay
Corbett	Jenkins	Rankin
Crosser	Johnson	Reams
Crumpacker	Jonas	Redden
Dague	Jones, Ala.	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Reed, N. Y.
DeGraffenried	Jones, Hamilton C.	Rees, Kans.
Delaney		Rhodes
Denny	Jones, Woodrow W.	Ribicoff
Denton		Richards
Devereux	Karsten, Mo.	Riley
Donohue	Kearney	Robeson
Dorn	Keating	Rodino
Doughton	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Colo.
Eaton	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Fla.
Elliott	Kerr	Rooney
Ellsworth	Kilburn	Ross
Elston	Kilday	St. George
Engle	King, Calif.	Sasscer
Evins	Kirwan	Saylor
Fallon	Klein	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Feighan	Lane	
Fenton	Lanham	Secrest
Fernandez	Lesinski	Seely-Brown
Fine	Lind	Shelley
Fisher	Lucas	Sieminski
Flood	Lyle	Simpson, Ill.
Fogarty	McConnell	Sittler
Forand	McCormack	Smith, Miss.
Forrester	McCulloch	Smith, Va.
Frazier	McGrath	Spence
Fugate	McGuire	Springer
Fulton	McMillan	Staggers
Furcolo	McMullen	Stanley
Garmatz	Machrowicz	Teague
Gary	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Gathings	Madden	Thornberry
Gavin	Magee	Tollefson
Goodwin	Mahon	Trimble
Gordon	Mansfield	Van Pelt
Gore	Martin, Mass.	Van Zandt
Graham	Miller, Calif.	Watts
Granahan	Miller, Md.	Wheeler
Granger	Miller, N. Y.	Whitten
Grant	Mills	Wier
Green	Morano	Wigglesworth
Gregory	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Hagen	Morton	Willis
Hale	Multer	Wilson, Tex.
Hand	Mumma	Winstead
Hardy	Murphy	Wolcott
Harris	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton
Harrison, Nebr.	Norrell	Yorty
Harrison, Va.	O'Brien, Ill.	Zablocki
Harrison, Wyo.	O'Neill	

NOT VOTING—113

Aandahl	Doyle	Latham
Addonizio	Durham	McCarthy
Allen, Ill.	Eberharter	McKinnon
Barden	Gamble	Marshall
Battle	Greenwood	Martin, Iowa
Beall	Gwinn	Merrow
Blatnik	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Nebr.
Boykin		Mitchell
Brown, Ohio	Hall, Leonard W.	Morrison
Buchanan		Moulder
Buckley	Halleck	Murdock
Burton	Harden	Murray, Wis.
Camp	Harvey	Norblad
Cannon	Hedrick	O'Brien, Mich.
Carnahan	Heffernan	O'Konski
Case	Heller	Potter
Celler	Herter	Powell
Chatham	Hillings	Radwan
Chudoff	Hope	Rains
Clevenger	Horan	Regan
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Riehlman
Combs	Hunter	Rivers
Cooley	Jackson, Calif.	Roberts
Coudert	Javits	Rogers, Mass.
Cox	Judd	Rogers, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Kean	Roosevelt
Dawson	Kee	Sabath
Deane	Kennedy	Sadlak
Dempsey	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
D'Ewart	Kersten, Wis.	Sheehan
Dingell	Kluczynski	Sheppard
Dollinger	Lantaff	Short
Donovan	Larcade	Sikes

Simpson, Pa.	Thomas	Widnall
Stigler	Vinson	Wood, Ga.
Stockman	Walter	Woodruff
Sutton	Weichel	Yates
Tackett	Welch	
Taylor	Werdel	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Lantaff with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Widnall.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Short.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Case.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Battle with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Deane with Mr. Sheehan.
Mr. Heller with Mrs. Harden.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Aandahl.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Chatham with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.
Mr. Regan with Mr. Norblad.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.
Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Cole of Kansas.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Harvey.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Werdell.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Eberharter with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Stigler with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Hillings.
Mr. Sutton with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. HAGEN, and Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PROUTY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the serious and radical nature of the proposal to abolish the Small Defense Plants Administration should be made absolutely clear to all Members. Here is what it means: It is my opinion that any Member of this House who votes to liquidate the Small Defense Plants Administration, whether he intends it or not, thereby casts his vote against at least 95 percent of the business enterprises in his district. By killing this agency, or by not appropriating it enough money to do its job, we will be denying the small-business men of our districts and the thousands of people who work for them the representation they must have if they are to survive and prosper under the adverse effects of the mobilization program.

Duplication has been charged. Whatever real duplication had been in existence was avoided when the President issued an Executive order transferring the procurement and financial assistance functions of the Office of Small Business, NPA, Department of Commerce, to SDPA. The truth is that SDPA performs functions no other agency is equipped to do, wants to do, or has yet done.

In the short time this agency has been in operation, and despite the limitations of a meager appropriation, it has made definite progress in safeguarding free enterprise under the defense effort and has evolved sound programs for the future. I will review those accomplishments in a moment. First, it is necessary to review a little history.

The Small Defense Plants Administration was created by unanimous vote of Congress. Not the least consideration in Members' minds was the record of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during World War II. As the legislation finally turned out, SDPA was created almost in the image of the SWPC, although not in all respects. Nevertheless, it was a reasonable facsimile.

The new agency was created on July 31, 1951. The Administrator of the agency, the Honorable Telford Taylor, took office on October 19. No funds were available until November 1, and even then the paltry sum of only $350,000 was appropriated to finance the agency until June 30, 1952. This required that SDPA sternly limit itself to no more than $50,000 a month. There could be no thought of making use of the $50,000,000 revolving fund authorized for SDPA in the Defense Production Act, because to this day not one dime of that fund has been appropriated.

Despite these handicaps, the agency has begun to function with considerable effectiveness. Now, it is just possible that its very effectiveness is the cause of this cynical attempt to abolish it. Nevertheless, small business looks to SDPA as its good right arm and, as I have intimated, we are going to hear from small business if we adopt the Appropriations Committee's recommendations in this matter.

Now, what has SDPA been authorized to do? What has it done already? What is it doing now? What is it planning for the future?

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION FUNCTIONS

The act gives the administration five broad functional areas. They are: First, procurement, including assistance in obtaining prime and subcontracts and acting itself as prime contractor whenever we give it any portion of the $50,000,000 revolving fund; second, assistance in obtaining scarce materials; third, financial assistance, including help in obtaining loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; fourth, consulting with other agencies in formulating regulations on materials and other matters; fifth, provision of technical and managerial information.

MUST REVERSE TREND

Many small concerns must get defense business or die. But the Munitions Board concedes that the percentage of military contracts going to small business concerns, already deemed by Congress to be unsatisfactorily low last year, is still dropping. To reverse this trend, SDPA is negotiating with the armed services to install its representatives in major military contracting offices in order to screen proposed procurement and, jointly with military officers, to earmark business to be restricted to small concerns. A similar procedure employed by the Smaller War Plants Corporation in World War II was credited by the Army service forces with having more than doubled the small business share of procurement between 1943 and 1945. This is no ill-conceived plan; it worked during the last war and it will work now.

The agency also gives advice and assistance to hundreds of small companies, helping them to find defense business, enabling them to be placed on bidder's lists, contacting local procurement officers on their behalf, and giving them technical assistance.

WANTED BY SMALL CONCERNS

In this connection, it is interesting to note the results of a survey conducted among small-business men in February by Trilane Publications, Inc., publishers of the Government Procurement Daily Bulletin. No less than 84.8 percent of the small-business men replying to the questionnaire said they believed SDPA could be of serious value to their firms. Ninety-one percent of them regarded the agency so highly that they expressed a desire to have an SDPA branch office established in their area.

In addition, SDPA has been certifying small-business concerns as competent to perform specific contracts, and procurement offices are directed to accept such certification as conclusive. Partly through this device, Congress intended to break the vicious circle whereby small concerns could not obtain contracts if they lacked financing and could not obtain financing unless they had contracts.

SDPA likewise is working with large prime contractors to encourage and assist them in placing more subcontracts with small concerns. It has also recommended to the Renegotiation Board changes in its proposed regulations to authorize favorable consideration of prime contractors who subcontract substantial quantities of defense work to smaller firms.

SDPA has also been directed by Congress to make a complete inventory of the facilities of small-business concerns available for defense production. It has been agreed among all Government agencies concerned that full and sole

responsibility for this inventory rests with SDPA, and the agency has made remarkable progress in carrying it out.

RECOMMENDS LOANS

SDPA is authorized to recommend to RFC loans to small-business concerns engaged in national defense or essential civilian work. This lending authorization enables qualified small concerns to obtain financial asistance which would be refused under every other authority. Over $60,000,000 worth of loan requests have been received and the volume of applications is increasing steadily. Over 20 small-business loans have already been recommended by SDPA to RFC and more are on the way.

SDPA has also made a study of the regulations of the Defense Department governing the granting of V-loans, and found that the procedures being followed do not adequately reflect Congress' purpose of assisting small business to participate in the defense effort, and has urged specific changes in these regulations.

In the field of controlled materials, SDPA has its people on all the important committees of DPA and NPA, checking every action to make sure small business gets a fair break. This has been going on since last November. The share of allocated materials granted to many small concerns has been cut well below their break-even point. Through the joint efforts of SDPA and NPA, a special small-business hardship account was established to supplement low materials allocations of small concerns. SDPA is represented on the panel administering this program.

SDPA has recommended to DPA changes in the procedures whereby certificates of necessity for accelerated tax amortization are granted, so that small concerns will secure a better break in this program and be able to maintain their competitive position. Representatives of both agencies are now cooperating to develop procedure to accomplish this purpose.

UNDER ONE ROOF

SDPA has set up a "one stop" office, where representatives of small concerns running into difficulties under the defense program may be assisted. Hundreds of such firms have been aided in this way. SDPA has lifted from Members of Congress a large part of the burden of dealing with the problems of their constituents under the defense program. One of the main purposes of this legislation was to centralize in one place the responsibility for handling small-business problems. With even a portion of its authorized revolving fund, SDPA could greatly expand its program of technical and managerial assistance.

NO DUPLICATIONS

Now, what about this charge of duplication? It is totally false, as I shall show. As I said, some of SDPA's activities did, at the outset, cover the same ground as some of those of the Office of Small Business of NPA. The President issued an Executive order transferring these duplicated functions to SDPA. They included, among other things, aid to small business in procurement, financial assistance, and managerial bids.

There is no duplication between SDPA's lending activities and those of any other agency. The authority under which they recommend loans to RFC is different from, and broader than, any other provision of law.

There is no duplication in the SDPA program of having representatives in major contracting offices, even though the military may have small-business specialists in the same offices. SDPA representatives are the only ones responsible to an authority whose sole purpose it is to assist small-business concerns in the defense effort. Even if the responsibilities were the same, which they are not, it is no more illogical to have two men, one representing small business and the other the military, screening the possibilities of helping small business in procurement than it is to have 9 Justices of the Supreme Court, 435 Members of the House of Representatives, or 3 men arbitrating an issue. This is nothing but representation for the interests concerned.

In summary, it is only through SDPA's efforts that the viewpoint of small business will be adequately reflected in these matters. This is not duplication, but a recognition by Congress that small business needs an advocate.

I had hoped and believed, as had many of my colleagues, that this issue was resolved upon passage of the small plants amendment to the Defense Production Act. Congress then decided unanimously that all the expressions, in a dozen statutes of pious hopes that small business would get a better deal would never bring that result about. Neither would the promises of other Government agencies whose main responsibilities lie in other fields. It was therefore found necessary, just as in World War II, to establish an agency devoted solely to preserving small business as an essential element of our free-enterprise system. A handful now propose that this unanimous decision be reversed. I am sure this House has the wisdom not to let it happen.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, on the vote earlier today, on the resolution relating to the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee Investigation, I was detained elsewhere on official business, but had I been present I would have voted "yea."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SISTERSVILLE, W. VA.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I wish here to give a very fascinating history of Sistersville, W. Va., a beautiful and historic spot, a place that offers vast opportunities for industrial expansion.

When George Washington journeyed down the Ohio River in 1770, he pitched camp about halfway in the Long Reach on the west side of the river. It is across from the spot where the town of Sistersville, W. Va., now stands.

It is no wonder that Washington was impressed with the beauty of the Ohio, for the 20 miles in the area of Sistersville are among the most beautiful in the United States.

The Indians wanted the country back and fought for it until 1802, when they lost the battle for the fort in Wheeling. A number of Indian relics have been found in the vicinity.

Sistersville was settled in 1810 by Charles Wells, a farmer from Baltimore County, Md., who raised 22 children there. In 1815 Charles Wells died and Sistersville was laid out in lots by Sarah Wells McCoy and Dililah Wells Grier, his seventeenth and eighteenth children. It derived its name from the joint ownership of the two sisters, the only town by that name in the United States.

Shortly before the Civil War a 51-man company of soldiers called the Sistersville Blues was organized, most of whom, according to the records of the times, were six feet tall or over. The ladies of the town made their flag and everyone was very proud of the company.

The war, however, broke it up, with 21 of the men serving on the Southern side and the rest serving with the Union Army. For many years there was bitter feeling among the old comrades. The vicinity was in northern territory, but many of the residents were southern sympathizers. A number of them fled South to serve in the Dixie armies.

One of these, Charles P. Russell, a prominent lawyer, was associated with Jefferson Davis, as his counselor when Mr. Davis was tried for treason. Sistersville was also the home of the Honorable Abraham Dickenson Soper, chairman of the Wheeling Convention which organized West Virginia as a State.

During this time, the only transportation to Sistersville was supplied by river steamboats. In 1884, the B. & O. Railroad was built bringing trains to the town.

The thing that brought about the real expansion of Sistersville, however, was the discovery of oil in 1891 with the drilling of the famous Pole Cat Well, first producing oil well in the region. Discovery of the well opened up the Sistersville pool, one of the country's richest fields, famous as the only field ever found in which water was on top of the oil. The Pole Cat pumped water more than

a year and a half before it began producing oil commercially.

With the opening of the Pole Cat a real western-type boom descended on Sistersville. It suddenly sprang from a rural village of about 300 to a boom mining town of 15,000. Houses were torn down to make room for drilling derricks. Shacks and tents were thrown together to help house the people, and houseboats lined the river banks on both sides for a mile along the river.

The town was wide open. Saloons and gambling houses flourished. Theaters sprang up. One of the most popular entertainers was Ben Turpin, later to become the famous cross-eyed entertainer of the movies.

At one point there were 50 different oil companies operating in the Sistersville field. They drilled 2,500 oil wells. When the Standard Oil interest got control, and it was learned how to separate the salt water from the oil, the field was finally stabilized. By 1912 things had settled down. The boom was over.

Since that time Sistersville has become a staid family community. It has a reputation of being one of the cleanest cities in the country and a few years ago had the largest bank deposits per capita of any city its size in the United States.

One of the great advantages of Sistersville is that it is above high water mark, safe from flood damage when the mighty Ohio runs amuck. It is located on West Virginia and Ohio major highways placing it on direct routes to the Great Lakes, the eastern seaboard, the Shenandoah Valley, Sky Line Drive, Columbus, Cincinnati, and the West.

This location plus the presence of coal, salt brine and cheap electric power make it one of the most desirable spots in the United States for industrial expansion.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, someone has decreed the execution of the Small Defense Plants Administration. I do not want to be a party to the crime. In reporting the deficiency bill to the House last Friday no funds were allowed this Administration, which means in effect the House Committee on Appropriations is denying the $850,000 requested to carry on the activities of the Administration for the balance of the current fiscal year. This means the death of the Small Defense Plants Administration, which was created on July 31, 1951, when, by unanimous action of the Congress, section 714, establishing the agency, was added to the Defense Production Act.

It was the express intent of Congress that small-business concerns be encouraged to make the greatest possible contribution to the defense program; that small business be maintained as a vital part of the national economy. The SDPA was established as an agency with no primary function or interest than the preservation and promotion of small-business enterprises. Accordingly the Congress provided that SDPA shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government.

The three principal functions of the small-business agency, as prescribed by Congress, are to see to it that, first, small business gets its fair share of the defense contracts it can handle; second, that it receives a fair share of critical materials; and, third, that it gets the financial assistance needed to participate effectively in defense and essential civilian business.

A precedent for SDPA was the Smaller War Plants Corporation of World War II. This agency was able to assist small business to make an invaluable contribution to the war effort and our ultimate victory in that conflict.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about something the small people in this country are very much interested in. I am certainly glad to know of his particular interest because he is on the Appropriations Committee and his help will certainly be worth a lot in the cause.

Tomorrow, I understand from talking to the gentleman a few minutes ago, an amendment will be offered to restore this amount of money together with the $10,000,000 revolving fund. I hope it receives the same bipartisan support that the passage of the bill received.

This bill has the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Small Business, both Republicans and Democrats, the unanimous endorsement of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and it passed the House of Representatives unanimously, with not a single vote against it. I certainly hope that amendment is adopted tomorrow. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from New Jersey is giving the amendment his vigorous support, because he has always been with the little man, the small people, and I know that he will be helpful in this cause.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate what the gentleman from Texas has just said, because that revolving fund of $10,000,000, which is one-fifth of the amount authorized by law last year, is the lever which this administration can use to enter into prime contracts, if necessary, which would be subcontracted by the agency to small concerns. Since any such funds used by SDPA for prime contracting would come back to the Government when contracts are completed, the revolving fund must not be confused with appropriations for operating expenses. The revolving fund is the guaranty SDPA can offer small business that it will not be forgotten when the Pentagon resorts to the brush-off so familiar to thousands of little fellows doing legitimate business in the United States.

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right, and the fact that they have the power to take these prime contracts means they will not even have to take them at all. That happened before, and the Government could save money by setting up this agency as the over-all agency, as intended, and cut down on other small-business agencies in the different agencies—in other words transfer them to this one and save a great deal of money in that way.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman from Texas is familiar with the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. A report was filed by this committee just a few days ago. The chairman of the committee is the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, Mr. O'MAHONEY. The report contends that in our appropriation-committee approach this year, we could cut the President's budget $10,000,000,000 but at the same time this Committee on the Economic Report went out of its way to emphasize that the funds for the Defense Plants Administration should be left untouched.

Mr. PATMAN. I happen to know something about that. I think you will find that the recommendation is that other small-business agencies be transferred to the SDPA except where a small skeleton crew, we will say, is necessary to maintain normal relationships. In other words, they are recommending that the other small-business groups be included under the SDPA.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The gentleman realizes that a brick wall is only as strong as the small bricks that go in to make it up?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I congratulate our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, for the speech he has made. The speech was very sound, and the gentleman is absolutely correct. The small-business men of this country comprise a powerful segment of our national economy. It is of vital importance at all times particularly in the emergency which confronts that they not be squeezed out. The agency to which the gentleman has referred has done admirable work in connection with looking after the interests of small business of America. With the funds appropriated, they will be able to do far more effective work. Again I want to congratulate my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, in the remarks that he has made today, and on the position that he has taken in connection with this important matter.

Mr. CANFIELD. I appreciate the observations made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I wish to say that I do not think we are going to have any trouble tomorrow in restoring the funds for the regular operations of the agency.

The fight tomorrow will come over the revolving fund, which as I have said before, is the lever which that agency needs to prod the Pentagon into giving contracts to small business. In passing, let me quote John E. Orchard, of Ruthrerford, N. J., who is an aluminum fabricator. He says this agency is a red-tape cutting organization which has helped him and hundreds of New Jersey small-business men.

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a recent issue of Business Week dated February 16, 1952, with a featured article captioned "Small business versus the Pentagon." This article goes on to say:

Telford Taylor, boss of SDPA, wants aides to sit in on every military procurement bill. The brass is not amused at the idea of carrying on its business in a goldfish bowl, but Taylor has Congressional backing in his fight to get the same concessions for small plants that they finally won in World War II.

That is the issue to be resolved on the floor of the House tomorrow: Whether Taylor and this administration still have Congressional backing in this fight.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Do I understand from the remarks that the gentleman has made that we have not provided for the Small Defense Plants Administration a single solitary dime of this $50,000,000 revolving fund which we authorized when we passed the act last year.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true, and the administration is now asking for $10,000,000 to enable them to do the job that they say is necessary at this time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. The point I wanted to make is that the operations of the Small Defense Plants Corporation to date has been without those funds which we impliedly promised when we passed the act last year.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. ELLIOTT. And if the report of this committee is adopted by the House tomorrow this agency will be killed completely?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true except there will be some funds for liquidation.

The gentleman has referred to the passage of Public Law 96 last year. As the gentleman knows, this administration was set up under the Defense Production Act and this item was unanimously approved by this House. It was in that act, of course, that we authorized the $50,000,000 pool or revolving fund to help this administration promote the cause of small business.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield further to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I wish the gentleman would consider putting in that part of the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report of last Saturday, wherein it recommends that other small-business groups and agencies be transferred to SPDI. That was put in there for the obvious purpose of making the SPDI a one-stop agency; in other words, an organization under one roof where the small-business man could put his problems in the lap of a representative, and the representative would do the running around if any running around was to be done; then he would not have to go from one place to another. I think that is such an excellent recommendation in that resolution that I hope the gentleman will consider putting it in his remarks.

I again congratulate the gentleman on his remarks. He is one of the ablest Members of this House, and I appreciate the fact that he is standing up for this group that needs support right now.

Mr. CANFIELD. I thank the gentleman. I shall make further reference to the report tomorrow.

In closing, I desire to say this approach was extremely helpful to small business in my area during World War II and my people are being helped today by the new SDPA. Its Administrator is anxious and determined that the hundreds of concerns and thousands of workmen that make up small business in America are going to get their just share of defense work. Its people are courteous and cooperative. They sense a challenge and they are doing a job.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MANPOWER REGIMENTATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the reason it was impossible for me, by my vote on UMT, to please everyone is made clear by a letter from a loyal, conscientious, Christian woman, who wrote:

I am at a loss as to what to say, as I belong to the American Legion Auxiliary, which is very much in favor of the passage of these bills; but I also belong to a church which is very much opposed; so I think I will just leave it to you.

I am sure you have only the greatest good of our country at heart and will vote as you think best.

I pray God will direct your vote in the way which is best for all of us.

Using the information available, giving consideration to the hundreds of communications received, using my judgment, my vote was cast against UMT as presented.

Most respectfully—yes, and with great humility—permit me, nevertheless, to suggest that some who urged me to vote for this bill did not realize the purpose of the program of which it is but a part.

Of course, no one wants anyone sent to war—or, for that matter, into any civilian activity—without adequate training.

Legislation now on the books permits the conscription of men desired by the armed services. It permits the armed services to hold and train those men, not only for 6 months, but for as long a period as may be needed.

UMT as voted upon would not go into effect as long as the present selective-service legislation is in effect. No one suggests we repeal selective service while we are at war.

During debate I asked the chairman of the committee handling the bill when those affected by it would begin training. He repeated that neither he nor anyone else knew. So why the hurry?

THE PROGRAM

The program of which UMT is but a part is one to give the administration control for 8 years over the lives and activities of every young man and woman—and get that word "woman"—as he, or she, reaches the age of 18 years.

It is said "That is not true. Women are not included."

The bill as presented to the Armed Services Committee—and that is the bill on which the vote was taken—read:

SEC. 105. (a) Persons shall be inducted into the corps.

The word "trainee" was defined as:

SEC. 102. (c) "Trainee" means a person actually inducted for training.

True, the committee amended the bill by striking the word "persons" and substituting "male persons" as the definition of a trainee.

But those amendments were not in the bill when the vote was taken. To prove that, I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4, page 1864:

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do I understand, then, that the vote to follow will occur on the bill as reported to the House, including the committee amendment?

The SPEAKER. It does not have any committee amendments.

Then, after the vote was taken, to make the situation clear, the Speaker, referring to his previous ruling said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 4, page 1864:

However, the Chair should have gone one step further, if he had understood the gentleman entirely, and said that the bill that would be voted on at that time was the bill as originally introduced and referred to the Committee on Armed Services without the amendments adopted by the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee of the Whole, because those amendments of the committee to the bill as originally introduced were not reported to the House by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole.

The Chair wanted to make that statement before the final vote was announced so that all Members could understand the exact situation and be allowed to change their votes if they so desired. The bill is now before the House as originally introduced.

Two Members changed their votes; one from "nay" to "yea" and one from "yea" to "nay."

The original bill shows just what the President, Mrs. Rosenberg, and those who go along with them, intend to give the country—regimentation and socialization.

MORE THAN MILITARY TRAINING

While many of those supporting the bill thought and argued that it was a simple bill for universal military training, that is not the program.

If anyone knows the purpose, Assistant Secretary of Defense Anna Rosenberg, who appeared with Secretary of Defense Marshall, does. She said:

Now, there are, of course, some men who will not be able to go into the Armed Forces on any practical basis because they are incapable of meeting the minimum physical, mental, and moral qualifications, and here

we get away at this point from the universality of the plan. * * *

At this moment the President has no plan which we want to submit—which he wants us to submit for these numbers—relatively small numbers—of men.

It is his concept and that of the Department of Defense that this must be a universal program and that every man physically and mentally and morally capable of performing a service, either in the military or outside, must perform that service. (Senate hearings, p. 51.)

Note the following:

Senator JOHNSON. Next question is: Under a USM Act, what nonmilitary programs would be provided for individuals who are not physically or mentally qualified for military service?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. That is a program that the military has nothing to do with. That is the program where there are men who are not qualified for military service. The President will have a program. We will not. We will have a program for the limited-service men in the military.

Senator JOHNSON. But as you testified originally, there will be such a program although it will not be administered by your Department; is that right?

Mrs. ROSENBERG. I have been given to understand that the President is contemplating the formation of such a program. Just when, I cannot say. * * *

Senator JOHNSON. * * * the committee would like to have any information that can be obtained bearing on that general subject before it presents its bill to the full committee and to the Senate. What is or is not done by that group may have considerable bearing on the outcome of the whole picture.

Mrs. ROSENBERG. Senator, there will be no more than about 150,000 men, as we showed you, in that class; and I will try to obtain the information for you as to when you can expect it. (Senate hearings, p. 148.)

* * * * *

Then we said that there would probably be another 100,000 or 150,000—it may even go a little higher—who could be used for some type of national service, but could not be used by the military. (Senate hearings, p. 193.)

In brief, the adoption of UMT would have given the administration authority to take into the military service for a period of 8 years, every young person, male and female, as he or she reached the age of 18 years.

It was also the further purpose of the administration—and Anna Rosenberg, the President's appointee, so stated—to make all those who were not physically or mentally fit for military service, as they reached the age of 18 years, wards of the Government and assign them to such service as the administration might direct. If that is not regimentation, what is it?

That such was the purpose of the administration was recognized by James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO, when he testified that the bill "smacks of national service legislation which not one of us would want to see replace the voluntary free labor which has so successfully served the Nation in previous periods of peace and war."

The purpose of the bill and of the program of which it was a part, was shown by the hearings to be a move by the administration to, for a period of 8 years, obtain absolute control over the lives and the activities of our youth.

It is futile to talk about endeavoring to either carry the "four freedoms" throughout the world, or to help free nations, or a free people, by the expenditure of our dollars, our natural resources, or our manpower, if we impose 8 years of involuntary servitude upon our youth as they reach 18. By so doing, we lose our own freedom.

Does anyone who understands the situation, expect a Member of Congress to vote for such a program?

History shows that every nation which adopted universal military training, except Switzerland and Sweden, failed to remain at peace or continue prosperous. War and, ultimately, defeat was the fate of all.

There are many other reasons, some carried in the communications sent me and voiced during the 5 days' debate, which show the futility of the program, the ruinous effect of such a program upon both our citizens and the Nation.

Believing the bill—and the program of which it was a part—to be destructive in its nature, I had no hesitancy in doing my utmost to defeat it. I have no regrets.

FEDERAL PROBLEMS VITAL TO CALIFORNIA—MY VIEWS AND VOTES ON IMPORTANT ISSUES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the 1951 California State Legislature has reapportioned the Nineteenth Congressional District. The new district has approximately half a million residents. It is the largest in population of California's 30 congressional districts. It has an irregular shape, extending from a point west of South Pasadena in a southeasterly direction to the Orange County line near North Long Beach. In the Nineteenth District are found the cities and communities of: Downtown Los Angeles, Monterey Park, Montebello, Norwalk, Artesia, Elysian Park, El Sereno, Lincoln Heights, Boyle Heights, City Terrace, East Los Angeles, Montebello Park, Montebello Gardens, Rivera, Los Nietos, Santa Fe Springs, and Hawaiian Gardens.

For the past 10 years I have had the honor or serving most of the present district as their United States Representative. I welcome the opportunity of serving the people in the new areas which are now a part of the new Nineteenth Congressional District.

Since I was first elected in 1942, I have maintained a competently staffed local office in the approximate center of the congressional district. I have done this at additional personal expense in order to serve the people of the Nineteenth District more quickly and more efficiently.

This local office has answered thousands of requests by phone and letter and has brought congressional services as near as your local phone and neighborhood. My Washington office has likewise served the people of the district promptly and efficiently on the thousands of requests necessarily processed on the Washington level.

I am proud to report that I have had very few complaints on the promptness and efficiency of congressional services. This is indeed gratifying, as both my office staff and I have tried sincerely to serve our constituents to the best of our ability.

Every 2 years a Member of Congress comes before his constituents for reelection. This is well. The job of being a Congressman involves important and grave responsibilities to the people. Whether democracy will live or die depends upon the peoples' representatives. Your responsibility is to elect or reject your Representative every 2 years.

Therefore it is not enough to render competent and efficient service on routine requests. A Member of Congress must stand up and be counted on every type of legislation.

My record of attendance is excellent and I have never dodged a vote or evaded an issue. In every public appearance in our district I have invited questions on my voting record and my position on vital public problems.

I believe it is my duty to inform my constituents as to my position and vote on the important issues of the day. I have therefore caused to be printed at my personal expense a statement of my convictions on several important subjects.

The list of course cannot be complete due to lack of space, but I will be glad to answer any question or letter on any subject which is not covered and is of particular interest to a constituent.

THERE IS NO SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE AND COMMITTEE SENIORITY

The longer a Representative serves in Congress the more valuable he becomes to his constituents. He gains needed experience in the complicated field of legislation. As the years go by he moves from low man on a committee of 27 members to the top of the committee in responsibility and prestige. He attains seniority. He becomes chairman of important subcommittees, holds hearings on legislation, and conducts investigations of Federal agencies. He becomes experienced in debate and in handling bills on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Having served 10 years in the House, I have attained high seniority—next to the chairman—on two important committees, the Joint Committee of the Senate and House of Representatives on Atomic Energy, and the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am also a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which has jurisdiction over our international legislation. I am chairman of two subcommittees, the Subcommittee on Atomic Energy Legislation and the Subcommittee on Reorganization, which considers the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Each new Member of Congress must attain experience and seniority before he can represent his constituents really efficiently and effectively. A Congressman must learn through experience how

to serve his constituents effectively in processing veterans problems, in helping his local business firms in their contacts with the Federal Government. He acquires the ability to appear before other committees of Congress to advocate or oppose legislation affecting his district. He also learns how to support appropriations for flood control, parks, harbor improvements, and other projects.

REDUCTION OF TAXES

Can taxes be reduced by curtailing the expenses of Government? The answer is "Yes." Taxes can be reduced by eliminating present Federal services or by eliminating waste wherever it exists, or by a combination of both.

It has been proved very difficult to eliminate Federal services which our citizens have come to regard as necessary. An example was the order of the post office cutting home mail deliveries from two to one per day. I received thousands of letters protesting this curtailment of service. The same protest occurs when any service is eliminated. However, the elimination of waste in Government expenditures is worthy of continuous study and investigation.

The Hoover Commission pointed out in their 1949 report many instances of waste, duplication, and inefficiency. They made many recommendations to cure this waste evil.

The Committee on Executive Expenditures, of which I am the subcommittee chairman, has taken the lead in putting the Hoover Commission recommendations into effect. We have secured legislative consideration of 37 Presidential reorganization plans of which 28 have become law. In addition to these plans, I have voted for 46 laws to improve the efficiency of Government operations. The Citizens' Committee on the Hoover Report has stated that over 55 percent of the 300 or more recommendations in the report have been put into effect, leading to savings of over $2,000,000,000 annually.

MAINTAINING A SOUND ECONOMY

Serious domestic and international problems during the past 10 years have made necessary the building of our military strength and caused our taxes and national debt to increase sharply. The alternative during the years between 1940 and 1945 would have been surrender to Hitler and since the end of the war, the alternative would have been to surrender the free world to communism. We could not accept either of these alternatives and retain the freedoms inherent in the American way of life.

Our great job has been to meet these totalitarian threats and at the same time maintain a decent standard of living for our people at home. We have, in the main, succeeded. We defeated the Hitler axis. We have stopped the growth of communism in Europe and here at home. We have maintained full employment. We have increased greatly our production of consumer and military goods. Some price inflation has occurred but the standard of living, as expressed in actual increased consumption of consumer goods, has improved. Corporate net income and individual net income, after taxes, is higher than it was in the prewar years.

I shall continue to fight inflation of prices and do all in my power to increase the purchasing power of the consumer's dollar.

WATER, THE LIFEBLOOD OF CALIFORNIA

The one indispensable factor in the continuing welfare of every citizen of California is the maintenance of an adequate water supply. Our underground water supply level has lowered from near the ground surface to a depth of several hundred feet in the last few years. The Mulholland Aqueduct from Owens Valley is totally inadequate and we are now dependent on water which is pumped through the Metropolitan Water Aqueduct from the Colorado River 475 miles away.

During the past few years a dispute on water rights has been bitterly waged between California and Arizona. We believe that legislation introduced by Arizona and now pending in the Congress will jeopardize California's claims to a substantial amount of Colorado River water.

Together with the other California Congressmen of both parties I am vigorously defending our water rights.

FLOOD CONTROL

The flash floods, such as those recently suffered by many of our communities in the Los Angeles watershed, are a continuing threat to life and property. The Nineteenth Congressional District in particular is traversed by the Los Angeles, Rio Hondo, and San Gabriel Rivers. All of these rivers are important diversion channels for flash-flood waters which accumulate between the mountains and the ocean. In 1941 Congress passed an enabling bill for $350,000,000 for southern California flood-control projects. Actual appropriations of $120,000,000 have been made of these Federal funds, to aid the citizens of our communities in their fight against these disastrous floods.

I have appeared many times before the Appropriations Committees of Congress and testified in behalf of these appropriations which are so necessary to preserve life and property.

TIDELANDS OIL FIGHT

The State of California for many years has been receiving millions of dollars in royalties from oil pools which lie off shore and below the ocean waters adjacent to our coast line. The State of California has used these funds for the purchase of public beaches, parks, and recreational facilities for the people of California. The Federal Government has, in recent years, claimed rights to these offshore oil deposits, claiming Federal ownership of submerged lands.

I have joined with other California Congressmen in the fight to maintain California's right to these offshore oil royalties.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

Our rapidly increasing population has provided industrial workers and therefore more consumers for industrial products. Wartime defense expansion on the Pacific coast gave impetus to our industrial development. The location of defense industries and the allocation of defense contracts have been a constant concern of California Congressmen.

I have, together with my California colleagues in Congress, vigorously fought for the establishment of steel, aluminum, shipbuilding, aircraft, rubber, machine tool, and many other industrial facilities in southern California. We have also been successful in insisting that large defense contracts be allocated to the West instead of to eastern and southern areas. This has helped immeasurably in the growth of our southern California industrial plant, and the employment at good wages of thousands of our citizens.

INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS

During the past 10 years we have fought and won World War II against the totalitarian regimes of the extreme right.

One of our allies in that fight against the common foe was Soviet Russia. When the war was over, the Soviets joined with us in forming the United Nations. We had every reason to believe that all nations were tired of war and would proceed to build a peaceful world. Time and events have proved that the Soviet Union was not sincere. This totalitarian nation of the extreme left has violated every principle of international equity.

We are now faced with the aggressive force of communism throughout the world. We are fighting this ideology on both the economic and the military fronts. Our economic aid to free nations in Europe and Asia is for the purpose of strengthening their domestic economies and building their military strength. We are succeeding although the task is difficult and progress sometimes seems too slow. As the free world becomes stronger the danger of political or military success of communism becomes less.

The struggle of the 16 member nations of the United Nations against the Chinese and North Korean Communists may not be fully understood by many Americans. It is essentially a struggle to preserve the United Nations reason for existence, that is, collective international action against aggression. Unless the principle of collective action against aggression is established firmly among nations, we can never establish peace in the world. It is the only chance to stop Communist aggression. That is why we are fighting in Korea.

I have voted for economic and military aid for our allies in the United Nations and I have supported our own military appropriations to make our own Nation strong in the fight to preserve our freedom and liberties.

GRAFT IN GOVERNMENT

Approximately 2,500,000 citizens are Federal civilian employees. Of this number a few hundred have betrayed their trust and committed dishonest acts. It is obviously unfair to charge that this great body of Federal employees is corrupt and dishonest. There is absolutely no excuse for dishonesty in government or anywhere else. Betrayal of public

trust is reprehensible and should be exposed and punished immediately.

My own Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has continuously investigated Government agencies and exposed inefficiency and dishonesty. We recently secured House of Representatives approval of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 to reorganize the Bureau of Internal Revenue abolishing the political offices of collectors of internal revenue and replacing them with civil-service employees. We believe that this change will relieve the collectors of political pressures and insure a more responsible and honest administration of our tax-collection agency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include a statement.

Mr. MORANO in two instances and to include editorials in each instance.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a letter received by him from a minister regarding taxes.

Mr. HOEVEN and include an article from the February issue of the Farm Journal.

Mr. COLE of New York and include a short editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MANSFIELD and include a speech by Secretary Chapman in honor of the Honorable MIKE KIRWAN.

Mr. PATMAN and include a statement at the end of today's business concerning the Small Business Plants Administration appropriation which will come up tomorrow.

Mr. BRYSON and include a radio transcript.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KING of California (at the request of Mr. LYLE) and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include a recent speech.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include an article.

Mr. BROOKS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRANGER and to include an editorial.

Mr. LESINSKI.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY and to include two items of extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include two resolutions and an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts).

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. STEED and to include a magazine article.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LANTAFF, for 4 days, on account of committee business.

Mr. GREENWOOD (at the request of Mrs. KELLY of New York), for an indefinite period, on account of death in family.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL), for the week of March 10, 1952, on account of official business.

Mr. DOYLE, indefinitely, on account of committee business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1238. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to equalize certain benefits between and among members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1239. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of an experimental drydock to the Junior Midshipmen of America under authority of section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 897; 34 U. S. C. 546f), pursuant to section 6 of the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 898; 34 U. S. C. 546k); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1240. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the fourth report regarding the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, pursuant to section 6 of Public Law 897 (the Yugoslav Emergency Relief Assistance Act of 1950), for the period from September 15, 1951, through December 15, 1951 (H. Doc. No. 392); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

1241. A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Tan Yap Eng or Tan Eng, file No. A-9537742 CR 34140, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee of conference. S. 1851. An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally (Rept. No. 1505). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3098. A bill to amend sections 1331 and 1332 of title 28, United States Code, relating to amount in controversy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3166. A bill to amend the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1509). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 5577. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., of the State of Wisconsin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1510). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HART: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 363. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*; without amendment (Rept. No. 1507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4671. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jack Bravo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1508). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6984. A bill to grant foster children dependency status for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H. R. 6985. A bill to amend section 402 (f) of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6986. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for

other purposes," approved October 15, 1914, and to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, for the purpose of prohibiting loss leader sales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 6987. A bill to provide for the award of certain public contracts to bidders from areas of very substantial labor surplus where their bids do not exceed by more than 5 percent the most advantageous bids submitted from other areas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 6988. A bill to provide an extension of time for claiming refund or credit of overpayments of income tax with respect to sales of livestock; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 6989. A bill to amend the act of May 31, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes," so as to require the inclusion of certain stipulations in contracts for carrying the mails by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6990. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 6991. A bill to amend section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 6992. A bill to require the payment of prevailing wage rates to employees of contractors under contracts with the Post Office Department for transportation of mail by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 6993. A bill to provide that the Postmaster General shall furnish flat-top stools for post-office clerks who perform the duty of distributing mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6994. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide more effective price support for milk and other dairy products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSTERTAG:

H. R. 6995. A bill to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 6996. A bill to adjust the salaries of postmasters and supervisors in the field service of the Post Office Department by eliminating the effect of the $800 ceiling imposed in the salary schedules in the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 204, 82d Cong.); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6997. A bill to extend to certain naturalized citizens of the United States the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6998. A bill to amend the act of May 31, 1940, entitled "An act to provide for a more permanent tenure for persons carrying the mail on star routes," so as to require the inclusion of certain stipulations in contracts for carrying the mails by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6999. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act with respect to the amount of active service which certain former members of the Armed Forces of the United States and its allies who are inducted under such act may be required to serve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas (by request):

H. R. 7000. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue and require licenses for the recreational use of land, improvements, and facilities in national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 7001. A bill to amend section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, with respect to the exemption provided thereby for persons employed in connection with the operation or maintenance of irrigation systems; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7002. A bill to equalize certain benefits between and among members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ARMSTRONG:

H. R. 7003. A bill to provide for the distribution of funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 7004. A bill to provide for a lapel button which may be worn by persons who served in the Armed Forces during the national emergency which began June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RICHARDS (by request):

H. R. 7005. A bill to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 7006. A bill to provide that the procedural limitations placed upon the conveyance of certain restricted Indian lands belonging to members of the Five Civilized Tribes shall apply only to Indians of the full blood; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. Con. Res. 304. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of certain material relating to Indians, as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 563. Resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the laws pertaining to veterans, enacted during the Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7007. A bill for the relief of Domenico DiColandrea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 7008. A bill for the relief of John Cotton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 7009. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Franklin Yariott; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 7010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kayoko Kumai Tamaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 7011. A bill for the relief of Ralston Edward Harry; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 7012. A bill for the relief of Victoria Clita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7013. A bill for the relief of Clara M. Briggs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York (by request):

H. R. 7014. A bill for the relief of Hiroki Hollopeter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 7015. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 7016. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arthur Parent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7017. A bill for the relief of Konstance Alsine Marie Parsons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 7018. A bill for the relief of William and Helen Kobielski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7019. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Kuty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

623. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by the Racine (Wis.) Taxpayers Association Inc. to decrease Federal spending for the fiscal year 1953 by deleting from the budget all expansion and proposed new programs by eliminating all nonessential activities and by adopting the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

624. Also, resolution adopted by the Southeastern Wisconsin Taxpayers Associations' conference at Watertown, Wis., urging the Congress of the United States to reduce the Federal spending program proposed for fiscal 1953 to an amount consistent with public ability to pay, without additional taxation and without increasing the Federal debt, and proposing that this be done by elimination from the program all new, proposed, expanded, and nonessential activities and by adoption of the Dirksen amendment and the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

625. By Mr. THORNBERRY: Petition of Miss Nova Mae Scaff, Mrs. Ernest Linder, Mrs. George Gregg, Mrs. C. A. Rice, Mrs. Rosa Varner, Miss Fay Atkinson, Mrs. T. E. Whitley, Mr. A. K. Ross, Mr. Ernest Linder, Mr. C. A. Rice, Mr. and Mrs. E. O. Carmosin, Mr. and Mrs. C. L. Lawrence, all of Travis County, Tex., urging enactment of the provisions of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

626. By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN: Resolution No. 23, approved on February 4, 1952, at the plenary session held by the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico, containing the final declarations of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico after that body had adopted a Constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in accordance with the terms of Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress as approved July 3, 1950; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, again through sleep and darkness safely brought, restored to life and power and thought, we would face the new day with a vivid sense that we labor always in Thy presence. May this consciousness lift our duty above drudgery. Even in the heat and burden of noonday's tasks and of evening's weariness, let not our strength fail nor our vision fade. Make us patient and considerate one with another in the fret and jar of human contacts, remembering that even in the glare of public gaze each fights a hard battle and walks a lonely way. Give us, O Lord, a reverence for truth, a deep desire to think and speak truly, and a passion to hasten the day when the rule of justice and love shall engirdle the earth. We ask it in that Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 11, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 7, 1952:

S. 1710. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain road right-of-way easements in De Kalb and Putnam Counties, Tenn., to the State of Tennessee.

On March 10, 1952:

S. 1411. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to issue duplicate checks without requiring bond when such checks of the Post Office Department are lost while in the custody of the United States or lost without fault of owner or holder; and

S. 2078. An act to authorize the establishment of postal stations and branch post offices at camps, posts, or stations of the Armed Forces (including the Coast Guard), and at defense or other strategic installations, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to transact routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL DRYDOCK TO JUNIOR MIDSHIPMEN OF AMERICA, NEW LONDON, CONN.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Junior Midshipmen of America, of New London, Conn., had requested the Navy Department to transfer an experimental drydock for use in testing material under a Navy contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

LAW ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of Public Law 23, enacted by the Legislature of Guam, entitled "An act relating to taxicabs; amending the Vehicle Code by amending section 100 thereof; and by adding thereto sections 125, 126, 127, and 128 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SURVEY REPORT OF PEE DEE RIVER WATERSHED, VIRGINIA, NORTH CAROLINA, AND SOUTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report dated May 1950 of the Pee Dee River watershed in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

SURVEY REPORT OF BRAZOS RIVER WATERSHED, TEXAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report of the Brazos River watershed in Texas, dated January 1951 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

SURVEY REPORT OF QUEEN CREEK WATERSHED IN ARIZONA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report of the Queen Creek watershed in Arizona, dated July 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

SURVEY REPORT OF THE SNY WATERSHED IN ILLINOIS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report of the Sny watershed in Illinois, dated May 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON YUGOSLAV EMERGENCY RELIEF ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Yugoslav emergency relief assistance program, for the period September 15 through December 15, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS— WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Tan Yap Eng or Tan Eng from a report relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on July 2, 1951; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the New York State Defense Council, Albany, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide necessary appropriations for a civil defense shelter program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Woman's Press Club of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds to prevent the smuggling of narcotics; to the Committee on Finance.

A memorial signed by Mrs. Cecil C. Conley, and sundry other members of the Missionary Society of the Second Baptist Church, of Ashland, Ky., remonstrating against the appointment of an Ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Filipino Shipowners Association, Manila, Philippine Islands, signed by Generoso F. Tanseco, president, relating to the withdrawal of United States Maritime Commission vessels from the Philippine coastwise service after expiration of the bareboat charter agreements on April 30, 1952 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the plenary session of the Constitutional Convention of Puerto Rico, relating to a certified copy of the Constitution of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Kentucky State Association of Master Plumbers, Inc., Louisville, Ky., relating to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States concerning taxation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Hudson County Press Club, Inc., West New York, N. J., protesting against the ban by the Speaker of the House on broadcasting and telecasting of committee hearings; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Lions' Club of Rio Piedras, P. R., signed by Hermand Monserrate, president, favoring the confirmation of the nomination of Clemente Ruiz Nazario as judge of the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Maui, Wailuku, T. H., relating to certain remarks by Senator CONNALLY; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 245. Resolution to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act since December 18, 1941; with an additional amendment (Rept. No. 1294).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1536. A bill to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1296).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT ON JANUARY 1952 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT (REPT. NO. 1295)

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, submitted a report on the January 1952 Economic Report of the President, which was ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 90, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, RELATING TO ESTABLISHMENT OF DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 284, submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on February 27, 1952. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

I may state that the total cost involved is $110.31.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Was the report of the committee unanimous?

Mr. HAYDEN. It was.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Senate document room, 1,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 90, Eighty-first Congress, relating to the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States.

MARY E. CARLSON

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably, with an amendment, Senate Resolution 273, submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on February 5, 1952. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 5, after the words "equal to", it is proposed to strike out "one year's" and insert "6 months'."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, Mr. Fred A. Carlson was for a long time a very able member of the Corps of Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate. The resolution as originally submitted proposed to pay his widow 1 year's salary. The Committee on Rules and Administration found that a number of years ago the committee had adopted a policy that only the widows of attachés or officials of the Senate who had served for 25 years should receive a full year's salary, and that for others the uniform rule was the payment of 6 months' salary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know the members of the committee have the utmost sympathy for Mrs. Carlson, but the committee was following the precedent, and I am sure there will be no objection to what the committee did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mary E. Carlson, widow of Fred A. Carlson, late an official reporter of debates of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO NUMBER REQUIRED FOR ADOPTION OF CLOTURE MOTION—INCLUSION OF NAME ON MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, when the minority views on Senate Resolution 203, amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion, were submitted, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] was not present, and his name was not included. I ask unanimous consent that his name be included as one who signed the minority views, and that the report (No. 1256) of the Committee on Rules and Administration be reprinted. I make this request on behalf of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 2841. A bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAYBANK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. BENTON, Mr. LANGER, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. GREEN, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 2842. A bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2843. A bill for the relief of William H. Wise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2844. A bill to direct the President to revise the budget so that the estimated expenditures thereunder will not exceed estimated revenues; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2845. A bill to authorize the purchase of land and improvements in Gunnison County, Colo., to facilitate research into range improvement and range land management in the Rocky Mountain area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2846. A bill for the relief of Edith Busnardo Gardin;

S. 2847. A bill for the relief of Astrid Helgestad Marquez; and

S. 2848. A bill for the relief of Ichiko Konno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended.

The bill was submitted by Secretary of the Treasury Snyder.

The purpose of the bill is to make permanent the temporary authority of the Federal Reserve bank to buy directly from the Treasury rather than in the open market, direct obligations of the United States, in an amount not to exceed $5,000,000,000 held at any one time. The Federal Reserve had such authority without limitation from 1913 to 1935. Temporary authority has been granted successively since the latter date. Under the present law the authority will expire on June 30, 1952.

The proposed direct purchase authority will furnish the Treasury a means of smoothing out the effect of short-run peaks in Treasury cash receipts and disbursements, so that the disturbing effect of their flow through the banking system may be held to a minimum.

The bill (S. 2841) to amend section 14 (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT OF 1952

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled, "The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952."

It is an omnibus immigration and naturalization bill, recodifying present immigration and naturalization law, and making a number of changes in the present law designed to meet the present world situation, and to introduce needed elements of realism, justice, and humanitarianism in our immigration laws.

The bill is the result of almost a year of work on the part of its senatorial sponsors and the many others associated with us in this project. It is an adaptation to an omnibus framework of S. 2343, the so-called Lehman bill, of which I was coauthor and cosponsor.

A large number of groups and organizations have worked with the sponsors

of this bill. It is indeed a collaborative product. I want to pay particular tribute to the efforts of the distinguished junior Senator from New York, whose personal dedication and energies helped carry this bill through all of its developmental stages. I request therefore that this bill be called the Humphrey-Lehman bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule of the Senate regarding the nomenclature to be used in connection with a bill, it is not provided that it shall be called anyone's bill; the bill is designated by number, not by name.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct, Mr. President, my only reference to it was because of the identity it has with particular groups. I understand the rule of the Senate. It is merely a matter of record.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a joint statement on the bill issued by my colleagues and me and the summary of the provisions of our new omnibus Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint statement and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2842) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The joint statement and summary are as follows:

JOINT STATEMENT BY SPONSORS OF NEW OMNIBUS IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILL—SENATORS HUMPHREY, LEHMAN, BENTON, LANGER, KILGORE, DOUGLAS, MCMAHON, GREEN, PASTORE, MURRAY, KEFAUVER, MORSE, AND MOODY

We are today introducing an omnibus immigration and naturalization bill which codifies, simplifies, and humanizes our immigration and naturalization laws.

This bill strengthens our legal defenses against the admission of subversive and undesirable aliens, and facilitates the deportation of those already in this country.

At the same time, this bill permits the processing and admission, within the framework of our present quota system, of increased numbers of deserving and desirable aliens who can bring to America the invigorating stream of fresh talent, fervor, and energy which has, in the past, contributed so much to America's greatness.

This bill would enable us to meet the emergency world situation by providing a haven for religious and political persecutees from eastern, southern, central, and northern European countries behind the iron curtain. It would open our doors to limited numbers of otherwise qualified aliens from the teeming and overcrowded cities and villages of Italy, Greece, Holland, Germany and Austria—areas where surplus populations, indigenous and refugee, now strain the political stability and internal economy of the countries involved.

This bill would recruit aliens of special skills and capabilities, in agriculture, in industry, in the professions and the arts. The abilities and energies of these people would represent a vital contribution to our national economy and welfare.

This bill would reunite divided families, some members of which are already in the United States as citizens of permanently resident aliens.

Under the terms of this bill, all the above would be done within the quota framework. We would admit aliens in numbers which we could easily absorb and actually require for our expanding economy. All this would be done in accordance with a carefully designed system of checking and screening to insure the selection of deserving and desirable aliens and the rejection of subversive and undesirable aliens.

At the same time this bill would eliminate from present law the damning and damaging stigma of racial discrimination, and discriminations based on sex.

Another purpose of this bill is to couple justice with humanitarianism as the twin symbols of America in immigration as well as in other fields. We urgently need more equitable and more uniform procedures in the administration of our immigration laws. Peoples abroad know America best, and at closest hand, from their experience, or that of their neighbors, with our immigration officials. Unchecked bureaucracy is too much a feature of our present immigration laws. Under the terms of our bill, a board of visa review is set up, within the State Department, to provide greater uniformity in the granting and refusal of visas, and to provide a practical review and appeals procedure.

Under another section of our bill, the present Board of Immigration Appeals, now set up by Executive order, is given permanent and statutory authority to carry on the fine work it has been doing. Under the terms of our bill, the Administrative Procedures Act, providing court review of administrative decisions, is made applicable to deportation processes.

These are the main purposes and designs of our proposed omnibus immigration and naturalization bill.

We are aware that another omnibus immigration and naturalization bill, which evolved from measures sponsored by Senator MCCARRAN, has been reported by the Judiciary Committee as S. 2550, and is now pending on the Senate Calendar.

We feel that our bill, rather than S. 2550, is the answer to our present needs in the immigration field. S. 2550 codifies existing immigration and naturalization laws and purports to correct some existing inequities, such as racial and sex discrimination. But, in actual effect, S. 2550 perpetuates and extends most present inequities, including the principle of discrimination, and in scores of different ways, some of them subtle and technical, operates to restrict, hobble, and hamstring immigration.

However worthy of its declaration of purposes, S. 2550 does not tighten up on immigration; it strangles immigration. Moreover, it grants new, arbitrary, and unchecked authority to consuls and immigration officials for exclusion and deportation, while emasculating the authority of the Attorney General to admit individuals and to suspend deportation.

S. 2550 adopts the arbitrary procedures of the police state in handling aliens who have just escaped tyranny and are seeking entry to the home of freedom. Many of the deportation procedures of S. 2550 are of a like nature.

S. 2550 contains no liberalizing provisions to meet the needs of the present world situation by admitting refugees and escapees from tyranny, or by providing haven for some of the surplus peoples in southern, central, and northern Europe. S. 2550 virtually shuts off the immigration of freedom-seeking individuals without ties or connections in this country—the so-called new-seed immigration from which many of our greatest Americans have come or sprung.

Our bill is the product of consultation with and deliberation among more than 30 voluntary agencies and religious groups and organizations directly concerned with immigration and the administration of our immigration and naturalization laws.

Representatives of Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, Quaker, and Seventh-Day Adventist groups have been consulted and have participated in the discussions which have led to the framing of this bill. Religious and lay organizations which have operated for years in the immigration field have lent the benefit of their experience in the formulation of this measure.

These groups have been especially concerned over restrictive and discriminatory provisions of S. 2550. Minority groups and nationality groups have been similarly struck. The objections thus voiced to S. 2550, and to the McCarran bill from which S. 2550 evolved, have been taken into account in drafting our bill.

Our bill is based primarily on the philosophy and assumption that immigration in limited and practicable amounts is good for our country. In the past immigration has provided the infusion of new blood through which our country has grown strong and dynamic. This infusion must continue and be increased, for the sake of our own national strength and interest, as well as to help the individuals—the escapees from tyranny, poverty, and wretchedness. In the present hour this is vital for the successful conduct of our foreign policy.

Some of the further effects and operations of our omnibus bill are summarized as follows (a summary of most of the actual terms of our bill is attached as a separate document):

1. Our bill, by basing the quota system on the Census of 1950, instead of 1920, and by abolishing the intolerable exclusion of American Negroes from the census for quota-determination purposes, would increase the total quota by approximately 60,000 persons annually.

2. Our bill, by authorizing the pooling and utilization of the unused portions of the quotas now in effect, would make the entire quota system more flexible and more realistic and would permit the entrance of a further number of 50,000-70,000 persons annually. (Britain, for example, now has a quota of 65,000 of which only a small fraction is used.)

3. Our bill, through its system of preferences, would permit the use of otherwise unused quota numbers for:

(1) Religious and political persecutees.

(2) Escapees from behind the iron curtain.

(3) Displaced persons who were unable to meet the dateline requirements of the Displaced Persons Act.

(4) Displaced persons who qualified under our Displaced Persons Act and had completed their processing but who failed to secure visas by the time the Displaced Persons Act deadline had passed.

(5) Otherwise qualified persons in countries, where the pressure of surplus population constitutes a threat to the economic life and the internal stability of the country concerned, but whose quotas are already far oversubscribed.

(6) Relatives of United States citizens and of aliens permanently resident in the United States.

4. The so-called "pooling" of the unused quotas would be of special benefit to otherwise qualified persons from the following countries and areas: Italy, Poland, Greece, Holland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Germany, Austria, Yugoslavia, Venezia Guilia, the Middle East—especially refugees.

It is not the purpose of our bill to require the United States, by itself, to try to solve the problem of overpopulation in certain areas of Europe, or the problem of refugees in Germany, or in the Middle East. Our bill does, however, provide for a modest United States contribution to the solution of these problems. The entire problem, involving mass migrations, requires a cooperative world effort on many complex fronts. Such an effort has, in fact, been launched.

The limited additional number of immigrants proposed to be admitted to this

country under the terms of our bill would be selected on the basis of the preferences and qualifications set forth in the bill from the vast numbers seeking admission to this country.

It would be possible, of course, during the present world emergency, to divide, by a practicable formula, the unused quota numbers among the nationalities and groups listed above. This could be accomplished by simple amendment to this bill. For the long run, however, we believe that preference should be extended on an individual rather than on a nationality basis.

5. Our bill would amend existing law to admit, on a nonquota basis: (1) alien parents and children of American citizens; (2) aliens who have served honorably in the American Armed Forces; and (3) orphans brought into this country for adoption. S. 2550 does none of these things.

6. Our bill eliminates the present mortgages on quotas required by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 and other legislation. These mortgages reduce the number of any nationality quota for future years by the number of immigrants of that group who were admitted to this country under the Displaced Persons Act.

One-half of the quotas for some countries is "mortgaged" many years into the future. For instance, the quota for Greece is mortgaged until the year 2013; Latvia until 2274; Estonia until 2146; Hungary until 1985; Lithuania until 2087; and Poland until 1999. Yet these are the very countries whose refugees most urgently need asylum in this country. We propose to strike out these restrictive mortgages as unrealistic and prejudicial to our national interest.

7. Another feature of our bill is its elimination of an obscure but shocking provision discriminatory against Negroes. The present immigration law stipulates that "the descendants of slave immigrants" be excluded from any computation of the population of the United States in 1920 for the purpose of determining quotas and quota eligibility. S. 2550 does not propose to change this highly discriminatory aspect of present law.

As a matter of fact, S. 2550 actually introduces new discriminatory provisions, aimed, among other things, to forestall immigration from colonial areas, thus unjustifiably affronting all colored races and peoples. Designed to establish tight statutory limits on immigration from Jamaica, Trinidad, and other colonies of the British West Indies, the provisions in question are offensive and discriminatory in principle.

8. Our bill provides that non-quota status be granted to all natives of the Western Hemisphere, including persons born in Western Hemisphere colonies. This represents little practical change from present law, which grants nonquota status to all Western Hemisphere nations other than colonials and includes colonials within the quotas of their mother countries.

9. Our bill eliminates the present bar against the admission of some Asiatics and provides for proportional quotas to Japanese, Burmese, Koreans, and other Asiatic groups who at present have no quotas; our bill also provides proportional quotas for Chinese, Indians, and others who are presently limited to a maximum quota of 100. S. 2550, while eliminating the outright prohibitions against immigration from Japan, Korea, Burma, etc., establishes a new discrimination in the form of an Asia-Pacific triangle, with a discriminatory test of "nationality-by-origin" instead of "by birth" for this area.

10. Our bill, while reenacting the provisions of the Internal Security Act of 1950 providing for the absolute exclusion of subversive aliens, nevertheless recognizes that reformed totalitarians can be stanch defenders of democracy and, therefore, authorizes their admission in connection with proper safeguards.

SUMMARY OF NEW OMNIBUS IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION BILL

The proposed new omnibus immigration and naturalization bill (new omnibus bill) would modernize the quota system by basing quotas on the 1950 census (thus increasing the total quota), would provide greater flexibility in the operation of the quota system by allowing the pooling of unused quotas, and would eliminate racial discrimination. It would admit to this country additional classes of deserving aliens without regard to quota restrictions and would establish a system of preferences, based on national need and family reunion, for most quota immigrants while at the same time reserving a portion of each quota for self-initiated immigration. The new omnibus bill would assure adequate review of denial of visas and denial of admission to this country and would make the McCarran-Walter Administrative Procedure Act applicable to deportation cases. It would provide adequate protection against subversive and other undesirable aliens without resorting to abusable and repressive restrictions.

In these provisions and in other vital matters of substance the new omnibus bill differs from S. 2550, recently reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee. The two bills correspond in general form, and in making many technical changes involved in codifying existing immigration and naturalization laws.

The following summary of the major provisions of the new omnibus bill emphasizes the principal changes that would be made in existing law and the most important differences between the new omnibus bill and S. 2550.

1. Nonquota status: The new omnibus bill would add several new classes of nonquota immigrants to those of existing law. Recognizing the desirability of reuniting families, the bill would exempt the immigrant parents of citizens from quota limitations. Other classes deserving special consideration to which nonquota status would be accorded are orphans entering the country for adoption and immigrants who have served honorably in the Armed Forces. Existing laws grant nonquota status to immigrants born in Canada or in independent countries in Latin America but deny such status to immigrants born in colonies or dependent areas in the Western Hemisphere. The new omnibus bill would correct this obvious inequity. Furthermore, S. 2550 would require professors, who are now admitted as nonquota immigrants, to enter under quota restrictions. S. 2550 places unnecessary restrictions even on the time-honored nonquota status of religious ministers. The new omnibus bill would strengthen the provisions of existing law in regard to both ministers and professors.

2. Quotas: While adhering to the principle of establishing a ceiling on immigration and while retaining the national origins quota system as the basis for the initial allocation of quotas, the new omnibus bill would make a number of much-needed improvements in the operation of the quota system.

By providing for the use of the 1950 census as the basis for calculating quotas, rather than basing quotas on the 1920 census as would S. 2550, the new omnibus bill would take into account increases in population and changes in the composition of the population which have taken place in the last 30 years.

The new omnibus bill would amend existing law so as to eliminate racially discriminatory features remaining from the Oriental Exclusion Act—the features which have been so bitterly resented throughout Asia. S. 2550, too, purports to eliminate racial discrimination, but, instead, merely disguises it in a new form. In S. 2550 certain oriental nations are given, for the first time, minimum quotas of 100 and the right to naturalization. But in place of outright exclusion, there is substituted the novel concept of an Asia-Pacific triangle with a total limit of immigration from this area, and a mortgage against quotas in this area for all immigrants, wherever born, who can trace as much as 50 percent of their ancestry back to this area, however remotely.

The new omnibus bill abjures not only this new form of racial discrimination but all other racial discrimination existing in present law. Thus, the new omnibus bill rejects the intolerable exclusion of American Negroes from the census for purposes of establishing quotas, an exclusion provided in the Immigration Act of 1924 and proposed to be perpetuated in S. 2550.

Also the new omnibus bill would grant equal nonquota status to all nations and dependencies in the Western Hemisphere, avoiding the further racially discriminating feature of S. 2550 which limits to 100 the possible immigrants from colonies, even those within the Western Hemisphere; this feature of S. 2550 discriminates especially against the natives of Jamaica, Trinidad, and other Caribbean dependencies. (Present law gives these latter nationals the equivalent of nonquota status by charging immigrants from these dependencies against the quotas of the mother countries.)

S. 2550, in addition to its other racially restrictive and discriminatory features, places an outside limit of 2,000 on immigration of persons either coming from the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle, or born outside this geographic area but tracing as much as 50 percent of their ancestry back to it. S. 2550 provides further for the reduction in the minimum quotas of countries within the Asia-Pacific triangle if their combined quotas should ever exceed 2,000. The new omnibus bill avoids all these novel, provocative, and discriminatory features.

In the allotment of most quota immigrant visas, the new omnibus bill would give preference to persons whose services are urgently needed in this country and to certain relatives of citizens and of aliens admitted for permanent residence. Unlike S. 2550, the new omnibus bill would set aside a portion of each quota to encourage self-initiated so-called "new seed" immigration, in addition to making available for that purpose quota numbers not used by preferred immigrants.

By providing for the pooling of unused quotas, the revised bill, unlike S. 2550, would remedy one of the most serious shortcomings of our immigration system. Experience has shown that while some quotas are generally oversubscribed, others have consistently been used to only a small extent and that, as a result, only 44 percent of the authorized quota immigration visas has ever been issued. It has generally been recognized that, in its operation, the rigid structure of the quota system has discriminated against natives of southern and eastern Europe. The new omnibus bill would alleviate this situation by allowing quota numbers which remain unused during any given fiscal year to be used during the following year without reference to national origin.

Pooled quota numbers would be issued on a preferential basis to relatives of citizens and of aliens admitted for permanent residence, to persons whose services are urgently needed in this country, to persons who have been persecuted abroad on racial or religious grounds or because of their adherence to democratic beliefs, and to persons whose cases, because of special circumstances or hardship, merit special consideration.

The new omnibus bill would eliminate charges made against quotas by the Displaced Persons Act. No good purpose can be served by continuing to permit these quota mortgages, some of which extend well into the next century, to bar the present immigration of qualified aliens.

These quota mortgages bear especially heavily on countries like Lithuania,

Latvia, Estonia, and Poland, whose nationals, refugees from the Soviet terror, most desperately need to find haven in the United States.

3. Exclusion: The new omnibus bill would establish, as would S. 2550, several new grounds for excluding undesirable aliens such as persons who have violated narcotics laws, laborers who would actually displace American workers, and persons who have been convicted in their own countries of two or more offenses (other than purely political offenses) not involving moral turpitude. In the latter case, the new omnibus bill, unlike S. 2550, would permit exceptions to be made on the basis of special circumstances.

In general, the new omnibus bill relies to a greater extent on factual grounds for exclusion than does S. 2550, which relies heavily on the opinion and belief of administrative officials.

The new omnibus bill contains provisions similar to those of the Internal Security Act of 1950 relating to the exclusion of subversive aliens.

These provisions are designed to prevent the admission of persons subscribing to the practices or teachings of the world Communist movement, or of any movement whose object is the establishment of totalitarian government in the United States, or the control of the United States by a foreign power.

Past association with such movement or doctrines is deemed presumptive evidence of ineligibility for admission into the United States. But individuals who have broken with their past and who can show positive and conclusive evidence that they are antitotalitarian are made admissible. The new omnibus bill and S. 2550 have similar provisions to this effect.

The new omnibus bill, however, is consistent in its treatment of such reformed persons, among whom are found some of the stanchest and most effective fighters against communism. S. 2550, however, while admitting the possibility that aliens abroad who once were associated with totalitarian movements can break with the past and reform, makes no such allowance for aliens within the United States. Aliens legally resident in the United States who have belonged to Communist or even to Communist-front organizations, no matter how remotely in the past, are made automatically deportable. The fact that they may have broken completely with their past and become outstanding advocates of democracy is no bar to deportation under the terms of S. 2550.

The new omnibus bill, like S. 2550, places new restrictions and safeguards against the entry of stowaways and other illegal entrants, and would protect the United States against the discharge of alien seamen at ports within this country.

The new omnibus bill would grant the President the right, in time of war or national emergency, to suspend all immigration, or, in such emergency periods, to admit temporarily any aliens whose entry would be in the national interest. This is in contrast with comparable provisions of S. 2550 which would simply authorize the President to suspend all immigration at any time in his discretion; no standards are established for the exercise of this extreme and extraordinary authority.

4. Board of Immigration Appeals and Visa Review Board: The new omnibus bill makes provision for adequate review of administrative actions, both in the granting of visas and in deportation proceedings. A statutory basis is provided for the Board of Immigration Appeals, and it is made an independent board, to assure its freedom from administrative influence in weighing appeals and reviews in deportation cases.

A Visa Review Board is established within the State Department to handle appeals on the granting of visas by consular officials. This is designed to provide uniformity of practice in the granting of visas; the absolute right of appeal is reserved to American citizens who have filed petitions in behalf of would-be immigrants on the basis of blood relationship or other preference qualification.

5. Deportation: The new omnibus bill grants new powers to the Attorney General to accomplish deportation more effectively and expeditiously. It establishes new grounds for deportation, analogous to the new grounds for exclusion of would-be immigrants. These powers are surrounded, however, with safeguards assuring the right of review and appeal, based on facts and findings, rather than on mere opinion or belief as provided in numerous provisions of S. 2550.

In the new omnibus bill the provisions of the McCarran-Walter Administrative Procedures Act are made applicable to deportation proceedings, along with provision for review by the Board of Immigration Appeals. S. 2550 specifically exempts deportation proceedings from the terms of the Administrative Procedures Act.

The new omnibus bill makes involvement in subversive activities grounds for deportation. Present membership in Communist or Communist-front organizations is made grounds for deportation, except that in the case of Communist-front organizations, nonawareness of the nature of the organization can be successfully pleaded if proved.

Under S. 2550, many new grounds for deportation would be retroactively applicable. An alien could be deported for an act which did not constitute a ground for deportation when committed. The new omnibus bill makes the new grounds for deportation applicable only to acts performed after the new bill becomes law.

S. 2550 would so restrict the discretionary authority of the Attorney General to suspend deportation that such authority would be meaningless. The new omnibus bill recognizes that extenuating circumstances may make deportation unduly harsh in certain cases and would give the Attorney General broader authority to suspend deportation than would S. 2550.

The new omnibus bill, unlike S. 2550, would restrain deportation to any country in which an alien would be subjected to any form of persecution because of race, religion, or political opinion. S. 2550 would permit deportation to any country unless the deportee would face in such country actual physical persecution.

6. Naturalization and denaturalization: The new omnibus bill and S. 2550 include many similar provisions governing naturalization, denaturalization, and expatriation. However, the new omnibus bill, unlike S. 2550, would not erect unnecessary barriers to naturalization, such as the stipulation of S. 2550 that any absence from the United States, of whatever duration, would break the continuity of required residence.

The new omnibus immigration bill eliminates, for all practical purposes, the distinctions, of recent origin and of doubtful constitutional validity, between naturalized and native-born citizens.

The new omnibus bill eliminates from present law the provision, included in S. 2550, that naturalized citizens who join Communist-front organizations can be denaturalized. The new omnibus bill reenacts the provisions of present law which provides for denaturalization in any case where fraud and illegality occurred in procuring naturalization.

The new omnibus bill would permit, under careful safeguards, the naturalization of persons who, because of religious training or belief, object to swearing to bear arms. S. 2550 would bar such persons from naturalization.

7. Other provisions: The new omnibus bill would establish a Joint Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Policy, composed of members of the Senate and House Judiciary Committees, to make a continuous study of the administration of immigration and naturalization laws, the effect of such laws on the national security, economy, and social welfare of the United States, and other matters having a bearing on immigration and naturalization policy. S. 2550 would not establish this highly important committee.

The new omnibus bill would not, as would S. 2550, tamper with the internal organization of the Department of State in violation of the Hoover Commission's recommendations in order to create a Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs. However, the new omnibus bill would make available to the Secretary of State a position at a salary equal to that paid the highest grade of the classified civil service. Such a position will give adequate recognition to the officer to whom the Secretary of State may delegate authority to supervise the Department's consular activities under the bill.

The new omnibus bill would not, as would S. 2550, confuse lines of authority in both the Departments of State and Justice.

Under existing laws carriers are, except in certain well-defined cases, required to pay the detention and deportation expenses of aliens whom they have brought to this country and who must be detained for examination or deported. Administrative fines are levied against carriers for bringing certain aliens to this country. S. 2550 would incorporate into the law vague new provisions for the relief of carriers, foreign as well as domestic, from expenses and fines and would probably have the effect of shifting the payment of most such expenses to United States taxpayers. The new omnibus bill would retain provisions similar to those of present laws at least until further examination can be made of this matter.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PHILIP L. RICE TO BE JUDGE OF THE FIFTH CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in acordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, March 21, 1952, at 2 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Philip L. Rice, of Hawaii, to be judge of the Fifth Circuit, Circuit Courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Rice is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired July 30, 1951. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

Address entitled "Why Eisenhower Is Needed as President," delivered by Paul G. Hoffman, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 6, 1952.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

Copy of a letter written by him to the Secretary of Agriculture and an article entitled

"United States Official Urges Farmers To Sign for United States Cash or United States Employees To Lose Jobs," published in a recent issue of the Tampa Tribune.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Article entitled "GI Alcoholism Is Increasing in German Zone," written by Arthur Noyes and published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 12, 1952.

RADIO BROADCASTS ON PRICE-CONTROL PROGRAM

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from the Office of Price Stabilization in regard to its so-called TV programs and radio broadcasts, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD. I make this request because there are currently circulating many reports regarding radio broadcasts on the price-control program. The Joint Committee on Defense Production, of which I am chairman, has received many inquiries concerning these broadcasts and the propriety of using Government funds for such a purpose.

In the interest of presenting the facts, I should like to have inserted in the RECORD, following my remarks, the letter and news release from the Office of Price Stabilization giving the exact status of these broadcasts.

There being no objection, the letter and news release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION,
Washington, D. C., March 10, 1952.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Defense Production,
Senate Office Building, Room 11C,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: The joint committee has asked to be advised about a series of radio transcriptions produced recently by the Office of Price Stabilization.

The agency announced on February 14 that 13 nationally famous stars had volunteered their talent as a public service for a series of radio programs entitled "Stars for Defense," sponsored by the agency as a part of its public-information program.

We indicated that transcripts of the 15-minute broadcasts would be furnished without charge to radio stations throughout the country. Stations who wish to do so may broadcast the programs as a public service. The Office of Price Stabilization does not pay for radio time.

These 13 stars were not, as some newspaper reports have indicated, employed. They donated their talent, free of charge, as a service to their country. Such contributions, as I know you realize, are often made to assist public-service efforts, both governmental and nongovernmental.

Certain newspaper columns have also publicized the rumor that the agency is using fan dancers to popularize its program. There are no fan dancers on the list. The stars who have given their time and talent in this effort are Gordon MacRae, Jo Stafford, Dick Haymes, Dinah Shore, Bob Crosby, Martha Tilton, Nat "King" Cole, Doris Day, Tony Martin, Bob Hope, Margaret Whiting, Dennis Day, and Connie Haines.

Reference has also been made to the agency's announcement that these stars were being used to "popularize the Office of Price Stabilization." This announcement was not made. A copy of our news release of February 14, 1952, is attached. No mention is made of popularizing price controls. The release specifically states, "The purpose of these programs is to help inform the public about inflation and about price stabilization and its relation to the defense effort. The musical parts of each program are built around a central message, delivered by a guest star, telling what every citizen can do to help hold prices down."

These transcriptions are a part of the general OPS information effort. The essential purpose is to inform the public and to inform as many people as possible. Each transcription contains factual information about inflation and price controls.

I know you appreciate that public information is an essential part of stabilizing prices, because effective stabilization is virtually impossible without widespread public understanding and voluntary cooperation.

These transcripts are not used to advocate the extension of the Defense Production Act. Nothing in the transcriptions advocate this and it is not the purpose of these programs to bring about a new controls act or to keep the agency in existence. The transcriptions are not designed to influence Congress in any way but only to further the effective administration of the price stabilization program which has been fully authorized by the Congress.

We know, of course, that it would be most improper and illegal to use Federal funds in a propaganda campaign for or against any congressional legislation.

There were naturally certain expenses in producing and manufacturing these recordings. The agency felt those expenses to be small in relation to the immensity of the information job and its importance in effectively administering price controls. The 13 high-priced radio stars did not receive a penny for their services. The agency does not pay for broadcasting time. Radio stations which wish to do so broadcast these programs free of charge as a public service.

I hope you will not hesitate to call upon us if we can provide you with additional information with reference to this particular question.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE,
Office of the Special Assistant to the Director.

STARS FOR DEFENSE

Thirteen nationally famous stars have volunteered their talent, as a public service, for a series of radio programs, "Stars for Defense," sponsored by the Office of Price Stabilization as part of its public information program.

OPS will furnish transcripts of the 15-minute programs to radio stations throughout the country without charge. They may now be obtained through the agency's regional and district offices. Radio stations that wish to do so will broadcast the programs as a public service. OPS does not pay for radio time.

Programs included in the series:

Gordon McRae with the Normal Luboff Choir, Carmen Dragon and his orchestra, and Marvin Miller, announcer.

Jo Stafford, with Paul Weston and his orchestra, and Del Sharbutt, announcer.

Dick Haymes, with Four Hits and a Miss, Sonny Burke and his orchestra, and Fort Pearson, announcer.

Dinah Shore, with Frank Del Vol and his orchestra, and Vern Smith, announcer.

Bob Crosby and Gisele MacKenzie, with Paula Kelly and the Modernaires, Jerry Gray and his orchestra, and Del Sharbutt, announcer.

Martha Tilton, with George Cates and his orchestra, and Fort Pearson, announcer.

Nat "King" Cole with Billy May and his orchestra and Art Gilmore, announcer.

Doris Day, with Paul Weston and his orchestra and Vern Smith, announcer.

Tony Martin, with Victor Young and his orchestra and Vern Smith, announcer.

Bob Hope, with Les Brown and his orchestra and Hi Averback, announcer.

Margaret Whiting, with Lou Busch and his orchestra and Art Gilmore, announcer.

Dennis Day, with Charles Dant and his orchestra and Vern Smith, announcer.

Connie Haines, with George Cates and his orchestra and Del Sharbutt, announcer.

The orchestral theme for the series was composed by Paul Weston as a contribution.

The purpose of these programs is to help inform the public about inflation and about price stabilization and its relation to the defense effort.

The musical parts of each program are built around a central message delivered by the guest star, telling what every citizen can do to help hold prices down.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR TO SGT. CORNELIUS CHARLETON, OF NEW YORK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a statement not to exceed 1½ minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from New York is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I have just returned from a ceremony in the Pentagon, at which the Congressional Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously to Sgt. Cornelius Charleton, of New York. Sergeant Charleton was a Negro who through extreme heroism made the supreme sacrifice in Korea. This simple but moving ceremony emphasized deeply the fact that when loyalty and heroism and sheer patriotism are demanded of Americans, there is no distinction among us.

In this connection, I am reminded that today marks the seventh anniversary of the enactment of the New York State law against discrimination. This law was the first statutory step in this country toward combating the evils of discrimination in employment because of race, religion, national origin, or ancestry, and I am gratified to be able to report that the operation of this law has been remarkably successful. It proves, I believe, that the problem of discrimination in employment can be met through the force of law in an effective and equitable manner.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR LEGISLATIVE BRANCH AND MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION, 1952

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there is a measure on the calendar which I should like to have taken up, and I am sure its consideration would take just a moment. I refer to House Joint Resolution 396, making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952. The resolution as amended appropriates $867,000, for various items. The House has passed the joint resolution, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations has reported it with the addition of some items for the Senate and House of Representatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, there are very few Senators in the Chamber at the moment, but I shall not object to the consideration of the joint resolution, because, I may say as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my understanding that the measure merely makes it possible for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission to pay certain claims which are found to be legal, and which there is no money on hand to settle, and the joint resolution further provides for extending the life of the Commission for a period of 6 months.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is not exactly correct. It provides for paying for the investigation of certain claims.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what the other $400,000 is for. Is that for various committees which are conducting investigations?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct and $15,000 is for an additional amount for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. As the Senator will recall, we considered that question yesterday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is $400,000 for committees which are investigating various matters, and $15,000 for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] appeared before the committee and stated that this $15,000 was absolutely necessary. In addition an amount of $400,000 is provided for expenses of special and select committees of the House of Representatives, and a like amount for the expenses of Senate committees.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure there is no objection, inasmuch as the joint resolution was unanimously reported from the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 396) making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 5, after the word "following", to strike out "sum" and insert "sums."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, after line 5, to insert:

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

SENATE

Salaries, officers and employees

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1952, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Minnesota, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 3,000,000 but less than 5,000,000, the population of said State having exceeded 3,000,000 inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

Contingent expenses of the Senate

For an additional amount for "Joint Committee on Atomic Energy," $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

For an additional amount for "Expenses of inquiries and investigations," $400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 11, to insert:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

For an additional amount for expenses of "Special and select committees," $400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the total amount of the bill is $867,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Four hundred thousand dollars is for Senate committees and another $400,000 is for House committees.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the legislative branch and the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes."

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McMahon
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Benton	Hennings	Moody
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Seaton
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Ecton	Malone	Stennis
Ellender	Martin	Thye
Ferguson	Maybank	Underwood
Flanders	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of addressing the Army War College at Carlisle, Pa.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1952

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 285, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I did not know that the resolution had been called up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not come up on motion. The Chair thought it was automatically before the Senate.

Does the Senator from Arizona move that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution, or does the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] wish to make such a motion?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, Mr. President; I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 285) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The statute provides for not to exceed 10 hours of debate, or 5 hours on each side; but the statute does not provide what Senators shall control the time. Unless there is an agreement regarding control of the time, the Chair will have to recognize Senators under the rule.

Mr. McCLELLAN rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas wish to make a request?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the author of the resolution. Since I am chairman of the committee which held the hearings and made the report, the Senator from Georgia has suggested that I control the time on behalf of the proponents of the resolution.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. If there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], respectively, control the time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

From now on, while this resolution is under consideration, the time will be under the control of the two Senators just named, the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I may say that I have conferred with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. We hope that in a little while, after we are able to obtain some indication regarding the number of speakers on either side, we shall be able to reach an agreement for a further limitation of the time for debate, with the idea that we might reach a vote sometime tomorrow afternoon, perhaps around 2 or 3 o'clock. However, we shall withhold making that request at the present, until we have had an opportunity to determine the number of speakers.

Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the matter before the Senate is a plan to reorganize the Internal Revenue Bureau, in the Department of the Treasury. This plan was sent to the Congress by the President under the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949. Under the provisions of that act no affirmative action is needed on the part of either House of the Congress, to cause this plan to become law. Unless disapproved under the procedures established in that act, this plan would become law 60 days after it was transmitted to the Congress by the President, which would be midnight, March 14. This plan would then become law, in the form in which it was submitted. There can be no amendment to the plan, there can be no modification of it, there can be no reservation written into it; and no limitation can be attached. We either by negative action or inaction permit the plan to become law as it stands, or we nullify it by affirmative action, namely by adopting a resolution of disapproval; which is the resolution now before the Senate.

In order to disapprove the plan, there must be 49 Senators present and voting for disapproval. A mere majority vote of the Senate disapproving the plan is not sufficient to reject it. Under the procedure of the Reorganization Act, 49 affirmative votes in favor of the resolution must be recorded. There are some who feel that requirement of the Reorganization Act imposes a hardship or a definitely unreasonable restriction, in that they feel that a simple majority of either House of Congress should be permitted to reject a reorganization plan. Either House of Congress may refuse to pass a bill, or may vote adversely on it, and the bill cannot become law. This is a departure from the orthodox procedures of enacting legislation.

When the reorganization bill of 1949 was before this body, strong contention was made that the bill should provide that either House of Congress by a majority vote should be able to approve or reject any reorganization plan. I was very much opposed to that provision of the bill, Mr. President, and I insisted that either House should have that power, in order to observe and to preserve the integrity of legislative procedures. Finally, we had to compromise, and the affirmative vote of 49 Senators now required is the result of a compromise between those two conflicting opinions.

Mr. President, in view of this unusual procedure established by an act of Congress, governing the consideration, approval, or rejection of reorganization plans, when a plan is submitted it becomes more incumbent upon the Congress to consider the plan as thoroughly as possible, through hearings before committees and the use of every other means available, in order to understand fully its implications, to give it proper interpretation, and to enable better judgment to be exercised as to what the results and consequences of a given plan would be if permitted to become law.

Having in mind, Mr. President, not only that responsibility, but also the fact that this particular plan is one of such magnitude and importance that it deserves searching study before any final decision is made upon it, the then Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which the bill was referred, which committee has since been designated the Committee on Government Operations, conducted public hearings on the plan for seven separate days, giving every opportunity to sponsors and advocates of the plan to appear before the committee and to make full explanation of it.

At the conclusion of the hearings, after hearing the Secretary of the Treasury, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission; after hearing Mr. Flemming, former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and others, who testified in support of the plan, and two or three witnesses, including the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who testified in opposition to the plan, a majority of the committee reluctantly came to the conclusion that this plan should be rejected. They felt that the plan carried with it such implications and created such confusion and uncertainty regarding certain statutes embraced within the Internal Revenue Code that it should be considered by the appropriate committees of the Congress having jurisdiction of internal-revenue legislation.

Mr. President, no plan submitted to the Congress under the Reorganization Act of 1949 has been so far reaching in its consequences as is this plan. The committee, in the closing paragraph of its report, had this to say:

> Under the procedures established by the Reorganization Act of 1949 governing the consideration of reorganization plans, this plan cannot be amended to eliminate the defects in it or to provide proper safeguards in the public interest. It can only be approved or rejected in its present form. Therefore, for the reasons set forth in this report, it is the judgment of the committee that Senate Resolution 285 should be adopted and the plan rejected. If it is permitted to become effective, uncertainties and confusion will inevitably result.
>
> The committee believes that the needed reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is a project of such magnitude that it should be accomplished by legislation that has had adequate consideration by the appropriate revenue committees of the Congress.

While the Committee on Government Operations, formerly the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, does have jurisdiction of reorganization plans as such, when proposed legislation is introduced to effectuate reorganizations, frequently such proposed legislation is referred to the legislative committee having jurisdiction of the department or agency to be reorganized. It can be appreciated, I am sure, that the Committee on Government Operations is not composed of Members of this body who are experienced in the handling of revenue or taxation legislation. The Department of the Treasury and the Bureau of Internal Revenue are legislatively under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee of this body.

In the course of the hearings, Mr. President, it developed that the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate and the ranking minority member of that committee felt that the plan should be rejected and that the reorganization should be handled by legislation considered by the Finance Committee of the Senate and reported to this body. Pursuant to that conclusion and to their judgment, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate and the ranking minority member of that committee submitted the resolution which is now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall not go into all the aspects of the matter——

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point, on the question of jurisdiction?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the distinguished chairman's yielding to me. Is it not a fact that proposed legislation to make the correction in the Internal Revenue Bureau and to put officers under civil service would not be within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee at all, but would rest with the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the Senate were taking up a separate and independent bill covering certain employees into the civil service, that might be; but this plan involves far more than whether there shall be civil service employees in certain positions or whether there shall be the general reorganization which the plan envisions.

Mr. MONRONEY. If the distinguished Senator will permit me to ask a further question, the Senator would not dispute, will he, that the crux of the issue is whether collectors of internal revenue shall be removed from the patronage system and placed under the civil service system?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not agree at all that that is the crux of the issue, Mr. President.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield t the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad the distinguished chairman of the committee made that answer, because that is a minor feature of the whole program. If that were all there were to it, it would not be worth while to fuss about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair is advised that the 15 minutes time allotted by the Senator from Arkansas to himself has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield myself another 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for an additional 15 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for purposes of propaganda, for purposes of selling this plan to the public, it may be well to place the emphasis upon the question of patronage. I regret that from some sources some charges or statements have been made which carry with them a strong implication to the effect that those who may oppose this plan in its present form and who are seeking to have it considered in the more orthodox way in legislative procedure are simply concerned about losing a little patronage. I should like to make the statement, which I know cannot be challenged, that the senior Senator from Arkansas stands no chance whatsoever of losing any patronage in the Internal Revenue Bureau if this plan is adopted. I do not know of a single Senator on the other side of the aisle who is going to lose any patronage. One cannot lose what he does not possess; he cannot retain what he does not have. So, with that statement, I trust Senators will do me the kindness to indulge the belief that I am motivated by some other purpose than that of trying to retain patronage.

I certainly ascribe to those who disagree with me the highest motives and the most honest intentions and purposes to do a good job of reorganizing the Internal Revenue Department, which we all feel needs some reorganization. But I do not feel that I should be panicked into disregarding everything else and voting in haste for a reorganization plan in name, without adequate consideration and without being certain that it contains proper safeguards to insure reorganization on a sound and practical basis. I believe that can be done; I believe it will be done if this plan is rejected.

Mr. President, I desire to point out the importance of this character of legislation. This plan abolishes 68 offices which are now existing, but it creates 99 supergrade offices in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Someone has said that the purpose of the bill which I introduced was to make certain that more political appointments would be made available in addition to the 68 positions which now exist. I did not introduce a bill to increase the number of any type of officers that is not covered in my bill. The increase in the number of employees is sought by the agency and by the department which want the plan. The plan proposes creating 99 offices, 70 of them without name, without title. Is that legislating properly? It delegates to the Secretary of the Treasury the right to designate the titles of those 70 offices from time to time. That would be permanent law. In view of what the testimony has revealed as to the claimed intent of reorganization, I cannot see any reason or practical excuse why the reorganization plan should not name the 70 offices and let the titles be stated in the law, just as in the case of the 25 offices.

According to the plan all those officers would be under civil service.

I may point out that under this plan, not as the plan itself reads, but as the evidence explained how the reorganization would be effected under the plan, there would be appointed policy-determining officials, under the civil service, who would have control over the tax destiny of the American people. I do not believe that is right. I may be wrong, but I believe it was the purpose of the founding fathers to provide a check by the legislative body upon appointments by the President of policy-making officials. That procedure has served this Nation well up to this time.

Someone may say these appointees will not be policy-making officials. Let me say that under the plan the taxpayer who has a controversy with reference to the amount of tax assessed against him, or the amount of tax demanded of him, will reach his final destination, in his effort to settle, before an appeal board or an appeal staff of civil-service employees, and that body will be under the direct supervision and subject to the final judgment of a civil-service district commissioner. Quasi-judicial power and authority with life and death powers over taxpayers are to be reposed in individuals selected by the Civil Service Commission, with no remedy other than by appeal to the Tax Court. Perhaps the taxpayer may be able to appeal; perhaps not.

Mr. President, many problems are involved in this question. Changing the general structure of organization may make a marked improvement over the present set-up. I do not know. I am not sufficiently experienced in the ramifications of the tax structure to pass final judgment on that question. I should like to have the experienced committees of the Senate that are equipped with trained staffs, go into the question and then submit their recommendations to this body.

Mr. President, much is involved in this question. Taxes collected last year from 55,000,000 taxpayers amounted to approximately $51,000,000,000. Eighty-two million tax returns were filed. It cost the Government $246,000,000 to operate the Internal Revenue Bureau last year.

It is said that ultimately there may be some savings under this plan. Under the Reorganization Act which gives the authority to the President to submit this plan to Congress, it was required by Congress and expected that in the message transmitting the plan there would be stated the amount of savings and economies which would be effected under the plan.

Mr. President, I invite any Member of this body to read the message of the President transmitting the plan now being discussed and see if he can find that the President had concluded, or that anybody else had concluded, that any economies would be effected.

Mr. President, I do not think the statement can be successfully challenged that as to any reorganization plan which Congress has yet adopted no competent authority has been able to point out to Congress any particular savings which have resulted.

If there is a desire to talk about economies, there is one thing on the face of this plan which should be considered. According to the plan, there would be established 25 regional offices which do not now exist. These offices would have to be staffed first by district commissioners at a salary of $14,000 a year or more each. So, to begin with, there would be 25 officers at an annual salary of $14,000 plus each. Then, space will have to be provided for them. Each commissioner will require a staff. Other expenses are involved in the maintenance of 25 offices of such magnitude. What the total expense may be, I do not know. Some reduction in expense or some saving may be brought about by certain consolidations, it is true. The expense may not be so great as would appear on the face of the plan. Some of the cost may be held down. But no one can say, Mr. President, from the face of this plan, or from any explanation that has been given by its sponsors, that there will ever be one dollar of saving.

If the plan does increase the cost of collecting taxes, I would not say that that would justify rejecting the plan, that it ought to be rejected solely for that reason. If the plan will produce a better organization, an organization that can function more effectively, and if the result of such improvement will be the collection of more revenue, then the additional cost of the plan or of the operations of the Bureau might be justified. But all these questions, Mr. President, were certainly not resolved by the testimony which was presented before our committee.

It is contended that Congress has already given to the Secretary of the Treasury, under Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950, all the power he would have under the plan now before the Senate. I do not think that is true. There is some difference. But, Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the first plan submitted under the Reorganization Act of 1949, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, was a plan to reorganize the Treasury Department. That plan did not have in it what the sponsors of this plan now claim is the crux of the issue, namely, the question of civil service. That plan was rejected because it had in it one aspect which

was a grab of power over another agency, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, which the Congress did not want to place under the Treasury Department. That plan was rejected by the Senate.

Later Reorganization Plan No. 26 was submitted, which was a repetition of plan No. 1, save for the elimination of the provision regarding the Comptroller of the Currency's office. Plan 26 did not embody the civil-service features of reorganization which this plan now embodies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that 30 minutes have expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield myself five additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there are those who contend that the crux of the issue in this plan is the question of civil service. I invite their attention to a letter addressed to me, as chairman of the committee, by the Secretary of the Treasury, and signed by him, on May 14, 1951, in response to the committee's request for his comments on Senate bill 1150, which provided for reorganization of the Treasury Department, which bill was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and which contains a provision to abolish certain offices which are proposed to be abolished in this plan, and place them under civil service, and taking away the confirmation powers of the Senate. Reporting on that bill, the Secretary of the Treasury said on May 14, 1951:

> Also of concern to the Department in this connection is the proposal that the Secretary shall appoint all officers and employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Bureau of Customs.

It was of concern at that time. Listen to what was said:

> As you know, various officers of these bureaus, including the collectors of internal revenue and of customs, are appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. It has been the Treasury Department's experience that Presidential appointees located in strategic positions in these bureaus can do and have done effective, efficient work.

It is a little strange that in that short time there has been such a change in attitude and policy on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. Now it is said that the whole question of honesty in Government, and of efficient organization and efficient administration, rests upon one issue. It is a bit strange that that contention should now be made.

Mr. President, I have no objection to civil-service standards being required in the selection of Internal Revenue Bureau officials if such standards can be so formulated as to make certain that each official meets the requirements of knowledge, experience, and training which would equip him for the job. I do not believe that anyone should be appointed, politically or otherwise, who does not possess the necessary qualifications. But let me point out how this plan was intended to operate.

It is proposed to place all these officials under civil service. Next, it was proposed to hold a Nation-wide examination to fill the positions. Selections would be made beginning with the three at the top of the eligible list. It is said that such procedure would eliminate politics, if a Nation-wide examination would be held to fill these places.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield myself five more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. When the situation was called to the attention of the proponents of the plan, they got together and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission gave a promise, which the committee exacted, that they would hold examinations in the region or area to be served. I think that is all right. I think they are sincere in that promise. But I point out, from the hearings in the House, that that was not the plan in the beginning. It was only when the committee brought the situation home to them that they made such a promise.

That is one thing which is wrong with this plan. We are legislating on the basis of promises. We are not making such promises a part of the law of the land. The promises are not in the plan. The plan, not the promises, becomes the law.

I have no doubt that the present chairman of the Civil Service Commission would fulfill his obligation as long as he held that office. However, Mr. President, I have seen judges whose nominations were confirmed by this body reverse their decisions, which they have a legal right to do, and institute another policy, a new interpretation of law. In this case we are legislating in a vacuum, in which, under the plan which we are asked to enact, the Congress is denied the right to say by law that these positions shall be filled in a certain manner. There are many implications in the plan.

Then there is the proposal for rotation, under the civil service. Perhaps it is a good idea. I am not opposed to it as a general practice. But suppose this promise is carried out, and the plan goes into effect immediately, and examinations are held. Of course, those in charge of the department do not have to hold examinations at all. They can appoint from the civil-service lists. I think that is all right; I am not opposing that. When civil-service employees measure up to a standard and are career people, I think it is well to give them the jobs. But suppose an examination is held in a certain State, and that a selection is made from among the three highest contestants in the examination. He comes from the area to be served, under the terms of the promise given—not under the law—that he would be selected from the area which he is to serve.

He is appointed. The next day there is a vacancy in the office of district commissioner. The deputy district commissioner may be entitled to be promoted to district commissioner; and it may be right that he be appointed. The next day after he is appointed, anyone in the civil service anywhere in the United States can be transferred into that State as collector, or deputy commissioner. If we want to put these officials under civil-service standards, very well. But some of these things ought to be corrected by appropriate legislation before we let this plan become law.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude with just one other statement. I want the Senate to realize one thing. We hear a great deal of talk about corruption. We are told that we must get rid of corruption. I shall now refer to testimony given by Mr. Dunlap. Let us see if corruption is the real issue. Let us see whether the plan is needed to clean up the Internal Revenue Bureau. That is the argument which is being made for it. It is said that we must adopt the plan. We are told that haste is needed without due consideration or the orthodox approach. There is offered to us a plan of greater scope and magnitude than any plan which has been offered heretofore. It is said that it must be acted on in haste because of the corruption in the agency.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] asked some questions of Mr. Dunlap:

> Senator NIXON. Mr. Commissioner, I think the major interest of the committee, as you have probably gathered from the questions that have been asked, is to determine whether this plan will allow you to deal more effectively with the problem of corruption and dishonesty because that, of course, would be the primary reason for speed in the enactment of the plan, rather than to send this plan to a legislative committee and allow them to consider it over a period of time?
>
> Mr. DUNLAP. That, of course, Senator, we have done. We have adopted measures which we think enable us to cope with that situation as best we can, under our present organization, but that is only one of the factors.
>
> The other is the tremendous growth in the Bureau's workload which is becoming more and more unmanageable, and we are becoming more and more unable to handle it as time goes along under our present set-up.

Therefore, Mr. President, it would seem that the plan was needed primarily because of the workload. A legislative committee could very well study the problem. We do not need to act in haste. We should not be asked to act in haste, in 60 days' time, when we are preoccupied and engaged in many other matters of serious import. We should not be asked to give consideration to this plan without opportunity of amendment or change, and without knowing what its full implications are.

The interrogation continues:

> Senator NIXON. That is exactly my point, then, the primary purpose of this plan is not to deal with the so-called problem of corruption, but to make the Bureau operate more efficiently; is that right?
>
> Mr. DUNLAP. That is the primary purpose.

Let it not be said on the floor of the Senate by the advocates of the plan that

the primary purpose of the plan is to clean up the situation. Rather, the primary purpose is to deal with the over-all reorganization.

Senator NIXON. And that is in line with the chairman's remarks that it might well go to a legislative committee that deals with that problem.

Then the primary purpose is that, but a secondary purpose is to deal with the problem of corruption also; is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. I don't like to word it that way.

Senator NIXON. Well, the problem of handling, shall we say, dishonest practices, when they occur; is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. I still don't like that wording.

Senator NIXON. Very well. You use your own wording.

Mr. DUNLAP. I would say that it is one of the purposes of the plan to establish and to maintain the machinery and the avenues for examination which would insure the proper conduct of the Government's business and the proper conduct of its employees.

Senator NIXON. Let me see if I understand you correctly, then: You feel that under this plan the Bureau would be able to deal more effectively than it can at present with the over-all problem of discovering instances of dishonesty, and dealing with them effectively; is that a fair statement?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is right, as well as improving the efficiency of our people.

Senator NIXON. And the corollary of that, of course, would be that at the present time you do not feel that you can deal effectively with instances of dishonesty and corruption; is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. No, sir; I would not say that.

Senator NIXON. Then why the plan?

Mr. DUNLAP. I say that we are dealing with it adequately and properly now.

Senator NIXON. Now, just a moment, then. As I understand it, then, this plan is not necessary for the purpose of dealing with the problem of corruption, because you say you are dealing with it effectively now; is that right?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is correct, sir, but the plan is necessary to give us a more efficient over-all organization with which to conduct the tax business of the Government.

Mr. President, the administration witness and sponsor of the plan tells us that so far as corruption is concerned, which has aroused the righteous indignation of the people of the Nation, the problem of corruption is being dealt with adequately and is being cleaned up. Therefore, if the plan is a plan to reorganize and strengthen the Bureau from the standpoint of management and operational purposes, there is no reason to make so much haste and bypass the established committees of Congress with a plan—listen to this, Mr. President—which contains only 374 words and repeals the law providing for the office of collector of revenue, which is mentioned in the Internal Revenue Code 336 times.

Does anyone know what the effect would be? No one knows. I do not know. Certainly the attempt is made to bypass the legislative committees. However, Mr. President, there is a legislative responsibility and duty resting upon us, when no emergency exists and there is no necessity for haste, which dictates that the proper course, the sound course, and the wise course for the Senate to pursue is to have the Committee on Finance immediately begin hearings on a bill which I introduced as a substitute.

I introduced the bill for no other purpose than to get the plan before the appropriate committee. I do not know that I would vote for the bill in the form in which I introduced it. I know that it has some provisions the plan does not contain. I believe other features should be also considered and discussed. However, the purpose of introducing the bill was to get the plan before the committee. It contains all the structural features involved in this plan. The purpose was to get the plan before the proper committee of the Senate, which is competent and properly equipped to study it and to make a report on it to the Senate. The committee could make a decision on the proposal based on its experience. The Senate could act much more intelligently after such a study were made than it can act on this plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The Chair announces to the Senator from Arkansas that 49 minutes of the entire time under his control have been consumed.

The Chair is advised that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is substituting for the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] in allocating the time on the other side.

To whom does the Senator from Kentucky yield at this time?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I did not sign the minority views which oppose the resolution calling for a rejection of this reorganization plan. I did not sign those minority views because I disagreed with some of the reasons stated in them for opposing the resolution to reject the reorganization plan.

Mr. President, let me say that I do not like to appear in the position of making a speech for a resolution and then voting against it. However, it is very difficult for me to do anything else, under the circumstances.

This reorganization plan is very faulty. I think the statement which has been made by the chairman of our committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who conducted the hearings, was in many respects absolutely valid. I consider the statement which was made before our committee by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in explaining the defects in the plan, to be one of the most thorough, incisive, and analytical discussions of a public problem I have heard during the 4 years I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States. Of course, I would not engage with them in an argument over the details of tax administration or tax laws, with which they have dealt for so many years, and in which field they are recognized authorities.

However, I have had some experience in observing public opinion. I do not mean to say that I have my ear to the ground or that I am trying to court or kowtow to public opinion. However, I believe that the predictions I have made have turned out to be about as accurate as those of Drew Pearson and a little bit more accurate than the Gallup poll.

What worries me is the feeling that if this reorganization plan is rejected the country will be alarmed and appalled because of a belief that we have failed to do anything to correct one of the most deplorable situations which ever faced the Republic. I, for one, do not wish to see any high official say that he wanted to clean up the Augean stables, but the Congress of the United States tied his hands behind him. If this plan represents an overdose of disinfectant, I do not think that is such a bad fault, either, if the rights of the people of the United States and the taxpayers of the United States can be preserved and saved by amendments rather than complete rejection.

Therefore I am glad to say now that, so far as I personally am concerned, although for the reasons indicated, I am unwilling to vote against the resolution to reject this plan, it will be a pleasure for me to vote for separate bills along the lines proposed in the bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and I hope they are promptly reported from committee and are passed as soon as possible.

In the first place, I think the so-called assistant general counsel, who will become or can be called and styled the chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, should be named by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. I should like to support, and in my opinion, Congress should pass, a bill to require his confirmation by the Senate. He will interpret what the tax laws mean.

In this connection I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a very profound minority opinion delivered very recently by Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson, of the Supreme Court, in which he said that it is not the business even of the Supreme Court to alter or frustrate the legislative command after it has been written. This was in the case of Richard Guessfelt against J. Howard McGrath.

Mr. President, it is a serious thing to have a man whose nomination is not confirmed by the Senate interpret the intent of Congress in regard to tax laws. However, this objection is mitigated by the fact that the President of the United States has submitted the name of Charles W. Davis to be assistant general counsel assigned to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and to become the chief counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Mr. Davis formerly was chief clerk of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and there he served on a committee and on a staff which have rendered very great service to the Nation. In this particular case I do not believe the emergency is so great as it would be if the name of someone else, someone who did not understand the intent of Congress in this regard, had been submitted.

Mr. Davis is from Illinois. His forebears came from Virginia and went through Kentucky. They did not stay there long enough to make a Kentuckian out of him, which was a mistake on their part. However, except for 3 or 4 years which he spent in the Army of the United

States, after 1947 he has been in Washington, either in the Treasury Department or on the staff of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. While I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I heard the distinguished chairman and the other members of that committee pay Mr. Davis a very high tribute at the time when he was named to the position to which he has not yet been confirmed.

Mr. President, I think the criticism of the American Bar Association regarding the uncertainty in this plan as to what official can be sued is absolutely valid, and I believe that situation should be corrected immediately. In my judgment, the criticism leveled at this plan is justified on that ground, as well as upon the ground of failure to provide for the confirmation of counsel by the Senate. Yet I feel that if this plan is rejected outright the impression will be created throughout the country that we have failed to do anything except to tie the hands of those who want to clean up an unfortunate situation as a result of which 51 employees are either under indictment, are being tried, or have been dismissed. Altogether, I think there were 168 such cases at the time the head of the Bureau of Internal Revenue appeared before our committee, although only 7 of the officials were not under civil service.

I do not think the civil service is a panacea. Indeed, there is almost contained in this plan a suggestion that the maladies from which the Internal Revenue Bureau suffers should be corrected on the theory that "the hair of the dog is good for the bite." Nevertheless, it will do no harm to place those who were formerly called Collectors of Internal Revenue under the civil service, except for the Commissioner and the chief counsel, who should be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Doubt has been expressed as to the best way of accomplishing the desired objective. Again I say that I very seriously doubt my own opinion in the matter, in contrast with the views held by others, whose opinions I respect far more than I do my own, and who have had such a long experience in the handling of these matters. Still I asked the counsel of the committee whether corrections could be made if the plan were not rejected but accepted. He said they could be made.

What then is the value of the plan? The principal value of the plan is that it gives to the head of the Bureau of Internal Revenue and to the Secretary of the Treasury the right to reorganize their own departments. No saving of money may result, although what worries the American people is the amount of taxes they are paying. I believe the Members of the Congress understand that fact, as well as anyone else in Washington. They realize that the people of the country are staggering under an appalling tax load which is so heavy that they themselves have scarcely begun to realize or understand its impact. Many persons go along without worrying over taxes until they start paying them; but, come March 15, they will begin to feel the pinch of the heaviest tax load they have ever known. Three months from now they will begin to understand it better. Are we going to say that we have done absolutely nothing in order to guarantee to them that when taxes are collected, they are going to be collected with the utmost fairness? I have understood that this plan fails to carry forward the criminal liabilities which should attach to employees of the Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to yield to the Senator from Kentucky whatever additional time he may desire.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I am through, except that I should like to complete that sentence.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator may take whatever time he needs.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the criminal liabilities ought to be continued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield further to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I yield whatever time the Senator needs.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I thank the Senator. That is all I wanted to say, that I think the criminal liabilities ought to be continued. Some other provisions ought to be clarified, and there should be no doubt of the right of the taxpayer to sue any official or responsible authority within the Bureau of Internal Revenue upon any claim or grievance he may have against him. But I believe it is better to go ahead and adopt this plan and hold the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department responsible for cleaning up the unhealthy situation which exists, in accordance with limitations which can be enacted into law in very short order, limitations which I shall be glad to support.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senator from Kentucky is familiar with the letters presented by Commissioner Dunlap to the committee, which letters were signed by the Secretary of the Treasury, John W. Snyder; and, later on, the letter dated February 28, 1952, to the Secretary of the Treasury, signed by Joseph C. Duggan, Assistant Attorney General, Executive Adjudications Division, and the letter, signed by the Attorney General, regarding the right of suit by the taxpayer against the collector, or, in this instance the deputy collector.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct; but it might still require a suit in order to ascertain whether the opinion is correct; and the right to sue might become valueless because of delay in the courts. I see no reason why immediately following the adoption of this plan we should not pass a bill, as quickly as we possibly can, which would provide without equivocation that the right to sue and the right of trial by jury are guaranteed to every taxpayer; that he may sue in any Federal district court having jurisdiction of the matter; and that he may sue any officer or responsible authority within the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The taxpayers should, of course, have that right.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will yield further, let me say I thoroughly concur with him as to the need of clarification and as to the desire of the Congress or the need of the Congress to make provision on this subject very concise and pertinent; and I think it can be done. I only want to point out for the RECORD that the chief law officer of the Government and the Secretary of the Treasury, who would have the general jurisdiction in this instance, recognize that at least under the terms of the common law, under a series of cases, as cited by Mr. Joseph C. Duggan, the Assistant Attorney General, that right does exist. I refer to the right of trial.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator is entirely correct in saying the right exists. But I would not take any chances on it whatever. I shall be glad to receive any support I possibly can, from those who are not voting for this resolution to reject this plan, for a bill to require confirmation by the Senate of the chief legal officer or counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; to clarify the right of any taxpayer to sue any responsible authority within the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and to carry forward the criminal liability of any employee of the Department. If we were to provide for those things, we would then remove the largest and most important objections to the plan, and we could afford to accept it, even with its faults and errors, which should not be found in a plan sent to us. But, even so, we can afford to go ahead and accept it, placing full responsibility on the Secretary of the Treasury and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Collector of Internal Revenue, and, if you please, the President of the United States, saying to them, "We have given you everything you wanted, and everything you say you want, except as to the matter of confirmation. Do not let us have another theft or embezzlement, let us not have any crookedness, in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, so long as the responsibility is yours."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky another question. First, I should like to say to the Senator that his analysis of the limitations of the plan are, of course, very pertinent to the discussion and the debate, and I think it is fair to say that none of us who are supporting the plan feel that it is a matter of the millennium, nor do we feel that it has been passed down by divine providence, but it is an improvement which is needed. At the same time I, for one, would be more than happy to join with the Senator from Kentucky in endeavoring to clarify the law as to the right of an individual taxpayer to sue a deputy collector. I would be happy to join with him on the matter of the confirmation of the nomination of solicitors or the general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Those are matters which can, of course, be taken up. The Congress will be in session for a long time. As the Senator from Kentucky has well pointed out, the plan does not in any way obviate the possibility of doing that. It merely accentuates the importance of having a full and complete reorganization, which no one plan can possibly accomplish.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct. That is what I was trying to say. We can take away any alibi from anyone based on the statement that he has had his hands tied behind him. If we approve this plan with those corrections, then the responsibility will rest upon whoever is in charge of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I further say to the Senator that the plan calls for its full operation by December of 1952? In other words, there are several months before the full operation will go into effect.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is correct. I might say, further, that I am still making a speech on the opposite side from the one on which I am going to vote, but I am in grave doubt about the 25 regional offices. So far as Kentucky is concerned, any time we are included in a region we start getting the worst of it, and I am not sold on the regional idea at all. I do not think there is going to be a chance within a year's time to establish the regional offices. If it is necessary or advisable, that feature can be corrected; but, in the meantime, we are going to make two or three collections on the biggest tax bill in the history of the country, with people staggering under the load and worrying themselves to death about where they are going to get the money to pay their taxes. We do not want the taxpayers to feel that someone is likely to steal the money, anyway. We want complete fairness and equity and complete honesty, of course, in connection with tax collections.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the great issue here is not whether we are in any way being unkind to a collector or whether we are being inconsiderate of an area such as Minnesota or Kentucky, but, as the Senator has well pointed out, the taxpayers in the United States are sick and tired of hearing about malfeasance, corruption, and misconduct in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I think the Congress of the United States had better take some action. There is no use arguing that we can delay it. We need to take what action we can take now, and if we have not taken sufficient action this week, we can take further action next week. The American people have a right to expect that the tax money will be collected honestly and that no efforts will be made to delay cleaning up the situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois 5 minutes. If he needs more time, he can have more.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one of the first special assignments I had in the House of Representatives was as a Member of the Select Committee on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch. I became initiated into the intricacies of the situation and the prolixities of the remedies. Subsequent to that time the Brown-Lodge resolution was introduced, bearing the name of Representative BROWN and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Then the so-called Hoover Commission was organized.

While a member of the subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations, I should say, in all candor and in all fairness to that committee and to its very distinguished chairman, Representative CANFIELD, of New Jersey, that the investigations taking place at the present time were initiated by that subcommittee. I recall our investigation of the internal revenue office in Boston, and I also recall some other investigations which were made, but it was out of those preliminary investigations that other data were adduced which finally brought this matter to the front page.

In connection with the work of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations, I had some hand in compiling the report on the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949, and in that report we wrote this language:

> The most serious defect in the organization and operations of the Bureau is the fact that the men who are charged with the actual collection of the revenue, the collectors, are political appointees. The Commissioner, who administers the entire Bureau, does not have effective control over the collectors throughout the country. Whether collectors of internal revenue actively attend to the affairs of their offices or merely bask in their patronage appears to be largely a matter of their own volition.
>
> The committee recommends the enactment of legislation whereby the appointment of collectors of internal revenue would be removed from the patronage system and placed under civil-service laws and regulations. This would be a major progressive step in the operations of the Bureau, even though the administration of the civil-service system is badly in need of widespread improvements.

That language, Mr. President, appeared in the report of the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations for the fiscal year 1949, when I was a member of that subcommittee. Since that time I was out of congressional service for a couple of years, and I enlisted myself in the service of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report. In that connection I made a great many radio and platform appearances and sought as best I could to devote my feeble talents to the business of energizing the interest of the people, in the hope that our approaches and our endeavors in the field of Government reorganization would be real rather than illusory.

In all candor, Mr. President, I feel, in view of the record, that I ought to support the plan which is now pending. I say that for a number of reasons. In the first place, it comes within the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949. I have endeavored to examine the broad provisions of that act, and I think the plan in substance conforms to those provisions and those requirements.

When all is said and done, there must be some vehicle with which to start; there must be some authority under which to approach the business of eliminating patronage and the political factor from the Internal Revenue Bureau. I believe that no matter how broad the scope of the plan, with good administration the objective can be accomplished. I believe, also, that it would serve to provide greater flexibility of operation——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield another 5 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield another 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. May I say to my delightful friend from Tennessee that I am rushing to attend a committee meeting, but I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under the present law, the President has the right to discharge an unfaithful or dishonest employee, has he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. But if this resolution should be adopted, the President would be deprived of that power, and it would be merely a matter of preferring charges against a civil-service employee.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my esteemed friend, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, that precisely the same consideration applies to many thousands of employees of the Government who are under the merit system today. There, too, it is necessary to show cause. There must be charges preferred.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is true, but it does not apply to the collection of revenue, which is very, very important, as we all know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it more important than what is true as to a good many other positions in the Government today? I doubt it very much. We grant to many employees the power to make policy, which actually brings about the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. The proposal under debate deals with the collection of revenue. I am equally concerned with the expenditure of revenue.

I have seen the result of granting power to make policy time and time again in the case of thousands of employees, and nowhere is it shown more clearly than by the constant parade of witnesses before the Committee on Appropriations. I know that my very distinguished friend, the Senator from Tennessee, is an expert in that field.

So, to continue this very brief appraisal, I think the plan would develop greater stability in the Internal Revenue. At the present time there is a high rate of turnover. I become rather distressed by the fact that employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue so often have feelings of their own instability. That follows partly, of course, by reason of the fact that if they are political appointees, they are never secure. So I hope the merit system will be extended

to these employees so as to give them a sense of stability, because they are responsible for the duties they discharge in the Bureau. In truth and in fact, Mr. President, I believe the adoption of the merit system would diminish the rate of turn-over in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

If the program is honestly administered, and the selection of personnel is made on a competitive basis, certainly it ought to bring people of better talent into the Government. I do not go so far as to say that it is assured that every one who may be employed will be honest, or that his integrity will be unassailable and unimpeachable. I doubt whether by legislation that can be accomplished. But I believe that from the standpoint of capacity, if the examinations are properly conducted and if the job standards prescribed for these positions are properly written and applied by the United States Civil Service Commission, we cannot help getting better talent into the Bureau.

While perhaps the plan is not identical with the recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission, yet in substance it reaches out toward precisely the same objective which was aimed at in the Hoover Commission recommendations. I would not expect the plan to be identical, but I do know what the objective was. So, under this vehicle, at least, it is possible to move in the direction of that plan. If the expected result does not follow, that is a horse of another color. But at least the instrumentality will be available.

As I have said, the plan itself is certainly not a guaranty of honesty and efficiency. But good administration, I think, will carry us in the direction of the goal we seek to achieve.

I wish to mention one other thing. As I recall some of the processes of Reorganization Plan No. 26—and I recall them rather vaguely, to be candid—that plan was general in scope, but at least the plan which is now before the Senate would be implemented somewhat, I think, by the one that was adopted earlier. The adoption of this plan certainly would not impair the power of Congress with respect to the Bureau.

Congress can abolish the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It can abolish every position in the Bureau. It can create a wholly different instrumentality for collecting revenue, and put it under some other agency or department of Government. If Congress desires so to do it can take the Bureau out of the Treasury Department.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. Would the Senator anticipate that if the new reorganization plan goes into effect, it would be possible to make any substantial change in the present procedure within the next 5 years? It would take at least 2 years to put the plan into operation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that, frankly, I do not know. However, I do know that unless there is adopted a plan which is implemented by the will of the executive branch, we will be on dead center, and will not go anywhere. Certainly some progress can eventuate. If it does not, then the only conclusion which can be drawn, Mr. President, is that there was complete failure on the part of those who sent the plan here in the first instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield three additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There might be a remedy for it, which would be to install a new Republican occupant in the White House next year, and then we might get relief.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think I yielded too much time to the Senator from Illinois. [Laughter.]

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have one other matter to speak of, but I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Does not the Senator really believe that one of the chief troubles has been that men have been continued too long in these important positions without a change?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us apply that question to industry, for instance. In proportion as a man is seasoned and remains longer and longer in a position of responsibility, the amount of his paycheck goes up, his responsibilities are expanded, he becomes an expert in his field, and people fairly hang upon his words of wisdom. If that be a good rule for private industry, would it not be an equally good rule for Government, provided, of course, we start with honest talent, with men who bring character and capacity to their jobs?

Mr. GEORGE. I am afraid the Senator is now arguing against a change of administration in 1952.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, no, indeed. I reiterate the premise I just laid down as to the necessity and desirability of a change at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, sometime next year.

Mr. President, I have only one other observation of importance I wish to make at this time, namely, that if the plan fails of adoption, the result will be to shatter the hopes of literally thousands of people who have given of their time, their talent, and their energy to develop a consciousness on the part of the public of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission. I have journeyed from my home to Chicago, back to Washington, and to Baltimore, to New York, and elsewhere, and have spoken on the radio, simply to help create interest in the necessity for Government reorganization.

Consider a man like Bob Johnson, who headed the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, trying to get four or five hundred people who would be willing to make a study of the questions involved, and then devote their time and talents to visiting different sections of the country in order to impress on the minds of the public the necessity for contacting their Representatives in Washington and stimulating interest in what the Hoover Commission reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am willing to yield two additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois if he will stop electing a Republican President. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from Minnesota accepts the inevitable change next year with such good grace.

Mr. President, if by rejecting this plan we turn down the people who have so unselfishly given of their time to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, they will simply say, "It is no use. We have given ourselves freely and energetically to build up a case for this movement, which has been supported by some of the finest organizational talent in the country, and the Congress turns us down." It will be destroying a hope which it will be difficult indeed to recreate.

So, Mr. President, under these circumstances, based upon very considerable experience in this field, and for the reasons I have stated, I feel duty bound to support the plan that is before the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for yielding me this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] desires to speak for 5 minutes. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I shall support Reorganization Plan No. 1, although I am not sure that the 12th day of March is exactly the right day to bring up any legislation relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

I recognize that this plan has its defects, and perhaps it does not meet in full the recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission. I am sure that it will not cure corruption in government, because that cannot be done by legislation alone. But I do think that in providing for civil-service appointment of employees, including all but one of the employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, conditions will probably be made a little better as they relate to corruption and inefficiency. Certainly they will not be made any worse.

I realize that the President could have submitted this plan to the Congress in such a way as probably to insure its approval. It has been said by some that he expected that it would be disapproved by the Congress, and that he might even go so far as to make political capital out of it. I hope that will not prove to be the case. But whatever the situation may be, I think the Senate should approve the plan at this time. It is in consonance with the general policy of establishing a line of authority and responsibility from the President down through the departments. It is intended to remove the temptation to give jobs in the Internal Revenue Bureau as a pay-off for

political contributions or political effort. It is commendable in that respect.

The question which we must face is whether we shall stop trying to enact constructive legislation, stop trying to make the structure of the Government better, because we do not always trust all the men who are presently operating its machinery. I submit that if we adopted every single one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, that would not necessarily insure efficiency and economy in government, because no machine can do better work than those who operate it.

This reorganization plan can be used to promote efficiency and economy in Government. It is not perfect, as I have said. It can be perfected, or brought nearer perfection, either by further reorganization plans submitted to the Congress in the future, or by acts of the Congress itself. So we should take this step in spite of the imperfections of the plan, for we can revise it later if what is done under it proves to be inadequate or unworkable. I am sure that it will not be any more unworkable or inadequate than what we have at the present time.

As has been suggested by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], it may be subject to application by a different administration in the years which lie ahead. So I think we ought to vote, regardless of our feelings toward the men who operate the Government today, and regardless of political opinions, to make the structure of the Government as good as we can possibly make it, whenever we have the opportunity to do so, and deal with misfits in office by other means.

I hope the pending reorganization plan will be adopted. I do not believe that it would make the situation any worse. It might possibly make it better. As I have said, whether or not it would improve the situation would depend upon those who operated the machine.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am not sure whether or not the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] wishes to proceed with some of the speakers in support of the resolution.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, one or two of the speakers in support of the resolution are not available at the moment. However, we expect to use our share of the time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wished to balance the time. The Senator from Arkansas, chairman of the committee, has been eminently fair, and I want to be fair with him on the floor of the Senate.

I now yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and whatever additional time he may require.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall vote for President Truman's plan to streamline the Bureau of Internal Revenue, to take the local managers of our tax system out of politics, and to put them under the merit system.

I shall vote for this plan because it seems to me that in three sensible ways it will effectively discourage bribers and bribe takers. First, the plan will apply the best techniques yet devised for recruiting the best possible personnel to fill these jobs. Second, the plan will tighten the administrative structure of the Bureau of Internal Revenue so that it will be harder for taxpayers and employees to succumb to temptation. Third, I believe the plan will ultimately create a moral climate in the revenue offices which will close both the front and the back doors to favor seekers and influence peddlers.

The people of my State have a great stake in this plan. New York's families and business firms contributed more than $9,000,000,000 to support our National Government in the fiscal year 1951. That was almost one out of every $5 collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The people of my State have had many, many bitter lessons—bipartisan lessons if you please—in the evil effects of the patronage system. Those lessons have taught New Yorkers and have taught me, over a period of many years, to seize every opportunity to replace the patronage system with the merit system.

We have heard much in recent months about corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. As a result of energetic congressional investigations, we have learned that a few of the 57,000 employees of the Bureau have betrayed their trust. Some of them were patronage employees, some were civil-service employees. But it was the patronage employees who were in the key positions, who set the moral tone for these tax offices. It was the patronage employees through whom the morals of the political and commercial sewers seeped into the tax structure.

This is the judgment of Representative CECIL KING, whose Subcommittee on Administration of Internal Revenue has done such outstanding service for good government. This is why he supports this plan so vigorously.

Some critics of this plan rationalize their opposition to it by arguing that putting all tax officials under civil service is no answer to the present situation. They point to the few civil servants fired after these recent disclosures as proof that the merit system is not an absolute guaranty of integrity. These critics miss the significance, even of the bare statistics on the dismissals.

By now, 7 of the 64 patronage officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue have been dismissed. If the same incidence of delinquency, the same frequency of malfeasance had been found among the civil servants of the Revenue Bureau, we should be reading about the firing of almost 6,000 of its 57,000 employees. Instead, fewer than 200 have been involved in these ugly affairs.

We cannot ignore the meaning of these figures. They show that the bribers—about whom we should be hearing much more from those who are usually so eloquent about corruption—knew where to go to find those who are most likely to be susceptible to their shady approaches. They go to the patronage appointees, because they know that regardless of the theory of Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation, the obligations of these collectors are frequently to the local political bosses. It is to party cliques and party machines that these men are usually beholden. These collectors deserve censure, but so do those who tempt and suborn the collectors. And equal censure should be meted out to the system which permits these things to happen.

This plan is directed at that system. This plan can destroy the sinister network which makes the "tax fix" possible. That network starts with the unscrupulous tax-dodger trying to get away with something, trying to cheat his Government and his fellow citizens. Then comes the grubby legal negotiator who knows the ropes, who has the contact, who knows the right people in the organization. Then comes the political boodler, whose sole interest in party politics is what he can make out of it. And finally comes the man at the end of the network, the man who owes his very job to the patronage system.

How often this vicious network is actually used is far less important than the fact that it can be available. The feeling that such a network may exist corrodes the public confidence in the great principle of equality before the law, in the postulate that the tax laws shall be administered without fear or favor.

It is not enough to attack this network with severe punishment, if and when we catch those who are part of it; more must be done. Not only crime detection and punishment but also crime prevention are urgently needed.

A number of steps in that direction will be made possible by this plan. A tightened administrative structure will make it harder for the network to operate. An independent inspection service will discourage dishonesty. Above all, this plan will make it harder for the briber, the legal manipulator, and the boodler to find their most essential instrument—an official responsive to their will.

That is what the President's plan will do. It will make it harder to find officials whose sense of public obligation is dulled by a feeling of political indebtedness. It will root out of the tax system the feeling that, if you are an employee, you have to "play ball" or "know someone" to reach the highest career posts. It will banish the deplorable inference that there is one tax code for most Americans and another one for those "in the know."

Some critics of this plan seem discouraged because it will not legislate honesty into dishonest men. Obviously, that is impossible. Others argue that the civil-service system has many flaws. I, for one, agree, and will work and vote to correct such flaws at every opportunity and occasion. Civil service has, nevertheless, proved far superior to the spoils system as a public personnel mechanism, and we will help make it better by approving this very plan because we will remove one of the chief factors which corrupt the merit system—political influence.

The overwhelming majority of those who serve us in the executive branch have as high a standard of personal integrity as you will find anywhere in America. By voting for this plan, we

will show our respect for this overwhelming majority. We will show it by fostering a feeling in the revenue service that competence and not political influence is the way to advancement to the key nonpolicy positions.

The merit system of filling career positions on the basis of competition is in the best American tradition. Competition is the lifeblood of America.

The merit system of making appointments—

Theodore Roosevelt once said—

is in essence as democratic and American as the common school system. It simply means that in positions where the duties are entirely nonpolitical, the applicants should have a fair field and no favor.

This plan is an application of that observation by Theodore Roosevelt.

I believe that this plan will be as healthy for our party politics as it will be for our public administration. Throughout my own political career, I have urged that our country would be strengthened by the active political participation of more and more Americans. But I have always felt that in politics as in government, a desire to serve the public should provide the motive for participation in politics. This plan will encourage those who believe in public service to get into politics: It will serve notice on those others who see politics as a way to spoils and favors that they are, more and more, wasting their time.

And while I am talking about politics, I should like to comment on the charge that this plan is, itself, a political move. I do not believe that, if you mean that it is an effort to gain partisan advantage. Does anyone here allege that putting the bipartisan Civil Service Commission in charge of screening applicants for these posts is a political move? I do not think so.

The problem of corruption in our tax system is not uniquely a problem for Democrats or for Republicans. Administrations headed by Presidents of both parties have suffered with it. Both President Truman and former President Hoover have endorsed this plan as a way to meet the problem.

Three separate investigations—all headed by Democrats—the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and Representative KING—have dramatized this problem, all at a time when the Democratic Party was in power. A Democratic President and a Democratic national chairman have both advocated this plan strongly. Democratic and Republican members alike support it, and have sponsored legislation to achieve the same purpose.

Corruption, patronage, good government—these are matters above party, and I urge that we try to meet them at that level.

Our public morals command attention throughout a world in which we stand as the chief spokesman for democratic self-government. Our sincerity in advocating those morals is always on trial. This plan will be an argument for that sincerity, and I shall vote to adopt it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Reorganization Hits Home," published in the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post Standard of January 29, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REORGANIZATION HITS HOME

The Syracuse Chamber of Commerce has asked Congressman R. WALTER RIEHLMAN and other Washington sources to make sure that the proposed reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue does not deprive Syracuse of its present internal revenue office. According to one report, the reorganization plan might result in the reduction of the number of offices in New York State to two—thus possibly eliminating the important Syracuse district office, which handles over a million tax returns for individuals and business in this area.

We almost never disagree with the chamber of commerce. We do it on this occasion only with the greatest of reluctance. The Syracuse office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been a good one. There is no reason to believe that any of the dirt and dishonesty which featured many of the Bureau's operations has extended here. Certainly Collector Frank J. Shaughnessy is a most outstanding citizen and has conducted his office superbly well.

On the other hand, however, this newspaper, the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce, and many other organizations have vigorously protested the graft and corruption which have riddled the tax-collection system. We have demanded that changes be made and that truth and honesty be restored as basic requirements in this department. Having raised so much well-merited commotion on this point, we rather doubt that we are in a position to attack a plan which offers that very reorganization we have demanded because the reorganization would affect us here.

It smacks too much of the policy we have criticized in Congressmen who are always in favor of economy except in their own districts. They cannot say that they want economy and then be unwilling to bear a share of it, any more than we in the present instance can demand reorganization and then protest it because it happens to affect our own city.

We should be very sorry indeed to lose an office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in this city. Certainly there is always the hope that one of the 25 projected offices might come to Syracuse and that Mr. Shaughnessy will be one of the top men selected to continue. On the other hand, we must face the fact that we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. If reorganization is necessary to bring about honesty and integrity in the tax-collection system of the country as a whole, we must bear with it.

Assuming that the reorganization of the entire Bureau is approved as the best possible plan, the chamber of commerce will be more effective if it goes along with the improvements on which it and thousands of other similarly public-spirited organizations have insisted, and, at the same time, point out the advantages to the Government of locating the up-State branch office in this city and of retaining Mr. Shaughnessy as head of that office. Anything less than this makes Syracuse suspect of placing selfishness above broad national interests.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a strong letter from the New York State Bar Association, wholeheartedly endorsing this reorganization plan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW YORK STATE BAR ASSOCIATION,
SECTION OF TAXATION,
January 23, 1952.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
The Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: On behalf of the executive committee of the section on taxation of the New York State Bar Association, of which I am chairman, I take this means of informing you that a majority of the members of the committee recommend that favorable consideration be given by the Congress to the reorganization for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, known as Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives on January 14, 1952, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

In taking this action, the committee fully realizes that the reorganization plan of the President was neither comprehensive in scope nor perfect in detail. However, the committee believes that compared with the existing archaic, obsolete, and altogether antiquated field organization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the plan constitutes an advance in the administration of the internal-revenue laws of the country and, as such, it is worthy of approval.

As we see it, the object of the plan is to rescue the internal-revenue service from the existing chaotic overlapping and duplicating areas of jurisdiction and to establish an integrated field organization with actual decentralized power commensurate with the responsibility of carrying out functions regrouped in accordance with stable principles of organization and management.

In our opinion, the plan does more than provide a long-needed rectification of the methods of appointment of collectors of internal revenue. If put into effect, it will result in the integration of the auditing, appellate, collection, and enforcement functions of the Bureau into a rational system instead of the loose and arbitrary scattering of those functions among the two-hundred-odd offices throughout the country which now report directly to Washington and operate without any genuine decentralization of control.

The committee recognizes that practical reform of the Bureau of Internal Revenue must be slow and, like all reform, full of compromises. With this in mind, we wish to emphasize that we regard the plan as but a prelude to additional administrative reforms which will also embody sound management techniques and prudent governmental policies.

Very truly yours,
R. E. LEE, *Chairman.*

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a letter from the Long Island Association, strongly advocating the adoption of the reorganization plan.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LONG ISLAND ASSOCIATION,
GARDEN CITY N. Y.,
January 29, 1952.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We earnestly hope that the Senate can promptly adopt the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 which should develop more efficiently an economy in the

Federal Government. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government recommended the merit system for appointments of collectors of internal revenue.

Your support for this plan will be appreciated by our membership.

With kind regards, I am,

Very truly yours,

MEADE C. DOBSON,
Managing Director.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a resolution which was adopted by the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce endorsing the reorganization plan, and strongly urging its adoption by the Senate, together with the covering letter.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUFFALO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
January 7, 1952.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: The enclosed statement of the Buffalo Chamber of Commerce on appointments to the Bureau of Internal Revenue was adopted by the board of directors at its December meeting.

We would appreciate having your comments.

Sincerely,

CHARLES C. FICHTNER,
Executive Vice President.

STATEMENT OF THE BUFFALO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON APPOINTMENTS TO THE BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The disclosure of an ever-increasing number of acts of corruption among employees and officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue calls for an immediate and thorough reorganization of the Bureau's personnel.

The making of appointments of United States tax collectors for partisan political considerations should be promptly discontinued. Persons appointed to posts in the Bureau of Internal Revenue should give it full-time service.

The Buffalo Chamber of Commerce believes that employees and officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be career men carefully chosen for qualifications of character and ability and in recognition of the great public trust place in the faithful and impartial discharge of their duties. Because of the extremely high level of Federal taxation and supreme importance to the Nation's future of sound fiscal organization, every effort must be made to restore public confidence in the integrity of Federal tax administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in his excellent address has placed his finger upon the crucial issue which is before the Senate. It is: Politics as usual, which has gotten us into an unusual amount of trouble or a much-needed reform, which has been endorsed and recommended by the President now in office and by a former President, as well as by the Hoover Commission, the House of Representatives, and responsible citizens throughout the United States. I believe the Senator's case is well documented when it is pointed out that of the present 64 collectors of internal revenue, 17 came up through the ranks, and that on these 17 there is not a blemish or scar in terms of their record, background, or integrity. I thank the Senator from New York for his contribution.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I feel very strongly about this subject. I have seen the workings of civil service in my own State of New York. I believe that in New York State employees are at least 98 percent under civil service, and I do not recall any major scandal in the New York system in the time it has been in force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has asked me to yield a minute to him so that he may speak on another matter. I yield 2 minutes to him.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report favorably from the Committee on Armed Services 2,123 routine nominations in the Army, Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps.

In order to avoid the expense involved in printing these names on the Executive Calendar more than once, which I understand would be approximately $600, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations be confirmed and that the President be notified. I may say that there are no nominations above the rank of colonel; no flag or general nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, as in executive session, the nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 285) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I should like to discuss briefly the resolution providing for rejection of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1952, relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In my statement I should like to advance some of the reasons why I am in favor of the resolution and why I am opposed to the plan.

Judging from a great many of the newspaper articles, some newspaper editorials, some statements by radio commentators, and also from the President's letter relating to this matter, one would think that all the Senators who oppose this plan and who favor the resolution are actuated solely by a desire to retain patronage. I submit that is an utterly absurd statement, and I also submit that there is absolutely no foundation for taking such a position.

To begin with, the appointment of collectors of internal revenue is a prerogative of the President, and ordinarily he makes the appointment upon the recommendation of the Senators from the State or the recommendation of some authority residing within the State whose recommendation the President is willing to accept.

In any State the only position in connection with the Bureau of Internal Revenue which now is not under civil service is that of the collector; and it is only about once in every 5 or 10 years that a collector is appointed. It is utterly absurd to say that Senators are interested in retaining that patronage, when it is only once in very 5 or 10 years that they are able to recommend someone for appointment as collector.

For instance, in my own State of North Carolina there have been only three or four collectors in perhaps the past 25 years. During my 7 years in the Senate there has been only one vacancy, and it was filled on the recommendation of Senator Frank Graham, when he was my colleague in the Senate, and myself. So, in 7 years' time the Senators from North Carolina have made only one recommendation for the appointment of one official in that category.

The collector of internal revenue does not make appointments. He does not have patronage to dispense. Therefore, the only patronage feature is the appointment of the collector of internal revenue himself and the process of having his appointment for the designated term of service confirmed by the Senate. As I said a moment ago, during my 7 years of service in the Senate, only one person has been appointed collector of internal revenue in my State. Prior to that appointment, the previous collector had served for 17 years. Prior to that appointment, the previous collector, a Republican, had served for 12 years. Prior to that time the collector had been the late Josiah W. Bailey, later a Senator from the State of North Carolina. He was collector of internal revenue under President Woodrow Wilson's administration.

I mention these facts to show that patronage is insignificant in connection with this matter, and would not be controlling in regard to the position taken by any Senator on this floor in respect to the reorganization plan. In fact, Mr. President, the patronage feature of the plan is so small that I am surprised to see supposedly intelligent persons attribute selfish motives, allegedly based on a desire to seek patronage, to a Senator who opposes this reorganization plan. As I have stated, the fact is that patronage is involved in this plan only in respect to the appointment of one collector for a State, for ordinarily each State comprises one collection district, although some States, such as New York, have more than one collection district.

Therefore, I submit that it is very far-fetched indeed to say that any Senator who opposes this plan does so because he seeks to retain patronage, because the patronage feature of the plan is so small, so insignificant, and so lacking in effect that there would be no reason for any

Senator to desire to retain it. If the collector had the power to make many appointments of persons to serve under him, the situation would be different.

The collector who is appointed should be a man who is qualified to serve in that position in his State; he should be a man of character, ability, integrity, executive ability, and capacity to meet people and to deal with them. In view of the experience in North Carolina—and I think the same is true in other States—I submit that a better selection for collector can be made without resorting to the civil service rolls. In other words, during all the years in which I have been familiar with the collectors in North Carolina, under various administrations, the man who has been appointed collector has been a better man than one who could have been obtained from the civil service rolls.

When a list of possible appointees is made up for the civil-service rolls, those whose names appear on the rolls are graded. Under this plan, if it is adopted, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue would have to select one from the first three persons appearing on that roll, to be collector of internal revenue for any district, or to be commissioner, as he might be called. After the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue had selected one from that list, if thereafter another selection had to be made for appointment in the same category, the Secretary or the Commissioner would have to choose from three names again, two of the same names remaining on the list, who would be the two he rejected the first time. In other words, those two names would be before him again, and he would have to make his choice as between those two and one new name, when the next appointment was made.

I do not believe the proposed method would result in securing men of the character, fitness, and capabilities as are obtained under the method presently followed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the Senator from North Carolina has correctly stated the procedure which would be followed if the plan were adopted, in selecting one of the three names at the top of the eligible list. The whole theory of the plan is that it would result in taking this matter out of politics by removing the appointment of collectors from what is termed patronage—in other words, from confirmation by the Senate.

However, if this plan is adopted and if the Secretary of the Treasury is given the power to appoint one from among the three highest on the list, what is there in the plan or in law to prevent the Secretary from doing exactly what now is done in connection with post-office appointments, in respect to which a selection must be made from among the three highest on the list, namely, from consulting his political friends in regard to the one they want appointed from among the three? What is there in the plan or in law to prevent that from being done?

Mr. HOEY. Not a thing in the world; and those of us who know about other affairs realize that that is exactly what would happen. Under any administration, the executive officer, the Secretary of the Treasury, who would make the appointments, in all probability would confer with the Senators or Representatives from the State concerned in order to determine their choice among the three highest on the list.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would depend, would it not, pretty much upon whether that Senator or Representative was "going along" with the then administration?

Mr. HOEY. Yes, and whether he was in the good graces of the administration.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. So what we would be doing in actual, practical effect, under this plan, would be to say that the representatives elected by the people would have nothing to do with the appointment, but that such authority would be reposed in an appointee who could consult anyone he wished to consult politically and could be guided by such recommendations.

Mr. HOEY. That is exactly what this plan proposes.

Mr. President, I have no objections to the civil service; I think the civil service serves a good purpose. However, I do not believe that civil-service examinations will disclose the qualifications and fitness of a man to be a collector of internal revenue to the same degree or the same extent that his qualifications can be explored by those who know him and know the State and know the situation and can make appropriate recommendations to the President.

Furthermore, Mr. President, under the present law the President of the United States can remove a collector of internal revenue at any time he may wish to do so, without even one day's notice. However, if the collector of internal revenue were selected under the civil-service system, then he would be in office, and it would be a "land office" job to remove him. In that case, regardless of the situation which might exist and regardless of everything else, it would be necessary to go through a long, involved process before the collector could be removed from office, even though he might be utterly inefficient and might be entirely lacking in the qualities and characteristics necessary for efficient service.

Therefore, Mr. President, I do not subscribe to the theory that we would be remedying the situation in any particular if we changed the present Bureau of Internal Revenue only to the extent of abolishing the position of collector, and substituting the position of commissioner, and placing all such positions under civil service.

I desire to correct another misapprehension about this matter. I observe that the plan is referred to as a plan to "clean up" the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Mr. President, there is nothing in the plan which is designed to clean up the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Not a single sentence of the plan would give any authority which does not presently exist to clean up that Bureau.

As evidence that the plan is not proposed for the purpose of cleaning up the Bureau of Internal Revenue, I point out that the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. John B. Dunlap, who is a fine, capable man, and to whom I wish to pay tribute for the fine job he has done in the Bureau, does not contend that this plan is for the purpose of cleaning up the Bureau. He says the process of cleaning up the Bureau has gone forward, until now it is almost concluded, and it will be concluded before this plan can be put into effect in any sort of fashion. Therefore, this plan has no relationship to the cleaning up the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. President, the newspapers frequently ask, "If Senators want the Internal Revenue Bureau cleaned up, why are they not in favor of this reorganization plan?" The answer evidently is, because this plan has no relation to cleaning up the Internal Revenue Bureau, and it will make no contribution whatsoever to that objective.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not subscribe at all to the theory that it is possible to instill honesty in government, or assure integrity of character, merely by having a man pass a civil-service examination. I also wish to combat the idea and theory that, because employees are selected on what some are pleased to term a patronage basis, they are either dishonest, or are lacking in integrity, or are inefficient. Let us consider the record. Since the investigation of the Internal Revenue Bureau began, 141 employees and officials of the Internal Revenue Bureau in the United States have been discharged for malfeasance in office. Of the 141, all except 7 were already under civil service. Therefore, it cannot be argued that civil service assures honesty and integrity, whereas appointees employed upon the recommendation either of Senators, Representatives, or any other responsible agency do not possess those qualities. Therefore, I again submit that this is not a clean-up proposal, and that there is nothing about the administration of the Civil Service or its employees which can give a guaranty either of honesty or integrity in the administration of the Government offices which are affected.

I have two very valid reasons for being opposed to this plan and for being in favor of the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and by the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]; and these two reasons are as follows: First, this plan will not effect any economies in the administration of the Internal Revenue Bureau. If we are to reorganize a governmental agency, it seems to me that the fundamental questions to be considered are, first, is it going to promote economy, and, second, is it going to increase efficiency? I contend that this plan will result neither in economy nor efficiency. Let me submit a few observations in support of that position. How will it effect economy? To begin with, it provides for abolishing the 64

collectors, and at the same time it provides for reappointing from 64 to 78 commissioners, as the number of districts may later be determined, to fill their places. Mr. President, that involves no saving, and no reduction of employees, but rather an increase in their number. But that is not all. It provides for the creation, over and above all these officials, 25 regional districts, and appointing 25 regional commissioners, giving each one of them a large staff, and it also provides for increasing the compensation of these officials and their employees. For instance, it raises the limit from $10,000 to $17,500 for these appointees. Superimposed upon all the officials we now have is this added group of 25 regional commissioners, with increased compensation for themselves, and with large staffs to aid them. Is there any economy in that? Does it portend any reduction in expenses?

If we are concerned about the cost of Government, and about the cost of the various agencies, do we want to adopt a reorganization plan which, at its very inception adds a tremendous cost to the operation of one Government bureau? That is what this plan does.

There would be some excuse for it if it would result in increasing efficiency. But would it increase efficiency? And if so, in what particular? It certainly does not increase efficiency merely to abolish a collector and put a commissioner in his place. It does not increase efficiency to say to a man who has served well as collector, "We are going to have somebody stand an examination, to see how high a grade he can make, and we are going to take him from the civil-service roll and make him the commissioner." It does not add anything to the efficiency of the organization to require the appointee, the commissioner or collector, to pass a civil-service examination, because as the head of the district he does not perform the ordinary work of accounting, but he is the man who meets the people who want to deal with the Government. He is the man who confers with those who have business with the Government. He is the man who is at the front of the organization for the Government, and he ought to be a man of such type and such character as to command the respect of the people with whom he deals and, at the same time, to fill acceptably the position. A civil-service examination can make no contribution in providing a man of such qualities.

Mr. President, whence is efficiency going to come? Presently we have a great many regional offices established for various agencies, and I believe it will be found upon an investigation of the record and the facts that not a single one of these regional agencies or offices contributes to the efficiency of the Government. They do not expedite the handling of Government business. Let us take my State, for instance. Ordinarily there is a regional office either at Atlanta or at Richmond. What does it mean? It means that when some problem has to be administered it is taken, first, in the State of the individual concerned, and then it is carried to the regional office. It lingers there for a long time, and is batted back and forth, until eventually it comes to Washington to be settled. The same process is proposed to be followed under this plan. Is any efficiency developed by the mere fact that a regional office is established somewhere to which a great many of problems intimately affecting citizens are to be carried? Is it much more difficult for people to take up their matters directly with Washington from their State level than to take them up with regional offices, and then to have them referred from the regional office to Washington, repeat the same process over again, before they can have it finally and definitely determined? Therefore, I do not think the plan will add to the efficiency.

Mr. President, we may as well understand that this plan does not change the present revenue system. All the employees now in the revenue service are under civil service. The plan relates only to the collectors and to the higher officials in Washington who are appointed by the President, and who presently are appointed that way. I contend that there is nothing in this reorganization plan which increases the efficiency of the Internal Revenue Bureau, and I do not believe that its workings will demonstrate that it is any more efficient than the present plan.

I may say a word in commendation of the present very efficient internal-revenue service. Of course, it has had corruption in it. Many unfortunate incidents have happened, but, on the whole, the revenue service has been efficiently and intelligently administered, and, with very few exceptions, it has been honestly done.

When there are thousands upon thousands of employees in the Government service, I think it is a great mistake, merely because here and there an employee is recreant to his trust and violates the confidence which the Government has reposed in him, and which his fellow citizens entertain for him, to condemn the whole system, and to intimate that it is all a fraud and is all corrupt, and is all dishonest, and all tainted with bribery. That, Mr. President, simply is not the fact, and I think we ought to deal with this matter on a factual basis; and the factual basis is that the Internal Revenue Bureau as a whole has been marvelously administered, and taxes have been collected at a remarkably low cost. Of course, we can correct the irregularities, we cannot correct dishonesty and wipe out corruption by eliminating, removing, discharging, and punishing those who are guilty of it. We are doing that now. No less an authority than the present very efficient Commissioner of Internal Revenue says that process has been practically completed.

When we come then to pass on any reorganization plan, as I mentioned a few minutes ago, I think it ought to encompass two fundamental objectives. It ought to bring about greater economy, and it ought to assure greater efficiency. If it does not do those two things, I do not think reorganization is worth while.

Mr. President, I submit the present plan does neither of these things, and that there is no provision in this entire plan which can assure greater efficiency; and certainly it will not bring about as much economy as we now have.

Mr. President, there has been so much propaganda about this plan, and that it is one reason why Senators have been receiving so much mail regarding it. The Citizens' Committee supporting the Hoover Commission's report has lent its support to this plan. I think it is an admirable committee and I have no complaint to make about it at all. It is entirely proper for them to propagandize all they want to in behalf of any recommendations of the Hoover Commission or any other policies of Government. But I think if we reviewed the record which has been made in connection with the various reorganization plans, we would have a little more regard for the manner in which these changes are made rather than merely the form and substance of the plans adopted. For instance, since the publication of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, the Congress has approved 28 reorganization plans—all of them submitted by the President, and most of them in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I have supported all of them except one. Six plans have been rejected. So there has been a total of 36 plans submitted besides the present plan. That includes one extra. There are several more plans pending.

I was interested a few days ago in noticing that one member of the Citizens' Committee released an interview in which he said that the Hoover Commission plans already adopted by the Congress would result in saving $2,000,000,000 in administration.

I would have been greatly delighted to see that statement, except for the fact that I knew it was not true. So I made inquiry to find out about it. Mr. President, do you know how much has been saved by all these 28 plans? The best estimate we can get is that not $2,000,000,000, but around $28,000,000 have been saved. The total savings accruing from all 28 plans is around $26,000,000 or $28,000,000, according to the best estimates available.

There is a vast difference between $2,000,000,000 and $28,000,000, so that those of the Citizens' Committee who are so enthusiastic about these various plans which have been adopted and which I have supported will have to lower their figures considerably.

It is said that if we adopt the remaining Hoover Commission's plans we will save $2,000,000,000 additional. If this plan is adopted, we shall not save a single dollar. Some of the plans may save some money, but there would be a total saving of less than $60,000,000.

I am not discouraging support of the Hoover plans. I think many of them are good. I expect to support some which are still pending. I merely wish to invite attention to the wild estimates which are made and to the fact that the public is led to believe that the plans constitute a solution of all the problems which confront us, and that the present plan would bring about better administration of the tax-collection business.

My observation is that it would not accomplish the desired result.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. What the Senator is saying regarding these reorganizations as a whole with reference to the public being oversold is certainly applicable to the plan which is before the Senate, because the public is being led to believe that it is a plan to clean up corruption. Certainly every citizen who is interested in the welfare of his country wants corruption swept out of Government. The man who is in the position to know best what the plan will accomplish, who is at the head of the agency or the bureau which is being reorganized, says that so far as corruption is concerned, he is dealing with it adequately. If the people of the country understood that, if they knew that they could accept his statement at full value, then I think they would be willing to have us consider this plan upon its real merits and be willing to have it to go to a legislative committee to have the proper safeguards placed in it.

Mr. HOEY. I think the distinguished Senator from Arkansas is absolutely correct. The country has been led to believe that this plan will revolutionize everything in the Internal Revenue Bureau, and will eliminate all corruption. Corruption is being investigated, and no less an authority than the very able Commissioner says that his investigation is practically completed and that when he finishes the instances which are now under examination he will feel that the Bureau has been cleaned up.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In connection with what the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is saying, I believe it is well again to emphasize the civil-service situation. I should like to invite attention to some figures which I received in a letter from the Commissioner a short time ago in which he points out that of the 181 persons in the Bureau of Internal Revenue who have been discharged in 1950 and 1951 for malfeasance in office, which might mean corruption or other things of that kind, all but 6 have been civil-service employees.

I think the clear implication there is that placing under civil service a very few in number who are not now under civil service, would not correct any tendency toward corruption.

A substantial number of those who have been discharged were civil-service employees. While that may be repetitious, and while the Senator may have referred to it a while ago, I think it is well to emphasize the point in connection with the argument.

Mr. HOEY. I thank the Senator from Iowa. I had made reference to it. I gave the figures as to those who had been discharged. The number was 141. The figure of 181 includes some who were guilty of inefficiency and certain minor infractions. The preponderant number were under civil service all except 6 or 7. I thank the Senator from Iowa for emphasizing that point.

Mr. President, this plan has to be accepted or rejected. It cannot be amended; no changes can be made in it. It has been brought to the attention of the Nation by no less an authority than the American Bar Association that there is a very serious question as to whether if the plan is adopted, the taxpayer will not lose his right to have his case heard and determined in a court in his own district or place of residence, and likewise the right to a trial by jury. The Attorney General says he does not think the plan would have that effect; but that is only his opinion. The American Bar Association raises the serious question. If the plan should be adopted in its present form, I think a serious problem would be presented to the mind of any lawyer, as to whether the average taxpayer might be deprived of his right to have his claim determined and settled in a court in his own State, which would practically deny the right of recovery to taxpayers. They are not able to come to Washington or to maintain here attorneys and facilities for carrying forward their cases. They can do that in their own States.

The Constitution provides that such cases should be determined in the State of the party involved, and that there should be the right of trial by jury. I am unwilling to take away from the humblest citizen the right to have his cause determined by his peers, his jurors, in his own territory. I should not be willing to take any sort of chance that would carelessly deal with such a fundamental question as this. While there might be some remedial statues passed at some later time, we are dealing with the question today, and we must pass upon it as it stands now. As this plan is proposed, the question is whether it preserves the right of the individual citizen to have his cause heard and determined in his own State, or whether he is denied the right of a trial by jury, which is one of the fundamental rights provided in the Constitution for every citizen.

There are various other points which should be considered. I think the plan has been thrown together rather hastily. It has been stated that the facts have been in the possession of the Government officials for a long time, but they did not act upon them until recently. No committee of the Congress had an opportunity to discuss with them the provisions of the plan or to make suggestions with reference to it, or to provide any safeguards of the rights of citizens.

Therefore I do not believe this plan should be adopted hastily, and without proper consideration, in substitution for the system we already have, and which has worked remarkably well.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. HOEY. I gladly yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I believe the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is the only member of the Committee on Government Operations who is also a member of the Finance Committee of the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. HOEY. It is.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So there has been only one member of the Committee on Finance of the Senate who has had the opportunity to be present in the hearings held on the pending resolution, and an opportunity to question those who testified in support of the reorganization plan.

I ask the Senator, is there any reason why, if the subject is to come before the Senate Finance Committee, the Finance Committee could not go into all these matters which are doubtful and questionable, amend the plan, or a bill which uses the plan as a basis, and report proposed legislation which would be acceptable, and could be recommended by the Committee on Finance, the proper legislative committee of this body having jurisdiction of the department or bureau concerned?

Mr. HOEY. The Senator from Arkansas is absolutely correct and his observation is in line with the practice and procedure which should be followed in the enactment of good legislation. I know that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance is not seeking any obligation to consider a matter of this kind——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield the Senator two more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for two more minutes.

Mr. HOEY. I know that if the question were referred to the Committee on Finance it would be the subject of a very fair, thorough, and painstaking investigation. The Committee on Finance has examined into the nominations of all collectors, especially since trouble has arisen in the Internal Revenue Bureau. I think it is well for collectors of revenue to realize that when they enter upon their duties they are bound by the obligations of their offices. The examination of nominees by the Committee on Finance has added to the solemnity and the impressiveness of the duties they are called upon to perform. I do not believe that situation would be improved by transferring collectors to the civil-service roll.

For the reasons I have stated, Mr. President, I am opposed to the reorganization plan, and am in favor of the pending resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield whatever time the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] would like to have for her presentation.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very glad to. I know the 3 minutes will be very well used.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, at the outset of my remarks, I wish to say that I resent the reflection the President has made in his statements about opponents of the plan, implying bad political motives on the

part of such men of integrity as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I respect their integrity, and I have full confidence in their good faith and the sincerity of their views—even though I disagree with their position on the reorganization plan now under consideration by the Senate.

Let me say that it comes with poor grace for Mr. Truman, of all people, to accuse them of playing politics.

Mr. President, I voted for the reorganization plan in the Committee on Government Operations, and in so doing followed the lead set by our last Republican President, Herbert Hoover.

I am going to vote against the pending resolution and for the plan because I am going to vote against corruption. I am going to vote for a system that I feel is not perfect, but at least it is a start toward the goal of taking corruption out of tax collection. It is at least a start in a movement to prevent corrupt officials from picking the tax pockets of Americans.

I am going to vote for the plan because I have repeatedly raised my voice in and out of the Senate in protest against the corruption that has been going on in the Truman administration. I am now given a chance to do more than just talk against corruption. I am given a chance to vote against corruption, to vote to stop it instead of permitting it to continue. The vote on this plan is clearly a test of just how serious are those of us who talk so much against corruption. Are we willing to back up that talk with action?

I am going to vote for the plan because it proposes to take tax collection out of politics and tax collectors out of political patronage. That is the heart of the plan. That is exactly what the Hoover Commission recommended. That is what the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report is emphasizing in its support of the plan, for the Citizens Committee, which was organized at the specific request of our last Republican President, Herbert Hoover, and which committee bears his sponsorship, has said that the heart of the plan is substantially the same as that recommended by the Hoover Commission, headed by the senior statesman of the Republican Party, Hon. Herbert Hoover.

I am going to vote for this plan because I believe the American people want it, and are overwhelmingly in favor of it. I think that one of the clear expressions of the New Hampshire primary yesterday, in which the junior Senator from Tennessee scored such an impressive victory over President Truman, is that the people want corruption in government cleaned out. I think that the election results showed that the people think just as the Hoover Commission thinks, the same that the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report thinks, and the same as I do, that the pending plan should go into effect because it would take tax collection out of politics and tax collectors out of political patronage, and would do much to stop corruption in the collection of taxes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks the March 11, 1952, press release of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, which sets forth the clear position of the senior statesman of the Republican Party, former President Herbert Hoover, in support of the proposal to take tax collectors out of politics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 12.—"Politics lies at the heart of the corruption in tax collecting," Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, said today.

"Seven of the 64 collectors of internal revenue have been fired or forced out of the Federal service; that is 11 percent of the total," Dr. Johnson, who is also president of Temple University, declared. "This scandal is Nation-wide. The seven collectors who were involved in scandals and who are now private citizens are James P. Finnegan, St. Louis, Mo.; Dennis Delaney, Boston, Mass.; James W. Johnson, third district, New York, N. Y.; James G. Smyth, San Francisco, Calif.; Joseph P. Marcelle, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Lipe Henslee, Nashville, Tenn.; Frank Scofield, Dallas, Tex.

"Of the first 129 so-called civil-service employees who have been fired or forced out, 42 percent are not really civil servants at all. They were political appointees who were blanketed into the civil service by Executive order without the rigid tests which former President Hoover specified to our citizens committee at our second national reorganization conference on February 18, 1952. These are:

" 'First, probity. And by that I mean intellectual as well as financial honesty.

" 'Second, character. And by that I mean courage to stand up for decent administration against all comers within or without.

" 'Third, and not least, training and competence.

" 'Surely the Nation has a right to a better system of choice and management of its employees than one which has produced these months of humiliation. That humiliation extends to both the thousands of men and women who hold to the sacred honor of government service and the humiliation of the whole of a great and God-fearing people.'

"Even if we give our opponents the full benefit of the doubt and say that all of the employees who were blanketed into the Federal service were really civil service—and not originally political appointees—we find that only approximately 0.26 percent of the civil-service employees have been tainted with the vicious touch of corruption. This figure stands up unequivocally against 11 percent of the political appointees who have been so tainted. Some Senators have said that senatorial approval is a safeguard. Can they really mean this? It sounds like a raucous and cynical joke at the expense of the American taxpayer. Are some of these respected gentlemen not able, like the rest of us, to read the daily newspapers?

"Again and again former President Hoover has called for removal of these petty political appointees from politics. On January 18, 1952, he said in a letter to Congressman CECIL R. KING:

" 'MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which I was Chairman, over 2 years ago recommended that the personnel in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and certain other agencies be placed under the civil service in order to improve their qualifications and character and freedom from politics.'

"On December 29, 1951, he said to Col. Edward Sherman, executive director of the Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report, in a radio interview:

" 'I have no doubt that if the Hoover Commission's recommendations on collectors of internal revenue and on other political appointees had been accepted 2½ years ago, when they were made, these scandals could not have occurred.

" 'The dangers of corruption in tax collection weren't news to the members of the Commission. The Commission condemned the present method of selecting tax collectors.

" 'They are mainly selected by political bosses. They are certainly selected with their approval. The determination of their fitness is pretty much based on their ability to get votes or rewards for doing so.

" 'These exposures in Washington are just getting started * * *. Few of them have yet reached the indictment stage. Already, however, the Commission's recommendations are a hundred times justified. * * *

" 'It requires a vigorous examination to determine their competence for each special field. Thus these appointments are made with a background of merit, not on ability to get votes or please some political bosses.'

"On October 24, 1951, he said to the State chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report:

" 'And I would point out that urgent among the recommendations of the Reorganization Commission was that the Internal Revenue Service be placed in the civil service. That means the whole personnel would be appointed by merit examinations under the Civil Service Commission instead of by the political machine as of today. Your committee has urged and advocated this reform. Where Federal employees have been genuinely selected to the civil service, which includes consideration of character as well as ability, they have seldom been corrupt. Never was it more urgent that this method be genuinely extended into several departments than it is right now.'

"The Hoover Commission itself said:

" 'One of the chief handicaps to effective organization of the Department is the political appointment of collectors of internal revenue and of customs, and certain other officials. These appointments are regarded by some as sinecures. In any event, they form a bar to orderly development of an experienced staff.'

" 'RECOMMENDATION NO. 7

" 'The Commission recommends that all officials in the Department below the rank of Assistant Secretary should preferably be appointed from the career service without Senate confirmation.' "

That was unanimous. Commissioner McClellan did not make his general reservation from the entire 288 recommendations—and he was the only one of the 12 Commissioners who did this—until several months after the particular report had gone forward to Congress in print.

"The issue is clear. Will the Senate take tax collecting out of politics? Former President Hoover and the President agree that these 64 tax-collecting jobs must be taken out of politics. So do many public-spirited groups such as the A. F. of L., the Kiwanis International, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Investment Bankers Association, the National Civil Service Reform League, the Special Committee for Improved Federal Personnel Management, the National Association of Security Dealers, the Budget Bureau, and the Civil Service Commission.

"The problem for the Senate is also clear: Can the United States Senate rise above politics and take a constructive step to prevent future corruption as the Hoover Commission recommended?

"I assume that the voters, who watch the vote on this clean-cut issue, will also be watching at the ballot boxes next November."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield whatever time may be desired by the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR].

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I desire to state the reasons which prompt me to oppose the adoption of Senate Resolution 285, and to express my sincere hope that Reorganization Plan No. 1, pertaining to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, will become effective forthwith.

By way of preface I might assert that I do not contend that the sponsors of the resolution, in opposition to the plan, are motivated by political considerations.

I have just listened to the very forthright statement made by the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], with which I heartily agree.

It is impossible for me to believe that these worthy Senators would seek to block, primarily for political patronage, a proposal for needed revamping of such an important agency. Therefore, I dismiss that suggestion, and concede to these opponents that their attitude is based upon their sincere beliefs and convictions, although I am unable to agree with them.

Considerable discussion has ensued during committee deliberations both as to the plan itself, and as to the steps to be taken by way of implementation if we allow it to go into effect. In fact, the printed volume of hearings before the House committee covers 260 pages, and the hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations even exceed that figure with 311 pages.

In my opinion this extended collection of material boils down to two simple and dominant issues, which I might discuss briefly at this time. Those two issues concern, first, the question of replacing a political-appointment system for the designation of collectors of internal revenue with the kind of civil-service system so strongly recommended by the Hoover Commission, and, second, the possible disturbance under the plan of the right of taxpayers to sue locally in district courts for tax refunds.

Of the two questions, I feel that the latter really is not an insoluble problem, and that, however keenly and sincerely the uneasiness generated, in my judgment it should not be in the picture at all.

HOOVER COMMISSION VIGOROUSLY SUPPORTS PLAN NO. 1

First, let it be emphasized that the Hoover Commission strongly supports plan No. 1. I speak so definitely because a distinguished opposition witness before our committee stated categorically in writing that "the plan violates the underlying fundamentals of the Hoover plan." There may be one or two differences between certain details of the plan and the many collateral recommendations, some vital, some not so vital, made by the Hoover Commission in its various reports. But on the broad issues that count, this charge simply will not stand up to scrutiny and discussion. Because it has been made, however, I must quote short sections of statements by witnesses and others during congressional hearings which seem to dispose completely of that accusation. I first quote the following from a recent letter by former President Hoover:

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which I was chairman, over 2 years ago recommended that the personnel in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and certain other agencies be placed under the civil service in order to improve their qualifications and character and freedom from politics. * * * Placing these employees under civil service should be accompanied by the requirement that any employees affected should, before continuation in the Bureau, pass the Civil Service Commission requirements on the same basis of any new applicant for such employment.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

In similar vein, Mr. Robert L. McCormick, Director of Research of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, stated:

The citizens committee recognizes Reorganization Plan No. 1 as a major step toward efficiency and economy in the Federal Government. We support it. In our opinion, the reorganization proposals and the plans for extending the merit system to include the collectors of internal revenue are fully consistent with the recommendations made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—the citizens committee holds that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 should be adopted—and made effective without delay.

The testimony of Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, one of the best-qualified men in the United States to speak upon such a question as this, presented in equally strong terms the position of the citizens' committee. His extended testimony contained the most vigorous support registered for plan No. 1, particularly as to application of a civil-service system to supervisory personnel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, below the range of commissioner. Mr. Flemming spoke as an experienced former member of the Civil Service Commission and is one of the very active members of the former Hoover Commission. To get the flavor of his experience, knowledge, and testimony I shall read a short section of his thesis that under civil service—

You have an infinitely better situation in that you have a group of men who are responsible to the Secretary of the Treasury and who do not feel that they are responsible to persons outside of Government who may have been responsible for putting them in their jobs.

I think that that is the basic issue. You would have a much more clean-cut operating line under the proposed set-up than you can possibly have under the existing set-up.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that that is one of the reasons why the Hoover Commission made this recommendation. We did not make this recommendation because we thought that the civil-service system was a perfect system and that putting the positions within the system would automatically solve a lot of problems. But in all of our recommendations, we were trying to fix responsibility at a particular point, so that if things go right the person who is responsible for their going right can be commended, and if things go wrong he can be held responsible for the fact that they have gone wrong.

It seems to me that we made this recommendation to put collectors of internal revenue and collectors of customs under civil service in the hope that it would help achieve the objective of being able to fix responsibility with the head of the agency, so that he is answerable to the Congress and to the people when things do go wrong.

I feel that the Appropriations Committee of the House a few years ago put its finger right on it when they simply said, in effect, that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue does not have control over these collectors of internal revenue. And they, in effect, said that you cannot hold the Commissioner responsible for what goes on because of that fact. I think that is right.

I think this would put the Congress in a position where it could hold, not only the Commissioner of Internal Revenue responsible for what happens down the line in these offices, but could also hold the Secretary of the Treasury responsible.

Finally, I wish to mention briefly a news release issued a few days ago by James P. Mitchell, vice president of Bloomingdale Bros., Inc., of New York City, and chairman of the special committee on Federal personnel policy of the citizens committee for the Hoover report. The release announces that 22 nationally known personnel leaders joined with Mr. Mitchell in endorsing plan No. 1. The signatories of the statement included public relations and other types of personnel leaders associated with the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., the National Broadcasting Co., the New York Herald Tribune, Johnson & Johnson, American Cyanamid Co., United States Steel Co., and comparable experts in institutions of higher learning.

CIVIL SERVICE SHOULD REPLACE POLITICAL PATRONAGE

Mr. President, so much for uncontrovertible evidence that the Hoover Commission is for and not against plan No. 1. I turn now to the issue of civil service which inevitably creeps into the picture in any citation of Hoover Commission material.

The simple facts of the situation leading up to the submission of plan No. 1 are that certain malpractices were uncovered in connection with the functioning of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. As the result of those revelations, 7 of our 64 collectors of internal revenue have resigned or been ousted. Of these, 4 were charged with serious offenses, whereas the other 3 were separated because of other serious considerations, such as inefficiency.

The public may have reason to vent its indignation upon the Congress if we do not do something worth while to replace the political patronage system which has been involved in much of this trouble.

It should be stressed that plan No. 1 is only a supplementary phase of relevant action which we took 2 years ago. I refer to the enactment of plan No. 26, of 1950. At that time we approved a broad plan which centralized scattered functions and powers of the Treasury Department in the Secretary of the Treasury, with power of delegation. This im-

portant action was directly in line with similar authorization voted in other plans for Cabinet Departments of Justice, Interior, Commerce, Labor and Post Office, and the following independent agencies: Securities and Exchange Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Federal Power Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board.

Plan No. 26 applied the same general principle to the Treasury Department that we had worked out for these other important departments and agencies, so as to effectuate the basic principles so strongly emphasized by the Hoover Commission, namely, that clear lines of authority should run from top to bottom of every department and agency.

Following the adoption of plan No. 26, difficulties arose in its application because of certain statutes concerning appointment of collectors of internal revenue on a political basis, among other provisions. Plan No. 1, of 1952, in essence, therefore, provides only the necessary adjustments to make workable the comprehensive plan No. 26 enacted in 1950, covering all parts of the Treasury Department, including the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Plan No. 1 bases the improvement of functioning in the Bureau of Internal Revenue upon abolition of the present 64 collectors who are appointed by the President by and with the consent of the Senate. These collectors are to be replaced on a civil-service basis by local tax officials, who are to have the name of deputy district commissioners, because they will not only take care of the duties now handled by the collectors but, in addition, are to supervise additional tax-collection duties now scattered elsewhere in separate field offices in the local communities. Plan No. 1 also calls for a new intermediate staff level of not more than 25 district or regional offices covering the whole country, to provide improved supervision over State and local offices. The new regional district commissioners are also to be under civil service.

Other less important features of plan No. 1 I shall not attempt to cover. Certainly we are at the heart of this debate when we discuss whether the new top-level supervisory personnel which I have just listed should be continued under the present patronage system or be placed under civil service.

One can readily understand how the collectors of internal revenue came to be designated under political auspices when those offices were created by statute many years ago. At that time conditions were much simpler in the tax field and it was more or less to be expected that the tax collectors should have a political flair which would help develop a tax-collection system which of necessity had to enlist voluntary cooperation by the public in the task of tax collection.

But our tax system has become enormously complicated. Millions of taxpayers and tax returns are involved today. The kinds of taxes levied are much more numerous, and they are applied against an enormously complicated public structure, with corporations and holding companies. Difficult bookkeeping methods are in use by corporations which undoubtedly reflect for the most part the special requirements of fiscal control over their branch operations. In addition, however, those bookkeeping methods undoubtedly have been formulated in part so as to help keep at a minimum the taxes to be paid.

At any rate this very difficult situation calls for the very best brains and experience that we can find to serve the tax collection department of the Federal Government. We cannot rest content, all other considerations aside, with a system which yields the present jumbled background and experience of our tax collectors. On this score I have in mind the striking testimony of the King subcommittee, which investigated internal revenue conditions. It is:

> The miscellaneous background of experience which politically appointed collectors have brought to their task, for example, chiropractors, insurance salesmen, lawyers, ranch operators, newspaper publishers, and so forth, has generally proved to be of no particular advantage.

I insist, Mr. President, that unless we are to endanger proper administration of the increasingly difficult and important revenue problems of this country we must get and keep the best trained personnel on the job. As the Hoover Commission emphasized again and again, this is the only way that we can really carry on adequately the vital job of collecting necessary revenues.

The opponents of this change to civil service insist, however, that the corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue which was responsible for the introduction of Plan No. 1, will not be avoided in the future by the civil service approach. But let me point out that where civil service is in effect, employees owe their single allegiance to the Government.

Under civil service the appointees will be selected by competitive examination from the best available talent, with professional standing and attainments. Once employed, such civil-service appointees will develop status and will accumulate pension and other rights to protect their families and themselves in their old age.

Under such circumstances I am strongly convinced that the likelihood of wrongdoing by such individuals will be much less than occurs under the present system.

Opponents of civil service make another challenge which I want to discuss briefly. This second challenge is the assertion that the record of separations of employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue for cause during 1951 shows that only 4 percent of those who resigned or were forced to resign for serious reasons came from political appointees, in contrast to the 96 percent of those separated who came from civil-service rolls.

The impression sought to be given by these figures is that corruption was much more rampant among civil service than in non-civil-service personnel. Such a conclusion is entirely unjustified.

The facts on this score are tabulated in detail for the information of all Senators on pages 136 and 137 of the Senate hearings.

I shall not, of course, go into the details at great length. I wish to make one observation. This tabulation, covering all separations for cause from the Bureau of Internal Revenue in 1951, indicates that 74 employees resigned or were forced to resign for the serious offenses of dealing improperly with taxpayers and of embezzling public funds. Of these employees three came from the ranks of noncivil service, which to that extent supports the figure of 4 percent already presented.

The remaining 71 employees were from the civil-service ranks, from the vast mass of 58,000 civil-service employees in the Bureau which constitute all the personnel of this huge agency, except a handful of supervisory collectors and other employees.

Therefore, it is manifest that the 74 employees who were removed for serious cause from this huge total of employees represented a small ratio, although, of course, no one undertakes to excuse even that small portion. Certainly the situation is markedly different than is implied in the opponents' statements that 98 percent of the separated employees came from the civil-service rolls.

These figures constitute a strong denial of the inference that non-civil-service personnel has a better record with respect to criminal offenses than does civil-service personnel.

Mr. President, having briefly discussed these two criticisms made against the civil-service system of appointment, I think I can quickly summarize my position in favor of plan No. 1 and the civil-service employees it will bring to the Bureau of Internal Revenue by quoting the words of Chairman KING of the House committee after his excellent work searching out improper practices. As Mr. KING says:

> In my view, it is no accident that collectors and other politically appointed officials, whose duties are not primarily policy forming but technical, turned out to be the weakest links in the organization of the Internal Revenue Bureau. Therefore, any reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue ought to include as one of its principal features the removal of collectors and other officials from political appointment.

Mr. President, before I conclude my remarks I should like to make a few comments on the second question, having to do with the trial by jury in taxpayers' suits.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that I am pleased that the Senator from Maryland brought out the percentage figures with reference to the number of employees who have been removed. So that the record may be perfectly clear, it should be stated that 7 of the 47 collectors with no civil-service status have been removed, because 17 of the 64 collectors came up through the ranks in civil service, none of whom have been removed.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That constitutes approximately 15 percent of the total

number of politically appointed collectors. Approximately 135 persons out of approximately 58,000 civil servants were removed in the same period of time, which is less than one-fourth of 1 percent.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, that point should be emphasized, because of the figure which has been bandied about. It has been stated that 96 percent of those dismissed during the past year were from civil service.

Mr. O'CONOR. The very able Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct. It is important to stress that point because, as I undertook to say, no one condones the offenses of those who have been shown to be derelict; nevertheless, fortunately and to the credit of the civil-service system as a whole, a relatively small proportion of civil-service employees have been involved.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to emphasize one point in connection with this subject. I checked with the Civil Service Commission yesterday and found that 70 percent of the 135 employees worked in personal offices of the collectors, and that this 70 percent were those who were blanketed in during World War II under the blanketing-in of civil servants, and they did not come up on the basis of the merit system or on the basis of examination. They were political appointees who were blanketed in without regard to the merit system. If we were to apply the percentages on the basis of more than 58,000 civil servants, and compare them with the number of persons who have been dismissed, it would require 8,000 persons to be removed to approximate the 50 percent of the politically-appointed collectors who have been removed.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his timely observations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to say that I checked the figures yesterday with the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Civil Service Commission, because there has been a great deal of talk about the subject.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, of the two questions, Mr. President, which seem to me to dominate the whole discussion of plan No. 1, much the less important is the one raised as to the right of taxpayers to sue collectors of internal revenue in district courts for the refund of taxes improperly collected. It would seem to me that this legal question has been stressed entirely out of proportion. I have no hesitation whatsoever in reaching a personal decision in accord with that of the opinions voiced by the general counsel of the Treasury Department and corroborated in another opinion by the Attorney General of the United States.

As to the opinion of the general counsel of the Treasury Department, I refer to his full statement as printed on pages 237 to 239 of our hearings on plan No. 1. From that memorandum I quote this paragraph:

> It is my conclusion that there is no substance to any fear that suits against collectors, as a form of suit, will either be abolished or fundamentally changed under the reorganization plan. The basic duties now performed by collectors in the collection of internal-revenue taxes will be conferred, under the plan, not upon the district commissioners but upon deputy district commissioners, of which there will be at least one in every State. The existing right to sue the collector, and to have a jury trial in such suits, will survive, under the reorganization plan, in the form of a suit against these conveniently located deputy district commissioners.

The remainder of Mr. Lynch's memorandum is particularly interesting because it is devoted to improving the present legal situation in connection with taxpayers' suits, which has been characterized by the Supreme Court as an anomalous relic of bygone modes of thought. He suggests that an important contribution could be made to the further improvement of our revenue system through passage of new legislation to eliminate suits against tax collectors, and, at the same time, to preserve the valuable existing right of jury trial by permitting such a trial in tax suits against the United States. Note carefully that this proposal does not in any way weaken the unanimous sentiment in favor of the right of jury trial in taxpayers' suits, but rather, that it proposes an additional and better method of making that right effective.

Particularly in view of the cases cited by the general counsel of the Treasury Department I am satisfied, as I have said, that his opinion is thoroughly adequate. However, it happens that the Secretary of the Treasury was disturbed by the doubts on this score which were expressed at our hearings by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] in his brief opposing plan No. 1. He thereupon submitted the legal opinion obtained from the general counsel of his Department to the Attorney General of the United States for corroboration. Such action by the Secretary was particularly in point because the Attorney General has responsible charge of the Government's defense in all such suits. Hence his opinion is persuasive as to whether any technical objection could be raised in a jury trial, against whatever official comes to replace the collectors of internal revenue, in tax collection work throughout the 48 States of the Union and the communities thereof.

The Attorney General carefully reviewed the earlier opinion, and again arrived at the definite decision that the present right of taxpayers to jury trial will continue unchanged under the reorganization plan. His opinion is found in full on pages 239 and 240 of our printed hearings. The extended number of cases there cited unfortunately are of a technical character which do not lend themselves readily to presentation during debate such as this. I have studied them carefully, however, and beyond any question they add up to the final paragraph of the opinion of the Attorney General which I read herewith:

> The usefulness, the fitness, and the vitality of this common law remedy indicate to this office that courts will have no difficulty in applying the doctrine fixing responsibility for overcollection upon the collecting agent, to the public officials who may hereafter succeed to the public duty of collecting the revenues.

With two such strong assurances from the chief legal offices of the Government I cannot understand how there can be any residual fear about the possible abolition of suits against the collectors, because they will be somewhat modified in their title and duties under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952.

Nevertheless it is true, as has been pointed out during our hearings, that the American Bar Association has taken somewhat adverse action in this area. As I understand the situation, two of its committees studied the problem and rendered quite favorable reports on the proposed plan. In one of the two committee reports, the further recommendation was made that new legislation should be enacted which would finally dispose of any question as to the possible difficulties in the right of taxpayers to sue if the status of local collectors of taxes is changed as proposed.

When these two sets of committee recommendations were submitted to the general meeting of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, debate occurred, as the result of which the committee reports were upset, not with relation to their favorable attitude toward plan No. 1, but rather as to the timing of the legislation under discussion. More specifically, the whole Assembly urged that new legislation be passed which would finally dispose of any question of the right to sue, before plan 1 is enacted.

Of course if it is contended that additional legislation will be subsequently needed, I have no fear that it can be enacted and that there will be very prompt compliance with any such suggestion.

Of course, it is evident that these formal pronouncements will constitute an important part of the legislative history of this enactment, if it is not disapproved. The judicial branch of the Government could not help but take judicial notice of these facts. But, if to make doubly certain that present rights are preserved, additional legislation should be enacted, such action could be taken promptly and it's a foregone conclusion that a confirmatory statute could be passed forthwith.

Accordingly, in view of the above and for all pertinent reasons, I have concluded that it would be beneficial to the interests of the people at large if Reorganization plan 1 becomes effective, and therefore I must oppose the adoption of the Senate Resolution 285.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does one of the Senators who is in control of time yield some time to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I want only 1 minute.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

THE RESULTS OF THE NEW HAMPSHIRE PRIMARIES

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the repudiation of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in the New Hampshire primaries yesterday is a complete answer to his baseless and contradictory charges made in Texas as to United States foreign policy.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 285) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the author of the resolution of disapproval, desires to speak at this time. I suggest the absence of a quorum, so that we may have a better attendance.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and I have agreed that the time consumed in the calling of the quorum shall be charged equally to each side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McMahon
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Bennett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Benton	Hennings	Moody
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Conor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Connally	Kem	Seaton
Cordon	Kilgore	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Ecton	Malone	Stennis
Ellender	Martin	Thye
Ferguson	Maybank	Underwood
Flanders	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] such time as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, recently I appeared before the committee, on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, and individually stated my position upon the measure.

First, Mr. President, I wish to make this statement: I have been a Member of the Senate for nearly 30 years. I have been a member of the Finance Committee of this honorable body for a number of years, 20 years, perhaps, and have served as its chairman. When this Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 was submitted to the Congress and I had an opportunity to study it before making up my mind about it, I felt that when I did reach a conclusion it would be my duty, and that perhaps I would owe it to the Members of the Senate, to make my position clear with reference to the plan.

I did not reach a hasty conclusion. I talked in person with the Secretary of the Treasury on more than one occasion with regard to it, and, finally, when I reached the conclusion that I could not support the plan, I stated to him that I had reluctantly reached that conclusion and that I could reach no other conclusion.

Again, Mr. President, let me say that I have no interest whatever in patronage. I hope Senators and the people of the country will disabuse their minds as to that. I do not think the statement which has been made with reference to patronage is made in good faith by anyone. I cannot believe that any honest man would think that any Senator would favor or oppose this reorganization plan because of his interest in patronage matters. But, inasmuch as there has been a great deal of fraud and corruption disclosed through the efforts of individual Senators and of committees of the House and of the Senate, some of it connected with the Internal Revenue Bureau, a group of persons in the United States has seized upon the opportunity of saying that here is a clear-cut issue of patronage and corruption against honesty and decency in government. I profoundly regret that the President of the United States should have taken that position. The most charitable thing I can say of the President is that concerning his personal honesty and personal character I have no comment, but he is the poorest advocate of a cause, good, bad, or indifferent, that the world has ever produced. I have never had any patronage. I have never wanted any, except as to those officers which come within my own State and which affect my own people, concerning which I have felt that I had some right to speak. I am utterly indifferent about the patronage side of this question. That, of course, is a fine thing for columnists and radio commentators to talk about. I am not at all surprised when I read the statements issued by the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, because I find much of it repeated day by day on the radio; indeed, a great deal of it is repeated in the minority views filed on this resolution. The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report undoubtedly is a good committee. I do not want to be unduly critical of it; but it has a research director, and I dare say that when any organization of businessmen has a research director, he receives some salary and it is his business to spread propaganda over the Nation.

I have here some of the records of the director of research of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, if Senators wish to read them.

Mr. President, I am not critical of the Hoover plan. Indeed, I have supported many of the recommendations of former President Hoover. I should be glad to support most of them if they were taken in their entirety and not dismembered in such a way as to give more power to the Executive, add more to the cost of Government, and do nothing for economy and for what I believe to be sound government. But this plan, Mr. President, although it may mislead a great many people in the country, is not the Hoover plan.

May I say what I said on that point before the committee? I said before the committee that the plan violates the underlying fundamentals of the Hoover plan. It uses some language of Mr. Hoover and his planners. It makes mention of the collectors of internal revenue. But that was not the complete plan at all. Recommendation No. 5, page 16, of the Hoover report to the Congress is that the top staff of the Treasury Department should consist, among other officers, of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the rank of Assistant Secretary.

That is the Hoover plan. Let Republicans and Democrats who can get any consolation from it read it. That is the heart of the plan. But what does this plan do? It makes of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, an office which Mr. Hoover says should take the rank of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, a mere puppet—nothing more than a puppet, purely an administrative agency, with no authority on earth except that which the Secretary of the Treasury gives.

Moreover, Mr. President, the Hoover task force report recommended that the Assistant Secretary in charge of revenue should have under his immediate direction the Division of Tax Research and the Office of Tax Legislative Counsel if continued as a separate entity. There is a tax legislative counsel in the Treasury Department at this time.

The Hoover task force also recommended that the Commissioner should have general supervision over the proposed Revenue Service. In this way, all revenue policy matters of the Treasury would clear through one responsible official at the top level of the Department.

That is Mr. Hoover's proposal. That is his own task force's interpretation of the proposal. What does this plan do? It abolishes the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and makes him an assistant—to whom? It makes him an assistant to the General Counsel of the Treasury.

Let us not talk in abstract terms. I can talk about him respectfully, because I feel kindly toward him. The general counsel is Mr. Tom Lynch, who, I would say, is a fairly good lawyer. I would not pronounce him a great lawyer, but I would say he is a fairly competent, capable lawyer. The head of the office of tax legislative counsel is Mr. Kirby.

When a tax bill is considered, what happens? Does the Commissioner of Internal Revenue come here and tell us anything about taxation? Not at all. That is not the way the matter has been handled under the Government, at least during the period of the New Deal.

Mr. Hoover said the Commissioner should have the rank and dignity of an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, should have control of his bureau, and

should draft policies and recommend them.

How are taxes levied? This is not theoretical. This happens every year when Congress writes a tax bill. The Secretary of the Treasury comes before the tax committees and reads a statement which points out principally the condition of the Treasury—that is, whether a deficit exists or is contemplated, and what the expenditures of the Government will be for the ensuing year. He makes his recommendations and they are general.

Then the Secretary leaves with us his general counsel and the tax legislative counsel, Mr. Kirby.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has never appeared, and he will never appear, unless the committee itself sends for him in connection with a tax bill. I do not recall that we have ever sent for a Commissioner since Mr. Helvering occupied that office. We sent for him, and without his aid we would have been unable to devise a workable tax-withholding program.

I recall that in the old days Mr. Blair, when he was Commissioner of Internal Revenue, would come here and tell the committee what he thought about tax problems and what, from experience, he had learned were the difficulties and how they could be corrected. Perhaps there was one other Commissioner who appeared, but Mr. Helvering was the last one who appeared before the tax committees upon an important tax bill.

Distinguished Senators on both sides of the aisle may say this is a Hoover plan because Mr. Hoover said, among other things, that there ought not be any politics in the office of the collector. My! Certainly he said that. But what he also said is what I have read, namely, that the top man in that office should be the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the rank of Assistant Secretary. As his task force stated, the Assistant Secretary in charge of revenue should have under his immediate direction the offices of Tax Research and of the Tax Legislative Counsel. The Tax Legislative Counsel is Mr. Kirby. I say this without any disrespect; I am simply going to make it concrete: He is not going to be even counsel to the Commissioner, but an assistant to the General Counsel of the Treasury.

The plan submitted by the Treasury does not follow these recommendations. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue is not to be given the rank of Assistant Secretary. He is not to be given supervision of the Tax Legislative Counsel, Division of Tax Research, or his own legal officers.

Thus, under the proposed plan, there still exist points of interference with the operations of the Bureau relating to the promulgation of regulations, rulings, and so forth.

To Senators who cannot see anything but a great effort to smack corruption right between the eyes by adopting plan No. 1, I say corruption will hardly know it has received a blow, whether we adopt this plan or we do not adopt it. Any plan is all right. Some are better than others if they are properly administered. No plan can be a substitute for the vigorous, intelligent, and proper administration of the law.

Those who talk about corruption may say, "Suppose the Commissioner is reduced in status, and suppose his general counsel is taken away from him; suppose he has to go to the Treasury to learn what the law is; what difference does that make?"

Here is the difference it makes. I base my statement upon an experience of some 20 years in writing tax laws.

When the Secretary of the Treasury and his counsel come before the committee and say, "We recommend so and so to you," and the committee decides against that recommendation, as any committee of Congress has the right and power to do, and says, "No; that is not sound policy, and we will not follow it." then the general counsel of the Treasury, who submitted the recommendation, and his assistant, who urged it upon us and quarreled with us when we would not follow his advice, sit back in the Treasury and say to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, "We do not think Congress intended that. That was not the intent of Congress."

Do not think I am indulging in pure fiction. Year after year, for more than 20 years, the Committee on Finance, following in the footsteps of the House Committee on Ways and Means, or going along side by side with that committee, has asked Congress to undo a plain, clear misinterpretation written into a regulation by the Treasury, which was unwilling to take the opinion of the legislative branch of the Government and what it wanted to do.

We do that every year. In the last tax bill we had to write in what we intended, and we said, in the first place, that the Treasury would not have any right to outlaw a family partnership made in good faith and upon a consideration, whether by gift or by purchase. That is simply an illustration.

I beg Senators not to think for a single moment that this plan in essential respects is the Hoover plan, because in all its basic fundamentals this plan runs counter to the Hoover recommendations. We can find some language, of course, about the collectors. However, the appointment of collectors is not the main point in this controversy.

Attention is called to certain statements in the minority report. By the way, some portions of the minority report should be documented. I do not believe my friends can document them. I am sure that they were misled by someone. Certain statements are made, but I am sure that they did not intend to mislead anyone, and did not attempt to mislead anyone. I wish to call attention to just what I mean, if I can locate it promptly. At any rate, it is pointed out in the minority report that the tax committees of the Congress had the opportunity to be heard upon Reorganization Plan No. 1. That is simply not true.

I read in the newspapers before I left Georgia that such a thing as Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1952 was coming up. When I reached Washington on the 8th day of January I found a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, which I read. The letter set forth no plan, but stated what the objectives of the plan were. The objectives are good. They sound like a Sunday school lesson. However, they are not self-executing, as the lawyers say. I now come to a portion of the minority report to which I wish to invite attention, and with respect to which I ask for complete documentation if the minority wish to document it. It says: It is a curious note that some Members of the Committee on Finance now protest that the Finance Committee should have further time to study reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Since I am a member of that committee and appeared before the committee in opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 1, that must refer to me. I read again from the minority report:

> It seems to us that they do protest too much.

The minority grows a bit poetical. I believe the language is Shakespearean in quality. [Laughter.]

Again I am reading:

> The record shows that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation took no action with respect to the report of its own Advisory Group on Administration of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

That is a very unfortunate statement. I acquit all the members of the minority who signed the report. What happened was that in 1948 the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation organized a committee of very responsible accountants and tax men, looking to the reorganization of our internal revenue system. A report was made in January. It was sent to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue—

> The record shows that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation took no action with respect to the report of its own Advisory Group on Administration of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Here is another statement which is worthy of notice:

> The record also shows that representatives of the Treasury Department offered to discuss the reorganization plan before the Finance Committee and were not invited to appear before that committee for that purpose.

In the advisory report it was stated that it would take the Bureau 2 to 5 years to conduct studies on management and consult with outside groups. These studies were not made available to the taxing committees.

Mr. President, I did not return to Washington until the 8th of January. When I returned, I could not locate a single member of the Finance Committee, with one or two exceptions. The President had already said, in December, and again on January 2, that he had a model plan which would smite corruption right between the eyes and stop it in its tracks. I did not know a thing about it.

After the plan had been submitted to the Congress I received a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury in which he set out some little charts which did not explain much to me, but which, beyond

all doubt, were meaningful to him. The letter was a general explanation. It was entirely general, with nothing specific.

Reading again from the minority report:

A fair conclusion from this record is that the suggestion that further time is needed to study reorganization of the Revenue Bureau is merely a suggestion for delay in the adoption of a much needed reform.

Following the sending of the report of the joint committee's staff and special committee to the Secretary, there was organized by the Secretary a further study by an engineering firm competent in the field of taxation. That firm filed the so-called Paget report. The Paget report has not been released to this day by the Secretary of the Treasury, although they made it available to the King subcommittee and the Expenditure Committees of the House and Senate. I had never seen it until it was brought to me a moment ago by the chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The Paget report as far as the tax committees are concerned was pigeonholed. The Paget report does not follow this reorganization plan, nor does the plan follow the Paget report.

Is that the way to deal with the Congress of the United States? Is that the way to deal with the policy-making body of this Congress—so far as taxation is concerned—on this side of the Capitol?

I should like to read a bit of the Paget report:

Elevate the post of Commissioner to the rank of an Assistant Secretary in the Treasury Department and vest full policy and administrative authority in this position.

That is the Hoover Commission's recommendation. That is his philosophy. That is the fundamental thing in the Hoover report. It is directly in line with the recommendation of these experienced engineers. Let me read what they have to say:

Observation of the Commissioner's status in the present organization of the Treasury Department indicates that the importance of his post today is above that of a bureau chief.

Mr. President, that was before plan No. 1 came along. Plan No. 1 reduces him to the status of a bureau chief.

The important status of the Commissioner today is evidenced by the fact that the Commissioner reports directly to the Secretary and attends his top staff conferences. Despite these marks of superior status, the Commissioner's office is not the central source of policy advice to the Secretary, nor the central point of contact with the legislative branch, on revenue matters. As illustrated in exhibit 14, there are at least five divisions outside of the Bureau which impinge directly upon its operations, or participate in the formulation of revenue policy. While we have found no evidence of lack of harmony or cooperation between these groups and the Bureau at present, their continued existence as outside agencies detracts from the authority of the Commissioner, and the avoidance of friction is dependent upon the personalities of the officials concerned.

It is considered significant that the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (Hoover Commission) recognized this problem and proposed that a commissioner of revenue be established with the rank of Assistant Secretary, under whose supervision should be placed the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Bureau of Customs.

Mr. President, that is a true interpretation of the Hoover plan, but it is not the interpretation of propagandists or of radio commentators or of a public press that takes hand-outs from any bureau of the Government and publishes it as its own.

In addition, the task force report of the Hoover Commission proposed that the Division of Tax Research, the Office of the Tax Legislative Counsel, and a legal counsel be placed under the immediate direction of this Assistant Secretary. The task force pointed out that "in this way all revenue policy matters of the Treasury would clear through one responsible official at the top level of the Department.

Consideration of the benefits of integrating the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Internal Revenue was not within the scope of this study—

And so forth. Can there be any doubt about what the Hoover plan is—the heart and soul of it? There is at least the statement made by Cresap, McCormick & Paget, management engineers, New York and Chicago, for which Congress, if my recollection is clear, appropriated approximately $150,000.

That report was buried in the Treasury until this plan No. 1 came to Congress.

Of course, Mr. Hoover used some language about some wicked collectors of internal revenue, but what has that to do with this?

I do not wish to take up too much time of the Senate; I spoke at great length in my appearance before the committee, but what does plan No. 1 really do? Plan No. 1 creates a complete legal vacuum. That is all it does. It creates a legal vacuum and invites the Secretary of the Treasury to fill it; to write whatever he wants to write.

I am not critical of the Secretary of the Treasury. He is a good Secretary. However, he cannot know anything about the duties and obligations of the collectors of internal revenue, except what he is told second hand, third hand, or fourth hand.

It creates a statutory vacuum by abolishing certain offices without creating new offices to take their place. It abolishes the office of collectors and deputy collectors of internal revenue. It does not prescribe the duties of anyone else who may perform the same functions. It leaves it up to the Secretary. It is a complete resignation of the high responsibility of the Senate in writing tax laws as well as all other laws. It abolishes the Office of Assistant General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, who is supposed to be the legal adviser to the collector of internal revenue. It does not create any other officer to take his place.

The plan abolishes 64 collectors. Seventeen or eighteen of those collectors are already under civil service. That is, they are civil service career men, who retain that status.

I am very happy to note that the collector of internal revenue of my State, who has been appointed under both Republicans and Democrats, has never been investigated, prosecuted, or sent to jail.

I note with alarm that the collector of internal revenue in Boston, appointed at a time when there was no Democratic Senator from Massachusetts, was prosecuted and convicted and is on his way out. I note also that the collector in Missouri, appointed at a time, perhaps, when there was no Democratic Senator from that State, was tried and convicted.

However, on that point, Mr. President, let me make the following statement: They know at the Treasury and they know at the Bureau, although they have not told us, that they have the undated resignation of every collector of internal revenue in their possession. It is right on the President's desk or in one of its drawers. Every 4 years the collectors must have their commissions renewed; they must be reappointed if they want the position. Why quibble about who was President when so-and-so was originally appointed, when certainly he has been up for reappointment and has been reappointed once and perhaps twice since then, and there is a resignation procedure available under which he can be relieved of his office. There is authority under the law to dismiss him. The President can dismiss him. There is no one in the Civil Service Commission to say nay to it. Not even my good friend Bob Ramspeck can say to the President, "You must not dismiss him. You have no legal sanction for it."

Mr. President, I note another thing with much regret. Perhaps I should not mention it. However, since a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from California over the radio one night this week saw fit to instruct the Senate with respect to its duties on plan No. 1 and to talk about all of us who did not embrace plan No. 1 as being corruptionists, I am almost obliged to point out that one of the collectors of internal revenue in the State of California, with a number of his staff, has also been indicted.

It looks to me as though Senators and Representatives who seek to advise the Senate how it ought to vote or must vote should do a little bit of sweeping before their own doors at the proper time. At least, that is the way it looks to me, Mr. President.

Of course, the method of appointment does not determine the character of the officer. His character is determined by his integrity, his honesty, and his courage, not by the method by which he is selected.

Not only would this plan strip the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of everything except administrative functions, in the final analysis—that is to say, it would deprive him of any actual power to make a policy decision and to make it stand up—but this plan would also add vastly to the cost of the system. How much it would add, it is impossible to tell, because, as I have stated, the plan would abolish all the offices and all the functions, would put them under the Secretary of the Treasury, and would let him operate in a vacuum and do as

he pleased. Of course, I do not know how many officers he would appoint. I know that under plan No. 1 he would be privileged to appoint not more than 25 regional directors.

I see in the Chamber at this time my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arizona. I do not see his distinguished colleague. However, I may say now—and it should be pleasing to my distinguished friends across the aisle, the Senators from California—that one of those regional directors would be in California; let us not doubt that. Then Arizona and Nevada would have to crawl over the mountains into California to adjust their tax matters. Would not that be pretty tough? This plan provides for the privilege of appointing not more than 25 regional directors, although it is said that only 21 would be appointed right now. Those regional directors would have a vast staff of experts. Each regional director would have under him at least two States, or in some cases three States, besides the one in which he was located. There would be an enormous amount of work to do.

Those 25 district commissioners, with their vast staffs, would cost this Government many additional millions of dollars a year, and would do so speedily. Where is the economy in that, Mr. President? The Reorganization Act of 1949 requires that the President shall specify what economies will be effected by the plans he proposes; the act even says that as far as possible the President shall itemize the economies which will be achieved by his reorganization plans. The President did not attempt to do that in this case; he was too wise a man to attempt to do so. He knew he would not save a nickel by this plan; but, on the other hand, he knew that he would spend perhaps in excess of $30,000,000 a year in setting up this new organization.

Mr. President, plan No. 1 says the President or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may appoint not exceeding 70 deputy commissioners, although these are not actually named in the plan. Under the scheme, the deputy commissioner is presumably intended to take the place, more or less, of the collector of internal revenue. I wish to say just a few words on that point, Mr. President. I know very well that at common law it was held, following the analagous principle of principal and agent, that if one got money which did not legally belong to him and if he had it in his pocket, he could be sued for it. On that theory, a common-law right of action was sustained against the collector of internal revenue. It is possible that the Deputy Commissioner might likewise be suable; but—and here is a point which has not been noticed up the Avenue—the Commissioner serving in any particular place could be transferred at will, could be changed from time to time by the Secretary. It is so denominated in the bond. That would be the arrangement under plan No. 1. He might not be a citizen of the State in which he served. Of course, we are told, "We give you our word that he will be taken from the State." Mr. President, is not that a beautiful assurance to give to the legislative body of this country, which under the law and under the Constitution is charged with the legislative function? Is not that a beautiful assurance for us to have from the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission? At any rate, he is a delightful gentleman from my State—Bob Ramspeck. Is not that a beautiful assurance to have from the Secretary or to have from Mr. Dunlap—a very honorable man, I think, and very honest. I am not so sure that Mr. Dunlap knows too much about this problem at the national level at the moment, but he is a man of capacity and, I think, of character and standing.

At any rate, the scheme now proposed provides for what are called direct lines of responsibility. Mr. President, that is a beautiful phrase. Nowadays we often encounter the word "streamlining," as well as the phrase "direct lines." We are told that the beauty and the strength of the plan is that, under it, everything will operate on a direct line to Washington.

All right, Mr. President, suppose the plan does operate in that way. If it does, Mr. President, within 2 years—mark my words—the Secretary of the Treasury will have his lawyers contending before the courts of this country that this new scheme makes the Commissioner or the Secretary of the Treasury the actual recipient of the money, because it cannot remain at State levels, but must move by direct line all the way along, and must do so immediately; and they will be saying, "If you want to sue us, come to Washington and sue the United States."

Mr. President, that would be a beautiful situation. We can imagine how pleased the people of the States would be to have their Senators return home and say they had made that arrangement. Imagine how popular that would be, Mr. President: "Go to Washington and sue the United States." Those who sue the United States would not have a jury trial, unless the Congress provided for a jury trial.

Once this plan was approved, everyone, including the esteemed press, the radio comentators, and so forth, would be saying, "Do not disturb this plan now; do not disturb it until it is given a trial. You must not think of changing it now. It will be 4 or 5 years before we can see what will happen under the plan."

Furthermore, Mr. President, the theory of the "direct line" has taken hold so deeply that even in the minority views it is actually set forth that down at the field level, in the States, the field officials would refer cases for trial directly to the Attorney General, and the citizens would be prosecuted in that way—never coming through Washington, never touching the Commissioner's office or the Secretary's office. That is the so-called direct line. Senators can have it if they want it.

Mr. President, instead of indulging in so much talk about stopping corruption, I think it would be far better for Senators to prevent the fastening of such a tyranny upon their people.

Mr. President, what is it going to mean at the State level, when the deputy collector or somebody in the deputy commissioner's office does not like the way the taxpayer has acted, or does not like the way he has cooperated with them? Some of these officials think the citizen does not cooperate unless he lies down and lets them take all his money without even asking them the why or the wherefore of it. So if they think they do not get cooperation, they say, "Oh, we do not have to go through the Commissioner's office and the general counsel's office any more. We will rush this case right up to Mr. McGrath, the Attorney General of the United States, and we will say to him, 'Give us action, and give it to us quick.'"

Mr. President, under that procedure there will be more corruption that one has ever dreamed of. There will be more coercion. Citizens will be in the hands of these officials. I know the citizens would come to us and ask for legislative help; of course they would, because such a situation would be simply impossible. But, Mr. President, that is exactly how it stands. The citizen will have no one in the world with whom to deal except at the State level. Perhaps he did not vote properly at the last election. Heaven only knows what a collector of internal revenue may do to one who is far away from Washington, and who can have no friends here because, from now on, we will not be allowed to recommend anyone. The citizen could not even go somewhere to protest mildly. There would be no one to whom a protest could be made, except the Attorney General. Someone has been investigating his office, and he does not want to listen to Senators, either. Such persons become skittish of a Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is there any particular reason to feel that under the proposed system there will be appointed in Georgia men who are more honest than those recommended by the Senator from Georgia, or in the case of other States men who are more honest than those recommended by the Senators of such States?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think so, and yet that is not my main basis of opposition to this plan. My main basis of opposition is that it is fundamentally wrong. It sets up a system which cannot work satisfactorily.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I fully agree with the Senator from Georgia that it is fundamentally wrong; but I still insist that the average Senator—all Senators, in fact, whether they be members of one party or the other—know more about who is honest in a particular State than anyone in Washington could know about it.

Mr. GEORGE. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from New Mexico, but another basic defect in this plan—and it goes to the very bottom of it—is that it combines at the State level in the field office the auditor and the collector.

Mr. President, did you ever see a more beautiful, hand-engraved invitation to fraud and corruption? Is it possible to imagine one? Let us suppose there is in

a State a corrupt deputy district commissioner, and that he and his staff have the power not only to audit the returns of the taxpayer but to collect the tax due on it. He combines the two functions of auditor and collector. A taxpayer may think he is being overtaxed, and demand that he be given a hearing. He will try to convince the deputy district commissioner that he is wrong. If the taxpayer happens to be a corrupt man, he will try to corrupt that official, who has the power both to audit and to collect. There can never be a fair internal-revenue system until the collecting office is completely and entirely separated from the auditing office; and likewise there can never be a fair internal-revenue system unless the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is given power over all the transactions taking place in his office.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one Member of the Senate, I would appreciate it, if at an appropriate time, the Senator from Georgia would again explain and perhaps make a little bit clearer the first part of his argument, the principal point, regarding the independence of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who would have the status of an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. As I understood the distinguished Senator, that would mean that that officer, subject to the approval of the Congress once every 4 years, would have complete or independent responsibility in the matter of the interpretation of the tax laws; whereas, at the present time, that responsibility rests upon several officials, including lawyers, who are independent. This plan, once put into effect, would create a vacuum, which would lead to more independent interpretations of the law, which would not be in the hands of an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, or of any official subject to confirmation by the Senate. That part of the Senator's argument is not entirely clear to me.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have endeavored to point out, and I thought I had done so, that having been my purpose at any rate, that the fundamental thing about the Hoover report was the recommendation for a Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the status and dignity of an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. For a long time there has been a controversy among very reasonable and very able men over the question of whether there should not be a complete separation of the Bureau of Internal Revenue from the Treasury; but Mr. Hoover said "No." His report recommends that the Commissioner be retained, but that he be given the status of Assistant Secretary, with full power over the Bureau. Mr. Hoover's task force recommended that matters of policy connected with the making and inpreting and administering of taxes be left with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and his general counsel. Reorganization Plan No. 1 would give the Commissioner a lawyer, who would be an assistant to the general counsel in the Treasury, not to the Commissioner; and it would reduce rather than enhance the power and strength of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which is precisely contrary to what Mr. Hoover recommended.

Furthermore, the Paget report, made by a distinguished engineering firm, following, approving, and commenting on the Hoover report, pointed out precisely what that report meant. I pointed out that the Paget report had been buried in the archives of the Secretary of the Treasury, and that the staff of the joint committee came into possession of it following the submission to the Senate of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I judge that the senior Senator from Georgia does not have a particularly kindly feeling toward Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. GEORGE. Not this plan; but I should be glad to favor a good plan.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is the next point I wish to raise. The senior Senator from Georgia has spoken in rather commendatory terms, so far as I could judge, of the suggestions made by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. GEORGE. I think the real recommendations of the Hoover Commission are basically correct. As I say, there are a great many thoughtful persons who would go further and say that the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be separated entirely from the Treasury; but Mr. Hoover did not go that far, the Paget report does not go that far, and I would not myself favor going that far.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am receiving a considerable volume of correspondence, considering the size of my State, with reference to Reorganization Plan No. 1, for the most part urging me to vote for it. The Senator from Georgia has given weighty reasons for making me doubt whether I should vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1, but I should like to give some assurance to my constituents that if I vote against it, I shall not be simply, in effect, delaying any reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue or stopping further consideration of such reorganization, and therefore leading to a do-nothing situation. So I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether there is any prospect, either under his auspices or, so far as he knows, under the auspices of the committee to which this report was referred, of any movement to follow through with desirable reforms in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. GEORGE. I am pleased to answer the Senator categorically. Yes. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has introduced a bill. He does not mean to commit himself by the terms of that bill necessarily, but a bill is subject to amendment; it is subject to some modification. A reorganization plan is not so subject. We either take it or leave it. The bill is now before the Finance Committee. I have already had a conference—I hope the Senator will not press me further on that point, because I do not want to involve anyone else—looking to a speedy report by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to both the House Committee on Ways and Means and the Senate Committee on Finance, embodying some proper reorganization proposal. We are very anxious to do something about it. It should have been done before.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I feel considerably reassured by the words of the Senator from Georgia. I happened to be on the floor when the Senator from Arkansas mentioned his bill, and, as nearly as I can remember, he did not speak too well of his own bill; but I understand from what the Senator from Georgia says about it that both he and the Senator from Arkansas are taking it as a sort of jumping-off place until there is something better——

Mr. GEORGE. As a basis of consideration. I think the Senator's bill follows, in general, Reorganization Plan No. 1, as a matter of fact.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I introduced a bill embracing the basic reorganization plan in order to give the committee an opportunity to start with the plan and make appropriate amendments to it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I understand the situation now, and I thank both the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask if the proposed legislation now pending before the Senator's committee contemplates civil-service appointment of collectors of internal revenue or whether it permits continued political appointments of collectors.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not recall, but it is subject to amendment, of course.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The bill has left out the civil-service provision for the purpose of making it an issue so that it could be studied by the committee, and if it is retained as it is in the plan it can be amended to provide for certain situations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the virtue of the pending plan is that it places collectors under the civil service and takes them out of politics. I know the shortcomings in other respects which the Senator from Georgia has pointed out.

Mr. GEORGE. Any bill would be subject to amendment. I myself have no special opposition to dealing with collectors in any way that may be desired. I have no interest in that situation at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for one further question?

Mr. GEORGE. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I desire to press once more a point which is not entirely clear to me. The Senator has explained

very clearly what the Hoover Commission Report recommends with reference to establishing the office of Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. He further states that Mr. Hoover might have gone further in separating the Bureau of Internal Revenue from the Treasury, but an office would be created which would have the responsibility of collecting taxes and interpreting tax laws, as I understand. Would the Senator be willing to explain how the position of the Hoover Commission differs from Plan No. 1? He discussed the legal vacuum. That part is not clear to me.

Mr. GEORGE. By that I simply meant that there is no real plan set up in plan No. 1. It simply abolishes certain offices and authorizes the creation of certain other offices, but does not define the duty of the newly created offices nor prescribe their duties and responsibilities. It is left entirely to the Secretary of the Treasury to fill it in, in other words, to write out the plan in detail.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, what the Senator is now saying is that if this plan is adopted, there will be a vacuum in the statutes or laws enacted by Congress, so that there will have to be many interpretations and executive orders in order properly to carry forward Plan No. 1 so that taxes may be collected.

Mr. GEORGE. Undoubtedly so. There is a vast body of law with reference to the set-up of the collector's office.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. It is my recollection that the Hoover Commission recommended the appointment of a Commissioner of Revenue—not just internal revenue—who would have the rank of Assistant Secretary. Under his jurisdiction would be a consolidation of the Customs Service and the Internal Revenue Bureau, in other words, an effort was made to put all those instrumentalities of Government under one head.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. In other words, he would collect all the revenue.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. He would have charge of all internal revenue functions.

Mr. AIKEN. Reference has been made to the task force. In this particular case I think the Commission followed the recommendations of the task force rather closely. I would not want the Senate to feel that the task force recommendations were the same as the Commission's recommendations in all cases, because some of the task force recommendations were discarded completely as of little value.

Mr. GEORGE. I think that is correct, but I think they may have studied the report in order to be able to interpret properly what it meant.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Commissioner reports that he followed more closely the recommendations of the task force in this particular case than in some of the other cases.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it a fair interpretation of the Senator's position to say that if Reorganization Plan No. 1 is adopted, many present interpretations of the law, and possibly many of the laws themselves, will be repealed or possibly rescinded, and opinions invalidated, so that there will have to be a new interpretation of the tax laws, if the vacuum which the Senator mentioned is created?

Mr. GEORGE. Not so much in relation to existing law, but I refer to the passage of revenue acts from time to time. If the same man acts as judge of what we ought to write into the law, and then acts as judge of what we did write and of what our intention was, he is likely henceforth to depart from the congressional purpose and intent with respect to all revenue laws in regulations and putting them into effect. The authority that will actually write and interpret the regulations will be in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury. It will be the assistant to the general counsel of the Treasury. So the purpose and intent of Congress is very much more likely to be overridden.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assume for the moment that there had been no evidences of corruption in the past year which stimulated the consideration of this question in the public mind and in our own minds, and assume that the Hoover Commission's work and the necessity of looking into a revision of the laws were considered entirely apart from corruption, with the idea only of improving the administration of the tax laws; does plan No. 1 help or hurt the administration of such laws?

Mr. GEORGE. In my judgment, it will slow up the flow of money from the taxpayers into the Treasury. In my judgment, it will invite delays which are not now in the system, bad as the system is at the present time.

I would be opposed to this plan even had there been no fraud, no corruption, or anything of the kind. If that were the situation, we would then be able to judge the plan on its merits.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, so far as corruption is concerned, as I understand the Senator, as I have listened to him, there will be an even greater opportunity, possibly, for corruption, because the auditing and collecting will be in the hands of one official in one locality.

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly; there is no doubt about that. I do not see how reasonable men can differ about it. If the man who is going to levy my tax, collect it, and audit my return, is at the State level, and the auditing and collecting functions are vested in one agency, certainly there is an opportunity for fraud. If the official were corrupt, he could be corrupted.

I regret to say that while the vast majority of the American people are honest, while the vast majority of our taxpayers are honest, they operate under a voluntary system of taxpaying, without which we could not function, and while I think the vast majority of our officers, whether appointive or under civil service, are themselves honest, I do say that when the collecting and auditing of taxes is vested in one person, considering all the imaginable hardship cases with which the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is familiar, there is a strong temptation actually to practice corruption, and that is the field in which corruption will be practiced to the greatest extent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is an experienced legislator in tax law, and forgetting for the moment the question of corruption or the question of patronage, I should like to ask him if plan No. 1, in his opinion, would constitute an improvement in the administration of our tax laws, or whether it would constitute a step backward.

Mr. GEORGE. I think fundamentally it would be a step backward, although in some details it might be as good as the present system, or perhaps somewhat better. So far as fundamental and basic considerations go, I think it would be a step backward.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But there is the advantage, is there not, if the proposed plan is approved, theoretically, at least and we hope practically, in respect to the civil-service certification of the various collectors, that higher-type men or a type who would be more responsible to the Government would be employed?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know. I have my doubts about that. Practically all the employees are now under civil service, but if all of them are put under civil service, I think there will be a strong temptation for the man in the field service and all the way up to say, "I don't need to give any consideration to the taxpayer. If I do my job here and produce a lot of money and obtain proper results, I will have an enviable standing in Washington, and will probably be promoted."

Perhaps that is a motive we should not attribute to anyone, but it is as likely to be controlling as is any other motive that can be imagined, especially when such men do not need to assume any responsibility. If they merely carry out instructions and attend rigidly to their jobs, they do not have to trouble themselves, and the matter is of no concern to them.

So I am not sure that better men than we have under the present system would really be obtained. I believe it is proper for all employees of the internal-revenue system to be under civil service, as practically all of them now are. I myself should not complain if collectors were under civil service, because that is not the important point, as I see the matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the important point in the Senator's view, the question of the improvement of the administration, and he feels this plan would be a step backward rather than a step forward, because it would put the

Commissioner of Internal Revenue further under the chain of command, rather than separate him and make him an independent entity.

Mr. GEORGE. That is entirely correct. He would be strictly under the Treasury, and, in reality, under the general counsel of the Treasury and his assistants.

Mr. President, let me read a statement made on behalf of the Comptrollers Institute of America on this matter. That is a great institution, and I think the statement is impressive. Some 3,800 comptrollers and financial executives of about 3,000 corporations throughout the United States, are members. They have made a study of this problem, and here is what they had to say to the committee about it the other day:

The committee would like to take this opportunity to point out some of the things that appear to its members to require further study.

Too much emphasis appears to have been given in the proposed recommendations to operating detail; whereas what is needed is a greater consideration to the segregation of the functions of the Bureau pertaining to collection, enforcement, legal, procedural, and examinations and inspections so as to maintain adequate control over the Bureau's activities. The segregation of these functions should start directly under the Commissioner of Internal Revenue by creating groups to administer the separate functions. These groups should be responsible to assistant commissioners reporting directly to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Then they proceed with their thought, which is basically contrary to the whole idea of plan No. 1.

I shall conclude, Mr. President, with just one statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. GEORGE. I should be glad to, although I have already taken too much time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy.

Assuming this plan failed of approval, could the Senator, who is chairman of the Committee on Finance, and a very distinguished member of the majority party, give any assurance that there would be a Bureau of Internal Revenue reform bill offered to the Senate before the session closes?

Mr. GEORGE. I can assure the Senator that we shall report a bill. The job is a big one, and we all have plenty of work to do, but, fortunately, we are not going to raise taxes again this year, so we should have a brief breathing spell, and we shall report such a bill to the Senate. I cannot say what the Senate will do with it.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield, although I am about to conclude.

Mr. FREAR. Does the Senator from Georgia have any knowledge as to whether ex-President Hoover or his task force on internal revenue approve Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1952?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not authorized to make any statement in that connection. I will say to the Senator from Delaware that tomorrow I may be able to make a statement on behalf of certain members of the force, but not this afternoon.

Mr. FREAR. I listened very attentively to what the Senator from Georgia had to say this afternoon. I think I am correct, but I should like to have my recollection confirmed. In his statement did he or did he not say that the new plan would be more expensive to the taxpayers of the country, rather than less expensive?

Mr. GEORGE. Beyond all doubt it would be more expensive. It is difficult to estimate the additional costs, because the Secretary may or may not fill up the organization. But knowing the problems of the Bureau as I know them fairly well, I am sure that he could not eliminate any of his forces. I am also sure that he would create the additional positions, up to 25 regional directors, and up to 70 subregional or deputy directors, with all their staffs; and their staffs would be immense.

Mr. FREAR. What limit is placed upon the salary of such collectors or deputy directors?

Mr. GEORGE. They would all be under civil service, but they could be appointed without regard to the Classification Act, so far as numbers go.

Mr. FREAR. Then it is assumed that new specifications must be written for those jobs by the Civil Service Commission, and at that time a rating will be given to them, upon which a salary range will be based.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly so; and in order to get 25 regional directors who are capable, or even fairly capable, we must pay them the very top salary that can be paid. That sets the pattern all the way down the line. I doubt if we could find 25 men who would be anxious to take the job at the very top salary that can be paid under our civil service system.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that the distinguished Members who filed the minority view referred to the recommendations made by our Advisory Committee, to which it is said we paid no attention, and which, I explained, we had sent to the Secretary and to the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue expecting comments and had not received any.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that he has 2 hours remaining. He requested that he be informed at this point.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to conclude. I shall read a statement from one of the ablest men on the Advisory Committee, who furnished us his report, and whose report went to the office of the Secretary of the Treasury. He says:

I am definitely opposed to any plan designed to increase the powers of the Secretary of the Treasury. His powers are too great now. As a matter of fact, all changes needed to accomplish the type of administration I have always advocated can be made without the approval of the Congress if the Treasury really wants to improve the service, which prompts me to ask a question. Why has the Paget report on administration been withheld from the taxing committees of Congress?

This is the first day that I have seen it, although we spent $150,000 or more of the taxpayers' money to get it.

In conclusion, let me make this statement: The Constitution not only vests in the Congress the power to impose or levy taxes, but it reposes in the Congress in express terms the power and duty to see to it that taxes are collected. This plan is the greatest, most flagrant delegation of power that I have ever known any President to ask of Congress because this is the power over the very pocketbooks of the citizens of the United States.

Let us go back to the Constitution. The power to lay and collect taxes, declares that instrument, devolves upon the Congress of the United States. If the Senate yields to the pressure which comes from the press and from commentators and columnists, without adequate information or study, and votes on this important question against its better judgment, irreparable damage will be done to the prestige of the United States Senate, and the legislative branch under the Constitution.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for half a minute to insert a letter in the RECORD?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, pointing out his position with reference to the question of whether this plan is needed to deal with corruption in Government, and discussing some of his statements which are included in the majority report. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in full in the RECORD at this point, so that all Senators may have an opportunity to read it.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 12, 1952.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I note that one of the reasons advanced in the majority report of the Committee on Government Operations for recommending disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 is that "The adoption of the plan is not required to eliminate fraud." This conclusion is then followed by a statement to the effect that "The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has made this clear by his statements at the hearings that adequate authority already exists to correct all irregularities of defalcations within the Bureau of Internal Revenue, including its field offices." As a footnote to this statement, the report sets out in quotation a number of questions which Senator NIXON directed to me during the course of my appearance before the committee on March 4, 1952, together with my replies to such questions.

Since, as the result of the above-mentioned quotation, some confusion seems to have arisen respecting my views as to the effect which Reorganization Plan No. 1 will have upon the ability of the Internal Revenue Service to cope more effectively with problems of dishonesty and misconduct, I would like to clarify and restate my views.

The statements which I made before the Senate Committee on Government Operations on March 4, 1952, are consistent with the position which I have taken all along as to the many and varied accomplishments which this plan will make possible. The statements were made against this background and should not be taken out of the context in which they were given.

From the outset of the congressional hearings on the President's plan, I have stated that this plan will provide (1) better service to taxpayers, (2) tighter supervisory control over the conduct of personnel, and (3) real areas for economies in operations. These represent substantial benefits which will flow from the plan. It is neither possible nor fair to describe any one of these three major accomplishments as the primary purpose of the plan. All are important, and all are worth while. Certainly, improved service to taxpayers and greater economy in operations cannot be considered matters of secondary importance. These benefits, together with tighter supervisory control over the conduct of employees, add up to a more efficient Bureau of Internal Revenue in all of its aspects.

Allow me, however, to amplify further the benefit which will be derived from this plan in the form of tighter supervisory control over the conduct of employees. At the present time we are making every effort to detect and to punish any unfaithfulness on the part of revenue employees in the discharge of their high public trust. We have established an inspection service, and we are running down every lead, complaint, or credible rumor indicating any misconduct on the part of employees. However, corrective action is made more difficult by the present sprawling organization of the revenue service. There are 8 separate field organizations and over 200 headquarters offices reporting directly to Washington. These conditions, together with other weaknesses in the system, contribute substantially to opportunities for laxness and misconduct to which some are bound to succumb.

The President's reorganization plan, by eliminating the office of the politically appointed collector, by streamlining the Bureau organization, by consolidating field offices under one responsible head in each State or other local area, and by providing a stronger inspection service under an individual with the status of an Assistant Commissioner, will correct the conditions which have made it possible for some revenue officers and employees to misuse their official positions.

I have testified to the above accomplishments of the plan many times. For example, on the specific matter of dishonesty, I would like to refer you to a number of statements which I made before the Senate Committee on Government Operations during the course of my testimony on the reorganization plan.

The following appears on page 42 of the hearings:

"Mr. DUNLAP. We could not contend, of course, that civil service by itself will make a man completely honest or relieve him from temptation. We do claim that the tighter and more efficient organization set up by this plan would remove a lot of the underlying causes for some of our troubles now.

"Senator DWORSHAK. How would it do that?

"Mr. DUNLAP. Because it is a much tighter, much more closely supervised organization.

"Senator DWORSHAK. Haven't you had supervision up to the present time?

"Mr. DUNLAP. Yes, sir, but not as tight as this."

On page 109 of the hearings the following appears:

"Mr. DUNLAP. When you have tight control, I repeat what I said last Wednesday, you do away with a lot of the temptations that now exist. In any tight organization, any well-supervised organization, you just don't have the looseness which permits certain things to happen."

Again, on page 133 of the hearings, the following statement is made:

"Senator DWORSHAK. I am saying that after reading many newspaper articles over the years and reading about the fraud and corruption that have been exposed in the Bureau, that we are wondering whether this plan, if it is approved by Congress and sold to the public, offers any greater assurances that honest taxpayers will be given protection and that dishonest, fraudulent tax cases will not be tolerated.

"Mr. DUNLAP. The tighter organization and closer supervision all the way down is a better assurance of that. These people in the inspection service are still more assurance of it. That is a new set-up, as you know, the inspection service. The appellate division shown on the other chart is scattered over more offices now than it was, it is not concentrated, and it is therefore subject to much closer analysis of each of their cases, I believe that will be the best insurance we can hope to get."

With this background I would like next to refer to my discussion with Senator NIXON on the purposes of the plan before the committee. The report of this testimony contained in the majority report is somewhat abbreviated. The full transcript is shown beginning on page 288 of the committee hearings. Before Senator NIXON asked me the questions beginning on that page, he had previously asked me this question: "So it (the plan) does not get at the basic problem of corruption, then, at all; does it?" I replied to this question as follows: "I think so, sir, by providing a much tighter and a much better supervised organizational structure than we now have." (See pp. 276 and 277 of the hearings.)

As a preface to some of his later questions, Senator NIXON made the following statement to me: "You feel that under this plan the Bureau would be able to deal more effectively than it can at present with the over-all problem of discovering instances of dishonesty, and dealing with them effectively, is that a fair statement?" I answered, just as I would answer now, "That is right, as well as improving the efficiency of our people." (Hearings, p. 289.) Senator NIXON then asked me whether as a corollary of that statement, I felt that I could not deal with instances of dishonesty and corruption at the present time. With that I could not agree because, as I previously stated, we are at the present time able to detect and punish wrongdoing although our efforts in this respect are rendered more difficult because of the status of collectors as political appointees and because of the relatively loose type of organization which we now have. Furthermore, the corrective measures that we are and have been taking are largely after the actions have occurred. As I have indicated before, I feel most strongly that the plan is necessary to help correct the conditions which gave rise to these wrongful practices and to prevent their repetition.

Senator NIXON then directed questions to me to ascertain whether I believed the plan was primarily for the purpose of dealing with corruption. My answer indicated that the plan was not directed primarily to dealing with corruption for the reason which I have already stated, namely, that I could not agree to relegate to a secondary place the other major accomplishments of the plan.

My views on the important place of this reorganization plan in insuring honesty, integrity, and fairness in the conduct of Government perhaps have been best summarized by the following remarks which I made before the Senate Committee on Government Operations on March 4, 1952, in concluding my prepared statement:

"We have been making every effort to build the best Internal Revenue Service it is humanly possible to provide. This has especially included measures to detect and punish any individuals who have been unfaithful to their high public trust. The Secretary and the President have given me their fullest support in this effort.

"It is equally important, however, that we eliminate the weaknesses in our present organizational set-up which have contributed so much to these instances of wrongdoing. The presentation of this reorganization plan represents a major part of our efforts to correct these conditions. I earnestly hope that you will lend your support to this effort to reorganize the Revenue Bureau into a career service of the highest standards."

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to myself and my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY]. We may require additional time.

It is our intention tomorrow to discuss in some detail the outlines of the proposed reorganization plan. Therefore, at this time our efforts will be primarily directed to what I consider to be a very important analysis and a correction of the RECORD with reference to the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. All of us in this body have great respect for the Senator from Georgia, and surely all of us recognize his fund of knowledge, and his extensive and honorable background in the field of legislation.

I should like to say to my friend the Senator from Georgia that the proposal with which we are now dealing is not one which concerns substantive law. It is not one which concerns the matter of law pertaining to taxes. It deals with the organizational structure of the tax-collection agency.

I should also like to make another point crystal clear for the RECORD. I call this matter to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who has asked many questions, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], three able, intelligent, and effective Members of this body who asked some penetrating questions.

I would have them note that all powers which are involved in this plan have already been settled by a vote of this body in 1950, in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 26. If I recall correctly, there were not many, if any, dissenting votes on Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950.

Mr. President, I think it would be well for the RECORD to have Reorganization Plan No. 26 and the President's message pertaining to it placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the text of Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 and the message of the President pertain-

ing thereto were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949 and effecting reorganizations in the Department of the Treasury. The reorganizations included in this plan are identical with those contained in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, except that the functions of the Comptroller of the Currency are unaffected by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950.

In transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950 on March 13, I stated that the reorganizations contained therein were essential to clarification of the lines of authority and responsibility in the executive branch. I further emphasized that those reorganizations would put into effect in the Department of the Treasury the principal remaining recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government affecting the location of management responsibility. I urged the Congress to add its approval to my acceptance of these recommendations of the Commission on Organization.

On May 11 the Senate disapproved Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950. The reason for the disapproval was the inclusion of the functions of the Comptroller of the Currency among the responsibilities proposed to be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury. Accordingly, in order to meet the objection which led to such disapproval and to preserve the major benefits of the disapproved plan, Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 is transmitted herewith.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

I have found and hereby declare that it is necessary to include in the accompanying reorganization plan, by reason of reorganizations made thereby, provisions for the appointment and compensation of an Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. The rate of compensation fixed for this officer is that which I have found to prevail in respect to comparable officers in the executive branch of the Government.

The taking effect of the reorganizations included in this plan may not in itself result in substantial immediate savings. However, many benefits in improved operations are probable during the next years which will result in a reduction in expenditures as compared with those that would be otherwise necessary. An itemization of these reductions in advance of actual experience under this plan is not practicable.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 31, 1950.*

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 26 OF 1950

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled May 31, 1950, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949)

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, and subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury all functions of all other officers of the Department of the Treasury and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

(b) This section shall not apply to the functions vested by the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) in hearing examiners employed by the Department of the Treasury or to functions vested by any provision of law in the Comptroller of the Currency.

(c) Notwithstanding the transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury of the functions of the United States Coast Guard and of the functions of the Commandant of the Coast Guard, effected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, such Coast Guard, together with the said functions, shall operate as a part of the Navy, subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Navy, in time of war or when the President shall so direct, as provided in section 1 of the act of January 28, 1915 (ch. 20, 38 Stat. 800, as amended, 14 U. S. C. 1).

SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of the Treasury of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

SEC. 3. Administrative Assistant Secretary: There shall be in the Department of the Treasury an Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary of the Treasury under the classified civil service, who shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 per annum.

SEC. 4. Incidental transfers: The Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time effect such transfers within the Department of the Treasury of any of the records, property, personnel, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of such Department as he may deem necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this reorganization plan.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. What the distinguished Senator from Minnesota is saying is that the Senate, in Reorganization Plan No. 26, crossed the bridge of the reorganizational features which the distinguished and honorable Senator has outlined. The Senate decided that issue. If it did not follow to the very letter the Hoover reorganization plan, the time to have protested was certainly when Reorganization Plan No. 26 was before this body in 1950, and not now, when we are considering a matter which involves even bigger things—and it is the very heart of the tax-collecting system—namely, whether we should change a discredited system and try to install a real, genuine, blue-ribbon merit system in our tax-collection agency.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

The reorganization message of the President on Reorganization Plan 26 of 1950 was sent to the Senate on May 31, 1950. I wish to point out that it was in that reorganization plan that all functions pertaining to the Department of the Treasury were vested in the Secretary of the Treasury, and are powers which the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue have had. The powers he will have if and when Reorganization Plan No. 1 is adopted, are powers which the Congress has vested already in the Secretary of the Treasury.

This is no time for histrionics or oratory. Let the RECORD read in bold type that there is not one single delegation of power in Reorganization Plan No. 1 as to functions, as to duties, or as to obligations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue or of the Commissioner of that office and his subordinates that have not already been legislated upon, placed in public law, and approved by the Congress of the United States.

There is no man on the face of the earth who can dispute that statement. I do not think it is right because there is a difference between an Assistant Secretary and a Commissioner of Internal Revenue, to insinuate that somehow or other some powers are being vested, when they have already by legislation been vested in the Secretary of the Treasury by the very act of this body, the Senate, and its companion body, the House.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not correct to say that the Congress, itself in the Reorganization Act, called upon the President to do exactly what he has done, namely, to work out a reorganization plan and to submit it to Congress for its approval.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Michigan is correct.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not also correct to say that not only Mr. Robert R. McCormick, Director of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, and Mr. Arthur Fleming, a member of the Hoover Commission, but also Mr. Hoover himself have declared that this Reorganization Plan No. 1 is in line with the most important recommendations of the Hoover Commission?

The Senator from Michigan is eminently correct. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations I have listened to a good share of the testimony and reviewed the record. I know it from intimate first-hand knowledge.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe the Senator from Minnesota has in his possession the statement which was made by ex-President Herbert Hoover before the House committee in which the ex-President stated that Reorganization Plan No. 1 is in line with the Hoover proposal.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Who knows more about what the Hoover proposal represents, stands for, and recommends than does ex-President Herbert Hoover himself?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. On page 81 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on the Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, Eighty-second Congress, second session, dated January 22,

23, 25, 1952, there appears this statement by Chairman KING:

Chairman KING. At this time I wish to read into the record a communication from former President Hoover:

"MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which I was Chairman, over 2 years ago recommended that the personnel in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and certain other agencies be placed under the civil service in order to improve their qualifications and character and freedom from politics.

"The implication of the recommendation is that employees should be admitted to the service only after vigorous investigation as to character and loyalty and after the usual examinations to determine competence. Section 3 of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 would meet this requirement with one possible exception—that of blanketing incumbents into the new posts. The Congress should satisfy itself on this point.

"Simply to blanket the employees who have not undergone these tests does not seem to me to meet the present situation. Placing these employees under civil service should be accompanied by the requirement that any employees affected should, before continuation in the Bureau, pass the Civil Service Commission requirements on the same basis as any new applicant for such employment.

"Yours faithfully,

"HERBERT HOOVER."

Mr. President, by the testimony of Commissioner Ramspeck, of the Civil Service Commission, and Commissioner Dunlap, of the Internal Revenue Bureau, Congress did satisfy itself on that point.

I shall proceed quickly because I want the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who has been granted time to speak today, to deliver his address.

However, I wish the RECORD to be crystal clear as to what I have to say. Let us take another point. I am glad the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who asked questions on this point, is in the Chamber. Let us look at the record concerning the general counsel and the point which was made to the effect that the assistant general counsel to the Internal Revenue Bureau would more or less be under the control of the general counsel of the Treasury; and that, somehow or other, the assistant general counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue would, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] pointed out, more or less interpret the laws as the Treasury wanted them to be interpreted, even though Congress had legislated to the contrary.

I have in my hand United States Code, forty-sixth edition, titles 16 to 26. What do I find on page 3,931 of the Code? I find chapter 40, The Offices of General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury and the assistant general counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Without burdening the RECORD by reading the matter into the RECORD I give the citation for all to check. What does that public law do? It does exactly what it sets forth as it is now on the books. It will not be changed one iota, one scintilla, one millionth of one thousandth of an inch by Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Not even a small change is contemplated.

This public law was the result of the investigations by the Committee on Finance. The whole structure of the general counsel's office has been provided by legislation. I say to every member of the Committee on Finance and its staff that they know very well that there is not one change contemplated in the general counsel's office or in the assistant general counsel's office and in the assistant general counsel's duties with respect to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This act was passed in 1934, and no action since then has changed the system. It has been in effect for 18 years. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 does not change the relationship established by Congress in 1934. If Congress wants to change that relationship it can do so by law.

I want the RECORD to be clear that there has been some misrepresentation—I know not intentional—and some misunderstanding of the general law that pertains to the general counsel. Plan No. 1 does not in any way add to, diminish, restrict, alter, or fundamentally change even minutely the responsibilities and the relationships of the general counsel to the Bureau of Internal Revenue or of the assistant general counsel to the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, I point out that the position of General Counsel to the Treasury Department and of the Assistant General Counsel to the Bureau of Internal Revenue are along the lines of the Hoover Commission's recommendation as to the legal status of the departments of the Government.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, during the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], he raised the question that the plan might change the right of jury trials in cases against the commission, or in some way, not spelled out, interfere with a taxpayer's right to protect against an arbitrary action of the internal revenue officials.

Is it not a fact that in the record of the hearings it is clearly spelled out, in recorded testimony and by letter by the Department of Justice and by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, that not an iota of wording in this plan would change in any way the rights of the taxpayers to protect themselves in tax cases?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. President, the letters to which the Senator from Oklahoma has referred are now a matter of public record in the minority views. They are also a matter of public record in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, in the Eighty-second Congress, second session, on the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Since the power to prosecute rests with the Department of Justice and since that Department has said that under this reorganization plan the taxpayers will be entitled to all the rights they have had heretofore, including the right of jury trial, without restriction, it appears to me that this issue is settled. If there is any doubt that it is settled, the Congress can legislate again in this field; there is nothing to stop Congress from improving the plan in the future, if Congress wishes to do so.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not also a fact that the straw man which has been raised in this instance, namely, the claim that under the plan the taxpayer might lose his right of jury trial in a suit against the Bureau of Internal Revenue, is clearly shown to be without foundation in view of the fact that the testimony adduced at the hearings was that among the thousands and thousands of tax cases which have been filed, in not more than 22 instances a year in the past 2 years has a jury trial been requested, despite the fact that thousands upon thousands of cases were handled during that long period?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is entirely true.

Mr. President, in the face of the committee report, in the face of the report of the Department of Justice to the committee, and in the face of the fact that during the past 2 years, among all the many thousands of tax cases, in only 22 cases a year have jury trials been requested, it seems to me that one who proclaims here that an important defect of the plan is that it would do away with the right to have a jury trial in such cases, is raising a false issue designed to becloud the real issue, which is whether we wish to wipe political patronage from a system in which political patronage has brought shame on itself.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not true, as we may judge from the records mentioned by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, which records were sent to the committee by the Treasury Department, that the Bureau of Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department have been working for months and for years to bring about a proper reorganization of the Bureau? Of course, I wish they had done it sooner than they did.

Is it not also a fact that the Hoover Commission's report, the Paget report, and the other reports which have been referred to, all were available to the Treasury Department as it worked out this plan, and the Treasury Department took what it considered to be the best parts of the various reports, in line with the report of the Hoover Commission, and submitted them in this plan?

Is it not also a fact that this plan was taken from the Hoover report, the Paget report, and the other reports which were submitted?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is true; and I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to quote from the hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate, Eighty-second Congress, second session, on the reor-

ganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, I shall read from page 241 of the hearings, at the point where Commissioner Dunlap was testifying in response to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and was giving an analysis of the particular point the Senator from Georgia raised at that time, and has raised here again. The point the Senator from Georgia raised was that there had not been time to consider this plan, that the plan was presented without affording the Finance Committee or other congressional committees an opportunity to give it adequate study. Mr. President, listen to what the Commissioner had to say:

The last of the questions relating to this plan which seems to be of concern to some people is whether it represents hasty action, and whether more time should be spent in further study.

The Department has already documented before this committee the many years spent in study and preparation and review of reports, which have gone into the necessary background work for the development of this plan. These studies have been under way since 1946. I personally aided in the development of one of its more important phases as far back as 1947.

The plan draws from the best features of the suggestions and reports of congressional committees, the Hoover Commission, and the management engineering firm authorized by the Congress to study Bureau reorganization. In 1948, the advisory group to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which made a study of the Bureau organization, stated in the course of its report.

By the way, Mr. President, Members of the Senate Finance Committee are members of that joint committee, so that report is no secret. Let me say that I now hold in my hand a copy of the report, which was released not only to the general public, but also to the Finance Committee and other committees. I now read from the top of the cover page of the report:

For release with the report Friday, April 23, 1948.

Here is the report; it was released to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee and their staffs. The report is no secret. It has not been kept in cold storage or in a deep freeze. I do not think it behooves the committee to say that somehow or other the report has been withheld.

What does the report say, Mr. President? As quoted in the hearings at the point to which I have been referring, it says:

The Bureau needs a 2- to 4-year period to analyze and diagnose its management problems and to test and experiment with possible solutions. For this activity it should employ the best talent and techniques that are available, both within and without the Bureau organization.

The Commissioner further said at that time:

We have followed this course by employing all the means at our command to make the study suggested. This reorganization plan is the result.

Mr. President, that is the record.

What else did I hear said on this floor today? I heard references made to the Paget report.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield, before he discusses the Paget report?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly.

Mr. MONRONEY. The report the Senator from Minnesota has just mentioned, namely, the report of the Advisory Group on Administration of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, was from a subgroup of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and was available to the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee, was it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. That was the report about which the minority of the committee who signed the minority views were taken to task by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee; he took them to task for in some way misleading the Senate.

As a matter of fact, what we were pointing out—and we did so in such a way that anyone who runs could read it and could understand it, without having to interpret it—is clearly set forth at the top of page 18 of the minority views. At that point we stated:

The record shows that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation took no action with respect to the report of its own Advisory Group on Administration of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

That report was filed in April, 1948.

In discussing this matter, I gathered that inadvertently, perhaps, the Members of the Senate may have been left with the impression that we expected the members of the Finance Committee to act, but that they had no opportunity to act until January 8 of this year. However, Mr. President, this matter has been kicking around in the Finance Committee and in the Ways and Means Committee from the days of the Eightieth Congress, when the Ways and Means Committee, in the then Republican-controlled Congress, called attention to the need for reorganization.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. All we are calling attention to on page 18 of our minority views, for which we were rather severely criticized, is that the request for more time is nothing new, and that the plea for more time at this late date is not convincing, because the report and this matter have been before the distinguished gentlemen who have the power to propose legislation on this subject, but who up to this good day have done nothing to bring before us proposed corrective legislation such as that now sought by means of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I do not agree with the distinguished chairman of the committee that our small group, composed of the Senators who signed the minority views, should be criticized when, obviously, we simply pointed out what is a clear fact and is documented as a fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Let me refer to the date I mentioned a moment ago in regard to the release of the report of the Advisory Group to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. The Senator from Oklahoma said it was released in April. As a matter of fact, it was dated January 27, 1948; and then it was reviewed by the Treasury Department, and comments were prepared and were made available to the entire American public. Of course, I gather that the Senator from Georgia is a part of the public, and I gather that he and all other Members of the Congress would be interested in a report which was made regarding a matter in the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee and the legislative policies it studies and considers. It was on January 27, 1948, that the then Under Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable A. L. M. Wiggins, and the then Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. George J. Schoeneman, released the report. I submit that every Member of the Senate could have received a copy of the report if he wanted it. I submit that if a committee staff did not receive a copy of the report, the staff should be checked upon, because, Mr. President, believe me when I say that this report is the sort of report which belongs before a committee.

Now let us examine the Paget report. I have heard it said again and again to the Senate that the Paget report was more or less hidden in a deep freeze or hidden in some other way from the Finance Committee. That is the understanding I received from the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Georgia. If I correctly understood his remarks, I submit that understanding is not substantiated by the facts. I now hold in my hand Report No. 56 from the Committee on Government Operations, a report which was presented to our committee at the request of the chairman of the committee. It was presented by Mr. Dunlap, the Commissioner. The report indicates the following:

In response to the question by Senator MCCLELLAN relating to the report of the management engineering firm, Cresap, McCormick & Paget, the following information is given:

The two reports were submitted by the firm as follows:

Report on Offices of Collectors of Internal Revenue (survey or organization and procedures; two volumes), January 1949.

Report on Bureau of Internal Revenue (plan of organization; two volumes), August 1949.

Copies of the above reports have been made available to congressional committees and staffs as follows:

Let me digress at this point for a moment to say that only as of yesterday I consulted with the chief of staff of the subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee, under the chairmanship of Representative KING. I asked that chief of staff, "Did you get the Paget report?"

He said, "We did."

I said, "How did you get it?"

He said, "Just as we get all of them; I asked for it."

Mr. President, it seems to me that is a normal function among reasonable men, namely, if you want something seek it:

Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find.

As I stated a moment ago, this report says:

Copies of the above reports have been made available to congressional committees and staffs as follows:

This is the Paget report, Mr. President, which was supposed to be hidden some place, like a superduper secret:

March 20, 1951—

Mr. President, that was 1 year ago—

Staff of Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The Ways and Means Committee is not over 500 yards from here, and I submit that if we cannot find out what is going on, two blocks away from us, I do not know how we are going to find out what is going on in the rest of the world. When was the next time that this report was made available?

January 16, 1952: Staff of Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

January 21, 1952: House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

February 12, 1952: Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

As a matter of interest—

The Commissioner continues—

it may be stated that other references to the survey by Cresap, McCormick & Paget were made by Bureau officials to congressional committees. For example, under date of January 27, 1949, the Commissioner in a letter to ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, referred to the management engineering firm's study which was then being undertaken. Commissioner Schoeneman again referred to this study in his statement before the House Ways and Means Committee on February 6, 1951, on the Revenue Act of 1951.

Mr. President, there is the record, and, in all fairness, I ask any reasonable man, I ask any man who wants to judge this case on its merits, has this report been kept away from the Congress? Could the Finance Committee not have obtained this report? The Finance Committee is able to get other reports. It was able to get reports on the last tax bill, about which we argued here, certain reports which the Senator from Minnesota was unable to obtain, because the Senate Committee on Finance has a direct relationship with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Department of the Treasury. So, if the Senate Finance Committee did not get the report, I suggest again that the chairman find out why. Who was letting him down? Why did he not call upon those who were helping him to get the report, since he justly deserved it?

So let us put this issue aside, Mr. President. There has been no hiding of the reports, and I think the Senator from Oklahoma today has documented, once and for all, the fact that since 1948 this entire problem has been before the Congress. It is nothing new. If it takes 5 or 6 years—how many years is it? Four years?

Mr. MONRONEY. Four years, which was the time of the original report; and now 4 years later, and we are urged to get a new reorganization plan.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Here we are, 4 years later, ready to go to work; but now we hear that more time is needed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if we are through with the report for a moment, would the Senator care to yield for a question or an observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield. I am through with that matter.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia noted that the collector of internal revenue at Boston was on his way out, and he said, "Well, that is no reflection upon the Democrats, because there was no Democratic Senator sitting from that State at the time he was appointed." He then corrected a previous error which had been made, and stated that the collector in Missouri was on his way out, under auspices of prosecution, and that he was appointed when no Democratic Senator was representing that State. I think he brought up, inadvertently perhaps, one of the most cogent arguments for the necessity of approving this reorganization plan. Unfortunately, there are a great many States that at all times are not represented by Democratic Senators. We find that to be the case today. We perhaps shall find it to be the case next year, as it has been the case in years past. So what happens? Men, who are charged with the collection of hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars, occupying one of the most crucial and critical positions in the financial structure and stability of the Government, are selected by the political organizations in States which are not represented by Democratic Senators. In other words, the boys in the back room send up the names, and this honorable body, charged with the consideration of nominations, lacking any personal knowledge or personal information, is asked to confirm them. So, we wrap our arms around them, under the great system of the past, which some men seek to preserve, and we put the stamp of approval on men whom we do not know, and concerning whom we have no colleagues upon whom to rely for information.

It seems to me the Senator from Georgia has touched inadvertently one of the very weakest points in the argument for the preservation of a discredited system, because Senators and even Representatives, duly elected, do not have any power over the choice or selection of these men; it is the boys in the back room who get together and send to their party organization the nominees whom they wish to advance to these all-important positions. Even a United States Senator in many States may not have the sole privilege of selecting the collector of internal revenue. I, for one, as a Member of the United States Senate, would rather turn that responsibility over to the competitive merit system, and under that system have these men chosen, and have their characters investigated to the fullest possible extent by adequate and competent investigators, than to find their names on the executive calendar late some evening, and be asked to rubber-stamp their appointment.

So I think the Senator from Georgia, in bringing out this point, proved the very case of those of us who feel that there must be an end to this discredited system, affecting as it does one of the most vital aspects of Uncle Sam's operations, namely, the collection of approximately $70,000,000,000 worth of taxes to maintain the financial stability of our country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, I am not going to take very much more time, but I desire to come, not to the last point, but to what I consider to be the basic point emphasized by the Senator from Georgia. That point was that in audits and collections there was a consolidation. The Senator, if he was correct, was pointing out that power was being placed in one and the same individual both to audit and to collect. Of course, I must say the full story was not told about the right of appeal and the independence of the appellate jurisdiction.

Now, Mr. President, what does the report say? What does the Commissioner say? The Commissioner of Internal Revenue testified before the Senate committee. He was asked this very same question by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and in answer to that question, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue pointed out that there was not the consolidation to which the Senator from Georgia has referred, and about which the Senator from South Dakota had questioned. As a matter of fact, the head of the Cashiers Division, according to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in the field operations office, will collect the taxes voluntarily reported or agreed to; and, a separate official, Mr. President, a separate human being, a separate officer in the internal-revenue establishment, the head of the enforcement division at the field office level, will audit returns and report for assessment the liabilities agreed to. The head of the Appellate Division will make final settlement of tax liability for the Commissioner. The functions are clearly separated at a lower level. The same man does not do both jobs. As a matter of day-by-day operations, the independent Appellate Division protects the taxpayers.

Mr. President, I have gone into this point very carefully, because I think it is of a very serious nature. I have in my hands—I do not know whether I can get it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or not, since I am not too familiar with all of the printing practices—a chart of the present organization of the Internal Revenue Bureau, and also a chart of the proposed organization of that Bureau. They clearly indicate, without any shadow of a doubt, that the collection functions, the enforcement functions, the appellate functions, and the administrative functions are separate

and distinct. Any insinuation to the contrary is not based upon a reading of the record or upon an analysis of the charts to which I refer and which I have in my hand. The organizational chart was presented to us by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. In the present organization there is a hodgepodge the like of which it would take a magician to understand.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue gave some very interesting testimony when he indicated what they were trying to accomplish. He pointed out that under the present regulations a man connected with the Alcohol Tax Unit may go into a store and say, "Let me look at your books."

There is another man from the Withholding Tax Unit in connection with wages and salaries, and he will say, "Let me take a look at your withholding statements." There is another man from the Social Security Tax Unit, who makes a similar request; there is another one from the Excise Tax Unit, who says to a taxpayer, "I want to go through all your books. Let me check your corporate tax, your personal income tax, and all the other taxes."

Mr. President, that is the kind of inefficient bureaucracy at which the plan is striking a death blow.

Under this plan, all those functions will be performed by one investigator, one tax collector, one man who makes the collections, and one auditor. We do not need six auditors with six per diems, six travel allowances, six expense accounts. This plan provides one man to do the auditing and one man to do the collecting.

Please look at the chart again. Any taxpayer who feels that his audit is not fair has an independent appeals board to which to go, under an assistant commissioner, an appellate division, where final settlement is made in the field, not at Washington, but in the field.

Mr. President, I desire to put at rest for once and for all the charge that there is a consolidation of auditing and collecting functions. The issue is very simple. The real issue is whether the Congress of the United States is going to continue a Bureau of Internal Revenue which is under the domination of political appointees.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Does not the Senator from Minnesota agree that the entire tone and tenor of an office can exist either in political terms or in terms of merit and efficiency, and that the top man in the office is there to do a job, to collect taxes and audit them? Is it not also true that, while there have been many who have done good jobs, the recent disclosures with reference to malpractice in the Bureau of Internal Revenue have in every case been traced back to a political appointment and to the application of the spoils system to a bureau which ought to be above politics?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct, and the testimony in the record substantiates his conclusion.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota heard, I believe, the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee make the statement that the President or the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue can dismiss collectors any time they want to, not even requiring the permission of the Civil Service Commission to do so. It is unfortunate, indeed, that the testimony before the King committee in its investigation in California could not have been read by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. I am now referring to page 360 of that committee's investigation in California. In the testimony of Mr. McKenny, the chief supervisor for the Pacific coast, he said:

> One of my first contacts with Mr. Lewis, a collector at that time, outside the office, was on the occasion of an invitation to his home for dinner when he informed me, or, rather, when he asked me if I knew what treatment was accorded supervisors whom they did not like.

Listen to this:

> He asked me the question, "Do you know what we do with supervisors that we don't like?" I said, "No; what do you do with them?" He said, "We throw them out the window."

That is a perfect example of the sworn testimony before the King committee in connection with the war lord attitude that those political appointees had taken unto themselves. They consider themselves above the law, above the discipline of the Department, and above correction by anyone, including the Commissioner, the Secretary of the Treasury, or even the President of the United States.

Anyone who appreciates the importance of collecting $70,000,000,000 from the taxpayers must frankly admit that the toleration of these political war lords, sitting in their offices and literally thumbing their noses at the authority of the supervisors, of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and of the Secretary of the Treasury, is indeed bad business practice.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma has forcefully and very pointedly analyzed what is meant by political influence and political pressure. Let us not kid ourselves for a single minute. We are not babes in the woods in connection with politics. We are not talking to a group of people who have never been in politics. The fact of the matter is that a political appointee obviously knows how he got his appointment and to whom he owes his appointment. As the Commissioner of Internal Revenue pointed out, a political appointee owes his appointment, not to the people, but to a Senator, a national committeeman, or some friend in the political structure.

I point out first, Mr. President, that the powers which the Senator from Georgia suggested were being centered in the Bureau of Internal Revenue under Reorganization Plan No. 1 are powers which are there only because of statutory law and because of Reorganization Plan No. 26 which the Senate approved in 1950. The question of powers and functions has been legislated upon separately and distinctly in Reorganization Plan No. 26.

I think it is only fair to ask every Member of the Senate to scrutinize the record of the debate on that particular plan. I ask every Member of the Senate to evaluate the words of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], and the junior Senator from Minnesota as we state again and again the powers and functions under Reorganization Plan No. 26. Reorganization Plan No. 1 has absolutely nothing to do with them. Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a housekeeping plan, an administrative, structural, organizational plan which has reference to what might be called the administrative establishment. That administrative establishment is outlined in the chart which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that special permission of the Joint Committee on Printing will have to be obtained in order to have the chart reproduced in the RECORD. If the Senator will withdraw his request and renew it tomorrow——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I do not think it will be necessary to renew it. I need only say that it is to be found in the hearings of the committee lying now on the desk of every Senator.

The other point I tried to make today is that the Hoover Commission Report supports, in substance, Reorganization Plan No. 1, because the key to this reorganization plan is the abolition of the political patronage system. The rest of it is detail. The heart of it is getting politics out of tax collecting, and I think that should be the issue and it is the issue before this body.

The Senator from Georgia has emphasized the general counsel's office, and what kind of relationship will exist under the reorganization plan with the general counsel's office in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I ask the Senator from Georgia in all fairness, and I want him to answer this question tomorrow. Is there any change? Is it not a fact that the public law adopted in 1934 establishing the general counsel's office and its relationship to the Department of the Treasury and the Bureau of Internal Revenue still is the law? Is it not a fact that the only change of function that can possibly be in that office is under Reorganization Plan No. 26, which is already a law, and that Reorganization Plan No. 1 does not in any way alter, change, add to, or diminish the functions or the responsibilities of the general counsel's office, nor in any way alter the relationship of the general counsel's office with the Bureau of Internal Revenue or the Department of the Treasury?

I think the record is clear. I have read into the RECORD today the public law citations and the comments of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

I have also pointed out that the auditing and collection functions which the Senator from Georgia has charged are

being consolidated are not consolidated in one person? They are consolidated in one agency, in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, yes, as they justly should be, but not in one person. There is the Cash and Collection Division of the Treasury, and there is the Audit Division, and the report of the Audit Division is subject to appeal to an appellate jurisdiction, which is totally independent, thereby giving the taxpayer an appeal procedure at the community or regional level, not requiring him to come to the Nation's Capital.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to point out that the argument that we need more time, or that this plan has been hastily conceived, is one which cannot stand the test of examination. As a matter of fact, the time argument can be well summarized, when there is talk about hasty legislation, and it is summarized. A study has been underway continuously since 1940. The present Commissioner worked on this study and this reorganization since 1947, and the plan under debate now adopted the best features of the study.

The House investigation committee staff has studied the matter. The joint committee group studied it, and Public Law 147 was passed in 1948. The departmental management committee studied it from 1947 to this date.

The management survey report of Cresap, McCormick & Paget was completed in 1949, which report, I repeat, has been available to the committees of Congress, and was made available to the House Committee on Ways and Means on March 26, 1951, and I say, and I ask anyone to prove to the contrary, that if the House Ways and Means Committee could get the Paget report on March 26, 1951, why could not the Senate Finance Committee get it? Is there any reason? Is there anything in the RECORD which shows that the Finance Committee could not have gotten it? I say that if that committee did not get it, it did not ask for it, and it should have asked for it. The members of its staff, if not the busy members of the committee, distinguished Senators, should have asked for it.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who I am sure intends to discuss in some detail the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, particularly with reference to the plan now under consideration.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I hasten to reassure Senators who have not left the floor that I do not intend to discuss this plan in any very great detail. However, I served on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Eighty-first Congress and defended many of the Hoover reorganization proposals. Sometimes I was alone; frequently many other Members of the Senate defended some of them.

I have consulted at length with former President Hoover, and I have worked closely with President Johnson, of Temple University, the president of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, and because of my deep interest and considerable background knowledge of the subject, I have asked for time to speak in the Senate.

Mr. President, I support the President's plan to reorganize the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I oppose Senate Resolution 285. I do so for five kindred reasons. These five reasons together seem to me to be wholly persuasive.

First. This particular reorganization plan is overwhelmingly supported by the largest pressure group of all, even if frequently it is the least vocal; namely, the great majority of the American people.

Second, this plan offers us, as Senators, a unique opportunity to practice what we so often preach to others.

Third, this plan embodies principles of administrative efficiency and economy which have been so ably championed by the Hoover Commission.

Fourth, I shall go even further and say that this plan is one of the most businesslike, sensible reorganization proposals transmitted to Congress by the President.

Finally, this plan promises to wipe out the spots in our tax system which are most vulnerable to favoritsm and corruption.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-two's major challenge to representative government lies in the ability of Congress to keep pace with the immensely difficult problems arising from the necessary expansion of the executive branch in meeting the manifold problems of the twentieth century. Every reorganization plan submitted to Congress by the Executive is a phase of that challenge. Every reorganization plan is a test of our responsibility as Senators to review and audit and oversee the work of an administration charged with far-flung duties and authority.

Mr. President, our response in Congress to the challenge of executive reorganization has been very far from unanimous, and in my judgment it has been far from satisfactory.

While friends and supporters of the Hoover reorganization proposals boast that 50 percent have been adopted, much too little is said about the 50 percent which have failed of adoption or, in most cases, have as yet failed even of consideration. I bewail the fact today that 50 percent of the proposals have not yet been accepted, and I regret that only 2 of the 96 Senators were willing to sponsor for review by the Senate all the remaining proposals incorporated in the report of the Hoover Commission.

Some of the reorganization plans which have failed of approval by the Senate, Mr. President, have dealt with relatively narrow fields, in which small, special-interest groups, succeeded in protecting what they deemed to be their special privileges. The general public, regrettably, has not been well informed about or aroused by these plans. Most of the plans have no glamor, no public appeal, no political sex appeal. All too often Members of Congress deem it politically more profitable to bow to pressure groups which represent both votes and campaign contributions, in view of the fact that they seem to get no rewards if they do not bow.

This is a sad, familiar story. I recently reviewed it before the Second National Conference of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] complimented me by inserting my address in the Appendix of the RECORD on February 19.

It was the Congress which knuckled under to the medical and educational lobbies to defeat plan No. 1 of 1949, and plan No. 27 of 1950. It was the Congress which yielded to special business and professional groups, such as the American Bankers Association and the NAM, and defeated eight reorganization plans in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress alone.

It was, of course, to be expected that the impact of pressure groups would converge on Congress, the cockpit of our democracy. But why did not such selfish pressures stop these plans before they emerged from the Bureau of the Budget or the White House? The fact is that the Executive resisted those particular pressures while the Congress yielded to them. The fact is that in these instances Congress capitulated to narrow group influences, operating against the public interest and using political pressures for which we, in Congress, so often freely criticize the Executive if he yields to them.

Mr. President, it seems to me that tomorrow the Senate will face a more clear-cut test than it has in the case of many of the previous reorganization proposals. Tomorrow we shall have an unprecedented opportunity to cast a vote against demonstrated corruption and against archaic bureaucracy.

Again in Congress we are witnessing outside pressures upon those in both parties who favor or who rationalize the patronage system. We are hearing from those who think more about corruption as a political issue than they do of stamping it out as a public evil.

Mr. President, the American people want Congress to take the step proposed in Reorganization Plan No. 1. Sixty-nine percent of them have said so in a Gallup poll. Eight of every ten Americans who have read about corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue favor putting the collectors under the civil service.

There is one big difference, however, between the situation today and that confronted in connection with past reorganization plans. The others have had little publicity and there has been virtually no incentive for Members of Congress in terms of popular support. That is not true of the plan before the Senate today. This plan deals with the tax structure—and taxes reach into every American home and into every American business. In the long run, this plan will affect the balance sheets of thousands of firms, and the household accounts of millions of families. Taxes, and the way we collect and spend them, are everybody's business today.

As to my second point, I would wager that every one of us has lectured other people from this floor or elsewhere about how vital it is for our Government to be economical, for the executive branch to be efficient, for public service to be free of corruptors and those who can be corrupted. All of us have said or implied that we want these things done without regard for the tender feelings or prerogatives of anyone. If our constituents

thought we felt otherwise, they would throw us out. All of us have inveighed against the danger to free institutions in the growth of public cynicism about integrity in Congress and in Government.

It seems to me that tomorrow we must vote to resist not only the pressures I have mentioned, but perhaps an even greater pressure, namely, the pressure of our own self-interest as Senators, the desire to keep personal control of some patronage plums, regardless of how worm-eaten those plums may be. In my judgment, those of us who fail to resist such pressure will have no right to be taken seriously henceforward when we talk about efficiency and when we ask for improved management regardless of who may be made uncomfortable. Those who fail to approve the President's proposal tomorrow will have little right, it seems to me, to criticize others for failure to fight corruption.

Some of us have joined in urging the appointment of a Commission of distinguished citizens to elevate the standards of public administration and morality. What better Commission, what more distinguished group of citizens, could be found than the Hoover Commission, which recommended the principles of the plan, and the Citizens Committee which has announced its full support?

By this plan the President of the United States is offering to sacrifice one of the privileges which politicians in both parties have always associated with that great office, the right to appoint collectors of internal revenue on the basis of patronage alone. He is putting it up to each of us in the Senate and asking us whether we are willing to give up one of our prerogatives, the privilege of Senators to confirm the nominations of collectors of internal revenue. This patronage seems to me little enough for us to give up, compared with what we in Congress, through our laws, are asking our taxpayers to give up this week.

We have asked the American taxpayer to assume fearful responsibilities for the general welfare, for the preservation of our liberties, for the security of our Nation. We have told him, in our tax laws, that those with the most must give the most for the common good.

The great body of taxpayers who favor this plan can be thwarted only by us, by our failure to give up what some of us deem to be a prerogative. Let us cast our votes on this plan in the interest of the general welfare rather than our own.

As to my third point, I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] that no reorganization plan is a panacea, and that no reorganization plan should ever be presented as such. There is certainly no sure-fire remedy for inefficiency and corruption. However, Reorganization Plan No. 1 is a vital part of the great program to streamline the Government, for which the Hoover Commission was established. The American people spent about $2,000,000 on the Hoover Commission. I feel that it has already been worth billions of dollars, and with our support it can be worth billions more.

I think it may help some of us to look backward, briefly, and to recall the framework of reorganization on which this present plan is built.

Five years ago the Congress recognized the imperative need to overhaul the sprawling, complex structure of the Federal Government. To determine how the job ought to be done, the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was created. Former President Herbert Hoover was named as Chairman. Eleven other eminent Americans, including our own senior Senator from Vermont and the senior Senator from Arkansas, were chosen as members. The President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives each designated four members. This was a bipartisan group. It performed its mission without regard for politics or personalities.

For 18 months this Commission carried on an exhaustive, painstaking review of the whole Federal establishment. More than 300 specialists from academic life, from private institutions, and from business were brought in to help. They were formed into 24 separate so-called task forces, each covering a major field of inquiry. The mass of information and analysis was set forth in 78 task-force studies. These total more than 2,500,000 words.

Then began the difficult task of deliberating, weighing, evaluating—of choosing the major targets for administrative reform. This resulted in 19 separate reports which cover the organization, the management, and the working of the executive branch.

From the recommendations have come a long series of common-sense guideposts leading us out of the wilderness of hodgepodge government—a wilderness, I may say, largely created by past Congresses. From the recommendations has come a renewed public interest in sound management of the public business; and from them has come the impetus for the plan which is now before the Senate.

When the Hoover Commission had finished its great work, the President and the Congress took up the responsibility of translating its recommendations into reality. It was perfectly clear to the old Washington hands that reorganization would not come easily, that vested interests within the bureaucracy and without would oppose changes. To make thorny proposals such as the one before us easier to handle, the Reorganization Act of 1949 was proposed by the President and adopted by the Congress. Without that act, we would have made very little progress indeed. Without it, the Hoover Commission proposals would have died on the vine as had all similar proposals for generations. Other commissions with similar objectives had come and gone and all had failed.

Due to the Reorganization Act of 1949, which puts a proposal into effect after 60 days unless a constitutional majority of either House votes it down—more than half of the Hoover Commission's recommendations are now in effect. Much has been put through by administrative action, much has been put through by legislation. The details of progress are set forth in Senate Document 91, submitted by the committee chairman, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

More than half the Hoover Commission's recommendations, or approximately half, are still awaiting action. The President, the Congress, both major parties, and the Citizens Committee deserve credit for the progress which has been made. But what lies ahead is the tougher half of the job. Our lack of progress on the tough jobs is disappointing. Indeed, we have taken most of the push-overs first.

The vote tomorrow will mark a very important milestone. If we vote down the proposal to eliminate corruption and bring about efficiency and to eliminate waste from the Internal Revenue Bureau, it certainly will not promise well for the many reorganization proposals which are still before the Congress. Voting down this plan tomorrow will give cheer and hope to groups who are going to oppose these plans for their own special and selfish interest.

With respect to my fourth point, I hope we can agree that there is no part of the Government which is more vital than the $70,000,000,000 enterprise by which our revenues are collected. This week I participated in a radio program with Commissioner Dunlap. I heard from him the remarkable and astonishing statement that he has 58,000 employees under him. Any group which handles $70,000,000,000 is certainly by far the biggest operation in the United States, or in the world.

Looking beyond the details of administration which have been discussed by members of the committee, I suggest that we inquire how this plan proposes to change some of the ways in which this $70,000,000,000 business is conducted. In brief, it seems to me that it does nothing but adopt management techniques which are very familiar to American business men. I think the President is proposing what any sensible and efficient business executive would propose. He says that we ought to hire the best people we can get to handle this $70,000,000,000 enterprise. He says that we ought to give up the old-fashioned way of filling collectors' jobs by political patronage. That method does not work satisfactorily. Indeed, I think it is a fair statement that it never has worked in the public interest. Heretofore we have never had the klieg lights of publicity put upon it.

At any rate, today those jobs require a degree of competence and experience which demands selection on a merit basis.

In Europe and Latin America it may be noted that the patronage system is also applied to business. Whether a man gets a job in Europe or Latin America all too often depends on whom he knows and who his relatives are. This is one of the grave and difficult problems affecting the economies of those countries. But we can be sure that American businessmen will not put into their key district offices persons who owe their jobs to someone outside the company.

Furthermore, I do not know of any corporation executive who would not rather have 25 persons in the field reporting to him than 200. I do not know

of any businessman who would not like to cut costs by getting the benefits of large-scale machine operation. I do not know of any businessman who would not like to save rent and other costs by merging and consolidating field offices. The Secretary of the Treasury and the collector of internal revenue have assured us that under this plan they can and will achieve all those objectives.

This plan is not the crass political move which opposition Senators would like to have us believe it is. It is primarily a proposal to incorporate business systems into government, and to make government more businesslike.

Last December former President Hoover recalled that his Commission had recommended civil-service selection of collectors after a vigorous inquiry into the loyalty, character, and integrity of applicants. President Hoover stated that it required "a vigorous examination to determine their competence for each special field. Thus these appointments are made with a background of merit, not on ability to get votes or to please some political bosses."

This plan would accomplish just that purpose, as the distinguished Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] and Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have pointed out, with their wealth of facts as well as their eloquence of presentation.

Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report, has called this plan a major step toward more efficiency and economy in the Federal Government. He continues:

> The reorganization proposals and the plans for extending the merit system to include the collectors of internal revenue are fully consistent with the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Mr. President, as this background shows, the plan on which we vote tomorrow was not hastily conceived or inadequately prepared. Back of it are studies over a period of 5 years by the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Hoover Commission, the King subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, and a study by a private management firm, pursuant to congressional authority, at a cost of $500,000.

This plan embodies the best features of these many studies. We do not now need more studies and more reports. The American taxpayers want action. They are entitled to action.

Furthermore, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has stated, this plan embodies the best features of studies which have been in progress for 5 years—studies by the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, the Hoover Commission, the King subcommittee, and other groups as well. I submit that we certainly do not now need more hearings, more studies, more reports, or more research. We need the action which has been called for after years of delay.

Some of the critics of the plan who do not talk about what the plan actually does have charged that this is a political move by the President. They say that he is merely trying to take the corruption issue out of the 1952 election campaign.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to say to Senators that if anyone wishes to interpret this as a political move, the only political move anyone could in any way insinuate is that this plan will take politics out of tax collecting. That is what the issue is. To state the issue simply, and to state nothing but the hard core of it, the question is whether we want political patronage politics in the Bureau of Internal Revenue or whether we want the business of that Bureau conducted on the basis of competency, skill, technical knowledge, background, and experience. That is the issue.

Mr. BENTON. I am sure that the Senator from Minnesota and I can agree that ex-President Hoover and President Truman have not been sitting at the White House putting their heads together in an effort to cook up from this plan some political advantage for either of them, or for anyone else. The only political motivation is exactly the one described by the Senator from Minnesota—to take politics, in the sense of political corruption, out of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and to bring in efficiency and good-business procedure. Four well-qualified persons have expressed themselves as to the conformity of plan No. 1 to the Hoover Commission Reports and have declared their support for the plan. These include: Mr. Robert L. L. McCormick, Director of Research of the Citizens Committee, who testified in support of the plan before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; the Honorable Arthur Fleming, a member of the Hoover Commission and a former Commissioner of the Civil Service Commission, who testified for the plan before our committee; Dr. Robert Johnson, Chairman of the Citizens Committee, who addressed a letter to each Member of the Senate urging support for the plan; and the Honorable Herbert Hoover, who expressed support in a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Internal Revenue Administration of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Some of the critics of this plan—who do not talk about what the plan actually does—have charged that it is "a political move" by the President. They say he is just "trying to take the corruption issue" out of the 1952 election campaign. Now does that charge make any sense—as an argument to vote against this forward-looking proposal—in the light of the 5-year background? Are we supposed to believe that President Harry Truman and former President Herbert Hoover have suddenly cooked this proposal up for somebody's immediate political advantage?

President Truman and Mr. Hoover are for this plan because they know from their years of experience that it is badly needed. They know that corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, however deserving of censure and punishment, is not a new problem. They remember the tax scandals under Republican administrations almost 30 years ago. They know that a real source of these scandals, then and now, is the patronage method of filling collectors' jobs. They know that, while the merit system has limitations, it is for better than the patronage system.

President Truman is not playing politics with this plan. Former President Hoover is not playing politics with this plan. They are for it because they know it will permit a long overdue step toward a more efficient, more trustworthy tax system.

Last December former President Hoover commented on the corruption disclosures:

> I have no doubt that if the Hoover Commission's recommendations on collectors of internal revenue and on other political appointees had been accepted two and one-half years ago—when they were made—these scandals could not have occurred.

He continued:

> The dangers of corruption in tax collection weren't news to the members of the Commission. The Commission condemned the present method of selecting tax collectors. They are mainly selected by political bosses. They are certainly selected with their approval. The determination of their fitness is pretty much based on their ability to get votes or rewards for doing so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is is not correct to say that what has now been culminated in Reorganization Plan No. 1, is a move which has been under study and upon which there has been a great deal of research and extensive hearings and engineering services for a period of 4 years.

Mr. BENTON. Five years.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; going on 5 years; that is correct. So, therefore it is not a hastily thought-up plan or a plan which has been pulled out of someone's back pocket. To the contrary, it is the result of hearings and factual and objective studies by engineering firms, citizens' committees, and the Hoover Commission, in the effort to provide a better organization for the Government of the United States.

Mr. BENTON. I agree wholly with the Senator from Minnesota. Furthermore, most of the reports tend to coincide and to come to the same conclusions, and in general plan No. 1 embodies those conclusions. Representative KING, who has served so stalwartly and has taken such fine leadership in the matter has actually stated that if the Senate rejects this proposal the great work of his committee will have come to naught and will have been wasted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to have this point made crystal clear in the RECORD. Regardless of what the vote may be, let the American people know

what the RECORD shows, namely, that all the doubts and the fears which have been expressed on the floor of the Senate today are not relevant to the central core fact, which is that the civil-service merit system would be applied from top to bottom in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It is that one central fact, I may say, which every report, without exception, has underlined and underscored.

It does not seem to me that it makes too strong a case or any kind of persuasive case to say that there may be some doubt as to jury trial, the centralization or consolidation and auditing of collections, or with respect to some minor detail or some minutiae. If Congress has any doubt as to the validity of this plan along those lines there is nothing to prevent us from legislating to correct such defects and resolve such doubts.

However, Mr. President, the central core of the problem is stated in the first few lines of the message in which the President of the United States asks Congress to adopt the plan and to place the Bureau of Internal Revenue under a blue ribbon—I think he used that expression—or highest type of civil-service standards. That finding has been supported by every investigation since 1948.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I agree with the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. As I have said, I think it is absurd and very unjust to charge ex-President Hoover with playing politics. President Truman has been much more sympathetic to the reorganization proposals and in encouraging them than have Congress and the committees of Congress. It is equally absurd to accuse President Truman of playing politics. These two distinguished gentlemen are for Reorganization Plan No. 1 because they know it would permit the taking of a step which has been urged again and again toward a more efficient and trustworthy practice and system.

In view of the scandals blazoned on the front pages of every newspaper why have we not had it sooner? They are shocking not only to Congress but to the people of the United States. In my several tours of public service nothing has made me so unhappy or has distressed me so greatly as the scandals in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. However, even with the scandals in front of us there is some doubt as to the Senate adopting this plan tomorrow.

In view of the record, Mr. President, it is not to be wondered that the President did not send the reorganization plan to Congress a year ago or 2 years ago—and he has been criticized for not doing so—when in his judgment and the judgment of his advisers there is still grave doubt about the approval of this plan tomorrow, in the face of the shocking record which has been exposed by the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and by Representative KING and his committee in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Connecticut will recall that similar doubt was expressed at the time the House of Representatives was considering this plan. However, I give these words of reassurance to the Senator from Connecticut: When the roll was called in that body, when the Members had to stand up and vote, there was not even a yea-and-nay vote or a vote by division. It was a voice vote. The opposition sort of faded away, somewhat after the manner of a great general. I am not saying that the opposition in the Senate will fade away quite so completely in this instance.

However, Mr. President, the record will stand for the American people to see, not only tonight or tomorrow, but for years to come, that this proposal has the support of committees of Congress, of eminent citizens, of a former President of the United States, of President Truman, and of men who have spent a lifetime in the service of their Government.

Mr. President, I am not moved one iota by jurisdictional fights as to which committee should act on the proposal—the Committee on Finance or the Committee on Government Operations. The American people do not understand that kind of committee business. What they want is action, not jurisdictional disputes. They have been waiting since 1948 for this action. They are a patient people, Mr. President, but 1952 is a very decisive year and their patience may run out.

Mr. BENTON. If they knew more about it, they would have been waiting for it since 1848.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I appreciate the outstanding address which the Senator from Connecticut is making on behalf of this proposal. He is continuing a long record of service in behalf of an adequate and a businesslike reorganization of our Government. I should like to ask my distinguished colleague the Senator from Connecticut if it is not a fact that one of the jewels of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress was the appointment of the Hoover Commission to make a study and recommend how governmental organization could be improved?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for his generous remarks about me. I am glad to find also that he is making generous remarks about the much-maligned Eightieth Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. That was one of the bright spots of what might otherwise have been a rather dismal experience.

Mr. BENTON. The Eightieth Congress also passed the Smith-Mundt Act, in which I had a very special interest, and as to which I also take an opportunity to congratulate the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. MONRONEY. With the approval of the program by the Eightieth Congress, with the findings of the two or three committees of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress that such reorganization must be brought about, that the political system in the Bureau of Internal Revenue must be changed, plus the endorsement of this specific plan by the Republican ex-President, Mr. Herbert Hoover, will it not be strange indeed if we find members of the Republican Party voting tomorrow against Reorganization Plan No. 1?

Mr. BENTON. I agree wholly with that statement. Nothing could be more preposterous than to use as an execuse the fact that this plan does not conform with the Hoover Commission proposal.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will not the distinguished members of the Republican Party find it a little bit hard to get their constituents and their people to believe in the sincerity of their desire to correct a system under which corruption has occurred, if they try to explain that they oppose the plan because they do not like the placement of the assistant general counsel in the Treasury Department, instead of under the Internal Revenue Bureau; or if they try to explain their opposition on the ground that the third Assistant Secretaryship of the Treasury Department is not given automatically to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue? Is it not a fact that such arguments will fall a little bit flat when the question is asked. "Why did you preserve a discredited patronage system simply because you were dreaming dreams that maybe on November 7 you might be in the majority?"

The people are going to ask that question and they will look at the vote tomorrow on the Republican side of the aisle with the greatest interest.

They will be entitled to find exactly where the Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle stand, and whether by their deeds we shall know them.

Mr. BENTON. I wholly concur in that view. I could not possibly have stated it with more clarity or eloquence than it has been stated by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. Perhaps he knows as much about the problem of the organization of the Federal Government as does any other Member of this body. He is famous throughout the country for his great leadership in the efforts to put through the Congress the reorganization bill, during his distinguished service as a Member of the House of Representatives. I concur wholly with the statement he has just made and the conclusions he has drawn.

Mr. President, only 10 days ago, after all the arguments against the plan had been developed, the Citizen's Committee for the Hoover Report formally announced its support of the plan and answered convincingly every argument made against it. The committee emphasized that—

The plan would strike a death blow at politics in tax collecting.

1. The plan, while not perfect, is a good one, following the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as we have certified;

2. The plan offers the first tangible opportunity to break up the political patronage system in accordance with the Hoover Commission's proposals; and this drive would suffer a sharp setback were the plan to be defeated;

3. Reorganization sentiment, both for this plan and for the other recommendations of the Hoover Commission, has been gathering force rapidly throughout the Nation and this sentiment is being reflected in Congress;

4. The administration, according to the Budget Director, is currently working on a

number of additional plans, which if permitted to become effective, will constitute further important progress toward our common objective, and the possibility of transmission and later approval of these plans would be greatly diminished were so crucial a proposal as plan No. 1 to be defeated.

And, above all, the defeat of this plan would undermine public confidence in the entire reorganization program. It might raise a serious public question whether or not the Congress is capable of meeting its responsibilities for eradicating the unfortunate conditions in which corruption is bred.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Connecticut yield to me at this point?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BENTON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will it not be a little difficult for the distinguished Members of the minority party to convince the public or even to convince the members of their own party that this plan is not in line with the Hoover Commission's reorganization report, because perhaps a Democrat said, in connection with quoting a task force report in regard to it, that he did not think it was, inasmuch as not only does the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report say this plan is in line with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, but even former President Hoover himself has said that Reorganization Plan No. 1 is in line with his ideas? So the Members of the minority party will be rather on the spot if they say they voted against this plan because it is not in line with the reorganization proposals of the Hoover Commission, will they not?

Mr. BENTON. Yes. Furthermore, as the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma may know, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report is headed, as chairman, by a distinguished Republican and an old friend of mine, Dr. Robert Johnson, president of Temple University. The various branches of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, both in my State and throughout the country, could hardly be said to be led by administration supporters or by registered Democrats.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely wish to live by the spirit by which this plan is supported, namely, the bipartisan spirit. I know it will be rather difficult for Republican Senators to vote against this plan, in view of the record. I also know that it will be difficult for Democratic Senators to vote against the plan.

The reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue or of any other department or agency of the Government goes far beyond partisan considerations. The American people know their Government is big, and they want it to be as efficient as possible. They know their Government affects their lives. They want to have all the governmental agencies which so definitely affect their lives staffed by persons of competence, technical skill, ability, good character, and integrity. They have a right to expect that.

So I think it ill behooves the Congress of the United States to heap its scorn, at times, and its criticism upon the President of the United States, when we ourselves have within our hands the power to correct most of these situations.

Whenever a political appointee goes wrong, if his appointment required Senate confirmation and was confirmed by the Senate, we must remember that to that extent we must bear a part of the blame. After all, we share both in the glory and in the guilt.

I suggest that the time has come for us to redeem ourselves. Now we have a chance to come forward with clean hands; we literally have a chance to redeem ourselves of the guilt in which we have shared.

I, for one, will do that by voting for Reorganization Plan No. 1. Let those who fail to do so attempt to explain what was wrong in voting for that plan.

Mr. BENTON. Certainly, Mr. President, it is the duty of the Congress to conduct investigations which will elicit the facts and will expose any persons who are guilty of wrongdoing.

In line with what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has just said, let me say that tomorrow is our chance to show by our votes whether we are really prepared to act in response to what our own committees have brought forward and in response to what they and we have ascertained.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a news release of Tuesday, March 11, by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. I make this request in order that that clear-cut and unequivocal statement will be before the Members of the Senate in the morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, in order that the Members of the Senate may have a better understanding of the reaction of the press to the subject matter of the current debate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks three items taken from the press. The first is an article entitled "Need To Close Tax Loopholes." The article is by the eminent journalist, Marquis Childs, and was published yesterday in the Washington Post. The second item is an editorial appearing in this morning's issue of the New York Herald Tribune. The third item is an editorial appearing in this morning's issue of the Washington Post.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 2, 3, and 4.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, Congress has demonstrated many times, particularly in recent years, its readiness to undertake energetic, searching congressional investigations. Now we must show whether we are willing to do anything about what we find out. Now we must show whether we are able to correct evils as well as to expose them. The forthcoming vote is the decisive vote on a decisive step in the fight against corruption.

Probably no Member of Congress is more immediately familiar with the shortcomings of the Bureau of Internal Revenue than is Representative CECIL KING. His subcommittee's investigation of corruption in the Bureau has made a great impression on all of us.

To me, his exposures and those stimulated by our colleague, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] have been the most unhappy and painful of any in my own various terms of service in the Government. All of us in Congress should feel indebted to these two leaders for their exposure of this most vicious cancer in our governmental body. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] supports the reform before us, and Representative KING has given us his considered judgment that unless we adopt this plan, the great work of his group will have been wasted.

With a close vote anticipated, it now seems evident that if these scandals had not been brought to light, the plan proposing this great reform would not have had a chance to receive favorable action by the Senate. Perhaps this explains why the proposal was not rushed to the Hill 2 years ago. At that time its proponents knew it did not have a chance. This explains also why some of the other "tough ones" have been held back. Let us hope we shall not require exposures of theft, bribery, and corruption before we in the Senate, who are supposed to understand the Government, are willing to stand up and be counted on other and forthcoming reorganization proposals.

Let me quote to the Senate an observation by Representative KING, growing out of his experience with the problem on which we shall vote tomorrow:

> Everywhere the pattern has been the same. Political appointments to jobs requiring technical competence and high administrative ability simply will not work. Any taxing system, and particularly one such as we have now, where the burdens are heavy, creates constant temptations to corruption. The methods necessary to deal with this ever-present problem will not be aided or facilitated by imposing on top of it a major problem of divided loyalties. The President has proposed a reorganization plan which would eliminate political appointments in the field service and lay the groundwork for fundamental reforms which would discourage recurrences of the San Francisco type of situation. The President's reorganization plan is not a panacea. It is an essential step toward restoring a justified public faith in our taxing system. It represents one of the constructive results of this committee's long investigation. Its defeat would be a blow to the reforms that we are now urging.

Representative KING repeated these sentiments on the radio only last Monday evening.

Mr. President, 26 Senators have joined in sponsoring bills to accomplish by legislation what this plan does by simple Executive action, namely, to put tax collection under civil service.

I am sure the distinguished Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that on Friday morning, at the very minute when this plan goes into effect, if it is not disapproved by the Senate tomorrow, there is no reason why a congressional

committee cannot, if it wishes to do so, proceed to give legislative consideration to any further desirable changes in, or proposals or recommendations relating to, the organization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue or the organization of any other governmental department or agency. However, future congressional consideration of bills or other measures of that sort is no reason at all for delaying at this time this great forward step. Why should we wait now for additional legislative proposals on this subject, when we can take this forward step by our vote tomorrow, when we shall have a chance to follow the example set by the House.

Conceding that civil service is no cure-all, the distinguished Chairman of the Civil Service Commission testified that not one of the 17 collectors now selected under civil service has even been accused of misconduct, whereas 7 of the 47 collectors appointed under the patronage system have had to be separated from the service.

When we vote for this plan we vote to wipe out the jobs of all the present collectors. In effect, we then put all incumbents out of office. There could not possibly be a cleaner sweep than this of any wrongdoers in these jobs. After we approve this proposal, the various district officers would be appointed under civil-service standards. Some of the old collectors might qualify, and I am sure will qualify, but only if they have superior experience and only if they have been scrupulously honest and upright in their jobs.

Mr. President, it is no answer to say that the plan is unnecessary because the corrupt collectors have been dismissed. Such a suggestion has appeared in the press. The danger I speak of is inherent in the whole system of political appointment. The remedy I favor is to abolish permanently the system of politically appointed collectors, which long has been the entering wedge for political pressures in the whole structure of tax collection and administration.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues not to support tomorrow the resolution which calls for the disapproval of this great plan to clean up the evils and to correct the waste and inefficiency in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. President, I must conclude with a personal explanation, which will take only a moment. As the Senate knows, the President's plan will be approved and will go into effect on Friday unless 49 Senators vote tomorrow to support the resolution which disapproves it. On that particular vote, the number of Senators who are here and on the floor and who opposed the resolution does not matter. The only question then is whether 49 Senators favor the resolution. If 48 Senators favor the resolution, and if not one Senator is present to vote against the resolution, the President's proposal will still prevail.

This plan or arrangement was deliberately adopted by the Senate in the Reorganization Act of 1949. For all practical purposes, this plan means that any Senator who is absent, who is not on the floor, and who does not vote, by his very absence is supporting the recommendations of the President, because, being absent, he cannot cast a vote to disapprove the reorganization proposal.

Mr. President, some weeks ago I agreed to attend hearings tomorrow, in Bridgeport, by a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, under the chairmanship of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON]. These are to be the very first hearings of this Subcommittee on Taxation. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from a statement I have prepared in regard to these hearings. I shall make the statement at the opening of the hearings in Bridgeport in the morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The statement appears in the Appendix, under the appropriate heading.)

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, let me say that at those hearings I must act as chairman because the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] cannot attend. Indeed, I am told that I am to be the only Senator present there. Because of the importance of these hearings; because as a member of the Small Business Subcommittee, some weeks ago I participated in setting the date; because the witnesses in Bridgeport, only five miles from my home, are my constituents and friends; and because even though I shall be absent from the Senate, I shall be showing my support of the President's proposed reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue by not being on the floor of the Senate and voting against the reorganization plan—for these reasons, Mr. President, even though I do not like to miss the vote which will be taken on the floor of the Senate, I am proceeding to Connecticut in accordance with my previous commitment to be in Bridgeport tomorrow, and reluctantly I shall miss the remainder of the debate and the vote on this subject.

EXHIBIT 1

NEWS RELEASE—CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE HOOVER REPORT

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 12.—"Politics lies at the heart of the corruption in tax collecting," Dr. Robert L. Johnson, chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, said today.

"Seven of the 64 collectors of internal revenue have been fired or forced out of the Federal service: that is 11 percent of the total," Dr. Johnson, who is also president of Temple University, declared. "This scandal is Nation-wide. The seven collectors who were involved in scandals and who are now private citizens are James P. Finnegan, St. Louis, Mo.; Dennis Delaney, Boston, Mass.; James W. Johnson, third district, New York, N. Y.; James G. Smyth, San Francisco, Calif.; Joseph P. Marcelle, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Lipe Hensiee, Nashville, Tenn., and Frank Scofield, Dallas, Tex.

"Of the first 129 so-called civil-service employees who have been fired or forced out, 42 percent are not really civil servants at all. They were political appointees who were blanketed into the civil service by executive order without the rigid tests which former President Hoover specified to our citizens committee at our Second National Reorganization Conference on February 18, 1952. These are:

"First, probity. And by that I mean intellectual as well as financial honesty.

"Second, character. And by that I mean courage to stand up for decent administration against all comers within or without.

"Third, and not least, training and competence.

"Surely the Nation has a right to a better system of choice and management of its employees than one which has produced these months of humiliation. That humiliation extends to both the thousands of men and women who hold to the scared honor of Government service and the humiliation of the whole of a great and God-fearing people.

"Even if we give our opponents the full benefit of the doubt and say that all of the employees who were 'blanketed into the Federal Service' were really civil service, and not originally political appointees, we find that only approximately 0.26 percent of the civil-service employees have been tainted with the vicious touch of corruption. This figure stands up unequivocally against 11 percent of the political appointees who have been so tainted. Some Senators have said that senatorial approval is a safeguard. Can they really mean this? It sounds like a raucous and cynical joke at the expense of the American taxpayer. Are some of these respected gentlemen not able, like the rest of us, to read the daily newspapers?

"Again and again former President Hoover has called for removal of these petty political appointees from politics. On January 18, 1952, he said, in a letter to Congressman CECIL R. KING:

"'MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which I was Chairman, over 2 years ago recommended that the personnel in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and certain other agencies be placed under the civil service in order to improve their qualifications and character and freedom from politics.'

"On December 29, 1951, he said to Col. Edward Sherman, Executive Director of the Massachusetts Committee for the Hoover Report, in a radio interview:

"'I have no doubt that if the Hoover Commission's recommendations on Collectors of Internal Revenue and on other political appointees had been accepted 2½ years ago, when they were made, these scandals could not have occurred.

"'The dangers of corruption in tax collection weren't news to the members of the Commission. The Commission condemned the present method of selecting tax collectors.

"'They are mainly selected by political bosses. They are certainly selected with their approval. The determination of their fitness is pretty much based on their ability to get votes or rewards for doing so.

"'These exposures in Washington are just getting started * * * Few of them have yet reached the indictment stage. Already, however, the Commission's recommendations are a hundred times justified.

"'It requires a vigorous examination to determine their competence for each special field. Thus these appointments are made with a background of merit, not on ability to get votes or please some political bosses.'

"On October 24, 1951, he said to the State Chairman of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report:

"'And I would point out that urgent among the recommendations of the Reorganization Commission was that the internal revenue service be placed in the civil service. That means the whole personnel would be appointed by merit examinations under the Civil Service Commission instead of by the political machine as of today. Your committee has urged and advocated this reform. Where Federal employees have been genuinely selected to the civil service, which includes consideration of character as well as ability, they have seldom been corrupt. Never was it more urgent that this method be genuinely extended into several departments than it is right now.'

"The Hoover Commission itself said:

" 'One of the chief handicaps to effective organization of the Department is the political appointment of collectors of internal revenue and of customs, and certain other officials. These appointments are regarded by some as sinecures. In any event, they form a bar to orderly development of an experienced staff.

" 'Recommendation No. 7: The Commission recommends that all officials in the Department below the rank of Assistant Secretary should preferably be appointed from the career service without Senate confirmation.'

"That was unanimous. Commissioner McClellan did not make his general reservation from the entire 288 recommendations—and he was the only one of the 12 Commissioners who did this—until several months after the particular report had gone forward to Congress in print.

"The issue is clear. Will the Senate take tax collecting out of politics? Former President Hoover and the President agree that these 64 tax-collecting jobs must be taken out of politics. So do many public-spirited groups such as the A. F. of L., the Kiwanis International, the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Investment Bankers Association, the National Civil Service Reform League, the Special Committee for Improved Federal Personnel Management, the National Association of Security Dealers, the Budget Bureau, and the Civil Service Commission.

"The problem for the Senate is also clear: Can the United States Senate rise above politics and take a constructive step to prevent future corruption as the Hoover Commission recommended?

"I assume that the voters, who watch the vote on this clean-cut issue, will also be watching at the ballot boxes next November."

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post of March 11, 1952]

NEED TO CLOSE TAX LOOPHOLES

(By Marquis Childs)

REVENUE REFORMS

For do-nothingness this Congress may take highest honors. But a few individuals have distinguished themselves by their zeal for righteousness. Conspicuous in this company is Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, Republican, Delaware.

WILLIAMS has pursued with remarkable singleness of purpose the evil-doers in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. He is responsible for bringing to light most of the scandals that have been revealed. In contrast to the scatter-shot charges contained in so many windy speeches, this is an example of what concentration and specialization can do.

Exposure is, of course, only the first remedial step. Correction must follow and the obvious form it should take is to put the collectors of internal revenue under civil service and thereby out of the way of temptation, as President Truman has proposed.

The Republicans may argue that this should be postponed until they come into power, when it can be done thoroughly. Naturally they want to exploit the scandal to the fullest in the campaign this fall. And as we come to that dread dead line of March 15, none of the scalawaggery makes as great an impact on the public as does the cheating in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

But to turn down the reform for political reasons is to miss an opportunity that may not recur for a long time. Coming into power after 20 years of wandering in the desert, the Republicans would be ravenous for the manna of patronage. One could hardly expect them in view of this hunger to put such rewards out of reach on the civil-service shelf. It would be asking too much of human nature.

The time to strike is now. And that applies equally to another exposure which has made sensational headlines.

The deal in oil tankers engineered by former Representative Joseph Casey netted the principals some mighty fancy profits. What is more important, they were able to keep a far larger share of those profits than could have been retained if the profit had been counted as income. It was converted from income to a "capital gain" on which a much lower rate was paid.

From the tax standpoint, this appears to have been perfectly legal. In many respects it is unfair to the members of the Casey group to single out and publicize the transaction as though it were something most unusual.

The fact is that for those in the high income tax brackets this kind of legal tax manipulation is part of the regular order of business. If a deal can be made into a "capital gain" instead of income, then the rate paid may be only 26 percent instead of 70 to 90 percent. Nice work if you can get it as the old saying goes.

The important point is that so long as there are such loopholes in the law, clever lawyers will find an increasing number of ways to get through them. Closing the more obvious loopholes would mean an additional $4,500,000,000 in revenue for the Treasury, according to Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota. In a pamphlet called Tax Loopholes, brought out by the Public Affairs Institute, he shows how this can be done.

It contains recommendations HUMPHREY has repeatedly made in the Senate in the form of tax amendments that have been just as often turned down. Until Congress takes some action, the kind of profit-after-taxes maneuvered by the Casey group, and that is just one example out of many thousands, will be entirely legal.

So here is a chance to effect another reform while the public is aware of how the clever can wangle a legitimate way through the tax barrier that most of us have to climb over. This is not to say that loopholes are the only thing wrong with the tax structure. It is entirely out of balance by virtue of the fact that more than 80 percent of all revenue comes from corporation and personal income taxes. But that is another story which also promises to be continued well past this political year.

The quick rewards come from the exposure. The public reacts with a gratifying shock and anger. In the wake of that reaction, as psychologists well know, remedial reforms can be pushed through. If the opportunity is ignored, then the net result is likely to be an even greater cynicism about government.

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York Herald Tribune of March 12, 1952]

REFORM THE TAX COLLECTORS

We favor reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Seven out of sixty-four collectors have fallen by the wayside, marked with everything from criminality to incompetence. This scandalous state of affairs clearly calls for fundamental change. But a high degree of contrariness is evident in the Senate, which appears reluctant to endorse the reform which would place every appointment in the Bureau under civil service save for the top-ranking post of Commissioner. An uncomfortably large number of Senators, scandals or no scandals, wish to cling to political patronage. The results of that system are written very large in the public consciousness, but it is still argued that reorganization under civil service would not necessarily change anything. If this be true, then corruption must be taken as an inescapable part of Federal tax collection. This we refuse to believe.

The existing system, a product of politics, could hardly be more discredited. To gain honesty and efficiency, drastic changes are needed. President Truman's reorganization plan is not the complete panacea, but it is a long step in the right direction. The Chief Executive was 3 years late in getting around to proposing the Hoover Commission's ideas, but the intervening scandals have proved the need for reform. The House long ago voted against interfering with reorganization, and the Senate should rise above patronage and beat down the efforts to keep the Truman plan from taking effect by Friday's deadline. The choice is between politics and the merit system. The whole country knows what happens under politics. Now, Senators, let us clean house under civil service and install the promise of integrity in tax collection. All those who vote otherwise will have to do some difficult explaining to the voters back home.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the Washington Post of March 12, 1952]

DANGEROUS POLITICS

Senators who have the best interests of their country at heart cannot afford to let partisanship lead them into a defense of corruption. Seven of the 64 politically appointed collectors of internal revenue have become involved in scandal. That is more than enough to condemn the system. The real issue before the Senate when it votes tomorrow on President Truman's plan to reorganize the Bureau of Internal Revenue will be whether that system, with its invitation to corruption, shall be continued in operation.

Senator GEORGE seems to think that the question is whether the President or Members of the Senate are responsible for the corruption in the Bureau. In trying to lay the fault at the door of the White House, he accused the President and Secretary Snyder of burdening the Bureau with Collectors James P. Finnegan and D. W. Delaney, the first on trial for alleged bribery and the second convicted of accepting bribes. Later he found it necessary to apologize for this error and acknowledge that both the scandal-tainted collectors mentioned were appointees of Franklin D. Roosevelt. We wish that the Senators who are taking a partisan attitude toward this issue would as readily abandon their error of judgment.

It is true, of course, that under the existing patronage system many Senators have recommended trustworthy and competent men for appointment as collectors of internal revenue. But others have not. The inescapable fact is that both the President and many Senators have used these vital posts in our tax-collection system as patronage plums. In part, at least, the present scandals are a result of that practice. The administration is further at fault for allowing corruption to become widespread before doing anything about it. But that is not the issue before the Senate. The question for it to decide is whether a vigorous move to clean up the Bureau shall be approved.

The Senate cannot turn down the reorganization plan without voting to continue corruption. That is the nub of the matter. Undoubtedly Mr. Truman wishes to take the corruption issue out of the 1952 Presidential campaign, as his critics contend. But most voters are likely to view this as a worthy motive—a sincere effort to correct a scandalous situation. Of course, the Republicans who are fighting the reorganization plan are eager to retain the corruption issue for campaign purposes. But will they stand up and be counted in favor of retaining a corrupt system in an effort to keep the issue alive? The effect would be to shift the smirch from the administration's skirts to those of the opposition.

In other words, disapproval of the President's plan would give him precisely the issue he is looking for. Senators who play this game ought to remember the fate of the lady who smilingly went for a ride on the back of a tiger, only to return inside with the smile on the face of the tiger.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to myself such time as I may require.

Tomorrow the Senate will cast one of the most significant votes, I believe, of the Eighty-second Congress. We shall decide whether we are going to take the patronage system out of the agency which collects Uncle Sam's revenues. We shall decide whether a discredited system shall be continued and political appointees shall remain in charge of collecting seventy or seventy-five billions of dollars of revenue with which to operate the Federal Government, or whether this agency, one of the most vital of the Government, shall be put under civil service.

I, along with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MOODY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], have proposed what I call the good government bill, which among other things provides for a blue-ribbon civil service. We felt deeply honored that the President of the United States, in referring to the reform of the Bureau of Internal Revenue through the taking of politics out of the collectors' offices and substituting career men for political appointees used the term "blue ribbon" civil service.

I am happy to say that this reorganization plan, in addition to eliminating politics, offers a great opportunity for reform along civil-service lines in an agency where it can be given a real operating test, with rapid promotion for demonstrated efficiency and ability, and, yes, with rapid discharge for demonstrated lack of ability, of attention, or of energy on the job. Under it also a young man may get ahead without necessarily waiting until everyone above him in the higher echelons dies or retires. The plan provides for putting the incentive system into government career service, so that those of ability may be rewarded and those of no ability may be dropped from the civil-service rolls in this particular bureau. The plan does not affect any other department.

I was greatly gratified to receive this evening from Key West, a teletype message from President Truman, with reference to Reorganization Plan No. 1; and, of course, referring to "blue ribbon" civil service. I take this opportunity to read to the Senate this message from the President of the United States:

You know of my complete accord with your efforts to broaden the scope and improve the standards and prestige of our Federal civil-service system. I heartily agree with you that disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 for the Bureau of Internal Revenue would be a severe blow to our efforts in that direction.

When I announced that Reorganization Plan No. 1 would be submitted to the Congress, I expressed my intention of making the Bureau of Internal Revenue a blue-ribbon career civil-service organization. Approval of the plan will be a significant step toward this objective.

By placing the principal operating offices in the Bureau under the merit system, the stature, prestige, and incentive of the career service will be enhanced immeasurably. The fact that the chief operating offices are filled solely under the merit principle will strengthen morale and increase efficiency throughout the organization. In short, there will be a revitalization of the entire career service in the Bureau.

The most careful selection process will be used in making appointments and promotions to the offices provided for in Reorganization Plan No. 1. Qualification standards will be prescribed most carefully by the Civil Service Commission. As part of the process of rating candidates who may qualify for the offices, full investigations will be made into their character, administrative ability, and technical competence. No recommendations from political organizations will be solicited.

Plan No. 1 will also help to assure the weeding out of the unfit. By authorizing an additional Assistant Commissioner, the plan makes possible an inspection service that will be responsible directly and solely to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. This strong, independent inspection service will speed up the process of discovering any inefficiency and any digressions from the highest standards of integrity.

I enlist your continuing aid, and the aid of the Congress in every measure to promote and improve the standards of the civil-service merit system. The one great step the Congress can now take toward that objective is to approve Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Arthur T. Esgate, of Arizona, to be Production Credit Commissioner of the Farm Credit Administration.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

George F. Kennan, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, vice Admiral Alan G. Kirk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Eric A. Johnston to be a member of the Public Advisory Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUTUAL SECURITY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of W. John Kenney, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED NATIONS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William H. Draper, Jr., to be a Special Representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to be also the representative of the United States of America to the seventh session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Hon. Harry E. Pratt, to be United States district judge for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Clemente Ruiz Nazario, to be United States judge for the district of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William W. Hart, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard L. Doyle to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified immediately.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 13, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 12 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment as chaplains of the Regular Army, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

James W. Helt, O956569.
Kenneth G. Irwin, O958879.
Edwin A. Jones, O932215.
Emil F. Kapusta, O962469.
James W. Morrill, O1547724.
Frank C. Riley, O931557.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, and Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

Paul E. Beckman, JAGC, O993253.
James M. Burlingame, JAGC, O991775.
Joseph C. Chandler, JAGC, O993520.
Vernon M. Culpepper, JAGC, O993509.
Eugene L. Grimm, JAGC, O2209796.
James R. Harrington, JAGC, O992433.
Heyward G. Jeffers, Jr., JAGC, O991776.
Dwan V. Kerig, JAGC, O1848579.
Kenneth J. Mackley, JAGC, O991783.
Thomas C. Oldham, JAGC, O992434.
Harry E. Robbins, Jr., JAGC, O993380.
Wade B. Vannoy, Jr., JAGC, O992435.
Dennis A. York, JAGC, O947850.

To be second lieutenants

Mary J. Damitz, WAC, L1020604.
Beverly J. Lott, WAC, L1020610.
Evelyn L. Ross, WAC, L1020615.
Joan F. Ruddy, WAC, L1020616.
Virginia M. Schneider, WAC, L1020618.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

John E. Carr III, O2202209.
Harold E. Durst, O953802.
Robert C. Gunsel, O2200513.
Alexander H. Hunt, O959884.
George H. Kilpatrick, O957434.
Alan Kinghorn, O2204108.
John M. McCreary, O1031664.
Vincent T. McKelvey, O2012038.
James E. Murphy, O1686615.
Juneus T. Oba, O2210336.
Fred A. Osterhout, Jr., O2210281.
Charles L. Phillips, O2200319.
Dan D. Stedham, O964664.
Charles R. White, O2204177.

To be second lieutenants

John F. Ahern, Jr., O1339027.
Robert H. Beck, O958599.
James C. Bowden, Jr., O969932.
Robert U. Boyd, Jr., O975670.
Robert W. Brownlee, O2104085.
Morris C. Cannon, O2209341.
Jack L. Conn, O967616.
James W. Donald, O948819.
Roy H. Duggan, Jr., O546859.
William A. Feek, Jr., O971106.
John B. Finazzo, O2210194.
James L. Gaither, O1178475.
David E. Hartigan, Jr., O2026383.
John G. Hayes, O2014519.
Harrison W. Hodgkins, O1873668.
James L. Hudson, O1915526.
Norman A. Jensen, O2210199.
William M. Jones, O971011.
Donald M. Judd, O2002983.
Roy E. Kimble, O2205074.
William S. Martin, O1878847.
James M. May, O1878753.
John M. McKinley, O1862110.
Elidio J. Monoriti, O1874112.
Paul J. B. Murphy, Jr., O1651391.
George W. Peterson, O948138.
Frederick A. Pieper, O961168.
Hugh H. Riddle, O1686746.
Theodore S. Riggs, Jr., O1924878.
Howard R. Rockhold, Jr., O2028382.
Alonza O. C. Sargent, O957942.
Richard B. Schaefer, O2211833.
Leroy W. Smith, O2200013.
Roddy L. Smith, O946163.
Henry J. Vandermause, O973750.
Edwin S. N. Wong, O1692447.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Edward L. Arnold	William A. Rathbone, O2003101
Victor A. Cullen	Carl P. Rodolph, Jr., O1915286
Jack J. Gardner	Richard P. Talley
Charles A. Gatzka.	Thomas A. Tokarz
Amos D. Glad	Samuel B. Whigham, Jr.
Richard W. Goodrum, O2003063	
Robert P. Loshbough	

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARKANSAS

Otis W. Gilleylen, Murfreesboro, Ark., in place of C. L. Duncan, removed.

CALIFORNIA

Joseph M. Davis, Campo, Calif., in place of F. C. Palmer, transferred.

Marcel F. Braquet, Gilroy, Calif., in place of R. M. Martin, retired.

Richard M. Mollin, Pleasanton, Calif., in place of H. H. Dietrich, deceased.

COLORADO

Bill E. Osborn, Bristol, Colo., in place of W. A. Russom, retired.

Henry G. Klein, La Junta, Colo., in place of C. M. Wilson, retired.

CONNECTICUT

Ruth T. Lathrop, Andover, Conn., in place of H. O. Gatchell, retired.

FLORIDA

Frank Stacy Ledbetter, Jr., Kissimmee, Fla., in place of E. A. Cantrell, deceased.

IDAHO

Wendell J. Bailey, Albion, Idaho, in place of W. M. Sears, retired.

ILLINOIS

Van W. Isom, Coulterville, Ill., in place of H. H. Kattenbraker, retired.

Denver C. Bailey, Creston, Ill., in place of J. T. Conour, resigned.

Lois M. Kilbride, Essex, Ill., in place of M. C. Schosser, retired.

Lee J. Boston, Palatine, Ill., in place of William Kehe, Jr., transferred.

Thomas A. Denton, Pinckneyville, Ill., in place of M. O. Harriss, transferred.

Myrtie M. Houghtby, Shabbona, Ill., in place of V. J. Bale, transferred.

INDIANA

Albert N. Smith, Fort Wayne, Ind., in place of C. F. Dreisbach, retired.

Marian L. Keyes, Orland, Ind., in place of F. L. Linendoll, deceased.

IOWA

Allan M. Stebbins, Buffalo, Iowa, in place of L. M. Adams, retired.

William A. Mannasmith, Coin, Iowa, in place of B. L. Yance, deceased.

Robert M. Smith, Lamont, Iowa, in place of J. L. Carr, retired.

Robert J. Lind, Lisbon, Iowa, in place of J. E. McHugh, retired.

Charles H. Howe, Nichols, Iowa, in place of W. R. Schmitt, retired.

William F. White, Oakdale, Iowa, in place of I. G. Gatton, deceased.

Donald R. Kinne, Tingley, Iowa, in place of L. E. Williams, deceased.

Leo F. Faust, Westfield, Iowa, in place of W. B. Neal, resigned.

KANSAS

Quinten J. Hickert, Clayton, Kans., in place of V. W. Brooks, transferred.

Gladys M. Miesner, Oberlin, Kans., in place of E. W. Coldren, retired.

Ralph L. Stadel, Quenemo, Kans., in place of Aletha Hawkins, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Roger T. Easley, Nicholasville, Ky., in place of Joe Keefe, retired.

John D. Buckner, Shelbyville, Ky., in place of M. T. Fullenwider, retired.

MAINE

Harold M. Horne, Dixfield, Maine, in place of R. G. Kidder, resigned.

Kenneth J. Libby, Prouts Neck, Maine, in place of V. T. Shaw, retired.

MARYLAND

Julia B. McNamara, Washington Grove, Md., in place of E. B. Spilman, removed.

MASSACHUSETTS

Gerald F. Lennerton, Leicester, Mass., in place of W. J. Powers, removed.

John E. Reinhardt, Wareham, Mass., in place of J. E. Marvelle, retired.

MICHIGAN

Sylvester F. Dehn, Belding, Mich., in place of Lucille Ledger, resigned.

Daniel C. Lamoreaux, Lawton, Mich., in place of Irwell Brody, retired.

George K. Dechow, Maple City, Mich., in place of H. A. Davis, removed.

Morienne L. Thatcher, Ravenna, Mich., in place of F. D. Kruger, retired.

Rufus E. Keithly, South Haven, Mich., in place of H. E. Merritt, retired.

Leonard E. Pennanen, Toivola, Mich., in place of Albin Lahikainen, deceased.

Sherwood P. Sergeant, Vernon, Mich., in place of Iva Wampler, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Edmund H. Winter, Adrian, Minn., in place of L. C. Roerig, resigned.

Edith L. Hansen, Eyota, Minn., in place of C. J. Keefe, transferred.

Gordon W. Dysthe, Iona, Minn., in place of L. J. Hilger, removed.

Derald C. Groth, Ogema, Minn., in place of J. M. Wozniak, resigned.

Leo D. Gaffaney, Villard, Minn., in place of L. A. Peterson, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

William B. Schumpert, Amory, Miss., in place of Romie Green, retired.

Emmette Ross Clifton, Jr., Ethel, Miss., in place of J. H. Middlebrook, resigned.
John C. Garner, Newhebron, Miss., in place of D. A. Myers, retired.
Temple G. Broadus, Purvis, Miss., in place of A. M. Avery, transferred.
Hiram Wilton Griffin, Vardaman, Miss., in place of J. E. Morgan, resigned.
Marvin Massey, Wesson, Miss., in place of A. E. McGee, transferred.

MISSOURI

Henry L. Long, Belleview, Mo., in place of Edna Keesling, removed.
George C. Brammer, La Plata, Mo., in place of N. E. Young, Sr., retired.
Walter L. White, Jr., Lincoln, Mo., in place of H. F. Brill, resigned.
Robert W. Bell, Nevada, Mo., in place of D. D. Graves, retired.
Minnie L. Manning, Pineville, Mo., in place of P. R. Viles, transferred.
Elmer S. Workman, Portageville, Mo., in place of O. A. Cook, retired.

NEBRASKA

Ivan W. Newbold, Minden, Nebr., in place of Emil Nelson, retired.
Inez Logsdon, Orleans, Nebr., in place of J. A. Dunlay, transferred.

NEW MEXICO

Faris E. Roberts, Clayton, N. Mex., in place of A. L. England, retired.
Joseph W. Burns, Tatum, N. Mex., in place of J. A. Foreman, resigned.

NEW YORK

John P. Fallon, Jr., Ardsley-on-Hudson, N. Y., in place of W. E. Sweetman, deceased.
James A. Bonesteel, Cairo, N. Y., in place of C. E. Canniff, removed.
Cora F. Davison, Highview, N. Y., in place of G. D. Davison, deceased.
Margaret A. Kneuer, Industry, N. Y., in place of G. B. Allen, resigned.
Kenneth L. Struble, Livonia, N. Y., in place of M. E. Murphy, retired.
Herman Wood, Long Beach, N. Y., in place of Fannie Schwartz, deceased.
John M. Southard, Massapequa Park, N. Y., in place of D. J. O'Rourke, resigned.
Donald J. Bosworth, McDonough, N. Y., in place of Wilson Sherman, transferred.
Robert C. Tatem, Old Westbury, N. Y., in place of P. C. Tatem, retired.
Steven A. Vamosy, Stamford, N. Y., in place of E. F. Govern, retired.
Rene A. Devillers, Schenevus, N. Y., in place of F. C. Beams, transferred.
Andrew J. Mohan, Stillwater, N. Y., in place of A. N. Cisler, transferred.

NORTH CAROLINA

Raleigh J. Putnam, Cherryville, N. C., in place of J. W. Mosteller, resigned.
Howard B. Pate, Jr., Spring Lake, N. C., in place of F. E. Williams, removed.
Thelma M. Hollowell, Winfall, N. C., in place of W. G. Hollowell, deceased.

NORTH DAKOTA

John B. Wright, Antler, N. Dak., in place of Benjamin Wright, retired.
Francis L. Gerou, Mooreton, N. Dak., in place of W. F. Henger, transferred.
Robert G. Brown, Wimbledon, N. Dak., in place of L. E. Peterson, resigned.

OHIO

Herbert E. McCracken, Centerburg, Ohio, in place of R. S. Keadey, transferred.
Robert E. Manniko, Conneaut, Ohio, in place of J. M. Paull, retired.
Clarence E. Scarr, Coshocton, Ohio, in place of J. W. Johnston, retired.
Kenneth E. Caldwell, Freeport, Ohio, in place of R. R. Pettay, retired.
Charles C. Achauer, Logan, Ohio, in place of F. G. Brown, deceased.
Richard E. Arehart, Lucas, Ohio, in place of Hoyt Leiter, resigned.
Richard E. Staley, Miamisburg, Ohio, in place of F. E. Treon, removed.
Vernard E. Mason, Ney, Ohio, in place of C. A. Goller, transferred.
Newman E. Kincaid, Peoria, Ohio, in place of W. I. Hamilton, retired.
Max D. Sowers, Roseville, Ohio, in place of C. S. Myers, retired.
Arthur B. Bishop, Wellston, Ohio, in place of C. M. Hogan, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Edd Miskel, Camargo, Okla., in place of K. L. Andrews, removed.
Winfred C. Lister, Hammon, Okla., in place of T. J. Hammons, transferred.

OREGON

Thomas G. Southwell, Molalla, Oreg., in place of S. B. Powers, transferred.
Dorris G. Bennett, Mulino, Oreg., in place of S. A. Howard, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul F. Petrillo, Birdsboro, Pa., in place of B. L. Nagle, retired.
William P. Kelly, Jr., Clarks Summit, Pa., in place of M. A. King, retired.
Edmund P. Lawlor, Homestead, Pa., in place of J. D. McConegly, deceased.
Charles B. McNamee, Pomeroy, Pa., in place of N. R. McNamee, deceased.
John Alvin Mills, Prospectville, Pa., in place of G. K. Neff, resigned.
Anthony N. Ricchezza, Upper Darby, Pa., in place of E. S. Thompson, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Margy G. Scarborough, Lynchburg, S. C., in place of J. W. Willis, retired.
Thomas S. Gettys, Rock Hill, S. C., in place of L. C. McFadden, retired.

TENNESSEE

Gray E. Vance, Bell Buckle, Tenn., in place of B. G. White, deceased.
John B. Hackworth, Richard City, Tenn., in place of J. T. McCabe, retired.
James S. Maxwell, Sherwood, Tenn., in place of J. D. Creson, resigned.

TEXAS

Florence B. Meadows, Anahuac, Texas, in place of M. E. Sims, resigned.

VERMONT

Edward W. Grover, Londonderry, Vt., in place of M. L. Grover, deceased.

VIRGINIA

John T. Phipps, Abingdon, Va., in place of I. M. Keller, retired.
Charles G. Patterson, Lyndhurst, Va., in place of D. D. Turner, resigned.
Robert C. Cutler, Newport News, Va., in place of R. P. Holt, retired.

WASHINGTON

Paul R. Rader, Ephrata, Wash., in place of D. C. Thiemens, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Michael Kandel, Montgomery, W. Va., in place of D. A. Kelly, retired.

WISCONSIN

Roy W. Williams, Brooklyn, Wis., in place of S. S. Chandler, transferred.
Edward J. Oldenburg, Lac du Flambeau, Wis., in place of J. A. Stewart, transferred.
Allen E. Duncanson, Mondovi, Wis., in place of E. L. Silverness, transferred.
William H. Taft, Necedah, Wis., in place of C. T. O'Brien, retired.
Byron F. Pope, Phillips, Wis., in place of E. E. Donovan, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 12 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

PUBLIC ADVISORY BOARD

Eric A. Johnston, of Washington, to be a member of the Public Advisory Board. (Established under title I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948.)

MUTUAL SECURITY

W. John Kenney, of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director for Mutual Security.

UNITED NATIONS

William H. Draper, Jr., of New York, now special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to be also the representative of the United States of America to the seventh session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Frederick L. Anderson, of California, to be deputy special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, pursuant to section 504 (a) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951.

James Clement Dunn, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to France.

Ellsworth Bunker, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

Cavendish W. Cannon, of Utah, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Portugal.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

To be a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Frederick C. Oechsner

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Jack R. Johnstone
Joseph W. Schutz.
Hugh N. Whitaker

To be consuls of the United States of America

Robert W. Bradbury — F. Taylor Gurney
Gillespie S. Evans — Henry L. Taylor

To be a consul of the United States of America

Dudley C. Bostwick

To be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Leonard Unger

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Richard S. Leach
James H. Roberton

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Harry E. Pratt to be United States district judge for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

Clemente Ruiz Nazario to be United States judge for district of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William W. Hart to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Illinois.

Howard L. Doyle to be United States attorney for the southern district of Illinois.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for transfer in the Regular Army of the United States, as indicated:

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Maj. Edward Harry Kurth, O21807, United States Army.

The following-named officer for appointment, by transfer, in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States:

Capt. John Harvey Holt, O37814, United States Army.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, without specification of branch, arm, or service:

Lt. Col. James Martin Hanley, Jr., O41688, Judge Advocate General's Corps, United States Army.

Second Lt. John Charles George Rennie, O59767, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

The nomination of Charles Clarke White Allan, et al., for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 14, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Charles Clarke White Allan, which is shown on page 1013, and ending with the name of Phyllis Helene Fauble, which is shown on page 1019.

REGULAR AIR FORCE

The nominations of Eugene R. Alt et al., for appointment in the Regular Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 14, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Eugene R. Alt, which is shown on page 1012, and ending with the name of David D. Zink II, which is shown on page 1013.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Kirby P. Ambler	Kenneth D. Lindquist
Rex D. Andrews	Fred M. Lurie
Paul T. Armistead	Benjamin G. Mattox, Jr.
Earl E. Bethke, Jr.	"J" "H" Mohrman
Closkey L. Blair, Jr.	Vincent D. Morrison
Earl R. Blue	Raymond A. Nelson
Charles H. Brewer, Jr.	Wallace C. Palmer
Henry Bowers	Robert G. Pipkin, Jr.
William C. Bostic III	Sheldon J. Plager
Carl S. Crittenden	William S. Pregnall
Daniel W. Davis	Tad T. Riley
Wallace F. Flitter	Andrew T. Sheets
Edward W. Fox	Norman L. Sothan
Edward C. Franzen, Jr.	George M. Starr
James W. P. Gregory, Jr.	Raymond W. Stein
Dale W. Johnson	George M. Stephens, Jr.
Jack E. Koslow	James L. Whitney
Edwin F. Laak	

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be ensigns in the Navy in lieu of ensigns in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct name.

Wilbert M. Fiander
Lucio W. Hill

Guy J. Lookabaugh (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

James W. Firoved
Albert E. Morris

LIEUTENANT

Louis R. Krasno

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

James E. Banta, Jr.
Franklyn C. Hill, Jr.
William C. E. Pfischner, Jr.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Richard V. Peterson

LIEUTENANTS

John F. Bucher	William A. Peterson
William A. Monroe, Jr.	Leon G. Suehs
Merlin E. Naylor	Simon W. Susewind

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Fred M. Amman	Raymond "W" Millbourn
John R. Anderson	Charles "S" Scruggs
Charles W. Cogar	
Frank J. Malone, Jr.	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grade indicated in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Paul L. Austin
Elwin N. Sire

The following-named to be ensigns to the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Mary P. Beaulieu	Elnora J. McCarty
Mary A. Conley	Alice J. Miller
Beverly J. Denison	Mary I. Rignall
Irene C. Knapka	Ann Sefchok
Elizabeth V. Lurenz	Mary L. Steele
Frances A. McCann	Mary J. Wathen

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Alice M. Boogaerts
Ann O. Watson

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Robert T. Stivers, Jr., et al., for appointment in the Marine Corps, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on February 25, 1952, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert T. Stivers, Jr., which is shown on page 1331, and ending with the name of Ralph B. Neal, which is shown on page 1332.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Ernest M. Echols, Amity.
Cora M. Wise, Thornton.
Kenneth R. Bradley, Winslow.

COLORADO

Virginia M. Gabriel, Frederick.

FLORIDA

Helen B. McWhinney, Lake Hamilton.

GEORGIA

Mittie K. Carter, Lake Park.
Jack H. Bowman, Rock Spring.
Hugh W. Hudsputh, Temple.
Norment A. Barnes, Waycross.

IDAHO

Richard D. Gibler, Kamiah.
Arnold L. Runyan, Wendell.

ILLINOIS

Mabel V. Vaughan, Cropsey.
Leona L. Schmidt, Fieldon.
Grace M. McKeon, Gifford.
Robert W. Straus, Island Lake.
Leroy M. Moore, Lake Forest.
Carl V. Fellers, Pana.
John F. Hora, Richmond.
Ralph E. Plappert, Sorento.
Forest Wayne Neal, Tuscola.
Ernest J. Bammann, Washburn.
William E. Maher, Waverly.

INDIANA

Harold K. Nutty, Brookville.
Milton D. Freeman, Ellettsville.
Edward T. Jansen, Osceola.

IOWA

Verlyn I. Gemberling, Alburnett.
Anton E. Rasmussen, Forest City.
Herbert H. Wiebel, Lowden.
Luther R. Horn, Moulton.
Cecil W. Campbell, Ollie.

KENTUCKY

Lawrence L. Aylor, Florence.
Irene G. Gulley, Sharpsburg.

LOUISIANA

Roxie E. Eeds, Cullen.
Travis E. Albritton, Farmerville.
Ashton J. Lafargue, Keithville.
Huey G. Ragus, Pioneer.

MINNESOTA

Mel Sheridan Dale Swanson, Argyle.
Beatrice M. Dumas, Long Lake.
Leroy W. Rodgers, Minneiska.

MISSISSIPPI

William P. Loper, Forest.
Marion A. Ousley, Goodman.
James Cecil Young, Nettleton.
Stanton W. Johnson, Richton.

MISSOURI

Marion A. Mitchell, Aldrich.
Jessie L. Coleman, Dalton.
Alfred L. York, Fort Leonard Wood.
Gladys G. Simmons, Laclede.
Charles J. Shaw, Oronogo.

NEBRASKA

Glen L. Christensen, Newman Grove.
Harold J. Hoeppner, North Loup.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

David L. Jones, Bartlett.
Henry J. Proulx, Franklin.
John S. Gould, Hanover.
Donald T. Bonnette, Hillsboro.
William F. Byrne, Winchester.

NORTH CAROLINA

Milton N. McLaughlin, Cleveland.
James W. Nantz, Sr., Mount Holly.
Annie P. Southerland, Willard.

OHIO

Paul D. Smith, De Graff.
Robert W. Schroeder, Elmore.
Gerald D. Keller, Oberlin.
Lawrence D. Beardmore, Salem.
Effie R. Miller, Terrace Park.

OREGON

Bernice R. Reuterskiold, Bonneville.
Clifford V. Bride, Sheridan.
Lucille M. Schultz, Westfir.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph J. Habeeb, Chinchilla.
Richard Downing, Jr., Conneaut Lake Park.
Clyde M. Buzard, Ellwood City.
Martin H. Liggins, Florin.
Dorina B. Torris, Green Ridge.
Natalie G. Landenberger, Holmes.
Marie G. Hastings, Penndel.
Olga T. Graham, Russellton.
Guy V. Kingree, Jr., Smoketown.
Dean L. Musick, Youngstown.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Orin H. Garner, Jonesville.

TEXAS

Helen K. Humphries, Balmorhea.
Joel Parker Carroll, Bryan.
Gurley N. Sellers, Coolidge.
Thomas L. Cheatham, Edgewood.
Floyd S. May, Iowa Park.
Paul D. Cauley, Sr., Kingsville.
Almer D. Woods, Jr., Marquez.
Roy L. McGuire, Seymour.

VERMONT

Frederick R. Rousseau, North Hero.

VIRGINIA

Marian Irene Davenport, Lancaster.
Robert E. Booker, Jr., Lottsburg.
Rolla Wallace Rosen, Staunton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the only source of light and hope in these days that are shrouded in darkness, and as we look wistfully and anxiously toward the future, grant that we may know the secret of triumphant and joyous living.

May we daily reaffirm our faith in Thee, confident that none of the hopes and longings for peace, which Thou dost vouchsafe unto our minds and hearts, are too lofty to be fulfilled by Thy divine wisdom and power.

Show us how we may strengthen the bonds of brotherhood. May our hearts go out in sympathy and our hands in helpfulness to men and nations everywhere in their struggles and sorrows.

Enable us by Thy grace to gain for ourselves and others the mastery over all trials and tribulations and may the spirit of our blessed Lord be the strength of our souls, His truth our shield, His companionship our joy.

In His name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2697. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today, after disposition of the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered, and to extend my remarks at that point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HISTORY REPEATS

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, some 1,919 years ago, Judas was given 30 pieces of silver as a payoff for betraying the Saviour of us all.

Yesterday, while testifying before a congressional committee, Presidential Appointee Newbold Morris admitted that he had been given $30,000 as his share of a shady tanker deal in which oil was transported to our far-eastern enemies—oil for the tanks of China.

Because of Judas, the noblest leader of all time died.

Because of Newbold Morris—and men like him—an untold number of American boys died.

History has only biting contempt for Judas.

What history will have to say of Newbold Morris only time will tell.

Thirty pieces of silver.

Thirty thousand dollars.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 23]

Aandahl	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Miller, Calif.
Addonizio		Mitchell
Armstrong	Halleck	Morrison
Barden	Harden	Moulder
Barrett	Hart	Murdock
Battle	Harvey	Murray, Wis.
Beall	Havenner	O'Konski
Blatnik	Hébert	Patterson
Boykin	Hedrick	Potter
Buchanan	Heffernan	Powell
Buckley	Heller	Rains
Camp	Herter	Roberts
Carnahan	Hope	Rogers, Mass.
Case	Horan	Sadlak
Celler	Hull	Sheehan
Chatham	Hunter	Sikes
Cole, Kans.	Irving	Staggers
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Sutton
Coudert	Kee	Tackett
Cox	King, Calif.	Vorys
Dawson	Kluczynski	Walter
Deane	Lantaff	Weichel
Dempsey	Larcade	Welch
Dollinger	Latham	Werdel
Doyle	McKinnon	Widnall
Fernandez	Mack, Ill.	Wood, Ga.
Flood	Madden	Yates
Gamble	Martin, Iowa	
Greenwood	Merrow	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures may sit during general debate in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as to time for general debate.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think we might have not to exceed 2 hours.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman give those of us some time who are in favor of restoring the appropriation for the Small Defense Plants Administration?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. I may say that I have no applications at all for time up to this minute; so, following the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that we have not to exceed 2 hours of general debate, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that general debate on the bill continue for not to exceed 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6947, with Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this deficiency bill—we call it a supplemental bill, but it is really a deficiency bill—is a test of the adequacy of the regular bills which have been passed during the preceding session, for the current fiscal year. If the bills have been cut too deeply and unwisely, we can expect a large deficiency bill. On the other hand, if they have not been cut enough, which is usually the case. We do not have such imposing requests for supplemental appropriations.

But, Mr. Chairman, judged by that criterion, the items fall into two classes. In fact the estimates for deficiencies in every supplemental bill, in every deficiency bill, should be considered under two categories, and that is especially true in this case. So, with that in view, I would like to call your attention very briefly to the distinction between the two classes of appropriations in this bill.

I might say by way of preface that the total estimates submitted to the committee aggregated approximately a billion dollars, or $1,069,542,625. We bring them back to the House with the recommendation that only $970,192,943 be appropriated. That is a reduction in the estimates submitted to us of practically $100,000,000, or specifically $99,349,682.

Of the two classes of estimates, one is for items on which the Committee on Appropriations had some latitude as to recommendation, a possibility that we might reduce the amounts proposed. The other is on items on which we had practically no latitude. They were for purposes over which we had little, if any, control, and in which, consequently, we were unable to make any material reduction.

Taking up the latter class first, those in which we had no option but to appropriate, there were the claims by persons of Japanese ancestry. It is quite an item. It runs over $14,000,000. These are claims for persons of Japanese ancestry who were dispossessed, taken out of their homes during the Japanese war for obvious military reasons, but frequently at great injustice to the expatriates. These claims have been processed and adjudicated. They have been submitted to the proper authority, and the courts have decided that these amounts of money are due; that they have a legitimate claim against the Government for damage in these amounts for loss incurred in the unfortunate transfer from their homes to concentration camps, and therefore the committee recommends payment in full on claims aggregating $14,800,000. It is an amount over which we have no control whatever. The courts have said it is due, and we must pay it.

Then there is the item for the support of United States prisons. No one knows how many prisoners will be convicted and incarcerated. It depends on the number of cases which result in convictions in the courts of the United States. If they commit a large number of people to prison we must support them. We have no choice in the matter. We must accept the figures based on the prison population. Therefore, while we nominally cut them $25,000, we have in effect given them the full amount requested.

On Federal airport claims, the estimates originate in the requisition by the military authorities of private airports for the use of Government which are alleged to have taken over their facilities and damaged their runways, and otherwise interfered with ownership control to their financial disadvantage to the extent of $701,170.

The courts handed down decisions sustaining the contentions of the plaintiffs and the committee had no choice but to provide the appropriation which we have recommended, the full amount.

On Federal aid to highways, I think most of us will agree there is no money better spent than the money we spend on highways, but we have a system which is highly unsatisfactory in that it does not permit an annual review by the Congress. Not a dollar should be taken out of the Federal Treasury which has not been submitted for scrutiny and which has not been processed by the Committee on Appropriations and passed by the House of Representatives.

However, under the law they may go ahead and commit money in advance, and then when Congress meets, we have no choice but to allow the money. So we have a token cut, merely to let them know we passed by, but that money must be appropriated and we include it in our recommendation.

There were also various pay raises. We provided in the regular bills ample money to pay all salaries of employees of the United States. Subsequently Congress came along, and in its wisdom, or lack of wisdom, raised the pay of everybody, after the original pay roll had been provided. It is statutory, and we have no choice but to provide the amount approved by Congress.

We are criticized for the tremendous amount of money we are appropriating. We are criticized for the increase in the payment of Federal salaries. But the Committee on Appropriations pleads confession and avoidance, "We would not have appropriated this money, but Congress directed that it be appropriated, and we have no choice but to comply and propose appropriation of the required amount, $26,640,000."

The same situation obtains on postoffice rates. We had provided all the money necessary for the postal transportation, and along comes the Interstate Commerce Commission, and under the authority vested in it by the Congress of the United States, increases postal rates. What can the Committee on Appropriations do? We are criticized for these increases. We are criticized for making this appropriation. We are criticized for spending so much money. But the Interstate Commerce Commission has spoken, and we have no choice but to provide the money.

Under the employees' compensation fund, the proposition here is merely a question of how much is due under the law. The report indicates that the amount provided in the regular bill for the payment of employees' compensation is $2,200,000 short. So, we have necessarily recommended the full amount.

Then on the provision for fighting forest fires. When a fire starts in a stand of valuable timber, one of our most valuable national resources, we have to put it out. And it costs us $3,000,000 to do it. It is a bargain at that price. We save billions of dollars worth of timber. We have no choice in the matter but to allow the full amount, and again we recommend the comparatively small appropriation of $3,000,000.

With reference to the Veterans' Administration, here are items for the benefit of veterans and their dependents such as pensions, readjustments, indemnities, and indicating that the regular appropriations are $285,800,000 short of what the law requires. Again, we have no choice but to provide the full amount required by law.

Under increased pay costs carried in the last chapter of the bill, we must meet statutory raises. Accordingly we provide the money required by law.

That totals $906,793,943, an amount over which we have practically no control whatever.

In the rest of the bill, where reductions were possible, we have made substantial reductions. These reductions have been concurred in by a majority of the committee on both sides of the table. We do not believe they will interfere with the service and we trust they will have the approval of all Members of the House who believe in an economical administration of Government funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, when we are considering the bill under the 5-minute rule, it is my intention to offer an amendment to cut out from this bill the language relative to what is known as the Burke Airport, which you will find on page 4 of the bill.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, spending any further money upon this particular airport is worse than a waste of money. It is endangering the lives of a great many people in the most rapidly growing area in the Washington general vicinity. I refer to Fairfax County, which is fast becoming known as the bedroom of Washington. They say that because of all of those great apartment installations and homes that are found in that community. I say it is worse than a waste of the $50,000,000 which it will ultimately cost. I say it is a waste not only of the $50,000,000, but we are trying to foist upon the people of Fairfax County, most of whom, through their trade associations, board of county supervisors, and school district organizations, oppose this particular airport. Why, in the name of common sense, should we spend $50,000,000—and some people say this will run more than that amount—when just 30 miles from this Capitol we have the great new airport at Friendship, which is begging for the surplus traffic? Friendship is not being used more than 30 percent of its capacity, if that much, yet here is a story in Life magazine stating that it is proposed, in order to salvage the pride of the Washington Board of Trade, or something of that nature, to put in another $50,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in cold cash, toward establishing an auxiliary airport for Washington.

What have you got out there in those rocky hills in that community which has been selected as the site by the Civil Aeronautics Authority? They did not even make drill tests as to whether or not there might be considerable rock underlying that place. They made no such tests, yet they ask us in this bill today to give them a further million dollars, and more, for the acquisition of more land for that site.

Now, remember it will be said that we have already put up a million dollars for this purpose. Yes; we did that last year, but today we can kill this proposal and it will only cost the taxpayers of America $132,000, or thereabouts, in money which

has been expended. That is less than one-third of 1 percent of what is proposed to be expended upon this absolutely unnecessary airport.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In just a moment, if you please.

I am personally interested in this from two viewpoints. First, I am looking at this $50,000,000 which, in my opinion, will be absolutely wasted, when you have Andrews Field, 14 miles or so from Washington; and you have Friendship Airport, 10 miles this side of Baltimore, connected with Washington by an all-land route, 30 miles from the Capitol. I am interested personally in the fact that I have some of my relations living in that vicinity who, along with thousands of other people, do not like the idea of these runways pointing directly at one of the most heavily settled sections of Fairfax County. They remember Newark too well.

If we follow up this proposal we may reenact what happened at Newark airfield. I do not think you want to do that. I think the Members of this House want to give this whole proposition another thorough looking into.

Let me recall to you first, every organization in that particular county that I know of is opposed to this expenditure. They are opposed not only from the viewpoint of the waste of taxpayers' funds, but because of the fact that it would create a blight upon the area immediately surrounding this proposed 4,000-acre site. The FHA just announced a month or so ago that they would not insure property located within a certain distance of airports.

Why should we place another airport 14 miles airline from the Washington National Airport? Why should we expend $50,000,000 if not more when we have this great 4,500-acre site at Baltimore already constructed? And I think you will find today that the people of Baltimore are more than willing to permit this surplus air traffic from the National Airport to use their field; they want it.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. When I fly from Detroit to Washington does the gentleman expect me to land somewhere near Baltimore and then drive all the way to Washington?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, for it calls back to my mind that I have not brought out a very salient fact. Friendship Airport when the present road under construction is completed will be within 40 minutes' driving time from the Statler Hotel by an all-land route. Burke airport, according to certificates of the police department of that county, is from 19 to 34 minutes' driving time on clear dry days from the Statler Hotel to the cloverleaf intersection 6 miles from Burke. You will have to add 10 minutes to that time to traverse the 6-mile access road, so the driving time between the airport and the Statler Hotel would be from 25 to 44 minutes. Just to save 8 minutes' driving time we are asked to spend about $50,000,000. It might be more convenient, but it would be a mighty expensive convenience.

Mr. DINGELL. I am talking about 19 minutes as against 45, and no amount of explaining will eliminate the difference.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Perhaps the gentleman knows more than the local people about it.

Mr. DINGELL. I know where Friendship Airport is, and I know where this Burke airport is going to be.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Let me read from these official records of the police department of that county on a number of different occasions when they made trial trips and took the time: 21 minutes from the cloverleaf which is at the end of the 6-mile access road to the Statler Hotel, 21 minutes on one trial, 23 on another, 34 on a third, 25 minutes on a fourth; here is one at 22 minutes, another one at 24 minutes, one at 30 minutes. Add to that 10 minutes and you will have the driving time required from the Burke Airport to the Statler Hotel—about 6 minutes less than the time it takes to go to the Friendship Airport from the Statler Hotel.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I wish to ask the gentleman if there is any question in his mind but what the Washington National Airport traffic reached the saturation point as far back as 1948 and that there must be an additional Washington airport.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The first part of the gentleman's question I agree with; we do need additional space, but we do not need an additional airport when we have Friendship Airport 30 miles from here ready and anxious to take care of this surplus air traffic.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I wonder if the gentleman knows how far it is from the downtown area of Detroit to the Willow Run Airport?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The answer is an average of 55 minutes driving time.

Mr. TABER. It would be a long way from 40 miles.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I do know that from LaGuardia Field, for example, it takes much longer than from Friendship to get downtown and with almost no exception to get from any large airport in the Nation would require from 30 to 50 minutes to get downtown in our larger cities.

Let me give you one more point. Remember that in case of war, the first object of the enemy is to knock out bridges. If the Potomac River Bridge over here were knocked out, what good would Burke Field be? But Friendship will still be there. Think that over. Is it not foolish to spend $50,000,000 more down there at Burke where nobody wants it, where the entire county is opposed to it, when the delegation from Virginia is very lukewarm, when Senator BYRD says he is very much opposed to it? Why inflict it upon those people when for $8,000,000 we could put Andrews Field into operation as a first-class auxiliary to the National Airport, if that line of thought would be followed.

Of course, these Army officers want to live here in comfortable surroundings. They perhaps do not want to go and establish themselves some place else.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Assuming that a few minutes were saved or gained in getting from the airport, considering the condition of the Federal Treasury and the high taxes we are paying, what justification is there to load on to the taxpayers such a tremendous cost as the Burke Airport would involve?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Absolutely none.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. When we have one reasonably close to handle the traffic.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. There is no justification at all. Here is one of these things we can pull out of now with only an expenditure of about $150,000 at the most. We have acquired land over there. The money is on deposit in the Federal court in Alexandria. The Government may own up to $800,000 worth of that land, but it can dispose of it and get out from under.

Appropriate this additional $1,400,000 as requested here and next year they will be in here for another $2,000,000 because they have again estimated wrongly as they have previously.

The question occurs to me, Mr. Chairman, just who does want this airport?

Nobody out there seems to want it. I think we should look into that, I think we should look into a lot of things before we put further money into this matter.

These are my reasons, Mr. Chairman, for asking the committee to cut this out of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss at this time an appropriation for the Small Defense Plants Administration. Last year the Congress passed unanimously an amendment to the defense-production bill setting up the Small Defense Plants Administration which was patterned after the most successful agency that was set up during World War II to help and otherwise assist the smaller concerns in the United States.

We drew from the experience and the trials and errors of that fine organization and developed the best set-up that it was possible for us to develop to help the smaller concerns in this present emergency. The Small Defense Plants Administration has already been in operation. The President selected Gen. Telford Taylor as Administrator. The President could not have selected a better man than Mr. Taylor for this position. His background and experience

are ideal for a position of this kind. He is doing a wonderful job and will be doing a better job if given the power that Congress said last year would be given to him.

Briefly, the larger corporations do not need an agency to assist them. They have all kinds of people here in Washington at all times; they do not need any agency. I am told that one of the large corporations of the country has 70 representatives here in Washington, D. C., just one concern daily contacting the Members of the House and the Senate and the different administrative agencies. That is just one large corporation. You can multiply that not only 25 times but 50 times to arrive at the number of representatives here representing the larger concerns.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Will the gentleman from Texas give us the name of the concern that has 70 representatives here?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; General Motors. Check up for yourself and find out.

Mr. BUSBEY. I just wanted it for information.

Mr. PATMAN. It is not an overstatement; it is possibly an understatement.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. I am informed by the UAW, in its relationship with plants in the United States, that 80 percent of the plants have less than 500 men; 64 percent have less than 200.

Now, if you want to talk about being for small business and throw this out the window, you are certainly doing some double talking in this House.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. This is small-business day in the House of Representatives. Will the gentleman tell us how the members of this committee, Democrats and Republicans, feel about the approach of this agency?

Mr. PATMAN. The Committee on Small Business of the House, 11 members, voted unanimously for it. This bill has bipartisan support. It is not a bill of the Democrats nor the Republicans; it is a bill supported by both Democrats and Republicans on the floor of this House. There is no difference of opinion between us on this particular bill, and certainly we should not fail to carry through what we have already voted.

Now, concerning the larger organizations, I have never known an organization—this is a broad statement, but I say it deliberately after much careful consideration—I have never known a big national organization, and I will name a couple of them, I do not mind that, like the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers—they have representatives who are very fine, outstanding people; they have got to be or they would not have those positions. They are able, they are sincere, they are honorable. They want to do the right thing all the time. And as long as there is no conflict of interest between big business and little business they get along fine. But I challenge any Member of this House to stand up and ask me to yield to him and say that he has ever known of a time when there was a conflict of interest between big business and little business that they failed to take the side of the big man. I yield to anyone who knows of any statement of fact that will contradict that. Their membership is composed of probably 90 percent smaller concerns.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman contradicts it, I will yield to him. I am yielding to those who say they know of such a case.

Mr. BUSBEY. The way the gentleman puts it, he would put an onus on every Member of this House.

Mr. PATMAN. No.

Mr. BUSBEY. Since I have been here, I have never received any information that would verify your statement.

Mr. PATMAN. I will construe my words. I have that right and I am going to exercise it. I am not going to leave it to the gentleman to construe what I said. I said I have never known a Nation-wide organization composed of little fellows and big fellows where, in the case of a conflict of interest between big business and little business, they failed to take the side of the big man; or I will change it and say, that they ever took the side of the little man in case of such a conflict. That will make it easier on the gentleman, that they ever took the side of the little man. I do not believe anyone has ever heard of a case that will contradict that. That shows the necessity for an organization like this to help the little man. As the gentleman from New Jersey said, this is the small-business man's day in the House of Representatives. Let us go through and do something to help him, as we promised to do last year.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I believe the gentleman brought out here once before that some of the so-called small-business men's organizations are even financed and controlled by big business.

Mr. PATMAN. We have a bunch of fakes like that. There are a lot of fake small-business groups. I do not say all of them are. There are some of them that are good, fine small-business groups, but there are more fakes in proportion than any other proposals that I know of in the country. A lot of them are backed by big-business concerns, get their money from big-business concerns, and come to the Members of Congress and claim they represent little business. "Whose bread I eat, his song I sing." You have heard that. That is exactly what they do when it comes down to the point of doing something. They do it for the big man. The SDPA is not giving the little fellow an advantage, it is giving him an equal opportunity. This is a bill calling for equality of opportunity. That is all it does, it gives equality of opportunity. Who is opposed to that?

This organization can do a wonderful job in procuring supplies for the benefit of the armed services and in our national defense effort, and can use to the maximum extent these smaller concerns all over the United States that we badly need in the defense effort at this time.

This bill was not sent out from the executive offices downtown. It was not sent out from any agency downtown. It is not the creation of any bureaucrat. This is a product of the minds of the Members of the House and Senate of the United States. This is our own creation. It came out of our own committees without suggestion from anybody. It was developed from the experience of World War II, when a similar agency was used. So this is our own baby and we should support our own baby and do what we promised last year to do, by giving it the money and the support it is entitled to receive.

This act gives the Administrator five broad, fundamental functional areas: First, procurement, including assistance in obtaining prime and subcontracts, and acting itself as prime contractor whenever we give the agency a part of the revolving fund. It will be proposed here by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] I understand, to give them $10,000,000 in that fund. That fund will not be wasted. It will be used to good advantage. Not a penny of it will be lost. It will be paid back, and it will be a revolving fund. During World War II the Smaller War Plants Corporation only took a few prime contracts. But the fact that they had the power to take a prime contract meant that they would not have to take them. They could go ahead and negotiate with the large concerns, and get agreements on national defense work as to where they would put those contracts if the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which stay out, and let them have the contract. That was what was done. In the whole war, the Smaller War Plants Corporation spent only about $33,000,000 compared to an expenditure of about three or four hundred billion dollars during that time—an insignificant amount. The amount we spent here will be insignificant compared to the good that it will do in our national defense effort in strengthening the backbone of the small business institutions of the country. The small business institutions are the backbone of the country. So prime contracts are fundamental and we must have that $10,000,000 to put them into effect.

Second, assistance in obtaining scarce materials.

Third, financial assistance—loans from the RFC.

Fourth, consulting other agencies and formulating regulations on materials and other matters.

Fifth, provisions for technical and managerial information.

That is the point 4 part of this program domestically for small business. We believe in point 4 internationally—yes, and we believe in point 4 for the small-business concerns here at home.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman discuss what the Joint Committee on the Economic Report says about this agency?

Mr. PATMAN. The Joint Committee on the Economic Report said it should be continued, and that same joint committee recommended $10,000,000,000 be cut from the budget, but they will not discontinue the SDPA. Here is a way, I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri, that he can save more money that he is spending here. There are a great number of organizations—small-business agencies that you are appropriating money for, which would be worth a great deal more if they were connected with this organization. In other words, build this organization up and make it strong. Reduce the others where they will not be so effective. The Joint Economic Committee recommended that the other small-business agencies be transferred to the SDPA.

In that way, you will save a great deal of money, and you will save much more than the SDPA will cost. I recommend for the consideration of this great Committee on Appropriations that they make this organization a strong organization because it is a genuine small-business group to help genuine small-business organizations, and where any cutting is to be done, cut the others.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am just as much interested in small business as the gentleman from Texas who preceded me. The question before the House is: How can we best help small business? As a guide to the answer of that question let us consider what we are doing now for small business. May I say at the beginning, that with the exception of one or two subsidiary plants, I do not have anything except small business in my district. As a matter of fact, there is practically nothing but small business in the entire State of Virginia.

Now, what are we doing for small business? We have in the Department of Commerce several divisions engaged in helping small business. First we have the National Production Authority, with 77 employees, engaged solely in helping small business. Then, we have the Office of Field Services of the Department of Commerce, with 135 engaged in helping small business.

Then, we have in the Department of Commerce, the Office of Technical Services, with four employees engaged in helping small business.

Do you know what is proposed? In the city of Richmond we have an office of the Department of Commerce which is doing the very same thing that the Small Defense Plants Administration contemplates doing, and yet they propose to open another office in the city of Richmond to duplicate the work that the Department of Commerce is already doing. I say to you, if the Department of Commerce is not helping small business in the city of Richmond, then close it up, because we do not have anything else there, with the exception of one or two plants of some of the larger corporations. There is nothing in Virginia except small business. Therefore, if the office of the Department of Commerce is not serving small business, it is not doing anything at all.

I have had numerous communications from small-business people in my district wanting to know how they can get contracts under the Defense Production Act, and requesting other information. In every instance I have referred them to the Department of Commerce, and in every single instance they have gotten the service that they required. There is, therefore, no need for this agency.

But that is not all. In the Department of Defense we have in the Munitions Board 10 personnel set up for the Department of Defense. In the Air Force we have 45 personnel, whose duty it is to look after the interests of small business. In the Navy we have 76 personnel assigned to that task. In the Army, 364. That makes a total of 495 in the Defense Department who are engaged in helping small business.

In the General Services Administration we have 10 persons assigned to small business. In the Mutual Security Administration we have 14 assigned to that task. In the Atomic Energy Commission we have 10 assigned to that task. In the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—and there is an agency set up to help small business. If they are not helping small business, then let us abolish it. That was the purpose of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. They have 12 people just to look after the interests of the small-business man.

That makes 757 people, all told, that we already have set up in the Government today for the aid of small business.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. In just a moment, please.

If you want to help small business, the best aid you can give it today is to reduce Government expenditures, and cut the taxes on the small-business man. That is what small business wants. To date I have received one telegram from my district asking me to support this appropriation. I have received hundreds of letters and telegrams and telephone calls and personal interviews from constituents of mine asking me to cut the budget of the United States; to cut our Federal expenditures and to see that at least at this session we do not impose more taxes; and, if possible, to reduce the taxes already authorized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. If they get this $825,000, they could not operate more than 2 months anyway in the fiscal year. That would be 400 employees up from nothing, at $2,000 each for 2 months. It is terrific.

Mr. GARY. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars was appropriated for this agency for the second and third quarters. They have only obligated thus far $270,000, and now they are asking for $875,000 just for the balance of this fiscal year.

If the organization is continued after June 30, nobody knows what they will ask for next year; the sky will be the limit. Here is an opportunity to cut Federal expenditures and to save money. I now yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know the gentleman well, and I know how fair he is. Is it not true that last year the gentleman from Virginia supported the bill authorizing the building of this agency and later supported a bill appropriating funds to start this agency into operation?

Mr. GARY. If I did and, frankly, I will say to the gentleman I do not recall how I voted on this measure; I may have done so, but if I did it was with the understanding that the activities in behalf of the small-business man were going to be coordinated and centered in one agency. That has not been done. What we are doing is superimposing another agency on top of a number of other agencies that are already operating in this field. Nobody thought that it was to be a duplication of effort or a triplication of effort. Had I thought that, I would not have supported it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. It was intended that this would be the agency that would coordinate the others and that the other agencies would be transferred to it.

Mr. GARY. Then I ask why that has not been done?

Mr. PATMAN. We have not had the money; that is, the agency has not; they are asking for it right now. It will be done if this appropriation is allowed.

Mr. GARY. Certainly there is no assurance that anything of the kind will be done, because in the time the agency has been operating nothing has been done in that direction. I think it is the Book of all Books that says: "By their works ye shall know them."

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Assuming that this agency were given the $10,000,000, that does not guarantee the coordination of the agencies referred to, does it?

Mr. GARY. Absolutely not. There is no provision to compel coordination at all. This just asks for $10,875,000 for the balance of this fiscal year. Ten million dollars, of course, is a revolving fund that will be used as previously stated, but $875,000 of it is for expenses just for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is on the Appropriations Committee and is a very able and diligent member of that committee. I congratulate him on the fine service he has rendered. His committee is in a position to compel coordination of these agencies, for the power of the purse string is sufficient to accomplish it.

Mr. GARY. I differ with the gentleman on that point. That is not the duty of the Committee on Appropriations; that is the duty of the Congress. There

should have been a provision in the law establishing the Small Defense Plants Administration to require cordination. I think small business ought to be taken care of; but it does not take 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, or 14 agencies to do it.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In support of the recollection of the gentleman from Virginia in answer to a question that was asked him about voting for funds for this thing, my recollection is exactly the same as that of the gentleman from Virginia, that no funds have been appropriated by Congress at any time for this agency; that the last time it came before the Congress they refused to give them any money but said: "First, develop a program." The only money they have had has been transferred by the President from other funds.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the position taken by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], a member of the Committee on Appropriations, in opposing the Burke Airport. As far as this particular item is concerned it is threshing old straw for me, because the authorization for this airport originated in the committee of which I am a member. I opposed it in the committee, and I opposed it when it came up for consideration on the floor. The authorization made by the committee and by the Congress was improvident in my opinion. This, to me, is the final opportunity I will have to express my continued opposition to the enterprise.

As an interpolation, I would like to answer the inquiry made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] as to the time required from Detroit, Mich., to the Willow Run Airport. According to the information given in the hearings it is 55 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I want the gentleman to understand very definitely that I am no party to the continuance of the Willow Run Airport. I want an airport just north of Detroit, about 10 minutes from the heart of town.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am trying to give that information the gentleman inquired about.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Has the gentleman ever been to the Willow Run Airport?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No.

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman had been he would know how much his 55 minutes are off.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am glad the gentleman brought out this point about Detroit being 55 minutes away from the Willow Run Airport.

Mr. RABAUT. It is not 55 minutes away.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Most big cities are at least from 45 to 65 minutes away from their main airports. The substitute that we suggest being used here for this Burke Airport, 34 minutes distant, is Friendship, which will be only 40 minutes distant. I maintain, as the gentleman from Iowa does, that it is mighty expensive to expend $50,000,000 for a convenience involving only 6 minutes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I agree entirely with the gentleman from Minnesota. I want to continue now with this Burke Airport and why I express my opposition to it.

Here is an opportunity for an economy-minded Congress, and this is what we are told the Eighty-second Congress is, to save about $50,000,000 of the taxpayers' money. That is the first reason for opposing the Burke Airport. That is actually what it is going to cost before we get through with it. The original estimate was $14,000,000 for acquisition of land and surveys and another $10,000,000 for appurtenances and buildings out there.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman feel that the people of Elizabeth, N. J., are going to see to it that the airport there is taken quite a ways out of town, probably 20 or 30 miles?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Of course, an investigation is going on at the present time of those accidents at the Newark Airport. There is probably some great pressure being put on at that particular point.

The second reason for opposing the airport is this: As was pointed out by the gentleman from Minnesota, this area is entirely unsuited for an airport. There has been no adequate survey made of the terrain out there. I am told on reliable information, from people who actually live in the area, that there is a tremendous amount of hard granite rock out there that will have to be moved at tremendous expense in order to put this airport in that area.

The third reason is that the people who live out at Burke and in that vicinity do not want it. They are living a quiet life out there and they are almost to a man opposed to this airport coming. Not only that, but the united delegations in Congress from Virginia and from Maryland, and likewise the cities in the vicinity, are also opposed to the airport.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I want to quote from a letter by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, dated January 24, 1952. Senator BYRD wrote Mr. David L. Walter, 120 East George Mason Road, Falls Church, Va., as follows:

MY DEAR MR. WALTER: Answering your letter, I am very much opposed to the construction of the second national airport in Fairfax County and will oppose the additional appropriation that will be requested this year for that project.

With best wishes, I am,

Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Of course, the delegation from Maryland does not want this airport because they have invested Maryland taxpayers' money in the Friendship Airport between Baltimore and Washington under the airport program that was passed by the Congress. The taxpayers of Baltimore and the State of Maryland were encouraged to spend their money for the Friendship port by some Federal money. Also they were led to believe that its facilities would be used to supplement the Washington National Airport. I would like to see it used instead of going into Virginia and improvidently and uselessly buying another airport at a cost of $50,000,000. I would much prefer to have the Friendship Airport used.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Not only that, but the Federal Government, and therefore the taxpayers of this Nation, have around $15,000,000 invested in an expressway from Washington through the Fort Meade reservation to near Baltimore.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is precisely true, and when that expressway is finished, the Friendship Airport at Baltimore will be nearly, if not quite, as accessible as the airport proposed to be built now at Burke.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman will recall 4 years ago, when we had the proposal before us for Friendship, it was then advanced to us that it should be an overflow airport for the Washington National Airport.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Precisely so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And that it should be utilized by both communities, Baltimore and Washington.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Precisely so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. And as a result the taxpayers of the Nation put $3,000,000 toward that end.

Mr. DOLLIVER. True.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Here we are leaving Baltimore in this plight: They have put in $12,000,000 of their own money on the basis that it should be an auxiliary airport to help not only Baltimore and Annapolis and that region, but Washington, and I do not think we in the Congress are being fair to that large community by even thinking of putting in another airport 14 miles out here in the sticks.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If we were to say that the Friendship Airport was far away, which I do not think it is, but even if it were, there is an airport only 9 miles out here, the Andrews Field, now used by the Army, which could very easily be used for this purpose, and the Army,

with no inconvenience to themselves, could use one farther out. That would save us mileage, that would save us a great deal of money; $2,000,000 alone for the road we have to build.

Mr. DOLLIVER. There is a great deal to what the gentleman from California says.

Mr. Chairman, finally, because my position is so perfectly clear on this, who is it that is after this airport over here in Virginia? Well, without casting any aspersions, I think it is the people who are trying to build up an airport domain down here in one of these Federal agencies.

Now what is the fundamental pattern of our airport development in the United States? It has been a sharing of responsibility by the local community with the Federal Government. Under the Airport Act, nearly any community in the country that wants an airport can get Federal aid. But this Burke Airport is not that kind of an enterprise. It is an enterprise that is backed up and promoted by some people who want to build up an airport empire of their own, regardless of State control or State contribution.

Mr. Chairman, this is a chance to save about $50,000,000 for the taxpayers of this country. When the amendment is offered by the gentleman from Minnescta, I sincerely hope that it will have unanimous support.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] in whose district this airport is located.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated by the chairman of the committee, the Burke Airport is located in my district. I am in a rather peculiar position about it. I undertook, when the bill was before the legislative committee, to put a restriction on that this airport could not be built in any place without the assent of the governing body of that county. I think that is a sound principle. I was defeated on that. I was successful, however, in securing an amendment to the bill that required consultation with the local authorities before the airport could be located.

We are in this situation in my county of Fairfax, that the Government has made serious encroachments upon the tax-paying values of that county. It is a serious problem. I am constantly having to oppose the acquisition of property by the Federal Government.

I was defeated in my efforts. After that the act was passed and an appropriation of I believe $1,000,000 was made to begin the construction of the airport. A large part of that money was paid into court, which passed the title of the property to the United States. You are stuck with the land.

I have taken this position with my constituents, and I have been, I hope, very frank with them, that while I opposed the thing in the beginning, Congress having established a policy and having appropriated the money I did not feel it was proper for me to undertake by this method to defeat a proposition where Congress had adopted a policy, even though I did not agree with the policy.

That is one side of the proposition, but there is a great deal of objection to this by individual citizens in the locality of that airport. I am the only voice they have here to express their opposition. I want to say to you just how they feel about it. I think they are entitled to have that position stated on the floor of the House.

I have had the governing body of that county come to my office in a body, the board of supervisors, objecting most strenuously to this appropriation. They feel that if this appropriation is defeated then their problem is solved. It is partly solved, but still the Government will own their homes and their land because that has already been done, because the law is that the Government, having put its hand upon it and deposited the money in the court, the title has passed to the United States Government..

However, there are people out there whose families have lived there for generations, who have their homes there, some of them, to which they are attached, to which they have a family attachment. The Government reaches out its hand and wrests from them a thing that is very dear to them. I think they are entitled to have you people know just how they feel about that, and to have you, maybe, meditate a little bit about how you would feel, let us say, if your ancestral home, if you have one, were ruthlessly taken from you by your Government.

I had every county officer, I think, in that county call me and ask me to take a position against the continued purchase of this land for that purpose.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I appreciate very much the very fair statement of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. He knows, of course, I am sure, that only 1,040 acres have been acquired of the four thousand-odd-acre tract by the Government. There are still 3,475 acres for which the Government must come in and put up money. Is not that a fact, that acquisition has proceeded only about one-fourth as far as area is concerned?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will wait, I will answer his question. Although I have no personal knowledge myself, I have understood that condemnation for this whole area has been filed, and that the appraised value of it has been deposited with the court. If that is true, the title has passed. I am not sure, and the information of the gentleman on it may be better than mine.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would the gentleman say whether he considers the airport at Burke a satisfactory terrain or a satisfactory piece of ground for an airport? I drove out to see it, and it impresses me as being a very rolling piece of ground, and not nearly as good as other locations.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I would not be able to express any opinion on it. If the gentleman has been over the ground, he probably knows about it better than I do. I have not traveled over the area. I just wanted to state my position to the House—not my position, but the position of the people who are suffering by reason of having their homes taken away from them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. It is a fact though that whether the airport is constructed at Burke or not, the situation is such with reference to air service in and around Washington, that an additional commercial airport is going to have to be provided?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, asked me that question because I think it brings up a matter which ought to be considered. That is, if you are not going to build it at Burke, certainly you ought to proceed very rapidly to construct an airport somewhere else. Personally, I have always felt that the armed services, and the protection of the Capitol, and the furnishing of a civilian airport would be better if they shoved the Army out of Andrews Field, which is right here close to Washington, and put them a little farther away from Washington so that if a bomb was ever dropped on this city, we would still have an airport and some planes left.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman from Virginia is absolutely correct there. Andrews Field so far as defending Washington is concerned is too close to the Capital.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; you try to pry anything loose from the Army. I have tried to pry things loose from the Army before, and you never get anywhere with them. But, I want to state in answer to the gentleman from Arkansas that I do think it is very desirable that the Congress act with speed in providing another airport, because this Washington Airport has become dangerous and has become a public nuisance to the people who live within 3 or 4 or 5 miles of it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. With the Burke Airport only 14 miles away, would it still not leave a dangerous situation when it is only 14 airline miles from the National Airport?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Oh, no; I do not think there is anything in that argument.

Mr. GROSS. It would be still following the same pattern.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No; I do not think so. The gentleman asked me a question, and I have answered according to what I believe.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman from Virginia is absolutely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the chairman of the subcommittee, which has jurisdiction of this matter and which has reported out this item, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] for his very fair and forthright statement with regard to this situation. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] just made an inquiry with regard to the necessity for this additional airport. As I see it, that is the first of two steps you should consider. The Washington National Airport traffic reached the saturation point as far back as 1948. We must have an additional airport. Now, the second question is, where is it going to be located? You are not going to pick any site for its location where the citizens living on that site are going to relish having their land condemned. The Congress has already appropriated a million dollars, a great part of which is on deposit down here in court in Alexandria and part of which has been spent for preliminary plans and surveys. This is already a going concern. This is a matter which was passed upon here in the House 2 years ago. Mention has been made of a cost of $50,000,000. That is utterly inaccurate. If you will read the testimony, you will find that the contemplated cost of the present plans for the additional airport amounts to $14,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the Friendship International Airport is one of the best airports in the United States. It is certainly a credit to Baltimore and puts that city in the very favorable position of being one of the few communities in the United States that has airport facilities adequate to provide for its own normal aviation expansion, but Friendship Airport is not a facility that can logically serve Washington. Let me cite reasons.

First of all, surveys show that about 60 percent of the airline traffic originating in the Washington area comes from the downtown district. Therefore, any airport that is to serve Washington must have reasonable access to the downtown area. By road, the distance from downtown Washington to Friendship Airport is over 36 miles and the average off-peak driving time is 56 minutes. This average time was determined as a result of test runs made jointly by representatives of the city of Baltimore and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. The Washington-Baltimore expressway now under construction will provide a much better and somewhat shorter route between Friendship Airport and the District line. The net reduction in driving time, however, based on driving at the maximum legal limit, will be only 6 or 7 minutes. This makes 50 minutes a reasonable estimate of the average time required to drive from downtown Washington to the airport when the expressway is completed. Fifty minutes is well beyond the acceptable limits for ground transportation time to an airport. The site near Burke can now be reached in 28 minutes driving time from downtown Washington during off-peak periods. With the completion of the access road which is proposed as a part of the development the Burke site can be reached in about 25 minutes driving time.

Second, when planning to handle air traffic from two major air terminals in one area, adequate provision must be made for the interchange of passengers made necessary by the separation of air carriers. The test runs showed that the average driving time for the 42 miles between Friendship Airport and Washington National Airport was over 63 minutes. The completion of the Washington-Baltimore expressway can reduce this time to about 62 minutes or a little over an hour. Requiring airline passengers transferring from one plane to another to spend more than an hour in ground transportation time is unreasonable. The airport at Burke will require only about 20 minutes ground transportation time for the interchange of passengers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. The third reason that can be cited is that Baltimore will need all of the present capacity of Friendship Airport to take care of its aviation needs. Air traffic is constantly increasing throughout the country and Baltimore is going to get its share of this increase. Although the present facilities at Friendship are not now being used at anywhere near capacity, they are going to be required by Baltimore's own air traffic. Even with a major expenditure for the construction of dual runways at Friendship Airport the increased capacity would not be sufficient for all of Baltimore's air traffic, plus the traffic increases which are forecast for Washington.

The arguments in favor of using Friendship Airport have all been heard before. They were presented in 1950 when Congress passed Public Law 762, Eighty-first Congress, which authorized the construction of a new airport to serve Washington. At that time Congress determined that such a new airport was required and that Friendship Airport at Baltimore was not the answer to Washington's needs.

I now yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. What the gentleman had to say in his last statement is entirely correct, but the Congress surrendered its authority as far as selecting the actual site is concerned. That is where they made a mistake. The Burke site has been selected——

Mr. ROONEY. I did not yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for a speech. I yielded to him for a question. The gentleman may get his own time for his speeches.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is that not correct? The Congress had nothing to say definitely about the Burke site itself.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not so at all. The Congress appropriated $1,000,000 for acquisition of land at Burke airport and $1,000,000 has been spent upon Burke airport.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] for a consent request.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the RECORD at that point in the reading of the bill dealing with immigration and naturalization under "Salaries and expenses and claims of persons of Japanese ancestry."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I just wish to call attention to a slight inaccuracy which I am sure was not meant on the part of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. The gentleman from New York stated that after this 6-mile access road had been constructed to the Burke Airport the driving time between the airport and the Statler Hotel, I believe he said, was 25 minutes. I ask who knows better than these policemen from Fairfax County who made trial trips from the cloverleaf on the Shirley Highway which is 10 minutes from the Burke Airport; these particular police found, as I stated before, that it took 23 minutes for one trip, 21 minutes for another trip, 30 minutes for one, 24 and 22 for others, an average of approximately 24 minutes. Add 10 minutes as the time necessary to drive the 6 miles of new road and you have 34 minutes to do it and stay within the law.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the gentleman does not claim that these Fairfax policemen are not interested witnesses?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Surely the gentleman from New York does not question their integrity?

As for the gentleman's statement of 60 minutes being required to drive from the Friendship Airport to the Statler Hotel, the CAA estimates that when the new highway is constructed the driving time between the Friendship International Airport and the Statler Hotel in Washington will be not more than 40 minutes. That is quite a bit less than the gentleman's statement of 60 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, of course this problem is nothing new with me; I appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce opposing the building of a new airport in close proximity to Washington. The people of Baltimore and Maryland offered the facilities, paid for by the taxpayers of Baltimore City, to the overcrowded Washington Airport traffic, thereby saving the Government the expense of building one.

The gentleman from New York [Mr ROONEY] said that in 1948 the Washington Airport traffic had reached the saturation point. The attention of the CAA has been called to that fact and they were asked if an airport reaches its saturation point it is not hazardous to passengers to continue such operation, but to date they have not answered and they have not done anything about transferring any traffic to the Baltimore Friendship Airport, which is one of the finest airports in the country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Surely the distinguished gentleman from Maryland would not expect a New York passenger bound for Washington to land in Baltimore and then have to drive by automobile to Washington?

Mr. FALLON. I do not know why the gentleman always speaks about their landing in Baltimore, for the field is 10 miles outside of Baltimore and 30 miles from Washington. They can get to that airfield as quickly as they can from La-Guardia Airfield to the center of New York City, so the time element is not much of a factor.

Coming from the south the other night we had to reduce speed 500 miles outside of Washington slowing down the flight three-quarters of an hour. Fifteen or twenty minutes is the difference in time between the Burke Airport and Washington and the Friendship Airport and Washington.

Mr. ROONEY. That is another very good reason why we need additional airport facilities here in Washington.

Mr. FALLON. But would you rather spend three-quarters of an hour extra in the air or 10 minutes extra driving on a new highway?

That is not the question; that was argued out a long time ago. The question is one of wasting money, requiring the taxpayers of Baltimore to build an airport not only for their use but to contribute to one for Washington out of their own tax dollars. In other words, dual dollars for airport facilities for which they will have no use. If it were to be built under some formula as every other airport is built, that would be another problem; but this is being built by the Federal Government out of State taxpayers' money.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I say that I have confirmed the statement I made to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] when I remarked that scarcely over 1,000 acres have already been condemned and the money put up for it. We have still about 3,500 acres that have not been touched.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if this situation really bothers the gentleman from Minnesota, if he will turn to page 61 of the committee's hearings, he will find that the entire site comprises 4,520 acres. The total valuation of that is $1,703,250 and the status of the land acquisition has been under a declaration of taking filed on 63 plots totaling 1,050 acres. You have already spent a million dollars on this project. Are you going to throw that down the drain pipe?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. May I answer the gentleman?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman knows, of course, that the larger plots are less. There are large and substantial holdings to the extent of 20 or 25 homes costing anywhere from $16,000 to $40,000 that are yet to be taken in.

Mr. ROONEY. That is not so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is the information I have.

Mr. ROONEY. I fully appreciate the position of my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Does the gentleman know that in testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce back in 1949 the Airport Commission of Baltimore City and some of the Members from the State of Maryland offered to the Washington Airport the facilities of the Baltimore Airport and said they could take care of any overflow traffic for a number of years to come?

Mr. ROONEY. I fully appreciate the position of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], and his colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX], and all the Members of the Maryland delegation with regard to Friendship Airport. But let us look at this from the position of the taxpayer of the Nation. Having spent $1,000,000 with the full approval of both Houses of Congress, we must not abandon the development of Burke Airport.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DEVEREUX].

Mr. DEVEREUX. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself to the same question, the Burke Airport. I regret that some of my remarks may be repetitious, but I think it is worth while going into. When the amendment is offered I intend to support the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], and these are my reasons:

First. The ultimate cost will be fantastically out of proportion to the airport's value in handling Washington air traffic.

Second. The airport will menace the safety of a heavily populated area on its perimeter; and

Third. Adequate facilities for handling Washington's overflow traffic are presently available at a fraction of the cost of the Burke Airport.

By the CAA's own estimate the $14,000,000 it has requested represents little more than one-third of the final cost. Emphasis has been placed on this sum, presumably in the hope that the Congress, once committed to the project, will be more likely to approve further costs.

According to a CAA estimate, dated June 13, 1951, $14,000,000 is the cost of only the first stage. There are three more stages that bring the final total to $38,000,000. Even these CAA figures are grossly underestimated in certain visible details.

I think the figure of $50,000,000 is probably much closer to the estimate. If you will bear with me a minute I would like to give you one of the details that was not property considered.

Earth-moving costs are fixed by the CAA at 44 cents per cubic yard, or about $7,000,000 in all. State highway commissions estimate such costs at from 40 cents for overburden up to $3 per cubic yard for rock. CAA's tacit assumption that only overburden will have to be moved at the Burke tract is ridiculous. The terrain is extremely hilly and, according to Government geologists, a considerable portion is underlain by hard granite rock which can be moved only by the costly process of drilling, blasting, and excavating.

In assessing the availability of the Burke site to Washington the CAA has ignored the fact that the Potomac bridges already are inadequate to handle the daily rush-hour motor traffic. Additional traffic to and from the airport will place the Burke site still farther distant in time during those hours.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman probably knows, as most every Member of this House today knows who has ever driven on Shirley Highway and tried to get into Washington from that region, that section, that corner of the District is the most conglomerated as far as traffic is concerned of any section in this area, and we are just making a bad matter worse to put another installation in at that point.

Mr. DEVEREUX. The gentleman is correct.

Destruction of or major damage to even one of the principal bridges would isolate the airport from Washington.

The main runway at Burke points directly to the most thickly populated areas of northern Virginia. The tragic implications of this fact are exemplified by recent disasters on the outskirts of the Newark (N. J.) Airport, and others elsewhere in the country.

Within easy driving distance of Washington the Friendship Airport, as an alternative to the Burke project, offers accessibility, safety, economy, and room for further expansion.

The State of Maryland is eager to have Washington's overflow air traffic handled through Friendship.

To set the committee straight, in that I may be accused of self-interest, I would like to report that I do not represent the district in which the Friendship Airport is located and that I will not represent the city of Baltimore, as I do presently, next year.

I would like also to bring your attention to another fact. The city of Baltimore put up $12,000,000 for this project. The State of Maryland put up $1,000,000, and they were encouraged in this project by an appropriation of $3,000,000 from the Federal Government. Now, I suggest to you Members of the House that the Federal Government encouraged this political subdivision to go ahead and do something on its own. If we go ahead and enact this legislation, we will be in fact, discouraging the

enterprise as shown by the city of Baltimore. I wonder whether or not this may be an avenue to drive all of our local enterprise to come to Washington with hat in hand and wait for a hand-out by the Federal Government.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEVEREUX. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I back the gentleman up in his statement. I quote from the hearings on S. 456, as follows:

> Friendship Airport was developed with the encouragement and assistance of CAA as a second terminal airport to serve the growing air traffic of the Washington-Baltimore area.

To this end, the Federal Government appropriated $3,000,000.

Mr. DEVEREUX. In conclusion, I urge that the House refuse to approve funds for the Burke Airport because the project is highly uneconomical, because it will create a public hazard, and because a better means of handling the increased volume of Washington's air traffic is ready at hand.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, together with my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] and my colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] I am interested in the appropriation for the Small Defense Plants Administration. I am convinced that the House should put these appropriation facts into the bill, and I take this time only to give certain facts to the House as I believe the situation has not been very clearly put forward here and understood.

It was our intention in authorizing this new Small Defense Plants Administration to provide an agency which would have more effectiveness and, indeed, more resources than did the Office of Small Business in the NPA in the Department of Commerce. Therefore, all of the arguments that the Small Defense Plants Administration which we authorized has not yet taken over all the functions of the other agencies it seems to me misses the main point. It was our desire to have a new agency which would have financing and which would have the capability for doing the job.

Mr. Telford Taylor, a very distinguished lawyer who was our chief counsel at the Nuremberg trials, and who is the head of this new organization, testified—hearings, page 460:

> All the responsibilities on procurement and finance have been transferred from the Office of Small Business of NPA to the Small Defense Plants Administration under the Executive order. My understanding is that the size of the Office of Small Business over there is now about one-third of its former size.

In other words, in the last 5 months this new agency has been in the process of accomplishing exactly what the Congress intended it should accomplish. But this move being proposed today is to cut it off a-borning. That certainly runs counter to the unanimous desire expressed by this House, in addition to the personal convictions of practically every small-business man in the country.

It seems to me shocking that we would take that 5 months experience in the transitional phase and say, "This is the final experience. This shows the two are in business together. Therefore, let us eliminate one. But which one? Not the former—the Office of Small Business of NPA—no, the latter—the Small Defense Plants Administration—which we ourselves decided we needed to organize to assist small business in this country to participate in the defense effort.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The question has arisen as to whether the Congress has appropriated any funds for this organization. I hold in my hand Public Law 253 of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, approved November 1, 1951, "Small Business Plants Administration, salaries and expenditures, $350,000"—a direct appropriation by this Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] made a statement a few moments ago concerning the numerous small-business functions and services in the various departments of the Government. He is correct in saying that there are small-business services in the Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the General Services Administration, the various defense agencies, and others. However, it was the specific purpose of Congress in setting up the Small Defense Plants Administration that all these small-business functions might be consolidated and merged into one service.

Throughout our testimony throughout the country the small-business people stated that when they came to Washington they were given the run-around into various departments of the Government. With the SDPA we now have a central agency—a clearinghouse—which acts for all segments of small business. Small-business problems are now being solved more effectively. This agency is doing a good job. They are settling many of these problems and rendering a valued service and I think this service should be continued.

It is unthinkable to me that within the period of a few months the House would reverse itself and today vote to kill the Small Defense Plants Administration which the Congress only last year established.

This agency to aid small business was created as the result of public demand and after it was determined that something should be done to assist the small-business enterprises of the Nation during this period of mobilization and emergency.

We all know its functions: to see to it that the small businesses of the Nation receive their fair and proportionate share of critical materials, such as copper, aluminum, and steel; and, second, to assist small business in obtaining defense contracts and subcontracts; and, third, to encourage the widest possible participation by small business in the defense and mobilization effort. In other words, to broaden the base by utilizing the small businesses of the Nation in the defense program.

I am sure it is obvious to all that many of the small-business concerns of the Nation need help; many are being forced to shut down because of their inability to obtain materials or to obtain a Government contract.

Small business has found itself, when dealing with the Government, to be operating in a vicious cycle—they cannot get a defense contract or subcontract unless they have proper financing; they cannot obtain proper financing because they do not have a defense contract. All of this, however, is being alleviated by the Small Defense Plants Administration.

Today small business is beginning to share and participate in the defense program. Much has been accomplished. Much more remains to be done in this direction.

The Small Defense Plants Administration has just gotten organized under the direction of Mr. Telford Taylor, the Administrator. This agency has worked out a method of procedure with the Defense Production Administration, the National Production Authority, and various procurement agencies of our Defense Department.

There has been a coordination and a consolidation of many overlapping small business functions and services of the various departments of the Federal Government—these being consolidated with the Small Defense Plants Administration which is the center or clearinghouse for all small business functions and services of the Government.

Here, however, is the rub. Herein lies the difficulty which the Small Defense Plants Administration is today experiencing.

The Congress in setting up this independent small business agency provided that the SDPA "shall not be affiliated with or be within any other agency or department of the Federal Government." In addition to this independence of other agencies, by executive order, small business functions have been transferred to the Small Defense Plants Administration and some few officials of other agencies—have been sniping at the Small Defense Plants Administration. They did not want it created in the first place and certainly not outside and independent of their particular agency.

They opposed its creation—and failing in this—they now snipe at its existence by trying to cut out funds for its operation.

The members of the Appropriations Committee should not be the ones—the sole judge—to determine whether or not the will of the House and the Congress as expressed in this legislation last year shall, in effect, today be repealed.

I say that the Congress should not permit this to happen. The House should restore the needed funds to continue the very vital services of the Small Defense Plants Administration.

By Executive order there has already been transferred to the Small Defense

Plants Administration various functions relating to small business from other agencies of the Government. We are consolidating these services into one agency, and certainly the Committee on Appropriations should not be the sole judge here as to whether this arm of the Congress is to be continued or discontinued. Congress unanimously created this agency, and now the Committee on Appropriations and certain agencies of the Government are attempting to kill SDPA because it may be usurping some function of an existing agency. We should not permit this to happen.

Let us take a look at the procurement picture and see whether or not this service is needed. Since the outbreak of the Korean conflict the quarterly rate of deliveries on military contracts has quadrupled, reaching a level of $5,000,000,000 during 1951. During October of last year, the Director of Mobilization, Mr. Wilson, estimated that the use of materials for military production was at a rate of $8,000,000,000 per quarter.

To meet mobilization schedules, according to Mr. Wilson, military deliveries must rise to a rate of more than $10,000,000,000 per quarter, reaching a peak in 1953. During the World War II period, 67 percent of contract awards, totaling $175,000,000,000, went to 100 large corporations. Obviously, with such huge military expenditures, every protection should be provided to insure that the small-business enterprises of the Nation are permitted to participate and to receive their fair and proportionate share of Government contracts and Government awards.

As of September 1950, less than 10 percent of Air Force procurement went to small business. Twenty percent of Navy procurement, as of September 1950, went to small business, and approximately 40 percent of Army procurement. The average over-all picture discloses that only 20 percent of the dollar volume of Government contracts were awarded to small-business interests during 1951, while more than 80 percent of the dollar volume of our tremendous defense-procurement program went into the hands of large corporations and big business. I say that the Congress should take every step to insure that small-business concerns are permitted to share to the fullest extent possible and make the greatest contribution to the defense-mobilization effort. Progress in this direction is being made. We should take no action here today which would be adverse to this objective.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Chairman, about 2 years ago the Congress appropriated over $13,000,000 to build the bridge over the Anacostia River. When this bridge is finished it will tie in directly with the new Baltimore freeway, and it will make an access road or highway to the Friendship Airport, and will cut down very materially on the time between even the present National Airport and Friendship Airport. If we will just give that a little thought when we are thinking of spending $50,000,000—if we are really thinking about economy—let us wait and see what we are going to do when this new freeway is completed. The new freeway should be finished very shortly, long before this new airport can be built. Then we can see just where we are, and we will also be able to see better if we cannot save $50,000,000 and utilize the present facilities at Friendship Airport, which I think are only being used to the extent of 20 percent of its capacity at this time.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEALL. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does the gentleman state that Friendship Airport is being used only about 20 percent at this time?

Mr. BEALL. That is my understanding. It is being used about 20 percent of capacity.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly that adds more fuel to the fire we are trying to put under this Burke Airport proposition, does it not? Is it not a shame to waste the facilities of that great airport at Friendship, an airport which is already there, and then to spend $50,000,000 here, out in the woods somewhere, 13 miles by airline from the National Airport, and create a hazard for everybody concerned? I am sure the gentleman agrees with me—I just wanted to bring that point out.

Mr. BEALL. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I think if we just wait until we have the facility of this new bridge, and the new highway, to see just how much time and distance that will save.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland whose district is directly and immediately concerned with the site of this airport.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, in addition to the reasons advanced, I approach this subject matter from another angle, and that is that the Civil Aeronautics Administration, an administrative body, should not be in the business of operating airfields.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has been charged with the primary function of fostering the development of civil aeronautics and air commerce.

Running an airport is just something extra which they have taken on as an expanding Federal bureau.

And running an airport is the type of business it would be best for the CAA to discontinue.

In Airport Design, a publication issued by the CAA in 1949, the CAA makes this recommendation:

> Safety of aircraft operations is of primary importance in the selection of an airport site. On this point there can be no compromise in favor of other considerations.

I thoroughly agree with this CAA pronouncement.

To extend it just a trifle I am convinced that on the entire question "safety of aircraft operations is of primary importance," and "on this point there can be no compromise in favor of other considerations."

I am convinced that the CAA would stick to its knitting much better and take a realistic view of the critical situation now existing in Washington, if the CAA, itself, were not operating Washington National Airport.

So, therefore, I propose to introduce legislation that the CAA and other Government agencies charged with regulatory powers to assure safety in the field of aviation be prohibited from operating airports, or other facilities subject to their own regulations.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from New York to yield to me in order to correct a previous statement I made in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] in which I stated my recollection as to what the House had done with respect to the previous requests for appropriations for the Small Defense Plants Corporation. My recollection as to what the House had done was correct, that the House had refused to grant any funds for this small-business plants operation, but I regret to have to correct the actual fact by stating that the other body did put in $350,000, and the House conferees were compelled to agree with that action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include two communications.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, in speaking about the appropriation for the Small Defense Plants Administration, I find myself in a somewhat unusual position. I have usually concurred in all efforts to cut appropriations. I have done so in the belief that Federal agencies generally can very well get along and do a good job, even a better job, on less money, if they will use the money we give them more efficiently and economically.

In this instance, however, I am compelled to take the position that something needs to be done for small business under the emergency situation we face in this country today. I wish it were not necessary to have all of the red tape and controls that have been set up, but we have them.

The fact is that those controls weigh most heavily upon the small-business man. The large corporation can afford to hire experts to deal with the numerous complicated Government regulations and procedures involved in the administration of emergency controls, but the small-business man finds himself in a maze of red tape with which he cannot cope.

The Government created that situation. It seems to me only fair that the Government do all within its power to ease those burdens on the small-business men. We should provide assistance in dealing with the Government under the controls we have today, in obtaining their fair share of scarce materials, and

in getting fair consideration on defense business, to replace the civilian business which materials controls have taken away from them.

I also seem to be in an anomalous position because I find myself on the same side of a question as the Governor of our State, a Democrat, and also Walter Reuther, the president of the UAW-CIO.

I want to read to the Members of the House a telegram I sent to Governor Williams, of the State of Michigan, today:

This will acknowledge receipt of your telegram of March 12 concerning the small defense plants administration.

I congratulate you on taking an interest in the problems and obstacles which confront small business enterprises today. A controlled economy, which of necessity must be shaped to the pattern of entire industries, inevitably emphasizes the advantages of the larger business enterprise and adds to the burdens of the small, independent concern. Large concerns can better afford to maintain staffs to deal with the red tape and regulations inherent in Government economic controls. Big business can cope with big Government, while small business is smothered by a plethora of bureaucratic red tape, procrastination and arbitrary edicts.

I hope you agree with me that the long-range cure for this unnatural, man-made blight on the free competitive system is to remove these Government controls at the earliest possible moment, and that we bring an end to the long-standing period of crisis and emergency, the intensity and duration of which is partly the result of human mismanagement and stupidity.

Meanwhile, I concur with those who believe it is necessary for the Government, through an agency such as the small defense plants administration, to give assistance to small business in coping with Government controls and regulation and in seeking to obtain fair consideration in the award of defense contracts.

GEORGE MEADER,
Member of Congress.

I enclosed a copy of that telegram in a letter I wrote to Mr. Walter Reuther, president of UAW-CIO, and said this:

As you will observe from the enclosed copy of a wire to Governor Williams, I am very much concerned about the plight of small business enterprises in this country. If a free competitive enterprise system is to be maintained, our economy must be such as to preserve real equality of opportunity so that small enterprisers with courage, initiative and willingness to work can advance and grow, limited only by their ability.

Recent trends toward big Government and big business have impaired this equality of opportunity which must be restored if we are to have the kind of country that both you and I want to live in.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

I hope both Governor Williams and Walter Reuther, will see fit to concur with me in this desire to do something in the future for small businesses to grow and advance on a basis of competitive merit which has been the essence of the American system of free enterprise.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill comes to the House with slightly less than a 10 percent cut. It contains some items that I feel are a little liberal, and I hope that as the bill progresses we may be able to save a few dollars for the taxpayer. I am glad the bill does show a $99,349,000 cut. It was my privilege to participate in some of those cuts. Frankly, I hope those cuts that have been made by the committee will be sustained by the House, because we are in a very serious situation in this country from the standpoint of our financial stability and we are going to need to save all the committee has recommended, and any reasonable suggestions for further cuts that can be offered.

I do feel at this time I should say a word about this so-called small-business set-up. I shall not say very much at this point, because I hope that when the bill is read it will be possible to have more Members present, and I will say more then. But to show you what a ridiculous situation they presented, they did not have any substantial program. It was what we might call ephemeral rather than lasting. It was in the nature of a trip-around-the-lot proposition. There was no indication but what there was another agency prepared to do just as much of a job as these people might do.

The great accomplishment that Mr. Taylor indicated he had made was to submit to the RFC 29 suggested loans of which the RFC has passed on 6. He did not even say in his testimony whether they had approved any of them and whether they did or not I do not know and there is not any evidence before the committee that they had actually accomplished anything.

They have asked here for $825,000 additional. The set-up was such that they already have 129 on their payroll, part of them in the field and part of them in the District of Columbia. On top of that, if they were given $800,000 more it would pay 250 or a little better for 3 months at $1,000 a month. It would seem to me as though they were jumping up too fast.

We might better get some kind of a statement out of that group. If they really need anything, if they are really going to accomplish anything, we should have a constructive statement submitted as to what they possibly could do.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. With reference to loans, I am advised that the Small Defense Plants Administration has had 277 loan applications from 37 States. Twenty-two are being favorably recommended to the RFC and ten have been granted. That is the information I have.

Mr. TABER. Well, Mr. Taylor on page 464 or 465 said that they had presented 29 applications to the RFC and that 6 had been passed on. He did not say whether any had been granted. That is all I know about it. I cannot go any deeper than that.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman used the name of Gen. Telford Taylor. I heard him eulogized on the floor here today. There is something dubious about this man and particularly his record. I find in examining the RECORD that on February 26, 1948, I had something to say regarding this individual. I called attention to the machinations of a Communist clique in the American zone of occupation in Germany having to do with the Nuremberg trials. You remember, General Taylor took the place of Justice Jackson as prosecutor. On his staff he had two people, one by the name of Josiah E. Dubois and another by the name of Belle Mayer, both of them on the Nuremberg prosecuting staff under Taylor.

Mr. Dubois' record is not what a good American would like to have.

At the time Judge Wennerstrum, from the State of Iowa—who was the presiding judge at the trial—voiced scathing criticisms of the trial procedure and the distortion of justice at the trials, by a staff penetrated by left wingers.

The statement that was made by General Taylor against the judge was termed by the Pentagon as "baseless slander." This is the man who is at the head of this small business organization.

Mr. TABER. Is this what the judge said about it?

Mr. DONDERO. That is what the Pentagon said about the statement against the judge, made by General Taylor.

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know, but it sounds rather difficult for me to entrust an $825,000 item and allot $10,000,000 as a revolving fund to a fellow who has no more sense of responsibility than that, and who cannot tell intelligently what he proposes to do.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Outside of the remarks that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] just made, what are the qualifications of General Taylor for handling this administrative job in the Small Defense Plants Administration?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has already told what he thought about him.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. When Mr. Taylor was before your committee, did you ask him anything about this?

Mr. TABER. No; but I suppose when he was asked to tell what these things were all about, that he would tell what the story was.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman think it is rather late to bring it up now, in the consideration of this particular proposal?

Mr. TABER. No. I do not think it is late to bring anything up that is the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct my questions to the airfield proposition. As I understand, we have something like $25,500,000 invested

in the National Airport, which is now serving the city of Washington. If that is not correct, I wish some member of the committee would correct me.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan will yield to me, I should like to say that the correct figure is $23,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The figure which I have came from the Senate report, whether it be $23,000,000 or $25,500,000 is somewhat immaterial at the moment, and that the CAA estimates the new airport to serve the city of Washington would cost about $37,721,000 not including hangars; $8,000,000 for the hangars; additional land cost of about $999,250; that the National Airport has about 729 acres in it, and the new Burke Airport would, if carried out according to present plans, have about 4,520 acres. On this question of the $1,000,000 which has been appropriated, I understand that approximately $832,000 of the million has been deposited with the United States district court at Alexandria in connection with the proposed lands deals, and if this project is not completed, that $832,500 could be recovered. Now, if that is not correct, I wish someone would straighten me out on that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am not positive but what the eight-hundred-and-some-odd-thousand dollars is committed; nevertheless, the Government could recover that through the sale of the property.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Suppose the commitment is really made and the deal must go through. You would obtain, in consideration of the $832,500, acreage which could probably be sold for a 25- or 50-percent mark-up, and make money on the deal, because the way land is being sold around here, I think, based on figures I have seen, that could be done.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. That $1,000,000, or whatever the amount is, is a deposit made by the United States Government when a condemnation suit is filed, guaranteeing the payment for land that is taken. We do not know if all the land has been taken. However, all that can be recovered, because I understand a very small portion of the land has actually been acquired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The only reason I am raising this point is so that we will not be misled into spending additional moneys unnecessarily simply because we have already put $1,000,000 into the deal, because I understand that could be recaptured in one way or another.

May I ask the committee, the gentlemen who are familiar with this proposition and who are handling it, this question: Assuming that the new airport is built, what do you propose to do with the National Airport, where we now have twenty-three to twenty-five million dollars invested?

Mr. ROONEY. Its use would certainly be continued.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The idea is to continue the present airport?

Mr. ROONEY. Absolutely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Irrespective of what happens to Burke or to Friendship as far as the Washington area is concerned? Would that mean that the traffic would be split between the National and the Burke Airports?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then we would have the problem, as I think somebody explained here, of transferring passengers as between Burke, National, and Friendship. Is that correct?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Naturally, as the gentleman will understand, the major airlines would try to use the National Airport as far as possible, it being built up with facilities as it is, and all that we would have going over to Burke would be merely the spillover. They are apt to have an airfeld out there at Burke which would be used very little if any.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time on this side and the remainder of all time for general debate to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has given me these 2 minutes in order that I might call the attention of my colleagues to a serious omission in this pending deficiency appropriation bill that has to do with the present Federal program of assisting impacted school districts that are having trouble meeting their school facility needs due to Government activity in the defense areas.

Time will not permit me to put all the facts in the RECORD that I think my colleagues are entitled to, but I want to announce to the committee at this time that when we read this bill for amendment I shall offer an amendment in order at least that I may get the facts in the case in the RECORD, whether I get any money out of it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired. All time for general debate has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry," $14,800,000.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, included in the pending appropriation bill is the item in the sum of $14,800,000 for the payment of claims of persons of Japanese ancestry. These claims grow out of the evacuation and relocation of Japanese people during World War II. There has been considerable delay in the settlement of these claims. Much of the delay, in my opinion, was unnecessary. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I strongly urge the House of Representatives to approve the full sum. I trust that the balance of claims will be acted upon just as soon as possible so that the people of Japanese ancestry who are rightfully entitled to their claims for damages will receive prompt payment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be helpful for the Members of the House to have placed in the RECORD the following letter which I have received from Mr. Mike Masaoka, national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League. The Japanese American Citizens League has been most helpful in presenting this problem to the Congress. The letter is as follows:

JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1952.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
Congressman from Washington,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACKSON: This is in reply to your recent request for our views, as the organization most concerned with the interests of persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States, on the administration of the Japanese-American evacuation claims program by the Department of Justice.

Frankly, we feel that the Department of Justice is now doing a remarkably able job with this difficult subject and is entitled to commendation for its efforts to liquidate its responsibility in this regard at the earliest opportunity. We are, therefore, in hearty accord with its request for $14,800,000 in supplemental appropriations for the payment of compromise settlement claims.

Eighteen months ago, however, we were not so favorably impressed with the Department's handling of evacuation claims. We believed that it was overly technical and legalistic in its approach to the human problems involved in the mass movement of over 100,000 individuals from their west-coast homes 10 years ago and that its narrow construction and interpretation of the statute of July 2, 1948, was contrary to congressional intent in enacting that remedial act.

In addition, the Department was adjudicating claims so slowly that, according to estimates based upon the report to Congress of the attorney general on the progress of the program in 1950, it would have taken more than a century to complete the processing of claims. And, because of limited administrative funds, it opened up just two field offices in Los Angeles and San Francisco, and practically all of the claims being adjudicated at that time were limited to those filed in California.

In the calendar year 1950 the Department of Justice adjudicated only 211 claims, of which 73 were dismissals. $62,595.16 was paid out as awards in the 137 claims for which payment was authorized. $141,373.83 was the total originally claimed by these same 137 claimants.

In 1949 only 21 claims were adjudicated, one of which was dismissed. Of the total of $13,543.99 originally claimed, $6,882.20 was paid in awards.

In these 2 years almost every adjudicated claim except those dismissed were from areas in the immediate vicinity of Los Angeles and San Francisco.

More important, though, was the exorbitant cost of adjudicating these claims, all of which were small ones involving less than $2,500 each. In 1950, we estimated that it was costing the Government an average of almost $1,500 to adjudicate and pay an average award of less than $450.

While the number of adjudications increased in 1951 to 344, of which 33 were dismissals, the program really began to move after Congress approved an amendment August 17, 1951, which authorized the Attorney General to compromise and settle all claims upon the basis of affidavits and available records up to three-fourths the amount of compensable items, or $2,500, whichever is less.

Although we recognized no justice in waiving 25 percent of our compensable items claimed, in order to expedite the program so that the aged and the poor might receive their evacuation claims in time to aid in their rehabilitation and resettlement, we endorsed this compromise settlement formula and urged its passage last summer.

Beginning in October and continuing through November and December, the Department of Justice compromised and settled 1,813 claims.

In the last 3 months of 1951, claimants from 249 different communities in 30 States and the Territory of Hawaii, including 103 from Seattle, Wash., were listed as having accepted compromised settlements of their respective claims.

During this same period, the average administrative expense in compromising and settling the average award of $773.65 was $43.37 per claim.

The total amount originally claimed by these 1,813 evacuees who compromised and settled their claims was $2,725,550.53, while the actual amount awarded by the Department was $1,402,619.45. While so-called noncompensable items accounted for most of the difference between what was claimed and what was finally authorized for payment, a substantial amount was for the 25 percent automatic and arbitrary deduction of compensable items in every claim which is required by law as the price of compromise settlement.

Since the beginning of the year, the Department has been able to increase its production to well over 1,000 claims a month, thereby reducing even more its administrative expenses per claim. We now understand that it hopes to compromise, settle, and pay 17,725 claims out of the 23,725 claims pending as of July 1, 1951, by the end of this fiscal year, June 30, 1952.

In the past several months, the Department of Justice has adopted what we consider a more humane and realistic approach to this whole problem. At the same time, it has perfected its machinery for processing claims to the point where it threatens to outstrip the speed of the claimants in submitting compromise offers of their evacuation claims. Indeed, we feel that Holmes Baldridge, Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Claims Division, and his colleagues in this special section are to be praised for the manner in which they have developed this compromise settlement procedure which saves the Government substantial sums in administrative expenses while providing claimants with expeditious authorization of awards on as generous a basis as the Department believes possible under existing law.

Because Congress last year appropriated only half a million dollars for the payment of claims this fiscal year, the overwhelming majority of those who compromised and settled their evacuation claims have not yet been paid, and will not be paid until this supplemental appropriation is approved.

As noted previously, 10 years have passed since the wartime evacuation of persons of Japanese ancestry from the west coast. This compromise settlement procedure was devised for the aged and the needy. And, since the original legislation authorized the appropriation of such funds as would be necessary for this program, it is our belief that Congress should reaffirm as speedily as possible its expressed intention to compensate in part for some of the economic losses suffered by those who were evacuated by the military in 1942 by approving this supplemental appropriation for the payment of these claims.

Although this may not be the appropriate place or time to suggest what we consider to be serious deficiencies in the basic legislation, at least as interpreted by the Department of Justice, we feel obliged to call at least a few of the more important ones to your attention. The Department of Justice, for example, has ruled that expenses involved in preparation for that wartime movement from long-established homes to desert wilderness camps are not "loss to real or personal property," and, therefore, not compensable. Another is the denial of transportation expenses incurred in returning from relocation centers to prewar homes. A few others illustrative of the Department's restricted interpretations include rejection of losses of rental, at least in certain cases; expenses of management of properties and businesses during the period of exclusion; and losses incurred by heads of families who were interned and later released or paroled and sent to evacuation centers.

We do not intend to press for any legislative amendments at this time because we realize that the program is far from being completed. After the compromise settlements of $2,500 and less are processed and paid, there are several thousand larger claims remaining to be adjudicated.

When a substantial number of claims has been paid and we are able to review the program in the light of the actual record, we again may request Congress to amend this measure to bring within the meaning of the statute some items which we sincerely believe should be included in this remedial legislation.

Sincerely,

MIKE MASAOKA,
National Legislative Director,
Japanese American Citizens League.

The Clerk read as follows:

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $4,000,000; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for personal services, is increased from "$30,159,900" to "$33,117,250"; *Provided,* That appropriations granted under this head for the fiscal year 1952 shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed 40 passenger motor vehicles in addition to those heretofore provided, and for purchase or construction of buildings and adjunct facilities for detention of aliens.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER: On page 3, line 19, strike out "$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,610,000."

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce by $1,390,000 this item provided in this particular section of the bill. The proposed $4,000,000 item in the bill is over and above the present allotment for the operation of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. There are three different items included in this proposed cut. One has to do with the addition of 335 additional employees who have not been employed previously. These 335 new employees would be continued on the payroll from year to year and the total cost would run into many millions of dollars. The second phase of it has to do with the construction of two detention centers along the Mexican border where illegal aliens would be concentrated for deportation. If those things are necessary that is very well and good. But, from reading the hearings, I do not find ample justification for that type of expenditure. It will be recalled that last year when this same proposal was before the House, there was a request for funds for these various additional purposes. When the attention of the House was called to the purposes for which they were designed, and when an amendment was offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] the House promptly struck out that entire request. Now the procedure that is followed at the present time is that if illegal aliens are picked up anywhere, they are put in jail where they belong. They have jails all up and down the border from California clear down to the Gulf of Mexico. The work has been proceeding so far as I know very well under that arrangement. Last year when the House struck out the request, $3,000,000 was restored in the Senate, and finally the conferees cut it to $1,000,000. Out of that $1,000,000 instead of building detention camps which they now claim they need, what was it used for? It was used principally, according to this hearing, on a gigantic airlift taking illegal aliens away into the interior of Mexico. Nearly $1,000,000 was spent for that purpose. Now of the items I propose to cut out, more than $500,000 would be used for a similar purpose during May and June. It seems to me, if these people need free airplane rides down into the interior of Mexico—of course, they should be deported—but if they need these free rides, then why should not the Republic of Mexico pay that expense, and why should Uncle Sam bear the entire burden of transporting these Mexican nationals hundreds and hundreds of miles into the interior of their own country? Especially is that true when this country has already spent a million dollars or more on this one undertaking. It seems to me that expense could very easily be eliminated from this bill without doing any violence so far as the enforcement of the law with respect to illegal aliens is concerned. So it would seem that since there are over 700 permanent patrolmen already along the border area and enforcing that law, we can ill afford the cost of adding another 300 to that total.

The Department of Labor has a major part in the administration of this labor program along the border. It spent over $1,000,000 during the past year. Something like $500,000 is provided by this bill. If they need that, very well. I make no point about that. But, the total cost is pyramiding and to a certain extent being duplicated.

If, under the new international labor agreement which is pending with Mexico, it can be made more workable and much of the red tape and difficulties ironed out, which difficulties have existed in the past, then much of this problem itself will be eliminated, and this tremendous additional cost of putting more and more men on the public payroll can be eliminated.

Here is a chance to save the taxpayers many millions of dollars and hold the line against the pressure for more and more people to be added to the public payroll.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we all know the desparate, lawless situation on the Mexican border with regard to wetbacks, and how the border at the Rio Grande is just like

a sieve. Either this is a nation of law and order and people are going to recognize that we are going to have law and order, and that people who are illegal entrants into this country from Mexico must be deported, or we do not want law and order.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not yield at this moment. Let me proceed. I will yield to the gentleman later.

Either we are going to have law and order or we are not. The Immigration and Naturalization Service has been forced to fly illegally entered aliens back hundreds of miles into Mexico. They find that that is the only way they can discourage their coming right back across the border. In these troublous times, when we are geared for war production, as we are, and with the international situation as it is, do you not think it short-sighted to permit our border at Mexico to be as open as a sieve? You all know there is presently no adequate protection against smuggling narcotics, contraband, or the illegal entry of spies and foreign agents.

This money which the pending amendment would cut out of the bill would provide facilities for detaining aliens, establishment and maintenance of two detention camps, $878,000 to remove by air approximately 43,000 aliens during the coming months of May and June, and an increased staff and equipment for the border patrol to prevent illegal entries.

The committee asks that you vote down this amendment, if you believe in the preservation of law and order, and if you want to keep out of this country people from Mexico who are not legally entitled to be in it.

I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Does the gentleman know of anybody who is opposed to the application of law and order along any border in the United States, either New York or Texas or any other place?

Mr. ROONEY. I must say to the gentleman from Texas, who is a distinguished and able Member of this body, that I interpret the opposition to this item in this bill for the Immigration and Naturalization Service to be a step toward abandonment of law and order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me try to make clear to the Members of the House what the situation is. I think while this may add information it may also add some amusement.

Let us start by saying we are all for law enforcement. The border between the United States and Mexico is just about as definite as the border between Maryland and the District of Columbia. Suppose you were a person living in Chevy Chase or in Bethesda, and work was offered to you inside the District of Columbia. If you came down Wisconsin Avenue, you paid $10 to the State of Maryland. If you came down Connecticut Avenue, you paid $10 to the State of Maryland, but if you stepped over one block and came across the border between those entry points, you did not have to pay $10 to the State of Maryland and perhaps you did not have to pay a little fee to the man who put the stamp upon your papers. The problem of the wetback, about which our friends in the North talk so eloquently, is a problem created just as much in Mexico as in the United States.

Let us talk about flying them back. I opposed that last year. I think that is one of the most extravagant ideas that any bureaucratic agency of the Government has thought up yet. Suppose, as I say, you were living in Bethesda or in Chevy Chase, and you came across the border into the District of Columbia, and then the Immigration Service of the District of Columbia picked you up.

The Immigration Service picks you up and at great expense, as you see in this bill from $250,000 to $300,000 a month, goes out and hires airplanes; it is a very expensive method—perhaps they might better get them from the Army; I do not know; they could probably get them much cheaper, but they do not; they hire airplanes and then fly you way back beyond your home; they take you up to Hagerstown or over to Baltimore, dump you off, and then you have to walk home.

As I said facetiously last year when we were considering this bill, the reason the Immigration Service thought this up was so that the immigration official could get back to the United States before the Mexican got back. Whatever the reason, it is an extravagant program. It is creating a social and economic situation in Mexico which I said last year I thought would cause us to hear officially from the Republic of Mexico. The Mexican who does not live in the southern part of Mexico is taken to that part of Mexico, and set down farther away from the United States than where he belongs. It creates a real economic problem for the Republic of Mexico, the problem of feeding him, a police problem, and the problem of taking care of him.

I speak in support of the amendment, or to that part of it which has to do with the airlift. I think it is $878,000 requested, for the rest of this year, to put people across the border. We are all for that; if they are illegal entrants, they are not supposed to be here. I do not see why we should spend money to hire airplanes to set people down in Mexico a long way from their homes, so it will take a longer time to come back.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. I may point out to the gentleman from California that this is for 2 months; the proposed cost for 2 months would run something like $1,000,000, according to the hearings.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That makes it worse; I thought it was for three instead of two.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. In a recent crime survey conducted in four Southwestern States, namely, southern California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, it is shown that 11½ percent of the crime committed in that area is committed by these wetbacks, who are illegally in the country.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not know that. I wonder what the crime situation is in New York City.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Very little; most of the crooks have gone back to California. I still think that to get these people out of the country would save money for the people of the United States.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We will agree with the gentleman that we would like to have them sent back to their homes but not to take them several hundred miles south of where they live so they will have to walk back.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment comes to the floor now not entirely unexpected. I see no point in trying to compare the situation along the Mexican border with New York City or the District of Columbia, Maryland, and other nearby suburbs. I think most of the Members of the House are thoroughly cognizant and aware of the situation that prevails and exists on the Rio Grande. I think most of us deplore the fact that the back door of the agreement arrived at between the Government of the United States and the Government of Mexico is evaded by permitting these thousands of wetbacks to come across the border in violation of the agreement and in violation of the law and then to be exploited by the large farm owners of that area, which might be in my book actually called servitude. I do not think there is any question in the world but what actual servitude is taking place in that area of this Nation because of these wetbacks.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. REGAN. Would it surprise the gentleman to know that these Mexican immigrants are paid wages equal to those paid American workmen in the same area? And that the amount paid to a Mexican farmhand in 1 day would be as much as a bricklayer could earn in Mexico City in 10 days or 2 weeks time? The money that they earn is cleared through our post offices along the border to the extent of thousands of dollars. They contribute to the economy and the good of Mexico, and if they did not earn good money they would not come over here.

Mr. WIER. I would like to believe the statement of the gentleman from Texas. I have heard that statement made several times during the course of debate on wetback legislation now pending in the Congress, but it always generates from that area in which this problem is alive.

Mr. REGAN. That is where we know what the situation is.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The record shows that farm labor in the area the gentleman is talking about is paid more than farm labor in New York State.

Mr. WIER. Never mind New York State. Let us stay with the problem on the Rio Grande.

The fact of the matter is that the proponents of the continuation of this existence of servitude down there, and I refer reservedly to servitude, do not want any legislation and they have proven that time and time again in the last 2 years by their efforts to cripple any legislation on this subject.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Why does the gentleman say servitude?

Mr. WIER. I say servitude because the condition actually exists down there. Please do not try to convince me that with the agreement pending between Mexico and the United States Government relative to the importation of labor or to the relationship in transferring Mexican workers to this country under a properly arrived at contract, which means mutual agreement between the Governments, this method should not be followed through. I agree with the gentleman on that. I have no quarrel with that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Then what is the argument about?

Mr. WIER. We see here the proponents of these crippling amendments continually wanting to keep that back door of the Rio Grande open. They do not want it policed, as you saw a few days ago, neither do they today want the necessary finances to be appropriated so that that area can be properly policed and the agreement, if you please, protecting the Mexican citizens in their employment up here preserved.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is not the argument. The argument is not about sending them back across the border, with which we agree, but whether we are to fly them back to the center of Mexico and create another problem down there in Mexico.

Mr. WIER. That is just mussing up the picture. I have no sympathy for the expense of flying, and I express no sympathy and do not defend that, but I am going to continue to take the floor here in reference to closing up that back door. I understand that in California you also have a great number of these wetbacks that the big-farm owners want to continue to use the services of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to have Mexican agricultural labor in the States near Mexico and also some of the States north of Mexico. There are two ways of getting that labor. One way is the legitimate way through agreements with the Mexican Government which have certain safeguards regarding the return of the labor to Mexico, the wages that are paid, and other types of safeguards. I think every Member of the House can sustain that method.

The other method of getting this labor is by condoning the illegal entry of immigrants into this country. That is exactly what is happening on this wetback situation on the border of California and on the border of Texas. These people come across to get work because they can get higher wages, and if they come across under legal agreements, they are protected. If they do not come across under legal agreement, then it is left up to the beneficence of the employer as to whether they are treated right or not. Many of them are treated right, and I must confess that many of them are treated wrong. Any cut in appropriations to the Immigration and Naturalization Service in patrolling these hundreds of miles of border is a condoning of illegal entry of aliens into this country, and this particular cut, in the name of economy, is to further cripple the return of wetbacks from this country, illegally entered aliens, back to their point of origin, or south of their point of origin.

Now, it is not silly, and it is not similar to the reference to people crossing the border of Maryland or Virginia, to send these people back across the border several hundred miles. Otherwise the experience is that the officials take them across one day and they come back across the following night, because it is an impossibility to patrol the unfenced and practically unguarded borders of Mexico and Texas, with their limited personnel of the border guards. From the standpoint of necessity therefore, the Immigration and Naturalization people are using these planes to drop them several hundred miles south of the border so that they will not have to catch the same wetbacks the following night.

Mr. Chairman, I support the committee appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call this fact to the attention of the committee: that last August—I am sure it was last August—a bill was before this House to bring in this immigrant labor. The proponents of that bill assured the House that it would not cost the taxpayers of America one single dime. Then, about 10 days later, a supplemental appropriation bill was brought to the floor which requested $4,000,000 for this purpose of bringing into this country immigrant labor and also to transport the laborers back to Mexico. In that amount was requested 85 automobiles which were to be used to bring the laborers in and to take them back. I offered an amendment to strike out the full amount which was in that supplemental bill of $4,000,000, and the amendment was adopted.

Now, here we have before us another request for funds to fly the immigrant laborers back home.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I wanted to correct a misunderstanding that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] apparently had about this amendment. He said it was an attempt to reduce the appropriation of the present set-up for the enforcement of the law along the Rio Grande. It does not do that at all. It simply prevents an increase, a part of which has indirectly to do with the enforcement of the law on the Rio Grande. It is simply to prevent the increase of the Federal payroll by several hundred thousand dollars per year. It does not change the existing enforcement set-up at all. The gentleman from California apparently did not understand the amendment when it was read.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, here is a good place to save over a million dollars. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Certainly when the proponents told us last year that this would cost the taxpayers nothing, let us take them at their word and strike out this amount, which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] has requested in his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and supported by the gentleman from California brings forcibly to the minds of the Members of Congress the floor fight we had over the passage of wetback legislation in the last session of Congress.

I recall that the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from California both supported this legislation. I also recall that I attacked that legislation on the floor of the House on the ground that it was filled with hidden Government subsidies which the Government would have to pay. I also recall that I attacked their proposal of charging the farmer $10, which was in the House bill, and $20 in the Senate bill, and I offered an amendment to put into the bill the actual cost on the basis of the experience up to that time, which was $34.95. The bill was agreed on between the House and the Senate for a sum far less than that.

The Government is now being asked through this supplemental appropriation to put up money that rightfully should have been charged to the farmers down there who used these wetbacks on their farms. Instead of that, it comes up here now as a subsidy, and the inconsistency of it all is that the gentleman from Texas now proposes to cut out of the appropriation bill the necessary funds to carry out the law for which they were largely responsible.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REGAN. Then the gentleman agrees that this appropriation should be reduced?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not. I think the charge should be transferred to the people who are using the wetbacks.

Mr. REGAN. Then the gentleman favors a reduction in this appropriation?

Mr. BAILEY. I do not. I want to kill the wetback legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. We ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 105, noes 48.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADDITIONAL WASHINGTON AIRPORT

For expenses necessary for the acquisition of land, interests therein, and appurtenances thereto, for the site and appurtenant facilities for an additional public airport within or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia, as authorized by Public Law 762, approved September 7, 1950; plans, specifications, and surveys; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $1,400,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 4, line 14, strike out all of lines 14 through 22, inclusive.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, so that I may explain this amendment to a certain degree, I ask unanimous consent for another 5 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I object. I am willing to settle this matter now, without any further debate. We have listened all afternoon to this.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Minnesota will proceed.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, as I stated in general debate here, we have an opportunity here to do many things. First, we can save the taxpayers of America $50,000,000 by eliminating this further appropriation for Burke Airport. Secondly, we can help a lot of people over in Fairfax County, which county is overwhelmingly, in fact, almost unanimously, opposed to the establishment of that particular airport. Let me quote from the hearings on page 107. The governing body of the county, the board of supervisors, said:

The establishment of such an airport in Fairfax County, Va., would be extremely detrimental to the general welfare, health, and safety of the residents, and practically ruinous to the future development of the entire community as a residential area.

As stated previously, my only interest first of all is the saving of these $50,000,000. Through the establishment of such an airport as is proposed at Burke, we are creating a hazard in that heavily populated area similar to that which exists in Elizabeth and in Newark. We have Friendship Airport available as has been brought out, and as these half a dozen gentlemen who have backed me up today in my argument can testify. We have a splendid airport up there which is only being utilized to 20 percent of its capacity. That airport is only 40 minutes from the Statler Hotel. The testimony of police officers in Fairfax is to the effect that you will only save 6 minutes in time from Burke to the Statler as compared to the time from Friendship Airport, and even then you may have to break the legal speed limits to try to do that. Why should we inflict upon a community, and upon the State of Virginia, such a situation as is proposed here. Why should we inflict upon them the establishment of a very expensive airport, as far as the Federal Government is concerned? We can draw out of this mess with a loss of only $150,000, one-third of 1 percent of the $50,000,000 which it would ultimately cost. Do you not think it is good business to do so?

We are talking about economy. Here we can do something to help. We can save $50,000,000. That may not be considered too much by some people, but it is still a lot of money to me. When are we going to start saving if we do not knock out nonessentials such as this?

Those of you who were present during general debate heard the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] practically admit that my amendment was justified. He certainly did not defend the Burke Airport site. I quote in the debate a letter from Senator BYRD to the effect that he would vote against any further appropriation for this particular item.

From a military viewpoint, are we going to put ourselves in a position where, in case of war, if the Potomac River bridges are knocked out, we will be out entirely as far as the National Airport and the Burke Airport are concerned, whereas the Friendship Airport, only 40 miles from the Statler Hotel, is available, along an all-land route?

I hope the House will see fit to accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that most of the 2 hours of general debate was spent on this item, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, a great bulk of the Membership of the House were not present during general debate. Certainly we are entitled to be heard on this $50,000,000 project. I object.

Mr. CANNON. We have spent nearly 2 hours on this. How many desire to be heard?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that is going to leave only about 2½ minutes for each Member except the committee.

Mr. CANNON. They have had 2 hours' debate on it already.

Mr. POAGE. But we did not have any of it.

Mr. CANNON. That was because the gentleman was not present on the floor.

Mr. POAGE. I was present.

Mr. CANNON. But the gentleman did not ask for time. If he had it would have been granted him.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] is recognized.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, no one can argue the need for additional facilities to relieve the traffic congestion and hazards now existing at the Washington National Airport. However, I do not believe that the construction of an additional airport in the Washington area would relieve the traffic hazard, nor the congestion, as too many airports located in one area would make the air lanes more congested and more dangerous.

Before the sum of $14,000,000 requested in S. 456 was appropriated by Congress, I strongly urged that the facilities at the new Friendship International Airport be utilized.

With the present need for elimination of all unnecessary expenditures, is it fair to the taxpayers to impose this additional burden on them for the Washington traffic, when the Government has already invested about three million in the Friendship Airport? This investment in that airport can only be justified on the use of it as a regional facility. Furthermore, it has been shown that the fourteen million was only the beginning of the cost of the new airport.

In testifying before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on this airport as late as June 30, 1950, the spokesman for the Department of Defense stated:

The Department contemplates no foreseeable military requirement for the utilization of the proposed new public airport. It is conceivable, however, that a future national emergency may require utilization of the airport by military aircraft operation in the interest of the national security. In view of this defense value in time of emergency, the Department of Defense recommends that the land acquisition and planning for the lay-out of the air-field facilities and the airport be such that it can readily be expanded in accordance with military standards and criteria.

A considerable length of time would be required for the construction of the airport to permit its use for defense or security purposes. Friendship Airport was planned and constructed to serve not only the growing Baltimore air traffic, but the overflow from the Washington National Airport as well. It has been estimated that Friendship, with the present National Airport, will be adequate to serve the needs of the capital area for at least 10 years. Should defense need require additional facilities, Friendship would provide that need, having been so constructed that it can be increased quickly to two or three times its present capacity at a cost of only five or six million dollars.

Furthermore, the physical location and the equipment at Friendship offer efficient and safe handling of aircraft

during inclement weather conditions. The site was chosen because, from a meteorological standpoint, it is the best in the entire area. And with the completion of the Baltimore-Washington Expressway, already authorized by Congress, rapid transportation to Washington will be provided.

Therefore, I urge the Members to oppose the outlay of money for the additional airport as entirely unnecessary at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this amendment. I do not believe the Federal Government should pay the total cost for an airport for any community in the United States. The taxpayers of the country already pay a large part of the cost of air transportation: The control towers, the weather stations, and all the other facilities a plane requires when it takes off on its journey, for its guidance through the sky, and again to land, are at Federal cost. If the local people cannot pay a just portion of the cost they should not have an airport.

Another reason: Is this something we can get along without? There seems no dispute but what there are ample facilities at the Friendship Airport that should be used. With the present condition of the United States Treasury, the overburdened taxpayers, and our heavy tax load, there is no reason why the Federal taxpayers should further subsidize this community for its air transportation. There is no reason why the Federal taxpayers should pay the total cost of a Federal airport which is not used exclusively for governmental purposes. We have one federally built and supported airport here now. Why should we build another?

Still a further reason why I believe that this ought to be rejected and we should back up on this project is that the costs are very likely to exceed the original estimates. This Congress should speak up against bureaucratic domination of projects. These agencies advance them and suggest the costs will be much less than they eventually turn out to be and thus get the camel's nose under the tent, thus compelling the Congress to appropriate millions and millions of dollars to complete it or lose the original investment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, at the moment there is no need for an additional third airport in this immediate vicinity and the need undoubtedly will not arise for a number of years. Even though the money were appropriated for the Burke Airport, it will be a considerable time before it could be put into actual use.

While I am opposed to all unnecessary Government expenditures at this critical time, I have consistently worked for the development of the Friendship Airport. Let me say now if just one third of the money which is contemplated in this appropriation were applied to the immediate completion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, the development of the Burke Airport would be a complete nonessential expenditure. The Friendship Airport is already in existence and capable of handling all air commerce which might overflow from any of the overcrowded fields. There is absolutely no necessity to spend the $14,000,000 asked for in the initial appropriation—the ultimate investment of which, conservatively figured, would eventually exceed $25,000,000.

I have been very active, as chairman of the Public Works Committee on Roads not only in developing Friendship but also in initiating and supporting legislation which authorized the construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, which connects with the airport. Further to sustain my position, I am quoting what the Civil Aeronautics Administration had to say, as recently as January 1949, in its Washington and Baltimore regional study:

> In order to prepare a sound analysis of existing and future airport requirements, it was considered necessary and desirable to include in a single study the metropolitan areas of Washington, D. C., and Baltimore, Md.
>
> The total distance between the two cities is only 38 miles from center to center; the metropolitan district boundaries of the two are contiguous at one point and are continually expanding toward one another.
>
> Therefore, it is logical when one considers the airplane as a long-distance carrier to study the two metropolitan districts as a single unit with respect to the air transportation problem.
>
> The over-all master plan which guides the development provides for a satisfactory ultimate airport which will be capable of accommodating future air traffic peak loads for the entire Baltimore-Washington region, should such a need ever arise.

We now have Friendship International Airport operating. I have made a study of the figures to see if Friendship could handle with ease any overload from the Washington field and it most certainly can.

Recently, the Air Transport Association of America wrote to all its members throughout the country and abroad, advising them that "Baltimore now has one of the three finest airports in the world." One of the "shocking circumstances," revealed the letter, "is that generally airline personnel do not know that Baltimore now has one of the three finest airports in the world or that it is served as adequately as it is at present."

Surely, in view of the availability of this magnificent airport, if Congress approves this appropriation today for the construction of a third airport in Virginia which even the officials of that State say they "do not have need of and have not asked for," it will be another classic example whereby we are overruling the natural economic forces at work and eliminating the opportunity for Friendship, a new enterprise, to come into the field.

Further, is it logical to spend many millions of dollars for a third regional airport at this time when it will require thousands of man-hours of labor which could properly be used in other fields? It will require thousands of tons of steel and other critical material which also could be used in other fields. For example, at this very moment many automobile factories in our Western States are closed because of the shortage of steel.

When the hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1950 to authorize the construction of the Burke Airport, I vigorously voiced my opposition in committee and also protested the construction of this airport from the floor of the House. The statements that I made then are true now. Certainly it is common sense when taxpayers throughout the United States are seeking economy in Government not to increase their burden by spending a large sum of money for an airport which is not wanted, is not needed, and will not be needed for a great many years to come.

The time has come when good hard American common sense in Government activities and spending must be applied. I am opposing this appropriation for the reasons I have stated. I sincerely believe, under the present conditions, any further expenditure of money here is wanton waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, when news about this site first appeared in the press I drove over to Burke station to inspect the site, and twice since then I have driven over the area. I express, now as I have expressed before, a great deal of surprise that an area of such rolling nature, so very expensive to prepare as an airport, has been selected for this particular airport. I have always been surprised, as I expressed this morning, that we should add to the traffic difficulties we face every morning and evening, and as I faced for 2½ years when living in Alexandria, in getting across the bridges; and, finally, the evidence before the committee has pointed out that there are several airports—Friendship is one of them, and I hold no brief for any—but Andrews is much nearer and the saving would be considerable. The construction of the highway to Andrews, for example, would save us a million. I do not know whether that is the right figure but we could certainly save money there. Even if we would lose a million at Burke, we would save two million on the road alone to Andrews, which is a better airport and saves time.

So I think we should adopt the amendment which would save us money. At the same time we should ask the friends of the airport, and those of us who believe we should have a second airport, in which class I belong, to reconsider this Burke situation as not being the most desirable spot.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman has brought out the rugged character of that part of the State of Virginia. It certainly is a fact that there has been no drill test that I know of taken as to the site to see how far the

granite rock stretches throughout that area.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Virginia has always been rugged, for which I am very glad.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I want to talk to you just as one ordinary citizen to another about a proposition that has quite a lot of technical aspects about it. Everybody agrees that Washington needs a good airport, everybody agrees that there are four airports in Washington right now, all paid for by the United States Government: the National Airport, Bolling Field, the Navy Field, and Andrews Field. I think everybody will agree that Andrews Field was originally built for the defense of Washington at a time when we used low-speed planes, when the defense of our city required an airport very close to it. We now depend for defense upon high-speed jet planes that should be based a great distance from the city.

There is no justification in the world for maintaining Andrews Field as a military field that I know of, except it is more convenient for the officers who are located there to live in the city of Washington. They might just as well be moved, might much better be moved a substantial distance from Washington, where they could serve their purpose of defense much better. But if you don't want to move them very far they might be transferred over to Friendship Airport, which has already been built and apparently is not being used to capacity. But why do we not use the thing we have? We have Andrews Field. It belongs to the United States Government. It is ideally located as a civilian airport. It is not well located for the defense of Washington. It is not needed as a military transport center. Bolling Field and the Navy field provide adequately for that need.

Are we afraid of the military? Is that not the reason that we are spending so many billions of dollars? We must be afraid of the brass and of the stars on somebody's shoulder and of the gold braid. Let us not be deterred by the fear that we are going to offend the military. Let us do what we need to do with the public property of the United States and let us make it serve the most pressing public need. In this case that public need at this particular point seems to be a new commercial airport.

Everyone knows that we need a field close to Washington, a good civilian field, one we can get to and from very quickly. We have an express highway to Andrews Field. We do not need a defense field right here on the target. The defense field should be a substantial distance away. So we will gain two things by using Andrews Field. We will help the civilians and the military at the same time, and we will save a large part of the 50 or 60 million dollars that would otherwise be poured into a new civilian field at a great distance from the city. Why should we spend $50,000,000 or more to make the civilian field inconvenient and to make the air defense of Washington inefficient?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, a perusal of the hearings on this particular question, together with the debate that has been had, convinces me that here is an opportunity for me to help deter the spending of another unnecessary $50,000,000. I am obligated to my people to do that very thing.

The Federal Government has about $3,000,000 invested in the Baltimore Friendship Airport on the assumption and with the understanding that field would be used by both Baltimore and the people in the city of Washington area. The record shows that Friendship Airport is occupied to about 25 to 28 percent capacity. To go out and further appropriate for the development of the Burke Airport, in my opinion, is a mistake, and, therefore, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] made a very good point when he brought out the facts about Andrews Field. Why should we not consider all possible angles of this matter? All my amendment would do would be to give the Congress an opportunity to determine what is the best thing to do to provide additional service for Washington through properly located air fields.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, that is true. We have all of these airfields here in this very congested area, and it seems to me that every time you build another field you increase the traffic hazard by reason of the concentration of planes within a given area.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, first I would like, in a friendly way, to admonish my good and long-time friend the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] not to get excited and say things that he evidently does not mean. When he so loosely associates my name with spending a mythical $50,000,000 of the taxpayers' money, let me remind him that scarcely 3 weeks ago he appeared before the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations with a request for $54,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for which there was not even a budget estimate or authorization, and went over to the Senate and did the same.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman always loves to interrupt me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a fairly simple matter. Our committee listened to the testimony of engineers in regard to this item. I have no personal interest in this and have never previously expressed a preference in regard to locating the airport at Burke. This has never previously been before our committee. The gentlemen who testified before our committee were qualified to talk on aviation and airports. They are admittedly experts in that special field, and I feel that they are better experts than you or I, or any of the rest of us who talked here today. The fact is that the Washington National Airport traffic reached the saturation point in 1948, and it is rapidly becoming a dangerous situation. You must get started, and get started immediately on another airport. Now, where are we going to put the airport? The Civil Aeronautics Administration told us that they have spent a million dollars so far of the taxpayers' money on the Burke Airport, and with the approval of the Congress. I sympathize with the people who do not like to have their property condemned. No property owner likes condemnation of his property, and merely a fair and reasonable value for it as fixed by the Government and the court. But where else are you going to put your vitally needed airport. The experts went out to this rugged terrain in Virginia where they are getting land for about only $375 an acre, to build an airport to cost not $50,000,000, as has been suggested here, but $12,000,000. Why the plans do not even contemplate a hangar.

This is primarily to build landing strips, fuel facilities and the like as a supplementary airport to Washington, and the total estimate, if you will read the testimony, is $12,000,000. Suppose I lived in the South, do you think I would want to fly north across Washington, nearly up to Baltimore and have to ride all the way back from Baltimore to Washington to attend to my congressional duties?

Mr. Chairman, we have heard extended debate on this subject this afternoon. I am not going to burden you any further. You know what the story is. Do you want to abandon the $1,000,000 that you have already spent, or do you not? Are you going to listen to the aviation experts, whose testimony is in the record, engineers, if you please, or are you going to listen to the engineers and aviation specialists you heard here today?

Mr. Chairman, I urge the defeat of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were: ayes 128, noes 41.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $550,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 6, line 6, strike out "$550,000" and insert "450,000."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, in this appropriation process we find that things become so complicated sometimes that it is a little hard to follow them. Many of us have been trying very hard to reduce Federal expenditures and after

a great deal of time and effort, amendments are offered and adopted on the floor of this House, only to learn later that supplemental items are brought in which completely negate the expressed will of Congress.

In this particular instance, in 1952, we provided $20,600,000 for the Office of the Treasurer for an average employment of 1,262 people. As a 1953 request, they asked for $21,500,000 to provide for 1,529 employees. The committee cut them $500,000 to $21,000,000. Then the bill came here on the floor a week or so ago and by a very substantial majority we reduced the figure another $500,000. Now they are in here with this request for $550,000 for the next few months of the current fiscal year.

It is time we taught these agencies that when we make a reduction in an appropriation as an economy move it is not just a gesture, that we mean what we say, and they cannot come in here with supplemental requests which set at naught the action we have taken in the interest of the taxpayers.

We have expressly provided by law on this subject, and the question I want to put to the chairman of the committee is whether in his judgment the law has not been violated by this agency in this instance. The law states:

All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes shall on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made.

What do we find with regard to this agency? We find on page 395 of the hearings the program this Department laid out at the beginning of the year for their quarterly apportionment of appropriations. We find for the first quarter $5,325,000. Now that is substantially more than one quarter of the total appropriation made for the fiscal year amounting to $20,687,430. The same is true of the amount programed for the second and third quarters. Then they program a much smaller sum for the last quarter but actually plan to spend several hundred thousand dollars more than they have programed, relying on a request to Congress to take up the slack by a supplemental appropriation. That makes a mockery of the entire system and flies directly in the face of the statutory provision we have enacted to prevent that very practice of spending at any rate fixed by an agency rather than at the stated rate fixed by Congress.

There is only $100,000 in money involved in this amendment but a fundamental principle is at stake. If we are going to demonstrate to the departments and agencies of Government that we will not tolerate such reckless disregard for action taken by Congress to limit their appropriations, we will adopt this amendment.

In all fairness, I think I should add that the Office of the Treasurer is only one of many, many offenders in this regard. Indeed, probably the amounts involved here are modest compared to the expenditures made in many other agencies over and beyond the expressed will of Congress. But this amendment permits the House to go on record as condemning this practice. I hope they will maintain a firm position.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that there has been no violation of the law, and there will be no violation of the law in this Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield with pleasure to my chairman.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this Department will finish its appropriation year without a deficit, if the amount allowed in this bill is not appropriated. But, what will be the result? In an effort to avoid a terrific backlog in its workload, this agency has spent more than three-fourths of its annual appropriation in the first three-quarters of the appropriation year. Notwithstanding the fact that they have over-expended to some extent for the first three quarters, on January 1 they had a carry-over of 12,000,000 paper checks in their starting operation, as compared with a normal backlog of approximately 5,000,000. This backlog has increased in excess of 3,000,000 over the past month, and will undoubtedly continue to increase, at least at this rate, over the remainder of the fiscal year.

On January 18, the carry-over in Federal Reserve half notes, presented for redemption, totaled 42,500,000 notes, while the normal carry-over is 4,500,000. This figure had increased 9,000,000 notes since the end of December, and will continue to increase proportionately.

If the House does not allow the amount, which the committee has recommended, it will be necessary for the Treasurer to discharge 200 regular, trained employees between now and the end of the fiscal year in the face of a backlog which is already very large, is steadily increasing and will pyramid rapidly with the decrease in personnel. If that is what the House wants, then support this amendment. Our committee cut the amount requested, but we felt they did need the amount which we recommended to carry on for the rest of the year.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that approval of this amendment today will be protested by the banks of the United States, because it will affect their clearances; and is it not also true that it will injuriously affect the audits of the Comptroller General's office of the United States?

Mr. GARY. I have talked to the Comptroller General's office today, and they said that a large backlog would be serious.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has addressed himself to the increased workload. I was raising the point of whether the law has been violated by the programing of these expenditures as they appear on page 395 at an amount in excess of the amount which they should have. It is not a question of the actual expenditures, but the program is set forth on page 395 and it shows they were programing at a rate which this agency was not permitted by law to program.

Mr. GARY. The law has not been violated because the law says that the work of the agency must not be programed so that there will be a deficit, and there will be no deficit if this amount is not appropriated. They will discharge the necessary employees, and they will live within the amount that the Congress has allowed them. Therefore, there has been no violation of the law. But in order to do so they will have to permit the workloads to pyramid, and we will have a very serious condition in the office of the Treasury.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The amounts programed for the first three-quarters of this present fiscal year exceed three-fourths of the amount allowed to this agency for the entire fiscal year, and that seems to me to be contrary to what the Congress intended when it enacted this legislation.

Mr. GARY. That is not a violation of the law or contrary to what the Congress intended. All the Congress requires is that the agencies live within their appropriations. The Treasurer will live within her appropriation regardless of the action of the Congress on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARY) there were—ayes 100, noes 65.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. GARY and Mr. KEATING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 115, noes 82.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

The amount authorized to be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, for "Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance," by the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1952, is increased from "$58,000,000" to "$60,100,000."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to go back to page 8.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think we have passed that point in the reading of the bill, but I hope the gentleman may have permission to offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Where does the gentleman desire to offer his amendment?

Mr. BAILEY. I had prepared the amendment to be offered at the bottom of page 12, but I see another item on page 8, line 16.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to offer an amendment to that section of the bill?

Mr. BAILEY. I desire to offer the amendment where it will be germane and I presume following line 9 on page 8 would be the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 8, line 9, insert the following item:

"Office of Education: To supplement existing appropriations for schoolhouse construction under the provisions of Public Law 815, $65,000,000."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to unduly excite the members of the committee with an item of this size. In my discussion during general debate I said I wanted to get some facts in the RECORD for the information of the Members of the House. A majority of the Members, I know, are particularly interested in this item of Federal assistance to impacted school districts due to defense activities in the defense effort.

I want to give you a full and complete picture. I do not know that I shall press for a vote on this amendment, but I do want to give you a picture of the situation in the thought that we will have to meet it, if not at the present time, in the future.

The need for this item of $65,000,000 in the authorized program for construction of school facilities in federally impacted areas is predicated on two important factors.

(a) Under the emergency housing legislation approved by the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, the President was given authority to declare certain defense areas as critical. To date he has set up so many of these critical areas—due to the Korean emergency and other defense needs—that it makes the provisions of Public Law 815 wholly inadequate to meet the situation.

(b) The President's veto of H. R. 5411, which passed on the closing day of the first session, has thrown this whole matter back into the lap of the Congress. To date no new legislation has been prepared to take the place of the vetoed bill. To meet this situation, let me state briefly what has been done:

First. Original request from Commissioner McGrath's office, $215,000,000.

This would care for 900 school districts, in which there are 750,000 pupils, for which there are no housing facilities available.

Second. Bureau of the Budget in lieu of the $215,000,000 granted contract authorizations in the amount of $150,000,000 for advance spending. This will take care of only 600 of the 900 school districts and care for only 500,000 of the 750,000 pupils presently without housing.

The $150,000,000 in contract authorization will take care of only those districts that have a priority rating above 35 percent on the basis of need. Unless the $65,000,000 is included as an item in this appropriation many of my colleagues will have schools in their districts already qualified for aid that will be cut out of the program entirely. This will be rank discrimination.

What I want the Members of the House, who have school projects in their districts, to know that this $150,000,000 construction authorization which the budget office is proposing is subject to whatever action the subcommittee and the general Committee on Appropriations might take in the appropriation bill for 1953. That $150,000,000 will take care of only 600 of the 900 projects that need to be constructed. That leaves 300 projects that will have to be temporarily or permanently abandoned; and let me say to you that they represent projects in the smaller school districts that fall in the category of less than 35 percent priority set up by the Commissioner of Education.

I want to call your attention to that as the author of Public Law 815 and as the chairman of your subcommittee, who has been laboring to get you additional steel allocations. I want the Members of the House to understand how serious this situation is. Here are all these projects that you are proposing, under the budget procedure, to delay construction until after July. At the present time there are 750,000 children who will not have a schoolhouse roof over them on the first day of September unless this Congress acts and does something about it.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. Can we afford to wait until July?

Mr. BAILEY. That is the question.

Mr. LANHAM. It seems to me that the gentleman ought to insist on a vote on his amendment now, because if we wait until July for an appropriation, then it will take a year or 18 months to get the schools built.

Mr. BAILEY. I think the point made by the gentleman from Georgia is well taken.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Certainly we have a very real problem along the lines the gentleman is describing in my own district. It is my understanding that this item will be brought in in the regular appropriation bill probably within 2 weeks.

Mr. BAILEY. After I finish my statement the gentleman will understand. This contract authorization of $150,000,000 is just part of the program. We would do two-thirds of the job that needs to be done, and we have no assurance that we will get the $150,000,000. In the meantime these projects are going to have no attention and cannot be processed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. The difference between what the Commissioner asks for, for the full program of the 900 school projects, and the proposal of the budget office, that it be a contract authorization of $150,000,000, leaves a difference of $65,000,000. My amendment would insert in this supplemental appropriation bill the difference between the needs for the whole program and the contract authorization which would be the sum of $65,000,000.

Now, I do not want to be a party to discriminating against any Member of Congress, and I know that if this halfway proposal goes through there is going to be a score of Members in Congress who are going to have projects in their districts that this program will not reach, and I think it is grossly unfair that we jump into these large defense areas and do projects, because they are a little more emergent than they are in some other areas. Many of those other areas have been waiting for months and months for money to go ahead with their projects.

I sincerely hope this matter rests in the minds of the members of this committee and the Members of the House, because I am sure an appropriation item covering this need will be in the budget coming over from the other body, and I wanted you to have these facts to show the need for agreeing with the Senate item in the budget.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

For an additional amount for "Defense community facilities and services," $9,375,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the construction of any project unless funds are available for the completion of such project.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 14, line 11, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided further*, That $543,975 of such amount shall be applied to the provision of library facilities and services in critical defense areas."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not add any money to

the bill. It does not propose to do anything which is not already intended in the bill. It earmarks an item which has already been discussed as a part of the program.

If you will turn to page 14, line 8, you will see the figure of $9,375,000. When that figure came to the subcommittee it was for twice that amount. It was reduced in the full committee to the present figure. In order that the smaller item to which I refer may be protected, I have asked that it be designated in the bill as calling for $543,975.

The request came to the subcommittee too late for our hearings. It came to the subcommittee too late with the supporting evidence to permit analysis in our subcommittee, so I have made an analysis of the requests already presented to the subcommittee, and have broken the requests into headings of books and equipment and additions to existing buildings and new buildings, and new construction. I have struck out the requests for new construction, because I think that should have more discussion in the committee. My own feeling is that much of that is an obligation of the local community or the State. I do think we should protect the library facilities. As a salesman just out of college traveling over Ohio, and later when I was in two cantonments in World War I, I know that I personally, and my family, made use of the public libraries as a means of recreation and enjoyment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Is it the gentleman's intention that these funds will not increase the total appropriation but will be a part of the over-all sum of $50,000,000 altogether authorized?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON. In other words, it will not save a dollar.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is not intended either to save or to spend, it is intended to earmark a sum already existing.

Mr. CANNON. No saving is proposed here at all?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No saving and no spending, other than already discussed.

Mr. Chairman, I hope I may have an affirmative vote on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to those familiar with the bill, this amendment is decidedly puzzling.

We have here a limited emergency fund which is available for a number of community requirements. This money can be spent for hospitals or for water systems, school facilities, sewer systems, and purposes immediately and directly affecting the health of the community. It is money which, if not properly spent, could mean contagion and death and lack of hospitalization.

The amendment proposes to take this emergency money away from hospitals and sewer systems; from facilities to supply pure water and local health administration, and give it to libraries. Libraries are wonderful institutions. We are all in favor of libraries. But when it comes to the point of whether we shall give a dollar to a library or give it to a hospital—of giving a dollar to a library or to a school—of spending a dollar for books or pure water and adequate sewage disposal, it presents a question on which there can be little difference of opinion. The amendment is puzzling, to say the least. What is the reason? Why should we take money away from fundamental necessities which directly affect the health of the community, and especially of its children, just to give somebody an opportunity to read a book?

Let us at least leave it to the authorities to say, after they have considered the matter, whether we ought to give libraries preference over hospitals and schools. Why should we single out libraries, of all the facilities needed, for preferential treatment. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PHILLIPS) there were—ayes 46, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $200,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Salaries and expenses," Office of Defense Mobilization.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 19, after line 11, insert:

"SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the Small Defense Plants Administration, including expense of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $825,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for seven additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, we have before us an ill-considered recommendation to abolish an executive agency that was established only 7 months ago without a dissenting vote in either House of Congress. Two hundred and sixty-one Members of this House were original sponsors of the legislation creating the Small Defense Plants Administration. Twenty-four of them are members of the Appropriations Committee. Now, just as the agency is in a position to carry out the mandate we gave it, the Appropriations Committee has decided it should be cut off without a further penny and be liquidated at once.

The reasons for continuing the Small Defense Plants Administration in existence with adequate appropriations are the same reasons Congress had for establishing the agency in the first place. The main purpose of the legislation was to centralize in one place the responsibility for handling small-business problems under the mobilization program. If you have ever tried—and I am sure many of you have—to get a constituent a little more copper or aluminum to keep his business going, or tried to arrange a loan for him, or tried to track down someone in the Pentagon who knows when bids are going to be opened on a particular procurement—if you have ever had to deal with the countless small-business offices in Government, you know why Congress decided to give one agency the sole duty of protecting small business, with no other functions to perform.

The simple fact is that until Congress created the Small Defense Plants Administration, the responsibility for assisting small-business men was scattered all over Washington—with no design, no coordination, and a great amount of duplication. We put an end to that duplication when we established SDPA and made it the single spokesman for small business. Yet the Appropriations Committee has decided that black is white—that SDPA is duplicating the work of other agencies.

I ask you to think back to the first year of the Defense Production Act, when the act contained only a noble expression of the principle of aid to small business. The proportion of defense contracts going to small business steadily decreased. The Munitions Board's own figures prove it: In fiscal 1950, the percentage of dollar volume going to small business was 24.5; in fiscal 1951 it was 20.9; and in the first half of fiscal 1952 it fell to 19.7. Precisely the same thing happened during World War II, until the Smaller War Plants Corporation got started and was able to throw its weight around on behalf of the small-business man.

In the 13 months from November 1942 to December 1943, small business got only 12.8 percent of the dollar volume of contracts awarded. During this time the Smaller War Plants Corporation had to spend a lot of its time overcoming organizational problems and making arrangements to do its work in the scores of procurement offices throughout the country. But after SWPC really got going, look what happened: From 12.8 percent in 1943, the figure rose to 20 percent in 1944, to 26.7 in the first half of

1945, and to 30.4 in the last half of 1945. Navy figures showed a similar increase.

Now, there is every reason to believe that if SDPA is given the relatively small appropriation it is requesting, it can repeat the history of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. This is the most valid reason for reversing the action of the committee.

Let me list the other achievements of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. It assisted in the formation of some 250 small business production pools and got them over $600,000,000 in war contracts. These pools represented 2,000 companies employing 140,000 workers. In other arrangements with the military services, the Smaller War Plants Corporation examined nearly 205,000 proposed procurements. With SWPC assistance, small firms got an estimated 60,000 prime contracts with a total value of $6,000,000,000.

In addition, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, through persuasion, suggestion, by providing information to big plants, and assistance to small ones, helped in the awarding of more than 52,000 subcontracts valued at $30,600,000,000.

In the vital area of loans the Small Defense Plants Administration's predecessor authorized nearly 6,000 loans and leases valued at more than a half-billion dollars.

I have given you the figures on small business' increasing share of defense contracts. Let me add only this fact: The official history of the Purchasing Division, Headquarters, Army Service Forces, credits the joint screening of procurement by SWPC and military representatives with playing a significant part in boosting this percentage. This joint screening process is precisely what SDPA is negotiating with the military to revive immediately.

These accomplishments by the Small Defense Plants Administration's predecessor can easily be duplicated and even surpassed if the new agency is given adequate funds with which to enlarge its staff and take other measures to assist small business. You cannot expect small business' battles to be fought by so-called small business specialists within the military procurement offices who are on the Defense Department's payroll. No subordinate is going to dispute his superior. Nor are the small business representatives in other agencies going to do anything about it. They have not so far, and that's sufficient reason to suspect they will not in the future.

The SDPA, in its request for additional funds, is seeking to eliminate this inefficient and unsound system. Obviously, Small Defense Plants Administration procurement specialists assigned to key military procurement centers will push vigorously for more contracts for small business. They have the freedom and authority to do so, backed by Congress and the proper legislative authority.

To attempt to do away with the Small Defense Plants Administration at this critical juncture in its program to assist small firms throughout the country, is to deny reason and cast sound Government practices out the window.

The House Member who denies small firms adequate representation in Washington and in the major military procurement centers throughout the country is subject to a charge of failure to do his duty for an important segment of his constituency.

A little over 2 years ago, because of the emergency we were in at that time, and remembering the experience of small business in this country during the last World War, 261 Members of this House sponsored legislation that would create the Small Defense Plants Administration. Of those 261 Members, 24 were members of the Appropriations Committee of this House.

Everyone knows the reason that this Small Defense Plants Administration was established. Anyone who was here during the last world war knows very well that in 1940, 1941, and 1942 it was impossible for the small-business people of this country to get any relief whatsoever from the defense agencies, or any other then-existing agency of the Government that had to do with the letting of defense contracts. The Smaller War Plants Corporation was set up by the Congress to cure that deficiency. Those of us who had experience then with small-business concerns in our own States will not soon forget that when we went to the Smaller War Plants Corporation we at least got special treatment, and in many, many cases thousands of small businesses in this country did not have their doors closed because of the activity of this Smaller War Plants Corporation. The record of that Corporation speaks for itself. The percentage of contracts that was given out to small business increased every year from the time that Corporation was established by the Congress.

Now we find ourselves in a similar position. In 1951 this Congress passed legislation establishing this Small Defense Plants Administration. Not one Member of Congress spoke against the establishment of that agency. We voted to establish an independent agency for the sole purpose of helping small-business people of this country because we found by experience during the last war that the agencies of Government—and that goes for the Department of Commerce—never lifted their fingers in the interest of small business. Yet it has been stated on this floor today that the Department of Commerce is in a position to do exactly the same thing that the Small Defense Plants Administration is set up to do. That is not a true statement of fact, and the gentlemen who made those statements know they are not true statements of fact. The Department of Commerce does not have the authority that is vested in the Small Defense Plants Administration. When this legislation was before the House and Senate, Mr. Sawyer, head of the Department of Commerce, testified before the very committee that established this program that he was for this authority. He claimed that his department needed the authority in order to channel some of the defense contracts into the hands of small business. He was all for it. It was not until the Congress decided to give to an independent agency this authority that Mr. Sawyer testified he was not in favor of it. Since Congress set up this independent agency, Mr. Sawyer has been lobbying against it because he lost it out of his own department. Further than that, only last month, by Executive order which is now law, the President took away certain powers of the Department of Commerce, and they are now powers of the Small Defense Plants Administration. So those of you who claim that the Department of Commerce, or any other agency of Government, has the same authority as the Small Defense Plants Administration today in helping the small-business firms of this country either do not know what the law is, do not know that the Executive order has just been issued, or are trying to becloud the issue before the House.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Will the gentleman state to the House why the Department of Commerce cannot perform the duties that are performed by this Small Defense Plants Administration?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes; and I can tell you why: Because this Congress by a vote including that of the gentleman from Virginia, if he was here when the Defense Production Act was passed, gave the authority to the Small Defense Plants Administration and refused to give the power to the Department of Commerce. Every small-business concern in this country knew it could not get consideration from the Department of Commerce, or from the Army or the Navy, or the Munitions Board, or the General Services Administration. That is the reason the Small Defense Plants Administration was set up.

Mr. GARY. Will the gentleman tell me what the Department of Commerce is doing in my State where we have only small business and do not have any big business except occasional subsidiary plants? They have agencies set up there and are operating very well.

Mr. FOGARTY. Apparently small business in the gentleman's State does not have any trouble getting some of these controlled materials; apparently they are on the "in" with some particular agency or are getting some contracts from the large contractors. But let me tell the gentleman that the Department of Commerce in the gentleman's area, Richmond, Va., does not have the authority that the Small Defense Plants Administration has to help small business; and the gentleman knows that as well as I. It is obvious that whatever is being done presently in the gentleman's district for small business would be greatly improved if SDPA were equipped with funds to do its job.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. This Congress made this agency an independent agency answerable only to the Congress and not to any other bureau down town.

Mr. FOGARTY. And this agency has to report to the President and to the Congress every 90 days on the accomplishments they have made. The statement has already been made on this floor that they have accomplished nothing. The question is asked: What have they accomplished? The gentleman knows as well as I that they have been in operation for only 4 months; and the gentleman knows as well as I do that the $350,000 was given to them last fall for one purpose only: To develop a program and set up a staff. Despite the fact that they have been in operation for only 4 months they have not only set up their staff and prepared a program but they are now ready to go, and small business firms are already being helped by them. They have produced results even with the meager sum of $350,000. Small business firms from all parts of the country have been helped already by this agency, and not a few have been rescued from failure by it.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I wish to point out to the gentleman that the Small Defense Plants Administration does have an authority which the Department of Commerce does not, and that is the authority to enter into prime contracts with small business firms for the purpose of furthering the security program.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GARY. Could not that authority be given to the Department of Commerce by Congress without setting up a separate agency to administer it?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman knows the answer to that question. This Congress last year had no confidence in the Department of Commerce. To the Members who have been attacking the bureaucratic agencies of Government at this time and seeking to reduce expenditures I may say there is no more bureaucratic agency in the Government than the Department of Commerce. If there is I would like to know what it is. The reason they did not give it to Commerce was for one reason only. It was because small business concerns could not get any consideration from the Department of Commerce. They have not yet, and the record shows it. Just about all of these defense contracts that are going out now are going to big business. The percentage of contracts given out by the defense people, up to this time, to small businesses is going down, down, and down. That is the record of the existing agencies at the present time. This is harmful to national security and weakens the national economy.

We are going to be faced with this issue today. Let us not make any mistake about it. You may defend the 800 or 900 people in all these other governmental agencies today who are operating supposedly in behalf of small business, but they themselves have not offered a plan of any kind. If you are looking for duplication, there is your duplicating in the existing agencies today. It was said on the floor of the House this afternoon that they had in the neighborhood of 800 or 900 men in these various agencies.

The basic issue facing us today is, Do you want to live up to what you voted for a year ago or do you want to allow the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, and I am very proud of it, to do your legislating? For the 6 or 7 years I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee I have never thought it was the responsibility of my committee to do the legislating for the Congress of the United States. When the Congress speaks by an overwhelming or by unanimous vote, I do not think any committee has the authority to deny the will and the vote of the overwhelming majority of the Members of this body. That is what this committee is doing at the present time. They are wiping out legislation which was passed unanimously by both Houses of the Congress by denying any funds whatsoever for this particular agency.

Those of you on the opposition side can talk all you want to, but the issue this afternoon and the resulting vote is going to be on one and one issue only. It is going to be on the issue of whether you really want to help small business or not. That is going to be the vote today. If you want to help small business, if you are sincere, if you are honest in your convictions, if you want to do something about it instead of talking about it, you will vote to restore these funds. But if you are not for small business, if you want them to continue to be kicked around as they have been in the past and will be in the future by existing agencies at the present time—I repeat, if you want them kicked around and deny them the opportunity to keep their doors open, you will vote against the amendment. And in so doing you will be voting against the best interests of your small-business constituents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to commend the gentleman for the very fine statement he is making. I think it is quite clear that a much better job can be done in assisting small business in obtaining defense contracts. The Small Defense Plant Corporation is the best means devised thus far to accomplish that job. As one who served 8 years on the House Small Business Committee, I know first hand the fine work done by the Small War Plants Corporation during World War II. By making defense work available to small business we will aid our national defense in obtaining a more effective dispersal of our defense plants. It is the most effective way of dispersing our defense program.

We have learned from past experience that unless an agency is set up that has the authority to compel the defense agencies to make subcontracts and otherwise aid small business nothing will be done about it.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is absolutely right. The opponents of this legislation, and when I say "this legislation" I mean the pending appropriation bill, and this is practically legislating in an appropriation bill, that is what you are doing here today, let us not make any mistake about it, but what the gentleman said is exactly true, and the opponents of this legislation know very well that every small-business concern in this country that got any relief during the last war got it through the Smaller War Plants Corporation. They are writing to Members of Congress now because of that experience, and because of that record. That is because they know the need for the establishment of this Small Defense Plants Administration at the present time. They went through this thing once during the last World War, so they know what they are talking about.

Those of you who were here during the last World War, and had any experience with the Small War Plants Corporation, know very well that that was the only agency in the Government in the last World War that was created to help and keep in business some of these small plants. They would have gone out at that time because of the shortage of materials, and because of the failure to spread defense contracts. If you are for small business, you are going to vote for this amendment today; if not, you will vote against it. The issue is clear cut—now is the time to be counted.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, I would like to include a strong statement of endorsement of SDPA by Russell E. Maintain, president of the Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc.:

SMALLER BUSINESS ASSOCIATION
OF NEW ENGLAND, INC.,
Boston, Mass., March 10, 1952.

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOGARTY: Attached is confirmation of the telegram sent to you Saturday pointing out the importance of all Members being on the House floor on March 12 when the extension of the Small Defense Plants Administration comes up for action.

Thousands of small and medium-size manufacturers are in business today solely because of the fine job that the Smaller War Plants Corporation did in World War II; but prior to the formation of SWPC most of them were on the verge of bankruptcy because they had not been permitted to participate in war production.

We learned from that experience that only a separate agency, with specialized personnel and supervision, can provide effectively the service needed by small business. SDPA provides one place instead of eight for small-business men to go for information, guidance, and certification. SDPA would not duplicate work of other agencies, because it would give expert directions to the effective performance of those functions—and at less cost.

Our association will gladly supply any number of small-business men who can testify from their own experience that only a

Small Defense Plants Administration can insure total industrial mobilization of small business for defense.

We have never gone to Washington asking for hand-outs. We do not intend to do so. We ask that the Government cut the appropriations of other agencies that are now supposedly acting for small business, and concentrate all small-business functions in SDPA. It will cut down government cost.

Yours very truly,

RUSSELL E. MAINTAIN,
President, Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc.

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Imperative all Congressmen regardless of appointments should be on floor of House on Wednesday 12 when extension of Small Defense Plants Administration comes up for action. No other organization can coordinate, centralize, unify, and adequately mobilize the industrial production of small business which accounts for 54 percent of Nation's production.

RUSSELL E. MAINTAIN,
President, Smaller Business Association of New England, Inc.

I would also like, at this time, Mr. Chairman, to include another strong statement of support for SDPA by Mr. T. A. Monahan, chairman of the Governors' Commission on Small Business, Rhode Island, and director of the Smaller Business Men's Association of New England:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *March 11, 1952.*

Congressman JOHN E. FOGARTY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of hundreds of smaller manufacturers in Rhode Island, I respectfully request you use all influence to restore sufficient funds to the small defense plants administration to allow it to operate efficiently. This administration is no duplication of effort. To date with its limited funds it has done more for the little fellow in a few months than any other single or combination of Government agencies since the Korean emergency.

T. A. MONAHAN,
Chairman of Governors Commission on Small Business and Director of Smaller Business Men's Association of New England.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COTTON to the amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: Strike out "$825,000" and insert "$300,000."

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handled this item for small defense plants, I am offering this amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. I offer it to give the House the opportunity to continue until the end of this fiscal year, until next June, the Small Defense Plants Corporation, reasonably equipped, reasonably staffed, and with reasonable expansion so that at that time when we approach the next fiscal year the committee and the House can determine how fast and how far they want this agency to grow. It was indicated in the meeting of the subcommittee that this organization began to function by the appointment of the head of the organization some time last October; that $350,000 had been largely spent or obligated; that they wanted $825,000 more to continue the growth of their agency; to establish regional offices, to establish liaison officers in the various departments, and they also wanted $10,000,000 for a revolving fund for the purpose of financing and taking Government contracts, and then redistributing them to small business.

It was felt by the majority of the committee, I believe by all of the members of the committee, that in view of the fact that they had only until next June to go, and that there was a question of duplication with some of the other established agencies of the Government, that this was rushing the growth of this agency in a headlong manner. Some of us suggested that we give them a reasonable amount so that they could continue through until June, and then we could determine just how far to go. I assume if this amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island is adopted, giving them the whole $825,000, that shortly thereafter another amendment will be offered to give them the $10,000,000 for their revolving fund, and you will immediately launch into a mushroomed growth of this agency. If, on the other hand, you choose to adopt the amendment that I have submitted, they will receive $300,000, which considering the difficulties of recruitment, will give them ample funds to continue until next June. You will not have destroyed this agency, and the committee and the Congress can have full opportunity to determine where else they should prune in order to prevent duplication, what other departments should be restricted, and just how far and how fast they want this one to grow.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. First, I want to say that I much prefer the gentleman's amendment to the other one. Secondly, if we give them this $300,000, in the gentleman's opinion will there be a chance for us to take out of the forthcoming appropriation bill for these other departments appropriations where similar work is provided for, Commerce or whatever those departments are, and throw the whole thing under one head and get it concentrated and do a job of it?

Mr. COTTON. The answer to that is an emphatic affirmative. That is one of the purposes of my amendment. The National Production Authority has a small-business organization. The Defense Department has a small-business organization over in the Munitions Board. As has already been commented, the Department of Commerce has a small-business organization. If we are going to proceed that way, let us proceed in a businesslike way. If we are going to support this agency, let us take away from some of these other agencies. My amendment simply means you do not give them a blank check, carte blanche, to go ahead and build and spend as rapidly as possible between now and next June, but it does give them enough for a reasonable growth and development of their work, especially considering the difficulties of recruitment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Does not the gentleman think it would be far more appropriate for the House to consider this not in an appropriation bill but where we could have full discussion of the problem, rather than bringing it up this way and letting the Appropriations Committee become the legislative body of this House?

Mr. COTTON. I will say to the gentleman that that is one of the purposes of my amendment, in view of the fact that this is a supplemental bill, when they started only last October, and that they are trying to rush ahead as rapidly as possible. My amendment gives the House the opportunity to decide just how far they want to go and to fix our policy as we start the next fiscal year.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Knowing that the gentleman has given this matter great study, I should like to have him inform the House how he has reached this arbitrary figure of $300,000.

Mr. COTTON. I reached the figure of $300,000 based partly on the fact that they have had $350,000, of which they have obligated $270,000, and the $300,000 more should give them, in my opinion, an ample amount to continue the legitimate growth and development of the agency to next June without cramping them and at the same time without advancing too rapidly. It is an arbitrary figure, based on my best judgment after the hearings. I think it is reasonable.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I think the gentleman's amendment is a great improvement over the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island. However, I do not think this amendment should not pass without recognition here in this body of the signal victory the gentleman achieved yesterday in his New Hampshire primaries.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from New Hampshire; it would slash the appropriation called for in the Fogarty amendment. I am in support of the Fogarty amendment, because I favor giving small business the help it needs. In the defense effort and in our going economy, free enterprise is the salt of American life. Mr. Chairman, the Fogarty amendment will keep the big fellows on their toes and the little fellows in the game.

That it possibly hurts the pride of the Department of Commerce to see this small business defense agency jump out of Commerce's kangaroo pouch and go on its own, should not matter. Was not the Federal Reserve Board miffed at the creation of the RFC? Where once we had only the Federal Reserve Board, today we have the Export-Import Bank,

the RFC, the World Bank for Reconstruction and Development, GI loans, and numerous other credit and lending agencies of the Federal Government to spur American production and consumption to higher levels. Because the Fogarty amendment will sharpen competition and serve to promote greater production, with an equal opportunity to all who are in the game, I am for it.

Likewise, the cost of putting the amendment into operation, the more than $800,000 called for in the amendment, will more than be saved by the Government. At present, in the Department of Commerce, there are 14 agencies a small-business man might have to contact before negotiating a successful defense order. He can get 14 run-arounds. He is apt to give up after six and hire a 5-percenter, a contact man, whose fee can be reflected in the contract and be paid indirectly by the Government.

Under the Fogarty amendment, the small-business man makes one contact in one place and pays nothing for the contact, the advice, or the order. No run-arounds, no 5 percent, and no padded contact fees paid for by the Government.

Mr. Chairman, there are slightly more than 4,000,000 business concerns in this country. Over 90 percent of them are classified as small business. While we must not allow subversive elements ever to control this great proportion of America's economic life, neither can we allow selfish elements to choke it. Vigilance is needed. I trust the Fogarty amendment will pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Fogarty amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the members of our subcommittee anticipated that this would be controversial. You do not have to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations for long to appreciate that any time you attempt to cut appropriations in order to stop the mushrooming of a Government agency, you are going to get into a controversial position. But I do want you to know that insofar as the membership of that subcommittee, who were present and active, are concerned, there was no controversy. It was a unanimous decision that this mushrooming should be stopped, and this money should be cut down. In the general debate, there was a great deal of time devoted to this particular question, and the whole thing seemed to boil down to this: One group of people support the theory that the only way you can help small business is to create a Government agency, and make more Government money available, and the other group, and I think the sound group, that believes the way to help small business is to cut the Government expenditures and the Government burdens, and take Government off the back of small business. That was the way the gentleman from Virginia put it, and I think he put it well. Also, in the general debate, there was considerable discussion about Mr. Taylor who has been appointed as Administrator. His qualifications probably are not the real issue, but certainly we have heard enough here to question the statement which was made that a better man could not be found to do the job. Look at the hearings in which the chairman of the committee asked Mr. Taylor about his background. That background showed he may be a very competent Government lawyer, but it does not show any great broad experience in the field of small business which would justify the statements that a better man could not be found to do this job.

When this proposition was originally presented to the committee last year, the committee denied any funds. Then it went to the other body, and finally $350,000 was appropriated. But, now comes this supplemental request for $825,000 to provide, not for keeping this agency at its level until the end of the year, but to provide for a great mushrooming and great expansion during the course of this fiscal year. I think that is an issue which ought to be resolved at a later date. Certainly, we ought to cut it now so as to prevent this great mushrooming. Perhaps there is a basis for it, but we ought not to permit that in the face of great increases in expenditures at this time. They have something over 100 people.

This money they are asking for, if granted under the Fogarty amendment, would permit them to greatly expand the level of their personnel; a group of personnel, by the way, which has the highest average compensation of any emergency agencies of the Government at the present time. It looks to me as if permitting this agency to expand in accaccordance with its own program and in accordance with the program of the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island would make duplication in agencies of Government, which have been established to help small business. They have plans for establishing regional offices in all of the 13 regions of the country. They want to put a man or a staff in every field office of the Department of Commerce. They want to have a man sitting at the elbow of the men in the RFC who handle the loans; somebody looking over their shoulders. Certainly we do not want any more people watching other people in this particular area of Government at the present time.

In their plans for getting consideration for small business for Government contracts, they completely overlooked the fact that we have had a successful program of this kind in the National Production Authority.

In their programs for loans, in response to a question by the chairman of the committee, they acknowledged that they have no authority to make decisions. All they could do would be to recommend. Then it would be up to the RFC to make a decision on the grounds of security and credit and the other things that have to be taken into consideration. In the field of claims agency, which they plan, there again it was acknowledged that all they could do would be to act as an intermediary; somebody in addition to the other people who are doing that same kind of work. They said in response to a question that they are coordinating.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The testimony shows that they are a coordinating rather than an operating agency. It leads one to ask the question, What will they do if they are permitted to expand in the manner that they contemplate expanding?

We asked them, "What do you do if these Government agencies will not give these Government contracts to small business?"

The answer to that was, "Well, then we come and complain to Congress. Then we put a statement about it in our report that you told us we have to make every 90 days."

If that is all they can do about it, what in the world have we got the standing Committee on Small Business of the House for? What have we got this Committee on Small Business in the Senate for? Can they not do just as good a job of complaining to Congress as some group of paid hirelings in the executive department?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin knows that the money originally given to this establishment was for planning and programing, and that is all. It was to develop plans. I read every word of the testimony, and it was testified that they did have a higher rate of personnel, but they have no clerical help to speak of. They had to get the top personnel in order to develop the plans, and that is the reason the average is higher than these other average departmental agencies. But on the question of expanding the program, I agree with the gentleman. The record shows that during the past war these existing agencies of Government absolutely refused to cooperate with small business, and it was not until the Congress established the Smaller War Plants Corporation that they came in and helped. That is the reason why Congress established this agency last year, and that is the only reason. Not because of the expanding program. I would be in favor of cutting this out entirely if we could force the military to channel the stuff down into the smaller defense plants.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have two additional minutes. I used up a lot of his time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with you that we should do that if we could, but the last war showed that we could not do it until we gave them the authority. I

know they do not have the authority. I know the RFC has to go over their recommendations, but the RFC cannot issue a loan unless they recommend it. We provided that in a statute.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is in a statute which will expire on the 30th of June, but my contention is that we ought not accept the amount of money involved in your amendment, because by so doing we are giving this group a vested interest in the mushrooming of their personnel, where they do not have that foothold in the door at the present time, and I do not want them to get that foothold until we review this at the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. The testimony before the Small Business Committee indicated one thing in particular, and that is that the small-business men of this country wanted one place where they could go and present their story and have some action taken. That is exactly the function of this agency, to be a coordinator. I agree with the gentleman from Michigan who said earlier that as we increase the Small Defense Plants Administration we should be able to decrease other agencies. I am willing to go along on that basis.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman believe that if the only thing this agency can do is complain, if small business does not get the business this agency thinks it ought to get, that we ought to have an agency to do that? They could come before the gentleman's committee and do that; the gentleman is a Member of Congress and can do a better job of complaining to his colleagues than this group down here can.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Can this group not plan and coordinate?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. If my friend will again read the testimony, he will see that such planning and coordinating as are contemplated will not justify the mushrooming agency involved in this amendment. The Cotton amendment, if adopted, will hold the agency at its present level.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Cotton amendment and in favor of the Fogarty amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly clear to me now that this Congress is not going to kill this agency. I do not think this Congress is going to cripple it. I think I know, too, when I observe a retreat. Yesterday this subcommittee was for striking out all of the funds of this agency; today one of its members proposes that they be given 50 percent of the funds held to be necessary by the agency itself.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I made it clear that I was for this in the committee. This is not 50 percent; this is merely an amendment to save the agency without sending it ahead too fast; and that was my position in the committee.

Mr. CANFIELD. Am I mistaken in thinking that the committee stood 7 to 0 for absolutely eliminating the funds?

Mr. COTTON. But the gentleman, a member of the committee, knows that a member can make a reservation of an amendment he intends to offer on the floor.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad to hear that my good and able friend from New Hampshire made that reservation and that he is standing up today for small business, even though not in the amount that I think this agency ought to have.

I am a subscriber to Business Week. Business Week is a pretty good business magazine; its editors, and ownership, are not red, pink, or leftists in any way. I want to read an article that appeared in Business Week on February 16, 1952. It says in part:

Telford Taylor, the small-business man's champion in government, has leveled his lance at one of the toughest targets in Washington: the Pentagon, citadel of the military's top brass.

Taylor is determined to pry from the generals and admirals a real voice for his Small Defense Plants Administration in giving little companies their fair share of arms contracts. Taylor wants his representatives to sit with the services' contracting officers and screen every order. That plan has the brass gasping.

Betting in Government circles is that Taylor will have to fight for anything he gets.

And the odds are equally heavy that he won't win any such scrap with the Pentagon—not in a hurry, anyhow. Washington has had small-business crusaders many times before; few have accomplished much.

But Taylor already has pricked one of Washington's tougher bureaucratic hides, that of Commerce Secretary Charles Sawyer. Sawyer has been fighting SDPA ever since it was a mere gleam in the eye of congressional small-business committeemen. He argued that it would simply duplicate work already being done by the Commerce Department's National Production Authority. Last week—at Taylor's behest—President Truman ordered the transfer of most of the staff and functions of NPA's small-business office to SDPA.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Does not the gentleman admit that the difficulty which the Small Defense Plants Administration has encountered is due to the fact that it was made an arm of Congress rather than being turned over to the Department of Commerce?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true. Far from simply duplicating work that is already being done, some time ago at President Truman's behest most of the staff and functions of the Small Business Office were transferred to SDPA.

Now, who is Telford Taylor? We have heard about him in many innuendos here today. I have never met him. I am told Taylor is a native of Schenectady, where he was born 44 years ago next February. His father was an engineer for General Electric. Taylor was educated at Williams College and took his law degree at Harvard in 1932. His first job was as private secretary to the revered judge of the New York Federal circuit court, Augustus Hand.

From 1935–39, Taylor was associate counsel of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee and ran its New York office. The chairman of that committee was Burton Wheeler, of Montana.

Taylor first moved to Washington in 1939 when he became special assistant to Attorney General Robert Jackson. The latter, now a Justice of the Supreme Court, swore Taylor into his present post, a few weeks ago.

From the Justice Department Taylor moved to the FCC and then into military intelligence when war came. In 1945, when Jackson became chief prosecutor of the Nuremberg war crimes trials, he chose Taylor as his top assistant.

Mrs. Taylor, the daughter of American missionaries, grew up in Shanghai.

He is always hatless, wears badly battered shoes, and an old Army raincoat.

Taylor carries this indifference to rank into his official activities, while other officials of the Federal bureaucracy ride around in Government-owned Cadillacs and Buicks, Taylor has ordered for his agency a 1947 Ford costing $400.

As chief of the Small Defense Plants Administration, Taylor is what might be called the poor man's 5 percenter, but he does not look upon himself as running a relief agency for small business.

Our purpose is to strengthen and speed up the defense program by putting all the resources of small business to work for the country, not to use the defense effort to bail out small business.

In the few weeks he has been in office, Taylor and SDPA have already begun to have an impact on defense procurement. In the months ahead, the impact is certain to increase.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I think that during the course of this debate some effort has been made to smear Mr. Taylor.

Mr. CANFIELD. That is true.

Mr. COOLEY. While I do not know the gentleman personally, I would like to ask if it is not a fact that during the time he was participating in the Nuremberg trials Russia did not have judges conducting the trials and were actually participating at that time in the trials?

Mr. CANFIELD. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Taylor had no right to fire any of those attorneys that had been assigned there by Russia?

Mr. CANFIELD. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Nor to dismiss any of the judges before whom he was required to appear. So it seems to me they have made a very laborious effort to slander, besmirch and smear a man who was there doing what he conceived to be an honest duty.

Mr. CANFIELD. And who today wears the Distinguished Service Cross for bravery in action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if there were a way to help small business by voting for this appropriation or for the amount that the gentleman from New Hampshire has suggested, I would do so, but I am afraid there is not.

Mr. Taylor, the head of this outfit, was before the committee, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] started the ball rolling when he asked Mr. Taylor, and this appears on page 456 of the hearings:

> Will you give us a summary of your background?

I do not know how many Members were here and heard what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said while I had the floor earlier today. But Mr. Taylor was a prosecutor at Nuremberg succeeding Justice Jackson. He had on his staff Josiah Dubois, a notorious left-winger, and Belle Mayer, another one, and their performances were such that they drew down upon the United States prosecuting counsel and themselves the wrath of the judge, a gentleman from Iowa, who was presiding.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Well, it is a fact that Nuremberg was an international court. Is the gentleman suggesting that Mr. Taylor employed and hired these men and gave them their assignments?

Mr. TABER. They were a part of his staff.

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, and there were Russian judges sitting on the court, too.

Mr. TABER. Yes; there were; but he would not have somebody on his staff that he did not employ. Would the gentleman have somebody in his office that he did not have control over? Not for 1 minute; he would not. Now, do not try and apologize for Mr. Taylor in that way.

Mr. COOLEY. I am not apologizing.

Mr. TABER. That makes matters worse; that is all. But we have got to have a man in charge of that organization whose first loyalty is to the United States, if he is going to get anywhere.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I note that Belle Mayer, at the time she was on the staff of the Kilgore committee, was praised by the Communist press, and it was said that the staff was hewing to the Communist Party line. That is the type of person Mr. Taylor had on his staff at the time of the Nuremberg trials.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that Mr. Taylor did not employ that person and did not pay that person.

Mr. DONDERO. In addition to that, even the Red Star, the newspaper of the Russian Army, had much to say in eulogizing both Dubois and Belle Mayer. You can depend on it that if they were loyal Americans they would not eulogize them.

Mr. TABER. Let us get down a little further into the meat of this question. Then, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], tried to find out what this thing was all about and what they were doing. They had 129 on the payroll. In the 4 months that he had been operating he said they had recommended about 29 loans to the RFC, and the RFC had passed on 6. He did not even say that they had allowed a single one. I do not know. Is that a great record of accomplishment in 4 months? One good man would have done better at working out something that really might have been of some use.

Now, I cannot go along with that. It was absolutely impossible to find out if there was any definite program, if there was anything that would do any good for small business. Frankly, my experience with this former small-business corporation was not as good as those that some others have talked about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Going directly to the testimony on page 458, the chairman of the committee, Mr. Chairman, asked Mr. Taylor this question:

> You have not yet been able to get your program under way at this time?
>
> Mr. TAYLOR. We have the loan program under way, Mr. Chairman.

Was he referring there to the loans made by the RFC, may I ask?

Mr. TABER. Yes, he was.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then the RFC was doing the job?

Mr. TABER. The RFC was doing the job, yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, continuing, Mr. Taylor said:

> We have some of the matériels program under way in the set-up of this reserve pool.

What did he mean by "reserve pool"?

Mr. TABER. I do not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then he said this:

> I guess it would be fair to say in the field of procurement it is mostly a matter of programs and proposals. To put those into effect, we have to reach agreement with the Defense Department representatives.

How can this agency get any steel for the little-business man in my district unless he has the cooperation and agreement with the Defense Department? That is the job on this thing. And I have not yet been able to get any satisfaction out of this department or the one in World War II for a single firm in the Eighth Congressional District of Michigan.

Mr. TABER. That is one of the troubles with this whole situation, and that is one of the reasons why we should not embark upon this kind of a set-up.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think I stated before that the RFC has no authority under the statute as it exists today to make loans to these small businesses unless it is recommended by the Small Defense Plants Administration. They have to recommend it to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order to get a loan. That is how it stands today.

I know what the work pool is that he talked about. That was established in the last World War, where several small business concerns would band together to take a prime contract where one could not do the work. Eight or ten might get together and take a prime contract and distribute the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. I want to say two or three things more, not very much.

They had 129 persons on the roll when they were up here, according to the papers they brought up. If we adopt this amendment and give them $825,000, even with their average payroll of a little over $7,000 a year, which is about $600 a month, that will let them build up a force of 450 or 500 people. That is perfectly and absolutely ridiculous.

Frankly, if they were going to be given anything under any circumstances, which I think is bad, the $300,000 the gentleman from New Hampshire has proposed is a very liberal figure. They do not need it. They should not be allowed any $10,000,000 to go into taking contracts and peddling them around, because I do not believe there is anybody connected with that set-up, including Mr. Taylor himself, who is competent to make any such arrangements or to do anything of that character. I do not believe he has the business experience. He has no positive, definite program. It was impossible for the committee to get anything out of him.

On the other hand, there is an agency in the Department of Commerce which is doing a great job of the things this outfit is supposed to do. The Defense Department all the way through it, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, have set up agencies where they have from 50 to 60 or 70 men in each set-up that has the job of seeing that small business gets every opportunity. One big corporation that has $500,000,000 of contracts in a year sublet to small business better than half of it. That would be the way it would work out if you would give them a chance.

Let us not be fooled, let us not do something that is going to leave us high and dry and leave us out where we are not going to be able to get any results for small business, because if you get started and go ahead with this kind of deal you will not have anything for small business. The way to get it is to make our regular departments do their work.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we have debated this amendment exhaustively for 2 hours. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto close in 50 minutes, the last 7 minutes to be allotted to the committee.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYS of Ohio moves that the Committee do now rise, and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the purpose of asking unanimous consent later to withdraw it, so that I could get some time which I have been trying to do for about an hour to say a few words about this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under the gentleman's statement he is not entitled to recognition if his motion is merely made for purposes of delay.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is well taken. This motion should not be used as a subterfuge to secure time.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized and will proceed in order.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would not want to do anything that anyone else never did here.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, that is the reason why the gentleman should not continue.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman from Missouri as I usually do except in this instance.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a little concerned about the attack made on the chairman of this small-business group downtown. I do not know the gentleman, and I would not know him if he came in the door, but it seems to me a rather back-handed, nasty way to try to defeat a measure to attack a man like that. Why use unjustified character assassination. I suppose if you carried this thing out to its logical conclusion, you could say that because of the fact the Committee on Un-American Activities had been holding hearings in the city of Detroit, and it was brought out that there were numerous Communists uncovered in the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], and he representing that district in the House, then he is a Communist. Understand, I do not say that, and I do not like that kind of tactic, but if you want to carry this thing out to a logical conclusion, you could draw deductions like that.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. I am very glad to hear the gentleman speak the way he does. The gentleman is speaking about Mr. Taylor who happens to come from my district, and he is no more un-American than you or I.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about this Small Defense Plants Administration. I judge things by their accomplishments. I have had two small business firms from my district that have been around in Washington for several months trying to get a hearing first from one organization and then the other. The only place they could get anyone to listen to their troubles was down at this Small Defense Plants Administration. They not only listened to them, they solved their problem and it was done expeditiously. I do not know if they have a full staff or not, but I do know that with the staff they have they are doing some good, and that is more than you can say about the Department of Commerce, and I am sorry to have to say that. I would like to see anyone who has had a small business from their district, or from any place else who has received any aid from the Department of Commerce. I do not want to get into personalities. The Secretary of Commerce is from my State. He is a man I have known for a long time. Probably it is not his fault, but the fact remains that the Department of Commerce is not doing anything for the small-business men who are the backbone of our American economy.

This is a good time to put first things first.

In these days of astronomical national budgets, economy is very much desired, and I am for it but I insist the place not to start is with the prostrate form of the American small-business man, while we hand out billions to improve things along the Nile.

The thing that enables America to bring help to our friends abroad is our dynamic American economy, and the foundation of that is our free enterprise system which has its first healthy beginnings in the small-business man. Let us neglect him, hamper him or penalize him and we pull down the whole structure and invite the success of communism.

Mr. Chairman, the small-business man and his welfare are the keys to our whole system of national prosperity and international strength, and if we give him as a hostage to fortune then we are gambling dangerously with America's safety and destiny.

Another thing I would like to get straight and that is this talk of duplication: the charge has been made in the eliminating of this total appropriation for the Small Defense Plants Administration that it is duplicating functions of other Government agencies. On the contrary, I insist the SDPA is the eliminator of duplication. It was set up for this very purpose. This agency was established only after this Congress had taken a long, hard look at the problems of the small-business man; it was established only after this Congress had learned from committee hearings in all parts of the country that small business was being fed large doses of lip service, that the program of small-business aid was being carried on helter skelter in various governmental agencies.

It was on the basis of its own findings that Congress then said: "We will put an end to this confusion; we will endeavor to assist the small-business man; not torment him; we will put the responsibility and focus for aid in one place, we will centralize the task"; and that is how the Small Defense Plants Administration came into being.

To arise now at this late date, in view of all that has happened and say the SDPA is a duplication of other governmental services to small business is only to scourge the record. Congress created this Agency, gave it certain specific, definite tasks; and I, for one, can say that I know for a certainty it is performing with efficiency and has won the confidence and respect of the small-business man.

If there are those who are persuaded there are duplicating functions going on in the name of small business then the thing for them to do is not to advocate the liquidation of SDPA but rather let them apply their talents to strengthening this young champion of small business so that it can expand and extend its already helpful program.

With the true instinct of those struggling for survival, businessmen throughout America have acclaimed the SDPA as their true spokesman in this emergency economy. Like an infant knows its mother by blessed instinct so do the small-business men of this country recognize the SDPA as their champion. They have been helped by it; they have been received with sympathy and aided with enthusiasm. In the scramble for financial aid and scarce materials and a fair share of defense contracts, considerations assential for the survival of small business, the people who have sought out SDPA have been given expert counsel and practical aid.

It would be a legislative blunder of the first magnitude, one fraught with grave consequences, if this Congress were to deal a death blow to the Small Defense Plants Administration, for the first victims would be the struggling small-business men of the Nation who are striving so valiantly to keep alive in these trying days of partial mobilization.

So much good can be accomplished with so little in this appropriation that I am amazed that there should be any serious thought of its denial.

In this critical year of 1952, let us send out word to the small-business men of America that we are going to stand by him and place at his disposal every constructive aid his Government can provide.

Small business is the first line of national defense—let us not only save it but strengthen it. Let us adopt the Fogarty amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I object, and I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York, a member of the committee, is recognized in opposition to the motion.

Mr. ROONEY. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I think I was first to rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized in opposition to the motion.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking more time than I should on this matter, but one or two questions have been discussed that I think should be answered. One is that we have 14 agencies now to represent small concerns. That is the best reason for the enactment of this legislation, to make it possible to have one agency under one roof, where you can tell your constituents to go to that agency under that one roof and get everything that he wants, if it is possible to grant it. He can put his problems in the lap of the Small Defense Plants Administration representative, and he stops there. If there is any running around to be done, it will be done by the representative of the Small Defense Plants Administration. Now he has 14 agencies to go to, and that is really giving a man a royal runaround. We want to stop that.

This is an economy measure. When we set up this over-all agency and stop this runaround for the small-business man, we can save money by eliminating many of the other agencies. That is the object of it. You will save more money that way than you will spend on this proposition. This is an economy measure. I am telling you, and it should have the support of this Congress, just as it had before.

I do not believe we can justify promising the small-business people of this country less than 6 months ago that they would have this agency where they could go to one place under one roof and get service, and then now, in less than 6 months, take it away from them. Is this Congress going to be an Indian giver? Give it to them and then take it away?

It will be in the interest of economy; it will be in the interest of the defense effort; it will save a lot of money to the Government, and will bring real service to the small-business people of this country. I hope the whole amount is granted.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. One of the most telling effects on this measure is the fact that in 1942 only 12 percent of the contracts were going to small business, but when they got into operation it got up to 30 percent. Under the figures from the Munitions Board today, in 1950 25 percent of the defense contracts were going to small business, and in 1951 it went down to 20 percent, and now it is down to 19. Unless we do this it will keep right on going down.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know of anything that a Member of this House could be more proud of then to go back to his constituents and say, "I voted for one agency where the small-business man can go, one stop, under one roof." He would not have to go to 14 different agencies as heretofore, and then get nothing. This is an agency that has the power to grant relief.

I hope the Members of this House will vote for the $825,000, and not vote for a reduction of it.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the pending motion has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been close to small business all my life and fully realize its importance to our national economy. For the past 85 years my grandfather, my father, and now my brothers have been engaged in a small retail business in the district in Brooklyn which I have the honor to represent. I want to do the right thing to help small defense plants. I was a cosponsor of the legislation which set up the Small Defense Plants Administration. Recently when hearings were had before our committee with regard to this requested appropriation, at the time of the mark-up of this bill and when it was before our full committee, I had leave of absence because I could not be here in Washington due to certain personal circumstances at home. As chairman of the appropriations subcommittee which handles appropriations for the Department of Commerce, I feel that it is my duty and responsibility to advise you exactly what the position of the Department of Commerce is with regard to this requested appropriation for the Small Defense Plants Administration.

First, concerning the $350,000, already appropriated, they say, "This money has gone down the drain with nothing to show for it." The Department claims that far-flung plans have been made by SDPA for setting up 14 regional offices which will duplicate offices already set up and in operation by the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, and the Defense Mobilization Agencies; that each of the regional directors is to receive a salary of $10,800; and that in addition there will be 14 deputy directors at a salary of $9,600 and 70 specialists in the field also at a salary of $9,600.

They point out that there has existed for many years in the Department of Commerce a small-business advisory committee which has recommended strongly against new agencies and duplication of functions; that this committee is meeting next week in the city of Washington for 3 days; that every member of this committee pays his own expenses and that the committee meetings held by SDPA have had their expenses paid by the SDPA.

They claim that the Commerce Department, after many months of effort—including continued consultation with other agencies—has prepared and has issued a procurement manual. This is alleged to be an exhaustive study to provide methods and information in connection with procurement and the claim is made that it does not require the assistance of any new agency. The Commerce Department says that further activity in this regard would constitute pure and simple duplication.

The NPA in the Department of Commerce and the General Services Administration and the Military Establishment have within the last 4 months set up clinics all over the country to which were invited 2,500 businesses. This list of firms was based upon the probable effect of certain curtailment of use of critical materials. This is an example of action, says the Department of Commerce, as contrasted with talk. They advise that this action consituted the first step in the direction of planned procurement, which has been the desire of the Congress in assisting the small business effort; that when this suggestion was brought to the attention of Mr. Taylor he objected to the clinics because they did not include approximately 12,000 additional firms, regardless of the amount of materials which had been allocated to them. The Commerce Department says that the result of these clinics showed that in many cases firms were already fully occupied with Government contracts, that in many other cases it was impossible for them to take Government contracts, and in cases where they needed Government contracts and had facilities to perform them—approximately 70 percent of those who attended the meetings—arrangements were made promptly for them to negotiate for Government business, both prime and subcontracts.

The Department points out that 3 weeks ago telegrams were sent to 11,000 manufacturers by NPA in an effort to find out the effect of the allotment of steel, copper, and aluminum upon their third-quarter operations; that as a result of this survey and other data available to the Department of Commerce, a policy adopted early in November was expanded to give additional materials to small firms in trouble; and that a Small Business Hardship Account has been set up within NPA and administered by its Office of Small Business to provide additional materials to small manufacturers faced with operating hardships resulting from the initial amounts of material allotted to them.

The Department of Commerce contends that the new agency has leaned heavily upon the Department for personnel experienced in small-business matters and that they have not tried to obstruct its activities; on the contrary, they say they have tried to assist them. The Department offered to transfer, and finally received word from the Administrator of SDPA that he would accept, nine employees who had been experienced in assisting small firms in obtaining defense contracts as an activity of NPA. These employees have been working for SDPA since November 19, 1951, but they have been paid by the Commerce Department. At the request of the Administrator of SDPA, four personnel technicians of the Department

of Commerce were loaned to him for the purpose of helping organize his personnel office and to assist in performing the personnel functions of this temporary organization. Three of these employees are still working in SDPA and are being paid by the Commerce Department.

Mr. Chairman, with these allegations before us we should carefully consider every point in this important debate, and with an open mind.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, on July 20, 1951, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] was able to place in this RECORD a list of 261 Members of this House, 60 percent of its membership, all of whom favored the establishment of a Small Defense Plants Administration through his proposed amendment to the Defense Production Act.

I am pleased to recall that my name was included on that list and I do not propose to reverse myself at this point and kill this agency by cutting out its rightful request for funds. Last year this Congress went overwhelmingly on record in favor of an independent agency whose function it would be, not merely to protect the interests of the thousands of small-business concerns in the country, but also, and more importantly, to safeguard the long-term economic welfare of the Nation by preserving the potent productive strength of our small manufacturing establishments.

I pointed out in a press release on this subject last year, that reliance on large corporate enterprise in the early years of World War II forced the closing of one-sixth of the small businesses in the Nation. The reason for the truly deplorable situation was that there was no independent agency specifically charged with effecting the distribution of Government procurement contracts so as to draw the full measure of our economic strength and to preserve the free, competitive productive units which are the foundation of our national economic vitality.

We rectified that blunder by setting up the Small War Plants Corporation. To avoid the same blunder in this present mobilization effort, the Congress gave strong support to the establishment of SDPA. It is now proposed that we reverse our field in one of the most stupendous feats of backtracking ever asked of this body.

The reason? We are told that there is no need for the administration's activities and that its functions duplicate those of other agencies of the Government.

Our procurement experiences in World War II should be proof enough that without such an agency as this, small business faces a grossly unequal fight for survival. They cannot afford the lush offices running over with contact men maintained in Washington by the powerful corporations. They cannot bargain over the allocation of materials like General Motors or du Pont. The staggering size of Government procurement activities makes it practically impossible for a small manufacturer—whose capital assets are usually a small building, a few milling machines and lathes—to find where he can fit into his rightful place in the picture. So there is a definite, established need for such an agency. Kill it and you must shoulder the responsibility for the extinction of small individual enterprise which can so easily result.

General Taylor, the head of SDPA, who has only been in office since the middle of last October, told the Appropriations Committee that the functions of the Office of Small Business in NPA were transferred, by Executive order, to his administration, and that there remained only the relatively minor small-business activities of the Munitions Board and the three military departments.

But the real solution to such problems of duplication as still exist is not to kill this agency. It is this office which Congress established to carry out its announced policy of encouraging small business to make the greatest possible contribution toward achieving the objectives of the Defense Production Act. Congress has recognized the need for an independent agency to meet the requirements of such a policy, an agency manned by personnel who do not have to answer to some higher procurement official who must find, in many cases, the quickest and easiest way to solve his procurement problems. SDPA is answerable to no one but Congress, for it is the policy of Congress which the agency was commissioned to carry out.

I ask you to be consistent and follow out in full detail the excellent plan laid down in the Defense Production Act of 1951. Let us have no reversals of field and no backtracking. The contest for the preservation of a sound and stable national economy is no place for legislative broken-field running.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 128, noes 19.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting all afternoon to say something, but there were so many members of the committee who wanted to speak, that I did not have a chance. That is all right with me, but I would just like to say a few words on the Fogarty amendment. I cannot see any reason in the world, when we are going along the way we are, why that is really and truly not economy. We set this agency up, and do you know that the director was not appointed until October 19? How can you expect a man to set up an organization across these United States in that short length of time? He has done a good job in spite of all the talk against him to the contrary, because as a member of the Small Business Committee, I happen to know some of the work he has done.

When this Small Defense Plants Administration was set up by this Congress, there were three things we were told to do. Small business was to get a fair share of the defense contracts. It has not been getting them; it is not getting them today. Secondly, they should receive a fair share of the critical materials. It has not been getting them. Now we are beginning to get them in my district, as far as we are away from the center of the United States, the Capitol here in Washington. Third, small business was to get financial assistance. That has been started, and is on its way, and it has nothing to do with RFC loans either. It is combining the small-business organizations in the local community into a solid group, or even corporations. They can go out and put their bids in in one name and be accepted as a bidder under the procurement agencies of the various organizations.

One other thing I would like to say, it is one thing to talk about getting contracts for the folks at home when you live down in Richmond, Va., but it is quite another thing if you live out in Colorado or out on the West coast, and if you do not think that is true, you try to help your folks and you will find out.

ECONOMY

Mr. Chairman, I have consistently been a firm advocate of economy in governmental expenditures and I feel that the tremendous budget presented to us for the coming year makes economy the scales on which we should weigh all-out actions in this body.

There are, however, several kinds of "economy"; one valid and legitimate, the other wholly false. In the case at issue here, I feel that it would be truly uneconomic to put an end to the Small Defense Plants Administration by cutting off its funds. Not only does the SDPA incorporate economies resulting from putting an end to duplications and overlapping, but it also brings a firm promise of other real economies.

I speak, Mr. Chairman, of economies which will result from a fuller utilization of the small manufacturers of the Nation in our defense effort. We are all aware of the vast expenditures of funds by the military departments for war goods, many of which could be procured more cheaply from those smaller producers who are not yet integrated in the defense effort.

Further economies would result by cutting the amount of direct and indirect subsidies now being paid to large corporations for expanding their operations to fill military requirements when idle plant capacity exists among the smaller concerns of the Nation. The SDPA is directed to bring these forgotten firms into full production.

More economies will result from the operations of the Small Defense Plants Administration in channeling defense orders and scarce materials to smaller

producers who are now forced to turn much of their work force over to the relief rolls of their communities. Such unemployment is certainly uneconomic in these days when every man and every square foot of plant space should be a weapon in our arsenal against the Communist threat.

For these reasons and many others, Mr. Chairman, I feel that we would not be fostering the cause of economy by ending the operations of the Small Defense Plants Administration. The direct and indirect costs and ramifications of such action would be manyfold the amount we would hope to save.

SDPA APPROPRIATION

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] mentioned small business in and around Richmond. Efforts were made at the beginning of this legislation to make mandatory the transfer of all other small-business offices and functions to the new centralized SDPA. We now see the great wisdom of this suggestion.

Under the pleas of several Cabinet heads, the transfer was made permissive to take care of a few specialists to maintain liaison. It was a great mistake to make the language permissive. It is not necessary to name the men who are fighting SDPA in order to retain their own empire. These men are hanging on to their own ineffective small-business offices. And the House Appropriations Committee now uses these illicit small-business operations as an excuse for liquidating the new Small Defense Plants Administration. If we pass this appropriation, I think it might be a good plan for Congress to take early action to insure that the appropriations of such other Departments as Commerce be cut by an amount equal to the SDPA appropriation. We do not need to stand for this wasteful duplication. Congress made very clear last year that it wanted SDPA to be the single agency to handle small-business problems in the Government. We should not permit other Government agencies to pad their payrolls with so-called small-business offices and then make the plea to Congress that they are prepared to carry out the work of the Small Defense Plants Administration. They have not done a job in the past; they will not in the future. Let us give the Small Defense Plants Administration the money it needs and cut out the wasteful duplication of small-business appropriations for seven or eight other Government departments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that in the course of this debate Members have become so intemperate in the presentation of arguments that they have, without cause or justification, in subtle fashion, attempted to smear and to besmirch the good name and reputation of a public official who has only recently been appoined by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The insinuations, innuendos, and implications of some of the remarks concerning Mr. Telford Taylor are utterly ridiculous. I am certain that most of you know something about the Nuremberg trials. I hold no brief for either the Nuremberg trials nor the Tokyo trials. In fact, I am afraid that they will some day rise up to haunt us. While I do not even know Mr. Telford Taylor, I did make inquiries concerning him before he was ever appointed, and upon the information which I have received I am convinced that he is a true, patriotic, and loyal American citizen and is devoted to the traditions and principles of our Government. We all know that the Nuremberg trials were conducted in an international court. Citizens of Russia participated in those very important trials. Russia was then considered a loyal ally, and representatives of our Government associated with Russians freely and without fear of some day being slandered and maligned because of such associations. We sent our representatives to Nuremberg and to Tokyo, knowing that citizens of Russia would meet them at both places. In the preparation and presentation of cases certainly it was necessary, and at that time considered advisable, that our representatives be associated with and work with the representatives of Russia and other countries. To accuse by innuendo or in other subtle fashion a citizen of this country of being a Communist or fellow traveler is a grave and important matter. All I ask you to do is to look at the record of Telford Taylor and reach your own conclusions concerning his loyalty, his ability, and his worthiness. I remind you, however, that Telford Taylor is not here on trial.

Now coming to the matter actually before us: My recollection is that this House, and perhaps both Houses, unanimously approved and authorized the creation of this agency of our Government, the Small Defense Plants Administration. Now, before the agency actually starts to really function, it is suggested by this committee that it should be put out of business and discontinued.

I believe that Mr. Taylor and his associates have been rendering good service. I believe that this agency of the Government has already been of great assistance to the small-business men of the country. I believe that the money which has heretofore been appropriated for the agency has been well and wisely spent and that the appropriations now proposed will be a good investment in the future welfare of the Nation.

Another ridiculous suggestion has been made to the effect that all the duties and functions which might be performed by the Small Defense Plants Administration could be very well performed by the Small Business Committee of the House. What could be more absurd? The Small Business Committee is composed of busy Congressmen who, of necessity, must give their time and attention to a myriad and a multiplicity of duties, obligations, and responsibilities. The members of that committee have not the time to devote to the hundreds of applications for materials and loans which will be filed by the small-business men of the Nation, asking help at the hands of the Government and anxious to contribute to the defense of our country. If you are for small business, now is the time to stand up and be counted. Kill this agency and see what happens to the small-business men of America. The small-business men of the country do not want lip service. They want a fair share of critical materials, financial assistance, and defense contracts. If this agency is defeated, where will you go and where will I go to aid the small-business men of our districts who want to participate in our great program for the defense of the Nation. This is an agency to which our contribution may be directed—yes, an agency which we will have every right to expect will render services to those who are in need of advice and assistance. Do not forget, this agency, if given the necessary money and manpower, can lift a great burden off the offices of every Member of this Congress. I urge the adoption of the Fogarty amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate here this afternoon with respect to trying to help small business. I want to go on record as heartily endorsing the Fogarty amendment.

I happen to come from one of the most highly distressed areas in the country, in the anthracite-coal region, in which we have more unemployment than perhaps in any other section of the country. I have heard a lot here this afternoon about the Department of Commerce helping small business. I have heard a lot here about the Reconstruction Finance Corporation helping small business. I have heard a lot about the Defense Department helping small business. In my years of experience here, certainly in the past year or so, I have almost gotten down on my knees to try to help small business in my area by going to the heads of these various Departments. So I am heartily in favor of this Small Defense Plants Administration proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I am strongly opposed to any action which will deny an appropriation to the Small Defense Plants Administration.

How is such a contemplated death sentence to be explained?

In its report, the Appropriations Committee seeks to base its reason for cutting off the Small Defense Plants Administration without a cent on the ground that it duplicates the activities of other agencies. If that is so, and I seriously question the premise, it is certainly contrary to the wishes of Congress. By its vote on the legislation only last July, and in the discussions preceding the vote, the House left little doubt that its primary interest in establishing a single independent agency to aid small business was to put an end to duplicate effort on the part of various other departments and bureaus which had been generally ineffective in their attempts to develop aggressive programs in behalf of small-business men.

Not to recognize this is to fail to understand the basic fact of the problem of aid to small enterprises.

Surely the House is aware that one important function of the Small Defense Plants Administration is to stimulate various executive departments so that they will bestir themselves and do more within their respective jurisdictions for small business that experience has shown they had been doing before the advent of a small-business agency. If this be duplication, then I am perfectly willing to let the Nation's small-business men make the most of it. They need all the help they can get.

The Department of Defense, the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been proclaiming in loud tones how much they are doing for small business. Is any Member so naive as not to see a direct causal relationship between this recent flurry of small-business activity and the entrance upon the scene of the Small Defense Plants Administration?

I can think of no better way for the House to open itself to the charge of insincerity, hurled by the small-business community of the Nation, than for it to reverse the position taken by it last July when legislation creating the Small Defense Plants Administration was passed without a dissenting vote.

If that action was right, and there is no doubt in my mind but that it was, then agreement with the present position taken by the Appropriations Committee cannot be anything but wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY].

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment.

It has already been said by one of those who preceded me on the floor that it is one matter to come to Washington from a district closely adjacent to Washington to take care of the small business interests in your area. The one in that position is fortunate and can probably get some results. However, I come from the Pacific coast, approximately 3,000 miles away from this area. We on the Pacific coast certainly support the idea of a Small Defense Plants Administration. In the early part of World War II we saw our small businesses pushed up against the wall and put out of business.

This is a combination of several different situations and several factors.

You have the natural tendency of men in a government agency to be reluctant to give up any authority or power they have had over the years. There is a desire in every human being to extend his authority and to extend his power. Naturally the Department of Commerce does not want to give up that which they say they have had but which they have not used well and zealously on behalf of small business. Likewise, the armed services have not shown any great understanding of or sympathy for the problem of small business. To be fair, this is understandable—it is much easier for one of the contracting or procurement officers in the services to do business with one of the large national corporations who can take care of all the problem instead of spending time and energy trying to find small-business firms to whom contracts can be awarded. It helps keep the desk clear and cuts down the worry. As I say, Mr. Chairman, it is understandable. As a matter of fact, these things have been so well understood that they are the very reasons that Congress last year set up the Small Defense Plants Administration.

The fact is that until recently responsibility for small business was scattered among and diffused through a number of different Government agencies, none of which had the necessary breadth of authority to deal with the entire problem. It was precisely in order to end this state of diffusion and overlapping responsibilities that Congress set up the SDPA, and provided that the President could transfer to it the functions and powers of other agencies relating to small business. If we liquidate the SDPA now, matters will just go back to the old and unsatisfactory state of affairs which existed before this legislation was unanimously adopted last year.

Very soon after his appointment as Administrator, Mr. Taylor wrote to the President—December 1, 1951—and proposed that, in order to end duplication, the functions of the Department of Commerce relating to financial aid to small business, and getting an increased share of Government procurement for small business, should be transferred over to the SDPA. As a result of this letter, the President issued an Executive order—Executive Order No. 1023, dated February 5, 1952—transferring the financial, procurement, and certain other small-business responsibilities of the Department of Commerce to the SDPA. This was the first step in streamlining the Government's small-business activities. No doubt others will follow if we give Mr. Taylor a chance to work things out. But if we wipe out the SDPA now, matters will simply fall back into the same old state of confusion and duplication that Congress found them in last year, and that Congress unanimously determined to correct by the legislation establishing the SDPA.

Now, the most important things that SDPA is doing have never been done by the Department of Commerce, or by any other agency ever since the liquidation of the old Smaller War Plants Corporation in 1946. Mr. Sawyer himself felt that these additional activities on behalf of small business were necessary and recommended that they be enacted into law. The Congress decided to put these new activities into an independent agency instead of in the Department of Commerce, because the Congress felt that there ought to be an agency whose sole purpose, unlike that of Commerce, would be to act as spokesman and claimant for small business in all phases of the Government's activities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the only question before the House is whether we will vote to give small business this representation in the Government—this voice to speak for them and claim for them. That is what the SDPA is for, and that is what the small-business men want. The SDPA has been in existence only a little over 4 months, and already some 3,000 small-business men have written in to it or visited it to seek its assistance, whether in getting Government contracts, or for help on their metal allocations, or for financial assistance, or other reasons. If, as the Committee on Appropriations now tells us, the SDPA is just doing what other agencies do already, why have 3,000 small-business men come to it in the first 4 months of its existence? And bear in mind that this is just in Washington. There have been no field offices to help the small-business man out where he really does his business.

Mr. Chairman, I get a little impatient when I hear all these gentlemen talk about duplication under circumstances like these. If you ask the Department of Commerce whether they can help a small-business man get a loan from the RFC, they will have to tell you that they cannot do anything about it. They cannot help him get a contract either. We have given the SDPA that authority, and the President has transferred over to the SDPA those functions.

With all respect to the Committee on Appropriations, I do not think they have understood the situation at all clearly. I have been looking at the record of the hearings before the subcommittee, and I see that Mr. Taylor was asked to describe his plan for the future activities of his agency. After he had done that, the chairman of the subcommittee suggested to Mr. Taylor—hearings, page 460—that this was much too comprehensive a program to be accomplished in the 4 months remaining between now and June 30, when the legislation creating the SDPA will expire unless extended by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, if the SDPA program is too comprehensive, it certainly is not a duplication of what other people are doing already. And, of course, nobody ever expected the SDPA to accomplish its purpose in 4 months. Like the other agencies set up under the Defense Production Act, it was anticipated that the act would be extended for as long as the emergency lasts.

Mr. Chairman, there is abundant evidence to show that in the last war small business was struggling against a rising tide until there was established an independent agency whose only responsibility was to assist small business. A marvelous job was done in the last war by the Smaller War Plants Corporation. In this present emergency, small business was in exactly the plight it was in, in 1942, before SWPC was organized. Six months ago Congress showed that the experience of the last war had not been lost. It again set up by unanimous vote an independent agency whose only and primary responsibility was to assist small business. Just as that agency is starting active operations and getting to work on a desperately needed program, its very existence is threatened. Where does that leave small business?

The Congress of the United States set up this organization to do a job which was not being done. In the light of the experience had by Congress and the small-business people in World War II and the early days of the Korean conflict, small business had to have this

assistance. I sincerely hope the Members of the House will support the Fogarty amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, Congress should protect the small businessman. I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment to provide the appropriation of $825,000 requested by the Small Defense Plants Administration, to insure that small business would be assured an opportunity to get a fair share of the contracts placed by Government departments. I believe the Small Defense Plants Administration should be continued, and should be allowed to have this small appropriation, because the work they are doing is the thing that is keeping a lot of these small defense plants going. In fact, this is a real time where the Members should recognize that both the chamber of commerce and the workers want this program continued. Industry, both management and labor, is united in this position. As one of the original Members of Congress sponsoring the legislation establishing the Small Defense Plants Administration, I believe this program is well worth while.

Mr. Davies, of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, the executive director of the Smaller Manufacturer's Council of that body, called today by long-distance phone urging the Congressmen from Pennsylvania to vote and support this appropriation so that this agency will not be discontinued. My constituent, Philip Murray, from Pittsburgh, has also written the Congressmen urging the importance of this agency to small business and those employed by it. So I am very pleased to be able to say that both sides in industry in this instance believe firmly that this agency should be continued.

Of course, we are always hearing about big labor and big business. It is the poorly equipped businessman, the small businessman who is more limited in his overhead budget and types of administrative personnel, that finds that he cannot get these big agencies in the Government to stand up for him. He needs special advice and direction in the Government agencies to obtain fair treatment and justice for the problems that are so big to him, but so small in the total agency view. In this case we have the small-business man at a real disadvantage, and he is pushed from governmental pillar to governmental post. And we Congressmen have all seen the kicking around the small-business man takes in Washington—we need no examples.

I am sure where there are these other larger agencies that take care of the big business, that we in Congress ought equally to take care of the many little- and medium-business men and let them have just this few hundred thousand dollars to support the Small Defense Plants Administration as a particular agency for their own protection in the battle of the behemoths. The small-business man in the United States of America is entitled to his place in the sun—he has certainly earned it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask one simple question: What did Charlie Sawyer, whom I think my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] should have been referring to instead of the Department of Commerce—what did Charlie Sawyer and his department do for small business between the time that the Korean war started and the 16 months before we created this Small Defense Plants Administration last fall? The answer is nothing. It is the same Charlie Sawyer and the same Department of Commerce who opposed setting up of the special emergency agencies such as the ODM, the DPA, and the NPA. Charlie Sawyer was saying at the beginning of the Korean conflict, "I can do it all." Well, we in the Congress overruled him because we knew that once he started to do it all we would have a terrible time stopping him from doing it all, and because we were not satisfied with what he was doing at the time. Small-business men were not satisfied with what Charlie Sawyer and the Department of Commerce was then doing for them, and that is why they came to the Congress and asked us to set up this administration for their benefit. These small-business men still want this administration to continue. The Congress wants this administration to continue. Charlie Sawyer and the Committee on Appropriations want to veto our will as expressed last fall. As between the Fogarty amendment and the Cotton amendment, I suggest to you that we wholeheartedly support the Fogarty amendment because if we are going to cut down, as the Cotton amendment would cut down, we are going to eliminate the efficiency of the Small Defense Plants Administration. Those of us who are economy minded, and I have put in a bill on this subject, should seek to achieve our economy by transferring these duplicating efforts in NPA and in the Department of Commerce to the Small Defense Plants Administration. In this way we should economize rather than by adopting the Cotton amendment. Therefore, I strongly support the Fogarty amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment.

In this debate, it seems to me too many questions have been raised. There are really three separate questions.

First, should the Federal Government do something for small business in a period where we have emergency controls?

Second, by what method should the Federal Government afford that assistance and relief?

Third, how much money should we give the Federal agency created to carry out that task?

The first two of those questions have already been decided by the Congress. In my judgment, they are not appropriately before the House in this debate on an appropriation bill. We passed a law which established the Small Defense Plants Administration as the means whereby the Federal Government would give aid and assistance to small business in the defense period to facilitate conversion from normal civilian production to defense production, and to minimize the disruption of production and employment resulting from the imposition of materials allocations and other economic controls.

If we want to change that method of assisting small business, now is not the time to do it. The time to do that is when we consider the extension of the Defense Production Act. That problem should go before the proper committee and that committee should study the action or the policy it thinks desirable and make its recommendations to the House. That is a matter of substantive legislative policy, which has been decided, and which should not be tampered with in this appropriation bill.

Now, with respect to the amount of money involved, we have heard a great deal about mushrooming. If we decide that we are going to help small business and we are going to do it through this agency, let us really help, not just make idle gestures. Do not tell me that 129 people can do much good. They want 500 people.

I hold no brief for the Administrator of this agency, for the job that the agency has done in the past, and I make no predictions about what it is going to do in the future. That is a problem of administration. We cannot do very much about that except to outline the policy, create the agency, and appropriate adequate funds. Later we can investigate to see whether the job is properly done, but it is too early to go into that now.

This agency is only 4 months old, and it is not too much to expect it to grow in the beginning. It will have to be of some size if it is going to afford any effective relief to the small-business men of your district and mine who come down here needing copper, aluminum, or other scarce materials, or have other problems and who cannot get anywhere themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, the Small Defense Plants Administration is by law mandated to do the work which was supposed to be done, but which was not being performed by at least six other agencies.

The Department of Commerce least of all has any right to complain about this new agency because they had no less than 150 men and a budget of $800,000 assigned to its Office of Small Business.

If you do not make this appropriation in accordance with the Fogarty amendment for this Small Defense Plants Administration, there will be nobody in the Department of Commerce to do the work because the duty to perform that work has already been transferred by Executive order from the Department of Commerce to this administration and the

Department of Commerce has already let go of two-thirds of its staff, which was assigned to this job that they were not doing.

If you want this job done for small business, there is only one way to get it done, and that is through this agency.

We took thousands of pages of testimony, both the Small Business Committee of this House and the Small Business Committee in the other body, all through the country, and wherever we went we were told that the Commerce Department was not doing anything at all for them; the RFC was not doing anything for them; the Army was not doing anything for them; the Munitions Board was not doing anything for them; and until we got this agency on the job, after you authorized it a few months ago, then, for the first time, did small business begin to get some real help in connection with the defense effort. If you want that program carried on, you must support the Fogarty amendment and give them the money and the manpower with which to do the job.

You can show the small-business men of America today whether the House of Representatives is for them or against them. The issue is as simple as that.

Not to provide an appropriation for the Small Defense Plants Administration, as has been recommended by the Appropriations Subcommittee, is the same as saying to thousands upon thousands of small independent businessmen that we do not care whether they sink or swim.

The disruptions of the mobilization program demanded that an agency be created to safeguard the interests of small business. Congress responded to that demand only last July when it established the Small Defense Plants Administration without a dissenting vote. I repeat, without a dissenting vote.

Do not we know our own minds? Are we trying to establish a record for inconsistency? If we were right 8 months ago in setting up this much-needed agency to assist the smaller producers of the Nation, how can we be anything but wrong—dead wrong—in abolishing it today.

It is an open secret that certain persons in Government do not want a single centralized point within Government where small and medium-size companies can go for help. No—that would be too sensible, too efficient. They prefer to see businessmen run around to a dozen different departments and bureaus with all the waste, delay, duplications, and red tape that that involves.

Why? Because before we established the Small Defense Plants Administration, these departments and bureaus each had a small-business unit of their own, albeit an inefficient one in almost every insaance. It was because of this duplication and ineffectiveness that a single agency was created.

But the empire builders have been busy. For months they have been lobbying against the Small Defense Plants Administration. The reason is clear. SDPA in a few short months, and with limited funds and personnel, has done such an outstanding job of aiding small-business men that the former efforts of some other bureaus appear pitiful in comparison.

Today, perhaps more than ever before, small business needs help from its Government. The way to give it that help is to keep alive the small business agency created by us for that very purpose. Not to do so will be more than merely a mistake, it will be a rank injustice to all of the small-business men who have come to look upon the Small Defense Plants Administration as the embodiment of their Government's desire and duty to help them over the rough spots of our presently dislocated economy.

The Small Defense Plants Administration must be continued as long as the present world emergency lasts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I may have to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Very well.

Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman these two questions: In his opinion is the force of excessive taxation on small business today doing greater harm, and also is the force of the absence of military spending at the present time doing more harm to small business than the creation of this agency now before us?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Before answering that, I would like to have the gentleman's views on that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In my opinion, the two greatest forces operating against small business in this country today is the fantastic tax burden imposed on small business only last year by the Congress; and, secondly, the small amount of military expenditures, as related to appropriations, which the Congress has approved for military purposes. I think those two forces are doing much greater harm to small industry in this country than either the presence or absence of this agency we have been discussing this afternoon. Reference has been made, if the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reference has been made to the small percentage of military contracts which are being filled by small business concerns today as compared with the percentage filled during World War II at the peak of expenditures. This Congress has appropriated and is appropriating approximately $7,250,000,000 average for monthly military expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, may I say, with all due respect, that this is no facetious statement I am making, because the people in my district understand what I am talking about. I have discussed it with them many times within the past 60 days.

If this Government was spending this money—and I mean $7,000,000,000—each month for military expenditures, you would have a volume of business which would keep all industry busy, large as well as small industry. If with a military expenditure of over $7,000,000,000 a month along with peacetime requirements you cannot supply the industry of this country with the necessary business; if with that kind of expenditure you cannot keep people employed in this country in reasonably full employment, I wish you would tell this Congress how you expect to run this country in the coming months and years, and after the heavy military appropriations cease and the expenditures for military equipment on a large scale are discontinued.

Mr. Chairman, little business faces the great productive capacity of the plants under the control of so-called big business, not just the capacity now ready for production, but that greatly expanded capacity which is now taking form throughout the expanse of this whole land. These new military plants now being constructed at the cost of many billions of dollars will have capacity in the coming years and where will that capacity or production be sold. I might also mention another great harm that is coming to little industry in the United States: I refer to the insistent and consistent policy of the State Department wherein that great arm of this Government insists on surrendering the market here in the United States to the producers located in other lands and who desire to send their goods here for sale. This comes about through the reciprocal trade-agreements program, the mutual-aid-assistance program, the point-4 program of the President. All these programs cost billions of tax dollars and little industry and little business must contribute greatly to these programs. The State Department wants the trade or tariff barriers removed so foreign goods can come into this country and the net effect of all of this is to take markets away from our little business here in the United States. Only within the past 15 days I have been before the Tariff Commission protesting against the State Department policy and speaking in behalf of little business in my own congressional district.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope this great Committee on Appropriations is not going to get itself in the position of marching up the hill and then down the hill again. Such a policy in my opinion is dangerous at this time. The issue here as I see it is not so much trying to take care of anyone, for

I think American business can pretty well take care of itself, but is one of production so badly needed at present. I wish I had 30 minutes to go into detail as to the actual production and show you how far we are behind, and give you some of the reasons and opinions I believe are sound as to why I believe this Congress has got to tackle the problem with all means, efforts, and with everything we can possibly put to work in this effort.

I am deeply concerned; I am concerned because of the fact our boys are still in Korea. I do not want to sit here in this body and assume the responsibility of not being able to put planes, tanks, or guns anywhere in the world where we are involved and where needed. It is a deadly vicious thing that we are in, and we will be in it a long time. I am not concerned about the characters in the Small Defense Plants Corporation; this Congress can make it work; I know it has possibilities, and Americans, the American Government, and everybody else needs every ounce of production capacity we can secure from every and all agencies and sources.

Mr. Chairman, it is tragic, tragic. This program we are in for rearming America has been extended over a 3-year period instead of 2. Where are we now? Six months, 12 months, and 18 months behind on items that are needed and are presently short. Small business can throw into this program if properly advised and consulted and well planned a source of support we sorely need. We need to cut out this jealousy that exists in all Government agencies and get to work. This is no small task.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, one of the Members who spoke in opposition to the Fogarty amendment inadvertently stated that none of the employees of this Small Defense Plants Administration were competent. I happen to know some of those employees—one a respected lady from my home town, Mrs. Marie Moore Stewart. She has worked in some of the most important Government agencies over a period of several years. She is thoroughly competent, and far above the average. She had a son-in-law in World War II, and now in world war III, fighting for our country. Most all of you Members of the House and I are acquainted with John E. House, who worked on the Hill for many years. I know he, too, is thoroughly competent. He is typical of the high caliber of the Small Defense Plants Administration employees, and I know several others who are likewise competent, who are now employed by this agency, who are rendering a valuable service to small business in such capacity.

I think all of us should support this Fogarty amendment. I urge you to do so. If we fail to do it, it will be comparable to a parent bringing a child into this world and then failing to accept the responsibility of supporting that child. All of us voted for the Small Defense Plants Administration some months ago and now we should at least appropriate for its continuance. We are interested in economy. It will save us a lot of money in the long run, and will save a lot of small businesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, the two Members of the House who had the most to do with putting through the provision for the Small Defense Plants Administration were the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. This is therefore distinctly a matter not based upon partisanship, as has been shown by that joint sponsorship and by the debate.

It is based upon social philosophy and the social philosophy is this: Will you give subsidies to small business when small business gets in trouble, or will you give small business the opportunity to get advice, technical guidance, and marketing facilities, in all of which every study of small business has shown that it falls short? Will you give small business that opportunity through this Small Defense Plants Administration and through this very modest sum of money? That is the fundamental social question facing us.

The fault I find with the amendment of my very good friend, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who had such a great victory yesterday, is that it proposes to continue the Small Defense Plants Administration only to the extent that it has been operating today, which has given the very opening for saying that there is duplication. It has perhaps been unable to take over fast enough the functions of the other agencies operating in the field; well, if we vote down the Fogarty amendment and we vote up the Cotton amendment, all we are doing is bolstering the opposition based on the alleged duplication. Let us decide it decisively on the fundamental question of social philosophy, pass the Fogarty amendment and show that we know how to deal with the small-business problem in the defense mobilization period.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, in the 2 minutes I have left I want to commend the remarks of my friend the gentleman from New York, and remind the members of the Committee of three facts: First, the Fogarty amendment involved $825,000. Part of that $825,000 is to be used to administer a revolving fund that would undoubtedly be presented to you in a later amendment, a $10,000,000 revolving fund which involves making loans.

During World War I the agency which was the predecessor of this agency made in 5 years, according to the testimony before our committee, some $30,000,000 of loans, and it must have cost the Government more than $30,000,000.

Second. This $825,000 is to be used, in part, to establish branch offices, 13 or 14 of them, throughout the United States where there are branch offices of the Department and the RFC at the present time. That in my book is duplication.

Third. Mr. Taylor testified himself that he had no teeth in the usual sense, he could only report to Congress if he did not have the cooperation of these agencies.

My amendment, Mr. Chairman, would preserve and keep alive your Bureau until we can avoid duplication and give it proper growth. It is not a matter of going up the hill and walking back; it is a matter of going up the hill reasonably and gradually. It is not a matter of not supporting your child; it is a matter of not trying to let your child become 21 years in 1 year. Therefore, I want to suggest that if you want to save this agency, and I believe the small-business people want it saved reasonably and with economy, vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to close debate.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Appropriations approached this question from a purely factual point of view. No one on the committee had any predisposition, or any preconceived opinions. We went into every phase of the question solely on its merit and we were unable to find where this agency up to this time has done anything worth while or that they proposed to do anything that was not already being satisfactorily done by other and more experienced agencies.

For example, the Department of Defense agencies have taken steps to have their large contractors designate a top executive as a small business liaison officer. For example, over 2,000 have been so designated by various Air Force contractors. These men have the responsibilities of utilizing small firms in subcontracting work thus enlarging the industrial base. The effectiveness of the program can be gathered from two examples:

First. Wright Aeronautical-Curtiss-Wright are one of the largest contractors for jet engines. Over 38 percent of their prime contract dollars already committed have gone to small business by subcontracts in the first tier.

Second. Republic Aviation, which has the new control for the F–84 plane, has committed over 30 percent of their prime contract funds to small businesses in the first tier.

An analysis of 13 large prime Army contracts in the latter part of 1951 showed that 42 percent of the dollar volume went to small firms.

The maximum of small business potential in Air Force procurement in the first half of fiscal year 1952 was 10.8 percent of the total contract values. Of this amount small firms secured 61 percent. Through February 1952 this percentage has risen to 62 percent. This percentage is comparable to that of the Navy and the Army.

The latest Navy statistics show that small firms received over 25 percent of the $657,240,943 awarded by the Navy in prime contracts in January 1952.

Prime contracts have been awarded by the Navy to small firms at an average of $187,000,000 monthly during the

present fiscal year, over three times larger than the average for the same period in fiscal year 1951.

An analysis is now being made of 91 prime contracts of the Army. Of this number, 19 of the 91 have been completed to date, and they show over 40 percent of the total prime-contract dollars were subcontracted to small firms.

In fiscal year 1951 over 58 percent of the value of contracts awarded by the General Services Administration were awarded to small firms. This increased to over 69 percent in the first quarter of 1952.

In fiscal year 1951 over 29 percent of the value of contracts awarded by the Department of the Army were awarded to small firms. This increased to 32 percent in the first quarter of 1952.

In fiscal year 1951 over 29 percent of the value of Atomic Energy Commission contracts reached small firms through either prime or subcontracts. In the second quarter of 1952 over 67 percent of the value of the contracts awarded reach small business.

This situation is fully appreciated and approved by small-business men themselves. Here is a telegram which came unsolicited this morning from one of the outstanding small manufacturers of St. Louis:

ST. LOUIS, MO., *March 12, 1952.*

Congressman CANNON:

The stand of the Committee on Appropriations for discontinuing the separate Small Defense Plant agency is certainly correct. The Department of Commerce is set up to do this job. Why have a competing agency? Basically there is no difference in the activities of a small or large business. We small fellows must operate efficiently and within the price the customer is willing to pay; otherwise we have no right to be in business. I spoke on this very subject before the Nebraska Small Business Association and they agreed in toto.

WALTER SIEGERIST.

In that connection a great many people have been misled as to what constitutes small business. Grocers, confectioners, druggists, and drygoods men have been led to believe it will help them.

It does not include any of them. The most restrictive definition of small business which the committee could get was that it included business of less than 500 employees, and in the heavy-manufacturing business, such as steel, it included business of less than 2,500 employees. Still another definition—the definition which seemed most acceptable to the Agency—was any business the stock of which was not quoted on the stock exchange. And that would include the Ford Motor Co., as its stock is not quoted on the exchange. A lot of people selling shoestrings and popcorn consider themselves as benefited by this legislation. As a matter of fact, the proposed appropriation applies only to manufacturers. And, so far as the committee could find, it had not perceptibly provided anything they are not already getting.

When it comes to loans, a feature on which great emphasis is laid, it is apparent at a glance that the Agency is ineffectual. Someone here on the floor attempted to leave the impression that RFC could not grant a loan unless it was recommended by the Small Business Agency. RFC cannot only grant any such loan without a recommendation, but even when a recommendation is made RFC processes the application as if it had never been brought to their attention. So any work by the Agency is a duplication and is utterly wasted. It is not only a duplication; it is a triplication, a quadruplication, a quintuplication. It is lost motion and is an intermediate step for which there is no need or excuse. It slows down the processing of the application and delays the receipt of the money by the applicant. And it will cost the taxpayer more and more money every year of its useless existence.

The committee which recommends the discontinuation of this waste of time and money consists of 50 men. Among them are some of the most experienced men in the House. Not a one of them has any reason to oppose service to small business. On the contrary, all of them would prefer to serve small business. But after exhaustive consideration and on a cold statistical review of the whole situation we urgently recommend that this money be saved. And we at the same time assure the House and the country that small business will receive more adequate service and prompter service through existing agencies.

It should also be noted that the House is not committed to this provision of law or to support any appropriation proposed in support of it. Much has been said about the vote by which the original authorization passed the House when there was no contest. But they entirely overlook that fact that last session when the question of implementing the legislation was before us, the House did not appropriate a penny for it and sent it to the Senate without a dollar of the estimate. In short, the House thereby completely nullified its action in adopting the legislation. The only reason the $350,000 was provided was because the Senate put it on and we had to agree to it in conference.

Incidentally somebody here on the floor, indignant that a larger appropriation was not made, referred to the amount as a "paltry" $350,000. If he will inquire in his district as to how many of his constituents had to come in and plank down their income taxes to make up that $350,000, it will not seem quite so paltry.

If there was ever a time when any question of doubt should be resolved in favor of economy it is in this session of Congress. This is a fifth wheel to the wagon. If its unwarranted and unnecessary cost is saddled on the already overburdened taxpayer, the free-spending Congressmen who voted for it will not soon be forgotten.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COTTON) there were—ayes 91, noes 123.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. COTTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 113, noes 130.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 19, after line 11, insert the following:

"SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION REVOLVING FUND

"For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $10,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, pending the consideration of this amendment, if the gentleman will yield to me, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I did not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island yield for that purpose?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island does not yield for that purpose.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take long on this amendment because I know each and every one of you wants to finish this bill early tonight and get home.

This amendment goes along with the one that was just offered and carried in the Committee of the Whole. As you know, when this legislation was offered by the House, the House authorized a $50,000,000 revolving fund under the same procedure that was used on the Smaller War Plants Corporation during the last war. The House authorized this fund but never matched that action with an implementing appropriation.

This revolving fund is not a drain on the Federal Treasury. This $10,000,000 which is being asked for at this time is just for the purpose of being used as a revolving fund. There will be no money lost to the general funds of the Treasury of the United States. The revolving fund is for the purpose of helping the Small Defense Plants Administration force some of these defense agencies to hand out some of the defense contracts to small business. Maybe they will not use a dollar of it. There were only a few instances in the last war when a similar fund was invoked, but the Smaller War Plants Corporation used this revolving fund effectively. Then it was only to force some of the military agencies which refused to cooperate with small business to break up some of their contracts and force them into the channels of small business. That is the only reason for the authorization of this $10,000,000. Perhaps none of it will be used. If some of it is used, it will be used in exactly the same manner as in the case

of prime contracts. The money will be paid back into the general funds of the Treasury so there will be no loss to the Government of the United States at all. The money will be there for that purpose if they need it. They can use it if they need it, and then the money will be returned to the Treasury of the United States. In view of the fact that the other amendment was adopted, I hope you will adopt this companion amendment because it gives SDPA just that added weapon to bring to bear on defense agencies that have the authority to let these subcontracts and forces them to give at least a fair percentage of the contracts to small-business firms throughout the country.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. This is the organization's big weapon. This is what makes the organization tick, and no money is lost by the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. FOGARTY. You are absolutely right. This will make the Small Plants Administration more effective. It gives them something to work with. Congress authorized a $50,000,000 revolving fund, and all we are requesting here is a $10,000,000 revolving fund. I repeat it is not a drain on the funds of the General Treasury. It is merely a working tool.

The best explanation I can make, Mr. Chairman, of this revolving fund, its purpose and efficacy is to say that in World War II it was the signal and the actual authority for the SWPC to say to the procurement agencies: Here is a contract that we say small business can perform; we certify to that effect. To make the proposition operative we will take the contract in our own name, serve as the prime contractor and then sublet it to small business.

Now it is worthy of note that the SWPC did not run hog wild with that authority. They used it sparingly, they used it constructively, they used it fruitfully. In all, the SWPC invoked this authority to act as a prime contractor itself some 12 times. It was able to do so because of the revolving fund it had so that it could actually proceed along business lines to bring about the production of the item it had assumed responsibility for.

As I say, the Smaller War Plants Corporation used that authority 12 times and the contracts it took in this way amounted to between $30,000,000 and $35,000,000.

Now I want you to follow me closely on this: The very fact that the Smaller War Plants Corporation had the power to do all of this and had a revolving fund to make this idea operative, was the "cop on the beat" that soon compelled the procurement agencies to award many hundreds of other prime contracts to small business. In this way the war production effort was speeded, concentration of war contracts to big business was flouted and an equitable share of contracts was spread out to small business. This is how it worked out in World War II, and this was herein proposed. And again I wish to stress the fact that the funds used to finance these prime contracts taken in the name of SWPC were ultimately reclaimed to the United States Treasury.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 102, noes 107.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 132, noes 103.

So the motion was agreed to.

Thereupon the Committee rose; and Mr. COOPER having assumed the Chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 6947, the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1952, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today may have three legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR REST OF WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make an announcement in relation to the program for tomorrow and the rest of the week. Tomorrow there will be the consideration of the conference report on the Mexican labor wetback bill and a continuation of consideration of the appropriation bill that has been before us today.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman from Massachusetts tell me which will be taken up first?

Mr. McCORMACK. The conference report will come up first.

On the program there is the Immigration and Naturalization Code. At the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that is being taken off the program and will not come up this week and it is not being programed for next week.

The other bill relates to the jurisdiction of the United States Code in certain cases. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary informs me that when they were before the Rules Committee there was some suggestion by some of the members of the Rules Committee in relation to the reports, both majority and minority, being filed and the chairman of the committee either expressly or by implication promised that the reports would be filed. I was not aware of that when I programed the bill. In view of the fact that the reports have not been filed as yet, so the chairman of the Judiciary Committee informed me this afternoon, that bill will not come up and will not be programed for next week either.

MOTOR CARRIER CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 396, making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952 with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "sum" and insert "sums".

Page 1 after line 5 insert:

"LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

"SENATE

"Salaries, officers, and employees

"The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1952, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Minnesota, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 3,000,000 but less than 5,000,000, the population of said State having exceeded 3,000,000 inhabitants.

"Contingent expenses of the Senate

"For an additional amount for 'Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,' $15,000.

"For an additional amount for 'Expenses of inquiries and investigations,' $400,000.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"For an additional amount for expenses of 'Special and select committees,' $400,000."

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the legislative branch and the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, the changes that have been made in the resolution by the other body were all relative to the legislative establishment to take care of increased expense of certain committees.

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

IMMIGRATION, NATURALIZATION, AND NATIONALITY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will consider this week a very important bill, H. R. 5678, revising the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality.

A careful study of this bill will leave the reader with mixed emotions. Undoubtedly, many improvements have been included in this bill. However, there are certain provisions in the bill which, in my opinion, should be changed by amendment before its final passage.

I believe that section 212 (a), which transfers from Congress to the President the right to prohibit the immigration of any and all foreigners to the United States upon his own determination is a very unwise provision. I shall vote to eliminate it. I believe that Congress should retain this control, which is given it by the Constitution. In my opinion, were this provision ever tested in the courts it would be declared unconstitutional.

I do not like the feature which restricts future immigration, by in effect mortgaging future quotas, through charging against those quotas people who have entered the United States under the Displaced Persons Act.

While previous laws have not been free of racial discrimination, I regret that a new provision is contained in this bill which changes the principle of national origin by providing an additional restriction on those citizens of other countries who are descended from Asiatic ancestors. I fear that this provision will be capitalized upon by the Communists in their propaganda throughout the Asiatic world.

Another fault of the bill, in my opinion, is the omission of a provision which would allow the pooling of unused quotas. I realize that the 1924 law did not contain such a provision and it is a matter of policy, which, in my opinion, should be changed in this current legislation.

There are some other portions of the bill which I find objectionable. I sincerely hope that the House will give detailed attention to each section in reviewing the bill for amendment. We should take time to listen to members of the Committee on the Judiciary explain what effect is sought by each section, and all of us who question or disagree with the intent or language should have ample opportunity to be heard. Provisions in this bill have far-reaching effects upon human lives all over the world.

Among the provisions of the bill which I consider desirable is section 311 establishing the principle that race shall have no bearing on any person's eligibility for citizenship. In discussing this section which applies to Japanese and other Asiatics in the South Pacific area, I have conferred with Mr. Mike Masaoka, national legislative director of the Anti-Discrimination Committee of the Japanese American Citizens League. As my colleagues will remember, Mike was one of the heroes of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Regimental Combat Team and is a fine American citizen, known and respected by many Members of Congress. In reply to certain specific questions which I directed to him he has given me a letter dated today, March 12, 1952. In order to give my colleagues the benefit of the information contained therein, I include Mr. Masaoka's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before the debate opens on H. R. 5678:

JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1952.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Congressman from California,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOLIFIELD: You have asked us specific questions about the Walter omnibus immigration and naturalization bill and for our answers to certain objections raised by various individuals and organizations against this measure.

In preparing our replies, we approached the omnibus bill not as technicians but as laymen interested and concerned with improving our immigration and naturalization policy as much as possible consistent with the security of our Nation and the promotion of our international relations.

We also appreciate that because of the personal nature of this problem to so many, emotionalism often overcomes reason and logic.

Appraisal of this legislation should not be piecemeal nor on the basis of what we believe to be the ideal in immigration and naturalization; it should be judged on its over-all impact in the field and whether taken as a whole it is better or worse than existing law.

As you are well aware, legislation of this magnitude and complexity is always a compromise, of trying to secure the greatest agreement of divergent opinions and interests. Because the omnibus bill is compromise legislation, it will not satisfy every individual in every respect. But the question is whether as new legislation it represents improvement over present statutes.

Consideration should also be given to the fact that more than 4 years of intensive and exhaustive study, first by a Senate subcommittee and later by a joint Senate and House subcommittee, with professional experts, were devoted to this complicated subject, including several months of public hearings, before the omnibus bill was drafted.

A 328 page report by the Judiciary Committee, which includes a section by section comparison of the proposed bill with existing law, explains the background and the committee reasons for the various individual provisions.

Thus, our comments will be expositions of our own thinking, rather than a repetition of the committee report with possibly one or two exceptions.

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

A major criticism is the charge that the Internal Security Act of 1950 is made a part of the permanent immigration and naturalization law and in a far more restrictive form.

In the first place, it must be remembered that this act is already on the statute books and that it affects immigration and naturalization practices. Even if the omnibus bill is not passed, the Internal Security Act remains as a serious factor in immigration and naturalization policies.

In the second place, the very fact that legislation so seriously affecting immigration and naturalization is not considered part and parcel of the basic laws creates confusion and misunderstanding, especially among aliens who may not understand the English language very well. By codifying such pertinent parts of the Internal Security Act as it relates to this field, a public service is rendered by making available in a single statute all the aspects of the subject.

Finally, and most important, except for simply restating the language of the pertinent sections of the 1950 Internal Security Act, all substantive changes are liberalizations rather than restrictions. Take for example the proviso relating to the so-called "redemption" clauses. Under the omnibus bill, discretionary authority is given the Attorney General to admit an alien who at least 5 years prior to applying for a visa has withdrawn from membership in a proscribed organization and who since that time has opposed that subversive doctrine. Under existing law, this principle of redemption is not recognized and these aliens are forever barred from admission into the United States unless their membership was involuntary, while under the age of 16, or for purposes of obtaining employment, food, or other essentials of living.

POOLING OF QUOTAS

Another major criticism is that the omnibus bill does not provide for the so-called pooling of unused quotas. "Pooling" means that the unused visas are assigned to a general immigration visa pool and issued to applicants under various conditions.

Without commenting on the desirability of such a provision, or on the validity of the national origins principle, it should, nevertheless, be pointed out that such promiscuous pooling of quotas is contrary to the spirit and the intent of the national origins principle which was adopted as basic in 1924. It should also be noted that in the present legislative atmosphere of the Congress, such a departure from established practices would, in our opinion, be overwhelmingly defeated. We believe, therefore, that insistence upon this ideal objective will prevent passage of any immigration and naturalization legislation, no matter how much improved such legislation may be over existing law.

COLONIES AND DEPENDENCIES

Still another criticism has been directed at the provisions limiting immigration quotas to 100 per year for colonies and dependencies. While we do not necessarily approve of the practical results of this new provision, we do recognize that, as the committee report declares, colonies or dependent areas should not have a greater preference than independent countries as, for example, India, Israel, and Australia, which have annual minimum quotas of 100.

BIRTHPLACE VERSUS ANCESTRY

A question may be raised that the omnibus bill continues the discrimination in immigration against persons of Asian ancestry born outside the Orient by making them chargeable to the quota of their ancestral land rather than their birthplace. While this is true, there is no denying that the proposed legislation marks a significant advance by eliminating complete exclusion.

We reluctantly acknowledge that the political realities which conceived this formula for the Chinese and East Indians remain today. Opening wide the doors of immigration to the hundreds of thousands of Orientals now residing in Canada and Central and South America would threaten to revive the now dead antiorientalism of the west coast.

Insistence upon complete equality of immigration at this time means no legislation on this subject at all. We submit that the overriding considerations of extending annual quotas to all Asian and Pacific peoples are such that the United States should not fail to take the major forward step proposed in this bill.

While the matter of lifting immigration barriers is important to the nations involved, of even greater practical and personal

concern to us, as an organization representing persons of Japanese ancestry presently residing in the United States, is the naturalization privilege which the omnibus bill extends to resident aliens.

Under the annual quotas for Japan, for example, 185 immigrants per year may be admitted into the United States. Korea and the others are authorized minimum quotas of 100 each annually. Less than 500 additional immigrants would be admitted under these new quotas every year.

Today, according to the most reliable census figures, approximately 88,000 resident aliens are ineligible for naturalization because of race, 85,000 of whom are Japanese. Accordingly, in terms of numbers alone, since it would take several centuries under the proposed quotas for as many aliens to enter this country as are now here who are ineligible to citizenship, this matter of naturalization transcends other considerations. We sincerely feel that it is far more important to secure naturalization privileges for our 85,000 aged parents now than to increase the risk of losing this opportunity for citizenship by demanding the politically impossible concession of substituting for immigration purposes place of birth for land of ancestry.

EXCLUSION AND DEPORTATION

Other criticisms relate to the exclusion and deportation of aliens and the denaturalization of naturalized citizens.

In the light of world conditions and in the interest of internal security, we can see the necessity for the careful screening of prospective immigrants. Intelligent self-interest dictates the barring of those individuals who may become economic liabilities to this Nation or who are hostile to the primary precepts on which this Government is founded. Neither can we quarrel with the desire of the Government to exclude those who are patently unfit to become useful members of the community, that is, dope peddlers, prostitutes, criminals, mental incompetents, sex deviates, and carriers of contagious diseases.

The proposed deportation procedures, though they may seem stringent, are designed to close the loopholes in existing law which, in too many cases, reward the unscrupulous and penalize the law abiding.

The committee report noted:

"The committee is aware, too, of the progressively increasing number of cases in which aliens are deliberately flouting our immigration laws by the processes of gaining admission into the United States illegally or ostensibly as nonimmigrants but with the intention of establishing themselves in a situation in which they may subsequently have access to some administrative remedy to adjust their status to that of permanent residents. This practice is grossly unfair to aliens who await abroad their turn on the quota waiting lists and who are deprived of their quota numbers in favor of aliens who indulge in the abuse. This practice is threatening our entire immigration system and the incentive for the practice must be removed."

Denaturalization procedures, too, are amended generally with the security interests of the Nation given priority.

Finally, it should be remembered that the congressional prerogative of introducing private bills to correct individual injustices is not in anyway circumscribed.

EQUALITY IN IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

On the clearly positive side, we submit the following as among the more significant improvements that the omnibus bill proposes over existing legislation.

The most important is the elimination of race as a bar to immigration and naturalization.

For the first time in American law, this provision would establish the principle of equal opportunity in immigration and naturalization, to all persons without regard to race. At the present time only the Japanese, Koreans, and the peoples of southeast Asia are denied these opportunities. Chinese, East Indians, and Filipinos, who comprise most of the peoples of Asia, enjoy these immigration and naturalization privileges. The obvious selection of some peoples over others simply highlights the contradictory status of our immigration and naturalization laws.

In this delicate hour of world history, when we are trying to rally the freedom-loving peoples everywhere to our banner, we can ill afford to maintain so flagrant a discrepancy between what we profess as a democracy and what we in fact practice. It is ironical that while we invest our very lifeblood in Korea to thwart Communist advances there and labor to win the allegiance of Japan and southeast Asia to our cause, we render suspect the sincerity of our enterprise abroad by our discriminatory policy at home.

The number involved is small, but the principle gained is important. For Asians there can be no sharper rebuttal of Communist arguments.

The House has approved on at least four separate occasions legislation to authorize the naturalization of lawfully admitted resident aliens, but because of Senate reluctance to act upon this issue as a single and separate item, this inequity has yet to be abolished.

We do not think this is too much to ask for our parents, who reared their children to be exemplary Americans, who sent their sons first to World War II and now to Korea to fight as American soldiers for an American ideal.

SEX DISCRIMINATION

A further ameliorative provision in the omnibus bill is the elimination of discrimination between sexes. At the present time, the citizen husband is accorded preferential treatment in that he is allowed to bring his alien wife into this country as a nonquota immigrant. An American citizen wife with an alien husband, however, cannot bring him into the United States as a nonquota immigrant if they were married after January 1, 1948.

The omnibus bill provides for nonquota status for the spouses (husbands and wives) of American citizens and their minor, unmarried children. Together with the preference quotas authorized for parents of United States citizens, spouses and children of alien residents, and the alien brothers, sisters, or married children, or children over 21 years of age, the measure implements the underlying intention of our immigration laws to preserve, insofar as possible, family units.

Enactment of the omnibus bill will obviate the necessity for extending the so-called Soldier Brides Act, which expires March 18, 1952, providing for the admission for permanent residence of the racially ineligible alien spouses of American veterans and servicemen married prior to the expiration date of the law. It will also eliminate the need for private bills for the admission of the racially ineligible alien spouses of civilian occupation employees in Japan and elsewhere in Asia and destroy the existing discrimination in general legislation on this subject between service and civilian personnel.

This particular nonquota provision for the spouses and children of American citizens proposed by the omnibus bill will in itself authorize the admission of considerably more immigrants per year than actually enter under existing statutes. This, we suggest, is a significant fact to keep in mind: there will be more immigrants admitted into the United States annually under the proposed measure than can enter under present law.

SELECTIVE IMMIGRATION

The bill under consideration introduces a new and overdue concept into American immigration law by providing for a system of selective immigration. Not more than 50 percent of the quota for each country is to be made available to immigrants, including their spouses and minor children, "whose services are determined by the Attorney General * * * to be urgently needed in the United States to be substantially beneficial prospectively to the national economy, cultural interests, or welfare of the United States." This proposal is based upon the assumption that this Nation has a right to select from among applicants for admission those whose training and background will contribute most to the welfare of the United States. We do not think this unreasonable, especially since it has been provided that the unused quotas of one category or preference group will be made available to the next lower preference quota.

"New seed" immigration, such as that which developed this Nation in its early history, is not excluded.

There are, of course, many aspects of the Walter omnibus bill which we have not discussed, but we believe that we have touched upon the major points of controversy.

IMPROVEMENT OVER LAW

As stated in the beginning, legislation of this magnitude is necessarily a compromise and the test should be not whether a Utopian situation is created but whether the Walter omnibus immigration and naturalization bill is an improvement over existing law.

In this connection it is interesting to observe that Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, of the Judiciary Committee, one of the leading advocates of liberal policy, states in his additional views appended to the committee report that "improvement over existing law cannot be doubted."

The committee report quotes the State Department to the effect "that the revised bill is in many respects an improvement over existing law. The Department endorses the idea of an omnibus immigration measure which will constitute a codification of all existing laws on the subject. The bill constitutes a step in the direction of better relations with foreign countries."

We, too, are of the judgment that, after all the factors have been carefully weighed, the Walter omnibus immigration and naturalization bill makes substantial improvements in the present law.

Enactment of this legislation does not preclude later amendments; quite the contrary may be true. By bringing together all the laws, Executive orders, and regulations, by codifying the present hodgepodge of documents, and by revising in the light of present world tensions defective statutes, as in the case of the Nationality Act of 1940, further amendment and revision might be facilitated.

The way to better law is a step-by-step proposition of improving basic legislation through appropriate amendments. The Walter omnibus immigration and naturalization bill, by bringing order out of chaos, is a logical first step.

Sincerely,

MIKE MASAOKA,
National Legislative Director.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD in two instances and to include additional material.

Mr. ASPINALL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DURHAM.

Mr. GREEN in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, and to include a paper prepared by Charles M. Steese.

Mr. DAGUE and to include a speech by Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post.

Mr. CRAWFORD and to include brief quotations on defense housing.

Mr. DENNY.

Mr. POULSON in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WHARTON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SITTLER and to include three editorials.

Mr. ADAIR and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BERRY and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in five instances; to include in one a speech by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189; and in four instances, to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington to revise and extend his remarks on H. R. 6947 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include several letters.

Mr. MUMMA (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include an excerpt.

Mr. RABAUT in two separate instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. D'EWART and to include an excerpt from the Agricultural Research Administration.

Mr. STEED and to include an editorial.

Mr. OSTERTAG.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in three instances and to include extraneous matter in each instance.

Mr. BRAY in two instances, in one to include an editorial from the Indianapolis News of March 8.

Mr. AYRES (at the request of Mr. BRAY).

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. MORGAN) in four instances.

Mr. SHELLEY and to include an editorial.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. GREEN), for the balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. FURCOLO (at the request of Mr. MACHROWICZ), from March 12 to March 16, on account of official business of Katyn Forest Massacre Committee.

Mr. MACHROWICZ, for balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. MADDEN for balance of week, on account of official business.

Mr. YATES, for today, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 13, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1242. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Public Law 23, a law enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, was taken from the Speaker's table, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6383. A bill to restore to 70 pounds and 100 inches in girth and length combined the maximum weight and size limitations for appliances, or parts thereof, for the blind sent through the mails; without amendment (Rept. No. 1511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5790. A bill to amend chapter 33 of title 18 of the United States Code by adding a new section to be known as section 711; with amendment (Rept. No. 1512). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 7020. A bill to provide for a delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 7021. A bill to provide for a delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ADAIR (by request):

H. R. 7022. A bill to amend veterans regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during wartime a further presumption of service connection for nonpulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 7023. A bill to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 7024. A bill to provide for the opening of an area of not less than 20 percent of the total area of the Brigantine National Wildlife Refuge for hunting each year; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H. R. 7025. A bill to provide for exemption from the land limitation provisions of the Federal reclamation laws as applied to supplemental water projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 7026. A bill to require the payment of prevailing wage rates to employees of contractors under contracts with the Post Office Department for transportation of mail by motor vehicle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 7027. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn $100 per month without deductions being made from the benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7028. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to alleviate shortages in railroad freight cars and other vehicles during periods of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H. R. 7029. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 7030. A bill to amend certain acts and parts of acts which require the submission of documents to the Post Office Department under oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 7031. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations to establish a conclusive presumption of service connection for poliomyelitis becoming manifest within 1 year after separation from active wartime service, or service after June 26, 1950; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 7032. A bill to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 7033. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recording and releasing of liens by entries on certificates of title for motor vehicles and trailers, and for other purposes", approved July 2, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7034. A bill to amend the Code of Law of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 7035. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Columbia to review certain claims for benefits and payments under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 7036. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7037. A bill to amend section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 7038. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide full retirement annuities for employees who retire after 30 years of service (regardless of age) or at age 60, to reduce the age requirement for an annuity for a spouse or a surviving widow, widower, or parent from age 65 to age 60, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 7039. A bill to authorize the United States to accept the gift of certain land in Chester County, Pa., for use as a national cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 7040. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7041. A bill to provide for adjustment in the salary of certain rural carriers attached to post offices of the first class; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 7042. A bill to amend section 23 (x) of the Internal Revenue Code to increase the maximum allowable deduction for medical expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. J. Res. 400. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse the State of New York for funds expended in improving the New York State canal system between the Hudson River and Oswego, N. Y., to the extent of $1,500,000; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Res. 564. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the activities of James E. Curry as attorney for the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. Res. 565. Resolution requesting a review of the reports on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to a resolution adopted by the New York State Defense Council on February 21, 1952, pertaining to a civil-defense shelter program in accordance with recommendations of the New York State Civil Defense Commission; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7043. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mary K. Reynolds, as successor in interest to the Colonial Realty Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H. R. 7044. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 7045. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mitsu Watanabe Cohen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7046. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toyo M. Kuroishi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 7047. A bill for the relief of Artur Swislocki or Arthur Swislotzki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 7048. A bill for the relief of Lionginas Kublickas, Juozas Grismanauskas, and Edmundas Paulauskas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 7049. A bill for the relief of Beryl Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 7050. A bill for the relief of Frank Morettin or Frank Francesco Morettin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 7051. A bill for the relief of Antonio Del Ponte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 7052. A bill for the relief of Masuko Kosaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7053. A bill for the relief of the estate of George Jacobus, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7054. A bill for the relief of Miyako Toda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 7055. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eunice Weaver Bula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Res. 566. Resolution, providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 2779) for the relief of the Gay Street Corp., of Baltimore, Md.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world where all without is change and decay and where within is fear of failure and of the unknown future, at the springs of Thy abiding presence we would keep alive our faith in values that are permanent and that cannot be shaken.

For this still moment may we hush all other sounds save the divine knocking and the entreating voice which says: "If any man will open the door, I will come in." We know, O Master Divine, that when our heart's door swings on its hesitant hinges and Thou dost enter, those things which are unlovely and unclean cannot stay to embitter and pollute. Help us to walk and work in His overshadowing presence, in the peace that the world giveth not, in the charity that thinketh no evil, in the good will that bridges all chasms, and when the sunset comes may we face its summons with a conscience void of offense toward Thee and our fellow men. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 12, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 396) making an appropriation for the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 396) making additional appropriations for the legislative branch and the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during the coming week, for the reason that in my State the farmers, the small-business men, and the laboring people who compose a nonpartisan league are having a biennial convention, one which I have attended ever since 1915. I have been invited to attend the convention, and, therefore, I make this unanimous-consent request in the belief that my attendance there will produce more good and will profit the people of the United States more than if I remained here.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

CALL OF THE ROLL AND ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after a quorum call Senators be permitted to transact routine business, without debate, and without the time being charged to either side.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 651. A bill to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,419, for certain land in California; with amendments (Rept. No. 1297);

H. R. 4515. A bill to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1298);

H. R. 4798. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to qualifications of jurors; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299); and

H. R. 6242. A bill to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3144. A bill relating to certain construction cost adjustments in connection with the Greenfields division of the Sun River irrigation project, Montana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1304); and

H. R. 3847. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301).

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 1043. A bill to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1302).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 3954. A bill to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 1306).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 25. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1303).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2569. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 1305).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT ON THE JANUARY 1952 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—SUPPLEMENTAL AND MINORITY VIEWS (REPT. NO. 1295)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on yesterday, March 12, I submitted the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1952 Economic Report of the President. I now present supplemental views and minority views, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in connection with the majority report No. 1295.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 2 OF REPT. NO. 1137)

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], members of the Committee on the Judiciary, I submit minority views on the bill (S. 2550) to revise the laws relating to immigration, naturalization, and nationality; and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed as part 2 of Report No. 1137.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The minority views will be received, and, without objection, printed as requested by the Senator from Tennessee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 2849. A bill for the relief of Silva Galjevscek; and

S. 2850. A bill for the relief of Hiroshi Maenaka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2851. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Irma Benjamin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 2852. A bill to amend section 7a of the act entitled "An act to regulate the employment of minors within the District of Columbia," approved May 29, 1928; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 2853. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Urwicz;

S. 2854. A bill for the relief of James J. Ford;

S. 2855. A bill for the relief of Anna F. Schwartz;

S. 2856. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Jose;

S. 2857. A bill for the relief of Ro Kum Sook;

S. 2858. A bill for the relief of Jack Yun Ting Kwan; and

S. 2859. A bill for the relief of Miss Rita Keskula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2860. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial at the grave of Elizabeth Daniel, the widow of Joseph (Job) Daniel, a Revolutionary War soldier; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (by request):

S. 2861. A bill to provide additional compensation for enlisted men and certain officers of the Armed Forces during periods of certain ground combat duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2862. A bill to exempt from the income tax amounts received as retirement pay or annuity for service as a teacher; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. NIXON):

S. 2863. A bill to authorize the integration of the Solano County project, California, with the Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2864. A bill providing for the collection of internal-revenue taxes and the administration of the internal-revenue laws by an agency independent of the Department of the Treasury; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2865. A bill for the relief of Michael Wehby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 2866. A bill to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. BRICKER):

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution creating a Louisiana Purchase Commission, and providing that such Commission shall participate in the commemoration and observance of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase and the explorations of Lewis and Clark; to the Committee of the Judiciary.

PROTECTION OF SURFACE VALUES OF LANDS WITHIN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement I have prepared explaining the bill, and a letter addressed to me dated March 3, 1952, signed by Dwight H. Plackard, executive secretary, of the New Mexico Mining Association, expressing the feeling of that association with regard to this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2866) to protect the surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Anderson, was read twice

by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ANDERSON

MINING CLAIMS IN THE NATIONAL FORESTS

Briefly, this proposed legislation would separate the surface and the mineral rights. A mining claim or patent would grant rights or title to the mineral resources and rights to use the surface of the land for mineral development. It would also grant rights to use timber for mineral development but would require timber cutting to be done according to acceptable forestry practices, except where clearing is necessary in connection with mining operations.

The United States would retain title to the surface, the right to use and manage the surface, and the right to dispose of the timber, insofar as such use would not interfere with the rights granted to the claimant or patentee.

In order to clear up the present confusing and almost impossible situation of overlapping, partially abandoned and poorly defined claims which cover at least 2,000,000 acres of national forest land, the proposed legislation would void all existing mining claims unless patented under existing law or relocated in accordance with the new law within a period of 5 years after the date of its enactment. Also, all new claims would have to be located definitely with respect to survey corners or location monuments and recorded with the local district land office of the Bureau of Land Management.

Placer and strip mining, which by their very nature are most destructive of the surface, are of course a great threat to good forest land management. There is already much public displeasure at the unsightliness of placering and stripping operations and the almost inevitable pollution of streams and erosion which are a result of many of these operations. The legislation I have proposed does not place any special restrictions on placer, strip, or other mining operations because if a pending bill, H. R. 4916, is enacted, it would remove sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, and cinders from the purview of the mining laws, and would remedy most of the placering and strip mining problem.

I do not believe that miners, prospectors, or the mining industry could validly claim that this proposed legislation would discourage prospecting or interfere with the development or production of minerals by a bona fide miner or producer.

I have communicated with the New Mexico Mining Association in my State and they are in accord with the provisions of this bill.

The letter presented by Mr. ANDERSON is as follows:

NEW MEXICO MINING ASSOCIATION,
Albuquerque, N. Mex., March 3, 1952.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Your letter of February 8 to Mr. T. M. Cramer, of Carlsbad, concerning H. R. 4196, entitled "A bill to protect surface values of lands within the national forests, and others purposes," has been referred to me for reply.

We have studied the bill and it is our opinion that it is in the interest of the conservation of natural resources.

We particularly favor the provisions contained in section 5, which are exceptionally good and which we would strongly support.

Respectfully yours,

DWIGHT H. PLACKARD,
Executive Secretary.

PERMISSION FOR FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO MAKE COMMITMENTS TO PURCHASE CERTAIN MORTGAGES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the joint resolution, to be followed by a list of the commitments which were on hand but not executed, and for which this joint resolution would provide funds, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement and list of commitments will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and other Senators), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

The joint resolution provides for a $52,000,000 net increase in the former $200,000,000 commitment authorization. It also permits two military projects for which FHA commitments had been issued prior to December 31, 1951, to be covered by FNMA advance commitments.

The Senators will recall that in the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act enacted last September we included the authority for the Federal National Mortgage Association to make up to $200,000,000 of advance commitments to purchase mortgages on programed defense housing and on military housing to be insured under title VIII of the National Housing Act. The authority was limited to December 31, 1951.

Applications covering about $45,000,000 of mortgages on defense and military housing in excess of the $200,000,000 authorized were filed before the December 27 deadline for acceptance of the prior commitment applications, but could not be granted because of the limited authorization. Also FHA commitments to insure mortgages on military housing at two important bases were issued December 28 and December 29, but unlike title IX loans, applications for a FNMA prior commitment could not be made in the case of title VIII loans without an FHA commitment, and thus these two projects could not be covered before the expiration date. It seems only fair, therefore, that provision for prior commitments should be made for these two projects.

Before introducing this joint resolution I consulted with the chairman of the committee and several members of the Banking and Currency Committee and also with the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. SPENCE, and I understand he has consulted with the ranking minority member of his committee, Mr. WOLCOTT, and it was agreed by all that their support of this joint resolution was with the distinct understanding that it would not be further amended. As every Member of this body knows, our committee is very concerned with the over-all problem of the currently tight mortgage market; and it is the intention of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, he informs me, to act on that problem as soon as the committee completes its work on the Defense Production Act. That problem is a much broader and more complicated problem, but it is our considered judgment that since this bill merely adjusts the amount authorized for the period covered by the statute, that is up to December 31, that we should act on this bill promptly instead of waiting until April to solve the whole serious problem of mortgage financing with which the home builders throughout the country are presently confronted.

The list of commitments is as follows:

Contracts on hand, unexecuted	Estimated number of units	Amount
Savannah River, S. C.	315	$2, 514, 850
Colorado Springs, Colo.	125	1, 000, 000
Valdosta, Ga.	250	2, 021, 900
Tullahoma, Tenn.	80	609, 000
Brazoria, Tex.	75	596, 000
Huntsville, Ala.	140	1, 106, 200
Borger, Tex.	30	226, 400
Camp Lejeune, N. C. (119)	20	180, 000
Lone Star, Tex.	15	126, 800
Wichita Falls, Tex.	160	1, 260, 200
Sanford, Fla.	40	294, 900
Camp Rucker, Ala.	15	195, 000
Benton-Bauxite, Ark.	160	1, 274, 200
Lawton-Fort Sill, Okla.	115	904, 000
Lone Star, Tex.	50	377, 000
Camp Polk, La.	50	396, 200
Cocoa-Melbourne, Fla.	140	1, 106, 700
Aberdeen, Md.	60	486, 000
Elkton-Bainbridge, Md.	100	800, 000
Lake Charles, La.	90	729, 800
Norfolk-Portsmouth, Va.	240	1, 950, 000
Biloxi-Gulfport, Miss.	270	2, 182, 000
Camden-Shumaker, Ark.	455	3, 642, 000
Fort Campbell, Ky.	70	540, 000
Marietta, Ga.	510	4, 081, 900
Newport News, Va.	210	1, 687, 800
San Diego, Calif.	260	2, 080, 600
Fort Bragg, N. C.	170	1, 381, 000
Bryan, Tex.	35	279, 650
Pine Bluff, Ark.	145	1, 182, 500
Bainbridge, Ga.	25	205, 000
Hondo, Tex.	30	245, 400
Camp Lejeune, N. C. (35)	290	2, 311, 460
Anniston Ordnance Depot, Anniston, Ala.	90	689, 500
Dougway Proving Ground, Dougway, Utah	400	3, 564, 000
Magda Village, Whiting Field, Fla.	80	566, 900
Magnolia Spring Apartments, Green Cove Springs, Fla.	325	2, 595, 000
Total	5, 635	45, 389, 860

EVALUATION OF FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I submit for appropriate reference a resolution proposing an evaluation of our foreign aid programs. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak on the resolution for about 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Nebraska may proceed.

The resolution (S. Res. 292) submitted by Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Whereas since the beginning of World War II, the United States Government has expended over $100,000,000,000 for foreign aid,

over and above the costs of direct military expenditures; and

Whereas during and after World War II various programs involving foreign aid have been undertaken by the United States Government; and

Whereas the Economic Cooperation Administration was created in 1948 in order to rehabilitate the war-torn economies of foreign nations; and

Whereas the President and his advisers gave assurances to the Congress at the time the ECA program was presented that it would attain its goals by 1952; and

Whereas although the 4-year period during which this program was to have been fulfilled is about to expire, the President and his advisers now advocate further foreign aid in amounts reaching many more billions of dollars and for an undetermined number of years; and

Whereas the indebtedness of the United States Government now exceeds $260,000,000,000; and

Whereas appropriate committees of the Congress have acted as "watchdogs" in a day-to-day study of this program as it developed, such committees have never undertaken to consolidate and evaluate the excellent work which they have done; and

Whereas there are now available the completed records of programs undertaken in piecemeal during various times in the last 4 years: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the special subcommittee on Foreign Aid of the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate is hereby authorized and directed to fully examine and evaluate the foreign aid program administered by ECA during the last 4 years making use of the study data which it had assembled as well as other sources which may now be available; and be it further

Resolved, That such subcommittee report its examination and evaluation to the Senate prior to the time that any consideration is given to any legislation authorizing further foreign economic aid.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, each year, at about this time, for several years past, the Congress has been confronted with requests for funds to support and perpetuate the administration's elaborate programs for foreign aid. The expenditures have been authorized and promulgated on a piecemeal basis, and any congressional check on these programs has been made on a piecemeal basis. We do not know to what extent these programs have been successful or have benefited the national interest. All we know is what we are told each year when further funds are requested.

In support of the present $7,900,000,000 program for mutual security, the President says that the expenditure is necessary to promote world peace, protect the security of our Nation, and make us friends in other lands.

I recall that the same argument was used 4 years ago to justify the multibillion dollar ECA program. Then we were told that we were helping the people to help themselves. We were to benefit by promoting world peace and making friends who would serve as security outposts for our own Nation.

Confining myself to the lofty aims of our foreign-aid programs, I would like to reflect for a moment on the thought they carry about attracting friends with United States dollars. Certainly I would not argue that America can find takers for our dollars. People the world over will gather round a free spender. Still that is no gage of friendship. The cooperation that exists between friendly people comes from the heart and never from the pocketbook.

A little less than 2 years ago, thousands of miles from our shores, we called on our friends for aid and assistance. We did not ask for money. We asked that they come and stand with us against the aggressor in Korea. Those nations that had received our generous help, either sent token forces or none at all to the Korean battleground.

That, Mr. President, is not my idea of cooperation. From the lesson in Korea, it might well be asked how many friends we have made with the American dollar. Our foreign aid has, undoubtedly, been of substantial help to political parties in foreign countries, but there seems to be no secret about the fact that the average people in the countries most benefited have little or no regard for the United States.

Another interesting proposition is that, according to a recent compliation by a reliable economist, the United States is putting 14 percent of its gross national product this year into military production. The nine Western European nations are putting from 9.6 percent, ranging downward to as little as 2.7 percent, of their gross product into defense expenditures.

I sincerely believe that at this time, it is time for Congress to check the reins and evaluate our foreign-aid expenditures. We must look at the total subject and must not go into each year's request on the basis that, while there may have been weaknesses in past programs, this one will overcome all the past mistakes. Our foreign aid is becoming a fixed item in our budget, and I believe we must take a good look at the whole subject.

The resolution I have submitted asks solely for an evaluation of the Economic Cooperation Administration, the most recent foreign-aid program. The findings of such an investigation would provide us with the information necessary to determine properly the utility of this new adventure. From any one of these programs, you can learn about the others. They all have the same approach when it comes to spending the taxpayer's money.

Congress has never had the benefit of a full study of foreign spending. Every time a commission or group has been suggested for this purpose, the administration has effectively used every means at its command to stop the effort. It should be noted that the Budget Bureau, the State Department, the ECA, and the Department of the Army, among other executive agencies, have strenuously opposed the foreign-aid investigation as proposed in S. 1166. Executive letters setting forth their opposition are quoted at length in Senate Executive Committee Staff Memorandum No. 82–1–33, dated May 22, 1951. The administration does not want foreign spending investigated by anyone.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AND HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—AMENDMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2645) to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

Address delivered by him at annual meeting of the National Beet Growers Federation, at Yakima, Wash.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Article written by him, entitled "Government Grads Get Juicy Jobs," published in the American Legion magazine for April 1950, and copy of Senate bill 558 of the Eighty-second Congress

By Mr. IVES:

Newspaper articles dealing with advantages offered by the State of New York.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article and editorial from New York Times concerning message to the Russian people.

By Mr. WELKER:

Editorial entitled "Now Idaho Studies the Facts of Life About Costs of 'Cheap' Public Power," published in the Deseret News of Salt Lake City on March 4, 1952.

Article by John Corlett relating to the Hells Canyon project, published in the Idaho Sunday Statesman of March 9, 1952.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

Memorandum prepared by the Legislative Counsel of the Senate and a copy of the findings of fact in the case of Auline J. Lee, etc., vs. H. M. Roseberry, et al., dealing with the 1950 burley tobacco farm-marketing quotas.

By Mr. LANGER:

Article entitled "What Is Democracy?" written by George E. Caraker, KSJB–KCJB commentator in Minot, N. D.

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "Oil For Education—Schools Need Help—Here Is How They Can Get It Without Any More Taxes," written by Albert H. Jenkins and published in the January issue of the Railway Carmen Journal.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Statement by Cliff D. Carpenter, president of the Institute of American Poultry Industries, presented before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on March 10, 1952, regarding changes desired in the Defense Production Act.

By Mr. ECTON:

Article in regard to Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, published in the Eagle River (Wis.) News-Review.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "Progress in Alabama," written by Paul W. Chapman, and published in the Progressive Farmer.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I take advantage of the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into on March 11, with respect to the amendment which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and I were discussing on the

floor of the Senate. There appears to be some doubt as to the exact language and effect of the amendment. I therefore give notice under the agreement that that amendment is open to reconsideration. It is my understanding that that is the order of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the understanding of the Chair.

ECONOMY IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET—RESOLUTIONS AND RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received from all over my State of Wisconsin, as my colleagues have received from their States, a tremendous amount of mail from my constituents who are deeply concerned about the enormous size of the Federal budget.

I share that concern, and I am delighted that so many Americans are thinking so clearly on this issue of preserving the American dollar and preventing insolvency.

I send to the desk a resolution urging Federal economy, which was forwarded to me by L. M. Bickett, of Watertown, Wis., chairman of the resolutions committee for the Southern Wisconsin Taxpayers Association Conference. This resolution, adopted by that organization at a meeting in Fort Atkinson on February 11, emphasizes the need for budget reduction if we are to save this Republic.

I also send to the desk a resolution which was forwarded to me by E. J. Ott, secretary of the Racine Taxpayers Association, on this same vital issue.

As an indication of my own stand on this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions and the text of an address which I have delivered over numerous Wisconsin radio stations with particular stress on the meaning of the March 15 income-tax deadline to our people be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ON THE FEDERAL BUDGET

Whereas a proposed Federal budget of $85,400,000,000 for fiscal year 1953 has been submitted to Congress by President Truman with budget receipts for that fiscal year estimated at $71,000,000,000; and

Whereas the resultant budget deficit would increase the Federal debt to within a few million dollars of its statutory limit of $275,000,000,000; and

Whereas the cost of Government is already mounting to about one-third of the national income; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated by the Hoover Commission and by other congressional bodies that many Federal expenditures are needless because of waste, extravagance, and duplication, and that the Congress has lost much control of Federal expenditures through authorizing new programs whose continuing and expanding costs must be financed by succeeding Congresses; and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Senate, by Senator DIRKSEN, a resolution (S. Con. Res. 57), with an identical measure in the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 193), requiring the President to submit at the earliest possible date a revised budget for fiscal 1953 in which estimated expenditures do not exceed the estimated receipts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by representatives of the taxpayer associations meeting in Fort Atkinson, Wis., this 11th day of February 1952, That the Congress of the United States be urged to reduce the Federal spending program proposed for 1953 to an amount consistent with public ability to pay without additional taxation and without increasing the Federal debt, and that this be done by elimination from the program all new, proposed expanded and nonessential activities and by adoption of the Dirksen amendment and the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Wisconsin Congressmen.

Resolutions Committee: John Adams Thierry, South Milwaukee, South Milwaukee Taxpayers League; John J. Byrnes, Elkhorn, Walworth County Taxpayers Association; George C. Krejci, town of Greenfield, Town of Greenfield Taxpayers Association; John O. Ott, Beloit, Beloit Tarpayers League; Robert K. Gerling, Kenosha, Kenosha Taxpayers, Inc.; L. M. Bickett, Watertown, Jefferson County Taxpayers Association; J. T. Petska, Milwaukee, West Side Taxpayers League; Harry J. Voelker, Racine, Racine Taxpayers Association; Thomas E. Allen, Whitefish Bay, Whitefish Bay Taxpayers Association.

Adopted, Fort Atkinson, Wis., February 11, 1952.

RESOLUTION BY THE RACINE TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, RACINE, WIS.

Whereas, President Truman has proposed for the fiscal year 1953 a Federal budget of $85,400,000,000, which if adopted would increase the cost of all government to about $550 for every person in Wisconsin, and would bring the Federal debt close to the statutory limit of $275,000,000,000; and

Whereas committees of Congress, and created by Congress, have revealed evidence of needless Federal spending because of waste, extravagance, and duplication; and

Whereas one of these groups, the bipartisan Hoover Commission estimated that $1 out of every $10 spent by the Federal Government was wasted, and presented to Congress a streamlining plan which could save more than $500,000,000 annually in the cost of Federal Government: Now be it hereby

Resolved by the Taxpayers Association of Racine, meeting in Racine, Wis., this 24th day of January 1952, That the Congress of the United States be urged to recognize and accept the findings of the bodies it created to supply it with information, and to decrease Federal spending for the fiscal year 1953 by deleting from the budget all expansion and proposed new programs, by eliminating all nonessential activities and by adopting the remaining recommendations of the Hoover Commission; be it also

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressman.

Adopted January 24, 1952.

RACINE TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
By E. L. OLB, *Secretary.*

RADIO ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS, MARCH 10 TO 15, 1952.

TAXES AND THE FEDERAL BUDGET

My friends, I would like to talk to you today about a matter which I know is of tremendous interest to you and to 50,000,000 other taxpayers.

I need hardly remind you that as of March 15, all of us will have filed our 1951 Federal income taxes.

When you add to these Federal taxes, your State taxes, and your local taxes, you note the heaviest tax burden in American history on Mr. Average American.

OUR THREE SUBJECTS

And so, this tax subject is one of the most crucial of all issues facing you and your Congress today. I would like now to explore with you some of the aspects of it.

Let's look at taxes:

(a) In relation to the budget;
(b) In relation to inflation; and
(c) In relation to national defense.

Let's have the facts speak for themselves on all these counts.

OUR HUGE DEBT

Now, first of all, my friends, let's spell out the financial picture of your Government and mine. Right now, the Federal Government has a national debt of $255,000,000,000. That debt is climbing steadily. What does that mean? It means a good many things unfortunately—and none of them good:

First of all, it means that future generations are going to be mortgaged. They will have to pay off that debt as best they can. We of this generation cannot hope to make a sizable dent in it. We're passing it along to our children and children's children. That's not good.

Second of all, it means that in 1952 and every year, we have got to set aside around $6,500,000,000—$6,500,000,000—merely to pay interest on that debt. That is an enormous sum. It is larger than the total United States budget before World War II. Remember that sum—coming out of your pocket—doesn't reduce the debt. It merely pays interest on the debt. It is as if you were paying interest on the mortgage on your house, but never reducing the size of the mortgage. That is not a healthy situation. It doesn't make for a bright prospect.

Third, the enormous size of this national debt means that there is constant pressure for further inflating of the dollar.

Throughout history, wherever there has been an enormous debt, there has been pressure for inflation. Why? Because, obviously, the cheaper the dollar, the more dollars available, the easier it is to pay off the debt. But in the process of cheapening the dollar, tremendous damage is inflicted upon the Nation.

That brings us to the second of our subjects; namely, taxes and inflation.

Now, just what do taxes mean to the inflationary situation? First of all, let's recognize the gravity of the inflation problem. Everyone who is listening to me today knows that the dollar in his wallet or in her purse or in the savings bank or in the savings and loan association or in any other fixed form, is only worth around 50 or 40 percent of what it was worth a decade ago.

THE FORGOTTEN MAN

Everyone knows, too, that the group which has been hardest hit by this inflationary price rise have been the people living on fixed incomes.

They are the real forgotten men and women of the 1950's. Who are they? They are the teachers, the policemen, the firemen, the white-collar workers, the old people living on pensions. They are veterans living on their disability payments, and widows of veterans living on their husband's pensions.

Yes; just think of the old people 65 and 70 years of age who cannot go out to make a living. They had retired on the basis of a modest pension or annuity, and now they find they can barely keep body and soul together on the basis of the $40, $50, and $60 a month they receive. Their purchasing power has been cut by one-half to two-thirds, and their hardship has been tremendous.

That's not a pretty picture.

But these old folks and other forgotten folks are headed for even more difficult times

unless we protect the dollar from further depreciation.

BLOATED FEDERAL BUDGET

Let's take a look at the Federal budget which helps send that spiral up or down.

The Congress has received an $85,400,000,000 budget. However, the President estimates that the amount of money that will be collected by Uncle Sam will only be $71,000,000,000. That means a deficit of $14,500,000,000—the difference between 85.4 and 71. That means deficit financing. It means the creation of more printing press money, and that in turn signifies further inflation—further cheapening of the dollar.

In other words, the present Federal budget signifies trouble—

Trouble for the dollar.

Trouble for the Republic.

Trouble for the free-enterprise system.

Now, what are you going to do about it? Think that over, my friends. It is your taxes which are at stake—your standard of living, your purchasing power.

After all, it isn't just the Congress which sets taxes and the budget.

It's you at the grassroots. Your ideas, your feelings, your resolutions, petitions, help create and constitute the climate of public opinion.

Are you personally, therefore, in favor of Federal economy, so as to protect the value of the dollar?

I'm sure you are.

You and I hear on practically every side that there ought to be economy exercised. But unfortunately, to achieve economy is far more difficult than to simply state it as an objective.

But there are indeed practical ways of achieving economy, and I would like to set them forth now. I believe that every fair-minded American, be he Republican or Democrat, can support these techniques:

WAYS OF ECONOMIZING

First, let the President of the United States order every executive agency to mobilize groups of management experts who will analyze the operations of each of the agencies.

Let them weed out, for example, extravagance and duplications, weed out unnecessary personnel. Remember, no further congressional legislation is necessary to achieve this. The President and the agency heads can do it by themselves, just the way any businessman can in his own business.

Second, let the Congress set up a Joint Budget Committee. Let it furnish that committee with a sufficient number of efficiency experts who can look into the vast 2,500,000-man Federal Government force, analyze unnecessary activities, and make recommendations for sensible economies.

Third, let the spirit—I emphasize the spirit—of the Hoover Commission reports be faithfully adhered to. Let there be genuine reorganization, not just paper reorganization in name only, not just the shifting of units from one department to another, but an actual consolidation of units with actual savings as a result.

Fourth, let the people of the United States remember these fundamental financial facts when they go to the polls next November.

Those are four points—simple points but helpful ones. They can shape the size of your future taxes next March 15.

What do you think about them?

ECONOMY COULD BE WRECKED

I need not tell you that a great many nations in history have been smashed on the financial rocks. I need not tell you that whole economies have blown up because prices have skyrocketed through the roof.

You will remember how Germany after World War I witnessed the collapse of its entire middle class. Why? Because all the savings were wiped out in the postwar inflation. Middle-class people saw all of their bank deposits vanish overnight. A German billion-mark note could not so much as buy a piece of bread.

We don't want that to happen in our country, do we? But it could happen, if inflationary pressures continue.

You may recall that Nicolai Lenin, who brought about the Soviet Communist Russian state, predicted that one day the United States of America might collapse by spending itself into insolvency. That was no idle wish on Lenin's part. A nation can be destroyed from within by wild spending, just as it can be destroyed from without by enemy attack.

Now, what about this national defense question? You and I want, of course, to appropriate every single dollar that is necessary for national defense. But you and I know that there has been a tremendous amount of wastefulness in the Armed Forces. If we had centralized procurement, which I have been recommending for years, we could save millions, yes, possibly billions in military appropriations over a period of time. But the Armed Forces have to see the light. They have to quit competing with one another and streamline their buying practices. They've got to get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent.

PROBLEM OF LOW-INCOME BRACKET

I submit these thoughts to you, my friends, today because they concern every single American. You know, folks used to think that taxes were simply a burden on people in the higher brackets, because up to 92 percent of the income at the highest levels was taken by taxes. But today the greatest brunt of taxes falls on people in the low- and middle-income brackets.

Moreover, if the Government were to completely confiscate the entire income of every single American earning $4,000 or more, such complete confiscation would yield only $9,000,000,000. That would be enough to run the Government at the current rate of expenditure for only around 47 days. Think of that, my friends. Complete confiscation of every single cent earned by every single taxpayer earning $4,000 a year or more wouldn't keep this Government running more than a month and a half. And yet the $9,000,000,000 which would presumably be collected, wouldn't be anywhere near to meeting the $14,500,000,000 deficit which is shaping up. Isn't that a warning to us against excessive spending?

So this tax and spending problem is one for every American to think about. It affects not just your pocketbook. It affects your home, your job, your health, your welfare, your Nation.

Taxes and the budget are interrelated problems:

Taxes and inflation.

Taxes and national defense.

A strong America is a solvent America, an America with fair, equitable, not excessive taxes. An America in which there are no forgotten, cast-off Americans. A country with a strong, healthy middle class—labor, management, and agriculture.

A strong America will be a secure America, a happy Nation which will not fall prey to the extreme right or the extreme left.

The key to it all is to put the brakes on spending so that we don't tax the American people into ruin and thereby kill the goose that lays the golden egg.

That I believe should be the keynote for this March 15 and for every day in the year.

This is your Senator, ALEX WILEY, signing off from Washington.

HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, has devoted a major part of his life to the public service of the country. He served under former Secretaries of the Interior Harold L. Ickes and Julius A. Krug. Throughout his public career he has considered uppermost the welfare of the Nation as a whole, but he has not neglected particular sections and segments.

He has sought to protect our public domain and natural resources against the exploitation of greedy interests. He has fought for the establishment and proper maintenance of our national parks and monuments, for reclaiming wasted and eroded lands, conserving our water resources, and the development of public power; he has diligently applied his energy, his zeal, and his honesty and courage in the interest of the public welfare. In doing so he has won an envied reputation among all who are familiar with his work.

In accomplishing this record, quite naturally he has incurred the enmity and ill-will of certain vested interests who would be willing to see our national wealth expropriated for the enrichment of the few. Recently Fortune magazine, America's most conservative periodical, severely criticized Secretary Chapman on his record and service to the Nation. Mr. President, certainly the Fortune magazine has the right to be critical of public officials when a basis exists for such criticism; but in this instance the attack, when examined, falls apart completely for lack of support.

Two articles have recently appeared in the press showing how utterly lacking the Fortune magazine is in facts to justify its conclusions. One of these articles comes from the Denver Post of February 10, 1952, entitled "Oscar Chapman Target of Fortune Barrage." The other article is by the very able columnist, Thomas L. Stokes, appearing in the Washington Evening Star of February 25, 1952, entitled "Private Power Renews Attack."

I ask unanimous consent to have these articles printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post of February 10, 1952]

OSCAR CHAPMAN TARGET OF FORTUNE BARRAGE

(By Robert W. Lucas)

Oscar L. Chapman, Denver's contribution to the Truman Cabinet as Secretary of the Interior, is the target of the magazine world's Big Bertha of big business this month.

Fortune magazine turns its lofty analysts into the vast western domain of the United States Interior Department's jurisdiction and they conclude that Chapman is something of a pleasant jerk who paradoxically, wields enormous influence and holds the great West in his shaking hands.

Fortune is contemptuous of Chapman's rise to political prominence, his talents, his record, and his general fitness for the high office he holds. Yet as chief trail breaker for Harry Truman's astonishing campaign triumph in 1948, Chapman is credited by the same magazine with having saved the presidency for his boss. Alleging him to be a man of no administrative vision and one who cannot make up his mind, the magazine accuses Chapman of a ruthless effort to impose a Federal power monopoly over large sections of the country.

The magazine insists Chapman calls almost everyone within telephone range for advice about Interior problems. "The most frequently called are Matt Connelly at the White House; Senator Joseph O'Mahoney, chairman of the Insular and Interior Affairs Committee; the Attorney General; the Democratic National chairman, and Drew Pearson," it says.

When former Secretary of the Interior Julius Krug was out of the Capital, and Chapman attended meetings of the Cabinet for him, Fortune says he "leaked" information to Pearson so often that Defense Secretary Forrestal finally refused to attend any sessions at which Chapman was present.

Reached by telephone in Washington Wednesday, Pearson told the Denver Post that Fortune completely distorted the facts. "There is no better way to destroy a good public servant's effectiveness," he said, "than to say he leaks secrets to a newspaperman. Although Oscar Chapman is an old friend of mine he is and has been completely discreet and loyal to the President."

The theme of Fortune's commentary on the Department of Interior can be stated in this way:

The Department was conceived as a catchall for unimportant Federal functions in the infancy of the Federal system.

Its most justifiable purpose has always been that of conserving and protecting those portions of land and resources left in Federal ownership after the homesteads and land grants were handed out in the nineteenth century.

For 20 years and dating back to the beginning of the Roosevelt new deal, however, the Department has assumed functions and has advocated policies that subvert States' rights and unfairly compete with private business—particularly the electric utility business.

Because it is asserting too much control over water and land resources; because it is expanding earlier and more conservative functions assigned to it in building multiple-purpose reclamation dams into a Federal power monopoly; because it is thus becoming a political colossus of frightening character and proportions, it should be broken up.

Fortune attempts to document these charges with illustrations. It refers to Chapman's vacillation on important decisions; to intradepartmental conflicts as between exponents of water projects on one side and champions of national parks or fish and wildlife on the other; to the widening activities of such agencies as the Bonneville Power Administration, which builds transmission lines and markets two-thirds of the kilowatts spun out by the generators in the Pacific Northwest's gigantic power grid.

The magazine's "analysis" of the Department of Interior then becomes an essay of pale superficiality when it trails off into vague, poorly reasoned and wholly contradictory suggestions for its reorganization. As a result of these conclusions, one is entitled to suspect the credibility of the whole article.

Any objective study of the subject would have included more legislative history of programs such as the Department's power marketing functions. For example the Bonneville Administration was created to market hydroelectric energy from the Bonneville dam by an act fathered by Senator Charles L. McNary, long the distinguished Republican leader in the upper House.

That dam was built by the Corps of Engineers with part of its repayment written off as an aid to navigation. But Bonneville is primarily a power dam, with no flood control or reclamation benefit attached. It was, therefore, the Bonneville act which helped establish the pattern of power marketing within the Department of Interior.

As other Federal dams were built, whether by the Bureau of Reclamation or the engineers, and whether primarily for power or with multiple purposes in mind, it was highly logical that the Department assume responsibility for marketing the enormous additions that have since been added to the basic power supply. And today this has evolved into a power pooling arrangement, by which all public and private power in the northwest is distributed through a flexible and highly efficient grid system.

Reclamation projects have been surveyed, approved, appropriated for, and built by the Reclamation Bureau under the Department of Interior for decades. The reimbursable costs are assessed against land owners and the projects revert to the irrigation districts when paid for. But some of the basic facilities, such as the main storage dams or the huge mountain storage basins or reservoirs, remain in control and management of the Federal Government, and for good reasons.

Now one may debate the merits of repayment policies, of allocable costs, of power rates and subsidies and contract terms interminably. And fair questions arise as to how far agencies within the Department of Interior should go in entering local political controversies over the distribution of power; whether by people's utility districts or through private utilities.

As to whether large blocks of power should be sold at the bus bar of Federal dams directly to private utilities, or distributed more diffusely over Government transmission lines—the Congress itself has decided that.

But what fundamental administrative reform would possibly be achieved by divesting the Department of Interior of these functions, and throwing them to multiple State systems is beyond comprehension. Indeed what is needed is a stronger not weaker concentration of administrative functions among Federal agencies involved in regional development and management—which is precisely what the Hoover Commission recommended.

Fortune wraps up its alarmed and testy criticism of the Department of the Interior in this fashion:

"Interior's future policy should be one not of acquisition, but of disposition. Each regional administration should have as its guiding principle the eventual return to the States of the lands and resources now administered by the Department.

"This should not imply any impulsive and immediate abandonment of resources vital to the Nation, but rather a gradual program of divestiture where feasible. Some lands and resources, of course, should remain in Federal hands: The national parks, for example, and the national forests; others, like water and power, just as clearly should be bought by the States."

Aside from mentioning that the national forests, before they can be hung onto by the Department of the Interior must be transferred there from the Department of Agriculture which now supervises them (through the Forest Service), we think Fortune's program is sufficiently meaningless to be filed and forgotten.

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 25, 1952]

PRIVATE POWER RENEWS ATTACK—UTILITIES LAUNCH HIGHLY FINANCED DRIVE TO END RURAL COOPERATIVES' PREFERENCE ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Several years ago, in the 1944 Flood Control Act specifically, Congress established the principle that in assignment and distribution of electric power from public power projects, preferences should be given to public bodies, such as towns and municipalities, and cooperatives like those created under the 1936 Rural Electrification Act, known as REA cooperatives.

That same 1944 act provided, likewise, that the Government could build transmission lines, itself, from the public projects where this was essential to delivery of the power to consumers.

By this method of authorizing the people themselves, through their Government and their own cooperatives, to utilize this great natural source of energy which belongs to them, there has been an amazing extension of electrification to farms and homes such as never had occurred, and would not be possible, under private utilities. The latter had neglected the opportunity which the people, themselves, took advantage of in the truly democratic, grass-roots way. Naturally the private utilities resisted. They fought stubbornly in Congress every step of the way.

This is to report that now, while public attention is diverted elsewhere, the private utilities have launched the most extensive and highly financed campaign since early New Deal days to kill off this constructive program.

Broadly, and along a wide front, the aim of the private utilities is to grab off remaining choice power sites—some where the Government already has done preliminary development—and without the preference established by law for local public bodies and cooperatives, to direct distribution and sale on their own terms and to whom they please, which, in the past, has proved not only highly unsatisfactory but also expensive to the consumer.

Just now the fight is concentrated on the projected power development of the Niagara River, distinct from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway also now before Congress. Offices of Members of Congress are flooded with expansive propaganda in behalf of construction of this power project jointly by five private companies. That would abolish completely the preference guaranty in what is to be potentially the biggest power development in our country. The propaganda is generated by numerous private utility organizations, including the so-called National Association of Electric Companies which pays $65,000 a year to its chief lobbyist, Purcell L. Smith, as well as by the State chambers of commerce organization.

The preference clause, likewise, would be eliminated under a proposal for the New York Authority to construct the project. This agency was completely revamped in personnel in 1950 and in testimony here last year repudiated a previous joint agreement with the Federal Government to give public bodies and cooperatives preferences. Instead, it would sell power at the bus bar, so-called, to private companies for their sale and distribution.

A third alternative, offered in a bill sponsored jointly by Senator LEHMAN, Democrat of New York, and Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, JR., would provide for Federal construction of the project but subsequent operation by the State of New York under terms that would retain the preference principle.

The fight, under way in other sectors, also has brought a conflict among Government agencies. In the Pacific Northwest, for example, the movement in Washington of public utility districts, PUDS, as they are called, to purchase and operate the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. and the Washington Water Power Co., as voted by the people in several referenda, is being blocked in procedures now before the Securities and Exchange Commission here and by a ruling by the Pacific Coast Federal Reserve Board Voluntary Credit Restraint Committee. This committee, packed with representation of private banks and investment houses, ruled against sale to the PUDS on the ground that such would be inflationary.

In other areas the Interior Department, which is in charge of the public power program, is in conflict with the Federal Power Commission which has granted private utilities licenses for remaining choice sites on river systems where the Federal Government

has built upstream dams and provided for the coordinated development of the whole system that makes the remaining sites so valuable such as the Roanoke River in Virginia and Kings River in California. These issues now are before the courts.

In the middle of this whole battle is Secretary of Interior Oscar Chapman, stalwart champion of power development in the public interest. In the 4 years that he has had charge of this program, before and since his appointment as Secretary in 1949, almost as many miles of Government transmission lines have been built to serve the public as in the 9 years previously.

RESOLUTION DISAPPROVING REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 285) disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The proponents of the resolution have an hour and 56 minutes, and the opponents have an hour and 53 minutes, making a total of 3 hours and 49 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the basis of the time remaining to each side, as announced by the Chair, it is indicated that the vote on this issue will come about 4 o'clock or half past 4 this afternoon. I make that announcement so that Senators may govern themselves accordingly.

I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I trust that all Senators on both sides of the aisle, resent, as I do, the inferences emanating from administration sources that those who oppose the President's plan are actuated by political motives, rather than a desire for honest administration of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

I refer to the statements in the press, credited to the President of the United States, asserting that Senators who differ with his proposal are "more interested in political patronage than in good public service."

Mr. President, to make such a charge against the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the ranking minority member of the Finance Committee, the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and other Senators, is utterly ridiculous. It is unworthy of attention or discussion.

However, it has received some attention in the press, and I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 10, entitled "Truman Can't Shift Blame to Congress."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the text of a resolution, adopted February 26, 1952, by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, recommending rejection of the President's plan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, there has been widespread acceptance of the assumption that the President's plan No. 1 contains the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the reorganization of the Internal Revenue Bureau.

That is not a fact. There is a resemblance, it is true, in the mutual agreement that political appointment of the 64 collectors should be abolished and that all Internal Revenue employees should be subject to civil-service qualifications.

In that connection it was most revealing to read in the hearings on the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 that of 141 persons dismissed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue for misconduct of varying degrees, only 7 were Presidential appointees and 134 were under civil service.

I should like to call attention to the statement of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that reorganization plans had been under consideration within the Bureau for at least 5 years.

Yet, neither the Finance Committee of the Senate, the House Ways and Means Committee, nor the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation were consulted or shown the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 until it was submitted to Congress.

I submit, Mr. President, that 60 days, the period allowed for congressional consideration, is not sufficient time for the proper consideration of such a far-reaching reorganization of one of the most important functions of our Government.

I am impressed by the statement of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that some 336 statutory changes in the Internal Revenue Code might be necessary should the President's plan go into effect.

The President's plan makes no provision for these hundreds of amendments to existing law which will be required by the shifting of responsibility among the various levels of authority in the proposed set-up.

The adoption of the President's plan is not necessary to eliminate fraud. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue in his testimony before the Committee on Government Operations frankly admitted that the Bureau already possesses adequate power and machinery to eliminate fraud.

In conclusion, I should like to quote from the testimony of our distinguished colleague, the able chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, before the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

Commenting on the President's proposal he said:

> The difficulty in the present situation has not been with the method of appointment, but with the caliber of the men selected.

That is the crux of the problem of corruption—the caliber of the men selected.

Much has been said, Mr. President, in the United States Senate recently, of the need for a new code of ethics for the guidance of public officials. The problem before us today demonstrates the need for a revival of the basic concepts of public service and responsibility. That cannot be corrected by law or regulation, but must be found in the hearts and in the moral fiber of men.

It is the caliber of men that must be "upgraded," rather than the jobs for which they will compete and be selected.

Let me make the overriding suggestion that our public officials take to their hearts the sacred code of ethics set forth in the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. There has never been—nor will there ever be—a better guide for human conduct.

Mr. President, my vote will be cast in support of the resolution to reject the President's reorganization proposals. At the same time, I shall do everything in my power, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, to bring to the Senate, legislation for the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue which will represent the consideration of all factors involved in such an important step.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of March 10, 1952]

TRUMAN CAN'T SHIFT BLAME TO CONGRESS

Whatever else they may accomplish, President Truman's latest blasts at Congress on the corruption issue are not going to speed the restoration of a high moral tone to the Federal Government.

If Mr. Truman was looking for more trouble with Congress, he took the easiest way to find it. In 1 day he spurned a congressional demand for facts bearing on honesty in Government and impugned the motives of Congress on the entire corruption question.

But if the President was seeking to strengthen his own leadership in reestablishing decent standards of official conduct, his heavy-handed slaps at Congress were just the sort of thing to give him another setback.

The situation confronting Mr. Truman just before he left for a Key West vacation offered him a chance to show that his pledge of "continued drastic action" against corruption was to be carried out effectively. The Senate was approaching a vote on a plan to reorganize the scandal-ridden Bureau of Internal Revenue. A House committee probing the Department of Justice had asked for data on cases referred to that Department which for some reason had not been prosecuted.

President Truman had every right to ask the Senate to approve his reorganization plan. His letter to the Senate, however, was not the kind that wins votes. By tartly informing the Senators that their vote would show whether they are "more interested in their political patronage than in good public service," Mr. Truman stirred up a row that anybody could have foreseen.

Many Americans will agree with Senator WALTER GEORGE's angry reply that the President is trying to blame the Senate for scandals for which he himself is responsible.

It may be desirable to end the political appointment of tax collectors. But under that method of appointment the tax bureau was free of scandals for decades—until the present administration. Moreover, the tax collectors who have been indicted for crimes were either appointed or allowed to stay in office by the President.

Mr. Truman's handling of the request for information from the Justice Department was similarly inept, unless his purpose was to make it harder for Congress to find out what has been going on.

If the Justice Department has any sensible system of maintaining files, it should not

be unduly burdensome to comply with the House Judiciary subcommittee's request for the cases which have not ben prosecuted. Information on these cases is vital, since it has been charged that favoritism has been shown by allowing cases to languish until the statute of limitations ran out.

But Mr. Truman's answer was "no," as it has been in many other cases where Congress sought information. Yet he has indicated that such data will be available to Newbold Morris, the corruption hunter named by the President himself primarily to probe the operations of Attorney General McGrath's department.

The President appears to forget that he cannot avoid responsibility for the scandals, the profitable operations of "cronyism," the shabby ethics that have taken place in his administration. His job is to assert his leadership in stamping out corruption and the conditions which make corruption possible.

Part of that task requires the cooperation of Congress, and Mr. Truman might get it if he himself displayed a cooperative attitude. But rejecting requests for legitimate information and trying to shift the blame for scandals on Congress is not seeking cooperation; it is simply asking for a fight.

The drive against corruption is not a tussle for political advantage. It should be a campaign to restore old-fashioned standards of morality—especially in the Government—and President Truman ought to use all the power and prestige of his office in leading it.

EXHIBIT 2

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, FEBRUARY 26, 1952

Whereas in order that the action of the house of delegates in rejecting the resolution of the tax section with reference to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 for the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue may not be interpreted as disapproval in its entirety of the proposed plan and may not be interpreted to indicate that the American Bar Association is not deeply concerned with the recent disclosures of fraud on the part of some persons in the services of the Government engaged in the assessment and collection of taxes; and

Whereas the American Bar Association is deeply concerned with the fraud disclosed and deplores the bad faith on the part of a number of Government employees including members of the bar, among the many honest and faithful persons in the services; and

Whereas notwithstanding the fact that it is believed that the fraud disclosed was not due primarily to organization but to personnel and might have existed under any type of organization, the American Bar Association feels that Congress and the Executive should continue to give attention to working out a plan of reorganization of the Bureau which will make it more efficient in the handling of its great tasks; and

Whereas the American Bar Association wishes to render any assistance which it may be able to render, when the problems are fully and openly discussed as would not be possible within the limited time within which the President's reorganization plan must be acted upon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association recommends to the Congress that it reject the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, and immediately arrange for hearings before the Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation on the proposals set forth in the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, and other proposals that are pending before Congress, including a proposal to separate the Bureau of Internal Revenue from the Treasury Department, with a view, as promptly as possible, to adopting appropriate legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Bar Association directs the section of taxation to render all possible assistance to the Congress and to the Executive in solving the problems involved.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall necessarily have to be brief, and so I shall discuss primarily one major point.

The internal revenue collector in Mississippi, the Honorable Eugene Fly, has been serving honorably since 1933. His is one of the longest and finest among the records of internal revenue collectors in the Nation. He was recommended for appointment by the late Senator Pat Harrison. I have no desire, and no prospect under the present law, of being called on to select another collector; the present one satisfies me entirely.

In considering the matter of corruption, I am reminded of what we lawyers know as the principle that hard cases make bad law.

I am afraid that in the quest for a solution of the present problem of corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue we may adopt a bad plan. The evils of the present system are apparent. I do not discount them in the least, and I am anxious to see them eradicated. However, I believe that if this reorganization plan should be adopted, the evils of bureaucratic control at the top levels over our vast tax-collecting system would be far greater than the evils we are now experiencing under the present system.

In our quest for integrity in tax collections, with all deference to the great civil-service system, I do not believe that system is the answer to the problem which confronts us. Rather, the answer lies in a sense of personal responsibility on the part of the men who are entrusted with the duty of collecting the Nation's taxes. What we need are some impeachments and vigorous prosecution of corrupt revenue collectors.

We are now collecting through this department of Government in the neighborhood of $60,000,000,000. The responsibility of collecting this amount of money is divided among a relatively few men. I believe they should have a deep sense of their responsibility and should realize that their positions call for a personal accounting to the people. Such a state of mind would be greatly promoted by having their appointments passed on in the first instance by the Senate of the United States, the representatives of the people.

I believe the plan now before the Senate represents a further centralization of vast power. Already on many, many fronts we are moving in that direction, and further and further away from the people. It is a dangerous trend that I oppose on all fronts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, when Reorganization Plan No. 1 was referred to the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I was inclined to be favorable to the plan, because of the build-up which it had received from the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report. Likewise, I realized that there has been such widespread corruption revealed in the Bureau of Internal Revenue that it was only natural that many Americans should be desperately looking for something which might give them a ray of hope for greater integrity and greater efficiency in this tax-collecting bureau.

Naturally I was suspicious of the fact that the President should offer his reorganization plan 3 years after the Hoover Commission had made recommendations for some reforms in the Internal Revenue Bureau. I wondered why a plan was not offered 2 years ago or a year ago, instead of at this precise time, when it is extremely important from a political standpoint for the President to do something which will divert public attention and condemnation from the indefensible maladministration which he and the Secretary of the Treasury have tolerated in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. President, I have attended the hearings of the committee, and have paid particular attention to the testimony of Commissioner Dunlap who has held this job for about 6 months. I consider him to be placed in the embarrassing position of being forced to deal with corruption, influence peddling, and political racketeering in complete harmony with the over-all pattern which has characterized the Truman administration.

In this connection, Mr. President, it is disconcerting to read in the President's letter of March 7 that "this reorganization plan is an essential part of a program to assure honesty, integrity, and efficiency in Government." Is the President not aware that he is the head of the executive branch of Government and that if there has not been honesty, integrity, and efficiency in the Federal Government, the full responsibility rests upon his shoulders? Is Mr. Truman not aware of the fact that both he and Secretary Snyder failed to take prompt and effective action when disclosures were made of corruption in the St. Louis office of the Bureau? Under such circumstances, how can the President contend that this reorganization plan is necessary to clean out corruption and graft in the Federal Government, when the record shows clearly that he has failed to set proper standards which not only would have prevented this corruption, in the first place, but, in the event corruption already existed, would have insured effective action to deal with it when exposed.

In his letter, the President also charged that the vote on this reorganization plan will show who it is who is merely talking about corruption and who it is who really wants to do something about it. That is a most serious indictment, Mr. President, when we recognize that first prize should be awarded to the President as the exempler of corruption

in Government. Not only should it be said that he failed to do something about cleaning out corruption or even to talk about it, but it would be far more accurate merely to state that he has just closed his eyes and has preferred to disregard convincing evidence that his administration will win distinction for being the most corrupt and venal in the political history of our country. In fact, the President has blocked every effort of Congress and congressional committees to expose corruption which has undermined the confidence of the people. He has withheld files in the Justice Department in pending cases which have not been prosecuted. And now, Mr. President, Members of this body are accused of playing politics with the public service because some of us are opposed to the complete surrender of our constitutional responsibility to maintain reasonable checks upon the executive department, and in this instance upon a most important agency, namely, the tax-collecting agency. Can we justify surrendering our authority to the Secretary of the Treasury, whoever he may be, merely because Harry Truman is desperately seeking some subterfuge to allay the rising tide of resentment which has engulfed Americans who are concerned about the preservation of constitutional Government?

Mr. President, this proposed plan would give the Secretary of the Treasury the power to select almost 100 top-flight officials in the tax bureau, subject to civil-service regulations. Proponents of this plan readily agree that the President should not be entrusted with the authority to name collectors or commissioners, because of the threat of political patronage. However, these same proponents want the Secretary of the Treasury to have this great authority, because it is said this official would not be amenable to political influence.

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has presented on the floor of this body on many occasions evidence to show that the Secretary of the Treasury had accurate reports on the corruption in the St. Louis office of the Internal Revenue Bureau for almost 1 year before any attention was given to the sordid mess which resulted in the indictment of Collector Finnegan. If the Secretary of the Treasury is not able to detect corruption in office, how can he be expected to select responsible men for the positions of commissioners and deputy commissioners? Is it consistent to say that such an official will be removed from political considerations in selecting these top-level officials, although the record shows that he did not take the necessary action to clean out corruption when it had been exposed in the St. Louis office? Such reasoning is far beyond my comprehension. Mr. President, in any administration the Cabinet members are as politically minded as is the President.

Yesterday the debate indicated that some Senators are supporting this plan because it is said that it will prevent corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. However, the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] made the following statement:

> To state the issue simply, and to state nothing but the hard core of it, the question is whether we want political patronage politics in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

So, Mr. President, apparently the main issue is whether to blanket the collectors or commissioners under civil service, which now is proposed to become the convenient cloak to outlaw politics in this bureau.

I am sure all Senators who had the time to read some of the hearings regarding this reorganization plan were impressed by the several colloquies dealing with the political aspects of the selection of the commissioners under this plan. The record will show that Chairman Ramspeck, of the United States Civil Service Commission, admitted under questioning at the hearings that the new personnel plan for the Bureau of Internal Revenue would be comparable to the plan now in vogue for the selection of postmasters.

Mr. President, I wish to ask every Member of this body whether there is any Senator who will stand on this floor and contend that the selection of postmasters under civil service is not 100 percent upon a political basis.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, some questions and answers taken from the hearings.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator DWORSHAK. Under the existing set-up of the Internal Revenue Bureau, how many officials and employees are not now under civil service?

Mr. DUNLAP. Sixty-eight, sir.

Senator DWORSHAK. But all the other employees are?

Mr. DUNLAP. Yes, sir.

Senator DWORSHAK. How many of these civil-service employees have you discharged during the past year because of inefficiency or alleged corruption?

Mr. DUNLAP. Because of inefficiency?

Senator DWORSHAK. Or alleged corruption, charges of any kind involving corruption?

Mr. DUNLAP. During the past year, leaving the inefficiency angle out, just talking about removals for cause, we actually removed 141 employees. There were 26 others under suspension at the end of the year, pending the investigation of their cases.

About half of those were removed for offenses having nothing to do with their honesty, and others were removed for cause having to do with mishandling of taxpayers' money or questions of venality.

Senator DWORSHAK. Were they all under civil service and had they been selected for those positions under civil service?

Mr. DUNLAP. No, sir. All of them had been under civil service, with the exception of the six collectors of internal revenue.

Senator DWORSHAK. They had procured their jobs through some procedure whereby their qualifications were examined?

Mr. DUNLAP. Yes, sir.

* * * * *

Senator DWORSHAK. But theoretically it is possible for you, if this proposed reorganization plan were adopted, to wind up with the same personnel in the top-level positions, with the exception of the eight men who are now overage; is that right?

Mr. DUNLAP. Theoretically, it is possible, but I would say mathematically the chances of it would be very remote.

Senator DWORSHAK. What I was trying to determine is whether merely putting these men under civil service would change their qualifications and their possibility for supervisory excellent merely because they are transferred from a system of political patronage to one of civil service.

Mr. DUNLAP. Of course not, sir.

* * * * *

The CHAIRMAN. I say a number of their deputies who are in civil service are included in this list of those who have been forced to retire.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right (p. 65).

* * * * *

Senator DWORSHAK. Mr. Ramspeck, in your prepared statement you stated that to be eligible for appointment to the new positions those collectors who do not have civil-service status must file application and be rated high enough on the examination to be appointed according to the usual rule of three.

Is that not essentially the same procedure followed in naming postmasters?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Well, the discussion here for an hour and a half has indicated that it is a misnomer and a subterfuge to say that postmasters are nonpolitical under civil service. The record shows that all postmasters, with possibly a very few exceptions, are political appointees (p. 81).

* * * * *

Senator DWORSHAK. You wouldn't contend that in my State when the Democratic national committeeman makes a recommendation of a postmaster appointee, with complete disregard for the sitting Members of the House and Senate from that State, that that is a nonpolitical procedure?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is nonpolitical insofar as the selection of the three eligibles is concerned.

Senator DWORSHAK. I am talking about the final appointment of a postmaster.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The selection between the three in cases such as you have described is a political choice between those three who are qualified.

Senator DWORSHAK. Political choice by whom?

Mr. RAMSPECK. By whomever the political adviser is.

Senator DWORSHAK. A Member of the Congress or a Senator, if he happens to be representing the minority party?

Mr. RAMSPECK. If it is a Democratic Senator or Congressman, they make a recommendation. Whether they make it purely on the basis of politics or not is not for me to say. I do say, and I have said it publicly before, and I will continue to say it as long as I am here, that it is wrong to submit eligible lists resulting from a civil-service examination to a political committee.

Senator DWORSHAK. You and I agree that it is wrong, but so long as that is the current practice, we must concede it is a political procedure.

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is a political procedure limited to the three eligibles.

Senator DWORSHAK. I don't want to take any more time on this point, except to point out that it is my own opinion that to the extent that the selection of postmasters is political, as everybody recognizes, when we know that the national committeeman of the majority party makes the recommendations, as he does now, then it is reasonable to assume that the same procedure would be followed in the filling of these new jobs in the Internal Revenue Bureau to be placed under civil service. In my State, for instance, the Democratic national committeeman would make the recommendations of the man who could be subsequently appointed to

fill the job of district commissioner or deputy commissioner. If that is true; is that political or nonpolitical?

Mr. RAMSPECK. If it were done, it would be the same as we have in the postmaster case. It would be political between the three eligibles submitted to the appointing officer. I would condemn it. So far as I know, the only cases in which that practice is followed at the present time is on postmasters and rural letter carriers.

Senator DWORSHAK. But that is the point I ask you, Mr. Ramspeck. This new reorganization would make the selection of these men or women to fill the present collector jobs comparable to the system we now have in filling the postmasterships.

If that be true, am I to believe that we are eliminating politics? That is the purpose of this reorganization, isn't it, to eliminate partisan politics, so that we can rely upon civil service and, under your administration, I am sure civil service does do a fine job. But if the same practice is to be followed, isn't it reasonable to assume that we will have a political selection of commissioners and deputy commissioners in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, just as we have a politically influenced selection of postmasterships?

Mr. RAMSPECK. My answer to that is it could happen, but it has not been the practice, so far as I know, except in the Post Office Department, to do that. I would be glad to see this Congress pass a law, as Senator MONRONEY has suggested, making it illegal for any appointing officer to take an eligible list and submit it to a political committee or an official of a political party. I think it would be a very wholesome thing to do, and I certainly would support it.

Senator DWORSHAK. If you think it is wrong now, to a certain extent to follow this procedure in naming postmasters, then you would certainly think it is wrong in following the same procedure in naming commissioners and deputy commissioners under this plan.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I certainly would (p. 82).

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I wish I had more time to discuss this matter; but under the circumstances I desire to take a few minutes to discuss the civil-service aspect which seems to be the crux of this entire debate.

Under this plan the Secretary of the Treasury would ask for a register of names from which he would select the various commissioners and deputy commissioners. In each case he would be given three names by the Civil Service Commission. He could reject all of them arbitrarily, and could say he wanted three more names. He could go down to the bottom of the register, and could take the fifteenth or the twentieth name—if above the rating of 70—and could appoint that man—not merely recommend him, Mr. President, but could have him appointed as a commissioner.

However, in the case of the selection of postmasters, there is this one radical difference: when the President selects one of the three names submitted by the Civil Service Commission, thereafter the Senate has the right of confirmation. I know there are many instances wherein that constitutional right of safeguarding and checking upon the powers of appointment by the President has made it impossible to put into office men not qualified and not fit for office.

So, Mr. President, the main difference in this situation is that in the selection of postmasters, which is entirely political, the Senate does have the right of confirmation. On the other hand, if this plan were approved, the Secretary of the Treasury would select from a register submitted by the Civil Service Commission any name he wished to choose, but there would be no senatorial right of confirmation.

So I say without fear of contradiction that instead of having less politics in the selection of collectors or commissioners of internal revenue, there would be more politics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield 2 minutes more to me?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I yield that additional time to the Senator from Idaho.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 2 minutes more.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. President, I know there has been much pressure upon Members of the Senate in connection with the consideration of this plan, and publicity and propaganda have been used to create false impressions in the minds and vain hopes in the breasts of the people. However, I wish to point out that at this time, especially the Members on this side of the aisle would be deserting the real principles of their party if they were willing to place this extreme power in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury, whether he be a Democratic Secretary or a Republican Secretary. Are we willing to perpetuate in office a bureaucracy? For 20 years we have complained and the American people have complained; they have asked, "Why do we not have a house cleaning? Why is not something done by the legislative branch of Government to curb the excesses, the abuses, and the corruption which are revealed and exposed almost daily in the executive bureaus, agencies, boards, and departments?"

Mr. President, I desire to point out that if this is a sound procedure, perhaps we ought to put Harry Truman under civil service, and then corruption would vanish over night, and he could remain indefinitely in the White House. It is long past time to do something about corruption in Government, particularly in the tax-collecting agency, but I contend that the plan submitted by the President for reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is a subterfuge designed to take the heat off the administration and to overcome the effect of the corruption, fraud, and maladministration within the Bureau which have been exposed within the past year.

So far as I personally am concerned, I know that the popular position to take is to approve this plan, because the public has been led to believe that then overnight all corruption would disappear from the tax-collecting agency. But I recognize the responsibility resting upon the legislative branch of Government, upon every Senator, and upon every Representative. In this case the immediate responsibility rests upon the Members of this body. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to vote to delegate additional power and to transfer the authority to make appointments from the President to the Secretary of the Treasury, and to remove entirely from the picture the Senate's right of confirmation; because to do so would inevitably result, not in less politics, but in more politics.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks certain excerpts from an editorial entitled "A Good Plan?" published in the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune of March 6, 1952, and an editorial entitled "Why Penalize Honest Men?" published recently in the Idaho Statesman of Boise, Idaho.

There being no objection, the excerpts and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune of March 6, 1952]

The Democratic administration is to blame in at least these ways:

President Truman moved too slowly and too reluctantly to stamp out corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau when the scandals first began. Bound by loyalties to men who had proved themselves disloyal to him and his principles, the President failed to fire some of the top men involved in the maneuvers of scandal. One of these who should have been fired was Attorney General Howard McGrath. McGrath should have been considered unavailable for his high post when he was forced to apologize publicly to a Federal judge for calling damnable and contemptible lies disclosures by the judge which were not lies. Instead of getting the sack, however, McGrath got the job of weeding out corruption in the Government.

So the Democratic administration must blame itself in large part for creating a situation in Congress wherein any plan submitted by the President, regardless of its merits, could be viewed with suspicion by some sincere and thoughtful Senators and Representatives.

[From the Idaho Statesman]

WHY PENALIZE HONEST MEN?

President Truman's plea to the United States Senate for approval of his plan for reorganization of the Internal Revenue department does not appear to us as "vital" as he contends. Mr. Truman, to attempt to put an end to irregularities within the department which have been brought to light during his administration, wants the agency put under civil service.

The Internal Revenue department does not deserve any sweeping change simply because a large number of high Democratic appointees have gone wrong. Here in Idaho, where the department is of the highest order, we see no reason for the President wanting to tear up the department. We most certainly would not favor the replacement of the present Idaho collector of internal revenue simply because some Internal Revenue department head in Missouri was found dishonest. The Idaho department is manned by personnel above reproach.

And civil service appointments are not always free of the political flavor, which seems to be the bad taste left in the President's mouth after he has been forced to swallow this bitter dose of thievery among his political family. There is just as much opportunity for dishonesty under civil service as there ever was under straight political appointments.

Mr. Truman does not take the proper approach to the irregularities in the Internal Revenue department, or in the other departments of Federal Government where they have been exposed. Had the President in-

sisted that all violators be prosecuted to the limit of the law, and had he directed the United States Attorney General to do the job, there would be no continuing complaint about any department. The President, unfortunately, accepts a certain degree of dishonesty among politicians, as was proven in his pardons of the Pendergast crooks who were in prison.

We hope every Member of the Idaho congressional delegation opposes any legislation which will penalize any member of the Idaho internal revenue office for something that has not been done in Idaho.

All the Internal Revenue department needs is the prosecution of those who have been proven dishonest.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from New York, for the purpose of reading certain documents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I spoke yesterday at considerable length in support of the President's plan. I shall be very brief. I wish to place certain documents in the RECORD. As Senators know, there has been some misunderstanding and doubt with regard to the position of John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as a result of the testimony he gave some days ago before the Senate Committee on Government Operations. His testimony was reported in the New York Times. I, therefore, under date of March 10, 1952, wrote to Mr. Dunlap, as follows:

As one who expects to support Reorganization Plan No. 1 and to oppose the pending resolution of disapproval, I was much interested in your testimony before the Senate Committee on Expenditures, as reported in the New York Times on Sunday.

Although I have read the plan and read the President's messages in regard thereto, I have not otherwise had the opportunity to participate in the consideration of this plan. Nevertheless, I have felt that the proposed reorganization would, in fact, do much to eliminate the climate of favoritism and political influence from the offices of the collectors of internal revenue. I have felt, further, that the blanketing of these offices under civil service would remove these offices from major susceptibility to political pressure, and thus strike a body blow at any disposition to weakness or laxity in the exercise of these functions in the face of such political pressure.

Yet you are quoted in the New York Times as saying: "It is correct that this plan is not directed primarily to the problem of dealing with corruption." Other remarks, in a similar vein, are attributed to you. I recognize, of course, that you are in an expert position to comment on this situation.

In preparation for the debate coming up on Wednesday, I would very much like to have a further expansion and interpretation of your remarks, as reported in the press. I naturally have no idea of the context in which your responses were given, and hence urgently need an evaluation of those remarks. Do you, in fact, feel that Reorganization Plan No. 1 would be of no major usefulness in preventing corruption in the Bureau?

I would very much appreciate hearing from you in regard to this prior to the debate on Wednesday.

I have received from Commissioner Dunlap a letter, dated March 11, 1952, reading as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your letter of March 10, 1952, in which you asked me to clarify my position as to the importance of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 in preventing improper conduct by Government officials. In your letter you state that your inquiry is prompted by a newspaper report of my testimony before the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

I appreciate this opportunity to clarify and restate the importance which I attach to plan No. 1 as a major step forward in providing the kind of revenue service the American people deserve. The statements which I made before the Senate Committee on Government Operations on March 4, 1952, are consistent with the position which I have taken all along as to the many and varied accomplishments which this plan will make possible. The statements were made against this background and should not be taken out of the context in which they were given.

From the outset of the congressional hearings on the President's plan, I have stated that this plan will provide (1) better service to taxpayers, (2) tighter supervisory control over the conduct of personnel, and (3) real areas for economies in operations. These represent substantial benefits which will flow from the plan. It is neither possible nor fair to describe any one of these three major accomplishments as the primary purpose of the plan. All are important, and all are worth while. Certainly, improved service to taxpayers and greater economy in operations cannot be considered matters of secondary importance. These benefits, together with tighter supervisory control over the conduct of employees, add up to a more efficient Bureau of Internal Revenue in all of its aspects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield two more minutes to the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be unable to finish in 2 minutes. May I have about 3 or 4 minutes?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield four more minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. The letter of Commissioner Dunlap continues, as follows:

Allow me, however, to amplify further the benefit which will be derived from this plan in the form of tighter supervisory control over the conduct of employees. At the present time we are making every effort to detect and to punish any unfaithfulness on the part of revenue employees in the discharge of their high public trust. We have established an inspection service, and we are running down every lead, complaint, or credible rumor indicating any misconduct on the part of employees. However, corrective action is made more difficult by the present sprawling organization of the revenue service. There are 8 separate field organizations and over 200 headquarters offices reporting directly to Washington. These conditions, together with other weaknesses in the system, contribute substantially to opportunities for laxness and misconduct to which some are bound to succumb.

The President's reorganization plan, by eliminating the office of the politically appointed collector, by streamlining the Bureau organization, by consolidating field offices under one responsible head in each State or other local area, and by providing a stronger inspection service under an Assistant Commissioner, will correct the conditions which have made it possible for some revenue officers and employees to misuse their official positions. I have testified to these accomplishments of the plan many times.

With this background, I would like next to refer you to my discussion with Senator NIXON on the purposes of the plan before the Senate Committee on Operations on March 4, 1952. A somewhat abbreviated report of the testimony is contained in the majority report to accompany Senate Resolution 285, page 3, but you will find the full transcript is shown beginning on page 288 of the committee's hearings, which I have enclosed for your convenience.

As a preface to some of his questions, Senator NIXON made the following statement to me: "You feel that under this plan the Bureau would be able to deal more effectively than it can at present with the over-all problem of discovering instances of dishonesty, and dealing with them effectively, is that a fair statement?" I answered, just as I would answer now: "That is right, as well as improving the efficiency of our people." Senator NIXON then asked me whether, as a corollary of that statement, I felt that I could not deal with instances of dishonesty and corruption at the present time. With that I could not agree, because, as I previously stated, we are at the present time able to detect and punish wrongdoing. But this is largely correction after the acts have occurred. As I have indicated before, the plan is necessary to correct the conditions which gave rise to these wrongful practices and to prevent repetition.

Senator NIXON then directed questions to me to ascertain whether I believed the plan was primarily for the purpose of dealing with corruption. My answer indicated that the plan was not directed primarily to dealing with corruption, for the reason which I have already stated, namely, that I could not agree to relegate to a secondary place the other major accomplishments of the plan.

My views on the important place of this reorganization plan in insuring honesty, integrity, and fairness in the conduct of Government perhaps have been best summarized by the following remarks which I made before the Senate Committee on Government Operations on March 4, 1952, in concluding my prepared statement:

"We have been making every effort to build the best internal revenue service it is humanly possible to provide. This has especially included measures to detect and punish any individuals who have been unfaithful to their high public trust. The Secretary and the President have given me their fullest support in this effort.

"It is equally important, however, that we eliminate the weaknesses in our present organizational set-up which have contributed so much to these instances of wrongdoing. The presentation of this reorganization plan represents a major part of our efforts to correct these conditions. I earnestly hope that you will lend your support to this effort to reorganize the Revenue Bureau into a career service of the highest standards."

Very truly yours,

JOHN M. DUNLAP,
Commissioner.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have carefully studied the President's plan while it was before the Senate committee and have listened to the debate that has been going on in this Chamber. In my opinion one issue—and only one—is presented for decision here today. That issue simply is whether this body is willing to agree to elimination of political patronage in the tax collection system.

This is the real issue in my judgment and no amount of skill or ingenuity in framing technical objections to the plan will hide this issue from the press and the public. Editorial after editorial and

columnist after columnist have put this plainly to their readers, particularly in the last few days since the Senate Committee on Government Operations voted to recommend disapproval. The action of that committee has been variously described as cynical, shocking, phony, deceptive, and worse. The almost universal conclusion put to the public is that this committee voted to recommend patronage in preference to reform. And the key question is then asked: "What will the Senate as a whole do?" We must therefore take a stand on the real issue of patronage or reform.

Many Senators who have addressed this body have appeared on television and radio, and have made strong statements to the press reflecting shock over the revelations of misconduct in collectors' offices. Some of us have devoted a great deal of our time to investigation of this misconduct. We have denounced in the strongest terms disclosures of the involvement of tax administration in local politics. Now we have the opportunity to provide a cure for the known disease.

The root of the trouble, it has been revealed in the last months, is the present system of political appointments in the Revenue Bureau. This is the basic source of the record of corruption which has been spread across the papers of the land. We shall never have fair, honest, and equitable administration of the tax laws among all taxpayers so long as tax officials feel obliged in making case decisions to listen to the advice or suggestions of the men who have made possible their appointment.

As we all know, our tax structure is one of voluntary assessment and collection. This system can be successful only so long as the taxpayer has confidence in the administration of the system. Today the tax burden reaches nearly all people who receive income. Revenue collection is the Nation's biggest business. The 55,000,000 taxpayers in this country demand that this business be conducted fairly and honestly among all. Revenue collection by patronage belongs to a past decade when the number of taxpayers and the size of the business were relatively small. With the size and impact of tax collection today we cannot risk sacrificing taxpayer confidence in that system in order to keep some 70 patronage jobs. It is curious, indeed, that there has been no abuse of office by the 17 career civil-service collectors. It is a source of great concern that 7 of the 47 patronage collectors have gone sour.

The Hoover Commission stated that the chief obstacle to effective organization of the Treasury is the patronage system of the Revenue Bureau. Chairman KING, of the House committee investigating tax administration, firmly expressed the view of his committee that political appointment of collectors must be abolished. Former President Hoover personally approved this tax reform. The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report gave its strong endorsement. The House Expenditures Committee voted unanimously in favor of this reform after exhaustive hearings. The House of Representatives voted in favor of the plan by an overwhelming majority. Many other outstanding legislators, private citizens, and public organizations have urged that patronage should be cut out of tax collection.

Tomorrow is the traditional deadline for this Nation's millions of taxpayers to make their returns. This is the time when the taxpayer is acutely aware of his tax obligation and the obligation of the tax collector to him.

Today is the deadline for the Senate to take a step to assure the public that we are determined to do everything in our power to give the taxpayer fair and honest tax administration.

It is indeed a fortuitous conjunction of dates that rises up to sharpen taxpayer consciousness of the issue that faces the Senate today. It should also acutely sharpen the awareness of the Members of the Senate of their duty to the tax-paying public.

It is incongruous indeed to yell about corruption of collectors and then to evade action to correct the obvious root of the evil.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I have no right to yield. The time has been allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana declines to yield.

Mr. MURRAY. If we fail to take the plain action which the people of this country expect us to take, we cannot later complain that our action will be called cynical and shocking, and much worse. We shall each of us have to make an account to the public. We shall not be able to excuse our failure because of this or that technicality.

The choice facing us is clear and simple. It is a choice between the spoils system and the merit system in the most sensitive area of our Government. This is the real issue, and it is on this issue that we must take a stand today.

Mr. President, I am happy to say that in Montana we are now following the merit system. The present collector in my State, whom I recommended for appointment some years ago, is a career man who has had an excellent record in the service covering many years. I am willing to surrender this patronage right in the interest of developing the confidence of the public in the Revenue Bureau.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, statements have been made by and to distinguished Members of the Senate which have created a misguided belief in some quarters that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 places too much authority in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury and deprives the taxpayers of certain appeal privileges they now enjoy. These statements have created an entirely false impression and tend to obscure the real purpose of the plan.

To permit a fair and unbiased decision on the merits of the statements, a factual analysis of each section of the plan is presented for consideration.

Section 1 would abolish all political patronage positions and other positions which restrict efforts to modernize the organization structure. Since these positions are required specifically by law, the Secretary of the Treasury cannot abolish them and therefore is blocked from transferring their functions under his authority in Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950. Any attempt at comprehensive transfer or realinement of their functions, without authority of the proposed Plan No. 1, would be faced with sabotage and insurmountable opposition from individuals and pressure groups who exercise influence, through certain incumbents of these positions, in tax and other governmental matters. The foundation for building the framework of a strong and revitalized organization is elimination of these politically controlled positions. Almost all Members of Congress have publicly criticized the Secretary of the Treasury for the corruption and inefficiency in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

However, it has not yet reached the point of corruption that was reached under "St." Andrew Mellon, when in a period of 2 months 156 collectors were dismissed for thieving from the Government. That was at a time when the tax collections were approximately $11,000,000,000 a year. But even one corrupt collector is one too many. They should all be exposed and dismissed from office.

A friend of mine came to me the other night and said, "There are going to be some votes against this plan. I am very much surprised. I did not think there would be any votes against it. Do you suppose it is because some people hope they will be able to name political appointees to these places?"

I said, "I do not know."

He said, "Do you think that hope springs eternal in the human breast, and that after 20 years they think they will take over and that it would be a downright shame to deprive them of the rewards of such a long period in the desert? I am afraid," he said, "that there may be some votes cast against it on that basis."

I said, "Never in the United States Senate. I would not think of that for a moment."

However, I suggest, Mr. President, that if this plan had been submitted on January 3, 1949, it would have had a very, very substantial vote, perhaps more substantial than it will have today.

But now that a valid plan for correcting the conditions has been submitted, many Members have voiced strong opposition solely to satisfy pressure groups who exercise influence through political channels or to retain their own influence in tax matters; and also, of course, to hold out bait to those who are out so that they can have something in front of their noses during the next 6 months to cause them to work vigilantly to get out those who are in.

Section 1 of the plan offers Congress the first tangible opportunity to pull up the roots of corruption and inefficiency in tax matters. Certainly this section does not give the Secretary too much authority or deprive honest taxpayers of any rights. What we want to do is

make sure that those who hold these positions will be in such a status that political considerations will be totally eliminated.

Section 2 authorizes, in lieu of the political positions abolished, the establishment of the new top positions which are essential to adequate staffing of the proposed new organization. The incumbents, by virtue of their status under the classified civil service, will have earned the right to their positions through experience and education, thus providing for a strong career service. Therefore, they will not owe allegiance to any political factions or pressure groups, and can better serve the interests of all taxpayers in an unbiased manner.

There is absolutely nothing in section 2 which gives the Secretary too much authority, or deprives honest taxpayers of their rights. In fact, the taxpayers will have a better chance to receive fair and equitable treatment at the hands of these officials than they now have from officials sponsored by local political factions.

Section 3 provides the necessary authority and restrictions on appointments and compensation of the top officials. Each such official will be appointed by the Secretary and will receive compensation in accordance with rules, regulations, and position classifications established by the Civil Service Commission. All appointments in these positions will be subject to review and approval of qualifications by the Civil Service Commission. It is plain to see that nothing in this section gives the Secretary too much authority or deprives the taxpayer of any rights. As a matter of fact, more taxpayers will have a right to compete for these jobs without requiring political support.

Section 4 covers the final proposal in the plan. This section was included merely as a precautionary provision to assure consistency with and continuity of authority vested in the Secretary by the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950, which gave him the authority to transfer functions between organizational units and to exercise delegation authority not previously within his prerogative. To accomplish this, Reorganization Plan 26 of 1950 provided for the transfer of all functions of the department from officials of bureaus and offices to the Secretary, exclusive of functions of the Comptroller of the Currency and certain functions of hearing examiners employed by the Department. Since the effective date of Reorganization Plan No. 26, four public laws have been enacted, which vested certain functions in the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and collectors of internal revenue. Obviously, any new functions assigned after the effective date of plan 26 should be assigned to the Secretary for reassignment or delegation pursuant to provisions of plan 26. Therefore, section 4 merely continues the authority previously vested in the Secretary and has no effect on the rights of taxpayers or the authority of Congress.

Adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 is essential to effective reform of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Such reform now, not next year, with the unanimous support of the Senate, as was given by the House of Representatives, is the only logical means of restoring and maintaining confidence of the public in the tax collecting system and the will of Congress to see that such system is honestly and efficiently administered.

In summarizing my remarks regarding the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury and rights of taxpayers, I am firmly convinced that the plan will not deprive honest taxpayers of any rights of appeal they have at present. Furthermore, such rights may be exercised more equitably among all taxpayers, if the Secretary is given authority to hire and fire the officials for whose actions he is held responsible.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated I shall support the reorganization plan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the majority report of the Committee on Government Operations submitted in connection with Senate Resolution 285, and I wish to say that I also associate myself with the statement made by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I also wish to associate myself with the statements which have been made and the position taken by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. President, during the past few days I have received some communications relating to the reorganization plan, as I know many other Members of the Senate have. Some of the letters seem to place emphasis on one proposition, namely, that those who oppose this plan take such a position solely and strictly because they believe in a continuation of the patronage system. In a sense, I think that is not only unfair but is a dishonest approach with reference to those who have serious doubts about having the plan go into operation. I refuse to be branded by that kind of cheap propaganda.

I happen to be a member of the Committee on Government Operations, and I am proud of the fact that I am. I have attended as many of the meetings of the committee as has any other member of the committee. I have tried to discharge my responsibility in extending courteous consideration to any citizen of this great country, or any member of a committee or any member of a group, who came before the committee to state his or her views. I think that is as it should be.

But I wish to say, frankly and candidly, that, according to some of the communications which I have received, some of my own constituents, as well as people from other States, have indicated blandly in their statements that the information which they have received from sources emanating from the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report is to the effect that the sole desire on the part of those who are refusing to go along with this plan is to have a continuation of a patronage system. Some go so far as to say that those who oppose this plan are condoning corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Corruption should be rooted out and could have been if this department had been properly operated.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] last night stated his position so clearly that any Member of the Senate or any person throughout the country who reads the statement should have no difficulty in understanding what the Senator from Georgia said and what he meant. And with him I am in complete agreement.

Mr. President, I wish to say now, with all the emphasis of which I am capable, that I am not basing my objection to this plan on the question of patronage. If I were so naive as to think a valid objection could be made on that basis, the history of the past 20 years, viewed from this side of the aisle, would not give me too much encouragement. But I am interested in clean government. I am interested in clean, honest operations on the part of those who are placed in positions of authority and who are charged with the serious responsibility of collecting the taxes of the Government.

What does the record show? As I said a moment ago, I attended the committee hearings day in and day out. I refer now to the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, page 134, and shall read into the RECORD the colloquy between the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and Secretary Snyder, as follows:

Senator DWORSHAK. You do recognize, Mr. Secretary, that there is a widespread lack of confidence on the part of the average small-tax payer that he is not receiving a square deal and that there is an opportunity for influence peddling in the settling of tax claims.

Secretary SNYDER. We are just as anxious as possible to clarify in the minds of the taxpayers at the earliest possible moment, that that matter is being straightened out and that all taxpayers are going to receive the same kind of treatment.

Mr. President, I wish to place in the RECORD all the colloquy beginning with what I have read, which appears on page 134 of the hearings, and continuing through the third question asked by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the reply by Secretary Snyder, on page 135.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator DWORSHAK. You do recognize, Mr. Secretary, that there is a widespread lack of confidence on the part of the average small-tax payer that he is not receiving a square deal and that there is an opportunity for influence peddling in the settling of tax claims.

Secretary SNYDER. We are just as anxious as possible to clarify in the minds of the taxpayers at the earliest possible moment, that that matter is being straightened out, and that all taxpayers are going to receive the same kind of treatment.

Senator DWORSHAK. You think that by taking politics out of the selection of top-level

officials, to take the place of collectors, you will have a greater opportunity to obtain this objective?

Secretary SNYDER. We believe that by streamlining the operation and pin-pointing the responsibility and not having an appointment at a level that is not a policy-making level will help us work out that plan. I do want to again reiterate a statement I made there.

I want to pay a compliment to the body of collectors. They have been fine people. And it is no intent upon my part and has not in any of my testimony nor the Commissioner's to lay any disparaging reflections on the body of collectors.

It is a most unhappy event that some have deviated, but I do not want to say that the collectors are not—I don't want any impression left that I do not think we have got in the collectors' jobs some very fine people. This is a process of progress in the development of the structure of the tax-collecting group that we think is timely, is overdue, as a matter of fact, and we have been endeavoring to build up to the point where we can ask for this capstone that will enable us to carry out to the fullest the reorganization plan.

Senator DWORSHAK. Are we justified in assuming that you do believe that the patronage system has played an important part in this corruption and fraud that has been exposed within the Bureau?

Secretary SNYDER. I would have to have an analysis of each of the cases. The patronage system has had very little to do with these deviations if we analyze many of them. I would have to look at each one of them there to see how much we could apply. We couldn't apply it broadly, I am sure.

Senator DWORSHAK. I thought one of the desirable features of this reorganization plan was to eliminate the political considerations in the selection of collectors or commissioners.

Secretary SNYDER. That certainly takes place, yes, sir.

Senator DWORSHAK. Then you must admit that that same patronage or political system has been at least partially responsible for much of the difficulty which you have encountered within the Bureau.

Secretary SNYDER. It could have been in certain instances.

Senator SMITH. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator SMITH.

Senator SMITH. It is true, isn't it, Mr. Secretary, that whether it is in the United States Senate or among the collectors, one bad actor can do a good deal of damage to the over-all picture?

Secretary SNYDER. It is most lamentably true, but, remember, not one single time do I want to condone one single person. I think it is bad and I am an unhappy man that this has happened, and certainly I will never rest until I feel it is well taken care of.

Senator SMITH. It is also true, isn't it, that while we hope to have some corrections made, that even the civil service can't be an over-all cure?

Secretary SNYDER. We have never tried to make that cure. We are quite certain that human frailties would be in civil service as well as they would be in any politically appointed person or in an elected person or any other type of person.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I turn to another part of the hearings, page 288, when the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], a member of the committee, was questioning Commissioner Dunlap. The following colloquy appears:

Senator NIXON. Mr. Commissioner, I think the major interest of the committee, as you have probably gathered from the questions that have been asked, is to determine whether this plan will allow you to deal more effectively with the problem of corruption and dishonesty because that, of course, would be the primary reason for speed in the enactment of the plan, rather than to send this plan to a legislative committee and allow them to consider it over a period of time?

Mr. DUNLAP. That, of course, Senator, we have done. We have adopted measures which we think enable us to cope with that situation as best we can, under our present organization, but that is only one of the factors.

The other is the tremendous growth in the Bureau's workload which is becoming more and more unmanageable, and we are becoming more and more unable to handle it as time goes along under our present set-up.

Mr. President, I ask that that portion of the hearings which I have just read, and a continuation of the colloquy which appears on page 289, as I have designated, be incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. However, I wish to quote the last two statements, as follows:

Senator NIXON. Then the general public should not, under any circumstances, get the impression that this plan is directed primarily to the problem of dealing with corruption; isn't that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. It is correct that the plan is not directed primarily to dealing with corruption.

Senator NIXON. Because you could handle it now and you are handling it now?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is right; we are handling it now.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator NIXON. Mr. Commissioner, I think the major interest of the committee, as you have probably gathered from the questions that have been asked, is to determine whether this plan will allow you to deal more effectively with the problem of corruption and dishonesty because that, of course, would be the primary reason for speed in the enactment of the plan, rather than to send this plan to a legislative committee and allow them to consider it over a period of time?

Mr. DUNLAP. That, of course, Senator, we have done. We have adopted measures which we think enable us to cope with that situation as best we can, under our present organization, but that is only one of the factors.

The other is the tremendous growth in the Bureau's workload which is becoming more and more unmanageable, and we are becoming more and more unable to handle it as time goes along under our present set-up.

Senator NIXON. That is exactly my point, then, the primary purpose of this plan is not to deal with the so-called problem of corruption, but to make the Bureau operate more efficiently; is that right?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is the primary purpose.

Senator NIXON. And that is in line with the chairman's remarks that it might well go to a legislative committee that deals with that problem.

Then the primary purpose is that, but a secondary purpose is to deal with the problem of corruption also; is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. I don't like to word it that way.

Senator NIXON. Well, the problem of handling, shall we say, dishonest practices, when they occur; is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. I still don't like that wording.

Senator NIXON. Very well. You use your own wording.

Mr. DUNLAP. I would say that it is one of the purposes of the plan to establish and to maintain the machinery and the avenues for examination which would insure the proper conduct of the Government's business and the proper conduct of its employees.

Senator NIXON. Let me see if I understand you correctly, then: You feel that under this plan the Bureau would be able to deal more effectively than it can at present with the over-all problem of discovering instances of dishonesty, and dealing with them effectively; is that a fair statement?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is right, as well as improving the efficiency of our people.

Senator NIXON. And the corollary of that, of course, would be that at the present time you do not feel that you can deal effectively with instances of dishonesty and corruption, is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. No, sir; I would not say that.

Senator NIXON. Then why the plan?

Mr. DUNLAP. I say that we are dealing with it adequately and properly now.

Senator NIXON. Now, just a moment, then. As I understand it, then, this plan is not necessary for the purpose of dealing with the problem of corruption, because you say you are dealing with it effectively now, is that right?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is correct, sir, but the plan is necessary to give us a more efficient over-all organization with which to conduct the tax business of the Government.

Senator NIXON. Then the general public should not, under any circumstances, get the impression that this plan is directed primarily to the problem of dealing with corruption; isn't that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. It is correct that the plan is not directed primarily to dealing with corruption.

Senator NIXON. Because you could handle it now and you are handling it now?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is right; we are handling it now.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I do not desire to have this testimony considered out of context, because it should be considered as a whole. But it specifically refutes arguments which have been made on the floor of the Senate and refutes arguments some propagandists and pressure groups have sought to make, which have been branded as misrepresentations.

I refuse to go along with that kind of comment. Although my experience in the Senate is perhaps not so extensive as that of most Senators, I believe I have as high a regard as has any other Member of the Senate for officialdom in the responsible discharge of their duties.

The senior Senator from Kansas is not going to fly in the face of the advice of men such as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who have given a major portion of their lives to the legislative service of their country and are experts in tax matters. They came before our committee and earnestly, candidly, logically, fairly, and in an enlightening manner pointed out to us some of the disastrous effects of the reorganization plan. The Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of Internal Revenue testified before the committee. On the basis of that type of testimony, if we cannot reorganize this agency under legislation which is pending, then I say that there is something wrong with the Congress.

I believe that this plan should be rejected. I think it would be more expensive by far than the present system, and that it would involve a centralization of authority which would be detrimental to the country. We have seen

bureaucracy develop and grow by leaps and bounds, and the people are becoming sick and tired of it. We want more honesty and efficiency in departments of our Government under proper safeguards, spelled out in many instances as matters of law.

I would prefer to deal with the question by the proper consideration of legislation, with an opportunity to amend, change, or alter, and to obtain advice as to the workability of any proposal. I do not subscribe to the views of the fatalists who say that the Senate is incapable of considering reorganizational legislation reported to it by the Finance Committee, or that the House is incapable of considering legislation recommended to it by the Committee on Ways and Means. Last night the Senator from Georgia gave the Senate assurance that it will be the purpose of the committee to present reorganizational legislation to this body, which will permit of amendments. I say that that is the proper approach. That is the practical approach, through committees that know and understand what is needed in the face of what has been disclosed in this country in this internal-revenue department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may I have one more minute?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield one more minute to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. So far as I am concerned, the pressure groups can throw all the pressure they desire on the Senator from Kansas, but I will still vote my convictions, based upon a careful reading of the testimony, listening to witnesses, and listening to men whose legislative background and history demonstrate that they have a very high regard for public trust, and I want a plan or law that meets the conditions of the Hoover Commission recommendation—which I submit this plan No. 1 does not do.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the time be disregarded so far as the limitation of debate is concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate will be in order. Persons other than Senators will please retire to the space provided in the rear of the Chamber for their comfort and for the convenience of the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not in a peculiar position, but I feel differently from other Senators, who may be running for office this year. Irrespective of political consequences, I wish to associate myself with those who believe in American institutions and who would save American institutions. I wish to associate myself with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the other Senators who believe in the type of government which was created for this country.

It is said that savings would be made if we were to let Bureau Washington make the appointments. If any Senator within the sound of my voice can tell me when Bureau Washington has ever recommended the saving of one penny, I will be willing to vote for the pending reorganization proposal.

In 22 years of experience with Bureau Washington and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, in listening to representatives of Bureau Washington who have appeared before that committee, I have only this to say: The only interest of Bureau Washington is in pay day, pensions, retirement, and the hope that their sons and daughters may succeed them.

Mr. President, I also resent the implication, based upon sanctimonious hypocrisy and on the pretext of political virtue, that any Member of this body would dare to recommend for appointment as collector of internal revenue anyone who is dishonest. I resent it very much.

I am glad that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is now presiding over the Senate. The collectors of internal revenue in his State and in my State are the collectors who have served the longest under the system which now prevails. I would ask any bureaucrat in Washington: What is wrong with the collector of internal revenue in Mississippi? What was wrong or crooked about the Senator from Mississippi who had recommended him? The same question can be asked concerning the collector of internal revenue in New Mexico, Mr. S. P. Vidal. He was recommended by former Senator Bratton, now Judge Bratton, of the Circuit Court of Appeals of New Mexico.

Mr. President, will anyone dare tell me that Senator Bratton was crooked, or that he would have recommended a crook for appointment as collector of internal revenue?

I do not subscribe to the theory that only Washington knows what is honest. If we want a Stalin type of government, or if we want the old Prussian system of civil service, we should vote in favor of the reorganization plan. However, being the recipient and beneficiary of the ideals and opportunities which the average American enjoys under our system of government, I cannot be in favor of the plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I have one more minute?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Much is said about career men. Who was it in Detroit that accepted the benefits of an automobile, or home, or machinery? It was a career man who is now being sent to Iran. Who was it that wasted $50,000,000 in North Africa by paying labor as much as $13,000 a month? It was a career man. Let us keep our Government in the hands of the people if we want to retain the American system of government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has again expired.

The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I had intended to speak for more than 3 minutes on this very important matter.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and having had all of my life an intense interest in good government, and a fair and impartial administration of all public business, I would be among the last in this body to lift my voice in opposition to any well-considered program looking toward the betterment of the public service. However, no such well-considered plan is embodied in the President's proposal.

A few days ago, I addressed the Senate in reference to the problems facing the Government in the matter of the discharge of civil-service employees under the log-jammed system now in vogue. Delay, considerable cost, uncertainty, resulting confusion, total disruption of the public business, and numerous other untold detriments inevitably arise in the complicated personnel processes involved in any lay-off of civil-service personnel. Had those in the Internal Revenue Bureau who have been derelict in the performance of their duties been under civil service, their removal could not have been effected with dispatch by Presidential order; they could have been removed only through the cumbersome processes established by the wordy and entangled regulations prescribed by civil service.

At one time in our history it may have been correct to say that a person in the civil service was marked with a badge and was placed separate and apart from persons in private employment. Unfortunately, that no longer is the case, following the vast, hasty expansions of the executive branch of the Government and the accompanying loose control and mismanagement in it.

Mr. President, in the press within the past few weeks, there has been a studied campaign to exert pressure upon us in favor of the present proposal. Furthermore, certain radio broadcasters have tried to stampede us in the direction urged by the President; on the radio there have been charges and imputations that if the President's proposal to place the collectors of internal revenue under the civil service is not approved by us we shall be saying that we favor corruption in public office, and thereby we shall become a party to a continuation of it. These charges and imputations not only are reckless, unfounded, and unjust, but also at the same time are completely false. There is not a

Member of this body or a conscientious citizen in the land who fails to recognize that the collection of taxes is our most sensitive public business. It touches all of us; in varying degrees, it affects us all. We are all deeply and vitally concerned with the absolute necessity for a just, even-handed, honest, and meticulously fair system, and an upright administration of such a system, in regard to the collection and disbursement of public funds. The statement of this truth and the assertion of this principle admit of no contradiction. To them there is no exception.

The problem with which we are faced today requires sober, considered, and mature judgment. It calls for a studied, not a hasty, approach. In the nature of things, there cannot be an overnight cure-all for the ills which have been revealed during the past several months.

The President's proposal is no sulfa drug, no penicillin, for the evils which he and his appointees have permitted to grow up around him. The difficulty, as I see it, is, not that the system is bad per se, but that in practice it has been badly administered. The fault lies with the administration of that system and with the few in the executive branch who have had the power to appoint, supervise, and direct the key officials in that system.

It is not for me to assess the responsibility for the failures that have occurred. Those are personal responsibilities which must be borne by those whose duty it has been to make the selections that have proved unworthy. Moreover, the more important thing, as it appears to me, is that the responsibility for the wrongdoing lies with the Executive, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who have had working contact, day by day, month by month, and year by year, with the collectors.

The President, with the FBI at his disposal; the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the Secretary of the Treasury, with their Secret Service at their disposal; and all the other agencies of the executive branch of the Government, with their investigators at their disposal, cannot now with good grace say to the Congress, "Do exactly as we say and pass this plan or you will share in the blame attaching to us." What kind of a sham is that, Mr. President? What kind of an escape does such thoughtless clamor provide? Oh, no; it is not the system that is so much to blame. The engineers who have been operating the system are the ones who now are being confronted with the results of their poor administration.

If I thought for a moment that merely by putting into effect Reorganization Plan No. 1 for 1952, we could stop future wrongdoing, I would favor the plan.

Mr. President, since becoming a Member of the Senate, it has not been my responsibility to be called upon to make a recommendation for an original appointment of a collecter of internal revenue in my State. No vacancy exists now in that office. The one in office has continued there since he was recommended for appointment by my predecessor. The present collector has made a good record, so far as I know; and I believe he ought to be continued in office. Hence, politics, so far as I personally am concerned, does not enter the picture.

Mr. President, are we to destroy a system which through the years has proved itself workable, though not perfect, only because in recent months revelations prove that those presently in charge of administering that system have utterly failed?

I cannot be high-pressured into believing that the President's plan is a sinecure; I cannot be high-pressured into the delusion and illusion that by the adoption of the President's plan, all our troubles will automatically come to an end. This plan might end the President's troubles for the moment, but it will not solve the long-range needs of the Nation. Hardly a day goes by that I am not shocked by additional evidence of the imperfections of our present civil service and its continuing need for improvements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina wishes to have two additional minutes, I shall yield that much additional time to my chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let me prove the point that the present system is not so bad. Let those who think that civil service is a magician waving a magic wand that will change oil into water, ponder this example: Hundreds and hundreds of Federal judges have been appointed throughout this country since the establishment of our Federal courts. They have been appointed by the President under the same system under which the internal revenue collectors have been appointed. Those appointments have had to be X-rayed by the confirming process of the Senate. In the whole history of our Federal judiciary, the United States Senate as a court of impeachment has had to try only eight Federal judges. If that system has been good for the judiciary, a coordinate branch of our Government, it certainly cannot be so bad for another part of the executive branch of our Government, namely, the collectors of internal revenue. If one who is unfit is appointed, his unfitness can be developed when his appointment is before us for confirmation. This test is superior, in my judgment, to any written test that may be promulgated by a group of theorists who may not have the slightest practical knowledge of the day-by-day requirements of a collector of internal revenue. Too often we find a good man in theory who is a total misfit in practice. Oftentimes theory never replaces practical experience.

I have read with care the report of the Committee on Government Operations, and I subscribe without reservation to its recommendation.

Let me briefly restate, in summary, the reasons which compel me to support Senate Resolution 285. Let there be no confusion that the President's plan is a Hoover Commission plan. It is no such thing. If it were, or if it could be so construed, then why is it sent to us at the eleventh hour of the last day, so to speak? It could have been submitted when the Hoover Report was submitted to the Congress in 1948.

My reasons for opposing the plan are the following:

First. The mere passing of a civil-service examination is no guaranty of an individual's honesty. The collateral investigation determines his reputation, but does not necessarily give us any criteria for a sure determination of his character.

Second. The transfer of responsibility for appointing of a collector from the system of recommendation to the President by a Senator, and subsequent confirmation by the Senate, would impose a dual responsibility greater than the single responsibility now proposed to be funneled to the Secretary of the Treasury, who himself is an appointed, not an elected, officer. The result would be that the Secretary, acting alone, would replace the individual responsibility of each of two Senators, the President, and the confirming power of the entire Senate.

Third. The opportunity for continuing political appointments, hidden in the chicanery of unilateral Executive action, would remain the same, even if Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 were approved. Let there be no mistake about this.

An over-all objection which I have, Mr. President, to this plan, is simply this: We are allotted a few days in which to accept or reject a proposal involving tremendous legislative implications, without even the right of amendment. We can take it as is or we can reject it. We have no other choice. I do not at all fear the unwarranted calumny to which I may be subjected for voting to reject a plan which I believe should run the gantlet of the legislative process by being studied by the appropriate committees and by being debated fully, in all its details and implications, by the Congress. Much less do I fear any calumny when I realize that the wrongdoings which have come to light have come to pass under the very administration of those who now seek to to be excused from their shortcoming by presenting to the Congress a plan which they sponsor as a magic remedy for their own corrupting practices.

Involved in this plan are questions affecting the civil service which the Senate Civil Service Committee ought to study. The plan involves questions relating to the raising of taxes which the Finance Committee of the Senate and the Ways and Means Committee of the House should study. The plan involves questions of law relating to the rights and remedies of the taxpayer in the overpayment or the underpayment of taxes and matters of judicial process which the Judiciary Committee should study and weigh.

This plan is not a reorganization plan. It is a piece of major legislation. It has far-reaching consequences. The Congress should legislate in its time-tested way on so grave a set of problems as the

ones referred to by this plan. Should we accept this plan as is, without reservations? No, no, Mr. President!

Of course, I realize that if we reject the plan we shall be condemned by those who would condone the very corruption which has been tolerated by those who have submitted to us this so-called remedy. Such condemnation is entirely unjustified, for no one desires a quicker solution to the ills that plague our Government than I do. No one desires a more lasting cure than I do.

The fact remains, however, that in enacting legislation on a matter of such transcendent importance, the principles of sound legislative procedure should not be abandoned for mere Executive fiat.

I do not oppose real reforms; but my wish for lasting reforms of a constructive nature prompts my opposition to the President's plan and at the same time compels me to support Senate Resolution 285.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call at this time, without having the time required for it charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McMahon
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Cain	Hunt	Nixon
Capehart	Ives	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kefauver	Russell
Connally	Kem	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Seaton
Douglas	Langer	Smathers
Duff	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ellender	Malone	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Thye
Flanders	Maybank	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Watkins
George	McClellan	Welker
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business, acting as chairman of the subcommittee on Taxation of the Senate Small Business Committee in connection with the opening of hearings today at Bridgeport, Conn.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, very shortly the Members of the Senate will vote on the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1.

When the Senate Crime Investigating Committee was conducting hearings last year, we discovered some instances of corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. We particularly found such instances in the Bureau's California office in San Francisco. A public report was made on the matter, which was called to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the proper executive offices approximately a year ago. Some months later the California situation was substantially straightened out. Since that time the House Ways and Means Committee, of which Representative CECIL KING is chairman, has investigated and reported on other instances of corruption and wrongdoing concerning employees and officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

One of the principal things about which the people of the Nation are concerned in the matter of wrongdoing and lack of integrity in Government has been the revelations relative to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, because there, more than any other place, is where absolute integrity in dealing with the people's money and treating everybody alike is required.

At the last session of Congress I introduced two bills which I thought would do much to straighten out the difficulties in the Bureau and restore the confidence of the people in this vital arm of Government. One of the bills provided for placing all collectors under civil service, thereby taking their appointment out of partisan politics, and providing for the very highest qualification standards for those who wished to apply for such positions.

I do not think persons charged with collecting tax money should be in partisan politics. I do not think they should owe their jobs to any one man or to any one political faction. I certainly do not want them to feel indebted to me or to anyone else.

I think the President's reorganization plan, taking the collection of tax money out of politics, accomplishes the desired purpose. I do not know that there is any particular advantage in having a lesser number of collectors of internal revenue, but after studying the plan I feel that since it puts them under civil service and that lines of authority are more definitely drawn, the President's proposal will accomplish what the members of our committee had in mind when we recommended that collectors of internal revenue be placed under civil service with the highest qualifications required.

On both sides of the aisle we have been doing a great deal of talking about corruption in Government, about the necessity of having public officials who are without partisan interests, about the urgency of having those who handle the tax money collected from the people possessed of the very best qualifications and the highest integrity. Now is the time for the United States Senate to do something about it. Whether we agree with every detail of the President's reorganization plan or not, it does accomplish the very necessary purpose of taking collectors out of politics and placing them under civil service, so that they will not be obligated to any partisan political influence. The fact, Mr. President, that 10 or 11 collectors of internal revenue have come up through the ranks, that, according to Commissioner Dunlap, they have made the most outstanding success in their positions, and that no finger of suspicion has been pointed at any of them, certainly speaks well of the proposal which is before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield two or three more minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, undoubtedly Commissioner Dunlap inherited a bad situation in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. My experience with him has been that he tried his best to expose conditions, to see that the public knew what was going on, and to ferret out the collectors who had not kept the trust of the Government. I believe he is trying to do a conscientious and honest job. He has studied the methods of handling the Bureau of Internal Revenue which would be in the public interest. So I think we should give the President and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue the tools which are necessary in order to reorganize the Bureau and to restore public confidence in the conduct of that office.

There are many more things that should be done by the Federal Government in this general over-all effort, but it will be discouraging to those who have that responsibility if we do not support them in their present effort.

I feel, also, that collectors of internal revenue should be prohibited from having outside employment. That is the purpose of another bill which I introduced some months ago. I hope that later on the bill may be brought up and considered on the floor, supplementing the President's reorganization plan, and giving us a streamlined, revitalized, absolutely honest and dependable Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. President, I hope the President's reorganization plan will be adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Tennessee to say that approximately a year ago he had introduced a bill providing for the removal of collectors of internal revenue from political patronage and putting them under the merit system?

Mr. KEFAUVER. It was not quite a year ago. The facts which our committee ascertained about the situation in California were presented to the Department with the recommendation at that time that collectors of internal

revenue should be taken out of politics and put under civil service. I announced last fall that I would introduce bills for the purpose of placing them under civil service and prohibiting them from having outside employment. The bills were introduced some months ago, but the general purport of the bills is contained in the President's reorganization plan. I think it covers the situation in every respect except one, namely, that collectors should not be allowed to have outside employment. The reorganization plan, in my opinion, would do much to restore confidence in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and I think it would assure the Government and the people that the Bureau of Internal Revenue is free of any chiselers, wrongdoers, or persons who are subject to the influence of racketeers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My reason for asking the question is that the charge has been made that the plan under consideration has been hastily conceived and suddenly placed before the Congress, and that we have the choice of either accepting it or rejecting it. The fact is, however, is it not, that because of bills which the Senator himself has introduced, there have been measures before the committees of Congress for some months, and that there was nothing in the world to prevent the holding of hearings on those bills; and, further, that the bills which the Senator introduced could have become an all-out, over-all reorganization bill had the committees of the Congress so desired and acted accordingly? Is not that correct?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is correct. It is also correct to say that this matter was discussed with the Secretary of the Treasury, with Mr. Foley, and with Mr. Cunningham, many months before any reorganization plan was sent to the Congress. I was present at the time, and discussed the general matter with those gentlemen. So that the subject has been given a great deal of consideration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is true, is it not, that there has been no secret as to some of the difficulties in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and that many Members of this body have been aware of them?

Mr. KEFAUVER. That is true. In my opinion, Mr. Dunlap has performed his duty well in bringing out the facts. I have confidence in Mr. Dunlap.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks excerpts from an address delivered by me, and broadcasted from Station WWL, expressing my views in support of the pending resolution.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There has been much discussion during the past several weeks about this plan for reorganizing the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Many of you have written me asking my opinion of the matter, and outlining your views. Tonight, I should like to tell you how I stand on this question, and why I have taken this position.

I, along with you, have been shocked, surprised, and disappointed at the increasing number of instances involving corruption in Government. A few district offices of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, unfortunately, seem to have been the chief offenders.

The President, in submitting his so-called Reorganization Plan No. 1 to the Congress, asked its immediate approval, and asserted that it would correct some of the abuses of our present tax-collecting machinery.

The plan was submitted by the Chief Executive under the authority given him by the Reorganization Act of 1949, and handed to the Congress. Under the law, the plan cannot be amended. It must be voted up or down.

Many of you will recall that when the bill to reorganize the executive departments was before the Senate, I supported the measure. I believed then, as I do now, that initiative in reorganization matters should rest in the hands of the Chief Executive, but subject to the right of the Congress to reject any reorganization plans that we consider unsound. In voting for the bill in 1949, I reserved the right to carefully and thoroughly review all of the proposals submitted by the President, and to oppose any of them that I considered to be unsound.

Since 1949, I have supported most of the reorganization plans that have been submitted, and I have opposed only a few that, to my mind, did not accomplish the purpose for which they were intended—that is, efficiency and economy in Government.

In the plan to reorganize the Internal Revenue Bureau, the President submitted to the Congress a highly complex and intricate administrative procedure that was so closely interwoven with our tax laws as to be almost indistinguishable from them. When we consider that the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee spent a combined total of 83 days in holding hearings on the 1951 Revenue Act, which sought to change only a relatively small part of our basic tax structure, it is obvious that anything as far-reaching as a complete overhaul of the tax-collecting structure could not be given adequate consideration in the limited time provided by the Reorganization Act. Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has devoted the major part of his many years in the Senate to the study of tax matters. The veteran Senator from Georgia, whose opinion in tax matters I highly respect, pointed out the many important and far-reaching changes that would be made by the proposed plan, and I agreed with him that the Congress would do well to pause and consider the consequences of hasty action.

The President's plan would substitute, for our present collection system, a network of 25 regional offices, each headed by a district commissioner. Serving under these commissioners would be deputy district commissioners, one located in each city presently having a collector of internal revenue.

At the top of this new system would be a Commissioner of Internal Revenue, appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

A thorough examination of the plan revealed that it involved several dangerous and, I believe insurmountable, problems. For example, it called for Louisiana and the southern half of Texas to constitute one so-called district. There would be a deputy commissioner in New Orleans, but in all probability, the district commissioner would have his office in Texas. This would mean that if someone in Louisiana had a tax problem that he wished to appeal—and the right of appeal would not come under the authority of the deputy commissioner in New Orleans—he would have to journey to Texas to find the answer. Under present machinery, the collector at New Orleans is empowered to act as a sort of court, and his decision is subject only to revision by the proper officials in Washington. I approve of decentralization when it works to the benefit of our citizens, but when it adds up only to extra trouble, and extra expense, then I am most vigorously opposed.

There was another major and serious objection to the President's plan. Heretofore, any taxpayer could file suit against a Federal tax collector if he felt such action were justified. Suits of this type are handled by the Federal courts, and verdicts in tax cases are rendered by juries.

The President's plan abolished the office of tax collector, and substituted for it a network of commissioners. There is nothing in our legal code that says the tax commissioner was to be liable to court action by a taxpayer. This is a principle that would have to be decided by the courts. Even assuming that such a case were decided in favor of our present system of checks and balances, set up with reference to the collection of taxes, the time involved in filing test cases, selecting juries and conducting trials, would be more than enough to throw our whole revenue program out of balance.

Viewed objectively—and I have always tried to take that viewpoint on all matters—the President's reorganization plan was faulty indeed. That there have been cases of dishonesty cannot be denied. But what was to prevent the President from cleaning up the Internal Revenue Bureau, under the existing set-up. He has had, and still has, full authority to remove any and all Internal Revenue employees, including the district collectors of revenue, who may be inefficient, disloyal or dishonest. Why then this sudden need to place the collectors of revenue under civil service?

No one knows for sure what the final implications of the President's internal revenue reorganization plan will be. The long-range effects might be very serious—our whole tax structure could be endangered, the right of a taxpayer to protest an unjust levy might vanish altogether, and our economic ability to resist the inroads of communism and maintain our freedom might be swept away.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield 45 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, on March 7, 1952, the President of the Senate received a letter from the President of the United States urging the approval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, which is now before the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter, which I am sending to the desk, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 7, 1952.

Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
President of the Senate of the United States, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to urge favorable Senate action on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The plan already has been overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives. It will become law on March 14 unless disapproved by the Senate by that date.

Reorganization Plan No. 1 provides the basis for a thorough reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Its essential feature is abolition of the offices of the 64 collectors of internal revenue and other statutory offices requiring Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation. Under the plan, all positions below the Commissioner

of Internal Revenue are filled through the civil-service merit system.

This reorganization plan is an essential part of a program to assure honesty, integrity, and efficiency in Government. Unfortunately, those who find it to their advantage to preserve the present system, or to play politics with the integrity of the public service, have raised specious arguments against the plan that obscure the real issue.

The plain fact is that the plan must stand or fall on one issue—whether we want to take the necessary steps to assure efficient, honest, and impartial administration of the internal-revenue laws.

It has been called to my attention that a bill was offered to the Senate last week as a so-called substitute for my reorganization plan. Its language is almost the same as the language of plan No. 1—with two differences. One difference purports to safeguard existing rights and remedies of taxpayers. Legal officers of the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department have assured me this provision is not necessary, since all existing rights and remedies of the taxpayers are preserved. The second difference is the fundamental one. It would require Senate confirmation of appointment to 99 revenue offices—more political appointments than at present—while my plan would place all these positions under civil service. Since that is the only real difference, it is clear that those who support the "substitute" bill also support all of my reorganization plan except the part which eliminates political patronage in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This presents squarely the one vital question: Is the business of tax collection to be taken out of politics?

Those who have studied this question say that the answer is clear—that internal-revenue officers must be divorced from political obligations and influences. The Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government has taken that position. In its report on the Treasury Department, the Commission said the political appointment of collectors of internal revenue and certain other officials is one of the chief handicaps to effective organization of the Department. The Commission said these appointments are regarded by some as sinecures and that, in any event, they form a bar to orderly development of an experienced staff. Mr. Robert Ramspeck, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, in answering the question, has said that a civil-service employee's allegiance is to all the people, while a collector of internal revenue must give first allegiance to the people who got him his political job. Because of the political-patronage system, Mr. Ramspeck says, collectors believe it is more important for them to play politics than to be efficient tax collectors.

Civil-service status is certainly not an absolute guaranty of honesty and integrity. But the record shows a far smaller proportion of misconduct among employees with civil-service status than among those selected on a patronage basis. In the past year it has been necessary to separate from the service 7 out of the 47 internal-revenue collectors not having civil-service status. That is 1 out of 7—nearly 15 percent. In the case of civil-service employees, on the other hand, the number accused of improper conduct connected with tax collections is only a small fraction of 1 percent.

I have been interested to note that 26 Senators have sponsored bills to require civil-service appointment of collectors of internal revenue. Those bills are S. 2412 and S. 2484, both introduced this year. It is also interesting to note that 7 of these 26 Senators are members and constitute a majority of the committee which voted against my reorganization plan. It seems obvious that a vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1 is inconsistent with the sponsorship of these bills.

Approval of plan No. 1 will be a major step toward good organization and better management in the Government. Disapproval of the plan, on the other hand, would be a step in the opposite direction involving serious consequences. Disapproval of the plan would be a blow to our efforts to assure efficiency and prevent improper conduct in Government. Its disapproval would mean continuance of a revenue system which is not adapted to present-day requirements for sound and efficient administration. Disapproval of the plan would be a defeat for civil-service reform—and a victory for proponents of a political patronage system. We must not let these things happen.

The action of the Senate on plan No. 1 will have a significance far beyond administrative improvement in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Our citizens are entitled to a tax-collecting agency of thorough efficiency and unquestioned integrity. They are entitled to a revenue service with an organization and management which justifies their complete confidence. Plan No. 1 provides a concrete test of our willingness and ability to take positive action to promote such a service.

Millions of American taxpayers will be watching the Senate action on the reorganization plan. They have been hearing a lot lately about corruption in Government, and they are concerned about what is being done to strengthen the Federal service against it. These taxpayers will be greatly interested in seeing whether Senators are more interested in their political patronage than in good public service. They will be greatly interested in seeing whether some Senators are more interested in using corruption as a vehicle to attack the administration than they are in actually taking steps to assure clean government.

I would hate to think that the Senate will consider this matter on a partisan basis. However, I have noticed that five of the six Republican Senators on the committee voted against this reorganization plan to provide increased efficiency and integrity in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Those five Senators—like many of their Republican colleagues—have made a great cry about cleaning up any graft and corruption in government. I think it is fair to ask whether they really want to do something to assure clean, efficient government or whether all their talk is pure politics.

The vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1 will show who it is that is just talking about corruption and who it is that really wants to do something about it. I hope the Senate—Republicans as well as Democrats—will keep faith with our taxpayers by voting for this important reorganization plan.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The President's letter includes the following:

The action of the Senate on plan No. 1 will have a significance far beyond administrative improvement in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Our citizens are entitled to a tax-collecting agency of thorough efficiency and unquestioned integrity. They are entitled to a revenue service with an organization and management which justifies their complete confidence. Plan No. 1 provides a concrete test of our willingness and ability to take positive action to promote such a service.

Millions of American taxpayers will be watching the Senate action on the reorganization plan. They have been hearing a lot lately about corruption in government, and they are concerned about what is being done to strengthen the Federal service against it. These taxpayers will be greatly interested in seeing whether Senators are more interested in their political patronage than in good public service. They will be greatly interested in seeing whether some Senators are more interested in using corruption as a vehicle to attack the administration than they are in actually taking steps to assure clean government.

I would hate to think that the Senate will consider this matter on a partisan basis. However, I have noticed that five of the six Republican Senators on the committee voted against this reorganization plan to provide increased efficiency and integrity in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Those five Senators—like many of their Republican colleagues—have made a great cry about cleaning up any graft and corruption in government. I think it is fair to ask whether they really want to do something to assure clean, efficient government or whether all their talk is pure politics.

The vote on Reorganization Plan No. 1 will show who it is that is just talking about corruption and who it is that really wants to do something about it. I hope the Senate—Republicans as well as Democrats—will keep faith with our taxpayers by voting for this important reorganization plan.

There are few instances in our history when a President of the United States has so grossly insulted the Senate of the United States and the Senate has been so acquiescent.

The proper treatment of the President's letter would be to refuse to accept it, to hurl it into the teeth of its author, and to reject its ballyhooed proposals until they have been brought here for consideration with Presidential recommendations, in language and on the plane of statesmanship that should characterize official utterances coming from the White House.

It is said that the letter is very clever politically; that it is a veritable tour de force in putting Senators on the spot, in putting them in position of being in sympathy with corruption if they do not vote for the President's program, and that this smelly tactic, although hitting at Members on both sides of the aisle, is expressly directed at Republican Senators.

Well, who is put on the spot? Before I have finished I expect to demonstrate that the President has put himself on the spot.

I cannot assay the moving factors in the minds of other Senators, and so I shall not be impertinent enough to pass judgment. I will simply say that under the existing state of public opinion, I would certainly consider myself on the spot were I to face my constituents and admit that Mr. Truman is my preceptor, and that I am his abject follower in matters involving Government morals and efficiency.

I would certainly be on the spot if I were to tell my constituents that in this matter I groveled under the lash of Mr. Truman's vile insults.

I would certainly be on the spot if I were to face my constituents and admit that I am fool enough to allow Mr. Truman to hand me the job of diapering his badly soiled, unhousebroken political offspring.

I would certainly be on the spot if I were to face my constituents and tell them that I had allowed Mr. Truman to pass to me any part of his own responsibility for condoning inefficiency and corruption among agencies under his control.

I would certainly be on the spot if I were to face my constituents and admit

that I had not objected to grants of power to the executive department completely sufficient to achieve efficiency and honesty where they are absent in the revenue-collection service, and then had helped to vote additional powers before those already granted had been exercised in good faith.

It is my purpose to show that the President and his Secretary of the Treasury already have all the power that is needed to restore efficiency and honesty wherever inefficiency or dishonesty are present in the revenue-collection service and to establish qualifications, standards, and operational practices that will sharply deter, if they do not completely eliminate, inefficiency and corruption.

From this it should be clear, if it is not already so, that there is no purpose in the present request for additional power except to set up false lights to divert attention from the fact that existing power has not been used and that inefficiency and corruption, where they have existed, have been condoned.

It is my purpose to bring the matter before us into proper perspective and relationship with the claims that we will be going back on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission if we do not support this proposal; that we cannot have efficiency and get rid of corruption unless we abolish 68 non-civil-service jobs and substitute 99 new jobs under the civil-service system.

First, let me meet head-on the President's claim that these new powers must be granted or we must expect that corruption and inefficiency will continue. My answering point is that the President and the Secretary of the Treasury already have sufficient power to right the shoddy and criminal practices which have shocked the Nation.

In 1950, the Senate, without a disapproving resolution, adopted Reorganization Plan No. 26. It is brief, and I ask unanimous consent that it be included at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, plan No. 26 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 26 OF 1950

(Prepared by the President and transmitted to the Senate and the House of Representatives in Congress assembled May 31, 1950, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949, approved June 20, 1949)

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, and subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury all functions of all other officers of the Department of the Treasury and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

(b) This section shall not apply to the functions vested by the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237) in hearing examiners employed by the Department of the Treasury or to functions vested by any provision of law in the Comptroller of the Currency.

(c) Notwithstanding the transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury of the functions of the United States Coast Guard and of the functions of the Commandant of the Coast Guard, effected by the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, such Coast Guard, together with the said functions, shall operate as a part of the Navy, subject to the orders of the Secretary of the Navy, in time of war or when the President shall so direct, as provided in section 1 of the act of January 28, 1915 (ch. 20, 38 Stat. 800, as amended, 14 U. S. C. 1).

SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of the Treasury of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

SEC. 3. Administrative Assistant Secretary: There shall be in the Department of the Treasury an Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary of the Treasury under the classified civil service, who shall perform such duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $14,000 per annum.

SEC. 4. Incidental transfers: The Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time effect such transfers within the Department of the Treasury of any of the records, property, personnel, and unexpended balances (available or to be made available) of appropriations, allocations, and other funds of such Department as he may deem necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this reorganization plan.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Because an understanding of the Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 destroys the necessity for Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, which is before us, and because in demonstrating this I shall make many references to plan 26 of 1950, I earnestly urge my colleagues to give closest attention to its pertinent language which is brief and unmistakably clear:

Section 1 of the Reorganization Plan 26 of 1950 includes the following:

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, and subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury all functions of all other officers of the Department of the Treasury and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

The exceptions referred to are not relevant to and do not affect the issues before us.

Section 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 is as follows:

SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of the Treasury of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

One of the agencies thus brought under the supervision and control of the Secretary of the Treasury was the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

What was intended by plan 26 of 1950? The words are clear. They do not need interpretation. But let us see, for example, what was said at the time by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive departments and by the President.

I interpolate at this point that the original plan was rejected because it proposed to put the Comptroller of the Currency under the Secretary of the Treasury, and that this provision was eliminated in the approved plan, No. 26 of 1950. The other features of the original plan, including those we have been discussing, remain the same.

The report of the committee on that plan states:

Page 3: Witnesses in testifying in support of the original plan reiterated the points raised in the President's messages accompanying the plan, contending that:

1. The plan conforms to one of the most basic recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with respect to the administration of executive departments.

I interpolate that the Commission referred to was the Hoover Commission.

2. It establishes clear lines of authority and accountability within the Department of the Treasury, and corrects a great weakness in the executive branch in the "line of command and supervision from the President down through the department heads to every employee, and the line of responsibility from each employee of the executive branch up to the President," as recommended by the Hoover Commission. The plan enables the Secretary to make improvements in the internal organization of the Treasury Department and provides more adequate assistance to manage departmental affairs properly.

I am not talking about the plan now under consideration. I am talking about a plan which has become law, Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950.

Next we note some observations in the message of the President transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 affecting reorganization in the Department of the Treasury:

The reorganizations included in this plan are identical with those contained in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950, except that the functions of the Comptroller of the Currency are unaffected by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950.

In transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950 on March 13, I stated that the reorganizations contained therein were essential to clarification of the lines of authority and responsibility in the executive branch. I further emphasized that those reorganizations would put into effect in the Department of the Treasury the principal remaining recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government—

I interpolate again that this is the Hoover Commission—

affecting the location of management responsibilities. I urge the Congress to add its approval to my acceptance of these recommendations of the Commission on Organization—

Again referring to the Hoover Commission.

On May 11 the Senate disapproved Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1950. The reason for the disapproval was the inclusion of the functions of the Comptroller of the Currency among the responsibilities proposed to be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury. Accordingly, in order to meet the objection which led to such disapproval and to preserve the major benefits of the disapproved plan, Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 is transmitted herewith.

Please note again that Reorganization Plan 26, according to the President—

Would put into effect into the Department of the Treasury the principal remaining recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government affecting the location of management responsibilities.

Again referring to the Hoover Commission.

So what could the Secretary of the Treasury and his boss, the President, have done if they had wanted to do it under the almost unlimited grant of power which we have given him?

What could the Secretary of the Treasury and his boss, the President, have done under Reorganization Plan 26 of 1950 without the aid of the proposed Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952?

They could have set up their own standards for the conduct of the collectors' offices.

They could have set up their own inspection and supervisory service to see that those standards were obeyed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield at that point?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad to have the Senator do so.

I should like to ask the Senator whether plan 26, to which he refers, gave any authority to the President of the United States to abolish the office of collector of internal revenue, which was a politically appointive office?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It gave authority——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator answer the question? Did it or did it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did it do what?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Did plan 26 give the Secretary of the Treasury or the President the power to abolish the office of collector of internal revenue, which is a politically appointive office?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The office of the collector is statutory.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. Is it not true also that the other offices which are abolished in plan No. 1 were provided for by statute, and could be abolished only by a new plan such as this?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is entirely incorrect, as I shall fully demonstrate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall fully demonstrate, after the Senator has concluded, that he is entirely incorrect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The distinguished Senator will try to demonstrate fully.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. After this discussion of plan 26, which the junior Senator from Colorado——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have not really commenced to discuss it yet. Perhaps the Senator had better wait.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Senator from Colorado will yield on my time for a moment, considering the statement he has already made with respect to plan 26, outlining its comprehensive nature, which embodied primarily a redistribution of functions, is it not true that everything which the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] said yesterday about plan No. 1 was a part of the loss, a part of the fear, and a part of the possibility under plan 26?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I cannot answer that because I was not present when the Senator from Georgia spoke. However, I shall demonstrate at length, and in detail, that under plan No. 26 every precaution could have been taken to prevent corruption and to assure efficiency.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Colorado that he can make that assumption. If we take the assumption as correct—and he says he will demonstrate that he is correct—the Senator from Minnesota says that everything the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] referred to yesterday as a fear, a possibility, and a danger under plan No. 1 as also a danger, a fear, and a possibility under the enacted plan No. 26, because the thesis of the Senator from Colorado is that it is possible to do anything that is necessary to be done under plan No. 26, which is already in effect.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is easy for the Senator from Minnesota to show an inconsistency in what the Senator from Georgia has said until he hears from the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota has heard him. He heard him yesterday.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Minnesota has never had any success in showing such an inconsistency after he has heard from the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota may not have such success in the eyes of some of his colleagues, but to an impartial and objective observer the RECORD yesterday will show that the fears of the Senator from Georgia and the points he raised yesterday were not buttressed by facts. If they were buttressed by facts, they would be arguments against every argument which the Senator from Colorado is making today.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The objective consideration which the Senator from Minnesota would give is an attribute which he attributes to himself, but which perhaps is not shared by others.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not say——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the support.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not say that the Senator from Minnesota is correct in attributing objectivity to himself.

Mr. President, from now on the time is my own. What preceded is, under his agreement, charged to the time of the Senator from Minnesota.

Out of general law they could have suspended or dismissed summarily anyone who did not obey.

They could have taken from any collector of internal revenue any of his functions.

They could have transferred all or any of those functions to the deputy collectors—who are under civil service—or to any other employee having civil-service status if that is the way they really want it.

They could have set up any desired operational practices.

They could have set up district offices and district officials and could have managed and controlled them by setting up their own standards, qualifications, operational practice, inspection, and supervision.

They could have streamlined, integrated, charted, graphed, and controlled to their heart's content the whole system of revenue collection under the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield again on my time?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; on the Senator's own time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The Senator from Georgia stated yesterday that one of the major weaknesses of plan No. 1 was that it permitted the consolidation of auditing and collection. The Senator from Colorado has just stated that under plan 26 it would have been possible to streamline, integrate, chart, and graph as much as one desired.

Mr. President, I submit that the argument which the Senator from Colorado is making should have been made at the time plan No. 26 was discussed, if I am to believe the argument of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The purpose of the plan——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me? I shall be glad to relieve the distinguished Senator from Minnesota from any obligation to accept anything I have said.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's comment. I am quoting from the RECORD. The Senator from Georgia said that one of the dangers of plan No. 1 was the consolidation of auditing and collection. I pointed out that that was not one of the dangers. The Senator from Colorado now says that all of it could have been done under plan No. 26.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, plan No. 26 did not mandate it. However, in my opinion, it could have come about under plan No. 26.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Colorado to read one line of plan No. 1 which mandates the consolidation of auditing and collection. If he does, I shall cease my argument. There is not one line in this plan that mandates it. The Senator from Colorado is double-talking. He is trying to point out that plan No. 26 had everything in it that plan No. 1 possesses except the political appointment of the collectors.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Minnesota has misunderstood my argument. I am talking about plan No. 26. I have not begun to talk about plan No. 1. I shall do so in due course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. When the Senator from Colorado has concluded his remarks on plan No. 26 I should like to have him tell me how it abolishes politically appointed collectors in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That will all be as clear as a bell, I assure the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That will be very interesting. It will be wonderful.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course I am always happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota on his own time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to state that it has been suggested at the desk that it is a little difficult to keep a record of the relative use of time when one Senator yields to another Senator on the other Senator's time. Which part of the debate is to be charged to the Senator from Minnesota, his questions or the answers of the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MILLIKIN. All the time that has been taken, for both the questions and the answers. This was at the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I am not taking any part of my time to answer questions of the Senator from Minnesota. If he wants an answer from me he must pay for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am always glad to pay for it. However, I am afraid that the commodity in this instance is not quite up to its estimated value. I should like to get a better quality.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have noted the tendency of the Senator from Minnesota to be a very bad shopper.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Colorado is selling some sort of moth-eaten baggage at this time, in terms of argument.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that there is no occasion for such exchanges.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, they could have streamlined, integrated, charted, graphed, and controlled to their hearts content the whole system of revenue collection under the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

They could have performed the substance of everything they say they intend to do if they get plan No. 1 now before us.

The most commendable and refreshing outbursts of frankness of Mr. Dunlap, lately appointed Commissioner of Internal Revenue, are my last witnesses for the point which I have been developing that the proposed plan before us is not necessary for stopping corruption or inefficiency in our revenue collection service.

At the hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, formerly the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on February 1, 1952, Commissioner Dunlap testified. The remarks which I shall now excerpt appear in the record of the hearings at page 130:

Senator DWORSHAK. Has the lack of efficient organizational structure been responsible for the fraud and maladministration exposed in the Bureau during the past few years?

Mr. DUNLAP. Not entirely, sir, but this plan envisions a much tighter organization, which would tend to decrease the areas within which those things can occur.

Continuing from page 130 of the hearings:

Senator DWORSHAK. Presumably because the commissioners and deputy commissioners would be under civil service?

May I have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DUNLAP. No, sir; because of the tightness and the closer supervision provided by this plan.

Senator DWORSHAK. But you still have the human element. You wouldn't necessarily eliminate the frailties of human nature.

Mr. DUNLAP. No, sir; but even with those same frailties of human nature, a man under close supervision isn't going to be quite as frail as one who isn't.

Senator SMITH. You think civil service will give them that close supervision?

Mr. DUNLAP. No; I think this plan will enable us to give it through the inspection service and the channel of command and the direct pin pointing of responsibility—that is what will give the closer supervision.

It is to be observed that Mr. Dunlap states that a tighter organization would tend to decrease the areas within which fraud and maladministration can occur.

We may well agree with this and as I have taken pains to demonstrate, the authority of plan 26 of 1950 is there now for achieving that tighter organization. That, you will remember, is what they said they were going to achieve under Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950.

Commissioner Dunlap said that a man under close supervision is not going to be quite as frail as one who is not.

And one may agree that this is correct. But as has been pointed out, all of the power that could be asked to set up close supervision has already been granted under Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950.

And then remember please, the question of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]:

Do you think civil service will give them that close supervision?

Mr. Dunlap replied:

No; I think this plan will enable us to give it through the inspection service and the channel of command and the direct pin pointing of responsibility—that is what will give the closer supervision.

Mr. President, it needs only to be repeated that the inspection service, the establishment of channels of command, and the direct pin pointing of responsibility are already authorized, in the clear language I have read to you, under plan 26 of 1950.

In fact, Commissioner Dunlap, according to his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee in another matter, has already, under authority of plan No. 26, set up teams of inspection. If those teams are not sufficient, others can be set up on the same basis of legal authority, to wit, under plan No. 26 of 1950.

The distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], with his usual skill and thoroughness, also riddled all pretenses for the need of plan No. 1, now before us.

Mr. President, because there is some duplication between the line of questioning by the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the line of questioning by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], I ask unanimous consent that the part of my manuscript which includes the examination by the Senator from California may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator NIXON. That is exactly my point, then; the primary purpose of this plan is not to deal with the so-called problem of corruption but to make the Bureau operate more efficiently; is that right?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is the primary purpose.

Senator NIXON. And that is in line with the chairman's remarks that it might well go to a legislative committee that deals with that problem.

Then the primary purpose is that, but a second purpose is to deal with the problem of corruption also; is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. I don't like to word it that way.

Senator NIXON. Well, the problem of handling, shall we say, dishonest practices when they occur; is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. I still don't like that wording.

Senator NIXON. Very well. You use your own wording.

Mr. DUNLAP. I would say that it is one of the purposes of the plan to establish and to maintain the machinery and the avenues for examination which would insure the proper conduct of the Government's business and the proper conduct of its employees.

Senator NIXON. Let me see if I understand you correctly, then: You feel that under this plan the Bureau would be able to deal more effectively than it can at present with the over-all problem of discovering instances of dishonesty and dealing with them effectively; is that a fair statement?

Mr. DUNLAP. What is right, as well as improving the efficiency of our people.

Senator NIXON. And the corollary of that, of course, would be that at the present time you do not feel that you can deal effectively with instances of dishonesty and corruption; is that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. No, sir; I would not say that.

Senator NIXON. Then why the plan?

Mr. DUNLAP. I say that we are dealing with it adequately and properly now.

Senator NIXON. Now, just a moment, then. As I understand it, then, this plan is not necessary for the purpose of dealing with the problem of corruption, because you say you are dealing with it effectively now; is that right?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is correct, sir, but the plan is necessary to give us a more efficient over-all organization with which to conduct the tax business of the Government.

Senator NIXON. Then the general public should not, under any circumstances, get the impression that this plan is directed primarily to the problem of dealing with corruption; isn't that correct?

Mr. DUNLAP. It is correct that the plan is not directed primarily to dealing with corruption.

Senator NIXON. Because you could handle it now and you are handling it now?

Mr. DUNLAP. That is right; we are handling it now.

Senator NIXON. In fact, do you know of any incident at any time, during any period at all, in which you were unable to deal with a problem of dishonesty when it arose in the Bureau, in the past, in which you could have dealt with it more effectively had this plan been in effect?

Mr. DUNLAP. We have always dealt with such problems adequately as soon as they were discovered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, to answer remaining unanswered contentions of Commissioner Dunlap, if any there be at this time, I shall read again the brief, clear, and decisive language of plan 26 of 1950:

SECTION 1. Transfer of functions to the Secretary: (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, and subject to the provisions of subsection (c) of this section, there are hereby transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury all functions of all other officers of the Department of

the Treasury and all functions of all agencies and employees of such Department.

Mr. President, I am quoting now. Plan 26 of 1950 provides not only for the mechanical setup, but for the performance:

SEC. 2. Performance of functions of Secretary: The Secretary of the Treasury may from time to time—

At any time he pleases—

make such provisions as he shall deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of the Treasury of any function of the Secretary, including any function transferred to the Secretary by the provisions of this reorganization plan.

Can anyone fail to see clearly the emaciated, mangy, and pathetic rabbit which they have scared out of the bush to divert the fire of the Congress and of the people from those who have not acted to eliminate the corruption and inefficiencies which they themselves had the power to eliminate or minimize and which they have allowed to remain unused.

Now as to civil service:

The plan before us would abolish 68 individual offices, would create a maximum of 99 new positions, and purports to place the latter under civil service.

Roughly speaking, there are two types of examinations for qualification under civil service—competitive and noncompetitive.

Competitive examinations are called "assembled" or "unassembled."

For assembled examinations, Civil Service sets up the standards, and the grading is done, and selection is made from the information secured from the application of the competitor and his answers to the written questions.

Sometimes, but not as a matter of routine, inspectors are sent out to check complaints against, or statements made by, the applicant.

The so-called assembled examination is usually applicable to positions in the lower pay scales. The jobs which would be created under the proposed plan before us would be in the higher pay brackets and, therefore, we are not now concerned with this particular type of examination.

Then there is the so-called unassembled examination. Most of the higher grade jobs are filled by this type of examination. The Commission sets up the standards, usually with the aid of the affected agency.

In practical effect it is a method of selecting persons for jobs where the application and written examination might not by themselves reveal the presence or absence of the special aptitudes desired, such as experience, judgment, courage, personality, tact, general administrative ability, or special talent desired for the particular position.

Since no type of examination ever devised will accurately measure qualities of the type mentioned, there is only one reasonably safe method of getting at it, and that is to study the applicant's actual experience, which is done under the unassembled type of examination.

It will be noted that the unassembled type of examination allows large leeway in drafting standards and qualifications that will fit a particular applicant, and large leeway for decision as to which applicant best meets the standards of qualification. This does not carry any implication of bad faith. It is well to keep in mind that it is sometimes very difficult to get exactly the right man for a particular job, and that with nothing but the best public interest in mind, it is entirely defensible for an agency to try to make it easier to bring into the service the person it feels is best qualified to do the job. But, of course, opportunities of that kind are not overlooked by those who are corrupt at heart.

In other words, without the slightest reflection on civil service or on anyone, conferring civil-service status on highly paid, especially desired talent, does not afford invariable assurance of competition or certain assurance of fair competition.

I suggest that probably there cannot be any other way in the public interest of conferring civil-service status on highly desired special talent. There will always be a narrow band of wrongdoing, and it is well to remember that we cannot legislate righteousness.

It will be noted that the proposed legislation before us does not require a strictly competitive examination, does not preclude the use of the so-called unassembled examinations. When the officials involved talk about competitive examinations, assuming for the purpose of debate a good-faith intention, they will find under practice, if they really want to get the best grade of talent into their organization, that they cannot place rigid and exclusive dependence upon strictly competitive procedures.

But there are other methods of filling positions under civil service without any semblance of competitive examinations. There is the right to promote those who have civil-service status and the right to reinstate those who have had it. There it is necessary only to meet the minimum standards which are set up for the particular position—as I have stated before, usually with the help of the affected agency.

There is still another method which frequently is used when highly paid, special talents are desired by an agency. Positions coming under civil service by the method which I shall now describe are referred to as "excepted."

The authority for filling these excepted positions without any examination comes from civil service rule VI, from which I shall read an excerpt:

SEC. 6.1. Positions excepted from the competitive service: (a) Because of their confidential or policy-determining character, or because it is not practicable to make appointments thereto through competitive examination, the positions named in schedules A (secs. 6.101–6.149) and B (secs. 6.201–6.216) shall be excepted from the competitive service. The Commission may, upon the request of an agency, determine that similar positions also should be excepted from the competitive service. Upon publication in the Federal Register of its determination excepting such positions from the competitive service, appointment thereafter may be made to such positions in the same manner as under schedules A and B. At the end of each fiscal year the Commission shall submit to the President for review a list of the positions which it has excepted from the competitive service under this section during such year.

Mr. President, you have noted that offices filled under rule VI are policy-making or confidential jobs or those where it is felt that competition is not practicable. In this area, the agency simply directs a request to the Civil Service Commission that it be allowed to fill a position, and if it makes a case coming within rule VI the agency is permitted to do so.

And, Mr. President, let me remind you again that assuming good faith, it may be in the best public interest to make appointments under this noncompetitive method in positions of this type.

As we observe these different ways of getting jobs under the civil-service system it should be kept in mind that we are talking about jobs such as the Assistant General Counsel of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the proposed district commissioners, and indeed, the proposed deputy district commissioners, all of whom, each in their own spheres, are policy-making and confidential.

A promise that every position will be filled by competitive examination is most profligate and in practice will not be carried out. For example, here are the duties of the chief counsel who is actually designated as assistant general counsel of the Treasury for the Bureau. I shall read from page 57 of the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue for 1950, where he describes the duties of that office. Mr. President, note the duties of this office, in relation to statements that "we intend to have a fully competitive examination for all these people." Note these qualifications. I read:

The Office of the Chief Counsel furnishes legal advice to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and to the administrative units of the Bureau. It renders legal opinions, written or oral, for the guidance of officers and employees of the Bureau, arising in the administration of such laws as they are called upon to administer. The activities of the office include the preparation or review of material for publication, regulations, Treasury decisions, and other rulings connected with such laws; the making of recommendations for advisable changes in the laws administered by the Bureau of Internal Revenue; the review of all closing agreements; the supervision and control of the defense of petitions to the Tax Court of the United States, and the determination whether to acquiesce in the decision of the Tax Court or to recommend appeal; to decide what suits should be brought in the courts under the laws administered by the Bureau of Internal Revenue; to decide what cases should be prosecuted in the criminal courts; to decide how suits brought in the courts against the United States or Government officials under said laws should be handled; to decide what court decisions should be appealed to higher courts; and in all court actions to make appropriate recommendations to the Department of Justice concerning same. The office is charged with the review of all cases in which it is proposed to abate, refund, or credit taxes, interest and/or penalties amounting in the case of any one person to $200,000 or over, and to prepare the required

reports to the Joint Congressional Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; the supervision of the action on claims for reward under section 3792 of the Internal Revenue Code; and the performance of the functions prescribed for the General Counsel by section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code in connection with offers in compromise. The office is made up of eight divisions—viz, Alcohol Tax, Appeals, Civil, Claims, Interpretative, Legislation and Regulations, Penal, and Review—the Chief Counsel's Committee and the Engineers and Auditors Sections. A detailed statement, in statistical form, of the work handled by certain of the divisions will be found in the statistical tables in the Appendix under the heading "Office of Chief Counsel."

It is apparent that this is one of the most important jobs in the United States Government. It involves both policy-making and confidence. If the job is to be well served, it requires a host of aptitudes which cannot be measured by a slide rule or a test tube.

Would anyone contend that it is certain to serve the public interest, using this position merely as an example, that it must always be filled by truly competitive civil-service examinations?

We may fairly conclude that the proposal before us may in practice turn out simply to authorize a transfer of Presidential and senatorial patronage to bureaucratic patronage, or to exclusive Presidential patronage.

I have read from the testimony of Commissioner Dunlap before the Committee on Government Operations to show the repeated admissions that civil service will not cure corruption.

Why does Commissioner Dunlap frankly admit that putting these jobs under civil service will not be an effective deterrent to corruption?

The Commissioner did not elaborate but the reason is obvious. Civil service can apply its flexible standards ranging from a strict competitive basis to complete freedom from competition.

Civil service in a limited number of cases can keep an employee from being arbitrarily fired by an agency. Cases of this kind are where the person sought to be fired alleges that the reason is racial or religious discrimination or political bias or where there is special protection because the employee is a veteran.

But here is the gist of the thing so far as corruption or inefficiency are concerned.

Civil service has its flexible methods for putting persons into office and in instances of the kind mentioned to prevent them from being put out of office. But let me double underscore this. Civil service makes no attempt to keep the employee straight or efficient while he is in his job. That is when he becomes inefficient, and that is when he becomes corrupt.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Of course—on the time of the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield enough of our time for that purpose. Would the junior Senator from Colorado wish the Senate to understand that the civil service is any impediment whatever in the way of an immediate discharge for dishonesty or lack of integrity?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me answer that question by saying that for dishonesty or lack of integrity an employee may be dismissed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Immediately?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If the Senator is referring to a collector, the President has power to do that summarily——

Mr. MONRONEY. Ah.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Independent of civil service.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. But will the Senator cite one single case under any previous administration, in the past 40 years, where a collector has been dismissed by the President of the United States?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator cite me one case where he has been dismissed under civil service?

Mr. MONRONEY. There has been none under civil service? In the past year, immediately and without any delay whatever, there have been dismissed 147 civil-service workers out of 57,000 who are employed in the Internal Revenue Bureau. I suggest if the Senator from Colorado is going to apply the political-patronage test against a civil-service test, that he should look at the box score.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have said that civil service may have an influence in putting a man into a job. It may have influence in seeing that he is not taken out of it unfairly.

Mr. MONRONEY. Or arbitrarily.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let no one misunderstand the point to which I am now addressing myself. My point is that the civil service does not exercise inspection or supervision to see that an employee keeps straight and honest while he is on the job.

Mr. MONRONEY. One of the principal purposes of Reorganization Plan No. 1 is to improve the inspection service which now is a hodgepodge and a mess, so far as concerns the lines of authority to do the things which should be done.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will say to the distinguished Senator that there is nothing in plan 1 that instructs the Civil Service Commission what to do about its own service, and there is nothing in the plan that instructs the Civil Service Commission to maintain inspection or supervision. But, I stated that there is authority for the agency to maintain inspection or supervision in Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Senator will admit that with the improved inspection service provided under plan No. 1, with the collectors no longer the favored sons of a State-wide political organization or the recipients of appointments at the hands of one or two United States Senators, it will be a great deal easier to fire a civil servant than it would have been under the old system.

Mr. MILLIKIN. But there is no problem whatever about firing or suspending an employee who is corrupt. That can now be done. Giving new authority to the civil service is not in plan No. 1. The inspection teams that have been lately set up and are now operating and that can be expanded if it be desired to do so, are under Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Senator knows that the inspection system is improved under Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I challenge that statement head-on. There is not one scintilla of evidence to show that it would be improved under Reorganization Plan No. 1, when all the authority for inspection and supervision already exists and is being used under Reorganization Plan No. 26. What does plan No. 1 add to it?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. On the Senator's time.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not a fact that the nub of this whole matter is whether the collectors of internal revenue are appointed on a political basis or on a civil-service-merit basis? Is not all the rest of the oratory completely off the point?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have just been discussing how collectors and the other officers contemplated might be appointed. Has the Senator been present and listening?

Mr. MOODY. Yes; but the Senator from Colorado has not made his point.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado further yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator has attempted to make the point that because there might be an unassembled examination it would not be competitive.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I said "excepted" positions are noncompetitive. That means no competitive examination at all. I read rule 6 of the Civil Service Commission to sustain my contention.

Mr. MONRONEY. They have civil-service status. Any person not having career status will have to take a competitive examination. It would seem that an unassembled examination in which 50 or 100 persons are carefully examined for their qualifications can be just as competitive as would be the answering of questions on a written examination.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator's statement overlooks two points. One is that a competitive examination is not necessary to fill all civil-service positions. There can be assembled and unassembled examinations, and there can be appointment with no examination whatever. I read rule 6 of the Civil Service Commission to sustain my contention.

Mr. MONRONEY. The only exception that would be possible would be in the case of those who now have civil-service status.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did not the Senator hear me read rule 6 of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MONRONEY. I did not hear the Senator read it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Let me read it again on the Senator's time. I shall be delighted to read it again, if I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

I am reading civil-service rule 6 which deals with excepted employment:

Positions excepted from the competitive service. (a) Because of their confidential or policy-determining character, or because it is not practicable to make appointments thereto through competitive examination, the positions named in schedules A (secs. 6.101–6.149) and B (secs. 6.201–6.216) shall be excepted from the competitive service. The Commission may, upon the request of an agency determine that similar positions also should be excepted from the competitive service. Upon publication of the Federal Register—

And so forth.

Does not the Senator agree that there is civil-service authority to employ personnel without giving them competitive examinations? Does not the Senator agree?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is talking about a highly specialized job that may be open. He does not expect the Members of the Senate to believe, after the testimony by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Treasury, and the Civil Service Commission, that collectors will be appointed without reference to civil service.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Still on the Senator's time, let me say that I have no confidence whatever as to what will happen in the future, under this plan. But, passing that, I suggest that the Senator read the language of the law, not plans with which it is intended to implement the law. Please read the law and spell out where it refers to competitive examinations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Gladly; all on the time of the other side.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Colorado has just read a ruling of the Civil Service Commission; is that correct?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are not the rules of the Civil Service Commission promulgated by that Commission?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Are not those rules subject to change?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; but there is nothing in plan No. 1 that requires a change.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is very emphatic. Apparently he feels that if the Civil Service Commission says something, that is what it means. He has been reading rule 6. Now, listen to what the chairman of the Civil Service Commission had to say.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did he announce a rule, or did he just talk?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Listen to what he said.

Mr. MILLIKIN. He enunciated no rule, but just talked.

Mr. HUMPHREY. At page 60 of the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 Mr. Ramspeck said:

When the new jobs have been classified and the examination requirements set, open competitive examinations will be announced for the district commissioner jobs and any other key positions that are to be filled, I believe a total of about 90.

I now ask the Senator from Colorado, in view of the testimony of Commissioner Ramspeck, who is a former Member of the House of Representatives, and is the present Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, whether the Senator has one scintilla of evidence to show to the Senate today whether Mr. Ramspeck was lying or whether he was telling the truth.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What the Senator has read purports to be no more than a statement by the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. The Senator would not contend that the Chairman is the Commission. I challenge the Senator to read the language in the proposed law that requires that kind of an examination.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield further?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am sure the Senator will agree that rule 6 applies to every civil-service agency and department in the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I believe it does. That includes the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. MONRONEY. It applies to the Atomic Energy Commission and to all other agencies of the Government. If we can trust the Civil Service Commission—and I do not think the Senator is asking for a vote of no confidence in the Civil Service Commission—then we can expect it to make good on its testimony?

Mr. MILLIKIN. We have given the Treasury 2 years to make good on its testimony with respect to Plan 26 of 1950.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Noncompetitive, "excepted" positions under Civil Service Commission rules are nothing new. All attorneys and many other professional people come under that exception, and, if it is desired to obtain such people for the Government service, the chances are they will have to be obtained under that kind of an exception.

Mr. MONRONEY. I think the Senator is erecting a straw man.

Mr. MILLIKIN. My straw man is rule 6 of the Civil Service Commission. My straw man is the practice, resting on the fact that sometimes, in the best of good faith, special talent must be obtained. Such talent cannot always be obtained by strictly competitive examinations. Therefore, it is necessary in such instances to ask for "excepted" appointments. They have been asked for and have been granted.

Mr. MONRONEY. What the Senator has said, he has said in good faith. I take it he will assume that the Civil Service Commission will act in good faith.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Any agency can make requests. My discussion goes to the agency. The agency makes the request.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; but the Civil Service Commission must approve the request, or the exception is not granted, and the Senator now proposes to tell the Senate that the same Commission, which has heretofore acted in good faith, is not going to act in good faith under reorganization.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No, I have been scrupulously careful to cast no aspersions on the Civil Service Commission, and I do not do so. But remember, the agency, which is acquainted with what it needs, as a matter of practice draws up the qualification. The agency says, "This will be a confidential position. This man must possess certain talents which we do not believe we can get by competitive examination. It is not practical to hold a competitive examination." The agency makes that representation.

If the Senator is suggesting that I am giving, for all time to come, blanket endorsement to the good faith of every agency making a request of that kind, he is very much mistaken. I will not give that kind of blanket endorsement to any agency, even the agency immediately concerned in the issue which is before the Senate.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator, therefore, say, according to what he is telling the Senate now, that the Bureau of Internal Revenue can get an exception without approval of the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not even intimate anything of that kind.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, the Bureau cannot do so?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Did not the Senator hear me say that the agency makes the request, prescribes the qualifications, asks for the exception, and usually gets it?

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Civil Service Commission must grant the exception; and unless the Senator is impugning the intelligence and ability of the Civil Service Commission, he is stating as his position that there can be no exception given by the Civil Service Commission as to these jobs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Can we not have removed from the debate any thought that I am impugning the intelligence, patriotism, or good intentions of the Civil Service Commission? How many times does the Senator wish me to say so? I have now a reservation, and I intend to continue to entertain the reservation as to the possible future good faith of agencies which may ask for excepted positions.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the intention of the agency is futile and of no account whatsoever unless the Civil Service Commission approves it. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct, and usually the excepted positions are based on the showings that are made by the agencies to the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield, but on the time of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Is not the Senator from Colorado actually contending that this is not a plan to place collectors of internal revenue under civil service?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am contending that it cannot be proved that it is intended to place them under civil service. It is not in the proposed law.

Mr. MOODY. If the Senator will permit me to say so——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Will the Senator join with me in that statement? Will he produce any words in the proposed law which says these positions are to be filled

by competitive examination? Will the Senator do that?

Mr. MOODY. As the Senator from Oklahoma has just said, unless one desires to impugn the integrity of the Civil Service Commission, then this plan definitely does place collectorships under the civil service.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The RECORD will show whatever impugning I have done, and the RECORD will also show that neither the distinguished Senator from Michigan nor any of the other distinguished Senators who have engaged in debate with me have pointed out anything in the proposed law which provides that these positions shall be filled exclusively by competitive civil service examinations.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator from Oklahoma has just outlined——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator from Michigan join with me in that statement?

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator from Oklahoma join issue with me on that? Let him read it, if it is in the proposed law.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator well knows that one exception is for men who are already in the civil service.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Those in the civil service can be promoted without examination. Outsiders who have had civil service status can be brought in without examination. Yes, that is in the law.

Mr. MONRONEY. Only if they qualify under the specifications written by the Civil Service Commission. That is the point.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The qualifications are suggested to the Civil Service Commission by the agency, which alone knows what the qualification should be.

Mr. MONRONEY. The testimony before the committee by Chairman Ramspeck was that the Civil Service Commission would write the job specifications, and appointees must measure up to the qualifications set by the civil service. I repeat, what the Senator from Colorado is trying to do is to persuade the Senate to believe that we cannot trust the Civil Service Commission to perform its functions in this one little agency, although we trust it with agencies having to do with atomic energy and national defense, and every other agency.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If that statement did not come from the mouth of a high grade man I would say it was pure tub-thumping in view of what I have said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to remind the Senator from Minnesota that 17 minutes of his time has been taken in the colloquy. The Senator from Colorado has 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. No time of mine has been taken in the colloquy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 5 minutes.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, let me read what section 3 of the plan provides:

> Each Assistant Commissioner and District Commissioner, the Assistant General Counsel, and each other officer provided for in section 2 of this reorganization plan shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury under the classified civil service—

And so forth.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Where does it say "by competitive examination"? Does it say that? Cannot the Senator answer a question directly? Does it say it, or does it not?

Mr. MOODY. If the Senator cannot answer directly, why should I?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then why does not the Senator sit down and permit me to proceed in my own time?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that in the hearings Commissioner Dunlap admitted that already, under existing statutes, he had full authority to deal with corrupt actions in his Bureau?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The Senator from Idaho is correct. It has been repeatedly admitted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the Senator's own time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think we should keep the record straight. I believe there is nothing in the reorganization plan which sets up a merit system. The Senator is correct when he says there is nothing within the plan which says "under competitive examination." However, I remind the Senator that in the Classified Civil Service Act there are provisions for competitive civil service examinations, as well as noncompetitive.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I remind the Senator that the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, three top officers of the Government, have testified before a committee of the Congress, have placed their reputations before the people of this Nation, and have placed their whole professional standing before the entire American public on the basis that there would be competitive examinations for the positions we are discussing.

I ask the Senator, what evidence does he have which would negative these statements of honorable men, trusted public servants who have given faithful service to their Government? In my opinion the Senator is making a mountain out of a molehill, and he is refusing to recognize the mountain of abuse which is within the internal revenue system today incident to the political appointment of collectors, political collectors, who cannot be supervised and who are not supervised, according to testimony before the King committee. I ask the Senator from Colorado to look at that testimony. The King committee of the House of Representatives said in clear and unmistakable terms that the inspection service in the case of politically appointed collectors was literally an impossibility. Yet I hear the Senator from Colorado asking that we maintain the same political system. It simply does not make sense to me.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, is the Senator ready for me to say something?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I am ready.

Mr. MILLIKIN First, I cannot accept the Senator's thesis that the Senator from Colorado is making a mountain out a molehill.

The Senator asks, How can we face the declarations of the officials of the Civil Service Commission and not accept them? I suggest that whenever the time comes when the agencies cannot fill those jobs under competitive civil service, they will ask for excepted, noncompetitive appointments. Such exceptions have been granted in the past.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us assume that the Senator is correct, and that there is a possibility that such a contingency might occur. I think we ought to open these questions up before the public. If such a contingency should occur, and the positions could not be filled through competitive examination, and because of the high qualifications which are prescribed persons would have to be recruited to fill the positions, does the Senator tell us that it would be better to have the Democratic or Republican national committeemen make recommendations? Does he believe that it would be better to have Senators or Representatives making recommendations, or does he believe that it would be better to recruit such workers on the basis of their technical ability and background? That is the whole issue. Does the Senator want to recruit them through civil service, or through a political machine? That is the question.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have pointed out to the Senator—and I see no need to continue to repeat it—that in the enforcement of this law, or any other law, under which the Secretary of the Treasury may operate, special talents may be required. Special qualifications may be prescribed, which require an exception. The reason for the exception is that the experience of the Government has shown that there should be exceptions in certain cases. If we place the agency in a strait-jacket, so that it cannot ask for an exception in any case, we may be rendering a very severe disservice to good government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Senator to answer my question. Does he believe, in the instances in which it is not possible, through competitive examination, to obtain someone to fill a position that it is better to rely upon the agency and the Civil Service Commission, which have public service at heart, and not political service? Or does he believe that it is better to rely on the present system, which is one of political patronage, and which has been brought into disrepute? I cannot understand how anyone today can defend a political-patronage system which has been brought out into the open and which has been shown to have failed in its public trust. Seven collectors of internal revenue——

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have been defending the civil service. I have pointed out reasons why there may be sound justification for preserving the principle of noncompetitive exceptions. The Senator has put his question specifically. He has asked whether I would like to see appointment made by the national committeemen of the parties. My answer to that is no. Neither do I want the President to make them; and I do not want them to be made by any of his political bureaucrats.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Obviously, someone must make the appointments. They will not be made by act of God, or by divine writ. Some earthly creatures must make the appointments. Does the Senator want those earthly creatures to be a political organization, or the Civil Service Commission and the established agency of Government? The Senator cannot duck the question. The question is simply put. Does the Senator want the appointments to be made on the basis of politics, or does he want them to be made on the basis of merit and competition?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I have said that I prefer that they be made on the basis of civil service. I am pointing out some of the hazards of civil service, when the administration of the agencies is entrusted to those who already have had the power to clean up and to establish efficiency, and who have not used the instruments which we have given them to perform that task.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator knows, because he is a wise, good, and true man, that until we abolish the position of collector of internal revenue, as provided for by statute, the position being a political appointment, we cannot apply the civil-service procedure. The Senator knows that to be so. I ask my good friend, the Senator from Colorado, who is respected as one of the finest Members of this body or any other body, to come clean on this issue. What does the Senator want? Does he want political appointments, or does he want the best we can get through the civil service?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is entirely agreeable to me that the collectors be placed under civil service. Number 1——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Plan No. 1——

Mr. MILLIKIN. Wait a moment. Plan No. 1 disregards the Hoover Commission, which did not recommend abolition of the office. The plan would abolish the State level of collector. The Hoover Commission did not recommend that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has shifted his scenery.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I am not shifting my scenery. The Senator is shifting Mr. Hoover's scenery.

Inspection and supervision of the employee on the job is the responsibility of the agency.

Commissioner Dunlap has said that inspection and close supervision are the keys to the elimination of corruption. I believe that we will all agree that this is obvious. But since civil service has no inspection or supervisory powers over the actual operation of the job under civil-service status, civil-service status can have no relationship to corruption or inefficiency while the man is on the job.

Again, I emphasize, that the elimination of the inefficient and the corrupt is the job of the agency.

I present these facts which you may find interesting.

The deputy collectors are all under civil service and several million other employees are under civil service, taking the Government as a whole. In the Bureau of Internal Revenue there are over 57,000 civil-service employees. Clearly, the President could limit his appointments of collectors exclusively to those who are already in the service. There are 17 collectors who already have civil-service status.

A while ago it was pointed out that if the proposed jobs are not filled out of the "excepted" category, they will probably be filled by "unassembled" examination which you will recall means that past experience will be the principal determining factor in making the choices.

And who, my colleagues, are those who will fare best under that kind of a system? Obviously it will be the collectors who are already in office. Except where they are completely inept they will have an overwhelming advantage over citizens who have had no experience with the rules, regulations, laws, and procedures affecting the collection of our revenues.

We have seen from our analysis of plan 26 of 1950 that the Secretary of the Treasury already has the power to set up any kind of a supervisory and inspection force and indeed under existing authority of plan 26 of 1950, he has made a start at doing this.

We have seen that under plan 26 of 1950 the Secretary of the Treasury has complete jurisdiction over all functions in the revenue collection service. Therefore, he could set forth his own standards for the performance of those functions. And, as has been noted, he can set up inspection and supervision to see that his standards are met in practice.

Under existing general authority the President can fire summarily any wrongdoer in the revenue collection service.

The Secretary of the Treasury can suspend any suspected wrongdoer.

The Secretary of the Treasury under plan 26 of 1950 can transfer functions around in any way that he sees fit and to any persons in the service.

I respectfully suggest that it has now been demonstrated that the proposed plan is unnecessary and can have no purpose except to divert attention from the derelictions of those who already have the power and authority to establish an efficient and honest revenue collection service.

Indeed, this could have been done 2 years ago without any further legislation, could have been done yesterday and can be done tomorrow without any additional legislation.

Our message to the President and the Secretary of the Treasury should be, use the power you already have to get rid of corruption and inefficiency and out of that experience if there are any gaps which need to be filled, then come to the Congress and ask for it and not before.

Mr. President, we have been told that opposition to the reorganization plan before us does not accord with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

So I invite attention to the fact that, under the proposed plan, there will be nonuse or abandonment of five of the most important features of the Hoover Commission's recommendations.

In the first place, the Hoover Commission recommended that the Bureau of Customs and the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be consolidated. There is nothing in the proposed plan to cover this.

Second, the Hoover Commission proposed that the head of the new Revenue Bureau should be raised to the rank of Assistant Secretary thus affording him immediate access to the Secretary of the Treasury without danger of improper interference at secondary levels. The proposed plan does not cover this recommendation.

Third, the Hoover Commission recommended that the Assistant Secretary in charge of the revenue agency should be responsible both for tax administration and for determination of tax policy so that each could be made consistent with the other. The proposed plan does not contain any provision for carrying out that recommendation.

Fourth, although the Hoover Commission did recommend that the post of collector should be brought under civil service, it did not recommend the abolition of the position. The proposed plan before us proposes to abolish the position altogether. The Hoover Commission wanted to keep that office at the State level, where I think it should be kept.

Fifth, the Hoover Commission proposed that the chief law officer for the Bureau should be immediately responsible to the Commissioner and not in any way subservient to the general counsel for the Department of the Treasury. The plan before us makes no provision for carrying out the recommendation.

As has been said so many times, all authority for organizational streamlining, for all functional corrections, for supervision, for inspection, for maintaining high standards of honesty and efficiency, which are paraded as the reasons for adopting the proposed plan, were already granted to the Secretary of the Treasury under plan 26 of 1950.

And plan No. 1, before us, does not supply the omissions from the Hoover Commission's recommendations.

And so by our approval of the proposed plan, which will be taken as approval of the accompanying intended implementing plans, we are abandoning five important features of the Hoover Commission's recommendations.

We are destroying the intended integration of the whole Hoover plan for reorganization of the Treasury Department.

Those of your constituents who are fundamentalists so far as the Hoover plan is concerned, who condemn every departure from it, will not like the omissions to which I have referred, and will not like action which implies the approval of those omissions.

If there should be any criticism that we have not supported the Hoover Commission's recommendations we can say to our constituents that we do not feel like granting additional authority to the very persons who have neglected that which has already been granted pursuant to Hoover Commission recommendations; that we believe that when the responsible officials have made a fair trial of the authority already granted, have used the instruments we have already

put into their hands, complying, as far as they went, with Hoover Commission recommendations for the elimination of inefficiency and waste, that then we will welcome further requests for additional legislation on the demonstration of its need.

We may also say to our constituents that we resent using the Hoover Commission's prestige as a cloak to cover derelictions which would not have occurred had the Hoover recommendations already in force been put into effect, and to use the Hoover Commission's recommendations as a front for abandoning them.

We may add in our discussions with our constituents that we have not heard from the task force of the Hoover Commission that did the original job and made the additional recommendations; that we are of the opinion that had the task force which was not then confronted with questions of corruption, been assigned to make a restudy of the situation in the light of present facts, it would never have dreamed of asking for additional grant of authority to those who have neglected and abused that which they already have and who propose to scuttle five of the important recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, if we strip from this issue the violent adjectives, thin excuses, oft-repeated technicalities, and fallacious sophistry, what do we find? We find that we of the Senate are about to stand up and be counted on the fundamental issue of honesty and efficiency in Government.

I will be mighty curious about the count, for corruption in Government has come to be ranked with Mark Twain's weather: Everybody talks about it, but no one ever does anything about it.

Here, at long last, is an opportunity to do something about it. For the first time, in this session, the whole Senate has an opportunity to act.

The vote will be a test of whether we are here to seek virtue, or only to praise it.

The matter before us is the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, providing for reorganizations in the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Its draft is based on years of study of the problem. It was sent to Congress only because Congress itself had failed to enact original legislation designed to take the Internal Revenue Bureau out of politics and modernize the system of tax processing.

That the Bureau's basic organizational pattern is defective was recognized as long ago as 1926, in the report of the investigation of the Couzens committee, headed by a great Senator from my State of Michigan, James Couzens.

The result of that study, as you know, was the establishment of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. This was a good move in itself, but it was external to the Bureau.

The time is long since past when the Bureau itself should be taken out of politics.

The plan is simplicity itself; yet its achievements would be immeasurable. It is designed to achieve six major objectives:

First. To protect against privilege and corruption by freeing the tax-collection function from the burden of local political obligation and putting it in the hands of nonpolitical career employees selected under the merit system.

I should like to have any Senator tell me what is the matter with that proposal.

Second. To streamline administration by providing clear lines of authority from top to bottom and pin-pointing responsibility—by placing a premium upon honesty and efficiency.

Third. To effect economies through centralization of processing and filing, consolidation of functions, and increased mechanization.

Fourth. To improve the services to the taxpayer by providing a single responsible office to which he need go to transact his tax business.

Fifth. To improve the inspection service by making it directly responsible to the Commissioner and independent of the rest of the Bureau at every level.

Sixth. To foster public confidence in our voluntary-assessment tax-collection system by providing the system with an improved organization, staffed by career civil servants of unquestioned integrity and technical skill.

That, in brief, is what this plan can accomplish. We can have better government, more honest government, at less cost to the taxpayers.

Is there any question that the people of this country want this plan adopted?

The Gallup poll of January 22 reported that 69 percent of those polled favor taking the Internal Revenue Bureau out of politics. Only 5 percent were opposed.

Now, what possible objection could there be to this reorganization proposal?

I have received several telegrams from businessmen in my State asking that I vote down the plan. Frankly, I am at a loss to understand this demand. They give no reasons; and I cannot supply them.

However, some objections—none of them tenable—have been raised on the floor of the Senate by distinguished Senators for whom I have the highest personal respect. I should like to address myself to them for a few minutes.

It has been said that 60 days is too little time to permit a thorough study of this Executive proposal. I submit that hearings have been exhaustive, the plan is simple and easily understood, and that actually the general proposal has been before this deliberative body for approximately 6 years. Why should we stall for months to decide the question of whether we do or do not want to take politics out of the Internal Revenue Bureau?

It has been said that corruption is not involved at this time; that only efficiency is at issue, and therefore the reorganization plan can wait. I submit that efficiency cannot wait—when a simple, easy method of achieving efficiency is ours for the taking.

It has been urged that the Congress wait a little longer and take up broader, more inclusive governmental reorganization proposals.

Now, Mr. President, I have the honor to be a cosponsor with Senators MONRONEY, SPARKMAN, and SMATHERS of the so-called clean Government bill of 1952, which provides for a blue ribbon civil service in the Internal Revenue Bureau, and calls for many reforms in the conduct of the people's business.

I hope this bill is given early and favorable consideration by this Congress. But I am conscious of the delays which any legislation may encounter, and so I fight for adoption of this Executive proposal as an immediate thing.

An executive reorganization bird in the hand is worth two legislative birds in the bush.

Now, it has been said on the floor of the Senate that Reorganization Plan No. 1 is not compatible with the recommendations of the so-called Hoover report.

This simply is not so.

In fact, there is ample overwhelming expert testimony to the contrary.

Robert L. L. McCormick, director of research of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, testified before the House Expenditures Committee on this plan. He said:

> The citizens committee recognizes Reorganization Plan No. 1 as a major step toward efficiency and economy in the Federal Government. We support it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so that the RECORD may be documented at this point?

Mr. MOODY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of the Hoover Commission Report on the Department of the Treasury dated in March 1949. It is its report to Congress.

Under the subhead entitled "Over-all Departmental Management," we read:

> In our first report we urged that good departmental administration requires that the Secretary have authority from the Congress to organize and control his organization, and that independent authority should not be granted directly to subordinates.

Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from Michigan that this part of the recommendation was accomplished by the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 26, which dealt with the functions of the Department of the Treasury. Is that correct?

Mr. MOODY. That is correct. However, plan No. 1 deals with the political situation. Do we want to have collectors appointed through politics or do we want them to be appointed on the merit system? When we get right down to the facts and strip away the oratory, that is the simple issue before the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. MOODY. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am glad the Senator from Michigan brought out that point. On page 17 of the Hoover Commission Report on the Department of the Treasury I find a statement which I de-

sire to quote. I may say, incidentally, to my absent protagonists that we are not talking about the task force. We are not talking about the hirelings or the hired hands, who went forth and did the spade work. We are talking about the Hoover Commission, which made the ultimate policy decisions based on those reports.

Mr. MOODY. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We have heard a great deal about the task force. I want to make it perfectly clear that Congress has never adopted any report based on all the recommendations of the task force. The Senator from Colorado is not really doing the record much constructive good when he says that there are things in this plan which are not in the task force reports.

The task force consisted of the clerks and specialists who dug up the facts and gathered the information for the Commission. This is what the Commission says, at page 17 of the Report on the Treasury Department:

> One of the chief handicaps to effective organization of the Department is the political appointment of collectors of internal revenue and of customs, and certain other officials. These appointments are regarded by some as sinecures. In any event, they form a bar to orderly development of an experienced staff.

I ask all the doubters how the words of the Hoover Commission line up with this plan, particularly recommendation No. 7, in which the Commission recommends that career-service appointments be made instead of political appointments. I also ask that question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Of course, the Hoover Commission in its outline states exactly the principle that we are advocating here today. I marvel at the fast footwork and the mental agility of the opponents of this plan in getting around the point of this issue. But they refuse to meet the issue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield again to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. MOODY. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Michigan will recall that a number of reorganization plans have already been before the Congress; I believe there have been approximately 30. It has been my privilege to vote for every one of these 30 reorganization plans.

I ask the Senator whether in his study of those plans he has found it true that each of those plans omitted certain portions of the Hoover Commission's report dealing with the same subject matter.

Mr. MOODY. Of course.

Mr. HUMPHREY. However, does not the Senator agree that in each case the basic part of the Hoover Commission's report was included in the plan?

Mr. MOODY. Yes.

Mr. President, I do not believe anyone would seriously contend that Congress should become a complete rubber stamp for the Hoover Commission or for any other group or for any person.

When this plan was drafted, those who drafted it had the benefit not only of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, but also of the recommendations of the Paget report, which was referred to here yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and also the benefit of other recommendations. This plan is a compilation of their best judgment regarding what sort of reorganization would best serve the people and would take the Bureau of Internal Revenue out of politics.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further to me?

Mr. MOODY. I yield, gladly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am somewhat amazed by the arguments made against the plan, particularly those submitted by the Senator from Colorado, namely, that some portions of the Hoover Commission's recommendations are not included in this plan. On the basis of that reasoning, the Senator from Colorado never would use soap, because the purest soap in the world is Ivory, which is only 99.44 percent pure. However, the Senator from Colorado wants it to be 100 percent pure.

I submit that there never has been and never will be a plan or a proposal not subject to some improvement. However, that fact is no justification for refusing to adopt a good plan which in the future can be improved if improvements in it are found to be necessary.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not also true that in the case of the reorganization plans which have gone into effect with the approval of Congress—and there have been many of them—the same arguments which have been advanced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations and by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee could have been raised against every one of them, namely, that the whole idea of the reorganization proposals was that Congress would have the right of veto?

Certainly the argument that Congress should or might be willing to legislate on this subject is of no force in the face of the over-all principle of Reorganization Plan No. 1 which incorporates the first proposal or recommendation under the Hoover Commission's program.

The means by which those who now oppose the reorganization plan could have avoided the necessity for it would have been to have acted at some time in 1948 or 1949 or 1950 or 1951 by passing of legislation on this subject.

However, now the reorganization plan is before the Senate, after having been approved by the House of Representatives. On Saturday the plan will become law, if the Senate approves it by rejecting the resolution of disapproval.

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] asks us now to wait on his committee, while his committee holds hearings and takes 3, 4, or 5 weeks to write a bill on this subject, with the bill thereafter to be placed on the calendar, and later debated and possibly passed; and thereafter the entire procedure in the House of Representatives would have to be followed.

However, the question now before us is whether we want reform. If we want reform, now is the time to get it.

Mr. MOODY. Exactly. After all, if we vote today for the resolution of disapproval, and thus against the plan, how do we have any assurance at all that those who now oppose the plan would not find some excuse to vote against a future bill which might be drafted for the purpose of taking politics out of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, even though the bill might be drafted by the wisest of committees?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is entirely correct.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Pursuing the same thought, is it not also true that the defects which may be found in this reorganization plan can be corrected, even at this session of Congress, by means of a separate bill?

Mr. MOODY. That is true. It would take much less time, it seems to me, to make minor changes in a plan which already was in effect, rather than to begin from scratch to draw up a new, complicated plan which would take many months to put into effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield once more to me?

Mr. MOODY. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to have one point clearly stated, because in the colloquy between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and myself, as a result of all the side issues which were discussed, sometimes we forgot the central theme.

Mr. MOODY. That is true. I wish the Senator from Colorado, who apparently has convinced himself had remained in the Chamber to be instructed by what the Senator from Minnesota is saying now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think the Senator from Colorado has become unconvinced; he has gone out to do some meditating on these problems. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOODY. I hope that is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The central thesis of the Senator from Colorado was that plan No. 26 provides everything that we need for the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. MOODY. Except for taking politics out of the Bureau.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; except for the one thing which the Hoover Commission recommends in its recommendation No. 7, namely, the removal of the politically appointed collectors, and the substitution of career civil servants.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator from Minnesota that there has been much well-deserved criticism of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and all of it has come

as a result of the fact that in some of the collectors' offices in various parts of the country appointments were made of men who on their merit were not entitled to those jobs, and who have violated the trust which was placed in them. They were not appointed under the civil service. They were appointed by politics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further time to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes more.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I quote further from the statement made by Mr. McCormick, director of research for the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover report:

> In our opinion, the reorganization proposals and the plans for extending the merit system to include the collectors of internal revenue are fully consistent with the recommendations made by the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government over 2½ years ago.

Arthur Flemming, a member of the Hoover Commission and a former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, told the chairman of the House Ways and Means Subcommittee:

> This plan carries out the most important recommendation of the Hoover Commission.
>
> Adoption of the plan would enable the Government to apply sound principles of management to the operation of one of the most important bureaus.

A similar statement as to the consistency of this plan with the Hoover Commission's recommendations came from former President Herbert Hoover himself.

Could there possibly be better or higher authority for these conclusions?

Mr. President, other objections of lesser importance have been raised against this plan—all of them equally erroneous in concept and equally refutable by competent testimony.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that of the seven district collectors of internal revenue who have been suspended or forced to resign—three of them have been indicted, and I believe that two of them have been convicted—each of those seven was politically appointed?

Mr. MOODY. Yes; that is the point I made a moment ago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And they were 7 out of a total of 47. In other words, approximately one-seventh of the politically appointed collectors went sour; is that not true?

Mr. MOODY. That is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this time to permit me to amplify in regard to the box score?

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. There are 64 collectors of internal revenue. Seventeen of them have been promoted from the career service. Representative KING, who has carefully investigated this matter, says that no cause for complaint has been found in regard to them. Forty-seven of the collectors were strictly political appointees. Of those 47, 7 have been discharged for cause; and, as my distinguished colleague has said, 2 have been indicted and 1 has already been convicted.

So among that group, almost 15 percent—15 percent of the politically appointed collectors—have been discharged for cause.

Let me refer to another statistic, if the Senator from Michigan will yield further.

Mr. MOODY. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Out of the 57,000 career employees in the civil service, during 1951, 141 were discharged for cause. Those 141 constitute 0.0025 percent of the total number of career employees in the civil service. I submit that percentage is quite different from the percentage of those among the politically appointed group who were discharged for cause. In the latter case, 15 percent were discharged, or approximately one out of every seven.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield further, let me ask if it is not true that the civil-service employees who went sour were concentrated in congested districts such as New York, Brooklyn, St. Louis, and San Francisco, where the whole office was a cesspool of politics?

Mr. MOODY. That is right.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Illinois is eminently correct. Most of them were not genuine civil-service workers, but were political appointees who were operating under the guise of civil-service workers.

Mr. MOODY. And let me point out that that is precisely what Reorganization Plan No. 1 was drafted for, namely, to wipe out the possibility of having men of that type in position to handled the taxpayers' money.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. MOODY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New York, but I must yield only briefly, for my time is limited.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that if we apply to the civil service appointees the percentage figure in the case of the politically appointed collectors of internal revenue who have been discharged for cause, we find that, in the same proportion, instead of having 141 of the civil service appointees discharged—as has been the case—the number, in the same proportion as in the case of the politically appointed collectors, would be between 6,000 and 7,000.

Mr. MOODY. I believe that is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have part of my prepared remarks printed at this point in the RECORD, without reading, inasmuch as my time is growing short.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

FURTHER STATEMENT BY SENATOR MOODY

The question before the Senate boils down to one simple issue. Are we for efficiency and integrity in Government, or are we against it? How are we going to record our vote for public gaze?

This reorganization is sent to the Congress in line with the Reorganization Act by the Congress itself. If the President had failed to act, especially in this instance, he would have been subject to severe criticism. Had he acted months ago, some or all of the malpractice that has been uncovered in the Bureau in recent months would in all probability never have occurred. He should have acted more promptly. Now that he has acted, is the Senate going to block him?

Of all the thousands and thousands of employees in this Bureau chosen by the merit system, very few have been open to criticism. Those who did violate their public trust, in almost every instance, were creatures of the patronage system; they were men charged with handling public money, who had been chosen, not solely on basis of merit, but on a basis of politics.

I am of course casting no reflection on the many fine, honest men who have served and are serving as collectors of internal revenue in many of our communities, in pointing out that the danger of corruption is much greater when the head of an office carries the burden of political obligation for his appointment. That is the way it has worked out in practice. The tone of an entire office is set by the head of the office. When that head is dependent for his job on any other factor than the strict good of the service, where public money is involved, a laxity can seep down through the ranks—and unfortunately it has.

[From the Detroit Free Press of February 29, 1952]

HARD TO ANSWER

A bipartisan rebellion against President Truman's plan to revamp the Internal Revenue Bureau has broken out in the Senate.

Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, Democrat of Georgia, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, Republican of Colorado, the ranking Republican on the committee, are sponsoring a resolution to kill the President's proposal to reduce the number of collectorships from 64 to 25 and take them out of politics.

Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat of Arkansas, chairman of the Executive Expenditures Committee, supports another bill, which would cut down the number of collectors but would keep them on the patronage list instead of putting them under civil service.

The admission by President Truman that his reorganization plan lay on his desk until scandals in the tax-collecting service forced him to send it to Congress reveals a lack of ardor on his part for reforming tax collectors.

Yet now that he has acted, and the House has approved of his plan under the Hoover Commission set-up, the Senate, if it blocks this reform measure, will have a lot of explaining to its constituents to do.

What will their answer be if Mr. Truman proclaims at every whistle-stop: "I tried to make the Bureau corruption proof but the Senate wouldn't let me."

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I am curious to know why any Senator would wish to preserve the tax-collection agents of our Government as personal patronage? No Senator, I feel sure, would seek to use his influence with a personal appointee to

grant favor in a tax case. No Senator, I am confident, would want any appointee of his to be open to the pressures of political influence from others.

All right, then; why submit our collectors to such pressures? If we do not want our tax-collecting system to be a political system, why not take it out of politics? Here is our chance to do it. Why raise technical, off-the-point esoteric reasons against a plan which, while it may not be perfect, certainly constitutes a vast improvement in the present system, and certainly is long overdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield two more minutes to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield one additional minute to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute more.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I submit that the issue drawn here is very clear indeed: Is the Senate for the political system which has permitted malpractice to spread in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or does the Senate stand for reform and clean government?

Do Senators really favor the Hoover report or are they just talking when they tell their constituents they do?

Are they really for Government economy, or is it just a conversation piece?

Do they really want to remove corruption and the opportunity for corruption from this vulnerable Bureau, or, at least, do all they can to this end; or do some of them really want to leave the door open for corruption so they can continue to talk about it?

If there are some details that could be improved in this plan, then we can take legislative action to correct them and can do it rapidly, more rapidly, than to write an entire new plan. As I have stated, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and myself have introduced a bill providing the mechanism for clean government in other areas, including a blue-ribbon-type civil service for this Bureau.

Any changes that might be required in this plan could be achieved by amendments to that bill.

There is absolutely no good reason why this plan should be rejected, Senators, and every reason why it should be sustained. Let us not kid ourselves, and let us not try to kid the public.

Which do we want in the Bureau of Internal Revenue? Reform and the merit system? Or patronage politics and the spoils system, with its all too frequent ugly handmaiden, corruption?

Do we want a clean Bureau of Internal Revenue, or do we want a political bureau that makes a juicy morsel for conversation or attack?

Which do we desire, the shadow of corruption or the substance of reform?

This roll call will decide.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have no one who desires to speak at this time. I wonder whether the Senator from Arkansas has.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 27 minutes, the Senator from Minnesota, 26.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Since I have more time than the Senator from Minnesota, I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas, if he wants to discuss the question at issue.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Let us not waste time. I am happy to yield 10 minutes to the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, I shall take but a few moments to relate some of the experiences I have had with the Civil Service Commission. To begin with, I may say that my vote on this resolution will not be determined by any hope of patronage in connection with the office of collector. I was told by Mr. Dunlap a few days ago that the collector in North Carolina is one of the very top men in the Internal Revenue Bureau. He is a much younger man than I, and has been in that office now for about a year and a half. I am confident that he will continue his service in a most acceptable manner. I may say, too, Mr. President, that the history of the collectorships in North Carolina has been most acceptable. One of my predecessors, former Senator Simmons, was once the collector. Another of my predecessors, former Senator Josiah W. Bailey, was collector. I am very certain that in North Carolina we have not had, nor shall we have, any such rascality as that which has been disclosed in certain of the other collectors' offices in the United States. Therefore, anyone who suggests that I am taking my position because of the hope of patronage is himself guilty of making a statement of monstrous mendacity, because I have nothing at stake in this matter. But I do believe that we have come to a fundamental question of government; the question of whether the Congress is going to abdicate its functions, whittle away more and more the powers granted to it by the Constitution, and turn over to a bureau and a group of bureaucrats the administration of laws passed by the Congress without checks thereon. That question should be given serious attention by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I have had experience with the Civil Service Commission, and while I do not desire to impugn the motives or the honesty of any member of that Commission, I can stand here to say from my own personal experience that I cannot attribute to the Civil Service Commission all the virtues which some might attribute to its estimable members. While what I shall say relates to a fairly recent time, I must absolve the present Chairman of the Commission from any suggestion that he was in any way connected with the matters that I am about to mention. He was not then the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. I refer, of course, to Mr. Ramspeck. But I did have this personal experience, and I shall take but a few minutes to tell the Senate about it.

In 1946, as I recall the date, the Senate passed, without one dissenting vote, the so-called Administrative Procedure Act, and following the signing of that act by the President of the United States, upon the recommendation of the Attorney General of the United States, as I recall, the Civil Service Commission set up a group of consultants, supposed to have been composed of men who would be honest and efficient in apportioning the appointments of examiners to conduct hearings under that law. I desire to state the names of those who were members of that group, and also to state what happened to them.

The first was Justice Douglas Edmonds, of the Supreme Court of California. Another was Joseph W. Henderson, a former president of the American Bar Association, and a leading lawyer of Philadelphia. Other members of the group were Justice Laurence M. Hyde, of the Supreme Court of Missouri; Mr. Wilson M. Matthews, an examiner of the Civil Service Commission; and Mr. Carl McFarland, a former Assistant Attorney General of the United States and member of the Attorney General's Committee on Administrative Procedure, who was then a practicing attorney in Washington, D. C., and who is now president of the University of Montana; and the present junior Senator from North Carolina. In addition to those whom I have named, there were two other very distinguished American jurists, Chief Justice Carl V. Weygandt, of the Supreme Court of Ohio, and Justice John V. Spaulding, of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts.

Under the authority granted to that group of consultants, it determined and passed upon the qualifications of men who were to be appointed as trial examiners for the purpose of conducting hearings impartially, Mr. President, and nonpolitically. That is what we understood was to be the work of that group. Yet when an attempt was made to remove from office certain very incompetent employees, we met with objection. Such, for example, was the man who went to my State of North Carolina, as an examiner to conduct a hearing on behalf of one of the departments. He had been approved by the Civil Service Commission. When he arrived he did not like something that occurred in the hotel, got into a dispute, and made a spectacle of himself, and knocked everything off the hotel desk onto the floor. He said he had had a couple of beers when asked about his condition.

We, of course, challenged his right to represent the great Government of the United States, and we wanted to have him dismissed.

What did the Civil Service Commission do? Instead of dismissing him, they repudiated everything the group of consultants had done. They turned down a register of about 250 very fine men who wished to engage in public

service. Then one of the representatives of the Civil Service Commission called me in North Carolina on the telephone, to apologize to me, because I was the one Democrat in the crowd whom they did not wish to offend. There were several Republicans. My reply was that I had understood the civil service was supposed to be nonpolitical, was supposed to be fair and honest; and that I did not appreciate apologies from anyone for what had happened.

So, Mr. President, you may see, and the Senate may see, the activities of the Commission are not on a purely nonpolitical basis. As we know, there are the Civil Service Commissioners, who have been appointed by the President and, to be sure, confirmed by the Senate. We know that those Commissioners are politically appointed and politically minded. If anyone disbelieves that, let him look at the complection of the Commission today, and let him say whether he has ever heard of those people being in politics.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. If the Senator has any time, I will yield him his time.

Mr. MOODY. I am afraid I do not have any time.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Very well.

Mr. President, everyone who stops to think about it, must know that the Civil Service Commission is not as pure as the driven snow. I have no desire to impugn the Commissioners' motives; but I do say we ought not to relinquish one of the fundamental principles of this Government, the principle of checks and balances, and allow a bureau in Washington to be administered as that bureau may see fit without checks and balances. I know that is what is going to happen, and anyone who does not think so must really be a personification of naiveness.

In the instance to which I referred, what did the Commission do with those incompetents? It restored them to their jobs, or allowed them to remain on their jobs, and then threw overboard the suggestions and work of the group of men I have mentioned.

Mr. President, I may say further that, only last week, in the city of Washington, a great lawyer and a great judge, Chief Justice Bolitha J. Laws, rendered a judgment against the Civil Service Commission because of its attempted juggling of the appointment of hearing examiners. That suit was brought—and I believe the judgment has been printed in the RECORD—by some of the Federal examiners who did not believe that the Civil Service Commission should have the right to juggle them back and forth. And that was the decision of the court. I do not believe that any Senator who knows Justice Laws thinks of him as other than a highly intelligent and honest judge.

Something has been said during the debate, Mr. President, about getting rid of persons who are under civil service. Only a short time ago we read in the press that it cost the United States Government more than $500,000 and about 5 years of litigation to get rid of a man who was on the public payroll at the Government Printing Office. Do we want to have to go through that kind of procedure every time it becomes necessary to dismiss an employee? Of course we do not.

I read today, as I was seated here, a discussion on page 46 of the hearings on the plan during which the chairman of the committee asked Secretary Snyder how long it took to get rid of the Missouri collector in St. Louis. It took 5 months. Of course, we know there was politics in that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a very brief argument in answer to the contentions of the opponents of the plan. I shall endeavor to read as much as I can, and I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD those portions which I may be unable to read because of my limited time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there are several reasons which prompt me to rise in support of Reorganization Plan No. 1.

I am supporting plan No. 1 because I regard it as a constructive step toward better government—toward better organization and better management in a Government agency of unique importance.

I am supporting plan No. 1 because I strongly favor bipartisan implementation of the Hoover Commission recommendations, and in spite of everything that has been said on the floor of the Senate trying to leave the impression that the plan does not carry out the spirit and intent of the Hoover reorganization plan. I am convinced that the pending proposal does carry out one of the purposes of the Hoover reorganization plan.

Mr. President, when a reorganization plan comes before the Congress, as this plan does, with the active support of the bipartisan Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, there is a strong presumption in its favor. I applaud the action of the distinguished Senator from Maine, who, in joining the minority of the committee in voting against the pending resolution and in favor of plan No. 1, has demonstrated that steps toward better government need not be dealt with as partisan issues.

Unfortunately, the majority of the committee have failed to recognize in their report that the present issue is civil service versus political patronage. Instead, that report deals largely with asserted legal impediments to the plan. The majority report expresses fears both as to the legal foundation for the plan and as to its legal consequences. As a lawyer, I was naturally interested in those legal issues.

Mr. President, I have carefully studied each of these asserted legal obstacles. A vote for plan No. 1 will mean but one thing to the American people—a vote for improved Government efficiency. A vote against plan No. 1 will mean but one thing—a vote for continued inefficiency in Government.

I think the so-called four legal impediments of plan No. 1 are nothing but legal myths which I, as a lawyer, cannot accept.

The first of these legal myths is that the plan does not comply in all respects with the Reorganization Act of 1949. It is said that section 3 of that act requires the President, in transmitting a reorganization plan, to specify the reduction in expenditures which it is thought the reorganization will bring about. It is asserted that this requirement is not met by the statement in the President's transmittal message which reads as follows:

> The taking effect of the reorganizations provided for in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 will make possible many benefits in improved organization and operations which may be expected to produce substantial savings in future years. Those savings should not be expected to be reflected in an immediate reduction in expenditure by the Bureau of Internal Revenue but in an improved service to the public and a more efficient collection of revenue.

With the criticism of this statement I strongly disagree. Section 2 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 enumerates six distinct purposes which reorganization plans may be designed to accomplish. One of these purposes is to reduce expenditures and promote economy. Another is to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government. Still another is to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort. The testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury upon this plan as well as the report of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments make it clear that this plan to remove the internal revenue service from political influences is aimed primarily at better management, better administration, and increased efficiency. The reorganization act permits the President to prepare and transmit a reorganization plan to accomplish any one of these purposes. The reorganization act does not require that a reorganization plan be aimed primarily at the reduction of expenditures.

In any event, the Congress has approved reorganization plans of which the President has frankly said, in his transmittal message, that no reduction in expenditures was expected. In contrast to this, the transmittal message of plan No. 1 contains a definite statement that the plan is expected to produce substantial savings in future years. No more definite statement than this in regard to expected savings can be found in any one of the many reorganization plans which the Congress has approved. If there is any truth in the assertion that this plan does not comply with the Reorganization Act of 1949 because of lack of an itemized specification as to reduction in expenditures, then not one of the plans which we have approved complies with that act.

Mr. President, my view that plan No. 1 complies in all respects with the Re-

organization Act of 1949 is consistent with that of the Department of Justice. The Acting Attorney General had this to say of the plan in a letter of January 11, 1952, to the President:

> The proposed plan and accompanying message are in accordance with the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1949 and I approve them as to form and legality.

The second of these legal myths is that abolition of the statutory office of collector of internal revenue will result in confusion and uncertainty as to the application of a number of the provisions of the internal revenue laws which refer specifically to that office. It should be noted, however, that all of the functions of the collectors of internal revenue were transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950. As a result, such duties as are now being performed by the collectors of internal revenue are performed pursuant to delegations from the Secretary of the Treasury under plan No. 26.

Moreover, the Reorganization Act of 1949 contains saving provisions which permit functions to be transferred from one officer to another without upsetting statutory rights and duties prescribed by law. Specifically, section 9 of the Reorganization Act of 1949 provides as follows:

> Any statute enacted * * * before the effective date of such reorganization, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, have the same effect as if such reorganization had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested the function in the agency from which it is removed under the plan, such function shall * * * be considered as vested in the agency under which the function is placed by the plan.

It has been asserted, however, that if the office of collector is abolished there will be uncertainty as to the application of those provisions which impose duties upon taxpayers to file returns and other documents with the collector. There have been cited particularly sections 53 (b), 58 (d) (2), and 821 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code which require that income tax returns, declarations of estimated tax, and estate tax returns be filed with the collector of internal revenue for the taxpayer's district. Mr. President, I cannot imagine what this asserted difficulty may be. If it is meant that taxpayers will not know where to file their returns, the answer is that the revenue forms will bear on their face complete and specific filing instructions. If, on the other hand, it is meant that legal uncertainties will arise, this objection also lacks validity. There are court decisions which make it very clear that the transfer of functions under a reorganization plan is not only binding on the officials involved but is also binding on the public with respect to duties required to be performed by the public.

One of these decisions is *Czarnecki* v. *United States* (95 F. (2d) 32), which upheld the conviction of two individuals for possessing an unregistered still. The provision of law under which these individuals were convicted had originally required registration of stills with the collector of internal revenue for the taxpayer's district. The designation of the officer who was to receive such registrations was changed several times. Finally, by an Executive order and Treasury decision issued pursuant to a Reorganization Act, it was provided that stills should be registered with the district supervisors of the Alcohol Tax Unit. In holding that the transfer of functions under the reorganization was binding on the public, the Court had this to say:

> The effect of the changes worked in respect to section 3258 consists of nothing more than a substitution of another officer for registration in lieu of the collector of the district as originally designated by the statute. The change so worked is binding upon the public and fulfills the requirement of law. We are therefore of the opinion that the right and duty to receive the registration of set up stills was vested in the district supervisor of the Alcohol Tax Unit as the agent and assistant of the Deputy Commissioner of Internal Revenue at the time referred to in the indictment. If the appellants had in their possession and custody or under their control a still set up and had not registered it with the officer designated, they committed a violation of the law.

It is clear, therefore, that any duties which the public is now required to carry out with the collector must be carried out under the reorganization plan with the officer to whom the duties of the collector are transferred. This also effectively disposes of the argument that difficulties might arise under section 3601 (c) of the Code, which imposes criminal penalties upon any person who forcibly obstructs or hinders any collector in the execution of any power or authority vested in him by law.

Reference has also been made to section 2815 (a) of the Code, which provides that a collector who approves a distiller's bond before all requirements of law have been complied with shall forfeit $2,000 and be dismissed from office, and section 2816 (a) of the Code, which requires every distiller to file detailed plans of his distillery with the collector. How, it has been asked, can the penalty of section 2815 (a) be enforced or the statutory duty of section 2816 (a) be carried out if the office of collector should no longer exist?

This question has been moot ever since 1936. In that year, Congress enacted the Liquor Enforcement Act of 1936, which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue or any other Treasury Department officer or employee any of the rights, privileges, powers, duties, or protection conferred or imposed by any law relating to the taxation, transportation, manufacture, possession, or use of distilled spirits. Pursuant to this authority, Treasury Decision 4662, dated July 3, 1936, transferred to the Deputy Commissioner in charge of the Alcohol Tax Unit and his assistants, inspectors, and agents, all rights, privileges, powers, duties, and protection conferred and imposed upon any other Treasury Department officer or employee by any law relating to the taxation, transportation, manufacture, possession, or use of distilled spirits. As a result, the provisions of section 2815 (a) and 2816 (a) have been carried out for more than 15 years with officers other than the collectors of internal revenue.

It has also been asserted that if the statutory office of collector of internal revenue is abolished the Government will lose the protection which it now possesses under sections 3975, 3976, and 3977 of the Internal Revenue Code, which authorize, under certain circumstances, the issuance of warrants of distress against delinquent collectors and authorize the sale of their personal and real property in satisfaction of their debt to the United States. This argument also is easily answerable. Title 31, sections 506 to 520, of the United States Code contains identical provisions applicable to every type of defaulting public officer who receives public moneys before they are paid into the Treasury of the United States. Hence, if there were any doubt whatever as to the applicability of sections 3975, 3976, and 3977 of the Internal Revenue Code to the officials who under the reorganization plan will succeed to the collectors' duties, then the identical general provisions of title 31 clearly would apply.

So much for the instances cited in support of the assertion that abolition of the statutory office of collector would create a legal vacuum. Not one of these instances stands up under research and analysis.

The third of these legal myths is that the reorganization plan would deprive taxpayers of the right to a trial by jury in suits for refund of taxes. This assertion is also invalid.

It should suffice for me to describe the conclusions of those learned in the law who have looked into this matter carefully. In a memorandum of February 15, 1952, which was presented in the hearings on the reorganization plan, the general counsel of the Treasury had this to say of the effect of the reorganization plan upon the right to a jury trial in tax refund suits:

> The suit against the collector * * * is not a statutory suit but is in the nature of a common-law action of assumpsit for money had and received. The Supreme Court has held—*Philadelphia* v. *The Collector* (5 Wallace 720 (1866))—that a suit to recover money on account of taxes erroneously or illegally assessed is maintainable against a collector not by virtue of any specific statutory provisions but as a result of the necessary implication arising from the provisions of law which impose upon him the authority and duty to collect taxes and remit them to the Treasury of the United States. Under the proposed reorganization plan all functions, duties, and responsibilities which, by Supreme Court precedent, are made essential to the founding of a suit for money had and received against an officer or employee of the Federal Government in a tax proceeding will be imposed upon the newly created Deputy District Commissioners. Thus, the existing suit against collectors will survive as a suit against the Deputy District Commissioners, and the existing right of trial by jury will not be disturbed in any manner.

This is also the view of the Assistant Attorney General, as shown in a letter of February 28, 1952, prepared following his consideration of the memorandum of the general counsel of the Treasury and of a legal memorandum affixed as a statement made by the distinguished

Senator from Georgia during the hearings. Referring to doubts expressed in the latter memorandum, the Assistant Attorney General said:

> Thus, the two most recent decisions of the Supreme Court on the point have destroyed, as a premise for any conclusion, the argument that the common law basis for the action against the collector has been expressly removed by legislation. And since the right to maintain such a common lawsuit does not arise by statute, no discernible reason remains for doubt as to the survival of the principle if the office of collector is abolished and duties that officer performed are otherwise devolved.

The fourth of these legal myths is that the reorganization plan would deprive the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the power to secure directly from the Bureau of Internal Revenue information and data relating to internal revenue taxation.

Following adoption of plan No. 26 of 1950, Congress enacted Public Law No. 2, Eighty-second Congress, providing that the statutes empowering the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to obtain data directly from the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be applied in accordance with their provisions without regard to reorganization plan No. 26 of 1950 or to any other reorganization plan becoming effective on, before, or after the date of that enactment.

Mr. President, Public Law No. 2 is a limitation on the powers respecting reorganizations; obviously, it was expressly designed for that very purpose.

The Reorganization Act of 1949 itself contains several limitations on the powers respecting reorganizations. One of these limitations, for example, is that no reorganization plan shall authorize any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time it is transmitted to the Congress. Reorganization plans, being creatures of statute, can have validity only within the statutory limitations. No reorganization plan could validly transgress the limitations prescribed in the reorganization act itself. For the same reason, no reorganization plan can transgress the limitation prescribed by Public Law No. 2.

I close by expressing the question that there are no legal impediments to the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 1. That plan must stand or fall on the single issue—improved Government efficiency against political patronage. On this issue I consider it in the interest of better government to vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Arkansas has sent me a note which indicates that he will yield to me 3 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Washington 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington will oppose Reorganization Plan No. 1 for many reasons, four of which are these:

(a) Because the plan does not follow the Hoover recommendations in fundamental particulars.

(b) Because the plan, if adopted, would almost certainly guarantee increased costs.

(c) Because the plan does not identify or list money savings to be achieved as required by law.

(d) Because the plan delegates powers and authority to the executive branch which belong properly to the legislative branch.

These are important reasons, any one of which, and much more all of them together, justify Reorganization Plan No. 1 being rejected.

Mr. President, there is another good and basic reason for strongly opposing the President's plan to reorganize the Internal Revenue Bureau. The President has stated that the plan will put an end to corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau. Aside from acknowledging the presence of corruption, the President's statement assumes that people generally are without the ability to think for themselves.

As of this minute the President can cure corruption completely as it may exist among the collectors of internal revenue. He needs only to accept their resignations or dismiss them. It will not end corruption by merely making permanent the assignments of those who are corrupt. This proposal to cement collectors within civil service will not make the honest more honest.

If our present concern runs to corruption, and mine certainly does, the President is obviously and logically the one who can continue it, enlarge it, or eradicate it. The President has much power which sometimes he abuses or misuses or does not use at all.

I recall with sadness that the President exercised his great power to remove a distinguished far eastern commander, an honest man. The degradation of the present day is the President's unwillingness to exercise his great power to remove undistinguished collectors of internal revenue who have been dishonest. No plan will do for the President what he can better do with the almost unlimited powers he has available to himself.

The President seemingly subscribes to the late Harry Hopkins' public declaration that "The people are too damned dumb to understand." I do not share any such view. I believe the people would overwhelmingly denounce the President's plan if given an opportunity to consider it. I would only be a stooge for the President if I voted to support an ill-considered plan which avoids the real corruption issue. This I gladly refuse to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. We are drawing to the close of the debate on the resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1. Reorganization Plan No. 1 is one of a series of organizational proposals submitted by the President under the terms provided by the Congress in the Reorganization Act of 1949. The purpose of that act was to further and to implement and to put into effect the basic recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and to place in effect the management studies which had been made of the many bureaus and agencies of the Government.

When we debated the Reorganization Act of 1949 we came clean on what the purpose of the program was. We recognized that if we were to handle through the legislative committees every single reorganization plan, we would find no reorganization of any consequence taking place. This has been the history of reorganization over a hundred years of our Government, and commission after commission has recommended the procedure which we are now being called upon to follow. Since the enactment of the Reorganization Act of 1949, some 30 reorganization plans have been adopted by the Congress, to the benefit, the efficiency, and the integrity of the Government of the United States.

I was interested today in the moving address of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], who in a goodly portion of his address concentrated his attention upon Reorganization Plan No. 26 as presented to the Congress in May 1950, and as subsequently adopted. But let it be crystal clear that Reorganization Plan No. 26 deals with functions of government, particularly with centering the responsibility for functions of the Treasury Department in the Secretary of the Treasury, while plan No. 1 deals with the structure of a department, and not functions. There is a clear-cut, unmistakable difference. One deals with functions, authority, and power, the other with organization, structure, and administration.

The central theme of plan No. 1 has been cited again and again. Why talk about the sideshows when we need to concentrate on the main tent? The main purpose of plan No. 1 is to rid the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the malignant growth which it has within it, which has caused the country great trouble, and brought shame upon the Government, namely, the political patronage system affecting the collectors of internal revenue. The collectors of internal revenue are not policy officers; they are administrative officers. They are supervisory officers, and as such they should be removed from political control or political influence.

The Civil Service Commission does have its faults; no one would care to underestimate them. We are not painting them as paragons of virtue. But the choice is not between something handed down from on high, from providence, and something from the bowels of the earth. The choice is not a choice between two alternatives. It is not a choice between God and the devil. The choice is whether we want political patronage and influence in the Internal Revenue Bureau, or whether we want those who supervise the tax laws and collect the taxes to be appointed on a basis of merit, background, experience, and technical knowledge. I submit, Mr. President, that with all the arguments to the contrary, we cannot evade or avoid this issue.

When the roll is called in a little while on the resolution disapproving plan No.

1 the vote will turn on the answer to the question, Do you really believe that the present system, with political patronage, is so good that it should be left intact, or do you believe it should be improved by utilizing the services of the Civil Service Commission? I shall vote for the civil-service program of merit, for the classified civil-service system.

A number of other comments have been made to which I should like to reply, but since I do not have the time to analyze the arguments, I merely desire to highlight one or two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask 1 minute to seek unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD an analysis of the arguments which have been made in the debate, and my replies to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1952

Following is a point-by-point analysis of the statement made by Senator GEORGE on March 12 in the Senate on plan No. 1. This analysis shows (a) each point in opposition to the plan made by Senator GEORGE, (b) the facts and testimony in the record which bear on such point, and (c) the conclusion to be drawn as to the argument made by the Senator.

1. PATRONAGE AS THE REAL ISSUE

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "The appointment of collectors is not the main point in this controversy. * * * I have never wanted any [patronage], except as to those officers which come within my own State and which affect my own people, concerning which I have felt that I had some right to speak." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1952, pp. 2163, 2164.)

(b) The facts are: The political appointment of collectors is the chief issue before the Senate. Senator MCCLELLAN's bill (S. 2747), which has been proposed as a substitute for the reorganization plan and referred to the Finance Committee, incorporates in legislative form the entire reorganization plan except that it provides for political appointment to the key offices instead of appointment under civil-service law as provided by plan No. 1. The Hoover Commission report on the Treasury Department (p. 17) stated "One of the chief handicaps to the effective organization of the Department is the political appointment of collectors * * *." The plan also incorporates the recommendation of the report of the investigation of the Revenue Bureau by the House Appropriations Committee in 1948 that the patronage system of appointing collectors be eliminated. It also incorporates the recommendation of the management engineering firm, employed under congressional authorization, that key posts be filled with career trained executives appointed under the merit system (hearings before Senate Committee on Government Operations, p. 242). The record of the hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations is also replete with statements by the following that the elimination of patronage in the tax collecting system is the chief issue and one of the major accomplishments of plan No. 1: Secretary of the Treasury Snyder (hearings, p. 31); Robert Ramspeck, Chairman, Civil Service Commission (hearings, p. 59); Arthur S. Fleming, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report (hearings, p. 157); Special Committee on Federal Personnel Policy of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover report (minority report, p. 33); National Civil Service League (minority report, p. 34).

In addition, 21 Senators have sponsored bills presently pending in the Congress to eliminate the patronage system from revenue collection. Public opinion polls indicate that the public regards this plan as a plan to take collections out of politics and that 69 percent favor that suggestion (minority report, p. 6).

(c) Conclusion: Leaders from all walks of life, and the public generally recognize political patronage as the chief issue involved in the debate on plan No. 1.

2. ACCORD WITH RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER REPORT

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "The plan violates the underlying fundamentals of the Hoover plan." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1952, p. 2163.)

Senator GEORGE says that—

(i) "It makes of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, an office which Mr. Hoover says should take the rank of Assistant Secretary, a mere puppet" (p. 2163).

(ii) The Commissioner "is not to be given supervision of the Tax Legislative Counsel, Division of Tax Research, or his own legal officers" (p. 2164).

(iii) The plan "abolishes the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue and makes him an assistant * * * to the general counsel of the Treasury" (p. 2163).

(iv) It mentions collectors but "the appointment of collectors is not the main point in this controversy" (p. 2164).

(v) "This plan runs counter to the Hoover recommendations" (p. 2164).

(b) The facts are: (i) The plan does not affect the status of the Commissioner at all. It does not mention his office and does not deal with his functions. Since Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 every function exercised by the Commissioner has been delegated to him by the Secretary and this will not be changed under plan No. 1. The trend has in fact been toward delegation of more authority and responsibility to the Commissioner. This is in conformity with the basic tenet of the Hoover Commission, appearing on page 3 of its report on the Treasury Department, "that good departmental administration requires that the Secretary have authority from the Congress to organize and control his organization, and the independent authority should not be granted directly to subordinates." While the Hoover Commission did recommend that the Commissioner of Revenue have the rank of Assistant Secretary, this plan deals solely with the Bureau of Internal Revenue and not with its relationship to the Treasury. The most that can be made of the point is that the plan does not put into effect every recommendation of the Hoover Commission. Moreover, the Commission itself said, on page 13 of its report on the Treasury, that it was "setting no hard and fast rule of organization."

(ii) The Hoover Commission did not recommend that the Commissioner of Revenue be given supervision of the tax legislative counsel, the Division of Tax Research, or his own legal officers.

Recommendation No. 5 of the Hoover Commission, page 16 of its report on the Treasury Department, placed the division of tax research directly under the Secretary, and placed the tax legislative counsel under the general counsel. This is precisely where they are today and precisely where they will be under plan No. 1, since plan No. 1 does not deal with them at all.

The Hoover Commission report on the Treasury Department made no recommendation with respect to the legal officers for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The present system was explicitly set up by the Congress, upon the recommendation of the Finance and the Ways and Means Committees, in the Revenue Act of 1934. It makes the General Counsel the Department's chief legal officer, responsible to the Secretary and deriving his powers from the Secretary. It specifically provides for the Assistant General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and gives him only those powers delegated to him by the General Counsel. Reorganization Plan No. 1 changes the method of appointment of this Assistant General Counsel from political to civil service. It does not affect in any way or change by one iota the relationship spelled out in 1934 by the Congress between the Commissioner, Assistant General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and General Counsel for the Treasury Department.

(iii) The plan does not mention, much less abolish, the office of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and, of course, it does not make him an assistant to the General Counsel. It may be that Senator GEORGE had in mind the Assistant General Counsel for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. If so, the fact is that that office was abolished only as a means of eliminating the requirement for political appointment. The same office is also recreated as a merit system career office, and as pointed out above the plan has nothing to do with the office's relationship to the Commissioner and the General Counsel, which was specifically provided for by the Congress in 1934.

(iv) The Hoover Commission, on page 17 of its report on the Treasury Department, states that "one of the chief handicaps to effective organization of the Department is the political appointment of collectors of internal revenue." The method of appointment of collectors is not only one of the fundamental recommendations of the Hoover Commission but it is the crux of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952.

(v) The plan does not run counter to the Hoover Commission recommendations in any way. While the relationship between the Secretary and the Commissioner is beyond the scope of the plan, there is nothing in it that runs counter to suggestions of the Commission on that score. The minority report points out at page 13 that three well-qualified persons have confirmed the fact that the plan accords with the most important recommendations of the Hoover Commission. They are Hon. Herbert Hoover, Chairman of the Hoover Commission; Hon. Arthur Flemming, a member of the Hoover Commission and former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission; Mr. Robert L. L. McCormick, director of research of the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report.

(c) Conclusion: Not one of Senator GEORGE's assertions stands up when compared with the Hoover report recommendations. This conclusion need not be based on opinion; a simple reading of the report refutes the charges. But if opinion is of value, then we have the opinion of Mr. Hoover himself and the statements of the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report that the plan accords with the most important recommendations. There is no recommendation in the report to which the plan runs counter.

3. CONSIDERATION BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION AND THE FINANCE COMMITTEE

(a) Senator GEORGE says the minority report (p. 18) indicates that the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation did not act on the report of its own advisory group on internal-revenue administration and that the Finance Committee failed to invite representatives of the Treasury Department to discuss plan No. 1 with that committee after a request by a Department representative was made. We sent the report to the Secretary and the Commissioner expecting comments and have not received them. "I do not believe my friends can document them" [referring to the statements in

the minority report]. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1952, pp. 2164, 2165, 2169.)

(b) The facts are: Senator GEORGE does not deny that the joint committee failed to hold any meetings to consider the report of its advisory group. As to receiving reports from the Secretary or the Commissioner on the advisory group reports, the record will show that the Department sent to the chairman of the joint committee two reports, one dated April 16, 1948, and the other dated January 27, 1949. These are documented in a letter from the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to Senator HUMPHREY dated March 13, 1952. As to the failure of the Senate committee to invite Treasury representatives to discuss plan No. 1 with them, the facts are set forth in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, page 273.

(c) Conclusion: The statements in the minority report indicating delays in consideration of reorganization by the joint committee and the Finance Committee are substantially correct.

4. THE PAGET REPORT

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "The Paget report as far as the tax committees are concerned was pigeonholed. The Paget report does not follow this reorganization plan, nor does the plan follow the Paget report."

(b) The facts are: (1) The knowledge by congressional committees as to the Paget report is shown in the attached material in the hearings before the House Committee on Government Operations, page 256. (2) The reorganization plan incorporates the principal recommendations of the Paget report in eliminating the political offices of collectors and streamlining the operations of the Revenue Service, with field supervision under regional administrators. (Commissioner Dunlap, hearings before Committee on Government Operations, p. 242.)

(c) Conclusion: The Paget report was available to congressional committees, was particularly studied by the Subcommittee on Administration of Internal Revenue Laws of the House Ways and Means Committee and this plan adopts its principal recommendations as to internal organization of the Revenue Bureau.

5. EFFECT ON STATUTORY DUTIES AND POWERS

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "Plan No. 1 creates a complete legal vacuum. * * * It creates a statutory vacuum by abolishing certain offices without creating new offices to take their place. It abolishes the office of collectors and deputy collectors of internal revenue. It does not prescribe the duties of anyone else who may perform the same functions." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1952, p. 2165.)

(b) The facts are: (1) The Commissioner of Internal Revenue pointed out in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Government Operations (Hearings, pp. 233 and 234) that the present statutory system for collection of taxes would be unchanged since the plan merely abolishes the political officers and substitutes civil-service officials. (2) All revenue officials, including the collectors of internal revenue, have since 1950 been operating under authority delegated by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to Reorganization Plan No. 26. This delegation was necessary because all of the functions of all of the Treasury Department employees and officers were transferred to the Secretary pursuant to plan No. 26 approved by Congress. The present delegated duties of the collectors can be transferred to any other official and in this case will be the deputy district commissioner. (3) The basic statutes for tax administration will still be applicable under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 in accordance with section 9 (a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949. Thus there will be no confusion in the duties of the officials collecting our taxes or in the responsibilities of the taxpayers.

(c) Conclusion: There is no legal vacuum since a delegation of the collection functions and duties would be made to the deputy district commissioners pursuant to the authority of the Secretary under plan No. 26.

6. EFFECT OF THE PLAN ON THE COST OF ADMINISTERING THE REVENUE

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "This plan would also add vastly to the cost of the system. * * * Those 25 district commissioners, with their vast staffs, would cost this Government many additional millions of dollars a year." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2166.)

(b) The facts are: The staffs of the district commissioners will consist of present personnel who will perform functions similar to those they are now performing. For example, each of the 64 collectors' offices now handles the processing and accounting work in connection with returns filed in its office. Under the plan, this routine processing and clerical work will be centralized in the offices of the 21 district commissioners. This centralization will permit large-scale handling, use of the latest accounting machinery, centralized file maintenance, etc. Savings in travel and per diem costs will result from consolidation of audit work. Stepped-up production can be obtained through more direct supervision. Wasteful interoffice routines will be eliminated by the merger of the Bureau's local offices. The plan will thus definitely result in operating economies. (Testimony of Commissioner of Internal Revenue, hearings, p. 243 and elsewhere.)

(c) Conclusion: Substantial economies, rather than increased costs, will result from the adoption of the plan.

7. EFFECT ON AVAILABILITY OF FACILITIES IN EACH STATE

(a) Senator GEORGE says that persons from "Arizona and Nevada would have to crawl over the mountains into California to adjust their tax matters" because the district commissioner would probably be located in California. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2166.)

(b) The facts are: No revenue facilities will be removed from any State. No taxpayer will have to travel outside his State to adjust his tax matters. Present collectors' offices will remain where they are as deputy district commissioners' offices. Additional revenue facilities will be put in these offices; for instance, the audit facilities of the 39 revenue agents' offices will be distributed to the same 64 cities. The same is true of appellate facilities and the special agents' offices. (Secretary's statement, p. 32 of hearings; Commissioner's statement, p. 121 of hearings.)

(c) Conclusion: Revenue facilities at the local level will be added to and not decreased under the reorganization plan.

For documentation see: Minority report, page 9, item 2 (b); Secretary's letter to Senator MCCLELLAN, Senate hearings, page 17; Secretary's statement, Senate hearings, page 32; Commissioner's statement, Senate hearings, page 121.

8. METHOD OF APPOINTMENT

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "Of course, the method of appointment does not determine the character of the officer" (p. 2165).

(b) The facts are: The present system of appointment makes occasional bad appointments almost inevitable since the primary consideration in the selection of collectors under the patronage system is not administrative or tax knowledge, but political loyalty.

This subject was exhaustively discussed during the hearings by many citizens and officials all of whom stressed the bad results that follow from the present system of appointment.

See statements by: Secretary Snyder, Senate hearings, page 32; Commissioner Dunlap, Senate hearings, page 233; Chairman Robert Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission, Senate hearings, page 59; Arthur S. Flemming, Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, Senate hearings, page 159; Congressman CECIL KING, Senate hearings, page 301.

These are only a few of the authorities who have endorsed the elimination of a political patronage system. Others are cited on pages 7 and 8 of the minority report and in its appendix.

The hearings also brought out the following points: Supervision of political appointees is difficult because officials responsible for supervision are likely to be threatened by politically initiated reprisals if they give bad reports on collectors.

When a political appointee is not guilty of any misconduct but is merely a less competent administrator than is desirable in his position, it is difficult to handle his case. In the civil-service system such a man, if he were otherwise capable, could be transferred to a different position. There is no such flexibility in the present collector system.

Persons appointed under the present system usually lack the knowledge of tax administration needed for effective performance of their duties.

(c) Conclusion: The present method of appointment is much less satisfactory than appointment under the civil service merit system.

9. RIGHT OF TAXPAYERS TO JURY TRIALS IN TAX REFUND SUITS

(a) Senator GEORGE says the plan will endanger the right of taxpayers to jury trials in suits for refund of taxes (p. 2166, columns 1 and 2).

(b) Facts and testimony: The committee hearings, page 239, contain a letter from the Justice Department, the only Department which can raise this question, stating that under the plan this right will survive against the deputy district commissioner, of whom there will be at least one in every State. The hearings, page 236, contain similar assurances of the Treasury Department.

The hearings, page 237, contain a legal analysis by the general counsel of the Treasury demonstrating that the present suit against the collector with a jury trial is not a statutory right, but is in the nature of a common law action against the person who receives the money. The right goes with the function of collecting. Under the plan the deputy district commissioner will have this function and, therefore, can be sued with recourse to a jury trial.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue testified (hearings, p. 235) that only rarely is a suit against the collector with jury trial resorted to. The minority report, page 12, points out that in the last two fiscal years there were not more than 22 such cases per year out of several thousand tax cases in the courts.

(c) Conclusion: The plan does not impair the right of the taxpayer to bring suit for refund of taxes in his own State with the right to a jury trial, and the Justice Department is estopped from asserting the contrary. Moreover, the importance of this issue has been magnified.

10. RIGHT TO JURY TRIAL AFFECTED BY TRANSFERABILITY OF DEPUTY DISTRICT COMMISSIONER

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "It is possible that the deputy commissioner might likewise be suable; but—and here is a point which has not been noticed up the Avenue—the Commissioner serving at any particular place could be transferred at will, could be changed from time to time by the Secretary" (p. 2166, column 1).

(b) Facts and testimony: As the memorandum of the general counsel of the

Treasury points out on page 238 of the committee hearings, because the suit against a collector is a personal action for money had and received, it can be brought only against the collector to whom the money was paid even though he is out of office or dead. The suit cannot be brought against a successor collector to whom the tax was not paid. The suit must be brought in the judicial district wherein the collector resides, even though he has moved away to a new judicial district.

During the hearings the Secretary of the Treasury made it clear that the authority to rotate deputy district commissioners from one district to another would be seldom exercised. At page 56 of the hearings, the Secretary said:

"It is a question in administration as to whether or not the district commissioner or the Commissioner of Internal Revenue would ever like to avail themselves of that authority to rotate, but the fact that they do have it is an important factor in the removal of temptation in the whole service and operation."

(c) Conclusion: A career civil-service official could be expected to have longer tenure in office than a political appointee such as the collector. Hence, difficulties arising from the fact that the individual who collected the tax must be sued would be lessened instead of increased under the plan. Moreover, the Treasury Department has recommended (see pp. 236–239 of the hearings) that this difficulty be eliminated entirely by permitting the use of a jury trial in tax-refund suits against the United States. While the reorganization plan cannot accomplish this result, Congress can do so at any time by legislation.

11. THE TAXPAYER WILL NOT HAVE TO COME TO WASHINGTON TO BRING SUIT FOR REFUND OF TAXES UNDER THE PLAN

(a) Senator GEORGE says that after the plan goes into effect the Treasury Department will say to the taxpayer, "If you want to sue us, come to Washington and sue the United States." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1952, p. 2166, column 2.)

(b) The facts are: As shown in comment No. 9, the present right to sue the collector will, under the plan, be preserved against the deputy district commissioner, of whom there will be one in at least every State. Moreover, as pointed out in the memorandum of General Counsel of the Treasury at page 238 of the hearings, "* * * a suit against the United States for refund of taxes is brought in the judicial district of the taxpayer's residence. The taxpayer is never confronted by any problem of seeking out the defendant, and he is always assured that the suit will be litigated in a forum easily accessible to him." In contrast, a study has shown that the residents of about one-half of the counties of the United States are located in judicial districts other than that of the office of their collector. Today, these individuals are denied the right to a jury trial in tax suits brought in their own judicial district. However, the Treasury Department has recommended (see pp. 236–239 of the hearings) that Congress enact legislation to give taxpayers the right to a jury trial in tax suits against the United States, which in every case may be brought in the taxpayer's own judicial district.

(c) Conclusion: The reorganization plan cannot deprive the taxpayer of the right to sue the United States in his own judicial district. Instead, if Congress acts upon the Treasury Department's recommendations, the rights of the taxpayer will be enlarged by making jury trial more convenient and accessible.

12. REFERRAL OF FRAUD CASES TO THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "Furthermore, Mr. President, the theory of the direct line has taken hold so deeply that even in the minority views it is actually set forth that down at the field level, in the States, the field officials would refer cases for trial directly to the Attorney General, and the citizens would be prosecuted in that way—never coming through Washington, never touching the Commissioner's office or the Secretary's office." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2166.)

(b) The facts are: The direct referral of fraud cases to the Justice Department is not a part of the plan, but is already in effect. In the hearings, the Secretary of the Treasury testified as follows:

"We are taking further steps to speed up all our operations. We have already instituted a new procedure for the reference of criminal tax cases directly from the field to the Department of Justice for prosecution. This change is the result of the study of nearly 1,000 cases of tax fraud. The new procedure will mean a saving on the average of 4 months or more in each case" (hearings, p. 28).

(c) Conclusion: Decentralization of the handling of fraud cases is consistent with other steps which have been taken to decentralize operations to the field; it bears no relation to the plan.

13. CONSOLIDATION OF AUDIT AND COLLECTION FUNCTIONS UNDER PLAN NO. 1

(a) Senator GEORGE says the plan "combines at the State level in the field office the auditor and the collector. This is an invitation to fraud and corruption. * * * There can never be a fair-minded internal revenue system until the collecting office is completely and entirely separated from the auditing office." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1952, p. 2167.)

(b) The facts are: Under the plan the same man does not audit a return and also collect the tax owing on it (Commissioner Dunlap, hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations, p. 272). The collection function as a matter of day-by-day operation will be under the Cashier Division and the audit function is under the Enforcement Division (chart 2 on p. 36, hearings before the Senate Committee on Government Operations). However, under the present system, under the plan, and under any system the final authority for audit and collection functions will rest in one official, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue (Commissioner Dunlap, hearings, p. 272). Moreover, under the present system, more than 80 percent of the returns audited are audited in the collectors' offices (Commissioner Dunlap, hearings, p. 272). The plan improves on the present system by consolidating in an Enforcement Division the audit function which is now performed in part by the collectors' office and in part by the office of the internal revenue agents (Commissioner Dunlap, hearings, p. 273). The taxpayer is assured fair treatment by the opportunity to appeal to representatives of the district commissioner's office, who will hear his appeal locally but will not be under the control of the local deputy district commissioner's office (Commissioner Dunlap, p. 273; minority report, p. 14). The pinpointing of responsibility under the plan and the strengthening of the Inspection Service under an Assistant Commissioner will protect the system against corruption.

(c) Conclusion: Under the plan one man will not as a matter of day-by-day operation audit the taxpayer's return and also collect his tax. Moreover, the plan assures fair treatment by continuing the right of the taxpayer to take his case up with independent officials of higher authority.

14. WHETHER THE PLAN WILL SLOW UP OPERATIONS

(a) Senator GEORGE says of the plan: "It will invite delays which are not now in the system * * * it would be a step backward, although in some details it might be as good as the present system, or perhaps somewhat better." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 12, 1952, pp. 2168.)

(b) The facts are: Plan No. 1 will not result in delays but instead will provide quicker service. The plan will provide additional local facilities for service to taxpayers (Commissioner Dunlap before the committee hearings, p. 123). The taxpayer will have only one office to come to for all of his tax problems. Better service will be provided him in examining his returns through better supervision and informal conferences (Commissioner Dunlap, hearings, pp. 123–125). Quicker handling of cases will result from additional authority at the local level and more adequate supervision (minority report, p. 21). Moreover, the plan draws from the best features of recommendations made by various groups in the past for the reorganization of the Bureau on a more modern and efficient basis. The principal recommendations for streamlining the organization of the Bureau and providing for greater efficiency in the handling of cases made by the Hoover Commission, the advisory group to the joint committee, the investigative staff of the House Appropriations Committee, and the management engineering firm are all incorporated in this plan (hearings, p. 242).

The provisions of this plan have largely been recommended by the various committees of Congress which have studied the Bureau's organization (Commissioner Dunlap, hearings, p. 247).

(c) Conclusion: The plan is organizationally sound, being based upon years of study of Bureau reorganization. The plan will provide for the more efficient handling of all tax matters.

15. OBLIGATION OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH IN CONNECTION WITH PLAN NO. 1

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "The power to lay and collect taxes * * * devolves upon the Congress of the United States. If the Senate yields to the pressure which comes from the press and from commentators and columnists, without adequate information or study and votes on this important question against its better judgment, irreparable damage will be done to the prestige of the United States Senate, and the legislative branch under the Constitution."

(b) The facts are: The basis for this reorganization plan is the Reorganization Act which Congress passed in 1949. This plan does not detract from the authority of the Congress because the Congress by the Reorganization Act specifically authorized the recommendation and adoption of a plan such as this. Pursuant to this authority, numerous reorganization plans have already been put into effect, including plan No. 26 of 1950 which placed in the Secretary of the Treasury authority necessary to manage properly the functions of the entire Treasury Department. The Reorganization Act of 1949 was not a surrender of any authority by the Congress, but rather the recognition by it that responsibility for administrative management should be given to the head of the Department. Consistent with that purpose, the President has recommended plan No. 1 which is based on the studies made by or under the authority of various committees of Congress for more than 3 years. (Secretary Snyder, hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, p. 26.) These are the report of the House Appropriations Committee (1948), the report of the advisory group to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation (1948), and the Subcommittee on Administration of Internal Revenue Laws of the House Ways and Means Committee. The plan was unanimously approved by the House Committee on Expenditures and the House of Representatives.

(c) Conclusion: The plan is based upon studies made over the years by congressional

groups and is fully consistent with the authority provided by the Reorganization Act of 1949 for improved management of Government operations.

16. PROSPECTIVE NEW LEGISLATION

(a) On the floor of the Senate yesterday, appearing on page 2167 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senator FLANDERS asked Senator GEORGE the following: "The Senator from Georgia has given weighty reasons for making me doubt whether I should vote for Reorganization Plan No. 1, but I should like to give some assurance to my constituents that if I vote against it, I shall not be simply, in effect, delaying any reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue or stopping further considerations of such reorganization, and therefore leading to a do-nothing situation. So I should like to inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether there is any prospect, either under the auspices or, so far as he knows, under the auspices of the committee to which this report was referred, or any movement to follow through with desirable reforms in the Bureau of Internal Revenue."

Senator GEORGE answered: "I am pleased to answer the Senator categorically. Yes. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] has introduced a bill. * * * The bill is now before the Finance Committee. I have already had a conference. * * * We are very anxious to do something about it. It should have been done before."

(b) The facts are, and it is true with all legislation, nothing prohibits the Congress from introducing new or corrective legislation. The Senate Finance Committee has not on its own initiative done anything in the way of new or corrective legislation to reorganize the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Indeed, not until the submission by the President of Reorganization Plan No. 1 did the Finance Committee become actively interested in reorganizing the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The Finance Committee has not shown any interest in plan 1 or has it taken action which would correct the many defects in the structural organization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The bill referred to by Senator GEORGE which was introduced by Senator McClellan is the same as Reorganization Plan 1 with two exceptions.

The McClellan bill retains not only the present 64 patronage jobs of collectors of internal revenue but adds to that the 25 proposed district commissioners of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. In effect, the McClellan bill authorizes the appointment of 99 patronage jobs. Plan No. 1 abolishes the patronage system and substitutes in its place a career civil service for the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The McClellan bill provides the right of jury trial for a taxpayer. This point is in no way a pertinent one because the Congress has been assured by the Attorney General, the chief law officer of our Government, that the taxpayers' present rights are preserved and plan No. 1 in no way alters or affects that right.

(c) Conclusions: It has been clearly stated and the record has proven it to be correct that the President's plan No. 1 is a well-thought-out reorganization plan which embraces recommendations from four independent reports, one of which being the Report of the Advisory Group of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. This group was organized by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to study the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Therefore, it can be clearly seen that the arguments for further study by the Finance Committee of the Senate and the introduction of new bills to replace plan No. 1 is nothing more than a delaying tactic. The one bill thus far introduced (McClellan bill) in itself clearly points out the main issue before the Senate—that being the one of patronage. Therefore, the main point is: Do we want to support Reorganization Plan 1, which provides for a streamlined, efficient, nonpolitical revenue service, or defeat plan No. 1 and be satisfied with the present organization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, or the one bill proposed to place more political appointees as top officials in the Bureau of Internal Revenue?

17. WHETHER BETTER PERSONNEL CAN BE OBTAINED UNDER THE PLAN

(a) Senator GEORGE says: "I am not sure that better men than we have under the present system would really be obtained." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 2168.)

(b) The facts are:

(1) Of the 47 collectors without civil-service status, 7 have recently been removed or forced to resign. This constitutes approximately 15 percent. Out of 57,000 civil servants in the Bureau, only 135 were removed in the same period. This is less than one-fourth of 1 percent.

(2) More than 70 percent of the civil servants removed worked for the collectors.

(3) A large number of the employees who were fired worked in the offices of the seven collectors who were removed. This illustrates the direct relationship between political supervisors and unsatisfactory administration.

(4) The Bureau has many other field offices whose heads are career civil servants, such as the 39 agents in charge, the 14 special agents in charge, the 12 Appellate Division heads, etc. In these offices the opportunities for corruption are even greater than in the collectors' offices. Yet not one of these civil-service heads has been fired or even accused of wrongdoing.

(c) Conclusion: Experience conclusively shows the advantage of civil-service appointments over political appointments in securing competent and trustworthy administrators.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter dated March 12, 1952, addressed to me by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Dunlap, printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 12, 1952.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I note that one of the reasons advanced in the majority report of the Committee on Government Operations for recommending disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 is that the adoption of the plan is not required to eliminate fraud. This conclusion is then followed by a statement to the effect that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has made this clear by his statements at the hearings that adequate authority already exists to correct all irregularities of defalcations within the Bureau of Internal Revenue, including its field offices. As a footnote to this statement, the report sets out in quotation a number of questions which Senator NIXON directed to me during the course of my appearance before the committee on March 4, 1952, together with my replies to such questions.

Since, as the result of the above-mentioned quotation, some confusion seems to have arisen respecting my views as to the effect which Reorganization Plan No. 1 will have upon the ability of the Internal Revenue Service to cope more effectively with problems of dishonesty and misconduct, I would like to clarify and restate my views.

The statements which I made before the Senate Committee on Government Operations on March 4, 1952, are consistent with the position which I have taken all along as to the many and varied accomplishments which this plan will make possible. The statements were made against this background and should not be taken out of the context in which they were given.

From the outset of the congressional hearings on the President's plan I have stated that this plan will provide (1) better service to taxpayers, (2) tighter supervisory control over the conduct of personnel, and (3) real areas for economies in operations. These represent substantial benefits which will flow from the plan. It is neither possible nor fair to describe any one of these three major accomplishments as the primary purpose of the plan. All are important, and all are worth while. Certainly improved service to taxpayers and greater economy in operations cannot be considered matters of secondary importance. These benefits, together with tighter supervisory control over the conduct of employees, add up to a more efficient Bureau of Internal Revenue in all of its aspects.

Allow me, however, to amplify further the benefit which will be derived from this plan in the form of tighter supervisory control over the conduct of employees. At the present time we are making every effort to detect and to punish any unfaithfulness on the part of revenue employees in the discharge of their high public trust. We have established an inspection service, and we are running down every lead, complaint or credible rumor indicating any misconduct on the part of employees. However, corrective action is made more difficult by the present sprawling organization of the revenue service. There are 8 separate field organizations and over 200 headquarters offices reporting directly to Washington. These conditions, together with other weaknesses in the system, contribute substantially to opportunities for laxness and misconduct to which some are bound to succumb.

The President's reorganization plan, by eliminating the office of the politically appointed collector, by streamlining the Bureau organization, by consolidating field offices under one responsible head in each State or other local area, and by providing a stronger inspection service under an individual with the status of an assistant commissioner, will correct the conditions which have made it possible for some revenue officers and employees to misuse their official positions.

I have testified to the above accomplishments of the plan many times. For example, on the specific matter of dishonesty, I would like to refer you to a number of statements which I made before the Senate Committee on government operation during the course of my testimony on the reorganization plan.

The following appears on page 42 of the hearings:

"Mr. DUNLAP. * * * We could not contend, of course, that civil service by itself will make a man completely honest or relieve him from temptation. We do claim that the tighter and more efficient organization set up by this plan would remove a lot of the underlying causes for some of our troubles now.

"Senator DWORSHAK. How would it do that?

"Mr. DUNLAP. Because it is a much tighter, much more closely supervised organization.

"Senator DWORSHAK. Haven't you had supervision up to the present time?

"Mr. DUNLAP. Yes, sir; but not as tight as this."

On page 109 of the hearings the following appears:

"Mr. DUNLAP. * * * When you have tight control, I repeat what I said last Wednesday, you do away with a lot of the temptations that now exist. In any tight organization, any well-supervised organization, you just don't have the looseness which permits certain things to happen."

Again, on page 133 of the hearings, the following statement is made:

"Senator DWORSHAK. * * * I am saying that after reading many newspaper articles over the years and reading about the fraud and corruption that have been exposed in the Bureau, that we are wondering whether this plan, if it is approved by Congress and sold to the public, offers any greater assurances that honest taxpayers will be given protection and that dishonest, fraudulent tax cases will not be tolerated.

"Mr. DUNLAP. * * * The tighter organization and closer supervison all the way down is a better assurance of that. These people in the inspection service are still more assurance of it. That is a new set-up, as you know, the inspection service. The appellate division shown on the other chart is scattered over more offices now than it was, it is not concentrated, and it is therefore subject to much closer analysis of each of their cases, I believe that will be the best insurance we can hope to get."

With this background I would like next to refer to my discussion with Senator NIXON on the purposes of the plan before the committee. The report of this testimony contained in the majority report is somewhat abbreviated. The full transcript is shown beginning on page 288 of the committee hearings. Before Senator NIXON asked me the questions beginning on that page, he had previously asked me this question: "So it [the plan] does not get at the basic problem of corruption, then, at all, does it?" I replied to th'; question as follows: "I think so, sir, by providing a much tighter and a much better supervised organizational structure than we now have." (See pp. 276 and 277 of the hearings.)

As a preface to some of his later questions, Senator NIXON made the following statement to me: "You feel that under this plan the Bureau would be able to deal more effectively than it can at present with the over-all problem of discovering instances of dishonesty, and dealing with them effectively, is that a fair statement?" I answered, just as I would answer now, "That is right, as well as improving the efficiency of our people." (Hearings, p. 289.) Senator NIXON then asked me whether as a corollary of that statement, I felt that I could not deal with instances of dishonesty and corruption at the present time. With that I could not agree because, as I previously stated, we are at the present time able to detect and punish wrongdoing although our efforts in this respect are rendered more difficult because of the status of collectors as political appointees and because of the relatively loose type of organization which we now have. Furthermore, the corrective measures that we are and have been taking are largely after the actions have occurred. As I have indicated before, I feel most strongly that the plan is necessary to help correct the conditions which gave rise to these wrongful practices and to prevent their repetition.

Senator NIXON then directed questions to me to ascertain whether I believed the plan was primarily for the purpose of dealing with corruption. My answer indicated that the plan was not directed primarily to dealing with corruption for the reason which I have already stated, namely, that I could not agree to relegate to a secondary place the other major accomplishments of the plan.

My views on the important place of this reorganization plan in insuring honesty, integrity and fairness in the conduct of Government perhaps have been best summarized by the following remarks which I made before the Senate Committee on Government Operations on March 4, 1952, in concluding my prepared statement:

"We have been making every effort to build the best internal revenue service it is humanly possible to provide. This has especially included measures to detect and punish any individuals who have been unfaithful to their high public trust. The Secretary and the President have given me their fullest support in this effort.

"It is equally important, however, that we eliminate the weaknesses in our present organizational set-up which have contributed so much to these instances of wrongdoing. The presentation of this reorganization plan represents a major part of our efforts to correct these conditions. I earnestly hope that you will lend your support to this effort to reorganize the Revenue Bureau into a career service of the highest standards."

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this letter puts at rest for once and all any doubt of the opinion of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue as to the importance of this plan as a means of combating corruption. He goes on record unmistakably as saying that it is a paramount step in combating corruption.

Finally, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, dated March 13, 1952. This is a letter which puts at rest the argument that this plan was hastily conceived and that Congress did not have time to review it, because the Commissioner recites from the record that the facts of the plan have been before the Congress since 1948.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, March 13, 1952.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your oral request for my comments on the following statements by Senator GEORGE on the floor of the Senate on March 12, 1952, in relation to Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952.

The comments referred to herein concern primarily the utilization of reports of investigations of the Bureau's organization. On page 2164 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Wednesday, March 12, 1952, Senator GEORGE stated: "A report was made in January. It was sent to the Secretary of the Treasury and to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue." On page 2169 of the RECORD, Senator GEORGE stated that the "distinguished Members who filed the minority view referred to the recommendations made by our advisory committee, to which it is said we paid no attention, and which, I explained, we had sent to the Secretary and to the office of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue expecting comments and had not received any."

COMMENTS

I have no desire to inject my views in the deliberations of the Senate; and, accordingly, I shall confine my response to your request to supplying information as shown by the RECORD relating specifically to the statements contained therein.

The record shows that replies were forwarded to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Under date of April 16, 1948, Under Secretary of the Treasury A. L. M. Wiggins and Commissioner of Internal Revenue George J. Schoeneman addressed separate letters to Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. Copies of these letters are enclosed.

The letter of the Commissioner commented in detail upon each of the specific suggestions contained in the advisory group's report.

No formal action was taken by the committee either in respect to the report of its advisory group nor in response to the letters of the Under Secretary and the Commissioner.

Under date of January 27, 1949, the Commissioner addressed, on his own initiative, another letter to the committee. At that time the chairman was Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON. A copy of this letter is enclosed.

I wish to quote the opening paragraph of this letter.

"Under date of April 16, 1948, I addressed a statement to Hon. EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, chairman, Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, commenting on the investigation by the advisory group of the joint committee, pursuant to section 1203 (b) (6) of the Revenue Act of 1926. I believe that the members of your committee have continuing interest in the results of the efforts that the Bureau is making in response to the report of the advisory group. This statement, therefore, may be regarded as supplementary to my earlier reply of April 16."

No response was ever made to this letter or any formal hearing ever held, nor any other formal action taken by the committee.

Incidentally, it should be noted in passing that the Bureau of Internal Revenue has considered the Report of the Advisory Group of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation one of the finest and most helpful investigative reports ever prepared in respect to the Bureau. The caliber of its recommendations and its complete objectivity from the standpoint of the over-all national interest and interest of taxpayers in general are indeed of a high standard.

Much discussion of the recommendations and objectives contained in the report appear in the hearings before the Appropriations Committees of both Houses. The record will show that ever since the issuance of this report the Bureau has been striving to implement its recommendations.

I am, of course, fully aware of the fact that members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation have been occupied in their capacity as members of the taxing committees on strictly matters of tax legislation which have prevented them from going into the recommendations of the advisory group to the extent to which I am sure they would like to have done. We are fully conscious of the heavy load which the Finance Committee has carried and it is precisely because of this that I am fearful that it will not have the time to go into the detailed matters of Bureau organization if such is now referred to it.

FURTHER STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE

On page 2164 of the RECORD, Senator GEORGE stated: "At any rate, it is pointed out in the minority report that the tax committee of the Congress had its opportunity to be heard upon Reorganization Plan No. 1. That is simply not true."

COMMENTS

The reference in the minority report concerned the fact that representatives of the Treasury Department had asked the chairman of the Finance Committee for an opportunity to explain the reorganization plan to the committee in a manner similar to that

which had been done in the case of the Expenditures Committees of both Houses; the King subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee, at which was present the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; and the subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee having the Treasury and Post Office bills. The record of testimony on which the minority report appears to have been prepared in respect to this question is as follows:

"Senator MUNDT. You see, this committee is placed in a rather difficult position, because we have not specialized in tax legislation. We have never conducted any investigation into internal revenue functions. We have great reliance on the testimony of the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and the ranking member of the Finance Committee, and when they introduce a resolution of disapproval, and it is sort of a bronze light for members of this committee who do not have that background of information.

"Mr. DUNLAP. I realize that, sir, and that is the reason why I am so appreciative of the added opportunity that your chairman has given me to come down and explain some of these things before you.

"I would like to also state that we have never had an opportunity to explain this plan to the members of the Finance Committee.

"Senator MUNDT. That was my next question, sir, and you have anticipated me, whether you ever had, formally or informally, presented this plan.

"Mr. DUNLAP. We suggested that we would be happy to do it, but we never received an invitation to explain the plan to the Finance Committee.

"Senator MUNDT. Neither in a formal nor informal conference?

"Mr. DUNLAP. That is right. Neither in a formal nor informal appearance. We have offered to do so both ways, but we have received no invitation on either basis."

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 14 minutes left.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. NIXON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I shall not take the 3 minutes. As a member of the Committee on Government Operations I concurred in the report of the committee which favorably reported Senate Resolution 285. The arguments which I had intended to present have been already ably expounded by the other members of the committee, and by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and other Senators who have spoken on the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement I had prepared to be presented be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NIXON ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1

As a member of the Senate Committee on Government Operations I concurred in the report of the majority of the committee which reported favorably on Senate Resolution 285.

Statements have been made by some members of this body which indicate that they propose to support Reorganization Plan No. 1 because they believe: one, it will be instrumental in arresting corruptive practices recently exposed in the Bureau of Internal Revenue and, two, that the plan conforms to the recommendations of former President Hoover when he expressed his views in a letter dated January 18, 1952, to the Honorable CECIL KING, chairman of the Subcommittee on Administration of the Internal Revenue Laws for the House of Representatives.

In my opinion the plan does not meet either of these criteria, and in the time allotted to me I shall attempt to explain my conclusion.

When I first approached the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1, I was fully cognizant of the many instances of corruption and incompetence uncovered and which involve many collectors of internal revenue and other Bureau personnel. It has been my duty to participate in some of these disclosures as a member of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations. Consequently I approached the consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1 with the hope that evidence presented before our committee, together with a detailed analysis of the plan, would develop that the plan would in fact do what the proponents of the administration claimed for it. Statements have been made in the public press by many people, commencing with the President of the United States, that if Reorganization Plan No. 1 was not approved, Members of Congress voting in opposition to its enactment, would be hamstringing the efforts of the administration to clean up the corruption which has defiled the Internal Revenue Bureau. Now, I ask, Who should be in a better position to know whether or not the plan will contribute to the fight on corruption than the present Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Dunlap? Charged with the responsibility of dealing with those in the Bureau who have betrayed their public trust, he should know better than any other man whether this plan before us would assist him in discharging that phase of his important responsibilities. Thus it was that I waited with keen anticipation for his testimony before our committee, and what did he say? Commencing on page 555 of the official transcript of the hearings before the Committee on Government Operations on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, this exchange took place between Commissioner Dunlap and myself:

"Senator NIXON. As I understand it, then, this plan is not necessary for the purpose of dealing with the problem of corruption, because you say you are dealing with it effectively now; is that right?

"Mr. DUNLAP. That is correct, sir. The plan is necessary merely to give us a more efficient over-all organization with which to conduct the tax business of the Government.

"Senator NIXON. Then the general public should not, under any circumstances, get the impression that this plan is directed primarily to the problem of dealing with corruption; isn't that correct?

"Mr. DUNLAP. That is absolutely correct.

"Senator NIXON. Because you could handle it now and you are handling it now?

"Mr. DUNLAP. That is right."

I am sure that you will all agree that this should be the final word on whether or not Reorganization Plan No. 1 will contribute or assist Commissioner Dunlap or his successor in ferreting out either past corruption, or preventing future breaches of the public trust by officials of the Internal Revenue Bureau. The final word is, categorically, that it will not. When the American public understands that they have been misled by the pronouncements of the administration's adherents heralding the plan as a cure-all for dishonesty, bribery, and corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue we can confidently expect that the American public will heartily endorse our disapproval of a plan which was launched as a battleship, when in fact it resembles a derelict lifeboat.

The value of Reorganization Plan No. 1 as an aid in the fight on corruption having been so thoroughly demolished by the testimony of Commissioner Dunlap which I have just quoted to you, I then addressed myself to the question as to whether or not the plan does in fact provide a genuine, foolproof, and unassailable system for appointments to responsible offices in the Internal Revenue Bureau, by the merit system of civil service.

We all recall that when the law was adopted providing for the appointment of postmasters under civil service, many of us believed, and certainly the American public was led to believe, that postmasters were being removed from the spoils system. This has not proved the case in actual practice. Testimony before our committee by Mr. Ramspeck showed that he was, in fact, disappointed by the applications of the principles of civil service to the selection of postmasters. In addition, in too many cases the choice of the Democratic administration for a postmaster vacancy has been given an acting appointment. After he has served a probationary period, he is permitted to take a noncompetitive examination and upon passing this examination, his appointment is made final. We know that the examination has at times consisted of a character check and an oral interrogation as to the appointee's general background, with no attention given to his understanding of the particular responsibilities which the job entails.

Members of our committee interrogated Mr. Ramspeck as to whether or not we could have any firm assurance that Reorganization Plan No. 1 would guarantee that the abuses found in the appointment of postmasters under civil service, would not be pursued in the selection of top personnel in the Internal Revenue Bureau. Senator DWORSHAK, at page 83 of the official hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952, after discussing the defects in the appointment of postmasters, asked Mr. Ramspeck this question:

"But if the same practice is to be followed, isn't it reasonable to assume that we will have a political selection of commissioners and deputy commissioners in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, just as we have a politically influenced selection of postmasters?"

Mr. Ramspeck replied: "My answer to that is it could happen, but it has not been the practice as far as I know, except in the Post Office Department, to do that.

"Senator DWORSHAK. If you think it is wrong now to a certain extent to follow this procedure in naming postmasters, then you would certainly think it wrong in following the same procedure in naming commissioners and deputy commissioners under this plan.

"Mr. RAMSPECK. I certainly would.

"Senator DWORSHAK. That bothers me. If you could give me assurances that we could eliminate partisanship and patronage to a large extent and place this upon the high level of civil service, with the sole objective of getting conscientious, efficient service, then I might think it is good. But I can't convince myself that would be accomplished under this proposal. Can you?

"Mr. RAMSPECK. The only person who can give you that assurance at the present time is the Secretary of the Treasury."

Again, at page 81 of the official proceedings, Senator DWORSHAK inquired:

"Mr. Ramspeck, in your prepared statement you stated that to be eligible for appointment to the new positions those col-

lectors who do not have civil-service status must file applications and be rated high enough on the examination to be appointed according to the usual rule of three. Is that not essentially the same procedure followed in naming postmasters?

"Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes."

As will be apparent from the last quotation, Senator DWORSHAK was inquiring as to the eligibility of appointment under this plan of collectors who do not now enjoy civil-service status.

We have been told that of the 17, approximately half a dozen of that number are beyond the civil-service retirement age and will thus be ineligible for any civil-service job. In the report of the minority members of our committee who support Reorganization Plan No. 1, we are told that we have the assurances of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission that there will be no "blanketing" of present collectors into new positions, but each will have to take his chances under the regular procedures. Assurances? What kind of reorganization plan which will have the force of law, is it where we must depend upon assurances of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission that we will not see the same type of "blanketing" in our collectors as has too often made a mockery of civil service in the past?

I earlier made mention of former President Hoover's letter of January 18, 1952, to Congressman CECIL KING. A portion of that letter, I see from the record, was read to the Senate yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. There is an additional paragraph of that letter which Senator HUMPHREY did not bring to your attention, which states:

"Simply to blanket the employees who have not undergone these tests does not seem to me to meet the present situation. Placing these employees under civil service should be accompanied by the requirement that any employees affected should, before continuation in the Bureau, pass the Civil Service Commission requirements on the same basis as any new applicant for such employment."

Thus, I submit, from what I have said, we may all justifiably conclude that Reorganization Plan No. 1 does not meet the sound suggestions made by Mr. Hoover in the concluding paragraph of his letter to Congressman KING. Since the plan does not meet his requirements, how can it be said that this plan has his endorsement?

On January 14, 1952, 23 Senators, including the junior Senator from California, introduced S. 2412. This measure, I submit, correctly interprets and furthers the principles of civil service in its careful requirements for appointments of collectors of internal revenue under sound civil service regulations. In urging disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 1, it is my firm hope that S. 2412, sponsored by 23 Members of this body, may soon be brought before us for consideration, and I predict that when that is done, it will be approved by an overwhelming majority of the Senate.

So, in conclusion, may I say that since, as we have seen, Reorganization Plan No. 1 does not contribute to the laudable and continuing fight which must be made to eradicate past and prevent future corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and since further, it does not assure the appointment of officials on the only principle that justifies civil service, and that is the merit system, I intend to vote against Reorganization Plan No. 1, and I urge my colleagues to do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California yields back the remainder of his time to the Senator from Minnesota or the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes left, and the Senator from Arkansas has 13 minutes left.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. In a few minutes, the Senate will be voting on what I consider to be one of the most important measures which will face this body in this or future years. It is simply a question of killing or approving the proposal of the President to remove the Bureau of Internal Revenue, on which Uncle Sam must rely for $70,000,000,000 a year in revenue, from political favoritism and political patronage.

Let us admit that the plan is not perfect and will not do all that needs to be done. But this is the first step. If the Senate today refuses to approve this plan, then we shall in effect be hanging on the doors of the Senate Chamber a sign saying, "No reforms are wanted here."

This is the first step. If we take this step, we can go forward with reforms that every Member of this body knows are needed.

I know that our opponents, able and distinguished as they are, and experienced as they are at writing tax legislation, would not interest themselves in this matter merely to protect a small amount of political patronage. But they are protecting a system which has been discredited. Their resistance to change will perpetuate the patronage system. That is the big issue. If Senators doubt it, let them wait until they return home and try to explain their vote on this question.

Senators will find that they can talk about Reorganization Plan No. 26. They can say they objected to this plan because the Commissioner of Internal Revenue was not made a third Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, or the General Counsel of the Treasury is under the Treasury instead of under the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Objections such as these were raised here yesterday. But I tell Senators that their people are going to say, "Yes, but you voted to continue a discredited patronage system." Make no mistake about that.

In response, Senators who oppose the plan may say, "This program did not group the agencies correctly." Then some smart fellow in the audience will answer, "Yes, Senator, but you crossed that bridge when Congress passed Reorganization Plan No. 26 in 1950." He will throw that at you.

Let us not fail to realize that there will be fellows like that in the audience, because they follow what Senators say. And they will still want to know why you voted against changing the patronage system.

We are practical men. I think we all know that the rotten cancer of political favoritism and patronage of the politically appointed collectors sits astride the spinal column of our revenue system. At one end we have in a career service a high type of men inspecting, investigating, and auditing, devoting a lifetime to honest, capable performance. That is the field service. At the other end we have high-caliber career men in the Washington office. But sitting astride this line of communication, the spinal cord, is this cancerous growth—an island in many cases of political patronage, pap, and favoritism. This short circuits any hope of efficiency and fairness and determination properly to administer perhaps the most vital agency we have today aside from our National Defense Establishment. I do not believe that we want to perpetuate and keep in the Government this discredited political-patronage method.

It is strange to hear the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] say that the plan is not in line with the Hoover proposals. I do not think it is the Millikin report about which we are speaking. I think it is the Hoover report. I believe that former President Hoover is better qualified than is any Member of this body to say whether the plan is in line with what his commission recommended. I believe that his testimony before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is better evidence than any of us on the floor of the Senate can offer.

This is one of the most vital of all the Hoover proposals because it strikes at the island of political favoritism and patronage and political interference in our Government system. During the years we have brought most of the departments under a career merit system. But if we fail to get rid of political control in the Internal Revenue Bureau, we shall be saying that we want to continue to make a mockery of civil service in that Bureau.

Mr. President, we are practical men. We know that in almost all the offices of the Bureau throughout the country the politically appointed collector of internal revenue today determines promotions. Many employees are not on the basis of merit or efficiency, not on the basis that a given employee is better qualified to fill his job than is someone else. Too often he is on the basis that he knows someone who is important politically or that his promotion or assignment would be good for the political organization or the political sponsor who got the collector his job. We cannot make civil service work under that kind of handicap.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance [Mr. GEORGE] brought out a most important point yesterday when he stated that the collectors of internal revenue in Boston and in Missouri were appointed at a time when there were no Democratic Senators from those States.

If that be true, then is it not important to realize that under the system which we are discussing, when, unfortunately, there are no Democratic Senators from certain States, appointments must come from the smoke-filled back rooms of the political clubhouses?

The job of collecting the hundreds of millions of dollars of vitally needed revenue is not turned over to the best career service, nonpolitical control, but goes to boys in the back room.

They say, "We want Old Joe for collector of internal revenue. He is a good party man; he came up from precinct boss; he became ward boss and then county boss. We want Old Joe."

I think that system might be all right if we were appointing street cleaners or garbage collectors. The patronage system might work in such cases. But it is not the system to employ in connection with the vital job of collecting hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue for Uncle Sam. So I feel that the chairman of the Finance Committee, in making that reference, pointed out the failure of the present system.

Senators certainly cannot be responsible for the appointment of new men whose nominations are submitted to the Senate when such nominations are made by the boys in the back room. We cannot tell anything about the caliber of the appointees when the nominations are before us for consideration.

It may be argued that we place the stamp of approval on an appointee when we confirm his nomination. I have been present in this Chamber on numerous occasions when the Executive Calendar has been called. Usually the majority leader, the minority leader, and two or three other Senators are present. The Presiding Officer says, "Without objection, the nomination is confirmed."

Thus, it may be said that the Senate gives its stamp of approval to the appointee. Of course, there has been a little examination in committee, but in 90 percent of the cases the Senate places its stamp of approval on the nomination when fewer than five Senators are in the Chamber.

Now, it is protested that this plan takes away from the Senate the power of confirmation. It is said that it is proposed to take away the protection which the public expects from the Senate. Confirmation under such circumstances is no protection. I cannot go along with that kind of argument. We cannot have knowledge of these men and we should not take the responsibility for them. I want to turn that job over to the agency whose duty it is to properly select competent career men.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, in his statement yesterday, said:

> They know at the Treasury, and they know at the Bureau, although they have not told us, that they have the undated resignation of every collector of internal revenue in their possession. It is right on the President's desk or in one of its drawers.

The Senator from Georgia further stated:

> Every 4 years the collectors must have their commissions renewed; they must be reappointed if they want the position. Why quibble about who was President when so-and-so was originally appointed, when certainly he has been up for reappointment and has been reappointed once or perhaps twice since then, and there is a resignation procedure available under which he can be relieved of his office.

I have before me a letter signed by Mr. John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which reads as follows:

> MARCH 13, 1952.
>
> Hon. A. S. MONRONEY,
> *United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> MY DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your phone inquiry of this morning as to a statement made by Senator GEORGE yesterday concerning the appointment of collectors of internal revenue.
>
> The statement of Senator GEORGE begins on page 2165 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, March 12. This statement is as follows:
>
> "However, on that point, Mr. President, let me make the following statement: They know at the Treasury, and they know at the Bureau, although they have not told us, that they have the undated resignation of every collector of internal revenue in their possession. It is right on the President's desk or in one of its drawers. Every 4 years the collectors must have their commissions renewed; they must be reappointed if they want the position."
>
> The Internal Revenue Code provides that collectors of internal revenue will be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. There is no provision of law concerning the length of service nor renewal of appointments.
>
> I personally served as a collector of internal revenue and have no knowledge of undated resignations being obtained from collectors by either the President or the Secretary.
>
> Neither is there any procedure for renewal of commissions every 4 years or for any other period.
>
> In other words, every collector now on the rolls who was appointed by the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt is still operating with precisely the same commission which was originally issued to him.
>
> Very truly yours,
>
> JOHN B. DUNLAP,
> *Commissioner.*

So I am afraid that the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee was inadvertently in error.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, it is not in error. It was not inadvertently made. It was made as a factual statement. They have the undated resignations——

Mr. MONRONEY. Then the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder, with whom I talked this morning, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, are in error in their statements?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know who stated anything to the Senator, but I say that they do have the undated resignations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Are they on hand at this time?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I gathered from the Senator's remarks that they are on hand today.

Mr. GEORGE. They are always on hand, unless they are thrown away.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Commissioner and the Secretary of the Treasury——

Mr. GEORGE. They may be with the President. The President does the appointing.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Georgia was in error with respect to the 4-year reappointments; was he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield two more minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I read the box score a moment ago as to which system is best. We have 64 collectors. Seventeen of them have civil-service status. None of the 17 have been found to be wanting in any way by investigators. That is zero percentage of defalcations.

Seven of the remaining 47 noncareer, politically appointed collectors have been fired for cause. Some are under indictment. That represents 15 percent who have been weighed and found wanting and discharged for cause. That is nearly 15 percent, a pretty high percentage.

One hundred and forty-one career employees in the regular civil service in the Internal Revenue Bureau, out of 57,000, have been discharged for cause. That is less than two and one-half one-thousandths of 1 percent. I ask Senators which system they would buy if they were trying to assure the honesty and integrity of the agency dealing with the Government's revenue.

Mr. President, I should like to speak for a moment to Members on the Republican side. Perhaps the greatest achievement of the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress was the creation of the Hoover Commission. President Hoover has testified before the House committee that this plan is in line with his proposal. Do Republican Senators intend to back up the greatest achievement of the Eightieth Congress, or do they intend to repudiate it? Do they mean business when they say they want to clean up corruption in Government, or are they going to vote to continue the system under which corruption can develop?

I believe that the program for this Congress on both sides of the aisle should be to prosecute to the extreme extent every guilty employee, no matter how high or how low his station.

We should continue to investigate thoroughly, to be sure that nothing is swept under the rug.

But more important than those two things is the correction of the system which has been found wanting so that these things will not happen again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Does the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] desire to use time?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, one point which has been giving me some concern in the past 2 years has been the tendency on the part of the administration to pick out a little facet from the many recommendations of the Hoover Commission, tie onto it a whole program, and then label the result as a recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

I would feel somewhat better about it if a little more opportunity were given

to Congress to exercise its judgment and deliberation as to what may be called a recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

I was somewhat perplexed by the debate on this bill with respect to the position that I should take. I am persuaded that the plan before the Senate does not do all that needs to be done. We need not merely take the collectors out of politics. We need to take the functions of the offices out of politics. By that I mean that the position of the tax collector should not be a part of any particular political administration.

Therefore, Mr. President, I have taken a great deal of interest in a bill which was introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. If I may do so, I should like to introduce a similar bill at this time, and ask that it be appropriately referred. It was originally introduced in the House as House bill 6127. It is a bill which provides for the collection of internal-revenue taxes and the administration of internal-revenue laws by an agency independent of the Department of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2864) providing for the collection of internal-revenue taxes and the administration of the internal-revenue laws by an agency independent of the Department of the Treasury, introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE. May I have an additional minute?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield one more minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, this bill would create an independent agency to be known as the Internal Revenue Commission to handle the collection of taxes.

Mr. President, it does not seem to me that in the light of the answer of Mr. Dunlap to the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] that we ought to be misled. The Senator from California said:

> The general public should not under any circumstances get the impression that this plan is directed primarily to the problem of dealing with corruption; isn't that correct?

Mr. Dunlap answered:

> That is absoutely correct.

Mr. President, if we want to do a good job we should take not merely the collectors but the functions of the office of the collector away from the political administration. Therefore, I hope the plan may be voted down and that the appropriate committee will give serious consideration to the proposal to which I have just referred.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield half a minute to the distinguished Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not have time to make the statement I desire to make. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement of my reasons for voting against Reorganization Plan No. 1.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WATKINS

There are several good reasons why Reorganization Plan 1 of 1952, the plan which relates to the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, should not go into effect. Most of these reasons have already been mentioned during the course of the debate—that legislation by the device of a reorganization plan is objectionable; that Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 is not consistent with the recommendations of the Hoover Commission; that the plan was hastily dreamed up for strictly political purposes; that the plan will bring about no economies, but on the contrary, may cost us additional millions of dollars each year.

Stress has also been placed on the fact that the adoption of the plan would create legal problems, especially as to the right of citizens to sue the Government and to be granted trial by jury.

These reasons are all substantial and worthy of serious consideration. But to my mind, there are two other issues which are of paramount importance.

First, we must ask ourselves what effect the Reorganization Plan No. 1 will have upon the corruption which congressional committees have found to be rampant in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Does this plan provide an effective way of curbing and making impossible any future scandals in connection with the tax dollars paid in by the hard-working and conscientious citizens of our country?

Second, what will be the effect on citizens who have to deal with the Bureau of Internal Revenue? Will the changes provided in this plan make it easier for them to deal with the Bureau or will they further complicate an already difficult situation?

In seeking the answers to these two fundamental questions, I have come to the conclusion that Reorganization Plan No. 1 does not provide an answer to the problem of corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The mere placing of certain positions under the civil-service system does not insure that integrity and honesty will thenceforth pervade the entire organization.

I would like to remind you that of those employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who have been dismissed or forced to resign since these scandals were brought to light, 95 percent were civil-service employees. You have heard it stated that none of the major dismissals involved a civil-service employee. To be sure, the seven collectors who were removed were not in positions covered by the civil-service system. But what about the other 160 employees who have been dismissed, forced to resign, or are now under suspension? All of them are civil-service employees. And I might add that two of the dismissed collectors held civil-service status at one time.

If this is not proof enough that corruption would not be cured by applying civil-service coverage to the collectors, I ask you to look at the Post Office Department. Competitive civil-service does not seem to have prevented sale of jobs in Mississippi, and I know that all of you can cite instances of where political patronage was still the deciding factor in the selection of postmasters. No; extending civil service to the collectors is not a cure-all. We cannot create honesty and integrity in public office by merely adopting a reorganization plan. Far from cleaning up the corruption which is being brought to light, the proposed plan would freeze in the corrupt and corruption.

Now I come to my second point—the effect upon the citizens who must use the facilities provided by the Bureau. I have already mentioned that legal problems would be created if this plan were allowed to go into effect. In addition, I understand that a new supervisory level would be added—the 25 new district commissioners, each with three or four assistants.

Certainly, those of us who have had an opportunity to observe bureaucracy in action know that the more levels you have in an organization, the less become your chances of getting any speedy or effective action.

The present collectors of internal revenue would still be there in the form of deputy district commissioners, but there would be these new district commissioners and their assistants who would have to be considered. Instead of settling a case in Salt Lake City as we do under the present system, the citizen who has tax problems would be likely to find himself referred to the district commissioner's office at Seattle or Denver or some other place hundreds of miles distant. And remember that it is not only the citizen who would have to travel these additional hundreds of miles, but also his attorneys and counsel.

I have been informed by reliable CPA's and attorneys who have worked with the Bureau of Internal Revenue for many years that their task would be made much more difficult were the Reorganization Plan No. 1 to be adopted. Much time would be lost in travel and in dealing with another level to which tax matters could be referred for advice or decision.

The Reorganization Plan No. 1 provides no satisfactory answer to the problem of corruption in the Bureau of Internal Revenue. It adds to the inconvenience and the expense of the public in attempting to deal with the Bureau on tax matters. For these reasons alone, the Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 should be rejected.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Senator from Arkansas has 9 minutes remaining. The Senator from Minnesota has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to say that I am fully cognizant of the atmosphere that prevails in the Chamber over this issue, and that has prevailed throughout this debate. This situation has largely been engendered by a letter written by the President of the United States to the President of the Senate which challenges the integrity and motives of Members of this body who may disagree with him regarding this reorganization plan. I regret it, because in my humble judgment the statement of the issue as set forth by the author of this plan, in his letter is as far from the basic, fundamental issue actually involved in this plan as any statement could possibly be.

I believe this challenge comes with poor grace. It is a pretty good sign of the weakness of the position of anyone when he says: "If you do not agree with me, your motives should be impugned and challenged."

Mr. President, if it was the intent of the letter to intimidate or coerce those of us who may have other convictions, I shall answer it by my vote to disapprove the plan.

It has been contended all the way through this debate, that the purpose of this plan is to remove politics from the tax collecting machinery of the Nation. It is said that we must get rid of the little collectors of revenue, who it is contended are political poison in the system.

In order to substantiate that statement the proponents of this plan in committee sought to have Representative KING, the chairman of the investigating subcommittee in the House of Representatives, submit a statement in support of the plan. He submitted such a statement, and it is incorporated in the report of the hearings. It deals with the issues of politics and corruption. I shall read from Representative KING's statement, and I challenge any proponent of the plan to make a declaration that this plan will remove the crux of the evil as reported by Representative KING in his letter to the committee.

I read from page 302 of the hearings. Representative KING says:

> The office of the collector of internal revenue in San Francisco prior to September 27, 1951, was badly administered. Control of the office over a long period had fallen into the hands of a top echelon of political appointees whose chief failing was their gross incompetence. Their second and also serious failing was a devotion to political interests which transcended their loyalty to the revenue service and caused them to engage in petty and sometimes criminal manipulations. In these they were encouraged and protected by the complacency and indifference of an inept top administration in Washington.

Mr. President, there is the crux of the corruption. It lies in those in high places who have not only encouraged it but have protected it, according to Representative KING, who said he supports the plan.

Senators who claim that the plan would remove politics from the machinery of tax collection are making a grave mistake indeed. They are crucifying the little collector whose nomination the Senate has the authority to confirm. If we approve the plan we would be taking the political power away from ourselves, away from the control of this constitutional body, and concentrating it in the higher echelon of what he terms "inept" management to which and which he says has protected and encouraged it by "complacency and indifference" we will not clean up corruption by doing that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is satisfactory to me. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brewster	Butler, Nebr.
Anderson	Bricker	Byrd
Bennett	Butler, Md.	Cain
Capehart	Holland	Moody
Carlson	Humphrey	Morse
Case	Hunt	Mundt
Chavez	Ives	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Dirksen	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Kem	Pastore
Duff	Kilgore	Robertson
Dworshak	Knowland	Russell
Eastland	Langer	Saltonstall
Ecton	Lehman	Schoeppel
Ellender	Lodge	Seaton
Ferguson	Long	Smathers
Flanders	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Frear	Malone	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Martin	Smith, N. C.
George	Maybank	Sparkman
Gillette	McCarran	Stennis
Green	McCarthy	Thye
Hayden	McClellan	Tobey
Hendrickson	McFarland	Underwood
Hennings	McKellar	Watkins
Hickenlooper	McMahon	Welker
Hill	Millikin	Wiley
Hoey	Monroney	Williams

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the adoption of Senate Resolution 285.

The Chair will state that resolutions on reorganization plans create somewhat of a reverse situation, in that in the present case the resolution is a resolution of disapproval of plan No. 1 submitted by the President.

Therefore, Senators who favor the President's reorganization plan will vote "nay" on the resolution; and Senators who are opposed to the reorganization plan will vote "yea" on the resolution.

The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business, acting as chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Senate Small Business Committee in connection with the opening of hearings today at Bridgeport, Conn. On this vote the Senator from Connecticut is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

On this vote the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON]. If present and voting the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted as follows:

YEAS—37

Bennett	Eastland	Holland
Butler, Nebr.	Ecton	Johnson, Colo.
Cain	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Capehart	Flanders	Long
Carlson	Fulbright	Martin
Case	George	Maybank
Chavez	Hayden	McCarran
Cordon	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Dworshak	Hoey	McClellan
McKellar	Russell	Watkins
Millikin	Schoeppel	Welker
Mundt	Smith, N. C.	
Nixon	Stennis	

NAYS—53

Aiken	Humphrey	Murray
Anderson	Hunt	Neely
Brewster	Ives	O'Conor
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Kefauver	Pastore
Byrd	Kem	Robertson
Clements	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Connally	Knowland	Seaton
Dirksen	Langer	Smathers
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Sparkman
Frear	Malone	Thye
Gillette	McFarland	Tobey
Green	McMahon	Underwood
Hendrickson	Monroney	Wiley
Hennings	Moody	Williams
Hill	Morse	

NOT VOTING—6

Benton	Jenner	Taft
Bridges	Kerr	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 37 and the nays are 53.

Under the law, a majority of all Senators elected and sworn in must vote for the resolution of disapproval in order that it may carry.

Therefore the resolution of disapproval is disagreed to; and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952 goes into effect at 12:01 a. m. on the morning of March 15.

PREVENTION OF ILLEGAL ENTRY OF ALIENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) entitled "An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1.
>
> That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:
>
> In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:
>
> On page 3, beginning on line 10 and ending on line 23, strike out paragraph (c).
>
> And the House agree to the same.
>
> HARLEY M. KILGORE,
> JAMES O. EASTLAND,
> WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
> HOMER FERGUSON,
> WILLIAM E. JENNER,
> *Managers on the Part of the Senate.*
>
> EMANUEL CELLER,
> FRANCIS E. WALTER,
> LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
> *Managers on the Part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, by direction of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I desire to make a brief announcement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. RUSSELL. Heretofore in the consideration of the mutual security program, particularly that portion of the program dealing with military assistance, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly, have proceeded to consider the matter, under a unanimous-consent agreement obtained in the Senate.

There is, of course, ample room for argument and controversy as to proper jurisdiction over legislation of that character. The Armed Services Committee had never raised any issue as to its right to consider that measure, because of the fact that arrangements had been worked out for hearings by the two committees, sitting jointly. As proof of the thin line of demarcation between the jurisdiction of the two committees, it may be pointed out that, last year, the Vice President referred the message relative to this subject to the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

The Senate Committee on Armed Services has no desire to interfere with the operations of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, but in view of the fact that no agreement has been reached this year for consideration of the bill by the two committees, sitting jointly, I wish to serve notice on the Senate that, when the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations shall have reported the bill to this body, the Senate Committee on Armed Services will request a directive by the Senate to examine the bill.

The members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, if I may state the case briefly, feel that such a request is justified in view of the fact that more than 85 percent of the funds which are authorized in that proposed legislation relate to the procurement of military equipment, and to the distribution of the military equipment which is produced in this country, and its division between that which goes to the Armed Services of the United States and that which goes to our various associates and allies.

I shall not discuss the question at length. I merely wish to apprise the Senate of the fact that the Senate Committee on Armed Services will respectfully request the Senate for a directive that that committee examine this proposed legislation when it is reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think the able Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has made a very important and significant statement, and he has done so acting on behalf of the full Armed Services Committee.

I desire merely to add that, as the Senator from Georgia has pointed out, more than 85 percent of the program deals directly with the National Defense Establishment, particularly the disposition of excess or nonexcess military equipment, which has a direct effect upon the armed services of the United States. That is a matter which is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee; and I believe that if arrangements are not made to have hearings by the two committees, sitting jointly, there is an obligation upon the Armed Services Committee and the Senate to see to it that the bill is rereferred to the Armed Services Committee for its consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the remarks of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from California, who are members of the Armed Services Committee. It is the attitude of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that this measure was referred to that committee; and, inasmuch as it was referred to that committee, we expect to do our duty in connection with it. What the Senate may do after we submit our report will be up to the Senate. But I remind Senators that this is a matter affecting foreign relations, if there ever was one. It deals only with matters affecting foreign relations, and it is pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations. After the committee shall have completed its consideration and efforts, if the Senate then wants to rerefer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, that will be the business of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator agree that when the previous legislation was before the Senate, it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services, sitting jointly?

Mr. CONNALLY. I may say that was done with our consent. We were willing to do it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Are we to understand that the Senator is withholding his consent at this time?

Mr. CONNALLY. No consent is called for at this time. The Senator from Georgia did not request any consent; and I thought he was the chairman of the committee, not the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wanted to clear the record by ascertaining whether the Senator from Texas was objecting to this bill being considered by the two committees, sitting jointly, as has been done in the past.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state for the information of the Senate that the previous bill was, by unanimous consent, referred to both committees. No such consent was requested in this case, and the Chair referred the President's message to the Committee on Foreign Relations, because that is the committee to which it should have been referred, if only one committee were to consider it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to reply to the Senator from California that there is no unanimous-consent request before the Senate. Of course I have not objected when there was no request. If the Senator would listen and pay attention to his duties, he would know that without my having to tell him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I realize, of course, that the matter has been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee. Ordinarily, I do not believe it is advisable to have a bill considered by two committees. I think the committee which has the major interest should be the committee to consider proposed legislation. However, this bill involves questions in which both committees are intensely interested. A part of it relates to the defense of the United States, and naturally the Armed Services Committee would ordinarily have jurisdiction of that feature. I suggested last year that the bill then before the Senate be divided so that it could be considered by the Armed Services Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee.

Under the circumstances, since we are trying to make progress and to get through as early as possible, I hope the chairmen of the two committees will get together and try to work the matter out so that each committee will not have to go over the same evidence.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator is "laying down," on me.

Mr. McFARLAND. I would not say I am "laying down" on anyone. I am trying to expedite the business of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the bill has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and so long as it is before that committee we shall do our duty by it. On two previous occasions our committee agreed with the Committee on Armed Services that the latter committee might have subsequent jurisdiction of a bill after we had acted upon it; and we have invited that committee to sit with us during the hearings. They were present today, and they will be there tomorrow if they want to come. They have been invited.

There is no question now pending, and I do not at this time want to make any agreement about voting in the Foreign Relations Committee by members of the Committee on Armed Services. If the question comes up later, it will be up to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rules of the Senate, the Chair can refer a bill to only one committee, no matter what the bill may be. When a bill has been referred to two committees it has to be by unanimous consent. I think all Senators understand that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out to the Senate that when the first measure providing for military assistance to our allies and

associates overseas was sent to Congress the question of the jurisdiction over the bill was discussed between the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senator from Texas, as a result of the discussions, requested unanimous consent that the bill be considered jointly by those two committees.

When the second bill providing for the implementation of the military program, along with economic aid, came before the Senate, a similar course was followed. Over the years the percentage of funds which are devoted wholly and exclusively to military assistance as compared with funds which may be for economic assistance has increased, and the percentage this year going to military assistance is higher than it was in the last session.

Of course, Mr. President, I shall not ask unanimous consent that the two committees sit together. It would be far from my purpose to have the Armed Services Committee seek to intrude into another committee where it is not welcome. There have been many matters which involved a border-line decision as to jurisdiction. Heretofore they have been settled by unanimous consent.

I should like to point out that last year the Senate Committee on Armed Services inaugurated an inquiry into the famous MacArthur removal controversy. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations thought it had some jurisdiction, and I was approached by the chairman of that committee. I rose on the floor of the Senate and requested unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee sit with the Committee on Armed Services in investigating the question, and as chairman of that joint committee I undertook to deal justly and fairly with every member of the Foreign Relations Committee and to extend to the members of that committee every right and privilege that I extended to the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. President, I shall not seek to intrude into the Foreign Relations Committee. Of course, in view of the statement of the Senator from Texas, I shall not ask unanimous consent at this time, but there is no doubt in my mind that the bill more directly affects the defenses of the United States than does a treaty which has already been ratified by the Senate. We are dealing with the future when we deal with the military equipment covered by the bill.

Mr. President, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is a motion in order at this time that the bill be referred to the Committee on Armed Services after it has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think such a motion would be in order at this time, because the bill is not before the Senate. It is before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senate can take no action on it until it is reported to the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I repeat what I stated in my opening remarks. I said I wished to serve notice on the Senate that, in my opinion, the Senate Committee on Armed Services should be directed to examine the bill before it is voted on by the Senate. It bears a very vital relationship to matters which pertain to the equipment of the armed services of the United States and to the defense of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senator yields, the Chair will state to the Senator from Georgia that if and when the bill is reported to the Senate from the Committee on Foreign Relations, after it is up for consideration and not until then, a motion will be in order to refer it to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the Parliamentarian has carefully examined the precedents in the matter. I have a recollection, which is indistinct and not sufficiently clear for me to predicate a definite statement upon it, of a motion having been made in times past after a bill had been reported by one committee, that another committee consider it when there was a borderline question of jurisdiction involved. Even the distinguished Presiding Officer had some misgivings about it, because he referred the message relating to the matter to the Committee on Armed Services in the last session of the Congress, and later on we agreed that there would be a joint hearing by the two committees when the bill was considered in committee. I hope the Parliamentarian will examine the precedents.

It seems to me that when the bill is on the calendar the Senate can permit it to go to the Armed Services Committee.

I recall that in times past, when considering such legislation, the Senate has directed more than one committee to consider a bill of this nature.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the hazard of the Presiding Officer attempting to pass upon a parliamentary question in advance of its being raised. The observation of the Chair will not be binding on the Chair, if and when the question comes before him in a situation which may later arise. The Chair appreciates, of course, that the Senator from Georgia is one of the most expert parliamentarians in the Senate, and has great respect for his opinions in regard to parliamentary procedure.

Of course, the Chair always consults the Parliamentarian of the Senate in regard to questions of this sort, although every now and then the Chair has an opinion of his own.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I hope the Chair did not think I intended to reflect upon the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Oh, no; the Chair does not entertain any such feeling.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Chair has ruled, and very properly ruled. The Chair is the one who made the observation. That is the reason why I asked the Chair to go into the question more fully.

Whatever the circumstances may be, Mr. President, with offense toward none, but in the firm conviction that the Senate Committee on Armed Services is entitled to examine the proposed legislation at the first appropriate opportunity, whether it be after it is made the unfinished business, or it is found that it can be done upon motion at some future time, I shall request that the Senate direct the Committee on Armed Services to make an investigation into the question of the effect the furnishing military supplies to our allies and associates will have upon the Armed Forces of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels, in justification to himself, that he ought to suggest that the Chair will pass on that question if and when it arises.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will not be bound by an ex cathedra observation at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to the fact that I had opportunity to make a hasty observation of the committee print of the bill this morning, and to inform him that the committee print, which the Committee on Foreign Relations is now considering, specifically in its terms, in paragraphs, reappropriates and reauthorizes funds which were the subject of the joint hearings last year.

This bill specifically refers to, and specifically brings up, the question of reauthorizing and reappropriating funds which were the subject of joint hearings last year.

Under the ruling of the Chair the matter has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations alone. I respectfully call that to the attention of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, because it seems to me to make his point doubly strong.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I again wish to make an appeal to the chairmen and the members of the two committees involved to use every possible means to resolve the difference with respect to consideration of the proposed legislation. I do not believe the United States Senate should require witnesses to appear before two committees and testify as to the same matter.

I realize the importance of this measure, but there are many ways in which the difference can be ironed out. We have previously ironed out such differences between the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. We had the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs consider the items which strictly involved irrigation and reclamation, and that committee made its recommendations to the Committee on Public Works.

Of course, the matter could be handled by holding joint hearings, but I am appealing to the chairmen and members of the two committees to consider the importance of getting together and resolving their differences without having

to bring them to the floor of the Senate and spending days on the consideration of mere procedure.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to observe that I shall be very happy to do anything in my power to avoid any repetition, duplication, controversy, or ill feeling. I merely desired to advise the Senate of the opinion of the Senate Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think I should have an opportunity to reply.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has made a very able speech on the question of jurisdiction and as to the committee to which the Chair should have referred this matter. According to his contention, the contention of the Senator from Massachusetts and possibly the contention of the Senator from California, it should have been referred to the Committee on Armed Services. However, it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There is now no mutual security bill pending before the Senate. There is a proposed draft to which the Senator from Massachusetts referred, but there is no bill that is as yet before the Committee on Foreign Relations or before the Senate.

Mr. President, if the Committee on Foreign Relations is not doing its duty, or if it has not performed its duty on previous occasions, it will be satisfactory to have this matter taken away from it. Let it be sent to the Committee on Armed Services.

A statement has been made that a precedent was established on two previous occasions. If there is a precedent, it was in connection with a unanimous consent agreement, and the Committee on Foreign Relations did not object. We made no objection to the referral which was made.

After the Committee on Foreign Relations has acted upon this mutual security measure and has reported it, it will then be before the Senate; but that stage has not yet been reached. The Chair is to be congratulated upon not ruling in advance upon a question which may not be the same when it comes before the Senate at a future date.

I have no prejudice in this matter, but I know how the members of my committee feel about it. We feel we are capable of handling the bill. We feel it is within our jurisdiction and that it is our duty to act under the reference, having due regard to the committee, to the Senate, and to the country.

The Senator from Massachusetts says that there are one or two places in the bill somewhere which refer to some appropriations. If one will examine the whole bill, it will be seen that it is a bill relating to foreign countries. There may be some small exceptions, but the entire measure is inextricably intertwined with foreign policy and our relations with foreign countries. Where should the bill go, if not first, at least, to the Committee on Foreign Relations? A Senator has just said in an aside that it should be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. That covers a lot of territory. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, so far as the bill concerns the reappropriation of money, it should be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and it will be referred to that committee, I assure the Senator from Texas, because the Committee on Appropriations is not going to give over its duties to any other committee, much as it respects the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the chairmen of other committees. It is not going to give its duties over to the Committee on Foreign Relations or the Committee on Armed Services. We are going to appropriate the money, and I suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations that all portions of the bill which reappropriate money for foreign countries should be removed before the bill comes to the Senate, and I hope they will be.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I assure the eminent Senator from Tennessee, that we will consider his suggestion when we act on the bill. I think the Senator said "We are going to appropriate the money." If Senators have made up their minds in advance that they are going to appropriate it, why should the Senator bother having the bill referred to his committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. We do not want to have appropriated so much as apparently it is sought to appropriate.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has not looked at the bill. How does he know?

Mr. McKELLAR. I have heard that many billions of dollars—many hundreds of millions of dollars—are to be appropriated, and we want to know all about what the bill does appropriate.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think it is unfortunate that the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations does not know the difference between millions and billions. Those are different terms.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is not so much difference in these latter days, when it comes to giving money to foreign countries.

Mr. CONNALLY. If it is the Senator's view, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that it does not make much difference whether it is billions or hundreds of millions, I am afraid we ought not to refer the bill to his committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Members of the Senate for having the energy and willingness to work upon this important measure. I see that we are not going to experience any difficulty in having the bill considered. I do not know what the situation will be when it comes to passing it, but Senators are willing to consider it. I congratulate Members of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has the floor. The Chair suggests that all that has been done so far has been to refer the message of the President to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I realize that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No bill has been introduced, and no bill is pending.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is true; but several speeches from the Armed Services Committee are pending.

Mr. President, if there was ever a question considered on this floor affecting our foreign relations and dealing with foreign countries on matters of the highest importance, not alone to the United States, but to the whole free world, it is the question involved in this proposed legislation.

With respect to all the technical parliamentary maneuvering, Senators are not afraid that the Foreign Relations Committee will not do its duty. The members of the Armed Services Committee wish to handle the subject. They wish to control it. They have their duty. The rules of the Senate prescribe what the Committee on Armed Services shall do. I have not interfered with that committee, and my committee has not interfered with the Armed Services Committee. But merely because a bill deals with arms, it is said that it should be referred to the Armed Services Committee. I suppose that every bill for foreign relief ought to be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because the subject deals with something to eat.

So it is with all the various committees of the Senate. A bill can be taken away from any committee of the Senate on the theory that it affects something else. Of course, it affects something else. Every dollar we spend affects something else. Every appropriation which the Senator from Tennessee so generously recommends affects something else all over the world.

Mr. President, I am speaking not only for myself, but for other members of my committee. We believe that this message was referred to our committee under the Constitution and the laws. We think we know our duty. We think we are able to perform that duty and consider the legislation in question.

We have been courteous to the Committee on Armed Services. On two former occasions we agreed that the members of that committee should sit with us and vote——

Mr. RUSSELL. It was done on three occasions, not two.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. Because we have treated the members of that committee well on three occasions, complaint is now made that we do not treat them as well on another occasion. Did not the members of the Senator's committee vote on the other occasions?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have made no complaint.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not say the Senator had.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; we voted on the other occasions, just as the Senator from Texas voted in the MacArthur hearings.

Mr. CONNALLY. That was not in connection with legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not yet. Let me reply to the Senator from Georgia.

The Foreign Relations Committee sat in the MacArthur hearings, and that is all we did. On three former occasions

the Senate Armed Services Committee, with the consent of the Committee on Foreign Relations, not only sat through the hearings, but voted, just as did members of the Foreign Relations Committee, notwithstanding that the President of the Senate did not refer the subject to the Armed Services Committee, but referred it to the Foreign Relations Committee. Notwithstanding that, we agreed upon three former occasions that members of the Armed Services Committee should sit with us. Now they demand the same treatment again.

According to that theory, we shall have to change the rules and expand the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee to include any matter which is pending before the Foreign Relations Committee over which the Armed Services Committee—not the Chair, but the Armed Services Committee—believes it has jurisdiction.

Mr. President, I am not speaking merely my own sentiments. I speak the sentiments of quite a number of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We have a pride in our committee. We try to do our duty. We are subject to the control of the Senate. If we do not do our duty regarding a bill, the Senate can reject what we do. The Senate has a way of disciplining us. It has a way of punishing us if we do not perform our duty.

After we have considered these matters and reported a bill——

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Hampshire for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The question is this: Was that a left hook the Senator was delivering, or a one-two punch? [Laughter.]

Mr. CONNALLY. This is a New Hampshire lick. [Laughter.]

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator should not forget what New Hampshire did on Tuesday.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am telling the Senator from New Hampshire that that is what I am going to do to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I present a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CONNALLY. If it is not a long one. I yield for a brief inquiry.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It will not be so long as some conversations I have heard.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will not yield for the present; if the Senator is going to make critical remarks, he will have to wait until I finish.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am making no critical remarks.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will yield in a little while. While I am on this subject, I wish to conclude my observations with respect to it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. On the matter which I am now discussing?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not wish to be misunderstood. The Senator seems to think that I approve all the appropriations which he is undertaking to make in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. We do not make appropriations in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not want to have any misunderstanding on that question. I have not attended the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations, but from what I have heard, that committee is undertaking to make many appropriations which I do not approve, and do not expect to approve when the time comes for hearings before the proper committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, knows that we do not appropriate a dime in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Tennessee was speaking about our committee making appropriations. We make authorizations. After the authorizations are made, we must go before the Committee on Appropriations on our hands and knees, and say, "Oh, Mr. Chairman, we have authorized this. Will you make the appropriation?" The Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations sits upon his dais, on the rostrum, or on his throne, and says, "No; you cannot have it. It is true that the Senate has authorized this appropriation, but it has not authorized me to do anything with it that I do not want to do."

That is what the Senator from Tennessee wants.

Mr. McKELLAR. We shall be glad to invite the Senator from Texas——

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to be invited.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Texas need not come before the Commitee on Appropriations on his hands and knees.

Mr. CONNALLY. Whenever our committee makes an authorization, it is sent to the Committee on Appropriations. We do not send a guard with it. We do not send a military squadron to present it to his highness. We send it there under the rules of the Senate. The Committee on Appropriations does not need to recommend the appropriation of a dime, and the Senate does not need to appropriate a dime unless it wishes to do so, unless it believes that it is in the best interests of the country. I would not coerce the Senator from Tennessee into giving us $100, any more than I would point a pistol at his head and demand $100.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to know that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, those are the views of myself and of some of my colleagues on the committee. As I understand, no unanimous consent request it pending.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No unanimous consent request is pending.

Mr. O'MAHONEY and Mr. RUSSELL addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that under the rules adopted by the Senate and the Congress in the Reorganization Act, there are certain fields in which the jurisdiction of committees is well defined. However, there is also a twilight zone in regard to the jurisdiction of committees. A bill may contain several matters which, if separated, might be referred to different committees. According to the rule and the precedents a bill is usually referred to the committee which has jurisdiction over the preponderance of subjects in the bill.

The bill to which reference has been made would be an authorization bill. No bill has yet been introduced. The Chair referred the message from the President to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Heretofore authorization bills have been considered by certain committees. By a unanimous-consent agreement a bill may be referred to two committees sitting jointly. However, such reference to two committees does not establish any precedent. When the message was read, the Chair felt that because a preponderance of the matters involved in it related to subjects under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the message should be referred to that committee.

The bill has not been introduced, and the Chair does not bind himself as to its reference. In any event, he would feel obligated to be governed by the preponderance of the matters contained in the bill with regard to its reference. The Senate by unanimous consent could agree that it be considered by two committees. However, that issue is not before the Chair and is not before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, in the course of my remarks a short time ago, in reply to an inquiry or interruption by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], I said in effect that if the Senator had been here and looking after his business, it would not have occurred. I understand that remark is offensive to some Senators. Therefore, I ask leave to withdraw that statement from my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas withdraws that part of his remarks.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Texas has seen fit to withdraw the remarks he made recently about the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. KEM. No, I do not yield now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say that I meant no reflection on the Senator from California.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, in my judgment and in my observation, there is no Senator in this Chamber who is more conscientious, more industrious, and more devoted in the performance of his

duties than is the Senator from California; and I may say that in the opinion of many of us, no Senator in this Chamber approaches those duties and discharges them with any greater ability.

So I am glad the Senator from Texas has seen fit to withdraw his remarks, which I cannot help but think were untimely and in poor taste.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Joint Resolution 20.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER obtained the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Earlier in the week the Senate was discussing the submerged lands bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator from Louisiana will pardon me a moment, I should like to say that there was considerable discussion during the early part of the week about a letter which was addressed by the Secretary of the Interior to the Governor of the State of Washington. I have received a letter from the Secretary of the Interior dealing with the subject raised by that letter, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. CAIN. Would the Senator from Wyoming please a number of us by reading the letter which he has just received from the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have asked the counsel of our committee to hand a copy of the letter to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I am appreciative of that courtesy, but in view of the fact that many Senators who are deeply interested in this question are present in the Chamber it might be constructive for the Senator to read the letter.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read the letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the letter.

The Chief Clerk read the letter, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 11, 1952.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: In looking over the issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the past week I have noted Senator CAIN'S references on the floor of the Senate to the letter which I wrote to the Governor of the State of Washington on February 15, 1952, respecting the issuance by that State of oil and gas permits or leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the Washington coast. Senator CAIN'S remarks indicated that he construed my letter of February 15 as casting a cloud on the title of the State of Washington—or its grantees—to the tidelands and to the beds of navigable inland waters—such as bays, rivers, lakes, and Puget Sound—situated within that State.

I understand that on March 6 the Solicitor of the Department furnished to you a map of the State of Washington, on which was superimposed a line showing the landward limit of the area claimed on behalf of the United States in my letter of February 15 to the Governor of Washington. That map graphically illustrated the fact that my letter to the Governor of Washington related only to submerged lands of the Continental Shelf underlying the open waters of the Pacific Ocean, and that it did not assert any claim on behalf of the United States to tidelands or to the beds of navigable inland waters situated within the boundaries of the State of Washington.

With regard to the tidelands and the beds of navigable inland waters situated within the boundaries of a State, it has been well settled by decisions of the Supreme Court for more than a hundred years that such lands belong to the State (or its grantees). So far as I am aware, no responsible official of the Federal Government has expressed a contrary view at any time during the past hundred years.

On the other hand, the decisions in recent years by the Supreme Court in the cases of *United States* v. *California* (332 U. S. 19 (1947)), *United States* v. *Louisiana* (339 U. S. 699 (1950)), and *United States* v. *Texas* (332 U. S. 707 (1950)), establish conclusively that the coastal States have no rights of ownership in the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to their shores, extending seaward from the low-water mark along the coast or from the mouths of bays, rivers, or other inland waters; but that, instead, all rights in such lands underlying the open sea are vested in the United States. By virtue of Executive Order 9633 (10 F. R. 12305), the Secretary of the Interior has jurisdiction and control over the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the coast of the United States, pending the enactment of legislation with respect to such lands.

This Department first learned late in 1951 of the issuance by the State of Washington of oil and gas permits or leases on submerged lands underlying the open waters of the Pacific Ocean. Such information came to our attention in connection with conferences growing out of a controversy between this Department and the State of Washington over whether the site of certain oil development in the vicinity of Gray's Harbor was land which had accreted to an Indian trust allotment or was a tideland area belonging to the State of Washington. During the course of those conferences, we learned that the State of Washington had not only granted oil and gas rights on the area involved in the particular controversy, but that the State had also granted oil and gas permits or leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf situated seaward of the disputed area.

Being under a duty imposed by Executive Order 9633 to protect the interests of the United States in submerged lands of the Continental Shelf and their mineral deposits, I wrote the letter of February 15 to the Governor of the State of Washington upon learning that the State of Washington had previously issued oil and gas permits or leases on submerged lands of the Continental Shelf underlying open waters of the Pacific Ocean. The purpose of the letter, of course, was to put the State of Washington and its permittees or lessees on notice respecting the rights claimed by the United States in lands underlying the Pacific Ocean which the State had purported to make available for oil and gas development. In this connection, silence on my part might have been unfair to the State's permittees or lessees, in that they might have expended large sums in developing the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf without their attention having been called to the rights in such lands asserted by the United States under the doctrine of the California, Louisiana, and Texas cases.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate for a moment in regard to the letter of the Secretary of the Interior which has been read to the Senate.

In the letter the Secretary of the Interior states the law in the way the bureaucrats would like to have it, but not in the way it is at the present time.

In his letter, of March 7, the Secretary says it has been held in the Texas, California, and Louisiana cases that the States have no rights of ownership in the submerged lands on the Continental Shelf. Then the Secretary proceeds to say that the Federal Government has all rights in such lands. Mr. President, that simply is not the law. It never has been held that the States have no rights in these lands. It has been held that they have no title to them, but it never has been held that the Federal Government has all rights in these lands. It has been held that the Federal Government has paramount rights in them, but by no means all rights.

The bureaucrats tell the States that they cannot have these lands because international considerations are involved.

I should like to point out that when the Secretary of the Interior says the Federal Government has all rights in the submerged lands, he is making a statement about which the courts have never decided. If the Secretary of the Interior had said the States have no title in the submerged lands, perhaps he would have been correct. However, the Secretary of the Interior is incorrect when he says the States have no rights in the submerged lands and that in connection with those lands no consideration whatever is due the States.

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF JAPANESE TREATY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has the floor. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the majority leader, provided I do not lose the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely wish to announce that it is our expectation that the Senate will go into executive session tomorrow for the purpose of considering the Japanese peace treaty.

LETTERS FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have before me a letter which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks so that every Senator may read it. The writer has asked me to read it on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOLNA, N. DAK., *February 23, 1952.*

Hon. Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HON. SENATOR LANGER AND ALL YOUR ASSOCIATES: There are any amount of us taxpayers 2 years behind in tax payments, and just about all the boys are drafted. We are old and nearly licked. Please [do not] let these Senate bills pass, UMT. We do want 100 percent of parity.

We want the offshore oil revenues used for all the Nation, earmarked for Federal aid to education.

At the present rate we are headed to destruction at a fast pace. Our income does not equal our expenses, taxes everything out of line. I do know you are not a miracle worker, who is? We pray God shall guide you fellows.

Excuse my scribbling. These times are breaking me down fast and I am not old yet.

Tax nerves, etc., hard work, and no pay.

God bless you Bill.

Sincerely,

PETER E. SCHINDELE.

I hope you read this out loud on the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a letter which I received from Mr. J. P. Hemmingsen, of McCanna, N. D.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCCANNA, N. DAK., *March 2, 1952.*

DEAR MR. LANGER: My family and myself we just like to tell you that we appreciate so much what our soldiers and our Congress has done in the last 30 years, or so. Now we ask that our Congress see to it that our soldiers, if it have to be, see to it that Stalin gets the same treatment as Hitler did.

Sincerely yours,

J. P. HEMMINGSEN AND FAMILY.

THE PRICE OF HOGS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have before me a letter from a farmer who got $10 for a hog for which he had paid $100 and $37 in express charges. It demonstrates the low price the farmers of the Northwest are getting for pork. Of course the 23 cents per dozen we get for eggs is even worse but it is all getting more reminiscent of the drought days.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with the receipts from Armour & Co., showing exactly what was paid.

There being no objection, the letter and the receipts were ordered to be printed, as follows:

RICHARDTON, N. DAK., *March 1, 1952.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND BILL: I thought I would write you a few lines. I would like to know what is wrong with the hog market. I am sending you a slip where I got 10 cents a pound and it was a well-fed stag. I paid for that pig when I bought it at $100 and $37 express. How can a person make a go of it when a person goes in the butcher's shop and buys hamburger or other pork? You will have to pay around 60 cents a pound and I am getting 10 cents a pound liveweight. Don't you think there is something wrong? There is a nigger in the wood pile somewhere and then we got to listen to the talk that the farmer is making too much money. If most of the farmers will get a poor crop they will just about be broke.

As ever, your friend,

ANTON KRAUMAN.

ROUTE 1, RICHARDTON, N. DAK.

No. 709246: Sold to Armour & Co., West Fargo, N. Dak.; date, February 26, 1952; weigher, E; from Richardton; shipper, Anton Krauman; net weight, 315; hog, 1; dock, 40; price, $10; amount, $31.50.

709246: $31.50.

COMMUNISM IN GUATEMALA

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, recently the problem of international Communism in Latin America has received considerable attention both on the floor of Congress and in the press. Previous references to this problem may be found on pages 1335 through 1339 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 25, 1952. Several newspaper articles dealing with Communist infiltration of Latin America are included in this discussion. Some of the authors include Ludwell Denny, Scripps-Howard foreign editor; and Duncan Aikman, who also is author of a book on inter-American relations. The articles are entitled "Marriage of Convenience—Communist Clique Runs Guatemala," which appeared in the Washington Daily News; "Economic Suicide in Guatemala—Reds Out To Wreck United Fruit Co." which also appeared in the Daily News; "Central America Rich Field for Reds," from the February 15 issue of the Daily News; "Red Front Tightens Grip on Guatemala," from the Washington Post of February 17; and "Guatemala—the Price of Caviar," which appeared in the February 11 issue of Time magazine.

Particular concern has been expressed regarding the serious influence which Communists have been able to achieve in Guatemala. With your indulgence, Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to this problem.

In 1944 the 13-year, iron-handed dictatorship of Gen. Jorge Ubico was ended by a genuinely popular revolution. Juan Jose Arevalo, a seemingly liberal and progressive ex-teacher, returned from self-imposed exile in Argentina, and was elected President by an overwhelmingly popular vote.

Shortly thereafter, under the guidance of this self-styled spiritual socialist, things began to happen in Guatemala. Vicente Lombardo Toledano, a Mexican Communist labor leader, was invited to Guatemala to organize a labor movement. He did so—so successfully, in fact, that when Arevalo stepped down from office a year ago, organized labor was the most important single factor in the political life of the country. Moreover, it was under the tight control and leadership of the international Communist movement. Both the principal labor federations were, and still are, affiliated with Toledano's Communist Latin American Workers' Federation and with the Moscow-run World Federation of Trade Unions. The extent of Soviet control of the labor movement in Guatemala is revealed by the fact that Victor Manuel Gutierrez, most important labor leader there, and head of the recently formed General Federation of Labor, recently returned from a visit to Moscow, where he had been a guest of the Soviet Union.

The General Confederation of Labor, which now dictates policy to all Guatemalan labor, was formed several months ago as the principal achievement of a meeting held last spring, attended by prominent European and Latin-American Communists.

Penetration of Guatemala by international communism has not been confined to the labor movement. Communists and pro-Communists achieved great influence in the pro-Government political parties, in the Congress, in the Government press and radio, in the Social Security Institute, the National Petroleum Institute, the National Electoral Board, and in many other phases of Guatemalan life. Pro-Communists were appointed to the diplomatic service, and prominent Communist labor leaders traveled freely throughout the world under the immunity of diplomatic passports issued by the Guatemalan Government. Communist-front organizations and movements, such as the Soviet-sponsored "peace" campaign, flourished. In Government circles it became fashionable to be a Marxist or Stalinist; and Arevalo himself set the pace by granting official audience to such openly avowed Communists as Lombardo Toledano, Pablo Neruda, the well-known Chilean Communist poet and ex-Senator, and others.

In this atmosphere, Guatemala became the haven for radical leftists and Communists who were unwelcome in their own countries, where it was recognized that, willingly or unwittingly, they served the interests of the Soviet Union and of international communism, rather than the interests of their own countries and people. These persons not only were welcomed in Guatemala but many of them were given jobs and the direct patronage of the Guatemalan Government.

Why was it that the Guatemalan revolution of 1944, which at first seemed to be making laudable progress toward representative democracy, could have been so distorted in seven short years? Why was it that seemingly sincere Guate-

malans who, apparently, were trying to deliver their country from its historic yoke of dictatorial oppression, could have allied themselves with the agents of a more sinister and terrible form of dictatorship—in fact, international dictatorship?

The answer is that the Communists, small in number, but well organized, fanatical and determined, with an influence all out of proportion to their numbers, have cunningly devised to identify themselves as the champions of the social justice and nationalistic aspects of the Guatemalan revolution. They have thus cloaked their true insidious purpose in the aura of aspirations held dear by the Guatemalan people. Many people throughout the world, as we all know too well, have been taken in in this manner by the Communists. Some have discovered their error before it was too late and some have not. It is to be fervently hoped that the Guatemalan people will soon be able to see through the smoke screen of professed Commmunist friendship.

This was the situation which Col. Jacobo Arbenz inherited from Arevalo when he took over the reins of Government a year ago. Colonel Arbenz, not a Communist, had nevertheless been a key member of the Arevalo government and had depended in large measure on the support of the Communist-influenced pro-government parties and the Communist-dominated labor movement for his election. Thus far, Colonel Arbenz has apparently been either unwilling or unable to deal firmly with the problem of Communist penetration into his country. The situation regarding toleration of Communists remains, therefore, substantially as it was when Arevalo left office. There is a difference, however. Because of this continued toleration the Communists have carried out their activities more and more openly and brazenly, with consequent increased influence on the Government and its policies.

Mr. President, I have before me an exhibit which I should like to have printed at this point in my remarks. It is from the May 1951 issue of the Intelligence Digest, and it is found at page 23. I do not know too much about the Intelligence Digest. I inquired at the Library of Congress, and was informed that it is a publication which is received by the Library of Congress, and that it is published by Kenneth Coursey, of London. But I wish to say that the statements made by him in this article, or in excerpts therefrom, which I am about to place in the RECORD, are borne out by other documentary evidence which I propose to place in the RECORD in connection with my remarks. In this publication Mr. Coursey proceeds to point out that the new government—that is, the present government—in Guatemala is definitely of a leftist slant, and that some of the men in key positions are very dangerous. He also declares that—

The Foreign Minister, Manuel Galich, has leftist leanings, but few convictions. He will do whatever Arbenz orders. The department of agriculture goes to Nicolas Brol, an extreme leftist. He can be expected to continue the work of Spanish Communists in his department and to continue the practice of making the state farms a source of revenue, and training grounds for the Caribbean Legion.

FELLOW TRAVELERS IN MINISTRIES

The Ministry of the Interior is in the hands of Ramiro Ordonez Paniagua of the National Renovation Party, a movement very close to the Moscow line. Finance is directed by a consistent fellow traveler and bitter enemy of the United States, Augusto Charnaud MacDonald, of the Revolutionary Action Party. One of his close colleagues has the important Ministry of Education. Communist propaganda in the schools will receive every encouragement.

The health, commerce and labor, and defense departments are also in the hands of pronounced leftists. The new Minister of Communications and Public Works, Maj. Carlos A. Paz Tejada, is said to be opposed to the continuation of the Pan-American highway.

Mr. President, one result of Communist success in Guatemala has been to distort Guatemalan nationalism into deliberate harassment of United States companies doing business there which, in the Communist line, are termed "imperialistic exploiters of the people." This in spite of the fact that United States concerns pay higher wages and provide greater benefits by far than any other commercial enterprises in the country including those operated by the Guatemalan Government.

I may say at this point, Mr. President, that the United Fruit Co., a concern which does a large volume of business in the Caribbean area and in New Orleans, has large holdings in Guatemala, and I am informed that the rate of pay to employees on its plantations is from two to three times what is paid by any concern of Guatemalan origin.

The aim of the Communists in Guatemala is the same as elsewhere in the world, to sow hatred and mistrust of the United States, thereby making it difficult, if not impossible, for United States interests to continue to operate in the country. In this way it is calculated that the moral and material strength of the United States and the free world will be gradually weakened until the point is reached when they will be easy prey for the Soviet Union.

Almost all United States companies in Guatemala have suffered at the hands of this Communist-directed campaign and presently the United Fruit Co. is in danger of being forced to abandon the country entirely. The newspaper reports indicate that the company has reached an agreement with its employees on the west coast and that there is a possibility of settlement of its other labor problems at Puerto Barrios and Bananera, but even if the present critical issues should be settled in such a way as to permit this company to continue operations, this may be only a temporary respite at best. As long as Communist influence remains strong, United States interests will continue to be the target for attack.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks I should like to have printed in the RECORD a news item which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on March 12, 1952, date-lined "Guatemala," which shows that some kind of agreement is now being worked out between the government and the United Fruit Co., whereby it may be possible for the United Fruit Co. to proceed with the development of its own properties there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the news item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GUATEMALA UNION APPROVES UNITED FRUIT RESTORATION

GUATEMALA, GUATEMALA, March 12.—Banana workers union members have voted aproval of an agreement which will let the United Fruit Co. restore its 23,000-acre plantation at Tiquisate at a cost of about $10,000,000.

Yesterday's settlement of the 6-month dispute between the workers and the fruit company over wages and firings will allow the company to resume operations later this week.

The only step needed now is approval of the Minister of Labor and Economy and he said this will be forthcoming immediately.

The agreement extended an existing contract for 3 years. The company promised to rehire about 3,500 workers dismissed after a hurricane destroyed the Tiquisate plantation last September. The company also will pay about $800,000 in back wages. The workers dropped demands for wage increases.

Mr. ELLENDER. I wish to repeat, Mr. President, that this settlement may only be temporary, and that so long as this Communist influence remains in Guatemala, all investments, whether they be from the United States or from some other country, are in jeopardy.

The successful penetration of international communism into a country of this hemisphere with which the United States has historically maintained friendly relations, is a cause for the greatest concern. Moreover, it poses a new problem for this hemisphere, one for which a solution must be found before it is too late. While Communists are active in all countries of the hemisphere, including our own, Guatemala is the only government in this hemisphere which has thus far had its policy come under serious Communist influence. However, the situation in Guatemala is only symbolic of what can and will happen in other countries of this hemisphere if those countries do not recognize and take steps to protect themselves from this danger.

Mr. President, in that connection, I should like to place in the RECORD another excerpt from the Intelligence Digest, the issue of July 1951, page 30, which is indicative of the fact that this Communist movement is not confined entirely to Guatemala, but is present in many of the islands of the Caribbean area. I ask that the entire excerpt be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FRENCH WEST INDIES

During the recent conference of the "Little Cominform" for the Caribbean area for the

inauguration of Arbenz, the new President of Guatemala, a new member took an important part in the proceedings. He was known only to the Red Spanish delegate and the Soviet observer.

THE COMMUNIST DELEGATE

A tall, strong Negro, speaking good French, Spanish, and English, he passed by the name of Rocca—almost certainly an alias—and was introduced as the delegate from the Communist Party of the French Antilles.

Up to this time, these territories had been absent from all conferences of Caribbean Communist parties. The Communist parties of Guadeloupe and Martinique were attached directly to the Communist headquarters in Paris. All funds and directives came direct from there.

The probable reason is that, in 1945, the Antilles became a department of metropolitan France, under the Ministry of the Interior, against the advice of the colonial authorities.

DOMINATION OF TRADE-UNIONS

The Antilles Communist Party has gained a large degree of control of the local administration through its domination of the trade-unions. Trade-union members are mostly backward Negroes working in the sugar plantations, and it has been easy to muster their votes.

The population generally is passive and disinterested in politics. Less than 40 percent of the voters go to the polls. A determined minority can, therefore, do almost anything. In 1948 the Communists were able to win two out of the three Martinique seats allotted to the department, although only 10 percent of the electorate voted for them. The seats were held this time.

They were also able to capture important local administrative positions, such as the mayoralty of Fort de France, the capital of Martinique.

THE MENTALITY OF THE NEGRO

The official head of the Communist Party is an important local government official. He is a man of considerable political acumen and an able demagogue, who thoroughly understands the mentality of the Negro, which is far closer to the superstitions of central Africa than to the European status conferred on him by law.

The main weapon, however, is not the Communist Party itself, but the GCT (General Conference of Workers).

Union discipline is very strong. Whenever the zeal of members shows signs of flagging it is whipped up by a strike—such as that of the sugar workers this spring—which is usually carried to the point of bloodshed. It is not difficult to induce the Negroes to use their machetes against the police.

UNDER COMMUNIST CONTROL

The waterfront workers and those of the sugar plantations are well under Communist control, and through them, the island's main industries.

Within the CGT, the Communists are organizing an armed force. As far as our observer could ascertain, there are arms dumps in both Martinique and Guadeloupe, but he thinks that their importance should not be overestimated. There are so many arms deposits in the Caribbean area and such good shipping facilities, that arms could probably be brought in any time from Guatemala or Mexico without much difficulty.

ORGANIZING ARMED FORCE

Besides the armed force being organized for direct action on the islands, there is also a Communist police force in the process of formation. This is, in reality, a part of Soviet intelligence, designed to remain in existence in the event of the banning of the Communist Party.

There are strong indications that the man going under the name of Rocca, referred to at the beginning of this report, is not only the leader of the Communist police and underground, but the supreme authority in the party.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article which appeared in the United States News & World Report of March 7, 1952. The article is entitled "Communists Are Making Inroads in United States 'Back Yard.'" In bold type appears this statement:

While United States is running around the world trying to stop Communism, a Red menace is rising close to home.

Mexico has Communist troubles. So have Cuba, Panama, Guatemala, Chile, Argentina and other Latin American states.

It's a situation that threatens United States investments and trade. If things get worse, United Stated may have few "good neighbors" left.

I wish to quote from this article a paragraph in which it is stated:

These sore spots are showing up in an area that provides the United States with a third of its imports, including some of high strategic value. In this area, American direct investments of more than 5 billion dollars are larger than in the whole Eastern Hemisphere. Latin America, in hostile hands, could be a grave menace to United States security.

Mr. President, I am sure that all who read the RECORD will agree with that statement.

On page 38 of the U. S. News & World Report there appears a map of South America, indicating the countries which have communism in their midst. There is much trouble. The accompanying article is headed "Trouble spots in Latin America," and reads as follows:

1. Cuba: Communist votes will be important factor in election.

2. Mexico: Government breaks off defense talks with the United States; Communists active in presidential campaign.

3. Guatemala: Pro-Communist Government tightens screws on United States companies.

4. Panama: Communists agitate against United States.

5. Colombia: Semianarchy prevails in parts of country.

6. Venezuela: Outlawed leftist party plans violent come-back.

7. Brazil: Communists infiltrate armed forces; President Vargas' decree hampers United States firms.

8. Bolivia: Anti-United States groups plan revolution.

9. Chile: Presidential candidates angle for Communist support.

10. Argentina: Government press and radio attack United States; President Perón dickers with Communists.

In this article, Mr. President, there is a detailed account of each country which is being affected by the Communists. I hope all Senators will find time to read these excerpts.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpts may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Communists find good fishing in these troubled waters. Through the press, over the radio, and on the rostrum they push the line that Yankee imperialism is to blame for nearly everything that is wrong.

Nationalists, intellectuals, and liberals find it easy to go along with the Communist idea. They resent the fact that the United States pours billions into Europe and Asia, while only a little aid trickles down to Latin America.

In Cuba, opposition stirred up by Communists caused the government to change its mind recently about sending troops to fight in Korea. The Communists say they have well over 100,000 voters in their popular Socialist Party, and they expect to win several seats in congress this year. By helping to elect an anti-administration man to the presidency, they hope to swing quite a little weight with the next government.

In Panama, there is an upsurge of anti-Americanism. The Canal Zone, United States run, is a strip of territory that cuts across the middle of the Republic of Panama. A good many Panamanians don't like United States control of the Zone.

Extreme nationalists in Panama are watching the news of Egypt's attempts to push Britain off the Suez Canal. Some would like to follow Egypt's example. Communists go along with this idea. They lead student groups that demonstrate often. A presidential election this year promises violence, with the students in the thick of it. United States military commanders, meanwhile are guarding the Panama Canal closely against sabotage.

In Venezuela, the majority Democratic Action Party is plotting a revolution to regain power from the military junta. Although driven underground, many members have arms. Their leaders charge United States oil companies helped to cause their downfall. This charge never has been proved; it is the policy of the oil companies to stay out of politics.

Still, the democratic action leaders nurse their grudge. They are watching to see how Iran makes out with the oil properties it seized. If Iran makes a go of it, oil companies in Venezuela may find themselves in trouble.

In Colombia, the conservative administration is the only Latin-American Government that has forces fighting in Korea. Internally there is violence between conservatives and liberals. In some areas there is virtual anarchy. Communists, who made hay during the Bogotá riots in 1948, are helping to keep things stirred up.

In Chile, the Communist Party, although illegal, is well organized and active. It controls a good-sized section of organized labor. Communists and fellow travelers keep urging seizure of American-owned mines, biggest overseas source of copper for United States defense industries. They are agitating against a military agreement with the United States.

Chilean Communists claim a hard core of at least 50,000 voters. In a country with so many political parties, a block of 50,000 votes can be decisive. Thus, presidential candidates are angling for Communist support. A president under obligation to the Communists could make trouble for the United States.

In Bolivia, a revolution is being planned by a coalition of Communists, Fascists, and other elements opposed to the United States. Their candidate, Víctor Paz Estenssoro, won a plurality of votes for the presidency last May, but failed to get the absolute majority required for election. When it looked as if Congress would give him the Presidency, the army took over the Government.

The army hopes to keep Paz and his coalition from seizing control. Still, anti-American sentiment is stronger than ever because of trouble with the United States Reconstruction Finance Corporation over tin prices. It's uncertain how long the army can sit on the lid. It is expected that Paz, as President, would nationalize the mines and make it hard for the United States to get Bolivian tin.

In Argentina, President Juan D. Perón has trouble on his hands. Political opponents

refuse to stay suppressed. Important sectors of the armed forces object to the power wielded by Perón's wife, Evita. Drought and Government policies have cut farm production sharply. Inflation is running wild.

Perón is afraid of a revolution. His press and radio have stepped up their attempts to blame the United States for all Argentina's troubles. His police have jailed scores of those suspected of wanting a revolution. With Evita in poor health, he has lost her aid in keeping the country lined up. Now, trying to broaden his base of support, he is negotiating for a deal with local Communists.

In Brazil, President Getulio Vargas is under pressure from both the right and the left. Communists, although outlawed, can muster several hundred thousand votes. They have infiltrated the armed forces, and they have tried to prevent a military agreement with the United States. Their propaganda attacks Vargas because he has not stopped inflation.

Extreme nationalists, on the other hand, charge that Yankee investors are trying to take over the country. They do not welcome competition. Vargas, making a play to both Communists and Nationalists, has issued a decree that threatens severe hardship to big United States investors.

These are the biggest sore spots. Others are likely to show up before long. For example, in Costa Rica a socialistic candidate has a pretty good chance of being the next president. While not anti-United States, he is expected to nationalize American-owned properties if elected.

Fact that trouble spots exist does not mean that the United States has lost out completely in Latin America. When a showdown comes in the U. N., most of the Latin-American governments usually go along with the United States. Several countries are signing military agreements with the United States. American private capital, government loans, and technical assistance are helping to improve backward conditions.

Improvement is low, however. Often the people in Latin America do not know that the United States is doing anything to help them. The United States has lost most of the popularity it enjoyed 5 years ago. As long as Washington focuses its attention on Europe and Asia, troubles are likely to increase in Latin America. Communists are to keep stirring things up, and some of these troubles can turn out to be serious.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, it would appear to me that the problem of Communist penetration into any country is primarily one for that country itself to solve. However, if that country fails to recognize or effectively respond to the danger which international communism represents, then the problem becomes one for international concern because of the inevitable impact which Soviet international communism has on that country's neighbors and on other nations of the free world.

As we know, Guatemala's nearest neighbors—the American Republics—joined themselves in a system of collective security known as the Organization of American States. Within this Organization, the nations of the Western Hemisphere have by formal resolution taken cognizance of the danger involved in Communist encroachments. In my opinion, Soviet-directed Communist penetration of this hemisphere is as much a threat as would be the direct physical intervention of a non-American state. I hope, therefore, that all of the American states will address themselves with vigor and courage to this problem.

Mr. President, I have a statement which indicates that vast sums of money have been appropriated since 1947 for the economic help of our South American friends.

In 1947 we appropriated $17,000,000 for economic and technical assistance to our Latin-American neighbors.

In 1948 we again appropriated $17,000,000.

I may say at this point that economic and technical assistance includes health and sanitation, food, agricultural extension work, educational, natural resource development, and transportation. It seems that with the expenditure of these vast sums we should be able to strike a more responsive chord in the hearts of our friends to the south. They should realize what vast amounts of money we must now spend in order to fight Communism in Europe and in Asia. I am very hopeful that the money we propose to spend in the future will hit the mark and do a little more good than is now apparent on the surface.

Mr. President, in 1949 we appropriated $12,000,000; in 1950 we appropriated $8,500,000; in 1951, $9,800,000. In this fiscal year we shall spend by June 30 $21,245,000 for economic and technical assistance, plus $38,150,000 for military aid.

In 1953 it is estimated that we will spend $23,000,000 for economic and technical aid and $62,000,000 for military aid.

Since 1947, for economic and technical aid, we have spent $108,545,000. That figure includes the 1953 estimated appropriations. Military aid funds spent, or which will be spent in the next fiscal year, amount to $100,150,000. In short, a total of $208,695,000 has either been spent or requested for the benefit of our friends to the south of us since 1947.

It is my judgment that when the Appropriations Committee is called upon to study money requests for the 1953 fiscal year, it should examine very carefully amounts requested in the light of what is happening to our friends in South America, Central America, and the entire Caribbean area.

BATON ROUGE ENGINEER DEPOT, BATON ROUGE, LA.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the Baton Rouge Engineer Depot was built during the latter part of 1942 and the early part of 1943 at an over-all cost to the Government of $2,907,257.92.

On September 22, 1949, this property was sold as surplus by the War Assets Administration at Dallas, Tex., to the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc., at Baton Rouge, La., for $41,000 down payment, with $164,000 more to be paid over a period of 10 years, or a total of $205,000.

The officers of the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co. at that time were: Jack Motley, president; Martin Weaver, vice president; Tom E. Foster, vice president; and Al Pinkston, secretary-treasurer.

Two months after purchase of this property the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc., on November 21, 1949, arranged with the Commodity Credit Corporation for these facilities to be partially utilized by that agency, and on December 9, 1949, the first shipments were unloaded.

Following the outbreak of the Korean war the Commodity Credit Corporation began withdrawing from these facilities, and on August 2, 1951, the last commodity was loaded out.

During the intervening 20 months the Commodity Credit Corporation paid to this group storage charges amounting to $193,571.48.

On June 26, 1951, the United States Air Force, through its agent, the Machine Products Co., Inc., leased approximately two-thirds of this property at a rental of $219,816 per annum.

On July 16, 1951, condemnation proceedings were instituted by the Department of Justice at the request of the Secretary of the Army whereby the Government sought to acquire a leasehold in the depot property. In these proceedings the issue of rental valuation was not determined.

On September 28, 1951, upon the recommendation of the Department of the Army, there was included in Public Law 155 of the Eighty-second Congress, an authorization of $2,500,000 for the repurchase and restoration of this depot on the basis that the Army has now determined that it will need this property for a minimum of 10 years and that it would be more economically sound to repurchase the property rather than to pay over $2,000,000 in rentals for a 10-year period.

In its belated concern for the taxpayers the Department of the Army, when testifying for the $2,500,000 authorization, did promise that they would attempt to repurchase the property for $1,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter dated February 26, 1952, addressed to me by Mr. Jess Larson, of the General Services Administration, outlining the procedure which has been followed by the Department in this transaction.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Reference is made to your letter dated January 29, 1952, requesting a detailed development of the history of the handling of the Baton Rouge Engineering Depot, Baton Rouge, La., by the General Services Administration.

A survey of records which entailed a lengthy examination of files both in the central office and the field has now been completed. The information developed is set forth immediately below.

1. Description: The industrial portion of the original facility contained 530.5 acres of fee-owned land and 185.5 acres of perpetual easements. This property was comprised of approximately 70 buildings and structures, of which were 6 major buildings containing about 780,000 square feet. The related personality of this facility consisted of a Diesel locomotive, Ford fire truck, and miscellaneous handling equipment. The facility also contained 103.59 acres of land which was classified as agricultural land.

2. Sales price: The industrial portion of the facility, along with the personality, was originally sold by the War Assets Administration on August 19, 1948, to Steinburg Hide & Fur Co., Baton Rouge, La., for $440,385. The purchaser defaulted and the facility was returned to the custody of War Assets Administration on May 16, 1949.

3. Transfer of property: The 103.59 acres of agricultural land was assigned to the Farm Credit Administration on June 14, 1946, for disposal, and the files indicate that this portion of land was disposed of by the Farm Credit Administration through the Federal Land Bank of New Orleans, La.

4. Readvertisement and sale: The facility was readvertised for sealed bids to be received until July 11, 1949, from qualified priority holders, and until July 25, 1949, from all others. One bid was submitted by Seidenbach & Diefenthal, New Orlean, La., in the sum of $107,111. It was rejected as insufficient. The facility was then advertised for negotiated sale. Jack Motley and associates, Center, Tex., later known as the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc., submitted an offer of $205,000. Two other offers were submitted, one by Seidenbach & Diefenthal in the amount of $125,000 and the other by Rudy Prins Co., Dallas, Tex. The latter did not make an offer to purchase but proposed to lease the property for a period of 2 years at $2,250 a month subject to the acceptance of an option to purchase at the end of 2 years for the sum of $225,000. The regional office of the War Assets Administration concluded that it was to the advantage of the Government to accept the offer of the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc., because of deterioration of buildings and increasing maintenance costs.

The regional director of War Assets Administration advised Jack Motley on September 23, 1949, that his offer of $205,000 had been accepted, subject to certain terms and conditions, including manner of payments, clearance by the Department of Justice, and right of entry and assumption of custody of the facility as of 12:01 a. m. on October 1, 1949. An amendment was made to the offer of acceptance changing the date of assumption of custody of the facility to October 22, 1949, which amendment was accepted by Jack Motley, president, Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc.

5. Rentals: At the time the War Assets Administration disposed of the facility rentals were being received in the sum of $1,264 per month from private enterprise. There was also a charge of $3 per railroad car for switching which amount was not converted to the Government but rather to the railroad companies.

6. Representative of the Government: The sale of this facility was conducted by Karl E. Wallace, regional director, War Assets Administration, who now holds the position of regional director, General Services Administration, Dallas, Tex.

7. Purpose of construction of facility: The files reflect that the facility was declared surplus by the Corps of Engineers on June 5, 1947, and that its prior use had been an engineering depot and backup storage center for the New Orleans Port of Embarkation.

8. Leasing or repurchase of the facility by the Government: Our records reflect no information relating to any current interest of the Department of the Army in this site.

9. Storage of Commodity Credit Corporation commodities: Records of this administration do not reflect any arrangements for storage contracts for the Commodity Credit Corporation during the period that GSA, or its predecessor, War Assets Administration, had custody of this property.

It is suggested that you may wish to get in touch with the Commodity Credit Corporation for a report concerning any storage contracts which may have been executed at this site.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters; favorably.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Earl Wayne Beck, of Missouri, to be Recorder of Deeds, District of Columbia, vice Marshall L. Shepard, resigned; adversely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur T. Esgate to be Production Credit Commissioner of the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have known Arthur Esgate for 33 years. He was formerly cashier of the Valley National Bank in Arizona, and was recognized as an outstanding banker in my State.

He has for the past several years worked for the Farm Credit Administration, and has earned this promotion. He is a man of integrity and ability. It is with pleasure that I move the confirmation of his nomination to be Production Credit Commissioner of the Farm Credit Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George F. Kennan to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in executive session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, March 14, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13 (legislative day February 25), 1952:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Arthur T. Esgate, of Arizona, to be Production Credit Commissioner of the Farm Credit Administration.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George F. Kennan, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal Presence, as we pray together, we would thank Thee for the gift of a new day, challenging us to lay hold of those ideals and principles which invest life with dignity and worth.

Inspire us with a more vivid and satisfying sense of the great divine realities and resources as we face the many opportunities that beckon us to heroic endeavor and noble service.

We humbly confess that we are so slow to see that our human life has no standards and stability, no defense against despair and defeat, no bulwarks against communism and chaos unless we cultivate faith in Thee and in the moral and spiritual values.

Grant that during this day we may yield ourselves to the spirit of our blessed Lord, whose mind is wiser than our own, whose strength is invincible, and whose peace will keep us calm and courageous.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ALIENS ENTERING OR REMAINING IN THE UNITED STATES ILLEGALLY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1505)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) entitled "An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter

proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

On page 3, beginning on line 10 and ending on line 23, strike out paragraph (c).

And the House agree to the same.

EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARLEY M. KILGORE,
JAMES O. EASTLAND,
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
HOMER FERGUSON,
WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) entitled "An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The bill (S. 1851), as it passed the Senate, limited the authority to make an arrest for a violation of a provision of the act to "officers and employees of the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service designated by the Attorney General, either individually or as a member of a class, and all other officers of the United States whose duty it is to enforce criminal laws." House amendment No. 1 struck out the words "of the United States", so that other officers whose duty it is to enforce criminal laws, would have authority to make an arrest for a violation of a provision of the act. The conferees have agreed to House amendment No. 1.

The bill (S. 1851), as it passed the Senate, contained a provision which reads as follows:

"(c) When the Attorney General or any district director or any assistant district director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service has information indicating a reasonable probability that in any designated lands or other property aliens are illegally within the United States, he may issue his warrant authorizing the immigration officer named therein to go upon or within such designated lands or other property other than a dwelling in which the warrant states there may be aliens illegally within the United States, for the purpose of interrogating such aliens concerning their right to enter or to be or remain in the United States. Such warrant shall state therein the time of day or night for its use and the period of its validity in no case shall be for more than 30 days."

House amendment No. 2 struck out the words "issue his warrant" in the above-quoted provision as it passed the Senate and inserted in lieu thereof the words "obtain a warrant under oath from any court of competent jurisdiction," so that, instead of issuing warrants pursuant to the language of the provision as it passed the Senate, the Attorney General, a district director or assistant district director of the Immigration and Naturalization Service would only be authorized to obtain warrants from a court of competent jurisdiction.

The comparable provision of the bill as it passed the Senate and the comparable provision as it passed the House cannot be reconciled in principle and both provisions contain unnecessary limitations on the existing power of immigration officials. Therefore, the conferees have agreed to strike out the provision in its entirety, thus leaving undisturbed the authority of immigration officers as set forth by the act of February 27, 1925, as amended (43 Stat. 1049; 54 Stat. 1238; 60 Stat. 865; 8 U. S. C. 110), and in section 16 of the act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 885; 54 Stat. 1223; 54 Stat. 1238; 58 Stat. 714; 60 Stat. 1049; 8 U. S. C. 152).

The first of the above-cited statutes provides that authorized employees "shall have power without warrant" to arrest aliens entering or attempting to enter the United States in his presence or view and in violation of law, as well as any alien who is in the United States in violation of law who is likely to escape before a warrant can be obtained for his arrest. Also such employees are empowered to make arrests for felonies which have been committed and which are cognizable under any law of the United States regulating the exclusion, expulsion or admission of aliens if there is reason to believe the person so arrested is guilty of such offense and there is likelihood of his escaping before a warrant can be obtained. Moreover, such employees are empowered to execute any warrant or other process issued by any officer under any law regulating the exclusion, or expulsion of aliens.

The second of the above-cited statutes provides that immigrant inspectors are "authorized and empowered" to board and search for aliens any vessels, railway car, or any other conveyance in which they believe aliens are being brought into the United States. By the same section they are empowered to interrogate persons concerning their right to enter, reenter, pass through, or reside in the United States. The same statute provides for punishment by imprisonment for a term of not more than 1 year, or by a fine of $2,000, or both, for any person who shall assault, resist, prevent, impede, or interfere with any immigration official in the performance of his duty. If any person uses any deadly or dangerous weapon in resisting any officer in the performance of his duty the section provides that he shall be deemed guilty of a felony and be punished by imprisonment for not more than 10 years.

Several court decisions have sustained the power of immigration officers to question aliens concerning their right to be in the country and to control the activities of third parties where necessary to insure proper enforcement of the immigration laws (*Zakonite* v. *Wolf*, 226 U. S. 272; *Lees* v. *United States*, 150 U. S. 476; *Head-Money* cases, 112 U. S. 580; *International Mercantile Marine Co.* v. *Stranahan*, 214 U. S. 344).

The managers on the part of the House believe that the legislation herewith presented to the House should be approved and accordingly they recommend the approval of the instant conference report.

EMANUEL CELLER,
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence for a moment not to discuss this conference report but to permit me to draw the attention of the House to the propaganda drive that is being engaged in now by certain members of the American Jewish Congress opposed to the Immigration and Nationality Code. This code, as you know, was set down on the program for consideration by the House for today and tomorrow.

I say "propaganda drive" advisedly, because the attacks made on this code are without foundation. Some time ago a Dr. Israel Goldstein, president of the American Jewish Congress, made a speech in New York in which he attacked this measure. Because of the reporting of his speech I wrote a letter to the editor of the New York Times and I should like to read it to you, because I am sure that after you have heard the explanation I make you will be thoroughly convinced that this Immigration and Naturalization Code is a progressive measure designed to protect, first, the interests of the United States, and, second, the law-abiding alien who desires to live among us. In my letter of February 20 I stated:

DEAR MR. EDITOR: Permit me to express my astonishment at the revoltingly misleading statements attributed to Dr. Israel Goldstein, president of the American Jewish Congress, by the New York Times on February 20, 1952, regarding the new Immigration and Nationality Code proposed in my bill, H. R. 5678, pending before the House of Representatives.

It is hard to believe that the president of the American Jewish Congress would see fit to present to the members of his own national executive committee such a completely false picture of this important legislation.

There is not a scintilla of truth to the statement that my bill places "a legislative seal of inferiority on all persons of other than Anglo-Saxon origin and would result in millions of naturalized Americans having to live in permanent fear of deportation or loss of citizenship for the most trivial and frivolous of reasons."

The equality of all races, the final repeal of all racial discrimination now contained in our immigration and naturalization laws, as well as the repeal of all discrimination based on sex, nationality, etc., are the basic features of my bill. At no point would my measure provide for the deportation of a United States citizen, native-born or naturalized.

Every legal authority consulted on my bill—and over 60 witnesses testified before a joint House-Senate committee—agrees that it represents a vast improvement over the existing law and jurisprudence regarding the availability to an alien of fair administrative and judicial practices and procedures.

Similarly, the provisions of my bill permitting the admission of reformed totalitarians and subversives have been unanimously recognized as one of the most laudable features of H. R. 5678.

I do not feel, Mr. Editor, that I am entitled to taking up more of your valuable space. I could go on nailing down more of the untrue statements made by Dr. Goldstein; however, I prefer to refer him to the bill itself and to the accompanying report (No. 1365), which explains my measure on 328 printed pages.

This much, however, I want to stress for the benefit of the members of the American Jewish Congress who might have been misled by the statements attributed to their president. The only categories of aliens who, under my bill, will find it more difficult to remain in our midst will be the criminals, the narcotic peddlers, and the subversives (incidentally, as recommended by the Kefauver committee). If Dr. Goldstein, as reported by the New York Times, dislikes the provisions providing better protection for the citizens of this country, I would refrain from discussing this matter with him.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Member of Congress, Chairman.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I had a wire this morning from Dr. Walter W. Van Kirk, executive director, Department of International Justice and Good Will, National Council of Churches in the United States of America, who is a distinguished church leader, stating that this bill, in his opinion, badly needed amendment.

I have a similar wire from the National Lutheran Council. Also I would like to ask the gentleman whether he does not agree that there are at least two major changes in this law far more substantive than the gentleman has mentioned; one of which puts a quota limitation of 100 on Negroes coming from the British colonies in the Caribbean, a change in existing law; and the other one uses 50 percent of the quota for people with special skills—which is a very great change in the existing quota law.

Mr. WALTER. Of course, I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this is the principle of using 50 percent of the quota for people needed in the United States. But, if that entire 50 percent is not used in that category, then the unused numbers go down to the next category which replies to the objections that these Jewish organizations make much of, that families are being separated. That very provision will make it possible for people to reunite their families.

To answer the rest of the gentleman's question so far as the representations made by other religious groups are concerned, I am well familiar with them. They are interested in finding a way to take care of the 7,000 Lithuanians, Latvians, other Balts, and a certain number of Poles whose names were in the pipeline at the end of the displaced-persons program, but to whom visas could not be issued because of the intervening expiration date of the law. They feel that perhaps somehow, having been misled as they have been, that situation can be dealt with in this code. I believe that this is a matter which should be considered in separate legislation, being entirely unrelated to the permanent code.

Mr. JAVITS. I have no doubt we will have a chance to debate the bill, but the only point I had in mind was to point out to the House that this opposition is not confined to the one group which the gentleman mentioned, and that there are other very important substantive parts of the bill.

Mr. WALTER. I might call your attention to the fact that Mr. Harry N. Rosenfield, Commissioner of the Displaced Persons Commission and incidentally a brother-in-law of a lawyer who is stirring up all this agitation, in a speech recently said:

> The proposed legislation is America's Nuremberg trial.
>
> It is "racious" and archaic, based on the theory that people with different styles of noses should be treated differently.

I say that is a most unfair statement to make, and designed to arouse the sort of feelings that we ought not to know in America.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman referred to propaganda that was being put out against the bill. Were you referring to these releases which have been coming in to Members of the House from some seven or eight different organizations?

Mr. WALTER. Yes. I have a clipping from the Associated Press here; 13 religious, civic, and veterans' organizations are opposing the omnibus immigration bill on the ground that it would tear down precious rights of American citizens. The group said in a letter to House Members that the measure had not been given adequate hearings.

In the same mail that brought that article to me comes the People's Voice, which, incidentally, is a Communist publication, in which they describe me as "the possessor of an outstanding anti-labor record." The article referring to the immigration bill goes on to say: "Despite lengthy hearings." These organizations, according to the Associated Press, protest that there were not adequate hearings, and this Communist sheet talks about the lengthy hearings.

The fact of the matter is that this legislation was under consideration for nearly 3 years. A joint subcommittee of the Senate and House heard 56 witnesses and received 78 statements. Almost all of the testimony that we heard was truly constructive. Some of it was critical of certain parts of the three bills pending before the joint subcommittee. Some of it was outright laudatory.

Upon the conclusion of the hearings, the members and the staff of the Senate and House subcommittees went very carefully over the entire testimony and abstracted from it concrete suggestions for the purpose of drafting amendments. More than 300 amendments were then considered in a lengthy series of conferences lasting from June until October 1951. A great number of amendments were then incorporated in the bills S. 2550 and H. R. 5678, the latter having been further amended in the Committee on the Judiciary. I can hardly think of more painstaking study and consideration being accorded any legislative measure.

During the hearings, there were only two statements made which were entirely hostile to the whole bill. One by the American Jewish Congress and the other by the representative of the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, represented by an attorney who is also advising and counseling the American Jewish Congress. He is not interested in legislation. He is interested in litigation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And fees.

Mr. WALTER. And fees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know why you are disturbed about this propaganda, because every Member of the House knows you have always been a friend of organized labor, and you have devoted a lot of time and ability to drafting this bill and holding hearings. What I wanted to ask you about is this: Why did we not get this bill yesterday? Is that postponement to help these fellows?

Mr. WALTER. I do not think it was because I was in Detroit and therefore unable to object to the request that it go over, but the bill was set down for today and tomorrow.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would have been glad to object for you had I known you wanted to do so.

Mr. WALTER. I was too busy exposing the Communist conspiracy in the gentleman's State of Michigan. I could not be here.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to give you a couple of photographs that were put in the Federal court, naming some of these 600 at Briggs as Communists.

Mr. WALTER. As a matter of fact, one of the editors of this sheet, the People's Voice, was one of the witnesses before our committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You do not refer to our distinguished State senator up there, do you?

Mr. WALTER. Yes; of course, I do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. He said that he would not answer whether he was a Communist?

Mr. WALTER. Yes.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not think the gentleman needs to worry about what anybody might say about him.

Mr. WALTER. The only thing I am disturbed about is this: I spent the entire morning answering the telephone, and I thought that by making a brief statement here I would be saved the necessity of sitting close to my phone for the balance of the day.

H. R. 5678 is the outgrowth of over 4 years of studies, investigations, conferences with various departments of the administration and extensive hearings. It is a codification and revision of all immigration and nationality laws, never previously attempted. The extensive and searching report on the bill is House Report No. 1365.

It makes these basic changes in our immigration, nationality, and naturalization laws:

First. The bill eliminates all racial bars to immigration for naturalization.

Regardless of what some critics of the bill say, at no point would the eligibility of any person to come to the United States and to become an American citizen depend on this person's race. There are only numerical limitations imposed on immigrants, and their ability to meet certain economic, security, and health standards.

Second. The bill eliminates all discrimination between the sexes with respect to immigration and naturalization.

Third. The bill introduces a system of selective immigration by giving special preference to skilled persons whose services are urgently needed in this country.

Fourth. Taking due cognizance of the existence of a world-wide Communist conspiracy, hostile to the United States and to the free world, the bill strengthens requirements for security screening and makes it possible both to prevent the entry of Communist conspirators and to weed out those who have infiltrated into our midst.

Fifth. Taking notice of the shocking percentage of aliens in the recently investigated activities of the criminal element, the bill broadens the grounds for exclusion and deportation of criminals, violators of the narcotic prohibitions, stowaways, and deserting seamen.

Sixth. It tends to curtail certain lax practices that have developed through the years in the adjustment of the immigration status of aliens who have entered this country illegally or who are subject to deportation after entry. In this and many other respects the bill favors the law-abiding alien who desires to come to the United States when permitted to do so by the law. But it certainly does not favor—as some of its critics would apparently prefer—the alien who sneaks in in violation of the law, gets his status adjusted, and takes the place of his countryman who has been patiently awaiting outside for many years for an opportunity to enter the "promised land."

Seventh. The bill continues the existing quota system and the determination of the annual quota for natives of each quota area is based on the United States census of 1920. The Bureau of the Census has been requested by the committee to submit as soon as possible an analysis of the 1940 and 1950 censuses for possible future revision of the 1920 basis. However, that will take over a year to obtain the necessary analysis and, therefore, the 1920 basis should not be altered at the present time.

Eighth. As a consequence of the repeal of racial bars, and taking into consideration recent political changes which have occurred in the world, 12 new quota areas will be established as follows: Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Indonesia, Korea, Laos, Libya, Pakistan, Somaliland, Vietnam, Yemen, and the Asia-Pacific triangle.

Each of those 12 quota areas would receive a quota of 100 annually. The new quota for Japan will be 185.

The net result of a mathematical formula establishing annual quotas, and of the creation of 12 new quota areas, would be that the total annual quota of 154,277 would be increased to 154,657.

Within this quota system, based on the principle of national origin, the bill provides both for selective immigration and for the safeguarding of our old principle of keeping families united.

Ninth. The bill provides a fully sufficient protection for American labor, but, at the same time, it has several provisions permitting the admission of foreign workers temporarily if their services are urgently needed in certain areas. It is sincerely hoped that these provisions will at last permit us to arrive at an equitable and sensible solution of the troublesome problem of Mexican farm labor.

The bill makes fewer changes with respect to nationality and naturalization than immigration because of the more recent revision of the nationality code in 1940.

First. The bill eliminates race as a bar to naturalization, thus making all lawful permanent residents of the United States who can meet the qualifications, specifically those relating to their good moral character and loyalty, eligible to become American citizens.

Second. The bill lowers the minimum age for filing a petition for naturalization from 20 to 18 years. It makes the so-called first papers optional and not a prerequisite to naturalization as the present law requires.

Third. It retains the 5-year residence requirement for naturalization but it requires only 3 years of such residence in the case of the spouse of an American citizen.

Fourth. The provisions relating to the loss of citizenship remain basically the same.

Mr. JENKINS. If that helps you any, we are glad you have done it, but I rose to bring out this proposition: Whenever you discuss the matter of reuniting families, that is an old provision in the immigration law, and it has been a fine provision to allow families to reunite themselves by being placed at the head of the quota. That is a fine provision and it is an old provision.

Mr. WALTER. Yes. And we have extended it to include brothers and sisters of American citizens.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan. I have been a member of the Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee No. 1, for a very short time.

During that time we have had before us this bill that has been presented here. I have not had time to go through the bill as thoroughly as I expect to, but I do want to say that our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], has been one of the most hard-working and one of the most conscientious gentlemen it has been my privilege to know, and I feel that he merits the confidence and respect of every Member of this great House of Representatives.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we are considering this morning, of course, the conference report on the wetback bill. We have been diverted considerably, but having heard the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania I cannot refrain from answering him. I have great respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. He has done a splendid job in fashioning this Immigration and Naturalization Code. That code which will be presented to us in my estimation marks a major advance in immigration and naturalization legislation. But in turn it has numerous faults. It contains numerous disparities and discriminations. It is not perfect; it can be perfected. It can be bettered, and I propose to offer certain amendments to the bill when it comes before the House to improve it, to liberalize it, to remove considerable of the injustice now resident therein. The gentleman spoke untowardly when he harshly criticizes those who in turn criticize his bill. He might well be more tolerant.

I think it is a bit unfortunate that the gentleman from Pennsylvania might have been carried far away in his enthusiasm for his bill and his resentment against criticism. He should not have overemphasized as he did the people of one particular faith who are opposing the bill.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. That is only one group; there are other very fine Jewish groups who endorse the bill.

Mr. CELLER. That is correct, and I was going to mention that. So that in that group itself there are some who may agree with the bill and some who may disagree with the bill. Sharp objections to the bill are not limited to the American Jewish Congress, a very creditable organization, and other racial and religious fronts. I received, for example, an important communication this morning from the executive director of the National Lutheran Council which reads as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 12, 1952.*

Hon. EMANUEL CELLER,
House of Representatives,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Please consider the serious restrictions now incorporated into pending omnibus codifications of immigration legislation. There are increased restrictions on those applying for entry and hazards of deportation are increased so that average potential immigrants are severely penalized. Such restrictions do not offer protection from subversives, but rather create an isolationist immigration policy for United States. The 154,000 quota numbers available annually are so distributed that approximately half are not used. We urge formula whereby unused quota numbers are made available for refugees' relatives and needed workers and also to cancel current mortgaged quotas.

PAUL C. EMPIE,
Executive Director,
National Lutheran Council.

This is a sample of communications objecting to that provision in the bill. I have received from various and diverse religious organizations similar communications of protests. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America object to provisions of the bill; there are similar protests from other organizations representing labor, notably the CIO.

I happen to know intimately well Dr. Israel Goldstein, eminent divine in New York, and the rabbi of one of the oldest congregations in America. He is an erudite scholar and a distinguished and patriotic citizen and divine. I think he has a right to voice his objections; but because he expresses his objections and voices that which to the gentleman from Pennsylvania might be unorthodox does not lessen, in my book, his stature as a rabbi and an American. We should encourage freedom to express opinion whether for or against that which we espouse. I think some of the rabbi's objections are untenable, but that does not indicate that he has not the right to object. Much of what Rabbi Goldstein says is sound and well taken. Frankly, let us have more people like Rabbi Israel Goldstein who courageously and forthrightly take a position on the all-important subjects of immigration and naturalization. Frankly there has been too much apathy and disinterest generally on these subjects.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope very much when we come to debate this bill that spirited advocacy and spirited opposition will

not in any way be considered a criticism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] or anybody else. I would like to say that my respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania equals that of anyone in this House. I have seen him in action on the displaced persons legislation and in connection with the Brussels Conference which was recently held. I have met him at home and abroad, and I think he is very seriously working toward the objectives which he considers most sincerely to be highly desirable. I hope very much because of some of the things that have been said here and the letters which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] read that the debate when it occurs will be on a high level.

Mr. CELLER. I yield to no one in my regard of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We have worked together for almost two decades; we have worked ardently and faithfully on measures like immigration and others—all for the welfare of this country.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON H. R. 6925

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 6925.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted me today be canceled and that I may have permission to address the House for the same time on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today and 10 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Aandahl	Halleck	O'Konski
Addonizio	Harden	Patterson
Armstrong	Harvey	Potter
Blatnik	Hedrick	Powell
Bolton	Heffernan	Rains
Boykin	Heller	Reams
Buchanan	Hope	Reed, Ill.
Buckley	Hull	Rivers
Burdick	Hunter	Roberts
Camp	Irving	Rogers, Mass.
Carrigg	Jackson, Calif.	Sabath
Chatham	Kennedy	Sadlak
Cole, Kans.	Kluczynski	Sheehan
Combs	Lantaff	Sikes
Coudert	Larcade	Simpson, Pa.
Cox	McConnell	Smith, Va.
Dempsey	McCormack	Stockman
Denny	McKinnon	Sutton
Dingell	Machrowicz	Tackett
Dollinger	Madden	Weichel
Doyle	Martin, Iowa	Welch
Flood	Miller, Calif.	Werdel
Furcolo	Mitchell	Widnall
Gamble	Morrison	Wolcott
Greenwood	Moulder	Wood, Ga.
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mumma	Murray, Wis.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposal of all legislative business on the calendar today and all previous special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes to give the membership a report of my inspection of all the American cemeteries in Europe this past summer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6947, with Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. Without objection the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 19, after line 11, insert:

"Small Defense Plants Administration revolving fund: For the revolving fund authorized by paragraph 2 of subsection (a) of section 714 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, $10,000,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think the Members would like to know about how long this debate will continue. If the Members present will indicate their desire to be heard on this amendment perhaps we can reach some tentative agreement at this time fixing a limit of time for debate; so, tentatively, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope that I might have 10 minutes of that time, and I trust that the chairman can arrange that we get 10 minutes of that time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] and 10 minutes to the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us how many times the gentleman from Texas is going to speak on this? Not that I have any objection.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman knows that we listen always with pleasure and profit to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, sure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, with 10 minutes reserved to the committee and 10 minutes reserved to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I know the Members are all aware of the fine speech which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] made on this subject last night. He covered the complete territory and anything that I might say will be perhaps repetitious.

I supported the amendment which authorized this Small Defense Plants Administration to do the work because I know of some of the good work that has already been done in my district in California. I happen to have the downtown section of Los Angeles and the East Side industrial section in which we have thousands of small plants capable of doing defense work, as well as the largest nationally known manufacturing corporations in America.

Small-business men have come to my office for assistance, and I know from past experience that, if you do not have a special agency concerned solely with forwarding their interests, then the small-business man gets lost in the maze of Washington red tape.

The present amendment will provide this revolving fund and, in my opinion, is a very fine provision. It is not money that will be used needlessly but will stand in reserve for the use of the Administration to insure the letting of contracts to small businessmen. In other words, when these contracts come up which small defense plants can handle, in

place of the contracting officials letting them to the big corporations, which is the natural thing for them to do, and it is the easiest thing from the administrative standpoint I admit, the Small Defense Plants Administration may come forward and say: We will let you take this contract if you will subdivide it and give the smaller defense plants a right to come in on the subcontract basis and do this job. In other words, it is a power that is held in reserve, and they can threaten at that time, if the large corporations will not let this work out on subcontracts, that they themselves can take it.

Now they must have this $10,000,000 revolving fund in order to administer the taking of contracts and the necessary work of bringing in these small people, processing their bids, and inspecting their facilities and their qualifications to do the job. I consider that as long as the House has spoken on the initial authorization of this Small Defense Plants Administration, that they should also implement it by giving this $10 million revolving fund, which possibly will never be used, but it will have a salutary effect on the contracting officials of the defense departments and cause them to know that unless they do subcontract defense work, that the Small Defense Plants Administration can take the contracts and do the actual job of administering the subcontracts themselves.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island will be adopted. I also call the attention of the Members to the facts that the small-business hardship program originated in the Office of Materials, SDPA for two purposes: First, to develop a method of channeling additional controlled materials to the small businesses which faced shutdown or bankruptcy; second, to break the mathematical distribution of materials by products that was in effect in NPA in favor of a program that would allow distribution of materials in relation to the need of the individual companies.

This program was developed and issued as a joint program of SDPA and NPA and was covered in a joint release by Messrs. Fowler and Taylor.

The other area of protection to small business was the joint effort of SDPA and the staff of NPA to channel more material into the so-called "nonessential civilian goods" such as jewelry, aluminum windows, and similar products. NPA has now been able to equalize distribution to all types of consumer goods thereby spreading the load of sacrifice on a more equitable basis. This action, together with the small-business hardship program outlined above, has greatly improved the material situation in reference to small-business companies and specifically, the civilian type single-purpose companies.

Without these two actions, the small business area would be at least in dire distress if not faced with actual bankruptcy or liquidation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Fogarty amendment to set up this revolving fund to appropriate $10,000,000 for this Administration will prevail.

Mr. Chairman, let us understand precisely what it is. Even though we are appropriating $10,000,000 in accordance with the authorization in the law which calls for $50,000,000, this $10,000,000 is not an expenditure.

Despite anything that may have been said in general debate, or thus far under the 5-minute rule, the $825,000 which we appropriated yesterday by adopting the Fogarty amendment yesterday, is not to administer the $10,000,000 fund we are now trying to set up.

The $825,000 appropriation is for the operation of the agency.

The $10,000,000 is to be used for the taking of contracts.

In other words, if the Small Defense Plants Administration goes in and makes a bid to take a contract from the armed services to make tooling machinery for $1,000,000, and the Small Defense Plants Administration gets the contract, it then will take that contract and allocate all of the work under it to subcontractors who will be small-business men. They will then get paid by SDPA for that work as they make delivery, and the armed services will then pay the money to SDPA under the prime contract. That money will then go back into the revolving fund.

In World War II we had a similar revolving fund allocated to the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Not one dollar of that money was lost to the Government. Every dollar of money that was so used to take contracts in the name of the corporation, was used by it as a prime contractor who then subcontracted the work to small business. When the contracts were fulfilled—and every one of them was fulfilled—payment was made by the Armed Services and the money went back to the Smaller War Plants Corporation and then back into the United States Treasury at the end of the war. The same thing will be done with this $10,000,000 fund.

Not one dollar of that money will be used for administration of the agency, and not one dollar of it will be lost or wasted. It will be used merely to finance contracts which then can be sublet to small-business men.

In other words assume we have a tooling contract for $1,000,000 if there are ten shops that can do tooling work for only $100,000 each, the ten of them can get the contract by participating as subcontractors of the SDPA. The ten cannot come in and bid for that $1,000,000 contract, but the Small Defense Plants Administration can take the contract and subdivide it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: How is the Government reimbursed after it spends this $10,000,000? In other words, the contractor is going to get the use of it?

Mr. MULTER. The contractor will not get the use of it. What you do is this. You have the $10,000,000 revolving fund. SDPA then can bid just as anybody else. If it is the low bidder, the Small Defense Plants Administration gets the contract. It is then the prime contractor. It sublets to ten small business subcontractors. If for example, the contract was for $1,000,000, the agency then subdivides that among the ten—each of whom gets a $100,000 contract. SDPA is responsible for the full prime contract. The subcontractors deliver the merchandise or the tools, whatever it may be, each of the ten, $100,000 worth of equipment to the Small Defense Plants Administration in name only, but actually directly to the Armed Services, if that is where it is to go.

Mr. JONAS. In the first place, the money comes from the Government?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. JONAS. In the final analysis, how does the Government get the money back?

Mr. MULTER. At the end of the emergency or whenever the Small Defense Plants Administration is to be liquidated or wound up, the money goes back to the United States Treasury.

When the subcontractor makes delivery in accordance with his contract, and only then, SDPA pays him his money. When delivery is completed under the prime contract, the Armed Services pay SDPA, again, however, only in accordance with the contract. The money is then back in the revolving fund. When the agency authority expires as fixed in the law, the money reverts to the United States Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER]. I want to inform the House that in my district we have a very serious situation, with regard to small business, which will lead me to vote for the Fogarty amendment. Schenectady, N. Y., is a vital defense area and I would like a survey made in the entire district, pertaining to small business and in particular the bus line in Schenectady and many glove concerns in Fulton County.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. The gentleman is speaking of small business. What is the gentleman's idea of what a small business firm is? Is it based on the number of employees or the volume of business or the financing effect on it?

Mr. KEARNEY. There seems to be quite a difference of opinion. As I understand, it is a question of not only the returns but also the number of employees involved.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. As I understand the definition of small business, it depends upon whether or not that business is dominant in its particular field.

Mr. KEARNEY. The answer, I believe, is given here for the purpose of this section in the law:

A small business concern shall be deemed to be one which is independently owned

and operated and which is not dominant in the field of operations.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Taylor, the Administrator, was asked by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations what his definition of a small business was, and his answer was:

In the past the procurement agencies have usually followed the blanket test of whether there are more or less than 500 employees. That is what the Defense Department uses. Recently Mr. Sawyer's Department of Commerce has come out with a very much more elaborate definition in which, for instance, in the field of steel you may have up to 2,500 employees and still be a small business. In other fields it is as low as 100. We endeavor to use all of these tests Congress has given us and come to the best conclusion in a particular case that we can.

Mr. KEARNEY. I understand the gentleman from Rhode Island has interpreted that statement of Mr. Taylor, then, to mean that the determining factor is the type of business one is engaged in?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. I, too, live in an area which is distressed at this time. I have conditions something like those in Schenectady, N. Y. I have today a wire from the Paterson (N. J.) Chamber of Commerce stating its approval of this program.

Mr. HILL. If the gentleman will yield further, when Mr. Taylor gave the report of his organization he said something about financial assistance. All over this country from one end to the other we have a number of small business firms that can take contracts from the procurement divisions of the armed services only if they have the proper information and the know-how to make the product and to make it financially worth while as far as the Armed Forces are concerned in allotting the contract.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss this proposition further as brought out by the gentleman from New York, and discuss for a moment the report of our Small Business Committee on this matter when Mr. Taylor attempted and did a good job telling us what he was trying to do. These are his words:

One of the most pressing problems of small-business concerns in any mobilization program is that of obtaining the necessary financial assistance for full participation in defense efforts.

Full participation means you must have financial backing.

SDPA is empowered to recommend to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation small business loans for defense, and essential civilian production. Joint procedures were worked out by the RFC and SDPA for handling applications for those loans.

That is now going on.

Only last night was I called by a Colorado firm in my district, only a short way from my own home where we have a small manufacturing concern now employing 250 people in an area where unemployment is rather great at this time because of certain other conditions that prevail. This firm is shutting down, and it is shutting down because they cannot get the necessary brass to do the manufacturing that it has the contracts from the armed services to perform.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. In line with what the gentleman just said, I want to point out that today there are meeting in our home town of Nashville, Tenn., the representatives of about 100 small manufacturers. They are meeting in a clinic to decide what they can do to stay in business. They have with them a representative today of the SDPA to help guide them along. That is a situation similar to what the gentleman has described.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, I hope every Member of the House realizes the conditions that exist, and the attempts of these little business firm to carry on with their manufacturing activities in a way acceptable to the procurement officers. If I had the time here, we could drop back and give you a history of what is the trouble with our small businesses. They have grown up independently, and they have been independent. That is what we want, and that is what we like. Believe it or not, most of our business is done by small-business concerns. But most of them are many, many miles removed from Washington, and it is really expecting the impossible to expect a small-business firm to send people to Washington. I have another firm right in my own home town, which is now making a nice piece of farm equipment. It is a new revolutionary idea. I do not know how many times he phoned me, and we have helped him. That firm could no more send a man to Washington to meet with organizations here, conferring with these Federal agencies in these various offices than it could fly to the moon with a piece of the farm equipment that he expects to manufacture. The reason for that is he runs the firm. When he is gone, the top of the firm is away. The man that does the top jobs and all the engineering work. Of course, the plant would be closed while he was away. Then you sit here and argue over $10,000,000 to help firms like that. I tell you there is something wrong with us, and really and truly we should not be arguing about anything of that sort.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has given us a good practical definition of small business for the purposes of this legislation. I compliment him on the statement he has just made for it applies as well to small business in Iowa.

Mr. HILL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be given to the gentleman from Colorado who is now addressing us.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield, and thank the gentleman for giving me his time.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not true that as a member of the Small Business Committee you have attended many hearings where small-business men came before our committee and have said how desperately anxious they were to obtain subcontracts?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Is it not also true that this $10,000,000 revolving fund will make it possible for many more of these small-business concerns to obtain subcontracts?

Mr. HILL. Exactly. And they cannot get the contract. They cannot get the contract without an understanding, and that understanding has to come from Washington, D. C. They do not have the opportunity to come to Washington. They do not have the manpower, and neither have the financial assistance.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. In my district I have 117 small plants, not one of whom can afford, as the gentleman said, to send a representative here for any period of time. Not one of those organizations has been able to get either a direct or a subcontract.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the gentleman. I know exactly what he is talking about. I noticed yesterday the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] talked about Richmond, Va. What a short space it is from Richmond to Washington, with a four-lane highway. It is very easy for a man there to attend to business in Washington, while it takes a man from the west coast—he has to spend two or three hundred dollars, in the first place, to get here, and if he drives it would take him a week. There are just as many firms in the condition the gentleman spoke about all over this country as there are near Washington. If a man lives in the gentleman's district, or in Connecticut or Rhode Island or Maine or California or Oregon, he cannot get this information at all. You want to take the money away from him that we are trying to provide in this bill to keep this organization going, which we set up ourselves only 8 or 9 months ago.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think it was made plain that this is not an appropriation of $10,000,000. It is a revolving fund that will finally revert back to the Treasury, exactly as the revolving fund that was used in the Smaller War Plants Corporation during the last war. It will not cost a dime. It is the intention of this

administration to charge enough on the prime contract to cover all costs of administration, and when the program is over this $10,000,000 revolving fund will be returned to the Treasury of the United States, exactly as it was after the last World War. There was no opposition to the use of this revolving fund during the last World War. Not a Member of Congress raised his voice against it. It was only used on 12 occasions, and that revolving fund was returned to the Treasury of the United States. The Congress has already authorized $50,000,000 for this fund. All we are asking today is $10,000,000 revolving fund.

Mr. HILL. I might add that we passed this $50,000,000 revolving fund less than 9 months ago. Certainly you have not changed your opinion entirely in that short time.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does it not seem ridiculous to the gentleman that the Department of Justice is spending millions of dollars in antitrust suits, breaking up big business, when our Government will not give any business at all to the small-business concerns?

Mr. HILL. Certainly.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Does not the gentleman agree with me that the most "costly citizen" is he who wants to get a job and cannot find work? We must do all that we can to help our small-business firms so that our people may be given jobs.

Mr. HILL. Yes. And when you multiply that by the number of small firms there are all over the United States, you see what a problem you have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN] is recognized.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to acknowledge the splendid contribution which has been made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and in so ably debating it.

I will not detain this House long because I believe that the Members are desirous of voting.

However, I desire to acknowledge the splendid contribution which has been made by my distinguished friend from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in bringing this important matter to the floor of the House and so ably debating it.

After careful inquiry and investigation, the other body has confirmed the head of the Small Defense Plants Administration and that agency is now functioning. It awaits only the green light from Congress to go forward with a carefully planned program, which is not only needed, in my opinion, but which will be of inestimable value to small-business men throughout the country.

I will briefly enumerate parts of the program and some of the services, which the agency engages in, helpful to small business that the Department of Commerce has no authority to do, or is not equipped to do. I think the fact of the matter is that the Department of Commerce has not performed a great many of these functions which this Congress certainly intends should be performed in the interest of small-business men:

First. The SDPA recommends small business loans to RFC, which are made pursuant to a special $100,000,000 fund which RFC may use only upon SDPA recommendation. Commerce has no authority or funds.

Second. SDPA certifies the competency of small concerns to perform specific contracts. Under the law these certifications must be taken as conclusive. Commerce has no such power.

Third. It has authority to determine jointly with procurement agencies which proposed contracts are to go to small business. Commerce has no authority in the procurement field since the executive order specifically transferred such authority to SDPA.

Fourth. There has never been a complete inventory of the facilities of small business available for defense production. Congress directed SDPA to make one, which it is now doing. All other Government agencies concerned have agreed that SDPA has full and sole responsibility for making it.

Fifth. SDPA has authority to subcontract prime contracts to small firms and no other agency has this authority.

Sixth. Under congressional mandate, SDPA ascertains and coordinates the means by which the productive capacity of small business can be most effectively used for defense and essential civilian production. No other agency holds this authority.

Seventh. The agency surveys and makes appropriate recommendations to NPA to insure a fair and equitable percentage of controlled materials to small concerns. This is very important because it provides small business with representation in decisions by NPA.

Eighth. Under executive order February 5, 1952, several specific functions of the Office of Small Business, NPA, Department of Commerce, were transferred to the SDPA to do away with duplication. These functions included among other things, aid to small business in procurement, financial assistance, the furnishing of technical and managerial aid, and the classification of manufacturing concerns according to size. All these functions are no longer performed by the Department of Commerce and, therefore, if they are to be performed at all, they must be performed by SDPA.

To my mind Congress clearly intended when it unanimously created this new agency that it should serve to furnish these invaluable aids to small business.

I think that even the distinguished Secretary of Commerce is in complete agreement with the objectives of this legislation because in a letter to our distinguished friend, Senator SPARKMAN, dated June 28, 1951, he wrote as follows:

> I find myself wholeheartedly in accord with the objective in introducing the amendment to section 701 of the Defense Production Act of 1950. It is of utmost importance not only to mobilize the productive facilities of small business for effective use in this time of emergency so as to broaden the production base but also to preserve small business during this period of mobilization when it is impossible and difficult for small independent businessmen to obtain the materials that they require to maintain them as effective units in our civilian economy.

And I would call this especially to the attention of the House, the Secretary continues, and I quote:

> Small business comprises nearly 90 percent of our business establishments, employs nearly half of our nonagricultural workers and handles over one-third of the total volume of business. I strongly believe that there is need for additional statutory provisions for assistance to small business at the present time. In my opinion, the need for additional legislation is immediate. I feel definitely that the statutory authority can be conferred best by an appropriate amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1950. There are many plans and worthy programs which could be undertaken immediately upon the passage of the proposed amendment. I would regret such further delay as would be required by the extensive hearings and other time-consuming aspects involved in the enactment of a separate bill.

I think that the Secretary has made out the strongest possible case for this new agency. The Congress has already authorized it. It is definitely under way. Its program is fully prepared and ready to go. I hope, therefore, that the House will rally to the assistance of small business throughout the country and authorize all necessary funds to continue and expand this most important activity.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. On this same subject, in 1938 a provision was placed in the law—the Buy American Act—that if there were domestic bids in this country that exceeded foreign bids by 25 percent, the contract could be let to the foreign bidder. That is being done now. At least in one case with which I am familiar if the contract is awarded to the foreign bidder several hundred men will lose their jobs. Is there any sense in that?

Mr. PHILBIN. I know that is being done right now; I know of one case in my own district where a hearing is going on at the present time, and the matter under consideration has been whether they would let contracts to foreign producers rather than American producers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, we have not pinpointed exactly what we are talking about and why we need this particular amendment for $10,000,000 in addition to the amendment that we carried yesterday in the Committee of the Whole; and I would like to confine my statement to the need for this particular amendment.

Yesterday we decided that this agency would continue, and that it would then be able to give the technical assistance and marketing facilities which small business lacks. Let me emphasize that: Technical assistance, which is engineering and similar advice, and marketing

facilities which means keeping in touch with the governmental procurement agencies and means to complete the procedural requirements those agencies have.

There are still other problems besetting small business; one is the problem of conversion to defense and even changing plants and changing methods. For this purpose we have provided $100,000,000 to the RFC which can use this money for this purpose on recommendation of the Small Defense Plants Administration. That still leaves one area which is completely uncared for, that is the situation in which in order to get a contract it is necessary to pool the activities of many smaller business concerns, and it is this last area which we are dealing with today. The idea is to provide a $10,000,000 revolving fund. It will enable the Small Defense Plants Administration to get together a group of small-business men to go into this pool and have the necessary financing for that purpose. That is exactly what the Smaller War Plants Corporation did in these 12 transactions during World War II which have been referred to by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. We are all very worried about how small business fits into the defense effort because small business is an appreciable part of the defense effort of the United States.

I have copied off the news board outside here, and every Member should go and see it, a statement made this morning in some kind of a congressional hearing by James F. King, Deputy Administrator of the Defense Production Administration for resources expansion and he is quoted in eight very meaningful words:

All defense programs tend to favor big business.

Of course, it is very hard to get planes, ships and tanks made by small companies, yet the social structure of the country demands that small business be fitted into the defense effort. Those who favor this amendment and the amendment which preceded it come before you with a plan and program for small business in the defense effort, consisting of technical aid, marketing facilities, the opportunity to get loans for reconversion from the RFC, and now this very necessary amendment, the opportunity to finance a pooling of small concerns in order to get an order.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman know that the last report for January indicates that 25 percent of the $657,000,000 of contracts went to small business in January?

Mr. JAVITS. But it is not also a fact that small business is falling by the wayside in many cities of the country, which is why Members like the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN], and gentlemen from other cities and States are here arguing for this amendment?

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I would like to answer the question that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] propounded by saying that under the definition which the Secretary of Commerce uses it includes every firm that hires up to 2,000 people. The companies I am talking about do not have 2,000 employees. They are lucky if they have 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment in this supplemental appropriation bill.

I call attention to the fact that I voted for the $825,000 additional appropriation for this agency yesterday.

The reason I am opposed to this $10,000,000 revolving fund is because I think this program needs closer scrutiny by the Congress. I do not believe that it will impair the setting up of this agency, which is only at its beginning. I think the work of the administration during this fiscal year will be consumed in getting the agency staffed and organized. It will not have the opportunity to use a $10,000,000 revolving fund before the Defense Production Act extension is acted upon by the Congress. That legislation is now pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency. This question, is a very difficult and important one. It ought to be gone over very carefully by the Banking and Currency Committee and all of its effects and implications should be intensively scrutinized.

This provision puts the Government in business. In general, I am opposed to the Government engaging in business. It may be necessary in order to aid small business to put the Government in business temporarily in this emergency through this Small Defense Plants Administration set-up.

The reason I have misgivings about this program is because of experiences I had while counsel for the War Investigating Committee of the Senate. At that time I had occasion to observe examples of operations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in the last war, and they did not look too good to me.

I believe that safeguards should be put around this extraordinary authority putting the Government into the business of taking defense contracts before it is passed upon formally by the Congress and before we set it in full operation.

I have two specific examples in mind, one involving a lumber company in Maine. I would like to call this to the attention of those who have said that no money has been lost by the Government. The Government did lose money on that enterprise. I have in mind another case where the Smaller War Plants Corporation took a contract for rubber liferafts. All the other contractors were making them for $70 a liferaft or less. The Smaller War Plants Corporation subcontracted its contract to one contractor for $105 a lifeboat and the man who handled it for the Smaller War Plants Corporation resigned and went with this company at $90,000 a year.

Now, that is the kind of thing that we do not want to encourage. When the Government goes into private enterprise it invites that kind of operation. I believe that adequate safeguards should be put around this extraordinary authority before it is actually put into operation. I am not opposed to it altogether. It may be necessary to grant this unusual authority to effectuate aid to small business, but let us take a better look at it and surround it with safeguards so that we can do it in the proper way, through the proper committee.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to recommend that the Committee on Banking and Currency obtain the confidential files of the Senate War Investigating Committee on these two instances. I ask that committee to go into the subject and see if something cannot be done to provide necessary aid to small business but, at the same time, prevent the Government going into business as we have authorized the Small Defense Plants Administration to do.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HILL. I was thinking of this question. With a great deal of the remarks the gentleman has made, I agree. But let me ask him this: A great number of, shall I say, big-business firms, have been able to enlarge their plants already by the Federal Government playing up a proposition whereby they could take the enlargement of the plant out of their income tax over a period of 5 years.

Mr. MEADER. I am familiar with that, and I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HILL. Would the gentleman say the Government is not in business with the big-business firms today?

Mr. MEADER. I will say this: That the Hardy committee went into the matter of certificates of convenience and necessity, and we condemned the looseness of the administration of that authority. But that is not Government in business in the same sense as actually taking and performing production contracts. I fear loose controls and administration in a hastily set up agency. I do not want to see another case like that of the Hazleton Steel Co. The three stockholders had only a $600 investment. But they got an authorization for an $8,000,000 loan. They would have gotten the money if the Hardy committee had not blocked it.

Government personnel are not well equipped to make estimates and bids involving engineering knowledge and practical production experience. It is better for private enterprise to do this job, except as a last resort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has already been mentioned here, but I think it is of sufficient importance to repeat what was said this morning at a congressional committee, that at a committee headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURTON], a subcommittee of the

Small Business Committee, attending Mr. SEELY-BROWN, Mr. EVINS, and Mr. MULTER, this significant statement was made by an official of the Defense Production Administration. I am going to quote it again. Notice what he said:

All defense programs tend to favor big business.

He has merely said what we have all known all the time, but we have not had that admission from that particular source before.

Mr. Chairman, with that knowledge, can we afford not to set up a special agency that will give special consideration to the group that does not have a fair chance and an equal opportunity in a preparedness program? I believe that we would be failing to do our duty were we to fail this appropriation. Now, this is not money that will be spent for salaries, or anything else; it is marked money, it is a fund; not the Government going into business, but the Government staying out of business. It is used to help the private individuals and corporations to do this work, the ones that are too small or unable to get help otherwise. That is what the $10,000,000 is for. It is to implement the Small Defense Plants Administration. It is a shotgun in the corner. It is possible that it will not be needed at all, but the fact that the shotgun is in the corner will give this organization tremendous bargaining power.

During the last World War the Smaller War Plants Corporation took prime contracts aggregating $33,000,000 only; only 12 prime contracts. But by reason of having that power, by having the shotgun in the corner, that organization was able to force $6,000,000,000 worth of contracts to small concerns. This is the way it operates in practice. The military authorities were told, "Now, there is a contract, and we have a large number of small concerns that can perform it. We can allocate it to 10, 25, or 50 different small concerns all over the Nation and they can assume this prime contract."

The military authorities were told further that if that contract was not given to these small fellows the Small War Plants Corporation would take it itself. They had the power to take it. By reason of having that power they channeled $6,000,000,000 worth of contracts into the hands of the smaller concerns in this country.

So all we are doing here is placing a shotgun in the corner to be used in the event that it is needed. The money will not be wasted. It will come right back to the Treasury. I insist that the organization should have these regional offices. The gentleman from Virginia yesterday made a good argument stating that in Richmond they had a good organization and they could get help at Richmond. I do not doubt that. However, as the gentleman from Colorado mentioned this morning, there is a four-lane paved highway from Richmond and it is only about a 2-hour drive to Washington, D. C. Richmond has a fine representative here in Congress to look after it. He has the ear of the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Defense and all the rest of them. He can get something done. He can expedite. It is right here in the shadow of the Capitol of the United States. But what about San Francisco, Seattle, Wash., and Houston, Tex., and San Diego, Calif.? They are not so fortunate in that they are not so near the Capitol of the United States. So this organization is setting up agencies all over the Nation, as it should, regional offices, near enough so the little man can come from nearby and put his problems in the lap of a representative of the Small Defense Plants Administration. That is one stop, under one roof. There is no running around to Tom, Dick, and Harry, to 14 different agencies, as they have here now. It will just be a one-stop deal. That is what we want for the small people in this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman said that people in California and these other places could not get here like the gentleman from Virginia. We do not have any trouble.

Mr. PATMAN. They could come here if they were as close by, but they are not as close by. They have good Congressmen, too.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We do not have any trouble. Michigan has Congressmen here, and they tend to their business, and we do not have trouble with that.

Mr. PATMAN. I know this will be very helpful to the country. I hope the gentleman realizes how much help it will be and how much it will benefit the people he represents. I know the gentleman is a good Representative, but he cannot do everything for them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right, but they tell me they do not need any help, and this agency is not helping them at all.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not believe they will be displeased with the gentleman's vote for this because they know this is in the direction of strengthening the economy of the entire Nation. Small business is the backbone of the Nation. This is helping the backbone of the Nation, and I believe the gentleman wants to help the backbone of the entire Nation. So I hope that the gentleman will consider the fact that this is a revolving fund and that it is needed. It will not be used except to help private individuals and corporations carry out contracts with the Government. It will be a means of distributing production. We need that production in the national defense effort. It will help the smaller concerns of America, and it is very much needed to implement this organization. I hope there is not a single vote against this amendment.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman agree there is no such shortage of machine tools and factory capacity in this country as the Defense Department and the Defense Mobilizer and others seem to assume? In my district there are dozens of smaller plants with 100 to 500 employees, mostly highly skilled workmen. They were used in the last war to great advantage. Some have now had to reduce operations, but still they cannot get either prime or subcontracts. The Government planners never use them. They insist on going out somewhere and getting three, four or five thousand acres of land, cutting down trees, leveling the ground, building up a big-business type of plant costing $50,000,000 or so with 5,000 employees. Then they have to build houses, schools and theaters, and persuade or pay workers to move to it. They pass up the capacity that is already available to do the job at less cost and with greater speed and with greater efficiency.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is exactly right. One of the best things this organization will do will be to take an inventory of these facilities which the gentleman mentions. They will have them card indexed, and they can tell you right off where they can produce and what they can produce. That is something which is very much needed.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman whether he would agree with me in deploring the general proposition of Government going into business?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want the Government in business. This will keep the Government out of business. I appreciate the fact that the exceptions, which the gentleman mentioned, should not occur again. Our committee looked into that. Our legislative committee looked into it. The Committee on Appropriations is not the committee to do this. They have not looked into it. They have heard no witnesses. The Committee on Banking and Currency did not even know they were striking out this appropriation. This was not tried on its merits. It was tried in secret, and condemned without an adequate hearing. That is the truth of the matter.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the establishment of this $10,000,000 revolving fund will go a long way toward solving the problem that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] raised?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely. And I think the gentleman asked the question for the purpose of bringing that point out. I know the gentleman is a good friend of the small-business concerns. His whole life has been spent in small business. He is a valuable and able Member of the House. I hope he stays with us on this and makes this another big day for small business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-eight Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is about time we got up to date on this proposition. I am going to call attention to three or four things, which to me are of outstanding significance in connection with this proposition. In the first place, I want to call attention to page 10 of Public Law 96, the authorizing bill for this so-called small-business corporations law. Paragraph C, right in the middle of the page. It says:

To arrange for the performance of such contracts by letting subcontracts to small-business concerns or others for the manufacture of supplies or assembly of such articles, equipment, or materials, or parts thereof or for servicing or processing in connection therewith—

And now listen carefully and see where the sleeper is—

or such management service as may be necessary to enable the administration to perform such contracts.

Now, what does that mean? It means that they are going to take over the management of these small businesses, and you are going to have the whole thing regimented. It is going to cost the Government an enormous sum of money. It will work to the disadvantage of every one of these small-business concerns. I want you to see just for a moment what has happened.

Beginning in fiscal 1952, on July 1 last—this is the record of the Navy Department; I have not had time to get the others—for 1952, July, it showed a drop in small business of 5 percent. August showed a jump from 14 percent to 25 percent, an increase of 7 percent over the previous year, in contracts going to small business.

September showed an increase of 3.2 percent, or 19.7 percent over last year.

October, 23 percent, an increase of 4.1 percent.

November, 31.9, an increase of 17.7 percent.

December, 22 percent, an increase of 2.3 percent.

January, 25.4 percent, an increase of 12.4 percent.

The fact is that small business is getting a break, and you are beginning to get action on it. Now, let us not muss it up.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I do not yield. I only have 4 minutes.

Now, here is the picture. With this situation the old law made it mandatory that they could actually take a contract. Here it is only permissive and, in effect, requires approval of the contracting officer in each agency. Now, if you provide this $10,000,000, you will see those fellows going into it and mussing it all up. On the other hand, if you leave it alone and let these agencies do what they have been told to do, take care of small business, you have got a chance to help small business at home. You will not do it the other way, where you will be regimented completely, where they are going to go into the factories and take over the management and upset any private management at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. When a contractor enters into a defense contract there is usually a penalty clause.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MEADER. When the Government, through the Small Business Plants Administration, enters into a contract and then fails to deliver and becomes subject to a penalty, does the Government sue itself to recover the penalty?

Mr. TABER. I expect so.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, as he always is, but when he referred to the sleeper in this particular revolving fund of management services, it is not for the purpose of going in and taking over management at all. It is only set up for one express purpose. If they want some advice as to change in their equipment in order to get a defense contract, then they will get that advice from some of the competent engineers that are in this managerial service.

Mr. TABER. I wonder why they did not say it that way in the law. They said it so that it can be done the other way. I would expect this outfit to go ahead and jump in and land on every contract in every factory that there is to deal with.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is not their purpose at all.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid of just that sort of situation. I think you are getting into a dangerous situation. Those who are voting to get into this kind of a deal are going to do their very best, although they do not realize it, to hurt small business. I think it is time for the people to wake up and realize what we are up against and what we are doing. I hope that we will not adopt this amendment; that we will leave it and let it be investigated just as thoroughly as possible, so that small business can have a chance, and not be taken over body and breeches by some governmental racketeer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] for 2 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Texas for the very kind remarks he made with reference to me just a few moments ago. I hope my constituents will remember them when they vote this fall. But he stated very effectively the reason why I stand before you today.

We do have a broad four-lane highway from Richmond to Washington, just as he said; the distance is only 110 miles; it can be covered in an automobile in little over 2 hours. In addition we do have a very effective office of the Department of Commerce which is now operating in the city of Richmond and which is helping small business. Notwithstanding those facts, I read in the paper just a few days ago that the Small Defense Plants Administration is contemplating opening a regional office in Richmond. You know what a regional office means. It operates in the several States within the region. Then, of course, we shall have to have a State office, and before we get through we shall have two or three more offices in Richmond trying to handle the work which one office is already handling satisfactorily.

I pointed out on this floor yesterday that there are today 14 agencies helping small business. I am in favor of small business, but certainly we do not need 14 agencies to handle the problem. If the gentleman will first coordinate the activities in behalf of small business in any one agency, I do not care what the agency is, then I will stand up here and fight for an appropriation for it. But when we are already making appropriations for 14 agencies for that purpose, I see no reason for creating a fifteenth.

Yesterday we voted the Small Defense Plants Administration $825,000 with which to operate for 3 months, because it is only 3 months to the end of this fiscal year or rather, will be only 3 months by the time this act is adopted, for it cannot get through the Congress before April 1—so we will have only April, May, and June, and the law provides that the agency shall expire automatically on June 30; yet they now ask for $10,000,000 as a revolving fund. A revolving fund is the dream of all bureaucrats—just give us a revolving fund to play with and then we can go to town, because we do not have to account to anybody; we can use the revolving fund to suit ourselves. This request is made in face of the fact that the Defense Production Act already authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend $2,100,000,000 for defense purposes; and section 714 of that act authorizes the RFC to lend $100,000,000 for small business for both defense and civilian purposes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Did the gentleman from Virginia hear the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] explain that by giving this $10,000,000 to the Defense Plants Administration and giving them authority to take and perform contracts was taking the Government out of business instead of putting the Government in business? If he heard it I would like to have him explain the rationalization of that statement.

Mr. GARY. I cannot explain it because what we are doing is putting up this money so that the Government can buy contracts. If that is not putting the Government in business I do not know

what it is. The Government buys the contracts from the Government and then turns around and sells them to operators of small business. Why we should set up this agency for that intermediate step, I do not know. Why cannot the Government award the contracts to small business enterprises in the first place?

Here is the situation we are facing: This bill covers only 3 months. Since they have the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that can put up any funds that are necessary during that time, would it not be wise to postpone consideration of this $10,000,000 item until the House considers the entire Defense Production Act, or until we review this entire program and decide legislatively whether it shall be continued for another year? There will be ample time then to determine how much of the $50,000,000 revolving fund authorized by the Defense Production Act is necessary. As has been stated, the Smaller War Plants Corporation during the entire period of World War II did not use but $35,500,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman referred to the Department of Commerce office in Richmond. This organization is going down there to supplant some of these people who have not been able in the past all over the country to perform a service for small business.

Mr. GARY. I differ with the gentleman. There is absolutely nothing in the law that would require them to supplant anything and I will say to the gentleman that if he will see that a provision is written into the Defense Production Act requiring a coordination of small business activities into one agency then I will vote for the appropriation necessary to operate that agency.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I neglected to state that all military organizations in this country today are following the rule of considering a small war plant as one with not over 500 employees.

Mr. GARY. And they have personnel assigned to the task of placing defense contracts with those small-business corporations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know of any community in the United States where local banks are refusing to advance the necessary credit to small companies to handle their war contracts?

Mr. GARY. I do not, but even if there are the RFC can finance them up to $100,000,000. The RFC is authorized to lend funds up to $2,100,000,000 for defense purposes. Any part or all of this amount can be used for small plants today, and $100,000,000 is specifically set aside for small plants.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot of talk about economy, and let me say that I am wholeheartedly for economy. Providing SDPA with adequate funds is one of the best economy moves this House could ever take. Everybody knows that the bedrock of economy is efficiency. You cannot have an efficient operation if functions are scattered, efforts are duplicated, and 10 or a dozen separate agencies, all working independently of each other, are dabbling in the small-business problem. With one overall small-business agency, such as SDPA, you save untold thousands of dollars by eliminating wasteful efforts, by cutting red tape, and by putting some design and purpose into the program to assist small business under the mobilization program.

I have consistently been for economy in Government. But we will lose much more than we save if we deny SDPA the modest appropriation which the Fogarty amendment provides. SDPA is economic, first, because it puts an end to duplication and overlapping, and second, because it offers a solid promise of even further economies. It is my firm belief that when SDPA gets its program into full operation, we will be amazed at the additional economies it will bring about in terms of more efficient and less costly use of the Nation's productive facilities. If we eliminate SDPA we eliminate very necessary functions of consolidation and coordination which no other agency performs, can perform, wants to perform, or is set up to perform.

The record of the Smaller War Plants Corporation during World War II is undeniable proof that if you put all these powers under one roof and give the agency strong congressional support, you save hundreds of thousands of the taxpayers' dollars and preserve the Nation's economic and industrial strength at the same time.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I consider it merely a patriotic duty to speak here in support of the small-business men of my district and the country. I must confess my impatience with the prolongation of this debate and the apparent hesitation on the part of some Members to give vitally needed assistance to our small businesses.

It is barely 7 months ago, you will recall, that this House, and the Senate, unanimously voted to create the Small Defense Plants Administration as an independent agency with the sole and primary responsibility of assisting small business. Would anybody here be so bold as to declare that the needs of the small-business man have become less and his position materially improved since last August; I think not.

It is obvious that the small-business concerns need Government help it cannot be challenged and not one single dissenting voice of a Member of Congress was heard when we passed the originating legislation to create the Small Defense Plants Administration last year. To continue in existence these small-business people need a helping hand badly and they need it now.

There is no question but what they are being almost totally ignored in the awarding of contracts by the various Government procurement offices. We have the experience and abundant evidence from the last war demonstrating that small business was on the point of being extinguished until the Small War Plants Corporation was established for the particular purpose of aiding them. It is a matter of record that this Corporation performed an eminently satisfactory job. In this present emergency small business has its back to the wall in the same desperate plight it was back in 1942 before the SWPC was instituted. The Small Defense Plants Administration is being established on the same lines as SWPC and is prepared to carry out the same essential program that proved so successful.

Up in my home area there are hundreds of small businesses founded on the honored American traditions of private initiative and personal responsibility. With the decline in civilian goods output and unavailability of basic materials, channeled into defense production by large corporations, these vital business units of our economy are threatened with disaster. They cannot afford to leave their business or send representatives running to Washington, and other procurement sources, in search of Government contracts. The great corporations, as we all know, are well able to fly everywhere and maintain standing field agents at every procurement point. The only voice the little-business man has is yours and mine and we are neglecting our obligation if we do not speak up for him in his hour of need.

The small-business men of this country are only asking for a proportionate part in rightful entitlement. They want a fair share of critical materials, financial assistance, and defense contracts which, as things stand now, it is impossible for them to get. They are tragically in need of the guidance and direction toward these objectives which the continuation of the Small Defense Plants Administration is designed to give and will give, under the able direction of Mr. Telford Taylor and his staff.

In aiding small business we are only insuring the fundamental integrity of the Nation. The defense needs and the strength of our economy require that the facilities of small business, currently lying idle for the most part, be fully utilized in developing our maximum military potential in this mobilization emergency. It is as equally important that we safeguard the long-term economic welfare of the United States by preserving the potential productive strength of our small-business units.

The only objection against the continuing of SPDA, that in my opinion, merits any comment, is the question of whether the appropriation is warranted. Mr. Chairman, as you all know, I have been a consistent advocate of economy in Government spending and I am vigorously in favor of judging every proposed appropriation by a rigid yardstick of economy. There are, however, two kinds of economy; one legitimate and the other false. I very strongly believe it would be a prime example of false economy to eliminate funds for the

Small Defense Plants Administration because, not only does this agency incorporate economies resulting from cutting out current procurement duplications and overlappings but it also contains a real projection of many more desirable economies.

Undoubtedly some substantial savings will develop from a greater utilization of our small manufacturers in the defense effort. We all realize the vast expenditures being made by the competing military branches for war products, a great many of which could be gotten more cheaply from the smaller producers who are not yet being permitted participation in the mobilization program.

A more striking economy would be accomplished in the prevention of unemployment which is unquestionably uneconomic in these dangerous days when every person and every resource of the Nation should be brought into this vital struggle against Communist aggression.

Mr. Chairman, throughout the history of this country those engaged in small business have repeatedly demonstrated they are an essential artery of our production body and in our survival as a democratic people.

I earnestly urge you, my colleagues, to vote, without further delay, in favor of extending this aid to enable small business to maintain its rightful place in our traditional American life and history.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the House on its action yesterday when it added to the supplemental appropriation bill now before us the sum of $825,000 with which to keep the Small Defense Plants Administration operating to the end of this fiscal year.

In my experience in Congress I have not seen another such attempt as has been made here to kill off the Small Defense Plants Administration. It has been pointed out that there are several agencies and departments of the Government that have personnel whose functions it is to aid and assist small business. The same situation was true last fall when this Congress created SDPA. At that time it was thought that SDPA as a one-stop agency for the small-business man might be able to coordinate the activities that affect small business that are now spread around in various sections of the Government. It was thought that the personnel to serve small business in the other agencies and departments of the Government might be greatly reduced, and I believe that this has, to some extent, been done, but I do not believe that it was ever contemplated that these agencies and departments would be free to forget the problems of small business just because we had created SDPA.

As one of the sponsors of the Small Defense Plants Administration, it was my thought that SDPA could and would serve as a clearing house of information, and action, for small business in this country.

It is my recollection that the Small Defense Plants Administration was not set up until about last December. In other words, it has been alive only 3 months.

Yesterday we were faced with a recommendation by the House Committee on Appropriations that its life be taken, its remains buried, and its grave left unmarked.

I have not before experienced such an about face on a legislative matter of such importance in the short period of 3 months.

Our answer to such a radical proposal yesterday was to vote in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for an appropriation of $825,000. I trust this decision will be upheld by the House later on today, if a further attempt is made to kill this one agency that can and will give efficient service to the problems of the small-business man of this Nation.

I also hope that our action here will be considered as final by the Appropriations Committee, and that it will forthwith recommend to this House sufficient funds to carry on the work of SDPA for the fiscal year 1953.

I, of course, do not know the background of the fierce fight that some of the Members are making on this new agency. They spill out their innuendos attacking the administration of SDPA. I do not personally know Gen. Telford Taylor, the Administrator, but I do know that only a few short months ago he was confirmed by the Senate, undoubtedly after a searching inquiry had been made into his background and qualifications. I do know the Deputy Administration, or second in command in this agency, Mr. John Horne, of Alabama, and in my judgment there is not an abler, more conscientious, or finer character in Government service today. So, why is this vicious fight on SDPA being made? Certainly it is not because of any great amount of service that the agency has thus far been able to render to small business. It has only been in existence 3 months. Most of that time has necessarily been taken up in getting organized to carry out its mission of service to small business.

The fight is not being made on the agency for its failure to adequately serve small business, because no one could reasonably expect its accomplishments to be great at the end of 3 months from the time of its creation.

No; I believe this fight on this agency stems from some other motive, and whatever that motive is, I hope this House will reaffirm the position it took when it created the agency, vote it the funds to do the job that needs to be done for our small business.

Perhaps big business does not have need for the SDPA. I don't know. But, I do know from the complaints that come to my office that there is a great need on the part of small business for the services of this agency, and I feel that it should be encouraged by the Congress to go full steam ahead.

In order for SDPA to do its most effective work, we should provide it with the $10,000,000 revolving fund that the second Fogarty amendment calls for. This fund can be considered as a loan from the Treasury to SDPA, and it will be paid back to the Treasury. SDPA will use the fund to make sure that some of the larger contracts are so awarded that small-business men will have an opportunity to do some of the work. I do not contemplate that it will be necessary to use the authority which this fund will give SDPA very often, but the fact that it has it will help greatly to disperse defense contracts to small business over the Nation.

As I see it, it is easy for the representatives of the people to declare themselves in favor of the stability and integrity and well-being of small business. They can demonstrate on this amendment, just as they demonstrated yesterday on the first Fogarty amendment, whether those spoken intentions mean anything. This is an opportunity for us to render a great service to small business, and in turn, to the country.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Fogarty amendment. The committee yesterday, in approving the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island's amendment to continue administrative funds for the Small Defense Plants Administration, demonstrated that it understood the need for a Government agency ready to pitch in and fight to protect the interests of small-business men. However, in the face of the lack of concern for small-business problems shown by Government contract-awarding offices, unless we go a step further and give SDPA a means of prying loose some of these contracts, the small-business concern is still liable to get only short shrift when it comes to actual contract awards. The $10,000,000 in this bill will actually cost the taxpayer nothing—but it will mean a lot to small firms trying to take part in the defense procurement program. Any moneys spent from the fund will be returned to the Government as the contracts pay off. Without the fund and the authority to take prime contracts for subcontracting to small business, the SDPA will have no way of assuring what Mr. Taylor calls the fullest degree of cooperation from the contracting agencies in obtaining awards.

I am sure that practically all of my colleagues in the House have had the same sort of experiences I have had in trying to help constituents with small shops get a foot in the Government procurement picture. Defense contracting offices prefer, understandably, as I said yesterday, to deal with the big outfits who can supply them, under one contract, with everything they need. That is fine for them, but it is mighty hard on the small firm trying to keep its business going. Without some way of certifying to these agencies, in the case of any particular contract, that it is one that small business is qualified to handle, and without the authority backed up by capital from the revolving fund to take the contract itself, the SDPA will not be much more successful than you or I have been in getting contracting officers to listen to reason. Experiences during World War II with the Smaller War Plants Corporation showed that, once the buying agencies knew that SWPC could and would step in if need be, they gave much more consideration to qualified smaller firms. The right to take prime contracts was exercised by SWPC only a dozen times or so. Small businesses got an equitable share of the business—but they would not have had it if the implied threat of

SWPC's authority was not there. Since Korea the same situation has existed. In spite of small-business offices in the Commerce Department, NPA, and the Defense Department, small business has not had a look-in when the contracts are handed out. Those offices can only advise. Congress has authorized SDPA to do the same kind of a job SWPC did during World War II. It is up to us now to implement that authority by voting to them the $10,000,000 they have requested so that, if necessary, they can step in and say, "This is a contract small business can handle at no additional expense to the Government—give it to them."

Mr. Chairman, in setting up the Small Defense Plants Administration last year we authorized $50,000,000 to be used as a revolving fund in taking prime contracts from Government agencies and letting subcontracts to small businesses. The conditions which warranted the House to take that unanimous action last year have not changed. Small businesses are still suffering under major cuts in their raw-materials supply so that they cannot produce for civilian consumption. They are still getting only a dribble of contracts to produce for the military. Unless we do something to break down the defense agency's resistance to contracting with small firms, the situation will continue and your friends and my friends running their own businesses will continue to go out of business or limp along on 2 or 3 days a week production. Those people are the real backbone of the American free-enterprise system. Unless Congress appropriates this money for SDPA the only free enterprise left will be the enterprising zeal with which big business snaps the padlock on the doors of the little shops which they have driven out of competition.

I do not want that to happen, and I do not think you do. To avoid it, I most strongly urge that the Committee approve the Fogarty amendment and provide this $10,000,000 to put the SDPA in business for small business.

Mr. Chairman, under the leave granted today, I also include as part of my remarks a letter from a constituent of mine on this same subject matter. I feel these comments from Mr. Toon are to the point and certainly should convince those who read them:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *March 10, 1952.*
Congressman JOHN SHELLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The action taken by the Appropriations Committee in refusing the $825,000 request for operating expenses of the Small Defense Plants Administration and the $10,000,000 revolving fund, and the committee recommendation that the agency be liquidated at once, I feel deserve expression from the many small-business men. For that reason, I have hastily written the attached memorandum reflecting our over-all problems.

During the last 2 years I have spent over 7 months in the National Capital trying to find ways to do business with the many agencies of the Government and further understand the many rules, regulations, controls, and systems that one must have knowledge of. I have heard of the many criticisms of some of the people in the Commerce Department and Munitions Division in the Department of Defense who say, "We can serve small business and we are. SDPA will merely duplicate our functions." Being a taxpayer, I would be one of the first to support the closing of any agency that is duplicating the effort of an existing operation and, as you know, I have pointed out before the areas of duplication that I found in the military and some other departments that are half handled by the various departments, but their authority or responsibility seems to be of nebulous nature. I pray for reconsideration of this action by the committee and should you find that the Munitions Division or the Department of Commerce is manned with specialists, then take them out of their divisions and set them up into an agency armed with the authority and responsibility to act in the interest of small business; do not expect them to function as stepchildren to the big-business operations of the Military and Commerce Departments. Should further consideration show the true facts I am sure Congress wants to know, then I feel confident Congress will increase the budget and scope of the Small Defense Plants Administration and cut from the Defense and Commerce Department budgets more than enough funds to cover the cost of really representing the many thousands of small-business operators who have no lobbyists here in Washington to speak for them.

I ask your sincere consideration to the thinking expressed in the attached memorandum.

Sincerely,

T. O. TOON.

This is written with due apology to the many fine public servants in the Government departments and in the military, and to the men who represent big business in masterful manner and the management force that make up big business in America. To approach the problem in a fair manner we must consider the people who are in decision positions in our Government departments, civilian and military, and also the people who represent and manage the operations of big business in the country.

It is natural that the administrative branch of the Government should be attracted to the people who have made national reputations as successful operators of their various industries or other chosen fields of work and, when conditions arise such as we have today, top men like Mr. Wilson, of NPA, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Johnson, and others should be drafted by the President to organize our all-out production effort. It is also natural that the agencies vested with the responsibilities of policing our price and materials structure should call in leaders in their respective fields to help set up formulas and programs that can act as the regulatory pattern to protect our economy as nearly as possible under abnormal conditions. These key men and women muster under them, or recommend for administrative positions, people who subscribe to their thinking, which is a most natural result. Examination of the people in responsible positions will show that in the majority they reflect the thinking and techniques of big-business operations, since in the majority they come from that section of our national life; and as their able assistants they have the civil servants who have selected Government employment as their lifetime vocation.

The method of the selection of the most efficient worker versus the one with the longest work record, plus military service, etc., is no part of this memorandum, but has a bearing on the output in Government versus private operation. Briefly here again there runs in conflict the hard working, sincere employee versus the people who are on the job because they rate the job in length of service. In the majority of cases these employees have had little experience, if any, in the operation of small business and their approach to the problem is through their study of economics and the understanding they feel they have of the problem. They lack the rich experience of sweating blood to meet the payroll, the sleepless nights that go with the lack of business which results in the cut-back in staff or the losing of more money than little business can stand, knowing full well when you let off an employee his youngsters may suffer, or he may lose the little home, or his car that he is making his payments on and depends upon small business to find the income. They lack the heartaches one has when the credit at the bank has been cut off because the bank has more attractive fields for their funds. They lack the experience of having $20,000 in the bank on Monday and $200 on Tuesday, but with the knowledge that the payroll has been met, there is an inventory of raw materials on hand, materials in process, and the accounts receivable are on the credit side of the ledger. They lack the feeling of satisfaction when the board of directors or the shareholders vote you their confidence and give you a pat on the back that is worth more in many men's lives than many dollars could buy, and yet these public servants are not alone in not enjoying these experiences.

Many successful executives who have been drafted into Government service in most cases have graduated from one department to another of a big organization, mastering every assignment given them but always surrounded by able men, ample finances, and some pattern of operation. He has always thought and worked in the realm of big business, doing things in a big way, and when he became the top official and could show his organization how a new idea, person, or property would be profit producing for his organization they could find the funds to acquire or develop this new venture and his legal, merchandising, engineering, production, and financial staffs were always at his side. He did not have to fight all the problems himself as is the case with the truly small-business man.

Then the other segment of people here on the scene in Washington are the representatives working out of the many business offices in the city. They are in the most part men who are employed by the big-business groups and have at their call engineering and legal staffs in the preparation of presentations. Their background has been with big business that does things in a big way and they can find an answer for any Government agency in a matter of hours and can court contracts with all the skill their companies possess. They have team mates who represent other branches of their industrial family who can render aid in gathering information, planting suggestions, and locating any given material or machine in their multiple branches of industry. They have no worries in connection with the problems of financing a contract or work assignment which they may secure from the Government; their principle function is to get along with and understand Government and its principal agencies. They do exactly the same things that a small-business man would do if he could afford it, so no thought must be taken that anyone blames these men for doing their job for big business to the best of their ability. It has been said often that to be a part of the central intelligence agencies possessed by some of the big business interests operating here in Washington is the quickest way to find out what is going to be bought, where to find materials, or any other function that one may reasonably expect to go to the Government to get information about; however, it is a known fact that some of these highly organized central intelligence agency groups of big business know more about what is going on in all branches of Government than any Member

of the Congress or any member of any Government agency functioning by and for the will of the people.

When someone starts to measure the impact that would and is gradually taking place on our national economy, sees that the truly small-business operations are becoming fewer and more dependent upon the grace of some big business operation—considers that small business represents a considerable part of the very backbone of the American life and economy, and that too many small cities and towns depend on their big business which is nationally classified a small business, then we may well ask the question, What can the Government, Congress, or the people do about it?

Recently a number of stories have found their way into the newspapers about how small business is being looked after. He who would seriously suggest or believe that a small group of specialists in the Military Establishment or in the Department of Commerce could, even though they had the experience, look after the interests of the small-business segment of our national life has not studied the over-all problem of what small business means to America or expects an unnatural thing to be accomplished by superhumans. You may just as well expect a fellow that is in a poker game where the stakes are for $1,000 to pay attention to the boys who would like to get in the game but insist upon a 10-cent limit. Or you might just as well expect some store clerk to give you the same amount of attention if you are going to buy a $1 necktie when he sees a lush customer come in at the same time who is ready to buy a $150 suit.

I feel sure the Commerce Department and the Munitions Division both are staffed with men who have had small-business experience, but they still must go to the higher echelons in their departments to get decisions, and so they are little equipped to fight for the interests of small business when their superiors are wrestling with the problems of volume production, mass operation, and the bulk placement of funds which can be effectively treated in minimum time with the big-business operators. Their actions would be somewhat like ours if we were up in an apple tree picking apples. We would want to go to that part of the tree that had the most fruit so we could fill our basket with the least effort rather than to go out on the limbs and pick off the good fruit, which would require much more labor, effort, and time; and yet maybe out on that limb is some community in Missouri, or in the Dakotas, or in Alabama, or in New England, whose existence depends upon fair consideration for small business.

Those who subscribe to the theory that small business is already represented and their interests are taken care of by existing agencies will pull out all sorts of statistical figures to impress, confuse, and distort the problem. They will bring in a few witnesses who are small-business men, and they will tell you that although X company received over $1,000,000,000 in contracts, X percentage of this was subcontracted out to X number of small-business plants, and this is a good, sound, salable argument, but it doesn't reflect the facts. Not that there is any objection to X company getting the billion-dollar contract; certainly no small-business man could handle it; but consider the subcontracts that they give out. In the majority of cases the practice is sound, but in other areas they give out parts of work they cannot keep under their own wing; or they build a new plant and get tax write-offs, and thereby grow bigger. The record will speak for itself. If you examine the subcontract conditions that are attached to the work sent out you would find that when the prime contractor would get any kind of cutback he naturally starts cutting off the little subcontractors that have been, through his good grace, given some work for their plant. This experience in the last war makes many small-business operators leary of taking his facility and doing his bit in the defense program as he has no protection afforded the big operators with their skilled legal staffs.

With all the problems of controls and materials regulations and other factors encountered in the operation of business, big and small, with the added problem that this is not an all-out war effort and the production of defense items must be coordinated with the production of civilian goods, many far-reaching factors need the undivided sincere study and attention of an agency of Government that is set up specifically to look after the interests of the American people in the healthy retention of that segment of our economic life—small business. The men in Congress who lack the cooperation of the lobbyists of and for the people or the small-business man may well ponder the action taken by the Appropriations Committee when it recommended the liquidation of SDPA, the creation of the Congress and the one ray of hope the small-business man had remaining. A fair survey from every section of America would show that small-business men are crying for help, but they have no masters in presenting their cause to Congress or to the administration as these divisions of Government are too well surrounded with too many men who view the over-all problem with and through the eyes of big business.

During the last war the Federal Government created the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Its functions and its value to the war effort and to small business were appreciated by those who studied the problem. It was responsible for many small firms staying in business and producing many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of needed materials. It retained people in their local areas rather than forcing them to migrate to areas where big business needed more manpower. This resulted in a chain reaction in scores of areas because the local butcher, baker, and candlestick maker did not lose their valued patrons, and it reduced the need for additional war housing in congested areas. It appreciated the values in many areas where the small plants were operating, it created a wider base for the country's growth and afforded opportunity to those who would work. It formed the core of industry that the returning veteran could fit into after oversea service and it helped maintain that vital factor in our way of life, the individual ownership of many businesses by many people. None of us would argue but that what America needs big business—the small-business man would be the first to fight for the rights of big business. He likes to, as much as he can, copy their progressive developments, ideas, and programs because he dreams always of the day when he may be classified by big business as a big-business man, when he at the moment has to be satisfied with being a big man in his community only. He gets many work orders and does much business with his big brother. He shows his attitude by subscribing to such agencies as the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and other trade association groups.

He sits on many civic committees and devotes freely of his time, money and energy in the cause of business and in common problems with big business. He proportionately contributes more dollars per man and many more hours per man than his big brother. He is unknowingly used to foster the wishes of his big brother and he carries the fight for issues when his big brother may be embarrassed by having his name on the masthead of some issue or project. The organizations he belongs to are manned by men who can separate the chaff from the wheat, who know on which side their bread is buttered, and who bend to the will of experienced leadership always present in every organization and usually made up from the bigger blocks of members who represent one of many special interests, who know how to trade votes and influence actions when the chips are down.

It is no reflection on the small-business man to say that he is the tool of his bigger brother. He may do just the same thing if he had the issues and the people that he could use, but he has to keep his nose to the grindstone and operate his little business while his big brother's staffs plan the grand strategy and relieve him of the messy detail up to the point of preparing the resolutions, the policies, and the speeches. Then he flatters his little brother by allowing him to sponsor the issue, take the job of sitting in the chairmen's or president's chair so that the press can report that such and such an organization sponsored such and such issue and that the idea was conceived by a little-business man in the interest of the general welfare and for the good of the area's economy. The people in public office and on the street are left with the feeling that such and such an expression is the will of and for the interest of the majority of their people when, as a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the truth. However, as is true in so many cases, when you try to contradict this you will find many small-business men siding with their big brother even though to their own detriment because they would rather think that the idea was of their own making and they were not the voice of big business.

In closing I might suggest that I am quite sure there is no Member of the Congress, be he Republican or Democrat, in the Senate or in the House, but who has not received scores and scores of letters from his constituents asking for help, advice, and suggestions. To help these Members in the legislative branch of the Government they should have set up this Small Defense Plants Administration armed with authority and responsibility to serve small business. The Members of Congress should support this agency with all the vigor and power they possess to preserve and retain as healthy contributing segments of our national economy the American system of small business, owned and operated by so many people in the communities.

T. O. TOON.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 101, noes 106.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 115, noes 127.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Except where specifically increased or decreased elsewhere in this act, the restrictions contained within appropriations, or provisions affecting appropriations or other funds, available during the fiscal year 1952, limiting the amounts which may be expended for personal services, or for specified types of personal services, or for other purposes involving personal services, or amounts which may be transferred between appropriations or authorizations available for or involving such services are hereby increased to the extent necessary to meet increased pay costs authorized by Public Laws 201 and 204, approved October 24, 1951, and Public Law 207,

approved October 25, 1951, and comparable pay increases granted by administrative action pursuant to law.

Mr. TABER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, these are items that all relate to the amounts supposed to be required for pay raises, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read down through page 42, line 16, and open to amendment as well as being subject to points of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, there is no objection to the gentleman's request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all members who wish to do so, may extend their remarks previous to the last teller vote taken in committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 44, after line 2, add a new paragraph to chapter 11 as follows:

"None of the funds appropriated in this chapter for the Post Office Department shall be available for obligation or expenditure in excess of 99 percent of the amount carried in this chapter for said Department and none of the funds appropriated by this chapter for any other department or agency shall be available for obligation or expenditure in excess of 90 percent of the amount appropriated in this chapter for such department or agency."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have just offered applies only to chapter XI of this bill. It will require the departments and agencies concerned to absorb just a little bit more than they have already absorbed of the pay increases voted last year. It will not, of course, reduce the pay increase to any individual.

As you will see on page 34 of the committee report, pay increases enacted last year total approximately $699,000,000. Of this total amount the operating agencies have indicated their ability to absorb $311,000,000, or about 44 percent.

House bill H. R. 6947, the bill we are now considering, would impose a total reduction in this chapter XI of only $5,297,582, which would require a further absorption within appropriations already available, of less than 1 percent of the total pay increase cost.

My amendment will require them to absorb $12,623,054 more, which is less than 2 percent of the total pay-raise cost.

When enacting the recent pay-raise legislation, the Congress, of course, realized that it would entail some additional burden on the public purse. At the same time, it was just as clearly the intent of Congress that every possible operating economy would be devised and put into effect, to offset the higher pay rate.

As steps toward that end, the Appropriation Act for 1952 prescribed such economies through limitations on filling vacated positions, on grade promotions, on employment of chauffeurs, on numbers of workers employed in information and publicity units, on purchases of automobiles, and so forth. It would seem that these prescribed economies alone would account for, or should have made possible, absorption of pay-raise costs to at least the extent of the $311,000,000, which the operating agencies have now presented as the top limit of their ability to pay these higher salaries and wages without new appropriations.

In the belief that some further absorption is possible and is entirely practicable, without hampering any of the work programs involved, I am proposing this amendment to the committee bill, which, as I have already said, carries a reduction of less than 1 percent of this particular item. This amendment would require a further absorption of nearly 2 percent of the total pay-raise costs.

Even with the adoption of this amendment, the operating agencies still will be absorbing less than 50 percent of the total of such costs.

I call your attention to the fact that the hearings on this bill do not appear to have gone specifically into this matter, and the committee report explains its action in 11 lines on page 35 of the committee report. The committee considered total estimates of $353,006,460, and recommended, as I previously said, a reduction of $5,297,582.

The Presidential request for this item is contained in House Document No. 358, and contains a tabulation listing the agencies and the amounts requested, with the amounts absorbed. The figures reflect that some of the agencies have done a splendid job in absorbing some of these costs. The tabulation shows that 22 of the agencies absorbed these increased pay costs 100 percent; the percentage ranges down from 100 percent to zero, some of the agencies having absorbed none of the costs.

While the agencies concerned have absorbed some 44 percent of the over-all average of these costs, I call attention to the fact that much of this is occasioned by the new leave system passed by the last session of the Congress.

Each of the items in this chapter involving Federal funds has been considered, and, as a general rule, a cut of about 10 percent in the amount recommended by the committee is proposed. An exception to this is the Post Office Department, in the case of which a cut of only 1 percent, amounting to $2,431,540, is provided.

In many cases, depending on the size of the past appropriation and the character of the activities involved, the proposed cut will vary somewhat above or below 10 percent. But it should be borne in mind that over all, or on the average, the proposed reduction represents a very insignificant percentage of the total appropriation and of the total computed cost of the pay and leave legislation.

It is notable that the executive agencies show a 44-percent absorption of pay-act increases, very largely because a few big operations are absorbing 100 percent. It will be seen on pages 16 and 17 of House Document 358 that the Secretary of Defense, the Army, the Navy, and Air Force, with total pay-act costs of about $190,000,000, show 100 percent absorption. So does the Tennessee Valley Authority, with a total cost of $3,910,000; the Mutual Security Agency, $5,406,881; the Atomic Energy Commission, $2,678,000; and several others. When these large total absorptions are taken out of the total cost of $699,000,000, the record of absorption by the other 90 or 95 percent of the operating agencies does not make such a good showing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. On page 35 of the bill, line 30, there is an appropriation of $79,000 from tribal funds of the Indians, not Government funds; would the gentleman's amendment affect that in any way?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. My amendment proposes to reduce Federal funds. It is intended to apply only to Federal funds.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. FORD. Would this amendment reducing by 10 percent the funds of all agencies except the Post Office Department, affect the funds allocated under the Fogarty amendment to the Small Defense Plants Administration?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It would affect only those items carried in chapter 11.

Mr. FORD. Nothing before chapter 11?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. No; it applies only to chapter 11.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. Do I understand that the gentleman means to cut the funds of the legislative branch in his amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. By 10 percent?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes; and in connection with that I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the legislative branch has already absorbed $454,102, and that this small amount is not, in my opinion, going to affect the efficiency or work of this branch.

Mr. CANFIELD. This will probably affect clerk hire of the Members.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It will affect them to the extent that it applies to funds available for that purpose.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

If we are going to get any economy at all, should not the Members of Congress be willing to take their share of the cut?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not see why we should call on other agencies to accept a cut and to practice economy

and then say we cannot practice it in the legislative department; that is my attitude about it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is presented by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge DAVIS, one of the most useful Members of the House, a colleague for whom all of us have the highest regard and the warmest esteem, and whose judgment I have always been glad to follow.

But I am a little dubious about this particular amendment. It is an amendment across the board, a horizontal reduction, an amendment of the class known in congressional parlance as a shotgun amendment, which hits everything indiscriminantly. Necessarily such an amendment cuts some items too drastically and other items too lightly. Any appropriation which is susceptible to an amendment of this character will carry items in which there should be a cut of more than the 10 percent here provided. And it will inevitably have items in which no cut at all can reasonably be made. In other words, its rigid application is highly inequitable.

That is especially true of this particular bill. This is an omnibus bill. It is made up of various chapters reported by as many different committees. Some of these committees perhaps cut lightly; some of them more heavily. So when this inelastic reduction is applied to all it does not cut them equally.

I think we can all agree that an amendment of this character is, as a rule, unwise. These appropriations are in the nature of deficiencies and certainly each of them should be considered on its individual merit. So I am exceedingly doubtful about the wisdom of adopting the amendment, on that account.

In the second place, if an amendment of this character were to be offered, it should have been offered in the committee where there would have been an opportunity to consider it a little more leisurely, a little more carefully, than when precipitated suddenly here on the floor of the House.

"Haste always makes waste."

In the third place, this amendment will seriously disorganize the administration of indispensible Government activities such as narcotic control, the Secret Service, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the clerk hire of Members and Delegates, medical, hospital and domiciliary service of the Veterans' Bureau, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, rural electrification, meat inspection, animal-disease control, safety of railroads under the Interstate Commerce Commission, air safety regulation under the CCA, mine accidents, the postal operations, and others. All these are operating on a close budget and many of them cannot possibly be operated on the reduced amounts this amendment provides. Unquestionably, early readjustments will have to be made. In that respect this amendment is particularly ill advised.

However, I am by nature an economizer. The only difference of opinion I have ever had with my colleagues on the subcommittees is where I objected to raises or wanted to cut deeper. Perhaps I am wrong in that respect. But if there is to be an error, I would rather err in cutting too deeply than in not cutting deeply enough. In voting on appropriations any doubt should, generally speaking, be resolved in favor of economy. So, Mr. Chairman, for that reason, and in the hope that money will be saved, in spite of the logic of the situation, the committee accepts the amendment, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XII

SEC. 1201. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an arganization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN on page 45, after line 11, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1202. Section 1310 of Public Law 253 of the Eighty-second Congress is hereby amended as follows:

"At the end of subsection 'a' before the period, insert: '*Provided further*, That any agency may promote any employee permanently to a position if such promotion will not increase the number of employees holding permanent positions in the grade of such position in such agency above the number in such grade in such agency prior to September 1, 1950: *Provided further*, That permanent promotions may be made to any position in a category for which the Civil Service Commission authorizes permanent appointments under the terms hereof.'

"And in the last proviso of subsection 'c' after 'register,' insert, 'or is eligible for appointment, in accordance with a regular appointment system or procedure established prior to September 1, 1950, to a higher grade position outside the competitive civil service,'.

"And at the end of subsection 'c', before the period, insert 'or being advanced to a grade level not exceeding that for which he had previously established eligibility as required by the terms hereof: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions hereof, and in order to avoid undue hardship or inequity, the Civil Service Commission, when requested by the head of the agency involved, may authorize promotions in individual cases of meritorious nature.' "

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, these amendments were worked out by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, and myself, with the cooperation of representatives of the Civil Service Commission and the Comptroller General.

These amendments do not change the basic policy nor objectives of section 1310 of Public Law 253, the so-called Whitten rider.

These amendments, if adopted, will prevent certain interpretations placed on section 1310 of Public Law 253, which were not intended and which, in my judgment, in most cases were not required by that act, from bringing about results not intended.

These amendments preserve the intent to hold the average grade and salary, and to limit the total number of employees to that of September 1, 1950. As, I say, it has been worked out with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and others, and it has also been worked out with the Civil Service Commission representatives, and with the Comptroller General's office.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, it is intended to take care of what is known as the purpose of the original Whitten amendment and take care of some of the discrepancies that have been discovered, that have come to our attention since the Whitten amendment was adopted.

Mr. WHITTEN. I say to the gentleman from Kansas, an expert in this field, that he is absolutely correct. We retain the objectives and policy of that amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I have received some criticism of the so-called original Whitten amendment, which may be criticism of the wording of the law and which may be a criticism of the way it has been administered. The criticism was that in certain departments, specifically the Post Office Department, there were temporary employees put on who were not under civil service, in an effort to meet the problem arising from the so-called Whitten amendment. Is this designed to meet that specific situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. This should help to cure that though that situation was not caused by the Whitten amendment

though it has been claimed it was. These amendments take away any such claim. The Whitten amendment left authority to the Civil Service Commission to authorize all the permanent appointments they wanted to so long as the total number of permanent employees did not exceed that of September 1, 1950. Under the report in connection with that amendment the Civil Service Commission was directed to keep up the normal number of permanent appointments in the postal service. This they did not do, and the rider is not what has kept the permanent appointments from being made. For instance, there are many other places where the same thing occurred. The total number of permanent employees was limited to the number there were on September 1, 1950, but an Executive order, prepared by the Civil Service Commission was issued which set up certain restrictions, and the actual number is several hundred thousand below the ceiling fixed in the Whitten amendment. Most of the complaints you and I have had, while charged to my amendment were not required by it. However, we do not wish them to occur, and they have been ironed out. These provisions are the result of conferences between the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], the Civil Service Commission representatives, the Comptroller General's representatives, and others, and I think it will relieve all of those things by clearly giving power to get away from interpretations which have worked hardships in some individual cases, not intended and in nearly all cases not required by such amendment or section.

Mr. KEATING. The effect of the amendment which the gentleman is today offering would be to make it possible for a Government department to take on career civil-service permanent employees rather than these temporary employees that do not have civil-service status?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is true. The civil service may authorize that as long as the total number of permanent employees is not increased beyond the level of September 1, 1950. They may make permanent promotions, as long as the total number in that grade and agency is not increased beyond that existing on that date.

Mr. KEATING. This should have the effect of cutting down the number of temporary employees brought in who do not have civil service status.

Mr. WHITTEN. It should have that effect.

Mr. JAVITS. I have a letter from the Post Office Department also dealing with this subject proposing to set up a new class of people without civil-service status, not temporary but provisional.

Mr. WHITTEN. We do not set it up here, but the civil service has authority to meet that kind of problem in event they see fit to. As I have pointed out—we directed the Civil Service Commission to provide for a normal number of permanent appointments in the Post Office Department. This they have not done.

Mr. JAVITS. This will give them the legislative background for making such adjustments?

Mr. WHITTEN. This certainly should be taken as a directive to the Civil Service Commission to exercise its authority and this action should be a basis for them to ask for modification of the Executive order which really has limited permanent appointments in this instance.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Is the gentleman from Mississippi convinced that this proposed clarifying amendment will solve most of the complaints that have been filed against his original amendment to the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. I say to my friend from West Virginia that we have discussed every possible case that might arise and tried to meet it. Then to make sure we have given the Civil Service Commission authority to specially handle cases of undue hardship. That is, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Civil Service Commission's representatives, and the representatives of the Comptroller General and myself, have worked out these provisions. It either works out or authorizes the handling of all of the cases that we have had called to our attention as well as those we could foresee that may arise. Again, practically all of the complaints I have personally had were not intended and were not required.

We have worked on this matter for some time. In the light of experience gained, being fully convinced that section 1310 of Public Law 253, the Whitten admendment was urgently needed and being determined that interpretations and other restrictions not included therein should not be permitted to be built up and used for the purpose of repeal.

It has always been my desire to be fair. I have sought information. I have tried always to profit by experience. This section means far more than many would believe.

It will prevent what happened in World War II. It prevents an overbuilding up of the permanent civil service. It provides for orderly promotions and it is estimated will save a half a billion dollars a year, judged by what happened in World War II.

I would like to briefly review the history of this provision. During World War II we had no such section as section 1310 of Public Law 253. During the period of World War II, due to the fact that there was expansion of emergency defense agencies and in many other fields, the competition between agencies for a limited number of available and qualified personnel resulted in tremendous upgrading. We would have some agency come in with a specific task, and in order to acquire personnel they would say, "Come on over to us and we will give you a two-grade promotion or even a greater jump." Then another agency would say "Come on over here and we will give you an additional two-grade jump." All these promotions did not go across-the-board, but they went to those who jumped from one agency to another. As a result, we ended up with a tremendous upgrading in most of the governmental departments. In fact, at the outset of my efforts along this line I had a study made of two of the governmental departments. This study revealed that during the course of World War II these departments ended up with an average upgrading throughout the department of about two grade levels. You understand some got none, others four or more. All this was in addition to salary raises. And this two-grade average upgrading within such departments if it existed in all departments, and there is reason to believe it did exist substantially throughout all departments, means an average annual expense of about a billion dollars which we have to pay now.

With the beginning of hostilities in Korea, realizing we would once again be supporting a huge military program, I decided to dig into this question of how we could prevent the situation which had occurred during World War II from happening again. I also wanted to make available to the military effort the services of experienced personnel which we had in the Government. We set out to get those changes made by the Civil Service Commission. But after months and months they still were following their regular rules. Even if a man was in the Reserve and employed in a given agency as a permanent employee the minute he left for military service his job was filled on a permanent basis. If a man was called out of one of the governmental departments with a permanent position, permanent classification, to serve with the Atomic Energy Commission, for instance, the day he left his job was filled. Notwithstanding that, many of the emergency agencies and national defense itself needed the experienced personnel in the old line departments there was no provision for retention of reemployment rights, no other protection than if he left to go to one of the new agencies or went to any other agency to meet the defense demands. He had no reemployment right to go back to the agency from which he came.

The first move which we made, as I say, was to try to get some change by the Civil Service Commission. When that was not forthcoming I wrote the first rider, which was as follows and which was adopted on the 27th day of September 1950:

SEC. 1302. After September 1, 1950, and during the fiscal year 1951:

(a) In making appointments in the Government service the Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to make temporary appointments in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel and no employee in the Federal civil service promoted, transferred, or appointed to a position of higher grade shall be eligible, in the event of separation from the service through reduction in force, to reinstatment at a grade above the grade held by such employee on September 1, 1950; and all reinstatements, transfers, or promotions to positions in the Federal civil service shall be temporary and for positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to the individual reinstated, transferred or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency

personnel office or the Civil Service Commission;

(b) The names of all persons to be terminated under reductions in force in the departments and agencies of the Government shall be certified as eligible for appointment to positions in agency programs determined by the President to be related directly to national defense, if qualified, at not to exceed the grade and salary last held in the terminating agency or department; and

(c) The Department of Defense is authorized to call on other departments or agencies for such additional personnel as it may require within the limits of its funds.

Had there been proper regulations or proper changes in the regulations of the Civil Service Commission it would not have been necessary to incorporate this into the law. After this became law and we began to operate under it, some improvement was brought about but we found that even then there was a slowness on the part of the Civil Service Commission to change its regulations in order to conform with this change in the law. Thus it was that last year after the other rider had been in effect for approximately a year, and since there had been some objections made by representatives of the Civil Service Commission and others, I asked the Commission if they would submit the changes they felt were needed for the consideration of the Congress. This invitation they neglected to accept. Thus it was that I again wrote the rider of last year as follows:

SEC. 1310. Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950: *Provided*, That any position made vacant by call to military service or by transfer to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary basis. All transfers (except at the same or lower grade and salary), reinstatements, or promotions to positions in the Federal civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission. All transfers of permanent employees at the same grade and salary made on a temporary basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act. Nothing in this paragraph shall operate to impair the permanent status of employees who are changed to a temporary or indefinite basis or to alter their retention status under reduction-in-force procedures from that in existence prior to September 1, 1950.

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourage the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide for reemployment rights in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in and outside the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade.

(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary, (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than January 1 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on December 1 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous December 1.

This provision was adopted by the House of Representatives. Then the Commission sent its representatives down to talk to us about it, and they said they would prefer, of course, that this be handled, not by law but by regulation. They stated, however, that if we were going to do it by law that it would require that provisions be made for exceptions to the limitations proposed by the legislative provision which at that time had passed the House. I asked them then to spell out the exceptions which would be needed to meet the objectives which we had, limiting the total number of permanent personnel, regulating promotions on a regular basis, as against having the governmental agencies competing with each other for a limited supply of trained people and prevent the upgrading which had existed before. The representatives of the Civil Service Commission then came up with the following language as being essential to make the section workable in meeting the objectives which the House of Representatives had and which we were seeking in this legislative provision:

SEC. 1310. Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950: *Provided*, That any position vacated by a permanent employee called to military service or transferred to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary or indefinite basis. All reinstatements and promotions in the Federal civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis, and all permanent employees who are transferred from one agency to another shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission. All transfers of permanent employees made on a temporary or indefinite basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That such employees shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred.

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourage the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide reemployment rights for permanent employees in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade: *Provided*, That the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service and the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service may by regulation provide for promotions of two grades in 1 year (1) to positions not higher than GS–5, (2) to positions not higher than GS–11 which are in a line of work properly classified under the Classification Act of 1949 at two-grade intervals, (3) to positions in the same line of work when the employee has completed a training period under a training program approved by the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service, or approved by the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service, and (4) of an employee of the agency concerned when there is no position in the normal line of promotion in the grade immediately below that of the position to be filled: *Provided further*, That this subsection shall not apply to any case involving an employee who is within reach for appointment to a higher grade position on a competitive civil service register, or being advanced up to a grade level from which he had been demoted or separated because of reduction in force.

(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level, (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary, (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than July 31 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service

Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on June 30 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous June 30, and each annual and supplemental budget estimate shall include a statement comparing the average grade and salary provided for in each item of appropriation or fund allowance therein with similar figures reported for the two previous periods.

I accepted these provisions and they were incorporated in the law.

Now since that time we have had a considerably different construction made of these provisions from that which was intended by myself, by the committee, and by the representatives of the Civil Service Commission who helped work out these provisions. There is much to indicate that some people down the line in the Commission, in its legal department and elsewhere, took the view that the Congress had written the law and spelled out its objectives, and since the Congress had also said some things to indicate how those objectives should be met, the Commisison would just give them a double dose. In other words, someone in the Department apparently set out to see that they would not only do those things set out in the law to reach the objectives but that they would do that much more.

For instance, the section provides that a person shall serve for a year in the preceding grade before being promoted to the next highest grade. Nowhere does it say that the service in such preceding grade shall be immediately prior to the promotion. But the Commission, through its legal department, held that the service must immediately precede and you can see the ridiculous situations which sometimes arose. For instance, if a person had a grade 10 and had worked for many years in Federal service, but through some misfortune his job was abolished and he was left here in Washington and took a grade 5 just to have something to do, but worked only a few weeks at it, under the interpretation placed on this section by the legal division of the Civil Service Commission he was not eligible to go back to a grade 10 or be promoted to a grade 11.

The legislative provision and the report in connection with it as it was spelled out did limit the total number of permanent personnel to that of September 1, 1950, but the Civil Service Commission wrote a provision, which became an Executive order, which limits permanent appointments, and the total number of permanent employees in the Federal Government is several hundred thousand below the ceiling fixed by this so-called Whitten rider. That comes about from this Executive order prepared by the Commission itself.

I would also like to point out that in the report which was released in connection with the final adoption of the rider last year it was spelled out that the Post Office Department should make a normal number of permanent appointments. This the Commission has not authorized. It was never the intention of the committee to prevent the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for instance, from taking people they had employed in the FBI in minor capacities, while they attended schools conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and appointing them as special agents upon completion of their schooling for such position. It was thought by myself that we made provision for such exceptions when they were on a competitive examination register that this would take care of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but it developed that on interpretation where we said "competitive civil-service register," this language excluded registers that might have been established by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. There were those who would contend that the Civil Service Commission's representatives intended by the words "civil-service register" that the Federal Bureau of Investigation might be required to get the Civil Service Commission to set up the register. I make no such accusation as the people I have dealt with in the Commission on this matter I feel sure did not have any such intention. But certainly there was no intention on our part to require the FBI to desist from its appointment of agents under this provision.

I could point out any number of other places where due to opinions of the Comptroller General's office, or due to legal interpretation by the Civil Service Commission, I feel that the legislative section has been made to pinch many times where there was no necessity for it and no intent for such consequences. I realize this is a matter of opinion.

But I do want to say that the amendments which we have offered here will meet those cases, in the judgment of myself, the folks on our committee, and according to the best judgment of the representatives of the Civil Service Commission. In other words with the adoption of these amendments we can meet the objectives set out in the original rider and we can do it with a minimum of injury or hardship to anyone. We are convinced that is true. Through this means we will thereby hold down the total number of permanent employees; we will hold down the average grade and salary throughout the civil service. We will protect those in the civil service who are working in an orderly, able, manner, expecting promotions in an orderly, regular sort of way. We will prevent the emergency agencies from competing with each other and thereby building up over a period of time a tremendous upgrading in the various agencies.

We also will make experienced personnel available for defense work, because a man can afford to go into national defense work when he has full right to return to the job from which he leaves. It would be grossly unfair to bring in thousands of people who believed they were getting permanent jobs, retirement, and all those benefits, when actually we know that it is not so. We tried to leave to the Civil Service Commission the full rights within the limit of these objectives to handle it in the best possible manner. This we intended to do before and, as I have pointed out, we accepted their language. But subsequent events have proven, and we do not mean to fix any responsibility as to that, that the language which the Commission's representatives wrote does not fully meet the needs of this freedom of action in line with the objectives; this we attempt to do here, and I trust that the future will prove that this will be not only to the benefit of the Government but of the Federal employees. The Congress I am sure will realize that the intent once again is to meet these objectives but as long as they do so in such a way as to keep at an absolute minimum the ill effect on individuals and individual cases. You will note that one of these provisions provides that the Civil Service Commission can make exceptions themselves to prevent undue hardship. This we think will certainly meet the objections which have been raised, and again I do not attempt to fix responsibility but will say that practically all of the hardships which have occurred were not intended by the committee nor were they anticipated by the representatives of the Civil Service Commission. In conclusion, I think that we have in Federal service as fine a group of public servants as you will find anywhere. They are just as patriotic and work just as hard, and the fact that we try to regulate this situation in no way can be taken as an attack on them. I also want to say that I personally have the highest regard for the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission as well as others on the Commission. However, I do believe that with these changes and with the cooperation of the Civil Service Commission, which I know we will have, the personnel operations of the Government will be improved. With these proposed amendments, the entire provision will read as follows:

SEC. 1310. Immediately upon the enactment of this act and until termination of the national emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950:

(a) The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel of the Federal Government above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950: *Provided*, That any position vacated by a permanent employee called to military service or transferred to a national-defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary or indefinite basis. All reinstatements and promotions in the Federal civil service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis, and all permanent employees who are transferred from one agency to another shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred. All appointments, reinstatements, transfers, and promotions to positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949 shall be made with the condition and notice to each individual appointed, reinstated, transferred, or promoted that the classification grade of the position is subject to post-audit and correction by the appropriate departmental or agency personnel office or the Civil Service Commission. All transfers of permanent employees made on a temporary or indefinite basis since September 1, 1950, shall be changed to a permanent basis as of the effective date of this act: *Provided*, That such employees shall retain their status as permanent employees in the agency to which transferred at the grade

or basic pay level of their permanent positions in the agency from which transferred: *Provided further,* That any agency may promote any employee permanently to a position if such promotion will not increase the number of employees holding permanent positions in the grade of such position in such agency above the number in such grade in such agency prior to September 1, 1950: *Provided further,* That permanent promotions may be made to any position in a category for which the Civil Service Commission authorizes permanent appointments under the terms hereof

(b) The Civil Service Commission shall facilitate the transfer of Federal employees from nondefense to defense activities and encourages the retention of employees in defense activities, and shall provide reemployment rights for permanent employees in the activities from which such employees are transferred.

(c) The Civil Service Commission shall make full use of its authority to prevent excessively rapid promotions in the competitive civil service and to require correction of improper allocations to higher grades of positions subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. No person in any executive department or agency whose position is subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be promoted or transferred to a higher grade subject to such act without having served at least 1 year in the next lower grade: *Provided,* That the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service and the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service may by regulation provide for promotions of two grades in 1 year (1) to positions not higher than GS–5; (2) to positions not higher than GS–11 which are in a line of work properly classified under the Classification Act of 1949 at two-grade intervals; (3) to positions in the same line of work when the employee has completed a training period under a training program approved by the Civil Service Commission for positions in the competitive service, or approved by the head of the employing agency for positions outside the competitive service; and (4) of an employee of the agency concerned when there is no position in the normal line of promotion in the grade immediately below that of the position to be filled: *Provided further,* That this subsection shall not apply to any case involving an employee who is within reach for appointment to a higher grade position on a competitive civil-service register, or is eligible for appointment, in accordance with a regular appointment system or procedure established prior to September 1, 1950, to a higher grade position outside the competitive civil service, or being advanced up to a grade level from which he had been demoted or separated because of reduction in force, or being advanced to a grade level not exceeding that for which he had previously established eligibility as required by the terms hereof: *Provided further,* That, notwithstanding the provisions hereof, and in order to avoid undue hardship or inequity, the Civil Service Commission, when requested by the head of the agency involved, may authorize promotions in individual cases of meritorious nature.

(d) From time to time, but at least annually, each executive department and agency shall (1) review all positions which since September 1, 1950, have been created or placed in a higher grade or level of difficulty and responsibility of work or in a higher basic pay level; (2) abolish all such positions which are found to be unnecessary; (3) with respect to such positions which are found to be necessary, make such adjustments as may be appropriate in the classification grades of those positions which are subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, or in the basic pay levels of those positions which are subject to other pay-fixing authority. Not later than July 31 of each year each department and agency shall submit a report to the Post Office and Civil Service Committees and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives concerning the action taken under this paragraph, together with information comparing the total number of employees on the payroll on June 30 and their average grade and salary with similar information for the previous June 30, and each annual and supplemental budget estimate shall include a statement comparing the average grade and salary provided for in each item of appropriation or fund allowance therein with similar figures reported for the two previous periods.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this amendment. I do not see how any Member can oppose it.

This amendment will, first, grant, in the case of systems outside the competitive civil service, authority to make promotions of employees to grade levels for which they are eligible; second, permit advancement of employees to grades for which they have previously established eligibility; third, permit the Civil Service Commission to make exceptions in proved hardship cases; fourth, permit agencies to make permanent promotions of permanent civil-service employees when such promotions will not increase the number of employees holding permanent positions in any grade; and, fifth, permit permanent promotions to be made in cases where additional permanent appointments are authorized.

The first section of this amendment will correct an inequity that has developed in the appointment of FBI agents from employees of the FBI in categories other than agent. At the present time employees in other agencies may be appointed at a higher rating when they are selected from a regularly established civil-service register.

Since register is identified in the law today as a civil-service register, it has recently been held by the Comptroller General that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain other agencies who maintain their own registers and their own system of examination are denied the right of promoting qualified employees from within their organization.

Here is an example just brought to my attention:

The Federal Bureau of Investigation had selected some of their employees in a clerical capacity from the agent register which they maintain and placed them in training for agents. This ruling of the Comptroller General will require not only that these employees who have been determined to be qualified must be withdrawn from the training classes but they have been ordered to return overpayments resulting from the higher classification pay.

I am sure that the Members of the House can readily see that, if we do not correct this situation, we are creating an inequity to the employees concerned and raising a serious obstacle to the planned program of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to their recruitment of agents.

It is the purpose of the second section of the amendment to permit the advancement of employees to a grade level to which they have previously established eligibility. There are cases where employees have accepted positions temporarily in a lower grade although eligible for an appointment to a higher grade had such a position been available at the time they accepted the appointment.

Without the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], we have situations where many qualified and able employees whom agencies want to employ will not accept positions but wait for a time when positions calling for higher grades from the particular register from which they are selected are available.

I am informed that this is a serious situation in the emergency agencies.

The amendment permits the Commission to make exceptions in hardship cases.

In general, the Whitten amendment contains a proscription against promotion within a year of more than two grades. However, in carrying out this directive of Congress, there developed a number of hardship cases. I am sure that most every Member here has had brought to his attention situations that have developed affecting persons from their district or persons with whose situations they are personally acquainted that could be corrected if the Civil Service Commission had the authority to make exceptions in hardship cases.

The action of the Commission in approving such hardship cases must be based on an original request by the head of the agency concerned.

In my discussions of this particular problem with the Commission, it was decided that the agency head must clearly demonstrate that there is a hardship or an inequity involved and a valid reason for complying with the agency request.

This amendment will permit an agency to promote an employee permanently to a position when this promotion will not increase the total number of employees holding permanent positions in the same grade in the particular agency concerned.

I have had a number of instances of this type called to my attention where, because of a death or resignation or retirement of a career employee, the agency desired to promote the assistant to the position so vacated. However, such a promotion would have to be made on a temporary basis. Many employees confronted with such decisions have contacted me seeking advice as to whether they should accept the temporary promotion or retain their permanent grade. Frankly, I could not answer such a question because it is one that must be answered by the individual himself, difficult as it must be under the circumstances to reach such a decision.

The present situation stems from the fact that the employee is faced with making a decision as to whether he will risk his permanent status by accepting a temporary position in which, if a reduction in force occurs, he faces the real possibility of being separated because of his temporary status.

This amendment will permit the making of permanent promotions to any position in a category to which the Civil Service Commission may authorize permanent appointments under this law.

The purpose of this amendment is to permit the promotion of qualified permanent employees to positions which, while increasing the number of grades at the level to which they are being promoted, will not increase the number of permanent positions or employees.

An amendment of this nature is necessary to meet situations which develop during reorganizations or during a normal increase in volume or change of functions. These situations are bound to develop in the carrying out of a Government activity as vast as our Federal Government and if we, as Congress, are going to insist on efficiency, in my judgment, we should approve this particular amendment which will make possible adjustments during such reorganizations or shifting of functions. This amendment will encourage the use of experienced career people.

This authority will not be used in cases of purely temporary emergency functions but is provided to take care of the problems faced in permanent establishments.

This amendment will not permit any increase in the number of permanent employees over the number on September 1, 1950.

This amendment has been prepared after consultation with representatives of the Civil Service Commission and the General Accounting Office, together with members of the staffs of both the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

The results of this amendment represent necessary clarifications to meet situations that have developed during the period this law has been in effect.

Mr. Ramspeck, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and a former esteemed Member of the House, has faithfully carried out the policy of Congress with regard to placing limitations on the over-all size of the permanent personnel force of our Government.

The Civil Service Commission, to the extent it has administrative discretion under the law, has developed a number of administrative regulations. However, in the areas to which the amendment offered today directs itself, it was impossible to arrive at a workable solution without additional legislation. This was confirmed in informal discussions with staff officials of the General Accounting Office.

A number of these situations have developed recently, such as the cases involving promotions within the FBI, which made it necessary to bring this amendment to the floor at the first opportunity.

This supplemental appropriation bill presented that opportunity. I trust that this amendment will be adopted today so that these needed modifications of the Whitten amendment may be placed into effect promptly. I assure the Members of the House again that this amendment has had careful, deliberate, and detailed consideration.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, once in a while I go hunting. Once in a while I go fishing. Sometimes when I am standing in a blind a flock of ducks will go by and I single out one and maybe I get him. The others go on and do not pay much attention; none, in fact, so far as I can see. When I go fishing and get one fish out of a school, the rest go on. They do not pay any attention either.

When I go home to my district and talk to people, if I happen to hit a family where their boy has been taken and sent abroad, they have something to say about it, but the neighbors, at least those 10 or 15 miles away, do not seem to care anything about it. At least they do not say anything to me.

However, there is one thing the home folks always do mention to me. All of them speak to me about this one thing. They seem to be really personally interested. They say, "Why are you increasing my taxes and taking those extra cents, pardon me, dollars, out of my pocket?" They are interested in that, may I say, "extraction." And do not think they are not. It is a personal matter with each one. Each individual is not only interested. He has something to say to me, his Representative, about it. He says, "How come?"

Always you and I tell them, "I am doing all I can. If the other fellow would go along, we would cut these tax bills." But for some reason or other, I do not get by with that excuse. Neither do you, my colleagues. Our constituents, the people by whose favor we are here, expect a little bit more than I am able to accomplish here.

I have been and am opposed to so many of these appropriations that I have been charged with being an "ag'iner." Apparently we are not going to get anywhere unless we send some of these appropriation bills back and let the committee come in with a less sum.

Cutting a bill in the House and approving it when it comes back after conference carrying additional millions is not getting us anywhere, nor are the people being fooled. They judge our actions by the amount they have to dig up to pay their taxes. I know the committee works very, very hard. I know they work long hours and do their best. But still the over-all picture is that always these appropriations go up, and taxes go up. Always the taxes increase.

Always the money to a large extent is wasted or used unlawfully. Now, to make clear exactly what I am talking about, I want to read to you, or at least call it to your attention—and I will put the rest of it in the RECORD later—a letter which came to me from a citizen and which he received from the Mutual Security Agency, Washington, D. C. This is the way it reads:

MUTUAL SECURITY AGENCY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: If, after reading Jack Kroll's letter and the enclosed pamphlets, you would like to order them for distribution to key people in your union or in the community, you may do so by filling the attached form and returning it to us.

We would value your comments as well as suggestions as to other material you would find useful.

Sincerely yours,
NATHALIE E. PANEK,
Labor Information.

Please send me ------ copies of The Working People of Europe.
Please send me ------ copies of Shirt Sleeve Diplomats.
Please send me ------ copies of OEEC Wheel.

Name ----------
Address ----------
Organization ----------

That is sent out, mind you, here in Washington by the Mutual Security Agency, and the letter that they referred to as having been written by Jack Kroll, and enclosed, is printed, believe it or not, on the letterhead of the PAC, Congress of Industrial Organizations' Political Action Committee, and they enclose three pamphlets, and, believe it or not, it comes in the envelope of the Mutual Security Agency, Washington, D. C., official business, franked through.

The Kroll letter reads:

CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS,
POLITICAL ACTION COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1952.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: On my trip to Europe last summer, I became even more convinced of the importance of our members getting a clear picture of the European situation. There is a great deal we can do both through the Government, through the ICFTU, and by direct contact to help our brothers abroad build their trade unions and build the economies of their nations. They must succeed in this building program if our world is to be free and if depressions everywhere are to be licked.

There are forces at work in this country to deceive us and to confuse the people on the importance of a foreign aid program. Some would have us abandon foreign aid and withdraw to our own shores. In my opinion, this retreat would abandon the rest of the world to totalitarianism and place in jeopardy our own precious freedom.

In order to get accurate information on this subject, I have asked the Mutual Security Agency to send you the enclosed two pamphlets. Shirt-Sleeved Diplomats gives the background of the European labor movement and tells what ECA has done there to assist our fellow workers. Working People of Europe was written by Ray Davidson, of the CIO Oil Workers. It describes the need of European workers and tells how they must have prosperity in order for us to have it in America. It also suggests what we can do to help.

I recommend both of these pamphlets to you and hope that you will find them as informative and instructive as I did.

Sincerely and fraternally,
JACK KROLL, *Director.*

That is the way part of the money that we vote here, for almost every agency, is spent. That is where it goes. For propaganda to push executive New Deal agencies. Do not forget, please, there is a Federal statute which makes

it a criminal offense for these agencies to engage in political activities by spending tax dollars.

Yet boldly, brazenly, under their frank, they put out political material to be used against us. To defeat the Senators and Congressmen who oppose the extension of their activities, their pay raises, to elect those who vote as they wish. I called that to the attention of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments this morning. I suggested I thought it was illegal and unethical. But, if in the judgment of the Congress, and if in the judgment of the committee, it was not illegal and it was not unlawful, it did seem to me that at least to be fair—it would be only fair—to let the Republican Members of Congress ask the agencies which are spending the money which we are appropriating to send out our Republican campaign material and material which counteracts what the agencies put out. I do not see why the PAC, being against me, should have their material sent out by a Federal agency. Of course, it is obvious that a candidate should pay his own campaign expenses. It is equally obvious an agency should not use tax dollars to increase either its power or salaries of those who run it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not think that if the Government assumed the liability for all the Republican propaganda that goes out, we would not have to increase the appropriations?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I would assume it? Well, bless your dear heart. I find it difficult to even contribute to the millions that you gentlemen have been using through the agencies around here. Do not forget this, I would say to my good friend the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY], we are contributing to that when we pay our income taxes, and you gentlemen are getting the exclusive use for political purposes of the tax dollars we pay in.

Mr. BAILEY. I do not doubt what the gentleman is saying, but I do question that the agencies are using the money for political purposes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What—the agencies? If this is not political propaganda, and the gentleman can read it tomorrow, I will be glad to apologize. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] said the armed services spent thirty million for propaganda. How much for UMT he did not mention.

What else is it? And that is not all. These agencies——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, I will offer a preferential motion because I am against this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I will try not to use all of that time. Honestly, if I used all of that 5 minutes and told all of the story, we would surely be ashamed of ourselves—at least on that side, because this unlawful spending of dollars for the putting over agency and administration plans is a wicked thing. Look, we are trying to help the farmers—the poor farmers. I know some of these foreign nations do not like to take the money that we offer them, which we insist on their having, but I had not realized the extent of the propaganda which is necessary in order to get our own people to take money for which they did not ask. Listen to this letter. It is typewritten here, but I am reading from a copy. It came to me written in pen and ink from a gentleman that I just happen to know.

Listen to what the gentleman writes:

I am writing you to tell you of the way money is wasted in the PMA.

There were at least 40 farmers in Martin township who weren't enough interested in the program to sign and mail their applications for payment back to the county office, so the township committeemen were paid to go out to get them to sign the applications for payment.

If it were not for the committeemen stirring up interest in the program so they could keep their jobs the thing would die out.

I was committeeman last year, but I would not go out to get those that would not return their applications to sign but the new men took them out. This program has been in operation long enough so that it would be possible to operate it by mailing the forms to the farmers, and those that were interested could fill them out and mail them back.

A spot check could be made for compliance, say 1 in 10 farms.

Now, think of it. Suppose I offer my colleague here in front of me, Mr. John Doe, $10. He refuses to take it. So I ask my colleague from Podunk, Richard Doe, "Will you take $25 and go out and get Mr. John Doe to take $10 that I want to give him?"

How absurd that is. Yet that is just what the Federal agency is doing to put across FMA. When are we going to begin to really cut appropriations and make it stick so that we can honestly, speaking not only for ourselves but for our colleagues, when we go back home and our constituents ask us, "When are you going to cut the tax bill?" reply, "We have cut appropriations and we will, if elected, do as we did in the Eightieth Congress, and cut your taxes." Let us act so that we can honestly tell the taxpayers that we are on our way; that we hope we will get there before we go broke.

In a special order later today I will repeat some of the above and call attention to the wasteful spending of the TVA.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER: On page 45, at line 11, insert a new section, 1202, to read as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress."

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment appropriately follows the remarks that have just been made by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I decline to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] wants to accept the amendment offered by the gentleman.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to discuss the amendment, and I hope it will prevail.

This amendment was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] to almost every appropriation bill we adopted in the last session. I urged him to offer it again today, but I think he is beginning to believe it is rather futile to include this language in any appropriation bills, because the executive agencies proceed to ignore it.

I want to call to the attention of the Congress one specific instance of Government propaganda and publicity which I have been able to identify. I have been very much interested in this matter of publicity and propaganda, not only from the viewpoint of expense but from the viewpoint of the tendency of the executive branch of the Government to try to influence public opinion, which is not their function. It is our function to determine policy, and it is their function to carry it out. It is not any of their business to try to promote this or that philosophy.

The reason we have not been able to get anywhere with this type of amendment is that they conceal the people who are doing this publicity and propaganda work. You cannot get them out in the open.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. How much does the gentleman suppose the Department of Defense was paying for propaganda and publicity articles? Thirty million dollars.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman for that contribution. It happens that I became concerned about the material that was coming across my desk every week from the National Production Authority, the Department of Commerce, radio, television, and film section. Every one of you Members of the House, and I suppose every Member of the Senate, gets this little weekly discussion that you may use on your radio reports to your constituents back home, a 15-minute transcript that you can use to promote the philosophy and interests of the National Production Authority. We found that they had 94 employees down there last September that were engaged in publicity and propaganda work. I am not sure that the particular appropriation bill in which NPA was included contained this language, which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has offered on previous appropriation bills. If it did, I believe, with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that they are illegally using public funds

when they use them for propaganda purposes against the express desire of this Congress, and I believe something ought to be done about it. Perhaps the inclusion of this language is futile because the agencies will go ahead as they always have and pay no attention to Congress.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. It may interest the gentleman to know how many publicity people are employed in the agencies of the Government. According to the last survey made there were 23,000 permanent and 22,000 part time.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. Gladly.

Mr. BUSBEY. Does the gentleman from Michigan think it might be a good idea to cut off funds of departments and agencies unless they do obey the laws passed by Congress?

Mr. MEADER. Something should be done to carry into effect the will of Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] and ask for a vote.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded reading the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] on page 19.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Andersen amendment with regard to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the so-called Davis amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Page 4, line 14, strike out all of lines 14 through 22 inclusive.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOGARTY: On page 19, after line 11, insert:

"SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION
"SALARIES AND EXPENSES

"For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for the Small Defense Plants Administration, including expense of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation, and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $825,000."

The question is on the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON) there were—yeas 158, noes 70.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 44, after line 2, add a new paragraph to chapter 11 as follows:

"None of the funds appropriated in this chapter for the Post Office Department shall be available for obligation or expenditure in excess of 99 percent of the amount carried in this chapter for said department and none of the funds appropriated by this chapter for any other department or agency shall be available for obligation or expenditure in excess of 90 percent of the amount appropriated in this chapter for such department or agency."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 141, noes 58.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to change section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, my understanding is that that bill will not be moved on the floor until Wednesday.

Mr. CANNON. That is my understanding, although I make that statement subject to correction. We expect to dispose of the bill next week, and we expect to dispose of two additional appropriation bills the following week.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be called up Wednesday next.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire as to the program for next week?

Mr. PRIEST. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. In addition to that, there will be one suspension on H. R. 5891 from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. That deals with the 2-year presumptive period for disease of psychosis.

On Tuesday, the Private Calendar will be called, and in addition to that there will be an omnibus claims bill, H. R. 6444.

On Wednesday, the independent offices appropriation bill will be taken up and continued until concluded.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

UNITED STATES AGAINST WILLIAM L. PATTERSON

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House:

MARCH 13, 1952.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia I have received a subpena duces tecum, directed to me as Clerk of the House of Representatives, to appear before said court as a witness in the case of the *United States* v. *William L. Patterson* (No. 1787–50, criminal docket), and

to bring with me certain and sundry papers therein described in the files of the House of Representatives.

The rules and practice of the House of Representatives indicates that the Clerk may not either voluntarily or in obedience to a subpena duces tecum produce such papers without the consent of the House being first obtained. It is further indicated that he may not supply copies of certain of the documents and papers requested without such consent.

The subpena in question is herewith attached, and the matter is presented for such action as the House in its wisdom may see fit to take.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, No. CRIMINAL 1787–50

To Hon. RALPH ROBERTS, Clerk of House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, second session:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at Judge Youngdahl's court in the city of Washington on the 17th day of March 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *William L. Patterson* and bring with you documents and other materials in the possession of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities as set forth in the attached schedule.

This subpena is issued upon application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MARGARET H. ESSER,
Deputy Clerk.

Dated March 5, 1952.

SCHEDULE OF SPECIFICATIONS

1. The original or carbon copy of the minutes of the hearings before said Committee, held on August 3 and 4, 1950, involving the Civil Rights Congress as they were originally received from the stenographer or reporter who took the same.

2. Copies of said minutes and galley sheets, if any, as same were amended or revised, subsequent to the receipt from the stenographer of the original said minutes.

3. Copies of all bank records, photostatic or otherwise, of the Civil Rights Congress obtained by the committee, particularly from the Amalgamated Bank of New York, New York City.

4. All other data, reports, on, or of mentioned committee, or any member of its staff, in connection with the subpena issued to the Civil Rights Congress, and to William L. Patterson, its national executive secretary, in connection with the hearings of said minutes of the aforesaid committee whether of executive session or otherwise, at which action was considered or taken relative to the subpena issue of the Civil Rights Congress or William L. Patterson, its national executive secretary, to appear before the committee on August 3 and 4, 1950, or at which the committee considered or acted on the citation for contempt against the said William L. Patterson for alleged refusal to produce documents of the Civil Rights Congress subpenaed by the committee.

5. Records of the committee indicating the names of the stenographers or reporters who took the minutes of the hearings of said committee on August 3 and 4, 1950.

6. Any correspondence between the committee, any of its members, its clerk, William L. Patterson, pertaining to the appearance of said William L. Patterson before said committee on August 3 and 4, 1950, and pertaining to requests or demands by said committee and pertaining to the refusal to produce said records on requesting delivery of records of the Civil Rights Congress, concerning which the said William L. Patterson on August 3 and 4, 1950, testified at hearings before the committee.

7. Statement or statements filed with the committee by William L. Patterson on August 3 and 4, 1950, in connection with his testimony before the committee on said date.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 567) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas in the case of the *United States* v. *William L. Patterson* (No. 1787–50, criminal docket), pending in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, subpena duces tecum was issued by the said court and addressed to Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House of Representatives, directing him to appear as a witness before the said court on the 17th day of March 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m., and to bring with him certain and sundry papers in the possession and under the control of the House of Representatives: Therefore be it

Resolved, That by the privileges of this House no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the House of Representatives can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

Resolved, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the House is needful for use in any court of justice or before any judge or such legal officer, for the promotion of justice, this House will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges and rights of this House; be it further

Resolved, That Ralph R. Roberts, Clerk of the House, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in his possession as Clerk of the House; be it further

Resolved, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the papers and documents called for in the subpena duces tecum, then the said court, through any of its officers or agents, have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding and then always at any place under the orders and control of this House and take copies of any documents or papers and the Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such documents and papers in possession or control of said Clerk that the court has found to be material and relevant, except minutes and transcripts of executive sessions, and any evidence of witnesses in respect thereto which the court or other proper officer thereof shall desire, so as, however, the possession of said documents and papers by the said Clerk shall not be disturbed, or the same shall not be removed from their place of file or custody under said Clerk; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions to transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena afore-mentioned.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify in the case of the United States against William L. Patterson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, CRIMINAL NO. 1787–50

To Hon. HENDERSON L. LANHAM, of Georgia, House Office Building:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, at criminal assignment court, courtroom, Chief Judge Laws, Judge Youngdahl's court in the city of Washington on the 10th day of March 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *William L. Patterson*.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk.*
By MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Dated March 5, 1952.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 568), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative HENDERSON LANHAM, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *William L. Patterson*, Criminal Docket No. 1787–50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative HENDERSON LANHAM is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *William L. Patterson* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have been subpenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify in the case of the United States against William L. Patterson, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. WILLIAM L. PATTERSON, CRIMINAL, NO. 1787–50

To Hon. CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to appear in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia at criminal assignment court, third floor, Municipal Court Building in the city of Washington on the 17th day of March 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m., to testify in the case of *United States* v. *William L. Patterson*.

This subpena is issued on application of the defendant.

HARRY M. HULL, *Clerk*.
By MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Dated March 11, 1952.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 569), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Whereas Representative CARL ALBERT, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify in the case of the *United States* v. *William L. Patterson*, Criminal Docket No. 1787–50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative CARL ALBERT is authorized to appear in response to the subpena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States* v. *William L. Patterson* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us when we can expect Congress to adjourn.

Mr. PRIEST. We can expect Congress to adjourn, of course, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, as soon as we finish the legislative program. That is the necessary legislative program. I cannot fix a definite date today, and I doubt if anyone else can.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, it is obvious that we will probably adjourn when we get through with our work, but my question is when do you think we can get through with our work.

Mr. PRIEST. I cannot say, of course, to the gentleman when we will finish our work, but the Congress is pushing just as fast as we can, and it is my hope and feeling that certainly we can finish by early July, if we keep on going along as well as we have. I believe we can do that. We have an appropriation bill coming up next week and two more will be ready the following week. The House is moving along very progressively on a schedule. We have no legislation for tomorrow so I ask unanimous consent that the House go over until Monday. But I can assure my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that we are moving as rapidly as possible and I believe we can be ready to adjourn by early July. I cannot say definitely and, of course, the gentleman does not expect me to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My only point in objecting previously on other occasions has been that we might hurry up our work. We did stay last night until half past 6 and that was fine and we got through with much of our work. But if we adjourn over every Friday I was afraid maybe we would be here way into July. Of course, this is an election year and if we finish our work and if we voted all of the taxes on the people that we think they can stand and still have the people reelect us I think we ought to get home and explain to them we only did what was necessary along that line.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, it is deeply regretted that the debate on the supplemental appropriation bill yesterday consumed all of the time of the House and prevented many of us from taking the floor and expressing our congratulations and best wishes to the Girl Scouts of America on the celebration of their fortieth anniversary. This important birth date of Girl Scouting is of sufficient importance to command the attention of the Congress of the United States, especially in view of the fact that this body chartered the Girl Scouts after a famous American, Juliette Low, of Savannah, Ga., proved that the organization could become one of America's finest assets.

When we endeavor to measure the source of strength of our Nation and to account for the phenomenal success America has enjoyed in terms of patriotism, loyalty, and good citizenship, we can truly give credit to those fine organizations which placed emphasis on molding the lives of our youth and in the development of a philosophy in the younger generation which embraces a proper appreciation for God and for the free institutions of our land. All America is indebted to the Girl Scouts organization for having taken the lead in accomplishing these aims.

I know that today the Members of the House of Representatives share the sentiment I have just expressed and join with me in extending felicitations to Girl Scouts everywhere and in commending them for what they are today and for what they will mean in the future to a strong, God-fearing, patriotic America.

GEORGE H. WHIKE CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5317) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio, together with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "any law to the contrary" and insert "the bar of the statute of limitations."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "losses sustained in performing."

Page 2, line 2, strike out all after "Ohio." down to and including "contract." in line 15.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, or a subcommittee of that committee, to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with particular reference to the manner in which the Bureau has performed its function of studying the various tribes, bands, and groups of Indians in order to determine those which are qualified to manage their own affairs without supervision and control by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend this resolution to be considered as a reflection upon the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, the Honorable Dillon Myers. There have been many charges and countercharges made relating to this important Bureau within the Department of the Interior and I should think that the Bureau of Indian Affairs would welcome and cooperate with such an investigation.

It is my opinion that the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs feels that the wardship of the Government over the American Indians should be terminated at the earliest possible date.

There are many complications, however, which would be encountered in the releasing of tribes from the trusteeship of the Government.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] now has pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a resolution seeking a similar study; however, under her resolution the investigation and study is to be made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It is my studied opinion that a subcommittee of the House could conduct this investigation more economically and also that it is the function of the Congress rather than the executive department for it relates to legislation to accomplish the ends which both the gentlewoman from Utah and the gentleman from Ohio seek.

At a later date I shall ask for a special order to discuss in detail this resolution and will urge others who are interested in the American Indians to participate in the discussion on the floor of the House.

I cannot help but feel, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has neglected many of the vital problems facing the American Indians today and that the time has long since passed when some affirmative action should be taken. I hope that many Members will rally to the support of the resolution.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered, for 1 hour.

DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Speaker, this week this House passed a District of Columbia bill which for another year changes the time for a few months under the plan loosely referred to as "daylight saving." I realize that a large number of people in this country, perhaps the majority, like to have the clock turned forward an hour in the spring and back an hour in the fall. A great many people consider this in the interest of health and certainly in the interest of recreation and pleasure.

To many other people, however, it is an undue handicap upon their business. It is very apparent that changing the time sporadically by cities, counties, the District of Columbia, and the several States is an undue burden upon many businesses, little and big.

This twice-a-year change of time confuses employees, heckles, and restrains the orderly operation of railroads, airlines, bus lines, radio stations, telephone companies, and other businesses engaged in interstate commerce. We can have all the benefits of having our clocks set an hour earlier in the spring and turned back again in the fall and also eliminate most of the inconvenience and burden on individuals in interstate business if this is done in an orderly fashion from the Atlantic coast to the Pacific.

Therefore, I have introduced a bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to authorize the Congress in any year to establish daylight-saving time throughout all time zones.

Section 2 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, would be amended to read as follows:

Within the respective zones created under the authority of this act, the standard time of the zone as prescribed in this act shall govern and be observed for all purposes; notwithstanding the law of any State or any political subdivision thereof or of the Territory of Alaska or any political subdivision thereof.

Such act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Congress may by concurrent resolution provide in any year that the standard time for all zones within the continental limits of the United States created under the authority of this act be advanced 1 hour, if it appears that the majority of the people so desire, for a period commencing not earlier than the last Sunday in April of such year and ending not later than the last Sunday in September of such year, and such advanced time shall be the standard time throughout all zones during such period.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect at 2 o'clock antemeridian on the first Sunday occurring more than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this act.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere belief that this act would provide an orderly, systematic, and satisfactory arrangement by which the people of the country can have the benefit of the so-called daylight saving. This benefit would come unattended by difficulties now present in the arrangement which we have practiced in this country for the past 30 years.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY CONTRACTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this morning before the Committee on Expenditures, I called to the attention of the chairman and the committee three certain things on which I thought there should be an investigation.

I have spoken on two of them earlier today. The other had to do with the stories appearing in the Washington Times Herald and the Chicago Tribune, showing the way in which the Tennessee Valley Authority was letting contracts.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to include those newspaper articles in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The letter to the chairman reads:

MARCH 13, 1952.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DAWSON,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives, Washington 25, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAWSON: Subcommittees of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the House of Representatives have held many hearings. Most of the hearings were in the United States, but some were held abroad.

If memory serves me correctly, one trip—over a period of 42 days—took the subcommittee completely around the world. Another trip was to the Far East. At least two more were in Europe. No doubt, valuable information was obtained at all of these hearings. However, it is extremely difficult, especially with reference to hearings held abroad, to find an adequate remedy for any misfeasance or malfeasance resulting in wasteful or improper use of Government funds or resources.

The first of this week, the Washington Times-Herald and the Chicago Tribune carried stories apparently charging improper methods in the letting of contracts by the Tennessee Valley Authority. A letter complaining of that situation reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 12, 1952.*

Representative CLARE HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to call your attention to a copyright story by the Chicago Tribune printed in this morning's editions of the Washington Times-Herald reporting that the Tennessee Valley Authority is employing "fantastic" methods in the letting of multimillion dollar contracts for coal for its steam electric plants.

The Tribune article reports that a 3-day-old corporation which misrepresented itself to TVA as a coal producer and had a paid-in capital of only $10,000, has been awarded a $37,000,000 contract for coal by TVA.

The article further reports that another $10,000 corporation promised TVA the output of a strip mine which was closed and had no machinery, was given two contracts for coal by TVA totaling $3,979,000.

In still a third instance, the Tribune reported that a roadside honky tonk operator and two partners in a firm previously unknown in the coal industry, received a TVA contract for $1,257,120 worth of coal.

The article further reported that a partner in a junk yard and tourist court, who operates a mine producing less than one carload of coal a day, was awarded a TVA contract for 2,500,000 tons of coal, contingent upon his being able to borrow money to develop the mine.

It is my understanding that coal miners in the Tennessee Valley area in the established coal mines now are working less than 4 days a week because of a slackening in the demand for coal. The Tribune article reported that TVA had given coal purchase contracts to fly-by-night mine operators at considerably above the going market price at which coal was offered to TVA by the established coal companies.

I believe that you will agree with me that a congressional inquiry of these reports is warranted.

Very truly yours.

Another letter was included in my letter to the chairman and shows waste on the part of the Agriculture Department. As it was read earlier today, I will not again print it. My letter to the chairman continued:

To me, it would seem that if a Government activity isn't sufficiently meritorious in and of itself to induce those who receive benefits from its operations to voluntarily accept those benefits, the program should be discontinued.

It has been reported that some nations have been reluctant to accept gratuities offered by this country. Certainly, it should not be necessary for the home folks, who are the recipients of Government payments and who should be fully aware of the proposed program, to be propagandized by paid Federal employees in or ier to induce them to accept those payments.

Santa Claus has always been considered to be generous to a fault, but never yet have I heard that it was necessary for him to send out paid representatives in order to induce those to whom gifts were contemplated to accept those gifts.

Then, there is another activity which would seem to require investigation, especially in view of the fact that Federal statutes forbid the use of tax money by executive departments for political purposes.

Mutual Security Agency, here in Washington, has been franking out a booklet published in Paris by the Economic Cooperation Administration, which purports to show some of the benefits derived from the use of ECA money. My statement was that Mutual Security Agency had been franking out that material. Perhaps I am in error and the Agency has merely loaned its frank to the political action committee of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

In the envelope carrying this franked material, there is included a letter on the letterhead of Mutual Security Agency, Washington 25, D. C.

That letter, as well as the Jack Kroll letter, was read by me to the House during the consideration of the appropriation bill.

My letter to Mr. Dawson continued:

It occurs to me that, inasmuch as the Political Action Committee is actively supporting the President and some members of the Democratic Party, including Members of both branches of the Congress, it might be well for this committee, which is charged with the duty of checking expenditures by the executive departments, to learn the extent of this latter activity, as well as of the other two agencies mentioned.

If it is proper for the administration to frank out political material designed to aid Democratic candidates for office, should not like political help be extended to the Republican Members of Congress?

It will be my purpose, if time and opportunity permit, to speak more at length on these three matters from the well of the House.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

Of course, tax dollars should not be spent to elect Democratic or Republican candidates to public office, nor should they be spent to put across the plans or further the ambition of Departments or those in them. It is not only dishonest, it is unlawful. I have no doubt the chairman will act to stop the practice.

The article showing a part of the method of letting TVA contracts is printed as a footnote.[1]

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

KEEP FAITH WITH OUR HONORED DEAD

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 13, 1951, I was granted an official leave of absence by the House of Representatives in order to go to Europe and make a personal inspection of the operations of our many and varied missions, and, particularly, to ascertain how the billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money were being spent and determine the results of such expenditures.

Before I left the United States I was requested to make an inspection of the American cemeteries and battle monuments of both World War I and World War II in Europe, and report my findings and conclusions to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations. This I did. I appeared as a witness before the committee on February 19, 1952, and my complete and detailed report will be found in my testimony which appears in part 3 of the printed hearings covering independent offices appropriations for 1953, pages 1599 to 1614, inclusive.

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to give the House of Representatives a résumé of my observations and conclusions after having visited every American cemetery and battle monument in Europe. Our American cemeteries in Europe are located all the way from the Normandy coast in western France to the borders of Germany on the east, and from Italy and southern France on the south to Holland and England on the north.

---

[1] TEN THOUSAND-DOLLAR FIRM GETS BUSINESS OF THIRTY-SEVEN MILLION—FUEL REQUIRED FOR "WATER POWER"

(By Carl Wiegman)

CHATTANOOGA, TENN., March 11.—Fantastic methods of letting multimillion dollar coal contracts for the tax-supported Tennessee Valley authority's steam generating plants have been disclosed by a Chicago Tribune investigation.

Here is a summary of facts thus far uncovered:

1. A 3-day-old corporation, which misrepresented itself as a producer of coal and has a paid-in capital of only $10,000, was awarded a $37,000,000 contract.

2. Another $10,000 corporation, which promised the output of a strip mine that was closed and had no machinery, won two contracts for a total of $3,979,000. One of these contracts was awarded at a price higher than that quoted to the TVA by a large, responsible company.

UNKNOWN FIRM GOT CONTRACT

3. A roadside honky tonk operator and two partners in a firm previously unknown in the coal industry were awarded a contract for $1,257,120 worth of coal.

4. A partner in a junk yard and tourist court, who operates a mine producing less than one carload a day, was awarded a contract for 2,500,000 tons of coal, contingent upon his being able to borrow money to develop a mine.

5. A congressional investigation probably will be necessary to reveal the ins and outs of similar deals. Most of those who sell coal and other supplies to the TVA fear reprisals if any word of criticism is spoken.

TVA's coal purchasing is becoming a gigantic business. By 1956 the authority expects to be buying 10,000,000 tons annually to supply five generating stations now under construction or being enlarged. This is the same Government agency which was organized primarily to control floods on the Tennessee River and did so by permanently flooding more land than was ever covered by water in big floods.

STEPS UP STEAM CAPACITY

Now the TVA has launched a program to increase its steam generating capacity 870 percent by 1956. Thereafter, more than half of the authority's power will be produced in steam plants, although the TVA originally was intended to operate only hydroelectric units.

Since the taxpayers who are supporting TVA may be interested in its coal-buying operations, the Tribune sought an interview with R. M. Mills, chief of the materials division of TVA, whose office is in Chattanooga.

Mills was asked to explain why contracts were awarded to firms and individuals with no experience in coal mining, who appear to be merely speculators.

"DOWN TO CATS AND DOGS"

"We have bought all the coal we could from the reputable companies and now we're down to the cats and dogs," Mills said. "Every pound we can get at a reasonable price, we're buying."

This statement later was challenged by reputable coal operators, who pointed out that bidders on a long-term contract for the Widows Creek plant in northeastern Alagama, which will need two and one-half to three million tons a year, had offered a total of 34,600,000 tons. Among the bidders were such large operators as the Magnolia Coal Co., West Kentucky Coal Co., Bell & Zoller Coal Co., and the Nashville Coal Co. All these bids were thrown out, and the TVA has not readvertised.

CALLS OPERATORS "CUTTHROATS"

Mills complained that the coal industry was run by individualists.

"They don't get together on prices as the steel industry does," he said.

"Coal operators are a bunch of cutthroats. We would much rather deal with producers than brokers, but what can we do when the output of a mine is tied up by a broker?"

He said that when a contract is awarded to a broker who controls the output of a mine, the TVA acquires a lien on the coal in the ground, and that thereafter "no operator can come in and jack up the price."

Attorneys experienced in the coal business said Mills' claim that the TVA controls the coal in the ground in such instances is ridiculous. If a broker defaulted, the lawyers said, the TVA would have a damage claim against him, but would have no claim against the real property of the mine.

CITE LACK OF RECOURSE

They pointed out also that if the successful bidder is an irresponsible firm, the TVA would have no recourse in the event of failure to fulfill the contract. The irresponsible contractor, in effect, gets a free opportunity to gamble on selling the contract, the lawyers said. One speculator is reported to have referred to his contract as "a license to steal."

Following is one example of how the TVA is buying coal:

Last June 27, a new corporation named the Bransford Coal Co., Inc., was chartered by the Tennessee secretary of state. The incorporators were H. R. Young, now dead;

INTRODUCTION

My inspection included the following items:

Walls and fencing: First, retaining walls; second, renpheral walls.

Water supply: First, wells and tests; second, sprinkler systems; third, pumps and pump houses; fourth, reservoirs; fifth, pipelines.

Headstones and foundations: First, concrete beams and pilings; second, setting of headstones; third, inspection of headstones; fourth, accuracy of inscriptions; fifth, grading of top soil.

Structures: First, reception building and office; second, superintendent and assistant superintendent quarters; third, garage group and storage buildings; fourth, gasoline storage; fifth, fire hazards.

Sewers and drainage.

Grading and planting: First, procurement of soil building materials; second, procurement of top soil; third, final grading of grave blocks and other areas; fourth, seeding of lawn areas; fifth, planting of flowers, shrubs and trees.

Roads and parking areas: First, construction of roads to cemetery; second, construction of parking areas.

Memorials and memorial areas: First, excavation; second, weather damage; third, pointing; fourth, replacement of broken and damaged stones; fifth, general maintenance; sixth, inscription of names of missing men.

DIFFICULTIES OF CARRYING OUT WORK OVERSEAS

First. Instability of foreign currencies.
Second. Escalator clauses in contracts.
Third. Language.
Fourth. Numerous holidays.
Fifth. Temperament of people.
Sixth. Constant inspection and supervision.
Seventh. Standard of construction lower than United States.

Each of the following cemeteries and battle monuments were inspected by me personally:

Cemeteries: Brookwood, England; Waregem, Belgium; Bony, France; Suresne, France; St. Laurent, France; St. James, France; Belleau, France; Fere-en-Tardenois, France; Romagne, France; Thiacourt, France; Epinal, France; St. Avold, France; Hamm, Luxemburg; Neuville-en-Condroz, Belgium; Henri-Chapelle, Belgium; Margraten, Holland; Florence, Italy; Anzio, Italy; Draguignan, France; Cambridge, England.

Monuments: Bellicourt, France; Chateau Thierry, France; Sommepy, France; Montfaucon, France; Montsec, France.

ADMINISTRATION

In the case of every American cemetery the title rests with the host Government which gives us the use of the property in perpetuity free of taxes. There are some unknown buried in every cemetery, and inscribed on the walls of the chapel in each cemetery are the names of those missing in action in the conflict in that particular area.

There are 124,153 graves which come under the jurisdiction of the American Battle Monuments Commission. Thirty thousand nine hundred and eight of these are World War I graves, and 93,245 are World War II. There are 8,139 unknown buried in these cemeteries: 1,647 of them are World War I, and 6,592 are World War II. There are 4,450 missing in action from World War I and approximately 83,000 missing in action during World War II.

During my inspection I took many pictures, as well as several hundred feet of colored movies. I wish it were possible for you to see them.

I am very happy to report that all of the World War I cemeteries are in excellent condition. We, as Members of Congress, who have the responsibility

---

Maurice R. Pinson, an insurance dealer, and Charles C. Diehl, who is now under indictment for embezzlement and larceny. These three apparently were merely fronts for the actual owners.

Three days after the firm was chartered it submitted a bid to the TVA to supply 10,000,000 tons of coal over a period of 20 years to the Kingston plant in eastern Tennessee. The data questionnaire required to be submitted with the bid to show sources of supply stated:

"Name of mine: Central."

"Name of producer: Bransford Coal Co., Inc."

NO BOND REQUIRED

On the following September 28, the Bransford company was awarded a $37,000,000 contract—500,000 tons of coal annually for 10 years, automatically renewable for an additional 10 years, at a price of $3.70 per ton. No bond was required to be posted to insure performance of the contract.

The mine referred to as "Central" in the data questionnaire is the property of the Central Coal Co. of Monterey, Tenn., although the new-born Bransford Coal Co., Inc., represented itself as the producer.

TVA regulations require that a bidding firm which is not a producer must submit an affidavit from the actual producer authorizing him to bid. There is no record in the TVA file that the Bransford campany had any contractual relationship with the Central Coal Co. prior to June 27, when the bid was submitted to TVA.

AGREEMENT MADE AFTER AWARD

On the contrary, the first evidence of any agreement between the Bransford company and the Central company is a letter dated October 17, or 19 days after the contract was awarded. This letter, acknowledging that the Bransford Coal Co. was the sales agent for the mine, was recorded in Putnam County, Tenn., last January 18, and thereafter a copy was attached to the TVA file.

When the letter was recorded the Central Coal Co. mine, from which the TVA expects to get 500,000 tons a year, had ceased operations and removal of its equipment started soon afterward. The Bransford Coal Co., Inc., however, is free to sell its $37,000,000 contract to another operator.

"We're not worried about the Bransford Coal Co.'s lack of capital," Mills said. "We never expected the company to be the producer, but the mine has a favorable freight rate and somebody will operate it. Two or three operators are trying to get in there now."

OWNERS ASSOCIATED SINCE 1948

Owners of the Bransford company are Vaden Lackey, 49, and James T. Riddle, 48. Lackey is the president and Riddle the secretary-treasurer. They have been associated since 1948 as coal brokers in the Bransford Fuel Co., a partnership.

Lackey and Riddle were interviewed in their office, a one-story concrete block building in Nashville. A sign on the building says "Bransford Fuel Co.—Pinson & Co., general insurance." This building is also the office of the new Bransford Coal Co., Inc., and of Premier-Cumberland, Inc., another coal brokerage firm owned by Lackey and Riddle.

Asked why the partners formed a new company 3 days before they bid on the $37,000,000 TVA contract, Lackey said:

"That's a hell of a lot of money and responsibility. We didn't want to assume the liability."

NET WORTH $56,644

Their liability, if they had entered the contract under the name of the Bransford Fuel Co., presumably would have included the assets of that partnership. A credit reporting agency's report on the partnership, dated April 9, 1951, says that tangible net worth of that firm is $56,644. Lackey admitted that the capital invested in the Bransford Coal Co., Inc., is only $10,000.

The partners were asked why they misrepresented the Bransford Coal Co., Inc., as the producer on their TVA bid. Lackey replied that E. J. Davis, owner of the Central mine, had been trying to sell the property.

"Therefore we didn't know who the producer would be," Lackey said. "So we decided to put down Bransford Coal Co. as the producer."

Lackey was asked if the Bransford Coal Co., Inc., had an exclusive contract to sell the output of the Central mine. He exhibited a letter dated March 30, 1951, from Davis, the president of Central. This letter, however, said "the Bransford Fuel Co. is authorized to bid for the Central Coal Co. as their agent."

There was no reference in the letter to the Bransford Coal Co., Inc., which became the successful bidder.

COULD AVOID OBLIGATION

Attorneys said that under these circumstances the TVA could enforce no claim on the Central Coal Co.'s, coal, inasmuch as the Central company could invoke the statute of frauds to escape from the obligation.

The Lackey-Riddle firm called Premier-Cumberland, Inc., which has $10,000 paid-in capital, has been awarded two contracts to supply a total of $3,979,000 worth of coal for the Widows Creek plant. One of these contracts, awarded January 26, 1951, lists Premier-Cumberland as the producer, and specifies that the coal would come from the Cherry Branch mine at Colling, Tenn.

Lackey was asked whether the Cherry branch mine is now operating.

"There is no Cherry branch mine," he said. "But we have control of the acreage, the Cherry branch property, which we can develop."

CONTROL NOT PERTINENT

He was asked to show evidence that Premier-Cumberland controlled the property and therefore was entitled to bid.

"I don't think that's pertinent," he replied.

He added that the gist of his contract is that "if we get the coal, TVA gets it; if not, there's no liability."

The handling of this contract illustrates the remarkable solicitude of the TVA for Lackey and Riddle. Their successful bid was $3.65 per ton plus $1.20 rate, making a total of $4.85 per ton. TVA granted an increase to $4.95 to compensate for a wage increase.

Premier-Cumberland then informed TVA that the former Cherry Branch mine (a strip mine) was not operating, but that they would ship from an underground mine if given an increase of 10 cents a ton. This request was granted, making the price $3.85 per ton, plus $1.20 freight for a total of $5.05 per ton. On the same contract the Nashville Coal Co. offered $4.82½ a ton, delivered at the plant, but did not get the business.

Lackey and Riddle were not surprised when the Tribune reporter appeared at their office. They had been alerted, they admitted, by a telephone call from their friend, R. M. Mills, Chief of the Materials Division of the TVA.

of appropriating the money to build and maintain these cemeteries and monuments can be exceedingly proud of every World War I cemetery. I know it must be a great satisfaction to a mother or father, who had to sacrifice a son on the battlefield in World War I, to see the beautiful surroundings in which he is buried and the painstaking, tender care given his place of rest.

For instance, I visited Brookwood Cemetery on Sunday, July 29, 1951. This is a World War I cemetery located about 30 miles southwest of London. The headstones have been in for 24 years and they are washed twice a month. I was particularly impressed with Brookwood, not only because it was kept up in absolutely perfect condition, but with the contrast between its beauty and the shabbiness of the cemeteries of our allies of World War I in the immediate vicinity. The relatives of anyone buried here could not help but be moved by the care given the loved one's grave. The comparison in the American cemetery over the British is more obvious due to the fact that one is compelled to drive through a section of a local British cemetery, that certainly needs much attention, in order to reach Brookwood. While one is gripped with a feeling of disappointment as he starts driving off the main highway, nevertheless, when he actually arrives at the American cemetery he cannot help but feel a sense of pride being a citizen of a country that gives such splendid attention to the graves of those who gave their lives in the service.

There is, however, a great deal of unfinished work in the World War II cemeteries. It is a sad experience to witness a relative visiting a soldier's grave where the work is not completed. You can imagine the disappointment he suffers when he finds the permanent headstone not as yet placed, construction work going on and the chapel and memorial unfinished. This made a deep impression upon me because, quite by accident, I ran across the grave of the son of a very dear friend of mine. By contrast, his grave was a comfort and a solace. It was in excellent condition, the headstone was scrubbed gleaming white above the soft carpet of green grass. My friend has never been able to make the trip to Europe but I took a picture of his son's grave and know the satisfaction and assurance it brought to look at the photograph of the dignified and quiet resting place of his lost loved one.

I realize that the tremendous amount of work to be done cannot be accomplished over night. The space of time which has elapsed since the Graves Registration Division of the Quartermaster Corps turned the cemeteries over to the American Battle Monuments Commission has been altogether too short to have completed this work, even if the money had been appropriated and available. However, I sincerely believe that you and I, as representatives of a grateful people and the best and greatest country on the face of the earth, should do everything within our power to see that the sacred work of building World War II cemeteries is carried to final completion at the earliest possible date.

The wives, mothers, and fathers of these boys who made the supreme sacrifice are going to Europe now, and, for the most part, will be making the trip in numbers during the next few years to view the final resting places of their sons. In most cases they are just average people who must deny themselves many things they would like to have in order to scrimp and save enough money to make the pilgrimage. I dare say that in 95 percent of the cases they will only be able to make the one visit. Surely they are entitled to return home with the memory of that boy's grave a beautiful one.

After World War I many private organizations and associations of divisions that fought in the war erected memorials of various sizes, shapes, and descriptions, without regard to any well-thought-out plan or any means to maintain them. I saw dozens of these all over the battlefields and I am ashamed to report that they have been permitted to go to ruin with grass and weeds growing up around them. These are not only an eyesore, but a disgrace to those in whose memory they were erected. In order to prevent a recurrence of this practice after World War II, Congress, in its wisdom, passed a law which prevented a repetition of this method of erecting memorials. At the time this law was passed giving the American Battle Monuments Commission the legal authority to prevent the erection of private memorials, the private organizations were assured that the United States Government would complete the memorials at the earliest possible date. I, for one, never want to stand accused by a Gold Star Mother of not having kept faith with that promise.

OMAHA BEACHHEAD

There are many interesting observations which I would like to relate but time will not permit. I wish I could go into detail on each separate cemetery and each battle monument, but that is out of the question. If you are interested in my observations on each particular cemetery and battle monument, I suggest that you read my report which I have already stated appears on pages 1599 to 1614, inclusive, in part 3 of the printed hearings relating the independent offices appropriations for 1953. I would, however, like to mention a word about St. Laurent Cemetery. This is a World War II cemetery located in France. I visited it on August 1, 1951. It covers 146½ acres, there are 9,390 graves, 304 of which are unknown. The number of missing in action has not as yet been determined accurately.

This cemetery is located on the Normandy coast at the point which was known as Omaha Beach during the invasion June 6, 1944. The placing of the permanent white marble headstones was started 4 days prior to my arrival and it was estimated at that time that they would probably be able to erect approximately 1,500 headstones per month. Allowing for unforeseen delays and difficulties, the setting of all headstones should be completed long before the end of 1952. At the time of my visit they were just in the process of excavating the site for the memorial. A contract was let in June and it should be completed by the middle of 1952.

The location is particularly appropriate, inasmuch as it is about 160 feet above the sea, right on the edge of the bluff overlooking many miles of invasion beachhead. I was tremendously impressed to see the numerous ships that had been sunk about a mile offshore in order to insure the success of the landing of our troops. It added a great deal of significance to the location of the cemetery and the ships themselves were a tribute to the boys who sacrificed their lives in the invasion. However, I was extremely disappointed to be informed by Gen. Thomas North, executive secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, that the French Government had recently contracted with a Belgian salvage concern to dismantle the boats for scrap. Upon returning to Paris I took the matter up with our United States Minister, Mr. Philip W. Bonsal, who checked with the French authorities, but it was determined that the ships would not be preserved as historical relics and as monuments to the battle which was fought there and to the liberation of France. The French authorities contended that the severe winter storms on this particular coast made maintenance of the wrecks virtually impossible and alleged the pilferage was a danger to navigation of local fishing boats. The remaining hulks were to be sold for scrap.

My personal opinion of the matter is that this whole action on the part of the French authorities was uncalled for, unnecessary, and the few francs they could receive from the ships as scrap are insignificant compared to the billions of dollars we have been giving them to support their government. I think our State Department should have demanded that dismantling of the ships cease. Those ships were a tribute to our boys who sacrificed their lives to liberate France from the Germans and would mean much to visiting parents and wives. This is our only cemetery in Normandy and is more prominent in that it represents those who died at both our landing and the operation which followed.

OBSERVATIONS

The American battle monuments through Europe are stately and dignified. I am particularly reminded of Montfaucon Monument which I visited on August 13, 1951. This is a stately tower surmounted by a figure of Freedom, honoring the dead of World War I. It is 18 miles north of Verdun and it commemorates our victory in the Meuse-Argonne battle. It is 170 feet high, equivalent of 13 stories—and I climbed the steps. There is a circular stairway inside the monument which leads to the observation tower 13 stories above its base. From the observation tower one gets a wonderful view for miles and miles of the Meuse-Argonne battlefields. Many of the trenches and vestiges remain of World War I. I served with the One Hundred and Twenty-fourth Field Artillery, Illinois' own Thirty-third Division, in the Meuse-Argonne engagement back in 1918 and was, naturally, pleased with the beautiful monument erected in

memory of my buddies who did not make it back.

Other impressions remain with me. Florence Cemetery lies on the main highway from Florence to Rome in Italy. It is on the side of a hill at the south of which runs a little mountain torrent. There is a beautiful background of trees and I was particularly impressed with the umbrella pines.

At Margraten Cemetery in Holland I was told that on Memorial Day 11,000 people attended the memorial services. At Romagne Cemetery in France, Mr. Michanovitch is the assistant superintendent. It was interesting to learn that he remained in charge of one of our cemeteries during the German occupation at considerable risk to his own liberty. Romagne is by far the largest American cemetery in Europe and is certainly one of the most impressive. It is a point of call every day for many bus loads of foreign visitors.

GENERAL SUMMARY

There are so many interesting sidelights to almost every cemetery and monument I visited that you may want to read my complete report to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations. I do, however, want to give you a general summary of my observations and conclusions:

First. I was very pleased to find the premises of all of the cemeteries clean and neat, particularly around the buildings used for workshops and equipment, storage, and so forth. I could readily appreciate that General North does not tolerate rubbish, old materials and matter of any nature that would detract from the beauty of the cemeteries, whether visible to the public or in the portion used or designated as tool sheds or work houses. In every cemetery I could readily appreciate that General North has done a splendid job of impressing on those in charge that nothing which could be considered a fire hazard was permitted, and that all fire-fighting equipment was in working order and located at a most strategic point for use in the event an occasion arose where it was needed.

Second. I earnestly recommend that the memorial chapels in the World War II cemeteries be completed at the earliest possible date. Relatives visiting the cemeteries should have an appropriate place of beauty and solemnity in which to retire for meditation during the visit to the cemetery. These memorial chapels are not as most people think, a small roadside chapel—they are designed to be real monuments to our honored dead, in keeping with the dignity and manner in which the United States is known to handle matters of this kind throughout the world. It is on the walls of these memorial chapels that the names of all the men missing in action in adjoining territory are inscribed. That is the only place on the premises that we so honor them.

Third. Some provision should be made for having appropriate pictures made of the graves and cemeteries. These should be made available upon request to those relatives who cannot afford, or for other reasons are unable, to visit the cemeteries in Europe.

Fourth. I pointed out earlier the necessity for erection of war memorials as soon as possible. The United States has assured private organizations that in denying permission to them to erect memorials we intend to erect a suitable one in each instance. Although the law did not guarantee erection of these memorials, we implied by expression that the United States would do so. If we prohibit units from erecting memorials with the promise that we will erect them, the Government should live up to the promise.

Fifth. The superintendent of each cemetery is a veteran who has served in the Armed Forces of the United States Army and married to a national of the country in which the cemetery is located. This, I believe, is a very good policy. It has a tendency to keep the superintendent at the cemetery permanently, whereas, if he were married to an American girl there would always be the possibility of the lady wanting to return to the United States just about the time the superintendent had become proficient in his duties. However, I believe consideration should be given to the problem of leave for the superintendent, similar to that given officers in the Foreign Service.

Sixth. The problem of guest houses at some of the cemeteries should receive early consideration. I experienced the difficulty of attempting to find lodging in places where the cemetery was many miles from a town. Some arrangements should be made whereby visitors could find lodging for a nominal fee close to the premises. An extra room or two could be added to the superintendent's quarters, such as exists at Romagne.

Seventh. The American Battle Monuments Commission's offices overseas are subject to a ceiling on civilian personnel engaged in administration, maintenance, and construction. This ceiling is set by law and it must not be so low as to hamper the efficient operation of the offices of the Commission. I witnessed the technical skill required and the difficult task to manage operations. It is extremely difficult to recruit an organization such as the American Battle Monuments Commission has operating in Europe, due to the language and special technical aspects of the work. We must take into account the execution of expensively acquired plans, some of which are already being carried out, the hazards of storing plaster models, and the problem of mosaics which have been prepared and not installed.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to pay tribute to Gen. Thomas North, Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission. He is not only tremendously interested in his work personally, but he is one of the most economically minded men I have ever met in any department of Government. I was convinced on my tour of inspection that he did everything possible to economize on the contracts of the cemeteries, even if it only involved a matter of a few dollars. Not one penny of the taxpayers' money has been unnecessarily wasted. General North's record of efficiency and economy could well be set up as a pattern for other administrative officers in Government to follow.

The work of completing the program of the American Battle Monuments Commission should be accomplished at the earliest possible date. A very serious factor is that General North, the Secretary of the Commission, is fast reaching the retirement age. I am sure you will agree that the success of the program is due more to General North than any other person. His tremendous personal interest in the Commission's program is evident by the long hours he has devoted and the great sacrifices made to accomplish what he has. If we should lose his services before the World War II cemeteries are well near completion, it would cost the taxpayers untold amounts of money. He no longer has to work by trial and error, but has the knowledge of all the places where the work could have been done better on World War I cemeteries to contribute to the present construction of World War II cemeteries. There is no substitute for honesty, efficiency, and experience. His experience and knowledge are saving thousands and thousands of dollars every year.

Delay in completing the American cemeteries and monuments in Europe is false economy, because the longer we delay the construction program the greater the cost will be to the taxpayers. The World War II cemeteries should be in the excellent condition I found the World War I cemeteries when I visited them. The wives, fathers, and mothers of a loved one lost and buried in foreign soil are entitled to the satisfaction of knowing he lies peacefully in such beautiful surroundings and is receiving the tender care of a grateful Government. The result will be a symbol to the world of the dignified reverence in which we hold the memories of our honored dead.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure you it was an honor and a privilege for me to engage in the work of inspecting our American cemeteries and monuments in Europe. It was, indeed, an experience which will live in my memory forever.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VELDE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

RESTRICT THE TRAVEL OF SOVIET DIPLOMATS IN UNITED STATES

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to bring to the attention of the House a matter of importance, not only to this body, but to the American people as well.

It has come to my attention that on March 10, 1952, the United States Department of State presented to the Soviet Embassy a note which advised that Government that in the future there would be restrictions placed upon the travel of Soviet diplomats and nationals within the United States. This note in part stated, and I quote:

The United States is constrained to regulate the travel of Soviet personnel assigned to the Embassy in Washington, Soviet representatives of other publicity media who are assigned for duty in Washington and Soviet official personnel assigned to Amtorg (Soviet Purchasing Mission) in New York.

Effective immediately Soviet official personnel of the Embassy in Washington, Tass representatives, and others who are Soviet citizens assigned for newspaper work in Washington are required not to travel to any point more than 25 miles distant from the center of Washington without previous official notifications at least 48 hours in advance.

Soviet official personnel assigned to Amtorg shall not travel to any point more than 25 miles distant from the center of New York without previous official notification at least 48 hours in advance.

The United States Government states that it is prepared to reexamine the question of travel regulations in the light of the treatment accorded United States official representatives in the Soviet Union.

In connection with this matter, I should like again to bring to the attention of the House, a report released by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House, on December 30, 1951, entitled "The Shameful Years—30 Years of Soviet Espionage in the United States." This report furnishes positive proof that over the period of the past 30 years the Soviet Government has abused the privileges afforded it by the Government of the United States to actively engage in espionage operations against this country.

I should also like to call attention to the annual report issued by the Committee on Un-American Activities, which was released on February 17, 1952, which included in its recommendations the following section:

Reciprocal restrictions on travel by Soviet and satellite diplomats. The committee's investigations have also disclosed that Soviet espionage has been assisted by the fact that Soviet nationals have been given unlimited freedom to travel throughout the United States and to and from Canada and Mexico. The committee's reports dealing with Soviet espionage clearly show that Soviet officials have abused this freedom to actively engage in espionage operations. This situation exists even though United States diplomats in Russia and her satellites are virtually under house arrest and under constant surveillance by the Russian secret police. There have been instances in which United States officials have been prohibited from contact with American nationals who were being held by authorities in Soviet countries.

For these reasons, the committee feels that there should be reciprocal restrictions enforced by this country with the Soviet and satellite countries.

I view with pleasure that the Department of State of this country has placed a wise, although belated, restriction upon Soviet diplomats and nationals. If this Nation is to remain secure against its enemies, positive steps must be taken to minimize the efforts and success of espionage operations by foreign governments.

It is my fond hope that the additional recommendations made by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House will be given equal consideration.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. NORRELL and to include an address by President Truman.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BARRETT.

Mr. ANDREWS and to include a letter from the Ledger-Enquirer, of Columbus, Ga.

Mr. CELLER in two instances.

Mr. COLE of New York and to include excerpts from a letter.

Mr. ANGELL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARENDS and to include an editorial.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GEORGE and to include copy of a letter he received.

Mr. BOW.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH and to include an article, notwithstanding it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $273.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in three instances and to include extraneous material in each instance.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous material.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan) and to include a newspaper editorial.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the legislative branch and the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GRANGER), for the remainder of this week, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, March 17, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1243. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a survey of the Postal Savings System completed September 30, 1951, made by the Division of Audits of the General Accounting Office as a primary phase of the audit of the Post Office Department, pursuant to the authority contained in the Post Office Department Financial Control Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 460) (H. Doc. No. 393); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

1244. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report pursuant to subsection (i) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1245. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

1246. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the Administrator's Report, which is the first part of the Annual Report of the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 6787. A bill to extend the Rubber Act of 1948. (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1513). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 690. An act to permit certain lands heretofore conveyed to the city of Canton, S. Dak., for park, recreation, airport, or other public purposes to be leased by it so long as the income therefrom is used for such purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6154. A bill to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the period of March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 1515). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6925. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies," approved July 2, 1890, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1516). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7056. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at San Francisco, Calif., as the William Randolph Hearst Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 7057. A bill relating to short-cycle vegetables; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7058. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 1 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7059. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7060. A bill to provide for an appropriate medal to be awarded to individuals for the performance of certain acts in behalf of the United States requiring valor and great personal sacrifice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 7061. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to extend the period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded certain hospitalized or otherwise incapacitated veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 7062. A bill to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the use of broadcasting facilities by candidates for public office; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7063. A bill to amend section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 7064. A bill to allow an exemption of $25,000 corporate income taxes on corporations which has been expended by the corporation for capital expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7065. A bill to clarify the deduction for income-tax purposes of allowances for salaries or other compensation for personal services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 7066. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain property of the Veterans' Administration (in Johnson City, Tenn.) to the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REAMS:

H. R. 7067. A bill to amend the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes and to authorize the Congress in any year to establish daylight saving time throughout one or more zones; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. J. Res. 401. Joint resolution creating a Louisiana Purchase Commission, and providing that such Commission shall participate in the commemoration and observance of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase and the explorations of Lewis and Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. J. Res. 402. Joint resolution creating a Louisiana Purchase Commission, and providing that such Commission shall participate in the commemoration and observance of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase and the explorations of Lewis and Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. Res. 570. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 80; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Res. 571. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate and study the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with particular reference to the termination of all Federal supervision and control over qualified Indians; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 7068. A bill for the relief of Cecylia Morgenstern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 7069. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 7070. A bill for the relief of William M. Geer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7071. A bill for the relief of Wieslaw Kiniczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

627. By Mr. MARSHALL: Petition of Emma Wood, Grasston, Minn., and others, in support of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

628. Also, petition of Pearl Philo, Oak Park, Minn., and others, in support of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

629. Also, petition of Ellen Jorgensen, Milaca, Minn., and others, in support of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

630. Also, petition of Mrs. George LaDew, Big Lake, Minn., and others, in support of legislation to prohibit advertising of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

631. By the SPEAKER: Petition of recording secretary, Woman's Press Club of New York City, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging the appropriation of sufficient funds for the expansion of personnel to safeguard all ports of entry into the United States against the smuggling of narcotics; to the Committee on Appropriations.

632. Also, petition of Addie Cornelius and other citizens of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

633. Also, petition of Marian Mott and other citizens of New Port Richey, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who art in heaven and on the earth and in all Thy works, we pause in the midst of thronging duties and confused issues to commune with Thee, the source of all goodness and beauty and truth. Thou hast called us whose lives pass swiftly as a watch in the night to labor with Thee in the unfolding purpose of the ages.

Enrich our attitudes and actions, we pray, with that love for our fellows without whose golden gleam all that we say, though we speak with the tongues of men and of angels, is but as tinkling cymbals. Mastered by that love which seekest not its own, but whose passion is the coming of Thy universal kingdom, may the words of our mouths and the meditation of our hearts be this day, and always, acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our strength and our redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 13, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5317) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that, as in legislative session, Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in executive session, but, as in legislative session, Senators will be permitted to present routine matters without debate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter from the Governor of the State of Vermont, transmitting a copy of an act providing that the State of Vermont may enter into a compact with any other State for mutual helpfulness in meeting any civil defense emergency (with an accompanying

paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Property Owner's Federation of Puerto Rico, San Juan, P. R., favoring the confirmation of the nomination of Clemente Ruiz Nazario to be judge of the United States District Court for Puerto Rico; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 5598. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a parcel of land to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association, Salt Lake City, Utah; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307); and

H. R. 5951. A bill to add certain federally owned land to the Mound City Group National Monument, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308).

By Mr. FLANDERS, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 1999. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2867. A bill for the relief of Helga Rossmann and her child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2868. A bill for the relief of Michael Miakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 2869. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Nishimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2870. A bill for the relief of John Aristidis Dragazis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2871. A bill to amend section 548 of the act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Address on the subject Public Power Issues in the Congress, delivered by Senator MORSE in Chicago, Ill., March 12, 1952, at the annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Editorial entitled "Oil for Lamps of Learning," published in the National Union Farmer for February 1952.

By Mr. McMAHON:

Statement prepared by him entitled "Why Are We in Korea?"

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Summary of address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL before the United Nations Association of Maryland on March 10, 1952.

Article entitled "Congress Ready To Dig Into Past in Computing Foreign Aid Needs," written by Mark Sullivan, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 12, 1952.

Article discussing youth of today as leaders of future world, written by James A. Farley, and published in the Baltimore Evening Sun of February 27, 1952.

By Mr. IVES:

Newspaper articles dealing with advantages offered by the State of New York, published in the New York Times of February 24, 1952.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

Editorial entitled "PATMAN in the Chair," published in the Washington Post of March 13, 1952.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "They Want American Ideas," written by Arnold Whitridge and published in the Saturday Review of February 23, 1951, relating to conditions in Greece.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Morris Comes to Washington," published in the Washington Times-Herald of March 14, 1952, relating to the hearing of Mr. Newbold Morris before the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Editorial entitled "The Power Authority and the Seaway," published in the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times of March 11, 1952.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Editorial entitled "Oil and Profit Motive," published in Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of March 12, 1952.

CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS BY CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION IN LIEU OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, which were, on page 5, after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 3. All findings, records, and reports made or compiled by the Civil Service Commission under this act, shall be made available to committees of the Congress, upon request of such committee.

On page 5, line 3 to strike out "SEC. 3." and insert "SEC. 4.", and on page 5, line 7, strike out "SEC. 4." and insert "SEC. 5."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRIVATE AND PUBLICLY OWNED POWER PROJECTS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT AND ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, there was released in Chicago yesterday a message by President Truman to the annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. This message was delivered by Secretary of the Interior Chapman, who also made some remarks of his own. The President's message and Secretary Chapman's remarks dealt with the campaign now being intensively waged by private-utility interests against all publicly owned power projects, and also against pending proposals for additional projects, including two in which I and the people of New York State are vitally interested, the St. Lawrence and the Niagara projects.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in this morning's New York Times, commenting on the President's message and Secretary Chapman's remarks, with the text of the President's message, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I had risen to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the addresses to which the distinguished Senator from New York has referred. I shall not now make the request, but I shall hand to the Senator the full text, since the New York Times did not carry the full text, with the thought that the Senator from New York will wish to include the full text of the remarks of both President Truman and Secretary Chapman.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe the full text of the remarks of the President is included in the article which I have submitted. I doubt very much, however, whether the full text of the address by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Oscar L. Chapman, is included. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the message by the President of the United States and the address by the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Oscar L. Chapman, included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address by the Secretary of the Interior, containing the message from the President together with the article from the New York Times, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR OSCAR L. CHAPMAN AT THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NRECA CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 13, 1952, CONVEYING A SPECIAL MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

I am here today to bring to you of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association a special message from the President of the United States dealing with one of the great issues of our time.

It is an issue whose roots go back to the early days of our Nation's history. From the days of Jefferson on, the democratic tradition has always provided that the Nation's resources shall be used as a national heritage, not as a private dominion. It is tragic that this tradition has not always guided men's actions. In the last half century, however, this issue has been an important symbol in the never-ending struggle to make democracy a living force constantly going forward to meet the needs of a growing Nation.

As I stand here before this convention of a Nation-wide organization embodying that progressive tradition, I am reminded of the leaders of the past who fought their fight to build what we have inherited. They have not been limited to any single party. They include President Theodore Roosevelt and his great forester, Gifford Pinchot. They include Senator Robert M. La Follette and Senator George W. Norris, and many others of their generation who fought to save the oil reserves, the water power, and all the natural wealth of our public domain. They include President Franklin D. Roosevelt and my own predecessor in the Department of the Interior, the late Harold L. Ickes.

All of these men were aware that the health of our body politic depends upon maintaining and developing the Nation's natural resources for the people, free from monopolization by vested interests, and they felt that this was particularly true of the Nation's water power.

Along with the heavy burdens of a world in process of readjustment this great tradition has been faithfully carried on and reinforced by President Harry S. Truman.

Secretary Brannan has already presented to you the President's regrets at his inability to appear here in person to discuss this and other matters of great importance with you. Although he is not able to be with us today, I am honored to be the bearer of a special message to you from President Truman. From here on, the words are the words of the President of the United States.

SPECIAL MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT TO THE NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

I am taking this opportunity to send you a special message about our Federal power policy, because of the extraordinary importance of that subject to you. Right now, there is a terrific fight raging over our Federal power policy—and the Rural Electric Cooperatives have a very large stake in that fight.

Last September, speaking in San Francisco, I said something about our power policy.

I said then and I say now that I don't believe in Government for special privilege. Our resources should be used for the benefit of all the people, not just a few.

I said then and I say now that when electric power is produced with the people's money it ought to be used for the benefit of the people and not for the benefit of the private power companies.

Those are the principles on which the Federal Government has been operating. But the private power lobby never has agreed with those principles and it doesn't agree with them now. That is what is back of the attacks on our Federal power policy today.

The power policy which has been followed by the Federal Government in recent years is strongly supported by people who put the needs of conservation and the public interest first. That policy is entirely in accord with the American tradition.

It provides for multiple purpose river-basin programs, including the development of hydroelectric power, and it assures widespread use of this power by preventing private companies from monopolizing it.

Pioneering in a field which the private power companies had willfully neglected, the Federal power policy actively encourages the growth of rural electric cooperatives so that rural families may have the advantage of electric service at reasonable rates.

This policy recognizes the long-established right of each American community, rural or urban, to undertake its own electric service on a cooperative or municipal basis, or to permit a private agency to perform that service under public regulation.

It assures communities that choose to provide their own electric service that they will not have to pay toll to private power companies for their supplies of power developed from public waters by public investment in river-basin programs. To this end our power policy gives a preference to rural electric cooperatives as well as to States, municipalities and other public bodies, and provides for transmission of the power by the most economic means to the points of wholesale delivery.

Now, these things are the heart of our Federal power policy. And anyone who is not blinded by prejudice can see that it is a perfectly simple, common-sense policy for increasing the strength of our country and the welfare of our people.

In bringing concrete benefits to the people, and in demonstrating to the whole world what American democratic methods can accomplish, the results of this power policy have been tremendous. Beginning with the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933, it has provided a terrific stimulus to the entire electric power business of the country, public and private.

Residential rates for electric service have gone down, making possible about a threefold increase since 1933 in the average home use of electricity.

The number of electrified farms has increased six times over. We are rapidly approaching the time when virtually 100 percent rural electrification will be attained, at rates permitting constantly expanding use for all farm purposes.

Corresponding increases in the use of electric power per industrial worker have contributed to the phenomenal output of American industry.

Federal water-power development has demonstrated that ample supplies of low-cost energy lead the way to great industrial growth in regions which were formerly largely dependent upon raw material production.

The private power industry meanwhile, far from being hurt by this program, has expanded its capacity, its output, its revenues, and its profits, far beyond anything achieved in its previous history.

This Federal power program has created billions of dollars of new wealth by productive, self-liquidating investment, which has, in turn, created new industries and new jobs. It has thus broadened the base for State and local as well as Federal taxation.

It has produced constantly expanding demands upon the electrical equipment industry for turbines, generators, and other electric system equipment; for electric motors and other facilities for industry; for the many electrical devices and appliances which have become essential to our urban and farm homes and to our agricultural production.

Beyond this, it has made possible the development and expansion of new metallurgical and chemical industries, which have greatly increased the range of resources available to serve our people.

In short, the stimulating effect of this power policy on entire economy has vastly increased the strength of the Nation, both in its domestic affairs and in its world position.

But in the face of this record of accomplishment, the forces of private monopoly are today attacking this policy on many fronts, behind one of the most vicious propaganda barrages in history.

Until recently, the power industry's propaganda campaign was largely aimed at the Valley Authority idea and at the "yardstick" concept in public power operations. The industry undertook to present figures, statistics, and what-not to show that Government ventures in the power field were inefficient and wasteful.

Then suddenly, this propaganda line changed. It is easy to see why it changed. It wasn't convincing anybody because it wasn't true. Millions of people, including the members of rural electric cooperatives, could see by their own electricity bills that public power operations could be at least as efficient as private operations. The people were convinced, by concrete results, of the value of the Federal power program, and their representatives in Congress—who had learned at the polls how the people felt—repeatedly voted down every attack on that program.

So the private power interests shifted to a new line of propaganda. They raised the cry of "socialism"—apparently on the theory that if you can't persuade people, maybe you can frighten them; if you haven't got the facts, try a few scare words.

You can hardly pick up a newspaper or a magazine these days without seeing an expensive full-page advertisement denouncing the "socialism" of our public power program. Incidentally, the cost of those ads is mostly paid for by the taxpayers, because the costs of such advertising are deductible for income tax purposes. It looks to me as though that advertising campaign itself is pretty close to "socialism," because the taxpayers finance so much of the cost.

I want to say right here that this propaganda campaign is one of the most cynical and dangerous developments in many years.

It is cynical because it assumes the people of this country cannot be trusted to decide on the basis of facts what is best for their own welfare. It assumes that the way to get things decided in a democracy is through big, expensive advertising campaigns in magazines and newspapers, and a big, expensive lobby in Washington.

This propaganda campaign is dangerous because it undermines faith in the free-enterprise system itself.

People in this country are intelligent. They know what is good for them. They know that all the people ought to have a fair chance at the benefits of our great natural resources, and they know that these benefits ought not to be monopolized by powerful private interests.

If the people ever come to be persuaded that the free-enterprise system means they have to pay tribute to private companies in order to enjoy the great natural resources that belong to all of us, then they are going to begin to be doubtful about the free-enterprise system itself. That is not what the free-enterprise system means to me. But it seems to be what it means to the crowd that is back of this vicious propaganda campaign.

It looks like these people are actually willing, in order to restore the privileges they had before 1933, to help destroy the very house in which they are living.

I firmly believe that this propaganda campaign is bound to backfire in the end. But in the meantime, we have a hard, tough fight on our hands, against a concerted, Nation-wide drive to reverse a Federal power policy which has its roots in the very beginnings of the conservation movement under President Theodore Roosevelt nearly half a century ago—a policy which has been strengthened and reaffirmed by the Congress of the United States time and time again in the last 20 years. This drive has the main purpose of restoring the unlimited right of private monopoly to exploit this Nation's water-power resources.

You can see examples all around the country. The forces of reaction want to monopolize St. Lawrence power at the bus bar, and even take over Niagara Falls itself for private development. They are trying to block the rural electric cooperatives in Missouri from tying together steam and hydro plants that will result in more power at lower cost.

They are trying to grab the Hell's Canyon Reservoir site on the Snake River—where public development would produce 600,000 more kilowatts than private development. They are trying to prevent public bodies in the State of Washington, acting under laws

supported time after time by the voters of that State, from buying power facilities that private companies are willing and eager to sell.

The same campaign is being waged by the forces of reaction clear across the country. And we have to fight it every step of the way, just as we have had to fight for every gain made for the public interest in the last 20 years.

For my part, I am determined to do everything I can to see that the policy of conserving and developing our priceless water power resources for the public benefit shall go forward. I am sure that the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association will work hard for the same result. The country needs the continued help of your organization, which has done so much to make our power program effective.

We have a good program. We can be proud of it, for it has met the test. With the support of the rural electric cooperatives, and other great progressive organizations, we will continue to advance until the right of every American to enjoy the full benefits of the age of electric power has been assured.

That concludes the special message from President Harry S. Truman.

I can say to you honestly, with all the vigor I can command, that the President is with us in this great fight. He has been fighting side by side with you to improve the welfare of the farm families of this great country. He is our ally in the battle against special privilege—and under his leadership we have made progress against fierce opposition.

As the member of the President's Cabinet primarily responsible for the administration of our Federal power marketing program, I am grateful for the opportunity you have given me to add a few words of my own to the President's forthright statement.

As the President has told you, a well-organized private utility campaign is driving on many fronts to destroy our Federal public power program.

For example, the New York State Power Authority has recently denounced the preference provisions which protect and assure equity to public and cooperative systems, and is driving ahead to turn over Niagara and St. Lawrence power to private companies at the bus bar.

The New York plan is brazenly put forward as a precedent for having all Federal power projects taken over for ownership, operation, and control by the States. We all know that this proposal is made as an opening wedge in the battle to deny equality to public agencies and cooperatives. Such a program would benefit no one but the utility interests.

Sale at the bus bar, without preferences and other essential safeguards, simply means that it would be the utility companies rather than the consumers in the Northeast who would get the benefits of public development of this exceptionally low-cost hydroelectric power.

In this campaign the utility interests have set up the Department of the Interior as a target to divert the people from the real issue. No one will be deceived. The real issue is whether the people shall get the benefits of low-cost federally produced electricity.

Another example is the attempt of the major private power company in Virginia to grab the two best power projects in the approved Federal Roanoke River program.

These are some of the threats which endanger our program. Anything which strikes at the Federal power program means higher costs to farm and urban consumers. Anything which strikes at this program hinders our ability to mobilize our efforts for defense or for peace.

The President has drawn the power issue as it is presented to us today. This campaign to destroy Federal power policy must not succeed. That policy means too much to consumers throughout the land, to the very life of the country, and to the future of democracy.

Democracy is a continuing fight. The fight has been going on from the day this Nation was founded. It has had many victories, but none of them is ever final, and none of us who serve in democracy's ranks can ever be mustered out.

For democracy's job is forever unfinished, and today's struggles are built on yesterday's triumphs. The fight for democracy did not begin with any one individual or party. It cannot be carried to final and complete success in one battle or by the enactment of any one measure. It will have to be fought over and over again, as often as selfish interests seek to get control of the natural wealth which belongs to the Nation. It will continue so long as the American people rise in the strength of their democratic faith to protect their heritage.

TRUMAN ACCUSES POWER INDUSTRY OF VICIOUS DRIVE ON HIS PROGRAM

CHICAGO, March 13.—President Truman charged today that the Federal power program now was the target of "one of the most vicious propaganda barrages in history," aimed at "restoring the unlimited right of private monopoly to exploit this Nation's water-power resources."

Mr. Truman's attack was voiced in a special message to the tenth annual convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association delivered by Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior. He is the Cabinet member primarily responsible for the administration of the Government's Federal power marketing program.

More than 4,000 farmer delegates, representing about 3,000,000 families served by rural electric systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration, heard the President's charge that the "forces of private monopoly" had "shifted to a new line of propaganda."

"Until recently," the President said, "the power industry's propaganda campaign was largely aimed at the valley-authority idea and at the yardstick concept of public power operations. The industry undertook to present figures, statistics, and what-not to show that Government ventures in the power field were inefficient and wasteful.

"Then suddenly, this propaganda line changed * * * They raised the cry of socialism—apparently on the theory that if you can't persuade people, maybe you can frighten them; if you haven't got the facts, try a few scare words.

"You can hardly pick up a newspaper or a magazine these days without seeing an expensive full-page advertisement denouncing the socialism of our public power program.

"Incidentally, the cost of those ads is mostly paid for by the taxpayers, because the costs of such advertising are deductible for income-tax purposes. It looks to me as though the advertising campaign itself is pretty close to socialism, because the taxpayers finance so much of the cost.

"I want to say right here that this propaganda campaign is one of the most cynical and dangerous developments in many years."

The President said it was easy to see why the power industry had changed to a new line of propaganda.

SAYS CAMPAIGN FAILED

"It (the industry) wasn't convincing anybody, because it wasn't true. Millions of people, including the members of rural electric cooperatives, could see by their own electricity bills that public power operations could be at least as efficient as private operations.

"The people were convinced, by concrete results, of the value of the Federal power program, and their representatives in Congress—who had learned at the polls how the people felt—repeatedly voted down every attack on the program."

Describing the results of the power policy as tremendous, Mr. Truman added:

"The private power industry, meanwhile, far from being hurt by this program, has expanded its capacity, its output, and its profits, far beyond anything achieved in its previous history."

Mr. Truman declared that "it looks like these people are actually willing, in order to restore the privileges they had before 1933, to help destroy the very house in which they are living."

CHAPMAN ATTACKS AUTHORITY

After reading Mr. Truman's message, Secretary Chapman seconded the President's charge that "a well-organized private utility campaign is driving on many fronts to destroy our Federal public power program."

"For example," he declared, "the New York State Power Authority has recently denounced the preference provisions which protect and assure equity to public and cooperative systems, and is driving ahead to turn over Niagara and St. Lawrence power to private companies at the bus bar (at the power plant).

"The New York plan is brazenly put forward as a precedent for having all Federal power projects taken over for ownership, operation, and control by the States.

"We all know that this proposal is made as an opening wedge in the battle to deny equality to public agencies and cooperatives. Such a program would benefit no one but the utility interests."

SURVIVAL OF FREEDOM IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, no foreign people excel the people of Czechoslovakia in their desire for freedom. We know this vital fact in spite of the forced suicide or actual execution of the younger Masaryk. We know this in spite of the imprisonment of William Oatis by the Red-dominated authorities of that unfortunate country. We know this in spite of the Communist enslavement of nearly 12,500,000 Czechoslovaks.

As the English poet, Richard Lovelace, once wrote:

> Stone walls do not a prison make,
> Nor iron bars a cage.

Americans are aware of the Czechoslovak yearning for liberty because of the increasing number of escapees who have torn the iron curtain apart and fled to havens of freedom. They have walked to liberty, flown to liberty, and even set the throttle of an entire passenger train toward a land of liberty. Diplomatic officials and participants in international sports have claimed sanctuary in countries where all men are free.

Is further proof of Czechoslovakian desire for freedom necessary? If it is, let us look about us. There is living witness in every fine, loyal American of Czechoslovak origin. In war, they have given their lives for our liberty. In peace, they have given their strength for our security.

It is not the people of Czechoslovakia, it is the Government, which threatens peace today.

An editorial in the Washington Star of March 13, 1952, powerfully summarizes the undying love of liberty of the Czechoslovaks:

INCIDENT IN BRATISLAVA

In his recent statement marking the fourth anniversary of the Communist seizure of Czechoslovakia, President Truman declared that the people of that country, and all other countries temporarily under the Red totalitarian yoke, still yearn deeply for the liberty they have lost. The yearning, which is a threat to the men of the Kremlin within their slave empire, is undoubtedly very real and very widespread, and a good example of it is offered by a report in News From Behind the Iron Curtain, the monthly magazine published by the National Committee for a Free Europe. The report, quoting a Czech refugee, is about a young salesgirl in a Bratislava bookstore. The girl, it seems, put together a window display made up of the titles of current books. The titles, after she had arranged them one on top of the other, read as follows:

We Want To Live.
Far From Moscow.
In the Shadows of Skyscrapers.
Under a Foreign Flag.

According to the refugee, the salesgirl was arrested, presumably by some passing commissar. Presumably, too, she has since felt the full weight of the puppet Czech tyranny. Yet her brave little gesture of defiance probably has buoyed up and inspired a lot of people in Bratislava who have been one with her in yearning to be free. It is a spirit that the Red totalitarians will never down. It is what they must reckon with all the time as a dormant but nonetheless volcanic force that one of these days may well tear them apart and blow their evil empire sky high.

ANNIVERSARY OF DECLARATION OF HUNGARIAN INDEPENDENCE AND TRIBUTE TO LOUIS KOSSUTH

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, tomorrow Americans of Hungarian descent will commemorate the declaration of Hungarian independence and pay tribute to their great leader, Louis Kossuth. On this occasion I join with my fellow citizens who are of Hungarian origin in their observance of Hungarian Independence Day and voice my sincerest hopes for the speedy liberation of Hungary from the Soviet occupation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement I have prepared for this occasion.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

The 15th day of March is of special significance to all Americans of Hungarian descent. It is a day to be noted by every freedom-loving person, for it marks the liberation of the Hungarian people from Hapsburg despotism.

The great leader in the battle for Hungarian independence in 1848 was the renowned Louis Kossuth. The memory of this champion of freedom is held dearly by all Hungarians. It has given to the brave people of Hungary the will to resist all oppressors and will continue to sustain them until their ultimate liberation is secured from the Russian invaders.

Louis Kossuth is well known in this country. One hundred years ago, on his visit to our shores, he was hailed as the "champion of world freedom" and accorded many honors by the people of the United States.

This year Hungarian Independence Day takes on added significance. The centennial of Kossuth's visit is being commemorated by special programs throughout the country. These celebrations will be held in conjunction with a special drive to donate 100,000 pints of blood to the American Red Cross. This is truly a most sincere expression of the loyalty and the patriotism of our citizens of Hungarian descent.

I join with all Americans in this most appropriate tribute to Louis Kossuth. I fervently hope that this independence day brings the gallant people of Hungary closer to their liberation from the Soviet tyranny.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, next Sunday Hungarian Freedom Day will be celebrated throughout the country. A special observance will take place at the Yorkville Casino in New York City. I had hoped to be present on that occasion, but prior commitments prevent me. I have, however, addressed a letter to Mr. Aloysius C. Falussy, who is chairman of the celebration, and ask unanimous consent that this letter, on the subject of Hungarian Freedom Day and its implications for all of us, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
PUBLIC WELFARE,
March 13, 1952.

Mr. ALOYSIUS C. FALUSSY,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. FALUSSY: Please convey my warmest and most heartfelt greetings to all those who on March 16 assemble to observe Hungarian Freedom Day. I had wished to be present myself at your observance at Yorkville Casino. Unfortunately, urgent commitments in connection with my duties in the Senate, whose decisions so vitaly involve the very fate of all freedom, prevent me from joining you, in person, in solemnifying Hungarian Freedom Day.

This Freedom Day, this year, is indeed a grim one for the people of Hungary. All those in this country who are descended from that noble nation, who have ties with it, or cherish its history and traditions must feel deeply saddened by the dark night of tyranny which today envelops all Hungary.

Freedom is remembered in Hungary. It is cherished in the hearts of the vast majority of the Hungarian people. Of this I am sure. But all the outward manifestations of freedom have been repressed and rooted out of that unhappy land.

Terror stalks through the cities and the countryside. Godlessness, hate, and prejudice are promoted and incited as a means of justifying tyranny, and as a means of retaining power. Meanwhile, the once proud Hungarian Nation blindly follows the dictates and serves the selfish interests of the Kremlin.

Hungarian history tells of a prince by the name of Rakoczi, Francis II Rakoczi, who liberated Hungary from alien rule and sought to bring freedom and social justice to his people. That was 250 years ago. Today there is another Rakoczi in power in Hungary, a Communist Rakoczi. This Rakoczi helps to enslave and not to free, and helps to make Hungary more subservient, and not less, to a foreign master.

But better days will come. We know they will come. Hungary will once again know glory, and inspire pride in the hearts of all who love and admire that great people and that fine nation.

One hundred years ago this year the great Hungarian patriot and statesman, Louis Kossuth, came to the United States as an exile, as an advocate of freedom for his country. All his years he spent in that great cause. Today there are many Kossuths in this country, and there are many Kossuths, born and unborn, in Hungary.

These men and women and children hold the promise of tomorrow. I am confident that liberty will be restored to its honored place on the plains and in the valleys and on the mountain ridges of Hungary. Freedom will again—and soon, I hope—ring from the Carpathian mountaintops.

I salute you. I hope your meeting will be a memorable and auspicious occasion.

Very sincerely yours,
HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

THE SIOUX IN THE MARINES—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON STAR

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as Americans we are all guilty of neglecting or overlooking the contribution of the original American to our American society. However, I was happy to note that the March 11 issue of the Washington Evening Star commented editorially on a number of recruits to the United States Marine Corps from the Pine Ridge and Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservations of South Dakota.

Mr. President, the names of these recruits are strange to the ears of many of our citizens who have never resided close to Indian populations. They are colorful names of good and loyal Americans, and I feel certain that they will serve the Marine Corps well, and will be a real credit to their country and to their Sioux ancestors. As a fellow South Dakotan I am indeed proud of them, and I should like to have the editorial from the Washington Evening Star appear at this point in the record.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SIOUX IN THE MARINES

A little news story in a recent issue of the Omaha World-Herald makes the United States Marine Corps seem more formidable than ever. At any rate, the corps has been enriched by some new recruits whose names—real names, legal names, not fictitious names—certainly seem admirably suited to life among the Leathernecks, in war or peace.

The recruits are from the Sioux reservations at Pine Ridge and Rosebud, S. Dak. Enlisted to form an all-Indian platoon after they finish their boot training at San Diego, they include among their numbers the following young men: Patrick Aloysius Red Elk, Lloyd P. Walking Eagle, Maynard Gerald Top Bear, Percival E. Left Hand Bull, LaVern Carr Two Bulls, Wesley Warfield American Horse, Jr., Adam Makes Room for Them, Woodrow George Respects Nothing, Merrill J. Whirlwind Soldier, and—last but not least—Leroy M. Kills Enemy.

One can hardly read this roster without feeling at the same time that the Marines—strong as they are—are even stronger today for having such Americans among them. These are fine Sioux names, some of them dating back to the unhappy years of the Indian wars. They belonged to brave men in the past, and those who wear them now are part of the power of a Nation that has long since ended the struggle of the plains against possessors whose descendants (such are the swift changes of history) are ready to fight and die, if need be, for that Nation.

THE SCHUMAN PLAN AND THE INTEGRATION OF EUROPE

Mr. CONNALLY obtained the floor.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield in order that I may make an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that I may place in the body of the RECORD as a statement a very notable address delivered by Dr. Walter Hallstein, Secretary of State of the New Federal Republic of Germany, entitled "The Schuman Plan and the Integration of Europe." The address was delivered at Georgetown University in Washington on the night of March 12, 1952. The speaker was introduced by the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president, Georgetown University, and regent, school of foreign service, who said:

In 1946, during a turn of duty in Germany, it was my privilege to deliver an address before the faculties, student body, and friends of the University of Frankfort. The invitation came from the then rector of that institution, a well-known scholar and professor of law, Dr. Walter Hallstein. His election to the presidency of his university was a spontaneous tribute paid by his academic colleagues to a sound scholar, a courageous thinker, and an experienced interpreter of the best and more enduring qualities of German culture. His presidential address on the occasion of his inauguration was a notable statement on the role of natural law in the science of jurisprudence.

Later in the same year, I returned to Frankfort and again stood with Dr. Hallstein on another platform to discuss the problems facing all of us during the crucial period of postwar reconstruction. The ties that link Dr. Hallstein to Georgetown were further strengthened by the year he recently spent here as an exchange professor in the School of Foreign Service and the Law School, where his lectures on jurisprudence are still remembered. The succeeding years saw other Georgetown professors lecturing at Frankfort and members of their faculty lecturing at Georgetown. Both institutions recognize that science, law, truth, and knowledge transcend international frontiers and are best served by open, frank, and rational inquiry among men of good will.

These relationships and this constant cooperation in the mutual desire to build international peace on the firm foundation of reciprocated confidence were further advanced last summer, when the University of Frankfort conferred the academic distinction of doctor of laws on the Reverend Francis Jucey, S J., regent of the Georgetown Law School.

Now Dr. Hallstein returns again to this campus, but invested this time with the public character and high responsibility of first Secretary of State in the first Cabinet of the Federal Republic of Germany.

Dr. Hallstein's address which followed was a very noteworthy contribution to the major problems of our day. It deserves the reading of the Congress, and I therefore wish to place it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, before getting down to the subject of my lecture I would like to make a few personal remarks.

This is the third time that I have visited this country.

The first time I came as a prisoner of war. It was a strange kind of freedom I had left: The "freedom" of the Third Reich; and it was a strange kind of imprisonment I entered. I was permitted to set up, in a prison camp, a little university, a university based on the values of truthfulness and the freedom of the spirit. At the same time, I was permitted to study the people and the institutions of this vast country. Even more: I made my first friends here, and when I left for home it was with the comforting feeling of how strong the good in man must be if a war, as terrible as the last one, was not able to destroy it.

The second time I came as a university professor, having meanwhile, in a very modest way, worked for restoring and safeguarding cultural values in my own country. I had received an invitation from Georgetown University to carry on research work and to teach here. The year of 1948–49 which I spent here was one of the most rewarding of my life.

Not only was I able to widen my knowledge in my own special subject, the law, but I traveled many thousands of miles, and found doors opened to me everywhere; and wherever I went I was able to learn, and found a friendly hearing. I left your country deeply impressed with the value of its liberal institutions, with the forceful vitality of its people, with their large conceptions, their decisiveness, their love of action and dynamic change, and with their sense of fairness. And I am not sure if, without those impressions, I should always have had the courage to carry out what fell to my task in the political life of my people. I do wish to express once more my gratitude for all this now, and here.

My thanks are due above all to Georgetown University and its authorities, in the person of its president. In particular I should also like to thank Father Walsh, the regent of the foreign service school, who was formerly my host, and Father Lucey, regent of the law school, in which I had the privilege of teaching. I feel that I belong to this university—if you will permit me to say so—as an "academic citizen," and I am very happy that meanwhile a close and lasting link of cooperation has been wrought between this university and my own, the University of Frankfurt, through a current exchange of teachers.

More than this, a bond has also been established between this university and my own department in the German Government, the foreign office, for at present no less than nine young German diplomats are studying at the Foreign Service School. For this, too, I should like to express my heartfelt thanks.

And now I am here again, this time not so much as a German but rather as a European, and I would like to speak to you about our most important European issue, namely, the Schuman plan and the integration of Europe of which it is the beginning.

AMERICANS APPLAUD FREEDOM

That I should speak on this subject to you, as Americans, is appropriate, I think, on two grounds:

In the first place, it is well known that the American people have everywhere and always sympathized with all efforts made towards furthering the liberty of nations and their consolidation in democratic communities.

Wherever in the world people have fought for independence and self-determination, and have cast off hampering fetters of the past, the American people have extended their sympathy and help. In my opinion therefore, Americans cannot but be interested in the attempt being made by the whole of Europe now to free itself from the outlived forms of its nationalist and reactionary past, to strive for a new all-European democratic organization, and thus at the same time to take a firm stand against the danger which we all recognize and by which your country is threatened, too.

Secondly, the unification of Europe now in progress, and of which the Schuman plan, as I wish to demonstrate, represents only the first decisive step, is of vital importance not only for Europe, but directly for the whole world.

We are, in fact, one world, and nothing of moment can take place in one continent without involving the rest of the world. This particularly applies to Europe and to the dangers which have repeatedly arisen there. Europe has been the storm center where the devastating disturbances originated which have desolated the world in our century, the two greatest wars which history has known, which have exacted more victims than all the foregoing wars of the world taken together. It is, therefore, with deep concern that all statesmen look to Europe and its quarrels because these conflicts endanger the whole world.

Two World Wars were needed to make this fully obvious.

It was formerly thought that conflicts could be localized, that is, that the European quarrels could be confined to Europe. But developments have shown clearly enough, I think, that this has become an illusion. The world has become too small for such localization. Technical, economic, and communication developments have brought the peoples of the world too close together.

The epidemic of war now inevitably infects all of us. It is like a real disease. Formerly as each man lived alone on his farm at a distance from his neighbor, he could hope that his neighbor's contagious disease would not reach him. Now that we all have come closer together, and modern transportation carries the germs of the epidemic everywhere, it is a danger for everyone, and no one can hope that it will be localized and that he will be spared.

We are experiencing how difficult it is to keep hostilities within bounds even somewhere on the periphery, as in Korea, and this has only been possible through an appalling sacrifice of blood and wealth particularly from your country.

It is, therefore, no longer a question of localizing European conflicts, but of preventing such conflicts from arising at all.

BALANCES OF POWER TIP OVER

Statesmen have long sought for a means of such prevention, and that at a time when matters were not so threatening as now. In the course of European politics in the nineteenth century, petty and full of intrigues as they may perhaps appear to the outsider, it was frequently recognized that an outbreak of hostilities in Europe was no longer, as in previous centuries, a small and limited affair, to be settled with a few mercenaries and limited to the direct participants. It was already recognized then that such a war implied the danger of plunging the whole of civilization into a ruinous conflict. The means, however, by which this was to be prevented were taken from the old ideology of purely national state politics, and were inadequate to meet the danger.

It was the idea of the so-called European balance of power, i. e., that groups of states could be formed in Europe, no one of which should be superior in power to the others, and each of which would therefore shrink from engaging in hostilities; nor has this idea completely died out. But experience has shown how ineffective is this medicine taken from the diplomatic pharmacy of the past.

In our present-day world of progress and dynamics, such a balance of power between groups of states can only be an unstable affair, as temporary as the equilibrium of a pyramid placed upon its point.

This balance is threatened each day by shifts in the economic forces, by discoveries in the techniques of war, and by changes in the political structures. Thus, through intensifying and extending the efforts on both sides, a race is set in motion which in the end becomes insupportable for both, and which leads to the very conflict that it was hoped to avoid.

This, then, is the great lesson which we have learned amid blood and tears—that the European conflicts which have twice involved the world in indescribable sacrifices cannot be abolished by traditional methods; that these conflicts can neither be localized nor suppressed through the system of the balance of power. The only means of avoiding them is by radical treatment and this consists of a unification of Europe which excludes the possibility of such conflicts a priori.

Farseeing statesmen recognized this earlier. But the road to realization was full of disappointments. After the First World War a French and a German statesman, Briand and Stressemann, came to the conclusion that European unification, including above all their own two countries, ought to take place.

These two names will be familiar to you in connection with the work of European reconciliation carried out at Locarno. But this Treaty of Locarno, which, after the resentment and still-existing hate of the war years, first opened up the way to normal European relationships, was, in the intention of the two statesmen, only to have been a beginning; it was to have been followed by a far-reaching understanding.

It is a fact that in 1929 Briand submitted a plan for European unification to the League of Nations. But, although his plan was a very cautious one and made extensive concessions to the traditional sovereign powers of the individual States, it did not meet with success. The peoples were not yet sufficiently mature for this great idea. They chose the path of national obduracy.

In addition, mistakes were made on all sides; the economic crisis further confused the counsels of reason; nationalist passions once more prevailed; and so an avalanche started which could no longer be restrained by the traditional measures of diplomacy, and which ended in the catastrophe of the Second World War.

UNITED STATES FOSTERS UNIFICATION

After this Second World War, as soon as the mood of war and revenge had disappeared, it was only natural that the efforts toward European unification should be renewed with even greater intensity. The war experience had been too overwhelming and clear-cut for the idea of a union to be opposed any longer—at least in theory.

The impulse came from two sides—from without and from within.

First, from without from your country. It arose out of the generous aid of the Marshall plan. The latter, which had taken shape in the speeches of Secretary of State Marshall and the message of President Truman in 1947, and had crystallized in the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, not only provided immediate and indispensable aid for Europe but laid down from the beginning the condition of economic cooperation between the countries of Europe.

It thereby inaugurated the first European economic organization on a large scale—the OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation) in which, from the very beginning, 16 European member states participated, in addition to the West German zones of occupation, at that time not yet united in the German Federal Republic.

Thus, a solid organization for concrete European cooperation in a very important field had been created. The activities of this organization, however, are limited to questions of economic recovery, and its decisions depend upon the unanimous agreement of all participants.

The second impulse came from Europe itself. Union was demanded by movements everywhere, in which above all the youth of Europe was active—the European Movement, the European Union of Federalists, and others.

This striving found its first realization after a European congress held in the Dutch capital in 1948, in the so-called Ten Power Pact of London in the summer of 1949, by which the organization of the Council of Europe was founded. This Council set up a Committee of Ministers at a European level, consisting of the Foreign Ministers, a Consultative Assembly, and a Secretariat.

But once more, these developments did not fulfill the hopes they had aroused.

The Council of Europe and particularly the European Consultative Assembly are of an extraordinary importance for European unity; they have become indispensable and they will continue to play an important part. But the Committee of Ministers requires a unanimous decision on all important questions, and as regards any vital measures, it can only make recommendations to the various governments; the Consultative Assembly, as its name implies, has only advisory functions.

Thus the Council of Europe is in essence only an international and not a supranational organization.

It has, therefore, not been able to bring about the realization of a close European union, and obviously will not be able to do so. This is not so much due to its institutions as such—since these institutions could be amended if all the member states unanimously resolved to do this—but rather to underlying conditions. The nations of Europe—this has become evident—are not yet prepared to effect a complete union at one stroke.

UNITED STATES TOOK ONE STEP AT A TIME

This is certainly regrettable, and you may well feel impatience at the slow-moving Europeans. But you will remember from your own history, that in the process of uniting your own States only the imperfect instrument of the Articles of Confederation of 1777 was at first achieved, imperfect and inadequate—similar to the present solution of the statute of the Council of Europe—and that it was only after the painful experience of the following years that the great work of union was completed.

You will understand how much stronger the impediments are in Europe than was the case in America. From the beginning you were united by one language, by a common history, and by a common struggle.

In Europe it is the other way around. The nations speak different languages, they are not united but rather divided by their previous history; and when they have fought up to now it has been against each other.

In the course of a thousand years contrasts have developed everywhere, which have become crystallized in traditional institutions. It is, therefore, perhaps understandable that the nations of Europe cannot suddenly shake off these burdens of the past in all respects. Not all at once can they free themselves from former imperfections, but—and we have had to realize this—these imperfections can only be overcome step by step as we progress toward unity.

You may remember the autobiography of your great countryman, Benjamin Franklin. In describing the conduct of his life he says that it is impossible, and indeed harmful, to rid oneself of all imperfections at once, and so he drew up for himself a plan for living by which he gradually and systematically stamped out one imperfection after another. It is similar with the imperfections of Europe; these, too, can only be abolished step by step in systematic progress, leading up to a system of unification.

This then is the further decisive lesson which we have learned from experience, the lesson, namely, that if a united Europe is, indeed, to become a reality, and if the professions of loyalty to this ideal are not to tail off into mere theoretical assertions, which after some time are taken seriously by no one, a start must be made by finding a thoroughgoing solution to one single set of problems.

Credit is due at the bar of history to my French friend, Jean Monnet, and to the French statesman whose name the Schuman plan bears, for having recognized this fact clearly and for having given effect to this recognition by the momentous declaration and invitation of the 9th of May 1950.

Credit is due to the governments of the other five member states of the plan for having adopted this idea and for having carried it through. Joint credit is due also to Chancellor Adenauer for having made it a part of his foreign policy which is firmly oriented toward European unity.

There is something else which I must not omit to mention here. It is often said in Europe "the Americans are the best Europeans," and indeed, the moral and political support given by the United States was an essential contribution to this European work. I must mention here the names of two men to whom particular credit is due for their devotion to this task, your Ambassador in Paris, Mr. Bruce, and your High Commissioner in Germany, Mr. McCloy.

It is thus that the Schuman plan, which has already been sanctioned or is about to be so in the six member states—France, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Luxemburg, and Germany—was conceived and completed.

SCHUMAN'S BASIC IDEAS

What are its fundamental ideas?

There is first the idea already mentioned, that in the existing state of affairs the unification of Europe can only be accomplished gradually.

Secondly, there is the idea that the sphere and the method selected for this step should be such as to insure immediate, far-reaching, and vigorous effects.

And thirdly, there is the idea—and this is very important—that this step must be so conceived that it generates impulses toward further development, toward complete federation, that its effect is not static but dynamic.

As I have already said, the first idea of a step-by-step development was necessitated by the trend of events.

Allow me now to develop in more detail the second and third ideas, the direct effects of the Schuman plan and its dynamic aspects. They are what constitutes the real worth of the Schuman plan, and if, as I believe, it will prove to be of historical significance, that significance will be based on them.

The Schuman plan constitutes, as you know, according to its direct purport, a pooling of the sovereign rights of the six member states in the sphere of the basic industries of coal and steel, sovereign rights which formerly belonged to the individual States: this is to say a genuine European union if only in a partial sphere, a supranational structure on the pattern of a Federal Union, and not a mere system of agreements under international law. Just as in the case of a complete union of the European states would be amalgamated, so here the sovereign rights in the sphere of basic industries are amalgamated. There are no longer any basic industries under national sovereignty, but only basic industries under the European community.

What does this mean? All customs duties and levies which opposed the free exchange of products will disappear; all subsidies

which, contrary to the natural course of development, artificially maintained nonviable industries in the individual states, will be abolished.

To sum up: The limited individual markets of the European states, protected against each other by all manner of artificial means of state intervention, will be replaced by a large common market, in which any form of discrimination on grounds of nationality is out of the question.

The member states of the European coal and steel community can, in future, no more interfere in this joint market than can your States interfere in the field of Federal competency. In this common market a common set of rules, as laid down in the treaty, is to prevail, both producers and consumers being subject to one and the same law without regard to their nationality.

For you, who have for a long time past enjoyed the beneficial effects of such a common market, all this will perhaps seem a matter of course. Fundamentally, it is a matter of course, but probably for this very reason it is for Europe a revolutionary experience both economically and politically.

PLAN ATTACKS WEAKNESS

Let us take the economic side first. You probably know from statistics how far European industrial development lags behind that of America. While in 1870 European industrial production amounted to almost nine-tenths (88 percent) of world production in 1949 it was less than half (47 percent). The production of the United States of America now equals that of the British Commonwealth, Europe, China, India, the Near East, and Africa put together.

Steel consumption per head in particular, which offers a good standard of comparison for the development of industry and prosperity, is about four times greater in your country than the average amount consumed in the countries of continental Europe. During the last 15 years, the figure in America has almost doubled (between 1937–38 and 1950; it rose to 194 percent), while in most of the member states of the Schuman plan there has only been a slight rise, and in Germany the figure has even dropped.

The basic reasons for this are to be found to a great extent in those conditions which the Schuman plan is about to abolish: in the splitting up of Europe up to now into small and inadequate markets, cut off from one another. Everywhere up to now the natural course toward the best economic development has been hampered by barriers set up between the individual states. Genuine mass production was hindered; economically unprofitable industries existed everywhere which were only kept alive through state aid and interference.

All this was an economic drain upon the countries in question, and, as I have shown, affected consumption and living standards. For such artificial production costs money. If a State keeps a certain enterprise going which, according to natural economic conditions, is not viable, this means that part of the economic force of the country is artificially deflected to a production which is less remunerative than the enterprise to which this force would be devoted in the natural course of events.

This results necessarily in a drop in the national dividend as a whole, and each individual citizen receives less. By removing these artificial barriers and these artificially sustained industries in favor of a common market, the prosperity of all the countries concerned rises automatically. And over and above this immediate result, the spirit of true economic thinking is revived whereas, in a system of autarchic national industries, economic thought is bound to harden into the antieconomic mentality bent on the protection of vested interests.

But that is only the economic side of the question.

Over and above this, union will also achieve political results. For the prevailing motive for isolating autarchic national industries was not an economic one but was due for the greater part to political considerations, namely to the desire of each country to organize its industries in such a way that in the case of a conflict it was independent of other countries, and could employ these industries as a means of fighting. This was especially the case with the basic industries which provide material for armaments.

The Schuman plan, therefore, in doing away with this dispersal and incongruity, does not only abolish the material basis for a hostile attitude between the various states, but also changes the political mentality which by readying these material resources for a possible outbreak of hostilities prepares it.

In other words: The Schuman plan does not only ban war between its members—experience has shown that criminal aggressors are not deterred by the prohibition of war—but it makes war impossible.

These then are the direct economic and political effects of the Schuman plan. Still more important however, we hope, will be its remote effects, the ones I have just characterized as its dynamic aspect, the onward-driving impulse, which in a relatively short time, is to lead to complete European federation.

This dynamic character of the Schuman plan is of a threefold nature.

PLAN IS ESSENTIALLY DYNAMIC

I have already touched upon the first point. It is the solvent effect which the Schuman plan in itself exerts upon the limited mentality of national economic and political ideology. When it has become a matter of course in the basic industries of all six countries that narrow national advantages, which in reality are no advantages at all, no longer prevail, but that economic rationalism prevails, then all economic thinking will be impelled to concentrate upon the larger whole. Without this reformation in the habit of practical thought a united Europe cannot come into being.

There is no use in acclaiming a united Europe in theory, even though the intention may be honest, if in daily practice our thoughts still run in the old narrow rut. A united Europe presupposes a habitual pattern of thought in wide terms as a matter of course. There is no better means of breeding this pattern of thought, than to sow it in the field of those industries, upon which all business life is based.

A second point must be added. The Schuman plan is not only dynamic in itself but also in its relation to those spheres which lie outside the plan, and in which, therefore, national sovereignty continues to exist.

By this I mean the following: A certain incongruity naturally results when, on the one side, the most important industries are removed from national sovereignty and are united on a European basis, whereas, on the other, the rest of the economy and of public activity remain under national sovereignty. Certain clashes and discrepancies are bound to occur. Think only of questions of transport, of commercial and social policy. Some critics of the Schuman plan who realize this counted it as a decisive drawback of the plan. But the contrary is the case. We welcome these discrepancies. For the fact of the matter is that these discrepancies will necessarily produce the urge to remove them.

This can, however, only happen in one of two ways. The first is that we should put everything back under national particularism. This we consider impossible, since, in our opinion, once the idea of European unity has been achieved in one point, it cannot die again.

The second way of removing the discrepancies is, on the contrary, to adapt the old to the new—to dissolve the still remaining particularism of the national states in a European solution. This, we believe, is the solution to which everything points.

Since, therefore, the Schuman plan makes us face up to these alternatives, one of which must be chosen, it is doing something of the greatest importance, over and above its direct object, for the common aim to which we aspire.

There is, finally, a third point, which is probably the most important of all. It concerns the fact that the Schuman plan in its constitutional structure intentionally anticipates the institutions of the future all-European federation.

As you know, the Schuman plan contains a very extensive set of such constitutional institutions. For this reason, too, the Schuman plan has been criticized. It has been said that an unnecessarily clumsy mechanism has thereby been created. But this criticism fails to recognize the circumstances of the case.

Even if the Schuman plan were of a purely economic nature, it could not, as some critics think, have been limited to a few legal provisions, chiefly of a prohibitive character, concerning the setting up of a common market and the removal of custom barriers, etc., leaving everything else to the automatic functioning of economic life. For the former state of affairs could not be terminated by a few legal phrases; extensive and coordinated measures, also, of an administrative nature were needed in order to bring about the new condition of a common market to strengthen it and to secure it against later disturbances. I need only recall in particular that competition had to be safeguarded against trusts and monopolies.

ECONOMIC STEPS HELP POLITICAL

Above all, however, the afore-mentioned critics failed to recognize the main point, namely, that the Schuman plan is not only nor even in the first place a mere economic affair but, above all, as I have shown, it is, thanks to its dynamic aspect, the beginning of the integration of all Europe.

It follows that it must contain in embryo all the organs which will be needed in varying form if and when such a future total integration takes place, whether its institutions are merely to serve as a model or whether they themselves are taken over—with the necessary modifications.

All the constitutional institutions of the Schuman plan were envisaged from this point of view. If you examine it from this aspect, you will at once see that it contains everywhere genuine Federal institutions, similar to those which exist in your own Federal Constitution. In the course of further developments, these institutions will naturally require certain alterations; some of them will gain in importance and others will lose. But it can already be said that certain fundamental structures will remain because they are inherent in the nature of such a Federal union.

First, there is the oft-named high authority. This is the executive power and corresponds, therefore, to your Federal administration; to it is attached a consultative committee.

There is further the so-called assembly, composed of representatives of the member nations of the community; this corresponds, therefore, to your House of Representatives.

Further, there is an organ, representing the federated states, called the council of ministers, in which not the population of the common area as such, but the individual states are represented; this organ corresponds roughly to your Senate, in which the individual states are represented as states regardless of their size; the manner of its composition is, of course, somewhat different

from that of your Senate and corresponds to the prevailing European tradition; but in practice it is about the same.

Finally there is a court of justice, which corresponds to your Supreme Court, and which, in the same way, by acting as a consistent court of justice for all disputes, shall insure that justice is respected within the community; in its organization and functions it has been formed on the lines of your Supreme Court, modified by ideas which were customary up to now in continental Europe.

You see, therefore, that the Schuman plan contains the embryo of a European federation; it is, so to say, a blueprint of the federal building which is to come later into being.

EUROPEAN ARMY TAKES SHAPE

An important beginning has thus been made. As you know, the Schuman plan countries have initiated a defense community as the second step toward integration. This is to culminate in the formation of a European army, i. e., an army not to be formed loosely as a coalition army from the armies of individual states, but a genuine European army in which Europeans shall serve as Europeans.

It was not a free choice on the part of the countries concerned that this defense community was elected as the second step toward integration. The menace from outside forced this decision upon them.

You can imagine how particularly difficult the creation of a European community is in this sphere.

Military affairs in Europe are the very hub of national sovereign rights; national armies, used in interstate conflicts, are considered as indispensable elements of national existence, of national sovereignty. Now they are to disappear in favor of a European army which is only to be used for defense against a common foe. This decision breaks with many European traditions.

But the decision has been taken, and the work of organization to which it has given rise is by this time almost completed in the negotiations of the governments concerned. In view of the obstacles this is something very big. It would not have succeeded if the supporting scaffolding of the Schuman plan had not already existed. It served as an auxiliary construction, and wherever opinions differed it provided the basis for understanding. Its institutions have for the greater part been taken over.

A commission has been proposed for the defense community, whose composition and methods of work correspond almost exactly to the high authority of the Schuman plan.

A council of ministers is provided as in the Schuman plan.

The assembly of the defense community is basically the same as that of the Schuman plan, and the court of justice of the defense community is identical with the count of the Schuman plan. Thus, congruity and interrelation exist all along the line.

Over and above this the tendencies toward final federation may already be seen in the new community. The defense community consultations have convinced all those taking part that the community cannot continue to exist without final general federation. The dynamic aspect of the Schuman plan, therefore, has already been extended to include the defense community. The latter, in turn, is imbued with the impulse toward further development. And in particular, the assembly of the Schuman plan (that is to say its house of representatives) has been given the task of acting as a preparatory constituent assembly of this greater federation and of submitting drafts for this purpose within a given period of time.

These plans have not yet become realities, there are many difficulties still to be overcome. In order to overcome these, Europe will need to apply all her forces and all her good will. She will further require the helpful sympathy of the entire Western World and in particular of your great country. It has already been an essential help in the case of the Schuman plan. It will be still more so in the further course of events.

For the unification of Europe in the service of peace can only be built up and completed in peace. And as long as it is not complete it needs, for the preservation of peace, the assistance and protection of the Western World of which it is to form a part.

As was the case with the building of the temple in the Old Testament, we too must for some years to come while building up the new Europe hold the trowel in one hand and keep the sword ready for defense in the other. Without the aid and the power of America this will be impossible.

UNIFICATION MAKES PEACE

The unification of Europe and the peace of the world are therefore interdependent. As I have tried to show you, we are, by unifying Europe, creating an essential element of world peace. And vice versa, this unification is only possible if, during the period of development, while the new-born child is still small and helpless, the peace of the world is maintained.

We hope that we shall not need to remain long in this condition of helplessness and growth. We hope to arrive at this unity soon. We shall give all we have toward this aim.

When we have succeeded, when a united Europe exists, we hope to repay what we have received. Then, we hope, the unity of Europe will be one of the pillars of world peace. We then hope in the second half of this century, the first half of which was afflicted with so much misery, to achieve that which we all so passionately desire: peace in our time.

LOW PRICE OF EGGS AND HIGH PRICE OF SHOES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of RECORD a letter dated March 6, 1952, written to me by B. H. Klinkhammer, concerning the low price of eggs and the high price of shoes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator will have the letter printed in the Appendix, instead of in the body of the RECORD, I shall not object.

Mr. LANGER. That is satisfactory to me, just so it appears in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Appendix.

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

NOMINATIONS OF POSTMASTERS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in executive session.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the Executive Calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it is desired that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the treaty of peace with Japan.

NOMINATION OF IVAR H. PETERSON TO BE MEMBER OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. There is pending on the Executive Calendar the nomination of Mr. Ivar H. Peterson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board. I have entered into an understanding with several of my colleagues that I will allow the nomination to go over until Monday. However, I wish to say most respectfully to the majority leader than on Monday I shall ask to have the nomination considered in executive session, because I think it is only fair to the National Labor Relations Board, to Mr. Peterson, and to the junior Senator from Oregon that that nomination be disposed of at a very early date. I include the junior Senator from Oregon because Mr. Peterson happens to be my administrative assistant, and I should like to know at an early date who my new administrative assistant is to be, because it is rather desirable, in the interest of efficiency, that I appoint a new one at an early date.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that I have no disposition to delay the consideration of Mr. Peterson's nomination. However, if there is to be a contest on it, I do not believe that the Senate should lay aside the consideration of the treaty of peace with Japan to take up a contested nomination. I am willing to have the nomination considered at an early date. I am hopeful that the differences can be ironed out so that there will be no contest; but, even if there is to be a contest, I am willing to have it considered at an early date.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, a second reading of the treaty is required. If there be no objection, the second reading will be considered as having transpired. It is a mere formality.

There being no objection, the treaty was considered to have been read the second time, as follows:

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

Whereas the Allied Powers and Japan are resolved that henceforth their relations shall be those of nations which, as sovereign equals, cooperate in friendly association to promote their common welfare and to maintain international peace and security, and are therefore desirous of concluding a Treaty of Peace which will settle questions still outstanding as a result of the existence of a state of war between them;

Whereas Japan for its part declares its intention to apply for membership in the United Nations and in all circumstances to conform to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; to strive to realize the objectives of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; to seek to create within Japan conditions of stability and well-being as defined in articles 55 and 56 of the Charter of the United Nations and already initiated by post-surrender Japanese legislation; and in public and private trade and commerce to conform to internationally accepted fair practices;

Whereas the Allied Powers welcome the intentions of Japan set out in the foregoing paragraph;

The Allied Powers and Japan have therefore determined to conclude the present treaty of peace, and have accordingly appointed the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, who, after presentation of their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed on the following provisions:

CHAPTER I—PEACE

Article 1

(a) The state of war between Japan and each of the Allied Powers is terminated as from the date on which the present Treaty comes into force between Japan and the Allied Power concerned as provided for in Article 23.

(b) The Allied Powers recognize the full sovereignty of the Japanese people over Japan and its territorial waters.

CHAPTER II—TERRITORY

Article 2

(a) Japan, recognizing the independence of Korea, renounces all right, title, and claim to Korea, including the islands of Quelpart, Port Hamilton and Dagelet.

(b) Japan renounces all right, title and claim to Formosa and the Pescadores.

(c) Japan renounces all right, title and claim to the Kurile Islands, and to that portion of Sakhalin and the islands adjacent to it over which Japan acquired sovereignty as a consequence of the Treaty of Portsmouth of September 5, 1905.

(d) Japan renounces all right, title and claim in connection with the League of Nations Mandate System, and accepts the action of the United Nations Security Council of April 2, 1947, extending the trusteeship system to the Pacific Islands formerly under mandate to Japan.

(e) Japan renounces all claim to any right or title to or interest in connection with any part of the Antarctic area, whether deriving from the activities of Japanese nationals or otherwise.

(f) Japan renounces all right, title and claim to the Spratly Islands and to the Paracel Islands.

Article 3

Japan will concur in any proposal of the United States to the United Nations to place under its trusteeship system, with the United States as the sole administering authority, Nansei Shoto south of 29° north latitude (including the Ryukyu Islands and the Daito Islands), Nanpo Shoto south of Sofu Gan (including the Bonin Islands, Rosario Island and the Volcano Islands) and Parece Vela and Marcus Island. Pending the making of such a proposal and affirmative action thereon, the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters.

Article 4

(a) Subject to the provisions of paragraph (b) of this Article, the disposition of property of Japan and of its nationals in the areas referred to in Article 2, and their claims, including debts, against the authorities presently administering such areas and the residents (including juridical persons) thereof, and the disposition in Japan of property of such authorities and residents, and of claims, including debts, of such authorities and residents against Japan and its nationals, shall be the subject of special arrangements between Japan and such authorities. The property of any of the Allied Powers or its nationals in the areas referred to in Article 2 shall, insofar as this has not already been done, be returned by the administering authority in the condition in which it now exists. (The term nationals whenever used in the present Treaty includes juridical persons.)

(b) Japan recognizes the validity of dispositions of property of Japan and Japanese nationals made by or pursuant to directives of the United States Military Government in any of the areas referred to in Articles 2 and 3.

(c) Japanese owned submarine cables connecting Japan with territory removed from Japanese control pursuant to the present Treaty shall be equally divided, Japan retaining the Japanese terminal and adjoining half of the cable, and the detached territory the remainder of the cable and connecting terminal facilities.

CHAPTER III—SECURITY

Article 5

(a) Japan accepts the obligations set forth in Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations, and in particular the obligations.

(i) to settle its international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered;

(ii) to refrain in its international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations;

(iii) to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter and to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations may take preventive or enforcement action.

(b) The Allied Powers confirm that they will be guided by the principles of Article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations in their relations with Japan.

(c) The Allied Powers for their part recognize that Japan as a sovereign nation possesses the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense referred to in Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations and that Japan may voluntarily enter into collective security arrangements.

Article 6

(a) All occupation forces of the Allied Powers shall be withdrawn from Japan as soon as possible after the coming into force of the present Treaty, and in any case not later than 90 days thereafter. Nothing in this provision shall, however, prevent the stationing or retention of foreign armed forces in Japanese territory under or in consequence of any bilateral or multilateral agreements which have been or may be made between one or more of the Allied Powers, on the one hand, and Japan on the other.

(b) The provisions of Article 9 of the Potsdam Proclamation of July 26, 1945, dealing with the return of Japanese military forces to their homes, to the extent not already completed, will be carried out.

(c) All Japanese property for which compensation has not already been paid, which was supplied for the use of the occupation forces and which remains in the possession of those forces at the time of the coming into force of the present Treaty, shall be returned to the Japanese Government within the same 90 days unless other arrangements are made by mutual agreement.

CHAPTER IV—POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC CLAUSES

Article 7

(a) Each of the Allied Powers, within one year after the present Treaty has come into force between it and Japan, will notify Japan which of its prewar bilateral treaties or conventions with Japan it wishes to continue in force or revive, and any treaties or conventions so notified shall continue in force or be revived subject only to such amendments as may be necessary to ensure conformity with the present Treaty. The treaties and conventions so notified shall be considered as having been continued in force or revived three months after the date of notification and shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations. All such treaties and conventions as to which Japan is not so notified shall be regarded as abrogated.

(b) Any notification made under paragraph (a) of this Article may except from the operation or revival of a treaty or convention any territory for the international relations of which the notifying Power is responsible, until three months after the date on which notice is given to Japan that such exception shall cease to apply.

Article 8

(a) Japan will recognize the full force of all treaties now or hereafter concluded by the Allied Powers for terminating the state of war initiated on September 1, 1939, as well as any other arrangements by the Allied Powers for or in connection with the restoration of peace. Japan also accepts the arrangements made for terminating the former League of Nations and Permanent Court of International Justice.

(b) Japan renounces all such rights and interests as it may derive from being a signatory power of the Conventions of St. Germain-en-Laye of September 10, 1919, and the Straits Agreement of Montreux of July 20, 1936, and from Article 16 of the Treaty of Peace with Turkey signed at Lausanne on July 24, 1923.

(c) Japan renounces all rights, title and interests acquired under, and is discharged from all obligations resulting from, the Agreement Between Germany and the Creditor Powers of January 20, 1930, and its Annexes, including the Trust Agreement, dated May 17, 1930; the Convention of January 20, 1930, respecting the Bank for International Settlements; and the Statutes of the Bank for International Settlements. Japan will notify to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris within six months of the first coming into force of the present Treaty its renunciation of the rights, title and interests referred to in this paragraph.

Article 9

Japan will enter promptly into negotiations with the Allied Powers so desiring for the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral agreements providing for the regulation or limitation of fishing and the conservation and development of fisheries on the high seas.

Article 10

Japan renounces all special rights and interests in China, including all benefits and privileges resulting from the provisions of the final Protocol signed at Peking on September 7, 1901, and all annexes, notes and documents suplementary thereto, and agrees to the abrogation in respect to Japan of the said protocol, annexes, notes and documents.

Article 11

Japan accepts the judgments of the International Military Tribunal for the Far East and of other Allied War Crimes Courts both within and outside Japan, and will carry out the sentences imposed thereby upon Japanese nationals imprisoned in Japan. The power to grant clemency, to reduce sentences and to parole with respect to such

prisoners may not be exercised except on the decision of the Government or Governments which imposed the sentence in each instance, and on the recommendation of Japan. In the case of persons sentenced by the International Military Tribunal for the Far East, such power may not be exercised except on the decision of a majority of the Governments represented on the Tribunal, and on the recommendation of Japan.

Article 12

(a) Japan declares its readiness promptly to enter into negotiations for the conclusion with each of the Allied Powers of treaties or agreements to place their trading, maritime and other commercial relations on a stable and friendly basis.

(b) Pending the conclusion of the relevant treaty or agreement, Japan will, during a period of four years from the first coming into force of the present Treaty

(1) accord to each of the Allied Powers, its nationals, products and vessels

(i) most-favored-nation treatment with respect to customs duties, charges, restrictions and other regulations on or in connection with the importation and exportation of goods;

(ii) national treatment with respect to shipping, navigation and imported goods, and with respect to natural and juridical persons and their interests—such treatment to include all matters pertaining to the levying and collection of taxes, access to the courts, the making and performance of contracts, rights to property (tangible and intangible), participation in juridical entities constituted under Japanese law, and generally the conduct of all kinds of business and professional activities;

(2) ensure that external purchases and sales of Japanese state trading enterprises shall be based solely on commercial considerations.

(c) In respect to any matter, however, Japan shall be obliged to accord to an Allied Power national treatment, or most-favored-nation treatment, only to the extent that the Allied Power concerned accords Japan national treatment or most-favored-nation treatment, as the case may be, in respect of the same matter. The reciprocity envisaged in the foregoing sentence shall be determined, in the case of products, vessels and juridical entities of, and persons domiciled in, any nonmetropolitan territory of an Allied Power, and in the case of juridical entities of, and persons domiciled in, any state or province of an Allied Power having a federal government, by reference to the treatment accorded to Japan in such territory, state or province.

(d) In the application of this Article, a discriminatory measure shall not be considered to derogate from the grant of national or most-favored-nation treatment, as the case may be, if such measure is based on an exception customarily provided for in the commercial treaties of the party applying it, or on the need to safeguard that party's external financial position or balance of payments (except in respect to shipping and navigation), or on the need to maintain its essential security interests, and provided such measure is proportionate to the circumstances and not applied in an arbitrary or unreasonable manner.

(e) Japan's obligations under this Article shall not be affected by the exercise of any Allied rights under Article 14 of the present Treaty; nor shall the provisions of this Article be understood as limiting the undertakings assumed by Japan by virtue of Article 15 of the Treaty.

Article 13

(a) Japan will enter into negotiations with any of the Allied Powers, promptly upon the request of such Power or Powers, for the conclusion of bilateral or multilateral agreements relating to international civil air transport.

(b) Pending the conclusion of such agreement or agreements, Japan will, during a period of four years from the first coming into force of the present Treaty, extend to such Power treatment not less favorable with respect to air-traffic rights and privileges than those exercised by any such Powers at the date of such coming into force, and will accord complete equality of opportunity in respect to the operation and development of air services.

(c) Pending its becoming a party to the Convention on International Civil Aviation in accordance with Article 93 thereof, Japan will give effect to the provisions of that Convention applicable to the international navigation of aircraft, and will give effect to the standards, practices and procedures adopted as annexes to the Convention in accordance with the terms of the Convention.

CHAPTER V—CLAIMS AND PROPERTY

Article 14

(a) It is recognized that Japan should pay reparations to the Allied Powers for the damage and suffering caused by it during the war. Nevertheless it is also recognized that the resources of Japan are not presently sufficient, if it is to maintain a viable economy, to make complete reparation for all such damage and suffering and at the same time meet its other obligations.

Therefore,

1. Japan will promptly enter into negotiations with Allied Powers so desiring, whose present territories were occupied by Japanese forces and damaged by Japan, with a view to assisting to compensate those countries for the cost of repairing the damage done, by making available the services of the Japanese people in production, salvaging and other work for the Allied Powers in question. Such arrangements shall avoid the imposition of additional liabilities on other Allied Powers, and, where the manufacturing of raw materials is called for, they shall be supplied by the Allied Powers in question, so as not to throw any foreign exchange burden upon Japan.

2. (I) Subject to the provisions of sub-paragraph (II) below, each of the Allied Powers shall have the right to seize, retain, liquidate or otherwise dispose of all property, rights and interests of

(a) Japan and Japanese nationals,

(b) persons acting for or on behalf of Japan or Japanese nationals, and

(c) entities owned or controlled by Japan or Japanese nationals,

which on the first coming into force of the present Treaty were subject to its jurisdiction. The property, rights and interests specified in this sub-paragraph shall include those now blocked, vested or in the possession or under the control of enemy property authorities of Allied Powers, which belonged to, or were held or managed on behalf of, any of the persons or entities mentioned in (a), (b) or (c) above at the time such assets came under the controls of such authorities.

(II) The following shall be excepted from the right specified in sub-paragraph (I) above:

(i) property of Japanese natural persons who during the war resided with the permission of the Government concerned in the territory of one of the Allied Powers, other than territory occupied by Japan, except property subjected to restrictions during the war and not released from such restrictions as of the date of the first coming into force of the present Treaty;

(ii) all real property, furniture and fixtures owned by the Government of Japan and used for diplomatic or consular purposes, and all personal furniture and furnishings and other private property not of an investment nature which was normally necessary for the carrying out of diplomatic and consular functions, owned by Japanese diplomatic and consular personnel;

(iii) property belonging to religious bodies or private charitable institutions and used exclusively for religious or charitable purposes;

(iv) property, rights and interests which have come within its jurisdiction in consequence of the resumption of trade and financial relations subsequent to September 2, 1945, between the country concerned and Japan, except such as have resulted from transactions contrary to the laws of the Allied Power concerned;

(v) obligations of Japan or Japanese nationals, any right, title or interest in tangible property located in Japan, interests in enterprises organized under the laws of Japan, or any paper evidence thereof; provided that this exception shall only apply to obligations of Japan and its nationals expressed in Japanese currency.

(III) Property referred to in exceptions (i) through (v) above shall be returned subject to reasonable expenses for its preservation and administration. If any such property has been liquidated the proceeds shall be returned instead.

(IV) The right to seize, retain, liquidate or otherwise dispose of property as provided in sub-paragraph (I) above shall be exercised in accordance with the laws of the Allied Power concerned, and the owner shall have only such rights as may be given him by those laws.

(V) The Allied Powers agree to deal with Japanese trademarks and literary and artistic property rights on a basis as favorable to Japan as circumstances ruling in each country will permit.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in the present Treaty, the Allied Powers waive all reparations claims of the Allied Powers, other claims of the Allied Powers and their nationals arising out of any actions taken by Japan and its nationals in the course of the prosecution of the war, and claims of the Allied Powers for direct military costs of occupation.

Article 15

(a) Upon application made within nine months of the coming into force of the present Treaty between Japan and the Allied Power concerned, Japan will, within six months of the date of such application, return the property, tangible and intangible, and all rights or interests of any kind in Japan of each Allied Power and its nationals which was within Japan at any time between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, unless the owner has freely disposed thereof without duress or fraud. Such property shall be returned free of all encumbrances and charges to which it may have become subject because of the war, and without any charges for its return. Property whose return is not applied for by or on behalf of the owner or by his Government within the prescribed period may be disposed of by the Japanese Government as it may determine. In cases where such property was within Japan on December 7, 1941, and cannot be returned or has suffered injury or damage as a result of the war, compensation will be made on terms not less favorable than the terms provided in the draft Allied Powers Property Compensation Law approved by the Japanese Cabinet on July 13, 1951.

(b) With respect to industrial property rights impaired during the war, Japan will continue to accord to the Allied Powers and their nationals benefits no less than those heretofore accorded by Cabinet Orders No. 309 effective September 1, 1949, No. 12 effective January 28, 1950, and No. 9 effective February 1, 1950, all as now amended, provided such nationals have applied for such benefits within the time limits prescribed therein.

(c) (i) Japan acknowledges that the literary and artistic property rights which en-

isted in Japan on December 6, 1941, in respect to the published and unpublished works of the Allied Powers and their nationals have continued in force since that date, and recognizes those rights which have arisen, or but for the war would have arisen, in Japan since that date, by the operation of any conventions and agreements to which Japan was a party on that date, irrespective of whether or not such conventions or agreements were abrogated or suspended upon or since the outbreak of war by the domestic law of Japan or of the Allied Power concerned.

(ii) Without the need for application by the proprietor of the right and without the payment of any fee or compliance with any other formality, the period from December 7, 1941, until the coming into force of the present Treaty between Japan and the Allied Power concerned shall be excluded from the running of the normal term of such rights; and such period, with an additional period of six months, shall be excluded from the time within which a literary work must be translated into Japanese in order to obtain translating rights in Japan.

Article 16

As an expression of its desire to indemnify those members of the armed forces of the Allied Powers who suffered undue hardships while prisoners of war of Japan, Japan will transfer its assets and those of its nationals in countries which were neutral during the war, or which were at war with any of the Allied Powers, or, at its option, the equivalent of such assets, to the International Committee of the Red Cross which shall liquidate such assets and distribute the resultant fund to appropriate national agencies, for the benefit of former prisoners of war and their families on such basis as it may determine to be equitable. The categories of assets described in Article 14 (a) 2 (II) (ii) through (v) of the present Treaty shall be excepted from transfer, as well as assets of Japanese natural persons not residents of Japan on the first coming into force of the Treaty. It is equally understood that the transfer provision of this Article has no application to the 19,770 shares in the Bank for International Settlements presently owned by Japanese financial institutions.

Article 17

(a) Upon the request of any of the Allied Powers, the Japanese Government shall review and revise in conformity with international law any decision or order of the Japanese Prize Courts in cases involving ownership rights of nationals of that Allied Power and shall supply copies of all documents comprising the records of these cases, including the decisions taken and orders issued. In any case in which such review or revision shows that restoration is due, the provisions of Article 15 shall apply to the property concerned.

(b) The Japanese Government shall take the necessary measures to enable nationals of any of the Allied Powers at any time within one year from the coming into force of the present Treaty between Japan and the Allied Power concerned to submit to the appropriate Japanese authorities for review any judgment given by a Japanese court between December 7, 1941, and such coming into force, in any proceedings in which any such national was unable to make adequate presentation of his case either as plaintiff or defendant. The Japanese Government shall provide that, where the national has suffered injury by reason of any such judgment, he shall be restored in the position in which he was before the judgment was given or shall be afforded such relief as may be just and equitable in the circumstances.

Article 18

(a) It is recognized that the intervention of the state of war has not affected the obligation to pay pecuniary debts arising out of obligations and contracts (including those in respect of bonds) which existed and rights which were acquired before the existence of a state of war, and which are due by the Government or nationals of Japan to the Government or nationals of one of the Allied Powers, or are due by the Government or nationals of one of the Allied Powers to the Government or nationals of Japan. The intervention of a state of war shall equally not be regarded as affecting the obligation to consider on their merits claims for loss or damage to property or for personal injury or death which arose before the existence of a state of war, and which may be presented or re-presented by the Government of one of the Allied Powers to the Government of Japan, or by the Government of Japan to any of the Governments of the Allied Powers. The provisions of this paragraph are without prejudice to the rights conferred by Article 14.

(b) Japan affirms its liability for the prewar external debt of the Japanese State and for debts of corporate bodies subsequently declared to be liabilities of the Japanese State, and expresses its intention to enter into negotiations at an early date with its creditors with respect to the resumption of payments on those debts; to encourage negotiations in respect to other prewar claims and obligations; and to facilitate the transfer of sums accordingly.

Article 19

(a) Japan waives all claims of Japan and its nationals against the Allied Powers and their nationals arising out of the war or out of actions taken because of the existence of a state of war, and waives all claims arising from the presence, operations or actions of forces or authorities of any of the Allied Powers in Japanese territory prior to the coming into force of the present Treaty.

(b) The foregoing waiver includes any claims arising out of actions taken by any of the Allied Powers with respect to Japanese ships between September 1, 1939, and the coming into force of the present Treaty, as well as any claims and debts arising in respect to Japanese prisoners of war and civilian internees in the hands of the Allied Powers, but does not include Japanese claims specifically recognized in the laws of any Allied Power enacted since September 2, 1945.

(c) Subject to reciprocal renunciation, the Japanese Government also renounces all claims (including debts) against Germany and German nationals on behalf of the Japanese Government and Japanese nationals, including intergovernmental claims and claims for loss or damage sustained during the war, but excepting (a) claims in respect of contracts entered into and rights acquired before September 1, 1939, and (b) claims arising out of trade and financial relations between Japan and Germany after September 2, 1945. Such renunciation shall not prejudice actions taken in accordance with Articles 16 and 20 of the present Treaty.

(d) Japan recognizes the validity of all acts and omissions done during the period of occupation under or in consequence of directives of the occupation authorities or authorized by Japanese law at that time, and will take no action subjecting Allied nationals to civil or criminal liability arising out of such acts or omissions.

Article 20

Japan will take all necessary measures to ensure such disposition of German assets in Japan as has been or may be determined by those powers entitled under the Protocol of the proceedings of the Berlin Conference of 1945 to dispose of those assets, and pending the final disposition of such assets will be responsible for the conservation and administration thereof.

Article 21

Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 25 of the present Treaty China shall be entitled to the benefits of Articles 10 and 14 (a) 2; and Korea to the benefits of Articles 2, 4, 9 and 12 of the present Treaty.

CHAPTER VI—SETTLEMENT OF DISPUTES

Article 22

If in the opinion of any Party to the present Treaty there has arisen a dispute concerning the interpretation or execution of the Treaty, which is not settled by reference to a special claims tribunal or by other agreed means, the disputes shall, at the request of any party thereto, be referred for decision to the International Court of Justice. Japan and those Allied Powers which are not already parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice will deposit with the Registrar of the Court, at the time of their respective ratifications of the present Treaty, and in conformity with the resolution of the United Nations Security Council, dated October 15, 1946, a general declaration accepting the jurisdiction, without special agreement, of the Court generally in respect to all disputes of the character referred to in this Article.

CHAPTER VII—FINAL CLAUSES

Article 23

(a) The present Treaty shall be ratified by the States which sign it (including Japan, and will come into force for all the States which have then ratified it, when instruments of ratification have been deposited by Japan and by a majority, including the United States of America as the principal occupying Power, of the following States, namely Australia, Canada, Ceylon, France, Indonesia, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Republic of the Philippines, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. The present Treaty shall come into force for each State which subsequently ratifies it, on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

(b) If the Treaty has not come into force within nine months after the date of the deposit of Japan's ratification, any State which has ratified it may bring the Treaty into force between itself and Japan by a notification to that effect given to the Governments of Japan and the United States of America not later than three years after the date of deposit of Japan's ratification.

Article 24

All instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America which will notify all the signatory States of each such deposit, of the date of the coming into force of the Treaty under paragraph (a) of Article 23, and of any notifications made under paragraph (b) of Article 23.

Article 25

For the purposes of the present Treaty the Allied Powers shall be the States at war with Japan, or any State which previously formed a part of the territory of a State named in Article 23, provided that in each case the State concerned has signed and ratified the Treaty. Subject to the provisions of Article 21, the present Treaty shall not confer any rights, titles or benefits on any State which is not an Allied Power as herein defined; nor shall any right, title or interest of Japan be deemed to be diminished or prejudiced by any provision of the Treaty in favor of a State which is not an Allied Power as so defined.

Article 26

Japan will be prepared to conclude with any State which signed or adhered to the United Nations Declaration of January 1 1942, and which is at war with Japan, or with any State which previously formed a part of the territory of a State named in Article 23, which is not a signatory of the present Treaty, a bilateral Treaty of Peace on the same or substantially the same terms as are provided for in the present Treaty, but

this obligation on the part of Japan will expire three years after the first coming into force of the present Treaty. Should Japan make a peace settlement or war claims settlement with any State granting that State greater advantages than those provided by the present Treaty, those same advantages shall be extended to the parties to the present Treaty.

Article 27

The present Treaty shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America which shall furnish each signatory State with a certified copy thereof.

In faith whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed the present Treaty.

Done at the city of San Francisco this eighth day of September 1951, in the English, French, and Spanish languages, all being equally authentic, and in the Japanese language.

For Argentina:
HIPÓLITO J. PAZ
For Australia:
PERCY C. SPENDER
For the Kingdom of Belgium:
PAUL VAN ZEELAND
SILVERCRUYS.
For Bolivia:
LUIS GUACHALLA
For Brazil:
CARLOS MARTINS
A. DE MELLO-FRANCO
For Cambodia:
PHLENG
For Canada:
LESTER B PEARSON
R W MAYHEW
For Ceylon:
J. R. JAYEWARDENE
G. C. S. COREA
R. G. SENANAYAKE
For Chile:
F. NIETO DEL RÍO
For Colombia:
CIPRIANO RESTREPO JARAMILLO
SEBASTIAN OSPINA
For Costa Rica:
J RAFAEL OREAMUNO
V. VARGAS
LUIS DOBLES SANCHEZ
For Cuba:
O GANS
L. MACHADO
JOAQUÍN MEYER
For the Dominican Republic:
V. ORDÓNEZ
LUIS F. THOMEN
For Ecuador:
A QUEVEDO
R G VALENZUELA
For Egypt:
KAMIL A. RAHIM
For El Salvador:
HÉCTOR DAVID CASTRO
LUIS RIVAS PALACIOS
For Ethiopia:
MEN YAYEHIRAD
For France:
SCHUMAN
H BONNET
PAUL-EMILE NAGGIAR
For Greece:
A. G. POLITIS
For Guatemala:
E CASTILLO A
A M ORELLANA
J MENDOZA
For Haiti:
JACQUES N. LEGÉR
GUST LARAQUE
For Honduras:
J. E. VALENZUELA
ROBERTO GÁLVEZ B.
RÁUL ALVARADO T
For Indonesia:
AHMAD SUBARDJO.
For Iran:
A G ARDALAN
For Iraq:
A. I. BAKR
For Laos:
SAVANG
For Lebanon:
CHARLES MALIK
For Liberia:
GABRIEL L DENNIS
JAMES ANDERSON
RAYMOND HORACE
J. RUDOLPH GRIMES
For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:
HUGUES LE GALLAIS
For Mexico:
RAFAEL DE LA COLINA
GUSTAVO DIAZ ORDAZ
A. P. GASGA
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
D U STIKKER
J H VAN ROIJEN
For New Zealand:
C BERENDSEN
For Nicaragua:
G SEVILLA SACASA
GUSTAVO MANZANARES
For the Kingdom of Norway:
WILHELM MUNTHE MORGENSTIERNE
For Pakistan:
ZAFRULLA KHAN
For Panama:
IGNACIO MOLINO
JOSÉ A REMÓN
ALFREDO ALEMÁN
J. CORDOVEZ
For Paraguay:
LUIS OSCAR BOETTNER
For Peru:
F BERCKMEYER
For the Republic of the Philippines:
CARLOS P. ROMULO
J M ELIZALDE
VICENTE FRANCISCO
DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL
EMILIANO T. TIRONA
V. G. SINCO
For Saudi Arabia:
ASAD AL-FAQIH
For Syria:
F. EL-KHOURI
For the Republic of Turkey:
FERIDUN C ERKIN
For the Union of South Africa:
G. P JOOSTE
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
HERBERT MORRISON
KENNETH YOUNGER
OLIVER FRANKS
For the United States of America:
DEAN ACHESON
JOHN FOSTER DULLES
ALEXANDER WILEY
JOHN J. SPARKMAN
For Uruguay:
JOSÉ A. MORA
For Venezuela:
ANTONIO M. ARAUJO
R. GALLEGOS M.
For Viet Nam:
T. V. HUU
T. VINH
D. THANH
BUU KINH
For Japan:
SHIGERU YOSHIDA
HAYATO IKEDA
GIZO TOMABECHI
NIRO HOSHIJIMA
MUNEYOSHI TOKUGAWA
HISATO ICHIMADA

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the Treaty of Peace with Japan which was signed in the English, French, Spanish, and Japanese languages at San Francisco on September 8, 1951, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

In testimony whereof, I, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this tenth day of September, 1951.

[SEAL] DEAN ACHESON
Secretary of State
By M. P. CHAUVIN
Authentication Officer
Department of State

The VICE PRESIDENT. The rule provides that the treaty shall be proceeded with by articles. Without objection, that part of the rule will be suspended, and the text of the treaty will be subject to amendment at any point.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Mundt
Brewster	Hayden	Murray
Butler, Md.	Hill	O'Conor
Carlson	Ives	O'Mahoney
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chavez	Kem	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Seaton
Dirksen	Langer	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lehman	Thye
Ecton	Martin	Tobey
Ellender	McFarland	Welker
Fulbright	McMahon	Wiley
Gillette	Morse	

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] is absent on official business in connection with hearings being held by the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Senate Small Business Committee.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

Mr. WELKER. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senators from Ohio [Mr. TAFT and Mr. BRICKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] is absent on official business as chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Senate Small Business Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr.

JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. WILLIAMS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate has before it the peace treaty with Japan, and I hope Senators will take occasion to study the transactions with regard to this document and that I may now have their attention.

Mr. President, in this world of Communist intrigue, sabotage, and aggression the task of peace-making has become exceedingly difficult and painfully slow. It is, therefore, encouraging to be able to point out that some specific progress is being made.

On behalf of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee I present to the Senate at this time the Japanese Peace Treaty with the United States and other countries and three additional treaties relating to our security interests in the Pacific area. These treaties should be considered as a unit, since they are very closely related. Together they constitute an important step forward in rebuilding the fabric of peace in the Far East.

Mr. President, the committee report explains the treaties in detail.

I shall be glad if Senators will study the report.

Several members of the committee and of the Senate intend to speak on various aspects of the matter, including the questions of security, commerce and trade, fisheries claims, and so forth. I shall take only a short time, therefore, to present the main issues. Once these issues are understood, I think the Senate will agree that the treaties should be approved. They were approved in the committee by a unanimous 13 to 0 vote.

For several years our Government has exerted every possible effort to bring about an effective peace settlement in Europe and in Asia. But the Russian wrecking crew of Stalin, Molotov, Vishinsky, and Gromyko have put every conceivable obstacle in our way. As a result, peace treaties with Germany and Austria languish in the files.

It is true that we were able to come to conclude peace treaties with Hungary, Rumania, Italy, and Bulgaria. But even in these cases agreement was reached with the Soviet Union only after a display of obstructionism unique in the annals of international diplomacy.

Mr. President, I personally had a bitter taste of this Russian obstinacy. During the negotiation of these peace treaties, I sat opposite Molotov for a total of more than 200 days. I learned then—the hard way—that the Russians were not really interested in making peace.

At the Japanese Peace Conference held in San Francisco last September, the Soviet Union was up to its old tricks.

I may say, Mr. President, that I was not able to attend the San Francisco Conference, although I was appointed as a delegate. The pressure of official duties in Washington prevented my being present.

Russian delegates attended that conference with the express intention of disrupting the proceedings and sabotaging the conclusion of a satisfactory peace.

But the unity of the free world—which is a unity made firm because we stand for freedom—thwarted every Soviet effort. In the end, after the Russian delegation had tried every device to wreck our unity and had left the conference hall, 48 free nations approved the Japanese Peace Treaty in one of the most unusual actions ever taken by a group of sovereign states. Asiatic states like Pakistan, Ceylon, Australia, and New Zealand joined with states from Europe and the Americas in defending its terms. The Russians were administered one of the most serious diplomatic defeats they have suffered since the end of World War II. Forty-eight nations saw through Soviet subterfuge. Forty-eight nations showed they would vote for peace. Certain other nations are inclined to talk peace but make war.

During the past few years it has become apparent to us all that one of Russia's main objectives is to gain control over the productive capacity of two great industrial nations—Germany in the West and Japan in the east. If the Kremlin should achieve these two objectives, it would be well on its way to world domination.

That is why the situation in the Far East is of such vital concern to the United States. If the Soviet Union could encompass Japan within the Soviet orbit, then Russian, Chinese, and Japanese power in the Pacific would directly and dangerously threaten the peace and safety of America.

We learned in the last war that the Pacific was a pathway for Japan to use in attacking Hawaii and Guam and even our own coasts. If Russian and Chinese power were added to the power of a rearmed Communist Japan, the threat we met in World War II would seem small by comparison.

It is the task of the free world, therefore, to convert a former enemy into a friend; to show Japan that her destiny lies on the side of freedom and democracy rather than on the side of international communism and slavery.

An important first step in this process is to bring the war to an end and terminate the occupation of Japan. This the peace treaty before the Senate seeks to do. Japan can only build strength if she is free. Strength cannot be built by a nation under occupation.

Under American leadership the occupation has been an outstanding success; but it follows, as the night follows the day, that any unnecessary prolongation of the occupation will be resented by the Japanese people and will be exploited by Communist propaganda.

The armed attack launched upon the Republic of Korea in June 1950, emphasized the need for speedy action on our part. A potential enemy in control of Korea would be in an excellent position to dominate Japan and threaten our security position in the Pacific.

On September 8, 1950, President Truman invited former Senator John Foster Dulles to proceed with all possible speed to work with our allies and conclude a treaty of peace with Japan. One year later, on September 8, 1951, the treaty was formally signed at San Francisco.

As chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee I want to congratulate the executive branch, and particularly the Honorable John Foster Dulles, for the effective way in which these treaties were negotiated. From the very beginning, Senator Dulles conferred with the Foreign Relations Committee and he kept in constant touch with us throughout the negotiations. Since the conclusion of the United Nations Charter, I believe that the Japanese Peace Treaty represents a high-water mark in the development of closer executive-legislative team work in the formulation of foreign policy. It is significant that eight members of the Senate were named by the President to serve as members of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Peace Conference.

Before discussing the treaty itself, let me make it clear that the conclusion of such a treaty with Japan involves risks. Japan is a virile nation. She has an industrious and ingenious people. She has an efficient productive plant. The peace treaty will give Japan freedom and if a nation is free, she is free to do evil as well as good. A free Japan will be able to do great good or great evil. But there are also great risks involved if we do not end our occupation now and conclude a peace.

There are few things on which Far Eastern experts agree, but almost to a man they believe that the United States would be taking greater risks by refusing to approve a peace treaty now than it would by continuing the occupation. These experts agree that continued occupation of Japan would turn the Japanese people away from the free world and toward totalitarianism. We are in an anomalous position if we occupy and rule Japan while we preach freedom. We would be suspect in Japan for the same reason that the Soviet Union is suspect in the world because it preaches peace but practices war.

Now, Mr. President, let us turn to the treaty itself. I should like to review the main characteristics of the treaty and then review some of the arguments which have been advanced against it.

First. Under the treaty Japan resumes her position of equality in the family of nations with her sovereignty and independence fully restored.

Mr. President, in approaching the Japanese peace settlement we were confronted with two possible alternatives. In view of the terrible losses the Japanese inflicted upon us and our allies, we might have insisted upon a harsh peace, a punitive peace. That is the kind of treaty victorious nations have traditionally thrust upon vanquished countries in the past.

The treaty of Versailles is a case in point. It brought bitterness and resentment in its wake. Hitler came to power largely because of the frustration of a proud people. A harsh, primitive treaty is likely to invite a violent, emotional, and precarious peace.

We determined not to make that kind of peace with Japan. Instead, we offered to the Japanese people a peace of reconciliation without limitations and restrictions which a sovereign state would not voluntarily accept for itself.

Mr. President, this does not mean that our peacemakers were soft-headed. It means that they were dominated by the high ideals for which free people stand.

It means that they realized the desirability of setting Japan free at an early date so that the Japanese people might join with us in the all-important task of building the collective strength of the free world.

I am confident that history will prove us right in this decision. It is unthinkable that we should in any way attempt to relegate Japan forever to the status of a second-rate power.

Second. The treaty gives Japan that minimum security which is absolutely essential if she is to maintain her independence against the internal and external pressures of Soviet imperialism.

Mr. President, we must be realistic. In the Far East we confront a hard fact and not a theory. To give Japan independence without security would be an empty shell. It would be like giving a prisoner freedom in darkest Africa without a gun. He might survive, but the chances would be against him.

It would be a fraud upon the Japanese people to conclude a peace and then withdraw our troops, leaving Japan to the tender mercies of aggressor nations.

Fortunately both our Government and the Government of Japan recognized this simple fact. A little over a year ago the United States let it be known that we would sympathetically consider a request from Japan to leave some of our forces there after the peace treaty comes into effect. This we believed would prevent the creation of a dangerous power vacuum that would otherwise exist if our occupation forces were removed and Japan were left defenseless, threatened on the north by the Soviet and to the west by Communist China.

Prime Minister Yoshida, on behalf of the Japanese Government, and a preponderant majority of the Japanese people, warmly welcomed this suggestion. As a result, article 6 of the peace treaty was born. That article provides that foreign armed forces may be retained in and about Japan pursuant to agreements concluded between Japan and one or more of the Allied Powers. The security pact gives the United States absolute power to put forces into Japan.

I am perfectly aware of the argument, Mr. President, which often comes from Communist quarters, that this arrangement does not really meet with the approval of the Japanese people. "If it were not for the pressure exerted by the United States," the argument runs, "the Japanese would much prefer to have no foreign troops in Japan."

Mr. President, this argument is so completely false that I hesitate to dignify it with an answer. In the first place, I think it is obvious that Japan knows that without some protection while she builds up her own defenses she would be easy prey to the Communists. The Soviet Union covets Japan's industrial strength, as does Communist China. In the second place, wide samplings of public opinion in Japan indicate that a large majority of the people want to develop security relationship with the United States. The 174–45 vote which the upper chamber of the Japanese Diet gave to the treaty would seem to reflect that view. And finally, it is a fact that the United States has not attempted in any way to impose its will upon Japan with respect to the maintenance of American troops in Japan. That matter is covered somewhat more fully in the defense arrangement, by a separate agreement.

There is one further point I would like to make about the security provisions of this treaty. Neither the treaty—nor the security treaty with Japan—imposes any obligations whatsoever upon the United States. We are not obliged to leave any forces in Japan unless we are convinced that such action is in our own national interest. The door is open but we need not enter unless we choose to do so.

Japan has recognized—and is now obligated by the security treaty which I shall discuss in a few minutes—that it is to her advantage to have American troops stationed in Japan.

Third. The treaty gives Japan full opportunity to live and trade in the world and to maintain her economy on a stable basis.

This matter, Mr. President, is of prime importance to the United States. Since the end of the war the United States, as the principal occupying power, has given Japan assistance totaling some $2,000,000,000. Our aid has enabled Japan to keep her head above water.

But clearly we cannot go on indefinitely subsidizing the Japanese economy. Japan must be accorded the opportunity to buy abroad the food and the raw materials she needs to enable her 80,000,000 people to live and to work in a competitive world. She can do so only if she can trade. No other solution is satisfactory either for the United States or for Japan.

That is the main objective of the economic section of the treaty. It wisely refrains from placing heavy economic or financial burdens upon Japan. It imposes no restrictions upon the Japanese economy, and it places no limitations upon Japan's right to trade with other nations. These are generous provisions, and they promise Japan a real opportunity for full economic recovery.

The reparations provisions of the treaty are based upon the same sound principle of encouraging Japan to regain her economic strength as rapidly as possible. No one can doubt that the Japanese inflicted heavy damages upon people and property in the areas they occupied during the war. No one can doubt that many of the resulting claims—they approximate $100,000,000,000—are just and ought to be paid.

But no one could ever expect Japan, with her limited natural resources, to pay a reparations bill of $100,000,000,000. Indeed, if we were to insist upon the payment of reparations sufficient to cover only a small fraction of the claims advanced by injured countries and their nationals, it would result in wrecking the Japanese economy and bringing misery and chaos to Japan. Such chaos would surely be an open invitation to the Communists, and I suspect we would pay for it by calling on our own taxpayers.

While the treaty admits the proposition that Japan should pay for the damages and suffering it caused during the war, it also recognizes that full reparation cannot be made if Japan is to maintain a healthy economy. At the same time, however, Japan does have a substantial number of unemployed people as well as certain industrial capacity which is not fully utilized. The treaty provides that she will negotiate with the Allied Powers to make available the services of the Japanese people in production, salvaging, and other work. I believe that she can compensate in a small way for some of the damage she has done.

With these basic principles in mind, I should like to review now some of the main arguments which have been advanced against the treaty:

First. It is argued that the preamble of the treaty imposes upon the United States certain obligations with respect to the universal declaration of human rights. I should like to have Senators give attention to that particular matter.

Mr. President, that is a complete misrepresentation of the facts. It is true that in the preamble of the treaty, Japan alone expresses the intention to strive to realize the objectives of the declaration of human rights. If the Japanese people wish to go on record in this manner, I can see no possible objection to their doing so.

The point I wish to make, however, is this: Since the preamble has no binding legal effect, there is nothing in the treaty which makes human rights a matter of international contract. In any event, the statement in the preamble is a unilateral pronouncement made by the Japanese Government. By no stretch of the imagination does this statement affect American law. I want to make perfectly clear that in ratifying this treaty the United States does not undertake any commitment whatsoever with respect to human rights.

Second. It is argued that the treaty fails to safeguard the interests of American citizens who suffered damages in the occupied areas during the war.

Mr. President, I certainly want to do everything I can to protect the rights of American citizens abroad. But if the United States, as well as our allies, were to insist upon the payment of all such claims, it would impose upon the Japanese economy an impossible burden of well over $100,000,000,000. And obviously we cannot expect the treaty to discriminate against the people of Indonesia, the Philippines, and Australia in favor of American citizens.

On the other hand, if Congress wishes to make the necessary arrangements for the payment of these claims it can do so without further expense to the American taxpayer. There are available under the War Claims Act of 1948 certain funds which resulted from the liquidation of Japanese assets in the United States. A simple amendment of existing law would make it possible for the War Claims Commission to pay these claims, out of such property, as far as that property goes.

Third. It is argued that the treaty, in effect, gives validity to the Yalta Agreement and to the Russian claims over South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands.

On this point, Mr. President, I want to be most emphatic. It is true that, under the terms of the Yalta agreement, former Russian rights in South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands were to be restored after the war. It is true, too, that in accordance with article 2 of the peace treaty, Japan must relinquish sovereignty over all territory formerly occupied by her with the exception of the four home islands.

It does not follow, merely because the treaty leaves uncertain the future status of South Sakhalin and the Kuriles, that the Soviet claim over these areas is validated. Quite the contrary. Article 25 of the treaty expressly provides that—

> The present treaty shall not confer any rights, titles, or benefit on any state which is not an allied power as herein defined—

Later the definition defines Russia as not being an allied power with regard to this treaty—

> to wit, those who signed the peace treaty—

Russia did not sign the peace treaty, and therefore does come within that provision—

> nor shall any right, title, or interest of Japan be deemed to be diminished or prejudiced by any provision of the treaty in favor of a state which is not an allied power as so defined.

There is another specific provision.

Since the Soviet Union did not sign the treaty she is not an allied power as defined by it. Consequently she cannot receive any rights or benefits from it. The declaration of interpretation approved by the committee should certainly dispel any doubt that remains in anyone's mind on this point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I would prefer not to yield at this time. I shall be glad to yield after I have concluded my remarks.

Actually, of course, the peace treaty has nothing to do with the Yalta agreement. The territorial provisions of the treaty, which provide for the renunciation of Japanese sovereignty over certain areas, are based only on the Potsdam surrender terms. The surrender terms were drawn up without the Soviet Union which was not then at war with Japan. They constitute the agreement on which all our occupation rights rest and from which we derive our rights in the Ryukyu and Bonin Islands.

In this connection it might be well to recall the attitude of the Soviet Union. At the San Francisco Conference the Russian delegation officially protested the treaty provisions on the ground that they violate grossly the sovereign rights of the Soviet Union regarding southern Sakhalin and the islands adjacent to it as well as the Kurile Islands and are in flagrant violation of the Yalta agreement. Mr. President, the vigorous opposition which the Russian Government has put forth is enough to convince me that we are on solid ground.

Fourth. It is argued that the treaty will leave the Japanese Government free to restore normal relations with Communist China, and thus adversely affecting the position of the free world in the Pacific area.

Of course, Mr. President, none of us are wise enough to peer into the future and predict what will happen 10 years or even 5 years from now. On the other hand, it is extremely important to know just what relations the present Japanese Government intends to establish with the Nationalist Government of China and with the Chinese Communist regime.

On that score I think we have the best assurances we can get. On December 24, 1951, Prime Minister Yoshida declared in a letter to John Foster Dulles that it was his Government's desire to conclude a treaty reestablishing normal relations with the Nationalist government as soon as that is legally possible. At the same time he insisted that Japan has no intention to conclude a bilateral treaty with the Communist regime. One month later the Prime Minister went even further in expressing a negative position toward the Communists. In view of the hostile attitude of that regime, he declared, it would be impossible to enter into relations of any kind with the government in Peking.

I realize, of course, that the Yoshida letter does not have the same binding effect as an international treaty. But it does make perfectly clear the determination of the present Government of Japan not to recognize the Chinese Communists under existing circumstances.

Fifth. It is argued that once the peace treaty comes into effect the Soviet Union might exercise the right to put occupation troops in Japan on the ground they are still at war with that country.

It is, of course, possible that the Soviet Union might cast about for legal arguments which might justify their occupation of Japan. But whether or not they find legal considerations to satisfy their own perverted legal concepts, it is inconceivable to me that such considerations would either increase or diminish the risk of military action against Japan. Obviously, if they decide to take military action it will be for other than legal reasons.

A few final words, Mr. President, about the three other treaties relating to our security in the Pacific. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, will speak on these treaties in some detail. I will limit my remarks to one or two general observations.

We all agree, of course, that the ratification of the peace treaty before us will not solve the question of war and peace in the Pacific. We must continue to help build the collective strength of the free world in that area, as we are doing in Western Europe. That is the purpose of the three security treaties with Japan, the Philippines, and Australia and New Zealand.

The treaty with Japan grants to the United States the right to station our land, sea, and air forces in and about Japan.

I referred to that point a moment ago in discussing other provisions of the treaty. We are not dependent upon the consent of Japan. The treaty gives us the right to station our land, sea, and air forces in and about Japan. That is a right and not a duty. We are under no legal obligation to leave our boys in Japan any longer than we wish. Now I do not mean to imply that the United States will pull out and leave Japan to her own devices in the face of Soviet aggression. The Japanese people know that the freedom and independence of their country is of great importance to us and to the cause of world peace.

It has been argued in some quarters that if our Armed Forces remain in Japan they will somehow be under the jurisdiction of the United Nations and that the U. N. would have the right to terminate our use of Japanese bases. This is a fanciful argument which has no basis in fact. Under the security treaty with Japan we have the right to maintain our Armed Forces in and about Japan as long as we—as long as we—think it is in the interest of peace in that area to do so. It is purely within our discretion.

This right is not subject to any qualification whatsoever. The United Nations cannot bring the right to an end nor is the exercise of that right in any sense dependent upon United Nations approval.

The treaties with the Philippines and with Australia and New Zealand further develop the principle of collective security for the Pacific area. In these treaties, in the words of the Monroe Doctrine, we and our friends make clear to any potential aggressor that an armed attack in that area on any of the parties would be considered as dangerous to our peace and safety. We further agree to take action to meet any such dangers in accordance with our constitutional processes.

Mr. President, I need not remind the Senate that hesitation and uncertainty on the part of the free world merely invite aggression. These treaties tend to remove that doubt and uncertainty by making clear in advance the determination of free countries to stand together in defense of their liberty. They should serve as a deterrent to the aggressive designs of imperialist countries and a real stimulus to the cause of world peace.

In conclusion let me say that many Members of the Senate are anxious to do whatever can be done to clarify the position of the United States in the Far East. Here is an opportunity for us to

resume the initiative in a forward-looking, progressive way. The free world needs Japan and Japan needs the free world. The opportunity is here. The cause is impelling. Let us proceed to ratify these treaties without delay.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the able Senator from Texas. He said that because the Soviet Union had not signed the treaty at San Francisco, therefore it was not an allied power within the meaning of the terms of the treaty. What would be the Senator's position in relation to Communist China? Would the same situation apply with respect to Communist China?

Mr. CONNALLY. Communist China is not an allied power. It would apply to her also.

Mr. KNOWLAND. So the Senator's interpretation is that Communist China would not later be able to come in as, we might say, a façade for the Soviet Union and make claims that they were entitled to the benefits of the treaty?

Mr. CONNALLY. Not at all, according to my view.

Mr. President, these treaties are very important.

I realize the cruel and treacherous attitude of Japan in making the unjustified attack on Pearl Harbor at the beginning of her efforts in the war. There can be no defense of that action; there can be no palliation of it. But, Mr. President, we must face reality. We realize that Japan cannot bear reparations of $100,000,000,000. We recall that at the end of World War I, by means of the Versailles Treaty, Mr. Lloyd George and others demanded very large and extravagant reparations from Germany; but we know that those reparations did not develop. Other things occurred, and other arrangements were made, and those reparations never were paid.

Mr. President, I think it is to our interest and to the interest of the rest of the world that Japan be restored to a place of prominence and a place of power in the Pacific area.

As suggested by the Senator from California, Communist China is not far from Japan. If Japan will resist and will stand up to her professions with respect to these treaties, that will have a deterrent effect on the spread of communism in the Far East.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield again to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because there has been some misunderstanding—perfectly honest misunderstanding, I believe—regarding what was meant in the preamble of the treaty, where it is stated "to strive to realize the objectives of the universal declaration of human rights."

I should like to inquire about it. It relates, does it not, to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which was approved by the United Nations' General Assembly in Paris on December 10, 1948, by a vote of 48 to 0, with 8 countries abstaining? The nations abstaining were the U. S. S. R., the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Saudi Arabia, and the Union of South Africa. The Declaration of Human Rights does not apply to the draft of the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights, which has not yet been acted on by the United Nations. Is that correct?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from California is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In view of the circumstances and because I think it may be of interest to all Members of the Senate, I wonder whether the Senator from Texas would object to having printed at this point in the body of the RECORD the Universal Declaration of Human Rights to which I have just referred. It was approved by a vote of 48 to 0, as I have said, but with the Soviet Union and her satellite powers and Saudi Arabia and the Union of South Africa not participating in the vote. I should also like to have printed in the body of the RECORD the 1951 draft of the United Nations Covenant on Human Rights.

I may say that that draft is still tentative; it has never been voted on as a whole by any of the United Nations' bodies concerned with it, and the United Nations is still engaged in discussing what should be the substance of the covenant and in what form the substance should be expressed.

After the United Nations has approved the draft text, if it does, in the General Assembly, a determination will then be made by the Government of the United States in regard to whether it should ratify the Covenant.

In order that there may be a very clear distinction between these two documents, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have both of them printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I would not wish to have them printed in my speech.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not suggesting that. However, if the Senator from Texas has finished his speech, I shall make the request in my own right. I think the Senate is entitled to the information.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall not object to that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. With regard to the Declaration of Human Rights, it is not binding on the United States. It is merely a recommendation from the subsidiary committees, and we are not bound by it in any way, regardless of whether it has been ratified by the United Nations or only by the General Assembly. I wish to say that we reserve that right.

In the preamble of the treaty of peace with Japan the declaration or expression regarding Japan's hope is not binding on the treaty or on us; it is merely the expression of a fervent hope on the part of the Japanese. That is their business, not ours. We are under no obligation whatever.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am not suggesting that we are. I am merely trying to obtain some clarity regarding the situation. There has been quite an honest difference of opinion about it, and I think there has been some confusion as between the Declaration of Human Rights and the other document which has not yet been acted on by the United Nations.

If the Senator from Texas has finished his speech and is ready to yield the floor, I shall ask to have these documents inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not quite through; I shall be through in a few moments.

Mr. President, even though the United Nations may have approved that declaration, it is not binding on the United States or on any other country unless the United States or that country adopts that plan. We are not going to adopt it until we get good and ready to do so.

Yes, of course, there is a distinction between that declaration and the other; the other one has not even been adopted by the United Nations. It is merely a recommendation. The recommendation carries no force except that of a recommendation, and we are under no obligation whatever to observe it or adopt it or urge Japan to adopt it. Whether Japan shall adopt it is her business. As I have said, the declaration in the preamble of the treaty of a hope on the part of Japan is merely that and nothing more; it is not a part of the treaty. It does not confer on us any obligation of any character whatever.

I yield now to the Senator from California, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to request the printing of these declarations in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from Texas yields the floor, I should like to have the privilege of asking him a question, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me, and if that will be agreeable to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; so long as it is understood that I may obtain the floor later.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the very excellent presentation he has made, the Senator from Texas has made reference to the question of recognition of the Government of China with which Japan will have relations. The Senator from Texas correctly states the attitude as expressed by the Prime Minister of Japan and the actions that have been taken by Japan, namely, that they propose no recognition of Communist China, and that they have said positively that they would not recognize Communist China, although they did propose to recognize the Nationalist Government located on Formosa.

Is it not true that at the present time they are actually negotiating a treaty with Nationalist China and that they have virtually completed those negotiations?

I do not know whether it may be that by this time the negotiations have been completed. In the press a few days ago I saw that approximately 18 or 20 of the articles of the treaty had been agreed upon, and I believe the treaty originally contained approximately 22 articles.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Alabama that it is my understanding that the Japanese have been negotiating with Nationalist China

and that they are now in the process of drawing up a treaty.

The assurances of the Prime Minister of Japan as to his Government's objection to recognizing the Chinese Communists, of course, is not forever binding, but it indicates an attitude—an attitude of sympathy with us and an attitude of opposition to Communist China, which attitude I respect, and which I believe is sincere. Japan is bound to know, by the generous terms of this treaty, that the United States does not want to crush her into the earth. I believe the Japanese have learned their lesson. I think Hiroshima and Nagasaki had an effect upon the thinking of the Japanese. They are tired of war; they are crushed; they are defeated; they have been humiliated. I believe there has developed in Japan a real spirit of democracy, a desire for free government, and a desire to enjoy the privileges and the opportunities of all other great nations of the world.

I earnestly hope that out of all these transactions there will evolve a new Japan, a Japan with a long look into the future as to her own safety, the development within Japan itself of a free civilization, and the abandonment of the military concept which existed in Japan some years ago. I then observed with alarm and misgiving the military spirit. Troops, cavalry and infantry, were parading the streets. It all resulted in tragedy to Japan. The military caste in Japan succeeded in influencing the Government of Japan to enter World War II, to her eternal disgrace and damnation. I believe that there will be a new spirit in Japan, and that if we can erect, or help erect, or encourage the erection of a strong Japan in the Pacific, it will react to our welfare, and to the welfare of the entire free world, in stopping the aggression of Communist China and other elements in that area with a similar design and a similar ambition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at this time I desire to have several documents printed in the RECORD. I do not intend to speak on the treaty this afternoon, but I hope to do so some time next week. I consider it to be important, however, that several documents be placed in the RECORD.

First, I wish to have printed as a part of my remarks a letter which was addressed to the President of the United States under date of September 12, 1951, reading as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Members of the United States Senate, we are opposed to the recognition of Communist China by the Government of the United States or its admission into the United Nations.

Prior to the submission of the Japanese Treaty to the Senate, we desire to make it clear that we would consider the recognition of Communist China by Japan or the negotiating of a bilateral treaty with the Communist Chinese regime to be adverse to the best interests of the people of both Japan and the United States.

Sincerely yours.

Mr. President, that letter was signed by 56 Members of the Senate of the United States.

I desire next to have printed as a part of my remarks, in the body of the RECORD, release No. 37 of the Department of State, under date of January 16, 1952, which gave the full text of the letter addressed to Ambassador Dulles and signed by Premier Yoshida, of Japan.

I also ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is referred to in the preamble of the treaty, together with the explanatory note which appears on the reverse side of the front cover, pointing out that the Soviet Union and its satellites had opposed this Universal Declaration of Human Rights when it was adopted by the United Nations.

Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, immediately following that, the other document, which has been confused as being the former one, namely, the Draft International Covenant on Human Rights. As I pointed out before, but as I shall repeat now, this draft is still tentative. It has never been voted on as a whole by any of the United Nations bodies concerned with it. The United Nations is still engaged in discussing what the substance of the covenant should be, and in what form the substance should be expressed. After the United Nations shall have approved the draft text in the General Assembly, if it does, a determination will then be made by the Government of the United States as to whether it should ratify the covenant. So, obviously, Mr. President, this document cannot be the one to which reference is made in the preamble of the Japanese Peace Treaty. This begins on page 1008 of the Department of State bulletin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the several documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1952.

Following is the text of a letter from Shigeru Yoshida, Prime Minister of Japan, to John Foster Dulles which was made public by the Prime Minister last night (January 16 Tokyo time):

THE GAIMUSHO,
December 24, 1951.

His Excellency JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AMBASSADOR DULLES: While the Japanese Peace Treaty and the United States-Japan Security Treaty were being debated in the House of Representatives and the House of Councilors of the Diet, a number of questions were put and statements made relative to Japan's future policy toward China. Some of the statements, separated from their context and background, gave rise to misapprehensions which I should like to clear up.

The Japanese Government desires ultimately to have a full measure of political peace and commercial intercourse with China which is Japan's close neighbor.

At the present time it is, we hope, possible to develop that kind of relationship with the National Government of the Republic of China, which has the seat, voice, and vote of China in the United Nations, which exercises actual governmental authority over certain territory, and which maintains diplomatic relations with most of the members of the United Nations. To that end my Government on November 17, 1951, established a Japanese Government Overseas Agency in Formosa, with the consent of the National Government of China. This is the highest form of relationship with other countries which is now permitted to Japan, pending the coming into force of the multilateral treaty of peace. The Japanese Government Overseas Agency in Formosa is important in its personnel, reflecting the importance which my Government attaches to relations with the National Government of the Republic of China. My Government is prepared as soon as legally possible to conclude with the National Government of China, if that Government so desires, a treaty which will reestablish normal relations between the two governments in conformity with the principles set out in the multilateral treaty of peace. The terms of such bilateral treaty shall, in respect of the Republic of China, be applicable to all territories which are now, or which may hereafter be, under the control of the National Government of the Republic of China. We will promptly explore this subject with the National Government of China.

As regards the Chinese Communist regime, that regime stands actually condemned by the United Nations of being an aggressor and in consequence, the United Nations has recommended certain measures against that regime, in which Japan is now concurring and expects to continue to concur when the multilateral treaty of peace comes into force pursuant to the provisions of article 5 (a) (iii), whereby Japan has undertaken "to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter and to refrain from giving assistance to any state against which the United Nations may take preventive or enforcement action." Furthermore, the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance concluded in Moscow in 1950 is virtually a military alliance aimed against Japan. In fact there are many reasons to believe that the Communist regime in China is backing the Japan Communist Party in its program of seeking violently to overthrow the constitutional system and the present Government of Japan. In view of these considerations, I can assure you that the Japanese Government has no intention to conclude a bilateral treaty with the Communist regime of China.

Yours sincerely,

SHIGERU YOSHIDA.

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(Approved by the General Assembly at Its Plenary Meeting on December 10, 1948)

PREAMBLE

Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice, and peace in the world;

Whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common people;

Whereas it is essential, if man is not to be compelled to have recourse, as a last resort, to rebillion against tyranny and oppression, that human rights should be protected by the rule of law;

Whereas it is essential to promote the development of friendly relations between nations;

Whereas the peoples of the United Nations have in the Charter reaffirmed their faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person and in the equal rights of men and women and have determined to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom;

Whereas member states have pledged themselves to achieve, in cooperation with the United Nations, the promotion of universal respect and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

Whereas a common understanding of these rights and freedoms is of the greatest importance for the full realization of this pledge:

Now therefore

The General Assembly,

Proclaims this Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this Declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of member states themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 1

All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.

ARTICLE 2

Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status.

Furthermore, no distinction shall be made on the basis of the political, jurisdictional or international status of the country or territory to which a person belongs, whether it be independent, trust, non-self-governing or under any other limitation of sovereignty.

ARTICLE 3

Everyone has the right to life, liberty and the security of person.

ARTICLE 4

No one shall be held in slavery or servitude: slavery and the slave trades shall be prohibited in all their forms.

ARTICLE 5

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

ARTICLE 6

Everyone has the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

ARTICLE 7

All are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to equal protection of the law. All are entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this Declaration and against any incitement to such discrimination.

ARTICLE 8

Everyone has the right to an effective remedy by the competent national tribunals for acts violating the fundamental rights granted him by the constitution or by the law.

ARTICLE 9

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention or exile.

ARTICLE 10

Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him.

ARTICLE 11

1. Everyone charged with a penal offence has the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law in a public trial at which he has had all the guaranties necessary for his defence.

2. No one shall be held guilty of any penal offense on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a penal offense, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time the penal offense was committed.

ARTICLE 12

No one shall be subjected to arbitrary interference with his privacy, family, home, or correspondence, nor to attacks upon his honor and reputation. Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks.

ARTICLE 13

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state.

2. Everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country.

ARTICLE 14

1. Everyone has the right to seek and to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution.

2. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from nonpolitical crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 15

1. Everyone has the right to a nationality.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his nationality nor denied the right to change his nationality.

ARTICLE 16

1. Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality, or religion, have the right to marry and to found a family. They are entitled to equal rights as to marriage, during marriage and at its dissolution.

2. Marriage shall be entered into only with the free and full consent of the intending spouses.

3. The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is entitled to protection by society and the state.

ARTICLE 17

1. Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others.

2. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

ARTICLE 18

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

ARTICLE 19

Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.

ARTICLE 20

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association.

2. No one may be compelled to belong to an association.

ARTICLE 21

1. Everyone has the right to take part in the government of his country, directly or through freely chosen representatives.

2. Everyone has the right of equal access to public service in his country.

3. The will of the people shall be the basis of the authority of government; this will shall be expressed in periodic and genuine elections which shall be by universal and equal suffrage and shall be held by secret vote or by equivalent free voting procedures.

ARTICLE 22

Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international cooperation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each State, of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality.

ARTICLE 23

1. Everyone has the right to work, to free choice of employment, to just and favorable conditions of work, and to protection against unemployment.

2. Everyone, without any discrimination, has the right to equal pay for equal work.

3. Everyone who works has the right to just and favorable remuneration insuring for himself and his family an existence worthy of human dignity, and supplemented, if necessary, by other means of social protection.

4. Everyone has the right to form and to join trade unions for the protection of his interests.

ARTICLE 24

Everyone has the right to rest and leisure, including reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

ARTICLE 25

1. Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care and necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

2. Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance. All children, whether born in or out of wedlock, shall enjoy the same social protection.

ARTICLE 26

1. Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit.

2. Education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

3. Parents have a prior right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

ARTICLE 27

1. Everyone has the right freely to participate in the cultural life of the community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits.

2. Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary, or artistic production of which he is the author.

ARTICLE 28

Everyone is entitled to a social and international order in which the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration can be fully realized.

ARTICLE 29

1. Everyone has duties to the community in which alone the free and full development of his personality is possible.

2. In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order, and the general welfare in a democratic society.

3. These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 30

Nothing in this declaration may be interpreted as implying for any state, group, or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein.

DRAFT INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON HUMAN RIGHTS

[As revised at the seventh session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, April–May 1951. The Commission at this session drafted the provisions on economic, social, and cultural rights in part III and the implementation provisions in part V and revised the implementation machinery in part IV. Due to the lack of time, the Commission did not consider or make any changes in parts I, II, and VI except with respect to article 72. This draft will be considered by the United Nations Economic and Social Council at its thirteenth session, July–September 1951.]

PREAMBLE

The states parties hereto,

Considering the obligation under the Charter of the United Nations to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and freedoms,

Bearing in mind the Universal Declaration of Human Rights,

Recognizing that the rights and freedoms recognized in this covenant flow from the inherent dignity of the human person,

By this covenant agree upon the following articles with respect to these rights and freedoms.

PART I

Article 1

[This article 1 was initially drafted by the Commission to be applicable only to the articles on civil and political rights in part II. The discussions in the April-May 1951 session of the Commission indicated that the Commission did not intend to have this article applicable to the articles on economic and social rights in part III, except possibly the nondiscrimination provisions of paragraph 1. Due to the lack of time at its April-May 1951 session, however, the Commission did not have an opportunity to clarify these matters by appropriate revisions in this articles.]

1. Each state party hereto undertakes to respect and to insure to all individuals within its territory and subject to its jurisdiction the rights recognized in this covenant, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political, or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.

2. Where not already provided for by existing legislative or other measures, each state undertakes to take the necessary steps, in accordance with its constitutional processes and with the provisions of this covenant, to adopt within a reasonable time such legislative or other measures as may be necessary to give effect to the rights recognized in this covenant.

3. Each state party hereto undertakes to ensure—

(a) That any person whose rights or freedoms as herein recognized are violated shall have an effective remedy, notwithstanding that the violation has been committed by persons acting in an official capacity;

(b) That any person claiming such a remedy shall have his right thereto determined by competent authorities, political, administrative, or judicial;

(c) That the competent authorities shall enforce such remedies when granted.

Article 2

1. In the case of a state of emergency officially proclaimed by the authorities or in the case of public disaster, a state may take measures derogating, to the extent strictly limited by the exigencies of the situation, from its obligations under article 1, paragraph 1, and part II of this covenant.

2. No derogation from articles 3, 4, 5 (paragraphs 1 and 2), 7, 11, 12, and 13 may be made under this provision. No derogation which is otherwise incompatible with international law may be made by a state under this provision.

3. Any state party hereto availing itself of the right of derogation shall inform immediately the other states parties to the covenant, through the intermediary of the Secretary-General, of the provisions from which it has derogated and the date on which it has terminated such derogation.

PART II. CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

Article 3

1. Everyone's right to life shall be protected by law.

2. To take life shall be a crime, save in the execution of a sentence of a court, or in self-defense, or in the case of enforcement measures authorized by the Charter.

3. In countries where capital punishment exists, sentence of death may be imposed only as a penalty for the most serious crimes, pursuant to the sentence of a competent court and in accordance with law not contrary to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

4. Anyone sentenced to death shall have the right to seek amnesty, or pardon, or commutation of the sentence. Amnesty, pardon, or commutation of the sentence of death may be granted in all cases.

Article 4

No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected against his will to medical or scientific experimentation involving risk, where such is not required by his state of physical or mental health.

Article 5

1. No one shall be held in slavery; slavery and the slave trade in all their forms shall be prohibited.

2. No one shall be held in servitude.

3. (a) No one shall be required to perform forced or compulsory labor.

(b) The preceding subparagraph shall not be held to preclude, in countries where imprisonment with hard labor may be imposed as a punishment for a crime, the performance of hard labor in pursuance of a sentence to such punishment by a competent court.

(c) For the purpose of this paragraph the term "forced or compulsory labor" shall not include:

(i) Any work or service, other than work performed in pursuance of a sentence of hard labor required to be done in the course of detention in consequence of a lawful order or a court;

(ii) Any service of a military character or, in the case of conscientious objectors, in countries where they are recognized, service exacted in virtue of laws requiring compulsory national service;

(iii) Any service exacted in cases of emergency or calamity threatening the life or well-being of the community;

(iv) Any work or service which forms part of normal civil obligations.

Article 6

1. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention.

2. No one shall be deprived of his liberty except on such grounds and in accordance with such procedures as are established by law.

3. Anyone who is arrested shall be informed, at the time of arrest, of the reasons for his arrest and shall be promptly informed of any charges against him.

4. Anyone arrested or detained on a criminal charge shall be brought promptly before a judge or other officer authorized by law to exercise judicial power and shall be entitled to trial within a reasonable time or to release. Pending trial, detention shall not be the general rule, but release may be subject to guaranties to appear for trial.

5. Anyone who is deprived of his liberty by arrest or detention shall be entitled to take proceedings by which the lawfulness of his detention shall be decided without delay by a court and his release ordered if the detention is not lawful.

6. Anyone who has been the victim of unlawful arrest or deprivation of liberty shall have an enforceble right to compensation.

Article 7

No one shall be imprisoned merely on the ground of inability to fulfill a contractual obligation.

Article 8

1. Subject to any general law, consistent with the rights recognized in this covenant:

(a) Everyone legally within the territory of a State shall, within that territory, have the right to (i) liberty of movement and (ii) freedom to choose his residence;

(b) Everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own.

2. (a) No one shall be subjected to arbitrary exile;

(b) Subject to the preceding subparagraph, anyone shall be free to enter the country of which he is a national.

Article 9

No alien legally admitted to the territory of a State shall be expelled therefrom except on established legal grounds and according to procedure and safeguards which shall in all cases be provided by law.

Article 10

1. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, or of his rights and obligations in a suit at law, everyone shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing, by an independent and impartial tribunal established by law. The press and public may be excluded from all or part of a trial for reasons of morals, public order, or national security or where the interest of juveniles so requires, or to the extent strictly necessary in the opinion of the court in special circumstances where publicity would prejudice the interest of justice; but the judgment shall be pronounced publicly except where the interest of juveniles otherwise requires.

2. Everyone charged with a criminal offense shall have the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to law. In the determination of any criminal charge against him, everyone shall be entitled to the following minimum guaranties in full equality:

(a) To be informed promptly of the nature and cause of the accusation against him;

(b) To defend himself in person or through legal assistance of his own choosing; to be informed, if he does not have legal assistance, of this right; and to have legal assistance assigned to him in any case where the interests of justice so require and without payment by him in any such case where he does not have sufficient means to pay for it;

(c) To examine, or have examined, the witnesses against him and to obtain compulsory attendance of witnesses in his behalf who are within the jurisdiction and subject to the process of the tribunal;

(d) To have the free assistance of an interpreter if he cannot understand or speak the language used in court;

(e) In the case of juveniles, the procedure shall be such as will take account of their age and the desirability of promoting their rehabilitation.

3. In any case where by a final decision a person has been convicted of a criminal offense and where subsequently a new or

newly discovered fact shows conclusively that there has been a miscarriage of justice, the person who has suffered punishment as a result of such conviction shall be compensated. This compensation shall be awarded to the heirs of a person executed by virtue of an erroneous sentence.

Article 11

1. No one shall be held guilty of any criminal offense on account of any act or omission which did not constitute a criminal offense, under national or international law, at the time when it was committed. Nor shall a heavier penalty be imposed than the one that was applicable at the time when the criminal offense was committed. If, subsequent to the commission of the offense, provision is made by law for the imposition of a lighter penalty, the offender shall benefit thereby.

2. Nothing in this article shall prejudice the trial and punishment of any person for the commission of any act which, at the time when it was committed, was criminal according to the generally recognized principles of law.

Article 12

Everyone shall have the right to recognition everywhere as a person before the law.

Article 13

1. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion. This right shall include freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.

2. Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others.

Article 14

1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.

2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing, or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.

3. The right to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights, freedoms or reputations of others.

Article 15

The right of peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary to ensure national security, public order, the protection of health or morals, or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

Article 16

1. The right of association shall be recognized.

2. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of this right other than those prescribed by law and which are necessary to ensure national security, public order, the protection of health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others.

3. Nothing in this article shall authorize states parties to the Freedom of Association and Protection of the Right to Organize Convention, 1948, to take legislative measures which would prejudice, or to apply the law in such a manner as to prejudice, the guaranties provided for in that convention.

Article 17

All are equal before the law; all shall be accorded equal protection of the law without discrimination on any ground such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political, or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.

Article 18

1. Nothing in this covenant may be interpreted as implying for any State, group, or person any right to engage in any activity or perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms recognized herein or at their limitation to a greater extent than is provided for in this covenant.

2. Nothing in this covenant may be interpreted as limiting or derogating from any of the rights and freedoms which may be guaranteed under the laws of any contracting state or any conventions to which it is a party.

PART III. ECONOMIC, SOCIAL, AND CULTURAL RIGHTS

Article 19

The states parties to the present covenant—

1. Bearing in mind the link between the rights and liberties recognized and defined above, and the economic, social, and cultural rights proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

2. Resolved to combat the scourges, such as famine, disease, poverty, the feeling of insecurity, and ignorance, which take toll of or degrade men, and prevent the free development of their personality;

3. Resolved to strive to insure that every human being shall obtain the food, clothing, shelter, essential for his livelihood and well-being, and shall achieve an adequate standard of living and a continuous improvement of his living material and spiritual conditions;

4. Undertake to take steps, individually and through international cooperation, to the maximum of their available resources with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in this part of the present covenant.

Article 20

Work being the basis of all human endeavor, the states parties to the covenant recognize the right to work, that is to say, the fundamental right of everyone to the opportunity, if he so desires, to gain his living by work which he freely accepts.

Article 21

The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to just and favorable conditions of work, including—

(a) Safe and healthy working conditions;

(b) Minimum remuneration which provides all workers:

(i) With fair wages and equal pay for equal work, and

(ii) A decent living for themselves and their families; and

(c) Reasonable limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay.

Article 22

The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to social security.

Article 23

The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to adequate housing.

Article 24

The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living and the continuous improvement of living conditions.

Article 25

The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest standard of health obtainable. With a view to implementing and safeguarding this right each state party hereto undertakes to provide legislative measures to promote and protect health and, in particular:

(i) to reduce infant mortality and provide for healthy development of the child;

(ii) to improve nutrition, housing, sanitation, recreation, economic and working conditions, and other aspects of environmental hygiene;

(iii) to control epidemic, endemic, and other diseases;

(iv) to provide conditions which would assure the right of all to medical service and medical attention in the event of sickness.

Article 26

The states parties to the convenant recognize that:

(1) special protection should be accorded to maternity and motherhood; and

(2) special measures of protection should be taken on behalf of children and young persons, and that in particular they should not be required to do work likely to hamper their normal development.

Article 27

The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone, in conformity with article 16, to form and join local, national, and international trade unions of his choice for the protection of his economic and social interests.

Article 28

The states parties to the covenant recognize:

1. The right of everyone to education.

2. That educational facilities shall be accessible to all in accordance with the principle of nondiscrimination enunciated in paragraph 1 of article 1 of this covenant.

3. That primary education shall be compulsory and available free to all.

4. That secondary education, in its different forms, including technical and professional secondary education shall be generally available and shall be made progressively free.

5. That higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit and shall be made progressively free.

6. That fundamental education for those persons who have not received or completed the whole period of their primary education shall be encouraged as far as possible.

7. That education shall encourage the full development of the human personality, the strengthening of respect for human rights, and fundamental freedoms and the suppression of all incitement to racial and other hatred. It shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial, ethnic, or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace and enable all persons to participate effectively in a free society.

8. The obligations of states to establish a system of free and compulsory primary education shall not be deemed incompatible with the liberty of parents to choose for their children schools other than those established by the state which conform to minimum standards laid down by the state.

9. In the exercise of any functions which the state assumes in the field of education, it shall have respect for the liberty of parents to insure the religious education of their children in conformity with their own convictions.

Article 29

Each state party to the covenant which, at the time of becoming a party to this covenant, has not been able to secure in its metropolitan territory or other territories under its jurisdiction compulsory primary education, free of charge, undertakes, within 2 years, to work out and adopt a detailed plan of action for the progressive implementation, within a reasonable number of years, to be

fixed in the plan of the principle of compulsory primary education free of charge for all.

Article 30

The states parties to the covenant undertake to encourage by all appropriate means the conservation, the development, and the diffusion of science and culture.

They recognize that it is one of their principal aims to insure conditions which will permit everyone—

1. To take part in cultural life;

2. To enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.

Article 31

The states parties to the covenant recognize the equal right of men and women to the enjoyment of all economic, social, and cultural rights, and particularly of those set forth in this covenant.

Article 32

The states parties to the covenant recognize that in the enjoyment of those rights provided by the state in conformity with this part of the covenant the state may subject such rights only to such limitations as are determined by law only insofar as this may be compatible with the nature of these rights and solely for the purpose of promoting the general welfare in a democratic society.

PART IV

[The implementation machinery set forth in this part of the covenant was initially drafted by the Commission at its March–May 1950 session with respect to the civil and political rights in parts I and II. Due to the lack of time at its April–May 1951 session, the Commission did not decide whether this implementation machinery should also apply to the economic, social, and cultural rights in part III. The discussions in the April–May 1951 session indicated, however, wide sentiment in the Commission against the applicability of this part of the covenant to the economic, social, and cultural rights.]

Article 33

1. With a view to the implementation of the provisions of the International Covenant on Human Rights, there shall be set up a Human Rights Committee, hereinafter referred to as "the committee," composed of nine members with the functions hereinafter provided.

2. The committee shall be composed of nationals of the states parties to the covenant who shall be persons of high moral standing and recognized competence in the field of human rights, consideration being given to the usefulness of the participation of some persons having a judicial or legal experience.

3. The members of the committee shall be elected and shall serve in their personal capacities.

Article 34

1. The members of the committee shall be elected from a list of persons possessing the qualifications prescribed in article 33 and specially nominated for that purpose by the states parties to the covenant.

2. Each state shall nominate at least two and not more than four persons. These persons may be nationals of the nominating state or of any other state party to the covenant.

3. Nominations shall remain valid until new nominations are made for the purpose of the next election under article 39.

A person shall be eligible to be renominated.

Article 35

At least 3 months before the date of each election to the committee, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall address a written request to the states parties to the covenant inviting them, if they have not already submitted their nominations, to submit them within two months.

Article 36

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall prepare a list in alphabetical order of all the persons thus nominated, and submit it to the International Court of Justice and to the states parties to the covenant.

Article 37

1. The Secretary-General of the United Nations, on behalf of the States Parties to the Covenant, shall request the International Court of Justice to elect the members of the committee from the list referred to in article 36 and in accordance with the conditions set out below.

2. On receipt of the list from the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the President of the International Court of Justice shall fix the time of elections for members of the committee.

Article 38

1. No more than one national of any state may be a member of the committee at any time.

2. In the election of the committee consideration shall be given to equitable geographical distribution of membership and to the representation of the main forms of civilization.

The persons elected shall be those who obtain the largest number of votes and an absolute majority of the votes of all the members of the Court.

3. The quorum of nine laid down in article 25, paragraph 3, of the statute of the Court shall apply for the holding of the elections by the Court.

Article 39

The members of the committee shall be elected for a term of 5 years and be eligible for reelection. However, the terms of five of the members elected at the first election shall expire at the end of 2 years. Immediately after the first election the names of the members whose terms expire at the end of the initial period of 2 years shall be chosen by lot by the President of the International Court of Justice.

Article 40

1. Should a vacancy arise, the provisions of articles 35, 36, 37, and 38 shall apply to the election.

2. A member of the committee elected to fill a vacancy shall, if his predecessor's term of office has not expired, hold office for the remainder of that term.

Article 41

A member of the committee shall remain in office until his successor has been elected; but if the committee has, prior to the election of his successor, begun to consider a case, he shall continue to act in that case, and his successor shall not act in that case.

Article 42

The resignation of a member of the committee shall be addressed to the chairman of the committee through the secretary of the committee who shall immediately notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the International Court of Justice.

Article 43

The members of the committee and the secretary, when engaged on the business of the committee, shall enjoy diplomatic privileges and immunities.

Article 44

1. The secretary of the committee shall be appointed by the International Court of Justice from a list of three names submitted by the committee.

2. The candidate obtaining the largest number of votes and an absolute majority of the votes of all the members of the Court shall be declared elected.

3. The quorum of nine laid down in article 25, paragraph 3, of the statute of the Court shall apply for the holding of the election by the Court.

Article 45

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall convene the initial meeting of the committee at the headquarters of the United Nations.

Article 46

The committee shall, at its initial meeting, elect its chairman and vice chairman for the period of 1 year.

Article 47

The committee shall establish its own rules of procedure, but these rules shall provide that:

(a) Seven members shall constitute a quorum;

(b) The work of the committee shall proceed by a majority vote of the members present; in the event of an equality of votes the chairman shall have a casting vote;

(c) All states parties to the covenant having an interest in any matter referred to the committee under article 52 shall have the right to make submissions to the committee in writing.

The states referred to in article 52 shall further have the right to be represented at the hearings of the committee and to make submissions orally.

(d) The committee shall hold hearings and other meetings in closed session.

Article 48

1. After its initial meeting the committee shall meet

(a) at such times as it deems necessary;

(b) when any matter is referred to it under article 52;

(c) when convened by its chairman or at the request of not less than five of its members.

2. The committee shall meet at the permanent headquarters of the United Nations or at Geneva.

Article 49

The secretary of the committee shall attend its meetings, make all necessary arrangements, in accordance with the committee's instructions, for the preparation and conduct of the work, and carry out any other duties assigned to him by the committee.

Article 50

The members and the secretary of the committee shall receive emoluments commensurate with the importance and responsibilities of their office.

Article 51

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall provide the necessary staff and facilities for the committee and its members.

Article 52

1. If a state party to the covenant considers that another state party is not giving effect to a provision of the covenant, it may, by written communication, bring the matter to the attention of that state. Within 3 months after the receipt of the communication, the receiving state shall afford the communicating state an explanation or statement in writing concerning the matter, which should include, to the extent possible and pertinent, references to domestic procedures and remedies taken or pending, or available in the matter.

2. If the matter is not adjusted to the satisfaction of both parties within 6 months after the receipt by the receiving state of the initial communication, either state shall have the right to refer the matter to the committee, by notice given to the Secretary of the committee and to the other state.

3. Subject to the provisions of article 54 below, in serious cases, where human life is endangered the committee may, at the request of a state party to the covenant referred to in paragraph 1 of this article, deal forthwith with the case on receipt of the

initial communication and after notifying the state concerned.

Article 53

The committee shall deal with any matter referred to it under article 52 save that it shall have no power to deal with any matter—

(a) For which any organ or specialized agency of the United Nations competent to do so has established a special procedure by which the states concerned are governed; or

(b) With which the International Court of Justice is seized other than by virtue of article — of the present covenant.

Article 54

Normally, the committee shall deal with a matter referred to it only if available domestic remedies have been invoked and exhausted in the case. This shall not be the rule where the application of the remedies is unreasonably prolonged.

Article 55

In any matter referred to it the committee may call upon the states concerned to supply any relevant information.

Article 56

The committee may recommend to the Economic and Social Council that the Council request the International Court of Justice to give an advisory opinion on any legal question connected with a matter of which the committee is seized.

Article 57

1. Subject to the provisions of article 54, the committee shall ascertain the facts and make available its good offices to the states concerned with a view to a friendly solution of the matter on the basis of respect for human rights as recognized in this covenant.

2. The committee shall, in every case and in no event later than 18 months after the date of receipt of the notice under article 52, draw up a report which will be sent to the states concerned and then communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for publication. The committee shall complete its report as promptly as possible, particularly when requested by one of the states' parties where human life is endangered.

3. If a solution within the terms of paragraph 1 of this article is reached the committee shall confine its report to a brief statemen' of the facts and of the solution reached. If such a solution is not reached, the committee shall state in its report its conclusion on the facts and attach thereto the statements made by the parties to the case.

Article 58

The committee shall submit to the General Assembly, through the Secretary-General, an annual report of its activities.

Article 59

The states parties to this covenant agree not to submit, by way of petition, to the International Court of Justice, except by special agreement, any dispute arising out of the interpretation or application of the covenant in a matter within the competence of the committee.

PART V

[The implementation provisions set forth in this part of the covenant were drafted by the commission at its April–May 1951 session with respect to the economic, social, and cultural rights in part III. The commission left open the question whether these implementation provisions should also apply to the civil and political rights in parts I and II. Sentiment in the commission was divided on this issue.]

Article 60

The states parties to this covenant undertake to submit reports concerning progress made in achieving the observance of these rights in conformity with the following articles and the recommendations which the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council, in the exercise of their general responsibility may make to all the members of the United Nations.

Article 61

1. The states parties shall furnish their reports in stages, in accordance with a program to be established by the Economic and Social Council after consultation with the states parties to this covenant and the specialized agencies concerned.

2. Reports may indicate factors and difficulties affecting the degree of fulfillment of obligations under this part of the covenant.

3. Where relevant information has already previously been furnished to the United Nations or to any specialized agency, the action required by this article may take the form of a precise reference to the information so furnished.

Article 62

Pursuant to its responsibilities under the Charter in the field of human rights, the Economic and Social Council shall make special arrangements with the specialized agencies in respect to their reporting to it on the progress made in achieving the observance of the provisions of this part of the covenant falling within their competence. These reports shall include particulars of decisions and recommendations on such implementation adopted by their competent organs.

Article 63

The Economic and Social Council shall transmit to the Commission on Human Rights for study and recommendation the reports concerning human rights submitted by states, and these concerning human rights submitted by the competent specialized agencies.

Article 64

The states parties directly concerned and the specialized agencies may submit comments to the Economic and Social Council on the report of the Commission on Human Rights.

Article 65

The Economic and Social Council may submit from time to time to the General Assembly, with its own reports, reports summarizing the information made available by the states parties to the covenant directly to the Secretary-General and by the specialized agencies under article — indicating the progress made in achieving general observance of these rights.

Article 66

The Economic and Social Council may submit to the Technical Assistance Board or to any other appropriate international organ the findings contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights which may assist such organs in deciding, each within its competence, on the advisability of international measures likely to contribute to the progressive implementation of this Covenant.

Article 67

The states parties to the Covenant agree that international action for the achievement of these rights includes such methods as conventions, recommendations, technical assistance, regional and technical meetings and studies with governments.

Article 68

Unless otherwise decided by the Commission on Human Rights or by the Economic and Social Council or requested by the state directly concerned, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall arrange for the publication of the report of the Commission on Human Rights, or reports presented to the Council by specialized agencies, as well as of all decisions and recommendations reached by the Economic and Social Council.

Article 69

Nothing in this covenant shall be interpreted as impairing the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and of the constitutions of the specialized agencies which define the respective responsibilities of the various organs of the United Nations and of the specialized agencies in regard to the matters dealt with in this covenant.

PART VI

Article 70

1. This covenant shall be open for signature and ratification or accession on behalf of any state member of the United Nations or of any nonmember state to which an invitation has been extended by the General Assembly.

2. Ratification of or accession to this covenant shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of ratification or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and as soon as 20 states have deposited such instruments, the covenant shall come into force among them. As regards any state which ratifies or accedes thereafter the covenant shall come into force on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession.

3. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall inform all members of the United Nations, and other states which have signed or acceded, of the deposit of each instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 71

[The consideration of this article was postponed. The United States proposed the following language for this article in the Commission in 1950:

"In the case of a federal state, the following provisions shall apply:

"(a) With respect to any articles of this covenant which are determined in accordance with the constitutional processes of that state to be appropriate in whole or in part for federal action, the obligations of the federal government shall to this extent be the same as those of parties which are not federal states.

"(b) With respect to articles which are determined in accordance with the constitutional processes of that state to be appropriate in whole or in part for action by the constituent states, provinces, or cantons, the federal government shall bring such articles, with favorable recommendations, to the notice of the appropriate authorities of the states, provinces, or cantons at the earliest possible moment."]

Article 72

[Adopted by General Assembly at its 1950 session.]

The provisions of the present covenant shall extend to or be applicable equally to a signatory metropolitan state and to all the territories, be they non-self-governing, trust, or colonial territories, which are being administered or governed by such metropolitan state.

Article 73

1. Any state party to the covenant may propose an amendment and file it with the Secretary-General. The Secretary-General shall thereupon communicate the proposed amendment to the states parties to the covenant with a request that they notify him whether they favor a conference of states parties for the purpose of considering and voting upon the proposal. In the event that at least one-third of the states favor such a conference the Secretary-General shall convene the conference under the auspices of the United Nations. Any amendment adopted by a majority of states present and voting at the conference shall be submitted to the General Assembly for approval.

2. Such amendments shall come into force when they have been approved by the General Assembly and accepted by a two-thirds majority of the states parties to the covenant in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

3. When such amendments come into force they shall be binding on these parties which

have accepted them, other parties being still bound by the provisions of the covenant and any earlier amendment which they have accepted.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to say briefly at this time that I believe the Japanese Peace Treaty should have an early ratification. I think it extremely important to the peace and security of this Nation in the Pacific that Japan shall once again take her place among the free nations of the world; and I think she has an opportunity of becoming one of the great stabilizing powers in that area of the world.

I should be less than frank, Mr. President, did I not say that I have been disturbed by the slowness of the completion of the treaty between the Government of Japan and the Government of the Republic of China, which is temporarily on the island of Formosa. I must differ with my able colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. It is my observation that there has been a slowing down process in bringing that treaty to a final culmination. What the purpose of the delay is I am not certain of at the moment, but I have a very definite impression that the Government of Japan has been dragging its feet in the negotiations.

Mr. President, I may be mistaken—I hope that I am mistaken—but in view of the Premier's letter to Mr. Dulles, and in view of the letter sent to the President of the United States by 56 Members of this body, a very clear majority of the Senate of the United States, I hope that there will be no unnecessary delay in the ratification of the agreement between the Government of Japan and the Republic of China on Formosa. Certainly it would seem to me that a great service could be performed if that treaty could be ratified prior to the time the Senate of the United States ratifies the pending treaty, which will be before us possibly for a week's time.

Mr. President, I think that those who have raised some objection to the treaty base, in large part, their doubt as to the advisability of ratifying it on the possibilities of what Japan may do in dealing with Communist China; and certainly if any reservation would at least be worthy of some consideration by the Senate of the United States—and I personally hope it will not be necessary to make any reservation—it would be one which would preclude the placing of a heavy burden of reparations upon Japan for the benefit of Communist China.

I do not believe that either the people of the United States or the Congress of the United States could view with anything but misgivings a negotiation with Communist China which might, under the terms of the treaty, give to Communist China the benefits of reparations, which in effect would mean that the energies of 80,000,000 energetic people of Japan would be put to the use of international communism, as represented by its satellite state, Communist China. I hope that those who are carrying the burden of this treaty on the floor of the United States Senate will give ample assurances and ample documentation that never in the future will the 80,000,000 people of Japan be placed in such a position that they may have to pay reparations to Communist China, thereby building up in Communist China strength which she could use against the United States and the United Nations, as she is doing in Korea at this very moment. I expect to explore that situation further. In the meantime, I hope that the Department of State and those responsible for the treaty on the floor of the Senate will provide some clarification of this point.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to support this treaty, which has been so ably discussed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and I also intend to discuss the security pacts entered into with the Philippines, Austria, and New Zealand.

I had the honor, Mr. President, of being a delegate to the San Francisco conference where these treaties were signed.

The Japanese Peace Treaty and the three related instruments are, in my judgment, outstanding in many respects. They are worthy milestones in Asiatic and world relations.

At the outset, Mr. President, I should like to commend the executive branch for the fine bipartisan and cooperative manner in which it negotiated the treaties. We all know that Ambassador Dulles, a former Republican Senator from New York, was the one principally responsible for negotiating the treaties. He did a grand job in keeping members of the Foreign Relations Committee constantly informed of his negotiations. He consulted with us time and time again to give us a general outline of what was going on. Ultimately the American delegates who signed the treaty, including a number of Members of Congress, were chosen on a completely bipartisan basis.

I should like to spell out at the start what I think the treaty means to America and to the 50 nations which have signed it, and what it means to the people of the earth as they become generally informed as to its contents.

Mr. President, some time ago in my office I had occasion to talk to an Italian newspaperman. The conversation occurred before I went to Europe last summer. The newspaperman spoke to me of what he called the revolutionary American approach to the solution of world problems. He said that until this treaty was negotiated the theory of "to the victor belongs the spoils" always characterized the procedure. He said that America had introduced the revolutionary concept, "to the victor together with the vanquished, belongs the responsibility of building a new world."

We have all come to recognize the truth of that observation. We know, too, that the treaty which we are considering is the result of more than a year of patient consultation with the various signatory nations, both victor and vanquished, and with General MacArthur. Mr. Dulles traveled back and forth. I suppose, if he were to sit down and dictate his experience with the respresentatives of the various nations he talked with in relation to the treaty the result would not only be an interesting document, but it would fill probably several volumes, because, after all, the old idea that to the victor belong the spoils was not dead.

We remember very well the photographs of what occurred to General MacArthur when he landed in Japan immediately after the surrender. The Japanese turned their backs on him as he walked down the street as an indication of what they thought. Then something happened. The victor did not despoil the nation. The victor built not only the material house but the spiritual house of the people. The Japanese at that time could not understand it. Then it finally began to dawn upon them that General MacArthur represented something new in this world, something that they, the Japanese, had never put into practice, something diametrically opposite to the treatment they had accorded peoples whom they had conquered. For the Japanese it was very difficult to think that there was not some hidden motive, something that did not appear on the surface, something that was coming after in the nature of American retribution.

Then this treaty—a treaty between equals—was suggested to the Japanese.

Mr. President, in San Francisco I talked with Japanese representatives, and it was evident that, through General MacArthur's patient and consistent and constructive administration, and by the terms of the treaty, there had dawned upon the Japanese people a recognition of this revolutionary process about which the Italian newspaperman had spoken to me.

Parenthetically, Mr. President, I might say that when I was in Europe in 1947 I noticed that the Germans were very much in doubt as to what the future held in store for them, so far as their conquerors were concerned. They well remembered Versailles.

When I was in Europe last year I visited with Chancelor Adenauer and members of the West German Parliament. I might say that I also talked with members of Parliament in Austria. They spoke openly in our meetings of the new historic concept wherein the conqueror pays the bill and aids and assists financially, morally, and legally to resuscitate the conquered people. I repeat that in Germany, in open public meetings, the people spoke of this new approach.

Let the figures speak for themselves. From 1945 to 1951 we poured $3,250,000,000 into Germany. The Germans remembered what happened after the last World War. From 1945 to 1951 we poured $1,900,000,000 into Japan. Both nations had previously been in wars. They knew what conquerors usually did. They also knew what they themselves did. They never expected to receive such honorable treatment as has been accorded them by the United States.

I know there are some who doubt the lasting effectiveness of this "revolutionary approach." Only the future will tell. But personally I feel that we have translated into action in Japan, Germany, and elsewhere, so far as the human mind can do so, the admonition, "Love thine enemies" and the statement that "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

Will it be an antidote to war? Will it make friends of those nations? Will

it give them the something which is needed so that the peoples of the world can have a new understanding and strive to avoid war? My faith tells me that this kind of a revolution, if that be the proper word for it, will pay dividends in more than material ways.

Mr. President, there are moral laws which we humans only partially comprehend, one of which is: "Cast thy bread upon the waters and it will return a thousandfold."

THIS IS A CHRISTIAN TREATY IN THE HIGHEST SENSE

Let me say quite definitely that the treaty before the Senate today is a Christian treaty in the profoundest sense of our Judeo-Christian culture and in the highest sense of the universal concepts of the world's great faiths.

It is a treaty not of vengeance but of conciliation, a true treaty of peace. I cannot emphasize this too strongly. In our tense and strife-torn world, a world of recriminations, insults, charges, and countercharges, an international act of forgiveness and generosity such as this treaty is a rare and a beautiful thing.

The treaty, unlike so many peace treaties of recent decades, does not punish, does not shackle our former enemy with a guilt clause or with impossible reparations.

REVENGE PACT WOULD MERELY BRING NEW WARS

We are all aware that many of the vindictive treaties of the past, instead of removing the seeds of war and eliminating sources of international tensions which led to war, have themselves become the irritants leading to new conflicts.

I am thinking in particular of the Treaty of Versailles, which was most notorious in this respect, and which helped to precipitate World War II. The Japanese Peace Treaty breaks away from this pattern and sets a new pattern, based on mutual respect. It recognizes that if the free world is to live in peace with Japan, Japan must be treated as a friend and an equal. I am convinced that this treaty, conceived in our Christian heritage, will establish a more durable peace than would a treaty based on revenge.

RESPONSIBILITY IMPOSED UPON JAPAN

The Japanese Peace Treaty restores sovereignty to the Japanese people over their homeland. The generous, statesmanlike terms of the treaty reinstate Japan to the community of nations with dignity, self-respect, equality, and freedom of opportunity. There are no war-guilt clauses; there are no lists of "do's" and "don't's"; there are no inhibitions, prohibitions, or limitations. From the day the treaty enters into effect Japan will be responsible for the conduct of her own affairs at home and abroad.

WE WILL HAVE A PARTNER IN JAPAN

We will gain a free and self-respecting friend in the Pacific. We will gain a partner who has no cause for bitterness, frustration, or revenge, a partner who can hold up his head in the society of nations. Such a partner is worth much more to us than a cringing, sullen, vindictive ex-enemy. A free and democratic Japan can add immeasurably to the hope for peaceful cooperation in the Far East.

This is revolutionary, Mr. President; it is extremely revolutionary. Will it pay dividends? My faith is that it will.

JAPAN CAN BE PROSPEROUS

Mr. President, I refer now specifically to another feature of the Japanese Peace Treaty which is most significant. The treaty does not wreck Japan's economy. It does not demand reparations from Japan which are beyond her capacity to pay. It does not deprive her of access to raw materials and markets. It does not deny Japan a merchant fleet.

In short, the treaty does not saddle Japan with restrictions that would prevent her from earning her own livelihood. That is important. If we were not willing to let Japan earn her own way, economic chaos and social unrest would surely result. The Communists would reap the advantages which they always do from such chaotic conditions. It is therefore my conviction that the economic clauses of the treaty are just and fair and will encourage economic health in the Far East.

Finally, the Japanese treaty will enable Japan to participate fully and freely in world affairs. Because of the remarkable changes that Japan has undergone in the last 6 years, I believe that Japan has a great contribution to make toward peace and stability in its own area and in the free world in general.

It is only natural that we of Wisconsin are proud of our great son, Douglas MacArthur, who was principally responsible for this fact. Never has an occupation been more peaceful, purposeful, and successful.

Let me say, parenthetically, that after General MacArthur was recalled, Senator Dulles consulted with him time and time again about this treaty, and had an understanding with the President to that effect.

Japan during the last 6 years has eliminated the influence of the militarists, instituted freedom of speech, religion, and assembly, and through democratic elections has chosen a responsible and nonaggressive government. This new Japan, with her skilled people, her industries, her culture, can confidently be counted on to play a constructive role in international relations. I look forward toward seeing her take an active part in the affairs of the world.

SECURITY PACTS CONSTITUTE A NEW MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. President, I wish also to comment briefly on the security pacts that must be considered a part and parcel of the Japanese Peace Treaty. These pacts with the Philippines, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand are designed to help bring true security and peace to the Pacific area.

We all know that peace is threatened in the Pacific by the aggressive designs of the Soviet Union and her puppets. Force has brought on war in Korea and Indochina. If the free states of the Pacific do not stand together, they will surely fall one by one.

The network of security treaties before the Senate will help meet threats of aggression.

Oh, they are not a cure-all, they do not foretell the coming of the millennium. The millennium is far off, because the human race and the human mind are far from accepting what is necessary to realize it.

The treaties, however, will constitute a new form of Monroe Doctrine for the western Pacific, a warning that we and our partners in the Pacific would regard any armed attack in that area as a matter dangerous to our personal peace and safety, a danger which we would meet in ways determined by our constitutional processes. This warning achieves two purposes.

In the first place, these treaties assure the states of the Pacific area that aggression from any source will be met by joint action of the interested states. The knowledge that the United States will not stand idly by and watch the Pacific region overrun by force will, in my opinion, give these countries the assurance they need so that they can work for their own and their region's development, and can collaborate in the task of making the Pacific area a safer and better place in which to live.

In the second place, the security of the Pacific area is promoted by the fact that Japan is not left defenseless. Japan gives the United States the right to station armed forces in Japan as long as we deem such action necessary to the defense of Japan.

CIRCUMSTANCES WHICH MAY END NECESSITY OF UNITED STATES BASES

We all hope for the day when we will not have to station American boys in such far-off places as Japan. That day will come when—

(a) Japan can provide for her own security, or

(b) When the United Nations has grown strong enough to command the respect of would-be aggressors, or

(c) When a regional defense system for the Pacific will insure the territorial integrity and independence of the countries there. But until that day the security pact with Japan will prevent Japan from becoming a power vacuum inviting Communist penetration.

The United States needs stability, peace, and freedom in the Pacific. These security treaties will not only help achieve that stability but they will assure us that if any of our possessions or areas under our trusteeship are attacked, our friends in the Pacific will stand with us.

REFUTATION OF CRITICISMS OF PACTS

Mr. President, I should now like to turn to a point-by-point refutation of the criticisms that have been directed against the Japanese Peace Treaty and its companion agreements.

First, one of the major and most often repeated objections made to the Japanese Peace Treaty and the Japanese security pact is that these documents will place Japan and whatever forces we have in Japan under United Nations control. Article IV of the security treaty is cited as the basis for this ob-

jection. Let us, however, see what article IV says:

This treaty shall expire whenever in the opinion of the Governments of the United States of America and Japan there shall have come into force such United Nations arrangements or such alternative individual or collective-security dispositions as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance by the United Nations or otherwise of international peace and security in the Japan area.

What does this mean? It means that unless we want to keep our boys in Japan indefinitely—which I am sure none of my colleagues advocate—the security treaty will have to expire some time. That time will come, the article says, when in our opinion—and I want to stress this—international peace and security in the Japanese area can be assured either by the United Nations, by Japan herself, or by a regional arrangement like the North Atlantic Treaty.

U. N. NOT PLACED IN CONTROL

The point to note is that American troops can and will be stationed in Japan until such time as we are sure that peace and security will prevail there. Does this provision place the United Nations in control? I submit that it does not. Nothing in the treaty compels us to put our forces under the United Nations, as has been alleged by some. On the contrary, the treaties give us the right to station forces in and about Japan as long as we and Japan deem it necessary. The United Nations has nothing to do with this arrangement, except that if the U. N. can assure peace and security in Japan, our boys can come home. As long as our forces are in Japan pursuant to this treaty, they will be under our own control, as they have been. I have already stated that this arrangement is ideally suited to meet the security needs of that area at the present time.

A similar fear is expressed about a possible future regional pact in the Pacific—that such a pact would mean the subjugation of American forces to some foreign commander or organization which would be closely affiliated with the United Nations.

In the first place, of course, no such pact could affect the United States without approval by two-thirds of the Senate. Moreover, our experience with the North Atlantic Treaty has demonstrated that this is not likely to happen even if we become parties to such a pact. NATO is not under the United Nations direction. Our forces in Europe are not under foreign commanders or subject to foreign control.

U. N. IS NO SUPERSTATE

I am concerned at times over frequent statements that the United Nations and organizations like NATO are superstates. This is a very unfortunate misinterpretation or misrepresentation. Neither organization can order us to do anything. They can recommend courses of action, but they cannot commit us to do anything. We are, as always, in control of our own destiny. We will work out our destiny—not in a vaccum—but against the background of world events. I, for one, hope that we shall always have as many friends as possible among the nations of the world and that we will work with our friends toward peace and security. I believe that what America has done since the war ceased is demonstrating to the world that we have nothing but a selfless desire to be helpful, and have in our heart of hearts only one thought, and that is, How can we bring about in the minds of other people a real desire to work for peace?

U. N. AND UNITED STATES ARE PARTNERS

Before taking up the next objection made to the treaties, I do not want to let pass these charges that somehow if we become too involved with the United Nations, we are not being true Americans. The United Nations is an organization which we ourselves helped to create for the purpose of building a better, more peaceful world. It is an organization which on occasion after occasion, has shown that it stands with the United States and freedom and against Soviet imperialism and slavery.

The world has not become so peaceful as we desire, though certainly we have done our share toward making it peaceful; but the fact that it is not peaceful is no reason why we should throw away the instrumentality which at present seems to be about the only hope left by which nations can get together and work out what we hope will be a peaceful solution to their problems. If we recklessly want to turn the world against the United States, if we foolhardily want to toss the free people of the earth into the maw of communism, then let us keep up this line of talk, implying that the United Nations is against the interests of the United States.

I, for one, am glad that we have United Nations forces limited as they are, helping us in Korea today. I think this is probably the first time in the history of centuries that such a thing has occurred. Is it the beginning of a better day of international collaboration when wars come? I hope so.

But for the fact that we made the matter of aggression in Korea a test of the strength of the United Nations, we might very well be going it alone in Korea, as the French are doing in Indochina with our help.

TREATY DOES NOT VALIDATE YALTA

Another regrettably misleading criticism of the Japanese Peace Treaty is the allegation that the treaty carries out the terms of the Yalta agreement. This is not true.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the Yalta Conference agreement, which will be found on page 28 of the report of the committee.

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE YALTA CONFERENCE: FEBRUARY 4–11, 1945

AGREEMENT REGARDING JAPAN

The leaders of the three Great Powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Great Britain—have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies on condition that—

1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved;

2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz:

(a) the southern part of Sakhalin as well as all the islands adjacent to it shall be returned to the Soviet Union,

(b) the commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U. S. S. R. restored,

(c) the Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South-Manchurian Railroad which provides an outlet to Dairen shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria;

3. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

The heads of the three Great Powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the National Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance between the U. S. S. R. and China in order to render assistance to China with its armed forces for the purpose of liberating China from the Japanese yoke.

JOSEPH V. STALIN.
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

FEBRUARY 11, 1945.

Mr. WILEY. The peace treaty gives effect to the Potsdam agreement, which states that Japanese sovereignty is to be limited to the four main Japanese islands.

I now ask that the Potsdam agreement, which is very brief, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the agreement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE POTSDAM CONFERENCE: JULY 17–AUGUST 2, 1945

PROCLAMATION DEFINING TERMS FOR JAPANESE SURRENDER, JULY 26, 1945

1. We—The President of the United States, the President of the National Government of the Republic of China, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain—representing the hundreds of millions of our countrymen, have conferred and agree that Japan shall be given an opportunity to end this war.

2. The prodigious land, sea, and air forces of the United States, the British Empire, and of China, many times reinforced by their armies and air fleets from the west, are poised to strike the final blows upon Japan. This military power is sustained and inspired by the determination of all the Allied Nations to prosecute the war against Japan until she ceases to resist.

3. The result of the futile and senseless German resistance to the might of the aroused free peoples of the world stands forth in awful clarity as an example to the people of Japan. The might that now converges on Japan is immeasurably greater

than that which, when applied to the resisting Nazis, necessarily laid waste to the lands, the industry, and the method of life of the whole German people. The full application of our military power, backed by our resolve, will mean the inevitable and complete destruction of the Japanese armed forces and just as inevitably the utter devastation of the Japanese homeland.

4. The time has come for Japan to decide whether she will continue to be controlled by those self-willed militaristic advisers whose unintelligent calculations have brought the Empire of Japan to the threshold of annhilation or whether she will follow the path of reason.

5. Following are our terms. We will not deviate from them. There are no alternatives. We shall brook no delay.

6. There must be eliminated for all time the authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan into embarking on world conquest, for we insist that a new order of peace, security, and justice will be impossible until irresponsible militarism is driven from the world.

7. Until such a new order is established and until there is convincing proof that Japan's war-making power is destroyed, points in Japanese territory to be designated by the Allies shall be occupied to secure the achievement of the basic objectives we are here setting forth.

8. The terms of the Cairo declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku, and such minor islands as we determine.

9. The Japanese military forces, after being completely disarmed, shall be permitted to return to their homes with the opportunity to lead peaceful and productive lives.

10. We do not intend that the Japanese shall be enslaved as a race or destroyed as a nation, but stern justice shall be meted out to all war criminals, including those who have visited cruelties upon our prisoners. The Japanese Government shall remove all obstacles to the revival and strengthening of democratic tendencies among the Japanese people. Freedom of speech, of religion, and of thought, as well as respect for the fundamental human rights shall be established.

11. Japan shall be permitted to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of just reparations in kind, but not those which would enable her to re-arm for war. To this end, access to, as distinguished from control of, raw materials shall be permitted. Eventual Japanese participation in world trade relations shall be permitted.

12. The occupying forces of the Allies shall be withdrawn from Japan as soon as these objectives have been accomplished and there has been established in accordance with the freely expressed will of the Japanese people a peacefully inclined and responsible government.

13. We call upon the government of Japan to proclaim now the unconditional surrender of all Japanese armed forces, and to provide proper and adequate assurances of their good faith in such action. The alternative for Japan is prompt and utter destruction.

Mr. WILEY. Neither the Potsdam agreement nor the Japanese Peace Treaty contain references to the Yalta agreement, direct or indirect. They do refer to the Cairo agreement, which as the Senate knows, does not mention the Soviet Union, the Kurile Islands, or South Sakhalin and to which the Republic of China was a party.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the minutes of the Cairo conference, which appear on page 28 of the committee report.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CAIRO CONFERENCE, NOVEMBER 22–26, 1943

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, GENERALISSIMO CHIANG KAI-SHEK, AND PRIME MINISTER CHURCHILL, DECEMBER 1, 1943

The several military missions have agreed upon future military operations against Japan. The three great allies expressed their resolve to bring unrelenting pressure against their brutal enemies by sea, land, and air. This pressure is already rising.

The three great allies are fighting this war to restrain and punish the aggression of Japan. They covet no gain for themselves and have no thought of territorial expansion. It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the first World War in 1914, and that all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China. Japan will also be expelled from all other territories which she has taken by violence and greed. The aforesaid three great powers, mindful of the enslavement of the people of Korea, are determined that in due course Korea shall become free and independent.

With these objects in view the three allies in harmony with those of the united nations at war with Japan, will continue to preserve in the serious and prolonged operations necessary to procure the unconditional surrender of Japan.

I OPPOSED YALTA CONCESSIONS

Mr. WILEY. The fact that the treaty carries out the territorial provisions of the Potsdam agreement is not shameful or dishonorable. The Soviet Union is not accorded any rights to the Kuriles and South Sakhalin. Along with many of my colleagues, I hold no brief whatsoever for the Yalta secret agreement. Personally I think it was a very serious mistake. Looking back, many of us can see mistakes which we made individually, or which nations have made.

In order to clear up the confusion that seems to exist in some people's minds about the relationship of the Yalta agreement to the Japanese Peace Treaty, I voted in the Foreign Relations Committee in favor of a statement to be appended to our resolution of ratification. Let me read a part of it:

Nothing in the said treaty * * * implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions in favor of the Soviet Union contained in the so-called Yalta agreement regarding Japan of February 11, 1945.

This statement should remove any reasonable doubts on this question.

RUSSIA OCCUPIES TERRITORIES

I am sorry that we cannot at this time make permanent disposition of the territories taken from Japan by the Japanese Peace Treaty. The treaty leaves the disposition of these areas to future negotiation. The present situation in the Pacific makes it unfortunately impossible to work out a satisfactory agreement on this question. Although Russia is physically in occupation of some of these ceded territories, she has no legal right to them. Short of armed force, however, there is no practical way to remedy that situation. I do not know of anyone who thinks we ought to try to expel Russia from those islands at this time. I am sure that none of my colleagues would advocate the use of such force.

ALLIES' DIFFERENCES ON CHINA PERSIST

Another question that opponents to the treaty have raised is that of the position of China under the treaty. China, as we recall, was not represented at the San Francisco Conference and is mentioned only once in the treaty.

I deeply deplore the circumstances which made this unhappy situation necessary. It indicates some of the difficulties encountered by Mr. Dulles. As Senators will remember, the British had already recognized the Communists, and we had not. Mr. Dulles did a great job in getting 48 nations together. To me it was a moment for great exultation when I saw representatives of the black, white, and yellow races, the various shades of nationalities, sitting together in communion. I observed the Russians and their tactics. I saw an American Secretary of State presiding and doing a grand job. There they were, meeting for one common purpose. To me it was an omen of a better tomorrow. So, Mr. President, I feel that while there may be some clouds on the horizon, there is much to be optimistic about. That was one of the things which gave me a "pick-up."

But with some of the nations of the free world recognizing the Communist regime in China and some recognizing the National Government of China, no agreement on which government of China to invite could be reached. Short of delaying the negotiation of the treaty until China was united under its legitimate government, the only practical solution was not to invite China to become a party to the treaty.

My own sentiments in vigorous opposition to the Red Chinese Government—branded as an aggressor in the eyes of the world—are so well known as not to require elaboration at this point.

Again I digress. This illustrates the situation on the world stage today. It requires a man of great ability to get people who feel so deeply in opposite directions to see a compromise way out of a problem. That is what was done in this case. That is why neither Communist China nor Nationalist China was represented.

FEAR OF JAPAN-RED CHINA AGREEMENT BASELESS

The question of the future policy of Japan toward China cannot be completely resolved at this time. The Japanese Prime Minister has declared in a letter to Ambassador Dulles, however, that "the Japanese Government has no intention to conclude a bilateral treaty with the Communist regime of China." As a matter of fact, within the past few weeks the Japanese Government and the National Government of China have been negotiating a treaty to reestablish normal relations between those two countries.

The fear that Japan may recognize the Red regime in China is completely baseless in my opinion, prewar Japanese trade with the mainland notwithstanding.

In the same category of fears is that which leads some opponents of the treaty to speculate that under the peace

treaty, Red China may be in line to get reparations from Japan, thereby enabling Communist China to help build up Soviet Russia. This fear is apparently heightened by the provision of article X of the peace treaty which states that "Japan renounces all special rights and interests in China."

The fact is, of course, that the National Government of China, while in effective control over all China, did not seize the property of Japan in China. Article X, therefore, merely confirms the acts of the National Government in China. It does not give any new rights to the Communist government. At the same time, it does not try to settle the present Chinese civil war by treaty flat.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield at that point?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Wisconsin is making a very important point, and I believe that considerable confusion exists throughout the country and in Congress with reference to it. Prime Minister Yoshida's letter, of course, relates to the Republic of China. The treaty itself, for reasons which the Senator from Wisconsin and others have stated, does not. It does not name either the Republic of China or the Communist regime in China.

Frankly, I have not been impressed by the argument that the Republic of China should not have been represented because it did not have de facto control on the mainland. As the able Senator from Wisconsin knows, during World War II, when the Nazis had overrun Europe, they occupied all of the Netherlands, all of Denmark, all of Belgium, and all of Poland with the exception of the part Russia had occupied. Yet, even though the Governments of those countries which had been allied with us did not control a foot of their territory, we recognized them certainly as the de jure government of those countries. Their governments in exile existed in London and in other areas outside the Nazi-controlled territory.

In the case of the Republic of China the aggressors who are attacking us in Korea today had driven the Nationalist Chinese off the mainland of China. Nevertheless, the Republic of China, instead of being a government in exile, still maintains jurisdiction over a part of China, namely, the island of Formosa, and the Pescadores.

I hope that in the future the question will not constantly arise that merely because the Nationalist Government does not exercise de facto control on the mainland it should be ignored.

Mr. WILEY. I agree fully that the argument of the distinguished Senator from California is a good legal argument. In his view and in my view the Chinese Nationalist Government is the de jure government.

However, it must be remembered that we were not the only ones consulted. Fifty nations were involved, of which 48 signed the peace treaty. It must be remembered also that when 48 governments get together to agree on a peace treaty there is a possibility that no treaty will be arrived at if we hold out to the letter on what we think is our legal right.

I am satisfied that that was the only reason for the omission of Nationalist China. I know that to be a fact from consultations in the Committee on Foreign Relations and with Mr. Dulles. As was shown by the newspapers at the time, there is considerable dispute as to who was what in China, and as to which government should be recognized. The mere fact that the great British Empire recognized one side and we recognized the other side put in juxtaposition the conflict of nations on a very vital subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. WILEY. I yield further.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct, but the fact remains that in the United Nations the Republic of China, temporarily located on the island of Formosa, is a charter member. It is also one of the big five members of the Security Council. During the whole Korean warfare, which some like to call a police action, the Republic of China has stood steadfastly with the free world. It has voted consistently with the free world in the United Nations. Four days after the aggression took place in Korea the Nationalist Chinese Government offered 33,000 of its best troops to help resist aggression in Korea, which is a larger number of troops than all of the 17 nations who are helping us in Korea have offered up to this very date.

In view of that background and that record, and the fact that the Republic of China is the victim of the same aggressor who tried to overwhelm Korea, it seems to me that we should be very certain in the ratification of this treaty that we do nothing to undermine the Republic of China; but, to the contrary, it seems to me we should do everything it is possible to do to uphold the part of China which still remains free. If continental China is ever to become free again, the seed corn of that freedom is on the island of Formosa.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator from California. I cannot disagree with him. I cannot disagree with his facts or with his logic. However, when we see on the floor of the Senate how easy it is for men in the same party to disagree about what should be done with relation to a bill, or when we see disagreements based on party lines or on geographic lines, it is easy to realize that differences are bound to arise when nations try to get together on some very vital point. It is at such a time that judgment, particularly, is needed.

I was a member of the conference in San Francisco, when the 48 nations signed the peace treaty. The Senator from California and his wife were present also. They, too, thrilled to the experience. It was then that I began to feel that a long step had been taken in the right direction. The mere fact that we could not get our way in everything indicated to me that good judgment had been displayed; and what we were doing was largely the result of the brain work of a former Member of the Senate, Mr. Dulles.

JAPANESE WILL SUPPORT PRO-WEST GOVERNMENT

In a similar vein, the opponents of the treaty fear that the present government of Japan may fall and a government of different political orientation may be elected. In a democracy of course this is a possibility, whether it be the free monarchy of Japan or the Federal Republic of Germany or the French Republic. Changing governments is the prerogative of a free people, a prerogative which I hope we will exercise next November. We would no more want to deprive Japan of this right than we ourselves would want to be deprived of it.

The Japanese people might elect a Communist government. However, I, for one, have full confidence that 6 years of tutelage under Gen. Douglas MacArthur have so convinced the Japanese people of the benefits of the democratic way of life, that they will not succumb to false ideologies. I have faith in continuity of fundamental Japanese orientation toward the west.

We all know that Russia has been Japan's traditional enemy in the Pacific, and the Japanese are firmly anti-Communist.

Mr. President, I have only one doubt: If Indochina should fall, if the Communists should take over all of Southeast Asia, and if the trade routes should be closed, the economic pressures on Japan might become very great, and she might be faced with a question of survival. On the other hand, Japan now has made a good recovery, and has balanced her budget—largely due to the Korean war, as we know—and she is trading with the Philippines. Today Japan is doing more business with Formosa than she did when she had control of Formosa.

However, I do not think the worst will happen in the southeast; at least, I hope it will not. I hope some solution will be found. The French are doing a good job there, as we know, though it has been a tough one. In Indochina the French have spent more than the amount they have received by way of Marshall plan aid. So the only fear I have is as to Japan's situation if the Communists were to take over all of Southeast Asia.

On the other hand, if we contain Russia, I think Japan will be able to do very well with her trade. I do not mean to say that if peace comes, Japan will be foreclosed from trading with the mainland of Asia. After all, we are trading with Russia. I simply mean that I believe Japan has had sufficient contacts with the Communist ideology and the Russians to know that it is sweeter to live with the American ideology and the American way of life or the free way of life the western peoples represent. I am sure Japan is in a position to know what it would mean to become Communist.

Not only that, but, as in the case of a man who suddenly is able to see, after having been blind from the time of his birth, today Japan has her eyes open. She could not live through the 6 years of occupation under General MacArthur and then have a peace treaty such as

this without realizing that there is something new on the world's stage, something which might even be termed a revolution, as it was called by the Italian to whom I made reference a while ago.

Of course, once the treaty is signed, the Japanese people will have a right to go their own way.

Therefore, Mr. President, I submit to my colleagues that the fear to which I have just referred and other fears are without foundation. I believe we can look forward to having a free self-respecting, democratic Japan put her resources and strength on the side of the peaceful, law-abiding nations and their security.

OUR CHINA RELATIONS SEPARATE FROM TREATY

Some opponents of the treaty have devoted a great deal of time in discussing our relations with China. I deplore the present situation in China just as much as they do. I, too, feel that in the past the administration has made many errors in our policy toward China—policies which contributed to the downfall of our Nationalist ally.

But I do not believe that we can change this situation by the treaty terminating war with Japan. Our relations with China are not affected in any way by the treaty. The purpose of this treaty is to make peace with Japan, not to solve the situation in China. Our problems as regards our friendship with the Nationalist Government now on Formosa must be handled separately.

CRITICISM OF PREAMBLE UNFOUNDED

There is one last criticism upon which I wish to comment. This criticism concerns the preamble of the peace treaty with Japan. We already have heard the answer given by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], in regard to the criticism of the preamble. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has clearly outlined the meaning of the preamble, and I shall have just a few words to say about it.

In the preamble, Japan sets forth her intention to observe certain universally accepted standards of international behavior. She declares her readiness to apply for United Nations membership and to act in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter. She undertakes to create in Japan conditions which will promote economic and social progress and higher standards of living. Finally, she agrees to conduct her trade in conformity with internationally accepted fair practices.

THESE DECLARATIONS NOT SUBVERSIVE

Mr. President, I welcome these declarations. Of course, they are only declarations. Yet the opponents would have us believe that there is something subversive in these expressions. What is wrong with having Japan state that she will settle her international disputes by peaceful means, refrain from the use of force against any other state, observe and respect human rights, and work for full employment and higher standards of living?

PREAMBLE NOT BINDING

The opponents argue that if we ratify this treaty we shall assume responsibility for forcing Japan to take these steps. Of course, the preamble of a treaty, like the "whereas" of a resolution, has no legal binding force. It is in the nature of a declaration, a statement of aims and hopes. I expect that Japan will always strive to work toward the achievement of the high aims she has set forth in the preamble of the treaty. We would be remiss in our duty if we did not ask for these declarations. Support of such expressions in no way constitutes a legal commitment on our part over and above anything to which we already have committed ourselves.

Mr. President, those are the main arguments that have been advanced against the treaty. They are, I feel, without foundation.

A year and a half ago General MacArthur, meeting with Secretary of Defense Johnson, General Bradley, and John Foster Dulles, recommended the early ending of the occupation with a treaty of peace and an agreement which would enable the United States to insure peace and security in the area.

These recommendations have been fully adhered to by the treaties now before the Senate. The peace treaty will restore Japan's sovereignty and will bring the occupation to a close. The accompanying security pacts will strengthen the defensive fabric of the whole Pacific area.

MAC ARTHUR'S SAGE WARNINGS

General MacArthur has warned that failure to conclude peace with Japan would be regarded in Japan and Asia as an effort on our part to colonize Japan, and might undo the good results of our occupation. General MacArthur added that limitations on the sovereignty of Japan would serve no useful purpose, because their effectiveness would "be limited by the bitterness and resentment which would thereafter dominate the Japanese mind." We have been assured that General MacArthur still holds these views.

NO RESERVATIONS SHOULD BE ATTACHED

Let us take that warning to heart. General MacArthur knows the Japanese people better than any Member of the Senate does. Therefore, I urge my colleagues, not to attempt to attach any limiting reservations to this treaty. The treaty is the best one that the nations of this world could devise at this time. It represents a great victory for freedom and democracy.

Forty-eight nations have signed the treaty. Forty-eight nations agree that it is the best thing to do now. The only substantial group of states that did not sign the treaty are the Soviet States.

CONCLUSION

As was pointed out at San Francisco by Ambassador Dulles, we should not risk losing something that is very good, just for the sake of hoping to get something that is perfect.

The Japanese Peace Treaty is not perfect by any means; no one assumes that it is. It makes compromises on many points; but the compromises are reasonable, and are intended in good faith, without the sacrifice of any vital principle of honor.

There are a great many doubts and fears concerning the treaty; but as I have indicated, I believe these doubts and fears are groundless.

I believe this treaty will shine in the pages of history as one of the most enlightened documents in man's age-old quest for peace and security. I emphasize that statement, Mr. President, because it expresses my convictions. The treaty is a Christian document. It is symbolic of the revolutionary approach to which I referred. I believe the Japanese Peace Treaty will be reflected in the good will of the 80,000,000 industrious people of Japan. Today they have put away their Samurai swords and are prepared to play a constructive role in the family of nations. They will defend themselves and they will contribute to the defense of the Pacific. They will not be a power vacuum into which Russian communism or Chinese communism can move.

This treaty has been negotiated and debated openly. Millions of Americans saw the debate over television. They heard the Russian delegates present their arguments and try their sabotage techniques.

Millions of people have observed that Soviet Russia has been screaming against this Japanese Peace Treaty. The treaty bodes no good for Russia. It bodes well for the cause of the United Nations.

The treaty should be ratified intact. America, which took the lead in its formulation, should pose no obstacle to its complete fulfillment.

However, America must always make clear that this treaty is but a mechanism, a machine. It will not work unless human hands and human hearts fulfill both its letter and spirit.

Mr. President, a few days ago I placed in the RECORD a statement I had prepared regarding what I consider to be the effect of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1. In connection with that reorganization plan, many references have been made to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Of course, a few years ago Mr. Hoover was not so popular as he is today. However, today he has become so popular that some persons seem to believe that if the Congress enacts a law which incorporates some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, then immediately, ipso facto, that law will bring about perfection and result in the millennium.

Mr. President, I desire to make it plain that this treaty does not accomplish the millennium. It is a compact on the part of 48 nations, with different mental concepts, different spiritual approaches, different economic levels, and different social ideals; and it can be imagined that it will not of itself bring about all at once a fulfillment of the ideal, "on earth peace, good will toward men." But it is a step in the right direction. It is a mechanism. It is an international contract. It will not work unless human hands and human hearts fulfill its spirit, "for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." If the nations follow the spirit of brotherhood, which this treaty exemplifies, then the world will make substantial progress on the road to peace. I respectfully urge my colleagues

to join in ratifying the treaty, without reservation.

VERSAILLES TREATY COMPARED

I have in my hands, Mr. President, a brief comparison, which places in juxtaposition a few of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty as against the provisions of the Japanese Treaty. To some extent, a comparison is extremely difficult, because the Versailles Treaty (a) as it was written and (b) as it utlimately worked out, differed considerably.

Moreover, the treaty of Versailles was so long and so complex that it is difficult indeed to try to sum it up in a few short sentences. Nevertheless I think this little comparison may be of some interest. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FEW COMPARISONS BETWEEN VERSAILLES PEACE TREATY AND JAPANESE TREATY

LENGTH

The whole spirit of the two treaties is expressed in part by the fact that the Japanese Treaty is compressed into a mere 27 articles, whereas the Treaty of Versailles was over 440 articles long, not to mention a great many additional annexes relating to Alsace-Lorraine, etc.

GENERAL APPROACH

The whole approach of the Versailles Treaty was fearfully to impose heavy restrictions on Germany, while that of the Japanese Peace Treaty is to welcome her back to the family of nations on a free, equal, and unrestricted basis.

REPARATIONS

Versailles

A vast system of reparations was imposed upon Germany to the tune of around 80,000,000,000 gold marks which were worth around 40 cents apiece after 1934 devaluation. Germany actually ultimately paid into the reparations account around 21,500,000,000 gold marks which were equivalent to $8,500,000,000.

Japanese Treaty

Under Japense Peace Treaty no specific reparations are imposed upon Japan. However, it is recognized that Japan should negotiate agreements to recompense through resources available to her in surplus supply (such as her manpower and industrial capacity). Thus she will process raw materials for creditor nations without draining her treasury.

TERRITORY

Versailles

Germany lost a vast amount of territory—both lands which she had taken over after the War of 1870, for example, as well as much territory which had been traditionally German. She lost, for example, the free City of Danzig, Memel, control over the Polish corridor, for 15 years control over the Saar, plus much other territory to Belgium, Poland, France, etc.

Japanese Treaty

Under the Japanese Treaty, Japan's 80,000,000 people are henceforth restricted to the four Japanese home islands. Those islands are however maintained intact under her sovereignty. On the other hand, Japan renounces rights to Korea, Formosa, the Kuriles, etc.

TRUSTEESHIP

Versailles

Germany lost vast territories in Africa; and in the Pacific her mandates were turned over to Japan.

Japanese Treaty

Japan loses her overseas empire. The Ryukyu Islands were left under Japanese residual sovereignty, but are placed under United Nations trusteeship with the United States the administrator.

MILITARY

Versailles

Germany's military forces were severely limited. Her army could consist of only 100,000, including officers. Her air force was abolished; her general staff wiped out, conscription eliminated, enlistments made only on a 12-year basis. Her navy was reduced to six battleships.

Japanese Treaty

The Japanese right to self-defense through military, naval, and political forces is recognized.

INTERNATIONAL

Versailles

By Germany's ratification of the Versailles Treaty she also ratified the Covenant of the League of Nations, which was made a part of the Versailles Treaty as was the Constitution of the International Labor Organization.

Japanese Treaty

Japan pledges herself to the fulfillment of the objectives of the United Nations' Charter. She renounces force and threats of force. She may voluntarily enter into collective-security arrangements.

ECONOMIC

Versailles

Germany was deprived of her rights under treaty "most-favored nation" clauses.

Japanese Treaty

Japan is not subject to any permanent discriminations or disabilities. Her economy is unrestricted.

OCCUPATION

Versailles

The left bank of the Rhine was occupied until 1935. Three bridgeheads at Cologne, Coblenz, and Mainz were to be occupied from 5 to 10 to 15 years, respectively.

Japanese Treaty

The Allied occupation of Japan is to end 90 days after ratification of the treaty; thereafter, however, Japan may set aside military bases in accordance with free treaty negotiations.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to compliment both the senior Senator from Texas and the senior Senator from Wisconsin upon their wonderful presentations in support of the Japanese Peace Treaty. It is this bipartisan effort which will help bring peace to this troubled world. Both Senators are to be congratulated upon working together in an effort to bring about the ratification of the treaty without reservations. The presentations of the Senators were to the point, and they should certainly be persuasive to anyone who cares to study the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, unless some other Senator desires to speak upon the treaty this afternoon, I now, as in executive session, move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until Monday, March 17, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

David K. E. Bruce, of Virginia, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Monetary Fund, and United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years, vice James E. Webb.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line and staff corps indicated, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Henry C. Daniel	Wallis F. Petersen
Harold P. Smith	Ira H. Nunn
Thomas C. Ragan	Harry B. Temple
Robert Goldthwaite	John C. Daniel

MEDICAL CORPS

Robert M. Gillett

SUPPLY CORPS

Joseph L. Herlihy
Walter W. Honaker
Frederick L. Hetter

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy with ranks as indicated:

Lt. Comdr. Clay Harrold
Lt. John M. Smith
Lt. (jg) Bernard E. Bassing
Lt. (jg) Rex C. Eaton, Jr.
Lt. (jg) Reginald G. Ferrell
Lt. (jg) Donald J. Loudon
Lt. (jg) Andrew J. Owens
Lt. (jg) Brent C. Rosa
Lt. (jg) Carl A. Young.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy with the rank of ensign:

Paul W. Forehand	John B. Stetson
Theodore J. Larson	Walter R. Wagner
Pharo A. Phelps	Caryll N. Whipple

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (Naval ROTC) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Thomas R. Abernathy	Wallace S. Butler
Stephen M. Albrecht	James A. Campbell, Jr.
John H. Allison, Jr.	
Robert L. Anderson	Leonard "M" Carlman
William D. Anderson	John Cazin, Jr.
James L. Austin	Donald C. Colburn
Jack E. Balalock	Dwain A. Colby
John V. Bancroft	John B. Conkle, Jr.
Richard E. Bellamy	Marion H. Cornell
Donald R. Berg	Robert C. Craig
James L. Blackwell	George B. Crist
Walter F. Bowron	Allan R. Crosby
Albert E. Brewester, Jr.	Thomas L. Curran
	Richard L. Day
Thomas A. Briody	John M. Dean
Leonard B. Brown	George J. Dignan, Jr.
William A. Brown	Eugene T. Dolan
William R. Brown	David S. Doty
Arlan J. Buchman	Earl C. Dugan
William K. Buechl	Ronald P. Dunwell
Philip F. Buran	Jarrell R. Elliott

Albert M. Ellison	Richard T. Metcalfe
Rodolfo R. Enderle	William A. Meyer
Jerry L. Ewing	Robert L. Middlekauff
Thomas R. Fadell	Robert L. Milbrad
Harry W. Farris	Robert B. Milner
John C. Featherstone	Donald L. Moloche
Rudy V. Fimbres	Eugene R. Monson
Ralph D. First	Robert S. Morgan
Joseph P. Flemming	David W. Morrill
James F. Garvin	John D. Murray
Donald L. Gaut	Roger B. Neilson
Paul F. Geerlings	David L. Nelson
William J. Geiger	John M. Nielsen
Richard O. Gillick	Karl W. O'Connor
Thomas P. Goggin	Richard C. Partridge
John F. Gould, Jr.	David R. Pefley
Raymond H. Graham	Bob K. Peterson
Bryce R. Graves	Carl D. Peterson
Thomas N. Greer, Jr.	Richard G. Peterson
D'Wayne Gray	Rhys J. Phillips, Jr.
Thomas F. Gray	Thomas M. Pickford
Claudius J. R Grey	Frank L. Pilar
William J. Hallisey, Jr.	Paul P. Pirhalla
Carl D. Hamilton	James R. Plummer
Francis W. Haskins	George R. Rainoff
William K. Hayden III	Donald J. Rendall
Robert A. Haydock	Joe O. Replogle
Francis J. Heath	William W. Rogers
George L. Heidkamp	John C. Rowett
William R. Henley	John A. Ryan
Harold P. Henrie	Richard G. Scheide
John G. Hoffman	Fredreck R. Schumacher.
Richard F. Hopper	
LeRoy L. Hovde	John E. Seitz
Genaro Huerto	Ronald T. Shawhan
Richard H. Humphreys	Arthur B. Shilan
	Billie D. Simpkins
Barry W. Jackson	Richard L. Sklar
Edward C. Johnson	Silvio J. Spigolon
James P. Johnson	Carlton J. Spring, Jr.
Richard C. Johnson	William E. Starbuck
Richard E. Johnson, Jr.	Thomas H. Staton
	Robert A. Stewart
Gordon S. Jones	Donald Stiggers
Robert F. Jones	Richard D. Taber
Robert W. Jones	James G. Tarr
Jack D. Jorgenson	Robert M. Taylor
Thomas M. Kelly	Joseph P. Till
Charles E. Kilduff	Thomas L. Tobin
William J. Knowles	Theodore S. Topalian
Alfred B. Lang	James P. Turner
Edward A. Langing	Jack L. Underwood
Robert L. Larzalere	David L. Upshaw
Robert L. Leathers	Richard P. Van Dyke
George S. Le Crone	Lawrence A. Van Gorder
Dean L. Levi	
James K. Lippert	Louis D. Volpp
Homer L. Litzenberg III	Donald H. Wahl
	Henry Waterkamp
Harry L. Loflin, Jr.	Gordon "K" Webb
Donald J. Loughlin	Benjamin F. Weems III
Daniel F. Lynch	
Robert L. McCarthy	Karl H. Wegner
Donald G. McCaslin	Albert P. Weiner
Angus G. MacDonnell	Frank K. West, Jr.
Carroll C. McDuffie	Sherman E. Wheeler
Robert J. McKee, Jr.	David H. Will
Earle A. McKeever II	Earl L. Williams
George S. McIsaac	Justin Williams
Walter J. McManus	Roger L. Williams
Arthur A. Macy	William C. Wilson
Howard C. Marchand	William C. Wood
William Q. Martin	George L. Yaney
Roy C. Megargel	

The following named to be ensigns in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Willis E. Bean	Albert C. Harris
Urban J. Bender	Joseph E. Honish
Weldon G. Browne	Wallace R. Howard
Thomas G. Byrne	Samuel L. Huff
Joe W. Cloud	Robert G. Hughes
John F. Costa	Kenton Hypes, Jr.
Harold E. Daniel	Cecil R. Johnson
Louis E. Doucet	John L. Karrer
Wilbur R. Drake	Alfhild L. Larson
Rollin H. Flournoy	Robert K. Lewis
Gale R. Green	Thomas W. Lewis
William J. Green, Jr.	Fred E. Liedtke
Frank O. McClendon, Jr.	Leonard A. Peppler
	William B. Pike
Charles E. McKay	Weller J. Shaffer, Jr.
Kenneth D. Mayfield	John M. Thompson
Robert E. Meyer	David M. Wylie
Orville K. Owen	

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the line (aviation) of the Navy:

ENSIGN

Edward V. Laney, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Reinelda E. Vickey

LIEUTENANT

Mary B. Bucher

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Irvie L. Reese.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard:

Robert E. Wolfard	John H. Hedetniemi
John F. Mundy, Jr.	William C. Jefferies
Roland P. Amateis, Jr.	John C. Parker
	Edward G. Ware
Roy M. Wimer	William E. West, Jr.
Robert F. Hornbeck	Kenneth B. Hofstra
Roland J. Frappier	Edward O. Wille
Edward J. Geissler	Emmett G. McCarthy
Thomas L. Wakefield	

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be ensigns in the United States Coast Guard:

Donald H. Reaume	Arthur G. Morrison
Harold R. Brock	John T. Rouse
Joseph F. Hallameyer	James R. Meeker
Robert B. Matson	Frederick J. Lessing
Glenn D. Jones	Donald J. Riley
George H. Drinkwater	Donald E. Greenamyer
Oscar J. Jahnsen, Jr.	
William J. Spinella	

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 14 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Henry C. Williams, Atmore.
Roy L. Nolen, Jr., Montgomery.
Charles O. Mason, Jr., Pine Hill.

KANSAS

Hazel H. Stoehr, Murdock.
Florian L. Zeller, Paxico.
Sara L. Becker, Vermillion.
Mary A. Mallams, Weir.

PENNSYLVANIA

Robert F. Oliver, New Milford.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, Thou hast ordained that in the leadership of the nations the care of the many must rest upon the shoulders of the few. We beseech Thee, give understanding, humility, and charity to those who in Thy name and for the Nation's sake are entrusted here, in this Chamber of legislation, with the power of governance. Save us from inner friction, from narrow partisanship, from the pursuit of selfish, personal goals which weaken the influence and impact upon a broken world of this land of liberty which may be, in Thy providence, if it keeps the faith, the last best hope for the healing of the nations. When day by day we have done faithfully the work Thou hast given us to do, in quietness and in confidence may we leave the result to Thy unerring judgment, knowing that in the annals of the centuries even the wrath of man may be made to praise Thee. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 14, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On March 12, 1952:

S. 2394. An act to repeal the 10-percent surcharge on postal cards; and

S. 2458. An act to correct a typographical error in Public Law 204, Eighty-second Congress, relating to assistant superintendents in the Motor Vehicle Service of the Post Office Department.

On March 14, 1952:

S. 664. An act to amend section 4 of the act of May 5, 1870, as amended and codified, entitled "An act to provide for the creation of corporations in the District of Columbia by general law," and for other purposes; and

S. 1345. An act to amend acts relating to fees payable to the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1851. An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally; and

H. R. 3219. An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that, as in legislative session, Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION ACT 1952—GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 107)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the legislative branch, Government Printing Office, for the fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION—JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 108)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $4,357,648.58, to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments rendered against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, together with the reports of the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, for the period from July 1, to December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

MID-DECADE CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929, 46 Stat. 25, 13 U. S. C. 216, relating to mid-decade census of agriculture (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

CANCELLATION OF CERTAIN REIMBURSABLE CHARGES AS DEBTS AGAINST CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON SURVEY OF POSTAL SAVINGS SYSTEM

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a survey of the Postal Savings System, dated September 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Resolution 8

"Resolution commending the Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Federal Congress for its action taken in investigating the legal proceedings involving water rights brought by the United States Attorney General against the residents of Fallbrook, Calif., and vicinity; urging the Federal Congress to give prompt consideration to H. R. 5368 in the forthcoming session of the Congress and to prevent further Federal encroachments of this kind; and condemning the action taken by the United States Attorney General

"Whereas the Attorney General of the United States has recently instituted legal proceedings to deprive 14,000 citizens of Fallbrook, Calif., and vicinity of the use of water from the Santa Margarita River, on the theory that when the United States Government acquired Camp Pendleton, across which this river flows, it acquired all of the river's water; and

"Whereas the right of such citizens to use water from this river has been long established by the laws of the State of California; and

"Whereas the action of the United States Attorney General is clearly an attempt to assert a paramount right of the Federal Government to this water, in complete derogation of the laws of the State of California and the rights of the citizens of California under the laws of that State; and

"Whereas a subcommitte of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Federal Congress has investigated this matter and has reported in parts as follows:

" 'Nothing which deve'oped indicated the necessity or any good reason for bringing suit involving thousands of defendants with trifling or nonexisting water claims. No useful purpose is being served by securing a legal and encyclopedic definition of water rights down to the last bucketful. It can be concluded that the legal theorists in the Attorney General's office have unnecessarily put the Federal taxpayers to great expense and the local people to great provocation and legal expense for no practical reason whatever'; and

"Whereas it is apparent that the action of the United States Attorney General illustrates a greedy officialistic and bureaucratic desire to extend the Federal power in direct violation of the sovereignty of the State of California and the rights of its citizens under the laws of that State; and

"Whereas despite the report of the committee, the United States Attorney General has stated that the litigation would continue and that only an order from the entire Congress would compel him to drop the suit; and

"Whereas House bill 5368 has been introduced in the present session of the Congress, designed to require a division of the water involved between the Government and the citizens and to forbid further Federal encroachment; and

"Whereas the Michigan State Senate deems the action of the United States Attorney General in this situation to be a threat to the rights of every citizen of the United States to the use of water and other natural resources, as are guaranteed such citizens under the laws of the several States, which action must be condemned, as well as any similar future attempts to extend the Federal power in derogation of the rights of citizens derived from the laws of the several States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Michigan*, That the action of the Subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, of the Federal Congress, in investigating the encroachment by the Attorney General of the United States on the rights in water of the citizens of Fallbrook, Calif., and vicinity, given such citizens under the laws of the State of California, and in introducing H. R. 5368 as a means of quieting the vexatious litigation instituted by the United States Attorney General against these citizens, is deemed highly commendable; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of Michigan does urge the Congress of the United States to give prompt consideration to H. R. 5368 in the forthcoming session of the Congress and to be ever vigilant in the consideration of ways and means of preventing further encroachments upon and violations of the rights of citizens of the United States guaranteed such citizens by the laws of the respective States in which they reside; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the action of the United States Attorney General is hereby vigorously condemned; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to all Representatives of this State in the Federal Congress; to the Speaker of the United States of Representatives; to the President of the United States Senate; to the chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Federal Congress; to the Governor of the State of California; to Jim Wayman, Ed Berg, and Carroll Huscher, all of Fallbrook, Calif.; to the First Methodist, Christian Science, and Baptist churches of Fallbrook, Calif.; to the United States Attorney General, and to both houses of the Legislature of the State of California."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a single purchasing and surplus property disposal department for the armed services and to provide that supervisory personnel employed by the Federal Government be not awarded extra compensation or additional rating principally by the reason of a large number of employees under supervision.

"Whereas it is evident that the course of world affairs necessitates a large expenditure of money for equipment and supplies for the Armed Forces and that economy dictates that such purchases be made as inexpensively as possible; and

"Whereas the Federal Civil Service Commission presently classifies supervisory Federal personnel, in part, by reference to the number of employees so supervised, which system tends to enlarge the scope of Federal employment and is not conducive to the principles of economy or efficiency: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of the State of Colorado*, That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to enact the necessary legislation to create a single department charged with the purchase and procurement

and surplus property disposal of all of the supplies and equipment required by the Armed Forces of the United States. That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to enact the necessary legislation so as to provide that supervisory personnel in the Federal service do not receive additional civil service credit and rating and the attendant additional salary principally by reason of the fact that such personnel have under their supervision a large number of employees, and that efficiency ratings be made the principal factor in the determination of promotions; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this joint memorial be immediately forwarded to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member from Colorado of the Congress of the United States.

"GORDON ALCOTT,
"President of the Senate.
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"Secretary of the Senate."

The petition of Mrs. Martha E. Hamilton, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide increased pensions for Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by St. Petersburg Townsend Club, No. 1, and senior citizens of Pinellas County, at St. Petersburg, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Mrs. Fred Knecke, of Garnaville, Iowa, remonstrating against the appointment of an ambassador to the Vatican; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a meeting of more than 1,000 farmers—essentially cotton farmers—of the State of Arkansas, at Moscow, Ark., relating to a stabilized price for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the return of the military reservation embraced by Fort De Russy, in Waikiki, to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Mothers' Club of Public School No. 77, Queens, Ridgewood, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to strengthen the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Harbor Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of House bill 5693, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose certain duties upon the importation of tuna fish; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the city and county of Honolulu, relating to the filling of vacancies existing in the Circuit Court of the First Judicial Circuit of the Territory of Hawaii, by the appointment of new judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Kalihi Business Association of Honolulu, Hawaii, endorsing the American citizenship of residents of Kalihi, Honolulu, T. H.; ordered to lie on the table.

PROTEST AGAINST IMPORTATION OF INFECTED MEAT FROM CANADA—MEMORIAL OF GREEN LAKE COUNTY, WIS., FARM BUREAU

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from Conrad L. Naparalla, organization director for the Green Lake County Farm Bureau a memorial adopted at a bureau meeting the other night remonstrating against the importation of meat from lands which have been infected by the dread hoof and mouth disease. I ask unanimous consent that the memorial be printed in the RECORD, including the signatures, and that it thereafter be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, including the signatures, as follows:

GREEN LAKE, WIS., *March 13, 1952.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: We believe that all Mexican and Canadian meat from foot-and-mouth diseased areas should be barred from entry into our country. Please do everything in your power to keep us free from animal and human disease by strict laws and control of further products flooding our markets.

Mr. and Mrs. Willard Murray, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Ed Lichtenburg, Berlin, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Emil J. Schilf, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Joe S. Steeps, Berlin, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Eric Kloe, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Schmuhl, Markesan, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Ben Elvers, Markesan, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Liefko, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Arlo Pitcher, Green Lake, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Leo Page, Berlin, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Edw. Hazlewood, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Carl O. Dumdie, Berlin, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Edward Grusczynski, Ripon, Wis., Mr. and Mrs. Alfred Nuldebrasdt, Ripon, Wis.

GOVERNMENT EXPANSION AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Monday, March 3, the junior Senator from New Jersey addressed the Senate on the subject of Government Expansion at the Federal Level.

In support of his observations there was inserted in the body of the RECORD a resolution of the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Ocean County, N. J., which, as Senators know, is a county unit of government, and a communication from the Governor of New Jersey, with supporting memoranda, all pointing to the problems which are created at the State and local levels of government when the Federal Government expands its land acquisitions beyond its needs.

This morning I received from the Honorable Thomas A. Mathis, former State senator from Ocean County, N. J., a very impressive appeal accompanied by further resolutions directed to precisely the same problems which constituted the subject matter of my remarks of March 3, 1952. I ask unanimous consent that these further resolutions be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks, and appropriately referred, in the hope that the whole matter of land acquisitions may have proper study and consideration.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this committee has been advised that the War Department, or some other agency of the Federal Goverment, proposes to take by condemnation a very large and substantial part of Jackson Township, Ocean County, N. J.; and

Whereas we have been advised that the lands so proposed to be taken constitute valuable privately owned farm lands, a number of dwellings, State of New Jersey Fish and Game Reservation; and State of New Jersey Wild Life Sanctuary; and

Whereas while this committee realizes it is necessary that the Federal Government acquire sufficient lands for defense purposes, it believes that sufficient vacant and unimproved lands in the immediate neighborhood can be acquired without causing the financial losses to this municipality by the taking of such substantial part of improved properties, and that the vacant and unimproved lands which the Government could take for its purposes would serve the Government as well; and

Whereas the Federal Government and its War and Navy Departments have previously taken large areas of this municipality and adjacent municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Township Committee of the Township of Jackson, in the County of Ocean, as follows:

1. That the Federal Government, War Department, and any other interested Federal agency, be and hereby are respectfully requested to take as little land as possible in Jackson Township and to desist from taking valuable farm land, improved properties, State reservations and sanctuaries, particularly in this municipality.

2. The township clerk shall forthwith send a certified copy of this resolution to each of the following:

(a) Hon. H. ALEXANDER SMITH, United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(b) Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, United States Senator, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(c) Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, Congressional Office Building, Washington, D. C.

(d) Hon. Thomas A. Mathis, Toms River, N. J.

Whereas it has been reported to this board that the War Department or some other agency of the Federal Government proposes to take, by condemnation, a very large and substantial part of Plumsted, Jackson, and Manchester Townships in this county;

Whereas this board realizes the necessity of the Federal Government acquiring sufficient lands for defense purposes, it realizes that the Government proposes to take such substantial parts of said municipalities as will cause the townships to be weakened financially by the loss of substantial areas of territory and cause a great hardship to the persons residing in said areas proposed to be condemned;

Whereas large portions of said lands are valuable farming lands, particularly in Plumsted Township, and are needed for agricultural purposes and further that there are other vacant and unimproved lands in this county which could be taken and used for the same purposes without damaging anyone or causing any undue hardship; and

Whereas, the Federal Government and its War and Navy Departments have previously taken large areas of said municipalities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Ocean, as follows:

1. That the Federal Government, War Department, and any other interested Federal agency be and they are hereby respectfully requested to take as little land as possible in our county and to desist from taking valuable farm land and improved properties, particularly in Plumsted Township and Jackson Township, Ocean County, N. J.

2. That the clerk of this board shall forthwith send a certified copy of this resolution

to the War Department and to Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, our Congressman and to our United States Senators, the Honorable ALEXANDER SMITH and the Honorable ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON.

Whereas this committee is informed that the United States Government contemplates taking a large area in Plumsted Township, about 75 percent of which is good tillable farm land and which constitutes about 10 percent of our taxable valuation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this committee opposes any such taking of property in Plumsted Township; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Hon. Thomas A. Mathis, our Congressman JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS, and the Board of Chosen Freeholders of Ocean County.

This is to certify, that at a special meeting of the Township Committee of the Township of Plumsted, in the county of Ocean, held on the 26th day of February 1952, a resolution, of which the foregoing is a true copy, was adopted.

Witness my hand, this 27th day of February, 1952.

KENNETH POTTER,
Chairman.
HOWARD S. ASSON,
Township Clerk.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, to the people of New Jersey, this is a matter of deep concern, as it should be to the people of every State in the Union. I know it must be of deep concern to the people of Illinois. Unless it is curbed, the trend toward overexpansion in Federal land holding may come back to haunt us many times.

LETTER AND RESOLUTIONS OF CALIFORNIA STATE SOCIETY, NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter from Mrs. Ruth Apperson Rous, corresponding secretary of the California State Society of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

This letter transmitted to me copies of resolutions unanimously adopted by the California society at its forty-fourth State conference on February 15, 1952, at Los Angeles, Calif.

These resolutions concern, respectively, communism, Communist literature, socialism, the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, world government, and the United Nations Organization.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mrs. Rous' letter, together with the resolutions in question, may be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter and resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

Ordered to lie on the table:

CALIFORNIA STATE SOCIETY,
DAUGHTERS OF THE
AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
Santa Monica, Calif., February 26, 1952.

Mr. PAT MCCARRAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MCCARRAN: The enclosed resolutions were unanimously passed by the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution at the forty-fourth California State conference on February 15, 1952, at Los Angeles, Calif.

We respectfully call your attention to the resolutions and earnestly hope that they will receive your favorable consideration.

Sincerely,
(Mrs.) RUTH APPERSON ROUS,
Corresponding Secretary.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION ON COMMUNISM

"Whereas shocking disclosures, both by State and Federal Investigating Committees, have exposed the alarming extent of infiltration of Communists, communistic activities and propaganda, influencing every facet of the daily lives of the people of this country; and

"Whereas communism is a godless ideology, dedicated to the overthrow of this country by any means best suited to its purpose; and

"Whereas no group with this declared purpose should be granted the status of a political party through which the promotion of communism can be furthered: and

"Whereas the subterfuge and devious methods used by the advocates of communism to influence the thinking of people of this country, is conclusive proof that the denial of such status would send this ideology underground: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the Forty-fourth Conference of the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, recommends to the President of the United States, the State Department, the Congress of the United States, and any other agency of the Government dealing with this matter that a study be made of appropriate means to accomplish the outlawing of communism as one of the bona fide political parties of the United States, and immediate action taken thereon; and

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, California Members of the Congress of the United States; and any other agency of the United States dealing with this matter and to the resolutions committee of the Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution."

"RESOLUTION ON SOCIALISM

"Whereas thinking people realize that the United States has traveled well along the road toward socialism; and

"Whereas many powers now delegated to the Federal Government do not in themselves constitute socialism, but add up to a Socialist government; and

"Whereas Federal aid to education, Federal housing, socialized medicine, control of electrical power through the ruse of conservation projects, control of the Federal Reserve Board, and major Government holdings in the country's banks, control of credit and Government controls of all kinds, would add up to a Socialist United States; and

"Whereas in a socialistic state the people become the servants of the state, and the state becomes all powerful; and

"Whereas socialism would cost the citizens of the United States their treasured freedoms and independence: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, petition the Congress of the United States to make an over-all survey of the above-proposed legislation, controls, and Federal powers, and oppose all measures which would infringe on amendment 10 of the Constitution of the United States which provides 'that the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.'"

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"RESOLUTION ON COMMUNIST LITERATURE

"Whereas the Soviet Embassy in Washington has mailed an attractive propaganda magazine called the U. S. S. R. Information Bulletin, a semimonthly, to public school libraries and professional organizations of teachers for the past 3 years; and

"Whereas in California a newsletter called The Repeal, urging repeal of the Levering Act, which requires a loyalty oath of all State and local government employees, has been mailed unsolicited to various educational groups; and

"Whereas the Post Office officials say they have no authority to bar communistic propaganda from the United States mail: Be it

"*Resolved*, That Congress be requested to amend the law prohibiting fraudulent and salacious literature to include 'Communist propaganda' from the use of the United States mail; and

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the California Members of the Congress of the United States and to the resolutions committee of the Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION ON UNESCO

"Whereas the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is furthering a campaign to destroy the integrity of our tax supported schools by indoctrinating the teachers and, through the teachers, the children, with the idea that their first loyalty is to a world government, and that they must think of themselves as world citizens; and

"Whereas UNESCO advances the un-American doctrine that the prime function of education must be that of capturing the minds of our children at the earliest possible moment for the cause of political world government; and

"Whereas there has been established by law a United States National Commission for UNESCO which has already completed a study of American world history books in use in our schools with the intent to revise these books, deleting all terms and references which would instill patriotism and love of our country in the minds and hearts of our children, and

"Whereas $600,000 has been given by the United Nations to UNESCO for the writing of a History of Mankind, the Development of Peoples, and

"Whereas there are four men branded as atheists on the editorial committee, and

"Whereas, this book and the revised history books will be subverting the minds of the children of the United States only a few years hence: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the forty-fourth conference of the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, opposes with every means at its command this diabolical corruption of American child minds and of the school system to which they are entrusted; and

"*Resolved*, That the members of the California State Legislature and our California Representatives in the Congress of the United States be petitioned to make immediate investigations into UNESCO activities, including a survey of the United States Commission for UNESCO; the State Department UNESCO staff; the United States Office of Education."

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION ON WORLD GOVERNMENT

"Whereas there are now many well-organized movements, both within and without the United States, for the promotion of a world government; and

"Whereas there is a planned program for use in the schools of the United States, first

to break down loyalty to our country's traditions and institutions, and second, to inculcate ideas of world citizenship and world government in the minds of school children, beginning in the kindergarten; and

"Whereas, world government may be achieved by devious and diabolical means, such as an Atlantic Union, Covenant of Human Rights, Genocide Convention, UNESCO program; and

"Whereas by such federation the United States would lose its sovereignty, the constitutional rights of its citizens would be abrogated, and our men and resources and our very lives would be at the mercy of a representative majority of such a world government because on the basis of proportional representation the United States would have only a minority vote: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, in convention assembled this 15th day of February 1952, reaffirm its unqualified opposition to world government; and

"*Resolved*, That we oppose any world government plan, Atlantic Union, Genocide Convention, Covenant of Human Rights, and the reeducation of our children for world citizenship as being steps toward world government, and

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the California Members of the Congress of the United States and to the resolutions committee of the Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution."

"RESOLUTION ON THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

"Whereas the California State Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, has previously endorsed the ideal of the United Nations as a means of amicably settling world difficulties and disputes; and

"Whereas the United Nations Charter has treaty status in the United States, which takes precedence over the Constitution of the United States or any of its provisions; and

"Whereas the United Nations is evolving into an international federation whose laws, whose fiscal policies, and whose police actions are subject only to that organization, and are slowly and surely destroying the sovereignty of this Nation and drawing us into a world government: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the California State society, Daughters of the American Revolution, petition the Congress of the United States to (1) resume its constitutional powers of legislation in relation to taxation, treaties, and declaring war; (2) stand firm against further encroachment upon the rights of the American people by opposing the proposed Genocide Convention, the Covenant of Human Rights, the Atlantic Union, and that part of the Japanese Treaty which deals with the United Nations Covenant of Human Rights;

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be urged to make thorough investigation of the implications inherent in United Nations actions with the purpose of either (1) repudiating measures which encroach upon the sovereignty of the United States, or (2) withdrawing from the United Nations;

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of resolutions of the Continental Congress, National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment;

S. 420. A bill for the relief of Gloria Wilson (Rept. No. 1311);

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki (Rept. No. 1312);

S. 1037. A bill for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan (Rept. No. 1313);

S. 1422. A bill for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni (Rept. No. 1314);

S. 1679. A bill for the relief of Stephen Gerove (Rept. No. 1315);

S. 2210. A bill for the relief of Richard A. Seidenberg (Rept. No. 1316);

S. 2294. A bill for the relief of Carl Himura (Rept. No. 1317);

S. 2551. A bill for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko (Rept. No. 1318);

S. 2611. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 1319);

H. R. 827. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas (Rept. No. 1320);

H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Calcedonio Tagliarini (Rept. No. 1321);

H. R. 1828. A bill for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer (Rept. No. 1322);

H. R. 1831. A bill to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence (Rept. No. 1323);

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of James Yao (Rept. No. 1324);

H. R. 2923. A bill for the relief of Adelaida Reyes (Rept. No. 1325);

H. R. 3374. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lourdes Augusta Pereira Ladeiro Rose (Rept. No. 1326);

H. R. 4010. A bill for the relief of William Grant Braden, Jr. (Rept. No. 1327);

H. R. 4263. A bill for the relief of Elvira Zachmann (Rept. No. 1328);

H. R. 5347. A bill for the relief of Fusako Terao Scogin (Rept. No. 1329);

H. R. 5389. A bill for the relief of Ching Wong Keau (Mrs. Ching Sen) (Rept. No. 1330); and

H. R. 5558. A bill for the relief of Anna Maria Krause (Rept. No. 1331).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Yuriko Tsutsumi (Rept. No. 1332).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 2672. A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Mueller (Rept. No. 1333).

MRS. CLAIRE PHILLIPS CLAVIER—REFERENCE OF S. 911 TO COURT OF CLAIMS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1334) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 293) reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 911) for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant: *Provided, however*, That the passage of this resolution shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

PROGRESS REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION (REPT. NO. 1310)

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Joint Committee on Defense Production, submitted, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act, Progress Report No. 14, relating to world supply, production, consumption, imports and exports of steel, copper, and aluminum, and domestic requirements and allocations, which was ordered to be printed.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), submitted a report of that committee on persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or for the committee for the month of January 22, 1952, to March 15, 1952, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 17, 1952.

SENATE PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

To the SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of persons employed by the committee who are not full-time employees of the Senate or of the committee for the month of January 22, 1952, to March 15, 1952, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution No. 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

Name of individual and address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Louis W. Sornson, 407 Hamilton Ave., Silver Spring, Md.	Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C.	$8,040

CLYDE R. HOEY,
Chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 17, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2872. A bill to increase the maximum travel allowance for postal transportation clerks, acting postal transportation clerks, and substitute postal transportation clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2873. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. FERGUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2874. A bill for the relief of Demitirous Vasilious Karavogeorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. LEHMAN):

S. 2875. A bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 2876. A bill to equalize certain benefits between and among members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2877. A bill for the relief of Juan Ezcurra and Francisco Ezcurra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 2878. A bill for the relief of Michael D. Singh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2879. A bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—INTERNATIONAL MATERIALS CONFERENCE

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and I ask unanimous consent that I may speak briefly on the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Michigan may proceed.

The bill (S. 2873) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, under the guise of cooperation for defense, an international cartel has been created for the purpose of allocating raw materials among the free nations of the world.

This is the International Materials Conference—IMC—created by the State Department last year at the urging of Prime Minister Attlee.

Originating with the United Kingdom, United States and France, the IMC now consists of a central group of 8 nations which, with its commodity subcommittees, govern the world distribution of raw materials to more than 40 nations.

This body now fixes the amount of copper, zinc, sulfur, nickel, cobalt, and newsprint we may consume, how much of our own production we may sell to ourselves, and how much we must deliver to other nations, according to a master plan.

The International Materials Conference has no statutory authority. It claims only powers of recommendation. Nevertheless, its dictates have the force of law in the United States because they are implemented by the allocation and price-control powers of the Defense Production Act.

This international control over our material resources and requirements through the mechanism of the DPA and the OPS has denied vital materials to American producers with the result that serious unemployment has already developed in many areas of the United States.

These same materials that would have kept American workers employed and American consumers satisfied have been diverted to foreign nations without regard to their contribution to the common defense effort and without any requirements that they be used in the production of defense equipment.

This is a situation which threatens to undermine the American standard of living by an international application of the Marxian doctrine of taking from those who have, and handing it out to others according to need. The IMC is the first step in a master plan to control and distribute the world's natural resources.

The Congress now has an opportunity to destroy this cartel by amending the Defense Production Act so that the powers granted for defense cannot be usurped by this unauthorized international group.

I first brought the International Materials Conference to the attention of the Senate on January 31, and at that time, I said that I shall introduce an amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1951 or any extension thereof to make it perfectly clear to everyone, including the State Department personnel, that no foreign nations nor their representatives shall in any way exercise any of the authority conferred by any act of this Congress.

The bill which I have introduced is designed to make it impossible for this administration to usurp the powers of the Defense Production Act for unauthorized purposes in the future.

NATIONAL LITERACY EDUCATION ACT OF 1952

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, earlier today, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], I introduced a bill (S. 2875) to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the bill together with an article, Literacy and the National Welfare, which I have written for the March 1952 issue of the magazine School Life, the official journal of the United States Office of Education.

There being no objection, the bill and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "National Literacy Education Act of 1952."

FINDING AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that—

(a) Whereas, according to the 1940 census, more than 10,000,000 of the adult citizens of the United States had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling and were accordingly to be accounted as functionally illiterate; and

(b) Whereas the United States was by reason of this widespread adult illiteracy deprived of the fullest use of its military and industrial manpower during World War II; and

(c) Whereas the lack of basic elementary education among these millions of citizens, both native and foreign-born, constitutes a continuing national problem of great magnitude and urgency in time of peace, as well as war, because it increases the amount of ill health and poverty, retards economic development, and impedes the personal growth and social contribution of citizens in a democracy; and

(d) Whereas the excessively high illiteracy rate in the United States and our programs for reducing it have a direct influence on our international relations; and

(e) Whereas the States are making progress in providing general elementary education for all their children, which will aid eventually in preventing the recurrence of illiteracy among adults;

(f) Now, therefore, it is declared to be the policy of the Congress in the promotion of the general welfare and in the interest of national security to assist the several States in speedily removing adult illiteracy in the United States by the establishment and maintenance of programs of basic elementary education for adults, for a period not to exceed 10 years, which period may be materially shortened by the speed with which such a program is established and the progress made by the States in their general elementary education programs.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this act—

(a) The term "State" means the several States and possessions and the District of Columbia;

(b) The term "basic elementary education" means education designed to develop the ability to read, write, speak, and understand the English language, to perform elementary arithmetical computations, and to understand the main features of our constitutional republican form of Government and of our American way of life, equivalent to the ability of the average person who has completed 4 years of schooling;

(c) The term "adult" means any person beyond the compulsory school age who is not enrolled in a regular full-time day school;

(d) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education in the Federal Security Agency;

(e) The term "State educational agency" means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer); or (2) a board of education controlling

the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia, it shall mean the board of education;

(f) The term "minority race" means any race or racial group which constitutes a minority of the population of the United States;

(g) The term "equitable apportionment" of the funds provided under this act for the benefit of minority races in a State which maintains by law separate schools for such races, means any plan of distribution which results in the expenditure for the benefit of such minority race, of a proportion of such funds not less than the proportion that the number of the functionally illiterate adults of such minority race in such State bears to the number of functionally illiterate adults in the total population of that State;

(h) The term "index of ability" means the percent that the State per capita income is of the national per capita income for the latest year available as reported by the Department of Commerce. The "inverse ratio" of the index of ability is obtained by subtracting the State index of ability from 200 percent.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 4. In order to promote the development and maintenance by the States of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the sum of $5,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, the sum of $10,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for each succeeding fiscal year through June 30, 1961, the sum of $15,000,000; and for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1962 and 1963, the sum of $5,000,000. The funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be used for making payments to the States which have submitted and had approved by the Commissioner applications for funds as set forth in section 5 hereof for carrying out the purposes of this act.

STATE APPLICATIONS

SEC. 5 (a) In order to be approved by the Commissioner, a State application for funds shall—

(1) designate the State educational agency to be responsible for the administration, or for the supervision of the administration, of a program of basic elementary education for adults within the State;

(2) outline the State plan for a program of basic elementary education for adults which shall include provisions for the organization and conduct of classes for adult illiterates, for the training of teachers and supervisors for such classes, and for the fostering of research, experimentation, and demonstration in educational institutions or other approved agencies or organizations in cooperation with local public-school authorities of improved methods and materials for use in such classes;

(3) provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official shall act as custodian of funds made available to the State under this act and shall expend the same only on warrant of the State educational agency;

(4) provide that the State educational agency shall make reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and give the Commissioner upon demand access to the records upon which such information is based;

(5) provide for the designation of a State advisory council of not less than seven persons representing the major interested groups to consult with the State educational agency in planning and promoting the State program of basic elementary education for adults; and

(6) provide, in States which by law maintain separate schools for minority races, for an equitable apportionment of funds secured under this act for the benefit of such races.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State application for funds which complies with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

PAYMENTS TO STATES

SEC. 6. (a) Not less than 98 percent of the funds appropriated under section 4 of this act shall be distributed to the States in the following manner: Each State for which a State application under section 5 has been approved shall be entitled to an allotment from any appropriation made pursuant to section 4 of the sum obtained by multiplying (1) the sum which bears the same ratio to the total amount of such appropriation as the number of adults in such State who have not completed the fifth year of school, according to latest figures available as reported by the Bureau of the Census, bears to the total number of such adults in the United States, by (2) the inverse ratio of the State's index of ability. In the event the funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 4 of this act are insufficient to pay to all eligible States the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State, computed in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the amount to be paid to each eligible State shall bear the same ratio to the amount of the Federal allotment to such States as such appropriation bears to the sum of the Federal allotment to all eligible States: *Provided*, That no State's entitlement shall be less than $10,000. The Commissioner shall, before August 15 of each fiscal year, estimate the sum to which each State is entitled under this section during that fiscal year and shall thereupon certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated, reduced, or increased as the case may be, by any sum by which the Commissioner finds that his estimate for a prior year was greater or less than the amount to which the State was entitled for such year. The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Commissioner, the amount so certified.

(b) Any funds paid to a State under this section and not expended for the purpose for which paid shall be repaid to the Treasurer of the United States. Sums allotted to a State for any fiscal year for the purposes of this act and unencumbered at the end of such year shall remain available to such State for the next fiscal year (and for such year only) in addition to sums allotted to such States for the next fiscal year.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACT

SEC. 7. (a) This act shall be administered by the Commissioner under the supervision of the Federal Security Administrator and with the advice of an advisory council composed of persons representing the major interested groups. The Comissioner, with the approval of the Administrator, is authorized to promulgate such rules and regulations and to perform such other functions as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided herein, nothing in this act shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee the right to exercise any supervision or control over the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, methods, or materials of instruction in any State with respect to which any funds had been or may be expended under this act.

(c) The Commissioner shall annually report to the Congress upon his administration of this act, including the progress made by the several States in the removal of adult illiteracy and any related matters.

[From School Life for March 1952]

Excerpts from

LITERACY AND THE NATIONAL WELFARE

(By HARLEY M. KILGORE, Senator from West Virginia)

I am pleased to have the opportunity to express my views on the problem of illiteracy to the Nation through the columns of School Life. My interest in the problem is of long standing. It goes back to the days when I, just out of the University of West Virginia, taught public school in my native State. Later, as judge of the criminal court of Raleigh County, W. Va., I saw at first hand many of the tragic results of illiteracy.

It will be remembered that in 1948, I introduced a bill in the second session of the Eightieth Congress to assist the States in the removal of the blot from our Nation. I again introduced a similar bill in 1949 in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. And it is my intention to continue to do everything in my power to solve this problem until the Nation is aroused to its importance and the Congress assumes its responsibility in the matter. The reasons for my interest are fundamental, and may be stated very simply and directly.

ILLITERACY SLOWS NATIONAL DEFENSE

Adult illiteracy is a serious problem to our defense authorities. The loss in manpower because of illiteracy during the last war is well known. The number of men rejected by the Selective Service System would have made 40 army divisions. Even today, with our limited mobilization, the military could do a much more effective and speedy job of preparation if they did not have to contend with the illiterates. It is estimated that approximately 75,000 male youths who are functionally illiterate (had completed fewer than 5 years of schooling) reach registration age each year, and that the corresponding number of females is approximately 50,000. Unless means are provided to lift this mass of undereducated youth to a level of functional literacy, and if we face all-out mobilization, the Defense Establishment will find itself saddled with the burden of training as was the case during the last war. To the extent to which this is necessary, it will, of course, divert the time and energies of the military from their primary task of defense.

ILLITERACY RETARDS ECONOMIC GROWTH

Our economic strength is an important link in our defense program. The industrial and agricultural activities which are at the foundation of our economic strength are becoming highly mechanized, requiring an ever-increasing amount of literacy. Lack of ability to read makes the illiterate a menace to himself and his fellows in industry and prevents the agricultural worker from benefiting fully from the services of Government bulletins, county agents, and other sources of helpfulness. The products of industry and farm are second only to manpower in our defense efforts. Anything, therefore, which impedes their flow, as does illiteracy, is an enemy within our ranks. It retards economic growth and development and should be stopped without delay.

Normally, when our economic establishment should be geared to the scientific and technological progress of our times, illiteracy is as much of a deterrent as in times of emergency. It is well known that industrial wages and farm income of individuals, communities and States rise in proportion to the rise in literacy. Retail sales also are closely related to literacy. The flow of interstate commerce, the interdependence of individuals and groups, and the elimination of geographical boundaries by modern transportation and communication facilities are more and more becoming matters of national concern. And anything which affects them,

as does illiteracy, becomes a national responsibility.

LITERACY PROMOTES SOCIAL PROGRESS

Social progress is dependent upon individual progress. One of the most important ingredients of this progress is the ability to use effectively the tools of modern communication. The ability to function effectively as a worker, as a citizen, and as a member of a family is a powerful contributor to the general welfare of society. And the extent to which an individual can communicate with his fellows and understand the printed page, to that extent will he contribute to social advancement. In order to do these things, a command of the skills of communication is necessary. This includes not merely the ability to read and write, but also the ability to speak and listen with discrimination. The complexity and tempo of our civilization make these abilities mandatory. Employers do not want illiterates because they cannot meet the exacting requirements of the average job. The duties of a citizen in a modern community today call for competencies which illiterates do not possess. The relationships among the different members of the family today call for knowledge, skills, appreciations, and attitudes which are almost impossible for the illiterate to acquire. If, therefore, the Nation's progress and welfare depend on the efficiency of its workers, the competenices of its citizens, and the wholesomeness of the relationship of its families, it follows that anything that will contribute to the achievement of these goals—as does literacy—becomes an urgent responsibility of the Nation.

ILLITERACY ENDANGERS DEMOCRACY

Democracy, more than any other form of government, calls for a literate population. Our founding fathers recognized this, however, they did not specifically provide for its achievement in the organic law. Nevertheless, the principle has been so generally accepted that we have established the most comprehensive system of free universal compulsory education found anywhere in the world.

Despite this fact, we still have millions of adult citizens who are illiterate, whose lack of education is a handicap to themselves, and causes them to become a drag on society and a potential menace to our democratic way of life.

In order to function effectively in a democracy, citizens must possess facts about many things and people. If they are to exercise the kind of independent judgment which our representative form of Government requires and are not to be unduly swayed by the rabble-rousers, and the bombardment of mass media, they must think clearly and discriminatingly about those things and people. They cannot think clearly and independently unless they can participate effectively in the arts and skills of communication which is functional literacy.

The extent to which the individual is the cornerstone of our democracy to that extent is it necessary that there be a high rate of literacy among all groups of our population, because, as I have often said, "talk about 'democracy' and 'our way of life' is largely unintelligible to illiterates."

The 1950 census data on illiteracy are not yet available. But according to the 1940 data, and the estimates of the Census Bureau in 1947, the problem is extensive and widespread. As I pointed out in my speech in the Senate on June 3, 1948, "the men and women in the United States who are now in the darkness of functional illiteracy are not all foreigers or Negroes, or members of other underprivileged groups. * * * Educators have long known that a grim percentage of our native-born white citizens have had little or no schooling." I also emphasized in that speech a fact which is not generally known—namely, that illiteracy exists throughout the Nation.

LITERACY IS A NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

A national program of action is needed for several reasons: (1) It is needed to equalize the burden of education because many States are not able to support an adequate program of education; (2) since each State must contribute its share to the security of the Nation, it is the responsibility of the Nation to assure the effectiveness of that contribution; and (3) the magnitude and complexity of the problem require a concerted, coordinated, and frontal attack.

A national program of action such as I have been advocating will not only serve our own national needs, but will also contribute directly and indirectly to the strengthening of our international relations.

In the speech referred to earlier, I called attention to our contributions to the UNESCO program. Since that time we have contributed huge sums through ECA and point 4. A national program to eradicate illiteracy in the United States could help furnish the know-how in attacking the problem throughout the world. It is conceivable that such a program would also enable us to supply the many requests that come to us from other lands for teachers and leaders. The significance of this possibility is realized when it is recalled that practically one-half of the population of the world is illiterate, and that communism is making a strong bid for leadership of those masses. If we could thus give a needed emphasis on the human and social aspects of our aid to the world, in addition to our present emphasis on economic and military assistance, I am confident that it would pay handsome dividends—namely, greater faith in our humanitarian and democratic motives.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO ASSENTS OF CONTROLLED OR CONTROLLING STOCKHOLDERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2354) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assents of controlled or controlling stockholders, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF PERSONNEL OF UNIFORMED SERVICES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (f), 362 (g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

REVOCATION OF WATER CARRIER CERTIFICATES AND PERMITS UNDER CERTAIN CONDITIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2364) to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to revoke or amend, under certain conditions, water carrier certificates and permits, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO RESTRICTION OF AGRICULTURAL AND FISH EXEMPTION FOR MOTOR CARRIERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted amendments in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2357) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to restrict the application of the agricultural and fish exemption for motor carriers; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. CAIN:

Transcription of program entitled "What Is the Role of New Japan?" participated in by Senator SPARKMAN and Representative JUDD, of Minnesota, and broadcast on the American Forum of the Air on March 16, 1952.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Statement prepared by him and article entitled "Subsidy at a Profit," written by Peter Edson dealing with the Informational Media Guaranty Contract Service in the Mutual Security Agency.

Editorial entitled "Newbold Morris Strikes Out, Swinging," published in a recent edition of the Daily Plainsman, of South Dakota.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

Editorial entitled "Freedom Unearned Breeds Chaos," published in the Arkansas Democrat of March 14, 1952.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Editorial entitled "We Change, and Why," relating to the St. Lawrence seaway, published in the Indianapolis News of January 30, 1952.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Article entitled "United States Employees Crowd Ships and Planes," published in the March 4 issue of United States News and World Report.

By Mr. MARTIN:

Article entitled "State Obtained Ancient Charter by Mere Chance," written by John Scotzin, and published in the Harrisburg Evening News of March 11, 1952.

Editorial entitled "It Is Congress' Duty, Mr. Morris," published in the Washington Observer of March 13, 1952.

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

Editorial entitled "The Democratic Process Triumphs in India, But a Cloud Appears," published in the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 25, 1952.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

Editorial entitled "The Korean Stalemate," published in the Twin Falls (Idaho) Times-News of March 11, 1952.

By Mr. KEM:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Brannan's Barn Door," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 13, 1952.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

Letter and editorial on the subject of the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

By Mr. MAYBANK:
Article entitled "Russia Making Jets Even Better Than MIG–15s," written by Ansel E. Talbert, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 13, 1952.

MOVEMENT OF STORED GRAIN AND PROSPECTIVE WHEAT CROP—LETTER FROM G. F. GEISSLER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at about this season for the past several years our citizens in the wheat producing areas have become concerned about the movement of stored and loan Commodity Credit Corporation grain, and the prospective new wheat movement.

Last fall the winter wheat producing States planted an increased acreage, and present prospects indicate a very large crop. In Kansas approximately 15,000,000 acres of wheat were planted last fall, and my reports indicate that it has gone through the winter in very good shape, and has substantial subsoil moisture.

A number of grain dealers and elevator operators have expressed concern about the movement of this crop. If some immediate action is not taken, I have every reason to believe we will again be confronted with a boxcar shortage which will delay movement of the Commodity Credit grain, as well as some direct losses to our wheat growers, because of their inability to get the crop into storage facilities.

As I stated, this problem is not new, but it does seem to me there should be some solution to it. Certainly those of us who have had to deal with it had hoped that we might work out a program of staggered maturity dates on grain loans that would partially alleviate this problem.

During my 4 years as Governor of the State of Kansas, we held extensive hearings with representatives of farm organizations, grain dealers, the Department of Agriculture, and transportation agencies, and all were agreed that some action should be taken. In our efforts we had the finest cooperation from the Association of American Railroads, and I pay tribute to Ralph E. Clark of that agency. He personally went into the wheat harvest area and took charge of the boxcar movement. As one who had to deal with it very directly, I wish again to express my appreciation to Mr. Clark and the splendid group of assistants he has in the field.

Recently I again discussed this problem with him, and regret very much that present indications are we must go through the same ordeal again. My hopes for any solution of the problem before the coming harvest were greatly discouraged when I recently received a copy of a letter written by Mr. G. F. Geissler, Administrator of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to Mr. H. F. Easterling, general chairman, Southwest Shippers Advisory Board, Dallas, Tex.

As I interpret Mr. Geissler's letter, the Production Marketing Administration intends to continue using a substantial part of the boxcar supply to move old grain stocks during the period when the new crops are being harvested, rather than to use these cars for the handling of the new crop grains.

I personally think it is more important to get the new crop grains under cover than to move the old grains which have been in suitable storage for long periods.

I am fully aware of the difficulty facing the Production Marketing Administration in regard to the movement of millions of bushels of grain following the maturity dates of the loans and the movement of the new crop within a very short time after they receive title to the stored grain.

I am taking this opportunity to call this matter to the attention of the Senate, as I am confident that next June my office, together with the office of every other Senator from the grain-producing area, will be flooded with requests for assistance in securing needed cars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks a letter written by Mr. G. F. Geissler, administrator of the Commodity Credit Corporation, to Mr. H. F. Easterling, general chairman of the Southwest Shippers Advisory Board, Dallas, Tex.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 6, 1952.

Mr. H. F. EASTERLING,
General Chairman, Southwest Shippers Advisory Board,
Dallas, Texas.

DEAR MR. EASTERLING: This is in reply to your letter of January 13, 1952, recommending that we advance grain loan maturity dates so as to permit the old crop to be moved out of storage prior to May of each year in order to eliminate the excess demand for rail transportation caused by moving the old and new crops during the same period.

We have received, over a period of several years, many requests for advancing, staggering, or retarding price-support program maturity dates. During periods of steady markets, producers want maturity dates retarded to allow them more time in which to take advantage of any rising market that may occur. For example, in the first 3 months of 1951, many requests were received from producers in the Southwest asking that the grain sorghum program maturity date be set back from 60 to 90 days. At the same time, we were receiving resolutions and letters from warehousemen and transportation groups asking for an advance in price-support program maturity dates.

When a program maturity date is established, or consideration is given to changing a program maturity date, all factors affecting all groups concerned must be carefully considered and weighed.

Warehouse storage rates under the uniform grain storage agreement provide for earning a full year's storage charges in the first 200 to 230 days after the date of deposit of the grain with the remainder of the storage year on free time. Because of this, warehousemen are anxious to ship commodities as soon as possible after this earning period ends. Transportation companies have established rates for all grain they carry regardless of when the grain is shipped.

The purpose of price support programs of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to assure the producer a fair price for his commodity. Maturity dates, as established, give producers as much time as possible in which to sell their commodities through the regular channels. The Commodity Credit Corporation does not want grain turned over to it unless trade channels cannot handle it. An advance of maturity dates would tend to defeat this purpose by making a shorter marketing period for producers.

The staggering of maturity dates would not provide all producers with the same opportunity to sell their commodities through trade channels. Producers in an area with early maturity dates would not be in a position to liquidate their loans and dispose of the grain through the trade if market prices advanced during the latter part of the marketing year. Producers in the late maturity date area would be in a position to take advantage of any market increase caused by large amounts of grain being turned over to CCC in the early maturity date area, or market increases due to a later crop report in years of poor crop prospects.

One of the main causes for heavy demands on box cars during harvest time results from changes in methods of harvesting. With the use of modern farm machinery such as combines, the harvest period has been greatly reduced. The Department has attempted to assist in attaining orderly marketing to prevent congestion in transportation and markets by offering grain storage programs whereby producers can hold their commodity on the farm until such time as it can be moved to everyone's advantage. In 1949 a complete study was made of program maturity dates to establish the most satisfactory dates for all groups affected by the maturity date. As a result, the grain sorghum maturity date was advanced from April 30 to March 31, the soybean program maturity date was set back from April 30 to May 31, and the corn program maturity date advanced from August 31 to July 31. The advancing of the grain sorghum maturity date has made it possible to utilize available transportation facilities a month earlier.

While we realize that few, if any, programs are entirely satisfactory to all groups concerned, we believe, for the reasons stated above, that the advancing or staggering of maturity dates is not the practical solution to the transportation problem. We are always open to suggestions to improve programs that will be satisfactory to all groups involved, but, until such time as a better plan is developed, we do not think it advisable to change grain maturity dates.

Your very truly,

G. F. GEISSLER,
Administrator.

PROPOSED RETURN OF GEN. D. D. EISENHOWER

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, as the Senate knows, I am one of those who believe that the period of survival of the free world depends not only on the defense which we in the United States can raise, but also on the maintenance and strengthening of our alliances both in Europe and South America, and also in the Middle East and Far East. This is a program to which I am compelled to adhere by my reason, and which is, I believe, supported by logic. It is a program in which I very deeply believe.

Last week, at a meeting of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I suggested to the committee that we might well consider inviting Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, General of the Army and Supreme Commander of NATO operations, to come home to testify upon the Mutual Security bills, on which we are now holding hearings. After some deliberation on that suggestion it was agreed to postpone further consideration until a later time.

I made the motion on the day the New Hampshire primary was being held, and,

of course, before the results of that primary could be known. I did so because I realized that any suggestion as to any action which General Eisenhower might take on any matter could be commented upon and interpreted as one which was motivated by partisan political considerations. I tried to avoid that as far as I could by making the suggestion before the New Hampshire primary results had come in. We held a meeting on Tuesday morning, while the balloting was still in progress.

The more I saw of the statements which were being made by Members of Congress and by other prominent citizens of the United States relative to what could be done with the mutual security program by way of cutting it and gutting it the more convinced I became that if the program was to be saved for the survival of the United States and of the free world, it was going to be essential for one of the chief architects of this policy, in which he so deeply believes, to return to tell the Foreign Relations Committee, the Congress, and the American people of the faith which I feel is in his heart, and the conviction which he entertains that only through maintenance of our alliance and our strength can we guarantee the survival of this Nation.

So I pointed out to the committee this morning that we had not before us the consideration of the Republican nominee for the Presidency; that we were not designed, tailored, and purposed to scheme on the division of delegates between any candidates in any convention; but that we were there to consider the proposal to appropriate $8,000,000,000 of the money of the people of the United States for the purpose of implementing the NATO agreement. Our military authorities, including General Eisenhower, agree that this program is essential to the security of the United States. About three-quarters of the money would be spent through his command.

I was pleased to read yesterday the dispatches which came from Paris, one quoting General Clay to the effect that he felt certain that if General Eisenhower believed that his testimony was necessary for the proper presentation—nay, the achievement—of the program, he would be quite willing to come home. On the other hand, he was quoted as saying that if he believed that this action was motivated by some partisan purpose, he would decline the invitation. So I take this occasion to say to my friend of many years standing, to whom the American people owe so much, that there is no political motive of any kind behind my motion, but rather the conviction that General Eisenhower will really be embarrassed unless he comes home and supports the program. I see brewing in the Congress an effort so to cut the program as to make it inoperable, and make it a failure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes more.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. McMAHON. This morning the Foreign Relations Committee took a vote on the question of inviting General Eisenhower to return home, leaving to him, of course, the final decision. The vote was 6 to 5 against extending the invitation. On a motion to reconsider, although there was no roll call, I believe I can say that the vote to reconsider was unanimous. It was unanimously agreed that the question would be postponed and raised again, after we had heard from General Gruenther. That is the present status of the matter.

In justice to myself and the deep conviction which I feel regarding the essentiality of the mutual security program and the necessity and the great advisability of bringing to its support before the Congress and the people the man who, as much as any other, was responsible for its initiation a year ago in two appearances before the Congress, I thought it would be an act of statesmanship to see to it that we now mobilize the support which is essential to build the strength necessary to sustain the security and assure the survival of the people of the United States.

THE GENERAL WELFARE CLAUSE—SENATOR HOEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Virginia may proceed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as a boy I recall that my grandfather frequently said: "the tendency of everything is to be more so." As applied to government the French political philosopher, Montesquieu, expressed the same thought when he said:

> The corruption of any government generally begins with the corruption of its principle, and the duration of any given form depends upon the persistence in a given society of the particular principle which is characteristic of that form.

From my viewpoint one of the most unfortunate developments of the past 18 years was the adoption by President Franklin D. Roosevelt of the Hamiltonian view of the general welfare clause of our Constitution. He sold Congress on the view that under the general-welfare clause it had the right to appropriate for anything it saw fit so long as it piously inserted a preamble to the effect that what it proposed to do was for the general welfare. And while his original Court-packing plan failed, he finally succeeded in appointing a majority of the Court that concurred in his views with respect to the general-welfare clause.

As a result, the Congress of the United States, notwithstanding the levying of unprecedented taxes, has proceeded to spend our Nation to the brink of financial disaster and nothing now stands between our people and national bankruptcy except a resolute determination of the Congress to eliminate all unnecessary spending whether it be spending for those purposes which the Constitution authorized the Congress to finance or for the aid of specific groups which the founding fathers never contemplated that Congress would undertake to aid.

Through the years Southern States have sent to the Congress men imbued with the spirit of the founding fathers that the Federal Government was a government of delegated and therefore limited powers, with all other powers reserved to the sovereign States which united to form a more perfect union or to the people thereof.

Virginia is justly proud of the able and patriotic statesmen who through the years her sister State of North Carolina has sent to the Congress—men who believed in economy and efficiency in Government, Democrats who were loyal to the States' rights views of our party founders, Jefferson and Jackson. It was my privilege to serve for 14 years in the House with that noble Roman, ROBERT LEE DOUGHTON, whose decision to retire from public life at the end of his current term is regretted by all who know him. And it has been my privilege for the past 6 years to serve in the Senate with another outstanding statesman, the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], who will be honored by his fellow citizens at a dinner in Raleigh, N. C., next Wednesday evening.

Representative DOUGHTON and the senior Senator from North Carolina, stanch advocates of a central government of limited power and of prudence in taxing and spending, are worthy heirs of that great North Carolinian, Col. Hugh Williamson, who was a member of the Philadelphia convention which framed the Federal Constitution in 1787.

Speaking against the enactment of the Codfisheries Act of February 1792, Williamson said that if Congress established the doctrine of granting bounties under the general-welfare clause, that clause, "in the hands of a good politician may supersede every part of our Constitution and leave us in the hands of time and chance." And with prophetic insight, he foresaw many projects for legislation that are now being advocated each year. He said:

> If Congress can apply money indefinitely to the general welfare and are the sole and supreme judges of the general welfare, they may take the care of religion into their hands; they may establish teachers in every State, county, and parish, and pay them out of the Public Treasury; they may take into their own hands the education of children, establishing in like manner schools throughout the Union; they may undertake the regulation of all roads other than post roads. In short, everything from the highest object of State legislation down to the most minute object of police, would be thrown under the power of Congress; for every object I have mentioned would admit the application of money, and might be called, if Congress pleased, provisions for the general welfare. • • • I, sir, have always conceived—I believe those who proposed the Constitution conceived—that this is not an indefinite Government deriving its power from the general terms prefixed to the specified powers, but a limited Government tied down to the specified powers which explain and define the general terms.

When the senior Senator from North Carolina goes to Raleigh next Wednesday to give an account of his stewardship, I hope that he will convey to the people of North Carolina the genuine appreciation of their neighbors in Virginia that North Carolina has sent to the Congress two such men as DOUGHTON and HOEY and that he will say to them that on both sides of the aisle in the Senate he has colleagues who realize how fundamentally right Col. Hugh Williamson was 160 years ago and who are firmly resolved that they shall stand at this session of the Congress against a type of spending that leads to disaster.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Florida may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] which related to one of the finest persons who has ever been a Member of this body. I refer to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. With his customary modesty the senior Senator from North Carolina immediately fled from the floor of the Senate when he heard the Senator from Virginia begin to praise him for his service and for his high qualities. He still remains absent from the floor.

Mr. President, since, like the Senator from Virginia, I shall find it impossible to be in Raleigh on Wednesday night, because of the fact that I had agreed to remain here on Wednesday to participate in an important hearing of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I wish to associate myself with the praise extended to the senior Senator from North Carolina by the Senator from Virginia, and also to say that one of the rarest privileges and pleasures which has come to me as a Member of this body has been that of being, from the beginning, a desk mate of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina. I am sure I speak for all other Senators when I say that no Senator exceeds him in the high degree of respect in which he is held by every other Member of the Senate.

I think I also speak for every other Member of the Senate when I say that there is no Member of the Senate for whom we have deeper personal affection than we have for the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina. An outstanding lawyer of his State, he is perhaps the only member of the North Carolina bar who has litigated in every county of that great State. He has represented his great State most ably in the Hall of the House of Representatives and also in this body, the Senate of the United States. Between those two services, he rendered to his progressive State, as one of its greatest Governors, 4 years of constructive leadership in that executive office.

So I am sure that every one of us wishes to join with his distinguished fellow citizens of North Carolina next Wednesday night when they pay tribute to a magnificent American, who so ably, conscientiously, and effectively has represented not only his great State but also the American Union as a whole in every position he has taken in this body during his distinguished service as a United States Senator.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON FHA AND VA MORTGAGE LOAN PROBLEMS

As in legislative session,

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD three letters, one from the Bowery Savings Bank of New York, one from the Dry Dock Savings Bank, of New York, and a third from the Union Dime Savings Bank of New York City.

These letters were received after the hearings were sent to the printer. It was understood, during the round-table discussion which was held with certain bankers by the Committee on Banking and Currency that certain memoranda would be filled with the committee. Unfortunately, these letters arrived after the hearings had been sent to the printer. I believe that it is worth while to read these letters, in connection with housing legislation. I ask unanimous consent that the letters be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BOWERY SAVINGS BANK,
New York, N. Y., February 18, 1952.

Mr. JOSEPH P. MCMURRAY,
Staff Director, Banking and Currency Committee, United States Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOE: Sorry I could not get this to you before the end of last week, but was sort of laid low on Tuesday with virus X and was unable to comply with your request. However, for the benefit of the committee, here is an answer to your letter of February 13, 1952.

On the questions of inability of permanent mortgagees to operate in certain States, it would be well nigh impossible to set up a definitive listing of individual State requirements, disabilities, and restrictions upon out-of-State banking institutions investing in such States. Basically, such matters revolve around doing-business statutes of such States, together with the question of agency, taxation of investments within a State made by an out-of-State institution, and redemption provisions in connection with defaulted and foreclosed real estate mortgages. From experience it has also been found that attorneys differ as to opinions and methods of transacting business in the out-of-State territories. Based upon such opinions, restrictions, and disabilities, as I pointed out, there are certain States where the risk involved in doing business precludes certain institutions from participating in the permanent financing of mortgages. The local mortgage bankers' associations in certain States have been instrumental in having enacted enabling State legislation to permit limited qualification of out-of-State institutions to purchase completed mortgages in these States. In other States the matter is under consideration. Eventually, I believe, the matter will be straightened out in most instances. At the present we are able to participate in the Nation-wide mortgage market only subject to existing limitations, laws, and opinions.

It would seem to me that a résumé of the 3-day meeting with the committee would indicate that defense housing located in relatively stabilized areas, not predominantly dependent upon a defense facility, can and will be financed by private mortgage lending institutions. Also, a certain portion of defense housing in other areas where permanent mortgage financing is available might well be served by such financing.

In Raymond Foley's testimony, he estimated the needs for defense housing as approximately 200,000 units. Based upon Home Loan Bank Board statistics, in connection with nonfarm mortgage recordings of $20,000 or less from 1945 to 1951, the all-time high for average amount of all mortgage recordings was $5,732 in August 1951. Using this figure, it would seem that the entire 200,000 units could be financed for $1,146,400,000. (200,000 × $5,732.) As pointed out, private financing will take care of a portion of this amount. If we assume that only 30 percent—$343,800,000—of this amount will be privately financed, it would seem that the balance of $800,000,000 would have to be made by FNMA. (In using 30 percent as an assumed figure for private financing, I believe I am being ultraconservative.) Of this $800,000,000, FNMA already has set aside $200,000,000 for the purchase of mortgages covering programed defense housing. Thus it appears that if it is anticipated that FNMA would be required to finance $800,000,000 of defense housing, it could be done by increasing their appropriation by not more than $600,000,000. As an appropriate measure, this amount initially might be substantially reduced—to say $250,000,000—in order to gather some idea of what percentage of defense financing is to be done by private institutional investors.

From the discussion, the most critical area—in which funds for defense housing are apparently unavailable—was California. The following quotation from the fall 1951, issue of Housing Research, published by the Housing and Home Finance Agency, entitled "Metropolitan Mortgage Market: San Francisco," will undoubtedly throw some light upon the supply of mortgage funds available for housing in at least one major California area:

"The supply of mortgage-loan funds in the Bay area mortgage market is subject to rapid changes with changing market conditions and interest-rate patterns. This market is particularly sensitive to changes in bank policies because of their over-all importance in the market and their dominance of the construction-loan field. The current rise in interest rates has particular significance for the bay area mortgage market because of the broad participation by banks and insurance companies in bond and other investment markets. Insurance companies have been the last important institutional group to support the 4-percent VA rate. The rapid expansion in their loan portfolios in 1949 and 1950, their large backlog of preregulation X commitments, and the exercise of some moral suasion, in company with the rise in Government bond yields, have apparently caused a temporary withdrawal from the mortgage market in early 1951."

This situation not only has continued throughout 1951, but was further affected since March 1951, when the peg was pulled from under the Government bond market.

In assuming that only 30 percent of needed defense housing will be financed by private institutional investors, I am also assuming that the FHA and VA rates of interest will remain frozen. Much testimony, including my own, indicated that an increase in the rates would have a salutary effect upon the amount of private institutional funds which find its way into the mortgage market. In last Saturday's New York World-Telegram, Harold R. Bunce, financial writer, in an article entitled "Interest Hikes Hit at Savings Bonds," stated:

"The price of every type of money the Government borrows has risen sharply from

the frozen rates charged during and immediately following the war.

"The cost of 91-day money represented by Treasury discount bills had risen fourfold, from three-eighths to 1⅝ percent. From the shortest of Treasury security right on up to the longest marketable bonds, interest yields have risen progressively. Victory 2½'s sold on a 2.34 percent yield basis 2 years ago. Today the basis is 2.70 percent."

Interest yields, rising progressively during the period involved, certainly would indicate that guaranteed or insured mortgage investments at frozen rates and yields are placed in an extremely uncompetitive position in comparison to other investment opportunities. To a great extent, FNMA, which was created as a stand-by agency for mortgage funds not available in the private market, has been given powers on a direct competitive lending basis and, in effect, is acting as the prop to uphold unrealistically frozen interest rates. It is my belief that Congress intended that FNMA act only as a supplemental mortgage market. However, this primary purpose has changed with the change in the investment yield situation. Basically, the inherent dangers in FNMA as it is now constituted are threefold: first, an open market for secondary financing can well lead to overexpansion of mortgage operations in certain cases of institutions and mortgage companies; second, it provides a purchasing agency for mortgages at a price in excess of the free market price; and third, it provides a means of disposing of mortgage securities on which the rate of return is unfavorable, in comparison to going rate of return which can be secured on conventional loans in the mortgage market. Further, experience has proved that each time FNMA was close to running out of available funds, there was an accelerated flow of mortgages into FNMA for the purpose of getting in under the wire. A review of this situation should be undertaken at this time and administrative or legislative changes should be put into effect to limit FNMA to its original purpose, i. e., that of a stand-by secondary market.

One other matter which has bearing upon not only the mortgage market, but also the defense housing program, is the question of the relation of established rentals on programed houses to total cost. Tom Coogan testified, I believe, that the difficulty with the programed rental housing for defense was that scheduled rentals would not capitalize at anywhere near the cost required to erect such rental units. Inasmuch as about 50 percent of the programed housing is rental housing, it would seem that, if the agencies involved cannot agree on rentals which would capitalize satisfactorily, almost half of the program would be on dead center within the agencies. Obviously, if such properties do not capitalize on the basis of net rentals to be received, mortgagees could not be expected to assume the additional risks inherent in such a situation.

I hope these thoughts will be helpful, and wish to congratulate you and the committee on the excellence of the 3-day meeting and the results obtained.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY,
Harry Held,
Vice President.

DRY DOCK SAVINGS BANK,
New York, N. Y., February 18, 1952.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I listened with interest to Bob Pratt on the subject of his testimony and that of other bankers before your committee last week and also read some comments on it in the press here. He said he thought I should send you some of my views, as he doubted if they had been brought out in the testimony.

I for one do not think that the interest rates being offered are unattractive or unreasonable. Our bank has invested over $100,000,000 in FHA and VA mortgages all over the Nation of which $22,000,000 alone went into Wherry bill housing. We are pleased with nearly all our investments of this character and are continually increasing them at the present rates.

I believe that instead of increasing interest rates more thought should be given to making the investment itself appeal to new sources of capital and attract a greater percentage of asset investment in this media from those presently making it their major investment. At the same time, this appeal should be by means which would not be unwise or burdensome on the FHA or Treasury if it should ever come to that.

The large sources of investment funds are, of course, the insurance companies, the mutual savings banks, the savings deposits in commercial banks, the savings and loan associations, and the rapidly increasing pension trusts which in 10 years may well have greater assets than the savings banks or savings and loan associations.

At the present time pension trusts have made little, if any, investments of this type. The savings and loan associations committed, as they seem to be, to the highest possible dividend rates have, according to Federal Home Loan Bank statistics, placed a comparatively small percentage of their funds in FHA and VA loans because of the necessity of obtaining the higher rates which prevail on conventional mortgages. Unless these associations should reverse their policy, which seems doubtful, the demand I believe can be created must come from pension trusts, insurance companies, mutual savings banks, and commercial banks. Our problem therefore, is to attract pension trust funds to this media and obtain a greater percentage of asset investment from the insurance companies, savings banks, and commercial banks. I think my suggestion might well bring this about, and I have been encouraged by the response to it from the limited number of men in these investment fields with whom I have discussed it.

My suggestion is that the Congress authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator or the FHA Commissioner, whenever they find it difficult to find purchasers of insured mortgages under certain titles, to covenant that debentures received under these titles could be converted into 5-year 1¾ percent or 2 percent debentures at the option of the holder. This is not original, of course, as it merely follows the plan devised by the Treasury last year for converting the 2½'s of 72 into nonmarketable 2¾'s which in turn could be converted to 5-year marketable notes. The response to the Treasury offer of the very same investors you want to attract to such an option in certain FHA debentures was remarkable. I also believe that over the span of years there will be little reconversion of these 2¾'s, nor will there be much of similar FHA debentures. I say this because it is the fear of having to meet sudden demands that compel us to keep a substantial short position and this permits it, but the crisis rarely arises. Even if it did such conversions should have no unfavorable influence on the FHA. The converted debentures would give an immediate saving in interest costs and in the 5 years before maturity the critical cycle would long since have passed. Under normal conditions, the debenture holder would prefer to hold and receive the higher interest rate. The volume of possible conversions would be quite limited in comparison to other Government debt outstanding, so if interest rates on converted debentures were fixed, as I am sure they would be in consultation with the Treasury, there need be no unfavorable impact on the Government bond market generally.

From the FHA standpoint I do not think such a privilege would be objectionable. It would only be given when experience showed mortgages on properties of this character could only be sold to FNMA. If successful, FNMA would be relieved of this burden and might even be able to liquidate the mortgages it has already purchased or committed to purchase. The reason it is difficult to sell these mortgages to investors is the belief that cessation of the cold war, or other factors beyond our knowledge but well within the Government's, these projects could well become a total loss as far as mortgage investment is concerned.

Naturally we all prefer to buy mortgages we believe will not default or at least are in areas where only the normal changes in the economic cycle must be faced. However, this conversion feature in debentures would equalize this situation and may well attract the pension trust funds which are largely managed by men who are greatly attracted by short maturity investments. In 5 years, which is the shortest period the debentures would have to run, FHA would have ample time to liquidate the property and when the final loss were known to retire a large part of the debentures with the proceeds. If there were any large losses of this character it would be only because peace had become secure. In that event the savings in a few months because of the decreased cost of our Military Establishment and defense plants would more than offset all the losses.

As to the VA loans, I also believe the interest is fair. There is no trouble in placing them here in New York or other areas where there are ample investment funds whenever the builder is doing an honest job. We have over $10,000,000 of VA loans in this area but reject many because we do not think the builder is giving value to the veteran. This situation will be cured to everyone's benefit when builders realize they can only get loans if they give value and not by VA offering higher interest rates for shoddy goods. This real problem in VA loans though is in the areas where there is not sufficient savings growth to meet the demand for mortgages. In such cases the loans have to be sold to us and serviced by a local institution for a fee which is usually one-half of 1 percent. This makes the yield unsatisfactory to us although a local VA loan is. I think this problem might well be solved if the local institutions in the areas needing investment funds would sell us their 4¼ per cent FHA loans and service them at one-half of 1 percent which usually nets them a profit of one-fourth of 1 percent and keep all the VA loans themselves. Usually the VA loans are twice as numerous as the FHA so such an arrangement would give a community one-third greater mortgage funds than it generated from its own savings and the overall yield to the local bank or savings and loan association would be 4 percent. The VA loan is better for it to hold, as in the event of default it results in an immediate cash payoff and the funds can be reinvested at going mortgage rates. They have no problem of a loss if debenture values should be less than par when received for FHA mortgages. In these areas capital and surplus are usually limited so its impairment, even temporarily, should be avoided if possible.

Undoubtedly all this has already occurred to you but if any of it is new and you feel it offers a constructive solution, I am happy to have sent it to you.

With all good wishes,
Faithfully yours,

THURMAN LEE.

UNION DIME SAVINGS BANK,
New York, N. Y., February 25, 1952.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: Here is a suggestion you might consider in connection with your committee's deliberations of the FHA-VA mortgage-loan problem. It has nothing to do with interest rates. It is probably not new, but I think its adoption would make the FHA-VA single-family house loans considerably more attractive to institutional investors, and at not too great a cost to FHA or VA.

Briefly stated, it is to cloak future FHA-203 and VA-501 loans with the feature prevailing in the FHA-608's. To be specific, gave the mortgage investor the option, in case of default, of assigning the mortgage to FHA or VA at 99 percent (as against foreclosing, acquiring title to the real estate and subsequently conveying such title to FHA or VA).

It is generally recognized that a very considerable amount of available mortgage money is in the East. Also, that a substantial portion of such capital is represented by the savings banks of New York State. Such banks are permitted by the laws of New York to invest in FHA and VA loans on a Nation-wide basis. However, before acquiring loans on properties in a foreign state, the laws of the foreign state need to be examined to study the statutes relating to foreclosures and to ascertain if the laws permit a corporate lender coming into the State to do business in the State.

For example, we have acquired FHA-608 4-percent loans in States foreign to our own, but we would shy away from FHA-203 4¼-percent and VA-501 4-percent loans in the same States. With the FHA-608's, we can assign the loan to FHA at 99 percent in case of default. In the case of FHA-203's or VA-501's, we would be required to foreclose, acquire the real-estate title, and thereafter convey title to FHA or VA. In such process the foreclosure period is exceptionally long in some States (as much as 18 months). Moreover, the holding of the real-estate title (even for 1 day) would (or could) subject us to the duty of filing franchise tax returns in such State and the payment of franchise taxes for "doing business" in such State.

The laws of many of the States seem to permit foreign corporate-mortgage investors to acquire and hold mortgages without qualifying to do business within such States, but the minute a foreign corporation holds title to real estate, it is something else again.

You understand I do not mean to imply that a long-term 4-percent yield is necessarily attractive (and such return on VA-501's becomes 3.5 percent after payment of 0.5 percent to a local agent to service such loans) but I do think the option to assign such mortgages to FHA or VA at 99 percent would make such FHA and VA loans much more attractive.

It goes without stating that the foregoing represent my personal views only.

Respectfully,

HERBERT WILLIAMS.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1938) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, Mr. MORRISON, and Mr. REES of Kansas had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 5317) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co. of Canton, Ohio.

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Philip Neville, of Minnesota, to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota, vice Clarence U. Landrum, retiring; and

Arthur J. B. Cartier, of Massachusetts, to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

CONVENTIONS WITH FINLAND RELATING TO DOUBLE TAXATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive K, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, and Executive L, Eighty-second Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income, signed at Washington on March 3, 1952. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the conventions, and the conventions, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the messages from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The messages from the President are as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on estates and inheritances.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury. The provisions are consistent with policies approved by the Senate recently in connection with its consideration of tax conventions between the United States of America and a number of other countries.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 17, 1952.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) convention between the United States and Finland relating to taxes on estates and inheritances.)

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Finland signed at Washington on March 3, 1952, for the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of fiscal evasion with respect to taxes on income.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the convention.

The convention has the approval of the Department of State and the Department of the Treasury. The provisions are consistent with policies approved by the Senate recently in connection with its consideration of tax conventions between the United States of America and a number of other countries.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 17, 1952.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) convention between the United States and Finland relating to taxes on income.)

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate now being in executive session, the Chair lays before it the unfinished business, the treaty with Japan, which is open to amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey obtained the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Jersey will yield to me for that purpose, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That may be done only by unanimous consent. If there is no objection, does the Senator from New Jersey yield for that purpose?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be vacated and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the unfinished business, namely, the treaty of peace with Japan, and the accompanying security pacts and to advocate their ratification.

BACKGROUND

As the background for my remarks I merely desire to state that one of the things which impressed me particularly during my trip to the Far East in 1949 was the very obvious yearning for freedom on the part of the people of Japan, China, Korea, Formosa, and the Philippines. The present difficulties in the Middle East and especially in the Far East are, in my judgment, largely the result of the unrest reflected in the yearning of the people to be free. I simply mention that because it seems to me that the prevalence of that feeling has much to do with the treaty we are considering today.

Mr. President, early in 1950, President Truman asked Mr. John Foster Dulles to undertake the negotiation of a peace treaty with Japan. As one of the first steps in the performance of that duty, Mr. Dulles requested the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to meet with him; and from that time on, those of us who were members of that subcommittee, which was composed of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] as chairman, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and myself, were in close touch with Mr. Dulles in his negotiations. I mention that because it is perhaps somewhat unique in the history of undertakings of this kind that the executive department, in this case represented by Mr. Dulles, should take the legislative department of the Government into its confidence. The result was that the program which was developed was the result of close cooperation between the executive and the legislative departments.

Of course, it is primarily the responsibility of the Executive to negotiate treaties, but in this important instance joint collaboration was insisted upon. During the year it took to prepare a treaty for signing at San Francisco, we had many conferences in the United States. In the meantime, some of us were not only in touch with far eastern conditions, but also took the opportunity to travel abroad. It is to be noted that in July 1951, nine members of the Foreign Relations Committee, including the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and myself of the subcommittee, went to Europe to get a feeling in Europe of the progress being made toward collective security among the Atlantic Pact countries. When we returned, we were invited by Mr. Dulles to go to San Francisco as delegates to the conference which was called to sign the peace treaties. Thus we had the experience not only of living through the negotiations with respect to this peace treaty but also of having given immediate attention ourselves to problems in other areas of the world, especially in the Atlantic Pact countries. At the invitation of Mr. Dulles, who was returning to Tokyo following the signing of the treaty in San Francisco to take up certain matters with the Japanese Government, the Senator from Alabama and I, went with Mr. Dulles, in order to be in Tokyo for these discussions. We visited Hawaii, Japan, Korea, and Formosa, in order to be in a position to relate what was going on in those areas to the discussions of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

During the course of that visit I was again impressed, as were my colleagues, with the insistence of the people of Asia upon being free. That feeling was made very plain to us in our discussions with our friends in Japan. They wanted to be free and independent, and a part of the free Western World. There was in the Far East strong sentiment against imperialism and colonialism of any sort. We also had to consider our immediate problem in Korea. Thus, all of these various areas of the world had an important bearing on our consideration of the Japanese Peace Treaty. I merely mention this as background to indicate the atmosphere in which we found ourselves when we discussed the treaty with the leaders in Tokyo.

Already we have had a presentation of the treaty by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] on the Republican side of the aisle has also spoken on the subject. I shall not review what they have said, but I reiterate their suggestions, which are urgently seconded by the committee, that the treaty be ratified promptly. I can conceive of no more serious consequences than those which would follow undue hesitation to ratify or failure to ratify the treaty, or the adoption of reservations which would damage its effectiveness.

In discussing the treaty, I desire to call particular attention, first, to the message of the President of the United States, submitting the treaty to the Senate. That message in annex 1, which appears in the document from the President, contains a splendid analysis of what the treaty signifies. The analysis is embraced in a speech made by Mr. Dulles on behalf of the United States delegation at the San Francisco conference, on September 5, 1951. In it Mr. Dulles reviewed first the Japanese treaty, and then, in subsequent annexes, the various security pacts which are presently to be considered. I consider this review by Mr. Dulles of such importance that I hope the Members of the Senate who are interested in this subject will be particularly careful to read it. It makes plain the spirit of the approach of those who negotiated the treaty.

While we were in Tokyo, we had the privilege, of course, of conferring directly with the important representatives of the Japanese Government concerned with this matter. I talked with Prime Minister Yoshida, who was the leader of the Japanese Government at the time, and who was the man whom we saw most frequently while we were in Japan. We met the president of the Bank of Japan who contributed a great deal to our understanding of the economic conditions in Japan and of what might be the effect of the termination of the United States occupation. We met representatives of the important Japanese newspapers. We also had the great privilege of lunching with the Emperor himself who showed the greatest interest in the treaty and in the relations between the United States and Japan.

On another occasion the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], Mr. Dulles, and I had the privilege of meeting with the Japanese Diet, and also had an extended session with its Foreign Affairs Committee. This gave us a relationship with those persons in Japan who were considering the same kind of problems that we consider here in the Foreign Relations Committee. These various conferences gave us intimate contacts which I value very highly, and I look upon those discussions as most important in creating a relationship between Japan and the United States which should be very valuable to us in the future.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] have pointed out many important features of the treaty, and I am going to limit myself in my remarks to some matters which strike me as being particularly worthy of emphasis.

The security pact with the Philippines was signed in Washington last year. Then there followed the security pacts with Australia and New Zealand, and, finally, the security pact with Japan which was signed in San Francisco. In light of the contribution which has been made by the Senators who have preceded me, I shall pass over them very briefly and devote my attention to certain other matters.

The Senator from Alabama and I felt, as members of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that it was important to visit Japan and the far-eastern area before the treaty was signed.

Last fall, after the signing of the treaty, but before the treaty came to the Senate of the United States for ratification, we felt that if we visited the Far East we would be better qualified to explain to our colleagues the significance of the treaty, and this new chapter, as

it were, in the relations between Japan and the western powers.

General MacArthur, in 1949, told me first-hand of the necessity for a peace treaty with Japan, and of the importance of its prompt negotiation. As a member of the Far East Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations I was kept informed on the progress of negotiations from their inception. In my conferences with Mr. Dulles I was able to help in the shaping of the treaty of peace during its formative stage. In my 8 years' experience in the Senate I have never been more closely associated with nor more fully informed about any treaty or agreement entered into by this country. It was a truly bipartisan effort, and one in which the executive and legislative branches cooperated fully. As one who was a member of the American delegation to San Francisco I am convinced that the interests of our people and of the world are conscientiously served by these treaties. They represent, I believe, a new stage, a new enlightenment, in the relations between nations. Rarely, if ever, have victorious powers accorded a defeated state the same forgiving generosity as has been shown Japan. I rejoice that they have done so. The treaties constitute a new and firm foundation on which we may build, if we are wise, a lasting peace in the Far East. They afford us an opportunity to go forward in the development of healthy and harmonious relations between the United States and its neighbors in the Pacific.

THE SPIRIT OF THE TREATY

An interesting fact which I desire to stress here is that a similar attitude to the one I have just expressed toward the treaties was shared by the majority of the delegates at the San Francisco conference where the treaties were signed.

I wish to quote just a very few brief statements made by some of the important delegates. Mr. P. C. Spender, of the Australian delegation, addressed the conference regarding the attitude of his country and said:

> This treaty, sir, is both benevolent and magnanimous. Its like is not to be found in modern history. Its generous provisions are designed to bring Japan back into the family of free nations and afford her the great opportunity to play a full and useful part in it. It is a treaty not only of peace but for peace.

That is a very significant statement from a man who represented Australia, a country which had naturally been in great fear of Japan during the period of the Japanese military aggressions.

In the same vein the Ambassador of Colombia, Cipriano Restrepo-Jaramillo, said:

> In consequence of our love of peace and liberty, I shall sign this treaty in the name of my Government. In doing so, I pray to God that Christian civilization may rule the world and that this instrument may constitute a sure step toward harmony among nations, so that humanity, free from anguish and fear, may orient its efforts along the path of common progress and the well-being of all the peoples of the world.

And Oscar Gans, Minister of Cuba, said:

> Cuba does not agree with all of this draft treaty; but to negotiate is to compromise. In the relationships among states of an effective nature, none may find complete satisfaction for all of its ideas and interpretations. When compromise does not violate essential principles, it is our duty, in the light of solidarity among nations, to harmonize our interests with those of other nations. Inspired by this ideal, my Government is willing to sign this peace treaty.

Finally, Mr. President, I desire to quote from one delegate who impressed me particularly at the conference at San Francisco and who represented an area of the world which is very important to us and to Japan. I am speaking of J. R. Jayewardene, of Ceylon, who spoke in part, as follows:

> We in Ceylon were fortunate that we were not invaded, but the damage caused by air raids, by the stationing of enormous armies under the southeast Asian command, and by the slaughter-tapping of one of our main commodities, rubber, when we were the only producers of natural rubber for the Allies, entitle us to ask that the damage so caused should be repaired.

Mr. President, this was in connection with a discussion of reparations, which question had been presented to the conference. Everybody had agreed that drastic reparations would not be in order.

> We do not intend to do so, for we believe in the words of the great teacher whose message has enobled the lives of countless millions in Asia, that "hatred ceases not by hatred, but by love." It is the message of the Buddha, the great teacher, the founder of Buddhism, which spread a wave of humanism through south Asia, Burma, Laos, Cambodia, Siam, Indonesia, and Ceylon, and also northward through the Himalayas into Tibet, China, and finally, Japan, which bound us together for hundreds of years with a common culture and heritage. This common culture still exists, as I found on my visit to Japan last week on my way to attend this conference; and from the leaders of Japan, ministers of state as well as private citizens, from their priests in the temples, I gathered the impression that the common people of Japan are still influenced by the shadow of that great teacher of peace and wish to follow it. We must give them that opportunity.

I have included in my remarks the quotation from Mr. Jayewardene because it brings to mind the great religious teacher in whom the people of the Asian countries believe, and because it is so much in line with the precepts of our own great Teacher, Jesus Christ, in His Sermon on the Mount.

So, Mr. President, I make this reference in support of this treaty, a treaty of reconciliation, a treaty aimed at associating Japan with the Western Powers who believe in freedom.

I now wish to summarize briefly the provisions of the treaty.

SUMMARY OF TREATY PROVISIONS

The preamble of the peace treaty places Japan on a footing of equality with all the other sovereign powers in the world. We could do no less with a proud and able people like the Japanese. The state of war is terminated. For that we are all grateful. The territorial provisions are in keeping with the announced objectives of the Allied Powers during hostilities. That is as it should be. The bases for the security of Japan and the Far East are effectively provided. World peace needs these arrangements. The political and economic clauses are realistic and fair. Any other arrangement could only have led to discontent, disturbance, and default in Japan and thus to defeat of the purposes of the treaty. Such reparations as can be obtained are to be arranged and the peaceful settlement of disputes over the treaty is provided for. This is only equity. Finally, neither Japanese sovereignty nor the Japanese economy are subjected to any permanent restrictions. That is as it should be. The treaty is enlightened, fair, and far-sighted.

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in regard to the security treaties which accompany the pending treaty, although, as I said earlier, my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Alabama, is going to deal with that subject more fully.

THE SECURITY TREATIES

As Senators well know, it is not only the treaty of peace that is before the Senate. There are also three security pacts, which are absolutely essential to our security, as well as that of the Far East. To have given Japan her freedom without some force with which to guard and protect her would have been an empty gesture, if not a fraud. These security arrangements provide Japan and her neighbors with a unique but strong system of protection.

The security treaty with Japan is calculated to provide Japan with a military force sufficiently strong to protect herself against both external aggression and any riots and disturbances instigated from abroad.

Of course, we are faced with the difficulty of Japan being left defenseless. The fact of her rearming conflicted to a certain degree with the provisions of her constitution, which provide against any further rearmament. However, there had to be found here a middle ground, because Japan could not be left in a vacuum, without any security whatsoever. That is why I say the security treaty with Japan is calculated to provide Japan with a military force sufficiently strong to protect her against both external aggression and any riots and disturbances instigated from abroad.

In order to insure that there shall be no future embarrassing situations comparable to those which attended the Anglo-Japanese alliance in the early twenties, a mutual security arrangement has been simultaneously and correlatively entered into between the United States, Australia, and New Zealand. This treaty provides the basis for a broader security organization in the Pacific area. Finally the United States has entered into a security treaty with the Philippine Islands which is a logical employment of our other joint defense arrangements with the Philippine Government.

We are now asked to advise and consent to the ratification of all four treaties. These treaties will all be before us, Mr. President, and I hope will be ratified during this week. I am convinced that, given the present condition of the world, they are essential to our interests and our security. The Senate has been advised that these defense measures anticipate the eventual creation of a more comprehensive security arrangement. Thus, in a sense, while the treaty of peace is entered into on a permanent basis, the security pacts can be regarded as more or less temporary in nature, to be replaced by a broader arrangement for the Pacific area at a later date.

I wish to emphasize the difference between these security arrangements and those which we have made with the nations of the north Atlantic community. Article V of the North Atlantic Treaty states:

> The parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.

In drawing up the security treaties for the Pacific areas it was felt by Mr. Dulles and his colleagues, and I think very wisely, that the United States was not yet in a position where it could subscribe to an article as strong as that in the North Atlantic Treaty. We were not prepared to agree that an attack upon one would be an attack upon all.

The treaties with Australia, New Zealand, and the Philippines provide in article III for consultation among the parties whenever the territorial integrity, the political independence, or the security of any of them is threatened in the Pacific.

Under article IV each of the signatories recognizes that "an armed attack in the Pacific area on either of the parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common dangers in accordance with its constitutional processes."

I myself think it was most essential to follow that procedure as distinguished from the procedure followed in another area of the world, where some of the problems we have in the Far East do not exist.

During the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations the question arose as to what type of action was contemplated in the event an armed attack should occur. When asked this question Ambassador Dulles replied that each country would have to decide the question, "in the light of the fact that there is recognition that it is a common danger, and that each will act in accordance with its constitutional processes to meet that danger."

This program for the Pacific area is similar to the Monroe Doctrine which prevailed for so long in the Western Hemisphere. By the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro a few years ago the Monroe Doctrine became a multilateral doctrine, participated in by all the Americas and distinguished from the unilateral doctrine which was its original form.

Mr. President, in drawing up these new treaties, we were thinking in terms of the precedent of the Monroe Doctrine, and the language used is virtually that of the Monroe Doctrine.

THE NEED FOR SECURITY

Some well-meaning and conscientious people have been disturbed because the United States has deemed it necessary to enter into these security pacts.

I may say that I have received a number of letters from people who regret that we were called upon to enter into a security arrangement of this kind, and who felt that Japan should not be rearmed. They are naturally and sincerely afraid of an outburst of further militarism in Japan.

These people maintain that the peace treaty alone would have been sufficient to terminate the state of war with Japan. That is true. The treaty of peace would by itself terminate the state of war with Japan, but it would not prevent Japan from falling prey to aggression. The history of the Soviet Union and its far-eastern aggressions gives rise to real concern regarding Japan's ability, lacking her own national armed forces, to protect her freedom and newly developed democratic institutions. Today the Japanese people are in no position to protect themselves. Were the United States to withdraw all of its military forces from the area of Japan it would leave behind it a power vacuum into which Soviet pressure would immediately rush.

When the aggression occurred in Korea in 1950, it was viewed in strategic circles as a direct thrust at Japan and a bid for Soviet control over the Japanese islands, which in turn would have paved the way for Communist conquest of the entire Far East.

I share that view, having studied this matter very carefully. Having been in that area and having seen the geographical relationships between Korea and Japan, I am convinced that had that effort succeeded we would today be faced with a very serious and critical situation. Probably we would have to withdraw our own defense lines from where they are in the islands in the Pacific, at least to Hawaii, and possibly to the Pacific coast.

It has been recognized by far-eastern strategists that Korea is one of the avenues to the conquest of Japan and also one pathway to the control of the continent of Asia. Communist China has deliberately defied and is today defying the United Nations forces in Korea. She has been branded an aggressor by the U. N. I submit, therefore, that a moment's reflection on these tremendous forces which menace Japan and its great industrial potential, are a complete justification for the security treaties.

TRADE WITH CHINESE MAINLAND

Mr. President, I should like to discuss briefly Japan's prospective trade position in the Far East, especially toward China. My colleagues are aware that in the past Japan's trade with China has been large and the source of much of Japan's foreign exchange. The question naturally arose during the peace treaty hearings whether Japan can earn her living in the world markets without her traditional trade with the Chinese mainland. This question is, of course, bound up with the fears that Japaan might begin to trade with Communist China, now dominated by Moscow, as soon as the peace treaty comes into force.

Perhaps the question can best be answered by pointing to the experience of the past 6 years. In those years, Japan's trade with the Chinese mainland has been negligible. Yet in spite of the loss of this trade, Japan has achieved substantial economic recovery, and most of her standard of living has been restored to prewar levels.

At this point I wish to pay tribute to the magnificent work which was done by General MacArthur and his aides in connection with the economic recovery of Japan. I was there earlier, in 1949, and again last fall. I talked with those in charge of this work. It is an amazing thing which has been done. During the last year, in fact, Japan has been able to earn her own way. Although this was due in large measure to the extraordinary earnings of Japan for services rendered the United Nations troops in Korea, it is a healthy sign. By the time that this unusual revenue ceases, Japan's recovery should be complete, if we can help her to build up her trade with the other areas in the Far East, and especially in southeast Asia.

Because of Japan's geographic location toward China, this state of affairs is, of course, highly unnatural. China has always been a traditional market and source of raw materials for Japan. I fervently hope that the conditions that caused the disruption of this trade are temporary. We must keep hoping that the mainland of China can be brought back to the family of free nations. However, this change cannot take place overnight.

In the meantime, it is my conviction that Japan can and will be economically self-sufficient without trading with Moscow-dominated China.

We went into this question in great detail. It was discussed by Mr. Dulles, the Senator from Alabama, and others. The question was whether it would be possible for Japan to be economically self-sufficient without trading with Communist-dominated China. I came to the conviction, as I have just stated, that Japan can and will be economically self-sufficient without trading with Moscow-dominated China. We can help her to this goal by not barring our doors against her goods and letting her have free access to the raw materials of the world.

In spite of the fact that Japan can earn her way without China some people have expressed fears that Japan will engage in such trade for the sake of the great profits at stake. This fear I believe to be unfounded.

I invite the attention of the Senate to a letter from Prime Minister Yoshida to Mr. Dulles, wherein Prime Minister Yoshida expressed the intention of the Japanese Government to open negotiations for a bilateral peace treaty with

the Nationalist Government now on Formosa, and under no conditions to do business with Communist China while Communist China is defying the United Nations, as she is doing today in Korea, and threatening to do in other parts of the world.

Japan has alined herself squarely with the free world in embargoing strategic goods to Communist countries. In fact, she is embargoing more than the necessary minimum. She has certified to us that she is complying with title I of the Mutual Security Assistance Act—more commonly know as the Battle Act. Senators will remember that this act terminates economic and military assistance to countries selling strategic and related goods to Communist countries.

Parenthetically I should like to state that I wish that other nations which are supposed to be allied with us in the United Nations' endeavor would carry out the spirit of the Battle Act to as great an extent as we found Japan was doing. If, therefore, Japan should decide to trade with a Moscow dominated Communist China she would under the Battle Act automatically become ineligible for American aid. This is an important factor to keep in mind. Equally important, however, is the fact that Japan, in the Yoshida-Dulles letters, expresses its concurrence with the United Nations' resolution recommending an embargo on Moscow dominated Communist China and North Korea and its antipathy for the Red Chinese regime in general. Japan has so much to fear from Russia, her traditional enemy, that I am convinced she will remain alined with the free world against aggression, direct or indirect.

In summary, Mr. President, I maintain that Japan can be economically self-supporting without trading with Communist China and will continue to aline herself against aggression by not trading with the aggressors.

ASIA'S YEARNING FOR FREEDOM AND INDEPENDENCE

Mr. President, a month ago I reported to the Senate on my recent trip to the Far East. Since then developing events have only strengthened the convictions which I expressed on January 29. I am more than ever convinced that, despite the importance of Western Europe in building the defenses of the free world, it is in the restless areas of the Near East and Far East that the most immediate threats to world security now lie.

I know that there are those in our Government who do not agree with that conclusion, but having been in the far-eastern area and having sensed the imminence of trouble there because of the danger of a sudden aggression in Indochina and elsewhere, my feeling is that, however important the Western European build-up, the immediate threat is likely to come in the far-eastern area. The restlessness to which I have referred and which grows out of the yearning of the Asiatic peoples for freedom and independence, takes its expression in deep-seated resistance to any form of imperialism or colonialism. We cannot forget this social ferment as we consider the Japanese treaties. It is of the greatest importance that we avoid any semblance of colonialism or imperialism in our actions. It has been difficult, in dealing with some of the countries which heretofore have had interests and possessions in the Far East, and which have been charged with a certain degree of imperialism or colonialism, to make it clear that we must be independent of colonialism or imperialism, and that we must move toward the elimination of all forms of imperialism and colonialism in the area. The peace treaties which we have before us will go far in that direction. There is a real danger that injudicious actions—no matter how well intentioned—may do serious harm to the security of the Far East in general and to our own interests in that area in particular. Soviet propaganda, which is busily trying to paint the United States as an imperialistic power, would welcome our imposing a treaty of retaliation and revenge. These treaties which we have before us, being reasonable and just in their provisions, will rob Soviet propaganda of much of its effectiveness.

I now move to a question which to me is of great importance, because it seems to me that it may be the key to the future peace of the Far East. That is the subject of a free and independent China—free and independent from any outside control.

A FREE AND INDEPENDENT CHINA

We must recognize, Mr. President, that a stable peace with Japan is dependent upon, and inextricably interwoven with, our relations with other far-eastern nations, especially China. During the last war we recognized, as we have always done, that the key to peace and stability in the Far East was a free and independent China.

We worked for it and we backed up China continuously, in the first place against Japan. Historically this has always been our policy. When, at the close of the last century, the major imperialistic powers were planning to divide China into spheres of influence, it was an American Secretary of State, John Hay, who insisted that we would not stand idly by while such a partition took place. We insisted upon China remaining open and free to trade with all nations. This policy has ever since been known as the open-door policy. Later, when Japanese forces invaded China and created the puppet state of Manchukuo, it was Secretary Stimson who announced that the United States would not recognize that conquest as valid.

The Stimson doctrine stated:

> But in view of the present situation and of its own rights and obligations therein, the American Government deems it to be its duty to notify both the Imperial Japanese Government and the Government of the Chinese Republic that it cannot admit the legality of any situation de facto, nor does it intend to recognize any treaty or agreement entered into between those governments, or agents thereof, which may impair the treaty rights of the United States or its citizens in China, including those which relate to the sovereignty, the independence, or the territorial and administrative integrity of the Republic of China, or to the international policy relative to China, commonly known as the open-door policy; and that it does not intend to recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the covenants and obligations of the Pact of Paris of August 27, 1928, to which treaty both China and Japan, as well as the United States are parties.

I have quoted Mr. Stimson's words in full because it seems to me that we become a little confused when we think, as we have for sometime in the past, in terms of the possibility of recognizing Communist China, which we know is dominated by Moscow. We would be abandoning the Stimson doctrine if we permitted Communist China, so long as she remains defiant of the United Nations and while she is dominated by Moscow, to come into the United Nations. I consider it unfortunate that some members of the United Nations have recognized Communist China.

Throughout the entire history of American-Chinese relations the theme of a free and independent policy has been repeated over and over again. We have insisted upon Chinese freedom regardless of the opposition. We have always insisted upon the maintenance of the territorial integrity of China. When foreign powers have cast covetous eyes our policy has been to demand that China be allowed to become free and independent. That must still be our policy today.

A TWO-PRONGED POLICY FOR ASIA

Much remains to be done before China can again achieve her freedom. The United Nations can and must stop Communist aggression in Korea and elsewhere in the Far East. I repeat what I said on January 29: "Only a close uniting of all the United Nations forces on a courageous, determined policy to apply extreme sanctions in the event of further outbreaks" will prevent the aggression which constantly menaces all free countries in Asia.

An effective policy to meet any defiance of U. N. authority requires close cooperation between the United States, Britain, and France in uniting against all forms of aggression in the Far East.

I am hopeful that we can get together with our principal allies in Europe, Great Britain and France, on a common policy with respect to this issue in the Far East.

We and our allies must be prepared to take strong and unified action against any future "Koreas" which may be precipitated as well as any further attacks in Korea itself. We must be willing to act together in withdrawing recognition, imposing blockades and embargoes, making limited air attacks, and carrying out any other measures which can serve to meet and oppose Communist defiance of the United Nations. This could include the removing of restrictions on the Nationalist forces on Formosa, which forces could well be used for guerrilla raids on the China coast and for resistance to any Communist attacks elsewhere in Asia.

The threatened attack on French Indochina would suggest to me the immediate removal of the restrictions on the Nationalist forces in Formosa.

But the use of force to prevent aggression will not in itself be sufficient to develop China into the kind of partner

we need in the Far East. China must be won away from the control of the Soviet Union. It is not too late. The Chinese are a proud and independent people. They have a great and unique culture. Throughout history the Chinese have been able to withstand any and all attempts to subject them to complete foreign domination. A positive and imaginative American foreign policy could still, at this late date, bring China once again into the community of free nations. Such a policy, as I visualize it, would combine specific security guaranties with trade agreements and economic aid. When and if China is able to demonstrate her independence from Soviet control and her willingness to resist, along with the free nations of Asia, Communist imperialism and expansionism, this Nation should be willing, as it has so wisely done in the case of Yugoslavia, to support such resistance. In this way China's independence and opportunity for self-determination would be protected.

Mr. President, it is within this context that the Japanese treaties must be considered. Japan is the industrial hub of the Far East. The full economic development of this area cannot take place unless and until normal trade patterns are developed between Japan and her neighbors. Should China assert her independence from the Soviet Union it is not unlikely that healthy trade relations could be established between Japan and China. Such trade, when combined with American aid could furnish the push needed to start China on her way to the full development of her vast resources. With some of her economic problems under control, China would have a real chance of developing those democratic institutions so long sought by Sun Yat-sen and others of her past leaders and friends.

The contrast between the picture which I have outlined and that promised by the Soviet Union must soon become apparent to the people of China. Many Chinese are already noting the hasty manner in which the Soviet Union is sucking materials and resources from their country. Armaments is all that the Chinese are getting in return. Every day we are presented with new evidence of the extent to which China's present masters are willing to go to secure conformity. Purges are becoming almost as extensive and frequent as those carried on in the Soviet Union itself. The day will come when China will tire of the Soviet parasite. When that day comes, and it need not be far off, the United States must be ready with an attractive alternative.

It would include also other areas, such as Ceylon, from the remarks of whose delegate I quoted a short time ago.

SOUTHEAST ASIA

I have dwelled at length on the importance of China in the far-eastern picture. I have purposely emphasized her place in these relationships for I consider it to be of extreme importance. I should also like, however, to stress the importance of the smaller nations in this area. The peoples of southeast Asia, like their neighbors to the north, are striving for full economic and social independence. If we are to win them as our friends we must support them in their just struggle. The economic welfare of these people is closely tied to the economy of Japan. This peace treaty, which represents the American policy of fostering a healthy Japanese economy, is also a contribution to the economic welfare of southeast Asia. I refer, of course, to the area which includes Indochina, Thailand, Burma, and Indonesia, and Malaya.

INDIA

This approach to Asia's problems which I am proposing has a particular relevance to the nation of India. In the past India has demonstrated a certain misunderstanding and fear of United States intentions. We have so far failed to secure the full cooperation of a nation which is destined to play a crucial role in determining the future of Asia. Should America develop an Asian policy along the lines I have discussed it is not unlikely that India would find in us a nation with which she could work with full confidence. We would have demonstrated our genuine interest in the welfare of the people of Asia and our willingness to aid them in their efforts to raise living standards. We would have proven our opposition to all forms of imperialism, eastern or western.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I have stated that the Japanese treaties can be the basis of a lasting peace in the Far East. I should like to be more specific. It is my hope that before long we shall be able to build upon these treaties a strong Pacific treaty organization within which we, with the United Nations, would offer the people of Asia, in exchange for security agreements, a comprehensive program of cooperative trade, cultural exchange, and technical aid. Asia is on fire. While we concentrate on Europe we may lose the battle of Asia. But the battle is not yet lost. The Japanese treaties are a vital step toward our goal.

Therefore, Mr. President, I urge the prompt ratification of these treaties. They open a new chapter in the history of the Far East and, in fact, in the history of the world. They give a new illumination to the future; a new dawn of freedom, independence, and self-determination for the suffering masses in the overcrowded areas of Asia.

In these treaties I see real progress in the fulfillment of the promise of long ago that the individual human personality is sacred and is entitled to full self-realization. The world needs the release of the creative energies of the people of Asia.

Mr. President, following centuries of suffering, our ancestors saw a new destiny here on our shores, and they were willing to die in order that the individual liberty they sought might be made a vital truth. I have always been convinced that they were inspired and led by a power beyond their own, that they were guided by Almighty God to the great destiny America has achieved.

By these treaties of reconciliation with Japan, America and her allies today are seeking to give to these people in the Far East the great gift of freedom, inspired by God, which has been our inheritance. This conception of freedom and independence for all peoples will point the way to real, lasting peace in Asia and throughout the world.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I note with much interest that the Foreign Relations Committee makes a unanimous recommendation and urges unanimously the ratification of this peace treaty.

I am sure the Senator from New Jersey recalls, that about 5 years ago the Foreign Relations Committee made a unanimous recommendation regarding another peace treaty, that with Italy. At that time the Senate voted overwhelmingly for ratification of the treaty, primarily because of the recommendations and the report submitted by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether there is any analogy between this treaty and the treaty which was signed with Italy, which subsequently has been repudiated by everyone concerned, with the possible exception of Red Russia.

Many Members of the Senate, including myself, have some misgivings and doubts about treaties of the magnitude of this one. Naturally, we wish to know whether the Foreign Relations Committee has carefully considered and scrutinized the terms of the treaty and its impacts and, in connection with the treaty, the possibility of restoring Japan to the status of an independent, sovereign nation.

Can the Senator from New Jersey give us any assurances that a year hence or 2 years hence we shall not face a situation comparable to that involving the Italian Peace Treaty, and that we shall not reach a time when there will be widespread demand for repudiation of this treaty with Japan?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Idaho has asked that question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I ask it most sincerely.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I realize that.

I suppose the best answer I can give to the question is that we learn by experience. Mr. Dulles and our group discussed the other treaties to a great extent; I refer to those with Italy and with the satellite countries. We discussed the strengths, if any, and the weaknesses of those treaties.

We knew that we had been all wrong about the treaty with Italy; we have discovered that since the ratification of that treaty. We realize now that that treaty was one of retaliation and revenge. In that treaty we deprived Italy of the means of self-defense; apparently we gave her no chance to defend herself. However, following the repudiations which have been made, Italy has been

given an opportunity to return to the family of nations.

So it was with great care and with knowledge of that situation that we have favored this treaty, which is not a treaty of revenge, but is a treaty of reconciliation and of inclusion of the Japanese people among the family of nations, which includes the Western Powers.

It is for that reason that I have no hesitation in saying that I do not believe the difficulty referred to by the Senator from Idaho will arise in connection with this treaty. Of course, difficulties may arise. However, I believe we have approached the matter from the standpoint of preparing a treaty which will invite the development and cooperation of Japan, as opposed to a treaty similar to the Versailles Treaty or the Italian Treaty, which had to be revised.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further to me?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator from New Jersey give us any assurance that the interests of Nationalist China are adequately taken care of by the treaty to such an extent that in the near future we shall not be met with a demand for reconsideration of this treaty in order to take care of some defects or imperfections in it which keep it from giving adequate treatment to Nationalist China or from making sufficient allowance for the developments which may occur between Japan and Nationalist China?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In response, I may say that, of course, one of the important questions we went to Japan to consider, after the treaty had been signed at San Francisco, was the question of which China Japan would recognize. We knew that here there was a strong feeling against recognition of Communist China by Japan. We also realized that for us to say to Japan, "You must do this, that, or the other thing," probably would be the wrong approach, if we were going to carry out our treaty with Japan on the basis of recognizing Japan as a free, independent state with her own sovereignty.

Therefore, we discussed that issue in a friendly way with the Japanese leaders. We did not hide anything. We went "right to bat" with the Foreign Relations Committee of the Japanese Diet, and with Mr. Yoshida, in particular, and with Mr. Iguchi, the Japanese Foreign Minister.

I am sure the Senator from Idaho is aware of the so-called Yoshida letter, which was addressed to Mr. Dulles. In that letter Mr. Yoshida stated clearly the intention of the Japanese Government to negotiate a treaty of peace with the Nationalist Government of China, with which Japan formerly had been at war, and the intention of the Japanese Government not to have any contact whatever with the Communist group, because of their defiance of the United Nations.

Of course, no one can guarantee what will happen in the future. We are watching with interest the current negotiations between representatives of the Japanese Government and representatives of the Nationalist Chinese Government on the island of Formosa. In that connection we hear that various points are being raised from time to time—points which very naturally are the subject of discussion between the two nations. Of course, we do not know what the final result will be.

I believe it should be pointed out that the position we took was one which it is perfectly natural for the American people to take, but one which is new in negotiations between nations. We said to the representatives of the Japanese Government, "It is up to you to make your own choice, after knowing these facts." Following that, they reached the decision which was reported by Mr. Yoshida to Mr. Dulles. It seems to me that we did the logical thing in that situation.

DEATH VALLEY NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF.—AUTHORIZATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTIES BY EXCHANGE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have requested the leader of the majority to come to the floor. There is on the calendar a bill which has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and which involves the exchange of land in the Death Valley park. Private concerns desire to exchange lands, the value of which runs to about $2,500, for about 20 acres of land, the value of which is about $25. The reason for that is that the land desired is on the floor of the valley, and is very essential for use as a landing field.

Mr. President, I dislike very much to make a motion or to submit a request without the presence of some one of the leaders, but I now, as in legislative session, respectfully ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be momentarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill, which erroneously appears as Order No. 1299 on the calendar, the correct number of which should be 1229. It is House bill 4515 to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes. It is a bill to which there can be no objection, it having been passed unanimously by the House and approved unanimously by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The bill is now in proper form.

My reason for being anxious to have the bill considered is that we are desirous of getting an appropriation of the necessary funds, in order that an airport may be constructed on the floor of Death Valley. It is all-essential from a military standpoint, and it is all-essential from a commercial standpoint. Twenty acres of land in Death Valley is all that is involved. The land which is offered in exchange for the land on the floor of the valley is much more valuable for scenic purposes and scenic reasons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Nevada to say that it was Calendar No. 1229?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is Order No. 1229, but it is erroneously numbered on the calendar. On the calendar it appears as Order No. 1299, but that is an error.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. The order number is really 1229.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Has the Senator from Nevada conferred with the minority leader, or with the ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, regarding this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have conferred, but not regarding the matter of taking it up. I urged the passage of it, and it was reported to the Senate only the other day, by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the chairman of the committee. It has been on the calendar for several days. I did not confer with the Senator about taking it up.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, under the circumstances, as acting minority leader, I am compelled to object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, some time ago, when neither the majority nor the minority leader was present, I attempted to have called up a bill which involves the exchange of land in the Death Valley National Monument. It is Calendar No. 1229, H. R. 4515. The bill has been passed by the House, it has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, and, as I have stated, is now on the calendar of the Senate.

I shall state again why I am anxious to have the bill considered. It involves the exchange of land. A private party, a company known as Borax Consolidated, Ltd., is offering to exchange 230 acres of land in Death Valley for about 25 acres on the floor of the Valley.

The reason for making the exchange is that the 25 acres is in the center of a site which is most advantageous for the construction of an airport. I am anxious to have the bill passed so that the exchange may take place in order that the money may be appropriated during this appropriation period. The appropriation will amount to about $125,000, to be used for building an airport on the floor of Death Valley. The construction of this airport is highly essential from a strategic standpoint, and from the commercial point of view, as well.

The junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], who is now in the Chamber, as the acting minority leader objected when I made the request formerly, but now the leader of the minority, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is present. I have discussed the matter

with him, and I now ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4515.

The report of the committee—No. 1298—is very short, and I shall read it. It is as follows:

The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4515) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

H. R. 4515 would provide for an exchange of land between the Federal Government and the Borax Consolidated, Ltd., in order to give the company perpetual rights-of-way over certain lands for general utility purposes.

No expenditure of Federal funds necessary.

The Federal land, which consists of 20 acres, is valued at approximately $25. The privately owned land involved consists of two separate tracts, about 230 acres in size, valued at about $2,875. The land that the company offers the Federal Government can be utilized fully, one tract as part of a proposed airport and the other tract as one of the important scenic viewpoints in Death Valley.

All parties concerned have completely approved the exchange of land, and the Department of the Interior feels that it will be most beneficial to the Government and will have no adverse effect upon the monument.

An identical bill (S. 1730) was introduced in the Senate by Senator Knowland.

The favorable report of the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereinbelow set forth in full and made a part of this report.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada that, as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill 4515?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4515) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif. and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill, but I wish to have the RECORD show that the bill does not in any way violate what has become known as the "Morse formula" in regard to the disposition of Federal property. Let the RECORD show that in this instance the Federal Government is getting a fair exchange for its Federal interest, and, therefore, in my judgment, the taxpayers are receiving fair and equitable compensation for the Federal interest in the property. Therefore, I do not object.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when consideration for this bill was sought a short time ago the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] was acting as minority leader, and he objected to its consideration. Since that time we have checked on the matter, and as a result of that check I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Nevada.

Is it a fact, as I have been told and led to understand, that the bill had the support of all the members of the committee to which is was referred?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am so advised; but the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who is a member of that committee, has just entered the Chamber, and I am sure he can advise the Senate whether or not House bill 4515, Calendar No. 1229, was unanimously reported. It refers to the exchange of land on the floor of Death Valley.

Mr. WATKINS. Yes, it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then it had the unanimous support of the members of both parties in the committee, did it?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes; there was no objection. As a matter of fact, it appeared from the evidence brought before the committee that it would be to the interest of the United States to make the exchange.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

CITATION OF MARY JANE KEENEY FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, there is another matter to which I invite the attention of the acting minority leader. As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 283, citing Mary Jane Keeney for contempt of the Senate. The resolution appears on the calendar as order No. 1145. It has been approved by the Committee on the Judiciary, and if Senators wish a further explanation, I shall make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may ask the able Senator from Nevada whether he has conferred with the majority leader regarding this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have conferred with the majority leader in regard to it. He told me that, at any time I could get the resolution taken up, I might do so. It must be considered by the Senate, so I desire to draw it to the attention of Senators, in order that they may act on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate as in legislative session, proceeded to the consideration of Senate Resolution 283, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Subcommittee to Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Mary Jane Keeney to answer a series of questions before the said subcommittee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States Attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Mary Jane Keeney may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to offer a brief explanation. If this resolution should prove to require any length of time, I shall withdraw the request.

The resolution requests the President of the Senate to certify the report of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, as to the refusal of Mary Jane Keeney to answer a certain queston before that subcommittee, together with all facts in connection therewith, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, in order that the said Mary Jane Keeney may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Briefly stated, this resolution calls for issuance of a contempt citation. Mary Jane Keeney, an American citizen formerly employed in the secretariat of the United Nations, appeared before the Internal Security Subcommittee pursuant to subpena, and in the course of her questioning she was asked if anyone in the Department of State had assisted her in procuring employment with the United Nations. Mrs. Keeney refused to answer this question on the ground that a United Nations staff rule bound her to secrecy concerning such a matter, touching, as she alleged, the internal administration of the United Nations. In other words, Mrs. Keeney refused to answer to a question pertinent to the inquiry of the subcommittee, and continued her refusal despite the command of the subcommittee, in reliance upon the supremacy of United Nations rules over the laws of the United States Government.

The committee has promptly called for the adoption of this resolution in order that such a challenge to the authority of the Senate may be tested by judicial process.

Later, Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary received a most remarkable letter from the attorney for the former witness, Mary Jane Keeney. This letter stated, in effect, that the question of whether the witness should have testified has now been submitted to the Legal Division of the United Nations, and that if the Legal Division of the United Nations decided that she should have testified she would then be willing to come before the committee again and testify. Mr. President, that is almost intolerable effrontery. This is a matter to be decided by the courts of the United States, not by the Legal Division of the United Nations. Mrs. Keeney is not even employed by the United Nations, and has not been for quite some time. What possible reason she and her lawyer can have for submitting this question to the legal staff of the United Nations, except the possible desire to make some further gesture in the direction of setting that body up as superior to the Senate of the United States is hard to imagine.

Still more recently another letter from this lady's attorney says she will now answer the specific question which she

refused to answer before the committee on the grounds that the United Nations rule excused her. The attorney indicates he has received a ruling from the Legal Division of the United Nations. Furthermore, he does not make an offer that his client will testify fully; but only that she will answer the particular question which she previously refused to answer. I am advised that the opinion from the Legal Division of the United Nations which was furnished to this attorney saved the question of whether the United Nations rule might excuse the witness from answering any other questions.

Mr. President, if and when the day comes that a ruling of the Legal Division of the United Nations is held superior to the right of Congress to hear a witness, I predict that the Congress will assert itself in unmistakable terms.

So that this question may not plague us any longer than necessary, I urge that the Senate now approve the resolution, Senate Resolution 283, citing Mary Jane Keeney for contempt of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day the Senate passed Senate Resolution 283, citing Mary Jane Keeney for contempt of the Senate. There was an amendment on the desk which should have been considered. I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was agreed to be reconsidered, in order that the amendment may be offered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, as in legislative session, the vote by which Senate Resolution 283 was agreed to earlier in the day will be reconsidered.

The clerk will state the amendment which is on the desk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, at the beginning of line 6, it is proposed to strike out "series of questions" and insert "a certain question", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Mary Jane Keeney to answer a certain question before the said subcommittee, together with all facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Mary Jane Keeney may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY—TRIBUTE TO THE IRISH

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, today is the 17th of March, St. Patrick's Day, the day on which the sons and daughters of Ireland, wherever they may be, turn their hearts and minds to memories of the Emerald Isle and its noble role in the history of mankind. It is the day on which the Irish gather together to pay a tribute of gratitude, affection, and reverence to Ireland's patron saint, and it is a day on which they may in all decency and without boastfulness express their pride in the magnificent achievements of their race in every land and clime.

Mr. President, this is a year of trial and tension everywhere, a time when the age-old battle between liberty and tyranny is being fought throughout the world and when the outcome of that struggle is fraught with meaning not only to all of us here in America but to all men wherever they may live who hunger for the freedom and well-being we enjoy. At such a time it is more than ever fitting to remind our friends here and abroad that throughout the many centuries since the idea of individual freedom dawned, the cause of liberty has had no more vigorous advocates or gallant defenders than the people of Ireland. Those who fight to escape from tyranny and to win the right to a free way of life can well take courage from the history of a nation whose men for centuries fought and died to establish man's God-given right to enjoy that way of life.

In other and better times we might well reflect on Ireland's other values; on its piety, its peacefulness, its productivity. But in times like this it is well to focus our attention on those Irish attitudes which characterized the long, long years through which men fought for Ireland's freedom; years which presented to the world a picture of indomitable courage, of persistent sacrifice, of selfless heroism, and of the fact that, backed by such a spirit, the idea of freedom can and will triumph over all obstacles and despite all tyrannical concentrations of military power.

It is so short a time since Ireland won its freedom, Mr. President, that all of us can well remember the details of that victory. But what I would recall to mind—what I regard as of the utmost importance to today's world and in today's struggle against tyranny—is one often overlooked and seldom recognized aspect of the Irish Revolution. It is the fact that during Ireland's long struggle for freedom from an imperialistic oppressor, not once did the people of Ireland, embittered as they might well have been, lose sight of their real goal or of the true values they sought to win. Never in the heat of the immediate battle did they forget that they fought for freedom and justice not for themselves alone but for all men everywhere. Time and time again in the course of that heroic struggle, whenever Britain in its relations with other nations was in the right, the Irish flocked to serve the cause of justice in Britain's fighting forces. The job being done, always they returned to their struggle to establish Ireland's freedom. And when that battle was finally won, the proud, fighting Irish proved humble in victory, restrained in their triumph, willing to prove to the people of England the essential friendliness which characterizes all the Irish people.

Mr. President, I think that Britain has learned that Ireland's victory and the establishment of the Irish Republic was a gain and not a loss. That it is far more valuable to Britain to have a free people and a free nation for one's neighbor than it is to waste their substance in trying to hold a nation and a people enthralled. Britain learned that lesson as regards southern Ireland. She is learning it again in her efforts to maintain her empire in other parts of the world. Perhaps, in the not-too-distant future, we will have more definite proof that the lesson has been finally learned when northern Ireland too becomes a part of Eire.

But, Mr. President, in the history which I have been recounting there is a lesson for us, too, and for free men everywhere. For in this story of the relationship between Ireland and Britain lies the proof that we in the free democratic nations are right in the course we are pursuing and that Russia is wrong; proof that if other nations, victims of aggression, will show the same courage, understanding, and willingness to sacrifice in the cause of freedom as did the Irish, we and the world will win. And, Mr. President, it is proof, too, that tyranny over the minds and souls of men in other lands does not pay off; it cannot permanently prevail.

It may be that we cannot today penetrate the iron curtain and see for ourselves what is going on in the minds of men in Poland and in Latvia, in Czechoslovakia, or in Bulgaria. It may be that we cannot now document the feelings which will sooner or later overtake the people of China as more and more of their freedom and their substance is stolen by the dictators of Moscow. But this we do know, Mr. President, and we know it from our study of Ireland's history: we know that every time Moscow has enslaved a nation, it has weakened itself and has driven yet another nail in what will eventually be the coffin of communism. For it is only in freedom and in the amicable relationships among free nations that strength and well-being can be found. Wherever the minds of men are kept in chains, there too we will find exploitation, waste, and festering political sores on the body politic. Therein lies the lesson which Ireland's recent history holds for the world.

But we have been speaking of Ireland's recent history and of the world of today. Permit me, Mr. President, since this is St. Patrick's Day, to speak awhile of Ireland's past and of what that, too, meant to the world. For this is a day on which we should remember an earlier time in history when Eastern hordes swept over Europe and the Dark Ages overtook western civilization. It was in Ireland then that the torch of learning was kept alight. In Ireland's schools and monasteries, men remembered and taught and studied. A people, who instinctively valued knowledge and learning, willingly gave of their all-too-little wealth to support those institutions, and today, when some carping, short-sighted critics object to America's giving a little of her great wealth in the same cause, it is well to remember what came of the willingness of the Irish people to sacrifice for so-called intangible results. Our people and the world should be reminded that when the time was ripe and

men in the Europe of the Middle Ages were sickened unto death by centuries of bloodshed, rapine, plunder, and petty tyrannies, when most of Europe was what most of the Communist world must be like today, then it was that these seeming sacrifices proved their immeasurable value. For when the hearts and minds and souls of men again sought peace and faith and knowledge, it was Ireland's scholars and teachers, spreading out through France, through Belgium, Germany, and Italy, who brought back to Western Europe the light it so sorely needed.

And from that time to the day in which we live, Mr. President, wherever Irishmen have gone, their capacity for work, their friendliness, their simple loyalty, their faith and their intelligence have contributed much to the well-being of the world. It is perhaps here in America that their contributions to the Nation have reached their highest level. In every walk of life, in every State of the Union, Irishmen of courage and of stamina, of intellect and decency, have won the respect of their neighbors and friends.

In closing this tribute to the people of Erin, Mr. President, I should like to make sure that in speaking as I have of Ireland and its people, I am not misinterpreted. The Irish make no claim that theirs is a race or a people or a heritage superior to all others. History proves that the qualities characteristic of the Irish which are responsible for Ireland's peaceful and prosperous place in the world of today are to be found in many lands and among many peoples. It further proves that wherever those high qualities have appeared and amongst whatever people, the Irish have been quick to hold out the hand of friendship and respect. And history also shows that wherever like-minded men, seeking to establish a decent, self-respecting, free and moral way of life, met with opposition and oppression, the Irish have hastened to their aid; not with money or with arms alone but with their blood as well. Centuries ago in France and in Scandinavia; then in a colonial America fighting in 1776 for its independence; in the early 1800's when our great South American neighbors won their freedom; and in the 1940's when Israel won its liberty, yes, whenever men of other races and other beliefs fought for independence and for freedom, there, too, fighting at their sides, were the men of Ireland.

So, Mr. President, when I speak of Ireland and its virtues, I am confident that Ireland's friends throughout the world will know and understand that ours is not vainglorious or self-serving talk. With us they recognize the fact that March 17 is Ireland's day, and as we pay our tributes of gratitude, affection, and reverence to St. Patrick, they will, I know, join with me in singing the praises of the Irish people.

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that I call on all who hear my voice or read these words to pledge themselves anew, and, in these days of world-wide crisis, to emulate the courage, the fortitude, and the determination of those who fought for Ireland's freedom. God grant that we shall continue to fight as they did for the rights and liberties of free men everywhere; fight to insure the strength of free nations, the dignity of the individual, and the establishing of justice and of peace throughout the world.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

Mr. JENNER. On behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and myself, I offer four reservations to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reservations will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and myself, I offer three reservations to the security treaty between the United States of America and Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The three reservations also will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the same sponsors, I offer a reservation to the security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That reservation will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the same sponsors, I offer a reservation to the mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The same procedure will be followed as to this reservation.

The reservations submitted by Mr. JENNER (for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine) were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed as follows:

JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

RESERVATION NO. 1

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishments, and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

RESERVATION NO. 2

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to diminish or prejudice in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied Powers as defined in such treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, or any other territories, rights, or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer on the Soviet Union any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto, and nothing in such treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions of the so-called Yalta agreement of February 11, 1945, or the so-called Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945.

RESERVATION NO. 3

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to abrogate the claims of the United States for direct military costs of the occupation, or just and proper claims of private citizens of the United States.

RESERVATION NO. 4

In accordance with the so-called Stimson doctrine of January 7, 1932, which states that "The American Government * * * cannot admit the legality of any situation de facto nor does it intend to recognize any treaty or agreement * * * which may impair the treaty rights of the United States or its citizens in China, including those which relate to the sovereignty, the independence, or the territorial and administrative integrity of the Republic of China or to the international policy relative to China, commonly known as the open-door policy; and * * * does not intend to recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the covenants and obligations of the pact of Paris of August 27, 1928," no rights or claims referred to in this treaty shall be deemed to accrue to any government or so-called Government of China established by recourse to war, and, as used in this treaty, the word "China" refers to the legally established Republic of China, the sovereignty of which shall be deemed to extend to all areas which were a part of China at the outbreak of the late war between Japan and China, including Manchuria, Formosa, and the islands adjacent to Formosa.

TREATY WITH THE PHILIPPINES

RESERVATION

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment, and its domestic concerns.

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND JAPAN

RESERVATION NO. 1

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment, and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

RESERVATION NO. 2

Since Congress under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war and authorize the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States, any so-called administrative agreements under article III of this treaty relating to the right to dispose of the Armed Forces of the United States or any part of its military establishment in or about Japan shall not become binding on the United States unless ratified by the Senate as a treaty in accordance with article II, section 2, of the Constitution, or approved by the Congress by act or joint resolution specifically referring to such agreement or arrangement.

RESERVATION NO. 3

The rights of the United States under this treaty shall not expire until all agreements or arrangements for our security in the Pacific, referred to in article IV, have been ratified by the Senate as a treaty in accordance with article II, section 2 of the Constitution or approved by the Congress by act or joint resolution specifically referring to such agreements or arrangements.

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND THE UNITED STATES

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that nothing contained in this

treaty shall be construed to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, and its domestic concerns.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, in several recent statements I have put before the Senate a fundamental analysis of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the three Pacific security treaties.

On February 20 I spoke at length on this subject on the floor of the Senate. I do not intend to speak very long this afternoon. I pointed out that the treaties were contracts in which the language was unclear. On the surface they appeared to resemble the propasals of General MacArthur for peace with Japan, and military assistance for defense of Japan until she was prepared to defend herself.

I understand, Mr. President, that we must have a treaty, and I am for a treaty, but I want to be sure that the interests of America are preserved.

Carefully examined, the contracts have been transformed into a legal maze in which we give up command of our own military forces and accept permanently in the Pacific the policy of confusion and defeat which we suffered in China and face today in Korea.

I have just offered reservations designed to clarify the treaties so that they will conform to the historic policies of the United States in the Pacific and preserve our full sovereign power over our Military Establishment in accordance with our Constitution.

The reservations which the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and I have just offered are very simple.

They merely assert that the United States does not surrender any of its sovereign power over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, or its domestic concerns, and does not agree to any limitation of sovereignty on Japan or China.

These reservations can, I am sure, be approved by every Member of this body. They will not delay the peacemaking nor prolong the occupation. They do not necessitate sending the peace treaty to other signatories. Already by unanimous vote the Foreign Relations Committee has accepted one reservation concerning Yalta. That reservation was offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

They do not involve disagreements with other nations, unless our stating that we are opposed to government by conquest is offensive to some other nation.

THE PEACE TREATY

Reservation No. 1 to the peace treaty with Japan is a simple assertion that, in agreeing to this treaty, the Senate is not consenting to any limitations on the sovereignty of the United States, or on the elements that make up sovereignty—control of our foreign policy, Military Establishment and domestic concerns.

We likewise impose no limitations on the full sovereignty of Japan.

This reservation is necessary because in several places throughout the treaty there are phrases which limit our military or diplomatic action to choices approved by the United Nations.

Since the U. S. S. R. and her satellites are among the governing bodies of U. N., and Red China may be invited in—more than likely she will be—the treaty as it stands limits us in the Pacific to policies which the U. S. S. R. or its satellites agree.

Reservation No. 1 establishes our freedom to make diplomatic and military moves in the Pacific as our national interest or moral responsibilities require even if we stand alone. Americans are willing to stand for that which they think is right, whether they have help or not. We still believe that God and one make a majority.

This reservation also is necessary to preserve our sovereignty in domestic affairs. The treaty refers at several points to the U. N. declaration of human rights, and the imposition by U. N. of policies of FEPC, compulsory racial equality, full employment, and other purely domestic policies imposed by articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter.

If the Senate of the United States wishes to approve the U. N. definition of human rights, it can do so openly. We cannot approve it for Japan without approving it by indirection for ourselves.

Mr. JENNER. I know it is said that this declaration occurs only in the preamble, and that it is not in the body of the treaty, and therefore is not binding.

If the Senate of the United States wishes to impose FEPC, compulsory racial equality, and State-controlled full employment upon Japan and ourselves, it can do so openly, not by indirection in a treaty.

The provisions of this treaty as they stand are contrary to the recently submitted Bricker amendment which would specifically forbid Congress to permit interference by an international body in our domestic concerns under the guise of a treaty.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is the first reservation which the Senator proposes a long one? In order that we may have it clear, will the Senator read it?

Mr. JENNER. I do not have a copy before me. It is very brief. Several days ago I sent a copy of it to every Senator. The Senator has a copy of it in his office.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think it would be well to clarify this question as the Senator discusses the reservations, if he could read reservation No. 1.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, may the clerk read reservation No. 1 to the Japanese peace treaty?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read reservation No. 1.

Reservation No. 1 was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

RESERVATION NO. 1

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

Mr. JENNER. I am somewhat confused by recent statements that what is contained in the preamble is not binding in the courts. This issue is not going to be submitted to the courts. It is going to be decided by political action. This preamble, together with similar statements, is designed to win electoral consent to a gradual change in our sovereignty and our military command.

If it is affirmed it is as effective in the preamble as anywhere else, in winning political support.

It will not be decided in the courts.

The Constitution gives Congress the power to declare war and to raise and support armies.

This is the indispensable power in representative government.

We cannot cling tightly to Congress' legal right to control of the sword and ignore the actuality that the power of the people's representatives to decide whether we shall resort to war, is being eroded by political action which will never be subject to judicial tests.

Reservation No. 2 to the peace treaty is the amendment submitted by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, except that it excludes Potsdam as well as Yalta.

Potsdam in effect reaffirms the Yalta agreement.

Potsdam took the territories away from Japan but did not decide what to do with them. Yalta took the territories from Japan and gave them to Russia.

Therefore, voting not to recognize Yalta would still leave us fully committed to the Yalta agreement through its reaffirmation at Potsdam.

Forrestal reports in his diary how President Truman said, "that if one part of the agreements at Yalta were breached, he—the President—would consider the entire Yalta agreement was no longer binding."

If Russia has breached the agreement again and again, why should we validate it now?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. Gladly.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it the position of the Senator from Indiana that the reservation put into the treaty by the Committee on Foreign Relations only did a part of the job, so to speak?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. It provided that we would not recognize Yalta in any sense of the word. However, it is impossible to say it without at the same time also mentioning Potsdam, because the Potsdam agreement reaffirms the Yalta agreement. Under the Potsdam Agreement we said we would take the territories away from Japan, but we did not specifically say to whom they were to be awarded. Of course de facto the Kuriles and South Sakhalin, for example, are in Russian hands because they are occupied by Russian troops.

Mr. BRIDGES. In other words, the job which the Committee on Foreign Relations purported to do has been only partly done by it, unless the reservation proposed by the Senator from Indiana, which follows through with Potsdam, is adopted by this body.

Mr. JENNER. That is my understanding.

Reservation No. 3 merely retains for the United States freedom of decision with respect to occupation costs and private claims until the reparations issue and the claims of other nationals are all submitted.

We can then forgive occupation costs, use them as we used the Boxer indemnity, or collect them, as seems best when we have complete information.

In other words, it would look absurd if Communist China were to make claims for reparations against Japan for $50,000,000,000, which Mr. Dulles said she could do, and for us to turn right around and forgive Japan all of our costs of occupation, and so forth, while at the same time permitting Japan to pay Communist China the $50,000,000,000. Under the reservation we would not decide until all reparations and claims issues were decided.

Reservation No. 4 reaffirms the Stimson doctrine and the open-door policy, which represent our traditional policy in Asia, namely, that we agree to no carving up of the Republic of China.

This is also reaffirmation of the Cairo declaration, which says:

> All territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores shall be restored to the Republic of China.

This reservation is necessary to preserve our historic policy of nonrecognition of conquest.

But it is also a matter of vital self-interest to us.

The treaty, as it stands, conforms to the Yoshida letter, which amputates all mainland China from the legal government of the Republic, now on Formosa.

It, therefore, conveys all war claims, including reparations—estimated by Mr. Dulles at $50,000,000,000—to mainland China, now Red China.

I am sure that Members of this body do not want to be a party to any deal like that.

The reparations clauses of this treaty fix exactly the proposals of the Pauley reparations mission to Japan in 1945.

Recently, before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Lattimore, under oath, referred to his influence on the Pauley report.

The Pauley report was the Morgenthau plan for Japan.

It provided for a leveling down of the production and standard of living of the Japanese to that of the rest of Asia, just as Germany was to be leveled down to the standards of Eastern Europe.

The so-called surplus equipment of Japan was to be used to industrialize the rest of Asia as the so-called surplus equipment of Germany was to be used to increase the war industries of Russia.

The only difference is that the present treaty does not transfer industrial plants as in Germany.

It transfers the output of the plants, as in Finland, Czechoslovakia, and the Balkans.

The Soviet Union learned from its failure in Germany and Manchuria that commandeering output was a far more profitable kind of tribute than seizing plants.

So far as the treaty stands now we are agreeing that a substantial part of the annual output of Japanese plants must be transferred to Red China if she wants it.

And we know she wants it.

Reservation No. 4 preserves intact the legal sovereignty of the Republic of China over the mainland and makes it the claimant for all reparations labor and output which are alloted to China.

The reservation withholds our consent to the arrangement by which Japan could be compelled to provide modern arms and construction to build up a Communist China.

THE SECURITY TREATIES

Reservation No. 1 to each of the three treaties reaffirms our sovereign right to control of our foreign policy, military establishment and domestic concerns.

Reservations No. 2 and 3 to the Japan Security Treaty reaffirms Congressional control of the right to make war.

The second reservation provides that the so-called administrative agreement with Japan, which will determine our rights to troops and bases—and I quote from the treaty—"in or about Japan," shall not be binding until ratified by Congress.

Mr. President, we now have a draft of that agreement, most of which deals with the legal status of military and civilian personnel at our bases. But Article XXVI sets up a joint commission of one American and one Japanese with virtually unlimited power over our "facilities and areas"—I quote from the agreement—in Japan.

Mr. President, I do not want any personal diplomacy. If there is going to be war, either under the United Nations or PATO or anyone else, I want Congress to have the right to say whether our country will participate in that war. The Congress represents the people of the United States. We who serve in Congress cannot turn over to someone else the war-making power of the Congress, and then hide behind our action. So far as the welfare of the people of the United States is concerned, the power to make war is one of the most important powers dealt with by the Constitution of the United States. In the absence of a constitutional amendment to that effect, the Congress cannot give that power to anyone else.

Mr. President, will the lone representative of the United States on the proposed joint commission composed of one American and one Japanese represent the State Department or the Defense Department? I do not know. No Senator knows, and no one else knows. Congress needs to know what commitments are made in our name.

The third reservation to the security pact between the United States and Japan provides that our rights under this treaty which are to expire when the Government of the United States and Japan approve a substitute arrangement, shall not expire unless the agreements which replace those rights have been approved by Congress. Mr. President, do you see anything wrong with that? Could any other nation in the world object to that?

In other words, under the mutual security pact we are to build bases and to station men in Japan for the defense, peace, and security of Japan. However, whenever our Government and the Japanese Government determine that there is sufficient security in and about Japan, then under this treaty, by a stroke of the pen the President of the United States will be able to turn over to United Nations' command our equipment and our soldiers in that area.

As the treaty now stands, the President has the power to decide that either the U. N. or a Pacific regional pact, or PATO, satisfactorily provides for the collective security of the United States in the Pacific. The President then can transfer our military forces in the Pacific and our bases there either to U. N. or to PATO.

Reservation No. 3 requires that any substitution must be approved by Congress. We do not want any more Koreas or any more police actions, and this is the only way to prevent them. This is a reaffirmation of the position of Congress on troops for Europe, and would prevent a repetition of the situation of June 1950, when the President, without consulting Congress, transformed American forces in the Korean war into U. N. forces, which are not subject to congressional policy making. That is exactly what happened. This treaty will provide for it again, unless the Senate adopts these reservations.

POWER OF THE SWORD

These are details, Mr. President, designed to clarify the wording of the proposed contract. Mr. President, I say again that I am in favor of a Japanese peace treaty. I know we must have a treaty with Japan. However, the underlying meaning of every word of the reservations is this:

By ratifying these treaties as they stand, Congress effectively and finally transfers its constitutional power over the sword to the Executive arm, which in turn can transfer it to another sovereign power, U. N. or PATO.

Representative government stands or falls on the power of the people's representatives to keep the military establishment obedient to the public will.

It does not make the slightest difference what the Congress does, how busy it is, or how many so-called laws it passes; if the Executive can use the military establishment to serve its own purposes, we have despotism. It may be a long time before the full evil is unveiled, but the transfer of power is complete and soon irrevocable.

Mr. President, the people's control of their own Armed Forces, through the

Congress, was not won by any paper document describing their rights. It was won by the vigorous assertion of their power by the Parliament under the Stuarts, and by the American Continental Congress under the Georges.

The right of Congress to choose when we shall invoke armed force against another nation rests, not in the written rights of Congress, but in the political wisdom and skill of Congress in maintaining this right against all forms of Executive encroachment, including guile.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield at this point for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator from Indiana recall that some time ago we found on our desks in the Senate Chamber a pamphlet described as a study of the executive power from the the standpoint of the Executive? It had an introduction, as I recall, signed by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Does the Senator from Indiana recall that in that pamphlet it was stated that it is now apparent that the power of Congress to declare war is in abeyance? If the Senator remembers that, does he agree with the results of that study?

Mr. JENNER. I certainly do not agree. That is exactly what I am trying to point out in connection with this treaty, so that we shall not encounter that situation again.

Mr. President, I will not consent, either now or ever, to let any President transfer the Armed Forces of the United States to any sovereignty.

I will not sign a blank check which permits a President of the United States to haul down the American flag in the Pacific and to put another flag over air fields and naval bases constructed with money taken from the American people for defense of their country.

I cannot agree to a constitutional change, hidden in a peace treaty, which will effectively transfer the power of the sword from the Congress to the Executive.

Mr. President, in statements I have made to this body on previous occasions I have given the arguments supporting my position. On February 20 I made a long speech on this entire subject. I have spent many hours of work on this matter. As I understand, until today no Member of the Senate other than myself has raised his voice in this body in regard to this situation. Many Senators have admitted to me that they have not read this proposed peace treaty.

Mr. President, I am just a country lawyer; I am not a great constitutional lawyer. Nevertheless, I have dug deeply into this matter. I ask all my colleagues to listen to the questions and have them answered to their satisfaction. That is all I ask. I know that all Senators are busy, and cannot read every speech or follow every bill.

However, Mr. President, I ask all my colleagues, Members of the United States Senate, if they do not have time to study this treaty—and a study of it requires long hours of very patient work—then vote "no," or at least do not vote at all.

At this critical hour, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues not to vote for this treaty without first including in it the necessary clarifying reservations, unless Senators are willing to deliver to the Presidency the military power of this Nation and unless Senators are willing to let a strange, new flag wave over American soldiers and sailors in the Pacific water so recently stained with American blood.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me at this time?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the Senator from Indiana aware of the fact that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has submitted a unanimous report urging ratification of this peace treaty at an early date, thus creating the impression that the members of the committee are entirely satisfied with the provisions of the treaty and that there is little, if any, justification for any delay in ratifying the treaty or any scrutiny of the various provisions of the treaty?

Mr. JENNER. I am aware of that. I do not know why there should be so much rush.

Only a little while ago the admission was made on this floor that Yoshida now is trying to negotiate a treaty with Nationalist China located on Formosa, and that those negotiations have been under way for several weeks. Very well; then why do not we look into that matter? I do not know why there is so much rush.

Many thousands of our troops are pinned down in Korea, and Korea is the sword point directed toward Japan. So why is there so much rush, Mr. President? I do not know. But, Mr. President, do not get me wrong. I am not opposed to the Japanese Peace Treaty. I want a treaty. We must have a treaty. But I want a treaty which will not pull down the American flag, to erect in its place a United Nations flag. After all, General Ridgway is in command of the United Nations forces in Korea today; but there is no guaranty that, a year from now, or 2 years from now, under NATO, even a United States general will be in charge of the American boys in Asia. So, let us look at this realistically. Let us have these questions answered satisfactorily. For example, does this body want the Japanese economy to engage in the production of war reparations to Red China, to the extent of $50,000,000,000, to build up the strength of Communist China, and to enable them to proceed with their deadly assaults upon Indochina? But it can be done under this treaty, unless this reservation concerning reparations and claims is adopted by this body.

Mr. President, we are supposed to be opposed to communism. This should afford a test of where we stand. I do not know the answers, though I know that I have dug deep and hard. I know I am fearful about this; and all I ask of this body is to listen, read, and study before Senators cast their votes.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KEM. I would like to ask the Senator from Indiana whether he has presented this point of view to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

Mr. JENNER. No, I have not.

Mr. KEM. Does the Senator plan to do so?

Mr. JENNER. As a matter of fact, I did not get into it in time. I have not had time enough to do that. As Senators know, the Japanese Security Pact was signed before the Senate had had an opportunity of seeing it. No Member of this body that I know of, with the exception possibly of a small committee, had an opportunity to see it. I did not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it had not been my intention to address myself to the Japanese peace treaty this afternoon, but since no other Senator seems to be ready to speak, I think I shall avail myself of this opportunity. It will not be my purpose to discuss in any detail the reservations proposed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. It is my understanding that the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will discuss the reservations at a later time.

Mr. President, I should like at this time merely to call attention to two or three general propositions, without going into detail.

The first one is this: The first reservation offered by the Senator from Indiana provides that there shall be no limitation on severeignty. A treaty, by its very nature, imposes certain limitations, otherwise there would be no necessity of entering into a solemn and binding contract such as a treaty.

In another instance, the distinguished Senator from Indiana objects to our use of the term "China." As I recall he refers to that in connection with Article 10, and also in Article 21, I believe it is. The language used in Article 10 is the exact language recommended by the Nationalist Government of China. On this point, there has been, of course, a great deal of discussion from time to time about the failure to have the Nationalist Chinese represented in this peace treaty. Of course, I wish that they might have been present, and might have participated; but the failure to have them do so was the result of conditions with which we were confronted. We were confronted with the alternative either of having no peace treaty at all, or of following the practical solution of not having either of the Chinese governments invited, and of leaving it to Japan to decide upon the one with whom she would execute a treaty.

At the time, we were in contact with the Nationalist Chinese Government, the only government we recognize. While that Government naturally was disappointed in the solution arrived at, I believe they understood it fully and I may say that as the treaty was being gradually built up, we were in communication with representatives of the National Chinese Government and accepted many of their suggestions as to what should be placed in the treaty. It was not a situation in which Nationalist China was left

without friends among those who were drafting the treaty.

I have listened to all the debate which has taken place on this peace treaty—perhaps I should call it the discussion, rather than the debate, because I believe there is a fair degree of unanimity as to the desirability of having the treaty with Japan ratified as early as possible. Every person who has represented us in connection with Japan, its occupation and the administration of its affairs, has urged that very thing. As a matter of fact, it was General MacArthur who gave the word as to when he thought we were ready to begin drafting a treaty of peace with Japan; and all the way through, he urged that we proceed to that end. The same thing was true of General Ridgway; it was true of our various political representatives who deal with the Japanese problem from time to time.

Mr. President, I wish to second the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] as to the manner in which this peace treaty was formulated. As I said in the course of the hearings, and as I am glad now to repeat, I feel that the drafting of this peace treaty, and all the work connected with bringing it to this point, has constituted perhaps the finest demonstration I have yet seen of proper bipartisan cooperation between the executive and legislative branches of the Government. Before a single word of this treaty was put on paper, Mr. Dulles, who ably represented the State Department all the way through, and Mr. John Allison, who was his chief assistant, and Mr. Dean Rusk, who was the Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, sat across the table from our subcommittee, the members of which include the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], as well as myself. We sat across the table and discussed, first, why we needed to execute a peace treaty at this time; second, what were the general principles which should underlie the peace treaty and, third, methods of operating whereby we might get an overwhelming majority of the countries who were concerned to participate in the formulation with us of the treaty.

Fifty-four countries were concerned with the treaty with Japan, the greatest number, I suppose, that ever tried to work out a peace treaty with a conquered nation. Little by little the treaty developed. I remember that at another meeting Mr. Dulles brought to us the first draft, consisting of approximately 6 pages, simply a general statement. He said at that time, "We want this treaty to be brief." He told us how long some treaties were, the treaty with Italy, for instance, and said, "We want about the shortest possible treaty the world has ever seen."

The treaty expanded somewhat from six typewritten pages, but not very much. It is still one of the shortest peace treaties of record, but it covers the whole field, and we believe it covers it adequately.

Mr. President, the treaty was not drawn and brought to us with the statement, "Here it is." It was worked out step by step and word by word within our committee, by our subcommittee, consisting of two Democrats and two Republicans, and by the able representatives of the State Department, and, in turn, between them and the representatives of the various governments concerned. Every time there was a new development, we would have an additional meeting, and then Mr. Dulles or Mr. Allison would start off on a swing that took them practically around the world as they consulted with the 54 governments concerned with this peace treaty.

There were many jobs to be done. I see the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] on the floor. I well recall one time when we were trying to work out this treaty and he made a trip to Japan and to the far eastern area in order to talk with the people and to make such contribution as he could, even though he was not a member of our committee; but he was greatly interested in such matters as maritime activities, shipbuilding, fishing, and things of that kind.

So the treaty was built little by little, and I believe I am safe in saying that there never before was a treaty built more carefully and more painstakingly than was this one.

As I say, Mr. President, it is not my purpose, and I hope the Senate will not construe it so to be, to answer at this time the reservations proposed by the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. It is my understanding that the distinguished and able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will discuss them at a later time.

Mr. President, I desire to turn most of my attention to the security pacts.

It is a pleasure for me to rise in support of these treaties. I wish to speak in several capacities: First, as a citizen; second, as a Senator; third, as the chairman of the Subcommitte on the Far East of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations; and fourth, as one of the United States delegates to the San Francisco Conference. I think it may be in order to state that I visited the Far East accompanied by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] just before the opening of this session of the Congress. It is thus with some first-hand knowledge and with great interest in this area that I rise to address the Senate.

Mr. President, I am fully aware of the apprehension which many American citizens and our brave former allies have in entering into these treaties. I am also aware of the many dangers that lie in wait for the world if we fail to make peace with Japan. Balancing one against the other, I have no hesitation in supporting these treaties with firmness and with wholehearted conviction.

When we decided to negotiate a treaty of peace with Japan, we meant to go much further than merely ending the state of war. It was our firm intention to strengthen the cause of peace and mutual security throughout the entire Pacific area. That is why we now have three security pacts before us for consideration at the same time we consider the treaty of peace with Japan. These four treaties taken together make clear that our interests in the Pacific are not confined to a single country but are as broad as the area itself. They also show that for both practical and sentimental reasons we desire the closest cooperation with the Australians, the New Zealanders, and the Filipinos, who, like ourselves, are deeply concerned with creating peaceful and stable conditions in the Far East.

Mr. President, let us look for a moment at the background against which we must appraise these treaties. Vast changes have occurred in Japan since the historic signing of the surrender instrument on board the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Harbor on September 2, 1945. The war-making power of Japan has been liquidated, its aggressive spirit has been transmuted into economic production, its large monopolistic combines have been broken, women have been given political rights and are now on the road to equality with men, and a democratic constitution has been promulgated. It is a new democratic Japan, which we confront—one ready to take its place with the peace-loving states of the world, prepared to make its contribution to a peaceful and orderly Far East. The Japanese people, freed of feudalistic inhibitions and warlike traditions, eagerly await the opportunity to test their new institutions and freedoms unshackled by occupation forces and regulations. Since they are ready to assume their responsibilities as an independent state, I, for one, believe that the United States should join promptly in granting them the freedom they now seek. As Senators know, it has long been our stated purpose to accord the Japanese people freedom and independence just as soon as they are ready.

The problem, Mr. President, is far more complicated than merely granting Japan her independence. The facts are that Japan is located in an area of great change and restlessness. In her present disarmed conditions she could easily fall prey to aggression unless someone helps her. Without in any way condoning past Japanese aggressions, we can all recall from our study of history that for many generations it has been Russia's aim to conquer the Asiatic mainland and then, in, turn, to seize control of Japan. Let any doubter scan the history of Russian aggression in the Far East. Let him recall the dreams of Muraviev, the bunglings of Alexeiev, the schemings of Count Witte, the history of the Trans-Siberian Railway, the Russo-Japanese War, the running fights between Japan and the Soviet Union during the 1930's, and the postwar Soviet colonialism throughout Eurasia. The record is so voluminous that we cannot possibly ignore it.

Every Senator knows that there is an urgency about the Russian problem. It concerns the treaties before us. But recently something new has been added to Russian expansionism. The Soviet Union is served by satellites and minion states who do its bidding. In June 1950 one of the puppets, North Korea, embarged upon aggression against its freedom-loving neighbor, South Korea, and directly menaced the security of Japan. Where the next aggression may come

from is, of course, a strategic mystery; but that aggression is contemplated can no longer be doubted, and that it may affect Japan can also no longer be doubted. Look, for example, at developments in Indochina. The Far East is riddled with Communist propaganda, the consequences of which are unpredictable. Conquests are schemed and engineered by Soviet and other Communist governments producing a restlessness in which aggression may appear at any moment. In the very center of this area lies Japan and on the periphery we find the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand.

This is the background against which we must examine the treaties before us. Obviously, if there is a pressing problem in the Far East, it is that of security.

The Senate will recall that the Japanese constitution uniquely renounces war forever as an instrument of national policy. Furthermore, by article 5 of the Treaty of Peace Japan undertakes to live peacefully, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, which according to article 2 (6) of the Charter, means that Japan is obligated to refrain in international relations from the threat or the use of force. In addition to these contractual obligations Japan does not now have the physical means with which to defend herself against attack.

She has thus entered upon noble undertakings which in a different situation might spell stability, but in today's world make her an easy mark for the aggressor. If Japan were left without any kind of protection against aggression, that condition would constitute an open invitation to disaster and serfdom for Japan. In fact, in my opinion, it would spell disaster for the peace and security of the Far East generally. Russian forces are poised only a few miles from the Japanese homeland. They are located on the Habomai Islands, on the Kurile Islands, and on Karafuto—Southern Sakhalin—all of which are situated only a few miles from Hakkaido. Is there anyone among us who sincerely doubts that the Soviet forces would be able within a few hours to conquer most of Japan, if Japan were left without means of defense?

I know there are those who would point out that article 5 of the peace treaty states that Japan possesses "the inherent right of individual and collective self-defense." But let us be realistic. I ask Senators, if that right is not implemented with real power, can it be exercised? Obviously not. Japan could easily be shorn of all her rights in her present unarmed condition. What good is any right of self-defense if a country is unable to exercise it? Who would plead that an unarmed man was adequately protected by his inherent right of self-defense when attacked by an armed murderous madman?

Under these circumstances I am sure every member present will agree with the underlying purposes of article 6 of the peace treaty. That article calls for the end of the occupation of Japan, but at the same time gives Japan the opportunity of securing the defense it needs provided it asks for the aid. Article 6 sets a 90-day period in which the occupation forces now in Japan must be withdrawn. The period is to be measured from the time the treaty comes into force. But, as already indicated, this same article also permits Japan to enter into multilateral and bilateral treaties or arrangements for the retention or the stationing of allied troops in Japan. I want to emphasize that the determination of whether or not she shall enter into such agreements depends completely on Japan's decision to do so.

This arrangement grew out of the suggestion made by Ambassador Dulles to Japanese officials in February 1951, that the United States would "sympathetically consider" the stationing of armed forces in Japan for the defense of Japan if Japan so wished. On February 11, 1951, Premier Yoshida warmly welcomed this offer. Subsequent discussions developed the conclusion that the best arrangement would be a bilateral security agreement between the United States and Japan.

When the conference met in San Francisco last September, Ambassador Dulles made this comment:

> No person in this room, and I mean that literally, honestly believes that Japan seeks collective security with the United States because it is coerced. That is palpably absurd.

In discussing the dangers confronting Japan and speaking of a peace which granted Japan sovereignty and freedom without permitting Japan to protect them, he went on to say:

> That kind of peace, in this kind of a world, would be a fraud. To give a sovereignty which cannot be defended is to give an empty husk. Indefensible sovereignty is not sovereignty at all. An undefendable and indefensible Japan would be so subject to the menace of surrounding power that Japan would not, in fact, be able to lead an independent existence.

Mr. President, these are some of the reasons why something more than a peace treaty seemed to be needed. These clearly point out why a security pact between the United States and Japan was deemed important and necessary. We shall examine its nature in just a moment.

Before going into that, however, let me make one point, which seems, at least to me, to be very important. Some anxious people have raised an important and sound question. They ask, When the treaty comes into effect, since Soviet Russia and China are not signatories nor parties to it, will these countries still be at war with Japan If they are still at war with Japan, will it not be perfectly proper for them to move in and occupy Japan? If they were to do so, in what position would that leave the Allied Powers? The argument has been made that there would be no legal obstacle in the way of such Russian or Chinese action.

Mr. President, I believe that those who are worried on this score can be completely reassured. The committee looked into the matter and was told by the Secretary of State that no basis exists in law for such unilateral action. Legally, the situation is this: The Potsdam surrender terms of July 26, 1945, to which the Soviet Union became a partner, called for Allied occupation until the basic objectives set forth in the declaration had been attained, and when the Japanese people had set up a government of their freely expressed choice. The occupation was thus a joint undertaking, not that of a single power, neither that of the United States nor of the Soviet Union, nor of Great Britain. No nation, except as it might act in the behalf of the other powers, had by itself any occupation rights in Japan. That continues to be just as true today after the signing of the peace treaty with Japan as it was before the signing. It will continue to be true after the treaty has become effective. Neither the Soviet Union nor the Chinese Communist Government has any right to act alone in Japan. They have neither belligerent nor occupation rights to do so.

The San Francisco conference on these treaties showed clearly that it considered the terms of the Potsdam declaration fulfilled, and that the time for peace had arrived, not only because those powers desired peace with Japan, but also because Japan under the terms of the Potsdam declaration was entitled to a peace treaty. I am sure that only those who seek an excuse for aggression would reason otherwise.

We all know that there will always be those who, for aggressive or selfish purposes, will invent spurious arguments to justify aggressive acts, and we all know that no human instrument can be given ironclad protection against such assaults. But looking at the matter with complete candor and balance, I am sure that Senators will reach the same conclusions. Russia and China have the physical power to embark upon aggression, if they so desire. Whether they will do so, they alone can tell. If they embark upon aggression in Japan, it will not be for legal reasons. Such pseudo-legal justifications as they might make would only cloak their previously determined judgment that the time was propitious to seize with force that which they were unable to obtain by legal means.

Now, that being the case, if any power were to resort to what has been euphemistically called "belligerent rights," it would violate the Potsdam surrender terms and bring into immediate play article 2 of the security treaty with Japan, which reads:

> During the exercise of the right referred to in article I, Japan will not grant, without the prior consent of the United States of America, any bases or any rights, powers, or authority whatsoever, in or relating to bases or the right of garrison or of maneuver, or transit of ground, air, or naval forces to any third power.

It is clear to me at least that Japan would have to oppose any such effort to conquer her country, and this would bring the whole Pacific security arrangement into play.

In such a case, I need not point out that any aggression of this sort could only mean that its perpetrators have deliberately embarked upon their acts with a view to plunging mankind into world war III. They would not stumble into such a debacle. They would deliberately with malice aforethought launch their aggression.

It is only reasonable then that the preamble of the security treaty with Japan should recite the conditions which prevail in the world and state that Japan has voluntarily sought an agreement with the United States to protect Japan from irresponsible militarism. It is reasonable likewise that the preamble should state that the United States in the interests of peace and security is willing to maintain Armed Forces in and about Japan. And article I logically grants the United States the right to dispose its land, sea, and air forces in and about Japan, and provides that the troops so stationed may be used for the protection of peace and security in the Far East. They may also be employed to put down large-scale riots and disturbances in Japan caused through the instigation and intervention of an outside power.

Mr. President, I think that statement is deserving of emphasis. It is not merely to quell disorder within the country itself, but to put down large-scale riots and disturbances in Japan caused through the instigation and intervention of an outside power.

Since the treaty merely provides the framework for the arrangements, article III provides that details shall be spelled out in administrative agreements. The first of these has already been signed, and I shall say more about it in a moment.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the unofficial text of the administrative agreement to which I have made reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the agreement will be printed as requested.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. In negotiating the treaty it was recognized that security conditions in the Pacific might change, particularly that the United Nations might provide a broader framework for peace and stability than that contained in this security treaty. Thus article IV sets forth the conditions for the termination of the treaty, namely, whenever the two governments agree that the United Nations has provided for the peace and security of Japan or when alternative arrangements to that end have been furnished.

Mr. President, some persons have raised objection to the treaty or to the security pact because of this particular provision in it, and have brought up the argument that, in effect, it subordinates the United States to the United Nations, and that the United Nations could order us out of Japan at any time it might wish to do so. I wish to emphasize as strongly as I can that that is not true under the terms of the agreement. The reason this provision is inserted is that we cling to the hope that eventually—the sooner the better—the United Nations may become an effective organization and be able to maintain peace throughout the world. Even short of that, we recognize the desirability of regional pacts which are made within the framework of the United Nations. I refer to such pacts as the North Atlantic Pact, for example.

There are many people who look forward to the day when there may be a Pacific pact. We believe that the time may well come when the bilateral agreements existing between the United States and Japan, between the United States and the Philippines in another case, and between the United States on the one hand and Australia and New Zealand on the other, may all be merged into an over-all Pacific pact agreement, in which other nations in that area may join with all of us in seeing that peace is maintained in that area of the world. That is the purpose of this provision of the security pact.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it not true also that what we are doing here will provide us with a blueprint and a good foundation, constituting a step in the direction of a formal Pacific pact, which we hope will be entered into in the not too distant future?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Senator is exactly right. I believe we might find a comparison in something which happened more than a hundred years ago. A hundred and twenty-five years ago or more the United States unilaterally announced what became known as the Monroe Doctrine. After all, these pacts in the Pacific amount virtually to an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to that area. The Monroe Doctrine has lived throughout the years. But we saw a few years ago the organization of an agreement among the American states. That does not necessarily replace the Monroe Doctrine, but certainly it brings it in as an area agreement, and that is what we look forward to as a possibility some day in the Pacific. I hope that day will come soon. I should like to see Japan, the Philippines, Nationalist China, Indonesia, Siam, Indochina, Australia, New Zealand, Burma, and an independent Korea unite in a regional pact which might have the same premise and might develop the virility which we see developing under the North Atlantic Pact, and under other pacts into which we have entered.

Thus it is clear that the treaty constitutes only a first step—as do the other two security treaties—toward a more general arrangement for the security of the entire Pacific area. It imposes no obligation on the United States, merely giving this country the bases and the rights with which to aid in the defense of the Japan area. I wish to emphasize that we are not obligated to station troops or ships anywhere, nor are we required to provide Japan with anything except that which we voluntarily choose to supply. On that point Mr. Dulles significantly said during the hearings that "what we do will be determined, I take it, by what an enlightened view of our own self-interest requires."

I may interpolate at that point that the United States feels a very definite obligation to help maintain peace in that area of the world. We feel a very definite obligation toward helping Japan to rebuild herself into a condition in which she can fulfill her responsibilities in the family of nations. Certainly we feel that obligation toward the Philppines, to whom we gave independence only a few short years ago. Certainly we feel such an obligation to our gallant allies in the recent war, Australia and New Zealand. We want to see peace in that area; and within the spirit of these various treaties we dedicate ourselves to that end.

Since the Committee on Foreign Relations has concluded its hearings and consideration of these treaties, the State Department has announced that it had signed an administrative agreement with Japan governing the disposition of our Armed Forces in and about Japan, and an unofficial text of that agreement was released on February 28, 1952. It is the text which I asked to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks. It is an executive agreement, and therefore does not require congressional action. Suffice it to say that the agreement conforms in general to similar agreements concluded with sovereign countries throughout the world in which United States forces are now maintained.

Among many other things stated in the press release on this subject is the following sentence:

> Concluded on the basis of sovereign equality and trust by direct negotiation between the two countries, the agreement is satisfactory to both the United States and Japanese Governments and will strengthen the close bonds of mutual interest and regard between their two people.

I believe that one of the reservations which have been proposed by the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] relates to an administrative agreement, not requiring action by Congress.

In that connection, Mr. President, I should like to invite attention to the fact that an administrative agreement is provided for in the security pact itself. It is anticipated and its formulation is provided for. However, such an agreement is a document which relates to what places will be occupied, where the troops will be placed, matters of administration, what rents shall be paid, arrangements for utilities, and so forth, and covers just about every imaginable subject that could be thought of.

We must recognize the fact that the many hundreds of details which must be worked out in these various administrative agreements are subject to change from year to year, from month to month, and even from day to day. It would be impossible to change a treaty each time some detail in it had to be altered.

Mr. President, as I mentioned, they are the kind of administrative agreements we have been using with other governments under which our troops have been placed in foreign countries. I do not know that I should make it as a positive statement, but I do not recall any treaty having been made with England with reference to stationing our troops on the bases we occupy there. I do not recall the making of a treaty with any power when we have obtained from it air bases and when we have located

our air forces and other troops in such countries. That has all been done through administrative agreements, just as is sought to be done in this instance.

Mr. President, it is article III of the security treaty between the United States and Japan which makes reference to these administrative agreements, and I desire to read it:

ARTICLE III

The conditions which shall govern the disposition of Armed Forces of the United States of America in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two governments.

Mr. President, I shall mention one problem that we know will be subject to change and will have to be worked out under an administrative agreement. I refer to a problem which the Presiding Officer, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, who has been president of the American Bar Association, will readily recognize as being a real one. It is the subject of extraterritoriality with reference to criminal offenses committed by our forces in Japan. Who shall try them? What law shall be applied?

It is a difficult problem to solve anywhere, particularly as between the West and the East, because our respective backgrounds and traditions and legal principles differ so greatly.

Finally, this agreement was reached, and I believe everyone will concede that it was a wise solution of the problem, namely, that for the time being American forces will retain jurisdiction over our men when they commit offenses, but when the agreement which we draw up with reference to our forces in the NATO countries is agreed to or comes into being that agreement shall be applied. I have not tried to give the exact wording, but in substance, that is the agreement. It takes into consideration that changes may take place and, indeed, are anticipated.

I believe the Senate will recognize the wisdom of making it an administrative or executive agreement and not requiring its ratification by the Senate or its approval by Congress as a whole.

As the Senators know, Japanese security is only a part of the security of the whole Pacific area. Therefore, when the United States considered the former, the latter also inevitably had to be taken into account. Both Australia and New Zealand were menaced by Japanese aggression during the late war. Any all-out aggression in the Pacific, regardless of its source, was bound to affect both countries. Thus the United States deemed it imperative to enter into a security arrangement with them, especially in view of the lack of some over-all arrangement, which would guarantee the peace and security of the whole Pacific area. A security arrangement with Australia and New Zealand would have the great merit that it would tie the four powers concerned by two security treaties into a common defense of the peace of the Pacific area and thus constitute a stronger deterrent to aggression than would the efforts of one or two countries alone to furnish such a guaranty. Unlike the Japanese security treaty, which ends with the determination of the two signatory powers, article 10 of the treaty with Australia and New Zealand provides that it shall remain in effect indefinitely.

This treaty reaffirms the faith of the contracting parties in the principles of the U. N. Charter, notes that the United States is in occupation of the Ryukyus, recognizes the military obligations of New Zealand and Australia in the Pacific, declares the unity of the contracting parties, warns potential aggressors that each party does not stand alone, and proclaims the desire of the signatories to coordinate their collective defense for purposes of peace and security in the Pacific area. There is a most excellent and persuasive precedent for this treaty. The terms are framed after the North Atlantic Treaty and in many instances the wording of the two documents is identical.

Senators will recognize, for instance, the following language in article I. It states that the contracting parties undertake to settle their disputes amicably and not to resort to the use of force or threat of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Likewise, article II has a familiar ring. It states that the parties agree separately and jointly by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid to maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack, and article III provides for consultation whenever the territorial integrity, the political independence or security of any of the parties is threatened in the Pacific.

The most important provision, article IV, deviates somewhat from the more positive terms of the North Atlantic Treaty. Article IV states that the parties agree that an armed attack in the Pacific area would be dangerous to the peace and safety of the parties, and they agree to meet the common danger in accordance with their constitutional processes.

Mr. President, the statement I made a few minutes ago, to the effect that this treaty virtually means an extension of the Monroe Doctrine to that area of the world, was based on the article to which I have just referred, for its language is the language of the Monroe Doctrine, applied to the security pacts.

The attack must be reported to the Security Council of the United Nations, and measures taken to combat the attack shall terminate when the Security Council has taken the steps necessary to restore international peace and security.

Finally, provisions are made for the establishment of a council of foreign ministers or their deputies, whose duty it shall be to implement the treaty. Pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security, the Council is authorized to maintain a consultative relationship with State, regional organizations, associations, or States, or other authorities in the Pacific area in a position to further the purposes of the treaty and to contribute to the security of the area. Thus, the Council and the organization which it may set up to implement the treaty possess the authority and power to coordinate the security arrangements which now exist or which may be created for that purpose in the Pacific.

In this connection let me call attention to the third paragraph of the committee report before us. It reads:

The committee agrees that the treaty will serve the national interests of the United States by making clear our mutual interests and our common destiny with our allies in the Pacific. It seems highly desirable that our friends as well as our enemies understand that our concern over such matters as the North Atlantic Pact and the Japanese Peace Treaty in no way implies any lack of interest on our part in working for peace with such valuable allies as New Zealand, Australia, and the Philippines.

Mr. President, I may add that it is my own personal conviction that once we had determined that a security treaty with Japan was in our own interest we were of necessity bound to enter into security arrangements with our doughty allies, the Australians and the New Zealanders. That we did.

The treaty before us has two salutary effects. In the first place, it means that if trouble does develop in the Pacific area, where we are so heavily committed because of our many vital interests there, we shall not be required to go it alone. Of course, that principle operates with equal force for our partners in this treaty. In the second place, it gives assurance to the New Zealanders and the Australians, who suffered so much during the late war, and who have had to make substantial sacrifices under the Japanese Peace Treaty that they have not been forgotten and that we and they have joined hands to move toward a common destiny together.

The third security treaty before us at this time is the mutual defense treaty with the Philippines. It is closely patterned after the treaty with New Zealand and Australia, with the exception that it does not specifically provide for a council.

The Senate will recall that there already existed a security arrangement between the United States and the Philippines in the form of a base agreement, but between the two countries there was no formal security agreement similar to that with Australia and New Zealand. It is generally understood that the United States would consider an attack on the Philippine Islands as a threat against American security, and that this country would act accordingly. Therefore, the treaty with the Philippines was a natural complement to the other security treaties, and has been entered upon accordingly. In a major sense it formalizes what has actually been an unwritten yet inescapable obligation on the United States since the Philippines were granted their independence.

I hope the Senate will permit me to express one more thought before concluding. It concerns the use of Japanese facilities by the U. N. forces. The situation in Korea and the involvement of the United States, the United Nations, and Japan in the Korean affair caused the United States Government to make sure that the treaties with Japan would have no adverse effect upon the assistance

now being given by Japan to the U. N. effort in Korea.

In article 5, Japan promises to furnish the U. N. every aid in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter. An exchange of letters between Secretary Acheson and Prime Minister Yoshida dated September 8, 1951, set forth fully Japan's intention to give effect to both the terms and the spirit of Japan's commitments to the U. N. Premier Yoshida said, in part:

> I have the honor, on behalf of my Government, to confirm that if and when the forces of a member or members of the United Nations are engaged in any United Nations action in the Far East after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan, by the member or members of the forces engaged in such United Nations action, the expenses involved in the use of Japanese facilities and services to be borne as at present or as otherwise mutually agreed between Japan and the United Nations concerned.

Mr. President, there are many other aspects of these treaties which we might discuss. Let me call attention to the committee report now before us for a more extended treatment of this subject.

In closing, let me say that I hope I have said enough to show that the treaties constitute parts of a pattern. All four of the treaties are necessary if we are to bring to an end the state of War with Japan and if we are to embark upon the construction of a more stable, secure, and peaceful Pacific area. All four of the treaties are essential to the security of the United States.

I strongly urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of these pacts.

Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes to refer to the main treaty and some of the conditions existing in the Far Eastern area of the world. I do not intend to duplicate the statements made earlier today by the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

It was a privilege for me to have the fine experience of spending most of the month of December in that area along with the able Senator from New Jersey and former Senator John Foster Dulles, who now is serving as a special representative of the State Department. That was a delightful experience for me. From it I received many impressions which I never would have been able to obtain had I not been able to make that visit.

I went abroad a little ahead of time, in order to be able to visit a few of the other countries in that area of the world. That was the first time I had ever been to the Far East. I visited briefly the Philippines, Hong Kong, Thailand, Formosa, Japan, and Korea. For most of the time when I was in Formosa, the Senator from New Jersey was also there, and we were together from that time on, as we went to Japan and Korea and returned to the United States.

Mr. President, everywhere I went I was tremendously impressed with what seemed to me to be a new feeling among the peoples of that part of the world, a belief in the possibility of a peaceful Pacific which, I think, may very well mean a peaceful world. I believe we are fairly well along with building peace in Western Europe, Mr. President. I believe that the particular trouble area immediately ahead of us is the Pacific.

In proposing this treaty and the three security pacts, I believe we are taking a long step toward building a peaceful Pacific which may be the key to a peaceful world.

Mr. President, I am thoroughly convinced that, certainly as of today, the key to the Pacific is Japan.

It will not be easy for Japan to maintain herself and to maintain a sound economy for her people. In Japan there are approximately 85,000,000 persons, who are increasing at the rate of approximately 600,000 a year, or perhaps even more than that. In fact, during the past 10 years I believe the population of Japan has increased at the rate of more than 1,000,000 a year. All those people live in a country smaller in size than the State of California.

I believe that Japan is the fourth or fifth most heavily populated country in the world. I believe that Japan has the greatest density of urban population in the world. I believe that Japan possesses the fourth largest city in all the world.

The 85,000,000 people of Japan certainly are among the most industrious people in all the world. They are striving, struggling, determined to rebuild their country and to restore it to the family of nations.

Mr. President, I never conceived of such things as those I saw—a people who, when defeated, accepted defeat absolutely, and who, almost immediately, started with determination on the job of rebuilding; a people who have appreciated the attitude shown by the victors toward the vanquished; a people who, I believe, stand ready to show their appreciation by alining themselves with the free nations of the world.

I enjoyed the very able discourse on the subject of the peace treaty by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in which he touched upon certain of these things, and by our distinguished friend the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], as well as by the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. I believe we cannot be too diligent in trying to understand the spirit of these people, their willingness, their determination, their resolve to rebuild a nation at peace and to make a contribution not only to a stable condition in the world but to bring about a peaceful world.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from Alabama hear the speech of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] this afternoon?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; I heard it.

Mr. MORSE. As one who was not a member of the Senator's committee, but who understands that the committee was unanimous in its report, I should like to know whether the committee had before it the main points raised by the Senator from Indiana in his reservations, whether the committee gave careful consideration at least to the objectives of those reservations, and whether, having done so, the committee then came forward with its unanimous report. Or does the committee find itself in the position of not having considered some or many of the points which the Senator from Indiana has raised by his reservations?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I may say that the reservations of the Senator from Indiana were not before our committee, and that, as he stated at the conclusion of his speech today, they had not been presented to our committee by him. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, as I said in the beginning, I am not going to discuss the reservations in detail, because that task, I believe, is to be undertaken by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, who will at some later time take them up and discuss them one by one, I understand.

But let me say that, as I remember them, I believe that every point covered in the reservations proposed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana was considered by the committee; and I believe that if any Senator will review the hearings he will find that those questions came up at different times in the course of the hearings. Let me mention one of them, for instance, because I think perhaps we have heard more about it than any other. I refer to the Declaration of Human Rights. The claim has been made that the treaty constitutes a back-door method of ratifying the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As a matter of fact, that simply is not the case. That question was discussed, and the discussion will be found in the testimony of Mr. Dulles.

I do not see the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] on the floor at the moment, but some time ago, when this question was first raised, I knew that the Senator from Ohio intended to introduce a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment covering this matter. Knowing that he is a very fine lawyer, I asked him what he thought about the suggestion concerning the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and whether he had checked into it.

He said he had. "Furthermore," he said, "I took it up with the American Bar Association, and they tell me that there is nothing wrong with the treaty provision in that respect." I wish the Senator from Ohio were present in order that he might state whether he is still of that opinion. That must have been a month or so ago. I merely cite that as an example. It will be found that the question of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is discussed in the committee report on page 17.

By the way, I may also call attention to the remarks of the able Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], last Friday, at which time he obtained permission to have certain documents printed in the RECORD, to show that the treaty would not ratify the declaration referred to.

I do not want to take up the reservations in detail one by one. It is not my purpose to thrust any one of them aside, but, as I mentioned a few moments ago,

in each case, the first reservation both to the main treaty and to each of the security pacts, says that (a) the treaty shall not be in any way a limitation of the sovereignty of the United States, and (b) that nothing in it shall be construed to be a continuing limitation upon Japanese sovereignty.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me conclude this thought, please. I stated in the beginning that a treaty, by its very nature, contains a certain amount of limitation of sovereignty, that is, to the extent provided in the treaty itself, because it becomes a binding contract between the powers; and there is a continuing Japanese obligation in this treaty which I do not believe the able Senator from Indiana would want to strike out, but which his reservation would do. If his first reservation were adopted, it would virtually amount to eliminating the treaty altogether, and each one of its parts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It was not my purpose to ask the Senator from Alabama to discuss the points raised by the Senator from Indiana this afternoon. I was only interested in the procedural matter, because I think most of us follow the policy of giving the benefit of a rebuttable presumption to a committee report; and, when the committee report is unanimous, I, in evaluating the report and determining whether it is entitled to the benefit of that presumption, wanted to find out from the Senator from Alabama whether he, in fact, considered the points raised by the Senator from Indiana. I certainly think his points are deserving of consideration by the Senate, and I wanted to know whether the committee report was adopted after the Senator became cognizant of the objections which the Senator from Indiana had raised.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Oregon understands, I hope, that the reservations proposed by the Senator from Indiana were not submitted to the committee. He did not make the proposals, until after we had reported the treaty to the Senate. But I believe I am safe in saying that every single point covered by the reservations of the Senator from Indiana came up in the course of the hearings and in the course of the committee discussions. For instance, he made reference to the proposed reservation which the Senator from Utah had offered. We felt all along, and we still feel, that the treaty itself says exactly what the Senator from Utah thought it ought to say but we admit that it is necessary to construe perhaps two or three sections together in order to get the true meaning; therefore, in the resolution of ratification we wrote into the resolution a statement, although the question raised is already taken care of in the treaty.

The Senator from Indiana refers to the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945, and says there should be no limitation based upon that. As a matter of fact, the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945, related entirely to Europe and had nothing whatever to do with Japan. Terms of surrender were agreed upon at Potsdam, I believe, at an earlier date, and it may be those to which the Senator from Indiana makes reference. But I submit that there is not one thing in this treaty which recognizes the right of Russia to occupy a single one of the islands referred to and Mr. Dulles so testified very clearly in the course of the presentation of the treaty.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to make it clear that I am not passing judgment on any of the objections raised to the treaty by the Senator from Indiana. I certainly want to study his objections before I reach any conclusion in my own mind with respect thereto. But from a procedural standpoint, let us assume that the Senator from Alabama is in error in his impression that the treaty, in effect, covers some particular point which the Senator from Indiana raised, but covers it in a little different language than the Senator from Indiana would have it covered. Let us assume, in the second place, in my hypothetical question, that the Senate, in its wisdom, might decide to attach to the treaty reservation X. Could it be attached on a bilateral arrangement between Japan and the United States, or would there be necessitated another treaty conference in which all the parties to the treaty would have to meet and accept the reservation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, answering the able Senator from Oregon, I think I am correct in saying that if the reservation should be attached to our ratification of the treaty, it would amount to a substantive change which would require renegotiation of the treaty.

Mr. MORSE. And, therefore, a renegotiation of the treaty not only on a bilateral basis between the United States and Japan, but really on a basis involving the United Nations and Japan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I refer to to main treaty. Of course, the security treaty is a bilateral treaty between the United States and Japan.

Mr. MORSE. I am talking about the body of the treaty itself.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; the Senator is correct.

Let me repeat that the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] will discuss this question in greater detail, probably tomorrow. I am not posing at this time as an absolute authority on these points, but I think that what I have said is correct.

The Senator from Oregon referred to the unanimous report of the Committee. I may say that every step taken in the formulation of this treaty was by unanimous agreement by the four members of the subcommittee, two Democrats and two Republicans, but as we went along many changes were made by suggestions in the conferences.

I think the Senate might like to know something about our subcommittee meetings. Frequently Mr. Dulles would call us and say, "I should like to see you right away." Perhaps it was a committee meeting of some kind. We would meet in the morning and in the afternoon. We found the best time to get a committee together was at breakfast, so that most of our committee meetings were held around the breakfast table before the regular meetings of the day started. But every step taken in the formulation of the treaty was by unanimous agreement of the subcommittee.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator permit me to raise an additional point by way of supplementing what I have already said? One reason why I am raising these questions is because I understand the Senator from New Jersey and, possibly, other members of the committee, will discuss the nature and effect of the Jenner reservations. But if the statement of the Senator from Alabama is correct, if I correctly understood him, that in his opinion, at least, some of the reservations can be interpreted as requiring substantive changes in the meaning and intent of the treaty, then it follows that, in some respects, at least, the points raised by the Senator from Indiana are not already covered by the treaty in effect and meaning by way of other language, but that his reservations constitute really new language on an independent point not presently covered in the treaty.

Of course, if that be true, and if the Senator from Alabama is correct as to the matter of procedure—and it is my understanding as to the procedure, that a new treaty conference would be required, then I think it becomes clear that in effect the adoption of the Jenner reservations would be really a rejection of the treaty and would necessitate a new treaty conference with 48 nations, where there would be faced the possibility, and, I dare say, the probability, that in a new conference, perhaps some other nation than the United States might wish to make some substantive changes. That would not only mean delay, but it would raise a doubt as to whether we would finally have a treaty which the committee would feel by its unanimous vote would be as good as this one.

I waive the procedural points because, frankly, I do not know what the effect of the Jenner reservations would be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Oregon is correct, and I am glad he brought out the point in the way he has, because I certainly should not like anything I have said to be interpreted as meaning that everything mentioned in the proposed reservations ought to be a part of the treaty. I do not admit that to be so. I think the Senator from Indiana mentioned some reservations which, upon closer examination, everyone would say should not go into the treaty. I think the first proposed reservation would amount to a repeal of the treaty, if there is such a thing as repealing a treaty. I think the treaty would be without effect.

In the fourth reservation there is a provision the effect of which I think would be to do away with the plan we worked out with reference to reparations. It is true that Japan was not burdened with a heavy load of reparations. We worked out a plan which we felt Japan could meet, in an effort to avoid a duplication of what came after Versailles, when Germany could not meet the reparations imposed upon her. I think it is

the fourth reservation of the Senator from Indiana which would break up the plan of reparations.

One of the hardest things we had to do was to satisfy the Philippines, Indonesia, and some of the other nations with reference to reparations. I think the matter was worked out admirably. We know that if we increase the burden on Japan it will delay her getting on a firm footing.

All these problems, Mr. President, were within the purview of the committee at the time it was considering the various questions, even though the Senator from Indiana had not at that time presented any reservations.

Mr. President, I referred to being in Japan during December, along with the able Senator from New Jersey. As he stated, it was a working trip for us. We were there approximately 2 weeks, and we were working. It would be interesting to know how many conferences we had. We had not been there an hour before we called on the Premier, and then there was a continuous round of conferences with the Finance Minister, with the Governor of Japan, with the Diet, with the Foreign Affairs Committee and the Presiding Officers of the two Houses of the Diet, with the Emperor himself, and with General Ridgway and various other military officers and private citizens. The Senator from New Jersey and I saw many private citizens. I should like to dispel the thought that we talked only with persons who were favorable to the treaty. We talked with everyone we wanted to see, or whom we could see, in order to obtain their viewpoints. We talked with the opposition. We heard them make their arguments. We sat down with them and discussed the various points. We talked with labor leaders and with industrialists. We conferred with just about everybody whom we could reach, from whom we could get helpful information, and I believe we did get helpful information.

Mr. President, a short time before we were in the Far East, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey went through the same area and he included a visit to Japan. When he returned, he wrote a series of articles for Collier's magazine, I believe three, certainly as many as three. All of them were very interesting. I commend to everybody a reading of them for a very good report. His second article, entitled "Can Japan Stay On Our Side?", is a very fine presentation of the whole Japanese problem, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the question of Nationalist China, what her attitude is, and so forth, has come up many times. The able Senator from New Jersey and I were in Formosa. We talked with practically all the Chinese officials there, both of the Nationalist Government and of the Government of Formosa.

A great deal has been said about trading with Red China. The day before the Senator from New Jersey and I arrived, I called on the Foreign Minister, Mr. George Yeh, and we began to talk about the question of trade with China. Of course, the officials there were greatly interested. I think I could say they were primarily interested in seeing that Japan recognized the Chinese Nationalist Government. I had no hesitancy in saying that I wanted to see it done, and that I believed the great majority of the Members of the Senate also wanted to see it done.

Much has been said in the press to the effect that the three of us went there to persuade the Prime Minister of Japan and his Government to recognize Nationalist China. I submit that we did nothing of the kind.

I recall one day in Tokyo when we sat in a press conference. The room was filled with newspaper representatives. The question was asked if we believed that a peace treaty with Japan could be ratified, and if it was necessary for Japan to recognize Nationalist China in order to have a peace treaty negotiated. Some had received the impression that we were there to tell the Japanese that they could not get a treaty negotiated until Nationalist China was recognized. I answered that question every time it was put to me. I think the Senator from New Jersey will speak for himself and will bear out my statement. We always said that in whatever treaty we negotiated with Japan, we would recognize the right of sovereign Japan to recognize whatever governments she wished to recognize. But whenever we were asked the practical question as to what effect that would have upon ratification of the treaty in the Senate, I remember answering one time in this way.

"I would not say that the Senate cannot ratify it if Japan does not act. I can state only my own views. I will say, of course, that a treaty would be much easier of ratification if Nationalist China were recognized." But always I would repeat that it was a matter about which sovereign Japan would have the right to make up her own mind.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to confirm what the distinguished Senator from Alabama has just said, and to suggest, as I did earlier today, in speaking on the same subject, what we tried to do.

In discussing this matter with Prime Minister Yoshida and his foreign minister, Mr. Iguchi, we tried to indicate what the consequences would be of recognizing one-half of the country as Communist China and the other half as Nationalist China, and its effect on the future of both the Far East and the Western World.

There was no attempt in any way to hold them at the point of a gun and say, "If you do not do this, we will not do anything at all to help you." The whole procedure was one of persuasion. They were convinced that it was to their best interest to do what they are trying to do now.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the able Senator from New Jersey. We were not trying to do anything secretly or to keep things away from anybody. The Senator from New Jersey knows that many times we talked with the representative of the United Kingdom, and he knew at all times what our interests were.

There have been many reports circulated in the press and in other ways that we were over there trying to break faith with the British Government and our other allies in the drafting of this treaty. That is as far from the truth as it can be, because the representative of that Government knew from the very day we arrived, and he was kept advised of every step we took and what our wishes were.

I had started to say something about the attitude of the Nationalist Government of China with reference to Japanese recognition. The Chinese Nationalist Government wanted recognition, and wanted it badly, and I do not blame them.

By the way, Mr. President, it was interesting to me to note, as on every side, I gathered from everybody I talked with in Formosa, including the Generalissimo, his Minister of State, his Foreign Minister, his Defense Minister, and the very able Governor of Formosa, that there was no bitterness or resentment so far as I could detect, on the part of those people with reference to the treatment the United States had accorded them. Do not think I mean by that that they were pleased with everything that had been done. But I found on the part of the Chinese Nationalists a spirit of willingness and a desire to cooperate, and to work out a plan of cooperation.

The question of trade with Red China was, of course, troublesome all along. It was the Foreign Minister of the Nationalist Government who made to me a suggestion which, though I am not certain, I am rather of the opinion that he mentioned to the Senator from New Jersey when he saw him on the following day. This is what he said to me:

"We realize the close tie between Japan and the Asiatic mainland. We would not insist that there be no trade relations with the Asiatic mainland. What we want is to be recognized as the Government."

That is exactly what is taking place. Japan has recognized the Nationalists as the Government of China.

Many persons contend it is necessary for Japan to trade with China and Manchuria. That may be so, I do not know, but, if it is, there is ample provision under the law whereby it can be done, just as Denmark may trade with Poland or the Netherlands with Czechoslovakia or England with Bulgaria. Under the act which Congress passed last year, that determination can be made, and trade may be permitted if it serves the security of the United States. That is a question which must be determined.

I was interested in the statement of the able Senator from New Jersey to the

effect that such trade was not necessary. I certainly commend to the careful reading of Senators the testimony given by Mr. John Foster Dulles, beginning at page 27 of the hearings. I asked him this question:

A great many people have it fixed in their minds, I think, that Japan is dependent upon China both as a source for raw materials and also as a market for her manufactured goods. You give some statements which I think largely offset that, but I wonder if you could go a little more into detail or if you would make this statement. Are you convinced that Japan can build a sustaining economy without being closely tied with the Chinese mainland?

Mr. DULLES. I think this, Senator SPARKMAN. Let me first express my very deep appreciation of the words you have been kind enough to say about my work here. It is not often that a witness on the stand has such an enjoyable interlude as you have given me, and I am deeply grateful for it.

The question you put is probably the most difficult question there is to give an absolutely clear answer to. I would say this—

This is something for us to remember when people talk about the absolute necessity of trade between Japan and the Chinese mainland:

That prior to the 1930's, Japan's trade was primarily overseas trade and not to any large extent trade with the Asian mainland, and the mainland was not a major source of supplies for Japan.

When 1930 came along with the worldwide depression which largely disrupted Japan's overseas trade, and with the concurrent growth of militarism in Japan, there developed in Japan a desire actually to control its own sources of raw materials so that they would not be subject to interruption either through world-trade convulsions, or perhaps through economic sanctions which the League of Nations might impose to try to restrain Japan from adopting an aggressive policy.

So that, beginning with the thirties, there came the effort by Japan to try to get control of its own sources of raw material on the Asian mainland, particularly in Manchuria.

From then on, Japan increasingly got coal and iron ore from that area, whereas, previously it had largely gotten its iron ore, for example, from the Philippines and Malaya. But, in order that its trade in those items should not be vulnerable to the forces to which I alluded, the Japanese sought to get control of Manchuria.

During the 1930 period there was an increasing change in the Japanese trade from the overseas trade to a colonial trade in relation to the Asia mainland.

That trade was, of course, broken off completely at the end of the war, and it has never been resumed to any substantial extent.

Dropping down a little:

I can see that over a period of some years, granted access to southeast Asia markets and perhaps granted some help to meet the heavy foreign exchange burden of importing coking coal, particularly from long distances, that the Japanese can get along reasonably well. I think that one must recognize that over a long-range period—I am talking now in terms of decades and not necessarily just of years—over a long-range period it is as I say, abnormal that there should be an iron curtain which cuts Japan's trade completely off from the nearby markets and sources of raw material in Asia.

EXPECTED DISAPPEARANCE OF SOVIET COMMUNISM IN CHINA

That is why I believe that we must assume and can properly assume that the conditions which require that interruption of trade are not going to be with us permanently. It would be, in my opinion, a wrong and a defeatist policy to assume that these conditions which exist in China today are in China forever.

I do not believe they are there forever. I think they are going to change. I do not think, as I said in my main statement, that indefinitely the Soviet brand of communism is going to rule in China. There will be increasing resentment against that, hatred of it, and eventually it will disappear as so many foreign conquests of China have disappeared in the past.

I think Mr. Dulles was discussing the matter of trade with Asia in a very realistic manner, and and it may be well for us to keep these things in mind.

Speaking of the relationship between Japan and Nationalist China, I have been pleased to note in the press within the past few days that apparently considerable headway is being made toward drafting a treaty of peace between Japan and Nationalist China. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] raised some question about that the other day. He seemed to think that the negotiators were dragging their feet, so to speak. My recollection is that of a total of 22 articles 18 have been agreed upon. I understand there were 22 in the original draft.

I believe it is fitting at this time to read a statement which was issued by Dr. George Yeh, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of China, on January 18, on the occasion when there was published in Tokyo the letter which Prime Minister Yoshida addressed to Mr. John Foster Dulles, dated back in December. This is what Mr. George Yeh said at that time:

The publication in Tokyo of the letter from Premier Yoshida to Mr. Dulles on the subject of the conclusion of peace between China and Japan has served the purpose of cleaning up certain misapprehensions in this regard. It also makes clear Japan's intentions to concert her efforts with the free and democratic nations in the maintenance of the peace and security of the world. My Government has consistently made known its desire for an early conclusion of peace with Japan and has directed its efforts in conjunction with the other Allied Powers toward this end. The conclusion of a peace treaty between China and Japan has been unduly delayed. The Chinese Government will therefore hold itself in readiness to enter into negotiations with the Japanese Government with a view to its early conclusion. It is gratifying to note in Premier Yoshida's letter that Japan fully realized the true character of the enslaved Communist regime now occupying the Chinese mainland and of the so-called Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance concluded in Moscow in 1950. We also welcome the expressed intention of the Japanese Government to render every assistance to the United Nations in all its measures to stem aggression.

Let me say a brief word as to some of the things Japan has done, showing her intent to carry out her obligations under the treaty and to restore herself to full enjoyment of the proper relationships among the family of nations.

One of the first treaties or agreements which Japan executed was a tripartite agreement—I am not sure that it is a treaty—between Japan, the United States, and Canada, with reference to fishing in the North Pacific. It was an agreement which was negotiated without too much trouble. It did exactly what we want to see done, and what we have been trying for a long time to do. It promoted good practices of conservation.

Japan has worked out an agreement for reparations with the Philippines. This was one of the hardest tasks she had to undertake. It may be remembered that the Philippine representative at the San Francisco conference made a very strong speech in which he evidenced certainly a degree of distrust, resentment, and reluctance on the part of the Philippine people. When I was in Manila, I was told that the Japanese commission was coming there within a few days. I know that there was some concern expressed. I was at breakfast one morning with the President of the Philippines and his Minister of Defense, a Mr. Magsaysay, and our friend Carlos Romulo, who is now the Ambassador to the United States, as well as our former colleague in the House Representatives, "Mike" Elizalde, who was formerly Ambassador to the United States. Various others were present. I heard some concern expressed by some of those present as to whether or not it would be safe for the Japanese to come there. That feeling was there; and we can understand it when we think of the devastation and destruction the Philippines withstood during the war. Yet, in spite of all that, the Japanese went there in earnest and sought to negotiate a treaty of reparations. I believe it has been completed. I believe the Japanese have also completed such a treaty, or agreement, with Indonesia. They are working very hard at rebuilding their economy and to rebuild their proper standing in the family of nations.

I conclude my remarks with a short quotation from the speech which Mr. Dulles delivered at the San Francisco Conference on September 5, 1951. It is found at page 16 of the pamphlet entitled "Japanese Peace Treaty and Other Treaties Relating to Security in the Pacific," containing the message from the President of the United States transmitting the treaties. It reads:

Fortunately, there are also in most of the Allied countries those who see with truer vision. They know that this treaty is good to the point where it cannot be made better without its becoming worse. Better words might theoretically be found, but to seek these is to let escape what is now within our grasp. There come times when to seek the perfect is to lose the good. This is such a time.

EXHIBIT 1

[Unofficial text]

ADMINISTRATIVE AGREEMENT UNDER ARTICLE III OF THE SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN

PREAMBLE

Whereas Japan and the United States of America on September 8, 1951, signed a se-

curity treaty which contains provisions for the disposition of United States land, air, and sea forces in and about Japan;

And whereas article III of that treaty states that the conditions which shall govern the disposition of the Armed Forces of the United States in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two Governments;

And whereas Japan and the United States of America are desirous of concluding practical administrative arrangements which will give effect to their respective obligations under the security treaty and will strengthen the close bonds of mutual interest and regard between their two peoples;

Therefore, the Governments of Japan and of the United States of America have entered into this agreement in terms as set forth below:

ARTICLE I

In this agreement the expression—

(a) "Members of the United States Armed Forces" means the personnel on active duty belonging to the land, sea, or air armed services of the United States of America when in the territory of Japan.

(b) "Civilian component" means the civilian persons of United States nationality, who are in the employ of, serving with, or accompanying the United States Armed Forces in Japan, but excludes persons who are ordinarily resident in Japan or who are mentioned in paragraph 1 of article XIV. For the purpose of this agreement only dual nationals, United States and Japanese, who are brought to Japan by the United States shall be considered as United States nationals.

(c) "dependents" means:

(1) Spouse, and children under 21;

(2) Parents, and children over 21, if dependent for over half their support upon a member of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component.

ARTICLE II

1. Japan agrees to grant to the United States Armed Forces the use of the facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article I of the Security Treaty. Agreements on specific facilities and areas not already reached by the two Governments by the effective date of this agreement shall be concluded in consultation between the two Governments through the joint committee provided for in article XXVI of this agreement. "Facilities and areas" include existing furnishings, equipment and fixtures necessary to the operation of such facilities and areas.

2. At the request of either party, Japan and the United States shall review such arrangements and may agree that such facilities and areas shall be returned to Japan or that additional facilities and areas may be provided.

3. The facilities and areas used by the United States Armed Forces shall be returned to Japan whenever they are no longer needed for purposes of this agreement, and the United States agrees to keep the needs for facilities and areas under continual observation with a view toward such return.

4. (a) When facilities and areas such as target ranges and maneuver grounds are temporarily not being used by the United States, interim use may be made by the Japanese authorities and nationals provided it is agreed that such use would not be harmful to the purposes for which the facilities and areas are normally used by the United States Armed Forces.

(b) With respect to such facilities and areas as target ranges and maneuver grounds which are to be used by United States Armed Forces for limited periods of time, the Joint Committee shall specify in the agreements concerning such facilities and areas the extent to which the provisions of this Agreement shall apply.

ARTICLE III

1. The United States shall have the rights, power and authority within the facilities and areas which are necessary or appropriate for their establishment, use, operation, defense or control. The United States shall also have such rights, power and authority over land, territorial waters and airspace adjacent to, or in the vicinities of such facilities and areas, as are necessary to provide access to such facilities and areas for their support, defense and control. In the exercise outside the facilities and areas of the rights, power and authority granted in this article, there should be as the occasion requires consultation between the two Governments through the Joint Committee.

2. The United States agrees that the above-mentioned rights, power and authority will not be exercised in such a manner as to interfere unnecessarily with navigation, aviation, communication, or land travel to or from or within Japan. All questions relating to frequencies, power and like matters used by apparatus employed by the United States designed to emit electric radiation shall be settled by mutual arrangement. As a temporary measure the United States Armed Forces shall be entitled to use, without radiation interference from Japanese sources, electronic devices of such power, design, type of emission, and frequencies as are reserved for such forces at the time this Agreement becomes effective.

3. Operations in the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces shall be carried on with due regard for the public safety.

ARTICLE IV

1. The United States is not obliged, when it returns facilities and areas to Japan on the expiration of this Agreement or at an earlier date, to restore the facilities and areas to the condition in which they were at the time they became available to the United States Armed Forces, or to compensate Japan in lieu of such restoration.

2. Japan is not obliged to make any compensation to the United States for any improvements made in the facilities and areas or for the buildings or structures left thereon on the expiration of this agreement or the earlier return of the facilities and areas.

3. The foregoing provisions shall not apply to any construction which the United States may undertake under special arrangements with Japan.

ARTICLE V

1. United States and foreign vessels and aircraft operated by, for, or under the control of the United States for official purposes shall be accorded access to any port or airport of Japan free from toll or landing charges. When cargo or passengers not accorded the exemptions of this agreement are carried on such vessels and aircraft, notification shall be given to the appropriate Japanese authorities, and such cargo or passengers shall be entered according to the laws and regulations of Japan.

2. The vessels and aircraft mentioned in paragraph 1, United States Government-owned vehicles including armor, and members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents shall be accorded access to and movement between facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces and between such facilities and areas and the ports of Japan.

3. When the vessels mentioned in paragraph 1 enter Japanese ports, appropriate notification shall, under normal conditions, be made to the proper Japanese authorities. Such vessels shall have freedom from compulsory pilotage, but if a pilot is taken pilotage shall be paid for at appropriate rates.

ARTICLE VI

1. All civil and military air traffic control and communications systems shall be developed in close coordination and shall be integrated to the extent necessary for fulfillment of collective security interests. Procedures, and any subsequent changes thereto, necessary to effect this coordination and integration will be established by mutual arrangement.

2. Lights and other aids to navigation of vessels and aircraft placed or established in the facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces and in territorial waters adjacent thereto or in the vicinity thereof shall conform to the system in use in Japan. The United States and Japanese authorities which have established such navigation aids shall notify each other of their positions and characteristics and shall give advance notification before making any changes in them or establishing additional navigation aids.

ARTICLE VII

The United States Armed Forces shall have the right to use all public utilities and services belonging to, or controlled or regulated by, the Government of Japan, and to enjoy priorities in such use, under conditions no less favorable than those that may be applicable from time to time to the ministries and agencies of the Government of Japan.

ARTICLE VIII

The Japanese Government undertakes to furnish the United States Armed Forces with the following meteorological services under present procedures, subject to such modifications as may from time to time be agreed between the two governments or as may result from Japan's becoming a member of the International Civil Aviation Organization or the World Meteorological Organization:

(a) Meteorological observations from land and ocean areas including observations from weather ships assigned to positions known as X and T.

(b) Climatological information including periodic summaries and the historical data files of the central meteorological observatory.

(c) Telecommunications service to disseminate meteorological information required for the safe and regular operation of aircraft.

(d) Seismographic data including forecasts of the estimated size of tidal waves resulting from earthquakes and areas that might be affected thereby.

ARTICLE IX

1. The United States shall have the right to bring into Japan for purposes of this agreement persons who are members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

2. Members of the United States Armed Forces shall be exempt from Japanese passport and visa laws and regulations. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall be exempt from Japanese laws and regulations on the registration and control of aliens, but shall not be considered as acquiring any right to permanent residence or domicile in the territories of Japan.

3. Upon entry into or departure from Japan, members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of the following documents: (a) Personal identity card showing name, date of birth, rank and number, service, and photograph; and (b) individual or collective travel order certifying to the status of the individual or group as a member or members of the United States Armed Forces and to the travel ordered. For purposes of their identification while in Japan, members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of the foregoing personal identity card.

4. Members of the civilian component, their dependents, and the dependents of members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of appropriate documentation issued by the United States authorities so that their status may be verified by Japanese authorities upon their entry into or departure from Japan, or while in Japan.

5. If the status of any person brought into Japan under paragraph 1 of this article is altered so that he would no longer be entitled to such admission, the United States authorities shall notify the Japanese authorities and shall, if such person be required by the Japanese authorities to leave Japan, assure that transportation from Japan will be provided within a reasonable time at no cost to the Japanese Government.

ARTICLE X

1. Japan shall accept as valid without a driving test or fee the driving permit or license or military driving permit issued by the United States to a member of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

2. Official vehicles of the United States Armed Forces and the civilian component shall carry distinctive numbered plates or individual markings which will readily identify them.

3. Privately owned vehicles of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall carry Japanese number plates to be acquired under the same condition as those applicable to Japanese nationals.

ARTICLE XI

1. Save as provided in this agreement, members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall be subject to the laws and regulations administered by the customs authorities of Japan.

2. All materials, supplies, and equipment imported by the United States Armed Forces, the authorized procurement agencies of the United States Armed Forces, or by the organizations provided for in article XV, for the official use of the United States Armed Forces or for the use of the members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, and materials, supplies, and equipment which are to be used exclusively by the United States Armed Forces or are ultimately to be incorporated into articles or facilities used by such forces, shall be permitted entry into Japan; such entry shall be free from customs duties and other such charges. Appropriate certification shall be made that such materials, supplies, and equipment are being imported by the United States Armed Forces, the authorized procurement agencies of the United States Armed Forces, or by the organizations provided for in article XV, or, in the case of materials, supplies, and equipment to be used exclusively by the United States Armed Forces or ultimately to be incorporated into articles or facilities used by such forces, that delivery thereof is to be taken by the United States Armed Forces for the purposes specified above.

3. Property consigned to and for the personal use of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, shall be subject to customs duties and other such charges, except that no duties or charges shall be paid with respect to:

(a) Furniture and household goods for their private use imported by the members of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component when they first arrive to serve in Japan or by their dependents when they first arrive for reunion with members of such forces or civilian component, and personal effects for private use brought by the said persons upon entrance.

(b) Vehicles and parts imported by members of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component for the private use of themselves or their dependents.

(c) Reasonable quantities of clothing and household goods of a type which would ordinarily be purchased in the United States for every day for the private use of members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, and their dependents, which are mailed into Japan through United States military post offices.

4. The exemptions granted in paragraphs 2 and 3 shall apply only to cases of importation of goods and shall not be interpreted as refunding customs duties and domestic excises collected by the customs authorities at the time of entry in cases of purchases of goods on which such duties and excises have already been collected.

5. Customs examination shall not be made in the following cases:

(a) Units and members of the United States Armed Forces under orders entering or leaving Japan;

(b) Official documents under official seal;

(c) Mail in United States military postal channels and military cargo shipped on a United States Government bill of lading.

6. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the Japanese and United States authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods imported into Japan free of duty shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not entitled to import such goods free of duty.

7. Goods imported into Japan free from customs duties and such other charges pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 may be reexported free from customs duties and other such charges.

8. The United States Armed Forces, in cooperation with Japanese authorities, shall take such steps as are necessary to prevent abuse of privileges granted to the United States Armed Forces, members of such Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents in accordance with this article.

9. (a) In order to prevent offenses against laws and regulations administered by the customs authorities of the Japanese Government, the Japanese authorities and the United States Armed Forces shall assist each other in the conduct of inquiries and the collection of evidence.

(b) The United States Armed Forces shall render all assistance within their power to insure that articles liable to seizure by, or on behalf of, the customs authorities of the Japanese Government are handed to those authorities.

(c) The United States Armed Forces shall render all assistance within their power to insure the payment of duties, taxes, and penalties payable by members of such forces or of the civilian component, or their dependents.

ARTICLE XII

1. The United States shall have the right to contract for any supplies or construction work to be furnished or undertaken in Japan for purposes of, or authorized by, this agreement, without restriction as to choice of supplier or person who does the construction work.

2. Materials, supplies, equipment, and services which are required from local sources for the maintenance of the United States Armed Forces and the procurement of which may have an adverse effect on the economy of Japan shall be procured in coordination with, and, when desirable, through and with the assistance of, the competent authorities of Japan.

3. Materials, supplies, equipment, and services procured for ultimate use by the United States Armed Forces, or by the organizations provided for in article XV shall be exempt from commodity and gasoline taxes upon appropriate certification by the United States Armed Forces. With respect to any present or future Japanese taxes not specifically referred to in this article which might be found to constitute a significant and readily identifiable part of the gross purchase price of materials, supplies, equipment, and services procured by the United States Armed Forces, or for ultimate use by such forces, the two Governments will agree upon a procedure for granting such exemption or relief therefrom as is consistent with the purposes of this article.

4. Local labor requirements of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component shall be satisfied with the assistance of the Japanese authorities.

5. The obligations for the withholding and payment of income tax and of social-security contributions, and, except as may otherwise be mutually agreed, the conditions of employment and work, such as those relating to wages and supplementary payments, the conditions for the protection of workers, and the rights of workers concerning labor relations shall be those laid down by the legislation of Japan.

6. Persons in the civilian component shall not be subject to Japanese laws or regulations with respect to terms and conditions of employment.

7. Neither members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, nor their dependents shall by reason of this article enjoy any exemption from taxes or similar charges relating to personal purchases of goods and services in Japan chargeable under Japanese legislation.

8. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the Japanese and United States authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods purchased in Japan exempt from the taxes referred to in paragraph 3, shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not entitled to purchase such goods exempt from such tax.

ARTICLE XIII

1. The United States shall not be subject to taxes or similar charges on property held, used, or transferred in Japan by the United States Armed Forces.

2. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents shall not be liable to pay any Japanese taxes to the Japanese Government or to any other taxing agency in Japan on income received as a result of their service with or employment by the United States Armed Forces. The provisions of this article do not exempt such persons from payment of Japanese taxes on income derived from Japanese sources nor do they exempt United States citizens who for United States income-tax purposes claim Japanese residence from payment of Japanese taxes on income. Periods during which such persons are in Japan solely by reason of being members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component of their dependents shall not be considered as periods of residence or domicile in Japan for the purposes of Japanese taxation.

3. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents shall be exempt from taxation in Japan on the holding, use, transfer inter se, or transfer by death of movable property, tangible or intangible, the presence of which in Japan is due solely to the temporary presence of these persons in Japan, provided that such exemption shall not apply to property held for the purpose of investment or the conduct of business in Japan or to any intangible property registered in Japan. There is no obligation under this article to grant exemption from taxes payable in respect of the use of roads by private vehicles.

ARTICLE XIV

1. Persons, including corporations organized under the laws of the United States, and their employees who are ordinarily resident in the United States, and whose presence in Japan is solely for the purpose of executing contracts with the United States for the benefit of the United States Armed

Forces shall, except as provided in this article, be subject to the laws and regulations of Japan.

2. Upon certification by appropriate United States authorities as to their identity, such persons and their employees shall be accorded the following benefits of this agreement.

(A) Rights of accession and movement, as provided for in article V, paragraph 2.

(B) Entry into Japan in accordance with the provisions of article IX.

(C) The exemption from customs duties, and other such charges provided for in article XI, paragraph 3, for members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian components, and their dependents.

(D) If authorized by the United States Government, the right to use the services of the organization provided for in article XV.

(E) Those provided for in article XIX, paragraph 2 for members of the Armed Forces of the United States, the civilian component, and their dependents.

(F) If authorized by the United States Government, the right to use military payment certificates, as provided for in article XX.

(G) The use of postal facilities provided for in article XXI.

(H) Exemption from the laws and regulations of Japan with respect to terms and conditions of employment.

3. Such persons and their employees shall be so described in their passports and their arrival, departure, and their residence while in Japan shall from time to time be notified by the United States Armed Forces to the Japanese authorities.

4. Upon certification by an authorized officer of the United States Armed Forces depreciable assets except houses, held, used, or transferred, by such persons and their employees exclusively for the execution of contracts referred to in paragraph 1 shall not be subject to taxes or similar charges of Japan.

5. Upon certification by an authorized officer of the United States Armed Forces, such persons and their employees shall be exempt from taxation in Japan on the holding, use, transfer or transfer by death, or transfer to persons or agencies entitled to tax exemption under this agreement, of movable property, tangible or intangible, the presence of which in Japan is due solely to the temporary presence of these persons in Japan, provided that such exemption shall not apply to property held for the purpose of investment or the conduct of other business in Japan or to any intangible property registered in Japan. There is no obligation under this article to grant exemption from taxes payable with respect to the ownership or use of private vehicles.

6. The persons and their employees referred to in paragraph 1 shall not be liable to pay income or corporation taxes to the Japanese Government or to any other taxing agency in Japan on any income derived under a contract made in the United States with the United States Government in connection with the construction, maintenance, or operation of any of the facilities or areas covered by this agreement.

The provisions of this paragraph do not exempt such persons from payment of income or corporation taxes on income derived from Japanese sources, nor do they exempt such persons and their employees who, for United States income tax purposes, claim Japanese residence, from payment of Japanese taxes on income. Periods during which such persons are in Japan solely in connection with the execution of a contract with the United States Government shall not be considered periods of residence or domicile in Japan for the purposes of such taxation.

7. Japanese authorities shall have the primary right to exercise jurisdiction over the persons and their employees referred to in paragraph 1 of this article in relation to offenses committed in Japan and punishable by the law of Japan. In those cases in which the Japanese authorities decide not to exercise such jurisdiction they shall notify the military authorities of the United States as soon as possible. Upon such notification the military authorities of the United States shall have the right to exercise such jurisdiction over the persons referred to as is conferred on them by the law of the United States.

ARTICLE XV

1. (a) Navy exchanges, post exchanges, messes, social clubs, theaters, newspapers, and other nonappropriated fund organizations authorized and regulated by the United States military authorities may be established in the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces for the use of members of such forces, the civilian component, and their dependents. Except as otherwise provided in this agreement, such organizations shall not be subject to Japanese regulations, license fees, taxes, or similar controls.

(b) When a newspaper authorized and regulated by the United States military authorities is sold to the general public, it shall be subject to Japanese regulations, license fees, taxes, or similar controls so far as such circulation is concerned.

2. No Japanese tax shall be imposed on sales of merchandise and services by such organizations, except as provided in paragraph 1 (b), but purchases within Japan of merchandise and supplies by such organizations shall be subject to Japanese taxes.

3. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the Japanese and United States authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods which are sold by such organizations shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not authorized to make purchases from such organizations.

4. The obligation for the withholding and payment of income tax and social security contributions, and, except as may otherwise be mutually agreed, the conditions of employment and work, such as those relating to wages and supplementary payments, the conditions for the protection of workers, and the rights of workers concerning labor relations shall be those laid down by the legislation of Japan.

5. The organizations referred to in this article shall provide such information to the Japanese authorities as is required by Japanese tax legislation.

ARTICLE XVI

It is the duty of members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, and their dependents, to respect the law of Japan and to abstain from any activity inconsistent with the spirit of this agreement, and, in particular, from any political activity in Japan.

ARTICLE XVII

1. Upon the coming into force with respect to the United States of the "agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces," signed at London on June 19, 1951, the United States will immediately conclude with Japan, at the option of Japan, an agreement on criminal jurisdiction similar to the corresponding provisions of that agreement.

2. Pending the coming into force with respect to the United States of the North Atlantic Treaty agreement referred to in paragraph 1, the United States service courts and authorities shall have the right to exercise within Japan exclusive jurisdiction over all offenses which may be committed in Japan by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, excluding their dependents who have only Japanese nationality. Such jurisdiction may in any case be waived by the United States.

3. While the jurisdiction provided in paragraph 2 is effective, the following provisions shall apply:

(a) Japanese authorities may arrest members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, or their dependents outside facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces for the commission or attempted commission of an offense, but in the event of such an arrest, the individual or individuals shall be immediately turned over to the United States Armed Forces. Any person fleeing from the jurisdiction of the United States Armed Forces and found in any place outside the facilities and areas may on request be arrested by the Japanese authorities and turned over to the United States authorities.

(b) The United States authorities shall have the exclusive right to arrest within facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces any person subject to the jurisdiction of Japan and found in any such facility or area will, on request, be turned over to the Japanese authorities.

(c) The United States authorities may, under due process of law, arrest, in the vicinity of such a facility or area, any person in the commission or attempted commission of an offense against the security of that facility or area. Any such person not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States Armed Forces shall be immediately turned over to Japanese authorities.

(d) Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3c, the activities outside the facilities and areas of military police of the United States Armed Forces shall be limited to the extent necessary for maintaining order and discipline of and arresting members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

(e) The authorities of the United States and Japan shall cooperate in making available witnesses and evidence for criminal investigations and other criminal proceedings in their respective tribunals and shall assist each other in the making of investigations. In the event of a criminal contempt, perjury, or an obstruction of justice before a tribunal which does not have criminal jurisdiction over the individual committing the offense, he shall be tried by a tribunal which has jurisdiction over him as if he had committed the offense before it.

(f) The United States Armed Forces shall have the exclusive right of removing from Japan members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents. The United States will give sympathetic consideration to a request by the Government of Japan for the removal of any such person for good cause.

(g) Japanese authorities shall have no right of search or seizure, with respect to any persons or property, within facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, or with respect to property of the United States Armed Forces wherever situated.

At the request of the Japanese authorities, the United States authorities undertake, within the limits of their authority, to make such search and seizure and inform the Japanese authorities as to the results thereof. In the event of a judgment concerning such property, except property owned or utilized by the United States Government, the United States will turn over such property to the Japanese authorities for disposition in accordance with the judgment. Japanese authorities shall have no right of search or seizure outside facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, with respect to the persons or property of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, or their dependents, except as to such persons as may be arrested in accordance with paragraph 3a of this article, and except as to cases where such search is required for the purpose of arresting offenders under the jurisdiction of Japan.

(h) A death sentence shall not be carried out in Japan by the United States Armed Forces if the legislation of Japan does not

provide for such punishment in a similar case.

4. The United States undertakes that the United States service courts and authorities shall be willing and able to try and, on conviction, to punish all offenses against the laws of Japan which members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, and their dependents may be alleged on sufficient evidence to have committed in Japan, and to investigate and deal appropriately with any alleged offense committed by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, which may be brought to their notice by Japanese authorities or which they may find to have taken place. The United States further undertakes to notify the Japanese authorities of the disposition made by United States service courts of all cases arising under this paragraph. The United States shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from Japanese authorities for a waiver of its jurisdiction in cases arising under this paragraph where the Japanese Government considers such waiver to be of particular importance. Upon such waiver, Japan may exercise its own jurisdiction.

5. In the event the option referred to in paragraph 1 is not exercised by Japan, the jurisdiction provided for in paragraph 2 and the following paragraphs shall continue in effect. In the event the said North Atlantic Treaty agreement has not come into effect within 1 year from the effective date of this agreement, the United States will, at the request of the Japanese Government, reconsider the subject of jurisdiction over offenses committed in Japan by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

ARTICLE XVIII

1. Each party waives all its claims against the other party for injury or death suffered in Japan by a member of its armed forces, or a civilian governmental employee, while such member or employee was engaged in the performance of his official duties, in cases where such injury or death was caused by a member of the Armed Forces or a civilian employee of the other party acting in the performance of his official duties.

2. Each party waives all its claims against the other party for damage to any property in Japan owned by it, if such damage was caused by a member of the armed forces or a civilian governmental employee of the other party in the performance of his official duties.

3. Claims, other than contractual, arising out of acts or omissions of members of, or employees of the United States Armed Forces in the performance of official duty or out of any other act, omission, or occurrence for which the United States Armed Forces is legally responsible arising incident to noncombatant activities and causing injury, death, or property damage in Japan to third parties shall be dealt with by Japan in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) Claims shall be filed within 1 year from the date on which they arise and shall be considered and settled or adjudicated in accordance with the laws and regulations of Japan with respect to claims arising from the activities of its own employees.

(b) Japan may settle any such claims, and payment of the amount agreed upon or determined by adjudication shall be made by Japan in yen.

(c) Such payment, whether made pursuant to a settlement or to adjudication of the case by a competent tribunal of Japan, or the final adjudication by such a tribunal denying payment, shall be binding and conclusive.

(d) The cost incurred in satisfying claims pursuant to the preceding subparagraphs shall be shared on terms to be agreed by the two Governments.

(e) In accordance with procedures to be established, a statement of all claims approved or disapproved by Japan pursuant to this paragraph, together with the findings in each case, and a statement of the sums paid by Japan, shall be sent to the United States periodically, with a request for reimbursement of the share to be paid by the United States. Such reimbursement shall be made within the shortest possible time in yen.

4. Each party shall have the primary right, in the execution of the foregoing paragraph, to determine whether its personnel were engaged in the performance of official duty. Such determination shall be made as soon as possible after the arising of the claim concerned. When the other party disagrees with the results of such determination, that party may bring the matter before the Joint Committee for Consultation under the provisions of article XXVI of this agreement.

5. Claims against members of or employees of the United States Armed Forces arising out of tortious acts or omissions in Japan not done in the performance of official duty shall be dealt with in the following manner:

(a) The Japanese authorities shall consider the claim and assess compensation to the claimant in a fair and just manner, taking into account all the circumstances of the case including the conduct of the injured person, and shall prepare a report on the matter.

(b) The report shall be delivered to the United States authorities who shall then decide without delay whether they will offer an ex gratia payment, and if so of what amount.

(c) If an offer of ex gratia payment is made, and accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction of his claim the United States authorities shall make the payment themselves and inform the Japanese authorities of their decision and of the sum paid.

(d) Nothing in this paragraph shall affect the jurisdiction of the Japanese courts to entertain an action against a member or employee of the United States Armed Forces, unless and until there has been payment in full satisfaction of the claim.

6. (a) Members of and civilian employees of the United States Armed Forces excluding employees who have only Japanese nationality shall not be subject to suit in Japan with respect to claims specified in paragraph 3, but will be subject to the civil jurisdiction of Japanese courts with respect to all other types of cases.

(b) In case any private movable property excluding that in use by the United States Armed Forces which is subject to compulsory execution under Japanese law is within the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, the United States authorities shall upon the request of Japanese courts possess and turn over such property to the Japanese authorities.

(c) The United States authorities shall cooperate with the Japanese authorities in making available witnesses and evidence for civil proceedings in Japanese tribunals.

7. Disputes arising out of contracts concerning the procurement of materials, supplies, equipment, services, and labor by or for the United States Armed Forces which were not resolved by the parties to the contract concerned may be submitted to the joint committee for conciliation, provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not prejudice any right which the parties to the contract may have to file a civil suit.

ARTICLE XIX

1. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, shall be subject to the foreign exchange controls of the Japanese Government.

2. The preceding paragraph shall not be construed to preclude the transmission into or outside of Japan of United States dollars or dollar instruments representing the official funds of the United States or realized as a result of service or employment in connection with this agreement by members of the United States Armed Forces and the civilian component, or realized by such persons and their dependents from sources outside of Japan.

3. The United States authorities shall take suitable measures to preclude the abuse of the privileges stipulated in the preceding paragraph or circumvention of the Japanese foreign exchange controls.

ARTICLE XX

1. (a) United States military-payment certificates denominated in dollars may be used by persons authorized by the United States for internal transactions within facilities and areas provided for by this agreement. The United States Government will take appropriate action to insure that authorized personnel are prohibited from engaging in transactions involving military-payment certificates except as authorized by United States regulations. The Japanese Government will take necessary action to prohibit unauthorized persons from engaging in transactions involving military-payment certificates and with the aid of United States authorities will undertake to apprehend and punish any person or persons under its jurisdiction involved in the counterfeiting or uttering of counterfeit military-payment certificates within the facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces.

(b) It is agreed that the United States authorities will apprehend and punish members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, or their dependents, who tender military-payment certificates to unauthorized persons and that no obligation will be due to such unauthorized persons or to the Japanese Government or its agencies from the United States or any of its agencies as a result of any unauthorized use of military-payment certificates within Japan.

2. In order to exercise control of military-payment certificates the United States shall have the right to designate certain American financial institutions to maintain and operate, under United States supervision, facilities for the use of persons authorized by the United States to use military-payment certificates. Institutions authorized to maintain military-banking facilities will establish and maintain such facilities physically separated from their Japanese commercial banking business, with personnel whose sole duty is to maintain and operate such facilities. Such facilities shall be permitted to maintain United States currency bank accounts and to perform all financial transactions in connection therewith including receipt and remission of funds to the extent provided by article XIX of this agreement.

ARTICLE XXI

The United States shall have the right to establish and operate, within the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces under this agreement, United States Military Post Offices for the use of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents, for the transmission of mail between United States Military Post Offices in Japan and between such military post offices and other United States post offices.

ARTICLE XXII

The United States shall have the right to enroll and train all eligible United States citizens, residing in Japan, in the Reserve organizations of the Armed Forces of the United States, except that the prior consent of the Japanese Government shall be obtained in the case of persons employed by the Japanese Government.

ARTICLE XXIII

The United States and Japan will cooperate in taking such steps as may from time to time be necessary to insure the security of the United States Armed Forces, the members thereof, the civilian component, their

dependents and their property. The Japanese Government agrees to seek such legislation and to take such other action as may be necessary to insure the adequate security and protection within its territory of installations, equipment, property, records, and official information of the United States, and the punishment of offenders under the applicable laws of Japan.

ARTICLE XXIV

In the event of hostilities, or imminently threatened hostilities, in the Japan area, the Governments of the United States and Japan shall immediately consult together with a view to taking necessary joint measures for the defense of that area and to carrying out the purposes of article 1 of the United States-Japan Security Treaty.

ARTICLE XXV

1. It is agreed that the United States will bear for the duration of this agreement without cost to Japan all expenditures incident to the maintenance of the United States Armed Forces in Japan except those to be borne by Japan as provided in paragraph 2.

2. It is agreed that Japan will:

(a) furnish for the duration of this agreement without cost to the United States and make compensation where appropriate to the owners and suppliers thereof all facilities, areas, and rights-of-way, including facilities and areas jointly used such as those at airfields and ports, as provided in articles II and III.

(b) make available without cost to the United States, until the effective date of any new arrangements reached as a result of periodic reexamination, an amount of Japanese currency equivalent to $155,000,000 per annum for the purpose of procurement by the United States of transportation and other requisite services and supplies in Japan. The rate of exchange at which yen payments will be credited shall be the official par value, or that rate considered most favorable by the United States which on the day of payment is available to any party, authorized by the Japanese Government or used in any transaction with any party by the Japanese Government or its agencies or by Japanese banks authorized to deal in foreign exchange, and which, if both countries have agreed par values with the international monetary fund, is not prohibited by the articles of the agreement of the fund.

3. It is agreed that arrangements will be effected between the Governments of Japan and the United States for accounting applicable to financial transactions arising out of this agreement.

ARTICLE XXVI

1. A joint committee shall be established as the means for consultation between the United States and Japan on all matters requiring mutual consultation regarding the implementation of this agreement. In particular, the joint committee shall serve as the means for consultation in determining the facilities and areas in Japan which are required for the use of the United States in carrying out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty.

2. The joint committee shall be composed of a representative of the United States and of Japan, each of whom shall have one or more deputies and a staff. The joint committee shall determine its own procedures, and arrange for such auxiliary organs and administrative services as may be required. The joint committee shall be so organized that it may meet immediately at any time at the request of the representative of either the United States or Japan.

3. If the joint committee is unable to resolve any matter, it shall refer that matter to the respective Governments for further consideration through appropriate channels.

ARTICLE XXVII

1. This agreement shall come into force on the date on which the security treaty between the United States and Japan enters into force.

2. Each party to this agreement undertakes to seek from its legislative necessary budgetary and legislative action with respect to provisions of this agreement which require such action for their execution.

ARTICLE XXVIII

Either party may at any time request the revision of any article of this agreement, in which case the two Governments shall enter into negotiation through appropriate channels.

ARTICLE XXIX

This agreement shall remain in force while the Security Treaty remains in force unless earlier terminated by agreement between the parties.

NOTES EXCHANGED BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN CONCERNING THE USE OF FACILITIES AND AREAS BY THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

UNITED STATES NOTE TO JAPAN

His Excellency SHIGERU YOSHIDA,
Prime Minister of Japan.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to our discussion on the terms of the administrative agreement signed today, in which Your Excellency stated as the opinion of the Japanese Government that, as the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers comes to an end on the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces on the basis of occupation requisition also comes to an end on the same date: thereafter, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces must be based upon agreement between the two Governments, subject to the rights which each might have under the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the Security Treaty, and the administrative agreement. I hereby confirm that such is also the opinion of the United States Government.

In article II, paragraph 1, of the administrative agreement, it is stipulated that, "agreements as to specific facilities and areas, not already reached by the two governments by the effective date of this agreement, shall be concluded by the two governments through the joint committee provided for in article XXVI of this agreement." The United States Government is confident that our two governments are agreed that consultation shall be on an urgent basis in order to complete such arrangements at the earliest possible date. With this in mind, the United States Government is prepared to join with the Japanese Government in constituting a preliminary working group, consisting of a representative and the necessary staff from each government to begin such consultations immediately, with the understanding that the arrangement made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the administrative agreement.

However, unavoidable delays may arise in the determination and preparation of facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty. It would be much appreciated, therefore, if Japan would grant the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

DEAN RUSK,
Special Representative of the President of the United States of America.

JAPANESE NOTE TO THE UNITED STATES

His Excellency DEAN RUSK,
Special Representative of the President of the United States of America.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your note of today's date in which Your Excellency has informed me as follows:

"I have the honor to refer to our discussion on the terms of the administrative agreement signed today, in which Your Excellency stated as the opinion of the Japanese Government that, as the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers comes to an end on the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces on the basis of occupation requisition also comes to an end on the same date; thereafter, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces must be based upon agreement between the two Governments, subject to the rights which each might have under the Treaty of Peace with Japan, the security treaty, and the administrative agreement. I hereby confirm that such is also the opinion of the United States Government.

"In article II, paragraph 1, of the administrative agreement, it is stipulated that, 'agreements as to specific facilities and areas, not already reached by the two Governments by the effective date of this agreement, shall be concluded by the two Governments through the joint committee provided for in article XXIV of this agreement.' The United States Government is confident that our two Governments are agreed that consultation shall be on an urgent basis in order to complete such arrangements at the earliest possible date. With this in mind, the United States Government is prepared to join with the Japanese Government in constituting a preliminary working group, consisting of a representative and the necessary staff from each Government to begin such consultations immediately, with the understanding that the arrangement made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the administrative agreement.

"However, unavoidable delays may arise in the determination and preparation of facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article 1 of the security treaty. It would be much appreciated, therefore, if Japan would grant the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements."

The Japanese Government fully shares the desire of the United States Government to initiate consultations on an urgent basis in order to complete arrangements for the use of facilities and areas at the earliest possible date. The Japanese government agrees, therefore, to the immediate constitution of the preliminary working group referred to in Your Excellency's note, with the understanding that the arrangements made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the administrative agreement.

With full appreciation of the contents of Your Excellency's note, I have the honor, on behalf of the Japanese government, to confirm that the Japanese government will grant

to the United States the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

SHIGERU YOSHIDA,
Prime Minister of Japan.

EXHIBIT 2

[From Collier's of December 8, 1951]

CAN JAPAN STAY ON OUR SIDE?

(By Thomas E. Dewey)

(If the Kremlin's plans for world conquest are to be thwarted, this country must have strong allies in the Pacific, as well as a powerful defense cordon in the Far East. To see at first-hand economic, political, and military conditions, to study the problems of the free nations trying to protect themselves against the Reds, Governor Dewey made a 41,000-mile trip. He talked to leaders and ordinary citizens in a dozen important Pacific areas. This is the second of three articles telling what he found.)

II

It was a big day when I arrived in Japan. It was a big day not because it was the Fourth of July or because I arrived. It was a big day because at the customary Independence Day reception at the American Embassy Maj. Gen. Andrei P. Kislenko, the highest representative of the Soviet Union in Tokyo, appeared at a social gathering for the first time in many months.

My plane had been 4 hours late, so it just gave me time to dispose of greetings and press questions at Haneda Airport, get to the Imperial Hotel for a much-needed shower after 2 days of flying, and get to the reception. The several hundred people already there were buzzing with excitement. They interpreted General Kislenko's presence to mean the Russians really were serious in their bid for a truce in Korea. The cease-fire talks were only 4 days away.

The general was smiling and brought his wife along. He was nice even to me, though his Government had branded me Public Enemy No. 1 on several occasions.

Beneath the surface of the optimism, however, I soon found crosscurrents and grave concerns. Every point of view was represented since nearly everybody of importance in Tokyo was present.

Our military men were hopeful but worried. Many were frankly fearful that the truce was a trap. If the Reds could achieve a lull during which to realign their forces and bring up reserves and supplies, freed without harassment from the air, they might launch a surprise offensive of crushing weight.

There was even more alarm over the expected effort of the Communists to make a settlement on the thirty-eighth parallel. If we could be tricked into accepting that indefensible, artificial line, our position would be precarious to impossible.

The Japanese were worried too, but for even more fundamental reasons. What if the truce should succeed? Suppose a political settlement should be made? Would America then withdraw all her troops from Korea? If so, the Japanese saw in the future just a repetition of what had already occurred—another attack, perhaps successful, and then a Communist-occupied Korea pointing like a dagger at the heart of Japan.

This fear I thoroughly understood, because 4 years before, in a public speech, I warned that if we withdrew our troops from Korea, we would leave a vacuum into which the Soviets would inevitably move.

The Koreans were unhappy too—bitterly unhappy—for they saw the possibility of a settlement again dividing their country, perhaps permanently.

I never saw so many people so worried over the prospect of peace.

This was my introduction to Japan.

My specific reason for going first to Tokyo was to accept the invitation of the America-Japan Society to speak on the 6th of July. The recall of General MacArthur had, of course, created the greatest uncertainty and uneasiness among the Japanese people. would it mean a complete change of policy? Would America abandon her efforts for a treaty of reconciliation? Or worse, would we abandon Japan to the Russians?

One of my closest associates for many years, Ambassador John Foster Dulles, was in charge of the peace treaty. He strongly urged that it was vital for a Republican not associated with the national administration to visit Japan and buttress the American position, giving further evidence of our good intentions, both by a friendly visit and by a major speech.

So the completion of my speech was the first order of business. In its final revision I particularly valued the help of two extraordinary men, Ambassador Sebald and General Ridgway.

William Sebald started life as a language officer in the United States Navy, one of his specialties being Japanese. In due course he married a lovely Eurasian lady—half Japanese, half British—and after resigning from the Navy in the 1930's, practiced law in Kobe for 7 years. It was natural that he should be asked to become political adviser, with the rank of Ambassador, to General MacArthur. With his knowledge of the Japanese people and his command of the language, his quiet manner and his immense capacity for hard work, my own opinion is that he has made a brilliant contribution toward the building of the new Japan.

General Matthew Ridgway is straight soldier. He was sent out to succeed the late General Walton H. Walker in command of the UN forces at a critical, if not desperate, time. Erect, calm, forceful, with his trademark of a live grenade on his shoulder strap, he rallied and reorganized our forces. Later, replacing General MacArthur, he moved easily into the position of Supreme Commander, which he has filled with distinction. After spending a whole day with him, I both like and admire him. Tremendously diligent, clear-thinking, and very able, he has surrounded himself with top-flight men, of whom Gen. James A. Van Fleet is a brilliant example.

Delivering the speech the next day was a very interesting experience. Would my audience understand enough English for it to be intelligible? And what about the extemporaneous remarks that somehow always creep in? They can fall very flat if they are not understood.

A test of audience appreciation

My fears were groundless. It was a distinguished audience, including the Prime Minister and other leaders of the Government, business, and professional people, and a number of Americans. At the opening I made it very clear that although I had been three times elected Governor of New York, I was speaking solely as a private citizen and in no way for the Government of the United States. Then I couldn't resist the temptation to add, "Some of you may recall that I tried a couple of times to get into the National Government but without success." This brought a good laugh and from then on I was sure that I had not only a politically conscious audience but one that understood English.

It was at this luncheon that I really began to feel that I knew Premier Shigeru Yoshida, and I liked him. I had seen him before at the Fourth of July reception and for an hour's private talk at his official residence the next day. But it was during the luncheon and afterward when we retired to a private room to take off our coats, drink some iced tea, and cool off that we really began to get acquainted.

Yoshida is a sensitive, quiet man of fine ability and character. Steadfast, unyielding in his opposition to militarists who had seized control of Japan, he suffered greatly in the days before and during the war, and was imprisoned in the last month of the war. He was a natural choice for premier of the new Japan. As leader of the dominant Liberal Party, he has successfully steered his country through the most remarkable political revolution of modern times.

In 6 years Japan has made the change from a country completely dominated by the military, without liberty or justice, to a genuine constitutional monarchy with the people actually in control of their Government. I do not know of any precedent in history for such a swift and vast transformation. It is easy for me to understand why people in almost every country I visited asked: "Has Japan really become a free and peaceful nation? Will it last?"

Americans inquire as a matter of interest. But the people of Asia, of the Philippines, of Australia and New Zealand lived right under the guns of a militarist Japan. They ask the question as a matter of life and death. I think the question can mean life or death for us, too.

We have learned the bitter lesson that with a hostile Japan we could hold no defenses short of Hawaii or even possibly the coast of California.

Will Japan remain a free country and on our side? Nobody knows. The answer will come from Japan, from events in Washington, Moscow and elsewhere, and—like a Greek chorus dominating every scene—southeast Asia.

Right now is a critical time for Japan. What happens in the next few months will determine the outcome of the elections next spring, and they may decide the direction of Japan for years to come. Underlying every moment of the lives of 83,000,000 people is the basic Asian problem—tomorrow's rice. This edge of hunger is never far away. Despite a generally almost adequate diet, the first big essential for Japan is rice. Nobody can get very interested in political or economic theories or world affairs if he is hungry. What Japan—and most of the Orient—needs first of all is more food. Almost every home I saw in Japan which had as much as 20 square feet available had a vegetable garden. The garden is not for fun but from necessity.

Of all the people in Japan, 55 percent live on farms, and the election next spring will be dominated by the farm vote. But the farmer is close to the edge, too. In the opinion of nearly every political leader with whom I spoke, the farmer will support the present government if he gets a fair price for his rice. If the farmer is in distress as a result of further inflation while the price of rice remains fixed, he may overturn the government.

The Liberal party presently in power is made up of a solid group of able people who recognize that their only hope for the future lies with the United States and the Western World. They are basically in agreement with the Democratic party, which is a bit to the right of the Liberal. Both parties find much in common with a substantial group of independents or nonparty members.

The alternative to these parties, if a change occurs, would be the slightly leftish Socialist party, which has opposed the peace treaty because Russia and Red China are not signers. But the Socialists are split sharply on this issue by a large middle-of-the-road bloc of voters.

The Communist party has dwindled almost to the vanishing point. In the municipal

elections this year, where 90 percent of the men and women of Japan voted, the Communists got less than one percent of the vote.

Our occupation policy under General MacArthur's brilliant direction robbed the Communists of their most effective propaganda weapon—the promise of land reform. Today 90 percent of all the farmland of Japan is owned by the men who farm it. This is revolutionary. Before the war, most of the land of Japan was held by landlords who owned 15 to 20 acres apiece. To us this is trifling. In Japan it is enormous.

Experiment in land reform

Land Reform is the Communist battle cry in much of the world today, from the Philippines, through southeast Asia, India, the Near East, Italy, and elsewhere. Many countries are trying to meet the problem honestly, but none has been wholly successful yet. But in Japan, the first step is a great success.

During the occupation, the Government launched a program to buy all farmland owned by anyone who had more than the national average, which amounts to about 2.4 acres per family in Japan. The price was fair, about 40 times the annual rental in 1938. Each tenant was then allowed to buy from the Government his share, which usually amounted to a little less than 2½ acres. For this they gave their notes to the Government.

Then a tidal wave of inflation swept over Japan and the new landowners struck it rich. The yen had declined very slightly in value under the rigid wartime controls and for some months after the end of the war. But, as always, the dam finally burst. Before the war the yen was worth 40 cents. Today it is worth less than one-third of a cent, or about 360 yen to one American dollar.

This terrible inflation nearly wrecked the Japanese economy. The savings of the people were wiped out, life insurance and the working capital of businesses almost vanished.

But the tenant farmers, who bought their new land in the land-redistribution program at a fair price in 1946, were able to pay off their debts with the proceeds of two or three crops sold at 360 yen to the dollar. Then they, in turn, began to suffer as other prices rose faster than the price of rice.

The former owners of land were the major victims. They had sold their land at a fair price to the Government, which had paid them in bonds. The bonds then lost 99 percent of their value. The Government is struggling with the problem now of providing some fair reimbursement to the former owners.

In Japan, I followed a long-standing habit of spending at least 1 day visiting farms whenever I am in a foreign country. I am not an industrial expert, but I operate a dairy farm, at Pawling, N. Y., and do know something about farming. Agriculture is a kind of universal language. I find I can talk to people on farms and really learn to know them and how they are thinking. On the farms you find the thoughtful man and his wife who live away from the mass opinion and sometimes hysterical attitudes in the big cities. They are friendly and direct, too, and always pleased when their American visitor shares their feel for the soil and for its problems.

Far too many listeners-in

I tried to arrange my usual farm trip in Japan so I could go alone with an interpreter, and thought I had succeeded. But to my dismay, when I finally got to the country, I found myself in the company of the Minister of Agriculture, the governor of the province, a dozen local officials, and 20 newspaper reporters and photographers. Serene private conversation with Japanese farmers was, to put it mildly, not easy.

The 28-year-old farmer we first visited had bought his land under the land-reform program. He had done a little better than the national average and had about 3½ acres. But the thing that really makes him uppercrust is that he owns a cow—not a milk cow but a working cow. The cow enables him to plow his land. In addition he can hire his cow out to his neighbors for their plowing. Or, if he cannot trust them to handle the cow, he goes and plows their ground himself. They pay him in hours of labor. As a result, when I found six people working in his fields, he explained they were paying for the use of the cow.

Having a cow is a great asset in another way. Most of the fertilizer of Japan is night soil—human fecal matter. The farmer who owns a cow goes to the village and collects the sewage from a group of families with whom he has a regular arrangement. He can put as many as 10 or 12 large cans on a long cart and after his own needs are met he sells the surplus to his poorer neighbors. In a 50-mile drive in the country you will see 10 manure carts for every automobile. Our American soldiers have gaily dubbed those night-soil cans "honey buckets."

This little farm of 3½ acres supports the farmer, his wife, and three children, his father and his grandfather. He raises rice, barley, and vegetables. I asked him how they keep the vegetables for use during the winter. He explained that that was his wife's function, that she preserved them and also did the cooking and the meals. What he did not say was that, in addition to those duties, she works as many hours in the field every day as he does.

Former landlords are being executed by the Communists of China today. In Japan they were allowed to keep the same share of their own land that anyone else could have. A former landlord we visited used to own about 14 acres. He is now reduced to three which he farms himself. He is obviously an intelligent man. He would be a landowner in any society where a good farmer could succeed.

I managed to make my conversation with him quite private with the help of a local interpreter. He betrayed no bitterness over the land reform. Even before the war he had been selling some of his land to the best tenants. He was still living in the family house and was happy, working his 3 acres with fine skill and effectiveness, letting his former tenants use his barn for the storage, just as they always did. He still had a horse and in addition—almost as precious—he had a pig.

His wooden bathtub interested me. Against the outside of his house, under the eaves, it is about 3 feet deep and 4 feet long, oval in shape, with a small metal stove in one end. They put a little charcoal or wood into the stove from the outside. The other side of the stove forms the end of the tub and heats the water. This barefooted family works long hours in the rice paddies in mud up to their knees. Nevertheless, they are a clean family. The bathtub is the most used piece of equipment in the house.

Under the land-reform program, Japan has greatly increased her food production. But the population has increased also—from 70,000,000 to 83,000,000 in 10 years. So the Japanese are just where they were a decade ago, still importing 20 percent of their rice. Both the people and the government want to become self-sufficient but they have a tough road ahead.

Stripped of her former possessions, the Kurile Islands, Manchuria, Formosa, Korea, and also denied many of her former fishing areas, Japan must trade for her food or starve.

The rice bowl of the Orient is southeast Asia. But will southeast Asia remain free?

Mao will drive hard bargains

That is the crucial question. If it does, Japan has a trade area which will be vitally beneficial to both. Each needs the other. If southeast Asia is lost, I do not see where Japan will get either her food, her minerals, or a market for her manufactured goods. If she is forced to get them largely from Red China, we may be sure that Mao Tse-tung will attach a political price to every cargo. Every transaction will increase Communist power in Japan until both economically and politically she will fall into the grasping arms of Soviet slavery.

Japan is our most populous ally in the Pacific. But a base of 83,000,000 starving people would be a hopeless liability, not an asset.

So, if Japan is to remain free, so must southeast Asia. Economically, Burma, Siam, and Indochina are part of the front-line defense of America. It disturbed me considerably to find so little knowledge of southeast Asia among the Japanese. I had hoped to find clear-cut opinions and constructive suggestions as to how to save southeast Asia from Communist aggression. But at meeting after meeting with individuals and groups I ran into a blank wall.

The truth finally emerged: The Japanese military and political leaders who occupied that area have been purged; the remaining people of Japan have been isolated from the world for 10 long years. They have been so isolated that very few are familiar with the conditions in the areas which are vital to their very life. Wherever I went the conversation drifted back to one simple theme: "America must stand by us or we will be lost."

This does not mean they are not willing to work hard and make every sacrifice. It just means that they know that without American friendship and strong support they are lost to the Red czar.

In talks with intellectuals I also found an uneasy concern among some of them over the work of the Communist underground. One distinguished scholar said: "The Communist leadership has been driven out of the trade-unions pretty well. But it is still in the teachers' unions and two Communists in a hundred can spoil the other ninety-eight."

A leading member of the judiciary expressed another worry. "Left alone," he said, "I am convinced Japan will have no internal trouble with communism. But I am worried about what will happen after the treaty, when the necessities of trade may bring an increasing number of Communists in one guise or another into our country."

Generally, however, Japan's problems today are more economic than political. There are excellent men in all parties. One of my best meetings was at the Diet Building with the leaders of the political parties. As usual, tea was served and we sat around a large table. I was delighted to find Frank Matsumota, a Diet member representing Hiroshima, serving as interpreter, just as he had done when the Japanese delegation came to Albany last year.

Abandonment by United States feared

Discussion was free and forceful. Every time a member of one party made a flat declaration, one of the others would crack back at him across the table. One of the Socialist members spoke highly of the proposed Japanese Treaty, although his party publicly opposes it without Russia and Red China as signatories. He was thoroughly ribbed by the liberals present, who said they wished he would say it in public, which brought a gale of laughter from the whole group. Even here, though, the grim question came out again and again: "Will America abandon Korea once more? And, if she does, might she not abandon Japan?"

This is quite natural. Stripped back to her four comparatively barren home islands,

Japan has no army, navy, or air force. Unhappily, we gave the Kurile Islands to Russia at Yalta. So today there are Russian divisions 3 miles from the Japanese home island of Hokkaido.

If Red divisions should ever occupy all of Korea, Japan would be surrounded on two sides or almost three—and defenseless. Every Japanese I saw feels with great intensity that Japan must be a part of the western world. They know their safety will require for many years the protection of American ground forces, Navy and Air Forces.

The extent to which Japan will rebuild her own defenses is by no means clear. I am convinced there is a genuine popular revulsion against military domination of the country. I found it in every stratum of society. Yet for her own safety Japan must rebuild her armed forces.

Right now there is little public support for a rearmament program. Moreover, there is no money for one. Only by the most drastic measures, almost coerced by the occupation, was the government able to balance the budget, and stabilize the yen. Even the governing Liberal Party is not united in favor of a balanced budget because the difficulties are so great.

We have conferred on Japan the dubious blessing of the progressive income tax, and it is very high. So are business taxes. The new defense forces cannot be built out of increased taxes. The money for defense, for hydroelectric dams and flood control and countless other needs can only come from a greatly increased volume of business.

Here again, however, we come right up against the basic lack of capital for expanded business. It will cost billions to build the needed new ships, new factories and new stores. Capital can come only from the savings of businesses or of people. Neither can save much, if anything, today.

Government salaries are an example. The average government employee makes between 9,000 and 10,000 yen or $25 to $28 a month. A member of the Diet is paid 50,000 yen or about $150 per month. The elected governor of a province gets about the same. Cabinet officers get little more.

In the silk mills, the girls work intensively and with great skill in the fascinating process of transforming cocoons at one end of the factory into baled silk at the other—all for $2 a month plus board and room. They have little or no opportunity to meet young men. But that isn't important since most of them come from nearby farms and by the time they are 20 years old their parents usually have arranged a satisfactory marriage with an appropriate young man from the neighborhood.

A good stenographer will get about 8,000 yen or about $21 a month. In the steel mills the most highly skilled workers can go as high as 15,000 yen or about $42 a month. Weavers earn from $20 to $40, a locomotive engineer $20 a month.

A people living with hunger

Very few savings for new capital can come from businessmen or employees. It takes about $28 a month to buy a little rice, a piece of fish and a couple of vegetables every day for a man with a wife and two children. Despite a small bonus for men with children, the simple fact is that no worker in Japan can earn enough to support a family under the present structure. His wife and some of the children must also work to keep a roof over their heads. That thin edge of hunger is so very close there can be few savings.

Despite this low living standard, the cost of Japanese goods is so high that they are being undersold in the world market in many articles. The businessmen blame this on the high freight rates they now have to pay and the 8-hour day which was imposed during the occupation, which means that only 6 hours of work are done, after deducting a paid lunchtime and tea and rest periods. Before the war, the Japanese worked a 10- to 12-hour day and I suspect that, rightly or wrongly, a longer working day is coming back.

In addition to new capital, Japan must have raw materials. She is acutely short of iron, coal, and salt. Six out of her seven million tons of shipping were sunk in the war and shipping is the very lifeblood of Japan. The gaunt skeletons of bombed-out factories dot the whole country from one end of the nation to the other. One B–29 fire raid on Tokyo did more damage than the atom bomb at Hiroshima. Today most of the Tokyo homes have been rebuilt, but the industrial damage remains.

On our visit to Hiroshima, however, we drove through a vast expanse of terrible devastation, to the heart of the city where only half a dozen buildings still stand, aside from new houses built since the war. After a visit to the museum showing Hiroshima exactly as it was after the atom explosion, we went to the city hall with the mayor, and up on the roof he showed us the plans for the new and beautiful Hiroshima which is to rise in the future. The psychology of the people of Hiroshima was very interesting and surprising. They eagerly welcome visitors. They want everyone to come and see the devastation of the bomb because they want Hiroshima to be a city dedicated to peace—a living demonstration of the horrors of war.

It was a startling change to go on a short flight from the horror of the past to the bustling, vigorous present of Osaka, the Pittsburgh of Japan. Here in Osaka and in Kobe which adjoins it, one gets the full impact of Japanese industry. In contrast to the charming rural atmosphere surrounding the silk factories and the brocade mills, these industrial plants are mighty and profoundly impressive.

Japan's industrial leaders

The men who run them are impressive, too. They have all survived the exhaustive purging and the breakup of the cartels which dominated Japanese business before the war. From Governor Bunzo Akama of the Osaka Prefecture to Governor Sachio Kishida of the Hyogo Prefecture, they are typical of the Japanese leaders of today. Alert, intelligent, almost all of them speaking English, they represent the future of Japan.

In the course of 1 day I saw dramatically almost all of Japan's critical problems other than food: the shortage of capital, raw materials and flood control and power.

On arrival at the harbor of Kobe we transferred to a launch in a driving rain and rode across that large and beautiful harbor to the Central Japan Heavy Industry Shipyard. On the way across the bay another great shipyard was pointed out which was standing idle. Each shipyard has to close down 1 day out of 5 for lack of electric power.

The Central Japan Shipyard was impressive. They have been building fine ships for 50 years, and a 10,000-ton freighter was about ready to be launched. This yard, as well as the steel mill we visited next, seemed to my inexpert eyes to be models of efficiency and productive power. With every passing hour I could see more forcibly than ever why Japan is a prime object of Stalin's desire—and why Russia must never get Japan.

The Japanese believe that if they can find the capital and if they can get the raw materials, they can rebuild their lost shipping in 25 years. But they do not know where the capital will come from.

The power shortage is equally critical. Only in America where the power industry has largely remained free of Government ownership is there still an almost adequate supply of power. I have always appreciated the value of the American free enterprise system, and everywhere I went it was driven home again and again that competitive private enterprise is the only system which can meet the needs of a modern society.

In Japan the need for flood control and electric power go together. Each year thousands of acres of priceless ricelands are devastated by floods. Each year the shortage of power grows worse. During a long ride in from the country one day, the Minister of Agriculture told me of his dream of a tremendous flood control and power program. He sees the absolute necessity of a $2,000,000,000 program over a 10-year period. If half of that or $100,000,000 a year could come from the United States either by Marshall plan aid or as a loan, he believes Japan could match it. Then, he believes, the food problem of Japan as well as the electric power shortage would be solved.

Even wood is in short supply. The old forests and even the trees in the cities were cut down during the war for fuel by the shivering, freezing, miserable Japanese people. To a newcomer it is hard to realize that Japan, which we think of as a hot country, is cold in the winter.

I asked repeatedly how the Japanese keep warm in the winter with their thin wooden houses and the glazed-paper windows. The best answer I got was from an American who shrugged his shoulders and said: "They don't." It is a pitiful sight to see women, old men, and children spending hours each day searching for the few twigs and sticks they must have even in summer for cooking. It is a sight you never escape in Japan, in city or country.

Yet, on the whole, the people I talked with in the shops and on their farms, in the factories and in the stores, were quite cheerful. In a letter from a member of the Cabinet which I received after I came home, he said:

"Once again I want to express the hope that you will inform the leaders and the people of America of the concrete progress Japan is making in recovery and that she is so democratized she will become a member of the family of the peaceful nations of the world and also a leader in Asia to be a bulwark to stop communism in this part of the world."

As of today I believe this is a genuine expression of Japanese sentiment. They know they have a tough but simple choice. Their choice is hard work, freedom and progress with the Western World or slavery under the claw of their ancient enemy—the Russian bear. They have made their choice and hope to be able to stick to it.

In the background of the Japanese scene there always remains Emperor Hirohito. He was rarely discussed except by a few Japanese who have been in the West enough to know they could be quite frank. They all knew that the issue of the Emperor was very acute. The Russians as well as many of the left-wing elements in our own Government thought the Emperor should be executed as a war criminal. They were frustrated and disappointed by the findings of the War Crimes Commission that, in fact, the Emperor had held out to the end against the war. It appears that this finding was correct.

Personally the Emperor is very little understood. I certainly do not pretend to be an authority on the subject after 10 days in Japan and a 1-hour visit with him. But some things are clear. He has been through a dreadful period of strain, finding his country launched on a disastrous war which he opposed with all the authority left to the Crown. After the war he took every action required by the occupying authorities to make it clear that he favored a free constitutional monarchy and that the Crown no longer claimed divine powers.

In his discussion of foreign affairs and matters of state he is obviously nervous and under strain. But immediately when the subject goes to science or farming, he relaxes and becomes completely absorbed in what his visitor has to tell him and in what he himself contributes to the conversation. He becomes himself.

The Emperor is an amateur biologist of considerable distinction and an avid student of the technical literature in the field. He has written a two-volume work on the flora and fauna of Tokyo Bay, which is regarded as excellent and authentic.

It is a strange contradiction that today, stripped of all claims of divinity, at the end of a terrible war, the Emperor is personally more influential than before.

Help must come from the west

Right or wrong, I left Japan, convinced that as of today, the Japanese, from the Emperor down, feel that their whole future is bound to the Western World. In the race against hunger, time, and the Communists to rebuild their factories and their ships, to develop new areas for trade and to expand their production of food, they will need substantial help.

Without southeast Asia as a trading area, I do not see how Japan can avoid falling into the clutches of the Reds or, in the alternative, becoming a permanent dependent upon the generosity of America. If the Rice Bowl of southeast Asia, the Philippines, and Indonesia are kept in the free world, Japan will have a trading area nearby. She can ultimately succeed as a self-sustaining member of the family of free nations. In time she can develop her own defenses.

How to be sure to save Indochina, Burma, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia? These are burning questions for Japan, for the whole Pacific, for the defense of our own shores. I was eager to get on to see them at first hand.

One thing is clear. We of America will have to do practically everything right if we are going to keep this decisive balance of power on our side. We cannot afford to make a single mistake or to let any more nations in southeast Asia fall to communism.

If our national influence is firm and constructive, if we solve the critical problem of southeast Asia and if the rice crop is good next year, I think our chances of keeping the Pacific free, without war, are good.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, following the very fine remarks of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I merely wish to say that I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] submitted his proposed reservations. However, I was present when he made his speech. Since that time I have devoted considerable attention to his arguments.

I realize that it is the privilege of every Senator to place his interpretation upon language, if he so desires. However, as the Senator from Alabama has stated, I feel that the reservations which have been suggested, if they were to be adopted by the Senate, would make it necessary to have a conference of the 48 signatory nations, and that in such case there would develop, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has suggested, a situation in which the other signers undoubtedly would also have their own ideas as to interpretations and reservations.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask that at this point in the RECORD there be printed my comments on the reservations proposed by the Senator from Indiana. In the comments I take up the reservations one by one. The other day I spoke somewhat generally on the subject, but in the comments I specifically treat each reservation.

There being no objection, the comments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS BY SENATOR WILEY

I. THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Reservation No. 1

This reservation in its first part provides that nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, its domestic concern.

A treaty, by its nature, is a contract that binds and accordingly limits the sovereign right of the parties. The statement that a treaty shall not impose any limitations is, in effect, the reservation of a right to break the treaty at will, in which event it ceases to be a treaty. Presumably this is not intended. If that is not intended, then the proposed reservation has no significance, because outside of a few obligations to Japan, such as to end the state of war, to recognize its sovereignty, and to waive certain claims, etc., the United States assumes no obligations and gives no one else any voice in, much less control over, the foreign policy, the Military Establishment, or the domestic concerns of the United States.

The second part of the reservation says that the treaty shall not be construed "(b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan." This would presumably mean that Japan is bound only by the provisions of the treaty that are not continuing.

This would nullify article 3, which requires Japan to give the United States continuing jurisdiction and legal authority over the Ryukyus and would thus jeopardize our Okinawa air and naval base.

There are other provisions, such as the renunciation of right, title, and claim to Korea, which might be held to be continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan as to which Japan might be relieved under the proposed reservation.

Reservation No. 2

This represents an effort to rewrite the declaration unanimously proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It differs in these respects:

(a) It eliminates reference to the Habomai and Shikotan Islands which Russia occupies and claims;

(b) It fails to identify the Yalta Agreement of February 11, 1945, as the agreement regarding Japan. There were two other agreements also dated February 11, 1945, one of which deals with liberated Europe and the other of which deals with German reparations and the proposed reservation does not make clear which of the three is referred to.

(c) It adds a reference to the so-called Potsdam Agreement of August 1, 1945. This agreement of August 1, 1945—not to be confused with the Japanese surrender terms formulated on July 26, 1945—deals entirely with European matters, principally Germany, and not at all with Japan. The Japanese Peace Treaty bears no relationship whatsoever to the Potsdam Agreement of August 1, 1945.

(d) It is cast in the form of a reservation which implies the necessity of a change in the treaty which in turn would require the approval of the other parties. The treaty does not in fact do any of the things against which the proposed Senate Foreign Relations Committee declaration, and for that matter, the proposed reservation, is directed. Therefore it is appropriate and in the interests of the United States to follow the form recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Reservation No. 3

This would alter article 14 (b) of the treaty by eliminating from its waiver the claims of the United States for direct military costs of the occupation and the claims of the United States nationals.

If we try to rewrite this article, others will do the same and this will expose Japan to reparation claims amounting to over a hundred billion dollars. It would totally wreck Japan's credit and economy and confront the United States with the alternative of seeing Japan go Communist or giving Japan vast relief, which would in effect mean that we would pay the reparation claims now barred, which the proposed reservation would revive.

United States interests are thoroughly protected as the treaty stands.

Japan has already paid the equivalent of $1,900,000,000 to defray the costs of our military occupation. A principal expense not borne by Japan was that of the so-called GARIOA aid which amounted to about two billion dollars.

Article 14 keeps this GARIOA obligation alive and gives it a priority over the reparations claims of others. That Japanese indebtedness is already more than Japan can repay and the proposed addition to that debt of more debt for direct military costs would merely make some addition to an amount which is already beyond Japan's capacity to repay. Furthermore, it would dilute our position by opening the door to claims by the British Commonwealth Occupation.

As regards the claims of private citizens, these, in so far as they relate to property in Japan, will be completely taken care of under article 15, dealing with restoration of property and the rights and interests in Japan.

Insofar as private claims are not covered by article 15, they can be met out of the proceeds of Japanese property in the United States which, under article 14, the United States is authorized to apply for this purpose. The value of these assets amounts to about $85,000,000. Certain American claims have already been met out of this fund and others can be met as soon as Congress passes the enabling legislation.

The United States, the richest of the Allied countries, gets the best financial treatment under the treaty. Its $2,000,000,000 GARIOA claim, as noted, is preserved intact and given priority. Its citizens' claims are of a kind that can be met almost 100 percent either by the provisions of article 14 or of article 15. No other national claimants are in nearly as good a position, and there has been bitter complaint on this score. If we now attempt to get an even better position we would in fact lose this very favorable treaty position we now have, and which has been acquiesced in, although reluctantly, by the other Allied countries.

Reservation No. 4

The first part of this reservation provides that "no rights or claims referred to in this treaty shall be deemed to accrue to any government or so-called government of China established by recourse to war, and, as used in this treaty the word 'China' refers to the legally established Republic of China."

The fact is that the treaty only mentions the word "China" twice. The first time is article 10, where it is used geographically. The text of article 10 is precisely word for word what was proposed by the National Government of China.

Under this article Japan "renounces" all special rights and interests in China. These rights merely disappear; they do not "accrue" to anyone.

Article 21 confirms, by cross-reference to article 14 (a) (2) the right to seize and liquidate Japanese property in China. This property was all expropriated 6 years ago (1946) by the National Government of the Republic of China, and the effect of the treaty is to validate that action.

The second part of the proposed reservation provides that the sovereignty of the Republic of China "shall be deemed to extend to all areas which were part of China at the outbreak of the late war between Japan and China, including Manchuria, Formosa, and the islands adjacent to Formosa." This reservation would carry into effect the proposals of the Soviet Union. At San Francisco, Gromyko complained that the treaty "grossly violates the indisputable rights of China to the return of integral parts of Chinese territory; Taiwan (Formosa) and the Pescadores." They want Formosa to be recognized as purely a Chinese internal problem, and they want to end any international interests in Formosa, which is the basis for continuing United States concern.

It is because of that that the treaty merely requires Japan to renounce its interests in these islands without ending the right of the United States as one of the victorious Allied Powers to continue to concern itself with the ultimate disposition and intermediate status of the islands.

This treaty handling of the matter was accepted by the Chinese National Government itself, and the alternative now proposed was, after careful study, rejected by United States negotiators, with the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee, as contrary to the best interests of the United States. We do not want to write ourselves out of Formosa.

II. UNITED STATES-JAPAN SECURITY TREATY

Reservation No. 1

This reservation, identical to Reservation No. 1 of the Japanese Peace Treaty, is subject to the comments made above. It is also subject to the further comment that if the security treaty does not impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan" that would enable the Japanese to repudiate article IV, which enables the United States at its election continuously to have the right to put its land, air and sea forces in and about Japan.

Reservation No. 2

This would make the so-called administrative agreements, made pursuant to article III, into treaties. This is impractical and would be very disadvantageous to the United States. These agreements are largely flexible and designed to deal with a situation which will be constantly changing as the number and character of United States forces vary, and as the facilities they require change from time to time. If the United States treats the administrative agreements as treaties, Japan will do the same and the United States position in Japan would in effect be frozen subject to Diet and Senate action, which it would be impossible to obtain quickly and which, in the case of Diet action, might be impossible to obtain at all.

Reservation No. 3

This would, in effect, write into the treaty a provision that the treaty cannot expire except with the concurrence of the Senate or of Congress. The treaty, as is customary, does not inject into external relations United States internal constitutional problems. It gives on option to the United States. How the United States shall act is a matter for us to decide for ourselves and it is not an issue into which Japan should be invited. If the present proposal is in fact a reservation it changes the treaty. Then it would have to go back to Japan for renegotiation and further action by the Japanese Diet. It is highly doubtful if today we could renegotiate as advantageous a treaty as we now have, particularly on the point of duration, because there is now very strong objection in Japan to giving us an easement for military purposes for an indefinite time which the Japanese cannot, of themselves, end. Particularly since the implications of the Security Treaty have now been made manifest by the detailed administrative agreements, there is increasing opposition; and to reject the present treaty which Japan has ratified, and the relevant administrative agreements which Japan has signed, might seriously prejudice the security interest of the United States.

III. AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND UNITED STATES SECURITY TREATY

The proposed reservation is similar to the first part of the proposed reservation No. 1 to the Japanese Peace Treaty and the comments there made are relevant here.

IV. UNITED STATES AND PHILIPPINES MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY

The proposed reservation is similar to the first part of the proposed reservation No. 1 to the Japanese Peace Treaty and the comments there made are relevant here.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I had intended to make some remarks tonight on the pending peace treaty, but in view of the lateness of the hour I think I will forego the privilege until tomorrow.

However, I wish to take advantage of this opportunity, so that my remarks may go into today's RECORD, to compliment the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] on what I believe to be a very fine presentation of the question at issue, and also to compliment, as he has been already complimented by everyone, John Foster Dulles on his very able work in connection with the treaty, not only at the time he was in Japan with the Senators who have worked on the treaty, but at the time he was there with me in connection with commercial matters, which are of vital importance, and to which I hope to address myself tomorrow. His whole attitude and his whole approach to the subject have been of the finest.

Mr. President, I desire now to refer to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). The Senator from Washington has the floor.

PROPOSED STATUE IN MEMORY OF LEIF ERICSON

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as in legislative session, on behalf of myself and several other Senators, I should like to discuss briefly a subject which has been before Congress ever since I have been a Member of it, and I suspect a long time before that. I think today is a good time to discuss it.

I have a joint resolution which I wish to introduce out of order at this time, and I ask that it be appropriately referred, as in legislative session.

As I say, similar measures have been before Congress probably for the past 30 years. The joint resolution is a simple one, and some of us cannot understand why we cannot get any action on it. It would authorize the erection in the District of Columbia of a statue of Leif Ericson. We have the statue. It was a gift to the United States from the people of Iceland. I believe the school children participated in its casting with small contributions. It now reposes, as it has for many years, in the Newport News Marine Museum. There it is. All we have been trying to do is to have Congress authorize the Secretary of the Interior to request the Fine Arts Commission to find a place for old Leif in the District. All we need is the pedestal. We want to put Leif where he belongs.

After all, he did discover America. America was not discovered by Christopher Columbus. Leif was the first one to come to America. He was not here once, but four times.

Although we do not have affidavits to that effect, the old Scandinavian sagas have never been disputed. His mother established the first Christian church on the Continent of North America. Such achievements have actually been proved.

Mr. President, we have erected statues to Christopher Columbus all over the United States, and we have erected statues to Civil War generals, Revolutionary War generals, Presidents, and Vice Presidents. That is all right; I do not object. We have erected such statues and we have paid for them. We have the statue of Leif Ericson. All we want is a base or pedestal to place it on.

I do not know to what committee the joint resolution should be referred. Sometimes such joint resolutions have gone to the Committee on Rules and Administration, sometimes they have gone to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe at one time such a resolution even went to the Committee on the Judiciary. If it is possible for the Chair to use his discretion in the matter I hope he can find a committee which has a sufficient number of members of Scandinavian descent to assure some action on the joint resolution.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I believe it is very appropriate indeed that the Senator from Washington should speak on this subject today, St. Patrick's Day, which we celebrate in honor of the great man who Christianized Ireland.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure it is proper to bring it up on St. Patrick's Day, particularly when it is remembered that Leif Ericson's grandfather, Leif the White, ruled Ireland for nearly 86 years. That fact has been established by several Norwegian sagas. Perhaps that is why so many Norwegians and Icelanders have blue eyes and dark complexions. They were driven out of Ireland by the ancestors of the people we are honoring today, the O'Malleys, the O'Tooles, the O'McFarlands, and others.

Mr. McFARLAND. Did the Senator say "O'McFarland" or "oh! McFarland"?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said "O'McFarland." [Laughter.]

The Vikings finally were run out of Ireland, and thereafter they landed in Scotland, and remained there for a few years, and then went to Iceland and then to Greenland, and then to North America and to what is now the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. One of my first responsibilities in coming to the Senate was to familiarize myself with the measure proposing the erection of a statue to Lief Ericson. I certainly hope that one of these days we can dispose of this measure, without forever being bothered about finding a base and a pedestal for the statue. I assure the Senator from Washington that I shall be glad to give whatever support I can to his joint resolution, and I hope no Member of the Senate will oppose its passage.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, and I appreciate his support.

As I said, Mr. President, I thought March 17 might be a good day to bring up this matter.

As the Senator from Wisconsin himself knows, on one of those expeditions the first white child was born in what is now the United States. That child was not Virginia Dare, but was a child of one of those who came from Iceland to North America.

Mr. President, we think the discoverer of America, who came from Iceland, is entitled to have his statue placed in the Capital, along with the many other statues which are located here.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk the old perennial, a joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericson in the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 142) authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericson in the District of Columbia, was read, received, twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in connection with the introduction of the joint resolution, I submit, on behalf of myself, the Senators from Minnesota [Mr. THYE and Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], a statement in regard to this measure, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON ON BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND SENATORS THYE AND HUMPHREY OF MINNESOTA, WILEY OF WISCONSIN, AND YOUNG OF NORTH DAKOTA, ON INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING PLACEMENT OF STATUE OF LEIF ERICSON IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL

It is with feelings of deep satisfaction, as of performing an act of justice long overdue, that we propose that the Government of the United States erect in this Capital City a statue commemorative of that magnificent figure of history and of legend—the great Norseman, Leif Ericson. I use the two words "history" and "legend" advisedly, for while our knowledge of Ericson's actual achievements is based on the sagas of the Greenland and Vinland voyages whose accuracy, of course, can never be proved, there can scarcely be any doubt whatever that such a person as Leif Ericson actually did exist. The evidence is too overwhelming.

The very name of Leif Ericson conjures up visions of stalwart warriors embarking on their dragon's-head ships. As one glances through the modern translations of those Norse sagas one seems to feel the sting and tang of the salt spray and hear the lusty shouts of the explorers above the roar of the waters. There is a peculiar fascination about those northern seas which no one who has ever traversed them—even in a modern liner—can ever forget.

If we, in the comfort and security of our great ships today are still reminded that we are at times no match for the mighty Atlantic, imagine the boldness, the enterprise, the intrepid courage of these early Norse voyagers.

In the year A. D. 999, as it is told, Leif Ericson, son of that famed warrior, Eric the Red, visited the court of King Olav Tryggvesson of Norway who commissioned him to sail for Greenland and convert the natives to Christianity. Leif himself in the Saga of Vinland is described as a big, strapping fellow, handsome to look at, thoughtful and temperate in all things.

Arriving in Greenland, Leif heard talk on all sides of lands even farther to the west. So he set sail once more and about the year 1002 landed, as is now commonly believed, somewhere in Labrador or Newfoundland and, finding them barren, sailed down the coast where he rounded Cape Cod, finding a fair, wooded country where wild grapes grew in abundance. Thus was discovered that "Vinland" which Americans have every right to believe is their own New England coast and certain adjacent islands, notably Martha's Vineyard and No Mans Land.

It is entirely fitting, therefore, that our Government erect here in the District of Columbia a memorial to the great and gallant figure who will ever live in saga and in history.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT OF WAYNE COY, FOLLOWING HIS RESIGNATION FROM THE GOVERNMENT SERVICE

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, on March 13, 1952, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] had printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which he wrote some 2 years ago for the American magazine. I commend it to all Senators as being good thinking and good reading. He submitted that article for printing in the Appendix of the RECORD, because of the fact that there had been much complaint and controversy regarding former Government employees, Mr. Joseph Nunan, Jr., and others, who had resigned their positions in various branches of the Government and received well-paid employment by various groups doing business with the Government agencies which those former employees had served.

At the outset, I wish to state that I am not trying to speak from a partisan viewpoint in regard to this matter. I am mindful of the fact that those of us who serve in the Senate see from time to time various former colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, who have been repudiated at the polls by their constituents, and then have returned to Washington as registered lobbyists, representing various industries or other forms of business, at large and lucrative retainers.

The other day I was impressed when I read about Wayne Coy, formerly chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Coy resigned his position only a few days ago, and within 24 hours accepted employment with Time magazine, as its radio and television expert, at a retainer of $25,000 a year; and he is still to be free to engage in other business activities on the side.

Mr. President, I do not wish to speak in a derogatory fashion of Mr. Coy or of Time magazine. I am mindful of the fact that perhaps Mr. Coy has sacrificed a great deal in working for the Government all these years. He began governmental service in 1933, in the State of Indiana, under Governor McNutt. Mr. Coy has served in many branches of the Government.

However, the salient fact in connection with this matter is that Time magazine now intends to go into the television and radio field; and Mr. Coy, who resigned from the Federal Communications Commission on February 21, within 24 hours of that time received his appointment from Time magazine, at a retainer, as I say, of $25,000 a year.

Mr. President, I wish to read an article which the American people, the television people, and the broadcasters, are having trouble in understanding, due to the fact that the very essence of good government is involved in criticisms which now are being focused upon Washington, D. C., and the lack of integrity on the part of many of the governmental agents and elective officials:

COY STATION GETS FCC NOD

WASHINGTON, March 8.—Federal Communications Commission this week granted KOB, Albuquerque, recently purchased jointly by Time, Inc., and Wayne Coy, after he resigned as FCC Chairman, authorization to operate on 770 kilocycles until September 1. The authorization was necessary pending settlement by FCC of the 10-year-old case concerning the facilities to be allotted KOB. During Coy's tenure as FCC Chairman, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals here last fall prodded FCC into faster settlement of the case.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. WELKER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the station referred to a television station?

Mr. WELKER. Yes, I understand it is a television station.

Mr. MORSE. The Portland, Oreg., area and the Denver, Colo., area are still waiting for the granting of television licenses which Mr. Coy never could see his way clear to grant while he was Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I never did feel that any sound reason was advanced why such discrimination should be practiced against the Portland, Oreg., area, or the Denver, Colo., area.

Mr. WELKER. I certainly appreciate the remarks of my distinguished colleague and friend, the junior Senator from Oregon. His remarks help focus the attention of the American people on such activities. It is my understanding that Station KOB was heretofore licensed, but of course the new purchasers had to get a new authorization.

Mr. President, what can the people of Portland, Oreg., think when they realize that the television application for their area has been delayed so many

years, along with the applications from many other sections of the country, when now they read in the newspapers that within 24 hours of the time the former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission resigned, he received the great honor of being appointed to represent Time magazine and its television chain, at a stipulated salary of $25,000 a year, for representing only that one organization and its television chain, and when they see an immediate authorization granted Wayne Coy and Time, Inc., to acquire and operate a previously licensed television station in New Mexico?

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

Mr. WELKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEM. Am I to understand that an exception has been made to the television "freeze" order, and that a permit has been granted to the Albuquerque, N. Mex., station?

Mr. WELKER. As I say, Station KOB was heretofore licensed; but I think the Senator from Missouri is on safe ground in assuming what he has said, in view of the press release I have read. I shall read others to the same effect.

Mr. KEM. On what ground was the exception to the general "freeze" order made, on behalf of the Albuquerque, N. Mex., station?

Mr. WELKER. That question is in my mind at this time; but since the station was a licensed station, Mr. Coy and Time probably are exceptions to the "freeze."

I am also familiar with applications made to the Federal Communications Commission by organizations in my own State and by organizations in many other locations, I am sure they will be unable to understand Mr. Coy's and Time's activity.

Mr. President, this matter does not look well or read well. I do not wish to be critical of Mr. Coy, but the American people have had about enough of this sort of activity.

I am mindful of the fact that various members of my own profession, the legal profession, and ex-members of this body have participated in bringing about ridicule and criticism, because of which the Members of this body must be embarrassed.

At this time I wish to refer to the duties of the Federal Communications Commission and its organization. In doing so, I have special reference to the statement made a moment ago by my good friend, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

As he well knows, being the attorney that he is, one of the duties of the Federal Communications Commission is to classify stations and their services, to assign the frequencies, and to make commitments for interstate and foreign radio and television services.

I am sure the American people can well question why this sudden employment of Mr. Coy has occurred within 24 hours of his resignation from the Federal Communications Commission, of which he formerly was chairman, whereas now we find that he is a coowner with Time magazine of the large Albuquerque, N. Mex., television station, which in my opinion will be worth a tremendous sum. The question may be asked, How about this deal? After he stated that he was resigning to replenish his private income, where did he get the money to help buy television station KOB? If he had no funds, what consideration did he offer so that he now is a coowner of this television station? Certainly if this activity does not deserve strict censure, I do not know what does? I think Mr. Coy and Time magazine should explain this setup.

Let me read now what the magazine Broadcasting under date of February 25, 1952, had to say of the matter I am speaking about. This magazine is a publication which is devoted to the broadcasting and television industries and related matters:

> While no announcement was made, it was learned that Time, Inc. (Time, Life, Fortune), intends filing applications for the maximum number of five television stations in strategic markets. Time, Inc., also may seek to purchase existing broadcast properties. This, presumably, will be Mr. Coy's principal activity. Mr. Coy is a UHF booster, and that may be the Time, Inc., pitch. The Washington law firm of Pierson & Ball has been retained by Time, Inc., to handle its communications affairs.

I read from a subsequent portion of the article:

> Mr. Coy also might negotiate for acquisition of an interest in broadcast properties, it is thought.
>
> Mr. Coy did not enter into negotiations with Time, Inc., until Friday morning—following his surprise resignation of the preceding day.

Let us bear in mind that within less than 24 hours after he resigned, he was hired by Time, Inc.

I read further from the article:

> He left for New York Thursday afternoon with Philip G. Locks, Washington attorney and friend. A number of proposals had been under consideration by Mr. Coy, it is understood.

Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a broadcast by Ray Henle in Three-Star Extra on National Broadcasting Co. on March 12:

> We hear that the Time and Life magazine people are trying to buy up no less than 16 important radio and television outlets in various cities across the country. Former FCC Chairman Wayne Coy is in charge. It eventually may mean a brand-new television network.

Mr. President, Wayne Coy is entitled to the greatest presumption of innocence. However, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, I am wondering what the small television operator in Portland, Oreg., or the small radio operator in Idaho or in Missouri thinks of such activities. They do not read well at a time when all branches of the Government are being carefully scrutinized and watched as never before.

It seems that in this case we have a man who is very well acquainted with the present members of the Commission. He worked with them for some 4 or 5 years, and he knows them well. Now he has resigned; and within 24 hours of his resignation he has begun to work for a giant television network. Certainly he can be accused—and justly so, I think—of being retained, not for his great television ability, but because of his former connection with the Federal Communications Commission and its activities. What asset greater than that would he have?

It is as the Senator from Nebraska has stated in his American magazine article:

> How to make a lot of money: Go to work for Uncle Sam, learn the ropes, make friends, then graduate and hire out at a fat fee to a private business which wants inside contacts in Washington. This old gradism invites skulduggery, says Senator BUTLER, and must be stopped before it undermines confidence in our Government.

Mr. President, this activity on the part of Time magazine and Wayne Coy may be 100 percent honest, and I hope it is. But it will have to withstand careful cross-examination by the Members of the Senate and its particular committees. The American people are tired of this sort of activity. What the answer will be, I do not know. Certainly Time magazine is entitled to seek and retain the best man available; and certainly Mr. Coy is entitled to seek and obtain the best employment possible but it should be done so that neither Coy nor Time are embarrassed or even questioned. The Senator from Nebraska introduced certain proposed legislation about 2 years ago on this subject matter. I invite the attention of my colleagues to it. Perhaps it is the answer. I do not have it. But I know it is unfortunate that at this time, when suspicion is so prevalent, that there should be such activity as is evidenced by the resignation of Mr. Coy, and, within 24 hours thereafter, his having a retainer of $25,000 a year, which leaves him free to represent all the other radio and television organizations in America, and then the startling disclosure that he is a coowner, and authorization is granted to a broadcasting station to operate at Albuquerque, N. Mex., Mr. President, I think the Senate certainly should watch that proceeding from this time hence. It is a bit of activity that can only add more fuel to the fire of criticism of Government from top to bottom.

INVESTIGATION OF IRREGULARITIES IN SALES OF LIQUOR AND COLLECTION OF TAXES IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial regarding the settlement of commercial bribery charges brought by the Federal Government, published in the Hamlin County Herald-Enterprise of Hayti, S. Dak., on February 28, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Seven South Dakota wholesale liquor dealers have offered $136,733 in settlement of commercial bribery charges brought by the Federal Government. The charges concern the offering of bribes to municipal liquor

store managers in the purchase of merchandise. The offers, acceptance of which is still pending in Washington, write finis to 2 years of patient investigation by agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Settlements were offered by the accused wholesalers on the basis of dollar for dollar for merchandise and cash gifts made by representatives to managers and buyers of 117 of the State's 134 municipal liquor stores. These represent only those instances in which ATU agents obtained evidence or confession; undoubtedly there are many additional cases of bribery that could not be uncovered. The violations occurred during 1948 and 1949, terminating early in 1950 when the Government investigations developed in earnest. The evidence is now in the process of further study by State authorities to determine whether State commercial bribery statutes were violated. What further action is to devolve will depend on this study, but it is obvious that only half of the picture has been dealt with. What about the venal managers and buyers who accepted the bribes? We understand that bales of signed confessions by these are in the files. These should be released to the public so that people may know which of their servants have been faithless to the trust imposed in them. Apologists point out that no single large amounts were involved in any case. Simple arithmetic based on the administrative settlement offers aggregating $136,000 and covering about 114 stores, indicates an average bribery of better than $1,000 per store. Obviously, some buyers did real well by themselves. They should be prosecuted, and restitution should be demanded. Subrosa information indicates that in some instances, if not most, the scheme went much beyond mere competitiveness; prices charged the municipal liquor stores were said to be substantially higher than for comparable privately owned stores. Municipal stores were penalized directly for bribes which liquor store representatives were passing out, buyers were accepting. This should be checked into also. The offending dealers' group points out sanctimoniously that it has policed itself "voluntarily" and that the "unethical" practices have been terminated. It might not be amiss to point out in rebuttal that the voluntary policing did not come about until after the Government had developed its case beyond possibility of controversion. Since then terrific pressure has been applied to public officials to drop the matter; to call off the field agents "who are embarrassing us"; and to soft-pedal the affair. We feel that United States District Attorney Leo P. Flynn deserves handsome applause for refusing to be intimidated and for insisting on going through with the matter regardless of where it hit. Will our State administration prove itself equally dispassionate in following up this scandalous affair?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, this editorial commends United States Attorney Leo P. Flynn upon the manner in which in the State of South Dakota he is handling certain cases involving the Alocohol Tax Unit, but at the same time it indicates that the State administration might have been somewhat lax, under the attorney general of South Dakota, Mr. Dunham, in the prosecution of such portions of the cases as affect them.

This is an erroneous impression because the attorney general of South Dakota has for many months been trying to get access to the records of the Justice Department in order that his agency might prosecute those State employees against whom charges were made. As far back as November 28, 1952, he requested my assistance in this matter.

I desire at this time to read excerpts from a letter dated November 28, 1951, addressed to me by Ralph A. Dunham, attorney general of the State of South Dakota. I do so to clear up any impression that Mr. Dunham might be dodging his responsibilities. The excerpts are as follows:

Shortly after taking office as attorney general of the State of South Dakota in January of this year I learned that a State-wide investigation of irregularities in the sale of liquor was being conducted by the Alcohol Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. Upon learning that this investigation was nearing completion I went with a member of my staff and the State's attorney of one of our counties to the Alcohol Tax Unit field office in St. Paul, Minn., where we conferred with a Mr. Albert L. Durkin, district supervisor of that office, and certain members of his staff. We learned that the report would be completed in the near future and would, when completed, be turned over to the United States district attorney for the district of South Dakota for appropriate action.

Subsequently, one of my assistants met with the United States district attorney, Mr. Leo Flynn, on several occasions, and when the report was sent to the office of the United States district attorney he permitted this assistant to inspect a part of it. The volume encompassed by the report was such that my assistant could only form a general impression of the conclusions reached by the Federal investigators and reported therein. The report generally indicated extremely widespread bribery by liquor wholesalers of those persons in charge of municipal liquor stores in this State, and there was also a suggestion of considerable income-tax evasion in that the moneys and merchandise used to effect this bribery were deducted by the wholesalers as business expenses.

Until July of this year the United States attorney for the district of South Dakota showed great eagerness to cooperate with my office in effecting prosecution of the wrongdoers, Mr. Flynn suggesting that he would prosecute the wholesalers and the State the corrupt municipal officials and employees. In fact, during July of this year Mr. Flynn, at a conference of States' attorneys and sheriffs at the capital in Pierre, stated in a speech that law-enforcement agencies of the State of South Dakota, in cooperation with his office, would shortly be engaged in investigations and prosecutions deriving from the sales of certain merchandise to municipalities throughout the State.

Shortly after this July meeting, and at Mr. Flynn's invitation, I attended a conference at the United States district attorney's office in Sioux Falls, S. Dak., in company with that assistant who had seen the report, which conference was also attended by Mr. Flynn, Mr. Durkin, and a Mr. Avis from the Washington office of the Alcohol Tax Unit.

* * * the meeting, which had been called for the purpose of determining a division of effort in effecting prosecutions, resulted in a statement from Mr. Flynn that the matter would have to be referred to the Attorney General of the United States. The meeting concluded on this unsatisfactory basis, with an agreement that Mr. Flynn would make application to the Attorney General, after which he was to advise my office of the determination reached, and whether or not the Federal Government would aid the State.

No indication has, of course, reached my office as to the conclusions of the Attorney General of the United States, and conversations subsequently had with the United States attorney have been most evasive on his part.

At the meeting just described Mr. Avis took the position that he believed this to probably be a proper case for administrative settlement of both the commercial bribery and income-tax charges against the various wholesalers, and he made it plain that should such a course be followed the State of South Dakota could not obtain the report of the Alcohol Tax Unit on which to base its prosecutions.

It would appear, then, that we have this situation: The Federal investigators did an honest job and laid the basis for prosecutions. High officials have apparently, however, for reasons best known to themselves, determined to follow the secret administrative settlement procedure.

The secret administrative settlement procedure is a device which lends itself to corruption, and moreover the general public never had a chance to discover the wrongdoers in its own midst, a most serious limitation on effective law enforcement. The attorneys general of the various States, at their national conference in Seattle in August of this year went on record as strongly opposing the administrative settlement device in dealing with criminal matters for just these reasons.

In not just this instance, but in situations arising under the PMA and FSA programs of the United States Agriculture Department, here in the State of South Dakota, it has come to my attention that very serious criminal derelictions involving the theft of Federal funds were or are being settled rather than prosecuted. The whole settlement procedure of the Federal Government should be closely investigated and, perhaps, terminated.

The investigation conducted by the agents of the Alcohol Tax Unit was extensive and expensive far beyond the abilities of my small office. I have neither the staff nor type of trained investigators to duplicate the Federal investigation, and it would appear a most unnecessary expenditure of public funds when a Federal investigation, probably costing much in excess of $100,000 has already been made by the Federal Government. I have at all times, therefore, insisted upon the full cooperation of the Federal Government in making available to my office both the evidence discovered in the investigation and the testimony of the personnel who made the investigation. I do not think this an unreasonable position, for Federal and State governments should cooperate fully when such cooperation is clearly beneficial to the entire community and when such cooperation can effect enormous savings of public time and money.

I have detailed to you a situation wherein an agency of the Federal Government has investigated and discovered corrupt practices permeating an entire State. In this situation the Federal Government apparently intends to dispose of the entire matter by secret administrative settlement. I think that you will agree with me that the philosophy and acts of the Federal agency do not serve the ends of good government.

This appears to be another item in the seemingly endless disclosures of corrupt or improper practices which are destroying the moral fiber of American Government.

I shall be most interested in having your reply, and I trust I shall hear from you at your convenience.

Yours very truly,

RALPH A. DUNHAM,
Attorney General.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am highly gratified that the able Senator from Delaware is bringing this matter

to the attention of the Congress and of the country. I am not entirely conversant with the details of the case which the Senator is discussing, but I have read the editorial to which he referred in the early part of his remarks. I am sure that the implications in the editorial would not have been made had the editorial writer been in possession of the full set of facts which the Senator from Delaware is now, for the first time, making available for public consideration.

I can say that the attorney general of the State of South Dakota is a very able and courageous attorney general. He has been doing some very useful work in investigating the situation which he has called to the attention of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and on which we shall begin public hearings on Wednesday of this week.

As I say, Mr. President, I am not intimately familiar with the details of this case, but I can assure the Senator from Delaware that the people of South Dakota like to see public business publicly conducted.

I think the attorney general is certainly correct when he insists that these settlements be not handled secretly and that the information be not denied to the American public. If there have been income-tax violations, if the Alcohol Tax unit has been in error, if the Federal Government, and thereby, the American taxpayer, has been cheated out of revenue which should rightfully have come to it, those are things which should be made public and should lead to whatever convictions seem to be indicated by evidence.

I appreciate sincerely the fact that the Senator from Delaware is bringing the matter to the attention of the public.

In the early part of last fall the attorney general of South Dakota talked to me about the matter, and I at that time suggested that the Senator from Delaware, because of his close familiarity with the whole situation and because of the tremendous public service he has been rendering in discussing certain derelictions in the Internal Revenue Bureau, was the logical man to go to for any additional facts which the attorney general was desirous of obtaining. The letter written on November 28 certainly was a fair request that the facts, whatever they are, be made known jointly to Mr. Flynn, for whom I have very high regard, and to the attorney general of South Dakota, so that they could focus on the same problem the investigative capacity and strength not only of the office of the United States prosecutor in that area, but also the office of the attorney general of the State. It seems to me, if we are to have law enforcement which is worthy of the name, there should be an end of rivalry between two law enforcement agencies and that they should cooperate in the public interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his contribution, and I want to emphasize the fact that I am not criticizing acts of the United States attorney or of the attorney general of the State of South Dakota. I do feel, as the Senator has said, that any evidence which the United States Government has assembled in the course of its investigation regarding bribery which involves State employees—I understand the cities and municipalities in South Dakota operate most of the liquor stores—should be made known. I see no excuse whatever for the United States attorney or the Attorney General of the United States not to make available to the attorney general of the State affected any facts they have in their possession. I think there should be a close working arrangement between agencies of law enforcement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as I say, I am not familiar with the situation which has developed, because the Senator from Delaware has made an independent investigation with his customary thoroughness and with his customary accuracy. In my State there are some municipal liquor stores. I am not aware of State stores selling liquor, but under our law certain municipalities are authorized to go into the liquor business as municipal stores.

I am not aware whether these alleged charges of bribery involve municipal officials or whether they involve private persons. I simply want to reiterate what I said earlier, that I know the good people of South Dakota sufficiently well to realize that whatever the facts may be, they want to know them. Whatever the settlement may be, they want to know how the settlement was made. They believe that public business is not something to be conducted in the dark of the moon or in the dark of a basement or behind closed doors and windows.

If I correctly understand the Senator from Delaware, that is the burden of his approach this afternoon. It is his desire to have made available to the public all the facts, let the evidence lead wherever it may, and to bring about a harmonious working together of law-enforcement agencies.

I have a very high regard for Mr. Flynn, the United States attorney in that area, and I also have great regard and respect for the State attorney general. It would be hazardous in the extreme if because of some rivalry or because of some administrative policy in Washington it were made impossible for the State to cooperate with the United States Attorney General.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, following the receipt of Mr. Dunham's letter I addressed a letter to Mr. A. L. Durkin, district supervisor, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to have that letter incorporated in the RECORD along with Mr. Durkin's reply thereto. In his reply he indicates that such an investigation had been conducted and that he had forwarded his report to the Bureau in Washington.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 2, 1952.

Mr. ALBERT L. DURKIN,
District Supervisor, Alcohol Tax Unit,
Bureau of Internal Revenue,
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR MR. DURKIN: It is my understanding that you have in your possession a report regarding a certain investigation of alleged irregularities in the sale of liquor and the collection of liquor taxes in the State of South Dakota. It is also my understanding that this investigation report contains evidence of numerous irregularities; however, no action has been taken.

Will you please advise me, furnishing either a copy or a summary, of the contents of this report.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE,
ALCOHOL TAX UNIT,
St. Paul, Minn., January 25, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 22, 1952, in which you refer to your letter of January 2, 1952, requesting information regarding certain investigations of alleged irregularities in the sale of liquor in the State of North Dakota.

You are advised that your original inquiry concerning the matter was forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, Bureau of Internal Revenue, Washington, D. C., for appropriate attention.

Very truly yours,

A. L. DURKIN,
District Supervisor, Alchohol and Tobacco Tax Division.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, following that, I addressed a letter under date of January 2, 1952, to Hon. John B. Dunlap, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter incorporated in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 2, 1952.

Hon. JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
United State Treasury Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DUNLAP: It is my understanding that early in 1951 an investigation was conducted by the Alcoholic Tax Unit of the Bureau of Internal Revenue regarding certain alleged irregularities in the sale and collection of liquor taxes in the State of South Dakota.

Will you please advise me the status of this investigation and if completed, furnish information regarding what was found and the action taken.

In the event that you see fit to answer this letter with your usual form letter, stating that the request must come from the committee, then I am asking that you assemble this information and be ready to furnish the answer January 8, 1952.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I now ask to have incorporated in the RECORD the reply by Mr. Dunlap to me dated January 8, 1952.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 8, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In your letter of January 2, 1952, you requested information as to the status of an investigation in 1951 of "certain alleged irregularities in the sale and collection of liquor taxes in the State of South Dakota."

The cases perfected as a result of the investigation of the wholesale liquor industry

in South Dakota have been referred to the United States attorney for the district of South Dakota and to the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice in Washington. These cases are in a pending status. Inasmuch as jurisdiction is in the Department of Justice, it is suggested that your inquiry be directed to that Department.

Very truly yours,

JOHN B. DUNLAP,
Commissioner.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to point out that Mr. Dunlap in his letter states that the case has been referred to the United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota for criminal prosecution.

At this point I should like to have incorporated in the RECORD my letter of January 2, 1952, to Mr. Leo Flynn, United States Attorney, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, together with his reply dated January 9.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 2, 1952.

Mr. LEO FLYNN,
United States District Attorney,
Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

DEAR MR. FLYNN: It is my understanding that early in 1951, an investigation was conducted regarding certain alleged irregularities in the collection of taxes by the Alcohol Tax Unit in South Dakota and that the evidence assembled in this investigation was turned over to your office for prosecution.

Will you please advise me what action has been taken.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA,
Sioux Falls, January 9, 1952.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: I have your inquiry of January 2, 1952.

I wish to advise that there is no prosecution pending in this district regarding certain irregularities in the collection of taxes by the Alcohol Tax Unit in South Dakota.

In all probability the investigation you have been advised of has to do with inducements that were made by certain wholesale liquor dealers to the managers of municipally owned liquor stores in this State. This investigation has been going on for some time but was not completed until November 29, 1951, when the final report concerning this investigation was submitted to this office.

This investigation divulged a folly carried on by the wholesale liquor dealers to induce managers of municipally owned liquor stores to purchase their liquor from them. This practice is perfectly regular when it is carried on with managers who own their own stores, but is not permitted when carried on with managers of municipally owned liquor stores. We have a peculiar statute in this State that permits municipalities to own and operate their own liquor stores. I understand that Minnesota is the only other State having a similar statute. I refer to it as a folly for the reason that the Government was, positively, in no way injured by this practice. The business was there to be had by one or the other of the seven wholesalers, and in their greed and anxiety to grab as much of this business as they could they were apparently willing to share their profits with the managers of the municipally owned liquor stores who had no right thereto.

By the greatest stretch of imagination, so far as the taxes are concerned, the Government is in no way involved, nor is there any showing in any way, shape or form that there have been any irregularities on the part of the Alcohol Tax Unit in South Dakota.

I have recently read a couple of articles concerning your activities in connection with investigations of matters concerning the Government, and I was especially interested in the instances in your own life that first started you in this kind of work.

I guess we have a rather peculiar type of people out here in South Dakota, for after being a prosecutor almost continuously since 1933 I can state that no one has ever come into my office to offer me any kind of an inducement to favor them, nor in my experience in working with investigative agencies out here have I ever seen any indication that any investigator was influenced by any individual, or that he was coloring his report in any way.

I want you to know that I am in complete sympathy with your activities with reference to unearthing graft and incompetency in the Federal Government. Also, that I am perfectly willing so far as the regulations under which I work permit me to give you any and all information in this and any other matter that may be pending in this office, or which may ultimately find its way to us.

I can well appreciate the fact that if I were so inclined I might find occasion to interpret your inquiry as an indication that I had been or am lax in my duties in this matter. However, I am inclined to interpret it as an honest inquiry, based upon a certain distrust that seems to be widespread in the Nation involving Federal employees who either don't seem to know enough to take the duties of their office seriously, or, if they do, don't care to.

I hope I will be hearing from you again and you may be sure that all of your inquiries will be received and acted upon in the same spirit of sincerity that I feel they are made.

Very truly yours,

LEO P. FLYNN,
United States Attorney.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall read one paragraph from Mr. Flynn's reply:

I wish to advise that there is no prosecution pending in this district regarding certain irregularities in the collection of taxes by the Alcohol Tax Unit in South Dakota.

I presume Mr. Flynn by that statement meant that perhaps such matters were in process of being settled by administrative fines, although his answer is not too clear.

Mr. President, following receipt of that letter, I addressed a letter to Attorney General Howard McGrath. In reply, I received a letter signed by Mr. James M. McInerney. I shall read the last paragraph of that letter, as follows:

Because of the fact that this is an actively pending case and the negotiations are now taking place, I respectfully request that you receive and treat this information in confidence.

I may say that in this letter Mr. McInerney points out the procedure the Department of Justice is following, and it is for the reason that the Office of the Attorney General of the United States had asked that this be kept in confidence that I am not incorporating their answer in the record now.

I make this statement today merely because I think there is unfortunately a misunderstanding on the part of some in South Dakota who are unjustly criticizing the Attorney General of South Dakota and other State officials for not enforcing the provisions of the law as they should be enforced. According to reports, there have been certain bribes which will aggregate about $125,000, paid largely to municipal employees, and certainly, if that is true the records should be made available to the Attorney General of South Dakota and other law-enforcement officers of that State.

I think this is more a matter of policy than of criticism of any individuals. I understand it is currently the policy of departments in Washington that administrative settlements and fines are secret and not released to the public. I feel that whenever a crime has been committed, the public has a right to know what disposition has been made of it. If it is settled by administrative fine, I think the public has a right to know the charge against the individual and the amount of settlement.

I understand that this position has been taken by the attorney generals in their recent conference. I sincerely hope that the United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota and the Department of Justice in Washington will establish a closer working relationship with the Attorney General of South Dakota to clear up the situation to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Likewise I think the Department of Justice should adopt a permanent policy of publicity listing all administrative fines and settlements. This will remove much criticism regarding possible favoritism or improper settlements.

NOMINATION OF IVAR H. PETERSON

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand some Senators wish to make further remarks on other subjects. I do not desire to deprive them of that privilege, but I ask unanimous consent that, out of order, the nomination of Mr. Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years, from August 27, 1951, be considered and acted upon at this time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, we on this side of the aisle could not hear all the majority leader said.

Mr. McFARLAND. I asked unanimous consent that the nomination of Mr. Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board be considered and disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ivar H. Peterson to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President will be immediately notified.

JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on yesterday I sat among those citizens who attended the program presented by the American Forum of the Air. The subject

under discussion was What is the Role of New Japan? The program guests were the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota. The moderator was Theodore Granik.

Earlier today I received consent of the Senate to have a transcription of the American Forum of the Air program printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

During the course of the program Mr. Granik recognized the Senator from Washington by this language:

Moderator GRANIK. I see another one of your colleagues in the audience, Senator HARRY CAIN, of Washington State.

Do you have a question, perhaps, Senator?

The question I offered was this:

I think that I understood the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN, to have stated in no uncertain fashion that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously repudiated the Yalta agreement by making very certain in language that no Japanese territory was legitimately ceded at Yalta to the Russian Government. Did I understand the Senator from Alabama correctly?

Senator SPARKMAN's response was this:

That is correct, and it is a part of the resolution that is pending before us. And it was unanimously adopted.

Mr. Granik then went on to say:

Did you want to comment further, HARRY?

No. I just want the American Nation to be fully aware of what the Senator from Alabama has just said.

Mr. President, so far as I know, the Senator from Alabama is the first spokesman for the administration to state publicly—and on yesterday he did so in the hearing and sight of millions of Americans—that the Yalta agreement was repudiated. The Senator from Alabama indicated that he was speaking for all of the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The membership of that committee numbers thirteen, and includes seven Democrats and six Republicans.

Webster's definition of "repudiate" is "to cast off; disown; to refuse to have anything to do with; to renounce; to refuse to accept as true, just, of rightful authority or obligation."

I respected and appreciated the frank and firm response which the Senator from Alabama offered to my understanding that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has repudiated the Yalta agreement. I believe that the Nation will take new hope from the firmness of the answer provided by the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. In connection with what the Senator from Washington has just said, does he recall what brought about the discussion of this subject?

Mr. CAIN. I am pleased to say that I was moved to ask my question because of a colloquy which had just been concluded between the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who was a guest on the program, and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who was an interested observer, as was I, seated in the audience.

Mr. WATKINS. As a matter of fact, I was called upon by the moderator, was I not, to say something about an interpretative reservation, covering the Yalta agreement, which I had sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to this treaty?

Mr. CAIN. When the program was about half finished, the moderator interrupted the proceeding to say that he understood the Senator from Utah had offered an interpretative or restrictive amendment to the Japanese Peace Treaty when it was before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and he inquired whether the Senator from Utah would not make his own references to his amendment.

It was after that that the Senator from Utah made it very clear to the Senator from Alabama, as I understood, that the Senator from Utah seeks in the Japanese Peace Treaty to make it conclusive and clear that under the terms of the Japanese Peace Treaty no title to any property previously owned by the Japanese was being given away to the Russian Government.

Mr. WATKINS. I call that to the Senator's attention for this reason: I want the RECORD to show that there was no doubt about what was under discussion during the broadcast. This matter had been specifically called to the attention of the Senator from Alabama, a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee. After he had been apprised of the reservation, what it meant, and its purpose, and the fact that it had been adopted, the Senator asked his question. In other words, there can be no doubt that when the Senator from Washington asked his question the Senator from Alabama had full information as to what had been discussed and what had been offered in the past, and what the committee had done.

Mr. CAIN. By way of compliment to my friend from Utah, I will say that I would not have felt impelled to ask the question had it not been for the observations offered but a few minutes before by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say in that connection that I felt that the Senator from Washington rendered a very great service to the country by bringing out that fact and having it clinched by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, as to what had happened and what was intended by the interpretative reservation which was actually written into the resolution ratifying and approving the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Mr. CAIN. It was my impression from what passed between the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Utah that they were in agreement that the Japanese peace treaty was not designed to give away Japanese territory to the Russian Government. My only intention—and I think it proved to be successful—was to inquire whether or not such an understanding represented a considered repudiation of the wartime agreement signed at Yalta.

The Senator from Alabama is no unimportant person, for many reasons. He is important as a Senator as well as a citizen. He is further important because he is the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee Subcommittee on Far Eastern Affairs, and therefore his answer that the Foreign Relations Committee has repudiated the Yalta agreement ought, by every means possible, to be brought to the attention of the Nation.

CITATION OF ABRAM FLAXER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I send to the desk, out of order, a resolution in behalf of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 294) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States as to the refusal of Abram Flaxer to answer a series of questions before the said subcommittee and the failure and refusal of Abram Flaxer to furnish records and supplemental information in compliance with a subpena duces tecum of said subcommittee and as ordered by the subcommittee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that said Abram Flaxer may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution, I submit, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, a report to accompany the resolution and also certain testimony, as a part of the report, and I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Without objection, the report will be printed as requested.

Mr. WATKINS. In that connection, I wish to make some insertions in the RECORD and to make a brief statement.

Mr. President, I have just reported a resolution to cite Abram Flaxer, president of the United Public Workers of America, for contempt of the Senate. Flaxer has contemptuously refused to comply with a subpena of the Internal Security Committee. He has refused to provide the committee with membership lists of the UPWA.

I wish to state for the record the remarks I included in my statement to the press. In that release I suggested that Federal employee members of the UPWA either clean up their union or get out of it without delay. Patriotic employees have no business belonging to any Communist-dominated union.

I cannot understand why the UPWA has not been included on the Attorney General's subversive list. I am informed by what I consider reliable sources that the United Public Workers of America has on several occasions been recommended for inclusion in the Attorney General's subversive list. These recommendations were made not only by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, but also

informally by officials of President Truman's own Loyalty Review Board.

BIRTH OF UPWA

The UPWA was born on April 25, 1946, at the Atlantic City Convention of the CIO. It was formed by a merger of two CIO unions, the United Federal Workers of America and the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America. Abram Flaxer, who was president of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America was elected president of the newly formed UPWA. The new union claimed a membership of 75,000.

Much of the credit for exposing the UPWA belongs to Jerry Klutz, Federal Diary Reporter, on the Washington Post, Jerry Klutz attended the 1946 convention of the CIO and became disturbed by what he saw and heard at the convention. Upon his return, he wrote several columns exposing what he called the extreme left-wing policy and actions of the UPWA.

In his column of May 3, 1946, Jerry Klutz reported on the convention activities of George Morris, of the Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communist Party in America. Morris, with the assistance of Flaxer, was able to get the newly formed UPWA to adopt a pro-Russian foreign-policy resolution. These resolutions charged that the demobilization of American troops was being deliberately delayed to further the imperialist ambitions of the United States and Great Britain. They called for the immediate withdrawal of American and British troops from all friendly countries, including China, the Philippines, France, Greece, India, Indochina, Belgium, and Iceland. These resolutions were 100 percent in accordance with the Communist line. They were adopted by overwhelming vote.

Convention speakers charged that the United States and Great Britain were plotting to destroy the Soviet Union with atomic bombs. An attempt to have the foreign-policy resolution include a recommendation for the withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, and other middle European nations, which are now behind the iron curtain, was shouted down. Those who supported inclusion of such language in the resolution were called reactionaries and Red baiters.

The constitution of the UPWA, as it was drafted and adopted at the Atlantic City convention in 1946, contained a section which read as follows:

> Membership in the international union shall not be denied by reason of sex, race, creed, color, nationality, or religious or political affiliation or belief.

This provision of the constitution of the UPWA was designed to welcome Communists into the union and to assure them of eligibility for membership. Some of the more patriotic American labor unions had already acted to bar Communists from membership and from holding union office. The newly formed UPWA had no such ban. Its constitution invited Communists to membership.

The UPWA constitution which was adopted at the Atlantic City convention contained a provision asserting the right of Government employees to strike against the Government. Following passage of legislation making it mandatory for Government employees to sign nonstrike affidavits, the UPWA executive board passed a resolution banning strikes by union members against the Federal Government. Nothing was said, however, about strikes against State and municipal governments. This move saved the jobs of Federal employee members of the UPWA.

I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the May 3, 1946, Federal Diary column of Washington Post Reporter Jerry Kluttz.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL DIARY—PUBLIC WORKERS' UNION LEANS TO LEFT, REPORTER FINDS

(A new CIO union was born at Atlantic City a week ago. Known as the United Public Workers, it is an amalgamation of the old United Federal Workers of America and the State, County and Municipal Workers, both CIO. Since his return from covering the Atlantic City convention, Post Reporter Jerry Kluttz has been flooded with requests from interested Government workers to tell the "real story" of what happened at the sessions. Kluttz in today's Federal Diary presents a behind-the-scenes picture of events at Atlantic City.)

(By Jerry Kluttz)

This is the story of the extreme left-wing policies and actions of the United Public Workers of America, the newly-created CIO union which has 75,000 members among Federal, State, county and municipal employes.

I arrived at the Atlantic City convention at noon a week ago yesterday April 24. I was promptly told—as were other reporters—that nothing newsworthy would happen for the remainder of that day as the convention had to go through the time-consuming process of merging the two CIO unions, the United Federal Workers of America, and the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America into UPWA.

As the afternoon wore on, George Morris of The Daily Worker, official Communist Party organ, and another New York reporter came into the convention hall at the Hotel Chelsea. Abram Flaxer, SCMWA president who was later elected president of UPWA, told them what he had told me earlier—that nothing newsy was on the schedule.

Morris, however, told Flaxer that he was concerned over the sharp criticism directed at the Russian foreign policy by Emil Rieve, president of CIO's textile workers and a leader of the right wing in the CIO, at the opening of the union's convention several blocks down the boardwalk. In so doing, Rieve indorsed the policies of both the President and State Secretary Byrnes.

This had made Morris most unhappy and he frankly told Flaxer that he needed a story from the public workers to offset Rieve's speech. Finally, The Daily Worker correspondent suggested to Flaxer that he "pull out the foreign policy resolution and get it passed." (Obviously, Morris knew what it proposed or he wouldn't have made the suggestion.)

Flaxer returned to the platform and took over the gavel. It was only a matter of minutes before the foreign policy resolution was called up for action.

The resolution in effect charged the demobilization of American troops throughout the world is being "deliberately delayed" to further the "imperialist ambitions" of the United States and Britain and to isolate Russia. It called for the immediate withdrawal of American and British troops from "all friendly countries including China, the Philippines, France, Greece, India, Indonesia, Belgium and Iceland."

RED WITHDRAWAL SUGGESTED

What became the real issue was stated clearly by Peter N. Demas, an employee of the Jamesburg (N. J.) School For Boys. Demas suggested a line be added to recommend the withdrawal of Russian troops from Poland, Czechoslovakia, Estonia and other friendly countries. He paid high tribute to the Russian Army but he asked the delegates to play the game both ways. He said what was good for the United States was also good for the Soviet Union.

"I like the Russians," he said, "but I put the United States first."

He warned the convention that the CIO was losing members because many workers say it is communistic.

Demas was answered by obvious spokesmen for the union administration who came right out and charged the United States and Britain were plotting to destroy the Soviet Union by atomic bombs before the Russians could get themselves prepared. One speaker, Frank Herbst of New York, even went so far as to set the date he said he was told when it would happen, sometime in June.

OPPONENTS BRANDED

The opponents of the resolution were called reactionaries and Red baiters.

In the end, Demas was shouted down and the resolution as proposed was approved by an overwhelming vote. Union officials say the vote was unanimous. However, several delegates told me they voted against it. They didn't make themselves heard very far if they did.

George Morris, the Daily Worker correspondent, was happy. He had his story to offset the Rieve speech.

(NOTE.—A foreign policy resolution similar to the one which was approved was voted on by many locals before the Atlantic City session.)

But at the opening of the convention on the day before, observers detected the Communist Party line in certain sentences of the officers' reports of both organizations. For example:

The UFWA report had this sentence which could have been taken from a Communist publication: "The present administration and Congress are actually carrying out a program of aggressive imperialism in foreign affairs and of attacking labor and lowering living standards at home."

POLICY DISCUSSION

The first 10 pages of the SCMWA officers' report discussed foreign policy and in it were typical left-wing phrases such as:

"We insist that the U. N. renounce their championship of the imperialistic-minded groups in our own country. * * * The universal denunciation of Churchill (for his Fulton speech) did not stop the British and American tories in their drive for world domination * * * whatever the decisions of this convention all perspectives and plans will be swept away in a maelstrom of atomic destruction if the war mongers succeed in their scheme."

And this incident, I believe, is worth noting as it also indicates the line some members of the UPWA are following.

I made it a point to buy copies of The Daily Worker to read stories on the UPWA convention. On Friday morning I went up to the hotel newsstand to ask for a copy. Before the girl had a chance to answer me, a young fellow jumped up from a nearby chair and told me in an apologetic manner that the copies hadn't arrived but that they would be in at any minute. And then he asked me:

"Have you contributed to the fund?"

FUND TO BUY DAILY WORKER

I told him I had not and I asked him about it. He explained that some of the delegates had thought it vital that a Sunday copy of The Worker be given to each of the 600 delegates and that they had collected a fund to buy several hundred extra copies. He insisted I come back in half an hour and get a free copy. I agreed.

I did return within the hour and I found a stack of Daily Workers at least 3 feet high. I picked up a copy. The same young man came up, and, again apologetically, he asked:

"You told me you hadn't contributed to the fund?" I nodded in agreement. Then he explained:

"We've had a l'ttle meeting and we've decided that those who haven't contributed should buy a copy." He went on to say that it was agreed the delegates would be likely to throw away the paper if it were given to them, but they would be sure to read it if they paid for it.

ON UNION MEMBERSHIP

Certain sections of the UPWA constitution which was adopted at the convention also give a clue to the new union's attitude. Many unions specifically bar Communists from either membership or from holding office. Section 2, article 3, of the UPWA constitution, in effect, welcomes Communists along with everyone else. It reads:

"Membership in the international union shall not be denied by reason of sex, race, creed, color, nationality or religious or political affiliation or belief."

The constitution also leaves the door open to strikes against municipal, county, State, and the Federal Governments. SCMWA has had several strikes.

In defending the strike language in the constitution, Don Murray of Washington, told the convention that Attorney General Tom Clark had recently written a letter in which he said there was no prohibition to keep Federal workers from striking.

REPORT NOT CONFIRMED

A check at the Justice Department revealed that Clark wrote no such letter. The Attorney General did answer a letter from Senator LANGER of North Dakota, who asked if any Federal agency is barred from bargaining collectively with its employees. Clark said he did not know of any such act but he cited an opinion of the late President Roosevelt in which he said collective bargaining could not be transplanted into the public service.

Off the convention floor, a distinct minority of the delegates added up the officers' report, the foreign policy resolution, and some parts of the constitution as acts of an extreme left-wing group. They charged the union was following the Communist line.

But the only concrete step taken by the opposition was Friday afternoon at a caucus of New Jersey delegates. Delegate Joseph F. Hambrose, of Camden, an Internal Revenue employee, suggested the New Jersey group back an amendment to the constitution which would say:

"We oppose all that is un-American whether it is nazism, fascism, or communism."

His proposal lost by a voice vote of the New Jersey caucus.

I don't mean to suggest or even hint that every delegate at the convention except Demas and Hambrose were Communists or even fellow travelers. If anything, it's the other way around as I believe very few of the delegates were outright Communists.

But on its record at Atlantic City the union has had an extreme left-wing label pinned on it. It must change that record on foreign policy and other issues before it can shake off the label.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, on May 19 Jerry Kluttz published a second column about Abram Flaxer and the UPWA. In his column he published some of the personal history and background of Mr. Flaxer. I request unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

Federal workers not only have a new union, CIO's United Public Workers of America, but they also have a new leader, Abram Flaxer of New York, the union president.

Flaxer is relatively unkown here. He made his first public speech to UPWA members here Friday night in the Commerce Auditorium. Those who attended saw and heard a persuasive speaker, an able organizer and a vigorous individual.

The union leader has a pleasant personality. He appears to take things easy. He is short, has a mop of black hair, and a straight-stemmed pipe is seldom from his mouth.

Though only 41, Flaxer is an old hand in union affairs. He was an official of the AFL's public worker union in 1937 when John L. Lewis, then the CIO boss, appointed him to form the State, County and Municipal Workers of America. He did and he built it up to an organization of 331 locals and 50,000 members.

UNION HAS $70,000 IN BANK

Flaxer today is more powerful than ever. His SCWMA was merged with CIO's United Federal Workers and he emerged as the dominant leader of the new union, UPWA. Two of the three top UPWA offices are held by former SCMWA officials, Flaxer and Bob Weinstein, director of organization. Eleanor Nelson, former UFWA president, is secretary-treasurer of UPWA.

Another important point—Flaxer's old union had a $70,000 bank account while UFWA found it most difficult to balance its books and for years it was given grants by the CIO. Further, SCMWA had twice as many members as UFWA.

So there is no question that Flaxer is the No. 1 person in the UPWA and what he says and does must be reckoned with by Federal, State, county, and municipal governments.

HE CALLS SOURCES DOUBTFUL

[A preliminary draft of this article was made available to Flaxer for comment. Flaxer contented himself with charging that the article was part of a campaign of misrepresentation and vilification by the Post, passing up the opportunity to rebut specific passages.

[Flaxer asserted that Kluttz used sources which Kluttz would not consider reliable. He added that Kluttz distorted "the views which I expressed several years ago in a magazine article by quoting the article out of context." He said the true program and purposes of the Government employees union were outlined in an advertisement in the May 15 Post.—EDITOR'S NOTE.]

ACTIONS HE DEFENDS

Since UPWA was created a couple of weeks ago at Atlantic City, Flaxer has had his hands full defending a couple of actions on that convention. They are:

1. The provision in the UPWA constitution that leaves the way open to strikes against Federal, State, county, and municipal governments.

2. The Communist-line foreign-policy resolution which demanded the removal of American and British troops from friendly nations and refusing to demand the same of Russia.

The Congress is threatening to enact legislation which would bar from Federal employment any member of any organization that asserts the right to strike against the Government.

RANK AND FILE BALK

Many union rank and filers are revolting against the pro-Russian foreign-policy resolution. They are supporting a substitute which supports the official CIO-PAC position which isn't Communist-biased.

And now, it is a proper question to ask—were these two actions of the UPWA convention accidents, or were they by design?

The official UPWA line, as set forth by Flaxer, Nelson, and other paid officers, is now to flatly oppose strikes in the public service, and (2) to kiss off the Communist line foreign policy resolution as a convention act made solely by the delegates themselves.

Maybe so.

But since Flaxer and his old SCMWA are so little known here, and in view of the intense controversy of the two convention actions, it is certainly in order to go back a bit to see how Flaxer and his union have behaved in the past. Doing so, will give us a better perspective of what happened at the Atlantic City convention.

DAILY WORKER CITED

First, the strike controversy.

In September 1941, SCMWA held its second biennial convention. The Daily Worker, official Communist Party organ, had an article on September 27 of that year in which it said Flaxer supported a proposed constitutional provision which declared:

"There is no law or any legal precedent denying us the right to strike and we will fight any abridgment of this right."

Several months later, in the April 1942 edition of Survey magazine, Flaxer wrote:

"The Government employer asserts that a strike against the Government is akin to insurrection. Therefore, if the Government employee strikes he is subject to penalties. But if the Government employee refrains from striking, he is barred from the collective-bargaining rights to which other citizens are entitled. Can a more effective trap be devised for trade-union men and women?"

And this added bit of evidence—Flaxer's SCMWA has engaged in several strikes in the public service. A SCMWA official told me in Atlantic City that he thought the number was 8. He wasn't sure.

FOREIGN POLICY

I also talked to Flaxer about the strike provision. The UPWA president told me in Atlantic City that it would be possible to have a strike under the Constitution, but he offered the opinion that it would rarely, if ever, occur.

Now, let's take up the Communist-line foreign-policy resolution. Was it really the will of the 600 delegates—an accident—or was it by design?

In 1938, the Communist line was anti-Hitler. In March of that year Flaxer had his name on a statement issued by the American League for Peace and Democracy, cited as a Communist-front by the Attorney General, which demanded cooperation of the United States, Soviet Russia, and other peace-loving nations to prevent the Fascist powers from obtaining the means to carry on war.

On March 25, 1939, SCMWA members participated in a stop-Hitler parade in New York City.

IN THE LIFE OT THE PACT

Then the Stalin-Hitler pact was signed and let's see how Flaxer and his union behaved.

The Daily Worker of September 12, 1940, quotes Flaxer as denouncing compulsory military service, declaring it could knock into a cocked hat civil-service tenure, seniority rights, and income levels.

Earlier, on April 6, SCMWA members staged a demonstration in New York's Madison Square Park to show how much they hate war and want the United States to stay out. Members were urged to write the

President to tell him the Yanks are not coming. Peace committees were formed in many SCMWA locals and a weekly score sheet for peace was published by the union.

Flaxer was a leader in the American Peace Mobilization which threw a picket line about the White House, and which, oddly enough, was withdrawn the day before Hitler invaded the Soviet Union. The peace outfit was against lend-lease, convoys, conscription and the imperialist war.

ANOTHER SOMERSAULT

But Flaxer and his group flopped again when the Nazis invaded Russia. At the 1941 CIO convention, Flaxer said in part:

"The object of our foreign policy is the defeat of fascism and we are going to take every step that is necessary to bring about this defeat. * * * It is a policy that requires the revision of our Neutrality Act * * * and requires that our seamen stand ready to their stations and be ready to shoot at sight * * * it is a policy that recognizes that this war is our war."

With the war won, the Communist line has changed again. The line is to charge the United States and the British with imperialistic ambitions; to demand the withdrawal of all United States and British troops from friendly nations, and to charge the United States and Britain are ganging up to isolate and destroy Russia.

This is the line indorsed by the UPWA convention.

So again, I ask in all sincerity: Was the convention action an accident, or by design?

Now, here are other straws in the wind which may, or may not, be a clew as to the character of the new union.

A good many people here—including many UPWA members—were horrified when a motion was voted down in a caucus of some New Jersey delegates at Atlantic City to amend the constitution to bar Communists, Nazis and Fascists from membership in the union.

Well, the SCMWA convention held in Lansing, Mich., in September 1941, according to the New York Times, rejected a proposal to outlaw Communists, Nazis and Fascists from union office.

And again the New York Times, the February 3, 1938, edition, quoted Flaxer on the issue of barring Communists from membership in CIO unions to this effect:

"We do not inquire as to the political affiliations of our members. We have no specific way of knowing or any specific interest in the way our members exercise their political franchise."

A FEW MORE INCIDENTS

So is it by design or accident that the UPWA constitution permits Communists, Fascists and Nazis to be members and officers of the union?

Other straws:

The October 28, 1940, edition of the Daily Worker reveals that Flaxer was a delegate on the committee of election rights to protest to the then Governor Lehman against attempts by pressure and coercion to keep the Community Party off the ballot in the November 5 New York election.

The New York World-Telegram on March 25, 1943, said that Flaxer was one of three CIO national presidents who signed a protest attacking their own leaders and others who protested the executions of Henryk Ehrlich and Victor Alter, Polish laborites, by the Soviet Government.

And there are other straws. Add them up and make up your own mind. I happen to believe it is most important for Government employees generally, and UPWA members in particular, to know something of the records of their leaders.

And these are the vital statistics: Flaxer was born in Vilna, Russia, on September 12, 1904. He claims citizenship through his father, who was naturalized in Brooklyn in 1917. He holds a bachelor of science degree in philosophy which he received from City College of New York in 1932. He married Charlotte Rosswaag in 1941.

THROWN OUT OF CIO

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in 1949 the executive board of the CIO authorized CIO President Philip Murray to appoint a committee to conduct hearings and to report back to the board on certain charges of Communist activities which had been formally made to the board. The committee appointed by Philip Murray consisted of Emil Rieve, Harry Sayer, and Joseph Beirne. The hearings began on January 9, 1950, and were concluded on January 11. They had been postponed to January as a consequence of a suit filed by the UPWA seeking to enjoin the committee from holding the hearings.

The Rieve committee in its report unanimously concluded that the policies and activities of the UPWA are consistently directed toward the achievement of the program and the purposes of the Communist Party rather than the objectives and policies set forth in the CIO constitution. The committee recommended to President Philip Murray that the CIO revoke the certificate of affiliation granted to the UPWA and expel it from the CIO. Such action was thereupon taken by the CIO.

THE UPWA AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

The UPWA naturally moved in on the United States Atomic Energy Commission. In 1948 it moved for recognition as agent or representative of the Atomic Energy Commission's Argonne Laboratory at the University of Chicago. The AEC took courageous action and directed the University of Chicago to refrain from recognizing the UPWA as an agent or representative of employees at the Argonne Laboratory. I invite attention to a letter which appears at page 193 of the Fifth Semiannual Report of the AEC. This is the order barring the UPWA as a bargaining unit at the Argonne Laboratory.

UPWA AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The UPWA was especially vicious in its activities in the New York regional office of the Veterans' Administration which employed some 2,000 people. They openly passed out scurrilous handbills; they viciously attacked the manager and they openly endorsed certain political candidates and viciously attacked others.

On February 17, 1950, the Veterans' Administration withdrew all recognition of the UPWA as agent or representative of employees of the Veterans' Administration. I request unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a telegram dated February 17, 1950, from Carl R. Gray, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to all Veterans' Administration field stations. It will be noted that this action was taken by the Veterans' Administration after the expulsion of the UPWA from the CIO for Communist activities.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEGRAM TO MANAGERS OF ALL VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FIELD STATIONS, FEBRUARY 17, 1950

The Veterans' Administration has as a matter of public policy determined that the United Public Workers of America will no longer be recognized as an organization representing Veterans' Administration employees. Veterans' Administration officials will no longer either contact UPWA as one of the regularly recognized organizations representing employees or confer with UPWA representatives seeking consultation with regard to matters affecting Veterans' Administration employees.

The content of this telegram will be brought to the attention of all employees.

CARL R. GRAY,
Administrator, Veterans' Affairs.

THE UPWA AND THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the State Department in an order dated February 27, 1950, formally withdrew its recommendation of the UPWA as an agent or representative of employees of the Department of State. I request unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point Department of State departmental announcement No. 44 of February 27, 1950. It will be noted that this action was taken after the expulsion of the UPWA from the CIO.

There being no objection, the State Department announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE DEPARTMENTAL ANNOUNCEMENT NO. 44

FEBRUARY 27, 1950.

Subject: Employee organizations.

1. Effective immediately the Department of State no longer recognizes the UPWA as an acceptable agent or representative of its employees. All personnel are hereby ordered not to enter into negotiations of any kind with this union.

2. This order does not affect in any way existing policy, as set out in section 383.1 of the Manual of Regulations and Procedures, which states that the Department subscribes to the belief that its employees have a right to join or refrain from joining employee organizations. The policy further states that any choice made in this matter will be without interference, coercion, restraint, fear of discrimination or reprisal.

PANAMA CANAL

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in July 1946 the UPWA launched a drive to organize Panama Canal employees. By September 1946 no less than 17,000 United States employees in the Canal Zone had joined Abram Flaxer's union.

An excellent report of this activity by the UPWA was contained in an article in Plain Talk of November 1946. I request unanimous consent that there be inserted at this point in my remarks an article entitled "Stalin's Hand in the Panama Canal" by Ralph de Toledano.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN'S HAND IN THE PANAMA CANAL

(By Ralph De Toledano)

(The material on which this article is based comes from unimpeachable sources. United States official quarters in Panama as well as in Washington have followed the undercover developments in the Canal Zone

with increasing anxiety. The author saw service in the Caribbean during the war and has a complete command of the Spanish language. He has long been a student of Falangist and Communist activities in Latin America. In the preparation of this article he has had the cooperation of persons in direct touch with the situation in the Canal Zone.)

When the United Public Workers, whose flagrant pro-Soviet record is unsurpassed among the labor unions of America, suddenly launched a whirlwind drive last July to organize the Government employees in the Panama Canal Zone, the question arose before the men in charge of our national defense:

"Is Stalin's hand behind it?"

The Soviet Government, even as those of Germany, and Japan in their days, has long taken an unhealthy interest in the big ditch—the keystone of the American defense system. As far back as 1933 the world was treated to the sensational exposure of an international espionage ring which showed Stalin's hand deep in the Military Establishment of the Panama Canal.

Now the leadership of the United Public Workers has demonstrated its unswerving loyalty to the Soviet system on numerous occasions, as our examination of the record will reveal. This is the union whose constitution favors the right of Federal employees to strike, a provision denounced by President Truman last June and he warned that if it ever happened the Government would cease to exist.

Why did the United Public Workers suddenly descend upon the faraway Canal Zone in its organizing activities when there are so many richer fields to cultivate right here at home? This question became a veritable challenge when it was announced officially by the CIO last September that 17,000 United States employees in the Canal Zone had been brought under the banner of the United Public Workers, forming in one swoop the largest local in that union.

As there is no private industry in the Canal Zone, the entire working force in our key defense area is claimed as being under the jurisdiction of the United Public Workers. This includes such diverse groups as teachers, hotel, and restaurant workers, locomotive engineers, nurses, doctors, power plant workers, truck drivers, painters, machinists, street cleaners, salesgirls, bookkeepers.

No wonder that top Government officials have expressed their anxiety over this development as a possible threat to the security of the country in the event of war.

If Stalin has in the Canal Zone, too, his secret battalion for the organization of catastrophe—as described by none other than Harold J. Laski—then he would be in a position to strike a deadly blow of sabotage at the jugular vein of our system of defense. Through such an operation he could paralyze our Navy and immobilize a whole fleet of aircraft carriers in a moment of crisis.

Panama began to witness unusual Communist activity in July 1931 during our great depression. It was 2 years after Stalin had declared before the special American Commission of the Communist International that when a revolutionary crisis develops in America, that, will be the beginning of the end of world capitalism as a whole.

That month, I am reliably informed, a raid on a three-story building in West Sixteenth Street, Panama City, disclosed an underground Communist press. Many arrests followed. Leaflets and other papers taken in the raids showed that the Communist Party of Panama described itself as a section of the Communist International.

The following year a certain mysterious Russian, Ivan Krassin, was arrested in Panama. It then appeared that Moscow had access to incoming and outgoing telegrams at Panama through an employee of the All American Cables & Radio Corporation.

In October 1932 a postal clerk in the Canal Zone opened a "dead letter" which had been returned to Cristobal because it had not been claimed at its destination.

The contents of the letter included two secret military documents, a summary memorandum on the antiaircraft practice of the artillery in the Canal Zone and the text of the so-called White plan described by the sender as a complete plan for the subjection of Panama in the case of revolution. The White plan was regarded by our military authorities as a vital secret plan for the defense of the Canal Zone.

While the investigation into the matter was going on, Col. C. G. Bunker, in command of Fort Sherman in the Canal Zone, discovered that confidential documents were missing from his files. This was in the spring of 1933.

There followed the arrest on espionage charges of Corp. Robert Osman, Headquarters Battery, First Coast Artillery, stationed at Fort Sherman. He was found to have had connections in New York City and admitted receiving money from a certain Communist whom he knew as Harry Duryea.

From Panama the threads ran to New York City. Osman was found in possession of a photograph of a Russian girl who went under the name of Frema Karry, of 6801 Bay Parkway, Brooklyn. Miss "Karry" who then vanished without trace, had written to Osman boasting of "being a cog in the machine" of the Communist movement. The "dead letter" had been addressed to a Mr. Herman Meyers of 1859 East Ninth Street, Brooklyn. It proved impossible to locate or identify Mr. Meyers. The mysterious Harry Duryea gave a mailing address in care of Dr. Joseph Stenbuck, of 444 Park Avenue, New York City, but the mention of Duryea's name there elicited no information.

There were many other threads running from "Big Ditch" to New York. Among the papers seized in the Panama City raids there had been a letter from one Arnold Reid, representative in Panama of the Colonial Committee of the Young Communist League of America. He wrote: "Immediately communicate with B. Small, 3451 Giles Place, Bronx." The correspondent in the Bronx was alleged in official reports to be a Communist Party member.

The Osman case attracted national attention. He was court-martialed, found guilty, and sentenced to 20 years at hard labor. One day in September 1933 a middle-aged couple called on Louis Waldman, New York labor attorney, with an introduction from a prominent labor leader. They were the parents of Cpl. Robert Osman. They pleaded with him to take over the defense of their son. After inquiring into the matter, he agreed to do so and went down to Panama to appeal the case, which eventually ended in an acquittal of Osman.

Throughout his investigations, the identity of Harry Duryea remained a major mystery. On March 21, 1934, the New York Times carried the following dispatch from Paris:

"A world-wide spy ring with a recruiting center in New York and formed to deal in military secrets of the United States and other countries, was said by the authorities to have been revealed by a Mr. and Mrs. Robert Gordon Switz."

On May 8, 1934, en route to Panama, in the lobby of the Hotel Nacional in Havana, Mr. Waldman picked up the March 26 issue of Time. As he leafed through it, his attention was caught by a photograph. Acting on a hunch, he tore out the page and took it with him.

"When I saw Osman, I took this photograph from my pocket," writes Waldman in the chapter Espionage in the Caribbean of his autobiography, Labor Lawyer. "I cut it out so as to expose the face, head, and shoulders of the photograph. The picture showed the long, narrow head of a young man with a small, ungenerous, dissipated mouth, cynical, pulled up to one side almost to the point of distortion; the nose was long and thin with a slight malformation at the bridge; and even in the black and white photograph the shading of the full and wavy hair suggested that it might be blond.

"Laying the picture before Osman, and watching him narrowly, I asked, 'Robert, tell me the truth, do you know who this man is?'

"Without a moment's hesitation, the young corporal replied, 'Sure, I do. That's my friend, Harry Duryea.' "

The Switzes had been arrested by the French police on December 18, 1933, and found in possession of a collection of baffling documents. Held incommunicado for several months, the Switzes maintained their innocence until confronted with their thumbprints discovered on a package of film brought from Switzerland which contained a key to a secret code for espionage communications. The Switzes then confessed and admitted meeting agents of an international spy ring in Berlin in July 1933.

Photographs of Robert Gordon Switz in the press led to his identification by Osman as Harry Duryea, his Communist patron. The investigation disclosed that Switz had registered at a hotel in Colon, Panama, on May 26, 1932, and on March 27, 1933, the latter date coinciding with the time when Colonel Bunker discovered the disappearance of secret documents.

As a result of the confessions by the Switzes, a number of persons, including some high French officers, received long prison sentences. When Gen. Walter Krivitsky, erstwhile chief of the Soviet secret service in Western Europe, who was found shot under mysterious circumstances in Washington in February 1940, was asked about Switz and a certain Alfred Tilden mentioned in the press, he replied:

"Switz? Yes; I knew him. And this 'Alfred'—I knew him well * * *. He was Soviet espionage chief in the United States in the early thirties."

Such is the background of Stalin's interest in the Panama Canal.

The United Public Workers of America—what is it? In addition to being a union, is its leadership also engaged in advancing Communist ends?

The United Public Workers was formed last April at a convention held in Atlantic City through the amalgamation of the two CIO unions, the United Federal Workers, with an estimated membership of 25,000, and the State, county and municipal workers, with a claimed membership of 50,000.

The United Federal Workers had a long history of adherence to Stalin's policies. It had been led by Eleanor Nelson, regarded by insiders as a pro-Communist, to whom the Daily Worker, Communist organ, devoted a fulsome biographical sketch with her photograph on August 9, 1942. As far back as October 1937, she was one of the speakers at the Communist-controlled National Negro Congress. In March 1938, she addressed another Communist-sponsored meeting in Washington. She was a member of the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which was active in behalf of Earl Browder when he was convicted and imprisoned in connection with his passport case. When Helen Miller was dismissed by the Department of Labor on suspicion of engaging in subversive activities, the United Federal Workers came to her defense.

Before the outbreak of the Second World War, the official organ of this union, the Federal Record, agitated for a world-wide fight against the Fascist aggressors. After August 23, 1939, upon the conclusion of the Stalin-Hitler pact, the line of the Federal Workers suddenly changed. Its various publications began to denounce all warlike expenditures, to oppose the projected draft, and to urge affiliation with the Emergency

Peace Committee which was cooperating with the American Peace Mobilization conducting the picket line around the White House.

In September 1940, following the adoption of a resolution opposing the proposed draft law, Kenneth Decker, president of the WPA local of the union, and several officers and members resigned, charging that this is the latest of a series of instances in which a small official group has undertaken to commit the union to a stand on political questions without full consultation with the membership.

During the period of the Stalin-Hitler friendship, the union leaders supported Communist-led strikes in important defense industries such as Allis-Chalmers, Ford, International Harvester. This was as late as April 1941.

Soon after June 22, 1941, when Hitler attacked Russia, the policy of the United Federal Workers once more changed sharply. It agitated for the passage of the teen-age draft bill without restrictions, for a break in diplomatic relations with Vichy France and Franco Spain, for a declaration of war on Finland and, of course, for the immediate opening of a second front—this in October 1942.

Among the fronts with which the Federal Works Union had cooperated were: Workers' Alliance, Consumers' Union, Labor Research Association, the Washington Bookshop, and the Washington Committee for Aid to China. Among the speakers who had addressed the union was Donald Henderson, dismissed Columbia University instructor and confirmed member of the Communist Party. The former editor of the union's Federal Record, Frank Rhylick, became the Washington correspondent of the Daily Worker.

Now let's look at the record of the other partner to the merger, the State, County and Municipal Workers Union, headed by Abram Flaxer, another stalwart, and see how closely he hewed to the Moscow line.

On February 3, 1938, when the question of barring Communists from membership in CIO unions was under discussion, the New York Times quoted Flaxer to this effect: "We do not inquire as to the political affiliations of our members." In March of that year Flaxer signed a statement by the American League for Peace and Democracy, an organization which Attorney General Biddle had cited as a Communist front. Later Flaxer was a member of the committee which protested to Governor Lehman against attempts to keep the Communist Party off the ballot.

Flaxer's union participated on March 25, 1939, in a "Stop Hitler" parade in New York City. When the Stalin-Hitler pact came, he did his somersault. On April 6, 1940, his followers staged a demonstration in Madison Square under the Communist slogan, "The Yanks Are Not Coming." Flaxer was reported by the Daily Worker of September 12, 1940, as violently denouncing the proposed draft law. He was active in the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House. Until June 22, 1941, the date of Hitler's invasion of Russia, the conflict in Europe was to Flaxer an "imperialist war." Some months later, at the 1941 convention of the CIO, Mr. Flaxer described his foreign policy as follows: "It is a policy which recognizes that this war is our war."

In September 1941, the State, County and Municipal Workers of America, at their convention in Lansing, Mich., rejected a proposal to bar Communists, Nazis, and Fascists from holding office in the union.

When Ehrlich and Alter, the two Jewish labor leaders from Poland who had sought refuge in Russia, were executed by Stalin in spite of the intercession of Wendell Willkie and other prominent liberals, there was a storm of protest in American labor circles. The Communists rushed to the defense of the executioners. Flaxer was one of those who publicly upheld Stalin's wanton defiance of justice.

At the Lansing convention Flaxer had supported a constitutional provision affirming for Government employees "the right to strike" and declaring that "we will fight any abridgment of this right." As a matter of fact, Flaxer's union had experimented in several strikes in the public services, just as a branch of Eleanor Nelson's Federal Workers had once staged a strike at the Social Security Board in Baltimore. Mr. Flaxer, in a magazine article, made light of the contention that a strike against the Government might amount to insurrection.

The United Public Workers of America came into existence in Atlantic City on April 25, 1946, through the merger of the two unions whose records have been outlined here. The new union made its debut at the very time that Soviet imperialism went on a rampage throughout the world. The union was new, but the familiar figure of Abram Flaxer appeared as its president. The secretary-treasurer was Eleanor Nelson. Other members of its executive board included the following persons who have been in varying degrees associated with Communist fronts: Robert Weinstein, director of organization, and vice presidents Mort Furay, James King, Thomas Richardson, and Arthur Stein. Two comrades, Ajay and Abrashkin, made up the art staff of the union's publications.

The newly named United Public Workers of America started out by flinging two significant challenges in the face of the Nation. The first of these was the provision in its constitution safeguarding the right of Government employees to strike. This challenge was promptly taken up by the Government of the United States. President Truman characterized it as a threat to the existence of the Government. In the Congress, Senator Joseph Ball, of Minnesota, sponsored legislation, which was quickly adopted, making it mandatory for Government departments to secure from their employees affidavits declaring that they had not engaged and will not engage in a strike against the Government.

The prompt action of the Senate had an immediate effect upon Flaxer and his associates. The executive board of the United Public Workers hurriedly met in June to save its 25,000 Federal members from possible dismissal, and passed a resolution banning any strike against the Federal Government "by any local of this union." This apparently leaves the door open to strikes against State, county, and local governments. Presumably the same executive board could by a similar resolution reverse the union's policy again, as the original provision in its constitution has not beeen repealed.

The second challenge thrown down by the United Public Workers was the pro-Russian foreign policy stand taken by the Atlantic City convention. It adopted a series of resolutions hardly distinguishable from those passed at Communist Party conventions. Their wording made it appear that the United States, and not the Soviet Union, was responsible for postwar disunity.

The convention demanded the removal of American and British troops from friendly countries, but refused to ask the same of Russia. Yet a demand was made that the secret of the atom bomb be shared with the Soviet Union. A resolution urging the severance of diplomatic relations with Spain was also passed. The Selective Service Act was attacked as an undemocratic maneuver to push America into war against Soviet Russia.

In brief, the foreign policy declaration of the United Public Workers was couched in terms which might have been culled from Daily Worker and Pravda editorials, the main theme of which has been that "Anglo-American imperialism" menaces world peace.

The road from Atlantic City to the Panama Canal became extraordinarily short. One week after the birth of the United Public Workers there was a May Day parade in Panama City. Three thousand participated in the march, thousands watched. The marchers demanded the establishment of diplomatic relations between Panama and the Soviet Union. They carried banners calling upon the masses "to break the chains of capitalism" and denouncing "Anglo-American imperialism."

The following day, on May 2, "Operation Panama," as it was labelled in the pro-Communist press, was formally launched. "A spectacular organizing drive in the Panama Canal Zone has brought over 17,000 United States Government employes who work for the Panama Canal into the ranks of the CIO Public Workers," announced the CIO News on September 2, 1946.

Spectacular indeed was the rise of the Canal Zone Workers' Union, chartered as local 713 of the United Public Workers, upon the arrival in Panama of its educational director, Leonard H. Goldsmith. He exploited shrewdly the justified economic grievances of the workers due to the high cost of living. He demanded equality in wages between native labor and white American workers. All this fell on fertile soil when sown to the refrain of "Yankee imperialism."

Early in August Goldsmith addressed a mass rally of 10,000 on the Pacific side at the Olympic Stadium in Panama City. This was followed by a rally of 6,000 on the Atlantic side. Goldsmith triumphantly announced that he had secured from Governor Joseph H. Mehaffey of the Panama Canal, a satisfactory settlement of all his demands and space for union quarters at the Pacific and Atlantic entrances to the Isthmus. He also declared that the officers of the Panama Canal West Indian Employes Association had unanimously agreed to join the CIO. He promised the new union the support of the PAC (Political Action Committee) in the United States to promote its interests and aims.

"Operation Panama" was apparently a pronounced success. But it is doubtful if the vast majority of the Canal Zone employes knew the history of Len Goldsmith. The record shows that in 1941 and in 1943 a Lenoard Goldsmith signed a Communist Party election petition from an address at 3145 Fourth Street, Brighton, Brooklyn, N. Y. Although a native of Tennessee, his career includes service as executive secretary of the CIO Council of New Jersey.

In 1939, Goldsmith was a member of the civil-rights committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy; in July of that year he addressed the National Conference of the International Labor Defense; he signed petitions issued by the National Federation of Constitutional Liberties against the deportation of Harry Bridges. All the three organizations involved were cited as Communist fronts by Attorney General Biddle.

Goldsmith was a member of the National Council of the American Peace Mobilization which picketed the White House and encouraged strikes in defense plants during the Stalin-Hitler collaboration. He is a sponsor of the American Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, a pro-Communist outfit. He was one of the signers of a statement in support of the Daily Worker on the occasion of its twentieth anniversary in January 1944.

Such is the partial record of Len Goldsmith, the man who, according to the CIO News, spearheaded the campaign in Panama. Before returning to the United States, Goldsmith elevated Edward Cheresh, a pharmacist employed in the Canal Zone, as regional director of the new big local. Cheresh, who was born in Brooklyn in 1908, has, according to my information, been an employee of the Canal Zone only since 1945.

The world over, pro-Communist organizers have always displayed a special interest in

the field of communications. Len Goldsmith, during his short sojourn in the Canal Zone, announced that the CIO planned to organize a longshoremen's union in Panama. He introduced to the Olympic Stadium rally M. L. Edwards, a delegate of the CIO Transport Workers' Union, whose assignment was to organize the employees of the Pan-American World Airways. One of these, a certain Lewendowsky who now goes under the name of A. E. Lovern, became the CIO representative in the Zone.

"Operation Panama" will probably be continued until the airways and shipping of the Canal Zone are brought under the control of the CIO. According to Washington press reports, Robert Weinstein, national director of organization for the United Public Workers, left for Panama on October 16, 1946, on a routine inspection trip. He was accompanied by J. L. Strobel, an organizer, who will remain in the Canal Zone for 6 months.

Robert Weinstein was an instructor at the Communist Jefferson School. He has been active in numerous "fronts," and has a record which might be the envy of many a Communist leader. A Robert Weinstein, residing at 4321 Eighteenth Avenue Kings County, N. Y., was the signer of a Communist election petition, No. 2356, on September 21, 1941. Significantly enough, a Jacob Strobel is listed as the signer of Communist election petition No. 10339, on June 7, 1942, for Israel Amter, once American representative at Communist International Headquarters in Moscow.

Coinciding with the arrival of the two CIO organizers in the Canal Zone was the appearance in Panama City of a new Communist magazine, ACLA, decorated with pictures of Stalin, Lenin, and Molotov.

In a poor country such as Panama, the comrades have been able to begin publication of a kind of naive New Masses, 76 pages thick with a two-color glossy cover, devoted to attacks on "el imperialismo yanqui" and to the glorification of the Soviet wonderland which is not imperialist because it is a socialist state and therefore has no need to exploit weak countries.

In the first issue of ACLA, an editorial titled "The Soviet Union, Defender of Latin America," takes up the question of espionage. The editors state that "while the American embassies are nests of spies * * * the diplomatic centers of the Soviet Union are agencies for peace and aid * * * which assure the stability and development of our economy."

The editors of ACLA forgot to tell the people of Panama of the recent revelations of Soviet machinations in the northern neighbor of the United States, Canada, where the Soviet Embassy was exposed by its own trusted official to be a nest of vast hemispheric espionage.

While the drive was going on in the Canal Zone, on July 19 the country was treated to a sensational announcement from Washington, which the New York Times carried under the headline: "Five ousted by Army to guard security." The dispatch reported that the War Department had dismissed five scientific workers employed at the Aberdeen Proving Ground, all of which were officials of the local union of the United Public Workers. The reason for the unusual act was officially given as "in the interest of national security." There followed a single protest by President Flaxer the next day, and then there was silence on the part of the vocal leadership of the union.

When the Washington Star recently raised the question editorially "as to where the loyalties of the leaders of this union lie," it did so for the avowed reason that their activity in the Panama Canal Zone might "endanger the security of this country."

The Panama Canal has long been regarded by our leading military authorities as the key to our Atlantic and Pacific defenses, as well as the central pivot of our security in Latin America. For this reason, the Government of the Canal Zone, with its complex administration, is semi-military in character and has been placed in the hands of the United States Army. Its employees are in the civilian field as vital to our defenses as the civilian employees of our War Department, for they have access to secret technical and military information of the highest value. Who controls these employees is a matter of major concern to the Nation, transcending any questions of the rights of labor unions in the ordinary sense.

The facts presented here show a development in the Canal Zone which calls for an immediate congressional investigation and for appropriate congressional action. Stalin's hand, which once delved deeply into our affairs in Panama, must not now be given any opportunity to resume its activities.

UPWA NOT ON SUBVERSIVE LIST

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the UPWA is not on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, even though its inclusion has been recommended not only by the FBI, but also by several other Government agencies, including the President's Loyalty Review Board.

There are reports that the Veterans' Administration, the Department of State, the Treasury Department, the Department of Commerce, and the Department of Defense, have suggested to the Attorney General that the UPWA be included on the subversive list. In that connection I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an article by Washington Post Reporter Jerry Kluttz which was published on March 29, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL DIARY

(By Jerry Kluttz)

NEW MOVE REPORTED TO PLACE UPWA ON SUBVERSIVE LIST

A new move is being made to have the left-wing United Public Workers of America placed on the Attorney General's list of subversive organizations, it was learned yesterday.

The Veterans' Administration is reported to be the most recent agency to urge that a subversive label be pinned on UPWA which claims 25,000 Federal-employee members. In addition, Civil Service's Loyalty Review Board is said to have discussed the possibility with the Justice Department.

State, Treasury, Commerce, and Defense are among other agencies that have either recommended that UPWA be listed as subversive or have discussed the matter with Justice officials.

The FBI gathers evidence which the Attorney General considers before deciding whether an organization shall be placed on his subversive list. It's reliably reported that the FBI has turned over material on the UPWA to the Attorney General.

The UPWA was expelled from the CIO a year ago on charges that it followed the Communist line instead of CIO policy.

Several agencies have refused to recognize the UPWA and meet with its leaders. Any number of UPWA members have been dropped from their Government jobs on loyalty charges. Most people consider the rank and file UPWA members as loyal but misled by the union leaders.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, why has the Attorney General not included the UPWA on the subversive list?

Why has the President not issued an order barring the UPWA as a representative of employees in all departments, agencies, and branches of the executive department?

Why is it that the Federal Government continues in its employ members of the UPWA, a Communist-dominated union expelled from the CIO almost 2 years ago because of its Communist activities?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to state to the Senator from Utah that a procedural question has been raised, and the Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Utah whether the resolution which he has submitted represents the expressed wish of the Committee on the Judiciary, as opposed to a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WATKINS. As this moment I am not prepared to say, but I would understand that it is the action of the entire committee. Although I cannot speak for the whole committee, I am sure it represents the action of the subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has been advised that the precedents of the Senate require that resolutions of the type submitted by the Senator from Utah be properly offered in the name of the full committee, rather than in the name of a subcommittee. The question appears to be whether the resolution in question was authorized by the membership of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot answer that question definitely, as I have already stated, but I do know that the material was prepared by the staff of the Committee on the Judiciary. I refer to the resolution and the report. I am not advised whether that was actually the case with reference to the full Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because the procedural question has been raised, the Chair would like to inquire of the Senator from Utah whether he would be willing, in view of the uncertainty, to offer the resolution in his name.

Mr. WATKINS. Since the question has been raised and I cannot answer definitely for the full committee, I would be very happy to do so, and I offer it in my own name as a matter of information for the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appreciates the Senator's consideration and courtesy.

Mr. WATKINS. I do so with the statement that possibly later we may have the concurrence of the full Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would accept the resolution as submitted in the name of the Senator from Utah, and would refer the resolution to the Committee on the Judiciary for a decision.

Mr. WATKINS. May I have it understood that it will lie on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah that his resolution lie on the table? In the absence of objection, the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF GEORGE KENNAN

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in view of the lateness of the hour, I shall not detain the Senate for more than a few minutes.

Mr. President, I would like to suggest to the Senate in general and the Foreign Relations Committee in particular, that where questions of foreign policy are concerned, less haste and more light would be desirable.

I doubt if there ever was a time in our history when the foreign policy encountered graver doubt with our people than now. No small part of this doubt has been provoked by the State Department itself. The Department's record for suppressing information, for distorting facts, and for going about its business by stealth is notorious.

I do not think the Senate should, by precipitate action, run the risk of convincing the country that we are collaborating with the State Department in these stealthy, if not outrightly conspiratorial tactics.

As a case in point, I may mention the confirmation of George Kennan to be Ambassador to Russia. This confirmation was put through at the very close of business and without a record vote, last Thursday, March 13, 1952, while the Senate was, for a brief moment, in executive session.

The only reference to the confirmation of Mr. Kennan is found on page 2282 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 13. The RECORD states:

> The legislative clerk read the nomination of George F. Kennan to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.
>
> The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

I would like to call to the attention of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a few facts. The nomination of Mr. Kennan was sent over by the President some weeks ago. Silence rested upon the scene. I assumed that, of course, a public hearing would be held upon this nomination.

What happened? In the Daily Digest section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 11, 1952, there appeared an announcement, and I quite the relevant portions entire:

> Committee Meetings for Wednesday, March 12 * * * Committee on Foreign Relations, executive, on nominations, 10:30 a. m., room F-53, Capitol.

That is all; not a word about Mr. Kennan.

The Daily Digest section of the RECORD on the next day—Wednesday March 12, 1952—contained this statement, which again I quote verbatim:

> Committee on Foreign Relations: In executive session, committee approved for reporting the nomination of George F. Kennan to be Ambassador to Soviet Russia.

That is all. There was a closed session of the Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination, and no record vote was taken.

The next day, as I said—Thursday, March 13, 1952—the nomination was brought up in the Senate at the very close of business and, without a record vote of the Senate itself, was hustled through confirmation.

It so happened that I intended to bring some material to the attention of the committee. I attempted a time or two to find out when the matter of Kennan's nomination would be up, but was told that the time was undetermined. I assumed that some form of clear notice on the matter of this nomination would be given. It was not.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee may tell me that due notice of committee action in the Kennan nomination was published in the Daily Digest. He is correct. It was so published. He may tell me that if I wished to discuss the Kennan nomination on the Senate floor, I could have done it on Thursday, when Kennan's name was brought up. That is most certainly true also.

All I can say is that I did not see the announcement in the Digest, nor was I present the next day at the close of business in the Senate when the Kennan nomination was rushed through.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee may tell me that my failure to see the announcement is no fault of his. True again, but I would point out to him that American relations with Russia are critical, that doubt and suspicion of our State Department are wide-spread, and that voters generally—and, I may say, rightly—observe Senators very narrowly these days on these questions.

The only excuse I have is press of business. I know that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has his hands full. So do I. He is a candidate for reelection next fall. So am I. These are busy days. But I cannot help but feel that where the nomination of a man to be Ambassador to Russia is concerned, some more forthright warning might be given than a three-line notice in the back of the RECORD, with subsequent Senate action with only a few Members present.

The voters, if they got wind of this, might be more than suspicious. They would be doubly suspicious if they knew that the nominee had, upon occasion, revealed the fact that the State Department had under consideration the granting of economic aid to the Chinese Communists.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee may tell me that it is useless to lock the stable door after the horse is stolen. Right again.

All the same, belated though the arrival of the information may be, I feel compelled to relate to the Senate a very curious story.

The Senate will recall that some months ago, during May and June 1951 there was an investigation into the circumstances of General MacArthur's recall and of the military situation in the Far East. This investigation was a joint affair, conducted by the Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, and the Foreign Relations Committee. During these MacArthur hearings a great mass of papers, documents, and materials of every conceivable sort came into the hands of committee members. So many avenues of questioning were opened up that it was impossible to explore them all.

It so happened that among the materials brought to the attention of a number of Senators was an off-the-record statement by Mr. Kennan. For some reason—why, I do not know—this Kennan fragment was lost sight of. It was not used as a basis for questions during the MacArthur hearings. I think it important, however, that the Senate and the public should know about it now.

This statement was made at a hearing held by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on June 17, 1949. The subject under consideration was the Korean Aid Act of 1949. Mr. Kennan was the witness, and at the time he was Director of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department.

Representative SMITH, a member of the House committee, asked Mr. Kennan this question:

> I would like to know if the State Department has reached the conclusion that China is gone, so far as we are concerned. Are we ready to do business with the new Red government that is about to be set up?

To this question Mr. Kennan replied as follows:

> The term "do business" is a very wide one. If it means trade and having economic relations, that will depend upon how that new regime, which is not yet set up, but which will be set up, how it will conduct itself, what respect it will show for the United States, and what terms it will permit that trade to be carried out on.
>
> I realize what has happened in China has been a very unfortunate thing. There is no question about that. None of us are complacent about it. I can promise you that. We are going to go through a bad time. China is.
>
> A greater part of China for a time will be in the hands of those who are thoroughly poisoned against us and from whom we must expect very unfriendly treatment.
>
> I think we will have difficulty in handling those people. We are not without cards in the coming period. They will require economic assistance. I think it will be vital to them.

Mr. President, let me repeat the last four sentences of the Kennan statement:

> I think we—

That is, the United States Government—

> will have difficulty in handling those people—

That is, the Chinese Communists—

> We are not without cards—

Said Mr. Kennan—

> in the coming period. They will require economic assistance. I think it will be vital to them.

Mr. President, in my time I have seen and heard of astounding State Department statements, but I cannot recall one that surpasses this remark of Mr. Kennan. It is hardly surprising that Representative VORYS, of the House Foreign Relations Committee, after hearing Mr. Kennan say "They will require economic assistance. I think it will be vital to them," should instantly ask Mr. Kennan this question:

> Who are?

To which question Mr. Kennan replied:

The Chinese Communists.

That is to say, Mr. President, Mr. Kennan, when testifying regarding State Department policy, made it perfectly clear that our Government contemplated the possibility of economic aid to the Chinese Communist Government, provided that government behaved.

I suppose there still are at large some starry-eyed dreamers who believe that the leopard is going to change his spots, that Communists who are now and always have been participants in an international conspiracy, will perhaps reform. But, Mr. Kennan, presumbaly, can hardly be put into any such category. Or can he?

Mr. President, so astonished were committee members at Mr. Kennan's statement, that at the next hearing on the Korean aid bill some of them cross-examined Mr. Kennan further.

Mr. Kennan is in a special position in respect to Russian affairs. In certain circles of what might be called intellectual cafe society, something of an aura hangs over Mr. Kennan by virtue of the fact that his great-uncle George wrote a famous work on Siberia and the Exile System.

Nor is this all. Mr. Kennan entered the Foreign Service more than 25 years ago—on September 1, 1926, to be exact—and during the 1920's, as the House committee was informed by him, he was sent to Russia with "four or five others to undergo a very thorough and long term study on Russian matters." Later, in 1933, he accompanied William Bullitt to Moscow, and was a foreign service officer there. In other words, Mr. Kennan, the eminent intellectual, was no Johnny-come-lately in respect to communism. He had observed it in Russia at first hand. He had pondered over it long.

The House committee questioned him closely. Mr. Kennan stated that at the time of the Yalta Conference, when he was Minister-Counselor of the Embassy at Moscow, he did not believe the Soviet Union would cooperate with us after the war. He said he had been concerned with Russian matters for many years. He said that he and those of the State Department colleagues who had been trained in Russian affairs since the 1920's. had very deep misgivings about things.

But—

Said Mr. Kennan, and I am quoting what he said to the House Foreign Affairs Committee on June 20, 1949—

we were a small handful of people and the appreciations that we had were far too small, too shallow, and they were among far too few people, really, to effect the course of events at that time.

In effect, Mr. Kennan tells us that all along he suspected Russian and Communist designs, but that his influence was then too slight to affect policy.

But by 1949 Mr. Keenan had become Director of the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department. Presumably he was a much more influential person.

Yet, with a perfectly straight face, this man told a House committee that we are going to be in a strong position with the Chinese Communists because they will need our economic aid.

Is this Mr. Kennan's idea of how to deal with our most deadly enemies?

I recommend to the Senate that it look closely into this matter. It is useless to examine the printed hearings for this particular statement of Mr. Kennan. I refer to the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, Eighty-first Congress, first session, on House bill 5330, June 8–23, 1949. It is useless because Mr. Kennan's remarks were off the record. But if the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will inspect the unexpurgated transcript of those hearings for June 17 and 20, 1949, it will find there the passages I have cited.

I had supposed that Mr. Kennan's record and accomplishments would be reviewed for the Senate in some detail. I would say the subject deserved it.

Some months ago, less than a year, Mr. Kennan published a book called American Diplomacy 1900–1950. I had supposed that this curious work would be analyzed for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. Kennan is the mysterious "Mr. X," the author of the American containment policy against Russia. His discussions of this interesting theory were originally published in the magazine Foreign Affairs in July 1947 and in April 1951. The discussions are included in his book on American Diplomacy.

It seems to me that the performance of a man who, as a high State Department official, was thinking about economic aid to the Chinese Communists, would be more than interesting to the Senate, and, I may say to the Nation also.

Furthermore, the author of the containment policy deserves special attention. I think he should have had it. If the United States succeeds in containing Russia and her satellites as successfully during the next 5 years as we have done in the past 5 years—and I say this, recollecting the submergence of China, the present situation in Indochina, the firing of General MacArthur, the payment of blackmail for Robert Vogeler and the American flyers, and numerous other painful illustrations of the containment policy—I would say that within the next 5 years the United States will have nothing left to contain. The Communists, under Kremlin leadership, will have it all.

I doubt if American voters are going to like that at all.

RECESS

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, as in executive session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Henry Abendroth, O245799, National Guard of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Howard Louis Peckham, O12058, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. John Max Lentz, O10343, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Patrick Henry Tansey, O9299, Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Preston Corderman, O16387, United States Army.

Col. Waldo Eugene Laidlaw, O16414, United States Army.

Col. Willis Small Matthews, O16932, United States Army.

Col. William Everett Potter, O17098, United States Army.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for aupointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be assistant veterinarians, effective date of acceptance:

Joseph Puleo
Wendell O. Kelley

Surgeon to be senior surgeon:

Manly B. Root

Senior assistant surgeon to be surgeon:

Leo E. Melcher

Assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon:

George W. Metcalf

Junior assistant sanitary engineer to be assistant sanitary engineer:

Mary R. Fulmer

Senior assistant scientist to be scientist:

Geoffrey M. Jeffery

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Ivar H. Peterson, of Virginia, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the unexpired term of 5 years from August 27, 1951.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 17, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, may we begin this new week with a clearer vision of Thy greatness and goodness; for then no task, however difficult, and no experience, however tragic, can darken our minds and obscure our hopes.

We pray that we may never feel that our life is in the grasp of a blind fate that neither knows nor cares, but give us the glad assurance that we are in the safekeeping of a God whose name is Love.

Grant that by Thy grace we may triumph over all our doubts and fears and quit ourselves like men who are serving their day and generation with faith and courage.

Inspire us with an increasing sense of human solidarity and social responsi-

bility, reminding us that we are members one of another and that in ministering to the needs of humanity we are doing Thy will and fulfilling Thy law.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 13, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On March 10, 1952:

H. R. 2212. An act conferring jurisdiction upon a United States district court to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others; and

H. R. 2858. An act for the relief of William C. Reed.

On March 14, 1952:

H. J. Res 396. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the legislative branch and the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2077) entitled "An act to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) entitled "An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally."

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52–14.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, the carnations being worn today by Members of the House and the Senate on the other side of the Capitol were presented by the League for an Undivided Ireland, and I am happy to see the spirit in which Members of the Congress are wearing these carnations, because it is in that same spirit that the wearing of the green is being displayed all over the world today.

The Irish certainly did a job in selling St. Patrick, not only to their own nation but to every nation in the world. There is not a nation in the world that has not its own patron saint, but the Irish did a world job in selling St. Patrick, because in China, in Japan, everywhere, you will find the people today wearing the green and they are wearing it in the spirit that St. Patrick must have displayed 1,600 years ago when he sowed the seed of Christianity in Ireland.

May I say from my observations in Ireland, having driven over a large part of it some 2 years ago, that never once did I hear the word "communism" mentioned in the whole of Ireland. I hope that when another saint comes along he will instill that same confidence in the world that St. Patrick instilled in it 1,600 years ago.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, once more on the flying heels of winter March 17 returns, bringing with it the promise of spring and the rebirth of tree and flower and beautiful things on the earth. No less surely do Irish hearts turn to that green and fragrant isle beloved in song and story. Today is especially dear to Irishmen everywhere for it is the feast day of the good St. Patrick, patron saint of the land of their fathers and a sacred bond between all Irishmen everywhere. One of the many blessed attributes of the saint is his ability to draw the sons of Erin together, as it were, into one family group so that they become his friendly sons, indeed.

Irishmen never tire of hearing the story of the holy youth. Born sometime between the years 373–389 into a Roman family of high rank which had embraced Christianity, at the age of 16 Patrick was captured and carried off into slavery to a part of Ireland which in all likelihood was the present County Antrim. There his master, a Druid priest, set Patrick to tending flocks. But although a slave, young, helpless and in a strange land, the faith of the youth did not desert him. Years later in his confession the saint was to record that during the dark years of his captivity while tending his flocks he prayed "many times in the day."

The love of God—

He relates—

and His fear increased in me, and the spirit was roused, so that, in a single day, I have said as many as a hundred prayers and, in the night nearly the same, so that whilst in the woods and on the mountain, even before the dawn, I was roused to prayer and I felt no hurt from it, whether there was snow or ice or rain; nor was there any slothfulness in me, such as I see now, because the spirit was then fervent within me.

Thus the years of captivity were transformed by a benign providence into a wonderful spiritual experience, a preparation for the great apostolate which was to follow.

After 6 years Patrick escaped and fled to France where, after long years of study and preparation, he was ordained a priest. His thoughts turned to the land of his captivity. Tradition tells us that during his years in France, Patrick was favored by visions of children from Focluth by the western sea who cried out, "O holy youth, come back to Erin, and walk once more amongst us."

After a pilgrimage to Rome he was commissioned by Pope Celestine I to carry the light of Christianity to the darkness of Ireland.

So in the year 432 Patrick set foot once more on Irish soil to claim its people for the faith. He landed, according to the story, at the mouth of the river Vantry, close by Wicklow Head. First, he proceeded to Dalaradia, where he had been a slave, to pay the price of ransom to his former master, and in exchange for the servitude and cruelty he had once received to impart blessings and the freedom of God's children.

Thus began the long and glorious apostolate to the Irish—one of the most memorable in the annals of Christianity. By the time Patrick and his followers and successors had finished their work Ireland had, indeed, become the isle of the saints. She was more than that: On Ireland alone from the sixth to the ninth century fell the main burden not only of propagating the Christian faith but of preserving European civilization and transmitting the precious treasures of the classics to posterity. From the sixth to the ninth century she held the torch to enlighten all Europe during the Dark Ages. By the time its golden fire was dimmed Irish monks had carried faith and learning to every part of the known world and perhaps beyond it.

Then came the days of misery when the land of St. Patrick and St. Columba was overrun by barbarian hordes in numbers too overwhelming for a small pastoral people to resist. First the Scandinavian invaders then the English. For a thousand years the isle of the saints lay under cruel foreign domination until, like Job's comforters, her enemies might have taunted her that there was nothing more to live for. But, like Job, her faith rose triumphant from the ashes and the potsherds until, after long centuries, the day of freedom came.

Meanwhile, many of her sons and daughters found haven and refuge in a new world, which—who knows?—St. Patrick himself may have foreseen, and there they and their children's children kept the faith of freedom alive until the blessed day of liberty dawned once more for the ould sod and Ireland, like her blessed Patrick, was released from captivity. To those brave spirits on both sides of the Atlantic, who never faltered during the years of darkness and political slavery, we raise today our voices in tribute. May the good, green land evermore retain the memory and the spirit of St. Patrick, and may Christian faith and unquenchable love of liberty ever

animate the hearts of her sons and daughters, whether in Ireland, America, or elsewhere.

Erin go Bragh!

ROBERT E. VIGUS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring therein), I return herewith H. R. 3219, entitled "An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus."

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 17, 1952.*

PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN INVESTIGATIONS BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes, insist upon its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MURRAY of Tennessee, MORRISON, and REES of Kansas.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to address the House on tomorrow for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House today for 5 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

CONGRESSIONAL DAILY DIGEST

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call attention to the birthday of the Congressional Daily Digest. The Digest starts its sixth year of operation today. It was established in conformance with part 2, section 221 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and has functioned very successfully under the supervision of the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate, respectively. In each issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Digest carries a report of all committee meetings and a brief account of the proceedings that transpire in both Chambers. Nowhere else is it possible to find a running account of the activities of all congressional committees such as is carried by the Digest. The Daily Digest also carries the legislative program for the day, a list of the committees that are meeting, along with the place of meeting, the time, and the subject matter to be considered by the committees. In addition to these services, they handle numerous telephone requests for various types of information, I have been told. So to any one who wants to keep well informed, I recommend the reading of the last four pages of each CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I take this occasion to wish continued success to the Congressional Daily Digest.

THE LATE HOWARD CHANDLER CHRISTY

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, millions mourn the passing of Howard Chandler Christy. We have lost not only a great friend and a great artist but a great American as well. As early as the First World War his painting and portraits of Americans and things American have looked out at us from the pages of magazines, from posters in windows and from the walls of famous buildings. During the Second World War his patriotic pleas on oil were more eloquent than words. One of his greatest works, the painting of the Signing of the Constitution hangs here in the Capitol—a daily reminder to us of the magnificent character and foresight of those revered few who chartered our future. We recognize the fine qualities in these men because they shine forth in the brush strokes of the man who placed them there with love and care for not only did Howard Chandler Christy paint with his hand and with his head but with his heart as well. His enthusiasm for our great traditions and for the momentous decisions that have framed our government impart a shining truth to each canvas so that when we see it we believe in its sincerity. Mr. Christy is famous as a portrait and landscape artist. Others have described his talents more eloquently than is possible here. It is the patriot we wish to praise; the man who carefully studied early American history so that each detail might be correctly portrayed; the man who traced America's past and believed in the fulfillment of a glorious destiny; the man who concerned himself with America's present. We must read his message that is preserved in glowing colors for all to see: "This was America then—look forward, go forward, but keep these events ever sacred, our forefathers did not fail us nor must we fail them."

Howard Chandler Christy had a great gift and he shared it with us all. Let us be thankful for the beauty that was his bequest to us and may we all in our hearts make a monument to the loving memory of a true American.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I was very much impressed with the speech just made by our distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. COX] with reference to Mr. Howard Chandler Christy. Howard Chandler Christy was born in my State, right close to my district. He was truly a great painter and a great American.

Just about a year ago I had a long talk with him about his painting of the great picture, the Signing of the Constitution. This picture is located on the east sidewall of the Capitol Building and can be seen advantageously from the balcony that surrounds the House Chamber.

He told me in great detail about how much work he had done and about how much time it took to paint that picture in order to make it accurate physically and historically. I am genuinely proud of his reputation not only as an artist but as an historian.

He did much to give us the story of the incidents surrounding the preparation and signing of the Constitution of our Republic. He has given us a picture of the room in which the Constitution was written as it was furnished at the time of the signing. He has also given us a picture of the faces of most of the signers and the clothes that they wore when they signed. Mr. Speaker, he will be long remembered by those now alive and posterity will recognize him as one of the world's greatest artists. I am proud to have been his friend.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I concur in the statement of my distinguished colleague from Ohio, as well as that of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. America has lost a great citizen and his profession has lost a real master.

THE TRUMAN TAX PROGRAM

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, today is the last day to file Federal income-tax returns. As many of you know, the Members of the California delegation have been deluged with shirts mailed by protesting taxpayers who have got a bellyful of the Truman tax program. You do not wonder at this spontaneous outburst of indignation when you realize that Harry S. Truman in less than 7 years has collected more taxes from the American people than all the other 31 Presidents who preceded him, including Franklin D. Roosevelt.

At this time I wish to present to the ranking Republican on the House Ways and Means Committee the shirt which I hold in my hand, and I ask him that it be filed with the chairman of his committee, as a symbol of the fact that

Harry S. Truman is back where he started—in the shirt business.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to say that if the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] desires to accept the shirt it is his business. It makes no difference to the Chair.

Mr. REED of New York. I know that if I accept this shirt I will be subject to a gift tax. I know if I pass it on to the chairman he will need it after the next tax bill, because he will not have a shirt left.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

PRESENTATION OF A SHILLELAGH TO THE SPEAKER

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, today Americans the length and breadth of the land are joining the Irish in honoring their patron saint and we pay our respects to the gallant people of Irish extraction on this St. Patrick's Day.

The Irish are noble people—honest, loyal, and patriotic, with the greatest respect for the law of the land. This is attested by the fact that many of them engage in the occupation of enforcing the laws that we, the State and local governments enact. Generous, kind-hearted, jovial, and devoted to the principles which founded this great Republic, they make the highest type of American citizen.

Today each of us received a fresh green shamrock, which was flown from Ireland to us with the compliments of the Ambassador of Ireland. We are most appreciative of this friendly gesture and wear the shamrock in celebration of this important day.

While I was in Europe last summer I spent some time in Ireland. I want to state that nowhere in all my travels throughout 13 foreign countries did I receive a more friendly hospitable reception than I did from the people of Ireland. With a twinkle in the eye and a bit of blarney on the tongue, I was made to feel that I was the most important visitor who ever set foot on the hills of Erin or gazed upon shimmering Killarney.

I hold in my hand a genuine blackthorn shillelagh which came from the county of Tipperary, Ireland. By virtue of the esteem the Members of this body hold for the Speaker, I believe it very appropriate for him to use a shillelagh on St. Patrick's Day to preside over the House of Representatives. This shillelagh was presented to me during my visit in Ireland by Mr. Nicholas Lakas, one of our younger and most promising Foreign Service officers, who was in charge of the United States consulate at Cork, Ireland. I, in turn, present it to our Speaker with my compliments, a shillelagh from O'BUSBEY to Speaker O'RAYBURN.

The SPEAKER. I appreciate the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois.

THE LATE HOWARD CHANDLER CHRISTY

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply impressed with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. COX], in regard to Howard Chandler Christy and the great contribution he has made to art in this country. But in the picture of the Constitutional Convention, in the front is Dr. Benjamin Franklin sitting there, and next to him is young Alexander Hamilton. Alexander Hamilton is portrayed as saying: "Doctor, what have we here?" And the doctor replied, "We have a Republic, if we know enough to keep it."

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, it should be of considerable interest to Members of Congress, as well as to all loyal American people, to review the leftist and pro-Communist propaganda being issued through the national weekly known as the National Guardian.

For a long time now this magazine has, in its editorial policies as well as its news reports, shown a tendency to support socialistic Communist causes and legislation. While a great deal of material has been assembled by the House Un-American Activities Committee, about this propaganda instrument, the committee has not yet notified the public through a report that it is actually published by an American Communist.

Cedric Belfrage, whose Communist Party name was for many years George Oakden, was recently described by Martin Berkeley as a very important Communist in the United States. He formerly lived in Hollywood, where he was a Hollywood correspondent for the Manchester Guardian, another leftist publication. While in Hollywood Belfrage was a cohort of Herbert Biberman, Gale Sondergaard, Lionel and Alice Stander, John Howard Lawson, and other such notable Communists.

The National Guardian is just another propaganda arm of Soviet Russia which follows the American Communist Party line down to a "t", creating race and class hatred among its readers and generally tearing down the precepts of our constitutional Republic. In addition to the evil effect of its editorial policy, the National Guardian sells its mailing list to other national publications, thus enabling it to survive financially.

I cannot overemphasize the sinister effect on Americanism that Cedric Belfrage and his Communist-propaganda machine promotes. The House Un-American Activities Committee should, and I feel sure it will, subpena Cedric Belfrage to appear before it to answer many questions which are important to the committee itself as well as many other American people.

PROPAGANDA OF COMMUNIST PARTY OF MICHIGAN

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a page from the Detroit Free Press for February 27, 1952 which contains a half-page ad inserted by the State Committee of the Communist Party of the State of Michigan. At the bottom of that ad is this statement:

> We predict that the people of Detroit and the State of Michigan will not permit the House Committee on Un-American Activities or any other group to bring about any of these described results by the present witch-hunt;
>
> That the people of Detroit and the State of Michigan will mount to ever higher levels in their fight to retain the basic constitutional rights of freedom of speech, of press, of assembly, of religion for every American regardless of his or her political beliefs.

This ad refers to the hearings recently held by the Committee on Un-American Activities in the House of Representatives in the city of Detroit at which time the activities of Communists were exposed.

This ad is a brazen attempt to simply deceive the people of the United States, and especially the people of Detroit, and the State of Michigan, into believing that those rights would be guaranteed and saved under a Communist regime. We all know that those freedoms, which the Communists claim they will fight for, as well as all other freedoms will be destroyed if communism ever controls the United States of America.

WALTER REUTHER

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time to compliment that great leader and labor statesman, Walter Reuther, for the courageous action he took in attempting to rid local 600 of the Communist influences which unquestionably dominated that union. The Committee on Un-American Activities conducted hearings in Detroit for 3 days last week. These hearings disclosed beyond any peradventure of doubt that

Communists dominated that large union, and the action taken by Mr. Reuther is to be commended by every patriotic American. Without strong courageous leadership such as Mr. Reuther furnishes, the labor movement in the United States would become impotent. I am not so certain that that is not what the Communists and their fellow travelers want. Weak labor organizations with the resultant low labor standards provide the soil in which the seeds of communism flourish.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Mr. BAKEWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BAKEWELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

OFFICE OF PRICE STABILIZATION

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Stabilization is beginning today to make checks in 139 cities of stores and wholesale outlets to ascertain what articles are selling above ceiling prices.

I have written a letter to Mr. Ellis Arnall, head of that office, asking that when his agency makes that check it also should report to Congress the number of articles that are selling under the ceiling price.

If the Congress is going to intelligently act upon the request for an extension of price control, certainly we should have all of the facts and not just a few facts. The Office of Price Stabilization should report to this Congress the result of its findings when it goes into these establishments on what articles are selling below ceiling prices as well as those above ceiling prices.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

OUR NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, quite understandably, many of us have received letters this past week protesting emphatically about the income taxes our people have to pay. That is only natural. I certainly do not blame him. In fact, its a healthy symptom that the people are at last widely aroused.

I have received one letter which has a rather novel suggestion. This correspondent suggests that each taxpayer be billed separately at income tax time each year for his share of the interest on the national debt. He wants a separate column in the income tax return to show how much of the total tax paid is made necessary by our huge national debt upon which we have to pay interest. Undoubtedly, this suggestion will not meet with favor from an administration dedicated to more and more spending and ever deeper debt but it deserves sympathetic study.

The annual interest on the national debt is over $6,200,000,000. Assuming that there are 40,000,000 families in this country, that means about $156 per family. For a man earning an average wage of $60 a week that represents about 2½ weeks work. He has to work that long just to pay his family's share of the interest on our national debt. And if the Congress does not rise up, assert itself and absolutely refuse to yield to the President on his inflated request for $86,000,000,000 to run the Government for another year, we will end up still deeper in red ink than we are now. That would mean, of course, sinking even more of our tax dollars in this item of interest on the national debt which yields no return whatever in the way of services or benefits, but which must be met to maintain national solvency and honor.

Little wonder that more and more of our citizens every day are coming around to realize that there must be a halt to the reckless squandering of the people's hard-earned dollars, extracted from their pay envelopes, their savings accounts, yes and even in many cases, from their pensions.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CORRUPTION IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to call the attention of the House to the subject of corruption in the executive branch of the Government.

On January 14, 1952, I introduced House Resolution 492, to create a special bipartisan committee to do the job that everyone recognizes needs to be done, namely, to find out whether wrongdoing prevails in the executive branch of the Government, and, if it exists, to eradicate it.

Mr. Newbold Morris, appointed by the President to clean up corruption, testified before the Hoey committee of the Senate on 2 days last week. It is my contention that his appearance before that committee conclusively demonstrated that he is neither qualified nor competent to conduct an investigation of corruption in the Federal Government. On special orders today I propose to quote from the record of the testimony of those hearings to establish that point.

I urge the House, and particularly the majority leadership of the House, to take action immediately so that the Congress can conduct an independent investigation of corruption in public affairs, in which the people of the country can have confidence.

FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE GIRL SCOUTS

Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, during the last week the Girl Scouts of America celebrated the fortieth anniversary of the founding of that organization. On Saturday in my own city of Lowell I attended the Greater Lowell Girl Scouts' celebration of the fortieth birthday. I wish the world could be ruled by the Girls Scouts ideal. I was tremendously impressed with their courtesy and what they have accomplished and what they stand for and what they live for. In these days of unrest, war, attack, and counter-attack, it is refreshing to see a group that is just trying to make this world better.

There has never been, so far as I know, during all the 40 years of Girl Scouting a single criticism or attack on any of them or on their leaders.

I am sure we all wish them a happy birthday.

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sunday Sun of March 9, 1952]

GIRL SCOUTS OF AMERICA TO HAVE FORTIETH BIRTHDAY

LOWELL PROUD OF GIRLS IN GREEN—TWO THOUSAND MEMBERS PLEDGE "ON MY HONOR"—AND THEY REALLY MEAN IT

(By Norma G. Ackerson)

LOWELL.—"On my honor, I will try"—

This is just about as much as you could ask of anybody—to try—and these are the words with which 1,500,000 Girl Scouts in the United States begin the recitation of the Girl Scout Promise, which each of these girls in green must learn and understand before she is formally invested and becomes a tenderfoot.

Next Thursday Girl Scouting in America will have its fortieth birthday party, and one of the finest youth agencies ever devised will receive the attention it so thoroughly deserves. There is no purer form of democracy in the world than scouting, and its effect is also being felt by thousands of volunteers.

The rest of the above quoted promise reveals that the Scout intends to do her best "to do my duty to God and my country, to help other people at all times, to obey the Girl Scout laws."

Before she may wear the gold trefoil pin that is the insignia of her organization, she must learn and understand these laws. She learns that her honor is to be trusted; she is expected to be loyal; her duty is to be useful and to help others; she is a friend to all and a sister to every other Girl Scout; she is to be courteous; she should be a friend to animals; she obeys orders; she is cheer-

ful, thrifty, and, last but far from least, she is clean in thought, word, and deed.

There are approximately 2,000 Girl Scouts in Lowell, about 300 of whom are volunteer adults. Without these women, the entire Girl Scout program would collapse of its own weight, and the only remuneration they receive is the personal satisfaction that comes from engaging in this type of service.

As a former Girl Scout leader and a present associate member, we can honestly say there's nothing like it.

What they do

These volunteers serve in many ways. Some are members of the council and as such serve on working committees—and they really work. Others are troop leaders, special program consultants or serve on troop committees. And then there are those who only serve once in a while, when called upon, but they all really roll up their sleeves and toil.

Girl Scouts work in cooperation with other agencies, mainly the Red Cross, Goodwill Industries, Lowell Tuberculosis Association, YWCA, and Girls Club in planning their programs and special activities.

The old timers

It is with deliberate intent that the names of those who have made scouting what it is in Lowell today are not given too much attention. But there were many of them, and they have worked for years. There are the women who have served the cause of developing character and skills in young girls ever since the organization started in Lowell in 1922.

They don't ask any favors, these old timers. They know their jobs and they go about them quietly. It's nothing to visit the Girl Scout headquarters at 150 Middlesex Street and find somebody working hard in the large assembly hall, surrounded by papers and record books, not getting in the way of the staff members but just going about her job and doing it well. It would be impossible to find the names of all these women and we wouldn't want to omit anyone.

In its early days, scouting in Lowell was sponsored by the Middlesex Women's Club. First headquarters were in Colonial Hall, and when that building was destroyed by fire it was found that the closet had not been seriously affected and the contents, containing precious early records, were practically intact.

Pride and joy of the agency then was the big bass drum used by the drum corps. This was found by the firemen who took it to the fire station and poured the water out of it. When it dried it was practically as good as new, served the unit for many years and was sold a few years ago.

The oldest records available are of troop 2 for 1924–25, and enrolled at that time were Constance Caverly, Ruth Doran, Isabelle Doyle, Elispolis Athanasia, Ethel Fling, Mary Hebb, Beatrice Hoar, Ruth Lambert, Mary Murphy, Sophie Panagiatacoupoulos, Helen Pappas, Adele Parra, Beatrice Robinson, Beulah Shaw, Evangeline Turcotte, and Myrtle Scott.

Financial support

Girl Scouting in Lowell is a Community Chest agency. This year the service received the sum of $9,805 from the chest, the largest allotment in many years. From this amount must be paid the salaries of three people, an executive director, an acting field director, and an office secretary.

The building in which the headquarters is maintained is owned by the ministry at large and no rental is charged. However, from the aforementioned amount must also come the cost of heat, light, insurance, all inside repairs (and there are always many in an old building), office equipment, files, records, postage, telephone, and the hundred and one expenses incurred in the direction of Girl Scouting.

All Girl Scouts, children and adults, pay a membership fee of $1 per year, which goes to the national organization. Their troop dues are 5 cents per week, and this money must provide equipment such as patrol books, craft utensils, supplies for occasional parties, and the like.

Troops occasionally have fund-raising activities within their own boundaries and the proceeds are used for such purposes as educational trips, scholarships to camp for needy and deserving girls, and other events. However, Community Chest agencies do not conduct major public-fund-raising drives because the chest does not wish to keep constantly asking people for money for the services it sponsors. The Girl Scouts adhere rigidly to this rule.

Occasionally a bequest comes to Girl Scouting, not often and not large, but in the event of such a windfall it is used for sorely needed equipment that could not possibly be obtained under the aforementioned overladen budget. At times benefactors send contributions for camp scholorships and these are awarded to girls known to leaders as deserving of this award.

Serves its purpose

There is no doubt that Girl Scouting is one of the finest youth services in the world today. Thousands of Lowell women speak proudly of the fact that they were once Girl Scouts, and their memories of scouting days are fond and happy ones.

We ought to know, because we're one of them.

CAMP RUNELS BEST IN REGION—LOWELL COUNCIL OPERATED RESORT IN PELHAM SO RATED BY EXPERTS IN FIELD

(By Norma G. Ackerson)

LOWELL.—The finest Girl Scout camp operated by a local council in this section of the country, judged on the basis of its physical set-up, location, equipment and preparedness for the purpose it serves, is Camp Runels, operated by the Greater Lowell Girl Scout council on Little Island Pond in Pelham, N. H.

This is not just the opinion of the writer, who has visited the camp on countless occasions and is admittedly prejudiced. It is the expressed judgment of experts in the field of camping who are often overwhelmed on their first visit to Runels by the excellence of the establishment.

Girl Scouting in Lowell was born in 1922, and it was not long after its formation, probably in 1924, that the need for a camp to complete its program was manifested. For the first 2 years of its summer program the agency rented the YWCA Camp at Long-Sought-For Pond in Westford for a short period in the summer.

Like everything else in scouting, the camp program was so good it grew far beyond the limitations found in renting a camp on a part-time basis. The use of adjoining property on the same pond was secured, and the single large cottage on the land became Camp Watusco. There are many women in Greater Lowell today who recall with happy memories the days they spent at Watusco, and if they could see themselves in the pictures we have examined while doing research for this article they would promptly laugh themselves into tears.

According to the camp folder for these years, the camp period ran from June 25 until July 30. The fee was $8 per week (those were the good old days) and the attire for camping was out of this world. The only dress brought to camp was the Girl Scout uniform, and judged from today's fashion standards the wearers were woebegone looking creatures.

Girls were told to bring middies, bloomers (absolutely no knickers), sneakers and stockings, brown or black. It was emphasized that there were to be no socks and no silk stockings. Visiting hours were held every afternoon from 3 until 6 o'clock, and the same visitors were not allowed to come to the camp more than twice each week.

Purchased in 1929

It was in May of 1929 that there appeared in The Sun a news story headlined "Girl Scouts Buy Permanent Site for Camp." Through the consecrated work of many volunteers who believed in the cause of Scouting, a 330-acre tract of land in Pelham, N. H., was acquired from the Martina Gage property.

Thousands of dollars were needed to develop the property. It was necessary to construct a passable road with little bridges over brooks, from the main road into the camp, a distance of nearly a mile. There was underbrush to be cleared, a beach to be developed, and many buildings had to be erected.

One of the most exciting fund raising projects from a community standpoint, was a street fair held May 10, 1931. One of the women who was a mainstay of Scouting in those days describes it in this way.

"What a disappointment that was! We had visions of dancing on the street, booths and music, suppers on the stone terraces. The theme was to be a medieval bazaar. And then it rained—a torrential rain! The street fair had to be in the Auditorium; added expense and lack of glamour. But it netted over $1,400 which went a long way after the contributions of more than $5,000 from kind Lowell people to insure the success of our camp."

Down but not out

Everything went smoothly at Camp Runels for a number of years—perhaps the quiet that comes before the storm. And what a storm it was! Everybody remembers the hurricane. Another of the "old faithful" workers in Scouting says of this experience:

"I shall never forget my first view of the camp after the storm. Nothing but great fallen trees, some more than 100 years old, and crushed buildings. Some one assumed that it would be years before we could function again, but as Mrs. Walter Chase stood looking at this desolation she said, "This camp will open the first of next July," and it did."

The camp committee and its many friends went to work, and 35 great stumps were hauled over into the woods, and many others were left to help support the shore line. The larger trees were brought to Lowell where they were transformed into the boards from which the new dining hall at the camp was made.

More trouble

For several years there was smooth sailing at Runels. The camp continued to grow and prosper, its reputation sailing higher and higher with each passing year.

And then, a few years ago, came the snow. There had been a lot of it, thick and heavy, and the camp committee was worried. Its members, their husbands and friends, headed for Pelham one Sunday afternoon. They had to go in that long camp road, nearly a mile, on snowshoes. And their hearts sank to their heels when they saw that the weight of the snow had caused the roof of the craft house to cave in. All the boats owned by the camp were stored in that building.

It took a lot of shoveling and other heavy work to determine the damage. When the wreckage had been cleared away the workers were close to tears. For just about everything in the building was damaged beyond repair. It took a lot of planning to replace those boats, but the job was done quietly and efficiently, just like every other part of the Scout program.

Camp Runels is licensed by the State of New Hampshire. Its registration list each year contains girls from all the New England States, New York, Pennsylvania, and as far west as Ohio. Many of the girls from out of

State are the daughters of former Runels campers.

The camp program is an exceptionally fine one, and Runels, which accommodates 100 girls, was 98 percent full for its 8-week period last summer. The only vacancies were caused when it was necessary to turn down applicants for the counselor-training program because they were under age.

This counselor training project is comparatively new in Girl Scout camping. It is a 2-year course, taking 4 weeks each year. The first summer the girls have an accelerated program in their own pioneer unit, perfecting the skills of camping. In the second year they serve an apprentice counselorship, assisting the leaders with crafts, waterfront, office duties and developing their skills in all-round camping.

Today the operating cost of the camp must come from the $17 per week which is the fee, also including insurance which covers the campers in case of illness or injury. The annual cookie sale pays for new equipment and repairs.

The camp is excellently equipped. It has six new rowboats, two older ones, two sail boats and five canoes. The kitchen is modern, with a large new range installed last year. The purchase of mattresses, bedsprings, screening, canvas and other equipment is done on the basis of a certain amount each year.

One of the greatest needs of Camp Runels now is a permanent building suitable for troop camping on a year-round basis. This house would have to have heating facilities and be usable for such things as troop camp week ends even in the winter. In the summer it could be used as a staff house, as at present there is no place in which staff members may have a period of relaxation when the day's work is done.

There is no doubt that Lowell can be proud of Camp Runels. Its exceptionally high standards, its excellent operation and the good reputation it has brought to this city are things in which any city may feel a just pride.

And at the rate it is going now, that pride will last for a long, long time.

REPRESENTATIVE ROGERS IS A TENDERFOOT

LOWELL.—Representative EDITH NOURSE ROGERS was formally invested a Girl Scout, and became a tenderfoot in May 1926. To do this she was required to memorize the promise and laws, like any other Girl Scout. She is thereby entitled to wear the gold trefoil pin that is the symbol of Scouting throughout the country.

NO BARRIERS IN GIRL SCOUTING

LOWELL.—In the Girl Scout program there are no boundaries regarding race, religion, background, or anything with the exception of a minimum age requirement.

Of the more than 200 troops in the Greater Lowell area, many operate under the sponsorship of Jewish, Protestant, and Catholic Churches, and others meet in schools or privately owned buildings.

Girl Scouts are trained to respect people as individuals, and to share with all other youngsters in activities that bear no restricting lines. The outstanding part of the Girl Scout program is working together in groups, sharing duties and interests, and doing things together. Troops meeting in buildings owned by various churches may not be restricted to girls of the faith or denomination represented by the church owning the property.

MIDDLESEX CLUB SPONSORED SCOUTING

LOWELL.—The Middlesex Women's Club, which sponsored the Girl Scouts in Lowell when the organization started here in 1922, has found that bread cast upon the waters will be returned in quantity. On several occasions the club has called upon these little girls in green to help with special programs, and the Scouts are always willing and eager to help the club. A Girl Scout council member is still named as cubchairman of the Middlesex club's community service committee.

SCOUTS ASSIST IN CHARITABLE ENDEAVORS

LOWELL.—Seldom is there a major community enterprise in this city in which Girl Scouts do not participate. They help fold Christmas seals for the Lowell Tuberculosis Association and prepare them for mailing, work on other volunteer projects as part of their training in community life.

PROGRAM INCLUDES VARIED ACTIVITIES

LOWELL.—The Girl Scout program covers 11 fields of activity in which the youngsters are trained. The list includes agriculture, arts and crafts, community life, health and safety, homemaking, international friendship, literature and dramatics, music and dancing, out of doors and sports and games.

"OLD TIMERS" MEMORIES GOOD

LOWELL.—Girl Scouts have phenomenal memories. It may be because the scouting program brings many memorable experiences. For it was due to the fact that many of the old timers in the organization were eager to cooperate in anything that would help serve scouting that much of the material presented here was obtained.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ELLSWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week, 15 minutes each day, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. WOOD of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DANGEROUS STRATAGEM OF THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is a violation of what we call congressional comity to criticize Members of the United States Senate. I hope my statement will not be considered a criticism of the Members of that body, but I do want to sound this warning: They have no right to vote the American people into Egyptian bondage, as I fear they will do if they approve this so-called treaty of peace with Japan, in its present form.

It seems to be an attempt to subordinate our national sovereignty, as well as our States' rights, to the domination of this so-called United Nations and in that way undermine, and probably destroy, American freedom. In the so-called United Nations, Communist Russia has far more influence, and she and her satellites have many more votes, than does the United States. This Japanese Treaty would go a long way toward undermining and destroying American freedom, as you will see from this telegram from a former president of the American Bar Association, which reads as follows:

I have only recently had an opportunity of studying the proposed Japanese peace treaty. To my mind it constitutes a backdoor attempt to secure Senate approval of many of the dangerous features of the Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Convention and the Draft Covenant on Human Rights. If this treaty is ratified by the Senate, and the courts enforce its provisions, then the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and other declarations, pacts, and covenants made under the UN charter will become the supreme law of the land and American rights, both State and individual, will be overridden by this new international law. This ratification would rob your constitutional amendment proposal of a large part of its effectiveness to protect American rights and American independence. The provisions of the treaty should be carefully analyzed by each Senator. It seems to me the matter is of such importance that there should be a public hearing before the treaty is presented to the Senate for final vote.

As has been pointed out:

The United Nations is steadily assuming the statute of a world government. It is slowly usurping the necessary powers from the hands of Congress.

A world government means the death of the sovereignty of the citizens of this Republic as set forth in the Constitution of this Union of Sovereign States. Each Senator, by his oath of office, is pledged to uphold that Constitution.

Now is the time to call a halt. The Senate should not vote to endorse the principles of the Declaration of Human Rights, the principles of International Law applied at Nurenburg and embodied in the Genocide Convention. It has no constitutional power to pass any law, or ratify any treaty, making these principles, as well as those that will govern public and private trade, subject to determination by any legislative body other than one subject to the vote of American citizens or the courts of this Nation. These powers must be retained in the hands of Congress to protect the Constitution of the United States of America.

Hanging over this Nation at this moment is the greatest constitutional crisis in the history of the Republic.

Mr. Speaker, we are in far more danger of losing our liberties and our freedom than the average American realizes. If we keep on going down this international road towards destruction, that has been followed for the last few years, the children of the next generation may not know what individual freedom means in this country.

We had better get back to the policies of Washington and Jefferson, of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none."

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the consent calendar.

AUTHORIZING PARTICIPATION OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN OLYMPIC GAMES

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 1184) to authorize the training for, attendance at, and participation in, Olympic games by military personnel, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATING FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A COORDINATED LOCAL, STATE, AND FEDERAL PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF BOSTON, MASS.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 254 to provide for investigating the feasibility of establishing a coordinated local, State, and Federal program in the city of Boston, Mass., and general vicinity thereof, for the purpose of preserving the historic properties, objects, and buildings in that area.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this House joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE PANAMA CANAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5490) relating to the compensation of certain employees of the Panama Canal.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

RECORDING AND PERFORMING RIGHTS IN LITERARY WORKS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3589) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (d) of section 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) To perform or represent the copyrighted work publicly if it be a drama or other literary work not enumerated in subsection (c) hereof, or, if it be a dramatic work and not reproduced in copies for sale, to vend any manuscript or any record whatsoever thereof; to make or to procure the making of any transcription or record thereof by or from which, in whole or in part, it may in any manner or by any method be exhibited, performed, represented, produced, or reproduced; and to exhibit, perform, represent, produce, or reproduce it in any manner or by any method whatsoever; and."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That subsection (c) of section 1 of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) To deliver, authorize the delivery of, read, or present the copyrighted work in public for profit if it be a lecture, sermon, address, or similar production, or other nondramatic literary work; to make or procure the making of any transcription or record thereof by or from which, in whole or in part, it may in any manner or by any method be exhibited, delivered, presented, produced, or reproduced; and to play or perform it in public for profit, and to exhibit, represent, produce, or reproduce it in any manner or by any method whatsoever; and'."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

. Amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Delete the last word of the committee amendment "and" and add the following sentence: "The damages for the infringement by broadcast of any work referred to in this subsection shall not exceed the sum of $100 where the infringing broadcaster shows that he was not aware that he was infringing and that such infringement could not have been reasonably foreseen; and."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TWO-YEAR PRESUMPTIVE PERIOD FOR DISEASE OF PSYCHOSIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, this bill is scheduled to be considered under a suspension of the rules today; I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

MINING DEVELOPMENT OF MINERAL RESOURCES OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 472) to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

MID VALLEY BRIDGE CO., HIDALGO, TEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1511) granting the consent of Congress to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Rio Grande, so far as the United States has jurisdiction over the waters of such river, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation not more than 3 miles above nor more than 3 miles below the Donna pump station, in accordance with the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 13, 1906, subject to the approval of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and subject also to the approval of the proper authorities in the Republic of Mexico as to the construction, operation, and maintenance of the bridge. Construction of the bridge shall not be undertaken until after an agreement regarding such construction has been effected between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Mexican States.

SEC. 2. The authority granted in this act for construction of the bridge shall cease and be null and void unless the actual construction be commenced within 2 years and completed within 4 years from the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby conferred upon the said Mid Valley Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, and all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property in the State of Texas needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches, as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the State of Texas, upon making just compensation therefor to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such State, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation and expropriation of property in such State.

SEC. 4. The said Mid Valley Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, is hereby authorized to fix and charge tolls for transit over such bridge, and in accordance with any laws of Texas applicable thereto, and the rates of tolls so fixed shall be the legal rates until changed by the Secretary of the Army under the authority contained in the act of March 23, 1906.

SEC. 5. The right to sell, assign, transfer, and mortgage all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred by this act, is hereby granted to the said Mid Valley Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, and any corporation to which or any person to whom such rights, powers, and privileges may be sold, assigned, or transferred, or who shall acquire the same by mortgage foreclosure or otherwise, is hereby authorized and empowered to exercise the same as fully as though conferred herein directly upon such corporation or person.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR AND INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER, NEW ORLEANS, LA.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 108 providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the national security and prosperity of the United States require the development of improved relations and increased trade with Latin America and the world; and

Whereas international friendship and trade are founded upon the good will and mutual respect of the people of one nation for those of another, and must be based primarily upon extensive popular contact and understanding; and

Whereas the natural expansion of our trade with Latin America and the world, without

subsidy or compulsion, will sustain employment and production and improve living standards both in the United States and throughout the world, preventing the infiltration of undemocratic philosophies there while promoting mutual good will, understanding, and confidence, lasting trade connections, and solidarity among all the nations of the world; and

Whereas any constructive long-range program for the development of a balanced foreign trade with the world must provide ample opportunity for the participation of small businesses, together with adequate merchandising facilities for their products and their representatives; and

Whereas there is a compelling need for the establishment of a trade center which will aid in carrying out these objectives and which will provide an opportunity to bring together large numbers of people from throughout the world and give recognition to their respective cultural, scientific, and artistic and industrial achievements; and

Whereas during the past quarter century outstanding statesmen, industrialists, and internationalists have frequently urged the establishment of such a trade center; and

Whereas the city of New Orleans, La., has been for over 200 years an international city and the natural gateway to the United States from much of Latin America for over two centuries by virtue of its geographical position and the rail, water, air, and highway connections with all parts of the United States; and

Whereas New Orleans in 1944 established International House, which has become a world-famous institution for the promotion of peace, trade, and understanding, and in 1947 established the International Trade Mart, which has assumed a position of much importance in world trading circles, and particularly in Latin America; and

Whereas New Orleans today is the second port of the United States in dollar values of foreign trade, and in recent years has made very rapid progress in foreign trade and has spent several millions of dollars in developing a foreign-trade consciousness in the Mississippi Valley region, and has worked diligently, intelligently, and with results in promoting healthy two-way foreign trade; and

Whereas the city of New Orleans, therefore, is a natural location for further development as an international trade center operated in the national public interest; and

Whereas 1953 is the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, which united the United States and started them on the way to becoming a world power, and this purchase was negotiated and consummated in New Orleans, capital of the Territory, and the business, cultural, social, and intellectual center of the South then and now: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Congress hereby expresses its endorsement of the establishment of an International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans in 1953 in observance of the Louisiana Purchase anniversary and as a nonprofit enterprise for the development of improved relations and increased trade with all nations. The President is authorized and directed, by proclamation or in such other manner as he may deem proper, to grant recognition to the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, calling upon officials and agencies of the Government to assist and cooperate with such center, and inviting the participation of all the nations of the world therein.

That all friendly nations be invited to send exhibits to display at this International Trade Fair and Center and that all such exhibits should be permitted to enter the United States duty-free.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 8, strike out after the word "with" the word "all" and insert "other."

Page 3, line 9, strike out "directed" and insert "requested."

Page 4, line 4, strike out "all of the nations of the world." and insert "foreign nations."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana: On page 4, strike out everything after line 4 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 2. All articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, to be held at New Orleans, La., from November 30, 1953, to May 31, 1954, inclusive, by the International House, Inc., a corporation, or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign exhibits at the said trade fair, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said trade fair to sell within the area of the trade fair any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided,* That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further,* That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs curtody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further,* That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the trade fair, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further,* That articles which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to, and entry for exhibition at, the said trade fair under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further,* That the International House, Inc., a corporation, shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisement, release, or custody; together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the International House, Inc., a corporation, to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 19, sec. 1524)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE MINERAL LEASING ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4752) to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals of oil and gas leases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHWABE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

COMPACT ON DELAWARE RIVER JOINT TOLL BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4900) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 1938) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that the Senate bill is identical with the House bill?

Mr. WALTER. It is identical; word for word.

Mr. McGREGOR. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the supplemental compact or agreement set forth below, and to each and every term and provision thereof: *Provided,* That nothing therein contained shall be construed to affect, impair, or diminish any right, power, or jurisdiction of the United States or of any court, department, board, bureau, officer, or official of the United States, over or in regard to any navigable waters, or any commerce between the States or with foreign countries, or any bridge, railroad, highway, pier, wharf, or other facility or improvement, or any other person, matter, or thing, forming the subject matter of the aforesaid compact or agreement or otherwise affected by the terms thereof:

Supplemental agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey.

Amending the agreement entitled "Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties," as heretofore amended, by extending the jurisdiction and powers of the commission.

Whereas the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "commission") was created by a compact or agreement entitled "Agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties," executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December 1934, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved the 25th day of June 1931 (Pamphlet Laws 1952), as last amended by an act of said general assembly approved the 18th day of May 1933 (Pamphlet Laws 827), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December, 1934, pursuant to an act of its senate and general assembly approved June 11, 1934 (chapter 215, laws of 1934; R. S. (1937) 32:8–1), to which compact or agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by section 9 of an act of Congress approved August 30, 1935 (Public No. 411, 74th Cong., 49 Stat. 1051, 1058); and

Whereas said compact or agreement was amended by a supplemental agreement executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 8th day of July 1947, pursuant to an act of its general assembly approved June 13, 1947 (Pamphlet Laws 592), and executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 3d day of July 1947, pursuant to an act of its senate and general assembly approved June 13, 1947 (ch. 283, laws of 1947), to which supplemental agreement the consent of the Congress of the United States was given by an act of the Congress approved August 4, 1947 (Public No. 355, 80th Cong., 61 Stat. 752); and

Whereas it is necessary to protect the investment made by the commission in the bridge now under construction between the city of Trenton, N. J., and the Borough of Morrisville, Pa., and the investments made by said Commonwealth and said State in the approach highways connected with said bridge, and in order to finance additional bridges over the Delaware River and thereby facilitate the flow of traffic between said Commonwealth and said State; now, therefore,

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey do hereby solemnly covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:

Paragraph (a) of article X of the agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission as a body corporate and politic and defining its powers and duties, which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 19th day of December 1934, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 18th day of December 1934, as amended by the supplemental agreement which was executed on behalf of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania by its Governor on the 8th day of July 1947, and was executed on behalf of the State of New Jersey by its Governor on the 3d day of July 1947, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) The commission may acquire, construct, rehabilitate, improve, maintain, repair, and operate bridges for vehicular or pedestrian traffic across the Delaware River between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey at any location north of the boundary line between Bucks County and Philadelphia County in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania as extended across the Delaware River to the New Jersey shore of said river. The commission may also, subject to the approval of the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey and the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, lease such bridges as lessor to, and contract for the operation of such bridges by, one or more public bodies, instrumentalities, commissions, or public agencies.

"Whenever any bridge north of the boundary line described above in this paragraph (a), proposed to be acquired by the commission pursuant to the provisions of this agreement, has been constructed pursuant to consent or authorization granted by Federal law, the acquisition of such bridge by the commission shall be by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the provisions of such Federal law, or the acquisition of such bridge by the commission shall be pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of sections 48:5–22 and 48:5–23 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey, and for all the purposes of said provisions and sections the commission is hereby appointed as the agency of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exercising the rights and powers granted or reserved by said Federal law or sections to the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jointly or to the State of New Jersey acting in conjunction with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commission shall have authority to so acquire such bridge whether the same be owned, held, operated, or maintained by any private person, firm, partnership, company, association, or corporation or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, public agency, or political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of, or created by or in, the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, or public agency of, or created by or in, a political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

"In addition to other powers conferred upon it, and not in limitation thereof, the commission may acquire all right, title, and interest in and to the Tacony-Palmyra Bridge, across the Delaware River at Palmyra, N. J., together with any approaches and interests in real property necessary thereto. The acquisition of such bridge, approaches, and interests by the commission shall be by purchase or by condemnation in accordance with the provisions of the Federal law consenting to or authorizing the construction of such bridge and approaches, or the acquisition of such bridge, approaches, or interests by the commission shall be pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of sections 48:5–22 and 48:5–23 of the Revised Statutes of New Jersey, and for all the purposes of said provisions and sections the commission is hereby appointed as the agency of the State of New Jersey and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania exercising the rights and powers granted or reserved by said Federal law or sections to the State of New Jersey and Commonwealth of Pennsylvania jointly or to the State of New Jersey acting in conjuction with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The commission shall have authority to so acquire such bridge, approaches, and interests, whether the same be owned, held, operated, or maintained by any private person, firm, partnership, company, association, or corporation, or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, public agency, or political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of, or created by or in, the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, or by any instrumentality, public body, commission, or public agency of, or created by or in, a political subdivision (including any county or municipality) of the State of New Jersey or the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The power and authority herein granted to the commission to acquire said Tacony-Palmyra Bridge, approaches and interests shall not be exercised unless and until the Governor of the State of New Jersey and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have filed with the commission their written consents to such acquisition.

"The word 'bridge' as used in this agreement shall include such approach highways and interests in real property necessary thereto in said Commonwealth or said State as may be determined by the commission to be necessary to facilitate the flow of traffic in the vicinity of any such bridge or to connect such bridge with the highway system or other traffic facilities in said Commonwealth or State: *Provided, however,* That the power and authority herein granted to the commission in connection with the approach highways shall not be exercised unless and until the Department of Highways of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said Commonwealth and the State Highway Department of the State of New Jersey shall have filed with the commission its written approval as to approach highways to be located in said State.

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this agreement or any provision of law, State or Federal, to the contrary, the commission may combine for financing purposes any bridge or bridges hereafter constructed or acquired by it with any or all of the bridges described or referred to in any trust indenture securing bridge revenue bonds of the commission at the time outstanding, subject to any limitations or restrictions contained in such trust indenture.

"Notwithstanding any provision of this agreement, nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit or impair any right or power granted or to be granted to the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission or the New Jersey Turnpike Authority, acting alone or in conjunction with each other, to provide for the financing, construction, operation, and maintenance of one bridge across the Delaware River south of the city of Trenton in the State of New Jersey: *Provided,* That such bridge shall not be constructed within a distance of 10 miles, measured along the boundary line between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey, from the bridge being constructed across the Delaware River by the commission between the Borough of Morrisville in said Commonwealth and the city of Trenton in said State, so long as there are any outstanding bonds or obligations of the commission for which the tolls, rents, rates, or other revenues, or any part thereof, of said bridge now being constructed shall have been pledged; but such bridge may be constructed at any other location north of the boundary line described above in this paragraph (a). Nothing contained in this agreement shall be construed to authorize the commission to condemn any such bridge."

In witness whereof, this 12th day of July 1951, Alfred E. Driscoll has affixed his signature hereto as Governor of the State of New Jersey and caused the great seal of the State to be attached thereto.

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL,
Governor, State of New Jersey.

[Great seal]
Attest:

LLOYD B. MARSH,
Secretary of State.

And, on this 17th day of July 1951, John S. Fine has affixed his signature hereto as

Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and caused the great seal of the Commonwealth to be attached thereto.

JOHN S. FINE,
Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

[Great seal]
Attest:

GENE D. SMITH,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SEC. 2. Subject to the provisions of the compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey creating the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, as amended, said commission is hereby authorized to acquire any bridge heretofore constructed under the authority or with the consent of the Congress across the Delaware River. Said commission is hereby authorized to combine for financing purposes any two or more bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission and to fix and charge tolls for the use of such bridges so combined and to pledge such tolls in accordance with the provisions of the said compact or agreement, as amended: *Provided*, That in fixing the rates of toll to be charged for the use of any bridge hereafter constructed or acquired by said commission or any bridges so combined, the same shall be so adjusted as to provide funds sufficient to pay the reasonable costs of maintaining, repairing, and operating such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities under economical management, and to provide funds sufficient to amortize the costs of such bridge or bridges and their approach facilities, including reasonable interest and financing cost, as soon as possible, under reasonable charges, and said commission may continue such tolls on all bridges heretofore or hereafter constructed or acquired by the commission until all such costs shall have been amortized; after funds sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge or bridges shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include a letter from the attorney general of the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of H. R. 4900 and S. 1938 the question was raised as to whether the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission was concerned with the recent litigation governing the sale of the Tacony-Palmyra and Burlington-Bristol Bridges by a private corporation to a public agency of Burlington County, N. J., so I asked Hon. Theodore D. Parsons, the attorney general for the State of New Jersey, to express his opinion on this question.

I received a letter from him dated February 29 in which he clearly states that "there is no liability on the part of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in connection with that litigation," and I am glad to include in my remarks a copy of this letter for the RECORD:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,
February 29, 1952.

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: This is in response to your inquiry regarding the liability of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in connection with the recent litigation covering the sale of the Tacony-Palmyra and Burlington-Bristol Bridges by a private corporation to a public agency of Burlington County, N. J. I would advise you that there is no liability on the part of the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in connection with that litigation. The highest court in the State of New Jersey has rendered its decision in this case and has denied leave for reargument. An application for review has been made to the United States Supreme Court.

The State of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey are, I know, extremely anxious to have congressional approval of the interstate compact referred to in Senate 1938. Both States are in complete agreement with the provisions of this bill as passed by the Senate. There is nothing in either the compact or Senate 1938 which affects the abovementioned litigation or which would involve the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission in such litigation.

With best personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

THEODORE D. PARSONS.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 4900) was laid on the table.

RESERVE CERTAIN LAND, PUBLIC DOMAIN IN NEVADA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4285) to reserve certain land on the public domain in Nevada for addition to Summit Lake Indian Reservation.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4323) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5990) to amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if some member of the committee could advise why there was no departmental report accompanying the committee report?

Mr. DURHAM. There is no departmental report, as I recall, but as far as I could determine there was no objection to it. I am sure the gentleman realizes the difficulty we find ourselves in. This only gives the Civil Defense Authority the same right and privileges of acquiring property that the Army, and the Navy, and the Air Force have at the present time. They have to receive authorization from the committee on each piece of property that they acquire over $25,000, and they also have to inform the committee of the acquisition of property between $5,000 and $25,000. At the present time I think the difficulty arises because of the fact that they have to go through this procedure and come to Congress for each piece of legislation.

Mr. BYRNES. I understand that is what they have to do, but I personally do not see anything wrong in coming to Congress. Did not this agency get into some difficulty some years ago in attempting to acquire some large tract of land and buildings?

Mr. DURHAM. No. Of course, the desire to acquire that property did not finally terminate in an agreement. The difficulty is that they have to come up here on each piece of legislation as far as this agency is concerned. If the Congress wants to take up the time, that is a different proposition.

Mr. BYRNES. Is it the gentleman's conception that the Civil Defense Administration is a temporary agency, or is it going to be a permanent agency?

Mr. DURHAM. Well, I hope it is temporary. Of course, we do not expect to stay in a state of emergency, I hope, all the rest of the centuries of our existence.

Mr. BYRNES. Since this is a temporary agency, I see no justification for putting it in the same class as the Army, the Navy, and Air Force, or the Defense Establishment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS OF THE NAVY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6319) to amend the Army-Navy Medical Service Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Army-Navy Medical Service Corps Act of 1947, as amended, is further amended by adding to title II the following new section:

"SEC. 208. (a) There shall be a Chief of the Medical Service Corps, appointed by the Secretary of the Navy upon recommendation of the Surgeon General of the Navy, for a term of not more than 4 years, from among officers of the active list of that Corps of the permanent rank of lieutenant commander or above, to serve at the pleasure of the Secretary. While so serving the officer shall

have the rank of captain in the Navy and shall receive the pay and allowances now or hereafter prescribed by law for that rank and his permanent status as a commissioned officer of the Medical Service Corps shall not be disturbed by reason of such appointment.

"(b) An officer of the Medical Service Corps who is retired for any reason while serving as Chief of the Medical Service Corps, or who having so served for 2½ years or more is subsequently retired while serving in a lower grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the rank held by him while serving as Chief of the Medical Service Corps and with retired pay based on the active duty pay of that rank."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE CUMBERLAND

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Wolf Creek Dam in the State of Kentucky as Lake Cumberland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Wolf Creek Dam in the State of Kentucky shall hereafter be known as Lake Cumberland, and any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lake is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such lake under and by the name of Lake Cumberland.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1499) to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind," approved August 4, 1919, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That for the purpose of enabling the American Printing House for the Blind more adequately to provide books and apparatus for the education of the blind, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to it, in addition to the permanent appropriation of $10,000 made in the act entitled 'An act to promote the education of the blind,' approved March 3, 1879, as amended, the sum not to exceed $250,000; which sum shall be expended in accordance with the requirements of said act to promote the education of the blind."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

USE OF PUBLIC LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3166) to amend the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by the States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes", is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. The Secretary of the Interior may, in the manner prescribed by this act, dispose of any public lands not reserved for power purposes to a State, Territory, county, municipality, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision for any public purposes, or to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association for any recreational or any public purpose consistent with its articles of incorporation or other creating authority. Before the land may be disposed of under this act for a purpose other than a recreational purpose, it must be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the land is to be used for an established or definitely proposed project.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior may (a) sell such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, at a price to be fixed by the Secretary, through appraisal or otherwise; (b) lease such land to the State, Territory, county, or other State, Territorial, or Federal instrumentality or political subdivision in which the lands are situated, or to a nearby municipal corporation in the same State or Territory, for the purpose for which the land has been classified, at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period, or (c) lease such land to a nonprofit corporation or nonprofit association at a reasonable annual rental, for a period up to 20 years, and, at the discretion of the Secretary, with a privilege of renewal for a like period. Each patent or lease so issued shall contain reservation to the United States of all mineral deposits in the lands conveyed or leased and of the right to mine and remove the same, under applicable laws and regulations to be established by the Secretary. Each lease shall contain a provision for its termination upon a finding by the Secretary that the land has not been used by the lessee for the purpose specified in the lease for such period, not over 5 years, as may be specified in the lease, or that such land or any part thereof is being devoted to another use.

"SEC. 3. All provisions for reversion of title to the United States contained in patents heretofore issued under said act of June 14, 1926, are hereby cancelled.

"SEC. 4. The Act of September 30, 1890, entitled 'An act to authorize entry of the public lands by incorporated cities and towns for cemetery and park purposes', and the Act of October 17, 1940, entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell or lease for park or recreational purposes, and to sell for cemetery purposes, certain public lands in Alaska', are hereby repealed."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike the word "the."

Page 1, line 6, insert a comma following the word "purposes."

Page 2, line 1, insert the designation "(a)" following the number "1."

Page 2, line 1, following the word "Interior", insert the words "upon application filed by a duly qualified applicant under section 2 of this act."

Page 2, line 3, strike the words "not reserved for power purposes."

Page 2, following line 12, add the following new subsections:

"(b) No more than 640 acres may be conveyed to any one grantee in any one calendar year.

"(c) Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior, or of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such Federal department or agency, or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, national park, or national monument, or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executive order for the use of Indians. Nor shall any disposition be made under this act for any use authorized under any other law, except for a use authorized under the act of June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609; 43 U. S. C., sec. 682a), as amended."

Page 2, line 13, following the word "may" add the words ", after due consideration as to the power value of the land, whether or not withdrawn therefor."

Page 2, line 18, strike the words ", at a price to be fixed by the Secretary, through appraisal or otherwise;" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and conveyances of such land for historic-monument purposes under this subsection shall be made without monetary consideration, while conveyances for any other purpose under this subsection shall be made at 50 percent of the appraised value of the property as determined by the Secretary."

Page 3, line 3, insert a comma following the word "rental."

Page 3, line 6, insert the word "a" following the word "contain."

Page 3, line 16, strike all of section 3 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 3. Title to lands conveyed by the Government under this act may not be transferred by the grantee or its successor except, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior, to a transferee which would be a qualified grantee under section 2 (a) and subject to the acreage limitation contained in section 1 (b) of this act. A grantee or its successor may not change the use specified in the conveyance to another or additional use except, with the consent of the Secretary, to a use for which such grantee or its successor could obtain a conveyance under this act. If at any time after the lands are conveyed by the Government, the grantee or its successor attempts to transfer title to or control over these lands to another or the lands are devoted to a use other than that for which the lands were conveyed, without the consent of the Secretary, title to the lands shall revert to the United States."

Page 3, following line 18, add the following new section:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary may authorize transfers of title or changes in use in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of this act with respect to any patent heretofore issued under any act upon application by a patentee qualified to obtain a conveyance under section 2 (a) of this act."

Page 3, line 19, renumber SEC. 4 to read "SEC. 5."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Recreation Act of

June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STOCKBRIDGE-MUNSEE COMMUNITY, INC., WISCONSIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5577) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Stockbridge-Munsee Community, Inc., of the State of Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] if this bill would add to a present Indian reservation in the State of Wisconsin?

Mr. MORRIS. It will add to it land that has, however, heretofore been acquired for the Indians. This bill is designed to put title in the Indians to about 13,000 acres of submarginal land that was acquired originally for them. This merely gives them title to the land which was acquired for their use.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not true that instead of giving title to the Indians the ownership is now in the hands of the Federal Government, and this simply adds to the power of the Indian Bureau to control this much more land as part of this reservation? Is that not a fact?

Mr. MORRIS. I think that is not exactly true. It is true that the title now is in the United States Government, and if this bill becomes law it will still be in the United States Government for the use of the Indians. In other words, they would be holding it in trust for the Indians. In this instance these Indians have built some homes there. They have their gardens. They have spent some of their own funds and of course some of the reimbursable loan funds on the land, but the tenure is uncertain, the title is uncertain, and this is merely intended to give title to the United States in trust for the Indians.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why must we give these lands in trust to the Indian Bureau? Why cannot these Indians own the land outright? Many of them are almost white. Not one of them, I am informed, is a full-blooded Indian. Why should they not own this land like any other citizens in this country?

Mr. MORRIS. We are working with might and main along that line, but it is a rather laborious process and and we will have to do it in an orderly way in order to do a good job of it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I want it done in an orderly way.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will withhold his request for a moment, is it not a fact that if this bill is passed the title to this land, which is now adjacent to an old Indian reservation, will then be in the same situation as the title to the original or the old Indian reservation land?

Mr. MORRIS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the bill is not enacted, there will be a cloud on the title of the land on which certain Indians have built their homes; is that not correct?

Mr. MORRIS. That is also correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. So the situation regarding the title then would be no different than the situation regarding the title of land in any Indian reservation, in any State in the United States?

Mr. MORRIS. I believe that last statement is correct. There might be some difference in regard to some reservations, but I will say substantially it would be the same as all other reservations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am very much in sympathy with what the gentleman says, but we have this unusual situation. There are treaties between many of the Indians and the Federal Government, which place certain property in trust from now on, let us say. That is a very delicate situation. Here is a tribe of Indians that is extremely wealthy, who participate in that treaty contract, and the land has a great oil-producing capacity. They do not want to be relieved directly or indirectly. They want the Federal Government to stay there, and be empowered in the administering of their funds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, sir; but I do not want this to be handled this way.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, but you have that treaty. What are you going to do about the treaty?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Surely the gentleman knows that we could fulfill those treaties and do justice to the Indians.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But we have abrogated many treaties with the Indians, and that is where a great deal of trouble has come from.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The gentleman surely knows that I am not advocating any injustice to the Indians. The very fact that this land is to be held in trust is turning the clock back. The gentleman knows many of us are interested in the matter of doing away with the Indian Bureau. Why should there be an Indian reservation in the State of Wisconsin, anyhow? Those people are American citizens, and they ought to be treated as such.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will yield, I place myself in that class, but I am going to respect the contracts as we tried to get out from under this situation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would expect the contracts of the Federal Government to be respected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. That is the last eligible bill on the Consent Calendar.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2697) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object.

SUITABLE ACCOMMODATIONS FOR THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS AND CERTAIN OTHER GOVERNMENT SERVICES AT EL PASO, TEX.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6863) to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) when the owners of tracts of land (more or less described in subsection (b)) situated in the city and county of El Paso and the State of Texas, having a frontage on South Santa Fe Street of five hundred and ninety feet, a width of two hundred and seventy-four feet, and containing approximately three and seventy-one one-hundredths acres (hereinafter referred to as the "owners") have agreed to erect upon such premises, or upon an equivalent area which has been approved by the Administrator of General Services, a building or buildings of such design, plan, and specifications as may be approved by the Administrator of General Services as suitable for the use of the Bureau of Customs, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Public Health Service, and the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, the Administrator of General Services is authorized, subject to an appropriation therefore, to enter into one or more leases at a fair annual rental for the use of such building or buildings and such premises, or such parts thereof as are necessary, for a term of 20 years after such building or buildings are ready for occupancy.

(b) Such tracts of land in the city and county of El Paso are described more or less as follows:

TRACT I

Beginning at a point in the easterly line of block 21 in Campbell Addition to the city of El Paso, Tex., and in the westerly line of South El Paso Street one hundred and sixty feet southerly from the northeast corner of the said block 21;

Thence southerly along the easterly line of block 21 and the westerly line of South El Paso Street seventy-three and eight-tenths feet to the northerly line of right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. Railroad;

Thence westerly, parallel with and twenty-five feet from the center line of the said right-of-way one hundred fifty and twenty-seven one-hundredths feet more or less to the north-south center line of a closed alley in block 21;

Thence northerly along the said alley center line thirty and seven-tenths feet more or less to a point four feet southerly from the south line of lot 5 projected;

Thence easterly along a line four feet southerly from and parallel with the south line of the said lot 5, one hundred and forty-four feet to the point of beginning;

Being parts of lots 2, 3, and 4, in the block 21 aforementioned, and easterly one-half of closed alley adjacent to the aforementioned property.

TRACT 2

Beginning at a point in the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street and the southerly line of the right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. Railroad, which point is sixty-six and eighty-two one-hundredths feet northerly from the southwest corner of block 21 of the Campbell Addition to the city of El Paso, Texas;

Thence easterly along a line twenty-five feet southerly from and parallel with the center line of the right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. Railroad two hundred eighty-nine and six-tenths feet more or less to a point in the westerly line of South El Paso Street, which point is forty-four and four one-hundredths feet northerly from the northeast corner of block 17 of the Campbell Addition;

Thence southerly along the west line of South El Paso Street and the east line of block 17, Campbell Addition, projected three hundred four and four one-hundredths feet to the southeast corner of said block 17.

Thence westerly two hundred and seventy-four feet along the southerly line of block 17 to the southwest corner of the said block and the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street;

Thence northerly along the westerly line of block 17 projected and the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street three hundred ninety-six and eighty-two one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning;

Being all of block 17, part of what was formerly Eleventh Street between blocks 17 and 21, and that part of block 21 lying south of the right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. Railroad.

TRACT 3

Beginning at a point in the west line of South El Paso Street and the east line of block 21, Campbell Addition projected twenty-five and ninety-six one-hundredths feet southerly from the southeast corner of the said block 21;

Thence westerly at an angle of seventy-three degrees twenty-six minutes with the east line of block 21, one hundred fifty and forty-four one-hundredths feet to the P. C., thence westerly along a curve to the right one hundred thirty-nine and eighteen one-hundredths feet more or less to a point on the east line of South Santa Fe Street and the west line of block 21 sixty-six and eighty-two one-hundredths feet northerly from the southwest corner of said block 21;

Thence northerly along the west line of block 21 and the east line of South Santa Fe Street fifty-six and forty-four one-hundreths feet to a point one hundred thirty-six and seventy-four one-hundredths feet southerly from the northwest corner of said block 21;

Thence easterly along a curve to the left one hundred fifty-four and forty-six one-hundredths feet more or less to the P. C., thence easterly along the tangent one hundred thirty-five and fifty-six one-hundredths feet to a point on the west line of South El Paso Street twenty-six and two-tenths feet northerly from the southeast corner of said block 21;

Thence southerly along the west line of South El Paso Street fifty-two and sixteen one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning;

Being a strip of land fifty feet wide in block 21, Campbell Addition, and in a part of Eleventh Street which has been closed.

TRACT 4

Beginning at the northeast corner of block 21 of the Campbell Addition to the city of El Paso, Tex., which is also the southwesterly corner of the intersection of West Tenth and South El Paso Streets;

Thence southerly along the easterly line of the said block 21 and the westerly line of South El Paso Street one hundred and sixty feet to a point four feet south of the south line of lot 5 in the said block 21;

Thence westerly four feet from and parallel with the south line of the said lot 5, one hundred and forty-four feet to a point in the north-south center line of an alley which has been closed;

Thence northerly along the said center line one hundred and sixty feet to a point in the northerly line of block 21 and the southerly line of West Tenth Street;

Thence easterly along the northerly line of block 21, one hundred and forty-four feet to the point of beginning;

Being lots 5–10, inclusive, and the northerly four feet of lot 4, and half of the alley adjoining the said lots in the block 21 aforementioned.

TRACT 5

Beginning at the northwest corner of block 21, Campbell Addition of the city of El Paso, Tex., which is at the southeast corner of the intersection of South Santa Fe and West Tenth Streets;

Thence easterly along the northerly line of the said block 21 and the southerly line of West Tenth Street, one hundred and thirty feet to the north-south center line of a closed alley in the said block 21;

Thence southerly along the north-south center line of the closed alley in block 21, one hundred ninety and seven-tenths feet more or less to the northerly line of a fifty-foot right-of-way of the E. P. & S. W. R. R.;

Then westerly along a curve to the right twenty-five feet from and parallel to the center line of the said right-of-way one hundred thirty-nine and seventy-five one-hundredths feet more or less to a point in the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street, which is one hundred thirty-six and seventy-four one-hundredths feet southerly from the northwest corner of block 21;

Thence northerly along the westerly line of block 21 and the easterly line of South Santa Fe Street one hundred thirty-six and seventy-four one-hundredths feet to the point of beginning, being lots 11–15 and part of lots 16, 17, and 18, and one-half of the alley adjoining the said lots in the block 21 afore-mentioned.

SEC. 2. The act entitled "An act to make provision for suitable quarters for certain Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes", approved June 19, 1934, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING VETERANS REGULATIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 5891) to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second last proviso of subparagraph (c) of paragraph I, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after the words "multiple sclerosis" the words "or active psychosis."

SEC. 2. The act of October 30, 1951 (65 Stat. 694; 38 U. S. C., ch. 12, note) is hereby repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is entitled to 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this bill seeks to provide a 2-year presumptive period for the disease of psychosis, instead of the 1-year period which exists today. Of course, the bill applies only to service-connected cases, including presumptively service-connected cases, and would provide compensation based on the degree of disability, and would provide also for priority in the admission of such cases to veterans' hospitals.

Hearings were held by a subcommittee and the bill was unanimously reported by the full committee. It is our belief that the 2-year presumptive period is a very conservative period of time, inasmuch as World War I veterans suffering from a similar affliction had until January 1, 1925, or approximately 6 years presumptive period.

I have contended all along, Mr. Speaker, that we should treat these boys at least as well as we treated the veterans of World War I, but we have had considerable opposition at the other end of the Capitol. On the last day of the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, the Senate passed a bill providing hospitalization for cases of this type, and denying compensation. In other words, they passed a bill providing hospitalization for these presumptively service-connected psychosis cases, but denied them compensation. I accepted that proposal in an effort to get some better treatment for men suffering from this dread disease. I believe that all pension and compensation benefits should be on a uniform basis, and thus the committee has reported favorably on this bill.

No estimate has been compiled as to the cost.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard a great deal this morning about the shirts that have been sent to Members of Congress by the taxpayers. You wait until the mothers and fathers, widows and orphans of disabled veterans and the veterans themselves, begin to send in bloody shirts to Congress, and then you will have something to look at, sure enough. We owe these men a lasting debt of gratitude, and if I had my way I would give them the same presumptive period that was provided for the veterans of World War I, not only for the tubercular and insane cases but the paralysis cases and others suffering from permanent and total disability from chronic diseases.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman should point out that this House passed a similar bill last year, which provided for a 3-year presumptive period.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and the gentleman from Tennessee was chairman of the subcommittee that held the hearings on it; but when it went to the other end of the Capitol they turned it down and sent back the bill that provided for only hospitalization for presumptive cases. That bill came back to the House on the last day of the session, if I remember correctly, and we had to accept it to get anything at all for these boys.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman point out that the Veterans' Administration has a list of critical diseases for which they provide compensation, and psychosis is one for which compensation is provided for the 1-year period, whether or not this legislation is enacted.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but that is not long enough. The truth of the business is that these cases as a rule get worse instead of better.

Mr. EVINS. A similar bill has been passed regarding tuberculosis, and provides for a 3-year presumptive period. This act asks for only a 2-year period on this dread disease.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and 2 years for multiplesclerosis also.

At this point, I am inserting that part of the report covering the subject of psychosis.

The matter referred to follows:

[Excerpts From the Merck Manual, Eighth Edition]

THE PSYCHOSES

Any mental disorder, including the psychoneurotic reactions, involves the total personality and extends to its depths. In the psychoses, however, the disturbance is of such magnitude that the mind is distorted more or less in entirety. The conscious portion of the ego no longer functions efficiently in its role of recognizing the source of at least some of the impulses that reach and pervade it. In one degree or another, therefore, it accepts as environmentally authentic material that actually is ideational. Thus the psychotic displays inability to correct his misconceptions about what is real and what is unreal.

Except that it includes the senile, presenile, and arteriosclerotic psychoses, this section deals only with those psychoses that are presumed to arise solely from intrapersonality conflict: schizophrenia, paranoia, and paranoid conditions, the manic-depressive psychoses, and the involutional psychoses. Numerous other causes for psychoses exist, such as specific infections, including syphilis, epidemic encephalitis, acute chorea, and tuberculous, epidemic cerebrospinal, or other forms of meningitis. Other causes are alcoholism, convulsive disorders (e. g., epilepsy), brain tumor, metabolic disease, trauma, and drugs and other exogenous toxins. This last group of substances includes mercury, manganese, carbon disulfide, carbon monoxide, opium and its derivatives, bromides, cocaine, the barbituric acid group, peyote, mescaline, belladonna, chloral, and paraldehyde. Many of these reactions are adequately described elsewhere in the Manual (q. v.). Delirium is a temporary psychosis. Patients with mental deficiency or a so-called psychopathic personality may develop a psychosis, often displaying a typical manic-depressive or schizophrenic reactions. There is little doubt that in most instances the psychopath is as he is because of his environment, and he and the feeble-minded individual may become psychotic because of continuing environmental stress.

Schizophrenia (dementia praecox)

The term "schizophrenia" means splitting of the mind, which is more descriptive of this condition than early or precocious dementia, as implied by the term "dementia praecox." Dementia, an irreparable impairment of cognitive and intellectual functions, does not occur with this condition. Rather schizophrenia may be considered as a psychobiologic reaction that arises on the basis of personality inadequacies, and results in an inability to meet the demands of adult adjustment. The reaction is characterized by progressive withdrawal from contact with persons and activities in the environment and regression to a childlike or infantile type of feeling or acting. An inferior affective capacity is one of the important results when the personality becomes disorganized or split in schizophrenia. This is displayed as an inadequate and inappropriate emotional response to situations, and represents a deterioration of emotional expression.

Etiology, Incidence, and Predisposing Factors

Schizophrenia constitutes from 15 to 20 percent of the first admissions to public mental hospitals, and 60 percent of their permanent population. The age of onset ranges from childhood to late middle life, but the psychosis is most frequent in adolescence or early adult life.

No constant or characteristic structural or biochemical change has yet been established in this condition. That the causes of schizophrenia are to be searched for in the individual's basic personality and the extent or limit of its adaptive power is the most generally accepted concept today. Childhood conditioning experiences, intrapsychic conflicts, persistent but consciously rejected instinctive urges and drives, feelings of insecurity or guilt, and other long-standing troublesome problems and frustrated purposes, in one combination or another, must be considered as potent precipitating forces.

Schizophrenia often represents only an extreme expression of the patient's previous schizoid type of temperament and personality. The contrasting poles of this type are sensitiveness on the one hand, and dullness or coldness on the other. The sensitive schizoid is timid and shy, self-conscious, perhaps stubborn and suspicious, and often dissatisfied; he is constantly being wounded. Reserved and socially inept, he may find in books a substitute for human companionship. The subjects he chooses usually are not of concrete objective type, but rather of abstract nature. He frequently is arabitious, conscientious, particular, and perfectionistic. Other schizoids lack the finer sensibilities of the group above. Many of these lack spontaneity and appear colorless personalities. This group varies from kindly, honest, but emotionally dull, unsociable and uncompromising individuals, to cold, reserved, and callous types.

Prodromal Stage

Frequently there is no abrupt transition, but rather an insidious change in mood and outlook. Long-existing disharmonies of thought, habit and interest became accentuated. The individual may seem preoccupied, be considered lazy, and may begin to believe others are talking about him or do not care for him. Such ideas of reference are common. He may become restless, taciturn, or ill at ease, yet appear unworried about odd mannerisms that make their appearance. Some ruminate on sexual topics and others on hypochondriacal ideas. At this stage the conflicts are not greatly disguised and may often be discovered without difficulty.

The Manifest Psychosis

An apparent poverty and increased disharmony in the feeling tone of the individual now may appear. However, some patients show not an absence of mood, but a prevailing one, such as euphoria or depression. But these moods will generally be found to have little or no relation to conscious mental content and none to external circumstances. Not infrequently, the opposite emotional response will be evoked by an idea or experience—an emotional dissociation or disconnection.

Since schizophrenia may be considered as a reaction characterized by introversion or the direction of the individual's energy and interests upon himself and his subjective life, and by the expression of rejected material through symbolism, one expects and finds no disturbance in consciousness or memory, and so none of orientation. The patient's intellect is inert rather than impaired.

The affect, or feeling tone, having been withdrawn from conscious mental assets and attached to complexes and other material in the unconscious, and being therefore inaccessible to the individual, the patient often feels changed throughout. He may come to feel he observes, as a spectator, his own actions which seem to him impersonal and mechanical. Such states of depersonalization are not uncommon. In his attempt to rationalize this sense of the loss of the limits of his own personality, his nihilistic ideas may increase until he feels he is dead, or no longer has body, or that there is no world.

Paralogia, a condition in which the reply to one's question indicates that it has been understood, although the answer because of defective reasoning, is erroneous, is due to the dereistic thinking which occupies much of the schizophrenic's attention. Symbols and associations, molded by unconscious instinctive drives and affects, rise into consciousness and constitute dereistic, or dreamlike thinking, a pleasurable thinking that disregards realistic, logical, and scientific concepts and thus tends to falsify reality.

Often, the dominant ideational content of the schizophrenic is delusional in nature. The delusions tend to center around themes of persecution, or grandiosity, and of sex. While these often appear grotesque, apparently they always are specific and adapted to the peculiar psychologic needs of the individual.

Normally, associations and ideas progress with logical connection on to ultimate completeness of thought, but in the schizophrenic they may be so fragmented and shortened, or otherwise distorted, as to appear illogical. In early schizophrenia, a flight of ideas may occur; this later tends to develop into incoherence. Neologisms, or coined words, probably represent extreme condensations and symbolizations of complexes, conflicts, and other unconscious material highly charged with affect. Blocking, or sudden cessation of a thought—and its verbal expression—is one of the hallmarks of schizophrenia, and presumably occurs when the patient's thoughts approach affectively overcharged and forbidden psychological ground. The train of thought abruptly terminates and cannot be reinitiated.

Hallucinations, the projection of inner experiences on to the external world, are frequent, and in no other mental disorder appear so frequently in the presence of clear consciousness. These are most frequently auditory. Visual hallucinations tend to be limited to the acute phase of the disease.

The capricious, impulsive behavior of the schizophrenic probably is to be looked upon as an ambivalence of impulse. His conflicting impulses, some conscious, some unconscious, control behavior in erratic sequence, or even struggle simultaneously to

direct it. This conflict may result in acts directly opposite to those suggested to the individual. This reaction, as well as increased suggestibility whereby the individual follows out each suggestion immediately, echolalia, and echopraxia, the latter two meaning, respectively, repetition of words spoken to him and repetition of the acts of another person—all common in varying degrees in schizophrenics—may be interpreted as defense reactions against the intrusion of the disavowed environment.

Activity mannerisms may occupy a large place in the clinical picture. They consist of stereotyped (without variation) affectations of manner, speech, and gait; of grimaces, ticlike movements, puckering out of the mouth or wrinkling the forehead, and, in many instances, of elaborate and ritualistic routines of behavior.

With such disorder and disequilibrium manifest in the mental life of the patient, it is not surprising to find a certain physical disequilibrium often accompanying schizophrenia. This may be manifested in cold, cyanotic extremities, or blotchy skin and widely dilated pupils. Seizures may occur, especially in the early stages. Some patients show a lowered metabolism. During acute phases, many schizophrenics lose weight.

Clinical Types

As transitions from one type to another often occur during different phases of the psychosis, the present tendency among psychiatrists is not to attempt to divide schizophrenia into the various classic types. However, these are descriptively important.

1. Simple: Manifested by a gradual and insidious change in personality, with increasingly pronounced disturbances in emotion, interest, and activity. If hallucinations occur they are fleeting. Delusions play no important role. Interest is withdrawn from the external world and there is a diminished response to social demands. Varied degrees of this deviation may appear. Many such persons become tramps, vagrants, delinquents, or prostitutes. Apathy, preoccupation, and inactivity characterize many hospitalized individuals of this type.

2. Hebephrenic: There is a tendency to include under this classification cases not readily fitting into other groups. The ideational content of the hebephrenic tends toward fantasy, with fragmentary rather than elaborate or systematized delusions. Hallucinations are frequent, associations are markedly loose, speech is incoherent, emotional reactions are shallow and incongruous, and regressive features (soiling, wetting), and a certain silliness of response and action, often predominate. The patient becomes bafflingly inaccessible. The disintegration of personality is perhaps greater than with any of the other types.

3. Catatonic: Characterized by phases of stupor and excitement, frequently alternating suddenly, although any given catatonic episode may consist of only one phase. The catatonic form frequently has its onset, which may be acute, between the ages of 15 and 25; and more often than the other types is precipitated by an emotionally disturbing experience. The prognosis for recovery and reintegration of personality is more favorable than in other types, but after several episodes the condition tends to become chronic.

Patients in catatonic stupor show increasing inattention, preoccupation, emotional poverty, dreaminess, and frequently progress to mutism. Inattention to their bodily needs, refusal to eat, and retention of saliva, urine, and feces are common. Negativism, gesturing, grimacing, and immobility may supervene and extend for a period of extremely variable duration. The patient slowly or at times suddenly emerges from this stuporous phase. He then may become virtually normal or may pass into a state of catatonic excitement.

A form of catatonia characterized by impulsive, often stereotyped, overactivity so largely motivated from within as to appear purposeless is called catatonic excitement. The patient may appear delirious or be sleepless and thus rapidly exhaust himself. Negativism and destructiveness may be observed. The speech may vary from mutism to a rapid pressing flow.

4. Paranoid: Delusions which are illogical and unrelated to reality, hallucinations, and the usual schizophrenic disturbances in associations and affects, together with negativism, are the most prominent symptoms in this group. This type tends to make its frank appearance in persons 30 to 35 years of age. Delusions of persecution are the chief manifestation, but depressive hypochondriacal, or fantastically expansive, obviously wish-fulfilling, ideas are common.

Prognosis

A permanent disorganization of personality does not invariably result from a schizophrenic episode. Not only the catatonic, but also the other forms may be episodic in character; frequently, however, the course of the disease ultimately becomes uninterrupted. Patients may recover with little scarring, but careful observation generally detects slight losses in spontaneity, in sense of humor or elasticity of personality, and a dulling of affectivity. If the psychosis represents an insidious development from a previously distorted personality and its inherent characteristics, the prognosis usually is poor. Consequently, the mildness of early symptoms bears no relation to ultimate outcome. In the simple type, the prognosis is not good, and the course of the hebephrenic form tends to be progressive. In the catatonic type many of the patients are restored to their prepsychotic level for varying lengths of time. The paranoid type is considered particularly malignant, although remissions which may be looked upon as social recoveries do occur.

Diagnosis

Schizophrenia in its initial stages must be differentiated from hysteria, compulsion neurosis, and manic-depressive psychosis (q. v.). Various conditions such as thyrotoxicosis, fevers, kidney or heart disease, toxemia of pregnancy, may precipitate a latent schizophrenia or a deliriold state resembling this disorder. Carefully appraising the patient's prepsychotic personality often helps in such differentiations.

In hysteria, the patient's psychologic motive more often is apparent, the symptoms are paroxysmal and more sudden in onset; and, unlike the schizophrenic where normal and psychotic elements exist side by side, the hysteric shows an alternation of normal and psychotic. In hysteria, the symbolization is conventional and intelligible, while in schizophrenia the use of symbols is individualized and archaic.

Compulsion neurosis: A patient with a compulsion neurosis consciously strongly resists his obsessions and compulsions, while the schizophrenic tends to display increasing apathetic unconcern. (The schizophrenic's hypochondriacal complaints lack the dramatization seen in the psychoneuroses.)

Manic-depressive psychosis: This frequently is most difficult to differentiate. The onset of schizophrenia tends to be more insidious, and the excitement paroxysmal rather than sustained as in the manic. The quality of infectiousness about the mood of the manic is lacking. The schizophrenic's delusions are more grotesque and create less tension. More often than the reverse, a psychosis at first thought to be a manic-depressive episode subsequently proves to be schizophrenic.

Treatment

Psychotherapy: According to some authorities a schizophrenic illness is to be viewed as a repudiation by the patient of an imagined hostile environment. To demonstrate that his conception rests on an unreal basis, it is necessary that the schizophrenic be supported by sincere and patient friendliness until he can gain insight into the fact that his illness has arisen because of his own misinterpretations. The objective is to stimulate his attention, detach his emotions from subjective material, redirect his interests to things outside himself, inculcate healthful social habits, and abstract him from his spiritual isolation. Important aids are occupational therapy, congenial companionships, and a carefully planned recreational program. The patient's distorted ideas should not be refuted, but accepted without critical comment or perhaps with an observation that they probably will change or have a different significance to him as he recovers from his illness. As the patient improves he may be allowed to interpret his own ideas, but this is not specifically encouraged. For, except by a skilled therapist, only extremely superficial interpretations can safely be given, since the psychologic significance of his psychotic ideas might be overwhelmingly traumatic to the patient.

Insulin therapy: This treatment is suitable only for institutionalized patients, since constant supervision is required. Insulin (B 14), 10 to 20 u., subcut., is given on the first day and increased by 5 to 10 u. on each succeeding day until signs of severe shock appear. (Food, of course, is withheld during the preceding several hours.) Coma is occasionally produced by a dose of 40 u., but most patients require 80 to 90 u. Subsequently a smaller amount may have the same effect, and it is wise to reduce the dose by 5 to 10 u. from time to time to test the effect. Shock treatments, at a rate of 5 to 6 times a week, may have to be continued until 65 or 70 have been given, but favorable cases often respond by or before the 50th treatment. In discontinuing the therapy, the dose is tapered off by a reduction of 20 to 40 u./day.

Wet, dry, and convulsive types of insulin shock are encountered. (1) Wet shock, the most common, starts with sweating, hunger, sleepiness, slurred speech, and confusion. Coma follows and a Babinski sign appears, to be replaced later in case of extreme shock by a general areflexia that includes loss of the pupillary light reflex. (2) Dry shock is practically the same except that the patient perspires very little. (3) In the convulsive type generalized clonic movements are characteristic. Extreme caution must be observed when patients characteristically respond with convulsions, which may occur at any time between the onset of hypoglycemia and full waking. Provided the total period of hypoglycemia has not exceeded 6 hours, an uncomplicated shock may be continued for 2 to 3 hours.

Shock is terminated by administering glucose. If the patient is in light shock and able to swallow, he is given 2 Gm. of glucose by mouth for each unit of insulin previously administered that day. Otherwise, 300 Gm. or more of glucose in a 25 percent solution is given by nasal tube; or in extreme cases, 25 to 50 cc. of 50 percent glucose I. V. (B 19). Epinephrine (B 20), 0.3 to 0.5 cc. of a 1:1,000 solution subcut., occasionally is administered to speed arousal after the glucose is given. Upon regaining consciousness, the patient must immediately take additional carbohydrates by mouth (usually several slices of bread). A carbohydrate rich meal is given as soon as the patient is fully conscious. Throughout the course of therapy a high caloric (4,000 to 5,000 C. daily), high vitamin diet is prescribed. (See Diets.)

Insulin shock therapy is attended by many dangers, among which are after-shock (a relapse into unconsciousness, perhaps many hours later), prolonged coma, severe convulsions, and extreme vasomotor or circulatory collapse.

Convulsive shock theapy: Electroshock has largely supplanted Metrazol for producing these therapeutic convulsions, as it is less terrifying to the patient, is equally or more efficacious therapeutically, and produces fewer fractures. Further electroshock treatments are usually contraindicated if a patient has not improved with 20 convulsions. Schizophrenic patients often become extremely disturbed after several convulsions, which ordinarily precludes the use of this form of therapy unless the patient is hospitalized. The relative value of insulin and electroshock therapy in schizophrenia has not yet been statistically determined, but there is some indication that insulin may prove to give lasting benefit more frequently, especially in the paranoid type. (For details about electroshock therapy, see Involutional Melancholia.)

PARANOIA AND PARANOID CONDITIONS

Classic paranoia, which is rarely if ever seen, is a psychosis in which a circumscribed delusional system exists without dilapidation of conation, affect, or associative processes. (By conation is meant the instinctually motivated striving aspects of the personality that are more or less beyond volitional control.) In its less strict and more modern sense, paranoia also describes any personality reaction characterized by the mechanisms of projection and compensation. To understand many normal as well as psychotic manifestations, familiarity with the nature of these mechanisms is necessary. They may be employed to excess in practically all psychoses, but usually are only incidental or transitory except in classic paranoia, paranoid conditions, and paranoid schizophrenia. The paranoid conditions range by imperceptible gradations from classic paranoia on to the state of disorganization seen in paranoid schizophrenia. Step by step, from patient to patient, a greater admixture of schizophrenic features is seen. This is reflected in inadequate affective responses, increasingly disorganized associations, and the symbolization and projection of mental material as hallucinations. In all of these reactions there is a tendency for what is troublesome within to be projected outward in ideational and verbal form. A patient with paranoid psychosis carries to extremes the normal methods of maintaining self-esteem; i. e., by blaming others for his own failures, denying the possession of those of his traits that he dislikes, and by overcoming his feelings of insecurity with various compensatory strivings.

Etiology

The personality aspects from which paranoia arises are: the need to shield particularly sensitive portions of thought-life, hunger for a recognition that cannot be achieved, and the fears and guilt feelings these conflicts and strivings evoke. Character anomalies become continuous with the psychosis; both are based on the habitual way in which the patient reacts to his inner conflicts and outer adversities. Sexual conflicts, often unconscious, usually are operative. Homosexual tendencies, normal at certain ages and stages of development, either reawakened or never fully relinquished and unconsciously craving expression, are perhaps basic. Freud's description of this mechanism is that the man cannot admit to conscious recognition the existence of his unconscious "I love him"; to be admissible he could only say "I hate him," but this does not solve the conflict. Eventually, the unconscious thought is projected and finally enters consciousness—as a subjectively valid interpretation of environmenal happenings—in the distorted form "he hates me," to which later is added "he persecutes me." It is then but one further ruminative step to the patient's conscious belief that he is important else he would not thus be singled out for attention. Grandiosity begins. (Grandiose and persecutory ideas almost always go hand in hand.) Perhaps the more rigid the personality and therefore the less possible the recognition that conflicts exist in any part of the psyche, the nearer the symptoms will approach those of classic paranoia. Conversely, the nearer the conflicts come to conscious recognition, and hence more dangerous to the ego, the nearer will the symptoms approach those of schizophrenia. (Sometimes an individual's intellectual and emotional acceptance of and coming to terms with his homosexuality may prevent—with proper psychotherapy—a schizophrenic dissolution of personality.) In a woman, conscience-dictated frustrations of heterosexual urges may cause discontent, tension, and a general sense of dissatisfaction to such an extent that regression takes place and homosexual conflicts are awakened. She may either believe she is persecuted by women or, working out her conflict on a heterosexual plane, by men; or else that some important man—perhaps her physician—loves her and their union is being prevented only by her enemies.

Symptoms

The history may reveal that as a child the patient was especially needful of appreciation; was moody, resentful of school and parental discipline; was unable to form good play adjustments, and perhaps suspicious. A compensatory striving toward superiority may have resulted. In the growing-up stage, the rigidity and tendency toward pride may have increased, as well as the patient's inherent sensitiveness to the attitude of others toward him. Before the psychosis becomes manifest, prodromal symptoms sometimes occur. Perhaps numerous situations have caused the patient to react with wounded and bitter pride. He analyzes his moods and sensations, may become hypochondriacal, is more reserved, and withdraws from attempts to discuss his problems. He displays sullen quietness, behind which lurks haughty disdain. Periods of moody dreaminess occur. Suddenly or gradually the conception may be born that his failures have been due to the enmity of others. Now he sees new and hidden significance in commonplace events: people deliberately slight him; his situation is endangered; he experiences vague fears and becomes increasingly resentful. All suspicions are vigorously defended. Hallucinations may or may not occur; however, either through hallucinations or ideation, he comes to feel important. Perhaps now he assumes the caricatured mien of the individual he thinks himself to be. The exalted paranoic may believe himself a chosen one of God—perhaps a reincarnation of Christ. He may develop a humble air, grow a beard, exhibit idiosyncrasies in closing, and picture himself as tolerant and understanding. He believes he would be serene were he not constantly molested. Effect determines his logic. He reinterprets past events through retrospective falsification and these falsifications consolidate his new evaluations. The litigious type, probably an individual who always had been defensive about his rights, after some legal action having resulted unsatisfactorily, may launch further lawsuits. His drive is to prove himself right and others wrong, rather than the desire for justice he expresses. By these activities sensitive insecurity is protected.

Another patient may believe himself loved by some wealthy or powerful woman. He writes to her; her failure to reply is to test his love. He may see symbols in the sky, or birds may chirp in an unusual fashion to show him he is loved. In other cases, sexual impotence may represent a paranoid defensive pattern; this shields the patient from conscious knowledge of his fundamental conflicts. Or dissatisfactions with self may be projected as the wife's discontent, and thus lead to delusions of her infidelity. Deafness in insecure persons often facilitates paranoid reactions. Their seclusiveness, suspiciousness, and proneness to misinterpret others' actions often are overcompensated by extreme aggressiveness. Folie á deux, a mental disorder in which two intimately associated persons develop the same paranoid ideas, is explained by the responsiveness of the weaker and more submissive to the stronger. Generally the infected individual relinquishes his delusions when separated from the other. Folie á deux is not infrequent between man and wife, but is more frequent between sisters or brothers, or any two individuals with the same background.

The paranoiac usually has superior intellectual endowments, which in fact are necessary for his rationalizations. Excessive use of this mechanism almost is a hallmark of the condition. His prolonged tense and expectant affective state stimulates attention, he sees connections where none actually exist, and at times his concepts are rationalized into an extensive delusional system.

Diagnosis

So-called acute paranoia is discussed under the manic-depressive psychoses (q. v.). In paranoia the ideas are more sustained and are supported by a less changeable affect, in contrast to the usual vacillations in the manic. Since the mental operations are only exaggerations of normal mechanisms, at times it is difficult to differentiate the nonpsychotic paranoiac from the psychotic paranoiac. The patient must be deemed psychotic if the reaction is continuous, if his beliefs cannot be corrected, if they tend to spread, and if they are completely illogical. Classifying these reactions as approximating either the paranoiac or the schizophrenic pole is aided by evaluating the degree of disturbance in the individual's contacts with reality. The more the repressed material comes into consciousness as hallucinations and the more archaic the form of adjustment, the nearer the reaction approaches schizophrenia.

Prognosis

Patients with classic paranoia or those with reactions closely approximating it, probably never recover; however, they may not require hospitalization. The patients' conduct often remains within bounds, society looks upon them as "cranks," they rarely act without reflection, and therefore avoid commitment more often than patients with schizophrenic-like reactions. Remissions may occur in the latter types, but the ultimate prognosis nevertheless is poor.

Treatment

Whether the patient is to remain free in the community is determined by his potential danger to others. If delusions are directed against specific persons, confinement is probably necessary; the greater the expressed hatred the more imperative is commitment. In all dealings with paranoid patients—schizophrenic or otherwise—scrupulous honesty and truthfulness are necessary. Often the patient will follow reasonable suggestions and greatly modify his behavior. The physician may become his one confidant. Despite contrary appearances, the paranoiac and schizophrenic crave love, as they live inwardly in a cold and colorless solitude to which they have withdrawn not through choice but from unconscious motivation. Healthy human companionships have come to appear unattainable and, through fear of their own aggressiveness, dangerous. They withdraw to their citadel only after—to them—endless frustrations. Hence, tolerance on the part of the physician, a philosophic detachment combined with a justified humility, a sense of humor about his own ineptness as well as the patients' peccadillos, discretion, understanding, and warmth, are the tools used to ease the paranoiacs' tensions, to help them achieve calmer environmental adjustments, and to bring some serenity, transient though

it may be, into the lives of these sometimes turbulent and always troubled individuals. Even slight deafness in a paranoid individual should be corrected, if possible; otherwise the use of a hearing aid should be insisted upon. Help in unraveling the family problems or irritating work situations are representative ways by which the physician may be able to aid his patient.

Drugs play only an incidental and not a curative role in managing and treating these patients. Extreme tension may be somewhat allayed with phenobarbital (℞ 2), 30 mg. (gr. ss) 3 times daily, and occasionally a mild hypnotic such as Amytal (℞ 3), 0.1 to 0.3 Gm. (gr. iss to v) at bedtime, may be indicated if the patient suffers from protracted insomnia.

MANIC-DEPRESSIVE PSYCHOSES

The term affectivity means the basal tone of the feeling life, and the manic-depressive psychoses are called affective psychoses because the patient's ideas, actions, and feeling tones are in harmonious agreement. Classically, the disorder is characterized by alternating periods of mania and depression, but some patients exhibit only one phase, which may be either depression or elation. An occasional patient may have only one or two attacks during his lifetime, but periodic recurrences are the rule.

Etiology and Incidence

If the disease is initiated by a manic episode, it most frequently occurs between the ages of 15 and 25; if by a depressive episode, between 25 and 35. Its incidence is greatest among the higher social and professional group, and twice as great in women as in men. An estimated one-third of siblings of patients with the disorder become affected; thus, presumably heredity plays a role. However, factors of environment may be of primary importance, as a child can incorporate his parents' traits through emulation and identification. The psychosis usually occurs in individuals with a "cyclothymic" temperament, which may be described under three subdivisions. The hypomanic is outgoing, vivacious, optimistic, and easily swayed by new impressions. His superficial judgment often leads to failures; for these he has ready excuses. Some hypomanics are hypercritical, domineering, and argumentative. The syntonic is the "normal" cyclothyme. He is genial, sociable, uncomplicated, and a practical realist. He radiates a certain warmth and ease. The melancolic often is quiet, kindly, solemn; but may be gloomy, submissive, and self-depreciatory; his hesitation and indecision betray his feelings of insecurity. He often is preoccupied with his work.

Symptoms and Signs

The manic phase: Excitement is the cardinal symptom. It may be mild (hypomania), acute, or delirious. There is a quickening of the individual's entire tempo, which is reflected in an apparent wealth of mental associations (verbosity), tireless overactivity, and feelings of elation. The patient may be mischievous, playful, and have fleeting delusions of grandeur. Irritability and anger may punctuate his elation when his requests are denied. If "impure" affects are present—as seen in a manic with a paranoid-like reaction—he may be haughty, arrogant, and demanding and become abusive toward those who momentarily annoy him. Close observation reveals that his apparent wealth of ideas actually represents a limited range of associational products, and his wordiness is a flight from, rather than a product of, thinking. He is preoccupied with the phonetics instead of the meanings of words. Everything around him distracts his attention. Since he is not concerned with its ideational content, his talk assumes a character not unlike that of free associations, and thus often affords clues to his unconscious motivation.

The manic's increased psychomotor reactions range from simple overactivity to sustained and frenzied busyness. He may tear his clothing, decorate himself bizarrely, disarrange his room, smear the wall with feces—all without malice. He sings, shouts to any passer-by, makes obscene sexual proposals, is too excited to eat, sleep, or pay attention to any physical illness, mild or serious. Particularly when his excitement is not extreme he may not appear fatigued, yet in other instances these patients rapidly exhaust themselves. Actual hallucinations are rare, but illusions that simulate hallucinations are not uncommon. While these patients usually retain correct orientation, their poorly sustained attention may disturb this. A short mild depression often precedes a manic episode.

The depressive phase: In a considerable number of patients the episodes are confined to depressions, and often these patients' prepsychotic personality has been of the melancholic type. Manic-depressive depressions may be mild, acute, or stuporous. Many mild manic-depressive depressions are not recognized as such. They usually take the form of inertia and staleness or of hypochondriasis. In either case, the patient will be downhearted, and a patient with hypochondriacal complains will consider these the cause rather than the result of his depression. These mildly depressed patients may be fearful, quiet, indecisive and have feelings of inadequacy. If impure affects exist, they may be irritable, sensitive, and morose, or peevish, stubborn, and faultfinding instead of sad. The more severe depressions often begin thus, but profound affective distress rapidly supervenes. This is reflected in a stooped posture and an immobile, or perplexed and troubled, facial expression. The patient sleeps poorly, wakes early, perhaps becomes constipated, and his sexual desires decrease. Because of psychomotor retardation, all physical activity becomes a great exertion. Subjectively, the patient may feel that his usual environment is strange or that a disaster is impending from which he cannot escape, and his outlook becomes hopeless. If the feelings of distress are projected, his ideas become delusional. A complaining, or a suspicious persecutory, paranoid trend may exist; or his thought life may be concerned with hypochondriacal ideas, self-accusations, ideas of guilt, remorse, and self-depreciation. His intense fear may create clouding of consciousness; however, unless a patient's attention is thus impaired by affective distress, orientation is not disturbed. Illusory misinterpretations are common, but hallucinations are infrequent. The psychomotor retardation, alone or augmented by some belief the patient holds—for instance, that he is unworthy of food—may make spoon- or tube-feeding necessary. Suicidal attempts or self-mutilations are not uncommon.

Stupor is the most intense form of these depressions: the patient makes no response to external stimuli, his sensorium is clouded, he is mute, and his face is masklike or wears a fixed expression of anxiety; spontaneous motor activity is slight or absent. A short hypomanic period often terminates the depressive episode.

Diagnosis

The psychosis must be differentiated from schizophrenia, paresis, so-called acute paranoia, and such psychoneurotic states as compulsion neuroses, neurasthenia, and hypochondriasis (q. v.). Paresis may be differentiated by history, neurologic signs, and laboratory tests. Acute paranoia is a misnomer for a hypomania in which exuberance is replaced by anger, resentment, irritability, irascibility, and perhaps delusions and litigious tendencies. Because of the obsessive ideas which a depressed patient may express, a compulsion neurosis sometimes is simulated; the differentiation is made by determining whether the obsessions or the depression came first. The patient's solicitude about his health is continuous and prolonged in neurasthenia. In hypochondriasis, mild symptoms usually will have existed for a considerable time, and the attack does not come on abruptly as in the depressive state.

Prognosis

The prognosis for individual episodes is good and there is no residual "scarring" of the personality. However, the disease may assume a certain chronicity in which the intervals between episodes are brief or nonexistent. The duration of manic-depressive episodes cannot be predicted with certainty, but on the average, manic attacks last 6 months and depressive attacks 9 months. If a first episode is a depression, it may be the last; if it is manic, others are apt to follow. The probability of future attacks varies inversely—to a degree at least—with the age when the disease first appears; if before 20, the prognosis is poor. Recurring episodes may occupy a large portion of some patients' lives; normal periods tend to become shorter as age advances. Chronic mania is uncommon before the age of 40, and the melancholia is more apt to become chronic. Repeated attacks usually leave the mind unchanged in basic functionings, but occasionally a patient may show some impairment of initiative and judgment.

Treatment

Only an occasional patient with manic-depressive psychosis can be cared for at home, and then a psychiatric consultant must be available and psychiatric nurses kept on 24-hour duty. It often is difficult to persuade the family to commit the patient to a hospital, as they do not realize to what extent the defective judgment of these patients constitutes a risk to themselves and others. When relatives are told that electroshock therapy may be indicated, and, if so, that it may put an end to the episode, they may more readily agree to the patient's commitment.

The manic phase: Manic patients want to be constantly occupied and outlets for their energy must be supplied, but not to the point of producing exhaustion. Arguments and contradictions should be avoided and the patient allowed to do as he wishes within safe limits. The patient's distractibility sometimes makes spoon feeding or tube feeding necessary. (See Melancholia.) A high caloric diet is imperative. The treatment of choice for excitement and insomnia is the use of prolonged neutral baths in tubs especially designed for the purpose ("continuous" tubs). These baths may be given for several hours daily, or continuously up to several weeks. Hypnotics are used as little as possible and repeated only when absolutely necessary. The most suitable are paraldehyde, chloral hydrate, and the barbituric-acid derivatives. Chloral hydrate (℞ 4), 2 to 2.6 Gm. (gr. xxx to xl), alone or combined with barbital (℞ 1), 0.3 to 1 Gm. (gr. v to xv), may be used. Paraldehyde (℞ 5) is given in doses of 4 to 12 cc.

If the patient is in good physical condition, and constant nursing attention which is absolutely essential, is available, partial narcosis, prolonged for a period of days, occasionally will terminate a manic episode. Sodium amytal (℞ 6) is the drug usually employed for this purpose, and the treatment is begun by giving 0.2 gm. (gr. iii) by mouth, or rectally, every 3 or 4 hours. The doses are gradually increased during the first 3 or 4 days, until the patient is kept asleep or deeply somnolent for 15 to 20 hours daily. He is kept continuously on his side to prevent aspiration of mouth contents or strangulation, and turned at regular intervals. At least two periods of wakefulness are allowed each day for feeding and nursing care. The physician sees the patient during each of these

periods. Pulse, blood pressure, and temperature are periodically determined; cyanosis is watched for, and the narcosis immediately terminated if any untoward signs or symptoms develop. If its course is uneventful, the narcosis sometimes is continued for 10 days, after which the dose of sodium amytal is gradually decreased over a period of 3 or 4 days. The effectiveness of this therapy is thought to depend on a partial dissolution of psychotic resistance to psychotherapeutic leverage. The psychotherapy used at this stage is entirely supportive. The constancy of the nurse's attentions and regularity of the physician's visits have supportive value. No interpretive psychotherapy is attempted at this time. After the patient has recovered from the episode, psychotherapy by an expert may decrease the probability of recurrence, but this is at best uncertain.

The depressive phase: General care is the same as for involutional melancholia (q. v.). Electroshock convulsions, 8 to 10, will terminate many of these depressions, but since this is a recurrent disease and because of the amnesic features associated with the therapy, experienced judgment is required to decide to what extent and with which patients it is to be used.

In managing mildly depressed patients, an organized program which fills the day is desirable. None of the activities should be strenuous or exhausting. Repetitive, and what the patient may consider as mildly degrading occupations—such as sorting and counting various types in a keg of mixed nails, or weeding a lawn—may arouse resentment against the environment, and thus deflect the patient's aggression away from himself. Also, the patient may respond better to an attitude of cool kindness than to a warmly sympathetic approach. As the depression recedes, the danger of suicide increases, since there is less psychomotor retardation and the patient has more energy to carry it out. This fact (which relatives find difficult to understand) calls for doubled precautions during convalescence. Indecision is characteristic of all depressions, and is a cardinal symptom in some of the milder cases; therefore, the patient should not be required to make decisions until he has fully recovered, and in many cases should not resume his usual business occupation for weeks or months thereafter. At least in the psychotic depressions, the use of stimulative drugs such as amphetamine is of questionable value and in some instances may be harmful.

INVOLUTIONAL PSYCHOSES

Whether involutional psychoses are related to manic-depressive psychoses is debatable, but for practical purposes considering them as separate entities is justifiable. They generally occur after the age of 40: In women most often in the late forties and in men in the late fifties. At these ages the woman's child-bearing potential, the symbolized source and end of energy and womanliness, is failing; and the man's physical and mental vigor, and hence the symbolized ability to coerce fate, is waning. In this psychosis, the patient's anxiety is tremendous and is accompanied by agitation, hypochondriacal and nihilistic ideas, delusions, and hallucinations. The psychodynamics probably are similar to those outlined under the manic-depressive depressions (q. v.), but with an involutional psychosis fearsome delusions are more frequent, and lacking are the manic-depressive's psychomotor retardation and history of earlier attacks of mania or depression.

Etiology

The patient often will have exhibited such premorbid traits as intolerance, stubbornness, penuriousness, oversensitivity; a tendency to self-punishment as manifested by avoidance of pleasure, a rigid moral code for himself and others, and overconscientiousness. Worrying, fretfulness, apprehension, and compulsive meticulousness may have further reflected his insecurity. At the age when the psychosis occurs a sense of frustration is perhaps usual. The time may appear to have passed when earlier errors can be repaired and when unfulfilled ambitions can be achieved. Hence, old conflicts often become stronger and threaten the ego with their accompanying anxiety. This ceaseless anxiety may bring the patient to a preoccupation with thoughts of death. In some but not all instances the psychosis is precipitated by loss of position, the death of an individual upon whom the person was dependent, or breaking up of the home.

Symptoms and Signs

Insidious changes in attitude and behavior may precede the manifest psychosis by weeks or months. Spells of weeping, disinclination for effort, pessimism, peevishness, irritability, and insomnia are common prodromal symptoms. This drastic variation from his accustomed effects is recognized by the patient, and he perhaps states that he is beginning to lose his mind. When the manifest psychosis begins, depression, anxiety, and agitation are seen, and delusions of sin, unworthiness, and impending death occupy his mind. Guilt feelings may cause the patient retroactively to interpret some earlier indiscretion as an "unpardonable sin." He perhaps insists that he is to be butchered, or that he is damned and God cannot forgive him. He states that he deserves his fate, yet begs for reassurance, only to refute any that may be offered as illogical and ridiculous. He may rationalize that his inner distress results from organic changes and disease; that his brain has dried up, that his intestines are rotting away, or that he has no stomach. Hallucinations are common; God may talk to him or a deceased parent reprove him. Although the patient's consciousness probably will be clear, the subjective absorption of attention may cause him to appear confused, perplexed, and bewildered. His fear of death, projected in symbolic forms and delusions, possibly accounts for the insomnia. (Characteristically, depressed patients wake up early in the morning.) Food may be refused because the patient believes it is poisoned, or because of nihilistic ideas about the absence of his stomach, or because he thinks himself unworthy. In no other psychosis is suicide so frequently attempted. This may represent an attempt to destroy rejected portions of the personality, and thus put an end to gnawing conflicts and troublesome desires. The patient loses weight, becomes dehydrated, and picks at his skin; his respirations are shallow and his extremities cold and cyanotic. In some cases the psychosis has a distinct paranoid coloring, and these patients often will have shown prepsychotic traits somewhat like those observed in the paranoid psychoses (q. v.).

Diagnosis

In manic-depressive depression, hallucinations are less common, and the apprehension, fear, and ideas of impending destruction are less marked. Also stereotypes (unvarying repetition) of behavior or speech, or other schizophrenic-like symptoms less seldom occur. The latter are more in keeping with involutional melancholia. Patients with arteriosclerotic psychosis who are depressed seldom exhibit the profound, sustained fear seen in the involutional psychotic, and slight loss of memory is usual rather than preoccupation. In the psychoneuroses hallucinations are rare and there are no true delusions. Any fear these patients may have is paroxysmal, although they may exhibit sustained anxiety. In contrast to the psychoneurotic, a patient with melancholia strives more against his sensed danger and as well may display gross misinterpretations of reality relationships.

Prognosis

With the advent of convulsion therapy, recoveries have been enormously increased; 80 to 90 percent of these patients are benefited by electroshock convulsions. Previously about 40 percent recovered, but frequently only after an illness of 2 or 3 years. The prognosis for the paranoid type is less favorable. With the latter, insulin may be indicated if electroshock fails to cure. (See Schizophrenia.)

Treatment

The danger of suicide is too great to permit these patients to be cared for outside a mental hospital. A high caloric diet is essential, and refusal to eat for longer than 24 hours is an indication for tube feedings. (See Diets.) Aspiration pneumonia should be guarded against through careful technic. Paraldehye (℞ 5) in amounts up to 8 to 16 cc. (dr. i to iv) is particularly useful for the insomnia. In aged infirm patients, sedatives must be used with extreme caution. Because these patients are so fearful, all changes in routine should be carefully explained beforehand.

Electroshock therapy: Absolute contraindictions to the use of electroshock therapy are few; they include extreme hypertension, severe anteriosclerosis, cardiac decompensation, coronary disease, intracranial disease, pregnancy, and skeletal deformities. Deaths attributable directly to shock therapy are rare. The occurrence of fractures can be reduced to a negligible point by proper technic. Electroshock treatments should be administered only by a physician well trained in the procedure.

Curare is a helpful adjunct. By reducing muscular spasm, it minimizes skeltal trauma during the convulsions. (The drug is contraindicated in patients with myasthenia gravis, since they are unduly sensitive to it.) A preparation suitable for I. V. injection must be used (℞ 15). The customary dose of standardized curare is 3 mg./17.7 kg. (40 pounds) body wt., but three-fourths of this amount is safer, particularly for the first administration. Oxygen and an intratracheal airway must be at hand, as the larynx may become paralyzed from overcurarization. Overcurarization is treated with neostigmine (℞ 16), 1 cc. subcut. of a 1: 2,000 solution. If it is necessary to repeat the latter, then atropine (℞ 17), 0.4 mg. (gr. 1/150) also is given to lessen any undesirable side effects of the neostigmine. Curare should be allowed sufficient time to take full effect, usually several minutes, before the convulsion is induced.

Shock treatments are given with the patient lying on a firm, smooth, resilient surface, such as a litter with a firm pad. No metal should touch the patient; hairpins, jewelry, and false teeth are removed. After the patient is lying in correct position upon the litter, he is asked to sit up. An ordinary pillow then is placed lengthwise across the litter and against the patient's buttocks; when the patient again lies down, the necessary hyperextension of the spine is effected. Six assistants are needed. Two stand on opposite sides and apply pressure on the patient's shoulders, each with his other hand grasping the wrist of the patient's arm nearest him. The patient's arms then are flexed and held firmly but not immovably against his chest during the convulsion. Another assistant applies downward pressure on the pelvis. Two others hold the patient's legs, with one hand above, and the other below, the knee. The sixth attends to the mouth gag. This may be an applicator thickly padded at one end with gauze, which is placed between the patients molars on one side; or a firm gauze-covered roll of cellulose may be placed in such position that the canines bite on its as the mouth closes during the convulsion. The mouth opens widely when the

convulsion begins, and during this phase the sixth assistant applies upward pressure on the jaw to prevent its dislocation and keeps the gag in position to prevent biting of the tongue or lips when the jaws close.

Before the electrodes are applied, the patient's temple areas are washed with warm soapy water; and an electrolytic-conducting jelly is rubbed on. The amount of current and length of application necessary to produce a convulsion vary; representative figures are 70 to 150 volts; 300 to 1,200 m. a.; 0.1 to 0.5 second. More than one application may be required, but not more than three or four should be attempted on any 1 day. The patient is allowed a few deep breaths between each. Ordinarily, the operator will increase the current, or time, or both, with each subsequent passage of current until the convulsive threshold is reached. Once this is determined, the same settings on the machine usually will be used initially on the next treatment day. Convulsions begin with a tonic stage affecting the extensor muscles, and end—the longer phase of the two—with clonic contractures of the flexors. A convulsion may last for 1½ minutes. When it ends, the patient is kept on his back until he has taken at least one deep respiration. Then he is turned on his side and a pillow is so arranged under his head that free drainage of mucus from his mouth and throat is assured. Massaging and pinching the abdominal muscles may aid in initiating respirations and, if necessary, artificial respiration can be given. An experienced person must stay with the patient until full consciousness returns. Immediately after convulsions, patients may be so overexcited as to require restraints.

Patients develop varying degrees of amnesia if a sufficient number of convulsions are given. This usually is at first an inability to recall familiar names, and it may progress until after recovery the patient may remember few of his psychotic ideas. Severe and lasting impairment of memory may be produced if more than 10 convulsions are administered in a consecutive series. With fewer than 15, usually only a transitory amnesia results. Customarily, electroshock treatments are given one, two, or three times a week. Each patient's schedule should be individualized, taking into account his physical condition and particular needs.

On an average, patients with involutional melancholia recover after six or eight convulsions. After the depression is lifted, most of these patients pass through a 15- or 20-day period of euphoria before they level out.

PRESENILE, ARTERIOSCLEROTIC, AND SENILE PSYCHOSES

Each of these psychoses is a dementia caused by organic changes in the crotical brain cells. Except in the arteriosclerotic psychoses, there is an uninterrupted deterioration of the patient's mental powers, which may begin as a simple inability to make fine ethical discriminations, and increase until almost all mental capacity is lost. The contents of consciousness are reduced both in quantity and quality; impressions are taken in slowly; associations are tar'y or nonexistent; memory is defective; disorientation and confusion may exist; the capacity for integrating past and present experience is lost; and the personality may appear desiccated through lack of its usual affective responses. The presenile psychoses—Alzheimer's disease and Pick's disease—are relatively rare forms of dementia which may occur in the forties, the arteriosclerotic dementias may be seen from 50 upward, while uncomplicated senile dementias seldom appear before the age of 60. Clinically, the senile and arteriosclerotic dementias are often difficult to differentiate, except in the fifties.

PRESENILE PSYCHOSES

Alzheimer's disease

In an individual exhibiting symptoms of dementia during the forties, this disease should be suspected. It is characterized by fairly rapid mental deterioration, memory defects, disorientation, delirium, speech disturbances, restlessness, hallucinations, and apprehensive delusions. The ability to perform purposeful movements may be impaired or lost. The most conspicuous pathologic lesion is the development of tangled thread-like fibrillary structures in the cortical ganglion cells. There also is nerve-cell atrophy and neuroglia proliferation. Dementia becomes pronounced in the later phases of the disease, and spasticity and epileptic-form seizures may occur. The typical atrophic changes usually are visible by means of air encephalography.

Pick's disease

This disease usually occurs between the ages of 45 and 60, and is twice as frequent in women as in men. In most instances dementia is well established within a year, although the memory usually is retained until the disease is far advanced. However, the fundamental dementia is revealed by the patient's inability to utilize the recalled material in forming new concepts. The symptoms arise from a relatively diffuse cortical atrophy, plus circumscribed, localized, bilateral areas of atrophy chiefly in the frontal and temporal lobes. The white matter atrophies early and the loss of ganglion cells is pronounced. The brain may be reduced in weight by 200 to 300 gm. The pupillary and other reflexes and the spinal fluid findings are not disturbed. Some patients with the disease are depressed, irritable, and suspicious, while others are euphoric. Stereotyped purposeless activity is common. A gradual aphasia occurs, but is not accompanied by the spontaneous logorrhea so frequently seen in aphasia due to vascular disease. Echolalia, apraxia, alexia, and agraphia are common. The patient becomes asthenic, requires bed care, is helpless, develops sphincter incontinence, loses all capacity for speech, and dies within 4 to 6 years, usually from some intercurrent infection.

ARTERIOSCLEROTIC PSYCHOSES

Any pronounced personality change in a person over 50, if paresis is excluded, should arouse suspicion of arteriosclerotic phychosis. Characteristic syndromes are produced if the arteriosclerosis is predominant in either the larger basal vessels or the finer arteries supplying the cortex, but any differentiation between these two conditions often is difficult. (After age 60 the picture of senile dementia may be complicated by a concurrent cerebral arteriosclerosis.) Onset on the diffuse small-vessel form often is insidious, and may first be manifested by easy mental fatigability, anxiety, irascibility, decreased initiative, loss of ability to concentrate, and perhaps a tendency to depression. Dizziness, headaches, and other unpleasant cerebral sensations may occur. The capacity for quick and accurate thinking is gradually lost, and the finer sentiments become blunted. The affections may change, and the patient may become obstinate, childish, and willful. Memory impairment, which may at first be only inability to recall a word, becomes general as time passes. Fluctuations are characteristic; memory and general alertness may be particularly bad one day and fairly good the next. Unlike the person with senile dementia, the patient usually is aware of and distressed by his disabilities. As the disease progresses, episodic outbursts of excitability, bewilderment, and confusion may occur, particularly at night. The patient may become meddlesome and quarrelsome; dress may be neglected; defective judgment and decreased inhibitions may result in sexual indiscretions or offenses. Panic states may be seen. Ideas of jealousy and hypochondriasis, as well as delusions of persecution, and sometimes of grandeur, are not uncommon. Speech is laborious and coordination of finer movements impaired.

The first evidence that the larger vessels are sclerosed may be an apoplectic stroke or an aphasic attack. However, there may be premonitory symptoms, such as morning headaches, mental and physical fatigability, vertigo, emotional liability; short periods of confusion, especially at night; fleeting aphasias or apraxias, and momentary loss of power in arm or leg. As the disease develops, the patient often weeps at trifles. The facies become immobile, and coarse muscular tremors sometimes appear. Heart and kidney disease may be associated. Occlusion or rupture of a vessel may cause focal destruction of nervous tissue, with resultant upper motor neurone paralysis and various aphasias, and apraxias. These focal lesions, and especially those causing the serious aphasias, hasten the deterioration and dementia. Epileptiform attacks, either jacksonian or general, may occur and sometimes are the most prominent symptoms. Intercurrent mild infections usually exacerbate the symptoms.

SENILE DEMENTIA

Waning mental capacity sufficient to warrant a diagnosis of a senile dementia seldom appears before the age of 60, and it often is difficult to draw the line between such dementia and the mental state common to old age. An exaggerated tendency to reminisce frequently precedes both the characteristic amnesia for recent happenings and the concurrent recession of ready recall to ever earlier life periods. Recognizing none of this, the patient's personality characteristics are displayed in accentuated form as he attempts to overcome the new frustrations he naturally meets. Egocentricity, irritability, and resentment of any imagined interference by younger persons are common. Various compensations are attempted, exaggerated sexual activity or sexual indecencies may result; there may be ideas of marital infidelity; pride of appearance may be lost. The patient may be distrustful, prying, and suspicious. He may become disoriented and wander about aimlessly, particularly at night. Defective judgment may cause him to disregard traffic hazards, leave gas jets open, and become victimized by unscrupulous persons. Many patients hoard useless articles. Both hallucinations and delusions are common. These symptoms often are accompanied by conspicuous physical signs of senility.

The senile psychoses may be divided into types and certain of these are adequately described by their names: viz, simple deterioration—the most common; delirious and confused; depressed and agitated. The paranoid type is distinguished by delusions of persecution. With this type, orientation usually remains unimpaired and defects of memory may be comparatively insignificant for a long time; as these increase the delusions become more absurd. (See paranoia.) The presbyophrenic type usually occurs in individuals whose prepsychotic personality was characterized by adaptability, vivacious activity, and cheerfulness. This warmth of personality is retained but the patient vacilates between friendliness and irritability. Severe memory defects exist, of which the patient is unaware. Characteristically, these voids are filled by confabulations—fantasies related as realities. These patients are loquacious, restless, and constanly busy in purposeless and sometimes destructive ways. Presbyophrenia is seen somewhat more commonly in women than in men.

Diagnosis

Certain differentiating features have been touched on in the preceding text and will

not be repeated. On grounds of sheer probability, a diagnosis of arteriosclerotic dementia is given preference over that of senile dementia. The depressed and agitated type both of senile and arteriosclerotic dementia occasionally must be differentiated from involutional melancholia and from manic-depressive depression (q. v.). Differentiation is based on the patient's age and evidence of organic mental impairment or beginning vascular disease.

Prognosis

The prognosis in any of these forms of mental disease is uniformly bad. However, an arteriosclerotic psychosis is not always uninterruptedly progressive. Particularly if there is an associated cardiac or renal disease, these patients may have periods of confusion which clear after a few weeks of simple hospital regimen. Subsequently, they may retain considerable, though impaired, mental capacity for several years before either an increasing dementia or a vascular accident produces permanent disability.

Treatment

Patients with a mild form of senile or arteriosclerotic dementia may be cared for at home, but life must be carefully regulated, particularly for the arteriosclerotic. Any condition that causes mental strain must be eliminated, and light pleasant occupations encouraged. Alcohol is contraindicated. For patients subject to arteriosclerotic convulsions, phenobarbital (℞ 2) not exceeding 0.27 gm. (gr. ivss) daily in three equal doses is recommended. During disturbed episodes, other sedatives also are indicated. Paraldehyde (℞ 5) probably is the most useful; it is given in doses of 4 to 16 cc. (dr. 1 to iv), repeated every 4 hours if necessary until the desired degree of sedation is obtained. In the aged, all sedation must be used with caution.

If the patient's judgment becomes defective, it may be necessary to appoint a legal guardian. If the patient talks of or attempts suicide, or shows any other tendencies dangerous to himself or others, he should be hospitalized.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there will be any opposition to this bill. One of the great tragedies of every war is the alarming number of servicemen who are discharged with mental disorders. Especially is this true of World War II, with its widespread use of modern weapons of war, terrifying as they are and so often causing a breakdown in man's capacity to withstand fear and privation.

Everyone who has visited a mental hospital has come away with an intense feeling of pity and a desire to help those who so palpably cannot help themselves.

This bill which is before us today is aimed to help such veterans. Many of them are entirely incapable of helping themselves, and their families, in most instances, either cannot assist them or else they are reluctant to admit that the veteran son is a mental case. This latter fact has made it very difficult for many of these veterans to service-connect their claims. The close relatives have been so reluctant to bring the veteran for treatment by a psychiatrist or a competent doctor, and the necessary proof of continuous treatment from date of discharge is all too often lacking.

This fact was recognized last year when compensation laws were liberalized to make 1 year the presumptive period. When that law was passed the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs felt that 1 year was altogether too short a period of time for presumption. When the bill passed the House of Representatives it called for a 3-year presumptive period, but the Senate at that time cut the period to 1 year. It was so late in the session that it was a case of accepting the 1-year period or getting nothing at all. But the need for a longer period is just as pressing today as it was then and if we pass this bill today I feel that we can prevail upon the other body to go along with us.

Of course, the question will be asked—as it always is whenever veterans' legislation is before us—of how much this measure will cost. The Veterans' Administration says it cannot estimate the cost, but that it will be considerable. I am not so sure of that, either. However, no matter what it might cost it is a duty and obligation we owe to those men who through no fault of their own are in a pitiable condition today. After World War I we heard a great deal about shell shock. You will recall that there were many, many cases so designated. You seldom if ever hear the term used today. Now it is psychosis, and this term is divided into many different categories. Just the same, it is the old shell shock caused by abnormal mental strain under the most terrifying and terrible conditions of war. It takes a man of very stable mental constitution to stand up under battle conditions as they exist today. Talk to the boys in the veterans' hospitals who have returned from the awful conflict in Korea. Look at their eyes, observe their actions, and note the way their nerves respond and react to situations that would not bother you and me. It takes a long, long time to mend disordered brains. It is undoubtedly the most trying and difficult task that faces the medical profession. That is the reason our neuropsychiatric hospitals are full to overrunning with veterans today. The healing process is so slow and the individual study and treatment of each particular case is so necessary to convalescence that our hospitals and their staffs are hard put to meet the situation.

I do not see how anyone can justify opposition to this bill. You give a 3-year presumptive period for active pulmonary tuberculosis and provide a 2-year period for multiple sclerosis. The bill is protected by the customary 90-day service requirement, as well as the misconduct rule.

I also would say, Mr. Speaker, that in the past year there have been a number of suicides and many murders because these men were not in hospitals. I, personally, Mr. Speaker, have helped secure the hospitalization of certain cases because they were considered dangerous to the community.

Insofar as the cost is concerned, Mr. Speaker, let me point out the fact that these veterans in time will be taken care of somewhere; they will be taken care of in State institutions if there be beds for them, but there is overcrowding in every State institution in the country. Nevertheless they will be taken care of somewhere sooner or later.

I hope the bill will pass, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein the statement on psychosis that appears in the House report. I think it will probably exceed the limit of two pages, but I ask unanimous consent that it be included, regardless of that fact.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 5891?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

TAX LIMITATION, OUR ONLY FISCAL SALVATION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, today is the 17th of March. Traditionally, it is a day of light-hearted gaiety, of fun and frolic and happiness. It is St. Patrick's Day. But alas, this 17th of March in 1952 is not a day of rejoicing. It is a day of sackcloth and ashes, of gloom and unhappiness, of belt tightening and empty purses, of wolf-at-the-door privation. It is income-tax day.

In the past week or two, hundreds of thousands of American families have been dismayed and depressed to see their meager bank accounts—carefully laid aside for a rainy day—wiped out by a confiscatory income tax. Millions of Americans have suddenly been brought face to face with the full impact of the tax bill which this Congress adopted last fall in answer to the administration's extravagant demands for more money to spend, more money to waste. And millions of American taxpayers became bitter, resentful, and angry as they made final payments to the Treasury on their 1951 income, and now look forward to still heavier taxes they will have to pay in 1952. Today the sinister prophecy of more than 100 years ago is coming true.

Mr. Speaker, why is the Federal Government spending so much money today? The President, Dean Acheson, and the other Cabinet officers say it is to preserve us from the ruthless advance of communism, to protect us from the Socialist system of poverty-stricken society which was devised by the evil mind of Karl Marx, which today threatens the prosperity and well-being of free America.

But how can a slave state threaten the existence of a free state? How can a doctrine so foreign to our well-established and well-proved concepts of liberty and justice prevail in the face of full employment, tremendous production, the highest standard of living the world has ever known, and a national income that exceeds—either in total or

per capita—any figure that any nation on earth has ever seen before?

The answer, of course, is found in the words and prophecies of Karl Marx.

In the Communist Manifesto of 1848 Karl Marx laid down his formula for the destruction of the capitalist system and the substitution of communism. Two points of the Marx formula are of especial concern to us on this 17th day of March in the year 1952. First, that all estates should be confiscated by the state so that the state, the commune, would eventually become sole owner of all land, buildings, factories, and business enterprises. Second, a graduated net income tax should be promoted because such a tax, however modest its beginning, would grow progressively to the point of confiscation, whereupon private property, private capital, private initiative, as we know them, would cease to exist.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way along the road that Karl Marx laid out for us. True, we have not quite reached the point of 100 percent confiscation of inheritances; however, left-wing bureaucrats are constantly urging the Congress to grab more and more of the property that changes hands by gift or by death. But in our income tax today we are closely approaching expropriation of both individual incomes and corporate earnings to pay for budgetary excesses in both civil and military affairs and in foreign benevolences. If we do not put a stop to these budgetary excesses, they are bound to result in national bankruptcy.

Not only are we completing the vicious circle of ruin that was predicted a century ago by Karl Marx, but we are also fulfilling the infamous destiny that was forecast for us in 1924 by Marx's leading disciple, Nicolai Lenin, when he said:

> Some day we shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction.

Mr. Speaker, we are already spending ourselves into destruction and oblivion. Our Government offices have been invaded by wastrels, rascals, and thieves. Our economy is being guided—God save the mark—by leftists, dreamers, and potential scoundrels. Today it is entirely possible, as has recently been unpleasantly revealed, for a knave to bribe his way out of paying the tax bill that he owes. And in the disorganized Pentagon today it is the general custom—not the exception—for taxpayers' money to be squandered in outrageous purchases, and in such appalling variance of contract prices, as would bankrupt any business corporation. Bureaucrats casually shrug off the loss of a million dollars here, two million dollars there, five million somewhere else, as if money grew on trees or bushes. The unsound fiscal policies of the present Administration have fed the fires of inflation, shrunk the value of the dollar, cut in half every individual's savings, and destroyed every citizen's future personal security. And the billions we are pouring down the ratholes of Europe provide little or no assurance that we shall be able to count on European support in our day of need.

Mr. Speaker, the process of hauling ourselves back to solvency will be no easy task, but it can be done. On this unhappy income-tax day we of the Congress should assure the people—the taxpayers—that we are not unmindful of their problems and their distress. We should pledge them two things: First, that the administration's outrageous budget shall be cut to the very bone; and, second, that income taxes from now on will be limited by a constitutional amendment to a figure that will no longer threaten bankruptcy to every family in the land.

Specific recommendations for reduction of the preposterous $85,500,000,000 budget have been made by various members of both parties in the Congress. Piddling cuts have been voted in a couple of appropriations; but until the full weight of a determined majority in the Congress effectively throws up a road block to halt the spenders, we shall continue to create—and pay for—more bureaus, more agencies, more Government control, more socialism and less freedom. We should heed the words President Lincoln uttered a century ago, and I quote:

> You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by discouraging the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

And, we might well add today—you cannot make a nation strong or mighty by impoverishing her people through excessive taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that Government economy must be the first great step toward relief for taxpayers. But the second great step should follow close on the heels of the first; namely, the imposition of a tax ceiling beyond which the Government may not constitutionally go. The need for such a tax ceiling has long been recognized by economists. It is only recently—as we have approached this unhappy income-tax day—that the people of America have come to realize that something must be done soon or they perish.

The excessive and oppressive Federal tax burden of recent years has brought about a tax rebellion that is today sweeping the Nation. It is a peaceful rebellion so far, but a grim and determined one just the same. Excessively high tax rates are drying up the streams of investment capital. Industrial expansion, the creation of more jobs, and the production of more goods are being curtailed and American industry is now being forced to go to the Government with cap in hand to beg for the risk capital needed for expansion. This eventually means Government ownership, Government supervision, and Government control—and that is socialism, just what England has today.

The experience of England should be a warning to us. England's heavy graduated income tax and her confiscatory inheritance taxes finally forced her into Government ownership and socialism. We are traveling down the selfsame road. No wonder our people say, "Something must be done. It is time to call a halt." No wonder every Congressman's mail reflects the tax rebellion now going on in every congressional district in the Nation.

What I have said about the attitude of the American taxpayer is not guesswork on my part, Mr. Speaker. It is based upon a scientific survey made over a period of more than a year. Periodically, since last year when the President demanded a $16,000,000,000 increase in income taxes, a Nation-wide group of taxpayers has been asked, "Should taxes be increased at this time?" In January of 1951, when the tax rate was at the reasonably low level that had been established by a Republican Congress, 42 percent answered the question by saying "No. We are already paying as much as the traffic will bear." Two months later, while the 1951 tax bill was under consideration in the Ways and Means Committee, the percentage opposed to any tax increase had risen to 60 percent. Last August, when the Senate was rewriting the tax bill and reducing somewhat the increase that the House had voted, 76 percent of our taxpayers said, "No, we cannot stand any further increase in tax rates." And just recently, after the President in his January message asked Congress to find another $5,000,000,000 of new revenue, 83 percent of our taxpayers—83 percent, mind you—stated emphatically that taxes should not be raised again; that they were now paying more than they could afford to pay and still live decently, and that the time had come to call a halt.

This is the greatest and most rapid change in public opinion that has ever been registered on any matter of national import—from 42 percent to 83 percent in 1 year's time. Yet Mr. Leon Keyserling, the Chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers, has recently expressed the complacent and politically unsympathetic opinion that a fourth increase in taxes would be entirely in order. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, how far do Mr. Truman, Mr. Keyserling, Mr. Snyder, and the rest of the administration spenders think they can push the American people before they create open revolt against their unwise tax policies?

In each of the past three Congresses I have introduced a House joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances, and gifts. House Joint Resolution 268, introduced by me on June 12, 1951, is now before the Congress awaiting action. It calls for the orthodox method of amending the Constitution. It differs from plans which seek to initiate a constitutional convention by the demand of two-thirds of the States. However, I can well understand why many of the States are aroused and now urge a Federal tax ceiling, because the Federal Government today takes four-fifths of every collected tax dollar, leaving the State and local governments in the difficult position of trying to support themselves on the remaining one-fifth. Twenty years ago the reverse was true.

The Federal Government got along on one-fifth of the tax dollar, leaving four-fifths for the State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, a constitutional convention is a risky experiment, for its machinery might easily be seized by subversives and its purposes perverted to objectives entirely at variance with those originally intended. I say, let the Congress act first—in the orthodox manner—pass the necessary limiting resolution, and then submit it to the States for ratification. Surely there are enough of us who recognize the necessity of giving immediate relief to the overburdened taxpayer. If the Congress acts first, then—in an orderly fashion—the amendment to the Constitution can be approved by the States and put into effect.

For many years our most profound students of economics and fiscal policy have advocated moderation in taxation, and have warned against giving too much power to the Federal Government. As long ago as 1910, Mr. Richard E. Byrd, then speaker of Virginia's House of Delegates, and father of Senator HARRY BYRD, said:

By approving this proposal—

The income tax amendment—

the State actually invites the Federal Government to invade its territory, to oust its jurisdiction, and to establish a Federal dominion within the innermost citadel of the reserved rights of the Commonwealth. * * * An army of Federal inspectors, spies, and detectives will descend upon the State. They will compel men of business to show their books and to disclose the secrets of their affairs. * * * On the one hand, the inspector can blackmail the taxpayer, and on the other, he can profit by selling his secret to his competitor. Who of us who have had knowledge of the doings of Federal officials in the internal revenue service can be blind to what will follow?

Prophetic words, those, Mr. Speaker, words which, in the light of recently exposed corruption in the Internal Revenue Bureau, might well have been uttered last week instead of 40 years ago.

Nor was Senator BYRD's father the only man to see the inherent dangers of the progressive net income tax. Another great Virginian, Senator Carter Glass, wrote into his party's 1920 national platform these words:

We advocate tax reform and a searching revision of the war-revenue acts to fit peace conditions, so that the wealth of the Nation may not be withdrawn from productive enterprises and diverted to wasteful or nonproductive expenditures.

Later, Senator Glass added:

In my report as Secretary of the Treasury, I specifically advocated the reduction of the maximum tax, and, indeed, of all the taxes of the upper brackets of the surtax, and laid down the principle * * * that the maximum surtax could easily be placed at a figure which would actually deprive the Government itself of revenue. * * *

This Government has no right—

The Senator went on to say—

to levy taxes for any purpose other than required by the Constitution for services economically rendered at cost. Beyond that it is public larceny.

Again, these are prophetic words—as we now realize. Our tax system of today is public larceny and nothing else. It does not even pretend to limit its expenditures to the purposes required by the Constitution—and you have only to read the testimony of civil and military witnesses before our various congressional committees to know that there is today no such thing as "services economically rendered at cost." In fact, in the gobbledygook of Truman Washington, the simple words "services economically rendered at cost" are entirely forgotten; they have been completely erased from the New Deal vocabulary.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you another pertinent quotation—from a man who was recognized, even by the political opposition, as greatest among all Secretaries of the Treasury, Mr. Andrew Mellon. In his book, Taxation, the People's Business, published in 1924, Secretary Mellon said:

It is the opinion of some authorities on taxation that this figure—

Where investment will convert from tax-exempt to taxable securities—

is below 15 percent. None of them place it as high as 25 percent. It is not too much to hope that some day we may get back on a tax basis of 10 percent, the old Hebrew tithe, which was always considered a fairly heavy tax.

If the matter were not so vitally serious to every wage earner in the land, we could split our sides laughing over the simple-minded guilelessness of a Secretary of the Treasury who could see no reason why the income tax should be higher than 10 percent. But we must remember Mr. Mellon held office in a day when the national budget was $6,000,000,000 instead of $85,500,000,000; when receipts exceeded expenditures instead of being 10 to 15 billion dollars short; when there was honesty in the Internal Revenue Bureau and in the Department of Justice. That was before big tax dodgers could avoid payment of their taxes by knowing the right people, by gifts of mink coats, by tips on the races, or by the pretense of illness. Unhappily, that day is gone. Today we have in Government none of the fine old conservative financial geniuses who used to keep the ship of state on an even keel by handling its money matters as carefully as they handled their own.

Mr. Speaker, taxes must come down. I repeat: Taxes must come down. And since no one seems to have the moral courage to bring them down by normal means, we must adopt a constitutional amendment to do the job. Do not tell me that it cannot be done. It can be done and it must be done—in spite of the arguments of big and little bureaucrats; in spite of recent hand-wringing protestations of the O'Mahoney committee and the Patman committee to whom it is evidently much more important that present-day bureaucrats keep their fore feet in the public trough than to have the future solvency of the United States protected and preserved. Their puny arguments, which I imagine few of you have bothered to read, are so easily shot full of holes that I shall not even take the time to answer them.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed constitutional tax limitation is not—as some have tried to argue—a rich man's tax relief program. On the contrary, it will help the little-income folks—the wage earners, the small-salaried people, the pensioners, and others of limited means who today are paying more than one-third of their incomes to support the administration's grandiose spending schemes, its impossible and impractical attempts to support the world. One-third of one's income is altogether too heavy a Federal tax for people with an income of $5,000 or less to bear.

My bill proposes to establish 25 percent as the top limit of income tax except in time of war. That, of course, is merely a tentative figure, never intended to be final, advanced to establish the principle of a tax ceiling. In operation the tax could be graduated—a low rate for low-bracket incomes, a higher rate for middle-bracket incomes, and the top rate for top-bracket individual incomes and for corporations, but never approaching the confiscatory tax rates that exist today and threaten to be even more tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, as a specific proposal—to study, to consider, to ponder over, and to amend—I offer the following personal income tax schedule as a basis or starting point:

Upon all taxable incomes of $0 to $2,000 a tax of 15 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between $2,000 and $4,000 a tax of 20 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between $4,000 and $6,000 a tax of 25 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between $6,000 and $10,000 a tax of 30 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between $10,000 and $20,000 a tax of 35 percent.

Upon all taxable incomes between $20,000 and over, a tax of 40 percent.

Such a personal income tax schedule would result in an immediate loss to the Treasury of $8,500,000,000, $6,500,000,000 of which would be tax relief for the taxpayers in the first two brackets—"the little fellows."

Along with this personal income tax schedule should go a 40-percent tax rate upon corporation income, made up of a 25-percent rate upon all corporation incomes, with a 15-percent surtax upon all corporation incomes over $25,000. This would also result in an immediate loss to the Treasury of $8,500,000,000.

The question immediately arises, "Can the Treasury stand an immediate total loss of $17,000,000,000?" Judging the future by the past—and that is the only way we can judge it—the answer to our question is an emphatic "Yes." That would still leave $54,000,000,000 Treasury receipts to operate the Federal Government, out of the estimated $71,000,000,000 tax expectation.

The excessively high tax rates of World War I were reduced four separate times under the urging of Andrew Mellon, and each time the business expansion that took place as a result of the tax reduction so broadened the tax base that more dollars actually flowed into the Treasury after the tax reduction than before.

Again, in 1945, the Congress passed the Doughton tax-reduction bill, reduc-

ing the high war taxes between six and seven billion dollars. This was done in the face of a Federal deficit for that year of $21,000,000,000. What was the result? A tremendous business expansion happened almost overnight. Five million new jobs were created; the national-production index jumped 15 points; and the Treasury receipts jumped to an all-time high, ending the fiscal year of 1948 with an actual Treasury surplus of $8,400,000,000. Therefore, judging the future by the past, we state very emphatically and confidently that tax limitation, the adoption of a tax ceiling, with the resultant tax relief, will pay off in the long run. It will be good business. Also, in my opinion, it is the only fiscal salvation in sight today for the American people.

Only last week a group of State and local officials—governors, mayors, and county officials—came to Washington to protest the growing tendency of the Federal Government to hog all the tax receipts, forcing them to get along with the leavings. My mail—and yours too—expresses the dissatisfaction and resentment of our people over our present-day excessively heavy taxes. These are straws in the wind. They should indicate to this Congress that our spendthrift, profligate days are over, that we must provide tax reform and tax relief, and do it immediately.

For the foregoing reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass a tax-limitation resolution without delay. If we want to head off financial chaos, national bankruptcy, repudiation, and dictatorship, we must act, and act now.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 45 minutes.

COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY IN ART THREATENS AMERICAN MUSEUMS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, four times during 1949 I addressed this House on the subject of Communist infiltration in one of the greatest fields of American culture—that of art. I received, and am continuing to receive, an overwhelming response from artists from coast to coast asking that I further expose the throttling dictatorship of this Red cultural monopoly. Data and information sent me from all sections of the country fit together into a graphic picture of communism, clothed in cultural immunity, working subtly to maintain and enlarge its hold on and control of art in the United States. I propose to expose Red infiltration and control in certain artists' organizations. I further will show that many great museums are being used by these organizations, and that the critical appraisal of art by some papers and magazines often aids this Marxist cultural conspiracy.

ATTEMPT TO CAPTURE UNESCO

On March 25, 1949, I brought to the attention of the House an organization called Artists Equity Association, in whose lists may be found practically all of the notorious Red artists in the country. I propose to show that Artists Equity Association is the latest link in a chain of Red-instigated artists' organizations designed to control art and artists of this Republic.

It is astounding to find that this left-wing artists' organization is ready to dominate the Visual Arts Panel of the United States National Committee of UNESCO with 6 of its 18 panel members, all connected with the above Artists Equity Association. They are: Hudson D. Walker, director of AEA, Russell M. Cowles, Stanley Hayter, Abraham Rattner, William Zorach, and Theodore Brensen, the chairman of Artists Equity's committee of international cultural relations.

The United States is going to participate in the UNESCO International Conference in September of this year and the president of AEA, Henry Billings, radical left-wing artist, has been made a member of the UNESCO Advisory Committee.

Is it not time that the State Department ceased in its attempts to promote communistic art that is distorted, perverted, and actually the sabotage weapon of international communism?

ART MUSEUMS ARE CATS'-PAWS OF REDS

Our great museums have been infiltrated by this same cultural fifth column. Here in Washington at the Corcoran Gallery, in its sixth annual area exhibition in January of this year, the sole juror or judge of painting was Philip Evergood, an editor of Masses and Mainstream, the Communist organ on culture. He was a teacher at the Jefferson School of Social Science in New York, cited by Attorney General Tom Clark as "an adjunct of the Communist Party."

The sculptors of this district fared no better. They had as sole juror Chaim Gross, known in leftist circles as "Brother Chaim" Gross, a member of the Communist International Workers Order, the Red insurance company ordered dissolved by the State of New York.

This is not an isolated case. It is a general condition. At a time when our Nation needs positive artistic expressions of true American ideals and aims, we are flooded with a horde of determined leftists parading as artists who are in fact cultural saboteurs.

ART FOR REVOLUTION PLANNED IN MOSCOW

Let us trace the sinister history of a conspiracy formed in and directed from Soviet Russia to use art as a weapon in the power-lust drive of international communism. The history of this cultural conspiracy, conceived in Moscow and carried out here in the United States, should be known to all Americans who are anxious to preserve our heritage of freedom.

The sabotaging of American art is the direct outcome of the conference at Kharkov, Russia, in 1930. I quote from the magazine Modern Monthly:

> In November 1930 * * * a solemnly enthusiastic congress of artists and authors, predominantly young and representing 22 countries * * * met in Kharkov and resolved upon the world-wide mass organization of art and literature as weapons of the working class in their struggle for power.

William Gropper, Communist artist, was present; and he has continued to be present in the series of art organizations set up in America as a sequel to this first get-together of the pen and brush phalanx of the Communist conspiracy.

According to the Daily Worker of December 6, 1930, the American delegates were instructed to form a national organization of revolutionary writers and artists upon their return to the United States. Obedient to the Soviet command, they formed the Workers Cultural Federation with Lenin's widow, Madame Krupskaya, Maxim Gorki, Henry Barbusse, William Z. Foster, Upton Sinclair, John Dos Passos, and Theodore Dreiser as members of the honorary presidium. It announced its appearance on the American scene in June of 1931. William Gropper, Potamkin, Alexander Trachtenberg, head of Soviet publishing house in the United States, who has just been arrested for conspiracy by this Government, and R. B. Glassford and Michael Gold were on the presidium. Twenty-two years ago, William Gropper became an organizer and teacher in the John Reed Club.

Regarding this Communist organization, important step in the design of Red control of art in our country, I quote from the report of Walter Steele, of the National Republic, before a Special Committee of the House Un-American Activities:

> The John Reed Club is a revolutionary organization of artists and writers in the United States. It was organized by the Communists in memory of the American Bolshevik, John Reed, who was deported to Russia and died there. His remains were placed beside those of Lenin in Moscow. * * * All of the John Reed Club leaders are engaged in revolutionary activities either in propaganda and agitation, or in organizational work.

Among the many hundreds of John Reed Club artists and writers, I find Diego Rivera, Mitchell Siporin, Ben Shahn, Meyer Shapiro, Lewis Mumford, Raphael Soyer, Louis Ribak, Anton Refregier, John Howard Lawson, Louis Lozowick, and Walter Quirt.

CLEARING HOUSE IN RED DRIVE

During this period, the Red artists and writers of all countries used the Soviet International of Revolutionary Writers as their base. This was their clearing house where a comprehensive Marxist analysis of the cultural life of all nations was tabulated and used to further the advancement of Stalin's aim—"the establishment of world socialism."

To Moscow went reports of the doings of Ozenfant, Leger, Louis Aragon, Andre Breton, Paul Eluard, Elie Faure, Paul Signac, Waldo Frank, George Grosz, William Gropper, and scores of other individuals from all countries and of varying degrees of usefulness to the ambitions of Soviet power. So abject and loyal to the Communist International was one of

the 54 founders of Artists Equity Association that in 1932 he reported back to Moscow in these words:

In reply to your cable received requesting me to report on my activities and action in fighting the imperial war, allow me to state in short as follows: (1) Enclosed are just a few of the many cartoons on the subject which have been published in the Morning Freiheit, the Jewish party paper, and one of the largest circulation. I have also drawn cartoons for other publications such as the New Masses. (2) I have held exhibitions of cartoons, drawings, and painting on the imperialist war and the defense of Soviet Union throughout the west coast of the United States of America like Berkeley, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and in galleries in New York City. (3) At present, I am at work on a mural painting to be exhibited in the Museum of Modern Art which thousands of people visit weekly and I shall register my protest by exposing the war plot against the Soviet Union in this painting. (4) I am also organizing, through the bureau of the John Reed Club, a counter exhibition to the exhibition of the Modern Museum, to be held in the galleries of the John Reed Club by its members. The artist group of the John Reed Club have also been active in painting posters and streamers for demonstrations. * * *

With revolutionary greetings,

WILLIAM GROPPER.

Such intellectual and cultural sabotage provides a fundamental weapon in talent and material for the Red propaganda attack on American institutions.

USE OF ART AND LITERATURE IN REVOLUTION DRIVE

In 1935, Earl Browder, general secretary of the Communist Party, and Lewis Mumford, John Reed Club organizer now fancied in certain circles as an aesthetic philosopher, took part in the next sinister act of the Moscow-directed plot to gain control of art and literature in the United States. This was the formation of the League of American Writers as a section of the International Union of Revolutionary Artists and Writers with headquarters in Moscow, and in the following year the formation of its other affiliate, the American Artists Congress.

ART AND BOOK CRITICS ORGANIZED

The writers and critics of the League of American Writers issued a "call" in 1935, and I read from that "call":

The capitalist system crumbles so rapidly before our eyes that, where as 10 years ago scarcely more than a handful of writers were sufficiently foresighted and courageous to take a stand for proletarian revolution, today hundreds of poets, novelists, dramatists, critics, and short-story writers recognize the necessity of personally helping to accelerate the destruction of capitalism, and the establishment of a workers government. * * * We propose that a congress of American revolutionary writers be held in New York City on April 26, 27, 28, 1935. * * * It will provide technical discussion of the literary applications of Marxist philosophy and of the relations between critic and creator. * * * We believe such a congress should create the League of American Writers, affiliated with the International Union of Revolutionary Writers.

Among the scores of so-called American writers who participated in this congress, labeled "subversive and Communist" by Attorney General Tom Clark, are Robert Coates, critic; Lewis Mumford, Waldo Frank, Lincoln Kirstein, Earl Browder, Michael Gold, Van Wyck Brooks, Agnes Smedley, Langston Hughes, Louis Lozowick, John Howard Lawson, and Alexander Trachtenberg.

My purpose in spotlighting this writers' congress is to emphasize again the Soviet-directed union of Red writer and artist that has done so much in establishing and inflating, in the public mind, the left-wing fakers as artists and by so doing badly damaged the standard of art, artists, and art teaching in this country.

ART CONGRESS, AFFILIATE OF INTERNATIONAL

Now I come to the sister congress, the American Artists Congress of 1936, the other affiliate of the Soviet International of Revolutionary Writers listed by our Government as Communist created and controlled. The initiators of this congress were George Ault, Arnold Blanch, Henry Billings, Peter Blume, Maurice Becker, Nicolai Cikovsky, Aaron Douglas, Stuart Davis, Adolph Dehn, William Gropper, Hugo Gellert, Harry Gottlieb, Minna Harkavy, Ishigaki, Jerome Klein, Louis Lozowick, the late Jan Matulka, Saul Schary, William Siegel, Niles Spencer, Harry Sternberg, and Moses Soyer. Most of these individuals knew each other in the John Reed Club. Maurice Becker was a founder of the Communist publication, New Masses, and Dehn, Gellert, Lozowick, Gropper, and Soyer were on its staff; Moses Soyer was art critic of the New Masses.

REDS ISSUE CALL FOR ART CONGRESS

The opening address was made by Lewis Mumford. His greeting to the artists was, I quote:

Friends, comrades, ladies, and gentlemen: Herewith we open the first American Artists Congress. On this occasion we are buoyed up and stimulated by a number of fraternal greetings from all parts of the world.

He then proceeded with greetings from the New Masses, the League of American Writers, and other Red groups. I might mention that Mr. Mumford answered both the writers' and artists' "call."

Another art propagandist who would prefer, no doubt, to be known as art critic and who answered this Red artists' "call" is James Johnson Sweeney, one-time editor of a publication called Transition, self-advertised as subversive. In this publication, written in English and published in France, we find the radical and Communist writers and artists of Europe and their American followers such as Max Ernst and his brother comrade of the French Communist Party, Paul Eluard, Berenice Abbott, Kenneth Fearing, Samuel Putman, former art critic on New Masses, the Trotskyite Andre Breton, the Stalinist surrealist Louis Aragon, Robert Coates, of the New Yorker magazine, Gertrude Stein and her collaborator Virgil Thompson, now music critic of the New York Herald Tribune, Emily Coleman, and scores of others. Two issues of Transition were confiscated by the port authorities and refused admission to the United States because they contained obscene matter.

Mr. Sweeney also has the dubious distinction of having the vile book, Out of This Century, dedicated to him by Peggy Guggenheim. Miss Guggenheim promoted not only the English Marxist art writer, Herbert Read, and a coterie of European art saboteurs but also, aided by Mr. Sweeney, James Thrall Soby, and Marcel Duchamp, was instrumental in launching the careers of Jackson Pollack and others, and incidentally they discovered Gypsy Rose Lee and added her to the list of American painters.

VISITED VIRGINIA'S EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

In 1950 Leslie Cheek, Jr., director of the Virginia Museum in Richmond, invited Mr. Sweeney as a one-man jury to present an exhibition at the museum, called American Painting—1950. Needless to say, Stuart Davis, national executive director of the subversive American Artists Congress, and others of Mr. Sweeney's cosigners of the Moscow call such as Max Weber, winner of the New Masses cultural award of 1945, Niles Spencer, Adolph Gottlieb, Ernest Fiene, and many others were not forgotten by Mr. Sweeney, nor were Miss Guggenheim's cultural contributions of Pollack, Baziotes, and Motherwell, and the European antiartists Max Ernst, Ozenfant, Tanguy, and others, whose painting was sufficiently subversive to be identified as "living art" by Mr. Sweeney.

It is alarming to learn that Mr. Sweeney, as a scholar, was induced to present a series of illustrated lectures at various colleges and universities in Virginia by the general education board of the Rockefeller Foundation through its project, the Richmond Area University Center.

RUG DISTRIBUTOR IN HISS CASE

Another left-wing art propagandist connected with the Communist American Artists Congress was Mr. Meyer Schapiro who explained modern art and literature to his close friend, Whitaker Chambers, in the early nineteen twenties. Mr. Schapiro became a leader of the John Reed Club and continued his friendship with Mr. Chambers. He selected, in 1936, at Whitaker Chambers' request, the now famous rug presented to Alger Hiss in gratitude by Colonel Bykov, the Red spy ring leader.

Another propagandist included among the signers of the artists "call" was Paul Strand. According to an Un-American Activities report he is noted as being a member of from 21 to 30 Communist-front organizations. It is not surprising, therefore, to find him writing the obituary article on the death of Alfred Steiglitz, an armory show promoter, in the Communist New Masses of August 6, 1946. He ends that article with these significant words:

In this America which will be surely won, Alfred Steiglitz will be revered as one of the great engineers who helped to build its soul.

Marxist writers endeavoring to use art critiques as an instrument to bludgeon artists into the Red cultural caravan in its search for the "new world" or "Communist society" is now a familiar device to the American artist.

Paul Strand also showed up at the birth of Artists Equity Association as a member of the board of governors.

The national executive committee of the American Artists Congress included among others, Peter Blume, Paul Manship, Alexander Brook, Louis Lozowick,

George Biddle, Rockwell Kent, Max Weber, Katherine Schmidt, William Gropper, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, Aaron Goodelman, Arnold Blanch, Harry Gottlieb, Lewis Mumford, Henry Billings, Lynd Ward, Ralph M. Pearson, and Lincoln Rothschild. As regional members of this committee, a casual scrutiny discloses three John Reed Club organizers—the late Morris Topchevsky, of the Chicago club, Nicolai Cikovsky, and Joe Jones.

The career of Mr. Joe Jones has been aided by his Red activities. In volume 7 of the Un-American activities reports, Dr. J. B. Mathews states:

All four of the speakers * * * were Communist Party members. They are Ella Reeve Bloor, Andrew Omholt, Herta Ware, and Joe Jones.

Also, from the same volume:

Mother Bloor and Jones left the following day to make a joint speaking tour of Arkansas.

Ella Reeve Bloor, "Mother Bloor" to the Communists, was the mother of Harold B. Ware, top-notch agent of the Comintern whose master cell in Washington included Lee Pressman, Nathan Witt, John Abt, Charles Kramer, and Alger Hiss. Andrew Omholt and Herta Ware are husband and granddaughter of the late Ella Reeve Bloor.

With these connections, it is surprising Mr. Jones did not end up in the State Department.

SOCIALIZATION OF ART—A PROJECT

The American Artists Congress was politically active and in its "call" it included the usual list of grievances that the Communists exploit and advertise. The over-all aim of the congress is, first, control of the artists; second, infiltration and control of the museums, and, lastly, the usual plan for a government art program on a permanent basis; all contribute to the Soviet final dictum—socialized art.

In August of 1938 the formation of the United American Artists was announced with Rockwell Kent, notorious Red, as the president. This group was also a Soviet first political art organization and included William Gropper, Hananiah Harari, Boris Margo, Gwathmey, Harry Gottlieb, Harold Ambellan, Ad Reinhart, and others. Paul Manship, listed 10 times in appendix 9 of the Un-American Activities, and Elizabeth McCausland, mentioned 6 times in the same volume, both promoted causes of this organization cited "a Communist front."

Another group, named ironically "An American Group," is listed in the Un-American Activities Committee files. Besides the ever present Mr. Gropper, the usual Red art fronters such as Saul Berman, Isabel Bishop, Adolph Dehn, Philip Evergood, and Joe Jones are present with others of the same ideological persuasion.

THE SPIDER CONTINUES HIS WEB

Next I touch briefly on the Artists League of America, located at 77 Fifth Avenue in New York, a small building in which the Lincoln Steffens Lodge of the International Workers Order is also housed. Rockwell Kent is president of both the Communist International Workers Order and the Artists League of America. When the ALA was formed, Elizabeth McCausland, writer for the American Federation of Arts, Philip Evergood, and Lynd Ward, veteran of many listings in the files of Un-American Activities Committee reports, were made vice presidents. The aims of the Artists League of America follow the Soviet pattern and are especially directed to Federal, State, and municipal patronage.

I have endeavored to focus attention on the years of planning, organizing, and publicizing the world Communist conspirators have devoted to a single branch of culture. Growing from a seed planted in the minds of a handful of conspirators meeting behind the iron curtain, carefully tilled and fertilized by Red culturists, we now see in Artists Equity Association the most ambitious of all the Red attempts at art regimentation and control, the fulfillment of the plan of the Kharkov conference of over two decades ago.

USUAL FANFARE PRECEDES ORGANIZATION

This Artists Equity Association was launched amid fanfare and publicity as an organization of painters, sculptors, and graphic artists, formed to serve the economic interests of artists, in April of 1947, at a gala affair at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, attended by a couple of hundred artists and museum men.

Artist Equity Association has printed the names of its fifty-four founding members. William Gropper, Communist organizer, is present again as one of the founders of AEA. He is joined by seven members of the Communist John Reed Club. They are Louis Guglielmi, Raphael Soyer, Adolph Dehn, the late John Sloan, Reginald Marsh, Ben Shahn, and Nicolai Cikovsky. This is a nucleus of experienced organizers.

Then I find the late Jo Davidson who since the days of the armory show of 1913 has been active in radical art causes. His record as an organizer I will read from the Un-American Activities Committee report of July 21, 1947:

The ICC-ASP was of Communist origin. It was set up by the Reds in January 1945 through their fronter Jo Davidson.

Davidson was cochairman of the NC–ASP, the organization that staged the Waldorf so-called peace conference, and eleven founding members of AEA were sponsors of that notorious Red propaganda stunt. Five of them were organizers and teachers of the John Reed Club mentioned before. Additional Red sponsors were Aaron Bohrod, Paul Burlin, Chaim Gross, Robert Gwathmey, Jack Levine, and Max Weber. Every one of these men has been loud and clamorous in the disloyal Communist cultural bund. The majority of the founders have been connected with Communists, Communist front organizations, or Communist publications.

Artist Equity Association as an organization has passed the first requirement of a Communist front. It has Red organizers, left sympathizers, and just enough innocents to meet the requirements. Now who is placed as secretary of this artists outfit? None other than Mr. Frank Kleinholz, one-time teacher at the Communist Jefferson School in New York.

PLANTED RED PROPAGANDISTS

Listed on the first letterhead of Artists Equity I find 22 sponsors of the Red Waldorf conference. They are honorary President Leon Kroll, Treasurer Joseph Hirsch, the three artists who are contributing editors of the Communist publication Masses and Mainstream, Philip Evergood, Robert Gwathmey, and the traitor to the artists of America, William Gropper; Harry Gottlieb, Jacob Lawrence, Mitchell Siporin, Paul Burlin, Nicolai Cikosky, Jo Davidson, C. Gross, Jack Levine, Sidney Laufman, Ben Shahn, John Sloan, Raphael Soyer, Paul Strand, Mitchell Siporin, Max Weber, Aaron Bohrod, and James Lechay of Iowa.

Now, after almost 5 years, let us see who comprise the officers of AEA, this group that is asking the artists of America to let it tend to their affairs and that advertises the service of placing its so-called artists as teachers in our colleges and schools, and that feels capable to advise the directors of our great museums.

The president is Henry Billings. I have already listed him as one of the initiators of the Communist American Artists Congress. He is mentioned as a member of the organizing committee of the John Reed Clubs. He was active in the Artists Union, a Red-leech organization of the first Roosevelt administration. In 1942 Billings, with the aid of Archibald McLeish, former Librarian of Congress, was instrumental in forcing the Reds into the Artists for Victory. Mr. Billings was a director of the Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, another Communist front.

Leon Kroll, honorary president, has a lengthy record in the Un-American Activities Committee reports. He was a director of the National Council of American Soviet Friendship, a member of the Artists Front to Win the War, a supporter of the Progressive Party, a member along with Paul Robeson of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee, and a member of the Independent Citizens Committee of Arts, Sciences, and Professions.

The other honorary president, Yasuo Kuniyoshi, a member of the executive committee of the Red American Artists Congress, has been active in left-wing activities for years.

Sol Wilson is the secretary of this Artists Equity. In appendix 9 of the Un-American Activities report I find him listed along with Frank Kirk, Minna Harkavy, and Stuart Davis as an exhibitor in Soviet Russia under John Reed Club auspices. In the Daily Worker of April 9, 1948, he is on a committee protesting the arrest of Pablo Neruda, Chilean Communist. In the same year, he is a signer of an open letter to Congress asking for the defeat of the Mundt bill.

Two individuals important in Communist circles, Gwathmey and Harry Gottlieb, are vice presidents of Artists Equity Association and Joseph Hirsch, cover artist for New Masses, sponsor of the Waldorf conference contributor to Red causes, is its treasurer.

The executive director is Hudson D. Walker. As far back as 1940 I find him and Comrade Herman Baron working together on an exhibition for the Red front, United American Artists. Again, in 1945, I find him associated with the Rockwell Kent outfit, the Artists League of America. He turns up again in 1947 as a director of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, where he is joined by Philip Jaffe of Amerasia magazine and others noted for Communist activities.

From these facts it is obvious that this organization spreading its tentacles into the very fiber of our artistic life was formed by a radical group, has been predominantly officered by notorious Red artists and so directed.

The false multi-art standards promoted by the avant garde of this cultural conspiracy, the destructive "isms," the futurists, the cubists, constructivists, abstractionists, expressionists, dadaists, surrealists, and now experimentalists, work to the advantage of an organization such as this Artists Equity which needs numerical strength to carry out its long-range objectives which are mainly museum control and Federal subsidy of art. Consequently, Artists Equity is out to organize the individuals who have the urge to create.

AGITATION FOR GOVERNMENTAL ART PROGRAMS BASED ON PROPAGANDA POLL

Under the heading "Governmental art programs," Artists Equity says:

Equity has been working with joint committees made up of representatives of six of the leading art organizations in the country to prepare recommendations for a program of Federal sponsorship of art.

Artists Equity does not need to do this. It has already been done and sponsored by a group of Artists Equity members. I refer to the platform for artists of the Progressive Party, adopted unanimously July 25, 1948, at its convention in Philadelphia.

Henry Wallace asked the group known as the National Council of Arts, Sciences, and Professions, the group that arranged the propaganda affair for the Reds at the Waldorf, to draw up a cultural plank for the Progressive Party. A program was drawn up and sponsored by 63 individuals, including 56 artists, and 51 are to be found in the membership lists of Artists Equity. This platform, or basis for socialized art, hailed by such notorious Reds as Rockwell Kent, William Gropper, and Philip Evergood, is a parallel to the Soviet art-control system.

Artists Equity, the Progressive Party, the New Masses, and the Magazine of Art, all publicize the same survey of the economic conditions of artists in the United States, made by Elizabeth McCausland, Red propagandist. Realizing that municipal, State, and Federal legislation is predicated upon a social need, the left wingers are conscious of the value of slanted surveys that attempt to prove need and justification for their socialistic bills. Miss McCausland sent questionnaires to 500 American artists and about 40 percent replied. I will let Mr. Carey McWilliams, sponsor of almost 50 Communist fronts, sum up this survey. He says:

Of those artists who replied—

To the questionnaire—

44 percent stated that they depended largely or entirely on incomes other than art. Of these 200 painters and sculptors with * * * an average of 20 years devoted to the practice of their profession the average total income was $4,144, but the average art income was $548. Such was the economic plight of the American artist in a year of high incomes.

Obviously the identity of these 200 artists must be a jealously guarded secret of Miss McCausland. One wonders if she sent questionnaires to the successful artists of the class that so irks her sister critic, Aline Loucheim, of the New York Times—those whose works of art are integrated into our glorious heritage of historical monuments. Or did she confine her questionnaires to the artists within her circle of Reds and fellow sponsors of the Soviet propaganda attacks against this country?

UNESCO TAKES PART IN FRONT

In San Francisco in 1950 Artists Equity, the Visual Arts Panel of UNESCO, and a local coalition of groups headed by an Equity member, circulated a questionnaire under the title "Freedom of the Artist." A meeting—arranged in conjunction with this UNESCO-Artists Equity questionnaire—was held at the San Francisco Museum of Art whose director, Mrs. Grace M. Morley, is a member of the Panel on Visual Arts.

The first question discussed at this meeting was "Do you believe that private enterprise can support fine art of the United States today?" Others such as "Why should there be public subsidy of fine art?" and "Is the artist free if he is insecure?" show the slant of this poll. Traditional American artists of San Francisco, most of whom declined to participate, said:

The questionnaire is so obviously a plot to show that the American artists are economically depressed and exploited. * * * It is an affront * * * to be subject to an inquiry which presumes a lack of freedom while living under our American system of government. * * * This data can be used as propaganda in Europe and elsewhere. * * * Another purpose could be to agitate for another PWA program * * * another step toward a socialized state and this entire program will support Artists Equity in the assumed role of being the champion of the downtrodden American artist.

Here is Artists Equity, Red lineal descendant of the American Artists Congress, using the Visual Arts Panel of UNESCO to further unionize American artists and to agitate for a socialistic art program.

MUSEUMS USED IN BUILDING SOVIET ARCHWAY

At the American Artists Congress in 1936, the museums were discussed. Ralph Pearson, signer of the "call," reasoned with naive Marxist simplicity, that since it was evident that our way of life had failed and a new society was in the offing, the museum was a good place to start rebuilding along the Soviet pattern of social-center or community-workshop plan where the museum is used not to develop art alone but also the mentality of the new Socialist human being.

No right-thinking American objects to museums exhibiting the work of living American artists; in fact, it has been quite customary. Many museums have art schools and lecture halls, all contributing to the culture and appreciation of beauty in our Nation. Funds left to purchase art of living American painters and sculptors should be utilized to advance the cause of art and to stimulate and encourage gifted artists. There is no quarrel with that. But the museums have a responsibility to see that no left-wing art organization such as the Artists Equity Association is able to use either the prestige or the museum facilities to advance its ambitious design for union control of art. There are between three and four billion dollars invested in museum buildings, collections, and facilities in the United States.

In the Artists Equity brochure, I find the statement:

Specifically, several exhibitions have been arranged only after consultation with Equity on its policies and recommendations. * * * A strong recommendation for a periodic competitive exhibition he—

Mr. Francis Henry Taylor, director of Metropolitan Museum—

said, had come from a group representing Artists Equity Association. * * * Discussion with Mr. Taylor had resulted in a statement by the group that the competition was urgently needed.

Both the Metropolitan Museum and Artists Equity advertised the part played by Equity in such manner as to strengthen that radical organization.

EXHIBITS UNDER RADICAL CONTROL

Now let us examine the competitions themselves. The first was called American Painting, 1950. Six thousand artists throughout the United States entered the competition. The exhibition consisted of 307 oil paintings. Of the 307 paintings selected to compete for the prizes, 170, or 55 percent, were by members of Artists Equity. The regional juries of selection, comprising Mr. Robert Hale, of the Metropolitan Museum, and 5 directors of other museums, had 20 artist jurors from all sections of the country. Thirteen of those artist jurors were members of Artists Equity Association. The national jury of selection included Mr. Hale and eight artists, five of whom were members of Artists Equity. The jury of awards selected to award Metropolitan Museum prizes amounting to $8,500 consisted of one museum director and two artists. Both artists were members of Artists Equity.

Let us see how the members of this organization, founded in the main by notorious Reds and fellow-travelers, fared financially.

First prize of $3,500 went to Artists Equity member Karl Knaths, of Boston, who signed the call of the Communist-created American Artists Congress of 1936. Second prize of $2,500 to AEA Member Rico Lebrun, of California. Third prize of $1,500 to Yasuo Kuniyo-

shi, of New York, radical, and president—at that time—of Artists Equity Association; and fourth prize of $1,000 to Joseph Hirsch, Artists Equity treasurer and a sponsor of the Waldorf conference, sponsor of the Communist New Masses cultural award, and illustrator for Communist publications.

To say that this competition was a triumph for Artists Equity is an understatement. The exhibition as a whole was hailed by Art Digest as a "triumph of abstractionism."

DISCREDITING FREE ENTERPRISE

This so-called form of expression is described as a very important revolutionary art form by Marxist Critic Herbert Read. He calls it "art in pickle" and with surrealism, whose object is—and I quote from Mr. Read—"to discredit the bourgeois ideology in art, to destroy the academic conception of art," they both, abstract art or "art in pickle" and surrealism, the destructive art of a transitional period, are playing revolutionary roles in the development of—to use Mr. Read's words—"the art of the future—the art of a classless society." Feeling as Mr. Read does that the Russian brand of social realism is too confining for a Freudian Marxist of his talents, he says:

> Nevertheless, in a world of competing tyrannies, the artist can have only one allegiance, to that dictatorship which claims to end all forms of tyranny and promises, however indefinitely, the complete liberation of man, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Americans do not believe in or have faith in any dictatorship, and the American artists are objecting to this pickling process of their God-given talents. Mounting indignation to the emphasis on the subversive "isms" and the playing up of known Communists and fellow travelers by certain so-called art authorities and museum directors is manifest from coast to coast.

The Metropolitan Museum's second competition, American Sculpture, 1951, increased this protest. It opened December 7, 1951, and closed February 24, 1952. Here again four of the six sculptors of the jury of selection were members of Artists Equity. The juries selected by the museum failed to impress many of the noted sculptors of America. Evidently the noted sculptors were right, for the resulting exhibition was received with shame and disgust. This exhibition, if it were a true cross section of American sculpture, would indicate that the expression of this age was one of confusion, of frustration anu rebellion, that the artists seeing nothing of beauty and order were at odds with the existing social order. As such, this misleading exhibition of repulsive, distorted expression is good Communist propaganda.

The jury of awards consisted of Henri Marceau, of the Philadelphia Museum, and two sculptors, Jose de Creeft, Equity artist and signer of the "call" of the Red Artists Congress, and Jacques Lipchitz, European modernist, whose revolutionary sculpture met the exacting requirements of the Communist cultural magazine, New Masses.

REVOLUTIONARY ARTIST AND MRS. JOHANNES STEEL CAPTURE TOP PRIZES

This jury awarded the first prize of $3,500 to Minna Harkavy, Artist Equity member. As a revolutionary artist, she taught revolutionary art to the Communist John Reed Club as far back as 1930. She is hailed by the New Masses, Red-culture mouthpiece, as a proletarian sculptress. Her type of so-called art, according to a Soviet propagandist, "tends toward a revolutionary change of the existing social order" and, as such, is the sabotage weapon of international communism used in non-Communist countries. Hers is the art described by William Z. Foster as the revolutionary art to be used as a weapon—I quote—"to challenge that of the existing ruling class." Minna Harkavy has consistently supported Communist causes for two decades and her radical record is of such proportions that she may be described as a notorious Red.

The second prize of $2,500 was bestowed on Equity member Rhys Caparn, the wife of the notorious Red radio commentator, Johannes Steel, who has supported 34 Communist or Red-front causes.

Another Equity member received third prize of $1,500.

Thus we see that the sinister conspiracy conceived in the black heart of Russia has become a threat to the standard of art in America. This has been accomplished by the revolutionary organization in the field of art by traitors like Gropper and Trachtenberg. Their task has been made easier by the advance guard of their brigade—the promoters of the destructive "isms," which had been used so ruthlessly by the Bolsheviks to destroy the cultural base of Czarist Russia during the period of war communism.

I have turned the spotlight of truth on the evil machinations of this cultural conspiracy. No immunity should be granted to the Red art termites. The loyal American artists in our cultural centers of New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and others, are determined to protect our cultural birthright from this horde of art saboteurs who would first destroy in order to control.

They must demand and get true critical appraisal in the press. They must insist that art juries be freed from domination of the leftists. And they must see that the United States Panel on Visual Art of UNESCO include no radical such as William Zorach, member of the Communist John Reed Club, and Henry Billings, organizer of Communist and Communist-front art organizations, to misrepresent the art and artists of our Republic.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VELDE. I just wanted to compliment the gentleman on his fine speech.

I do not know much about art myself, but I do know a little something about communism, and I realize the truth of a great deal of what the gentleman has to say about Communist art, especially modern or futuristic art. I just wanted to ask the gentleman this question: How does the American Communist Party use the artist to influence the thinking of the American people?

Mr. DONDERO. In every single picture they paint contained somewhere in it is the symbol of this foreign ideology; and they are trying to create the impression amongst the American people that our legitimate art as you and I have always understood it has been supplanted by this new form. In my opinion it is just a lot of senseless slush. No one can understand what they mean, yet that is what they are trying to impose upon our people.

Mr. VELDE. The gentleman is referring, I presume, to some of these surrealistic paintings.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes. I referred to it in my speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

UNITED NATIONS WORLD

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, information in my possession clearly demonstrate that it is high time the American people are informed of all the facts and the operations of those characters connected with the magazine, the so-called United Nations World.

On the basis of this information, and in the interest of national security, I am asking the House Committee on Un-American Activties to thoroughly investigate this publication.

Without delay, the complete background of the officials of the United Nations World should be brought to light. And it should be ascertained what the connection is between the United Nations World, the United Nations Organization, and a propaganda sheet known as the National Guardian.

It is something of an understatement to say that I was astounded a few days ago when I learned that the United Nations World was subsidizing the National Guardian through the purchase of that publication's mailing list, the income from which, in connection with just one commercial mailing to quote the sheet itself, "paid the printing bill for a whole issue of the Guardian at times when there was no other money to pay for it."

Now, what about this National Guardian? The House Un-American Activities Committee already has considerable information concerning some of its officials and it is incriminating enough to make any decent American demand to know why the United Nations World does business with such a sheet. Or is this a case of birds of a feather flocking together?

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VELDE. I am very happy to compliment the gentleman on his bringing out this very vital information. The gentleman mentioned the publication United Nations World. Does the gentleman know if there is any other publication reporting the news of the United

Nations conferences that uses the words "United Nations"?

Mr. GROSS. I only know of a barber shop in New York which claims to use it.

Mr. VELDE. Some time ago my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JENISON], made a study of the publication United Nations World and, it seems to me, he informed me at that time that in order to use the words "United Nations" special permission must be obtained from the United Nations Conference, indicating to me at the present time from what the gentleman has said that there is no other publication bearing that name or using the words "United Nations."

Mr. GROSS. I believe the gentleman is correct in that.

Mr. VELDE. I feel confident the gentleman will agree with me that this is a serious infringement upon the freedom of the press. It appears to me that any publication in the United States or any of its Territories should be allowed to use the words "United Nations."

The gentleman also mentioned the publication National Guardian. I think the gentleman was present when I spoke for 1 minute about the editor of that publication, Cedric Belfrage. Martin Berkeley, who is an ex-Communist from the Hollywood movie colony, testified at some length regarding the Hollywood Communists. He was quite a high official in the Communist Party in Hollywood. He also mentioned that he was acquainted with Cedric Belfrage and described him as a most important Communist in the United States today. He further said that he was certain that he was still a member of the Communist Party in the United States today.

As the gentleman knows, I have asked that Cedric Belfrage be subpenaed to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities and I guarantee we will try to find out just what goes with the National Guardian.

Mr. GROSS. I am very pleased to have the gentleman's observations. I want to compliment him on the talk he made earlier this afternoon before the House. He is a valuable member of the Un-American Activities Committee and I trust the gentleman's investigation will include the United Nations World and its officials as well as more than one official of the National Guardian.

For example, the committee and the Attorney General long ago cited the general manager of the National Guardian as belonging to or sponsoring a half dozen or more organizations described as Communist fronts, and as being an instructor in a so-called school cited by the Attorney General as an "adjunct of the Communist Party."

Nevertheless, this same general manager presumably was in on, and perhaps even rigged, the profitable deal with the United Nations World.

But he is not the only such individual with the National Guardian. This the committee already knows, and more can be developed in the same direction, making it additionally incumbent upon this House to probe to the bottom any dealings between the National Guardian, its officials and the United Nations World.

To sum up, deadly serious questions must be answered in the interest of our country. Among the questions are the following:

First. What is the real purpose of the United Nations World?

Second. Is it licensed to use the name "United Nations"?

Third. Is the United Nations World using the United Nations organization, or vice versa, as a vehicle to propagate internationalism?

Fourth. Who are the officials, past and present, of the United Nations World and what is or was the affiliation of some of them with organizations cited by the committee and the Attorney General as Communist fronts?

Fifth. Who are the backers, past and present, of the United Nations World, and to what extent financially?

Sixth. Why did the United Nations World subsidize the propaganda sheet, National Guardian, through the purchase of that publication's mailing list?

Mr. Speaker, if the committee will conduct a full-scale investigation of the United Nations World, ascertaining the answers to the questions I have listed and others which will logically develop, I predict revelations of additional international, anti-American snakes at work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVINS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 45 minutes.

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon I referred to the investigation of corruption in the executive branch of the Government, and gave notice that I intended to discuss that subject at some length this afternoon under a special order. I called attention to certain testimony given before a Senate committee by Mr. Newbold Morris last week.

Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1952, I introduced House Resolution 492 to create a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate corruption in the executive branch of the Government. That resolution provides that not more than half of the 10-man committee shall be members of the same political party, all of whom will be appointed by the Speaker, who will also designate the chairman.

I want to quote the second paragraph of that resolution, which defines the scope and task that committee would have. I quote from House Resolution 492, as follows:

> The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of the enforcement and administration of the laws of the United States, the exercise of powers, the discharge of duties, and the administration of public funds and public property by the executive branch of the Government, with a view to determining whether such activities have been conducted fairly, diligently, impartially, and honestly.

Today I have introduced a resolution to authorize that committee, if it is appointed, to spend $100,000 in the discharge of this task.

Certain events have occurred since January 14 when this resolution was proposed to which I want to call attention. I believe that it is now more important than before that the Congress should accept responsibility for investigating corruption in the executive branch of the Government, and discharge that responsibility effectively. It is the only way that confidence in their Government can be restored to the American people.

There is no disagreement that an investigation of corruption in the executive branch of the Government is needed. Even President Truman, himself, recognized that this corruption was so widespread and had attracted such public interest and attention that something needed to be done about it.

On January 9, 1952, in his state of the Union message, the President among other things said the following:

> Our kind of Government, above all others, cannot tolerate dishonesty among its public servants. Some dishonest people worm themselves into almost every human organization. It is all the more shocking when they make their way into a Government such as ours which is based upon the principle of justice for all.

I want to emphasize this last sentence:

> Such unworthy public servants must be weeded out.

Events that have occurred since that time, which I now shall proceed to describe briefly, intensify the urgency of the need for such an independent investigation.

On February 1, 1952, the President appointed Mr. Newbold Morris as Special Assistant to the Attorney General to investigate corruption. Subsequently, he was provided with $450,000 from the President's emergency fund to carry out this task. Only within the last few days has Mr. Morris obtained the beginnings of a staff.

I believe it may be well at this point to remind the House of Representatives that originally when this matter of corruption in the executive branch of the Government arose, the President had intended to appoint an independent commission—not an existing agency in the executive branch of the Government, but a commission on which there would be appointed outstanding private citizens as members. At that time he sought to obtain a man of high public integrity, and had some discussion with Judge Thomas Murphy, of New York, for that purpose.

Subsequent to his address to the Congress on January 9, in fact the following day, on January 10, 1952, in his press conference the President announced that he had abandoned that approach, and instead he would rely upon the Justice Department to conduct the investigation. That preceded the appointment of Mr. Newbold Morris on February 1.

Just 2 days before that, on January 29, 1952, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives adopted a reso-

lution creating a special subcommittee to investigate the Department of Justice. After some delays that committee has now appointed counsel and is beginning actual work.

The significance of that particular action, as bearing upon the propriety of the executive department investigating itself, seems to me to be this: It was only after a great deal of controversy, as I am sure my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] could confirm, that that resolution was adopted by the Judiciary Committee.

I understand from the press and from conversations with my colleagues that it was adopted in spite of the fact that the Attorney General appeared at the committee's meeting room and sought entrance, to be heard on that subject. The Judiciary Committee, after refusing to hear the Attorney General, by a substantial majority, decided that the evidence presented to that committee justified the creation of a special agency to examine the administration of the criminal laws of the United States by the Department of Justice. That action, as I say, occurred just shortly before the appointment of Mr. Newbold Morris.

There is a third event which I think has a great deal of bearing upon the consideration of the resolution that I am bringing to the attention of the House today.

On February 18, 1952, the Hoey investigations subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments commenced to hold hearings concerning the acquisition of oil tankers from the Maritime Commission by a group of prominent public persons, who made something over a $3,000,000 profit on an investment of a hundred thousand dollars.

It appeared early in that investigation that Mr. Newbold Morris, the newly appointed cleaner-upper, played a prominent role in some features of the tanker deal. Wednesday and Thursday of last week Mr. Morris appeared before that committee and had his day in court.

After having referred to these events, I want to say that it seems to me, without considering them, that it should be clear as a matter of public policy that the investigation of corruption in the executive branch of the Government should not be conducted by the branch of the Government which is under fire.

I point out there is no disagreement that the investigation of corruption is needed. The only disagreement is who shall investigate the corruption and how it shall be done.

My purpose in calling this to the attention of the House today is to urge that the Congress assume its responsibility to the American public to make a thoroughgoing, impartial, statesmanlike investigation of this subject, so that when the job is done the public will have some confidence that it has been done honestly and completely.

I want to observe at this point that whether we like it or not the public is going to hold the Congress responsible. When we go home to our constituents, all of whom are aroused by these disclosures of wrongdoing in the executive branch, the only persons our constituents can blame, the only persons they can get at, are their Representatives in Congress and their Senators.

They are not going to understand that the job of cleaning up the mess that has been partially exposed in the executive branch of the Government was being done by the executive branch of the Government itself and that Congress had nothing to do with it. They are going to say, "Are you not down there to represent me? And when a situation against the public interest is disclosed what did you do about it?"

I say to the majority leadership in the House of Representatives that that responsibility devolves more strictly upon them than it does upon the minority leadership, because it is only with the approval of the majority leadership of this House that any action can be taken by the House of Representatives.

Next fall when they are confronted by their voters and are asked the question: "What did you do about the situation which had the whole country aroused?" I hope my colleagues will be able to give an adequate explanation. I hope that explanation will be that they took all action within their power to have this matter gone into thoroughly and impartially by an independent branch of the Government, when the opportunity was presented.

I want to say to the majority leadership of the House that it seems to me this situation confronts them with an opportunity for outstanding statesmanship. They could gain well-deserved public acclaim by forthrightly taking the lead in ferreting out the wrongdoing in the administration controlled by their party, by purging the party of wrongdoers and restoring it to a condition making it eligible for the confidence of the American people in the forthcoming election contest.

The Democratic leadership in the House has an opportunity to rise above the narrow, petty interests of strict partisanship. It can perform a great service to the American public and to the cause of democratic government everywhere by insisting upon removal and punishment of unfaithful public servants regardless of their party, letting the chips fall where they may.

I earnestly urge the Democratic leadership in the House of Representatives to give careful consideration to the desirability of taking the lead in investigating corruption in the executive branch of the Government through an instrument in which the public can have confidence. The public will never be satisfied with the executive's investigating the executive.

Naturally, Democratic leaders in the Congress have and should have cordial and friendly relationships with members of their party in the executive branch of the Government. Yet Democratic legislators should always be aware of their primary loyalties and responsibilities as legislators. They should be jealous of the powers and functions and the independence of the legislative branch of the Government and quick to uphold and promote the agency of which they are a part. They should resent encroachments by the Executive into the legislative field and resist such encroachments with all the power at their command notwithstanding the fact that they may be made by members of their own party. Likewise, when a condition of widespread corruption is revealed to exist in the executive branch of the Government, Democratic legislators should be the first to exercise the investigative power of the Congress to advise itself and the American people of conditions whatever they may be and to take such action as lies within the power of the legislature to correct evils in the public interest.

Mr. Speaker, in my remarks on the floor of the House on January 14 I pointed out that President Truman's high-sounding protestations against dishonesty in Government had a hollow ring when he announced the clean-up job would be done by the Department of Justice. His protestations had an even hollower ring when the House Judiciary Committee by an overwhelming vote decided that the administration of the Department of Justice should be investigated. The situation is very much like selecting an indicted criminal for prosecuting attorney. The falsity of this proposition is apparent to everyone.

I want to call the attention of the Members of the House again to a matter I have referred to several times before, namely, the prosecution of those responsible for the half-million-dollar mail fraud alleged to have been perpetrated by the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. on the Lustron Corp. In that case, an agency of the executive branch of the Government, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, after a thorough investigation by competent investigators formally transmitted to the Department of Justice the findings of that investigation with respect to the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. and urged that prosecution be undertaken.

Subsequent to that, a United States Senate committee, of which I had the honor to be counsel, the Fulbright committee, in investigating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation held both executive and public hearings and called before it those who were alleged to be involved in this half-million-dollar mail fraud. After hearing all of their explanations and the evidence they offered, the committee in a formal report recommended strongly that the Department of Justice proceed to investigate and prosecute this half-million-dollar mail fraud.

What happened? Nothing. The Department of Justice sat on the case. I have suggested, and I have said this on the floor of the House before, that the reason it sat on the case was the same reason we on the Fulbright committee had trouble getting the case heard and a report filed. I can give the Members of the House personal evidence of the efforts at suppression and obstruction that were made.

I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] that one of those who was urging that the report be suppressed and toned down was none other than our friend, former Congressman Joseph E. Casey, who recently has been shown to be up to his ears in tanker

deals. Mr. Casey represented James and John Gottlieb and Paul Buckley, the stockholders and directors of Commercial Home Equipment Corp.

I was called on the phone by Mr. Peyton Ford, then of the Justice Department. He asked that the committee not proceed with the investigation. Then later Mr. Raymond Whearty, of the Justice Department, appeared before members of the Fulbright committee and urged that they not hold public hearings.

That, to me, is the tip-off for the reason no action has been taken by the Department of Justice in the 2 years that have elapsed since then. It explains the reason they have now adjourned the grand jury proceedings in Chicago after hearing only one witness. Why is the Justice Department permitting the statute of limitations to run out on the part of this half-million-dollar fraud that is least controversial?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman, in my judgment, has performed a real service in bringing this situation to the attention of our committee, which is now conducting an investigation of the Department of Justice. I can assure the gentleman that I am familiar with the Commercial Home Equipment Corp. matter to which he refers, and I believe I can assure him that our committee will engage in a thorough investigation of that matter.

I would like to say at this point, and at this stage of our proceedings, so far as our committee is concerned, that to date the majority members of the committee as well as the minority members have displayed a desire to go thoroughly into these various propositions which have been placed before us, and while we have encountered some obstacles in our inquiry, and may reasonably look for more obstacles in the future interposed by those who feel the pinch, in my opinion this committee will forge ahead with its inquiry and among others will specifically look into this matter to which the gentleman has called attention.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from New York, and I appreciate what he says about the attitude of the committe of which he is a very valuable member. I am very confident that it will do a useful and worthwhile job and penetrate below surface appearances and get at the real truth of the conditions existing in the Department of Justice.

That brings to my mind a matter which I wonder if the gentleman is familiar with—I do not think the general public is—and that is the role of the FBI in the investigation of corruption among public officials. I understand on rather direct and reliable authority that it is the policy of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to discontinue investigations when they run upon the name of a public official. Now that may be a very desirable policy from the point of view of the FBI. It may have kept the FBI out of hot water through not stepping on important people's toes.

I think the general public—and the Members of Congress—have the utmost respect for and confidence in J. Edgar Hoover and in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I believe, however, that this question might have arisen in their minds: "Well now, if all of this wrongdoing that is now coming out has been in existence so long, and the FBI has been in existence so long, why has not some of it come out before through the activities of the FBI rather than waiting for congressional committees to expose it?" But the answer to that is that FBI policy has been to desist from investigating when they run upon the name of a public official unless they are specifically ordered in writing by the Justice Department to proceed with the investigation. Apparently the Justice Department has not very often instructed the FBI to proceed with investigations when their preliminary findings disclose wrongdoing by public officials.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Michigan for his very fine statement on this matter. But, even after the FBI is requested to make an investigation of a public official it, in reality, does not mean anything, because the information is generally locked up under padlock and not made available. So, what is the use of it? It is just an investigating agency.

Mr. MEADER. I am glad the gentleman pointed that out, FBI investigations are confidential. The action that is to be taken upon those investigations must be taken by the Department of Justice.

There may be many investigations of public officials that are locked up in the files of the Department of Justice, and they may have been given the same treatment that has been given to this Commercial Home Equipment case.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Does not the gentleman think it is understandable why the Justice Department would not like to investigate vigorously cases that might embarrass the administration of which it is a part? The head of the Department of Justice is the Attorney General. What is the Attorney General? He is the President's lawyer. The gentleman now addressing us is also a lawyer, and how often has he known of lawyers setting out to convict their clients?

Mr. MEADER. I am not willing to go along with the proposition that the Attorney General is so subservient because of Presidential appointment that he will therefore fail to carry out the duties imposed upon him by law.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not true that an appointee is subject to the person who places him in a position? In my State the attorney general is not appointed by the Governor; he is elected by the people. He is the general attorney for the people, chosen to defend the people of the State of Minnesota, and their interests. If he disagrees with the Governor, he can criticize him or expose anything that he thinks is improper or illegal, and it has been done in my State. But the people of the United States do not select the Attorney General. Therefore he is not their representative. Rather, he is the general attorney to defend the administraiton that appointed him. If he did not do that, how long would he be in that position?

Mr. MEADER. Unfortunately I will have to say to the gentleman that the point he is calling attention to is a well-taken point, in view of the individuals now occupying the positions in question.

Mr. JUDD. It is a weak spot in our form of government. The Congress, in 1922 or 1923 passed the Budget and Accounting Act to change the method of auditing the accounts of the executive agencies and checking on the legality of their expenditures. Prior to that time the executive branch audited itself, and that was not a desirable proposition for obvious reasons. That defect was corrected by setting up in the Budget and Accounting Act, an independent auditing agency, the General Accounting Office, subject only to the Congress, and headed by a Comptroller General, appointed for 15 years, not eligible for reappointment, and given a maximum of independence. Inasmuch as Congress had to do that to get fair, accurate, and impartial auditing. The day may have come when we need to set up something like it to prosecute persons in the Government about whom the FBI turns up derogatory evidence. It would have to be an agency separate from and not under the Attorney General who is a member of the President's own official family. He needs his legal counsel but perhaps the people ought to have also a lawyer other than the administration's lawyer. It is asking a lot to expect a man to take action that would hurt those who hired him. People generally do not understand this situation, they think the FBI is responsible for getting rid of dangerous, or crooked, or unfit people in the Government—and they feel secure. They do not realize that the FBI merely investigates, turns its findings over to its superior, the Attorney General, and cannot do anything more, in the absence of overt acts, unless or until the Attorney General acts.

Human nature being what it is, a person is not inclined to try his best to expose and condemn and convict those who appointed him to the office.

I wish you lawyers would find some way to change our governmental mechanism so that we would have not only an independent judiciary and a semi-independent General Accounting Office but a more independent prosecuting agency.

Mr. MEADER. I must differ with the gentleman in part. I do not think the cure for the situation that exists here is structural reform. I think it has more to do with the kind of human beings that are exercising the powers that have been granted by statute. The enforcement of the law is an administrative and an executive function and must be done by the executive branch of the Government. The failure here is not in the structure of the law. We have had that structure for years, and never encountered the situation we have now.

This is a failure of human beings rather than a structural defect.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. It never occurred to the founding fathers that a day would come when men in as high positions as some of those who have been found guilty of malfeasance or corruption occupy, would descend to the level where they would put the administration or their friends ahead of the United States. But since that is a human weakness, we should not have structural arrangements which so easily subject men to such temptations.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman, since he has raised the point, if he believes that the Attorney General is so subservient to the President that he cannot independently enforce the laws generally, which he is ordered to do by the statute creating his position, does he have any confidence that a special investigator brought in from New York, coming down here to clean up the situation that has been shown to exist, will have that independence, when he is right under the President's eye?

Mr. JUDD. No; I do not think he will. I agree with the gentleman entirely on that.

Mr. MEADER. The fact that he happens to be a Republican does not mean anything at all.

Mr. JUDD. No; of course not.

Mr. MEADER. I think this goes far beyond partisan considerations. Here is a question of the confidence of the people in the processes of democracy. Whether the clean-up is done by a Democrat or a Republican in my judgment is wholly immaterial. To appoint a Republican to give a front of independence when the situation is really one where there is no independence does not answer the situation at all, in my opinion.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has put his finger on the principal problem, and I know the gentleman from Minnesota agrees, that it is the man who is selected to do a job which is more important than the way that job is set up. However, there is something, it seems to me, to what the gentleman from Minnesota says about the structure of our system. He is an able physician and I happen to be a lawyer, so that perhaps he will listen to another alternative to the suggestion which he has made.

I have had on my desk for some time, but have not introduced both a bill and a constitutional amendment directed to the same objective. I presume perhaps the latter would be the right way to go about it. They would provide that the Attorney General be an elected rather than appointed official, elected during the off years when the President is not running, with the idea in mind of establishing a greater independence for the office of the Attorney General. In other words, he is in a way the President's lawyer, but he is more than that, he is really or should be the lawyer for all the people in the United States. It is very important that he be independent from any political influences of any kind. That is essential to the administration of even-handed justice. I know the gentleman now address us is an able lawyer. I have, as I say, been debating the question in my own mind as to whether this might be another possible solution. I would be very grateful for any help or advice from any of the Members on that subject. I recognize the fact that there are objections which immediately might be raised to such a plan. My mind is open as to whether the advantages outweigh the disadvantages.

I am by no means completely wedded to the plan myself, but I think it does deserve careful consideration by us. It may be that this very committee on which I am now serving may pass on that question at some stage in its deliberations. At least I want to tell the gentleman from Minnesota, and the gentleman from Michigan, that we lawyers, at least some of us, are trying to work out a solution which will bring about a better situation than the one which exists now. I say that as I should, and at this stage of the proceedings, without any reflection on anyone now or formerly holding public office.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution. I assure him I shall certainly be glad to study his proposal carefully and to help him if I can agree with him, and if he has satisfied himself that that is the proper solution to the difficulties we find confronting us.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. I want the gentleman to be perfectly clear on this. I do not know the answer to the problem, but as a physician I recognize that here is a difficulty, a weak spot, and I have to call on the specialists in the field where the patient's malady lies for counsel and assistance. I am not trying to tell you what you ought to do. I am asking for help.

I want to say one further thing. I do not believe it tells quite the whole story to say that the degree or kind of activity and effectiveness that you get in the Attorney General's office depends upon the character and quality of the man who is appointed as its head. That is part of the story, but you have to go behind that. The character and quality of the man who is appointed depends to some degree upon the character and quality and objectives and motivations of whoever does the appointing. That, under our system is not the American people who are to be defended, but the administration which, being human, naturally wants to defend itself. I once had a conversation with the present President of the United States when he was a Senator. We were on a speaking tour together. He was reporting some of his experiences as the head of the War Investigation Committee. He was talking about a situation, the details of which I do not need to go into here, which was so bad that his committee had tried repeatedly but in vain to get the Armed Forces or the Chiefs of Staff to clean it up. It had to do with Hanford, Wash., where we now know there was an atomic-energy plant, and, of course, it was hush hush. He said, "We finally had to go to the point of telling the Joint Chiefs of Staff that they either had to clean it up or have a public exposure made of it, and that would not be in the public interest." Then he added, and I quote, "But you know the Army—it never corrects, it just covers up." Those were the words of our President when he was a Senator and on the investigating side of the fence. Now the same thing is to be expected of the Attorney General's office under the present circumstances, where all sort of irregularities have been discovered. If there is nothing wrong, of course, there is nothing to be feared or hidden. But, the more things there are that are wrong, the more the human tendency is not to correct, but to cover up.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. In regard to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York, first of all the Attorney General is not merely appointed by the President. He has to be confirmed by the Senate in accordance with the Constitution. Then, if in order to free such appointees to the office of the Attorney General from political influence, it is appropriate to amend the Constitution and make it by popular election to that office, I wonder what would be the thought of the gentleman from New York on applying the same thing to the appointment of the Supreme Court Justices and to the entire Federal judiciary in order to insure that they be free from political influences? Would it be better that they be subject to popular elections instead of being appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate in accordance with the Constitution? I just want to make that statement as expressing my thought on the proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman. I do not want to yield for too long, because that is a subject I did not intend to discuss.

Mr. KEATING. That is true. I did not intend to discuss it either. I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan, I would be vigorously opposed to the election of Supreme Court judges by popular vote as well as opposed to the election of any of the Federal judges by popular vote. I think the situation with regard to the office of the Attorney General is in quite a different category, but as I have already stated, I am not completely sold on this suggestion myself. When or if I am, I will debate it at greater length with the gentleman from Michigan at some future time when we are not imposing on the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. I am glad the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] is present, because I wanted to discuss the testimony given by Mr. Morris before the Hoey committee.

Briefly, Mr. Morris was the president of a corporation, a charitable foundation, the China International Foundation, which, through a series of corporations, had title to certain oil tankers.

One question was whether he got anything out of it. He said he did not, but

apparently he shared in fees to the extent of some thirty or thirty-five thousand dollars, less the overhead cost of operating the law office, that could appropriately be charged to this particular client. I quote Mr. Morris' testimony on this point elsewhere in my remarks.

The question I wanted to take up with the gentleman from Minnesota is the matter of carrying oil to the Communists in these tankers. I looked at the record very carefully to see whether or not Mr. Morris was justified in resenting the implications of impropriety in carrying oil from a Rumanian port to a Communist Chinese port, shipments which were discontinued only shortly before the Korean war began.

Mr. Morris' defense, in part at least, seemed to be that by that trade his company was draining dollars out of Communist countries. It was not dollars for oil. The oil came from behind the iron curtain and it stayed behind the iron curtain, but the dollars for shipping charges, which were higher than similar runs for other cargoes, had to come out of the Communist countries. Thereby, he argued, his company was fighting communism and was weakening the Communists.

The testimony before the Hoey committee on this point is, in part, as follows:

Senator NIXON. Do you or do you not agree with Secretary Johnson's appraisal of that situation, that this was detrimental, that this action of United Tankers in hauling oil to and from Communist China was detrimental to the interests of the United States?

Mr. MORRIS. I don't know that. It might have just lighted the lamps of China. I don't know what the oil was used for.

Senator NIXON. In other words, you question Secretary Johnson's judgment?

Mr. MORRIS. No, I am not in a position to agree or disagree.

Senator NIXON. You do not take a position?

Mr. MORRIS. I can't. I am just an ordinary citizen.

Mr. FLANAGAN. On that one point, so that we will be in agreement as to what was carried to China by these vessels, let me say that the cargo consisted f benzene, peanut oil, kerosene, crude oil, and in the trip in April 1950, that went from Constanza to Dalny in north China, it carried benzene and 1,008 tons of aviation lubricating oil.

Mr. MORRIS. From China back to Romania?

Mr. FLANAGAN. No, from Constanza to Dalny.

Mr. MORRIS. To tell you the truth, I don't know about the cargoes. I don't know how many people you can kill with peanut oil, but maybe you would know.

Mr. FLANAGAN. On that point, I might clear the record that that cargo, that specific cargo, left Rumania in April of 1950 and arrived in Dalny some time probably in May, some 6 weeks before——

Mr. MORRIS. Well, the answer to the Senator's question is: I am quite sure that in May of 1950, I was not aware that the Communist Chinese were stockpiling fuel to kill American boys.

The first I knew about the Korean war—I didn't know about it before it happened. Maybe you did. But June 25 was the first time I knew there was a war in Korea. I read it in the newspapers and heard it on the radio.

Further testimony on this point was as follows:

Senator MUNDT. I say, in your opinion, ECA has no relationship to communism and the effort of the free world to stop aggressions of communism?

Mr. MORRIS. Why, of course it has. It stopped it in Italy.

Senator MUNDT. All right. One of the reasons for ECA, probably the major reason, was to help the free world rehabilitate itself so that it could stop further Communist expansion. Is that right?

Mr. MORRIS. And promote free enterprise.

Senator MUNDT. Is that right?

Mr. MORRIS. Sure. You have got it.

Senator MUNDT. All right. Since you and I both agree that that was one of the major reasons for ECA, did it not occur to you at the time your ships were being paid by ECA to carry cargoes, that there was something wrong about using those same ships to carry Communist cargoes to help defeat the purpose of ECA?

Mr. MORRIS. I don't think, if you will examine those charters very carefully, that those four runs defeated the purposes of ECA.

Senator MUNDT. Not entirely, but they helped.

Mr. MORRIS. I don't think they even helped. They helped to draw dollars out of Russia. Was that not good?

Senator MUNDT. In other words, your testimony is that shipping benzene and aviation gasoline to Communist China was an assist to the free world, because it took some dollars out of China?

Mr. MORRIS. No. But at that time, as I explained, it was not inconsistent, as far as we knew, with the United States policy of trade. As I understand it, we trade today with the Soviet Union, do we not? I don't know. How do we get all those furs over here? I don't know.

Senator MUNDT. There is a considerable difference in my opinion between shipments of furs and shipments of aviation gasoline.

Mr. MORRIS. Oh, my dear Senator, if you get dollars for furs, then you can buy gasoline. That is the way foreign trade works.

Senator MUNDT. You were shipping aviation gasoline to China? The tankers were?

Mr. MORRIS. The tankers were carrying it; yes.

Senator MUNDT. Between Rumania and China? Is that right?

Mr. MORRIS. If they hadn't gotten these tankers, they would have gotten some others. It would have moved in one way or the other.

Senator MUNDT. The Casey group in the hands of Greek nationals refused to take it.

Mr. MORRIS. They might have had better business.

Senator MUNDT. This was a business, according to Mr. Jarvis, on which a high premium was paid. In other words, you received more for that kind of business than you would from tankers engaged in trading with free countries.

Mr. MORRIS. Then that helps the American mortgagees to get their mortgages paid off.

Senator MUNDT. That answers the question, I think. It gives you more money for your firm, the tanker firm.

Mr. MORRIS. But not for anybody's personal profit, please, sir. Not for anybody's personal profit.

I am just asking the gentleman from Minnesota, as an expert on foreign affairs and as an expert on the situation in the Far East, whether he can go along with that philosophy, when the ECA and the Defense Departments, through their officials, had complained about these very shipments. Does the gentleman think that Mr. Morris has made a defense to that charge, and has he got any right to feel that he has been abused because people call attention to the fact that the corporation of which he is president, which holds ultimate control of these tankers, was engaging in trading with what is now our enemy and helping our enemy to prepare itself to fight?

Mr. JUDD. I think there can be no justification for these tankers being engaged in that trade. But, taking the argument that getting dollars from the Communists was hurting them more than giving them oil was doing them good, it is obvious they would not have been exchanging their dollars for oil unless the oil was far more valuable to them than the dollars. Oil is necessary in carrying on a war machine, and our boys are being killed with vehicles and so forth that are using oil.

Mr. MEADER. It was partly aviation lubricating oil.

Mr. JUDD. Yes. They are being killed by planes which are lubricated with that oil. I do not think any kind of sophistry or excuse can justify such a trade.

Mr. MEADER. If the gentleman takes that position, would he agree with me that a man that would seek to justify his action on such a flimsy basis has failed to display the qualities of an investigator charged with the duty of making a thoroughgoing investigation of wrong doing in the Government? Would the gentleman have any confidence that Mr. Morris knows anything about going about that job?

Mr. JUDD. I have not read the hearings. I do not know that that is the sole justification he gave. Therefore, I am not going to pass on all that may be in the RECORD. I just answered the one question which the gentleman asked me.

Mr. MEADER. I did not mean to engage my colleague from Minnesota into agreeing with me on my general thesis, which is that Newbold Morris, in his testimony before the Senate committee, demonstrated clearly, if there had ever been any doubt of it before, that he is irresponsible, immature, and insincere.

He was guilty time and again of evasion, circumlocution, and tactics seeking to divert the attention of the committee away from the point at issue. He sought refuge in technicalities. He showed disrespect to the committee. They tell me that he even put that sign up in front of him, "Keep Your Shirt On," a message that his wife had given him. He put that sign up in front of him, and turned his back to the Senators when they were interrogating him.

After evasive answers Mr. Morris was three times confronted with the following quotation from the New York Herald Tribune before an answer was obtained:

Senator MUNDT, quoting from the article:

Mr. Morris also insisted that he never received a single dollar in the transaction of tankers which is the subject of a Senate investigation. Are you ready for the question?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Do you consider that a forthright answer to the American public, who expect forthrightness from their No. 1 cleanup man, when you are asked whether you received anything from the transaction and you say, "Not a single dollar," and now you say you are cut in on a $158,000 fee?

Mr. MORRIS. Just let me look at my wife's message, will you, and I will count three—one, two, three. I said that my firm represented United Tankers and everybody knows

that my firm represented United Tankers and everybody knows that attorneys are entitled to get paid for their services and everybody knows, including you, that Mr. Wasson's services were not overcompensated for.

Senator MUNDT. All right, then. To get down to the fact. You did receive some money from this transaction as a participating attorney. Right? Am I right or wrong now?

Mr MORRIS. As a member of the firm I did receive my share of the fee under the partnership agreement.

He engaged in attempts to bring ridicule and contempt upon the members of the committee by wholly irrelevant attacks upon them. I say that he has demonstrated clearly and without any question that he is not competent to discharge the serious responsibility of ferreting our corruption in the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. Morris was willing to condone and wink at this oil traffic with our potential enemies. He tried to justify the circumvention by himself and his colleagues of the maritime laws of the United States to achieve what was specifically intended to be prohibited in the statute namely, foreign acquisition of ownership and control of United States vessels at knock down sale prices from the Maritime Commission. Morris and his colleagues were willing to pay the Casey group $450,000 for the transfer of a hollow right that was not legal ownership. They were willing to pay "Oilboat Olga" Konow some $300,000 in addition in brokerage fees in order to do indirectly that which they could not do directly.

I say to you that attempting to defend that kind of thing demonstrates a lack of candor which ought not to exist in anyone to whom we entrust wide powers over the investigation of corruption in the Government.

I say there must be a blind spot in the eye of a person who can tolerate and attempt to justify that kind of activity. The person who is that blind will not be able to recognize a corruption if he sees one.

Mr. Morris confessed before the Senate Hoey committee that he did not really know very much about the people who put up the money that actually went into the buying of the tankers, that is, the Chinese who set up this China International Foundation. Why did he not look into their backgrounds to see if there was a possibility that they had Communist leanings.

Why was Morris callous and indifferent to the effort to make money by trading with the Communists by the China Industrial & Trading Corp.? I think he ought to have looked into matters of that kind and not gotten himself involved in this kind of situation. Any man who had so conducted himself as to lay himself open to such an attack before the Senate Hoey committee and was unable to give any better explanation than he gave is not fit to do the important job that has been entrusted to him.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield.

Mr. RHODES. Would not the gentleman favor legislation to have every Government official make public his total income, the source of his income, as one way of striking at the root of the evil we are now talking about?

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman, I suppose, is referring to this questionnaire that Mr. Morris has said he is going to send out. I do not know that that is the answer to it at all, and I am not sure that there is any simple panacea as a substitute for common honesty. Actually the situation here, in my judgment, is one that cannot be dealt with so easily on a structural basis, although there may be some structural improvements that can be made.

The gentleman must be familiar with the difficulty in World War II and the difficulty in the present emergency of getting people to leave private industry to do an important job in Government under emergency conditions where we have unusual economic controls. To pass a law of the kind the gentleman suggests might prevent obtaining well-qualified people from private life to do a specific Government job for a limited period of time. They might well decline to serve if you require them to disclose all of their personal affairs and their private gainful activities.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MEADER. I will be glad to.

Mr. RHODES. Would the gentleman favor legislation of that kind to include also Members of Congress and the Senate? It seems to me it is quite easy to criticize, but I believe we ourselves should not hide behind congressional immunity.

Mr. MEADER. I will go along with the gentleman on that. Any degree of honesty required in the executive branch of the Government should also be required of the legislative branch of the Government, and I sympathize with the gentleman's objective.

I am not sure, however, that this simple matter of requiring the filling out of a form would guarantee honesty. I think there would be a lot of people who perhaps would do whatever they did that was wrong while they were in the Government but not reap the reward and benefit of it until they had left the Government. I am sure the gentleman is familiar with what I am talking about.

His questionnaire, certainly, would not reach that kind of wrongdoing. I do not think there are simple answers to it. I believe that the whole subject must be looked into and a final, authoritative and honest report be made by the Congress.

As a part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star of Friday, March 14, 1952:

MR. MORRIS STUBS HIS TOE

If Newbold Morris has been essaying the role of a modern St. George out to slay the senatorial dragon he will not win any Oscars for his performance.

It is true that both Senate and House committee investigations often take an abusive turn. It is also true that some of the questions asked of Mr. Morris were offensive. It was suggested that he must have been a "dope or a dupe." And because a corporation over which he presumably could have exercised some control helped transport petroleum to Red China before the Korean war he has been accused, by implication at least, of contributing to the deaths of American soldiers in Korea. A man should not be expected to submit to this sort of thing without protest, and Mr. Morris would have been justified in taking vigorous exception to such questions.

But that is a different thing from the hammy performance he gave. The Senate committee was investigating a serious matter, in the course of which serious questions were raised concerning Mr. Morris. In the circumstances, Mr. Morris' behavior—the gesticulations, the loud asides, the business of turning his back on his questioners, and his own name-calling efforts—was inappropriate to say the least.

It is not feasible in this space to explore the jumble of corporations and interlocking directorates through which the tanker deals that are under investigation were negotiated. That is a job for Senator HOEY's committee.

But one thing which should be of considerable concern to Mr. Morris seems to have been established. Mr. Morris is president of the China International Foundation, Inc., which controlled the stock of a subsidiary, the United Tanker Corp. Virtually all of the money invested in United Tanker was Chinese money, although Mr. Morris insists that stock control was held by Americans.

In 1947 Mr. Morris went to the Maritime Commission to inquire about the possible purchase of some tankers by United Tanker Corp. The commission at that time had a policy against the sale of tankers to foreign interests for fear the ships might get into Russian hands. There was no sale to United Tanker, presumably because of the Chinese financial interest in that corporation. A little later, however, three tankers were sold by the commission to an outfit known as the National Tanker Corp., then headed by former Representative Joseph Casey, which immediately sold them to United Tanker. Then two United tankers were chartered by the Soviet oil agency, which used them to transport oil from Rumania to China almost until the outbreak of the Korean war.

There was nothing illegal about this, and Mr. Morris said the State Department did not object to the oil shipments. He added that he did not know former Secretary of Defense Johnson had lodged a protest against the shipments.

If not illegal, however, it seems clear that the tanker deal operated to thwart and defeat the policy of the Maritime Commission. And Mr. Morris shared in the fees of his law firm, which participated in the negotiations.

In these circumstances, his performance before the committee, including his attack on the Republican Senators, was not an admirable one. In his position, he should have been a willing and a cooperative witness. Instead of losing his temper and putting on a show, he should have endeavored to give every possible bit of information to the committee. That he did not do so is going to impair, and may destroy, his usefulness as Mr. Truman's investigator of corruption in the executive branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

JEWS VERSUS COMMUNISM

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on House Resolution 593

wherein the Katyn Massacre Committee asked for authority to extend the scope of its hearings outside of the United States, I had charge of the resolution on the floor of the House.

A number of Members of Congress asked me to yield during the progress of this debate. On page 2106 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 11, 1952, during the proceedings of the debate, Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, asked me to yield. Congressman RANKIN did not have a question to propound but proceeded to make an extended comment regarding Poland, the Polish Embassy located in Washington, the Katyn outrages, and the Nuremberg trials. Owning to the fact that the gentleman from Mississippi was not propounding a question, I immediately proceeded to search through my file envelope to find and read the contents of a letter which I proposed to present to the Congress. I did not listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Mississippi as my mind was concentrated on the reading of the above-mentioned letter.

The gentleman from Mississippi, in closing his remarks, stated that he wished our committee would thoroughly investigate the atrocious Katyn outrages and also the so-called Nuremberg trials. His last statement was:

> Let us not leave this question to embarrass the American people for a hundred years to come.

My reply was:

> Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

During the first part of his remarks the gentleman from Mississippi referred to "Yiddish Communists as controlling the leadership of communism in Russia, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist countries in Europe."

Of course I need not mention to the Members of this House that I do not in any way subscribe or endorse the import of a statement of that kind. A great number of nations and races across the water have been victims of Communist and Nazi dictators and the record will show that none have suffered more than the Jewish people from the ravages of communism and nazism. I do not need to review my record and efforts since becoming a Member of this House in combating the scourge of the Communist dictators which has been inflicted upon smaller nations and members of the Jewish race. I have done everything within my power to aid in the establishment and growth of Israel and the evidence today bears out that this small nation is our great beachhead in the Middle East in our fight against communism.

Last Tuesday I denounced on the floor of this House the Poles in the Polish Embassy for sending out Communist propaganda. Of course, the great percentage of the Polish people within subjugated Poland are vitriolic anti-Communist, but they are under the yoke of the dictators. The Polish people generally, both behind and beyond the iron curtain, should not be condemned for a few Polish Communists who have turned traitors to their race. This same statement could be applied to the Jewish race—in fact, could be applied to any nation or race. I do not know of any nation or race of people that does not contain a few misguided representatives of their nationality who have fallen into the clutches of communism. Why should any nationality or race be condemned because of a few black sheep in their ranks?

The patriotism and the loyalty of the Jews has been tested in wartime and in peacetime. It reveals a brilliant and patriotic service to their country. The Jewish people of this country have given far more than their share of lives and money to help our country in all times of crisis. They are now sacrificing millions upon millions of dollars to help Israel survive in order to preserve their homeland and also to fight the Communist aggressor. Testimony has been presented at the Katyn hearings where a great number of heroes who died at Katyn were Polish Jews.

These remarks of mine are not necessary to establish the position of the Jewish people as far as patriotism, liberty and freedom are concerned. Their record speaks for itself.

During World War II, the Jewish representation in the armed services was far above its pro rata allotment. A large concentration of Jewish people live in metropolitan centers. Agricultural, mining, and metal industries, and so forth, which were favored by draft exemptions did not apply to metropolitan centers. Besides the relatively large proportion of Jewish boys taken in the draft, there were approximately 35,000 Jewish volunteers. Statistics show that honors conferred on Jewish soldiers for valor in action included no less than 1,100 citations. These included the Congressional Medal of Honor, Distinguished Service Cross, Croix de Guerre and other decorations. The records also reveal that more than 10,000 Jewish commissioned officers were in several branches of the service. The total of Jewish casualties was from 13,000 to 14,000, including 2,800 who made the supreme sacrifice. The figures tell of a sacrificial devotion and patriotism to their country which is in line with their age-long battle for freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the bottom of page 2106 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 11, 1952, immediately following the last comment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that the words: "Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is absolutely correct," be stricken from the permanent RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WILLIAM TREADWELL STONE

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William Treadwell Stone has resigned from the State Department. The State Department should have fired Mr. Stone when I exposed his connection as a member of the editorial board of Amerasia in a speech in the House of Representatives on May 14, 1947, nearly 5 years ago. This speech can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 4, pages 5296–5297. That portion of my speech pertaining to Mr. William Treadwell Stone is as follows:

> Let me give you some idea of the personnel conducting the present program. Top-flight assistant to Mr. WILLIAM BENTON is William Treadwell Stone, Director of the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs. Here is his record:
>
> Member of the editorial board of Amerasia from 1937 through November 1941. Chairman of this board was Frederick Vanderbilt Field, now a regular columnist for the Daily Worker and a member of the Communist Party. Managing editor was Philip Jacob Jaffe, indicted and fined for the possession of confidential Government documents, charged by Hon. George A. Dondero on November 28, 1945, with being in close touch with Earl Browder, until recently head of the Communist Party, United States of America, and Tung Pi Wu, Chinese Communist delegate to the San Francisco Conference. Mr. Stone's membership on the editorial board of Amerasia covers the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact during which this magazine described the war in Europe as imperialistic, declaring that "Germany, industrially powerful but poor in resources and weak financially, is attempting to take by force what Great Britain possesses."
>
> Jaffe's Communist alias was J. W. Phillips (Washington Daily News, June 7, 1945, page 1). Mr. Field was executive secretary of the American Peace Mobilization, a Communist front which picketed the White House during the period of the Stalin-Hitler Pact.
>
> Writing in Amerasia of August 1937, together with such well-known defenders of Soviet foreign policy as Frederick V. Field, Edgar Snow, and Harriet Moore, Mr. Stone comments as follows on relations with Japan:
>
> "Nevertheless, the case against invoking the Neutrality Act, as presented by the State Department and a considerable section of the press, is not altogether convincing * * * on the other hand, if the events at Shanghai have precipitated a general war, as seems likely, a policy of drift which allows munitions shipments and trade in war materials to continue would not advance the cause of peace or reduce the dangers of American involvement. * * * Furthermore, the possibilities of collective action under neutrality have apparently not been explored by Washington" (p. 293).
>
> This statement should be compared with the official line of the Communist Party, U. S. A., at the time as expressed by Earl Browder, its spokesman in an NBC broadcast on August 28, 1936, as follows:
>
> "How long will the American people, who have so convincingly shown their unmistakable desire for peace, continue to hold aloof from collective efforts for peace which alone can check the war plans of the Japanese militarists in the Far East and of their ally, Hitler, in Europe? * * * President Roosevelt—hangs on to a policy of so-called neutrality or isolation which in practice has encouraged the Fascist aggressors. * * * It was this ineffective method which emboldened the Japanese militarists to advance their war plans against China and the United States."
>
> The following article, quoted in part, is taken from Amerasia of October 1940 published under joint editorship of Mr. Stone, Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Field, and others, apparently with their full knowledge and approval. The article is entitled "American Far Eastern Policy; for Democracy or Imperialism?" by

Frederick V. Field and reads in part as follows:

"Our Government is, as it has repeatedly stated, interested in the imperialist status quo. * * * Finally, it may be said that I am expressing an isolated, private view. * * * Over the Labor Day week end more than 22,000 men and women, of whom 6,000 were delegates, met at the Emergency Peace Mobilization in Chicago. * * * Two thousand went on to Washington to lobby and demonstrate against the conscription bill. * * * Because, to them, the building up of a great military machine for the purpose of becoming a partner in a war of rival imperialisms is not consistent with true national defense. I say, therefore, that the views I have expressed are not those of an isolated individual. Rather, they are the views, springing from deep convictions, of millions and millions of Americans who refuse to be duped into war or into an American form of dictatorship and fascism."

No statement appeared in Amerasia to challenge this viewpoint, by Mr. Stone or anyone else.

Again, under the joint editorship of Mr. Stone, with Messrs. Jaffe, Field, and others, there appeared in the January 1940 issue of Amerasia an article by Harriet Moore entitled "Two Wars or One," from which the following excerpt is quoted:

"It"—the United States—"should exert its influence to stop the European conflict as soon as possible by means of negotiated balance-of-power peace."

No statement appeared to challenge this viewpoint.

Mr. Stone was formerly with the Budget Bureau as administrative consultant at $9,800. He is said to have drawn up the plan for the Cultural Division of the State Department.

He has been in charge of selection of personnel for foreign broadcasting.

He is reported to have appointed George Shaw Wheeler, while Stone was in London for the Board of Economic Warfare. Wheeler has a long record of Communist affiliations and activities. Because of this record, Wheeler was removed by the Civil Service Commission and later reinstated as a result of left-wing pressure.

Mr. Speaker, since I exposed Mr. Stone's affiliation with Mr. George Shaw Wheeler, Mr. Wheeler and his wife both deserted our country for behind-the-iron-curtain communism. He and his wife are now living behind the iron curtain.

At that time Mr. William Benton was Assistant Secretary of State. Exception was taken to my reference to Mr. Stone and his association with George Shaw Wheeler in the above speech by Mr. Benton. I replied to his exception by letter on June 26, 1947, which may be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 12, page A3173. That portion of my letter to Mr. William Benton pertaining to Mr. Stone and George Shaw Wheeler is as follows:

I am indeed surprised that exception should be taken to my reference to the association of Mr. William T. Stone with Mr. George Shaw Wheeler. You evidently do not know and were not informed by Mr. Sargeant of the circumstances surrounding Mr. Wheeler's clearance by the Civil Service Commission. Mr. Wheeler was cleared by the Civil Service Commission as a direct result of pressure by certain individuals like former Congressman John M. Coffee and others with a significant list of Communist-front affiliations and sympathies. Mr. Wheeler can be proven to have been a Communist stooge inside the Socialist Party. Men who have returned from Germany have testified to his pro-Communist activity in that important strategic area. Files in my possession show that David A. Morse contacted William T. Stone, Chief of the Foreign Economic Administration in London and told Stone that he (Morse) wanted a statement from the FEA that Wheeler was trustworthy and could be continued on Morse's staff; that a day or two later Stone talked with Morse and stated that he (Stone) was convinced in his judgment that Wheeler was completely trustworthy and should be continued in his present post and that as far as Stone was concerned there was no question or reservation in his mind. This clearly indicates that someone is lying in connection with this case.

In further reference to Mr. Stone, you say that the editorial board of Amerasia, of which he was a member, never met. Would you consider sound the judgment of an individual, in such an important spot as Mr. Stone, who allows his name to be used on the masthead of a magazine involved in espionage activities (see case of Philip Jaffe), which has advocated without protest from Mr. Stone, a negotiated peace with Hitler's Germany, and which numbered among its contributors Frederick V. Field, whose Communist views and record are a matter of public knowledge? Mr. Stone's connections with Amerasia cannot be properly defended, nor can his employment by your Department.

Mr. Speaker, the Amerasia case will go down in history as a monument to the ability of the Communists to penetrate Government agences and as a reminder of the stupidity and lack of security provisions in certain Government agencies. No comment is necessary regarding the several investigations as to how Amerasia officials were able to obtain secret Government documents. Those investigations were a total and complete failure.

However, the State Department was fully aware that one of their employees was connected with Amerasia and was an associate of the known Communists connected with that publication. Yet the State Department, in the 5 years since I have exposed this, have taken no steps to get rid of this individual. Mr. Speaker, did it ever occur to you that these individuals which I and other Members of Congress have been trying for years to remove from the Federal payrolls have never once raised their voices against communism in any way, shape, manner, or form?

The recent hearings held by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary developed some information that indicates Mr. Stone had more than a passing interest in the attempt of Frederick V. Field, his associate with Amerasia, in securing a commission in the Armed Forces Intelligence Service. This information was available to the State Department but it is apparent that they have given no consideration to the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States. In upholding the Feinberg law of New York State, the Supreme Court said:

One's associates, past and present, as well as one's conduct may be considered in determining fitness and loyalty. From time immemorial one's reputation has been determined in part by the company he keeps.

Mr. Stone's associates on the editorial board of Amerasia are sufficient to raise a question as to his fitness and loyalty. If Mr. Stone's reputation is to be determined by the company he keeps, then the record of the activities of such people as Philip Jaffe, Harriet Moore, Frederick V. Field, Thomas A. Bisson, and Owen Lattimore should be considered by the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be said that the State Department did not know or had not been informed regarding the background and activities of Mr. Stone for I presented the proof to them nearly 5 years ago. Is it any wonder that some of us in Congress have become thoroughly disgusted with the failure of the State Department to weed out those undesirables known to be loyalty or security risks. On the evidence, there can be no doubt that Mr. Acheson and the members of the State Department Loyalty Board are more interested in seeing that the administration might not be embarrassed than they are in doing their patriotic duty by ridding the Department of persons of questionable loyalty. Is it more important to keep their faces from becoming red than it is to protect America? Are we to stand by and permit this sort of thing so that Mr. Acheson can continue to claim no one was dismissed by the State Department for pro-Communist activities, while investigations prove there are many who should have been dismissed long ago? How long must the American taxpayers be saddled with additional burdens for pensions and gratuities under accumulated leave, and so forth, for persons whose loyalty to our country is questionable? There are thousands upon thousands of our boys giving their life blood for our country and millions of patriotic citizens sweating it out with the bare necessities of life for the defense of this Nation, while right here in Washington top level officials in the administration, as well as the low-graded Government employees, resign when faced with the knowledge that the Loyalty Review Board, in reviewing the decision of the State Department Loyalty Board might find room for disagreement with the State Department decision and arrive at a decision that would result in their removal from the Government service. How long, I say, must we stand by and watch this performance?

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding all of this information and more regarding Mr. William Treadwell Stone which was in the files of the Loyalty and Security Board of the State Department for all these years, how do you think Mr. Stone's superiors in the State Department regarded him? Do you think they regarded him as one whose loyalty had been under investigation—not once but several times—during the past 5 years? They did not. They regarded him as one who should be completely trusted with the Government's most highly classified top secrets.

Very recently Mr. Stone was a special assistant to Mr. Edward W. Barrett, Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Public Affairs. Mr. Stone as a special representative of Mr. Barrett, was permitted to sit in meetings of the Psychological Operations Coordinating Committee where real hush-hush top-level

secrets were discussed between various defense and intelligence agencies on the subject of psychological warfare. POCC had a working committee headed by Mr. Vincent Wilbur, who was also the acting executive secretary of POCC. Mr. Stone, who was a special assistant to Mr. Barrett, was Mr. Barrett's representative on the working committee of POCC.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the beginning, Mr. William Treadwell Stone has resigned. What are the facts surrounding his resignation? The Loyalty and Security Board of the State Department had recently cleared Mr. Stone. It would be interesting to know how many times they had cleared him in the last 6 years. After a Department loyalty board clears a person who is a suspect, the Loyalty Review Board takes over the case on what is known as a post-audit. During the post-audit the Loyalty Review Board reviews the decision of the Department loyalty board to ascertain if, in their opinion, the Department loyalty board was correct in their conclusions.

It is the practice of the Loyalty Review Board to stop processing a case on post-audit immediately upon being notified that the individual has resigned.

Mr. William T. Stone's case followed very closely the pattern of the John Stewart Service case, up to the point of Stone's resignation. Both had been cleared by the loyalty board of the State Department. The Board was satisfied to pass on the loyalty and security of Mr. Stone on the information presented in the file. However, the eligible decision of the State Department Loyalty Board in the case of Mr. Stone was subject to review or post-audit by the Loyalty Review Board. Apparently when Mr. Stone discovered that his case was being reviewed by the Loyalty Review Board, and undoubtedly having in mind the action taken by that Board in the case of John Stewart Service, Mr. Stone thought it better to resign. More than 30 days passed before the fact of Mr. Stone's resignation was made known to the Loyalty Review Board. Why?

If Mr. Stone chooses to deny this reason for his resignation, let him, in the same breath, ask the Loyalty Review Board if they will be so kind as to accommodate him by making a final determination of his case after a complete investigation by the FBI.

The acceptance by the State Department of Mr. Stone's resignation permits him to collect payment for all his unused and accumulated annual leave, which, according to my understanding, is approximately $6,000. Further, it is my understanding that the payment of unused annual leave would not have been allowed had Mr. Stone been separated either as a security or loyalty risk. The acceptance by the State Department of Mr. Stone's resignation further permits him whatever benefits he may be entitled to under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

In order to fully protect the Government—which in turn means the people—President Truman should amend his Executive Order No. 9835, to make it mandatory for the Loyalty Review Board to make a final determination on every individual case, notwithstanding the fact the person under review has resigned As the case of Mr. Stone now stands, he can be employed by any department of Government—even the State Department.

Mr. Speaker, this is the day we pay our honor and respect to St. Patrick, the patron saint of Ireland. He will always be remembered in verse, song, and speech for having driven all the snakes out of Ireland. Is it not about time the President, the Secretary of State, and all the others responsible for the loyalty and security of employees in our Federal Government drive the Communist and pinko snakes out of Government? This is not a reflection on the large percentage of Federal employees whose loyalty is beyond question. Those employees are just as anxious as I to see that employees whose loyalty is questioned are dismissed from their jobs. It is high time those in high places stop trying to fool the Congress and the people and give us action instead of lip service by getting rid of all employees of questionable loyalty, instead of permitting them to resign after untold amounts of the taxpayers' money has been spent to prove their disloyalty.

Mr. Speaker, while Mr. Stone has been a very controversial figure in the Government for the past 5 years, not one word has been released by the State Department concerning his separation. When will the State Department learn that they must deal honestly with the public?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE AMERICAN AIR FORCE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been seriously concerned about the progress being made in the development of our Air Force. I am not concerned about the quality of that which we have. I believe in material and personnel we are far ahead of the Communist. I do not believe that there is a pilot within the Chinese Communists' air arm who can match our pilots in sheer ability and courage. This has been tested on a thousand air battlefields; and this is the factor more than any other single thing which has prevented our planes from being wiped out of the skies over Korea.

I have before me a dispatch from Tokyo, dated March 4, 1952. The first sentence of this dispatch reads:

> Outnumbered American Sabre jets attacked formations of Communist MIG's south of the Yalu River for the first time in 3 days and destroyed two and damaged five others in four flashing dog fights.

And then again in the body of the same article:

> The four separate air actions pitted 27 Sabres against 50 MIG's, 28 Sabres against 40 MIG's, and 27 Sabres against 60 MIG's. * * * Allied losses Monday, if any, were not announced * * *. Through February 29 the allies have lost 153 jets, mostly to ground fire.

And then again in the same article:

> Capt. Jack C. Schwab (337 Dorchester Street) Boston, Mass., got his first kill of the Korean war when he downed a MIG in the battle between 23 Sabres and 100 MIG's just south of the Manchurian border.

The dispatch from which I read extracts is not unusual. It is the variety of news which comes almost daily to us, informing us that our jets must fight engagements against what seems to me to be hopeless numbers—and yet because of superior training, ability and better material, our men come out of these contests fairly well. The battle for supremacy, however, is becoming more intense and more severe each week, and our losses, even though many may be from ground fire, should give us cause for serious thought.

This failure to produce combat planes in quantities which we need them at the present time may be due to a number of factors. It may be due to a change in plans made at the eleventh hour which has held back production of a modern type combat jet plane. Undoubtedly this factor has played some part in the failure to get our production of this type of aircraft underway at an early date. On the other hand, I believe the failure to properly allot critically short materials has played a much more important part in the collapse of our jet production program. The American radio commentator Drew Pearson mentioned this over the radio Sunday night and I thoroughly agree with him in the strong presentation for the need of additional jet production. There may be materials vitally needed to produce jet planes in critically short supply, but this type of production should have the green light for priority on these materials over every other item, unless it be some production of atomic materials. We cannot afford to let civilian demands or other governmental demands take from us materials which must be had in order to produce the modern combat planes which shortage is being so badly felt at the present time.

Of course, all branches of our Defense Establishment have been fighting for priorities of critical materials. The civilian economy likewise has felt the pinch of metal shortages and has felt as though it was being starved. Generally speaking, I believe that our defense production is moving along rather nicely. In reference to the production of planes, I believe that we have failed dismally.

Last week in one of the Senate committees, the matter of the proper handling of defense priorities in critically short materials was discussed. During the course of this investigation, one of the witnesses from the Defense Department, as I recall, stated that priorities were often decided by the toss of a coin to determine whether the Army, Navy, or Air Arm would receive available critical materials. I am glad that a top spokesman from the Defense Department said that no such action was taken by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and by top defense officials, and that such action was taken at a lower level.

We who are concerned over our own national defense may be inclined to feel

somewhat better from this lackadaisical denial. At the same time there are those who feel that perhaps tossing a coin for the decision on such an important matter, as Julius Caesar who rolled the dice before crossing the Rubicon, may have been as efficacious as the method employed in many instances in the past to decide what allocation was most important from a time element.

With dispatches indicating a growing preponderance of Communist air power in the Korean theater, the Pentagon and the NPA should be seized with no indecision as to what action to take. We must have far greater production of jets. It is not fair to daily pit our pilots against odds of four, five, and six MIG's to one American plane. If there are any shortages, available supplies should be resolved in favor of a greater production of American jet pilots. Tossing a coin may be the effective oriental way of making decisions of great magnitude, but it is certainly not the American way of whipping a serious production problem.

A good friend of mine with a large industrial background of experience has suggested that perhaps a civilian committee formed from earnest patriotic American businessmen throughout the country should be organized to aid in our plans to produce the planes we need. During the course of World War II we met our production goal of 75,000 planes a year; but my guess now is that our production of jets is less than 1,000 per year and this at a time when our men are fighting against terrific superiority in numbers in the swirling skies over Korea. It is not surprising that the grief-stricken widow of our greatest Korean ace aviator should cry out in anguish when news of his death reached us over the necessity of daily sacrificing our men to an unfair and unequal combat.

Such a committee, as has been suggested, could be made answerable to Congress and not to the executive department. I think that such a committee should work in close cooperation with the Armed Services Committees of Congress. It would help locate our bottlenecks industrially speaking and make recommendations as to how they may be removed. Such an industrial civilian committee might perform the creditable feat of putting the United States of America back in the jet production lead in the world.

Regardless of the suggestion, a stepped-up jet production is now vital. To delay further in making strong decisions is certainly gambling with the future of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, America is unhappy. America will continue to be unhappy as long as she lags behind Russia in needed production of jet airplanes. Let us correct this situation before we have the far worse experience of having MIG's in the skies over the United States of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, permission to sence was granted to Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), on account of official business, for balance of this week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Missouri and to include an address delivered by the President of the United States on last Saturday.

Mr. HÉBERT and to include an article by Eberhard P. Deutsch, entitled "A Decision for the People of America," notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $189.

Mr. MADDEN and to include an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. DORN and to include an article.

Mr. PERKINS and to include a joint statement.

Mr. WOLVERTON and to include several newspaper articles.

Mr. WERDEL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include a broadcast made last Thursday night, March 13, by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

Mr. JACKSON of California and to include extraneous matter in three instances.

Mr. DONDERO and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska.

Mr. ADAIR and to include an editorial.

Mr. GOODWIN and to include an editorial.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska and to include correspondence from a constituent.

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) in two instances, in each to include an editorial.

Mr. ELSTON and to include an editorial.

Mr AUCHINCLOSS in two instances, in one to include newspaper articles.

Mr. RADWAN and to include an article.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JOHNSON in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter.

Mr. STIGLER and to include an essay written by a constituent.

Mr. STEED and to include a magazine article, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the printed RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $210.

Mr. PHILLIPS and to include an article.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. HAVENNER) and to include a news item.

Mr. HARVEY and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BURNSIDE.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3219. An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus; and

H. R. 5317. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co. of Canton, Ohio.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1851. An act to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 18, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1247. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the Secretary of Defense and the semiannual reports of the Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force for the period July 1 to December 31, 1951, pursuant to section 202 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1248. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of certain legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1249. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting copies of orders canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians, pursuant to the act of July 1, 1932 (47 Stat. 564); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1250. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled, "A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled 'An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress,' approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25, 13 U. S. C. 216)"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 13, 1952, the following bill was reported March 14, 1952:

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7072. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted March 17, 1952*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 6375. A bill to amend the Agricultural

Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 6578. A bill to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agriculture, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1519). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 6839. A bill to modify and extend the authority of the Postmaster General to lease quarters for post-office purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6863. A bill to make provisions for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 15. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 4924. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the transfer to the Administrator of General Services of functions relating to the acquisition and assignment of passenger-carrying motor vehicles and to the control of office furniture and equipment; with amendment (Rept. No. 1523). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 5350. A bill to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1524). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5254. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1525). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 287. A bill relative to granting and giving instructions in civil and criminal cases in the district courts of continental United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 1526). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CROSSER: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Interim report pursuant to section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong., H. Res. 107, 81st Cong. as extended by H. Res. 51 and H. Res. 323, 82d Cong., and H. Res. 116, 82d Cong.) entitled "Commerce with Latin America" (Rept. No. 1527). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Progress Report No. 14, pursuant to section 712 (b) of the Defense Production Act (Rept. No. 1528). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 13, 1952, the following bill was introduced on March 14, 1952:

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 7072. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry 'ndependent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

[Introduced and referred March 17, 1952]

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 7073. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7074. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 7075. A bill to provide for representation of independent labor organizations on the Wage Stabilization Board, Economic Stabilization Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 7076. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for self-employed lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7077. A bill to provide a method of paying certain unsettled claims for damages sustained as a result of the explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944, in the amounts found to be due by the Secretary of the Navy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 7078. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), so as to extend the period during which vocational rehabilitation training may be afforded certain veterans who were prevented from receiving such training by reason of hospitalization or other incapacity; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7079. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 7080. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 7081. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to repeal the $50 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7082. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to complete the survey of the Pecatonica flood area, and to appropriate $25,000 for such purpose; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 7083. A bill to authorize the purchase of land and improvements in Gunnison County, Colo., to facilitate research into range improvement and rangeland management in the Rocky Mountain area and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 7084. A bill to facilita the development of small reclamation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7085. A bill to provide for an addition to the George Washington Memorial Parkway by the transfer from the Administrator of General Services to the Secretary of the Interior of the tract of land in Arlington County, Va., commonly known as the Nevius tract; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 7086. A bill to regulate the repayment to the United States of advances made to the States and local subdivisions thereof under title V of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEADER:

H. Res. 572. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 492, Eighty-second Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER. Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Vermont, transmitting a copy of an interstate civil defense compact as ratified and approved by the State of Vermont; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 7087. A bill for the relief of Samuel and Gregory Goekjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romola Nijinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Paul Bohus-Vilagosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 7090. A bill for the relief of William Robert DeGrafft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 7091. A bill for the relief of James Sech-chau Hwong and Mrs. Tseng-hwa Chow Hwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 7092. A bill for the relief of Ester Andreasen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 7093. A bill for the relief of Irene Ezitis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7094. A bill for the relief of Pio Valensin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 7095. A bill for the relief of Ruth Ann Holecek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7096. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. James D. Wilmeth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 7097. A bill for the relief of Kang Duk Yee or Mrs. John J. Hassett (married name); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7098. A bill to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres, who has expatriated herself; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTIRE:

H. R. 7099. A bill for the relief of Harus Sugahara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 7100. A bill for the relief of Peter Hirsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 7101. A bill for the relief of Cornelio and Lucia Tequillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 7102. A bill for the relief of Pietro Murgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

634. By the SPEAKER: Petition of National Commander, Philippine Pacific War Veterans, Minneapolis, Minn., relative to numerous bills now pending before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and requesting the privilege of appearing before said committee to present petitions and views on these bills; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

635. Also, petition of George W. Taylor, and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

636. Also, petition of E. K. Collings, and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

637. Also, petition of Louise Russell, and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

638. Also petition of M. B. Claypoole, and others, St. Petersburg, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

639. Also, petition of Emily Baldowski, and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

640. Also, petition of city and county clerk, Honolulu, T. H., relative to resolution No. 107, requesting the return of the entire area of Fort DeRussy Military Reservation, in the heart of Waikiki, city of Honolulu, to the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in a world that lieth in darkness, swept by fitful winds of despair and doubt, we pause at this sheltered sanctuary of Thy grace to make sure that the light within is not dimmed. Make our spirits great enough for these great days. Upon our feverish lives drop the still dews of Thy quietness, that in simple trust and deeper reverence we may be found steadfast in an unstable day, always abounding in the work Thou givest us to do, knowing that our labor is not in vain in the Lord.

"Thy love hath led us in the past.
In this free land, by Thee, our lot is cast.
Be Thou our Ruler, Guardian, Guide, and Stay,
Thy word our law, Thy paths our chosen way."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 17, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1499. An act to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind;

H. R. 1511. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande;

H. R. 3166. An act to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes;

H. R. 3589. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works;

H. R. 5891. An act to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis;

H. R. 6319. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6863. An act to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; and

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Wolf Creek Dam in the State of Kentucky as Lake Cumberland.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4515) to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT announced that on today, March 18, 1952, he signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 5317) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. BRIDGES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. CAIN was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that, as in legislative session, Senators may be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Woman's Press Club of New York City, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to strengthen the antismuggling laws; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Baltimore Chapter 48, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, Baltimore, Md., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide increased annuities for retired civil employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 1739. A bill to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1335).

By Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

H. R. 5369. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain lands located within, and in the vicinity of, the Federal Communications Commission's primary monitoring station, Portland, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1337).

PURCHASE OF CERTAIN MORTGAGES BY FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages, and I submit a report (No. 1338) thereon.

I may say that this joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. A similar joint resolution has been introduced in the House, and I am informed has been reported today by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

In effect the joint resolution amends the Housing and Facilities Act of 1951 which provided for an authorization of $200,000,000 for prior commitments by

the Federal National Mortgage Association in critical defense areas and military housing.

The full committee considered this joint resolution. I am reporting it on behalf of the full committee.

It is distinctly understood that these commitments would only cover those projects for which application has been made to the Federal National Mortgage Association prior to December 28, 1951, and in the case of two military projects which had received Federal Housing Administration commitments prior to December 31, 1951, but subsequent to December 28, 1951.

It is also distinctly understood that the joint resolution ought not to be amended, or enlarged by the Members of the committee who approved it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF ILLEGAL CONDUCT IN TRANSACTION OF GOVERNMENT BUSINESS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original joint resolution, and I submit a report (No. 1339) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 143) to authorize the appointment of a special investigator and not to exceed five deputies with power to investigate improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States, and to prosecute such conduct where found, reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

CITATION OF ABRAM FLAXER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original resolution, and submit a report (No. 1336) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The resolution (S. Res. 295), reported by Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary, was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States as to the refusal of Abram Flaxer to answer a series of questions before the said subcommittee and the failure and refusal of Abram Flaxer to furnish records and supplemental information in compliance with a subpena duces tecum of said subcommittee and as ordered by the subcommittee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that said Abram Flaxer may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2880. A bill for the relief of Yoko Minato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 2881. A bill for the relief of Francesco Mibelli;

S. 2882. A bill for the relief of Georgios Tsagaropoulos;

S. 2883. A bill for the relief of Constantine Piteris;

S. 2884. A bill for the relief of Demos Apesos; and

S. 2885. A bill for the relief of Nikas George Paschalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2886. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alma Egan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

S. 2887. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 2888. A bill for the relief of George Ban McCleland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2889. A bill to amend certain acts and parts of acts which require the submission of documents to the Post Office Department under oath, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NIXON:

S. 2890. A bill for the relief of Perry Dwight Landon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENTON:

S. 2891. A bill for the relief of Joseph Arthur Parent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2892. A bill to aid in meeting the defense mobilization requirements of the United States by providing for the training or retraining of civilian aviation personnel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2893. A bill to exempt Blackfeet tribal loans from certain restrictions applicable to Federal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2894. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fopp; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 2895. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to authorize the appointment of a special investigator and not to exceed five deputies with power to investigate improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States, and to prosecute such conduct where found; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN when he reported the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

INVESTIGATION OF RELATIONSHIP OF UNITED STATES WITH THE INDIANS—INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ECTON, and Mr. WATKINS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 296), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 292, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 13, 1950, and as extended by Senate Resolution 32, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, and as further extended by Senate Resolution 152, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951, authorizing an investigation by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the relations of the United States with the Indians and Indian tribes, is hereby increased by $15,000.

SUPERVISION OF OPERATIONS OF CONTRACT CARRIERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2361) to require the supervision, by the Interstate Commerce Commission, of the operations of contract carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 1499. An act to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 1511. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mid Valley Bridge Co., Hidalgo, Tex., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Rio Grande; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3166. An act to amend the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 3589. An act to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to recording and performing rights in literary works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5891. An act to amend the veterans regulations to establish for certain persons who served in the Armed Forces a further presumption of service connection for an active psychosis; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6319. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 (61 Stat. 734), as amended, so as to authorize the appointment of a Chief of the Medical Service Corps of the Navy, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6863. An act to make provision for suitable accommodations for the Bureau of Customs and certain other Government services at El Paso, Tex., and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Wolf Creek Dam in the State of Kentucky as Lake Cumberland; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. JENNER:

Television address entitled "To Caesar and to God," delivered by Most Rev. Fulton J. Sheen, D. D., on March 2, 1952.

By Mr. MOODY:

Article entitled "What Are You For?" written by the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, and published in the Washington Star of March 16, 1952.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "Let's Have It Straight Just for Once," written by Walter Weir, and published in Printer's Ink of February 29, 1952.

By Mr. HOEY:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Truman and Oscar Chapman Show a Supreme Indifference to Facts," published in the Charlotte Observer, of Charlotte, N. C.

By Mr. HENNINGS:

Editorial entitled "What Can I Do?" published in the Kansas City (Mo.) Star of February 24, 1952, dealing with the necessity for increased participation in voting.

By Mr. WILEY:

Article entitled "Wisconsin Factories Hum With Defense Work; Huge Orders Pouring in Weekly," published in the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of January 28, 1952.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article entitled "Kiwanis Shows the World," from the February 1952 issue of the Kiwanis magazine.

By Mr. NIXON:

Editorial entitled "Mr. Morris Stubs His Toe," published in the Washington Evening Star of March 14, 1952, and an editorial entitled "Low Boiling Point," published in the Washington Daily News of March 14, 1952, both relating to the appearance of Mr. Newbold Morris before the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. LOUIS C. KRESS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, last week the Nation lost, through death, one of the greatest exponents of cancer education, Dr. Louis C. Kress, director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute at Buffalo, N. Y.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks a short statement which I have prepared concerning Dr. Kress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Dr. Louis C. Kress was on his way to Rochester to make a speech on cancer research, one of thousands he had made before lay and professional groups over a period of 28 years, when he suffered a heart attack. An indication of the respect in which he was held by professional circles is the fact that the meeting in Rochester—a meeting of the Rochester Pharmaceutical Association—was scheduled for 10:30 in the evening so that all Rochester pharmacists could hear the famed cancer fighter after closing their drug stores.

Ironically, Dr. Kress died before he could see the fruition of his fondest dream—the completion of the expansion of Roswell Park Memorial Institute, which is the center for cancer research and treatment in up-State New York. Dr. Kress had fought for many years to have the institute expanded and had carefully planned every laboratory, operating room, and piece of equipment.

Dr. Kress in his lifetime set an example which may well become legendary in the field of cancer research. At the age of 28, he gave up a lucrative medical practice to devote his life to fighting cancer. In recalling that decision, he once told a reporter that he and his wife had made up their minds to forego big cars and mink coats and country clubs for the rest of their lives. And Dr. Kress then went on to become, in New York State, the leading light in the long hard task of educating people on cancer and pushing the much-needed research projects. Only last month the American Cancer Society selected Dr. Kress as recipient of its first annual award for important contributions to the control of cancer.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD, in connection with my statement, the text of an editorial entitled "Life of Devoted Service," which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, of March 14, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE OF DEVOTED SERVICE

In the death of Dr. Louis C. Kress, director of the Roswell Park Memorial Institute, there passed a man who made important contributions to the alleviation of human suffering. Practically all his professional career was given to the study of malignant diseases. He was a leader in the fight again cancer; he promoted research in the nature and cause of this dread disease, research looking to the discovery of an eventual cure for it. He was recognized nationally and internationally as an authority in this field of medical science.

Dr. Kress was long associated with the State Institute for the Study of Malignant Diseases, from which the Roswell Park Memorial Institute developed. His work there brought him appointment as director of the Division of Cancer Control of the New York State Department of Health. His selection as director of the enlarged institute here, which is in process of development as one of the greatest centers of cancer research and treatment in the Nation, followed as a matter of course. Unhappily, he could not live to see the project for the enlargement of its facilities completed.

No man has done more than did Dr. Kress to promote public education with respect to cancer—to spread information regarding manifestations of it and so get an early diagnosis. Thus the lives of a great many persons were saved, for cancer often can be cured if it is discovered in good time. He always was available for addresses before groups of citizens who wished to know something about the disease. He preached the gospel of hope in early diagnosis. He lectured at medical schools and before medical societies in this country and Canada on the findings of cancer research. For his devoted service he was cited by the University of Buffalo, and he received the first annual award of the American Cancer Society, New York State Division.

Cancer remains largely a mystery, but real headway has been made by scientists like Dr. Kress in combatting it. They and their successors will continue research until the mystery of it is pierced and it takes its place among the generally recognized curable diseases. There is no commensurate reward for men like Dr. Kress; they must find it within themselves. They light the way, step by step, for eventual conquest of the scourge of cancer. Dr. Kress will long be held in grateful remembrance for his devoted service for mankind.

QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and ask the indulgence of the Senate.

The day before yesterday, on the Nation-wide television program, See It Now, Senator MCCARTHY made a charge against me wholly at variance with the facts.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Inasmuch as the Senator's remarks evidently have to do with another Senator, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield for that purpose?

Mr. BENTON. Unless I have to yield for that purpose, I do not yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not have to yield for any purpose.

Mr. BENTON. Then, I decline to yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut may proceed.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, this television program is under the direction of the internationally famous broadcaster and commentator, Mr. Edward Murrow. I suspect that he is more embarrassed and distressed about this abuse of his broadcast than anyone else can possibly be. Mr. Murrow has achieved a reputation for objectivity and for truthful reporting. He is esteemed as one of the two or three most eminent commentators in the history of broadcasting. He would never wilfully or willingly give time on his program for the dissemination of false and misleading charges against any individual—even against a United States Senator.

Senator MCCARTHY's statement on this program I shall now read. I shall take nothing out of the context. At my request the Columbia Broadcasting System transcribed the statement from its kinescope recording. I shall quote everything they sent me, even though the first part of it may not seem very relevant. There can be no denial in this case of the accuracy of the transcript, as there has been by the junior Senator

from Wisconsin of the accuracy of the newspaper reports, and the sworn affidavits of radio officials, on his famous speech of February 9, 1950, at Wheeling, W. Va. Here is the transcript:

Mr. MURROW. A lot of people have said that you have smeared them and you have said recently you have been smeared. This raises the whole question of the rights and privileges of an ordinary citizen or a Senator before an investigating committee. What do you think ought to be done about that, Senator?

Mr. MCCARTHY. What do I think ought to be done about what, Ed?

Mr. MURROW. About the protection of the rights of an individual citizen who may be called before a congressional committee.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If a man is called before a committee and tells the truth—it is only the man who has something to cover up—the man who is perjuring himself—he has much to worry about.

Mr. MURROW. Then you feel if you should be called before an investigating committee you will have nothing to worry about?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I have been called in.

Mr. MURROW. Do you expect to be called again?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I don't know.

Mr. MURROW. Tell me this, Senator MCCARTHY, how do you feel on the subject of congressional immunity?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Congressional immunity, like many other necessary parts of our Republic, you understand, Ed, can be abused, has been abused, many times. You understand that the idea of congressional immunity originated way back in England when the representatives of the people couldn't freely speak their minds for fear of being hung by the king. Today we have congressional immunity, not for the benefit of the Senators, but for the benefit of the public, so they may get the facts. I have before me a document which I think displays the rather humorous attitude of some Senators about congressional immunity. I have the testimony of BILL BENTON, Connecticut's mental midget, before the committee. At that time he was speaking on the congressional immunity, objecting because I used congressional immunity to expose Communists. This was handed to the press and we find the following: "No part of this must be used by the press until it becomes immune as I testified." So you find the Senator shouting and screaming to high heaven "MCCARTHY shouldn't use congressional immunity to expose Communists." But he is using congressional immunity to smear MCCARTHY.

Mr. MURROW. What do you think is going to happen in the Wisconsin primaries?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Ed, I don't know. It is too early to predict.

Mr. President, now what are the facts? The facts are that I presented testimony to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections totaling something like 30,000 words. I could not know that the committee would sit both morning and afternoon—incidentally, with all members present—and would finish up the hearing of my testimony in 1 day. If the committee had not met in the afternoon, my testimony could not have been completed. If the committee had consumed more time in asking questions, or by statements of individual committee members, the hearings would have gone over to a second day and perhaps even a third day.

Most assuredly I should not have released my full 30,000 words of testimony, prior to the hearings, or even at their beginning. If I had, the committee could have read in the newspapers, prior to its presentation, the material which I intended to present to it. I suggest that this would have been regarded by many as discourteous on my part. Further, it would have violated traditional procedures.

Now, what was the statement made to the press when my testimony was given out? I shall read it in full. It is the only statement that accompanied my testimony. It was written and signed by Stan Allen, my administrative assistant, and an experienced newspaperman:

Caution: The attached testimony of Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, scheduled for delivery before the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections of the Rules Committee of the Senate starting at or about 9:30 a. m., Friday, September 28, 1951, must be held in strict confidence for release, as it becomes a part of the record of the subcommittee. No portion, synopsis, or intimation must be given out, published or broadcast, except under the conditions herein set forth.

Please guard against premature publication or announcement.

It will be noted that there is no reference here of any kind to any desire of mine for immunity. The Senate, I am sure, will agree that this statement is perfectly routine handling. It is designed to protect the press, which is itself concerned with the problem of libel. It seeks to deal fairly both with the press and the members of the committee.

Mr. President, there is a second glaring error in Senator MCCARTHY's remarks of last Sunday to Mr. Murrow and to some millions of his listeners. In view of the record, I think I am justified in assuming this was a calculated error. Senator MCCARTHY quoted me as objecting to his use of congressional immunity and claimed that I had—to use his words—"shouted and screamed to high heaven" about his abuse of immunity. The fact is that nowhere in my testimony did I object to his use of immunity. What I did, in my case No. 6, was to show that he had deceived the Senate with respect to his intentions regarding immunity.

I showed that on February 20, 1950, when he was challenged, on the floor he replied—without any qualification:

I will not say anything on the Senate floor which I will not say off the floor. On the day when I take advantage of the security we have on the Senate floor, on that day I will resign from the Senate.

Exactly 2 months later, at the conclusion of a speech before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Senator MCCARTHY was again challenged, this time by one of the editors. He replied:

One of your questions is: "Will you make the statement in public?" The answer is "No." No. 2, "Are you going to resign?" The answer is "No." O. K.?

Mr. President, what I was shouting and screaming to high heaven about—if you will pardon the quotation—was not immunity but honesty.

The Senate may recall that after Senator MCCARTHY launched his sensational attacks on the State Department in Wheeling, he followed up the next day with a second attack in Salt Lake City.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. BENTON. Do I have a choice, Mr. President?

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut is out of order. He referred to the honesty of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut will have to take his seat if challenged by any Senator.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from Connecticut be allowed to proceed in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, do I have to yield for that purpose?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that when this question is raised any Senator has the right to make the point of no quorum. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] moved that the Senator from Connecticut be allowed to proceed in order. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Millikin
Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Benton	Hickenlooper	Moody
Brewster	Hill	Morse
Bricker	Hoey	Mundt
Bridges	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Humphrey	Neely
Capehart	Hunt	Nixon
Carlson	Ives	O'Conor
Case	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Douglas	Knowland	Seaton
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. J.
Ecton	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Malone	Sparkman
Ferguson	Martin	Stennis
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Frear	McCarran	Tobey
Fulbright	McCarthy	Underwood
George	McClellan	Watkins
Gillette	McFarland	Wiley
Green	McKellar	Williams
Hayden	McMahon	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona that the Senator from Connecticut be allowed to proceed in order. [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" have it, and the Senator from Connecticut is recognized and will proceed in order.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, my testimony of last September before the Subcommittee on Elections shows how the Senator from Wisconsin changed his Wheeling statement that there were "205—a list of names that were made known to the Secretary of State as being members of the Communist Party and who nevertheless are still working and shaping policy in the State Department," to the charge that there were "57 card-carrying members of the Communist Party" in the State Department.

At the time of the Wheeling and Salt Lake speeches, I had been a Member of the United States Senate for less than 2 months. However, through my prior service as Assistant Secretary of State, I had devoted perhaps more of my life to studying Russian propaganda methods than any other Member of the Congress has had an opportunity to do. In my second speech on the floor of the Senate—on May 9, 1950—after 5 months' service as a Senator, and based on my own personal experience with Russian propaganda and with the techniques and tactics of its practitioners, I stated—at this point in my speech I was discussing the techniques of the handling of political propaganda or any other kind of propaganda—

To illustrate: The soap manufacturers did not invent the idea of cleanliness. Again: The religious evangelist can always count on an existing sense of sin. Surely there is no better example for all of us today than the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. He knows he can count on a vague distrust of the State Department. That is a sure thing, something the Senator from Wisconsin did not originate. Indeed, the distrust of foreign offices, as I have heretofore pointed out to the Senate, seems universal. But, though it may not have occurred to him, the Senator from Wisconsin is proceeding on the standard tactics of the Communist propagandist. Like the Communist propagandist, he is doing his best to exploit his prejudices by any and every means. He does not argue; he does not answer; he does not reason. He hits and runs. I submit that the Senator from Wisconsin is a very talented propagandist of the Soviet type.

Mr. President, that quotation is 2 years old, but it very neatly fits Senator McCARTHY's wholly inaccurate statements on the television program last Sunday.

The Senator may have refined and improved upon his tactics in the past 2 years, but they do not change. He hits and he runs. He does not answer facts. He never faces up to them. He hits—and then he runs again.

Not long ago in Milwaukee Senator McCARTHY made front-page headlines by announcing that he was going to demonstrate that he was not afraid to make statements off the Senate floor, where he had no immunity, and for which he could thus be sued for libel. What did he then do? The newspapers report that he gave a speech in which the statements made, for which he might have been held for libel, had already been delivered on the floor of the Senate. I am told by one of the top lawyers in this field that, although a legal test has never been made, such use of Senate material is believed by many lawyers to preserve the privilege of immunity. The newspapers have immunity when they print what is said on the floor of Congress, and in effect all a Congressman does when he repeats himself off the floor is to quote from the newspapers or from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In fact, a member of the press who was there told me that Senator McCARTHY said to his audience, "I am now going to read to you from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

Under that interpretation, I can repeat my 30,000 words of testimony before any audience, and preserve my immunity in regard to it. However, my inquiries indicate that a Senator, like any other citizen, can waive his immunity in court, and I herewith offer unequivocally to waive any immunity which I may enjoy under the Constitution or under the Senate rules, on any statement in those 30,000 words, if any question of my personal legal responsibility is ever raised by anyone. I testified under oath, and I gladly accept full legal responsibility.

Mr. President, I would quote to the Senate from that statement at some length, or briefly at least, were it not for the fact that I shall seek to avoid a recurrence of the delaying incident the Senate has just experienced, when I was ordered to take my seat.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, while the Senator from Connecticut said he did not want to yield, I wonder whether he will yield for one question before he proceeds further.

Mr. BENTON. Yes; I will yield for one question, but I prefer not to yield until I finish. I should yield now if only because I have referred to Wheeling, W. Va.

Mr. KILGORE. That is my only reason for asking the question, I may say. The Senator referred to a speech made at Wheeling, W. Va., on Lincoln's birthday a little more than a year ago. The Senator from Connecticut has followed this matter more closely possibly than I have. Has the Senator from Wisconsin in any statement before any committee of the Senate, or in any speech ever named a single employee of any type in the State Department—and I mean an employee who was on the payroll at the time he made his statement, or within the weeks before that—and given the name and address so that we could put our finger on the employee? I have asked the Senator from Wisconsin that question, but he has never replied. I ask the Senator from Connecticut whether he remembers the Senator from Wisconsin ever naming any such employee.

Mr. BENTON. He has specifically named many people on the floor of the Senate. He gave the names of 25 or 30 only a few months ago.

Mr. KILGORE. But were they in the employ of the State Department at the time he made the speech?

Mr. BENTON. I would assume that some of them were. I do not want to be unequivocal in answering the question. I do not remember, specifically.

Mr. KILGORE. That must have been one of the statements by the Senator from Wisconsin which I missed, I may say to the Senator, because, up to that time, he had never named a single one.

Mr. BENTON. The Senator from West Virginia may be better informed about this than I am. He may have looked the matter up and verified it, and I have not.

Now, Mr. President, I have in my office a copy of the 30,000 words which make up my charges against Senator McCARTHY. This statement is all a part of the Senate record of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I would welcome a chance to send it to any Member of the Senate and I can give assurance that it is very interesting reading. It is not a dull legal brief. I commend it to my colleagues.

One of the ten cases I may be able to mention briefly without being challenged under the Senate rules is the Lustron case. This is the case No. 2 with which this document deals, setting forth the way in which the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] accepted $10,000 from a corporation which was vitally concerned in a field in which the Senator from Wisconsin, as a legislator and as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, carried vital responsibility. But regarding all statements set forth in those 30,000 words, and many others of like character, I am prepared to stand legally and personally responsible. However, Mr. President, it seems to me that even without such a statement from me, and without any further action on my part, I am already fully responsible for charges of fraud and deceit against the Senator from Wisconsin.

Until today, I have refrained from speaking on the subject of my resolution to expel Senator McCARTHY from the Senate, with one exception, for the past 7 months. With this one exception, I do not now recall having talked about Senator McCARTHY. I have refrained from speaking because, with the matter before the subcommittee of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], I did not think additional speeches on my part were indicated, nor did I think they would necessarily prove helpful in attaining the desired objectivity in the procedures of the committee. However, now that the committee has taken its action calling for a vote by the full Senate, and now that the incident of the television program has arisen, which I could not ignore, I felt I should make this statement today to the Senate.

However, on one occasion, on February 9, in New York City, in a speech before the One Hundredth Alumni Association of the City College of New York, I made a statement, without benefit of immunity, to which I shall only refer briefly because here again I do not want to delay the Senate through an accusation that I am breaking the Senate rules. The entire speech has been released to the press, and I would be glad to give to any interested Senator the full text. Among other things I said:

I would, however, point out that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] has recently been widening his assaults—

Mr. President, earlier and later in the speech I made the same kind of

statements about Senator McCARTHY which I had made before the Rules Subcommittee—

extending them from attacks on the loyalty of defenseless public servants with whom he happens to disagree, to attacks on the loyalty of newspapers with which he happens to disagree. The Milwaukee Journal, one of Wisconsin's greatest newspapers, has criticized the Senator from Wisconsin. His reply—

And last night, Mr. President, I called the editor of the Milwaukee Journal to obtain verification of this, and to see whether it had happened again; the editor says it has happened twice.

His reply was to urge the retail food dealers of Milwaukee to stop advertising in the Journal. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is widely credited with having cost Drew Pearson, who has criticized him, his radio sponsor.

He has now written Henry Luce, the publisher of Time and Life magazines, which have criticized him, as follows: "I am preparing material on Time magazine to furnish all your advertisers, so they may be aware of the type of magazine they are supporting."

A day or two before this speech in New York the New York Daily News, no enemy of McCARTHY, now says to him: "Low Blow, JOE." I submit he seems to have touched the editor in a sensitive spot. Editor and Publisher says, "The whole thing reeks of totalitarianism." Yesterday's Washington Post said: "In a time of great national anxiety, Senator McCARTHY may manage by name calling to stampede some people into suppressing opinions with which they disagree. This is what he has tried to do in relation to Drew Pearson and Time magazine. If he succeeded, he would be robbing the American public of its right to read or not to read in accordance with its own best judgment. That is the way things are managed in Moscow."

My speech before this audience in New York went on:

So first we see McCARTHY violating the great Anglo-Saxon doctrine, that a man is innocent until he is proven guilty. Now we see him attempting to overthrow by intimidation an equally great Anglo-Saxon doctrine, freedom of speech and press. These are the ways of the dictator.

Mr. President, I have omitted a little of the text here, for the same reason that I did not quote further from my 30,000-word speech. In this New York speech, I further said:

I predict he will not find the press as soft a touch as the State Department.

Mr. President, if the Speaker from Wisconsin wants me positioned as legally responsible, as he seemed to in his television statement, he does not even have to ask for it in court. All he has to do is to call my office, and I will send him a copy of the speech, signed by me, that I made before this audience in New York. This speech, given off the floor of the Senate and away from Senate committees, does not carry immunity except perhaps on a few phrases or sentences. This speech was over a month ago.

Mr. President, on Sunday, Mr. Allen, my assistant, who saw the television program which precipitated my speech of today, immediately upon its close telephoned the Columbia network. He told Mr. Fred Friendly, producer of See It Now, that he expected the program to reply in its next Sunday broadcast to the inaccurate statements of the junior Senator from Wisconsin. I trust they will reply. This speech of mine provides them with plenty of material.

Mr. President, I cannot conclude without a brief reference to the present status of my testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. As the Senate knows, the subcommittee recently voted 4 to 1 its approval of a resolution which was in turn approved by 8 to 3 by the full Committee on Rules and Administration. I think I had better take the time to read the resolution in full, because it is of great importance:

That the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration requests Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, to raise the question of the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and of the integrity of the members thereof in connection with its consideration of Senate Resolution 187—

Which is my resolution calling for his expulsion—

by making a formal motion on the floor of the Senate to discharge the committee; and that Senator McCARTHY be advised by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that if he does not take the requested action in a period of time to be fixed by stipulation between Senator McCARTHY and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, that the committee (acting through the chairman of the standing committee or the chairman of the subcommittee) will itself present such motion to discharge for the purpose of affirming the jurisdiction of the subcommittee and the integrity of its members in its consideration of the aforesaid resolution.

Mr. President, I am told that the resolution to discharge the committee is worded in this negative manner because thereby, under the rules of the Senate, it enjoys the privilege of coming before the Senate the day after it is presented. I am told that that is why the resolution could not be couched in an affirmative form, calling affirmatively on the Senate to express its approval of the character, integrity, and honor of its subcommittee.

I should like to read two or three paragraphs from the remarkable letter which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] wrote to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] when he transmitted this resolution as the recommendation of his subcommittee. The letter is a matter of public record, but I shall not read from it because here again I have the fear that reading from it could cause a repetition of the delaying procedure through which we have just passed.

This letter, released by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the press, may not be unique in Senate history, but it is assuredly a most extraordinary and remarkable document. I urge the Members of the Senate to expose themselves to it. The letter gives the background of the attacks upon the committee by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. These attacks made the committee feel it imperative to call upon the United States Senate to vote its confidence in the committee's honor and integrity.

Mr. President, I am deeply sympathetic with the problems of the subcommittee of which the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is chairman. It has one of the toughest, dirtiest, and most difficult jobs in public life. Its courageous and unanimous report on the Maryland elections scandals required weeks of painstaking, heartbreaking work and work of a kind which delivers few, if any, political rewards. This is merely one example of the committee's responsibilities. Who among us would seek the obligation to look into the Ohio election campaign, the Hanley affair in New York, the regular and constant violations of the spirit of our Corrupt Practices Acts, and other of the seamy and unsavory aspects of our political life?

Yet, Mr. President, these things are all part of the tough and dirty job of this committee. In doing its job, it has been attacked by the Senator from Wisconsin in a way which the committee submits is outrageous and vicious. That is the reason for the resolution.

I hope we in the Senate can quickly agree that this hard-working committee is entitled to a speedy and a resounding vote of confidence by the Senate.

I, of course, have been most unhappy at the many delays, some of them I am sure unavoidable, which have prevented committee consideration of the carefully documented charges which I presented last September. Most recently, there was a further delay of 30 days or more due to the change in membership of the committee, when the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] replaced the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and shortly thereafter left on a speaking tour, in agreement that no action would be considered during his absence.

The newspapers have reported, seemingly authoritatively—or at least the reports have not been contradicted—that the staff of the committee has recommended that witnesses be called on 5 of the 10 cases studies which I presented to the committee. The newspaper stories indicate that this recomemndation of the staff does not reflect on the other five case studies on which the report either concedes that I have proved my point or for some other reason argues against further testimony.

Mr. President, I submit that the sooner the committee can get at its business of calling the witnesses, the better it will be for everybody. It is now 7 months since I submitted my evidence. It is less than 4 months until the Republican Convention. It is less than 8 months until election day. The longer we wait the more difficult it may become for the Senate, the press, and public to maintain the objectivity desirable. In my appearance before the committee last September I stated:

Mr. Chairman, the United States Senate is often acclaimed as the most important legislative body in the world. In foreign eyes, the character of the Senate is a measure of the objectives and the quality of the people of the United States and of their Government and their foreign policy. The measure of the Senate is its membership. Standing at all times in the blinding light of world attention, a United States Senator carries

the heavy burden of his country's prestige and honor.

This is far more important today than ever before. This is one of the many consequences of our world power which we, in the Senate, must now face up to, in our own thinking about ourselves as Senators.

I submit that the United States Senate is not yet as alert as it must become—to these grave consequences, applied to our own actions as Senators and the impact of our actions upon the national security.

The foregoing statement of last September shows the urgent importance I attach to this matter which is now before the Rules Committee. Shortly after making this statement I went to Europe as a delegate to the Strasbourg Conference on the Union of Europe. I visited not only France, but England, Germany, Austria, and Italy. I was amazed to find myself besieged with questions wherever I went about Senator McCARTHY. "Tell me," I would be asked in whispered or fearful tones, "do you think Senator McCARTHY will take over the Government of the United States?" Europeans see in his tactics the tactics of Hitler. I assure you, Mr. President, he is one of the most talked about, and I believe the best publicized, United States Senator in Europe—and by a wide margin.

With all due respect to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], I do not believe he is so widely known in Europe as is the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. With all my knowledge of Europe—and I have made so many trips there that it would take me a little time to try to count the number—I would not have realized the tremendous impact of the charges and speeches of the Senator from Wisconsin upon Europe if I had not visited there last fall and discovered at first hand the extraordinary reaction.

I submit that Senator McCARTHY'S publicity throughout the world is very dangerous and potentially very costly to all American people. For this reason, if for no other, Mr. President, I submit there is no more urgent matter before the Senate on which action can and should be taken immediately, than the vote reaffirming our confidence in our distinguished subcommittee headed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE].

It is now Senator McCARTHY who is directly causing the delay. The committee is leaning over backward in its efforts to do nothing which will incite him again to accuse its members of bias and prejudice. At the last meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration, when I suggested that 1 week should be sufficient time for Senator McCARTHY to make up his mind whether he would personally offer the resolution to discharge the subcommittee from its responsibility, one of the members of the subcommittee said, "No; we will give him a full 30 days."

Even at that time, Mr. President, Senator McCARTHY had announced flatly to the press that he would not offer the resolution to discharge the committee. Why does he not reaffirm that press statement, so that the committee itself may submit the resolution in order that we can get ahead with this most unpleasant and disagreeable business? Otherwise, I remind the Senate, 30 days after the meeting of the Committee on Rules and Administration, at which the vote of the subcommittee was affirmed will be April 6, which is a Sunday. This seems to mean a delay of 31 days, until Monday, April 7. I hope that on that day, at least, this matter will be given the very high priority that a substantial majority of the Committee on Rules and Administration feels it deserves.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his forthright remarks. In my opinion he has rendered a great service to our country in making the statements he did. He has brought to the attention of the Senate and of the American people a situation about which I believe we should all feel a very deep concern.

I was particularly impressed with the courage and sincerity reflected in the statement by the Senator from Connecticut when he said:

I herewith offer unequivocally to waive any immunity which I may enjoy under the Constitution or under the Senate rules, if any question of my personal legal responsibility is ever raised. I testified under oath. I gladly accept full legal responsibility.

Mr. President, in my opinion, that should be the attitude of every Member of Congress. Would that every one of us had the courage to back up statements and charges in a like manner.

I, too, have been deeply disturbed and distressed by what I fear is a growing tendency—a developing tendency—to subvert and abandon that great American doctrine, namely, that a man is innocent until he is proved guilty. We are steadily chipping away at that doctrine and that tradition.

I have been equally distressed by the tendency—it might even be called a policy—of trying to intimidate persons and organizations, including the press, periodicals, and individual writers and broadcasters. This intimidation has sadly met with some degree of success. Efforts of reprisal have been made against some who have dared to print, write, or speak critically—and honestly, as they saw fit.

I note with great unhappiness, though I do not like to acknowledge it, that the effect of such intimidation is being reflected in every department of the Federal Government, and, I fear, even on the floor of this great body, the Senate of the United States.

I do not believe there should be immunity of any kind in the case of such intimidation, whether it be on the floors of the Houses of Congress or elsewhere.

As has been so eloquently and so persuasively indicated by the Senator from Connecticut, I believe that any man who makes accusations should be held responsible for them. We have a rule under which my friend, the distinguished minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES], has insisted that the Senator from Connecticut take his seat, because the minority leader objected—I do not know why—to some of the words of the Senator from Connecticut. Yet we protect a Member in every way in making any kind of accusation, in blasting people, in holding them up to ridicule, to suspicion, to distrust, to the destruction of their reputations and their careers, simply because of a claim of immunity in the Senate. I think that is all wrong. This unfair and reckless procedure has engendered a dangerous climate of fear which permeates all actions and decisions. It is a danger to all of us and to our country—to its very security—in these days of world peril.

Mr. President, again I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his courage and foresight in making this address. It was, indeed, timely, important, and of great public service.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am most touched and very grateful to the distinguished Senator from New York. I only hope I can live to emulate his own courage and foresight.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BENTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to submit one question to the Senator from Connecticut. In general I agree with his statement, but if we are to be liberal, should we not be liberal in all aspects in order to prove our point? As I stated, I am in general agreement with the Senator from Connecticut, but two incidents occurred here this morning which I do not think prove any liberality on the part of any of us, although we might feel we were liberal.

In the first place, the Senator from Connecticut objected at the time the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] asked that he permit a quorum call so that the Senator from Wisconsin could be present. I am not talking about the merits of the matter, and I am in general agreement with the Senator.

Mr. BENTON. Let me state to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that I telephoned personally to Senator McCARTHY'S office at 11 o'clock this morning and told his secretary I intended to make the address I have just delivered. I hope he will agree that this was more effective than having a quorum.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well, but the ordinary procedure of the Senate is that there shall be a quorum called so that Senators may be counted to see that there is a quorum present.

Mr. BENTON. I acknowledge that the Senator may be quite right. I do not pretend that my experience is sufficient to enable me to pass judgment on that question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to assure the Senate that I do not yield in any particular to the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from New York on the question of liberality, but I do believe in liberality for the other fellow, too.

We are talking about the dignity of the Senate, and I believe in it. The Senator from Connecticut has stated

that one Senator in the committee said "Let us give him a week," and that another Senator said "No, let us give him 30 days." Is there any reason to question the motive of the Senator who said, "Let us give him 30 days"?

Mr. BENTON. None whatsoever. On the contrary, far from questioning his motive, I used the incident to illustrate the way in which the committee is going to every length to give the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] every consideration even though he had already announced to the press that he would not submit the resolution. Nevertheless, the committee thought he should be given 30 days.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not discussing personalities, with one exception. I am discussing the Senate of the United States, and the individual rights and privileges under our system of government, of every Senator, no matter the State from which he comes. The only personality to which I shall refer is that of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. I am for him strongly. I think no one should question his motive or the motive of any other Senator.

Mr. BENTON. I am sure that the Senator from Iowa will attest to the fact that I have never questioned his motives, or in any other way reflected on him or the members of his committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only point I am trying to make is this: Irrespective of merits—and I am in general agreement with what the Senator from Connecticut has in mind—I still think that any Senator who is elected from New Mexico, Minnesota, Montana, or Connecticut has some rights in this body, even when his conclusions are wrong.

Mr. BENTON. I agree. Indeed, I told the Committee on Rules and Administration that I hoped to remind them that the Senator from Connecticut was also deeply concerned in this case, along with the Senator from Wisconsin. But, apart from occasionally saying that I felt unhappy that so much time is going by, I have never to my knowledge reflected in any way on the work of the subcommittee, its staff, or members.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President——

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor unless the Senator from Virginia has a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am seeking recognition in my own right.

Mr. BENTON. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. ROBERTSON. For what purpose?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I wish to submit a very brief unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ROBERTSON. My remarks will take only 5 minutes. However, if the distinguished lady Senator from Maine will be briefer than 5 minutes, the Senator from Virginia will gladly yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator cannot yield for that purpose except by unanimous consent. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks my correspondence with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, concerning the Benton resolution.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 22, 1952.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman Rules and Administration Committee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It appears that my application for assignment to the Republican vacancy to the Subcommittee on Rules has brought considerable concern to some people who are extremely desirous of my remaining as a member of the subcommittee considering the Benton resolution.

The Subcommittee on Rules during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress was composed of yourself as chairman, the late Senator Wherry and Senator MONRONEY. At the beginning of this second session of the Eighty-second Congress, there were two Republican vacancies on the full Rules Committee. These two Republican vacancies resulted in one Republican vacancy on the Subcommittee on Rules and one Republican vacancy on the Subcommittee on Library.

In the normal and routine and regular manner, I applied to the ranking Republican on the full Rules Committee, Senator LODGE, for assignment to the Subcommittee on Rules. Senator LODGE could have taken this assignment for himself, but instead he graciously granted my request.

Senators BENTON and GILLETTE subsequently made statements to the press in which they announced that they would oppose my application. Apparently it is their contention that I am indispensable to hearings and report on the Benton resolution. Senator BENTON contended in his press release that approval of my application would result in "changing the jury halfway through a trial" and Senator GILLETTE is quoted by the press as saying, "I think it would be very unfortunate for any tribunal in the process of finishing up its work, to have changes made in the personnel."

The records of the Rules Committee show clearly and conclusively that these contentions of Senators BENTON and GILLETTE are untenable as the "jury" and the "tribunal" compositions of the Frivileges and Elections Subcommittee have undergone constant change. For example, there was a complete change from the Gillette-Stennis-Schoeppel subcommittee that started the investigations and hearings on the Maryland, Pennsylvania, and New York elections. None of these three Senators sat on the 1951 hearings in these three cases although they started the investigations and hearings on them.

It is clear, then, that the contentions of Senators BENTON and GILLETTE are not based upon precedents or principles but rather upon personalities. For some reason they want me to serve on the Benton resolution.

Now I think that I have repeatedly made it abundantly clear that I am perfectly willing to serve on the Benton resolution hearings and investigation. But I do not propose to permit my willingness on this score to prevent me from getting the assignment to the Wherry vacancy on the Subcommittee on Rules. If I do not get that assignment, it will go to one of the new Republican Members recently assigned to the full Rules Committee.

In other words, let me make my position on this controversy crystal clear. First, I want the Subcommittee on Rules assignment. Second, although I have never sought it, I am willing to serve on the hearings and investigation of the Benton resolution. I have never requested release from that.

In the interest of protecting my rights to assignment to the Subcommittee on Rules and to satisfy the demands of those who contend that I am indispensable to the hearings and investigation on the Benton resolution, I offer the following alternatives to the Committee on Rules:

1. First, I propose that the consideration of the Benton resolution be transferred from the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee to the Rules Subcommittee—the subcommittee that I am seeking. The Benton resolution would then be placed before you, Senator MONRONEY (who is also on the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee), and myself.

2. Should that not be acceptable, then I offer a second proposal that you appoint a special subcommittee on the Benton resolution to be composed of Senators GILLETTE, MONRONEY, HENNINGS, HENDRICKSON, and myself—and that consideration of the Benton resolution be transferred from the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee to this special subcommittee. This would preserve the identical "jury" and "tribunal" that Senators BENTON and GILLETTE have referred to in their contentions. At the same time it would not interfere with reorganization of the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee.

3. If neither of the above proposals are acceptable, then I offer a third alternative—that the consideration of the Benton resolution be transferred from the Privileges and Elections Subcommittee to the full Rules Committee.

You will see that under all these alternatives, the demands of my "indispensability" to the hearings and investigation on the Benton resolution would be fully met as they all provide that I would serve on the jury or tribunal considering the Benton resolution.

Sincerely yours,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

JANUARY 24, 1952.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: To keep the record straight, this is to inform you that my letter of January 22, 1952, is a standing and continuing offer on my part to continue to serve as a "juror" on the Benton resolution in any one of the three ways proposed in that letter, preferably through assignment of the Benton resolution to the Subcommittee on Rules, of which you are chairman, and Senator MONRONEY and myself are members.

Sincerely yours,
MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

FEBRUARY 19, 1952.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have received a letter dated February 15, 1952, from Senator GILLETTE with respect to his Senate Resolution 169, to set up a select committee on consumer interests, to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate. I have written Senator GILLETTE that there appears to be much merit to the resolution, for certainly more consideration and study should be given to consumer inter-

ests, and that the only question in my mind is whether that study should be conducted by a special select committee, as he proposes, or whether it should be conducted by a standing committee or one of its subcommittees, in compliance with the Legislative Reorganization Act.

However, Senator GILLETTE's request for action by the Committee on Rules and Administration on Senate Resolution 169 focuses attention on an even broader matter within the operation of the Committee on Rules and Administration and its subcommittees. Senate Resolution 169, according to the legislative calendar of the Committee on Rules and Administration, was referred to the Subcommittee on Rules on July 11, 1951. The calendar does not indicate that the Subcommittee on Rules has ever taken action on Senate Resolution 169 since that time, and that it is still before that subcommittee without having been acted on and reported to the full Committee on Rules and Administration.

I feel that the Subcommittee on Rules should act first on Senate Resolution 169 before it is taken up by the full committee. As a new member of the Subcommittee on Rules, having been appointed to that subcommittee on January 23, 1952, I am naturally interested in the work of that subcommittee.

I note that there are many bills and resolutions before the Subcommittee on Rules which have not been acted upon by the subcommittee. In addition to Senate Resolution 169, the calendar dated January 24, 1952, shows the following matters to be before the Subcommittee on Rules, with the time of reference and the length of time the legislation has been before the subcommittee without action by the subcommittee:

Number	Subject	Date of reference	Time pending	Number	Subject	Date of reference	Time pending
			Months				*Months*
S. 131	Antipoll tax	Jan. 17, 1951	13	S. 2057	Define authority of service of congressional subpenas.	Sept. 12, 1951	5
S. 1734	do	June 27, 1951	8				
S. 561	Require Senators, Representatives and high officials to publicly report incomes and sources of incomes.	Jan. 24, 1951	13	S. 2058	Provide for compulsory appearance before committees of persons evading subpenas.	do	5
S. 2284	Same subject as S. 561	Jan. 9, 1952	1	S. Res. 106	Study telecasting and radio broadcasting of congressional proceedings.	Apr. 11, 1951	10
S. Res. 190	Establishing regular question and report periods in which executive department heads appear before Senate.	Aug. 22, 1951	6	S. Res. 31	Increase committee memberships	Jan. 17, 1951	13
				S. Con. Res. 2	Requiring written reports on bills	do	13
S. Con. Res. 44	Establishing rules of procedure in congressional investigations.	Sept. 12, 1951	5	S. Res. 221	Conference reports	Oct. 10, 1951	4
				S. Res. 169	Select committee on consumer interests	July 11, 1951	7
S. Con. Res. 45	Establishing rules of procedure in cases where a Member of Congress in debate makes derogatory remarks concerning a citizen of the United States.	do	5				

In addition to these matters now pending before the Subcommittee on Rules, the calendar shows that while resolutions proposing amendment of the cloture rule were originally referred to the Subcommittee on Rules they were subsequently rereferred to the full committee. The calendar also shows that Senate Resolution 158, to provide for germaneness of debate, was referred to the Subcommittee on Rules on June 27, 1951, but on September 12, 1951, was taken away from that subcommittee and referred to a special subcommittee.

As the Republican member of the Subcommittee on Rules, I am anxious to see that subcommittee function fully and accept its assignments and responsibilities fully. It is disturbing that there are so many important legislative issues before the subcommittee that have not been acted upon by the subcommittee for so long. It is disturbing to see that in the cases of the legislation on cloture and germaneness, the legislation was taken away from the subcommittee. I am particularly interested in the pattern set on Senate Resolution 158 in which case that legislation was taken away from the Subcommittee on Rules and a special subcommittee was appointed to consider Senate Resolution 158. I am interested in the precedent set in that case since in a letter dated January 22, 1952, I proposed to you that a special subcommittee be appointed to consider Senate Resolution 187, popularly known as the Benton resolution, and the consideration of Senate Resolution 187 be taken away from Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. My proposal is still before you for action and decision, as is my proposal that consideration of Senate Resolution 187 be transferred to the Subcommittee on Rules or to the full committee.

I am anxious to see the Subcommittee on Rules really function and fully accept its responsibilities and I urge you, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules as well as the full Committee on Rules and Administration, to schedule the above-listed matters now pending before the subcommittee for the earliest possible consideration and action by the Subcommittee on Rules where they are now pending, lest they die in the subcommittee for lack of action.

I want to assure you my fullest cooperation on this important matter. Should the Republicans be fortunate enough to win control of the Senate next year, I will be chairman of the Subcommittee on Rules and it will be my purpose to press for action by the subcommittee on these matters through their reintroduction and reassignment to the Subcommittee on Rules. It was with this thought that I requested and received the Republican assignment to the Subcommittee on Rules on January 23, 1952.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
United States Senator.

WILLIAM J. GREDE, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

During the delivery of Mr. BENTON's speech,

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BENTON. I yield, if I may do so without losing the floor. I am willing to yield to permit the Senator from Wisconsin to ask a question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, strictly interpreted, a Senator who has the floor can yield only for a question, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BENTON. I just told the Senator from Wisconsin that I would yield to him. However, in view of the Chair's statement, I must ask the Senator from Wisconsin to wait.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

The VICE PRESIDENT. No other Senator can be recognized at this time unless the Senator from Connecticut yields to him; and the Senator from Connecticut has declined to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield in order that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for that purpose, without losing my right to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Wisconsin may proceed.

[Mr. WILEY made a statement in regard to William J. Grede, and asked and obtained consent to have an article about him printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where the statement and article appear under the appropriate heading.]

ANNIVERSARY OF HUNGARY'S DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

During the delivery of Mr. BENTON's speech,

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me, to permit me to proceed for not to exceed 2 minutes to make a statement in regard to the anniversary of Hungary's declaration of independence?

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, again I ask unanimous consent that I may yield, in this case for the length of time requested by the Senator from New Jersey, without losing the floor, and with the understanding that the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey will appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, this month marks the anniversary of Hungary's declaration of independence. In 1848, led by Louis Kossuth, the valiant Hungarian people revolted against foreign despotism and won their freedom and independence. This freedom, however, was short lived, and today it has reached a low ebb because of Communist oppression.

The spirit of independence, however, lives on in Hungary. This is shown by the increasingly severe penalties being invoked by the Red regime to overcome resistance to the Communist tyranny. For example, more severe punishment has been threatened violators of so-called labor discipline in Hungary. Official concern has been expressed over the great number of serious and mysterious accidents which occur in Hungarian factories. Factory workers' resistance to Communist labor policies has so

lowered the quality of Hungarian manufactured goods that, according to the deputy foreign minister, the country's export trade is being seriously affected.

The spirit of Hungary's independence continues also in our free United States. This is attested by the fact that approximately 1,000,000 American citizens of Hungarian origin are celebrating this year the winning of Hungarian independence 104 years ago. This month the first in a series of special programs marking that historic event took place in Independence Hall. During April, May, and June, Americans of Hungarian origin in my own State of New Jersey will hold similar programs, and the series will close in Iowa in July.

Mr. President, it is with a feeling of sadness for the plight of the Hungarian people, but with the confident hope that Soviet oppression will be put an end to by the indomitable spirit of the people themselves, that I join with Americans of Hungarian origin in celebrating the anniversary of their mother country's independence.

EXCHANGE OF HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS BETWEEN MANITOWOC, WIS., AND MACON, GA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, it is, of course, merely a coincidence that the junior Senator from Virginia had planned to speak for a few minutes today about Wisconsin. He did not know, when he planned a brief comment on the student-exchange program between Wisconsin and Georgia, that the first hour of the Senate session today would be taken up with a discussion relating to Wisconsin.

Mr. President, in June of 1946, my good friend, Frank B. Keefe, of Oshkosh, Wis., invited me to make a trip with him and General Spaatz, then Chief of Staff of the Air Force, to Oshkosh and the nearby town of Appleton where General Spaatz had accepted an invitation to address a big rally of war veterans. After the exercises at Appleton Representative Keefe wanted me to address a large gathering of sportsmen at a clubhouse on Lake Winnebago, north of Oshkosh. He also said that on the trip he could show me the very best Indian reservation in the entire United States.

I gladly accepted the invitation because, while I had traveled through Wisconsin on the Great Northern Railroad to a point in Michigan called Waters Meet to enjoy some of the finest smallmouth bass fishing in the entire United States, I had never visited in Wisconsin, carved from that great Northwest Territory, which Virginia ceded to the Union.

The memory of that trip is still fresh in my mind, and I pause here to pay tribute to the memory of Frank Keefe, an outstanding, patriotic American whose untimely passing brought sadness to the hearts of all in Washington who had known him during his legislative career here.

The parade in Appleton took nearly 2 hours to pass the reviewing stand and I was impressed by the vigorous manhood and the patriotic zeal of the Wisconsin veterans whom I saw passing in review. The speaking exercises were held at the ball park, and General Spaatz made a wonderful speech graphically describing how the airplane had wiped out space and how no longer was there a single great metropolitan area in the world that could not be reached by a bombing plane of a hostile nation.

As a courtesy to a visiting Member of Congress and a charter member of his home post of the American Legion, I was invited to speak and was encouraged by the friendly reception given my remarks. But the big encouragement was to come that night when I was the only speaker at the sportsmen's dinner, attended by the outstanding sportsmen and conservationists of the State of Wisconsin.

We traveled in a cabin cruiser from Oshkosh down to Appleton and then went back past Oshkosh on Lake Winnebago, one of the great waterfowl areas of the Nation, to the clubhouse for an evening meeting.

I not only talked that night about hunting and fishing and the value of our great natural resources but took the liberty of expressing my views concerning some of the political and economic problems facing our Nation, knowing full well that I was a Southern Democrat speaking to a Northwest audience composed principally of Republicans. To my surprise and great personal satisfaction, after I had concluded my address a great many in the audience came up to me and said: "I am a life-long Republican but if you were running for the Senate in Wisconsin I would support you."

The next day we visited the Menominee Indian Reservation where I saw the last stand of virgin timber in Wisconsin, met outstanding members of the only Indian tribe in the Nation that is self-supporting, and then fished for trout in the Wolf River, where, I wish to inform my friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], rainbow trout ranging from 5 to 7 pounds in weight are the rule and not the exception. I strongly recommend that stream to my friend from Oregon, an outstanding sportsman, who loves to hunt and fish.

Mr. President, I found on that trip to Wisconsin a living demonstration of the truth of Will Rogers' statement: "I never hated any man that I knew."

Late last fall the good people of Manitowoc, Wis., invited 30 high school boys and girls from Macon, Ga., to spend 2 weeks in their town, attending their high school and learning something about the manner of life in Wisconsin. Most of those Georgia boys and girls had never seen a snowstorm and they landed in Manitowoc when the streams were frozen and the ground covered with a deep snow. Those high-school students enjoyed that visit so much that they insisted that 30 high school boys and girls from Manitowoc pay them a return visit. That group of Wisconsin boys and girls arrived at Macon, Ga., last Saturday. Six thousand Manitowoc residents had turned out to meet the Macon students and an AP story of last Saturday from Macon said that more than 6,000 Macon citizens turned out to meet the Manitowoc boys and girls. All the merchants in Macon displayed banners furnished by the chamber of commerce bearing a welcome to the Manitowoc visitors. There was to be a parade with bands and 2,000 marching high-school students. There was to be a visit to nearby Warm Springs, President Roosevelt's "Little White House." There were to be old-time southern hay rides, barn dances, barbecues, tours of peach orchards in full bloom, and visits to colonial homes, industrial plants, and Army installations.

When the student exchange program has ended the people of Manitowoc, Wis., and the people of Macon, Ga., will have learned the truth of Will Rogers' statement and I hazard a guess that if the Democrats nominate for the Presidency a distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, who lives not far from Macon, there will be some votes cast for him in Manitowoc, Wis.

THE PRICE OF SOYBEAN MEAL AND SOYBEAN OIL

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the chaos which unworkable price ceilings can create in business is perhaps no better illustrated than in the soybean processing industry which has been unmercifully squeezed by Office of Price Administration rulings during the last few months. Many small processors have been forced to close down completely, and a lively black market in soybean meal has come into being.

Soybeans have become a major crop in Indiana during recent years and many new plants have been constructed to handle this growing business. My State ranks second only to Illinois in soybean production, with thousands of farmers devoting a considerable portion of their cropland to soybeans. At the same time, thousands of Indiana farmers buy the meal and other feed byproducts which come from soybeans.

For several months soybean meal has been at the ceiling price fixed by OPS. At the same time, soybean oil—the other important byproduct in soybean processing—has dropped from 20½ cents per pound a year ago to only 10½ cents per pound today. Although soybean prices are somewhat below the highs of a year ago, they have not declined enough to permit processors to absorb the sharp decrease in the price of soybean oil.

Some weeks ago the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] asked Secretary Brannan to meet with a group of Senators and at that time it became apparent that the Department of Agriculture was not greatly concerned over the fate of the soybean processors. We were told, in effect, that nothing could be done to support soybean oil prices. Thus, the Department's attitude apparently was that either farmers would have to market their soybeans at lower prices or soybean processors would have to continue to lose money. Soybean prices have not come down but it would appear that the effect of the Government's attitude has been to drive some processors into a sort of black market in soybean meal. I am told that it operates in this fashion: If a buyer wants soybean meal, he must go into the open market, purchase soybeans at around $2.65 per bushel, and then sell

them to some processor for 10 to 15 cents per bushel less. The processor will then deliver the buyer a quantity of soybean meal at the official ceiling price. The feeder or feed-mixer who must have soybean meal has no alternative if he wants to stay in business. The processor, at the same time, must either take a loss on his operations or lend himself to this plan for evading OPS ceilings on soymean meal.

It would seem to me that our Government could best solve this problem by pushing the export of soybean oil, instead of scarce commodities, through such give-away programs as are now being conducted by the Mutual Security Agency. There is a real need for fats and oils in Europe and if we were to export some of our surplus, domestic prices should strengthen enough to permit not only the soybean processors but the cottonseed processors as well to operate on a profitable basis. Unless these processors can stay in business, our farmers will be the next to suffer.

I should like to read into the RECORD two letters from soybean processors in Indiana, as follows:

HAYNES SOY PRODUCTS, INC.,
Portland, Ind., March 10, 1952.

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: As you are undoubtedly aware, the situation which today faces the soybean industry is a very serious one. The primary reason for this situation is that the present price ceilings which were issued in January 1951 are not in line with the present-day situation. When the ceiling price regulation was put on the soybean industry, soybean oil was selling at a little over 20.5 cents a pound. The regulation was 20.5 cents, and the ceiling for soybean oil meal was $74 a ton. The present-day price of soybean oil is 10.5 cents a pound.

With the present low market level of soybean oil and with the processors being frozen on a $74 ceiling for soybean oil meal, the processor is operating at a tremendous loss. We in the processing industry cannot continue on this basis without shutting down our plants.

The feed manufacturing industry is also very much concerned about this situation because they must have soybean oil meal as an ingredient in manufacturing poultry and livestock feeds.

February 15, 1952, Mr. Walter C. Berger, president, American Feed Manufacturers Association, filed a request with the Office of Price Administration for the removal of ceilings on soybeans and soybean products. They well realize the soybean processors cannot operate in the realms of the present price ceilings.

On February 29, 1952, the board of directors of the National Soybean Processors Association met with the group of OPS officials headed by George Mehrens, Food Section, requesting that the OPS decontrol soybeans and soybean products.

The OPS has assured the feed and soybean industries that they are studying the soybean problem but all press releases to date have shown that OPS will not decontrol soybeans and soybean products.

It has become very evident that congressional action must be taken in order to right this situation so that the farmer can get the most out of his soybean crop and the processor can afford to process the grower's soybeans and to make this valuable protein meal available to the feed manufacturing industry for the feeding of poultry and livestock.

We very urgently request that you act upon this vital subject as quickly as possible.

Yours truly,
HAYNES SOY PRODUCTS, INC.,
CLARENCE E. PETERS,
President.

FARM BUREAU MILLING CO.,
Hammond, Ind., March 10, 1952.

Senator WILLIAM E. JENNER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JENNER: You will recall that I have written to you before, on the soybean meal situation.

The pressure has eased slightly, due to the discovery of methods of evading the order. However, in final analysis, we are not dealing in a free market. Prices and quality of the various feeds deviate from regular standards, due to the ridiculous regulations imposed upon the industry.

I appeal to you, in all sincerity, to use your influence to remove ceilings from soybeans and their products at once.

Yours very truly,
FARM BUREAU MILLING CO.,
RUSSELL PAARLBERG,
General Manager.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the very able Senator from Indiana. I have on my desk letters which are identical with those the Senator from Indiana has read into the RECORD. There has been a greatly increased production of soybeans in recent years, and the processors have built excellent new plants in order to process efficiently the soybean crop, not only to obtain the maximum yield of oil, but also to make available to the feeder of cattle and poultry the high protein feed and meal.

Unless there is some consideration given by OPS to the present price ceiling on soybean meal we shall have not only gray markets but also black markets in soybean meal, and there will be other ways and means found to evade regulations.

I was present at the time when the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] arranged a conference with the Secretary of Agriculture to discuss the question, and it was brought up at another time in a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture at which the Secretary of Agriculture appeared.

I believe that the junior Senator from Indiana has rendered a great service, not only to the feeder, but to the producer and processor of the soybean as well by calling attention to the unreasonable and unfair OPS ceiling regulations.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield so I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). Does the Senator from California yield for that purpose?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will be glad to yield, with unanimous consent that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the further proceedings incident to the call of the roll be dispensed with and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the Japanese Peace Treaty and the implications which I believe it will have upon peace in the Pacific, the security of the United States, and our ultimate relations with Japan and other far-eastern countries.

At the beginning, I wish to say that I believe it is certainly fitting and proper that the Senate of the United States, in the exercise of its constitutional obligations of treaty ratification, should give ample discussion to the terms of the treaty which is now under consideration. I believe that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] are to be commended for presenting to the Senate the proposed reservations they have submitted for our consideration. Certainly they will open up the issues in the course of the ensuing discussion, and thus the reservations they have submitted will enable the Senate to debate the various questions which have been raised.

I do not agree that the reservations which have been offered are necessary, but I believe that a useful purpose will be served by bringing the questions involved to the attention of the Senate, so that they may be amply discussed before ratification occurs.

Under the Constitution, Mr. President, I think the Senate has no higher obligation than that resting upon it alone in connection with the ratification or rejection of treaties which have been negotiated. In the past I think quite often we have passed in a rather perfunctory manner upon treaties of far-reaching importance. Consequently, to that extent I certainly do not quarrel with the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Maine for presenting the reservations, if they believe that the issues raised should at least be amply discussed on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

Throughout the United States the American people are coming to have a greater interest in far-eastern affairs, and in the importance of this area of the world in the global problems confronting us. Such has not always been the case, and the reasons are not difficult to understand. Our own background as a nation is overwhelmingly European in origin. The natural ties of blood and history have directed much of our attention to the European scene. Distances from our centers of population, and of our economic and political life, are much shorter to the cities of London, Paris, Berlin, and Rome, than to Tokyo, Manila, Taipei, or New Delhi. More of our correspondents in

the past have covered Europe than Asia. Many times more students, businessmen, vacationists, and public officials moved eastward toward the Western World, than moved westward toward the Far East.

To be sure, Commodore Perry and the opening of Japan to the west; Secretary Hay and the open-door policy in China; Admiral Dewey at Manila Bay and his long line of military or civilian successors in the Philippines, were events Americans were familiar with from school days, but the daily impact on the social, economic, and political life of America flowed from across the Atlantic rather than the Pacific.

On the morning of December 7, 1941, every American came to a startled, even if long delayed, realization that having a wide ocean with the tranquil name of Pacific did not isolate us from the problems of Asia. Both prior to and subsequent to Pearl Harbor, there were many who favored an international outlook so far as Europe was concerned, but were isolationists when far-eastern problems were involved.

United States participation in the active war in the Pacific lasted from December 7, 1941, to August 14, 1945. For the Republic of China, to be sure, it was a much longer struggle. What we fought for in a bitter struggle extending for more than 44 months which were costly in manpower and resources was to a considerable extent nullified by 6 days of a far-eastern war by the Soviet Union against a foe already asking for surrender terms. For 6 years subsequent to VJ-day we carried the primary occupational responsibility in Japan.

It has been my belief for a long time that the Far East has been the priority target for the Kremlin planners based on the Lenin realization that from the Soviet viewpoint, "The road to Paris is through Peking."

While I do not doubt the Soviet desire to tie Germany and the industrial Ruhr into the Communist orbit, I believe that this is secondary on their timetable to Communist control of the more than a billion people of Asia, together with natural and strategic resources of that vast area. China, to be sure, was the key, but it was and is only a step in the chain reaction and not a final target.

The ultimate objectives are the rice of Southeast Asia so food can be used as a weapon for the further consolidation of power; all of Korea so that a strategic dagger will be poised at the heart of Japan; then between the economic pressures of raw materials promised or denied, trade opportunities opened and closed in the expanding Soviet orbit the planners in the Kremlin would hope that Japanese butterfly would voluntarily entangle itself in the spider web of communism. If not a reorganized Communist alliance of battle-trained troops from Korea, China and Siberia would be prepared to back up an ultimatum to Japan with force of arms. By hook or by crook the Soviet imperial system wants to bring the 80,000,000 industrious people of Japan, with the large industrial potential of that nation, into the Communist orbit.

The Yoshida government does not want to be so enmeshed. Neither, in my opinion, do the overwhelming majority of the people of Japan.

I have been privileged to visit that area of the world on three different occasions; once, shortly after VJ-day, in January 1946; again, in the fall of 1949, before the outbreak of the Korean war; and again in the fall of 1950, after Chinese Communist forces had entered the Korean war in support of the Communist forces from North Korea.

The rejection of the treaty in my judgment would shake the Far East to its foundations, bring about the downfall of the Yoshida government, please the Kremlin, and greatly strengthen the hands of the Communists in Japan. This, I submit, is a terrific responsibility on the part of Members of the Senate and on the part of other nations, which will be called upon either to ratify or reject the treaty. If the industrial potential of Japan is to be placed at Communist disposal, the rejection of the treaty will accelerate that fatal step.

Certain people have properly raised the question whether there is any danger of reparations from Japan going to Communist China, and they have pointed out, and I think quite correctly, that it would not be in our national interest to have the industrial power of 80,000,000 industrious people of Japan put at the disposal of Communist China. I do not believe the treaty places that potential at the disposal of Communist China. But I submit that if the treaty were rejected and the series of events which I have mentioned should take place, it might very well accelerate the placing of the Japanese industrial potential in the hands of Chinese Communists, and through them, of international communism as well. With such added capacity and with the psychological impact that a communism on the march would have in India, Indonesia, Pakistan, and the Philippines it would be the Communist expectation that most, if not all, of what remained of free Asia would drop like ripe fruit into the Communist lap. Once the manpower, resources, and industrial capacity of its Asiatic flank was secured the Soviet Union would be ready to strike with overwhelming force against the west. In the meantime they would be adding, as they are now doing, to their atomic stockpile. I believe the hour of greatest danger for the western world will come if and when international communism, under the leadership of the Soviet Union, has been able to consolidate its position and its control of the Far East, with its vast resources of manpower and strategic resources as well.

These then are the stakes in the far-eastern issues now before us. Needless to say, the Japanese Peace Treaty is one very important factor as to whether or not Soviet plans turn into realities. The men in the Kremlin know the importance of a just and prompt peace treaty with Japan in relation to that country lining up with the free world rather than with international communism. Hence, their bitter battle to prevent a treaty from being signed at San Francisco.

At the Japanese Peace Treaty Conference in September of last year the United States and the free world gained the initiative and won a diplomatic victory of major proportions over the Soviet Union. Once having accomplished this, we must not now fumble the ball on this phase of our far-eastern policy. That is why as soon as the conference had adjourned I urged a prompt ratification of the treaty by the Senate of the United States and why I believe this treaty should be ratified.

In June 1950 Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who contributed so much to changing a nation of 80,000,000 enemies into potential friends and the nation into a great potential stabilizing force for the free world in the far Pacific, had this to say:

> The Japanese people have faithfully fulfilled the obligations they assumed under the instrument of surrender and have every moral and legal right to the restoration of peace. On this point all of the Allied Powers concerned are in full accord and publicly committed and their failure to protect Japan in this right would be a foul blemish upon modern civilization. We should not allow ourselves to be deterred from moving invincibly forward along a course which we ourselves and the entire world would recognize to be morally and legally right.

By way of contrast, Stalin, leader of the Soviet Union and the satellite Communist states, has said that with Japan the Communist world would be invincible.

Fifty-four Allied Powers were invited to the San Francisco Conference. Three declined the invitation to cooperate in this combined effort to make a peace of justice rather than one of vengeance. The three—India, Burma, and Yugoslavia—made their decision to go it alone when they felt such a policy favored their own national interests which may well have included a desire not to offend the Soviet Union, which was invited, or the Chinese Communist regime, which was not.

The Soviet Union and its two satellites, Poland and Czechoslovakia, attended the San Francisco meeting and did everything possible to obstruct and sabotage the success of the Conference. Failing in this, they refused to sign the treaty. Forty-eight of the fifty-four Allied Powers signed the treaty, and those of us who had the opportunity of being at the Conference were greatly impressed with the statesmanship and courage of the delegates who signed and the nations they represented.

Mr. President, I think I have been as much concerned as has any other Member of this body with some aspects of our far eastern policy in the past. I desire to mention them today, not for the purpose of reopening old wounds, but because I think that, as representatives of a great constitutional Republic, it is necessary that we learn from our past mistakes—and we have made some very bad ones, I believe—to try to avoid making the same mistakes all over again.

It is not my intention to burden the RECORD or the Senate with a review of the so-called China White Paper which I believe contributed to the loss of continental China to the Chinese Communists, along with the policies which had been followed prior to the time of the issuance of the white paper. I think,

however, if we could pin one part of that policy to the Department of State and indicate where they got off the track, it would be found in the messages which came from our representatives in China wherein they laid down the doctrine that as between the Communists in China and the legal government of the Republic of China they should be dealt with as equal factions.

Mr. President, it is a rather novel approach to the situation, to take a revolutionary Communist group and treat it merely as a faction entitled to the same consideration to which the legal government of the Republic of China is entitled. Nevertheless, that was the policy followed, and that is where, I believe, we started to get off the track.

Another instance in which we made a very grave error, I think, was that the administration did not take Congress into its full confidence in the programs which were in the making in the Far East.

I want to document that statement at this point by pointing out to the Senate that in the case of the Yalta agreement, which was negotiated by President Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, and Stalin, and which had such a catastrophic effect upon conditions in the Far East, Congress was not fully informed until a year had passed. That is to say, the full agreement was not made available.

I point out that General Wedemeyer was sent to China and to Korea in 1947 and that his report on China was suppressed, though it had been requested by duly constituted committees of the Senate and the House, until it was published in the China white paper on August 1, 1949, 2 years after the event and soon after the decisive battles had taken place on the continent of Asia whereby the Chinese Communists were able to overwhelm most of the mainland.

The report on Korea, issued at the same time, was not made available until during the so-called MacArthur hearings in the early part of last year, and then it was only reluctantly made available to the Senate of the United States and to the country.

I point out, Mr. President, that on December 23, 1949, the State Department issued a confidential bulletin to all our embassies overseas in which it stated that the island of Formosa had no strategic value and to prepare the people for its passage into Communist hands and to try to discount the significance of what was contemplated to be the ultimate Communist control of the island.

Mr. President, it was amply brought out during the MacArthur hearings that this was contrary to the advice which the State Department and the executive branch of the Government had received from the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Not only once, but on several occasions, the Joint Chiefs of Staff pointed out that the island of Formosa had strategic significance and that its passage into unfriendly hands would be detrimental to our defense position in the Pacific. At no time did they or General MacArthur or any other responsible official in the Military Establishment suggest that the United States should take over Formosa or that we should even have bases on the island. They all joined, however, in recognizing the danger that would be inherent should an unfriendly power occupy the island of Formosa.

I think no one in his right mind could deny today that the Chinese Communists are an unfriendly power. They have been designated the aggressors in Korea. They have been fighting our troops up to today as we meet here in the Senate of the United States. I think no one would deny that the Republic of China is a friendly power. For a period of a great many years China has been our friend, and she has been our ally in two world wars. China is a prominent member of the United Nations and one of the so-called Big Five with a permanent seat on the Security Council. Any fair-minded person who will examine the resolutions and actions of the Security Council of the United Nations in resisting Communist aggression in Korea will find that in the overwhelming number of cases, if not in all cases, the Republic of China is lined up with the free world.

It will be found from the records that some of our other friends, such as India and a number of other countries, have almost consistently voted against us and in general support of the Communists in the United Nations discussions. So from that point of view the Republic of China has certainly been a friendly power. I think this is recognized both throughout the country and in the Congress of the United States.

For a long time the American people were led to believe by people in official positions, and many in unofficial positions that the Chinese Communists were only agrarian reformers. Of course, we now know that they were no such thing. They were part and parcel of the Communist conspiracy, and have been apt and willing pupils of the men in the Kremlin. They have demonstrated their alliance with international communism by entering the Korean war as aggressors, and by actions which have taken place since that time.

Mr. President, in line with this, on September 12, 1951, certain Members of the Senate sent a letter to the President. While I placed this letter in the RECORD on March 14, I think that as part of my remarks I will reread it at this time. It reads as follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Members of the United States Senate, we are opposed to the recognition of Communist China by the Government of the United States or its admission into the United Nations.

Prior to the submission of the Japanese Treaty to the Senate, we desire to make it clear that we would consider the recognition of Communist China by Japan or the negotiating of a bilateral treaty with the Communist Chinese regime to be adverse to the best interests of the people of both Japan and the United States.

Sincerely yours.

In the letter that was placed in the RECORD the other day, the names of the Senators who signed it were not included. I think that as part of the RECORD, and to refresh the minds of Senators who may read the RECORD, I should like to state the names of the Senators who signed this letter to the President of the United States on September 12, 1951, as follows: WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, MILTON R. YOUNG, RICHARD M. NIXON, HENRY C. DWORSHAK, HOMER FERGUSON, EDWARD J. THYE, ROBERT A. TAFT, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, ZALES N. ECTON, JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY, ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, MARGARET CHASE SMITH, KARL E. MUNDT, JAMES P. KEM, RALPH E. FLANDERS, KENNETH S. WHERRY, PAT MCCARRAN, JOHN J. WILLIAMS, HERMAN WELKER, LESTER C. HUNT, ALLEN J. ELLENDER, SR., FRANCIS CASE, WILLIAM E. JENNER, OLIN D. JOHNSTON, CLYDE R. HOEY, WAYNE MORSE, HARRY P. CAIN, HERBERT R. O'CONOR, HUGH BUTLER, JOHN M. BUTLER, FRANK CARLSON, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON, KENNETH MCKELLAR, EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, WALLACE F. BENNETT, JAMES O. EASTLAND, PAUL H. DOUGLAS, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, BLAIR MOODY, BURNET R. MAYBANK, HOMER E. CAPEHART, JOHN W. BRICKER, OWEN BREWSTER, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, GEORGE D. AIKEN, STYLES BRIDGES, JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, WILLIS SMITH, GUY CORDON, EUGENE D. MILLIKIN, EDWARD MARTIN, IRVING M. IVES, and GUY M. GILLETTE.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this list of names constitutes 56 Members of the Senate of the United States, out of a total membership of 96.

I think I may say, since I had something to do with circulating this letter among Senators at the time, that the lack of other names does not indicate opposition to the views expressed in the letter, because the letter was circulated in one 24-hour period. The circulating of the letter was stopped because the British and French foreign ministers, who were in Washington, were about to leave, and it was therefore decided to send the letter to the President of the United States and release it, so that the viewpoint of at least a part of the Senate could be shown. It is my considered judgment that if we had had another 24 hours, we would have had as signers a great many additional Members of the Senate, who were out of town and could not be approached during the one day when the letter was circulated.

Mr. President, I do not intend to burden the RECORD by again inserting the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, to which reference is made in the Preamble of the Treaty, and to compare it with the proposed Covenant of Human Rights, which as yet has not been acted upon by the United Nations. However, I wish to point out that in the RECORD of March 14, at page 2342, and continuing through page 2343, the two documents are very clearly outlined.

There has been considerable misunderstanding among a great many people who are rightfully concerned about what the effect of the pending treaty may be, who have mistaken one document for the other. As a matter of fact, there has been some irresponsible material circulated throughout the country which indicates that ratification of the treaty would either bind Japan alone, or Japan and the United States, to the covenant and to the Genocide Treaty and many other things. This is simply not the fact, and for the purpose of clarity and

for the RECORD that should be amply understood.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which is referred to in the preamble of the treaty and is binding only on Japan, in any event, and not on the United States, is a universal declaration that was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in Paris on December 10, 1948, by a vote of 48 to 0. As I mentioned the other day, it is significant that eight countries abstained and did not give their support to this declaration. They are the U. S. S. R., the Ukraine, Byelorussia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, Saudi Arabia, and the Union of South Africa.

Mr. President, I think it is appropriate to keep in mind that the Soviet Union did everything possible to obstruct the San Francisco conference. Those of us who were privileged to be there, and the American people who had an opportunity to view the conference in San Francisco by television, had ample opportunity to judge for themselves that the Soviet Union did not want the agreement entered into at that time, and the Soviet Union does not now want the pending treaty made effective.

I think it would cause great comfort in the Kremlin if the United States Senate at this time were to refuse to ratify the treaty. I have pointed out what I believe might well happen in that event. I think the very least that would happen would be that the government of Prime Minister Yoshida in Japan would fall. I do not think that that would be beneficial to our general security in the Pacific, or to ultimate relations between the United States and Japan.

Prime Minister Yoshida, as we know, wrote a letter to Ambassador Dulles on December 24, 1951, which was released on January 16, 1952, pointing out that it was the policy of his Government to negotiate a treaty with the Republic of China, now on the island of Formosa. He has taken steps to carry out the commitment which he made, and at the present time, as we are meeting here, negotiations are being carried on at Taipei. So I do not believe it is in the best interests of China to have the Yoshida Government in Japan fall.

Next, I think failure by the Senate to ratify this treaty would certainly cause great encouragement to the Communist forces in Japan, because they would benefit by the confusion that would follow.

I wish to point out some of the alternatives which would then present themselves, and I think they are serious alternatives. First, it might mean a complete renegotiation of the treaty with the many signatory nations, which was achieved after long months of delicate negotiations. There is grave doubt in my mind whether we would get another treaty as satisfactory to Japan and the United States as the one which is now before the Senate.

In addition, I believe there is grave doubt as to whether a future Government of Japan might negotiate a treaty as favorable to the Republic of China as I believe there is an opportunity to get from the Government in power in Japan at the present time.

Mr. President, as a part of my remarks I desire to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter from Premier Yoshida to Ambassador Dulles.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 16, 1952.

Following is the text of a letter from Shigeru Yoshida, Prime Minister of Japan, to John Foster Dulles which was made public by the Prime Minister last night (January 16 Tokyo time):

THE GAIMUSHO,
December 24, 1951.

His Excellency JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR AMBASSADOR DULLES: While the Japanese Peace Treaty and the United States-Japan Security Treaty were being debated in the House and Representatives and the House of Councillors of the Diet, a number of questions were put and statements made relative to Japan's future policy toward China. Some of the statements, separated from their context and background, give rise to misapprehensions which I should like to clear up.

The Japanese Government desires ultimately to have a full measure of political peace and commercial intercourse with China which is Japan's close neighbor.

At the present time it is, we hope, possible to develop that kind of relationship with the National Government of the Republic of China, which has the seat, voice and vote of China in the United Nations, which exercises actual governmental authority over certain territory, and which maintains diplomatic relations with most of the members of the United Nations. To that end my Government on November 17, 1951, established a Japanese Government Overseas Agency in Formosa, with the consent of the National Government of China. This is the highest form of relationship with other countries which is now permitted to Japan, pending the coming into force of the multilateral Treaty of Peace. The Japanese Government Overseas Agency in Formosa is important in its personnel, reflecting the importance which my Government attaches to relations with the National Government of the Republic of China. My Government is prepared as soon as legally possible to conclude with the National Government of China, if that Government so desires, a Treaty which will reestablish normal relations between the two Governments in conformity with the principles set out in the multilateral treaty of peace. The terms of such bilateral treaty shall, in respect of the Republic of China, be applicable to all territories which are now, or which may hereafter be, under the control of the National Government of the Republic of China. We will promptly explore this subject with the National Government of China.

As regards the Chinese Communist regime, that regime stands actually condemned by the United Nations of being an aggressor and in consequence, the United Nations has recommended certain measures against that regime, in which Japan is now concurring and expects to continue to concur when the multilateral Treaty of Peace comes into force pursuant to the provisions of article 5 (a) (iii), whereby Japan has undertaken "to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter and to refrain from giving assistance to any State against which the United Nations may take preventive or enforcement action." Furthermore, the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance concluded in Moscow in 1950 is virtually a military alliance aimed against Japan. In fact there are many reasons to believe that the Communist regime in China is backing the Japan Communist Party in its program of seeking violently to overthrow the constitutional system and the present Government of Japan. In view of these considerations, I can assure you that the Japanese Government has no intention to conclude a bilateral treaty with the Communist regime of China.

Your sincerely,

SHIGERU YOSHIDA.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I raised on the floor of the Senate the other day the question as to whether the Chinese Communists could get any benefits from reparations from Japan. I think that is a problem which has brought concern to the minds of many Members of this body and many persons throughout the country. I think it is a point which needs to be answered in an unequivocal manner, because certainly there would be more reluctance on my part to vote for the ratification of a treaty which directly or indirectly might enable the Chinese Communists to use the energy of the Japanese people and the industrial potential of Japan for building up the Communist regime in China, knowing, as we do, that it is allied with the Soviet Union and may join them in any future aggressions anywhere in the world. So I raisd that question in the discussion with the able ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Today I received a memorandum from Mr. Dulles which he received, in turn, from Mr. Fisher, the legal adviser of the Department of State, dealing with the Japanese peace treaty, the memorandum being headed "Japanese peace treaty—no provision for reparations tc Communist China."

I wish to read it into the RECORD at this point. It is dated March 17, 1952, and reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE LEGAL ADVISER,
March 17, 1952.

To: S—Mr. Dulles.
From: L—Mr. Fisher, ASF.
Subject: Japanese Peace Treaty—No provision for reparations to Communist China.

In answer to your inquiry, Communist China does not receive any reparations from Japan under the Japanese Peace Treaty. Article 14 (a) I, the reparations provision, obliges Japan to negotiate only with Allied Powers concerning compensation for damage done to territories occupied and damaged by Japanese forces. Communist China is not an Allied Power within the meaning of the treaty. Article 25 of the treaty specifically defines Allied Powers as only those states at war with Japan which have signed and ratified the treaty. Since Communist China has not and cannot sign the treaty, it is not an Allied Power, and consequently Japan is under no treaty obligation to negotiate or pay reparations to Communist China.

Is Japan obliged to negotiate a bilateral treaty with Communist China, which might contain reparations? The answer is "No." Article 26 of the peace treaty provides only that Japan will be prepared for a 3-year period to conclude a bilateral peace treaty with any state which is at war with her and is not a signatory of the San Francisco Treaty. There is only one state of China, though there are two groups, the Chinese Nationalist Government and the Communists, who claim to be the government of that

state. Japan, which is currently negotiating a bilateral treaty with China, through the Nationalist government, is not obliged to make any treaty with the Communist regime and does not intend to do so. Her only obligation is to negotiate with China, and she will have fulfilled that commitment when she concludes her treaty with the Nationalist Government. Consequently there is no obligation on Japan to conclude any bilateral peace treaty with the Communist regime, and there is no reason to expect that Japan would voluntarily assume obligations she didn't have to assume.

There is another very practical and realistic angle to this situation. I refer to the so-called Battle Act, Public Law 213, Eighty-second Congress, chapter 575, first session, H. R. 4550. This act deals with American aid in relation to those countries which ship strategic materials to Communist powers. I believe that under this act Japan, which will continue to receive some help from the United States, would be faced with the same obligation with which other powers are confronted. We cannot have strategic materials which would help to build up the Communist world going from our allies at the time our allies are receiving assistance from us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the so-called Battle Act. It is fairly brief. It should appear in the RECORD so that its significance will be clearly apparent.

There being no objection, the act was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Public Law 213, Eighty-second Cong., ch. 575, 1st sess.]

H. R. 455

An act to provide for the control by the United States and cooperating foreign nations of exports to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951."

TITLE I—WAR MATERIALS

SEC. 101. The Congress of the United States, recognizing that in a world threatened by aggression the United States can best preserve and maintain peace by developing maximum national strength and by utilizing all of its resources in cooperation with other free nations, hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to apply an embargo on the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, in order to (1) increase the national strength of the United States and of the cooperating nations; (2) impede the ability of nations threatening the security of the United States to conduct military operations; and (3) to assist the people of the nations under the domination of foreign aggressors to reestablish their freedom.

It is further declared to be the policy of the United States that no military, economic, or financial assistance shall be supplied to any nation unless it applies an embargo on such shipments to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under is domination.

This act shall be administered in such a way as to bring about the fullest support for any resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations, supported by the United States, to prevent the shipment of certain commodities to areas under the control of governments engaged in hostilities in defiance of the United Nations.

SEC. 102. Responsibility for giving effect to the purposes of this act shall be vested in the person occupying the senior position authorized by subsection (e) of section 406 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, or in any person who may hereafter be charged with principal responsibility for the administration of the provisions of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949. Such person is hereinafter referred to as the Administrator.

SEC. 103. (a) The Administrator is hereby authorized and directed to determine within 30 days after enactment of this act after full and complete consideration of the views of the Department of State, Defense, and Commerce; the Economic Cooperation Administration; and any other appropriate agencies, and notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, which items are, for the purpose of this act, arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and those items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war which should be embargoed to effectuate the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That such determinations shall be continuously adjusted to current conditions on the basis of investigation and consultation, and that all nations receiving United States military, economic, or financial assistance shall be kept informed of such determinations.

(b) All military, economic, or financial assistance to any nation shall, upon the recommendation of the Administrator, be terminated forthwith if such nation after 60 days from the date of a determination under section 103 (a) knowingly permits the shipment to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, of any item which he has determined under section 103 (a) after a full and complete investigation to be included in any of the following categories: Arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials of strategic value, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war: *Provided*, That the President after receiving the advice of the Administrator and after taking into account the contribution of such country to the mutual security of the free world, the importance of such assistance to the security of the United States, the strategic importance of imports received from countries of the Soviet bloc, and the adequacy of such country's controls over the export to the Soviet bloc of items of strategic importance, may direct the continuance of such assistance to a country which permits shipments of items other than arms, ammunition, implements of war, and atomic energy materials when unusual circumstances indicate that the cessation of aid would clearly be detrimental to the security of the United States: *Provided further*, That the President shall immediately report any determination made pursuant to the first proviso of this section with reasons therefor to the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the President shall at least once each quarter review all determinations made previously and shall report his conclusions to the foregoing committees of the House and Senate, which reports shall contain an analysis of the trade with the Soviet bloc of countries for which determinations have been made.

SEC. 104. Whenever military, economic, or financial assistance has been terminated as provided in this act, such assistance can be resumed only upon determination by the President that adequate measures have been taken by the Nation concerned to assure full compliance with the provisions of this act.

SEC. 105. For the purposes of this act the term "assistance" does not include activities carried on for the purpose of facilitating the procurement of materials in which the United States is deficient.

TITLE II—OTHER MATERIALS

SEC. 201. The Congress of the United States further declares it to be the policy of the United States to regulate the export of commodities other than those specified in title I of this act to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination, in order to strengthen the United States and other cooperating nations of the free world and to oppose and offset by nonmilitary action acts which threaten the security of the United States and the peace of the world.

SEC. 202. The United States shall negotiate with any country receiving military, economic, or financial assistance arrangements for the recipient country to undertake a program for controlling exports of items not subject to embargo under title I of this act, but which in the judgment of the Administrator should be controlled to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

SEC. 203. All military, economic, and financial assistance shall be terminated when the President determines that the recipient country (1) is not effectively cooperating with the United States pursuant to this title, or (2) is failing to furnish to the United States information sufficient for the President to determine that the recipient country is effectively cooperating with the United States.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. All other nations (those not receiving United States military, economic, or financial assistance) shall be invited by the President to cooperate jointly in a group or groups or on an individual basis in controlling the export of the commodities referred to in title I and title II of this act to any nation or combination of nations threatening the security of the United States, including the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and all countries under its domination.

SEC. 302. The Administrator with regard to all titles of this act shall—

(a) coordinate those activities of the various United States departments and agencies which are concerned with security controls over exports from other countries;

(b) make a continuing study of the administration of export control measures undertaken by foreign governments in accordance with the provisions of this act, and shall report to the Congress from time to time but not less than once every 6 months recommending action where appropriate; and

(c) make available technical advice and assistance on export-control procedures to any nation desiring such cooperation.

SEC. 303. The provisions of subsection (a) of section 403, of section 404, and of subsections (c) and (d) of section 406 of the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949

(Public Law 329, 81st Cong.), as amended, insofar as they are consistent with this act, shall be applicable to this act. Funds made available for the Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949, as amended, shall be available for carrying out this act in such amounts as the President shall direct.

SEC. 304. In every recipient country where local currency is made available for local currency expenses of the United States in connection with assistance furnished by the United States, the local currency administrative and operating expenses incurred in the administration of this act shall be charged to such local currency funds to the extent available.

SEC. 305. Subsection (d) of section 117 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 (Public Law 472, 80th Cong.), as amended, and subsection (a) of section 1302 of the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951 (Public Law 45, 82d Cong.), are repealed.

Approved October 26, 1951.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to discuss today only those reservations which deal with the Japanese treaty, and not with the other treaties with which we shall be dealing. I hope to have an opportunity to discuss the other agreements at a later date. I shall take up the first four reservations which deal with the Japanese peace treaty.

THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY—RESERVATION NO. 1

This reservation in its first part provides that "nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment, its domestic concern.

A treaty, by its nature, is a contract that binds and accordingly limits the sovereign right of the parties. The statement that a treaty shall not "impose any limitations" is, in effect, the reservation of a right to break the treaty at will, in which event it ceases to be a treaty. Presumably this is not intended. If that is not intended, then the proposed reservation has no significance, because outside of a few obligations to Japan, such as to end the state of war, to recognize its sovereignty, and to waive certain claims, and so forth, the United States assumes no obligations and gives no one else any voice in, much less control over, the foreign policy, the Military Establishment, or the domestic concerns of the United States.

The second part of the reservation says that the treaty shall not be construed "(b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan." This would presumably mean that Japan is bound only by the provisions of the treaty that are not "continuing."

This would nullify article 3, which requires Japan to give the United States continuing jurisdiction and legal authority over the Ryukyus and would thus jeopardize our Okinawa air and naval base.

There are other provisions, such as the renunciation of right, title, and claim to Korea, which might be held to be "continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan" as to which Japan might be relieved under the proposed reservation.

RESERVATION NO. 2

This represents an effort to rewrite the declaration unanimously proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. It differs in these respects:

(a) It eliminates reference to the Habomai and Shikotan Islands which Russia occupies and claims.

(b) It fails to identify the Yalta agreement of February 11, 1945, as the agreement regarding Japan. There were two other agreements, also dated February 11, 1945, one of which deals with liberated Europe and the other of which deals with German reparations, and the proposed reservation does not make clear which of the three is referred to.

(c) It adds a reference to "the so-called Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945." This agreement of August 1, 1945—not to be confused with the Japanese surrender terms formulated on July 26, 1945—deals entirely with European matters, principally Germany, and not at all with Japan. The Japanese Peace Treaty bears no relationship whatsoever to the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945.

(d) It is cast in the form of a reservation which implies the necessity of a change in the treaty, which in turn would require the approval of the other parties. The treaty does not in fact do any of the things against which the proposed Senate Foreign Relations Committee declaration, and, for that matter, the proposed reservation, is directed. Therefore, it is appropriate and in the interests of the United States to follow the form recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee.

RESERVATION NO. 3

This would alter article 14 (b) of the treaty by eliminating from its waiver the claims of the United States for direct military costs of the occupation and the claims of the United States nationals.

If we try to rewrite this article, others will do the same and this will expose Japan to reparation claims amounting to over a hundred billion dollars. It would totally wreck Japan's credit and economy and confront the United States with the alternative of seeing Japan go Communist or giving Japan vast relief, which would in effect mean that we would pay the reparation claims now barred, which the proposed reservation would revive.

United States interests are thoroughly protected as the Treaty stands.

Japan has already paid the equivalent of $1,900,000,000 to defray the costs of our military occupation. A principal expense not borne by Japan was that of the so-called GARIOA aid which amounted to about $2,000,000,000.

Article 14 keeps this GARIOA obligation alive and gives it a priority over the reparations claims of others. That Japanese indebtedness is already more than Japan can repay and the proposed addition to that debt of more debt for direct military costs would merely make some addition to an amount which is already beyond Japan's capacity to repay. Furthermore, it would dilute our position by opening the door to claims by the British Commonwealth Occupation.

As regards the claims of private citizens, these, insofar as they relate to property in Japan, will be completely taken care of under article 15, dealing with restoration of property and the rights and interests in Japan.

Insofar as private claims are not covered by article 15, they can be met out of the proceeds of Japanese property in the United States which, under article 14, the United States is authorized to apply for this purpose. The value of these assets amounts to about $85,000,000. Certain American claims have already been met out of this fund and others can be met as soon as Congress passes the enabling legislation.

The United States, the richest of the Allied countries, gets the best financial treatment under the Treaty. Its $2,000,000,000 GARIOA claim, as noted, is preserved intact and given priority. Its citizens' claims are of a kind that can be met almost 100 percent either by the provisions of article 14 or of article 15. No other national claimants are in nearly as good a position and there has been bitter complaint on this score. If we now attempt to get an even better position we would in fact lose this very favorable treaty position we now have and which has been acquiesced in, although reluctantly, by the other allied countries.

RESERVATION NO. 4

The first part of this reservation provides that "no rights or claims referred to in this treaty shall be deemed to accrue to any government or so-called government of China established by recourse to war, and, as used in this treaty the word 'China' refers to the legally established Republic of China."

The fact is that the treaty only mentions the word "China" twice. The first time is article 10, where it is used geographically. The text of article 10 is precisely word for word what was proposed by the National Government of China.

Under this article Japan renounces all special rights and interests in China. These rights merely disappear; they do not accrue to anyone.

Article 21 confirms, by cross reference to article 14 (a) (2) the right to seize and liquidate Japanese property in China. This property was all expropriated 6 years ago—1946—by the National Government of the Republic of China and the effect of the treaty is to validate that action.

The second part of the proposed reservation provides that the sovereignty of the Republic of China "shall be deemed to extend to all areas which were part of China at the outbreak of the late war between Japan and China, including Manchuria, Formosa, and the islands adjacent to Formosa." This reservation would carry into effect the proposals of the Soviet Union. At San Francisco, Gromyko complained that the treaty "grossly violates the indisputable rights of China to the return of integral parts of Chinese territory; Taiwan"—Formosa—"and the Pescadores." They want Formosa to be recognized as purely a Chinese internal problem and

they want to end any international interests in Formosa which is the basis for continuing United States concern.

It is because of that that the treaty merely requires Japan to renounce its interests in these islands without ending the right of the United States as one of the victorious allied powers to continue to concern itself with the ultimate disposition and intermediate status of the islands.

This treaty handling of the matter was accepted by the Chinese National Government itself, and the alternative now proposed was, after careful study, rejected by United States negotiators with the approval of the Foreign Relations Committee as contrary to the best interests of the United States.

Mr. President, I wish to touch on one additional problem. As I pointed out earlier in my remarks, we on this side of the aisle have justly been critical of the handling of many of our activities in the Far East, from the days of Yalta to very recently.

As I pointed out, there is legitimate ground for this complaint. I believe that where there was consultation with regard to certain policies in Europe the Republicans under the late great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan, played a very important and constructive part in the development of such policies. Senator Vandenberg himself on the floor of the Senate—and I personally heard him say it, and the RECORD will show that he did say it—pointed out very clearly that in regard to far-eastern policies and the China policy he had not been consulted; nor had the minority party been consulted in regard to far-eastern policies.

I believe the record can be amply documented in this regard and cannot be successfully contradicted.

In the Japanese Peace Treaty a contrary situation prevails. From the very start the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, both Republicans and Democrats, were kept adequately advised on all developments. The members of the Republican Party on the Committee on Foreign Relations, as well as the Democrats, were consulted on all phases of the development of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

I have already pointed out how that great American citizen who has done so much to turn 80,000,000 bitter enemies into 80,000,000 potential friends, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, had himself felt that the occupation had lasted as long as it should last, if not perhaps a little too long. I talked with General MacArthur in 1949, and again in 1950. I know that the statement in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations in that regard is an accurate statement.

Consequently, we have that background. We have the background that the committee was fully consulted by the State Department in this regard, and the report comes to the Senate as the unanimous judgment of the Committee on Foreign Relations by all of its members, both Democrats and Republicans. I believe that some weight should be given by this body, particularly by my colleagues on this side of the aisle, to the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Furthermore, Mr. John Foster Dulles, who carried a great, and I believe the principal, load in negotiating this treaty is a distinguished Republican and a former member of this body. I know that he has not only consulted with members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but he has discussed from time to time with other Members of the Senate the treaty and various phases of the negotiations.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Japanese Peace Treaty has been handled in a way which far-eastern policy has not been handled in the past, it seems to me that on this side of the aisle we have a great responsibility, if we are to be competent, as I believe the Republican Party is competent, to assume the obligations and high responsibilities of the executive branch of the Government of the United States. I believe that we must be prepared to assume our share of the responsibilities of the Government of the United States for a treaty that has been negotiated in the way that this treaty has been negotiated. Here there can be no complaint that there was no consultation with the Republicans. Here there can be no complaint that during all stages of the negotiations the Republican members of the Foreign Relations Committee were not kept adequately advised. Here there cannot be the complaint, which was made in earlier periods of our history, that Members of the Senate as a whole, and, in particular, the Republican Members of the Senate, had not been included in the treaty conference, because at the conference which was held in San Francisco we were ably represented by distinguished Republicans and Democrats, both of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. President, in view of all that background, and in view of the fact that I recognize that some doubts have been raised in the minds of Members of this body and in the minds of other persons throughout the country, I wish to state that, after careful study, I have come to the conclusion that the best interests of our Nation will be served by ratification of this treaty without reservations, and that we can do much to stabilize conditions in the Far East by a prompt ratification of the treaty. I say advisedly, on my responsibility as a Senator of the United States, that I believe that the alternative to ratification, namely, rejection of the treaty by the Senate, would be a disaster in our own foreign relations and in the entire stability of the Far East. I think it might very well lead to the setting off of a chain reaction which would give great impetus to communism in Asia. If we carry the ball as we started to carry it at the time of the San Francisco Conference, if we do not lose faith now, and if we continue to keep the initiative, I believe that the adverse conditions which have existed in the Far East can to some degree at least be remedied.

Mr. President, I am not so naive as to believe that we can unscramble the eggs of the disaster which already has occurred in many of the areas of the continent of Asia. However, as opposed to that disaster, which already has taken place, I do not believe that the only alternative is to do nothing. I do not believe that is the only alternative, because a do-nothing policy is what got us into trouble, even though at that time the policy had a different name, that of "wait for the dust to settle." Under that policy, we sat back and waited for the Communists to seize the initiative and move ahead, and we waited to pick up any pieces which might remain after that catastrophe had occurred.

This peace treaty is the alternative. By means of this treaty, we are taking some leadership. We are trying to build up in Japan a great, free nation which can help stabilize conditions in the Pacific.

Mr. President, Japan alone cannot do that. I think a free Republic of China on the island of Formosa is also required, because, as I have pointed out in times past, if China on the mainland is to once again be free, the ones to furnish the nucleus must of necessity come from the island of Formosa.

Likewise, Mr. President, I believe that stabilization of conditions in the Pacific requires the maintenance of a strong, sound Philippine Republic and Republic of Indonesia, and requires keeping southeast Asia outside the Communist orbit.

In the development of this policy I hope we may some day have the understanding of the Government and the people of India. I would be less than frank today, as I speak here in the Senate, if I did not say that I believe that throughout the United States there has been great disappointment at the attitude India has taken during the Korean aggression.

Until today, as we meet here in the Senate, all the United Nations' members outside the United States have contributed only 35,000 troops to the resistance of aggression in Korea. The United States of America alone has contributed more than 350,000 troops. The United States has suffered more than 93 percent of the casualties which have occurred among the troops in Korea. There are 61 members of the United Nations. Only 17 of them have contributed a single soldier, sailor, or airman to the resistance of aggression in Korea. India contributed not a single soldier, sailor, or airman.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the least we could expect from our associates in the United Nations, other than the Soviet Union and its satellite powers, who have continually tried to block any action to resist aggression, is not to give aid and comfort to the enemy by way of shipping to them strategic materials. Unfortunately, some of our associates in the United Nations have not felt the moral responsibility which I believe is theirs.

Certainly, I think we were entitled to have at least their support on the resolutions dealing with the Communist aggression. Yet I say with reluctance that in 75 percent of the cases, I believe, India has been voting with the Soviet

Union and the other Communist states. I think the American people and the United States of America, who have made such tremendous sacrifices to resist overt aggression in the Far East, are entitled to more support than that from the people of India and the Government of India.

I hope that some day they will see the light, because I believe they are living in a fool's paradise if they believe that if the United States and the other free nations were to go down before Communist tyranny, India could remain as an isolated island in a totalitarian sea. If that unhappy day ever were to come, I predict that the choice would not be India's to make.

In World War I, although the Kaiser did not respect the neutrality of Belgium, he did respect the neutrality of the Netherlands and Norway and Denmark. However, when World War II came, the desires of the Netherlands, Norway, and Denmark to be neutral were not the controlling factor. When the Nazis under Hitler decided to move, although at that time the desire of the Netherlands, Norway, and Denmark for neutrality was as great as is India's desire for neutrality today in the battle between the free world and the totalitarian world, the choice was not theirs to make, and their countries were overrun and were occupied, even though for a period of years they had been wedded to the idea of neutrality.

So I say that I think we have an opportunity to present a constructive alternative, which is not to sit back and let the Communist world dominate all of Asia.

Mr. President, in concluding, I merely wish to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very interesting article prepared by Dr. Stephen C. Y. Pan, who has been a professor at a number of American universities, and prior to that time had a distinguished career in China. His article is entitled "Legal Aspects of the Yalta Agreement."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE YALTA AGREEMENT

(By Stephen C. Y. Pan)

The far-eastern agreement signed at Yalta at the very end of the conference on February 11, 1945, was frequently defended and criticized at the hearings held in April–May 1951, on General MacArthur's dismissal. Yet its legal status has not yet been adequately discussed.

Herbert W. Briggs, professor of international law, Cornell University, termed this important document "the Yalta leaders' agreement" or "the leaders' agreement" or "the personal agreement of the three leaders."[1] He questioned the binding force of such an agreement. He asked: "Who were the parties to the agreement? Upon whom is it legally binding? Precisely what obligations were assumed by the contracting parties?" In answering these questions, he pointed out that the agreement was signed by the leaders or heads of the three great powers, which are the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The characterization of the signatories as the leaders in place of the official appelations, the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, is not generally a legal term and its precise implications are unknown to the United States and the United Kingdom. Professor Briggs considered the term "leader" as generally familiar terminology used by the Nazis and Fascists. Thus he seriously questioned the legality of that agreement, even as to its terminology.

Maj. Gen. Patrick Hurley considered that the Yalta agreement surrendered the territorial integrity and the political independence of China,[2] and violated the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the objectives for which the American people fought in World War II. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY even questioned whether this agreement is constitutional.[3]

Almost 7 years have elapsed since the signing of the agreement, and still not all the information about this once top-secret document is available. Thus, it seems to be desirable not to question the advisability or wisdom of this agreement as to its political implication, but, rather, to reexamine and reanalyze it carefully from a legal standpoint. Therefore, the text of "The Agreement Regarding Japan" is quoted in full, as follows:

"The leaders of the three great powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Great Britain—have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies on condition that:

"1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved;

"2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz.:

"(a) the southern part of Sakhalin as well as all the islands adjacent to it shall be returned to the Soviet Union;

"(b) the commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the preeminent interest of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded, and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U. S. S. R. restored;

"(c) the Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South Manchurian Railroad, which provides an outlet to Dairen, shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria;

"3. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

"It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

"The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

"For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the National Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance between the U. S. S. R. and China in order to render assistance to China with its armed forces for the purpose of liberating China from the Japanese yoke.[4]

"February 11, 1945.

"Signed by:

"J. STALIN.
"FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
"WINSTON S. CHURCHILL."

In examining the above-quoted text of the document, it is interesting to note that those who signed this international agreement did not attach their official title to their signatures. Nor did they say that they signed it on behalf of their respective governments or states. Nor did they state that they had been authorized to sign it. The titles of "Marshal" Stalin and "the President" were, however, mentioned in the text of the document. Stalin's exact official position was not stated. The term "Prime Minister" is not attached to Churchill's signature nor was it mentioned in the text. Such a form, or lack of form, is without established precedent in international agreements or treaties.

The details of this agreement require further legal comment. It is stated that "the former rights of Russia shall be restored," but those "rights" are not defined or even specifically mentioned. Both Dairen and Port Arthur, historically and geographically, are Chinese territories, and the Chinese have always considered them as such. Any Russian claims are questionable, to say the least.

Part of the price for Russia's entry into war against Japan after Germany surrendered and the war was terminated in Europe, was the concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in the Soviet claims in the agreement. The United Nations declaration of January 1, 1942, included the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and China and some 26 nations who agreed to ally themselves against aggression and pledged mutual aid. Why should China then, as an ally, consent to pay a great price to another ally, the Soviet Union? Why should China concur in terms and decisions of a conference in which she was not even a participant and on which she was not informed immediately? Was China considered a protectorate or a colony of any great power or combination of the Three Great Powers?

Furthermore, upon what authority could the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom justify the making of concessions to the Soviet Union on behalf of or for China?

In the form of a guaranty to Stalin, it was stipulated that (1) "The President will take measures in order to obtain" China's concurrence "on advice from Marshal Stalin"; and (2) "The heads of the Three Great Powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated." Now the questions involved here are: Why was the President (of the United States) obliged to promise to take measures? What kind of measures was he going to take or recommend? If China declined to abide by these terms, would the United States use every conceivable means, including force, to fulfill these conditions or claims of the Soviet Union? If it were in the province of the Three Great Powers, including the United States and the United Kingdom, to guarantee the fulfillment of some condition or the obligation of one state to another, this, then, would constitute a long-term international political agreement, participation in which should have the consent of the United States Senate.

However, no congressional action was taken on this agreement in 1945, possibly

[1] Editorial comment in this Journal, vol. 40 (1946), pp. 376–383.

[2] Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Foreign Relations, U. S. Senate (five parts, Washington, 1951), pt. 4, p. 2829. Hereafter it is called the MacArthur Hearings.

[3] Ibid., pt. 3, p. 2128.

[4] Department of State, Agreement Regarding Japan (Washington, 1946). This full text was released in February 1946.

because the text of the agreement was not officially released until a year after its signature. While the United States Government was faithfully taking adequate measures through diplomatic channels for acquiring the concurrence of Generalissimo Chian Kai-shek, China was requested by the United States Government to negotiate and sign a Sino-Soviet treaty of friendship and alliance with the Soviet Union on August 14, 1945, about 6 days after the Soviet entry into the war with Japan. At the time when Japan was actually seeking acceptance of unconditional surrender, the Sino-Soviet treaty was signed. In fact it was on August 6, 1945, that the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima and the Japanese Emperor broadcast to the nation his willingness to accept the unconditional-surrender terms. The Soviet Union declared war on August 8.

A MEMORANDUM OR STATEMENT?

It is rather interesting to note that the report of the whole Crimea Conference, released on February 12, 1945, signed by Stalin, Roosevelt, and Churchill, does not purport to be an agreement. It simply referred to its text as an agreement on the result of the conference.[5] Secretary Byrnes, 1 year later, referred to the document dealing with the Far East as a statement or a memorandum.

Furthermore, neither the form, contents, nor terminology of this agreement stipulates when it would come into force. Nothing is said about its ratification or termination. Therefore, it is fair to assert that its meaning is doubtful and its duration uncertain.

OUTER MONGOLIA

Next to the importance of the question concerning Manchuria, is the provision about Outer Mongolia. Roosevelt accepted Stalin's condition that "the status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved" and agreed that "these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated." Mr. Roosevelt's responsibility, in this respect is indeed great. It should be remembered that the Sino-Soviet agreement of 1924[6] stipulated that "The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recognizes that Outer Mongolia is an integral part of the Republic of China and respects China's sovereignty therein." Since that is the case, the preservation of the Mongolian People's Republic provided by the Yalta agreement tends to impair China's sovereignty and amounts to a violation of the said Sino-Soviet agreement. Although the United States and the United Kingdom were not parties to the Sino-Soviet agreement of 1924, yet Mr. Roosevelt signed an agreement with Marshal Stalin which in effect violated a treaty of which the Soviet Union is a signatory.

On the other hand, if Outer Mongolia was already the independent state called the Mongolian People's Republic at the time of the signing of the Yalta agreement, does it mean that both Roosevelt and Churchill, as leaders of their respective countries, assume the duties of perpetual guarantors or personal protectors of the independence of Outer Mongolia against China and the Soviet Union, or both? Or does it mean that they merely agreed not to oppose further or future Soviet domination or attachment of Outer Mongolia, over which China claims sovereignty?

As to the provision that the former rights of Russia, violated by Japan in 1904, shall be returned to Soviet Russia, a few facts were not clarified in the agreement:

(1) What were the Russian rights violated by Japan, and what where China's rights in Manchuria?

(2) Was territory or property taken from China by Japan considered as Japanese or Chinese territory or property?

(3) Port Arthur and Dairen have always been Chinese territories. Under compulsion, these ports were leased to Russia and later occupied by Japan. The Cairo declaration of 1943 announced that Manchuria should be returned to China. Since these ports are in Manchuria, why and how did Port Arthur become a Russian naval base and Dairen internationalized?

THE CHINESE EASTERN RAILWAY

The legal status of the Chinese Eastern Railway was determined by a contract between China and the Russo-Chinese Bank signed on September 8, 1896, which provided for the formation of a company under the name of the Chinese Eastern Railway Co. The Chinese Government paid 5,000,000 Kuping taels to the Russo-Chinese Bank to finance this project. This was not a contract between the Chinese Government and the Russian Government, but between the Chinese Government and the Russo-Chinese Bank. It was supposed to be under sovereignty and jurisdiction of the Chinese Government, because article I provided: "The seal which this company will employ will be given to it by the Chinese Government";[7] and article 12 stated: "At the expiration of 36 years from the day on which the entire line is finished and traffic is in operation, the Chinese Government will have the right to buy back this line upon repaying in full all the capital involved, as well as all debts contracted for this line, plus accrued interest."[8]

By a further agreement with the Chinese Government signed on July 6, 1898, and by the first supplement to the charter of the Chinese Eastern Railway on February 17, 1899, this company was authorized to construct a branch line from one of the stations of the main line to the ports of Dairen and Port Arthur, situated in the Kuantung Peninsula, also to operate this branch which shall be named "the South Manchuria Line of the Chinese Eastern Railway."[9] It was under the control of an interallied commission in 1919. The Washington Conference of 1922 decided that China should be charged with the responsibility for the condition and welfare of the railway and its shareholders. And above all, it was resolved that this railway was in the nature of a trust resulting from the exercise of power by the Chinese Government over the possession and administration of the railroad.

THE SOUTH MANCHURIA RAILWAY

As to the status of the South Manchuria Railway, a short historical account is necessary in order to determine its nature. The territory through which this railway was supposed to go was Fengtien Province, part of which was ceded to Japan by article II of the Treaty of Shimonoseki[10] signed by China and Japan on April 17, 1895. This, however, was canceled by diplomatic intervention of Russia, France, and Germany in the latter part of the same year.[11] As a price for this service rendered to China, the Russian Government succeeded in signing a contract with China for the construction and operation of the Chinese Eastern Railway under the ownership of the Russo-Chinese Bank in 1896. Two years later, China signed another agreement with Russia concerning the southern branch of the Chinese Eastern Railway, which later was called "the South Manchurian line" of the Chinese Eastern Railway.[12] These might constitute Russian claims of rights in the original Chinese Eastern Railway together with the original part of the South Manchuria Railway (later it was greatly extended by the Japanese themselves). But by article V of the Treaty of Portsmouth of September 5, 1905, Russia agreed to transfer to Japan, with the consent of the Chinese Government, the lease of Port Arthur, Dairen, and their rights and privileges and properties therein.[13]

Article VI of the Treaty of Portsmouth provided that Russia agreed to "transfer and assign to the Imperial Government of Japan without compensation and with the consent of the Chinese Government, the railway between Changchun and Port Arthur and all its branches, together with all rights, privileges and properties appertaining thereto in that region, as well as all coal mines in the said region belonging to or worked for the benefit of the railway."[14] By a treaty between China and Japan on December 22, 1905, China agreed to "consent to all the transfers and assignments made by Russia to Japan by Articles V and VI of the Treaty of Peace mentioned above."[15] Thus this was the first time Russia formally, though reluctantly, gave up her treaty rights in the original southern section of the Chinese Eastern Railway to Japan.

Japan acquired her rights in the South Manchuria Railway from the Treaty of Portsmouth with Russia, which was arranged by President Theodore Roosevelt in 1905. This again was approved by China in an agreement with Japan in the same year. Japan then exerted her effort toward building and extending this railway. In 1906, by a Japanese Imperial Ordinance, the South Manchuria Railway Joint Stock Co. was officially proclaimed. Article II of the ordinance stated: "The shares of the company shall all be registered and may be owned only by the Japanese and Chinese Governments or by subjects of Japan and China."[16] By an agreement between China and Japan in 1907, part of the rolling stock and equipment of the South Manchuria Railway between Mukden and Hsin Min T'un was to be handed over over to China.[17] In the same year, Russia signed a convention with Japan which stated that both the Chinese Eastern Railway Co. and South Manchuria Railway Co. shall "reserve the right to decide the plans of construction within the limits of its own ground."[18] Thus, the South Manchuria

[5] Department of State Bulletin, February 18, 1945, pp. 213–216; this Journal, Supp. Vol. 39 (1945), p. 103.

[6] Ibid., Supp., Vol. 19 (1925), p. 53.

[7] Manchuria: Treaties and Agreements, p. 14; and China's Maritime Customs, Treaties, Conventions, etc., between China and Foreign States (2 vols., Shanghai, 1917), volume I, pp. 208–219.

[8] Manchuria: Treaties and Agreements, p. 16, and China's Maritime Customs, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 233–237.

[9] Manchuria: Treaties and Agreements, pp. 49–50.

[10] China's Maritime Customs, op. cit., vol. II, p. 591; also Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Manchuria: Treaties and Agreements (Washington, 1921), p. 1.

[11] Manchuria: Treaties and Agreements, op. cit., p. 13.

[12] John V. A. MacMurray, Treaties and Agreements With and Concerning China, 1894–1919 (New York, 1921, 1921), vol. I. pp. 154–157.

[13] Manchuria: Treaties and Agreements, etc., pp. 75–77.

[14] Ibid., p. 72.

[15] Ibid., p. 78.

[16] Manchuria: Treaties, etc., op. cit., p. 85.

[17] Ibid., p. 101.

[18] Ibid., p. 108.

Railway might be called an "official," a "semi-official," or a "private" company.[19]

It is apparent that Russia gave up to Japan her interest in the southern section of the Chinese Eastern Railway, which later on was called by the Japanese the South Manchuria Railway, and that her claims to the railway in the Yalta agreement are not entirely based on fact or history. It was Japan which through her continuous effort extended and expanded this railway in Manchuria. The extension or expansion was done mainly by means of Japanese capital with Chinese labor and materials. Of course, these Japanese efforts in the South Manchuria Railway areas were of an aggressive nature. Yet this could hardly have been accomplished without first having the consent of Russia to the transfer of the railway rights to Japan.

Even if the Soviet Union had some rights in the Chinese Eastern Railway and certain alleged rights in the South Manchuria Railway before 1905, her subsequent acts have nullified her rights.

In the first place, as stated previously, Russia agreed to transfer her rights in the South Manchuria Line of the Chinese Eastern Railway to Japan.

Secondly, in 1924, the Soviet Union declared the abolishment of her unequal treaties with China, including her secret alliance with China of 1896 and the relinquishment of her rights in the Chinese Eastern Railway pending final settlement. This was evidently intended as a friendly gesture toward the Chinese people at that time. Such a declaration amounts to forfeiting the Soviet claims of rights in the Chinese Eastern Railway in Manchuria. However, this Soviet declaration never became a reality, for even after the Soviet Union signed a treaty of alliance and mutual assistance with the People's Republic of China in February 1950, these railways are still under Soviet-Chinese joint ownership.

Thirdly, in March 1935, Constantin Yureneff, Soviet Ambassador at Tokyo, totally disregarding the protests of the Chinese Government, signed an agreement or a contract with Koki Hirota, Japanese Foreign Minister, and Ting Shih-yuan, Ambassador of the puppet government of Manchukuo, for the sale of the Chinese Eastern Railway to Manchukuo.

SOVIET RIGHTS?

In view of the above established facts, the South Manchuria line of the Chinese Eastern Railway, which was partly owned by China and the Russo-Chinese Bank, had been transferred by Russia to Japan by a treaty between Japan and Russia and another treaty between China and Japan accepting the provisions of the Russo-Japanese Treaty in 1905. As to the rest of the Chinese Eastern Railway, it had also belonged to China and the Russo-Chinese Bank since 1896. Though the Soviet Union in 1924 had announced her intention of giving up Soviet rights in the Chinese Eastern Railway, this intention was never actually carried out. Then in 1935, the Soviet Government sold her shares in this railway to the puppet regime of Manchukuo in disregard of China's protest.

Under these circumstances, what right, if any, could the Soviet Union possibly assert to the South Manchuria Railway and the Chinese Eastern Railway with regard to her claims of joint ownership?

It is, therefore, very difficult to comprehend why President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, in the Yalta agreement, would concede as valid such Soviet claims to the railroads in Manchuria and two ports. It is possible, however, that President Roosevelt, preoccupied by many other important international problems, did not have enough time for adequate study of the real situation in Manchuria. Or he might have been ill advised by some of the China experts in the United States delegation at Yalta or in the State Department at that time, as former Ambassador Patrick Hurley has maintained. Indeed, the distorted terms of the Yalta agreement concerning Manchuria, Mongolia, and Japan in themselves clearly demonstrate a form of deceit peculiar to the Kremlin.

AN EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT

The Yalta agreement may be considered as an executive agreement, which does not require senatorial consent or approval. The treaty-making power of the President of the United States is stipulated by the Constitution. Section 2 of article II of the Constitution states that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." However, the President's authority for making executive agreements is obtained from various sources such as acts of Congress, treaty provisions, and constitutional provisions. Under the Chief Executive power, he can make administrative agreements. As Commander in Chief, he can make military agreements. Under the presidential power over foreign relations, he can enter into certain political agreements without obtaining the advice and consent of the Senate. Thus under certain conditions the President can enter into executive agreements with foreign states.[20] On such a basis, the Yalta agreement might not require approval of the Senate, as it is not regarded as a treaty. Of course, this does not imply that the President is thus free to abuse his executive power. However, nowadays, there is a tendency on the part of the legislative branch to play a more important role in the conduct of the foreign relations of the United States, with the hope that in its dealings with foreign governments it can avoid secret diplomacy. A congressional debate on such subjects may enlighten the people at large, for deliberation and such public debates can constitute an important factor of real democracy.

However, it should be pointed out that President Roosevelt himself had implied the Yalta agreement might not be exempt from congressional or senatorial approval. In the prepared text of his report to Congress on Yalta, on March 1, 1945, he wrote:

"I am aware of the constitutional facts—as are all the United Nations—that this Charter [of the future U. N.] must be approved by two-thirds of the Senate of the United States—as well as some of the other agreements made at Yalta." [21]

In his actual delivery, President Roosevelt changed his statement to the following:

"I have always been a believer in the document called the Constitution. I spent a good deal of time in educating two other nations of the world with regard to the Constitution of the United States—that the Charter has to be and should be approved by the Senate of the United States under the Constitution. I think that the other nations of the world know it now." [22]

Roosevelt's remarks stating that "some of the other agreements made at Yalta" were to "be approved by two-thirds of the Senate of the United States" were published in a release by the State Department. Even without considering the complicated legality and technicality of it, Roosevelt at the outset of his report to Congress did emphasize the following:

"Speaking in all frankness, the question of whether it is fruitful or not, lies, to a great extent, in your hands, for unless you, here in the Halls of the American Congress, with the support of the American people concur in the general conclusions reached at the place called Yalta, and give them your active support, the meeting will not have produced lasting results. And that is why I have come before you at the earliest hour I could after my return." [23]

It may be argued that, without considering the soundness of his judgment in time of war, the President considered the paying of a price to Soviet Russia for her entry into the far-eastern war a military necessity. However, this agreement not only includes wartime provisions, but also stipulates that "these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated." A duration of time for its fulfillment is not specified, nor is it stated how the Soviet claims will be fulfilled. These nebulous but nonetheless dynamic provisions involved not only military but political angles of great international significance.

As to the duration of the binding force of executive agreements, they may or may not be respected by the succeeding administrations, because, after all, an executive agreement is signed by the Chief Executive and not solemnly entered into in the name of the United States of America, in the form of international treaties. However, a number of executive agreements have been carried out during the terms of several succeeding administrations. Some maintain that—

"Executive agreements with foreign governments entered into under one President continue to remain in force under the successors unless and until the statutes or regulations in pursuance of which they are entered into are repealed or the specified time for their operation has expired or notice of a desire to terminate it is given by one side or the other." [24]

On the other hand, others think that, at least as a general rule, no agreement between the President and a foreign power can be considered as binding upon the United States under future administrations unless ratified by the Senate or assented to by an act of Congress, and that succeeding administrations are not obliged to carry out executive agreements of a preceding administration.

MILITARY OR POLITICAL AGREEMENT?

Secretary Byrnes on February 11, 1946, in releasing the text of this once top-secret document, on the first anniversary of its signature, called it "the agreement between the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Prime Minister, Winston S. Churchill, and Generalissimo Stalin." [25] He did not call it an agreement between the United States of America, the United Kingdom, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Byrnes thought that Roosevelt and Churchill would consider it as a military decision or agreement. Secretary Stettinius similarly stated that it was a military matter and thought it best remain on merely a military level.

On the ground of military necessity the Yalta agreement was then kept secret from a principal ally—China—whose vital interests were at stake. Yet Gen. George C. Marshall does not think that it was a military agreement, but believes that it was a political matter not discussed with the military. On

[19] C. Walter Young, Japanese Jurisdiction in the South Manchuria Railway Areas (Baltimore, 1931), p. 77.

[20] Wallace McClure, International Executive Agreements (New York, 1941).

[21] Department of State bulletin, March 4, 1945, p. 324.

[22] Franklin D. Roosevelt, Report to Congress on the Yalta Conference (Washington, March 1945), p. 6.

[23] Ibid., p. 1.

[24] William Hays Simpson, Legal Aspects of Executive Agreements, in Iowa Law Journal, vol. 24 (1939), p. 86.

[25] The New York Times, February 12, 1946.

May 11, 1951, in answering Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND's question in the joint Senate committee hearings on General MacArthur's dismissal, General Marshall stated that he was mainly engaged in military discussions at Yalta, but he was not aware of the Yalta Far Eastern Agreement. When Senator KNOWLAND asked him: "Were you familiar at Yalta with the Manchurian provisions of giving Dairen and the rights on the Manchurian railroads and Port Arthur to the Soviet Union?" Secretary Marshall replied: "I don't think I was, sir." [26]

The real nature of the Yalta Agreement may be considered either political or military, as one wishes. After all, sometimes it is difficult to draw a line of demarcation between military and political matters because they are interrelated and interdependent. It was, therefore, natural for Senator KNOWLAND to state at the said hearings:

"One of the difficulties we have, Mr. Secretary, is that there is a very fine line between the political discussions and the military; and when we seek information * * * I am making the general observation that sometimes we ask for information and the State Department will say that is military information, and the military may quite properly say that it is political; and it is hard to draw a clear-cut line." [27]

Whatever may be the real nature of the agreement, if it has to do with the cession of territories of an ally, it must obtain the consent of that ally; if it deals with an enemy state, it should certainly be embodied in the form of a peace treaty. Thus Secretary Byrnes was quite correct when, upon being asked whether the Yalta Agreement eventually would be put in the form of a treaty, he replied that he had heard President Roosevelt on one or two occasions taking the position that the cession of territory was a matter to be settled in an eventual peace treaty.[28] In other words, the competence and legality of any provision of any agreement dealing with territories should be embodied in a peace treaty, which requires the advice and consent of the Senate.

IS THE AGREEMENT AT VARIANCE WITH OTHER TREATIES?

Secretary of State Cordell Hull on April 29, 1934, issued a statement regarding the relations between the United States and China, as well as Japan and other countries, that clearly expressed his belief that the conduct of international relations should be governed by international treaties, multilateral and bilateral. He pointed out:

"In the opinion of the American people and the American Government, no nation can, without the assent of the other nations concerned, rightfully endeavor to make conclusive its will in situations where there are involved the rights, the obligations, the legitimate interests of other sovereign states." [29]

If this is a guiding principle for the conduct of American relations with China and the rest of the world, then the important question arises: Is the Yalta agreement at variance with other existing treaties between the United States and China and some other states or between the United States and some other states? Let us now proceed to examine the Nine-Power Treaty, the Sino-Soviet Treaty of 1924, the Atlantic Charter of 1941, and the Cairo Declaration of 1943 in relation to the Yalta agreement.

THE NINE-POWER TREATY

The open-door policy in China since the time of Daniel Webster, who, as Secretary of State, sent the first American minister to China, has been the traditional policy of the United States. The open-door policy before 1922, in the form of an exchange of notes, as a form of international agreements, provided for "the preservation of China's territorial and administrative entity," and "the equality of trade opportunities" in China. This policy was reaffirmed and reemphasized before 1922.[30] The corollary principles of this policy were embodied in a multilateral international treaty signed at Washington, known as the Nine-Power Treaty.[31] The United States of America, Belgium, the British Empire, China, France, Italy, Japan, The Netherlands and Portugal on February 6, 1922, declared:

"ARTICLE I

"The contracting powers, other than China, agree:

"(1) To respect the sovereignty, the independence, and the territorial and administrative integrity of China;

"(2) To provide the fullest and most unembarrassed opportunity to China to develop and maintain for herself an effective and stable government;

* * * * *

"(4) To refrain from taking advantage of conditions in China in order to seek special rights or privileges which would abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly states, and from countenancng action inimical to the security of such states."

The Yalta agreement by promising to give joint ownership of all the railroads in Manchuria, the internationalization of Dairen, a Russian naval base in Port Arthur and the preservation of the "People's Mongolian Republic" threatened the territorial and administrative integrity of China. It also placed China in an embarrassing position as she attempted to maintain a stable government. Such provisions would give Soviet Russia special rights or privileges, which would be inimical to the interests of friendly states, including the United States.

"ARTICLE II

"The contracting powers agree not to enter any treaty, agreement, arrangement, or understanding, either with one another, or, individually or collectively, with any power or powers, which would infringe or impair the principles stated in article I."

As signatories of the Nine-Power Treaty, the United States and the United Kingdom were bound not to enter into any agreement or understanding with any power or powers which would infringe or impair the principles of article I of the treaty, yet the Yalta agreement in itself is in direct violation of this provision.

"ARTICLE III

"With a view to applying more effectually the principles of the open door or equality of opportunity in China for the trade and industry of all nations, the contracting powers, other than China, agree that they will not seek nor support their respective nationals in seeking—

"(a) any arrangement which might purport to establish in favor of their interests any general superiority of rights with respect to commercial or economic development in any designated region of China;

"(b) any such monopoly or preference as would deprive the nationals of any other power of the right of undertaking any legitimate trade or industry in China, or of participating with the Chinese Government, or with any local authority, in any category of public enterprise, or which by reason of its scope, duration or geographical extent is calculated to frustrate the practical application of the principle of equal opportunity.

* * * * *

"China undertakes to be guided by the principles stated in the foregoing stipulations of this article in dealing with applications for economic rights and privileges from governments and natonals of all foreign countries, whether parties to the present treaty or not."

The Yalta agreement, by recognizing the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in Manchuria conceded to give joint ownership of all the railroads in that area together with a Russian naval base and a Soviet-dominated seaport under the veil of internationalization, certainly would destroy the open-door principles in Manchuria and would create a Soviet sphere of influence or interest which may lead to its detachment from China and its attachment to Soviet Russia.

"ARTICLE IV

"The contracting powers agree not to support any agreements by their respective nationals with each other designated to create spheres of influence or to provide for the enjoyment of mutually exclusive opportunities in designated parts of Chinese territory."

The United States and the United Kingdom by this article are supposed not to support any agreement which might lead to the creation of a sphere of influence in any part of China. Yet the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of Great Britain first of all promised to help to create a sphere of influence or extraterritorial rights in Manchuria and in Mongolia. Moreover, the President agreed that he "will take measures to obtain this concurrence" from the Chinese Generalissimo "on advice from Marshal Stalin." In a solemn manner it declared: "The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated."

SINO-SOVIET AGREEMENT OF 1924

The Sino-Soviet Treaty of 1924 stated that "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics recognizes that Outer Mongolia is an integral part of the Republic of China and respects China's sovereignty therein." The Yalta agreement recognizes "the status quo" of the Mongolian People's Republic. These two agreements are not in accord with each other.

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

The Atlantic Charter announced by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill on August 14, 1941, stated that the United States and Great Britain "desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned." Yet the Yalta agreement consented to and guaranteed the giving away of territories not only of an enemy country—Japan—but also that of a principal ally—China—with "the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned."

THE CAIRO DECLARATION

The Cairo Declaration signed by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in November 1943, stated that "all the territories Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China." [32] But the Yalta agreement promised to internationalize one Manchurian port and create a Russian naval base out of another. It also promised Russian joint ownership of all the railways in Manchuria. Such provisions make the return of Manchuria to China extremely difficult, if not impossible.

---

[26] MacArthur hearings, part I, p. 564.

[27] Ibid., pp. 560–561.

[28] Department of State Bulletin, Feb. 10, 1946, pp. 189–190.

[29] Department of State Press Releases, May 5, 1934, p. 245.

[30] Stephen C. Y. Pan, American Diplomacy Concerning Manchuria (Washington and Boston, 1938), chs. III, IV, and V.

[31] U. S. Treaty Series, No. 723 (Washington, 1937); this Journal, supp., vol. 16 (1922), p. 64.

[32] Dept. of State Bulletin, vol. 9, No. 232 (December 4, 1943), p. 393; this Journal, Supp., vol. 38 (1944), p. 8.

The contradictions of inconsistencies between the Yalta provisions concerning Manchuria and the various existing international treaties are quite clear. It was reasonable, therefore, for Gen. Patrick Hurley to state in his testimony before the joint Senate committee that the Yalta agreement was in contradiction to the aims and purposes of the open-door policy, the Atlantic Charter, and the Cairo declaration. Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER thought it was a violation of the Atlantic Charter, the Cairo declaration, and America's "announced antiimperialistic policy" growing out of World War II. Secretary of State Acheson, however, in answering Senator HICKENLOOPER, still said the agreement was not in violation of international agreements, but he admitted that the United States did use "efforts" to get China's concurrence and "the matters concerned in this agreement are extraterritorial rights." [33]

The fulfillment of Soviet claims in Manchuria paved the way for Soviet domination and encroachment in that area and other parts of China. Secretary of State Dean Acheson was correct when he stated in an address before the National Press Club on January 12, 1950:

"What is happening in China is that the Soviet Union is detaching the northern provinces (areas) of China from China and is attaching them to the Soviet Union. This process is complete in Outer Mongolia and in Sinkiang, there are very happy reports coming from Soviet agents to Moscow. This is what is going on. It is the detachment of those whole areas, vast areas—populated by Chinese—the detachment of these areas from China and their attachment to the Soviet Union." [34]

Ambassador Warren R. Austin declared at the United Nations on November 28, 1950:

"The preservation of China's territorial and administrative entity has been a major tenet of American policy ever since relations were first established between the two governments in 1844 by the Treaty of Wanghia. The American record of support to the Chinese Government against the imperialist pressures of Russia and Japan is well known. * * *

"The open-door notes of Secretary of State John Hay in 1899 awoke the world's conscience to an appreciation of the menace of Russian imperialist pressure on Manchuria. United States' efforts to support Chinese sovereignty over Manchuria have not relaxed since that time. This policy was not relaxed when Russian imperialism was replaced by Japanese imperialism in 1905. This policy was not relaxed when the Japanese imperialism was replaced in turn by the new Soviet imperialism in 1945." [35]

If this is true, certainly the Yalta agreement concerning China is not in accordance with the spirit and principles of American traditional policy in China.

The Yalta agreement, an executive agreement, may, like a treaty, become invalid through the expiration of its time limit. But it provided no special time limit. It may be void through nonperformance of its specified purposes. Some of the Yalta provisions concerning the Manchurian railroads and the two ports in Manchuria have been fulfilled by the Sino-Soviet Treaty and Agreements of August 14, 1945.[36] However, the guarantee of the independence of Outer Mongolia is unqualified, as neither the duration nor the method of the guarantee is mentioned in the agreement.

THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

As has been pointed out previously, the far-eastern agreement signed at Yalta is officially called the agreement regarding Japan. It, therefore, had a great bearing on the peace treaty which was signed with Japan at San Francisco by 49 nations on September 8, 1951. For instance, section 3 of the Yalta Agreement stated that "The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union"; and section 2 (a) of the same agreement stipulated that "the southern part of Sakhalin as well as all the islands adjacent to it shall be returned to the Soviet Union." On the other hand, section (c) of article 2 of chapter II of the Japanese Peace Treaty concerning territory provides:

"Japan renounces all right, title and claim to the Kurile Islands, and to that portion of Sakhalin and the islands adjacent to it over which Japan acquired sovereignty as a consequence of the Treaty of Portsmouth of September 5, 1905." [37]

Such a treaty provision gives the Soviet Union more legal ground than did the Yalta Agreement, because it presents the impression that Japan acquired all these islands only as a consequence of the Treaty of Portsmouth. This is hardly substantiated by history. It is also in direct contradiction to previous American interpretations of the status of the islands. Edward Stettinius, Secretary of State, wrote:

"The Kurile Islands, of course, were Japanese territory before the Russo-Japanese War of 1904. During the nineteenth century both Russia and Japan had laid claims to the Kuriles, and Japanese ownership was recognized near the close of the century." [38]

In spite of the fact that in the Japanese Peace Treaty, Japan renounced her legal title and claim to the Kurile Islands and the southern part of Sakhalin, the Soviet Union was still not satisfied with these provisions, because the treaty did not specifically mention that these islands should be transferred to the Soviet Union. Andrei A. Gromyko, Soviet Delegate to the San Francisco Conference, alleged:

"The Soviet delegation has already drawn the attention of the conference to the inadmissibility of a situation under which the draft peace treaty with Japan fails to state that Japan should recognize the sovereignty of the Soviet Union over the southern part of Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands. The draft is in flagrant contradiction with the obligations assumed by the United States and Great Britain with regard to these territories under the Yalta Agreement." [39]

Since the Soviet Union, together with Czechoslovakia and Poland, refused to sign this treaty, the Soviet Union is not bound to observe its provisions.

On the other hand, John Foster Dulles, chief architect of the Japanese Peace Treaty, though he did not deny the "rights" which the Soviet Union could claim from the Yalta Agreement, implied that the Soviet Union by its nonfulfillment of the agreement could not expect other parties to fulfill the Soviet claims. In reply to the various Soviet charges Dulles stated:

"As regards south Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, the treaty carries out the provisions of the Potsdam surrender terms, the only agreement by which Japan and the Allied Powers as a whole are bound. So long as other governments have rights under the Yalta Agreement which the Soviet Union has not fulfilled, there is at least question as to whether the Soviet Union can, with 'clean hands,' demand fulfillment of the parts of that agreement it likes." [40]

Shigeru Yoshida, Japanese Prime Minister, in accepting the peace treaty, however, tried to clarify the false impressions which had been created by the Yalta agreement, the statements of the Soviet delegate, and the Japanese Treaty provisions, that the Kurile Islands and Sakhalin had only been acquired by Japan since 1905. Thus the Japanese Prime Minister in rather strong language declared:

"With respect to the Kuriles and South Saghalien (Sakhalin), the Soviet delegate spoke the other day as though Japan had grabbed them by aggression. To state the truth, Japan's ownership of the South Kuriles was never disputed by the Czarist Government, while the exchange of South Saghalien for the North Kuriles between Russia and Japan was agreed upon in 1875 between the two governments through diplomatic negotiations. It was under the treaty of 1905 concluded through the intermediary of President Theodore Roosevelt of the United States that South Saghalien became also Japanese territory.

"Both Saghalien and the North and South Kuriles were placed under Soviet protection as of September 20, 1945, shortly after Japan's surrender. Even the islands of Habomai and Shikotan, constituting part of Hokkaido, one of Japan's four main islands, are still being occupied by Soviet forces." [41]

Consequently, conflicting views or interpretations concerning the legal status of the Kurile Islands and South Sakhalin are still prevailing, although these islands are now under actual military occupation of the Soviet Union. Thus, the question of the status of the islands, together with other questions concerning the Japanese Peace Treaty, should be examined and scrutinized before the consent of the United States Senate is given to the treaty.

Another important question pertaining to the ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty by the United States Senate is the reported concern of some Senators that, because China was not invited to the San Francisco Conference, Japan might sign a separate peace treaty with Communist China. If this is the case, it would mean that Japan would side with the Communist bloc in Asia, which would then occupy the most predominant position in the Pacific. Yet legally speaking, as soon as this peace treaty is ratified by Japan and the other signatories, Japan, as a new independent sovereign nation, could sign a peace treaty with either the People's Republic of China or the Republic of China. On August 29, 1951, Secretary of State Dean Acheson told press men that the peace treaty with Japan did not carry any assurance that Japan would not sign a separate peace treaty with Communist China. He was quoted by the press as saying that the Japanese "have great freedom to determine with whom they shall enter treaty relations." [42]

Under these circumstances, a paradoxical situation has been created by the legal and political possibilities confronting Japan, which she has as yet been unwilling to face. Prime Minister Yoshida in the latter part of August 1951 told the Japanese Diet that the signing of a peace treaty with China was a question to be decided by the Allies. Now, since the Allies, including the United Kingdom and the United States, left this question to be decided by Japan, a further complicated situation may be developed as a consequence of the exclusion of China from the Japanese Peace Conference.

In executing and defending the policy of the exclusion of China from the Japanese Peace Conference, the Office of Public Affairs of the Department of State in September 1951, in a pamphlet entitled "Background of Japanese Peace Conference, San Francisco,

[33] MacArthur hearings, op. cit., pt. 3, p. 1885.

[34] The New York Times, January 13, 1950.

[35] Ibid., November 29, 1950.

[36] Department of State Bulletin, vol. 14, No. 345 (February 10, 1946), p. 201; this Journal, Supp., vol. 40 (1946), p. 51.

[37] Department of State Bulletin, Vol. 25, No. 635 (August 27, 1951), p. 349. See also Department of State Publication 4330.

[38] Roosevelt and the Russians (New York, 1949), p. 93, footnote.

[39] The New York Times, September 9, 1951; New Times (Moscow), Supp., No. 37, September 12, 1951, p. 19.

[40] The New York Times, September 4, 1951; Department of State Bulletin, vol. 25, No. 638 (September 17, 1951), p. 462.

[41] The Washington Evening Star, September 8, 1951. The text of the Yoshida statement is not printed in the New York Times.

[42] The New York Times, August 30, 1951.

September 1951," presented the following argument:

"China was not invited for a reason as practical as it was obvious. Roughly half of the participating countries would not agree to sign any treaty at the same table with the National Government, the Republic of China. The other half, including the United States, would not sign with the Chinese Communist regime." [43]

As a matter of fact, out of the 53 nations which attended the conference only 8 nations had recognized Communist China. These were Czechoslovakia, Indonesia, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the U. S. S. R. Prior to the opening of the Japanese Peace Conference, the National Government of the Republic of China declared that any agreement made at San Francisco without China's participation and consent would not be binding upon the Chinese Government and people. It further announced that any Japanese peace treaty signed by other nations should not prejudice the rights and interests of China.

THE VALIDITY OF THE YALTA AGREEMENT

As to the validity of the Yalta agreement, it is interesting to learn what the late James Forrestal wrote in his Diaries under date of April 23, 1945, about President Truman's views on the Yalta agreement:

"The President said that he was seeing Molotov within the hour and that he proposed to put it to him quite bluntly that * * * He said that if one part of the agreements which they had entered with President Roosevelt at Yalta were breached he (the President) would consider that the entire Yalta agreement was no longer binding on any of the parties interested." [44]

Now the question is whether or not the present administration considers that the Soviet Union has violated the terms of the Yalta agreement. Apparently, this is primarily a political decision, rather than a legal one. However, Averell Harriman, who personally played an important part in the discussion and formulation of the Yalta terms and who has become a special assistant to President Truman for foreign affairs, more than twice openly expressed his opinion that there was nothing wrong with the Yalta agreement, and that many of the unhappy world events and international tensions are largely due to the nonfulfillment and violation of the Yalta agreement on the part of the Soviet Union. Harriman first expressed this idea at the nineteenth Annual Herald Tribune Forum in October 1950, and again repeated it to the MacArthur hearings committee of the Senate in the form of a letter addressed to its chairman, Senator Richard B. Russell, in August 1951.[45] In a more official manner, replying to an inquiry of the Senate, President Truman transmitted a report from the State Department to the Senate on June 2, 1948,[46] declaring that the Soviet Union had violated international agreements 35 times since 1945, including the Yalta agreement.

In view of the semiofficial and official expressions of the American Government concerning the validity of the Yalta agreement, the United States could legally consider itself no longer bound by the various Yalta understandings, especially the agreement regarding Japan. It seems clear, however, that the continuation of this agreement will be mainly determined by political, military, economic, and other practical factors rather than only by legal points. Similarly it will be true that the future ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty by the United States will also depend very much not only on legal but political considerations.

In considering the Yalta agreement as a whole, however, its legal aspects and implications deserve careful examination. This is because this Leaders' agreement was signed in such an unusual manner, as has been pointed out; because it assumed the acceptance by an ally of the claims of another ally; because it is at variance with several outstanding international agreements such as the Nine-Power Treaty, the Sino-Soviet Treaty of 1924, the Atlantic Charter, and the Cairo declaration; and because it also involves the Japanese Peace Treaty as well as the very validity of the Yalta agreement itself. Furthermore, the constitutionality of the Yalta agreement has been raised by some Members of the Senate who questioned the authority of the President of the United States of America, as a leader of one of the "Three Great Powers." The questions of ratification, duration, and abrogation of this agreement are still cloudy. Such loopholes may lead to further legal and political complications in international relations.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, because I think this matter has some relationship to the entire subject, part of an interview which was had with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate. The interview appeared in the U. S. News and World Report on May 5, 1950, and relates to the question of Korea. I read the following question from page 30:

Q. Do you think the suggestion that we abandon South Korea is going to be seriously considered?

A. I am afraid it is going to be seriously considered, because I'm afraid it's going to happen, whether we want it to or not. I'm for Korea. We're trying to help her—we're appropriating money now to help her. But South Korea is cut right across by this line—north of it are the Communists, with access to the mainland—and Russia is over there on the mainland. So that whenever she takes a notion, she can just overrun Korea just like she probably will overrun Formosa when she gets ready to do it. I hope not, of course.

Mr. President, I do not think we are required merely to sit back in the event of the Communists attempting to take over other segments of the Far East. We did not do it in the case of Korea. I do not believe it is the policy of this Government to permit the taking over of Formosa, because I think that today the American people clearly understand that the passing of Formosa into unfriendly hands would drive a wedge into our defense position, which runs from Japan to Okinawa and the Philippines, and, in the judgment of many of our highest military leaders would move the defense position of this Nation back to the Pacific Coast States of Washington, Oregon, and California. I do not intend to be provincial, but I say, both as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and as a member of the Armed Services Committee, that in this day and age of the airplane and the atomic weapons, the Pacific Coast States of Washington, Oregon, and California are not the area where our front line in the Pacific should be.

I think that if we use the same kind of courage and common sense which motivated the men who sat at Philadelphia and, who under Divine inspiration, drafted the Declaration of Independence, and, later, the Constitution of the United States, there is no foreign foe the United States need ever fear. I believe, Mr. President, that the ratification of the Japanese Treaty will contribute greatly to the development of a constructive, affirmative program in the Pacific.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto;

S. 465. An act for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan;

S. 589. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi;

S. 828. An act for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite;

S. 914. An act for the relief of Masako Miyazaki;

S. 1255. An act for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr.;

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok;

S. 1620. An act for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin;

S. 1782. An act for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos;

S. 1925. An act for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles; and

S. 2697. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MOODY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the remainder of the session of the Senate today.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, there have been so many able presentations of the treaty which is now before the Senate that I hesitate somewhat to add my opinions; but, because I had some part in the shaping of the treaty, and because I was fearful in the beginning that there might be some trouble in achieving the result which I hope will be achieved by ratification of the treaty this week, I deem it not inappropriate to express my sentiments. The trouble arises because, while we have certain things in common with Japan, yet we also have some economic problems with Japan, as evidenced by certain conditions which had developed prior to World War II.

The three great segments of the economy of Japan are the fisheries, the maritime, and the manufacture of goods. All

[43] Page 2 of the quoted document issued by the State Department as an official document circulated to the public.

[44] The Forrestal Diaries, the New York Herald Tribune, Sept. 28, 1951.

[45] Department of State bulletin, vol. 25, No. 636 (Sept. 3, 1951), pp. 371–379.

[46] U. S. Senate Report No. 1440 (Washington, 1948).

of these are somewhat competitive economically with America. In the beginning, when Mr. John Foster Dulles began his very able and competent work of rounding up the nations to join in the formulation of the document which is now before us I had several conversations with him and with members of the State Department, based upon the premise that unless we, during the negotiation of the treaty, also came to certain agreements regarding our postwar position on the very important matters to which I have referred, particularly the two with respect to which I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, have some responsibility to the Senate, the treaty might be open to many reservations, and thereby the great achievement, which I think will be accomplished by the ratification of the treaty, might be thwarted. So I wish to speak briefly of the treaty itself, and to inform the Senate as best I may of the progress which has been made in regard to these very serious matters, which must follow in our future relations with the Empire of Japan.

I am sure that what we do within the next day or two, as well as what we have done within the past week, will be watched with mingled feelings of emotion on the part of the American people.

It was not so long ago—on December 7, 1941—that the war lords of Japan staged an attack on Pearl Harbor—and I use the term "war lords" literally—at the very time the Ambassador from Japan was at Washington, D. C., making friendly overtures. We who are from the Pacific coast probably felt that wound more deeply than did the people in other sections of the country. We were closer to the scene, and we counted among our friends many men and women of Japanese ancestry. A wave of bitterness naturally swept over our people, and in the heat of emotion we saw thousands of Japanese-American citizens taken from their homes and relocated at points inland. In retrospect, our action in this regard appears somewhat shameful; but the temper of the people, indeed, the temper of the times, was such that this appeared the best thing to do.

I recall having stated publicly in December 1941 that when Japan had been brought to her knees—as we had no doubt she surely would be—a period of years should ensue before we undertook the task of negotiating a peace treaty. I was convinced, as were many others, that if a treaty were to follow too closely upon the heels of the Japanese surrender the bitterness we felt as a nation would inevitably creep into the provisions of the treaty.

Had our military, diplomatic, and congressional leadership, acting in concert with our allies, attempted to negotiate this treaty in 1945, 1946, or 1947 I am convinced we would not have had the kind of document before us that we have today. I am convinced, had we followed that course, we would have imposed upon Japan another Treaty of Versailles, with all its punitive, unworkable provisions, which in themselves contained the seeds of World War II.

It is impossible to crush an entire nation of 80,000,000 people to its knees and hold it there over an extended period without creating hate and resentment and without causing precisely the set of conditions which we seek so earnestly to avoid.

The United States and our allies have learned from experience. We have seen the error of the pattern we pursued following World War I. I believe the American people have shared in the lesson—a lesson for which we have paid a terrible price in lives and treasure.

We have come a long way since December 7, 1941. We have come a longer way since November 1918. As a nation, we have achieved a degree of maturity we did not possess at that time. We are older, we are stronger, and the best evidence of this fact is the treaty we are considering today.

Mr. President, I believe this is a good treaty. Like the distinguished occupant of the chair, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I know a great deal of the way in which the treaty was formulated. I repeat, it is a good treaty. It is a treaty consistent with our own self-interest and with the democratic principles and ideals we espouse. It is designed to encourage the Japanese people to become a free, prosperous, and democratic nation, with ability to exert a stabilizing influence in the Far East.

Mr. President, when I was in Japan, approximately 1 year ago, I was greatly concerned, because, having lived among them, I know the Japanese people quite well, about the question whether we could encourage a blueprint of democracy for the people of Japan. I realized that we could not encourage them to accept the exact blueprint as it applies to the American people, because of differences in culture, economy, and politics. I was not so naive, and I still am not so naive, as to believe that the Japanese people will not, after the ratification of this treaty, return to certain of their old ways. Their culture, their economy, and their traditions are so intertwined with their daily lives, and are of such long standing and far reaching that I think it would be somewhat too optimistic to believe that the Japanese people would not eventually return to some of their old ways.

Mr. President, I have been asked the question, as have been other Senators, "Is Japan going to be a democratic nation if we, as the victor, do these things for her? If we turn the other cheek, as we are doing in the case of this treaty, providing, as it does, a decent approach to what we hope conditions in the world will be in the future, can we rely on Japan to keep a semblance of democracy alive in the Far East as a bulwark against the advances of communism in that area?"

I was asked that question on many occasions, particularly by those who are familiar and friendly with the Japanese people. After talking to many of them, some of whom were long-time friends of mine, I have come to the conclusion that Japan is going to stick to the pattern of democracy.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the Japanese people have learned in five short years a better way to live, and they are not going to abandon democracy, whether it comes from us or from the moon. So, with this far-reaching document which is before the Senate today, considering the nature of the relations between Japan and the United States and our allies, I believe we can look forward with great hope that Japan will achieve those precepts of democracy which we know will not only help her way of life but will help to establish a bulwark of good ideals in the Far East.

So I say, Mr. President, the treaty is going to exercise a great influence in keeping Japan a democratic nation. While it takes from Japan many of her prewar possessions and removes her domination from Korea and other places, nevertheless it gives her an opportunity once again to become a self-respecting and self-sustaining member of the family of free nations.

As the committee so well states, the treaty represents 11 months of exhaustive effort by the Allied Powers, motivated by a desire for a just and lasting peace and a willingness to subordinate individual interests to the common good. "It is, in truth, a statesmanlike document, remarkable for the self-restraint and good will of the victorious powers evidenced therein."

Despite this fact, Mr. President, I recognize that there are many persons on the west coast who are disturbed, not so much by what the treaty contains, but by what is omitted. Many have written to me expressing concern over trade, fishing, maritime, and reparations provisions of the document. I should like to discuss each of these items briefly.

First, as to trade, Japan pledges her readiness to enter into negotiations with the Allied Powers on a stable and free basis with reference to trade. She agrees for a 4-year period to conduct trade on a competitive basis. It is a good pledge and one which I am extremely hopeful the Japanese people will observe.

I have been asked by many persons, and I am sure other Senators from the west coast have been asked the same question—I see two distinguished Senators from the west coast on the floor at this time—why not write into the treaty provisions with reference to the importation of products? Why not write into the treaty provisions with reference to the right to fish?

We on the Pacific coast are very conscious of some real difficulties we had prior to World War II in regard to such questions. We realize that we cannot write that kind of a treaty. Japan has agreed that these and other matters, primarily commercial matters, will be treated in separate agreements. So far Japan has acted in good faith. I am sure that as soon as the treaty is ratified and Japan technically becomes an independent nation, she will immediately begin negotiations for a unilateral trade agreement with the United States which will be to her benefit and to our benefit and which will surely solve the problem of two nations who are in almost direct competition in many matters, living in a peaceful way and trading peace-

fully, thereby achieving a step toward peace in the world.

Japan has pledged her readiness to enter into such treaties. I hope they will come along soon. I have asked the State Department with reference to them, so that the RECORD may show just what progress has been made, and I understand that already some conversations have been carried on and that agreements on several questions are now pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I hope action will be speedy, because I should not like to see immediately after the signing of this document a repetition of some of the economic problems which heretofore we had with Japan. I should not like it, because there are many persons who still believe that safeguarding provisions should have been written into this treaty. In my opinion, it was not advisable to do so, because I am sure Japan will not only keep good faith, but I know she is willing to enter into agreements such as I have indicated.

Mr. President, I visited Japan and held many conferences there. Mr. Dulles was there at the time and aided me considerably in connection with maritime questions and fisheries in particular.

In this treaty the word "maritime" will be found. Japan pledges her readiness to enter into a maritime treaty, and the word "maritime" is spelled out.

I hope I am not misstating the fact when I assure the Senate that if we go ahead and ratify this treaty Japan will carry out her part of it, and will, as she has shown a great willingness to do, enter into some maritime agreements.

Mr. President, I point out to the Senate and to my friends in Japan—I see a great many Japanese correspondents in the Press Gallery today—that many of us have not forgotten that prior to World War I, because of the lack of agreement between two then friendly nations, the American flag practically disappeared from the Pacific, and Japan's trade grew extensively. We spent $37,000,000,000 to build up our merchant marine so that it might become the fourth arm of our defense and our security. I do not believe the American people want such a situation to occur again. They want to maintain an adequate merchant marine, not only for our own security but for our economic needs. But unless we enter into agreements, particularly in the matter of rates and competition, taking into consideration higher labor standards and many other things which I do not need to mention, but which are obvious to most of us—unless we enter into such agreements and have friendly competition and somewhat equal rights, we cannot stand the economic drain.

We appreciate the fact that Japan is a maritime nation; that shipping plays a greater part in her economy than it does in ours; and we know that she is anxious to go into the maritime field, which she is now rapidly doing with the permission of the Allied Nations. Japan now has probably a little more than a million tons of shipping in class. She probably needs close to 2,000,000 tons of shipping in class to be able to handle her own domestic needs. When her needs go beyond that, then again she becomes competitive. We do not fear that competition if only we can enter into agreements—rules of the game, if you please—so that we shall both play the game with the same referee and according to the same rules. In this agreement Japan pledges herself to do that, and I am sure she will carry out her pledge.

I must say, frankly, that I think Japan would have already entered into some type of general agreement on maritime matters had it not been for some other maritime nations—not including the United States.

Mr. President, it is amazing that one can go to the United Nations, to the occupant of the chair who was so distinguished a delegate at one time, and can talk freely about anything from opium to wheat, but the minute there is any talk of shipping, everybody walks into a corner.

I think the time has come when we shall have to enter into a world agreement on shipping rates not only to preserve the maritime standing of the United States, but to determine the maritime situation throughout the world. Other countries, notably Great Britain and the Scandinavian nations, did not seem disposed, during all the negotiations, to enter into a general agreement. I must say, frankly, that Japan has always been willing to do so. It may be that since Japan, in carrying out her good-faith plan in this treaty, intends to negotiate an agreement for maritime standing, we may have to enter into a unilateral agreement with her in this matter.

To show their good faith, the maritime interests of Japan, with the sponsorship of the Japanese Government and SCAP, have already asked permission to enter into what we call the Pacific westbound conference, which is a rate-making conference. That should help considerably. I desire to compliment Japan on that.

For the sake of the security of both nations and the security of the Pacific, having in mind all the things we hope to do in the Pacific, I trust these things can be accomplished. I hope I shall not have to come back to the Senate later and say we have not been able to carry out agreements on these matters.

Mr. President, there is a good reason why this treaty should be ratified. From 1946 to 1951, inclusive, American taxpayers provided almost $2,000,000,000 of economic aid to Japan. Of course, we as a nation cannot indefinitely pursue such a course. The alternatives, which have been pointed out here, I believe, are to continue economic aid to Japan over an indefinite period; let her sink or swim, isolated from the free nations of the west; or give her an opportunity to trade with us on a reasonably competitive basis. The latter alternative seems to be the only sensible one in the interest of both nations. If such an agreement can be worked out, Japan can then at least have the opportunity to make herself economically sound.

I recognize also, Mr. President, that many problems will arise with respect to individual items in Japanese trade. As I have said, we can meet those problems as they come. Merely because such problems confront us is an insufficient reason for holding up ratification of the treaty, because I am sure that good faith means to the Japanese today exactly what the phrase means to us.

Many of my constituents, and other people, too, are concerned over the fact that matters affecting fishing rights were not spelled out in the pending treaty. On that question we had many conferences, as a result of which there is in the treaty a specific clause which I think should be emphasized in the RECORD. It shows again why the treaty should be ratified, again relying upon what I am sure exists in Japan, namely, good faith.

Article 9 of the treaty provides:

> Japan will enter promptly into negotiations with the Allied Powers so desiring for the conclusion of bilateral and multilateral agreements providing for the regulation or limitation of fishing and the conservation and development of fisheries on the high seas.

In the treaty there is specifically set forth in article 9, which I just read, the obligation on the part of Japan to enter into a fishing conservation treaty. I am very happy to report to the Senate that some progress has been made along that line, despite the fact that Japan is not now technically a nation, and cannot ratify such a treaty until the general peace treaty is signed.

A fishing treaty, which somewhat along the same mechanical pattern followed in the general treaty, after consultation of all those interested, has already been initialed in Japan, and it will be submitted to the Senate for ratification after the general treaty is disposed of. In that connection Japan has surely shown her good faith. The problem was a difficult one in the beginning because of the sad experiences prior to World War II. Many people wanted to spell out in the general treaty the fishing rights in the Pacific, but there were many who wanted to fence off the Pacific, going from one extreme to the other, saying that we ought to keep Japan on her side of the international date line, while we stayed on our side. Obviously, that was a bad approach to the problem, but it resulted because our people were so mindful of the difficulties we encountered back in 1937 and 1938, when there was almost a small war being waged in Bristol Bay between our own Pacific coast fishermen and the Japanese over salmon rights. That question can be worked out, and it has been worked out.

The treaty, as I have said, has been initialed. It has not been signed as yet, but I am sure it will be. If we had taken similar action prior to World War II, instead of getting into the difficulties which ensued, we might have alleviated many of the conditions which led up to the terrible catastrophe.

In this case, Japan has not only aided us, but we are making great progress. In general, the agreement is already in draft form.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the body of the

RECORD the draft of the proposed fishing treaty.

There being no objection, the draft was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(On Friday, December 14, 1951, at the conclusion of the Tripartite Fisheries Conference which convened at Tokyo, November 5, 1951, a document entitled "Resolutions and Request of the Tripartite Fisheries Conference" was signed by representatives of the United States, Canada, and Japan. Included in the documents is a recommendation that the three Governments conclude a convention conforming to the draft agreed to by their representatives as soon as possible. The draft convention, annex, and a protocol relating thereto are quoted below:)

DRAFT, INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE HIGH SEAS FISHERIES OF THE NORTH PACIFIC OCEAN

The Governments of the United States of America, Japan, and Canada, whose respective duly accredited representatives have subscribed hereto.

Acting as sovereign nations in the light of their rights under the principles of international law and custom to exploit the fishery resources of the high seas, and believing that it will best serve the common interest of mankind, as well as the interests of the contracting parties, to insure the maximum sustained productivity of the fishery resources of the North Pacific Ocean, and that each of the parties should assume an obligation, on a free and equal footing, to encourage the conservation of such resources, and, recognizing that in view of these considerations it is highly desirable (1) to establish an international commission, representing the three parties hereto, to promote and coordinate the scientific studies necessary to ascertain the conservation measures required to secure the maximum sustained productivity of fisheries of joint interest to the contracting parties and to recommend such measures to such parties, and (2) that each party carry out such conservation recommendations, and provide for necessary restraints on its own nationals and fishing vessels, therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. The area to which this convention applies, hereinafter referred to as "the convention area," shall be all waters, other than territorial waters, of the north Pacific Ocean which for the purposes hereof shall include the adjacent seas.

2. Nothing in this convention shall be deemed to affect adversely (prejudice) the claims of any contracting party in regard to the limits of territorial waters or to the jurisdiction of a coastal state over fisheries.

3. For the purposes of this convention the term "fishing vessel" shall mean any vessel engaged in catching fish or processing or transporting fish loaded on the high seas, or any vessel outfitted for such activities.

ARTICLE II

1. In order to realize the objectives of this convention, the contracting parties shall establish and maintain the international North Pacific Fisheries Commission, hereinafter referred to as "the Commission."

2. The Commission shall be composed of three national sections, each consisting of not more than four members appointed by the governments of the respective contracting parties.

3. Each national section shall have one vote. All resolutions, recommendations and other decisions of the Commission shall be made only by a unanimous vote of the three national sections except when under the provisions of article III, section 1 (C) (ii) only two participate.

4. The Commission may decide upon and amend, as occasion may require, by-laws or rules for the conduct of its meetings.

5. The Commission shall meet at least once each year and at such other times as may be requested by a majority of the national sections. The date and place of the first meeting shall be determined by agreement between the contracting parties.

6. At its first meeting the Commission shall select a chairman, vice chairman, and secretary from different national sections. The chairman, vice chairman, and secretary shall hold office for a period of 1 year. During succeeding years selection of a chairman, vice chairman, and secretary from the national sections shall be made in such a manner as will provide each contracting party in turn with representation in those offices.

7. The Commission shall decide on a convenient place for the establishment of the Commission's headquarters.

8. Each contracting party may establish an advisory committee for its national section, to be composed of persons who shall be well informed concerning North Pacific fishery problems of common concern. Each such advisory committee shall be invited to attend all sessions of the Commission except those which the Commission decides to be in camera.

9. The Commission may hold public hearings. Each national section may also hold public hearings within its own country.

10. The official languages of the Commission shall be Japanese and English. Proposals and data may be submitted to the Commission in either language.

11. Each contracting party shall determine and pay the expenses incurred by its national section. Joint expenses incurred by the Commission shall be paid by the Commission through contributions made by the contracting parties in the form and proportion recommended by the Commission and approved by the contracting parties.

12. An annual budget of joint expenses shall be recommended by the Commission and submitted to the contracting parties for approval.

13. The Commission shall authorize the disbursement of funds for the joint expenses of the Commission and may employ personnel and acquire facilities necessary for the performance of its functions.

ARTICLE III

1. The Commission shall perform the following functions:

(A) In regard to any stock of fish specified in the annex, study for the purpose of determining annually whether such stock continues to qualify for abstention under the provisions of article IV. If the Commission determines that such stock no longer meets the conditions of article IV, the Commission shall recommend that it be removed from the annex. Provided, however, that with respect to the stocks of fish originally specified in the annex, no determination or recommendation as to whether such stock continues to qualify for abstention shall be made for 5 years after the entry into force of this convention.

(B) To permit later additions to the annex, study, on request of a contracting party, any stock of fish of the convention area, the greater part of which is harvested by one or more of the contracting parties, for the purpose of determining whether such stock qualifies for abstention under the provisions of article IV. If the Commission decides that the particular stock fulfills the conditions of article IV it shall recommend, (1) that such stock be added to the annex, (2) that the appropriate party or parties abstain from fishing such stock and (3) that the party or parties participating in the fishing of such stock continue to carry out necessary conservation measures.

(C) In regard to any stock of fish in the convention area:

(i) Study, on request of any contracting party concerned, any stock of fish which is under substantial exploitation by two or more of the contracting parties, and which is not covered by a conservation agreement between such parties existing at the time of the conclusion of this Convention, for the purpose of determining need for joint conservation measures;

(ii) Decide and recommend necessary joint conservation measures including any relaxation thereof to be taken as a result of such study. Provided, however, that only the national sections of the contracting parties engaged in substantial exploitation of such stock of fish may participate in such decision and recommendation. The decisions and recommendations shall be reported regularly to all the contracting parties, but shall apply only to the contracting parties the national sections of which participated in the decisions and recommendations.

(iii) Request the contracting party or parties concerned to report regularly the conservation measures adopted from time to time with regard to the stocks of fish specified in the Annex, whether or not covered by conservation agreements between the contracting parties, and transmit such information to the other contracting party or parties.

(D) Consider and make recommendations to the contracting parties concerning the enactment of schedules of equivalent penalties for violations of this Convention.

(E) Compile and study the records provided by the contracting parties pursuant to article VIII.

(F) Submit annually to each contracting party a report on the Commission's operations, investigations, and findings, with appropriate recommmendations, and inform each contracting party, whenever it is deemed advisable, on any matter relating to the objectives of this Convention.

2. The Commission may take such steps, in agreement with the parties concerned, as will enable it to determine the extent to which the undertakings agreed to by the parties under the provisions of article V, section 2, and the measures recommended by the Commission under the provisions of this article and accepted by the parties concerned have been effective.

3. In the performance of its functions, the Commission shall, insofar as feasible, utilize the technical and scientific services of, and information from, official agencies of the contracting parties and their political subdivisions and may, when desirable and if available, utilize the services of, and information from, any public or private institution or organization or any private individual.

ARTICLE IV

I. In making its recommendations, the Commission shall be guided by the spirit and intent of this Convention and by the considerations below mentioned.

(A) Any conservation measures for any stock of fish decided upon under the provisions of this Convention shall be recommended for equal application to all parties engaged in substantial exploitation of such stock.

(B) With regard to any stock of fish which the Commission determines reasonably satisfies all the following conditions, a recommendation shall be made as provided for in article III, section 1 (B):

(i) Evidence based upon scientific research indicates that more intensive exploitation of the stock will not provide a substantial increase in yield which can be sustained year after year;

(ii) The exploitation of the stock is limited or otherwise regulated through legal measures by each party which is substantially engaged in its exploitation, for the purpose of maintaining or increasing its maximum sustained productivity; such limitations and regulations being in accordance with conservation programs based upon scientific research; and (iii) the stock is the subject of

extensive scientific study designed to discover whether the stock is being fully utilized and the conditions necessary for maintaining its maximum sustained productivity. *Provided, however,* That no recommendation shall be made for abstention by a contracting party concerned with regard to: (1) Any stock of fish which at any time during the 25 years next preceding the entry into force of this Convention has been under substantial exploitation by that party having regard to the conditions referred to in section 2 of this article; (2) any stock of fish which is harvested in greater part by a country or countries not party to this Convention; (3) waters in which there is historic intermingling of fishing operations of the parties concerned, an intermingling of the stocks of fish exploited by these operations, and of long-established history of joint conservation and regulation among the parties concerned so that there is consequent impracticability of segregating the operations and administering control. It is recognized that the conditions specified in subdivision (3) of this proviso apply to Canada and the United States of America in the waters of the Pacific coasts of the United States of America and Canada from and including the waters of the Gulf of Alaska southward and, therefore, no recommendation shall be made for abstention by either the United States of America or Canada in such waters.

2. In any decision of recommendation allowances shall be made for the effect of strikes, wars, or exceptional economic or biological conditions which may have introduced temporary declines in or suspension of productivity, exploitation, or management of the stock of fish concerned.

ARTICLE V

1. The annex attached hereto forms an integral part of this convention. All references to "convention" shall be understood as including the said annex either in its present terms or as amended in accordance with the provisions of article VII.

2. The contracting parties recognize that any stock of fish originally specified in the annex to this convention fulfills the conditions prescribed in article IV and accordingly agree that the appropriate party or parties shall abstain from fishing such stock and the party or parties participating in the fishing of such stock shall continue to carry out necessary conservation measures.

ARTICLE VI

In the event that it shall come to the attention of any of the contracting parties that the nationals or fishing vessels of any country which is not a party to this convention appear to affect adversely the operations of the Commission or the carrying out of the objectives of this convention, such party shall call the matter to the attention of other contracting parties. All the contracting parties agree upon the request of such party to confer upon the steps to be taken toward obviating such adverse effects or relieving any contracting party from such adverse effects.

ARTICLE VII

1. The annex to this convention shall be considered amended from the date upon which the Commission receives notification from all the contracting parties of acceptance of a recommendation to amend the annex made by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of article III, section 1.

2. The Commission shall notify all the contracting parties of the date of receipt of each notification of acceptance of an amendment to the Annex.

ARTICLE VIII

The contracting parties agree to keep as far as practicable all records requested by the Commission and to furnish compilations of such records and other information upon request of the Commission. No contracting party shall be required hereunder to provide the records of individual operations.

ARTICLE IX

1. The contracting parties agree as follows:

(A) With regard to a stock of fish from the exploitation of which any contracting party has agreed to abstain, the nationals and fishing vessels of such contracting party are prohibited from engaging in the exploitation of such stock of fish in waters specified in the Annex, and from loading, processing, possessing, or transporting such stock of fish in such waters.

(B) With regard to a stock of fish for which a contracting party has agreed to continue to carry out conservation measures, the nationals and fishing vessels of such party are prohibited from engaging in fishing activities in waters specified in the Annex in violation of regulations established under such conservation measures.

2. Each contracting party agrees, for the purpose of rendering effective the provisions of this Convention to enact and enforce necessary laws and regulations, with regard to its nationals and fishing vessels, with appropriate penalties against violations thereof and to transmit to the Commission a report on any action taken by each party with regard thereto.

ARTICLE X

1. The contracting parties agree, in order to carry out faithfully the provisions of this convention, to cooperate with each other in taking appropriate and effective measures and accordingly agree as follows:

(A) When a fishing vessel of a contracting party has been found in waters in which that party has agreed to abstain from exploitation in accordance with the provisions of this convention, the duly authorized officials of any contracting party may board such vessel to inspect its equipment, books, documents, and other articles and question the persons on board.

Such officials shall present credentials issued by their respective governments if requested by the master of the vessel.

(B) When any such person or fishing vessel is actually engaged in operations in violation of the provisions of this convention, or there is reasonable ground to believe was obviously so engaged immediately prior to boarding of such vessel by any such official the latter may arrest or seize such person or vessel. In that case, the contracting party to which the official belongs shall notify the contracting party to which such person or vessel belongs of such arrest or seizure and shall deliver such vessel or person as promptly as practicable to the authorized officials of the contracting party to which such vessel or person belongs at a place to be agreed upon by both parties. *Provided, however,* that the contracting party which gives such notification may keep such person or vessel under surveillance within its own territory, under the conditions agreed upon by both of the contracting parties.

(C) Only the authorities of the party to which the above-mentioned person or fishing vessel belongs may try the offense and impose penalties therefor. The witnesses and evidence necessary for establishing the offense, so far as they are under the control of any of the parties to this convention, shall be furnished as promptly as possible to the contracting party having jurisdiction to try the offense.

2. With regard to the nationals or fishing vessels of one or more contracting parties in waters with respect to which they have agreed to continue to carry out conservation measures for certain stocks of fish in accordance with the provisions of this convention, the contracting parties concerned shall carry out enforcement severally or jointly. In that case, the contracting parties concerned agree to report periodically through the commission to the contracting party which has agreed to abstain from the exploitation of such stocks of fish on the enforcement conditions, and also, if requested, to provide opportunity for observation of the conduct of enforcement.

3. The contracting parties agree to meet, during the sixth year of the operation of this convention, to review the effectiveness of the enforcement provisions of this article and, if desirable, to further consider means by which they may more effectively be carried out.

ARTICLE XI

1. This convention shall be ratified by the contracting parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged as soon as possible at Tokyo.

2. This convention shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of ratifications. It shall continue in force for a period of 10 years and thereafter until 1 year from the day on which a contracting party shall give notice to the other contracting parties of an intention of terminating the convention, whereupon it shall terminate as to all contracting parties.

In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries, duly authorized, have signed the present convention.

ANNEX

1. With regard to the stocks of fish and the waters named below, Japan agrees to abstain from fishing, and Canada and the United States of America agree to continue to carry out necessary conservation measures, in accordance with the provisions of article V, section 2, of this convention;

(A) Halibut (hippoglossus stenolepsis).

The convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America in which commercial fishing for halibut is being or can be prosecuted. Halibut referred to herein shall be those originating along the coast of North America.

(B) Herring (clupea pallasii).

The convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America, exclusive of the Bering Sea and of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean west of the meridian passing through the extremity of the Alaskan Peninsula, in which commercial fishing for herring of North American origin is being or can be prosecuted.

(C) Salmon (oncorhynchus gorbuscha, oncorhynchus keta, oncorhynchus kisutch, oncorhynchus nerka, oncorhynchus tschawytscha).

The convention area off the coasts of Canada and the United States of America, exclusive of the Bering Sea and of the waters of the North Pacific Ocean west of a provisional line following the meridian passing through the western extremity of Atka Island, in which commercial fishing for salmon originating in the rivers of Canada and the United States of America is being or can be prosecuted.

2. With regard to the stocks of fish and the waters named below, Canada and Japan agree to abstain from fishing and the United States of America agrees to continue to carry out necessary conservation measures, in accordance with the provisions of article V, section 2 of this Convention:

Salmon (oncorhynchus gorbushcha, oncorhynchus keta, oncorhynchus kisutch, oncorhynchus nerka and oncorhynchus tschawytscha).

The Convention Area of the Bering Sea, east of the line starting from Cape Prince of Wales on the west coast of Alaska, running westward to 168 degrees 58 minutes 22.59 seconds west longitude; thence due south to a point 65 degrees, 15 minutes 00 seconds north latitude; thence along the Great Circle course which passes through 51 degrees north latitude and 167 degrees east longitude, to its intersection with meridian 175 degrees west longitude; thence south

along a provisional line which follows this meridian to the territorial waters limit of Atka Island; in which commercial fishing for salmon originating in the rivers of the United States of America is being or can be prosecuted.

PROTOCOL

Protocol to the proposed International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean.

The Governments of Canada, Japan, and the United States of America, through their respective plenipotentiaries, agree upon the following stipulation in regard to the International Convention for the High Seas Fisheries of the North Pacific Ocean, signed at Tokyo on this 14th day of December 1951:

The Governments of Canada, Japan, and the United States of America agree that the line of meridian 175 degrees west longitude and the line following the meridian passing through the western extremity of Atka Island, which have been adopted for determining the areas in which the exploitation of salmon is abstained or the conservation measures for salmon continue to be enforced in accordance with the provisions of the annex to this convention, shall be considered as provisional lines which shall continue in effect subject to confirmation or readjustment in accordance with the procedure mentioned below.

The commission to be established under the convention shall, as expeditiously as practicable, investigate the waters of the convention area to determine if there are areas in which salmon originating in rivers of Canada and of the United States of America intermingle with salmon originating in the rivers of Asia. If such areas are found the commission shall conduct suitable studies to determine a line or lines which best divide salmon of Asiatic origin and salmon of Canadian and United States of America origin, from which certain contracting parties have agreed to abstain in accordance with the provisions of article IV, and whether it can be shown beyond a reasonable doubt that this line or lines more equitably divide such salmon than the provisional lines specified in sections 1 (C) and 2 of the annex.

In accordance with these determinations the commission shall recommend that such provisional lines be confirmed or that they be changed in accordance with these results, giving due consideration to adjustments required to simplify administration.

In the event, however, the commission fails within a reasonable period of time to recommend unanimously such line or lines, it is agreed that the matter shall be referred to a special committee of scientists consisting of three competent and disinterested persons, no one of whom shall be a national of a contracting party, selected by mutual agreement of all parties for the determination of this matter.

It is further agreed that when a determination has been made by a majority of such special committee, the commission shall make a recommendation in accordance therewith.

The Governments of Canada, Japan, and the United States of America, is signing this protocol, desire to make it clear that the procedure set forth herein is designed to cover a special situation. It is not, therefore, to be considered a precedent for the final resolution of any matters which may, in the future, come before the commission.

This protocol shall become effective from the date of entry into force of the said convention.

In witness whereof, the respective plenipotentiaries have signed this protocol.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish it understood, however, that this is only a draft and may be subject to some changes. In general, though, it is a good fishing treaty. It will do away with many of the problems we had before and, I am sure, will represent another milestone in what we hope will be friendly relations with Japan in the future.

Mr. President, in general the agreement stipulates the waters of the Pacific in which the Japanese may ply their trade. Fishing is a very important industry to the Japanese. The proposed treaty contains provisions for conservation of halibut, tuna, salmon, and crab. Within the last month I have written to the State Department, pointing out what I consider weaknesses in the agreement. I have every confidence, however, that the difficulties in the present draft will be surmounted before signatures are affixed to the document. We must prevent the international frictions which grew out of encroachments by Japan on our historical fishing grounds.

Mr. President, I have referred to maritime matters. I am sure that we ought to be able to work them out satisfactorily.

Furthermore, although it is not specifically mentioned in the general treaty, we will have the problem of an air transport agreement. I understand the Department of State has already made overtures to the Japanese in an effort to have them agree to sit down and begin negotiations on such an agreement.

Mr. President, the third thing which has been mentioned is the question of reparations. It must be remembered that no nation in history wreaked so much damage, and no nation has been treated so generously by the victorious powers. The committee estimates that the total damage attributed to Japanese participation in the war exceeds $100,000,000,000 in property alone. Yet this treaty requires Japan to apply to reparations only those assets which it has in surplus, namely, excess labor and unused plant facilities for processing raw materials, with the Allied Powers supplying the labor. This is indeed generous treatment; yet I see no other course to follow. The only way a nation can pay reparations is in gold or in goods and services. Japan has barely enough gold to meet her own minimum currency requirements. Most goods and services which she could provide would be directly competitive with things which we produce in this country, and things which are produced in other countries.

Does anyone on the west coast want Japan to pay reparations in the form of canned tuna or crab meat? Is there any manufacturer who wants reparations paid in terms of sewing machines or typewriters? Do our toy manufacturers want reparations paid in goods competitive with their product? Do our shipping companies want Japan to pay reparations by providing maritime services? Does American labor want reparations paid through the application of Japanese labor to raw materials?

I ask these questions to demonstrate what I think is the wisdom of pursuing the course incorporated in the treaty. More than $100,000,000,000 in damage was done by the Japanese. As one eminent economist has said, we cannot afford to let them pay us back, because of the impact which the importation of goods and services would have on our own economy. This goes to prove how stupid the business of war is, both for the victor and for the vanquished.

I therefore intend to vote for the ratification of the treaty without reservations, other than the committee's interpretation of article 2. I do so because I believe that the course we are pursuing is consistent not only with our own self-interest, but with our democratic principles, and because I believe that the Japanese people will respond generously to the generous treatment they are accorded in this document.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "New Evidence Offered of Japan's Good Faith," published in the Seattle Times of March 13, 1952. This editorial shows that a further step has been taken toward conservation, and toward the solution of the fishing problems in the Pacific.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW EVIDENCE OFFERED OF JAPAN'S GOOD FAITH

Some notion of problems ahead in applying terms of the tri-nation Pacific fisheries convention can be gained from a recent announcement from Tokyo. The Japanese Government, it was reported, has prohibited Japanese fishermen from fishing for crab in North Pacific waters this year.

Since the Japanese treaty has not been ratified, Japan, of course, remains under authority of the Allied Powers' supreme command. Aside from that circumstance, however, Japan itself has manifested good intent to cooperate with the United States and Canada in the equitable division of the Pacific Ocean fisheries. This announcement may be interpreted as a new evidence of good faith.

Until the peace treaty is ratified, the fisheries agreement which has been initialed by the United States, Canada, and Japan cannot be finally signed and enforced. By that instrument it was agreed that Japan would abstain from fishing halibut, salmon, and herring in waters of the west coast of North America. Canada agreed to abstain from fishing for salmon in the east Bering Sea. Japan was not asked, and did not agree, to abstain from crab-fishing in these waters.

The three-nation convention provides for creation of an International North Pacific Fisheries Commission, with four representatives from each of the contracting nations, which presumably will enforce terms of the agreement. The announcement from Tokyo suggests what one of its problems will be. For if Japanese fishermen are permitted to enter North American waters to fish for crab and other species not specifically banned by the covenant, they could also, without comprehensive supervision, fish for salmon, halibut, and herring. Obviously, it will be necessary for the international commission to establish a method of patrol and inspection to safeguard the specifically protected fisheries. The honor system in this case would scarcely suffice.

All this at the moment comes under the heading of crossing bridges before they are reached. Ratification of the treaty and the subsequent implementation of the fisheries covenant are not imminent. The spirit in which the fisheries agreement was concluded gave good hope that it will inaugurate a period of harmonious cooperation, as far as the three governments are concerned, in con-

trolling the North Pacific's great fish resources. The recent Tokyo announcement serves to strengthen that hope.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Flanders	Magnuson
Benton	George	Martin
Bridges	Green	McFarland
Capehart	Hendrickson	McKellar
Carlson	Holland	O'Mahoney
Case	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Tobey
Dworshak	Knowland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOEY, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SEATON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

FORMER SENATOR WHEELER'S ADVICE TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, according to the March 18, 1952, edition of the Times-Herald, The President, the book written by Mr. Hillman, contains this statement, quoting the President:

> In July 1945 Mr. Truman confided to his diary that he was not impressed by the views of four Senators who had reported to him on a European survey. He said Europe had been through so many ups and downs that "I am not impressed with the cursory glances of oratorical members of the famous 'cave of the winds' on Capitol Hill."

He calls Congress the "cave of the winds."

In 1945, former Senator Wheeler, of Montana, headed a group of four Senators which consisted, in addition to former Senator Wheeler, of former Senator Hawkes, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and myself. We went abroad at the express written suggestion of the late Secretary of Defense James Forrestal for the purpose of studying European communications. We visited England, France, Germany, Italy, Greece, Malta, Jerusalem, and we came back by way of Casablanca. We were accompanied by General Stoner and Admiral Redmond. While we were on the trip we gave out no statements of any kind or character, but when we came back we went up to the White House to make a report of our findings to President Truman. That was in July of 1945.

The day that we had the appointment with the President it is my recollection that he was leaving for New York that night and sailing the next day for Potsdam. During the conversation, Senator Wheeler said to President Truman, "Mr. President, you had better stand up to Russia."

The President replied that he was more afraid of England and France than he was of Russia. Senator Wheeler then said to him, "Mr. President, you are too optimistic about Russia."

The President shook his head vigorously and said, "No; I am not."

Again Senator Wheeler repeated the same thing to him, and again the President shook his head and said, "No; I am not."

Then Senator Wheeler said to him, "Get out your little memoranda book and write down what I am telling you today. You are too damned optimistic about Russia."

And the President again said, "No; I am not."

Of course, we all know that the President knew nothing about Russia because of the fact that he never studied anything about Europe or about Russia, and somebody in the State Department or in the group around him had evidently given him the wrong information with reference to Russia and the Communist crowd. It was shocking to us, who all concurred with Senator Wheeler, to have the President say he was more afraid of England and France than he was of Russia, at a time when England and France had been at war for 6 years.

Ordinarily I would not repeat what was said in a conference with the President of the United States, but he is the one who has brought this matter to the attention of the public, according to the press, in his book, and, of course, the public must know to what Senators he refers.

Subsequent events have shown how right we were in our report to the President; and if he had followed the advice that was given to him at that time by former Senator Wheeler, and concurred in by the rest of us, and had stood up to Russia at Potsdam—this was before he went to Potsdam—we would not be in the mess we are in at this time.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, yesterday, as appears on page 2373 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 17, the present distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. SPARKMAN] made reference to the Japanese Treaty and to a discussion which he had with me in regard to it.

I rise at this time to discuss the subject matter which the distinguished Senator brought to the attention of the Senate yesterday. I do so because of the fact that I am concerned, unless the constitutional amendment I have proposed is ratified, in regard to the so-called covenant of human rights which is being considered by a United Nations subcommittee and by the various treaties which ultimately may be submitted to this country by subcommittees of the United Nations. It has been particularly brought to a focus at this time because of a telegram which I have received, and which no doubt others have received, from Frank E. Holman, past president of the American Bar Association. I hold him in such high regard that I have given particular attention to this telegram of his opposing the ratification of the treaty with a provision in the treaty that is now to be found there and which I wish to discuss.

Mr. Holman is one of the very distinguished lawyers of our country. He is credited with first bringing to the attention of millions of people in the United States the danger of treaty law overriding the domestic law of our country, and the bill of rights and the individual human rights of citizens of our country.

Mr. President, I ask that this telegram may be printed in the RECORD in full, before I enter into a discussion of the proposed treaty with Japan.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., *March 12, 1952.*

Senator JOHN W. BRICKER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I have only recently had an opportunity of studying the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty. To my mind it constitutes a backdoor attempt to secure Senate approval of many of the dangerous features of the Declaration of Human Rights, the Genocide Convention and the Draft Covenant on Human Rights. If this treaty is ratified by the Senate and the courts enforce its provisions then the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and other declarations, pacts and covenants made under the U. N. Charter will become the supreme law of the land and American rights, both State and individual, will be overridden by the new international law. This ratification would rob your constitutional amendment proposal of a large part of its effectiveness to protect American rights and American independence. The provisions of the treaty should be carefully analyzed by each Senator. It seems to me the matter is of such importance that there should be a public hearing before the treaty is presented to the Senate for final vote.

FRANK E. HOLMAN,
Past President, American Bar Association.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the second paragraph in the preamble of the Japanese Peace Treaty reads in part as follows:

> Japan for its part declares its intention to * * * strive to realize the objectives of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Because of this provision in the preamble, many people have asked me to

vote against the treaty. In my judgment, the preamble provision just quoted is harmless, as was suggested yesterday by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. What was the last phrase the Senator stated?

Mr. BRICKER. I said that in my judgment the preamble provision just quoted is harmless.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. It has been argued that after ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty the Universal Declaration of Human Rights will acquire the force of law in Japan and the United States. The argument has also been made that approval of the treaty in its present form will constitute an indirect endorsement of the United Nations Draft Covenant on Human Rights, to which I am unalterably opposed. In my judgment, these arguments are not valid in regard to the pending treaty.

During the past year I have been waging an intensive campaign against the United Nations Draft Covenant on Human Rights. Last month 58 other Senators joined with me in proposing a constitutional amendment designed to prevent treaties and executive agreements from destroying the sovereignty and the Constitution of the United States. Since that time other Senators have indicated their desire to go along with that proposal, and I shall present their names to the Senate at an early date.

If the preamble to the Japanese Peace Treaty endorsed the U. N. Draft Covenant on Human Rights, my voice would have been heard long ago. The fact is that the draft covenant is not even mentioned in the Japanese Peace Treaty. The preamble refers to the Declaration of Human Rights, a totally different and separate document.

What is this Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is mentioned in the preamble of the Japanese Peace Treaty? It was adopted by the U. N. General Assembly on December 10, 1948, without a dissenting vote. It is nothing more than a general statement of purposes relative to the promotion of human rights. It does not even have the legal significance of a local police ordinance. Therefore, it did not need to be submitted to the U. N. member nations for ratification in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. Accordingly, there is little reason to criticize the Declaration of Human Rights. But because this innocuous statement of human rights is referred to in the Japanese Peace Treaty, many people contend that the treaty should be revised or even rejected. I am not disturbed by the fact that the nonlegal portion of a treaty refers to a document which has no legal force or effect.

What does the Universal Declaration of Human Rights mean? It means only that each nation promises to promote human rights in its own way. The declaration is too ambiguous for judicial interpretation. To the best of my knowledge, no court has attempted to give the declaration any legal application, and I would be very much surprised if any court should give its attention to it.

The Declaration of Human Rights represents a compromise with respect to the diverse customs, legal traditions, and aspirations of scores of nations and several billions of people. It means all things to all men. The declaration serves a useful purpose by helping to focus world and national opinion on human rights issues. It was never intended to do more.

Why is the Declaration of Human Rights referred to in the preamble of the Japanese Peace Treaty? Merely to record Japan's intention to promote human rights in her own way free of any outside interference. When and if Japan is admitted to membership in the U. N., she will be on a parity with the other U. N. member nations who voted for the Declaration of Human Rights. Surely no valid objection can be made to this purpose.

At this time, Mr. President, I wish to commend Mr. John Foster Dulles for the manner in which he has handled the human-rights phases of the Japanese Peace Treaty. Mr. Dulles has explained many times why he did not place any human-rights obligations on Japan in the body of the treaty. Had he done so, human rights in Japan would have been the subject of international law as interpreted by some international authority. As the treaty now stands, human rights are left as an internal, domestic Japanese problem, as they should be.

If the people of Japan had their fundamental human rights determined by some external authority, it could not be maintained that Japanese sovereignty was being restored. I was particularly impressed with this statement by Mr. Dulles at the San Francisco conference:

> Eighty million people cannot be compelled from without to respect the human rights and fundamental freedoms of their fellows.

I wonder if Mr. Dulles realizes what a devastating argument that statement is in opposition to the Human Rights Covenant. Can the United Nations ever hope to compel 150,000,000 Americans to follow the U. N.'s peculiar standards of human rights?

In any event, Mr. Dulles deserves immense credit for the manner in which he has handled a highly controversial issue. I can well imagine the pressure placed on Mr. Dulles by some in the U. N. and in the State Department who wish to make the definition and enforcement of human rights matters of international law. I can imagine the effort which must have been made to give the Declaration of Human Rights some legal standing in Japan. And I have no doubt that Mr. Dulles rejected many proposals designed to facilitate adoption of the human-rights covenant at some later date, and indirectly or inferentially bind this country to that nefarious and dangerous document.

It is true, of course, that any Senator could write a far better preamble than the one which appears in the treaty before the Senate. We could, for example, make a vast improvement by substituting for the words "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" the words "Constitution of the United States." However, this is a treaty of peace between Japan and 48 allied nations. It could not be written to reflect only the American point of view. Compromises were inevitable. Fortunately, Mr. Dulles did not permit the best to defeat the good. But at the same time, Mr. Dulles prevented any endorsement of the U. N. ambitions revealed in the Draft Covenant on Human Rights. The preamble to the treaty is an example of diplomacy at its very best, in the judgment of the Senator from Ohio.

At this time, Mr. President, I desire to explain why the harmless reference in the preamble to the Declaration of Human Rights has attracted so much bitter opposition, opposition which led to the telegram from Mr. Frank Holman, a distinguished lawyer, which I read into the RECORD a few moments ago. It is not, as some have claimed, an outburst of narrow isolationism. Nor is it an ingenious method for defeating the treaty. The violent opposition to the treaty's preamble is simply the reaction of patriotic Americans to some of the most poisonous propaganda I have ever seen.

As I have indicated, the Declaration of Human Rights is completely devoid of legal significance. This is the formal and official position of the U. N. and the State Department. However, this is not the line taken in the U. N. and State Department propaganda. There, the U. N. declaration is depicted as the noblest bill of human rights in the history of man. The U. N. declaration is claimed to be far better than the American Declaration of Independence. This is the sort of malicious propaganda which is permeating American schools and colleges. No wonder some patriotic Americans see red whenever reference is made to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

A reputable foreign affairs analyst for an Ohio newspaper was so impressed by this propaganda that he announced that the U. N. Declaration of Human Rights is better than the American Bill of Rights "because it was written 160 years later." This is about as sensible as saying that the letters of President Truman—and we heard some of them read on the floor a moment ago—are better than those of Thomas Jefferson because they were composed 145 years later. According to Lin Mousheng, secretary of the U. N. Human Rights Commission, the economic and social rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights were "developed under the inspiration of the Socialist and Communist movement of the nineteenth century." That is the covenant which I have been attacking and will continue to attack in the months ahead. That is one reason why I shall do everything within my power to prevent the Universal Declaration of Human Rights from being translated into a legally enforceable Covenant on Human Rights.

In conclusion, the Declaration of Human Rights does not have the force of law. The declaration is referred to in the preamble, not the body, of the Japanese Peace Treaty. Approval of the

treaty will not make the declaration part of Japanese or American law. There may be valid objections to the Japanese Peace Treaty presented in the course of this debate, but I am convinced that the preamble is not objectionable.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Ohio a question.

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. From what the Senator says about the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, I take it he does not like it.

Mr. BRICKER. There is nothing wrong with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It is only a declaration of aspirations and aims of the various peoples and nations of the world to strive in their own domestic way to bring about better human rights and human relationships. So, as a mere pious resolution, there is nothing objectionable about it, in the judgment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JENNER. Of course, the Senator from Ohio realizes that a declaration in a treaty is not subject to judicial interpretation.

Mr. BRICKER. A declaration in a treaty is not subject to domestic interpretation.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. Why does the Senator presume this declaration was placed in the preamble?

Mr. BRICKER. It was placed in the preamble—and I am confident I am right—because of the pressure which was constantly brought by the United Nations and the State Department on Mr. Dulles and others who worked on the Japanese treaty. It may have been that the United Nations and the State Department had some ulterior motive. If they did, I do not think it is meaningful. It may have been that they had some ulterior motive to get the approval, perhaps, of the United States Senate upon a title, upon a declaration which needs no ratification, and will never be ratified by any country a party to the United Nations. I do not know; but I would suspect the State Department of almost anything it might be charged with in connection with the ulterior purposes of the United Nations and its representatives to undermine the liberties of the people of America. Yet even if that were the purpose, this declaration in the preamble of the Japanese Treaty is not objectionable, and has no binding effect upon us or upon Japan. It is only a statement of her desire to bring about better human conditions in the islands themselves, according to their own domestic law.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, again we have the old story of "hurry, hurry, hurry" in this body. Again great misunderstanding concerning an important document confronts this body.

Yesterday on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] asked the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], if the Smith-Jenner reservation were adopted, what would its adoption do to the treaty? The reply came back that a complete renegotiation of the treaty would be required.

I wish to assure my colleagues that that was not my intention in connection with these reservations, and that I did not take the action lightly or in a hurry. I went to the Parliamentarian of the Senate, Mr. Watkins, and asked him if reservations would seriously affect the Japanese Peace Treaty or any of the mutual security pacts. His reply to me was that a reservation to a treaty is a reservation made to the resolution of ratification. It expresses the sense of the Senate. The Senate does not ratify a treaty. It only advises and consents to the ratification, and the Executive does the actual ratification.

I asked the Parliamentarian, "If these reservations were adopted, would that mean that we would delay or hold up the peace treaty? Would we have to call back the representatives of all the signatory countries to renegotiate?"

The Parliamentarian of this body, in whom I have every confidence, said, "Of course not. The Foreign Relations Committee has already adopted one reservation which is a declaration. Any of these reservations would be to the resolution of ratification, and could be dealt with informally." So I wish to clear up that point.

Late yesterday afternoon the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] came to the floor of the Senate with a reply to my statements concerning the reservations which had been submitted by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and myself. The question involved in the discussion by the Senator from Wisconsin of the Smith-Jenner reservations to the Japanese Peace Treaty is clearly whether Japan and the United States are acting as independent, sovereign nations, or within a limited framework called collective security, which will permit Japan and the United States to take only such action, military or political, as is approved by the United Nations.

That is the crux of the whole question. The test is Korea. In Korea our Armed Forces are operating under the direction of the President, but not under the Constitution. The President has turned American military units into what he calls United Nations forces. He is serving as the agent of the United Nations in carrying out the military operations of the United Nations. He has contrived to tie our ground and air forces down in a local, half-war on the Korean Peninsula while our military men engage in the Communists' favorite booby trap, namely, long drawn-out peace or truce negotiations. Cannot Senators see them this afternoon in their imagination? American military leaders get into a little jeep, holding a white flag, and ride into enemy territory to talk peace and truce with those atheistic, communistic people, for nine long months. Meanwhile every political and diplomatic means which the American Government could use to support its fighting men is stymied because we cannot move without the consent of the elusive United Nations.

Let us never forget that the United Nations can do only that which is approved by Russia and her satellites. Russia is a member of the United Nations, and China will be just as soon as peace comes in Korea, or soon thereafter. We know that to be so.

The Smith-Jenner reservations are designed to make sure that we shall never again be bogged down in a Korean war in which the President is acting as the agent of the United Nations, and the United Nations says what America can and cannot do. That is the nub of the argument on reservation No. 1.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am interested in reservation No. 1. I may say that I could possibly be in agreement with the reservation, according to my thoughts now. I read reservation No. 1:

> Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy—

Let us stop there. Would a correct interpretation of that part of the reservation mean that, so far as the United States is concerned, anything the U. N. would have to say about the treaty would have nothing to do with us?

Mr. JENNER. That is exactly correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I continue to read from Reservation No. 1—

> its military establishment and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

I heard the Senator from Indiana explain what the Parliamentarian of the Senate had told him with respect to the interpretation of a reservation. I may say, without discussing this particular reservation, that I have heard the Parliamentarian make the same explanation in a general way.

Am I to understand that the effect of Reservation No. 1 as a whole would be that the United States would conduct its own foreign policy and act on its military commitments, if any, without U. N. interference one way or another?

Mr. JENNER. That is exactly correct.

The Smith-Jenner reservations are designed to make sure we will never again be bogged down in a Korean war in which the President is acting as the agent of the U. N. and the U. N. says what Americans can and cannot do.

That is the position we are in today in Korea. That is the position we will be in if the Senate consents and advises to the ratification of the treaty without adopting the reservations.

The reservations put in positive form the statement that we reserve to ourselves the right to act as an independent nation, with full and unrestricted sovereignty in foreign and domestic policy. We retain full freedom to make any choice in our national interest regardless of whether it is approved by U. N. or any regional pact bound into U. N., which we may have through a Pacific pact.

Members of the Senate, the move is on. I have stood on the Senate floor and called the turn on our foreign policy for the past 5 years.

I do not believe the American people would willingly surrender any part of their national sovereignty if the issue

were honestly presented to them, and I do not propose to keep silent while the issue is disposed of by subterfuge in a treaty.

If the members of this body wish to establish any such limitations in this treaty, I think they should do so openly. I will never vote for any limitations on American national sovereignty, and I will not seek to impose on China or Japan restrictions on their legal sovereignty or their pride as nations which I am not willing to impose on my own country.

If any Member of this body can improve on the wording of the proposed reservations better to serve this purpose, I for one will be glad to withdraw my reservations and introduce the substitute. On February 27 I wrote to the 95 Members of the Senate and told them I should be happy to sit down with them and help work out a better form for these reservations, if one could be found.

If the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] had any suggestions for improving the wording, he could have reached me by telephone at any time during the last 3 weeks. His present comments certainly do nothing to clarify the meaning of the reservations. They only add to the confusion which has been so carefully cultivated in every step of the making of this treaty.

The Senator from Wisconsin says that all treaties are limitations on sovereignty but they are agreements not compulsions. I am perfectly willing to make an agreement with a sovereign Japan which limits what the United States intends to do, and to put all the honor of the United States behind the commitment, but I am not willing to let anyone, anywhere compel the United States to obey.

Agreements between sovereign nations have never had any meaning except a promise, a moral commitment. There is no one to enforce agreements between sovereigns. Only the conscience of the nation involved, and a decent respect for the opinions of mankind, can induce sovereign nations to keep their promises.

I am perfectly willing to rely on the word of the Japanese people, given through the Premier, that they intend to give us continuing jurisdiction over the Ryukyus and Okinawa. There is no way to put a superauthority over Japan that will not be a superauthority over us.

I am perfectly willing to rely on the solemn promise of the Japanese people through their Government that they renounce all right and title to Korea. I do not want any supergovernment which can compel Japan to obey, because that supergovernment will be strong enough to tell my country what it can and must do.

The supergovernment which is being entwined about the sovereign nations is the U. N. I am not discussing what commitments to U. N. or any part of U. N. which we have made in other treaties. I am talking about these treaties. I am asking the Members of this body to stop now, to look and listen, and make no commitments to any sovereignty above the United States in this treaty.

We rushed into the Italian treaty and rushed it through the Senate, and it was a mistake to do so.

If we go back to the early debate on the North Atlantic Treaty, it will be seen how much misunderstanding and confusion there was about it. Recently I picked up the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing the debate, and I should like to read an excerpt from the proceedings of July 15, 1949. At that time I said:

Mr. President, I say again what I have said before: Ratification of the North Atlantic Pact means that we are mortgaging our foreign policy to the interests of Europe. We had better keep management of our affairs in our own hands. "God helps those who help themselves."

What do I mean, Mr. President? I need cite only one example, which was furnished by the junior Senator from New York, Mr. Dulles—

That is the same Mr. Dulles who negotiated the treaties which are before the Senate—

who said on July 12, 1949, on the floor of this very Senate:

"At Paris last month there was some discussion as to whether to accept at all the Soviet proffered truce and to resume, even on a tentative basis, Four-Power consultations.

"The reason was that some feared any relaxation of east-west tension would bring a corresponding relaxation on the part of the American people, and therefore they needed to be kept artificially alarmed."

That statement was made by former Senator Dulles, of New York.

At that time, when addressing the Senate, I said—and how well it applies to the current debate:

Mr. President, I beg of you, and of all Members of the Senate, to note that statement. Of course, they decided against the course of action there suggested. Nevertheless, under article 9 of the proposed pact, the control of the affairs of the United States will be transferred into the hands of a superstate in Europe, and our interests will be mortgaged to theirs. That is exactly what I mean when I say that we should keep control of our own affairs.

Recently General Eisenhower said that in his position as Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, he was only one-twelfth an American.

In my speech to the Senate on July 15, 1949, I also said:

This is why I believe, as I have said before, that we could accomplish the same purpose of contributing to the security of the Western World merely by extending the Monroe Doctrine to the countries that have indicated a desire to join with us in the fight for freedom.

But, Mr. President, we can abandon, only at our peril, the traditional principles and legal safeguards of human dignity and freedom that have brought this great Nation to the present hour.

Let us never forget that circumstances change, times change, but these principles endure forever.

Mr. President, the Constitution of the United States vests in the hands of Congress the power to raise, maintain, and equip our armies, and to provide for the national defense of our country.

Through this debate the proponents of this treaty have insisted that its ratification does not commit us to arms implementation. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY], the junior Senator from New York, Mr. Dulles, and the ranking minority member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Vandenberg have consistently maintained there is no commitment of any kind, under the provisions of this treaty, to furnish arms. They insist the North Atlantic Pact and arms implementation bill have no relation to each other.

Yet, Mr. President, the moment that a reservation to the resolution ratifying this treaty was introduced on the Senate floor on July 13, by the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. Wherry, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee shouted "We cannot attach a single reservation to this treaty."

Yet, this reservation states in simple language the assurances they have given us.

I have been reading from debate which occurred in the Senate many, many months ago; but how well it applies to the situation confronting us this very day.

I read further from my speech to the Senate on July 15, 1949:

O Mr. President, why do we not say what we mean and mean what we say?

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, a ratification of this treaty without this reservation will take the national defense out of the hands of Congress, and will deposit it into the hands of a semisuperstate of 12 nations, or at best, into the hands of the Chief Executive for the next 20 long years.

Mr. President, I could read further from that 1949 speech in the Senate. That very speech and the very debate which occurred in the Senate at that time are most apropos to the debate occurring in the Senate this very day.

I know we have made such commitments in the past. Let us stop now. Let us put up the barriers now, and say that we are all through with the slow erosion of our sovereignty, that has been going on under cover in the last 10 years.

I am not opposing the United Nations as a deliberative and consultative body. I am opposing the gradual transformation of the United Nations into a world government which has sovereign power over what Americans may or may not do with their military forces, their foreign policy, and even their domestic affairs.

Let me refer briefly to the evidence that this treaty entwines us in a set of limitations on our military and diplomatic powers.

In the preamble Japan declares its intention "in all circumstances to conform to the principles" of the United Nations Charter, the Declaration of Human Rights, and articles 55 and 56 of the Charter.

On September 8, 1951, Secretary Acheson wrote to Premier Yoshida of Japan, as follows:

Upon the coming into force of the treaty of peace signed today, Japan will assume obligations expressed in article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The Secretary of State then asked for a commitment by Premier Yoshida for the Japanese Government that—

If and when the forces of a member or members of the United Nations are engaged in any United Nations action in the Far East after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan, by the member or members, of the forces engaged in such United Nations action.

On September 8, 1951, the same day, Premier Yoshida replied:

With full cognizance of the contents of your Excellency's note, I have the honor, on

behalf of my Government, to confirm that * * * after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will * * * facilitate the support * * * of the forces engaged in such United Nations action.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey subsequently said: Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator read portions of a certain communication from Prime Minister Yoshida, of Japan, dated September 8, 1951, and he seemed to draw conclusions from it that in some way this communication indicated that we would be put under control of the United Nations. In the interest of having the whole record before us, I wonder whether the Senator would consent to the inclusion of the full letter in the RECORD, at the point at which the Senator was referring to the matter.

Mr. JENNER. I have no objection. I merely took parts of Dean Acheson's letter and parts of the other letter for the purpose of simplification. I am glad to have the Senator place the entire letter in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think it proper to have the whole letter printed in the RECORD, because the purpose of the letter, of course, was simply to preserve a time and place in Japan for United Nations forces, if we had to continue the present Korean operations. I think that is the practical effect of the letter. In any event, I feel that the entire letter should be incorporated in the debate, in order to let the reader draw his conclusions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPANESE DELEGATION,
San Francisco, September 8, 1951.

His Excellency DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State of the United States of America.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of Your Excellency's note of today's date in which Your Excellency has informed me as follows:

"Upon the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace signed today, Japan will assume the obligations expressed in article 2 of the Charter of the United Nations which requires the giving to the United Nations of 'every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the present Charter.'

"As we know, armed aggression has occurred in Korea, against which the United Nations and its members are taking action. There has been established a unified command of the United Nations under the United States pursuant to Security Council resolution of July 7, 1950; and the General Assembly, by resolution of February 1, 1951, has called upon all states and authorities to lend every assistance to the United Nations action and to refrain from giving any assistance to the aggressor. With the approval of SCAP, Japan has been and now is rendering important assistance to the United Nations action in the form of facilities and services made available to the members of the United Nations, the armed forces of which are participating in the United Nations action.

"Since the future is unsettled and it may unhappily be that the occasion for facilities and services in Japan in support of United Nations action will continue or recur, I would appreciate confirmation, on behalf of your Government, that if and when the forces of a member or members of the United Nations are engaged in any United Nations action in the Far East after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan, by the member or members, of the forces engaged in such United Nations actions; the expenses involved in the use of Japanese facilities and services to be borne as at present or as otherwise mutually agreed between Japan and the United Nations member concerned. Insofar as the United States is concerned the use of facilities and services, over and above those provided to the United States pursuant to the administrative agreement which will implement the security treaty between the United States and Japan, would be at United States expense, as at present."

With full cognizance of the contents of Your Excellency's note, I have the honor, on behalf of my Government, to confirm that if and when the forces of a member or members of the United Nations are engaged in any United Nations action in the Far East after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan, by the member or members of the forces engaged in such United Nations action, the expenses involved in the use of Japanese facilities and services to be borne as at present or as otherwise mutually agreed between Japan and the United Nations member concerned. Insofar as the United States is concerned, the use of facilities and services, over and above those provided to the United States, pursuant to the administrative agreement which will implement the security agreement between Japan and the United States, would be at United States expense, as at present.

Accept, Excellency, the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.

SHIGERU YOSHIDA,
Prime Minister and concurrently Minister of Foreign Affairs of Japan.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, let us translate into plain English the legal verbiage of the exchange of notes between Secretary of State Acheson and Premier Yoshida. The Japanese Peace Treaty now before the Senate was made the order of business on last Friday. Some Senators wanted to have the Senate vote on the treaty this afternoon. After this treaty, without any reservations, comes into force, Japan will let us operate in and about Japan if we are engaged in an action approved by the United Nations.

Mr. President, let us make the acid test. Suppose the treaty without reservations is ratified and suppose the Communists agree to peace in Korea. I do not know why they do not; we have offered them everything they want. I do not know why that controversy is not settled in 5 minutes. It could be if the Communists would say "Yes."

Suppose the Japanese Treaty without reservations is ratified, and suppose the Communists agree to peace in Korea. Suppose—and we must suppose—that thereafter the Reds violate the peace and massacre our troops in Korea. As I understand, about 500,000 of our troops are in Korea now. Suppose that thereafter we wish to strike back. In that event, we can operate "in and about Japan" if the United Nations agree. We can go, hat in hand, to the other members of the United Nations and can ask them please to let us punish the troops who murdered our boys.

How long will it take? Will they cooperate? I cite the record of several important votes recently taken in the United Nations. Our great friends and allies have, I think, either abstained from voting or have voted against us on the major issues. As the United Nations records will show, there are about 130,000,000 people in the United Nations who are supporting us, but there are 800,000,000 people who are voting against us. It seems that, with all our money, with all our gifts, and with all we have done to elevate and make happy and prosperous the people of this world, we simply do not seem to be able to buy our friends, and to keep them bought. Let Senators examine the voting record in the United Nations. It is interesting reading. But if we make a peace, and the Communists break it, we must then ask the United Nations for permission to go back to punish those who murdered our boys. This is true, even if Red China be not admitted to the United Nations.

How long do Senators think it will be before Red China is admitted to the United Nations? As part of my remarks, I desire to read two articles which indicate that China will inherit the claim to reparations under the Japanese Peace Treaty.

On January 17, 1951, nearly 3 months before the dismissal of General MacArthur, Frank Hanighen published in Human Events a column showing how the growing differences between Mr. Acheson and General MacArthur sprang from Mr. Acheson's determination to recognize Red China, and the need of prolonged peace negotiations for the purpose of working out the terms of the deal. The article is as follows:

APPEASEMENT OF RED CHINA

(By Frank C. Hanighen)

The whole episode of the U. N. cease-fire proposal, which ended in a flat turn-down by the Communist China Government in Peiping, was part of an Acheson appeasement scheme, according to usually well-informed diplomatic circles. As explained to this column by these sources, General Collins and high brass went to Tokyo to protect the Acheson scheme on the military level, while on the diplomatic level the cease-fire proposal, termed "infamous" by some Members of Congress, was under consideration by the Chinese Communist authorities. The diplomatic play was concealed from Congress in its preparatory stages, thereby enraging Senator TOM CONNALLY, since the State Department had not kept him informed. The military play was to prevent MacArthur from staging the evacuation of Korea. The Far East commander wanted (and wants) to take the boys out of Korea and told Washington of his desire. (As a matter of fact, MacArthur never wanted to fight mass warfare on the Asian mainland.) Collins went to Tokyo to see that there was no immediate evacuation, and to say so publicly and loudly.

The reason why Acheson wanted to restrain MacArthur from evacuating Korea is that if our troops were withdrawn, there would obviously be no reason for engaging in an appeasement conference with the Chinese Reds (which was the very hub of the U. N. cease-fire offer). Acheson wanted such a conference so as to frame a deal involving the sell-out of Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek to the Reds. Since the Reds have rejected the cease-fire proposal, will he try to attain the same end by other means? In any case, such were the motives behind the cease-fire affair and this was why

those who understood Acheson's game violently attacked cease-fire.

The cease-fire negotiations have now been going on for almost 9 months, but, on February 4, 1952, Mr. Walter Lippmann, who frequently shows profound intuition in anticipating the administration's line, stated that it is highly desirable for us to recognize Red China. I desire to read his article of that date, published in the Washington Post, which is as follows:

CLARIFICATION IN THE FAR EAST

The far-eastern issues which trouble our relations with Britain would resolve themselves quickly enough if the American Government could make it plain that its policy was not unconditional surrender and that it was prepared to negotiate a peace with Red China on all the issues of the Far East. This has nothing to do with agreeing to the Chinese demands. It has to do only with the willingness to discuss the terms on which agreement might be reached. If this is our policy, then what is the answer to the question, Shall we recognize Red China? The answer is, "Certainly not" while we are at war but "Yes, when and if we have negotiated and ratified an acceptable treaty of peace." Shall Red China be represented in the U. N.? The answer is, "Not while she is at war with the U. N. in Korea, not while there is the threat of war on the Indochinese frontier, but yes, if and when, Red China makes peace with the U. N." What about Formosa? The proper answer is that the future of Formosa can be settled only in a treaty of peace which covers all far-eastern issues. Until then, we shall protect and neutralize Formosa.

There is not much doubt that if this were the declared American attitude, our disagreements with Britain would become easily manageable, and so in fact would our difference with our allies in Europe and with the large independent nations of Asia. Nor is there much doubt that the great mass of the American people would support a policy which is so prudent, so reasonable, so fair—if only it were stated plainly to them. There is no great number of Americans who really want to go crusading in China, or to fight, if not a world war then at least a very much bigger war than the Korean, for the purpose of changing the government and social order in China.

Before anyone blows his top about this being appeasement of an aggressor, let him recall what was his state of mined, let us say 7 years ago, about making peace with Germany and with Japan. What would he have said then, how would he have felt then, if he had had a crystal ball in which he saw himself rearming the Germans and Japanese and proclaiming them the indispensable defenders of freedom, democracy, and civilization? Let him then reflect on how impermanent are the emotions, and how little they can be trusted in determining the great policies of great nations.

Mr. President, in my analysis of February 20, I submitted the material from the Internal Security Committee, showing that it always has been the fixed intention of Mr. Acheson and of the State Department to recognize Red China and to admit her to the United Nations.

By this treaty, in the commitment to article 2 of the Charter, Japan is forbidden to engage in any military activity not sanctioned by the U. N. The Acheson letter and Mr. Yoshida's reply make it perfectly clear that Japan must accept this limitation on her sovereignty.

This limitation on her sovereignty is a limitation on our national security. As I said last month, if we could disentangle our own forces from the U. N. we could attack Red China from the middle of the Pacific Ocean.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is open to amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate, certain facts which I think will throw some light on the situation as to the further views of the Soviet Union and the Communist forces generally relative to the Japanese Treaty which is now under discussion in the Senate of the United States.

Earlier in the day I pointed out in my remarks that it was perfectly obvious to those who attended the sessions of the Treaty Conference at San Francisco and those who observed them on television that the Soviet Union and her satellite states were opposed to the treaty and were doing everything possible, including an incipient filibuster, to try to prevent the success of the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield at that point?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to put this information in the RECORD, first, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, I should like to place in the RECORD at this time a number of communications which I think show the attitude of Russia. I have before me a Tass dispatch, dated Shanghai, November 23, 1951, which reads, in part, as follows:

In the course of the discussion in Parliament—

I might say, parenthetically, that that has reference to the Japanese Parliament—

Communist deputies Ionehara, Kaneiwa, and others resolutely opposed these enslaving treaties, exposing their aggressive and colonizing character. They stated that the Peace Treaty signed without the participation of the Soviet Union and the Chinese People's Republic has no legal force, and that the aggressive American-Japanese security pact is aimed at converting Japan into an instrument of American aggression in Asia.

That is the testimony of the local Japanese Communists in the parliament of that country, where they have very few representatives, as to their objection to the treaty.

We call as another witness Chou en-Lai, who is quoted in a Peking Communist broadcast, under date of February 15, 1952, following the usual Communist line. This is what he had to say:

Since their disastrous failure in the Korean war, the American imperialists have been shamelessly stalling the Korean armistice negotiations, while continuing to occupy Taiwan in order to keep up what they call a tense situation for a new aggressive war on a still larger scale in the Far East and other parts of Asia. Last September, American imperialism and its satellite states signed with the Yoshida Government of Japan the unlawful, unilateral "San Francisco Peace Treaty," and at the same time concluded "the United States-Japanese security pact."

In December, Yoshida, Premier of the reactionary Japanese Government, assured America that it would conclude a bilateral treaty with the remnant Kuomintang gang on Taiwan. He also said he would continue to help America in acts of aggression against Lorea and China. At the behest of America, the British Government in Hong Kong has been allowing remnant Kuomintang gangsters to infiltrate into China's Kwang Tung Province from Hong Kong and Kowloon for purposes of sabotage. In southeast Asia, America is stirring up the Kuomintang bandit troops who fled to Burma to raid China's border. It is supporting the French imperialist aggressive war against the neighboring state of China, the Viet Nam democratic republic.

The pivot of this series of actions by American imperialism is the revival of Japanese militarism and the rearming of Japan, in order to try and create a military threat to the People's Republic of China, and hostility to the Soviet Union, in preparing for a new aggressive war on a still larger scale against the Far East as a menace to the security of the whole of Asia.

That is witness No. 2.

Then we have as witness No. 3, as to how the Communists feel about the treaty which is under debate, the Moscow, Soviet Far Eastern Service. To borrow a British expression, to say the The following comment came over the Moscow, Soviet Far Eastern Service, in Japanese and directed to the Japanese, under date of February 5, 1952:

Ever since the ratification by the Japanese Diet of the San Francisco peace treaty and the so-called security pact, many mimeograph leaflets have frequently been scattered in towns and villages in all parts of Japan. One of them said: "The slavish treaties of the aggressors and the traitors is nothing but a deceitful contract concluded between the foreign imperialists and the reactionary war criminals—the Emperor, the capitalists, and the landowners—which has converted Japan into a colony of the United States. Although the treacherous treaties have been ratified, the 80,000,000 Japanese, who are in a close unity with all of the free people of the world, will frustrate the bloodthirsty plot of the warmongers, will strike off the chain of oppression and will obtain through their struggle the freedom and independence of their country."

We have another witness from the U. S. S. R. Home Service under date of November 7, 1951:

The Soviet Union, which has repeatedly insisted on the conclusion of a genuine, just peace treaty with Japan on the basis of the Cairo and Potsdam declarations and the Yalta agreement would have betrayed its traditional peace policy had it put its signature to this treaty. The significance of this treaty is also minimized by the fact that the second Asiatic state in size and importance, India, had no part in its conclusion.

Mr. President, I thought it was necessary and important to put this material into the RECORD, because I think it is evidence, based on the Communist policy at San Francisco and what the Communists have said since through their mouthpieces, their small minority of the Japanese Diet, and their official propaganda broadcasts, that the Communist world is very much opposed to the treaty and would do anything possible to prevent its ratification.

They have attempted to intimidate Japan by threatening that if she went ahead with the negotiation of a treaty of this kind they might bring into full force and effect the Sino-Russian Pact, which was a clear threat that they might take action against Japan.

The people of Japan were unintimidated by such a threat. The people of the United States were unintimidated by such a threat. The people of the free world have been unintimidated by such a threat.

Mr. President, I do not believe the American people would stand for a far-eastern Munich at this time. The free world should have learned at the time of Munich that the road to appeasement is not the road to peace. It is merely surrender on the installment plan. I do not believe they have any intention of supporting a government that would participate in a far-eastern Munich. I believe the American people are clearly alive to the situation and that the very security of this Nation is tied up in not letting all Asia or all Europe go behind the iron curtain. The American people are possibly ahead of their Government in recognizing the dangers which would threaten their own Republic if all Europe and all Asia were permitted to go behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, in my opinion, the American people are becoming sick and tired of paying international blackmail. We paid it in Asia time and time again; we paid it in Europe in the release of Mr. Vogeler and in paying $120,000 for the release of four men wearing the American Air Force uniform.

I think those of us who served in World War II must have a deep-seated desire to see created a system of international law which will assure peace to the world—peace to ourselves and our children. We must also recognize that nations cannot yield to this type of blackmail any more than can individuals in a community.

Mr. President, consider your own community or the community of any other Senator. If a kidnaper steals a child, the threat is always the same; if the parents go to the authorities, dire consequences will follow; the child may be killed. If one yields to that type of blackmail on a kidnaping threat, then one's neighbor's child may also be a victim of kidnaping.

Or an extortionist or racketeer may go to a little cleaning establishment in a community and tell the proprietor that if he will not pay protection money an acid bomb will be thrown into the place, and his goods and property will be destroyed. Or a bomb may be thrown into a grocery store and the stocks destroyed. If the small merchant yields to such threats and says nothing to the authorities, then the appetite of the extortionist or the racketeer is whetted, and he goes forth and tries the same tactics on another and another, until finally the entire community is bending its knee before the gangster and racketeer.

Mr. President, what happens in international relations is not greatly different from that. The more that is paid the greater will be the demands upon us. The time has come when the American people, and people all over the world, must stand up against the type of extortion and blackmail now being practiced.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I venture to say to the distinguished Senator from California that if he believes in the stage show the Communists put on at San Francisco, and the way the Communists reacted, he apparently does not understand their method of operation. When Communists are against something they use knives, and not theatricals, as they used them at San Francisco.

We hear much about Communists and communism. I just wonder if we are really against communism.

Mr. President, I do not see how we can give Communists any more aid and comfort than our Government has given them over the past several years. It is common knowledge that the Marshall plan, when proposed, was offered equally to the Communists, but the Communists thought they could make more out of it by being against it, rather than by being part of it. They said, "We will oppose it, and America will pour billions of dollars into the effort, and we will bleed her white."

It was useless. Today we admit it was useless. France has an unstable government. The Communist Party is the largest party in France. In Italy the Communists' ratio is about the same. Great Britain announces that she will take no part in a continental army. France is afraid of a rearmed Germany, and so on.

Mr. President, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam have made the Communists what they are. We have to remember that the Communists have never spent a single ruble and have never used a soldier, nor have they fired one of their guns, in the trouble they have fomented.

At the end of World War II there were 175,000,000 Communists. Today, thanks to our country and its blundering foreign policy, there are 800,000,000. Communists dominate Poland, the Balkans, the Baltic countries, Manchuria, China, the northern half of Korea, Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands.

Does the Senator imagine we are against communism? We have taken the American taxpayer's dollar and sent it to Europe. Europe is taking our dollars and our materials and is trading with Communist Russia. England has furnished jet engines which are employed in killing American boys. The materials we sent and our dollars have gone to the Chinese Reds in Korea.

How silly can a government get? Everything we have done has fattened communism, and we are still playing right into her hands.

The Senator from California should not think that Communists were opposed to this treaty when they staged their theatricals at San Francisco. I saw that stage show in San Francisco. The Communists turned around and came back to their seats. That is just the point. The Communists say "Boo," and time after time we play right into their hands. This is the history of the growth of communism. History bears me out. Let us not do it again without complete protection of our sovereignty in the pending treaties.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG in the chair). Reports of committees are in order. If there be none, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first nomination on the calendar, that of Mr. Earl W. Beck, to be Recorder of Deeds of the District of Columbia, be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Philip Neville to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. B. Cartier to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of both confirmations made today.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate take a recess, in executive session, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 19, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 18 (legislative day of February 25), 1952:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Philip Neville to be United States attorney for the district of Minnesota.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Arthur J. B. Cartier to be United States marshal for the district of Massachusetts.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 18, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, whose beneficent spirit is here and everywhere, daily we are bringing unto Thee problems we cannot solve and the questions for which we have no answer.

We penitently confess that there is something tragically wrong with our civilization and our social order. We are baffled and wistfully bewildered. There seems to be a blind spot in our

thinking and living. Is it because we have allowed materialism and humanism to become our way of life?

We pray that Thou wilt lift mankind out of these atheistic and agnostic tempers of mind. Make us sensitive and responsive to the spiritual realities. Fill us with a joyous and victorious faith in the Lord God omnipotent.

Inspire the members of the family of nations with a greater faith in one another. May the spirit of man be more considerate and compassionate, more gentle and gracious, more magnanimous and unselfish.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4515. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes.

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2697) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not question the sincerity of the sponsors, but I am convinced that they have been sold a bill of goods. I feel very strongly that this is bad legislation, particularly at this time.

The bill seeks to eliminate oil stock peanut acreage allotments. Admittedly that program has not worked satisfactorily—but that is because the Department of Agriculture has deliberately flaunted the law. It has not tried to make the program work. Now the Department wants to get rid of the law which permits oil-stock peanuts to be grown.

This bill would change the rules in the middle of the game. In the lower South at least the farmer already has bought his fertilizer and his seed peanuts and has prepared his land for planting. Allotment notices have been sent out to the farmers. Yet at this late date it is proposed in this bill to change the allotment system so that the farmers will not be able to plant as much acreage in peanuts as they have previously planned. The farmer, particularly the little farmer, does not have money to spend for fertilizer and seed that he will be unable to use. At the very least this bill should be amended to make the change effective next year instead of this year.

Mr. ABBITT. I will say to the gentleman that this does not affect the allotment. This merely repeals the provision whereby the farmers could plant excess peanuts.

Mr. SIKES. But it stops the farmer from planting oil stock peanuts that he has been able to plant for the last few years. In that way it certainly reduces his allotment.

Mr. ABBITT. This provision was put in the law in 1950, and I will say further that the producers want this legislation as soon as they can get it.

This bill repeals the so-called excess peanuts for oil law which permits producers to plant peanuts in excess of their peanut acreage allotments up to their 1947 acreage without penalty, provided they market the peanuts harvested from such excess acreage through agencies designated by the Secretary of Agriculture. This provision of the law has not proved beneficial to the people interested in the production of peanuts. The producers of peanuts desire to put the peanut program on a sound economic basis and I think that the passage of this bill will be a real step in the right direction, and I hope that the House will pass this legislation so that we will have a better peanut program and one that will stand on its own merits.

As long as this legislation is on the statute books it will have the effect of depressing the price of peanuts to the producers and will cause the Commodity Credit Corporation to purchase a larger quantity of peanuts produced on the regular allotments than it ordinarily would. They feel that it is very hurtful to the present program.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. It strengthens the closed shop on peanut growing.

Mr. SIKES. I think that is all it does. I will be frank about it. I am surprised that this bill has the support of some of the outstanding Members of the Congress, both in the House and in the Senate. I fear that they have let the Department of Agriculture blind them to the needs of the farmer and particularly of the little farmer. It is the little farmer who has benefited most from the oil-stock-acreage allotments. His allotment of edible peanuts generally is low. An extra acre or two produced with family labor can be important to his family's well-being.

I believe the Department of Agriculture, which is insistent upon the passage of this legislation, is definitely hurting many farmers by doing so. The Department doesn't give two hoots for the little farmer and it is not friendly to the peanut price-support program. That has been shown many times by its hostility to legislation intended to help the peanut producer and shown again by the impossible restrictions put into effect at harvest time last year. The Department says the peanut program is costing too much money. It is true that we are subsidizing the peanut producer just as we are subsidizing most farmers. However, since this country is subsidizing everything and everybody from Timbuctu to German rearmament, I see no reason for drawing the line at the American peanut producer. I am opposed to this measure and I am sorry that I do not find more support for my position in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 359 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by striking out subsections (f), (g), (h), and (i). Repeal of these subsections shall not affect rights or obligations arising under marketing-quota or price-support operations with respect to 1951 or prior crops of peanuts.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6375) was laid on the table.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

ALEXANDER NEWMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6414) for the relief of Alexander Newman.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ELFRIEDE EHRHARDT OTTO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 183) for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, nothwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136 (e)), insofar as concerns any act or acts of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto, of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has notice at the time of the enactment of this Act, Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is not otherwise inadmissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSWALD A. DRICA-MINIERIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 465) for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General of the United States is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year the said quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. LOUIS S. K. YUAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 560) for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREGORY JOSEPH COLES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1925) for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor child, Gregory Joseph Coles, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Clinton J. Coles, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DESPINA HODOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1782) for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Despina Hodos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TORY LEE EAKIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1620) for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Tory Lee Eakin, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Lt. and Mrs. John B. Eakin, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. FRANCIS S. N. KWOK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1541) for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok, also known as Dr. Chew Nam Young, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEOPOLD KAHN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1255) for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Leopold Kahn, Jr., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASAKO MIYAZAKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 914) for relief of Masako Miyazaki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race, shall not hereafter apply to Masako Miyazaki, the Japanese fiancée of Lester G. Barrett, Jr., a citizen of the United States, and that the said Masako Miyazaki may be eligible for a nonquota immigration visa if she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that marriage between the above-named parties occurred within 3 months immediately succeeding the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERTA GOMES LEITE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 828) for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the ninth category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Berta Gomes Leite may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Berta Gomes Leite becoming a public charge.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDE VITA GUZZARDI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 606) for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Fede Vita Guzzardi shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER EDELTRUDIS SAILER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 589) for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Edeltrudis Sailer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEINRICH VON BIEL, MARGARETHE VON BIEL, AND DORIS SCHUMANN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 885) for the relief of Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the grant of permanent residence to such aliens, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER L. WIESIOLOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1261) for the relief of Alexander L. Wiesiolowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Alexander L. Wiesiolowski, of Los Angeles, Calif., and is directed not to issue any further warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such further warrants are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be considered to have entered the United States in November 1945, the date of his last entry, and to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota of the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alexander L. Wiesiolowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AROKIASWAMI ARUMAI SINGH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1464) for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Arokiaswami Arumai Singh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENTA ZIEGLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1968) for the relief of Senta Ziegler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Senta Ziegler, who entered the United States on November 14, 1948, for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence upon payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax. Any bond outstanding in her case shall be canceled. Upon payment of such visa fee and head tax, the Secretary of State shall instruct the propor quota control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Germany for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Senta Ziegler shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Senta Ziegler becoming a public charge."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. EDITH ABRAHAMOVIC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1969) for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of June 28, 1949, to the United States for permanent residence upon payment by her of visa fee and head tax. Upon payment of such visa fee and head tax, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic becoming a public charge."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARGARET CELIKCAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2222) for the relief of Margaret Celikcan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Margaret Celikcan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KUNIGUNDE BELDIE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2716) for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, Mrs. Kunigunde Beldie, a former citizen of the United States, shall be held and considered to have retained her United States citizenship.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That Kunigunde Beldie, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 404 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or be-

fore any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Kunigunde Beidie shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LESZEK KAZIMIERZ PAWLOWICZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2832) for the relief of Leszek Kazimierz Pawlowicz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Leszek Kazimierz Pawlowicz shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent resident to such alien, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out all of line 8 beginning with the word "Upon", all of lines 9, 10, and 11, and on page 2, strike out the words "quota is available" in line 1, and insert "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent resident pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011, 64 Stat. 219, 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEBASTIANO BELLÓ ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3155) for the relief of Sebastiano Belló, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenzo Dall'Alda, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Montini.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sebastiano Belló, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenzo Dall'Alda, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Montini, brothers of the Sons of the Sacred Heart, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct eight numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LYDIA DAISY JESSIE GREENE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3598) for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHAN TOY HAR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3953) for the relief of Chan Toy Har.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the alien Chan Toy Har, the Chinese fiancée of Harry S. Lee, Glendora, Miss., a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Chan Toy Har is coming to the United States with the bona fide intention of being married to the said Harry S. Lee, and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chan Toy Har, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Chan Toy Har, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Chan Toy Har as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALBERT O. HOLLAND AND BERGTOR HAALAND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5238) for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland shall not be held to have lost United States citizenship under any of the provisions of the Nationality Act of 1940 providing for loss of citizenship through continuous residence in a foreign state.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRESENTATION OF MERCHANT MARINE DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO HENRIK KURT CARLSEN

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 363) to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Maritime Administrator is authorized and directed to present the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal, of design provided under the act of April 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 217), to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*, in recognition of his heroic conduct and valor beyond the call of duty while attempting without regard to his personal safety to bring his ship and its cargo to port. His endeavors during the period December 29, 1951, to January 10, 1952, were in keeping with the highest traditions of the United States merchant marine.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK BRAVO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4678) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jack Bravo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Jack Bravo a patent in fee to the following-described lands on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The north half of section 33, lots 1 and 2, the west half of the northeast quarter and the northwest quarter of section 34, township 7 south, range 35 east, Montana principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OMNIBUS PRIVATE CLAIMS BILL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the omnibus private claims bill.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6444) for the relief of sundry claimants and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 25]

Bender	Cooley	Gamble
Bentsen	Coudert	Gary
Blatnik	Denny	Granger
Boggs, Del.	Dingell	Hall,
Bonner	Dollinger	Edwin Arthur
Bosone	Donovan	Hand
Boykin	Doughton	Hart
Buchanan	Doyle	Hedrick
Carrigg	Feighan	Heffernan
Case	Flood	Herter
Cole, N. Y.	Fogarty	Hoffman, Ill.
Combs	Forand	Hope

Hull	Murray, Wis.	Schenck
Hunter	O'Hara	Scott, Hardie
Jackson, Calif.	O'Konski	Shelley
Jonas	O'Neill	Smith, Wis.
Kee	Patterson	Tackett
Kennedy	Philbin	Thompson, Tex.
Kersten, Wis.	Poage	Vail
Larcade	Potter	Velde
Latham	Powell	Watts
McConnell	Price	Weichel
McCormack	Prouty	Welch
McKinnon	Rabaut	Wheeler
Mack, Ill.	Rains	Wickersham
Miller, Calif.	Regan	Wigglesworth
Miller, Md.	Riley	Winstead
Mitchell	Rivers	Wolcott
Morton	Roberts	Wood, Idaho
Murdock	Robeson	Woodruff
Murphy	Roosevelt	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 341 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

OMNIBUS PRIVATE CLAIMS BILL—MRS. EVELYN CAMPBELL

The Clerk read as follows:

Title I—(H. R. 2913. For the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell) by Mr. MORRISON.

That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Evelyn Campbell, of Baton Rouge, La., the sum of $20,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Evelyn Campbell against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her on April 27, 1946, in Baton Rouge, La., when she was run into and knocked to the sidewalk by personnel of the United States Navy who were running to board a troop train on which they were traveling under Government orders. The United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, on February 11, 1949, held that compensation for such injuries could not be obtained under the Federal Tort Claims Act because such personnel were not acting within the scope of their employment at the time of the injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: Strike out title I.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, there is only one issue involved in title I of the omnibus bill, and that issue is very clear. In objecting to this title my purpose is to bring this issue before the House so you may pass on it.

Many of you were here in the Seventy-ninth Congress when the Tort Claims Act was passed and went into effect. The purpose of that legislation was to make it possible for a person who had a tort claim against the United States Government to bring action in the Federal courts against the United States Government and recover whatever he was entitled to. A collateral purpose of the Tort Claims Act was to avoid bringing before the House and the Senate a multitude of tort claims which constantly arise in the operations of the Federal Government.

What happened in this instant case? A tort was committed against this woman, the claimant; she was seriously injured, and I raise no question about that; she was hurt. She brought action in the appropriate court, and the district court gave her a substantial recovery.

The case was then carried to the circuit court of appeals and the decision of the district court was reversed. The Supreme Court of the United States refused certiorari and so the decision of the circuit court of appeals stands.

Mr. Speaker, the only issue to be decided by this body today, the House of Representatives, is whether we are going to tear down the Tort Claims Act. To pass this title would be a precedent for permitting everybody who does not succeed in recovering under the Tort Claims Act to come back to the Congress, get someone to introduce a bill and recover in that way. You might just as well wipe out the Tort Claims Act if you are going to follow that procedure and bring all of these tort bills to this floor in the beginning.

It is going to be said in answer to what I am saying that there have been other cases that have come here in like manner, which, I presume is true; but sooner or later this issue is going to have to be passed on by the House of Representatives and by the Congress of the United States. It is up to you to say whether you are going to allow the good intentions that we have and those softhearted impulses which are a part of all of us to give $20,000 to this woman. She has already pursued all of the remedies which have been provided by law, and, appropriately enough, as it seems to many of us, she has been denied recovery. Are you going to go clear beyond that and say that despite the fact the courts would not give her any recourse for the injury which she suffered, she can come to the Congress and softheartedly we will allow her to recover anyway?

That is the question and the sole issue in this matter. You are going to have to decide it in a few minutes by your vote.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. Speaker, this is a very meritorious bill and, as the gentleman who rose in opposition stated, this woman recovered judgment in the lower court for over $20,000, but she was denied in a court of appeals decision this judgment due to the fact that the court of appeals stated that on account of the fact these sailors who had injured this woman were not in the scope of their employment she could not come into court under the Tort Claims Act and recover.

There is ample precedent for this bill in bills that have already passed this House, for instance:

H. R. 325 of the Seventy-eighth Congress awarded $6,000 when a man was shot without provocation by an armed soldier.

H. R. 2273, of the Seventy-eighth Congress, provided for relief for personal injuries caused by an attack by a group of soldiers at Monroe, N. C.

H. R. 1629, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, provided for relief for a man when he was struck by an egg thrown from the kitchen car of a troop train.

H. R. 1597, of the Eighty-first Congress, gave relief to a man when he was knocked down by several soldiers while performing his duties as passenger train conductor of the Atlantic & West Point Railroad.

H. R. 7454, of the Eighty-first Congress, gave relief to a man struck by an Army vehicle that was driven by a member of the Armed Forces outside the scope of his employment.

H. R. 8641, of the Eighty-first Congress gave relief as a result of a collision, said car being operated by an employee of the United States Department of the Interior not acting within the scope of his employment.

H. R. 2474, of the Eighty-first Congress, gave relief on account of personal injuries resulting from a gunshot wound by a seaman first class, United States Coast Guard.

H. R. 3495, of the Eighty-second Congress, gave relief for the death due to United States Army truck.

I urge you to please vote this motion down. This is a meritorious claim.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this is a most meritorious bill. This train carrying these sailors from the west coast had been on the move several days. It reached the city of Baton Rouge on the route to the Gulf coast and stopped there for an hour to ice the train. Since the sailors had been cooped up on the train for several days, some of them naturally left it to stretch their legs by walking around. The Heidelberg Hotel is located less than a block from the railway station in the city of Baton Rouge and some of these sailors walked to the Heidelberg Hotel and apparently entered it. Suddenly notice was given that the train was leaving and these sailors made a mad rush out of the hotel, rounding the corner at high speed. The train was then moving out of the station. The sailors ran into a group of five ladies who were on the north side of Convention Street at the Heidelberg Hotel corner and knocked one of them, Mrs. Campbell, down on the pavement. She was rushed to the hospital. In the meantime the sailors caught the train just before it left the station.

On examination it was found that Mrs. Campbell had sustained a broken wrist which has never healed and in which she has lost some motion. She sustained a fracture of the neck and hip bone and in order to hold the fractured ends together a nail had to be placed into the bone. The union, according to physicians, has never been very satisfactory and Mrs. Campbell is a hopeless invalid at the present time.

The lower court for the eastern district of Louisiana found that Mrs. Campbell had a very meritorious case and allowed damages in the amount of $21,800. The court of appeals on the contrary in reviewing the case felt that the Federal

Tort Act was not broad enough to cover her case, and that the action of the sailors in running into this group of ladies, injuring one very seriously, was beyond the scope of their authority. The court of appeals, therefore, threw this case out and Mrs. Campbell, although a hopeless invalid for the rest of her life, has no remedy in law.

Many precedents exist for allowing injured persons some relief who do not properly come within the scope of the Federal Tort Claims Act. I hold in my hand a fistful of bills which have created in the past the precedent under which Congress acted in allowing claims where the court finds the Tort Claims Act gives it no authority to afford the litigant relief. This bill, therefore, creates no new precedent. It does give a woman who, without fault whatsoever on her part, has been badly hurt and hopelessly injured for life by men in the Armed Forces of this country during the late war some relief. I, therefore, hope the House will deny the motion to strike this section from the omnibus bill and will approve this bill.

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Tort Claims Act requires, of course, that in order to recover in a tort action the negligence must arise in the course of and scope of the employment of the individual. In this case the district court held that the soldiers were in line of duty and therefore were acting within the course and scope of their official activities. The circuit court disagreed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we should take the position that we will never accord relief to anyone unless his case comes literally within the purview of the Tort Claims Act, we might as well close shop. We do extend relief by private bills every day. Very frequently old patents were erroneously issued or mistakes were made in the issuance. Title thus remains in the United States, because the statute of limitation does not run against the Government. We exercise jurisdiction in such cases and accord relief to clear the titles. We do that in immigration cases where, under general law, relief may not be available. And we should not, I submit, abdicate our jurisdiction and yield our power to grant relief in special cases. What we are doing today is making a special law because this is a special case. The law being silent, we are simply granting equitable relief.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand the parliamentary situation, a vote "no" is for the bill, and a vote "aye" is against the bill.

The SPEAKER. A vote of "no" would be a vote against the amendment striking the title out of the bill.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DOLLIVER) there were—ayes 46, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title II—(H. R. 657. For the relief of Tony Marchiondo) by Mr. FERNANDEZ.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,482 to Tony Marchiondo, of Raton, N. Mex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for certain Government pension checks payable to one Maria Manuela G. de Sena, a Civil War widow, negligently issued to her after her death, between January 31, 1934, and August 31, 1941, both inclusive, and fraudulently endorsed with her name and taken by said Tony Marchiondo at his place of business in good faith for value received and without any notice or suspicion of their infirmity, and for which he was held accountable as subsequent endorser: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. D'EWART: Strike out title II.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes to reimburse Mr. Marchiondo in the sum of $3,482 that he was forced to pay the Federal Government because of cashing pension checks.

It appears that a Civil War widow was paid a number of checks subsequent to her death, a total of 88 checks. Her son customarily took her pension checks to a small store owned by Mr. Marchiondo and cashed them after endorsing the checks. The bank reimbursed Mr. Marchiondo, and the Federal Government recognized the checks. Finally the widow died, on January 3, 1934, and following her death 88 of these checks were issued and cashed and paid by the Federal Government.

Finally, in 1944, these fraudulent checks were discovered and the Government brought suit against the bank and recovered the funds. The bank in turn brought suit against Mr. Marchiondo with the result that the bank had to reimburse the Government, and Mr. Marchiondo reimbursed the bank.

The grandson who fraudulently endorsed the checks was found guilty on 8 counts and was sentenced to 6 months imprisonment on each of the 8 counts. The sentences ran concurrently.

This is a case of the Federal Government issuing these checks to a widow and for years after her death these checks were fraudulently cashed. The Government was able to recover the money which was paid out on these fraudulent checks. There is no question about the facts in the case. The grandson cashed these checks and was found guilty and sentenced. We are asked here to reimburse the storekeeper who innocently took these checks after they had been endorsed by the grandson and after the grandmother who was entitled to these checks had died.

The Treasury Department opposes the enactment of this legislation, stating that since cases of this general character requiring recovery from endorsers of amounts paid by the Government on wrongfully negotiated checks frequently arise, enactment of this bill would not only discriminate against many other persons similarly situated but would also establish an undesirable precedent.

The Bureau of the Budget is opposed to the enactment of this legislation.

Certainly this is a case, it seems to me, of the Federal Government's being wholly right in the position it has taken. It was correct in collecting this amount from the man who cashed these checks, and it is justified in retaining the money. We should sustain the Government so that this will not set a precedent in other cases.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the storekeeper have knowledge that the widow had died?

Mr. D'EWART. He did not have knowledge that the widow had died. He had been cashing these checks before the widow died on the endorsement of the Mr. Marchiondo.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the grandson make the storekeeper good?

Mr. D'EWART. The grandson did not make the storekeeper good. The Federal Government sued the bank; the bank sued the storekeeper, and the storekeeper had to make the funds good. The grandson was sentenced and served his sentence.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will adopt the amendment to strike this title out.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the very fair manner in which the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] has stated the facts. From a strictly technical and legal standpoint, the facts are against us. If that were not so, we would not be here with this bill. The courts would have taken care of it. Only when the courts are powerless to act, and do full equity and justice, are we justified in coming before the Congress for redress. This is such a case. This is a case which strongly appeals to one's compassion and sense of justice. Those of us who know him, his family, and his circumstances feel he has been done a wrong through no fault of his. The committee, who are strangers to him, felt compassion for him and agreed with us.

Mr. Marchiondo came to this country in 1913. He, of course, had a very limited knowledge of the language. He rented the little store in Raton and raised his 10, fine, young boys and girls, seven of whom were in the military service at the time that the bank sued Mr. Marchiondo to recover the moneys which the bank had to pay to the Government. As the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART] has stated to you, this grandson had been cashing these checks, long before the old widow, died in the same manner and

in the same store. Mr. Marchiondo had gone to the bank and asked them if he should cash them. The bank said yes, they are just as good as gold, and he continued to cash them in this little store, and had been cashing them since 1921, when the old lady sent word to the Post Office to place these checks in her box, and through the years up to 1941, those checks were placed in the box or rather slips of paper were placed in the bank saying that the check was in the Post Office. The grandson regularly called for the check, took it and endorsed the old lady's name, and cashed them in Mr. Marchiondo's store, until 1934 when she died. Then he continued the same thing. The Government continued to deliver these checks to the grandson and to honor, without any investigation. Mr. Marchiondo at the time of her death was in New York, and did not know that the lady had died. There was no publicity to it. The bank did not know it, and they continued to honor these checks, which were cashed by Mr. Marchiondo in good faith. Mr. Marchiondo is a man of very excellent reputation. One of his boys now is a member of the legislature of the State of New Mexico. The grandson was also a man of good reputation up to that time, and there was no reason whatsoever for Mr. Marchiondo to ever even suspect that these checks were being cashed fraudulently. But, they were, and when it was discovered, and the bank sued Mr. Marchiondo, it nearly ruined him and ruined his health. Unfortunately the grandson, who alone had profited by the fraud was insolvent.

So, I say this bill is one which appeals strongly to one's compassion and one's sense of justice. I have a letter here from the Governor of the State urging that this little claim be allowed. It is a small amount true, but it is quite a bit of money for Mr. Marchiondo. I have a letter also from the district judge of the district in which Mr. Marchiondo lives, also urging that he be reimbursed for these funds because, after all, these funds would not have been lost except for the negligence of the Government. All these years this lady, 81 years of age, was being sent these checks and the Government continued to cash them. They were cashed by the grandson under his name, before and after she died, and the Government made no effort to find out if she was living. So I say if the money was lost, it was due to the negligence of the Government. And this great Government of ours ought not to penalize this poor citizen for this small amount, to the Government, of money which the Government lost through its own negligence. So I appeal to you that to vote against the amendment to strike out this title of the bill. I thank the committee for bringing this bill up again, and I thank you very much for your consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. D'EWART) there were—ayes 35, noes 41.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present, and I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 147, noes 184, not voting 101, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—147

Aandahl	D'Ewart	Merrow
Abbitt	Dolliver	Miller, Nebr.
Adair	Doughton	Morano
Allen, Calif.	Durham	Mumma
Allen, Ill.	Eaton	Nelson
Andersen, H. Carl	Ford	Nicholson
Anderson, Calif.	Forrester	Norblad
Andresen, August H.	Fulton	Osmers
Arends	George	Ostertag
Armstrong	Gross	Poulson
Auchincloss	Golden	Radwan
Ayres	Gwinn	Rankin
Baker	Hale	Reams
Bakewell	Hall, Leonard W.	Redden
Bates, Mass.	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Beall	Harden	Rees, Kans.
Beamer	Harrison, Nebr.	Richlman
Belcher	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Mass.
Berry	Harvey	Ross
Betts	Hesselton	Sadlak
Bishop	Hess	Saylor
Blackney	Hoeven	Schwabe
Bolton	Hoffman, Mich.	Scott, Hugh, D., Jr.
Bow	Horan	Scrivner
Bray	Jarman	Secrest
Brown, Ohio	Javits	Seely-Brown
Brownson	Jenison	Shafer
Budge	Jenkins	Sheehan
Buffett	Jensen	Simpson, Ill.
Burton	Johnson	Sittler
Bush	Jones, Hamilton C.	Smith, Kans.
Butler	Jones, Woodrow W.	Smith, Va.
Byrnes	Kean	Springer
Canfield	Kearney	Taber
Carlyle	Kearns	Talle
Chatham	Keating	Taylor
Chiperfield	Kilburn	Thomas
Church	King, Pa.	Tollefson
Clevenger	Latham	Vail
Cole, Kans.	LeCompte	Van Pelt
Cotton	Lovre	Van Zandt
Cox	McGregor	Vorys
Cunningham	McIntire	Vursell
Curtis, Mo.	McVey	Wharton
Curtis, Nebr.	Martin, Iowa	Widnall
Dague	Martin, Mass.	Williams, N. Y.
Davis, Ga.	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Davis, Wis.	Meader	Wolverton
Devereux		Wood, Idaho

NAYS—184

Abernethy	Colmer	Graham
Addonizio	Cooper	Granahan
Albert	Corbett	Grant
Allen, La.	Crawford	Green
Andrews	Crosser	Greenwood
Angell	Crumpacker	Gregory
Bailey	Davis, Tenn.	Hagen
Barden	Deane	Hardy
Baring	DeGraffenried	Harris
Barrett	Delaney	Harrison, Va.
Bates, Ky.	Dempsey	Havenner
Battle	Denton	Hays, Ark.
Beckworth	Dondero	Hays, Ohio
Bennett, Fla.	Dorn	Hébert
Bennett, Mich.	Eberharter	Heller
Blatnik	Elliott	Hill
Boggs, La.	Ellsworth	Hillings
Bolling	Elston	Holifield
Brambiett	Engle	Holmes
Brehm	Evins	Howell
Brooks	Fallon	Ikard
Brown, Ga.	Fenton	Irving
Bryson	Fernandez	Jackson, Wash.
Buckley	Fine	James
Burdick	Fisher	Jones, Ala.
Burnside	Flood	Jones, Mo.
Busbey	Frazier	Judd
Camp	Fugate	Karsten, Mo.
Cannon	Furcolo	Kelley, Pa.
Carnahan	Garmatz	Kelly, N. Y.
Celler	Gathings	Keogh
Chelf	Gavin	Kerr
Chenoweth	Goodwin	Kilday
Chudoff	Gordon	Kirwan
Clemente	Gore	Klein
Lane	O'Brien, Ill.	Sikes
Lanham	O'Toole	Simpson, Pa.
Lantaff	Passman	Smith, Miss.
Lesinski	Patman	Spence
Lind	Patten	Staggers
Lucas	Perkins	Stanley
Lyle	Pickett	Steed
McCarthy	Polk	Stigler
McCulloch	Preston	Stockman
McDonough	Priest	Sutton
McGrath	Rains	Teague
McGuire	Ramsay	Thompson, Mich.
McMullen	Reed, Ill.	Thornberry
Mack, Wash.	Regan	Trimble
Madden	Rhodes	Vinson
Magee	Ribicoff	Walter
Mahon	Rodino	Wier
Mansfield	Rogers, Colo.	Williams, Miss.
Marshall	Rogers, Fla.	Willis
Mills	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Tex.
Morgan	Rooney	Withrow
Morris	Roosevelt	Wood, Ga.
Morrison	Sasscer	Yates
Moulder	Scudder	Yorty
Multer	Sheppard	Zablocki
Murray, Tenn.	Short	
Norrell	Sieminski	

NOT VOTING—101

Anfuso	Heffernan	Patterson
Aspinall	Herlong	Philbin
Bender	Herter	Phillips
Bentsen	Hinshaw	Poage
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman, Ill.	Potter
Bonner	Hope	Powell
Bosone	Hull	Price
Boykin	Hunter	Prouty
Buchanan	Jackson, Calif.	Rabaut
Burleson	Jonas	Reece, Tenn.
Carrigg	Kee	Richards
Case	Kennedy	Riley
Cole, N. Y.	Kersten, Wis.	Rivers
Combs	King, Calif.	Roberts
Cooley	Kluczynski	Robeson
Coudert	Larcade	Sabath
Dawson	McConnell	St. George
Denny	McCormack	Schenck
Dingell	McKinnon	Scott, Hardie
Dollinger	McMillan	Shelley
Donohue	Machrowicz	Smith, Wis.
Donovan	Mack, Ill.	Tackett
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Thompson, Tex.
Feighan	Miller, Md.	Velde
Fogarty	Miller, N. Y.	Watts
Forand	Mitchell	Weichel
Gamble	Morton	Welch
Gary	Murdock	Wheeler
Granger	Murphy	Whitten
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray, Wis.	Wickersham
Hand	O'Brien, Mich.	Wigglesworth
Hart	O'Hara	Winstead
Hedrick	O'Konski	Wolcott
	O'Neill	Woodruff

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Price with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Hand.
Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Case.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Weichel.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Denny.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Hunter.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Kersten.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Riley with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Robeson with Mr. Phillips of California.
Mr. Tackett with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Prouty.
Mr. Watts with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Schenck.
Mr. Wheeler with Mr. Hardie Scott.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Donovan with Mr. Carrigg.

Messrs. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, EGGGS of Louisiana, HAGEN, and CHENOWETH changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. REDDEN, POULSON, BYRNES, WERDEL, MERROW, and JENISON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title III—(H. R. 3015. For the relief of John Fleckstein) by Mr. ROOSEVELT.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and designated to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Fleckstein, of New York City, late an employee in the service of the Isthmian Canal Commission and the Panama Canal, the sum of $1,200 to compensate him for physical disability incident to an injury sustained in December 1912, while in the discharge of his duties in the Canal Zone: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DOLLIVER: Mr. DOLLIVER moves to strike title III.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, it may seem to some that we are laboring at a gnat and swallowing a camel in this procedure on an omnibus bill. However, there is no escape from these minor matters.

On appropriation bills we are generally dealing with billions, while here we are talking about $1,200, in this particular bill. Probably some of you are wondering why this has come to the floor of the House at all. The reason is that this claim dates back to 1912. That is 40 years ago next December. The claim is therefore stale. Under the laws of any State of the Union this claim would long since have been outlawed.

Personally, I do not understand why it is here at all. I do not understand why the great Judiciary Committee would bring this kind of legislation and require the Congress to pass on it. If you go back to 1912, there is no telling what kind of a claim it may be. It is scarcely within the memory of most of the Members of the House of Representatives today.

There is something in the record to indicate this is a justifiable claim; that the man who is making the claim, Mr. Fleckstein, suffered an injury in the Panama Canal in December of 1912. We have nothing on it except what is in the record, and that simply says that he did suffer an injury. The thing that is hard for the objectors on the Private Calendar to understand is why the remedy was not pursued long ago.

As a matter of fact, there is something in the record to indicate that a bill for the relief of this man was passed back in the Seventy-third Congress. That is before most of us were here, but for some reason or other he did not get any recovery at that time. Now, finally, here in the second session of the Eighty-second Congress, nearly 40 years after the injury is alleged to have taken place, we are confronted with a relief bill for $1,200. I have an idea it is going to be said that this claimant is an old man. That necessarily follows. The record shows he is 71 years old and is seriously disabled. Of course, if we allow our merciful and generous sentiments to control us, we will vote against this amendment to strike this part of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is interest to be paid on this since 1912?

Mr. DOLLIVER. No. There is no interest to be paid. It is a flat sum of $1,200. Personally, I have every sympathy for the old gentleman who is concerned, a man 71 years old. But the Treasury of the United States is not a charitable institution, and it seems to me we have got to come to some place where we are going to stop spending the public's money. This is not $1,000,000,000. It is only $1,200, but even that is money.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if it is not your money or my money, why should we not give it to him?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Of course, I cannot subscribe to that kind of doctrine, as my colleague from Michigan well knows. It is not coming out of my pocket or his pocket either, except in the way of taxes, and we probably pay a small portion of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Almost every week I have cases of veterans who cannot prove that their injuries were service-connected, because the records have been lost, but they do not get anything. Should they not have something too? Should I introduce a special bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Perhaps the gentleman should introduce a special bill. That is what was done in this case.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. This case has been before other Congresses time and time again. The Seventy-first Congress did not report it favorably. The Seventy-fourth Congress did not report it. The Seventy-eighth, Seventy-nine, and Eightieth Congresses all refused to report the case favorably.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is correct. This is a stale bill, and the vote is "aye" to strike out the title.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to review the facts in this case very briefly for the benefit of the membership and for the benefit of my very good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, whose attention I would appreciate receiving. This is a very vital matter to the aged gentleman of 73 years, even though it may not be to some of the Members. Mr. Fleckstein suffered a severe injury by straining himself while lifting a heavy shaft in the mechanics shop at Empire in the Canal Zone in the latter part of December 1912, 40 years ago. Shortly thereafter he was admitted to the Colon Hospital in Panama. On January 25, 1913, Mr. Fleckstein's left kidney was removed by Dr. Noland, the chief surgeon of the hospital, and the operation was necessitated, as the records show, because of the effect of the strain he received while working for our Government in the Canal Zone.

As a result of this operation Mr. Fleckstein's health was seriously impaired and his earning capacity was greatly lessened, although he did go back to work for the Canal Zone.

He is now a man of 73 years of age; he is blind in one eye and fast losing the sight of the other, he is generally in ill health, and this ill health is in large measure due to the removal of this kidney as the result of the strain received while working for our Government.

While it is recognized that Mr. Fleckstein's injuries were incurred in 1912, and the subcommittee rule does not permit consideration of any claim which occurred prior to January 1, 1934—all that I agree to—this should in nowise relieve this Congress of its responsibility in this case. The great Committee on the Judiciary has given serious consideration to this case because they recognized a past inequity, and after very close and careful consideration of the circumstances of this case the Committee on the Judiciary has seen fit to waive the rule of not considering any injury that occurred prior to 1934; they have waived that rule, and they reported this bill favorably for your consideration.

I believe it is incumbent upon the Congress of the United States to see that Mr. Fleckstein is compensated even in this small amount of $1,200 after 40 years for injuries received while in the service of our Government, and I urge the passage of H. R. 3015 for his relief.

Let me point out one other important thing: The Federal Employees' Compensation Act was not in effect when this injury occurred; the Federal Employees' Compensation Act did not go into effect until September 7, 1916, 4 years after the injury to this man and some 2 years after his employment in the Canal Zone terminated. If it had been in effect earlier he would have been compensated long ago and would not now be dependent

on your sense of justice, equity, and fair play.

You all have the report on this bill. I think that merely because other Congresses did not act is no reason why this Congress should not recognize the inequity in this case and act to restore the damage done to this man; as a matter of fact, two other Congresses, the Seventy-third and the Eighty-first, did act favorably so far as the House was concerned, and the bill failed because the Senate did not actually get to a consideration of it one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for us to sit here in this House and talk about the necessity of saving the taxpayers' money and keeping the Treasury from spending $1,200. I am for economy just as much as anybody here is. I hope my good friends on my left will take advantage of the Economy Act of 1952 when it comes up and will vote for it. That will be a very good test of your economy-mindedness.

I hope, though, we will not let our penny-pinching instincts overcome our more generous recognition that justice when it is deserved must be done as it has always been done in the past by this Congress. I urge you to vote against this amendment which would strike out this long overdue and just claim.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROOSEVELT) there were—ayes 85, noes 51.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken: and there were—yeas 186, nays 141, not voting 105, as follows:

[Roll No. 27]

YEAS—186

Aandahl	Buffett	Ford
Abbitt	Burton	Forrester
Abernethy	Bush	Fugate
Adair	Butler	Fulton
Allen, Calif.	Byrnes	Gavin
Allen, Ill.	Camp	George
Andersen, H. Carl	Carlyle	Golden
	Chatham	Graham
Andresen, August H.	Chenoweth	Gross
	Chiperfield	Gwinn
Angell	Church	Hale
Arends	Clevenger	Hall, Leonard W.
Armstrong	Cole, Kans.	
Auchincloss	Colmer	Halleck
Ayres	Corbett	Harden
Baker	Cotton	Hardy
Bakewell	Crawford	Harrison, Nebr.
Bates, Mass.	Crumpacker	Harrison, Va.
Beall	Cunningham	Harrison, Wyo.
Beamer	Curtis, Mo.	Harvey
Belcher	Curtis, Nebr.	Heselton
Berry	Dague	Hess
Betts	Davis, Ga.	Hill
Bishop	DeGraffenried	Hillings
Blackney	Devereux	Hinshaw
Bolton	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Bow	Dolliver	Hoffman, Mich.
Brambletl	Dondero	Holmes
Bray	Durham	Horan
Brown, Ga.	Eaton	Ikard
Brown, Ohio	Ellsworth	James
Brownson	Elston	Jarman
Budge	Fenton	Jenison
Jenkins	Nelson	Smith, Kans.
Jensen	Nicholson	Smith, Miss.
Johnson	Norblad	Smith, Va.
Jones, Hamilton C.	Osmers	Springer
	Ostertag	Stanley
Jones, Woodrow W.	Phillips	Stockman
	Poulson	Taber
Judd	Radwan	Talle
Kean	Rankin	Taylor
Kearney	Reams	Thomas
Kearns	Redden	Thompson, Mich.
Keating	Reed, N. Y.	
Kilburn	Rees, Kans.	Tollefson
Latham	Riehlman	Vail
LeCompte	Rogers, Fla.	Van Pelt
Lovre	Rogers, Mass.	Van Zandt
McCulloch	Rogers, Tex.	Vorys
McDonough	Ross	Vursell
McGregor	Sadlak	Werdel
McIntire	St. George	Wharton
McVey	Saylor	Widnall
Mack, Wash.	Schwabe	Williams, Miss.
Martin, Iowa	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Williams, N. Y.
Martin, Mass.		Wilson, Ind.
Mason	Scrivner	Wilson, Tex.
Meader	Scudder	Winstead
Merrow	Seely-Brown	Withrow
Miller, Nebr.	Shafer	Wolverton
Miller, N. Y.	Sheehan	Wood, Ga.
Morano	Short	Wood, Idaho
Mumma	Simpson, Ill.	
Murray, Tenn.	Sittler	

NAYS—141

Addonizio	Furcolo	Marshall
Albert	Garmatz	Mills
Allen, La.	Gathings	Morgan
Andrews	Goodwin	Morris
Anfuso	Gordon	Morrison
Bailey	Gore	Multer
Barden	Granahan	Norrell
Baring	Grant	O'Brien, Ill.
Barrett	Green	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Greenwood	O'Toole
Beckworth	Gregory	Passman
Bennett, Fla.	Hagen	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Patten
Blatnik	Havenner	Perkins
Boggs, La.	Hays, Ark.	Pickett
Brehm	Hays, Ohio.	Polk
Brooks	Heller	Preston
Bryson	Howell	Priest
Buckley	Irving	Rains
Burdick	Jackson, Wash.	Reed, Ill.
Burnside	Javits	Regan
Busbey	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes
Canfield	Karsten, Mo.	Ribicoff
Cannon	Kelley, Pa.	Rodino
Carnahan	Kelly, N. Y.	Rogers, Colo.
Celler	Keogh	Rooney
Chelf	Kerr	Roosevelt
Chudoff	Kilday	Sasscer
Clemente	Kirwan	Secrest
Cooper	Klein	Sieminski
Cox	Kluczynski	Sikes
Crosser	Lane	Spence
Davis, Tenn.	Lanham	Staggers
Deane	Lantaff	Steed
Delaney	Lesinski	Stigler
Dempsey	Lind	Sutton
Denton	Lucas	Teague
Dorn	Lyle	Thornberry
Eberharter	McGrath	Trimble
Elliott	McGuire	Vinson
Evins	McMillan	Walter
Fallon	McMullen	Whitten
Fernandez	Machrowicz	Wier
Fine	Madden	Willis
Fisher	Magee	Yates
Flood	Mahon	Yorty
Frazier	Mansfield	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—105

Anderson, Calif.	Dollinger	Holifield
Aspinall	Donohue	Hope
Battle	Donovan	Hull
Bender	Doughton	Hunter
Bentsen	Doyle	Jackson, Calif.
Boggs, Del.	Engle	Jonas
Bolling	Feighan	Jones, Ala.
Bonner	Fogarty	Kee
Bosone	Forand	Kennedy
Boykin	Gamble	Kersten, Wis.
Buchanan	Gary	King, Calif.
Burleson	Granger	King, Pa.
Carrigg	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Larcade
Case		McCarthy
Cole, N. Y.	Hand	McConnell
Combs	Hart	McCormack
Cooley	Hébert	McKinnon
Coudert	Hedrick	Mack, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Heffernan	Miller, Calif.
Dawson	Herlong	Miller, Md.
Denny	Herter	Mitchell
Dingell	Hoffman, Ill.	Morton
Moulder	Rabaut	Smith, Wis.
Murdock	Ramsay	Tackett
Murphy	Reece, Tenn.	Thompson, Tex.
Murray, Wis.	Richards	Velde
O'Hara	Riley	Watts
O'Konski	Rivers	Weichel
O'Neill	Roberts	Welch
Patterson	Robeson	Wheeler
Philbin	Sabath	Wickersham
Poage	Schenck	Wigglesworth
Potter	Scott, Hardie	Wolcott
Powell	Shelley	Woodruff
Price	Sheppard	
Prouty	Simpson, Pa.	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Battle with Mr. Anderson of California.

Mr. Bolling with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Doughton with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Engle with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bender.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Herter.

Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Ramsay with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. Feighan with Mr. Hand.

Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Gamble.

Mr. Forand with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Gary with Mr. Case.

Mr. Granger with Mr. McConnell.

Mr. Poage with Mr. Hope.

Mr. Philbin with Mr. Wolcott.

Mr. O'Neill with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Miller of Maryland.

Mr. Murdock with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Patterson.

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Hull.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Prouty.

Mr. Winstead with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. HELLER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title IV—(H. R. 1269. For the relief of Boris Kowerda) by Mr. WALTER.

That, notwithstanding the provision of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Boris Kowerda may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. D'EWART moves to strike title IV.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, there is no question as to the facts in this case.

This bill proposes to admit a murderer to the United States. Specifically, the bill waives one exclusion clause of the immigration law regarding the commission of a crime involving moral turpitude, in behalf of Boris Kowerda. He is 43 years old, a native of Poland, of Russian parents, stateless, married, and the father of one child.

On June 7, 1927, Boris Kowerda, an alien then 19 years old, fired six shots at the Soviet Ambassador, in a railroad station at Warsaw, Poland, killing him instantly. The alien was subsequently convicted of the crime of premeditated manslaughter, sentenced to serve life imprisonment. He served 10 years in a slave-labor camp. The alien admits that he took the life of the ambassador with premeditation, acting as a Russian refugee who wanted to punish an official of the Soviet Government.

He is trying to enter this country as a displaced person. There is no question about his being convicted of a crime involving moral turpitude, to wit, homicide, and as one who "believed in the necessity and propriety of the unlawful arrest and the killing of the officers of a recognized government." So there is no question about the murder that was attempted by this alien. He was convicted, served his sentence, and now he wants to enter the United States.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The fact is that a great many of the bills that come on the private calendar are immigration bills, and practically all of them have been very carefully screened by the Judiciary Committee. Here, however, is a bill where the attempt is made to bring in a man who was convicted of murder. It was a political murder; nevertheless, he was guilty of premeditated homicide and apparently adhered to the idea that political homicide was a justifiable means of gaining his end. The question is whether we want that kind of man in this country.

Mr. D'EWART. I do not believe under the definition of the law as I find it that this was a political murder. If it was he could be admitted under another provision of the immigration laws which reads:

> That nothing in this act shall exclude, if otherwise admissible, persons convicted, or who admit the commission of an offense purely political.

There has been no ruling in the courts as to what political offense means, but there has been an interpretation, and I quote this definition from Black's Law Dictionary, citing Second Stephen's Criminal Law, page 70:

> As a designation of a class of crimes usually excepted from extradition treaties, political offenses denotes crimes which are incidental to and form a part of political disturbances; but it might also be understood to include offenses consisting in an attack upon the political order of things established in the country where connected, and even to include offenses committed to obtain any political object.

Neither of these reasons, I think, is applicable in this case.

I cite some of the testimony before the immigration officer who heard the case. This question was asked:

> At the time you took the life of Woykow, did you believe in, advise, advocate, or teach the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers, either of specific individuals, or officers generally, of any organized government, because of their official character?
>
> Answer. I committed this act independently, individually, without being connected with anyone else.

I do not believe the definition applies in this case.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. D'EWART. I yield.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The fact remains, does it not, that this man committed a premeditated homicide; and we are now being asked to permit him to come into this country. He has never been to this country and has no claim whatever upon our citizenship.

Mr. D'EWART. That is the case exactly: The man who murdered the representative of another government asks admission to this country. The question is, Will we admit a man who committed premeditated murder?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I think the matter under consideration now is the most interesting case of its sort the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization has had before it. It is true that Boris Kowerda committed murder, but the Members who offer the amendment to strike this title from the bill neglected to tell you that the victim was the head of the Soviet secret police who was rewarded for his work in murdering the czar and his family by being appointed Ambassador to Warsaw. This man was not a diplomat. He was a cold-blooded murderer, rewarded by the Bolshevik government by being appointed Ambassador to Poland. When he arrived at Warsaw, this 19-year-old school boy, suffering as he did as the result of what he had witnessed before he fled from Russia to Warsaw, shot and killed this man.

It is very significant to bear this fact in mind: He was tried before a three-judge court, not a jury. A jury might have acquitted Kowerda, and the feeling was so strong that this three-judge court, having no alternative to finding him guilty, imposed life imprisonment rather than the death penalty.

He served about 10 years and was pardoned by the President of Poland in 1937. He left Poland and went to Yugoslavia where he was married. Subsequently he was taken by the Germans and put in a slave-labor camp in Germany. After working in that camp for about a year he was liberated by the American forces. He was unquestionably a displaced person.

He, his wife and mother, and his daughter applied for admission to the United States as displaced persons. The mother and his wife and daughter are here. We have just heard it stated that he has no claims on the United States. I do not know how strong this man's claims are, but I have in my hand a picture of a fine looking family broken because, under the law, this man is inadmissible to the United States. As was pointed out, this was not a political offense. If he had acted in consort with anybody else, it would have been a political offense and he would have been admissible to the United States. But, because this boy, upset mentally as he was and acting alone, shot this man who was known as the leader of bloody hands, he is not admissible.

His mother and wife and daughter are in this country living with relatives who own a lettuce farm. The Tolstoy Foundation has put up the money to bring this man over here. I feel that we ought to reunite him with his family and do so by voting against the pending amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and eighteen Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last I addressed the House when we had under consideration the deficiency appropriation bill on a serious situation that had developed in the Government program of assisting school districts that are now impacted, due to Federal defense activities. In order to allow my colleagues of the House to know how serious this situation is I want to read into the RECORD at this time a letter I just received from the Miami Township Public Schools, in Ohio:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN BAILEY: We are in a critical defense area which has meant an increase in school enrollment from activity at Wright-Patterson Field. The increase is getting so large that we have made plans for a new school building. Last Saturday we opened bids and found them in excess of our bond money.
>
> We have applied for Federal aid under Public Law 815. The Office of Education has informed us that Congress will need to vote an immediate supplement of money before we can receive any aid with our priority No. 43. We wish to urge your immediate action on a supplement, as we must start construction this spring.
>
> Thank you for your serious consideration and good luck to you.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> JOHN HALCHIN,
> *Superintendent of Schools.*

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur strongly with the remarks of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY]. The gentleman in my opinion speaks with the greatest of authority on

this serious problem. He has probably done more intelligent and constructive work toward solving the problems of needed assistance to local school districts that any Member of the House.

Legislation passed by Congress last year, under Mr. BAILEY'S leadership, presumably solved a good part of the financial problems of school districts which had a serious impact caused by Federal activities connected with military and other Federal installations. However, to date, the appropriations to implement this legislation have been sufficient only to deal with a few of the more desperately impacted areas. There remain many school districts definitely eligible for and in need of assistance from this program, which have not yet received aid for construction and operation of schools because of the grossly inadequate size of the appropriations to date.

In the Fourth Congressional District of New Jersey, which I represent, and particularly in parts of Burlington County in the neighborhood of the large military posts of McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix, many school districts have not been able to receive financial assistance for which they are indisputably eligible because of the serious inadequacy of funds thus far made available.

With the imminence of an additional new and huge Air Force Supply Depot and MATS Terminal in lower Burlington County, this problem will become more seriously aggravated for districts such as Mount Holly Township, and many other Burlington school districts.

I have hopes that the Senate will include some immediate additional funds for this purpose in the third supplemental appropriation bill now before them, and that the House will concur in providing these seriously needed funds as speedily as possible.

TRIBUTE TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a member of the staff of the New York Herald Tribune, Mrs. Helen Waller, gave me a copy of a letter that was presented to the President of the United States on the occasion of his address to the student editors. It is signed by a delegation of students from 16 countries of the Middle East and Asia. It is such a beautiful tribute to the United States and indicates such insight into our purposes in the world that I wish to commend it to the membership of the House. The students say in this letter that they have a greater faith in mankind as the result of the things they have seen here. I think by reason of the trip that the New York Herald Tribune sponsored for these students that we have made new friends in Asia and that will help us interpret American policies to their people.

The letter is as follows:

NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE
FORUM FOR HIGH SCHOOLS,
New York City, March 15, 1952.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We, the nationally selected student representatives of 16 countries of the Middle East and Asia, whose combined population is more than 750,000,000, would like to tell you how our discovery of America has modified and changed our beliefs, and made us realize many new things.

We now have greater faith in mankind, perhaps. We have more respect and faith in the basic goodness of humanity than we otherwise would have attained. Everywhere here we have found a conscious or subconscious desire for better life. The aspiration for the future is never ending. This overwhelms the undesirable things we have seen here.

Before we came we were patriotic and nationalist in the way every person is. But only after coming here do we find ourselves really thinking about our countries and our people. We now know what is wanting in our countries and how big our problems are. We have also become prouder of our own people and the efforts they are making.

Never before have we experienced this same feeling of being useful. When we return, we shall be more actively interested in the welfare of our people. We have a better idea of our responsibilities to our countries than we had 3 months ago.

There is one thing more. Before we came here, we never thought of the future in terms of the world, or of mankind. Now, we sometimes find ourselves thinking of humanity as a whole.

We ask you to give our thanks to the American people who helped us to understand these things.

THE PRESIDENT'S BOOK

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, years ago they used to tell the American boy that he might some day be President of the United States. That was an inspiring thought. Now along comes a book from a President of the United States telling what it takes to be President. As I get the advance notices of the book, it does not seem to take too much to be a President, only essential is, that you get the right number of votes both in party convention and at the election, and you are in.

I could go along with the President on his theory Congressmen should be limited to 12 years in office, if some of those downtown who give so much inefficiency, waste, and extravagance, and I might add just a little by way of corruption, too, would have to get out at the end of 12 years. That would be necessary, for it takes the Congress more than 12 years to catch up with them. When you do have cases like that one in New York now, where another collector has just been removed, it does seem Congressmen should be on the job long enough to uncover the crookedness in Federal agencies. The President fires one man up there because he was a crook, and he puts in another one. This second one is doing the same thing or something which requires that he be ousted.

The President ought to put a chapter in his book about how to select public officials, even when they are to be confirmed by the Senate, because there seems to have been a lot of inefficiency in appointing faithful, competent public servants.

And about 12 years being enough the President seems to be doing a lot of fluttering about that as it affects the Presidency.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

TVA'S METHODS OF PURCHASING COAL SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any Member of the House would doubt my support of TVA. About a year ago, my distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRED COUDERT offered an amendment to the independent offices appropriations bill to reduce the TVA appropriation $12,500,000. I felt that this reduction would seriously hamper TVA in starting the new steam plant at Kingston, Tenn. I opposed the amendment on the floor, and several of my Democratic colleagues from Tennessee gave me their time and I made a 6-minute speech. The amendment was defeated by Republican votes. Since that time, I have been called Mr. TVA by some of my Republican colleagues. You know that I have always told you that regardless of your views on TVA, my State of Tennessee and six other southern States are absolutely dependent on TVA for electric power because of the enactments of the Congress, and that the question in your minds as to whether TVA should or should not have been authorized by the Congress of the United States is moot.

You conceived and gave birth to the child. You must support it, but you should exercise your parental responsibility and authority, and you are not doing that.

TVA, generally speaking, has done a good job. They have had many fine directors and executives. It is my considered judgment that the two incumbent members of the Board are capable men. President Truman should, without further delay, nominate the third member of the Board to fill the vacancy which has existed now many months too long. This third member should be a man who knows something about coal, because now the problems of TVA are more interrelated with coal, the basic industry of America than with hydroelectric power. TVA has almost exhausted its sources of producing electricity by water power, and to meet the demands

placed upon it by the Congress of producing electric energy for war plants such as the atomic energy plants at Oak Ridge and elsewhere and the great aluminum plant at Alcoa, Tenn., it has been necessary for TVA to turn to steam plants to produce the needed electric power. I am sure that there is a shortage in electric power in Tennessee, and that no new industry of consequence can be established there unless TVA can produce much more electric power.

Now, let us as responsible Members of Congress face the situation squarely and not be content to undertake to shift the burden or the praise. The United States of America, which we all represent, has more than a billion dollars invested in TVA. We have recently been appropriating around $250,000,000 a year to maintain TVA. Expenditures of that size justify a serious look.

I hope that my remarks will not be misinterpreted by my colleagues on both sides of the House who are unalterably opposed to TVA, and I know that there are many of you, both Republican and Democratic Members, who simply vote against TVA and its requested appropriations because it is TVA.

I shall support all reasonable requests of TVA for needed appropriations and feel that each of you should do so, but I certainly feel that much more light should be turned on these requests. I feel that TVA has made a serious mistake in its method of procuring coal for its steam plants. The Kingston plant, now in construction stage, is located literally at the mouth of the mines of the eastern Tennessee and southeastern Kentucky coal field, one of the great coal fields of America with dozens of fine established, solvent operating companies employing thousands of fine experienced coal miners, now operating 1 or 2 days a week due to depressed market conditions, and yet not one of these established experienced operating companies, not a single member of the Southern Appalachian Coal Operators Association received an award of any consequence from TVA in their recent lettings, involving millions of tons of coal. The contracts were awarded in some instances to corporations formed as recently as 3 days before the bid date to companies without assets, without coal and without performance bonds. I believe in competitive bidding and, certainly, want the United States to get coal or any commodity at the lowest possible price, but it seems to me that it is bad business judgment to contract for coal with companies who have no coal and who must depend on buying coal on a depressed market to supply the needs of this agency. Of course, when they cannot buy the coal and make a profit, they will say to TVA: "We are sorry, conditions have changed; you will have to buy your coal elsewhere at spot coal prices considerably higher than regular contract prices." This is what I call, to be charitable, artificial bookkeeping. TVA by its purchasing practices has completely ignored the great proverb east Tennessee and southeastern Kentucky developed coal fields. In the meantime, many, many thousands of fine coal miners are out of work in east Tennessee and southeast Kentucky.

TVA's plans and methods of making coal contracts must be investigated. The Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations has already taken notice of this situation and I believe that this subcommittee should continue their investigation to a final conclusion. It is my recommendation that these hearings be open public meetings and that they be held in Knoxville, Tenn., where both personnel and records of TVA and the coal companies are available. It may be interesting to my colleagues to know that I asked permission to attend this meeting of the Appropriations Subcommittee last week, but was told that the hearing was in executive session. I cannot see why a matter of such importance should be closed to a Member of Congress or to the public. This subcommittee should make sure that they obtain all facts that are related to these matters without delay. I urge that this request be granted.

SHORTAGES OF NURSES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, in the face of the critical shortage of nurses, the decision of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning to table H. R. 910, the bill to help produce nurses is a very disappointing one. I particularly regret that bill was not given more thorough study and consideration by the committee as a whole. But I want to take a moment to express my very deep appreciation to the distinguished chairman the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] and to those Members who fought valiantly to put it through.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, the tabling of the bill does nothing to solve the problem of getting more girls into nursing schools, provide adequate teaching staffs, and bring them through to active duty. It is my hope that the members of the committee who were not in favor of this particular measure, recognizing the urgency of national need, will want to discuss the matter with me in order to see whether an alternative bill cannot be brought in. The fact that the Senate has a bill might prove a way of giving further consideration to a possible solution.

Certainly the realization that a constantly lower ratio of nurses to need means that lives will be in ever increasing danger makes some solution seem imperative. In my own city of Cleveland and the surrounding suburbs, they are short a thousand nurses today. Hospital wards are being closed for lack of them. In addition there is the anticipation of having four new hospitals ready for occupancy within the next 18 months. What is happening in Cleveland is happening in varying degrees in all too many areas.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield gladly to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. If the committee does not like your method, I hope it will suggest some other method because something has to be done about the nursing shortage.

Mrs. BOLTON. It is just such suggestions I am hoping will be brought forward. I thank the gentleman very much for emphasizing this point.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield time during the course of my remarks and retain the floor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time today to bring to the attention of the House a resolution, which I have introduced, which is now pending in the Committee on Rules. The resolution provides that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs acting as a whole or by subcommittee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, with particular reference to the manner in which the Bureau has performed its functions, studying the various tribes, bands, and groups of Indians in order to determine those which are qualified to manage their own affairs without supervision and control of the Federal Government. The committee shall report to the House, or the Clerk of the House, if it is not in session, as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of this investigation and study, together with recommendations it deems advisable. Such reports shall include a list of those Indian tribes, bands, and groups, which are found to be qualified to be relieved of all Federal supervision and control in the management of their affairs, and shall contain specific legislative proposals designed for the ultimate orderly termination of Federal supervision and control over the Indians at the earliest possible time.

The committee shall further report, together with the recommended legislation, such steps by which further operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs may be discontinued. The committee shall further report on functions now carried on by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which may be discontinued or transferred to other agencies of the Federal Government or delegated to the States. The committee shall further recommend legislation that shall provide for competency of those Indians now legally incompetent.

Then, there are the usual provisions giving authority to the committee to sit

during adjournments of the Congress, and to have a staff to carry on this investigation.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman has introduced this resolution, which he has just described. It so happens that without any prior consultation with the gentleman who has introduced this legislation calling for an investigation of the Indian Bureau, I, myself, today have put in a resolution also calling for an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs on another subject. But, I think the two subjects, the subject of the gentleman's resolution and the subject of my resolution, could be very well combined in one resolution for an investigation.

The citizens of Oregon are highly incensed over recent revelations in the press concerning the disposition of Indian lands held in trust by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, indicating either a gross negligence on the part of Bureau officials or that such officials knowingly permitted, encouraged, or participated in sales violating the obligation of trust imposed by law.

My attention was called to this situation late last year when I was at home in my district. Since that time, I have been gathering information concerning the practices involved in the disposition of Indian lands. Recent stories in the press were devoted primarily to a single case. Were this a matter of an isolated instance, I should not be calling the attention of the House to this situation today. The facts are, however, that there are repeated instances of disposition of lands at a fraction of their value; the failure to use public notices or bid procedures; the use of third parties in land transactions who have profited handsomely for lending their names to give the color of legality to such sales.

Unpatented Indian lands are held in trust by the Bureau of Indian Affairs of the Department of Interior, and the relationship between the Federal Government and individual Indians and tribes is that of guardian and ward. In carrying out this obligation of guardianship, officials of the Government have a fixed legal responsibility to act as reasonably prudent men in carrying out their trust. Negligence or connivance on the part of such officials in the handling of such property fixes a liability under law upon the guardian, which in this case is the United States Government, to restore to the ward any losses suffered by negligence or misfeasance of the trust.

If the property of a ward is disposed of for a fraction of its reasonable value, no technicality, no color of legality, no rule or regulation imposed by the guardian can be relied upon as an excuse for failure to perform the trust.

There are repeated instances in the State of Oregon where the properties of Indians, wards of the United States Government, have been sold at a fraction of their value. In the most widely publicized instance, documents of record show that 800 acres of timberlands, which were approved for sale by the Indian Bureau, involved the transfer of property rights through three separate transactions on the same day the Indian Bureau approved the initial arrangement. Interestingly and peculiarly, the Indian Bureau placed a restriction on the resale of the lands to non-Indians; but nonetheless a warranty deed, transferring title in fee simple to non-Indians was executed on the same day. All three documents bear the date of August 7, 1951. On August 9, 1951, two days after the execution of the warranty deed, there was entered upon the record a document executed by the Indian Bureau removing the restrictions against sale of the lands to non-Indians.

The Indian wards of the Government received $135,000 for their property. The intermediary purchaser immediately resold for $165,000. The second purchaser immediately gave an option to third parties to purchase in the amount of $300,000 and the option holder thereafter offered the same lands to prospective purchasers for the reported sum of $800,000. Bona fide offers from interested purchasers ready, willing, and able to buy had been made to the Indian Bureau in amounts two or three times the price approved by the Indian Bureau. Competent appraisers and experts on the value of timberland express certainty that the lands were worth at least three times the amount approved by the Indian Bureau. One party who acted as intermediary in the transaction has indicated that $25,000 was paid for that service.

I have in my possession the copy of official record of another transaction approved by the Indian Bureau. This record recites the appraisal value placed on the lands by the Indian Bureau. Disregarding its own appraisal of the property, the Bureau acknowledges receipt as payment in full for the lands an amount equal to just one-half the appraisal value. Bona fide prospective purchasers had previously offered to negotiate for or bid for the same property at a price six times that approved by the Indian Bureau. I have photostat copies of correspondence from the Indian Bureau replying to inquiries from purchasers telling such prospective purchasers that the lands could be sold by bid only and that they would be notified. The lands were later sold without any notification and without any advertisement or bid procedure.

I have been told that there are instances where non-Indians have produced apparently valid deeds to Indian lands wherein the Indian ward involved knew nothing about any negotiations for the disposition of his property.

This is not only a matter of concern to the people of Oregon but it is a concern of the people of the United States and of the Congress. Wherein any property held in trust for the benefit of an Indian or a tribe has been disposed of in such a way as to violate the trust imposed by law, the owner of that property has a right of recovery against the Government or against those parties who participated in any such practice. In either event, there is a clear obligation upon the Government to take measures to stop such practices and to assure that they will not occur again in the future.

Accordingly, I am introducing a resolution in the House today calling upon the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee to investigate the sale of Indian lands in the State of Oregon; to make any recommendations to Congress for changes in the law as may be necessary; and to make any recommendations to the Attorney General which may be deemed warranted as a basis for action by the Department of Justice.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman. I am sure that we can join in the resolution that the gentleman has referred to.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman for introducing a resolution such as this. The study, I think, should be done not by a new committee, but by the committee already handling Indian affairs. I believe the record shows that about 160 years ago, the Congress appropriated some $40,000 to take care of Indians, and today it is appropriating $122,000,000 or more. A dozen Commissioners of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the past have said, "We will get the Indians off free. We are going to give them their freedom, and make them full-time citizens of the United States." But the Indian Bureau grows and grows, and there are some 5,000 laws and treaties governing the Indians. It becomes more and more complicated. I hope something can be done. We need no more new laws, but we need to put into operation the recommendations that have already been made. Your study might well bring that about. It is worth while.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming. I want to join with others in commending the gentleman upon his action in introducing House Resolution 571. I believe this to be a very important resolution and a very necessary one. I think its provisions are necessary if we Members of Congress are to be able to obtain necessary information relative to the conditions of tribes of Indians in this country, when they can receive their rights and privileges, and how soon others can receive their rights and privileges also. It seems to me inconsistent that we in this country boast so proudly in foreign countries about our constitutional rights and privileges while we as Americans keep in bondage the first Americans who were in this country when our forefathers arrived here. I do hope we will be able sometime in the near future to relieve that situation.

I might say that the gentleman and I are both members of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, and I knew that he feels as I have felt, sitting there listening to the pleas of some tribes of Indians who come here asking for a small per capita payment to them, of their own funds. It seems to me a very, very unfair situation that those Indians who have funds of their own, who have been kept in bondage so long, should be forced to come before the Congress of the

United States and beg for a small part of that money to be given to them for their own use.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MORRIS. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say to the distinguished gentleman who is now addressing the House that I agree with him wholeheartedly, that a study of this problem should be made. There is not any question about that. The gentleman being a member of our committee, of course, is acquainted with the fact that our colleague, the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] has introduced House Resolution 8.

Mr. BOW. I have that before me, and I will say to my colleague I intend to discuss it, in her absence. It is unfortunate that the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] is unable to be present today to discuss this resolution.

Mr. MORRIS. That is correct. That resolution authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior to study the respective tribes, bands, and groups of Indians under his jurisdiction, to determine their qualifications to manage their own affairs, without supervision and control by the Federal Government. Your resolution would seek to do the same thing, or substantially the same thing, except that your resolution, as I understand it, would authorize and direct a full and complete investigation and study of the activities and operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee or by subcommittee.

Mr. BOW. Committee of Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MORRIS. Now, it seems to me that the proper procedure would be to follow Judge BOSONE's resolution with your resolution. I want to make a short comment on it. It seems to me that we should first permit the Bureau itself to make this study and present it to our committee, which I assume would be the proper committee. Then, after they had made such a report, for us to determine whether or not they had done a good job of it; whether or not sufficient ground had been covered, and then, after they have made a report, if we determine that the report is not full enough or is not moving swiftly enough in the direction that we all want to go, which is the eventual elimination of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, if we determine it is not moving rapidly enough, by that report, or if the report is not sufficiently comprehensive, of course your resolution would be very much in point.

Then, this final observation, and I shall conclude. I thank the gentleman for giving me this opportunity.

I am of the opinion that the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs is definitely, sincerely, and actively moving in the direction that we want to go; there is no question in my mind but what he is doing that, and I know that at this particular time the Bureau is about ready to present to the proper committee of this House bills that will definitely relieve the Bureau of any supervision in certain areas of the United States, particularly the State of California and some other States; so I think there is no question in the world but what we ought to move in the direction that this gentleman's resolution suggests. But I do believe the best way, the most orderly way, the most efficient way would be to proceed as I have suggested, for this reason—and I conclude with this thought—They are prepared to do a good job; whether they will or not remains to be seen, but they are prepared to do it. If we start out before we received their report we might be in the position of having to spend large sums of money to accomplish this same thing. Not only would we have to spend large sums of money, but we would have to use time that I doubt the committee will have; so I suggest that the gentleman is definitely correct, but that I believe the resolution offered by the gentlewoman from Utah should precede that offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman now yield, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. BOW. I wish to say just a few words; then I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

It is very seldom I differ with my distinguished chairman; in this instance I do, and I should like to state very frankly why I differ with him.

The objectives of the Bosone resolution are the emancipation of the American Indian—with that I agree. It does not provide for any further examination into other activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and it is an investigation by the Bureau of Indian Affairs itself; it is the old question of whether a department or agency of the Government can properly investigate itself. I do not think it can. The matter of this emancipation becomes a question of legislation by the Congress of the United States, and it is the duty of the Members of Congress to make the investigation to determine the proper legislation.

Let me express one further thought and then I will yield to the gentleman from Nebraska: On the question of expense, I am convinced that the record will show that the Congress of the United States does a job of this kind much more inexpensively than a bureau of the Government. Let me point out that in the Bosone resolution there is a provision that $75,000 of appropriated funds shall be used for the investigation by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. I submit to the House that a proper subcommittee of the House of Representatives could at a great deal lower cost do a much more effective job of determining the functions of the Bureau and what legislation we should pass. I do not believe we should authorize the expenditure of $75,000 within the Bureau to tell us what legislation we should pass.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I just wanted to remark that over the past 150 years there have been no less than a dozen examinations of the problem by the Bureau itself. The Indian Commissioners come up with very fine words:

"We are going to emancipate the Indians; they are going to have full citizenship."

It has cost a lot of money but I think the records also show that after every investigation requests for appropriations have gone up from 50 to 75 percent after the investigation by the Indian Bureau. They are not going to legislate themselves out of business.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, a member of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman, and I wish to compliment him for the bill he has introduced. As the gentleman knows, I have been a member of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations for the past 10 years dealing with this Indian problem and I know something about the Indian Bureau and something about the Indians of this Nation. It is noteworthy that of all the Indians who have appeared before our committee in the past 10 years with hardly a single exception they have asked our committee either to cut out the appropriation for their tribe or to reduce the appropriation drastically.

I think the best proof that one can find as to why the Congress should be given this power to make the investigation was demonstrated during the last session of the Eightieth Congress. I had the honor of being chairman of the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations that year. On that committee was the very able gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE]. Knowing full well that Mr. SCHWABE was thoroughly acquainted with the Indian problem owing to the fact that Oklahoma has, I believe, more Indians than any State in the Union, and Mr. SCHWABE having had much dealing with the Indians of his State, I delegated to him the complete authority of the committee to make complete investigation and to bring in any Indians or any other people from the Bureau or from anywhere in the United States that he deemed proper to bring in.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] had 10 days of hearings and really got the facts. The gentlemen from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER and Mr. SCHWABE] held hearings in the State of Oklahoma and they came up with a lot of answers.

Mr. SCHWABE recommended to the committee the abolition of a certain number of district offices and a regional office or two. He made many changes which saved a lot of money and this was very pleasing to the Indians of every reservation. In other words, Mr. SCHWABE put the Indian Bureau on a commonsense administrative setup and he wrote certain language into the bill, he wrote certain directives that the Bureau should do, and it has been testified by the heads of many Indian reservations that that bill was the best bill the Congress ever passed for the Indians, even though we cut down their appropriations considerably.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] deserves a great deal of credit for the fine work he did and if this committee which the gentleman suggests is set up, I hope he will recommend people on the investigatory staff who will

have considerable knowledge of the Indian problem because certainly it is a problem. Many of these Indians should be emancipated. I will say that most of them could be emancipated within the next 5 years if this investigation is made and a report is brought to the Congress. There are a few tribes which could not be emancipated in that length of time, such as the Navajo Tribe—it will take longer for them—but a great majority of them could be emancipated to the benefit of the Indians and the Treasury in 5 years if the gentleman's bill is adopted by the Congress.

Certainly I do not want the Indian Bureau to have the authority to carry on this investigation.

As the gentleman from Nebraska just said, at regular intervals over the past 150 years the Indian Bureau has come up with reorganization programs and reorganization programs, and every time that they have put one into effect the mess becomes more of a stench.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. I call the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa to the fact that the Bosone resolution is not in the nature of an investigation. It is in the nature of an authorization and a direction to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to make a report, but not in the nature of an investigation.

Mr. JENSEN. I understand that, but this Congress needs no report, in my opinion. The things we are to look for is this rot and this maladministration and the things which are done by the Indian Bureau that are so foreign to good business principles and common decency, and we need no report from the Indian Bureau, I will tell the gentleman, because there are plenty of Members of this Congress that could write a program today without an investigation that would beat any report the Indian Bureau would bring in.

Mr. MORRIS. Of course I cannot agree with my distinguished friend from Iowa on that at all. I think the present Commissioner and the Associate Commissioner and the top men generally in the Eureau of Indian Affairs are men of the very highest character. I think, as a matter of fact, the present Commissioner is a man of unimpeachable character; not only that, but he is a man of outstanding ability, and he is a man of diligence, and I think definitely, fully and completely that he will do a good job. I feel that from the bottom of my heart. I feel if we are not careful in regard to our procedure here that we will do a great injury to the Indians themselves. I feel definite on that.

Mr. JENSEN. I hope the gentleman is not contending that this Congress or any committee of this Congress would do anything knowingly to the detriment of the Indians of this country.

Mr. MORRIS. Certainly, I would not contend that they would knowingly do so, but if a procedure is followed that is not a feasible and proper method, we will do it despite the fact of our good intentions.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. I want to agree with the chairman of our subcommittee on one thing only, and that is, that Mr. Dillon Myer is, without question, one of the best Indian Commissioners that I have had the privilege to come in contact with. I certainly am not questioning his integrity, and I think that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will admit that this resolution is certainly no reflection upon Mr. Dillon Myer individually. However, the resolution does proceed in an orderly fashion and that is that this Congress should do the job they are supposed to do. They are to get the facts on which to legislate. In deference to what the gentleman stated, he stated it is instructing the department to give us certain information. Well, they should give us that information any way. They have had it all of these years. They are presenting bills before the committee for the purpose of emancipating certain tribes of Indians. I think the Bosone bill is nothing but an idle gesture to say that the department should do something which they are supposed to do now. In this way Congress is merely getting the information for its own use to compare with the information which the bureau will give and that, of course, is the proper way for Congress to go about it. I wholeheartedly support the Bow resolution, and I think that the Bosone resolution is just an idle gesture.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the Delegate from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that the gentleman from Ohio, during his period of service on the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, has been a real student of Indian problems and has become a real authority on them. He always has been imbued with the desire to help the Indian people. The people of Alaska had occasion to realize that when the hospital at Bethel was destroyed by fire, and the gentleman from Ohio gave such help in making it possible for the structure to be replaced.

The gentleman traveled widely throughout Alaska last year as a member of a subcommittee holding hearings on a bill to settle native land claims within the Territory. I might add that he was a most valued member of that subcommittee.

May I ask the gentleman if he would not agree with me that, generally speaking, the native people of Alaska, who by and large do not live on reservations, are much better positioned than those in the States who have been forced to lead a reservation life, and that they are not in bondage, as the saying goes, to the extent that the Indian people in the States are. I would appreciate very much the gentleman's comments on that.

Mr. BOW. I agree with the gentleman that that is true in Alaska. That is one reason why I want this emancipation, to get these people off the reservations and let them begin to be assimilated into our way of life here. I expect to touch on that a little further as I go along.

Mr. BARTLETT. The fact is, of course, that efforts have been made by certain individuals not living in Alaska to have adopted for the Territory a reservation policy which many of us who are friends of the Indians feel would be destructive and detrimental to their best interests.

Mr. BOW. I think that is quite right. I can assure the gentleman that I certainly would not support or approve any reservations for the Indians in Alaska.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. This question of the Indian problem has been before this country since the early days of our history. It was Benjamin Franklin who reported to the Albany Congress of 1754 that—

> Many quarrels and wars have arisen between the colonies and the Indian nations through the bad conduct of traders who cheat the Indians after making them drunk.

Jefferson in his time faced the problem and had this to say:

> Encourage them to abandon hunting, to apply themselves to the raising of stock, to agriculture and domestic manufacture. The ultimate point of rest and happiness for them, is to let our settlements and theirs meet and blend together, to intermix, and become one people.

I think that is the objective today of the resolutions offered by both the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow]. I think both these resolutions are good. I think it is fine that they have been introduced, because they represent a change from the point of view that we have found for years in the administration of the Indian Bureau.

The passage of the Wheeler-Howard Act, which I think was a step in the wrong direction, was the last official policy act of the Congress dealing with these Indians in an over-all way. It widened and extended in actuality if not legally the domination of the Indian Bureau

So we come here today with two resolutions, one offered by the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] and one by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], that pinpoint the fact that we have been traveling in the wrong direction and that the time has come to change our direction and head away from further domination of the Indians, to make them independent and give them the right to manage their own business.

I have been on this committee for a number of years and have made a study of these several problems. It seems to me that we can approach the difficulty that faces us with respect to Indians in four ways:

First, we could go out of certain States. We could end the Indian Bureau activities in some of the States. I have in mind New York and California. Certainly no one will argue that we should longer be in those States.

Then we should get out of certain reservations. We should insist that the Indians on those reservations organize in some way under State law and get completely out from under the Indian Bureau. I have in that category the Klamath Reservation.

Then we should end certain functions. Services that the Indian Bureau now perform should no longer be performed by that Bureau. I have in mind the highway program, that could just as well be carried on by the counties or by the States or by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Then I have in mind the school program. It is to the credit of the Indian Bureau that they are at this time trying to get the States to assume the education of Indians.

I have a bill that will be before the Congress in a few days in regard to law and order and making it possible for the States to assume more of that responsibility.

Lastly, I think we should approach this problem by giving certain of the Indians who are able and qualified, and desire it, an opportunity to end wardship and to be declared competent Indians rather than noncompetent. By that I mean, competent in the legal sense, because they are all competent at this time. So we have this problem before us, it is one that we have not been making progress in over the years, but it is a problem which because of Mr. Bow's resolution we will have an opportunity to go forward on. I compliment the gentleman on his efforts toward that end.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like also to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for the statement he is making here today, the speech he is delivering to the House. I would also like to compliment Judge BOSONE for the resolution she has introduced in the House. As I take it, both resolutions have for their purpose making the Indians free of wardship and getting out from under the trusteeship of the Federal Government. Of course, that is a very worthy project. We hope it will come about in the near future. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not correct that the resolution introduced by the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] provides for a study by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or the Secretary of the Interior, and for a report to the committee or to the Congress toward emancipating the Indians—purely a study and a report—and I understand further that your resolution calls for an investigation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and also the getting of evidence and facts and data together toward finally emancipating the Indians? I wonder if those two can work hand in hand. If you try to make them both work along in the same operation, would they not probably eventually block each other, and tend to lengthen or extend the time that it will take the Indians to be freed from the trusteeship of the Federal Government?

Mr. BOW. I think in answer to the gentleman, I can say that under the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Ohio, it is a little broader. It takes in more ground than does the Bosone resolution. It is designed to give the States all we can, giving the States all the functions that we can be relieved of in the Indian Bureau, and those that might be delegated to other departments of the Government. I feel that with that complete and over-all investigation, we can reach our objective much sooner than by paying out possibly $75,000 for a report within the Bureau, which I understand they should, perhaps, be able to make now.

Mr. McMULLEN. Does not your resolution call for an investigation of the department?

Mr. BOW. It calls for an investigation of the department, the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. McMULLEN. I am not saying that it does not need investigation, possibly it does, I do not know. But I am wondering if the two will work hand in hand.

Mr. BOW. One would be done by the Bureau itself, and one would be done by the Congress.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Bosone resolution only calls for a study and a report to see which Indians and which tribes and bands are capable of managing their own affairs.

Mr. BOW. I would say this to the gentleman in all honesty, that the information received by the Bosone resolution certainly would be helpful to any committee making the study under the Bow resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. I again want to commend the gentleman and also the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] for the two resolutions they have introduced. I think they pinpoint the problem very well.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, first, however, it is well to point out some general information with respect to all Indians which will tend to point out the general Indian problems and their causes. The Indians in the United States exist today on a standard of living far below that of the average white citizen of the United States. Some of the principal causes are lack of proper capital for improvement of their material conditions, education, isolation, health, and heirship status of land.

The majority of the Indians of the United States are isolated due to the reservations upon which they have been placed by the Government of the United States. In almost every instance these reservations are made up of land which is unsuitable for human existence. For example, both on the Papago and Navajo reservations it is estimated that the land resources will only support one-half the population that now exists on such reservations.

There are poor roads in and to the reservations, and even poorer roads, if any at all, within many reservations. Further, the Indians do not have the means of transportation to become associated with the world outside; as a result they find it difficult to acclimate themselves to the ways of the outside world.

By and large the Indians of one-half or more degree Indian blood are not educated to the extent of being capable to compete with the average citizen of the United States in either the business or the agricultural fields. Because of this lack of education, there is a backwardness to see the advantages of improving their material conditions. There is a backwardness to see the advantage in educating the younger children.

In the United States today there are somewhere between 12,000 and 14,000 Indian children of school age for whom no school facilities are available. Such school facilities in many instances have been promised the Indians and have been so agreed to by treaty agreement between the Government of this country and the Indians.

I think one of the most appalling things, insofar as the Indian is concerned, is the statistics on health conditions on the reservations. I shall not take the time to discuss that in detail, but I should like to point out to the House that the tubercular rate among many of the Indian tribes is about 250 per 100,000. It is about 40 per 100,000 with the white man. On the Papago Reservation in Arizona, where our wards live, the life expectancy of an Indian born today is 17 years. They are our wards and our responsibility. The health conditions are such, and they have been kept in those areas of reservation so that their life expectancy today is 17 years, as compared with the white man of about 60 years. One out of every four of the babies die at childbirth on the reservations, for which we are responsible. They are our wards. We are their guardians. It is not a very good record of guardianship.

The thing that concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that although we give lip service and talk about the emancipation of the Indians and getting them off the reservations and doing all those things that we claim we will do for them; nevertheless, every year, instead of the Indian Bureau being liquidated or being cut down in size, it is getting bigger and bigger. More people are on the payroll to propagandize against the eventual abolishment of that Bureau.

Last year $68,379,512 was the budget. Sixty-eight million dollars last year. The budget request this year is for $122,000,000, or 80 percent greater than the budget last year. To me, that is not liquidation or cutting down or elimination of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

I am told that they want some 4,000 additional employees. All of this, if you please, for the guardianship of 435,000 Indians. I feel, Mr. Speaker, it is time that this House does something more than to accept the statement that we are going to get rid of these Indian problems; that we are going to eliminate the Indian Bureau. It is time we did something about it, and got some legislation to accomplish that. If we are going to cut down huge expenditures in the Federal Government, this is one place we can do it without adversely affecting anyone in the Nation, by doing the thing that we should do for the Indians.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is rather a typical story of socialism. I am not accusing the Bureau of Indian Affairs of being socialistic, or the membership or those who direct it, but here we have 435,000 American Indians, with complete Government protection and direction of their everyday life. They are given their roads, their schools; their life is completely one of a paternalistic government, at a much higher cost than the ordinary government. And their conditions are worse than any other place under our flag. Let us get rid of the socialism and the idea that we must be paternalistic, and bring them into our own society. I think we will render a great service to our Nation by doing this.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McMULLEN. Can the gentleman tell the House what is included in the increase asked from $68,000,000 last year to $122,000,000 this year?

Mr. BOW. There are increases in items for health, education, and things of that kind, which could be delegated to the local communities. They do not need to be done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I have promised to yield time to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. McMULLEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one further observation?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. McMULLEN. I agree with what the gentleman has said about emancipating the Indians, but does not the gentleman think that if health conditions are as bad as the gentleman has described—and I know it to be correct—does he not think that our country can afford to spend $122,000,000 on the Indians if we can afford to spend seven to eight billions in foreign countries?

Mr. BOW. I pointed out in the speech I made on this floor last year, the money we have been spending on hospitals in the four corners of the earth and how we have been sending health teams to the four corners of the earth, there is no reason why we could not spend a part of that money on our own wards. In the Papago Reservation the hospital burned 5 years ago, and it still has not been replaced. All these things would be avoided if we emancipated them and got them out into our scheme of life, and we would not need this $122,000,000 annual appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 23 minutes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend heartily the gentleman from Ohio for introducing this resolution, and I commend also those of my colleagues who are interested in this question and have spoken here this afternoon. It seems to me that this situation stems from a great many mistakes that have been made in regard to our treatment of the Indians. I think one of the greatest mistakes was putting them on reservations without any plan to help them work out their freedom. The reservations were set up and populated before the War Between the States and have been continued to the present time. They have been little better than concentration camps, where members of a minority group were concentrated. The idea was first to keep them under the military control. Then it seemed to be the easiest way just to keep them there under the paternalistic care of the Federal Government.

Other mistakes were made such as that in 1902 when the Congress and the Indian Commissioner himself serving under Theodore Roosevelt declared after a long study of this problem that it was time to abolish the Indian Bureau and to set these Indians free to give them full rights of citizenship as rapidly as they could assume those rights. Unfortunately the advice of that Indian Commissioner was not taken. The Indian Bureau, then spending about $3,000,000 a year was considered a terrible burden upon the people, but no moves were made to set the Indians free at that time.

Another great mistake was made in 1925 when Congress passed a resolution declaring that the Indians of this country were full citizens and were to have all rights of citizenship. Unfortunately that proved to be an empty gesture because at the same time Congress kept the Indian Bureau with its full control over the life of the Indians. There was an inconsistency there, of course, and instead of the Indians finding themselves full citizens as they supposed they would be, they found themselves still wards of the Government.

In 1933 we compounded all of the mistakes that had been made in the past when, as the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], so well said, the Wheeler-Howard Act virtually forced the Indians back into Indianhood. This was John Collier's idea, clearly evident in everything that he did as Indian Commissioner. His idea was that the Indians not only should remain Indians but should remain in their tribes. Indians were even encouraged to come back to the old reservations and wear their tribal headdress. The Indian Bureau prided itself upon getting up Indian dances and bringing white people in to see these so-called inferior peoples dance around. It was an absurd thing, the Wheeler-Howard Act. It never should have passed. Now Congress should move quickly to undo the disaster of the Wheeler-Howard Act that would indianize these Indians progressively and completely.

I will not go into what has already been said in regard to the cost of the Indian Bureau, but back when I made an investigation of many of the reservations in the Midwest, all over Oklahoma and out in the far West, as well as in a few of the northern tribes, I was astounded to find how we had turned the clock back in many areas, particularly where Indians were held on these reservations when most of them could have fulfilled their obligation of citizenship.

You see an illustration of what happened when we turned the Indians loose in the great State of Oklahoma. I was quite heartened by the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], when in the discussion the other day he said that, "We desire to move quickly toward liberating the Indians." I am glad he feels that way about it and I am sure all of our colleagues are. We are glad to know that progress is being made.

But in my study of the Indians in 1945 I traveled the length and breadth of Oklahoma and I began to ask questions of people of Indian descent. You will find there in that area set aside for the Indians, or at least a major part of it, a wise policy was followed. Instead of keeping the Indians concentrated, we permitted them to mingle with the population coming into that great and growing State. As a result, many of them did, in fact, become citizens, meaning they took their place of leadership in their communities. They produced such well-known individuals as Will Rogers. In that list of 435,000 Indians, as the gentleman from Ohio said, we find our own colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER]. His name is on that list. But you will find in Oklahoma, because they were permitted to mingle with the population and because we took the shackles off of them, that the people of that State consider them their finest citizens. They are proud of the people of Indian descent.

I stopped in Claremore and went into the courthouse. I asked one of the officials, "How many officials do you have in this county, of which Claremore, Okla., is the county seat?" He counted them up and said, "There are 20 officials." I asked, "How many of these officials are Indians or are of Indian descent?" I meant, of course, not full bloods but those who count themselves as Indians because of Indian descent. He took the roll and counted 16 of the 20 as Indians. They were not wearing blankets, they did not need to be wards of the Federal Government; they were American citizens and proud of it.

I say to you that it is not only time to investigate the Indian Bureau, but we should do what was recommended exactly 50 years ago. The Indian Bureau should be abolished.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I agree with the gentleman fully that we have some very wonderful citizens who are Indians in the State of Oklahoma, and there are many wonderful Indian citizens all over the great United States, or in many sections at least of the United States. I would suggest to the gentleman that although I am sure he sincerely believes in what he advocates, and I certainly do not challenge his motive nor his integrity in any way whatsoever, I disagree with him on some points. I think if the rug were jerked out from under the Bureau of Indian Affairs and it were abolished, there would be dire poverty, exhibited to all of us, showing that we had done a grave injustice to thousands of Indians in the United States of America.

I think that if the situation should occur that the gentleman is advocating without a step-by-step program, many of the treaties we have made would be ruthlessly violated and many thousands of Indian citizens all over the United States will be treated in a most shameful and tragic manner. Now that is my honest belief.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I say to the gentleman that I had not finished that part of my statement, and I thoroughly agree with him.

I introduced a bill at the last session to abolish the Indian Bureau, but it does not pull the rug out from under them. It proposes 10 years, a period of a decade, in order to liquidate, let me say, the Indian Bureau; not to abolish it immediately. I feel that that would give us plenty of time progressively to set the Indians free. I thoroughly agree that we should take no action that would be unjust to the Indians, particularly those who have not had the advantages of mingling with the population and becoming, in fact, citizens of their communities and States. I feel that within a certain period—if 10 years is not needed, then a shorter period—we should move as quickly as possible to settle these treaties; I do not mean to wipe them out, but to settle them with full justice to every one of the Indians and the Indian tribes; that we should also move to distribute the funds now being held by the Federal Government in an orderly manner, meaning to take as much time as necessary to see that every member of the tribe got his full share of the tribal funds. I think we should also move to settle these Indian claims. That is now being done, and I think it should be done even more quickly. We must certainly move as quickly as possible to eliminate these duplicating services now being carried on by the Indian Bureau, services which can be carried on by other departments of the Federal Government or by our State and local governments.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE. What the gentleman has said will apply not only to tribes and bands but also to individuals among the Indians wherever they may be found, will it not?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It will.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I just suggest further that I want to compliment the gentleman who has the floor and the gentleman from Ohio who just preceded him and say that this resolution that the gentleman from Ohio has introduced will leave at all times the program of study and investigation in the hands of the Congress and of this committee, where it belongs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has had almost a century to study the problem, and sometimes they have come up with an answer that put the Indians back further than they were, as we all must admit. On other occasions they have not advanced him as he should have been advanced. Let them make their report. They do not need $75,000 to make a report or a study but let this committee order that study to be made, and then let this committee employ sufficient, competent, capable help to make a proper study and investigation not only of the Department or the Bureau, but also of the Indians themselves and of the various tribal organizations and let it come up then upon an intelligent referendum of the individual Indian.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the distinguished gentleman and I agree with him heartily.

In conclusion may I say this: It seems to me that we could very well leave this in the hands of this distinguished committee. I will not discuss the merits of the other resolution offered by the distinguished gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] but it does seem to me that it would not be wise, after all these years and years of hoping and waiting that the Office of Indian Affairs would begin to recommend some reduction in its vast cost, some cutting down in this spreading personnel, after we have waited for these years hoping they would make some move toward setting the Indians free, and after we have seen their repeated insistence that the Indians of Alaska be placed upon reservations where they have never had reservations before, that it is time to put this in the hands not of that Office but of the committee of Congress entrusted with that responsibility.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that it has been stated here on the floor that the appropriation for the operation of the Bureau of Indian Affairs this fiscal year is $68,000,000-plus. The President's budget request for the coming fiscal year is $122,000,000-plus. In that budget there is an increase from $3,300,000-plus to $5,217,000 in general administrative expense; in other words, the Bureau is asking an increase for general administrative expenses of from only $3,000,000-plus to $5,000,000-plus. All this other increase is going to the Indians directly and to services for the Indians.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That is right, and it will increase and increase. The gentleman may remember that in my remarks made about the middle of the last session I predicted that unless we put some brake upon the spending of the Office of Indian Affairs they would be asking for more than $100,000,000, and that is exactly what has happened.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, and they have asked for that for the Indians.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Certainly; it is always for the Indians. I say it is time to turn this service back to the States and the local governments.

The gentleman knows the Bureau has now employed approximately 13,000 personnel. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORRIS. I am not certain.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Surely the gentleman knows, since he is an authority on the Indian question, that outside of those highly concentrated reservations in Arizona and New Mexico, the Navajos and the Hopis and the others that we have kept there in virtual slavery on poor land, outside of those I doubt that there are 13,000 full-blooded Indians in the United States of America. We now have more personnel looking after the Indians than there are Indians themselves. The figure of 435,000 Indians is padded by at least 300,000. I asked the Office of Indian Affairs in 1945 if they knew how many Indians we had, and they said that something over 400,000 includes everyone on the rolls, their children, their grandchildren, even to the eighth generation.

Mr. MORRIS. I did not know that point was coming up, and I do not know the exact figures on that, but I have put in the RECORD heretofore figures showing that there is one employee in the Bureau of Indian Affairs for about every 30 or 34 Indians.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But not full-bloods.

Mr. MORRIS. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is one public governmental official—local, State, and Federal—for about every 24 people in the United States, so the ratio of employment of personnel to operate the Bureau of Indian Affairs is not as great as the ratio of public officials to administer to all the other people in the United States. The Bureau of Indian Affairs takes care of many services for Indians that the non-Indians do not require. There are millions of people over the United States that do not require any Government service, but a great many if not most of the Indians do require some kind of service. So I say that in my judgment the Bureau of Indian Affairs is not out of line, at least in comparison with the general situation that exists.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman. I must say to him that I am opposed to that, too. I would not have that many taking care of and wet-nursing the people of this country.

Mr. MORRIS. Of course, the gentleman understands on that point, that that includes school teachers and other employees in the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand it; that is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. It includes, as I said, local, State, and national employees.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I agree.

Mr. MORRIS. It includes all of the people who are assisting in administering services to the people, and, of course, this personnel that the gentleman is talking about in the Bureau includes all of those who are in the Indian service.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman, but I still contend there is not a single service of the office of Indian affairs that could not now be carried on by other agencies of the Federal Government, the State, or the local governments. For a while during this period of liquidation of the Bureau, we would need to appropriate some money, certainly, for those who are concentrated as the Navajos are. Beyond that, I do not see a single reason why we could not immediately set free, or rather, I mean, remove all of the restrictions from the major portion of this 400,000 and move progressively from there. I hope the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio, a most significant and important step, will

be approved by the committee, and by the Congress.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. It should be recorded here that the drive for reservations in Alaska has not come from the Indian Bureau.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the gentleman tell me where it comes from?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have an opinion on that—yes—I believe it comes from certain attorneys within the States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. My information was that the Bureau was willing to accept and control reservations there.

Mr. MORRIS. As I said, I certainly do not challenge the gentleman's good faith in any way whatsoever. But, I believe that if the gentleman will check, he will find there are a number of matters just as the gentleman who was speaking, has indicated, where the Bureau has been unjustly accused. Far be it for me to say that they are not subject to criticism. Of course, every Bureau and every person is subject to some criticism. We all are because all people make mistakes. But honestly and sincerely, I believe that many erroneous views have been floating around which, if they were carefully examined, it would be found that the Bureau is being unjustly accused of many things.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] be permitted to extend and to revise her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOSONE. Mr. Speaker, since my resolution, House Joint Resolution 8, has come into this discussion, I would like to tell the Members on the floor of the House what the bill will and will not do—what its purpose is.

Basically the resolution represents a fundamental change in our attitude toward the Indian. In the past—for over a hundred years, in fact—we have tried to "take care" of the Indian. In the future I believe we should try to prepare the Indian to take care of himself.

The resolution is designed, therefore, to start the wheels turning to take the American Indian off Government wardship and give him the same rights and privileges enjoyed by all other American citizens. This would mean the eventual winding up of the Indian Bureau—one less Government agency in Washington.

Specifically the resolution directs the Secretary of the Interior to study the tribes, bands, and groups of Indians in this country and to decide which of them are ready to be taken out from under Government supervision and given the control and management of their own affairs, and which are not.

In the case of those who are ready the Secretary is required to submit legislation which will remove the controls in an orderly and expeditious manner. In the case of those who are not ready the Secretary is asked to state the reasons and to give an opinion as to the earliest practicable date by which these Indians might be expected to manage their own affairs.

The Secretary must report to the Congress on these matters not later than the first day of the first session of the Eighty-third Congress.

This resolution does not call for "an investigation of the Indian Bureau by the Indian Bureau" as some have charged. It does not call for an investigation of anything. It merely calls, as I have stated, for a report on the conditions among the various tribes, bands, and groups of Indians, so that Congress may take appropriate action, either to remove them from wardship now, or to enact legislation which will prepare them as soon as possible to be removed from wardship.

I do not see how the problem could possibly be approached in a more straightforward manner, or how Congress could more simply put into operation a long-range Indian program. It leaves the authority in the hands of Congress with the Office of Indian Affairs supplying the facts.

Three years ago I was the first Member of Congress to introduce a resolution to start the wheels turning to take the American Indian off wardship. Now, everybody seems to be trying to get into the act. In my estimation, the move to free the Indians is long past due. My conviction that there should be legislation to make people of the American Indians has been growing steadily ever since I came to Congress. At that time I asked for membership on the Indian Affairs Subcommittee of the House Public Lands Committee because of my interest in the Indian problem. I have sat now for over 3 years listening to the many Indian leaders who have come to Washington to testify on the bills concerning their welfare, and I have visited these leaders and the members of their tribes or groups on a number of reservations in the country. I find that many of the leaders feel that some of the tribes have already outgrown the outmoded system of Federal wardship, and that others can be prepared to manage their own affairs if given the proper sort of education and training.

It is my observation that the Indian wants more than anything else to live like the white man. He appreciates the standard of living and the knowledge and know-how of the white man. I feel confident that if we will give the Indian education and health training, he can hold his own with the white man. Yet many Indian children find it possible to attend only schools maintained by the Indian Bureau, and some of them do not find it possible to attend any school at all. It seems to me that the Government's position relative to the Indian should be to give him education, health training, and the opportunity to think and work for himself.

The American Indian has been under the supervision of the Indian Bureau for over 100 years. During these years Congress has enacted hundreds of laws relating to some phase of the Indian's welfare, and the Indian Bureau has administered these laws. And what is the result? We have succeeded only in so binding and restricting the Indian that he has little life of his own, and little control over his destiny. Instead of creating self-reliance and leadership, we have undermined his confidence in himself. I think we have only ourselves to blame that the Indian is still on wardship—and that the 1953 budget request for the Bureau of Indian Affairs was $122,000,000. We have a system which is unfair to the Indian, and unfair to the American taxpayer.

With scarcely an exception I have found that the Indians with whom I have talked have no thirst for revenge because of the treatment given them by the white man. This philosophy, this humility, this spirit to forgive has been an inspiration to me; and made me all the more anxious to do something for those people who I feel sure have an excellent contribution to make if we will but give them the chance.

Let us make free, unrestricted Americans of these Indians who are ready to accept their full responsibilities, and let us do whatever has to be done to prepare all of the other Indians to accept their responsibilities at the earliest possible moment. It seems to me it is high time we set our sights and begin to work toward these ends.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the gentlewoman from Utah [Mrs. BOSONE] was unavoidably absent, and it was impossible for her to be here at this time in connection with the matters that have been discussed on the floor in regard to these resolutions.

GERMAN WAR CRIMINALS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the treatment of German war criminals is a subject of major importance. It has figured prominently in the negotiations between the Allied High Commission and the German Federal Government in connection with new contractual status for West Germany. It involves a fundamental question of punishment for acts of genocide and similar acts against the free world's moral code and outside the rules of war. It represents in the eyes of the free world probably the deciding factor in determining whether the aggression and outrage of civilized values practiced by Germany under Hitler has been forgotten or condoned or whether we still intend to keep this experience before us as an object lesson for the future. The arrangements to be made regarding these German war criminals in the pending contract arrangement with the German Federal Government is therefore a major question.

I have just received a statement from the Department of State on this subject, appended below, which relates to the over 800 major war criminals held outside of Spandau Prison in Berlin, where those convicted by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg are confined. This statement makes

clear exactly what will happen with respect to these German war criminals under the contractual agreement. In view of the nature of these crimes application to these war criminals "of generally accepted penological practices" as for common criminals can hardly seem justified, and the existence of an International Board such as is contemplated will itself make for pressures to bring about early release of these prisoners as the subject is in Germany an important political question.

Under the circumstances, it is at least much better to have a precise definition of exactly what will occur than to have the matter left in the nebulous state it has so far been by the reports of the negotiations. Also it is important to note that the Board will only have the authority to recommend to the affected allied country unless the decision is unanimous, and can only make a recommendation if the German members join with at least one allied member. It is hoped that these safeguards may avoid serious mistakes which could materially hurt the whole allied position as indicating a callous disregard for the tremendous crimes against civilization of which these German war criminals were found guilty.

The text of the State Department letter follows:

MY DEAR MR. JAVITS: In your letter to the Secretary of February 28 you inquire concerning the agreement recently reached to create a new board to consider questions regarding the reduction of sentence and parole of German war criminals.

When the new agreements (or contractual arrangements) with the Federal Republic of Germany enter into force, the occupation of that country will come to an end. Certain basic Allied rights will be retained, but only to the extent required by the continuing division of Germany and the presence of a serious external threat to the Federal Republic's security and our own. This means that the Allied High Commission will be abolished and separate embassies of the three powers will be established at Bonn. Relations with the Federal Republic will thereafter be conducted by the methods customary between equal nations. It would be inconsistent with this new relationship for the American, British, or French Governments to maintain a prison for German nationals in the Federal Republic. Therefore, it is intended to transfer to the German authorities custody of the war criminals held by the Allies in Western Germany when the contractural agreements become effective.

The Federal Republic will agree to carry out the sentences of these prisoners and to maintain the conditions of confinement existing when custody is transferred. An international board will be established in order to provide a means for considering questions of termination or reduction of sentence, or of parole, after custody has been transferred to the Germans. Since there were war crimes trials held not only by the United States authorities in Germany, but also by the British and French, it was agreed that the board would be composed of one American, one British, one French, and three German members.

The board will act only with respect to particular cases, and at the request of one of the four governments or upon the receipt of a petition by or on behalf of one of the convicted men. It will have independent authority, since the members, in formulating recommendations, will not be subject to instructions from the governments which appointed them. The board will have access to the prisoners and to the institutions in which they are confined. It will be empowered to act by majority vote, and its recommendations to the governments will be advisory only, except in a case when there is unanimous agreement, in which event the recommendation will be binding upon the government concerned. While the right to terminate or reduce a sentence, or to grant parole, will remain with the government which imposed the sentence, this right will not be exercised unless the board has previously made a recommendation.

No criteria for the board's actions have yet been established. However, it has been made clear that the board will not have any authority to question the validity of the convictions. It is expected that the board will follow generally accepted penological practices in arriving at its recommendations.

The board's jurisdiction covers those war criminals confined by the United States, the British, or the French in prisons in the Federal Republic at the time the contractual agreements enter into force. The board will have no jurisdiction over those convicted by the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg, since they are held in joint custody by the American, British, French, and Soviet authorities in Berlin.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. WOOD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have kept a close watch on our Nation's program of vocational education. I have seen it develop from its infancy. I am fully aware of the wonderful contribution it has made to the security and freedom of individuals and our Nation. Much of the progress of this country in producing goods and services, that has resulted in such a high standard of living for the masses, has come about as a result of our Nation's program of vocational education.

Through the various activities carried on as a part of our Nation's program of vocational education we are helping our people to acquire skills, technical, and scientific knowledge that makes it possible for them to perform efficiently in the many occupations that are so essential to the well being of this Nation.

It is generally known that for years I have sought to protect, further develop, and improve our Nation's program of vocational education. I remember—during the early thirties—that I helped to lead a fight to keep the program from being destroyed. This was an attempt to eliminate Federal appropriations for vocational education, which would have destroyed one of the essentials for building a strong America.

Had the opposition to vocational education of that period been successful in destroying our Nation's vocational program, I shudder to think what might have happened during World War II.

When America became the arsenal of democracy it was the vocational schools that performed the Herculean task of preparing workers for war industries and thus make it possible for this country, through the skills of its trained people, to meet production goals that were so vital to the destiny, not only of America, but of the entire free world.

It was American production that stopped the German hordes at the gates of Stalingrad. It was American production that made possible the successful landing on the Normandy Beach of France. It was American production that brought to a successful conclusion the European phase of World War II. It was American production that made victory possible at Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Midway, Guadalcanal, and on hundreds of other battlefields on land, sea, and in the sky.

But, did you ever stop to think that had it not been for vocational education, which was started in 1917 on a Nation-wide scale, that we would not have had the skilled hands, the trained minds, the production know-how, that was so essential to produce the munitions, arms, and other essentials of war so necessary to make our glorious victory possible.

Today we face another crisis that may prove even greater than the one that faced us in the bleak days of December 1941. As we face the new crisis and dangers that loom ahead we are neglecting to provide adequate funds to make possible the training of all our people who need and can profit by vocational training of less than college grade. There has never been a time in the history of this country when there was greater need to prepare all our people so that they may use to the fullest their knowledge and their potential skill in our battle of production that continues to lag.

Today, in terms of what money will buy, we are actually appropriating less money for vocational education than we did in 1940. In 1940 we were appropriating for carrying out the provisions of the then George-Deen Act a total of $14,483,000. Today, under the provisions of the George-Barden Act, which in 1946 superseded the George-Deen Act, we are appropriating only $19,123,000. Everyone knows in terms of what money will buy, this is less than we appropriated in 1940.

All over the Nation school boards are seeking aid for establishing vocational programs in schools that do not at this time have such programs. I am told on good authority that for the whole field of vocational education for the Nation as a whole we are serving only about 50 percent of those who need such training in order to prepare them for useful and productive work. We have enrolled today only about 40 percent of the farm boys who need vocational training.

There are approximately 5,000 secondary schools serving farm youth without programs of vocational agriculture. There are almost 7,000 secondary schools with no programs whatsoever in homemaking. We are reaching less than 50 percent of the number that should be served with trade and industrial education. In the field of distributive education we have only scratched the surface so far as needs are concerned.

Even in the light of the facts which I have just presented, we decreased the appropriation for vocational education for 1952 in the amount of $854,499 below the amount available for the fiscal year 1951.

While we decrease aid for vocational education for our own people we are continuing to step up appropriations to aid with the further development of vocational education in foreign countries. I would like to submit for the record a brief summary of the United States Government programs of financial aid to

foreign students for education during fiscal 1951.

The following is a brief summary of the report of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, which gives the number of foreign students, leaders, scholars, and so forth, aided during fiscal 1951, and the cost:

Brief summary of U. S. Government programs of financial aid to foreign students for education during the fiscal year 1951

[Taken from reports by Helen A. Miller, Government Section, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, under date of Aug. 13, 1951, with revisions and supplements under dates of Feb. 26 and 29, 1952]

	Number brought to United States	Cost
1. Number and cost of students, scholars, etc., coming to the United States under Public Law 402 (Smith-Mundt grants) fiscal 1951 (average cost of grant, $3,659)	636	$2,327,750
2. Number and cost of students, scholars, etc., coming to the United States under Joint Smith-Mundt grants and the Fulbright program, fiscal 1951 (only the Smith-Mundt funds are shown. Under item 6 the total amount of foreign currency used under the Fulbright program is shown)	633	1,766,850
3. Leaders and students from Germany and Austria in the fiscal year 1951 under the Foreign Economics Assistance Act of 1950, Public Law 535 (81st Cong.) and Public Law 327 (81st Cong.)	3,101	6,759,000
4. Aid to Chinese scholars and students in this country in the fiscal year 1951, Public Law 535 (81st Cong.)	2,894	3,637,000
5. Aid to 332 foreign nationals to study in certain schools abroad (foreign currencies used)	332	134,000
6. The Fulbright program (Public Law 584, 79th Cong., during the fiscal year 1951) (foreign currency used which was derived from the sale of United States surplus property abroad)	1,503	6,665,000
7. Aid to Finnish nationals (Public Law 265, 81st Cong.), (funds used were credited to the principal and interest of Finland World War I debt to the United States)	67	284,000
8. Point 4 program—technical cooperation for undeveloped areas authorized under title IV, Public Law 535, 81st Cong. Under this program, a total of 264 trainees came to the United States during fiscal year 1951. The average cost was $2,100 when United States shared the expense with another country, and $3,560 when the United States carried the whole cost. The minimum cost of this program accordingly, was approximately ($2,100 times 264)	264	554,400
(A supplementary report from the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, under date of Feb. 29, 1952, reveals that as of "Dec. 31, 1951, there were 341 foreign national trainees and 31 leaders in the United States under the point 4 program." This report further reveals that though "only 264 actual trainees came to the United States under this program during the fiscal year 1951" that "by the end of fiscal year 1951 the various cooperating Government agencies and departments had obligated $1,375,200 for training grants, and $352,883 for training services.")		

Brief summary of U. S. Government programs of financial aid to foreign students for education during the fiscal year 1951—Con.

[Taken from reports by Helen A. Miller, Government Section, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, under date of Aug. 13, 1951, with revisions and supplements under dates of Feb. 26 and 29, 1952]

	Number brought to United States	Cost
9. Under "Mutual Defense Assistance Act" passed by Congress on Sept. 28, 1949, a total of 101 persons came to the United States for technical training during the fiscal year 1951. The cost of this program is not available because of security reasons	101	----------
10. Under the "Interchange of persons program for Japan and Ryukyus," a total of 839 persons were brought to the United States from Japan and the Ryukyus for study in the United States at an approximate cost of	839	$1,679,000
11. Economic Cooperation Administration program, Public Law 472, 80th Cong., as amended. There are 8 areas in the technical assistance program of the ECA under which a person can come to the United States for technical training. They include agricultural productivity, development of overseas territories, industrial productivity, manpower utilization, marketing, public administration, tourist trade, transportation and communications. In 1951 more than 2,800 persons were brought to the United States to study in 1 of these 8 areas of technical assistance program at an average cost of $1,500 per person	2,800	4,200,000
Grand total	13,170	[1] 28,007,010

[1] Does not include cost for 101 persons in item 9 above.

This program of aid amounted to a total of more than $28,000,000 in fiscal 1951. This exceeded by almost $2,000,000, the total amount of Federal funds made available as aid to States in training almost 3,500,000 American youth and adults. This does not make sense to me. We are spending lavishly on foreign students who are being brought to this country to study vocational education, American production and methods, and so forth; and at the same time we are cutting down on expenditures on the vocational training program for our own people. I believe in economy and I believe in charity, but to me charity should begin at home, and economy should be real economy and not false economy.

Please keep in mind that the more than $28,000,000 spent in 1951 as aid to foreign students, scholars, leaders, and so forth, includes only the cost of aid to foreign students, all of whom were brought to this country except 332, who studied in certain approved schools abroad. It does not include the cost of sending American vocational and other educational and technical personnel to foreign countries, nor the cost of training American educational and technical personnel for service in foreign countries. Neither does it include the cost of teaching materials furnished foreign countries. If all these costs could be obtained it would run into many more millions of American dollars.

It seems to me that we can at least afford to spend as many Federal dollars for the vocational training of American youth and adults under the provisions of the George-Barden Act as we do to aid foreign students to study in this and other countries.

If we were serving all the people in America who need and who are seeking vocational training—in order that they may provide security for themselves and be in a position to help provide freedom and security for our Nation—then it might be easier to try to justify indulging ourselves in helping foreign students and nations in developing more adequate vocational and other educational programs and facilities.

In light of my previous statements, it seems to me that we should appropriate for fiscal 1953 the full appropriation of $29,300,000 authorized by the George-Barden Act to help with the further development of vocational programs for our own people. The funds are greatly needed and, in my estimation, will do as much as any money we can appropriate to help strengthen America morally, economically, and militarily.

In conclusion may I point out to you that from the best information we can obtain Russia is expanding vocational education at an ever-increasing rate. The same is true in countries alined with the Communists. It is generally known that Russia is using thousands of highly trained vocational instructors to help augment and further develop its own program of vocational education. They are training their people in the skills, technical and production know-how in order to increase production of military and civilian goods.

If we are to maintain our present place of leadership among the nations of the earth we must never cease for a moment our efforts to train our present and oncoming generations in the skills, technical and scientific knowledge which is so essential to economic production. We are faced with communistic aggression abroad and dangerous inflation at home. Production and ever-increasing production is our only hope of dealing effectively with aggressors abroad and inflation at home.

Fundamentally, the only way to lick inflation is through adequate production which means for us at the present time increased production per man and full utilization of our total manpower. This means vocational training of less than college grade for the masses, including our physically handicapped. Let us stand together to see that America's vocational program is not weakened but instead strengthened. Much of the future of this country, whether we are at war or at peace, is dependent on the stand we take in protecting and further developing America's program of vocational education.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Delegate from Alaska is recognized for 10 minutes.

WITHDRAWALS OF LAND IN ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which if enacted

into law would do much to bring order into a situation in Alaska which has gotten completely out of hand.

The bill provides that in respect to all withdrawals of land heretofore made in the Territory of Alaska for any division of Government, Federal or Territorial, public hearings shall be held in Alaska to determine the advisability or necessity of renewing the withdrawals. If such renewal is indicated, it shall be for a period of not more than 5 years.

In respect to withdrawals sought after enactment of the bill, it is provided those, too, shall be for a period of not more than 5 years, at which time the agency concerned must make an appropriate showing as to need.

There are sound reasons why the bill should be passed.

As everyone who has had experience with reserved lands knows, it is tremendously difficult and even generally impossible to have them restored to the public domain, notwithstanding the fact that the land may be no longer required for the purpose for which it was set aside. When there is no termination date, when there is no requirement that the agency offer proof that withdrawals should continue in effect, then legitimate development is blocked. Homesteading rights can be exercised only on the public domain, and other public-land laws designed to promote private ownership of land continue in suspense so far as these reserved areas are concerned.

In Alaska the policy of reservations has been pushed almost to the ultimate extreme.

At this time nearly one-third of the lands of this vast Territory is in withdrawn status. It seems that merely because the country is big the different agencies of Government customarily ask for tracts far greater in extent than actually would be needed.

The job of determining just what reservations there are in Alaska has proved to be a huge one in itself. It has gone forward at the Department of the Interior for something like a year and one-half, and even now has not been completed. But enough has been learned to demonstrate that there probably are somewhere in the neighborhood of 600 reservations of one kind or another in the Territory. Until the study has been completed no one will know for sure just where they are, and, in reference to many of them, no one will ever know why.

I am informed that of the 375,000,000 acres contained in Alaska, in the neighborhood of 114,315,000 acres have been reserved for one agency of Government or another. There probably is some overlapping, but when the study is completed it is likely that the 114,000,000-acre figure will be a valid one.

Let us examine this for size. That acreage amounts to roughly 178,000 square miles. That is just short of the size of Spain. That is bigger than the States of Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Kentucky, Massachusetts, and West Virginia, all rolled together. Add less than 100,000 square miles to the reserved lands in Alaska, and you have a land as big as our largest State, Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the policy imposed upon Alaska by the Federal Government in connection with these withdrawals has been simply fantastic. No other word will suffice. Corrective steps should be taken. They should be taken now, before all the public domain is gobbled up by a Federal bureaucracy that in all too many cases has not, in my judgment, made a logical and absolute presentation of need.

It is generally assumed that all these withdrawals are made for the Department of the Interior, which is the Federal Department having chief responsibility for the Territory. That is not so. It is true that the Interior Department is guardian of the public domain and before lands can be reserved by any department the assent of Interior must be had. But the record shows that the Interior Department itself ranks third in the list of those having reserved land holdings in Alaska. The Department of Defense comes first with something like 51,000,000 acres, and Agriculture follows with close to 21,000,000 acres, while Interior is third with 18,000,000 acres.

There is nothing, Mr. Speaker, in the bill which I introduced today which would be hurtful to the national interest. It is true that it would be inconvenient at times to hold public hearings in Alaska in respect to new reservations or renewals of existing ones, but such procedure would definitely be in the public interest. I suspect that if such hearings are held and if the departments of the Federal Government and the agencies of the Territorial government are obliged, as they would be, to make an effective affirmative showing, a natural and rapid sequel would be that the extent of withdrawals would quickly diminish. And I suggest this would be in the best interests of everyone.

All too often, Mr. Speaker, the withdrawn lands are discovered to be close to the most heavily settled communities. Thus they cannot be homesteaded, thus they cannot be developed by private capital, and thus the proper settlement of Alaska is delayed.

No Alaskan, I am sure, objects to government making use of land for essential purposes. What Alaskans do object to is the extent of the reserves. From long and bitter experience we Alaskans have come to be distrustful of a policy which has operated only to gobble up more and more of the Territory and to retard progress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my bill will have prompt and favorable consideration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances and to include a speech of Hon. James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, and a letter from Frank A. Lopez, a prospective member of the bar.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. ANFUSO).

Mr. REAMS and to include an editorial from the Toledo Times.

Mr. POULSON in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ARMSTRONG and to include a brief article by Mr. Allen, president of the Boeing Aircraft Co.

Mr. BUFFETT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include an article by Mr. David Lawrence.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an article from the London Times.

Mr. KEARNS and to include an article pertaining to the observation of National Wildlife Week.

Mr. RADWAN in 11 instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT and to include an editorial.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELLIOTT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOLIFIELD (at the request of Mr. MULTER) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. YORTY in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HARVEY and to include an editorial.

Mr. MEADER in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JAVITS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOLLING and to include a speech.

RESOLUTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. RABAUT, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. BARING, for 3 weeks, on official business—mining hearings in Idaho and Nevada.

Mr. HINSHAW, for the balance of this week—to March 24, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4515. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, California, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 14, 1952, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 396. Joint resolution making additional appropriations for the legislative branch and the Motor Carrier Claims Commission for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 19, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1251. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 31, 1951, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of report on Dauphin Island Bay, Ala., with a view to determining whether any modification of the existing project is advisable at this time, with particular reference to providing a channel connection to Mississippi Sound. This investigation was requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, and the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, adopted on June 2, 1949, and February 25, 1949, respectively (H. Doc. No. 394); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

1252. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Government Services, Inc., for the fiscal year ended December 31, 1951, pursuant to a request of the Board of Trustees, Government Services, Inc.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1253. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of St. Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1951; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1254. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Food and Drug Administration, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1951; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1255. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1256. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Two Wai Hing or Yeung Kwai or Frank Chan, file No. A-9708072 CR-37687, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1257. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Fidel Real y Vasquez-Enriquez or Fidel Real or Fidel Real y Vasquez, file No. A-7222220 CR-33589, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1258. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter relative to the case of Edward Zurek, file No. A-9660331 CR-30597, requesting that it be withdrawn from those now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 561. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of foundations and other comparable organizations; without amendment (Rept. No. 1553). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 574. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4511, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1554). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 575. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 5012, a bill to amend the Navy ration statute so as to provide for the serving of oleomargarine or margarine; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 576. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6336, a bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research; without amendment (Rept. No. 1556). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 577. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 6787, a bill to extend the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 578. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 7072, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1558). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 430. An act for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann; without amendment (Rept. No. 1529). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 858. An act for the relief of Mrs. Pauline J. Gourdeaux; without amendment (Rept. No. 1530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 970. An act for the relief of Esther V. Worley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1458. An act for the relief of Joe W. Wimberly; without amendment (Rept. No. 1532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1604. An act for the relief of Truman W. McCullough; without amendment (Rept. No. 1533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1668. An act for the relief of Pansy E. Pendergrass; without amendment (Rept. No. 1534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1682. An act for the relief of Daniel J. Crowley; without amendment (Rept. No. 1535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1998. An act for the relief of J. Hibbs Buckman and A. Raymond Raff, Jr., executors of the estate of A. Raymond Raff, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2100. An act for the relief of Robert Joseph Vetter; without amendment (Rept. No. 1537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2157. An act to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to private property arising from activities of the Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 1538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 58. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 63. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 1540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 559. Resolution for the relief of Frank C. Torti; without amendment (Rept. No. 1541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. House Resolution 566. Resolution providing for sending to the United States Court of Claims the bill (H. R. 2779) for the relief of the Gay Street Corp., of Baltimore, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 975. A bill for the relief of Sarah A. Davies; with amendment (Rept. No. 1543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of the estate of Cobb Nichols; with amendment (Rept. No. 1544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1826. A bill for the relief of Ellis E. Gabbert; without amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2413. A bill for the relief of the Klo-

man Instrument Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2789. A bill for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife; with amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Thomas E. Bell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4455. A bill for the relief of Robert A. Buchanan; with amendment (Rept. No. 1549). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4932. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Voltin and wife, Tecla Voltin, and daughters, Mrs. Paula J. Voltin Sansom and Jacqueline Voltin; with amendment (Rept. No. 1550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5121. A bill for the relief of Felix Navedo Ramos; with amendment (Rept. No. 1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5753. A bill for the relief of Bernard J. Keogh; with amendment (Rept. No 1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 7103. A bill relating to withdrawal and reservation of public lands in Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES:

H. R. 7104. A bill to amend the act of Congress of September 3, 1935 (49 Stat. 1035), as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 7105. A bill to provide for Federal financial assistance to the States and Territories in the construction of public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 7106. A bill to amend the act of June 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 1061), relating to the establishment of the Independence National Historical Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 7107. A bill to authorize increased wage rates for the employees of the Norfolk Shipbuilding & Drydock Corp.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 7108. A bill to continue beyond June 30, 1953, authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 7109. A bill to increase compensation rates for childless widows of veterans whose death resulted from a service-incurred injury or disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 7110. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial of the institution of the territorial government of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7111. A bill to increase the income-tax exemptions, including the additional exemption for old age or blindness, from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the Washington State-Far East International Trade Fair, Seattle, Wash., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Res. 573. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to investigate and study transactions involving Indian lands in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Senate Resolution 24, requesting Congress to exempt hotels and motels from rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7112. A bill for the relief of Ludovica Nagel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 7113. A bill for the relief of Paul Dimitriu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7114. A bill for the relief of Henry N. Hale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 7115. A bill for the relief of Kyoko Kamamuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7116. A bill for the relief of Astrid Ingeborg Marquez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 7117. A bill for the relief of Robert George Buildeath and Lenora Patricia Buildeath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, from the flickering torches of our own understanding we would lift the difficult decisions of the public service into Thy holy light. As those set aside to prescribe for the ills of an ailing social order, we pray that Thou wilt first cleanse our own lives from moral pollution and mental darkness.

Turning from the dizzy world where truth so often eludes us along tangled paths, we would seek at this altar of faith the truth about ourselves, knowing that Thou canst not use us to change the crooked things that blight the earth unless our own hearts are homes of sincerity, integrity, and purity. Create in us clean hearts, O God, and renew a right spirit within us. Make us such men that Thou mayest speak to us and that to this bewildered generation we may be the broadcasters of Thy voice and will. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 18, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1012) to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 657. An act for the relief of Tony Marchiondo;

H. R. 885. An act for the relief of Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann;

H. R. 1261. An act for the relief of Alexander L. Wiesiolowski;

H. R. 1269. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 1464. An act for the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh;

H. R. 1968. An act for the relief of Senta Ziegler;

H. R. 1969. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic;

H. R. 2222. An act for the relief of Margaret Celikcan;

H. R. 2716. An act for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie;

H. R. 2832. An act for the relief of Leszek Kazimierz Pawlowicz;

H. R. 2913. An act for the relief of Mrs. Evelyn Campbell;

H. R. 3155. An act for the relief of Sebastiano Bello, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenza Dall'Alda, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Montini;

H. R. 3598. An act for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene;

H. R. 3953. An act for the relief of Chan Toy Har;

H. R. 4678. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jack Bravo;

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland; and

H. J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1938) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. ELLENDER, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet this afternoon and tomorrow afternoon during the sessions of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Armed Services was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brewster	Gillette	Murray
Bridges	Hayden	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Lehman	Schoeppel
Cordon	Martin	Seaton
Dirksen	McCarran	Smith, N. J.
Ferguson	McClellan	Thye
Flanders	McFarland	Tobey

Mr. McFARLAND. I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, Mr. IVES, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. McMAHON, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chahber and answered to their names.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Without objection, Senators will be permitted to transact routine business, without debate and without speeches.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE:

From the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 4467. A bill to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1340).

From the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1828. A bill to exempt certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense from the laws governing the employment, removal, classification, pay, retirement, leave, and disability and death compensations of Federal officers and employees; with amendments (Rept. No. 1341).

PERSONNEL NEEDS AND PRACTICES OF GOVERNMENTAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES—INTERIM REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE (S. REPT. 1342)

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, it is my privilege to submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 53, approved February 19, 1951, an interim report with respect to a study of the personnel needs and practices of the various governmental departments and agencies, as conducted by the Subcommittee on Federal Manpower Policies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 19, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1938) granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

S. 2896. A bill for the relief of Jeno Cseplo; and

S. 2897. A bill for the relief of Susan Elizabeth Martasin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 2898. A bill to provide increased annuities to certain civilian officials and employees who performed service in the construction of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 2899. A bill to require that Collectors of Customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the Civil Service laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. THYE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2900. A bill for the relief of Orsolina Cianfione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS AND CERTAIN OTHER OFFICERS OF BUREAU OF CUSTOMS UNDER CLASSIFIED CIVIL-SERVICE LAWS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of the collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs under the classified civil-service system. I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement with reference to the proposed legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

The bill (S. 2899) to require that collectors of customs and certain other officers of the Bureau of Customs be appointed in accordance with the civil service laws, introduced by Mr. THYE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have introduced this bill, because it seems to me that consideration should be given at this time to placing all revenue collectors in the same category. The President's reorganization plan for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which has had the approval of Congress, provides not only for revamping of the Bureau but for the appointment under civil service of those occupying positions now held by collectors.

There are 44 collectors of customs and 6 comptrollers of customs now appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. They are collectors of import duties for the Government and administrators of the Customs Service. Their responsibilities are, roughly, the same as those of the present collectors of internal revenue. Whatever the ultimate plan may be for the organization of a consolidated revenue service in the Treasury Department, as recommended by the Hoover Commission but not implemented in the President's recently approved plan, it seems entirely logical that collectors of customs should be appointed in the same manner as those performing the functions of collectors of internal revenue. The bill I have introduced is simply in the interests of logic and consistency, therefore, and is not intended to cast any reflection on present customs officials or agents or to offer a comprehensive plan for reorganization of the Customs Service.

Some curious twists in the development of laws and administrative regulations governing appointments of customs officials have occurred through the years. For example:

First. All the comptrollers of customs are political appointees except the per-

son performing these functions at San Francisco, who is a career official.

Second. All those performing the functions of appraisers of customs are career officials, except the one at New York, who is a political appointee.

Third. Forty-four collectors of customs are Presidential appointees, and yet two other officials performing the same duties in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico are under civil service.

Fourth. All collectors of internal revenue, under the new reorganization, are to be appointed under civil service, but collectors of customs with comparable duties have been left under the old system.

These inconsistencies highlight the need for the corrective legislation which I have proposed in the bill.

In this connection I wish to quote from the report to Congress of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government relative to the reorganization of the revenue services of the Treasury Department, as follows:

> One of the chief handicaps to effective organization of the Department is the political appointment of collectors of internal revenue and of customs, and certain other officials. These appointments are regarded by some as sinecures. In any event, they form a bar to orderly development of an experienced staff.
>
> The Commission recommends that all officials in the Department below the rank of Assistant Secretary should preferably be appointed from the career service without Senate confirmation.

The bill which I have introduced merely places Bureau of Customs people in the same category as Bureau of Internal Revenue people as now determined by the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1952. This simple and logical step would in no way interfere with further consideration of over-all reorganization of the revenue services along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 657. An act for the relief of Tony Marchiondo;

H. R. 885. An act for the relief of Heinrich von Biel, Margarethe von Biel, and Doris Schumann;

H. R. 1261. An act for the relief of Alexander L. Wiesiolowski;

H. R. 1269. An act for the relief of Boris Kowerda;

H. R. 1464. An actf or the relief of Arokiaswami Arumai Singh;

H. R. 1968. An act for the relief of Senta Ziegler;

H. R. 1969. An act for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic;

H. R. 2222. An act for the relief of Margaret Celikcan;

H. R. 2716. An act for the relief of Kunigunde Beldie;

H. R. 2832. An act for the relief of Lesnek Kazimierz Pawlowicz;

Flaxer in person when he appeared be-Evelyn Campbell;

H. R. 3155. An act for the relief of Sebastiano Bello, Dino Bianchi, Pierino Ciccarese, Vincenza Dall'Alda, Vittorio De Gasperi, Salvatore Puggioni, Giovanni Battista Volpato, and Leone Mortini;

H. R. 3598. An act for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene;

H. R. 3953. An act for the relief of Chan Toy Har; and

H. R. 5238. An act for the relief of Albert O. Holland and Bergtor Haaland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4678. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Jack Bravo; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. J. Res. 363. Joint resolution to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise;* ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Article entitled "Telling the Decatur Story," from Public Power magazine of March 1952.

Editorial entitled "Court Should Say," published in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer of March 18, 1952, with reference to pledge of presidential electors to support the nominee of the party.

Editorial and article from Twin City Sentinel, of Winston-Salem, N. C., with reference to amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 20, relating to oil for education.

Article by Mr. Coit Hendley, Jr., entitled "Oil for Education Faces Senate Test This Week," published in the Washington Star of March 15, 1952.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

Editorial entitled "General Vandenberg the Logical Choice," published in the New York Enquirer of March 10, 1952.

CITATION OF ABRAM FLAXER FOR CONTEMPT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as in legislative session, let me state that yesterday the Senate Judiciary Committee reported Senate Resolution 295, calling for a contempt citation against Abram Flaxer.

This is the man who was described to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee as "one of the tried fanatics" of the Communist Party.

When this man came before the Internal Security Subcommittee as a witness, he not only flatly refused to produce records and documents required under a subpena duces tecum regularly issued and served upon him; he also refused to answer questions, and was insolent, disorderly, and recalcitrant.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed, as in legislative session, to consider Senate Resolution 295, the contempt citation to which I have referred.

Mr. President, in furtherance of my request, let me say that Abram Flaxer was president of a so-called union, the United Public Workers of America, at the time when it was expelled from the CIO for having failed to function as a labor organization, for acting as a subsidiary of the Communist Party, an agent of the Soviet Union, for advancing the interests of the Soviet Union over and above the interests of the members of the United Public Workers. According to sworn testimony before our committee, Flaxer was a Communist at that time. Another witness who named this man as a Communist was his former wife, who was herself formerly a member of the Communist Party. She testified that, to her knowledge, Flaxer was a card-carrying Communist up to 1940, at which time she divorced him. Another witness, who was secretary-treasurer of another so-called union, known as the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, at a time when Flaxer was president of that organization, testified that he knew Flaxer was a Communist during their association, which terminated in 1944. A high official of the CIO not only testified that Mr. Flaxer was known to him to have been a Communist in 1950, but that he had good reason to believe Flaxer is presently a Communist.

This man Flaxer is one of the so-called left-wing labor leaders who met with Harry Bridges last October 12 in New York City to organize opposition to wage stabilization and price freeze.

Flaxer came before our committee accompanied by an attorney. On the ground that an answer might incriminate him, he claimed his privilege under the Constitution in declining to tell the committee whether he is a Communist. He made the same excuse in refusing to say whether members of the organization which he heads had obtained secret Government information for Russia, or whether he had ever discussed with Communist Party leaders the possibility that members of his group who were employed in offices of the Federal Government might be used as couriers or purveyors or grantors of secret information for the benefit of the Communist Party.

Let me be sure Senators understand me. What I am saying is that this man Flaxer refused to answer questions on those points, on the ground that to do so might tend to incriminate him.

The subpena served upon Flaxer had called upon him to produce certain records, among them records of the United Public Workers of America, showing names and addresses of members currently employed by the Federal Government or by any State, county, or municipal government. Flaxer failed and refused to produce these records; and, before the committee, stated flatly that he was refusing to produce them.

For this failure to comply with its subpena, the subcommittee urges that Flaxer be prosecuted for contempt.

Again, let me be sure I make myself clear, Mr. President. The Committee on the Judiciary is not asking for a contempt citation on Abram Flaxer merely because he claimed the privilege against self-incrimination under the fifth amendment. There is, in the opinion of the committee, a litigable question as to whether Mr. Flaxer properly claimed his privilege, and whether he did not attempt to extend it beyond proper bounds; but the core of the committee's request for a contempt citation against

Abram Flaxer is his completely unjustified, willful, and contemptuous refusal to produce records called for by a subpena duces tecum regularly issued and served upon him, and the production of which was further demanded of Mr. Flaxer in person when he appeared before the subcommittee.

Mr. President, I hope at this time that the Senate will adopt Senate Resolution 295, citing this man for contempt.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in legislative session, the Senator from Nevada requests unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 295, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 295) citing Abram Flaxer for contempt of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported by Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary on March 18, 1952.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 295) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States as to the refusal of Abram Flaxer to answer a series of questions before the said subcommittee and the failure and refusal of Abram Flaxer to furnish records and supplemental information in compliance with a subpena duces tecum of said subcommittee and as ordered by the subcommittee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia to the end that said Abram Flaxer may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate Resolution 294, a similar resolution on the same subject, submitted by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], will be indefinitely postponed.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business, the treaty with Japan, is open to amendment.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I feel the time has come when the Senate should take action upon the pending treaty. It is a document of tremendous import. If we act upon it in a manner that I sincerely feel to be appropriate, history may someday evaluate it as one of the great documents in the record of humanity's progress.

It is a treaty with the Japanese people—a treaty of peace. It is a remarkable instrument of agreement between people still bearing the scars of bitter warfare. Since nations first sought to settle their differences by the arbitrament of arms, resulting in the destruction and desolation of war, it has been traditional to use the formula: "To the victor go the spoils." Treaties ended gunfire, but the vanquished passed merely to a new phase of defeat, that of paying for the woe and destruction caused by the conflict. His field of economy and production suffered a blitz as devastating as the gunfire which previously swept the fields of battle. His machines of recovery were spiked, as his cannon had been. His war-weary people found piled on their shoulders reparation burdens which generations to come would be unable to cast off.

Such a record, written so often in the pages of history, is one which makes the document before us such a remarkable one. It is not a treaty dictated by lingering hate or drawn in the spirit of revenge. It contains no long list of reparation demands.

It is a treaty of peace in the full sense of what those few words really mean and say. It is a blueprint to guide 84,000,000 people in Japan back into proud sovereignty in the world family of free nations.

I visited Japan a few years ago. I found the Japanese people industrious. I found them tired of the miseries forced upon them by war lords. They were a people who wanted to be free. Their devotions were to their families, and family security constitutes the bricks and mortar with which a trustworthy national security is built. The Japanese people are ready for peace. They want to join the free nations in preserving the peace of the world. This treaty will permit them to regain their position as a great industrial nation and should place them on the side of the freedom-loving people of the world.

We have here a simple way to show the world that America does not have sinister motives in the Far East; that we are not imperialistic and are not secretively working toward colonization.

What will the people behind the iron curtain think when we ratify a treaty which deals in freedom, helpfulness, and new hopes, instead of humiliation, reparations, and revenge? What will the world think when there is completed a peace in which 48 free nations have joined, but which Soviet Russia rejects because there was "undue leniency in dealing with the subject of reparations"?

Our action here can be a shattering blow to the false charges made against us in the Far East. With occupation forces and with our money we helped a foe to her feet and joined in rebuilding her economy and her hopes. When our forces marched into Japanese cities a few years ago, the civilians were gone. Fearing brutality and butchery, they had fled to the hills. Instead of vengeance, they received food and help.

Today we prepare to withdraw our troops as an occupational task force of war and leave them as friendly forces to guarantee the security of a new free nation.

With this treaty we further aid the Japanese people to regain economic independence and we hold out a welcoming hand for them to join the family of free nations. Freedom, not despotism, is the American way.

Russia is the traditional enemy of Japan. First in the czars and now in Soviet communism Japan has faced that potential menace through her entire history. The Soviet thus has the high hurdle of national fear and suspicion to clear before reaching Japan. The Japanese people belong with the freedom-loving nations and by this treaty there is a voluntary identification on their part with the anti-Communist forces of the world.

Mr. President, in my judgment, the Japanese Peace Treaty and the treaties with Australia, New Zealand and the Philippines are instruments of common sense and common defense. From them hopes for the evolution of a democratic Asia can begin here today.

Mr. President, I am happy to be one of those who support this treaty, and I trust it will be ratified without reservation. I hope the Senate will come to a vote on it today or not later than tomorrow, so that the Japanese people may have prompt assurance that the Senate of the United States is behind the treaty and the movement to help them reestablish themselves as a free nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). The treaty is open to amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first let me propound a parliamentary inquiry to refresh my memory. The treaty is being considered in executive session, but not as in Committee of the Whole; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is being considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it necessary, then, after the Committee of the Whole has perfected or adopted or not adopted reservations and amendments, to report the treaty to the Senate for a vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reservations should be offered, to the resolution of ratification, and they are not acted upon as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. DIRKSEN. After the Committee of the Whole has completed its consideration and perfected the treaty, as the parliamentary language goes, the actual resolution for ratification must then come before the Senate, not as in Committee of the whole; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the resolution of ratification is before the Senate, it is then subject to any other motion which would normally be in order with respect to proposed legislation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is subject to amendment in the form of reservations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, a motion to postpone would be in order after the treaty has been reported to the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such a motion is in order at any time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. At any time, including the consideration of the treaty as in Committee of the Whole?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I would be less than candid if I did not confess the dilemma in my own mind in respect to this treaty. I am quite mindful of the fact that a treaty is a very solemn undertaking on the part of any nation. It becomes the supreme law of the land. Therefore it is an undertaking on behalf of the people of the nation. As the majority leader so well said, it can have a tremendous impact upon the destiny of this country for good or bad. But, Mr. President, to me it is rather astonishing that this treaty has received so little attention either in the press or on the part of the American people. Had it not been for a radio address which I delivered over some 16 or 18 stations in Illinois some time ago, merely giving my informal observations on the treaty, I doubt very much whether I would have received so much as a single letter. There is a peculiar inertia in connection with it. But, as I think of it, my mind goes back to an observation made a moment ago by the majority leader when he said that it is a treaty also in behalf of the people of Japan.

Frankly, Mr. President, I wonder what the people of Japan know about it. I wonder to what extent they are familiar with its terms and its implications, and I am wondering what the people of the United States, as a matter of fact, know about the treaty and whether the Senate is ready to ratify it or not to ratify it, depending upon what the judgment and the wisdom of the Senate may be. So, Mr. President, it becomes something of a dilemma. Certainly everyone wants to support a document which in the public mind is coextensive with and synonymous with peace. It is no easy thing to vote against a document of that kind. It requires a great deal of explaining, I think, to the people back home, although that is the least of my troubles, because, depending entirely upon what my conviction is, that is the way my vote will have to be, quite aside from any illusions or any erroneous ideas which may prevail in the minds of my people back home.

In that spirit, Mr. President, I have gone to Members of the Senate within the past few days and said to them, "What are your notions about this treaty?" I have been refreshed in part by the answer that they accept it in high faith. I wish my faith were equal to it. I wish my sense of detachment were such that I could simply accept it in that way. I think it would measure up to the pronouncement of the Apostle Paul a long, long time ago. But I cannot accept it in that way. So, by rules of common sense, I have had to come to some conclusion on the matter. I pretend to no expert knowledge in this field. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, this is the first treaty of major importance upon which, I have been called to vote as a Member of this body, and I try to accept that responsibility with all the earnestness and all the sincerity that it connotes. By standards of common sense, Mr. President, I try to come to conclusions.

So it has seemed to me that when we consider a treaty which is binding upon all the people of America and which, if ratified at the other end, is binding upon the people of Japan, it certainly must be a fair and honest document; it must be a moral document if it is going to endure. If it is not going to endure, Mr. President, then, obviously, we are going through a lot of motion which will be small comfort in the days ahead.

I am not insensible of the fact that before I became a Member of this body the Senate ratified a treaty with Italy, and I have been intrigued no end to hear many Senators, on many occasions, stand upon this floor and denounce the handiwork of the executive branch and the Senate of the United States, for reasons which need not now be labored. I merely preface my observations by these statements, because I feel very deeply about the question now before the Senate.

I do not want to vote against the treaty, but I would find difficulty in voting for it, and that was the reason, Mr. President, for the line of parliamentary inquiries, I propounded, namely, to ascertain at what stage in the proceedings a motion to postpone indefinitely might be in order, for if I make that kind of motion, it will be earnestly and very sincerely made.

Frankly, I think a case can be made for a motion to postpone, and my first step in support of such a motion is to raise the question, Why the haste on this treaty? It is not to go into effect for quite some time, if I understand the situation. I have gone through the hearings and the reports, and all the ancillary documents which have come with them. So I go back, of course, to the statement made by Mr. Dulles, appearing on page 16 of the hearings. There Mr. Dulles said:

> I would like to point out that the coming into force of the treaty depends, for a period of 9 months, upon the concurrent action of several other countries. It is not likely that the treaty could come into force for a period of several months. Under the provision of the treaty, for 9 months it cannot be brought into force except as there is a deposit of ratification by 6 countries of the 11 who are named in the treaty. So far, only one of those countries has ratified the treaty, and that is the United Kingdom. There is likely to be a very considerable period of time before the treaty comes into force, and it is fully the expectation of the Department of State, I understand, as well as the Defense Department, that the administrative agreement will, in fact, be concluded before the treaty comes into force.

Mr. President, under those circumstances, I cannot understand why there need be so much haste. Of course, it might be pointed out that this treaty was brought before the San Francisco conference away back in September of last year. Yet that is not a long time as time goes. This is a solemn undertaking, and who knows what its impact may be or what its implications may be for the people of our own country and a world that is so full of tumult and so full of fever.

In connection with the question of haste, I notice also that General Bradley had this to say to the committee:

> In our opinion, the treaty itself might interfere with these operations unless the administrative agreement goes into effect at the same time.

Then, in the same part of the testimony, he said:

> So I would say, the status is that our own Government is just about ready to start discussions with the Japanese on this draft.

Meaning, of course, the administrative agreement.

Mr. President, difficulties may ensue, and it may take a little time to reach a correct position, but I do not believe our action ought to be too rash or too captious. There is time, since only one country for which provision is made for signature has actually ratified the treaty up to this time.

If the agreement is presently not ready, and if our military authorities, speaking through General Bradley, say that their operations might be handicapped and made difficult unless that agreement is first agreed upon between the two countries, it seems to me that is an argument in behalf of taking a little more time upon this treaty.

Mr. President, the second reason I recite in behalf of the action to postpone would be that I am thoroughly distressed about the moral aspect of the treaty. The Republic of China was fighting 9 years before Pearl Harbor, as it resisted the aggressions of Japan in Manchuria. That is a long time. Then, when Pearl Harbor came, and they were conjoined with us as allies, their soldiers fought side by side with our own soldiers.

We have made some representations to the Republic of China. Those representations were made in the course of various conferences, and it seems to me that the Chinese have a full and fair right to rely upon the representations of a country like the United States.

When all is said and done, the strength of this country lies in the moral representations it has made, and by which it has abided in the eyes of the world. That is the strength of our cause in a world that is so full of tumult today. Yet Nationalist China was not invited to the San Francisco conference. That is strange, when 48 other countries were represented there.

China suffered enormous losses in World War II. Millions of men, women, and children in civilian status were killed. Millions of her soldiers were killed. Yet as I look over the list of countries that were invited to the San Francisco conference, some of them no doubt never suffered even a slight dislocation of their economy, let alone any loss of personnel and manpower. Yet they were there, and I can see no adequate explanation for the snide treatment we have accorded to a country with which we worked, whose soldiers were indoctrinated and trained by the United States of America, and to whom we made an avowal that we would not sign a separate peace.

It ill becomes our country to try to influence friends and win people in all sections of the world when the best weapon they have is to stand up on a pinnacle and say, "There is the United States, who disavowed an agreement in which it pledged its solemn word a long time ago." People in Burma, Indochina, India, and elsewhere in the Orient cannot be persuaded by that kind of conduct.

So I am somewhat distressed over the fact that the country with whom we fought, on the backs of whose people machinery was carried for 1,500 or 1,600 miles to reestablish their capital at Chungking in order that they might stay in the conflict, should not receive consideration. They had our word.

Frankly, it becomes difficult to vote for a document unless its moral foundations are pretty sound, and give some assurance to our country that in the days ahead they will endure. When all is said and done, what is the virtue of a treaty unless there is a reasonable assurance that it will endure? When we consider a treaty, the question is not what ought to be; the question of what will be is what we must deal with. I try to keep my eye upon the verities and the realities of a situation.

Are we going to build a kind of moral and spiritual "Heartbreak Ridge" into this treaty because of the treatment that was accorded to the country now exiled, so to speak, upon the Island of Formosa, a country to which we gave our word?

The expedient course is never a happy one. Some days ago I was in Buffalo talking to a church group. After my talk was finished, I had a seminar with some of the young people. At that time I said to them that I thought that in order to get our own country into good moral grace it was necessary to denounce explicitly the evil, infamous, immoral things we undertook at Yalta. Some youngster ih the audience rose and said, "Mr. Senator, that would be pretty difficult." I replied, "Whether it is difficult or not, unless it is done we send our country down the expedient road."

If this country's moral pretentions are going to be held high and lofty in the eyes of people everywhere, then we had better look out.

How can we spend a hundred million dollars upon the Voice of America in all sections of the world to build up an esteem for our country and then in one fell blow throw it down by becoming a signatory to a document which, in my humble judgment, does not commend itself to my own moral perceptibility?

So the first reason I advance for the desirability of postponing ratification of the treaty is that there is no necessity for haste. There is abundant time. We could well lay the treaty aside for a little while and reconsider it at a later date.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue for a little while, and then I shall be glad to yield.

The second reason I assign is that I am afraid of the moral Heartbreak Ridges which may be contained in a treaty like this because of the snide treatment we have accorded the Nationalist Government of China.

The third reason I assign for postponement is that if, in the language of the majority leader uttered only a few moments ago, this is a treaty with the people of Japan, I am interested in knowing how the Japanese people feel. Today they have a government which is referred to popularly as the Yoshida government. I understand that only within the past 10 days a Tokyo newspaper has taken a poll on the Yoshida government, and that its popularity has been waning rapidly. Today one of the great arguments in Japan, as I understand, is over the military budget. Six hundred thirty million dollars is included in the military budget of the Yoshida government. There are allegations of corruption, ineptness, and inefficiency. There is a general belief—and perhaps a fortified belief—that there will be general elections in Japan during the coming fall.

Suppose the Yoshida government fails. Are we dealing with the people of Japan, or are we dealing with an administration? I wish our own people knew more about the treaty. I doubt whether there is a Senator who has received from his constituency as much as 100 pieces of mail on this treaty. My own mail on the subject is limited to about a dozen letters. As I indicated, probably those would not have been forthcoming unless I had blanketed the air lanes of my State with an informal discussion of this subject.

There are problems in Japan. If a treaty rests upon the public will, we ought to be sure that the public is fortified. I do not like to say this, but, as a matter of fact, I think the press of the United States has done a miserable job in connection with the treaty. Newbold Morris has received more linage in the press—100 times more—than the Japanese treaty. A celebrated coonskin cap has been accorded far more space than the treaty. The narcotics scandal in Washington has been emblazoned on the front pages of the newspapers, but I defy anyone to find in the press a great ventilation of this treaty and its implications.

Can we, then, in grace and candor say that the people of the United States know something about this great document, which in its annex No. 1 contains some of the most beautiful and alliterative language ever set forth on the printed page? It is all very fine, but it is airy, and it is frothy. If the durability of a treaty is based upon the public will in two countries, I should like to know a little more about the public will, in order to make sure that what we are doing is for the people and for the well-being of our country.

The fourth reason I would assign with respect to the desirability of postponement of the treaty deals with the rights of nationals under article 14. I read the testimony of Mr. Allman, a Washington attorney, who practiced law in China for 10 years and who has represented American clients having claims in the far-eastern area. If I read the language of the treaty correctly, it simply means that we have completely cut off the rights of our nationals to prefer claims.

My friend from California, Mr. KNOWLAND, said that a remedy would probably be found in article 15 of chapter 5. If I examine and understand the language of article 15 correctly, it relates to property which was in Japan at a given time; but I can think of inchoate rights, choses in action, and claims which may have been asserted before that time, which have no particular relation to property in Japan as between any bracketed dates. If that language means what I think it does, I think we are cutting off rights of our nationals.

I do not say that our citizens should use the instrumentality of this Government to collect their claims. Perhaps they will not collect a dollar. That will be no particular concern of mine. But I do not want to see in solemn law—because this instrument supersedes all the other laws of the country—a provision that one cannot go into court and prefer a claim because the Senate of the United States has cut off his claim. I merely wish to be sure that we do not cut off a legitimate right. We do not do it in our own country. I find no such provision anywhere in the substantive law of the land; and certainly I do not want to be in the unhappy position of giving my vote to a treaty which cuts off such a right.

I am not unmindful of the economic problem which exists. I wish to refer to that subject for a moment. Whether claimants collect or not is of no concern to me. This may be a naked right, and it may be so argued, but it is still a right. But by the solemn action of an instrumentality of Government we propose to cut off that right. Until that situation is remedied I shall have some real difficulty, at least with my heart, in supporting this treaty.

The next reason I would assign for the desirability of postponement is that, as I previously stated, treaties must be viewed in the light of what may happen, and not what ought to happen. Yesterday the Secretary of State went before the Foreign Relations Committee. He said that he expected that the truce negotiations in Korea would be successful. I hope they will be. I hope there may be an acceptable truce, although I have my fingers crossed, and I doubt it, because time is running out. I begin to doubt whether a military victory, in the accepted sense of the word, can be achieved in Korea, because the will is beginning to weaken there, and the will is beginning to weaken here.

But if there is to be a truce, what will be the truce terms? What is to come after the truce? I do not know. I do not pretend to know. I do not suppose that anyone, from the negotiators at Panmunjom on down, have the slightest idea what the eventualities of the future may be.

There may be some complications. However, I accept the Secretary of State at his word. If the truce negotiations are to be successful, what is wrong with waiting for a couple of months to see what the eventualities may be? We shall know better—certainly I shall know better for myself, because, frankly, I cannot command or summon the faith which is evidenced by other Members of this body in a treaty which is, after all, the architecture of one man.

What are to be the eventualities? Young men are dying today upon the slimy bosom of a country 7,000 miles from home. To what will we be committed?

I am not unmindful that this is an operation which has been initiated by the

Commander in Chief. Parenthetically, let me say that this is a good opportunity to answer some of my constituents. Mail pours in by the thousands of letters; and Korea is still No. 1 on the list.

In February 20,000 letters went out of my office. The greatest amount of mail received in one day was more than 16,000 letters. The people are beginning to pour out their hearts. What are we to say to them? I know what I say. When a Member of the Senate comes to this body from a great constituency, his constituents have builded in their minds the impression that he has great power in Washington. My constituents thought I had some power when I was a humble Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, humble people by the millions have builded in their minds the idea that the junior Senator from Illinois speaks with great authority. So we might as well take the cover off the ball. I want to say to my constituents today, as I propose to say to them in a more rounded effort on that particular subject some time later, that the Senate of the United States has very little authority in the project in which we are engaged in the Orient. The President of the United States put us into this conflict. He had it in his power as Commander in Chief, a power which is vested in him by the Constitution. He has not consulted with us about it. If I correctly remember the history, it was nearly 60 hours before the Congress was advised as to the action which was taken in Korea in June of 1950. The President acted on his own responsibility.

So, Mr. President, where are we? We are in the unhappy position of adopting resolutions expressing the sense of the Senate. I believe it is time to tell the people of the United States the truth. They write to me and say, "If that is all you can do, why don't you come home?" Sometimes I begin to take that question seriously, if Senators do not mind my saying so.

Mr. President, there is some frustration about being a Member of the Senate of the United States and feeling so impotent, so futile, and so powerless, as the President of the United States runs the show, and the casualty list in Korea now stands at 109,000 American soldiers.

Mr. President, that cannot be laughed off.

Therefore the matter now begins to address itself to the anguish and the pain and the hopes of the American people as they look to the future.

What will happen? I do not know. The President of the United States does not consult me. Parenthetically, I may say, that I hope the people of the United States in November 1952 will remember that fact when they select a President. I hope they will remember that when they select a President they are also selecting a Commander in Chief. They have forgotten that in other days. That thought needs to be revitalized, and it needs to be refreshed in their recollection when they exercise their responsibilities as voters.

Mr. President, do you know what is going to happen in Korea? Would it be too much to lay this treaty aside for a few months, to see what will happen, what will be the eventualities, and what we propose to do? I know one thing that we propose to do. I use very good authority for my statement. Mr. John M. Allison, Under Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, spoke in Philadelphia on the evening of March 4 before a forum which is sponsored by the Philadelphia Bulletin. Before I quote from Mr. Allison's speech I should say that I have gone through it very carefully. I am quite certain, Mr. President, that divesting the quotation from its context does not do any injustice to the viewpoint expressed by Mr. Allison. I want to be fair.

He said:

> It is our policy to confine the conflict to Korea. We do not propose to widen the scope of the war. That has been our policy from the start. That remains our policy. It is up to the Communists. If they want to widen the conflict and engulf the world in a terrible world war, then they must be the ones to do it. We and the United Nations seek peace. We want a peaceful solution in Korea, but not at the cost of sacrificing our principles.

There it is, Mr. President. It is a limited war. That is the State Department speaking. It is going to be a retail war. If that be the case, if instead of agreeing with the energizing slogan of General MacArthur, which he expressed when he addressed the joint meeting of Congress, "There is no substitute for victory," we now say we are not interested in victory except on a limited basis, what will be the outcome of the affair in Korea?

I do not pretend to know. I only pretend here in public to express my own bewilderment and my own dismay of spirit. I would much rather find out how far we are going to go and the destination we are going to reach before we commit our country to other responsibilities thousands of miles away from home.

I believe such considerations dictate the desirability of postponing ratification of the treaty. I quote the words of Mr. Dulles, when he said that the treaty cannot come into being for some months. The administrative agreement has not yet been signed. Why the haste? It takes ratification by 6 out of 11 countries to have the treaty come into being. Only the United Kingdom has ratified it so far. We have made mistakes before. I want to see no such mistakes made again.

Mr. President, the next reason I assign for my hope that ratification may be postponed is that there is involved the question of cost. All too often that is forgotten. However, our country is now carrying a burden of a $270,000,000,000 debt. The budget for the fiscal year 1953 amounts to $85,400,000,000. The country is laboring under a heavy tax load. Members of the Senate have been asserting in the press, on TV, and over the radio that the time has come to make a substantial cut in the foreign-aid program.

The junior Senator from Illinois is in favor of making such a cut. He will probably go as far in that direction as any other Member of the Senate, and perhaps a little farther.

Let us look at the cost. When we make a treaty of this kind under the prevailing circumstances we are dealing with a country of 83,000,000 people, circumscribed in a few island possessions, where life gets to be rather difficult.

In the letter which Premier Yoshida sent to Dean Acheson on September 8, 1951, with respect to the security treaty, he had this to say:

> Since the future is unsettled and it may unhappily be that the occasion for facilities and services in Japan in support of United Nations action will continue or recur, I would appreciate confirmation on behalf of your Government, that if and when forces of a member or members of the United Nations are engaged in any United Nations action in the Far East after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan, by the member or members, of the forces engaged in such United Nations actions; the expenses involved in the use of Japanese facilities and services to be borne as at present or as otherwise mutually agreed between Japan and the United Nations members concerned.

What is the arrangement at present, Mr. President? Mr. Dulles testified that we picked up the check for $2,000,000,000 thus far. What other checks are we to pick up? We are going to burden our country much more. To what extent has that question been ventilated? I believe it has not been ventilated to the extent I think it should be. I think our people, who are going to pay the bill, ought to see clearly just what the division of expense is to be, and how much the cost will be before we get through. As a matter of fact, the subject has received wholly inadequate attention. That is another reason why I think there is some desirability for postponing action.

I feel very unhappy about voting against this treaty; but if I must vote against it, I shall do so, even though I may be the only Member in the Senate who shall do so. At least I shall do so with a conscience that will bring me comfort and with a sense of conviction that will cause me no uneasiness in the days ahead.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful of one fact. I see before me the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], for whom I have a rich and abiding affection. We served in the House of Representatives together for a long time. It is no mere pleasantry when I say to the Senator from Alabama that I have an abiding attachment for the fellowship and friendship we have experienced in other days. I listened to his radio program on Sunday afternoon, in which he stated that the treaty repudiated either all or some of the terms of the Yalta agreement.

Mr. President, the Yalta agreement goes back to February of 1945. Oh, Mr. President, how it was defended in its day. There was something invaluable about the judgment of those who sat around the council table and committed this country to a course of action which in my judgment is so infamous that I always feel the necessity of apologizing for it.

Seven years is not a long time. I think we could wait a few months, to make sure that we will not have to repudiate this treaty. It is only a few years back that we approved the Italian Treaty.

Now voices of denunciation have been leveled from time to time in this Chamber against the Italian Peace Treaty.

Mr. President, where do we stand? Where is the rock of principle? It must be somewhere. After meditation and adequate consideration, when perhaps the fevers of the day have subsided a little, there may come an opportunity to see more clearly whether this is the thing to do.

Mr. President, I assign still another reason why I think action on this treaty should be postponed, and that is the economic reason. If the figure given us is correct, in this instance we deal with 83,000,000 people in Japan. We cannot be insensible of the fact that self-preservation is the first rule. It is the most impelling of all motives affecting mankind. Those people must eat.

I know that in the casual conversations which have taken place here, it has been said that they must not do business with the Soviet Union, that we must be certain that they are not slanted or oriented in that direction, and that we must also be certain that they are not slanted or oriented in the direction of Red China. Mr. President, in an effort to meet the argument which has been made time and time again in that field, I see that Mr. Dulles has indicated in the hearings that present conditions in respect to China will not forever prevail; that, after all, Japan's trade was an overseas trade for the most part, and she was not too dependent upon the mainland.

Yet in a world where competition is becoming more intense, I wonder where Japan is going to find the food she needs. If she cannot look in the direction of the mainland, in what direction can she look? What have we done about her economic needs? All too little is said about the economic problem that faces some 83,000,000 people in Japan; but Senators cannot laugh it off, because when bellies growl and hunger asserts itself, then we know that words on paper, called a treaty, amount to exactly nothing; it becomes a scrap of paper.

I have before me some of Mr. Dulles' testimony. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] asked him a question, and Mr. Dulles replied:

> The question you put—
>
> About this economic matter—
>
> is probably the most difficult question there is to give an absolutely clear answer to. I would say this: That prior to the 1930's, Japan's trade was primarily overseas trade and not to any large extent trade with the Asian mainland, and the mainland was not a major source of supplies for Japan.

I do not know whether that is true. It could be true. However, why are not some statistics submitted in connection with that matter? Why is there not in this all-too-meager record a little more documentation to indicate what the past has been?

I quote Mr. Dulles further. I hope I do him no injustice as I elide a few parts of his testimony, because I would not do him an injustice for worlds.

He continued:

> During the 1930 period there was an increasing change in the Japanese trade from the overseas trade to a Colonial trade in relation to the Asia mainland.

Then he had this to say:

> Therefore, I do not think that we need to speculate about whether, 10, 15, 20, 30, or 50 years from now Japan can be getting along without access to these markets because I think there will be conditions at that time which will enable Japan to have access to these markets. The problem that Japan faces and we face at the present time is a transitory problem and not a permanent problem.

But, Mr. President, a man can starve in a month. We talk about 10, 20, or 30 years. What is the answer? At the outset, I said I am no expert. I do not pretend to be. However, I do know that people become hungry, and that hunger will assert itself, whether one person or 80 million persons are involved. I also know that unless the economic outlet for the future is reasonably well assured, there can be no durability to a treaty. If a treaty does not endure, then why go through the motions? There should have been provided more information on the whole question than there is at the present time.

Anyone who reads this treaty from a cultural or a political standpoint can see that one of its objectives, is to orient Japan to the western civilization, so to speak. It may work out. However, I think that every ethnic argument is on my side when I say they are Asiatics and they will be Asiatics. I think it is a rather tenuous and slender foundation upon which we build in that field; at least, it disturbs me.

Mr. President, the next reason I would assign for the desirability of postponing this treaty is that if there arises in Japan a situation that requires the attention of the military, will we change our position materially under this treaty and under the security treaty which also is under consideration? It has been said time and time again that by this treaty we lift the force of occupation from the necks of the Japanese people. However, when we read the provisions of the security treaty, we find that under that treaty we take unto ourselves authority to impair the sovereignty of Japan to the point where we can dispose our land, sea, and air forces in Japan. That is set forth in Prime Minister Yoshida's letter to the Secretary of State. That is merely putting on one hat and taking off another. We might leave there the same troops, who are in the occupation army, and might say to them, "You are no longer an occupation army; you are now troops in a different status for the United States." However, they would still be troops, as a matter of fact.

So if this treaty is designed to change a military status in Japan, I rather fancy that that could be effectuated to almost every necessary point without the necessity for hasty action on this treaty.

Mr. President, one other reason I may assign for postponement of the treaty is that I think we are now getting to the point where there will have to be a showdown on the question of foreign policy in the Orient. I have read to you what Undersecretary Allison, in charge of the far eastern desk, recently said. If we go beyond Korea, it will be only because that is the will of the Reds. The war in that area is a limited war. For how long it will be a limited war, no one seems to know. Or is it a permanent war? Is that what it is, Mr. President?

I was rather intrigued the other day when we had before the Banking and Currency Committee a witness who got beyond his field. Incidentally, he represented an organization known as Americans for Democratic Action. The witness was rather an able youngster, too, as a matter of fact; and he presented his case fairly well. However, after a while a general discussion ensued. I wish to do justice to him by quoting him as correctly as I can. He asserted the position of himself and of his organization on behalf of the full foreign-aid bill, with this little observation, which may have escaped some persons: that but for it, we might have deflation in America. Mr. President, that is a rather interesting observation, is it not? I suppose that thought has persisted in the minds of a great many persons.

Our foreign policy in the east is a rather unhappy business. Certainly it means jobs, but how do we separate jobs and corpses?

When the President delivered to Congress his message on the state of the Union, what did he say? He used a jewel of a phrase; he said, "Economic issues and international issues are inseparable."

That is a good line to remember, and it is right: Jobs in defense plants, but young dead in Korea. For when there are jobs, Mr. President, it is so easy for those who have the jobs to say, "I never had it so good. I am doing all right. I own my TV set, and I've got money in the bank. I have paid off the last installment on the plaster on my house, and I own a Chevvie. I have got five children. The old lady and me never had it so good."

But then we always have to intrude what in my judgment is an absolutely necessary comment, namely, "How much of it would give you back to put a throbbing arm into a throbbing socket of one of the boys who come from Walter Reed to visit us every day, and sit out here in the corridor?" How much would you give, Mr. President, to coax back the breath of life, even as the Lord told Ezekiel, long ago, into a dead host? How much would you give back, if the boy who lived in your block or in your household could be alive today?

It is bewildering to hear statements about a limited war—anything but victory. I become rather disconcerted by them. Why can we not reexamine this business and make abundantly clear to the American people where we are going, as they clutter the desks of Senators with letters depicting their frustrations and their bitterness and heartaches, as the shadow of a holy young son marches in parade? We do not laugh off that situation, and they are not going to laugh it off, either, this year, if the junior Senator from Illinois has anything to say about it.

There is one other thing, Mr. President, I might mention, in support of the position I take, that this treaty ought to be postponed for a while. When all is said and done, we are building a fighting

machine for our own security in the Far East, on the frontier of our security. It is a good thought; I do not quarrel with it; but when that kind of machine is built, what about the bread-and-butter needs of the people there? That aspect of the matter has received all too inadequate attention, Mr. President. The day may come when, notwithstanding the document which is before us, they may become dependent upon us. What then? How far can we charge the purses and the patience and the resiliency of our country, before we go down the dismal road to disaster?

One other thing, Mr. President. I said earlier that the United Kingdom is the only one, of the 6 necessary countries out of 11, who have ratified this treaty. This treaty has been in the main the work of one man. Others, of course, have given their sanction and their approval; but I think it is generally agreed that Mr. Dulles is the architect of this treaty. I know him. I do not know him well, but I esteem him as a friend. I have been a visitor in his house on Long Island, and certainly I would not demean him, Mr. President; but, as I think of Mr. Dulles and his philosophy, I think also of a colloquy which took place in Parliament not so long ago. To be exact, I think it was shortly after the 26th of February. That was about the time when Mr. Dulles was in New York, making a radio broadcast. According to Aneurin Bevan, the stormy petrel of the British Parliament, the London Times of February 12 carried a statement which Mr. Bevan read on the floor, as follows:

> Mr. Dulles during a broadcast discussion last night said that the United States must let all the Far East know that it would not stand idly by while any part of the world remained under the rule of either Communist or Fascist dictatorship.

Mr. President, how does that square with the statement made by the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Allison, in Philadelphia on the 4th of March? It simply does not square.

Aneurin Bevan turned to the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, and said:

> Does the right honorable gentleman accept that as a definition of British foreign policy?

The Prime Minister replied:

> No, sir; certainly not.

Where in the name of heaven are we today?

So, Mr. President, I simply confess my own bewilderment about this treaty. I say in all humility I want to do the right thing, but I will not commit my country to unknown and obscure undertakings, to a document which may not be durable, and to a document about which there is something dubious, when we consider the moral question and the commitment and the avowal which we made to people who walked in the shadow of Armageddon with our own soldiers in World War II, and who took such frightful losses. If that is included, Mr. President, I suppose the junior Senator from Illinois is going to have to reorient completely his thinking in this strange atmosphere of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that others will at least lend their support to the advisability of postponing action. I know that no Member of the Senate actually wants to vote against a document, which has been heralded, of course, as a repository of peace.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. JENNER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me first yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I wanted the floor.

Mr. MALONE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield first to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois is to be congratulated upon his very fine address.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JENNER. I have not taken a position favoring postponement. I have taken the position that a treaty is necessary, that the war with Japan is over, and that we therefore should have a treaty. But the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and I have proposed several reservations, and I want to suggest to the Senator from Illinois that he give consideration to them. I think they will possibly clear up some of the doubts he entertains about the treaty, in view of his position that he would like to see its ratification postponed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say at that point that I have examined the reservations, and I shall examine them further before they come before the Senate for action.

Mr. JENNER. In the latter part of the Senator's address, he referred to the unknown. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that in this legal maze of peace treaties and security treaties, which are woven together, provision is made that, as soon as the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan have determined that such forces have come into being, our bases, our Air Force, our Navy, our infantry and our Army, by a stroke of the pen of this Government, can be turned over, and will be turned over, to the United Nations; and that the very situation in Korea which the Senator deplores, the Senate proposes to authorize by ratifying this treaty unless the reservations offered by the Senator from Maine and myself are adopted? Does the Senator realize that?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my friend from Indiana that I sat up until midnight last night, puzzling over what I thought might be involved; and I thought that was one implication.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I have listened with great interest to the argument for the postponement by the Senate of the question of ratifying the treaty with Japan. Has the distinguished Senator from Illinois submitted a resolution or motion to recommit or to postpone?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to my friend from Nevada that I propounded a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, to ascertain whether we were considering the treaty in executive session as in Committee of the Whole, and whether it was necesary first to report the treaty back to the Senate before acting on the final resolution of ratification. I understand, however, that a motion to postpone indefinitely is in order, and that it may be made either now or subsequently. I intend to make such a motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state for the RECORD that, under rule XXIII, a motion is in order to postpone to a definite date.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I saw nothing in the rule requiring that the motion must be reduced to writing. If it is in order, Mr. President, I would like to make the motion at this point, I will reduce it to writing if necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the motion need not be in writing. Therefore, the motion is before the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I make the motion now, so that it may be under consideration by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires whether the distinguished Senator from Illinois moves a postponement to a certain date.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I move to postpone indefinitely, Mr. President; and I understand that under the rule the motion can be considered at any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that consideration of this treaty be postponed indefinitely. The motion is the pending question, and it is debatable. The Chair will state for the benefit of the Senate that a two-thirds vote will be necessary to adopt the motion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as the Senator from Illinois knows full well, I have a measure of affection and respect for him comparable to that which I hold for but few other men.

Portions of the Senator's argument sincerely concerned and interested me. I wish the Senator would tell us more about why, in his opinion, there should be no Japanese Peace Treaty while there remains uncertainty in Korea. I ask that question because from my point of view the uncertainty and indecisiveness in Korea today are two of the impelling reasons why we should have at the earliest possible moment the restoration of sovereignty to Japan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It seems to me that the only consideration involved would be the military force. What difference does it make whether the force wears its present hat or the hat we place upon its head under this treaty? From the standpoint of uncertainty, we could not have any more protection than we already have; we could not add any more assurance militarily than we already have. Our commitments and our responsibility are there to recognize——

Mr. CAIN. Admittedly, we certainly must make guesses in these days.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator may be correct in what he has just said, but my

thought concerning sovereignty for Japan is that it would encourage that nation, whose people take an ever more vital and growing interest in reestablishing their own ability to take care of themselves, to work with the western world.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad the Senator raised the question of sovereignty, because it is a disconcerting question. It is an impaired sovereignty, to begin with, because we are in the position of a victor, even though we have tried to take the sting and bitterness out of the treaty—and that, I think, has been done, and done quite well. But the fact of the matter is that this treaty would not be here, I fancy, unless we knew well in advance that we would have the right to station our own troops in Japan, plus the fact that no other country will be able to place any troops there except with the sanction of the United States of America. That is not exactly an uninhibited sovereignty.

Mr. CAIN. I express my appreciation for the candor of the Senator's response.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator referred to the unfortunate circumstances resulting from the ratification in 1947 of the Italian Peace Treaty. The Senator will recall that at that time there was a unanimous report made by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and that anyone who stood in this Chamber, as the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois has done today, to oppose what seemed to be an overwhelmingly popular treaty, found difficulty in getting even an opportunity to scrutinize the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty, because there seemed to be an overwhelming agreement that the treaty should be ratified at that time.

On this occasion the Committee on Foreign Relations has also submitted a unanimous report, and we find in the newspapers a demand for ratification of the treaty with Japan. There seems to be a general feeling and sentiment that the treaty with Japan should be ratified at this time. The Senator from Illinois has pointed out what appears to be the futility of exploring the various provisions of the treaty, primarily because the Committee on Foreign Relations has made a unanimous report, as was the case in June of 1947.

So, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois how he would have a more careful scrutiny of the peace treaty when there seems to be a general demand throughout the United States—whether it has been deliberately engendered by the press, the radio, and supporters of the treaty I do not know—for the immediate ratification of the treaty with Japan. How would the Senator from Illinois overcome that situation to the extent of enabling the Senate, which does have the constitutional responsibility to ratify treaties, to discharge its duty in such a way as to avoid future embarrassment such as we had because the treaty with Italy was ratified in 1947 and subsequently repudiated by nearly everyone?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The answer is very easy. If the Senate will support a motion to postpone, I am confident that all the proponents of the treaty, including those in the executive branch, will be able to prepare a better and a more comprehensive case and we shall have more time, I think, to direct the attention of the people of America to what is being proposed.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield in order that I may ask a question of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield. I was about to yield the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Was it not under the influence of a bipartisan conference that we adopted the Italian Treaty, which was distasteful to several of us, and is distasteful now to the entire Senate, but we are helpless to do anything about it?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Obviously it was a bipartisan program under which in 1947 the Italian Peace Treaty was considered, and apparently it is now a bipartisan program, with all the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate recommending that the treaty with Japan be ratified at this time. So it is extremely difficult, because of the situation, to determine whether there are any factors or elements involved in the ratification of the treaty which would indicate the advisability of deferring action.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to postpone indefinitely the consideration of the treaty.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on the motion to postpone, and also to discuss some of the points raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

In the first place, Mr. President, I think the motion to postpone would be most disadvantageous to the position of the United States in the Far East, and would be detrimental to the Government in power in Japan which is friendly toward the free world. It would undermine, I believe, the general situation in the Far East.

I happen to have had, as I pointed out yesterday, the opportunity on three different occasions of visiting Japan and the Far East and on each occasion to see General MacArthur when he was in that area of the world. The first time was in January 1946. It was a reasonably short time after VJ-day and before the occupation under General MacArthur had a chance really to come into full force and effect. I was there again in 1949 after the occupation had been in force for several years. No fair-minded person who had been in Japan could fail to recognize the tremendous progress which had been made by the people of Japan under the leadership of General MacArthur. I was back again in 1950, in the fall, approximately 6 months after the outbreak of the war in Korea, and I had the opportunity of seeing General MacArthur in Tokyo at that time.

As I pointed out in my speech yesterday, General MacArthur, in his statement in June 1950 felt that the Japanese people had lived up to all the terms of the ultimatum given to them on July 26, 1945, prior to the surrender. Our occupation, from a legal point of view, was based on the acceptance of the surrender terms. Those terms were agreed to by the British Government, by ourselves, and by the Republic of China. As I say, our legal occupation of Japan rested to a great extent upon the acceptance of the surrender terms. I know that in 1950 and, if my recollection is not incorrect as early as 1949, General MacArthur felt that the occupation had continued about as long as an occupation should continue, and he stated very clearly to me at that time that, in his judgment, if it were continued a great deal longer, there would be danger that much of the good which had been accomplished by the occupation would be undone.

So, Mr. President, I think we must give very careful consideration to the motion to postpone, because the effect of its adoption would be to cause the occupation of Japan to continue. No person is sufficiently wise to know whether a suitable cease-fire arrangement will be obtained in Korea. I have grave doubt whether there will be a satisfactory cease-fire arrangement with the North Koreans. Certainly the indications are that that will not come about. Even if there should be a temporary cease fire, I do not believe that in any sense of the word it would mean peace in that area of the world. To the contrary, a cease-fire might mean the opening shot in a new type of warfare in the Far East, because it might very well free the Communist forces to move against southeast Asia, against Formosa, against even India, if that happened to suit their purposes. So a cease-fire in Korea is no guaranty of peace in the Pacific. I think we must constantly keep that fact in mind.

Mr. President, I yield to the junior Senator from California.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. President, I think we have all been interested in the statement of my colleague concerning the feeling of General MacArthur that it is necessary to obtain a peace treaty as soon as possible. However, I wonder if on any occasion the Senator has discussed with General MacArthur the specific treaty now before the Senate, and whether General MacArthur has expressed an opinion as to whether this treaty should receive the approval of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I have no authority to speak for General MacArthur, but some weeks ago I went to New York to see General MacArthur and, among other things, spoke to him about the treaty. During the course of the conversation I made inquiry of General MacArthur about the treaty, because there had been a considerable amount of discussion throughout the country to the effect that the proposed treaty should perhaps be postponed since there were features of it which were not satisfactory. I pointed out to the general that many times in dealing with legislation we are not able to get a utopian proposal presented to us, and that in the case of

treaties I assumed that if we did not have to deal with 48 other countries, perhaps any of the 48 other countries might have drafted a treaty a little differently, or that we might have drafted it differently if it had been a treaty only between the United States and Japan.

On my own responsibility I addressed an inquiry to him, having stated that argument, and said, "If you were sitting where I am sitting, in the Senate of the United States, would you vote to ratify the treaty?"

The answer of General MacArthur was, "I would."

That may help to answer the question of my colleague the junior Senator from California.

The Senator from Illinois was critical of the fact that we are dealing with the government in power in Japan, the Yoshida government, as he called it. That is the constitutional government of Japan. Japan held its parliamentary elections. As a matter of fact, my recollection is that far more Japanese went to the polls in their parliamentary elections that normally go to the polls in our own elections. The vote by which the Japanese Government in power was elected was rather overwhelming. As I recall, the Communist vote in Japan was a very minor fraction, perhaps less than 5 percent of the total vote cast. So the government of Prime Minister Yoshida is the legal, constitutional freely elected government of the people of Japan.

Of course, in any free society under any constitutional form of government, the people from time to time have the right to change their government, even as we in the United States have the right to change our Government. No one has a crystal ball by which he can know, in the event there are parliamentary elections in the future, the government of Prime Minister Yoshida will be continued or will go out of office. No one has a crystal ball which can tell what will happen in this country in November of this year. Some of us on this side of the aisle hope there will be a change in the Government. But we cannot stop functioning as a country while waiting for the elections to take place.

The Yoshida government is the government of the hour. It is the constitutional government of Japan. It is the only government with which we could have negotiated a treaty if we are to have a treaty.

So I say, first of all, the Senate must decide whether the ratification of the treaty can be postponed indefinitely, as the Senator from Illinois desires, in which case the occupation will be continued, or whether we will have a treaty. That is the first question that must be decided.

I was much surprised to hear the able Senator from Illinois say that there had been charges made against the Yoshida government to the effect that it did not necessarily represent the people of Japan, and that there had been some charges of corruption. Of course, similar statements were made relative to the government of Chiang Kai-shek in China, as statements of that character have been made about the Government of Syngman Rhee in Korea, and about governments in other sections of the world. I do not think we should be too complacent or too self-sufficient about that. Those nations are not the only nations which have had five-percenters, who have had people who have betrayed the trust of their President, who have some officials who have been incompetent or corrupt. There have also been similar charges made in our own country.

On that basis governments might sit back and say, "We cannot negotiate with your government because there have been some charges of corruption." I think that would be utterly absurd.

The Yoshida government is the government in power at this time. It is now the only government with which the United States can negotiate a treaty.

Mr. President, there has been some discussion relative to the Yalta agreement. The treaty we are considering has no remote connection or similarity with the Yalta agreement. The Yalta agreement was secretly negotiated, primarily under the auspices of three responsible leaders of three nations, the United States of America, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain. At Yalta there was negotiated a completely secret agreement about which the American people knew nothing, except through some account that a conference was going on. For many months the Senate of the United States had no knowledge of what the terms of the Yalta agreement were. It was never submitted to the Senate of the United States for confirmation. To the contrary, the treaty with Japan has been the subject of discussion in the Congress of the United States. It was fully considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, furthermore, Members of the Senate of the United States from both political parties went to the San Francisco conference and participated in the discussions there.

As the Senator from Illinois has quite correctly pointed out, the man who has carried the greatest burden in the negotiations is Mr. John Foster Dulles, a distinguished and able former Republican Senator from the State of New York.

So there is no remote similarity between the way the Yalta agreement came into being and the way the pending treaty has come into being and is being considered.

A question was raised by the Senator from Illinois to the effect that there are great economic problems involved. I think no one who has a knowledge of the Far East would deny that there are great economic problems in that area of the world, as there are in other areas of the world. But I wish to point out that from 1930 to 1934 the average amount of exports to China from Japan was $146,000,000, and the imports from China to Japan were $96,000,000. In 1951 that figure had changed, so that the exports to China from Japan amounted to $25,000,000, and the imports from China to Japan amounted to $20,000,000.

Let us see how that compares with the figures for other areas of the world. Japan's trade with Asia other than with China, on the average for the 1930 to 1934 period, represented exports to other countries of Asia of $278,000,000. The imports to Japan from other countries of Asia amounted to $296,000,000. Those are average figures.

How had that situation changed by 1951? These are approximate figures. The exports from Japan to other countries of Asia amounted to $365,000,000, and the imports from other Asiatic countries amounted to $330,000,000.

Let us see what the relationships with the United States were. In the period from 1930 to 1934 the average of exports to the United States was $167,000,000, and imports from the United States were $183,000,000. By 1951 the approximate figures were: Exports to the United States, $238,000,000; and imports from the United States, $462,000,000. So in the case of both the United States and the other countries of Asia, comparing the period from 1930 to 1934, which was prewar, with 1951, as of 1951 trade is much greater than it was during the earlier period with either prewar China or with Communist China.

To throw further light on the subject, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks some figures which I received from the Department of Commerce under date of January 24, dealing with the trade between the United States and Japan, both exports and imports, for the years 1949 and 1950, and for the period January to October of 1951.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States trade with Japan, annual 1949 and 1950, and January-October 1951, by commodity groups and principal commodities

[Value in millions and tenths of millions of dollars]

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Annual				January–October 1951	
		Quantity		Value		Quantity	Value
		1949	1950	1949	1950		
Exports, including reexports, total				467.5	[1] 418.2		[1] 482.9
Exports, United States merchandise, total [2]				466.8	[1] 416.6		[1] 479.2
Foodstuffs				244.6	110.6		[3] 164.7
Dairy products				10.0	6.9		4.3
Nonfat dry milk solids	1,000 pounds	54,344	58,931	7.6	4.6	9,743	1.3
Grains and preparations				217.7	90.4		134.5
Barley	1,000 bushels [4]	15,869	8,191	22.8	10.6	24,556	37.1
Corn, except seed	1,000 bushels [4]	9,455	415	15.2	.6	1,971	4.1

[1] For security reasons data exclude "special category" exports beginning July 1950.
[2] Includes soybean oilcake and meal, 105,000 long tons valued at $9,800,000.
[3] Commodity data are exports of United States merchandise.
[4] 48-pound bushel.
[5] 56-pound bushel.

United States trade with Japan, annual 1949 and 1950, and January-October 1951, by commodity groups and principal commodities—Con.

[Value in millions and tenths of millions of dollars]

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Annual				January–October 1951	
		Quantity		Value		Quantity	Value
		1949	1950	1949	1950		
Foodstuffs—Continued							
Grains and preparations—Continued							
Grain sorghums	1,000 bushels [5]	3,788		5.6			
Wheat	1,000 bushels [6]	69,534	30,931	164.8	70.6	38,153	89.2
Wheat flour	1,000 hundredweight	1,701	83	8.6	.5	138	.8
Vegetables and preparations				5.1	.8		.5
Fruits and preparations				.4	1.2		.9
Peanuts, shelled	1,000 pounds	30,316	8	4.6	(7)	9	(7)
Sugar and related products				.8	3.6		7.8
Sugar	1,000 pounds	4,094	16,348	.3	1.2	58,336	3.6
Animals and animal products, inedible				7.2	7.6		13.3
Cattle hides, wet	1,000 pieces	89	75	1.3	1.2	84	2.5
Tal'ow, inedible	1,000 pounds	51,230	35,485	4.8	3.8	50,227	8.6
Vegetable products, inedible				20.0	[1] 16.5		[1] 45.2
Soybeans, except canned	1,000 pounds	350,343	283,345	15.8	11.9	684,261	39.3
Textile fibers and manufactures				106.7	227.3		145.9
Raw cotton, except linters	1,000 bales	630	1,228	101.0	217.6	560	119.4
Wood and paper				3.0	2.1		6.7
Nonmetallic minerals				19.0	[1] 5.4		[1] 39.7
Bituminous coal	1,000 short tons	1,355	147	12.5	1.4	1,252	11.5
Petroleum and products				3.5	[1] 2.9		[1] 24.4
Metals and manufactures				4.2	2.2		[8] 12.8
Iron and steel-mill products				1.4	1.2		2.9
Machinery and vehicles				6.4	[1] 11.4		[1] 20.4
Electrical machinery				.7	[1] 1.4		[1] 2.1
Industrial machinery				1.8	[1] 4.1		[1] 8.2
Automobiles, parts, and accessories [9]				2.1	3.4		7.7
Passenger cars and chassis, new	Number	857	1,613	1.2	2.3	3,892	5.9
Chemicals and related products				29.0	[1] 23.9		[1] [10] 20.3
Coal-tar products				3.3	1.9		[1] 2.3
Chemical specialties (excludes "special category" exports beginning May 1949).				1.8	1.9		3.5
Nitrogenous chemical materials	1,000 pounds	506,078	608,715	16.8	13.0	6	(7)
Phosphate rock	1,000 long tons	199	510	1.3	2.9	534	3.9
Commodities exported for relief or charity				23.5	4.5		2.6
All other exports of United States merchandise				3.2	[1] 5.1		[1] 6.6
Reexports, total				.7	1.6		3.7
General imports, total				82.0	182.0		174.9
Imports for consumption, total [11]				76.7	177.5		167.7
Foodstuffs				9.0	27.2		17.6
Fish including shellfish	1,000 pounds	14,006	74,212	4.5	21.4	61,389	[12] 13.1
Tuna fish in oil	do	1,782	31,809	.9	12.8	2,077	.9
Vegetables and preparations				1.7	1.9		1.6
Tea	1,000 pounds	4,529	4,932	1.7	1.9	3,059	1.2
Animal and products, inedible				2.5	4.6		6.5
Furs, undressed				1.1	1.2		1.3
Cod-liver oil	1,000 gallons	103	440	.7	1.0	874	2.5
Vegetable products, inedible				4.5	5.7		5.9
Rubber and allied gums and manufactures				.7	1.2		1.1
Drugs, and herbs, leaves, roots, etc				2.6	3.3		3.9
Textile fibers and manufactures				29.2	60.0		53.2
Cotton manufactures				2.7	12.2		10.1
Table damask and manufactures	1,000 pounds	272	3,115	.3	3.5	2,234	3.0
Cotton cloth	1,000 square yards	1,502	17,726	.4	2.6	710	.2
Flax, hemp and ramie and manufactures				.6	.5		.2
Wool manufactures				1.8	4.0		4.7
Silk and manufactures				21.4	37.4		32.4
Raw silk	1,000 pounds	2,316	6,477	5.9	17.4	3,602	14.9
Silk fabrics exceeding 30 inches in width [13]	1,000 square yards	30,565	37,257	13.8	13.8	24,210	9.5
Wood and paper				2.2	5.3		6.2
Wood manufactures				1.3	2.8		3.8
Nonmetallic mineral products [13]				8.9	13.6		15.0
Glass and glass products				1.2	1.7		1.9
Clay and clay products				6.0	8.3		10.4
Domestic or household table and kitchen articles and utensils	1,000 dozen	1,847	3,375	2.6	3.9	3,553	4.9
China ornaments	1,000 dozen	5,190	5,679	2.3	2.6	4,379	2.9
Pearls and parts, not strung or set				1.7	3.2		2.3
Metals and manufactures [13]				9.5	41.8		[14] 43.1
Iron and steel scrap	1,000 long tons	177	101	3.8	1.6	28	2.3
Aluminum and manufactures				.4	4.8		3.0
Copper and manufactures	1,000 pounds [15]	2,335	103,262	.3	16.9	12,198	2.9
Copper refined in ingots, plates, or bars	do [15]	2,225	46,482	.3	7.8	1,405	.3
Old and scrap copper	do [15]	110	42,048	(7)	6.0	3,135	.7
Old brass and clippings	do [15]	8,717	26,068	1.2	3.1	514	.1
Lead and manufactures	do [15]	9,675	46,746	1.0	4.9	1,139	.4
Machinery and vehicles				1.9	5.3		5.6
Sewing machines and parts				1.4	4.7		4.5
Chemicals and related products				.2	.7		1.9
Dolls and toys, athletic and sporting goods				2.4	4.1		3.5
Scientific and professional instruments				1.4	2.4		2.7
Beads and fabrics and articles of beads				1.0	1.2		.8
Pipes and smokers' articles				.8	2.8		1.8
All other imports				3.2	2.8		3.9

[1] For security reasons data exclude "special category" exports beginning July 1950.
[5] 56-pound bushel. [6] 60-pound bushel. [7] Less than $50,000.
[8] Includes iron ore, 894,000 long tons valued at $7,401,000.
[9] Motor trucks and busses manufactured to military specifications were included in this subgroup through June 1949 and excluded from it thereafter.
[10] Includes medicinal and pharmaceutical preparations, $4,700,000; and industrial chemicals, $2,700,000.
[11] Commodity data are imports for consumption.
[12] Includes tuna, fresh or frozen, 35,590,000 pounds valued at $5,186,000.
[13] General imports were as follows:

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Annual			
		Quantity		Value	
		1949	1950	1949	1950
Silk fabrics, exceeding 30 inches in width	1,000 square yards	35,651	37,565	16.0	13.7
Nonmetallic mineral products				10.1	13.5
Metals and manufactures				9.9	43.7

[14] Includes boiler and other plate, 145,500,000 pounds at $9,300,000; ferro-alloys, ores, and metals, $3,100,000; platinum, 115,000 oz. troy ounces, valued at $9,300,000; brass manufactures, $2,300,000.
[15] Copper content.
[16] Lead content.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, some point was made that because of the problems of food and raw materials Japan might have to trade with Communist China. I have pointed out that Japan's trade with China, even in the prewar period, was not so great as some have estimated. Secondly, I certainly think that at this time the free world should not be interested in encouraging trade with Communist China when the only things Communist China really wants from Japan are the products of her industrial plants, much of which would add to the war potential of Communist China, and ultimately of the entire Communist world. Certainly, as a matter of public policy, in the passage of the Battle Act, and in the action by the Senate on the so-called Kem amendment, we have clearly indicated, in the legislative arm of the Government, that we do not want the nations with which we are dealing and which we are helping, in turn to add to the arsenals of the Communist world. So certainly on that ground we should not favor another "let us wait for the dust to settle" policy, which might ultimately drive Japan into the arms of Communist China. It certainly does not make sense to me.

Some points was made about a speech in the British Parliament by Mr. Bevan. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] correctly quoted the speech. I have in my hands the reports of the parliamentary debates of the House of Commons for Tuesday, the twenty-sixth day of February 1952. It is a correct statement that Mr. Bevan had this to say, as recorded on page 993:

> Mr. BEVAN. It was not a good enough joke to repeat. The point that I am putting is this. Here is a quotation from the Times of the twelfth February—and I am not quoting politicians who are trying to get votes—"Mr. Dulles, during a broadcast discussion last night, said that the United States must let all the Far East know that it would not stand idly by while any part of the world remained under the rule of either Communist or Fascist dictatorship."

So, to that extent, the Senator from Illinois has correctly quoted Mr. Bevan; but the interesting fact is that Mr. Bevan did not correctly quote Mr. Dulles. What Mr. Dulles actually said was that we would "not be happy" at having China or the other countries under either a Communist or a Fascist dictatorship. So with the change, that Mr. Dulles himself was misquoted, I think that will take care of that phase of the discussion.

I need only ask: Since when has the Congress of the United States been particularly interesting in following the policies of Mr. Bevan? On the contrary, I think that the policies of Mr. Bevan in Britain would be fatal to the free world and to the British Government itself. Fortunately, I think, for Great Britain, and fortunately for the free people of the world who have been trying to build a system which would resist totalitarian aggression, Mr. Bevan is not the Prime Minister. He does not represent the Government of the hour. That is represented by that stalwart British citizen, Mr. Winston Churchill, who, when things looked far darker in Europe than they do today, when the Nazi totalitarian wave was overwhelming all the Continent, had the courage and the fortitude to stand up and resist Nazi totalitarianism, and ultimately to help the free world win a victory. He, and not Mr. Bevan, happens to be the leader of the British Government and the head of the Government in power. I think that, even though Mr. Churchill has been criticized in Parliament, it may be interesting to review for the Senate the fact that in his speech before the joint session Mr. Churchill had this to say:

> We are grateful to the United States for bearing nine-tenths or more of the burdens in Korea which the United Nations have morally assumed. I am very glad that, whatever diplomatic divergences there may be from time to time about procedure, you do not allow the Chinese anti-Communists on Formosa to be invaded and massacred from the mainland.

That was quite a change from the position of the former Labor Government, under Mr. Attlee, of which Mr. Bevan represents the extreme left wing.

Some point was made—I do not know why—to the effect that the Japanese are Asiatics. Of course they are Asiatics. No one denies that. But I think the free world and the Western World can learn much from Asiatics, as I think they can learn much from us. No one is suggesting that the Japanese, the Chinese, or the Filipinos shall become westerners. They are Asiatics. They have a very proud tradition. They had a very high state of civilization long before some western nations had a high civilization. But I believe that what we are interested in is not that they become westernized, but that they become contributing members of the free world. There is a vast difference. We can have human freedom in Asia without the Asiatics becoming westernized. I believe that they have a great contribution to make to the free world.

Mr. President, I think I have been as critical as any other Member of this body of the policy of this Government. I pointed out yesterday, and I shall point out again, that when we are facing the menace of communism, which is global in character, it does no good to close the door to communism in Europe if we leave the door wide open in Asia. Those of us on this side of the aisle have been critical of this administration for having left the door to communism wide open in Asia, and for having opened up a situation in which 400,000,000 people of China, who had been our historic friends, finally passed into the Communist hands of Mao Tse-tung.

How did that come about? It came about because we followed the catastrophic and fatal policy of waiting for the dust to settle, hoping that there might be some pieces to pick up when the dust had settled.

We waited for 5 or 6 years, and we have found that all of China on the Continent of Asia has passed behind the iron curtain. China is probably the key to the rest of continental Asia. Are we to wait again for the dust to settle, so far as Japan is concerned? Shall we prolong the occupation, when the outstanding American with knowledge of that area of the world, Gen. Douglas MacArthur, stated that the occupation had lasted long enough and that a continuation of the occupation might undo the good which had been done by the occupation?

Mr. President, I say that if we follow any such fatal course we may finally be responsible for plunging Japan into the arms of communism.

Mr. Stalin recognizes the significance of it even if there are some Senators who do not recognize it, because he has stated that with Japan, Soviet Russia would become invincible.

That is a pretty high responsibility for any Member of the Senate, be he a Republican or a Democrat, to take upon his shoulders.

What is the matter with us, Mr. President? Have we learned nothing from the fatal 6 years we have passed through?

Mr. Lenin many years ago pointed out that the road to Paris was through Peking, meaning of course that if the Soviet Union could gather into its orbit all the people of China, the Soviet Union would hold the key to Asia, and that with Asia the Soviet Union would hold the key to the 1,100,000,000 people of Asia.

Yes, they are Asiatics. But we need them on our side in this struggle for human freedom. We should welcome them with open arms. We should recognize them for the great contribution they can make to the cause of a free world. We should do it and say it with no disparagement. Their civilization happens to be a little older even than our civilization. We are now face to face in Europe and in Asia with a great totalitarian, Godless, and ruthless power. The men in the Kremlin are the most ruthless rulers the world has known, certainly in modern times.

We must welcome to the cause all men of good will, be they in Asia or in Europe or in Africa, who will stand up for human freedom.

Nowhere in the long history of the Soviet Union or of Imperial Russia, which preceded the Soviet Union, was there anything comparable to what the United States did in setting up a free and independent Philippine Republic. Nowhere in the history of Russia, either under the Czars or under the Commissars, was there anything comparable to what Great Britain did in setting up free and independent India and Pakistan, or what The Netherlands did in setting up a free and independent Republic of Indonesia, or what the United States did after the Spanish-American War in setting up a free and independent Cuba.

To the contrary, the Soviet Union has spread propaganda against the western powers. The whole Communist movement has been to destroy human liberty in the Soviet Union and to destroy the liberty of people in countries bordering on the Soviet Union. They have taken over Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. They have set up satellite governments in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Rumania. Day by day they are fastening their hold on the people

of China under their satellite leader Mao Tse-tung.

I think we have nothing to fear if we go to people who desire to be free and point out to them from the record of history that the most ruthless and imperialistic power anywhere in the world today is the Soviet Union and that in their slave labor camps, scattered throughout all sections of the Soviet Union, there are more than 300,000 Japanese prisoners of war who have never been returned to their homeland, as there are thousands of German prisoners of war who have been worked in the salt mines and slave labor camps of Siberia and Russia, as well as countless citizens of Poland and other countries who are unaccounted for or who are working in slave labor camps for the Russians.

I say with all humility that we should be glad to welcome Asiatics to the cause of preserving human freedom in the world, and we should point out to them that if human freedom goes down in America and in the Western World human freedom will be carried down in Asia as well. On the basis of that policy I believe we will have a great many steady allies, not only in Japan and not only in the Republic of China now on Formosa, but in the Philippines, southeast Asia, in Pakistan, and, some day I hope, in India as well.

Mr. President, I had not intended to speak today, but I thought that under the circumstances some answer should be given to the statement of my very good friend and distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I think it would be a fatal policy to postpone ratification of the treaty. We would lose the initiative we assumed in San Francisco, and we would again be fumbling the ball in the Far East.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand a telegram from Walter W. Van Kirk, executive director of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America, in which he says:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 18, 1952.*

ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America urges prompt ratification of treaty of peace with Japan. We believe treaty safeguards rights and insures dignity of Japanese people and lays foundation for durable peace in Far East. Strong Christian support for treaty in own country and Japan.

WALTER W. VAN KIRK,
Executive Director.

Mr. President, I believe this important communication will be of interest to my colleagues.

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have received a warrant for Town Meeting of New England Business to be held at Providence, R. I., on Thursday and Friday of this week.

This is the quarterly meeting of the New England Council.

The warrant for the meeting contains 12 articles, all of which will provide interesting discussions.

Two of these articles should be of particular interest at this time—not only to the people of New England, but to the people of the whole country and Canada as well.

Article 6 reads:

To see if the meeting shall take a position with reference to the development of the St. Lawrence seaway.

Article 9 reads:

To see if the meeting shall favor the development of hydroelectric facilities on the International Rapids of the St. Lawrence by the State of New York rather than by a Federal Government agency.

Article 6 indicates that there may be those who favor developing either the seaway or the hydroelectric facilities of the St. Lawrence without the other.

Article 9 is significant because it seems to assume that power will be developed on the St. Lawrence anyway either by New York State or the Federal Government.

I wish to discuss these two articles and at the same time point out some of the red herrings with which the waters of the St. Lawrence River have been stocked.

The proposal to separate the seaway development from the hydroelectric development has been widely promoted by the utility interests during recent years.

They have applied themselves so assiduously to this divide-and-conquer tactic that they have actually convinced a good many conscientious people that a separation of the power and navigation development would actually be desirable.

It is an old, old trick they are trying to play on the people of New England and the United States.

They are playing for time by this ruse, hoping that someday they may be able to exploit the tremendous wealth of the St. Lawrence for themselves and in the meantime reap a harvest of profits from excessively high power rates charged to the people of the Northeast.

Mr. President, although it is possible to separate the seaway development from the power development, it would not be practicable or economical. It would be much more expensive.

We know now that Canada is going to develop the seaway if the United States refuses to cooperate.

In that event we know that the Province of Ontario and the State of New York will, if permitted to do so, develop the 2,200,000 horsepower of electricity which could be generated at the Massena site.

We know too that the utilities, backed by New York and Boston financial interests, will do all in their power to block the development of the seaway either by Canada or as a joint operation and at the first opportunity seize all the enormous public power potential for themselves.

So, they come up with this proposition to separate the two great projects.

They even go so far as to say, "Let Canada develop the seaway if they want to," knowing full well that they intend to put every possible obstacle in the path of the Canadians.

They will not be successful in their obstructionist efforts in the long run, but each year they can delay the work represents enormous profits to the northeastern financial and utility interests.

If, however, they can prevent the cooperative development of navigation and power, they will have made the whole project far more costly.

If New York and Ontario can be forced to spend seventy-five to one hundred million dollars more on the power development than if it were developed jointly with navigation, then there is less likelihood of the people of the Northeast getting power at a cost which more favored sections of the United States enjoy today.

So long as the opposition can impede or delay the construction of the navigation facilities either by Canada or as a joint international undertaking, just so long will eastern railroads and their satellites enjoy the near monopoly control over rail transportation which they have today.

Once let the Great Lakes be opened to deep sea navigation and many western railroads would become terminal carriers and less likely to submit to eastern domination than they are today.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I know very little about this problem, and I am trying to learn something about it. The junior Senator from Louisiana is under the impression that if the canal were built the probabilities are that the railroads would have to put into effect what are called water-competitive rates, which would have the result of greatly reducing the revenues of the railroads. Of course, they are entitled to make a fair return on their investments, and it is the impression of the junior Senator from Louisiana that when railroads put into effect water-competitive rates, what they also do is to raise the rates somewhere else in order to make up for the reduced profit on operations which are carried on in competition with water routes.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that it is expected that nearly all the traffic carried over the St. Lawrence Canal will be traffic of a type which would not use the railroads, anyway; it will be iron ore, petroleum, and similar items.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield further to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. LONG. It was our experience with the waterways in the section of the country which I, in part, represent that in many instances the railroads established ridiculously low rates for the portions of their systems which paralleled the waterways, and did so only for the purpose of preventing any movement of traffic over the waterways. The railroads seek to prevent the movement of traffic by waterway and the low railroad rates to which I have just referred are established as a preventive measure, to keep traffic from moving over the waterways.

Mr. AIKEN. However, the railroads could not possibly establish a preventive rate sufficiently low to keep iron ore from moving over the waterways, because the railroad rate on iron ore is 10 times the water rate. Neither could the steel mills secure their necessary

materials by railroad for any length of time and still remain in business.

Mr. LONG. Would not the availability of transportation by water, at a low rate, force water competitive railroad rates so far as other commodities are concerned? Would not the same hold true in the case of the shipment of washing machines, automobiles, or grain from one section of the country to another?

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, the railroads would lose some cross-haul business in the case of grain which now is shipped from Buffalo to Baltimore and New York; but what the railroads lost the farmers would gain.

Furthermore, the 2,000,000 horsepower of electrical energy available at the St. Lawrence seaway would certainly create far more new freight tonnage for the railroads than the tonnage they would lose because of the shipment of grain via the St. Lawrence seaway.

However, as I have already pointed out, once we let the Great Lakes be opened to deep-sea navigation, many western railroads will become terminal carriers, and will be less likely to submit to eastern domination than they are today.

There was a time when virtually every western railroad supported the St. Lawrence seaway. Then the New York financial interests got their clutches on them and told them they must stop supporting the St. Lawrence seaway. Today some of those financial interests are using certain western railroads as fronts, in their efforts to oppose construction of the seaway, although actually those interests would gain, not lose, if the seaway were in operation.

The proposal to separate the seaway and power construction of the St. Lawrence development is red herring No. 1.

Red herring No. 2 is the contention of the opponents of the seaway that its development would take export business away from New England ports.

Just how the seaway can take from the New England ports something which they do not already have is not explained. Just how a Canadian seaway would be less damaging than a canal on the United States side of the river is not explained either. Just how a Canadian seaway would be less damaging than a cooperative seaway built between the United States and Canada, on the New York side of the river, is not explained, either.

New England at one time had a considerable foreign export business, but that business has largely been taken from them by the very interests who now seek to use New England ports as a front in their fight against the St. Lawrence development.

In 1922, the foreign exports from the port of Boston amounted to 588,449 tons.

In 1950, this export business had dropped to 238,534 tons.

In 1922, the foreign exports from the port of Portland Harbor, Maine, amounted to 625,983 tons; but in 1950 this export business had dropped to 105,573 tons.

It can hardly be said that the development of the St. Lawrence will reduce the export business of Portland and Boston much below the already irreducible minimum.

On the contrary, the development of the St. Lawrence seaway would undoubtedly greatly increase the business of the ports of Boston, Portland, and other New England shipping points.

Not only would the enormous output of electrical energy from the St. Lawrence produce millions of tons of freight which does not now exist, both for domestic and export commerce, much of which would be transported by New England railroads and shipped from New England ports, but there would develop a large transportation business between New England ports and ports on the Great Lakes.

No one was more familiar with the possibilities of this than the late Henry I. Harriman, one-time president of the Boston Chamber of Commerce, and later president of the United States Chamber of Commerce. Nearly 20 years ago Mr. Harriman urged the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway. In reference to the amount of increased business which might be expected between New England ports and those of the Great Lakes, I quote from his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

> The total annual traffic available on the most conservative basis for a water route between New England and the Great Lakes will be not less than 6,000,000 tons, and very probably it will be twice that amount, and the annual saving to our New England industries will not be less than $16,000,000. What holds true for New England holds equally true for eastern New York and Pennsylvania.

Mr. Harriman's estimate of savings of $16,000,000 to New England industries then could probably be multiplied several times over as of today.

So, Mr. President, red herring No. 2, predicting the New England ports would lose business by reason of the St. Lawrence development, is a sham and a fraud.

Red herring No. 3 is the contention that the 27-foot channel provided for by Senate Joint Resolution 27 would accommodate only a small percentage of the boats which comprise the United States Merchant Marine today. This is another distortion of the facts.

The business interests which would use the St. Lawrence seaway most are not recommending a channel more than 27 feet in depth at this time. Shipping on the Great Lakes today, landlocked as they are, exceeds in tonnage the total export business of the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific ports combined; and all of this shipping is done in vessels of less than 25-foot draft.

According to the United States Maritime Commission, approximately 80 percent of all the ships of the United States Merchant Marine could use the 27-foot channel proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 27.

However, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the joint resolution provides that all locks of the seaway development shall have a depth of 30 feet. If it is found desirable at a later date to deepen the channel of the St. Lawrence waterway to 30 feet, it can be done at a cost of $20,000,000 to the United States and $60,000,000 to Canada.

How ridiculous it is that the same interests that predict that the St. Lawrence seaway will take away the shipping of the New England ports, also lament that a 27-foot channel would prevent it from being used.

Red herring No. 3, designed to indicate that American shipping would not use a 27-foot seaway channel, distorts the facts to an absurd degree.

Red herring No. 4 is localized in its range. In fact, red herring No. 4 is intended primarily to excite the people of Connecticut. This red herring is supposed to show that if the people of Connecticut are to enjoy the benefits of a great new steel mill, they must first block the great Midwest steel industry from a new source of high-grade, low-cost iron ore.

What the opponents infer is that if the St. Lawrence seaway is blocked, ore from the great newly discovered Labrador fields will not be available to the Midwest industry and, consequently, New England, and, particularly Connecticut, may become the great steel center of the world.

Mr. President, if a steel mill is warranted by the business available in that region, a steel mill will be constructed anyway.

But how utterly fantastic and futile it is for anyone to advocate the removal of the Midwest steel industry, probably the greatest single business in the world today, in order to provide southern New England with a mill the feasibility of which is open to serious question.

This red herring has been developed, Mr. President, to influence the people of southern New England to bring pressure upon their Members of Congress, thereby giving them an excuse to vote against the St. Lawrence development if they choose to.

In regard to article 9 of the town meeting of New England business to see if the meeting shall favor the development of hydroelectric facilities on the International rapids of the St. Lawrence by the State of New York rather than by a Federal Government agency, the opponents will, in the final analysis, urge the development of the hydroelectric facilities by the State rather than by the Federal Government.

At this point, I desire to say that I also approve of the State of New York's operation of these facilities, but that is all I have in common with the opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway as a whole.

As I have previously stated, the ultimate intention of the opposition is to delay the project in the hope that they can acquire this great resource for themselves. In the meantime, however, they will advocate State construction. One reason for this is that, should the construction go through anyway, in spite of that, the cost of the power produced would be considerably higher than would be the case if the seaway and power facilities were made a joint development, and, secondly, should a Federal license be granted to Ontario and New York to develop the power of the St. Lawrence River, the State of New York would be promptly enjoined against proceeding with the construction.

I am certain that the courts would not sustain the opposition, but it would be

possible to delay the start of construction at least 2 years and perhaps much longer.

During this time which would be gained, the efforts of a small group of power interests to monopolize Niagara power would be intensified in the hope of establishing a precedent and eventually preventing the control of St. Lawrence power by either New York State or the Federal Government.

As I said, I have always favored the production and sale of St. Lawrence power by the State of New York, with due regard to the rights of other States.

The quickest way for New York State to secure the control of such operations would be to construct the seaway and power facilities as a joint undertaking between Canada and the United States, with provision for turning the power facilities over to the State of New York on a reimbursable basis and under proper safeguards.

Mr. President, I have great confidence in the people of New England. I do not question where they would stand on both the St. Lawrence seaway and power development, if they could be rid of the propaganda and distortion of facts which the opponents are constantly putting before them.

The people of New England are patriotic in the extreme.

Two eminent Bostonians, Benjamin Franklin and John Adams, together with John Jay, comprised our first International Boundary Commission. Benjamin Franklin lived in Boston at one time, and I believe he lived there at that time.

They fought valiantly and successfully to establish joint control over the St. Lawrence River for the United States.

They recognized the necessity even in those early days of forever preserving to the United States a navigable outlet from the Great Lakes to the Atlantic Ocean.

The warning for this necessity was also voiced by Abraham Lincoln in his address to the Congress in 1862.

Now it is proposed that the United States abandon the joint control which it has shared for 169 years, and that Canada be told to go ahead and build the seaway all by herself wholly in Canadian territory.

Mr. President, I cannot conceive what prompts the minds of those who would chip away the defenses of the United States which our forefathers so carefully established.

If we are not to abandon one of the greatest natural contributions to the security of our country, the Congress must act and act quickly.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to postpone indefinitely further consideration of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

If the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty would really bring peace to the war-torn Orient, it would have the unanimous approval of the American people. I am by no means convinced, however, that this treaty will bring us closer to our goal of world peace. In fact, it may lead us in exactly the opposite direction.

Whatever assurances may be given that a sovereign Japan will not revive trade and diplomatic relations with Red China, even a casual study of economics and history leads inescapably to the conclusion that there will be a much closer relationship between these two countries if the proposed treaty with Japan is concluded. Even today, there is a limited amount of trade between the free nations of the world and those under Communist domination. Manchurian soybeans, for example, find their way even to the countries of Western Europe. Our own Government, under a barter deal arranged before the outbreak of the Korean war, but concluded while our soldiers were dying in Asia, traded American cotton for Manchurian soybeans.

The plain truth is that Japan desperately needs the raw materials and the markets of Red China, just as Red China desperately needs the manufactured articles which industrial Japan can supply. In the long run, this one solid, basic fact will outweigh any assurances which anyone may give that Japan will not resume business and diplomatic relations with Red China.

While the alternative to Japanese-Chinese trade is not an easy one, it is not an insoluble one, even though it may not be the best one when considered from the viewpoint of the Japanese alone. Japan has made a remarkable economic recovery without this historical China trade, and, while it is true that American goods and dollars have contributed greatly to that recovery, it would probably be much cheaper for us to continue economic assistance on a limited basis, than to attempt at some later date to undo the consequences of a complete revival of Sino-Japanese relations.

Until we can get at least some semblance of peace in Korea, in French Indochina, and in Malaya, a peace treaty with Japan is premature. I believe we must give some thought to America's position in the eyes of our allies in the Pacific—the Filipinos, the Chinese Nationalists, and the millions of other peoples who suffered so grievously at the hands of Japan's militarists during the last war. They have not forgotten. They fear a resurgent Japan just as strongly as France today fears a resurgent Germany. We need every possible ally we can obtain anywhere today. A treaty of peace with Japan now would alienate some of our best friends in the vital Pacific area.

Although the Japanese treaty is advanced by its supporters as a necessary first step toward peace in the Orient, actually its approval would raise more new problems than it would solve. It could have no beneficial effect upon our position in Korea. Our signature upon this treaty still leaves Russia technically at war with Japan, and Japan at war with China. It would leave Japan subject to additional pressures from the Russians, without adding sufficiently to Japan's ability to withstand new demands.

Mr. President, I received a very good letter on this subject from an outstanding lawyer in North Dakota, which I desire to read. It is dated March 15, 1952, is addressed to me, and reads as follows:

NILLES, OEHLERT & NILLES,
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW,
Fargo, N. Dak., March 15, 1952.

Hon. MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MILT: I am advised that the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty may come before the Senate next week for ratification. Certain of its provisions constitute a back door attempt to secure Senate approval of the socialistic and dangerous features of the Declaration of Human Rights and the equally dangerous features of the Genocide Convention and the draft Covenant on Human Rights.

If this treaty is ratified in its present form and the courts enforce its provisions, then the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights and other declarations and pacts and covenants against which the ABA has been fighting will, by indirection, become the supreme law of the land, and a large segment of American rights, both state and individual, will be superseded by "treaty law." This maneuver by the State Department would rob the proposed constitutional amendment of a large part of its effectiveness in protecting American rights and American independence. It would be another case of locking the barn after the horse is stolen.

I have written you on this subject before and would urge that you decline to approve the Japanese treaty until the pending offending provisions are eliminated.

With best regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

H. G. NILLES.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. BREWSTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the treaty has been debated for some time. I have consulted with Senators on both sides of the aisle, and they all seem to be of the opinion that there should be a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock, debate upon the motion to postpone indefinitely consideration of the treaty be limited to 30 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; that debate on each reservation be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the proponent of the reservation, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; and that debate on the treaty itself be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, to be controlled by the Senator from Texas and the minority leader [Mr. BRIDGES] or any Senator whom the minority leader may designate.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. WELKER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. CORDON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the question, which is naturally of very great concern to everyone in the world. I recognize that the various difficulties which have been pointed out are not peculiar to this problem but are inevitable in the international difficulties in which the world now finds itself.

I should like to go back to certain fundamental principles of human relationships. It was Socrates, I believe, who was asked some thousands of years ago by a young man whether or not he should get married, and Socrates very wisely replied, "Whatever you do, you will regret it."

I think that can very well be applied to the problem we have before us. We must take the responsibility of proceeding with such wisdom as we may be given and such divine guidance as we continue to implore.

It was a great Senator in this body, some years ago, the late Senator Walsh, of Montana, who enunciated the principle that if a power is to be denied because it may be abused, then government must cease.

There, again, we are faced with the problem of dealing with vast and intricate human relationships, trying to resolve as wisely as we can the procedure which we as a great Nation may properly follow.

It was Benjamin Franklin, in all the vicissitudes of our achievement of independence, who wisely suggested that if we did not hang together we would all hang separately.

I think, Mr. President, in the face of the Communist menace we must all realize that that consideration, too, must weigh with us in the profound decisions we are now compelled to make.

Surveying the world's scene in recent months, with temporary visits to most of the world's capitals, discussions with some 20 of our Embassy officials abroad and military and diplomatic representatives of our own Government and of foreign powers, the Senator from Maine returned home, persuaded that the world is ready to establish an enduring peace if America may concur in the establishment of a firm, fair, consistent, and continuing foreign policy; and that, we trust, with a minimum of delay. This means that, having explored all the possible avenues, we should consider well whether we shall take affirmative action if humanly possible, to reconcile our position with the nations of the world and also to establish respect and confidence for our engagements not only among our own people, not only among our allies in the late unpleasantness, the war, but also to establish the respect and confidence of those who conceive themselves to be the enemies of liberty in this world. That is going to require a more firm and a more affirmative policy than has seemed at times to emerge from the deliberations of those immediately responsible for guiding this ship of state.

Mr. President, of the reservations that have been offered, the one which interested me most is reservation No. 4, dealing with the so-called open door in China. That is something which, it seems to me, may well be considered as a cornerstone of our policy in the Orient, exactly as the Monroe Doctrine was for a century the cornerstone of our policy in the Americas. The Monroe Doctrine was a unilateral declaration which was implemented by Presidents of both political parties in the decades that followed, and it preserved in large measure the Western Hemisphere from further encroachment from outside. In Mexico, during the War Between the States, there was a temporary assault upon its integrity which was eliminated by the wise action of President Lincoln. Later on, President Cleveland similarly recognized the principle when foreign powers infringed upon the sovereignty and independence of the Western Hemisphere.

In the early days of this century the open door policy in China was enunciated by John Hay, a Republican Secretary of State, followed by Lansing, a Democrat, by Kellogg, by Elihu Root, by Henry Stimson, and by Cordell Hull. Henry Stimson, in particular, with his doctrine of the non-recognition of conquest of foreign territory, further advanced this policy which had become a cornerstone of our attempt to establish peace in the Pacific and, as we hoped, to establish peace throughout the world. Our involvement in the Second World War resulted because Cordell Hull, following that principle, refused to bend the knee to the establishment of special spheres of interest in China; and Pearl Harbor, with all the tragic consequences that flowed from it, was the result.

Having established the territorial integrity of China by that action, in the 5 years which have followed, without debating at this time the responsibility for the full consequences of that course, we find China now recognized as being under the domination of a foreign power, in complete violation of the fundamental principle by which we had proceeded for half a century.

I was interested in a statement on page 20 of the message transmitting the treaty, that in article 1, it is provided that at the request of Japan, our forces there may be used "to put down large-scale internal riots and disturbances in Japan, caused through instigation or intervention by an outside power or powers."

It is then pointed out that this provision recognizes "the danger of indirect aggression and civil war," which have been resorted to so effectively by international communism against legitimate governments in Korea, Indochina, Malaya, and elsewhere in the Far East.

Apparently even now those who wrote the message are not prepared to say that Continental China was the outstanding example, although it has now been freely recognized by our Secretary of State and by every other responsible authority that China came to be dominated by the Soviet Union and communism, because the Soviets intervened in whatever aspects there may have been of internal disturbances, and so were able to implement their conquest before there was recognition by responsible authorities in this country of the ensuing course of events.

In other words, it was possible to achieve the subtle and sinister design of the Soviets by the failure of responsible people in this country to recognize what was going on. It is gratifying, however, to have even the belated recognition we now have, by the Secretary of State and others responsible, that it is true that under the mask of agrarian reformers, Soviet communism, directed by the Politbor in Moscow, was seeking successfully to dominate China, in contravention of the policy upon which this Nation had proceeded for a half century, and apparently for the present the Soviets have accomplished their design.

It is interesting to note that if that very provision in our Treaty with Japan had been in effect, although it was a part of our policy and recognized by every President for 50 years, as it was recognized by Cordell Hull in 1941, and if it had been applied by the administration, the Soviet Union would never have been able to accomplish their fell designs. So far as China is concerned, that is like locking the barn door after the horse has been stolen. At any rate, let us recognize our very great obligation to those who still remain upon Formosa, ready to carry on the battle, as they have demonstrated by their continued activity and training with the assistance which we are giving them in military and other lines, and ready at the proper time to meet the challenge, with whatever forces they and the other free nations of the world may find it prudent and proper to provide.

The problem is not simple. I have said that, after visiting with various ambassadors and representatives throughout the world, I came home with encouragement that peace is possible. There is developing in the Orient a growing realization of the menace of atheistic, materialistic communism, a growing readiness on the part of those who had been fighting and those who had ancient antagonisms which had extended even over the centuries, to get together in order to mobilize their joint forces against the threat of communism.

That is the meaning of the meeting now taking place on Formosa between representatives of the Japanese Government and of the Chinese Nationalist Government, two groups which have been at war, with tremendous forces at their command, for almost 15 years, 7 years before we ourselves entered the strife following Pearl Harbor. Yet now, on Formosa, they are discussing arrangements by which they may mutually defend their ideologies, their ideals, and their national interests against the menace of Soviet communism which they see looming on their western horizon. This is indeed a happy augury of a new day. I could only wish that that agreement were now consummated, in order that as we act upon this treaty we might act with full consciousness that those two countries had arrived at such an understanding, the consummation of which will afford an increased measure of confidence that Asia, as well as America and Europe, will be more and more united in this one design, namely, to preserve freedom among all the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

In the Middle East the same tendency is manifest. For 10 centuries, since the Crusades, war has been going on between the Moslem and the Christian. In the past few decades, it has been a war between the Moslem and the Jew. Yet while I was visiting in that area of the world in January last the secretary general of the Arab League, Azzam Pasha, proclaimed publicly that the worst enemy of the Moslem was not the Christian, was not the Jew, was not even the British, but was communism.

I think that that again is a sign in the Middle East of the dawn of a new day. Egypt has been giving repeated indications of its desire and readiness to accomplish a reconciliation of the differences that too long have plagued the peace of the Middle East, a reconciliation of their differences with Israel. That will spell a reconciliation with other Arab countries, and demonstrate a readiness once again, forgetting national prejudices and antagonisms, to unite all people who have any faith in Almighty God, whether they are Moslem, Jewish, or Christian, we may expect them to unite to preserve their liberty and to worship God in the way they believe to be right.

In Europe, we see friendly negotiations between the French and the Germans, who have been fighting each other for nearly 2,000 years, from 55 B. C., when Julius Caesar drove the Germans across the Rhine, down to 1945, 2,000 years later, when our own sons drove them across the Rhine. Within recent months we have seen these two countries come to complete accord upon the so-called Schuman plan with respect to steel. We have seen them, with complete trust, discuss and arrive at policies which will result in a united European army, if the financing can only be arranged. Finally, they are proceeding with discussions of political federation. These things all point to the dawn of a new day for lovers of liberty everywhere.

Mr. President, I speak of these things because they offer a ray of light on the eastern and western horizons, indicating that the world is getting ready, and perhaps the time is becoming ripe, if America will now establish its leadership, to go forward with a firm, clear, understanding hand, making sure that no devious, sinister, or selfish interests of any character in any country shall deviate us from the course of justice.

As colonialism in the world is doomed in this day and generation, it is evident that no longer can the colonial controls of an earlier century continue to dominate the peoples of the world. The spirit of nationalism is alive and will continue to assert itself, as we recognized when we gave liberty and independence to the Philippines and to Cuba. The American model for the twentieth century marks the course along which civilization must proceed if it is going to reconcile the challenge and the differences which now threaten to divide the free world and mankind.

The differences are not negligible. We have serious problems of our own. I would not blind my eyes to them. We have serious problems in connection with Japan and its reestablishment as a free and independent nation. In New England we are threatened with an inundation of Japanese textile machinery, which is a matter of very great concern to our textile interests. I shall not discuss this afternoon the problem of international trade. I continue to believe that the maintenance of our economy is of vital interest not only to America but to the other peoples of the world. But we are told that Japan must trade; and that also is true.

The obvious and natural outlet for Japanese trade is increasingly in Southeast Asia, where the great industrial potential of Japan could most easily find its full development. There is resistance from some of the areas still under control of European powers, which do not desire to surrender the advantages of their colonial control.

Japan has furnished a large amount of industrial products to southeast Asia, and has found $90,000,000 of its sales blocked. That is a problem which we ourselves, as well as other countries, must recognize, and with which we must deal. If we disrupt and destroy the economy of America, we shall not only do violence to our own people and their interests, but we shall do a deadly injury to the other people of the free world who are depending, as we have been repeatedly advised, upon the resources and the economy of America maintaining their strength, virility, and vitality, in order that we may continue to serve as the banker for all the world, as we are now apparently expected to do. If we are to be like Atlas, supporting the world, we must, in the first instance, pay attention to our own economy and make sure that its vitality shall be preserved.

We talk about our rights, and also our responsibilities. It is my concept that it is essential that there be an evolution of a foreign policy in this country that shall represent the considered conclusion of the representative groups regarding our foreign policy.

This country is privileged today to begin to read the memoirs prepared from the diaries of the one who formerly occupied the desk where I now stand, the late lamented and tragically lost Senator Vandenberg, whose diaries are being published today. Apparently they reveal in full measure the degree to which there was consultation in the evolution of the policies under which, in recent years, China has been lost.

It will be well for the American people carefully to consider and ponder the revelations of those diaries, showing what Senator Vandenberg understood regarding what was being done, and the degree to which he was consulted, as those who were in primary measure responsible for those policies seek to draw about themselves the protection of his great name. It will be well for the American people, as they consider the course they are now to take in the months and years ahead, to consider how far they may safely be governed by the advice and counsel of those responsible in no small measure for the tragedies which have developed in the Orient. Each of us, whatever may be his position, whatever may have been his record, will do well to examine the entire situation in the light of his conscience, his responsibility, and the interests not only of his country, but of the peace of all the world. The decisions are not easy ones to make, but it is my hope that there may be that charity of discussion which will permit our decisions to be made free from the prejudice of partisanship, which cannot but be calculated to prevent the decisions which will ultimately serve the cause with which we are all concerned.

Let us be free from any question of the motives of those on every side, but let us accord to each the liberty and independence of judgment consonant with the high responsibility which is ours, in this body which must pass upon issues fraught with profound consequences for the future, not only to our country but to civilization upon this earth.

So I hope that there may be careful consideration of the reservations presented by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and my colleague from the State of Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and that they may have the careful, deliberate, and sympathetic consideration to which they are entitled by reason of the responsibility and capacity of those who present them.

Because of the serious problems which are presented by the character of the treaty upon which we are now compelled to pass, it is my hope that whatever may be the disposition of these reservations, they may serve as a warning of the substantial interest which exists at this time in this country in properly safeguarding the rights and interests of the people of the United States, not in any selfish sense, but in order that the integrity and independence of America may continue to serve the independence and peace of all the world. Whether without these reservations the treaty can be safely adopted is another problem which we must ultimately face and resolve in the light of the considerations which I have mentioned, in the light of our historic policy regarding the Orient, and in the light of the tradition which we established in the Monroe Doctrine, bearing in mind the possible consequences if we shall now fail to act.

I think we are all profoundly indebted to those who have labored in this matter, including General MacArthur, who has established for himself a high place among the peoples of the Orient because of the wisdom and statesmanship with which he has conducted the affairs of a defeated nation, in glittering contrast, as we fondly hope, to the results which have flowed in some other areas. We are grateful for the work of John Foster Dulles, who, as the Ambassador dealing with this question, has brought to bear his great talents in an attempt to resolve differences with an eye single to the advancement of the cause of peace, progress, and prosperity, without which the free world cannot expect long to survive.

I close with a renewed expression of my earnest hope that a ray of light is dawning in the world as the people everywhere recognize their peril. We are told that it is darkest just before the dawn, and that man's extremity is God's opportunity. May we fondly hope that there will dawn in the minds and hearts

of men everywhere—even behind the iron curtain as the years shall pass—a recognition that we here in America desire injury to no man, but desire good to all mankind. As that recognition dawns and grows upon humanity everywhere, upon the common people of the world who suffer with recurring wars, we may expect that they will throw off the shackles of the awful despotism which now controls their actions, and establish themselves in association with us as free peoples of this earth, who desire only peace and progress under the guidance of the same Almighty God who has guided us so successfully and so far, from the Pilgrim days to the present, and will continue to guide us if we continue in His worship and in the recognition of His eternal power.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to postpone indefinitely consideration of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, would the distinguished majority leader withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a few minutes? I should like to speak briefly, not to exceed several minutes, on the question before the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was merely endeavoring to ascertain whether we could arrive at a unanimous-consent agreement. A number of Senators are waiting to see whether such an agreement can be entered into this afternoon. I am willing to withhold the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, but I would appreciate it if the Senator from Washington would let the quorum call proceed in order to determine whether a unanimous-consent agreement could be entered into this afternoon.

Mr. CAIN. The wish of the majority leader I find to be completely impelling. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his courtesy.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock, after the transaction of routine business, debate on the motion to postpone indefinitely consideration of the Japanese peace treaty be limited to 30 minutes to each side, to be controlled respectively by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; that debate on the reservations be limited to 30 minutes to each reservation, 15 minutes to each side, to be controlled respectively by the proponent of the reservation and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]; and that debate upon the treaty itself be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the distinguished minority leader the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], or anyone designated by the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on Thursday, March 20, 1952, following the transaction of routine morning business, debate upon the motion of Mr. DIRKSEN to postpone indefinitely the further consideration of the pending Japanese Peace Treaty be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. CONNALLY, respectively, that debate upon any reservation that may be proposed be limited to not exceeding 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such reservation and Mr. CONNALLY, respectively; and that debate upon the treaty itself be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by Mr. CONNALLY and the minority leader or any Senator he may designate.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington expects to vote to ratify the Japanese Peace Treaty. However, because of continuing and serious doubt he intends to continue to weigh and study the evidence until the time is actually at hand when we must vote.

Earlier in the afternoon the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] referred me to a very provocative article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of yesterday, Tuesday, March 18. This article rather emphasizes a portion of my serious concern regarding how best we can be of real service to the Japanese people.

Mr. President, for what I think is the benefit of the Senate, I should like to read the article, for its reading will take only a few minutes. I am likewise hopeful that one or more of the members of the Foreign Relations Committee will address themselves to the questions raised in the article.

The article, which is written by Mr. Oland D. Russell, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, reads as follows:

SHOWDOWN DRAWING NEAR—JITTERY JAPAN WAITS FOR RUSSIA TO TIP HER HAND

(By Oland D. Russell)

TOKYO, March 18.—Japan's Foreign Office, already jumpy and nervous about Russia, will breathe a huge sigh of relief if a Soviet freighter departing from Tokio today takes with it a sizable group from the Russian diplomatic mission here.

A small army of Japanese police and Foreign Office agents has been keeping close watch on the small coastal ship which arrived Saturday from Vladivostok. Ostensibly they are making certain that no Japanese board the vessel in an effort to get to Russia. But no small reason for the surveillance is to check on how many Russians and their families are going home from their mission here.

It's still a mystery as to whether the Soviet ship came here to take some Japanese leftists to Moscow for a trade conference in early April, or to transport Russians out of Japan.

RUSSIA DIDN'T SIGN

Foreign Office spokesmen frankly admit they fear Moscow's intentions regarding Japan after the peace treaty becomes effective. Russia didn't sign the treaty. Moscow could declare Japan is independent only in relation to those countries which signed and ratified. Thus Russia would be saying Japan is still a defeated enemy nation and must observe its 1945 surrender agreement.

Russia might go so far as to demand some right of control, and even want to send troops here to take the place to be vacated by the Supreme Command of Allied Powers (SCAP), which derived its authority from all the Allies, including Russia. SCAP, and the Allied Council, of course, passes out of the picture when the treaty comes into effect. Before any Russian move toward asserting such claims in Japan, Moscow most likely would greatly increase its diplomatic mission here—or at least try. However, if Russia merely intends to let events take their course, she may tip her hand by reducing her mission here.

CROSSED FINGERS

That is why the Foreign Office is watching that Russian freighter with its fingers crossed, and it may account for the inspired stories in the Japanese press that some high diplomats are going home and the embassy here is to become merely an agency to handle trade affairs.

Russia is saying nothing. As the showdown approaches, Japan is trying to pass the buck to the Allies the thorny question of what to do about Russia.

For one thing, the Japanese as a still-defeated enemy are going to be mighty hesitant about going up to the imposing Soviet Embassy here and informing that crowd of silent, hard-looking bully boys that they must register with the police as foreign nationals or pack up and get going. Japan would rather the Allies would do this little job for them. But that may be a vain hope.

The Allied Council is the only agency here that could act, and there may be no more council meetings.

WISHFUL THINKING

The Foreign Office has been quick to say it is ready to negotiate a two-way peace pact with Russia similar to the San Francisco treaty, but so far has had no encouragement from Russia. Japan would prefer that Russia take the initiative, so Tokyo could counter with a preliminary demand for the release of Japanese prisoners in Siberia and the return of the small islands seized by Russia. But all this is wishful thinking.

Mr. President, I hope that members of the Foreign Relations Committee will have an opportunity to read that article and to reflect on its substance before we vote on the Japanese Treaty.

Mr. President, at this time I wish to address myself to another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor.

AN ENIGMA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, inasmuch as I am on my feet, I beg the indulgence of the Senate for only several minutes longer, during which I should like to discuss, as in legislative session, a reasonably important question which is not related to the unfinished business.

Since the New Hampshire primary of a week ago, I have tried, along with others, to evaluate some of the results. Others may have succeeded, but I have failed.

As a Republican, I have quite naturally thought deeply about the Democrat side

of the New Hampshire primary. Anyone who knows anything about things military knows how basically important it is to study the enemy. If you do not know what the enemy or the opposition is up to, he can too easily outflank any orthodox defense or attack you may prepare or launch against him.

Perhaps the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who scored what was called a stunning victory in New Hampshire, will offer to set the record straight on the primary election results. I shall be most appreciative for any observations he may care to add to those which he offered on the day following the election.

In the Washington Post of Thursday, March 13, two interpretative political articles appeared on the first page. One was written by Robert C. Albright, and the other by Chalmers Roberts. Their columns were side by side.

To Mr. Albright, the Senator from Tennessee modestly denied his success meant repudiation of President Truman. He said it did mean that Democrat voters want new ideas, new faces, and aggressive action.

To Mr. Roberts, the Senator from Tennessee reiterated over and over that he does not consider his surprise victory a repudiation of President Truman. He emphasized his party regularity, his record of voting with the administration on practically all major issues. He declared his New Hampshire victory showed that Democrats want a rejuvenated party.

These observations by the Senator from Tennessee appear to me to be highly contradictory. A contradiction is anything the falsity of which is shown by the law or principle that a thing cannot both be and not be in the same way at the same time.

It would seem to me that if Democratic voters want new ideas and new faces, they logically want to be rid of the face they now have and the ideas that face offers.

I need some help on this question of what repudiation means, because so many interested persons constantly ask me about the Senator from Tennessee. They seek to determine what sort of a Democrat he is. If he is a Truman Democrat, which he indicated he was through his remarks to Mr. Roberts, that is one thing. If he represents a new look and new ideas, which he indicated he does, through his remarks to Mr. Albright, that is another thing.

Should the Senator from Tennessee find it convenient to establish an uncontradictory position, I shall gladly make it available to all of those who write to me about him.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to postpone indefinitely the further consideration of the treaty.

RECESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in executive session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in executive session, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, March 20, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose faithfulness reaches unto the clouds, we pray that fidelity may also be one of the cardinal and crowning virtues of our lives.

We humbly confess that the strength and security of our beloved country are in peril and in jeopardy today because many of our citizens are no longer placing a very high premium on this virtue of fidelity to moral and spiritual standards.

Help us to recognize the primacy and need of a greater fidelity to Thee as the basis and inspiration of all other fidelities.

Grant that our fidelity to Thee may be so clear and commanding, so consistent and courageous, that others may also feel the urge to cultivate and maintain this virtue in their relationship to Thee and their fellow men.

To Thy name we ascribe all the glory. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PERMITTING CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS TO IMPORT TEXTILE MACHINERY FOR EDUCATIONAL PURPOSES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1012) to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 12, after "prescribe", insert ": *Provided*, That free entry hereunder shall be conditioned upon the presentation to the collector of customs of an affidavit of a responsible officer of the importing society or institution that the substantial equivalent of the imported article is not manufactured in the United States."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, as introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and as passed by the House of Representatives, H. R. 1012 would permit the free entry under the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, of any textile machinery or machinery imported by any society or institution incorporated or established solely for educational, religious, or charitable purposes.

The exemption from duty would apply, however, only when the importation of the machinery is for the use of such institution in the instruction of students and not for sale or for any commercial use. The free importation would have to conform to the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Senate amendment limits the exemption from duty to imports of articles which are not manufactured in the United States, and to obtain the exemption an affidavit would have to be filed with the collector of customs to that effect.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment to H. R. 1012 is consistent with the Buy American Act, and the buy American provision in the Rural Electrification Act of 1938—June 21, 1938, chapter 354, title IV, section 401, Fifty-second Statutes, page 818—which provide that notwithstanding any other provision of law unless the head of the department or independent agency concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest or the cost to be unreasonable, only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States, shall be acquired for public use.

The time has come when the market of our industries should not be thrown open to goods and machinery which can be made here, whether it be for educational or other purposes.

Right now when unemployment is becoming a serious economic question, there are contracts for manufactured articles being placed in foreign countries even though there are domestic bidders with low bids slightly over the foreign bids. With the corporation tax here from 52 to 82 percent in the United States as against corporation taxes in foreign competing countries as low as 3 percent to 12 percent, it is obvious that foreign bids will be lower. There is an impending threat of $600,000,000 in contracts being placed abroad under the discretionary power placed in the hands of department heads under the Buy American Act.

The amendment of the Senate is wise and should be adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER EXPENSES OF SELECT COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING OPERATIONS UNDER THE GI BILL

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I offer the following reso-

lution (H. Res. 488), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 93 not to exceed $15,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

That the funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 3, 1951.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and ask the gentleman if he will yield to me.

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. STANLEY. Is it the purpose of the Select Committee Investigating the GI Bill to offer legislation correcting the inequities that they find in the present law?

Mr. TEAGUE. A bill has been introduced and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been holding hearings on it for the past month. It is expected that very shortly the bill will be reported, and it is also expected that this appropriation will complete the work of this select committee and that the committee will then be dissolved. Every group who appeared before the committee except one favored the bill.

Mr. STANLEY. It is the plan to request that that committee be dissolved after it has performed its duties?

Mr. TEAGUE. That is correct.

Mr. STANLEY. And it has about completed its work?

Mr. TEAGUE. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to say that in my opinion the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] and his subcommittee have done a magnificent job in investigating this whole matter. Since it is obvious and apparent to many of us that legislation dealing with this subject is to come before us, I certainly think that the work of the committee should be completed in order that we may have the best possible basis on which to work.

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman has stated that he expects to complete the work shortly. May I say also at this time that the members of this committee have done an excellent piece of work and I want to commend them for their report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. HARDIE SCOTT

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 579) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That HARDIE SCOTT was duly elected as Representative from the Third Congressional District of the State of Pennsylvania to the Eighty-second Congress and is entitled to his seat.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HON. ERNEST GREENWOOD

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up a privileged resolution (H. Res. 580), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ERNEST GREENWOOD was duly elected as Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of New York to the Eighty-second Congress and is entitled to his seat.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS AND LETTERS

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during general debate today on the independent offices appropriation bill I may be permitted to insert at different places communications and letters pertaining to the subject under discussion, namely, the SEC.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 578 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill or any provisions contained in said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 28]

Aandahl	Granger	O'Hara
Abbitt	Grant	Ponge
Baring	Hall,	Potter
Beall	Edwin Arthur	Powell
Bennett, Fla.	Hart	Prouty
Bennett, Mich.	Hedrick	Rabaut
Bosone	Heffernan	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Herter	Rivers
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Roberts
Carrigg	Hope	Scott, Hardie
Case	Hull	Sheehan
Celler	Kee	Smith, Wis.
Combs	Kersten, Wis.	Tackett
Cooley	Larcade	Thompson, Tex.
Denny	McConnell	Velde
Dingell	McKinnon	Weichel
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Welch
Doyle	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Feighan	Mitchell	Wickersham
Fernandez	Morton	Wilson, Tex.
Flood	Murdock	Wolcott
Gamble	Murphy	
Garmatz	Murray, Wis.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 366 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and pending that, I yield myself 15 minutes at this time.

Mr. Speaker, for the past two decades this splendid young Republic has been going through one crisis after another; some were real, others mere political creations advanced to perpetuate those in control of the government in power. Today we are faced with another crisis, a real crisis, a crisis that threatens to destroy the fiscal foundation of the Republic. We are on the brink of the precipice of national bankruptcy. More and more thoughtful citizens throughout the country are realizing and fully appreciating the dangers ahead if this unbridled governmental spending is permitted to continue.

Today we, the representatives of the people, are given an opportunity to apply the brakes and thus make a further contribution toward reversing the trend in extravagant governmental spending.

This rule makes in order the consideration of H. R. 7072, the annual independent offices appropriation bill, a bill appropriating funds for the next fiscal year for most of the Federal bureaus. The President, through his Budget Bureau, requested of the Congress a total of $2,085,097,390 for these bureaus. The Appropriations Committee, under the able leadership of its subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has cut that request by a total of $700,048,695. In every case the committee has made substantial reductions excepting, of course, such items which are fixed and not susceptible to reduction.

As one who has long been interested in this economy drive, I desire now to express, in the premises, on my own part and on the part of my coworkers, the gratitude of all economy-minded Members of this body for the committee's efforts. While further efforts will

be made in the form of appropriate amendments to make even further economies, I apprehend that determined efforts will be made by those Members of the House who consider themselves liberal minded to restore the reductions made by the committee in an effort to continue the spending spree. This effort must not prevail. The line must be held.

BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. Speaker, I have been alarmed for the past several years over the dismal picture presented of the country going deeper and deeper each year into the red while the Federal Government digs deeper and deeper into the pocket of the American taxpayers. More than a year ago a little band of southern Democrats, with the aid of others, in this body got together and agreed to accept the President's challenge to cut his budget. Last year we succeeded in trimming that budget several hundred million dollars. This year others have joined our group and the work continues. We have reason to believe that, with the addition of more and more converts to the cause, the budget can be balanced this year in spite of the $82,000,000,000 request of the President with the resultant $14,000,000,000 proposed deficit. If the economy line is held on this bill and the succeeding appropriation bills yet to come before us, there will be no necessity for any deficit. We can place ourselves on a pay-as-you-go basis. Therefore our immediate objective this year should be a balanced budget.

It is as obvious as the noonday sun that if we cannot balance the budget now, with an all-time high national income of cheap money together with an all-time high taxing program, the hope of ever balancing the Nation's budget is indeed him. In fact, prudence suggests that under such conditions we should be retiring a part of our gargantuan debt and fortifying our fiscal condition for the eventual rainy day.

FANTASTIC GROWTH OF NATIONAL DEBT

Mr. Speaker, the growth of our national debt and the fantastic amount of taxes extracted from our people has caused me to do a little research. I thought it might be well to call the attention of the Congress and the country to some comparative figures of taxes and expenditures by our Federal Government at 25-year intervals over a period of the past 160 years of the country's history. The startling results are as follows:

Period	Total expenditures	Net receipts	Change in public debt
1789 to 1813	$219, 233, 000	$221, 816, 000	[1] $6, 024, 000. 00
1814 to 1838	534, 759, 000	644, 634, 000	—71, 053, 000. 00
1839 to 1863	2, 232, 812, 000	1, 130, 702, 000	1, 109, 339, 000. 00
1864 to 1888	8, 833, 181, 000	8, 881, 529, 000	264, 858, 000. 00
1889 to 1913	12, 701, 857, 000	12, 787, 468, 000	—191, 584, 000. 00
1914 to 1938	124, 883, 429, 000	89, 393, 932, 000	35, 971, 693, 000. 00
1939 to 1952 [2]	638, 131, 389, 000	419, 494, 298, 000	260, 193, 628, 740. 39

[1] 1790 to 1813.
[2] To Mar. 13, 1952.

To say that the figures are startling is an understatement. It is significant to note that in the first period of the country's existence, when the Jeffersonian principle that the people who are least governed are best governed was in full bloom, and prior to the growth of the doctrine of paternalism that the poor young striving Republic actually had a substantial balance of more than $6,000,000 in the Treasury. Compare that figure with the national debt of more than $260,000,000,000 today and one is compelled to question the oft-repeated statement that the country today is more prosperous than ever before in its history. Moreover, I desire to again call the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Government is no different in its fiscal affairs from the individual or a corporation. The management of government is a business matter. The fact that government is big business makes no difference. And I repeat what I have often stated on the floor of this House, "There is a bottom to the Government's meal barrel as well as to the individual's or the corporation's."

INCONCEIVABLE DEBT

Mr. Speaker, we have been lulled into complacency so long by the so-called liberal thinkers and have been so accustomed to appropriating the taxpayers' money in denominations of billions that it is impossible to comprehend what a billion really is. Some mathematician, in an effort to comprehend a billion dollar figure, has come up with this startling illustration:

If a person had started in business in the year A. D. 1 with a billion dollars capital, and if he had managed his business so poorly that he lost $1,000 each day, in 1952 he still would have enough capital left out of his original billion to continue in business, losing $1,000 a day, for almost an additional 800 years, or until the year 2739.

Now in order to attempt to get some conception of how long it will take us to retire the present national debt of over $260,000,000,000 let us assume that we are frugal and prudent and start retiring that debt at the rate of $500,000,000 a year; 520 years would be required to retire the debt.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, if further emphasis is desired on our financial status one needs only to refer to the fact that it now requires more than $6,000,000,000 per annum in the form of interest to service this enormous debt. The Treasury has now asked for and we appropriated last week an increase of $300,000,000 to take care of the increased interest on that debt over last year. In other words, the interest alone on our national debt is costing the taxpayers now about one and one-half times as much as the total expenditures for 1 year of the Federal Government in the period 1914–38.

DARK BUT NOT HOPELESS

Mr. Speaker, that, sir, is the fiscal condition of the greatest business in the world, the United States of America. It is an unpleasant picture. It cannot be passed off lightly with the explanation that we are in a global warfare against communism, another crisis. Neither can we comfort ourselves into further complacency by adding to that the fact that we have recently emerged victoriously from a global strife with Nazi Germany and totalitarian Japan. The fact is that the country has been victorious in other contests at arms and through other crises throughout its history without serious impairment of its financial structure. Those crises, prior to World War II and prior to the Soviet Russian menace, were serious too in their day. Can it be logically reasoned that the situation in this country for the past 6 years has been so grave as to require the extraction of more taxes from the American people than was taken from them in the first 156 years of the country's existence? I think not.

Permit me to again point out to my colleagues what I have repeatedly pointed out on the floor of this House during the past 6 years that so far as the masters of the Kremlin are concerned they want neither war nor peace. Their main purpose, in my humble judgment, is to conquer this country, as they have conquered all others, by the simple procedure of bleeding us white in the destruction of our economy. They would accomplish this here as elsewhere through fear, infiltration, by prodding us into national bankruptcy, and taking over in the resultant confusion of chaos and hunger. No one realizes more than the Kremlin strategists that a hungry belly cares little about the type of government it lives under. In substantiation of this I call your attention to the well-known fact that more than 600,000,000 peoples have been drawn behind the iron curtain without the firing of a single gun by a Russian soldier.

When the blank checks, running into untold billions, are requested of the Congress for national defense and military and economic aid to foreign countries, we of the Congress, the Representatives and spokesmen for the American taxpayers, must stop and ponder. We must approach these requests realistically, giving due weight to the probability of the correctness of this view. For, it must be obvious to all that we Americans cannot indefinitely continue to arm and feed half the world. America is a rich nation but there is a limit even to the resources of this great Nation. As one who made an on-the-spot study of world conditions in 13 foreign countries immediately following the war, I have always recognized the necessity for a helping hand to those who were making an honest effort to resist the plague of communism. But I have always consistently opposed the enormous amounts involved and advocated a more realistic contribution. It is unthinkable that we should now comply with the President's request for another $8,000,000,000 contribution.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Speaker, the solution to our financial problem and the responsibility therefor are strictly up to the Congress. More than that it is up to this House to

see that the dangerous trend is reversed. I need not remind you that the wise men who founded this Government provided that because we of the House must originate all taxes and appropriations we should be elected every 2 years. We cannot hide behind the Chief Executive or complain of the traditional policy of the other body to increase appropriations. Certainly, at best the responsibility is twofold, the President and the Congress. Furthermore, I should like to refresh your memories today by calling your attention to the fact that the people of America are tax conscious as never before. The income tax, originally designed and practiced as a soak-the-rich tax, has become so enlarged that it now digs into the pockets of the smallest business man, the white-collar worker, and the day laborer. The policy, under the Fair Deal program, of everybody "touching" the Federal Government has likewise developed into the policy of the Federal Government "touching" everybody. Even the humblest citizen now realizes that the Federal Government is no Santa Claus. In fact, we have reached the saturation point in taxation. With the tax rate as high as 90 percent in the upper brackets, the incentive for businessmen to make money scarcely exists, while the day laborer and the middle class find it difficult to live under the high rate of their own taxes.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people, the overburdened taxpayers of this country, are looking to us, as their representatives, to at least balance the budget. In fairness to those who founded this Republic and to the generations of future Americans yet unborn, we can do no less.

SOLUTION

Mr. Speaker, I fear that I have been boresome, and that I may even be charged with pessimism, in this long recital in an effort to emphasize the seriousness of the situation. It is serious. America is at the cross-roads in its fiscal policy. If we do not change that policy we become a bankrupt people. If we destroy the faith and credit of the Government we lose everything, our economy, our standard of living, yes, even our cherished liberties.

If the Congress is to regain its constitutional control of the purse strings; if the budget is to be balanced; if we are ever to liquidate this enormous debt, I respectfully suggest and urge that the following formula be adopted:

First. Our legislative committees, as well as committees on appropriations, must cease reporting out bills except those which are absolutely essential to our economy and national defense.

Second. Every member of this body must recognize that the objective of balancing the budget is his most important assignment.

Third. Sectionalism, partisan politics, responsiveness to highly organized minorities, must give way to the national need for a sound financial policy.

Fourth. Every dollar appropriated must be considered as carefully as if it were coming out of the pockets of the Members themselves, as indeed the Members' proportionate share is.

Fifth. Our congressional committees, particularly the appropriation committees, must be staffed with an adequate staff of experts equal in efficiency to the staffs of the various governmental agencies who appear before them seeking appropriations.

Sixth. The Congress and the country must recognize that financial solvency is as important as military might in preparing ourselves against any potential foreign aggressor, a fact which our military captains should be made to understand.

Seventh. Our foreign friends must be made to understand that there is a limit to the resources of America.

Eighth. The system of permitting the carry-over of unspent funds from the current fiscal year into the new year must be abandoned. A meticulous study of the 1,200 pages of the President's budget this year will show that the carry-over of unspent funds from the current fiscal year will exceed $60,000,000,000.

Ninth. The procurement of military requirements, which constitute more than 50 percent of our expenditures, must be placed in the hands of trained civilians who appreciate the value of the dollar.

Tenth. And finally, the citizens of the Republic, now conscious as never before of the burdens of taxation, must practice the doctrine of States' responsibility as well as States' rights. The practice of looking to Washington for Federal aid in civil responsibilities of their own must cease. They must realize that there is no State, county, or city whose financial statement is not sounder than that of the Federal Government.

Finally, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this budget can be balanced and must be balanced this year. Whatever it takes to balance it must be done. A $14,000,000,000 deficit under the President's budget recommendations is unthinkable. If this country, the last fortress and haven of a free people, is to survive our fiscal policy must be placed on a sound basis. The time is now. Next year may be too late. Now is the time to place the country above party.

In the name of the founding fathers who gave the country its birth, in the name of the untold thousands who have died to preserve it, in the name of free peoples everywhere, I beseech you to save the Nation from bankruptcy and thus perpetuate this, the most glorious form of free government ever conceived by the minds of men.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 minutes, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed that my esteemed colleague from the State of Illinois, Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, has introduced an amendment which he intends to propose to the Defense Production Act now pending before the Senate Banking Committee.

The Dirksen amendment is designed to strip from the Wage Stabilization Board any and all authority which it may have to intervene in an attempt to settle labor disputes. This is precisely the same objective I had in mind when I introduced the Allen resolution 2 weeks ago—to attempt to persuade Congress that this Board should be limited by legislation.

Some of my colleagues have attempted to dissuade me from this effort.

Some of my colleagues have said that we should wait and see what the Wage Stabilization Board does in the steel and aircraft disputes before we act.

The point at issue here is that no Government agency, however constituted, should have the power to recommend a union shop. It may be that this Board—fearful of congressional action—may decide that it will pass up the present opportunity to foist the union shop on the steel industry. And if that is the course of events, we should all be thankful.

But that will not solve the problem of the Wage Stabilization Board and its extra-legal authority to settle labor disputes. This authority must be denied.

Personally, I do not feel that any governmental agency should compel or make anyone belong to a union if he does not want to belong to that union.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In my opinion the gentleman rendered a very valuable service to the country in offering his resolution and thereby bringing to public attention the behavior of this Board, which does undertake to coerce business to accept the demands of the workers. The gentleman stated that friends of his had taken the position that he might defer pressing his resolution for House consideration. I am sure the gentleman understands the position of the member of the Rules Committee now addressing him. While I am not assuming to speak for anyone other than myself, it is my conviction that the gentleman may have his resolution to investigate reported by the Rules Committee any time he desires.

Very frankly, I have taken the position, and I have taken it in conversation with the gentleman, that the holding of his resolution in abeyance operated as a club over the heads of this Board, and in my opinion was producing good results. But if in the gentleman's opinion the Board is undertaking to abuse its discretion, and shamefully so in the manner in which it has heretofore carried on, and wants his resolution, I am with him; I am ready to bring it out and to put the matter on the griddle where it ought to be.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I may say that I have had assurance from a majority of the members of the Committee on Rules that they will report this resolution. I also may say, I think without violating any confidence, that our great chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BARDEN, chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, has said that if we do report that resolution he will go to

the limit in stopping any agency of Government from compelling people to belong to a union or any other organization against their will.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will yield further for one brief comment——

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. COX. The manner in which the Board has carried on its activities, of course, has been such that management has not had a chance in the world. The Board has, figuratively speaking, taken them by the scruff of the neck and compelled them to yield at every point.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman that the President of the United States is all-powerful. When the Wage Stabilization Board makes a recommendation to compel people to belong to unions, or to settle labor disputes, although the President of the United States cannot compel them to do so, nevertheless the great power of his office in the allocation of priority rights for scarce materials, the withholding of transportation, the withholding of defense orders and so forth are such that while he cannot actually compel an individual company or an employee to belong to a union, they are powerful weapons that will bring many of them around to it.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] for introducing the resolution. I have been thinking, since he introduced it, that he should have more support on the floor of Congress, and I am glad that the junior Senator from Illinois is joining in the effort. It is dangerous to allow a picked and possibly a fixed board to legislate for the Congress of the United States and to usurp powers that should be guarded by us.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to associate myself with what the gentleman has said and also the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] has said. I wonder if the gentleman would allow me to propound a question to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. A few minutes ago the gentleman from Mississippi was talking about the budget and the prospect of a $14,000,000,000 deficit; he referred to the additional tax burden that would be placed on the people. I wish to see if he agrees with me that the prospective deficit of $14,000,000,000, if it materializes, may resolve itself into a tremendous inflationary force which goes beyond the tax burdens in that that inflationary force in its operation will further destroy the buying power of all the savings of all the people of this country.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will yield to me to reply, the gentleman is, of course, eminently correct. It is academic that governmental spending in such huge proportions is bound to bring about inflationary trends and, in fact, I think we can trace our whole inflationary status today to this huge governmental spending.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And if the gentleman from Illinois will yield further, we should know—and I want to associate myself with what the gentleman from Mississippi had to say about this bill that is now before us and the potential reductions that we may have a chance to make, I am for every one of them so far as I understand the committee report and the bill. All of us should realize that the Treasury Department—by that I mean the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Snyder—members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the top ranking men of the American Bankers Association, as well as the financial geniuses, you might say, of this great country, during the past 3 weeks, and it is going on today, have stretched their minds and imagination in conformity with each other to determine a course to follow for the Treasury in its refunding of its thirty to fifty billion dollars of bond issues which will mature during the coming few months.

The big problem is: What kind of paper is to be issued, what rate of interest is going to apply, who is to buy these bonds, and I am talking about the refunding issues and the additional fourteen billion of new issues which would have to be added if we have a $14,000,000,000 deficit? How can those bonds be sold so as not to completely destroy the buying power of our savings and earnings through inflation, all of which means, can those bonds be designed in such a way that individuals will buy them instead of their having to be put in the portfolios of the commercial banks?

Can the gentleman from Illinois answer that?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I think the gentleman is more qualified to answer that than is the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, if the other body does not approve the Dirksen amendment, I expect to press for action on my resolution. I may say that the majority of the members of the Rules Committee have told me they favor this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor has also indicated a favorable attitude, in order to stop the Wage Stabilization Board from doing things which it does not have the authority to do.

As it is now the Wage Stabilization Board destroys collective bargaining by substituting a Government board for the common sense and the judgment of the employers and the employees. It has created and insured a continuation of labor unrest. It makes the achievement of any real wage stabilization impossible.

It is a fact that wages have risen faster than prices since stabilization has been in effect. It is a fact that WSB regulations have encouraged wage increases greater than the increases in the cost of living.

It is a fact that WSB permits and grants wage increases without considering the effect of its action on prices.

It is a fact that the major objective of WSB is not to stabilize the economy by refusing potential increases of money in circulation which result from wage increases, but, rather, to allow organized labor to gain its wage objective regardless.

It is a fact that WSB has itself ignored congressional intent by exempting health and welfare and others from its control in spite of the definition of wages and salaries and other compensation contained in the Defense Production Act.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will get behind the Dirksen amendment which stops this unauthorized delegation of power which the Wage Stabilization Board is using in order to coerce the wage earners of this country. In the event the other body does not soon act, I hope the Members will get behind the proposition I have brought forth which will bring the Board before the Congress and ask them the reason for its unauthorized conduct.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, listening to the four gentlemen who preceded me, it would appear that this country is on the verge of bankruptcy. I do not concur in these statements. The fact is the country never has been more prosperous; the people have more money in the banks; the people can buy things they never dreamed of before, such as autos, radios, televisions, automatic home equipment, and so forth; they live better than ever before; the income of the Government is greater in proportion to our debt and expense than ever before. These gentleman claim that what they are doing, or trying to do, by granting to the Committee on Appropriations the right of waiving points of order on this bill, is to save millions of dollars, but it seems to me they are again under the erroneous impression in making these unfair charges and accusations for political reasons, that it will aid them in the Presidential campaign. I wish to advise them it will avail them naught, for the people do not want the reactionary Mr. TAFT or the military gentleman. We know that military men never give the people efficient government, as has been aptly demonstrated on several occasions in this country as well as in many other nations in the world. I have no objection to the saving of money. Frequently I have advocated economy and have voted against many of the billion-dollar bills that these very gentlemen who preceded me voted for. But, when it comes to a few dollars or a few millions that would aid the unfortunate exservicemen and the low-wage earners to obtain decent places to live in, when there is still a terrible shortage of adequate housing, which these gentlemen fail to realize, then they shout economy and want to save money. I will deal with this in more detail in a moment.

Now, I dislike making unfair, negative accusations and charges as my Republican friends are doing daily. Of course, they are extremely efficient in this, especially in mud slinging, but they do not use their mortar for building homes for our needy workers and their families. They dislike to vote against points of

order in rules involving drastic cuts in the home-building program for our veterans, defense workers, and low-income groups. The Appropriations Committee inserted a legislative provision in this particular appropriation bill which reduces the number of homes authorized to be started in fiscal 1953 from 75,000 units to 25,000 units under our public housing program enacted by this Congress. Against my protest and my vote the Committee on Rules joined the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] in securing this rule waiving points of order against this provision as well as about a dozen others.

Now this is nothing new on the part of the Appropriations Committee to request such rules. You older Members know that I have criticized and opposed this usurpation of power by the Appropriations Committee. This committee has, during the past few years, usurped more and more of the authority and jurisdiction of the legislative standing committees of the House, and I shall continue to oppose such actions. The Committee on Appropriations should appropriate—not legislate.

I have stated frequently on the floor of the House that I object to waiving points of order on appropriation bills which include unjustified and unwarranted legislation just because the Committee on Appropriations happens to have the power and can obtain from the Committee on Rules a rule waiving points of order, thus making in order legislation that they had no right to recommend and embody in their bill.

I fully appreciate that we have spent a great deal of money, and I wish that that could be brought to an end. I have voted against many of these billion-dollar appropriations as I stated earlier. I believe in economy, but I do not believe in false economy, taking it out of the most deserving and needy people as is being done now.

I was under the impression that I would have more time to address you now, but that time has been cut so that I cannot bring home to you some other very important matters. However, I want to say to you that I hope in the future the gentlemen on the left will stop their unfair charges and accusations and be fair. I believe in criticism, but I do not believe in unjustified and unfair criticism.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield.

Mr. COLMER. I hope the gentleman will yield to me for the purpose of helping him.

Mr. SABATH. I cannot yield. I do not have the time.

Mr. COLMER. I will give the gentleman more time.

Mr. SABATH. I have 1 minute remaining.

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will yield now, I will tell him that, out of fairness to the gentleman and to keep my commitment with him, I have arranged with the gentleman from Illinois for him to have the two additional minutes that he anticipated.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Now, let me say this: Not only do I not agree with the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Rules at times, but I sometimes do not even agree with the President on occasion, as I will indicate shortly, although I am charged with being with him on everything.

I do not agree with him, however, when he suggests that we should limit the terms of Members of Congress to 12 years. If this limitation had been in effect this House would have been deprived of the services of at least 30 to 50 outstanding Members, able and efficient legislators. In mentioning some of these Members I do not include myself, of course, because I know I am getting old and feeble, and I have been here too long altogether according to my Republican friends. However, as long as I am here I am going to continue to perform my duties as I see them in the interest of my district and the country as a whole. I have in mind the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]; our very genial, lovable, and able Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN]; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]; the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]; the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]; the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]; the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]; the gentleman from New Jersey, [Mr. EATON]; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]; the gentleman from Massachusetts, the distinguished Republican floor leader [Mr. MARTIN]; the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]; the gentleman from Massachusetts, our esteemed majority floor leader [Mr. MCCORMACK]; and many others in a list too long to mention in these brief remarks who have served seven terms or more in the House. Though I do not agree with some of these gentlemen, nevertheless they are active, efficient, and able legislators due to their years of experience and service.

Of course, I realize it is very difficult to withstand the pressure and power of the real estate lobby and the contractor's lobby as applied to the public housing program. They are always on the job when their selfish interests are concerned. In the light of their activities it is not too difficult to understand why a very small percentage of our Government employees, in Internal Revenue and other agencies, found it impossible to withstand the temptations and pressures of the Republican bribe givers. The givers are actually the guilty ones yet we do not hear our Republican friends condemning them or the press giving their names.

I do want to say, at this point, that I am with the President wholeheartedly in his statement appearing in Mr. Hillman's recent book entitled "Mr. President" wherein he states very clearly that if there were no bribe givers, there would be no bribe takers.

Unfortunately some of our employees succumbed to the alluring temptations dangled before them. They fell by the wayside and were removed from their posts but by the eternal God we never hear a word about those who made these weaklings go wrong. The very small percentage of the vast number of Government employees involved in these wrongdoings does not begin to compare with the very high percentage of bankers, bank cashiers, bank tellers, individuals handling funds in private business whom we read about almost daily absconding with millions upon millions, yes, even some lawyers here and there and even ministers, yet my Republican friends never raise their voices about them.

So, I would like once in a while to see the names of the bribe givers publicized and brought to justice.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] deplored the high cost of living due to the great expenditures by government. I concede that the cost of living is unjustifiably high but is his party not responsible for this in a measure because of the emasculation and weakening of the price control bill? He said that the cost of living under Republican administration was extremely low but unfortunately the people were unable to buy enough because of their meager wages and unemployment.

Nevertheless, due to these statements by my Republican friends and wishing to answer them, I deviated from my original purpose to explain more thoroughly the existing shortage of homes, but I am in hopes my Democratic colleagues will later on point out the seriousness of the curtailment of the housing program that the Appropriations Committee is determined to carry out under this pretense of economy. But as I stated before, when these self-same gentlemen vote millions upon millions in subsidies for peanut and cotton growers and refuse to vote for the elimination of many of the loopholes in our revenue laws that would bring in four to five billions of additional taxes, their position is certainly consistent when they support this proposal of the Appropriations Committee to legislate the emasculation of our public-housing program in an appropriation bill, which program is in the interest of the rank and file of our people. Yes; the Republicans did reduce taxes in the Eightieth Congress, but for whom? They voted reductions for their wealthy friends and these evaders of legitimate taxation, as well as for these fixers of the few weaklings in our Government agencies.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I say to my Republican friends that their unjustifiable charges will not fool a majority of the American people in the coming election, just as they failed in the last five presidential elections because, taking everything into consideration, the people realize and appreciate that under Democratic administration they have enjoyed, and I hope will continue to enjoy, the prosperity brought about by the Democratic administrations of Roosevelt

and Truman. I sincerely trust the coalition in the House will not succeed in depriving our ex-servicemen, the veterans who are now returning and the low-income wage earners and their families of their right to obtain decent and livable housing at prices they can afford.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States recently addressed a convention of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. At that time he took occasion to hurl questionable charges at the great electric power industry of our country.

He spoke of his opposition to special privilege, and maintained that the resources of the country should be used for the benefit of all the people, not just a few. He spoke of the electric power generated at the many huge Federal projects and, while maintaining that the benefits of this power should go to the people he, in a sense, neglected to include the many millions of people who use power yet, by circumstance of location or the source of their present service, would not be permitted to share in the benefits of this electric power generated at the Federal projects until other citizens were first served.

The President went on to say that when electric power is produced with the people's money it ought to be used for the benefit of the people and not for the benefit of the private companies.

Yes, it is the people's money that is spent to build these federally operated power projects—the money of 150,000,000 people. Yet, the benefits of this electric power which by fact, tradition, and history is but a byproduct of a greater and more universally beneficial idea, namely, the reclamation of our arid lands and the conservation of our precious water resources, is now limited to only those who bow to the conditions and stipulations set down by those who control the disposition of electric power at our great Federal dams.

Eighty percent of the electric power supplied to the people of this country today is being supplied by those electric power companies, which, the President claims, seek to monopolize the electric power from the Federal multiple-purpose projects. They have performed a great role in making America the industrial giant that it is today. And they have done it as a specialized servant of the people.

Because of their importance in the industrial and domestic pattern of a strong America, our predecessors in these Halls and in the legislative halls of the many States long ago imposed this public-service duty on them and set up laws which would prevent them from ever monopolizing, in the true sense of the word, the industrial lifeblood which was their product.

Their earnings were controlled, their service areas meted out, and their operations policed. They and other prime services were called utilities and recognized as regulated monopolies which could only operate in the true, efficient, American way as such.

They have ever been distinguished from monopoly in its true connotation because of their peculiar status of public service. Antitrust laws written in these Chambers even recognized the regulated character of their operations and did not include their operations.

Despite this, for many years now the President and many others continue to tell the people that this "unrestrained giant" seeks to monopolize and control the electric energy which has been so important in the growth of this country.

In these times of inflationary prices and high cost of living it is indeed paradoxical that this charge should continue to be hurled at this service industry of the people. Steadily and in the face of continued criticism the electric-power industry of this country has labored and improved its methods so that today electric power virtually stands alone as the only product essential to our day-to-day living that gives more than 100 percent value on the 1939 dollar.

In the face of this fact, it is difficult to understand why the President, the Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman, and their followers continue to cry out for what they misleadingly call cheap power. One gets the impression as he listens to this same talk year after year that it has long ago been decided that the people still like to hear these things, so the administration continues to say them. Never a word about the many industries whose prices have skyrocketed to the point where the average workingman struggles to buy the necessities of life; never a word about reducing the back-breaking taxes that have made the American people more tax conscious than at any time since the days of the American Revolution.

But instead we have a "look over here, not there" attitude from the administration as its excesses of the past are just now coming into the full view of the public. And as of old the battle cry is: "Look at these monopolists who are gouging the American people," or some similar theme.

I say to you that the time is not far away when the real people, not the people who are giving lip service in these Federal planners' outbursts, will demand an accounting as to just how they are benefiting from this endless spending of money, ostensibly for the people. The many millions of people in my State and in surrounding States will demand an explanation of the benefits of the people's power and the people's natural resources, which are supplied by their taxes; even people within the pale of these Federal power projects, taxpaying people who have been faithfully served through the years by the private enterprise utilities, will demand to know why they must stand in line to receive the benefits of these developments while their neighbors are privileged by law first to participate.

It is no coincidence that the natural resources of this country which generate electric power have been first singled out in the campaign of the Federal planners. Already, there are noticeable undercurrents of moves in the direction of other resources which may soon come under attack by those who know best what is good for the people. But it would not be timely or effective at this time to demand the people's share in the so-called benefits of governmental development of our petroleum, natural gas, or mineral resources. Control of them, first, would not necessarily be the key to the ambitions of the planners. Electric power, the heart throb of industrial might, is their goal.

One must, in a way, admire the forthright approach taken by the Socialist Party of Britain when it set out to socialize industry there. Perhaps the lack of any great hydro development opportunities in their land rendered useless any devious argument that power from the great natural resources belonged to all the people. Without such a roundabout approach they merely took over the electric power, and from there went to Britain's one great natural resource—coal. Steel, the prime industrial sinew, was next on the list when suddenly the British people made their decision to stop and reconsider the Socialists' undertaking.

When these planners speak of benefits for the people, let it be the real people they are talking about, and let them be sure that the people want these things done for them.

And when the Secretary of the Interior speaks against the action of the Federal Power Commission for carrying out its legislative prerogative of granting licenses to private enterprise utilities let him remember that this agency is but carrying out the will of the Congress within the discretions set out in the Federal Power Act.

No agency such as the Department of the Interior can dictate to a legally constituted body such as the Federal Power Commission. They both have their functions and they both have their responsibilities. When the Congress saw fit to delegate activities to the various administrative agencies, such as the Federal Power Commission, it gave these agencies responsibilities. In the present struggle between the Federal Power Commission and the Department of the Interior the courts thus far have recognized these responsibilities and have ruled in favor of the Commission. It is not for the Secretary of the Interior or the President to decide what is best for the public interest. It is for the Congress to decide if existing laws need revision in the interest of the people.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices, the subcommittee which wrote this bill.

I am opposed to the rule which is being sought in this case; I am opposed to the rule because I am opposed to the assumption of inordinate power by the Appropriations Committee of the House, and that is exactly what our bill proposes to do in at least two instances: It takes over the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, because it

changes the basic laws relating to the Housing Act of 1949 and the Civil Service Act of last year. This it has done without evidence, without testimony, without hearings of any kind except for the administrators of the programs. To my mind this is not orderly procedure.

Earlier in the discussion of this rule the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Michigan stated that this rule made in order the consideration of this bill. This statement is not entirely true, because the rules of the House make in order the consideration of this bill with or without this rule. The only purpose of this rule is to freeze into the appropriation bill legislative matters which should not be in it, because this rule proposes to waive points of order.

In the event this rule is not agreed to the bill may nevertheless come to the floor, but the legislative provisions will be subject to points of order and thereby subject to being stricken from the bill. I urge the House to consider carefully the question as to whether or not it wants the Committee on Appropriations or, for that matter, any other standing committee of the House, to assume the jurisdiction of another standing committee. That is exactly what this bill will do.

I urge the House to defeat the rule that is requested today.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I dislike at any time taking a position in opposition to a rule to bring a bill before the House. I am one of those who feel that any legislation that has been reported by a committee should come before the House for action.

But in opposing this rule, we are not opposing bringing the bill to the House because, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has just stated, this bill can come before the House without this rule. The only reason for obtaining the rule which you are going to be asked to vote on in a few moments is to get a provision waiving points of order.

Why do they need a provision waiving points of order? Obviously because the Appropriations Committee is attempting to legislate and is attempting to invade the jurisdiction of legislative committees by this bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has pointed out that the bill attempts to invade the function of at least two other legislative committees, namely, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I happen to be a member.

I call your attention to the fact that this appropriation bill not only tries to change the provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 but also attempts to legislate in futuro. It not only provides for cutting down from 50,000 public housing units a year to 25,000 units for this year but also for every year thereafter, as long as the Housing Act provisions are in effect. I say that is a function which should be performed by the Banking and Currency Committee after full and complete hearings, with all of the evidence submitted to it; and then on the basis of such a report and whatever facts may be submitted therewith, we would then be in a position to act on this matter.

There was nothing submitted or presented to the Appropriations Committee on the basis of which it had any right to come before you and say, let us cut back the public housing units to 25,000 a year for this year and for every year hereafter.

I urge upon you either to vote down the previous question so that we may then amend the rule and strike out the provision waiving points of order or that we vote down the rule and let this appropriation bill come up in accordance with the rules of the House without a rule, at which time it will be subject to points of order and we can strike out of the bill all provisions subject to points of order, all provisions which are in violation of the rules of the House and an invasion of the jurisdiction of the other committees, particularly the legislative committees, of this House.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 69, noes 42.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 228, nays 133, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 29]

YEAS—228

Aandahl	Buffett	Fernandez
Abernethy	Burleson	Fisher
Adair	Burton	Ford
Allen, Calif.	Busbey	Forrester
Allen, Ill.	Bush	Frazier
Allen, La.	Butler	Fugate
Andersen, H. Carl	Byrnes	Gary
Anderson, Calif.	Camp	Gathings
Andresen, August H.	Cannon	Gavin
Andrews	Carlyle	George
Angell	Chatham	Golden
Arends	Chelf	Goodwin
Armstrong	Chenoweth	Gore
Auchincloss	Chiperfield	Graham
Ayres	Church	Gregory
Baker	Cole, Kans.	Gross
Barden	Cole, N. Y.	Gwinn
Bates, Ky.	Colmer	Hagen
Bates, Mass.	Cooper	Hall, Leonard W.
Beamer	Cotton	Halleck
Beckworth	Cox	Harden
Belcher	Crawford	Hardy
Bentsen	Crumpacker	Harris
Berry	Cunningham	Harrison, Nebr.
Betts	Curtis, Nebr.	Harrison, Wyo.
Bishop	Dague	Harvey
Blackney	Davis, Ga.	Hays, Ark.
Boggs, Del.	Davis, Wis.	Hébert
Boggs, La.	Dempsey	Herlong
Bonner	Denny	Hess
Bramblett	Devereux	Hill
Bray	D'Ewart	Hillings
Brehm	Dolliver	Hoeven
Brooks	Dondero	Hoffman, Mich.
Brown, Ga.	Dorn	Horan
Brown, Ohio	Durham	Hunter
Brownson	Eaton	Ikard
Bryson	Ellsworth	Jackson, Calif.
Budge	Elston	James
	Evins	Jenison
	Fenton	
Jenkins	Murray, Tenn.	Short
Jensen	Nicholson	Sikes
Johnson	Norblad	Simpson, Ill.
Jonas	Norrell	Smith, Kans.
Jones, Mo.	Ostertag	Smith, Miss.
Jones, Woodrow W.	Passman	Smith, Va.
Kearney	Patman	Springer
Kearns	Patterson	Stanley
Keating	Phillips	Steed
Kerr	Pickett	Stigler
Kilburn	Polk	Stockman
Kilday	Poulson	Sutton
King, Pa.	Preston	Taber
Latham	Radwan	Talle
LeCompte	Reams	Teague
Lovre	Redden	Thomas
Lucas	Reed, Ill.	Thompson, Mich.
Lyle	Reed, N. Y.	Thornberry
McCulloch	Rees, Kans.	Van Pelt
McDonough	Regan	Vorys
McGregor	Richards	Vursell
McIntire	Riehlman	Watts
McMillan	Riley	Werdel
McVey	Robeson	Wharton
Mack, Wash.	Rogers, Fla.	Whitten
Mahon	Rogers, Tex.	Wigglesworth
Marshall	Ross	Williams, Miss.
Martin, Iowa	St. George	Williams, N. Y.
Martin, Mass.	Schenck	Willis
Mason	Schwabe	Wilson, Ind.
Merrow	Scott, Hardie	Wilson, Tex.
Miller, Md.	Scrivner	Winstead
Miller, Nebr.	Scudder	Wood, Ga.
Miller, N. Y.	Secrest	Wood, Idaho
Mills	Shafer	Woodruff
Mumma	Sheehan	
	Sheppard	

NAYS—133

Addonizio	Hale	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Hand	O'Brien, Mich.
Anfuso	Havenner	O'Konski
Aspinall	Hays, Ohio	O'Neill
Bailey	Heller	Osmers
Barrett	Heselton	O'Toole
Battle	Holifield	Patten
Bender	Holmes	Perkins
Bennett, Fla.	Howell	Philbin
Blatnik	Irving	Price
Bolling	Jackson, Wash.	Priest
Bolton	Javits	Prouty
Buckley	Jones, Ala.	Rains
Burdick	Jones, Hamilton C.	Ramsay
Burnside	Karsten, Mo.	Rankin
Canfield	Kean	Rhodes
Carnahan	Kelley, Pa.	Ribicoff
Celler	Kelly, N. Y.	Rodino
Chudoff	Kennedy	Rogers, Colo.
Clemente	Keogh	Rogers, Mass.
Corbett	King, Calif.	Rooney
Coudert	Kirwan	Roosevelt
Crosser	Klein	Sabath
Curtis, Mo.	Kluczynski	Sadlak
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Saylor
Dawson	Lanham	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Deane	Lantaff	Seely-Brown
DeGraffenried	Lesinski	Sheiley
Delaney	Lind	Sieminski
Denton	McCormack	Sittler
Donohue	McGrath	Spence
Donovan	McGuire	Staggers
Eberharter	McMullen	Taylor
Elliott	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Engle	Madden	Trimble
Fallon	Magee	Van Zandt
Fine	Mansfield	Vinson
Fogarty	Morano	Walter
Forand	Morgan	Widnall
Fulton	Morris	Wier
Furcolo	Morrison	Withrow
Gordon	Multer	Yates
Granahan	Murphy	Yorty
Green	Nelson	Zablocki
Greenwood		

NOT VOTING—71

Abbitt	Flood	Kersten, Wis.
Bakewell	Gamble	Larcade
Baring	Garmatz	McCarthy
Beall	Granger	McConnell
Bennett, Mich.	Grant	McKinnon
Bosone	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mack, Ill.
Bow	Harrison, Va.	Meader
Boykin	Hart	Miller, Calif.
Buchanan	Hedrick	Mitchell
Carrigg	Heffernan	Morton
Case	Herter	Moulder
Clevenger	Hinshaw	Murdock
Combs	Hoffman, Ill.	Murray, Wis.
Cooley	Hope	O'Hara
Dingell	Hull	Poage
Dollinger	Jarman	Potter
Doughton	Judd	Powell
Doyle	Kee	Rabaut
Feighan		Reece, Tenn.

Rivers	Tackett	Welch
Roberts	Thompson, Tex.	Wheeler
Sasscer	Vail	Wickersham
Simpson, Pa.	Velde	Wolcott
Smith, Wis.	Weichel	Wolverton

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Sasscer for, with Mr. Wolverton against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Case.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Meader.
Mr. Tackett with Mr. McConnell.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Welch with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Bakewell.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Gamble.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Jarman with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Vail.
Mr. Cooley with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Poage with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Carrigg.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Hope.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Saylor.

Messrs. DEGRAFFENRIED, VAN ZANDT, WIDNALL, HAND, KING of California, HAMILTON C. JONES, and Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7072, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the subcommittee I want to thank the members of the full committee and also the membership of the House generally for the courteous, fair treatment and support which it always has given our subcommittee. The subcommittee has worked long and hard on this bill and we have brought to you as your representative our best consideration of the many subject matters involved. We realize that our judgment is not perfect and we do not claim it to be, but we do insist that we have given to you the best that is in us and if we have made any mistakes it has been due to errors of the head and not of the heart.

The committee considered—and I will use round figures—$7,000,000,000 in Budget estimates covering the independent agencies including the Executive Office of the President and the Maritime Administration. Out of that $7,000,000,000 there are about $2,753,000,000 that we call untouchables. These are items that apply to the Veterans' Administration, for instance, insurance premiums, schooling, GI benefits, pensions for the disabled and for dependents of deceased, and so forth. So we have not touched those items. That does not leave too much to work on after you subtract that amount from the $7,000,000,000.

You hear it said on every street corner and in the cloak rooms and in conversation generally between the membership that all of the agencies are overstaffed. Frankly we think there is something in that, and we tried to do something about it. But I want to reverse the tables now and take the part of the agencies. They made the statement, and they are 100 percent true and correct in it, as they came before the subcommittee, "We believe just as much in economy as you do, but we are taxpayers just like every other citizen of the United States. But, after all," they say, "the Congress imposes duties upon us." And, they are right. We, as Members of Congress year after year and day after day pass more laws, piling more duties and obligations upon the agencies of Government, and as long as the Congress does that, they must increase their personnel. I might add right there that when we place these added duties upon the agencies we give far too little consideration to what those added duties are going to cost the taxpayers, and we never consider that until the time comes to provide an appropriation for them. But, it goes one step further. Congress will pass a bill, and it will put in half a dozen clauses, and in each clause they will add a little something here and a little something there, and when it gets over to the Bureau of the Budget, when it comes time to staff the agency, the Bureau of the Budget lays out the staffing plan, or if it does not lay it out it approves it. As fine and as grand as they are, they have a tremendous job to do. I give them the credit for doing it and doing it reasonably well, but they will set up this staffing plan and they will allow an assistant, they will allow a manager for this little clause and that little duty, and then they will give that manager an assistant manager, and they are always in grades 13 and 14. Then they will take the other clause and set up a manager for that and an assistant manager for him, and when they get through they could have consolidated three or four of those clauses, because they do not have too much to do.

So, a part of this responsibility has to be divided not only by the bureaus and the agencies, they should not assume it all, but the Congress ought to assume its part of it and Bureau of the Budget ought to assume its part of it.

My colleagues, your subcommittee is present. They know just as much about this bill as I do, and I am going to sit down and share the time with the members of the committee, and then whatever time we have left we are going to be delighted to share it with the membership generally.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman will explain, at the very start of this bill, the emergency fund for the President to the tune of $5,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS. With our reappropriation last year, to make it in round numbers we gave him about $5,500,000. In this bill we have given him $5,000,000. Since January he has allocated another $500,000, and up to date he has allocated out of that $5,000,000 approximately $1,452,000.

Mr. GROSS. Is it not true that there is an unexpended balance of approximately $4,000,000?

Mr. THOMAS. As of today there is an unexpended balance of about $3,500,000, but who knows what the next 3½ or 4 months may bring?

Mr. GROSS. Does that money revert to the Treasury?

Mr. THOMAS. Every dime that is unused reverts to the Treasury at the end of the fiscal year for which it is appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. That is not what the Budget Director says.

Mr. THOMAS. I am telling the gentleman what the law is. I do not know what he told my friend.

Mr. GROSS. You have it in your own hearings here.

Mr. THOMAS. It reverts, I assure the gentleman that. It reverts to the Treasury.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am told that the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration is cut $5,000,000, very much more than the Budget recommended. As I understand, except for a few men, it will completely wipe out the contact work in all of the subregional offices, leaving only a few of the contact men in the regional offices. It would mean a great hardship on the disabled veterans.

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted that our colleague the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has brought up that question, because she of all people is the one to bring it up on account of her outstanding work not only in this House but back in her district and all over the Nation in behalf of the veterans. But let me explain it briefly. Yes, the Budget calls for 1,526 contact employees, and we made a mistake there. I am going to admit it. The mistake we made is, we left 300 of them, and we should have cut out the entire 1,526.

Why do I say that? The gentlewoman knows better than anyone, because this legislation came out of the gentlewoman's committee. Last year alone at the end of the session or close thereto we added to the benefits of the veterans of this country an additional cost of ap-

proximately $125,000,000. Here is the question: Are we going to give these boys the benefits to which they are entitled or are we going to spend it on administrative jobs?

Back in the gentlewoman's home, in her home city, in her own county, there are public officials paid for by the city, there are contact officers paid for by the county, and there are local patriotic organizations doing contact work for the veterans. On top of that, if there is a veteran in the gentlewoman's district who does not get what he wants after he has contacted the Veterans' Administration, the gentlewoman hears from him, and she really goes to town for him. They are not hurt one bit.

The American Legion, and it is a fine and grand organization, has sent out a telegram concerning the matter. I know how much everyone is interested, but I want to point out that there is a limit to the appropriations we can provide and that we cannot continue to give veterans the benefits that they ought to have, and that we are giving them in this bill, and at the same time give them all the funds for offices and other administrative expenses that are requested. There is a limit to what you can give in benefits, if you are going to keep on with these unnecessary administrative costs. Let us take that amount of $5,000,000, and give it to the veterans in benefits. That is about all that it adds up to. And that great American Legion with that fine organization, with posts in every city and town in the country, whose purpose is to help the veterans can put these posts to work at home helping in a little contact work for the veterans rather than have this money come out of the Federal Treasury for that purpose. There are 343 of these little units scattered all over the country, and I would repeat, we made only one mistake and that is when we did not take it all out.

Now I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would say to the gentleman that I would be horribly ashamed of myself if I did not try to restore the money for these contact individuals.

Mr. THOMAS. Whatever the gentlewoman does, I would never be ashamed of it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Have you ever worked on a case of a boy who did not know his rights and died before his rights were explained to him? Did you know that in the veterans' hospitals all over the country today in many of them, there is only one contact man?

Mr. THOMAS. I assure the gentlewoman this is not going to hurt a single living veteran, or any of the heirs of veterans because we are going to see to it that they get what they want.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee brings this bill to the floor with a feeling of satisfaction. I concur with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee when he says that there is no such thing as a perfect bill, but I think we have come more nearly to doing a thorough job on this bill, without more adequate analytical help. I think we have set a goal which some of the other subcommittees will very definitely attempt to equal. As the chairman said, there are in the total $2,700,000,000 of requests that it would be difficult to cut. Those are the cuts for veterans. Those are the cuts for subsidies, for instance, insurance, indemnities, and for automobiles, which the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts has sponsored for injured veterans. We have made a cut of 16.6 percent, which I consider a good cut, upon those items which are controllable by the subcommittee. We made a cut of 10 percent, for the entire bill, a cut of 10 percent. I would like to interrupt my comments upon the bill to say that, in the 6 years during which I have been a member of this subcommittee, it is a pleasure to work on this particular subcommittee although it is a very difficult subcommittee. We have three parts to our bill. We have the budget for the White House, which consists of several separate parts. We have the budget for the independent offices, and there are some 30 or 35 of these independent offices, which come to us each year. There are the general provisions of the bill, which I suspect caused the vote over the rule, because if that were not the case, some Members of the House may have voted under a misunderstanding. We do have a difficult job, and it is a pleasure to work with the subcommittee, with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] as the chairman, and I publicly pay my respects to him, and my compliments to him as one of the most able men I have ever worked with. That would go also for the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and for my two colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], and particularly my colleague the gentleman from New Hampshire who has worked so hard and so well [Mr. COTTON].

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] has already stated, the bill has many items, and there may be many details that Members of the House, as they read through the bill, may not understand fully and may want further explanations. I think it would be better for those of us on the committee to confine ourselves to those explanations, rather than attempt to guess in advance what the questions may be and to answer them in general debate.

I want to point out to the membership, however, that this is a test of the sincerity and courage of the Members of Congress. There is no way to cut the expenditures of the United States without cutting them on some spot, sensitive to someone, and the best way, in my opinion, to approach that subject is to approach it as the committee did in the case of the so-called safety services of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is a duplication of what is being done by our States; or in the case of these so-called contact men for the Veterans' Administration, which is a duplication of work being done for the veterans by the States, by the counties, and by the veterans' organizations.

I have in my pocket a card as a 25-year member of the American Legion. I express to you my regret today that this organization, for which I have worked in my local post, should have sent out the telegram that they sent to me and other Members, without making any further effort to go into the merits of the case, or to discover what the situation was. The Legion, of which I am very proud to be a member, as I am of the DAV and other veterans' organizations, itself gives services which are duplicated by this item, which we are said to have taken out. As my chairman has said, we left in 300 of these contact men who can be put in areas where there otherwise would be a lack of service.

As a disabled veteran of World War I, as a member of the American Legion for 25 years, I will oppose any effort, and will vote against any effort to put back the unnecessarily duplicating contact service about which questions have been raised.

We will not have economy if we attempt to impose economy only upon the agencies in which we are not personally interested. We will not have economy, we will not bring the expenditures of the United States inside the income of the United States, we will not prevent further depreciation of the dollar and a further trend toward inflation unless we are willing in this body today—not tomorrow or next year, but today and tomorrow—as this first bill comes before you as a challenge, unless we are willing to vote as we say that we mean, and that our constituents at home meant when they said they could stand no more taxes, no more inflation, and no more depreciation of the dollar.

We now face a deficit of $14,000,000,000, of which we have made a reduction of $1,300,000,000, which is the equivalent of the reduction made in the Eightieth Congress.

I desire to read into the RECORD now these figures:

In 1948, in this subcommittee, we made a reduction of $1,411,690,732.

In the intervening years, in spite of that reduction, we have every year made a reduction of a half or three-quarters of a billion dollars.

This year we come to you again with a well-judged, well-balanced reduction of $1,392,548,695.

As to some of these other items, I will hold my comments. I will attempt to show you in the debate, how the Office of Housing Administration, which is but an agency to coordinate housing activities, has increased in 6 years from 143 employees to 1,472 employees, and how each agency of Government is increasing with a mushroom growth which can be stopped only by the methods adopted by the subcommittee. It is a courageous effort to get the agencies back to a point where they are giving the service we want them to give but not giving a service which duplicates other services, or is wasteful of the taxpayers' hard-earned money.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, this bill covers a wide field of activity, and one could not expect in one brief speech to

cover all the subjects in the bill; I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to one particular field in which your committee has developed great interest and concern; that is, in the field of cost-plus contracts which I think are endangering the economy of the country.

Cost-plus contracts are of two general types: Cost plus a fixed fee on the one hand and cost plus fixed percentage fees based on a percentage of cost on the other. The obvious reason why your committee is deeply apprehensive about this type of contract is that it increases costs. It is surely not necessary for me to argue in the well of this Chamber that a cost-plus operation, particularly a cost-plus percentage fee operation, encourages spending. But there is another matter that gives us grave concern. This type of contract literally invites all sorts of devious, unsavory financial schemes; yes, I may say invites widespread danger of scandal; then, too, this procedure of a cost-plus contract operator or cost-plus contract for construction or procurement tends to take control of the purse strings right out of the hands of the Congress. This is one of the vital constitutional powers that we have. It tends to minimize also the responsibility of the administrators of this vast undertaking to the Congress.

We realize that this cost-plus procedure is sometimes necessary. There are certain situations when a cost-plus contract may be justified; for instance, an entirely new undertaking such as the building of a reactor for an atomic-powered submarine could not be done on a competitive low bid. In such a situation the cost-plus contract, particularly if it is subject to renegotiation, may be justified; or, another example: Security may make it inadvisable to advertise the details of a project sufficiently to reduce it to competitive bidding; speed in getting started may be another reason.

Even so, the experience of Congress in World Wars I and II with cost-plus contracts proved highly unsatisfactory. After both World War I and World War II, Congress passed a series of acts forbidding cost-plus contracts. I can give you four citations here: May 10, 1918; June 28, 1940; February 19, 1948; and then June 30, 1949. There are many more.

The application of these prohibitions, however, was never able to quite stop the cost-plus procedures in one form or another and despite unfortunate experiences cost-plus contracts are back with us with a vengeance and they are tending to gobble up all procurement and construction expenditures.

As an illustration, only yesterday the Air Corps advised another subcommittee of which I am privileged to be a member that only 12 percent of Air Corps procurement, measured dollar-wise, goes to fixed-price contracts. Let me tell you further that only a part of that 12 percent represents an acceptance of the lowest responsible competitive bidder. Does that not illustrate to you to what extent this cost-plus contrivance has gone in this vast program? Is it any wonder then that there is widespread cheating and chiseling when we turn over to people who are never subject to report to Congress, to people who have never been elected to any responsible position by the people of this country, turn over to people about whom neither you nor I have ever heard, the decision as to who will be awarded contracts from which these vast profits are reaped?

The Atomic Energy Commission operates its vast and vital program largely on the basis of cost-plus contracts. I have become increasingly disturbed by this fact and I have given considerable thought and study to the subject. I confess to you that I do not have a satisfactory alternative to suggest, certainly not in all cases, but I do have a deep conviction, Mr. Chairman, that this is a subject to which the Congress should give immediate and serious consideration at the earliest practical moment.

Fees are going out of all proportion, costs are going up and up and up, and we are getting less and less national defense for our dollar. For the first time I have placed in the RECORD the fees of prime contractors of the Atomic Energy Commission.

If you will get the hearings on the Atomic Energy Commission and turn to page 1157 you will see there a list of the fees paid to the prime cost-plus contractors. You will notice to the right of the column containing the fee another allowance which is called overhead allowance.

I know you have read a great deal as I have read how the du Pont Co. is building the Savannah River so-called H-bomb project at a fee of $1 per year, or no fee at all. Well, if you will look at page 1169 you will see that that company is paid an overhead allowance of $5,900,000. Now we have been trying to find out what overhead allowances mean. It is a little difficult to pin it down and get an accurate definition of what is meant by overhead allowance. It may mean one thing in one contract and something else in another.

We had a hearing all this morning with the General Accounting Office. They gave us some very interesting information and deepened our concern about this whole problem. For instance, in some contracts they advised us that the General Accounting Office is prohibited by terms of the contract from auditing the overhead allowance. I think the committee may have a suggestion to make along that line tomorrow.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What reason could be given as to why the General Accounting Office would not have a right to audit any company that involves Government expenditures?

Mr. GORE. Well, we are going to ask that question tomorrow morning of the Budget Bureau and by tomorrow afternoon I will be able to give the gentleman the answer which they give us. I cannot give any justification for it at this time. I know of no justification for it, and so far as I am concerned, I am ready to support an amendment now prohibiting the execution of any other such contract.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's answer and I will be very much interested in having the answer to the question the gentleman has raised.

Mr. GORE. I will be very glad tomorrow to bring the gentleman the answer supplied us by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in his opposition to cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts, where they make some other provision for construction, but the thing that amazes me is that this administration, having gone through two wars, has not brought in some legislation or taken some steps to cure this cost-plus-fixed-fee contract construction.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I am sure he will agree with me that this is a subject that we should approach in a nonpartisan spirit, regardless upon which side of the aisle we sit.

Here is a national problem to which we must give our immediate consideration. As you will see, if you study these fees, large though they are, they relate only to the fees and overhead allowances of prime contractors. Now there is an additional problem that aggravates the cost-plus procedure. The prime contractors have subcontractors and the subcontractors of the prime contractors in turn have subcontractors, all on a cost-plus-fee basis. So you see you have a percentage of a fee and a percentage on top of a percentage fee. You have a compound interest proposition. So, up and up go the fees, and up and up go the costs, and we get less and less national defense for our dollar. Something must be done about it. Though in some cases the cost-plus procedure may be necessary, as I have acknowledged, a general use of the procedure is uneconomic, inflationary, wasteful, and may prove disastrous in many cases.

Now there is one particular kind of cost-plus contract that I think is the worst of all, and that is the cost-plus-fee operating contractor. Let me give you an interesting story. My attention was first directed to this question of cost-plus operating contractor by the Roane-Anderson Corp., which operated the community of Oak Ridge, Tenn. We found that the Roane-Anderson Corp. was organized without any substantial investment, organized for one purpose only, to make a contract with the Atomic Energy Commission to operate the city of Oak Ridge at a fee. When we pried into it, we found all the officials of this corporation drew handsome salaries which were reimbursed out of the Treasury. In addition, they drew a fee of $180,000 for operating Oak Ridge, which they divided among themselves. Your committee called it to the attention of the Atomic Energy Commission and asked them to do something about it. They promised to give it careful study. A year later they came back to

your committee and they were still studying it carefully.

So we offered an amendment. The first amendment was to cut the fee in two, to $90,000. When we offered that amendment, perhaps you remember that some of our distinguished and able colleagues, for whom all of us have a high regard, who were on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, came to this floor and resisted our amendment, predicting dire results. One of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, Mr. Sumner Pike, issued a statement in which he implied that the amendment I had offered was going to wreck the atom-bomb program. His statement was carried in headlines all across the top of the page in some of the Tennessee papers.

We stuck by our guns; the House stuck by us, and then later the Senate concurred. Today Roane-Anderson is gone, dissolved. Nobody is getting a fee for operating Oak Ridge, and it is operating better than it ever has operated.

I cite that not to be vainglorious but because I think it may be a case in point.

We have come upon another one of these cost-plus operators that is a gyp. Let me tell you this story. It has been my privilege to conduct the atomic energy hearings part of this budget for the last 4 or 5 years. I had that privilege again this year. While the hearing was under way, the Assistant General Manager who appeared before the committee was Gen. Thomas Farrell, an able and distinguished gentleman. Any references I make to him now are not intended to reflect upon him in any way other than favorably. I believe General Farrell as Assistant General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission was holding the highest and most responsible position of his lifetime. He seemed contented in his work. In the middle of a hearing, however, he was employed right away from the Atomic Energy Commission by ARO.

Now, what is ARO? ARO, we find, is a corporation organized under the laws of Tennessee for the purpose of making a contract with the Air Corps, and obtaining a fee for operating the aerodynamic wind tunnel facility at Tullahoma, which is now under construction. They have a cost-plus-fee contract, which means that the Government of the United States reimburses their expenditures and then pays them a fee. Therefore, it becomes pertinent to inquire into the salary which ARO is paying General Farrell, and it becomes pertinent, too, to compare that with the salary that General Farrell was drawing as Assistant General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission. As Assistant General Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, he was drawing a Government classified salary of $17,500 a year. I find that ARO is paying him $30,000 a year. Now that is much as if my wife and I went to an auction sale, and unknown to each other, start bidding against each other for the same antique. Up and up it goes. The Congress of the United States will have to appropriate money to pay the salary of Generall Farrell. So, you see, we are bidding against each other by this cost-plus contrivance.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Is there anything your committee has done, or can do, about this matter?

Mr. GORE. We are studying and trying to find out what we can do. We hope we can come forward with some suggestion. It is a big problem. I do not claim to have the answer to it. But, it is getting out of hand, and it is something to which the legislative committees as well as the Committee on Appropriations must give their attention.

I want to go on about ARO a minute. This caused the Committee on Appropriations, this hiring of a distinguished general manager of the Atomic Energy Commission right out from under our noses at a salary almost double that which he had ever drawn before, and which salary we must pay in addition to the percentage fee to this contract operator on a cost-plus basis. What does he care what he pays General Farrell; after all, the more he pays the bigger his fee will be. As I say, that caused us to want to inquire into it. We find that ARO, after all its officials are paid their salaries, is receiving a fee this year of $95,000. What is more, they expect twice that much next year. The Air Corps told our committee within the last few days that this ARO even tried to collect a 3½-percent fee on the power furnished this wind tunnel by the TVA. Imagine a moocher, sitting down there, demanding a 3½-percent toll on the power that one Federal agency furnishes to another.

There are many questions that are suggested. The more we have learned about ARO, the more determined we have become to seek answers to some perplexing questions. We would like to know, for instance, how it came about, and if it is proper that one Steve Leo, a former Air Corps publicity man, without engineering, scientific, or technical training or experience should become head of ARO with a contract to operate a highly technical supersonic and transonic wind tunnel research center at a salary of $20,000 a year, plus his share of the ARO fee of $95,000, which is the fee which will have to be paid this year. The committee would like to know if it is a mere coincidence that within a few days after Messrs. Symington and Leo left the Air Corps, Mr. Leo became a stockholder and officer of a Missouri corporation, Sverdrup & Purcel, which corporation had received approximately $10,000,000 in contracts from the Air Corps for paper work, and which corporation was further favored by the privilege of organizing and holding ARO to operate AEDC contrary, incidentally, to the recommendation of the Technical Research Development Board. A general by the name of Franklin O. Carroll was assigned as commanding general on this wind tunnel project. We understand that he refused to O. K. a budget for ARO for more than $1,500,000. He was overruled either in Baltimore or Washington, and a budget of $3,000,000 was arbitrarily fixed for ARO. Why was General Carroll, who was sent to the AEDC as a suitable commander for a highly technical aerodynamic facility, removed from his command and assigned to the Institute of Human Relations?

The AEDC is a vital aerodynamic research facility upon which the future safety and freedom of America may depend. Only yesterday Secretary Finletter said to our committee that "A single discovery of applied science may turn the balance of power."

Unless we can keep this vital project clean and free from suspicion, its usefulness, if not its very existence, will be endangered. I am determined to protect it against corruption and fraud, if I can possibly do so. The nest-feathering of ARO has put it under a cloud of suspicion. I have asked the committee not to act in haste, to withhold action on funds necessary for continuation of the project until we can get at the bottom of ARO.

I urge the Congress to give its immediate attention, I urge the chairmen of our legislative committees involved to give immediate attention to the scope, extent, and danger of the cost-plus contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] who wishes to ask a question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. WERDEL. I simply wanted to indicate another question to the gentleman from Tennessee, and that is to this effect: He has advised us of General Carroll receiving in salary $30,000 from a cost-plus contract at the same time he was receiving $17,500 in Government salary.

Mr. GORE. Not at the same time. He was taken from one job to the other, but we paid either one of the salaries.

Mr. WERDEL. I stand corrected to that extent. But I wanted to say that the gentleman's remarks have indicated another question, which is to this effect: That all over our great United States we now have executives who are denied the right to increase their salaries in private corporations, even as presidents, to the extent of ten or fifteen thousand dollars, as being a fraud upon the Government, in that taxes are evaded. Here we have a situation where Government employees make deals with cost-plus contractors, with the same Government. They can move freely, at the expense of taxpayers who cannot pay themselves a living salary at the head of corporations that are collecting the money to pay the cost-plus bill. I say that perhaps your investigation should go a little deeper than the gentleman has indicated.

Mr. GORE. I concur in the gentleman's opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute, and after that, with the agreement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], I will yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, in my preliminary remarks I omitted one comment which I now wish to make, and

that was to call attention to an item on the bottom of page 11 of the bill which says that the Civil Service Commission shall not impose a limitation of a maximum age on the people who are being appointed to positions in the competitive service.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] deserves a great deal of credit for his interest in that subject, and his work, which resulted in the inclusion of that provision, and I wish to associate myself with him and commend him for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the committee, if he will clarify certain language for me appearing on page 48 of the bill and having to do with the granting of operating differential subsidies under the Merchant Marine Act; particularly there is a proviso beginning on line 7 which limits the subsidy payments to no more than 1,600 voyages, and in line 12 appears the language: "of which 100 shall be for new operators."

As the gentleman from Texas knows, I am particularly interested in the expansion of the merchant marine and in the status of those operators who are endeavoring to add to the service, particularly those who have not been subsidized. There are operating on the Pacific Ocean at least two applicants whose subsidy contract applications are about ready for action by the Maritime Board; action on those applications may be taken during the fiscal year 1952 or during fiscal 1953 for which this bill provides. My question is as to whether or not the provision for 100 voyages for new operators will be available to those applicants whose applications are now pending but not yet granted regardless of whether they are granted during fiscal 1952 or 1953.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to my friend, the gentleman from California that the committee appreciates his interest in this subject matter. In the past he has been helpful to our committee in trying to work out some suitable language.

It is the committee's intention that this language mean just exactly what it says: New operators, new in the sense that they have not enjoyed any subsidy in the past. The gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the other gentleman on the subcommittee have a clear understanding that there are one or two companies on the Pacific Coast who have been endeavoring to get for themselves a subsidized route. It is our intention that a great many of these voyages will go to these new operators.

Mr. ALLEN of California. I thank the gentleman and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from California and the ranking minority member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee [Mr. PHILLIPS] for this time. I asked for it to give the Members information in regard to the many letters they have been receiving dealing with title V, Public Law 137, which treats of the proposed fees to be levied by the Securities and Exchange Commission on investment dealers and brokers throughout the United States. I think a little background information will be helpful.

Title V was brought into the House last year on the appropriation bill by this same committee. Because the appropriation bill was voted out of the Rules Committee under a rule waiving points of order there was no possibility of making a point of order against title V because it was legislation on an appropriation bill. No effort was made by the Securities and Exchange Commission to establish fees for broker-dealers until after the hearings were held this year. When the SEC was before the Subcommittee on Independent Offices appropriations they were asked what had been done toward levying fees to defray expenses of the agency.

From the testimony in the hearings of this year it was established that nothing had been done. Then very suddenly, within a week or 10 days, a schedule was put out.

From everything that I can ascertain, the SEC did not have any intention of levying fees under this law until a little heat was put on them to do so by the chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of contention as to whether the SEC can legally assess these fees. I want to read to you the first statement put out by the SEC regarding their proposal to levy fees. In their release of January 31, 1952, they state for their authorization:

> That act authorizes Federal agencies to prescribe fees and charges and states in part:
>
> "It is the sense of the Congress that any work, service, publication, report, document, benefit, privilege, authority, use, franchise, license, permit, certificate, registration, or similar thing of value or utility performed, furnished, provided, granted, prepared, or issued by any Federal agency * * * to or for any person (including groups, associations, organizations, partnerships, corporations, or businesses), except those engaged in the transaction of official business of the Government, shall be self-sustaining to the full extent possible."

Unfortunately they do not quote another vital section of title 5 of Public Law 137, as follows:

> To be fair and equitable, taking into consideration the direct and indirect cost to the Government, value to recipient, public policy or interest served, and other pertinent facts.

That latter part is very important.

I think I understand the intent of the committee when it put title 5 into the appropriation bill last year. It was to take care of a situation, for instance, like the National Archives, that are requested to furnish many photostats, certified copies, and various documents to people throughout the United States every day. Thousands of them in a year. The people who receive them do not reimburse the National Archives 1 penny for the service received. In my humble opinion they should pay for those services. But in the case of the SEC assessing a fee against brokers, there is no service whatever rendered by the SEC to the brokers.

On February 28 I wrote to Mr. Donald C. Cook, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission and pointed out that in the testimony of the former chairman before the Committee on Appropriations on the SEC last year he was questioned by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] regarding fees and I give you his testimony as follows:

> Mr. YATES. What possibilities for obtaining fees are there besides the ones you already charge which might compensate in measure for the cost of the work?
>
> Mr. MCDONALD. You cannot charge people for prosecuting them and a great part of our work is the prosecution of brokers who have committed violations.

There, in effect, is the basis of one of the major objections the investment dealers and brokers have in opposition to the SEC charging fees.

I pointed out in my letter to Mr. Cook, it would be just as reasonable to expect the Department of Justice to assess a criminal a fee to apprehend and prosecute him, or it would be just as reasonable to have the Internal Revenue Bureau impose a fee on a taxpayer to collect his taxes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that the Securities and Exchange Commission law was passed to protect the investors and not passed primarily to regulate and control the brokers, and therefore the brokers should not have to pay the whole bill because the great mass of investors are the ones that get the benefit?

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I am going to get down to that portion of the law in just a moment. What service does the Securities and Exchange Commission perform for the broker-dealers that would warrant charging a fee? A dealer has to fill out a form. I hold one in my hand. He is required to answer a few simple questions and then the form is deposited in the files of the SEC. That is all. There is no examination. They issue no license or certificate to do business, but still the SEC wants to charge the industry over half a million dollars a year, mind you, annually, for a registration. The only reason that the broker-dealers are required to register under the SEC is in order to bring them under the jurisdiction of the SEC so that they can be prosecuted for a violation, such as selling fraudulent securities. There is not an individual in the United States that the SEC can refuse a registration unless he has been convicted of some fraud in selling securities, or some crime.

The law states specifically, and I repeat, "to be fair and equitable, taking into consideration direct and indirect costs to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interests served, and other pertinent facts."

The Congress in its wisdom some years ago passed what was known as the Maloney Act which established the National Association of Security Dealers. Every broker-dealer in the United States has to belong to this organization and pay

fees annually. The National Association of Security Dealers is responsible for enforcing its code of business ethics in the securities business. The Securities and Exchange Commission is the policing body for the public. There are a few big houses on Wall Street that have quite a number of employees, but I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that over 80 percent of the security brokers of the United States have less than 10 employees in their service. If this were a case where a license were issued, like a physician or a dentist or a barber or even a chiropodist, before one could hang up a shingle to do business—and would have to renew that license every year—then it would be another thing. In that event there might be some justification for fees. On the other hand, there is a very serious question of the constitutionality of the SEC charging fees to the broker-dealers of this country under title V of Public Law 137. I do not believe the Congress can delegate that power to any agency of Government. As a matter of fact, all fees that the SEC now charge are by statute determined by the Congress.

For instance, during the fiscal year 1951 the Securities and Exchange Commission collected over a million dollars in fees as follows:

The fees they collected for registration of securities was done by statute under the Securities Act of 1933.

The qualification of trust indentures was done under what is known as the Trust Indenture Act.

From registered exchanges the fees were collected by statute under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

Congress at no time intended or directed the Securities and Exchange Commission to levy any fees except those passed by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have carried on quite an extensive correspondence with various people regarding this situation, including Mr. Donald C. Cook, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission; Hon. Robert Crosser, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; Hon. Louis B. Heller, chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; and the Honorable Albert Thomas, chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations.

Under permission previously granted me in the House, I include the following letters at this point:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1952.

Mr. DONALD C. COOK,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOK: I have received an avalanche of mail in my office protesting the putting into effect of any regulation whatever that the Securities and Exchange Commission might have in mind in connection with the proposed plan to charge broker-dealers a fee.

I am puzzled and deeply concerned as to why you put out your release of Thursday, January 31, 1952, entitled "Notice of Proposal To Adopt and Amend Rules with Respect to Fees and Charges by the Commission." In the first paragraph of this release you state that you propose to adopt new rules to amend existing rules with respect to fees and charges of the Commission as set forth below, to implement the provisions of title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952. That act authorizes Federal agencies to prescribe fees and charges and states in part:

"It is the sense of the Congress that any work, service, publication, report, document, benefit, privilege, authority, use, franchise, license, permit, certificate, registration, or similar thing of value or utility performed, furnished, provided, granted, prepared, or issued by any Federal agency * * * to or for any person (including groups, associations, organizations, partnerships, corporations, or businesses), except those engaged in the transaction of official business of the Government, shall be self-sustaining to the fullest extent possible."

To this I would like to add a point further down in the law which states, "to be fair and equitable, taking into consideration direct and indirect cost of the Government."

You will kindly note the law is not mandatory and it reads, "It is the sense of the Congress."

I would appreciate a detailed explanation as to just why the Securities and Exchange Commission thinks that under the law it should inaugurate rules and regulations providing a fee be charged broker-dealers. I would particularly like to know who, in or outside the Commission, originated this proposal with the Commission and if counsel for the Commission rendered a written opinion.

In the event counsel for the Commission rendered a written opinion, I respectfully request a copy be included with the answer to this letter.

In my opinion there is no justification for the proposed schedule of fees going into effect for the following reasons:

1. The Securities and Exchange Commission renders no services for which it could possibly charge broker-dealers a fee under title 5 of Public Law 137.

2. The law states, in referring to an agency of Government, that it "shall be self-sustaining to the full extent possible." The fees that would be charged under the proposed schedule by the Securities and Exchange Commission would not, in any way, be applied to sustaining the Securities and Exchange Commission. The proposed fees would, by law, have to go directly to the Treasury of the United States.

3. During the hearings, when the Securities and Exchange Commission was before the committee, February 28, 1951, Hon. SIDNEY YATES, of Illinois, asked the following question of Mr. Harry A. McDonald, who was then Chairman of the Commission:

"What possibilities for obtaining fees are there besides the ones you already charge which might compensate in measure for the cost of the regulation?"

To which Mr. McDonald replied:

"You can't charge people for prosecuting them, and a great part of our work is the prosecution of brokers who have committed violations."

This, in my opinion, states the relationship of the Securities and Exchange Commission to the broker-dealers rather conclusively. In other words, the Securities and Exchange Commission is in a similar position to brokers and dealers, if the proposed fees go into effect, that the Department of Justice would be in asking criminals to pay a fee for apprehending and prosecuting them. Another illustration would be to have the Internal Revenue Bureau ask the taxpayer to pay the Bureau a fee for collecting his taxes. In other words, it is well established by law that the Securities and Exchange Commission is the policing agency of the securities business and in no way renders a service to broker-dealers for which they should collect a fee.

4. I have, on this date, directed a letter to the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS, chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, asking that his committee hold hearings as to whether or not, in its opinion, the Securities and Exchange Commission comes under title 5 of Public Law 137; and that I may be permitted to appear before the committee as a witness.

5. I have on this date introduced a bill in the House of Representatives which, if passed, will specifically exempt the broker-dealers from being charged a fee under title 5 of Public Law 137.

Having been a broker for 32 years in Chicago and a member of the National Association of Security Dealers, I must confess that I am at a loss to see what justification the Securities and Exchange Commission could possibly have in its proposal to charge broker-dealers a fee.

In view of the above facts, I respectfully request that the Securities and Exchange Commission extend indefinitely the proposed deadline of March 10, 1952, for submission of views and comments by brokers, until such time as this situation can be clarified by the Congress.

I shall appreciate your immediate attention to this letter and trust I may receive your reply at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 6, 1952.

The Honorable FRED E. BUSBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

Re proposed fees and charges by the Commission.

DEAR MR. BUSBEY: This is in reply to your letter of February 28, 1952, in which you ask why this Commission believes that a registration fee for brokers and dealers should be inaugurated.

As you point out, title V states that it is "the sense of the Congress" that various items should be "self-sustaining to the full extent possible." In the same sentence "the head of each Federal agency is authorized by regulation" to prescribe fees "therefor." Since any registration is specified among the items which Congress desires to be self-sustaining to the full extent possible, we feel there can be no question that fees for persons registered with this Commission are authorized to be imposed by the Commission. Moreover, we fail to see how in the light of this legislation, whether or not it should be termed "mandatory," the Commission could conscientiously refuse to charge fees for registrations unless it believed that it would be impossible to collect a fee from registrants. As you state, title V requires that any fees received by the Commission would be turned over to the Treasury, but we do not consider this procedure, designed as it is to protect the congressional control over the budgets of agencies, to be so inconsistent with the declared policy of title V to make agencies self-sustaining to the full extent possible that it would prevent the very fees that title V sought to authorize.

Prior to the enactment of title V when the question whether or not fees should be imposed for various of the Commission's functions arose, the Commission took no position. It advised Congress that whether particular Government functions should be supported by special fees and charges is fundamentally a question of general fiscal policy for the Congress. As you point out, at the hearings on our 1952 appropriation Chairman McDonald stated that "You can't charge people for prosecuting them." Chairman McDonald may have been amplifying his earlier statement that there would be "terrific opposition" to any fee imposed upon brokers and

dealers and may have been differentiating between registration fees and charges for inspections. In any event, Congressman YATES, who was then asking questions apparently did not agree with Chairman McDonald, since he asked "Why not?" and asked a little later, "Isn't this a service which is necessary from the public viewpoint and which is really beneficial to the broker-dealers in that it does provide a means of policing those who are not living up to certain standards?" So far as appears from the hearings, no member of the subcommittee indicated disagreement with Mr. YATES. The subsequent passage of title V would make it appear that Congress intended that the philosophy expressed by Mr. YATES was to be followed.

We recognize, of course, that title V provides that any fee to be charged shall be "fair and equitable, taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interest served, and other pertinent facts" and we have attempted to take these matters into consideration in fixing the proposed fee schedules. The "public policy or interest served" was, of course, taken into consideration in that the proposed schedule is designed to recover only a portion of the cost of regulation. As the enclosed notice to our mailing list, dated February 18, 1952, shows, we estimate that the registration fee payable by brokers and dealers will be approximately $455,000. The direct and indirect cost of the regulation of broker-dealers is far in excess of this sum. Our present schedules are merely proposals and we are giving careful study to the numerous comments received to see that any fees ultimately adopted will be fair and equitable.

You also inquire as to who originated the fee proposals and as to whether Commission counsel rendered a written opinion thereon. After the Commission was advised by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, in response to an inquiry made by Chairman McDonald, that the Commission should proceed to implement title V, numerous staff conferences were held which led to the Commission's proposals which have been sent out for comment. No written opinion of counsel was prepared as to the power to impose fees since the various Commissioners and staff members, many of whom are lawyers, who considered the problem, all uniformly construed title V as authorizing the proposed fees.

You may be sure that the Commission will consider your request for extension of the time for comment.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD C. COOK,
Chairman.

MARCH 6, 1952.

Mr. DONALD C. COOK,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOK: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of March 6 in reply to my letter directed to you on February 28 regarding the registration fee for brokers and dealers, which you contemplate inaugurating in the near future.

While I appreciate your sentiment in the last line, stating that the Commission would consider my request for extension of time, at the same time I was disappointed that your letter did not state that any proposed fees would be delayed until such time as the Securities and Exchange Commission would complete its public hearing and the proper legislative committee would pass upon my bill, H. R. 6846, exempting brokers and dealers specifically from title 5.

Inasmuch as title 5 was legislation written into law in an appropriation bill and the Members of Congress did not have a chance to debate it, since the appropriation bill came in under a closed rule, I would appreciate an affirmative answer in regard to your withholding these fees until it has been properly considered.

Sincerely yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1952.

The Honorable FRED E. BUSBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BUSBEY: This will acknowledge your letter of March 6 relating to our earlier correspondence on the subject of proposed fees and charges to be promulgated by the Commission pursuant to title V of the Independent Officers Appropriation Act of 1952. You state in your letter that you were "disappointed that [my] letter did not state that any proposed fees would be delayed until such time as the Securities and Exchange Commission would complete its public hearings and the proper legislative committee would pass upon by bill, H. R. 6846, exempting brokers and dealers specifically from title V." You also request "an affirmative answer in regard to [our] withholding these fees until" your bill "has been properly considered."

As you undoubtedly know, public hearings on the proposed fees are to be held on March 14 and on March 31 to accommodate certain individuals and groups who have requested an extension of time in which to be heard, and, of course, no fees will be promulgated until these hearings are completed and the information received thoroughly considered by the Commission. In addition, the Commission will of course be willing to receive any written comments on this subject up until the completion of these public hearings.

However, in view of the provisions of title V and the usual legislative uncertainties surrounding any bill, I do not believe that we are in a position to withhold imposition of fees on brokers and dealers pending legislative action on your bill. As I know you will readily appreciate, to do so would be an unwarranted frustration of congressional intent by the Commission.

I would like to call to your attention, however, the fact that the only interest of the Commission with respect to proposed fees and charges is its desire to do whatever Congress wishes as a matter of good fiscal policy.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD C. COOK,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 28, 1952.

HON. ALBERT THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: First of all, I wish to express my appreciation to you for having given me so much of your valuable time, especially in view of your numerous responsibilities and the many demands that are made upon your time, to discuss the proposed plan of the Securities and Exchange Commission to charge broker-dealers a fee, under title 5 of Public Law 137.

As presented to you in our conference this morning, my views on the subject are as follows:

1. The law specifically states that "It is the sense of the Congress" and there is nothing mandatory upon the Securities and Exchange Commission to charge fees. In my opinion there is no justification for the proposed schedule of fees going into effect, due to the fact that the Securities and Exchange Commission render broker-dealers no service whatever on which to make a set charge.

2. The law states, in referring to an agency of Government that it "shall be self-sustaining to the full extent possible." The fees that would be charged under the proposed schedule by the Securities and Exchange Commission would not, in any way, be applied to sustaining the Securities and Exchange Commission. The proposed fees would, by law, have to go directly to the Treasury of the United States.

3. During the hearings, when the Securities and Exchange Commission was before the committee, February 28, 1951, Hon. SIDNEY YATES, of Illinois, asked the following question of Mr. Harry A. McDonald, who was then Chairman of the Commission:

"What possibilities for obtaining fees are there besides the ones you already charge which might compensate in measure for the cost of the regulation?"

To which Mr. McDonald replied:

"You can't charge people for prosecuting them, and a great part of our work is the prosecution of brokers who have committed violations."

This, in my opinion, states the relationship of the Securities and Exchange Commission to the broker-dealers rather conclusively. In other words, the Securities and Exchange Commission is in a similar position to brokers and dealers, if the proposed fees go into effect, that the Department of Justice would be asking criminals to pay a fee for apprehending and prosecuting them. Another illustration would be to have the Internal Revenue Bureau ask the taxpayer to pay the Bureau a fee for collecting his taxes. In other words, it is well established by law that the Securities and Exchange Commission is the policing agency of the securities business and in no way renders a service to broker-dealers for which they should collect a fee.

4. The thought I wished to explore in our conference was that, inasmuch as the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations wrote title 5 into law as part of the bill for fiscal year 1952, I thought possibly in reporting the appropriations for 1953, in its wisdom it would write into the law a specific exemption for the Securities and Exchange Commission.

5. Not knowing what position the committee might take in marking up the appropriations bill, I am today introducing a bill in the House of Representatives to specifically exempt the Securities and Exchange Commission from title 5 of Public Law 137.

Having been a broker for 32 years in Chicago and a member of the National Association of Security Dealers, I respectfully request that I may be given the privilege of appearing before your subcommittee in order to testify on the proposed fees of the Securities and Exchange Commission at a very early date, in view of the fact that broker-dealers only have until March 10, 1952, to file their protests with the Commission.

If, in the judgment and wisdom of your committee you feel that the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the circumstances outlined above and from your knowledge of the situation could advise the Securities and Exchange Commission at a very early date that it was not the intention of the committee that they should charge broker-dealers' fees, I sincerely believe it would cause them to stop their proposed program of charging such fees.

Sincerely yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 6, 1952.

Hon. ALBERT THOMAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Since writing you on February 28, 1952, regarding the proposed plan of the Securities and Exchange Commission to charge broker-dealers a fee under title 5 of Public Law 137, I have received word from Mr. Donald C. Cook, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, in reply to my letter to him of February 28, that the SEC will start public hearings on the proposed fees on March 14.

It is my opinion that the SEC should have held public hearings first before sending out any proposed schedule to brokers and dealers, but notwithstanding this fact, I do not see how any hearings held by the SEC could properly correct the injustices that will be done to brokers and dealers by such a hearing. The hearings, as you well know, will not be on the inequities of the law as interpreted by the SEC, or any amendment to the law, but merely upon the amount of fees to be charged. It is for that reason that I sincerely trust that, in the wisdom of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations, of which you are chairman, you will, in reporting out your appropriation bill, write into the law a specific provision exempting brokers and dealers from any proposed fees to be charged by the SEC under title 5, Public Law 137.

I look forward to receiving an early reply from you as to the position of your subcommittee on this whole matter, in order that the situation may be clarified at an early date.

Very truly yours,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1952.

Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRED: Thanks a million for your letter of the 6th which came this morning.

Concerning the proposed fees under title 5 of the Independent Offices Act of last year, that language is not a positive mandate or directive to any of the other 40 or 50 Government agencies involved. This being true, I think it would be improper for the committee to single out any one agency for exemption.

With every good wish and warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,
ALBERT.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C. March 11, 1952.

The Honorable ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CROSSER: On March 3, 1952, you submitted H. R. 6846 to us for such comment as we may desire to make thereon. This bill would add a proviso to title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, to the effect that nothing therein should authorize this Commission to prescribe any registration, filing, or other fee or charge with respect to brokers or dealers subject to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended.

Title V presently provides:

"It is the sense of the Congress that any work, service, publication, report, document, benefit, privilege, authority, use, franchise, license, permit, certificate, registration, or similar thing of value or utility performed, furnished, provided, granted, prepared, or issued by any Federal agency (including wholly owned Government corporations as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945) to or for any person (including groups, associations, organizations, partnerships, corporations, or businesses), except those engaged in the transaction of official business of the Government, shall be self-sustaining to the full extent possible, and the head of each Federal agency is authorized by regulation (which, in the case of agencies in the executive branch, shall be as uniform as practicable and subject to such policies as the President may prescribe) to prescribe therefor such fee, charge, or price, if any, as he shall determine, in case none exists, or redetermine, in case of an existing one, to be fair and equitable, taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interest served, and other pertinent facts, and any amount so determined or redetermined shall be collected and paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this title shall repeal or modify existing statutes prohibiting the collection, fixing the amount, or directing the disposition of any fee, charge or price: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this title shall repeal or modify existing statutes prescribing bases for calculation of any fee, charge or price, but this proviso shall not restrict the redetermination or recalculation in accordance with the prescribed bases of the amount of any such fee, charge, or price."

In accordance with that title, on January 31, 1952, the Commission issued for comment proposed rules which would adopt fees for various persons registered with it, including a fee payable by brokers and dealers. A copy of the notice of the proposal to adopt fees and charges is enclosed herein, together with a notice of our mailing lists of February 6, 1952, extending the date for comment from February 20, 1952, to March 10, 1952, a notice to our mailing lists of February 18, 1952, setting forth estimated receipts from the proposed rules, and a notice of March 6, 1952, advising that a public hearing will be held thereon.

The Commission has previously advised Congress that the general question whether a particular governmental function should be supported out of the Government's general funds or by special fees and assessments is fundamentally a question of general fiscal policy, on which it does not desire to advocate any position. The proposed schedule of fees, however, sets forth the Commission's tentative view of what would be fair under the standards contained in Title V. These proposals were sent out for comment and the numerous comments received must be analyzed before the Commission can reach any final determination.

We are aware that objection has arisen from brokers and dealers who claim that any additional fee will place an unfair burden on the securities industry in view of existing fees and taxes relating to that industry. The proposed bill, which would meet this objection, is thus related to overall fiscal policy upon which we do not undertake to comment.

Since we are not commenting on the bill we have not ascertained from the Bureau of the Budget whether it is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours.
DONALD C. COOK,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1952.

Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BUSBEY: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 6, 1952, relative to the proposal by the Securities and Exchange Commission to adopt new rules and amend its existing rules with respect to fees and charges for services rendered to implement the provisions of title 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952.

As you know, this subcommittee has requested the Securities and Exchange Commission to hold public hearings on this matter. The Commission has advised me that public hearings will be held on March 14, 1952.

Your request that this subcommittee start hearings on H. R. 6846, which you introduced on February 28, 1952, is noted. I shall bring your request to the attention of the subcommittee.

Very truly yours,
LOUIS B. HELLER,
Chairman.

MARCH 6, 1952.

Hon. LOUIS B. HELLER,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission Subcommittee, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your release dated March 5, in which it was the opinion of your subcommittee in executive session that the Securities and Exchange Commission should hold public hearings regarding its notice of January 31, 1952, which proposes to adopt new rules and amend existing rules with respect to fees and charges by the commission to implement the provisions of title 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952.

While it is my opinion that the Securities and Exchange Commission never should have considered adopting any fees whatever for brokers and dealers under title 5 without a public hearing, I am pleased to learn through your resolution and my conversation with Mr. Cook, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, that public hearings will start on March 14, 1952.

I am sure you will agree with me that the holding of public hearings by the SEC will in no way correct the injustices that will be done to brokers and dealers under title 5, Public Law 137, because the SEC takes the position that the law authorizes them to charge the proposed fees.

I disagree with the conclusions of the SEC and, therefore, respectfully request that your subcommittee start hearings immediately on H. R. 6846, which I introduced on February 28 and which was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Sincerely yours,
FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

MARCH 6, 1952.

Hon. LOUIS B. HELLER,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission Subcommittee, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This will acknowledge receipt of your release dated March 5, in which it was the opinion of your subcommittee in executive session that the Securities and Exchange Commission should hold public hearings regarding its notice of January 31, 1952, which

proposes to adopt new rules and amend existing rules with respect to fees and charges by the Commission to implement the provisions of title 5 of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952.

While it is my opinion that the Securities and Exchange Commission never should have considered adopting any fees whatever for brokers and dealers under title 5 without a public hearing, I am pleased to learn through your resolution and my conversation with Mr. Cook, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, that public hearings will start on March 14, 1952.

I am sure you will agree with me that the holding of public hearings by the SEC will in no way correct the injustices that will be done to brokers and dealers under title 5, Public Law 137, because the SEC takes the position that the law authorizes them to charge the proposed fees.

I disagree with the conclusions of the SEC and, therefore, respectfully request that your subcommittee start hearings immediately on H. R. 6846, which I introduced on February 28, and which was referred to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Sincerely yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1952.

To Members of Congress:

Because of your interest in the proposal of the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend its rules with respect to fees and charges, I am enclosing copy of a letter this subcommittee has sent to Mr. Donald C. Cook, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, requesting it to hold public hearings on this matter.

In response to this request, I am advised by the Securities and Exchange Commission that public hearings will be held beginning March 14, 1952.

LOUIS B. HELLER,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., March 5, 1952.

HON. DONALD C. COOK,
Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COOK: At an executive session of this subcommittee held at 2 p. m. today, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL proposed the following resolution which was seconded by Mr. JOHN A. MCGUIRE and unanimously adopted by the subcommittee:

"*Resolved*, That it is the opinion of this subcommittee that the Securities and Exchange Commission should hold public hearings regarding its notice of January 31, 1952, which proposes to adopt new rules and amend existing rules with respect to fees and charges by the Commission to implement the provisions of title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952."

Very truly yours,

LOUIS B. HELLER,
Member of Congress, Chairman.

On February 28, I introduced the bill H. R. 6846 in the House. It is very short, and reads as follows:

Be it encated, etc., That title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952 (relating to fees and charges which may be imposed by Federal agencies), is hereby amended, effective as of August 31, 1951, by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*And provided further*, That nothing contained in this title shall authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to prescribe any registration, filing, or other fee or charge with respect to brokers or dealers subject to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended."

There have been a great many letters received regarding that bill. I am glad to report to the Members that just this afternoon I was informed that the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has referred it for hearings to the Subcommittee on the Securities and Exchange Commission, under the direction of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER].

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Is it not a fact that in view of the very doubtful constitutionality of title V the courts would very likely throw out any cases that might be brought up? It is my understanding that cases have been brought up under similar legislation, namely, the National Recovery Act of 1933 and the Agricultural Act of 1933, and in all these cases the courts have upheld the petitioners against the law.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the gentlewoman from New York is correct. I would not take it upon myself to decide for the courts, but why go to all that trouble? Why should the Securities and Exchange Commission even think of these proposed fees? There is no reason and no justification for levying them, in the first place. It is causing a great deal of mail to come to every Member of the House, and is causing a great deal of trouble and expense to the industry as a whole.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. May I say to the gentleman that I am heartily in favor of his bill, and I sincerely hope it will pass without too much delay.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentlewoman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, the proposal of the Securities and Exchange Commission to levy fees against broker-dealers is in violation of the basic purpose of the law. Furthermore, they render broker-dealers no service whatever to justify charging any fee, let alone an annual fee. I am sure that at the conclusion of the hearings on my bill, H. R. 6846, that Congress in its wisdom should exempt broker-dealers from the provisions of title V of Public Law 137.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], a member of the committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I want first to express my gratitude to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for the very gracious statement he made a few moments ago, respecting my interest in the problems of the aging. I should in turn like to reciprocate by pointing out the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] has worked with me and has evinced great interest, too, in their problems.

On several occasions in the past I have urged the Congress to give attention to the plight of our aging citizens. On May 24, 1951, I filed House Resolution 238 for the appointment of a select committee to study the problems of the aging. On June 4 and on August 20, 1951, I took the floor to point out the nature of some of the difficulties which face our older people and to request that hearings be undertaken as promptly as possible to determine the best ways to deal with the problems. I shall continue to press for the appointment of such a committee and for such hearings, because time is catching up with us. The troubles of a major segment of our people will not disappear by themselves. We cannot wish them away, or continue to disregard them today in the belief that maybe they will go away tomorrow. Sooner or later we must face this fact: Our older people constitute the most rapidly growing portion of our population.

Since 1900 the total population of the United States has doubled. In the same period the number of persons 65 years of age and over has quadrupled. The 1950 census showed that on April 1, 1950, there were 12,300,000 persons 65 years of age or older, and the Bureau of Census estimates that by 1960 this group will number 15,000,000; by 1975 almost 20,000,000.

A few weeks ago, Dr. Edward Bortz, associate professor of medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, and a past president of the American Medical Association, predicted that within the next 25 years our average life span may well be increased to 100 or 120 years. Some of you may find this hard to believe, but when you remember that the average life span in George Washington's time was 25 years, when you recall that in the year 1900 the average life span had been advanced to 49 years, when you consider that today it has been pushed up to 67 years, does Dr. Bortz' statement still seem beyond the realm of possibility? Will it still seem incredible if medical science discovers cures for cancer and heart disease?

What will we do with the extra years of life? Will they be a burden or a blessing? These are very pertinent questions, for the fact is that we have not yet learned to use our present allotment of years. There is general acceptance of the principle that a person's productive years must end at a specific age, without regard to his strength and mental capacity. This makes his birth certificate the only test of his ability to work. At age 65, with compulsory retirement, it is insisted that a person's contribution to society must terminate, and, of course it is impossible for him to get a job anywhere. As a matter of fact, this type of economic death may come as early as 45 because he cannot obtain employment. The Civil Service Commission refuses to hire people who have attained the age of 62. As a result, we consign healthy, mentally alert men and women by the thousands to the scrap heap and to an early spiritual and physical decay and deterioriation. We refuse to recognize the fact that a large proportion of our older people want to work and can work and that a job is the best guaranty of their status and independence. If Dr. Bortz' prediction comes true, our people

will spend half their years in retirement.

We hear many people say a person can always find a job if he is willing to work. That is not true. One of the major problems of our older citizens is their inability to obtain employment for no other reason than their age. Jobs for which they are completely qualified in every respect, which they can do well, and which will permit them to continue to hold their heads up as decent, self-reliant, self-respecting citizens in their communities are now barred to them, solely because of a few years; and it is amazing and shameful that one of the greatest offenders in this respect should be their Government, which refuses to even take applications for employment from persons 62 years of age and over for any kind of job opportunity.

Does it make sense to you that a person who is 62 years of age or older should not be permitted to serve in the Congress? If that were the rule, 64 of our Members would be looking for other jobs. If that were the rule, 24 Members of the Senate would be looking for other gainful employment.

The Civil Service rule did not make sense to me and when the Civil Service commissioners appeared before our subcommittee for their appropriation, I asked them to explain the reasons for their regulation. They had none. They had none and they could give none, because there are no reasons which could possibly justify such an arbitrary rule. It cannot be said that all persons 62 years of age or over are too old to work under any and all circumstances for any type of employment.

I offered an amendment to this bill to eliminate that unfair and discriminatory regulation by prohibiting the Civil Service Commission from imposing a requirement or limitation of maximum age for Federal employment. I am grateful to the members of my subcommittee for accepting my amendment and placing it in the bill.

This is a constructive step. It is a step which should have been taken long ago, but it is not the entire answer. The Bureau of Employment Security of the Department of Labor has pointed out that the odds against a person 45 years of age or older—not 65, mind you—but 45, finding a new job are 6 to 1, even today in a tight labor market. The same survey shows that opposition to hiring women for new employment begins at age 35.

What a tremendous economic waste this is, apart from the spiritual and sociological deterioration. In 1890, 68 percent of all men over 65 were gainfully employed. In 1950, only 43 percent were so employed. If it is insisted that our aging citizens shall not work, the time is not far distant when the younger workers, as one commentator puts it, will be carrying the rest of the population on their backs.

For the fact is that many older people have neither earnings nor savings sufficient to support themselves—no matter how hard they have tried. Today, a person aged 65 must have accumulated approximately $17,000 to have an income of $100 per month for the rest of his life. For many American families one-fourth of all of them earning less than $2,500 per year, savings in such an amount are impossible.

The social-security system, while vastly improved by changes in the law in 1950, still provides inadequate benefits. In February 1951, the average monthly payment to a couple qualifying under old-age and survivors' insurance was $71 per month, or a total benefit of $852 per year. This is not even a bare subsistence income. And then, to add injury to inadequacy, the social-security laws themselves prevent a worker from continuing to work beyond age 65, if he wants to get the benefits accruing to him over the years. He may earn only $50 a month if he chooses to receive his benefits.

Mr. Chairman, the magnitude of the economic difficulties of our aging people cannot be overemphasized. People must live. If work is denied to them, they must receive old-age assistance, but it must be remembered that old-age assistance is only an unworthy substitute for the opportunity of gainful work and self-reliance. The New York Times of May 31, 1951, in an editorial, stated:

> In view of the national emergency and a tight labor supply, it is ironic that unemployed older workers should continue to meet resistance when searching for jobs. Yet this condition prevails generally throughout the country, and in New York City our welfare commissioner has painted a local picture that is not at all reassuring. The commissioner states that within a period of 9 months the number of employables on the relief rolls over 40 has risen from one-half to two-thirds of the total. At this rate, in a short time, the only employables left on the relief rolls will be persons over 40.
>
> Employer bias against hiring older persons penalizes such persons unfairly, for experience shows that they make good, steady, reliable workers when they are given a feeling of being wanted. Furthermore, such bias also penalizes the taxpayers of this city, who must maintain unemployed older persons on relief.

In June 1950 almost 3,000,000 people 65 years of age and older were receiving old-age assistance benefits aggregating $122,000,000 for the month, almost $1,500,000,000 for the year. The answer to this matter is not in public scrutiny of assistance rolls, as some have contended, for that deals only with the periphery of the problem. What is required is recognition of the fact that for Americans, work is not only a way of earning a livelihood. It is a way of keeping one's self-respect, to avoid the frustration and discouragement which is seeping into the lives of so many of our aging today. In short, the spark of life, the feeling that they belong and have importance to someone or something must not be driven out of them.

Mr. Chairman, there is a job for the Congress to do, apart from merely voting appropriations for old-age assistance, although these are essential under present circumstances. Here is a challenge for industry, for labor, for Government. We have learned to conserve our natural resources. We can do no less with our human resources for the men, women, and children of this Nation are its greatest natural resource.

We have given years to life; we must give life to the years now, by recognizing that our older citizens are a tremendous asset to this Nation, and that they have a right to lead a proud, productive, and independent life throughout their years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am very glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to ask the gentleman to yield for the purpose of complimenting him, but I must. My friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has made contributions as a legislator which are constructive not only in the interest of the aging people of America, but constructive in every other direction as well. I am proud of the opportunity to make this statement. One of the pleasures of my years of service in this body is the association I have had with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], who in my opinion is one of the finest and ablest legislators I have ever served with.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. He is very kind. If I have been able to make a contribution as a legislator, I am grateful and proud.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am moved to concur fully and enthusiastically with the remarks of our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I am overwhelmed by such generous praise.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I would like to state to the Committee of the Whole that the gentleman's interest in these problems of the aged has not only been one interest in which I join with him among a number of things, but that he has utilized so effectively his position and his prestige on this subcommittee to bring up in this bill a provision of the greatest merit as far as the aged of America are concerned. It has long been a great difficulty that the Civil Service itself, representing the conscience of the people of the country, should have barred perfectly effective employees because of their age. I think the aged people of the country should be deeply indebted to the gentleman for having utilized his position in this legislative body in such an effective way.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and for his kind remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I congratulate my colleague on his very constructive contribution which gives the aged a chance to use their talents. I only want to add to what you have said, that it will make these people self-sustaining financially, but it will make them much

more happy to have a useful job to take up their time and not be sitting there waiting for the time to come to die.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I am glad to yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, realizing of course that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, but even so, I must concur with the gentleman's general statement with respect to this problem. I have contended, as he has, that there should not be such drastic limitations with respect to the age of people employed in the Government. I agree with him that where men and women are physically and mentally able to carry on the work, the question of age should not be the thing that would put them out of employment. I also think that same rule ought to apply in industry and business as well. It ought not to be as drastic as it is.

Mr. YATES. I am grateful for the gentleman's contribution. He, too, has a great interest in this subject. Certainly, his statement that industry must cooperate in affording opportunities to work to our aging people is very true. Years are not indicative or conclusive respecting a person's talents or ability to handle a job. Industry will be lax, indeed, if it insists on overlooking the experience and wisdom which our older people have gathered over their working lives. These are assets which should be utilized.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. In other words, if the gentleman will yield, the Government itself should set the good example.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is exactly right. It is my hope that with the action we take today, in opening the door to Government employment for our older citizens, that private industry will do the same and develop job opportunities for the aging which it is not now willing to create. Upon the willingness of private industry to pitch in and cooperate depends the ultimate solution to many of these problems.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our majority leader and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] for the very nice things they said about our colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. He thought up this language and worked it out. The subject is very close to his heart and we all commend him. I think something good will come from it. He certainly deserves a great deal of credit.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am very much indebted to the gentleman from California for yielding me this time right after my colleague from Illinois for the reason that it is necessary to complete this picture. He has done a grand service in connection with eliminating age limitations on hiring in the civil service. That certainly is the first thing anyone will ask for.

But I think it should be emphasized here by those of us who have worked in this field, and there are many outside of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and myself, that the big job, the greatest job, has to be done by American industry. It cannot be done wholly by the Government. It takes actual retraining facilities, it takes special people and plants to determine what jobs people can carry on as they grow older in different types of jobs, it takes a readjustment of the pension systems and profit-sharing systems, one of the big objections met in the surveys I have made of American industry as to why they cannot hire older people.

I think by this provision with respect to the civil service we can give an impetus to American business to really handle this problem. American business has a chance to solve one of the most admirable public relations problems and can contribute greatly to community usefulness. But it will not be done by speeches. It has to be done plant by plant, very hard work.

I urge very much that the chamber of commerce, the Association of Manufacturers, and the other agencies do the pilot plant work to show their members just how these older citizens can be effectively utilized with great benefit to the country and with great benefit to industry itself.

It has been the experience of a great many employers that older workers have less absenteeism and less accidents than younger workers. Our unemployment pool is down practically to a minimum and the postwar establishment of so many new families cuts down the number of women who can go into defense production. The older worker and the handicapped therefore become a most important part of the manpower available for this purpose—it is significant that estimates of the manpower category which includes older workers is about half of the total estimated available manpower supply to meet the defense emergency.

I am inserting in the Appendix today a letter of the Civil Service Commission dated March 7, 1952, pursuant to my request which shows some progress in eliminating age limitations on civil-service jobs but does not go nearly far enough or as far as the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] would take us on the road to really doing something constructive for our older citizens.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veteran organizations have adopted the principle that we should have a strong American merchant marine so that, in time of emergencies, our troops can be transported with maximum safety and reasonable comfort. The taxpayers of America, who are in the main the mothers and fathers of those in the armed services, have even more forcefully endorsed this policy. American youth, when called upon, are not afraid to follow their command where ere it be, but they, too, are vocal, and properly so in their just demand that when taken from the mainland they be transported in American vessels properly constructed and capably manned so that they can travel with maximum safety and reasonable comfort.

Organized labor, with their varying degrees of differences, are united in the belief that in American shipyards should be built a strong merchant marine. The sorry spectacle of having American-trained mechanics in the field of shipbuilding out of work while the trip of the hammer, the buzz of the saw, and the din of machinsts' tools are vibrating in Japan, in Germany, and in England as well as in other countries turn the eyes of American labor toward Congress so that our know-how in shipbuilding will not become a lost art.

A report of the seventieth annual convention of the American Federation of Labor 1951 proceedings held in San Francisco, Calif., on September 17, 1951, contains at page 306, resolution 81, which, in part, reads as follows:

> Whereas the present Korean crisis has now focused attention upon the inadequacy of our fleet, and has vividly portrayed our national indifference to the lessons we should have learned as a result of World Wars I and II;
>
> • • • • • • • : Therefore be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the American Federation of Labor hereby declare itself in favor of a strong, well-balanced commercial fleet, to be operated by private industry, sufficient in numbers, tonnage, and speed to adequately serve the needs of our military, naval, and commercial requirements.

The shipping industry naturally is anxious to keep the American flag flying over our merchant marine in its proper place of leadership. It recognizes that just like labor, it alone cannot compete with the cheap markets of other nations. Therefore, it asks that Congress give it the same consideration that it does, and properly so, to other American industries. In true American fashion, it says, "Put us on an even basis with foreign competition, and we will fly the American flag and keep it in first place on the seas."

This is a rather unique combination of forces. All united for the ultimate—a strong American merchant marine. Some may raise the question, "Why should an American merchant marine be subsidized?" The answer to it is, that if we are to continue in our world leadership, we must do everything possible to keep our industries on an even footing with foreign competition. All of these groups are truly American; they ask no preferential treatment, but, by the same token, they ask Congress for equal competitive opportunity and protection against the forces which would destroy them.

Let us first discuss the 1936 Merchant Marine Act and see what prompted it. Before the outbreak of World War I, the United States relied largely on foreign flagships for cargo and passenger service. Remember, too, that these foreign flagships were all subsidized by the country whose flag they flew. Subsidies in vari-

ous forms were granted by Germany, Japan, Italy and France and other countries, and, for that reason, in 1914, we found ourselves practically cut off from overseas communication. We rushed into the breach and frantically undertook a shipbuilding program. It becomes quite obvious that, when a huge program is undertaken without proper planning, it is not economically accomplished. World War I ended and again foreign vessels were able to take over most of the commerce of the world because of the low wages paid and the subsidies granted by their governments. In 1936, Congress was aroused. It saw the importance that we were now to play in world affairs. It recognized that we could not maintain the position of leadership unless we were adequately represented on the seas. It laid down a policy of our country to promote a merchant marine, and that it should serve as both a military and naval auxiliary in time of war and of national emergency. It set forth provisions for a construction of differential subsidy so that these vessels could be built in American shipyards and by American labor. It went further and set forth an operating differential subsidy so that the American merchant marine could compete with foreign ships operating at a much lower rate of wages and other costs.

Discussing first the construction differential, one should keep constantly in mind the fact that the amount paid by the Government is not a gift to the shipowner. The differential operates to protect the American standard of living and the wages of the workers employed in the American shipyards. Another result is that it guarantees the continuance of the know-how of shipbuilding skills in America. The shipowner cannot design the vessel as he wills. There are certain additional directives made by our Government. For instance, it compels him to incorporate particular features so that the vessel could, when needed, be used for military purposes. It directs features as to the speed, the placing of gun platforms and the rearrangement of machinery to lessen the danger from submarine warfare. The United States Navy controls the construction in any other manner which it deems proper for defense purposes. The Act keeps in mind the fact that safety, in time of emergency, is always a cardinal principle. Thus, the 1936 Merchant Marine Act is not only a benefit to labor, the shipowners, the armed services, but also to the entire economy of America.

The second feature, referring to the same act, provides for an operating differential subsidy, so that the American Merchant Marine could operate on a par with foreign vessels. The shipping industry had been a sprawling one, not able to compete with any degree of success against foreign lines prior to the adoption of the act of 1936, because there had been no planned legislation. It was a sort of hit-and-miss proposition. Various measures gave little continuity to the development of this growing industry. Since 1936, every American has reason to be proud of the part played in times of war and peace, by vessels flying our flag. That achievement has been due definitely to the operating differential subsidy agreements. Naturally, subsidies encourage shipping and ship construction. It has even a broader purpose. It develops trade and aids in national defense. In its development of trade every segment of our economy, every State of our Union, is the beneficiary. The profits made by the companies, the compensation paid to those who man the ships, enable them to purchase things that are manufactured or raised in each State of the Union, and so, the Members of Congress can truly feel that the subsidy paid to the shipping industry gives some benefit to his respective community.

But do not misunderstand the word "subsidy," which is so often confused with a hand-out. It is nothing of the sort. May I just point out a few of the many obligations and restrictions that are placed upon the owners of these vessels: First, the contractor must own a suitable number of ships—they must be of a special type, size, and speed; second, they may not be used in any other service without Government approval; third, they must maintain common-carrier service for a period of years over essential trade routes on a fixed schedule set forth by the Government. In this regard, in normal times, essential trade routes could not be operated, except at terrific loss and, hence, without a subsidy, these routes would be closed to American ships. The owners must provide a plan for replacement of vessels and set aside appropriate reserves to replace, where needed, the original vessel. The operator may not, except with approval of our Government, operate any ship over 20 years old. He is limited, in that he may not engage in many of the auxiliary services which, at times, may be very profitable to him. Our Government demands that his accounts be kept on Government forms so that at all times we might know the nature and extent of the company's operation. Very properly, it provides that only materials and supplies of United States origin may be used. Since we have given to these ship owners certain rights under the act of 1936, we have definitely placed upon them certain correlative duties and obligations.

The benefit that inures to the American operator is that he is placed on a parity with his foreign competitors with respect to the operating costs of the vessel by absorption by the Government of the excess cost of American materials and maintenance and labor.

Let us look to the benefits that have come to our country as a result of the Maritime Act of 1936. The working men and women engaged in the shipbuilding industry have had employment and at a just rate of compensation. The wages of the American seamen on these vessels are the highest paid in the world and American seamen are the best fed. In every town and city and hamlet, articles have been manufactured, and people have been kept employed to supply this industry. Produce raised by American farmers has been used aboard our vessels. American commerce has been carried to the four corners of the world. All of these things have benefited the economy of this country; but, over and above that, something more important and more vital to our security has taken place. On June 25, 1950, the Korean situation, forceful in its potential dangers, was upon us. What would have happened had we not had an American merchant marine? One shudders when one thinks of the consequences; but we had an American merchant marine, which quickly assumed the gigantic task of carrying fighting men and equipment into the battle area. Privately operated American ships carried 80 percent of the logistical support of the Armed Forces. Without this fourth arm of defense, we would have been practically helpless. In the name of American security—forget, if you will, all of the dollar advantages and think only in terms of human life. It was well worth every cent that has been spent, and to those noble men who sponsored that legislation in 1936, and to the courageous Members of Congress who voted for it, should go the everlasting thanks of a grateful Nation. Let no one ever say that "this was the most one-sided law ever passed by the Congress," unless it was one-sided for the protection of America.

The present bill, H. R. 7072, attempts, at page 48, lines 10 to 12, to place a limitation upon the growth and development of our privately owned American merchant marine. The functions of a legislative committee is to pass basic legislation. The duty of the Appropriations Committee is to appropriate, and here we find an Appropriations Subcommittee attempting, by means of a rule, which waives points of order, to supersede the appropriate legislative committee. This is not good legislation and at all times should be strongly condemned. A reading of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 97, part 4, page 4798, finds the chairman of the Rules Committee, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] condemning this procedure.

At page 740 of the hearings of the Independent Offices Appropriation Committee for 1953, a splendid explanation is given as to the reason why the subsidies have remained constant. The question was asked by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], one of the most able gentlemen in this House:

Mr. THOMAS. Why has not the subsidy gone down any?

Admiral COCHRANE. Well, the subsidy is intended primarily to produce equality in the direct operating costs, not in capital expenditures, but direct costs of running the ships themselves. Operating subsidy is paid on the differences in cost, United States and foreign, on five specific items, of which the biggest by far is wages of licensed and unlicensed men actually on board, and as of today that is representing about 76 percent of the subsidies being paid, a direct comparison between the costs of manning one of our ships and manning a similar ship in competing foreign service.

Today, we are only carrying 34 percent of our own foreign commerce. Therefore, when putting a limitation upon voyages, what one accomplishes, in effect, is a limit upon the development of our merchant marine. It might be well also to point out that appropriations

hearings are held in executive session and they are limited to the testimony, as in this bill, to only Government witnesses. No opportunity was presented for management and labor and all other parties having an interest in the subject matter, to be heard. That is why I stress the point that it should have been considered by the appropriate legislative committee where a free and open discussion could be had on the subject matter. That is the American way of determining what basic legislation should be written.

The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], stated that, out of a total of 1,288 vessels only 252 were operating under subsidy; and hence, the inference could be drawn that a special privilege was reserved for a small special group. The answer to that is found in the hearings at page 750. Admiral Cochrane testified that of all the remaining approximately 1,000 ships, 450 were tankers, and 154 are in the domestic coastwise trade, which makes more than 600.

Of the remaining 400 ships, many were in a class known as trampers, ore carriers, and other bulk-carrying vessels. They do not operate over fixed routes and do not offer common-carrier service, and, hence, do not qualify for subsidy under the existing law. Therefore, it is rather a distorted picture to say that only a small part of the merchant marine is receiving Government aid and further, that a large part, providing the same service, finds it possible to operate otherwise. The so-called other vessels are not in competitive trade and, therefore, Congress wisely has not extended the benefits of the law to vessels of their class. This Government aid is not reserved for a special few. It is available to all American-flag companies who can qualify under the existing law, and who are willing to accept the regulations and restrictions heretofore mentioned, which the law places upon them. If the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is not satisfied with the existing law, then, of course, it is within his province to submit amendments to the basic statute. This could properly be considered by the appropriate committee. To date, he has not done so, but has elected throughout the bill to write into this appropriation language which should be considered by a legislative committee.

Previously, I stated that the law requires filing of all financial statements in the greatest detail by the Government-aided companies. There has been some loose talk about extreme profits. Their financial statements show that during 1950, the lines operating under subsidy agreements earned, after taxes, 8.89 percent on their capital necessarily employed, and 6.7 percent on their net worth. The record answers that clearly at pages 720 and 721 of the hearings. This rate of return is lower than the nonsubsidized United States vessels because the latter does not have to comply with the restrictions heretofore set forth. I would like to read to you the testimony of Admiral Cochrane at page 753 of this year's hearings before the subcommittee:

Admiral COCHRANE. Actually, in 1950 out of the 13 lines only 3 of them showed a profit before subsidy on their total operations. Before subsidy the total losses were $16,000,000, and the profits only $9,800,000, so that the net loss for all companies before subsidy payments was $6,667,000, and their return on net worth after taxes averaged in 1950 6.7 percent. The return on the capital necessarily employed, which is considerably smaller, was 8.9 percent.

This proves conclusively that there is no excess profit being earned by this group of Government-aided lines and I know establishes further that, without a subsidy, we could not maintain an American merchant marine. These ships would have to be sold to foreign competitors and when the day arrives when the American flag will not fly over our merchant marine, then we go back to the days of 1914 and America will cease to be a world power. It will then take its place among the nations that once were great. Many within this Chamber served here in the days of World War II and will recall that we expended $17,000,000,000 for the construction of emergency shipyards and of a wartime fleet. This is now a part of our national debt and we are paying interest on it. Compute that at 2 percent and you have $340,000,000 per year, which we are paying, and which we will continue to pay as a penalty for failure to develop a proper merchant fleet for national defense. And yet, that is nothing compared to the fact that our failure to have a merchant fleet prolonged the war at least 1 year, and only God knows how many lives were lost because of our failure to have a ready merchant fleet.

Are we to substitute dollar economy for human lives, security and national defense? Far better it would be to spend some fractional part of these 340 million dollars per year to promote and maintain an American fleet with trained officers and crews ready, if ever the call comes from our military forces.

An effort will be made by my very distinguished colleague, Mr. THOMAS, of Texas, and may I say parenthetically, while I differ with him, and differ with him violently on his attitude toward the merchant marine, I cherish his friendship, his great force of character and his brilliance of mind. I know, too, of his persuasiveness and, in his best manner, he will try later in debate, to paint a picture that members of the shipping industry are the "pampered pets" of Government. They certainly are not. Remember this: When any profits exceed 10 percent the Government recaptures one-half of such excess up to the full amount of the Government-aid payment.

Aboard these vessels many of you have traveled in safety and have been taken to your port of destination. Millions of Americans have safely returned home through their efforts. By these groups the American merchant marine will be ever honored. Many young men who are now training in our camps, and those who are still in our universities and schools, if war comes, which God forbid, will find themselves embarking for foreign ports. They expect, as the American Legion has said, that they will be transported with maximum safety and reasonable comfort in a ship that flies the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, at an appropriate time under the 5-minute rule there will be offered an amendment, I believe, to increase that provision of the bill calling for a limitation to 25,000 units of public housing each year to 50,000 units per year.

Let me say at the outset that I am quite appreciative of the tremendous job this committee has done and the arduous work it has put in to get this bill in shape for the floor. I have in mind the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee when he said that no bill that comes to the floor can be perfect. I venture the opinion that this bill would have been nigh-well perfect if it had omitted any attempt to legislate instead of merely to appropriate.

If you will turn to page 23 of the bill you will find a provision for the Public Housing Administration, by which the committee invades the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and without, I suggest to you, any sufficient evidence or facts submitted to the committee to justify what they there attempt to do. They recommend that the United States Housing Act of 1937 be amended so as to change the authorization as contained in that bill for the number of units of public housing that will be built for this year and each year hereafter as long as that law remains on the books.

May I remind you that originally the law provided for the starting of not more than 135,000 units of public housing each year. Then we cut that to 75,000 units per year. A unit, as you know, is sufficient accommodation for one family. Last year we cut it to 50,000 units per year. Now this distinguished committee recommends that you cut it to 25,000 units per year.

The formula the Congress adopted in arriving first at the 135,000 units and later cutting it back to 75,000 units was based on the proof submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency that the very minimum this Congress can do for those veterans and those nonveterans who cannot afford to pay what the market demands for rental housing is to build for them not less than 10 percent of the total new production of housing each year.

For the last 2 years and for the current year and next year it is estimated that we can afford to build in this country, and we will and we have been building each of these years, 800,000 to 850,000 units of housing. This includes the defense housing as well as private housing. If we adhere to the formula that was written into the law, then we should

authorize this year not less than 80,000 units of public housing.

Because of the stress of lack of materials and the need to economize in Government expenditures we cut that back to 50,000 units last year. I urge that you do not cut it back any further this year.

I should like to read to you at this time a telegram sent to me by the mayor of the city of New York, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 18, 1952.*
Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If the proposed cut-back on public housing in the independent offices appropriation bill now before the House of Representatives is adopted it would impose serious hardships on the people of New York City. It would delay four-fifths of the federally aided public housing construction program for the coming year, reducing the scheduled start of 10,581 apartments to little more than 2,000. Projects in the Bronx, Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens would be affected. It would hold down planning, site acquisition, and clearance to the rate of 1½ projects, 2,000 apartments, each year, with the result that the last project in the presently authorized program reservation of 24,000 apartments could not be planned for 12 years. Delays in building the proposed middle income projects under title I of the United States Housing Act of 1949 would be certain since new public housing projects are a part of the plan for relocating the site residents. Unemployment in the building trades, already serious, would increase. Low-income veterans who have lived since their return to civilian life in squalid quarters awaiting a chance to rent a decent home would meet again with frustration. Since the National Production Authority exercises controls to relate housing construction to national defense, any program smaller than 75,000 apartments for the country is completely unrealistic. I urge your consideration of the serious consequences of the Appropriations Committee proposal.

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor of the City of New York.

I am pleading now not merely for the city of New York because what the mayor of New York says about the city is applicable in each of 238 other localities throughout the country.

Sixty percent of the projects that are now planned for public housing throughout the country are located in the South, and only 40 percent of them are in the North. I do not have to urge upon you that we northerners nevertheless are willing that our taxes too be used for the building of a larger percentage of these public-housing units in the South because they need them there, they need them there the same as we need them in the city of New York.

There are 43 States that have laws calling for this kind of housing—this public housing, and I urge upon you, if you are to do your duty by your constituents, you will support the amendment when it is offered for 50,000 units a year.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use, not to exceed 3 minutes, to the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL].

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time because I was interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. He has truly said that the time is here when we must take another look at the old-age program. I only remind him that many people in both political parties have made politics of discrimination. Our people believe that discrimination now only takes place because of race, creed, or color, where, as a matter of fact, the greatest discrimination in our country in regard to employment is upon the basis of age or sex. I also remind him that under the social-security laws, and unemployment-insurance laws, our employing corporations throughout the United States have changed their policy. Where in the past, they have had to hire and discharge because of seasonal operations, they have changed their whole business policy, and have done work by contractors in order to avoid the additional tax that is applied if their employment and discharge fluctuates over a certain percentage. I say that to point out to the gentleman that when we get through making politics out of hand-outs to the aged, and making politics out of discrimination because of race, creed, or color, then we will say to the employers of the United States who do not hire the aged because of economic conditions that we will give them a tax preference when they hire their percentage of the people over certain ages. Then we will say to the other aged who are not employable that modern Government will do its best and do its duty and take care of them. Then, we will avoid the condition that now exists, for example, let us say in the State of California where as a result of 15 years of demagogy, each succeeding session of the legislature says if you are of a certain age, you get the same amount that someone else of that age gets regardless of what you need even though you have property approaching the salable value of $20,000. Those are inequities that result from politics in connection with these subjects.

I agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] that it can be solved. It does not have to be solved through chambers of commerce. What we can do under the tax law is to make it economically sound and desirable for employing organizations, under the tax laws, to take care of their burden of employment of the aged.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WERDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What would be the situation in a closed shop, where the employer is willing to employ a person and the person is willing to work, but the union says, "No; we will not let you go in there"?

Mr. WERDEL. You are assuming a closed shop?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. WERDEL. You are also assuming a continued lack of local autonomy in unions?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. WERDEL. You are also assuming a continued lack of secret ballot in union elections?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. WERDEL. That is one of the first orders of business if we are going to remain free in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes. A lot of things have to be changed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I propound a question to the gentleman from California? We have only one speaker for 5 minutes and then we will be ready to read the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We have requests here totaling not over 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate and salute this committee that has brought this bill to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, if the Congress faces up to its responsibility, and I have every confidence it will, this can be a "red letter" day for the Members of this House and a billion dollar bargain day for the American taxpayers. Pressed and ground down with almost unbearable taxes, the people who make up this Goverment are looking for many "billion dollar bargain days" from us, their Representatives. Never before have the people been so tax conscious and never before in the 10 years I have served in this Congress have their elected Representatives shown a greater desire to carry out the will of the people than is evidenced in this Eighty-second Congress.

Our Constitution wisely provided that the direct Representatives of the people must control the purse strings of the Nation. They are demanding that we reduce the budget by a minimum of $10,000,000,000, and the National Chamber of Commerce has pointed out that it should be reduced by $14,250,000,000. The Congress can, and should, cut every appropriation bill, using the meat axe, if necessary, to reduce this budget by $10,000,000,000, and with the full cooperation of the President we could and should reduce it by $14,250,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the members of this committee and particularly, the chairman and members of the subcommittee for their splendid work in reducing this Independent Offices Bill before us by $707,000,000 before bringing it to the floor of the House for our further consideration. I am sure the Congress will sustain the work of this splendid committee and I am hopeful that a hundred million more can be cut out of this bill by amendments before we take the final vote.

Such a reduction in this bill, added to reductions in the two appropriation bills previously considered, will indeed turn out to be a "billion-dollar bargain day" for the American taxpayers because the total will exceed $1,000,000,000 cut from the President's budget on the first three bills considered.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the Committee on their wisdom in establishing a policy in this bill of compelling the several agencies affected to absorb the pay increases which this Congress voted in the last session. This Committee has said, in effect, that these agencies cannot spend more funds for salaries than they did in the fiscal year 1952.

Since this is one of the earliest appropriation bills of the many to follow, I

would earnestly suggest to the Committee on Appropriations that they adopt this policy in reporting out such bills in the future.

The President requested for the agencies covered in this bill, 280,000 average positions at a total personnel cost in excess of $1,000,000,000.

In making a study of this bill it appears there are some items that can stand a greater reduction and I understand amendments will later be offered to bring that about. I hope we can cut many millions more from this bill when it is read for amendments.

Government bureaucracy has become so strong that it will spend and tax this Government to destruction unless it is stopped by the Congress. Our taxpayers' money is being scattered in outrageous purchases and waste as would bankrupt any business corporation in America. Bureaucrats shrug off the utter waste of countless millions throughout the vast departments of Government including the military with apparent indifference.

Congress is the voice of the people and the people are demanding we slow down this destruction by drastically reducing the President's budget request. This bill affords one opportunity to do it.

Mr. Chairman, it is my candid opinion that we will fall short of our responsibility to the people if the Congress fails to cut at least $2,500,000,000 out of the several appropriation bills to provide for the general cost of Government on the home front exclusive of national defense.

I believe the majority of the Members of this House are so determined to reduce the cost of Government that they will do it.

FOREIGN AID

We are going to have to fix our sights with determination and purpose on every appropriation bill that will come before us in the future. When the financial solvency of our Government is at stake, there can be no "sacred cows" to be protected. There is no question in my mind but that the Congress should reduce foreign aid when we come to that bill by $3,000,000,000.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

When we later come to the vast and enormous appropriations for direct national defense we should, in my opinion, without question reduce the amount by $5,000,000,000. The military can save that much alone by cutting out waste running rampant in every department, and our defense will be stronger by $5,000,000,000 rather than weaker.

In my judgment, it could and should be reduced $10,000,000,000, but if we reduce it only $5,000,000,000 and make the other reductions I have pointed out, we will reduce the budget by $10,000,000,000 which, to my mind, is the absolute minimum if the Congress is to live to its responsibility in these trying times to the American people.

PRESIDENT PREDICTS DEFICIT

While the President's 1953 budget calls for a $14,000,000,000 deficit, it is most likely he has underestimated Government receipts by a substantial amount, so that if this Congress effects the reduction of at least $10,000,000,000, we will likely come very close to balancing the budget which will stop the upward inflation spiral and turn it down. This will reduce the high cost of living, and will start the purchasing power of your dollars and bonds now at 50 cents, up in purchasing power toward the American dollar of 1939 when it was worth 100 cents throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, this is the year not only of decision, but for courageous action on the part of the Members of Congress on both sides of this aisle, who were entrusted with holding the purse strings of this Government when the Constitution was founded in 1787.

The people still have faith in Congress. They are looking to the Members of the Congress with the hope they will do their duty. We must not let them down. They know unless the Congress does its duty that within a short time the $260,000,000,000 debt which is costing them over $6,000,000,000 a year for interest alone, will soon reach the debt limit of $275,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I want to warn Members of Congress against the passage of any new legislation, unless it is absolutely necessary, that will add to the cost of Government. You cannot relieve the tax burdens of our people by reducing appropriations one day, and by enacting new legislation the next day that will wipe out the savings we are effecting when we reduce appropriation bills.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, my discourse is going to be of a twofold nature. First of all, when the bill is being read for amendment I am going to ask that a certain appropriation for a certain department of the Government be increased by $2,000,000, from $6,000,000 to $8,000,000. That is the first portion of my discourse.

The second is that after we have increased this appropriation from $6,000,000 to $8,000,000 I am going to show a way in which we can save the entire $8,000,000 for the overburdened taxpayers of the Nation. I am referring to the appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission. Now I come from a backwoods area like many of the good Members of this Congress do. Whenever I get home more people ask me, "When are we going to get television?" than who is going to be the next President of the United States. In the coming months and years ahead you, as a Member of Congress, are going to be deluged with mail and personal contact in the same way. I feel I know something about the workings of the Federal Communications Commission, because I happen to be in the radio industry. I know that if the amount cut by the Appropriations Committee from budget estimates remains as is, television is not going to move for at least 5 years more to come. I know many applicants that have waited as long as 5 years before they could get action on their application to construct a radio station. The Federal Communications Commission, as the result of the work they have imposed on them, due to this vast movement of television at the present time, is almost a year behind in its work. The Commission cannot possibly do the job that it has to do with the appropriation that this committee has allowed them. So I am going to introduce an amendment to have this appropriation increased by $2,000,000, in round figures, to what the Bureau of the Budget recommended.

Now here is the second phase of my proposal. There is no reason under the sun why the Federal Communications Commission should cost the taxpayers of this country one cent. In all the years I have lived I have gotten only one thing in my life for free, and that is a license to operate a radio station. The same is true of all other radio and television stations in our Nation. They all got their licenses for free. For as profitable a business as the radio and television business it is incredible that they get their licenses free. I know of one instance, gentlemen, where a 250-watt station was erected, where the entire physical valuation of that plant when it was bought was not worth 5 cents. In fact, it was not worth the scrap that the salvage would bring, and yet that radio station sold a short time ago for the fabulous sum of a quarter of a million dollars. In other words, when they paid that quarter of a million dollars they did not pay for the physical equipment of that plant; they paid only for the license, and to get that license the operator of that station did not contribute or pay one penny for the procurement of that license to the Government of the United States.

The other day, when I was at home, I wanted a short glass of beer, so I went over to a tavern. The man, of course, had a license to sell beer. I asked what he had to pay each year, what license he paid to operate his tavern. He said he had to pay for a license $500 a year to operate that tavern.

A license, gentlemen of the House, is something very limited in scope and nature. Yet the taxpayers of the United States are supporting the most favored industry in the United States today, the radio and television business. I went into a television station sometime ago and asked, "How much will it cost to put on a 1-minute spot on your television station?" He answered: "The cost will be $150 for 1 minute." He said, "There is one further catch to it. I cannot put you on until sometime next October."

Now, if you gentlemen of the House had any idea of the amount of money that these radio and television stations are making, and being protected by a license for which they pay absolutely nothing, absolutely not one red penny—you would be shocked! They pay nothing to secure that license to operate an industry that brings in those fabulous profits. I could bring you incident after incident. I know of one television station that was built at a total construction cost of $150,000, and a few weeks after they passed the requirements they sold that station for a million and a quarter dollars. They paid not one red penny for that license. The Federal Communications Commission should not cost the taxpayers of this country one cent. Believe me gentlemen, when I tell you that the only thing that I ever got in my life for nothing was a radio license,

the most favored industry in the United States today, I might say, in the world. Let us give the Federal Communications Commission the money they need to let this industry expand and grow. But at the same time let us make the radio and television industry foot the bill. That they do foot the bill I will propose as an amendment when legislation reaches the floor to amend the Federal Communications Act of 1934 very shortly.

Members of the House: If the proposed appropriation stands it is $2,000,000 short of what this Commission needs. If this proposed appropriation stands for the coming year the radio and television industry will be at a standstill. No agency in our Government has been called upon to take over more responsibility with less money as has the Federal Communications Commission. If you want television in your area the $2,000,000 cut must be restored. The Chairman says my time is up—I am sorry because there is so much more to be said in favor of increasing this appropriation.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 3 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

I call attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that my two colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who are filled with both facts and oratory, have refrained from taking time this afternoon in order to expedite the consideration of the bill.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the distinguished ranking minority member of this subcommittee for yielding me even this 3 minutes time this late in the day.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to call attention to section 401 of this bill. I have three points to make:

First. This committee is invading the prerogatives of the legislative committee of Congress in dealing with the question of the leave grants to those employed in the Government service. It belongs to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Second. The Congress passed in October of last year upon the question of annual leave—only 5 months ago. This section restores legislation that was repealed last October by this Congress. Even if changes are in order, these are too drastic.

Those employed in the Federal service have not had opportunity to become adjusted to the amendments approved by this Congress last October. I agree inequities are bound to creep in legislation of this kind, but I feel, under this legislation, you are making it more unfair and more inequitable for a number of employees in the lower brackets in attempting to correct situations not intended to exist under present law and regulations.

I think this legislation was intended to take care of some abuses. I understand a number of individuals have taken advantage of accumulated leave to the extent of thousands of dollars for each of them, but those individuals are, for the most part, administratively appointed employees and in higher salary brackets. Not many rank and file civil-service employees are included in that group.

Under this section you are going to cut down the leave of a number of people employed in the Government to 13 days. They will not be allowed to accumulate more than 13 days' leave. Many of them come to Washington from distant points of the country. They would hardly have time to get home and return during the 13-day period. They would have no chance to accumulate leave. Just 13 days and no more. If they take out a day or two in the meantime they will not even have the 13 days during the year, or at any time, for vacation period. I hardly think, upon further consideration, the committee means to approve legislation as drastic as is provided in this section.

Under the rule, this amendment will have to be considered, for it is not subject to a point of order, but that is not the most important question. The question is what is right or wrong with respect to this proposal. That is why I am directing your attention to this section of the bill during the few minutes that have been allotted me at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the White House Office, including not to exceed $100,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at such per diem rates for individuals as the President may specify, and other personal services without regard to the provisions of law regulating the employment and compensation of persons in the Government service; and travel and official entertainment expenses of the President, to be accounted for solely on his certificate; $1,907,643.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 2, line 20, strike out "$1,907,643" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,583,615."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can get an agreement on limiting debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, Congress and the people have been hoodwinked long enough on this item. It is just another blank-check fund "to be accounted for solely on his"—the President's—"certificate. The sum of $1,907,643 represents an increase of $24,028 over the current fiscal year on top of a whopping increase of about $300,000 appropriated for the current fiscal year over the last fiscal year. The Members may remember that I offered an amendment last year to eliminate that $300,000 increase, but I was steam-rollered. Another increase of $24,028 is absolutely unthinkable in this blank-check fund, and I trust the membership of this House will be more prudent than last year.

It should be pointed out that this item provides for payroll, travel, and entertainment, therefore overlapping other items in the Executive office budget appropriating for the same expenses. This includes the next two items in the bill.

Let us catch up with this racket. My amendment cuts the proposed item a total of $324,028, representing the $300,000 increase appropriated for this fiscal year and the proposed further increase of $24,028, leaving the President with a tidy sum of $1,583,615 for this one item. This should not hurt him a bit. It will not even compel him to tighten his belt, as he repeatedly admonishes the people to do.

I hope you will support this amendment. I know of no reason why the funds of the Executive office should be so sacred that we cannot cut them here along with reductions being made in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I really hope that our friend, the gentleman from Iowa, will not insist upon this amendment. This is a delicate subject, and deals with comity between the branches of Government.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Did the gentleman say comity or did he say comedy?

Mr. THOMAS. This is a serious matter. We all admire and respect our friend, and we are going to keep on admiring and respecting him, but we must be serious about this. At no time in the memory of any man on this floor, and if I am wrong I would like to be corrected, has the President of the United States, regardless of which party he belonged to or whatever his name was, ever told the Congress what it could vote for its own housekeeping purposes. If you cut this, and you offer to cut it if I remember correctly about $325,000, the President has 279 employees, and if you tell the President how to run his office and how many employees he needs, he is going to have the same right, and you cannot blame him then for coming here and saying, "Well, now the Congressmen have three or four employees in their offices, and I think that is about two too many. Therefore, I am going to veto this appropriation bill." This has never been done, and I want to be corrected, if within the memory of any man on this floor, this item has ever been cut. I would like for him to say so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Have we ever before in this country had a $260,000,000,000 debt? Have we ever had taxes as high as they are today?

Mr. THOMAS. No one is arguing with the gentleman about that. We are talking about how many employees you are going to give the President of the United States to run his office. Do you think it is a wise thing for the Congress to say to the President of the United States, regardless of what his name is or what party he belongs to, "In our judgment you do not know what you are doing as far as the running of your immediate offices is concerned." When you tell him that, he is going to come back and tell the Congress, "All right, now you people have three or four employees in your office." He will say, "You have so many employees in the House of Representatives, and I think you are wrong in both of these figures, and therefore I am going to veto it."

In other words, you are not making for smooth harmony in the actual physical operation of the White House or of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with you that we ought to have pleasant relationships with the President, we ought to get along just like we do in our families, but how do you expect that condition to obtain when he said we ought to quit in 12 years? That does not tend toward harmony, and the gentleman knows it very well.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will vote down this amendment. It is a serious mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

All time has expired on this amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 30, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND FOR THE PRESIDENT

NATIONAL DEFENSE

For expense necessary to enable the President, through such officers or agencies of the Government as he may designate, and without regard to such provisions of law regarding the expenditure of Government funds or the compensation and employment of persons in the Government service as he may specify, to provide in his discretion for emergencies affecting the national interest, security, or defense which may arise at home or abroad during the current fiscal year, $5,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for allocation to finance a function or project for which function or project a budget estimate of appropriation was transmitted pursuant to law during the second session of the Eighty-second Congress or the first session of the Eighty-third Congress and such appropriation denied after consideration thereof by the Senate or House of Representatives or by the Committee on Appropriations of either body.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS: On page 3, line 6, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, in previous years the so-called emergency fund for the President was actually a fund for emergencies. In recent years we have transferred what was originally the emergency fund, which had to do with floods, devastations, insect attacks, to a special fund, for some curious reason, under the control of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This Presidential fund no longer has attached to it the emergency nature which it once had.

Last year a much larger request than this was made. This House reduced it to $1,000,000. Last year a balance, which was then thought to be very small, was continued into the following fiscal year.

If you will turn to page 690 and succeeding pages, you will see the purposes for which the so-called emergency fund has been used. It has been used for money which should have been taken out of the $5,400,000 for the renovation of the White House. It has been used to create a Commission on Internal Security and Individual Rights. It has been used to pay for statistical information from the Security and Exchange Commission, and it has been used for a Materials Policy Commission, and for a Water Policy Commission, and for a Commission on Migratory Labor.

If you also read the hearings, which I will not take the time to do now, you will find that at all times the Congress was in session, and there was no reason why the President should not have come to the Congress and have asked for money for purposes which were strictly under the supervision of the Congress and for which he would undoubtedly have received the money. Today this is just a fund to make it unnecessary to come to the Congress and ask for funds. There is only one item of about $75,000, out of the expenditures, which could be considered an emergency. I suggest therefore that since we have always appropriated money for real emergencies when it was needed, that we do again this year as we did last year, reduce the amount to $1,000,000. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. I wish to ask the gentleman whether the $450,000 that was recently provided for Mr. Newbold Morris came from this emergency fund of the President.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not know, but if $450,000 was provided for Mr. Newbold Morris out of any fund it would almost necessarily have to be out of this fund, and the past record would indicate that that is probably the fund from which it was taken.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman from California will remember that after that item in last year's appropriation bill was cut there was an emergency down in Missouri and in the Mississippi Valley and a request was made of this Congress to make a special appropriation, whereas if it had been left in the emergency fund that money would have been used for that purpose.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman from West Virginia is in error about the funds; it was the other fund which was used, but that is now under the Office of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. BAILEY. Would it not apply to any other emergency?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The President's fund was not used for the emergency; money was put in the other fund when the emergency occurred.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to see if we can get an agreement on debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, the last 4 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will divide the time not reserved to the committee equally amongst those Members who were on their feet at the time the limitation was agreed to.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute to the Phillips amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS as a substitute for the Phillips amendment: On page 2, strike out lines 21 through 25; and on page 3, strike out lines 1 through 14.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment wipes out the so-called emergency fund for the President. We have had a permanent emergency, or emergencies, in this country for the past 20 years or so. Under this bill, $5,000,000 more would be handed over to the President to finance in this and foreign countries so-called emergencies which might or might not happen in fiscal 1953. In other words, to go with the permanent emergency, we have here the planned emergency. The President does not need a dime of this proposed $5,000,000. Budget Director Lawton testified before the committee that there was $4,722,600 in this fund as of January 23, 1952, and at that time the President was spending it at the rate of about $1,500,000 a year. Therefore, with $4,722,600 in the till, let us knock out this $5,000,000 provision of this bill. Why should the people go on paying for trumped-up and planned emergencies? Of the $807,500 spent from this fund from the beginning of fiscal 1952 until the 23d of January 1952, not a dime of it was for a bona fide emergency, as the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] brought out in the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CARL T. DURHAM, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, IN BEHALF OF HIMSELF AND REPRESENTATIVES STERLING COLE, HOLIFIELD, ELSTON, PRICE, HINSHAW, KILDAY, VAN ZANDT, AND HENRY JACKSON

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are deeply concerned about the independent offices appropriation bill as it applies to the atomic energy program. As the House members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, we consider it our duty to advise against two main features in the bill as it stands—the size of the money cut, and the insertion of two riders which could have a crippling and far-reaching effect upon our state of atomic preparedness.

We appreciate the immense difficulty of the problem confronting the Appropriations Committee of this House. It was necessary for that committee, in a matter of 2 or 3 days, to review a program unique in scope, complexity, and novelty. Over such a space of time it is just plain impossible to evaluate and analyze all the factors that are involved. We say this humbly because we have spent a very large share of our own waking hours over the past half decade doing our best to follow and understand the Nation's atomic energy enterprise. After all this time—and it has been continuous effort the year around—we still do not feel that we could hope to be called experts in every phase. However, we have worked conscientiously at this task and do feel most sincerely that we are on sound ground in raising our voice to warn against false economy and against the two riders which might wrap a strait jacket around the most vital new projects now unforeseen.

We also want to get into Government operations as much economy as possible. This is not only necessary but imperative in view of the fiscal position of our country. Yet the atom bomb is the very reason why today we are not required to spend even more billions than we are spending. Atomic energy is the best and cheapest defense we have got. It is the very keystone of our military security.

The Appropriations Committee proposes cutting the reactor program by $46,000,000—a great reduction of the $136,000,000 requested. Frankly, this proposal alarms us. If allowed to stand, it could well slow down to a walk our program to build atomic-powered aircraft. Such a reduction would doubtless mean that we are not going to have atomic-propelled bombers nearly as soon as the military has planned to have them. In this area alone, the House would take upon itself a solemn responsibility if it decided to keep from the arsenal of the United States a strategic weapon which may become our best shield and protection and deterrent to war in the coming years.

Another effect of this same money cut, if it is allowed to stand, could be to starve our program for atomic-propelled submarines. We may have in our hands the responsibility for deciding to keep open the sea lanes in the event of war—as planned by the constituted military authorities of the United States—or else, on the House's own initiative and without testimony from the Defense Department, to risk tampering with those plans, crippling our atomic submarine, and possibly handing over control of the oceans to the potential enemy. We do not wish to share in this responsibility.

But there is even worse to describe. The bill, as it is now written involves a recommended cut of $47,000,000 in atomic weapons and atomic weapons facilities. As we read the secret budget justification, we are forced to the conclusion that the Appropriations Committee must have had in mind a money reduction affecting the physical safeguarding of our stockpile of bombs. There is no other way to interpret that committee's action in view of what they have cut, and in view of what the secret budget itself says. If a time ever came when a potential enemy succeeded in sabotaging part of the atomic bomb stockpile, the responsibility might rest with the House today. Once again, we say most sincerely, that we want no share of any responsibility for impairing the security with which our atomic bombs are protected and guarded.

There is still more. In at least two important cases, and probably in added cases, operating budgets have not been reduced, but budgets for building new plants are reduced. As a result, the operating funds would be useless since the facilities to be operated would never come into existence. We do not believe that the committee members who approved these recommendations were themselves alerted to the consequences of their action. We do not see how it would be humanly possible for any individual to think through the implications of this atomic-energy budget in a few days of hearings. The separation of funds in this bill between operating funds and construction money, with no right of transfer between the two, is a matter of far greater importance than appears on the surface.

The reverse of the inconsistency which has just been cited is also to be found in the bill as now written. Funds have been provided for construction of certain facilities, but no funds for operations after the facilities are built. All will agree that there is no point in constructing plants which will thereafter stand idle and not be used.

The net effect of furnishing money for plants that can be built but not operated, or operated but not built is to impose a further very large and concealed money cut in the AEC program.

We are particularly disturbed by some of the language in the report justifying the bill. It is there stated that money reductions amounting to $25,000,000 have been applied to items "other than those involving the acquisition of fissionable materials." The term "fissionable materials" means uranium-235 and plutonium—it means the active material which produces an atomic explosion. That material depends upon uranium ore taken from the ground, and it depends upon manufacturing plants and processing and development work. The report justifying this bill says that no damage is to be done to our supply of end product for bombs, and yet it slashes the funds which go into producing that end product.

We cannot imagine that the members of the committee intended to reduce, for example, explorations for uranium ore in the United States to keep our plants running. We cannot imagine that they wish to see the production plants close down or their operation made more and more dependent upon foreign sources of raw material. But this would be the very result which we could reasonably expect from the report.

Another sentence in the Appropriations Committee report particularly disturbs us. It says:

> In general, the committee has provided funds for the continuing of construction of projects in progress, with some reductions, and it has deferred initiation of new construction where it believes such postponement would not hamper the preparedness program.

In a field as complicated and difficult as atomic energy, to strike out certain new construction projects after only limited days of study impresses us as a dangerous tactic. Our fears appear to be well-grounded in terms of the impact which the bill before us could actually be expected to have upon the military propulsion programs, upon the H-bomb program, and upon future atomic-bomb programs. We urge our colleagues in the House not to insist upon eliminating projects that are proposed for elimination after no testimony from the military—the customers for the end product—and after only limited consideration.

Even further, physical research is recommended for a cut of $15,000,000—or almost one-third of the total requested. Yet, from physical research came the original atomic bomb. From such research will come the unpredictable weapons and counter-weapons of the future. It is truly a penny-wise, pound-foolish approach to damage this area of endeavor. All else flows from it.

In the whole atomic field we are building facilities that have never been built before. Because of the urgency decreed by national security, it is not possible to finish detailed designs before starting construction. Otherwise, we would indeed invite the danger of falling behind Soviet Russia. It is impossible, therefore, to estimate with precision, months and years in advance, exactly how much some of the plants will cost. At the same time, the total reduction of $174,000,000 as advocated in the bill before us is highly unrealistic. It takes the most economical weapon we have got and gambles upon its effectiveness. The bill denies us our chance to squeeze the most security from the defense dollar.

We cannot, with safety, reduce it by $174,000,0000.

Thus far, however, we have not touched upon what may be the most serious feature of all in the bill before us. We refer to two riders. One states that no part of the appropriation shall be used to start any new construction project for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year. The other rider states that no part of the appropriation shall be

used to start any new construction project, the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 35 percent of the estimated cost included therefor in such budget. If these two riders had been in the law during this past year, we would have lost many months in three of the most vital projects. In other words, looking at the past year, as an example, it would not have been possible to start certain projects and to change radically certain other projects as soon as the necessary scientific information became available. This whole field is fast moving. New knowledge can change the picture overnight—and Congress may not be in session when it happens. When we find out something vitally important that we had not known before, we must exploit it immediately. This is what we have done and must continue to do. Therefore, we would have lost many months in striving to get the three most vital projects underway if these riders had been in effect last year. Let us not shackle ourselves next year.

Of course, the great handicap under which we labor is security. If we were to state the precise basis for the comments we have made, we could only help and assist the dictator of Russia. We simply cannot state the nature of the projects which were in fact started last year or changed radically after they were started, in light of new technical information developed after the budget had been presented and after Congress had acted. Nevertheless, the conclusions which we report are the blunt truth. We cannot urge too strongly that the riders be modified.

We are certain that the members of the committee that reported out this bill were not aware of the harmful effects which the riders could have. We understand that they had no testimony on these riders either from the Atomic Energy Commission or from the Defense Department.

We believe the riders and the money cuts may delay this Nation's H-bomb program. We believe these actions could delay and cripple this Nation's atomic bomb program. We are positive that no Member of the House wants to threaten our atomic supremacy over Russia by hobbling the project.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] my time.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, the minority members of your subcommittee, even though they respect the zeal and fighting spirit of the gentleman from Iowa, are compelled to oppose the cutting of the President's personal staff and expenses and we hope that his amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] will be rejected.

We do hope, though, that the committee will see fit to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS]. We have tried to approach this matter in a spirit of fairness. We have tried to legislate without personalities and while we do not like the increase in the White House expenses we feel that they should not be the subject to legislation here at this time.

The President's emergency fund, however, involved a real principle.

Mind you, the Congress has just one prerogative left and that is the control of the purse strings. When you jump from one million to five million to 25 million, soon the Executive will be disbursing many of our funds without legislative authority. So we want to hold it to $1,000,000 and reserve it for emergencies as it was originally intended. Our position is without regard to personalities, it would be true whether the President were a Democrat or a Republican. We think it is a fair, dispassionate, rational approach to this question, and we think the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] should be adopted. Congress is in session almost all the time and Congress can take care of any great emergency that confronts the Nation. It is perfectly proper that the President should have $1,000,000 at his disposal for sudden emergencies. But, this sets a precedent, and by increasing the sums of money placed at this disposal year after year, opens the gate to the destruction of the last power of the Congress of the United States. So, we ask you to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, an amendment which is the considered suggestion of the minority members on the committee who have studied and lived with this problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I discussed on the floor the cost-plus contract which ARO, Inc., has with the Air Corps for operating the aerodynamic wind tunnel at Tallahoma, Tenn. I am glad to report to the House that the General Accounting Office, under the direction of the Comptroller General of the United States, has assigned its top investigators to make a thorough inquiry into the expenditures, operations, and other pertinent facts relating to ARO.

In addition, the House Committee on Appropriations has asked and obtained assignment of FBI agents to study the ARO contract and operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I address my fellow futilitarians who are engaged in the almost futile business of trying to obtain fiscal control of the Government of the United States. So long as we are trying to do it under present law and practices, here, at least, is an opportunity to strike in the right direction at probably the most useless and unnecessary fund in the budget. The Phillips amendment would leave something for the President to play with, but not enough to make him independent of the Congress in any one of the fantastic enterprises which he might conceivably engage upon, because much of it in the past has been spent for futile, unnecessary operations.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the House will, at least, in this timely instance, reassert its independence, reassert its right to be called upon by the President when money is needed for specific purposes and will limit him to a little more pocket money, a mere million dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] on 50 percent of his statement. He is a grand gentleman and a most valuable Member of this body. But on the other 50 percent, now, let us be realistic about this thing. I have no personal interest in it and I know you do not either. This is the President's working fund, and I am told that most of the Governors of the States of this Union have a working fund. I am told that the Governor of the great State of California has a working fund and I am told that it is in excess of that amount. Now I see my good friend is going to correct me. Tell me, how much does the good Governor of California have for his emergency fund?

Mr. PHILLIPS. When I was in the California Legislature we kept it down.

Mr. THOMAS. How much does he have now?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not know.

Mr. THOMAS. Can anybody answer that question, please?

May I ask the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] how much does the Governor have for his emergency working fund?

Mr. WERDEL. I am advised that it is about $120,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Multiply that by 48, because there are still 48 States in the Union, and how much would it be for the President of the United States? Seriously, folks, I am not going to keep you too long, but you have got approximately 3,500,000 men under arms in this country today and a blank number overseas. I do not care who the President is or what party he belongs to. We had better give him a little money to operate with as a working fund. It is just good business sense. Is there any corporation in the country of any magnitude that does not allow its president that much latitude?

In January when we were holding this hearing the President had used but $800,000 of the $5,000,000-plus you gave him last year. We called over there this morning, and as of today he has used $1,452,000. If he does not use another dime of this money, on July 1 of this year every penny of it that is left from last year reverts to the Treasury. It is not a continuing appropriation.

Let us not tie the hands of the Chief Executive to that extent. You recall that in World War II the President had a total of about $600,000,000 as an emergency fund.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote. I sincerely hope we will not be small about this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The question will first occur on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and then on the amendment

offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I was under the impression that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] was an amendment to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offered an amendment to strike out the entire paragraph, which is not a substitute for an amendment to strike out and insert.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the Chair. Then it is understood that the first vote will be on the amendment I have offered?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the question the Chair is trying to put now.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 115, noes 47.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKETT: On page 3, after line 14, insert a new heading and the following language:

"DISASTER RELIEF

"The unobligated balances at the end of June 30, 1952, of appropriations heretofore made for Disaster Relief under the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 875); the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952; act of July 18, 1951 (Public Law 80); and the act of October 24, 1951 (Public Law 202), shall, to the extent that they exceed in the aggregate $5,000,000, not be available for obligation after June 30, 1952, and shall be recovered to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order, first, that the amendment is not germane to the bill. It has no relation to any item in the bill.

Second, it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

On both counts, or on either count, it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, it occurs to me that this is a limitation of an appropriation. Its effect certainly is to recover into the Treasury moneys which are just floating around, and apparently serving no purpose at this time. It never occurred to me, of course notwithstanding whatever the rule might be, that we would avoid trying to save money here just by raising points of order. It seems to me that we might save a little money by even legislating some time. I hope the point of order will be overruled.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] has offered an amendment. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] makes a point of order against the amendment on the ground it is not germane to the bill before the Committee and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair has had an opportunity to read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas. The amendment does not, as the Chair understands, apply to funds contained in the pending bill H. R. 7072, but has reference to funds which have been made available by the Congress in other legislation. Therefore, the amendment is not germane and is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, would it have been in order if the gentleman from Texas made it a transfer of the funds to the Housing and Finance Agency, which comes on about page 53, and which already has a fund for distress purposes, and merely transfer this money to that fund? It would, therefore, be a limitation upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. I am sure the gentleman from California will agree with the Chair when the Chair calls the gentleman's attention to the fact that the present occupant of the Chair has enough trouble without having to pass judgment on a hypothetical case.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, if I might be heard further, I might say that if there is any possibility that the amendment is germane, it will be offered at that point.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE MANSION AND GROUNDS

For the care, maintenance, repair and alteration, refurnishing, improvement, heating and lighting, including electric power and fixtures, of the Executive Mansion and the Executive Mansion grounds, and traveling expenses, to be expended as the President may determine, notwithstanding the provisions of this or any other act, $341,200, together with not to exceed $26,000 of the unobligated balance of funds appropriated for such purpose in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, before the ruling of the Chair in the case of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas is forgotten, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that a couple of weeks ago I offered an amendment having the same objective, to wit, reaching back to the heretofore appropriated funds in a vain effort to reestablish the control of the Congress over the fiscal affairs of the United States. That, too, was ruled out of order. Now the ruling that has just been made by the Chair further emphasizes the point that as of today under existing rules, the House has completely lost control over the fiscal affairs of the United States Government because it cannot effectively control over-all expenditures in any fiscal year, without the right to reach carry-over funds as it acts upon current appropriation bills. These are now dangerous derelicts, liable in any year to wreck the American economy. I have planned within the next few days to offer an amendment to the rules of the House that will permit the House to control, by action on appropriation bills, all of the funds either in the bill or theretofore voted for a given fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7072, independent offices appropriation bill, directed him to report it had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is this the last item of business that we have for the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then, Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to renew my request and I will object to any other request being made.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 1 minute, following any other special orders heretofore entered.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter from a constitutent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALE. The letter to which I refer is as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., *March 18, 1952.*

Hon. ROBERT HALE.

DEAR MR. HALE: As one of your constituents—Robinhood, Maine, being my legal residence—I wish to protest Mr. DONDERO's speech before the House in which my name was brought up. I wish to state that I never at any time was a member of the John Reed Club. I would like this made a matter of record.

I protest against anyone trying to create a political issue when all that is involved is an attitude toward art and its development.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM ZORACH.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I renew the request that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 1 minute.

CONTACT OFFICERS IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the cut which the Appropriation Committee has made in the contact officers of the Veterans' Administration, $5,000,000, is a staggering cut. It will result in great suffering and hardship for disabled veterans in and out of hospitals, especially those who are trying to have their claims established; those who do not know the benefits to which they are entitled. I know the committee did not mean to be cruel, but I do not think they realized what it means to these boys who have no one to tell them of their rights. To be sure, they have the service organizations and they may have State and county organizations, but they do not remain in the hospitals all the time. The veterans organizations are purely voluntary. They have no officers in the hospitals. After all, it is not their work to do this voluntarily. We send our men into war to fight and often they are hurt by our own guns, by ammunition from our own airplanes, certainly the least we can do is to see that they are given benefits from legislation which we have passed. Only this afternoon a paraplegic from Richmond, Va., told me of another paraplegic who 3 weeks ago entered the hospital. He had paid insurance premiums for years that he should not have paid. He did not know he was entitled to a house and he was not getting the rightful compensation. The contact man at the hospital told him of his entitlements.

I believe when the time comes there will not be a vote against the effort to restore the $5,000,000.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, only $5,000,000 to help our veterans who have been cruelly wounded, cruelly hurt, secure the benefits, the services to which they are justly entitled. They are, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, services that every Member of Congress owes our disabled—care.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN and to include a resolution passed last week by the Polish-American Congress.

Mr. PASSMAN and to include copy of a statement he made before the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee.

Mr. WIER and to include a resolution adopted by the United Lutheran Organization of the Twin Cities and also a speech delivered by a Mr. Lynn Thompson.

Mr. MORANO and to include information on Thomas I. Emerson.

Mr. CANFIELD and to include an editorial.

Mr. HALLECK.

Mr. JACKSON of California and to include two editorials.

Mr. MASON and to include a news release.

Mr. COTTON and to include a speech.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. BOGGS of Delaware).

Mr. SMITH of Kansas and to include a resolution.

Mr. BROOKS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANKIN to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee today and tomorrow and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO and to include an article.

Mr. PHILLIPS to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HELLER in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOW and to include a radio address by James R. Beverly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include certain telegrams opposing the cut in veterans contact officers of the Veterans' Administration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MURDOCK (at the request of Mr. PATTEN), for 10 days, on account of illness.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto;

S. 465. An act for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan;

S. 589. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi;

S. 828. An act for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite;

S. 914 An act for the relief of Massako Miyasaki;

S. 1255. An act for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr.;

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok;

S. 1620. An act for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin;

S. 1782. An act for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos;

S. 1925. An act for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles;

S. 1938. An act granting the consent of Congress to a supplemental compact or agreement between the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of New Jersey concerning the Delaware River Joint Toll Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; and

S. 2697. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 18, 1952, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4515. An act to authorize the acquisition by exchange of certain properties within Death Valley National Monument, Calif., and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5317. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 20, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1259. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled 'An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion'," approved June 19, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1260. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1261. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to revise certain laws relating to the mail messenger service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1262. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the suspension of the imposition or execution of sentence in certain cases in the municipal court for the District of Columbia and in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 488. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 93; without amendment (Rept. No. 1597). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 579. Resolution relative to the contested election case of Oser versus Scott, Third Congressional District of Pennsylvania; without

amendment (Rept. No. 1598). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BURLESON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 580. Resolution relative to the contested election case of Macy versus Greenwood, First Congressional District of New York; without amendment (Rept. No. 1599). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1212. An act to amend section 2113 of title 18 of the United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 1600). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 7085. A bill to provide for an addition to the George Washington Memorial Parkway by the transfer from the Administrator of General Services to the Secretary of the Interior of the tract of land in Arlington County, Va., commonly known as the Nevius tract; without amendment (Rept. No. 1601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 554. An act for the relief of Boutros Mouallem; without amendment (Rept. No. 1559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 588. An act for the relief of Juan Sustarsic; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 590. An act for the relief of Francesco Gaber; without amendment (Rept. No. 1561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 715. An act for the relief of Ana Cobo Alonso; without amendment (Rept. No. 1562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 931. An act for the relief of Bernard Kenji Tachibana; without amendment (Rept. No. 1563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 935. An act for the relief of Agnes Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 993. An act for the relief of Robert Wendell Tadlock; with amendment (Rept. No. 1565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary S. 1052. An act for the relief of Maria Rhee; without amendment (Rept. No. 1566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1226. An act for the relief of Emelie Simha; without amendment (Rept. No. 1567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1426. An act for the relief of Yoshiyuki Mayeshiro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1428. An act for the relief of John Tzanavaris; without amendment (Rept. No. 1569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2113. An act for the relief of Martha Brak Foxwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 1570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2150. An act for the relief of Joachim Nemitz; without amendment (Rept. No. 1571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2440. An act for the relief of Hanne Lore Hart; without amendment (Rept. No. 1572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1114. A bill for the relief of Edward Charles Cleverly; without amendment (Rept. No. 1573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1162. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kaiko (Kay) Fair and her minor children; with amendment (Rept. No. 1574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1960. A bill for the relief of Erika Nicolo and her minor child; without amendment (Rept. No. 1575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2182. A bill for the relief of Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1576). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2221. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Manhal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2296. A bill for the relief of Mother Anna Fasulo; with amendment (Rept. No. 1578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2303. A bill for the relief of Sisters Maria Salerno, Eufrasisa Binotto, Maria Ballatore, and Giovanna Buziol; without amendment (Rept. No. 1579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Odette Louise Tirman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2587. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette Thorn Pease; without amendment (Rept. No. 1581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of Mimi Fong and her children, Sing Lee and Lily; with amendment (Rept. No. 1582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3152. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Setsuyo Sumida; without amendment (Rept. No. 1583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3378. A bill for the relief of Natale Joseph John Ratti; with amendment (Rept. No. 1584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3572. A bill for the relief of Ying Chee Jung; without amendment (Rept. No. 1585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3732. A bill for the relief of Stephan Joseph Horvath; with amendment (Rept. No. 1586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5145. A bill for the relief of Tsutako Kuroki Masuda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5208. A bill for the relief of Sor Teresa Gea Martinez, Sor Eufrasia Gomez Gallego, Sor Francisca Gil Martinez, and Sor Rosalia De La Maza; with amendment (Rept. No. 1588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5526. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. Ernest Ayre; without amendment (Rept. No. 1589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5805. A bill for the relief of Patricia Lauretta Pray; without amendment (Rept. No. 1590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5956. A bill for the relief of Ingeborg and Anna Lukas; without amendment (Rept. No. 1591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5958. A bill for the relief of Pauline W. Goodyear; without amendment (Rept. No. 1592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILSON of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5976. A bill for the relief of Michiko Nakashima; without amendment (Rept. No. 1593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5984. A bill for the relief of Jimmy Doguta (also known as Jimmy Blagg); without amendment (Rept. No. 1594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6265. A bill for the relief of Marian Diane Delphine Sachs; without amendment (Rept. No. 1595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6314. A bill for the relief of Kiko Oshiro; without amendment (Rept. No. 1596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 7118. A bill to amend section 23 (k) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7119. A bill to amend section 502 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 7120. A bill to provide that the Federal excise tax on admissions shall not be levied on admissions if 50 percent or more of the proceeds therefrom inure to the benefit of a State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 7121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to permit certain actions for the recovery of overpayments of income taxes to be brought before the expiration of 6 months from the date of filing a claim for refund or credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7122. A bill to permit actions against the United States for the recovery of internal revenue taxes to be brought in United States district courts without regard to the amount in controversy and to permit any such action to be tried by the court with a jury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 7123. A bill to admit 50,000 immigrants, natives, and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 7124. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide harbor facilities

in cases where such facilities are not privately available, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 7125. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Navy Band at the annual State Convention of the Massachusetts Department, Veterans of Foreign Wars in Revere, Mass., from June 26 to 29, 1952; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 7126. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land and grant certain easements to the State of California for highway construction purposes in Richmond, Calif.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 7127. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H. R. 7128. A bill to avoid false representations to the consuming public as to the true weight of food products subject to shrinkage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 7129. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 7130. A bill to establish a Temporary National Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7131. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate the $50 work clause; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7132. A bill to provide that the $50 work clause contained in title II of the Social Security Act shall not apply in the case of work performed by individuals who are 65 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 7133. A bill to increase the normal tax and surtax exemption, and the exemption for dependents, from $600 to $800; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H. R. 7134. A bill to extend the provisions of the Railway Labor Act to certain air carriers engaged in foreign commerce and certain air carrier employees located outside of the United States, its Territories, or possessions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 7135. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 7136. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 405. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase from France by President Thomas Jefferson in 1803 and for public celebrations, historical exhibits, and pageants in the 17 Louisiana Purchase States in 1953 and 1954; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 581. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct investigations and studies of offensive and undesirable books and radio and television programs; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7137. A bill for the relief of Ernest Tomassich and Yoko Matuso Tomassich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Alberto Giacalome; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 7139. A bill for the relief of Miss Irene F. M. Boyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER:

H. R. 7140. A bill for the relief of Susan Kay Burkhalter, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 7141. A bill for the relief of Foon Ay Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 7142. A bill for the relief of Poulicos S. Loucacos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7143. A bill for the relief of Osman Demir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 7144. A bill for the relief of T. C. Elliott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7145. A bill for the relief of Lt. Thomas C. Rooney and Mrs. Thomas C. Rooney, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 7146. A bill for the relief of Carl Himura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 7147. A bill for the relief of Bronislaw Ludwig Matuszczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 7148. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Tobio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 7149. A bill for the relief of the Florida Dehydration Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 7150. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elsa O'Neil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII a petition was laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

641. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Polish American Congress, Inc., Chicago, Ill., relative to an expression of appreciation to the House of Representatives for creating the Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Massacre, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, February 25, 1952)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, whose love is so gracious and tender that it passeth understanding, we bow before Thee in gratitude at the remembrance of Thy mercies. Bring us, we beseech Thee, into the quiet sanctuary of Thy presence that we may be still and know that Thou art God.

In spite of all the evil that stalks the earth with shackles and chains, we thank Thee for human kindness, for hope that shines undimmed, for faith that is dauntless, and for all the qualities of high personality that cannot be bought. Let Thy beauty, O Lord, be upon us, that our spirits may be radiant as in Thy strength we face the perplexities of these troubled days. Use us, we pray Thee, as ambassadors of good will. At the end of the day, without stumbling or stain, may we be able to say, I have kept the faith. In the Redeemer's Name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 19, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto;

S. 465. An act for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan;

S. 589. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi;

S. 828. An act for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite;

S. 914. An act for the relief of Massako Miyazaki;

S. 1255. An act for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr.;

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok;

S. 1620. An act for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin;

S. 1782. An act for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos;

S. 1925. An act for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles;

S. 2697. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

H. R. 1012. An act to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL AND TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after a quorum call Senators be permitted to transact routine business without debate, as in legislative session, the time not to be charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bricker	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bridges	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Butler, Md.	Ives	Murray
Carlson	Jenner	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Cordon	Knowland	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Lehman	Seaton
Eastland	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Malone	Tobey
Fulbright	Martin	Underwood
George	McCarran	Wiley
Gillette	McClellan	
Hayden	McFarland	

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I announce that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BENTON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. ECTON, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HUNT, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEM, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NIXON, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON STATUS OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the status of appropriation accounts for the appropriation "Construction, Operation, and Maintenance of Roads, Alaska, Office of Territories," for the period ended November 30, 1951; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CREDIT FOR SERVICE PERFORMED BY CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF POSTAL SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REVISION OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO MAIL MESSENGER SERVICE

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to revise certain laws relating to the mail messenger service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED STATUTES RELATING TO SCHEDULES OF ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE OF MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of Fidel Real y Vasquez-Enriquez or Fidel Real or Fidel Real y Vasquez and Two Wai Hing or Yeung Kwai or Frank Chan from reports relating to aliens whose deportation had been suspended, transmitted to the Senate on July 2, 1951, and January 15, 1952, respectively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Edward Zurek from a report transmitted to the Senate on May 15, 1951, pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with a view to the adjustment of his immigration status (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Food and Drug Administration of the Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of St. Elizabeths Hospital, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUDIT REPORT ON GOVERNMENT SERVICES, INC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Resolution 24

"Resolution requesting Congress to exempt hotels and motels from rent control

"Whereas the Federal Government has recontrolled the rents and rates of hotels and motels in various areas throughout the State of California in order to enable construction of additional public housing; and

"Whereas Federal housing authorities are now contemplating the recontrol of rents and rates of hotels and motels in various other areas within the State of California; and

"Whereas declaration of critical areas made by Federal housing authorities and the attendant publicity is definitely detrimental to the promotion of tourist travel by organizations cognizant of the impact of income from the tourist trade on the economy of the State of California, to wit: Californians, Inc., All Year Club of Southern California, California Mission Trails Association, Redwood Empire Association, Shasta-Cascade Wonderland Association, and other similar organizations; and

"Whereas the freezing of rates and rentals of hotels and motels at off-season rates places these vital tourist accommodations in a permanent rental category during the tourist travel season; and

"Whereas this not only places a hardship on the operators of tourist establishments but also reduces accommodations for travelers to our State and nullifies the promotional activities of State organizations: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of California*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to amend the rent control law to exempt tourist industry accommodations from all rent or rate controls; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A telegram in the nature of a petition from the Diocesan Conference of the North American and Canadian Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, assembled at New York City, N. Y., signed by Archbishop Vitaly, chairman of the diocesan conference, expressing gratitude to this country for the hospitality granted to many Russian exiles; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Filipino Shipowners Association, Manila, Philippine Islands, relating to the withdrawal of certain United States Maritime Commission vessels from Philippine coastwise shipping (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The memorial of Dale Pontius, chairman, and sundry other members of Neighborhood E, Fifth Ward Independent Voters of Illinois, Chicago, Ill., relating to the conduct and procedure of certain congressional investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PRICE CONTROLS — LETTER FROM EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVE, MADISON, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation's farmers are following with close interest the deliberations by the Senate Banking Committee on the issue of future controls.

Today, I have received a message from the able executive secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture Cooperatives, Milo K. Swanton, who points out that a great many farm products have been selling below parity levels.

Thus, that crucial fact must of course be borne in mind by the Congress when the control bill is considered.

Mr. Swanton also points out the necessity of preserving on the statute books section 104 of the defense-production law for which I have previously spoken and voted. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Swanton's letter be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE COOPERATIVES,
Madison, Wis., March 17, 1952.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Member of the United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: This has to do with extension of price controls and is merely to restate our opposition at this time when the bill is soon to be taken up by the Senate.

As you know, we favor immediate termination of control of prices on agricultural commodities. We believe that such controls tend to hamper production and are of no benefit either to consumer or producer.

Maintenance of these controls on agricultural products, which products have been selling generally below parity, does nothing to prevent inflation.

You will probably recall our previous correspondence asking your support of the principals of section 104 of the Defense Production Act. We feel that section 104 is as much a protection to the rest of the world as it is to ourselves, a protection to American consumer as well as producer, and a protection to those parts of the world that need the oils, fats, and dairy products much more than we and which our high purchasing power could take from them.

Sincerely yours,

MILO,
Milo K. Swanton,
Executive Secretary.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTIONS AND LETTERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously placed in the RECORD numerous fine resolutions and letters which have come to me from Wisconsin organizations endorsing action on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway legislation.

At this time I have several such additional resolutions and letters. They speak for America's grass roots. I congratulate these groups and their members and only hope that their great ideal and mine—the seaway completed—will shortly see fruition.

I ask unanimous consent that these resolutions and letters be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions and letters were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Council of the City of Ashland, That this Council of the City of Ashland, Wis., does hereby go on record as favoring the participation of the United States in the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway, and does urge its Congressmen and United States Senators to do everything within their power to bring about the accomplishment of this project. That the city clerk is hereby directed to mail a copy of this resolution to the following: Congressman ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, and Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr.

Resolution 1

Whereas the Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, unanimously adopted resolution 51–7 at the 1951 department encampment held at Manitowoc, Wis., last June; and

Whereas this resolution placed the Department of Wisconsin on record in favor of the most rapid, practical, and full development of the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and urged Congress "to pass the necessary authorizing legislation for its implementation at the earliest possible date"; and

Whereas we are glad to see that Governor Kohler has taken definite steps to organize concerted action to secure approval by Congress of this important, magnificent project; and

Whereas the need for the St. Lawrence project is more compelling than ever in view of the uncertain international situation and should serve as an integral part of our defense mobilization program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Administration, Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, duly assembled at its midwinter conference at Beaver Dam, Wis., February 2 and 3, 1952, That we again go on record in favor of this vital project and that further we commend Gov. Walter J. Kohler, Jr., for taking definite steps in an effort to make this project a reality.

Whereas it is considered of vital national concern that the United States of America, through its National Congress, join with Canada in the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project: Be it hereby

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Beaver Dam, That this body go on record as being unanimously in favor of the passage by our National Congress of the bill, presently pending before it, to sponsor this great national project; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, and Congressman GLENN DAVIS.

MADISON JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Madison, Wis., March 17, 1952.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: Over 200 members of the Madison Junior Chamber of Commerce have asked me to write you, expressing their thoughts concerning the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway. It is our unanimous opinion that participation by the United States in the development of this project is not only desirable, but a necessity to the economy of the whole country.

We are aware of the fact that you have supported this project in the past and are confident that you will continue to do so in the future. You have our full backing and support in this work. We feel that there should be no limit to the time and energy expended to persuade Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to adopt this project which will save millions of dollars for consumers through lower freight costs, enhance the competitive position of Midwest products in world markets, and will furnish cheap and much needed electricity in the International Rapids area of New York.

America needs the seaway. The time for action is now.

Sincerely,

PHILLIP C. STARK,
President.

WISCONSIN STATE FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S AUXILIARIES OF LABOR,
Fond du Lac, Wis., March 1, 1952.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY: We, the executive board of the Wisconsin State Federation of Women's Auxiliaries of Labor, would appreciate your working for the passage of the St. Lawrence seaway project and your voting in favor of this bill.

Very truly yours,

Alma Richter, Secretary-Treasurer; Beatrice Wieland, President; Mae Thorson, Crystal Duranso, Ruth Sheehy, Bertha M. Olson, Viola M. Hornickel, Loretta Wiedenbeck, Alice Smith, Ann Kleinschmidt, Vice Presidents.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 20, 1952, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 183. An act for the relief of Elfriede Ehrhardt Otto;

S. 465. An act for the relief of Oswald A. Drica-Minieris;

S. 560. An act for the relief of Dr. Louis S. K. Yuan;

S. 589. An act for the relief of Sister Edeltrudis Sailer;

S. 606. An act for the relief of Fede Vita Guzzardi;

S. 828. An act for the relief of Berta Gomes Leite;

S. 914. An act for the relief of Masako Miyazaki;

S. 1255. An act for the relief of Leopold Kahn, Jr.;

S. 1541. An act for the relief of Dr. Francis S. N. Kwok;

S. 1620. An act for the relief of Tory Lee Eakin;

S. 1782. An act for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos;

S. 1925. An act for the relief of Gregory Joseph Coles; and

S. 2697. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 2901. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to alleviate shortages in rail-

road freight cars and other vehicles during periods of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2902. A bill for the relief of Josef Radziwill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 2903. A bill to amend "The act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 2904. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution to give the Secretary of Commerce the authority to extend further certain charters of vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN RESERVATIONS OF MINERAL INTERESTS BY FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2904) to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Association and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph "First" of section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 781), after 60 days after the date of enactment of this act no Federal land bank shall have power to issue any type of farm loan bond unless such bank, within such 60-day period, has entered into an agreement in writing with the Secretary of Agriculture reciting that such bank agrees, in consideration of its being permitted to retain its power to issue farm loan bonds—

(1) to include in the disposition of any real property acquired in satisfaction of debts or purchased at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages held by it all right, title, and interest of such bank in and to the mineral interests in such property; and

(2) upon application made within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act, by a private person who at the time of filing such application is the owner of the surface of land which was acquired by such bank in satisfaction of debts or purchased at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages held by it, to convey to such person by quitclaim deed all of its right, title, and interest in and to any mineral interests reserved by it in such land, upon payment of a purchase price therefor equal to the fair market value of such mineral interests as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture but not in excess of 10 percent of the appraised value of the lands as of the time of the making of the loan pursuant to which such lands were acquired by the bank.

SEC. 2. Section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1016), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(j) Any disposition by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation or the Land Bank Commissioner of any real property acquired in satisfaction of debts or purchased at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages held by or on behalf of such Corporation or Commissioner shall include all right, title, and interest of such Corporation or Commissioner in and to the mineral interests in such property."

SEC. 3. Upon application made to the Secretary of Agriculture within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act by a private person who at the time of filing such application is the owner of the surface of land which was acquired by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation or the Land Bank Commissioner in satisfaction of debts or purchased at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages held by such Corporation or Commissioner, there shall be conveyed to such owner by quitclaim deed all mineral interests in such land heretofore reserved by such Corporation or Commissioner upon payment of a purchase price therefor equal to the fair market value of such mineral interests as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture but not in excess of 10 percent of the appraised value of the lands as of the time of the making of the loan pursuant to which such lands were acquired by such Corporation or Commissioner.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. YOUNG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

Throughout most of the past 50 years the Government of the United States has, with few exceptions, followed a policy of reserving unto itself the mineral interests in lands that are sold to private buyers. This policy has led to a situation where the Government owns minerals to millions and millions of acres of land, the surface of which is owned by private individuals. It has resulted in a very considerable amount of confusion, uncertainty, conflict, and doubt.

Recognizing the need for a uniform policy concerning the retention or disposal of mineral interests, the Eighty-first Congress enacted Public Law 760. That act authorizes and directs the Secretary of Agriculture to convey to the owners of the surface title mineral interests which have been reserved and held by the Federal Government. It applies specifically to lands acquired under the old Resettlement Administration or the Farm Security Administration, later administered by the Farmers' Home Administration. Public Law 760 does not affect the mineral rights to lands purchased under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act for the purpose of retiring acreage permanently from production.

May I point out that the act to which I have just referred (Public Law 760, 81st Cong.) applies exclusively to mineral interests in agricultural lands and not to the public domain in general. The policy of the Government with respect to mineral interests in the public domain, acquired primarily for the conservation of mineral resources, is that they should be retained perpetually in the Federal Government. There is, however, a clear and unmistakable distinction between such mineral rights and those relating to lands devoted to agriculture.

Public Law 760 does not affect Federal land banks, as it applies only to Government-owned corporations. The bill which I am introducing today would further clarify the Government's policy regarding the reservation of minerals on agricultural lands, and would, in addition, provide for the disposition of mineral interests heretofore reserved by the various Federal land banks.

The Federal land banks, chartered by the Federal Farm Loan Act, approved July 17, 1916, and supervised by the Farm Credit Administration, are owned largely by the national farm-loan associations, the membership of which is made up of farmer borrowers from the land banks.

There is no uniformity of policy as between the various Federal land banks on the matter of reserving and disposing of mineral interests. For example, at least 2 of the 12 banks do not reserve any mineral rights; one bank reserves up to one-fourth of the minerals, and several reserve one-half. Some reservations extend for a period of 10 years; some for 50 years, and some are in perpetuity.

Obviously, under these circumstances, a private individual who desires to purchase a farm from the Federal Land Bank System, upon which to earn a livelihood for himself and his family, may or may not receive the mineral interests; may or may not find them reserved in the Government for 10, 25 or 50 years; may or may not find them emasculated by any one of countless restrictions administered according to the whims and fancies of scores of boards, agencies, and officials. Odd, is it not, that this should be the case, when each land bank is chartered by the same United States Government, and regulated by the same instrumentality?

Aside from the need for a more uniform policy, there are many compelling reasons why in equity and good conscience the land banks themselves should be required to convey mineral interests to those who now own the surface. Such a program would encourage the exploration and development of oil reserves, especially in unproven and semi-proven areas. It would add to the tax revenues of the Government. It would remove innumerable obstacles to the sale and conveyance of real property in thousands of transactions, all over the Nation, and simplify ownership.

The bill I have introduced would provide an orderly and eminently fair process for the Federal land banks to divest themselves of mineral holdings upon application and payment therefor by the present surface owner.

I submit that it is in the best interests of the Nation as a whole that such a policy be adopted. The proposal has obvious merit, and I hope it will, after full consideration, receive the approval of this Congress.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "Vandenberg's Monument," published in the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1952, dealing with publication of the private papers of the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg.

Editorials from the New York Times and the New York Herald Tribune of March 20, 1952, dealing with the Minnesota primary and the write-in votes for General Eisenhower.

By Mr. FREAR:

Editorial entitled "For Many, Life Is Better," published in the Journal-Every Evening, of Wilmington, Del., on March 19, 1952, dealing with recent wage increases.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Article entitled "Philippine Youths Make Good in United States," written by Harmon W. Nichols, and published in the Syracuse Herald-Journal on January 4, 1952.

By Mr. THYE:

Article by Cedric Adams, published in the column entitled "In This Corner," in the Minneapolis Star of March 17, 1952, referring to black-market practices in Korea.

Article entitled "Ask the GI Joes," written by Aldred D. Stedman, published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press on March 16, 1952, dealing with universal military training.

By Mr. MOODY:

A series of four articles entitled "Election Law Loopholes," published in the Washington Star.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to announce that there will be a late session today, in order to conclude action on the treaties, and if necessary there will be an evening session. Then it will not be necessary to have a session tomorrow, and we shall go over until Monday. A great many Senators have spoken to me and have said they would prefer to have an evening session today, rather than to have a session tomorrow. I feel that by holding a long session today, we can conclude action on the several treaties.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR ON MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, the calendar of bills to which there is no objection be called, from the end of the last calendar call, and also including the measures as to which consent was given that they be called during the next calendar call, namely, Senate bill 1331, Calendar No. 1088; and Senate bill 1828, Calendar No. 1270; and also that House bill 2737, Calendar No. 703; be called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

JEWISH YOUTH WEEK

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the week of March 21 to 28, the National Jewish Youth Conference, with headquarters at 145 East Thirty-second Street, New York City, will be celebrating what is called Jewish Youth Week. This is a conference of first importance to the young people of our Nation, and I am happy to call attention to it at this time when its meetings are under way.

At the request of the conference, I prepared a message to the Jewish young people, and I wish to read the message into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a message of greeting and good will to these young people and a word of encouragement to them in what they are trying to do in raising the standards of the young people throughout the country and especially among the Jewish groups in the United States. The message is as follows:

I am gratified to have this opportunity to extend my best wishes to the National Jewish Youth Conference and to express this personal note of encouragement and support during Jewish Youth Week. The splendid work done by the National Jewish Youth Conference through its annual assembly and its local and regional councils in all parts of the country has never been more critically needed. The problems faced by the free world are growing in complexity and magnitude, and it is of first importance that we develop leadership of superior intelligence and unquestioned integrity to solve these problems. By its democratic and cooperative program, the conference is not only helping to develop future leaders but is also providing an opportunity for youth to learn through participation the best way to deal with local, national, and international issues on a day-to-day basis. My confidence in the future strength of our country and of the whole free world rests principally on my conviction that our young people are alert, intelligent, and ready to shoulder their responsibilities as citizens in our democracy.

PROGRESS IN OVERCOMING DEFECTS AND WEAKNESSES OF OUR ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on March 5, 1952, I caused to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by Mr. Will Lissner, a distinguished writer on economic subjects. The article showed the rapid progress our country has made in overcoming the serious defects and weaknesses that had developed in our economic system, leading to the Wall Street collapse in 1929, and followed by the great depression of the thirties. The article showed the reduction of poverty and the rise in employment, the rise in national production, and the marked advance that had taken place in our country generally, resulting in widespread prosperity among the people.

The great majority of our people realize the tremendous advance which was accomplished through the Government's effective recognition of the right of every man to work and earn a decent living.

As sponsor of the Full Employment Act of 1946, which made the right to a job one of the cornerstones of national policy, and which was bitterly opposed at the time by the monopolistic interests in our country, I wish to point out that as a result of that constructive legislation we have today the highest employment and greatest prosperity our country has ever reached.

I am sure the American people are highly encouraged by the present successful operation of our economic system, and are not at all deceived by the propaganda which is being spread over the country in an effort to deceive the people and discredit the programs which have brought about the conditions under which we live today.

In this connection, Mr. President, I have prepared a list showing 10 yardsticks of democratic progress, and I ask unanimous consent to have the list inserted in the RECORD, following these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEN YARDSTICKS OF DEMOCRATIC PROGRESS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURRAY

I. WE HAVE JOBS

In 1932 nearly 13,000,000 men and women—a quarter of all those who normally worked—were totally without jobs. Millions of decent men and women tramped the streets, sat out the hungry days in parks, sold apples on street corners, roamed aimlessly around the country.

Today, apart from a few areas which are getting special action from the Government, we have attained practically full employment.

In 1951, only a few short years after the scoffers jeered at the goal of 60,000,000 jobs, America provided not 60,000,000 but 61,000,000 jobs.

Nor is this maximum employment the result just of a temporary arms boom. In 1947 and 1948, after arms spending had dropped 90 percent from a wartime peak, the American labor force was still almost wholly at work. The recession of 1949 was already on the way out before the North Korean aggression came. For the first time in history we had a major war not followed by a major depression.

Democratic government insured that. Democratic know-how. Democratic experience and planning. And Democrats wrote that policy into law, in the Full Employment Act of 1946. Democrats translated the right to a job from vague promise to reality.

For the first time in our history we can now look forward to a future under democratic government; where all who wish and are able to work have the chance to get a decent job at decent wages.

II. WE ARE PRODUCING MORE

Through improved wages and working conditions we have provided a purchasing power in the hands of the ordinary American which has made the United States the greatest industrial nation in the world.

We produced as a nation goods and services worth $328,000,000,000 in 1951. This tremendous total is nearly three times the national output of 1932, and twice the output during 1929, peak year of the Republicans' prosperity. These comparisons are adjusted for changes in prices. They represent the real changes in the quantity we are producing.

III. WE ARE EARNING MORE

On the average each American—man, woman, or child—had available in 1951 an income after all taxes of $1,443. In 1932 the comparable figure, adjusted for price changes, was only about half as much—$760. In 1929 it was $1,016.

Workers' weekly pay rose on the average from $17 in 1932 to $65 in 1951. Adjusting for price changes, and after Federal taxes, the increase was still 90 percent. Farmers' net income rose from $1,900,000,000 to $16,600,000,000. Corporate net income, after taxes, rose from a deficit of $3,400,000,000 to profits of $18,100,000,000. Business failures declined from 32,000 to 8,000 (23,000 in 1929).

IV. WE ARE EATING MORE

Each American—man, woman, or child—ate on the average 89 pounds more of food last year than in 1932. We are consuming, especially, much higher quantities of the nutritionally important foods: three-fifths more citrus fruits and tomatoes; a third more eggs; a quarter more green and yellow vegetables; an eighth more milk. As a result, we have a much better diet—because we can afford it. And because we buy more food, we have made possible higher farm production and farm prosperity.

V. WE ARE LIVING BETTER

We are today far better and more spaciously housed than in 1932 or even 1929, though much still remains to be done. American homes now have over 33,000,000 electric or gas refrigerators, compared to only 15,000,000 as late as 1940. Ninety percent of workers' housing now includes bathtubs or showers. Nearly 9 out of 10 farmers have electric power-line service today, compared to 1 out of 10 in the early 1930's. Twenty-four million Americans own their own homes today, compared to 14,000,000 in 1929. Forty million Americans own automobiles today, compared to 20,000,000 in 1929.

VI. WE ARE MORE SECURE

Today, 36,000,000 of us are entitled to social security pensions for our old age. Social security provides life-insurance protection worth $200,000,000,000 to 65,000,000 of us (about $3,000 a person)—and the total will rise to $250,000,000,000 in the middle of this year. Seven million of us have National Service life insurance policies, with a value totaling $49,000,000,000. Thirty-seven million of us have Federal-State unemployment insurance.

This tremendous security added directly by Democratic government is in addition to the great growth of industrial pension plans, medical and hospital insurance plans, and private life insurance—all stimulated by Democratic prosperity and progress.

VII. WE ARE BUILDING MORE

We are building far more houses, schools, hospitals, churches, roads, factories, and stores than in 1932. Of houses and apartments alone we built or started 1,094,000 units in 1951 compared to 134,000 in 1932, and 509,000 in 1929. Outlay for industrial plant and equipment rose from $2,600,000,000 in 1932 to $23,100,000,000 in 1951.

VIII. WE ARE GIVING OUR CHILDREN MORE

In 1929, in the Republican "good old days," only half the young Americans aged 14 to 17 were in school. Now three-quarters of them are. College enrollments have also greatly expanded. Nine million school children benefit from the Government-sponsored school-lunch program.

IX. WE ARE SAVING MORE

Personal net savings have risen from $3,700,000,000 in 1929 and a deficit of $1,400,000,000 in 1932 to $17,200,000,000 in 1951, and our savings now are safe, thanks to Democratic measures. In 1932 no less than 1,453 banks failed; last year not one failed.

X. THE MANY HAVE GAINED MOST—NOT THE FEW

The ordinary person has benefited most from Democratic progress. This fact has just been proved anew by a study for the independent National Bureau of Economic Research, reported in the New York Times of March 5, 1952.

Since Republican days, the 95 percent of the people below the top income brackets have substantially increased their share of the greatly higher national income. The 1 percent of the people at the top have gotten more money but a smaller share. Democratic government sought this result—not only as a means to social justice but to prevent depressions.

The Republican prosperity of the 1920's, on the other hand, brought the greatest gains to the top 1 percent of the people. The rest got a smaller and smaller share. Economic collapse and depression followed.

The American people will never voluntarily return to those harrowing days when the vested interests ruled the country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there other Senators who desire to submit routine matters? If not, routine business is concluded.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive A (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The treaty is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to postpone indefinitely the further consideration of the treaty. On that motion there is a limitation of debate of not exceeding 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by the Senator from Illinois and the other half to be controlled by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to a withdrawal of the motion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not made such a motion as yet.

Mr. McFARLAND. But I should like to have it understood that the same time limitation would apply, if and when it is again made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion has not yet been made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will make the motion now. Mr. President, yesterday, when I referred a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair, I sought to ascertain just when the motion to postpone indefinitely would be in order, and I was advised that it was in order as of that moment. However, I do not want anyone to feel that I was taking undue advantage of Senators whose reservations were pending, and which had been submitted before the motion was made. So, Mr. President, in the interest of fairness, I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion, with the understanding that I may offer it later, after the reservations shall have been disposed of, and with the further understanding that the same limitation on debate shall apply to the motion when it is again offered.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is, with the provision that the same limitation as to time shall apply.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. That is satisfactory.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The treaty is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and it is subject to amendment.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I desire to call up reservation No. 1 to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there an amendment to be proposed to the treaty? If not, without objection, it will be reported to the Senate.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Treaty of Peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I call up my reservation No. 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. JENNER. Am I recognized for 15 minutes, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reservation ought to be sent to the desk and read. The clerk will read the reservation.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Mr. JENNER, for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, offers the following reservation:

RESERVATION NO. 1

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservation offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] for himself and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, 15 minutes for debate is allotted to each side.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, at this times I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate. I spoke on these matters February 20, and I have spoken on them twice this week. But merely as a thumbnail sketch, I desire to say that this reservation is designed to make clear that nowhere in ratifying this treaty does the Senate accept any limitations, either explicit or implicit, on our freedom of action as a sovereign nation; nor does it impose any limitations on the sovereignty of Japan or China.

The implied limitations on sovereignty are contained in the preamble, in article 5 of the peace treaty and in letters of President Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Premier Yoshida referring to the treaty.

In the preamble, Japan promises to conform to the U. N. Charter.

This would prohibit her from any political or military action, alone or in cooperation with us, not sanctioned by the United Nations.

The essential elements of this limitation are accepted by Japan again in the body of the peace treaty, in article 5, where Japan explicitly accepts the obligation of article 2 of the United Nations Charter.

Article 2, section 3 of the U. N. Charter, binds Japan to settle her disputes by peaceful means—"peaceful" being defined by the United Nations.

Article 2, section 4 of the Charter binds Japan "to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

Thus Japan has agreed to limit her cooperation with the United States to actions approved by the U. N.

If the U. N. wanted to accept a defeatist peace with Red China, and a new administration did not, the U. N. could withdraw its present arrangement, by which it carries on U. N. military action through the President of the United States, and replace General Ridgeway with another commander.

This has already been proposed as a superior arrangement by the U. N. collective measures committee.

Then the United States could ship nothing to Korea by way of Japan, have no airfields or naval bases there.

Furthermore, the Allied Powers, which include the United States, "confirm that they will be guided by the same article 2 of the charter."

We also agree not to operate in the Pacific except as directed by the U. N.

In addition to this, Mr. Acheson asked for and Premier Yoshida gave, in their letters of September 8, an explicit commitment that Japan would conform to article 2.

President Truman's letter of transmittal to Congress on January 10, 1952, refers again to Japan's promise to provide facilities for nations "engaged in United Nations action in the Far East."

There is no free and open promise of cooperation there.

Mr. Acheson refers to the same limited commitments in his letter to the President on January 9.

Since there is nothing elsewhere in the peace treaty, the security treaties or the accompanying documents, which gives us any explicit rights to bases or any other rights in or about Japan, the only reasonable inference is that Japan cannot act under the peace treaty or the security treaty except as the U. N. approves.

In addition, Japan agrees in the preamble to strive to realize the universal declaration of human rights, to create within Japan the economic and social conditions defined in articles 55 and 56 of the treaty, and to abide by international fair trade practices still to be defined.

I am not impressed by the statement that the preamble is not legally binding.

If it is morally binding, it would still deprive us of any use of bases in Japan not approved by the U. N. including the U. S. S. R.

If it is neither morally nor legally binding, there is no objection to closing any possible use of it by a specific reservation.

We live in a period in which rulers increased their power at home and abroad, not by passing laws, going into courts, or even openly declaring war.

Strong governments today increase their powers by frequent restatements of their claims, innocuous descriptions of major political changes, and clever propaganda blurring the line between legislative and executive or judicial powers.

We cannot pretend that those lines are not blurred, that those subtle methods of acquiring political power are not at work.

We cannot hold them back by legal pronouncements.

The statements about the Charter, the U. N. declaration of human rights, and articles 55 and 56 are put into the Japanese Peace Treaty to get increased prestige for these ideas so alien to American political principles.

This reservation states that in consenting to ratification of the treaty the Senate does not give political sanction or prestige to the principles of the U. N. Charter or the declaration of human rights.

We may have given such sanction in other treaties and other laws.

This reservation says only that we do not give any such sanction here in this treaty.

Mr. President, I wish at this time to give to the Senate a digest of the declaration of human rights, and I ask that I be permitted to include it in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the digest was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS PASSED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY, 1948

The General Assembly proclaims the declaration of human rights, to the end that every individual and every organ of society (that means every individual in this country, Mr. President, and every newspaper, radio station, school, church, or other organ of society which advocates world government; this is not up in the stratosphere; it is right in your constituency), every individual and organ of our country, by keeping this declaration constantly in mind, shall strive, by teaching and education (not in any courts, gentlemen), "to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and * * * to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance" (not by statute, Mr. President) "* * * among the peoples of the member states themselves" (your constituents, Mr. President).

Article 1: "All human beings are born free and equal" (not "endowed by their Creator").

Article 2: "Everyone is entitled to all the rights and freedoms set forth in this declaration, without distinction of any kind, such as race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion," (even those with pro-Communist records, Mr. President?).

Article 7: "All are * * * entitled to equal protection against any discrimination in violation of this declaration" (that means Communists are protected by U. N. against any discrimination by our laws, Mr. President) "and against any incitement to such discrimination." (That means, Mr. President, that we cannot debate in our political meetings or our newspapers whether Communists shall be put under restraints. Don't let us be misled, Mr. President, because these powers have not yet been invoked. The net is being woven, many of the strands are already in place.)

Article 10: "Everyone is entitled * * * to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal" (a U. N. tribunal, Mr. President, to protect American citizens against our State and Federal laws?).

Article 12: "No one shall be subjected to * * * attacks upon his honor and reputation." (You will not be able, under this article, to discuss whether Mr. Jessup is a Communist, or Mr. Lattimore.) "Everyone has the right to the protection of the law against such interference or attacks." (The new world tribunal will take care of that, Mr. President, when the time is ripe.)

Article 13: "Everyone has a right to freedom of movement and residence within the borders of each state." (All world citizens, Mr. President, have a right to come into this country to live, and every individual and organ of society favorable to U. N. is pledged to promote that idea.)

Article 14: "Everyone has a right * * * to enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution." (We are obligating ourselves, Mr. President, to take in any Communist who claims to be a political exile.)

Article 16 (1): "Men and women of full age, without any limitation due to race, nationality, or religion, have the right to marry." (Our States could not make their own marriage laws, Mr. President.)

Article 21 (2): "Everyone has the right to equal access to public service in his country" (including Communists, of course, Mr. President; why should the U. N. permit any discrimination against Communists?).

Article 21 (3): Voting shall be by "universal and equal suffrage." (Our States cannot decide voting age, literacy, property or other qualifications.)

Article 23 (1): "Everyone has the right to work." (This is copied from the Soviet constitution, Mr. President, like so many of the articles of this declaration.)

(2) "Everyone has the right to equal pay for equal work." (Imagine a U. N. authority, Mr. President, deciding on equal pay for men and women, trained and untrained, educated and uneducated, from all parts of this country alone.)

Article 25 gives everybody the right to an adequate standard of living, Mr. President, and medical care, or socialized medicine. (Where do you think the money is coming from to give everyone this adequate standard, Mr. President? It is coming from legal confiscation of savings, so we can all be leveled down. Where do you think the money is coming from, Mr. President, to level up the 2,000,000,000 people of Asia and Africa and South America, Mr. President, if it is not coming from leveling down the very poorest people of our cities, our farms, our plantations, our mill towns? Their standard of living will go down, down, down till it reaches that of India and China. Then they will know that the poorest American was better off than any but the richest people of other continents. But then it will be too late.)

Article 26: "Education * * * shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace." (Not the three R's, Mr. President. Not the fine technical experience that American boys pick up, but lectures on racial equality and the beauty of the U. N. Every GI knows, Mr. President, what these lectures are like. We all heard them.)

Article 29, section 3: "These rights and freedoms may in no case be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations." (If you want to talk patriotism, Mr. President, if you want to extol the virtues of the United States where you believe our ways are better than those of other countries, you are going against the declaration.)

Article 30: This specifically bars "any right * * * to perform any act aimed at the destruction of any of the rights and freedoms set forth herein." (If you don't like Mr. Wallace's full employment scheme, Mr. President, when it comes up in the next depression, you can think what you like, but you have surrendered the right to say so.)

Maybe you can take comfort from the fact this trap has not yet closed upon us, that no one has erased the words of our Constitution, Mr. President, but I cannot.

The declaration says the member states have pledged themselves (by adopting the U. N. Charter) to achieve universal observance of human rights. The declaration merely defines the rights to help the full realization of this pledge.

These so-called rights are never going to be submitted to our courts or our lawmaking bodies. The U. N. authorizes all the

individuals and organs of society who believe in them, actively to seek observance. They work together according to a common plan. Those of us who oppose a declaration of rights based on Soviet principles of government work at cross purposes, or we do not work at all.

This war against our Constitution is being fought by volunteers, Mr. President. I just want to make one thing clear. The war is not being fought off in Madagascar or Mandalay. It is being fought in our schools, our colleges, our churches, our women's clubs. It is being fought with our money, channeled through our State Department. It is being fought 24 hours a day, while we sleep.

I will just give you one example, Mr. President. How many of you know what U. N. has done to change the teaching of the children in your home town? U. N. is at work there, every day and night, changing the teachers, the teaching materials, the very words and tones, and all the essential ideas we think our schools are teaching our children.

I will read you one paragraph, Mr. President, from a little pamphlet, published by UNESCO, mostly with our money, to reorient the thinking of our teachers.

It is a bulletin in a series called "Toward World Understanding."

Its title is "The Influence of Home and Community on Our Children Under 13 Years of Age." I quote:

"In the treatment of babies, besides the usual European ways of gratifying infants, southern Italian mothers sometimes put babies to sleep by masturbating them, for no physical pleasure of which the child is capable is in itself forbidden."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I desire to take the time of the Senate to read a paragraph or two from the declaration of human rights.

The declaration says that the member states have pledged themselves to achieve universal observance of human rights. The declaration merely defines the rights to help "the full realization of this pledge."

These so-called rights are never going to be submitted to our courts or our lawmaking bodies. The U. N. authorizes all the individuals and organs of society who believe in them actively to seek observance. They work together, according to a common plan. Those of us who oppose a declaration of rights based on Soviet principles of government work at cross purposes, or we do not work at all.

This war against our Constitution is being fought by volunteers, Mr. President. I want to make clear that the war is not being fought in Madagascar or Mandalay. It is being fought in our schools, our colleges; our churches, our women's clubs. It is being fought with our money, channeled through our State Department. It is being fought 24 hours a day, while we sleep.

I will give one example, Mr. President. How many of us know what U. N. has done to change the teaching of the children in our home towns? The U. N. is at work there, every day and night, changing the teachers, the teaching materials, the very words and tones, and all the essential ideals we think our schools are teaching our children.

I shall read one paragraph, from a little pamphlet, published by UNESCO, mostly with our money, to reorient the thinking of our teachers. It is a bulletin in a series called "Toward World Understanding." Its title is "The Influence of Home and Community on Our Children Under 13 Years of Age." I read as follows:

In the treatment of babies, besides the usual European ways of gratifying infants, southern Italian mothers sometimes put babies to sleep by masturbating them, for no physical pleasure of which the child is capable is in itself forbidden.

How outrageous, Mr. President; how shameful to think that the United Nations today is putting such rubbish at the disposal of the teachers of our children, telling them how Italian mothers put their children to sleep by masturbating them.

All that reservation No. 1 provides, Mr. President, is that our Nation shall not become entwined in this network of the United Nations. We are not going to lower the flag on our American boys and on American sovereignty and become entwined in this mesh of the United Nations that would put out such rubbish as that to the teachers of America.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, how much of my time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The Senator from Indiana has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I was going to ask the Senator in what way the sovereignty of Japan would be limited by the treaty. Has the Senator made any study of that question?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I have made a study of it. I wish I had time to go into all these matters. If the Senator will read my remarks of a few days ago, as I hope he has, he will note that I stated on the floor of the Senate, that under article 2 of the charter Japan is forbidden to engage in any military activity not sanctioned by the United Nations. The Acheson letter and Mr. Yoshida's reply make it perfectly clear that Japan must accept this limitation on her sovereignty.

We cannot answer these questions by looking at merely one instrument; we must consider them all together.

In other words, if we ratify these treaties as they are written, without reservations, and tomorrow a truce should come in Korea, the Executive could transfer our boys, our Armed Forces, into United Nations armies. If China or the North Korean Communists should break the truce agreement and attempt to murder our boys, does the Senator think Japan would permit us to use bases? Does the Senator think we could use them? No, not until we received permission from the United Nations, under article 2. We would have to go hat in hand and ask permission. Remember that Russia is still a member of the United Nations.

All the reservation does is to protect the sovereignty of America so that we shall not have to go hat in hand to beg the United Nations for the right to protect the lives of our boys.

Mr. WATKINS. Suppose that at some future time the United States and Japan should desire to engage in some military operation——

Mr. JENNER. They could not do so without the consent of the United Nations. We were not consulted about Yalta or Potsdam, or about Marshall's mission to China, or about the Korean war. They want this Nation now to sign on the dotted line. I, for one, will never vote to permit the American flag to be lowered over American boys and turned over to the United Nations, which includes Russia, and within 6 months or a year from today will probably include Communist China. I do not blame the President or the State Department or the people or the American GI's. If we are in it, we have no one to blame but ourselves.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator looking forward to the time when the United Nations may be controlled by a bloc which would be hostile to the United States?

Mr. JENNER. Has the Senator checked the record of votes of the United Nations? Of all the people in the world there are approximately 130,000,000 voting with us. The other side represents 800,000,000 people; and the nations to which we are giving our money, our allies and friends whom we are trying to buy, are either abstaining from voting or voting against us.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the reservation before us is giving a great deal of concern to those of us who for a year and a half have been working intimately with the problem of the peace treaty with Japan. Because of my concern as to the possible effect of the reservation, I wanted to find out, first of all, from the best authority alive, who is Mr. Dulles, one of the leading international lawyers of the country, what the effect would be. So I asked him in a message as to his judgment of the effect of the reservations and whether, in case they are agreed to, it would be necessary to renegotiate the treaty, because we have the responsibility of facing that issue first of all. His reply is as follows:

MARCH 19, 1952.

MY DEAR SENATOR SMITH: You have asked whether, in my opinion, the reservations proposed to the Japanese Peace Treaty and the three security treaties would, if adopted, require the renegotiation of these treaties. My answer is that renegotiation would be required.

The reservations proposed differ radically from the declaration contained in the resolution proposed by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. JENNER. I thought we might clear up that point at this time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me read the whole letter:

That declaration does not purport to be a "reservation." It is a recital of what the peace treaty already provides. The language of the declaration is carefully drawn to conform textually, in its essential respects, with the language of the treaty itself.

The proposed reservations purport to, and in fact would, change the rights and obligations of the parties to the treaties. This cannot be done unilaterally, but any such changes are subject to the agreement of the other party or parties.

The foregoing is my opinion as a lawyer.

The explanatory note which the committee attached to the resolution of ratification appears on pages 8 and 9 of the report of the committee. I ask unanimous consent at this point in my remarks, without reading, to have printed in the RECORD the resolution of ratification with the language incorporated in it by the Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution and additional language were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951. As part of such advice and consent the Senate states that nothing the treaty contains is deemed to diminish or prejudice in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, of the Allied Powers as defined in said treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, the Habomai Islands, the island of Shikotan, or any other territory, rights, or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto on the Soviet Union; and also that nothing in the said treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions in favor of the Soviet Union contained in the so-called Yalta agreement regarding Japan of February 11, 1945.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Dulles continues in his letter—and this, too, is important in connection with the whole discussion having to do with all the reservations:

As a principal negotiator of the treaties I give it to you as my considered opinion that the other Allied Powers would not accept the modifications of the Japanese Peace Treaty proposed by the reservations, but would themselves take the opportunity to demand additional rights for themselves, with the result that the entire treaty structure, as negotiated, would collapse. The security treaties are dependent upon the main peace treaty. The United States I suppose would not, and in my opinion should not, assume security obligations in the western Pacific if there is not a peace with Japan which will bring the Japanese people into a friendly relationship with the free world community.

Namely, to the effect that these treaties will have to be renegotiated if these reservations should be adopted. I mention that as a preliminary statement before I discuss the reservations which is now before the Senate.

Further, in my opinion—and I am sure that you and Senator SPARKMAN who were with me in Japan last December will agree—

And I do agree fully—

failure now to conclude promptly the peace settlement would bring bitter disillusionment to the Japanese people who, as General MacArthur said to us nearly 2 years ago, had even then "every moral and legal right to the restoration of peace".

The Japanese eager acceptance of this particular peace is testified to by the overwhelming ratification vote in both houses of the Japanese Diet, a vote which confirmed the judgment of Prime Minister Yoshida, expressed at San Francisco. "It is not a treaty of vengeance, but an instrument of reconciliation. The Japanese delegation gladly accepts this fair and generous treaty."

General MacArthur said in June 1950 that failure to protect Japan in its right to peace would be "a foul blemish on modern civilization."

Nothing would so destroy the prestige and endanger the vital security interests of the United States in Asia as would the failure of the United States promptly to ratify, without reservations, the pending treaties, which, as all the world knows, have from the beginning been negotiated with the full knowledge and cooperation of those Senators, Democrats and Republicans, who were given by the Senate the primary responsibility in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

P. S.—Since dictating the foregoing, I have just seen an opinion from the legal adviser of the State Department to the Secretary of State which confirms the legal opinion expressed by me in the first part of this letter.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President——

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether he agrees that there is a limitation upon the sovereignty of the United States. It will be noted that in the (a) part of reservation No. 1, the language is as follows:

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment, and its domestic concerns.

Is there anything in the treaty contrary to that limitation?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. In any treaty, as in any contract between individuals, there must necessarily be certain restrictions on every unlimited exercise of power. Otherwise, the parties who have signed the treaty could disregard it. Of course there is some limitation on the unrestrained exercise of our sovereignty.

Mr. WATKINS. Does this treaty limit our right to exercise complete and unlimited control over our foreign policy?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No.

Mr. President, is this colloquy to be taken out of my time? I am so limited in time that I am quite concerned about covering all my points.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The colloquy is taken entirely out of the time of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I may help clarify the Senator's problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey has one minute left.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask for additional time.

Because of the difficulties involved in these various reservations, I have taken the trouble during the past week to confer with our staff, with Mr. Dulles, and with all the experts I could locate who are familiar with the negotiations and the conferences which took place on our trip to the Far East; and I have, of course, consulted with my colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. I have tried to reduce to simple form, in three or four paragraphs, the main reasons why we feel these reservations should not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New Jersey. I wish to ask him a brief question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator from Texas yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. CONNALLY. That is all I have. I will help the Senator as best I can.

Is it not the view of the Senator, as is expressed in the legal opinion of the State Department, that the adoption of these reservations would mean rejection of the treaty?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. If the reservations had to be renegotiated, certainly it would.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I mean.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is my own judgment, and I am making that argument.

I shall continue reading this statement:

1. A strict construction of this reservation would nullify the entire treaty. This treaty, like all treaties, contains concessions by the parties. To vitiate the concessions in the interest of unbridled sovereignty would result in the cancellation of the treaty.

2. This reservation would contradict and make ineffective article 3 of the peace treaty—

I wish to call especial attention to this—

in which the United States is given jurisdiction over the Bonin and Ryukyu Islands, including our naval and air base at Okinawa. Article 3 reads as follows:

"ARTICLE 3

"Japan will concur in any proposal of the United States to the United Nations to place under its trusteeship system, with the United States as the sole administering authority, Nansei Shoto south of 29° north latitude (including the Ryukyu Islands and the Daito Islands), Nanpo Shoto south of Sofu Gan (including the Bonin Islands, Rosario Island and the Volcano Islands) and Parece Vela and Marcus Island. Pending the making of such a proposal and affirmative action thereon, the United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters."

3. This reservation would nullify all the supplementary agreements to be negotiated under the treaty in that both Japan and

the United States must make limitations on their respective sovereignties if they are to include fisheries, maritime, administrative, and other agreements.

The concession of sovereignty is inherent in any treaty. I continue reading:

4. If the reservation is aimed at the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, it should say so specifically.

I gather this from what I understood my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], that it is so aimed.

It is not required as a protection against the declaration. As the committee report pointed out, and as Senator BRICKER correctly explained—on the floor of the Senate—

Yesterday, or the day before—

the declaration is not to be found in the operative part of the treaty, but merely is referred to as setting the objectives toward which Japan says she intends to strive.

The declaration was written into the treaty at the request of the Japanese. I wish to pay special tribute to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] for the masterly way he went into this subject, which is close to his heart, differentiating this Declaration of Human Rights from the vague human rights declaration which is being circulated and which people tend to confuse with this declaration. The Senator pointed out, as Mr. Dulles did, and as we all have, that the statement in the preamble is merely a statement of the intention of Japan, and has nothing to do with the obligatory features of the treaty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey if he has consulted with General MacArthur concerning this reservation?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No, I have not. I have not seen General MacArthur.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 2 minutes.

Mr. JENNER. General MacArthur has not been consulted. General MacArthur was not called before the committee which held hearings.

So far as Mr. Dulles is concerned, I could not go to Mr. Dulles, I could not go to the State Department, I had no staff to help me. But I went to the best authority I knew of, the Parliamentarian of the United States Senate, and I hold in my hand a prepared copy of his opinion on this question.

Already the Committee on Foreign Relations has offered an amendment or a declaration, or whatever it may be called; and the Parliamentarian tells me that that will have to be resubmitted. So it does not follow that if the Senate adopted this reservation, the treaty would have to be sent back to be renegotiated.

I am not proposing a limitation upon any other country in the world except our own. The only limitation that is proposed is to preserve American sovereignty. Certainly other nations cannot object to that.

If the reservation should be adopted, other nations can see it, and they can look back to what has been done by the committee with respect to the Yalta agreement, particularly as it affects American sovereignty.

After all, who is Mr. Dulles? He has been rejected for public office by the people of his State. He may be the finest man in the world. But, after all, the question before the Senate is not one of personal diplomacy. We, as Members of the Senate, are the ones who are asked to ratify this document. I know that Mr. Dulles roamed all over the earth and told the representatives of other nations what our country's policy was. But we do not know what their policy is. Mr. Dulles has made mistakes. He recommended Alger Hiss to be secretary of the Carnegie Peace Foundation. Of course that was a mistake. He knows it now. Perhaps there are other mistakes. Let us stop, look, and listen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall vote for the treaty without reservations, briefly for these reasons:

First, I am satisfied that the adoption of the reservations would amount, in fact, to a rejection of the treaty, in the sense that it would have to go back to the 48 nations in the conference for renegotiation. I do not think it follows that because the reservations are an attempt to refer only to the obligations, duties, and liabilities of the United States under the treaty, therefore no other nation would have an interest in the reservations. The treaty is a joint enterprise among the 48 signers thereof, and it must be presumed that their signatures are based upon the assumption that whatever obligations, duties, and liabilities the United States assumed under the treaty when we signed it were at least a part of the consideration which induced the representatives of other nations, in turn, to sign the treaty. Therefore I think the adoption of these reservations would, in effect, amount to a rejection of the treaty.

The second point I wish to make is with regard to the legal concept of sovereignty. Whenever we enter into a treaty which involves conditions which we accept and which involves duties and obligations which we assume, in that sense the treaty affects the sovereignty of the United States. The question is not whether the treaty affects our sovereignty, but in what respects it affects our sovereignty. There is a need for a discourse which time does not now permit in this forum upon the legal implications of the word "sovereignty." I respectfully submit that the term "sovereignty" is being used rather loosely in debate these days. All the major treaties which we have entered into throughout our history have had a direct bearing upon the sovereignty of the United States in the sense that every liability we have assumed under those treaties has affected our sovereignty. The question is, Does this treaty do damage to the sovereign rights of the United States? I think it does not, and therefore I shall vote for the treaty without reservations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. First I inquire, does the Senator from Oregon desire any additional time?

Mr. MORSE. Not on this reservation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, yesterday in the debate the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on page 2501 the RECORD, in the third column, mentioned a question which had been raised by General Bradley, and then went on, speaking of the administrative agreement, to say:

If the agreement is presently not ready, and if our military authorities, speaking through General Bradley, say that their operations might be handicapped and made difficult unless that agreement is first agreed upon between the two countries, it seems to me that is an argument in behalf of taking a little more time upon this treaty.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the administrative agreement entered into between the Government of the United States and the Government of Japan, which appears beginning on page 382 of the Bulletin of the State Department of March 10, 1952, including the two letters which appear on pages 389 and 390 of the Bulletin, to show that the administrative agreement has been entered into.

There being no objection, the agreement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AND JAPAN SIGN ADMINISTRATIVE AGREEMENT

The Department of State announced on February 28 that the United States and Japan had signed at Tokyo on that date an administrative agreement in implementation of the security treaty between Japan and the United States. The security treaty was signed on September 8, 1951, at San Francisco in order to provide an unarmed and defenseless Japan with the necessary protection against the menace of Communist aggression by maintaining United States Armed Forces in and about Japan. This treaty was voluntarily agreed to by Japan in the exercise of its inherent sovereign right of individual and collective self-defense recognized in the treaty of peace with Japan as well as in the Charter of the United Nations.

The agreement conforms in general to the agreements which have been concluded with sovereign countries throughout the world where United States forces are maintained. Concluded on a basis of sovereign equality and trust by direct negotiation between the two countries, the agreement is satisfactory to both the United States and Japanese Governments and will strengthen the close bonds of mutual interest and regard between their two people.

The present administrative agreement, which is an executive agreement, makes the practical administrative arrangements for the disposition of the Armed Forces of the United States called for by the security

treaty. This agreement is within the framework and purposes of the Security Treaty and deals only with the use of facilities and areas, the sharing of costs, the jurisdiction over persons, certain privileges and exemptions, and the method of continuous mutual consultation, which are necessary and appropriate for the United States Armed Forces to carry out effectively their security mission. The agreement does not deal with the problem of possible future increases of Japan's own defensive capacity nor does it include any commitments by the United States or Japan with respect to the action to be taken in an emergency except that the two Governments will consult. So far as concerns the use of facilities and areas in Japan in support of the United Nations' security action in Korea, the Japanese Government in an exchange of notes on September 8, 1951, affirmed its willingness to "permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan" of forces engaged in such United Nations' actions.

By implementing the security treaty between the United States and Japan an important step has been taken in the defense of peace and security in the Pacific area and in the steady progress of democratic nations toward a system of collective security for peace and freedom which has been developing within the framework of the United Nations Charter.

TEXT OF ADMINISTRATIVE AGREEMENT

PREAMBLE

Whereas the United States of America and Japan on September 8, 1951, signed a security treaty which contains provisions for the disposition of United States land, air and sea forces in and about Japan;

And whereas article III of that treaty states that the conditions which shall govern the disposition of the Armed Forces of the United States in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two Governments;

And whereas the United States of America and Japan are desirous of concluding practical administrative arrangements which will give effect to their respective obligations under the security treaty and will strengthen the close bonds of mutual interest and regard between their two peoples;

Therefore, the Governments of the United States of America and of Japan have entered into this agreement in terms as set forth below:

ARTICLE I

In this agreement the expression—

(a) "members of the United States Armed Forces" means the personnel on active duty belonging to the land, sea or air armed services of the United States of America when in the territory of Japan.

(b) "civilian component" means the civilian persons of United States nationality who are in the employ of, serving with, or accompanying the United States Armed Forces in Japan, but excludes persons who are ordinarily resident in Japan or who are mentioned in paragraph 1 of article XIV. For the purpose of this agreement only, dual nationals, United States and Japanese, who are brough to Japan by the United States shall be considered as United States nationals.

(c) "dependents" means

(1) Spouse, and children under 21;

(2) Parents, and children over 21, if dependent for over half their support upon a member of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component.

ARTICLE II

1. Japan agrees to grant to the United States the use of the facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty. Agreements as to specific facilities and areas, not already reached by the two Governments by the effective date of this agreement, shall be concluded by the two Governments through the joint committee provided for in article XXVI of this agreement. "Facilities and areas" include existing furnishings, equipment and fixtures necessary to the operation of such facilities and areas.

2. At the request of either party, the United States and Japan shall review such arrangements and may agree that such facilities and areas shall be returned to Japan or that additional facilities and areas may be provided.

3. The facilities and areas used by the United States Armed Forces shall be returned to Japan whenever they are no longer needed for purposes of this agreement, and the United States agrees to keep the needs for facilities and areas under continual observation with a view toward such return.

4. (a) When facilities and areas such as target ranges and maneuver grounds are temporarily not being used by the United States Armed Forces, interim use may be made by Japanese authorities and nationals provided that it is agreed that such use would not be harmful to the purposes for which the facilities and areas are normally used by the United States Armed Forces.

(b) With respect to such facilities and areas as target ranges and maneuver grounds which are to be used by United States Armed Forces for limited periods of time, the joint committee shall specify in the agreements concerning such facilities and areas the extent to which the provisions of this agreement shall apply.

ARTICLE III

1. The United States shall have the rights, power, and authority within the facilities and areas which are necessary or appropriate for their establishment, use, operation, defense or control. The United States shall also have such rights, power, and authority over land, territorial waters, and airspace adjacent to, or in the vicinities of such facilities and areas, as are necessary to provide access to such facilities and areas for their support, defense, and control. In the exercise outside the facilities and areas of the rights, power, and authority granted in this article, there should be, as the occasion requires, consultation between the two Governments through the joint committee.

2. The United States agrees that the abovementioned rights, power, and authority will not be exercised in such a manner as to interfere unnecessarily with navigation, aviation, communication, or land travel to or from or within the territories of Japan. All questions relating to frequencies, power, and like matters used by apparatus employed by the United States designed to emit electric radiation shall be settled by mutual arrangement. As a temporary measure the United States Armed Forces shall be entitled to use, without radiation interference from Japanese sources, electronic devices of such power, design, type of emission, and frequencies as are reserved for such forces at the time this agreement becomes effective.

3. Operations in the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces shall be carried on with due regard for the public safety.

ARTICLE IV

1. The United States is not obliged, when it returns facilities and areas to Japan on the expiration of this agreement or at an earlier date, to restore the facilities and areas to the condition in which they were at the time they became available to the United States Armed Forces, or to compensate Japan in lieu of such restoration.

2. Japan is not obliged to make any compensation to the United States for any improvements made in the facilities and areas or for the buildings or structures left thereon on the expiration of this agreement or the earlier return of the facilities and areas.

3. The foregoing provisions shall not apply to any construction which the United States may undertake under special arrangements with Japan.

ARTICLE V

1. United States and foreign vessels and aircraft operated by, for, or under the control of the United States for official purposes shall be accorded access to any port or airport of Japan free from toll or landing charges. When cargo or passengers not accorded the exemptions of this agreement are carried on such vessels and aircraft, notification shall be given to the appropriate Japanese authorities, and such cargo or passengers shall be entered according to the laws and regulations of Japan.

2. The vessels and aircraft mentioned in paragraph 1, United States Government-owned vehicles including armor, and members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents shall be accorded access to and movement between facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces and between such facilities and areas and the ports of Japan.

3. When the vessels mentioned in paragraph 1 enter Japanese ports, appropriate notification shall, under normal conditions, be made to the proper Japanese authcrities. Such vessels shall have freedom from compulsory pilotage, but if a pilot is taken pilotage shall be paid for at appropriate rates.

ARTICLE VI

1. All civil and military air-traffic control and communications systems shall be developed in close coordination and shall be integrated to the extent necessary for fulfillment of collective-security interests. Procedures, and any subsequent changes thereto, necessary to effect this coordination and integration will be established by mutual arrangement.

2. Lights and other aids to navigation of vessels and aircraft placed or established in the facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces and in territorial waters adjacent thereto or in the vicinity thereof shall conform to the system in use in Japan. The United States and Japanese authorities which have established such navigation aids shall notify each other of their positions and characteristics and shall give advance notification before making any changes in them or establishing additional navigation aids.

ARTICLE VII

The United States Armed Forces shall have the right to use all public utilities and services belonging to, or controlled or regulated by the Government of Japan, and to enjoy priorities in such use, under conditions no less favorable than those that may be applicable from time to time to the ministries and agencies of the Government of Japan.

ARTICLE VIII

The Japanese Government undertakes to furnish the United States Armed Forces with the following meteorological services under present procedures, subject to such modifications as may from time to time be agreed between the two Governments or as may result from Japan's becoming a member of the International Civil Aviation Organization or the World Meteorological Organization:

(a) Meteorological observations from land and ocean areas including observations from weather ships assigned to positions known as "X" and "T".

(b) Climatological information including periodic summaries and the historical data of the Central Meteorological Observatory.

(c) Telecommunications service to disseminate meteorological information required for the safe and regular operation of aircraft.

(d) Seismographic data including forecasts of the estimated size of tidal waves resulting from earthquakes and areas that might be affected thereby.

ARTICLE IX

1. The United States shall have the right to bring into Japan for purposes of this agreement persons who are members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

2. Members of the United States Armed Forces shall be exempt from Japanese passport and visa laws and regulations. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall be exempt from Japanese laws and regulations on the registration and control of aliens, but shall not be considered as acquiring any right to permanent residence or domicile in the territories of Japan.

3. Upon entry into or departure from Japan members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of the following documents: (a) personal identity card showing name, date of birth, rank and number, service, and photograph; and (b) individual or collective travel order certifying to the status of the individual or group as a member or members of the United States Armed Forces and to the travel ordered. For purposes of their identification while in Japan, members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of the foregoing personal identity card.

4. Members of the civilian component, their dependents, and the dependents of members of the United States Armed Forces shall be in possession of appropriate documentation issued by the United States authorities so that their status may be verified by Japanese authorities upon their entry into or departure from Japan, or while in Japan.

5. If the status of any person brought into Japan under paragraph 1 of this article is altered so that he would no longer be entitled to such admission, the United States authorities shall notify the Japanese authorities and shall, if such person be required by the Japanese authorities to leave Japan, assure that transportation from Japan will be provided within a reasonable time at no cost to the Japanese Government.

ARTICLE X

1. Japan shall accept as valid without a driving test or fee the driving permit or license or military driving permit issued by the United States to a member of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

2. Official vehicles of the United States Armed Forces and the civilian component shall carry distinctive numbered plates or individual markings which will readily identify them.

3. Privately owned vehicles of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall carry Japanese number plates to be acquired under the same condition as those applicable to Japanese nationals.

ARTICLE XI

1. Save as provided in this agreement, members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall be subject to the laws and regulations administered by the customs authorities of Japan.

2. All materials, supplies, and equipment imported by the United States Armed Forces, the authorized procurement agencies of the United States Armed Forces, or by the organizations provided for in article XV, for the official use of the United States Armed Forces or for the use of the members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, and materials, supplies, and equipment which are to be used exclusively by the United States Armed Forces or are ultimately to be incorporated into articles or facilities used by such forces shall be permitted entry into Japan; such entry shall be free from customs duties and other such charges. Appropriate certification shall be made that such materials, supplies, and equipment are being imported by the United States Armed Forces, the authorized procurement agencies of the United States Armed Forces, or by the organizations provided for in article XV, or, in the case of materials, supplies, and equipment to be used exclusively by the United States Armed Forces or ultimately to be incorporated into articles or facilities used by such forces, that delivery thereof is to be taken by the United States Armed Forces for the purposes specified above.

3. Property consigned to and for the personal use of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall be subject to customs duties and other such charges, except that no duties or charges shall be paid with respect to:

(a) Furniture and household goods for their private use imported by the members of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component when they first arrive to serve in Japan or by their dependents when they first arrive for reunion with members of such forces or civilian component, and personal effects for private use brought by the said persons upon entrance.

(b) Vehicles and parts imported by members of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component for the private use of themselves or their dependents.

(c) Reasonable quantities of clothing and household goods of a type which would ordinarily be purchased in the United States for every day for the private use of members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, and their dependents, which are mailed into Japan through United States military post offices.

4. The exemptions granted in paragraphs 2 and 3 shall apply only to cases of importation of goods and shall not be interpreted as refunding customs duties and domestic excises collected by the customs authorities at the time of entry in cases of purchases of goods on which such duties and excises have already been collected.

5. Customs examination shall not be made in the following cases:

(a) Units and members of the United States Armed Forces under orders entering or leaving Japan;

(b) Official documents under official seal;

(c) Mail in United States military postal channels and military cargo shipped on a United States Government bill of lading.

6. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the Japanese and United States authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods imported into Japan free of duty shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not entitled to import such goods free of duty.

7. Goods imported into Japan free from customs duties and other such charges pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 may be reexported free from customs duties and other such charges.

8. The United States Armed Forces, in cooperation with Japanese authorities, shall take such steps as are necessary to prevent abuse of privileges granted to the United States Armed Forces, members of such forces the civilian component, and their dependents in accordance with this Article.

9. (a) In order to prevent offenses against laws and regulations administered by the customs authorities of the Japanese Government, the Japanese authorities and the United States Armed Forces shall assist each other in the conduct of inquiries and the collection of evidence.

(b) The United States Armed Forces shall render all assistance within their power to insure that articles liable to seizure by, or on behalf of, the customs authorities of the Japanese Government are handed to those authorities.

(c) The United States Armed Forces shall render all assistance within their power to insure the payment of duties, taxes, and penalties payable by members of such forces or for the civilian component, or their dependents.

(d) Vehicles and articles belonging to the United States Armed Forces seized by the customs authorities of the Japanese Government in connection with an offense against its customs or fiscal laws or regulations shall be handed over to the appropriate authorities of the force concerned.

ARTICLE XII

1. The United States shall have the right to contract for any supplies or construction work to be furnished or undertaken in Japan for purposes of, or authorized by this agreement, without restriction as to choice of supplier or person who does the construction work.

2. Materials, supplies, equipment, and services which are required from local sources for the maintenance of the United States Armed Forces and the procurement of which may have an adverse effect on the economy of Japan shall be procured in coordination with, and, when desirable, through and with the assistance of, the competent authorities of Japan.

3. Materials, supplies, equipment, and services procured for official purposes in Japan by the United States Armed Forces, or by authorized procurement agencies of the United States Armed Forces upon appropriate certification, shall be exempt from the following Japanese taxes:

(a) Commodity tax.

(b) Traveling tax.

(c) Gasoline tax.

(d) Electricity and gas tax.

Materials, supplies, equipment, and services procured for ultimate use by the United States Armed Forces shall be exempt from commodity and gasoline taxes upon appropriate certification by the United States Armed Forces. With respect to any present or future Japanese taxes not specifically referred to in this article which might be found to constitute a significant and readily identifiable part of the gross purchase price of materials, supplies, equipment, and services procured by the United States Armed Forces, or for ultimate use by such forces, the two Governments will agree upon a procedure for granting such exemption or relief therefrom as is consistent with the purposes of this article.

4. Local labor requirements of the United States Armed Forces or civilian component shall be satisfied with the assistance of the Japanese authorities.

5. The obligations for the withholding and payment of income tax and of social-security contributions and, except as may otherwise be mutually agreed, the conditions of employment and work, such as those relating to wages and supplementary payments, the conditions for the protection of workers, and the rights of workers concerning labor relations shall be those laid down by the legislation of Japan.

6. Members of the civilian component shall not be subject to Japanese laws or regulations with respect to terms and conditions of employment.

7. Neither members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, nor their dependents, shall by reason of this article enjoy any exemption from taxes or similar charges relating to personal purchases of goods and services in Japan chargeable under Japanese legislation.

8. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the Japanese and United States authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods purchased in Japan exempt from the taxes referred to in paragraph 3, shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not entitled to purchase such goods exempt from such tax.

ARTICLE XIII

1. The United States Armed Forces shall not be subject to taxes or similar charges on property held, used, or transferred by such forces in Japan.

2. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component and their dependents shall not be liable to pay any Japanese taxes to the Japanese Government or to any other taxing agency in Japan on income received as a result of their service with or employment by the United States Armed Forces or by the organizations provided for in article XV. The provisions of this article do not exempt such persons from payment of Japanese taxes on income derived from Japanese sources nor do they exempt United States citizens who for United States income-tax purposes claim Japanese residence from payment of Japanese taxes on income. Periods during which such persons are in Japan solely by reason of being members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, or their dependents shall not be considered as periods of residence or domicile in Japan for the purpose of Japanese taxation.

3. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents shall be exempt from taxation in Japan on the holding, use, transfer inter se, or transfer by death of movable property, tangible or intangible, the presence of which in Japan is due solely to the temporary presence of these persons in Japan, provided that such exemption shall not apply to property held for the purpose of investment or the conduct of business in Japan or to any intangible property registered in Japan. There is no obligation under this article to grant exemption from taxes payable in respect of the use of roads by private vehicles.

ARTICLE XIV

1. Persons, including corporations organized under the laws of the United States, and their employees who are ordinarily resident in the United States and whose presence in Japan is solely for the purpose of executing contracts with the United States for the benefit of the United States Armed Forces shall, except as provided in this article, be subject to the laws and regulations of Japan.

2. Upon certification by appropriate United States authorities as to their identity, such persons and their employees shall be accorded the following benefits of this agreement:

(a) Rights of accession and movement, as provided for in article V, paragraph 2;

(b) Entry into Japan in accordance with the provisions of article IX;

(c) The exemption from customers' duties and other such charges provided for in article XI, paragraph 3, for members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents;

(d) If authorized by the United States Government, the right to use the services of the organizations provided for in article XV;

(e) Those provided for in article XIX, paragraph 2, for members of the Armed Forces of the United States, the civilian components, and their dependents;

(f) If authorized by the United States Government, the right to use military payment certificates, as provided in article XX;

(g) The use of postal facilities provided for in article XXI;

(h) Exemption from the laws and regulations of Japan with respect to terms and conditions of employment.

3. Such persons and their employees shall be so described in their passports and their arrival, departure, and their residence while in Japan shall from time to time be notified by the United States Armed Forces to the Japanese authorities.

4. Upon certification by an authorized officer of the United States Armed Forces depreciable assets except houses, held, used, or transferred, by such persons and their employees exclusively for the execution of contracts referred to in paragraph 1 shall not be subject to taxes or similar charges of Japan.

5. Upon certification by an authorized officer of the United States Armed Forces, such persons and their employees shall be exempt from taxation in Japan on the holding, use, transfer by death, or transfer to persons or agencies entitled to tax exemption under this agreement, of movable property, tangible or intangible, the presence of which in Japan is due solely to the temporary presence of these persons in Japan, provided that such exemption shall not apply to property held for the purpose of investment or the conduct of other business in Japan or to any intangible property registered in Japan. There is no obligation under this article to grant exemption from taxes payable in respect of the use of roads by private vehicles.

6. The persons and their employees referred to in paragraph 1 shall not be liable to pay income or corporation taxes to the Japanese Government or to any other taxing agency in Japan on any income derived under a contract made in the United States with the United States Government in connection with the construction, maintenance, or operation of any of the facilities or areas covered by this agreement.

The provisions of this paragraph do not exempt such persons from payment of income or corporation taxes on income derived from Japanese sources, nor do they exempt such persons and their employees who, for United States income-tax purposes, claim Japanese residence, from payment of Japanese taxes on income. Periods during which such persons are in Japan solely in connection with the execution of a contract with the United States Government shall not be considered periods of residence or domicile in Japan for the purposes of such taxation.

7. Japanese authorities shall have the primary right to exercise jurisdiction over the persons and their employees referred to in paragraph 1 of this article in relation to offenses committed in Japan and punishable by the law of Japan. In those cases in which the Japanese authorities decide not to exercise such jurisdiction they shall notify the military authorities of the United States as soon as possible. Upon such notification the military authorities of the United States shall have the right to exercise such jurisdiction over the persons referred to as is conferred on them by the law of the United States.

ARTICLE XV

1. (a) Navy exchanges, post exchanges, messes, social clubs, theaters, newspapers and other non-appropriated-fund organizations authorized and regulated by the United States military authorities may be established in the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces for the use of members of such forces, the civilian component, and their dependents. Except as otherwise provided in this agreement, such organizations shall not be subject to Japanese regulations, license, fees, taxes or similar controls.

(b) When a newspaper authorized and regulated by the United States military authorities is sold to the general public, it shall be subject to Japanese regulations, license, fees, taxes or similar controls so far as such circulation is concerned.

2. No Japanese tax shall be imposed on sales of merchandise and services by such organizations, except as provided in paragraph 1 (b), but purchases within Japan of merchandise and supplies by such organizations shall be subject to Japanese taxes.

3. Except as such disposal may be authorized by the United States and Japanese authorities in accordance with mutually agreed conditions, goods which are sold by such organizations shall not be disposed of in Japan to persons not authorized to make purchases from such organizations.

4. The obligations for the withholding and payment of income tax and of social security contributions, and, except as may otherwise be mutually agreed, the conditions of employment and work, such as those relating to wages and supplementary payments, the conditions for the protection of workers, and the rights of workers concerning labor relations shall be those laid down by the legislation of Japan.

5. The organizations referred to in this article shall provide such information to the Japanese authorities as is required by Japanese tax legislation.

ARTICLE XVI

It is the duty of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents to respect the law of Japan and to abstain from any activity inconsistent with the spirit of this Agreement, and, in particular, from any political activity in Japan.

ARTICLE XVII

1. Upon the coming into force with respect to the United States of the "Agreement between the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces," signed at London on June 19, 1951, the United States will immediately conclude with Japan, at the option of Japan, an agreement on criminal jurisdiction similar to the corresponding provisions of that agreement.

2. Pending the coming into force with respect to the United States of the North Atlantic Treaty agreement referred to in paragraph 1, the United States service courts and authorities shall have the right to exercise within Japan exclusive jurisdiction over all offenses which may be committed in Japan by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, excluding their dependents who have only Japanese nationality. Such jurisdiction may in any case be waived by the United States.

3. While the jurisdiction provided in paragraph 2 is effective, the following provisions shall apply:

(a) Japanese authorities may arrest members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, or their dependents outside facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces for the commission or attempted commission of an offense, but in the event of such an arrest, the individual or individuals shall be immediately turned over to the United States Armed Forces. Any person fleeing from the jurisdiction of the United States Armed Forces and found in any place outside the facilities and areas may on request be arrested by the Japanese authorities and turned over to the United States authorities.

(b) The United States authorities shall have the exclusive right to arrest within facilities and areas in use by United States Armed Forces. Any person subject to the jurisdiction of Japan and found in any such facility or area will, on request, be turned over to the Japanese authorities.

(c) The United States authorities may, under due process of law, arrest, in the vicinity of such a facility or area, any person in the commission or attempted commission of an offense against the security of that facility or area. Any such person not subject to the jurisdiction of the United States Armed Forces shall be immediately turned over to Japanese authorities.

(d) Subject to the provisions of paragraph 3 (c), the activities outside the facilities and areas of military police of the United States Armed Forces shall be limited to the extent necessary for maintaining order and discipline of and arresting members of the

United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

(e) The authorities of the United States and Japan shall cooperate in making available witnesses and evidence for criminal investigations and other criminal proceedings in their respective tribunals and shall assist each other in the making of investigations. In the event of a criminal contempt, perjury, or an obstruction of justice before a tribunal which does not have criminal jurisdiction over the individual committing the offense, he shall be tried by a tribunal which has jurisdiction over him as if he had committed the offense before it.

(f) The United States Armed Forces shall have the exclusive right of removing from Japan members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents. The United States will give sympathetic consideration to a request by the Government of Japan for the removal of any such person for good cause.

(g) Japanese authorities shall have no right of search or seizure, with respect to any persons or property, within facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, or with respect to property of the United States Armed Forces wherever situated.

At the request of the Japanese authorities, the United States authorities undertake, within the limits of their authority, to make such search and seizure and inform the Japanese authorities as to the results thereof. In the event of a judgment concerning such property, except property owned or utilized by the United States Government, the United States will turn over such property to the Japanese authorities for disposition in accordance wih the judgment. Japanese authorities shall have no right of search or seizure outside facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, with respect to the persons or property of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, or their dependents, except as to such persons as may be arrested in accordance with paragraph 3 (a) of this article, and except as to cases where such search is required for the purpose of arresting offenders under the jurisdiction of Japan.

(h) A death sentence shall not be carried out in Japan by the United States Armed Forces if the legislation of Japan does not provide for such punishment in a similar case.

4. The United States undertakes that the United States service courts and authorities shall be willing and able to try and, on conviction, to punish all offenses against the laws of Japan which members of the United States Armed Forces, civilian component, and their dependents may be alleged on sufficient evidence to have committed in Japan, and to investigate and deal appropriately with any alleged offense committed by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, which may be brought to their notice by Japanese authorities or which they may find to have taken place. The United States further undertakes to notify the Japanese authorities of the disposition made by United States service courts of all cases arising under this paragraph. The United States shall give sympathetic consideration to a request from Japanese authorities for a waiver of its jurisdiction in cases arising under this paragraph where the Japanese Government considers such waiver to be of particular importance. Upon such waiver, Japan may exercise its own jurisdiction.

5. In the event the option referred to in paragraph 1 is not exercised by Japan, the jurisdiction provided for in paragraph 2 and the following paragraphs shall continue in effect. In the event the said North Atlantic Treaty agreement has not come into effect within 1 year from the effective date of this agreement, the United States will, at the request of the Japanese Government, reconsider the subject of jurisdiction over offenses committed in Japan by members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents.

ARTICLE XVIII

1. Each party waives all its claims against the other party for injury or death suffered in Japan by a member of its armed forces, or a civilian governmental employee, while such member or employee was engaged in the performance of his official duties, in cases where such injury or death was caused by a member of the Armed Forces, or a civilian employee of the other party acting in the performance of his official duties.

2. Each party waives all its claims against the other party for damage to any property in Japan owned by it, if such damage was caused by a member of the Armed Forces or a civilian governmental employee of the other party in the performance of his official duties.

3. Claims, other than contractual, arising out of acts or omissions of members of, or employees of the United States Armed Forces in the performance of official duty or out of any other act, omission or occurrence for which the United States Armed Forces is legally responsible, arising incident to noncombatant activities and causing injury, death, or property damage in Japan to third parties shall be dealt with by Japan in accordance with the following provisions:

(a) Claims shall be filed within 1 year from the date on which they arise and shall be considered and settled or adjudicated in accordance with the laws and regulations of Japan with respect to claims arising from the activities of its own employees.

(b) Japan may settle any such claims, and payment of the amount agreed upon or determined by adjudication shall be made by Japan in yen.

(c) Such payment, whether made pursuant to a settlement or to adjudication of the case by a competent tribunal of Japan, or the final adjudication by such a tribunal denying payment, shall be binding and conclusive.

(d) The cost incurred in satisfying claims pursuant to the preceding subparagraphs shall be shared on terms to be agreed by the two Governments.

(e) In accordance with procedures to be established, a statement of all claims approved or disapproved by Japan pursuant to this paragraph, together with the findings in each case, and a statement of the sums paid by Japan, shall be sent to the United States periodically, with a request for reimbursement of the share to be paid by the United States. Such reimbursements shall be made within the shortest possible time in yen.

4. Each party shall have the primary right, in the execution of the foregoing paragraphs, to determine whether its personnel were engaged in the performance of official duty. Such determination shall be made as soon as possible after the arising of the claim concerned. When the other party disagrees with the results of such determination, that party may bring the matter before the joint committee for consultation under the provisions of article XXVI of this agreement.

5. Claims against members of or employees of the United States Armed Forces arising out of tortious acts or omissions in Japan not done in the performance of official duty shall be dealt with in the following manner:

(a) The Japanese authorities shall consider the claim and assess compensation to the claimant in a fair and just manner taking into account all the circumstances of the case including the conduct of the injured person, and shall prepare a report on the matter.

(b) The report shall be delivered to the United States authorities who shall then decide without delay whether they will offer an ex gratia payment, and if so, of what amount.

(c) If an offer of ex gratia payment is made, and accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction of his claim, the United States authorities shall make the payment themselves and inform the Japanese authorities of their decision and of the sum paid.

(d) Nothing in this paragraph shall affect the jurisdiction of the Japanese courts to entertain an action against a member or employee of the United States Armed Forces, unless and until there has been payment in full satisfaction of the claim.

6. (a) Members of and civilian employees of the United States Armed Forces, excluding employees who have only Japanese nationality, shall not be subject to suit in Japan with respect to claims specified in paragraph 3, but shall be subject to the civil jurisdiction of Japanese courts with respect to all other types of cases.

(b) In case any private movable property, excluding that in use by the United States Armed Forces, which is subject to compulsory execution under Japanese law is within the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, the United States authorities shall upon the request of Japanese courts, possess and turn over such property to the Japanese authorities.

(c) The United States authorities shall cooperate with the Japanese authorities in making available witnesses and evidence for civil proceedings in Japanese tribunals.

7. Disputes arising out of contracts concerning the procurement of materials, supplies, equipment, services, and labor by or for the United States Armed Forces, which are not resolved by the parties to the contract concerned, may be submitted to the Joint Committee for conciliation, provided that the provisions of this paragraph shall not prejudice any right which the parties to the contract may have to file a civil suit.

ARTICLE XIX

1. Members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, shall be subject to the foreign exchange controls of the Japanese Government.

2. The preceding paragraph shall not be construed to preclude the transmission into or outside of Japan of United States dollars or dollar instruments representing the official funds of the United States or realized as a result of service or employment in connection with this agreement by members of the United States Armed Forces and the civilian component, or realized by such persons and their dependents from sources outside of Japan.

3. The United States authorities shall take suitable measures to preclude the abuse of the privileges stipulated in the preceding paragraph or circumvention of the Japanese foreign exchange controls.

ARTICLE XX

1. (a) United States military payment certificates denominated in dollars may be used by persons authorized by the United States for internal transactions within the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces. The United States Government will take appropriate action to insure that authorized personnel are prohibited from engaging in transactions involving military payment certificates except as authorized by United States regulations. The Japanese Government will take necessary action to prohibit unauthorized persons from engaging in transactions involving military payment certificates and with the aid of United States authorities will undertake to apprehend and punish any person or persons under its jurisdiction involved in the

counterfeiting or uttering of counterfeit military payment certificates.

(b) It is agreed that the United States authorities will apprehend and punish members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, or their dependents, who tender military payment certificates to unauthorized persons and that no obligation will be due to such unauthorized persons or to the Japanese Government or its agencies from the United States or any of its agencies as a result of any unauthorized use of military payment certificates within Japan.

2. In order to exercise control of military payment certificates the United States shall have the right to designate certain American financial institutions to maintain and operate, under United States supervision, facilities for the use of persons authorized by the United States to use military payment certificates. Institutions authorized to maintain military banking facilities will establish and maintain such facilities physically separated from their Japanese commercial banking business, with personnel whose sole duty is to maintain and operate such facilities. Such facilities shall be permitted to maintain United States currency bank accounts and to perform all financial transactions in connection therewith including receipt and remission of funds to the extent provided by article XIX, paragraph 2, of this agreement.

ARTICLE XXI

The United States shall have the right to establish and operate, within the facilities and areas in use by the United States Armed Forces, United States military post offices for the use of members of the United States Armed Forces, the civilian component, and their dependents, for the transmission of mail between United States military post offices in Japan and between such military post offices and other United States post offices.

ARTICLE XXII

The United States shall have the right to enroll and train all eligible United States citizens, residing in Japan, in the Reserve organizations of the Armed Forces of the United States, except that the prior consent of the Japanese Government shall be obtained in the case of persons employed by the Japanese Government.

ARTICLE XXIII

The United States and Japan will cooperate in taking such steps as may from time to time be necessary to insure the security of the United States Armed Forces, the members thereof, the civilian component, their dependents, and their property. The Japanese Government agrees to seek such legislation and to take such other action as may be necessary to insure the adequate security and protection within its territory of installations, equipment, property, records and official information of the United States, and for the punishment of offenders under the applicable laws of Japan.

ARTICLE XXIV

In the event of hostilities, or imminently threatened hostilities, in the Japan area, the Governments of the United States and Japan shall immediately consult together with a view to taking necessary joint measures for the defense of that area and to carrying out the purposes of article I of the security treaty.

ARTICLE XXV

1. It is agreed that the United States will bear for the duration of this agreement without cost to Japan all expenditures incident to the maintenance of the United States Armed Forces in Japan except those to be borne by Japan as provided in paragraph 2.

2. It is agreed that Japan will:

(a) Furnish for the duration of this agreement without cost to the United States and make compensation where appropriate to the owners and suppliers thereof all facilities, areas and rights of way, including facilities and areas jointly used such as those at airfields and ports, as provided in articles II and III.

(b) Make available without cost to the United States, until the effective date of any new arrangements reached as a result of periodic reexamination, an amount of Japanese currency equivalent to $155 million per annum for the purpose of procurement by the United States of transportation and other requisite services and supplies in Japan. The rate of exchange at which yen payments will be credited shall be the official par value, or that rate considered most favorable by the United States which on the day of payment is available to any party, authorized by the Japanese Government or used in any transaction with any party by the Japanese Government or its agencies or by Japanese banks authorized to deal in foreign exchange, and which, if both countries have agreed par values with the International Monetary Fund, is not prohibited by the articles of the agreement of the fund.

3. It is agreed that arrangements will be effected between the Governments of the United States and Japan for accounting applicable to financial transactions arising out of this agreement.

ARTICLE XXVI

1. A joint committee shall be established as the means for consultation between the United States and Japan on all matters requiring mutual consultation regarding the implementation of this agreement. In particular, the joint committee shall serve as the means for consultation in determining the facilities and areas in Japan which are required for the use of the United States in carrying out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty.

2. The joint committee shall be composed of a representative of the United States and of Japan, each of whom shall have one or more deputies and a staff. The joint committee shall determine its own procedures and arrange for such auxiliary organs and administrative services as may be required. The joint committee shall be so organized that it may meet immediately at any time at the request of the representative of either the United States or Japan.

3. If the joint committee is unable to resolve any matter, it shall refer that matter to the respective governments for further consideration through appropriate channels.

ARTICLE XXVII

1. This agreement shall come into force on the date on which the security treaty between the United States and Japan enters into force.

2. Each party to this agreement undertakes to seek from its legislature necessary budgetary and legislative action with respect to provisions of this agreement which require such action for their execution.

ARTICLE XXVIII

Either party may at any time request the revision of any article of this agreement, in which case the two Governments shall enter into negotiation through appropriate channels.

ARTICLE XXIX

This agreement, and agreed revisions thereof, shall remain in force while the security treaty remains in force unless earlier terminated by agreement between the parties.

EXCHANGE OF NOTES

UNITED STATES NOTE TO JAPAN

TOKYO, *February 28, 1952.*

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to our discussion on the terms of the administrative agreement signed today, in which your excellency stated as the opinion of the Japanese Government that, as the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers comes to an end on the coming into force of the treaty of peace with Japan, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces on the basis of occupation requisition also comes to an end on the same date; thereafter, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces must be based upon agreement between the two Governments, subject to the rights which each might have under the treaty of peace with Japan, the security treaty, and the administrative agreement. I hereby confirm that such is also the opinion of the United States Government.

In article II, paragraph 1, of the administrative agreement, it is stipulated that, "agreements as to specific facilities and areas, not already reached by the two Governments by the effective date of this agreement, shall be concluded by the two Governments through the joint committee provided for in article XXVI of this agreement." The United States Government is confident that our two Governments are agreed that consultation shall be on an urgent basis in order to complete such arrangements at the earliest possible date. With this in mind, the United States Government is prepared to join with the Japanese Government in constituting a preliminary working group, consisting of a representative and the necessary staff from each Government to begin such consultations immediately, with the understanding that the arrangements made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the administrative agreement.

However, unavoidable delays may arise in the determination and preparation of facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty. It would be much appreciated, therefore, if Japan would grant the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the treaty of peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements.

Accept, excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

DEAN RUSK,
Special Representative of the President of the United States.

JAPANESE NOTE TO THE UNITED STATES

TOKYO, *February 28, 1952.*

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your excellency's note of today's date in which your excellency has informed me as follows:

"I have the honor to refer to our discussion on the terms of the administrative agreement signed today, in which your excellency stated as the opinion of the Japanese Government that, as the occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers comes to an end on the coming into force of the treaty of peace with Japan, the use of facilities and areas by United States forces on the basis of occupation requisition also comes to an end on the same date; thereafter the use of facilities and areas by United States forces must be based upon agreement between the two Governments, subject to the rights which each might have under the treaty of peace with Japan, the security treaty, and the administrative agreement. I hereby confirm that such is also the opinion of the United States Government.

"In article II, paragraph 1, of the administrative agreement it is stipulated that 'agreements as to specific facilities and areas, not already reached by the two Governments by the effective date of this agreement, shall be concluded by the two Governments through the joint committee provided for

in article XXVI of this Agreement. The United States Government is confident that our two Governments are agreed that consultation shall be on an urgent basis in order to complete such arrangements at the earliest possible date. With this in mind, the United States Government is prepared to join with the Japanese Government in constituting a preliminary working group, consisting of a representative and the necessary staff from each Government, to begin such consultations immediately, with the understanding that the arrangements made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the Administrative Agreement.

"However, unavoidable delays may arise in the determination and preparation of facilities and areas necessary to carry out the purposes stated in article I of the security treaty. It would be much appreciated, therefore, if Japan would grant the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the treaty of peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements."

The Japanese Government fully shares the desire of the United States Government to initiate consultations on an urgent basis in order to complete arrangements for the use of facilities and areas at the earliest possible date. The Japanese Government agrees, therefore, to the immediate constitution of the preliminary working group referred to in Your Excellency's note, with the understanding that the arrangements made by the preliminary working group shall be put into effect as agreed and that the task of the preliminary working group would be taken over by the joint committee upon the effective date of the Administrative Agreement.

With full appreciation of the contents of Your Excellency's note, I have the honor, on behalf of the Japanese Government, to confirm that the Japanese Government will grant to the United States the continued use of those particular facilities and areas, with respect to which agreements and arrangements have not been completed by the expiration of 90 days after the effective date of the treaty of peace with Japan, pending the completion of such agreements and arrangements.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

KATSUO OKAZAKI,
Minister of State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not wish to take much of the time of the Senate, except to say that every treaty we negotiate, every treaty we sign, does not destroy our sovereignty but it does affect the exercise of that sovereignty. With respect to the particular agreements we make, we agree to forego the exercise of sovereignty as against those commitments.

This reservation says:

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy—

There is nothing there except the promises which we make. It does not otherwise affect our foreign policy—

its military establishment—

It does not affect our Military Establishment, except that it gives us more authority than we now have, under which we can station troops in Japan to see that she is not overrun or attacked—

and its domestic concerns—

This treaty does not affect our domestic concerns in any manner whatever.

or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

So I hope, Mr. President, that the reservation will be rejected. I am in agreement with the Senator from Oregon that we ought to ratify this treaty without reservations. It has been very carefully worked out, over a long period of time, by a very eminent representative of this Government, Mr. John Foster Dulles, a former distinguished Member of this body. I have confidence that this treaty is in our interest, and that it ought not to be modified, changed, or weakened by the proposed reservations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to reservation No. 1 to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The reservation will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The reservation was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment, and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McMahon
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Holland	Murray
Byrd	Hunt	Neely
Cain	Ives	Nixon
Capehart	Jenner	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Kem	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kilgore	Seaton
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Long	Sparkman
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Ecton	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Tobey
Ferguson	Maybank	Underwood
Flanders	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to reservation No. 1, offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] for himself and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understand, a vote of "yea" is a vote in favor of agreeing to the reservation, and a vote of "nay" is a vote against the reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—25

Brewster	Ecton	McCarran
Bricker	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bridges	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Watkins
Cain	Jenner	Welker
Capehart	Kem	Williams
Dirksen	Long	Young
Dworshak	Malone	
Eastland	Martin	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Frear	Johnston, S. C.
Anderson	Fulbright	Kilgore
Benton	George	Knowland
Byrd	Gillette	Lehman
Carlson	Hayden	Magnuson
Case	Hennings	Maybank
Clements	Hill	McClellan
Connally	Holland	McFarland
Cordon	Hunt	McKellar
Douglas	Ives	McMahon
Ellender	Johnson, Colo.	Millikin
Flanders	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney

Moody	Pastore	Stennis
Morse	Robertson	Thye
Mundt	Russell	Tobey
Murray	Saltonstall	Underwood
Neely	Seaton	Wiley
Nixon	Smith, N. J.	
O'Conor	Sparkman	

NOT VOTING—16

Bennett	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Taft
Green	Lodge	
Hoey	O'Mahoney	

So reservation No. 1, offered by Mr. JENNER, for himself and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I call up reservation No. 2 to the Japanese Peace Treaty, submitted by me for myself and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reservation will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty, subject to the following reservation and understanding, which is hereby made a part and condition of this resolution:

"RESERVATION NO. 2

"Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to diminish or prejudice in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied Powers as defined in such treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, or any other territories, rights or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer on the Soviet Union any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto, and nothing in such treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions of the so-called Yalta agreement of February 11, 1945, or the so-called Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, at the outset, before referring to reservation No. 2, I wish to place in the RECORD a copy of a document I received yesterday from the Parliamentarian of the Senate, Mr. Watkins. I ask that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RATIFICATION OF TREATIES

After the Senate has advised and consented to the ratification of a treaty, "The resolution of the Senate, certified by its secretary, is then delivered to the President, and is his warrant for his ratification of the treaty, an act which he is then, and not till then, authorized to perform. It is not intimated by this that because of the consent of the Senate, he is required to ratify the treaty, for after receiving the authority he may proceed or not at his discretion."

"But the necessary advice and consent of the Senate may be conditional or qualified; the nature of the condition is in the discretion of the Senate.

"What is now commonly called an amendment of a treaty by the Senate, is in reality a condition; the Senate consents on condition that the President is willing and able to secure the assent of the other power to the proposed amendment. If the President is unwilling to submit the proposed amendment to the other power, or if, upon such submission, it is not agreed to, the condition is not fulfilled, the instrument of ratification cannot be executed, and the treaty fails.

"The condition prescribed by the Senate, whether by way of amendment or otherwise, is expressed in the resolution of advice and consent to the ratification, and thus the President is made aware of the condition upon his receipt of the Senate resolution."

The above quoted matter is taken from a book by David Hunter Miller, special assistant in the Department of State, entitled "Reservations to Treaties, Their Effect, and the Procedure in Regard Thereto," pages 1 and 4.

After citing certain cases of ratification where the Senate had made changes in treaties, either in their texts or by reservations to the resolution of ratification, Mr. Miller makes this statement on page 76:

"Considering the matter in principle, and in the light of the foregoing precedents, a reservation to a treaty may be defined as 'a formal declaration relating to the terms of the treaty made by one of the contracting powers and communicated to the other contracting power or powers at or prior to the delivery of the instrument of ratification of the declarant.'

"One conclusion supported by all of the foregoing precedents is that the declaration, whether in the nature of an explanation, an understanding, an interpretation, or reservation of any kind, must be agreed to by the other party to the treaty. In default of such acceptance, the treaty fails, as in the case of the Naturalization Treaty with Turkey of 1874, which, so to speak, failed twice; in 1875, when we refused to accept the Turkish interpretation, and in 1889, when the Ottoman Government refused to accept the 'understanding' of the Senate."

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the document or memorandum from the Parliamentarian clearly shows that when Senators state, "If you adopt these reservations, a renegotiation of the treaty will be required," such statements are entirely incorrect, because in the case of the Yalta agreement the Foreign Relations Committee has already made what is called an explanation or a declaration, and from reading the last paragraph of the memorandum prepared by the Parliamentarian, we find that one conclusion which is supported by all the precedents is that a declaration regarding a treaty, whether in the nature of an explanation, an understanding, an interpretation, or a reservation of any kind, must be agreed by the other parties to the treaty. So, Mr. President, what the Foreign Relations Committee already has done in committee will require that this treaty go back for reconsideration by the other nations to the treaty.

However, that does not mean there will be renegotiation; that means that the declaration or explanation can be considered informally, by telephone, by word of mouth. If there is no objection, it will be all right. If there is objection, there will have to be renegotiation.

I thought that question should be clarified, for the information of all Members of the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Let me call the attention of the Senator from Indiana to the fact that in connection with ratification of the League of Nations Covenant, Charles Evans Hughes, then a very prominent lawyer and former Governor of New York, pointed out, in effect, the same thing, namely, that the so-called reservations were in effect interpretations, and did not require resubmission of the treaty to negotiation. He was very clear on that point. I think it was discussed in the debate which occurred in the Senate at that time, and I think it was clearly understood by the Senators at that time as being a fact.

Mr. JENNER. The Senator from Utah is entirely correct.

Mr. President, I have already asked that the statement prepared by the Parliamentarian be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. A few minutes ago the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] said he had conferred with Mr. Dulles and all the experts who know anything at all about the treaty with Japan. As the Senator from Indiana will recall, I asked the Senator from New Jersey whether he had conferred with General MacArthur.

Mr. JENNER. They did not confer with General MacArthur.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is true. Does the Senator from Indiana believe that General MacArthur is an expert and knows anything at all about the economic, political, and military background of Japan, and should be consulted as one of the experts who knows something about the question which is before this body today?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, on my time?

Mr. JENNER. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, I would have thought that in regard to a matter of this importance, a peace treaty which will affect the peace and security of the whole Asian continent, General MacArthur, who has spent a great part of his life in the Orient, and is considered an authority on affairs in the Orient, would have been called to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee. However, when I searched the record, I found that he was not called before the committee.

The Senator from Idaho will recall that in my remarks in the Senate on February 20, I stated that General MacArthur, Secretary Johnson, and others had laid down a basis for a simple treaty. However, when we go through this legal maze of treaties, all entwined with administrative agreements, and causing the future of the United States of America to be entwined with that of the United Nations, which has Russia as a member of its board of directors, and which, if our Government has its way, will have Red China as a member of its board of directors, we find that the treaties will limit the sovereignty of the United States, and that in that connection the rights and freedoms of the people of the United States are bargained away, and the American flag and American boys are placed under the say so of the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield at this point?

Mr. JENNER. Does the Senator from New Jersey ask me to yield in my time or in his time?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I ask the Senator from Indiana to yield to me in my time.

Mr. JENNER. Very well; I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The question asked me by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] was whether I had submitted these reservations to General MacArthur. My reply was that I had not.

I certainly talked to General MacArthur about this treaty in 1949, and I have talked to him about it since then, following his return to the United States. I talked to him on this subject two or three times—not regarding the details of the treaty, but regarding the whole approach to it; and I know that Mr. Dulles has done so. General MacArthur is the best living authority on the subject.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me on this point?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I should like to ask the Senator from New Jersey whether General MacArthur was consulted regarding the later drafts of the treaty, of whether his advice was obtained in connection with only the original draft of the treaty.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have not seen General MacArthur since the treaty was signed, but I know that before it was signed he was consulted fully about it.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I can only say that General MacArthur was not called to testify before the committee. I consider General MacArthur an expert on affairs in the Far East.

Be that as it may, the whole approach may have been approved by almost anyone, but the details are also most important. I refer to this maze, this legal mess, this reading of one treaty with another, and the administrative agreements. That is where the United States is losing its sovereignty and where we are tying our future and mortgaging our future to a determination of the United Nations, and how we would be creating by our own signatures a pattern for another Korea, in connection with which we would have no say so, but would be directed by the United Nations' spider web.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I only have 15 minutes, and I have not even reached reservation 2; but I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a moment.

Mr. CASE. Purely in order that it may be clear, the last clause refers to the so-called Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945. That refers to Europe. Is that what is intended by reference to the Potsdam declaration?

Mr. JENNER. I may answer the Senator by saying that I mean both. I care not whether it be the Yalta agreement of July 26, or the Potsdam agreement of August 1, the same parties were present; the same Machiavellian diplomacy was followed there; and although Potsdam does not give the Kurile Islands or the Sakhalin Islands to Russia, or to anyone, it leaves the matter hanging in the air. It does not even give them to the United States under a protectorate. But the fact is that Russia occupies them. Of course, at Yalta we gave them all to Russia. At Potsdam, we did not. We did not give them to anyone. But, in effect, we gave them to Russia, because Russia is occupying them; and from those very islands at this moment come the Communists who are infiltrating the Japanese economy.

Mr. CASE. The Senator apparently wants the reservation to apply to both agreements.

Mr. JENNER. I mean to include both, because, in point of time, those agreements were only 4 days apart. The negotiations were conducted by the same parties. I do not know why we should live up to either the Potsdam or Yalta agreement, since Russia has time after time broken both agreements; and I do not know why we, in this treaty, must go back to undo what Theodore Roosevelt did through the Treaty of Portsmouth—and I do not know that we need be ashamed of what he did in that treaty—but that is what we are doing. We are going back to hand all these things to Russia.

This reservation does not affect the declaration of the Foreign Relations Committee, except that it will exclude reaffirmation of the Potsdam agreements and the commitments made at Yalta. Both were proposed.

I may say to the Senator that we took from Japan the territories she received when Theodore Roosevelt helped settle the Russo-Japanese War, and added to the domain of Japan, the Kurile Islands, which never belonged to Russia. The Kurile Islands never were Russian islands. It is perhaps a singular thing. In any event, there was never an agreement made. If there was, it has never been kept by Russia, and it should not be recognized by the Senate of the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is concerned because I did not specify whether I meant the Yalta agreement of July 26 or the Potsdam agreement of August 1. Mr. President, I mean both. There is no distinction between the decisions published on one date and those published on another, except that the Soviet Union did not sign the Japanese section of the Potsdam agreement, because she had not yet entered the war. The Senator from Wisconsin says the agreement of July 26, defining the Japanese settlement, bears no relation whatever to the agreement of August 1; so, in answer to the Senator from South Dakota, perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin believes that, because Russia did not sign the Japanese section, she had nothing to do with its terms. Perhaps he thinks the moral climate of July 26 at Yalta was different from the moral climate at Potsdam 5 days later, on August 1. I prefer to consider them as one agreement, and to state explicitly that we are against both. I should be quite willing, therefore, to amend my reservation to add, after the last word, "or the proclamation of July 26, 1945."

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator amend it?

Mr. JENNER. No; I said I should be glad to do so. I do not think it necessary because I mean both of them.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am again presenting to the Senate a statement which was prepared in the light of these reservations, and which I think reflects the position of our committee in regard to this particular matter. It has to do, directly with the resolution of ratification, reported by the Foreign Relations Committee and includes this statement which is in controversy. The main points of the arguments against this reservation No. 2 are the following:

First. The reservation covers the same ground as the interpretative declaration accepted by the Foreign Relations Committee—but it does not cover that ground as thoroughly. For example, it does not refer to the Habomai and Shikotan Islands which Russia occupies and claims.

Second The Jenner-Smith reservation also rejects the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945.

The Senator from Indiana has discussed that question.

Since the agreement of August 1 does not relate at all to Japan, it is probable that the authors of the reservation have in mind the Japanese surrender terms of July 26, 1945, which resulted from conferences participated in by the United States, Great Britain, and the Republic of China. A refutation of these surrender terms would be most detrimental to American interests, inasmuch as they provide for the occupation and constitute the legal basis for everything done under the occupation. Without recognizing the Japanese surrender terms of July 26, 1945, we would have no right in the occupation of Japan, either today or for the past 6 years.

Third. It is also under those surrender terms that the United States has a legal basis for continuing control over the Bonin and Ryukyu Islands.

Do the Senators who support this reservation wish to give up Okinawa? Okinawa is a part of the same arrangement by which we obtained control through the surrender terms. That is where we have our big base today for all the operations in the Pacific. We are using Okinawa today for our operations in Korea. I have just been there. I have seen the installations. there. We could not do without Okinawa. We must not now raise any points which would question our title to it.

Fourth. The surrender terms also provide for the repatriation of Japanese troops—an extremely important thing from the Japanese point of view.

Fifth. It is also apparent that the rejection now of the Potsdam surrender

terms would give Russia a right to an independent occupation of Japan. The surrender terms provide for a joint occupation; and because we had that joint occupation, we were able to carry on as we have been carrying on since the surrender.

In order to make the RECORD complete, I desire to read the resolution which the Foreign Relations Committee submitted on this point:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

And here is the statement we added, which is in controversy:

As part of such advice and consent the Senate states that nothing the treaty contains is deemed to diminish or prejudice, in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied Powers as defined in said treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, the Habomai Islands, the island of Shikotan, or any other territory, rights, or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto on the Soviet Union; and also that nothing in the said treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions in favor of the Soviet Union contained in the so-called Yalta agreement regarding Japan of February 11, 1945.

It is the Yalta agreement which we want to repudiate at this point, by this statement. So the real difference is that the so-called Jenner reservation does not cover as much ground as does the committee's declaration and it makes the obvious mistake of trying to repudiate the Potsdam surrender terms, which would throw us out of the legal occupation of Japan and upset the entire treaty structure.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall not take up the time of the Senate to discuss the reasons why I oppose the reservations which have been offered. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement which I have prepared, together with correspondence I have had with Mr. E. Raymond Wilson and with Mr. Rhoads Murphey of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, and supporting documents.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I have not participated thus far in the debate on these historic treaties—the treaty of peace with Japan and the collateral Pacific security treaties. I have listened carefully to the debate and have read the reports of the distinguished committee which has studied and presented these treaties to us.

We are indeed taking historic steps today. The Foreign Relations Committee has unanimously advised, as have the leaders of our Government, that these steps are the right steps and that these treaties represent a constructive expression of our national policy in the Far East.

I am ready to accept these views. I am ready to vote for these treaties. I am certainly ready to vote against what I consider ill-advised and ill-conceived reservations whose effect in Asia, and in the rest of the world, would be in my opinion most unfortunate and even disastrous.

But I shall not cast my vote without disquiet. I have a feeling that we are determining a permanent policy with regard to Japan on the basis of what may be a temporary situation in the Far East. At least I pray that it may be temporary.

Yet I know of no specific alternative. Certainly we must oppose the aggressive and imperialistic spread of communism. Certainly Japan must be defended against aggression. But I am aware that there are many men of good will who have studied the far-eastern question who think that the rearmament of Japan at this time is a mistake. There are those who think that the policy reflected in some aspects of the security treaty with Japan will hurt as much as help the cause of peace, security, and democracy in the Pacific. They feel that economic recovery and democratic development in Japan may seriously suffer as a result of these treaty provisions.

I would like at this point, to insert in the RECORD correspondence I have had with Mr. E. Raymond Wilson, executive secretary of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, and with Mr. Rhoads Murphey, associate secretary of that fine Quaker organization. I do not agree with all the observations, and certainly not with all the conclusions set forth by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Murphey, but I think there is food for thought in those observations and conclusions. We may well read these views with profit.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, D. C., March 14, 1952.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I was sorry not to find you in when I called at your office yesterday with Mr. Henry Perry, of Boston, who has recently returned from a 7-month visit in Japan. He had an opportunity during this time to live with the Japanese people in their own homes and to see from their point of view the problems which they face. It is his considered opinion that to rearm Japan and to keep her insulated from the rest of Asia as a strategic outpost in the cold war against Russia would invite communism, not prevent it.

I am bound to say that I agree with him. Rearmament with its heavy expense would prevent the kind of sound economic development which Japan so desperately needs if she is to keep her head above water. Even if we pay the cost of the arms, as I am sure you realize that we would have to do, Japan's potential would not be available for productive development. In the present precarious state of her economy, made worse every year by galloping overpopulation, such a course seems certain to keep Japan permanently in a state of poverty. It is hard to keep communism out under such conditions; guns and planes will not do it.

The restoration of a military establishment in Japan also raises the old problem of Japanese militarism. Mr. Perry obtained a very clear picture of this danger during his visit. Many of the Japanese with whom he talked said quite frankly, that they were a nation of followers, who worship power. While that power was represented by our occupation forces, democratic developments had a chance. If, however, we now substitute for that a native government which has real military power at its disposal, there is a grave risk that the same groups who controlled a strong Japan before will do so again. This transcends the matter of ancient grudges or political justice, since it strikes at the heart of our own position of security in the Pacific.

What appears to be contemplated and urged by our representatives in Japan is a restoration of Japan's war industry and the training and equipping of a large army beyond the needs for maintaining order in the islands. While this force is of course intended for defense, it could equally well be used for aggression by an unscrupulous Japanese Government. A 1960 version of Tojo's Japan would surely be as great a calamity as we could imagine, and I assure you that rearmament, unaccompanied by other developments, would make that a real possibility.

Japan's basic need is for economic viability. She can never achieve that while the rest of Asia is in turmoil and is consequently closed to her trade. Japan has three courses open to her in this matter: trade with East Asia (primarily China, her major market and major source of raw materials), heavy subsidization by the United States for an indefinite time, or the same road of military conquest which she followed before and which we would give here the means to implement by encouraging and financing her rearmament. There seems to me to be no alternative to these three. Japan's 85,000,000 people must live, and they will take the only means open to them. This suggests that the pressing need from our own self-interest point of view is to create in East Asia conditions under which Japan can live at peace with her neighbors, trading where her economy requires her to do. She can no more live cut off from Asia than Great Britain could live cut off from Europe. The risk which this might present of Soviet infiltration or conquest of Japan is in my view less real and less present than the virtual certainty of disaster if we place our faith in rearmament to protect Japan from communism.

I would like to suggest that in my opinion it is illusory to hope for economic viability for Japan based on her trade with southeast Asia. Not only is that an as yet little developed market or producer of raw materials, but Japan would have to meet very heavy competition there. Nearly every country in southeast Asia, in particular the Republic of Indonesia, has ambitious plans for its own industrial development, and reasonable prospects of self-sufficiency in the same light consumer goods which Japan has previously sold them. Especially is this true of textiles, traditionally the foundation stone of Japan's foreign trade. There will of course be a market for industrial machinery, transportation equipment, chemicals, and some of Japan's heavy industrial production, but in these fields India will be a potent competitor. In my opinion, it is doubtful if Japan can do much more than maintain her prewar level of trade with Southeast Asia, which amounted in general to about one-quarter of her total foreign trade in the period of the 1930's. Even if that trade could be doubted, there would remain a large unfilled gap. I do not see how that gap can be filled in the long run unless Japan has commercial access to the rest of East Asia, primarily China.

I do not of course suggest that present conditions allow free trade between China and Japan. I do believe, however, that those conditions are alterable, and that it is this problem on which we should concentrate our efforts, with the long-term future of Japan (and thus our own interests) in mind. The present international impasse in the Far East is still a relatively recent phenomenon, and is, of course, organically bound up with the issue in Korea, the status of Formosa, and the relation of China to the world community. All these are problems so to speak left over from World War II. They have no permanent relation to the long-standing political and economic factors

which have shaped the far-eastern community. The menace of Soviet influence or conquest here, as elsewhere in the world, is in direct proportion to the degree of poverty, offended nationalist feelings, and tyrannical or corrupt government in each country concerned. Work on these problems is, in my view, a far more effective protection against communism than is rearmament. And correspondingly, genuine and determined efforts to reach a settlement of the outstanding international issues in the Far East is our best insurance against another disaster in Japan.

I hope that you will take an active part in the Senate's discussion of the Japanese peace treaty. I am sure that you have given and will give deep and conscientious consideration to the problems which it raises, problems which go far beyond the ending of formal hostilities. It is essential for us to enable Japan to maintain herself. Otherwise we shall reap the harvest of Japan's economic failure. I was in China during the early period of the Communist take-over, and have been kept informed by study and by returning friends. I think I understand pretty clearly the nature of that movement and of the danger which it represents. I think I am also aware of the nature and menace of Soviet communism as a world movement. But all of my experience and study lead me to believe that relative peace and stability can be reestablished in Asia without any surrender to communism and without sole dependence on armed force. If this is not so, then the future of Japan, for which we are in so many ways responsible, looks very dark, indeed.

I hope you may feel encouraged to seek constructive ways of reaching a settlement in Asia which will permit Japan to live, and ourselves to feel secure.

Yours sincerely,

RHOADS MURPHEY.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1952.

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Raymond Wilson has passed on to me your letter of February 15 since I shall be dealing with far eastern matters at the Friends Committee. I spent 4 years in the East during the war, and am now a professor of far eastern affairs.

Of course the issue of Japan's rearmament is a complex one, and I appreciate your sincere attempts to make a wise decision about it. I should like to encourage you to make your own judgment on the matter rather than accepting the judgments of military and diplomatic leaders as you suggest. For one thing, it seems to me that the Congress has an obligation to make such basic decisions on behalf of the American people quite apart from the recommendations of experts and nonelected officials. And, for another, I do not think it could be said that the record of our military and diplomatic leaders has been good in matters of far eastern policy. I would say that our policies there in both respects have been a decided failure, and while the men responsible for them have, of course, studied their failures carefully and made their new recommendations accordingly, those new recommendations, such as the rearming of Japan, seem to me largely indistinguishable from a policy which events in the East have consistently proven inadequate during the past 4 years.

Far from checking the spread of communism in the East or building friendship and support for the United States there, our policies have had precisely the opposite effect. Most Asians distrust and fear us, although they were once our firm friends. They can become so again if we can shape our policies in accordance with Asia's new situation instead of in accordance with the strategy of the cold war, an essentially sterile formula which has profited us nothing in Asia and lost us the tremendous advantage of friendship which we once enjoyed. In my opinion it is abundantly clear that the majority of the Japanese people do not want to rearm. They seem to understand better than we the economic disaster which rearmament invites for Japan (as Premier Yoshida has himself pointed out), and, more importantly, the inefficacy of military force against the threat of communism in Asia. The pattern of revolution in the East has been an economic and a nationalistic one, not a matter of force. Such ideas cannot be stopped by bullets, but only by building a sound economy and by respecting genuine nationalist movements. It was on those two points that our policy in China so notably failed, and I believe the danger of similar failure in Japan is equally great if we urge rearmament on Japan. Rearmament would permanently shelve the economic developments which must take place in Japan, with its marginal position, if that country is to be secure from the threat of communism. It would further harden the hearts of all Asians against us, and I am personally convinced would also impress most of the Japanese people as unwanted American pressure which would be bitterly resented. Thus it would repeat the same fatal mistakes which we made in China, against needed economic improvement and against Asia's new nationalism. This would invite communism, not prevent it.

You say that you must accept the judgment of our military and diplomatic leaders until it can be clearly shown that the rearmament of Japan is not necessary to halt Communist aggression and to create conditions of security in the Far East. Solely on the basis of our past experience in Asia, it seems unmistakably clear to me that it is not only unnecessary but extremely harmful. When one adds to this the knowledge of Japan's precarious economic position, the case against rearmament seems to me irrefutable. Communism thrives on substandard economies and on offended nationalist feelings. Rearmament would create both in Japan.

I do not think that our former position of influence and strength through friendship in Asia is irreparably lost, nor that we must make the best of an Asia united against us by continuing to mobilize force against it. We are dealing here, it seems to me, not with ideologies and power cliques, but with the more compelling facts of poverty and nationalism. If we allow or encourage poverty to continue, and ride roughshod over nationalism, we may create the kind of power clique which faces us in Russia, but we shall never prevent it nor do anything but hasten its spread. If, on the other hand, we try to assist economic development and try to work in harmony with the nationalist feelings of Asians, it will be apparent that we have more to offer them than they could win by force, or by subservience to the Soviet Union. No surrender to communism is contemplated or necessary, but only a policy which understands the facts about Asia and which safeguards American interests accordingly. The Soviets could make no headway against a China or Japan united in support of its own government and enjoying a healthy economy with American assistance, however small. You simply cannot fight communism with armies, especially in Asia, nor can you win supporters for it. I am sure you are aware of the great importance of this issue, transcending the events of the next few months, and that you will make a conscientious effort to reach a wise decision.

I have enjoyed working with you on immigration legislation, and look forward to seeing your bill introduced very soon so that all of us here may give the fullest and most energetic support to it. It is the greatest satisfaction to have a bill, and sponsors behind it, which we can support so unreservedly and work for with the firm assurance that we are on the side of the angels. I am personally deeply indebted to you for it.

With best wishes.

Yours sincerely,

RHOADS MURPHEY.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE
ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1952.

Senator HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: I have just received from three women members of the Upper House of the Japanese Diet an appeal addressed to the United States Senators regarding the Japanese Peace Treaty and the security treaty with Japan. They express their very deep concern about the implications of the proposed rearmament of Japan, and ask that the United States, instead of demanding the rearmament of Japan, uphold article IX of their constitution. This letter points up the tragedy of the rearmament of a country against which the United States fought such a bitter war to overthrow Japanese militarism.

I know one of these Japanese Senators personally and believe this appeal comes not only from their hearts, but represents the sentiment of many, many people in Japan.

Enclosed is a statement which came this week from the peace committee of the Japan Yearly Meeting of Friends, also opposing Japanese rearmament.

Sincerely yours,

E. RAYMOND WILSON.

FEBRUARY 15, 1952.

Mr. E. RAYMOND WILSON,
Executive Secretary, Friends Committee on National Legislation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WILSON: I read your letter of February 7 about the Japanese treaty with much interest. I also read the appeal signed by the three members of the Japanese Senate. Of course, I sympathize with their point of view. I might even say that I share it. I, too, feel a great disquiet about some aspects of the Security Pact with Japan. It certainly makes me uncomfortable to realize that we who fought against Japanese militarism and who applauded the antiwar provision in the Japanese Constitution should now be encouraging Japanese rearmament.

Nevertheless, there are certain hard realities in the world situation which have inclined our responsible leaders in the field of foreign policy to urge and support such a course. While having a sense of disquiet about this development, I feel that I must accept the wisdom and judgment of our military and diplomatic leaders in this regard unless and until it can be clearly shown that the rearmament of Japan is not necessary to halt Communist aggression and to create conditions of security in the Far East.

In any event, thank you for writing me and for sending me this very interestng material.

Very sincerely yours.

AN APPEAL OF THE WOMEN OF UNARMED JAPAN TO THE UNITED STATES SENATORS

TOKYO, JAPAN, *January 8, 1952.*

We, the members of various women's organizations of Japan appealed twice to Mr. John Foster Dulles, concerning the peace treaty and security treaty draft with which he was sent to Japan.

We are extremely anxious that our peace treaty should be such as would enable us to observe faithfully the principle of absolute pacifism clearly expressed in our Constitution. However, the peace treaty signed at San Francisco is quite contrary to our ardent hope and we are greatly disappointed. It is

true that the representatives of the Japanese Government signed the two treaties and the Diet gave consent to the Cabinet to ratify these treaties by a majority vote, but it must be borne in mind that over one-third of the House of Councilors opposed the security treaty; 147 for and 78 against. Moreover, the present Government and the Diet members were elected 3 years ago and cannot be said to represent the true will of the nation in general concerning the two treaties.

When Mr. Dulles visited Japan recently the press reported his arrival as if the nation as a whole welcomed him with deep gratitude; but this welcome (build up) seemed largely a diplomatic gesture of the political and business circles and also of the rightists who are now regaining power, while on the contrary the majority of the people, especially the women and the youth, has met this occasion with a deep sense of anxiety, uncertainty, and even heartbreak.

A recent public poll on the opinions of 8,932 students of 19 colleges in Tokyo showed the following results:

Opinion on—	*Yes* (*percent*)	*No* (*percent*)
The peace treaty	24.9	66.2
The security treaty	16.4	75.3
Rearmament of Japan	12.2	81.0

(Figures above quoted are from Educational Report, November 30, 1951, issued daily by the Institution of Educational Research.)

We, the women of Japan, do not oppose the police reserves for internal security, but cannot agree to the proposal of rearming Japan which contradicts the guiding principle of the Japanese constitution. We are determined never again to send our sons and husbands to the battlefields.

The Japanese people understand that article IX of our Constitution which reads "Japan forever forsakes war: the Japanese nation does not possess an army, navy, air force, or any other fighting force" was originally directed by the United States of America and her occupation authorities in Japan. Now, contrary to their belief, the people in this country have the impression that according to the two treaties signed in San Francisco, the same United States authorities are demanding the rearmament of Japan.

These facts can create a general mistrust on the part of the Japanese toward the sincerity of America and her leaders; we, therefore, feel it is our duty to express our profound dissatisfaction as we eagerly wish to see a lasting friendship established between the United States and Japan.

Thus, when the two treaties are introduced to the United States Senate, we wish the Senate to keep on record that we, the women of Japan, had eagerly desired that our Nation be left alone from the arming race.

(Mrs. Dr.) TOMIKO W. KORA,
(Mrs.) MICHIKO FUJIWARA,
(Mrs.) NAOKO TAKATA,
Members of the Upper House of the Japanese Diet Representing Japan Women's Disarmament Committee.

OUR PEACE TESTIMONY RESTATED

We, the members of the peace committee of the Japan Yearly Meeting of Friends, issued in February this year our peace testimony.

In view of the gravity of the situation brought about by the peace treaty and the security pact between Japan and the United States of America, we hereby reaffirm our stand that we do not seek security in the armament of any one nation or group of nations, wholly trusting in the security of disarmament and good will.

Our opposition to war is absolute and without exception and our abandonment of arms means complete disarmament. Herein lies our belief in God and our love and trust in all mankind as brothers in each of whom resides the seed of God. We believe that God, the Father of all mankind, does not allow us to seek for the security and happiness for ourselves or for our nation by taking the lives of others or by forcing sacrifice on other nations through the act of war.

Standing on the conviction stated above, we remind ourselves of the lofty mission resting on us to maintain intact the Constitution of Japan pledged to the principle of total disarmament whereby we must break at least in the Far East the world-wide vicious circle of unbelief, fear, armament, and war.

The peace treaty for Japan and the security pact between Japan and the United States of America signed at San Francisco on September 8 are said to be treaties of generosity and reconciliation, and yet, by turning Japan into a military base, having certain nations as potential enemies and by turning plowshares into swords instead of turning swords into plowshares, and requiring in effect, the people of Japan to take up those swords, these treaties entail the loss on the part of Japan her position of neutrality and obstruct thereby the road to world disarmament commencing with a disarmament constitution.

For these reasons, we declare hereby our opposition to the ratification of these treaties. Further, we wish to express our unchanging faith in our mission as Christians to continue our efforts for constructive peace. It shall be our constant endeavor, even after their ratification, to see that the Government and people of Japan cooperate, on the basis of friendship and mutual understanding, with all nations of the world, regardless of whether they are signatories or not of the treaties.

Our plea is to cut the vicious circle of war through prayer and all acts allowed to man, and to generate a circle for peace.

We would not hate but love, we would not take but give, we would not kill but give life, whatever be the price we must pay for these things. This is the only way open to us which we will follow without ever deviating from it.

Says Jesus:

"Put up again thy sword into his place: for all that take this sword shall perish with the sword.

"I say unto you, that ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right check, turn to him the other also.

"Love your enemies, bless them that curse you and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you, that you may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven.

"Blessed are the peacemakers."

TAMON MAYEDA.
IWAO AYUSAWA.
TOKUYA AZUMI.
TANO JODAI.
MASAHIKO SEKIYA.
TOYOTARO TAKEMURA.
KIYOSHI UKAJI.

NOVEMBER 11, 1951.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, when I look at these reservations I am reminded of an old story which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations related on another occasion. He told about a colored gentleman who caught a catfish. He was going to gut the catfish, but every time he took hold of it the fish slipped away from him. The man said, "Now, just keep quiet. I am not going to do you any harm; I am just going to gut you." [Laughter.]

Mr. President, we are interested in a treaty signed by 48 nations. Many of us saw on television the scene of the signing. The treaty was brought into being through the efforts of Mr. Dulles and General MacArthur. General MacArthur was consulted by Mr. Dulles all along the way, even after MacArthur was recalled.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. WILEY. No; I have only two minutes.

I was interested in the memorandum which was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] prepared by Mr. WATKINS. The memorandum itself says:

> One conclusion supported by all of the foregoing precedents is that the declaration, whether in the nature of an explanation, an understanding, an interpretation, or reservation of any kind, must be agreed to by the other party to the treaty.

As suggested in my opening statement the other day, this and the other reservations would, putting it in the language of the colored gentleman to whom I have referred, "gut" the treaty as it would require the 48 nations to agree to them. I am satisfied that the Senate of the United States will continue to vote down the reservations and ratify the treaty.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it a catfish or the United States that is being gutted by the treaty?

Mr. WILEY. I thought the Senator would indulge in a little pleasantry of that kind. I can assure the Senator that the judgment of Mr. Dulles, the judgment of the best lawyers in the United States whom we have consulted on the subject, and the judgment of General MacArthur, is that this is a good treaty and that it should now be ratified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WILEY. I ask for one additional minute.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield one more minute to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I want to say, in answer to the point made yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that there was no hurry, because the treaty could not go into force for 9 months, I should like to say that is another mistake. It is not a fact that the treaty cannot come into force for 9 months. It can come into force whenever approved by six of the nations involved and named in article XXIII. Five of them are already prepared to approve it—Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Ceylon, and the United Kingdom. The treaty can be brought into being by our ratifying it today and the President taking the proper course of action thereafter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, there does not seem to be any demand for additional time, and I request a vote.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 6 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am interested in the evisceration of this celebrated fish. I do not like the inelegant term which was used a moment ago, so we will substitute the word "evisceration"; and in that connection, I share the concern of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] as to whether it is our country or the document called a treaty that is before the Senate at the present time that is going to be submitted to that treatment.

Mr. President, I am frankly astonished at the treatment that was accorded reservation No. 1, and I am even more astonished at the discussion on the floor, because it entirely missed the point. If ever there was evidence that consideration of the treaty should be postponed, it is to be found in the discussion which took place a while ago on reservation No. 1. The language of the reservation is as follows:

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its military establishment, and its domestic concerns, or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

It does not say we are going to exercise our sovereign power over foreign policy, but suppose we wanted to: then what? It does not say we are going to exercise our sovereign power with respect to the military establishment, but suppose a controversy arose between the United Nations and the United States with respect to the defense and protection of our troops in Korea? It does not say we are going to exercise our sovereign power with respect to domestic concerns. It says we reserve the right to do so.

That matter was not made clear. Who could do less than to confess his astonishment that the discussion missed the whole point? Reservation No. 1 should have been adopted by the Senate of the United States, because it is far more important than are reservations 2, 3, and 4. I may comment on those reservations at some subsequent time.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE. May I suggest to the able Senator, with reference to clause (a) and clause (b), that my own attitude was determined by a feeling that we wanted to impose a continuing limitation on the sovereignty of Japan to the extent necessary to preserve the right to maintain air and naval bases in the Kuriles, those islands off the coast of Japan, and other islands close to Japan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think clause (a) is the important consideration. By our votes we have terminated our own right to manifest our voice in these considerations. Reservation No. 1 is the important one, Mr. President, and it is a matter of some dismay to me that it was not adopted and written into the treaty.

As a reservation No. 2, obviously, after the testimony of Mr. Dulles on page 56 of the hearings that this was the first formal act by the United States which involves a clear abandonment of the Yalta agreement, I know of no reason why the limitation should not be written into the treaty. If he says we are abandoning the Yalta agreement, then let us make it pretty specific and put it on the record as a part of our policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of reservation No. 2 proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McMahon
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Benton	Hennings	Monroney
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bricker	Hill	Morse
Bridges	Holland	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Murray
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	Nixon
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Clements	Kem	Russell
Connally	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Cordon	Knowland	Seaton
Dirksen	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Long	Sparkman
Eastland	Magnuson	Stennis
Ecton	Malone	Thye
Ellender	Martin	Tobey
Ferguson	Maybank	Underwood
Flanders	McCarran	Watkins
Frear	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to reservation No. 2, proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mr. CONNALLY and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—27

Aiken	Dworshak	McCarran
Brewster	Eastland	McCarthy
Bricker	Ecton	McClellan
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Kem	Watkins
Case	Long	Welker
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Dirksen	Martin	Young

NAYS—54

Anderson	Hill	Moody
Benton	Holland	Morse
Byrd	Hunt	Murray
Cain	Ives	Neely
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	O'Conor
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Knowland	Russell
Ferguson	Lehman	Saltonstall
Flanders	Lodge	Seaton
Frear	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	Maybank	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Stennis
Gillette	McKellar	Thye
Hayden	McMahon	Tobey
Hennings	Millikin	Underwood
Hickenlooper	Monroney	Wiley

NOT VOTING—15

Bennett	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smathers
Duff	Kerr	Smith, N. C.
Green	Langer	Taft

So Reservation No. 2, proposed by Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to Reservation No. 3 to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty. The reservation will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The reservation proposed by Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine was read by the legislative clerk, as follows:

RESERVATION No. 3

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to abrogate the claims of the United States for direct military costs of the occupation, or just and proper claims of private citizens of the United States.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, it may save a little time if I state that I do not particularly care for a yea-and-nay vote. If Members of the Senate will remain in the Chamber, we may save a little time.

Mr. President, this reservation is designed only to keep the door open until we have further information on the entire question of reparations claims. In connection with private claims, which, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] says, are all covered, I wish to read a letter addressed to Representative

JAMES P. S. DEVEREUX, of Maryland, by the State Department:

Reference is made to your letter of August 16, 1951, regarding certain provisions of the Japanese Peace Treaty * * * article 15 (a) of the treaty provides for the return of the property of each Allied Power and its nationals if such property was within Japan at any time between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945, unless the owner has freely disposed thereof without compensation in cases where such property was within Japan on December 7, 1941, and cannot be returned or has suffered injury or damage as a result of the war. In view of the limited resources available to Japan, it has not been considered feasible to extend the compensation provision to property losses which occurred outside Japan, including private bank accounts of servicemen in the Philippine Islands which were confiscated by the Japanese after the surrender of the islands in 1942.

In connection with the drafting of the peace treaty, the Department has given serious consideration to a wide variety of claims by nationals of the United States and its allies against the Japanese Government. The problem of providing compensation from Japanese resources for the various public and private claims arising out of the war is a very difficult one, particularly since the extensive losses of life and property and personal injuries suffered by our allies must be considered on the same footing as our own insofar as compensation by Japan is concerned.

Since the end of World War II it has been necessary for the United States to supply economic assistance to Japan to the extent of nearly $2,000,000,000 because of Japan's inability to earn from sale of her exports sufficient foreign exchange to supply even the minimum needs of her population for food and other necessary imports. The furnishing of aid to Japan has been considered essential to the basic goal of the United States with respect to Japan, namely that Japan achieve political and economic stability and become a peaceful and self-supporting member of the international community oriented toward the democratic countries of the world. A requirement that Japan pay compensation for war losses out of her inadequate foreign-exchange resources would consequently involve the imposition of a burden on the United States taxpayer and would constitute a barrier to the achievement of stability and self-support in Japan.

Sincerely yours,

JACK K. MCFALL,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, to be honest, I am quite confused about these claims payments; but if American boys and American nationals are to be excluded from filing claims for the money which the Japanese took from them when they invaded the Philippine Islands, I do not see why we should blindly approve reparations and payment of private claims, as provided in the treaty, until we know exactly where we stand, and what the fact is. I do not see why an American citizen should be deprived of his rightful claim when, as I shall show in connection with reservation No. 4, we are providing, by the definition of "China," for the possible payment of $50,000,000,000 from the Japanese economy to Communist China.

Mr. President, I do not care for a yea-and-nay vote on this reservation. I think the entire question is in doubt. I think it should be clarified, and that is the purpose of the reservation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to reservation No. 3 to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I merely wish to advise my colleagues in the Senate that the very important question raised by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has been given a great deal of careful study by those of us who worked on the treaty.

We had before us the testimony of persons who stated that there were certain claims for money which had been seized by Japan in the Philippines, and that it would be unjust not to give them protection. The private claims will be taken care of in this way, if the Senator from Indiana will accept my statement: We have impounded property belonging to Japanese in the United States. Originally it amounted, roughly, to $120,000,000. Now it amounts to approximately $68,000,000. We have been slowly paying off the private claims which some persons had against the Japanese.

If we do not do it in this way we would be confusing the whole reparations picture. It is being done in this manner because we had the funds available. It would take only an amendment to the War Claims Act, I am told, to make it effective for some of the other claimants. It would be a very simple matter to amend the War Claims Act. This question should not become a part of the treaty.

This reservation would have the effect of destroying the present preferred position of the United States under the treaty. Any reassessment of the claims would now be met by efforts of the other treaty parties to place the United States on a basis of equality with the rest of the signatory powers. We would thus lose the fruits of months of negotiation.

This reservation would reduce our $2,000,000,000 GARIOA claim to the vanishing point. We now have the right to repayment of the full amount of the GARIOA bill. The reparations creditors are provided with specific yet limited remedies which preclude foreign exchange claims against Japan. This reservation would destroy the foreign exchange safeguard we now enjoy.

The private claims of United States citizens against Japan can be taken care of by a simple amendment to the War Claims Act, which amendment has been recommended by the War Claims Commission. Under the amendment, the powers of the Commission would be broadened to pay the claims of the citizens of the United States referred to in the reservation. Adequate funds are now available and in the hands of the Commission. A substantial part of the sums were derived from Japanese property impounded during the war. The reservation, therefore, is unnecessary. All that is required is a simple act of Congress.

As I say, the War Claims Commission has recommended that such an amendment be adopted.

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. KNOWLAND requested the yeas and nays.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. JENNER. I believe the yeas and nays were requested only a short time ago and I believe there was not a sufficient number to second the request. Can the yeas and nays be requested again?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, they can.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays were not ordered a few minutes ago. There is no reason why they cannot be requested a second time. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ten minutes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I wish to serve notice on the Senate that hereafter I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on every reservation. I thought I had a gentleman's agreement with respect to yea-and-nay votes. However, I want the Senate to know that hereafter I shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote on every reservation. I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall read into the RECORD the 23 international schemes into which this Nation has entered since World War I. They are:

1. World War I.
2. Disarmament Conference.
3. Versailles Treaty.
4. Kellogg-Briand Treaty.
5. Neutrality Act.
6. Cash and carry.
7. Lend-lease.
8. Fifty destroyers for England.
9. World War II.
10. Four Freedoms charter.
11. Bretton Woods.
12. Export-Import Bank.
13. United Nations.
14. Morgenthau plan.
15. Russian appeasement.
16. UNRRA.
17. Greek-Turkish aid.
18. Marshall plan for European economic recovery (Foreign Assistance Act of 1948).
19. Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance (Rio Pact).
20. Brussels Treaty (creating western union).
21. North Atlantic Treaty.
22. Mutual Defense Assistance Act of 1949.
23. Korean war.

Mr. President, all I wish to say on this subject is that I think that we had better stop, look, and listen, because everyone of the schemes I have enumerated has failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended. I challenge anyone to debate any one of them with me at any time, at any place. They failed to accomplish the purpose for which they were intended.

In other words, we go from one emergency into another. We talk a great deal about following the advice of experts. Senators stand on the floor of the Senate and say that this or that is

the thing to do. Other Senators say that this or that is the thing to do.

Mr. President, I want to say to you that I am through following the experts, if the results are going to be what they have been in the past 20 years. I believe the American people are sick and tired of following the experts.

We are told that this treaty cannot be changed. If it cannot be changed, why do we take the time of the Senate to discuss it? Why do we not merely stamp it and send it back, if it cannot be changed? That is the position that the experts take.

We had World War I, World War II, the Korean war, the United Nations, the Atlantic Pact, and all the other things. They did not accomplish the purposes for which they were intended. Therefore, there must be something wrong. We are told that if we had gone into the League of Nations we would not have had World War II. Mr. President, we went into the United Nations, and we had a war within 5 years.

I think we should have a peace treaty with Japan. There is no question about it. However, I say that in making a peace treaty with Japan, we ought not tie our hands to the point where the treaty in itself is not going to solve the problem we would like to see solved and bring peace and protect the sovereignty of this Nation.

The Senate is getting to be a rubberstamp Senate. We approve everything that the so-called experts send to us. So far as I am concerned, they are not experts. I say that the test of leadership is keeping people out of trouble, not getting them into trouble. The leadership which now asks us to put our stamp of approval on the treaty is the same leadership that has given us the $260,000,000,000 debt and two wars in 6 years' time. It has given us the United Nations and all these other schemes. They are not working, Mr. President, and they are not going to work. Do Senators know why they are not going to work? It is because of the inability of the so-called experts, these leaders of ours, to evaluate properly the facts, to evaluate properly the situations. That is what is wrong.

I remember back in 1933 when the Senate approved the recognition of Communist Russia. If they had been able to evaluate the facts, they would not have done it. The President of the United States said a few days ago that it is no secret that Communist Russia intended to conquer the world. He said it was no secret and that it had never been a secret. Yet he proceeded to Potsdam and entered into all kinds of agreements. President Roosevelt went to Yalta and he entered into all kinds of agreements. The President of the United States in 1933 asked the Senate to approve recognition of Russia. Twenty years ago Russia was a backwoods country, torn with revolution and with no production. Yet in 20 years' time, through the help of the United States Government the Russians have been built up to the point where we are afraid of them, and where we are spending America into bankruptcy. Up to 20 years ago this Nation refused to recognize Soviet Russia. It is the same leadership, Mr. President. The present Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, was one of the persons who attended the first meeting when we recognized the Russian Government in 1933. He says, "Take this treaty. Do not make any changes in it."

Mr. President, we had better stop, listen, and think. I do not profess to be an expert on these matters. All I know is that we are getting deeper and deeper into the mire, and every scheme we go into fails to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended. We had better stop, listen, and think. We had better send this treaty back to the committee, and let it remain in the committee for 6 months. Let us stop going into these schemes. Let us stop following this leadership which gets us deeper and deeper into the mire.

Senators cannot successfully contradict the statements I am making. The able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], cannot successfully contradict them. He himself has been saying recently that they are leading us into bankruptcy and that we must stop these things.

So, Mr. President, I say we should look at the record.

I have nothing personally against the President of the United States or the Secretary of State or the so-called experts, except that their record is one of failure. Instead of keeping us out of war, they are getting us into war, and they are bankrupting us. They are getting us into one scheme after another, and it is questionable whether we shall be able to get out of them. I do not know whether we can.

So we had better stop and think a little. We had better stop saying to ourselves, "We cannot change this and we cannot change that."

I am not arguing the merits or the demerits of the proposal. I believe I am speaking for the great majority of the American people. Today they are fearful. They are afraid of this leadership. They know these things are not working.

O, Mr. President, I know it is easy for Senators to smile, and to sit here and say, "Oh, well, everything is all right, and everything will be all right." They say the things we are doing today will keep us out of a third world war. But, Mr. President, I say we already are in a third world war. Seventeen nations are fighting in Korea, and we are furnishing 95 percent of the men and all the money. If that is not a world war, I do not know what a world war is, because all 17 of those nations are engaged in it. The mere fact that that war has not expanded any more than it has is no reason for saying that it is not a world war. After all, 17 nations are participating in it.

The fact of the matter is that we have worked ourselves into that position, as a nation, following this leadership. Yet some Senators stand here and tell us that leadership knows exactly what it is doing. We have worked into a position where, in my personal opinion, we are going to be at war continually, because we have taken on the obligations.

Mr. President, my plea to the United States Senate is to make certain that we know what we are doing.

Before I take my seat, I wish to say that not 1 of the 23 international schemes into which we have entered, as set forth in the list I have read, has accomplished the purpose for which it was intended, and I challenge any Member of the Senate to contradict the correctness of my statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has expired.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All the time of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] has expired.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on this reservation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, after question arose as to the effect of the so-called reservations, I stated, in my opening argument on this floor, that in order to be sure about their effect, I had asked a distinguished lawyer to draft for me a memorandum on that subject. I hold that memorandum or brief in my hand. It is well documented, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in toto in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question has arisen as to what the effect would be of the inclusion of the nine reservations proposed by Senator JENNER on March 17, 1952 in any resolution of the Senate, giving the advice and consent of that body to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Japan and related treaties.

A reservation is "a formal declaration by which a state, when signing, ratifying or acceding to a treaty, specifies as a condition of its willingness to become a party to the treaty certain terms which will limit the effect of the treaty insofar as it may apply in the relations of that state with the other state or states which may be parties to the treaty." (Definition set forth by Harvard research group, composed of recognized authorities throughout the United States on international law, in its study of the law of treaties.)

Professor Manley O. Hudson, formerly judge of the Permanent Court of International Justice, defines a reservation as "an exception of particular provisions of an instrument from those provisions by which a state agrees to be bound; in many cases, it refers to the application, or the effect of the application, of particular provisions." 1 International Legislation (1931) 1.

A treaty is a contract between nations. A state which has signed a treaty cannot change the nature of the rights or obligations of the contracting states under that treaty by attaching a reservation to its ratification unless that state obtains the consent of the other states with which it is contracting.

Thus, the Harvard Research states:

"If a treaty is signed by all the signatories on the same date, a state may make a reservation when ratifying only with the consent of all other states which are signatories and of all the states which have acceded to the treaty prior to the ratification by that state."

Under article II, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States, the President has "Power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur." Therefore under the Constitution the power to enter into a treaty relationship must be exercised by both the President and the Senate. For that reason if the Senate by a two-thirds majority vote adopts a resolution advising and consenting to the ratification of a treaty which contains a reservation or reservations changing the nature of the rights or obligations of contracting states, the President cannot constitutionally transmit for deposit an instrument of ratification unless it contains the same changes in the nature of the rights or obligations of the contracting states as those laid down by the Senate. In turn these proposed changes must be agreed to by the other states with which we are establishing contractual relations. In fact, it is the practice of the United States in transmitting its instrument of ratification in any case where the resolution of the Senate contains more than mere approval of ratification, to include the identical language of the Senate so that there will be no possibility of confusion as to the exact nature of the proposed changes.

The problem was dealt with extensively in a letter of July 24, 1919, to Senator Hale from Charles Evans Hughes. In that letter with reference to the matter of a Senate resolution dealing with the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles, Mr. Hughes made it clear that if those reservations were included in any act of ratification the President would only have two alternatives, either to refuse to ratify the treaty entirely or to make the proposed reservations a part of the instrument of ratification. In dealing with the latter asumption he stated as follows:

"Assuming that the reservations are made as a part of the instrument of ratification, the other parties to the treaty will be notified accordingly. As a contract the treaty, of course, will bind only those who consent to it. The nation making reservations as part of the instrument of ratification is not bound further than it agrees to be bound. And if a reservation as a part of the ratification makes a material addition to or a substantial change in the proposed treaty other parties will not be bound unless they assent." V. Hackworth, Digest of International Law (1943), 102–103.

It is also possible for the Senate in approving a resolution giving its advice and consent to the ratification of a treaty to include in that resolution, declarations or understandings which do not change the rights or obligations of the contracting parties. For this reason they do not require the consent of the other parties. It is however the practice of the United States to include them in its instrument of ratification in order that the other parties may satisfy themselves that the rights and obligations of the parties are not in fact affected by them.

It must be borne in mind that the making of reservations to treaties, particularly multilateral treaties, is likely to lead to a reopening of the entire negotiations. Other contracting parties are entitled to negotiate as to the conditions on which they will accept our proposed reservations. They are also privileged to make reservations of their own, particularly in a multipartite treaty where the provisions are very closely interrelated. Moreover the attitude of any party concerning a proposed reservation is greatly affected by what he believes to be the attitude of the other parties concerning a proposed reservation, making it difficult to resolve the matter speedily.

The fact that Senator JENNER has entitled each of his nine proposals a "reservation" indicates that prima facie, at least, they must be considered as reservations and as changing the right or obligation of the parties and hence require their consent. Moreover, an analysis of this amendment indicates that this is in fact the case.

A few examples are set forth below.

Senator JENNER'S proposed reservation No. 3 to the Japanese Peace Treaty states that "nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed to abrogate the claims of the United States for direct military costs of the occupation, or just and proper claims of private citizens of the United States." This is in direct conflict with article 14 (b) of the Japanese Peace Treaty, which provides: "Except as otherwise provided in the present treaty, the Allied Powers waive all reparations claims of the Allied Powers, other claims of the Allied Powers and their nationals arising out of any actions taken by Japan and its nationals in the course of the prosecution of the war, and claims of the Allied Powers for direct military costs of occupation." Article 14 (b) thus states flatly that the Allied Powers waive claims for direct military costs of occupation. Senator JENNER'S reservation, by stating that "nothing contained" in the treaty shall be construed to abrogate this claim, constitutes a dimunition of the United States obligation under article 14 (b) to waive the claim. Other signatories waived their own claims in consequence of the waiver by all. Rewriting the treaty to save certain United States claims, which is what the reservation would do, would require their consent. Since they could not be expected to consent to save United States claims without reserving their own, a renegotiation of the treaty article would unquestionably ensue. The same consideration applies to the attempt to save claims of United States nationals not expressly provided for in the treaty.

Senator JENNER'S first reservation states that nothing contained in the treaty shall be construed to impose any limitation on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishments, and its domestic concerns, or to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan. Regarding the first part of this reservation, while there are very few continuing obligations of the United States to Japan in the treaty which limit the right of the United States to exercise these controls, there are certain which do so. For example, the waiver of reparations claims and of claims for direct military costs of occupation by the United States in article 14 (b) are limitations upon the exercise of unlimited control over United States foreign policy. Regarding the second part of the reservation, Japan has, for example, accepted a continuing limitation on its full and unconditional sovereignty in article III of the treaty, under which it agrees to concur in any proposal of the United States to place under United States trusteeship system with the United States as sole administering authority, the Ryukyus and other islands. Pending the making of such a proposal (which may be a period without limitation if such a proposal is not made by the United States), "The United States will have the right to exercise all and any powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction over the territory and inhabitants of these islands, including their territorial waters." This provision is clearly a continuing limitation upon Japan's "full and unconditional sovereignty" over these areas. The confusion resulting from the conflict between the treaty language and the reservation would require either renegotiation of the treaty or a third agreement clarifying the situation thus created.

Reservation No. 1 to the United States-Japan Security Treaty, identical to reservation No. 1 of the Japanese Peace Treaty, would enable the Japanese to repudiate article IV of the security treaty, which enables the United States at its election continuously to have the right to put its land, air, and sea forces in and about Japan. Since this obviously would diminish the rights of the United States as set forth in the treaty, the United States would need to seek renegotiation in order to protect the security of the Pacific area, which would be adversely affected if Japan were to become a defenseless prey to aggressors.

Reservation No. 2 to the security treaty with Japan states that "any so-called administrative agreements under article III of the treaty relating to the right to dispose of the Armed Forces of the United States or of any part of its Military Establishment in or about Japan shall not become binding on the United States, unless ratified by the Senate as a treaty, in accordance with article II, section 2 of the Constitution, or approved by the Congress by act or joint resolution specifically referring to such agreement or arrangement." Article III of the Security Treaty provides that "the conditions which shall govern the disposition of the Armed Forces of the United States of America in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two Governments." When the United States and Japan specifically referred to "administrative agreements" in a document which both acknowledged was a treaty, it is clear that they were not contemplating the reference of these subsidiary arrangements for parliamentary approval. The Japanese, for their part, have signed an administrative agreement on this understanding, without submitting it to the Japanese Diet. The Japanese Government has been criticized both on account of the provisions of the agreement, which is not popular in the Diet, and for failure to submit it to the Diet. If the United States were to condition its acceptance of the agreement upon legislative ratification, we would be in no position to object to the Japanese taking the same position.

The reservations proposed to the Australia-New Zealand-Philippines Treaty are identical with the provisions in the United States-Japanese Security Treaty. The reservations would be inconsistent with these obligations of the United States set forth in the treaty. The other parties to the treaties would undoubtedly call for renegotiation on the ground that under the treaties as interpreted by the United States, they were not getting what they had bargained for in the treaties.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations recommended that the following statement be adopted by the Senate with respect to the effect of the treaty upon any rights and benefits to the Soviet Union:

"Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951. As part of such advice and consent the Senate states that nothing the treaty contains is deemed to diminish or prejudice, in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied Powers as defined in said treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, the Habomai Islands, the island of Shikotan, or any other territory, rights, or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer any right, title, or benefit therein and thereto on the Soviet Union; and also that nothing in the said treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions in favor of the Soviet Union contained in the so-called Yalta agreement regarding Japan of February 11, 1945."

This statement is merely a declaration of what is contained in the treaty. It does not change the rights or obligations of the con-

tracting states, but merely restates the effect of the treaty articles themselves. Thus article 25 of the treaty provides:

"For the purposes of the present treaty the allied powers shall be the states at war with Japan, or any state which previously formed a part of the territory of a state named in article 23, provided that in each case the state concerned has signed and ratified the treaty. Subject to the provisions of article 21, the present treaty shall not confer any rights, titles, or benefits on any state which is not an allied power as herein defined; nor shall any right, title, or interest of Japan be deemed to be diminished or prejudiced by any provision of the treaty in favor of a state which is not an allied power as so defined."

Since the Soviet Union is not an allied power within the meaning of the treaty because it has not signed and cannot sign the treaty, the treaty cannot and does not "confer any right, title, or benefit" upon the Soviet Union. Nor does ratification of the treaty imply recognition by the United States of the Yalta agreement terms regarding Japan. The treaty neither mentions the Yalta agreement nor contains any of its terms. In fact its territorial provisions are contrary to Yalta. Neither the United States nor any other contracting state is in any way sanctioning the Yalta agreement by ratifying the Japanese Peace Treaty. In view of these circumstances, the declaration recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee would not require the consent of the other contracting states.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the third reservation submitted by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—23

Aiken	Ecton	McCarran
Brewster	Hendrickson	McCarthy
Bricker	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Watkins
Byrd	Kem	Welker
Capehart	Malone	Williams
Dirksen	Martin	Young
Dworshak	Maybank	

NAYS—58

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Morse
Benton	Hill	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Holland	Murray
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Carlson	Ives	Nixon
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Connally	Kilgore	Russell
Cordon	Knowland	Saltonstall
Douglas	Lehman	Seaton
Eastland	Lodge	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ferguson	Magnuson	Sparkman
Flanders	McClellan	Stennis
Frear	McFarland	Thye
Fulbright	McKellar	Tobey
George	McMahon	Underwood
Gillette	Millikin	Wiley
Hayden	Monroney	
Hennings	Moody	

NOT VOTING—15

Bennett	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Duff	Kerr	Smathers
Green	Langer	Taft

So reservation No. 3 of Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further motions or reservations?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I call up reservation No. 4.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the reservation.

The CHIEF CLERK read reservation No. 4, proposed by Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, as follows:

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty, subject to the following reservation and understanding, which is made hereby a part and condition of this resolution:

"RESERVATION No. 4

"In accordance with the so-called Stimson doctrine of January 7, 1932, which states, that

"'The American Government * * * cannot admit the legality of any situation de facto nor does it intend to recognize any treaty or agreement * * * which may impair the treaty rights of the United States or its citizens in China, including those which relate to the sovereignty, the independence, or the territorial and administrative integrity of the Republic of China or to the international policy relative to China, commonly known as the open-door policy; and * * * does not intend to recognize any situation, treaty, or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the covenants and obligations of the Pact of Paris of August 27, 1928.'

no rights or claims referred to in this treaty shall be deemed to accrue to any government or so-called government of China established by recourse to war, and, as used in this treaty, the word 'China' refers to the legally established Republic of China, the sovereignty of which shall be deemed to extend to all areas which were a part of China at the outbreak of the late war between Japan and China, including Manchuria, Formosa, and the islands adjacent to Formosa."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservation proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, this is a most important reservation, and I at this time request that the yeas and nays be ordered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the outcome of the vote on this reservation will determine whether the American Government is to acquiesce in a possible situation whereby we compel the Japanese economy to pay war reparations to Communist China to the extent of $50,000,000,000. It could amount to that much, according to the words of John Foster Dulles. That is the crux of this reservation. Why do I say that?

Article 14 (a) of the peace treaty says that Japan shall pay reparations to countries occupied by and damaged by Japanese forces.

There is a hidden problem in the reparations question. Japan agrees to pay these reparations "by making available the services of the Japanese people in production, salvaging, and other work for the Allied power in question."

Are these workers going to be paid? Who will supply the wages and working capital? If they are not paid, it is slave labor. If they are paid, it is reparations.

The true meaning of this curious provision emerges dimly out of the confusion. To get the answer we must put together several apparently remote facts.

The Potsdam agreement says: "Japan shall be permitted to maintain such industries as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of just reservations in kind."

This agreement was made at the same time as the Morgenthau plan for Germany, which was a plan for economic demobilization of Russia's most dangerous opponent in the west. It is identical with the Morgenthau plan, in that it is a plan for economic demobilization of Russia's most dangerous opponent in the east.

The details of this Morgenthau plan for Japan were spelled out in the Pauley report. We have recently had from Owen Lattimore, who appeared before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, a statement that he was "quite largely" responsible for the Pauley report. This Lattimore-Pauley report is in turn the basis for the reparations plan in the peace treaty.

The Pauley Report on Japanese Reparations of April 1, 1946, painted a picture of a "top-heavy industrial structure," with more workers and plant capacity than it had raw materials. It was dependent for raw materials on other countries. This was, of course, exactly the economy of England when she was

called "the workshop of the world." But the Pauley report concluded that, even after all the destruction of war, the industrial plant and equipment still standing in Japan had a production potential far greater than the Japanese needed for peace. This "surplus" they said, was available for reparations.

The report recommended "the allocation of surplus Japanese industrial potential to countries entitled to reparations, especially neighboring Asiatic countries."

"Plants should be removed," it said, "and in some cases whole industries eliminated in such a manner that Japan will no longer be able to control the economic life of the neighboring countries by acting as the key industrial consumer of their raw material." The effect of this would be exactly the same as if the "excess capacity" of England was reduced to that which she needed to supply the people on her home islands.

The Pauley report continues:

> The Allied Powers should take no action to assist Japan in maintaining a standard of living higher than that of neighboring Asiatic countries injured by Japanese aggression. * * * Under this principle a broad view should be taken of the economy and especially of the varying degree of industrialization of eastern Asia as a whole. The over-all aim should be both to raise and to even up the level of industrialization. This aim can be served by considered allocation, to different countries, of industrial equipment exacted from Japan as reparations. * * * In the over-all comparison of needs Japan should have the last priority.

Mr. Dulles' reparations plan starts from the assumption of the Pauley report that Japan has a population "not fully employed" and industrial capacity "not fully employed." This must be employed in making goods sold for export or the Japanese do not eat.

I do not know that this is the plan of Mr. Dulles. I am inclined to think it is the plan of Mr. Acheson. I am not sure that Mr. Dulles would have been doing this chore unless Mr. Acheson had approved.

Mr. Dulles proposes to use this surplus to process the materials of the war-devastated countries and give them in return, "not merely consumer goods, which would enable underdeveloped countries to speed up developing their own industry."

If this does not mean transferring Japanese industrial potential to east Asia, and leveling down the standard of living of the Japanese to east Asia, I do not know what it means.

Thus we come to the curious question of what countries are to acquire this vast wealth.

The reparations clause is frequently said to refer to the Philippines, but obviously, as Mr. Dulles admits, the Chinese have the largest claim, a good half of the total, which he estimates at $100,000,000,000.

That means that the Chinese would have a claim of $50,000,000,000 for reparations.

The Yoshida letter of December 24, 1951, says that Japan is making a peace treaty with the Nationalist Government of China, which will be applicable "to all territories which are now, or which may hereafter be, under the control of the National Government of the Republic of China," that is, a Nationalist China, sovereign over Formosa only.

That means the Nationalist Government is not recognized as the sovereign power on the mainland.

I hope Senators will get this, if they forget everything else I say:

But only mainland China has claim to reparations, because Formosa, like Korea, was not invaded. It was Japanese territory at that time.

There is the gimmick—there is the catch. If we ratify this treaty without this reservation and Communist China wants to make claim, she can claim $50,000,000,000 in reparations, and she can sweep to Indochina, Burma, India, and all the way around the world.

Furthermore, the peace treaty says, in article 14 (a), that Japan will enter into negotiations with allied powers—note this—whose present territories were occupied by the Japanese forces. That would bar Nationalist China even from negotiations over reparations. It would leave only Red China as the claimant under this treaty. Red China needs capital goods and war equipment, and Japan is her nearest industrial neighbor.

The proposed reservation would reiterate the historic American policy of the open door and the territorial integrity of China. At the same time, it would bar our recognition of Red China or its admission to the U. N. It would, finally, bar Red China from any claim to reparations or any other war damages.

Mr. President, if we do not incorporate this reservation into the treaty, we are aiding the overrunning of China by conquest, forcing Japan to pay reparations to Communist China in the sum of $50,000,000,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the committee [Mr. CONNALLY] from the floor, I yield myself 7 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the reservation very briefly. First, I invite attention to the fact that the word "China" is used only two times in the peace treaty. The first time it is used is in article X. I should like to have every Senator listen to this very carefully. Its use in article X was exactly as was suggested by the Nationalist Government of China.

I repeat what I said a few days ago, that in the course of the drafting of this treaty we were constantly in touch with representatives of the Chinese Nationalist Government, and many of their suggestions were accepted and put into the treaty. This was one of them.

The second reference to the word "China" is in article 21, and in that case it referred to the right of Japan to make a treaty of peace and to recognize the sovereignty of whatever government in China it saw fit to recognize.

I invite attention to the fact that Japan has exercised that option and is dealing with Nationalist China. Japan has a commission in Formosa at this time which has been working on a treaty of peace with China. I do not know how many articles have been agreed to, but I may say that I received a letter yesterday from a member of the commission who told me that the commission was there and that considerable progress had been made and that the treaty, they felt, was almost complete. Japan has shown that she is recognizing Nationalist China.

I invite the attention of every Member of the Senate to the letter which the Prime Minister of Japan addressed to Mr. John Foster Dulles, which is set forth in full on pages 9 and 10 of the hearings.

I will not take time to read the letter, but I invite every Member of the Senate to do so.

In that connection, I should like to call to the attention of Senators a statement which was issued by Mr. George Yeh, Foreign Minister of Nationalist China on Formosa, on the day this letter by Prime Minister Yoshida was given to the newspapers. It is to be found on page 31 of the hearings on the treaty. He there expresses complete satisfaction with the statement Prime Minister Yoshida had given out.

Mr. President, after all, the one government that ought to be concerned about this treaty is the Government of Nationalist China. From everything that is in the record, I submit that Nationalist China is not only satisfied or reconciled as to what has taken place, but is entirely pleased with it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator from Alabama assure the Senate that Japan will not change her mind?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No; and nobody can give such assurance, because that would violate the provision in the first reservation proposed by the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], which the Senator from Louisiana supported, that nothing in this treaty should be construed to limit the sovereignty of any government. When the treaty becomes effective, Japan will become a sovereign government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. Since I have only another minute, I wish to make one point. When I have finished, I will yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time allotted to himself by the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute more.

I merely wish to call attention to the inconsistency of this reservation with the first reservation which was proposed by the Senator from Indiana, which provided that nothing in this treaty should in any way limit the sovereignty of Japan.

The proposed reservation, if agreed to, certainly would limit the sovereignty of Japan, because it would tell Japan what she must do—that she must deal with Nationalist China. We cannot tell her that without limiting her jurisdiction. We want her to do that, and she is doing it. As affecting nations dealing

with each other in honor and with integrity, I do not know of anything more that we could insist upon.

Mr. President, I submit that this reservation ought not be agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to speak for 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I yield to no Member of the Senate on the question of a desire to support the Nationalist Government of China. For almost 4 years I have worked on that problem. I believe we made a serious mistake when we let the Nationalist Government down. Therefore, I am the last person who would in any way argue with the purport of what the Senator from Indiana has in mind, namely, that of having all of China under the Nationalist Government.

However, we have to face the facts that exist. When the treaty was negotiated, we wanted to have Nationalist China included in the negotiations at San Francisco. Our British friends, who had recognized Communist China, wanted to have Communist China included in the negotiations at San Francisco. In order to expedite matters, it was agreed that China would be left entirely out of the treaty negotiations signed at San Francisco. Therefore, China does not appear as a party to the treaty we are now discussing. Let me make that clear. China is not included. She has no claim to reparations or anything else under the treaty we are now discussing.

It was decided that when the treaty was ratified, Japan, of her own free will and acting under her own sovereignty, would determine which of the governments of China she would recognize, and then make her own separate treaty with that government. She is now making a separate treaty with Nationalist China, and is determining with Nationalist China the question of the amount of reparations, if any, she will concede. Japan has stated very definitely, as the Senator from Alabama has just pointed out, that she is not going to deal with Communist China. Communist China is in no way, shape, or manner to get anything under this treaty. She has nothing to do with it. A new treaty would have to be negotiated before Communist China could have anything to do with this matter.

Therefore, it seems to me the discussion is confused if we do not understand the earlier negotiations, in which China was left out entirely. She is not a party to this treaty.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California. He is familiar with this subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Because so few Senators were on the floor, I think it is important for me to say that on March 18, I placed in the RECORD, at page 2452, a memorandum from Mr. Fisher, legal adviser of the State Department, to Mr. Dulles. I will read the first paragraph, and Senators who are interested may read the whole memorandum. The memorandum was in response to an inquiry made by Mr. Dulles, according to what was said in a discussion on the floor of the Senate, where I raised the question.

In answer to your inquiry, Communist China does not receive any reparations from Japan under the Japanese Peace Treaty. Article 14 (a) I, the reparations provision, obliges Japan to negotiate only with Allied Powers concerning compensation for damage done to territories occupied and damaged by Japanese forces. Communist China is not an Allied Power within the meaning of the treaty. Article 25 of the treaty specifically defines Allied Powers as only those states at war with Japan which have signed and ratified the treaty. Since Communist China has not and cannot sign the treaty, it is not an Allied Power, and consequently Japan is under no treaty obligation to negotiate or pay reparations to Communist China.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from California for the statement he has read from Mr. Fisher, which confirms the statement I made earlier.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JENNER. Considering what the Senator from California has just said, does anyone believe that Japan can continue to exist without a treaty with China, and that she will not enter into a treaty with China? When she does, according to the Yoshida letter, it will deal with Red China, and Red China can claim reparations to the extent of $50,000,000,000; can she not?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. She cannot, because Japan would not have entered into such an agreement.

Mr. JENNER. Japan will have to make a treaty with China in order to live, and she will make such a treaty.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey the remainder of time on this side.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The question I wish to ask the Senator was partly answered by the Senator from California. It had to do with the definition of what constituted Allied Powers, as referred to in article 25. Article 14 asserts certain rights of the Allied Powers with respect to rights of the Japanese. Under the interpretation, the present Government of China is not one of the Allied Powers as defined by article 25. Would the Senator then say that Red China does not acquire rights established by article 14 for reparations or claims?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I say Red China cannot possibly have any rights under this treaty, to which she is not a party, and was not invited to be a party. If Red China makes a new treaty with Japan, that is Japan's business. It is inconceivable that Japan would give her any such reparations.

Mr. CASE. And Red China would not have rights of seizure according to certain statements in article 14?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I would say "No."

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is it not true that under the Italian Peace Treaty, Italy was not compelled to pay reparations to any of the Allied Powers except possibly Russia and a few satellite nations, but that under the pending treaty Japan actually will be required to pay reparations to the Allied Powers, a distinct innovation when compared with the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty? Is that not true?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. No. The Senator will have to read the treaty very carefully, and especially the reparations clause. In the first place, Japan's reparations are waived, except that under the proposed arrangement Japan will process raw materials of certain countries as a part of reparations payments. But those countries will have to be signatories to the treaty, which Communist China is not.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Italy, under her treaty, was not compelled to accept comparable conditions to process raw commodities and pay reparations to any of the Allied Powers; was she?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The two treaties in that respect are entirely different. This is an entirely new approach, as was discussed the other day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has 7 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 3 minutes to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I was very much impressed by the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], that China was mentioned only twice in this treaty. One place is in article 21. Let us see what article 21 says:

ARTICLE 21

Notwithstanding the provisions of article 25 of the present treaty, China shall be entitled to the benefits of articles 10 and 14 (a) 2; and Korea to the benefits of articles 2, 4, 9, and 12 of the present treaty.

If we turn to article 14, we find a provision relating to reparation payments.

Who has been injured by the Japanese occupation? China, above all, far more than anyone else. As I understand what the Senator from Indiana is proposing, it is this: If billions of dollars of reparations are to be paid by Japan to China, let them be paid to the Chinese Nationalist Government. We do not mean the Chinese Communist Government. This treaty does not bind Communist China. It does not bind Russia. Every Senator knows that Russian troops are now poised 3 miles away from Japanese territory. When Japan undertakes to make peace with Russia, the Russians are going to put pressure on Japan to get her to change the interpretation of what "China" means, and agree that, instead of meaning the Chinese Government on

Formosa, it means the government on the continent of China.

So far as the junior Senator from Louisiana is concerned, he wishes to go on record as saying that when the treaty mentions "China," it refers to Nationalist China.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to Reservation No. 4 proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—29

Bricker	Ecton	McClellan
Bridges	Hendrickson	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Seaton
Cain	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Kem	Thye
Case	Long	Watkins
Cordon	Malone	Welker
Dirksen	Martin	Williams
Dworshak	McCarran	Young
Eastland	McCarthy	

NAYS—48

Aiken	Holland	Moody
Anderson	Hunt	Morse
Benton	Ives	Murray
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Robertson
Ellender	Knowland	Russell
Ferguson	Lehman	Saltonstall
Flanders	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	McFarland	Sparkman
George	McKellar	Stennis
Hayden	McMahon	Tobey
Hennings	Millikin	Underwood
Hill	Monroney	Wiley

NOT VOTING—19

Bennett	Green	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Byrd	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Taft
Duff	Langer	
Gillette	Lodge	

So reservation No. 4, proposed by Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer a reservation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state it.

The reservation was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, and its domestic concerns.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a point of order. I think we have voted on this reservation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The reservation is in order. Some changes have been made in it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The whole reservation was voted on before. It seems to me that a motion could have been made when reservation No. 1 was before the Senate to strike from it the portion deleted in the reservation of the Senator from Illinois. Why should we go back and take another vote on it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the reservation is in order, because changes have been made in it, and the Chair so holds.

Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate in substance voted on this reservation and defeated it. The author of the reservation now simply strikes from reservation No. 1 the language:

Or (b) to impose any continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

In effect it adds nothing to Reservation No. 1. Since we have already voted on it and voted it down, I very much hope that the Senate will not agree to this reservation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am glad to hear the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations say that paragraph (b) of reservation No. 1 added nothing materially. That was the view I took in the earlier instance when I made some observations on reservation No. 1.

Therefore what is before us at the present time is the first clause of reservation No. 1, which was offered by the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. I shall read the reservation which I am offering. I ask Senators to note its reading because in my judgment the significance and meaning of this reservation was entirely destroyed and misunderstood. It was not done deliberately, to be sure. However, this is how the reservation now reads:

Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy, its Military Establishment, and its domestic concerns.

It does not say that that right must be exercised. It does not involve the question of sovereignty. It simply says that as a sovereign nation the right of this country over foreign policy, the Military Establishment, and domestic concerns shall not be limited by the provisions of this treaty.

There is a great deal of concern about this matter. Senate Joint Resolution 130, which was introduced by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] on behalf of himself and 55 other Members of the Senate, proposes an amendment to the Constitution which would provide that no treaty or executive agreement shall be made respecting the rights of citizens protected by the Constitution. Then it provides:

No treaty or executive agreement shall vest in any international organization or in any foreign power any of the legislative, executive, or judicial powers vested by this Constitution in the Congress, the President, and in the courts of the United States, respectively.

The joint resolution is responsive to an apprehension in the country that by treaty we are bartering away the rights of the Nation.

As everyone knows, under the Constitution a treaty is the supreme law of the land. It may be that these rights may never be exercised, but they should be protected. I believe they ought to be formally protected by the language in the reservation which is now before the Senate.

Let us not forget that in the preamble to the treaty we are urging Japan to become a member of the United Nations. When she becomes a member of the United Nations she assumes responsibilities, even as we have assumed responsibilities under the United Nations Charter. Suppose that one of our rights should come into issue between this country and the United Nations in Japan, in China, or in Korea. If we do not protect that right, how are we going to exercise it finally? If there is a limitation on it, how are we going to exercise that right?

With respect to our Military Establishment, it was pointed out that already

differences of opinion about military policy have developed in Korea. We find ourselves outvoted by those who have representatives in uniform in Korea. Suppose a conflict arises; suppose an adverse interest develops, then what about the right, Mr. President? Is it protected or has it been surrendered?

Because of the prolixities of this treaty, I do not propose to say that we can spell out every right and every possibility of impairment of those rights by the various clauses of the treaty. But I do say that if we mean business under the Bricker joint resolution, and if we are responsive to the fear and anxiety of the country today, as symbolized by resolutions in both branches of Congress, it is not too much to append to this treaty a reservation which merely says that the treaty shall impose no limitation on the rights of the United States in its control over its foreign policy, its domestic concerns, and its Military Establishment.

I think that if we are to respond to the rather vocal sentiment in the country today, and if we are to give some attention to the anxiety and dismay of the people, as they read from time to time about treaty legislation and the impairment of the sovereign right of this country, this reservation should be adopted.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

A doubt was expressed earlier as to the second provision of this reservation, namely, that it may impose continuing limitations on the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan.

I did not think it was of any particular consequence. The genial and gracious chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations seems to have borne out that contention in the remarks he made a few moments ago. I do not think it is material. However, lest it bring some disconcert of spirit to any Member of the Senate I have eliminated it. Therefore what is before us is the preservation of our right, if and when and under certain circumstances we want to exercise control of that right, with respect to the Military Establishment, our foreign policy, and domestic concerns.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. It may be, as the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee says, that clause (b) of the Jenner-Smith reservation was meaningless; but I should like to say that, so far as I was concerned, it was sufficiently material to make me vote against the reservation.

With clause (b) stricken out, I have no hesitation in voting for the reservation proposed by the Senator from Illinois, because as one of the proponents of the Bricker resolution, I believe we cannot be too careful in protecting the rights of our own United States Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my friend from Vermont.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Let me say that I think the elimination of clause (b) makes a very material difference in the reservation. I should like to support that statement by quoting from a memorandum with which I was supplied by the State Department itself. I asked the State Department for some data regarding these reservations.

Let me read the comment of the State Department in regard to the meaning of clause (b). The memorandum states:

> There are several clauses in the treaty of peace which are clearly intended to impose continuing limitations on Japan's sovereignty. A case in point is article 3 of the treaty, which requires Japan to give the United States rights in the Ryukyus and Bonins. On this article rests our right to maintain air and naval bases which are of primary strategic importance to the United States. Another example is Japan's recognition of the independence of Korea, which we certainly expect to be a continuing recognition. ' There are other clauses which might be regarded as continuing obligations on the part of Japan, for instance her renunciation of claims to the Pacific mandated islands over which we now hold a trusteeship, her renunciation of certain agreements and treaties which served as a pretext for her former imperialistic ventures, her waiver of all claims against the Allied Powers arising out of the war, and her recognition of the validity of all acts of the occupation.

Then this question is asked in the memorandum:

> Does the proposed reservation regarding the full and unconditional sovereignty of Japan contemplate that all these obligations, which are certainly "continuing limitations" on Japan and which are of great importance to the United States, shall be nullified?

It was because of that memorandum that I could not vote for the reservation in its first form. I can vote for it now; I think there is a material difference.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate the discussion we have had on paragraph (b) of the reservation. However, as I point out, it now stands as providing only that no limitation shall be imposed upon the right of this country as a sovereign country still to maintain control over its military, its foreign, and its domestic policies.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope the Senate in its boundless wisdom will see fit to approve this reservation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservation submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Several Senators asked for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, does any time remain?

Mr. CONNALLY. I believe I control the remaining time. Does the Senator from California wish to speak against the reservation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I wish to discuss the proposal of the Senator from Illinois, and I am not favoring it in the form in which the Senator from Illinois has presented it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well. How much time does the Senator from California desire to have?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to have about 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well; I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I think there is considerable merit in the statement which has been made by the Senator from Illinois on the general basis that neither this treaty nor any other treaty should affect the constitutional guaranties of the American people, the constitutional prerogatives of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief, the constitutional prerogatives of the Congress in connection with legislation and the legislative field, or the constitutional prerogatives of the judiciary in the judicial field. Those things are rather fundamental, but they do not apply exclusively to the Japanese peace treaty.

I would be inclined to favor a reservation of this kind if it were handled separately as a matter of general public policy, in the way provided by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in his joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to deal with this subject, or in the form in which I believe the able Senator from Nevada has proposed, for approval by the Senate, a somewhat similar piece of legislation. Then it would apply to this treaty and to other treaties, and certainly would set forth the sentiments and the general public policy as outlined by the Congress of the United States, composed of the Senate and the House of Representatives, until action is taken on the constitutional amendment which has been proposed by the Senator from Ohio. I have joined him in offering it, and I hope it will be adopted, because I think the questions to which it relates need clarification.

However, Mr. President, I do not believe this reservation should be added to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

In the first place, it has been pointed out that when we are dealing with nations, by means of treaties, to a certain extent we are dealing with sovereignties, depending upon what interpretation is placed on that particular word. For instance, if we enter with other nations into a treaty, providing that we will not engage in gas warfare, to that extent we are imposing upon our sovereignty in making war a limitation not to use everything at our disposal.

After all, the matter of treaties is largely one of good faith between nations. Even though we had entered into a treaty to the effect that we would not conduct submarine warfare, let us say, our Government, under the Constitution and under the powers of the Commander in Chief, subsequently could engage in submarine warfare if the President ordered the United States Navy to do so, despite the existence of such a treaty. I take it that nothing in the treaty could possibly interfere with the President's constitutional prerogatives as Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy.

However, Mr. President, it seems to me that the matter could be handled much better by means of the constitutional

amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio.

I should like to ask the Senator from Texas a question: If a resolution dealing with this matter, which resolution was not a reservation to this treaty, were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, could the Senator from Texas give to the Senate the assurance that a hearing would be held on that resolution or on one of that type within a period of, let us say, a month, so that there would be no question that the entire matter would be pigeonholed indefinitely.

Mr. CONNALLY. In reply to the question asked by the Senator from California, let me say that I certainly have no objection to having the committee consider such a resolution. So far as concerns the time element, of course I cannot guarantee that the committee would act on such a resolution within 1 month, because, as the Senator from California is aware, many matters and problems of pressing importance are before the committee at this time.

However, I would not obstruct such a resolution; I would not sidetrack it. I would be very glad to have the committee consider it, in the form the Senator from California has suggested.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. CASE. However, would not such a resolution come too late? It seems to me that the Senator from California is putting himself in the position of saying, "We will lock the barn if we can put ourselves in a position of locking it against everyone; but if in this case someone comes to steal a horse, we will not lock the barn against him."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator can point out in the treaty anything which he feels impinges upon our sovereignty, in the sense that it impinges upon the constitutional rights of the American people or of the President or of the Congress or of the judiciary, then I would be prepared to discuss with him whether this reservation should be supported in connection with this treaty.

However, I know of no such provision in the pending treaty.

Because of the fact that this treaty is not a bilateral treaty between the United States and Japan alone, but concerns approximately 48 other nations, the adoption of such a reservation might require a general reopening and rediscussion of the entire treaty.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, let me say to the able Senator from California that I have followed his entire argument in connection with the treaty——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Texas whether he will yield one more minute to me, so as to permit the interchange between the Senator from South Dakota and myself to be concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, I yield one more minute to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized for one more minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield again to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from California.

Mr. President, let me say that I have followed with a great deal of appreciation the statement the Senator from California has made. I think he has taken a sound approach to this treaty.

However, if there is no impingement by the treaty on the sovereignty of the United States, what harm is there in making plain that fact by the reservation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Only to the extent that it would be looked upon as a reservation applying to the field of sovereign powers. As has been pointed out, in any treaty there may be provisions affecting certain powers which normally are sovereign powers. We are trying to deal with Japan as a sovereign power on an equal basis. If instead of applying the same provisions to both nations, we were to say to Japan, "This provision will apply to you, but it will not apply to the United States," then immediately we would leave the plane of equality in dealing with Japan as a sovereign nation, and we would put ourselves in a somewhat different position regarding that matter. I think such action might be misunderstood in Japan. So I do not think anything would be served by adding such a reservation to this treaty.

I do not think the reservation would accomplish, in the case of this treaty, anything which could not be accomplished by the constitutional amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from California for his answer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I yield myself one-half minute at this time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I have 6 minutes remaining. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the proposed constitutional amendment submitted by the Senator from Ohio, for himself and 58 other Senators, has been brought into this discussion. If such an amendment were in the Constitution of the United States at the present time, there would be no question in regard to all the reservations which have been called up. I should like to advise the Senator from California, for the purpose of keeping the record straight, that the joint resolution proposing that constitutional amendment has been referred to the Judiciary Committee, that the chairman of that committee has already appointed a subcommittee to conduct hearings on it, and he has promised me that as soon as the hearings before the subcommittee are concluded the full committee will proceed to a hearing.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield me one-half minute? I think this is important.

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The point is that, should the constitutional amendment be adopted, would that, in the judgment of the able Senator from Ohio, be in effect retroactive with respect to this treaty, in that it would then be the supreme law of the land, without question?

Mr. BRICKER. In the opinion of the Senator from Ohio it would become the fundamental law of the land, and would take precedence over any treaty, subsequent or previous. However, I do not want to say that definitely, because it is a question which has never been definitely litigated before the Supreme Court of the United States, and therefore no one can make an unequivocal declaration on the subject.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Perhaps I should use some of my own time. The first point is that before the proposed constitutional amendment can become operative it must be approved or ratified by conventions in the several States.

Mr. BRICKER. It must be ratified by conventions in three-fourths of the States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That would mean that several years would elapse. Several years could ensue before the necessary States had ratified the amendment. Is that not correct?

Mr. BRICKER. It might be several years. The joint resolution proposing the amendment would have to be passed by the Senate and also by the House by a three-fourths vote, after which it would be submitted to all the States. There is a limitation of 7 years. I predict, however, that if it is submitted to the States during the present session of the Congress, it will not require more than 3 or 4 years to obtain its ratification.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 3 or 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I spoke on this reservation previously. I should like now merely to call the attention of the Senate to one or two points. I have heard similar discussions before. I do not think any of us are in disagreement with the main purposes of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. In this connection I may say that I am a cosponsor of the proposed amendment to the Constitution which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has introduced, so I am in entire accord with the spirit of the amendment.

With reference to the pending reservation, it seems to me that if we write it into the treaty, we ought perhaps write a similar reservation in every other treaty we make with any country. My attention has not been called to anything in the treaty which in any way restricts the sovereignty or control of the United States in matters affecting our foreign policy or our Military Establishment. In this treaty, as in all other treaties we make, there are certain limitations upon sovereignty and concessions have to be made on both sides. If we should take this action, I feel

absolutely certain that the British Government would make a similar claim, and so on down the line in the case of other nations. Each country would claim that there is nothing to limit its sovereignty, and Japan might very well be placed then in a position in which she alone is obligated, while no one other nation is obligated, if it elects to abrogate the agreements it has made.

Let me say that, in my judgment, this reservation would nullify all the supplementary agreements to be negotiated under this treaty. Both Japan and the United States must make limitations on their respective sovereignties in the ordinary form of treaties with respect to fisheries, maritime, administrative, and other matters. We have just concluded an administrative agreement in connection with which we shall have to take similar action, if we are to adopt this reservation. I am very much confused by this eleventh hour effort to write something into a treaty which, if done in the case of the Japanese Treaty, should be done in the case of every existing treaty with every country in the world, and the same thing would be necessary in the future.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the able Senator from New Jersey a question. Let us suppose a specific case. In the administrative agreement which has been negotiated with Japan, when the question rises as to jurisdiction in the matter of persons who are accused of crime, possibly our own citizens, possibly our own soldiers, we agree to apply the same rule as the one we will agree to with respect to NATO countries, and it is contemplated, I believe, that we shall work out some agreement whereby they can be tried locally, certainly for certain specified offenses. If this reservation were agreed to, I am wondering whether it would not negative that effort, because it would certainly be a limitation upon our control of certain parts of our Military Establishment.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think the Senator's conclusion is sound, I am very much concerned, if we adopt this reservation hastily, that we shall find ourselves forced to reexamine a great many existing treaties, and determine whether we should not have a similar reservation in each of them.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one other question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that, in the very nature of things, every treaty constitutes a certain limitation upon the contracting parties?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I may say to the Senator from Alabama that I have tried to make that point clear every time I have spoken. I spoke about it the first time I addressed the Senate on this subject. Every treaty is a limitation. Any contract I might make with the distinguished Senator from Alabama would impose a limitation upon my freedom to act, without regard to the responsibilities assumed by me to respect his rights under such a contract. I think there is a necessary limitation. In my judgment, a reservation of this kind would constitute an entirely new departure in international law. If one nation in making a treaty with another, should say, "Yes, we make this treaty, we make this agreement; we agree to this, and we agree to that; but nothing will interfere with our sovereign right to do as we please," I fear that matters would become complicated for us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has 3 minutes left.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senate will not approve this reservation. The difficulties to be anticipated have been clearly pointed out. This reservation if adopted, would have to be submitted to 48 nations.

What is the reservation which is proposed? It reads:

> Nothing contained in this treaty shall be construed (a) to impose any limitations on the right of the United States as a sovereign power to exercise complete and unlimited control over its foreign policy—

Where in the treaty is there anything that does that? No one has pointed out anything in this treaty which limits our control over our foreign policy, except the things in the treaty to which we agree. Where is there anything that does that? The reservation continues—

> its military establishment, and its domestic concerns.

There is nothing in the treaty which imposes any limitations upon those rights of the United States. Why should anyone try to put up a smokescreen by saying that such rights are not affirmatively provided? It is unnecessary that they be affirmatively provided, because they already exist. Suppose someone should propose a reservation against sin. Yes, we are against sin; but the particular sin is not designated.

No one has pointed out, no one can point out, anything in this treaty which would make it possible to do the things which are sought to be prevented.

When we are about ready to ratify the treaty, why should we, as an afterthought, fling back the treaty into the faces of 48 nations? Were we to do that, they would say, "Why in the world is it necessary to write into the treaty a reservation to cover the question of sovereignty?" There is nothing in the treaty to endanger our sovereignty. There is nothing in the treaty to endanger our control of our foreign policy. There is nothing contained in it which limits our control of our Military Establishment. Everything contained in the treaty regarding the military is to our advantage. We are given the right to occupy Japan. Japan is given no right of similar nature.

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that those who want to affect our foreign policy will allow it to continue to be a policy under which we stand by our treaties; and that when we make a treaty, we will not be heard later to say, "Oh, well, we signed the treaty," but we must point out this, we must point out that, and we must point out the other, by way of reservations.

No one on this floor has pointed to anything in this treaty which violates any of the guaranties which this reservation is designed to protect. Why merely throw in a glittering generality for the sake of making an attack on the treaty?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe I have some time remaining.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, since Reservation No. 1 was not adopted, we cannot look at the treaty by itself, as I tried to explain to the Senate; it must be read in connection with the mutual-security pact. We have entered into administrative agreements already under that pact, whereby one representative of the United States Government and one representative of the Japanese Government can make arrangements for the occupation of bases in Japan, and when military forces come into being in and about Japan, for the collective security of that area, the President of the United States and the head of the Japanese Government, by a stroke of the pen, can turn our soldiers and our sailors into the United Nations forces, and we shall have Korea all over again.

There is the answer to the distinguished Senator from Texas. Have we not had enough?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may say to my very gracious friend, the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY], that had there been a few glittering generalities along about February of 1945 we would not have had to expiate the sins of what was undertaken at Yalta. We would not be apologizing for the sins of omission and commission that now rise up from the pages of history.

Had there been a few glittering generalities in 1947, probably more than two-thirds of the Senate, individually would not be denouncing its own handiwork when it consummated the treaty with Italy.

I think, Mr. President, in the interest of our own people, in the interest of our own sovereign rights in a world that is filled with fury, instability, and uncertainty the time has come when we should give some assurance to the people of the United States.

The reservation simply safeguards and makes certain to our people that the rights which are ours over the Military Establishment, the rights which are ours over foreign policy, the rights which are ours over domestic affairs, shall not be taken away by a piece of treaty legislation. We have seen that ugly head too often, and that is why there are anguish and concern in America today.

That is why the American Bar Association, through its president, has been writing articles and making speeches against anything that would barter away the rights of this country. The reservation can be negotiated, Mr. President, through diplomatic channels. It requires no formal conference of the 48 countries which assembled in San Francisco. Even if it did, the first concern of the Senate as the representatives of the people of the United States should be to require and command the protection of the rights of our own country regardless of the difficulties of procedure.

I have heard discussion about the difficulties of procedure, the problems of renegotiating. So what, Mr. President?

The time has come to make sure that what we contrive today will be moral, will safeguard the rights of our people, and will recognize a handiwork of which we can well be proud.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservation offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bricker	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Seaton
Butler, Md.	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Capehart	Kem	Watkins
Case	Long	Welker
Dirksen	Malone	Williams
Dworshak	Martin	Young
Ecton	McCarran	

NAYS—47

Anderson	Holland	Moody
Benton	Hunt	Morse
Clements	Ives	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Douglas	Kilgore	Robertson
Eastland	Knowland	Russell
Ellender	Lehman	Saltonstall
Flanders	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Frear	Maybank	Smith, N. C.
Fulbright	McClellan	Sparkman
George	McFarland	Stennis
Gillette	McKellar	Thye
Hayden	McMahon	Underwood
Hennings	Millikin	Wiley
Hill	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—20

Bennett	Green	Neely
Brewster	Hoey	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kerr	Smathers
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Duff	Lodge	

So the reservation proposed by Mr. DIRKSEN was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as I understand, the question now is on the resolution of ratification, is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the resolution of ratification.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to propose at this time a reservation to the resolution of ratification. The reservation was adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations. It reads:

As part of such advice and consent the Senate states that nothing the treaty contains is deemed to diminish or prejudice, in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied Powers as defined in said treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, the Habomai Islands, the island of Shikotan, or any other territory, rights, or interests possesed by Japan on December 7, 1941—

I hope Senators will heed the following language—

or to confer any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto on the Soviet Union; and also that nothing in the said treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions in favor of the Soviet Union contained in the so-called Yalta agreement regarding Japan of February 11, 1945.

Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations adopted that language to be a part of the resolution of ratification so as to guarantee and to make clear that nothing in the treaty, anywhere in it—not in one line or another, nowhere in the treaty—could be so construed as to give to Russia any right in any of the territories mentioned when the war began on December 7, 1941.

Mr. President, that is a safeguard. It is suggested to meet the views of those who fear that something might be derived from the treaty which would give strength to the claim of Russia to any of these territories. It is an absolute safeguard, and I hope the Senate will gladly adopt it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. As I recall, the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator from Texas is chairman, was a unanimous report. Did that unanimity also prevail with reference to the reservation the Senator has just read?

Mr. CONNALLY. It did. The members of both political parties represented on the committee agreed to it, as I now recall.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservation proposed by the Senator from Texas to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have a brief statement I desire to make largely for the RECORD, and which I wish to have appear in the RECORD before the vote is taken.

Last August 22, which was 21 days before the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty at San Francisco, I discussed in the Senate some of the flaws and dangers in the territorial provisions of the proposed treaty. In the concluding paragraph of my remarks, I announced my intention to propose reservations for inclusion in the resolution of ratification to express the sense of the Senate that ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty should not be construed as ratification by the Senate of the Yalta agreement of 1945.

I announced also that my reservation would provide that ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty should not be construed as endorsement by the United States Senate of cession by Japan to Russia of the Kurile Islands and southern Sakhalin and its adjacent islands.

I request unanimous consent that my remarks of August 22, 1951, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

(Speech of Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, in the Senate of the United States, Wednesday, August 22, 1951)

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Japanese Peace Treaty in its present form has much to commend it. It does not assess punishments nor does it contain provisions which can be regarded as degrading and humiliating. It is a treaty of reconciliation which foregoes revenge and punishment. It will

clear the way for Japan to resume a place of dignity and equality in the family of nations.

While on the whole the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty is commendable there are some aspects which may seriously threaten the future peace and security of Japan, the United States, and the whole Pacific Ocean area. The principal fault in that respect is in those provisions regarding the future status of Sakhalin and, more especially, the Kurile Islands.

Russia is now in de facto possession of Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands. She is in what might be termed adverse possession as a military occupant.

Sakhalin is less than 24 miles from Japan. The Kuriles are even closer. Recently, when the Russians seized the Habomai Islands off the southern end of the Kuriles, Russia placed herself within 3 miles of the northernmost of the Japanese home islands.

By the provisions of a secret agreement negotiated at Yalta in February 1945 regarding Japan, President Roosevelt and Winston Churchill promised Russia the southern half of Sakhalin Island and its adjacent islands together with the Kurile Islands as part payment for Russian intervention on the side of the Allies in the war against Japan.

RUSSIA ATTACKS JAPAN

In the closing days of World War II Russia turned on Japan in spite of a nonaggression pact between the two countries. Soviet troops, assisted by naval landing parties, seized and occupied both Sakhalin and the Kuriles. A settlement and economic development program was immediately put under way. Airfields and submarine and naval facilities were enlarged and improved. Russia made it plain by her actions that she considered the Yalta arrangement a permanent award of territory. Now comes a proposed peace treaty which by the provisions of section (c) of article 2 of chapter II requires Japan to relinquish all right, title, and claim to the Kurile Islands and Sakhalin and its adjacent islands. With Russia in possession of these areas, this provision of the proposed treaty amounts to cession of Sakhalin and the Kuriles to Russia.

Sakhalin and the Kuriles overhang Japan from the north. In Russian hands they form the third quarter of a Communist circle about Japan and tend to make Japan another Berlin.

Japan's industrial and population areas are in easy bombing range of air bases in Sakhalin and the Kuriles. Japan's ports are within easy range of surface vessels and submarines based in Sakhalin and the Kuriles. Yokosuka, Japan's great naval base and the most powerful base in the western Pacific, is less than 650 miles from Russian bases in the Kuriles.

Much is being made of the fact that the United States and Japan will sign a mutual-security pact at the same time that they sign the peace treaty. By the terms of the mutual-security treaty the United States is to acquire the right, and the corresponding duty, to assist Japan in rebuilding and maintaining her own defenses. The United States will pledge herself to defend Japan and to that end will be given the right to certain bases in Japan and will maintain air, sea, and land forces in Japan.

Most important of the bases in Japan will be Yokosuka, at the mouth of Tokyo Bay. Thus the United States will sign one treaty at the San Francisco conference, the mutual-defense treaty, pledging herself to help maintain the security of Japan and the western Pacific. At the very same conference the United States will become a party to another treaty, the Japanese Peace Treaty, which signs away some of the most strategic areas of the far Pacific without which the defense of Japan is very difficult. The United States plans to sign one treaty at San Francisco pledging arms, men, money, and matériel for the defense of the very nation whose most vital defense areas, Sakhalin and the Kuriles, are to be taken from Japan at the very same conference.

Sakhalin, and more especially the Kuriles, are of tremendous strategic and economic importance to the Soviet Union. Possession of these island areas puts the Soviet Union in a forward position on the perimeter of the Pacific Basin.

The strategic value of the Kuriles for purposes of offense in the Pacific Ocean area was demonstrated by the Japanese in World War II. It will be recalled that it was at the largest of the Kuriles that Japanese carriers and warships assembled for the strike at Pearl Harbor in December 1941. It was planes and ships based on the Kurile Islands which supported the Japanese seizure of Kiska and Attu in the Aleutian Islands.

The Kurile Islands stretch for 800 miles along the path of the great circle air and sea routes which connect Alaska, Canada, and the United States with Japan, the continent of Asia, and the Philippines. Of even more significance is the fact that these islands are within easy bombing range of Alaska and could well serve as a springboard for the launching of attacks by air and sea against Alaska. Submarines and naval craft based in the Kuriles are based in the Pacific Ocean.

IMPORTANCE OF SAKHALIN

The importance of Sakhalin and the Kuriles to Soviet Russia for offensive purposes is probably exceeded by their value to Russia for defensive purposes. A glance at a map of the Pacific shows that the Kuriles, with Sakhalin behind them, lie as ramparts across the ocean approaches to Asiatic Russia. They close off the Sea of Okhotsk and make it a Russian lake. With Communist China and the Russian bases in Manchuria and Communist Korea they form a ring of buffers around Russia's Pacific flank.

From an economic standpoint Sakhalin and the Kuriles are also of tremendous value to the Soviet Union.

During the period of Japanese possession of southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles, the islands were developed into an important source of food to supplement Japan's home production. The Kuriles served largely as the base for fishing operations. Sakhalin, however, was suited for agricultural development. The main crops were hay, buckwheat, rye, oats, potatoes, and vegetables. Seaweed was gathered for food and fertilizer and lumber and wood pulp were produced in significant quantities. It is reported that the Russians, in the first year of their possession of southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles, have doubled the Japanese fish catch and have pushed agriculture in a drive to convert these islands into a significant food-producing asset to the Soviet in the Far East.

Sakhalin Island is rich in coal. Its coal reserves are estimated to be in excess of 3,500,000,000 tons. Coal production, which was estimated at 2,500,000 metric tons in 1941, has been greatly increased by the Russians.

Gold and iron pyrite have also been discovered in Sakhalin.

Sakhalin Island has significant petroleum deposits. It is the chief oil producing center east of the Ural Mountains. Oil deposits in the northern half of the island alone are estimated at 300,000,000 tons. Oil deposits in the southern half of the island are believed to be far in excess of that figure. Seventeen years ago, in 1934, there were 159 Japanese-controlled and 166 Russian-controlled oil wells in production in the island. The Japanese-controlled oil wells in Sakhalin accounted for one-quarter of Japan's total prewar oil production. In 1941 these wells produced about 4,000,000 barrels of oil. This production was stepped up during the war and has since continued to grow.

The Kuriles also have significant economic as well as strategic value. Like Sakhalin, the Kuriles are rich in lumber and forest products. They are the base for large fishing operations in the North Pacific. They were once the world's richest seal and otter hunting grounds. In recent years, silver, sulfur, and iron deposits have been discovered.

STALIN IS DELIGHTED

The oil and coal and the lumber, minerals, and food of Sakhalin and the Kuriles are invaluable additions to the Russian economy. Their greatest significance, however, is in respect to the Russian war machine. Possession of Sakhalin and the Kuriles frees the far eastern extremity of the Russian Empire from complete dependence on the trans-Siberian railroad and ocean transport. In addition, possession of these island areas puts Russia into the Pacific basin. This latter point can best be illustrated by reference to Stalin himself. On the day World War II ended, Stalin said in an address to the Russian people:

"From now on, southern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands will serve as a means of direct communication of the Soviet Union with the ocean and as a base for the defense of our country against Japanese aggression."

In a press conference on January 29, 1946, Mr. James F. Byrnes, then Secretary of State of the United States, announced that the Yalta Agreement in regard to Sakhalin and the Kuriles did not amount to a cession of these island areas to Russia. He stated that it would be necessary to formalize the transfer by treaty even though the territory in question was already in the possession of the recipient power. Secretary Byrnes pointed out that there was not any question about what was intended at Yalta with respect to Sakhalin and the Kuriles because at Yalta he had heard President Roosevelt on at least one or two occasions take the position as to cession of territory that it was a matter that had to be settled in the peace treaty. Secretary Byrnes emphasized that that was always President Roosevelt's view and that later at Potsdam President Truman had taken the same position in regard to the agreement for handling over Silesia, which had also been worked out at Yalta.

On January 31, 1946, President Truman endorsed and accepted the views expressed by Secretary Byrnes and President Roosevelt. He explained at his press and radio conference on that date that the secret agreement regarding Sakhalin and the Kuriles was not a treaty but merely a wartime understanding between the allies as to the best method of using their combined forces to win the war.

Section (c) of article 2 of chapter II of the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty will formalize and write into treaty form the infamous secret protocols of the Yalta agreement regarding Sakhalin and the Kuriles. To this date the Yalta agreement has not been ratified by the United States Senate nor has it otherwise received approval of the Congress of the United States by vote of either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

JAPAN CEDES INTEREST

Section (c) of article 2 of chapter II of the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty will formally divest Japan of "all right, title and claim to Sakhalin and the Kuriles." The treaty is silent as to who shall be the recipient of Japan's right, title, and claim to these vital island areas, but Soviet Russia is in possession and has made it plain that she regards the Kuriles and all of Sakhalin as hers. To date her claim has not been disputed nor has any nation or group of nations indicated either a desire or an intention of interposing objection. The simple fact of the matter is that Japan's renunciation of all right, title, and claim to Sakhalin and the Kuriles will for all practical purposes have the effect of perfecting Russia's claims to rightful possession and clear

title. Thus, should the United States Senate later ratify the Japanese Peace Treaty, the United States Senate will be ratifying and approving at least one aspect of the infamous Yalta agreement and will be assenting to formal transfer of these areas from Japan to Russia.

When viewed in light of the history of Russian designs in the Far East it is not surprising that Russia should announce that she intends to participate in the forthcoming San Francisco Conference.

World War II stripped Japan of her military power and removed her as a block to Russia in the Far East. World War II and its unfortunate aftermath have thrown half of Korea and all of China into the Soviet orbit. Now comes the Japanese Peace Treaty to give legal sanction to Russian possession of two vitally important island areas which lie on the very doorstep of Japan.

It has heretofore been said that section (b) or article 2 of chapter II is deficient for the reason that it does not settle the status of Formosa and the Pescadores and may open the way for a future deal with Communist China regarding these two very vital island areas off the coast of China. Section (c) of article 2 of chapter II of the proposed treaty is equally deficient and equally dangerous to the future peace and security of the Pacific. That section impliedly accepts and acknowledges Russia's seizure of the Kuriles and Sakhalin and the more recent seizure of the Hobami Islands.

APPROVING YALTA MISTAKES

By becoming a party to the Japanese peace treaty in its present form the United States will be compounding the mistakes made at Yalta. The proposed treaty, therefore, should be appropriately amended. Failing this the Senate of the United States should see to it that appropriate reservations are written into the resolution of ratification. Accordingly, if the proposed Japanese peace treaty is signed in its present form and section (c) of article 2 of chapter II is left intact, I shall propose an appropriate reservation for inclusion in the resolution of ratification which, when it comes before the United States Senate, will express the sense of the Senate that ratification of the Japanese peace treaty shall not be construed as ratification by the Senate of any of the open or secret protocols of the Yalta agreement of 1945; nor shall it be construed as an endorsement by the United States Senate of cession by Japan to Russia of the Kurile Islands and Sakhalin and its adjacent islands.

In my view, it would be in the interest of the security of the United States and the future peace and security of the world to permit Japan to retain the southern half of Sakhalin and all of the Kurile Islands. It would certainly be in the interest of the United States to go on record as favoring such a course of action even though for all present practical intents and purposes it is apparent that Russia will not withdraw either in favor of Japan or in favor of a United Nations trusteeship in which anyone other than Russia is the administering authority. In any event, the United States should not under any circumstances be a willing party to the signing over of Sakhalin and the Kuriles to Soviet Russia either in express terms or by implication.

Mr. WATKINS. On September 4, 1951, I dispatched a letter to Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, requesting the views of the Joint Chiefs in regard to certain statements which had been made on the floor of the Senate to the effect that the Japanese Peace Treaty and the arrangements to be made thereunder fulfilled 100 percent the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to security in the north and western Pacific. On the date of September 21, 1951, General Bradley replied to my letter of September 4. He advised me that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are fully aware of the strategic importance of the Sakhalin-Kurile Islands area and under present circumstances are not completely satisfied concerning security in that area.

I request unanimous consent that that exchange of letters be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 4, 1951.

Gen. OMAR H. BRADLEY,
Chairman, the Joint Chiefs of Staff,
Pentagon, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: I am writing to invite attention to the fact that in debate on the floor of the Senate on August 28, 1951, the Honorable WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, United States Senator from California, expressed the view that the provisions of the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty validate the defense position of the United States in Japan and in the Ryuku, Bonin, Volcano, and certain other islands south and southeast of Japan proper. Senator KNOWLAND observed that the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty and the defense arrangements authorized by its terms regarding Japan and the Ryukyus "meet 100 percent the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to security in that area."

I wish to invite specific attention to the provisions of section (c) of article 2 of chapter II of the proposed treaty and inquire whether the provisions of that particlar section of the treaty meet the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staffs as to security in the north and northwestern Pacific area. As will be noted, section (c) of article 2 of chapter II of the proposed treaty requires Japan to renounce all right, title and claim to the Kurile Islands and to southern Sakhalin and its adjacent islands.

I will appreciate receiving a statement as to the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in respect to the strategic significance of section (c) of article 2 of chapter II of the proposed treaty in order that I may make it a matter of record for information of my colleagues when the proposed peace treaty comes before the Senate for ratification.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,
Washington, D. C., September 21, 1951.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: It is a pleasure to give you my understanding of the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff regarding the provisions of section (c) of article 2, chapter II, of the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty. It should be noted that the provisions of chapter II of the proposed treaty are based generally on agreements reached with other governments at several conferences dated back to 1943.

At the Cairo Conference, November 22-26, 1943, it was agreed between President Roosevelt, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, and Prime Minister Churchill to force the unconditional surrender of Japan, and compel her to relinquish her sovereign rights to Pacific islands and other Asiatic territories seized, occupied or acquired by her through violence and greed.

The Yalta agreement of February 11, 1945, between President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin, provided, in addition to other matters, for the Soviet Union's entry into the war against Japan within 2 or 3 months after Germany's surrender, and specified that southern Sakhalin, the islands adjacent thereto and the Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

The terms of the Allies surrender ultimatum to Japan, in addition to other provisions, specified categorically that, "The terms of the Cairo declaration shall be carried out and Japanese sovereignty shall be limited to the islands of Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku, and such adjacent minor islands as we (the parties to the surrender proclamation) determine." The terms of the ultimatum were agreed to by the President of the United States, the President of the Republic of China, and the Prime Minister of Great Britain at Potsdam, Germany, July 26, 1945. The Soviet Government joined in the above declaration on August 8, 1945, in the Soviet declaration of a state of war with Japan.

Chapter II of the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty, in general, provides for the renouncement by Japan of her sovereign rights to certain Pacific islands and Asiatic possessions in keeping with the terms of the Potsdam surrender ultimatum. Section (c), article 2 of chapter II, provides for Japan's renouncement of her rights to southern Sakhalin, islands adjacent thereto, and the Kurile Islands. The treaty does not define the future status of these possessions.

Currently, Russia is the sole occupying power of the islands in question, having acquired them at the close of World War II. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are fully aware of the strategic importance of the area in question and under present circumstances are not completely satisfied concerning its security. However, in view of the current world situation, it is believed that the interests of the United States are best served by leaving the permanent status of the area to be determined at a future date when international tensions have been eased.

The Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff were freely and constantly consulted during the preparation of the proposed peace treaty. Essentially, the treaty is drawn in terms which do not contain within themselves the seeds of another war. The Joint Chiefs of Staff are of the opinion that this treaty, along with the proposed United States-Japanese Security Treaty, which should come into force simultaneously, will provide the United States the maximum security obtainable in the Far East at this time.

Sincerely,

OMAR N. BRADLEY.

Mr. WATKINS. Under date of September 14, 1951, I sent a letter to the Honorable John Foster Dulles in his capacity as special representative of the President, requesting an opinion from him as to whether Japan's renunciation of all right, title, and claim to the Kurile Islands and South Sakhalin would amount to a cession of those islands, together with the adjoining Hobamis and Shikotan Island, to the Soviet Union. In my letter I pointed to the principle of international law which holds that territories gained by force of arms are not to be considered as incorporated into the dominion of the conqueror without a renunciation in a treaty of peace or a long and permanent possession by the conqueror.

Under date of August 1, 1951, I received a reply from Mr. Dulles in which he states that in his opinion the territorial provisions of the treaty do not amount to a cession to Soviet Russia of these vital island areas. Mr. Dulles cited several matters in support of his view. I request unanimous consent of the Senate

to insert that exchange of correspondence in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEPTEMBER 14, 1951.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DULLES: I notice that the section of the Japanese Peace Treaty (ch. II, art. 2, sec. (c)), which divests Japan of South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, differs radically from the text of a similar section of the March 1951 draft of the treaty which would have accomplished the same end with respect to the same island areas. By the language of the earlier draft Japan was to "return" to Russia the southern part of Sakhalin as well as all the islands adjacent to it and to "hand over" to the Soviet Union the Kurile Islands. In the final draft of the treaty, however, Japan merely "renounces" all right, title and claim to southern Sakhalin and the Kuriles. There it stops. There is no language to indicate that renunciation is in favor of the Soviet Union. On the other hand there is no specific language stating that renunciation is not in favor of the Soviet Union. Inasmuch as you had a major role in the drafting of the Japanese Peace Treaty it occurs to me that you are the one best qualified to advise me as to the meaning of section (c) of article 2 of chapter II of the treaty, not only as that section reads in its final form but also as it read in the March 1951 draft.

By the terms of the Japanese Peace Treaty as it was signed at San Francisco, Japan renounces all right, title, and claim to southern Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands. Renunciation is not stated by the terms of the treaty to be in favor of Soviet Russia or any other power or group of powers. The fact is, however, that Russia is in possession of both Sakhalin and the Kuriles (together with the Habomais and Shikotan). These island areas were seized by force of arms and Russia has made it plain that she regards the islands as having been awarded to her under the terms of the Yalta agreement of 1945. The fact is that she has proceeded to annex and incorporate these island areas into the Soviet Union.

You no doubt are familiar with the fact that there is a principle of international law which holds that territory conquered by force of arms is not to be considered as incorporated into the dominions of the conqueror without a renunciation in a treaty of peace or a long and permanent possession by the conqueror. In the light of that principle and the facts I have set forth above, is it your view that Japan's renunciation of all right, title, and claim to the Kurile Islands and that portion of Sakhalin over which Japan acquired sovereignty as a consequence of the Treaty of Portsmouth, as provided in the Japanese Peace Treaty, amounts to a cession of those island areas (together with the Habomais and Shikotan) to the Soviet Union?

I will greatly appreciate a prompt reply to the inquiries contained in this letter. It is my intention to make both this letter and your reply a matter of record available to the public. I shall forego that intention and not publish your reply, however, if you so desire it.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, October 1, 1951.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: On my return I find your letter of September 14. You are quite right that the Japanese Peace Treaty text which deals with Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands differs radically from the language in the comparable section of the March 1951 draft. That March draft embodied in substance the language of the Yalta Declaration with respect to South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands.

As the negotiations developed it seemed inappropriate in any way to reflect the Yalta Agreement in the peace treaty. As I said in a recent public statement (New York Times, September 3, 1951):

"So long as other governments have rights under the Yalta agreement which the Soviet Union has not fulfilled, there is at least question as to whether the Soviet Union can, with 'clean hands' demand fulfillment of the parts of that agreement it likes."

It was accordingly decided that the territorial clauses of the treaty would be strictly limited to what was necessary to comply with the Potsdam surrender terms drawn up and promulgated on July 26, 1945, by the President of the United States, the president of the Nationalist Government of the Republic of China and the prime minister of Great Britain. The Soviet Union was not an original party to this proclamation but subsequently adhered to it.

As I said in my speech at San Francisco presenting the peace treaty:

"The Potsdam surrender terms constitute the only definition of peace terms to which, and by which, Japan and the Allied Powers as a whole are bound. There have been some private understandings between some allied governments; but by these Japan was not bound, nor were other allies bound. Therefore, the treaty embodies article 8 of the surrender terms which provided that Japanese sovereignty should be limited to Honshu, Hokkaido, Kyushu, Shikoku, and some minor islands. The renunciations contained in article 2 of chapter II strictly and scrupulously conform to that surrender term."

You ask whether in my opinion the result of the treaty language "amounts to a cession of those island areas (together with the Habomais and Shikotan) to the Soviet Union. My answer to this is "No."

In that connection you will note that article 25 of the treaty provides that subject to certain exceptions not here relevant the present treaty shall not confer any rights, titles, or benefits on any state which is not an allied power as herein defined; nor shall any right, title, or interest of Japan be deemed to be diminished or prejudiced by any provision of the treaty in favor of a state which is not an allied power as so defined.

The Soviet Union did not sign the treaty and it is not an Allied Power which, by article 25, are only states which have signed and ratified the treaty. The treaty is no longer open for signature by the Soviet Union so the Soviet Union cannot ever be an Allied Power within the definition of article 25; nor can it ever claim title under the treaty. Such claim, if made, would have to depend on other facts than the treaty of peace.

The view here expressed appears to be that taken by the Soviet Union itself. In this connection I call your attention to the statement at San Francisco by Mr. Gromyko, the Soviet Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs and principal Soviet delegate. He said:

"Similarly, by attempting to violate grossly the sovereign rights of the Soviet Union regarding southern Sakhalin and the islands adjacent to it, as well as the Kurile Islands already under the sovereignty of the Soviet Union, the draft also confines itself to a mere mention of the renunciation by Japan of rights, title, and claims to these territories and makes no mention of the historic appurtenance of these territories and the indisputable obligation on the part of Japan to recognize the sovereignty of the Soviet Union over these parts of the territory of the U. S. S. R. We do not speak of the fact that by introducing such proposals on territorial questions the United States and Great Britain, who at an appropriate time signed the Cairo and Potsdam declarations, as well as the Yalta agreement, have taken the path of flagrant violation of obligations undertaken by them under these international agreements."

He further said:

"The draft treaty is in contradiction to the obligations undertaken by the United States and Great Britain under the Yalta agreement regarding the return of Sakhalin and the transfer of the Kurile Islands to the Soviet Union."

And the Soviet Union proposed that article 2 (c) of the treaty of peace be amended to read as follows:

"Paragraph 'c' is to be amended to read as follows: 'Japan recognizes full sovereignty of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics over southern part of the Sakhalin Island, with all the islands adjacent to that part, and over the Kurile Islands and renounces all right, title, and claim to these territories'."

The delegate of Czechoslovakia had this to say at San Francisco:

"The draft treaty contains a stipulation that Japan renounces all sovereign rights and all claims to the Kurile Islands and to the southern part of the island of Sakhalin, with neighboring islands. But again, in direct violation of both the sovereign rights of the Soviet Union and binding international obligations, without a stipulation that, in accordance with the Potsdam declaration, the said territories should pass under the sovereignty of the Soviet Union, which, on the basis of the quoted agreement, already exercises supreme power over them."

(The reference to "Potsdam" is apparently an error for "Yalta".)

The Polish delegate had this to say at San Francisco:

"We also consider as correct the amendment of the Soviet Union regarding paragraph C of the same article, demanding the acceptance by Japan of the sovereignty of the U. S. S. R. over the southern part of the island of Sakhalin and all adjacent islands and also over the Kurile Islands. The agreement of Yalta gives in this regard an entirely clear formulation and states: 'Those requirements and demands of the Soviet Union must be satisfied without contention after victory over Japan'."

I trust that the foregoing clarifies the matter.

It is quite agreeable to me that you should make public both your letter to me and this reply.

With very kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

Mr. WATKINS. On Monday, January 21, 1952, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Omar Bradley; and Mr. John Foster Dulles, appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to testify in behalf of the Japanese Peace Treaty and the other treaties relating to security in the Pacific. At that time I submitted to the minority members of the committee a number of questions which I wanted asked of the witnesses. That series of questions and answers are of vital concern to the United States. I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from those hearings which contains the questions and answers to which I refer.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JAPANESE PEACE TREATY AND OTHER TREATIES RELATING TO SECURITY IN THE PACIFIC

MONDAY, JANUARY 21, 1952

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met at 10:30 a. m., pursuant to adjournment, in the caucus room, 318 Senate Office Building, United States Capitol, Washington, D. C., Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, presiding.

Present: Senators GEORGE (presiding), GREEN, FULBRIGHT, SPARKMAN, GILLETTE, WILEY, TOBEY.

Present on committe staff: Dr. Wilcox, Mr. Marcy, Mr. Holt, Dr. Kalijarvi, and Mr. O'Grady.

Senator TOBEY. Now, sir, I have a series of questions from ARTHUR WATKINS. I will read them slowly. They are 12 in number, not mine, but his.

No. 1. "In regard to Prime Minister Yoshida's letter to you under date of December 24, 1951, which was just released to the press: Does this letter have any status as an agreement between nations or is it merely and exchange of letters between Mr. Yoshida and John Foster Dulles?"

Mr. DULLES. The letter, of course, does not constitute a binding international agreement because such binding international agreements, under the Constitution of Japan and the Constitution of the United States, require ratification by the Diet of Japan and by the Senate of the United States.

Senator TOBEY. A meeting of minds.

Mr. DULLES. It is a declaration of intention which I am confident we can take at its face value. I am sure it is written in good faith. My confidence in that is not only because I have complete confidence in the good faith of Mr. Yoshida which has been tested on many occasions and which has been proved to be totally reliable, but also I have complete confidence in it because it reflects the natural wishes and desires of the Japanese nation and the Japanese people. In other words, we do not have to rely even upon that. If there should be a change in the Government of Japan, I am quite confident any successor Government would feel toward this China Communist matter the same way as expresed in that letter.

Senator TOBEY. No. 2. "Does this letter finnly commit the Government of Japan or is it merely an exchange of assurances between two officials who were instrumental in negotiating a treaty?"

Mr. DULLES. I believe that is covered.

Senator TOBEY. "In the event of a change in government in Japan with the consequent loss of office by Mr. Yoshida, what will be the status of the Yoshida-Dulles letter?"

Mr. DULLES. I think I covered that, also.

Senator TOBEY. "In your opinion is it sound international diplomacy for the United States to quiet its apprehensions in regard to future Russo-Japanese relations on the basis of a letter from the present Prime Minister of Japan to a subordinate official in the United States Department of State?" That is not my question, understand.

Mr. DULLES. The negotiations have throughout been conducted by me as a special representative of the President, and I take it to be nominal in this matter as in other matters relating to the treaty, that the Prime Minister communicated with me.

Senator TOBEY. "Do the territorial provisions of the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty, especially those in regard to the Kuriles and South Sakhalin, meet the Department of State's concept of the security requirements of the United States in the Pacific Ocean area?"

Mr. DULLES. I did not quite get it.

Senator TOBEY. I will read it again: "Do the territorial provisions of the proposed Japanese Peace Treaty, especially those in regard to the Kuriles and South Sakhalin, meet the Department of State's concept of the security requirements of the United States in the Pacific Ocean area?"

Mr. DULLES. As far as the security aspect of the matter is concerned I would, with General Bradley's permission, call attention to a letter which you, General Bradley, wrote to Senator WATKINS on that score. Do you have a copy of it with you?

General BRADLEY. No.

Mr. DULLES. Here it is. It is a letter dated September 21, 1951. It concludes:

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff are of the opinion that this treaty, along with the proposed United States-Japanese Security Treaty, should come into force simultaneously, and will provide the United States the maximum security obtainable in the Far East at this time."

Senator TOBEY. No. 6. "In regard to the Hobami Islands, why is it that the treaty remains silent? Does not Russian possession of these islands constitute a sore in Russo-Japanese relations which can be conveniently prodded at any time in the future to agitate and threaten Japan?" Do you recognize these islands?

Mr. DULLES. Yes; I know those islands. Those islands are a small group of islands which are to the north of Japan. If there is a map—we have no map of sufficient scale.

Senator TOBEY. He suggested maybe a burr under the saddle.

Mr. DULLES. Yes. Have you a pointer here? My arm is not than long.

General BRADLEY. You might point it out on a smaller map we have over here.

Senator GREEN. May I suggest that the pointer will not help the record any?

General BRADLEY. Perhaps you can point it out to them on this.

Senator GEORGE. We have a smaller map here.

Mr. DULLES. For the information of the committee, the Hobami Islands are these islands here, and then there is Sakhalin, which is probably in the same status. The Russians are in occupation of that. Although it is our opinion, as I expressed at the Japanese Peace Conference at San Francisco, that those islands are properly a part of Hokkaido, and that Japanese sovereignty remains over those islands.

Senator TOBEY. He suggests Russian possession of those islands constitutes a sore in Russo-Japanese relations—"threatens Japan."

Mr. DULLES. There are a multiplicity of sores in Japanese-Soviet relations, and it is not possible by any treaty or formal words to eliminate those. I cannot think of anything that we could have written into the peace treaty which would have accomplished the very desirable objective of getting those islands back into Japanese sovereignty. The willingness of the Soviet Union to relinquish those islands would depend either upon a change of heart by them, or upon the use of force, which we do not want to contemplate at this time.

Senator TOBEY. There are lots of sores.

"The Japanese are vitally dependent on deep-sea fishing for their subsistence. What, if anything, in these treaties gives Japanese access to the deep-sea fishing areas of the North Pacific? Does not Russia by reason of its occupation of the Kuriles hold a valuable source of food which can be used for bargaining purposes in the effort to force Japan to jump through the Russian hoop?"

Mr. DULLES. It is quite true that the Soviet Union is excluding the Japanese fishers from certain fishing areas which they used to fish in and which we would consider to be part of the open seas. Again that is something I do not know that we can do anything about. Certainly nothing we can write into the peace treaty will end the Russian conduct in that respect.

Senator TOBEY. No. 8. "Does the United States contemplate opening the area of the former Japanese mandated islands, now a strategic trusteeship, to Japanese fishing operations?"

Mr. DULLES. That will depend upon United States policy as trustee of the area, but is not matter to be dealt with by the treaty.

I might say that since the negotiations began, the Japanese Government has taken a very forward-looking attitude toward the problem of fishing which has been one of the sore spots in the relations of Japan with other countries, particularly between the United States and Japan.

There has been negotiated within the last few weeks a fishing treaty between Japan, the United States, and Canada dealing with the whole area of the North Pacific. I am not familiar with that treaty in detail, but I know in general it reconciles the principle of the freedom of the seas with the proposition that where a country itself takes steps of a costly and sacrificial character to conserve fishing, that the country or countries that do that conserving are entitled to a certain priority in the use of the fishing and the fish which results from those acts of conservation.

I am told that this treaty is entirely satisfactory to our west coast fishing people and it cannot come into force until the multilateral treaty comes into force and restores to Japan its full sovereignty.

But the treaty has been negotiated, has been initialed, and merely awaits action on the main treaty to be formally concluded between our countries.

Senator TOBEY. No. 9. In view of the Japanese need for trade with the Asiatic mainland, is it your opinion that such trade will be resumed in the immediate future? Do you think there is a possibility that such trade will include strategic materials and manufactured implements of war which could be of use to the North Koreans, the Red Chinese, and to the anti-American elements in Asia?

Mr. DULLES I think that question is answered by my main statement, but I would repeat here that there is no reason whatever to fear that that will be the case, because already the Japanese have taken steps to restrict that trade so that it is practically nonexistent today. They have already moved among the first of the other free nations to certify compliance with the Battle Act which calls for a total embargo on all exports to the Soviet bloc of any goods which we list as of strategic value and a strict control of other goods, even though not of a strategic character. In other words, the Japanese have already formally committed themselves to compliance with the United States policy in that respect as laid down by the Congress of the United States.

Senator TOBEY. No. 10 is similar to that, namely this: It has been suggested that a reservation be included in the Resolution of Ratification in the Japanese Peace Treaty to provide for immediate abrogation by the United States of Japanese trading privileges with the United States in the event of Japanese trade with Communist nations in strategic war materials. What is your opinion as to the legality in point of international law of such a reservation? What is your opinion as to the practicality of such a reservation?

Mr. DULLES. It seems to me to be totally unnecessary for this reason: That the policy of the United States, already established by the Control Act, so-called Battle Act, towhich I referred—it specifies that the United States

shall not give any military assistance or economic assistance to any country which violates our policy as laid down under that act.

By accepting that, you have, in effect, an agreement with ample sanctions because Japan's security depends upon the presence there of the United States forces. Its economy, to a large extent, depends upon access to our markets. The Battle Act provides sanctions of a totally effective character vis-a-vis Japan and any reservation would be a duplication of the situation that already exists and is voluntarily and wholeheartedly accepted by Japan.

Senator TOBEY. No. 11. "Have the trade policies of the United States and Great Britain been reconciled in the Asiatic area? What mutual promises in that respect have been made?"

Mr. DULLES. Trade policies between England and the United States and Japan?

Senator TOBEY. In reconciling the Asiatic area?

Mr. DULLES. Would you repeat the question again?

Senator TOBEY. "Have the trade policies of the United States and Great Britain been reconciled in the Asiatic area? What mutual promises in that respect have been made?"

Mr. DULLES. I do not quite get the purport of the question, and the bearing upon Japan. There is a question which might be put and which perhaps Senator WATKINS had in mind—the access by Japan to the sterling currency area of southeast Asia. That is a problem, but that is apparently not the question put by him.

Senator TOBEY. You might say "irrelevant and immaterial" on this.

No. 12, and the last one——

Mr. DULLES. Those are your words, not mine.

Senator TOBEY. I said you might say it.

No. 12, and the last one. "The original draft of the treaty proposes 'the handing over' of South Sakhalin and the Kuriles to Soviet Russia: What were the reasons for the change in terminology in that respect which now provides merely that Japan renounce right, title and claim to these areas? Does this latter provision have the effect of ratifying the Yalta and Potsdam agreements and in effect confirming Russia's military seizure and retention of these areas?"

Mr. DULLES. "The Yalta agreement contemplated the handing over of South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands to the Soviet Union under the treaty of peace. The treaty of peace before you does not carry out that provision of the Yalta agreement.

Now that is done deliberately because of the fact that the Soviet Union itself has been guilty of such violations under the Yalta agreement that we do not consider that the Soviet Union can come with clean hands and itself ask for the benefits of that agreement.

I call your attention not only to such violations as may have occurred with relation to Europe, but as regards Asia itself.

By the Yalta agreement the Soviet Union undertook to recognize and deal with the Nationalist Government of China. In pursuance of that it made a treaty with the Nationalist Government in August 1945 whereby it undertook to give aid and military supplies and moral support exclusively to the Nationalist Government as the Central Government of China. The ink was hardly dry on that undertaking before the Soviet Government turned over vast war supplies in Manchuria to the Communist regime.

That question was raised by me in the United Nations Assembly a year ago and no attempt was made by the Soviet Union to justify that flagrant violation of the Yalta Agreement.

Under those circumstances it did not seem that the United States and the other free nations who were largely responsible for drafting this treaty had any obligation to give the Soviet Union title by this treaty to South Sakhalin and the Kuriles. The treaty does not do so. It provides indeed that no country which has not signed the treaty shall get any benefit at all under the treaty.

The Soviet Union, by not signing the treaty, has lost irrevocably its opportunity to sign the treaty, thereby depriving itself of any claim under the treaty to any claim to South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands.

I think that probably covers the position.

Senator TOBEY. Thank you, Mr. Dulles.

Now, may I say if I read your mind aright I see there this thought: In the words of Shakespeare, "For this relief, much thanks."

Senator GEORGE. Senator FULBRIGHT? Senator SMITH, who is not here today, rather exacted a promise that you not be here until he could interrogate you.

Mr. DULLES. I will be glad to be here tomorrow.

Senator FULBRIGHT. I have no questions of General Bradley.

Senator GEORGE. Any further questions?

Senator WILEY. I have some questions.

Senator GEORGE. I thought if we could finish with General Bradley, he might then be excused unless you wish to bring him back.

Senator WILEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry I was called to Judiciary, and missed some of the interrogation. So all I am going to ask General Bradely is some questions that were submitted at the request of Senator WATKINS. Being the ranking minority member of this committee, I presume that is why they were submitted to me.

So this is the first question: "Do the territorial provisions of the Japanese Peace Treaty, in particular those provisions regarding South Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands, meet the security requirements of the United States in the North Pacific area?"

Then I might say he has a note on that question in which he says, "See copy of Bradley letter of September 21, 1951, to Senator WATKINS in which General Bradley says: '* * * The Joint Chiefs of Staff are fully aware of the strategic importance of the areas in question and under present circumstances are not completely satisfied concerning its security. * * *"

Another note: "Original draft of Japanese Peace Treaty provided for 'handing over' to Russia of Sakhalin and the Kuriles. Present draft merely requires that Japan renounce all right, title, and claim to these areas. Effect is the same inasmuch as Russia is in military occupation."

Now I would like to have your comments to that question and to his comments.

General BRADLEY. As I stated to Senator WATKINS at that time, from a military point of view we are not completely happy with it.

It so happens that Russia is presently the sole occupying power of the islands, having acquired them at the close of World War II.

In view of the current world situation, it is believed that the interests of the United States are best served by leaving the permanent status of the area to be provided for at a future date when international tensions have been eased somewhat.

Senator GEORGE. General Bradley, would you like to offer for the record the letter to which reference has been made? If you should do so, you may do so and supply the committee, the clerk of the committee, with the letter.

General BRADLEY. It would leave that entirely to the committee. It has been quoted from twice and if it would help it might be well to put the whole letter in the RECORD.

Senator GEORGE. It occurs to me it might be well to incorporate the whole letter.

(Committee insert.)

Senator WILEY. Question 2: "Are the present provisions of the Japanese Peace Treaty in regard to Okinawa, the Bonins, et cetera—article 3—in accordance with the wishes of the Department of Defense? Is it necessary to the security of the United States that these islands be placed under United States trusteeship? Could not the United States get the necessary bases in these island areas without at the same time taking the islands and their populations under trusteeship?" About three questions there.

General BRADLEY. Yes, sir.

We believe, from the security viewpoint, this arrangement is better than any other. It would be very difficult for us to come before you and ask for funds to build security installations on Okinawa and other islands unless we had a rather clear-cut right to be there and to stay there for some time. I understand from the question that the idea is we might make some arrangement with Japan for fortifications there, even though the islands might be returned to Japan. We do not believe that would be as good an arrangement as this one.

Senator WILEY. Question 3: "Would the security of the United States suffer if a specification were included in the Resolution of Ratification to limit the term of United States trusteeship and to provide for an eventual plebiscite by the Okinawans in order that they themselves may determine by their own expression their future fate, as to independence or return to Japan?"

General BRADLEY. No, sir. I do not believe it should be in this peace treaty. If later on, several years from now, we wanted to reconsider the matter, I think you could still do it. You would know then what your security arrangements had been and whether or not you would want to do it at the time. We do not believe, from a security point of view, that provision should be made now.

Senator WILEY. No. 4. "The treaty is silent in regard to the Habomai Islands just off the northeastern coast of Hokkaido. These islands are within 3 miles of Japan and within sight of the mainland. Are the Joint Chiefs of Staff satisfied with this aspect of the treaty? Russia is in occupation of these islands which are in reality a part of the Japanese home islands."

General BRADLEY. I believe my remarks on those islands would be the same as the Kuriles and the Sakhalin Islands. We are not too happy, but they are in possession of them, and under world conditions it is probably better to leave final disposition to a later date.

Senator WILEY. I understand your position in relation to the treaty is, it does not confirm the right of Russia in any of these islands?

General BRADLEY. I believe that is right. I believe it leaves it open.

Senator WILEY. No. 5. "The Kurile Islands lie at the edge of the great circle air and sea routes from the United States to the Orient. It was from the Kuriles that the Japanese staged their sea and air attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941. It was from the Kuriles that air raids were conducted against the Aleutian Islands and Dutch Harbor. Under the circumstances are the Joint Chiefs of Staff satisfied with the present territorial provisions of the treaty which require Japan to renounce right, title, and claim to those vital areas?"

General BRADLEY. I believe I have answered that, that we were not completely happy about it but there is nothing we can do about it at this time, and their final disposition should be left to a future date.

Senator WILEY. That is because of the occupation by the Russians?

General BRADLEY. At the present time, yes, sir.

Senator WILEY. No. 6. "In view of the size of the Russian fleet of submarines, does not Russian possession of the Kuriles put Russia in a position to dominate the commerce and the security of the North Pacific?

Are there any sites in the Kurile Islands suitable for establishment of air bases from which Russia could dominate the sea and air lanes to Japan as well as the Japanese islands themselves?"

General BRADLEY. I would say in answer to both of those questions that it would be to the great advantage of the Russians to have them in operation in the Pacific, but I do not believe that we can say that would permit them to dominate the Pacific.

Senator WILEY. To get the matter straight in my own mind, are there opportunities for air bases on those islands?

General BRADLEY. Yes, sir, but my point is, I would not go so far as to say this would permit them to dominate the Pacific. It would be to great military advantage, yes, but not to a point where we would admit they could dominate the Pacific by having them.

Senator WILEY. Are there good sea bases there, also?

General BRADLEY. I am afraid I cannot answer that. I do not know just how good they are.

Senator WILEY. Does the Russian possession of Sakhalin and Kuriles place the Russians in a strategic position for cutting off our access to the sea and air bases which we are retaining in Japan by other provisions of this series of treaties?

General BRADLEY. Again the answer would be no; they could not cut them off but it would help them in interfering.

Senator WILEY. What are the views of Australia and New Zealand and the Philippines in regard to their security as growing out of the present provisions of the treaty?

General BRADLEY. I cannot give you their views. I do not know their views because I have not talked to them.

Senator WILEY. I understand your general conclusions to be—and I am sorry that I missed your statement—that the treaty itself, these several treaties that we have with Japan and the treaties we have with countries down under—New Zealand and Australia—in your opinion, constitute a step forward toward the eventualities of peace in the Pacific?

General BRADLEY. We think they contribute very materially to the maintenance of peace in the Pacific.

Senator WILEY. And you think also that the treaties, if they become the law of the land, will contribute beneficially to Japan, as well as to our own country?

General BRADLEY. Yes, sir.

Senator WILEY. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WATKINS. On February 2, 1952, I sent a letter to the Honorable TOM CONNALLY, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, transmitting to him for the attention of the committee specific language for inclusion in the Resolution of Ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty which in my view would accomplish my intentions as announced in my speech of August 22, 1951.

I request unanimous consent of the Senate that my letter of February 2, 1952, and its enclosure be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 2, 1952.

Hon. TOM CONNALLY,
Chairman, Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CONNALLY: In a floor speech which I delivered on August 22, 1951, I announced my intention of proposing certain reservations to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty. It was my purpose in these reservations to make it plain that ratification of the treaty shall not be construed as a ratification or any other formalization of the Yalta Agreement of 1945 nor as United States acceptance or endorsement of Russia's claim to sovereignty over South Sakhalin, the Kuriles, and certain other Japanese islands to the north of Hokkaido Islands.

In my view, Russian occupation and possession of these islands is a serious threat to the security of Japan, Korea, and the United States in the Pacific Ocean area.

There is transmitted herewith for your attention and for the consideration of the Foreign Relations Committee, the proposed text of a reservation which will accomplish the purposes announced by me in my speech mentioned above.

I will appreciate it if this reservation is brought to the formal attention of your committee and I urge that it be included in the committee draft of the resolution of ratification. In the event that that is not done, I intend to offer it from the floor when the resolution of ratification comes before the Senate.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

[Enclosure]

JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

RESERVATION INTENDED TO BE PROPOSED BY MR. WATKINS TO THE RESOLUTION OF RATIFICATION OF THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of this treaty with the understanding that such ratification shall not constitute (1) any ratification, confirmation, or approval of any open or secret agreement entered into at the Yalta Conference of 1945, or (2) any recognition by the United States of the validity of any claim of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to right of title to the southern half of Sakhalin Island, the Kurile Islands, Shikotan Island, or the Habomai Islands.

Mr. WATKINS. I request unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a clipping from the Deseret News of Salt Lake City for February 3, 1952. As will be noted, the news report states that the chairman of the committee expressed the view that my proposed reservations were not needed and that their adoption would be unfortunate.

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONNALLY, UTAHAN CLASH OVER TREATY

(By Edwin B. Haakinson)

WASHINGTON.—Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, Republican, said Saturday he will ask the Senate, when it considers the Japanese Peace Treaty, to specify that approval does not carry with it endorsement of Russia's claim to islands Japan formerly held.

WATKINS announced he will propose a reservation stipulating that ratification of the treaty shall not be regarded as approving (A) the 1945 Yalta agreement, or (B) Russia's claim to the Kurile Islands north of Japan, based on that agreement.

He sent the proposed reservation to Chairman CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas) of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who replied immediately that it was not needed and that its adoption would be unfortunate.

CONNALLY'S committee has completed hearings on the treaty, and plans to meet Tuesday to consider what action to take. CONNALLY has predicted it will be approved by the committee and the Senate.

Under the peace treaty, Japan renounces her claims on South Sakhalin, the Kuriles and other islands she formerly held. Russian forces moved into these areas after the Japanese surrendered in 1945 and now occupy them.

"In my view," WATKINS said in his letter to CONNALLY, "Russian occupation and possession of these islands is a serious threat to the security of Japan, Korea, and the United States in the Pacific Ocean area."

CONNALLY promptly disputed WATKINS' contention that the treaty might have a bearing on "the understanding reached at Yalta with respect to the disposal of these islands."

"It neither affirms nor denies the validity of Yalta in this regard," the Texan said in a statement, "certainly it does not in any way imply any recognition of Russian sovereignty over the territories in question."

CONNALLY said the "treaty leaves the international status of the islands for future determination," and he added: "The Soviet Union has not signed the treaty, is not a party to it, and has thereby deprived itself of any rights or claims under the treaty."

Mr. WATKINS. On February 6, 1952, I was advised by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that interpretative language to accomplish the purpose which I had originally suggested on August 22, 1951, and which had been the subject of my letter to him under date of February 2, 1952, had been incorporated into the proposed resolution of ratification which the Foreign Relations Committee had reported to the Senate by unanimous vote of the committee.

I request unanimous consent of the Senate that there be inserted at this point in the RECORD the letter of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee to which I refer. I further request unanimous consent to insert immediately following this letter the press release which I issued imediately following receipt of the Foreign Relations Committee's letter. This release expresses my views in connection with the committee's action. I was gratified and complimented by the action taken by the Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the letter and press release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
February 6, 1952.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Thank you for your letter of February 2 in which you state your intention of proposing certain reservations to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty. I note also the text of the reservation dealing with the validity of any claim of the Soviet Union to certain territories in the Pacific area, which is attached.

While the terms of the treaty, in my view, are sufficiently clear to protect the interests of the United States in this regard, the members of the Foreign Relations Committee agree that it might be well for us to clarify the position of the United States.

Last Friday the Far Eastern Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, met with Mr. John Foster Dulles and considered in some detail this whole problem. At that time, they agreed upon a resolution of ratification including interpretative language to cover the issues you have raised.

Yesterday the Foreign Relations Committee voted unanimously to report out the Japanese Peace Treaty together with the three accompanying security pacts for the Pacific area. At that time, I presented your

letter to the committee for its consideration. The members agreed that the interpretative language approved by the Far Eastern Subcommittee would accomplish the objective which you have in mind and, indeed, would go even further in protecting United States interests.

For your information, I enclose copy of the language approved by the committee. I am sure you will agree that it amply covers the important problems which you have raised.

Sincerely,

TOM CONNALLY.

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951. As part of such advice and consent the Senate states that nothing the treaty contains is deemed to diminish or prejudice, in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied Powers as defined in said treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, the Habomai Islands, the Island of Shikotan, or any other territory, rights or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto on the Soviet Union; and also that nothing in the said treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions in favor of the Soviet Union contained in the so-called "Yalta agreement" regarding Japan of February 11, 1945.

PRESS RELEASE FROM SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS

Senator WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, one of the most outspoken critics of some of the territorial provisions of the Japanese Peace Treaty, expressed "complete satisfaction" with the resolution of ratification which the Senate Foreign Relations Committee today unanimously adopted and ordered reported to the Senate.

On February 2, Senator WATKINS submitted to the Foreign Relations Committee his suggestions as to the content of the resolution of ratification. The Senator wanted the resolution of ratification to specifically state that it was the sense of the United States that ratification of the treaty did not imply confirmation of the Yalta Agreement of 1945; and furthermore, that such action would not be construed by Russia or any other nation as recognizing Russia's claim to the right of title to South Sakhalin, the Kuriles, the Hobamai Islands, and Shikotan.

Russia currently is in military occupation of these island areas and the peace treaty requires Japan to renounce all right, title, and interest to the islands.

"I have thoroughly studied the committee's text of the resolution of ratification, and I am completely satisfied. The resolution, if adopted, will make it plain to the world that it was not intended by the territorial provisions of the Japanese Peace Treaty to ratify or approve Russia's claim to sovereignty over the strategic Kurile Islands and South Sakhalin, the Hobamais, and Shikotan. I am especially gratified by the inclusion of language by which the Senate will reject some of the most unfortunate provisions of the Yalta Agreement of 1945," Senator WATKINS said.

"The recommendations which I submitted last Saturday to Committee Chairman TOM CONNALLY, Democrat, of Texas, are contained in essence and in principle in the resolution of ratification which the committee adopted and reported to the Senate," he said.

"I took the floor on August 22, 1951, and stated my opposition to some of the territorial provisions of the treaty. I said I would seek in the resolution of ratification language expressing the sense of the United States with respect to the ownership of these island areas, and language which also would specifically deny that such ratification would by implication or otherwise approve the Yalta agreement."

Senator WATKINS' interest in the territorial provisions of the treaty was due to United States security in the Western Pacific. He viewed with alarm the possibility that United States security in the Pacific might be endangered permanently if Russia, by failure on the part of the United States to take appropriate action, should gain legal title to the island areas.

Last September the Senator wrote Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and requested his opinion with respect to United States security in the Pacific in view of the treaty's provisions. General Bradley replied on September 21, 1951, that "that the Joint Chiefs are fully aware of the strategic importance of the area in question and under present circumstances are not completely satisfied concerning its security."

Subsequently, General Bradley appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In answer to a question submitted by Senator WATKINS, who is not a committee member, the general confirmed the views of the Joint Chiefs of Staff as stated in the general's letter of September 21.

Senator WATKINS in commenting on the 13-to-0 vote of the committee noted that the committee's action provides what he believes is the first instance of congressional action of any kind to specifically reject any of the war-time Executive agreements. Senator WATKINS observed that this action by the Foreign Relations Committee is a significant move in the Senate's drive to recover its constitutional role in the foreign policy field.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, it seems to me that we have arrived at another milestone in history. If I remember correctly, only a few years ago it was freely predicted by the so-called experts that the United States would remain in occupation of Japan for more than 50 years from the end of hostilities. It was also said that we would level her industry and destroy every last vestige of militarism.

Times have changed, and we have now reached another milestone. I am happy to say that a different kind of feeling now prevails in the United States. Whether or not we have become more Christianlike than we were when we were in the war, is a question for the historians to decide.

Last fall I was paid a visit by a number of members of the Japanese Diet who were in Washington. One of those members was a young lady. By the way, she is one of the few women in the Japanese Parliament, and one of the first women to be a member of that great Parliament. She asked me this question: "Senator, do you think the people of the United States have actually forgiven the Japanese people, or are they willing now to be kind simply because they need their help in fighting the war with Russia and with communism?"

That is a challenge to all of America. I hope that we have reformed. I hope that today we have more of the Christian spirit. In my opinion this treaty goes a long way in the direction of conciliation. We waive heavy reparations. We have approached the question much more in the Christ-like spirit, and I have a strong feeling that if we had done so years before, when hostilities were threatened, if we had been just as willing to be patient and Christian-like in our concept, we might have averted a great war, and we might have averted a great many more wars.

It is important that we mark this milestone. It is important that the American people take a look at themselves to see whether or not they really have become more Christian, and whether or not we are meeting the challenge of the lady from Japan, who wants to know the answer to that very important question.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for this treaty because I think it is a step forward. It is an attempt to make a bad situation better. I believe that the committee has labored long, earnestly, and sincerely to bring about that result. I feel that Mr. Dulles has gone a long way, with the advice and counsel of General MacArthur and others, toward bringing about a better situation in the Pacific. It is unfortunate that we are in the position which we occupy at the present time. No one likes it. It was not foreseen by those in authority when we won the great victory. By a series of incredible blunders, we lost the peace, and here we are, struggling with piecemeal measures. No one is entirely satisfied with the Japanese Peace Treaty. Least of all the Japanese. No one is entirely satisfied with the security pacts with various other countries, including the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia, and Japan, by which we seek to erect a defensive structure against one of our former allies and some of its satellites.

Under those circumstances I believe the American people ought to think seriously of the present situation, because this action by itself does not end our troubles, although it is a milestone. It may be the beginning of still more trouble. We had better take a look at ourselves and see that not only have we prepared ourselves with arms, guns, tanks, planes, and bombs, but that we are fortifying ourselves in a spiritual way, so that we do not seek to survive by the sword alone.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the reservation submitted by the committee to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty.

The reservation was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now comes——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, consonant with the agreement earlier this afternoon, I now ask that my motion to postpone the treaty indefinitely be reinstated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

POSTPONE RATIFICATION OF JAPANESE TREATY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on September 11, 1951, the junior Senator from Nevada said that the State Department, led by Secretary Acheson, had driven the final nail in the coffin of Nationalist China.

STRENGTHENS RUSSIA'S HAND

The pending Japanese Peace Treaty strengthens the international hand of Communist Russia through the confirmation of many of the concessions made to Russia at Yalta. The administration, starting in 1933 with the recognition of Communist Russia, has built up Communist Russia through stopping our Army on the banks of the Elbe in 1945, while Russia moved into Berlin and took over.

We gave them Manchuria without any safeguards whatever—and laid the groundwork for the war in Korea.

THE MORGENTHAU PLAN FOR GERMANY

As an example of hasty action we, in cooperation with England and France, forced the nefarious Morgenthau plan on Germany, destroying her industry and the pride of that nation, by dividing it among four nations, Russia, France, England, and the United States.

We have destroyed industrial Germany. When that nation wanted to join a United States of Europe, it was prevented from so doing by the very nations preventing such an organization, which we have continuously supported through lend-lease, UNRRA, the British loan of $3,750,000,000, the Marshall plan, ECA, mutual aid, point 4, and many other schemes to divide the wealth of this country with the nations of the world, including the present tourist army in Europe.

At the same time France is taxing our military installations, and we are paying $93 to England for every soldier that is stationed in that country.

THE FREE TRADE (RECIPROCAL TRADE) ACT

This plan includes the so-called Reciprocal Trade Act, thereby putting into the hands of a thoroughly discredited Secretary of State the right to trade any domestic industry to foreign nations for some fancied advantage, and to remake the industrial map of this Nation.

REMARKS ON SEPTEMBER 11, 1951

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point parts of my remarks in relation to the Japanese Treaty, which I made on September 11, 1951.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY AND THE FUTURE OF ASIA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Japanese Peace Treaty just signed at San Francisco marked the final official slap at Nationalist China when the representatives of that great nation were not invited to sit in on the final treaty conference with Japan.

Nationalist China carried the load of the fighting for approximately 10 years, yet her leaders were completely ignored through the entire negotiations leading up to the draft of the treaty.

Consequently, it marks the end for Nationalist China, engineered by our own State Department. The way has been paved for the recognition of Communist China by Japan, which will happen within a comparatively short time, unless the public should realize what the administration's long-range program really is and prevents such recognition.

We have been able to postpone the recognition of Communist China by the United Nations by informing the people of the real plan of our own State Department to maneuver such recognition while giving the impression that they are opposed to it.

ACHESON WILL NOT USE VETO TO PREVENT RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. Acheson came back from his European trip early in 1950 and in an hour-long speech before a joint meeting of Congress told us nothing that we had not heard 50 times before, or that had not been previously stated by his henchmen, except, buried in one paragraph in the middle of his speech—leading up to it fast and getting away from it fast—he said that we would not use the veto to prevent recognition of Communist China by the United Nations.

He has never changed his attitude. He has never changed the statement.

ACHESON'S RECOGNITION

Riding high on the great job which the public is led to believe has been done on the Japanese Treaty, he will probably resign his job within 30 or 60 days, and we will get another man of the same type as Secretary of State. It will make no difference in the planned loss of China followed by Asia.

JAPAN'S COMING RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINA

Why will Japan recognize Communist China? It will be because the United States of America, through the State Department, has made it impossible for them to recognize any other Chinese government.

We have held Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa, refusing to allow him to gain the mainland and turn the conflict back into a Chinese civil war. Our great State Department was able within 5 years following the end of World War II, to turn the Chinese civil war into a war between the United States and Communist China; a great accomplishment.

We have been appropriating for Japan about three-quarters of a billion dollars each year since World War II. When we stop appropriating these funds, which, of course, we must eventually do, Japan must make its own living.

FREE TRADE—AND $750,000,000 ANNUALLY TO JAPAN

We now have free trade with Japan. They are sending their sewing machines, Christmas cards, precision instruments, and 101 other things, which, under normal conditions, would disarrange our American economy through displacing American investments and the American workingmen's jobs. However, by continued emergencies we are able, through higher taxes, new money from the sale of bonds to the American people, to keep our economy going. Eventually we must protect our own higher standard of living from the 7-to-15-cents-per-hour Japanese labor.

Then when we stop sending three-quarters of a billion dollars to Japan annually they must trade with China.

She must buy her raw materials and sell her manufactured articles there. The final downfall of Nationalist China was the brutal State Department action in utterly ignoring the almost century-old friendship of China and probably one of the few nations whose interests are parallel with our own.

We shall without doubt resume the peace negotiations at Kaesong within a very short time, and there will be peace in Korea, and we shall agree to confine our activities in Asia to a few miles beyond the thirty-eighth parallel as already outlined; then there will be no more interference with Russia's activities in consolidating her gains in Nationalist China and in Asia during the next 15 or 20 months or perhaps 2 years.

KILLING, IMPRISONING, AND ENSLAVING NATIONALIST CHINA'S LEADERS

Recently there appeared an Associated Press dispatch stating that 237 Nationalist Chinese had been executed. The Chinese Communists are executing the Nationalist leaders in China who might oppose the consolidation of Russia's gains in that area. The same dispatch stated that 3,000 Nationalist Chinese were imprisoned. We understand upon good authority that many of those 3,000 prisoners and many other Chinese Nationalist prisoners who were not reported in the press are on their way to the slave camps in Russia.

SOVIET RUSSIA WILL MOVE THROUGH BURMA

When Russia consolidates her gains in Communist China, she will move through Burma. Already the Communist Chinese control the northern half of Burma. They controlled most of Burma when I was in Rangoon, Burma, in 1948. They had just shot all the Cabinet at that time and then had appointed a new set of Cabinet officers; they play no favorites there.

So when Russia takes over Burma, which she can easily do, and then moves into Siam, Russia will take over the principal rice crop of Asia, for the surplus rice which is grown in Siam is shipped to the Malayan States and to Indochina. Then Russia will control the food supply and eventually she will move into the Malayan States and Indochina.

EYES OF AMERICANS FOCUSED ON EUROPE

Mr. President, while we are losing China and Asia, the eyes of the American people are being diverted to Europe, principally by means of the large appropriations which our Government is making for European aid. This august body just passed an authorization bill calling for $7,200,000,000—passed with very little understanding of the real impact upon the American taxpayer.

We shall lose China and Asia while we are dissipating our substance in Europe. It is a bottomless pit. General Marshall now says that, instead of the 6 divisions, totaling 90,000 men, going to Europe, we will send 400,000 men there. In a comparatively short time, he or his successor, will probably advocate twice that number.

Mr. President, overpopulation is Europe's problem. They have at least 20 percent more men than can ever find employment there. Whatever foot soldiers are needed in Europe should be supplied by the European countries—it simply aggravates the food supply to send more.

EUROPEAN COUNTRIES TRADING WITH RUSSIA

The European countries at the same time are sending to Russia the raw and other manufactured industrial equipment and processed goods which she needs to consolidate her gains in the iron-curtain countries and to fight world war III with us.

A bill was just passed by the Senate, advertised throughout the Nation by the administration as a bill to stop the trade between the European countries and Russia, the iron-curtain and other Communist countries including Communist China. The trade had already been stopped by the Kem-Wherry-Malone amendment, except for the joker which was slipped into the amendment in conference with the result that the amendment then allowed the President to exempt certain nations from the restriction. The President did exempt certain countries.

The new bill repealed outright the Kem-Wherry-Malone amendment, and permitted the decisions in regard to such matters to be made by an administrator, appointed by the President, who already has shown that he will allow the trade to continue—after Britain laid down an ultimatum to him that she intended to continue such trade. So, Mr. President, the administration bill provides that after the Administrator confers with the Secretary of State and with the Secretary of Commerce, he will make up his own mind as to what trade will be allowed.

We know what trade will be allowed then: The trade will continue as usual; the Euro-

pean countries will continue to send to Russia, the iron-curtain countries, and Communist China, the goods which they cannot produce, but which they need in order to consolidate their gains and to prepare for a third world war.

We must give Stalin credit for having more brains and better judgment than to attempt to cut off such trade.

THE ADMINISTRATION POLICY HAS LOST CHINA

Mr. President, there will not be a war in Europe in the next 2 or 3 years; and there will not be a war in Asia, because we are permitting Stalin to consolidate his gains in Communist Chain and in Asia and furnishing him the necessary manufactured goods via the ECA in Europe.

Our Secretary of State has succeeded in laying the groundwork to lose Asia, which means ultimately the loss of Europe, once the Communists consolidate their gains in Asia. Within 5 years we probably shall date history from the loss of China. It is of that importance.

NO FOOT SOLDIERS OUTSIDE WESTERN HEMISPHERE—SHOULD BUILD AIR GROUPS AND SUBMARINE FLEETS

Of course, Mr. President, we never should have sent a foot soldier to Korea. We never should have sent a foot soldier to Europe as such. We should build a sufficient number of air groups—not the 45 air groups the President actually started in 1948, nor the 54 air groups which he recommended, and not even confined to 70 air groups which the Senate authorized in 1948, but which the President refused to build.

What we need is 200 air groups to control the air over any area in the world, either in Europe or Asia, that is important to our ultimate safety. We also should build the necessary submarine fleets to blockade any nation which seeks to move into those areas. That is what we need and must have.

CHINA AND ASIA COULD HAVE BEEN SAVED

There was a time, last fall, when General MacArthur said that we should destroy the war industry of southern Manchuria and blockade the Chinese coast. I saw the southern Manchuria industry in 1948. If we had followed General MacArthur's recommendations, China and Asia would have been saved, and there would have been no war. Everyone now knows that to be so.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Nevada has just stated that, from his point of view, history will begin from the loss of China.

HISTORY—AND THE LOSS OF CHINA

Mr. MALONE. I said it is important enough in world events that history could be dated from the loss of China, because the loss of China is the most important thing that has happened in a century of time.

Mr. CAIN. I am reminded that not long ago in San Francisco a peace treaty with Japan was written and was signed by more than a score of nations. In due time, and we hope it will be soon, Japan will have her sovereignty restored to her.

Can the Senator from Nevada give us any information regarding the government within China with whom Japan is likely to sign a peace treaty? I ask the question because it was not discussed, to my knowledge, in what otherwise was a satisfactory gathering in San Francisco.

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the junior Senator from Washington that it is obvious that there is in China no other government except the Communist government with whom Japan can sign a peace treaty because Japan must trade with Communist China. So the government of Communist China will be the government with which Japan will sign the peace treaty; brought about by the United States of America's final repudiation of the Nationalist Chinese Government in the negotiations leading up to and the signing of the Japanese treaty at San Francisco.

The move in San Francisco was simply the last one of a long series, which now have resulted in a clear repudiation of the Nationalist Government of China.

We will agree not to interfere with the affairs of China while Russia consolidates her gains there. So the treaty which Japan will sign with China must inevitably be signed with the Communist government of China.

Mr. CAIN. It is true, is it not, that the Government of the United States does not recognize the Red regime as a legal government in China?

Mr. MALONE. That is true, of course. I may say to the junior Senator from Washington; but England does—and England dominates our foreign policy, and the Japanese Treaty is another link in a long chain of events engineered by England through our State Department making such recognition inevitable.

Mr. CAIN. Is the Senator suggesting that, because the question of with whom Japan is going to sign a peace treaty in China was not settled before the conclusion of the San Francisco conference and the signing of the Japanese Peace Treaty that Japan is likely to run the risk of being taken into the Communist orbit in the Far East?

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the distinguished junior Senator from Washington that Japan is going to join England in the recognition of Red China because we have put Red China in control. Our delay in recognizing Communist China has not been on account of the State Department—it has been the State Department's fear of what the people of the United States would do if we recognized Red China.

As a part of the long range plan the United Nations will recognize Communist China, in due time, with the United States voting perfunctorily against it, but not using the veto to prevent it.

Then Russia will have two votes in the Security Council, with always a possible chance of a third vote and control of the Security Council. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that we are headed for a Communist era in the world, and we shall be standing alone in a very short time unless the administration's foreign policy is reversed. We aided and abetted it at the San Francisco Conference.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada permit me to make an observation at this point?

Mr. MALONE. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I read with real interest in the press of yesterday a very highly laudatory reference by the President to the Secretary of State. The President went on to say that, by his conduct at the conference in San Francisco, the Secretary of State had turned out to be obviously much wiser than his critics. I took it from what the President said that the assumption was, he wanted all Americans and people generally throughout the world to conclude and believe that the difficult problems of today as they relate to the Far East had been solved through the signing at San Francisco of the peace treaty with Japan. Is the junior Senator from Washington on sound ground, in the opinion of the Senator from Nevada, in believing that the question of with whom Japan is going to sign a peace treaty in China remains one of the important and fundamental questions yet to be solved before there is any real likelihood of a return of peace to the world?

Mr. MALONE. No; I would say to the distinguished Senator from Washington, it does not remain to be solved. It is entirely in the hands of the Japanese, and it is a foregone conclusion.

Moreover, I may say that I agree with the President of the United States, that the distinguished Secretary of State was smarter than his critics, but for a different reason.

From the colloquy, I take it that the distinguished Senator from Washington believes that the President thought the Secretary of State was smarter than his critics because he was now solving the situation in the Pacific.

I say he was smarter than his critics, because he cleverly threw them off in the cross-examination, and the people of the United States were led to believe that he had a plan for the settlement of world problems which would work.

His critics were unable to pin him down, and he has been able to complete the loss of China to the Communists, and he has started Asia on the road to becoming a completely dominated Communist area. When the Communists completely control Asia, Europe will fall of its own weight.

So long as we continue to furnish to the countries of Western Europe billions of dollars in appropriations every year without any conditions or safeguards whatever, and so long as we are giving them everything they need to manufacture and process goods to sell Russia which she needs to fight us, and also to consolidate her gains in Eastern Europe, then we are helping along the loss of Europe, not saving Europe, as we would fondly imagine.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Nevada has suggested that in his opinion the decision concerning the Government within China with which Japan will sign a future peace treaty is the sole concern and responsibility of Japan. The Senator from Washington would like to offer a slightly contrary view. To the best of my knowledge, it will remain the concern of the signatories to the Japanese Peace Treaty, signed at San Francisco, until that treaty has been ratified by the several nations who are parties to it. I would ask whether the Senator believes that it would be desirable for the Senate to take a reasonable amount of time in order to give further consideration to the question of the government in China, with which Japan is likely to sign a peace treaty before we in haste ratify the Japanese Peace Treaty.

RATIFICATION A FOREGONE CONCLUSION

Mr. MALONE. I would say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that, with all the nice build-ups we have had here this morning on this side of the aisle for the Secretary of State and the Japanese Treaty, coupled with the steam roller on the other side of the aisle, there is not much likelihood that we shall postpone ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty, because it will be argued that, since we brought about the treaty—and, more particularly, since a very great erstwhile Republican wrote the treaty—naturally, the Republican side of the aisle should be wholly in favor of the treaty. Naturally, the Democrats are for the treaty, because they are responsible, and have been responsible for the whole business of losing Asia from the start.

From the time they sent Marshall to the Far East in 1946, to withdraw ammunition for the American guns which were in the hands of the Chinese Nationalists, from the time of the conference at Yalta, where Manchuria was given to the Russians, without any safeguards whatever, from the time it was arranged, at Yalta, that Korea would be divided and the Korean war thus made inevitable, and from the time, in 1933, when this same administration recognized Communist Russia there has never been a hitch

in the proceedings. It started in 1933; it did not start at Yalta. That conference was simply a crucial event in the progress of Soviet Russia's domination of Asia, and Kaesong is simply another Yalta.

THE BIPARTISAN TIDAL WAVE

I may say that the bipartisan movement for ratification of the Japanese Treaty will sweep over the Senate like a tidal wave, and that, even if the junior Senator from Washington were to join the junior Senator from Nevada in opposing it, we would both have hobnail prints on our bodies so deep from the stampede that it would take until next January for them to heal.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada kindly yield, to permit me to make an observation at this point?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. The experience of the junior Senator from Washington in partiicpating in the ratification of peace treaties is admittedly very limited. However, I recall with exceeding distress that, a few years ago, on the advice of others that immediate action was necessary, and that thought would be given to the question at some later date, the Senator from Washington voted, without sufficient knowledge, for the ratification of the Italian Peace Treaty.

Mr. MALONE. That was a great treaty, was it not? It hamstrung Italy.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington is perfectly willing to admit, publicly and/or privately, that he made a colossal mistake, and that the harm resulting from his decision and the decisions of others to vote too hastily for the ratification of that nation's treaty will linger on and be a real burden to this country for a long time. At any rate, the Senator from Washington has no intention of voting to ratify the Japanese Peace Treaty, or any other peace treaty, until he has had an opportunity not only to consider carefully every word and provision within it, but also to give consideration to the consequences which might flow from the Japanese Treaty—which is the important item in our present colloquy. It has not yet appealed to me that the Senate of the United States ought overnight to sign a treaty which leaves without consideration a number of questions which are important to America.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I would say to the junior Senator from Washington that the junior Senator from Nevada is deeply concerned with what may happen beyond this treaty, and he is highly encouraged by the words of the junior Senator from Washington.

I recall that in 1947 or 1948, at whatever time the Italian treaty came before the Senate, there was simply a bipartisan tidal wave for ratification.

The junior Senator from Nevada at that time sat over on the end seat, far away from the Presiding Officer and his voice was hardly heard beyond the center aisle, I am sure, as he stood and argued for a sane consideration of the results of the Italian Treaty, under which Russia and Czechoslovakia would provide the Italians with a certain amount of raw materials, the great Yugoslavia, which I read in this morning's press, the Reds have deprived of all free commerce. This was for the great, independent Communist, Mr. Tito, who is so different from Mr. Stalin, and who has nothing to do with Mr. Stalin, except that Mr. Stalin controls his trade, and totally controls his government.

Another dispatch this morning, to which the junior Senator from Nevada had expected to refer, indicates that the Reds are now controlling the farmers of Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia and Russia under the Italian Treaty was to furnish a certain amount of raw materials. The exact amount is unimportant. The raw materials were to be furnished by Yugoslavia and Russia, to the Italians, who were to process the raw materials free of charge, so that the increment of value would increase a certain number of hundreds of millions of dollars.

Having been in the engineering business for 30 years and in the industrial engineering business for 15 years, the mind of the junior Senator from Nevada works a little differently than does the usual mind on the Senate floor, I am sure, because he immediately began to think about where they would get the money to pay for the board of the number of Italians required during the period in which they were going to process the materials, and how many Italians would be required to do the work over the allotted period of 7 years.

So the junior Senator from Nevada stood on the floor of the Senate, and after considerable computations said it would take 198,000 Italians working 8 hours a day for 7 years to process and manufacture these materials, and increase the increment of value by the necessary hundreds of millions of dollars, and shipping them back to Russia; and that the Italians, with an average family of three or four persons, or whatever the average was in Italy at that time, would require just about an even billion dollars for the purpose of boarding them during that period.

There was no place to get the billion dollars, of course, except in the United States of America. I went into the matter in great detail. During this process I figured it would take about 14,000 Russian and Yugoslavian foremen to supervise the job, in order to be sure that they got the materials processed the way they wanted them.

The foremen would not be loyal Americans or Italians; they would be Communists, and they would have their effect on the Italian Government.

I recall that all this was said in plain words, but the bipartisan tidal wave rolled over the Senate. My address had no effect whatever, and I do not expect the coming debate on the San Francisco Japanese Peace Treaty to have much of an effect, with so many prominent Republicans lauding the Secretary of State for his wonderful foresight in preparing the treaty and paving the way for the full control of China and Asia by Russia—I do not expect the bipartisan tidal wave to be slackened very much; I expect it to roll over the Senate just as it did in the case of the Italian Treaty, and be just as much regretted later on.

THE REGRETTABLE ITALIAN TREATY

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may pay him a very sincere compliment?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to yield for that purpose or for any other purpose.

Mr. CAIN. The junior Senator from Washington remembers, as though it were yesterday, listening to the Senator from Nevada when he spoke against the Italian Treaty. The Senator from Washington listened, but did not pay very much attention to what the Senator from Nevada was saying. The Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Washington had not long been Members of the Senate at that time; they were young in experience. I was prevailed upon to accept, without scrutiny, without examination, or without thought, the recommendations of those who said we must ratify the Italian Treaty "this afternoon" or all kinds of terrible results would follow. I went along with that point of view, and then learned to regret it.

On the basis of my own study and because of the progress of history I hope that some of the mistakes we made in connection with the Italian Treaty are not to be repeated in connection with the Japanese Treaty. I am not yet qualified to say whether comparable mistakes are possible or likely; I simply have no intention of voting to ratify the Japanese Treaty until I know all there is that I can come to know about it.

Let me say to the Senator from Nevada and others who may be interested that as a result of the Italian Peace Treaty ratification—and we seem not to have any way in which to change it—we prohibited the Italians from taking their proportionate and necessary place in the defense establishment in Europe we seek these days to build with vast amounts of American money. I hope that war will not come now or in the future to Western Europe, but should it come within the foreseeable future, our chances of being successful with our allies in Europe will be ever so much less than they would have been had we taken more time to consider the Italian Treaty before we ratified it. What we did was to agree that Italy should not be permitted to use more than a small percentage of its total manpower in the building of a collective security effort in Western Europe. If war comes to Western Europe we shall find we need much more help on our eastern Italian flank than we shall have, because we did not consider the possibility that by that treaty we might so weaken the peninsula called Italy that in time of need it would not be able to serve adequately in our collective effort.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely compliment the Senator from Nevada for urging, as he is doing, that we should really be absolutely satisfied about what we are doing before we repeat, in the terms of the Japanese Treaty, without thought, what we did only a few years ago in voting for the Italian Treaty which immediately became a solid road block to progress, health, and strength.

ITALY'S POSITION IN EUROPE REVERSE OF JAPAN IN ASIA

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from Washington has so expressed himself. I would say, however, without extended debate at this time, that the Japanese position in Asia is exactly the reverse of Italy's position in Europe, in that we wanted Italy to join Europe to strengthen a European coalition.

In Asia, with the tremendous manpower of Japan, the last thing in the world we want them to do is to recognize Communist China, and yet we are leaving them no alternative.

It is not the fault of the Japanese, but of our policy in China, our coming agreement to hold our troops near the thirty-eighth parallel, and to leave the remainder of Korea and China unprotected. The last thing we want the Japanese to do is to join our actual enemies, Communist China. We are actually at war with Communist China, although they have denied it and have said that the Chinese Army is a volunteer army. They deny they are at war with us, yet we are negotiating an armistice with them behind their armed forces surrounded by armed guards.

Mr. President, I read something about Lincoln this morning. In the Civil War, when there was a conference, it was held on our territory. It was on the Union side that they said down to talk about peace; and they did not go in behind an armed guard, and we laid down the conditions of any cease-firing arrangement, and the fighting went on until the arrangements were definitely completed. That condition definitely prevailed in all of our wars until this world war III, or police action, as our President chooses to call it.

We lost the conference, Mr. President, so far as Asia is concerned, the first morning we walked in behind an armed guard.

AMERICANS DO NOT WANT JAPAN TO RECOGNIZE COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. President, I wish to say again that I believe we will all agree that the last thing we want Japan to do is to recognize

Communist China, but from the time we recognized Soviet Russia in 1933, on through Casablanca, Yalta, Tehran, and Potsdam, and now to Kaesong, every move has been pointed to one objective, and that is complete control over China and Asia by the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I was reminded a while ago by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington, of whom I am very fond—and I have admired the fights he has made in the Senate when he has made up his mind he was right about any certain thing, or that someone else was wrong about it—of that great bipartisan control of the Senate during the first 3 years the junior Senator from Nevada and the junior Senator from Washington were Members of this august body.

We heard it said earlier today that bipartisan control has worked wonderfully well in the matter of the Japanese treaty, in the getting of the nations together to sign, something about which no one realizes, or at least the signers do not realize, that Japan has been left not only with a free hand to recognize our enemy, but will be compelled to recognize our enemy to support her people—since the Communists through the good offices of our State Department, will be in complete and sole control of China.

BIPARTISAN CONTROL

Bipartisan control has made that result possible, Mr. President.

I wish to recall a debate engaged in between the junior Senator from Nevada on the floor of the Senate and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. We had broken bipartisan control in this body, but a few Members of the Senate, including the senior Senator from Texas, seem to want to bring it back.

In that debate the junior Senator from Nevada said, "If we are going to have bipartisan control, why do we not go further and have tripartisan control?" There are three independent branches of our Government set up by the Constitution, and since it is suggested by the senior Senator from Texas that we have bipartisan control by a handful of men on each side of the aisle cooperating with the executive branch through the State Department. The junior Senator from Nevada further said that if the advocates of bipartisan control would undertake to bring about a tripartisan control, so that it would be understood that everything sent down by the State Department shall be passed by the Senate without adequate debate, and that everything passed by the Senate will be held to be constitutional and be approved by the Supreme Court without adequate argument.

Then, Mr. President, everyone connected with such an arrangement should be impeached.

Mr. President, I make that statement, in view of the fact that the Constitution of the United States established three independent branches of our Government, the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary. Why did the founding fathers establish those three independent branches? Because Ben Franklin and others who attended the Constitutional Convention were smart enough to know that one branch might go haywire, or even two—and in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada they have done so—at least one branch is left to save the country from complete collapse.

In view of the fact that the Constitution of the United States has created three independent branches, any man in this body, or elsewhere, who would enter into such an agreement to circumvent the independent action of the separate branches would be entering into a conspiracy and ought to be impeached. That is what the junior Senator from Nevada believes. It would be collusion.

I remember when Senator Donnell, of Missouri, one of the great constitutional lawyers of this country, was with us. At that time the junior Senator from Nevada referred the question to him. He asked the Senator from Missouri what such action would be and the Senator from Missouri said, of course, it would be collusion and, of course, such persons should be impeached if they dealt in that way with the separate branches of the Government. I care not whether it is called bipartisan or tripartisan control.

The junior Senator from Washington has just outlined to us what happened to Italy through a treaty approved by this Senate without adequate understanding.

We have all watched the great bipartisan tidal wave roll across this Senate in approving the gifts of billions upon billions of the taxpayers' money to foreign countries.

The junior Senator from Nevada saw it roll across our country one time when he was not a Member of the Senate. A sectional issue was involved. Three quarters of a million acre-feet of water of the Colorado River belonging to Western States was traded for Rio Grande water for Texas.

That was done on the Senate floor. It was said that that trade was made because there was an international obligation to fulfill an implied promise of such a treaty. It was said that it would be a terrible thing to repudiate it and disappoint the neighbor nation of Mexico.

At the time that was done I was 3,000 miles away in Nevada, one of the States affected by that hasty action.

Those who engaged in that trade understood very little of what they were doing.

Still the bipartisan wave rolled over the Senate.

ENGLAND—ECONOMIC SQUEEZE ON IRAN

Mr. President, I notice that Great Britain is putting an economic squeeze on Iran. What is that squeeze? It is set forth in an AP dispatch which appears on page 2 of the Times-Herald of today:

"BRITAIN PUTS CASH SQUEEZE ON IRAN CHIEF

"LONDON, September 10.—Britain today drastically revised her economic relations with Iran in a clear bid to force the already wobbly government of aged Mohammed Mossadegh out of office."

How does Britain do it? Let us continue reading:

"This latest move in the months-old oil dispute came as Tehran claimed some Communist nations are entering the British-Iranian feud with bids to buy, fetch, and carry Iran's nationalized oil.

* * * * *

"The British Treasury announced Britain will take these measures—which 'can be revoked whenever the Persian (Iranian) Government makes possible a solution to the oil question':

"1. Cut off Iran's dollar supplies."

I suppose they will cut off the $25,000,000 we have already sent there to make a deal for Great Britain and the $1,500,000 the Export-Import Bank has already loaned to Iran.

"2. Stop Iran's sterling oil transactions and control all other sterling transactions.

"3. End Iran's right freely to transfer and convert her sterling—including her £14,000,000 ($39,200,000) balance in London which backs the nation's internal currency.

"4. Halt the export of scarce goods—including sugar, iron, and steel, semimanufactures, nonferrous metals, alloys and oil—to Iran."

Mr. President, we are entering into that deal, otherwise it would be impossible to carry it out. When one stands on the Senate floor and asks that we not give the taxpayers' money to Britain, France, and the other 14 Marshall-plan countries to furnish Russia and the iron-curtain countries the materials they need to fight world war III with us, what happens? The bipartisan steam roller rolls over us again. The Kem-Wherry amendment is washed out, and authority to continue the trade with Russia and the iron-curtain countries is put in the hands of the President and the Secretary of State, with an Administrator whom the President will appoint as the mouthpiece.

They have already expressed themselves. Britain has already defied the United States of America and said she would continue such trade.

However, we are entering into a cash squeeze against Iran, along with Britain, to bring about the resignation of the Premier of Iran; to squeeze a nation which wants to be friendly to us.

EVERY MOVE FOR 19 YEARS TOWARD COMMUNIST CONTROL

Mr. President, I have mentioned certain dispatches to give outstanding examples of our foreign policy. We have a foreign policy, do not make a mistake about that. Some persons may say we do not have a foreign policy, or that if we do, it is a mixed-up policy. It is not a mixed-up policy.

Every move we have made for 19 years has pointed toward the loss of Asia. Nothing could have pointed better or straighter to just what is happening in Asia now than what we have done for 19 years. Yet we are now entering into a plot against Iran.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada went through the Abadan plant in Iran in 1948. He saw the two or three hundred thousand Iranians who had raised their standard of living somewhat through employment, out of the total of 17,000,000 people in Iran. He visited with the King of Saudi Arabia, Ibn Saud, for a while.

The reason for the present situation is that Great Britain for years has not been paying a proper royalty on the oil which is produced in Iran.

A maximum of 17 cents a barrel has been paid for oil produced by Britain. Across the line in Saudi Arabia the Americans are paying from 40 to 60 cents a barrel royalty on the oil produced there.

That is what is the matter, Mr. President. The British held down the royalty payments, and are not offering to pay proper royalties now.

We are sending $25,000,000 of American money, with probably $75,000,000 more to come, to buy the Iranians off. The Export-Import Bank has loaned $1,500,000 more. Then we enter into a cash squeeze on Iran to force the resignation of their chief, so that they can keep the dollars from Iran, when, as a matter of fact, England, along with 16 other nations, are laughing up their sleeves at us.

They take our money and spend it for social security, eyeglasses, false teeth, free hospitalization, and other things. And we, in the Senate, are subject to the tidal wave of bipartisan control.

STATE DEPARTMENT PROMOTED COMMUNIST CHINA RECOGNITION

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I believe the administration's actions to date has made recognition of Communist China by the United Nations inevitable; and certainly their actions have made the recognition of Communist China by the Japanese inevitable.

By our own action we have gained the support for them which they needed in order to be recognized, starting with Acheson's statement before the joint meeting of Congress last year when he said we would not use the veto power in the United Nations to prevent recognition of Communist China, and he has never changed that statement. Of course, no one knows what individual assurances have been given.

Mr. President, as the junior Senator from Nevada has stated, he expects the resignation of Mr. Acheson within 60 days, on the wave of the present bipartisan upsurge of approval of the Japanese Treaty.

Russia wants peace in Asia. Why? She wants it because we have agreed to satisfy her by not interfering with her conquest of China.

The maximum demands we have made at Kaesong assure her a free hand in China so as to enable her to consolidate her gains.

Also, we have sealed off Nationalist China, which we have recognized, and we have bottled her up on Formosa, with our own fleet in front of her. And then we refused to invite Nationalist China to the peace conference in San Francisco. That was the final slap in the face. Of course Nationalist China is gone. Our State Department saw to that. Of course Japan must recognize Communist China in order to live and in order to trade, because she will not be allowed to trade with Communist China without first recognizing her. That should be clear to anyone.

COMMON SENSE VERSUS ISOLATIONISM

Mr. President, there have long been bandied about in the Senate the words "isolationism" and "liberalism." Let me say to you, Mr. President, that we do not have to be in favor of dissipating the wealth of the United States and dividing the taxpayers' money with all the nations of the world at random in order to favor protecting the ultimate best interests of the United States of America.

Let us put the position of the United States on the basis of what is good for the United States of America. Let us be for the United States of America as Churchill is for England. What is the matter with that position? Let us be for England as Churchill is for the United States of America. What is the matter with that position? Then we would know where we were going. We would be for the ultimate best interests of this country. We would then defend, as England has always done—in Asia, South America, or Europe what it is necessary to defend for our own ultimate safety, security and welfare. Let us make that our slogan.

Let me say again, for the benefit of some Senators who seem to forget, that the foreign policy of England was voiced by one of England's great prime ministers in 1858 or 1859. Let me state it again, so the Senate will not forget it.

England does not follow the policy of dissipating its wealth. It does not follow the policy of turning the thumbscrews on the taxpayers of England for the benefit of foreign nations. Investigate the taxes of England and see how they are collected. Income taxes in England are not paid to the extent they are paid in the United States of America. However, let us pass that by. Let us consider what a great Prime Minister of England said. He did not make the policy. He voiced the policy when he said: "We have no permanent friendships or permanent enmities; we have but permanent interests." Take that home and study it. Analyze it and see what it means. The policy has been reiterated by several subsequent Prime Ministers of England.

What happened in 1945? President Roosevelt, in one of his lucid moments, said to Mr. Churchill: "Why do you not relinquish your claims on the Malay States? They will get us into trouble." I do not quote him exactly, but the exact quotation can readily be supplied. What did Churchill reply? The junior Senator from Nevada considers Churchill one of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced. He is for England. He is for the best interests of England. He has always had a knack of clothing his thoughts in catchwords and phrases which rang around the world. Even a school child could remember them. He answered Mr. Roosevelt, "I have not become the King's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire." Mr. Roosevelt said no more, because the United States had no friend in England if he insisted on stopping colonial slavery and similar practices in the Far East. Yet, that policy contributes to not only the loss of China, but all of Asia.

Now we are told by France that we must send troops and additional help to Indochina. Why? To help hold their colonial slavery claims.

COLONIAL SLAVERY

Mr. President, to make the position of the junior Senator from Nevada clear for all time, he is not for England's policy of colonial slavery, or the policy of colonial slavery of any other nation.

He believes that the best thing America could do would be to denounce it and stop supporting it. If we did so, overnight we would have all the Moslems of the world in our lap. We would have the support of the African nations. We would have with us all the people of the world who want to escape from such slavery.

CAPITALISM REPRESENTED BY COLONIAL SLAVERY

What choice are we giving the people of the world? We are giving them a choice between capitalism and communism. Capitalism unfortunately is represented in half the world by colonial slavery.

RUSSIA THE SAVIOR

So Russia describes what she is doing as a great freedom movement, and Russia says she is going to free the colonial peoples from the system of colonial slavery. Such statements have their effect, of course.

Mr. President, I am for the United States of America, just as Churchill is for England; and I am for England just as Churchill is for the United States of America. I am in favor of defending any area in Europe or Asia that is determined by the Secretary of Defense and our State Department, having knowledge of the weapons available to us in the laboratories and the weapons already available, to be important to our ultimate safety and welfare.

The areas important to our ultimate safety change from time to time. They changed with the airplane, and they are changing again with the development of guided missiles and new atomic submarines, and they will change with the development of atomic-propelled airplanes.

So, Mr. President, it does not make sense for us to sign defense pacts with other nations and thus say to them: "Henceforth when you are in trouble, we are in trouble." How do they get in trouble, after all? They get in trouble in the way that Britain got in trouble in Iran, where she did not pay for the oil; or in the way that Britain and France have gotten in trouble in the Malayan states and in Indochina, by enforcing their systems of colonial slavery; or in the way Britain has gotten in trouble in Africa, by holding large areas of land in upper Egypt without proper authority, or because of maladministration in other parts of Africa.

EGYPT

I stopped unexpectedly to see the governor of one of the British-controlled Sudan areas of Africa—upper Egypt. Mr. President, the British have no more right in upper Egypt than we do. Nevertheless, Britain continues to hold on to upper Egypt because Britain is able to do so. Without our help, it would be impossible.

Britain is able to do all these things because of our money and support. When I was in London I talked with Mr. Cripps, after I had examined a number of the coal mines and steel mills in the Birmingham area, where I did not find one owner who wanted any of the Marshall-plan money.

I said to some of them individually, "Are you waiting for the Marshall-plan money?" They replied, "We just want to keep them out of our hair, because if we take any of the money, our steel plants will be nationalized." They hoped to avoid nationalization, but they were not able to do so.

Mr. President, today we support the Socialist Government in Britain, instead of letting it fall and having Mr. Churchill back in power.

Mr. President, the United States is fully capable of defending any area of the world that at any particular moment is important to our ultimate security and safety. However, we must concentrate upon a proper defense, and that defense will be airplanes and submarines and not foot soldiers.

Even if every man, woman, and boy in America were pressed into service, America would not be able to provide enough foot soldiers to combat successfully the foot soldiers of China. Suppose every man, woman, and child in America were armed as a United States foot soldier and engaged the armies of China, and suppose each of our soldiers shot down 10 of the Chinese soldiers. Even so, our forces would not be able to slacken the advance of the Chinese foot soldiers.

It is foolish and silly for the United States to send foot soldiers to Europe, where the countries are already heavily overpopulated.

Today more than 20 percent of the men in England cannot find sufficient work to make a living, unless we pay their board bill.

The same situation exists in practically all the other countries of Europe.

However, some of our people say that we must send American boys to Europe as bait, so those countries will know we are for them—as if two world wars were not sufficient to let anyone know what we will do in times of stress. Despite that fact, Mr. President, we are told that your boy and my boy and all other American boys must be sent to Europe or Asia to furnish the foot soldiers to engage the Asiatic hordes in the very kind of war that we cannot hope to win.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are beginning to think. After 160,000 of our American boys that have been maimed, killed, or lost in the fighting in Korea—not 80,000, as has been stated by the authorities, but 160,000—the people of the United States are beginning to think.

Soon we shall be confronted with a tax bill which no one can pay; the Congress is about to pass the new tax bill with more of the bipartisan control.

Just recently there was submitted in the Senate a resolution calling for a change in the Senate rules, so as to enable cloture to be invoked by means of a mere majority vote of those Senators on the Senate floor at any time. I hope that resolution never sees the light of day; but if it does, it will be just another job to be done on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope there is an end to the silly charge of "isolationism" which is bandied about here, the charge that unless one favors the Japanese Treaty, the recognition by the Japanese of Communist China, unless he favors the reckless and wanton expenditure of the taxpayers' money, and all of the other proposals which come to the floor of the Senate without proper debate, he is an isolationist, or is opposing the proper defense of America. My constituents in Nevada and, I believe, all the people of the United States understand what an isolationist is; and they also understand what a giveaway artist is, and they understand something about the shortcomings of the so-called great bipartisan policy. I regret that the name of a dead man was brought into this debate. He is gone now, but I agreed with very little that he did while he was on the Senate floor. He threw bipartisan support to the Italian Treaty.

He authored the Vandenberg resolutions.

What were the Vandenberg resolutions, Mr. President? If Senators will read the debate which occurred at that time, they will learn what those resolutions were.

However, when the Vandenberg resolutions were brought before the Senate, we were told that very little time was available

for debate and that it was necessary to hurry. Nevertheless, I did debate those resolutions with their author, and I said that that was the first time in the history of the United States that the Congress had ever officially requested the Secretary of State or the President of the United States or a group of States to bring in a treaty or pact, without first having it written out in detail so that we could know what we were approving.

I said that if the Vandenberg resolutions were adopted, any proposed pact or agreement which thereafter was brought before the Senate there was a moral commitment to accept it. As a matter of fact, in the belief of the junior Senator from Nevada, Mr. President, the pact had already been written before the resolutions were presented to the Senate.

Of course we were assured that there was no commitment; we were told that, following the resolutions, any pact which was proposed would come up in the Senate for approval. It is true that that did occur, but the pact was brought before us for only perfunctory consideration; the real approval had been given through the resolutions.

What came next? The arms-to-Europe bill came next. Every person who read the report on the pact knew that the arms-to-Europe bill was inevitable. Nevertheless, we were assured, "Oh, no; the Senate will have a chance to fully debate such a bill."

However, Mr. President, the so-called bipartisan tidal wave took care of the hasty approval on the floor of the Senate.

When I was bold enough to say that on the heels of the Vandenberg resolutions, the pact, then the arms-to-Europe bill, would come the sending of our boys and girls to Europe. Well, Mr. President, they are in Europe now if that is any consolation. The Senate was led to approve an unlimited armed force to Europe in four easy stages. It is only necessary to read the debate which occurred at that time to understand the well thought out plan.

Then those who favored that movement said "we will never send more than 6 divisions—90,000 men."

However, soon after that date the great Marshall, when testifying before a committee, said in rather an offhand remark that perhaps we should send as many as 400,000 of our boys to Europe.

That offhand remark by him was made in a manner somewhat similar to the one in which he made at Harvard University in regard to the sending of money from the United States to Europe, the suggestion which developed into the great Marshall plan.

Mr. Marshall had no idea of the import of what he was saying at that time. Someone else had written the paragraph in his speech. However, Mr. Bevin, of England, know what was meant. Mr. Marshall had scarcely taken his seat, following the delivery of that speech, before Mr. Bevin caught the ball on the first bounce, in Europe; and within 60 days he had told us just how much the great Marshall plan would cost us. It sounded like another case of collusion.

The next move did not take long. The great bipartisan machine again started to roll.

Mr. President, the American people are being led, driven, and coerced into a foreign policy about which they are not thoroughly informed—their substance is being dissipated—the 19-year-old foreign policy starting with the recognition of Communist Soviet Russia in 1933 and culminating in the second Yalta in Kaesong, Korea, has been designed by the administration as augmented by the so-called bipartisan policy.

It is time that we called a halt and examined critically the actions by irresponsible people in the State Department.

Mr. President, we cannot have the largest army in the world, the largest navy in the world, and the largest air force in the world.

What we must consider is how the next war will be fought. Within the next 6 months or 1 year the answer to that question will be so plain that the schoolchildren of our country will understand it.

It is obvious that the next war will be fought under the sea and in the air.

Today we have 3,500,000 soldiers. Instead, we need at least 3,000,000 men in the Air Force. We need a large Air Force, much larger than the army of foot soldiers.

So let us have a powerful Air Force of 200 air groups or whatever number may be needed. We can develop such an air force and we can control the air over any area in the world currently important to our ultimate safety. We should build a submarine fleet sufficient to blockade any nation seeking to move into any area important to us.

Mr. President, I hope we have heard the last of the idle talk of isolationism. Every man who does not go off the deep end is branded an isolationist.

So long as the Secretary of State speaks; so long as the President says we need $10,000,000,000, $8,000,000,000, or $5,000,000,000 for Europe, with the Amos and Andy chant, "Do not read it, there is no necessity of reading it," it is going to pass anyway. It is isolationism, Mr. President, when we ask for details. It will be remembered that when we debated on the Senate floor, and in the hearings, the great Marshall plan—which Marshall himself never understood—the junior Senator from Nevada asked that a few sensible conditions be placed on the furnishing of the money: First, a United States of Europe, or a customs union, which would prevent each one of these countries continuing as a government of dictators, kings, or princes, with no cooperation at all with each other. Each with their royal family to be retired as Beligum's king was recently retired on $120,000 annually—I point out that $120,000 is the annual pay of eight United States Senators.

But that was only one of them. There are many more European countries which retain royalty, whom we shall support for the rest of their lives in the style to which they have become accustomed, when they are retired. There was no condition imposed of a United States of Europe. We never determined where the money was going or why. Should a United States Senator, elected by a sovereign State, try to determine where the taxpayers' money was going? That would be a terrible thing; it might set a precedent in the United Staes Senate—it might run counter to the bipartisan policy. The junior Senator from Nevada asked that a condition be attached that the European countries guarantee the integrity of private investments before we poured our money into their countries. No; we could not do that, but we can initiate the great point 4 program, so that we guarantee the integrity of our own investments any place in the world. Is that not a wonderful idea—try that on a banker some time—try to get him to guarantee the integrity of the investment you mean to make with the money you borrow from him. Yes, it is silly, but we are doing it.

The junior Senator from Nevada also suggested that the United States should have access to the markets of the world which we are committed to defend. There could be no colonialism under that system. It would mean that any country in the world could fix an import fee or a tariff to protect its own workers and investments, but no country could force a third country to fix such tariffs or import fees to favor its own trade. They call such rates empire preferential rates. The great free-trade masquerade has been debated on the floor of the Senate under the name of reciprocal trade, under which the products of any nation of the world may come into this country without regard to that differential of cost by the differences in the wage standard of living. A continual emergency must exist in order to enable the Government to get more money from the taxpayers and to get more money through the sale of bonds to keep the economy rolling.

If we were to abandon that course, within 90 days the economy of this country would crumble.

As a matter of fact, since 1934 there has been a deliberate plan to wreck the economy of this Nation—through free trade, deficit financing, taxes manipulated to discourage private investments—and the SEC.

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada it was never intended that any regulatory body of any State or of the Nation should have the power to determine feasibility before allowing the sale of stock. No; it was meant that the regulatory body should determine that the prospective buyer of the stock is being told the truth; that is all.

Mr. President, there is one other action that assisted in wrecking the economy of this country. No one is trying to stop inflation. The effort to make it appear that the President wants to stop inflation is the greatest hoax ever sold to this country. If the President wants to stop inflation he can stop it. He is afraid to stop it. In 1934 we cut the string that tied the money to a sound principle of financing. That is, the metal behind it. The gold and the silver. We cut that string, and the balloon has been soaring ever since. No one knows where it is now. We would like to know. We would like to know the status of our currency in terms of inflation, so that the gold price could again be fixed and back up the currency. The money which we use for a common exchange must be based upon confidence in such medium of exchange—that confidence is rapidly disappearing.

SNYDER INSISTS NO RISE IN GOLD PRICE

I note an article under the headline "Snyder insistent on no rise in gold; interrupts talks with western ministers to say United States will not consent to higher price," which appeared in the New York Times, Saturday, September 8.

Mr. President, the last thing in the world which this administration wants to do is to stop inflation. They do not want to tie up the inflation balloon which is destroying our currency. They want the inflation of the dollar bill to continue to soar.

STOLEN ONE-HALF OF SAVINGS AND INSURANCE

The Senate of the United States has been a party to deliberately stealing more than one-half the savings and the insurance and the incomes of the people of the United States of America—the Senate, the House, and the administration have stolen them deliberately; and we are keeping up the theft—stealing more of the people's savings every day through inflation.

Mr. President, I shall close by saying that, though what I have described may be called bipartisanship, under it a number of unfortunate treaties have been put over. Now we hear lauded to the skies, Secretary of State who was a party to the Japanese Peace Treaty, and who was a party to everything that is now resulting in the loss of China with the ultimate loss of Asia. There is no choice for the Japanese people, who are customarily hard working people. They can fight and they can work and they will do both, but they will have to do what they are told, and they will have to join Communist China because we have brought about the loss of China to the Communists.

We are the ones who destroyed Nationalist China. The last backhanded slap in the face of Nationalist China and their ruination was the failure to recognize them at the

San Francisco Conference, or to collaborate with them in the preparation of the Japanese treaty.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the article entitled "Snyder Insistent on No Rise in Gold," which appeared in the New York Times, Saturday, September 8, 1951.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"SNYDER INSISTENT ON NO RISE IN GOLD—INTERRUPTS TALKS WITH WESTERN MINISTERS TO SAY UNITED STATES WILL NOT CONSENT TO HIGHER PRICE

"(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

"WASHINGTON, September 1.—Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder interrupted talks with the finance ministers of Britain, France, and Italy today to say the United States remained unalterably opposed to any increase in the price of gold over the figure of $35 an ounce in effect since 1934.

"Anticipating a renewal of demands to raise the price at next week's meeting of the International Monetary Fund and International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, Secretary Snyder told a news conference he could see no good reason for the United States Government to pay a higher price for gold.

"Secretary Snyder and other top-level officials of the Treasury and State Departments are being sounded out by the visiting delegations for their reaction to economic problems of their separate countries.

"DEARER GOLD HELD INFLATIONARY

"It was the Secretary's position that nothing would contribute more to a world-wide inflation of prices than an increase in the price of newly mined gold.

"The demands of official protocol having been met, Secretary Snyder and Hugh Gaitskell, Britain's Chancelor of the Exchequer, sat down with their experts today to talk about Britain's current economic and financial problems and the worse ones in prospect.

"There was no particular upshot of the talks and none is expected. In substance, the British are trying to explain well in advance of the fact why it may be necessary later to take certain unpalatable economic decisions.

"Britain's terms of trade have been running against her. In consequence, her balance of payments has taken an unfavorable turn. Mr. Gaitskell is telling this Government that it will be necessary to reduce imports from the United States still further.

"Solid rows of statistics have been submitted to the Treasury that suggest that Britain sees no other way out; that it may become necessary for Britain to force exports on the world market in order to keep up income. She will have to deprive her nationals of consumer goods to make this possible.

"It is implicit in the explanation of British payment difficulties that it is to be hoped the United States will appreciate the circumstances that makes necessary the unpopular course of action to come but that it will have to come, no matter how much fuss is made about it on this side.

"Substantially the same line of explanation is expected from Mr. Gaitskell at the meeting next week of the International Monetary Fund. The fund's articles require that members remove restrictions on international payments by next March. Britain has no intention of removing her exchange restrictions or to end discrimination against dollar imports.

"This position will have to be communicated to the fund, since the subject of exchange restrictions has a prominent place on the agenda of the meeting and the fund has announced it will soon press for abandonment or modification of present restrictions on payments.

"BRITAIN TO SEEK 5 YEARS' GRACE

"Britain is expected to move eventually for amendment of the articles of agreement to provide another 5 years of grace, during which existing trade and payments restrictions may be maintained. It is unlikely, however, that the British position will be thus formalized until some time later.

"Secretary Snyder told his news conference that there had been no mention in his talks with Mr. Gaitskell of the possibility that Britain might take advantage of the waiver clause in the Anglo-American loan agreement to avoid payment of interest due next December 31. Of the $119,000,000 payment due on the loan, interest accounts for $74,000,000.

"On another phase of Mr. Gaitskell's conversation here, a spokesman for Charles E. Wilson, Defense Mobilization Director, denied reports current yesterday that every American effort would be made to assure Britain delivery of between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 tons of American steel during the next year.

"Mr. Wilson, himself, had used these figures before talking with Mr. Gaitskell as the amount of steel the British would like to have from the United States. As it happened, however, Mr. Gaitskell asked only for 500,000 to 700,000 tons.

"Accordingly, an announcement today by the Economic Cooperation Administration said it would review an Office of Defense Mobilization request for 800,000 tons of steel for Britain during the year ahead after considering domestic requirements and the requests of other foreign claimants for American steel.

"Reports that Mr. Wilson had told Mr. Gaitskell that he would endeavor to get 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 tons for Britain's rearmament program 'if the economy of the United States could spare the metal,' brought prompt and critical reaction in Congress today. Despite assurances by Mr. Wilson's aides that no firm commitment was made at the meeting and an outright denial that any set amount of steel had been promised, Members of Congress leveled criticism at Mr. Wilson.

"Senator DENNIS CHAVEZ, Democrat, of New Mexico, said he was 'extremely distressed' to learn that Mr. Gaitskell had obtained even a qualified pledge of '2,000,000 to 3,000,000 tons of American steel next year.'

"He added that any steel shipped to Britain would have to be taken away from the construction of American schools, hospitals, and roads.

"Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, told the Senate that he strongly supported Senator CHAVEZ' statement."

THE STERLING BLOC—FORM OF PIRACY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, it is a well known fact that the sterling bloc countries, controlled from London, almost completely surround Japan's trade area, and that through "blocked sterling" and manipulations of the exchange price of the pound sterling in terms of the currency of other nations almost completely control the trade of the area. Such controls invite economic wars, which lead to actual wars.

A FORM OF PIRACY

Mr. President, such manipulation of the sterling currency by the London bankers, affecting about one-half of the world's foreign trade advantage, is a form of piracy and will assist in forcing the Japanese to join Communist China in order to secure the necessary raw materials and to sell their processed and manufactured goods.

ONE MORE LINK IN THE CHAIN

As the treaty is now written it is just one more link in the State Department's plan to follow England in the recognition of Red China and to complete the blackout of Nationalist China.

LET THE PEOPLE UNDERSTAND

We could well postpone the hasty consideration of this highly controversial Japanese Treaty until the people of this country and the Congress of the United States had time to understand the full import of its provisions.

This could well prove to be another occasion similar to the bipartisan rush of the Senate approval of the Italian Treaty in June of 1947—at that time the junior Senator from Nevada led the fight against the ratification—within three short years everybody in this Nation, and most foreign nations, realized what a terrible mistake had been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that the Senate indefinitely postpone consideration of the Japanese Peace Treaty. Under the rule of the Senate, a two-thirds vote is required to indefinitely postpone consideration of the treaty.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] it has not been established whether he would like to request the yeas and nays. I would be of the opinion that he ought to be permitted to make the request.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] requests the yeas and nays. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUT-

LER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—11

Bricker	Jenner	McCarthy
Dirksen	Kem	Welker
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Ecton	McCarran	

NAYS—64

Aiken	Hennings	Morse
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Benton	Hill	Murray
Brewster	Holland	Nixon
Bridges	Hunt	Pastore
Butler, Md.	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Seaton
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Long	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Ferguson	Maybank	Thye
Flanders	McClellan	Tobey
Frear	McFarland	Underwood
Fulbright	McKellar	Watkins
George	McMahon	Wiley
Gillette	Millikin	Williams
Hayden	Monroney	
Hendrickson	Moody	

NOT VOTING—21

Bennett	Green	Martin
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Neely
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Conor
Capehart	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Kerr	Schoeppel
Chavez	Langer	Smathers
Duff	Lodge	Taft

So Mr. DIRKSEN's motion to postpone indefinitely consideration of the Japanese Peace Treaty was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, as modified by the reservation of the committee.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time is divided equally between the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin such time as he requires.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the other day the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made a very appealing argument. I heard only a part of it, but afterward read all of it in the RECORD.

The Senator from Illinois made eight points in opposition to ratification of the treaty. In that connection, I shall not now take more than a minute of the time of the Senate. I have caused to be prepared a brief statement in reply to each of the eight points submitted by the Senator from Illinois. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON SUMMARIZED STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

1. Statement: There is no hurry because the treaty could not come into force for 9 months.

Comment: It is not the fact that the treaty cannot come into force for 9 months. It can come into force whenever approved by any six of the countries named in paragraph (a) of article 23. Five of these are already prepared to deposit instruments of ratification, namely, Australia, Canada, Ceylon, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom, so that the treaty can be promptly brought into force as soon as the United States acts. We are now the stumbling block because the treaty cannot be brought into force for a 9-month period without our concurrence. After the 9-month period the treaty can be brought into force by other countries whether or not we concur.

Today, only the United States action stands in the way of ratification. Only our delay delays ratification.

2. Statement: We need the administrative agreement before we could approve the treaty.

Comment: The administrative agreement has been concluded and is entirely satisfactory to the Defense Establishment. It has been put in full into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

3. Statement: Nationalist China was not invited to sit in.

Comment: It is true that Nationalist China was not invited to the San Francisco Peace Conference, and nothing that we can now do will ever alter that fact. Our refusal to ratify the Japanese Peace Treaty will not bring the Chinese Nationalists into the San Francisco Peace Conference. However:

(a) The Chinese Nationalist Government was fully consulted in the preparation of the treaty and the articles of the treaty relating to China were drawn up in accordance with its advice and counsel.

(b) The Japanese Government has recognized and is dealing with the Nationalist Government and refuses to have any dealings with the Communist regime of China.

4. Statement: How do the Japanese people feel about the treaty?

Comment: Prime Minister Yoshida said this about the treaty:

"The peace treaty before the conference contains no punitive or retaliatory clauses; nor does it impose upon Japan any permanent restrictions or disabilities. It will restore the Japanese people to full sovereignty, equality, and freedom, and reinstate us as a free and equal member in the community of nations. It is not a treaty of vengeance, but instrument of reconciliation. The Japanese delegation gladly accepts this fair and generous treaty."

The Lower House of the Diet ratified the treaty by a vote of 307 to 47 and the Upper House by a vote of 174 to 45. The opposition votes in each case were Communist votes plus a few left-wing Socialists. The right-wing Socialists and all the other parties voted for the ratification of he treaty.

The Japanese are planning a jubilee day to mark the coming into force of the treaty.

It is the considered judgment of those who know the situation, including Senators SPARKMAN and SMITH, who have recently been to Japan, that failure on the part of the United States promptly to ratify the treaty would bring about a wave of disappointment and bitterness which would turn the Japanese people from friendly allies into bitter enemies.

5. Statement: The claims of our nationals are cut off.

Comment: It is true that the treaty protects Japan against being completely submerged by the claims of those individuals who, in their person or property, had been injured by Japan. The total of these claims would amount to upward of a hundred million dollars, a sum far beyond any capacity of Japan to pay. However, the position of the United States citizens is well taken care of. If they had property in Japan, they are entitled to get it back, or if it was damaged, its equivalent back under article 15 of the treaty.

If they had property losses of the kind that were heard from at the hearings, principally soldiers who had made deposits in Philippine banks, then these claims can be taken care of under article 14, whereby Japan authorizes the United States to take and hold for reparation purposes private Japanese property in the United States. This property now amounts to about $85 million. It has been drawn upon to some extent already to take care of injuries done to military and civilian prisoners of the Japanese. There is, however, a very substantial balance which can be applied to meet other classes of claims. This awaits only congressional legislation to appropriate the money which will be available under article 14 of the treaty.

The United States has a further claim which is preferred as to foreign exchange amounting to about $2 billion for advances made over the last 5 years. If Japan is able to pay this or any part of it, it can be used to satisfy the claims of American citizens. If Japan is not able to pay, then there is no use increasing her debt beyond the $2 billion which she is already obligated to pay under article 14 of the treaty.

6. Statement: The treaty will cost a great deal. "We are picking up the checks."

Comment: Neither the peace treaty nor the security treaty obligate the United States to pay a single red cent to Japan or to anybody else. The security treaty does not obligate the United States to maintain any forces in Japan. It gives us the right to maintain them if we want to. If we think it is in the best interest of the United States to keep some of our Armed Forces in and about Japan, naturally it will cost us something to do so just as it would cost us to maintain them anywhere else. The point is that there is no treaty obligation of any sort upon the United States to pay anybody anything.

7. Statement: Japan cannot live without trading with Communist China and Soviet Russia.

Comment: Japan's trade with the Communist mainland has for a long time now been negligible. The latest figures which cover the first 9 months of 1951 show that less than 1 percent of Japan's imports and exports were with Communist China. Nevertheless, during this year Japan more than held its own in the world. It substantially increased its foreign exchange reserves and did so without any grants-in-aid from the United States. Japan has large possibilities of economic growth, assuming that the non-Communist areas of the world, particularly of southeast Asia, are not barred to her.

8. Statement: We are not actually ending our occupation but our troops are staying there.

Comment: It is true that our troops will continue to be stationed in Japan if we

want them to stay there, but the presence of troops in Japan is only one phase of the occupation. Under the present situation the entire Japanese Government is subject to the control of the occupation authorities. Under the surrender terms "the authority of the Emperor and the Japanese Government to rule the state shall be subject to the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers." Today every act that the Japanese Government takes in relation to its internal affairs, its economy, its budget, its trade, its foreign relations, is subject to the occupation authorities. All of that will end when the peace treaty comes into force and it is that ending that is devoutly sought by the Japanese. The continuing presence in Japan pursuant to the security treaty of some United States troops which would help to protect Japan is a totally different thing from maintaining the present occupation with its control over every aspect of Japanese Government. That, if perpetuated, would, as General MacArthur said, be in effect an act of colonialism.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, as modified by the reservation of the committee.

The resolution of ratification, with the reservation, is as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive A, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the treaty of peace with Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951. As part of such advice and consent the Senate states that nothing the treaty contains is deemed to diminish or prejudice, in favor of the Soviet Union, the right, title, and interest of Japan, or the Allied Powers as defined in said treaty, in and to South Sakhalin and its adjacent islands, the Kurile Islands, the Habomai Islands, the Island of Shikotan or any other territory, rights, or interests possessed by Japan on December 7, 1941, or to confer any right, title, or benefit therein or thereto on the Soviet Union; and also that nothing in the said treaty, or the advice and consent of the Senate to the ratification thereof, implies recognition on the part of the United States of the provisions in favor of the Soviet Union contained in the so-called Yalta agreement" regarding Japan of February 11, 1945.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on this question, I should like to have a yea-and-nay vote taken.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOBEY (when his name was called). I vote "yea," and I ask the Senator from Texas please to take notice. [Laughter.]

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is engaged on official business. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—66

Aiken	Hendrickson	Monroney
Anderson	Hennings	Moody
Benton	Hickenlooper	Morse
Brewster	Hill	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Murray
Bridges	Hunt	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Ives	Pastore
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kilgore	Seaton
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Magnuson	Sparkman
Ferguson	Martin	Stennis
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Frear	McClellan	Tobey
Fulbright	McFarland	Underwood
George	McKellar	Watkins
Gillette	McMahon	Wiley
Hayden	Millikin	Williams

NAYS—10

Dirksen	Kem	Welker
Dworshak	Malone	Young
Ecton	McCarran	
Jenner	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—20

Bennett	Green	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	O'Conor
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kerr	Smathers
Chavez	Langer	Taft
Duff	Lodge	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty.

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the next treaty on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive B (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Washington on August 30, 1951, which was read the second time, as follows:

MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

The Parties to this Treaty,

Reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments, and desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace in the Pacific Area,

Recalling with mutual pride the historic relationship which brought their two peoples together in a common bond of sympathy and mutual ideals to fight side-by-side against imperialist aggression during the last war,

Desiring to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity and their common determination to defend themselves against external armed attacks, so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that either of them stands alone in the Pacific Area,

Desiring further to strengthen their present efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Pacific Area,

Agreeing that nothing in this present instrument shall be considered or interpreted as in any way or sense altering or diminishing any existing agreements or understandings between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines,

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE II

In order more effectively to achieve the objective of this Treaty, the Parties separately and jointly by self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

ARTICLE III

The Parties, through their Foreign Ministers or their deputies, will consult together from time to time regarding the implementation of this Treaty and whenever in the opinion of either of them the territorial integrity, political independence or security of either of the Parties is threatened by external armed attack in the Pacific.

ARTICLE IV

Each Party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific Area on either of the Parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common dangers in accordance with its constitutional processes.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations. Such measures shall be

terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

ARTICLE V

For the purpose of Article IV, an armed attack on either of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the metropolitan territory of either of the Parties, or on the island territories under its jurisdiction in the Pacific or on its armed forces, public vessels or aircraft in the Pacific.

ARTICLE VI

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ARTICLE VII

This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines in accordance with their respective constitutional processes and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Manila.

ARTICLE VIII

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Either Party may terminate it one year after notice has been given to the other Party.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done in duplicate at Washington this thirtieth day of August 1951.

For the United States of America:
DEAN ACHESON
JOHN FOSTER DULLES
TOM CONNALLY
ALEXANDER WILEY

For the Republic of the Philippines:
CARLOS P. ROMULO
J. M. ELIZALDE
VICENTE FRANCISCO
DIOSDADO MACAPAGAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The treaty is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the treaty will be reported to the Senate.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the mutual defense treaty between the United States of America and the Republic of the Philippines, signed at Washington on August 30, 1951.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.]

Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty.

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the next treaty on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive C (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America, signed at San Francisco on September 1, 1951, which was read the second time, as follows:

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Parties to this Treaty,

Reaffirming their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all Governments, and desiring to strengthen the fabric of peace in the Pacific Area.

Noting that the United States already has arrangements pursuant to which its armed forces are stationed in the Philippines, and has armed forces and administrative responsibilities in the Ryukyus, and upon the coming into force of the Japanese Peace Treaty may also station armed forces in and about Japan to assist in the preservation of peace and security in the Japan Area,

Recognizing that Australia and New Zealand as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations have military obligations outside as well as within the Pacific Area,

Desiring to declare publicly and formally their sense of unity, so that no potential aggressor could be under the illusion that any of them stand alone in the Pacific Area, and

Desiring further to coordinate their efforts for collective defense for the preservation of peace and security pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Pacific Area,

Therefore declare and agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security and justice are not endangered and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE II

In order more effectively to achieve the objective of this Treaty the Parties separately and jointly by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

ARTICLE III

The Parties will consult together whenever in the opinion of any of them the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened in the Pacific.

ARTICLE IV

Each Party recognizes that an armed attack in the Pacific Area on any of the Parties would be dangerous to its own peace and safety and declares that it would act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

ARTICLE V

For the purpose of Article IV, an armed attack on any of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the metropolitan territory of any of the Parties, or on the island territories under its jurisdiction in the Pacific or on its armed forces, public vessels or aircraft in the Pacific.

ARTICLE VI

This Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of the Parties under the Charter of the United Nations or the responsibility of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ARTICLE VII

The Parties hereby establish a Council, consisting of their Foreign Ministers or their Deputies, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The Council should be so organized as to be able to meet at any time.

ARTICLE VIII

Pending the development of a more comprehensive system of regional security in the Pacific Area and the development by the United Nations of more effective means to maintain international peace and security, the Council, established by Article VII, is authorized to maintain a consultative relationship with States, Regional Organizations, Associations of States or other authorities in the Pacific Area in a position to further the purposes of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of that Area.

ARTICLE IX

This Treaty shall be ratified by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of Australia, which will notify each of the other signatories of such deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force as soon as the ratifications of the signatories have been deposited.

ARTICLE X

This Treaty shall remain in force indefinitely. Any Party may cease to be a member of the Council established by Article VII one year after notice has been given to the Government of Australia, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of such notice.

ARTICLE XI

This Treaty in the English language shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of Australia. Duly certified copies thereof will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of each of the other signatories.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done at the city of San Francisco this first day of September, 1951.

For Australia:
PERCY C. SPENDER

For New Zealand:
C. A. BERENDSEN

For the United States of America:
DEAN ACHESON
JOHN FOSTER DULLES
ALEXANDER WILEY
JOHN J. SPARKMAN

I, Alfred Herbert Body, First Secretary of the Department of External Affairs, Canberra, Australia, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true copy of the text of the original Security Treaty concluded between the Governments of Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America on the first day of September, One thousand, nine hundred and fifty-one.

Given under my hand and the seal of the Department of External Affairs this fourth day of October, One thousand, nine hundred and fifty-one.

[SEAL] A. H. BODY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The treaty is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the treaty will be reported to the Senate.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive C, Eighty-second Congress, Second Session, the security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America, signed at San Francisco on September 1, 1951.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.]

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD to show that on the ratification of this treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States of America, there was not a single vote in opposition.

Mr. JENNER. I vote "no."

Mr. CONNALLY. Then I think I will ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Texas ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. CONNALLY. No, I shall not ask for the yeas and nays. But I do not think one Senator ought to interfere with the pleasure of all the other Senators. Mr. President, I desire a rising vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators favoring ratification of the treaty will stand, and remain standing until counted.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, which treaty is being voted on?

Mr. WATKINS. The Senate is proceeding so rapidly that we do not know which treaty is being voted on. I want to learn what is before the Senate at the moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is Executive C, the security treaty between Australia, New Zealand, and the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY. In order to be accommodating, I withdraw the request for a rising vote, and suggest that the Chair announce the result.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty.

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive D (82d Cong., 2d sess.), a security treaty between the United States of America and Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951, which was read the second time, as follows:

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND JAPAN

Japan has this day signed a Treaty of Peace with the Allied Powers. On the coming into force of that Treaty, Japan will not have the effective means to exercise its inherent right of self-defense because it has been disarmed.

There is danger to Japan in this situation because irresponsible militarism has not yet been driven from the world. Therefore Japan desires a Security Treaty with the United States of America to come into force simultaneously with the Treaty of Peace between the United States of America and Japan.

The Treaty of Peace recognizes that Japan as a sovereign nation has the right to enter into collective security arrangements, and further, the Charter of the United Nations recognizes that all nations possess an inherent right of individual and collective self-defense.

In exercise of these rights, Japan desires, as a provisional arrangement for its defense, that the United States of America should maintain armed forces of its own in and about Japan so as to deter armed attack upon Japan.

The United States of America, in the interest of peace and security, is presently willing to maintain certain of its armed forces in and about Japan, in the expectation, however, that Japan will itself increasingly assume responsibility for its own defense against direct and indirect aggression, always avoiding any armament which could be an offensive threat or serve other than to promote peace and security in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

Accordingly, the two countries have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

Japan grants, and the United States of America accepts, the right, upon the coming into force of the Treaty of Peace and of this Treaty, to dispose United States land, air and sea forces in and about Japan. Such forces may be utilized to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East and to the security of Japan against armed attack from without, including assistance given at the express request of the Japanese Government to put down large-scale internal riots and disturbances in Japan, caused through instigation or intervention by an outside power or powers.

ARTICLE II

During the exercise of the right referred to in Article I, Japan will not grant, without the prior consent of the United States of America, any bases or any rights, powers or authority whatsoever, in or relating to bases or the right of garrison or of maneuver, or transit of ground, air or naval forces to any third power.

ARTICLE III

The conditions which shall govern the disposition of armed forces of the United States of America in and about Japan shall be determined by administrative agreements between the two Governments.

ARTICLE IV

This Treaty shall expire whenever in the opinion of the Governments of the United States of America and Japan there shall have come into force such United Nations arrangements or such alternative individual or collective security dispositions as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance by the United Nations or otherwise of international peace and security in the Japan Area.

ARTICLE V

This Treaty shall be ratified by the United States of America and Japan and will come into force when instruments of ratification thereof have been exchanged by them at Washington.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries have signed this Treaty.

Done in duplicate at the city of San Francisco, in the English and Japanese languages, this eighth day of September, 1951.

For the United States of America:
DEAN ACHESON
JOHN FOSTER DULLES
ALEXANDER WILEY
STYLES BRIDGES

For Japan:
SHIGERU YOSHIDA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The treaty is open to amendment.

Mr. JENNER. I call up my Reservation No. 2 to the Japanese Security Treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read Reservation No. 2, proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH].

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

RESERVATION No. 2

Since Congress under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war and authorize the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States, any so-called administrative agreements under article III of this treaty relating to the right to dispose of the Armed Forces of the United States or any part of its Military Establishment in or about Japan shall not become binding on the United States unless ratified by the Senate as a treaty in accordance with article II, section 2 of the Constitution, or approved by the Congress by act or joint resolution specifically referring to such agreement or arrangement.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the argument which has been made concerning the multilateral peace treaty, in which many nations are involved, cannot be made with reference to this reservation, because this is a bilateral treaty between Japan and the United States providing for administrative arrangements with reference to Japan. If the Senate should adopt this reservation, as it should do, there would not be any conflict in renegotiation, because there are only two parties involved.

The Japanese Security Treaty gives us no security whatever, in any legal sense. The binding commitments of such a security agreement are left by this treaty, in article 3, to a so-called administrative agreement to be arranged between the two countries.

Mr. President, we are here sworn under oath to support the Constitution, and under that sworn oath it is our job to raise and maintain armies and equip them. We cannot delegate that power. That is provided for in the Constitution. The Senate today has surrendered its power to the Executive. If we adopt this treaty we shall have nothing more to say in Asia. We must go hat in hand to the United Nations and say, "Please give us the right to protect our own boys in Asia." Russia, remember, is a member of that body, and Communist China will be a member of that body to which this great Government has to go hat in hand. Can Japan help us? Of course not, because we have committed her to article 2 of the United Nations Charter. Therefore she, too, is entwined in this network. She cannot even give us bases. She cannot even give us the right to ship supplies to our bases unless approved by the United Nations.

With reference to the administrative agreement, we now have the preliminary text of it. I think I have a copy of it here——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Has the Senator read the text of the so-called administrative agreement?

Mr. JENNER. I have read it many times, but there is no policy defined. It has to be worked out by a representative of this Government and a representative of the Japanese Government, and we are today signing a blank check, the amount of which we do not know. We cannot control our own forces. It is our responsibility to raise and maintain armies. It is not the responsibility of the Defense Department or the State Department. If we accept the treaty without this reservation, that is the situation in which we shall find ourselves. There is no policy involved; that is left to the administrative agreement.

Here [exhibiting] is the tentative administrative agreement, containing several pages, closely typed. We are delegating our constitutional right—to whom? I do not know whether Mr. Acheson will send Jessup or Dean Rusk to work out the administrative details. I do not know whether the Defense Department will send a representative. I do not know whom Japan will appoint. Yoshida has signed his political death warrant, as the Washington Post recently stated. So I do not know who is going to conduct the negotiations, and I do not think any other Senators know.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator give us any assurances that Mr. Acheson will not send Alger Hiss over there?

Mr. JENNER. I think his time is about up, and, in the eyes of some, he is a mighty fine boy, I assume. Perhaps we are going to set up an organization which will, in turn, set up something else. We should sign a blank check. This is a shocking way for a great nation to conduct its governmental business. Under the American form of government, the executive department presents its agreements in clear, complete, and concise form. The Senate consents or withholds consent. A policy is established, and the administrative problems are left to the Executive to be carried out. Within that policy framework Reservation No. 2 to the security pact between this Nation and Japan provides—and this is all it does, and I think no Senator should vote against it—that no so-called administrative agreements shall be binding unless they conform to the constitutional requirement that Congress shall make the policy for the setting up and the maintenance of our Military Establishment, and the Senate shall confirm policy arrangements with foreign nations.

If we do not adopt this reservation, Mr. President, we will turn over to one representative from this country and one representative from Japan the right to set up a military establishment.

This reservation provides for going into Japan. Reservation 3 provides for coming out of Japan. Vast armaments, airfields, barracks, and facilities can be established by two representatives, one from each nation, and then, unless we adopt reservations 2 and 3, the President of the United States, by a stroke of the pen, can turn all our bases and equipment and all of our Armed Forces over to the United Nations.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was impressed with some of the arguments of the Senator. It depends, though, I think, on the meaning to be given to the word "disposition" in article 3.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. What is the Senator's interpretation of that word? Does it extend to committing troops to battle or committing armaments to battle?

Mr. JENNER. It means exactly what I stated. It provides for our going in, and how we will set up bases, how many soldiers we will have, and what facilities we will have. Reservation 3 provides for our coming out. It is provided that the terms shall not be binding until ratified by the Senate. Otherwise, we could establish a vast army over there and then, by a stroke of the pen, without the consent of the Senate—and it is our duty under the Constitution to raise, maintain, and support armies—the Chief Executive can do the same thing he did in Korea.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Would it not be a violation of the 1945 Participation Act under which the United States is supposed to participate with the United Nations and under which agreements must be approved by the Congress?

Mr. JENNER. Was it in the Korean war?

Mr. WATKINS. That is a different matter.

Mr. JENNER. It is a United Nations war, is it not? There happens to be an American general at the head of the troops, because the President of the United States has been designated as the representative of the United Nations to conduct this war, but who is to say that 6 months from now General Ridgway will not be replaced and a foreign general put in charge?

Mr. President, we are signing a blank check here for many billions of dollars, the number of which no one knows.

Mr. WATKINS. I called attention to the 1945 Participation Act which provides that the President of the United States cannot furnish troops or defense forces except in accordance with the provision that agreements be entered into by the United Nations and the United States and ratified and approved by the Congress. I agree that the sending of troops to Korea and placing them under the United Nations was not only a violation of our own Constitution, but was a violation of the 1945 Participation Act and of the United Nations Charter. It seems to me, if what the Senator says is correct, that the President of the United States would be violating all three of those great documents.

Mr. JENNER. They are violated, of course.

Article 26 creates a joint commission of one American and one Japanese with virtually no limit to their power over our facilities and areas in Japan.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to inquire whether line 9 of the reservation, relating to the right to dispose of the Armed Forces, would not require that every time the leader of the Armed Forces in Japan wanted to move a regiment from one place to another, he would have to come to the Senate of the United States for authority.

Mr. JENNER. No, no.

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator kindly explain what kind of arrangement would give the head of the Armed Forces in Japan the required authority to dispose forces of the United States in Japan in various areas and cantonments and under various commitments? How does the Senator get from under that necessity in his reservation?

Mr. JENNER. I say we get from under it in this way: Congress determines the size of air fields and the number of soldiers. Of course, Congress could not administer the details as to the number of latrines which are to be in the barracks, and so forth, but we should not sign a blank check.

Mr. FLANDERS. That is what this reservation seems to say.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I have the floor, and I refuse to yield further. I have been limited to 15 minutes. I have been standing here all day, making a fight, almost by myself. I cannot give away my time.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question about the parliamentary situation. Is there a time limit on debate on the treaty now under consideration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The Chair advises the Senator from Utah that there is no time limitation.

Mr. WATKINS. That is my understanding.

Mr. JENNER. Very well. Then we can be deliberate about this matter.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Since the Senator's time is unlimited, will he yield to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to clear my thinking, because I am not so familiar with this matter as the Senator from Indiana evidently is.

It appears to me that if we signed a blank check to put troops in Japan, we did it when we voted to ratify the treaty with Japan. This security arrangement, and especially clause 3, relates primarily to an agreement between the United States and Japan that if anybody else comes on the horizon who can protect Japan satisfactorily to Japan and ourselves, we can then bring our troops out of Japan.

Mr. JENNER. If we could stand on the one agreement, yes, that is probably true, but we have not read them all in conjunction with one another. It should be remembered that when the Senate refused to adopt Reservation No. 1 to the peace treaty, we consented to become bound by the United Nations authority in Asia. If Reservation No. 1 had been adopted, we would have retained our own sovereignty.

I say that, without Reservation No. 2, there is an administrative set-up under which one man from this Government and one man from the Japanese Government make all administrative arrangements, such as the size of the army, the number of air fields, the number of barracks, and everything else.

We will have to raise taxes to pay the bills for those items. How much will the bills amount to? We know that Congress cannot administer the details of an administrative act, but the policy must be declared, defined, and put down in black and white. Otherwise we shall be handing out a blank check in this situation.

Mr. CORDON and Mr. WATKINS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. JENNER. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon is somewhat disturbed by the language in reservation No. 2, to the effect that—

> any so-called administrative agreements under article III of this treaty relating to—

I call attention particularly to this language—

> the right to dispose of the Armed Forces of the United States or any part of its Military Establishment in or about Japan shall not become binding on the United States unless ratified by the Senate—

And so forth. The question I propound to the Senator is, Does he intend that the ratification shall go to the right of agreement or the right to dispose, or to an agreement for the disposition of?

I call his attention to the fact that the right to dispose troops was given in the treaty which has already been ratified. It would appear to me that the Senator has in mind not in anywise limiting the sovereignty of Japan, but limiting the application of this treaty with respect to the power of the President of the United States. If that be the case, it would seem to me that the language should read, "relating to the disposition of the armed forces," rather than "the right to dispose of."

Mr. JENNER. The distinguished Senator from Oregon may be exactly correct, and that was what I was trying to make clear. I am perfectly willing to accept an amendment along that line.

As a matter of fact, on February 27 I sent copies of all these reservations to every Member of the Senate, asking their cooperation, and stating that if any changes were desired, I would cooperate with Senators. I am perfectly willing to do that.

This reservation was prepared in the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate. I stated what I was trying to do, and this is the language as it was prepared by that office. I am perfectly willing to have it amended to meet the circumstances stated by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. In view of the fact that the Senate has before it a very important series of security pacts, in particular this administrative agreement, and in view of the further fact, so far as I am concerned, that we have a copy of a State Department bulletin which has come to us today, does not the Senator think this matter ought to go over until tomorrow or some other day, when we can go into it a little further and be prepared to discuss it intelligently? I do not think we should rush these treaties through the Senate.

So far as I am aware, there has not been sufficient discussion of the effect of these security treaties and of the important questions raised in connection with the North Atlantic Pact. It seems to me that we do not know exactly what we are getting into. We do not know what these treaties mean or where we are going. We have had outlined for us a very vague course. I think we ought to know more about this matter. Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. JENNER. So far as I am concerned, that is up to the leadership. There has been almost a complete blank with respect to the information given the American people as to what we are doing in connection with these peace treaties. The American people do not know what is happening here today. There has been a complete blackout of news. For example, this morning I asked for a press conference. It was not even posted on the bulletin board in the news room. I do not know why. Neither do I know why this information should be kept from the American people. But I do know one thing we have done here today. We have entwined ourselves in the coils of the United Nations. We have set up a situation very similar to that which brought on the Korean war. We have provided that the Japanese economy may have to pay as high as 50 billion dollars to the Chinese Communists. We have surrendered the power of the sword to the executive branch of the Government. We have violated our constitutional oath, and have created a death trap for American GI's in the Orient. I had thought Korea would have been example enough to the Members of this body, and I did not think that they would sign their names to another Korean treachery.

I said earlier that we were not consulted about Yalta. We could not help what was done at Yalta. We were not consulted about Potsdam, and we could not help what was done there. We were not consulted about sending General Marshall to China. We were not consulted about the Korean war.

Now our foreign policy makers are getting bolder. They have asked us to sign our names to documents that are limiting American sovereignty by such arrangements as have been suggested. Reservation 2 related only to the administrative set-up of going into Japan under this security treaty. But here is the gimmick. After we get in with our bases, and so forth, there is a provision for getting out, and it is that whenever such forces shall come into being in and about Japan for the collective security of that area, the President of the United States by a stroke of the pen can convert all our barracks, all our equipment, all our supplies, and all our men into an army of the United Nations, of which organization Russia is a member, and of which China will become a member.

I would cite this example. After the treaty acted on a while ago becomes effective, and we enter into the security pact agreements, let us suppose that we have a truce and peace in Korea. I hope they will come. Let us suppose that the Communists break that truce. Do Senators suppose that we can go back and fight the Communists who have come down from the north and murdered American soldiers? No. We must get the permission of the United Nations. That is what we have done here today. That is what we are doing in these security pacts.

I am not an international lawyer. I have no large staff such as that of the Foreign Relations Committee or the State Department, to keep pouring out propaganda and information. I stand here as an American, doing the best I can to preserve the sovereignty of this Nation and to keep from selling it out to a United Nations which includes Russia, and will include Red China just as soon as our State Department has its way.

I beg of Senators to listen to what I am trying to say. Perhaps I do not say it in beautiful language. I know that I am limited in my facilities, but I have spent hours working on this problem. I have stood here for days. I spoke as early as February 20 on this subject. My speech is in the RECORD. I spent more than 2 hours on this floor. I did it deliberately, early, so that every Member of this body could have information as to my views. Since that time the Foreign Relations Committee and the State Department have worked day and night to fill the RECORD in answer to my speech. I stand practically alone. The distinguished Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] joined me in these reservations because she felt as I did. But we have been blanketed in the press.

I have talked with Senators on this floor—and I will not mention any names—no later than yesterday, who had not even read the Japanese Peace Treaty. Yet they are willing to turn our sovereignty over to the United Nations, which we now know has become nothing but a death trap for American GI's. There have been 109,000 casualties in Korea, and billions of dollars have been spent. Yet we sit here and sign a blank check to do the same thing over again.

What is required to open our eyes? We should not blame President Truman or the Defense Department. We should not blame the American people. We should never blame the American GI's. When the bloody waters are stained again in Asia, we shall have no one to blame but ourselves.

RELINQUISHING OUR SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana a question. I have listened with much interest to practically all his debate.

On September 11, upon the return of our eminent Senators from San Francisco after they had witnessed the signing of the Japanese treaty by the State Department, and were lauding them to the skies.

I then addressed the Senate.

I placed it in the RECORD again today, as further evidence that we should defer consideration of this treaty until the citizens of the country have had a chance to understand it.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana if there has not been a 19-year program of following the State Department in one step after another, abrogating our sovereignty, with the United States relinquishing its constitutional authority as an independent branch of the Government, as one of the three coordinated branches of the Government set up by the founders of the Constitution.

SENATE RETAINS PRIVILEGE TO VOTE DEFICIT APPROPRIATIONS

I ask if the Senate has practically anything to do now except raise the taxes each year and make deficit appropriations each year. Have we really anything else to do?

Mr. JENNER. The Senator is exactly right. Even in connection with this proposal, we are perfectly willing to delegate to one member of this Nation the complete administrative organization of our Armed Forces in Japan.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I made only one promise to my people when I ran for office in 1946, after we had reviewed the effect of all the hastily passed bills since 1933, up until 1946, and that was that I would never vote for any bill on the floor of the Senate until I understood it, and until my constituents had had an opportunity to understand it. I have kept that promise.

THE ATLANTIC PACT

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana a question. The Atlantic Pact and all the subsequent treaties have had "sleepers" in them. Nearly everything that comes from the State Department has a "sleeper" in it, by means of which, we learn afterwards, the State Department can do things of which the Senate had no knowledge at the time it voted.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if we are not bound by the Atlantic Pact, when we said that when the other nations are in trouble we are in trouble?

The empire-minded nations, such as Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium are parties to the North Atlantic Pact.

We say in the North Atlantic Pact that when they are in trouble we are in trouble. They get in trouble by defending their colonial slavery system. Are we not bound by that pact to send troops to their aid?

Mr. JENNER. Of course we are; and are we not doing it? Are we not sending money and supplies and aid to Indochina?

Mr. MALONE. Of course we are.

Mr. JENNER. Is not that next on the time table?

Further in answer to the question of the Senator from Nevada, during the 19 years we have been sitting here blandly giving away legislative powers to the Executive, let us see what has happened? What is the story which the American people believe? The story is that we are doing all this to stop the spread of communism. How silly and absurd! Let us look at the record.

In 1933 we recognized Communist Russia and brought her into the family of nations.

Mr. MALONE. Confirmed on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. JENNER. Yes, on the floor of the Senate.

In World War II we saved Communist Russia with lend-lease. We armed and equipped a Siberian army of 1,250,000 Russians to fight a 6-day war with us. We spent billions of dollars of the American taxpayers to build up Europe, to stop the spread of communism. Europe takes our dollars and our materials, and sells the materials to Russia. England trades jet engines to Russia. Those same jet engines are killing our boys this afternoon. Can Senators imagine a nation becoming so silly that she makes her wealth and her material into jet engines with which to kill her own boys?

We went into World War I to make the world safe for democracy. When we got all through with that, and the smoke had not quite cleared away, we had less democracy than the world had known for 500 or 1,000 years. Out of that war came Hitler, Stalin, and Mussolini.

Then we entered World War II. What was that for? That was to stop the spread of a political philosophy called nazism, under Hitler in Europe. It was also for the "Four Freedoms." But before the smoke of battle had cleared away we sat down at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam and gave to the most ruthless government the world has ever known, a government which had not only a political philosophy, but an economic and social philosophy to sell—anti-business, anti-farmer, anti-labor, and anti-God—the Balkans, the Baltic territory, and Manchuria. We made it possible for that ruthless government to take over Manchuria, the northern half of Korea, Sakhalin, and the Kurile Islands. Yet it is said that we are against communism.

I remind the American people that the Communists have not taken an inch of ground; they have not spent a 19-cent ruble; they have not fired one Communist shot by a Communist soldier that we have not approved and acquiesced in.

There were 175 million Communists at the end of World War II, thanks to our foreign policy. In connection with this treaty men have said to me, "JENNER, I really don't know, but we have to take it on faith."

On faith of whom? John Foster Dulles. He is spoken of as a Republican internationalist authority. I have never heard of my party designating John Foster Dulles as its spokesman on international affairs. He was repudiated by the people of his own State. The Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] defeated him when he went before the people to obtain authorization to come back here and speak for them.

To show how we fight communism, John Foster Dulles recommended Alger Hiss to be secretary of the Carnegie Peace Foundation. If he can make that kind of mistake in connection with a man like Alger Hiss, do Senators suppose that there might not have been other mistakes made in the peace treaty and security pacts? I do not know. I am asking questions. I have not yet received the answers. I have received only propaganda.

It is said that we are against communism. We have fattened communism. We are still doing so. Everything that we do is playing right into the hands of the Communists. We are bankrupting our country. We are on the timetable of our own destruction.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

KARL MARX POLICIES

Mr. MALONE. With reference to the 19-year-old plan of destruction of our economic system, I believe the distinguished Senator from Indiana will agree with me that we have adopted two of the principles which Karl Marx advocated more than 100 years ago.

The first one is with respect to free trade—he favored to hasten the revolution. The second one is progressive taxation—income tax—in order to destroy the economic system of a country.

BLAMING THE PRESIDENT

The junior Senator from Nevada stated on the floor of the Senate that some people, some of them even on the floor of the Senate, have blamed Mr. Roosevelt for the condition we are in today. There are others—some of the same ones—who blame Mr. Truman. Apropos what the distinguished Senator from Indiana said a moment ago, I said on two occasions within the past 12 months that I had read the Constitution of the United States and that it said unless the Senate votes for it, the President cannot do it. Therefore every Senator who votes for these things is as much to blame as Truman or Roosevelt.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. That is what I said. I do not blame anyone but ourselves.

BOUND TO PROTECT COLONIAL SYSTEM

Mr. MALONE. It was supposed to be a part of the 19-year plan, but the Senators ought to know better than to approve it.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana one further question. First I should like to read a paragraph from an article written by Mr. Ludwell Denny and published in today's Washington News. He says:

So Washington is being told it must underwrite larger Indochinese defense or

take the responsibility for a probable Red break-through into Burma, Siam, and Malaya.

CHOICE BETWEEN CAPITALISM AND COMMUNISM

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Indiana if this is a correct statement, and whether the distinguished Senator from Indiana agrees with me. Is it correct to say that we are giving the world a choice between capitalism and communism?

Mr. JENNER. Between communism and the free-enterprise system.

Mr. MALONE. And the free-enterprise system. That is probably a better way of stating it. The free-enterprise system or capitalism is represented in Malaya, Indochina, the Near East, and Africa—and we dividing Africa between the slavery-empire minded nations—by colonial slavery.

The Communists come in and say "We will free you from this yoke," and they go with them. Is that about what is going on over there?

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. MALONE. We are committed, then, to hold these people under their colonial-slavery system. In other words, as Mr. Ludwell Denny points out, we are now on the verge of probably sending new troops into Indochina, or on the verge of sending them more money and munitions.

Mr. JENNER. The answer is always more money.

Mr. MALONE. The request for $7,500,000,000, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana, which will be before us in a little while, will reinforce the people in the empire slavery nations and make more enemies for us.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct. So far as that is concerned, Russia does not have to do anything. There is a great deal of talk about defending Western Europe against communism. Mr. President, if Russia wanted Western Europe she could have it any week-end. That has been true for the past 4 years, and it will probably be true for the next 10 years. During the conference in Lisbon there was considerable discussion about 50 divisions being ready at the end of 1952.

According to the French newspaper La Monde, that cannot be. The London Times has stated that such talk is fine for American consumption, but, after all, they say these are paper divisions; perhaps 25 divisions by the end of 1952. Mr. President, what does Russia care about 25 or 50 divisions of troops in Western Europe, when she stands there today, only a few miles away—and the whole corridor of Europe is only 700 miles long—with 175 divisions?

So far as all these dollars and these forms of aid are concerned, Russia knew that when the colonial empire of Western Europe was finished it was the end of Western Europe.

What has happened? Why not be realistic? England has lost India, Pakistan, and Burma, and she is losing Malaya. The French have been fighting a war in Indochina for 6 years. Unless American boys go into Indochina and die, as they die in Korea, the French will lose Indochina eventually.

Mr. MALONE. They will lose it even with our help. Colonial slavery is deader than Julius Caesar.

Mr. JENNER. The Dutch have lost Indonesia. We have been trying to take American tax dollars to make up that gap between the East and West.

When the Marshall plan was before us I said that it was only the beginning and that we would have more pacts. Since that time we have had NATO. We are now trying to set up a PATO. We are absurd enough to give away the power of the sword and give the Chief Executive the right, by a stroke of the pen, to transfer American boys and American equipment and to haul down the American flag in the Orient, and to haul up the United Nations flag when there comes into being such forces as they think will be able to guard that area, leaving it to one man to determine the question again. We shall have a PATO in Asia, as we have a NATO in Europe.

Let us remember that this Nation will pay and pay and pay. Nothing will please Russia more than our paying. Russia knows that we cannot go on paying indefinitely and that we are bound to go down in bankruptcy. When we do there will go down the only hope for peace on earth, and Russia will be able to take over in this country and she will never have to use a single soldier. She has plenty of others right now in the city of Washington, and we know it.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further?

Mr. JENNER. I believe Senators want to vote. I am willing to vote. I cannot do any good here.

Mr. MALONE. I think we will just take our time. There may still be some ray of hope.

Mr. JENNER. No; I want to vote.

Mr. MALONE. The junior Senator from Nevada believes that this is the most dangerous town in the United States to the United States of America.

Mr. JENNER. We are not helping it in any way. We are not helping it today when we give away the power of the sword. Apparently we want to evade our constitutional duty when we set up an arrangement whereby we can have another "Korea," with 109,000 American casualties. Does anyone think we are helping the situation in that way?

Mr. MALONE. We are certainly not helping it, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana. I wish to say further that that is one of the things that is the matter with the United States of America, namely, that they are under this influence. If the Senators could break this spell of international—mostly European—influence.

Mr. JENNER. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that it does not apply only to military persons. I should like to read an excerpt from a speech I made on the floor of the Senate on February 20 of this year. I said:

> Are you sure, Mr. President, that we in Congress know exactly how many Government employees have been or will be assigned to international organizations in which the United States participates? Are you sure, Mr. President, that we know exactly what they are doing?

That is not all. Section 406 (b) of the 1949 Mutual Defense Assistance Act says:

> "Personnel of the Armed Forces may be assigned or detailed to noncombatant duty, including duty with any agency or nation."

Further on, in section 411 (f), the law defines "Armed Forces" as including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard"—and I ask you to listen carefully, Mr. President—"and the Reserve components thereof." Does that mean, Mr. President, that we have authorized the Chief Executive to assign any one in the Reserve to duty with any U. N. agency? If so, that may be very important in connection with universal military training. Does that legislation keep all the young men of the Nation for 8 years under obligation to serve in any international organization to which the President wants to assign them for some bold new program? American military and civilian personnel are already being assigned to NATO, to what extent we hardly know. NATO is not American. It is not responsible to the American Congress and the American Constitution.

Mr. President, today in this security pact with Japan we are laying the groundwork for a PATO in Asia, as we have established a NATO in Europe.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have been trying to follow the remarks of the Senator from Indiana, for whom I have great respect. Likewise I have great respect for the manner in which he feels he is performing a useful service to the Senate and to the country. He has made a very vigorous fight in presenting his point of view.

I am not quite able to grasp his position in regard to what we should do in the Pacific.

The fact of the matter is that one of the great criticisms which many of us on this side of the aisle have had is that for a period of 5 years after Yalta our country was taking some action in Europe, but was leaving the door wide open to communism in Asia. Many of us quite correctly, I think, were critical of our Government's policy by which we were losing 450,000,000 of our friends in China, a policy which I think ultimately jeopardized our position in the Far East, whereas in response to that criticism, I think the State Department quite justifiably has taken a very firm position in the Far East and has brought forward the Japanese Peace Treaty in order to make Japan a stabilizing force.

Then, of necessity, we must have the security treaty with Japan; otherwise, if we immediately pulled out of Japan, we would leave that country completely disarmed, in the face of a Communist Chinese threat and a Russian Communist threat.

Personally, I believe it is highly important to close the door to communism in China, as we have been trying to close the door to communism in Europe.

I, as a representative of one of the Pacific Coast States, and as a Senator of the United States, as well, do not want our first line of defense in the Pacific

to be the Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington and California.

Therefore, I think it is vitally necessary that through Japan, Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines, we have a line of defense in the Pacific. Is the Senator from Indiana opposed to that?

Mr. JENNER. I am 100 percent in favor of it.

All I am saying is, let us retain America's sovereignty, so that we can have it as our first line of defense, along with our sea power and our air power. In that way we shall be able to maneuver, and we shall not have to pit our strength against the strength of all the land masses of Asia. I recommend what General MacArthur has advocated.

However, when we enter into an agreement with Japan, under the peace treaty and under this security pact, whereby the Chief Executive of the United States by a stroke of the pen can turn over to a United Nations or a PATO our air power, our sea power, and our Army, we are committing ourselves to a PATO, as we have committed ourselves to NATO.

In that event we shall continue to have Korean situations, and American boys will have to spill their blood all over Asia and all over the Orient. We shall not be able to survive with that kind of a policy. That is my objection. I want to keep our sovereignty intact, so that we do not lose control over our own forces.

So far as the proposed administrative agreements are concerned, I wish to keep our sovereignty intact to the extent that those who propose a new program must come to Congress and must tell Congress what the proposed program is, and must give us a blueprint of the policy, and must tell us how much money it will cost, so that we shall not have to sign a blank check later on.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I understand that the Senator from Indiana agrees that it is important that we do not move our first line of defense back to the Pacific Coast States of Oregon, Washington, and California.

Mr. JENNER. Exactly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But that we have a line of defense running from Japan to Okinawa, Formosa, and the Philippines.

Mr. JENNER. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does the Senator from Indiana agree that in holding that line of defense, it is important that ultimately Japan will make the contribution of providing armed forces, and that the Chinese Nationalist forces on the island of Formosa, the forces of the Republic of the Philippines, the forces of Australia, and the forces of New Zealand will be helpful in holding that line?

Mr. JENNER. I certainly do.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In other words, does not the Senator from Indiana agree that we should not have to hold that line alone?

Mr. JENNER. I wish to say that when Japan gets through with paying the reparations which possibly she will have to pay under these arrangements, they will include reparations to be paid to Communist China, if we join in any kind of a program of this sort. That is one of the ultimate possibilities. Already the move is on for a PATO, and there is talk of including Burma and Indochina in the collective forces for PATO, just as, in the case of Europe, the NATO program started with a certain number of countries, but now has been extended, until today our defense perimeter in Europe extends all the way from Norway to Turkey.

If we knew what those in charge of the program would do, that would be different, but we cannot know what they will do. They propose the program piece by piece; they start with parts of a jigsaw puzzle, piece by piece, and we do not know what it amounts to until the entire puzzle is put together. After all of it is put together, then, but not until then, do we know what it amounts to; and by that time we have signed a blank check for it, and there is nothing we can do about it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may be mistaken, but did not the Senator from Indiana some time ago strongly urge—I know that some of the rest of us did, in connection with the question of NATO—that Greece and Turkey be brought into the picture because Turkey has some of the finest troops—and I believe it has—in Europe and the Middle East?

When I was in Korea, the Turks had made a greater contribution than had any other nation, other than the United States, with the exception of the forces of the British Commonwealth nations.

I had understood that the Senator from Indiana himself had strongly urged that the Turks be brought into the picture, for the purpose of strengthening NATO.

Mr. JENNER. In answer to the Senator's question, let me say that I am very glad the Turks are coming in. After all, England is dragging her feet and will not join in the continental army, and France is dragging her feet.

I was in Turkey and I talked to some of the officials there. I said to them, "Tell me about the strength of your forces." They said, "Well, we could tie up perhaps 15 or 20 divisions of Russian troops if they were foolish enough to follow our forces into the mountains. But if they came down through the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles, they could take us over at any time, because we have only a comparatively small army and a small navy." Of course, their navy includes the 50 ships we gave them.

So it is silly to think that the 150,000,000 people of the United States can care for, clothe, feed, and fight for all the people of the rest of the world. We cannot do it.

Some persons call me an isolationist. That is a silly thing to say of any man, but some persons do it in an effort to brush off or discredit one who disagrees with them these days.

I am not an isolationist. I am perfectly willing for Great Britain to defend all the way across Europe and Africa, from North to South, from the North Pole to the South Pole, and all the way east to our first line of defense, which I contend is Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, and Formosa. With that line of defense, we shall be defending over half the earth's surface. We can do that with our sea power and our air power, and not bankrupt our country; but we cannot do it if we permit ourselves to become entwined in a United Nations under which we have no control over our own destiny.

In Korea we cannot call the signals. General MacArthur was kicked out of Korea because he did not cooperate sufficiently with the United Nations. It is true that General Ridgway is in Korea today, but that is because we have a temporary arrangement whereby our President is the representative of the United Nations.

I do not want to lower the American flag over our boys, in connection with any line of defense or in connection with the spider web of the United Nations, about which today so much trash and so many claims and statements are issued.

I do not wish to change our basic, binding law, which begins with the statement:

> We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessing of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

I suppose some persons think that is no longer a part of our basic law. I thought Judge Cardozo interpreted it as such; but I wish to remind my colleagues that many things have been done under the general-welfare clause.

We are told that the preamble to the Japanese Peace Treaty is not binding in law. However, in that treaty we tell the Japanese people:

> Whereas Japan for its part declares its intention to apply for membership in the United Nations and in all circumstances to conform to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations; to strive to realize the objectives of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

If we favor an FEPC law and similar proposals, why do not we openly advocate them and make them a part of our own economy? Why do we impose such things, by means of the Japanese Peace Treaty, on a people who have been defeated in war, and now must have a peace treaty? I do not know why that is done. If I knew, I would not be so worried.

However, as I said a while ago, I know that everything we have done thus far along these lines has been against the interests of our own country. I know we are going down hill all the time, and I know that today we are in a terrible mess in Asia because of a blundering, stumbling foreign policy.

I trust that never again will we get into that situation. That is why I have

offered reservations to the security pact and to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further to me?

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, from the point of view of the objective of the Senator from Indiana, I think there are not many of us who disagree on the floor. We may have a somewhat different approach to the situation.

One thing about which I think all of us, regardless of the side of the aisle on which we stand, have reason to be critical of the State Department during the years following Yalta is that the State Department did follow a policy of "wait until the dust settles"—in other words, a policy to the effect that we would sit back and wait to see what might be the outcome in China of the struggle with communism.

I think we prematurely got out of Korea in June 1949, and left the South Korean Government with only a constabulary force.

However, for that very reason I do not wish to continue to "wait for the dust to settle" until we find that one and one-quarter billion of the people of Asia have passed into the Communist orbit, with the result that then we would find that we were an isolated island of freedom in what otherwise would be a totalitarian world.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the Senator from California has been misinformed if he thinks our policy was "wait for the dust to settle." We were not waiting for anything. We were aiding and abetting everything that happened in the Orient.

The Senator from California knows that in China we destroyed the only government and the only army that could possibly stem the tide of communism in the Orient. As a direct result of that misadventure, our boys are dying in Korea.

No, Mr. President; the Senator from California is wrong. Our policy was not "wait for the dust to settle." Our policy was to settle it with the blood of American boys. That was our policy.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield further to me.

Mr. JENNER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Indiana has not been any more critical of that policy than has the senior Senator from California. I wish to say that, because I felt there was ample justification to be critical of that policy, I happen to have been one of six Senators on this floor who voted against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Acheson.

Mr. JENNER. Count me as one of them.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I felt that he had been responsible to a considerable degree for this policy; but I do say that, having followed a "wait until the dust settles" policy, now that we are taking some initiative and trying to build up a wall of resistance to communism in Asia, I do not think we should now take the position that we will do nothing, but will leave the door wide open on that position.

Mr. JENNER. I agree with the Senator in part; but I do not want to do something which ties us into the United Nations, as a result of which the very thing the Senator fears, and which I fear, too, would be brought about by the vote of Communist Russia; and that is exactly what would result from these arrangements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Indiana wish to modify his reservation in the manner suggested?

Mr. JENNER. Yes; I do—as suggested by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Indiana state his modification for the RECORD?

Mr. JENNER. In reservation 2, page 1, in line 9, strike out "right to dispose" and insert "disposition."

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I had intended to make a statement, but for the sake of saving time I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] a portion of the report dealing with the security treaty between the United States and Japan. It is title C of the report, found on pages 19 to 22, together with a very brief statement.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

C. SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND JAPAN

20. BACKGROUND

From the moment the war in the Far East came to an end the United States, as the principal occupying power, hoped to conclude satisfactory peace arrangements and withdraw our troops from Japan at the earliest practicable moment. Yet, as time went on and world conditions grew worse, it became increasingly apparent that this could not be done safely unless satisfactory provisions could be made to protect Japan against the threat of Communist aggression. If any doubt existed on this point prior to June 1950, it was dissipated by the attack upon the Republic of Korea. Clearly the complete withdrawal of American troops from disarmed Japan would leave a political and military vacuum that would seriously threaten our security interests in the Far East and constitute a real danger to world peace generally.

Responsible officials in both Japan and the United States recognized this basic principle. Early in February 1951 Ambassador Dulles pointed out that the United States would sympathetically consider stationing some armed forces in Japan to assist in the defense of that country if the Japanese wished it. On February 11, 1951, Prime Minister Yoshida responded affirmatively:

"The Japanese Government and a preponderant majority of the Japanese people"—

He said—

"warmly welcome the Ambassador's invitation to a security arrangement with the United States for the protection of unarmed Japan by the stationing of United States Armed Forces in and about the country. We realize fully our responsibility to protect ourselves and defend our own land, and do what we can in this respect."

It was agreed that this objective could best be achieved by the conclusion of a bilateral security pact between the United States and Japan simultaneously with the conclusion of the general treaty of peace. To this end article 6 of the peace treaty provides for the withdrawal of occupation forces as soon as possible. But it also makes possible the stationing of foreign armed forces in Japanese territory "under or in consequence of any bilateral or multilateral agreements which have been or may be made between one or more of the Allied Powers, on the one hand and Japan on the other."

Thus the bilateral security treaty between Japan and the United States forms a natural complement to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

21. PROVISIONS OF THE TREATY

The preamble to the security treaty makes clear that Japan, as a sovereign nation, has a right to enter into collective security arrangements for self-defense purposes. It also emphasizes the desire of Japan that our Armed Forces be maintained there so as to deter armed attack upon the Japanese homeland. Meanwhile, it is expected that Japan will "increasingly assume responsibility for its own defense * * *."

Article I of the security treaty grants to the United States the right to dispose land, air, and sea forces in and about Japan. It further provides that these forces may be used not only for the security of Japan but "to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security in the Far East * * *." In view of the role of the United States in U. N. operations in Korea, this is an important provision. It makes clear that any forces we might station in Japan would not be limited to the defense of Japan but could be used for the maintenance of peace anywhere in the Far East including, of course, U. N. police action in Korea.

Article I also provides that at the request of Japan our forces there may be used "to put down large-scale internal riots and disturbances in Japan, caused through instigation or intervention by an outside power or powers."

This provision recognizes the danger of indirect aggression and civil war which have been resorted to so effectively by international communism against legitimate governments in Korea, Indochina, Malaya, and elsewhere in the Far East. It should be noted that this provision relates to disturbances instigated by an outside power. It should not be assumed that our troops would be used to put down disturbances of a purely local or domestic nature. This right to act against foreign-inspired insurrection is essential to the security of United States forces in Japan and of Japan itself.

Article II provides that Japan will not grant any bases or military facilities to any third power without the prior consent of the United States. This article reflects the special relationship which exists between Japan and the United States as the principal occupying power.

Article III provides for administrative agreements between the two Governments to cover the disposition of United States Armed Forces in and about Japan. Obviously the broad grant of power laid down in the security treaty will have to be supplemented by detailed arrangements dealing with such matters as the facilities and areas to be used, the rights of the United States in the areas, transit privileges, meteorological services, criminal jurisdiction, imports, taxation, and so on.

An over-all administrative agreement between the two countries is now in process of negotiation and will probably be completed before the security treaty comes into force.

Article IV provides for the termination of the treaty whenever the two Governments agree that there exist satisfactory alternative provisions for the maintenance of peace

and security in the general area of Japan. Such alternative provisions might emerge in the form of a strengthened United Nations or in some other form not clearly foreseen at present. It is apparent that the treaty constitutes only a first step in the development of collective security in the Japan area. In any event, in spite of suggestions which have been made to the contrary, it is apparent that the treaty cannot be terminated without the consent of the United States.

22. UNITED STATES COMMITMENTS

The security treaty imposes no commitments or obligations upon the United States. We are not obligated to station any forces in Japan unless we decide it is in our own national interest to do so. On the other hand, the rights conferred in the treaty by Japan are very far-reaching in nature. They constitute a significant contribution on the part of Japan to the cause of the free world and to collective security.

During the hearings the question was asked as to whether any obligation flowed from the treaty for the United States to aid Japanese security by supplying such financial assistance as may be required. Ambassador Dulles replied as follows:

"There is no understanding, express or implied, with reference to giving any particular economic aid or assistance to Japan. Everybody knows what the United States policy is, and it is natural that the Japanese should feel, as a partner with us, that they would not be discriminated against. But there is nothing that has been said or done which gives anyone in Japan any right to come to us and say, 'You are required to continue to give us economic aid.'

"What we do will be determined, I take it, by what an enlightened view of our own self-interest requires. That will be a guide and the policies which the Congress lays down. Within that framework I would believe and hope that Japan, if it needed it, would be qualified to receive the kind of help which we are giving others, although Japan would never, in my opinion, need aid in the form of a grant or a gift."

23. THE ADMINISTRATIVE AGREEMENT AND THE RATIFICATION OF THE PEACE TREATY

During the hearings, committee members asked representatives of the Defense Department whether the entry into force of the peace treaty with Japan might interfere with practical military operations in Korea. General Bradley replied that the treaty might interfere with such operations unless the administrative agreement contemplated in article III of the security pact with Japan were in effect. He pointed out that the agreement, which would make the necessary arrangements for the location of our Armed Forces in and about Japan, was then in process of negotiation. He suggested, therefore, that it might be wise to withhold ratification of the peace treaty until the administrative agreement is concluded. The two instruments could then enter into force at the same time.

More recently the committee has been informed by the executive branch that negotiation of the administrative agreement has been proceeding satisfactorily in Tokyo. The committee believes it would be entirely appropriate, therefore, for the Senate to move ahead with the peace treaty and the related security pacts at an early date. Ratification will not occur until the President decides, with Senate consent, actually to deposit the instrument of ratification.

24. USE OF JAPANESE FACILITIES BY U. N. FORCES

During the negotiations leading up to the conclusion of the peace treaty the United States Government took steps to make certain that the entry into force of the treaty would have no adverse effect upon the assistance now being given by Japan to the U. N. effort in Korea. Under article 5, Japan accepts the obligations set forth in article 2 of the U. N. Charter, including the pledge "to give the United Nations every assistance in any action it takes in accordance with the Charter."

While this commitment seems fairly clear, Secretary Acheson, on September 8, 1951, addressed a letter to Prime Minister Yoshida, in which he specifically raised the issue. He pointed out that Japan had rendered important assistance to the U. N. in the form of facilities and services made available to various U. N. members engaged in the Korean operation.

"Since the future is unsettled," he wrote, "and it may unhappily be that the occasion for facilities and services in Japan in support of United Nations action will continue or recur, I would appreciate confirmation, on behalf of your Government, that if and when the forces of a member or members of the U. N. are engaged in any U. N. action in the Far East after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan, by the member or members, of the forces engaged in such U. N. action."

The Prime Minister's reply was completely reassuring on this point. Under date of September 8, 1951, he wrote Secretary Acheson, in part, as follows:

"I have the honor, on behalf of my Government, to confirm that if and when the forces of a member or members of the United Nations are engaged in any United Nations action in the Far East after the treaty of peace comes into force, Japan will permit and facilitate the support in and about Japan, by the member or members of the forces engaged in such United Nations action, the expenses involved in the use of Japanese facilities and services to be borne as at present or as otherwise mutually agreed between Japan and the United Nations member concerned."

SECURITY TREATY BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND JAPAN—RESERVATION NO. 2

1. This reservation would make the administrative agreements to be concluded with Japan into treaties. In my judgment this would be most impractical and would be extremely disadvantageous to the United States. The reason can be simply and clearly stated. These administrative agreements are designed to deal with a situation which will be constantly changing as the number and character of United States forces in Japan vary and as the facilities which they require shall change from time to time. It is essential, therefore, to have the flexibility which would be impossible if formal treaties are used in every case.

2. Also, it should be kept in mind that if our Government treats the administrative agreements as formal treaties, Japan will of necessity have to do the same thing. Under these circumstances, our position in Japan would be frozen subject to the action of the Japanese Diet and our own Senate. It would be difficult, in some cases impossible, to obtain such action quickly; and in the case of the Japanese Diet it might be impossible to obtain it at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the reservation of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] as modified.

Mr. JENNER and Mr. SPARKMAN asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, may we have the reservation read, as modified, so that we may know just what it is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the reservation as modified.

The legislative clerk read the reservation proposed by Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, as follows:

RESERVATION NO. 2

Since Congress, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war and authorize the employment of the Armed Forces of the United States, any so-called administrative agreements under article III of this treaty relating to the disposition of the Armed Forces of the United States or any part of its Military Establishment in or about Japan shall not become binding on the United States unless ratified by the Senate as a treaty in accordance with article II, section 2 of the Constitution, or approved by the Congress by act or joint resolution specifically referring to such agreement or arrangement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to reservation No. 2, proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], as modified. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting the Senator from Utah would vote

"yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—22

Aiken	Ecton	Mundt
Bricker	Ferguson	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Hendrickson	Watkins
Cain	Jenner	Welker
Case	Kem	Williams
Cordon	Malone	Young
Dirksen	Martin	
Dworshak	McCarthy	

NAYS—45

Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Benton	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Connally	Kilgore	Nixon
Eastland	Knowland	Pastore
Ellender	Lehman	Russell
Flanders	Long	Saltonstall
Frear	Magnuson	Seaton
Fulbright	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
Hayden	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hennings	McFarland	Sparkman
Hickenlooper	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Thye
Holland	Millikin	Underwood
Ives	Monroney	Wiley

NOT VOTING—29

Bennett	George	McCarran
Brewster	Gillette	Murray
Butler, Md.	Green	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Humphrey	Robertson
Capehart	Hunt	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Tobey
Duff	Lodge	

So reservation No. 2 of Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I call up reservation No. 3 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the reservation.

The Chief Clerk read the reservation proposed by Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, as follows:

RESERVATION NO. 3

The rights of the United States under this treaty shall not expire until all agreements or arrangements for our security in the Pacific, referred to in article IV have been ratified by the Senate as a treaty in accordance with article II, section 2, of the Constitution or approved by the Congress by act or joint resolution specifically referring to such agreements or arrangements.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, the hour is late, and I shall be very brief. I should like at this time to have the yeas and nays ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Obviously a sufficient number of hands are shown. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I shall now address myself to reservation No. 3.

Article IV of the Japan Security Treaty provides that this treaty shall expire whenever the Governments of the United States and Japan believe that the United Nations or other collective security arrangements provide satisfactorily for international peace and security in the Japan area.

President Truman, acting in the belief that the United Nations could satisfactorily provide security in Korea, transformed American fighting forces in that area, without the consent of Congress, into United Nations forces, whose actions are subject to political and military policies, not of the United States, but of the United Nations.

In my statement of February 20, 1952, I pointed out that the President has the power, under the Mutual Security Act of 1951, to assign any officer or employee of the United States to serve as a member of the staff of any international organization, present or future, in which the United States participates. He also has the power, under the 1949 Mutual Defense Assistance Act, to assign personnel of the Armed Forces, including the Reserves, to duty with any agency or nation. He has the funds.

With these powers, and the powers conveyed by these Pacific treaties, the President has the power to set up a Pacific NATO or PATO, and furnish it with the means to operate, without asking the consent of Congress. Mr. Dulles has told us the pacts are "only an initial step in an evolutionary process of collective security."

The pending reservation provides that nothing in this treaty shall authorize any action by the President transforming our Military Establishment or any part of it, in the Japan area, into a United Nations establishment or a regional pact like NATO, or in any other way to permit this treaty to expire, or be replaced, without congressional approval of any substitute arrangements.

It does not attempt to deal with past delegations of legislative power, but restates for this treaty the constitutional principle of congressional power to determine the Nation's military policy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, although I do not believe the Senator from Indiana did so intentionally, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that he did not read correctly the text of article IV of the security treaty between the United States of America and Japan. Article IV reads as follows:

This treaty shall expire whenever in the opinion of the Governments of the United States of America and Japan there shall have come into force such United Nations arrangements or such alternative individual or collective security dispositions as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance by the United Nations or otherwise of international peace and security in the Japan area.

Mr. JENNER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I merely wanted to have the exact language in the RECORD.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I followed that language very closely.

This treaty shall expire whenever in the opinion of the Governments of the United States of America and Japan—

In whose opinion?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The opinion of the Government of the United States.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Who will be speaking for the Government of the United States?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It may be——

Mr. DIRKSEN. There must be an answer.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should think it would be when the executive department determines it. I do not see why there should have to be action by Congress to terminate the treaty.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; but article IV goes infinitely further, because it refers to "arrangements or such alternative individual or collective security dispositions as will satisfactorily provide for the maintenance by the United Nations or otherwise of international peace and security in the Japan area."

It completely divorces Congress from any voice in seeking any alternative or substitute agreement which, in the judgment of the United States, may be in the interest of international peace.

The Government of the United States will not be speaking through the people's representatives; it will be speaking through the State Department and the Executive. We shall then be in the same predicament we were in when we discussed the issue of troops to Europe and also the Korean issue.

I for one will not divorce myself, Mr. President, from the assertion of the authority of Congress to substitute a policy in the place of what we had before.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Reservation No. 3 proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the roll will be called.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois

[Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 41, as follows:

YEAS—26

Bricker	Flanders	Mundt
Bridges	Hendrickson	Seaton
Cain	Hickenlooper	Smith, Maine
Case	Jenner	Thye
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Watkins
Dirksen	Kem	Welker
Dworshak	Malone	Williams
Ecton	Martin	Young
Ferguson	McCarthy	

NAYS—41

Aiken	Johnson, Tex.	Moody
Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Benton	Kilgore	Nixon
Clements	Knowland	Pastore
Connally	Lehman	Robertson
Eastland	Long	Russell
Ellender	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Frear	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
Fulbright	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Sparkman
Hennings	McKellar	Stennis
Hill	McMahon	Underwood
Holland	Millikin	Wiley
Ives	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—29

Bennett	George	McCarran
Brewster	Gillette	Murray
Butler, Md.	Green	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	O'Conor
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hunt	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Tobey
Duff	Lodge	

So reservation No. 3 to the Japanese Security Treaty, proposed by Mr. JENNER and Mrs. SMITH of Maine, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

The yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I believe that we ought to have a security pact. I believe that it ought to be carefully studied and thoroughly understood by Members of this body. Judging from what I have heard today, and the questions asked, I doubt whether Members of this body really know what they are voting upon with respect to this pact.

I voted for the ratification of the Japanese Peace Treaty. I think we ought to give more consideration to these important security treaties than we are giving them tonight. Two of them have gone through by voice vote. I left the Chamber to make a telephone call after the Senate had voted on the Japanese Peace Treaty. When I returned after a brief telephone conversation two of the security treaties had been adopted. It seems to me that that is railroading them through entirely too fast.

Mr. President, I intend to vote "yea" on the pending treaty, so that later if I feel so inclined I can move to reconsider.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification of the Japanese security treaty, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive D, Eighty-second Congress, second session, the security treaty between the United States of America and Japan, signed at San Francisco on September 8, 1951.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is necessarily absent.

I announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Holland	Morse
Anderson	Ives	Mundt
Benton	Johnson, Colo.	Nixon
Bridges	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Case	Kilgore	Russell
Clements	Knowland	Saltonstall
Connally	Lehman	Seaton
Cordon	Long	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Magnuson	Smith, N. J.
Ellender	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Ferguson	Maybank	Sparkman
Flanders	McCarthy	Stennis
Frear	McClellan	Thye
Fulbright	McFarland	Underwood
Hayden	McKellar	Watkins
Hendrickson	McMahon	Wiley
Hennings	Millikin	Williams
Hickenlooper	Monroney	
Hill	Moody	

NAYS—9

Bricker	Ecton	Malone
Dirksen	Jenner	Welker
Dworshak	Kem	Young

NOT VOTING—29

Bennett	George	McCarran
Brewster	Gillette	Murray
Butler, Md.	Green	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	O'Conor
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Hunt	Schoeppel
Carlson	Kefauver	Smathers
Chavez	Kerr	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Tobey
Duff	Lodge	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think it takes unanimous consent to do so, but I make the request.

Mr. WATKINS. It does take unanimous consent, and I will ask for a ruling by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required.

Mr. WATKINS. We are rushing these matters [illegible] a little too fast. Two of the treaties have been ratified by voice votes. I think we should give a little more consideration to these matters. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

PROSPECTIVE PLANTINGS FOR 1952 OF CERTAIN AGRICULTURAL CROPS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, yesterday the United States Department of Agriculture reported on the prospective plantings for 1952 of most of the major agricultural crops of the United States. It is interesting to note that the survey shows that farmers plan to plant about 1,000,000 acres less than last year. The production goals recommended by Secretary Brannan are 7,500,000 acres in excess of the farmers' intention to plant. The reasons pointed out for this action on the part of farmers are the tight farm labor supply, concern over recent declines in farm prices, and a desire on the part of many farmers to keep land in grass for feeding beef cattle rather than plowing it up for crops. No doubt these reasons are valid. The Department went on to say that for individual groups the tendency is to shift crops of high labor requirements to those of a less intensive nature. I ask why is this true? And why is it that even though the demand for potatoes has been strong since harvest of the late crop potatoes last year, farmers are not producing what the market apparently demands? The administration does not come out with the truth; namely, that what thinking people have been saying all along is true—that price ceilings are adversely affecting production. Here is an official report strikingly illustrating the truth about the effects of price control. Farmers had a short crop of potatoes in 1951 due to no fault of their own. In the early part of the season prices were low. Later on in the year prices started rising and when they did, the OPS slapped on ceilings so that earnings over the year did not amount to parity. Look no further for the answer to the question of why farmers will plant less in 1952.

Yet this is only part of the muddle. Our Canadian friends know that price controls are wrong. Canadians are today buying good Maine potatoes at prices just a little higher than our consumers are permitted to pay here. The closing chapter of this pathetic interference with our free-choice system is that a boatload of potatoes left Spain for New York on March 15 and is scheduled to dock in New York this coming week.

STORAGE OF GOVERNMENT AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on March 13 the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] gave an outline of the events leading to the acquisition by the Federal Government of storage facilities in Baton Rouge, La. In his statement he did not appear to be critical, except that he gave a list of the events. In order to complete the picture I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, a statement which was sent to me by the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., dated March 18, 1952.

In its statement the company acknowledges having had for storage Mexican canned meat and linters. The report shows that the charges made were the lowest of any warehouse in the United States, and that the entire profit made by the warehouse company for the 20 months involved, including the storage of many other articles other than the two Government commodities, was only $28,000.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATON ROUGE WAREHOUSE CO.,
Baton Rouge, La., March 18, 1952.

The property of the Baton Rouge Warehouse Co. is the former Baton Rouge Engineer Depot, Sharp Station, Baton Rouge, La. This property was declared surplus after World War II, and advertised for sale. It was sold first to a Baton Rouge concern, who later defaulted and returned the property to the Government. After several subsequent attempts by the Government to dispose of it, it was sold on bid to the present owners by General Services Administration. The sale did not contain a recapture clause, and the Government has been paid in full for the property.

The Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc., stored only two government agricultural commodities, i. e., Mexican canned meat and linters.

The Baton Rouge Warehouse Co., Inc., rates for storage of Mexican canned meat were the lowest of any warehouse in the United States. These rates were as follows:

First 100 cars, 3¼ cents per 100 pounds per month.

Second 100 cars, 3 cents per 100 pounds per month.

Balance, 2¾ cents per 100 pounds per month.

This company stored a total of 133 carloads of Mexican canned meat for the Government and received a gross revenue on this item of $76,153.68. All services, including switching cars, loading and unloading cars, stacking in warehouse, etc., and all equipment used in connection with these operations were furnished by the company.

Other warehouses received as high as 5 cents per 100 pounds per month for the storage of this same commodity.

The only other agricultural commodity stored by this company was linters. The Baton Rouge Warehouse Co. rates for the storage of this item were also the lowest in the United States, and were as follows:

Warehouse No. 3 (ground-level storage), 13 cents per bale per month.

Warehouse No. 2 (built up with fire walls), 20 cents per bale per month.

A total of 53,017 bales were stored by this company at 13 cents per bale, and a total of 16,706 bales were stored at 20 cents per bale. The total gross revenue received for the storage of this item was $116,956.63.

The standard rate charged by other large warehousing concerns for the storage of linters was 33 cents per bale per month. It is estimated that the Government saved approximately $50,000 by storing these linters in the Baton Rouge warehouse. This warehouse qualified and operated under the United States Public Warehouse Act for the storage of linters.

No grain or other agricultural commodity was stored for the Government by this concern.

All Government commodities were shipped out of this warehouse without any shortages or claims of any nature.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Crying Over Spilled Milk?" published in the Times-Picayune of Monday, March 17, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRYING OVER SPILLED MILK?

Purpose of Senator WILLIAMS' statement on the sale of the Government engineer depot at Baton Rouge in 1949 at a fraction of its cost is no clearer than Representative SUTTON's finding that the dock board bought the big Michoud plant on highly favorable terms.

If these Members of Congress intend to show some chicanery or connivance in these sales they ought to say so. Up to now they haven't said anything of the sort.

It isn't even clear that they think the War Assets Administration and its successor were not justified in selling the properties at what they could get for them under conditions that existed at the time.

What Senator WILLIAMS and Representative SUTTON have said is what was already a matter of public record: That the Government took a huge loss on these surplus war assets whose use they now have to recover at considerable cost for rearmament purposes.

If these gentlemen simply want to dig up and rehash all the losses accepted in disposing of its surpluses, then they will have something to occupy them for the rest of their terms. The examples run into the hundreds, and generally were publicized at the time the sales were made.

If Senator WILLIAMS and Representative SUTTON were not among those who wanted the government to unload its unneeded properties after the end of the war, they were in the minority. Most people who took any interest in the matter objected to having the Government to hang on to a lot of plants and other real estate, keeping them off the tax rolls and exposing the treasury to the enormous expense of keeping them up. They were opposed to having Uncle Sam engage in a flirtation with socialism by having him operate the properties in competition with private enterprise.

The Government sold some of the war properties outright, and others were sold or leased subject to recovery in case of an emergency. A few of the plants were retained. Nobody foresaw, of course, that by 1950 we would be engaged once more in an all-out rearmament effort, requiring the use of the

then surplus properties. No amount of hindsight can change that fact.

The energy congressional committees have put into running down criminality, favoritism, waste, and inefficiency in the Government is having a wholesome result. The effort has the public backing.

But currently, some Members of Congress seem to be losing their tempers and their perspective. That has led to charges or implications that cannot be sustained, and results in the confusion of the public. That will be the effect of the statements of Senator WILLIAMS and Representative SUTTON unless people assume that they are just crying over spilled milk.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have not interposed objection to the various requests to have insertions made in the RECORD. However, I do not desire to have the people of the country receive the impression, because of the absence of objection—for, after all, such insertions can be made only by unanimous consent—that I am in accord with everything stated or set forth in the various articles and other matters which Senators have requested unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

Furthermore, while of course I shall not undertake to commit the present Presiding Officer, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] yet I do not believe that he agrees with all the statements and assertions contained in the various matters which have been inserted in the RECORD.

I make this statement merely because of what I believe may be the effect on the minds of the people of the country of having these various matters printed in the RECORD. I believe their printing in the RECORD may create a false impression.

I wish it distinctly understood that in making this comment I am not reflecting in any way on the Senator or Senators submitting the matters for printing in the RECORD.

Nevertheless, I do raise this question; and I also question whether such insertions should be made in the RECORD merely because the Senators making the insertions have been requested to do so.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, may our moments of prayer inspire us to live worthily, faithfully, and helpfully.

Grant that we may see and understand more clearly that the measure of our faith and trust in Thee will be the measure of our joy and courage.

May we give ourselves loyally and wholeheartedly to the things which we believe and know are righteous and just and true.

We beseech Thee that we may endeavor to do Thy will more perfectly, for in the doing of Thy will is our peace.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

• Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7151) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1602), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SCHWABE reserved all points of order on the bill.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. FURCOLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 558, Rept. No. 1603), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives to investigate and report to the House not later than January 3, 1953, with respect to the following matters:

1. The extent and nature of expenditures made by all candidates for the House of Representatives in connection with their campaign for nomination and election to such office.

2. The amounts subscribed, contributed, or expended, and the value of services rendered, and facilities made available (including personal services, use of advertising space, radio and television time, office space, moving-picture films, and automobiles and other transportation facilities) by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, to or on behalf of each such candidate in connection with any such campaign or for the purpose of influencing the votes cast or to be cast at any convention or election held in 1952 to which a candidate for the House of Representatives is to be nominated or elected.

3. The use of any other means or influence (including the promise or use of patronage) for the purpose of aiding or influencing the nomination or election of any such candidates.

4. The amounts, if any, raised, contributed, and expended by any individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, partnership, corporation, or labor union, including any political committee thereof, in connection with any such election, and the amounts received by any political committee from any corporation, labor union, individual, individuals, or group of individuals, committee, or partnership.

5. The violations, if any, of the following statutes of the United States:

(a) The Federal Corrupt Practices Act.

(b) The act of August 2, 1939, as amended, relating to pernicious political activities, commonly referred to as the Hatch Act.

(c) The provisions of section 304, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session, referred to as the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

(d) Any statute or legislative act of the United States, or of the State within which a candidate is seeking nomination or reelection to the House of Representatives, the violation of which Federal or State statute, or statutes, would affect the qualification of a Member of the House of Representatives within the meaning of article I, section 5, of the Constitution of the United States.

6. Such other matters relating to the election of Members of the House of Representatives in 1952, and the campaigns of candidates in connection therewith, as the committee deems to be of public interest, and which in its opinion will aid the House of Representatives in enacting remedial legislation, or in deciding any contests that may be instituted involving the right to a seat in the House of Representatives.

7. The committee is authorized to act upon its own motion and upon such information as in its judgment may be reasonable or reliable. Upon complaint being made to the committee under oath, by any person, candidate, or political committee, setting forth allegations as to facts which, under this resolution, it would be the duty of said committee to investigate, the committee shall investigate such charges as fully as though it were acting upon its own motion, unless, after a hearing upon such complaint, the committee shall find that the allegations in such complaint are immaterial or untrue. All hearings before the committee, and before any duly authorized subcommittee thereof shall be public, and all orders and decisions of the committee, and of any such subcommittee shall be public.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such public hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress, to employ such attorneys, experts, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, and to take such testimony, as it deems advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee, or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by any such chairman or member.

8. The committee is authorized and directed to report promptly any and all violations of any Federal or State statutes in connection with the matters and things mentioned herein to the Attorney General of the United States in order that he may take such official action as may be proper.

9. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of said committe or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the investigation heretofore authorized, shall be held to the penalties prescribed by law.

That said committe is authorized and directed to file interim reports whenever in the judgment of the majority of the committee, or of a subcommittee conducting portions of said investigation, the public interest will be best served by the filing of said interim

reports, and in no event shall the final report of said committee be filed later than January 3, 1953, as hereinabove provided.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 30]

Allen, Ill.	Grant	O'Hara
Baring	Gwinn	Philbin
Belcher	Halleck	Potter
Bosone	Hart	Powell
Boykin	Hedrick	Prouty
Brooks	Heffernan	Rabaut
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Rhodes
Carrigg	Ikard	Rivers
Celler	Kee	Roberts
Chatham	Kersten, Wis.	Rogers, Tex.
Chiperfield	Larcade	Shafer
Clevenger	McKinnon	Staggers
Combs	Mack, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Dingell	Martin, Iowa	Velde
Dollinger	Miller, Calif.	Welchel
Dondero	Mitchell	Welch
Doyle	Morano	Wheeler
Eaton	Morrison	Wickersham
Feighan	Morton	Widnall
Fisher	Moulder	Wolcott
Gamble	Murdock	Wood, Ga.
Granger	Murray, Wis.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. MADDEN, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 582, Rept. No. 1604), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4323) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continued not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7072, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 3, line 21, strike out "$341,200" and insert in lieu thereof "$289,600."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes, 1 minute to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BAILEY. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to try to save $50,000 in less than 5 minutes.

Yesterday, when I offered an amendment to this bill to cut approximately $325,000 from the nearly $2,000,000 a year appropriation for the White House office alone, the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. THOMAS] figuratively shed tears in his concern as to what such a reduction would do to relations between the White House and this body.

I assume we can expect the same specious argument with respect to this amendment. In other words, it seems to be the contention of the chairman of the subcommittee that the price of currying favor with the White House is to continue to write blank checks, the money to be spent at the whim and caprice of the President. There is little or no justification for the increase which this amendment seeks to strike, and the gentleman knows it.

Is it possible some part of this money is for the new row of shrubbery on the White House grounds, reputedly installed at a cost of $12,000?

So here we have another blank-check proposition, providing, among other things, for traveling expenses, as in the preceding two items, in any manner and amount desired by the President. More overlapping, more open sesame to squandering the taxpayers' money. The bill calls for $341,200 for this item. This is in addition to $26,000 now unexpended in the fund. The $341,200 and the $26,000 constitute an increase of $51,600 over the current fiscal year, so I propose, through this amendment, to eliminate that $51,600. It would leave the President with an appropriation of $289,600. That amount, on top of the $26,000 unexpended balance, totals $315,600 available to the President in this one item, the same amount appropriated last year, including the $26,000 balance. Last year I said the $315,600 appropriation was too much. The fact that there is a balance of $26,000 proves I was right, and certainly indicates the common sense of this amendment. Where I come from in Iowa, $51,000 is still a lot of money, and it is a lot of money in your districts, too.

Let me point out that $51,000 represents all Federal income taxes paid for an entire year by more than 1,000 taxpayers, each making a salary or wage of $250 a month and each having a wife and two children.

In the interests of all taxpayers, I urge you to support this amendment.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the paragraph on page 3 from line 15 through line 24 suggests to me something which I think the Members of this body should take under consideration. I seem to remember that it was a suggestion of Mrs. Roosevelt's that the responsibility for changes in the White House, for various subtractions and additions thereto, not rest too heavily upon the transient tenants of the White House but should be subject to the Fine Arts Commission and to such committees of the House as should be decided to be appropriate.

Why should not this sum of money for the Executive Mansion and the grounds be expended not "as the President may determine" but by an absolutely objective group.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield gladly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentlewoman is making an excellent suggestion. The difference between fact and the suggestion is that the idea has never been written into law, never put into a form in which it could operate as she wants it. The agencies to which the gentlewoman has referred are consulted, they are asked about it, but they do not have the authority the gentlewoman seeks.

Mrs. BOLTON. I would not know how to proceed about it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would think it would be by introducing a bill and having it referred to the proper legislative committee, a bill setting up that method of maintaining the grounds. I would be very happy to support it.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentlewoman find any reason for traveling expenses being included in the appropriation?

Mrs. BOLTON. That could well be studied when the whole matter is taken up in connection with the consideration of the suggested bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with this subject. I repeat, here is an item that has never been cut, and I hope it is not cut this year, for several reasons. It carries an increase in only one job by virtue of the enlargement and renovation. The increase in cost of operation of the Executive Mansion is largely due to the increase in the cost of electricity, heat, light, and power. That is something no one can control.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 34, noes 68.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the council in carrying out its functions under the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U. S. C. 1021), including newspapers and periodicals (not exceeding $200); not to exceed $2,200 for expenses of travel; and press clippings (not exceeding $300); $308,900.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 4, line 15, strike out "$308,900" and insert "$208,900."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to pay my respects to the members of the subcommittee in charge of this legislation for the splendid effort made in attempt to reduce the expenses of the Government.

The agency concerning which I have offered this amendment is the Council of Economic Advisers, headed by Mr. Keyserling. I notice the regular appropriation for this council in the 1952 act was $300,000. I also observed it is understood there would be a reduction, or an absorption of the increases because of increased costs of salaries of people employed on the payroll. Evidentally, this committee did not take that into consideration, and so they put the extra $16,500 in this appropriation. I think that is unwarranted. But what I wanted to call your attention to is that, after all, the reports of this agency, and I wonder if many of you read them, come out periodically. They consist of a series of bulletins, complex essays, dissertations, and a few facts which are obtainable from other sources. They are colored, slanted, and in support of certain economic and social programs, with which probably a majority of the Congress and even a larger majority of professional economists in the country are in sharp and serious disagreement. In the main we get long economic arguments and few useful facts. Look at the 27 pages of the committee hearings. I believe you will agree that I am right.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Would the gentleman agree with me that these other reports from other agencies, that is, other private agencies are actually more understandable, more readable, and better than the report that this Council puts out?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I concur with the statement of the gentleman from California. You can get information on the subject matter from other agencies, or other sources, more factual and more understandable and with less slant or color.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The original concept of the Council of Economic Advisers was that they should turn to all of the other agencies producing this material, and for much less cost collate it and put it into some shape and then consult with the Congress and the President.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. I think, perhaps, the creation of this agency in the first place was a mistake. But we have the legislation before us so let us reduce a part of its expenditures and save $100,000 for the taxpayers of this country. The Hoover Commission said it was an impractical set-up. We hear many recommendations of the Hoover Commission on the floor of the House. They told us it was an impractical set-up. The reports of this agency are periodic reports, which the statute requires, and could easily be produced if you want that work done by fiscal analysts already employed by the Bureau of the Budget with very little additional cost.

If you will read the hearings on this item rather carefully I do not believe you can sustain any of this appropriation. I am just asking you to cut it by one-third, and so we will cut it down $100,000, and save the taxpayers, and help the country as well.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman's amendment is a good one. This agency has been absolutely worthless, and is getting us into all sorts of things that we ought not to be in.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is right. It has extended itself into a great many fields of activity where it does not belong.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

There are few places in this large budget of ours, which comes out of all the subcommittees, where it would be easier to save $100,000. The Council of Economic Advisers began upon a very modest scale, as an advisory council to the President and as an agency to bring together material from all sources, and to furnish something in the nature of economic advice and an economic report. At the start, as you will remember, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, Dr. Keyserling, and Mr. Clark were the members of the Council. Dr. Nourse and Dr. Keyserling seldom if ever agreed. Mr. Clark very rarely said anything. Mr. Nourse finally, feeling that the Council had been turned into something of a more political nature, resigned; and today we have a Council which, instead of staying in the background, places itself constantly in the public prints with statements and reports, a great many of which do not agree with the findings of other estimable economic experts.

I would like to read from the hearings on this subject in which I asked about the travel. If you will turn to page 638, I asked the chairman:

You ask for $1,900 additional for travel. Why do you expect to have more travel in 1953 than you have had in 1952?

Mr. Keyserling then replied:

That is an estimate based upon requests that come to us for providing services at meetings of various kinds around the country. I place a great deal of stress on the meetings that we hold with economic groups, et cetera.

My question then is:

You mean your men go out as speakers at these meetings?

And Mr. Keyserling replied:

I would say as conferees rather than speakers.

It is a fact that they promote these meetings and then go out and address the meetings.

Then, if you will turn to the economic report itself, on page 131, you will find statements made by the Council which are far from the fact, as any one of us, not professional economists, would understand immediately to be the case. I could take time and recite the failure of the Council to consult with people who could give the answers for the price of a telephone call instead of at a price of three or four hundred thousand dollars.

I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas, and I hope it will be adopted.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for his support. As I understand it, this agency when it was organized was expected to be more or less advisers to the administration and perhaps to Congress. I think they are now going out over the country making speeches, trying to convince people with respect to their views in regard to various matters that come up in this country, especially including political and social matters as well as economic matters.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is right. The Council today has to be considered as a propaganda agency.

Mr. REES of Kansas. They are suggesting all kinds of socialized proposals of various kinds; is that not the fact?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, I would say that they are spending too much time on that; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that the subcommittee finds itself in disagreement with our distinguished friend from Kansas [Mr. REES], and certainly our own very able member of the committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], but I think I should point out to the House that this Commission originated by virtue of the Employment Act of 1946. Of course, at that time everybody was expecting the country to go into a tailspin. Well, if this House is not satisfied with this agency, let the House meet the thing squarely and head-on, and eliminate it altogether. If you think the purpose for which it was created does not exist today, let us get rid of the whole thing. But certainly today this agency is rendering invaluable assistance to the White House, to the war agencies, to Mr. Wilson's office, and the other governmental agencies.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], a member of the committee.

Mr. COUDERT. Would the gentleman accept an amendment to eliminate the agency completely?

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think so. We did not consider that in the committee. If we had thought that was the proper action to take we would have done it in committee, and not wait until the matter is before the House. We are a servicing agency for the House. In reply to my friends from California and Kansas let us get the facts: The council members came in here and wanted 39 positions; we cut them to 36, less than they had in 1952. Dollar-wise they had about $330,000 in 1952, and we have cut them back to $308,000: less money than we gave them last year, and we denied them the increase. Mr. Chairman, those are the facts, simply and I hope clearly stated. It is up to the House. They are rendering a valuable service.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The distinguished gentleman, of course, wants to take credit and he is entitled to it, for keeping them from expanding and going further than they have gone. I am just asking the gentleman to go along with us over here and take off just another $100,000. I am sure the agency can still function despite the cut.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to my friend that they are performing a valuable service to the White House and the war agencies and to a good many governmental agencies. If the House wants to cut it out altogether that is up to the House, but the facts are that we gave them $30,000 less than they had for this current fiscal year despite the fact they were asking for an increase.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this paragraph has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of memorials and cemeteries: For expenses necessary for the permanent design and construction of memorials and cemeteries in foreign countries as authorized by the act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 121, 123–132, 138), and the act of August 5, 1947 (50 U. S. C. 1819), $1,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That foreign currencies available to the credit of the Treasury shall be used to defray expenses incurred for this purpose wherever practicable.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on March 13, I made a rather detailed report to this House on my personal inspection of every cemetery and battle monument in Europe last summer. I hope those of you who have not read it will do so, because it is rather enlightening. It will be found on page 2309 of the RECORD, of that date.

I know the chairman of this committee is very economy-minded, the same as all Members of Congress this year. We have also heard a great deal about having to make these appropriations because it is the will of the House, a law has been passed.

I call the attention of the House to Public Law 871 of the Eightieth Congress which reads in part:

The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force are authorized and directed to compile a list of the names of all members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died while serving in such forces in the overseas theaters of operations on or after September 3, 1939, and whose bodies have not been recovered or identified or have been buried at sea. Upon the compilation of such list of names and other appropriate data, the American Battle Monuments Commission and the Secretary of the Army are authorized and directed to provide for the inscribing of each such name and pertinent data with respect to the individual on the wall of a chapel or other appropriate memorial erected by the American Battle Monuments Commission or by the Department of the Army. In determining the particular chapel or other memorial on the wall of which any particular name shall be inscribed, the Commission and the Secretary shall follow the general rule of having the name inscribed upon the wall of that chapel or other memorial which is appropriate in view of the circumstances under which the deceased died in the service of his country.

The cut in this particular item has been 80 percent for the cemeteries in which our boys who made the supreme sacrifice are buried.

I pointed out in my speech that the parents and relatives of these boys will not be going to France and these other countries 40 or 50 years from now but in the next few years. They are entitled to find the grave of the loved one a place of beauty and solemnity. They are entitled to find a chapel where they may meditate while visiting the cemetery. It behooves the House of Representatives and the Senate to appropriate the money to carry out the law providing for these memorials and chapels.

The $1,000,000 appropriated in this bill will not even permit the continuation of construction work that has already started. The American Battle Monuments Commission has spent large sums of money making arrangements for building these memorials. Refusal on our part to provide the necessary funds to carry on the work will dissipate a laboriously collected technical organization. It is extremely difficult to recruit an organization such as the American Battle Monuments Commission due to the language and special technical skill required. It will also prevent the execution of expensively acquired plans, some of which are already being carried out, while others are ready for execution and the remainder approaching that point. Plaster models of sculpture will have to run the hazards of storage. Mosaics which have been prepared cannot be installed—and in the meantime the artist may die.

These cemeteries and memorials should be built immediately because the longer we put it off the more it is going to be a burden on the taxpayers. There is no economy in postponing the work, none whatever. It is an obligation not only of the Government but of this country and of the Congress to complete this work, we promised we would do it.

The chairman of this committee made some reference to the Paris office being overstaffed. Out of all of the employees in the Paris office they only have two in executive positions. The others are merely clerks around there doing stenographic work and taking care of the records. It is not top-heavy as far as administration is concerned. In substantiation of my position I am listing the names of the employees of the Paris office and their duties:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

Andreé Courtois-Suffit, alien: Bilingual secretary; handles correspondence for the officer in charge.

Celia Moginier, American: Bilingual secretary; handles correspondence for the executive officer, chiefly on administrative matters.

Tatiana Nasliedycheff, alien: Switchboard operator, information clerk.

FINANCE BRANCH

Hrant Akmakjian, American: In charge of accounts, payrolls; prepares contracts.

Dominic Rich, American: Cashier; handles payrolls, vouchers.

Jeannine Amathieux, alien: Account clerk.

Michele Landois, alien: Account clerk.

Denise Pichenot, alien: Payroll clerk.

SUPPLY AND TRANSPORTATION

William Phillips, American: Supply clerk, in charge of property and records at all stations.

Arthus Darois, American: Assistant supply clerk; makes local purchases, handles imports.

Florent de Wambersie, alien; Patrick Barry, alien; Jean Penhoat, alien, chauffeurs: Drive officers and senior civilians on business visits to cemeteries, monuments, quarries, and so forth; drive trucks.

Pierre Saleyron, alien: Mechanic, keeps cars, trucks, and visiting trucks from cemeteries in shape.

MESSAGE CENTER AND FILES

Francis Yowarsky, American: File clerk.

Valantine Mouratoff, alien: Mail clerk; handles stamps, routes mail, makes up and receives pouches.

Donald Hopkins, American: Messenger; carries mail pouches to and from Embassy, runs errands, does photographic work—headstones, and so forth.

STENOGRAPHIC POOL

Mary Klinckhaemers, alien; Janette Castanet, alien; Marie-Louise Gervais, alien; Fernande Maury, alien; Solange Buquet, alien: Multilingual stenographers; handle correspondence with business people, contractors, foreign government agencies, ABMC Washington, and so forth.

Paule Jeanne, alien; Christiane Burnham, alien: Clerk-typists for general duty.

JANITORS

Henri Jamet, alien: Handy man; polices and guards office building and vehicles; saves more than his pay on repair work.

Marcel Cattel, alien: Cleans building and assists mechanic.

Paula Jamet, alien: Charwoman; cleans building, guards building and vehicles in husband's absence.

Marie Amiard, alien: Charwoman; cleans building.

HORTICULTURAL DIVISION

Charles Cooley, American: Landscape architect; converts American planting data to foreign plant material; handles planting contracts, selects plants, and supervises contractors.

Graham Rushton, American: Assistant and deputy to Mr. Cooley.

Arthur Trewin, alien: Advises and assists World War I cemetery superintendents in the maintenance and care of their plants and lawns.

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND DATA

Daniel Gibbs, American: In administrative charge of all cemeteries, World War I and World War II, particularly of records of 124,000 graves.

Kathleen Carter, alien; Carmen de Marchi, alien; Huguette Lesage, alien: Bilingual typists; prepare rosters of graves, handle inquiries from relatives as to graves, means of reaching them, and so forth.

SPECIAL ARCHITECT

Charles Thum, American: Designs and prepares specifications for superintendents' houses, garages, and storage buildings at 10 cemeteries.

Roger Demeyer, alien; Pierre Jovovitch, alien: Draftsmen; prepare designs for contracts.

MAINTENANCE DIVISION

Perry Moore, American: Designs and prepares contracts for repair of World War I chapels, memorials, and headstones.

Lucas Antonelli, American: Inspector of contractors carrying out these repairs.

ENGINEERING DIVISION

Pierre Rod, alien: Passes upon practicability of proposals by contractors for reducing costs; designs minor features; verifies translation into French of American specifications.

John Golden, American: Engineer; designs sprinkler, water distribution, drainage, road systems.

Jean Falck, alien: Estimate costs of all work we contemplate doing.

Oliver Meyer, alien: Estimator.

Georges Sagi, alien; Georges Aldebert, alien: Draftsmen and assistants to above.

Rouniker, Louis, American: Surveyor; verifies headstone setting and furnishes survey data to contractors.

As I pointed out in my report on March 13, a very serious factor in this delay is that Gen. Thomas North, the Secretary of the American Battle Monuments Commission, is reaching the retirement age. The success of the program is due more to his experience and knowledge than any other person. If we should lose his services before the World War II cemeteries and monuments are completed, the cost would be greater. I was convinced on my tour of inspection that he did everything possible to economize on the contracts, even if it only involved a matter of a few dollars. There is no substitute for honesty, efficiency, and experience. He no longer needs to work by trial and error. He knows all the mistakes that were made in connection with World War I cemeteries and can give valuable information about building the monuments and constructing the cemeteries which have grown out of World War II. His experience and knowledge are saving thousands and thousands of dollars every year.

My observations and conclusions, reached after personally inspecting all of the American cemeteries and battle monuments in Europe, prompt me to urge that the House of Representatives and the Senate make appropriations to finish these memorials and chapels. It is on the walls of the chapels that the names of those missing in action are inscribed. We have an obligation to those who sacrificed their lives for our country and lie in foreign soil. The American Battle Monuments Commission should be permitted to complete its program at the earliest possible date. The wives, mothers and fathers of these heroes are entitled to the satisfaction of knowing their loved ones lie peacefully in beautiful surroundings and are receiving the tender care of a grateful Government. The result will be a symbol to the world of the dignified reverence in which we hold the memories of our honored dead. Any delay in completing the American cemeteries and monuments in Europe is false economy. I cannot urge too strongly the need for appropriating the money to do the job now.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the American Battle Monuments section close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to what the gentleman from Illinois has said, I want to again appeal to Congress to restore the crosses on the graves of our dead in Hawaii, and to see that they are maintained everywhere else that our boys are buried.

We are in a world conflict between communistic atheism and Christian civilization. We need not deceive ourselves. The Christian people of America, and the Christian people of Hawaii, want those crosses restored, and it is the duty of the Congress to see that they are restored wherever those boys are buried, and if there is no monuments placed above their graves there should be crosses erected to let the world know that they represented this great Christian country of ours.

I shall continue to insist on the passage of the resolution which I have introduced to restore these crosses to those graves in Hawaii. Recently I showed you a picture illustrating how those graves were marked by these crosses, how beautiful that cemetery was before they were removed. After those crosses were removed, it looked like a cow pasture.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I just want to say that with the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], I visited the Punch Bowl National Cemetery in Honolulu last November. May I say that our hearts ached when we drove into that cemetery; in fact, we could hardly realize that we were in a silent city of the dead. We asked the colonel in charge just what brought the removing of those original upright tombstones, and he said, "Well, some organization in Honolulu wanted that done." I then stated, that I was sure the Congress would sooner or later pass a bill which will restore those white crosses or the upright monuments, as a silent reminder of the horrors of war; to bring to our minds and our hearts every time we gaze on them, the fact that our brave boys rest there, and that maybe sometime, somehow, the horrors of war will be brought so forcibly to the attention of the people of the world to such a degree that wars will be no more. I hope the gentleman's resolution will be adopted by this Congress at this session and that the pure white crosses will again be put back on the last resting place of those fine, American, patriotic, fighting boys and girls who gave their all, that our beloved America might live on and on.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I want to associate myself with the gentleman's statement. I think all members of the subcommittee will. There has never been resistance or reduction. We are in favor of what the gentleman has done.

Mr. RANKIN. Understand, I am not criticizing the gentleman.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CAMP. Are the graves marked at all?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the answer is that they are marked.

Mr. RANKIN. They may have marked some since we criticized that picture, but when the first picture was made they were not marked at all.

Mr. JENSEN. With flat slabs, but you cannot see them at a distance.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, in answer to the question as to whether or not these graves are marked; they are, with a slab.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. But just as the gentleman from Mississippi has stated, it resembles a cow pasture more than it does a national cemetery.

Mr. RANKIN. That is right. These crosses should be restored by all means.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Operating expenses: For necessary operating expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, including the employment of aliens; services authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of not to exceed 225 pasenger motor vehicles, of which 165 shall be for replacement only; purchase, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; publication and dissemination of atomic information; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms; purchase of newspapers and periodicals (not to exceed $4,000); official entertainment expenses (not to exceed $5,000); not to exceed $2,230,500 for expenses of travel; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard serviecs; not to exceed $7,290,800 for program direction and administration personnel in the District of Columbia and extensions; and not to exceed $16,273,475 for program direction and administration personnel outside the District of Columbia; $708,986,500, together with the unexpended balances, as of June 30, 1952, of prior year appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission, and such balances shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred by the Commission in connection with the construction of plants and the acquisition and installation of equipment: *Provided*, That of such amounts $100,000 may be expended for objects of a ccnfidential nature and in any such case the certificate of the Commission as to the amount of the expenditure and that it is deemed inadvisable to specify the nature thereof shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the sum therein expressed to have been expended: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation transfers of sums may be made to other agencies of the Government for the performance of the work for which this appropriation is made, and in such cases the sums so transferred may be merged with the appropriation to which transferred: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any officer or employee (except such officers and employees whose compensation is fixed by law, and scientific and technical personnel) whose position would be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, if such act were applicable to such position, at a rate in excess of the rate payable under such act for positions of equivalent difficulty or responsibility: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used in connection with the payment of a fixed fee to any contractor or firm of contractors engaged under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or contracts at any installation of the Commission, where that fee for community management is at a rate in excess of $90,000 per annum, or for the operation of a transportation system where that fee is at a rate in excess of $45,000 per annum.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRICE: On page 6, line 17, strike out "$708,986,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$801,500,000."

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I know it is not a very popular thing these days to come into the well of the House and offer amendments to increase amounts in appropriation bills, but I come here by direction of all the members on the House side on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The amendment I have offered increases the figure in line 17 on page 6 from $708,986,500 to $801,500,000, which means a complete restoration of funds approved by the budget and deleted from the bill by the House committee.

I know it is not a popular thing to suggest an increase in appropriations, but may I remind the House that neither is war popular. We have had a lot of war and a lot of trouble in the world because sometimes we have been caught off guard. I offer this amendment in the hope that we will be on guard here today.

This is a very serious measure. I hope the entire membership has had the opportunity this morning to read the statement placed in the RECORD by the vice chairman of the Joint House and Senate Committee on Atomic Energy, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. The statement was agreed to by each Member of the House representation on that joint committee on both sides of the aisle, and I think the statement would have been agreed to unanimously by members of that committee on both sides of the aisle in the other body if it had been referred to them.

As members of that committee, we have had a thorough opportunity to study the atomic-energy program. I think we are pretty well versed in the problems of the Commission and in the main mission of the Commission. I think any decrease in the funds sought by the Commission on the items that are here represented would be a serious setback to our program in several phases. This morning I want to cover at least one or two of those phases.

First, I should like the Members to know exactly to what section of the bill my amendment is directed. If you have a copy of the committee report, on page 5 you will find a table. My amendment is directed to the first two subsections of that table under the heading of "Operations." That subsection includes some of the very important phases of the atomic-energy program. One of them is "Source and fissionable materials." In the committee report it is stated:

> The committee wishes to point out that this reduction has been applied to items other than those involving the acquisition of fissionable materials.

We, as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, do not feel that that is an absolutely correct statement. We feel the committee itself in another sentence in that same paragraph of the report indicates support for my position and the position of our joint committee. The second sentence reads as follows:

> In other words, the committee has applied its reduction to such items as exploration work, the operation of facilities, processing and development work, and experimental work in connection with the operation of producing plants.

That is clearly a contradiction. It is, of course, impossible to reduce exploration work, operation of facilities, processing and development work, and experimental work, without also reducing items involving the acquisition of fissionable material.

I should like to go a little further and say that it could not affect a more important program, because this is the most important part of the atomic-energy program.

I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, my time is so limited, but before taking my seat I want to warn the House the money cuts in this bill can delay our H-bomb program. These reductions can delay the realization of atomic-powered aircraft and atomic-propelled submarines.

I do not think we should gamble with our atomic reactor program by reducing funds for our atomic-energy program. Our job is to stay far ahead of Russia in atomic development. Reducing these appropriations will hinder us in our effort to do so.

Our joint committee has put the push behind the H-bomb program and other weapon projects of the atomic program. I hope the House will join with us in giving support to an expansion of this important program which should have top priority in our plans for national security.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all paragraphs pertaining to the Atomic Energy Commission close within 5 minutes.

Mr. GROSS and Mr. JACKSON of Washington objected.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair suggest to the gentleman from Texas that if he desires to limit debate on all the paragraphs pertaining to the Atomic Energy Commission, he first ask unanimous consent that the remaining paragraphs be considered as read.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all the remaining paragraphs be considered as read, and that all debate on all paragraphs under the heading Atomic Energy Commission be limited to 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the first portion of the gentleman's request.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that all the remaining paragraphs on the subject of the Atomic Energy Commission, down through and including line 16 on page 8 be considered as read and printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Pending amendments will be considered, of course, when they are offered?

The CHAIRMAN. That will not prevent the gentleman from Washington, or any of the gentlemen from offering amendments.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It would limit the time to less than 5 minutes for each Member desiring to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. This portion of the gentleman's request has nothing to do with any limitation of time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. But, the second portion would limit the time on each amendment, would it not?

The CHAIRMAN. If the request is agreed to, the time would be limited, but the request presently before the committee has nothing to do with any limitation of time.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that all the remaining paragraphs on the subject of the Atomic Energy Commission down through line 16 on page 8 be considered as read and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Plant and equipment: For expenses of the Commission in connection with the construction of plant and the acquisition of equipment and other expenses incidental thereto necessary in carrying out the purposes of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, including purchase of land and interests in land, $371,741,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used—

(A) to start any new construction project for which an estimate was not included in the budget for the current fiscal year;

(B) to start any new construction project the currently estimated cost of which exceeds by 35 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget.

Liquidation of contract authority: For expenditure by the Commission to liquidate obligations incurred under prior year contract authority, $57,000,000.

Reduction in contract authority: Contract authority available to the Commission is hereby reduced by $635,623.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas that all debate on paragraphs of the bill relating to the Atomic Energy Commission, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 15 minutes?

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all paragraphs of the bill relating to the Atomic Energy Commission, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 20 minutes, with the last 8 minutes reserved to the committee.

Mr HOLIFIELD and Mr. VAN ZANDT objected.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on all paragraphs under the heading Atomic Energy Commission and all amendments thereto, close in 30 minutes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. How will the time be divided, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to divide the time among those Members who are on their feet seeking time on this subject.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member desire to be heard on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for only one purpose, and that is to seek information. We are all most anxious to provide the necessary funds for the Atomic Energy Commission, but I, for one, was impressed by the statement made yesterday by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] about the Government being obligated for the salary of some former employee who is now working with a concern which has a cost-plus contract with the Atomic Energy Commission, a salary which is almost double the salary the Commission paid him.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] whether any of the money provided in his amendment might be used for some such purpose.

Mr. PRICE. None of the money carried in the amendment I have offered has anything to do with construction. Evidently the case referred to by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] must necessarily have dealt with construction.

Mr. ALBERT. I would like to ask the gentleman this further question: Is there any likelihood that in protecting the necessary secrecy which clothes this Commission's work we may unnecessarily be giving to the Commission authority to enter into extravagant as opposed to necessary contracts?

Mr. PRICE. I do not think so. I am sorry that I did not have additional time, because this is a very important matter. Our program is threatened by this reduction of funds.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The fact is that in the Hanford plant and the Los Alamos plant there are contracts of just that kind operating right now. By direction of the Committee on Appropriations they have probably gotten rid of most of them at Oak Ridge, but it is only because the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] were alert and on the job that that was stopped. Unless something like this is done, you will have these folks running around wild with these operational contracts, letting contracts to people to operate towns even.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to say that my amendment has absolutely nothing to do with the condition about which the gentleman is asking. Nothing in the world.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman; I am for his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I know it is very easy to criticize any program today. We can probably criticize most of our own personal lives as we all make some errors. We can find instances all along the path of life that we would like to correct. What was the objective of this atomic energy program to begin with. It has been said by men who have far more knowledge than I have what this weapon has been worth already in the defense of the American people and the free people of the world. It has been said by Churchill and by others who are far better informed than most Members of this House that if it had not been for the development of this weapon in America and stockpiling it, the Soviet Government would have marched long ago, and probably would dominate far more territory than they do at the present time. We should forget about the little things involved here today that are played up to discredit this program. Of course I do not approve of wasting money, but we can correct those things, and we have corrected them. Every Member of this House has had some part in doing that at one time or another. I have never favored cost-plus contracts and we should stop it. There have been speeches made for the last 12 years in regard to that matter. Personally, I have opposed it from the very beginning days of World War II. I have introduced bill after bill to put this agency, AEC, under contract authority; and we have held hearing after hearing to secure full information so we can proceed with contract authority legislation and then, in my opinion, we could keep a close watch on each installation and new projects.

This cut without question, in my mind, cuts this operation to a point of danger. The weapons that defend America and the free world today are dependent in a large measure on our operation and production. I know the temper of this body here today is to cut deeply. I fear what may happen if we do not maintain our present program and we simply cannot do this under the restrictions and reductions carried in this bill before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] is recognized.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Price amendment. As a member of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, along with other members of that committee, I have sat in executive session mornings, afternoons, and evenings listening to testimony in an effort to keep abreast of the development of atomic energy. I feel sure I speak the sentiment of the majority of the committee when I say that the committee membership has kept abreast of the development of atomic energy. In addition, I feel the committee has protected at all times the interest of the American people, and we have intelligently represented most of the time the wishes of the majority of both Houses of Congress.

Unless the Price amendment is adopted, you are going to strike a blow at the

very heart of the development of atomic weapons.

My colleague from Illinois mentioned the exploration for raw materials. For several years I could not understand the extraordinary cost of locating new deposits, but having visited the project recently, I am convinced the costs are necessary.

The committee action strikes at the heart of the reactor program. If you want to support a program that will make possible the atomic-powered submarine, atomic-powered aircraft, then support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE]. If you want to support the development of tactical weapons and the type of bomb that can be carried on a fighter, interceptor, a light or medium bomber, vote for the Price amendment. If you want to support the development of the warhead for the guided missile, vote for Mr. PRICE's amendment. But if you want to curtail the development of the atomic aircraft carrier, the submarine, the tactical weapon, as well as the warhead for guided missiles, vote against the Price amendment.

Frankly, I feel the Committee on Appropriations does not have all available information on the atomic-energy program, and for that reason the Price amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there ought not to be a thing in the world partisan about this program, because it affects everyone equally, and I am sure there is no partisanship in it. The group of our colleagues comprising the legislative committee are men in whom we all have confidence, likewise our subcommittee. We have two studies of this program. It is strange to me, fine as these gentlemen are, patriotic as they are, that every time the Committee on Appropriations tries to eliminate any waste dire predictions are made. I will stand or fall on this statement: If you can put your finger on a more wasteful organization of this Government than the Atomic Energy Commission, I will go along with you in restoring this cut. There are no finer men in this House on either side of the aisle than those who are jointly offering this amendment; I know them and you know them; they are valuable, outstanding Members of this House.

Mr. Chairman, do you recall 2 years ago when your subcommittee tried to reduce a fee for community operations at Oak Ridge? The city operators were receiving a fee of $180,000 a year and the committee reduced it to $90,000, for doing a $25,000-a-year job. It was the same group that said the Atomic Energy Commission will fold if you do that. That was 2 years ago. The House went along with the Subcommittee on Appropriations at that time and reduced this item to $90,000—although we made a mistake then; it should have been reduced to $25,000. But the Atomic Energy Commission is still in operation.

This cut of $92,000,000 covers a myriad of items. It is not going to curtail their operations one bit; it is not going to hurt them. Most of this money is for salaries and expenses for operations. They have over 62,000 people outside of regular AEC employees in Washington and the field, what we call contract employees.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I may accept that later on, but I will not ask for the time now.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] may transfer his time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE: On page 8, after line 14, insert the following:

"No part of the appropriations herein made to the Atomic Energy Commission shall be available for payments under any contract hereafter negotiated without advertising by the Commission unless such contract includes a clause to the effect that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall until the expiration of 3 years after final payment have access to and the right to examine any directly pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of the contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of and involving transactions related to such contracts or subcontracts: *Provided*, That no part of such appropriations shall be available for payments under any such contract which includes any provision precluding an audit by the General Accounting Office of any transaction under such contract."

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, in the course of our study of cost-plus contracts we came upon the rather startling information—startling to us at least—that the Atomic Energy Commission was entering into certain contracts by which the Commission itself and the General Accounting Office were denied the privilege of auditing certain overhead allowances.

We do not think such a contract is in the public interest. This amendment is offered as a committee amendment, unanimously agreed to this morning by the subcommittee, and I ask that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennesse [Mr. GORE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JACKSON of Washington: On page 8, lines 10 and 11, after "estimated cost of which exceeds," strike out "35 percent of the estimated cost included therefor in such budget" and insert "the estimated cost included therefor in such budget:

"(C) to continue any community facility construction project whenever the currently estimated cost thereof exceeds the estimated cost included therefor in such budget; unless the Director of the Bureau of the Budget specifically approves the start of such construction project or its continuation and a detailed explanation thereof is submitted forthwith by the Director to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy; the limitations contained in this proviso shall not apply to any construction project the total estimated cost of which does not exceed $500,000; and, as used herein, the term 'construction project' includes the purchase, alteration, or improvement of buildings, and the term 'budget' includes the detailed justification supporting the budget estimates: *Provided further*, That whenever the current estimate to complete any construction project (except community facilities) exceeds by 15 percent the estimated cost included therefor in such budget or the estimated cost of a construction project covered by clause (A) of the foregoing proviso which has been approved by the Director, the Commission shall forthwith submit a detailed explanation thereof to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy: *Provided further*, That the two foregoing provisos shall have no application with respect to technical and production facilities (1) if the Commission certifies to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that immediate construction or immediate continuation of construction is necessary to the national defense and security, and (2) if the Director agrees that such certification is justified."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it places extra duties on the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I will withhold the point of order for the time being.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the language contained in the pending amendment is the same language that is in the current appropriation law for the Atomic Energy Commission. I think that we all share the concern that the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations have to save as much money as possible in connection with this program or any other program.

But I do want to make one thing clear to the Members of the House. If you will turn to page 5 of the committee report you will find that for the first time the committee has itemized the expenditure of funds in connection with the atomic energy program. This has never been done before. The truth is, so that all Members of the House will know, that the members of the joint committee, both Republicans and Democrats, have examined the secret budget, and it will disclose that by the action today you may seriously cut funds for atomic weapons. You have seriously cut into other phases of the program that are indeed vital. Now that view is shared unanimously by all members of the joint committee.

I am sure we are all aware of the difficulty under which we labor today. We labor under the difficulty of security. I can say this, that the most vital construction projects in the hydrogen bomb program now under way, in my judgment, could not have been started if the

proposed riders as contained in the pending bill before the House had been in the law last year.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. I want to say to the gentleman that I fully concur in what he has said about his amendment. The committee very carefully considered his amendment and the members who were present at the meeting unanimously agreed that it was sound, and I hope it will be adopted. I would like to say in addition that the adoption of his amendment will not increase costs.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is exactly right. It is a further limitation on the proposed rider that is in the pending bill.

The rider I propose, the same as that in the existing law, is even more restrictive than the one proposed in the bill before us. My rider places a limitation upon construction projects where the estimated cost is only 15 percent more than originally estimated in the budget, whereas the rider in the bill does not come into operation until the increase in estimated cost is 35 percent or more.

But the rider which I have proposed through my amendment has the tremendously important virtue of containing an escape clause. This escape clause functions when we develop new scientific information—information not foreseen at the time the budget had been prepared—information not foreseen at the time Congress acted on the budget—information which must be exploited immediately if we are to preserve and increase to the utmost our atomic advantage over Russia. In such cases, and, believe me, they have arisen recently in the H-bomb program and will arise again—they are vital cases—it is imperative that, with proper safeguards and proper certifications through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Commission be permitted to proceed.

Now I am no naive and uncritical admirer of everything the Atomic Energy Commission does. That Commission is composed of human beings, and they sometimes make mistakes. One such mistake occurred when they let a plumber make $756 in 1 week. We on the legislative committee immediately jumped on the Commission for that—we had them up for a hearing within 24 hours of learning what had happened.

We in the Congress—both the legislative committee and the Appropriations Committee—must do our best to cut costs. No one is more anxious than I to be ruthless in eliminating waste. No one is more anxious than I to create cost consciousness among Commission personnel and among the personnel of all other Government agencies.

But when all this has been said, the fact remains that the Congress may well be in recess from July through December of the present year. During that same period, judging by past experience, there may well arise in the hydrogen program and in the atomic-bomb program the absolute necessity of revising or radically changing plans for a given project. Unless we recognize this necessity, we will in the end cost the taxpayer far more money—and we will cut a slice from the very heart of our national security.

If you are building a house and part way through the job you find the roof will cave in unless you change your plans, you do not proceed blindly.

The amendment I advocate is a common-sense amendment. Its real effect will be to save money and to save our security as well. I urge that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. For the sake of time, I will concede the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On page 8, line 4, strike out "$371,741,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$435,500,000."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is concerned with the bottom third section of the chart on page 5 of the committee report. The question is just this, and I realize that the answer has already been given on the Price amendment because my amendment is similar to the Price amendment except that his applied to operations and mine applies to the plants in which to conduct the operations and the equipment which will go into some of those plants; yes, some of the plants that are now being constructed at Paducah, and Savannah, Ga., at a cost of many millions of dollars. Part of the equipment that will go into them is contained in this cut.

We are faced with a very difficult problem. The nine members of the Committee on Atomic Energy from the House are thoroughly aware of this program. We have spent not 2 or 3 days on hearings on this matter, as did the Committee on Appropriations, but we have spent weeks and months on this atomic-energy program. It is not a thing we can get up and argue openly on the House floor because if we did so argue, and give you the arguments that we know are good arguments, it would give comfort to the enemy, and certainly none of us wants to do that.

I can only say to you that the restoration of this appropriation has the full approval of the nine members of the House Committee on Atomic Energy, who have studied it carefully for many months. We believe it will do harm to the atomic program and that it will cripple us on that part of our defense program, which gives more value to the dollar, in my opinion, than any other part of our defense program. We are spending a billion dollars on atomic energy. In my opinion, it is the fear of the atomic bomb that is keeping Russia from spreading its tentacles all over Europe, South Africa, and South America, and eventually reaching to our own country. I ask you to restore this appropriation according to my amendment.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman would mind telling the House what his committee has done as to trying to eliminate the waste and extravagance that is going on in the construction at such places as Paducah at this time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. We have constantly watched these projects. We find that you have to sacrifice some money if you are going to get speed. This is a matter of getting certain things done within a very short length of time. I wish I had the time to go into it more thoroughly.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, we have already heard from several distinguished Members of this body who are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and for whom we entertain the highest feelings of respect and whose patriotism is to be commended. However, I just want to suggest to the members of this committee that we face this matter with a little common sense. I want you to bear in mind exactly the situation before you get terror-stricken by all this talk that we are endangering the security of this country every time we dare to say "No" to some small part of the request of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Atomic Energy Commission is a splendid organization, performing perhaps the most vital task in this country today. However, their headquarters is only a little more than a mile down Constitution Avenue. They have 2,200 automobiles. At this very moment they are either on their way up here with a supplemental request for more funds or they are stopping midway at the Bureau of the Budget. Before we could bring in this bill they were back with an additional request. They can come every day of the year to us, and they do come as often as necessary.

We are taking only about $170,000,000 out of an appropriation of $1,200,000,000. Do not tell me that is going to plunge us into a situation of insecurity and prevent the production of atomic weapons. We of the subcommittee are just saying to them, "Be a little careful. We want to watch this project as it goes along. We are with you, but we have an obligation to watch expenditures."

The members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy claim they have spent weeks on end examining this program, while the Committee on Appropriations spends only 3 days each year, but mark this:

In all the time we have been struggling with this problem I have never known of one single instance when a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

has come to one of us on the Appropriations Committee and said, "I have been out in these plants. I have looked over this program. I will tell you one place where you can save a little of the taxpayer's money."

All we are asking you to do is to back us up as we perform our sworn duty to keep an eye on this huge, ever-growing operation. Do not worry, the program will not suffer. They know where the Congress sits. They know the way to the Capitol. They have the automobiles so they can get there quickly. They will be up here tomorrow, if necessary, and if they really need more money they will get it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to restore the entire cut here on construction. First, let me tell you that the Atomic Energy Commission has grown so fast in the last 2 years, I doubt if they know exactly everything they have and what they are doing and where they are doing it. They have 32 or 33 installations. This money here covers construction, alterations, and repairs of dozens upon dozens of items—even for the construction of an office building. Think about it. There is $284,000,000 here for construction work at Savannah, the new plant. That is the budget estimate. Not one dime of that $284,000,000 was stricken. So the cut of some $81,000,000 is scattered over 100 or 150 different projects. It is not going to hurt them one iota. They have a building here that is being constructed—I am sorry I do not have the cost of it—at Scioto, which is already in a stand-by condition. Now is the time for this crowd to call a halt, and to look and see what they have, and to take stock. They should go on and complete the plant at Savannah. You have your full budget estimate for the cost there. This reduction will not hurt them one bit.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask the committee to vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two with reference to page 6, lines 9 and 10, where there is provided for official entertainment expense not to exceed $5,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission. Will the gentleman explain that item in this bill in view of his previous statements of wild spending on the part of the Commission?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I will answer the gentleman's question to the best of my ability. That example, may I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], is just positive proof that this committee has not hurt the Atomic Energy Commission one bit. They want $5,000 for entertainment every year, and your subcommittee, generous as we are, give it to them. That is the answer.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that that item could be cut out of the bill without any harm to atomic energy development? Who is the Atomic Energy Commission entertaining?

Mr. THOMAS. If you really press me for an answer, I will say "Yes." But it serves a useful purpose. They will have some distinguished scientists coming here from England, France, and Canada, and from our own United States who are not traveling at Government expense. They will go to Washington, and to these various installations, and, of course, they will be the recipients of that good old hospitality. That is what it is spent for. I am giving you the facts, and of course the committee can decide what to do.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me since when it became the custom for Europeans to pay their own expenses? It seems to me we have been paying them for a long time—in fact, far too long.

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot argue with my friend. I have given you the facts. There they are. Of course it is generous. I am not going to try to evade that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in performing the duties imposed by the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 151), the Ship Act of 1910, as amended (46 U. S. C. 484–487), the International Radiotelegraphic Convention (45 Stat. pt. 2, p. 2760), Executive Order 3513, dated July 9, 1921, as amended under date of June 30, 1934, relating to applications for submarine cable licenses, and the radiotelegraphy provisions of the Convention for Promoting Safety of Life at Sea (50 Stat. 1121), including newspapers (not to exceed $175), land and structures (not to exceed $3,000), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed $17,500), purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), $6,108,460, of which not to exceed $78,700 shall be available for expenses of travel.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'KONSKI: On page 13, line 10, after the comma, strike out "$6,108,460" and insert "$8,000,000."

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Communications Commission asked for a budget of some $8,700,000 in round figures. The Bureau of the Budget cut it to approximately $8,000,000 in round figures. The Committee on Appropriations cut it to $6,100,000 in round figures.

I know something about the inner workings of the Federal Communications Commission. For instance, I know that in the last 4 years the Federal Communications Commission has not approved one single television station. There has been a freeze on the general television industry. The freeze, as we understand it, is to come off the latter part of this month or the first part of next month. In spite of the fact that the Federal Communications Commission has not approved one single television application in the last 4 years, we find that as a result of their cut in personnel and as a result of transfer applications in radio, FM and AM, the Federal Communications Commission is about 1 year behind on its work in processing applications.

I say to you that if this cut which the committee has made in the appropriation for the Federal Communications Commission, a cut of some $1,900,000, remains as is, we people in the backwoods areas are not going to have television stations in our areas for a period of 5 or 10 years to come. Just as soon as the freeze is lifted, you Members of this House will find that approximately some 2,000 TV applications in the United States are going to be filed with the Federal Communications Commission. If in the last year, when they have not been working on television applications, they find themselves 1 year behind in the processing of applications, can you imagine what turmoil there is going to be in the Federal Communications Commission with the filing of some 2,000 TV applications.

In the processing of these applications the Commission will take them up according to the size of the communities, and it means that cities which already have television will have first chance to have their applications for new stations processed, and by the time they get into districts like mine where the largest town is some 40,000 people, it is going to be 10 years, if we do not give the Federal Communications Commission more personnel and more money in this year's appropriation bill. This appropriation is the most important in the history of the Commission.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Is the gentleman serious in his proposal that we increase the money for the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I am dead serious.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know that Commission, who composes the Commission, and does he know its record?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I do know that in the past there has been considerable discontent among the Members of the House in the personnel and management of previous Commissions. Most of it I feel has been without foundation.

Mr. COX. There is one man on that Commission who deserves the respect of the Congress, and that is Bob Jones. He is the only man on the Commission who deserves our respect.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia, whom I respect very much, more so than any other Member of this House, for his information I would like to say that regardless of what might be said of the Federal Communications Commission in the past, the present personnel of the Commission is among the finest in our whole Government setup. I do not know of a more sincere or harder working force anywhere in our Government.

I have heard criticism, I have heard a great many allegations in the past. But I will say for the present personnel of the Communications Commission to the

gentleman from Georgia that I think most of the things for which the Commission was criticized and for which most of the personnel of the Commission were criticized in times gone by has been eliminated and wiped out so that the personnel of the present Commission are beyond reproach in every respect. No agency of our Government has taken over so much responsibility with less money and personnel as has this Federal Communications Commission.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. COX. The present Chairman of the Commission has operated on the Commission for a great number of years. When Lawrence Fly was head of the Commission he was thinking of Mr. Fly, and when Mr. Fly's successor came in he operated in the same fashion.

I said a while ago that there was only one man on the Commission worthy of public respect; I want to amend that and add the nephew of the Speaker of the House, who went to the Commission a few days ago.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Getting away from the personnel of the Commission, the people in the backwoods area are entitled to this new thing, this new development, this new medium we call television; and we should not fight the people of America in holding back this industry by denying sufficient funds and personnel to the Commission to do the job regardless of what our attitude and feelings may be toward the personnel of the Commission. Why take our spite out on the people just because a few do not like the personnel of the Commission? The answer is simple. If we want television to grow, with 2,000 applications coming up, either the Commission gets more money and more help or millions of people will be denied television service for 5 to 10 years to come.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment to restore $2,579,032 to this bill for the operation of the Federal Communications Commission. The Federal Communications Commission is unlike any other commission or bureau of Government. It is charged by Congress with the duty of exercising a rigid control over the great private industries of telephone, telegraph, and radio and television. These private industries are fraught with a public interest and should be rigidly regulated. But this Congress by controlling and drastically cutting the appropriation for the operation of the Federal Communications Commission can stifle these businesses and retard the opportunity of the American people to enjoy radio and television.

At the same time that the Congress refuses to permit the FCC to have adequate funds to process applications for radio and television, it refuses permission to these private industries through fees or otherwise to purchase this necessary service. The result is that the people of the country are denied the full enjoyment of the possibilities of radio, and to a much larger degree they are denied the pleasure and benefit of television.

The Federal Communications Commission asked the Budget Bureau for $8,705,492 with which to operate for the year 1953. The Appropriations Committee reduced this by $2,597,032.

During the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of this House the then Chairman of the FCC spoke of the continually growing backlog of work before the Commission. He said:

> With this budget, there are many, many things that are proper functions of the Commission which are being slowed down almost to the point of extinction—functions which we have which are important but which we have had either to delete entirely or to slow down to a snail's pace because of the demand for a tight budget.
>
> I would like to say I believe if we had all of the money we think we need to carry on the work of this Commission, it would be good for the economy of this country. I am quite sure that if we had the money to keep abreast with the processing of applications that come before us, it would pay dividends to the Treasury of the United States over and above the outlay to the Communications Commission for the processing of those applications. And while this is a tight budget, or an economy budget, I think it is a false-economy budget, if I may say so, and it would be better if we had the money we need to process those applications in terms of the financial position of the country (p. 1180, hearings).

In the radio and television departments of the FCC alone there are 2,410 AM radio stations, 658 FM radio stations, and 108 television stations. This totals 3,166 broadcasting stations throughout the country under the direction of the FCC. Among the AM stations there are 1,048 which are now awaiting hearings on new applications, changes, or renewals of license.

For three long years there has been a freeze on television stations. This freeze, which denies most of the people of this country the opportunity to have television in their homes, is caused largely by the fact that the FCC does not have the staff with which to do their work. The Commission cannot be sure on these limited funds that it is expanding this great new field of communications in the interest of all the people for the indefinite future.

Cutting this budget is not saving money. It is stifling a young but a very vigorous industry. It is refusing the American people education, entertainment, and enlightenment to which they are entitled. It is keeping from the Treasury of the United States millions of dollars in taxes because it is withholding an opportunity for people in this industry market to operate the broadcasting stations and from manufacturers opportunity to build the sets and equipment which the people want.

Again, I repeat this is not economy. It is an arbitrary withholding of the right of a part of our population to do business and for a very large segment of our people to enjoy the results of it.

Congress, I am sure, without any intention of the Members of this House to do so, by cutting this bill and holding back the radio and television industry, is giving a new variation of Aesop's ancient story of the dog which lay in the manger and would not eat the hay nor permit the cattle to feed thereon. I urge this committee to restore the budget request. I believe the people of this great country want this done. I am convinced that it is in the interest of economy to our Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will divide the time evenly between those Members who were on their feet at the time the request was made.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Just a few days ago in conference with the Federal Communications Commission I found that they are rewriting and reclassifying the present television stations, one particularly in my State of West Virginia that will deprive several hundred people—several thousand users of television equipment of service. Those people already have their own television sets. The only way they can get service is for the Federal Communications Commission to enlarge their processing activities to process these applications. We have 14 applications pending in the State of West Virginia. These people are going to be without service until these applications can be processed. There are people who have invested thousands and thousands of dollars in television sets, yet they will have no service because of the action of the Federal Communications Commission in changing the classification of existing stations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, it surprises me that a fine responsible Member of this House and one for whom I have a very genuine affection should ask this House to increase the appropriation carried in the bill for the Federal Communications Commission. This Commission is supposed to be bipartisan, but I can say to my Republican friends that there has not been a time in 20 years when it could be said that they had representation on that Board, with the exception of Bob Jones. All others claiming to be Republicans were hybrids.

I have said before, and I repeat, that in the main the Board has been the nesting place of people in the Government who were most representative of the people that we are now trying to drive out of Government service. This Commission, of all governmental agencies in Washington, has performed as if it were the hired agent of the Reds. I speak the truth and I know what I am talking about.

I had a serious controversy with this Commission a number of years ago. They were on their way out. The effort to get rid of a majority of the Board, however, was stricken down by reason

of the intervention of President Roosevelt, who had seized the records in the Commission, the records in the Navy and the War Departments, and everywhere else and physically transported them to the White House, where they are still, so far as I know. In addition to that the representatives of the Navy and War Departments who had worked with the committee investigating the CCC were browbeaten, abused, and threatened with court martial.

I know the Commission has been entrusted with more money than it should have had. The effort that the Government has put forth to shield this aggregation of rascals has been shameful.

The present Chairman of the Commission was there when the scoundrel Lawrence Fly was down there terrifying the broadcasters all over the country. The present Chairman of the Commission slinked into my office about 10 days ago to offer explanations and make peace. But there is nothing that he could do that would make me feel that he is fit for the job he holds. The rascally part he played as one of Fly's men forever outlawed his right to public respect so far as I am concerned.

The Commission ought to be abolished and a new agency set up. I look forward to action in that regard and in that particular at some near date in the future. Of course, you will not grant the Commission more money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, I am not able to discuss the matter of television applications, but I wish to call the attention of the chairman of this subcommittee and the Members of the House to what I call a defiant attitude on the part of the Federal Communications Commission.

On the 5th of August 1951 one of my constituents inquired about the status of his application which had been filed by his radio station in my district on April 27, 1951, for permission to raise the height of its antenna 6 feet, a very simple application and to which there could possibly be no objection. On August 15, 1951, he received a letter from the secretary stating that, due to cuts made in their appropriation by the House, they did not have the personnel to handle such applications, that they had filed them in the order of their date and were handling them chronologically, that the order number of this application on August 15, 1951, was 47.

I wrote them a letter again in March, and on March 18, 1952, I received a letter, again defiant, that they could not do this because they did not have funds and that the order number now is 31.

So in a few days more than 7 months they evidently processed 16 applications. The letter that they wrote to me was an insult to my intelligence and to my office as a Member of this Congress, and I do not know what we are doing to allow such as that to go on in one of these agencies. If they can process but 16 applications in 7 months, the time has come when the entire appropriation should be taken from them and the duties of that office turned over to someone who can work.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say. I am indignant.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to our good friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP] that the committee has endeavored to eliminate that practice, and I might say that the gentleman who wrote that letter has now resigned, and we think that the Commission is going to do all right with the money we have given them. Certainly they do not need the nearly $2,000,000 extra that our genial friend the gentleman from Wisconsin seeks to add to this budget here.

Let me give you a few figures. You know this bill provides 1,151 jobs for that Commission. You know that is a tremendous number of jobs. Now, they have four or five big divisions of work. One is what we call safety and special services, taking care of short-wave-radio broadcasting for truck lines and bus lines and police stations. Then they have the field engineering and monitoring work and common-carrier activities. But the point is this, my colleagues: One of the big backlogs in the past has been regular broadcasting. They have practically caught up with that, as the gentleman from Georgia just pointed out, but now their big load in the future is going to be television. We have recommended that, instead of giving them a big increase in the number of personnel to take care of the TV as they wanted, we have requested them to transfer those employees who have been handling normal broadcasting work and whose work load is going down and down and down every day to TV. But, still, we tried to help them and we earmarked 10 additional employees for TV over and above the employees they can use from their regular broadcasting activities. I should think we have given them ample funds in 1,151 jobs, and we ask that the amendment be voted down because we do not think they can possibly use the additional amount provided in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Executive direction and staff operations: For necessary expenses in the performance of executive direction and staff operations for activities under the control of the General Services Administration; including not to exceed $86,565 for expenses of travel; not to exceed $250 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and processing and determining net renegotiation rebates; $4,648,300.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri: On page 15, line 8, strike out "$4,648,300" and insert "$4,029,750."

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is a cut of approximately $600,000. It actually will make a net cut of about 25 percent of this item, which is a new item. If you will refer to page 33 of the committee report, you will find that in the 1952 appropriation there was an item for operating expenses under the General Services Administration of $107,000,000. In the 1952 budget that has been broken down into four items, one of which is the item of executive direction and staff operations. By totaling these four items you will find that we, in this appropriation, actually would be increasing the $107,000,000 total to $109,000,000, an increase of some $2,000,000.

This executive direction and staff operations item is a very difficult one to run down to find out just what it is. If you will refer to page 153 of the hearings, you will find an analysis and some testimony, but very slight, on this subject of just what this executive direction and staff operations means. I think on examining it you will find that what it is, is top overhead and, actually, instead of an increase there should be a decrease. The General Services Administration in its own report has stated that it has been setting up field organizations to decentralize their activities to a certain extent. One statement the GSA makes—page 1530 of the hearings—is, "operating counterparts of each central-office function in this group are located in the regional offices, except for information and contract settlement." In other words, it would seem that as they decentralize there should be less expense, not more, at the central point. Actually, as I say, there is an increase that is being asked for in this new item of executive direction and staff operations.

It is my recommendation in this amendment that we cut that item back to $4,029,750. It is about a 25-percent cut of what they are asking. The committee cut 14 percent; my proposal cut is 11 percent more. As we can visualize it from the little information we have, it is mainly cutting the top overhead personnel, and should in no way affect the actual operation of the General Services Administration in the field, where they are performing their functions.

I call your attention to one further item: In the General Services Administration statement on page 1530 they make this remark:

Experience to date in GSA indicates that false economy begins to creep in when the percentage for such costs falls below 5 percent.

They point out that in 1951 the total cost was 5.3 percent; in 1952, 4.6 percent; and in 1953, 4.2 percent. However, they throw no light on where they get that percentage figure. As best I can determine, this item would not be cut much below a 5-percent figure if we accept the cut I have proposed.

I think this is exactly the point where we do want to make savings. I again say that GSA is supposed to be decentralizing its activities. If they are doing that, certainly the central office itself should be economizing in cutting back, and I think this is an opportunity for saving $618,550.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all the paragraphs under the heading of "General Services Administration" be considered

as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. TABER. And be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. They would be open to amendment; yes.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

(The paragraphs referred to are as follows:)

Public Buildings Service: For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; including the salary of the Commissioner of Public Buildings at the rate of $16,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; repair and improvement of public buildings and grounds (including furnishings and equipment) under the control of the General Services Administration; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; demolition of buildings; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and not to exceed $157,630 for expenses of travel; $98,346,030: *Provided*, That the foregoing appropriation shall not be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia into buildings acquired to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions of the executive establishment into areas outside of but accessible to the District of Columbia.

Federal Supply Service: For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as provided by law; including not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $69,000 for expenses of travel; and the purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; $2,094,100.

National Archives and Records Service: For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law; including preparation of guides and other finding aids to records of the Second World War; purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; and not to exceed $20,750 for expenses of travel; $4,739,200.

The appropriate foregoing appropriation to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) advances or reimbursements for salaries and administrative expenses chargeable against other appropriations of the General Services Administration, and such salaries and expenses may be paid from such foregoing appropriation; (2) cost of maintenance, upkeep, and repair included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U. S. C. 129); (3) reimbursements for services performed in respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (4) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the act of July 2, 1948 (50 U. S. C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, be so transferred.

During the current fiscal year, no part of any money appropriated in this or any other act shall be used during any quarter of such fiscal year to purchase within the continental limits of the United States typewriting machines (except bookkeeping and billing machines) at a price which exceeds 90 percent of the lowest net cash price, plus applicable Federal excise taxes, accorded the most-favored customer (other than the Government, the American National Red Cross, and the purchasers of typewriting machines for educational purposes only) of the manufacturer of such machines during the 6-month period immediately preceding such quarter: *Provided*, That the purchase, utilization, and disposal of typewriting machines shall be performed in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

For necessary emergency expenses of the General Services Administration not otherwise provided for, for operation, maintenance, protection, repair, alterations, and improvements of public buildings and grounds (including furnishings and equipment) to the extent that such buildings and grounds are under the control of the General Services Administration for such purposes as are provided for in Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; rental of buildings or parts thereof in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, including repairs, alterations, and improvements necessary for proper use by the Government without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U. S. C. 278a); restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; not to exceed $21,600 for expenses of travel; and payment of per diem employees employed in connection with any of the foregoing functions at rates approved by the Administrator of General Services or his designee, not exceeding current rates for similar services in places where such services are employed; $22,668,250: *Provided*, That of this amount, such sums as may be determined by the General Services Administrator to be necessary may be paid into other appropriations of the General Services Administration only for purposes of accounting: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to effect the moving of Government agencies from the District of Columbia to accomplish the dispersal of departmental functions.

Renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia: For expenses necessary for continuing the program for the renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia, for which funds are not otherwise available, including appurtenances and approaches thereto, that are under the control of the General Services Administration for repair and preservation, as authorized by title III of the act of June 16, 1949 (Public Law 105), $5,500,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $33,400 shall be available for expenses of travel.

Repair, preservation, and equipment outside the District of Columbia: For expenses necessary for the repair, alteration, improvement, preservation, and equipment, not otherwise provided for, of completed Federal buildings, the grounds and approaches thereof, wharves, and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto, and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for Federal buildings; the demolition of buildings thereon; and the purchase and repair of equipment and fixtures in buildings under the administration of the General Services Administration; $10,000,000, of which not to exceed $66,000 shall be available for expenses of travel.

Refunds under Renegotiation Act: For refunds under section 201 (f) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, $9,300,000, which, together with the unobligated balance of the appropriation granted under this head for the fiscal year 1952, shall remain available until June 30, 1954: *Provided*, That to the extent refunds are made from this appropriation of excessive profits collected under the Renegotiation Act and retained by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the appropriate subsidiary shall reimburse this appropriation.

Expenses, general supply fund: For expenses necessary for operation of the general supply fund (except those authorized by law to be charged to said fund), including not to exceed $150 for purchase of newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed $119,000 for expenses of travel; $13,998,000: *Provided*, That the general supply fund shall be available for the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only for the purposes of this appropriation.

For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act of July 23, 1946, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), not to exceed $142,600 for expenses of travel, and the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, $203,979,000, to remain available until expended, of which $70,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred pursuant to authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That any funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under said act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with subsection 6 (a) of the act of July 23, 1946 (50 U. S. C. 98e (a)), may be transferred to stockpiles established in accordance with said act.

REDUCTION IN CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Contract authorizations available to the General Services Administration under the headings hereinafter set forth are hereby reduced in the following amounts:

"Construction of public buildings outside the District of Columbia," $29,500,000.

"Federal Courts Building, District of Columbia," $3,875,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate be limited to 25 minutes on all paragraphs, and all amendments thereto, under the heading General Services Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Mr. Chairman, this cut offered by my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] figures out at about 11 percent. The committee has already cut this appropriation in excess of that. Instead of giving them an increase in personnel for 1953 over 1952, we have given them a number which is less than they had in 1952. He is exactly correct in the matter that this personnel is engaged not only in the District of Columbia, but in the field. They have a good many offices scattered throughout the United States dealing not only with public buildings and grounds—that is a part of it, but

dealing with archives and record centers. They have their offices all over the country. In addition to that, there is the tremendously important function of the Federal supply, namely, all common-use items of the Government except for the armed services are procured, and certainly it saves money. This group which is centered in the District of Columbia has about 60 percent of its personnel in the field and about 40 percent here, and it is their job to supervise and direct. You have given them a tremendous cut already in this bill, and if you add this cut you are going to cripple them to the extent where, perhaps, you may really hurt them. I ask the committee to consider that, and then of course your subcommittee is going to abide by your judgment, and we will do so with a smile.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I am very much interested in this Federal supply service. This does not include Federal supply. This is the overhead—will the gentleman not agree?

Mr. THOMAS. No, because that is not accurate, I will say to my friend, and I say it to him good naturedly—I do not want to be argumentative about it. A part of these funds also go to executive direction, and management as related to the Federal supply service.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I understand this is the overhead item, and then you have a specific item for the Federal supply service.

Mr. THOMAS. Surely, the gentleman is right. This is for executive direction and management. If you take out the top section of direction and management, then of course what you leave is only the bottom, and the bottom is important in my book. Certainly though, we have to have some executive direction and management.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS of Missouri), there were—ayes 79, noes 52.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to the paragraph beginning on line 9, page 15, and ending on line 6, page 16?

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAWSON: Page 16, line 1, strike out "$98,346,030" and insert in lieu thereof "$109,662,000."

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, it is with great misgiving that I rise before this body to propose an increase in this appropriation measure. When I know that behind me is coming the distinguished gentleman from Texas, with his most persuasive manner, I feel something like Daniel must have felt in the lion's den. But I am sustained by the knowledge that GSA had its beginning in the Committee on Expenditures. I am sustained by the knowledge that the members of that committee have followed their activities and have checked upon them, and I am of the opinion that if the Members of this House will give careful study to this item they will agree with me that its appropriation should not have been cut to the extent that is attempted here.

The amendment is still $3,427,000 less than the Bureau of the Budget's estimate. In other words, if you accept my amendment the committee will still have lopped off an amount of $3,427,000. The proposed amendment would increase the amount recommended by the committee by $11,315,970 to provide a justifiable increase in three critical activities; namely, building management, real property acquisition and utilization, and public-utilities management.

With respect to the individual activities, the effect of the proposed amendment would be as follows: First, building management. The proposed amendment would allocate or provide $104,920,000 for the operation and maintenance of public buildings. In 1952 the GSA had available $95,960,500 for building-management operation. In 1952, I repeat, GSA had $95,960,500. Since that time this Congress has by act of the Congress transferred to the GSA the landlording, the cleaning, and the maintenance of the buildings occupied by the following agencies: The Atomic Energy Commision, Civil Service Commission, Defense Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Veterans' Administration, Federal Security Agency, Agriculture Department, Commerce Department, Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, Department of the Air Force, Interior Department, Justice Department, Post Office Department, Labor Department, State Department, Treasury Department. From the budgets of these Departments was subtracted the amounts they used ordinarily for housekeeping, which amounts to $9,000,000. The Army alone was allowed $4,385,000 for this purpose. You transferred these activities to GSA, yet by this appropriation you are not allowing them one penny for the work you have transferred to them. That means you gave to GSA activities which you took away from other departments. You have taken the money from the other departments but you are not giving it to the GSA whom you now charge with the responsibility of carrying out the work. That means for them a great reduction of the lowest paid personnel employed by our Government, namely, janitors, elevator operators, and charwomen and the curtailment of maintenance services from 3 days a week to a 1-day service.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all paragraphs under the heading "General Services Administration" close in 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have two amendments on the desk and would like 5 minutes each.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment I wish to offer.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I amend my request and make it 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] asks unanimous consent that all debate on all paragraphs under the heading "General Services Administration" close in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the Chair will divide equally among the Members standing the time agreed upon, which will be approximately 3 minutes each.

There is an amendment pending. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to take his 3 minutes now?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I will take a minute and a half to rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to say that the distinguished gentleman from Illinois who heads a very fine committee of this House and who has handled many of these reorganization bills—and if I am not misinformed, who handled the reorganization bill which gives birth to this appropriation—he and his committee have done a tremendously important work in this Congress for the last 2 or 3 years, and I want to commend him; he is a valuable Member of the House; we all respect him for his intelligence and for his honesty and for his very fine outstanding character. As to his amendment: The committee granted a substantial increase for 1953 over what they had in 1952.

This appropriation, Mr. Chairman, carries the funds for some 4,500 buildings throughout the United States. Two hundred of them are in the District of Columbia. For what? For rent, utilities, heat, light, gas, water, maintenance, and operation. Between $33,000,000 and $36,000,000 of this is for rentals; the balance is for salaries, wages, and expenses and to leave the figure as reported by the committee is not going to hurt anybody.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: Page 15, line 11, after the semicolon in line 11, strike out the balance of the language in line 11, all of the language in line 12, and all of the language preceding the semicolon in line 13.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment refers to a very fine gentleman in the General Services Administration. He is doing a good job, and I am sorry to have to offer the amendment, but I want the Members of the House to know that his salary on July 1, 1949, was $10,330. On July 1, 1949, his salary was raised to $12,000. On October 16 it was raised to $14,000. Now it is sought to raise it to $16,500. This means a raise from $10,330 to $16,500 in 3 years' time.

This is an unusual example of the economy which is being practiced in this bill. I do not know why this gentleman

should receive an increase of over $6,200 in 3 years, which would bring him higher than the Deputy Administrator of the Civil Service. The Administrator of Civil Service gets $17,500, the Deputy Administrator gets $15,000 and all of the other Commissioners get $14,000, as does this particular individual. But now it is sought to give him $2,500 a year additional. This will throw the General Services Administration pay structure out of balance and cause a loss of morale to other equally deserving executives.

I hope that the chairman of the committee can explain this apparent discrimination.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I will be delighted to try. This appropriation covers in the neighborhood of $120,000,000 and this man Bert Reynolds is responsible for 92 percent of it. There are other people over there who draw far more money than he does. If there is a deserving executive in this Government it is Bert Reynolds. He is one of the few men in here who can step out tomorrow to private industry and draw a salary of $50,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is in favor of raising his salary $6,000?

Mr. THOMAS. Absolutely, and we are getting him cheap at that.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: Page 16, line 13, strike out the figure "$2,094,100" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,089,000."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this item refers to a restoration of about $990,000 to do the Federal cataloging job which this Congress has imposed upon the General Services Administration insofar as its part of the work is concerned. Over $50,000,000 is being spent by the military organizations to do a cataloging job. Since the inception of the catalog program only $1,500,000 has been allotted to the General Services Administration to identify the items which are in civilian supply inventories. Unless the work is done in the civilian agencies to coordinate the identification of strictly civilian use items with the catalog job that is done by the military, that part of the work will remain undone and the will of Congress as expressed in Public Law 152 and Concurrent Resolution 97 offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] will not be carried out.

I ask for a restoration of this amount so that the work can proceed in an orderly manner.

This appropriation supports the Government-wide activities of the Federal supply system by the General Services Administration as distinguished from the operation of the stores sales and direct delivery purchasing in connection with the general supply fund.

Specifically, this appropriation supports the activities of—

First. Commodity cataloging.

Second. Supply management.

Third. Supply schedule purchasing.

Fourth. Personal property utilization and disposal.

Fifth. Commodity specifications.

Sixth. Commodity inspection.

Seventh. Traffic management.

This amendment is an increase of $994,900 over the amount recommended by the committee but is a reduction of $698,000 below the budget estimate recommended by the President. The purpose of the amendment is to provide $994,900 for the operation of the commodity cataloging program which is the amount available for this program in 1952.

The Appropriations Committee recommended the complete abandonment of this project. I do not subscribe to the philosophy, and I know that many Members of the House feel that commodity cataloging which will result in a single Federal catalog for all agencies of the Government, both civilian and military, is absolutely essential to an efficient, economical Federal supply system. This question has been considered very carefully by the House Expenditures Committee and subcommittees thereof over a period of years. It was considered carefully prior to the passage of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, and subsequently we have examined into the operations of the military departments and the General Services Administration, working toward this achievement.

Military departments have spent approximately $50,000,000 in this undertaking to date, and the General Services Administration will expend approximately $1,500,000 during 1951 and 1952. By the end of fiscal year 1952 GSA will have identified and described approximately 185,000 items, out of a total workload of 1,500,000 items or articles.

It has been said that the military is accomplishing a great deal in this respect and that GSA's progress has been slow. I fail to see how any other conclusion could be reached when you compare the financing which is made available to the military for this purpose on the one hand and the GSA on the other. A great amount of work remains to be done. However, the GSA has been operating this program for a little over a year, and hardly anyone would expect them to become as efficient in their operations as other agencies who have had longer operating experience. However, an examination of the budget justification furnished by GSA in support of this program reveals that they have now reduced their cost to $6.50 to identify and describe a single catalog item. This compares favorably with the reported cost of approximately $15 per item in the military cataloging program.

Under conditions of normal times, I would recommend that GSA's appropriation for this program be doubled in order to get the job done at the earliest possible date. However, in the light of our program of frugality and austerity, I consider an appropriation for this program of $994,900 completely consonant with the economy objectives of the Congress.

I, therefore, solicit your support of the foregoing amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I will use 1 minute of my time in opposition to the amendment.

There is no other member of the subcommittee more interested in cataloging, nor who has had more experience both for the Government and for private industry than I, and I would just say that it is the feeling of the subcommittee that this is the orderly way to move onto the cataloging proposition; as the money is needed it will be supplied; and as we can afford it, but we are not in favor of putting any more money in than can be used.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has cut out all the money. This is not a partial cut. All the money for cataloging has been cut out of this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. You will recall that the evidence showed that it would take them exactly 10 years from last January to finish this cataloging. We took out the $994,000 for the reason that if it is going to take 10 years to finish the job, why appropriate this large amount of money at this time, when you have all of those years left to get the job done. So, I think you are throwing away $994,000, and that is the opinion of the members of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURNSIDE: Page 16, line 20, strike out the figure "$4,739,200" and insert in lieu thereof, "$5,565,000."

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call the attention of the House to the chance of saving $500,000 by this amendment. I am a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and of the subcommittee on reorganization. This amendment I have offered is in line with the Hoover Commission report.

It would do just this: It will allow savings in three centers that have been cut out: The one at Seattle, the one at Kansas City and the other at Boston. They are not in my district, and personally I have no interest other than the saving for the United States Government. In one center where they have tried this they have had a total gross savings of $1,328,000, over in Alexandria, Va. Here is what else it will save. It will save a vast amount of steel that is being wasted in making filing cabinets. We found out that they can change over to treated

cardboard paper and use that in place of steel. This shows the savings accomplished by the record center in Alexandria and will be comparable in the other three.

There are 60 cubic feet of records. Agency, 60 square feet; records center, 20; savings, 40. Space cost: Agency, $150; records center, $10.60; savings, $139.40. Equipment, cost agency, $425; record center, $33; savings, $392. Equipment: Steel, 1,475 pounds; records center, 110 pounds; savings, 1,365 pounds.

Just think of it for one center, when we have a scarcity of steel like we have now. I think it would be criminal to waste this steel if they can save it by an amendment of this nature. We will save a half million dollars by doing this. I think it would be penny-wise and pound-foolish to throw away this half million dollars and therefore I ask that you approve my amendment.

I wish I could get further time to prove my case, which is consistent with the Hoover Commission recommendations, but time will not permit me to do that. You will have to read it in the RECORD.

Operating expenses, Federal Records Center, Alexandria, Va., for 18-month period ending Dec. 31, 1951

Received 217,000 cubic feet of records from office space (average annual rental $2.29 per cubic foot)	$496,930
Received 136,000 cubic feet of records from storage space (average annual rental $1.25 per cubic foot)	170,000
Eliminated 37,000 cubic feet of records from those received (average annual cost 98 cents per cubic foot)	36,260
Emptied 12,500 filing cabinets (replacement cost $50 each)	625,000
Total gross savings	1,328,190
Less cost of operations, Federal Records Center, Alexandria (including equipment amortized)	442,000
Total net savings	886,190

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

I now address myself to the appropriation item entitled "National Archives and Records Service," page 16, line 14. This is the appropriation which supports the activities of the National Archives and Records Service, which are as follows:

First. Records management.
Second. Records centers.
Third. Microfilming.
Fourth. National Archives.
Fifth. Federal Register.
Sixth. Roosevelt Library.

I offer the following amendment:

In line 20, page 16, delete the amount "$4,739,200" and in lieu thereof insert "$5,565,000."

The amount recommended is $186,000 less than the President's estimate for this appropriation item, and exceeds the amount recommended by the committee by $825,800, and is designed to support two activities, that is, records centers and National Archives.

First. Records centers: The President's budget included an estimate of $3,576,000 for records centers, and under the proposed amendment $3,470,000 would be available for this purpose and will enable the GSA to establish three additional records centers in 1953. The principal reason for the reduction as explained by the committee is the elimination of three new proposed Federal records centers. The General Services Administration is now operating 7 Federal records centers in 7 of its 10 regional offices. An additional records center has been proposed for each of the remaining three regional offices of GSA. It is inconceivable that the Congress should turn its back on the findings of the Hoover Commission, studies of the House Expenditures Committee, the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, as amended by Public Law 754, Eighty-first Congress, known as the Federal Records Act of 1950. Many pages have been written by learned authorities as to the antiquated methods of the Government of keeping infrequently used records in expensive Government space and filed in expensive steel cabinets. Studies have revealed that it costs approximately $3.50 per cubic foot to maintain records in regular office space and equipment, whereas the same records can be housed, maintained, and serviced in a records center utilizing cheap space, cheap equipment, inexpensive labor in comparison with regular office help, at an aggregate cost of $1 per square foot. As you have undoubtedly noticed through recent articles in the press and elsewhere, all large private industrial organizations are now utilizing the technique of records centers for noncurrent records. Only last Sunday an article appeared in the New York Times describing the operations of the records center for the Chase National Bank. This is the principal method by which the General Services Administration is gaining control of a 20,000,000-cubic foot records problem. In 1953 alone, which would not be a full year's operation, these three new centers could save $1,200,000, as contrasted to initial outlay of $700,000. On the past operations of the seven centers now in operation, four were established in 1951 which resulted in savings of $1,300,000 in 1951. In 1952 three additional centers were established, and the combined operation will result in an additional savings of $1,800,000.

Closely allied to the records-center program is the records-management activity of GSA and I mention it at this time to cite some additional examples of the savings which have accrued to the Government and are financed by this appropriation item.

In October 1951, GSA issued an instruction to all Federal agencies permitting them to dispose of certain types of civilian-personnel records. As a result of these instructions to date there have been destroyed approximately 6,000 filing cabinets of these records. These cabinets, when utilized, can save the Government about $300,000 because they will be redistributed by the Federal Supply Service at once, obviating the purchase of new cabinets at a total cost of $300,000.

Another example of the savings which are being effected by this activity and also I might add justification for the creation of the General Services Administration is the manner in which the National Archives and Records Service and the Federal Supply Service have been working together in order to cut down on new purchases of filing equipment by the executive branch of the Government. Prior to GSA's creation the Government purchased annually approximately 70,000 filing cabinets at approximately a cost of $4,800,000. Purchases over the last 3 years have been as follows:

1951: 35,000 at a cost of approximately $2,400,000.

1952: 15,000 at a cost of approximately $1,000,000.

This achievement is contrasted to the fact that the over-all records problem since Korea has been increased from 20,000,000 to 23,000,000 feet and would not have been possible except through the operation of records-management activities.

As another example, the records-management group of GSA is just completing a survey of the Treasury Department and its records-management practices. This survey has covered only the records-disposal practices of the Treasury Department in the disposal of its records which were not being used on a daily basis. As a result, 3,000 file cabinets will be released immediately which will be available for redistribution through the Federal Supply Service system and will preclude the purchase of a like number of cabinets at a cost of approximately $210,000. The age-old question is often asked "What appropriations can be reduced as the result of such savings?" The answer to that question is a tough one but nevertheless who can deny that these examples do not represent cases of demonstrable savings which GSA is effecting for the Government on a repetitive basis.

Second. National Archives: Under the proposed amendment $1,400,000 would be available for this activity as contrasted to $1,298,200 recommended by the committee. In 1952, $1,410,000 was available for this work. It has been my experience that the classification, preservation, and reference service of the National Archives is of the highest order. Noble efforts to reduce growing backlogs cannot be achieved if the necessary funds are not provided. The impact of the new defense agencies has placed a heavy workload on the National Archives operation. Requests from executive agencies and Members of the Congress for reference service cannot be handled satisfactorily unless we provide them with the necessary operating funds.

I, therefore, solicit your support of the foregoing amendment in order to place the financing of this important work on an adequate basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say in reply to our good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE] that he seeks by his amendment to up the appropriation by about $825,000. I think over the years my good friend may be right. But, we thought they were expanding a little too fast in

establishing records centers. We have let them establish seven. They received funds for three of them last year, and we denied funds for three additional new ones. Let us see how well they operate with seven. They ought to get by with seven. And, remember last week, in a deficiency bill you gave them funds for a building for another one in Kansas City, Mo.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATTLE: On page 19, line 21, strike out "$5,500,000" and insert "$4,500,000."

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, the budget request in this case is for a 1953 appropriation of $5,500,000, which would be the final installment on a $30,000,000 program of renovation and modernization of Federal buildings outside the District of Columbia, the program being confined to projects costing $25,000 or more. The committee has allowed this request in full. The program was launched in fiscal year 1950. Two hundred and thirty-one such projects will have been completed by June 30 of this year, and GSA has planned to complete 50 more in fiscal year 1953. There will remain at the end of this current year 200 or more similar projects, all of them doubtless representing sound investment of public funds, and the Agency has expressed the hope—hearings, page 1425—that this Congress will extend the program through a new authorization for appropriations subsequent to 1953.

No question is raised as to the basic merit of the program underway or proposed. Excellent work has clearly been accomplished with the funds thus far provided.

We are in a situation now, however, in which every dollar of reasonably deferrable expenditure must be deferred. For that reason, and in the firm conviction that no serious loss will accrue from such action, I propose that by adopting this amendment the work be held at the same level as provided for in 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very small amount of money to protect your investment in about 4,500 buildings. I am not going to quibble with my good, close, personal friend, the gentleman from Alabama. We have a lot of business together every day. However, you are just spending this money now to protect your investment. You have roughly a billion dollars tied up in these properties, and you are 3, 5, 7, and 8 years behind in your maintenance, in taking care of them. That is all it is.

We give you the facts. I think we would not be saving a dime, I will say to my good friend from Alabama, over a period of a year or 6 months or 2 or 3 years by cutting this amount. It is going to have to be done sometime, and the longer you wait to make these repairs the more it is going to cost you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 78, noes 46.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BATTLE: on page 20, line 8, strike out "$10,000,000" and insert "$9,000,000."

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Chairman, this item supports the normal minor repairs and equipment of Federal buildings outside the District of Columbia. Projects included in this program involve less than $25,000 each.

The appropriation for the current fiscal year is $9,000,000. The agency has asked for $10,000,000 for 1953, seeking to restore the program to a level of the 1951 appropriation. The committee bill allows the estimate in full.

The buildings involved are the same 5,441, within the scope of the "Renovation and improvement" item just preceding. The decision as to which of these two appropriations is to be drawn upon is administratively made on the sole basis of whether the work involved will cost more or less than $25,000.

In this case, as in the other, the program is sound, and the work efficiently executed. On the other hand, good results are being obtained at the $9,000,000 level, and there is no special circumstance which would warrant action by the Congress in this, the most difficult budget year we have ever faced, to raise the appropriation as requested. This amendment merely holds the line against the day when our financial burden can be somewhat eased.

Mr. Chairman, I see the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is on his feet. Does the gentleman from Texas wish to endorse my amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. I always follow my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama, particularly when I realize the feeling of the House, and in order not to ruffle any feelings and to expedite the business of the House, the Committee will accept my good friend's amendment.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BATTLE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I merely take this time in order to call your attention to the stockpiling problem that the Congress has before it. In the report, which was filed supporting this bill, on page 11, it is stated that the committee believes the storage space required under this program, meaning the stockpiling program, can be located by the Government in existing warehouses and other facilities. As you all know, we have quite a large stockpiling program. It is no secret when I tell you that we bought over $2,000,000,000 worth of critical material, and in some categories we are still way behind in the stockpiling program. The estimated total cost of this program will be over $4,000,000,000. I do not have time to tell you why we have to do this, but I believe it is very essential to our safety that we pile up these materials.

The specific point I want to bring before you is that there is not enough warehouse space in the United States to take care of this very costly and critical material. There is a shortage of private warehouses, and of public warehouses, and the money allocated in this bill is not adequate to anywhere near take care of it. I am confident that by the time this bill comes back from the other body for a conference, and I am sure the other body will not agree to what this bill provides, you will be able to see that you must give more money for warehouse space, otherwise the losses on this critical material will be tremendous. The reason for that is that as we stepped up our military program in all the services they have gobbled up the warehouse space and storage space that should go to the Munitions Board, which is stockpiling this critical material. This is the problem in brief, and I will expand my statement here and give you a few more facts. I hope those of you who have the time will read what I have to say, because this is a very serious program. We do not want to cramp its development by not giving them adequate space to lay aside the very valuable critical material, which we might need some day very badly.

It will be of interest to the Members of the House to know that a combined study and survey of the GSA and the Army, Navy, and Air Force indicated that there is an over-all deficiency of 12,400,000 gross square feet of warehouse and shed space needed to accommodate the balance of planned purchase of materials requiring protected space.

There is a shortage of warehouse and shed space in each of the five districts, in two of them over 1,500,000, in one slightly over 1,000,000, and in the two others slightly under 500,000 square feet of storage space.

The lack of space could create losses in the value of these goods dollarwise of many millions, so say nothing of reducing our stockpile dangerously.

Furthermore storage space on a rental basis is very high; $10.42 per ton per year. This is almost prohibitive and what should be done is to build space with public funds. The cost in such a warehouse is $0.996 per ton per year, which indicates that the cost of such storage would soon amortize itself and in the long run really effectuate economy.

We are anxious that the strategic stockpile program go forward without delay as it is a pretty good guaranty of no war. While aggressors may know something about our stockpile—they do not know all about it—but the fact of partial knowledge will guarantee us against any overt act which might lead to war, which we hope and pray will not come.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. Can the gentleman tell us without divulging any secrets whether or not we are actually obtaining these strategic materials and stockpiling them?

Mr. JOHNSON. We are obtaining a good many of them, but in a half a dozen or more categories, which are very critical, the amount we have obtained is very low and acquisition is also extremely slow.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us whether or not the stockpiling is occurring much faster than is required on the basis of the rate of spending of military appropriations?

It probably is, but the point is the stockpile is not to be placed at the disposal of the military agencies unless war breaks out. They are not now permitted to use the material we are stockpiling, except in a few rare instances where small amounts of critical materials have, by Executive order, been withdrawn to help procurement programs for defense to proceed expeditiously. Stockpiling means keeping on hand something that might be denied us till the rainy day comes. It is insurance against disaster. The program which started in 1946 was the result of surveys of happenings in the World War which indicated that in several instances the war could have been seriously prolonged, had certain materials in distant places been denied us. We are aiming to prevent the recurrence of such a situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the Clerk's desk, and in view of the limitation of time, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read, and that I be allowed to extend my remarks at that point following the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, it was my intention when I asked for these 3 minutes, to support the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], but unfortunately, it was limited to a time that gave me no opportunity to speak in behalf of the motion. The cut in the General Services Administration is one of the cruelest cuts that could possibly be made. It is an unusual agency. I remember returning here in January, after my stay at home last fall, to find there were other Members of Congress who had felt the effects of these cuts much the same as I had. The remarks I have to make I would like to direct to the committee in connection with these cuts.

In the city of Minneapolis and in the city of St. Paul, where we have these Federal agencies, and throughout the country, this general-service agency is made up in the main of maintenance and operation service. That means that the great bulk of their payroll is devoted to the low-paid workers—janitors, charwomen, elevator operators, all those employees that go to make up the maintenance and operation of the building itself.

So, in my district I found 19 of these old-time civil-service employees, people who were too old to get employment any place else, being taken off of the payroll because of the cuts in this agency's budget made last year. In the city of St. Paul they laid off over 75 of those very loyal old-time employees, because of the cut in the appropriations. That is what I call cruel. The only people affected by the cut you made last year, and probably will be affected by this cut that you are making now, are the people in the low-income brackets—janitors, charwomen, elevator operators, painters, and those people who are necessary to keep a building in operation. I know that because I have an office in the Federal building at home. They reduced the force from 14 to 8 people. That means that those 8 people have to do the work that 14 people formerly did in that building. Some of those people who were laid off had 15, 16, 17, and 18 years of civil-service rights, civil-service priorities, but because of some young veterans on the job, the older boys got the ax. They were people who could not be transferred to other civil-service jobs because of their age and like cuts in other Government agencies. That is what I call the cruelty of this kind of a cut in the General Services Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Under unanimous consent agreement, the Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOLIFIELD: On line 2, page 21, strike out "$13,998,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$18,000,000."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I now address myself to the appropriation entitled "Expenses, General Supply Fund" contained on page 20, line 22 of H. R. 7072.

This appropriation supports the expenses relative to the operation of the general supply fund, a revolving capital fund for the continuous financing of the purchase-sales-at-cost reimbursement cycle for common-use items required by agencies of the executive establishment.

During fiscal year 1951 the Congress increased the appropriated capital of the fund from $10,000,000 to $44,000,000 in order to expand the stores inventories both as to numbers of items as well as volumes stocked for the primary purpose of realizing the substantial economies resulting from volume purchasing, consolidated warehousing and distribution.

Specifically this appropriation supports the activities of: First, stock replenishment and direct delivery purchasing; second, stores operations; third, equipment management and maintenance; fourth, commodity inspection; and, fifth, staff operations; together with the provision of adequate warehouse space and costs related thereto.

I offer the following amendment:

On line 2, page 21, delete the amount of "$13,998,000" and insert "$18,000,000."

The amendment is an increase of $4,002,000 over the amount recommended by the committee, but is a reduction of $1,613,000 below the budget estimate recommended by the President.

The program for expanding the stores inventories under the increased capital requires a minimum of 3 years to progressively acquire adequate warehouse space and facilities and to increase inventories in the kinds and quantities of stocks needed by the agencies. Actual and projected sales from stores stock under the expansion program are through for the 3-year period ending June 30, 1952, as follows: 1950, $26,000,000; 1951, $44,800,000; and 1952, $95,000,000.

The appropriation recommended by the President for 1953 was based on a stores sales of $157,800,000, highlighted by a progressive increase in use of the supply centers for common-use items by the military departments.

As late as March 11, 1952, at hearings before the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, its chairman reiterated the committee's long-standing recommendation to the transfer of procurement for items in common use by military and civilian agencies from the Department of Defense to the General Services Administration, and stated that the program has received acceptance from the Secretary of Defense and the Munitions Board.

Obviously, if the procurement of common-use items is so transferred, the GSA must be provided with funds to cover the cost of handling this business.

The printed hearings, with respect to H. R. 7072, failed to disclose any discussion questioning the proposed volume of business, yet the Appropriations Committee's report, in explanation of the recommended reduction, indicated its opinion that the GSA is unduly optimistic as to the business which it will perform and its intention to limit obligations to the 1952 level. This would negate the ability of GSA to handle the business from the military departments.

The proposed amendment will provide funds for operating a stores-sales program of $140,000,000 in 1953; and direct delivery sales of approximately $97,000,000.

This program will, first, permit an expanded volume of sales to the military agencies; second, help eliminate competition between military and civilian agencies in the procurement of common-use items, and third, make it unnecessary for other agencies to procure many items directly from suppliers, at prices averaging not less than 20 percent higher than they could obtain from GSA's supply centers.

Economies resulting from volume purchasing and consolidated warehousing, and furniture and equipment repairs during 1951 exceeded $11,400,000. This represents a saving of $1.61 for each $1 of operating expense appropriated under this title. The expanded sales programs for 1952 and 1953 will generate savings at comparable rates.

In my opinion this would be a realistic program which can be attained and I, therefore, urge and solicit the support of the foregoing amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed $210,000 for expenses of travel; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the agency; and transportation expenses and not to exceed $25 per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 73b–2), for persons serving without compensation as members of any advisory committee established pursuant to title VI of the Housing Act of 1949; $4,606,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of inspections and of providing representatives at the site of projects being undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949 and of projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950; shall be compensated by such agencies of institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed $374,000.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORD: On page 22, line 22, strike out "$4,606,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,606,000."

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment affects the office of the Administrator, and his office only.

In looking through the hearings I came across a rather startling statement by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee when he was commenting on the businesslike manner in which this agency was operating.

Let me quote it. It appears at page 869 of the hearings:

Mr. THOMAS. I was not able to find it last night, and when a thing is muddled up like this and you have to spend 4 or 5 hours to try to run down the figure, and the only indication that it exists is on the chart and there is no intimation in narrative form of where it is or why it exists or the need for it or the justification * * * it is a pretty unsatisfactory way to do business; is it not?

Let me give you some more information about the function of this particular office. The only function is supervision and coordination of the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Housing Administrator, and the Public Housing Administrator. Let me remind you again, it is only supervision and coordination. Several members of this subcommittee had a few things to say about the kind of job they were doing. The chairman of the subcommittee, on page 871, was questioning Mr. Foley, and he said this:

You are a coordinator, and as far as the field is concerned, you have not coordinated anything. You have set up three different offices here. That is the meat in the coconut.

Then, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], another member of the subcommittee, in questioning Mr. Foley on the same subject, said this, and I quote from page 872:

When you speak about coordination, do you have the power under any law or reorganization plan, to overrule the Commissioner of FHA on any of his decisions?

Mr. FOLEY. No.

Then he goes on with a partial explanation. Later the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] had this to say on the same page:

In your coordinating efforts do you have any authority to tell FHA what to do in connection with the over-all program?

Mr. FOLEY. I would not have the right to say to the Commissioner of FHA to insure a mortgage for a given amount on a given project.

In other words, it is rather conclusively brought out in the hearings that this office is really not doing a good job of coordinating and supervising, yet the subcommittee would give the office $4,606,000.

Let me make another point. I tried to the best of my ability to read through this testimony, which is a maze if I ever saw one, to find out how many employees they have and how many they seek for the next fiscal year. Frankly, it is almost impossible to locate that data in the hearings. The subcommittee showed considerable disgust with the presentation of this particular agency. The best I could find out in reference to employment was that in 1947 they had 226 employees; in the 1953 budget request they wanted 1,472. That is a rather sizable increase in a period of 6 years.

Fortunately, the subcommittee used good judgment in cutting the requested appropriation for this agency, but, from the testimony, the evidence that was brought out by this subcommittee, we could well afford to cut another $1,000,000.

It should be noted that during the questioning of Mr. Foley and his staff, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] was interested in the pay scale of the Administrator's office. During the hearings the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] said:

I suspect you pay better than any agency in the Government from looking over your schedule—

Yet we have all this confusion in the testimony, and lack of ability to make a clearcut presentation to the Committee on Appropriations.

This office can be cut because the Congress has reduced the Defense Housing program and the Public Housing projects. The budget request for this office was predicated on larger programs in both instances.

I respectfully recommend to the members of the committee that this particular agency could well afford, on the record, a reduction of another $1,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. This is one of the two or three items in the appropriation bill to which the minority took exception, because we felt that there could be a further reduction in the office of the Administrator. The gentleman could have turned to page 971, where the Administrator of the Home Loan Bank Board was being interrogated. After a number of questions the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] asked:

As a matter of fact, you run your shop, and discharge the responsibilities placed on your agency by law with your own employees?

He said:

Yes; that is true.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph relating to the Administrator's office, and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that include the Public Housing Administration?

Mr. THOMAS. No; just this paragraph on the Administrator's office.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is prompted by misinformation. The office of the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency does not have 1,473 employees. That was the number requested. It has at the present time 900 employees.

Its duties are not confined to coordination. In 1947 when there were 147 employees in that office its only function was the coordination of housing activities. Since that time the number of employees whose time is devoted to coordination activities has been reduced to 100. So they are doing a good job of economizing wherever they can.

There are at least 300 employees that were transferred to this agency under Reorganization Plan No. 17 of 1950. Those men were transferred from General Services Administration to this agency in May of 1950 when you transferred their duties and functions from General Services Administration to this agency.

In addition to that it has employees working on slum clearance and urban redevelopment, it has employees working on the Alaska housing and college housing loan programs under laws which have been enacted by this Congress since 1949.

They have employees working on the housing research program authorized in 1949.

In addition to that, they have employees working on defense activities under the Defense Production Act of 1950 and the Defense Housing and Community Facilities Act of 1951.

In addition to that they have employees working on engineering, planning, and construction of schools under Public Law 815.

All of these duties have been imposed upon this agency by law since 1947 and to take this $1,000,000 from them is going to strip them of the opportunity to do the work that we have compelled them to do by law. If you are not going to give them this money you might just as well tell them to stop work on defense housing, on college housing, on community facilities and all of these other jobs, including the job they have taken over from General Services Administration.

I suggest that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Is it not true that the former duties of the Administrator, Mr. Woods, which formerly came under this office, have now been transferred from here over to the emergency agency, and is it not also true, as brought out in the hearings, that all school construction and funds for those employees are transfer items of reimbursement from the Federal Security Agency?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, every transfer of duties carried with it a transfer of the employees doing the work. This agency cannot do the job that they are required to do by law and by the various reorganization plans that have been adopted if we cut this appropriation any further.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there have been some misstatements made here with reference to this office, unintentionally, of course, but let me try to clarify the record.

In the first place, this office has been cut perhaps the heaviest of any agency in the budget. It has been cut dollarwise 26 percent.

Think about that, 26 percent.

Now my good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], seeks to add 20 to 21 percent on top of that. And, figure how much that will be. Forty-seven percent.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. FORD. Even with the cut which the subcommittee made, is it not true that they will get more than they received last year?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, and I will try to explain that to the gentleman.

I am just as anxious to save dollars as anybody in this House, and we have shown it throughout this bill. What did the Congress say to Mr. Foley? You passed a law last September and you said, "The Administrator shall do this and nobody else has a right to act to the tune, before you get through with it, plus what is in this year's budget that has yet to come over as a supplemental, of $500,000,000." On what? On war housing. Nobody can do that work except Mr. Foley, under the law you passed. Now, for $500,000,000 more do you not have to give him additional money than he had last year to administer it? What more has this Congress done? This Congress says that the Administrator, namely, Mr. Foley, shall handle how much more in addition to the $500,000,000? $1,500,000,000 more. For what? For slum clearance. Nobody has a word to say about that except the Administrator. That is $1,500,000,000. And how do you arrive at that $1,500,000,000? You Members of this House voted a Treasury authorization of $1,000,000,000—and you are not going to get a vote on it any more—for slum clearance, but it has got to be administered by Mr. Foley. He has got to say yes before that $1,000,000,000 ever gets out of the Treasury. Is that all? Now, you voted $500,000,000 more for slum clearance, making a total of $1,500,000,000, and nobody can say anything except Mr. Foley, the one that we have already cut 26 percent. That is in the form of a grant. Of course, he has to come to the Congress to get that. That is one time we did not divest ourselves of all jurisdiction for the next 40 years.

In addition to those things, what other duties does he have? He becomes a coordinator. But these duties I have mentioned to the tune of $2,000,000,000 are specifically placed upon him by this Congress. And under the reorganization plan he is the coordinator of what? FHA, Home Loan National Bank Board and Public Housing. Not only that, he is the coordinator of Fannie May, Alaska Housing, and the Congress put another duty on him about 3 years ago and gave it to nobody except him, and that is, you told him that he has got to head up a research program for housing, and I think you gave him almost the sky that he could spend. But, the Committee on Appropriations has cut him down and down and down anywhere from 25 to 50 percent over the last year and a half.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. It is true, is it not, that he is the administrator of this university housing?

Mr. THOMAS. I am glad my distinguished friend mentioned that. The Congress again put it on him to administer the building program as far as housing is concerned at universities.

Now, I will say to my very distinguished friend, does he not think that this committee has treated him pretty roughly anyway with that 26 percent cut we put on him?

Mr. FORD. I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas that you are still, under your figure, giving him $600,000 more than he had last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 99, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Annual contributions: For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U. S. C. 1410), $29,880,000: *Provided*, That except for payments required on contracts entered into prior to April 18, 1940, no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment to any public housing agency for expenditure in connection with any low-rent housing project, unless the public housing agency shall have adopted regulations prohibiting as a tenant of any such project by rental or occupancy any person other than a citizen of the United States, but such prohibition shall not be applicable in the case of a family of any serviceman or the family of any veteran who has been discharged (other than dishonorably) from, or the family of any serviceman who died in, the Armed Forces of the United States within 4 years prior to the date of application for admission to such housing: *Provided further*, That all expenditures of this appropriation shall be subject to audit and final settlement by the Comptroller General of the United States under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of 25,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 25,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Public Housing Administration shall not, after the date of approval of this act, authorize the construction of any projects initiated before or after March 1, 1949, in any locality in which such projects have been or may hereafter be rejected by the governing body of the locality or by public vote, unless such projects have been subsequently approved by the same procedure through which such rejection was expressed.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 24, line 11, after the words *"Provided further"*, strike out the remainder of line 11 and all lines thereafter through the word "Congress" in line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provisions of the Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of 50,000 dwelling units."

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, this is the public-housing amendment. Everybody knows what is in it. Can we get a unanimous-consent agreement to limit all debate on public housing to 30 minutes?

Mr. JAVITS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Thirty-five minutes?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, this is the most important and the largest item in controversy in this bill. Many of us have not had an opportunity to talk about it at all. As one Member of the House, I should like to discuss this subject for 5 minutes. I wonder if the chairman would not agree to go along with the debate a little while and see if we cannot wind it up pretty soon. Would the gentleman mind holding up his request a little bit, until we see how the debate goes?

Mr. THOMAS. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, many have told me I am a brave man for proposing this amendment to the House today. I am inclined to agree with their viewpoint, yet I am sustained by the belief that the 25,000 units that have been authorized by our subcommittee are almost an empty gesture compared to the needs of the entire Nation, and I shall proceed.

When the Housing Act of 1949 was passed, just three short years ago, we provided for the construction of 810,000 low-cost public housing units, 135,000 units to be constructed each year for 6 years. The first year's allotment of 135,000 has not even been constructed as yet. As of January 4 of this year there had been built only 10,516 of such units. With the 50,000 units that were authorized last year and with the 50,000 units which I hope will be authorized this year, by the end of fiscal 1953 only 90,000 of the so-called low-cost public housing units will have been constructed.

To my mind, this is indeed a sad story. There have been so many road blocks that have been put in the path of this program, obstacles that should never have been placed there. We should not equivocate any longer. We should permit this program to proceed.

The argument has been made that the low-income housing program is socialistic, that matters of this type should be left exclusively to private enterprise, as my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts stated a few moments ago. But if private enterprise is not willing to undertake such a housing program; if private enterprise is unable to undertake a program of this type, then these people would say that a program of this type should not be undertaken at all. They say it is not for the Federal Government to go ahead or for its appropriations to be used for this purpose. I would like to tell you a story, an incident which will always remain in my memory and which impressed me very much. I first came to the Congress, 3 years ago, I was appointed to the Committee on Appropriations. My first meeting was one in which an appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority was involved. I remember the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman GORE, arguing in favor of the Johnson steam plant for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I remember a Member from the State of Michigan asking Congressman GORE to yield, and asking him, "Congressman GORE, why should I vote for this appropriation? It will not benefit the people in my district." And I recall Congressman GORE's reply, "You should vote for this appropriation because this appropriation will benefit the people of the State of Tennessee. It will improve their standard of living, it will improve their purchasing power. As a result the people of Tennessee will be able to purchase the automobiles and tractors you make in Detroit, the lead paint you make in St. Joseph, and the apples that are grown throughout the lower part of your State." This was a statesmanlike answer. This is the way these problems should be approached, and we from the cities have supported programs to help rural people. We in the cities know that we prosper when the agricultural people of this country prosper, because the health and prosperity of the people of this Nation is indivisible. When one group or area is unhealthy, just as an infected toe will be felt throughout the entire body, so will an unhealthy, unhappy, or unprosperous area in this Nation be felt throughout the body politic. Should the Government build housing? Should it intervene when there is a recognized public need?

We know that during the depression, our Government had to intervene in order to prevent complete catastrophe in our economic system. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was created to place the credit of the United States behind many corporations which were threatened with complete collapse for themselves and for their millions of investors. The integrity of the Government was used to restore public confidence in savings institutions which were faced with closing. The building industry was induced to overcome its timidity and to enter upon construction of homes when the credit of the Government was placed behind their activity through FHA. In other instances, such as the Rural Electrification, loans by the Government were granted in order that our people be given an opportunity to have the benefits and necessities of life brought within their grasp. These steps are considered to be perfectly proper because they were necessary; they had to be taken. We have learned through realistic progress in this democracy that the Government belongs to all the people of this country, and that its use for public purposes is not always to be condemned. I believe firmly in the capitalistic system, and in private enterprise. This is a nation, based on private enterprise, and that is as it should be. Private enterprise should be given every opportunity in the many fields of economic endeavor to provide the public with its wants and necessities. But if private enterprise is unwilling—if private enterprise is unable to serve an obvious need of the people, as it has in this case where they cannot enter the field of low-cost public housing because it is unprofitable, does that mean that the needs of the people who need the housing must be forgotten and that the Government should not be permitted to intervene? I do not believe so. I do not think the great majority of our people believe so.

We in the cities have our problems, just as do the people in the rural areas. We are desperately short of housing. We have thousands of people who are doomed to live in rat-infested, unhealthy and unsanitary slums because they do not have the means to escape to the sunlight. For them the only hope is that a benevolent government will give consideration of their plight and permit them to raise their children in a decent place to live.

The argument will be raised, too, that this program costs too much. My very able chairman—and I have the greatest respect and admiration for him; there is no more capable person in this House; I have sat beside him on the Appropriations Committee, and I have been tremendously impressed with the manner in which he dealt with the numerous agencies that appeared before us; I do not think anybody in this House could have done a more capable job—my chairman will point out the cost of the public-housing program. He will tell you that this program will cost something like $336,000,000 a year for 40 years. This is a large sum; there is no escaping that fact. But less than 3 years ago, in this very House, we considered the question as to whether or not there should be appropriated for this program the sum of $16,000,000,000. I read through the debates on the Housing Act last night thoroughly. There was no subterfuge in that debate. There was no concealment of the fact that this program would cost a lot of money. The opponents of the program pointed out the cost and the proponents of the program pointed it out. It was a factor, an issue, very much before the House. And at that time we decided it was the right

of every American in this country, regardless of his economic condition, to have a decent place to live in which to bring up his children.

Based upon our experience under the 1937 public-housing program, it has been proven that this program will not cost $336,000,000 for 40 years. It would not cost as much as 80 percent of it. True, this, too, is a large program; but, nevertheless, the fact remains that this is a program that has already been authorized and approved by the Congress and should be allowed to go ahead.

Two other important factors must be taken into consideration in this question of cost. Our slums, our blighted areas, are enormously expensive to the taxpayers. Think of what you are pouring into the slums and into the blighted areas of the country today through your local, State, and Federal Governments, and through welfare and charitable organizations. Billions of dollars in the form of fire and police protection to protect against crime, juvenile delinquency, and against broken homes, disease, and hospitals. Although slums and blighted housing make up only 20 percent of our city residential areas, they are the breeding place for 45 percent of the major crimes; 55 percent of the juvenile delinquency; 55 percent of the arrests; 60 percent of tuberculosis; 50 percent of all diseases; 35 percent of fires, and 45 percent of city-service costs.

Moreover, these slums return only 6 percent of our real-estate tax revenues.

Let me call your attention to this fact, too: we are subsidizing the slums and continuing them through our old-age assistance programs. We spend approximately $1,500,000,000 a year in State and Federal programs to help our underprivileged people through old-age assistance. Twenty percent of this cost is for rent and is paid for slum accommodation. The city of New York, aware of the problem, is taking constructive steps to correct this evil. It is using funds for public housing to construct homes for our older people who cannot afford to have homes of their own.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to give sympathetic consideration to the needs of the people in our cities today and to vote for my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the entire subdivision, public housing, close in 45 minutes.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to know how much time that will give those who are going to talk on this particular section; in order to know, we should see how many wish to speak on it.

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to reserve the last 5 minutes to the committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I understand another amendment is to be offered. That will make two amendments and will require considerably more time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I amend my request to 60 minutes, the last 10 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, one gentleman has just spoken for 10 minutes, in fact, 11. Another gentleman is going to offer a substitute to decrease. It seems to me in all fairness that he should have an equal amount of time.

Mr. THOMAS. I will make it an hour and 10 minutes, then, Mr. Chairman. That will put everybody on all fours.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. May I offer an amendment to the effect that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], who will offer the reducing amendment, be given 10 minutes of that time?

Mr. THOMAS. I included that in my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraphs of the bill pertaining to public housing, the so-called public-housing section, close in 1 hour and 10 minutes, 10 minutes of the time to be reserved to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] for the purpose of offering an amendment, the last 10 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

It there objection?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make it in the form of a motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot include reservations in a motion.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the public-housing section and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does that permit the gentleman from Texas to have his 10 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. That would not permit the gentleman from Texas to have time specifically allotted to him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask for a division.

The Committee divided; and there were—ayes 89, noes 25.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENSEN. During this 1 hour and 10 minutes will it be possible to introduce other amendments that have not up to this time been introduced?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; at the proper time other amendments may be offered during the course of the 1 hour and 10 minutes.

If there is no objection, the Chair will divide the time equally among those who were on their feet. Is there objection to that arrangement?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to see the gentleman from Texas have 10 minutes. I will be glad to yield the time allotted to me to him.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCUDDER. Would those having amendments be permitted to offer their amendments so that discussion may be had on them?

The CHAIRMAN. At the proper time amendments may be submitted.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment pending now?

The CHAIRMAN. There is.

Mr. FORD. There will be another amendment to the public housing section offered. Having agreed to an hour and 10 minutes debate on this section, will the vote on the pending amendment and the anticipated amendment come at the conclusion of the 1 hour and 10 minutes or will the question be put on one or more of the amendments prior to that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will endeavor to put the question on the amendments as rapidly as the Chair can. As long as Members, whose names have been read to the Chair, insist upon being heard on amendments, the Chair will hear them before putting the question on the amendments. The Chair will endeavor to bring about a vote on amendments that may be offered to this particular subject matter as rapidly as he can.

This will give each gentleman two and a half minutes, unless there is objection to that arrangement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the form of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 24, strike out line 11, all the language down to and including the word "Congress" in line 25 and insert the following: *"Provided further,* That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949 (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of 5,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration in respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 5,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress."

(Mr. PICKETT, Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi, Mr. POAGE, Mr. COLMER, and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. FISHER.)

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Since points of order have been waived under the rule, does that apply also to amendments that may be offered?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in the future as well as at present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has had an opportunity to read and to analyze the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. The gentleman's amendment is identical with the language in the bill on page 24, beginning with line 11 through the word "Congress" in line 25, except for the figures in lines 16 and 22, where the gentleman's amendment would strike the words "twenty-five" in each instance and insert "five." That, to the Chair, is a perfecting amendment, and under the rules it is entirely possible for this procedure to be followed. The section of the bill to which the amendment is offered is legislation which has been permitted to remain by waiver of points of order. Such legislative provisions can be perfected by germane amendments which add no further legislation. The amendment before us is germane and adds no further legislation. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered would reduce by 20,000 the total number of new public-housing units which could begin during the next fiscal year. If this cutback could be made permanent, as I shall demonstrate to the committee, if time will permit, the saving to the American taxpayers will total about $348,400,000. That is for the 1-year allocation referred to, and this does not include administrative costs that could result in some savings.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is to be commended for reducing the request for the new construction from seventy-five thousand down to twenty-five thousand, the seventy-five thousand having been requested by the President. But, in my judgment Congress should, by all means, reduce this figure even more, and the amendment which I have offered would cut it to five thousand.

This five thousand is for the purpose of easing any hardships that might develop from any outstanding commitments that may have been made. Mr. Chairman, during this emergency it is imperative that we concentrate on housing for defense purposes in critical defense areas. A defense housing program is now under way. The committee very properly took that into account in the public housing that was recommended. The justification for that will have to be determined when the issue comes up.

The committee, on page 13 of its report, says:

> Funds have already been appropriated under recently enacted legislation which will permit the initiation of construction of housing in certain defense areas and the President's budget for 1953 indicates that authorization will be requested for an additional $300,000,000 for defense housing. In view of the accentuation of this type of housing and the scarcity of materials required for such construction, the committee is of the opinion that the reduction recommended by it in connection with the normal housing program is not excessive.

The identical reasoning should apply to the pending amendment to reduce the number still further.

It will be recalled that a year ago the same issue was before this Congress, this House. At that time the House by a vote of more than 2 to 1 adopted the so-called Gossett amendment whereby the total number of housing units which were to be begun during the current fiscal year was cut to 5,000. But it went over to the other body and was increased, and when the bill was finally written into law it was raised to 50,000.

Certainly the case for suspension of new construction under this act, at least until our budgetary situation is improved and until the Congress can take a fresh and exhaustive look at the whole program and where it is leading us, is not only as valid as it was a year ago, it is very much more valid today. If the average constituent of each and every Member of the House, bedeviled by inflated living costs and staggering taxes, really understood that he is the fellow who is paying this bill as a part of his tax load, can it be doubted that he would insist on laying this benevolent program aside at least until our financial skies brighten?

HIGH-PRICED HOUSING AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE

Mr. Chairman, this program is often referred to as low-cost housing. I want to point out that nothing could be further from the truth. Actually, this public-housing program is probably the highest-priced housing that has ever been undertaken in this or any other country; and I want to give you a few facts to substantiate that statement.

I think most of the Members understand the general procedure that is followed in the financing of these public-housing units. The local housing authority is created by some municipality. They then make application to the Public Housing Authority here in Washington for an allocation or reservation of units. After that is all done, a contract is signed between the Public Housing Authority in Washington and the local housing authority and the city, which enters into part of this, whereby the city waives all taxes, real or personal, for a period of 40 years on this project. The property is taken off the tax rolls from then on, and the burden of paying for all the local services for 40 years passes to the neighbors across the street and others who live in town.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot yield, but I anticipate that my friend is going to say, "Yes; but they give them something in lieu of taxes." I am reading the gentleman's mind. That is true, but I wish you could examine just how much that amounts to.

LOCAL TAX LOSSES

Do you know how much the net cost is, the net donation or subsidy by the local taxpayers to these projects, I mean after giving credit for the "in lieu of" tax allowance? Do you know what it is? I have some figures on it here, right out of the Agency itself. This is a Senate document prepared by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency and the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This is what they say:

> It is expected that the contributions made by the localities through full tax exemption less "in lieu" payments will average about 50 percent of the actual Federal contribution over the life of the project.

HIGH FEDERAL SUBSIDY

What is the present contribution by the Federal Government to these projects, the subsidy which Uncle Sam pays to them, that is, the part of the rent bill each month that the American taxpayer is required to pay for these people who live in these projects? How much is it? The hearings are very clear on that. It runs $25.34 per month per unit. That figure is found at page 1003 of the hearings. So that is all settled. We know, therefore, that for every month of the year, for every one of these units, for 40 years, Uncle Sam, the American taxpayers, contribute a total of $25.34. They contribute $25.34 per month for every housing unit built under the 1949 act in the country.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, that means for every tenant, does it not?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, that means for every tenant and for every individual unit—all of them. That is $304 per year per unit when you multiply that by 12. Now then, let us multiply a little bit by this $12 a month per unit that the local people suffer in loss of taxes. In other words, the occupants of these units stop paying their just share of local taxes and the burden is shifted to their neighbors. So how much would that amount to? Well, that is $12 per month for 12 months, which makes $144 per year per dwelling unit. The local people contribute to keep these units up, $144 per year per unit. This is in addition to the taxpayers' share of the Federal subsidy. This is not a controversial question, it is a matter of record. And $144 a year per unit for 40 years, adds up to $5,760 that the local people contribute per apartment, mind you, which is money that the public housing tenants would pay in taxes if the city were permitted to tax the project as it taxes the property across the street.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I think I can anticipate some of the gentleman's questions. I can probably enlighten the gentleman a little before yielding to him, without taking the time now.

So, the total Federal subsidy that the taxpayers have to contribute is $12,160 during the life of the project which is 40 years. That is per unit and the local contribution—the local subsidy to the same thing also paid by taxpayers is $5,760. That is a total of $18,920 per apartment, and this is on a unit which already has a high cost of about $10,000. Of course, it would be better for Uncle Sam if he were going into this kind of business to build the units for $10,000 and then give them to the tenants and get out of it. The taxpayers would save $8,920 to start with, not to mention 40 years of high Federal overhead of this hand-out agency. And they call this low-cost housing. It is the most expensive housing that anybody ever figured out in this or in any other country. It undoubtedly is the most expensive kind of housing. Mr. Chairman, the total cost, just to get it into the record, of the local contribution by the people in the town where this housing is located, per unit over the life of it, for the saving of 20,000 units that this bill would save, runs to $105,200,000 over the 40-year period. Now then the contribution that Uncle Sam pays under the subsidy from Washington amounts to $12,160 times 20,000 units, which makes a total of $243,200,000. Therefore, the total savings to the American taxpayers by this single amendment would be $348,400,000. This, of course, is a small thing as compared with the 810,000 units contemplated under the 1949 law that we are operating under—here we only have 20,000, but this example serves to emphasize how terribly expensive this operation is on just 20,000 units. I want to repeat that the total projected cost of the 20,000 runs to $348,400,000 which is what the American taxpayers will pay.

DANGERS IN ISSUANCE OF TAX-EXEMPT BONDS

And say, there is something else that I want to mention in this very limited time that I have. The public-housing bonds are sold by the local housing authority on Wall Street. These are the only fully tax-exempt bonds backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government, and which are now being issued. Holders of these bonds pay no income taxes on them. I wonder if there is any member of the Committee on Ways and Means present, with the exception of the distinguished gentleman who is now presiding over the Committee of the Whole? I know the members of that able committee can back me up in this statement:

Since 1941, it has been the policy of this country, the policy of the Treasury, and the policy of the Congress of the United States to frown upon tax-exempt bonds that are sold as revenue-bearing bonds. In fact none have been issued since 1941.

Mr. RAINS. I am sure the gentleman will not yield, but I can answer that if he wants me to.

Mr. FISHER. I think I can answer for the gentleman. If the gentleman will just be patient a little. I have a great deal of information which I would like to give to the gentleman.

Mr. RAINS. I am listening, but I am not convinced.

Mr. FISHER. I think if the gentleman will bear with me, he could find out a great deal about this.

The public-housing authorities are selling tax-exempt bonds, and of course they are very much sought after because they do not have to pay income taxes on it. They are tax free. As a matter of fact, the Public Housing Commissioner, on page 1001 of the hearings, reported that already in the fiscal year 1952 $461,805,000 have been offered. He predicted that they would continue to issue about $1,000,000,000 worth of them per year at an interest rate of 2 percent. One of the morning papers reports today that over $167,000,000 in addition to the nearly $500,000,000 mentioned by the Public Housing Commissioner, will be offered on April 1 of this year.

Mr. Chairman, I want it thoroughly understood that the people who buy these bonds pay no income tax whatever on the income from them. Some Members may not be taking this matter very seriously, but I want this committee to know that the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board—an agency of the Congress—charged with protecting the value of the American dollar, is deeply concerned.

William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, in a recent statement to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, reported:

> One important new factor in the market which is very disturbing to us at the Federal Reserve is the tax-exempt bonds which are being issued to finance public housing. Some $328,000,000 of such issues were floated in the last half of 1951—together with $45,000,000 of 6-month notes—and the market anticipates total issues for 1952 in the neighborhood of $750,000,000. Not only do such issues absorb some of the funds that would otherwise supply a market for Government bonds or for mortgages generated by new private construction, but they afforded an opportunity for wealthy individuals and corporations to reduce legally their income-tax payments in a period when it is essential that tax revenues be as large as possible. The issuance of these bonds at this time has been of special concern to the Federal Reserve since the Voluntary Credit Restraint Program Committee, organized under the Defense Production Act, has been exerting strenuous efforts to keep down the volume of such tax-exempt securities otherwise originated.

Mr. Chairman, 2 percent interest may sound low to some of the Members, and you may wonder why the big financial houses are buying these bonds, and why well-to-do individuals would buy them. I have here a table put out by one of the most reputable financial houses in the country, Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane, of New York City. This table shows that a 2 percent yield on a tax-exempt bond is the equivalent of a yield of 13.33 percent on a taxable bond held by an individual in the $80,000 to $90,000 individual income tax bracket.

The same 2 percent tax-exempt bond is shown to yield 4.17 percent to a corporation in an income tax bracket of more than $25,000. So, is it any wonder that some of the veterans are unable to get a home loan at 4 percent? A bank is only a trustee for its depositors and of course would more prudently lend on a bond with no servicing charges and an equivalent yield of 4.17 percent, backed by the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

Here, Mr. Chairman, is a ready-made loophole, ever expanding, and at a time when I know this Congress is very properly concerned over the inequities brought about by tax loopholes. And yet you cannot escape the fact that if you vote against my amendment you are voting to perpetuate and expand this very serious condition. Do you want to take that responsibility when this Government is already facing a ten to fifteen billion dollar deficit? Do you want to put the tax-exempt public housing bonds in competition with the United States Treasury in its efforts to borrow money to cover these deficits and to refund the savings bonds now coming due? If every dollar of the savings bonds are not refunded when they are due and are presented, and if the Treasury cannot raise enough money to cover that deficit, what do you think might happen to the value of the American dollar and to the faith of the people in their Government? We know the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board is concerned about this; are you?

WHERE WILL THIS PROGRAM LEAD?

Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the Members to pause and give thought to some of the deeper implications of public housing. Here we are, with the Congress fighting corruption in every way it can. And at the same time I can show you that this program is a veritable breeding ground for corruption. We do not have to go to the enemies of this program. Listen to what some of the friends of this movement have to say about it. Charles Abrams, a former consultant to the United States Housing Authority and ardent supporter of public housing, wrote in the New York Post of January 19, 1949, among other things:

> The politician who dominates the housing authority controls the city's political destiny.

Speaking of the projects in New York City, Mr. Abrams went on to write:

> Within a few years the families in housing projects will be nearly 10 percent of the city's total, and the investment of the Authority will exceed $2,000,000,000, with all this means in construction contracts, patronage, and other rewards for the worthy.
>
> Selection of sites enables carving out blocks where hostile voters are numerous and then retenanting the projects with those who vote "right," while tenant relocation on vacant areas could change a whole neighborhood's political complexion overnight.

I want to point out that Mr. Abrams was speaking of New York City, but there should be no question that the dangers he points out are inherent in the whole program. Details may vary but the tendencies will be the same, simply because human nature is what it is.

Langdon Post, a former chairman of New York City Housing Authority, and later a regional director for the San Francisco region of the Federal Public Housing Authority, made this state-

ment in his book, The Challenge of Housing:

Until 1938, there was no money to be made in public housing and little political preferment to be gained by its espousal. Now the picture is different.

In a housing program there are land to be bought, houses to be built, and tenants to be selected. Each step holds great possibilities for the politician and the businessman. • • • The inhabitants of the slums are tumbling over themselves to get into the developments, which means that there will not only be the usual jobs for those in control to give out, but apartments as well.

This last plum is a new brand of political fruit which has enormous possibilities for exploitation. Imagine the golden opportunities latent in a $500,000,000 housing program in New York City. Commissions, profits, fees, jobs, and finally, apartments for at least 200,000 voters. It is a bonanza beyond the wildest dreams of the most optimistic politician.

These two gentlemen sincerely believe in public housing. But I believe these candid statements should be a warning to every American interested in stopping corruption and keeping the institution of personal liberty alive.

Now some may say that the present program of 810,000 units is not very much. To these I want to point out that the 810,000 is considered by one of the top public housing officials to be only the beginning. Warren J. Vinton, First Assistant Commissioner of the Public Housing Administration, said in a speech in Cleveland, Ohio, less than 3 months after the 1949 act was passed October 11, 1949:

What we do in the next 5 or 6 years will show what can be done in future years. The work which we now start must be continued for decades before our goals are fully accomplished.

I know some friends of this movement say that we can have a little bit of public housing and stop it before it gets out of hand. Surely this is not the view, however, of the CIO union which is a prime backer of the whole plan. John W. Edelman, speaking for the CIO when the 1949 act was before our own House Banking and Currency Committee, stated:

Although we are strongly of the opinion that the number of units of public housing called for in this bill should be increased substantially, we are prepared to endorse the attenuated proposal so as to demonstrate that CIO can be as modest and conservative as the next man. Seriously, however, our belief is that once this program is well under way it will develop sufficient political momentum of its own so that the Congress will automatically in the future increase and extend this authorization to whatever extent may be necessary.

THE POLITICAL ASPECT

I wonder if this House has forgotten that after the Congress first became acquainted with public housing, it refused for 10 years to expand the program. Some people may think that the 1949 act was finally passed because it would accomplish some of the high-sounding sales talk used by its supporters, like helping the needy and downtrodden, doing away with divorce, disease, delinquency, and so on. But I want to quote you the statement of an expert of why the bill was passed. The same Mr. Vinton, in his Cleveland talk, said:

The Housing Act of 1949 was adopted because the supporters of this legislation had achieved an effective political organization through the cooperation of such divergent groups as the United States Conference of Mayors and the American Municipal Association, labor organizations, civic associations, women's organizations, minority groups, and religious bodies of all faiths and denominations. If the planners are to have the power and dignity to which their profession is entitled, they, too, will have to get out into the hurly-burly of real life, amass power, and accept responsibility.

In spite of all this political pressure to which Mr. Vinton referred, in which the public housers got a lot of admittedly sincere and well-intentioned folks to endorse this program, in my opinion, unwittingly, I want to remind the House that the 1949 act, as far as the public-housing feature was concerned, was defeated in the Committee of the Whole and restored in the House by a margin of only five votes. Mr. Chairman, a change of only three votes, and the 1949 public-housing program would have failed in this House. I was one of those who foresaw the socialistic danger in this undertaking, and voted against the act in 1949. I have voted against every appropriation to expand it since that time. I did this in spite of the fact that great claims of good were made for this program, because I know that regardless of the claims the results are bound to be against the long-range interest of the American people and their free institutions.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence to back up our worst fears is trickling in. In a local election in Miami, Fla., for example, the manager of the Edison Courts Public Housing project literally ordered the tenants to vote yes on the ballot to expand public housing in a city-wide election. Here is the actual letter:

EDISON COURTS MANAGEMENT OFFICE,
June 26, 1950.

SPECIAL BULLETIN

To All Tenants of Edison Courts:

Tomorrow, June 27, is voting day. Tomorrow we either win or lose more public housing in Miami. If you appreciate what public housing did for you (and is still doing) when you needed housing so badly, then go to the polls tomorrow, Tuesday, the 27th, and vote "Yes."

Every tenant in this project will be expected to vote "Yes" tomorrow. The polls are open from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., located in Edison High School Auditorium, Northwest Second Avenue and Sixty-first Street.

If you need transportation contact our office.

V. M. KIMBREW,
Housing Manager.

On another occasion in Kern County, Calif., the executive director of the housing authority actually recommended that every employee of the Federal and local authorities put in up to 5 percent of their salaries for seven pay days to fight against a proposed amendment to the constitution of that State in the 1950 general election.

There are other examples which I could cite, but these will serve to illustrate the point I am making—that public housing tends to become here as it has in other countries which have experienced it, wide-open politics.

I have been supplied with a partial list of the results of action in local referendums and city council votes directly on the public-housing issue. These data are as follows:

Grand Rapids, Mich., July 20, 1949: 10,678 to 6,874.
St. Petersburg, Fla., November 19, 1949: 3,876 to 3,300.
Seattle, Wash., March 14, 1950: 57,732 to 33,529.
Yakima, Wash., March 14, 1950: 7,168 to 1,098.
Racine, Wis., April 4, 1950: 12,312 to 2,339.
Lubbock, Tex., April 4, 1950: 4,045 to 3,944.
South Haven, Mich., April 25, 1950: 613 to 603.
Portland, Oreg., May 19, 1950: 62,478 to 53,327.
Astoria, Oreg., May 19, 1950.
Rapid City, S. Dak.
Houston, Tex., July 21, 1950: 35,141 to 22,060.
Raymondville, Tex.
Pine Bluff, Ark., August 29, 1950: 1,165 to 1,061.
Flint, Mich., September 12, 1950: 16,937 to 10,596.
Tucson, Ariz., September 26, 1950: 6,403 to 1,213.
La Crosse, Wis.
Madison, Wis., November 7, 1950: 16,063 to 13,483.
Kenosha, Wis., November 7, 1950: 12,294 to 10,631.
Tyler, Tex., April 3, 1951: Approximately 3 to 1.
St. Joseph, Mo., August 21, 1951: 9,288 to 4,987.
Jamestown, N. Y., September 29, 1951: 2,176 to 1,909.
East Orange, N. J., November 6, 1951: 7,144 to 5,655.
Clifton, N. J., November 1951: 3,828 to 2,475.
Briston, Conn., November 26, 1951: 3,017 to 1,772.
Southington, Conn., November 26, 1951: 71 to 42.

The following cities are reported to have defeated public housing through action by their city councils: Tucson, Ariz.; Winslow, Ariz.; Yuma, Ariz.; Berkeley, Calif.; Redmond, Calif.; San Jose, Calif.; San Luis Obispo, Calif.; San Mateo, Calif.; Visalia, Calif.; Cordele, Ga.; Moline, Ill.; Rockford, Ill.; Sterling, Ill.; South Bend, Ind.; Portland, Maine; Fitchburg, Mass.; Ecorse, Mich.; Jackson, Mich.; Kalamazoo, Mich.; Monroe, Mich.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Reno, Nev.; Montclair, N. J.; Nutley, N. J.; Summit, N. J.; Niagara Falls, N. Y.; Dunn, N. C.; Sunbury, Pa.; Amarillo, Tex.; Kilgore, Tex.; Palestine, Tex.; Pasco, Wash.

In addition to these cities, I am informed that the great city of Los Angeles, Calif., has recently rejected a huge public-housing project by action of its city council, and submitted the matter to a city-wide referendum in June. The Federal public-housing people have forced a $12,000,000 suit against the city but Los Angeles is sticking to its guns. In another fine city in the great Middle West, Indianapolis, Ind., the city council in the last few days, according to the press, has rescinded action it had formerly taken and disapproved a big project for that city.

Even the local housing authorities in Allentown, Pa., and Breckenridge, in my

own State of Texas, have voted down public housing in their areas. As a further indication of public feeling, the legislature in Texas and the legislature of Nebraska have recently passed laws requiring a vote of the local citizens before public housing can be put in their towns. The citizens of California have adopted an amendment to their State constitution making it mandatory that the local voters have a chance to pass on the matter before any public housing can come in.

Mr. Chairman, the American people are catching on to what public housing really is. I hope the Members will consider the facts that are being brought out on the floor, and will show the same wise judgment that is being exhibited by these cities across the country.

My amendment is at least a step in the right direction. The Congress must regain control over the spending of the taxpayers' hard-won earnings. We may have to regain this control a step at a time. The least we can do is to take this step, and take it now. The American people are looking to the Congress. It is up to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to explain to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] that the Chair was advised the gentleman had 12½ minutes. The gentleman has consumed 12½ minutes, when in fact the gentleman was entitled to 15 minutes. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT], all had yielded their time to him. The Chair had overlooked that when the Chair recognized the gentleman for 12½ minutes. The gentleman is recognized for two and one-half additional minutes if he cares to use it.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the remaining 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to yield my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, my constituency is greatly perturbed over the proposal to limit the number of low-rent public housing units to 25,000 during the coming fiscal year. In the face of new threats to cripple the public-housing program and emasculate the Federal Housing Act of 1949, I am again entering my plea to permit the densely populated cities of our country to implement the slum-clearance program which they have been striving for during these postwar years. There does not appear to be any justification for prolonging the delay in providing low-rent housing for our low-income families, many of whom are veterans of both world wars. Most of the large cities of the country have already completed their plans for proceeding with the erection of public-housing developments in accordance with the previously designated number of units. In Philadelphia construction is about to get under way for the construction of 4,149 new low-rent dwellings. Any downward adjustment in this figure would result in the scuttling of the plans toward which much time and large sums of money have already been spent.

In view of last year's reduction to a ceiling of 50,000 units, I believe it is even more imperative to authorize the 75,000 units for fiscal year 1953 as recommended by the President, and even this figure is a far cry from the original intent of providing 135,000 units per year. The special interests have already succeeded in retarding our public-housing program and the promises of privately constructed low-rent houses have yet to be fulfilled.

There has been no cessation in the number of appeals made to me to assist destitute persons in obtaining housing accommodations to meet their meager budgets. Aged persons living on pensions, veterans' families who have been compelled to share their parents' homes, and others who cannot afford present-day rental on their fixed incomes call on me from time to time to assist them in finding apartments or houses. Their plea is for a home, apartment, or house, where they will not be compelled to live in unhealthily overcrowded conditions, or sleep on floors, and so that the sick will have the privacy of a bedroom for recuperation. It has just been impossible for them to find the housing they need and which they can afford.

Although there have been some objections to certain sites selected for public housing projects, such as the Wilson Park site in Philadelphia, these same persons thoroughly understand the need of Federal assistance in providing low-rent housing and urge the enactment of legislation providing the necessary funds. Persons who have expressed resentment at having public housing projects erected contiguous to their personally owned private homes have assured me that they are keenly interested in the Federal Government aiding less fortunate persons in obtaining adequate housing.

I hope that the House will amend the independent offices appropriation bill, 1953, to include 75,000 low-rent housing units for construction during fiscal year 1953.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this is the second time in 2 years we have been treated to an effort to re-argue the fundamental policy which dictated the passage of the Housing Act of 1949. I would like to emphasize that that act was passed with votes on both sides of the aisle and that there were over 20 votes on the Republican side of the aisle to pass it or it would never have been law.

I think, in all fairness, the people who argue in the fashion we have just heard from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER], have to demonstrate that there is reason for changing the fundamental philosophy and the fundamental policy which induced the Congress first to pass this law. I respectfully submit that an appropriation bill is not the place or the way to do it.

One must be forced to conclude that those who oppose this fundamental policy are carrying on a battle which they started in 1949, and which they do not feel they can win in any other way except under the guise of economy, which is so popular these days.

It is understandable why they should be seeking a popular excuse for an effort to eliminate the low rent publicly aided housing program, for their argument today is worse than it was last year. Last year we were just going into the defense mobilization. We were tightening up all along the line—even then we ended up by allowing 50,000 units. This year, on March 5, we have just been presented with order M–100 on housing construction of the National Production Authority. This order liberalized the amount of materials available for housing construction materially increasing the amount of steel made available per housing unit.

I ask a majority of the House whether it is fair to say that everybody else can have more housing, but that this is exactly the time to cut in half what was done on public housing in the last fiscal year for those of really low income. That is exactly what is attempted by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

All that my colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES] is doing is going back to what we did last year, 50,000 units. It would be more equitable to have moved it up to 75,000 units, in view of the fact that the NPA now says there is more material available for all housing. The fundamental basis for this program which has absolute validity today is that we are trying to equalize the housing available to the people of the United States, regardless of income. About 10 percent a year was figured to be what we ought to make available to our people whose income is so under par that they cannot attain decent private housing. Ten percent of the units to be started next year would be 80,000 and not 50,000—as the testimony before the subcommittee shows 800,000 housing starts are expected next year. I submit, therefore, it is restraint, not profligacy, which induces those of us who stand for this program to support the 50,000-unit amendment for the next fiscal year.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, one of the great tragedies in American life is the inability of deserving people to

have a home. The story becomes more tragic when one hears it from the lips of the veteran, who has served his country, and, returning home, finds he is unable to have a home of his own. The action of this committee in limiting the construction of public housing to 25,000 units for this fiscal year is certainly unwise, but, when the House attempts to further reduce the number of units to 5,000, it, in effect, makes a mockery of the legislation passed in the Eighty-first Congress.

My colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER] and myself worked assiduously during the Eighty-first Congress, and, when the Housing Act was passed providing for 810,000 units over a period of 5 years, we felt that our efforts were rewarded. Now, by one act we find that that salutary legislation has become almost a nullity. I plead with the Members of this House, from all sections of the country, to recognize the housing problem which we have in our big cities.

When the ravages of flood struck the areas in the West, quickly the men and women of the big cities gave every legislative assistance that was possible.

America is no longer made up of 48 different economies—it is one national economy; and, what hurts us in the big cities, has its effect in the rural areas. By the same token, anything that will assist the people of the farm districts is, in fact, a benefit to those in the big cities. I urge you, therefore, to set aside all partisanship and sectionalism, and adopt the Yates amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FINE] is recognized.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINE. Mr. Chairman, I am vehemently opposed to the reduction in our public housing program as recommended by the House Appropriations Committee. The committee bases its action upon the scarcity of materials required for construction and therefore concludes that the reduction is not excessive. It fails to take into account the vital need for these housing units.

Mr. Chairman, it appears that in reducing the number of units from 75,000 to 25,000 the committee would compel thousands of low-income families with small children to continue to live in the disease- and filth-infested dwellings from which we have been striving to liberate them for nearly a decade. Yes; I am opposed to the reduction because of my deep concern and interest in the families in the low-income brackets, upon whom the blow will fall most heavily.

What will such a reduction mean to my own city of New York—to its citizens in every county in the city? It will mean a delay of four-fifths of the federally aided public housing construction program for the coming year, reducing the scheduled start of 10,581 apartments to little more than 2,000 projects in my own county of the Bronx as well as in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and Queens, all densely populated areas inhabited to a great extent by low-income families. It will hold down planning, site acquisition and slum clearance at the rate of 2,000 apartments each year, with the result that the last project in the presently authorized program reservation of 24,000 apartments could not be planned for 12 years. Delays in building the proposed middle-income projects under title I of the United States Housing Act of 1949 would be certain since new public-housing projects are part of the plan for relocating the site residents. Further, unemployment in the building trades, already serious, would increase. Low income veterans, who have lived since their return to civilian life in squalid quarters awaiting a chance to rent a decent home, will meet again with frustration. Since the National Production Authority exercises control to relate housing construction to national defense, any program providing less than 75,000 units for the country is completely unrealistic. We have just been informed that the authority has now made available sufficient material for the 75,000 units.

In my opinion the committee has been short-sighted in its zeal for economy. Decent housing makes for better citizens. Money spent for this purpose is money well spent. The mayor of the great city of New York has, in a telegram to the Members of the New York delegation, requested our assistance in obtaining restoration of the appropriation for the 75,000 units on the ground that the proposed cut-back on public housing would impose serious hardships on the people of the city of New York.

The debate today on this important subject matter reveals a sad situation. A concerted effort is being made by Members of Congress from outside the cities to scuttle the entire public-housing program, only because the big cities are involved. This is regrettable. I wish to point out to this bloc that the people of our cities are also entitled to live properly and well. I trust that this attempt will be completely thwarted.

I urge your consideration of the serious consequences of the committee proposal and ask you to join me in giving assistance to the mayor's request at least to the end that the amendment calling for the restoration of 50,000 units be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out just one thing: I have in my district a title I project, that is a slum clearance project by private industry made possible by the contributions of the New York City and Federal Government under title I of the act. I find, however, that you cannot clear a slum and put in a title I project even with the contributions from the city and the Federal Government unless you also have a public housing project alongside of it, because you displace too many people who do not have enough money to go into the title I project.

If you cut out this public housing—and that is what you are really trying to do here, when you start cutting it to 5,000 units, or even if you left it at 25,000 you are making it impossible for private industry under title I to try to do its share of slum clearance.

I am going to read into the RECORD a telegram I have received from the mayor of New York City and also one from Louis Hollander, president, and Harold J. Garno, secretary-treasurer, of the New York State CIO.

The matter referred to follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 18, 1952.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

If the proposed cut-back on public housing in the independent offices appropriation bill now before the House of Representatives is adopted, it would impose serious hardships on the people of New York City. It would delay four-fifths of the federally aided public housing construction program for the coming year, reducing the scheduled start of 10,581 apartments to little more than 2,000. Projects in the Bronx, Manhattan, Brooklyn and Queens would be affected. It would hold down planning, site acquisition and clearance to the rate of 1½ projects, 2,000 apartments, each year, with the result that the last project in the presently authorized program reservation of 24,000 apartments could not be planned for 12 years. Delays in building the proposed middle income projects under title I of the United States Housing Act of 1949 would be certain since new public housing projects are a part of the plan for relocating the site residents. Unemployment in the building trades, already serious, would increase. Low income veterans who have lived since their return to civilian life in squalid quarters awaiting a chance to rent a decent home would meet again with frustration. Since the National Production Authority exercises controls to relate housing construction to national defense, any program smaller than 75,000 apartments for the country is completely unrealistic. I urge your consideration of the serious consequences of the appropriations committee proposal.

VINCENT R. IMPELLITTERI,
Mayor of the City of New York.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 19, 1952.*

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, Jr.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Proposals now under consideration to limit public housing program to 25,000 units annually threaten to perpetuate housing crisis and sabotage American standards of decency. Terms of proposed rider to appropriation bill H. R. 7072 would be shameful sacrifice of urgent needs of people to demands of real estate interests. On behalf New York State CIO call upon you to actively work to obtain provision for at least 125,000 units nationally with adequate appropriation for effective administration of program. This legislation vitally important to people of State. Urge you make every effort to be on hand until settled.

LOUIS HOLLANDER,
President,
HAROLD J. GARNO,
Secretary-Treasurer, New York State CIO.

As a Representative of a city district I have continually preached to my people that we must help support the farm and rural areas of this country, because we can be prosperous only if the whole country is prosperous; but the day is coming, Mr. Chairman, when my people will not listen to that any more and

they will misunderstand if I continue to support the farm programs.

I hope that the people who are opposed to public housing take a national viewpoint of this problem and realize that we in the cities have a major and serious housing problem and we must do something about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I am also from a city, but I am against it; I am even for striking out the 5,000 units. I think that probably the most misrepresented legislation we passed was this so-called slum clearance and public housing. In my particular area, and I speak about my particular area, they had so-called public housing but they did not have any slum clearance and we have a section of the city where they could make a great improvement. But what did they do? They went out to one of the best residential areas where we have what they call the rolling hills, where the higher priced homes are located. They condemned that land and want to put in a public housing project there where the people who live in it positively will need two cars in the garage if the wife is to get away at all, because the man will have to drive to work anyway. The only people who will live there will be those who live right politically. It is the worst political racket ever devised. When a majority of the duly elected city council voted against public housing, the Federal Government tried to cram the housing project down the city's throat and compel them to go ahead.

In my opinion you should wipe the whole thing out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to the amendment or to the substitute?

Mr. GWINN. It is an amendment to the Housing act.

The CHAIRMAN. But not to either of the pending amendments?

Mr. GWINN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order at the moment. The gentleman will be recognized later to offer his amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the cut in public-housing units under this bill as recommended by the committee will deny thousands of families in low incomes to enjoy the American privilege of normal living. The Yates amendment will aid greatly to relieve the deplorable housing shortage in industrial areas. I notice the same influences are fighting this public-housing provision that have fought legislation to aid the low-income group to own their homes for the last 15 years.

In the industrial Calumet region of Indiana we still have the spectacle of thousands of families living in trailer camps and slum areas. These home conditions have been proven localities which breed crime and Communists. The cost of public housing is the best investment our country can make to further the American way of life. I only wish that all Members of Congress could visit the congested industrial areas of this country and observe how our defense workers are compelled to raise their children. Communist agitators thrive on the people who live in slum areas—trailer and so-called tourist camps. We are spending billions to fight communism. Let us spend a few millions to curtail and prevent its indoctrination into the minds of people who live in subnormal conditions.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I am from the city of New York, but I assure you that the city of New York needs public housing only as much as the rest of the country does.

My distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER], in company with the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], has only recently visited many places outside of New York City as members of a subcommittee on housing. I wish time permitted you to hear from them the facts about slums and the need for public housing throughout the country.

What you are going to do if you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] to cut this to 5,000 units, or if you do not adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to increase it to 50,000 units, is to make worthless millions of dollars of investments of cities and States throughout the country.

I want to direct your attention to the fact there are 13 cities outside of the city of New York and outside of cities in Puerto Rico, the number of which I do not know, in 8 different States outside the State of New York in which millions of dollars have already been spent to acquire housing sites and in order to remove slums and for planning for public housing, all of which will be wasted unless you increase the number in the bill before you to 50,000 units.

Let me direct your attention also to the fact that in 43 States and in every Territory of this country there are laws which integrate the State and local law into the Public Housing Act so as to permit the building and construction of public housing. There are only five States in this country that do not have public housing projects or laws permitting them. In every one of the other 43 States you have public housing projects planned and under way which will be stopped unless you adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. Even in Texas you have such a project. I refer to Houston, Tex. I am sure if the gentleman from Texas who offered the amendment would travel just a short distance from his own district to Houston, Tex., he would see how necessary public housing projects are. As to the gentleman from California, may I say that they have there local and State laws which provide they can by referendum stop all public housing. So if they do not want public housing and the community agrees it does not want it, they will not get it. But let the rest of the country that needs it, and wants it, have it.

So far as the proposition is concerned that it is cheaper to give away the housing to the low-income earner, that is a fallacy. You were told that these units cost originally $10,000, and an additional $8,000 to maintain them over the 40 years. The people who are permitted to move into them do not remain there for any 40 years, or even 10 years. In many instances they move out after several years because the law provides that only the lowest income groups may occupy this public housing and when their income gets above a certain point, they are moved out and another family who cannot afford to pay for rental housing at the market price is moved in.

I tell you that you are making a very serious mistake if you do not go along with this project, at least to the limited extent of 50,000 units per year. We have heard the cry since 1937 that this is socialism and communism. But we started this program for the first time in 1937 and no Socialists and no Communists have taken over the Government yet nor will they.

If you want to do the right thing by your constituents, if you want to do the right thing by those people who cannot help themselves, if you want to eliminate delinquency and crime among the low-income groups, give them a decent place in which to live, give them a place where they can bring up their children in some sort of decent fashion, so that they may realize the ambition of every American to attain the standard of living that we recognize as the very minimum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL]

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentlemen from New York who just preceded me. I come from one of those families that originally lived on the Atlantic coast but decided to go West. The gentlemen from New York say that New York needs public housing at the taxpayers' expense, at a greater expense even than giving it away would involve. They go on to say that we all need it. I say, looking at it from the standpoint of the West, none of us need it. I propose in my bill H. R. 6302 that we sell everything that this Government has ever built that competes with private industry except the battleship *Missouri* and the Panama Canal. I say what this country needs is more mayors in New York City with courage enough to tell the people there what the truth is instead of telling Washington to put a suction pump on the rest of the country. That is what New York City needs, instead of talking out of one side of their mouths about not having special classes of citizenship and then coming to Con-

gress and telling us that we must set up a special class of citizens to have housing below the cost of production at the expense of the other people of the United States making perhaps less income. We are to set up within all of our communities a group of people who think that all they have to do is vote to get everything that everybody else in that community has accumulated by reason of thrifty Christian family life. I say, let us kill every public housing project we can now. If we agree on public funds for slum clearance, let us definitely provide for local control, where the local people can look at it and be proud of it or do away with it if they have reason not to be proud of it. Arrogant powers exercised from 3,000 miles away, is not Americanism.

Sound Government policy never said one thing when nature said another. Mr. Chairman, nature tells its creatures to erect and control their own abodes.

(Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. SMITH of Virginia.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me as a member of this subcommittee that we may be missing the point at stake here this afternoon. I agree with many who have spoken that in 1949 this Congress engaged on a program that will long be a monument to Government inefficiency and an example of the many contributing to special privileges for the few. But the point at stake here this afternoon is not so much the merits of public housing as whether or not we want to recapture for the Congress of the United States some control over the purse strings of this Government. When people say that the Committee on Appropriations ought not to be attempting to legislate, they forget that every year it is the Committee on Appropriations that feels the first impact of this situation. Each year we on the Appropriations Committee are reminded once more that in 1949 we said to a bureaucrat downtown: "You can bypass the Congress. You can put your hand into the Federal Treasury. You can spend money for 40 long years and Congress has absolutely no control over you. The Committee on Appropriations must fall in line like obedient and submissive children and give you everything you demand."

The language we have inserted in this bill is more important than whether we permit 5,000 units or 25,000 units or 50,000 units. The important thing is that we here provide that the Congress shall regain some control over this expensive program. Korea has happened since that surrender of the prerogatives of Congress took place. No one knows what may happen next year. All we are asking is that this House send us into a committee of conference to say, "We want to recapture for the Congress of the United States the dignity, the power, and the control that the people's representatives must have to preserve the Republic."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. RAINS).

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I do not set myself up as a champion of public housing. I merely feel that the position of the committee in this instance is certainly not an unreasonable one. I address my remarks to support of the committee's position.

I simply say this in plain English, that if you really want to kill it, why does not somebody offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, and really wipe it out? It would be more consistent.

When I came to Congress about 8 years ago I took the place on the Committee on Banking and Currency of a distinguished and esteemed southern Democrat from Alabama by the name of Henry Steagall. If you will go back in your minds, you will remember that he was the author of the first public-housing bill that came through this Congress. I have remembered a good many times through the years that I have been here that another distinguished American, by the name of BOB TAFT, of Ohio, has supported public housing. It is difficult for me to believe that this type of housing is socialism if those two great Americans sponsored and supported it.

Since I have been in Congress I have been a member of two housing committees and have traveled this Nation over to look at housing. I have looked at slums and shotgun houses in cities and towns all over this Nation.

I believe in private enterprise. I think that if private enterprise could remove the shacks, which are absolutely dangerous to the health of a community, they should do it. If they cannot, is it better for the State and the Federal Government to support these people in the poorhouses, as we know them in the South, and to keep them on the old age pension rolls? Or shall we let the low-income people freeze and starve to death? In your district or in any place in America, the situation is the same.

It is easy to say, "I am for private enterprise." So am I. I have about as good a record for that as anybody else. But I listened to the gentleman from California say that we ought to sell everything except the battleship *Missouri* and the Panama Canal. Some of my friends would agree with him on this. Would you sell the TVA? Would you gentleman from the South sell the TVA? Would you sell to private enterprise the great public lands we have?

Let us be careful about making rash statements. It is easy to oppose something, but let us have a basis for it.

Now may I turn for a moment to the remarks of my good friend, the gentleman from Texas. He said it was known as low-cost housing. I never heard it called low-cost housing and I have been studying it for a long time. I have heard it called low-income housing. Nobody pretends that it is low-cost housing because it certainly is not. Last year you set up a committee sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, my colleague on the Committee on Banking and Currency [Mr. WOLCOTT], a man for whom I have very great admiration. He said that he wanted a certain subcommittee to look into the defective housing of Veterans' Administration and FHA-insured loans in this country. With three distinguished Republicans and three of my colleagues from the Democratic side, we have been looking into it. That is private enterprise. I wish you could see some of the houses around Hackensack, N. J., and Bayshore, Long Island. Ask those veterans what kind of housing they have. They are nothing but the slums of tomorrow. And when they wind up in the slums, and the man is a veteran, and is in the low-income group and is unable to work, what will we do with him—put him in the poorhouse? So my friends, there is another side to this problem.

I would like to say this to my friends from the South in all sincerity—ordinarily we get the bad end of the stick, but in this particular program 60 percent of all the projects which have been approved and built are in the South. But, we only got 35 percent of the units. Not only is that true, but many of the people in this Congress are greatly concerned about our southern colored people; so are we. So I say that the greater portion of these projects that go to the South, that you are voting against, are aimed and intended for them. But look at the heart of the great cities in the South, and throughout the Nation, at the vast acres of shacks and shotgun houses, as we call them. Look and see who lives in them—low-income people. Do you know that 65 percent of all the money expended in the South for police and fire protection goes to these slum sections? Did you know that over 60 percent of all the money expended in this country for health and sanitation problems—public-health problems—is caused by slums? Do you further know that if we had the chance to clean up those sections in the cities of the country, you cannot carry through a slum clearance program unless you have some public housing in which to put them—you cannot tear down their houses and put them on the ground. So while I did not ask for this time, I merely wanted to interrogate my friend from Texas about two or three statements that he made. I do say this simply and sincerely, that this program was founded back in the days of 1939 by stalwart southern Democrats. Then here all of a sudden we decide that there is to be not only a curtailment of it, for which I am willing because the tax burden is heavy now even for the most essential things—no, we must go beyond what the committee did and by one fell swoop wipe it all out.

I am convinced that if you strike it out completely, and that is what I would rather see you do as to cut it to 5,000, if you strike it out completely, the people of America in every section of this country of ours are going to want to

know why it is that we have money for every other thing except the people who are so unfortunate as to not have the money with which to pay for decent housing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Yates amendment.

In 1949, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] pointed out, this whole issue was fought out and it was finally decided that because of the tremendous number of houses in this country that were obsolete—over 9,000,000 nonfarm residences are now considered substandard, because of the relatively limited number of homes built from 1930 to 1940, because of the tremendous increase in population from 1930 to 1950, the United States should build for a period of the next 10 years, 1,350,000 homes a year. We decided, therefore, that we should build each year 135,0000 public-housing units. For every 10 private-housing units that were built, we would build 1 public unit. Because of the limited number of private homes to be built during 1952—it is estimated they will be between 700,000 and 800,000—it was decided to cut the program for public housing to 50,000. Next year we will probably build eight or nine hundred thousand private-housing units.

In Massachusetts, and I assume the conditions are the same all over the country, there are 10 or 12 or 15 veterans applying for each of these public-housing units. What can they do if those units are not built? They can only do one of two things: Either they can get substandard housing, because the only housing that will be available to them for the price they can afford to pay is substandard, or they can live as they were living from 1945 to 1950, divided up, husband and wife separated. In other words, these public-housing units are going to veterans who cannot afford to pay for adequate private housing. If there are 10 or 12 or 15 veterans applying for each public-housing unit now, what will happen if this program is cut to 25,000? Our population is increasing tremendously and there will be men coming back from the Korean war, who will not have the income to permit them to buy private housing. Their only alternative is to buy third- or fourth-rate private housing, substandard private housing, or to move into public-housing units. I therefore feel if we are going to build eight or nine hundred thousand private-housing units next year 50,000 public-housing units will not be too much, particularly as it is spread through the entire country. The Government of the United States has a clear-cut obligation to assist these families. This program of public housing is essential. I hope the Yates amendment increasing the number of units from 25,000, as provided in this bill to 50,000, will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

I wholeheartedly support his amendment. I want to quote for a minute from a newsletter which I published on July 16, 1951:

HOW TO BUILD A SOCIALIST STATE

Racing, as we are, down the road to socialism, I strongly feel that certain figures I have just been furnished on public and private housing starts ought to be given the widest possible publicity.

From January 1951 through June, there were 575,300 housing units started in this country; 60,500 of these were public-housing units. From January 1950 through June of last year, 750,700 housing units were begun, but only 9,200 of them were public in nature, which means that public housing has increased 600 percent since last year.

With hundreds of private buildings stopped midway in construction by the pyramiding Government regulations coming out of Washington, it seems to me that private builders and the general American public ought to be pretty hot under the collar over the starting of 42,300 public units in the month of June alone. The rest of the shameful record of last June shows a 4,000 percent increase in public housing starts over the same month of last year.

Mr. Chairman, if there is ever a time for the socialization of our economy it is not during a time of great international emergency. This program, as the gentleman from Chicago, my friend, Mr. YATES, stated, is a slum-clearance program. Now, mind you, we are in debt more than $260,000,000,000, and the tax bill next year is going to be more than it was this year. We have just passed an appropriation bill in this House including an item for $6,200,000,000 to pay interest on that debt. The Members who are for economy had better get busy and practice what they preach.

Private enterprise is able, willing and anxious to build all the housing there are materials available for.

Let us stop the march toward socialism and preserve our form of government before it is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to burden you with further facts because my colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], and others who have spoken in favor of his amendment have made it clear that these homes for the underprivileged are necessary.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and those who represent rural areas apparently do not know about, nor do they appreciate, the deplorable housing situation confronting the wage earners in our metropolitan, manufacturing, and industrial areas. It is the hard-working wage earner in these manufacturing and industrial districts that produce the wealth of this country.

This same gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and those of his colleagues from the oil-producing States say nothing about the vast benefits derived by the huge oil corporations under the depletion provisions of our tax laws, millions upon millions of profits which should accrue to all the people if the tax laws were properly amended. They shout to high heaven and plead with us not to wreck their local economies by recouping these ill-gotten millions to the Federal Treasury and thus relieving the hue and cry about economy when we authorize housing programs such as this for our struggling workers. There is enough money taken each year by these oil barons through this one loophole to pay for all the housing needed for the real producers in our land, yet the powerful oil lobby has prevented through their friends in this body to thwart such action. Again, when my friends from the South come before the Congress with their pleas for subsidies for their peanut and cotton growers—with their wails about the suffering and hardship their constituents are undergoing, they are usually joined by most of the Republicans and are successful in securing everything they ask for. It comes with very poor grace for them to oppose the pleadings of our wage earners and their families in this critical hour for the one God-given right to decent shelter for their families and themselves, in the face of all the benefits and assistance Congress has extended their constituents, as outlined heretofore.

For whom do these gentlemen really speak? I wonder if it is for the apartment-house owners in the metropolitan areas, who, due to the shortage of shelter that exists are mulcting tenants most shamefully? I wonder if they have in mind the powerful real estate and private contractors' lobby, now attempting to hold up these unfortunate workers with homes far beyond their means to carry?

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and some of my Republican friends pointed out the great cost of these homes. If they had not voted against public housing when it was originally proposed, and the program had been initiated then when construction costs were one-half of what they are today, the entire program would have been completed and there would not be a shortage of homes today.

I have been here in this body for 46 years, and during that long period I have voted at all times, whether it was for the North, South, East, or West, for all improvements that were necessary. I voted for billions in agriculture appropriation bills, appropriations for mining projects, for research and development beneficial to big business, and other bills whether they were for the North or South, the East or West. I never asked a single thing for my district, as you know. But I ask today and plead with you for consideration for the hundreds of thousands of unfortunate people in these metropolitan areas who cannot obtain decent housing and places to live. In Texas, of course, and other rural sections where we have given every aid to the farmers they have built beautiful, expensive homes, and are not affected by this legislation, but in the large centers of population and in the manufacturing districts there is a great shortage of just ordinary shelter for these workers and their families. I have received telegrams from many organizations, civic, labor, charitable, and community, from officials of cities and coun-

ties, urging and pleading with me to be here in Washington today to beseech you to vote down this proposal to so drastically slash the housing program. I call your attention particularly to the two telegrams inserted below:

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 19, 1952.*
Representative ADOLPH SABATH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Housing situation in Chicago and Nation desperate. Limitation of 25,000 starts would be disastrous. We urge your militant opposition to this rider on housing appropriation bill H. R. 7072. Also urge your attendance in Washington through Friday on this measure.

MICHAEL MANN,
Executive Secretary, Chicago Industrial Union Council.

CHICAGO, ILL., *March 19, 1952.*
Hon. A. J. SABATH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We urge that you vigorously oppose the limitation of 25,000 units per year in rider to independent offices appropriation bill H. R. 7072. Over 125,000 units urgently needed had been scheduled for construction in various States this year. We ask your support to raise the number of units to 125,000, with adequate administrative appropriations.

MAURICE F. MCELLIGOTT,
Secretary-Treasurer, Illinois State Industrial Union Council, CIO.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much misrepresentation of the true facts surrounding the proposal of the Appropriations Committee to legislate a reduction in the number of new public housing units to be constructed in fiscal 1953 under this bill. The statement was made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] before my committee on Tuesday that this proposal would save $560 million during the coming year. This statement also appears on page 3, line 5, of the report. There is no basis whatever in fact for this assertion. The only actual saving in this abortive attempt to deny the low-income group adequate housing during the coming year will result from the reduced administrative costs of the operation of the Public Housing Agency, and that will amount to about $1,500,000, mostly through a reduction in the staff. The $560,000,000 figure they refer to has been pulled out of a hat by the magicians who, through sleight of hand, attempt to mislead the membership and the public generally into believing that so many dollars will be saved the taxpayers. They fail to disclose to the unsuspecting that all of the funds advanced for this construction is returned to the Treasury of the United States except the very small percentage of administrative cost and an annual contribution to reduce interest and amortization charges.

This same group fails also, designedly or otherwise, to give you the true picture of the desperate need for this public housing throughout the country, not only in the metropolitan areas, but in the smaller towns as well. In my home city of Chicago the need for low-cost housing has become more acute by the month. The influx of families and workers from the South has strained beyond the limit the demand for shelter. The great share of these workers are engaged in defense work, and unless adequate housing is provided for these families, serious consequences could result. I find that the present program under public housing calls for the construction of over 24,000 units in the State of Illinois, with almost 20,000 of these in Chicago, under the projected program from July 1, 1952, on. In the Nation as a whole there are 203,000 units contemplated for this same projected period, under the over-all program provided for by the Housing Act of 1949. Construction will have been completed at the end of this fiscal year of 140,000 units under the act, with only 4,600 of these in the State of Illinois and of these only 1,300 in Chicago, where housing is so urgently needed. From these figures it will be seen that the great city of Chicago will be called upon to bear far more than its share of any curtailment, and this in the face of a need that is probably greater than in any other community.

Much has also been made of the fact that this Congress authorized a defense-housing program which is supposed to take care of housing for workers in the new defense plants located in outlying areas. I believe the figure used by the proponents of these public-housing curtailments ran into several billions, and the fact that this had been authorized was used to appear as though it was all to be expended in fiscal 1953, which is absolutely absurd. The truth is that since we authorized the defense-housing program, the surface has hardly been scraped for the first few foundations for this shelter. The savings myth is so theoretical it amazes me to find any Member brazenly attempting to prey upon the gullibility of other Members of this great body, attempting to convince them of these fantastic and illusory claims of savings and economy.

A further claim they make is that private housing is meeting the demands of the low-income group for shelter. This, too, is as far-fetched and unfounded as their other claims mentioned previously. As a matter of fact there is a virtual strike on as far as private low-income housing is concerned. This strike has been initiated by the mortgage bankers who have rebelled at the 4-percent interest rate in effect; they are holding out for 4½ percent, and as a result private construction in this field is virtually at a standstill. It has become so serious that Senator MAYBANK recently announced that unless the log-jam on private construction is broken he will move for a much more broadened public-housing program, in view of the very urgent need for low- and middle-income projects.

Any extensive program such as that embodied in the Public Housing Act of 1949 must be planned in advance. A great deal of time and money has been spent to set up the advance program. The need today, and for the next fiscal year, has far exceeded the basic estimates employed in the formulation of the 1949 act. All this present abortive move of the Appropriations Committee accomplishes is to throw this program into utter chaos administratively, and to deny to thousands upon thousands of anxious families the fruition of their hopes and dreams for a decent house in which to live and rear their children. As an example of what this proposal does, let me impress upon you the fact that the 25,000 units it limits new construction to is just about the number of units planned for one community—my city of Chicago in the over-all program. From this you can see the blight it will throw on the country generally. Far from making any of the savings its proponents mention, it will only actually save the $1,900,000 in administrative costs while creating chaos and dismay in virtually every section of our great land. Our workers are entitled to more decent treatment than this. They represent the true and fundamental strength of our Nation; they are the real producers of our defense needs. They should not be required to live in squalor, their children denied the very ordinary comforts that make for good citizenship, thrown into the breeding spots of crime, in the name and under the guise of this sort of economy. As for me, I want no part of that kind of economy. I believe this is a cruel and vicious procedure against a great number of our very worthy and deserving citizens and their families. They have no real-estate lobbies, no contractors' lobbies, no highly paid lawyers to represent them when these vital matters come before us. They must depend solely upon us, as individual representatives of their interests, to fully protect them in these vital matters. I trust that each and all of you will probe your consciences to see whether this unfair, certainly unlegislative procedure to strike down a program which we, ourselves, so recently gave our assent to, should be thrown out the window in these critical times, in this unholy manner. I call upon you to vote down this un-American proposal.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Yates amendment and I hope it will pass because I feel you Members owe something to those of us who have consistently supported beneficial legislation for your constituents at all times.

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to yield the time assigned to him to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is part of a fight that has been going on ever since Congress started socialized housing in 1949. Some people have argued that this is important because it will give somebody a house. Many have argued, and quite rightly, that it is bad to do this thing because it will cost a lot of money, at a time when the Government is operating at a deficit, and I am in thorough accord with that.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the most important thing to consider on this question is where is your country going? Are we going to stop the trend to socialism or are we going on to the bitter end of the road that led the United Kingdom to socialism? I know that some of my friends are going to disagree with me about whether this thing is socialism or not. We can all

have our own opinion on that. Some will say that this is not socialism. Let us all be willing this afternoon to stand up and be counted on this thing, and then let the people of America determine whether this is a socialistic program or not and let them determine whether they want to stop socialism or whether they want to go ahead to the end of the road.

Let us see what this bill does. I remember very distinctly that it came before the Rules Committee and was fought very hard there. It came before the House and it was fought hard there.

What this bill in effect does is to undertake to give to folks who do not have very good housing, at Government expense, at your people's expense, the type of a house to which they would like to become accustomed. It is estimated, I believe, and properly so, that this will subsidize the rent on these houses to the tune of $25 a month. Maybe I am not a good student of socialism, but I think I know something about Americanism. When I came to Congress I thought I knew something about the Constitution of the United States, but the way the public-welfare clause of the Constitution has been abused by this and preceding Congresses since I have been here is something that leaves one in great doubt as to whether the language of our Constitution means anything.

How can anybody justify under the Constitution or under common sense or under any other principle that is known to the American people that we shall take $25 a month out of Joe Doak's pocket because he has worked hard and has earned something—take that $25 a month and put it into Bill Jones' pocket in order that he may pay his rent? I would like to hear someone answer that proposition during the course of this debate. What justification on earth is there under the Constitution or under any principle of fairness and justice for the Congress of the United States to take money out of the pocket of one class of citizens and put it into the pockets of another class of citizens?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not at this time. It is true and the gentleman knows it is true. So what is the use of his arguing with me about it? We very seldom agree. My esteemed chairman says he has been here for 46 years. We all love him, I am devoted to him, I fight with him every day, but I still love him. He came here during the time of the Theodore Roosevelt administration. I wonder what this Congress would have said, I wonder what the American people would have said, if the gentleman from Illinois when he first arrived here in 1906 during the term of Theodore Roosevelt had gotten up on the floor of this House and proposed any such proposition as we are now confronted with today? What would have happened? Why, at that time nobody would have ever conceived of such a thing.

Let us pursue this a little further. You take money out of Joe Doak's pocket and put it into Bill Brown's pocket. Then you build some houses. All right. Here are Jim Brown and Bill Jones living down in my town and they both would like to become accustomed to living in a better house; so they both apply for housing. Well now, you cannot give one of my constituents a house and say to the other constituent you cannot have a house. If we are going to build 5,000 houses, or if we are going to build one house and give it to Joe Doaks, and help pay his rent on it, why do we not build enough houses so that everybody can be treated fair? I do not want you to give a house to one of my constituents and tell the other, "No, we are not going to give you one." Who is going to say who is to get a house? Is Congress to say who is to get one? Oh, no. Some bureaucrat downtown will figure it all out, and they will find out how much money he makes, and then they will check and if the fellow makes an income of say, $100 a month, he can have a house, but there are not enough houses to go around. I want to know whether you can ever, in principle, under the American Constitution or the rules of fair play, deal fairly with this matter. I want to know how you can justify yourself in giving a house to one person, and deny it to the other, in similar circumstances.

Now I mention these things because I like to see this thing thought about some here. You know, I am one of those who, every time we have a bill to cut anything, votes to cut it. I am for economy and I have been working for it for years, as many of my friends know, and I am for economy in this thing. But I do not think that is so important this afternoon as these Members being willing to stand up and going on record whether you are for this type of socialism or whether you want to return to the Constitution of the United States, and stand firmly on those principles.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to close debate on the pending amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to sustain the position of the committee.

Let me review this problem with you briefly. You all know the facts and the figures. This act was passed back in 1949 when the country was not at war. Now in addition to these 25,000 houses that the committee has recommended to the Committee of the Whole here, this Congress will be called upon before this present session expires to appropriate in the neighborhood of another $350,000,000 to $400,000,000 to build war-defense housing, housing in out-of-the-way camps where there is no housing now, and war housing to service war plants where there are no such houses available now, and the taxpayers will have to pay that bill, too. So all of that is in addition to the cost of these 25,000 units that the committee has recommended to you.

Subproviso (2), line 17, ought to be read and thoroughly understood by the Committee before it votes. That language says that the Public Housing Authority cannot contract—get those words—cannot contract to build in future years more than 25,000 houses a year without the consent of Congress. Today, gentlemen, you have lost the control of how many you can build up to 135,000 units, and we have lost absolutely the control to limit the number that the Public Housing Authority can contract to build. They can contract to build in the fiscal year 1953 the remaining 600,000, to be built in 1954, 1955, and 1956. As of today you have 15,000 completed under this program of 810,000. You have 90,000 building, and they have contracted to build 103,000 more in the years to come. That language ought to be retained regardless of what you do on the number of units.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the sustitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The question was taken; and the Chairman being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 138, noes 118.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FISHER and Mr. THOMAS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 143, noes 127.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 138, noes 111.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman I ask for tellers.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Could it be stated that a vote in favor of this amendment is a vote on the 5,000 units?

The CHAIRMAN. This is a vote on the Yates amendment as amended by the substitute offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. THOMAS and Mr. YATES to act as tellers.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. If this amendment is voted down, that leaves the committee bill in order, does it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 145, noes 121.

So the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCUDDER: On page 24, after line 6, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the Public Housing Administration shall investigate the income of the occupants of each housing unit, and the rental for each such unit shall be the rental established by law or 20 percent of the total income of the occupants thereof, whichever is the greater."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment, but I reserve it at this time.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will provide an opportunity for making available to people in the low-income brackets thousands of public-housing units that are today occupied by people who have incomes in excess of that contemplated by the law and can afford to live in private homes.

The total cost of the whole program under way or pending on February 29 this year would be at least $2,460,000,000. On this program there is a subsidy payment which the Federal Government must put up that amounts to about 3.75 percent per annum. When these units in the current program are finished, it will, therefore, cost the taxpayers about $92,000,000 a year, and over the 40-year period will cost the taxpayers of our country $3,690,000,000.

This is only a start of the program. When the entire 810,000 units are completed they will have cost the taxpayers of this country over $12,000,000,000 to service and to subsidize in this program.

There is an economic rule which has been set up and established providing for the segregation of income, such as housing, food, clothing and so forth. A rule has been established that between 20 and 25 percent of one's income can be allocated for housing.

Under my amendment it is provided that 20 percent of the income of the occupants of housing units must be paid to the housing authority, which will mean that those in the high brackets will be able to rent on the outside more cheaply than they can afford to live in a public-housing unit. So this will make available many thousands of units which are now being occupied by people who can well afford to live in private houses and will make available for the people you are endeavoring to help in this housing program many units for their use.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Chairman, there is in the authority a proviso for setting the amount of rentals that are paid. In other words, there is a provision for between $1,500 and $2,400 for two people, which carries a certain rental charge. Then there is provision for three or more, four or more, and so forth. There is a difference in the rentals that are charged in those various brackets.

This amendment will not interfere with that, but does provide that these occupants in the aggregate will have to pay at least 20 percent of their income as rental.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from California has offered an amendment, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] makes a point of order.

The Chair has had an opportunity to examine the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, and is of the opinion that the amendment proposes to add new conditions regarding determination of rentals of public housing thus altering existing law. The amendment also would impose additional duties not required by existing law upon housing officials.

It is the opinion of the Chair, therefore, that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 25, line 10, strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$7,000,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GWINN: Page 25, line 8, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That no part of any appropriation contained in this section shall be used to pay annual contributions on any housing unit of a project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which is occupied by a person who is a member of an organization designated as subversive by the Attorney General."

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, yes, it is true that when this House passed socialized housing it was passed by a very narrow margin of 3 or 4 votes. It was sold to this House on the theory that it was a Federal obligation; that the people must look to Washington as the center of mercy and goodness and other people's money to house another group too poor to house themselves.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my friend from New York that he was nice enough to submit that amendment to the committee a while ago, and the committee has had a few minutes to look it over. We are going to accept it, if we may, with your permission and the permission of the House, with the reservation that when we get more opportunity to study it, and it shows that there is any defect in it that the gentleman who offers it does not realize, we reserve the right to attempt to throw it out in conference. But as the matter stands now, with that reservation we are delighted to go along with the gentleman.

Mr. GWINN. I thank the gentleman.

Since the disastrous American adventure in socialized housing we have had 5 years' experience with it. Private enterprise was held responsible for the development of slums and disease. Now we find instead of clearing up the slums and disease as promised, public housing has developed worse slums and diseases of the Socialists and Communists themselves living in the very heart and center of the American housing projects. Everywhere the staff of the Un-American Activities Committee has been able to examine, there they are.

This Congress stands in the position of compelling one group of our citizens to provide a living for the Communist elements in our midst at half rent with no municipal taxes. They organize the tenants. Sometimes they vote the tenants 100 percent for the party that builds the houses. They threaten the tenants that if they fail or refuse to vote their living space will be taken away from them. So we have allocation of living space right here in most of our big cities NKVD American plan. Besides the patronage and political corruption of the voters makes a political bonanza of compulsory voting for the party in power unlike any dreamed of before.

A few examples follow:

[From the Detroit Free Press of March 4, 1952]

Thirty-day eviction notices were sent to William Allan, of 17092 Belton, Herman Gardens, and Gustave Jurist, of 5643 Conner, Stone Homes.

Allan, Michigan correspondent for the Daily Worker, Communist Party newspaper, is an admitted member of the party. He and his wife have three children.

Jurist, named by a House committee witness as a member of the west side section of the Communist Party, is president of the Detroit Public Housing Tenant's Council.

* * * * *

On February 20, common council adopted a resolution calling for the eviction of Allan and any other known Communists from city housing projects.

The DHC approved the resolution, but at that time was not sure it had legal grounds for action.

Allan said he was going to fight the case.

He declared there was "danger" to all residents of projects who "can be discriminated against for whatever reason city officials care to choose."

"It seems to me," Allan said, "that the Housing Commission has many more grave problems than finding ways of evicting people who mind their own business and pay their rent."

* * * * *

As president of the tenants' council, Jurist led a recent fight against increasing veterans' rents by 20 percent.

According to the Pittsburgh Press of April 2, 1950, the Red tag was pinned on Toni Nuss, named by two FBI men as a Communist, but she could not be moved out of the public housing project where she lived because "officials of the Pittsburgh Housing Authority made it clear the Communist charges will not affect Mrs. Nuss' tenancy in the Arlington Heights project. The housing authorities"—of Pittsburgh—"said it has no rule under which a Communist may be evicted or barred from a project."

Mr. Chairman, my amendment gives the housing authority the power to do so. It requires the authority to evict Communists if the authority wants to collect subsidies from the general taxpayer.

According to the same article a man named Mamula, 40, managed the public housing project in Arlington Heights. He was identified by FBI undercover agents as a Communist leader and branded by the Attorney General as disloyal. He became publicity director of the Wallace organization for the Presidency. Examples can be cited without end.

The Massachusetts Association of Housing Authorities in March of 1947 wrote to Senator TOBEY pointing out that they had "sad experience with the administrative policies of those who were in charge of housing and who possessed

ideologies foreign sometimes to our American way of life."

Here is a copy of a clipping from the New York Daily Mirror which charges that thousands of pro-Communist workers have infiltrated into the public housing projects in New York City:

THOUSANDS OF PRO-REDS LIVE IN HOUSING PROJECTS

(By William Henderson)

While thousands of veterans and their families are still living in inadequate, substandard so-called emergency quonset-hut housing projects in outlying city districts, thousands of Communist party liners are occupying eminently desirable apartments in huge new developments constructed with Government funds, it was disclosed yesterday.

A Mirror survey revealed that a hard core of American Labor Party members, unswervingly devoted to the Moscow-dictated line, has infiltrated virtually every one of the 50-odd housing projects under jurisdiction of the New York City Housing Authority, and is busily engaged in stirring up dissension, discontent and political bias in them.

Admitting that the Authority is unable to take adequate measures to weed out the politically disaffected and outright subversive elements from the many thousand applicants seeking apartments in city projects, a spokesman for the body explained that regulations forbid screening on the basis of political affiliation.

CAN'T QUIZ TENANTS

Under the existing contracts for receiving State and Federal funds for the erection of low-cost housing units, the Authority is forbidden to ask questions that would disclose whether pospective tenants are members of the Communist Party or of its thinly disguished offspring, the ALP.

"Once admitted to the projects, the only cause for eviction of even an avowed, active Communist is nonpayment of rent, destruction of property, or willful violation of lease obligations," the spokesman said.

A favorite device of these Red-led, low-cost housing tenants to foment trouble for their own political and propaganda purposes is the immediate formation of tenant leagues, under various titles, to attack Authority policies and practices worked out from long experience for the common good.

The two projects most heavily occupied by Red party liners are the developments smack in the heart of former Representative Marcantonio's bailiwick. These are the East River Houses, One Hundred and Second Street and First Avenue, and the James Weldon Johnson Houses, One Hundred and Twelfth Street and Park Avenue.

According to the records of the board of elections, registration for the 1950 elections at the East River Houses disclosed 387 ALPers, 134 Republicans, and 648 Democrats. Yet, in the congressional race between Marcantonio and coalition candidate James Donovan, the ALP candidate received 607 votes from the project residents, a clear indication of the underground tactics of the ALPers in concealing their affiliation by registering under another party label.

"UNDERGROUND" VOTE

Registration figures at the Johnson project showed 221 ALPers, 379 Democrats, and 19 Republicans. Here again, there was evidence of "underground" voting with Marcantonio receiving 317 votes on the ALP line.

Registration figures of residents of several other large housing projects under city management also showed sizable groups of ALP constituents, as follows:

Vladeck Houses, Madison and Gouverneur Streets, 85.

Lillian Wald Houses, East Houston Street and Roosevelt Drive, 139.

Abraham Lincoln Houses, One Hundred and Thirty-second Street and Fifth Avenue, 54.

Fort Greene Houses, Myrtle Avenue, Brooklyn, 158.

Williamsburg Houses, Leonard Street, Brooklyn, 169.

Queensbridge Houses, Bridge Plaza and Vernon Avenue, Queens, 154.

Mr. Chairman, as the Members know, the House Expenditures Committee discovered serious Communist infiltration in the public-housing projects in San Diego, Calif., in 1948—see pages 6 and 7 of House Report 2351.

Mr. Chairman, it should be no wonder that the Communist are building cells in these public-housing projects across the country since public housing is one of the principles of the constitution of Soviet Russia. We find here in article 6 among other things "bulk of the dwelling houses in the city and industrial areas are state projects."

The Veterans of Foreign Wars in their last convention, in 1951, petitioned the Congress to bar members of the subversive organizations from occupying public-housing units—VFW Resolution 404.

Gentlemen of the House, is it not obvious that socialized housing or any other socialized area of our economy will by the very nature of things be managed and directed by Socialists and Communists? They spread the propaganda in every city and on the floor of this House to the effect that private enterprise will not or cannot build houses for the poor as they should; that they are too selfish and greedy; that only the Government is unselfish. The truth now appears. These various Socialists and Communists, infiltrated in the public-housing departments and in the rent-control department, refuse deliberately, cynically, with evil design to raise the rents so that little rental housing operators and builders cannot build houses or even improve or repair rental housing for the poor. The result is that we have 3,000,000 less rental housing units than we had when rent control started in 1940.

At the same time another branch of the Government refuses to grant building permits and allocate building materials to private builders of houses. They are willing and anxious to build houses; they are absolutely restrained. Their throats are cut by the Socialists and Communists. It is done arbitrarily, whimsically, irresponsibly so that a case may be made out for socialized housing.

For every unit of socialized housing built at least three to four houses ready to be built by private enterprise are lost to the community. As public housing advances with its terrific cost, waste, and corruption, and voting of the people under compulsion, private enterprise must make way at an accelerating rate. It is not only deprived of materials, credits, and rents necessary to support building, it is deprived of confidence in its own Government necessary to make plans for the future.

Since we started to socialize housing and stopped private building of houses, as all socialism must stop private enterprise, we have observed not only what happens at home but abroad as well. France socialized housing and rents 33 years ago. Her slums have increased ever since. Her building of houses for rent has almost completely dried up. In Vienna the evidence is perfectly clear. Socialists and Communists in charge of the government occupied the great block upon block of Englehoffs and Marxhoffs. When Hitler came with his legions he knew where the Socialist and Communist Party members were and in the night turned his artillery upon the public-housing projects and destroyed the Socialists and Communists. Why should they expose themselves unnecessarily by concentrating in our public housing in America?

Mr. Chairman, I hope we will not hear a single dissenting voice to this amendment which will stop forcing the American taxpayer to subsidize the Communist movement in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to announce to the House that immediately after the Committee rises the resolution from the Committee on House Administration in relation to the Katyn special committee will come up. I say this so that Members will remain in the Chamber. Ordinarily when a motion that the Committee rise is made it means the end of the legislative business of the day, but it is vitally important that this other matter be taken up tonight, because if the resolution is adopted, some of the members and staff of the committee concerned will have to leave for Europe tomorrow afternoon or tomorrow evening.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Following out what the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, I understand there is some opposition to this resolution, and that it is quite possible there will be a roll call on it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I further inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. May I first give the program for the remainder of the week, and then I will answer the inquiry about next week?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Let us first find out what is going to happen tonight. How much further are we going to run in considering this appropriation bill?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that just as soon as the gentleman from Massachusetts has finished stating the program I shall move that the Committee rise.

Mr. McCORMACK. Tomorrow after the termination of the consideration of this bill there will be in order the bill H. R. 4323, reported unanimously out of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. A rule has been reported out on that bill.

There is another bill relating to the same subject matter, the Post Office Department, reported out of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, but no rule has been reported on it. If there are no serious objections to the bill H. R. 4323, and none are expected—however, no one can tell about that, and my information is that there is no opposition to the bill—then an effort might be made to bring the other bill up by unanimous consent. I assume my friend from Massachusetts has been consulted about that, and if not, he will be. The bill H. R. 4323, however, I am programing for tomorrow after the pending appropriation bill is disposed of.

We are going to be under pressure the next 2 or 3 weeks to get appropriation bills out of the way. The Members are of course well aware that the leadership on both sides are very anxious to give the Members the usual Easter recess, starting the Thursday preceding Easter Sunday and extending until a week thereafter, that is, from April 10 to April 21. The chances now appear to be about 99 out of 100 that we will be able to have this recess. That is the reason I want to get these bills out of the way as quickly as possible.

We have a number of appropriation bills coming up, together with other legislation, that we want to pass or have the House consider by the time of the recess, and we might meet early some days in order to accomplish that.

The program for next week is as follows: Monday is District Day. There are two District bills to be considered, H. R. 15, relating to business corporations, and the bill H. R. 6635, which exempts from taxation certain property of the AMVETS and American Veterans of World War II.

Also to be considered on Monday are four bills out of the Committee on Armed Services: H. R. 6787, to extend the Rubber Act of 1948; H. R. 6336, relating to research facilities of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; H. R. 4511, dealing with the transfer of the Hawaiian Naval Air Station; and H. R. 5012, amending the Navy ration statute, my impression is to permit the use of oleomargarine in the Navy.

It is understood that if all these bills cannot be acted on, those not acted on will be displaced, and the following program will be in order for the remainder of the week, from Tuesday through Saturday.

On Tuesday we will start the consideration of the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill of 1953. Following that will be the Interior appropriation bill of 1953. Then the bill H. R. 5678, relating to the immigration and naturalization code, and H. R. 3098, concerning the jurisdiction of Federal courts. That is the $10,000 damage jurisdiction bill which was on the program for last week but was displaced because I later found that a promise had been made by a member of the Committee on Rules that reports could be filed by members who favored the bill and those who opposed it. I understand now those reports have been filed.

Any further program will be announced later, the usual reservation, and, of course, conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. One of our colleagues inquired as to whether we are going to come in early tomorrow morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. On that I am guided by the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill, and he thinks it would be a good thing. When the Committee rises, and we are in the House, I shall ask unanimous consent to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the full Committee on Appropriations is supposed to have a meeting tomorrow morning at 10:30 to report out the Interior Department appropriation bill, and there will not be time to do that if the House meets at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 556) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That further expenses of conducting the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 390, Eighty-second Congress, as amended by House Resolution 539, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the select committee created by such House Resolution 390, not to exceed $100,000, in addition to the unexpended balance of any sums heretofore made available for conducting such investigations and studies, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the select committee, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers authorized by the select committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to inquire of the gentleman regarding the division of time. I understand that 1 hour is set aside for debate on this. Would the minority have any time?

The SPEAKER. The time is entirely in the control of the gentleman from Virginia, and he may yield or not yield to anyone during the next hour.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], it is hoped that very little time will be used on this resolution, and I shall be glad to yield to him a little later.

Mr. Speaker, I am in the most unusual position of reporting from the Committee on House Administration a resolution which I do not favor and have consistently opposed in the committee. I opposed the authorizing resolution on the floor last week and I am still in the same frame of mind.

This is a resolution (H. Res. 556) to provide funds to continue the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre that occurred on another continent more than a decade ago. It provides money to extend the investigation into Europe with some of our Members going abroad—leaving tomorrow.

Since I am chairman of the committee that considers all such requests for funds, I should like it clearly known here that I am not opposed to congressional investigations in general. As a matter of fact, I am today prepared to report to the House two such bills that I heartily favor. One is to provide funds for further investigation of the waste in defense procurement, and the other is to continue the work of the Un-American Activities Committee. I think it is decidedly within the jurisdiction of the legislative branch of our Government to survey the operations of the executive branch and see that it carries out the mandates of the Congress. We are charged with appraising the execution of the laws we pass. I believe in the investigative function, and some investigations have proved entirely worth while. But I also believe that we should always weigh value to be received against the funds that we expend. I think that is what the vast taxpaying public would want us to do.

In regard to this investigation of the massacre years ago in the Katyn Forest of Russia in which no Americans were involved, I do have the greatest pity for the gallant Polish officers who were killed there. It was a criminal act against every law of humanity. But any action that we may take here goes beyond our jurisdiction, is a matter for historians to research and record, and will not bring back to life those poor men of Poland who died.

In taking this unusual action of reporting a bill out of committee and then arising to oppose it on the floor, I am doing it because I think we must vote

our convictions regardless of the disposition of the Congress in favor or in opposition to a measure.

Last week when the authorization to extend the Katyn Forest investigation came before us, only four votes the other way would have stopped it. It was said in committee this morning that an overwhelming majority of the House favored the expansion of the investigation. I invite my colleagues' attention to the first roll call—163 to 156. On a second roll call, on the resolution, the Members did vote it overwhelmingly, having seen the handwriting on the wall. We have all seen this happen time and time again. There is a natural inclination to go along with final approval when it appears inevitable.

I believe that first roll call vote, which was close, shows a disposition on the part of the membership to examine more closely these investigations and the value we are supposed to receive from the funds we spend to conduct them.

Specifically, here are my reasons for opposing the expansion of this Katyn Forest investigation:

First. In statements on the House floor last week, the chairman of the investigating committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], stated that every bit of evidence gathered so far has indicated that the Russians were entirely responsible, and that this was already being told to the rest of the world on the Voice of America.

I will quote Mr. MADDEN's statement:

> The testimony so far taken before our committee preponderantly reveals that the Soviets committed these mass murders at Katyn.

And then the gentleman from Indiana said:

> The enslaved people are learning the true facts. Misrepresentation in Communist propaganda is being exposed. I have broadcast regarding the evidence presented to this committee on four different occasions over the Voice of America. I know other members of the committee have also talked on the Voice of America. I think this committee has contributed an avalanche of material already in overcoming Communist propaganda.

I ask then, if the investigating committee is so convinced that the Russians are guilty and are already telling it to the rest of the world, why should we continue to expand this investigation further? The point of the whole investigation seems to have been covered already.

Second. Let us assume that we have proved Russia's guilt in this 12-year-old matter, or that we are going to prove it, what do we do about it then?

Third. In the eyes of the rest of the world, and I refer particularly to the free nations, what possible jurisdiction does the Congress of the United States have over Russian atrocities committed against Polish nationals? Would not we be accused of meddling? There may be propaganda value in this investigation, and I do not doubt that there is, but what is our jurisdiction over these murders? It is like a court in California trying a murder case committed in Florida, when the murderer cannot be caught even if he is convicted.

Fourth. This morning it was brought out in our committee that a bill was introduced a year ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] to investigate the reasons why sentences had been commuted in the case of German murderers who killed several hundred Americans at Malmedy, Belgium, during the war. This bill never got beyond the Rules Committee although the victims of these murders were American soldiers, not Polish. These were our own boys.

One member of the Katyn investigating committee [Mr. FLOOD] said that he had in mind now two amendments to the bill which authorized the investigation of the Katyn Forest murders. One amendment would authorize the investigation of the murder of American soldiers in Korea several months ago, and the other would go into these murders of the American soldiers in Belgium.

Now it would seem to me that we should adopt a sort of America first attitude and look into these murders of our own citizens first. But instead, we are going over to Europe to find out who killed the Polish soldiers 12 years ago, even before America entered the war.

If those two amendments that the gentleman has in mind are finally passed, it looks like this special committee has a long life ahead of it. It's another case of getting the foot in the door and then becoming a permanent fixture. In other words, another long-standing committee appears imminent, and we get even farther away from the committee structure created by the Reorganization Act of 1946.

Fifth. And finally, what of the financial aspects of this investigation and this journey to Europe? The Eighty-second Congress is already breaking all records in granting funds for special investigations. The House Administration Committee has approved more than $2,000,000 in this Congress and there are requests before us now for several hundred thousand more.

It may be said on the floor of this House that passage of an authorization bill imposes a mandate upon us to provide funds under a companion piece of legislation. As a member of the committee that receives so many of these subsequent requests for funds that come along behind the authorization, I disagree with this idea. I believe that the true mandate imposed upon me and my committee is to view the appropriations request separately and determine whether there is a real justification for going beyond the authorization and providing funds. If it is my considered opinion that there is no merit in the funds request, I think that I am obliged to vote against it. By the same token, I would vote just as quickly to appropriate the money if in my opinion it was to be spent on a worthy project.

Now, $65,000 may not sound like a whole lot of money—and don't forget that this is the second time we have appropriated funds for this Katyn Forest thing. But I would just like to tell you how much money it really is. It is every single cent of all the taxes paid through the entire year by 138 average taxpaying citizens. Now, as one of those 138 taxpayers, I do not want my tax money spent to send this investigating group over to Europe to meddle into something that happened years ago and which is none of our business anyway.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STANLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not believe the Clerk reported the committee amendment, as I heard him read the bill.

Mr. STANLEY. I was referring to the amount carried in the amendment.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I realize that, but I think we ought to have it clarified. I do not know when the committee amendment should be reported, but the resolution was amended to read "$65,000" and I do not believe the Clerk reported it.

Mr. STANLEY. The Clerk will report it when the amendment is being considered.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather unusual situation. As the gentleman from Virginia stated, some time ago the House approved a resolution to take evidence across the ocean. That resolution passed by a vote of 206 to 115. The gentleman's committee this morning reported out a recommendation for $65,000 to complete the committee's work by a great majority. This will not only include the taking of evidence across the water but will include the complete expenses of this committee until its work is completed. We also have several series of hearings in this country before the work of the committee will be completed.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, in regard to economy that I firmly believe this is the greatest economy piece of legislation that has ever been brought to the floor of this House. For the sum of approximately $65,000—and to date under the original resolution we have spent about $15,000—the Katyn Committee will have done more to arouse Mr. Stalin and his henchmen across the water than the millions of dollars that have been spent on so-called psychological warfare during the last few years.

I am going to prove that statement to you by reading a couple of excerpts here. Let me quote one paragraph from last week's Newsweek magazine:

> The Kremlin is apparently badly worried over the revival of the Katyn Forest case. The Voice of America has frequently broadcast the evidence of the hearings that the Polish soldiers were murdered not by the Nazis but by the Reds.

The Russians are finding it necessary to broadcast frequent protestations of their innocence.

Let me also call your attention to the New York Herald Tribune dated March 10, 1952, just one paragraph:

> Congressional investigation that has proved to be one of the most potent blows yet struck in the United States campaign of truth against Soviet communism soon will be transferred almost within the shadow of the iron curtain. There it will continue to unfold publicly a story whose impact on the people behind that curtain is now of obvious concern to Moscow.

Then it goes on with a lengthy dissertation on the Katyn Committee.

Here is an article from the Christian Science Monitor which states:

Apparently the Voice broadcasts directly and indirectly reach so many people that the Kremlin felt forced to take counteraction. Almost the entire space of Pravda was set aside for republication of the 1944 report of the Soviet commission.

Now that only happened 2 weeks ago. Every newspaper behind the iron curtain ignored this committee's investigation up until 2 weeks ago when all iron-curtain newspapers printed the 8-year-old report about the Russian commission that had investigated these massacres. What is the reason for that? Men of the type of Dr. Miloslavich, who was one of the great medical experts of Europe, and whose name is a household word in Poland, Mr. Mlynarski, Mr. Sikowski, and Mr. Skarzynski, of the International Red Cross, are all names well known behind the iron curtain. Men of that type have testified before our committee. I myself have made four broadcasts that have been translated into other languages that have gone behind the iron curtain. When the testimony of these prominent Poles is brought to the ears of the people behind the iron curtain, it is certainly going to cause more consternation and more inquiries about the false propaganda being sent out by the Kremlin in the last 8 years than anything that has happened.

When I say that this $65,000 is the most economical piece of legislation that has ever been presented to this Congress, I mean it, because millions upon millions have been spent by this Congress for psychological warfare, and this committee has brought more results in its short period of operation than all these various forces of psychological warfare have ever brought forth.

Mr. Speaker, I know that this matter has been debated before on the floor of this House. The House overwhelmingly voted for it. The gentleman from Virginia's committee this morning, by a large vote, has recommended $65,000 to complete the work of this committee. I ask you to approve this appropriation for this great work that the committee is doing.

The reason why the resolution is called up at this late hour is because our committee has had a great deal of difficulty securing boat reservations. Two investigators leave tomorrow evening by boat. These reservations must be reserved several weeks ahead of time, as well as for other members of the committee the week after next. The Speaker of the House asked that we utilize the Easter recess for this hearing across the ocean. That is why this matter is being brought up at this late hour.

I ask you Members of the House to approve the resolution.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the question of the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre was disposed of twice by the House, first by resolution authorizing an investigation in this country and then last week by an additional resolution that provides for an investigation overseas. The people of Poland have an heroic history and the massacre of 12,000 officers in the Katyn Forest 10 years ago is a terrible crime. The only thing that is before the House now is a resolution providing originally for $100,000, but by committee amendment now providing for $65,000.

A good many Members, including the very distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY], have questioned the wisdom of this investigation overseas. That, however, has been passed upon.

This morning when the Committee on House Administration looked into the question of this resolution I offered an amendment providing $40,000 for this committee investigation in Europe. The budget presented by the committee shows a need only for $28,500 for the investigation in Europe, and there is unexpended $4,000 in the fund that was previously provided by the House of Representatives.

Of course it is true there is an additional budget for completing the investigation in this country, but there will be an opportunity later, it seems to me, to provide more money to the committee of which the gentleman from Indiana is chairman, if a need is shown. The gentleman's own estimate, as I read it, that he submitted to the committee this morning asked for only $28,500 for the investigation in Europe, which he contemplates making in London, where the Polish Government-in-exile is situated at the present time, and in Berlin, in Paris, and possibly in Geneva.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Immediately when the committee returns from Europe preparations will be under way to provide hearings here in Washington.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I understand that, but that will not be for 45 days.

Mr. MADDEN. That would necessitate coming in here in another 45 days and asking for about $30,000 more.

Mr. LECOMPTE. The gentleman's own figures here are only $28,500 for the investigation in Europe. If I read the gentleman's figures correctly, the investigation in Europe will cost $28,500.

Mr. MADDEN. That includes transportation, witnesses, and other expenses in Europe. That is the estimate. It might be less, it might be more. I do not know.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am not questioning the character of the gentleman's committee by any means.

Mr. MADDEN. As the gentleman recalls, when Congress passed on this we submitted an estimate of a total of $100,000, but I stated at that time that we had not made any survey of what the expenses to close the work of the committee would amount to. The nearest estimate we can make, after going over the matter, with the State Department as to expenses in Europe, and also the expenses involved in our future hearings here, is that the cost will run about $65,000. If any money is left over, it will be returned.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am not questioning the fact that you will save as much money as you can, but as an actual matter of fact your estimate for the investigation in Europe is $28,500, and the additional money is for completing the work of the committee and in writing the report after you return to this country.

Mr. MADDEN. No; including the complete closing up of the committee, we estimate the cost to be about $65,000.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This is the sheet the gentleman submitted to the committee, and it says in capital letters, "Total estimated expense for Europe, $28,500." The additional money is for completing the work of the gentleman's committee after returning to this country.

Mr. MADDEN. That is right.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That will be at least 30 to 45 days from now, because the gentleman contemplates a 30-day investigation.

Mr. MADDEN. Should we offer another resolution when we return, to wind up the committee's activities?

Mr. LECOMPTE. That I think would be the correct way to do it, but that is up to the House of Representatives. The taxpayers are laboring under a burden that is backbreaking. All day we have worked on a bill from the Appropriations Committee and we have succeeded in reducing many items for many departments. The Congress must be equally diligent in reducing requests for our own committees and undertakings. I cannot in good conscience vote for $65,000 when the budget of the committee itself calls for less. Let us have economy right here.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI].

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have been a Member of this House for 10 years. I have yet to take a trip outside continental United States at Government expense. This record should clearly show that I am not interested in any junkets at taxpayers' expense.

I happen to be a member of this committee. Frankly, I do not relish the idea of going there. Let me tell you honorable gentlemen what this investigation is all about and why it is so essential. You have heard of the Nuremberg trials, have you not? At the Nuremberg trials we convicted the Germans of certain crimes. For most of the crimes they should have been convicted. For many of their crimes we did not convict them enough. We were a part of the Nuremberg trials. We were a part of the prosecution at the Nuremberg trials. Among the crimes for which we convicted the Germans was the Katyn massacre of 15,000 allied soldier prisoners of war. I repeat that among the crimes for which representatives of the United States of America convicted the Germans was the massacre of 15,000, some people say, Polish soldiers; but they were allied soldiers, first of all. In fact, they were the first allied soldiers of World War II at the Katyn Forest in Russia, and they buried them in a mass grave.

Now, gentlemen of the House, I urge you—each of you—to examine your conscience. We have convicted the Germans for a crime which allegedly now we find by evidence that is coming up

they did not commit. Let us as justice-loving Americans examine our conscience. Do you want the world to remain as is, under the pretext that the Germans committed the crime, or do you want the world to know the truth? Do you want the world to know the truth or are you willing to just forget about it and not rectify our mistakes if a mistake was committed?

On the evidence already presented we know that the Russians did it. That is, on the evidence presented thus far. But the bulk and weight of the evidence has not yet been presented. Thus far we have heard from persons who now reside in Canada and the United States. These are people who have had first-hand knowledge of this ghastly massacre.

Please permit me to tell you some of the witnesses we have to interview and have to testify in Europe. The only place we can get them is in Europe. Among the most prominent witnesses in the world on that massacre today are 12 known medical men of 12 countries of Europe who were the first medical authorities to observe the scene of the crime. One of them is in the United States, a doctor at Loyola University in St. Louis. He testified before us last week. There are 11 other such doctors who were the first great medical men and authorities of the world to visit the scene of this inhuman massacre. The only place we can interview them and have them testify is in Europe. Yes. It looks like the Russians did it, but this is the most beastly and the most ghastly crime that has been committed in the history of all mankind.

On the basis of the evidence presented in America, the Russians seem guilty. We have to get every shred of evidence. This is no small matter. It will take much effort and time to document all the evidence. Permit me to warn you gentlemen of the House: you are going to regret it if you turn down this resolution. You will regret that you did not actually and honestly establish the guilt of the people who perpetrated this crime with all its unbelievable horrors.

All you have to do is to look at a similar matter in Korea. Some day gentlemen you will need the Katyn massacre evidence as a precedent. I need not remind you that for some reason or other the truce talks in Korea seem to come to a dead stop whenever you ask the enemy to account for some 50,000 missing prisoners. Mark you this, gentlemen of the House, that some day and soon you will learn to your horror that those prisoners probably were disposed of just as the 15,000 allied soldiers were massacred in the Katyn Forest. If you do not establish definitely the guilt and find positive proof that is in existence in Europe today with regard to who actually committed this crime in Katyn, you will regret it for all time to come. The time is late. Evidence is disappearing. Witnesses are being trailed like rats and hunted down to talk no more. Already the time is late. We must act now or never.

I say to you, this is the first time in all my 10 years of service in this House that I propose to take a trip at Government expense. I am inclined right now, with the attitude of this House, to not hand in a bill for it, because, I am telling you, gentlemen, this is the most important investigation that this Congress has ever undertaken, to my knowledge. You know how I tried to warn this House in 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946. In fact, in 1944 I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the fact that the Russians and not the Germans committed the ghastliest crime of the ages at Katyn. But what happened? The OWI went on the air at the taxpayers' expense and said, "No. The Germans committed the crime and not the Russians." We have a duty to perform. We have an obligation. Let us examine our conscience. We are incriminated. Since we took part in convicting Germans for a crime we now seem to learn was not committed by them, we owe it to humanity, decency, and our sacred honor to find out who did it. Then when we discover the same crime committed in Korea we will know for certain who did it and why.

We owe it to the German people, to the German nation; we owe it to decent people all over the world and to all of our allies to establish who it was that actually committed the crime at the Katyn Forest, where 15,000 allied soldiers were murdered in cold blood. If we fail to do this we do not deserve to lead the world in truth, decency, and justice. Do we propose to live under a lie for all time to come? Or do we propose to tell the truth to the freedom-loving people of the world? That is the meat of this whole resolution before the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. REGAN].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I wish somebody would explain the money involved. All the discussion has been on the merits of going or not going.

Mr. STANLEY. The original resolution calls for $100,000. It was amended in the committee to $65,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I call attention to one item: Eleven witnesses abroad, $5,000; to take depositions from 11 witnesses in Germany. Does not that seem high? Could not that be reduced?

Mr. MADDEN. There are about 40 or 50 witnesses.

Mr. REGAN. I apologize for trespassing on your time but we took 45 minutes yesterday to consider a $1,200 item, so I hope you will bear with me a couple of minutes to discuss this important question.

The Committee on House Administration has various committees come before it for appropriations to carry on investigations. Some of them are most meritorious. But when we get to the end of the year the authorizations amount to a considerable sum of money. Some I do not consider so very meritorious, and this happens to be one I do not believe should be passed by this House in any part whether it is $5,000, $50,000, or $105,000. I do not think we ought to grant this money.

A gentleman appeared before the committee this morning and said: "I do not want to appear in a cloak-and-dagger role, but we are risking our lives in going over there," or words to that effect. Now, they want to send a delegation of 10 Members of this Congress—10 Members—now, to go to Europe, to go to London, Paris, Berlin, maybe Vienna, and I do not know where else; 4 of them for 45 days and 6 for 30 days. It is true that they are using, as the Speaker directed, the Easter vacation period, but they are also using much more time than that; they are taking 30 to 45 days to go over to Europe to do what? To get us into trouble.

I do not believe this House should authorize this committee to expend one dime.

We are accused often of sending junkets around the country. That may have been true in some cases, but we do have some investigative committees that are serving the best interests of the Nation, but I do not think this could serve any good interest of the Nation or do anything except possibly get us into trouble.

I hope you vote down the resolution.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. My question is this: The gentleman from Texas has just made a statement with which I am in full accord, 100 percent. It is not the dollars involved; it is the risk we take in losing our case which we have already made. I certainly hope the House will deny this whole proposition.

Mr. REGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the hour is getting late and I shall try not to use the 5 minutes, but I would like to point out first of all that the Committee on House Administration heard this group this morning and then by a vote of 11 to 5 voted to give them the money to back up the action the House had already taken.

Somebody in that hearing this morning made the statement, and I think it is true, that if the iron curtain collapses, if Stalin is overthrown, it is going to happen from within.

We are going to vote in a few weeks on appropriating $50,000,000,000 or more for the armed services to protect ourselves against communism, yet here we are quibbling about whether or not we should give this committee $65,000 to finish documenting their case, a case which if well established can do more damage, in my opinion, to the regimes behind the iron curtain than $50,000,000,000 worth of planes, tanks, and guns.

I ask you merely to consider this case on its merits and I think you will find it is a very good investment.

I want to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK], who has been trying so long to ask a question.

Mr. SADLAK. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

As I look at it, it appears to me that there are good lawyers on this commit-

tee, and like all good lawyers they are desirous of getting an iron-clad case against the perpetrators behind the iron curtain if they are responsible. I am for the appropriation.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is exactly correct about this thing. Russian prosecutors stood there in Red uniforms throughout the Nuremberg trial and pointed an accusing finger at Germany. Some of them were hung for crimes. I would vote for this resolution if it amounted to a cost of a million dollars because it will mean much more than that to the free peoples of the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is amazing to me to listen to some of the arguments in opposition to the pending resolution now when the House has already on two occasions voted first to establish the special committee originally and to authorize the committee to go over there and get evidence which I consider to be of vital importance in making its findings. The argument of the gentleman from Ohio, the argument of the gentleman from Indiana, and the fine argument of the gentleman from Wisconsin seem to me to be unanswerable. I hope the resolution will be agreed to.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does not the gentleman honestly believe that getting the facts and substantiating them and if it turns out as everyone now believes has been substantiated already by some eyewitnesses that this great atrocity was perpetrated by orders of the Kremlin, the same people who now enslave the Polish people, that it will be one of the most effective ways of driving a wedge between the people of Poland now enslaved by the Kremlin and their enslaving masters?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 1, line 5, strike out "$100,000" and insert "$65,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY], and I hesitate to stand up here and oppose him. But I have listened to the debate this afternoon and I recall our meeting this morning. I do not think we are extravagant and I believe we are doing the wise thing in approving this resolution for the amended amount. As an attorney I am quite sure that any attorney in this House this afternoon would not convict until they had all the evidence in.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that this amended amount will be approved.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the massacre at Katyn Forest was the cruelest and most beastly disregard of decency and the laws of humanity that can be imagined. The depravity that existed in perpetrating such a crime cannot be permitted to go unpunished. We owe it not only to the Polish officers who were killed by this dastardly act of criminals but also to the whole civilized world to ascertain beyond any doubt the guilty parties of this outrageous crime against humanity. I shall vote for the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 235, nays 114, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 31]

YEAS—235

Aandahl	Church	Greenwood
Addonizio	Clemente	Gwinn
Albert	Cole, Kans.	Hagen
Allen, Calif.	Cole, N. Y.	Hale
Andresen, August H.	Cooley	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Anfuso	Corbett	Harden
Arends	Cotton	Harvey
Armstrong	Coudert	Havenner
Aspinall	Crosser	Hays, Ark.
Auchincloss	Crumpacker	Hays, Ohio
Ayres	Curtis, Mo.	Heller
Bailey	Dague	Herter
Baker	Davis, Tenn.	Heselton
Bakewell	Davis, Wis.	Hess
Barrett	Dawson	Hillings
Bates, Ky.	Deane	Hoffman, Ill.
Bates, Mass.	Delaney	Holifield
Beall	Dempsey	Holmes
Beamer	Denny	Howell
Beckworth	Denton	Irving
Bennett, Fla.	Devereux	Jackson, Wash.
Bennett, Mich.	Donohue	Javits
Bentsen	Donovan	Jenkins
Bishop	Dorn	Jensen
Blackney	Eberharter	Jones, Ala.
Blatnik	Elliott	Judd
Boggs, Del.	Ellsworth	Karsten, Mo.
Bolling	Fallon	Kean
Bolton	Fenton	Kearney
Bramblett	Fernandez	Kearns
Bray	Fine	Keating
Brehm	Fisher	Kelly, N. Y.
Brown, Ohio	Flood	Kennedy
Brownson	Fogarty	Keogh
Buckley	Forand	Kerr
Budge	Ford	Kilburn
Burdick	Fulton	Kilday
Burnside	Furcolo	Kirwan
Busbey	Gamble	Klein
Bush	Garmatz	Kluczynski
Canfield	Gavin	Lane
Carnahan	George	Lanham
Case	Goodwin	Latham
Chelf	Gordon	Lesinski
Chenoweth	Graham	Lind
Chudoff	Granahan	Lyle
McCarthy	Phillips	Seely-Brown
McCormack	Poage	Sheehan
McCulloch	Polk	Shelley
McDonough	Preston	Sheppard
McGrath	Price	Sieminski
McGregor	Priest	Simpson, Ill.
McGuire	Radwan	Simpson, Pa.
McVey	Rains	Sittler
Machrowicz	Reams	Smith, Kans.
Mack, Wash.	Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Wis.
Madden	Reed, Ill.	Spence
Mansfield	Reed, N. Y.	Springer
Martin, Mass.	Rhodes	Stigler
Meader	Richards	Tackett
Merrow	Riehlman	Taylor
Miller, N. Y.	Riley	Thompson, Mich.
Morgan	Rodino	Thornberry
Moulder	Rogers, Colo.	Trimble
Multer	Rogers, Mass.	Vail
Mumma	Rooney	Van Pelt
Nicholson	Roosevelt	Van Zandt
O'Brien, Ill.	Ross	Vursell
O'Brien, Mich.	Sabath	Walter
O'Konski	Sadlak	Wier
O'Neill	St. George	Wigglesworth
Osmers	Sasscer	Williams, N. Y.
Ostertag	Saylor	Withrow
O'Toole	Schenck	Wolverton
Patman	Scott, Hardie	Yates
Patten	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Yorty
Patterson	Scudder	Zablocki
Perkins	Secrest	
Philbin		

NAYS—114

Abbitt	Frazier	Miller, Nebr.
Abernethy	Fugate	Mills
Adair	Gary	Morris
Andersen, H. Carl	Gathings	Murray, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Golden	Nelson
Andrews	Gore	Norblad
Angell	Gregory	Norrell
Barden	Gross	Passman
Battle	Hand	Pickett
Berry	Hardy	Poulson
Betts	Harris	Prouty
Boggs, La.	Harrison, Nebr.	Rankin
Bonner	Harrison, Wyo.	Redden
Bow	Herlong	Rees, Kans.
Brooks	Hill	Regan
Brown, Ga.	Hoeven	Robeson
Bryson	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Fla.
Buffett	Hope	Schwabe
Burleson	Horan	Shafer
Burton	Hunter	Smith, Miss.
Byrnes	Jarman	Smith, Va.
Camp	Jenison	Stanley
Cannon	Johnson	Steed
Carlyle	Jonas	Stockman
Colmer	Jones, Mo.	Sutton
Cooper	Jones, Hamilton C.	Taber
Crawford	Jones, Woodrow W.	Talle
Cunningham	Lantaff	Teague
Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte	Thomas
Davis, Ga.	Lovre	Thompson, Tex.
DeGraffenried	Lucas	Vorys
Dolliver	McIntire	Watts
Doughton	McMillan	Werdel
Durham	McMullen	Williams, Miss.
Elston	Magee	Willis
Engle	Mahon	Wilson, Ind.
Evins	Marshall	Wilson, Tex.
Forrester	Miller, Md.	Winstead
		Wood, Idaho

NOT VOTING—83

Allen, Ill.	Harrison, Va.	Murphy
Allen, La.	Hart	Murray, Wis.
Baring	Hébert	O'Hara
Belcher	Hedrick	Potter
Bender	Heffernan	Powell
Bosone	Hinshaw	Rabaut
Boykin	Hull	Ramsay
Buchanan	Ikard	Ribicoff
Butler	Jackson, Calif.	Rivers
Carrigg	James	Roberts
Celler	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Scrivner
Chiperfield	Kersten, Wis.	Short
Clevenger	King, Calif.	Sikes
Combs	King, Pa.	Staggers
Cox	Larcade	Tollefson
D'Ewart	McConnell	Velde
Dingell	McKinnon	Vinson
Dollinger	Mack, Ill.	Weichel
Dondero	Martin, Iowa	Welch
Doyle	Mason	Wharton
Eaton	Miller, Calif.	Wheeler
Feighan	Miller, Md.	Whitten
Granger	Mitchell	Wickersham
Grant	Morano	Widnall
Hall, Leonard W.	Morrison	Wolcott
Halleck	Morton	Wood, Ga.
	Murdock	Woodruff

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mrs. Buchanan with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Ikard with Mr. Widnall.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Dondero.
Mr. Harrison with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. King of California with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Mack of Illinois with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Murphy with Mr. Short.
Mr. Feighan with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Rabaut with Mr. McConnell.
Mr. Granger with Mr. Hull.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin.
Mrs. Kee with Mr. Woodruff.
Mr. Grant with Mr. Scrivner.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Carrigg.
Mr. Baring with Mr. Velde.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Jackson of California.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. King of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Hedrick with Mr. D'Ewart.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. O'Hara.
Mr. McKinnon with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Doyle with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Miller of Maryland.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Morano.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. James.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Rogers of Texas with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Bender.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. RANKIN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SITTLER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PROVIDE FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 487) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of further conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 95 of the Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on the Judiciary acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $75,000 including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, clerical stenographic, and other assistants, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee or any subcommittee thereof, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$75,000" and insert "$100,000."

Line 11, strike out "or subcommittee."

Line 12, strike out "or subcommittee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF CERTAIN FUNDS FOR THE EXPENSES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 526) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $200,000, including expenditures for employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 557 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 38, Eighty-second Congress, incurred by the Committee on Armed Services, not to exceed $100,000, which said sum shall be in addition to the expenses authorized under House Resolution 114, Eighty-second Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, special counsel, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee and signed by the chairman of the committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, after any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE COLUMBIA SCHOLASTIC PRESS ASSOCIATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address by President Truman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEECH ON MARCH 15, 1952, BEFORE THE COLUMBIA SCHOLASTIC PRESS ASSOCIATION IN NEW YORK CITY

You know that I was very much afraid that you were going to take that admonition of Dr. Murphy's seriously but I'm very glad that you didn't when he told you not to make any noise after the broadcast went on.

I'm happy to be with you today. It's a pleasure to talk to the young people who run the school papers of this great country of ours. You probably don't know it but I was a school editor myself once, for a high-school paper in Independence, Mo., and it was a first edition, too. Charley Ross, and four or five other kids and myself, got out the first number of the Gleam, named after that admonition in Tennyson's poem, "After it, follow it, follow the gleam." I've been trying to follow it ever since. From then on I kept going and meeting all the trouble that I'm in today.

HIS LIFE INTEREST

So you see, if you're not very careful, you may end up by living in the White House and I'll say to you that it's a wonderful experience indeed in spite of all its trouble. All my life I've been interested in the presidency and the way Presidents are chosen.

I remember very well the first presidential nominating convention that I attended. It was in Kansas City, Mo., in 1900 when Bryan was elected—or nominated—the second time for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency. I was 16 and I enjoyed that convention very much because I thought old man Bryan was the greatest orator at the time, and I still think so.

President Roosevelt said he was one of the great progressives of all times but he was ahead of his time, and a lot of us are in that condition. Now besides being nominated for the Presidency three times, Mr. Bryan became an editor. And you know I'm very much interested in editors and publishers.

It's a very great responsibility to be the editor of a great newspaper or a great periodical and we have some wonderfully great magazines and newspapers in this country.

HITS UNFAIR TACTICS

It's the duty of editors of these great publications to see that the news is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and these great ones do just that. But we do have among us some publications who do not care very much for the truth in the news and sometimes make propaganda out of it, and then write editorials about it. But an editorial written on misrepresentation on the news and on propaganda, is just as bad as the foundation on which it rests. I hope that if any of you become editors of great publications and you are now editors of great publications in your sphere, that you would stick strictly to the truth and nothing but the truth when you publish the news.

I heard Mr. Bryan say one time that the first convention he attended was at Philadelphia in 1856 and he crawled in through a window and that ever since that time they have been trying to put him out over the transom but never have succeeded.

The first convention that I attended was the one I referred to in 1900. I walked into that convention, and I also later walked into the White House, which Mr. Bryan did not. Not one of us knows who got the best of it. Mr. Bryan got his message over just as well as had he been elected President. I don't know whether I am getting mine over or not.

Another convention I remember very well was the one in Baltimore when Woodrow

Wilson was nominated. I was running a tractor around a quarter section of land and it took 2 miles to map that circuit. At the corner was a little telegraph station, about a quarter of a mile from where I was working. I'd go down to that telegraph station and see how the convention was coming on. That is how I found out that Woodrow Wilson was nominated. We did not have radio or television in those days, and we did not have pollsters or false political prophets either. I voted for Wilson, in that year and I believed ever since in the policies he followed. He was one of our greatest Presidents, and I sincerely believe that if we had followed him in what he wanted to do we would certainly have avoided the Second World War. I hope that we will not make that same mistake after this last world war.

APPEALS TO YOUTH

Now, I understand that a lot of people are mystified and wondering why I came all the way up here from Key West to talk to you today. The answer is very simple. I came because the future of this great Republic of ours depends upon young people like you, and also for the reason that for the last 7 years the young people have been coming to see me at the White House. There is hardly a week goes by that I do not see a delegation of young people who pass through my office and shake hands with me, and I either have a word or two to say to them. And now I am here, and you are in exactly the same position that you would be at the White House—you'd have to listen.

The United States of America is the greatest Republic in the history of the world. We want to keep it the greatest Republic. It will be up to you young people to do that job in the future.

Youth is the hope of the world. That was the motto on the front door of the high school from which I was graduated, only it was in Latin, Juventus spes mundi. I will never forget it; I have never forgotten it. And I still think that the youth is the hope of the world, and it always will be. It is just as true now as when I came out of that small-town high school. It is necessary for the young people to understand the road to be followed if this country is to accomplish the mission which God intended it to accomplish in this world.

I hope I can give you some idea of how to follow that road into tomorrow, and the future of the world. I hope you will go back to your schools and talk about it and discuss it. I hope you will write about it in your publications, because it is your responsibility as editors to work for the good of your great country, and for the future of the world. Both are in your hands.

IDEALS COME FIRST

Now, the thing I want to impress upon you is that government must be operated on the basis of the greatest good for the greatest number of its citizens. That is the fundamental basis of the domestic program and foreign policy of this Government of yours and mine. No nation—is good and can last unless it is built upon ideals. Our Nation is built upon ideals, ideals of unselfishness and respect for the rights and welfare of others.

The fundamental basis of this Nation's ideals was given to Moses on Mount Sinai. The fundamental basis of the Bill of Rights of our Constitution comes from the teachings we get from Exodus, St. Matthew, Isaiah, and St. Paul. The Sermon on the Mount gives us a way of life. Maybe some day men will understand it as the real way of life.

The basis of all great moral codes is "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you." Treat others as you would like to be treated. Some of you may think that such a philosophy as that has no place in politics or government, but it is the only philosophy on which you can base a lasting government. Governments built on that philosophy are built on a rock and will not fail.

When our own government has looked after the average man first, we have grown and prospered, but when those in power have used our government to increase the privileges of the few at the top, the life and spirit of our country have declined. Thank God, most of the time we have been on the right road.

RECALLS DEPRESSION

In the lifetime of everyone here we have had a chance to see how this works, although some of you may not be old enough, and I'm sure none of you are old enough to remember the great depression. In the last 20 years, the government of the United States has made great progress in measures to help and to protect the average man. We have not been ashamed to work for human welfare at home and abroad.

I just want you to examine the facts and see for yourself what the results have been in better living conditions for the American people and in strengthening the base of our democracy. More and more people have been able to have better and better living conditions.

In 1939 only one out of four families had an income of more than $2,000. In 1949, it was two out of three. There are fewer poor people and more well-to-do people in this country now than ever before. Not only in this country, but in the history of the world.

We have been reducing inequality not by pulling down those at the top but by lifting up those at the bottom. This great record of progress has been the result of our policy of the Fair Deal and under that policy we look out for the other fellow as well as for ourselves.

That same program applies to our foreign policy. We cannot isolate ourselves from our neighbors in the rest of the world. When something hurts them it hurt us; when something helps them it helps us.

The way to keep our own country strong and prosperous is to encourage and develop prosperity in the rest of the world. We can learn a lot from the rest of the world. There are many things that even the people of undeveloped countries in the world can teach us. We must exchange ideas; we must exchange goods; we must exchange friendships.

NO IMPERIAL AIMS

We are not imperialists. We do not want any more territory. We do not want to conquer any people or to dominate them. The Russian propaganda says that we are imperialists and want to conquer the world. That just isn't true. We know the Soviet Government is a menace to us and to all the free world. That is why we are building up our strength, not to march against them but to discourage them from marching against us and the free world.

We want to help people in other countries to help themselves because that makes for prosperity for us all. I want you young people to understand that if we accomplish the purpose which we propose to accomplish it means the greatest age in the history of the world and you will live in the grandest, most peaceful times that the world has ever seen. It's up to you to help carry on that purpose for it may take more than one generation to accomplish it. But we can accomplish it. We are going to accomplish it and I know that you will help accomplish it. I appreciate again being here. May God bless you all.

PETITION

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I have received a petition from residents of my district which has made a deep impression upon me and I would like to call it to the attention of the House. This petition is signed by people living for the most part in Crestone, which is located in Saguache County, Colo. These persons are calling upon Congress to take steps to end the war in Korea. The petition reads as follows:

PETITION

To the Honorable J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
Congressman, Third District of Colorado,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the following mothers, wives, sisters, sweethearts and relatives of men now fighting in Korea, or who will be called for duty in Korea, respectfully request that you urge Congress to immediately take the necessary steps to terminate the unnecessary, arbitrary, and unsuccessful so-called police action in Korea, which is causing needless death and injury to thousands of American boys.

We are told that the will of the people is reflected through the acts of Congress, and if this be true, we are of the firm belief that thousands of like petitions bearing millions of signatures can be presented to other Congressmen in support of our contention that the present slaughter of our young men in Korea must cease immediately.

We make this request in the name of Almighty God, unequivocally and unreservedly attested to by our signatures, with the further request that it be read in the Congress of the United States and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that legislative body.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by 57 persons, all of whom are mothers, wives, sisters, sweethearts or relatives of men now fighting in Korea. These people have a personal interest in our attitude toward Korea. I suspect they are expressing the sentiment of a vast majority of American citizens, who are pleading with Congress to take the necessary steps to bring an end to this stalemate in Korea.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think Congress can, or should, longer postpone the action that the signers of this petition seek. They are speaking for the rank and file of our people, who are demanding an end to this useless slaughter of American boys.

The time is here, Mr. Speaker, when the situation in Korea should be carefully appraised by Congress and our influence used to bringing an end to this tragic chapter in our history.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SHORTAGE OF NURSES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the tabling by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Tuesday of this week of H. R. 910, my bill to produce more nurses, leaves the country in too critical a situation to permit it to pass unnoticed. I have asked for time this

afternoon in order to pull together the picture of the problem which the shortage of nursing presents at this moment, pointing up certain possibilities of solution which will, after all is said and done, have to be found.

The present estimate of the nurse shortage is reckoned at some fifty to sixty thousand. It is important that there be no misunderstanding of the causes of the shortage for it does not in any sense mean that there are fewer nurses. The estimate of nurses on active duty today is 325,000 to 330,000 nurses as against 300,533 in 1949. It does mean that there has been a tremendous expansion of health and medical services, with even greater expansion taking place almost daily. It means that there are more old people—that more women go to hospitals to have their babies. It means that as men have gone out to fight more nurses are needed in the armed services and in veterans' hospitals. It means all these things and more.

It is perhaps natural that the hospitals feel the shortage most, for nurses are no different from other human beings—they go where the salaries and the work hours are the best. The spread out of hospitals into industry and public-health services is therefore to be expected. On top of that has come the flow into the armed services which, though not sufficient to meet their needs, is accelerated by the pay and perquisites now offered as well as by the improved working conditions.

What we are faced with is a deficit of some fifty to sixty thousand trained nurses—and the probability is that the conditions which have brought this about will continue to function so that we shall be facing an ever-growing need. Unless drastic steps are taken to fill it, we shall find ourselves in a gravely serious plight.

Mr. Speaker, no situation is ever wholly without a constructive side—for necessity is a wonderful enlightener. The inability to secure a sufficient number of nurses to cover the care of their sick has forced the hospitals to face the facts of the uneconomic use of this skilled personnel which has carried over from the days of apprentice training. Ward maids are more and more assuming the housekeeping, housecleaning side of patient care; ward secretaries have begun to do the time-consuming paper work, and semiskilled groups are serving under nurse supervision in ever-increasing numbers. The use of the so-called practical nurse is fast becoming recognized as a necessary and vital factor in any program of over-all care of the sick. Not only is she also in short supply—but her training has not as yet been safeguarded as it must be if she is to be a responsible factor in the general program, nor have license laws been passed in more than a very few States.

Another result of the present need for nurses has been the realization that the 3-year period of training, the time period required by most States for license background, could be shortened, probably to good advantage.

Such a step would require amendment of the State license laws for nurses which, while it might be a long, slow process, is certainly not an insuperable problem.

In order to protect the nurse, therefore, any present plan to shorten the actual time involved in nurse training would have to contain temporary measures conforming to the 3-year period required by State law. You may recall that Public Law 74 provided a 2½-year period of training and 6 months' service in a hospital. This proved to be a lifesaver to our hospitals and provided a kind of internship for the student which was of the greatest value to her. What has been done once can be done again, although the form of it might be different.

What are the situations that must be faced by anyone honestly trying to meet the facts of today's need? What elements tend to delay constructive action? Where are the dragging feet?

No one factor is probably more difficult to bring into line than any other, difficult as some of them certainly are. Perhaps the most difficult of all is that doctors and nurses both have not yet recognized the reality of the changing world. In this they are not unlike the majority of laymen—who never really want to change—who just want to be left alone, to go on doing the way they have always wanted to do.

Unfortunately, such days are over and done with. And those who are not awake and aware are apt to get run over or find themselves deserted on the highway.

Studies being made all over the United States appear to bring out a few common ideas: (a) scientific medicine of itself has created a need for new skills in nursing, skills which are not necessarily required to be a part of the knowledge and practice of all those who care for the sick; (b) a consequent thought therefore emerges: That the care of the patient might best be done by a team, each of whom has the adequate training for a particular area of service—the doctor with his staff of technicians, the scientifically trained nurse with her staff of trained assistants, the hospital housekeeping department with its corps of trained, organized, and thoroughly understanding personnel.

Already some hospitals are experimenting in various ways of carrying out this idea—although hampered by the difficulty of securing adequately trained personnel. But it is not a new idea. It requires only a fluid attitude on the part of boards of trustees, hospital managers, as well as of the professional groups.

Fundamental to any attack upon our lack of nurses is the truly desperate need of teaching personnel. Whatever assistance which might be given students will be pretty futile if there are not teachers to teach them. This would mean provision for assistance to nurses for graduate work to fit them for teaching positions. Without more teachers any large increase in the number of students would create an impossible situation and we must have a very much larger number of students as soon as we can get them if we are ever to begin to meet the situation that looms before us.

Nor can we neglect the field of recruitment in whatever program we build. With a rather dramatic drop in the total number of high school girls available who are being sought by the armed services, as well as by industry, we cannot expect to attract any great number into nursing unless a very real effort can be made through a well-considered recruitment plan. This does not need to be elaborate, though it will need some funds to function.

In whatever program that is evolved the training of the practical nurse must be a definite part, for she will be an indispensable member of the team. Much of her training can be within the purview of the vocational schools, in close cooperation with nearby hospitals.

Talking with members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, who objected to the provisions of H. R. 910, I have found them keenly aware of the gravity of the situation the country faces. This awareness will, I trust, make possible a meeting of minds that will bring before this House a bill which the committee membership will wholeheartedly endorse.

From my conversations I should imagine that, first, it should not attempt any permanent legislation but should be set up to meet the emergent needs, even though it would of necessity want to recognize the time element involved in nurse training; second, although the actual funds would have to channel through a Federal agency, the use of those funds would be placed under State authority with possibly a few simple standards and ratios written into the legislation. Many States have agencies in whom this authority could well rest. Those that do not would have to get busy and set them up.

No one can fail to be aware of the emergent need for more nurses, Mr. Speaker, to care for the Nation's sick, nor of the inability of existing schools to meet that need without assistance. Where can the schools turn in the emergency except to the Congress?

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, that I shall hope for a very real cooperation from those who, because of their tabling of H. R. 910, will undoubtedly have developed ideas which can be drafted into sound legislation, perhaps somewhat along the lines I have suggested.

Mr. Speaker, I am including herewith three articles from the New York Times resulting from an exhaustive survey made by them, giving a clear picture of the facts we are faced with that the Membership may be thoroughly informed:

[From the New York Times of March 4, 1952]

NURSE LACK ACUTE AT CITY HOSPITALS—STAFF IS LEAVING FASTER THAN IT CAN BE REPLACED—LOW PAY AMONG CHIEF REASONS—ONE HEALTH CENTER IDLE—VOLUNTARY INSTITUTIONS FARING BETTER—VA FACILITIES ALSO REPORT LITTLE SHORTAGE

(By Harold Faber)

The Nation-wide shortage of nurses has hit New York harder than any other large city in the country.

Nurses are leaving the city hospitals faster than replacements can be made. Those who remain cannot give adequate care to patients because of their increased work load in already overcrowded facilities. As a result, the department of hospitals operates with only 53 percent of the registered nurses it needs.

The shortage in the hospitals is paralleled in the department of health. To maintain its public-health services, it needs at least 1,600 nurses, has an authorization for 1,071 and employs only 795.

The reasons are simple: low pay and poor working conditions compared with the voluntary hospitals in the city, which have only a minor nurse shortage. And there are no indications that either condition will be improved in the foreseeable future.

The results have been that the city has been forced to close wards in some hospitals, has failed to open many new wards in other hospitals and cannot find the nursing staff to open at least one new child-health center. In addition, nursing service is spread dangerously thin in most hospitals and health centers.

CITY HOSPITAL SITUATION

Specifically, the nurse shortage has kept the following hospitals from operating at full capacity, although the need for their beds is urgent:

James Ewing Hospital, First Avenue and Sixty-eighth Street: This cancer hospital has a capacity of 275 beds, but only 199 beds are in use.

Francis Delafield Hospital, Fort Washington Avenue and One Hundred and Sixty-third Street: It has beds for 307 patients, but only 156 are occupied.

Kings County Tuberculosis Hospital, Clarkson Avenue, Brooklyn: Only 468 of its 725 beds are in use.

More dramatic than these empty beds is a completely vacant child health center in the Melrose housing project at 348 East One Hundred and Fifty-sixth Street, the Bronx. There a fully equipped station lies useless because two nurses cannot be found to staff it.

In addition, the visting nurses of the department of health are so busy that they cannot visit classrooms in schools more than once a year, and they can only tell a new mother how to prepare a baby's formula because they haven't time to show her.

KEY CALLED LOW PAY

The key to the shortages, overwork, and crowding is low pay. The basic starting wage for a city nurse is $2,650 a year, which includes a $250 cost-of-living bonus. That is about $10 a month less than the voluntary hospitals pay their nurses, who, in addition, get an afternoon and night differential of from $10 to $40 a month.

Higher than both these scales is the pay offered by the Armed Forces and the Veterans' Administration. The Army, Navy, and Air Force start their nurses as second lieutenants at $213.50 a month, plus $42 for food, and provide either quarters or $75 a month for rent. The Veterans' Administration gives $3,740 to its beginners.

To compete with these higher pay scales, the department of hospitals and the board of health are asking for a $350 pay increase for the nurses in the budget for the next fiscal year. There is only a slight chance that they will get it.

In asking for the increase, Dr. Marcus D. Kogel, commissioner of hospitals, summarized the situation this way:

"I doubt if history records any previous period when our hospitals were in greater distress from their inability to recruit and hold personnel essential to the operation of a modern hospital. Our greatest problem is still the bedside nurse. The competition of hospitals for nurses is something close to frenzy and the shackles which bind us make us a poor last in the race.

"The prospect before us is frightening. It cannot be denied that there are patients who suffer needlessly and their recovery is retarded because of the critical nurse shortages. Our most desperate plight is revealed during the afternoon and night shifts when one nurse may have to assume charge for 400 to 600 patients.

"We carry a dreadful and grave responsibility if, knowing the facts, we stand by supinely and take no action that can improve the situation."

CITY LOSING GROUND

As a matter of fact the big worry at the present time is not how to improve the situation but how to stop a steady deterioration of nursing service, both numerically and in quality. Dr. Kogel frankly admits that the city hospitals are losing ground.

He and his associates, taking a realistic attitude, know that the problem of the nursing shortage cannot be solved in one institution—it is a national problem. All their efforts, if successful, will only keep city institutions in the same relative position in regard to other institutions, a position in which the city hospitals always will be losers.

For example, at one time several years ago, the city hospitals took the lead in raising salaries and put themselves in a relatively good position as far as quantity of nurses was concerned. But the voluntary hospitals with a much more flexible financial policy, soon overtook them and attracted more nurses.

At present, the voluntary hospitals in the city have a nurse shortage, too, but it can only be described as slight. Most of the private hospitals say they are not hit hard and insist that they haven't been forced to curtail services. Here are what some of them report:

Lenox Hill Hospital: Could use a few more nurses, but the superintendent added, "we're not badly off at all."

Long Island College Hospital: In a first-rate position and didn't need any more nurses.

Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center: 29 vacancies in an authorized staff of 362 nurses, but "is not feeling any acute shortage."

Roosevelt Hospital: Needs 17 more nurses out of a total of 66, but is not critically short.

New York Hospital: With 642 nurses on its staff, is 20 percent short of its requirements, but a spokesman said only one medical ward and one private-duty unit had been closed. She added, "We're getting along fine."

Mount Sinai Hospital: Shortage of 13 nurses in calls for 193 nurses one day last month, but the director said the situation was "not too bad."

Most of these hospitals have nursing schools attached and the work of the student nurses helps relieve the pressure. All of them have stepped up their employment of auxiliary workers and some have increased their advertising for nurses, a policy that others consider unethical.

In the competition for nurses, which goes on below the polite surface of concern about mutual problems, the city departments, of course, come off worse than private and Federal agencies.

CITY CANNOT COMPETE

Dr. John F. Mahoney, commissioner of health, admitted what everybody knew when he testified on his budget requests last month—that the city couldn't compete for nurses with anybody else, especially the Federal agencies—and asked for higher wages.

The Veterans' Administration, in particular, has been the chief target for those who accuse the Federal Government of "stealing" nurses from city hospitals everywhere. A spokesman for the agency said these charges were "not exactly true."

"A nurse would be a fool if she didn't take the highest pay available," he explained.

The competition apparently is going to sharpen in the future, because the supply of nurses is not going to rise as fast as the need. City officials who have described the situation as critical for years now are running out of words, but, in fact, their problem is getting worse.

For example, one of the biggest headaches at the department of hospitals is what will happen to Bellevue Hospital when the new Veterans' Administration Hospital, now under construction at First Avenue and Twenty-third Street, is completed in 1953.

"How many nurses do you think are going to remain at Bellevue," one nursing executive asked, "when they can walk across the street and do the same work for $1,000 a year more?"

Nursing jobs in city hospitals

Title	Authorized jobs	Vacancies	Filled by registered nurses	Filled by practical nurses	Filled by hospital attendants
Professional nurses	6,804	388	3,604	515	2,297
Practical nurses	1,863	144	------	1,271	448
Hospital attendants	4,180	175	------	423	3,582
Total	12,847	707	3,604	2,209	6,327

These figures were announced by the Department of Hospitals in making its budget requests for the next fiscal year.

Nurses' pay scales compared

City hospitals (New York)	Voluntary hospitals (New York)	Armed Forces	Veterans' Administration
Staff nurse, $221–$260.	Staff nurse, $230–$270.	2d lieutenant, $213.50 plus $42 food and $75 quarters.	Junior grade nurse, $312–$379.
Head nurse, $226–$266.	Head nurse, $250–$290.	First lieutenant, $249.38 plus $42 food, $82.50 quarters.	Associate nurse, $370–$433.
Chief nurse, $250–$290.	Chief nurse, $280–$320.	Captain, $313.50 plus $42 food, $90 quarters.	Nurse, full grade, $422–$484.

The above monthly figures do not include any allowance for a differential ranging from $10 to $40 a month granted by voluntary hospitals for night and afternoon work. In addition, the Armed Forces scale includes the Navy in the ranks of ensign, lieutenant (junior grade) and lieutenant.

[From the New York Times of March 5, 1952]

NURSE RECRUITING GETS TOP PRIORITY—THREE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-THREE NEEDED BY ARMED FORCES BY JULY, BUT PROSPECT OF GETTING THEM IS SLIM

(By Harold Faber)

The Armed Forces need 3,763 more nurses before July 1 and getting them has become the No. 1 priority in all recruiting activities.

Despite reports from civilian hospitals all over the country that nurses are leaving for military service, the Army, Navy, and Air Force do not have enough nurses to meet their requirements and are worried about whether they are going to get them.

The actual shortage in numbers, according to Department of Defense figures, was 2,249 at the end of December. However, nurses continually leave the service because their terms are up or because of pregnancy, and an additional 1,424 will be needed to fill the gaps left in the period ending June 30.

If the Armed Forces are that many short, are our men and women in service receiving adequate nursing care?

The heads of the nursing branches and Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, in charge of manpower and personnel, all agree that adequate nursing service is provided at present at the expense of overworking nurses.

In general throughout the services, nurses work about eight hours a week overtime to make up for the shortage. In the Navy, for example, nurses get a day and a half off every 2 weeks, except if they are on night duty, when they get a night a week off.

Mrs. Rosenberg believes that this overwork, if sustained, will sooner or later lead to a breakdown of patient care because nurses just won't be able to keep up their work. That is why the Department of Defense has made recruiting nurses its top procurement task.

PROSPECTS NOT BRIGHT

But the prospect of getting more nurses is not good, despite the need. This is admitted frankly by almost everyone concerned. They realize that the military nurse shortage is a reflection of the national nurse shortage and they know that even if the training of nurses is stepped up, the results cannot help for at least 3 years.

In addition, the Department of Defense finds itself in the peculiar position of competing with itself for high school graduates. It needs more nurses and would like to see young women take 3 years to prepare for nursing, but it also needs 72,000 young women for its other activities by July 1. A young woman who wants to serve may be a bit confused.

The armed forces calculate their requirements for nurses on the basis of medical needs, which, in turn, rest on the strength of the Military Establishment. Following is a table of military manpower as of February 4 and what the average strength will be for the fiscal year 1953, barring international complications:

	Feb. 4	*Average, 1953*
Army	1,570,000	1,552,000
Navy	790,000	832,000
Marines	219,000	237,000
Air Force	900,000	1,018,000
Total	3,409,000	3,639,000

The nursing needs are based on these figures, plus the expected patient load (with one nurse allocated for 10 usable beds), staffing of combat zone hospitals, outpatient nursing service, evacuation jobs for flight nursing and hospital trains, and training and other overhead functions.

The requirements are estimated quarterly and reviewed by the Health Resources Advisory Committee and the Armed Forces Medical Policy Council before being submitted to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for approval.

ARMY NEEDS GREATEST

During World War II when troop strength was stabilized, there were 6.5 nurses for 1,000 troops in the Army, which has a heavier requirement for nurses because it has the bulk of battle casualty admissions and maintains most of the overseas hospital facilities.

However, at one time last year, when the Health Resources Advisory Committee considered figures that the Army used indicating a need for some 5 nurses for 1,000 troops, the committee commented that such a ratio was not necessarily a permanent minimum necessity. There are some persons who still question the basis of the military figures.

The present numbers for each 1,000 troops, based on the requirements and how many nurses are on duty, are as follows:

	Nurses on duty	*Nurses Required*
Department of Defense	3.3	4.6
Army	3.5	5.3
Navy	3.3	4.0
Air Force	3.0	4.5

To fill the gap between what is necessary and what is available, the Department of Defense, like the civilian hospitals, is expanding its nursing supply by using more nonprofessional nurses.

The military always has used auxiliary personnel, especially in combat areas and in training for combat, and is proud of the record of its hospital corpsmen, here and abroad. The auxiliary program is being stretched now by training practical nurses and others to relieve nurses of nonprofessional duties.

By directive of the Secretary of Defense, the military departments also are moving toward relieving nurses of what has been their chief bottleneck, clerical housekeeping and supply duties.

"It is necessary that registered nurses in the Armed Forces be utilized economically and that the nursing services be operated with increased efficiency," the Secretary said in the directive. "In this way, military personnel may continue to receive the best possible nursing care and there will be no needless drain of this valuable resource from the civilian economy."

Nurses in the Armed Forces

	Department of Defense	Army	Navy	Air Force
Total military nurses on duty	11,603	5,536	3,346	2,721
Full-time civilian nurses	2,421	1,200	408	813
Total requirement	16,273	8,270	3,960	4,043
Shortage, Dec. 1951	2,249	1,534	206	509
To replace losses by July 1, 1952	1,424	470	240	514
Total shortage	3,673	2,204	446	1,023

This tabulation is based on figures released by the Department of Defense.

[From the New York Times of March 6, 1952]

NURSE CRISIS SPURS HUNT FOR SOLUTION—MORE EFFICIENT USE OF PRESENT SUPPLY IS BEING ATTEMPTED BY MANY HOSPITALS—DUTIES SHIFTED TO AIDES—NONNURSING FUNCTIONS HALTED—FEDERAL SCHOLARSHIPS URGED TO HELP WIN RECRUITS

(By Harold Faber)

With the nursing shortage growing more acute, leaders of the profession are coming to the conclusion that the only practical way to get more nursing service lies in using the present nurse supply more efficiently.

The obvious solution of recruiting and training more nurses to meet expanding needs is regarded as academic by many nursing officials. They know that, despite the tremendous amount of publicity about the nursing shortage and the need for nurses, enrollment in the Nation's 1,170 schools of nursing dropped from 44,185 in 1950 to 41,667 in 1951, a loss of 5.7 percent.

In addition, it is apparent that stepped-up student recruitment, if possible, can only provide more nurses when they complete their schooling in from 3 to 5 years; to meet the shortage that exists now other steps must and are being taken.

While many nursing leaders work on the long-range solution, hospitals and public health agencies are faced with a deteriorating situation: how to maintain adequate nursing service without enough nurses.

Almost everybody has found the same practical answer: They hire more practical nurses, attendants and nurses' aides and use them under the supervision of a registered nurse. In 1946, hospitals throughout the country employed 177,552 auxiliary workers, including maids; today they employ 297,310.

This, of course, has resulted in a changing pattern of nursing service. In New York hospitals, for example, registered nurses performed 75 percent of the nursing care 10 years ago; today they do 30 percent. The same thing is happening all over.

NEW TREND IN TRAINING

Nursing officials recognize this changing pattern and the fact that recruiting more nurses is not going to be easy, if possible at all. They, therefore, believe that the main hope for the future lies in training nurses for supervisory jobs as well as for patient care.

One advocate of this theory, Miss Marion W. Sheahan, director of programs for the National Committee for the Improvement of Nursing Services, thinks that the numerical shortage of nurses is less important than the proper training and use of existing manpower.

Throughout the field of nursing, the word "utilization" is being used more and more as hospitals conduct studies, aided by engineers in some cases, to find out how many functions of the nurse can be performed safely by others. The number is surprisingly large.

At Harper Hospital in Detroit, for example, it was found that 42 percent of all treatments could be handled by practical nurses and 30 percent by nurses' aides. A New York State official estimates that from 30 to 50 percent of a nurse's time is spent in nonnursing functions.

Hospitals everywhere are reassigning nonnursing activities to non-nurses as a matter of necessity, not of theory. But the theory of nursing is changing, too, along with the advances in medicine.

A big part of the work of a nurse today is teaching her patient how to do things for himself, trying to get him out of bed earlier, helping him understand why he is taking a medicine. That takes more time than doing the job herself.

SCHOOL REQUIREMENTS HIGH

It also calls for a better-trained nurse, which is one of the reasons that entrance requirements for nursing schools are so high, a girl usually must be in the top half of her high-school graduating class. Some people think, however, that this restriction is too severe.

One of the big new theories in nursing education is the 2-year plan for training nurses instead of the accepted 3-year course. Mrs. Louis McManus, director of the Department of Nursing Education at Teachers College, believes the short course, if properly organized, can produce better nurses and, of course, more, thus helping to relieve the shortage.

An experiment in the 2-year plan, started 4 years ago at the Metropolitan School of Nurses in Windsor, Ont., will end in September, and the available results indicate that it has been successful. A similar plan is

being considered for Brooklyn and Queens Colleges here.

MEN'S ENROLLMENT UP

All of these considerations bring the problem back to the school of nursing and the high-school graduate. Although many nurses are dubious about increasing the over-all recruitment, there are two fields still not completely exploited, male nurses and Negro nurses.

Last year there were only 2,971 Negro student nurses in the country, a drop from 1950. In 1949, the last year for which full statistics are available, only 39 young Negro women in 10,000 entered nursing compared with 151 out of 10,000 white girls. Those who have studied the situation believe it is not the result of prejudice in nursing schools, but rather it is poor education facilities in the South that do not give Negro girls the preparation necessary to enter nursing schools.

In 1951 there were 1,023 men enrolled in nursing schools, an increase over the previous year. The difficulty in male nursing, of course, lies in prejudice against them, not only in schools, but outside. Some authorities feel that there can be a big field for men nurses, especially in psychiatric hospitals, which are the hardest hit by nurse shortages.

A third source of more nurses lies in cutting down the drop-out rate of girls already enrolled in schools. That rate is now about 34 percent, about three times what it is for medical and dental schools. The main reasons, in order, are failure in class work, dislike for nursing, and marriage.

One of the touchiest subjects in the nursing field is the place of the practical nurse. Registered nurses feel that most practical nurses are not adequately trained for their jobs and need much supervision. Practical nurses and many doctors believe that there are many jobs that the nonprofessional nurse can do.

As a matter of fact, the number of practical nurses is rising; they are being employed more and more, and registered nurses, no matter how reluctantly they accept the situation, are finding that practical nurses do have a place in the nursing service.

The biggest news in the field of nursing education, the Bolton bill, affects practical nurses as well as registered nurses. The bill introduced in the House of Representatives last year, provides Federal aid for schools of registered and practical nursing and for scholarships. It is a long-range program, with costs estimated at $47,000,000 a year.

Its backers are optimistic that more girls would enter nursing schools, which in many cases have surprisingly high tuition fees, if they could get scholarship aid and if schools could be expanded.

NO TALK OF UNIONS

Meanwhile, with enrollment dropping, with nurses leaving the field because of low pay, there is no noticeable movement of nurses to get together and better conditions except in their professional organizations. The question of unionization rarely comes up even in conversation.

Nursing officials, touchy about their "professional" status, like to talk about "job satisfactions," a phrase that working nurses translate into pay and hours.

The attitude of many nurses, especially the old-time nurses, in resenting any change or delegation of authority is another factor complicating solution of the shortage. Some critics have suggested that nurses and some nursing organizations are more interested in maintaining their professional status and prestige than in solving the basic problems of more nursing care for the Nation.

"All they do is talk about the shortages," one working nurse complained. "Nobody ever does anything."

Following are reports from various parts of the country on what is being done:

BIRMINGHAM

Many hospitals are working nurses a 12-hour shift instead of the normal 8, with some nurses performing double-shift duty. Many hospitals are using practical nurses to cover situations where trained nurses are needed.

Last year, the Alabama Nurses Association and the Alabama Hospital Association pooled $5,000 and appointed a full-time nursing recruiter for the State. While many young women were recruited during the year as nurse trainees, the funds are exhausted and the drive has closed.

BOSTON

Massachusetts General Hospital has affiliated with the School of Practical Nursing in Boston, giving students from that institution 13 months of bedside training, in the 15 months that the students are working for their licenses as practical home nurses. This helps to free professional nurses for other duty.

The hospital also has hired aides, who are trained in 6 weeks, there being no educational requirement, for work under supervisors. These are replacing the volunteers of the war years.

Then, the hospital operates a team plan. The team is headed by a graduate nurse, who patrols a wing. She is assisted by aides and practical nurses. The group takes morning temperatures, gets breakfasts, and is given instructions for the day's program. Student nurses assigned to these teams also get a chance to take care of various kinds of patients. The graduate nurse, getting her instructions from a head nurse, calls the signals for the rest of the group.

CHATTANOOGA

Hospital officials here agree they need a better recruiting program, but have not united to do anything about it. So far it's every hospital for itself. They say various nurses' organizations do little, if any, recruiting. They also agree the shortage here is sure to get worse before it improves, and that only an intensified recruiting program will increase the supply, and training will take some time.

Chattanooga's Kirkman Vocational School is preparing a new course to prepare licensed practical nurses to help spread the registered-nurse supply.

CHICAGO

The Illinois Hospital Association and the Blue Cross plan for hospital care now are entering the third year of a joint drive to increase nursing school enrollment and reduce the student-nurse withdrawal rate. The groups' goal is 3,500 admissions each year and 2,250 graduations. Cooperating in the drive are the Illinois State Nursing Association, the Illinois League of Nursing Education, and the Illinois Medical Society.

A feature of the campaign is student nurses' week proclaimed annually by the Governor. Prior to the week's opening sponsors of the drive get their message to the public through the newspapers, television and radio, church sermons, hospital-sponsored poster contests in schools, with scholarships awarded to winners, hospital equipment exhibits in department stores with doctors in attendance, open house at hospitals for high-school girls and teas for them. Also supporting the drive are civic and fraternity organizations and women's groups.

Meanwhile, the Chicago Council on Community Nurses has assumed leadership in training practical nurses as one approach to easing the shortage. Working with the board of education and aided by several grants, the council has training branches in two Chicago schools.

CLEVELAND

In a desperate attempt to obtain qualified nurses, hospitals have installed a general 40-hour week, increased wages, and improved working conditions.

One hospital opened a nursery adjacent to the hospital in an effort to attract nurses who had married and retired. Ten nurses with young children took advantage of the project and returned to duty.

Several hospitals experimented briefly with nurseries for the children of personnel in the hospital buildings, but abandoned the plan as unfeasible because of the fear of epidemics of children's diseases. Other hospitals declined to install nurseries because of the high cost of operation.

In the current emergency, hospitals have been employing students as nurses' assistants. They work split shifts and receive extra remuneration. Many interns also are picking up spending money by working extra hours as nurses.

ENGLEWOOD, N. J.

The Englewood Hospital has built up a team of part-time nurses who can spare a few hours a day away from their homes. During February, the nursing staff, which normally is 82 full-time nurses, was 60, but 57 part-time nurses did work equivalent to 21 full-time graduates.

LOS ANGELES

The nurse shortage has caused a mushrooming of hit-and-run commercial schools, which advertise that for less than $200 tuition and in as little as 20 hours' instruction they can turn out practical nurses who can earn big money. Such schools actually do not even have nurse-aide training, but they give graduates a cap and a pin and turn them loose. Several such schools are transplanted eastern enterprises—one of them had taught air-conditioning and television in Baltimore.

NEW YORK

Mount Sinai Hospital has instituted a group-nursing program, in which private nurses care for more than one patient. Each nurse gets paid more than the normal $12 a shift plus meals, each patient gets adequate care at less cost, and the hospital can answer more calls for private duty nursing.

PHILADELPHIA

The Community Nursing Bureau of Metropolitan Philadelphia, organized by professional and lay people who contributed both funds and material, opened in February to register nurses to supply hospitals, physicians, and the general public. Nurses may register for full-time, part-time, or hourly work.

The careers in nursing committee of the Nursing Council of Metropolitan Philadelphia has been conducting a vigorous enlistment campaign. It holds career forums in various sections to stimulate interest in nursing. Since the program started 4 years ago, schools of nursing and hospitals have held open house each spring so parents and prospective trainees could see nurses in action.

The nursing council also is encouraging the training of practical nurses. The Philadelphia public-school system has a program for training practical nurses, with pupils receiving 3 months of classroom work and 9 months in hospitals.

PITTSBURGH

In this highly industrialized area, workers in mills and plants send their daughters to college to become nurses, then can't understand why their pay as graduates is less than that of elevator girls in the city's office buildings.

There has been no attempt by hospital organizations to raise pay of nurses or to make careers attractive. The American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations, generally have shunned attempts to organize nurses because of State laws forbidding strikes and collective bargaining in nonprofit public and private institutions. Leaders of nurses' organizations,

preferring to achieve economic goals as professionals, have given little encouragement to union officials.

SAN FRANCISCO

Steps are being taken on several fronts to cope with the shortage. Miss Kathryn Smith, instructor in pediatric nursing at the University of California School of Nursing and acting chairman of the Student Nurse Recruitment Committee of California, said that a program to that end had been put under way about a year and a half ago, with two employed directors.

These directors do field work, with emphasis on meeting with counselors in junior high schools, high schools and junior colleges. They speak at "career-day" student assemblies and try to interest students in nursing.

Just getting under way is a new project, patterned after one that has been successful in Michigan. This is the formation of future nurse clubs for high-school girls, with the club members taking field trips to hospitals and other nursing centers.

SEATTLE

The legislature has passed a law providing for licensing of practical nurses with only 450 hours of special schooling and 5 months of on-the-job training. The University of Washington School of Nursing plans to announce soon a working agreement with the Virginia Mason Hospital, Seattle, to conduct a training program tied in with nursing-school work, similar to a program already in effect at the Kings County Hospital.

Hospitals here are using more practical nurses and nurses' aides than ever before. Practical nurses are assigned by the professional nurses' registry, both for duty in private homes and hospital duty under supervision.

The Kings County Nurses Association voted recently against use of practical nurses on private duty in hospitals. It was believed that enough responsibility had been delegated to practical nurses already.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

HISTORY OF ARNOLD ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT CENTER

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, all of the facts and dates which I will now cite come from official papers furnished me by the Air Force and by the General Services Administration. It has to do with the development of the great AEDC facility at Tullahoma, Tenn., and the sale of an air field and improvements at the same site. Its original conception by the Air Force dates back to 1944 and 1945. One of the first indications of USAF facility needs occurred back in August 1944 at Wright Field. In October of 1945 a formal committee was established and charged with the preparation of plans for an air engineering development center. In April of 1946 a meeting of the NACA Executive Committee was held and from this meeting a panel was formed known as the Raymond panel to study the national requirements of transonic and supersonic wind tunnels.

On December 19, 1947, the Research and Development Board, hereafter referred to as the RDB, at its tenth meeting, approved the establishment of an air engineer and development center. This action was approved by the Secretary of Defense on the 30th of December 1947. On the 16th of April 1948 the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the NACA jointly recommended to the Bureau of the Budget a draft of the proposed legislation authorizing the unitary wind-tunnel plan.

On the 28th of April 1948 the RDB Committee on Aeronautics approved Camp Forest, Tenn., as a site for AEDC and recommended prompt initiation of construction. On the 13th of May 1948, at its thirteenth meeting, the RDB itself formally approved the establishment of an AEDC and also approved the above action of the Committee on Aeronautics. On the 17th of May 1948 Dr. Vannevar Bush, Chairman of the RDB, submitted the RDB approval of May 13, 1948, to the Secretary of Defense. The Secretary gave his approval in a memorandum dated the 22d of May 1948.

The AEDC was formally presented to the Congress in a bill in May 1948. The Eightieth Congress adjourned in August 1948, before hearings were completed. On October 19, 1949, the Congress passed the measure and the President signed the bill into law.

On the 9th of November 1949, with the approval of the President, the Secretary of Defense and the RDB, the Secretary of the Air Force formally announced the selection of Camp Forest, Tenn., as the site on which AEDC would be built.

Thereafter developments came fast. I will not take the time of the House at this late hour to discuss in detail these developments. For one thing many of us undertook to obtain the project for our home States. It appears now that those in the know must have enjoyed the show—quite a "rhubarb." Suffice it to say that after it was under way the Air Force faced a decision on how to operate the AEDC. The Research Development Board recommended that a nonprofit corporation be set up to operate the AEDC. Overruling the recommendation of the Research Development Board, the Secretary of the Air Force approved a procedure by which a profit corporation would be created. This profit corporation was created by a Missouri corporation called Sverdrup & Parcel. The corporation was known as ARO, Inc., to which I referred yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the contracts which Sverdrup & Parcel have had and now have with the Air Force, all for design, plans, studies, and so forth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. They are as follows: $3,235,814, $6,069,220, $165,000, $1,060,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked the General Services Administration to bring to my committee the complete files on the sale of the William Northern Air Field and improvement at Tullahoma, Tenn. This is important because after AEDC was located there the Air Force then needed an air field, then needed many buildings. The voluminous files have revealed some quite interesting communications to which I do not wish now to refer.

I find from the files, which I have studied carefully, that the William Northern Field cost the United States Government $5,477,175. All of these improvements were sold for $15,745. Now the Government is renting at many thousands of dollars per year only a part of the buildings all of which were sold for $15,000.

The sale of the William Northern Field occurred on August 5, 1948, when its sale was formally approved by the War Assets Administration. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that this was over 3 months after the Research Development Board selected Camp Forrest, Tenn., as the site for the AEDC. It was more than 2½ months after the Secretary of Air gave it his formal approval.

It is not a very pretty picture. We are going to give all of these facts and others very, very careful study. I do not know that there is anything we can do about it. It may be that the horse is already out of the barn, but it is important that the people have the facts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

COMMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE UAW-CIO FOR ITS PURGE OF COMMUNISTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, March 15, 1952, the administrative board of the International UAW-CIO took over management of Ford Local 600, which has more than 40,000 dues-paying members, and fired 5 of its officers. They were fired, said the board, because they had used the local "to advance the interests of the Communist Party at the expense of the Ford workers." This action immediately followed the exposure of the Communist membership of these officials by a congressional subcommittee.

It is a pleasure to join my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who, on the 17th, complimented—and I quote:

> That great leader and labor statesman, Walter Reuther, for the courageous action he took in attempting to rid local 600 of the Communist influence which unquestionably dominated that union.

Mr. Reuther and those who acted with him in this purge of the Reds have been highly praised for their action.

For years the CIO News, the Daily Worker, left-wing radio announcers, columnists, and some editors have falsely characterized my legislative activities as being antilabor and Red-baiting. So now, when the tide has turned, it seems proper to note the fact that 14 years and 9 months ago, from the well of the House, I condemned and named Communists and others who were attempting to take over labor organizations.

In January of 1924, a Senate document, compiled under John L. Lewis'

supervision, entitled "Attempt by Communists To Seize American Labor Movement," named and described a designated group as "fakers, repudiated leaders, traitors to the unions, opportunists, and purveyors of every falsehood, slander, and deception."

In 1928, Lewis' Mine Journal said the group "was doing its dirtiest to capture the United Mine Workers and transform this splendid union into a Communist organization."

Lewis knew all that when he left the AFL, fathered the CIO and later, in 1937, under the protection of Gov. Frank Murphy, used the Communists to call and carry on the sit-down strikes in Michigan.

During those strikes, the CIO—and Walter Reuther was then a member—and its Communist allies deliberately followed a planned program of seizing factories, destroying personal property, beating individuals, defying peace officers, disregarding the law, ignoring court orders and the rules of common decency.

President Roosevelt had warned:

If communism breaks in America, it will be in the Detroit area where it will first manifest itself.

And Governor Murphy said:

Communism is not coming, it is here.

On the first day of June 1937, it was my privilege to call the attention of the House, not only to the unlawful activities of the CIO under Lewis, who had Reuther's assistance, but to name some Communists and left-wingers—more than 40 in all—who either were furthering or had prepared the ground for the sit-down strikes—Communist infiltration into labor unions.[1]

[1] Let me call the roll, in part at least, of those who, in 1922 and 1924, according to the report prepared by the United Mine Workers of America, of which Mr. Lewis was president, brought "imported revolution" to and stood "knocking at the door of the United Mine Workers and of the American people," and who sought "the overthrow and destruction of this Government," and give you his description of those men and their activities.

One of the principal organizations named as engaged in the attempt to overthrow and destroy the labor organizations and our Government was the Communist Party of America. Of that organization it was said—I quote:

"It is purely a revolutionary organization and makes no pretense at legality. * * * This party has at its head the supreme executive revolutionary committee in America, responsible only to * * * officials of the Communist International.

"On the surface and working partly in the open is another revolutionary organization, known as the Workers Party of America. * * *"—

With a mission—

"fundamentally the same as that of the Communist Party of America, i. e., to overthrow the Government of the United States."

Continuing to quote:

"Joined with these two revolutionary parties * * * is the Trade Union Educational League, headed by William Z. Foster. * * * This league is * * * the direct instrumentality * * * of the Communist International."

Then was named the "American Civil Liberties Union" at New York as another of the groups engaged in the then effort to overthrow American Government.

For the last 9 years, on the wall of my office in Washington, have hung six photographs showing five CIO pickets, two of them Communists, beating a defenseless worker. At that time, Lee Pressman, an admitted Communist, was general counsel of the CIO and presumably directed its activities.

Can it be said that Walter Reuther, an intelligent man, who had worked in Russia, was ignorant of the fact that the CIO, in the sit-down strikes, was using Communists and their methods?

Just why, while our men are being shot and killed in Korea in their effort to contain communism, those safe here in America should be praised for throwing Communists out of a position where they

---

Other groups were likewise designated as having the same objective, looking toward the same end, and, quoting again:

"They are fused into united effort, giving mutual support to each other in their numerous activities."

Through this interlocking arrangement—quoting again:

"These Communist groups interlock also with the Communist International and the Red Trade Labor Union International at Moscow, so that the revolutionary movement in America is the direct offspring and agency of the Communist regime in Russia, for the purpose of seizing and possessing themselves of the American continent through the medium of revolution, inspired and conducted from the stronghold of bolshevism on the other side of the Atlantic."

Today these same groups, with like inspiration, acting together, are behind, and acting with the CIO in its present war on industry and the American Federation of Labor.

Lewis then named Earl Browder as Foster's right-hand man. Browder, one time general secretary of the Communist Party, its candidate for President in 1936, then so roundly condemned by Lewis, today is an ardent supporter of the CIO and its methods.

Powers Hapgood, John Brophy, and Adolph Germer, all in that movement, were later described by Lewis as:

"Fakirs, repudiated leaders, traitors to the unions, opportunists, and purveyors of every falsehood, slander, and deception."

Brophy and Hapgood were described as agents of the Communists and one of them at least, Lewis intimated, was paid direct from Moscow.

Lewis' United Mine Workers Journal, on May 1, 1928, made the statement that the leadership of Brophy, Patrick Toohey, and Hapgood and a few others had been—

"Doing its dirtiest to capture the United Mine Workers and to transform this splendid union into a Communist organization."

Powers Hapgood is now field representative for the CIO.

John Brophy, then characterized as a traitor to the unions, the purveyor of every falsehood, slander, and deception, is now directed to supervise the administration of the CIO.

Adolph Germer, as stated, was roundly denounced by Lewis in 1930. For years he was a Socialist agitator. Today he is an organizer for CIO, his work second only to that of Hapgood and Brophy.

Patrick Toohey, a leader in the movement which was "doing its dirtiest to capture the United Mine Workers and to transform" it "into a Communist organization" and who is now in charge of Communist activities in Philadelphia, is the man who saved the day for the CIO in the RCA strike in Camden, N. J.

Sidney Hillman, one of the original seven who formed the CIO, president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America—which made 1936 campaign contributions of $62,281.89, principally to Labor's Nonpartisan League and the American Labor Party, and including $4,350 to the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party—is one of those who in 1922 organized the Russian-American Industrial Corporation to raise a million dollars among the workers of America to bring about the "rehabilitation of Russia." He was active on the I. W. W. defense committee and an honorary president of the Ultra Red National Religion and Labor Foundation.

David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union—which made campaign contributions in 1936 of $61,385.85 to the American Labor Party, Labor's Nonpartisan League, and the Minnesota Farmer-Labor Party—was the man who undertook to raise $100,000 from the American radical unionists for the support of the Communist "red" front in Spain.

Clinton S. Golden was for several years business manager and field director of Brookwood Labor College at Katonah, N. Y., a school for labor students, prospective organizers, and strike leaders. He was a member of the board of counselors of Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark., where, according to a legislative inquiry in 1935, free love practices prevailed and communism and atheism were taught.

While Golden and Hillman were directors of the Garland fund, money was allocated from that fund to the Ferrier group, whose publication then stated:

"We are anarchists because we see in the State an enemy of liberty and human progress; and we are Communists because we conceive communism as the most rational and just economic theory yet proposed. * * * As anarchists, we seek the abolition of the State."

This group then said:

"The all-important thing is that industry be controlled at the point of production."

Which is what the CIO accomplished at Flint, Detroit, and other places.

Other CIO organizers, and ardent supporters who have been listed as Communists, can be named. Among them are:

Alfredo Abilio, a member of the Communist Party at South Chicago and a paid Steel Workers' Organizing Committee organizer among Mexicans in that section.

John W. Anderson, a CIO organizer, who was the Communist candidate for Governor of Michigan in 1934.

Merlin D. Bishop, graduate and former member of the staff of the Brookwood Labor College, and who is on the payroll as "educational director" for the CIO.

Peter Chapa, who for years was a Communist organizer, is now a full-time organizer for the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee at Gary.

Ruth Chapa, wife of Peter Chapa, who is paid by the Steel Workers' Organizing Committee, the S. W. O. C., to do missionary work in the homes of Spanish steel workers.

Joe Cook, a member of the Communist Party, and who is a part-time organizer for the S. W. O. C. in South Chicago.

Margaret Cowl, Communist writer and agitator, who is on the CIO payroll and was active in promoting the women's activities in the strike at Flint, Mich.

Dave Doran, Pittsburgh district organizer for the Young Communist League, who is on the S. W. O. C. payroll and who is a close associate of William Z. Foster, and confers frequently with Philip Murray, director of CIO's steel organization drive.

James W. Ford, colored, Communist candidate for Vice President in 1936. He attended a conference of Negro leaders, called by Philip Murray at Pittsburgh on February 8.

William K. Gebert, associate of William Z. Foster and member of the central committee

might lessen production for defense, is a little difficult to understand.

But let us not be critical. Converts are always welcome. St. Luke wrote:

That likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance.

So, again, even if we assume that Walter Reuther and his associates did know the CIO has been harboring Communists, let us all commend them for now kicking Communists out of Local 600. Let us all express the hope that those who seek, as do the Communists, to overthrow this Government by force, who contend that "there is no God," that "ministers and priests are hypocrites," that "religion is a fraud," may be exposed, removed from all positions, both in labor organizations and Government, which give them power or opportunity to spread communism.

Unfortunately a walk-out or wildcat strike in the plant of the Benton Harbor Malleable Industries at Benton Harbor, Mich., may seriously hinder production in a plant which has secondary contracts for defense production. It may also afford another opportunity for Mr. Reuther to learn whether those responsible

---

of the Community Party, is now a CIO organizer, and confers frequently with Philip Murray.

Paul Glacer, attorney for the section committee of the Communist Party, is a full salaried member of the S. W. O. C. staff.

Doyle Glormer, reporter for the Communist People's Press, is on the payroll of the S. W. O. C.

Jess Gonzales, Mexican, member of the Communist Party and a full-time salaried man on the S. W. O. C. in Pittsburgh.

Francis J. Gorman, president of the United Textile Workers, just recently became a member of the advisory board of communistic Commonwealth College at Mena, Ark.

Hansen, first name unknown, member of the Communist Party at Chicago Heights and a full-time organizer for the S. W. O. C.

Charles Henry, member of the Communist Party and part-time organizer for the S. W. O. C. in South Chicago.

Mary Hillyer, leader in the left-wing League for Industrial Democracy, who has been assisting Comrade Margaret Cowl, who was active in promoting women's activities in the Flint, Mich., strike.

Clarence Irwin, district organizer for the Communist Party and on the S. W. O. C. payroll in Pittsburgh.

Genora Johnson, member of the Socialist Party and leader of the women's brigade at Flint.

Leo Krzycki, vice president of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, a member of the national executive committee of the Socialist Party, and a member of the advisory board of the CIO.

Louis Majors, member of the Communist Party, and on the payroll of the S. W. O. C. in Pittsburgh.

Homer S. Martin, former Baptist minister, who has been a left-wing orator for years, is president of the United Automobile Workers and Lewis' right-hand man in Michigan.

Leonides McDonald, Negro, Communist leader, on the payroll of the S. W. O. C. at Indiana Harbor.

Mike Ostroski, member of the Communist Party, and on the payroll of the S. W. O. C. in Gary.

Blain Owen, alias Boris Israel, and whose real name is Isreal Brestein, and who formerly represented Amtorg, the Soviet trading agency on the Pacific, at present is working with William K. Gebert in the Pittsburgh district.

George A. Patterson, member of the Communist Party, and on the payroll of the S. W. O. C. in South Chicago.

Rose Pesotta, veteran anarchist leader, who was an intimate of Emma Goldman, is an active CIO organizer in the rubber and automobile industries.

George Powers, alias Morris Powers, former district organizer of the Communist Party in South Carolina, is now a district director of the S. W. O. C. of the CIO in Pittsburgh, at a large salary.

Lee Pressman, radical lawyer, CIO's general counsel.

Walter Reuther, Victor Reuther, Roy Reuther, long-time agitators for left-wing causes and now CIO organizers. Victor and Walter are graduates of the Communist Brookwood Labor College at Katonah, N. Y., a training school for black and white agitators.

Eleanor Rye, colored, an organizer for the National Negro Congress, a Communist organization, and on the private payroll of Van A. Bittner, Chicago regional director of the CIO.

John Schmies, former assistant to William Z. Foster and one-time organizer of the Auto Workers' Union, a Communist organization, which was active until a few years ago. He is the Detroit representative of the fraternal-orders committee, organized by the CIO to line up fraternal organizations.

Tom Shane, member of the Communist Party and a full-time CIO organizer on the steel workers' payroll in Pittsburgh.

Tucker P. Smith, president-director of Brookwood College, who writes for the auto workers' CIO organ and who assisted the CIO in founding a training school at Saugatuck, Mich., last summer, for the training of agitators for the sit-down strikes.

Jack Stachel, member of the central committee of the Communist Party, who is a director of CIO payroll organizers in Pennsylvania and who wrote the foreword to one of Foster's propaganda pamphlets distributed by CIO organizers.

Maurice Sugar, radical lawyer, who was the Communist candidate for the office of recorder's judge in the city of Detroit in 1936, and who is on the payroll of the CIO.

Mary Heaton Vorse, well-known Communist author, who has been directing the organization of CIO women's auxiliaries.

William Weinstone, secretary of the Michigan district of the Communist Party, who has been directing Communist activities in the Flint and Detroit strikes, and who is the author of the pamphlet, The Great Sit-Down Strike.

In addition to the long list of Communists and supporters, whose names I have recited as being moving spirits in the Committee for Industrial Organization, we have numbered, among those giving it active or tacit aid, the National Labor Relations Board; the Secretary of Labor, Madam Perkins; the Governor of the State of Michigan, Frank Murphy; the President of the United States.

Small wonder then that, with the hope of higher wages, with its preaching of class hatred so often and so effectively used by the President himself, and by the use of force, which so far has proven to be irresistible, the CIO is enlisting and drafting into its army the workmen of the Nation.

As Lewis in 1924 charged many of these men with being Communists, bent upon the destruction of the American Federation of Labor, and of the Government, so today he is, by the American Federation of Labor, characterized as a Communist, described as being "in bed with Communists" and charged with an attempt to destroy the American Federation of Labor and our democratic form of government.

Working with these men, through them, using their organizations and their methods, he cannot now escape responsibility for their acts or the result of his own actions.

His present purpose is the same as that which he attributed to the organizers of the industrial union when, in 1924, he said their purpose was:

"The overthrow and destruction of this Government, with the establishment of an absolute and arbitrary dictatorship, and the elimination of all forms of popular voice in governmental affairs."

If the fact that those who, in 1924, were described by Lewis as Communists, having shown no change of thought or of method, are now all united with him in this CIO drive against industry and the American Federation of Labor, and the statement of William Z. Foster that—

"The CIO organizers of today have a great advantage * * * in the fact that today there is in existence a strong Communist Party to lend its active assistance"—

does not prove that the present move is communistic, let us compare the methods which they recommend and those which the CIO is using.

If the guiding, controlling actors be Communists; if their methods be those of Communists; if their purpose be control and regimentation of labor and of industry; and if those who follow their banner gain, in the end, no material advantage, the movement is wholly dangerous and unworthy of support.

William Z. Foster, America's Communist No. 1, national chairman of the Communist Party in America, outlined the plan and described the methods of procedure for unionizing steel, the methods which have been followed in the CIO drive and strikes.

First, Foster recommended that supporting committees be formed among fraternal organizations. Within a month Philip Murray and three full-fledged Communists spoke at a fraternal orders' conference in Pittsburgh. Lewis sent his blessings, and a fraternal orders' committee was formed, with Bill K. Gebert, recently district organizer for the Communist Party in Chicago, as its national chairman. This organization took an active part in the Detroit strike.

Second. Foster suggested that support should be extended to the building up of the Workers' Alliance. As everyone knows, the Workers' Alliance, as now constituted, is a combination of three "red" organizations, and not long ago, when a State-wide meeting of that organization was held at Harrisburg, Pa., Clinton Golden, the CIO regional director, thanked the alliance for the support it had given and pledged the support of the CIO to the alliance.

Third. Foster suggested that prominent speakers of the National Negro Congress, organized by Communists, should be brought into the steel districts. In February Philip Murray met in conference with James W. Ford, ranking Negro Communist, candidate for Vice President on that ticket; John P. Davis, of the National Negro Congress; and Thyra Edwards, not long returned from Soviet Russia.

Fourth. "The women relatives of the steel workers are a vital factor in the steel industry," said Foster, and directed that they "be organized into ladies' auxiliaries." The CIO immediately adopted the idea.

On the payroll of the CIO, into Flint went Margaret Cowl, leading Communist organizer and writer. There the women's auxiliaries, with their red arm bands and red berets, under Mary Hillyer, leader in the League for Industrial Democracy, and Mary Heaton Vorse, Communist author, marched in the streets assisting the pickets and the sit-downers in the factories.

May 26, at Detroit, these women's auxiliaries marched on the Ford plants in Dearborn.

Fifth. The sit-down strikes no more than began when Foster issued further recommendations dealing with anticipated strike problems. These were distributed through

for the strike are following the Communist line as he found the officials of local 600 were doing at Detroit.

Permit a brief statement of what happened this morning.

Benton Malleable Industries about 3 weeks ago entered into a contract with local 880 of the UAW-CIO. William N. Gaines is president of the local. Walter P. Reuther is president of UAW-CIO, which approved of the contract. The contract was satisfactory to both the union and the company. It was approved by the international.

There has been no complaint as to wages, hours, or working conditions since the contract was signed.

There was, a few days ago, some difference of opinion as to the exact procedure to be followed if and when so-called grievance complaints were to be adjusted.

Earlier today, when an attempt was being made to settle this question as to a grievance complaint, without any warning the men walked out.

They gave no notice of an intention to strike, no strike notice. Under the leadership of the local's president, William N. Gaines, and Augusta Harper, the men just walked out. They walked out leaving 30 tons of molten metal unpoured. Fortunately volunteers assisted the company officials and clerical force to pour the hot metal and avoid damage to the equipment which might easily have amounted to a quarter of a million dollars.

And what was it all about? Well, a week ago last Saturday, that would be March 8, a truck driver was not working. The company was trying to make improvements to the plant to enable it to handle prime defense orders. Improvements which would create additional jobs, make available a greater pay roll, all of course benefiting the families of the workers, the merchants of the city. The company wanted to haul in some I-beams with one of the small trucks used to haul things around in the plant. But the pavement was wet, someone thought the small equipment was not large enough, so the truck which the driver who was not working usually drove was used. It was driven to haul the I-beams for about 20 minutes. So the union officials demanded that the driver who did not work on Saturday, the 8th of March, be paid. Just how much I do not know. When the company refused the men went out. And the plant is down. The men are out of their jobs, which are waiting. Ordinarily the company employs around 600 men, recently perhaps 300 more. Ordinarily the weekly pay-roll would be around $5,000 a week, $1,000 a day. You see what a day's idleness means to someone.

Some, perhaps a dozen, of the men live at Covert. One Augusta Harper, a member of the committee, was active in the strike at West Allis, where the union of which Harold Christoffel was an officer, held up production in World War II for more than 70 days. Christoffel was later convicted of perjury when before the House Committee on Labor he denied he was a Communist.

It seems strange that men would walk out, without notice, violating their contract and the State law just because the company refused to pay one man a certain sum. The contract must have provided a way to settle such a dispute without a walk-out, a work stoppage.

Is it possible that Communists are at work in this union? Are doing what Walter said they were doing in Local 600 at Detroit?

It is my hope that Reuther and the FBI will move quickly to ascertain whether this work stoppage is due to Communist activities, to hasty radical action on the part of the management or union. Certainly there is little sense, when there is unemployment in Detroit, when the Moody-Dingell bill is asking that we about double unemployment benefits—in stopping work, throwing men out of their jobs, because of a dispute over whether a man should be paid something around $10 or even $20.

Here is another chance for Mr. Reuther to straighten out a local, if that is what it needs. To, in any event, assist in adjusting and settling this dispute. If the trouble is because of Communists, kick them out, as he did in Detroit. If due to breach of contract, the public should know who is at fault.

Communist and CIO channels. One of these recommendations was this:

"Prominent liberals, and others should be brought into the strike areas. A national citizens' committee, comprising such liberal strike sympathizers, including educators, writers, artists, etc., should be set up."

Within a few days from New York into Flint and Detroit went the American Civil Liberties Union, and a national citizens' committee to support the strikers was formed.

Sixth. Foster advised:

"Not only should all the strikers be mobilized for picketing, but their women and children as well."

We have been accustomed to picketing by women, but in Flint, children were bedecked with the signs and slogans on characteristics of "red" meetings.

Seventh. Foster recommended a legal department and said:

"Here the International Labor Defense can also play an important part."

Onto the stage and representing the strikers came Maurice Sugar, Detroit representative of the Communist International Labor Defense.

ALIENS UNLAWFULLY IN THIS COUNTRY LEAD A SIT-DOWN STRIKE

Eighth. Foster stated:

"Especially vigorous campaigns must be made against all attempts at deportation of foreign-born workers. This emphasizes the need to build up the I. L. D. in the strike centers."

Three of the CIO organizers who assisted in taking possession of the Parke-Davis plant at Detroit—John Dolphin, Solomon Fine, and Anthony Probe—are aliens who are illegally in the United States. Anthony Probe is a candidate for vice president of the U. A. W. A.

CIO DEFIES COURT

Ninth. Foster, the "red" leader, advised:

"When injunctions are issued the strikers should follow the * * * policy of ignoring such court orders."

When Judge Gadola, at Flint, issued injunctions against the continued possession of General Motors plants by the CIO strikers, those injunctions were ignored, and Governor Frank Murphy, executive officer of the State of Michigan, called in the National Guard and prevented the enforcement of those orders.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Messrs. HERLONG, BATTLE, and BURNSIDE.

Mr. STIGLER and to include an article from a Washington paper.

Mr. WITHROW and to include a statement by President Thomas of the Postal Transport Association.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include two articles.

Mr. HOPE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BRAMBLETT in two instances and to include two articles from the Ventura Star-Free Press.

Mr. JACKSON of California and to include two news releases.

Mr. REES of Kansas and to include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include a letter and a table from the American Legion relating to cuts in contact representation in Veterans' Administration offices.

Mr. DORN and to include an article.

Mr. FISHER and to include in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole extraneous matter.

Mr. KEOGH and to include an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 15.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO and to include an article.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) and to include an article.

Mr. HART (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) and to include an article.

Mr. MCCARTHY (at the request of Mr. ADDONIZIO) and to include an article.

Mr. SITTLER and to include a letter printed in the February 22 issue of Washington Observer.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL in six instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. SCUDDER (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) and to include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD) in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILLINGS in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include an address by the Reverend Robert B. Whyte, pastor of the Old Stone Church (Presbyterian) of Cleveland, at the Washington Pilgrimage of American Churchmen in 1951.

Mrs. BOLTON and to include an editorial from the January 7 issue of Steel magazine.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the

following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1012. An act to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BARING (at the request of Mr. ENGLE) for the weeks of March 17 and March 24 on account of official business.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for Friday, March 21, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 21, 1952, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1263. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated May 1950, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, of the Pee Dee River watershed in Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, made under the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 395); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1264. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated January 1951, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, of the Brazos River watershed in Texas, made under the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 396); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1265. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated July 1950, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, of the Queen Creek watershed in Arizona made under the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 397); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1266. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a survey report dated May 1950, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, of the Sny watershed in Illinois made under the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 398); to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1267. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease under the terms of Public Law 8, Eightieth Congress, for the month of January 1952; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1268. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, together with the reports covering the operations during the same period of foreign trade zones Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 located respectively at New York City, New Orleans, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, and San Antonio pursuant to section 16 of the Foreign Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended by Public Law No. 566, Eighty-first Congress, approved June 17, 1950; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7151. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 558. Resolution providing for the appointment of a special committee of the House of Representatives to investigate the campaign expenditures of the various candidates for the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1603). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 582. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 4323, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 5 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1604). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 5652. A bill authorizing the Oregon State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a dam and dike to prevent the flow of tidal waters into north slough, Coos County, Oreg.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1605). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. House Joint Resolution 350. Joint resolution to provide an extension of time for the authorization for certain projects for local flood protection in the Tennessee River Basin; without amendment (Rept. No. 1606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 6635. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 160. A bill to amend section 5192 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the reserves of certain national banks; without amendment (Rept. No. 1616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 2085. An act to further amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to underwriting and dealing in securities issued by the Central Bank for Cooperatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 1617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 2608. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 1618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3177. A bill to amend title IV of the National Housing Act as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 4792. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Jeremiah Curtin home and underlying land to the Milwaukee County Historical Society by the Public Housing Administration; with amendment (Rept. No. 1620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6101. A bill to extend the provisions of the Federal Credit Union Act, as amended, to the Virgin Islands; without amendment (Rept. No. 1621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 403. Joint resolution to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages; without amendment (Rept. No. 1622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Thirteenth intermediate report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, entitled "Construction at Andrews Air Base" (Rept. No. 1623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 556. Resolution to provide additional funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 390, as amended; with amendment (Rept. 1624). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 487. Resolution to provide funds for the Committee on the Judiciary; with amendment (Rept. No. 1625). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 526. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 1626). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 557. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigations and studies authorized by House Resolution 38; without amendment (Rept. No. 1627). Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1749. An act for the relief of Gordon E. Smith; without amendment (Rept. No. 1608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1949. An act for the relief of Hattie Truax Graham, formerly Hattie Truax; without amendment (Rept. No. 1609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2004. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David H. Perkins; without amendment (Rept. No. 1610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FRAZIER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2005. An act for the relief of Harriet F. Bradshaw; without amendment (Rept. No. 1611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FINE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2418. An act for the relief of Britt-Marie Eriksson and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 1612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLER of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2628. A bill for the relief of the George H. Soffel Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4037. A bill for the relief of M. Neil Andrews; without amendment (Rept. No. 1614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4492. A bill for the relief of Norma J. Roberts; with amendment (Rept. No. 1615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 7151. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 7152. A bill to provide for voluntary coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system for lawyers engaged in the practice of their profession; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska:

H. R. 7153. A bill to abolish free transmission of official Government mail matter and certain other mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 7154. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp honoring the centennial of the Indiana State Fair; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. R. 7155. A bill to relieve from liability to refund to the United States any compensation received for any period prior to July 1, 1935, in contravention of dual compensation laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7156. A bill to provide that certain unclaimed deposits in national banks shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 7157. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 7158. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to provide support for the price of defatted milk at 1½ cents per pound; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7159. A bill to recognize nonprofit nonpolitical veterans' organizations for purposes of bestowing upon them certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7160. A bill to provide for the training of candidates for appointment as nurses in the military services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7161. A bill for the safety of life and property by making certain commercial fishing vessels subject to the rules and regulations of the United States Coast Guard marine inspection; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 7162. A bill to authorize the Chief of Engineers to enter into contracts for the use of dams and reservoirs under the control of the Department of the Army for the storage and release of water for domestic and industrial uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. Res. 583. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives, so as to make in order provisions in and amendments to general appropriation bills which reduce, or impose limitations upon the expenditure of, appropriations previously made; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. Res. 584. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the activities of the Tribal Council for the Indians of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. J. Res. 406. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leif Ericsson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 7163. A bill for the relief of Peter M. Mihalovici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7164. A bill for the relief of Peter Rousetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos, also known as Panagiotis Roussetos Metritikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENNY:

H. R. 7165. A bill for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 7166. A bill for the relief of Chien So Chen and Chien So Chuing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7167. A bill for the relief of Osamu Yamaguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7168. A bill for the relief of Nalani Jean Damon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINE:

H. R. 7169. A bill for the relief of Aroussian Agopian and Tacor Agopian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 7170. A bill for the relief of Johanna Zeline Zolliker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 7171. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Toumanoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7172. A bill for the relief of Cosmo Spinosa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 7173. A bill for the relief of Linda Darlene Kunz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7174. A bill for the relief of Charles Edmund Dumaresq Clavell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 7175. A bill for the relief of Robert Keith Slotvig; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

642. Mr. HART presented a petition of the Hudson County Press Club, Union City, N. J., which unanimously passed a resolution protesting House Speaker's ban on broadcasting and telecasting in House committees, which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and ever-blessed God, as we continue in the business of this new day, may we be conscious of the creative and cooperative presence and power of the spiritual factors and forces.

Make us see that we cannot solve any of our human problems without Thy help and that all our efforts will end in futility and failure unless we have divine guidance.

Lift our timid and trembling spirits out of the doubts and fears which make us cowards, into the glorious faith that enables us to go forth as conquerors, courageous and invincible.

Grant that our lives may be strong in the integrity which remains steadfast in times of trial and temptation.

May we be patient and hopeful in the hours of darkness when all earthly lights are eclipsed and extinguished by adversity.

In Christ's name we bring our petition. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION, 1953

Mr. NORRELL (on behalf of Mr. KIRWAN), from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7176) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1628), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. JENSEN reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Abbitt	Belcher	Brownson
Auchincloss	Bolling	Buchanan
Bailey	Bolton	Burdick
Baring	Bosone	Burnside
Battle	Boykin	Butler

Byrnes	Heffernan	Patman
Carrigg	Herter	Potter
Celler	Hinshaw	Powell
Clevenger	Hull	Prouty
Combs	Jackson, Calif.	Rabaut
Corbett	James	Ribicoff
Dawson	Kee	Rivers
Dingell	Kersten, Wis.	Roberts
Dollinger	King, Pa.	Rogers, Tex.
Dondero	Larcade	Sheppard
Doyle	McConnell	Short
Fernandez	McKinnon	Staggers
Flood	Mack, Ill.	Stockman
Fogarty	Martin, Iowa	Velde
Fugate	Miller, Calif.	Weichel
Gore	Morgan	Welch
Granger	Morrison	Wheeler
Grant	Morton	Wickersham
Halleck	Murdock	Widnall
Harrison, Va.	Murphy	Wigglesworth
Hart	Murray, Wis.	Wolcott
Hays, Ohio	O'Hara	Wood, Ga.
Hedrick	Passman	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 349 members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 hour today, following the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7072, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 12 on page 25. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Committee, including one Director at not to exceed $17,500 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent, and including contracts for the making of special investigations and reports and for engineering, drafting, and computing services; equipment; not to exceed $213,400 for expenses of travel; maintenance and operation of aircraft; purchase of four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed $100 for newspapers and periodicals; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5. U. S. C. 55a); $46,522,200.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to say a few words about this program and how important it is to our national defense and to the development of an Air Force, in which I think every Member of the House is interested. You may recall that the NACA operated for many years without contract authority, except from the appropriations authority, many facilities which are now necessary to carry out the basic and fundamental research that is necessary now. We did not have a supersonic wind tunnel in this country until after World War II. That was a great mistake because we have seen the slow development of the jet engine and the metallurgical problems that have slowed down the jet program, in my opinion, more than any other one thing. We will bring before this body on Monday an authorization for a metallurgical laboratory. I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if there are any funds carried in this appropriation, which we are considering today, which can be used to begin a metallurgical laboratory.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to our distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, that there are funds in this bill authorizing the construction of four separate and distinct brand-new projects. We have been given to understand by the NACA that the gentleman's subcommittee was in the act of approving this, and, as the gentleman will recall, I discussed the matter with him and, on the assumption that he was going to approve them and bring them to the House for the approval of the House, we are supplying some funds for this work.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman very much. I think it is very wise to put the necessary funds into the present appropriation to start this metallurgical laboratory.

There are reasons why that is necessary that cannot be gone into on this floor. Speeds are developing problems in our metals and alloys that are beyond comprehension. I feel that if we can have the necessary scientific tools we can solve some of these problems and speed up the program.

The wind-tunnel program, which is being carried out today, is one of the most scientific and highly technical problems facing scientists, because it goes into the highest problems of science.

I understand we are cutting out today 800 positions in the personnel of NACA. Is this correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Let me give the gentleman the exact figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute, that the gentleman may answer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me go back to the beginning. I do not know of any agency in this Government that has had any better treatment than this agency. I agree with my distinguished friend from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM]. He certainly has done wheel-horse work on this agency. But this crowd had less than six or seven hundred people right after World War I. In 1941 they had only 844 employees. We have let them go up now to 7,800. Just think of it.

Mr. DURHAM. Does not the gentleman think it was justified in the development of the Air Force?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course they are justified, to some extent, but, frankly, I think we have let them go too fast. They ought to consolidate; they ought to stop and take a look and pull in their horns and see if they cannot do a better job with the people they have without expanding at the rate of seven or eight hundred or a thousand employees every year.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. I wonder if I may propound a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not out of my time, I hope.

Mr. THOMAS. No.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the paragraph dealing with NACA, and all amendments thereto, close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose to vote for any and all amendments which will cut down appropriations, perhaps for a reason that others may not have. The Library told me this morning that we had spent for the Marshall plan $597,000,000. Then, for ECA through 1948 to 1952, $22,539,913,000 under Paul Hoffman—he says no relation—from April 3, 1948, to October 1, 1950, actual expenditures, exclusive of administrative costs, $8,463,000,000; total appropriations during that period, $10,146,000,000.

A total of $23,136,913,000 spent.

I noticed in the press recently that Paul Hoffman, who was the Administrator of ECA—it is now known as Mutual Security—and who so efficiently—no, I do not want to say that—so quickly and with so little to show for his spending, spent so many billions abroad, is coming back home and I understand—and this is not a political speech in any way—that he is to be the campaign manager of a candidate—I will not name names—of a candidate for the Presidency. Paul and his candidate are presumably of one mind as to our foreign policy: It is the policy of the internationalists and financial interests of this country. I am also told by my colleagues from the Northeast—I have been told several times in the last few days—that the gentleman whose campaign Paul will manage, will be elected. If that is so, as long as Paul and those associated with him—you can get most of their names from the press; they as a rule are politicians and statesmen intending to carry out the policies of

the present administration, the foreign policies—I think that we ought to save a few dollars, for certainly Paul and most of the others are advocates of billion-dollar spending. I want to cut this bill. I will not say what I will do later on as other bills come up. But I want to cut this bill so that there will still be some money left so that if afterwards I do change my mind and want to appropriate a few billions to help this Republican candidate who they say is the people's choice and who they say Paul Hoffman is going to manage—there may be a few dollars available. So there will be some opportunity for someone on this side of the aisle who believes in that policy to find at least a little money somewhere to support that campaign for a foreign policy which so far has brought us nothing but grief.

Now, I am serious about this. If we are to continue this present foreign policy of Acheson, of the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Pennsylvania, and all those others, Paul Hoffman and our good friends here from the Northeast, the big industrialists, the steel makers and the New York financial interests who feel we must save the world, all of those who so enthusiastically and so successfully backed Willkie and then Dewey twice in the nominating conventions—if we want to have something for those people, or, more accurately, their program, then we will have to save money out of this bill, because may I say that when I go home all I hear is: Must we go along? Have we no choice? No chance to vote on the real issue, which is: Is our first duty to the world or is it to the United States of America? Our folks are tired of rising taxes, the conscription of men and later possibly of women, to fight either in Asia or in Europe. I would be more willing to appropriate dollars to hire Chinese to do the fighting if they want to fight, and that seems to be their avocation, or occupation in life, and I would much rather have them do it than have our men sent all over the world to fight—to maintain the prestige of Britain or France.

Then my good friend here from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and my good friend from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] after we have made a new crop of veterans, come along, and justly so, ask for benefit payments to veterans. My thought is that if some of these people, and I do not include the gentleman from Mississippi, would just avoid getting into so many wars we would not have so many veterans. I fear very very greatly that if we are to continue on with an ever-increasing number and an ever new crop of veterans that the sad part of it will be that the veterans do realize that in the end when some of us older fellows will no longer be taxpayers the veterans themselves will have to pay the check. The check not only for what they have received—to which they are entitled, but the check for billions for others—for billions which have been—will be wasted.

That is why I am a little worried, a little disturbed over this idea of Paul Hoffman coming back after election—and he undoubtedly will be back here if his candidate is successful—asking for, should I say millions, billions, or go one step further and jump to trillions for aid abroad? Yes, and for an unlimited number of men, American men, year after year, to police the world, fight the wars of U. N. or some other world organization. Oh, my good friends—and I see some of you here from the northeast—yes, you can nominate, as three times before you have dictated the nomination—and I am so, so sorry that you did not succeed before in electing your nominee, I am afraid you will have a terribly hard time in convincing the Mid-Westerners and those who furnish the cannon fodder for war that they should continue spending billions of dollars sending millions of boys abroad to fight—in wars which are not necessary for the advancement of our people, for the security of our Republic.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to turn to page 27, the section having to do with locomotive inspection. I have an amendment I would like to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Page 27?

Mr. WITHROW. Page 27, line 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object, and I hope the gentleman will forgive me for doing so. That has already been passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U. S. C. 1861–1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $95,000 for expenses of travel; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $3,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRIEST: Page 30, line 6, after the semicolon, strike out "$3,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,500,000."

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment, and I hope very much the Committee will see fit to accept it. I feel very strongly about the importance of it at this time.

The National Science Foundation last year operated on a budget of $3,000,000 and requested this year $15,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations allowed them $3,500,000.

Recently I had a conference with Dr. Waterman, the Director, and some of the other members of the Board and others interested in this subject and I asked Dr. Waterman at that time how well the Foundation was progressing on the policy of assuming chief responsibility for the Federal Government's research program. He told me that he would send me some information. Of course, they have not had time yet to do very much on evaluating all of the Federal research that is being done. It amounts, Mr. Chairman, to approximately $2,000,000,000 all told in all of the agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read from a letter that Dr. Waterman sent me a few days ago in which he stated:

> The President has stated his objective of having the National Science Foundation "ultimately assume major responsibility for the Federal Government's support of basic research through grant or contract." (President's letter to the Congress, Hearings, pt. I, p. 179.)
>
> The President's budget for 1953 reflects this policy. It reduces the basic research budgets of defense agencies by approximately $7,300,000.

The reduction is in the Department of Defense, $5,000,000—this is for basic research—Atomic Energy Commission and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and other agencies, $2,300,000.

Mr. Chairman, I simply take that $7,000,000 by which the basic research appropriation for some of the other agencies has been reduced, and add it to the $3,500,000 appropriated here by the committee for the National Science Foundation bringing the total to $10,500,000, which I believe, is the minimum, if this organization is really to do the job that Congress directed it to do when it passed an authorization sometime ago. The Foundation already has awarded, as you know, 50 grants for basic scientific research. These grants were awarded to 30 different institutions in 19 States. I think if you members of the Committee will read that list you will be greatly pleased in the awards of these first 50 grants by the Board of the Science Foundation. I note, for example, that there was no concentration in the larger institutions as some had feared. I notice that in Indiana, four small colleges that you do not hear of very often, but that have a very high scholastic standing, received awards for research in the biological sciences. Practically all of the first 50 grants were in research in medicine and in biology.

Mr. Chairman, I have been amazed at the number of the Members of the House of Representatives who have been unable to answer roll calls recently because of illness due to virus infection. What do we know about virus? Some research scientist out in Indiana or Iowa or somewhere else may find out some day about that thing that exists now in that never-never land between an inert, dead organic chemical, and a living organism. We call it virus but we do not know much about it. All of these first 50 grants were in the field of medicine and biology.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and place in the RECORD some information about some of the discoveries in these fields recently, not by some widely known institution but by some little scientist out here in the laboratory, a one-man laboratory, who has been able to operate because he had a little assistance in that operation.

I want to call your attention to the program and some future plans of the National Science Foundation.

Recently, I had an opportunity to review with Dr. Barnard, Chairman of the

National Science Board, and Dr. Waterman, Director of the National Science Foundation, the progress that this young agency has been making. I wish to assure you that the program of the foundation is in fine shape. The morale of the staff is high; they are imbued with a mission—that of making America scientifically strong. The quality of the research projects so far supported by the foundation has earned for the agency the respect of outstanding scientists throughout the country.

During the first week in April the foundation expects to announce the award of some 500 graduate fellowships in various fields of the natural sciences. These fellows are now being selected out of more than 3,000 applications which have come from every State in the Union, from the District of Columbia, from Hawaii, Puerto Rico and Alaska, and from Americans living abroad. The selection process is based on merit; it is carried out with great care. Applicants for these fellowships represent the cream of the crop in the sciences—the finest and most promising young scientific minds that we have. As the Members of this House know, American intelligence is our most priceless asset. The National Science Foundation, through this graduate fellowship program, is making it possible for this asset to become of maximum use. Through the fellowship program the best in young scientific talent is being trained.

I am happy to be able to report that the initial projects supported by the National Science Foundation are in the field of basic research in biology and medicine. You and I know that the cost of disease in this country is appalling. In a time of national emergency when we need every available hand at work in the shop, at the plow, or back of a gun, we cannot afford the terrible loss of manhours through sickness or the premature crippling diseases which remove useful persons from the labor supply.

I have previously referred to the virus. Under certain conditions it appears to thrive and multiply and to destroy living cells. Attacks on the human body by viruses and other virulent agents are as great a danger to the country as attacks by any other type of enemy. And we must fight them with equal vigor. How this inert substance can suddenly become alive and dangerous is a subject of much interest to our biochemists and physiologists.

This and other distressing problems have long been the subject of direct clinical research. They have not been solved. There is now general belief that the answer lies in more complete knowledge and understanding of these matters; mere search for a cure will not suffice. Now this is in the realm of basic research. It is this kind of research, basic research, which is stressed in the program of the National Science Foundation. An investment in this type of research is an investment in the future strength and health of our country.

A most encouraging research story, which illustrates the point I have just made about basic research, has made headlines recently. I refer to the report of a sensational treatment for acute cases of that dread disease tuberculosis. It appears to be a fact that this treatment, although only in the experimental stage, offers promise of positively stopping acute phases of the disease. Thus cases ordinarily fatal may now recover.

The patient rallies and shows remarkable gain in weight and vitality. This is indeed welcome news and again evidence of the importance of research to every citizen. The fact that this treatment does not cure the chronic sufferers, as thus far found, and that further careful investigation is necessary to discover possible harmful reactions, should not detract from the fact that a capital discovery has indeed been made. This kind of progress in medicine grows out of scientific research at the frontiers of biological knowledge.

As Members of the House you have already come to know how basic research has helped to strengthen our military competence. We all know, surely, the many new devices, weapons, and techniques which are now in use by our Armed Forces as results of the application of basic scientific findings. There is hardly a modern weapon now being used for our defense which did not have its beginnings in the research laboratories. Tomorrow's weapons are in today's laboratories. We must keep the basic information for scientific developments pouring from our American research centers. The National Science Foundation is dedicated to the stimulation and encouragement of such activity—toward the increase of basic knowledge upon which our military and our whole economy may draw.

It is sometimes thought and said that all that is done by research is to bring about more costly devices and processes. This is far from true. First, let me say that in critical matters of military equipment we dare not delay the development of a revolutionary or clearly superior weapon or piece of equipment. Such are the means by which our defense is made impregnable.

While this highly critical type of project does result from research we would be foolish indeed to do other than prosecute such developments with the utmost dispatch, cost what they may. However, basic research does far more than point the way to revolutionary advances. It is only by full attention to basic research and the soundness of its coverage that we can hope to eliminate unnecessary developmental work. This type of research is cheap; it is in the development of the application where large funds are expended.

It goes without saying that the time when economies must begin is before these large developments are undertaken. It is in the basic and background research which precedes the start of an expensive developmental project where the real savings may be made.

Thus basic research can point out lines of procedure which are not promising, and others whose initiation should await further research before being attempted. Of what profit is it to develop the most powerful jet engine if it can be proved in advance that the life of the engine is only a few hours, and if it can be proved that the country's supply of critical materials will not permit the manufacture of the engine in usable quantities? Of what use is it to develop a jet plane costing over a million dollars if at its supersonic speed no pilot has quick enough reaction time to fly the plane? Of what use is it to develop a guided missile which cannot find its target?

From the examples which I have already cited in the medical and biological sciences it can be seen that this type of research is providing countless savings in man-hours, increased production, and improved living conditions. In the same way basic research has been able to provide the military with economical techniques for making best use of its men and machines.

I do not mean to imply by these examples that the mission of the National Science Foundation is to provide information for the military solely, or to create better health conditions solely. As has abundantly been shown in the past, these will be byproducts of that program. The mission of the foundation is designed to increase the scientific competence of the Nation as a whole, in all fields of science. It does this through its support of basic research, through its stimulation of increased scientific activity in the basic sciences via the foundation's grant program.

Universities and laboratories throughout the breadth of the United States and its Territories are encouraged to make studies leading to new knowledge and new principles. Such findings are the bases for all future developments, for the improvement of our standard of living, and for the strengthening of our defenses. And such findings yield the direction by which such improvements can best be made. In the long run such findings are keys to the economic use of man, machine, and money in research.

This is one of the primary responsibilities of the foundation, the stimulation of basic research and the support of such activities. It was recognized as such by the sponsors of this agency, and I am proud to call myself one of those sponsors. This young agency, now only beginning its second year of operation, was designed to be the main independent agency on the policy level of government which would look toward progress in American science. It was to such a purpose that the President addressed his last message on the National Science Foundation.

I quote from that message:

> The foundation is much more than a new executive agency added to those already in existence with a research mission. It was conceived as a much-needed keystone in the structure of the national research program. Its principal task is to appraise the rapid growth of research activity, both public and private, and to recommend the broad goals toward which this massive effort should be channeled. In addition the foundation will support those areas of basic research and scientific training where the needs are most acute and will ultimately assume major responsibility for the Federal Government's support of basic research through grant or contract.

As long as the Federal Government continues to be the largest factor in the national research effort, it must frankly face the responsibility to insure that this effort is conceived and executed soundly and effectively. The results to be obtained from the operation of the foundation far outweigh its cost. The foundation's annual budget represents no more than a small fraction of the annual Federal outlays for research and development.

The funds involved represent a long-term investment in the national security no less than the funds presently being invested in the expansion of productive capacity to carry us through a long period of partial mobilization.

Through this agency, we have put our faith in the knowledge that American intelligence and American science can produce countless benefits for our way of life. By backing the Foundation we are insuring that there will be a strong base for future research and development. By backing the Foundation we are in fact giving support to the training of our future scientific talent and thereby we are increasing our scientific potential.

You all know the critical shortage which now exists in scientific manpower. Trends now indicate that this shortage will be even more critical in future years. The number of trained graduate scientists and engineers coming from our universities and technical institutes is dwindling. As legislators for the Nation we must do something positive to alleviate this situation. By supporting the Foundation we are taking positive action. It is one of the missions of the National Science Foundation to train new scientists.

Through the Foundation's fellowship program such an effort is now under way, even though it is only on a modest scale. The 500 fellowships being awarded this year by the Foundation marks an earnest beginning in this direction. The limited budget which the Foundation received last year allowed for only the skimming of the very top of the cream of young American talent. The total number of applicants worthy of support, in the judgment of some of our leading scientists, far exceeded the limited budget which could be allotted for that purpose in the past year.

It is to be hoped that this program can be increased to some 2,000 fellowships annually for coming years. Such an investment in our human resources is a small thing to pay for the future of the United States. First-rate scientists now being trained under such a program will bring back benefits a thousandfold to American progress.

There remain to be said only a few words about the nature of the National Science Foundation program in relation to the research programs of other agencies. I must reemphasize that the National Science Foundation is destined to be the key agency in basic research whose purpose is the progress of science itself. This fundamental mission of the Foundation has been recognized by the President and by agencies within and without the Government.

During the last year this concept was given careful consideration in planning the future activities of Government organizations. It shows realistically in their estimates. The plan has thus been to reduce their basic research budgets and to increase by a comparable amount the budget of the National Science Foundation. The result, from the taxpayers' point of view, is that this year's basic research budget has not been increased by the existence of the program of the National Science Foundation. Here again we find a real effort to establish a valid approach to research planning and supervision of research expenditures.

In these brief minutes I have tried to give you some idea of the nature of the Foundation's work. I have tried to tell you what real benefits can accrue from such work. At the end of its first year the Foundation has already won the hearts of American scientists and the cooperation of other scientific groups, both Government and private. Its modest beginning through the grant and fellowship programs have won wide approval and mark the first step toward the development of a strong government policy toward the development of American science. I close by repeating my statement of belief in the Foundation which I made last year: The Science Foundation Act is the legislative expression of the truth that to live well and safely tomorrow, we must prepare today.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the paragraph close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WITHROW. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the entire paragraph on National Science Foundation close in 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I propounded a unanimous-consent request some few minutes ago because I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber when the item that I was particularly interested in was taken up. There was objection.

Mr. Chairman, I believe in economy. I think we all believe in economy, but I believe that we should be cautious in practicing so-called economy in certain fields of Interstate Commerce Commission activities. I have particularly in mind that field which pertains to the inspection of locomotives.

Let me bring to your attention the fact that the budget estimate on the item of locomotive inspection, that is, the actual inspection of the engines that operate on the railroads, was $761,000 for 1953. The actual appropriation for 1952 was $706,600. The committee has recommended $664,000 for this activity of the Government, which is very important, or a cut under the amount they received in 1952 of $42,600.

That cut is being made on the premise that there is a duplication of services in the States. That premise is false. That was the argument made by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] in the general discussion upon this bill that a great many of the items that are carried in the Interstate Commerce Commission budget are duplications of activities of the States. I concede that in part he was right, but in this particular item, namely, the inspection of locomotives, there is no State duplication whatsoever in any State I know of.

This item is essential to the safety of the people who travel on the trains and of the men who work on the trains. It is not a large item but it is essential. I have had a great deal of experience in the railroad field, and I know that this money is badly needed and these inspectors are needed. We should have more of them, because this inspection contributes materially to the safety of the men who work on the passenger and freight trains and also to the safety of the general public who travel.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true they have many more locomotives than they have inspectors; therefore, there are many locomotives not inspected today because we do not have the inspectors to do the job?

Mr. WITHROW. That is true. Very, very few times during the year do these inspectors get to a terminal. Very seldom do they get there more than twice a year. This inspection is badly needed. I hope that when this measure goes to the other body and goes to conference the question of restoring this very, very small amount of $42,600 will be sincerely considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I wish to support the Priest amendment in relation to the National Science Foundation. I think more attention should be given to the work of this organization, which is for the first time trying to coordinate the scientific research that is engaged in by the Federal Government.

The present budget takes from the Armed Forces and the Atomic Energy Commission certain research funds which they received last year and turns them over to the National Science Foundation. If this cut which has been made by the committee prevails, that research will not be done. It is something that has been taken out of the budget of these other agencies.

I am especially interested in the work of the National Science Foundation because of the fine start that has been made during the first year of the operation of this organization. At the time the Foundation was authorized, great fear was expressed that it would merely centralize further work in the so-called Ivy League institutions. The big institutions of learning which do most of this work through large endowments have

already been centralized as to research. But the work of the National Science Foundation, if we are to judge the future by what has happened in the past, will be to emphasize this work in all the institutions of learning throughout the country. I think it is highly important that this effort to decentralize to that degree, and to help in an intelligent approach to these scientific investigations, and help in every aspect of scientific educational work in the country should be encouraged by at least an appropriation that is not several hundred percent less than it was for this type of research activity last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I take the time of the House to point out something in connection with this particular amendment, in which I support our distinguished friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], that has not yet been discussed; and I think it is extremely important. It is awfully easy to believe that the only struggle we are in with the Soviet Union is the military struggle, the economic struggle and the ideological struggle of the propaganda war—what we like to call the education and information front. But the Soviets do not think so, because in the Soviet Union among the classes at the top who are much honored and who receive great emoluments are the scientists. They realize something which perhaps we do not adequately realize: that an important part of this struggle whether men's minds and souls shall be dominated by these master craftsmen of brutality and totalitarianism in the Kremlin, or by the idea of freedom, will rest in the scientific field.

This particular increase of about $7,000,000, which our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] gives us an opportunity to vote upon, is for the general staff that is directing the scientific effort of the United States. I do not think you need to do much more in substantiation of what I just stated than to read the list of the members of the National Science Board. These are by all odds among the most distinguished scientific minds in our country, and they are serving on a small per diem fee. This is not a group of bureaucratic employees; these are indeed scientists trying to marshall the scientific effort of the United States. Indeed, one of the most eloquent witnesses before the Appropriation Subcommittee was Dr. Chester I. Barnard, president of the Rockefeller Foundation, and one of the most distinguished men in America. You do not have a group here that is trying to build up its power. You have a group that deeply and sincerely feel that at least the amount of money they have asked for is needed for a general staff or directing brains for the fundamental coordination of basic research in the United States, a general field in which, in the Federal Government establishment alone, we are spending $2,000,000,000 a year. If this is going to be a push button conflict, hot or cold, we have got to have some pretty intelligent minds at the push buttons, and also some pretty intelligent minds to determine how many push buttons are needed.

This foundation does not do any research itself. What it does is to plot out the fields for research, ascertain gaps in research, and point out where there is duplication of research. They have already been instrumental in saving the small amount of money the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST] is trying to add by his amendment. They can save a very large amount of money, but what is even more important they can make more certain our victory in the fundamental struggle in science between freedom and communism. I think the National Science Foundation is entitled to this modicum of support. We are asked to support the top scientists of the country, who are some of the most outstanding and patriotic men we have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, one of the major consequences of our growing burden of taxation is its serious effect upon our colleges, our universities, and the expansion of our scientific research.

Today as never before in world history, we should be doing everything in our power to maintain and strengthen our colleges, but our tremendous taxes have made it impossible to establish new endowment funds. The fixed income derived from many of the established funds is no longer sufficient to provide the facilities that modern colleges require.

All of this creates a two-way squeeze. Because of the tax set-up, hundreds of small colleges which once took pride in their scientific departments are unable to maintain them adequately. At the same time, the Federal Government points to this shrinkage and says that it must establish and support Government-sponsored scientific research. This vicious circle causes us to lose out on every count. The colleges and universities suffer, and the Federal Government then comes to Congress demanding more and more money for what could have been done in the first place at the institutions of higher learning. It is time that we understood that big taxation has social and educational results that strike deeply at our entire pattern of American life.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the reason that the research program was not given more money in this particular budget is because it is not yet ready for it. The record will show, on page 203, that the Federal expenditures for all sorts of research now come to over $2,000,000,000, and that this agency was created, admirably, and with no resistance from the subcommittee or from Members of Congress, to coordinate the research work already being done and to be developed. I think it is a matter of time, and I suggest we are not yet ready for the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

However, I would like to raise a mild voice of inquiry as to how all the people in the past got their research work done without financial help from some government. I wonder how Darwin, Newton, Marconi, Henry Ford, Pasteur, the people who discovered penicillin, and insulin, and some of these other benefits to mankind, managed to get anything discovered without $10,000,000 of Government money. Of course, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] would quickly point out that Newton was following strictly the bureaucratic pattern, because he lay down under a tree in a position of complete inactivity and let an apple fall on him. I think we can wait just a little and find support in some later budget for the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I am glad to be given credit for that quip and I thank the gentleman from California. Now, is it not a fact that when this agency came in with their budget request for this fiscal year, that those parts of their budget for new research constituted the major portion, and a very minor portion was for coordinating and preventing duplication in other governmental agencies engaged in research?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. And the other agencies have their own research money. What we want is coordination, and eventually economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman realize that the budget estimate for the Defense Department called for $1,700,000,000 for research, and that they have their own special outfit coordinating that research?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PRIEST. If the gentleman will yield for one comment on the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York——

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe, however, that practically all of the research engaged in now by the Defense Establishment, or at least a major portion of it, is applied rather than basic. We do not have time now to separate the two; but I think that is the fact, and the RECORD should so show, that it is applied research rather than basic research.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I exceedingly regret that I find myself in opposition to the amendment offered by my genial friend. I doubt if there is a man who is more beloved and better thought of by the entire membership than our able friend the gentleman from Tennessee. I regret it, too, because this little subcommittee, of which I have the honor of being a member, is very scien-

tifically minded. But as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and my distinguished friends, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], have brought out, what we are spending this year for research—and I hope the membership will get the hearings and turn to page 682 where the Bureau of the Budget sets out what we are spending by agencies for scientific investigation and research this year—reaches the tidy little sum of $1,987,000,000.

There is nothing wrong with this new agency; this is the third year we have appropriated for it. We are for it, make no mistake about that, and I hope my distinguished friend in his efforts to raise this appropriation by $7,000,000 will get his very able committee together and give them some authority to do what it was intended to do when it was created; namely, give them that authority to coordinate the research of the various agencies and tell Agency A or B to cut out this duplication of research, and to Agency C: "You stay in this field." When you do that you are going to save this Government millions of dollars.

We gave these people 78 employees, the same number they had this year. They want to spend $15,000,000, of which $13,393,000 is for grants to 2,200 students, and for research support. They are going to send them to school at a cost of from $2,000 to $4,400 a year as a stipend, 2,200 of them to be sent to school to learn to be scientists; and, of course, they are excluded from the draft by virtue of the law, and that is as it should be. Of the $15,000,000, they want to spend $8,800,000 at 40, 50, or 60 universities for research support. We think that is fine, but let us postpone this work until we get rid of this war. We have one agency in this bill to which we have already given nearly $24,000,000 this year for biology and medicine, and that is the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including not to exceed $500 for the purchase of newspapers; not to exceed $90,000 for expenses of travel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); $5,245,080.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to see if we cannot clarify the situation a little upon the tremendous number of letters each Member of Congress has been receiving in regard to the proposed fees to be put into effect on investment dealers and brokers by the Securities and Exchange Commission; and if I may have the attention of my genial and distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations, for a minute I would like to ask him when they inserted title V of Public Law 137 into the Appropriation Act of 1952, how many agencies they thought would come under this title.

Mr. THOMAS. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that there are at least 40 or 50. My memory may not serve me in this regard, however.

Mr. BUSBEY. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would be kind enough to try to give us a list of those agencies at this point?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; we will comply with the gentleman's request with pleasure.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, we have been receiving many letters. If I were not so modest, I would say I think I was somewhat responsible for the Securities and Exchange Commission starting hearings on this matter, plus the fact that a bill I introduced in the House on February 28, 1952, has been referred to the Subcommittee on the SEC of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished friend that his modesty is more than well founded. He actually did the work.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and thank him. I would like to ask the chairman another question: In view of what he has learned since the Securities and Exchange Commission has proposed these fees, does he think that the SEC is still justified in going through with its proposal?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to quibble or to be evasive, but, frankly, I have not studied this matter. As a general proposition, as brought out in the hearings by our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and by our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY], it certainly is not reasonable to request a man to pay a fee for being investigated. I believe that is as far as I can go. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HELLER] has a subcommittee that is dealing with an investigation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and all of its operations. He told the subcommittee the other day he was going to begin hearings on this item and go into detail. I am sure what that distinguished subcommittee does will meet with the complete satisfaction of the Members of the House.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope the gentleman's observations are correct.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I should like to point out to the gentleman, inasmuch as my name has been mentioned, that during the subcommittee hearings my questioning was not directed only to the Securities and Exchange Commission. I went into the matter of fees by all of the agencies that appeared before our subcommittee. Each of the agencies was interrogated with respect to the possibility of charging those being regulated by the agencies for a portion of the costs that are incurred as a result of regulations. For example, it was believed by our subcommittee that a company which is given a valuable franchise by the Federal Communications Commission to operate a broadcasting studio or to operate a television studio should bear at least a portion of the costs incurred in the hearings.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman is taking up my time.

Mr. YATES. With respect to the Securities and Exchange Commission, let me invite the gentleman's attention to a Senate study made on the subject. I would call the gentleman's attention to a report that has been issued by the other body on July 20, 1950, by Senator MCCLELLAN's committee entitled "Fees for Special Services." I direct the gentleman's attention to page 14 of that report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, in view of my generosity in trying to clarify this matter and in yielding so much of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the committee's attention to one particular paragraph in the proposed rules to be adopted by the Securities and Exchange Commission in their release of January 31, 1952, in which it is stated:

> If the registration fee of any company is not paid on or before the date specified in paragraph (b), the Commission may order the registration of such company suspended or terminated for that reason.

Mr. Chairman, there has never been an agency that I know of in the history of this country that has usurped the powers of Congress to that extent. Everybody is entitled to his day in court, and even under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 the SEC has to serve notice on any investment dealer or broker and then prefer charges and have a hearing. But here they propose that if a dealer does not get his annual fee in by June 1, he is out of business; the same as revoking his license. Furthermore, the SEC does not give a license to any dealer. There is not a soul in the United States who cannot be registered if he just fills out a simple form that is put in the files, unless he has a criminal record. That is something to which we should give very serious consideration.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I only want to take this opportunity to commend my distinguished colleague for the strong line he is taking upon this subject. As one Member of this House it seems to me quite clear that the Securities and Exchange Commission is stretching very far the language of this act and is certainly interpreting it in no sense as Congress intended that it should be interpreted. I commend the gentleman for

the amending legislation that he is offering, and for my part I am inclined to believe that this entire section 5 should be repealed because under it, if other agencies are permitted to extend their power contrary to the obvious intention of the Congress as this one is, then it will definitely create a secondary tax structure and consititute a very great burden on business.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say to the gentleman from New York in regard to my amendment that I did not offer it at this time to the appropriation bill because I knew a point of order would be made that it would be legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore I did not want to take up the time of the committee.

But I would like to ask the distinguished chairman, if I may, in regard to the paragraph I just read from their proposed regulations, if he thinks there is any justification for the SEC terminating a dealer-broker's license just because he does not pay his fee by June 1 of each year.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to get on my feet so much and take too much of my friend's time. In answer to that, may I read to you one section of the law? Section 5 lays down a yardstick and it suggests to them; that is all it does. It lays down a suggested yardstick to be used in arriving at a fee. Here it is: One of the things to be considered by the agency shall be direct and indirect costs to the Government, and value to the recipient.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am glad my friend mentioned that.

Mr. THOMAS. So that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. BUSBEY. Let me read it as it is in the law: "to be fair and equitable, taking into consideration direct and indirect costs to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interests served, and other pertinent facts."

I contend, and, if I am wrong, I hope the chairman will correct me, that when the Securities and Exchange Commission proposed these fees and made out their schedule they did not take into consideration any cost whatever in accordance with the law. There is no cost against which the fees may be charged, because they render no service whatever to the investment dealers and brokers of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have studied the provision carried in last year's appropriation bill and I think the substance of the provision is very sound. For years I have advocated that services should be charged for wherever possible by any agency of the Government. To the extent that revenue is brought in by reason of services being properly charged for, it inures to the benefit of all taxpayers.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Not just now.

Mr. BUSBEY. I just wanted to agree with the gentleman on one point.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad my friend agrees.

Mr. BUSBEY. As far as he has gone.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, but he disagrees in one particular respect.

I am not taking issue with my friend on the bill he has introduced. I am not taking issue on the particular question to which he addressed himself in his remarks today and in the House the other evening. My mind is open on that. However, I do not think the Securities and Exchange Commission should be the subject of criticism because the members of that Commission do what they think Congress directed them to do. That is the issue now.

My purpose in rising is to at least let members of commissions of the executive branch of the Government know that when they are doing something they think is carrying out the law as intended by Congress and are exercising their best judgment in relation to that, even if some of us think they are mistaken, they should not be subject to criticism.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I asked the gentleman to yield to correct what I think is an erroneous impression the gentleman from Massachusetts has. This law was put on the books a year ago, and the Securities and Exchange Commission must have known they did not come under the jurisdiction of this law, because they did not do one single thing about fees for investment dealers and brokers until after the hearings this year.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] has stated that the first time such a provision appeared was last year. I believe the Commission has been studying this matter for some time. The attention of the SEC was directed to this matter in a report issued by the other body on July 24, 1950, Report No. 2120, entitled "Fees for Special Services." This is what the report says so far as the Securities and Exchange Commission is concerned. This is on page 14:

> It is understood that the regulation of investment companies by the Securities and Exchange Commission results in the reservation to them of a segment of securities dealings not available to others engaged in similar transactions. This may well be found to be similar to the granting of a franchise and, thus, an equitable subject for appropriate fees. Similarly, the registration and supervision of brokers and dealers can readily be visualized as representing a tangible asset to those covered thereby. There is no charge now for either of these two services.

I make this point for the purpose of showing that the Securities and Exchange Commission is only examining the propriety of its charges and is holding hearings to determine the nature of the charges that should be made.

It has invited representatives of the industry. It has asked for its suggestions, it is giving them an opportunity to make constructive suggestions and state their objections. I think this is a fair way of looking into the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I just want to make clear the fact that no charges have been imposed by the SEC, but they are merely sending out a list, and they are discussing it and the decision will be made pretty soon.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, I think instead of impugning their motives, we ought to commend them. If we do not agree with them, let us legislate. Apparently this legislation on the part of the Congress started the chain of events operating, which has brought about the present situation in this matter. I do not want to get into any argument on the merits of it because my mind is open. But, I am not going to sit here and listen to the Commission being attacked for doing something that they think was imposed upon them by law, which law came into existence as a result of the action of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I might say that there is no directive or mandate to the SEC to put into effect these proposed fees. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the very first sentence of title 5 of the public law involved here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know you are going to say it is "the sense of the Congress." But when you are talking about "the sense of the Congress," you are putting a construction upon it which is consistent with your views. Now I have no objection to your doing that, but if you were a member of the Commission connected with another branch of the Government, you would have to consider that a little bit differently than you would as a Member of the Congress. If I were a member of the Commission, to me that would be a rather strong direction, and it means that I should take affirmative action, or at least affirmative consideration should be given. It is not mandatory, but it would be somewhat obligatory upon me. At least that is my opinion.

Mr. BUSBEY. I want to agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts to the extent that——

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will pardon the interruption, if you and I can agree—if you and I can agree, then my purpose is accomplished because the only purpose I had is not to attack the SEC for doing what it is doing. If they are wrong, let us change it by a law, if they, as a result of these hearings, decide to continue to impose these fees.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will say to the gentleman, I have made no attack on the SEC. I have contended all along that this whole controversy, the time and expense and everything else could have been eliminated.

Mr. McCORMACK. When you say that they do not have the authority to do something, and are asserting authority they do not possess, I consider that to be an attack.

Mr. BUSBEY. At no time could anything I have said be construed as an attack on the SEC.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I want to take this opportunity to make clear to the House first that this title 5, which is the present subject of controversy is not limited in its application to the SEC, but applies to all Government agencies.

Mr. McCORMACK. A very wise provision in substance.

Mr. COUDERT. Therefore, it is not a question of the SEC at all here except as an example. Second, I would like to ask the gentleman a question—the act in effect directs the establishment of a fee system and purports to establish standards by which the agency shall determine how much to charge. Is there anywhere in the Government a right of review of the schedule of fees that this or any other agency can charge? In other words, have we not legislated perhaps unfortunately in directing that fees be established under a vague set of standards, and then not providing that there be some place for a review of those fees?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a fair statement—a very fair statement. But, it comes back to what we have said before, that Congress is to blame for that, and not the Commission.

Mr. COUDERT. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, so that we will not get too serious about this, I desire to call the attention of the Committee to the fact that if they want to know what the Securities Act, the Stock Exchange Act, and the Utility Holding Company Act mean, and what authority is granted under those acts—all three of which laws the Securities and Exchange Commission administers—if they would read three reports which were filed when those bills were presented to the House, and three speeches which were made at that time, they would understand the powers and the functions of this Commission. Of course, Mr. Chairman, modesty forbids my saying who filed those reports and who made those speeches.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed $250 for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $69,500 for expenses of travel, National Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Management; not to exceed $363,500 for expenses of travel, State Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Servicing; $92,500 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board, of which not to exceed $3,500 shall be available for expenses of travel; and $215,200 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Doctors, Dentists, and Allied Specialists, of which not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for expenses of travel; $36,597,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: On page 31, line 18, strike out "$36,597,000" and insert "$33,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate upon this subheading and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes after the gentleman from Mississippi has finished—4 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to add my expressions of appreciation for the splendid work done by the subcommittee which has reported this bill. They have done a splendid job, in my opinion, in reducing unnecessary and wasteful Government expenditures in this bill, and I think they are entitled to the commendation and cooperation of every Member of this House. They have done such a splendid job that I want to help them do an even better job, and that is the reason I have offered this amendment.

Last year Selective Service was given $30,154,000 for the 1952 appropriation. Later they found it necessary, because of the increase in the number of persons to be inducted under the system, to come back to the House and ask for another $2,955,000, not only to cover the additional workload but also to cover the costs of the Pay Act increases that we granted last year. The total for 1952, therefore, may be considered as $33,109,000.

It is noted that the 1952 budget was based on inducting 300,000 men. Later, they found it necessary, before the year was over, to induct 600,000, thus doubling what you might consider to be their workload. Yet they only found it necessary to come back to the House and ask for an additional 10 percent in appropriations to take care of this doubled workload.

The amendment which I have offered would hold them to virtually the same amount they had last year. The prospect in 1953 is that they will induct 650,000 men, which is only 50,000 more than last year.

I realize that General Hershey probably has the most difficult job in Government. He has an almost impossible task. One of the main reasons why General Hershey has such a tremendously hard job may be found in the haphazard, absurd recruiting systems that we continue to allow the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force to operate. If you will turn to the hearings—I believe they start on page 309—and read General Hershey's testimony, you will find that he is having to operate under almost impossible conditions, not primarily because of laws set out by Congress, but because of the absurd recruiting systems, as well as the varying standards for induction laid down by the Army, the Navy, the Air Forces, and the Marines. You will find that it is primarily the rejections that are causing the most expense in this program—that are causing his workload to be so heavy.

You will find that General Hershey estimates approximately 50 percent of the men he sent the services for induction last year were returned to him as disqualified. You will find further that 50 percent of those rejected were turned down because of mental reasons, failure to pass the mental standards laid down by Mrs. Rosenberg. You will find that General Hershey, in his testimony before the committee, deals at great length with that subject.

I feel that Selective Service can do the job this year for the same amount of money they had last year.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. I think if we reduce this amount, it will perhaps put some sense in the recruiting programs that we have in the Armed Forces. We have four different groups competing against each other, and practically all the men who are taken in by recruitment are the byproducts of the people who are processed by Hershey's selective-service group. As soon as a man gets notice of induction or thinks his time for induction is coming up he starts looking for a chance to enlist. Today I had a session with a man who was worked on by two different military agencies who came to him offering to enlist him—the Army and the Marine Corps.

I think that if we cut this appropriation, it will perhaps help get the recruiting program on a sensible basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for his splendid contribution.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Can the gentleman advise me how much work of selective service is done by civilians and how much by personnel of the Armed Forces transferred to the various selective-service units throughout the country?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That question, of course, I cannot answer; I do not know.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. I think that is the key to the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee is in sympathy with the purpose of the statement and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi to cut this amount; but facts are facts, and they cannot be disputed Let us set the record straight. If you can cut a dime more out of this item than your committee, we are going to be with you all the way down the line.

Let us not charge Selective Service with the weaknesses of the armed services, because they are two separate and distinct things, and Selective Service has no right and no power to tell the armed services what to do. Had the Selective Service System had the authority, they would have stopped a long time ago that very wasteful and expensive and duplicating recruiting system that now goes on in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps all in competition with the Selective Service System. The Selective Service System has their hands tied.

Let us see what we have done here. The armed services, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told the Selective Service System that for the fiscal year 1952 they should induct 300,000 men, and we gave them enough to do that. But before the year was out the armed services raised the number to 400,000 men and, of course, Selective Service had to come to the committee for more funds, which we gave them in a supplemental appropriation bill a few weeks ago. To be accurate the Joint Chiefs of Staff said they did not want 400,000 inductees next year, but they wanted 650,000. Think of it. An increase from 400,000 to 650,000.

The program of the Selective Service System is broken down into three parts: The local draft boards in your town and mine and in every county in the United States, and there are, roughly, 3,850. Then there is the national headquarters and the State headquarters, and every State has an office. Twenty-eight million four hundred thousand dollars of the entire appropriation goes to the local draft boards. We did not cut off a nickel. Why? The people in your community, your local draft board—do you know how much compensation they get a year? They do not get a penny. There are 40,000 of them; they work for nothing as a patriotic duty, and they are to be commended for the job they are doing. In each draft board there is one paid employee, that is a local person in your home town or home county, and they are the poorest paid of any Federal employees. Look at your own town; there will be a man or woman doing the same or similar type of work and be classified as grade 6 or 7 under the Classification Act. This employee of the draft board, of course, does not come under the Classification Act, and there is only one in each draft board, but there are 10 or 15 other people working there, local citizens, and they work for nothing. Do you get that? Now, we have taken the national headquarters here in the District of Columbia, and what did we do to them? We cut them between 20 and 25 percent. We took your various State headquarters, located at your home State capitals, and what did we do to them? We cut them between 20 and 25 percent and we put a limitation on their travel, too. We reduced that by 33 percent.

Mr. Chairman, those are the facts. You are fooling with dynamite and I do not want to see the House make a mistake, because 90 percent of the appropriation goes back to your local draft boards where 40,000 of your local citizens work for nothing. The amendment should be voted down. This is dangerous.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think I know as much about the selective service boards as our very brilliant chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations because I was for several years chairman of a selective service appeal board in California. I do not want to hurt those people who are working for nothing as members of local boards or those who are working as clerks for very nominal wages. However, I am trying in some way to get a little common sense into the armed services and their competitive recruiting systems. They are today wasting millions of dollars each year. I cannot offer an amendment covering this particular feature because it would be stricken out on a point of order, but if we reduce the amount here by approximately $3,000,000, in my opinion, there might be some indirect effect felt over at the Pentagon and they will straighten this duplicating of recruiting matters out.

The Members will recall that when we had a bill up here sometime ago in reference to this very matter I offered an amendment to consolidate the recruiting services of all four of the armed services. Unfortunately this amendment was defeated; however, I do not think it was defeated on merit, but because the Members present did not thoroughly understand it.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the gentleman from Mississippi, and I hope that reducing the amount that is made available to the Selective Service System will perhaps result in a little common sense being used by people who are running these costly and ineffective recruiting services.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Can the gentleman advise me, or can the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations advise me, how much of the work in connection with selective service in the local offices to which the gentleman refers is performed by men in uniform or officers in uniform drawing down Army pay? How much of the actual work is being done by civilian employees today?

Mr. THOMAS. There are military personnel working in your local draft boards. I hope the members of the Armed Services Committee will correct the defect the gentleman points out. These people cannot do it. We have no authority to do it. The gentleman's committee has the authority. He is an able and valuable man and I hope he will do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 49, noes 53.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 114.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Salaries and expenses, Smithsonian Institution: For all necessary expenses for the preservation, exhibition, and increase of collections from the surveying and exploring expeditions of the Government and from other sources; for the system of international exchanges between the United States and foreign countries; for anthropological researches among the American Indians and the natives of lands under the jurisdiction or protection of the United States, independently or in cooperation with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States, and the excavation and preservation of archeological remains; for maintenance of the Astrophysical Observatory and making necessary observations in high altitudes; for the administration of the National Collection of Fine Arts; for the administration and for the construction and maintenance, of laboratory and other facilities on Barro Colorado Island, C. Z., under the provisions of the act of July 2, 1940, as amended by the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946; for the maintenance and administration of a national air museum as authorized by the act of August 12, 1946 (20 U. S. C. 77); including not to exceed $35,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); not to exceed $9,100 for expenses of travel; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards and elevator conductors; repairs and alterations of buildings and approaches; and preparation of manuscripts, drawings, and illustrations for publication; $2,274,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for the repair, alteration, improvement, preservation, and equipment of leased premises, and the construction of auxiliary and appurtenant temporary structures, ramps, roadways, and approaches thereto, at the Chicago International Airport, O'Hare Field, Park Ridge, Ill., to house the National Air Museum storage collections.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 33, line 3, strike out "$2,274,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "including $100,000 to enable the Smithsonian Institution, through construction and utilization of a pilot plant and otherwise, to extend its studies on solar radiation to include determination of the practicability of utilizing solar energy for the production of electricity, $2,374,000."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph dealing with the Smithsonian Institution and all amendments thereto close in 13 minutes, 10 minutes for the gentleman from Mississippi and 3 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERATING ELECTRICITY WITH SUN HEAT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I called the attention of the House several days ago to the fact that Dr. C. G. Abbot, down in the Smithsonian Institution, as a result of more than 20 years of hard struggle, has developed a process for generating electricity with sun heat. What I am asking for here is a small appropriation to enable the Smithsonian Institution to establish a pilot plant to test out his program.

I am looking down the centuries, on a proposition that will mean more to future generations of America than probably anything else that has been proposed in your day and mine. I know that Dr. Abbot has been criticized just as Thomas A. Edison was criticized when 70 years ago that greatest contributor to the welfare of humanity was struggling day and night to develop the incandescent lamp.

One of the great scientists of the world denounced it as ignis fatuus. Another one said it was airy ignorance. Another said it was an American hoax. But the greatest of all of them said that even if he did develop this process he could not divide the electricity. It would all be in bulk. In other words, you could not have one light here and another one over yonder.

With all that criticism of Edison, that great man developed the incandescent lamp. With it he gave us the spark that fires the gas that makes the motor machine possible. He did more for humanity than any other man who has ever lived in all the tides of time.

Here we have the scientists of America urging us to move forward with this development which means more, especially to the arid areas of the Southwest, than anything else that has been proposed.

I wrote the other day to Dr. Gano Dunn, a leading scientist, in New York and received this letter from him in which he says:

> My opinion goes along with that recently expressed by President J. M. Conant of Harvard University that within the next 50 years a large part of the power used in this country will come from solar energy.

That does not come from some man who is accused of being old and senile, it comes from one of the great scientists of America. He said:

> Dr. Abbot's experiments already give incontrovertible proof of the immense amounts of power that solar energy [would] develop including large allowances for nighttime and obscuration by clouds.

I have the records here. Here is one from Massachusetts, where they have been using this solar energy to warm buildings at night. They are using it in Florida even to cook with at night.

But here when we come asking for this small amount, merely to test out this theory, which would mean the transformation of the great arid areas of America, and which would mean the use of the greatest source of power the world has ever known, or ever will know, we are denied funds for that purpose.

When we burn coal, we are merely releasing the heat which was deposited there by the sun untold centuries ago. When we burn wood, we are merely releasing the heat that was put there by the sun while the timber was growing. When we burn oil or gas, we are merely releasing heat that was placed there by the sun. Yet, here when we come and find a process of developing this energy, we cannot even get a hearing. For that reason, I have come before the Congress of the United States advocating that this program, and asking for this reasonable amount of money be allowed in order that this process may be tested out in full at the earliest possible date.

Let me show you what is happening. Take the arid areas of the Southwest. They tell me that they can generate a trillion horsepower in the arid areas of New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada. Do any of you know how much power that amounts to? It probably means a million times as much electricity as we are now using. If that process were in operation, they would have power to pump all water they want, to pump all the sea water, and to distill it and separate the salt from it, and use it to irrigate the land.

President Peron of Argentina has announced that his scientists who have flooded in there from war-torn Europe, have developed a process of "generating electricity from atomic energy derived from sun heat."

His scientists are merely taking this program of Dr. Abbot's and are now trying to take credit for it. Last summer, President Peron said that in 2 years from that time, they would have the entire Republic of Argentina electrified in that way.

Russia is trying it out in Asia, and now we find that Great Britain is preparing to test it out in Australia. Are we going to sit here and let them take the process that has been developed by our own scientists, at our expense, and not even give ourselves a chance to try it out here in the United States?

Let me show you what it would mean. You could not only pump all the water you need in the arid area, but as I said, you could also distill sea water and separate the salt from it, and use it to irrigate that vast area. That is what they are trying to do in Australia. This man said that they could generate a million horsepower almost over a square mile of ground, in Arizona and New Mexico. I said, "I live in the same latitude. We do not have as much sun heat, but we do have about 75 perecent or 90 percent as much. What could you do there?" He said, "We could generate from 500,000 to three-fourths of a million horsepower on a square mile of ground, which is now covered with pine bushes or clay gullies. This program may not work; but I think it will. The great scientists that I have listened to, and I will read to you the letters from some others I have received, if you care to hear them, are of the same opinion pointing out that this will probably be one of the greatest developments the world has ever known.

I ask you to give us this $100,000 in order that we may test it and see. Here is a letter from W. F. Durand, who was formerly connected with Stanford University. He is one of the great scientists of America. He says:

> Replying to your letter of recent date regarding Dr. Abbot's studies in connection with the power from the sun, I would say that I have known of this work of Dr. Abbot now for many years, especially in 1936, at the time of the World Power Conference. I witnessed a laboratory set up for this purpose which looked most promising.
>
> There is no question but that the earth receives from the sun daily enormous amounts of power in the form of heat, and it only remains to devise ways and means of transforming the heat into mechanical power.
>
> I would recommend most warmly, and without reservation, the granting of this appropriation to Dr. Abbot in order that he may carry on his work on the pilot plant level. Power from the sun is bound to come sometime. Let us push the effort to solve the problem.

Another from a leading scientist in Wisconsin, Dr. Farrington Daniels. He says:

> Solar energy is our great hope for the future and fundamental research and pilot plants should be rushed vigorously, not only for the present but for the long-range future.

I am calling your attention to these letters in order that you may understand just exactly what it means.

I also have a statement from Dr. Conant of Harvard University, another great scientist who also supports this program.

I see my time is up.

I trust this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment before the House seeks to increase the amount of this appropriation by $100,000.

It is not an easy matter for me to rise in opposition to an amendment offered by our distinguished friend from Mississippi, JOHN RANKIN. If I may humbly say so, you have just heard one of the most brilliant minds of this House. He is a monument, and the possessor of one of those scientific minds that is forward looking. Certainly for the last 25 years I doubt if there is a man in this House who has left a deeper imprint on it than has the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I hope he will forgive me for rising in opposition. But, Mr. Chairman, there is in this budget now in the neighborhood of $110,000 or $115,000 for this same purpose. Do you know how long it has been going on? We call them astrophysical laboratories. That is a rather large word for me, but this same item has been in these budgets for 60 consecutive years.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Not for this purpose. We are only asking for a small amount, compared with the importance of the question involved, asking that they may test out this pilot plant, to see whether or not this project will work. If it works, it will revolutionize the world.

Mr. THOMAS. My sense of humility is not going to permit me to argue with

my distinguished friend, but let me repeat, this same item, with slight variations, has been in this bill for 60 consecutive years, and $115,000 or $118,000 is in it now.

I think myself, with the gentleman and that very fine mind of his, the possibilities are bound to be unlimited, but one group has been handling this for 60 years. Well, let us not start now giving it more consideration and do it in a big way. I am not going to quibble with my friend from Mississippi, but I hope the amendment is voted down at this time, and let us take another look at it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 13, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to propound a question to the gentleman from Texas:

Will the gentleman give us a hearing? These scientists want to come here and testify before a House committee to present this problem. Will the gentleman give us a hearing before his committee?

Mr. THOMAS. We cannot deny our friend from Mississippi any request he makes.

Mr. RANKIN. All right; we will present the question.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 12A), including purchase (not to exceed two) and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; the purchase (not to exceed 110 for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $185,270,000, to remain available until expended, and to be available for the payment of obligations chargeable against prior appropriations: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority by this paragraph shall be used for the maintenance or operation of any aircraft for passenger service that is not specifically confined to the active operation of the official business of the Tennessee Valley Authority by officers or employees of such Authority, and not to exceed $1,375,000 of funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for expenses of travel.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: Page 35, before the period at the end of line 24, insert the following: "*: provided further*, That no funds appropriated for the Tennessee Valley Authority by this paragraph shall be used for the purchase of coal unless the purchase is made under a contract with a contractor who has furnished a bond for the proper performance of the contract."

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment should be obvious; there has been widespread publicity in the newspapers throughout the country concerning the methods employed by TVA in purchasing coal for future delivery for its coal-consuming steam plants. By 1956 it is expected that TVA will be buying 10,000,000 tons of coal annually to supply five coal-consuming electric-generating plants. It would serve no useful purpose for me to review these newspaper stories; they have been placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have been read by most of the Members.

On Tuesday of this week I extended my own remarks in the RECORD and requested the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee to investigate fully in public hearings TVA's method of awarding these contracts. I believe that will be done; it should be done.

The public is entitled to know whether these methods are the best and in the interest of the taxpaying public. The answer to this whole question is very simple. Here is the situation: One of the greatest coal fields in America is located in east Tennessee and southeastern Kentucky. There are dozens of fine, established, operating coal companies employing thousands and thousands of experienced coal miners. These mines at the moment are operating about 2 days a week. TVA—and I am not saying whether rightly or wrongly—in their recent awards of millions of tons of coal did not award any contract of any consequence to one of those established coal operating concerns; on the contrary, they were awarded to companies in many instances recently formed with small capital, in some instances to individuals who are not producers of coal. Now, let us say for the moment that that is not necessarily wrong.

According to the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the investigation conducted so far shows that there is no proof that TVA or the Government has lost any money. That may be true as to now, but let us see where it would lead to.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. May I say that the minority members of the subcommittee, particularly the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and myself, want to associate ourselves with the suggestion of an investigation. We think it is quite necessary.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman is discussing a very important and vital subject. I assume, of course, that he has gone into it and that he knows his amendment will solve the problem. Is there any doubt in the gentleman's mind about that?

Mr. BAKER. I shall discuss that point very shortly.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is talking about what will happen many years hence. I have called attention to the fact that within the last 3 months the greatest gas well ever produced east of the Mississippi was brought in in Monroe County, Miss., in the district I represent and, of course, within the TVA area. It produces 35,000,000 cubic feet of gas and oil each day.

It will only be a short time until we will be able to supply gas at a very reasonable rate to operate all of these steam plants, and it will not be necessary to have this row with the coal dealers.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAKER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. In answer to the gentleman from Mississippi, may I say that the TVA did undertake to purchase gas on an interruptible basis for the Johnsonville steam plant or for a certain number of units at that plant. The record discloses they could dispense with these contracts at any time they desired. In other words, they could let them have gas today and deny them gas tomorrow. In the interest of national defense, which should be paramount in our thinking, it does not make sense to contribute further to the underutilization of the coal industry and its available manpower while at the same time aggravating the existing and prospective shortages of steel and of gas.

The decision of the Federal Power Commission was sound because any other decision would have detracted from the dependability of TVA's fuel supplies. Any other decision would have discouraged the development of highly desirable underground storage of gas to meet peak demands, and it would have deprived other users of steel and gas of their essential requirements at a time when shortages of them already exist and such shortages are impending.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. In that decision the Federal Power Commission stated that TVA should use coal and not gas. This decision was wholly sound.

May I say further that I am not opposing the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee. I have tried to keep up with the investigation that has been going on the best I could, and personally I do not believe that there is anything wrong with the TVA's purchases of coal. I think they are all aboveboard. However, I may be mistaken in this belief and I intend to make further inquiries, but I now believe the TVA in every instance has awarded the contracts to the lowest bidder.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss how this amendment, in my judgment, will solve the problem. I certainly want TVA to acquire its coal at the lowest possible price. There is only one way under competitive bidding to be assured that that will be done.

The market now is in a depressed condition. The market now is about $3.50 to $4 a ton f. o. b. the mines.

During World War II coal, generally speaking, in Tennessee and Kentucky

was from $5 to $6 a ton f. o. b. the mines. I remember distinctly that in the latter part of World War I coal in our fields went from $10 to $12 a ton.

What does this mean? It means that if you let bids to people who cannot produce or to people who do not have a bond and do not have sufficient assets, if they are not under a performance bond, the temptation is too great when prices go up to channel coal off into the black market or otherwise, if there should be a ceiling price, and then say to TVA: We are sorry, we cannot deliver.

This is not a new thing. Title 40 of the United States Code, section 270 (a) provides that all contractors for public buildings and public works in the United States receiving contracts in excess of $2,000 shall furnish performance bonds. In titles 41 and 42 of the United States Code there are various references to performance bonds. The cost will be very small. If a person cannot furnish a performance bond, especially for these contracts that run for years in the future, then the United States of America has no business dealing with him. If the market price goes up substantially, as it is most likely to do, the temptation will be too great for irresponsible fly-by-night operators to divert their coal into the open market.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that TVA should welcome this amendment. It will result, in my honest judgment, in a saving of millions and millions of dollars to TVA and to the taxpaying public of the United States in the next 5 years. And an even almost equally important thing is this. If world war III should come, this electricity is of the utmost importance to the atomic-energy plants and to the Alcoa aluminum plants. What would happen if TVA could not get this coal and the atomic-energy plants were to shut down or Alcoa would shut down? I believe the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] will join me in this request. I repeat, I hope that the subcommittee will fully investigate the methods, but let us now put this performance-bond provision in there and be sure that TVA gets its coal at $3.70 so that it will not have to shut down those plants.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to the paragraph dealing with TVA close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. COUDERT. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments to this section dealing with the subject matter of TVA close in 40 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I intend to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER]. I know he has in mind doing a public service in this regard. I do think his amendment is a bit restrictive. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee states, "furnished a bond for the proper performance of the contract." We know that bonds cost money. In a moment I shall offer an amendment, which I believe the gentleman from Tennessee can accept, to insert the word "performance" before "bond", and, immediately after "bond", to insert "or other satisfactory security."

As the gentleman and I know, many of these concerns can furnish a financial statement upon which they can bid, and I think that would be satisfactory warranty. However, if they are forced to put up a performance bond, which costs money, then that would necessarily be added to the price of coal. I hope the gentleman will accept my amendment to his amendment. If so, then I can go along with his amendment.

Mr. BAKER. I accept the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GORE to the amendment offered by Mr. BAKER: In front of the word "bond", insert the word "performance", and, after the word "bond", insert "or other satisfactory warranty."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 35, line 14, strike out "$185,270,000" and insert "$171,270,000."

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. TABER and Mr. JENKINS was given to Mr. COUDERT.)

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. PRIEST, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. PERKINS was given to Mr. GORE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is recognized.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, here we have again before us the platinum-coated, sacred cow of the Government herd of sacred cows. In fact, this is the No. 1 bull of the herd, and that is why I stand here again in the well of the House to try to represent the small, still voice of the partially disfranchised populations of the great metropolitan areas who have so long supported in luxury and comfort the population served by the cheap electricity of the TVA area, and perhaps some other similar areas. If there be any doubt as to the sacred character of this bull, just take a look at the bill that is before you. Just take a look at the enlightening comparison of the treatment accorded this agency, this sacred bull, with the treatment given to all of the twenty-odd other large agencies in this bill—some of them possibly almost as important as providing flood-lighted golf courses for people in the TVA area.

The over-all reduction effected in this bill—the over-all average for all agencies is some 33 percent from requests. Perhaps the most important or the most touted agency from the standpoint of defense is atomic energy, and what did the majority of the members of this subcommittee do to atomic energy? Did they leave that alone? Oh, no, Mr. Chairman, they knocked 12 percent off the requested funds for atomic energy. Then what did they do with housing? Housing, the only city, metropolitan counterpart of the give-away hand-out which the TVA represents, they knocked that off 20 or 25 percent. What did they take out of the plantinum-plated hide of the TVA bull? They took exactly just 5 percent—just 5 percent—of the total $250,000,000 which was intended for use, planned for use, in this next year's budget, the budget we are working on now for the construction, acquisition, and development of new projects.

What is the background against which we have to examine this? As of today, the TVA produces about 3,600,000 kilowatts. There is in the works, under construction, some $750,000,000 worth of plants and equipment for the production of power so that when presently authorized projects, plus what is asked for in this bill, are completed, the TVA power will have increased from 3,500,000 to 8,000,000 kilowatts for the benefit of those very fortunate people in the TVA area. How nice it would be to live there. How nice it would be for my New York City constituents who pay so much of the bill. The amendment itself would simply eliminate an additional two units of steam generating capacity. The original request was for eight additional units.

The subcommittee, in its wisdom, reduced it by two. My amendment would postpone two more. So that would only cut down the request for additional steam-generating units from eight to four. We would cut it down by half.

In the area where the steam plant might best be cut out, the two Shawnee units, there is available ample electric power generated by private industry that can be brought into the area without difficulty.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this presents a pretty far-reaching and important issue that affects every one of us. Yesterday a majority of the members of the Committee of the Whole passed through tellers on this floor; and, for all practical purposes, cut out public housing. Why did they cut it out? Why, they said, "This is socialism." They said, "we in the State of Tennessee, the State of Alabama, the State of Virginia, and all the other great anti-Socialist States could not tolerate the thought of Socialist housing in New York." But for them the TVA is an entirely different story, because their States are receiving the benefit of it. The Members who voted against housing ought to vote for this amendment, because if public housing is bad socialism, certainly TVA is no less so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted

to me be allotted to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks immediately following the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished and able friend and colleague from New York [Mr. COUDERT], for whom I have a deep affection, would like very much, I believe, to fight the battle of TVA all over again, which battle was fought before either he or I were privileged to be Members of this body. The TVA is an established, going utility.

I would like to inquire of the gentleman which two steam units he would cut out.

Mr. COUDERT. The two remaining Shawnees, the committee having taken two of them, we reduce two more.

Mr. GORE. I believe the gentleman has just revealed himself defenseless, because the Shawnee plant is for one purpose only, and that is for supplying electricity to the atomic energy plant being built at Paducah, Ky.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman recall that the subcommittee itself, with the gentleman's assent, reduced that Shawnee plant by two in committee?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so.

Mr. COUDERT. So evidently Shawnee cannot be of such vital importance.

Mr. GORE. I will be delighted to respond to the gentleman.

The subcommittee studied this matter and studied it carefully. We reduced as much as we thought we safely could reduce. We are not trying to kid ourselves or you. The two units which the subcommittee eliminated were eliminated, not because they will not be needed, and soon, but because we found, rightly or wrongly, that because of delays in the atomic-energy construction program, those two units which we eliminated could safely come later. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] has made no such finding as to the other two units which he has suggested be eliminated.

What is the situation with respect to Shawnee? It narrows down not to a question of whether TVA is an advisable concern since the gentleman specifies that the units to be eliminated are those to supply power to the Atomic Energy Commission; it is a rather narrow issue; TVA is not an issue, because the Atomic Energy Commission is responsible for the Shawnee plant, not the TVA. TVA did not come to the Congress, upon its own, asking for an appropriation to build the Shawnee steam plant. Who came? The Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC was unable to secure power for that enormous new atomic energy plant from private utilities; they had been able to secure a warranty from a combination of power companies that they would supply one-half the load of that plant. They were turning in desperation for another source from which to obtain electric power. They came to your committee requesting an appropriation, requesting that TVA furnish half of the power for that enormous undertaking, and in so doing they said to us that they were more certain of their ability to build the gaseous diffusion plant on time than they were of their ability to secure the power with which to operate it. What you have here, therefore, is really a question of whether you want to build a gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah, Ky., and not have the power to operate it. I now yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I am very much interested in the gentleman's observation. The gentleman takes the position that the elimination of these two plants would seriously impair the Atomic Energy Commission's power to build the proposed plant. Can the gentleman advise the committee as to the precise percentage of the TVA electric power that the Atomic Energy Commission uses?

Mr. GORE. I am not sure that I can give the precise percentage; I can state, however, that when these plants are completed they will be using more electricity than the city of New York.

Mr. COUDERT. I am afraid that is a little irrelevant; and, besides, the city of New York is not getting any of this power, I regret to say.

Mr. GORE. I was using it only as a manner of indicating size of load. Actually, I think I can give the gentleman the percentage. When the plants are in operation they will be using something better than 40 percent of the entire TVA output.

Mr. COUDERT. Approximately better than 40 percent. What percentage of the total production of TVA would be represented by these two additional units that I suggest be taken out of the bill?

Mr. GORE. That is not relevant to the Paducah question.

Mr. COUDERT. What could be more relevant?

Mr. GORE. Paducah, Ky., is almost as far from Chicago as it is from the Norris Dam. It is uneconomic to furnish hydroelectric energy at Paducah, Ky., from a hydroelectric plant over in North Carolina. Transportation of power, like transportation of anything else, is a very expensive proposition; you lose a lot; it costs a lot to build transmission lines. The only feasable way to supply a huge electric demand is to have a generating capacity in the vicinity of the demand. That is not an arguable point, so what the gentleman has raised here is whether or not we shall have a gaseous diffusion plant at Paducah, Ky., upon which the security of this country may depend, without the power to operate it.

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman will yield further, I do think the gentleman is obscuring the issue. He has just stated that at the most only 40 percent of the total production of TVA power would be utilized by Atomic Energy. Now, is there any reason in the world, under these circumstances, why these two additional little plants, costing a measly $50,000,000, cannot be deferred another year?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so, there is a very good reason, and if the gentleman had studied the proposition as I have studied it, I am sure he would be aware of the reason, which is very plain. In order to supply the expansion at Oak Ridge, additional hydroelectric, additional steam plants, are now under construction to meet the demand of those plants which are going to demand more, more, and more power.

Mr. COUDERT. The gaseous diffusion plant to which the gentleman refers, is that under construction and, if so, when will it be completed and performing?

Mr. GORE. The plant is under construction and we measured very carefully in the subcommittee the construction schedule of the atomic-energy facility with the construction schedule of the power units, units 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6. Now the committee thought we could take a chance in eliminating the starting of the last two, but we do not say to the Congress that they should forever be deferred. We know they are going to have to be built; however, we could not go so far as to eliminate units 3 and 4 because I think that part of the atomic energy construction schedule will be so far ahead they will have to have this power. Does the gentleman desire further information?

Mr. COUDERT. As far as I can see, the gentleman is merely saying what I said in introducing the amendment, that TVA has to have everything it asks for regardless of anybody else and regardless of the total over-all national picture, and that so long as TVA is satisfied nothing else matters.

Mr. GORE. I hope the gentleman will not seriously entertain that point of view because the committee has acted I think responsibly in this. I cannot acknowledge the charge that I am unwilling to make any reduction in TVA or to accept any change. As a matter of fact, the distinguished gentleman from the Second District of Tennessee and I have just worked out an amendment which I support. I am supporting the cut in TVA that is contained in this bill, but I am not willing to go so far as to eliminate the power for the atomic-energy facility.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee, a member of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time be yielded to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN. In the beginning of the gentleman's remarks, stating that TVA was an established business, and that we ought not to be reviewing again, possibly——

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman permit me to say that I did not say it should not be reviewed?

Mr. GWINN. I mean as a project.

Mr. GORE. It is an established, going concern. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York does not go to that question at all, because the Shawnee plant is not for the purpose of supplying power to the people of Tennessee. It is not for the purpose of supplying power to the municipalities of the Tennessee Valley. It has only one function and is created for only one function, it was not requested originally by TVA, but by the Atomic Energy Commission, and that is to supply power to the new gaseous diffusion plant now under construction at Paducah, Ky.

Mr. GWINN. I had reference, if the gentleman please, to a fundamental concept. If we, as the House, decide that we have gone into socialized housing and into socialized power by mistake, ought we not to review the problem that Government monopoly creates when private enterprise is destroyed in the area?

Mr. GORE. Well, I do not think if an atomic attack should come to this country, that we are going to have too much time debating theories of government. I want the maximum amount of atomic readiness and I am not going to share the responsibility of eliminating power necessary to operate an atomic energy facility.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If it had not been for the Tennessee Valley Authority, we would not have had the atomic bomb in the last war, would we?

Mr. GORE. I think that is a fair statement. The gentleman has offered this amendment in haste. I am sure he is doing something or attempting to do something which upon more mature consideration he would not desire to do. I ask the committee to vote down this amendment.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly to see the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] offer this amendment. To my recollection every year that I have been a Member of the House, he has seen fit to offer amendments objecting to certain expenditures proposed to be made by the Tennessee Valley Authority, regardless of the adverse effect such amendments would have on their corporate endeavors.

Over 90 percent of the funds made available under this section of the bill will be used for new construction and acquiring new generating facilities. We must keep in mind that TVA is the only supplier of the area. It must not only supply the immediate needs of the area but construction must be made to take care of the expanding needs and requirements of 1952, 1953, and 1954. Like all utilities, TVA must make plans now for new electrical capacities to meet the eventual demands of our growing economy. This is the constant dilemma of power supply planning.

Let us for a moment look at the overall power needs in the entire United States for the next 3 years. A very realistic report was most recently made by the Electric Power Advisory Committee of the Defense Power Administration. Mr. Edward W. Morehouse, vice president of General Public Utilities Corp., is chairman of this advisory committee and is a resident of New York City. Let us see what this authority, who comes from the same city as the author of this amendment, has to say.

Mr. Morehouse and his committee in their report pointed out that 30,000,000 kilowatts of new capacity now planned and on order by the electric utilities of the country for construction in the next 3 years is not in the aggregate excessive—if anything, it may be too small. The committee concluded that the load estimates for the 1953 peak made by utilities should be increased by as much as 2,000,000 kilowatts, and that the 1954 estimate should be from 4,000,000 to 5,000,000 kilowatts larger than had been estimated. According to the committee report, there would be more than sufficient power to serve the load in certain areas, while in others there would be deficits. Consequently, it was recommended by the committee that these situations be corrected by installing generating capacity now on order in locations different from those for which it had been originally intended.

The electric power advisory committee then proceeds to analyze the energy requirements sectionallywise. The committee mentioned particularly the section between the Great Lakes and the Gulf into which large defense loads would have a tendency to gravitate. The prospect in this situation the committee reported, is one of tight power supply. I would like to emphasize that the Tennessee Valley Authority is in this area.

This finding alone should be convincing to every Member that the proposed generating capacities for TVA will be needed not only for domestic use but for the enormous defense-plant activities. These findings by the Morehouse committee were very carefully prepared and the load estimates were made by the utilities after careful examinations. They were made as a result of a series of 22 meetings held in various parts of the country during October and November 1951.

Unless presently indicated trends toward sectional deficits are altered, some curtailment of the loads in various areas will be unavoidable during the coming 3 years. Such curtailments must fall largely on essential industry. The reason for this is that it is physically possible to ration power for large industries simply because deliveries are made in large enough blocks to be policed. Theoretically, it is possible to ration power to the small user—rural, residential, and so on—but these uses cannot be rationed effectively by any means which have thus far been devised.

Close examination of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York clearly shows that its adoption would reduce the power potential requirements in the TVA areas, and more particularly affect the atomic-energy plants now under construction in the State of Kentucky.

I sincerely hope that the Committee will reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

(Mr. PHILLIPS asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted him to Mr. KENNEDY.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I think that the House is familiar with what is happening up in New England. We are in danger of losing two basic industries, textiles and shoes, to the South. There are three reasons for this: First, lower wages; second, lack of unionization; and, third, cheap power. For instance, in Boston the industrial rate of 1,000 kilowatts of demand and 400,000 kilowatt usage per month is $5,785. For the same amount of power in Chattanooga, Tenn., it is $2,390. Now, we do not blame the South for trying to build their industrial position. I think we, in New England, have been backward not to develop water power in our own area. But, if the South attempts to extract our industries, they cannot expect us to contribute to our own demise as we are doing. For example, if the rate of unemployment was carried throughout the country as is now taking place in Lawrence, Mass., there would be more unemployment than there was during the height of the depression.

When the Government attempted to assist us by permitting certain defense contracts to be given to distress areas, even if they may not be the lowest bidder, the gentleman from Tennessee who seeks this money for TVA had this to say on page 675 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Should this be consummated, as is now almost the case, then instead of following the practice long established in the United States of procuring through the lowest responsible bidder, we will be back on the costly, extravagant, wasteful trail of negotiated cost-plus contracts. That would be a deplorable day—condoning unnecessary spending and rewarding inefficiency.

Now, when the gentleman has attempted to prevent assistance for unemployment in New England, he cannot in return expect us to contribute our taxes to increase unemployment in our State.

The gentleman from Tennessee talked about what the power demands would be for national defense. According to the representative of the TVA in Washington by 1955 there are expected to be 7,100,000 kilowatts. Of the 7,100,000 kilowatts, a total of 1,740,000 kilowatts, including 1,200,000 kilowatts for the Atomic Energy Commission, are expected to be channeled to Federal agencies, for

industrial loads 1,485,000, and for municipalities and cooperatives 3,875,000 which means that less than one-third of this project is going to be for Federal agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission. Most of it is going to be for cooperatives or the industrial load in this area, more than two-thirds. Therefore, it would seem to me that some cut could be made in this appropriation. The fact is that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is of such high repute in this House that year after year he has been able to push through large appropriations for TVA, and I do not blame him, but, after all, we in Massachusetts are in a very difficult predicament. Five or six of our cities have enormously high unemployment levels. If this flight of industry continues, and the American Woolen Co. is talking about going into the South, what is going to happen to our people? It is our fault in great measure for not doing what the South has done.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Why do you not do something about it? You have a great river up there.

Mr. KENNEDY. There is now a survey being carried out, but unfortunately it will not be until 1956 before the survey will be completed and its recommendation carried into effect. However, in the meantime we cannot be expected to contribute our taxes to the support of this attempt to ruin us industrially.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. The gentleman is in favor of the development of the power of the Niagara and the St. Lawrence?

Mr. KENNEDY. Certainly, I am in favor of the development of power in our area of the country. I am in favor of the development of power in the South. On the other hand, I do not expect that we should contribute tax money in large quantities to the South which will result in the loss of our industry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON].

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, the same old platinum-plated bull is being given us today. Yes, the same old bull, the same old suggestion from the same gentleman from New York. He says he regrets that his constituents cannot use this cheap power. The door is always open in Tennessee. We welcome you and your plants.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. Not at this point.

Mr. COUDERT. That is what we object to in New York and Massachusetts.

Mr. SUTTON. Now, may I say to my good friend from Massachusetts that we in Tennessee wholeheartedly support his developments in Massachusetts. I do not blame the manufacturer in Massachusetts for coming down South. It is the fault of the people in Massachusetts that have not demanded cheaper power. It is the private monopolies that have caused you to have excess rates. We in Tennessee will join you in reducing your rates.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The Members are addressing the gentleman who is speaking not once or twice but continuously without recognizing the Chair, and I think the Chair should be recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will certainly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I wholeheartedly subscribe to what my friend from Tennessee is saying. The reason we have not developed the public power that is available in the Northeast is that the private utilities have blocked it at every turn of the road, and they are the most powerful lobby in this Congress.

Mr. SUTTON. I agree with my friend 100 percent. We in Tennessee will join with our friends from New York and Massachusetts, in developing their power projects.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I certainly agree with what the gentleman from New York said. It is our own fault we have not done it. Now we are faced with a difficult situation in unemployment.

Mr. SUTTON. We in Tennessee hope you will help us, because it is your fault you have not done something about your excessive rates.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The South ought not to be charged with the moving of the industries that are being run out of Massachusetts and other States in that part of the country by the FEPC.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, being just a simple bystander, innocent, it might be added, I do not want to get into the debate between the South and the people of Massachusetts. But I do think the people of Massachusetts should not be criticized so severely because they have not been looking around all the time for a hand-out—hanging around the Federal Government for a hand-out. If they have mistakenly thought they could go along in the good old way of their forefathers, working, thrifty, and developing, making improvements, increasing production, bringing up the output of their factories, I can understand their position. Just because the South wants to pay common labor so much less and have them, as the gentleman from Florida told us yesterday, live in those shacks and freeze, as he said, down in Miami—and that is the first time I ever heard about that—I do not think it is right—is no reason why southern Representatives should criticize our Massachusetts citizens when they lose factories but still insist on paying a living wage and supporting themselves.

I do not think it is fair to criticize the gentleman from Massachusetts or his people. Moreover, there is this to be thought about. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER], and we all have respect for his ability as a parliamentarian, asked our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], how many hearings of the subcommittee he had attended and suggested that he was not present at many of the meetings, and more especially when the bill was marked up. Since the gentleman made that suggestion, I learned, might I say, possibly through Drew Pearson, that when this bill was being marked up, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], came in and told them what to do, what to put in this item. And if you want to know and insist on my telling you, I can give you my version of the reason why the bill came to us as it did and in whose interest it was written. Maybe it has something to do with the coming election in Tennessee. I just do not like that slinging of dirt from over here. May I say that the gentleman from New York did not know I was going to say what has just been said. My statement is my own and I make it because I resent the insinuation that our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] was not on the job and does not know what he is talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FRAZIER].

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Chairman, the TVA has become the most important agency in the Tennessee Valley. Whether you know it or not, it is the only agency that furnishes power in the Tennessee Valley. We do not have any other electric power company in existence in east Tennessee or in the Tennessee Valley. We are dependent solely upon this agency. It furnishes all of our electric power.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. GWINN. The fact that the private power companies do not exist in your area is because they are forced by the Federal Government not to come into the area; is that not true?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; the private power companies sold out to the Government a great many years ago for tremendous prices.

Mr. GWINN. And now the TVA is an absolute monopoly and refuses to let any other private industry compete with them; is that not true?

Mr. FRAZIER. No; it is not.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRAZIER. I yield.

Mr. SUTTON. And is it not a matter of fact that the gentleman from New York was here in the Congress when the Congress itself made us have this complete monopoly by selling out private power to public power?

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The gentleman from Tennessee must remember that this side of the House was not in control when that legislation passed.

Mr. FRAZIER. That may possibly be true, but I just want to call your attention to the fact that there are a great many manufacturing plants that exist in east Tennessee and throughout the Tennessee Valley which get their power from this source. In the war effort, the TVA furnishes power not only for the atomic-energy plant at Oak Ridge, but for the great aluminum plant at Alcoa, the Kingsport munitions plant at Kingsport, the Arnold Engineering Base at Tullahoma, and it is now being called upon to supply power for the new atomic-energy plant at Paducah, and to supply the power for the guided-missile plant at Bristol.

At Chattanooga the Wheland Co. is now engaged in the manufacture of guns. All these plants require tremendous amounts of electric power.

I urge you to vote against this amendment which will not only retard the growth of that area, but will materially interfere with the war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much the prejudice which has been indicated in the debate on the floor of the House on this bill. Every year, year after year, since I have been here, the gentleman from New York has always gotten out his ax against TVA. He seems to have a deep seated and great prejudice, and a sectional prejudice against the TVA. He is a very articulate man. He is a very handsome man. He is a very smooth man, but he is certainly imbued with a deep prejudice, a very deep prejudice which I regret to see—and which I deplore. I regret also the partisanship that has been shown here. If the gentleman would visit the Tennessee Valley, and see the great progress that has been made there, and the great prosperity that has been brought to the farms and to the agricultural section of the country some of his prejudices against a great Government agency might be removed or minimized. He should be proud that a great section of America is making great progress.

He speaks of the advancement in power production. Does he resent the fact that America is producing electric power that is so greatly needed today? Does he regret it? It seems to me that the gentleman from New York and all the Members of this body should be very proud that America is building power, which is so greatly needed today in our national defense program and for other purposes. The Tennessee Valley Authority is making a great contribution to our national defense, and to the prosperity and well-being of all our people. I also point out that the Tennessee Valley Authority belongs to all the people, and it pays into the Treasury of the United States approximately $30,000,000 annually.

Mr. Chairman, will the time never come when the private power lobbyists, the paid snipers and underminers of TVA, will cease their despicable work of attempting to cripple the TVA and do injury to our country? I urge that the pending amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be reserved until after the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] offers his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time will be reserved.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT), there were—ayes 96, noes 87.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. COUDERT and Mr. GORE.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 122, nbes 98.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 35, line 24, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "and not to exceed $99,131,125 of the funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for personal services."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment but will reserve it to permit the gentleman from New York to make his statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is to bring this appropriation in line with the policy adopted by the Committee with regard to all other agencies. It would, in fact, save about $4,000,000.

The purpose of the amendment is to require this agency to absorb pay raises as has been required of all other agencies and as has been done in all other cases. One reason, perhaps, why the subcommittee did not take the same action here as with regard to the other agencies is because in the case of TVA, corporate income is available for obligation, as well as the amounts appropriated in this bill. The savings effected by this amendment mean that much more will be paid back into the Federal Treasury. Thus from appropriations and income, there will be a total of about $365,000,000 which may be spent by TVA in fiscal 1953. It is indicated that TVA intends to spend about $347,000,000, turning back $18,000,000. If this amendment is adopted, they will turn back $22,000,000.

I see no reason why the same formula should not be adopted here with regard to personnel as was adopted in the case of the other agencies, namely, to require that they absorb the pay raise by a reduction of personnel. On the contrary, in this case they propose a thousand more employees in this agency for next year than they have this year. That is contrary to the trend which we have been seeking to establish here day after day and it seems to me it is a trend that is not a healthy one.

It illustrates, of course, why it is dangerous and unsound for any agency of Government to be permitted to spend from its receipts. The receipts should go into the Federal Treasury and all expenses paid from appropriated funds. I do not know how else Congress can possibly maintain control over the Federal purse strings, as the hard-pressed taxpayers are expecting us to do.

When the TVA Act was originally approved, I wonder how many at that time realized that in the year 1953 we would have a colossus of 22,000 employees in this little empire? Think of it. More than an army division. The purpose of this amendment is to reverse that trend. I hope it will be supported by all those who are as worried as I over the financial picture in the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee is in sympathy with what our distinguished friend from New York has said and what he is trying to accomplish. He has given the facts quite succinctly and quite accurately. Of course, you have two types of funds—corporate funds and appropriated funds—but in truth and in fact and in the final analysis all the funds are taxpayers' funds because the corporate funds stem from those.

The committee has served notice in no uncertain terms upon TVA that in the future they must justify every 5 cents of their expenditures in a very detailed breakdown, not only of appropriated funds but also of corporate funds and the expenditures in personnel and in supplies and materials under those categories.

I renew the point of order that the amendment covers funds not included in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] on the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment follows exactly the wording of the limitation at the bottom of page 35 in regard to travel. It says that not to exceed one million-odd dollars of funds available to the TVA shall be used for expenses of travel. In this same item are personal services. The additional limitation is here offered that not to exceed ninty-nine million-odd of the funds available shall be used for personal services. It seems to me that it is exactly in line, that it is clearly a limitation, and that the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to ask the gentleman from New York if his amendment does not apply to funds for the TVA other than those contained in the bill before the committee?

Mr. KEATING. No, Mr. Chairman. It applies only to the item of $185,000,000 as now reduced by the Coudert amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair has before him the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York on page 35, line 24, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] makes a point of order. The amendment says not to exceed so many dollars of

funds available to the Tennessee Valley Authority shall be used for personal services. As the Chair reads the amendment it is not limited to funds contained in the bill now before the Committee. The fact that the amendment may be patterned after language in the bill would still not make the amendment in order if it goes to funds beyond those contained in the bill before the Committee, thus adding legislation.

The Chair is not called upon to rule on the question of legislative provisions allowed to remain in the bill, in view of the rule adopted waiving points of order. The Chair is of the opinion that this amendment applies a new restriction on funds not contained in the bill thus adding legislation and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: Page 35, line 24, strike out the period and insert a comma and add the following: "and not to exceed $99,131,125 of funds available under this section shall be used for personal services."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. I made the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. It says "funds available." There are two types of funds available to the TVA—appropriated funds and its own revenues.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to request, if there is no objection, that the amendment be again reported.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me it meets expressely the ruling which the Chair has just made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment refers only to funds contained within this section of this bill and is merely a negative limitation, which is in order. Therefore, the Chair overrules the point of order.

Permit the Chair to say that under the limitation of time adopted some bit ago the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] had not consumed his time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to my chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may yield his time to the gentleman from Texas, if he desires the time.

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I say in all courtesy and fairness to my good personal friend from New York that the committee has not the slightest idea of what his amendment does. We have not had the opportunity to see it, and I do not condemn him for that. Perhaps he has not had an opportunity to present it to us. However, I gather that he is seeking to cut down some salary costs. Is that it?

Mr. KEATING. No, Mr. Chairman. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that the amendment reduces the figure which is in the bill for personal services by $4,000,000. It is just limited to personal services. It does in dollars what your committee did with regard to all other agencies of Government, requiring that additional pay be absorbed by elimination of personnel.

Mr. THOMAS. How does the gentleman expect to reduce the personnel cost by $4,000,000 by his language? That is what I do not quite understand.

Mr. KEATING. The amount in the bill as it stands if this amendment were not adopted is $4,000,000 more than $99,000,000 for personal services.

Mr. THOMAS. There is not a dime set out in here for personal services.

Mr. KEATING. That is true, but it appears from the record very clearly, and I am sure the gentleman would agree with me, that of the $185,000,000, $103,000,000 is for personal services. This reduces that item to $99,000,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I am sure the gentleman means to do what he says he intends to do, but I cannot see how the amendment he has offered can possibly do what he says it will do. Indeed, it may have a contrary effect.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, when this Coudert amendment comes up on a roll call, when we get back into the House, it should be voted down by all means. It is one of the most dangerous blows at our national defense program that could be made at this time, since it would tend to paralyze our atomic-bomb plant at Paducah, Ky.

If we should be plunged into another European war, it would be an atomic war that would probably destroy every city along the Atlantic seaboard. Our hope for survival, and for the survival of our civilization, would depend upon the strength of our Air Force and our supply of atomic bombs.

This Coudert amendment is supported by the same element that has fought the Tennessee Valley Authority, and has fought the development of the Columbia River, for the last 20 years.

If they had succeeded in their attempts to prevent the development of the Tennessee and the Columbia Rivers, we could not have produced the atomic bomb, and many other facilities, that enabled us to win World War II. Now, when we are faced with a dangerous international situation, as well as enemy infiltration at home, they bring up this amendment to prevent the construction of this steam plant at Paducah, Ky., where our new atomic-bomb plant is situated, knowing that this plant is to be constructed, not for the power consumers throughout the TVA area, but for this atomic-bomb plant at Paducah that is producing the materials necessary to defend this country, and to save the lives of our American boys, if we should be plunged into another world conflict.

It has certainly been surprising to me to hear these attacks made on the Tennessee Valley Authority by certain Members from the Northeastern States on the ground that their industries are leaving them and moving into the South.

The TVA is not responsible for that situation. Those industries are moving into Texas, Louisiana, and other Southern and Western States that are outside of the TVA area.

One thing that is driving those industries out of some of the Northeastern States is the communistic FEPC that has been fastened on to some of those States, including New York and Massachusetts.

No one would go to a State that has this FEPC written into its laws to establish a new industry, and many of the industries that have been operating there for years and years are now seeking locations beyond what might be called the FEPC iron curtain.

Another thing that is causing them to move is the fact that in those States where most of this criticism is coming from they have no coal, no gas, no oil, very little wood, if any, and no raw materials, and they will not develop and distribute what water power they have at rates the people can afford to pay.

Let me remind you that those industries are also moving to the West and the Middle West, as well as to the South.

For almost 100 years the South and West have borne the burden of economic discriminations never before imposed by any other country on the people of any section of their own domain. A great economist at Harvard University said a few years ago that no country that ever lost a war had paid the indemnities the South had paid in indirect taxes, high protective tariffs, discriminatory freight rates, and other discriminations. The same situation applied to practically every State west of the Mississippi River. This great economist might have revised his remarks and said that no country that ever won a war, or helped to win a war, had ever paid the indemnities the people of the Western States have paid in the discriminations borne by their people since the War Between the States.

That day is now over. If there is any prosperity in this world for the next century, the South and West are going to enjoy their portion of it. They have everything to make it. They have coal, gas, oil, wood, water power, raw materials, soil, climate, rainfall, and a people who are willing to work, and who are interested in building up their own country and promoting their own prosperity.

You would think to hear some of these attacks that the TVA, and the Columbia River development, and all the other water power developments in the South and West, were being paid for out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the other sections of the country. That is not true. The TVA and the Columbia River development, and all of those other water power developments, will pay for themselves in the years to come. And, I might add, that they have added more to the wealth of the Nation, as well as

more to its national defense, than anything else that has occurred during our generation.

It is absolutely silly to refer to these developments as being socialistic. The power business is a public business. It has become a necessity of our modern life. Nobody can live and enjoy the benefits of our modern civilization without the use of electric energy. It must be handled by a monopoly. It would be ridiculous to have a half dozen, or a dozen, concerns supplying electricity to the people of any one city, town, or community. The overhead costs would be so great they could not bear them.

Besides, the water power of this Nation already belongs to the Federal Government. That was decided by the Supreme Court of the United States many years ago in both the Ashwander case and the Appalachian Power case.

Then, how can any man contend that it is socialism to have the Government improve the navigation, controls the floods, generate the electricity in these navigable streams, and supply the transmission lines to carry it to the various cities, towns, and rural areas where it is used and paid for?

As I have said before, the TVA has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times. It has greatly aided the people in every section of this country by showing them what electricity is worth and how it can be used to stimulate business of every kind, brighten the homes, lift the burdens of drudgery and make our country a brighter and a better place in which to live.

In addition to that, it enabled us to produce the weapons of war that helped us to win the victory in World War II, and probably saved the lives of a million American boys.

If the House should adopt this vicious amendment, I hope the Senate knocks it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For necessary expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, in carrying out the functions pursuant to all laws for which the Administration is charged with administering, including purchase of 38 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); maintenance and operation of farms; recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained by the Veterans' Administration; expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration except burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended; aid to State or Territorial homes in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888, as amended (24 U. S. C. 134), for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; not to exceed $6,000 for newspapers and periodicals; not to exceed $3,138,400 for expenses of travel of employees; not to exceed $45,300 for the preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educational information and descriptive material, including the purchase or rental of equipment; $803,586,430, together with not to exceed $12,500,000 of the unobligated balance of funds appropriated for this purpose in the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952," from which allotments and transfers may be made to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of 70 persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for the purchase of any hospital or home; and this appropriation may be used to repair, alter, improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and the purchase of materials.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGRATH: On page 37, lines 8 and 9, strike out "$803,586,430" and insert "$809,382,260."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all sections and paragraphs under the heading "Veterans' Administration" be considered as read and printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, how liberal, may I ask the chairman of the subcommittee, is he going to be with the time later on? Is he going to cut us down to 2 minutes?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] that we are going to try to finish the bill in a reasonable length of time and give everybody who wants to be heard an opportunity to be heard. Everybody is familiar with what is involved here. You know and we all know that we can talk here for a week, if we wanted to, on this subject. So let us get down to business and finish this in a reasonable length of time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object: Might I suggest to my friend that he could accept this amendment and that would obviate the necessity of taking up a great deal of time.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I have not used any time at all on this bill, and I have an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York and I would like to have 5 minutes at least.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I just want to say to the gentleman from Texas that, as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we want some time on all these amendments, and so will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], as well as other members of the committee. I do not think you ought to just take a sweeping stroke and cut out debate on the entire section because there are going to be some very important amendments.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the committee has convinced us that we should proceed for a while at least. So, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply restores the contact officers in the Veterans' Administration. Unlike the previous discussion that has been had today, there is nothing sectional about it. It is for the American veteran. I am very hopeful that the suggestion of the majority leader will be accepted by my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee. The Committee on Appropriations struck out $5,795,000 which eliminated 80 percent of the contact office workers in the Veterans' Administration. These contact men are the very people to whom the returning veterans go with their many, many problems, whether they be questions of rights of education under the GI bill of rights, or whether they be questions of rehabilitation or of hospitalization. These men do a remarkable job. In the main, they are the first contact with the returning veteran. We have passed a great deal of beneficial legislation for the veterans. These men return home. Many of them come to a new section where they did not live before. They do not know where to turn except to the contact officers of the VA. They must go to someone who will advise them as to their rights.

In the general debate it was suggested by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that they could go to the veterans' organizations. It is true the veterans' organizations are doing a good service, as far as they are able, but we must remember there are 19,000,000 veterans in the United States today. We have passed legislation that inures to the benefit of the families of veterans and that number is 80,000,000 individuals. In addition to that, I call your attention to the fact that there have been 670,000 veterans who have been added since the Korean situation. While it is true the men in the various posts of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars have attempted to do what they can, they cannot meet this great burden which would be placed upon them.

Again, these men who are contact officers have been trained. Those of us who try cases in court know that the presentation of a case is a very important thing, and if you deny a veteran the right, because he has not been in a position to logically and in succinct fashion present his case, you deny to that veteran the very thing that you voted for in this House.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Does your amendment restore the full amount for contact officers, or does it just come up to the budget recommendation?

Mr. McGRATH. It is just up to the budget recommendation, which was $7,231,329. At no time have I attempted to go over the budget estimate.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. The budget estimate recommends approximately a two-thirds cut in the veterans' contact officers; is that not right?

Mr. McGRATH. That is right.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. As I understand, that two-thirds cut would practically eliminate this contact service to veterans out in rural areas. There would only be service available in the larger metropolitan areas; is that true?

Mr. McGRATH. The advantage of this amendment is this: that it gives to the men in the rural sections an opportunity to continue these contact officers. In the big cities, we would not be hurt as much as in the rural areas. While I come from New York, I can say that the Legislature of New York has passed legislation which gives us contact officers, but my amendment will be for the benefit of those in the rural sections.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. In the State of New York alone, with 262 contact employees, there were over 200,000 single operations handled in the last fiscal year.

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct. In addition to that, there have been a great many handled by the veterans' organizations.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Will the gentleman's amendment keep in contact those contact officers in the remote, rural areas, a long way from the regional offices?

Mr. McGRATH. It will.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that if we accept your amendment, we still lose 200 contact offices?

Mr. McGRATH. That is true. The reason for that is we have kept within the budget estimate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Chairman, I have voted consistently for reductions in the cost of Government. Many businessmen, friends of mine and members of veterans' organizations have protested to me against exorbitant cuts involving veterans. I want to hear all that I can regarding the reason for these cuts. I will not vote for reductions that will cripple the work with veterans, particularly the work with disabled veterans. Therefore, I want a complete explanation of all these proposed cuts.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. MARTIN of Iowa be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the House Appropriations Committee, in my opinion, has committed a most grievous mistake in recommending the elimination of the Veterans' Administration Contact Service.

This is the service that operates at the grassroots level of our Nation to provide information and help to veterans and their dependents who need Veterans' Administration benefits, as enacted by the Congress.

The Veterans' Administration now has 343 contact offices throughout the country—most of them many miles distant from the big VA regional offices where applications for benefits are adjudicated. In addition VA maintains contact services in the big regional offices for the thousands of veterans who stream into those offices every day for help.

In the month of January, 1952, alone, this contact set-up handled approximately 500,000 visitors—veterans and their dependents who needed help.

On February 29, 1952, VA had 2,212 persons in the Contact Service. The VA budget, as submitted to the Congress, cut this number to 1,526 employees. This alone would have required the closing of 200 of the 343 contact offices. It further would have required VA to abandon the formula agreed upon by the Bureau of the Budget and VA for the closing of contact offices. This formula was made known to Members of Congress on March 20, 1951. It provides that if the number of visits to any contact office east of the Mississippi River falls below 450 a month for 4 consecutive months the office would be closed. For contact offices west of the Mississippi River, the number was set at 350 visits per month, except in metropolitan areas where the 450 figure would prevail.

Now the House Appropriations Committee comes along with a recommendation for only 305 contact personnel. That recommendation, if adopted, would force VA to close all of its 343 contact offices and to reduce by 75 percent its contact staff in its 70 big regional offices.

Yet our veteran population continues to grow larger. In addition to the 18,500,000 veterans of World War II and prior wars, we now have 655,000 veterans with military service since the Korean conflict started. By the time the men and women now in service are discharged as veterans, the since-Korea veteran population will equal if not exceed the number of persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War I.

The present Congress already has enacted Public Law 28 that gives since-Korea veterans virtually all World War II benefits except those in the GI bill. The present Congress also has enacted Public Law 23 that sets up an entirely different type of postservice Government life insurance system for our since-Korea veterans. The present Congress further is considering at this moment the extension of GI bill benefits to our since-Korea veterans.

In other words, we are increasing the number of benefits that VA administers; but, in the House Appropriations Committee recommendation, we are asked to consider cutting off the good right arm of VA in administering these additional benefits efficiently and expeditiously.

All of your major veterans organizations already have or are now protesting this recommended cut. They do not have the personnel or the money to replace this invaluable VA service.

Further, the Secretary of Defense has notified VA within the last 10 days that the counseling structure of the Defense Department "is built around the availability of contact service provided by the VA through its network of field offices" and "any marked curtailment in this contact service would have a direct effect upon the Armed Forces separation counseling program."

In view of all this I think the committee's recommendation is penny-wise and pound-foolish. My earnest advice is that you provide the Veterans' Administration with approximately the $3,500,000 it needs to maintain the present contact service.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not absolutely true that the State contact officers do not have rights in the Veterans' Administration that the Federal contact officers have?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They go in under sufferance, and they can shut them out many times, and they have been shut out many times.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I have supported every single amendment designed to save dollars for the taxpayers that has been offered during the reading of this bill, but to me the action of the subcommittee in cutting the item which concerns contact officers is false economy. Therefore in the few minutes at my disposal I shall try to paint a word picture of what the situation is, in hope that the majority will agree that we need the contact officers we have today, and for that reason will support the McGrath amendment.

Let me begin by pointing out that we have in this country today approximately 19,000,000 veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions. In addition we are making 20,000 new veterans a month as a result of the Korean war. As the gentleman from New York has mentioned, since the beginning of the

Korean war we have added to the veteran ranks of this country 617,000 new veterans. To speak of veterans alone is not sufficient, because the Congress provides benefits to both the veteran and his dependent. Therefore, in this country today we have 61,000,000 people who are entitled to benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration in accordance with existing laws.

To do this job, the Veterans' Administration has 152 Veterans' Administration hospitals scattered throughout the United States and Territorial possessions. In addition they have 70 regional offices and 343 other VA offices. The other VA offices may be a district office, a suboffice, located in some public-health hospital, a State institution, or an Army or Navy hospital. These contact officers must be available to any of the 61,000,000 people who are entitled to benefits and who need information, necessary forms, as well as assistance in executing such forms.

The contact program of the Veterans' Administration is engaged in assisting veterans, their dependents and beneficiaries, and representatives in the preparation and presentation of claims as has been authorized with the beginning of World War Veterans' Act in the early twenties and has been reiterated in other veterans' legislation over the years, including the so-called GI bill. The contact service is the focal point in regional offices where visitors come for assistance and answers to questions relative to laws passed by the Congress for the benefit of veterans and their dependents. This is advantageous not alone to the veteran, but to the taxpayer, as through this method claims are properly prepared, permitting prompt action by the Veterans' Administration to effect determination as to benefits and subsequent payment when indicated with the least practicable delay and without the expense of continued correspondence.

The various ex-service organizations have individuals who are trained in a comparable manner to contact representatives, but they are limited in number and, in my opinion, the funds of these organizations would not permit the employment of a sufficient number of trained personnel to replace the services rendered by contact personnel. In any event, you cannot deny the right of veterans and their dependents to come to the Veterans' Administration seeking aid. There is undoubtedly a mistaken idea that competent advice and assistance can be rendered to veterans and their dependents in every community where there may be a post of any service organization. I say this because the service officers of such posts are generally veterans who have full-time employment in private vocations and perform this extracurricular work as a means of helping their fellow veterans, but could not possibly be coversant with all rules, regulations, and laws that apply as is the case with the employees of contact service or full-time, paid representatives of service organizations who are rarely available except in locations where regional offices are situated and hence in metropolitan areas. I have the greatest sympathy for these post service officers. They do the best they can, but I assure you that they cannot render service as one employed full time. In fact, it is well known that VA contact representatives, in order to keep on a current basis, are continually studying on their own time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I have not taken much time on this bill and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for five additional minutes

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think a strong powerful point is that the contact representative is the outpost of the Veterans' Administration in helping the veteran get his rights under the law.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Absolutely. I was in my home town last night where we have a Veterans' Administration hospital. The veterans of Altoona and vicinity depend upon a contact officer, and unless the McGrath amendment is adopted they will lose his valuable services.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is not the contact officer rather a diagnostician for the veteran? In other words, if he were to go to a regional office and there was no contact officer, the veteran would not know where to go and that in turn would waste a good deal of the time of the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. If a veteran walks into a facility and there is no service officer there he goes to the contact officer. This contact officer is briefed in law, briefed in policy, he knows a little bit about medicine, he gets to know the veteran and aids him by gathering information and preparing his claim for presentation to a board who decides whether or not the veteran is entitled to benefits. The VA contact officer is a valuable man, he is a liaison between the veteran population of this country and the Veterans' Administration. Frankly, when you abolish the contact officer position you are toying with the misery of millions of veterans who seek relief from the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This case came to me and I think the gentleman can straighten it out for me. A veteran of World War II had an insurance policy which was about to expire. He placed the money in the hands of one of these contact men before the time of expiration occurred. The money was later sent to the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration denies this by saying it did not receive the money in time. Are these contact men permitted to accept such deposits? In other words, what happens in a case of that kind and who is responsible?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Of course, the law is very specific when it comes to dealing with this particular question of insurance and the interpretation undoubtedly made by the Veterans' Administration was that this veteran, even though he had the assistance of a contact officer, did not meet the provisions of existing law. I have had similar cases and I had to agree because it was the interpretation of the legal division of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Even if this amendment is adopted, still 60 percent of the present offices will be closed?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Regardless of whether or not the amendment is adopted, we stand to lose 200 contact officers.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Which is 60 percent.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think that is a rather substantial cut?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes. Instead of cutting we should provide more contact officers because of the increasing veteran population in this country. Let us not forget these veterans did not declare war on anybody. The Government of the United States declared war and many of them were drafted, many volunteered, and today as veterans they are entitled to the benefits granted to them by the Congress of the United States in the name of the American people and administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The contact officers we are trying to restore are simply representatives of the United States Government, the Veterans' Administration and the American people who are there to assist the veteran population to this country to receive the benefits that they are entitled to.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] for the clear, forceful, and logical statement he has made today in support of the pending amendment. It is characteristic of the part he has taken on all occasions where the interests of the veterans are concerned.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to increase the amount provided in this bill for the maintenance of contact offices. I consider that the welfare of the veteran is at stake in this matter. I have

continuously voted to reduce the expenditures of Government but cannot with good conscience do so in an instance of this kind.

I am in full accord with all that has been said in support of the amendment. There is no justification for cutting this necessary service for veterans. In my opinion we should consider increasing these facilities instead of cutting them. As the name implies, these contact facilities provide a means of enabling veterans to contact a representative of the Veterans' Administration to ascertain the answer he needs to his problems of one character or another and incident to his rights as a veteran. Otherwise, it would be necessary for him to travel long distances to regional offices or carry on extensive and involved correspondence. This is difficult for the average veteran and very unsatisfactory.

To provide contact offices for veterans where they may obtain desired information as to their rights or attention for physical needs is one of the finest and most necessary services provided for veterans. At the present time there are 1 526 of such offices provided for veterans. Unless the pending amendment is adopted, this number would be reduced to approximately 300. Such a cut would result in great distress to our veterans. I cannot believe the Congress will consent to any such drastic cut, especially in view of the fact that each month several thousand more veterans from the Korean war are being added to the 19,000,000 veterans already existing as a result of our previous wars. And, in addition to these veterans there are also the members of the families of deceased veterans who have rights and benefits under our veteran legislation who need the services of these contact offices.

I have personal knowledge of the necessity as well as the advantages of these contact offices. There has been one located in Camden, N. J., for many years. A short time ago the Veterans' Administration sought to close it or greatly curtail its facilities. Veterans' organizations from all over south Jersey opposed this action by the Veterans' Administration. After a united and persistent effort we were able to keep it open, and, today, it is still rendering splendid and efficient service to the veterans of south Jersey. If this amendment is not adopted it will mean that this facility would be closed and veterans from south Jersey, as far south as Cape May, would have to travel to Trenton or Newark to get the attention they need. This is unthinkable.

Within the next few weeks we will be called upon by the Administration to appropriate billions of dollars for aid to foreign countries. If we have money for such a purpose, to benefit countries all over the world, then, we should be willing to do what is necessary for our veterans. To cut down their benefits and the service they are entitled to, while spending billions of dollars in foreign countries, is without justification. Our first duty is to those who have served our country in its hour of emergency. I will support the pending amendment so that the services through contact offices will continue to be available to our veterans. I trust that my colleagues in the Congress will do likewise.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I also desire to compliment the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his continual support of the veteran and to state that I intend to support the amendment restoring the contact officers.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman. Let me say this in conclusion. There are 1526 contact officers scattered throughout the United States and our Territorial possessions. Unless the McGrath amendment is adopted it will mean we will reduce the contact officers from 1526 to a mere 300. If these veterans cannot go to these contact officers they will go to Members of the Congress of the United States, and, believe me when I tell you, your offices will be swamped with requests for assistance.

The Department of Defense has at this time stated that they have built their counseling service around the availability of the contact service provided by the Veterans' Administration through its network of field offices conveniently located throughout the country, which is indeed an important factor in view of those being discharged for disability and other reasons from the Armed Forces, incident to its present operations, particularly from Korea, and, as is well known, the number is continually increasing.

The proposed 80 percent reduction in funds for the contact program for the Veterans' Administration will eliminate all 343 VA contact offices, eliminate all service to veterans in private and State institutions, reduce the availability of service in the regional offices to a number that would not permit contact service to be rendered as necessary. In fact, 45 percent of the 70 regional offices would be reduced to one contact representative and one clerk. The number of visitors to regional offices and VA offices to the contact service during January 1952, for example—which excludes services rendered in VA hospitals—was approximately 500,000, which represents in the neighborhood of 6,000,000 visitors to these offices a year, and I ask who is going to help these people.

Irrespective of the amount cut from the budget request, I am informed it will be necessary to close 200 of these offices immediately even though the funds requested are granted, which will have an adverse effect on service to veterans and their families. To maintain the contact service as it presently exists will require approximately $809,382,260 instead of the $803,586,430 recommended by the appropriations committee. So it is evident that the committee action would result in the virtual elimination of the contact service, which has been of such great benefit to those who have served their country and to their dependents.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to understand the thinking of the persons who would recommend, so shortly after the Second World War and at a time when so many of our young men are on active military duty that services to our veterans be drastically curtailed. The proposed 90-percent cut in contact services to our deserving veterans cannot be justified at this time.

Last year over 16,000,000 contacts were handled by the Veterans' Administration contact representatives. It would be folly to assume that the demand for such service would diminish to such an extent that the needs of veterans throughout the country would be satisfied by the few existing regional offices.

Should this curtailment in funds for VA contact offices be effected, all veterans in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would have only the Philadelphia or Pittsburgh offices to assist them in matters pertaining to the privileges and benefits to which they are entitled under existing legislation. It would be impossible for these two offices to take on the additional burden of furnishing information on claims, hospitalization, education, GI loans, and so forth, and continue to efficiently perform their other functions. Not only are our veterans entitled to have this service as readily available to them as possible, but it would be most unfair and result in severe hardships and unpleasant consequences in many cases to suffer the delays which would be unavoidable in prolonged correspondence with the distant regional offices. To attempt to serve our veterans via long distance would result in a gross negligence of the Nation's obligation to those who served our country in its hour of need.

In addition to the hundreds of thousands of veterans of World Wars I and II who still from time to time find it necessary to obtain assistance in negotiations with the VA regional office and central office, the return of large numbers of Korean veterans increases the demand for contact representatives in the remote communities throughout each State. There is also the factor to be considered that the majority of these positions have been filled by disabled veterans who have been adequately trained to assist other veterans in their problems with efficiency and dispatch.

I strongly urge that the reduction of $5,795,830 proposed by the Committee on Appropriations be restored and that the House of Representatives approve the complete budget estimate of $7,231,329 for operation of Veterans' Administration contact offices throughout the country.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to the amendment offered by Mr. MCGRATH: Strike out "$809,582,260" and insert in lieu thereof "$806,484,345."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

the McGrath amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour and 5 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and 6 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LANTAFF. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand, in the event the McGrath amendment or any of the substitutes therefor or amendments thereto are not agreed to, that the time limitation would not apply to other amendments to the section?

The CHAIRMAN. The time limitation requested by the gentleman from Texas only applies to the McGrath amendment and all amendments thereto.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following those of the previous speaker, and further that my time be allotted to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the budget request for this item called for $7,231,329. The committee bill has cut that by $5,795,830, which amounts approximately to a cut of 80 percent, or four-fifths of the amount the budget request carried. My amendment would restore half of that reduction to the bill.

In the fiscal year 1951 there were 3,034 of these contact officers, departmental and in the field. In the fiscal year 1952 that number had been reduced to 2,234. The amount carried in the budget for the fiscal year 1953 called for 1,526, which likewise was a reduction from the number in 1952. Seven hundred and eight of these contact officers were cut off by the budget request figures from the number in the 1952 fiscal year.

The committee bill would cut the 1,526 which the budget request calls for by four-fifths, to approximately 300. I believe that is much more drastic than any reduction which has been made in any bill which has come before us up to this time. Some items have been reduced 20 percent, possibly some 25 percent, but I know of none that has been reduced as much as 80 percent, or four-fifths.

I realize, of course, that the distinguished gentleman from Texas is a careful man. I know he works hard and diligently on the items in the independent offices appropriation bill. For that reason, having read the hearings which begin at page 1270 and finding very little information in there on which to base an opinion as to whether or not this is a reasonable cut, I talked to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who is the able chairman of this subcommittee, and asked him what there is to justify this drastic cut. He told me that the Veterans' Administration could very well cut out all these contact officers without doing any harm to the veterans' program.

Having the respect for the gentleman's opinion that I have, I was so concerned that I took it upon myself yesterday morning to go down to the Veterans' Administration office here in Washington for the purpose of seeing just what work is being carried on by these contact officers there. I have been in the reception room in the Veterans' Administration office in Atlanta, which is in my district and I have seen there on a number of occasions anywhere from 25 to 50 veterans sitting in the reception room at one time waiting for one of the contact officers to take up their problems.

I went down yesterday morning to the office here in Washington. There were some 20 or 30 veterans sitting there in the reception room in the office when I went in. So I went around to a number of them, and asked them what they were there for. I wanted to know myself whether a real and necessary service is rendered by these contact officers. I questioned 4 of these veterans at some length about what they were there for. The first one I questioned was there to see about cashing in his life insurance, which is a legitimate thing for a veteran to go there to see about. And certainly the Veterans' Administration is obligated to give him information on that when he goes there. The second one was a student who was taking a course under the GI bill of rights, and he was there on a legitimate errand in connection with that. The third one was there because he had some trouble with his insurance premium payments, and the monthly payments that he had been making. I know all of you have had trouble laid in your lap by your veteran constituents on that very thing. He was there—not taking it up with his Congressman, but directly with the Veterans' Administration, and that was a legitimate errand. The next one I went to was in to see about having some dental work done, which he contended was necessary because of service connection, and also to see what his civil-service rights were as a veteran. All of them I talked to were there on legitimate errands, and certainly were entitled to have some competent, capable person dealing with them when they went there. So I am convinced that these contact officers, if they work constantly and diligently at their job really render a service to the veterans.

I asked the head of the Department also to give me some information about how much work they do. I have here a summary of the contact activities for the month of January 1952, which when we go back into the House, I am going to ask permission to insert at this point in my remarks:

Contact and administrative services—Contact activities, January 1952

Location	Personal contacts		Counter contacts	Telephone contacts	Correspondence prepared	Forms prepared	Applications prepared
	At office	Away					
Grand total	622,486	22,300	140,138	512,804	175,776	331,841	156,453
Central office	4,623	0	202	9,774	2,109	2,633	1,499
Total hospitals and domiciliaries	134,321	137	20,545	42,799	24,970	59,024	24,927
Total regional offices	476,706	21,937	117,949	444,516	146,881	265,962	128,125
Alabama: Montgomery	7,131	167	1,024	4,591	2,446	3,069	949
Alaska: Juneau	1,727	61	276	1,137	1,107	779	614
Arizona: Phoenix	4,917	287	353	2,492	1,071	2,609	847
Arkansas: Little Rock	6,581	548	1,568	4,203	2,273	3,427	1,589
California:							
Los Angeles	20,651	263	3,057	31,736	11,077	11,564	6,307
San Diego	4,106	68	368	4,252	720	2,001	849
San Francisco	9,960	815	2,334	11,786	2,342	4,885	2,408
Connecticut: Hartford	7,175	973	1,281	5,167	2,418	4,475	2,560
Delaware: Wilmington	630	16	2	1,049	153	446	230
District of Columbia: Washington	7,403	177	1,671	11,623	2,720	2,845	872
Florida:							
Miami	7,837	364	1,191	7,451	1,923	3,690	1,067
Pass-A-Grille	8,976	224	1,379	5,606	2,323	4,826	1,814
Georgia: Atlanta	12,466	420	3,132	8,355	3,601	7,247	2,995
Hawaii: Honolulu	2,716	656	370	1,706	861	1,786	742
Idaho: Boise	2,791	66	388	1,457	905	1,467	761
Illinois: Chicago	18,852	459	4,429	22,115	4,815	9,578	6,134
Indiana: Indianapolis	10,559	236	1,631	9,606	2,329	4,945	3,612
Iowa: Des Moines	4,993	18	1,826	4,649	1,252	3,430	1,764
Kansas: Wichita	2,216	36	375	2,093	674	1,342	773
Kentucky: Louisville	6,345	87	1,980	3,456	2,010	3,567	1,506
Louisiana:							
New Orleans	7,000	118	1,905	4,522	1,929	3,454	1,090
Shreveport	1,928	8	472	2,039	605	1,060	401

Contact and administrative services—Contact activities, January 1952—Continued

Location	Personal contacts		Counter contacts	Telephone contacts	Correspondence prepared	Forms prepared	Applications prepared
	At office	Away					
Maine: Togus	2,265	493	500	2,284	1,243	1,681	760
Maryland: Baltimore	6,348	304	2,089	5,563	1,464	3,273	1,160
Massachusetts: Boston	23,363	1,594	11,679	22,343	8,915	11,394	6,647
Michigan: Detroit	8,191	1,639	3,880	11,154	2,955	4,620	3,031
Mississippi: Jackson	3,813	21	520	1,483	748	1,271	500
Missouri:							
Kansas City	5,750	45	1,646	8,758	2,197	4,606	2,598
St. Louis	5,081	329	446	3,086	880	2,109	962
Montana: Fort Harrison	1,932	47	976	1,292	879	709	411
Nebraska: Lincoln	2,813	48	678	2,995	767	1,827	1,102
Nevada: Reno	878	21	52	665	259	463	238
New Hampshire: Manchester	3,347	135	804	1,960	969	1,925	1,010
New Jersey: Newark	12,054	623	1,491	14,554	5,113	7,551	3,147
New Mexico: Albuquerque	3,418	354	944	1,937	1,423	1,464	574
New York:							
Albany	5,044	479	1,109	4,090	1,652	3,133	1,655
Brooklyn	12,623	44	3,829	14,746	2,496	6,690	3,362
Buffalo	7,473	621	1,094	6,771	1,704	3,666	1,363
New York	32,280	1,727	9,958	42,381	10,406	17,847	10,192
Syracuse	5,059	367	743	4,424	1,957	2,627	1,485
North Carolina: Winston-Salem	5,579	46	1,969	4,485	1,877	3,116	923
North Dakota: Fargo	1,252	37	184	958	784	712	361
Ohio:							
Cincinnati	9,847	231	2,647	10,687	4,059	6,540	4,242
Cleveland	12,562	168	3,040	11,126	3,249	7,063	4,772
Oklahoma:							
Muskogee	4,097	128	723	2,777	1,587	3,185	1,778
Oklahoma City	6,177	1,012	1,261	4,693	1,820	3,519	1,843
Oregon: Portland	5,023	189	2,274	3,869	2,026	2,490	1,168
Pennsylvania:							
Philadelphia	10,958	482	5,047	11,405	2,934	7,909	3,466
Pittsburgh	11,665	128	2,406	9,509	2,407	6,729	3,434
Wilkes-Barre	11,895	425	2,888	7,440	2,676	7,936	4,056
Puerto Rico: San Juan	7,293	635	1,931	867	2,118	3,644	1,349
Rhode Island: Providence	5,890	631	813	3,435	1,731	2,829	1,498
South Carolina: Columbia	5,424	157	1,558	3,796	1,910	2,748	1,374
South Dakota: Sioux Falls	847	106	359	1,056	268	364	176
Tennessee: Nashville	6,220	23	541	5,025	1,215	2,321	804
Texas:							
Dallas	5,489	108	789	5,054	1,714	2,444	792
Houston	6,459	264	2,089	6,031	2,252	3,338	1,542
Lubbock	5,254	132	781	3,381	1,363	2,368	955
San Antonio	6,315	502	641	4,599	1,671	3,168	1,278
Waco	4,854	35	610	3,153	1,237	2,496	1,188
Utah: Salt Lake City	1,708	17	1,543	3,323	1,251	1,579	900
Vermont: White River Junction	935	243	284	812	382	623	439
Virginia: Roanoke	4,750	118	715	4,838	1,312	2,343	1,381
Washington: Seattle	9,340	406	2,277	8,317	2,494	5,124	2,949
West Virginia: Huntington	17,628	251	4,231	13,670	3,053	13,909	2,619
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	8,620	381	2,326	7,649	3,218	5,031	2,430
Wyoming: Cheyenne	1,033	124	372	1,024	692	786	327
Total Do-Ro centers	6,836	226	1,442	15,715	1,816	4,222	1,902
Colorado: Denver	4,790	126	1,094	5,092	1,225	2,329	816
Minnesota: St. Paul	2,046	100	348	10,623	591	1,893	1,086

It shows, and I will give some specific instances here, that at the office I visited yesterday morning, that during the month of January 1952 there were 7,403 veterans who came in with a problem which called for having their files brought down from the file cabinets and taken up across the desk with the veterans. They do not list here in that column those who merely come in to ask questions, and who get information directly without having to have their files brought down. They have those listed in another column called the counter-contacts. That shows 1,671 contacts in addition to the 7,403. Now to do that work, and carry that load, they had here in Washington 46 of these contact officers. If this bill goes through as it now stands, the 46 will be reduced down to 9. There is grave doubt in my mind whether nine contact men working as hard as they could all the time would be able to handle anything like the load that rests on this office here.

I want to give you some other illustrations of reductions which would result from the reduction carried in the committee bill. These facts were furnished to me by the Veterans' Administration:

New York now staffed with 149 contact VA officers, reduced to 26.

Los Angeles now staffed with 63 contact VA officers, reduced to 12.

Chicago now staffed with 77 contact VA officers, reduced to 11.

St. Louis now staffed with 31 contact VA officers, reduced to 4.

Jackson, Miss., now staffed with 18 contact VA officers, reduced to 2.

Dallas, Tex., now staffed with 33 contact VA officers, reduced to 3.

Nashville, Tenn., now staffed with 26 contact VA officers, reduced to 3.

Atlanta, Ga., now staffed with 53 contact VA officers, reduced to 6.

Boston, Mass., now staffed with 100 contact VA officers, reduced to 11.

Washington, D. C., now staffed with 46 contact VA officers, reduced to 9.

Maine now staffed with 12 contact VA officers, reduced to 2.

Vermont now staffed with 6 contact VA officers, reduced to 2.

Rhode Island now staffed with 19 contact VA officers, reduced to 3.

Memphis office will be cut out altogether.

This tabulation shows how drastically the personnel will be reduced if the bill goes through as it now stands.

My amendment will add one-half the amount cut off by the committee. If the House believes that 1,526 contact officers are too many to perform this work, then let us try to get along by cutting only half the number provided in the committee bill. We can try that for a year, and if that is too many, the number can be reduced again next year. I think these contact officers are performing a needed and valuable service to the veteran, and I do not believe that this necessary work can be carried on by one-fifth the number now engaged in that work.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree thoroughly with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] who has served on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs a great many years, and who knows the problems of the veterans.

I realize that I am pro veteran. I get more letters than almost any other Member of the Congress. They come from every State in the Union, almost every day, and they are letters on veterans' affairs and concerning veterans, as a rule. I know there is no service rendered by the Veterans' Administration or by any other administration that is more valuable to the servicemen than this contact service in every State in the Union. For that reason, I sincerely trust that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia will be voted down because the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] certainly goes far enough.

Is it not strange that we will take up a proposition of this kind to abolish these contact officers, deprive these veterans of this service, and at the same time pour literally billions of dollars into foreign countries, giving it to people who sometimes laugh at us with contempt? Is it not strange that we would treat our veterans that way?

These contact officers not only serve the veterans, but they serve the widows and orphans, the fathers and mothers of these boys who have been killed in the various wars through which we have passed.

Every veterans' organization that I know anything about is opposed to cutting down this appropriation. I know the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the AMVETS have all supported this appropriation, as I understand it, and have opposed this reduction.

There are many people on the Federal payroll that you can get rid of and save a great deal more money without injuring anybody than by putting in an amendment to cut down this appropriation below the danger point, as far as the veterans' service is concerned.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said we will save $5,000,000 here and make it available to veterans' pensions. The gentleman knows and you know there is a schedule of pensions provided by law, and if we do not spend this $5,000,000 on contact officers, it will not be spent on pensions.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; and the gentleman knows and I know that a majority of the veterans do not belong to any veteran organizations. They feel a hesitancy in calling on veterans' organizations that they do not belong to, but they feel as if the contact office is open to them, and that is the reason they go there and talk about their cases, about their insurance, and about various other things, such as bringing home the bodies of their deceased boys, on down to the minutest problems that affect veterans.

I sincerely trust that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] will be voted down, because, in my opinion, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] goes far enough.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I would like to read to the Members just the effect this will have on the offices across the country:

Los Angeles has 83, and it will be cut down to 12, if the committee bill goes through.

Chicago has 77, and it will be cut to 11.

St. Louis has 31, and it will be cut to 4.

Jackson, Miss., has 18, and it will be cut to 2.

Dallas, Tex., has 33, and it will be cut to 3.

Nashville, Tenn., has 26, and it will be cut to 3.

Atlanta, Ga., has 53 and it will be cut to 6.

Boston, Mass., has 100 and it will be cut to 11.

Washington, D. C., has 46, and it will be cut to 9.

The State of Maine has 12, and it will be cut to 2.

Vermont has 6, and it will be cut to 2.

Rhode Island has 19, and it will be cut to 3.

And the Memphis office is to be cut out altogether.

Mr. RANKIN. That bears out my argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi has consumed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, back in the Eightieth Congress, when there were even more contact men in the Los Angeles office than at the present time, a member of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs, my colleague from Missouri [Mr. BAKEWELL], chairman of a subcommittee, was inspecting the San Francisco office of the VA with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Sarbacher, and he found a veteran on the floor on a stretcher. There were not enough contact men there to come out to see him they said. The contact was crowded with veterans. I spent 2 weeks myself in San Francisco inspecting veterans' facilities at that time. This member of the committee found that that man was hemorrhaging.

That would occur much more frequently if you cut out the contact men in the office in San Francisco and over the country generally.

I do not know how many Members realize that if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia is passed there would not be a single contact representative in the military and naval hospitals.

Mr. PHILLIPS. On what basis does the gentlewoman make that statement?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I received that information from one of the men in the Contact Division of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Does the gentlewoman mean to say that with 190 hospitals and one-thousand-four-hundred-and-odd people under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia that they could not put a contact man in each hospital?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I do not mean in veterans' hospitals; I am talking about military hospitals. I think a lot of you who go to Walter Reed Hospital and the naval hospital realize that they have but one VA contact man, but perhaps you do not. When I go out there I find so many boys who do not know what their rights are and cannot get any information. Some of the boys even come out of the hospitals without knowing their rights.

I have a letter that the people in the Pentagon building sent to the Veterans' Administration saying that they would welcome very much the help of the Veterans' Administration in a counseling course; but they cannot have that counseling course without a contact man in the hospital and they say in this letter to General Gray that they assume that there will be one there. It is of vital interest to these boys, and there are six hundred and some odd thousands of them more than there were at the time the members of the committee were analyzing when they marked up this bill. They are certainly entitled to care. The following is the letter from the National Defense:

MARCH 11, 1952.

Mr. CARL R. GRAY, JR.,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GRAY: It has come to the attention of this office through the Interdepartmental Committee established as a result of your letters of December 19, 1951, that, because of anticipated budgetary limitations, the Veterans' Administration plans to reduce the number of field offices and contact representatives now in existence throughout the country.

The Chairman, Armed Forces Medical Policy Council, by letter to you dated November 5, 1951, has indicated the desirability of reactivating the benefits counseling program in effect during and subsequent to World War II at service hospitals. This means that it would be highly desirable if the Veterans' Administration could furnish contact representatives at each major service hospital to assist the military authorities in giving technical advice and assistance to those personnel who are being separated or retired from the service because of physical disability and, particularly, assisting those personnel who are being transferred to Veterans' Administration facilities.

As far as the counseling program for servicemen being separated for reasons other than physicial disability is concerned, this program appears to be proceeding satisfactorily now. The services are giving separatees basic benefit information by means of lectures, personal interviews, group discussions, pamphlets, etc. Thus, the individual is given basic information as to veterans benefits available at this time; then he is referred to the agency administering a particular benefit for further details, if desired. As far as Veterans' Administration benefits are concerned, this program assumes that the present Veterans' Administration field offices will remain in existence. The present counseling structure is built around the availability of the contact service provided by the Veterans' Administration through its network of field offices conveniently located throughout the country. Any marked curtailment in this contact service would have a direct effect upon the Armed Forces separation counseling program.

Under present plans, the volume of separations from the Armed Forces will reach a peak the latter part of this summer, remain at a high level until the summer of 1953, and then gradually taper off. Thus, the counseling program will assume more importance as separations increase. Also, as you know, the Congress is presently considering legislation which will provide benefits for veterans of Korea.

I do not believe that the counseling program on veterans benefits, in which both the Veterans' Administration and the Department of Defense have a vital interest, should be curtailed in any matter at this time.

Sincerely yours,

ANNA M. ROSENBERG.

BOSTON, MASS., *March 19, 1952.*

HON. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

We, the Amputee Veterans Association of America, Department of Massachusetts, strongly protest the contemplated action of closing the veterans' contact offices. Many

of our members have been especially trained for this work and are rendering necessary service to the veterans of the State. To close these offices would deprive these amputee veterans of their employment and take away from other amputees a service which they deserve. Your help in this matter will be appreciated.

JOSEPH BANTUONO,
Commander, Department of Massachusetts, Amputee Veterans of America.

BOSTON, MASS, *March 20, 1952.*
EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you use every effort to prevent passage of H. R. 7072, cutting Veterans' Administration staff 90 percent, as their help badly needed now by all veterans.

UNITED SPANISH WAR VETERANS,
Department of Massachusetts.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 20, 1952.*
Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives:

AMVETS urgently request that independent offices appropriation bill be amended to restore drastic curtailment of vital veterans' services. Present bill pending in House virtually wipes out the very much needed contact service and curtails to alarming extent progressive medical research program of Department of Medicine and Surgery. Last year over 13,000,000 contacts were handled by contact service. They involved letters, personal contacts, telephone contacts, and a very good itinerate service. To wipe out this function of VA means that there will be large backlogs in every phase of VA activities. Veterans will be unable to obtain adequate information on claims, hospitalization, education, GI loans, and other veterans' benefits. Veterans' organizations' service officers already overworked and will not be able to take up additional load. The Nation's obligation to its veterans cannot be carried out if this service is reduced. If medical research program is curtailed needed progressive improvements in hospital program of VA will not be realized resulting in longer hospitalization and increased cost to the Government. In our considered opinion this curtailment of veterans' service will cost taxpayers additional money rather than effect any savings. We earnestly request your continued efforts to restore these veterans' benefits.

RUFUS H. WILSON,
Acting Legislative Director.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that in addition to the Army and Navy hospitals there are many of them scattered throughout the United States in Public Health hospitals, State institutions, and private institutions?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; that is true and it is especially necessary to have that service in mental institutions.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Why, certainly; and a contact officer should be at each institution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And these boys cannot pursue their claims without that help.

In 1922 I was requested by the President of the United States to make an inspection trip of the veterans' hospitals of the country. Conditions were very bad as shown by the report I brought back from a western trip which took me to California and back and up north. I brought back hundreds of veterans' claims because there had not been enough persons to help them with those claims. I have tried to help those men ever since. It is a very vital service.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the kind and able fighter in Congress, a great warrior in World War II, and a badly disabled one.

Mr. PATTERSON. Does not the gentlewoman believe it would be a good idea to have these contact officers stationed at areas where our boys are discharged so that before they go out into civilian life they are told of their various rights and privileges under the veterans' regulations?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and I would say to the gentleman that today that is not done. At Fort Devens, which is in my district, during World War II they had a contact officer and a man who was discharged from the service or separated from the service up to a few years ago was always told of his rights; they had a contact man there to advise him of his rights.

Did the gentleman wish to say something further?

Mr. PATTERSON. I was just going on to say that some of these veterans would have special privileges under civil service if they established the fact that they have a service-connected disability. In clarifying their records at time of discharge would entitle them to an extra 10 points on any Government examination they might take. Yet as things are now they go out into civil life and many times do not know their rights. Then it means a letter to a Congressman or Senator who has to probe into the various records in order to find and establish the veteran's rights, something he should have been told of at the time he was discharged. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts who is the veteran's best friend here in the House will agree with me. I personally believe the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is the best-informed Member of this body where the disabled veteran is concerned. There should be more contact representatives protecting the interests of our veterans. I support wholeheartedly the McGrath amendment. The American Legion, DAV, and all other veteran contact officers are to be commended for the great work done for our veterans of all wars.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And no civilian has the privileges or information that a Veterans' Administration representative has. He is the man to tell the veteran what rights he is entitled to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO], who is such a friend of the veterans, for a question.

Mr. FURCOLO. I support the gentlewoman in her argument and shall support the McGrath amendment.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When you visit one of these hospitals you first go into the ward where the sickest men are, men who are not going to live, to find out whether they have established their claims for compensation. I have known men to leave hospitals because their claims were being worked on, they had not established service connection and they had to have money for their families. If they established service connection they could stay hospitalized and try to get well; they would probably hemorrhage and die if they leave the hospital. Many men do not know their rights in insurance matters; in compensation; for housing or loans, and so forth; they do not know their rights for training. Only the other day I found a case of a man in the South, a double amputee, he was a colored man. He was a World War I veteran. He did not realize he was entitled to compensation. And that is not an isolated case. You have had hundreds of cases in your office and have seen hundreds of cases in the Veterans' Administration and you realize how much those men need help. Go into a regional office and see the widows and the children waiting because there was no contact man available. And, remember, last year the blind men were taken off of the contact rolls, the amputees and others. You may remember last year a good many contact men were removed from their jobs.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that when we created the contact office in VA we took a lot of work off the shoulders of Members of Congress?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; but it is not that. The Members are very glad to do that work. Most of them do not have the staff for that purpose; they are glad to help, but they cannot do it. They cannot go into the files of the VA at any time. It takes a long time to get a file down here to the Capitol and you do not give the men the service they are entitled to. Then a Member does not have the necessary information.

J. Leo Ashe, the commander of the Massachusetts American Legion, and Mr. John Walsh, the chairman of the Disabled Veterans Committee of Massachusetts, came to Washington and led the fight to restore the cuts in the contact men in the VA.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will support the McGrath amendment, which restores the budget request, and defeat the Davis amendment, which would only restore a part of the committee cut. The distinguished

gentleman from Georgia has called our attention to the fact that if his amendment is adopted a number of reductions will take place in these large contact offices, but the process of elimination of the contact offices will be the result in my part of the country. Down my way, there are only two people in these contact offices as a rule.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. The reductions which I read and referred to were not if my amendment was adopted, but if the committee amendment went with it.

Mr. MORRIS. Yes; but the gentleman's amendment also will destroy the contact offices down my way, and I certainly do not want them destroyed if I can possibly prevent it. I have had the honor, the privilege, and the experience of having served as a post commander of the American Legion and as a service officer for about 12 years. Being a lawyer, an ex-judge, and so forth, I have had some legal experience. I know—it is not guesswork with me—that if you cut out these contact offices you are going to do a great injustice to thousands of these boys, not just a few. If a veteran does not start his claim out right in the beginning, if experienced advisers do not assist these boys, these veterans, with their claims to start with, and get them started on the correct theory, not any manufactured theory but on the correct theory, based on their injuries and what their rights are, and explain the law and the rules and regulations, which are quite often complicated, to them, then oftentimes because of a bad start, for lack of proper advice, they will later lose their cases regardless of how good and valid they actually are.

And again, without these offices, many emergencies will arise where even deaths will occur for lack of proper and immediate advice and attention. Also, not only in regard to claims of veterans is this contact work most important but it affords a proper and necessary convenience if fairness to the veteran is to obtain. It also takes some of the workload off of the regional offices and prevents delay in decisions. It is my judgment that this contact service is essential to the welfare of our veterans who need VA service. I truly hope the McGrath amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the McGrath amendment.

I know I am considered proveteran—and I am. I want to stand on the side of the veteran in this fight, as I have in every other battle on the floor of the House. I hope the friends of the veterans will unite here this afternoon to prevent the unwarranted cut in the contact representatives of the Veterans' Administration.

Every Member of Congress should be aware of the usefulness and the importance of the contact representatives to the veterans of all wars. Curtailing this service to the veterans will result in depriving thousands of them of the assistance they require in preparing their claims—will deprive them even of a chance to learn of their entitlement for benefits under laws passed for their welfare by this Congress.

Certainly I am interested in economy, but when you attempt to cut this service to our war veterans by 80 percent, that is not the kind of economy I will support. I know something about the veterans' needs. I have handled hundreds of claims for worthy veterans and I have learned from experience how valuable is the aid furnished by these contact representatives. If anything, we need a few more of them.

The action of the Appropriations Subcommittee in cutting the budget estimate and Veterans' Administration request practically eliminates contact services for veterans throughout the entire country. Yet the demand for this service is constantly increasing due to the large numbers of Korean veterans being discharged.

Yes; I am for the veteran, and I am proud of it. I make no apologies for fighting for the veterans here this afternoon. I urge my colleagues in the House to support the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] and restore the full amount approved by the Bureau of the Budget. Do this for the veterans. If we do not restore this cut, a great hardship will be worked on our disabled veterans.

This is a service our Nation owes our disabled veterans. Let us help our veterans secure the benefits to which they are justly entitled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask one or two questions of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]. Assuming we provide for 5,000 or 10,000 contact officers, would that necessarily give the boys the information? I mean the fellows who are uninformed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It would help enormously.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understand it would help, but if we were to have 15,000 contact officers we could still argue that the boys do not know their cases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But not to any great extent.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me ask another question: Is there a Member of this House who will admit that he takes a less interest or that she takes a less interest in one of these cases than does a contact man? Of course, you take as much interest as any contact man in the United States.

Will any of you admit that you have had veteran after veteran after veteran tell you that he could not get any service out of the Veterans' Administration or out of the contact officer? I think all of you have had that experience.

It seems to me that we need to do a lot of thinking on this proposition if the desire is to actually give the veteran what we think he is entitled to.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry we do not have more genuine, down-to-earth, straightforward information on this proposition before we have to vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ARMSTRONG].

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Chairman, occasionally some of us in this House who work hard to cut out or cut down appropriations that we think are not necessary are accused of blind cutting. Well, we are not in this instance trying to do any blind cutting. Some of us honestly try at every opportunity to cut where there are waste and extravagance. But we now come to a bill where we feel that too much cutting would itself result in no benefit to this country.

As one who has worked for many years as chairman of child welfare for the American Legion in my State, closely in touch with the rehabilitation of the veterans of the First World War, I may say to you that I am of the opinion that intelligent work on the part of the contact officers can save the taxpayers a lot of money. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], who from his great knowledge of veterans work, has so ably stated the case for adequate support of our Veterans' Administration contact officers. I believe it would be a mistake to cut out what was in the budget request for this item of the Veterans' Administration.

I hope that all Members who have in the past joined with many of us in economy moves will consider seriously the real need for this appropriation by our veterans. I repeat, adequate service for veterans by contact officers can actually save money.

(Mr. DEVEREUX asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. PHILLIPS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I favor the McGrath amendment, which insures the money necessary for the pay of the veterans' contact officers in the Veterans' Administration budget. This puts back the amount cut out by the committee bill from the budget request.

I believe that these veterans' representatives are vitally necessary for assisting our veterans on their claims. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] that we people in Congress should be standing up in every respect for the rights of these veterans and their representatives before the Veterans' Administration. We must remember that the Veterans' Administration is a large bureau. It contains many branches, and many levels and types of bureau services, beset with many technical rules.

These people who are the veterans' representatives as contact officers are actually the men taking the veterans' point of view before the veterans' bureau. Unless we have contact officers that stand up for the veterans' interest and take the veterans' slant on the Veterans' Administration problems, we then have these veterans individually, without previous experience in many cases, and often sick or disabled, coming up against

a large bureau and a great variety of procedures that they know nothing of.

I believe that we have had good service from these veterans' representative contact officers in the Pittsburgh area and the State of Pennsylvania, and generally in the United States. I would like to see these contact officers maintained as they have been, and give this good service to our veterans, and the good veterans' organizations. The small amount for the salary of these veterans' contact representatives is money well spent.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. I would like to point out that in my district alone there have been over 3,500 home loan applications made, and that every one of those veterans has received his information from the contact officer.

Mr. FULTON. That shows the fine work of these veterans' contact officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this or any other reasonable amendment to restore, in whole or in part, funds approved in the budget estimates intended to support and maintain our veteran-contact service throughout the United States.

In my humble judgment this cut of more than $5,000,000 goes far beyond any point that is wise and in the interest of efficiency or economy. This reduction would for all practical purposes destroy this essential service. Essential because, in addition to the millions of veterans who lean heavily on the contact service for help, thousands of our service men and women in returning to civilian life will require guidance and attention insofar as their adjustment problems are concerned. To a certain degree, it is a responsibility of our Federal Government to provide out-post service to our deserving veterans and I believe these veteran-contact offices aid in a measurable degree to bring about efficiency in this important governmental service and operation.

Mr. Chairman, although I have supported, and I shall continue to support, every reasonable proposal to reduce the staggering cost of government, I do not believe we should destroy this vital service and I hope that the Members of this House will support this worth-while adjustment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the move to cut the Veterans' Administration contact representatives at the present time. I think it would be a great mistake to reduce these offices by 80 percent at a time when we are calling into active service men to fight in Korea. I support the Korean rotation policy and I believe that we should release the men who have been in Korea for a long period of time. At least we should bring back home men who have been over in Korea a long period of time. I notice that the Defense Department recently stated the high point in the release of Korean veterans will be reached during the present summer and will continue through the year 1953. With tens of thousands of Korean veterans returning to this country and being released from service, I think it is a very poor time to reduce the veteran-contact offices. These men are being taken out of civilian life, are being required to spend many months in foreign and combat service and then are being returned to civilian life. This is a time when we should be prepared to protect their veterans' rights and aid them in asserting Veterans' Administration claims where they need assistance.

I have the figures on what the proposal to reduce these offices will mean to my State of Louisiana. In the New Orleans district office at the present time there are 28 contact representatives. They are located either in the central office or in suboffices in Lafayette, Baton Rouge, Houma and other places throughout south Louisiana. This proposal would reduce the number from the present 28 down to 2 or 3 contact representatives, all located in the New Orleans office.

As for the Shreveport regional office, at the present time we have 15 contact representatives there. They are located either in the central office in Shreveport, the veterans' hospital there in Shreveport or the suboffices in Alexandria, Bastrop, or Monroe. This proposal would reduce to two veteran-contact representatives for that whole area of north Louisiana, leaving them in the central office.

The New Orleans regional office has handled 7,000 cases in the offices and 118 cases away from the offices. Shreveport regional office has handled 1,928 in the office and 8 away from the central office. The State of Louisiana does provide for State representatives. They are doing an excellent job and work without regard to political factionalism and serve the needs of our veterans efficiently and well. I would do nothing to disturb that set-up in Louisiana. On the other hand, I think we should have the help which the Budget Bureau recommends even in my own State of Louisiana. In the other States which do not provide so well for this service, the need for veteran-contact representatives is overwhelming and most pressing. I hope that we will restore the budget cut.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at the conclusion of my remarks the telegram which I recently received from Commander Donald R. Wilson, national commander of the American Legion, in regard to this matter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March 17, 1952.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Independent offices appropriation bill which comes up for consideration March 19 practically eliminates contact services for veterans throughout entire country. Demand for this service constantly increasing due to large numbers Korean veterans being discharged. Respectfully urge restoration to amount approved by Bureau of Budget. Thanks and regards.

DONALD R. WILSON,
National Commander, the American Legion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, in the short time of 1¾ minutes available to us it is rather hard to go into the details of some of the problems I have had, and I know that every Member of the House has had many of the problems I have received from veterans. I have a file 2 feet high of veterans' problems that have arisen since the Korean mess broke out.

It does happen that as a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for 28 years, and having played quite an active part in the post to which I belong, I have had considerable experience, because in Minneapolis and St. Paul we have the Fort Snelling Veterans' Hospital, and problems have come to me on many occasions because of the proximity of that hospital to my district.

Just yesterday I had to take up with the central office here in Washington the question of the Korean veterans. I wrote the department down here with regard to the reissue of section 2, circular 26, to provide out-patient treatment for these Korean veterans who are pending adjudication of their claims to the out-patient list; in other words, our Korean veterans are on the waiting list even for out-patient care.

I want to subscribe to the McGrath amendment and ask for the defeat of the Davis of Georgia amendment. I have every respect for him in his effort to try to compromise this situation, but in his explanation he certainly described to this House the very severe cut that is going to be occasioned in many of these hospitals. I think that contact work is the most important work there is in connection with the needs of veterans.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. PHILLIPS.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ross].

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Davis amendment, which would restore only approximately 612 Veterans' Administration contact officers to the pending bill, and in support of the McGrath amendment, which would reinstate an additional 1,226, making a total of 1,526.

I oppose the Davis amendment without at all reflecting upon the sincerity of purpose of the gentleman from Georgia. I know from personal knowledge of his great interest in the welfare of the veteran and I have reason to believe that he has introduced his amendment to restore 612 contact officers because he is concerned that the McGrath amendment will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, when I was here in the Congress in 1947 and 1948, I had the honor of serving on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I know some of the problems of the veterans and of the necessary service performed by the Veterans' Administration contact officers, and I concur wholeheartedly with the views presented here by the distin-

guished chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and the ranking minority member, the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

I hope the McGrath amendment will pass, Mr. Chairman, because I believe it would be a serious mistake to eliminate these contact officers at this time, when they are performing such vital service to the veteran, and when so many new veterans are returning from the Korean war.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, in the short time allotted to me, it is very difficult to present any strong argument to you. I want to say I am 100 percent in favor of the McGrath amendment, and opposed to the amendment presented by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. I hope that the Members of the Congress realize the good work that the contact officers do. In Philadelphia they have done an outstanding and admirable job. I can only think of what would happen to my office if they cut down the contact officers. How any Member of Congress who has daily contacts with his people, and with the great number of veterans we have in our districts today, and the number we are going to have as a result of the Korean situation, could keep up with that work, it is hard for me to believe that an economy of this kind is reasonable. I think that everything should be done to help the veterans of the country. Giving the veterans these fine benefits is part of the job, but we must give them assistance, counsel, and advice. The contact officer does this. I think this is one way we can show these fellows that we want to do everything that we can to help them because although our offices serve them, and my office serves them well, and we do a good job for them, many times I would be tickled to death to turn a particular matter over to somebody who is a specialist in a particular field, and most of these contact officers are specialists. They not only handle Federal matters but handle State and local matters for the veterans. They do an excellent job and I hope there is no cut in the contact officers. We can do this by voting down the Davis amendment and passing the amendment of my good friend from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, nobody has a right to speak in this debate any longer on a cumulative basis. I should like to take but a minute to share two thoughts with my colleagues.

One is the relationship here. The amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH], which I support, seeks to restore a budget estimate of $7,231,329. If you will look at page 38 of this committee report, you will find that we are spending something like $3,500,000,000 for the services upon which contact officers are to advise. These include compensation, pensions, readjustment benefits, hospitalization, and so forth.

This seven and a quarter million dollars is the human element, which is involved here. You can give a man all the benefits in the world, but if he is frustrated, lost, and has to wander around to get them, and feel his soul seared in the process, he will not appreciate it. So the budget provision for contact officers is to make it convenient and comfortable and sensible for the veterans to get with a full heart almost $3,500,000,000 of benefits. I submit to you, it is just not right and it just does not add up. The least we ought to do is to provide for these contact officers. Secondly, I think I am one of a group of those veterans in the House of Representatives who are very careful about any measure which has dealt with bonuses or other efforts to just compensate the veteran because he was a veteran. Therefore, I think it is up to us as veterans to fight the hardest for an amendment like this, which represents tangible and intrinsic value important to a man's soul as well as to his well being and that of his family. I hope very much the House will grant this very meritorious increase.

The whole situation is well put in a telegram from the American Legion, Department of New York, in support of the amendment of our colleague [Mr. MCGRATH]. This telegram is signed by State Commander James V. Demarest, and I quote from it:

> The American Legion, Department of New York, vigorously protests drastic reduction in Veterans' Administration contact service budget * * * if enacted would virtually wipe out that service and place tremendous additional burden on veterans' organizations who are not physically equipped to assume it. The service which is to be reduced in New York State handles over 200,000 operations monthly with 262 employees. Proposed reduction amounts to approximately 90 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE].

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGrath amendment, which will restore this money for contact officers in the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, in all this deliberation on whether or not we should retain the Contact Services Divisions of the Veterans' Administration, it seems to me that our decision should be based on sensible consideration of the basic facts involved, which have mostly been overlooked.

In the first instance, I would like to emphasize that the original appropriation to maintain these services was not recommended by the agency itself nor by any prejudiced source but by the Bureau of the Budget.

A few other fundamental facts to be observed are that the advice and guidance provided through the Veterans' Administration Contact Service to our some eighteen million veterans is extended to the widows and orphan children of the heroes who gave up their lives, which brings the number of persons involved to approximately sixty million; God forbid that we should forget the needs of the families and veterans of the Korean war which are still to be met.

It is said that a part of the work performed by the contact services can be done by the service officers of the various veterans' organizations but in analyzing that shallow claim we need but reflect that about one-fifth of our veterans belong to such organizations and the service officers are chosen each year at annual post elections; substantially what this means is that, just as the service officer is beginning to acquaint himself with the multitudinous rules surrounding veterans' benefits and entitlements, he is replaced by another individual who must start the learning process all over again. Earnest and industrious as such service officers are admitted to be, we cannot sensibly compare them with the skilled and trained contact man in the Veterans' Administration office who is doing the job every day.

I am in entire sympathy with those who would mainly place their judgment in this matter on the basis of economy. No one has been more energetic than I in advocating the elimination of nonessential Government spending in this time of heavy taxation burdens due to our necessary war-production program. As I have said before, and will repeat again, we must not blind ourselves to the fact that there is a real difference between sound economy and false economy. In my conviction the approval of an adequate appropriation to provide the veterans of this country, and their surviving family members, with the skilled guidance of the contact-services personnel of the Veterans' Administration is very sound economy.

It would be an obvious contradiction, as well as an unwarranted cynical rebuff to our own American citizens to say, in one and the same breath, that we can give financial assistance to almost every country on the earth, including some with totalitarian governments, and we cannot afford to insure adequate services to the most deserving of our American citizens and families. It might, indeed, be a course fraught with tragic consequences if at a time when we are recalling veterans and drafting young men, we deliver this morale destructive blow under the guise of picayune economy by wiping out the full and adequate services offered by the Veterans' Administration contact personnel.

The amount of money is comparatively little and the morale factor involves the very heart of our defense preparations, the individuals who are being compelled to leave their homes and employment to enter the military service.

In full justice to them and their families, I urge you, my colleagues, to join with me in supporting their cause.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONOHUE. I yield.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I am also supporting the McGrath amendment. I think it is a proper amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the McGrath amendment. I hope the House will vote to reinstate the services of the contact officers both in my State and in every State throughout the country.

The cuts which have been made by the subcommittee in the Veterans' Administration Contact Service budget would, if they are not nullified by the House, work the greatest of hardship upon veterans and their families throughout the country.

In the State of Massachusetts alone, these cuts, if they were carried out, would leave only one single office at Boston to serve the entire State. I think that the House can readily understand just what this means. It means that widows, dependents, and disabled veterans, sick and infirm veterans, will in a large number of cases receive no contact advisory service whatever, or be compelled to travel long distances in order to get it.

Obviously, the single office at Boston would be overcrowded, its personnel overworked and not in a position to render the advice and assistance which this Congress intends should be accorded to every veteran and every veteran case. Such a situation will unquestionably have a grave effect upon veterans and their families in my State, and what is true of my State applies generally to the whole country.

The record shows that I have favored economy and efficiency in the Federal Government, but, frankly, I must unalterably oppose a policy masquerading under the name of economy that will deny to our veterans, their families and dependents, the very meager and minimum advice and assistance they require to secure proper hospitalization, disability allowances, pensions, compensation, clinical services, educational training, and other rights to which they may be entitled by laws which the Congress has enacted for their benefit.

I have received a very large number of protests against the proposed closing of contact offices in my district and State, not only from various veterans' organizations but from very many individual veterans, members of their families, as well as civic-minded organizations and citizens, all of whom realize that a distinct and great injustice would be done the cause of the veteran by the application of this most unwise curtailment.

We have been spending billions and billions of dollars for the benefit of peoples and nations all over the earth. The very least we can do, in my opinion, is to see to it that nothing is left undone by this Congress to help our own veterans and people who in so many ways have unselfishly served our Nation and to whom we are so greatly indebted.

I hope and urge that the House will take a realistic, as well as a humane, position on this question and not be swerved from our purpose by popular catch words. One of the first and most sacred duties of this Congress is to protect the rights and entitlements which Congress itself has so wisely conferred upon our loyal veterans. This is a good chance to show where we stand toward the veteran.

I will, therefore, vote for this amendment and I hope that the cuts that have been made in this important budgetary item will be promptly restored.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILBIN. I yield.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I likewise am supporting the McGrath amendment.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think we would be very unwise at this time to limit the veteran's contact with his Government. Korean veterans are now being discharged at the rate of 20,000 per month. They have performed an epic service for the people of this Nation. They are entitled to every consideration. They should be given the same rights, benefits, and privileges as are enjoyed by veterans of World War II.

The subcommittee has cut, or recommended the cut of, the contact service by 80 percent.

I urge the House to adopt the McGrath amendment. It will restore a substantial portion of the contact service, though it will still be less than the service enjoyed by veterans this year by one-third.

The veterans' organizations themselves do a wonderful job in this field, but it must be remembered that not more than one veteran out of four belongs to a veterans' organization. I am interested in seeing the unorganized veteran have good contact with the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly when the members of the subcommittee speak they will endeavor to point out that already the several States are appropriating millions of dollars for service officers which duplicates the contact officers furnished by the Veterans' Administration. May I say to the members of the committee that 26 States appropriate funds to aid organized veterandom in providing service officers to assist veterans, while 24 States, including 2 Territorial posts, do not provide a penny.

The American Legion last year spent $650,000 for rehabilitation work; the Veterans of Foreign Wars spent $450,000; the Disabled American Veterans spent $360,000. But you cannot stop there. The several State departments of these veterans' organizations spend thousands of dollars likewise, and so do the county councils, so do the district organizations, and likewise the posts.

Mr. MORRIS. Does it not stand to reason that with the Korean war on we should expand the service rather than contract it?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is what I am coming to. With 61,000,000 American people eligible for benefits, the contact officers provided by the VA and the service officers provided by the various veterans' organizations only scratch the surface when it comes to assisting the veteran and his dependents.

Go into the various hospitals, whether they be Army, Navy, VA, or what, and you will find long lines of veterans waiting to receive assistance from VA contact officers.

Frankly, the VA contact officers and the veterans' groups' service officers today cannot do the job of assisting the veteran and his dependents simply because the veteran population is already too large, or, in other words, the load is too great.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and yield the balance of my time to Mr. KLEIN.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGrath amendment. I believe that the budget estimate for the Veterans' Administration was a fair and proper one and that it should not have been cut as proposed by the Appropriations Committee. I urge the Congress to increase the amount as contained in H. R. 7072 to the amount as recommended by the Budget Bureau.

I have received many letters and telegrams from veterans and veterans' organizations, urging this action. Time will not permit me to read all of them. I do desire to read at this time the letter received by me from Bernard Weitzer, national legislative director of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, as follows:

MARCH 19, 1952.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: I know that you have been on the floor all afternoon fighting against the monstrous cut in the Veterans' Administration appropriations included in H. R. 7072. It is difficult to picture adequately the harm which will be inflicted upon veterans all over the United States should the recommendation of the Appropriations Committee as embodied in this bill, be accepted.

The Bureau of the Budget had already made a cut in the request from the VA, which the VA had already pared down from last year's budget.

May I call your attention to just one item which if approved by the House, could very well cause chaos in the VA to the great disadvantage of veterans, and which would entirely negate the intent of Congress in authorizing the veterans' benefits program. I am referring to the cut from the Budget Bureau's request for contact, offices and personnel, from $7,231,329 to $1,435,499. This is not meat-ax economy; it is steam-roller

economy. Typical is the result which you would see in the New York regional office where contact personnel would be reduced from 199 employees to approximately 30. Can we imagine how effectively such a cut would block veterans from filing or getting action on their claims? The chances are that you and other Members of the House would have to add one or two clerks in your offices just to handle the complaints that would pour in on you, and you would not be able to get much action from VA headquarters because the contact personnel at headquarters are likewise due for a cut. Headquarters would be flooded with complaints which would slow up the entire VA operation. Remember that Korea has already created 100,000 more veteran claimants and unfortunately, will probably create thousands more. These claimants, in many cases, will have problems which are urgent and their needs will require prompt attention. There will, of course, also be the millions of veterans from among those currently in our Armed Forces who will be entitled to GI benefits whose needs may not be so urgent but who are entitled to prompt and clear answers to their questions and adjudication of the rights which they may have. Is it fair to frustrate these men whom we have called to serve their country, by undue delays? I am confident that you will see to it that this injustice is not perpetrated.

This item is a key cut but there are many others which are just as serious and which I hope you will fight by restoring to the appropriations, the original amounts recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

With all good wishes,

Cordially yours,

BERNARD WEITZER,
National Legislative Director, Jewish War Veterans of the United States.

I also would like to read the telegram from Edward I. Condren, department commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as follows:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *March 19, 1952.*

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Members Veterans of Foreign Wars your district urge and petition you to vote favorably for Budget Bureau estimates for Veterans' Administration. Reduction in VA personnel and appropriations would deprive veterans and their dependents of adequate and efficient service. Members of VFW this State will be ever grateful for your support.

EDWARD I. CONDREN,
Department Commander.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] is recognized.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Chairman, in supporting the McGrath amendment, I do so with the feeling that while cuts can be made in the cost of operation in the Veterans' Administration, the cuts should not be made in the contact officers' services.

I have been of the opinion for many years that thousands of employees of Government could and should be severed from the Federal payroll. The difficulty in this proposed cut is that it goes to the heart of the veterans' program. With the cost of the rehabilitation program running well over $3,000,000,000, a necessary complement of contact officers all over the country are necessary for the proper processing of veterans' claims. Bear in mind the tremendous case load now before the Veterans' Administration and compare that with the additional case load of the various veterans' organizations and the tremendous amount they are spending which runs into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. Bear in mind the thousands of cases that are being returned from the so-called police action in Korea and no one knows how long it will continue. The case load is increasing—not decreasing. The proposed cut will work immeasurable harm to the disabled both in and out of the hospitals. The care of the disabled is first; make the cuts in other bureaus of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the McGrath amendment.

Taxes are going up, but the services we promised to the veterans of all wars are being slashed.

Now economy is a fine thing when it works.

Penny-pinching savings that cause far more damage than good have a way of being far more expensive in the end. When the hatchet strikes at one essential service of the Government without thought as to the consequences, the inevitable bill for surgical repairs doubles the cost.

Why the Government should pick on the veterans first is beyond understanding or sufferance.

Especially when a $6,000,000 cut, in round figures, in contact office service to the veterans will eliminate local aid to the disabled and throw the burden on the VA staffs in the few and scattered big cities.

One would expect the Government to go after the billion or more in legitimate taxes from the vice lords and others, which these elements are withholding from the Treasury, instead of crippling the functions of the VA with small but disastrous economies.

First, let us look at the savings themselves on the basis of figures alone.

Percentagewise, the reduction for the VA contact offices amounts to about one fourteen-thousandth of the budget for the fiscal year 1952.

Or one hundred and fortieth of 1 percent. Maybe less.

It would take a microscope to see the tiny gain in this economy "bloodcount."

On the other side of the ledger there is our solemn promise to help the veterans, their widows, and dependents, which can be seen in the laws and can be felt in our conscience.

The credit of the United States Government is not measured simply by the soundness of the dollar, or its record in meeting financial obligations. There is also the yardstick of character, determining its success or failure in living up to the obligations it has undertaken in behalf of its own people.

If we default on the veterans who have always carried the heaviest burden of citizenship in sacrifices not limited to a budget, then we shall forfeit all claims to respect and trust.

I cannot conceive of a more callous inconsistency then to meat-ax the Veterans' Administration at a time when thousands of veterans are returning, broken in health, from the fighting in Korea. The new casualty list of widows and orphans is increasing daily. And the young of the land are being summoned to military service, some to take the places of the fallen in Korea, others to stand strong for us in strange places and under conditions so difficult that time alone will reveal.

The Veterans' Administration cannot ignore its continuing and increasing responsibilities. True there is a tapering off in educational and-on-the-job training benefits with consequent savings to the Government for promises fulfilled. But the disabled will be with us for so many years to come that a grateful Nation will insist that all pledges made to them will be adequately and honorably maintained. The VA will do its job well for them; as long as it is not hampered by impulsive and ill-considered economies that cause a breakdown in servicing the needs of our veterans and their dependents.

The contact offices not only give advice and help in filling out forms for benefits due under legislation concerning veterans, but give additional assistance to the disabled, particularly the amputees. These range all the way from securing license, registration and plates for the automobiles of amputees, to special tax counsel, and information on civil-service opportunities for the millions of others who are physically impaired.

Bear in mind that the contact officers and clerks will be assigned to central offices in the few large cities, cutting off personal calls at the homes of sick veterans, the infirm, and widows tied down by youngsters. Under the proposed consolidation, there will be heartbreaking delays. We cannot expect disabled vets to travel long distances and then wait in long lines for attention to their problems. And we cannot see the value of getting a monthly disability check to a sick veteran months after he has passed away. Overburdened VA staffs in the larger cities will be overwhelmed and unable to keep up with the concentrated workload.

We in Massachusetts are up in arms over this squeeze play, because we are veteran-minded. There are many hundreds of thousands of veterans in the Commonwealth, and the concentration of schools and colleges and hospitals in this area is a service to veterans from New England and beyond.

We recall with a mingling of "I told you so," and "It can happen again," the economy wave of 1943–44 that hit the VA and how it backfired.

To cure the resulting paralysis, the employees who were let go had to be called back in a hurry. But this was not enough to untangle the pile up of claims. More employees had to be hired and trained in VA operations before they could be of help.

We cannot afford to repeat that foolish experience in the name of economy that turns out to be extravagance in disguise.

The veterans of this Nation know what it is to be the target of enemy action, and many of them will endure the painful effect of that experience for life. The least we can do for them now and for the rest of their days is to protect them from the snipers who would cut down the benefits and services that we owe to all men and women who have given to their country in a manner that can never be repaid in full.

The VA needs this amendment to head off the proposed curtailment of service not of its own making.

This can be compensated for many times over in other agencies of Government where economy will not directly affect human beings.

Before that time, it is necessary for us to authorize an appropriation to maintain contact offices at the local level.

And by so doing to keep faith with all veterans, past and future

I sincerely hope that the McGrath amendment will prevail.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I have yielded so much time that I probably have left just about enough time to say that I support the McGrath amendment, and am opposed to the Davis amendment.

To cut this item I think is foolish economy. There may be room for economy in the Veterans' Administration, but I say to my friend the gentleman from Texas, chairman of the subcommittee, that if I had my way while I might make the Veterans' Administration take a cut, I would not do it in this item. I would cut General Gray; I would cut him out entirely. I think the Veterans' Administration has a great deal to learn about public relations, and particularly its administrator. If you want to cut, I would start with the office of General Gray, and the first one should be Mr. Gray, himself.

We had a situation in New York, and not only in New York but in Massachusetts and Virginia, I believe, where they decided to cut out certain offices and consolidate them. This was done under the guise of economy. So they went into Philadelphia and either leased or bought a building, uprooted the employees in those three offices, many of whom either had to sell their homes and move to Philadelphia, or in many other ways break up families. This meant that many employees had to leave their families, with double expense of maintaining the family in one city, and themselves in another. This naturally led to worry and unhappiness on the part of the employee, with the attendant loss of efficiency on his or her part.

Yet, when Members of Congress from these three States, led by the very able and distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] attempted to see Mr. Gray to protest, he would not give us the courtesy of seeing us, and passed us off to one of his deputies. In my own city, we have a splendid VA regional office. Its manager, Charles Reichert, a man of great ability, who has devoted a lifetime to the veteran and his affairs, is doing a great job—both he and his staff.

It is regrettable that Mr. Gray does not follow the example set by Mr. Reichert and so many others in the VA, particularly with regard to courtesy to Members of Congress, whose only desire it is to better the welfare and treatment accorded to the veterans of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD].

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGRATH amendment.

The testimony I am receiving from the Legion, the VFW, the Disabled Veterans, and the Amvets, is distinctly contrary to the testimony being received by the gentleman from Texas. I could never justify my voting for an 80 percent cut in this veterans' item, particularly at a time when we are making new veterans every day.

Now, our Korean veterans have some beefs against this Government and those beefs are well grounded. One is that we do not call that conflict a war. Another is that the Congress has been slow and remiss in legislating benefits for those veterans. News of any such cut will not be well received by them.

I was secretary to a Member of Congress for many years after World War I and, believe me, if there was ever a veterans' contact officer on Capitol Hill I was that individual. Most of my time was spent upon hundreds, yes thousands, of cases that came in over the years. Our files got so big and so extensive we had to get a special room up in the attic of the Old House Office Building to store the same, and if anybody wants to see them today I can show them.

I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], who has fought in World War I and in World War II, who was thrice Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that we in our own offices are going to take on a new and onerous task if we do not maintain these contact officers in the Veterans' Administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, as I sat here and listened to the debate on this particular amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] my mind went back to 1917 when an outfit I had the honor to serve with was stationed at Camp Mills in New York. Before we sailed overseas the Governor of the great State of Illinois came down there to give us a talk. He stood on the platform before our regiments and with tears streaming down his cheeks he said: "Boys, when you come back nothing will be too good for you."

They all said that. Many of these boys never came back. You can visit these hospitals and see men, veterans of World War I, who will never get out of them alive.

If we are going to entrust the destiny of this Nation to people who are going to lead us into wars, we better think about the cost of it when the wars are over or when these boys come home. It would be a sad and unfortunate thing for this Congress not to furnish contact men as provided under the language of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH]. Yes, I am not one of those who agreed to the philosophy that the serviceman is not entitled to special preferences. If we are going to pick these boys up, put them on the battlefield to be shot at and possibly be killed, disrupt their regular way of life and their future hopes of getting into business and getting an education, the least we can do is furnish a few contact men for them. I sincerely believe the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] should be supported by the Members of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, the issue before the committee today is not whether the veterans are going to have contact offices, but what amount is necessary for that contact advice, and whether we duplicate other services. That was in the minds of the subcommittee members when this item was brought to us. Some of us in this House are old enough to remember the Economy Act of 1933 and the tragedies that came from that Act, which was the outcome of the spending movement in the days prior to 1933.

I think we should remember, Mr. Chairman, that when our hearts bleed upon the floor of the House, they do not always bleed blood; they bleed dollars. I think we should wonder whether, for a few moments' temporary credit in this debate, we can take the chance of paying the veterans not with a 50-cent dollar, as we are paying them with now, but with a 40-cent dollar, which is inevitable if we continue deficit spending. The veterans, with the consent and the support of all Members of this House, are the recipients of over $2,700,000,000 of this budget alone, indemnities and benefits, which is a thousand times the amount proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. Do you want those payments made in cheaper dollars? I hope the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia will be adopted, because that would be adequate, in the opinion of the subcommittee, and would allow $4,333,085 for contact work in the next year.

Contact work is presently carried on by the States, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said, by the counties, by the cities, by the American Legion, by the VFW and the DAV and other organizations.

The finest contact man in my experience was a man who never drew a dollar

from any public fund but who, in the post of which I myself have been a member for more than 25 years, made his job in that post, as a volunteer, to see that the veterans knew what their benefits were. The place to provide veterans with this kind of information, as the gentleman from Connecticut has said, is when they get out of the service. I hope that the Members of this House will consider very seriously whether it is necessary to return the full request of the Bureau of the Budget. This would probably be the only item in the bill of an administrative nature, in which we allowed the full amount. It would be desirable, if we support either amendment, to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS]. In my opinion, that is as far as this Congress ought to go if we are to protect the money which gives the veterans the compensation and the other benefits which they so well deserve.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman mentioned a moment ago about the member of his post who handled the veterans' affairs.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, I did.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. He is not a contact officer; he is an accredited representative of the American Legion to the Veterans' Administration, and for that reason he does not have the same right or the same privileges that the contact officer has.

Mr. PHILLIPS. He did as good or better job than the paid contact officers.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman feel that this is a very unfortunate time to make this reduction when the Defense Department tells us, and tells us in no uncertain terms, that the high point in releasing Korean veterans will be reached this summer and will continue at least during the year 1953?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, I do not think there is any bad time in the history of a nation to prevent a deterioration of its money, especially when duplicating services are given, in the opinion of the members of the committee, you set up to save you from bankruptcy.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Delaware.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. I have been advised, and I think I recall that this is so, that this Congress appropriated money in the past to have a management survey made of the whole Veterans' Administration.

Mr. PHILLIPS. And it is not yet in.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. That survey is now being made by Booze, Allen & Humphreys, a management-survey firm.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. And that is due sometime early in April, in the next couple of weeks, and that will cover this subject.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct. We could well wait for that report before making this decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard some very fine, clear, lucid statements on the subject, but in the beginning let me kindly state to the House that there is not a one of us now—let us not kid ourselves—who has a monopoly on our desire to help the veteran. Let us get that debunked first. And there are so very few men on the floor of this House who have ever voted against a single veterans' benefit that you can put them in the palm of your one hand. Now let us "debunk" that. As far as this subcommittee is concerned, with one little tiny deflection, there is not a single man on it that has ever voted against a single dime of benefit, and certainly I have not.

Now, let us not arrogate unto ourselves all the patriotism and all the knowledge and all the sanctity. Now the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH]—and I love that New York Irishman; he is a gentleman and a scholar—restores the cut. Our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] restores half the cut.

I do not yield to any of you in the desire to help the veterans. I do not think you know too much more than we know about it. We are going to say you know a little bit more, but we are not going to give you too much of the edge, now. But I repeat to my colleagues with every ounce of sincerity that I possess that it will not hurt the veteran—get my word—one iota, and you know it deep down in your conscience. You are not taking one red 5 cents worth of service from him that cannot be dispensed with. If anybody is going to be hurt it might be a little handful of jobholders. How many do they have over there now? Let us get right down to the case. If we had almost that many troops in Korea we would be a whole lot better off. We just have 180,000 jobs in the Veterans' Administration now. You make all this noise about taking off about 1,000 or 1,200 that are not rendering one red 5 cents worth of service, and you know it and I know it. There are some people who get up here on the floor——

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A statement like that is not true, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman can use his own judgment and I can use mine. The gentleman does not have a monopoly on this subject, I may say to my friend.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Nor do you.

Mr. THOMAS. Even though he may think he does.

It has been suggested here that they ought to restore these contact offices to get the pressure off Members. That is not fair to the Members. I venture to say that every Member on this floor writes his veterans, and when he is at home through speeches, he says, "Write me if I can help you." I know you do because I do it, and I have never turned one down yet, and you have not either, and you know you have not and you will not. That is a part of your job, and you do your job and you do it well.

Back in your home county and in your home city you have contact officers paid for by your local people and these great service organizations back home. I have been a member of the Legion for 20 years, with pride and joy. My post helps, your post helps, and every post will. Why? Those posts are set up for just one thing. It is not profit. It is for service. Service to whom? To the veterans. They put that army to work in addition to your civilian helpers, that army of 180,000 in the Veterans' Administration.

Now, think about your service offices paid for by your cities and your counties and your Legion posts. Is that all? Why, no. In those budgets you are going to consider next week there is more. In the Labor Department there is $285,000 in the budget to help contact work for the veterans. Is that all? No. In this bill you are considering now there is some money in the item for the Civil Service Commission to help the veterans.

Are we going to spend our money on jobs, unnecessary jobs? What did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] say, and bless him, he is shot all over the map so far as his body is concerned. Do you think he would misrepresent it? You heard what he said. But who is going to get hurt? Are you taking one penny away from the veterans? In this budget alone there is approximately $3,500,000,000 for benefits. I am not going to call the number of figures because I have been told that that might hurt our security and give away the number of troops in Korea. Those chaps are entitled to these benefits and you know it, and you are going to give it to them sooner or later, just as soon as that great committee headed by my friend from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] bring in the bill. You know it is coming. What will it cost? $1,000,000,000 extra, $2,000,000,000 extra? Regardless of what it is, we are going to pay the bill.

Now, are you going to spend some money for jobs or are you going to give it to these veterans who rightfully deserve it in the form of benefits?

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by my good friend from New York be voted down and I ask that the substitute be voted down. If you must adopt one of the two, I ask you to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time for debate on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 47, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McGRATH) there were—ayes. 109, noes 93.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. McGRATH and Mr. THOMAS.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 134, noes 108.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to this paragraph? If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION

PAYMENT OF CLAIMS

For payment of claims, as authorized by the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, from funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the war claims fund created by section 13 (a) of said act, such sums as may be necessary, to be available to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment of claims under sections 4 (a), 4 (b) (2), 5 (a) through (e), 6, and 7 of said act to the payees named and in the amounts stated in certifications by the War Claims Commission and the Secretary of Labor or their duly authorized representatives, which certifications shall be in lieu of any vouchers which might otherwise be required: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That no claims shall be allowed or paid under the provisions of said War Claims Act of 1948 from any funds other than those covered into the Treasury pursuant to the provisions of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, as amended, as provided by section 13 (a) of said War Claims Act of 1948.

CHANGE IN PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word on page 42 under War Claims Commission, for the purpose of making a brief announcement for the benefit of the Members.

On yesterday I announced that the bill (H. R. 5012) amending the Navy ration statute relating to oleomargarine would be on the program for next week. At the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services that bill is being displaced and will not be any part of the program for next week.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public Housing Administration: Of the amounts available by or pursuant to law for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law including funds appropriated by title I of this act and not to exceed $205,000 of the funds appropriated for such expenses under the head "Defense Housing" in the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, not to exceed $11,455,000 shall be available for such expenses, including purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles, for replacement only; not to exceed $620,000 for expenses of travel; and expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Administration: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures by the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by or pursuant to law shall not exceed $31,690,000: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $50,000 of funds made available by the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2035) shall be available for necessary expenses, including administrative expenses, of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the act of May 19, 1949 (Public Law 65).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMAS: On page 59, line 12, strike out "$11,455,000" and insert "$10,455,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Hereafter no part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act, including the government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during any calendar year and unused at the close of business on June 30th of the succeeding calendar year: *Provided*, That the head of any such corporation or agency shall afford an opportunity for officers or employees to use the annual leave accumulated under this section prior to June 30 of such succeeding calendar year: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States: *Provided further*, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: On page 62, line 17, after the words "United States", insert " or employees who are entitled to less than 15 days of annual leave."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it adds additional duties and it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] on the point of order.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is, in my judgment, only a limitation. It is legislation, of course, on an appropriation bill, but points of order have been waived by the House and I do not see how it can be construed to be legislation on an appropriation bill. It is an amendment to a proposal that has already been accepted, although it is part of the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has offered an amendment to line 17, page 62, to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] makes a point of order on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has had an opportunity to analyze the language of the amendment and feels that the amendment is an exception to the legislative limitation starting on line 5 of page 62 of the pending bill. Section 401, which starts on line 5 of page 62, is a legislative provision allowed by waiver of points of order to remain in an appropriation bill. The pending amendment appears to the Chair merely to be a perfecting amendment which is germane to the provision to which it applies and one which does not add legislation. Therefore, the point of order is overruled.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto, and in reference to the limitation dealing with annual leave, close in 10 minutes after the gentleman from Kansas has finished his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have sent to the desk an amendment which relates to section 401 of the bill we are considering. The section itself places a restriction on the accumulation of annual leave by providing that Federal employees must use the annual leave accumulated in any calendar year before June 30 of the succeeding calendar year. My amendment will eliminate the application of this restriction to those employees who are entitled to less than 15 days of annual leave each year.

May I first of all state that I oppose the trend toward legislating in appropriation acts on matters with respect to Federal employees. As long as there is an established committee of the House having the legislative jurisdiction over substantive laws for any specific field, I believe matters relating to changes in these laws should be referred to the committees concerned. The provisions of section 401 are a good example of what can happen when legislation is included in an appropriation bill.

May I remind the House that in a law approved by Congress and signed by the President on October 30, 1951, we completely changed the leave provisions for Federal employees. These new leave provisions were effective January 6 of this year—just a little more than 2 months ago.

The new leave act placed Federal employees on a graduated leave system whereby those employees with less than 3 years' service would be entitled to approximately 13 days of annual leave each year; those employees with more than 3 years but less than 15 years service would be entitled to approximately 20 days' leave per year; while those with more than 15 years' service would be entitled to 26 days' annual leave a year.

My amendment would give those employees entitled to less than 15 days annual leave a year the privilege of continuing to accumulate their leave. At the end of 3 years service, these employees would be entitled to 20 days annual leave a year and no longer ex-

empted under my amendment from the requirement of section 401 of the bill.

Even if these employees saved every day of leave to which they would be entitled during their first 3 years of service, the maximum amount which they could save would be approximately 40 days. Employees who come from far distances cannot afford either the time or the transportation to travel home unless they are able to combine their first year of leave with some of the leave of the succeeding year.

I should like to remind the House that the employees which my amendment exempt from these restrictions on accumulation of leave took the biggest reduction of any group when we revised the leave act. In fact, we cut the leave in half, from 26 days to 13 days a year, for these employees.

When we passed the leave act we limited the accumulation of leave for any employee to 60 days. Those that have already accumulated 60 days annual leave must take their leave currently or lose it. I believe that the sponsors of section 401 themselves will agree that it is unfair to restrict the leave of those employees who are only entitled to 13 days of annual leave a year. Certainly every Member whose district is located far from the seat of government where many of these employees work must join with me in disapproving of this limitation on leave.

There is nobody in this House who believes more in economy than I do but if we are to have economy we must have it with equity. I challenge any Member of this House to stand up and say there is equity in adding an additional restriction on the leave of these employees within 60 days after we have cut their leave by 50 percent. In fact, virtually the entire savings in annual leave came out of the annual leave taken away from the very employees with which my amendment is concerned. The question of savings through the restriction on the accumulation of annual leave is very hard to justify.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, who is a former member of our committee.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, no Member of this House has been more critical of abuses in the matter of leave than the gentleman from Kansas, and no one has done more to correct those abuses. I think the message he is giving us now ought to receive the consideration and attention of all Members of the House.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished member of our committee.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I also would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Kansas: Is it not a fact that this section is primarily to correct some abuses in the very highest brackets and not to correct any abuses—which have never occurred—in the lower brackets, where many of the employees are entitled to only 13 days or 2 weeks vacation?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentlewoman is exactly right. This section is leveled at a group of people who are in the lower brackets and who do not abuse the feature we have discussed here with respect to annual leave.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, when we passed the leave act we limited the accumulation of leave for an employee to 60 days. Those who have already accumulated 60 days of annual leave will take it now or lose it within a certain specified time.

I think the sponsors of section 401 will agree that it is unfair to restrict the leave of those employees who are entitled to only 13 days. You talk a lot about equity and fairness. Here is a place where you should do equity where it ought to be done. I do not think there is anyone on the floor of the House who can claim to be more careful with reference to expenditures of the taxpayers' money than I, but there is one place where I do not believe any Member can show that any amount of money is being saved by reason of the amendment you have placed in this bill. You are keeping some folks from going home to spend their 13 days or 15 days or 20 days of leave, that is all you are doing.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, for whom I have profound respect.

Mr. THOMAS. The admiration is mutual, and I have shown it to my distinguished friend, but surely my good friend does not want to leave the idea with anybody on the floor that this amendment is taking one minute of leave away from any employee? Certainly the gentleman does not want to do that?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I do not want to do that, but I say you put them in a position where they cannot use their leave, as they ought to have to do it if you are going to let them have it.

Mr. THOMAS. Read the amendment. It directs the agencies to give them their leave.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Thirteen days, but they must use it within the year. All I am saying is that you ought not to restrict these people who have only 13 days leave in a year. You know, as a practical matter, these people are bound to take off a few days during the year—perhaps to look after business matters, go to a dentist or something else. So, generally speaking they do well if they have as many as 7 or 8 days left during the year.

Mr. THOMAS. We are not restricting them at all. All we are saying is, "You either use it or else you do not get cash for it."

Mr. REES of Kansas. But the gentleman fails to observe this amendment does not affect those in higher salaries or who have been in the Government longer. Here you restrict the folks in the lower brackets. It is those in the higher categories, who get the large amounts of cash leave. This amendment is inequitable.

Mr. THOMAS. Does the gentleman believe they come to work for the Government with the idea of getting paid for their annual leave?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Of course not. That is the reason I say you do not save any money for the Government by this section of the bill. They just hope that, after they have been in Government service 2 or 3 years, they may have accumulated enough time to go home, if they want to do so, for 3 weeks. I am sure those who live near their place of employment will take their 13 days off during the year. You do not seem to realize that those who are in higher brackets, and who get 26 days or more, are not affected by your amendment. You just hit the lower salaried people of whom most have little cash when separated from the Government. If I thought this amendment were equitable and would save any substantial amounts of money I would be the first to support it. I had no idea you were submitting this kind of proposal. There is not a word in your hearings that supports your contention that it will save any money. You are hitting the little fellow in this case.

I agree with you that there are too many employees on the payroll of our Government. I have spent a lot of time and effort in dealing with that problem. Furthermore, we do not have a competitive merit system. But that is another. In this legislation you do not reach the fellow who abuses the leave provisions of the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY].

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. This question of annual leave was given very careful consideration by the members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I think they worked out a formula which was conceded to be an acceptable compromise. It is true that both the gentleman from Kansas and the chairman of the committee have stated that nothing will be taken away from present employees in terms of number of days. But they will not be able to get any kind of effective annual leave unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas is adopted by the committee.

I think it only fair, particularly when many of these employees do not have any permanent status; when they are here in a sense serving the country and making a sacrifice to do it, that we should permit them to accumulate their annual leave in the manner which is proposed by the gentleman from Kansas. I understand that Chairman Ramspeck of the Civil Service Commission has expressed his support of the proposition which the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has made.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman is correct in his statement.

May I say that we are not saving any millions of dollars by reason of this provision. We have already cut these people by 50 percent of the annual leave they formerly had. Now we are saying to many of them that as a matter of practice they will not get to use any of it. Is that not correct?

Mr. McCARTHY. That is quite correct. I think it should be added that Mr. Ramspeck has been most cooperative with those Members of Congress who have been trying to reform the civil service.

The fact that he has expressed his opposition to the committee amendment should carry considerable weight.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, surely there cannot be any misunderstanding about this amendment. I submitted it to our good friend, the ranking member of the Committee on the Civil Service, 6 weeks ago. Perhaps I misunderstood him. I thought he was very favorable to it. If I am in error, it is my error. I submitted it to the chairman of that committee and he said he is for it. The chairman came by less than 2 minutes ago and said, "I just want to tell you I am still for it." This amendment does not take away 1 minute of annual leave. Now get that straight. Certainly, no one can claim, if he reads the amendment, that it takes away 1 minute of annual leave from anybody—not 1 minute. Do you know what it says? "Either take that annual leave or you do not get paid for it." That is all that it says. What is the purpose of annual leave? Its purpose is to refresh the employee so that he will be able to do a better job when he comes back to his work after he has had his leave. Does industry pay people for not taking their annual leave? Why, certainly not. This amendment as drawn by the committee will save the taxpayers $125,000,000 a year.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is exactly correct when he said he conferred with me about this provision. I endorse it and I say it is a good provision and ought to be kept in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. It will save the taxpayers $125,000,000.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. The chairman stated that anyone reading this provision could understand it, and I am sure most Members who read it can understand it, but perhaps the distinguished chairman will forgive my ignorance—there is just one point I would like to have perfectly clear.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentlewoman cannot understand it, I would not claim to understand it either.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the chairman, but what I would like to ask is this: Do I understand that leave can be accumulated as long as it is not paid for?

Mr. THOMAS. Up to January 1 of this year, if an employee had $500, $600, $700, or $1,000, or $2,000 worth of annual leave coming to him, he can get the cash for it. That is after January 1 of this year. Then, beyond that he can accumulate that year's leave and use it and if he does not use it, he cannot be paid for it. Is there anything wrong in that? That is exactly the same principle that industry has.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Does not the distinguished chairman foresee that we may run into some trouble if before that date a great many of the employees with accumulated leave choose to take it?

Mr. THOMAS. Not a bit in the world.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Suppose I, as an employee, have 6 months' annual leave coming to me.

Mr. THOMAS. Most of the Members of the House by their votes have indicated they believe there are too many employees in most of these agencies now anyway. May I say, because I do not want to be facetious, our distinguished friend the gentlewoman from New York, is honest and sincere, and is trying to do a good job, and is doing a good job—as I say, this will not hurt anybody. I remind you that the purpose of annual leave is to protect the health of the employees, and to give them rest so that they will be able to do a better job when they come back to their work.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. But may it not hurt the offices downtown where a large number of these employees might decide to take their annual leave?

Mr. THOMAS. Do not worry about the offices, they are all right. They are going to do all right.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am not worrying about that, but I am afraid the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and his party may be worried about them.

Mr. THOMAS. If we adopt this amendment, offered by my good friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the conservative estimate is that that amendment will cost the taxpayers of this country $50,000,000 a year. Now, if you want to add $50,000,000 or more a year to our burden, that is what this amendment does.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Is it not true that the bill also gives the employee 18 months in which to take his leave?

Mr. THOMAS. After the 1st of January 1952, it does.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is not according to the way the bill is written.

Mr. THOMAS. That is the way it is, I must say to my friend the gentleman from Kansas, and I hope my friend will withdraw his amendment. I know he wants to do the right thing. I know he does not want to hurt anybody, and I know he wants to save some money. The Federal employees are not kicking about this because they know it is not retroactive. They are not kicking because we are not taking anything away from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 402. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRAY: Page 64, after line 7, insert the following:

"SEC. 403. In no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of Government under any appropriation or authorization in this act exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951."

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment to the appropriation bill is very simple. It provides that all of the departments in Washington under this appropriation bill are limited to one-half of the passenger automobiles that they had this last year. Washington has a good bus service and the various Federal buildings are relatively close together. Let those employees walk or ride the bus who do not care to use their own cars. There is no reason why the Washington bureaucrat should joyride in a Government automobile at the taxpayer's expense. The citizens in my district are having a most difficult time paying the present high taxes and I assure you that I do not intend, if I can help it, to allow the Washington bureaucrats to ride around Washington at their expense. This committee has already done a fine job in cutting the budget, but this amendment which I offer is just

one more step in the long way that we must go to bring our Government back to the people, eliminating Government extravagance and bringing taxes back to the place where the taxpayer can afford to pay them. I ask you to support this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. The committee wants to commend our colleague for his motive and the purpose he has in mind. I think what the gentleman seeks to do in his amendment is just about what the committee has done.

I may say to the gentleman that the committee will be glad to accept his amendment with the reservation that after we study it in some detail, should it develop—I do not think it does—but should it develop that it goes too deep, then we reserve the right to reject it in conference. But I think what the gentleman's amendment does is just exactly what the subcommittee has done already.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRAY. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the minority would be glad to accept it without reservation.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] if this amendment does not accomplish about what the subcommittee has done already?

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 404. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation included in this act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government, whose principal or primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance). This section shall not apply with respect to any person whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur for the President of the United States.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUSBEY: Page 64, after line 21, insert the following:

"This section shall not apply with respect to any person whose principal or primary duties consist of acting as chauffeur for the American Battle Monuments Commission."

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, the reason I have offered this amendment is due to the fact that the cars of the American Battle Monuments Commission are used overseas, principally in France.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman has made a rather minute study of the situation abroad, and the committee is inclined to accept his amendment, because really it has only one purpose and that is to do right by everybody.

The committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am familiar with the situation which the gentleman seeks to correct. It applies actually to only one person in the employ of one agency situated in France. I think there is a fear, perhaps, that the gentleman's amendment is so broad it would act as a loophole for other agencies of which the House is not advised at this time. Could the gentleman's amendment be confined to this one instance in which it might be desirable?

Mr. BUSBEY. I may say to the gentleman from California that this applies only to the American Battle Monuments Commission, the work of which agency is taking care of the cemeteries and battle monuments in Europe. According to the language in the bill it must employ American chauffers or be driven by someone in the agency. That is impossible. Let us take a situation in France of some years ago. There was an American driver of one of the automobiles of the American Battle Monuments Commission in Paris going out to a cemetery on official business. A French woman was killed.

Now, the United States Government does not go into a tribunal in protection of the drivers of its automobiles if he is an American citizen. In the particular case to which I just referred the driver was convicted and sent to prison.

We must have native drivers for more reasons than one. It is the native driver's responsibility then and not the responsibility of the United States Government and one of our American citizens.

I think the amendment is very necessary. It only applies to one or two automobiles, so it is very insignificant.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is this for the special protection of one or two individuals who are employed by the American Battle Monuments Commission? There is an amendment in here that will apply to the entire bill. Is this for the benefit of one or two individuals?

Mr. BUSBEY. No. The chauffeurs of these cars that go out to the cemeteries which are located in far, out-of-the-way places. One cannot get to them by train or bus. This is the only agency in this bill that operates overseas.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk again report the Busbey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the Busbey amendment.

Mr. BUSBEY. In other words, Mr. Chairman, it applies to one agency in Europe that takes care of American cemeteries.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Can the gentleman inform me if you have a chauffeur, an American chauffeur, driving a car for a consulate, whether he will be protected from civil suit?

Mr. BUSBEY. The consulates overseas always have native drivers. There are no American drivers for consulates.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Supposing they did have an American driver, would he be so protected?

Mr. BUSBEY. The Government would not go into a tribunal and protect that man under any circumstances if he is employed by a commission. That is a policy of the United States Government. The subject of my amendment is so we can have native drivers employed by the American Battle Monuments Commission in the country in which the cemeteries are located.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Why select this one agency? Why not take in all of the drivers? It is the only agency involved in this bill. No other like agency is operating overseas.

These chauffeurs and the chauffeurs of the President of the United States should be in a like category; is that the idea?

Mr. BUSBEY. My amendment has nothing to do with the chauffeurs for the President of the United States.

Mr. CLEMENTE. Well, it is right in the bill that the gentleman is amending.

Mr. BUSBEY. This is the only agency involved overseas where we need native drivers of the country in which the cars are driven.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to be a trivial amendment, but I just want to suggest for the consideration of the Committee that this bill makes one exception, and one only, on this matter of chauffeurs, and that one is the President of the United States. Now, if all this story about liability and all the rest which the gentleman has suggested to us is sound, we are still adopting a poor policy if we exempt this one agency. This agency can take care of the situation very well without being exempted. They have messengers. They have many French-speaking people in their employ, but if you put in one more exception next year you will have some more requests. It will be just the beginning of another flock of chauffeurs. Let us keep one exception only, the President of the United States. Nobody can ever misunderstand that, Mr. Chairman, or take it as an invitation for more Government chauffeurs.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. Well, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to fact that none of the other agencies have this peculiar situation operating overseas like the American Battlefields Commission.

Mr. COTTON. I will say to the gentleman that I never saw an agency that could not develop a peculiar situation in a few months. We will have

them back here with more peculiar situations than you can now imagine if we open the door. Limit it to the President only and let us not have any more chauffeurs.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 64, after line 21, add a new section 405 as follows:

"SEC. 405. Money appropriated in this act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond the total sum of $6,900,000,000."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I will withhold it for a moment.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, this bill before us now offers a particularly striking example of the importance of regaining control here in the House not only of the requests in the pending bill for new appropriations but control of all expenditures, including those hanging over from prior years.

Now we are confronted with a bill asking us to authorize an additional $6,200,000,000, and you think that is all that we are going to be confronted with in spending in 1953. The President's expenditure budget provides for expenditures in 1953 of $8,268,000,000 for the very agencies for which we are now appropriating new money. Now, all my amendment would do would be to put a ceiling on the funds we are now appropriating, so that together with the old funds they will not exceed $6,900,000,000 which is $700,000,000 more than you are being asked to appropriate in this bill for 1953. Actually, the country will face on July 1 next a total carryover of some $70,000,000,000, plus the $85,000,000,000 that we will probably vote this year in our budget bills, making a total of $155,000,000,000 to be expended in 1953 if the administration wants to, and can spend it.

I have offered an amendment to Rules of the House that was introduced yesterday which, if the Committee on Rules will adopt, would confer upon this House, when considering a bill of this sort, the right to act upon all of the moneys, all of the appropriations available for all of the agencies presently before the House, so that instead of dealing piecemeal with appropriations we would be able to reach out, rescind, limit and do whatever we like with all of the money that is available for any agency. I think that is vital for the recapture of the purse strings. Without it we have no control. I hope the Committee on Rules will act favorably on it.

In the absence of the willingness of the leadership to give the House a chance to vote on House Joint Resolution 371, to require the President to offer a new budget within our income for 1953, the only way we can operate is in this difficult, rather complicated fashion, through the back door of hitting each appropriation bill and limiting the use of new appropriations to such a point that with the old ones they will not exceed the total income of the country. Vote this amendment, if it is not overruled, and if we will do the same on every other bill we will not spend more than our income of $71,000,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, the country is confronted not with one $85,000,000,000 budget but with three $85,000,000,000 budgets in successive years.: The spending budget of $85,000,000,000, the new requests of $85,000,000,000, and the carryover into the third year, which certainly cannot be less.

If the point of order is insisted upon and is then sustained—and I do not think it should be sustained, for this does not touch any of the old appropriations, it only limits the use of these funds—then we have no resort whatsoever except the Rules Committee and the resolution or some resolution like it that would amend the rules and give the House an opportunity to deal in over-all fashion with the total expenditures for the fiscal year we are entering.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas insist on his point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we insist upon the point of order that it is legislation. It changes figures heretofore voted upon in the House in the last 3 days. Therefore, that is legislation. It puts duties on the various agencies not otherwise called for in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COUDERT. I most certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. This clearly does not touch the funds of prior years; therefore, it does not appropriate with respect to them. It only places a limitation upon the use to which the funds requested in this bill, the new obligational authority, may be put. It limits the freedom of expenditure and nothing else.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] proposes as an amendment to the bill, on page 64, after line 21, a new section, 405, against which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] makes a point of order on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair appreciates the fact that the author of the amendment afforded the Chair an opportunity earlier in the day to read the amendment and gave the Chair some time to study the language of the amendment.

The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is a limitation upon the funds which are contained in the bill H. R. 7072, presently before the Committee; that it is nothing more than a limitation on those funds. The Chair is, therefore, constrained to overrule the point of order and hold the amendment in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may again be reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Coudert amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, naturally the subcommittee finds itself in the same position the Chair is in. I do not mean to say that is any fault of the gentleman from New York, because, as well as I remember, he came by 4 or 5 minutes ago and said he was going to offer an amendment. Still, under the circumstances at that time, the subcommittee did not have an opportunity to read it.

I want to be very frank and fair with the House. His amendment limits expenditures under this bill to $6,900,000,000.

Mr. COUDERT. Not under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am seeking light. I surely will.

Mr. COUDERT. This amendment does not in any way, shape, or form limit the total that can be spent except to $6,900,000,000, which is $700,000,000 more than this bill carries.

Mr. THOMAS. Does it limit the expenditures under all the items in this bill, H. R. 7072, to $6,900,000,000?

Mr. COUDERT. If the agencies choose not to spend a dime from the old, overhanging appropriations, then they can spend every dime that is appropriated in this bill.

Mr. THOMAS. What is the limitation on the over-all amount of fresh money they can spend for 1953?

Mr. COUDERT. There is no limitation on the fresh money in this bill. This is on over-all limitation, period.

Mr. THOMAS. For how much?

Mr. COUDERT. Six billion nine hundred million dollars. It is $700,000,000 more than you are asking for new money for 1953.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in order to arrive at a half-way sensible conclusion so far as this amendment is concerned, we have to rapidly calculate those funds in the Veterans' Administration which are continuing funds in the way of veterans' benefits. And, if my memory serves me correctly, there is probably a billion dollars for pensions, benefits, and for hospitals for the Veterans' Administration. They are continuing funds. According to the gentleman's limitation then, you would not be able to spend 1 nickel of that $1,000,000,000 for veterans' benefits.

Mr. COUDERT. Not at all. The gentleman does not correctly interpret the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope my friend will listen. We understand him and know him. He works hard on the committee, and has done a fine job. Why will the gentleman not withdraw this amendment? We have not had sufficient time to learn what his amendment really does. No one knows what it is.

Mr. COUDERT. In my humble judgment, it is one of the most important amendments to come on the floor of the House in a long time.

Mr. THOMAS. Frankly, I cannot give the members of the Committee of the Whole any advice, or any help, so far as coming to a decision on this amendment. I know nothing about the amendment, and I am not going to get up in Committee of the Whole and talk to you about something and ask you to do something, when I do not know what I am talking about. That is my position here.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York some questions. The evident intent of the amendment is to limit expenditures. I am trying to think of some of the funds which would be involved. How about the maritime construction, and how about the atomic-energy construction? Has the gentleman made any estimate of how much would be involved here?

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman has made approximate estimates of how much would be necessary to limit the spending of these agencies in order that application of a similar ratio to other agencies of the Government would result in not spending more in 1953 than the President's estimate of income of $71,000,000,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In other words, the gentleman is attempting to avoid a deficit?

Mr. COUDERT. Precisely. And if this amendment passes, it will become the duty of the President, as obviously the head man of all these agencies, to adjust these various budgets so that the total of them will fall within the maximum limitation of $6,900,000,000, which is still $700,000,000 more than the committee is asking for in this bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. You have stated what the limit would be on spending, if your amendment passes. How much money could be spent if your amendment is rejected?

Mr. COUDERT. Eight billion two hundred and fifty million dollars by these agencies, and that is the amount set forth in the President's expenditure budget for these agencies in 1953, and that is one of the reasons we are going to have a $14,000,000,000 deficit.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I want to ask the gentleman from California a question, which can probably be answered by the gentleman from New York. Is it not conceivable that a situation may arise under this amendment which would have an effect on the amendment just adopted by the committee with respect to the contact men for the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I do not see how it could affect any specific individual or group of individuals.

Mr. EBERHARTER. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York is adopted, will it not cut the funds for these contact men for the Veterans' Administration as well as the funds for any of the other agencies upon which the committee has acted this afternoon?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The amendment, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will not in any way, shape, or form limit payments to veterans for compensation or pensions or for contact men or anybody else. All the amendment does in effect is to say to the President, through his agencies, that altogether they cannot spend more than the given amount, and it is up to him to adjust the budgets.

Where there are legal obligations, fixed obligations, such as pensions and veterans' rights, of course they have priority and will come first and will be paid 100 cents on the dollar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask the gentleman one question. Am I correct in understanding your statement to the effect that if your amendment is adopted, this will make it possible to spend $700,000,000 additional, above that allowed by the committee in the bill brought in?

Mr. COUDERT. May I explain to the gentleman: I wonder if the gentleman does not lose sight of the fact, as I so often do—I have to pinch myself, whenever I get on these subjects, to remind myself that we are dealing every day with two parallel budgets. You are dealing with the over-all, total-expenditure budget, which includes money left over from last year, the year before, and the year before that, and this new requested budget of obligational authority. Those things are parallel.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman understands that in addition to the money appropriated in this bill there are carryovers. Therefore, the amount expended, even without the gentleman's amendment, would be more than the amount we have in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understood the gentleman, he said his amendment, if allowed, would carry $700,000,000 extra.

Mr. COUDERT. No, no. We are talking about the spending budget, not new authorization.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think we are dealing with something very dangerous. I very seriously doubt if the House would want to take action like this without more consideration.

This is what I fear: You cut this amount this much, without allotting the funds here, there, and yonder, and I fear that the departments of Government would be legislating on this money that is voted. In my opinion, under this amendment—and I looked at it this morning—in my opinion, these departments could get together and say whether they are going to spend any money for this activity or how much money they are going to spend for this or other activities. I do think that an amendment which is as far-reaching and fundamental as this one, and which I fear is dangerous, should be considered a great deal more carefully than it is going to be considered in the House this afternoon. I am speaking to you out of fear of what the departments may do to the legislative body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 115, noes 148.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to trespass upon the time of the Committee at this late hour. I wish to direct attention to the item for appropriation for the annuity fund that is administered by the civil service for Federal funds for those who have retired, and for those who will retire from employment in the Government service.

Under the law employees are required to contribute 6 percent of their pay to the retirement fund and the Government is expected to contribute a similar amount. The thing to which I want to direct your attention is that the subcommittee in charge of this bill takes credit for having reduced the request of the Commission by $136,869,000. The report describes this item as a "saving." I wish that were true. You do not really save anything by so-called reduction of this item. The fact is by reducing this item, the annuity fund is further decreased. On an actuarial basis, according to Civil Service it is in the red in the amount of $4,875,000,000 as of June 30, 1951. The rather startling thing is that three billion seven hundred million of this deficit was incurred in the last 4 years.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, also a diligent member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANFIELD. I think the chairman of the committee is ready to admit that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to quote for the record from the hearings at page 453. It is a colloquy between Mr. Ramspeck, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee:

> Mr. RAMSPECK. Well, the assets as of June 30, 1951, are $4,419,927,112.89, and the liabilities as of that same date are $9,294,927,112.89.
>
> Mr. THOMAS. Leaving there a total deficiency as of June 30, 1951, of $4,875,000,000.

So, the fact remains if this Congress is going to follow a policy of maintaining a fund that is claimed to be actuarially sound, there is a further deficit, or indebtedness in our Treasury to the tune of $5,000,000,000 right now, although it is not shown in the Treasury statement. If you have a further explanation, I would like to have it. All I am trying

to do is to lay this matter before the Members of this House.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 64, after line 21, insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within a department, independent executive bureau, board, commission, corporation, agency or office, provided for in this act;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to all employees in veterans' medical facilities, exclusive of medical departmental personnel in the District of Columbia;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1, 2, and 3;

"(f) to employees of the General Accounting Office:

"(g) to employees of the Tax Court of the United States;

"(h) to the American Battle Monuments Commission;

Provided further, That when any department, independent executive bureau, board, commission, corporation, agency or office, contained in this act shall, as the result of the operation of this amendment reduce its personnel to a number not exceeding 90 percent of the total number provided for in this act, such amendment may cease to apply and said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded at any time during fiscal year 1953 this amendment shall again become operative."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, and on the further ground that it places extra burdens and duties on the various boards, agencies, and bureaus.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman point out the specific language in the amendment to which he refers?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, it is near the end:

As the result of the operation of this amendment reduce its personnel to a number not exceeding 90 percent of the total number provided for in this act, such amendment may cease to apply and said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded—

There is an alternative there, as the Chair will see—

at any time during fiscal year 1953 this amendment shall again become operative.

Somebody has got to make some decisions there; it places extra duties in order to arrive at decisions; and on top of that it is legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa briefly if he desires to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the best evidence that this amendment is germane to the bill and is not legislation is the fact that the amendment was adopted by the House last year and was held to be germane by the Chair. Points of order were raised against it at that time, as I recall.

The amendment is not mandatory in the sense that the word "may" is used where the additional burdens and responsibilities might be placed on the agencies other than the 10 percent reduction that must be made which is purely a limitation on an appropriation bill and comes within the language and the intent of the Holman rule.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa is legislation on an appropriation bill for the following reasons: As stated in the next to the fourth line from the bottom, upon the attainment of that condition under operation of the amendment, thereupon the amendment affirmatively legislates in the following language:

Said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953.

That language, I respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, is legislation, it is affirmatively fixing a legal ceiling upon the employment upon the attainment of a condition in the amendment; therefore I respectfully suggest it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MILLS). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has offered an amendment to line 23, page 64, of the bill presently before the Committee. To this amendment the gentleman from Texas makes a point of order on the ground it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair has listened attentatively to the statements made by both the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. The Chair has also had an opportunity to study the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa and has paid careful attention to the statements made by him.

The Chair will read for the benefit of those who are interested from the so-called Holman rule, clause 2, rule XXI:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

The gentleman from Tennessee says that the language contained in the amendment "said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during the fiscal year 1953" is legislation.

The Chair is of the opinion that even if that language is legislation, it is clearly within the Holman rule, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. This, in the opinion of the Chair, is a limitation within the meaning of the Holman rule by limiting the number of employees within these agencies of Government covered by this bill and the amount of money to be made available under this bill.

The precedents of the House have been called to the attention of the Chair and the Chair has given consideration to those precedents also. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is in order and therefore overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto as well on the bill close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the first provision of my amendment applies to "any appropriation or authorization contained in this act," and it also restricts the payment of compensation therefrom to any position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1952, with certain specified exemptions.

The first exemption—paragraph (a)—not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies. This simply prohibits affected governmental units covered in this bill for fiscal year 1953 from filling more than 25 percent of their vacancies during the year.

Paragraph (b) permits the affected governmental units contained in the bill to fill positions within their same organization.

Paragraph (c) exempts offices or positions required by law to be filled by Presidential appointment by and with advice and consent of the Senate.

Paragraph (d) provides that the inhibition contained in the first paragraph of the amendment shall not apply to employees in our veterans' medical facilities, exclusive of the departmental medical personnel in the District of Columbia.

Paragraph (e) exempts employees in grades CPC–1, 2, and 3. The work being performed by the employees in these grades has been defined by the Congress in the Classification Act of 1949, Public Law 429, of the Eighty-first Congress.

Briefly the duties of CPC–1 employees are to run errands, check parcels, or perform light manual tasks with little or no responsibility. Employees in this grade consist chiefly of messenger boys and girls and their salary ranges from $1,510 to $2,170 and the Civil Service Commission has advised me that as of June 30, 1951, the various departments and agencies of the executive branch in the continental United States employed only 63 persons in this classification.

Grade CPC–2 is the lowest grade for adult employees. Positions in this grade, generally speaking, are unskilled laborers, char employees, adult messengers, elevator operators, and kitchen helpers and waiters in the various governmental institutions. Positions in this grade range from $2,120 to $2,840 and the various departments and agencies of the executive branch in the con-

tinental United States employed 27,362 in this grade, as of June 30, 1951.

The employees of CPC–3 includes custodial or office-labor positions, the performance of which requires some skill, training, or experience, or involving some degree of responsibility. This grade includes semiskilled laborers, chauffeurs, truck drivers, straw bosses of a group of charwomen, firemen of low-pressure heating boilers, and messengers who also do light manual or office-labor tasks with some responsibility. The pay scale ranges from $2,252 to $3,032. As of June 30, 1951, in the various departments and agencies of the executive branch in the continental United States the Civil Service Commission advised me that there were 23,323 persons in this grade.

The purpose of exempting the employees in these three low-paid pay scale grades is because of the nature of work performed and the extremely high turnover within these grades.

I have provided in this amendment that the employees of the General Accounting Office should be exempt from the provisions in the inhibition. This proviso was in the amendment last year, and I am quite sure that every Member of this House is cognizant of the excellent job being done by our former colleague the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States. Mr. Warren, with the aid of his efficient and loyal assistants, improved the efficiency of his organization each succeeding year.

Paragraph (g) exempts employees of the Tax Court of the United States. This proviso likewise was in the amendment offered to the bill last year. The purpose is to make uniform the exemption provided to the judiciary as was contained in the Justice Department appropriations bill last session.

The last paragraph of the amendment provides that when any governmental unit contained in this bill shall, as the result of the operation of this amendment, reduce its personnel to a number not exceeding 90 percent of the total number of employees provided for in this bill, this amendment shall cease to apply and the said 90 percent shall become a ceiling for employment during fiscal year 1953, and if exceeded any time during the year this provision shall again become operative. This last paragraph provides an option by permitting the governmental unit to make a 10-percent cut at the outset or, as provided by paragraph (a), they have the option of filling only 25 percent of their personnel vacancies until the 90-percent ceiling for employment has been achieved.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is not necessary for me to go into a complete explanation of this amendment due to the fact that a similar amendment was adopted to the independent offices bill and to four other appropriation bills during the last session of the Congress. There are, however, a few minor changes in this amendment compared to the amendment which was adopted last year. Last year I excluded from the provisions of the amendment employees in CPC grades 1 and 2. In this amendment I have also excluded from the provisions of the amendment the CPC grade 3 employees. Then, also, we have excluded the employees of the Tax Court of the United States. Under present conditions I am sure they will have their hands full and need all the employees this bill provides to handle the job properly. I have also excluded the employees of the American Battle Monuments Commission. There are only some 400 employees, and many of them are in the low-grade salary positions.

I must say, in fairness to the subcommittee dealing with independent offices appropriations, that they have done what I think is a very good job, generally speaking. However, I do not think they went far enough in the reduction of personnel. It is true they did reduce the personnel that was requested by the Bureau of the Budget by approximately 8 percent. This amendment provides for another reduction which will amount to approximately 6 percent, or in other words, will keep approximately 10,000 off the Federal payroll during fiscal year 1953, and will effect a dollar saving to our taxpayers of $50,000,000. Do you not believe that is worth saving?

If the amendment I am now offering is made the law of the land, funds are provided for about 260,000 employees in this bill now before us, costing over a billion dollars. When you take into consideration the travel pay, per diem pay, leave pay, office rental, furniture, and so forth, it will run in the neighborhood of a billion and a quarter dollars.

There is a limit to all things. I am sure they would get along very nicely if they had even less than 200,000 people handling this job if properly managed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Ten minutes remain under the limitation of debate.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that 2 minutes of that time be allotted to the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Iowa may proceed for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Thank you—the chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. THOMAS, is one of the most gracious, lovable gentlemen I have ever known. It gives me no pleasure to disagree with my friend, but I must in this instance.

In conclusion, I do want to bring to your attention the investigation that was made in 1950 by the committe headed by our colleague the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Look at this chart on government service employees in four departments of Government, which I am sure is a fair example of all department personnel.

Please note they have just as many grade 9's as you have grade 1's. The line should come from the head man, No. 15, and start on a gradual incline up to about grade 5 and then level off, but these departments are so thoroughly and completely subdivided into divisions, units, and bureaus and with head men with big, fine-sounding titles, each put at the head of a few employees, then he is raised to grade 9, 10, 11, 12 and up. Yes and up, up, up goes the expenditures for personnel, no end.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do hope the House will vote down this amendment. I at least have been laboring under the impression that the subcommitte had done a pretty fair job.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sorry the gentleman was not listening, because I said that.

Mr. THOMAS. There was nothing personal in my remarks. I love my friend. He handed me a bouquet that I do not deserve, but I appreciate it just the same.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman deserves a whole bushel full of bouquets.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman. Still, I am going to ask the House to vote down the amendment offered by my distinguished friend. His objective is fine, and the subcommittee has no argument to enter into with him on his objective. We cut these agencies very hard, and I think the House realizes that. Now, the gentleman's amendment and it only applies to this bill, reduces it 10 percent below what we have already done, and, frankly, I do not believe they can stand it. I say this advisedly and I believe the House, and my friend from Iowa, will back me up in it, that this subcommittee has cut the independent agencies over the last three consecutive years right to the bone, and that is right where they are now.

Mr. JENSEN. If this bill goes through as is, it will only cut the employment in all these agencies during the last 3 years about 11 percent.

Mr. THOMAS. But you exempt the veterans' medical facilities, and I want to point out to my friend that the veterans' medical facilities has 127,000 employees, of which 20,000 are dentists, doctors, and nurses. Now, there are 107,000 other employees: finance officers, warehousemen, cooks, pantry people, maintenance and repair people, scrub people, gardeners, chauffeurs, stenographers, and clerks, and so forth. You exempt them. I am complaining about it because I think we have already cut them enough. But, if you are going to make your amendment apply to independent agencies here, there are only 282 or 283 thousand people altogether in the independent agencies, and in one fell swoop you have exempted 127,000 under the item of medical facilities of the Veterans' Administration, when in truth and fact, there are only 20,000 dentists, doctors, and nurses out of that 127,000 in the medical facilities. I hope my friend will not insist on this amendment because this committee, with the good help of the House, has really cut these agencies right to the bone.

Mr. JENSEN. If my amendment does not amount to much, why all the fuss? Why worry about it?

Mr. THOMAS. You are going to take it out of the other agencies.

Mr. JENSEN. Another thing, the gentleman said in answer to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts the other day when she criticized the committee for taking 300 people off the payroll in a certain agency—as I say, the gentleman said "Well, the mistake we made was that we did not take all 1,526 off."

Mr. THOMAS. That is right. Do you want to take those other 300 off? But the House did not want to take them off. That is water over the dam. I certainly agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when the independent offices appropriation bill, H. R. 7072, was before the House for consideration, the limited time for debate did not permit full expression of views of all Members of the House on the many features embodied in this piece of legislation. While I had no disposition to impede the passage of this appropriation bill, I would like to go on record as opposing in principle some of its features. I am referring now to the maritime activities section of the bill. In this section the appropriation committee imposes a limitation upon the number of subsidized voyages which may be operated, and specifies that a particular number of those so authorized shall be reserved for contracts which may in the future be awarded to new operators. The policy of the United States concerning the building and operation of an adequate privately owned American merchant marine has already been decided and set forth in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Our merchant fleet has not yet reached the size and capacity to conform to that policy. We are today carrying only about 34 percent of our own commerce in United States flag ships. I do not consider, nor do I think the majority of the Members of Congress considers, that this represents the substantial proportion stated in the policy declaration of existing law. Therefore, it seems to me that it is contrary to existing congressional policy to place a ceiling upon the development of our merchant marine by means of limiting the number of ships or the number of voyages which may be operated by appropriations for the year 1953 or any other fiscal year.

I appreciate that any activity supported by the Government should be subject to strict congressional control. It should certainly be limited to the amount of money which the Congress is willing to make available for such purpose. In the present instance there is no controversy over the amount of funds appropriated. What I am objecting to, and what the friends of American shipping are objecting to, including management, sea-going labor, shipbuilders, shipyard workers, and others, is a specification in an appropriation bill as to particular voyages and ships which are authorized. This is in direct conflict with the practice and policy embodied in other appropriation bills. When money is made available for the Army, Navy, or any other governmental department, it has never been the policy of the Congress to specify the particular items which may be purchased or the ships, divisions, airplanes, or whatnot authorized to be purchased and/or operated through the use of such funds. Certainly when these governmental departments request funds they send up through the Bureau of the Budget what is properly termed "justification material" which states in general terms the purposes for which it is proposed to use the funds so requested. However, to my knowledge, the Congress has never limited the funds when available to such specific and detailed purposes. All of these functions, including the maritime, are of a purely technical character. They are influenced by changing conditions during the fiscal year. It is not only a ceiling upon the development of our merchant marine, but is a hampering restriction upon the use of the technical knowledge and discretion of our governmental departments to follow this policy.

I hope that we may soon cease this unwise procedure, and that we may return to appropriating such funds as Congress is willing to make available in annual appropriations bills without taking over the function of the Government departments, and without changing the established policy of the Congress through restrictive provisions in an appropriation bill. These provisions would have been subject to a point of order, and I believe such a point of order would have been made but for the fact that a closed rule was granted for consideration of H. R. 7072.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 157, noes 108.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 578, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Fisher amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], reducing the appropriation for the Tennessee Valley Authority, on page 35, line 14, by $14,000,000.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The so-called Fisher amendment relates to the reduction of housing units, does it not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. It is the Yates amendment as amended by the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. The amendment that will be voted upon will be the Yates amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Fisher amendment is also the Yates amendment, is it not?

The SPEAKER. No. It is vice versa.

Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. YATES: Page 24, strike out line 11, all the language down to and including the word "Congress" in line 25 and insert the following: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949 (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1953 the commencement of construction of in excess of 5,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration in respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 5,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1953, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 192, nays 168, answered "present" 1, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—192

Aandahl	Bennett, Fla.	Byrnes
Abernethy	Bentsen	Carlyle
Adair	Berry	Chatham
Allen, Calif.	Betts	Chenoweth
Allen, Ill.	Bishop	Chiperfield
Allen, La.	Blackney	Church
Andersen, H. Carl	Bonner	Cole, Kans.
	Bow	Cole, N. Y.
Anderson, Calif.	Bramblett	Colmer
Andresen, August H.	Brehm	Cooley
	Brooks	Cotton
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cox
Armstrong	Bryson	Crawford
Baker	Budge	Crumpacker
Barden	Buffett	Cunningham
Bates, Mass.	Burleson	Curtis, Nebr.
Beamer	Burton	Dague
Beckworth	Busbey	Davis, Ga.
Belcher	Bush	Davis, Wis.

Dempsey	Johnson	Reece, Tenn.
Denny	Jonas	Reed, Ill.
Devereux	Jones,	Reed, N. Y.
D'Ewart	Hamilton C.	Rees, Kans.
Dolliver	Jones,	Regan
Doughton	Woodrow W.	Richards
Durham	Kearney	Riley
Ellsworth	Kearns	Rogers, Fla.
Elston	Keating	Rogers, Mass.
Fenton	Kilburn	Ross
Fisher	Kilday	St. George
Ford	King, Pa.	Schenck
Gamble	Latham	Schwabe
Gary	LeCompte	Scrivner
Gathings	Lovre	Scudder
Gavin	Lucas	Shafer
George	Lyle	Sheehan
Golden	McCulloch	Simpson, Ill.
Goodwin	McDonough	Simpson, Pa.
Graham	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Gross	McIntire	Smith, Miss.
Gwinn	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Hagen	McVey	Smith, Wis.
Hale	Mack, Wash.	Springer
Hall,	Mahon	Stanley
Edwin Arthur	Martin, Mass.	Stockman
Harden	Mason	Taber
Harris	Meader	Talle
Harrison, Nebr.	Miller, Md.	Teague
Harrison, Wyo.	Miller, Nebr.	Thompson,
Harvey	Miller, N. Y.	Mich.
Hébert	Mills	Thompson, Tex.
Herlong	Murray, Tenn.	Vail
Hill	Nelson	Van Pelt
Hillings	Nicholson	Van Zandt
Hoeven	Norblad	Vinson
Hoffman, Ill.	Norrell	Vursell
Hoffman, Mich.	Osmers	Werdel
Hope	Ostertag	Wharton
Horan	Patterson	Whitten
Hunter	Phillips	Wigglesworth
Ikard	Pickett	Williams, Miss.
Jackson, Calif.	Poage	Willis
Jarman	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.
Jenison	Prouty	Wilson, Tex.
Jenkins	Radwan	Winstead
Jensen	Redden	Wood, Idaho

NAYS—168

Addonizio	Gore	O'Brien, Ill.
Albert	Granahan	O'Brien, Mich.
Andrews	Green	O'Neill
Anfuso	Greenwood	O'Toole
Angell	Gregory	Patman
Aspinall	Hand	Perkins
Ayres	Hardy	Philbin
Bakewell	Havenner	Polk
Barrett	Hays, Ark.	Powell
Beall	Hays, Ohio	Preston
Bender	Heller	Price
Bennett, Mich.	Heselton	Priest
Blatnik	Hess	Rains
Boggs, Del.	Holifield	Ramsay
Boggs, La.	Holmes	Rankin
Bray	Howell	Reams
Brown, Ga.	Irving	Rhodes
Buckley	Jackson, Wash.	Riehlman
Burnside	Javits	Robeson
Camp	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Canfield	Jones, Mo.	Rogers, Colo.
Cannon	Judd	Rooney
Carnahan	Karsten, Mo.	Roosevelt
Case	Kean	Sabath
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Sadlak
Chelf	Kelly, N. Y.	Sasscer
Chudoff	Kennedy	Saylor
Clemente	Keogh	Scott, Hardie
Cooper	Kerr	Scott,
Coudert	King, Calif.	Hugh D., Jr.
Crosser	Kirwan	Secrest
Curtis, Mo.	Klein	Seely-Brown
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Shelley
Dawson	Lane	Sheppard
Deane	Lanham	Sieminski
DeGraffenried	Lantaff	Sittler
Delaney	Lesinski	Spence
Denton	Lind	Steed
Dingell	McCarthy	Stigler
Donohue	McCormack	Sutton
Donovan	McGrath	Tackett
Dorn	McGuire	Taylor
Eberharter	McKinnon	Thomas
Elliott	McMullen	Thornberry
Engle	Machrowicz	Tollefson
Evins	Mack, Ill.	Trimble
Fallon	Madden	Walter
Feighan	Magee	Watts
Fernandez	Mansfield	Wier
Fine	Marshall	Williams, N. Y.
Forand	Merrow	Withrow
Forrester	Mitchell	Wolverton
Frazier	Morris	Yates
Fulton	Morrison	Yorty
Furcolo	Moulder	Zablocki
Garmatz	Multer	
Gordon	Mumma	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Patten

NOT VOTING—71

Abbitt	Fugate	Murphy
Auchincloss	Granger	Murray, Wis.
Bailey	Grant	O'Hara
Baring	Hall,	O'Konski
Bates, Ky.	Leonard W.	Passman
Battle	Halleck	Potter
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	Rabaut
Bolton	Hart	Ribicoff
Bosone	Hedrick	Rivers
Boykin	Heffernan	Roberts
Brownson	Herter	Rogers, Tex.
Buchanan	Hinshaw	Short
Burdick	Hull	Sikes
Butler	James	Staggers
Carrigg	Kee	Velde
Clevenger	Kersten, Wis.	Vorys
Combs	Larcade	Weichel
Corbett	McConnell	Welch
Dollinger	Martin, Iowa	Wheeler
Dondero	Miller, Calif.	Wickersham
Doyle	Morano	Widnall
Eaton	Morgan	Wolcott
Flood	Morton	Wood, Ga.
Fogarty	Murdock	Woodruff

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Granger against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mrs. Bolton against.

Mr. Rogers of Texas for, with Mr. Widnall against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Bolling against.

Mr. Fassman for, with Mr. Corbett against.

Mr. Carrigg for, with Mr. Herter against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. O'Konski against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Auchincloss against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Ribicoff against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Vorys for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Patten for, with Mr. Murdock against.

Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. James.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Scudder.

Mr. Combs with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Fugate with Mr. Potter.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Wood of Georgia with Mr. Morton.

Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Welch with Mr. Brownson.

Mr. Wheeler with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Morano.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. MURDOCK. If he were present, he would vote "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

Mr. KEARNEY changed his vote from nay to yea.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 35, line 14, strike out "$185,270,000" and insert "$171,270,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 199, nays 159, answered "present" 1, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—199

Aandahl	Fisher	Miller, N. Y.
Adair	Ford	Mumma
Allen, Calif.	Fulton	Nelson
Allen, Ill.	Gamble	Nicholson
Allen, La.	Gary	Norblad
Andersen,	Gathings	Osmers
H. Carl	Gavin	Ostertag
Anderson, Calif.	George	Patterson
Andresen,	Goodwin	Phillips
August H.	Graham	Pickett
Arends	Greenwood	Polk
Armstrong	Gross	Poulson
Ayres	Gwinn	Prouty
Bakewell	Hale	Radwan
Barden	Hall,	Reams
Bates, Mass.	Edwin Arthur	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Hand	Reed, N. Y.
Beamer	Harden	Rees, Kans.
Belcher	Hardy	Regan
Bender	Harrison, Nebr.	Richards
Bentsen	Harrison, Wyo.	Riehlman
Berry	Harvey	Robeson
Betts	Hébert	Rogers, Fla.
Blackney	Herlong	Rogers, Mass.
Boggs, Del.	Heselton	Ross
Boggs, La.	Hess	Sadlak
Bonner	Hill	St. George
Bow	Hillings	Sasscer
Bramblett	Hoeven	Saylor
Bray	Hoffman, Ill.	Schenck
Brehm	Hoffman, Mich.	Schwabe
Brooks	Hope	Scott, Hardie
Brown, Ohio	Hunter	Scott,
Budge	Ikard	Hugh D., Jr.
Buffett	Jackson, Calif.	Scrivner
Burleson	Jenison	Scudder
Burton	Jenkins	Secrest
Busbey	Jensen	Seely-Brown
Bush	Jonas	Shafer
Byrnes, Wis.	Jones,	Sheehan
Canfield	Hamilton C.	Simpson, Pa.
Carlyle	Jones,	Sittler
Case	Woodrow W.	Smith, Kans.
Chatham	Judd	Smith, Va.
Chenoweth	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Chiperfield	Kearney	Springer
Church	Kearns	Stanley
Cole, Kans.	Keating	Stockman
Cole, N. Y.	Kelley, Pa.	Taber
Cooley	Kennedy	Talle
Cotton	Kilburn	Taylor
Coudert	King, Pa.	Teague
Crawford	Lantaff	Thompson,
Crumpacker	Latham	Mich.
Cunningham	LeCompte	Thornberry
Curtis, Mo.	Lind	Tollefson
Curtis, Nebr.	Lovre	Vail
Dague	McCulloch	Van Pelt
Davis, Wis.	McDonough	Van Zandt
Denny	McGregor	Vinson
Devereux	McIntire	Werdel
D'Ewart	McMillan	Wharton
Dolliver	McVey	Wigglesworth
Durham	Mahon	Williams, N. Y.
Eberharter	Martin, Mass.	Willis
Ellsworth	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Elston	Meader	Wolverton
Fallon	Merrow	Wood, Idaho
Fenton	Miller, Md.	

NAYS—159

Abernethy	Crosser	Gore
Addonizio	Davis, Ga.	Granahan
Albert	Davis, Tenn.	Green
Andrews	Dawson	Gregory
Anfuso	Deane	Hagen
Angell	DeGraffenried	Harris
Aspinall	Delaney	Havenner
Baker	Dempsey	Hays, Ark.
Barrett	Denton	Heller
Beckworth	Dingell	Holifield
Bennett, Fla.	Donohue	Holmes
Bennett, Mich.	Donovan	Horan
Bishop	Dorn	Howell
Blatnik	Doughton	Hull
Brown, Ga.	Elliott	Irving
Bryson	Engle	Jackson, Wash.
Buckley	Evins	Jarman
Camp	Feighan	Javits
Cannon	Fernandez	Johnson
Carnahan	Fine	Jones, Ala.
Celler	Forand	Jones, Mo.
Chelf	Forrester	Karsten, Mo.
Chudoff	Frazier	Kelly, N. Y.
Clemente	Furcolo	Keogh
Colmer	Garmatz	Kerr
Cooper	Golden	Kilday
Cox	Gordon	King, Calif.

Kirwan	Moulder	Roosevelt
Klein	Multer	Sabath
Kluczynski	Murray, Tenn.	Shelley
Lane	Norrell	Sheppard
Lanham	O'Brien, Ill.	Sieminski
Lesinski	O'Brien, Mich.	Simpson, Ill.
Lucas	O'Neill	Smith, Miss.
Lyle	O'Toole	Spence
McCarthy	Patman	Steed
McCormack	Perkins	Stigler
McGrath	Philbin	Sutton
McGuire	Poage	Tackett
McKinnon	Powell	Thomas
McMullen	Preston	Thompson, Tex.
Machrowicz	Price	Trimble
Mack, Ill.	Priest	Vursell
Mack, Wash.	Rains	Walter
Madden	Ramsay	Watts
Magee	Rankin	Whitten
Mansfield	Redden	Wier
Marshall	Reece, Tenn.	Williams, Miss.
Miller, Nebr.	Rhodes	Winstead
Mills	Riley	Withrow
Mitchell	Rodino	Yates
Morris	Rogers, Colo.	Yorty
Morrison	Rooney	Zablocki

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Patten

NOT VOTING—73

Abbitt	Fugate	Murray, Wis.
Auchincloss	Granger	O'Hara
Bailey	Grant	O'Konski
Baring	Hall,	Passman
Bates, Ky.	Leonard W.	Potter
Battle	Halleck	Rabaut
Bolling	Harrison, Va.	Ribicoff
Bolton	Hart	Rivers
Bosone	Hays, Ohio	Roberts
Boykin	Hedrick	Rogers, Tex.
Brownson	Heffernan	Short
Buchanan	Herter	Sikes
Burdick	Hinshaw	Staggers
Burnside	James	Velde
Butler	Kee	Vorys
Carrigg	Kersten, Wis.	Weichel
Clevenger	Larcade	Welch
Combs	McConnell	Wheeler
Corbett	Martin, Iowa	Wickersham
Dollinger	Miller, Calif.	Widnall
Dondero	Morano	Wilson, Tex.
Doyle	Morgan	Wolcott
Eaton	Morton	Wood, Ga.
Flood	Murdock	Woodruff
Fogarty	Murphy	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Fogarty against.

Mr. Butler for, with Mr. Bolling against.

Mr. McConnell for, with Mr. Granger against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. Doyle against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Hedrick against.

Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Hart against.

Mr. Leonard W. Hall for, with Mr. Bates of Kentucky against.

Mr. Vorys for, with Mr. Dollinger against.

Mr. Patton for, with Mr. Murdock against.

Mr. Carrigg for, with Mr. Flood against.

Mr. Harrison of Virginia for, with Mr. Rivers against.

Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Boykin against.

Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Clevenger for, with Mr. Wheeler against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Combs against.

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Battle against.

Mr. Widnall for, with Mr. Kee against.

Mr. Wolcott for, with Mr. Wood of Georgia against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Grant against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Staggers with Mr. James.

Mr. Barring with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Bailey with Mr. Burdick.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BISHOP changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. MURDOCK. If he were present he would have voted "nay." I voted "yea." I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. COUDERT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COUDERT moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 64, after line 21, add a new section 405 as follows:

"SEC. 405. Money appropriated in this act shall be available for expenditure in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, only to the extent that expenditure thereof shall not result in total aggregate expenditures of all agencies provided for herein beyond the total sum of $6,900,000,000."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 112, noes 209.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO CORRECT SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CONSUMERS PRICE INDEX FOR FEBRUARY 1952

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, our vigorous anti-inflation program is beginning to achieve results. I am delighted to see that the Consumers Price Index for February shows a slight decline of six-tenths of 1 percent. This means that the load which the consumer has had to carry is beginning to ease off. Our anti-inflation program has arrested the upward swing of prices and is slowly bringing them back to decent levels.

Let us not be premature in our self-congratulations. We are achieving stabilization—yes. But we are achieving it at a level which places the necessities of life beyond the reach of millions of Americans whose incomes have not kept pace with the price rises. Price levels are still unfair to fixed income families: school teachers, clergymen, white-collar workers, veterans living on pensions and disability allowances, and senior citizens living on savings and annuities.

NO TIME TO ABANDON INFLATION CONTROLS

This will no doubt be the occasion for a loud chorus of demands to kill OPS. It will spark hundreds of lobby campaigns for special amendments to prohibit any controls over individual products even though their prices may rise seriously in the future.

This is no time to talk of weakening the Defense Production Act. The wolf is off the front porch, but he may still be lurking in the garden.

We know not what dangers lie ahead.

Some factors continue to militate for higher prices. Increases allowed under the Capehart amendment have already resulted in annual price increases of

$800,000,000. The tempo of military production has yet to reach its peak.

To demolish our dikes against inflation at this time would be a historic folly.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE OF SOLDIERS OF POLAND

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, may it please the House:

I want to very briefly discuss the Katyn Forest massacre of thousands of Polish soldiers. I serve on the congressional committee investigating it.

I cannot possibly tell you the story of Katyn Forest in the few minutes' time I have today. I can merely tell you a fraction of it. I think the very first time it will be told in its entirety will be some months from now when we file our report.

Katyn is the name of a forest in Russia near the ancient city of Smolensk. Katyn Forest has existed for centuries, but its significance in world history begins in September of 1939.

POLAND IS ATTACKED

On September 1, in that year, Hitler had attacked Poland and the mechanized might of the Nazis swept into Poland across the western borders. Great as were the odds against them, the Polish troops fought magnificently. They were the first to resist Nazi aggression.

After 17 days of heroic resistance, an ominous rumble came from the east and Soviet Russia swept across the undefended eastern border of Poland. They came, they said, to aid Poland and to defend the Polish Nation against the Nazi onslaught. They asked the leaders of Poland's gallant army to cooperate with Russia against the common enemy. They promised to respect the territorial integrity of Poland and they made many other promises, none of which was kept.

OFFICERS SEPARATED FROM ENLISTED MEN

There is much to the story but, to shorten it as much as possible, let me simply say that thousands of Polish warriors were taken and held in custody by the Russians. Then, gradually, the Russians began to separate the Polish enlisted men from the officers. Finally approximately 15,000 officers were quartered in three prison camps in Russia—the camps of Kozielsk, Starobielsk, and Ostáshkov. There they were allowed to write home to their families and, by correspondence, they kept in touch with their loved ones.

SILENCE

That was the situation from fall of 1939 until spring of 1940—then silence, and nothing more. It was as though the earth had suddenly opened, and swallowed up thousands of Polish prisoners.

RUSSIAN-POLISH RECONCILIATION

During all this time, world events were happening in rapid sequence. In September of 1939 the Nazis and the Russians had joined forces. That alliance continued until June of 1941. That month the Nazis attacked Russia. Immediately after that Russia joined the Allied Powers and, in that capacity, became the ally of Poland, too. On August 12, 1941, there was a formal reconciliation between Russia and Poland, with a clause stipulating that Russia would release all Polish citizens. Poland agreed to form a Polish Army to help in the fight against the Nazis. Russia accordingly issued a decree releasing all Polish prisoners, and the gates of prisons and camps were opened. Polish soldiers began reporting to places where the Polish Army was forming—they came by the thousands—but very few officers reported.

"WHERE ARE OUR OFFICERS?"

Of course it was a puzzling circumstance and the Polish leaders renewed their inquiries of the Soviet authorities. "About 15,000 of our Polish officers are missing," they said, "officers who were taken in custody by Soviet Russia in September of 1939. Since early 1940 no one has seen or heard from them, or of them, directly or indirectly. Where are our missing officers?" was the question Polish officials asked of Russian officials.

The inquiries went as high as Stalin himself, and the question was asked time after time, month after month, year after year. The answer? There was no one answer—in fact, often there was not even any reply at all. But when there were replies, they ranged from evasions to outright denials.

"They have all been returned home," the Russians said. But the Polish families knew better. "They have gone to join the Polish Army," the Russians said. The Polish Army knew that was not true. "They escaped into Manchuria; they were given to Germany; we do not have records," were other answers.

Words, words, words—but no Polish officers.

KATYN FOREST

At any rate, in June of 1941 the Nazis had surged into Russia. In August of 1941 they took control over Russian territory in the Smolensk area, including Katyn Forest, that secluded woods near Smolensk.

Quiet, peaceful, beautiful Katyn Forest was an ideal place for a family picnic, a sheltered glen in the beautiful countryside. It seemed to be a majestic island of peace in the sea of inhumanity and brutality of warring nations, somehow detached and apart from the savage war that had steeped the civilized world in blood.

That was Katyn Forest, its lofty trees reaching up into the heavens, the limbs spread protectingly over the world below, the foliage sheltering the soft earth. Yes, that was Katyn Forest; a place of quiet and beauty; and it was here that Poland found some of her missing sons.

THE GERMAN ANNOUNCEMENT

The German announcement was in the form of a crisp, official bulletin, issued on April 13, 1943:

Bulletin: From Smolensk comes news that the native population has revealed to German authorities the spot where, in secret mass executions, the Bolsheviks murdered 10,000 Polish officers. German authorities made a horrible discovery. They found a pit 90 feet long by 50 feet wide in which, 12 deep, lay the bodies of 3,000 Polish officers. Search and discovery of other pits continue.

END OF THE TRAIL

The long search was over. The missing Polish officers had been found.

THE INVESTIGATION BEGINS

Events moved rapidly after that. Russia said the prisoners had been in camps in that area, that they fell into German hands and, if murdered, the Germans had done it. The Polish asked the International Red Cross Committee at Geneva, Switzerland, to investigate. The International Red Cross was a neutral organ. Germany also made the same request, but Russia did not. As a result of Russia's refusal, the International Red Cross Committee did not conduct an investigation. Russia not only refused to ask for an investigation but Russia also broke off diplomatic relations with Poland.

GERMANY ACCUSES RUSSIA

The next step was taken by Germany. A commission was appointed composed of medical authorities from many nations. There were doctors and university professors from Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Croatia, the Netherlands, Bohemia, Rumania, Switzerland, Slovakia, Hungary, and Moravia. This so-called German investigation was made from April 28 through the 30th, in 1943. The conclusion was that the murders had been committed by the Russians approximately 3 years before.

RUSSIA ACCUSES GERMANY

The war continued and in August of 1943 Russia recaptured Smolensk and the Katyn Forest area. In January of 1944 the so-called Russian investigation was conducted by Russian doctors. The conclusion was that the murders had been committed by the Germans in 1941.

THE FULL STORY

There is so much more to tell. It would take hours to recount details of each investigation; of reports filed by United States investigators, missing or concealed; of the farcical trial at Nuremburg; of United States broadcasts during the war; and of testimony of witnesses heard by our congressional committee in the past few months.

It would take hours to tell. And there is much that has never been told.

WHY A KATYN FOREST COMMITTEE?

If I may digress for just a minute, that is one of the reasons for the establishment of a committee of the Congress of the United States to investigate the massacre. The Katyn Forest Massacre Committee was formed for several reasons. Without listing them all, because time does not permit, let me just enumerate a few of them:

NAME THE GUILTY NATION

First, the nation guilty of committing the murders must be identified after an investigation that will be considered to be unbiased, impartial, and fair. It is not only that this generation should know but it is also imperative that the

verdict be recorded for history. Regardless of what our own opinions may be, certainly posterity is not going to accept the investigation report of either Germany or Russia when those two nations each stand accused of the crime.

AMERICA'S DUTY

Second, America is the world's major neutral country. We stand for truth and justice. We have told all the nations of the world that we will seek truth and justice for any people who have been victims of totalitarian atrocities. All nations in the world, even those behind the iron curtain, know that is our proud boast. They also know of the Katyn massacre. What better test of our good faith than an American investigation? Is that not a duty we in America—the leader of the free world—owe to all the people of the world?

MAKE THE ACCUSATION

Third, eventually of course, the United Nations should take action. America should assume leadership in making such a recommendation to the United Nations and I have already asked President Truman to be ready to assume that responsibility.

But of course no one in America would want to make such a recommendation solely on the basis of any conclusion reached by either Germany or Russia, when it is agreed that one of those two nations committed the murders. An investigation by the committee of the Congress of the United States should result in a carefully documented presentation of facts to the President of the United States on which he would be completely justified in asking the United Nations for action.

It will be more difficult for the United Nations to refuse consideration of a request that carries the dignity and weight of a carefully considered and fully documented investigation. If America is to take leadership in asking for United Nations action, America of course must first have taken the time and trouble to study the case, prepare the evidence, and present a factual indictment. That is the purpose, the function, and the responsibility of a congressional committee.

REVEAL THE FACTS

Fourth. Aside from everything else, there have been stories for years that one or more departments or agencies or branches of the United States Government have covered up and hushed up some phases of the Katyn massacre. Reports filed by United States investigators have been missing or misplaced or concealed. There is also some question about the truth of certain statements made by official information bureaus of the United States Government. Of course in that situation no other nation in the entire world except America has the right or duty to investigate that phase of the case.

IT WILL SAVE LIVES

Fifth. American boys and the boys of other nations are being captured in Korea. They will be prisoners of some nation just as the Polish officers had been prisoners. Let us let every nation in the world know that America will not overlook treatment of prisoners. Let the Katyn investigation be an example of that. If any nation is disposed to illtreat prisoners, knowledge that the United States will take action—and the Katyn investigation is the proof—may cause such nation to think twice. The Katyn investigation may save prisoners in the Korean war or in other wars. It may save the lives of American boys as well as boys of other nations.

GENOCIDE

There are many other reasons, but they take too long to discuss in the time available to me today. But it does not take long to tell one part on which everyone agrees: the bodies of about 5,000 Polish officers were found in Katyn Forest. Each one had been killed by one bullet fired in the back of the skull, coming out at the forehead.

Murder? Yes; but more than that. It was genocide.

The dictionary defines genocide as, "the deliberate and systematic extermination of a racial, political, or cultural group." Let me tell you what the 15,000 murdered Polish officers meant to Poland. I say 15,000 even though less than 5,000 bodies have been found. The other 10,000 are still missing, but there is no real doubt of their fate.

THE MEANING OF GENOCIDE

What did the fifteen thousand mean to Poland? Let me tell you in the words of former Ambassador Tadeusz Romer. Here is part of his testimony before our committee, and I quote:

> Among them were top- and high-ranking Polish Army officers; also well-known scientists, politicians, lawyers, editors, physicians, economists, and clergymen. They were the flower of the Polish intelligentsia. These men were, of course, badly needed, not only for our war effort, but also in connection with future plans for mutilated Poland.

It was put another way by another witness, Colonel Grobicki, who had been in the prison camp at Koziélsk. He said, and I quote:

> In Kosiélsk there was concentrated the brain of the Polish Nation. By killing these men, they wanted to put away the brain of the Polish Nation. It is much easier to handle the people when the intelligentsia, the brain of the nation, is put away.

Or, as it was put by a witness at the hearing in Chicago:

> The massacre at Katyn destroyed the creative force of Poland.

SELECTIVE MURDER

The massacre at Katyn Forest was genocide—a cold-blooded, deliberate, calculated attempt to destroy the leadership of Poland. There have been many mass exterminations and wholesale killings that far exceeded the number murdered at Katyn. But there has never been such a wholesale case of selective murder.

There have been exterminations of millions—ruthlessly, indiscriminately—without regard to which were leaders and which were rank and file. But Katyn marks the first time in recent history, at least, of genocide in the sense of selective, discriminate, and carefully planned murder intended to eliminate solely the leadership of a nation, yet keep the masses, the rank and file, alive—for exploitation, for slavery, or for whatever purpose was in the minds of the murderers.

The aim was to eliminate the leadership that might lead those masses in resistance; to destroy the intelligentsia that might teach the less educated the truth; and to kill the creative force that might rebuild a nation. It was genocide—to keep a gallant nation from its true destiny.

The perpetrators of the Katyn massacre well knew how easy it is to lead the flock of sheep once the shepherd has been removed.

Oh, yes, there have been greater mass murders and exterminations than at Katyn. That is not its significance. Its significance lies rather in the attempt to enslave an entire nation by destroying its leadership. The purpose was to cut off the head, but keep the body to work.

A CRIME AGAINST HUMANITY

There is much more to the Katyn Forest story. As I said in the beginning, it cannot possibly be told in this brief time. All I have hoped to do is to awaken your interest a little because it is important that you know about it. It is not a crime against only the Polish people: It is a crime against humanity.

I know of the interest of those of Polish descent. In fact, I have received literally dozens of invitations to speak on Katyn from Polish organizations in half the States of the Nation. But it should not be a matter solely of concern to the Polish people. It concerns everyone.

THE WORLD MUST REMEMBER

You may never have heard even the name of Katyn before, but now you have. And you will hear more of it—and your children will. Every generation born in every country in the world must hear of it, learn the truth about it, know what it means, and understand its significance in the history of mankind.

Until we all know the terrible truth about it, the ghosts of Katyn will haunt the world—not merely crying out for vengeance—far more than that—pleading for truth and knowledge and justice, so that never again will there be another Katyn.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

IS THERE A SUBVERSIVE MOVEMENT IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS?

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the somewhat voluminous documentation which I am presenting here may be charged against a practice in which Congressmen—and perhaps even others—sometimes indulge. It is proof that a public speaker's departure from text can have unanticipated results.

This document might be described as the product of freedom rather than planning—in this instance, freedom of speech.

The whole thing started innocently enough. Its origins were entirely casual and unpremeditated.

The initial incident occurred during the recess of Congress, at a dinner meeting of a Republican club in my home State, although outside my own district, at which I was the guest speaker.

In the course of my address, and by way of elaborating a point which I do not now even recall, I mentioned that I had recently received an invitation from a superintendent of schools in my district to deliver a nonpolitical talk in the high school but that the invitation was subsequently withdrawn by a somewhat embarrassed superintendent who explained that there had been objections from school board members. In referring to this occurrence, I commented in my speech that the school board "evidently had knuckled under to the Democrats." I further remarked that it was not the only such experience I have had, and I added that invitations to Congressmen to make such nonpolitical talks in the schools had become rare, although they were a commonplace in times past.

Subsequently I was queried by my home-town newspaper about these remarks. I repeated them and added the comment that there are "subversive activities and movements in some of the schools of the country and in some teachers' colleges."

There was one other item in my original remarks which is part of this narrative. In connection with a comment I made to the effect that Americans need to find some means of creating greater interest and activity in local elections—including school elections—I raised the question as to whether this lack of interest was not due, in part at least, to the trend toward nonpartisan local elections. I offered the observation that partisan elections generally create greater public interest than those conducted on a nonpartisan basis. This was later inaccurately quoted in the press as an advocacy of partisan school board elections. I did not and do not advocate such a policy and I certainly am unalterably opposed to injecting party politics into the schools.

The sequel of this incident and of the publicity given my remarks—with some elaborations—by the Battle Creek newspaper, was the appearance of a newspaper article quoting anonymous spokesmen of teachers in the public schools of the Battle Creek area. These spokesmen denounced me for my comments and demanded that I either clarify and prove my charges or retract them. I was not, however, contacted directly by any representatives of the teachers at that time.

I immediately replied, through the press, calling attention to the anonymous character of this criticism and demand for retraction. While making clear that I had offered no blanket indictment of teachers and had not stated or implied that the canceled invitations to speak had occurred in the Battle Creek area, I did elaborate the subversive comment to the extent of stating the obvious truth that "an increasing number of Americans at the grass roots are concerned and disturbed over trends in educational philosophies and methods which run counter to the traditional American philosophy and principles of government."

The alleged spokesmen of the teachers thereafter made their identity known, and later the executive body of the Calhoun County branch of the Michigan Education Association adopted a resolution demanding that I prove or retract my charges.

Thereupon I invited representatives of the schools in Calhoun County to meet with me to discuss the matter. Some 60 individuals, including school superintendents, teachers, and school board members, attended. Also present was a representative of the Michigan Education Association, apparently on the invitation of the teachers' group.

The demands for proof or retraction of my charges were repeated at this meeting.

I stated that I saw no valid reason for precipitating a community controversy over the cancellation of my invitation to speak by identifying the school involved, especially since it was not located in the Battle Creek area and since my criticism, in that instance, had been directed at the school board and not at the superintendent or any teacher.

I repeated my disclaimer of "any intention of making a blanket criticism of the loyalty, conscientiousness, or good faith of members of the teaching profession." I pointed out that I had made no accusation against any individual teacher or specific school system in my district so far as my reference to subversive movements was concerned. I added, however, that I was fully aware of the fact—as they must also be—that "there are movements afoot in educational circles which are dedicated to the promotion through the schools of a system of planned and controlled economy and a system of world government to which national sovereignty in matters of national defense is to be subordinated."

I stated my conviction that there could be no question as to the right to discuss publicly the broad issues posed by this educational movement. I urged, however, that I not be required to extend that discussion or document the subject, under the circumstances, lest I appear to be making it a local issue or one based on personalities, to the detriment of the schools and the community.

Nevertheless, the demand was insistently repeated that I document the allegation, and I reluctantly agreed to do so.

Curiously, following the meeting, the two principal spokesmen for the teachers' group expressed the opinion that the matter could well be dropped. I reminded them that, at the insistence of several members of the group, I had promised, in the presence of some 60 persons, that I would provide the documentation. I added that I could not lightly break that promise.

Some weeks thereafter I received a letter from the two spokesmen repeating their insistent request for the documentation.

So far as I am concerned, there is no question as to the major issue upon which the insistence of the teachers' spokesmen is focused.

I am convinced that it is focused upon my reference to an educational movement which I labeled as "subversive."

Accordingly, I am not going to quibble over side issues.

The matter of the canceled invitations to speak is a matter of personal knowledge and first-hand experience which requires no proof or elaboration. Furthermore, it involves confidences that I will not violate.

As for the major item, the movement in public school circles which I described as "subversive," I welcome the demand that I document that subject.

As I will make abundantly clear, I make no blanket indictment of the schools or teaching profession, and I am engaged in no witch hunt.

Instead I am addressing myself to an existing educational movement which is closely identified with the program of the national "social planners"—a program which I believe bodes no good either for the schools or for the Nation.

I use the term "subversive" in the connotation of "undermining allegiance and faith." I use the term in the sense in which I assume that it was used by Dean Henry W. Holmes of the graduate school of education of Harvard University when he cautioned that "Teachers must see that their teaching is neither subversive nor reactionary"—Progressive Education, October 1933, pages 414–418.

I am certainly realistic enough to recognize that America is not perfect—neither is its government, nor its economic system, nor its social arrangements. But I believe that it is still "the last best hope on earth."

America is not perfect—but I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which "accentuates the negative," which minimizes, ignores or denies the strengths, accomplishments and potentialities of our Government, our economic system and our social arrangements, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which minimizes or denies the potentialities of individual and collective self-improvement of the American people and American institutions, save through the expanding agencies of government, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which pits class against class in America, which attributes only evil and viciousness to one class or group of citizens and only virtue to another class or group, and which proposes that the schools teach and promote such a belief and attitude, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which brands the capitalist or owner as the inevitable and implacable foe of human rights, as incapable of social conscience or responsibility, and as hostile to improvement or opportunities for improvement for his fellow men, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which insists and would teach in the public school classroom that the only solution—and the desirable solution—of the problems of Americans, of the problems of self-government, economics and social well-being, lies in increasingly bigger government, in increasing concentration of

power in centralized government, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which proposes to convert the public schools into an agency for the promotion of socialism, a planned collectivist economy, government regimentation or the welfare state, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which arrogates to the educational profession—or which undertakes to assign to any other profession or segment of the national life—the awful responsibility of "social reconstruction," is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement which urges the teachers or any other single group in the national life "to reach for power and then make the most of its conquest," and which claims for any single group a freedom from accountability to the public and an immunity from public criticism, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which proposes to convert the public schools into an agency for the promotion of supernational sovereignty or world government and which urges the systematic eradication—beginning in the kindergarten—of nationalism, and which decrees that nationalism and the loyalties which it involves must go, is subversive.

I believe that an educational movement and philosophy which, in the name of so-called progressive education and academic freedom, attributes supreme virtue to the new, to the attitude of critical skepticism, to cynical distrust of human motives and impulses, and which, at the same time, belittles the old, decries inherited loyalties, and minimizes truths and values established by past experience, is subversive.

In all of this I am expressing my own opinion and judgment.

But in the material which follows I am not presenting personal opinion. I am documenting a movement in public-school education from the record and testimony of its own leaders and adherents.

I. A STATEMENT OF THE SUBJECT UNDER DISCUSSION

This is a documentation of a movement and a trend in present-day public-school education in the United States.

Basically, the fact here documented is that a significantly influential segment of public-school leadership in the United States proclaims—as it has been proclaiming for some 20 years—the right and duty of teachers, school administrators, and educational leaders to undertake to remake American society and government through the agency and medium of the public schools.

This movement and trend have found, and continue to find, advocacy, expression and implementation through the policy pronouncements of educational organizations, through professional books and journals, through the counsel and instruction of teachers of teachers in colleges of education and at educational conferences and workshops, and through the activities of disciples of the movement in developing curricular content and classroom procedures in elementary and secondary public schools.

I have used the two terms "movement" and "trend" advisedly, although I will use the single term "movement" hereafter for brevity. What is here described is a movement, since it involves planned and organized activities directed to specific ends; it is also a trend, in the sense that the effects and influence of the movement extend beyond specific, organized, and planned activities.

Certain basic premises characterize this movement:

First. It proclaims that capitalism in the United States is doomed—that it is dead, or dying—and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of planned economy, government control, or outright socialization, essentially new and different in character, is both desirable and inevitable.

Second. This movement and its sponsors hold that the schools should participate actively in building a new social order along these collectivist lines, that this activity should be carried on either through outright indoctrination of these premises and concepts or through processes of guided group study and discussion and uncoerced persuasion within the classroom, and that the schools, through both the content and methods of instruction, should prepare and condition the child for participation in that new social order.

Third. The movement calls for such revision of the educational system, and of its philosophy, procedures, and subject matter, as is necessary to advance and accomplish these purposes.

Fourth. More extreme educational sponsors of this movement also hold that the transition to collectivism will, in all probability, involve class conflict; that the schools, accordingly, should adopt the class approach in their educational activities, aline themselves with the worker class, and utilize class consciousness and conflict as a "potential resource."

Fifth. Advocates of the program of social reconstruction through the schools recognize the inevitability of opposition to that program and accordingly propose certain "steps to power" designed to enable the schools and the profession to deal, both offensively and defensively, with the anticipated resistance.

Sixth. The movement also includes advocacy of a variety of other subsidiary proposals for changes in the form, philosophy, and procedures of government in the United States.

Seventh. Since teachers are envisioned by this movement as "engineers of social change," the political-economic-social views of teachers become a matter of vital concern to advocates of social reconstruction through the schools.

Eighth. Since the Second World War, the program of social reconstruction through the schools has received significant restatement in a formally adopted program of the progressive education organization.

Ninth. A further postwar development in the movement has been the addition of the goal of world government and a supernational sovereignty to the program of social reconstruction through the schools.

These are the main features, the principal tenets, of the movement here being described, and the foregoing summary constitutes a brief outline of the material documented herein.

There should be further preliminary understandings with respect to this documentation.

I make no claim that it is complete or exhaustive. The source material itself is too voluminous even for complete perusal; moreover, constant additions are being made to the literature of the movement. I do claim, however, that the documentation offered is fairly typical and representative of the basic premises and objectives of the movement as stated by its own advocates and adherents.

I have attempted to identify my sources with painstaking care. A partial bibliography of the movement is appended to this document. I have also attempted to indicate accurately the official educational position held by the professional leaders quoted and the exact professional status of any educational organizations referred to.

I have made no attempt to estimate or compute, on any statistical basis, the extent of the acceptance of the tenets of this movement among members of the teaching and school administration professions. I do not know of any information available in this form. In any event the influence of such a movement can scarcely be gauged in such terms. Later I will have occasion to cite certain estimates of the influence of the progressive education movement, offered by its own spokesmen, including a statement of the peak membership of the organization. In another instance, I will cite the tabulations of a survey of teacher sentiment on political-economic-social issues, polled by leaders of the movement here documented. But that is the extent of my statistical information.

I make no attempt to single out individual teachers or specific school systems which may be adherents of this movement. I do not have access to such information and I am engaged in no such enterprise. Responsibility for alertness to this movement, at the local level and in specific school systems, rests with local boards of education, parent-teacher and other community groups, and with all interested parents and citizens.

If this documentation adds to the general knowledge and understanding of the movement and increases public awareness of need for local vigilance, it will serve its purpose.

I wish particularly to emphasize that I am not indulging, and have never indulged, in any blanket indictment of the public-school system or of the teaching profession. I will have more to say on that point a little later.

By the way of summing up the basic facts which are the subject of this documentation, I cite a statement made by the late Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, long professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, a gentleman who was by no means hostile to the movement here being documented. Speaking at a meeting of the Department of Superintendence of the Na-

tional Education Association—now the American Association of School Administrators—on February 27, 1935, Dr. Kilpatrick said with respect to members of the profession:

> There are many who think that our social-economic system should be radically reconstructed. To this proposal, opinion responds over a wide range from an extreme yes to an extreme no, with all gradations in between. Some who are most anxious to bring about this social-economic reconstruction urge the school to take an active part in helping to build the new social order. To this proposal also, opinion responds over a wide range from an extreme yes through intermediate positions to an extreme no. (NEA Proceedings, 1935, p. 567.)

This documentation is concerned with the segment of the profession falling in the area "left of center"—veering in the direction of what Dr. Kilpatrick called the "extreme yes" with respect to the two propositions he mentioned. More specifically, this documentation is concerned with the organized, vocal and aggressive element of the educational profession dedicated to the support of the social reconstruction through the schools movement.

II. THE SMEAR CHARGE

No responsible American would wish to place the public school system or the teaching profession generally under a cloud of suspicion.

Unfortunately there are those who are willing to take advantage of that very fact in order to forestall legitimate criticism or exposure of abuses.

There are those who instantly respond to a discussion and documentation of the type here being undertaken with the cry of "smear."

The ultimate effect of cowering before that outcry would, of course, be to estop all necessary and proper criticism.

If this documentation does result in misgivings with respect to the public schools and the teaching profession, the responsibility for those misgivings must rest upon the movement being documented, not upon the documentation.

Indeed, as I see it, one of the potential values of this documentation is that it defines—or at least undertakes, in good faith, to define—the particular movement under discussion with sufficient objectivity and accuracy that the interested American will be able clearly to distinguish between those who are advocates or adherents of the movement, and those who are not. That, certainly, is the complete opposite of a blanket indictment or an indiscriminate smear.

It is regrettable that there is currently prevalent an official and widely expressed attitude among many leaders of public school education which adds to public confusion and misunderstanding and so tends to cast an unmerited shadow of suspicion upon the public schools and the teaching profession. I believe it is important to call attention to this attitude before moving into my actual documentation.

I refer to the attitude of hypersensitivity, resentment and hostility to criticism of the schools verging upon a persecution complex, which has even produced a blanket denunciation of critics of the schools as "the enemy."

It is not an exaggeration to say that educational officialdom has declared an open season on critics of the schools.

Typical of the official pronouncements on this score is a resolution adopted by the Michigan Education Association on August 25, 1951, condemning "the irresponsible attacks which are now being made on our schools, their personnel and procedures, attacks which often are designed to discredit the public schools, reduce their financial support, curtail their program, and destroy free public education for all children." The MEA pledged its resources "to expose and combat" these "vicious attacks."

The National Education Association at its San Francisco convention, July 6, 1951, adopted a resolution asserting that—

> The NEA believes that one of the year's most challenging problems is presented by attacks of front organizations and pressure groups on the public schools, on their teachers and administrators, and on the quality of instruction. The Association believes in and welcomes honest and constructive criticism but condemns general and irresponsible attacks on schools. Often the real purpose of such attacks is found to be the reduction of school costs and the curtailment of the public school program. (NEA Journal, September 1951, p. 383.)

The thirtieth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, entitled "The American School Superintendency," devotes several paragraphs to the subject "Attacks on the Schools." It quotes an article by Arthur D. Morse in McCall's magazine—September 1951—to the effect that—

> Public education in America is under the heaviest attack in its history. This attack is not aimed at the improvement of free education. It is aimed at its destruction.

The yearbook charges:

> In some cases this pressure may be sparked by organizations or individuals who are authoritarian in intent, seeking to destroy the American way of life by undermining public confidence in the schools. They are persistent, devious, and clever in the way they twist statements and acts of educational leaders and by innuendo and association create doubt of the motives and methods of the entire public-school system (p. 258).

One current interpretation of criticisms of the public schools is that these attacks are the result of "a central command," and that they emanate from persons "who have no competence to judge educational matters"—Fact Sheet, Community Relations Service of New York City, March 1, 1951. This same publication cites as proof of the "central command" the fact that there have been flare-ups in widely separated communities. My own home city of Battle Creek, Mich., is listed as the scene of one such flare-up, despite the fact that within the last 2 or 3 years its citizens, with the active support of the real estate and property owner groups, voted a million and a quarter dollars in extra tax funds for needed school rehabilitation and despite the fact that my home city was cited by the superintendent of schools in a national educational magazine as a model of public cooperation in support of the schools.

The same charge of a planned attack on the schools is made by David Hulburd in his book, This Happened in Pasadena, 1951:

> It is a fact that certain forces, vicious, well organized, and coldly calculating, would like to change the face of education in the United States (p. ix).

Perhaps the most shocking manifestation of the "persecution complex" was the official report on the Pasadena school controversy made to the National Education Association at its San Francisco meeting last July. In this report—Bulletin No. 35, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy through Education of the NEA—the commission chairman, Harold Benjamin, branded the opposition to the Pasadena superintendent as "the enemy" and proceeded to describe the stereotype "enemy" of the public schools.

The consequences of this defensive attitude toward criticism are extremely serious so far as the public relations of the schools are concerned. Any individual who ventures a criticism of the schools finds that he has spoken at his own peril and that he has thereby incurred the wrath of a powerfully organized pressure group. Even elected public-school officials—school-board members—discover that they are not immune from organized retaliatory pressure measures.

The impression created by this hypersensitivity to criticism is that those in educational circles demand a double standard of freedom. They seem to insist upon virtually absolute academic freedom for themselves. At the same time, they insist that criticism of the schools by the public must be restricted to what they designate as constructive—and therefore permissible.

The situation has an ironical aspect. Criticism of the public schools is not a new phenomenon. Indeed, one of the most prolific sources of criticism of the schools over the past three decades has been the very movement here being documented. This criticism has come both from within the profession and from lay supporters of the movement. Yet this criticism has brought no answering denunciations from educational officialdom, no labeling of the critics as "the enemy," no accusations of a plot under central command" to destroy the schools. Instead, spokesmen of this movement have often been welcome speakers at educational conferences, applauded to an echo for their attacks on the schools.

Leaders in this movement have repeatedly insisted—and continue to insist—that the schools are "in need of thorough reconstruction." They have charged that "educational leadership has too much interest in the matter of pleasing boards of education." They have accused the schools of furthering social chaos. They have alleged that "after 150 years, American education has left us as vicious socially and as dishonest as we were before that education began." They have denounced "the commonplaces of American education" as "faint voices from a distant and mythical land" when compared with the social and educational developments in Soviet Russia in the 1930's.

A spokesman for this movement branded a report of an NEA commission as "full of pompous idealistic expressions and threadbare axioms—a shallow and spineless analysis."

There have been bold pronouncements that "the public generally has registered its loss of faith in its educational system," and that education "must clean house of a multitude of rubbish." Teachers have been told, by leaders of this movement, that they must emancipate themselves from the domination of the business interests and that they must "cease cultivating the manners and associations of bankers." That last, by the way, was written back in the days when there was no more fighting word than "banker."

Teachers have been told that they must "abandon smug middle-class tradition"—a somewhat unkind and sweeping generalization about the so-called middle class. Teachers have also been warned that they would have "to restate their philosophy of education, reorganize the procedures of the schools, and even redefine their own position in society." Talk about blanket indictments.

These are typical of the attacks upon the public schools and the teaching profession which have emanated—and still emanate—from the progressive education movement. And the Progressive Education Association has not been bashful in its claims as to the accomplishments and influence of the movement and its attacks.

Vinal H. Tibbets, director of the Progressive Education Association, declared in 1945, that "the impact"—of the association—"upon educational thinking and practice is immeasurable." He further commented that the association's largest annual membership was under 11,000, and that "probably no group so small, except the early Christians, has ever made such progress in so short a time in changing the direction of a social movement"—Progressive Education magazine, March 1945, page 3.

That the attacks upon school and teacher philosophy and practices have been intense is further attested by the comments of a letter, appearing in the same issue of the magazine, from Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, superintendent of schools of Battle Creek, Mich., then a vice president of the Progressive Education Association and now president of the American Association of School Administrators. Dr. Rogers wrote:

> Some of us who have been associated with the Progressive Education Association * * * for many years, rejoice in the fact that we have been able to maintain a good magazine in spite of the depression years, and notwithstanding the terrific battles which progressive education has had to fight during these recent years of reaction to modern education.
>
> I especially like the friendly and forthright fashion in which news articles deal with serious conflicts in American education (p. 2, ibid).

Since public school education—including progressive education—has obviously flourished heretofore on criticism and conflict, it is passing strange that criticism now suddenly becomes the mark of "the enemy." Of course, human experience records that there have been other instances in which former heretics, having achieved power and the status of orthodoxy, proceed to denounce the new generation of dissenters.

III. SKELETON IN THE CLOSET

The sensitivity of educational officialdom to criticism is particularly acute with respect to any charge or suggestion that collectivism or socialism is being fostered in the public schools. The official reaction to such an accusation is an air of injured and indignant innocence.

Since the phrase "socialism in the schools" is a man-in-the-street version of the movement here under discussion, it becomes relevant to this documentation to record some of the official denials of this allegation.

I quote, first of all, from a monthly bulletin issued by Superintendent C. C. Trillingham of the Los Angeles County, Calif., public schools. This bulletin was published in the October 1950 Education Digest, page 39:

> Anyone who knows about the general educational program of the schools today knows that the charges that the schools are leading the country toward socialism, that the fundamental skills are being ignored, and that there is no attempt to discipline youngsters, are untrue. That these are the results of a premeditated program of so-called "progressive education" is sheer nonsense.

In the report on the recent Pasadena, Calif., school controversy, entitled "The Pasadena Story," issued by the National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education of the NEA—of which commission Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers, of Battle Creek, Mich., was a member at the time—attention is called to "certain general charges" made by groups critical of the schools:

> They apparently claim that this country has already moved into, or is rapidly moving toward, some form of socialism, collectivism, or statism. They contend that subversive elements have sifted into public education and that many teachers are seeking to change the American way of life. They charge that John Dewey's progressive education is an instrument designed to break down American standards and weaken the fabric of American society. They oppose Federal aid to education on the ground that it is a collectivist measure. They oppose certain educators who they assert are seeking to indoctrinate the youth of the country for a changed social and economic order (p. 23).

Commenting on this summation of charges, the Commission's report says:

> Many explanations could be given for these criticisms. Probably the most general one is the wave of reaction which has swept over this country as the result of the fear of communism (p. 22).

Similarly, the Defense Bulletin issued by Harold Benjamin, chairman of this NEA commission, and previously cited, refers to these allegations in a sarcastic vein. In his description of the so-called Enemy and his tactics, Mr. Benjamin says:

> He has whipped up pseudo-popular revolts there (in Pasadena) against teachers, administrators and school programs on the grounds that they are indoctrinating the children in communism, socialism, or at least mentioning democracy, and they are helping to increase taxes.

Dean Ernest O. Melby of the New York University School of Education, writing in the pamphlet, "American Education Under Fire," 1951, explains that such accusations may arise from a misunderstanding:

> Often * * * when schools deal with controversial issues they are accused of communism or leftist leanings merely because various viewpoints are presented and arguments are carried on with regard to the various issues (p. 32).

This same "explanation" is elaborated by Dean Melby in an article in the October 1951 NEA Journal—pages 441–442—in which he says that "most of the attacks being made on public education are dishonest and unjustified":

> Schools must deal with controversial issues. In doing so they are sometimes accused of leftist leanings by persons who fail to realize that teaching about communism is not the same thing as teaching communism. What the schools are trying to do is to equip boys and girls to deal with the present ideological conflict successfully.

Dean J. B. Edmondson of the University of Michigan School of Education was even more emphatic in an article in the September 1951 NEA Journal—pages 381–382. Writing on "the threats to public education," Dean Edmondson listed as one of these "threats":

> The insidious efforts of some persons to create the false impression that teachers are committed to a "progressive philosophy of education" that is socialistic and communistic in its influence on children and youth.

As a final example, I quote a newspaper report of an address in February 1952, before the Battle Creek (Mich.) Exchange Club by Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers:

> "Economic education has become a necessity today, where once the American way of life was looked upon as a subject everyone knew about," Dr. Rogers said. "Not until this generation have the free-enterprise system and the democratic way of life been seriously challenged by socialism and communism and this creates a difficult situation for teachers," Dr. Rogers said.
>
> "In order for boys and girls to know what it is that imperils our way of life, it is necessary to teach about communism and socialism," said Dr. Rogers, emphasizing the word "about."
>
> He said the teachers "teach about these other forms of government carefully, always pointing out the dangers to our way of life."

If I am capable of understanding the English language as used by the educators in the foregoing statements, those statements are a categorical denial of the existence of the movement and trend here being documented. In view of the record which this documentation clearly establishes, this denial is inexplicable. It means to me that educators who speak and write in this vein are less than frank with the American people. They are hiding a skeleton in the closet. The effect of these denials can only be to create confusion, misunderstanding and the very attitude of suspicion which they profess to be so anxious to avoid.

In the documentation that follows, there will be abundant evidence that advocacy of socialism is one item of belief identified with the movement under discussion. Even more to the point is the fact that the movement calls for the

remaking of our society by and through the schools, and that it claims the right and duty of the teacher to engage in that enterprise in the classroom under the guise of academic freedom.

IV. MEET DR. COUNTS

Some 4 or 5 years after his appointment as a professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. George S. Counts, read a paper before a conference of the Progressive Education Association in Baltimore, Md., in February 1932.

This paper, bearing the title "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" proved to be an epochal event in the history of modern American education. It is also the necessary starting point in the documentation which I am here undertaking.

Because of the major—even dominant—role which Dr. Counts played in the early history of the movement under discussion, it is important to become somewhat acquainted with him and his views. In doing so, I am not indulging in personalities or undertaking to cast Dr. Counts in a villain's role. And my interest in Dr. Counts' relationship to the movement being described here is not limited to its origins.

If I am any judge of the record, Dr. Counts is an educator who has himself gained considerable education in the past 20 years. Indeed I am convinced that he is today a wiser and possibly sadder man than the 43-year-old Columbia professor who issued the ringing summons to social reconstruction through the classroom in his paper before the Baltimore meeting. I believe he is not only a man with the courage of his convictions and the courage to change his convictions in the light of experience and reflection, but also a man who has demonstrated real physical courage by carrying his convictions into the enemy's camp with brave defiance—the enemy's camp being a Communist-sponsored "international cultural" gathering held in New York City in 1949.

Dr. Counts' dominant leadership in the launching of the social reconstruction movement is attested not only by the Baltimore address but by his authorship of the monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" in 1932; his chairmanship of the Progressive Education Association committee on social and economic problems which issued the 1933 Call to the Teachers of the Nation; his service as research director of the American Historical Association Commission on Social Studies, and his editorship, for several years, of the Social Frontier, official journal of the movement.

It contributes to an understanding of the background of Dr. Counts' paper before the Baltimore meeting of the Progressive Education Association to know that at the time he was an enthusiastic observer and commentator on the "great collectivist experiment" in Soviet Russia. He was one of several American educators who, in keeping with the custom of the times—a custom encouraged by the Communist organization in the United States—had made several pilgrimages to Russia to view first hand, under proper chaperonage, the workings of that experiment. In 1931 Dr. Counts wrote a book entitled "The Soviet Challenge to America."

His estimate of the importance of the collectivist experiment in Russia is expressed in this statement:

The world today is full of social experimentation. There is one experiment, however, that dwarfs all others—so bold indeed in its ideals and its program that few can contemplate it without emotion. Because of the clouds of passion which still envelop it, there is serious danger that its most revolutionary, though least sensational, features may escape adequate notice. Soviet Russia is endeavoring with all the resources at her command to bring the economic order under a measure of rational control. She may fail in the attempt, but in the meantime every student of human affairs should follow the effort with breathless interest. She issues to the Western nations and particularly to the United States a challenge—perhaps one of the greatest challenges of history. But she issues it not through the Communist International, nor through the Red Army, nor through the Gay-Pay-OO (political police), as most of our citizens naively and timorously believe, but through her State Planning Commission and her system of public education. (The Soviet Challenge to America, pp. ix-x, foreword.)

Dr. Counts drew a contrast between Soviet Russia's approach to economic problems and that of the United States which left no doubt as to where, in theory at least, his sympathies and inclinations lay. He wrote:

In the societies of the West in general and the United States of America in particular the evolution of institutions proceeds for the most part without plan or design, as a sort of byproduct of the selfish competition of individuals, groups and enterprises for private gain. In Russia, on the other hand, since the days of 1917, the Soviet government has sought to promote the rational and orderly development of the entire social economy. * * * In the great 5-year plan of construction, which was launched in October of 1928 * * * a whole civilization is harnessing its energies and is on the march toward consciously determined goals (ibid., p. 7).

He said further:

If the revolution is sucessful the social order which is emerging today in Soviet Russia will first of all be collectivistic. In its essence this means that the institution of private property, at least insofar as it applies to land and the tools of production, will be abolished. It also means that no individual will be able to acquire great wealth, that the motive of personal gain will cease to drive the wheels of the economic order, that the senseless competition in the conspicuous consumption of goods will come to an end, and that land, railroads, factories, mills, shops, houses, and natural resources will be owned collectively and administered in the interests of all (pp. 24–25).

There are further comparisons drawn, again by no means favorable, in Dr. Count's judgment, to the American system:

No sensitive mind can remain long in the Soviet Union without feeling himself in a veritable furnace of the world where the elements composing human society are in a state of fusion and new principles of right and wrong are being forged. Under such conditions the commonplaces of American education sound like faint voices from a distant and mythical land (p. 324).

And again:

The revolutionary movement embraces much that is rich and challenging in the best sense of the word. The idea of building a new society along the lines developed by the Communists should provide a genuine stimulus to the mind and liberate the energies of millions. It is certainly no worse than the drive towards individual success which permeates not only the schools but every department of culture in the United States. If one were to compare the disciplined effort of the Soviets to industrialize the country, to socialize agriculture, to abolish poverty, to banish disease, to liquidate unemployment, to disseminate knowledge, and generally to raise the material and spiritual level of the masses, with the selfish scramble for wealth and privilege, the cruel disregard of the less sensational forms of human suffering, the relative absence of a sense of social responsibility, the reluctance to come honestly to grips with the major problems of the time, and the apparent decay of the political, ethical, and religious life in America, one would find small grounds for complacency. Whatever may be said on the other side concerning the regimentation of opinion and the restriction of individual freedom, there exists in Soviet Russia today an idealism and a driving passion for human betterment which contrast strangely with the widespread cynicism of the United States. It is only natural that this idealism and this passion should sweep through the schools as well as through the rest of the social order (pp. 328–330).

Finally, consider these rhapsodical lines with which Dr. Counts closes his book:

This cultural revolution possesses a single mighty integrating principle—the building of a new society in which there will be neither rich nor poor, in which the mainspring of all industry will be social rather than private profit, in which no man will be permitted to exploit another by reason of wealth or social position, in which the curse of Eden will be lifted forever from the soul of woman, in which a condition of essential equality will unite all races and nations into one brotherhood. Although the cultural applications of this principle often assume crude and exaggerated forms, as in the case of the Proletcult and the censorship of art, it is nevertheless authentic and vital. There is consequently in the Soviet Union today a sensitiveness to the more fundamental human wrongs and a passion for social justice that simply cannot be matched in any other quarter of the globe. A devotion to the common good and a deep interest in the oppressed of all lands penetrate and color every aspect of the cultural life of the country. That the pursuit of the goal may often be blind and unintelligent during the current period of stress and experimentation is only to be expected. The school, the press, the theater, the cinema, and life generally in Russia are full of excesses and imbecilities and of sound conceptions poorly executed. But back of it all, even the excesses and the imbecilities, there stands a great and challenging ideal which the rest of the world cannot continue to ignore and which may in time serve to bring art, science, and philosophy into essential harmony. In the meantime the leaders in American industry, politics, and thought, instead of dissipating their energies in the futile attempt to erect barriers against the spread of Communist doctrines, would do well to fashion an alternative program of equal boldness and honesty to discipline the energies and humanize the spirit of industrial civilization (pp. 338–339).

Let me interject at this point in the interests of complete fairness and accuracy that 20 years later—and 20 years

wiser and sadder—Dr. Counts recorded a much more sober judgment with respect to Soviet Russia. Writing in the January 1951 National Education Association Journal, Dr. Counts said:

The Soviet leaders boast every hour of the day about their grandiose achievements in economy and government, war and revolution, science, art, and culture. While some of these claims are justified, others are dubious, to say the least. Yet they have to their credit one truly staggering achievement about which they say nothing—their all-embracing system of mind control. * * *

The Soviet system of mind control is the product of perverted genius. It is the most comprehensive thing of its kind in history, surpassing immeasurably its predecessor under the Tsar. * * * Employing with complete ruthlessness and singleness of purpose all the resources of science, of mechanical invention, of medicine and psychology, it is able to attain power and reach heights of efficiency which dwarf the efforts of earlier despotisms.

The system embraces all of the organized processes and agencies for the molding of the minds of both young and old.

Pointing out that during the closing months of the Second World War the high command of the Communist Party in Russia "decided to reverse completely the war-time policy of friendly collaboration with the western democracies and to revive the policy of revolutionary aggression in the spirit of 1917," Dr. Counts goes on to observe, with obvious sorrow:

The reason for this tragic action * * * is not difficult to discern. But in order to know the truth we must renounce all wishful thinking and face the fully authenticated reality—the ultimate goal of the Soviet high command has not changed since the revolution and probably will not change for many years.

That goal is the overthrow at all costs, and by all means available, of the entire "capitalist," "bourgeois," or non-Soviet world. (Mind Control in the Soviet Union, pp. 29–32, NEA Journal, January 1951.)

While Dr. Counts as recently at least as 1945 had by no means abandoned his concept of the desirability of "general economic planning" in the United States, there are noteworthy modifications in his view of the American economic system and of the role of the school in reconstructing that system. Writing in "Education and the Promise of America," he said:

The young * * * should study critically the values and weaknesses of the "system of free enterprise," the dangers and possibilities in collective action (pp. 127–128).

As we will have occasion to see, Dr. Counts had come a long way from his 1932 views when he acknowledged, in this 1945 statement, that there are values in the system of free enterprise, and dangers in a system of collective action.

Something of the same eye-opening and disillusioning experience which Dr. Counts had with respect to the Soviet Utopia was repeated insofar as the American brand of Communists were concerned. After a bitter experience with Communist Party units of Teachers College, Columbia University, Dr. Counts wrote as follows regarding Communist tactics—The Social Frontier, February 1939, pages 135–140:

Seemingly even the editors of the Social Frontier live and learn.

A concluding word on the broader significance and implications of the story here unfolded may not be inappropriate. * * * Those who resort to the tactics and strategy reflected in that story should know that they are playing with fire. They profess to be fighting the growth of fascism in America and the world. Yet they indulge lightheartedly in irresponsible provocation, villification of character, and distortion of history. They appear to operate on the principle that they will destroy by any means at hand whatever they cannot rule. Thus, by a strange dialectical process, they serve as a midwife of fascism; they prepare the very food on which fascism feeds. With my own eyes I have seen them create Fascist attitudes at Teachers College. They profess to be defending democracy against reaction and preach the united front of all popular forces. Yet they proceed to violate the most elementary democratic virtues of fairness and integrity, and by their methods bring inevitable discord into the ranks of the popular cause. They meet fundamental criticism with the cry of "red baiting," and then reserve to themselves all the other colors of the rainbow.

One lesson contemporary history teaches with unmistakable clarity—ends and means cannot be separated—undemocratic means destroy democratic ends. Such means if long continued and widely practiced may bring twilight both to Teachers College and to American democracy.

Two years later Dr. Counts wrote:

The Communist Party, as an instrument of popular advance, must be completely repudiated. My experience convinces me that it poisons everything that it touches. * * * Democracy must stand on its own feet and formulate its own program for dealing with the problems arising out of a world in revolution. (Frontiers of Democracy, May 15, 1941, pp. 231–232.)

Truly, Dr. Counts had lived and learned.

One more reference to the metamorphosis of Dr. Counts:

Following publication of his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" in 1932, a review was published in the Progressive Education magazine—February 1933, page 71 and following pages—written by J. I. Zilberfarb, a member of the State Scientific Council at the Commissariat of Education of the Russian Republic. In a letter accompanying this review, Zilberfarb expressed his pleasure to Dr. Counts at "the remarkable progress which you have made in challenging capitalism." In the review he expressed the belief that Dr. Counts "continues to make great strides ahead" and added the hope that he would come to take "a firm stand on dialectic materialism" which will bring him to "socialism, communism." Clearly he saw in Dr. Counts the makings of a true comrade.

Sixteen years later, the Daily Worker—March 28, 1949—denounced Counts, along with several others, as "a vociferous group of Trotskyites and other anti-Communists." Occasion of this blast was Dr. Counts' uninvited appearance at the Communist-sponsored International Cultural and Scientific Conference in New York City late in March 1949. Dr. Counts had invaded the meeting to challenge Communist delegates to account for the disappearance in Russia of several scholars who had displeased the Stalin regime. And, as a further offense, Dr. Counts was one of the sponsors of a rival mass meeting held at the time of the Communist-sponsored conclave.

Incidentally, one of the invited and warmly applauded speakers at the International Cultural and Scientific Conference was John J. DeBoer, professor of education at the University of Illinois and a former president of the Progressive Education Association. And a cosponsor of the conference was Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education of New York University, who served as vice president and board member of the Progressive Education Association at the time Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, of Battle Creek, held the same offices.

Obviously Dr. Counts has gained wisdom with the years, as has many another well-intentioned and overzealous "liberal" who once hailed the Soviet collectivist experiment as the hope of humanity. I have recorded that change of attitude in the interests of complete accuracy and fairness.

This change of attitude, on the part of Dr. Counts, is only incidental, however, to the social reconstruction through the schools movement which he pioneered. That movement, as we shall see, persists to this day. And there likewise persist the collectivist and socialistic premises which characterized that movement from the outset.

V. "CAPITALISM IS DEAD; LONG LIVE COLLECTIVISM"

The fundamental premise of the movement which I am here documenting is stated categorically and with almost monotonous repetition in the literature of that movement.

That premise is that capitalism is doomed—that it is dead, or dying—and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of planned economy, governmental control or socialization, essentially new and different in character, is both desirable and inevitable.

Whatever later modifications and qualifications of this premise we may encounter, and whatever the euphemisms in which the theories and proposals may later be expressed, they must still be appraised in the light of this original premise. For it was this premise which gave birth to, and still gives vital impulse to, the movement here under discussion.

This premise is stated by Dr. Counts in his original paper delivered before the Baltimore Progressive Education Association meeting:

We live in troublous times; we live in an age of profound change; we live in an age of revolution. (Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?, Progressive Education magazine, April 1932, p. 261.)

A new world is forming, he asserted, a world in which economic issues will be fundamental and "the center of bitter and prolonged struggle." Citing the evils, abuses and contradictions in the economic situation disclosed by the depression, then at its worst, Dr. Counts ex-

pressed the belief that nonetheless "we hold within our hands the power to usher in an age of plenty, to make secure the lives of all, and to banish poverty forever from the land." But—

The achievement of this goal * * * would seem to require fundamental changes in the economic system. Historic capitalism, with its deification of the principle of selfishness, its reliance upon the forces of competition, its placing of property above human rights, and its exaltation of the profit motive, will either have to be displaced altogether, or so radically changed in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost (ibid. pp. 261–262).

Dr. Counts makes very clear what this involves. In his own words, it means development of "a coordinated, planned, and socialized economy."

Continuing, Dr. Counts says:

The important point is that fundamental changes in the economic system are imperative. Whatever services historic capitalism may have rendered in the past, and they have been many, its days are numbered. With its deification of the principle of selfishness, its exaltation of the profit motive, its reliance upon the forces of competition, and its placing of property above human rights, it will either have to be displaced altogether or changed so radically in form and spirit that its identity will be completely lost.

* * * The growth of science and technology has carried us into a new age where ignorance must be replaced by knowledge, competition by cooperation, trust in Providence by careful planning, and private capitalism by some form of socialized economy.

* * * The day of individualism in the production and distribution of goods is gone. The fact cannot be overemphasized that choice is no longer between individualism and collectivism. It is rather between two forms of collectivism: the one essentially democratic, the other feudal in spirit; the one devoted to the interests of the people, the other to the interests of a privileged class (ibid. pp. 47–49).

The same basic premise is summarized in "A Call to the Teachers of the Nation," issued in 1933 by the Committee of the Progressive Education Association on Social and Economic Problems, of which Dr. Counts was chairman. This committee had been created as a sequel to Dr. Counts' Baltimore address. Although Dr. Willard W. Beatty, president of the PEA, carefully emphasized in an introductory statement that the report "does not commit either the board of directors of the association or the members of the association to any program or policy embodied in the report," the committee included outstanding leaders in the progressive education movement—Merle Curti, John Gambs, Sidney Hook, Jesse Newlon, Dr. Beatty, Charles Easton, Frederick Redefer, and Goodwin Watson, in addition to Dr. Counts.

The premise of the doom of capitalism and its inevitable replacement by collectivism is stated in the "Call" as follows:

To those who may see a threat to freedom in such a program he addresses these remarks:

That under such an economy the actions of individuals in certain directions would be limited is fairly obvious. No one would be permitted to build a new factory or railroad whenever or wherever he please; also, no one would be permitted to amass great riches by manipulating the economic institutions of the country. On the other hand, by means of the complete and uninterrupted functioning of the economic system the foundations would be laid for a measure of freedom in the realm of personal life that mankind has never known in the past. Freedom without a secure economic base is simply no freedom at all. Thus, in comparison with the right to work and eat, the right to vote is but an empty bauble (ibid., pp. 261–262).

It is noteworthy that in this superficial line of thinking, government prohibition of the freedom to start a legitimate business is classed in the same category as government prohibition of obviously improper speculation and financial manipulation. It is also noteworthy that there is no recognition here that "the right to work and eat" can readily be forfeited with the loss of the "empty bauble"—the right to vote.

In his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" which combined his Baltimore address with two other papers, Dr. Counts is even more explicit in his diagnosis and prescription:

If we accept industrialism, as we must, we are then compelled to face without equivocation the most profound issue which this new order of society has raised and settle that issue in terms of the genius of our people—the issue of the control of the machine.

* * * If the machine is to serve all, and serve all equally, it cannot be the property of the few * * *.

If democracy is to survive, it must seek a new economic foundation. * * * If property rights are to be diffused in industrial society, natural resources and all important forms of capital will have to be collectively owned. Obviously, every citizen cannot hold title to a mine, a factory, a railroad, a department store, or even a thoroughly mechanized farm. This means that, if democracy is to survive in the United States, it must abandon its individualistic affiliations in the sphere of economics (pp. 43–45).

Dr. Counts acknowledges that he does not have all of the details worked out: "What precise form a democratic society will take in the age of science and the machine, we cannot know with any assurance today." On the other hand—

We must * * * insist on two things: First, that technology be released from the fetters and the domination of every type of special privilege; and, second, that the resulting system of production and distribution must be made to serve directly the masses of the people. Within these limits, as I see it, our democratic tradition must of necessity evolve and gradually assume an essentially collectivistic pattern. The only conceivable alternative is the abandonment of the last vestige of democracy and the frank adoption of some modern form of feudalism (ibid. pp. 45–46).

We must decide in whose interests our mighty mechanism for the production and distribution of goods is to be managed. It might be made to serve either the few or the many; it cannot be made to serve both. * * *

Clearly, if democracy is to survive, it must be divorced from its union with the simple agrarian life of the past and be adjusted to the complex industrial society of the present. In the sphere of economic relationships, it must be dissociated from its individualistic connections and be rephrased in terms of the collectivist reality. The old foundations are gone. In the highly integrated social order of the twentieth century individual men cannot own and operate the means of production as they did at the time of the founding of the Nation. As a consequence, the fulfillment of the old ideal requires a reversal of loyalties at certain points. Today the individual can be guaranteed freedom for cultural and spiritual growth only by the abandonment of economic individualism. Liberty of persons is no longer to be attained through freeing business enterprise from restraints but rather through deliberate organization in the name of material security for all. Thus the democratic tradition has come to the end of an era. If its spirit is to live on, its forms must suffer radical change (pp. 16, 17, ibid.).

It is all as simple and neat as that.

This same premise that capitalism is dead, or dying, and that its replacement by some form of collectivism, by some form or degree of Government-planned economy, governmental control or socialization essentially new and different in character, is both inevitable and desirable, underlies the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on Social Studies sponsored by the American Historical Association.

This report, constituting the seventh and last volume of a series of publications by the commission, marked the consummation of commission studies and activities extending from January 1929 to December 1933. As previously mentioned, Dr. Counts served as research director for the commission from August 1, 1931, until the termination of its operations.

The premise of the inevitable replacement of capitalism by collectivism, constituted the "general point of view or frame of reference" of the Conclusions and Recommendations of the commission—page 3. This premise is elaborated as follows:

Under the molding influence of socialized processes of living, drives of technology and science, pressures of changing thought and policy, and disrupting impacts of economic disaster, there is a notable waning of the once widespread popular faith in economic individualism; and leaders in public affairs, supported by a growing mass of the population, are demanding the introduction into economy of ever wider measures of planning and control (p. 16).

The report continues:

Cumulative evidence supports the conclusion that, in the United States as in other countries, the age of individualism and laissez faire in economy and government is closing and that a new age of collectivism is emerging.

The report acknowledges that "as to the specific form which this 'collectivism,' this integration and interdependence, is taking and will take in the future, the evidence at hand is by no means clear or unequivocal. It may involve the limiting or supplanting of private property by public property or it may entail the preservation of private property, extended and distributed among the masses."

The report speculates that—

Most likely, it will issue from a process of experimentation and will represent a composite of historic doctrines and social conceptions yet to appear.

However, the Conclusions and Recommendations are emphatic as to the "inevitability" of expanding government

and expanding exercise of governmental compulsion:

Almost certainly it will involve a larger measure of compulsory as well as voluntary cooperation of citizens in the conduct of the complex national economy, a corresponding enlargement of the functions of government, and an increasing state intervention in fundamental branches of economy previously left to individual discretion and initiative—a state intervention that in some instances may be direct and mandatory and in others indirect and facilitative. In any event the Commission is convinced by its interpretation of available empirical data that the actually integrating economy of the present day is the forerunner of a consciously integrated society in which individual property rights will be altered and abridged (pp. 16–17).

The Commission emphasizes the viewpoint that "the emerging age is particularly an age of transition." Elaborating this point, it adds:

It is marked by numerous and severe tensions arising out of the conflict between the actual trend toward integrated economy and society, on the one side, and the traditional practices, dispositions, ideas, and institutional arrangements inherited from the passing age of individualism, on the other. In all the recommendations that follow the transitional character of the present epoch is recognized (pp. 17–18).

The Commission succinctly capsules its fundamental premise in the proposition that collectivism is "the future already coming into reality"—page 37.

Essentially this same premise found significant expression in the report of the Committee on Education for the New America of the Department of Superintendence of the NEA—now the American Association of School Administrators. This report was presented at the seventy-second annual meeting of the NEA, June 30–July 6, 1934, in Washington, D. C., by Dr. Willard E. Givens, then superintendent of schools of Oakland, Calif., and for many years since executive secretary of the NEA.

The pertinent statement was as follows:

A dying laissez-faire must be completely destroyed and all of us, including the "owners," must be subjected to a large degree of social control. (NEA Proceedings, 1934, pp. 647–655.)

Even more significant, in reflecting the definite Socialist trend of thinking in the group which drafted the report, is the following excerpt:

A large section of our discussion group, accepting the conclusions of distinguished students, maintain that in our fragile, interdependent society the credit agencies, the basic industries and utilities cannot be centrally planned and operated under private ownership. Hence, they will join in creating a swift Nation-wide campaign of adult education which will support President Roosevelt in taking these over and operating them at full capacity as a unified national system in the interest of the people (ibid p. 647).

This statement on the thinking of the group raises a question as to the consistency—if not the sincerity—of a subsequent declaration in the report that education will give the individual "a new appreciation of ownership of property" and that under the envisioned new order "the employer will be permitted to make a fair profit on his investment"—pages 647–9.

Further interesting evidence of this preoccupation of a representative segment of NEA membership, or leadership, with the possibility and desirability of achieving socialism is provided by the unusual action of the NEA at its 1933 meeting in Chicago. I refer to the following resolution, adopted by the delegates:

The officers of the NEA are requested to provide, through its journal and otherwise, reliable, authentic information for the use of its members concerning publicly owned, publicly controlled, and publicly operated gas, electric light, and power plants, especially as to the following items: (1) Name of municipality; (2) population; (3) rates of service; (4) net earnings to the municipality; (5) a similar showing concerning comparable privately owned and privately operated utility companies. (NEA Proceedings, 1933, p. 222.)

Incidentally, this resolution was published in the November 1933 NEA Journal—page 213—below an article on "How Public Ownership Reduces Rates," by Carl D. Thompson, secretary of the Public Ownership League. This article, advancing arguments for municipal and public ownership of utilities, was accompanied by suggestions for classroom activities in connection with this broad subject.

A major vehicle for expression and elaboration of the basic premise that capitalism must bow out in favor of collectivism was provided in the decade from 1934 to 1944 by the educational journal, the Social Frontier and its successor, Frontiers of Democracy. These publications were launched specifically to promote the movement under discussion here. The former publication, edited by Dr. Counts, with Dr. William H. Kilpatrick as board chairman, numbered among its directors more than 60 leading American educators. I cite a number of typical expressions of this basic premise from the editorial columns of these publications, as well as from articles which appeared in these and other educational journals and books.

The lead editorial in the initial issue—October 1934—of the Social Frontier, which bore the title "Orientation," stated the basic premise which the journal was designed to promote:

For the American people the age of individualism in economy is closing and an age of collectivism is opening. Here is the central and dominating reality in the present epoch. * * *

* * * (The Social Frontier) represents a point of view, it has a frame of reference, it stands on a particular interpretation of American history. It accepts the analysis of the current epoch presented above and outlined in greater detail in Conclusions and Recommendations, Report on the Social Studies of the Commission of the American Historical Association.

The Social Frontier assumes that the age of individualism in economy is closing and that an age marked by a close integration of social life and by collective planning and control is opening. For weal or woe it accepts as irrevocable this deliverance of the historical process (pp. 3–4).

In the next issue—November 1934—the Social Frontier editorially elaborated its acceptance of collectivism as an inevitability:

The Social Frontier is not engaged in any battle for collectivism as such. That issue has been decided by the forces of history. As Prof. Walton Hamilton says in the last paragraph of a brilliant article in the Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, the "Commitment to collectivism is beyond recall." * * *

* * * Accepting the rise of a collectivist order as irrevocable, it (the Social Frontier) refuses to adopt a fatalistic attitude toward the question of the form which collectivism is to take in the United States. * * *

The most crucial and fundamental of the choices which the American people will be called upon to make, which they are being called upon to make, has to do with controlling purposes and interests. * * * The Social Frontier will throw all the strength it possesses on the side of those forces which are striving to fashion a form of collectivism that will make paramount the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population (pp. 3–4).

Despite this professed dismissal of concern over "the question of the form which collectivism is to take in the United States," the publication indicated the alternative to capitalism in fairly definite terms in an editorial in the April 1935 issue:

Loudest in the chorus of praise for freedom and imprecation for collectivism are the grateful beneficiaries of our inherited economic institutions. To them freedom is God and collectivism is Satan.

That the propagandas of profit-motivated reactionaries and the notions of honest but deluded liberals have gained a hold on the popular mind is due in no small measure to the failure of those committed to a collectivist social order to set up effective counter propaganda and to disseminate true notions of liberalism. * * * The mistaken notion that democracy and freedom are identical with the institutions of property and profit should not be allowed to go unchallenged. On the contrary, teachers and laymen should make clear by all means at their disposal that a collectivist social order is not only necessary in a world of large scale production, corporate control, and human interdependence, but also that under these circumstances only social ownership and democratic control of the means of production can secure a free and democratic life (p. 9.)

In still another editorial in this same issue—April 1935—the Social Frontier pronounced this judgment of absolute doom upon capitalism:

The end of free business enterprise as a principle of economic and social organization adequate to this country is at hand (p. 8).

Nor did this publication, in the editorial development of its premise of the inevitability of collectivism, blink at the prospect that it must involve increasing regimentation. Quite the contrary. In an attack on a view expressed by former President Hoover, a June 1935 editorial insisted that there is "good" as well as "bad" regimentation:

With respect to Mr. Hoover's assumption that regimentation must inevitably lead to the conversion of this fair land into a zoo, it is legitimate to ask: What alternative have we? * * * The only other choice is the wilderness where the lions prey upon the lambs.

And finally, is economic regimentation really evil? Must it necessarily result in the dehumanization of man? No general answer to these questions is possible. It all depends on who does the regimenting and the purpose the process is intended to serve. If regimentation is imposed by the few people at present in power, for the purpose of maintaining that power, it is evil because dehumanizing. The end products then are material, cultural, and spiritual poverty for the vast masses of people. But if regimentation is the consequence of the human urges of the millions who seek a life of work, dignity, security, and material and cultural plenty, it is humanizing and consequently good. Such regimentation is no regimentation at all; it is rather humanization, liberalization, and socialization (pp. 5–6).

The same basic premise of the necessary and inevitable replacement of capitalism with collectivism provided a major theme for many of the contributors to the magazine, Progressive Education, in the early 1930's, and for contributors to the Social Frontier and Frontiers of Democracy in the decade during which those journals were successively published. A few typical citations will suffice to illustrate the point.

Writing under the title, "Teachers Must Be Leaders," in Progressive Education, October 1932—pages 410–413—Jesse H. Newlon, director of the Lincoln school, said:

To effect a more equitable distribution of the national income, a curb must be put upon the operation of the profit motive. The making of profits can no longer be regarded as the chief aim of production. Production must be primarily for use. Integration and planned control of the agencies of production and distribution are inescapable in production primarily for use. They can be achieved only through organs of economic planning that can exercise wise control over credit and over many basic industrial and agricultural operations. To accomplish these ends will necessitate fundamental modifications of our forms and processes of government, both national and local, in order to adapt them to contemporary needs.

In an address before the Sixth World Fellowship of the New Education Fellowship—the international organization of the Progressive Education movement—at Nice, France, in 1932, Dr. Harold Rugg, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia University, declared:

The world is on fire, and the youth of the world must be equipped to combat the conflagration. Nothing less than thoroughgoing social reconstruction is demanded. (Progressive Education, December 1932–January 1933, pp. 11–18.)

About a year later, Dr. Rugg wrote:

We know now beyond cavil that sufficient physical and human resources exist on the North American Continent to give every man, woman, and child a standard of life several times higher than the minimum of 1929. But we know also that to do so a vast degree of socialization in the central control and operation of the entire continental system of production and distribution must be instituted now. * * *

* * * Advocates of the democratic method who are troubled by the image of a destroyed Bill of Rights evoked by the Fascist specter * * * are desperately striving for a program of socialization of the production-distribution system which will be carried out with the "consent" of the people. (Progressive Education, January–February 1933, pp. 3–5; the Educator and the Scientific Study of Society.)

Granville Hicks, at the time assistant professor of English at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and later a member of the editorial board of The Masses, writing in the January–February 1934, Progressive Education—pages 49–54—on "The Social Interpretation of Literature," tersely stated the premise we are documenting here:

Today the majority of those authors who make any attempt to portray contemporary life frankly admit that the capitalist system is doomed.

Hicks was an exponent of the view that "Marxism must be the basis for the analysis of literature as a social phenomenon," as opposed to "the conventional methods of teaching English, which give the student a cultural polish without challenging any of his convictions, without raising any serious questions about the existing order."

The Roosevelt New Deal provided exponents of the collectivist premise with the opportunity—which they fully capitalized on—to emphasize the fact that they were talking about something more sweeping than palliative reforms of capitalism. Their praise of Roosevelt's program was always qualified by a reminder of that fact.

Thus, a statement drafted by Willard W. Beatty, president of the Progressive Education Association, and published in the October 1933, Progressive Education, page 304, said:

Despite the tremendous efforts which the [Roosevelt] administration has put forth in the short period since it took over the reins of Government, we have made no more than the most preliminary steps along a new pathway.

Norman Woelfel, subsequently managing editor of the Social Frontier and even later professor of education at Ohio State University, wrote an article, "The Educator, the New Deal, and Revolution," in the January–February 1934, Progressive Education, in which he insisted that the then current phrase, "the Roosevelt revolution" was a misnomer. The Roosevelt program, he wrote, deserved the educators' support only because it left open "the path to a more revolutionary future." He urged educators to provide "stimulus to further leftward responses on the part of the administration," but made clear that "what really has happened is, of course, far from being a revolution" since "the traditional pattern of administering the industrial resources of the Nation by private business in the interest of money profit remains the same."

Dr. Woelfel then defined his conception and goal of revolution by asserting that it:

Implies that there be no unnecessary delay in making completely public the ownership and control of the natural resources and the industrial structure of the Nation (pp. 107–112).

And he added bluntly that in the achievement of this purpose "we must not blindly shrink from the fact that it may require some use of force against those at present privileged."

The same reminder that the Roosevelt program fell far short of the premise and goal of collectivist reconstruction was given by Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild writing in the October 1934, Social Frontier:

The old economic structure is a house built upon the sands, and the President, instead of doing anything to install a firm foundation or to move the house over to bedrock, contents himself with putting in a new beam here, shoring up a wall there, and spreading whitewash liberally wherever he can find an exposed surface.

This is the tragedy of the New Deal. * * *

There are many, even in capital-minded America * * * who will not be satisfied with a New Deal—they want a new deck (pp. 15–18, A Sociologist Views the New Deal).

Broadus Mitchell, associate professor of economics at Johns Hopkins University, writing in the April 1936 Social Frontier criticized the "apologists of capitalism" who talk of correcting the shortcomings of the economic order "within the framework of the present system." And he pointed to a small group of American economists "but rapidly growing, which finds the only practicable exit in the common ownership of the social means of production and in their operation for use rather than for profit"—pages 215–217.

One of the popular, euphemistic phrases used by many of these educators to define the desired collectivism was "social design"—a polite term for governmental control or ownership. Thus, Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education at New York University, wrote in Frontiers of Democracy—January 15, 1940, pages 111–112, 126–127:

We need today a design for tomorrow. We need an American design which encompasses and unifies the partial, contradictory, often destructive plans of our traditional economy. We need a design where nature's goods at last are consciously, collectively controlled by the majority of our people.

And a few months earlier, Dr. Harold Rugg, professor of education at Columbia Teachers' College wrote—Frontiers of Democracy, October 15, 1939, pages 9–11:

A large-scale, sustained-yield economy can be operated here if a practicable social design and an efficient and socially acceptable scheme of control can be provided. Both seem to me to be called for; the design must be comprehensive enough to cross any boundaries, either of States or personally owned properties that interfere with the efficient and humane operation of the social system. The central control to administer it must be created by the people themselves.

And Dr. Rugg adds, "that, it seems to me, is what we must teach." Regarding that latter assertion, I will have more to say later.

Again, permit me to point out, the advocates of collectivism did not dodge the fact that a planned economy means a controlled economy and a controlled economy means governmental regimentation. Thus Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes wrote in Frontiers of Democracy, January 15, 1940, under the title "Should Social Change Be Consciously Directed?"—pages 106–110:

The only way to plan is to plan. It is impossible to graft a planned economy on

to a competitive economic order and still hope to preserve the latter. Planning is compatible only with a considerable amount of collectivism and economic regimentation.

Friends of planned social change might as well recognize this fact and either withdraw from the movement or be prepared for the regimentation of economic life and the restriction of complete intellectual freedom which effective planning must entail. On the other hand, there is no reason for believing that effective planning must involve so ruthless a type of mental and social regimentation as the Soviet Union and the Fascist states have instituted. But it is equally certain that Stalin and Coolidge will not mix. We cannot have social planning without paying a price therefor in terms of some curtailment of pioneer individualism and freedom. Let those who count the price too high reflect that the alternative is chaos and misery which would make the bank holiday of early March 1933, seem a beatific idyll by comparison.

These views also found expression outside of the journals I have been quoting.

Dr. John Dewey, patron saint of progressive education, wrote in his "Liberalism and Social Action," page 90:

Earlier liberalism regarded the separate and competing economic action of individuals as the means to social well-being as the end. We must reverse the perspective and see that socialized economy is the means of free and individual development as the end.

Stuart Chase, in his address before the Department of Superintendence of the NEA at its Atlantic City meeting, February 25, 1935—NEA Journal, April 1935, pages 107–110—said:

If we have even a trace of realism in our natures, we must be prepared to see an increasing amount of collectivism, Government interference, centralization of economic control, social planning. Here again, the relevant question is not how to get rid of Government interference, but how to apply it for the greatest good of the greatest number.

Writing in the thirteenth yearbook of the Department of Superintendence of the NEA—1935—Dr. John L. Childs, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia, said:

Democracy is supposed to denote a society in which control is by and for the people. Under present industrial conditions democratic control can be made a reality only by the collective ownership of those industries whose coordinated administration is essential to the success of a planned economy (p. 133).

* * * Enough data are now available * * * to show the general direction in which we must go. Industrialism points to national social planning. Our national ideal of social democracy requires that this planning be under collective control. Collective control cannot be made a reality in a regime of private ownership of the basic industries. Undoubtedly we can learn much from the experience of other countries, particularly Russia, but we also have our own unique conditions, resources, and ideals, and it would be disastrous for us to import wholesale the social methods of Communist Russia. Until we have seriously undertaken the task of inventing economic and political institutions which will make effectual social planning possible in our country and which will also seek to promote a career for individual initiative, we need not prematurely assume that collective planning and dictatorial bureaucratic regimentation of social life are necessary correlatives (pp. 137–138).

The citations could be endless. But nothing could more graphically sum up this commitment to the premise that capitalism must inevitably be replaced by collectivism than these concluding lines from a report on an educators' tour of Russia, written by Dr. Goodwin Watson, professor of education at Teachers College, Columbia, and a member of the Social Frontier board of directors—the Social Frontier, February 1937, page 143:

For each of us there were sights we approved and others we disapproved, but how about the balance of judgment on the new civilization as a whole? One became skeptical and remained rather unfavorable toward Soviet life. A half dozen who came prepared to find a bad situation had been transferred into warm admirers of the Communist scene. None who came with high expectations has been disappointed. The sum total would be more than 95 percent favorably influenced by this brief study. We had not always been comfortable, but we had been aware of a society directed toward the sustenance of major human values.

One question lingered in our minds. Anna Louise Strong had stated it for us. "I wish I knew," she said, "whether it will take longer for the Russians to develop efficiency or for America to develop socialism. Then I'd know where I want to live."

VI. UTOPIA VIA THE SCHOOLHOUSE

The educational movement here being described involves not only a summons to a belief but a summons to action—action on the part of teachers and school administrators, in and through the public schools, in behalf of that belief.

Therein lies the enormous and ominous significance of that movement. And therein lies the importance and relevancy of the premise documented in the preceding section.

There can be no question as to the right of a public school teacher to accept and, as an American citizen, to promote outside the classroom the premise that capitalism will or should be replaced by collectivism. That, incidentally, is not saying that a member of the Communist party should be permitted to teach in the public schools. The National Education Association and I are in perfect agreement on the proposition that Communist party membership disqualifies a person from teaching in the public schools of the United States.

The teacher's right of personal belief and advocacy, stated above, is one thing. It is something else, however, to propose that the teachers become the active agents for the promotion of collectivism as a part of their activities in the classroom, before the involuntary audience of pupils. It is something else, too, to propose that public education become the agency and medium for accomplishing that purpose.

Yet this is precisely the program of action advocated by the movement and activities here being documented. It is a proposal that, in the phrase I have already quoted from Dr. Kilpatrick, "the school take an active part in helping to build the new social order."

We will, in documenting this proposed course of action, encounter a variety of terms to describe the classroom process involved in this program. The blunt word, "propagandize" is sometimes used—though rarely. "Indoctrination" is another of the more forthright terms used—and the question of just what constitutes indoctrination becomes a subject of hair-splitting controversy among the educators. There are more euphemistic terms. Those who are hesitant to advocate outright classroom indoctrination in behalf of the collectivist goal, still accept collectivism as the "frame of reference" and basic "orientation" of the new education. The "democratic vision" of the possibilities of the new order are to be presented to the pupil, and his loyalties enlisted in its behalf. The objective is defined as that of attaining "uncoerced persuasion."

By whatever name it is called, the basic premise remains the same—the schools are actively to participate in building "the new social order" or in preparing and conditioning the child for participation in that order.

And that means, of course, that the educational system, its procedures and curriculum, are themselves to be reconstructed and revised to the extent necessary to carry out this program of action. But let the advocates and spokesmen of utopia-via-the-schoolhouse say it in their own words.

The whole point and purpose of Dr. Counts' original address at the Baltimore meeting, of his subsequent monograph, and of the "Call to the Teachers" which he inspired was, of course, that the teachers and the schools were to do something about it. The premise is implicit in the challenging title of the monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" The Call to the Teachers was not alone a call to belief, but to action as well.

In the Baltimore speech, Dr. Counts elaborated the achievement of the progressive education movement since its inception in 1921. Impressive though these achievements were, he held that there was something still lacking. "There is no good individual apart from some conception of the nature of the good society," he argued. Likewise, "there is no good education apart from some conception of the nature of the good society." What progressive education lacks is a "theory of social welfare." The corrective?

If progressive education is to be genuinely progressive, it must emancipate itself from the influence (of the upper middle class), face squarely and courageously every social issue, come to grips with life in all of its stark reality, establish a theory of social welfare, fashion a compelling and challenging vision of human destiny, and become somewhat less frightened than it is today at the bogeys of imposition and indoctrination. (Progressive Education, April 1932, p. 257.)

The "challenging vision of human destiny," as we have already abundantly documented of course is collectivism.

Changes in our economic system will—

Dr. Counts declared—

of course, require changes in our ideals.

And the role of the school must be an active one in promoting these changes:

When I say that progressive education should face all of these questions I do not mean merely that provision should be made in our progressive schools for children to

study the problems of economics, government, and so on. This much, of course, should be done. But unless the progressive education movement wishes to change its name to the contemplative education movement, the goodwill education movement, or the hopeful education movement, it should go much further. To my mind, a movement honestly styling itself progressive should engage in the positive task of creating a new tradition in American life, a tradition possessing power, appeal, and direction.

But, you will say, is this not leading us out upon very dangerous ground? Is it not taking us rather far from the familiar landmarks bounding the fields that teachers are wont to cultivate? My answer is, of course, in the affirmative. * * * If we are content to remain where all is safe and quiet and serene, we shall dedicate ourselves, as teachers have commonly done in the past, to a role of relatively complete futility, if not of positive social reaction. Neutrality with respect to the great issues that agitate society, while perhaps theoretically possible, is practically tantamount to giving support to the most powerful forces engaged in the contest (ibid. pp. 262–3).

That the role which Dr. Counts envisioned for the school involved active promotion in the schoolroom in behalf of "a coordinated, planned, and socialized economy" is clearly indicated in his further statement:

You will also say, no doubt, that I am flirting with the idea of indoctrination. And my answer is again in the affirmative, or, at least, I should say that the word does not frighten me. We may all rest assured that the younger generation in any society will be thoroughly imposed upon by its elders and by the culture into which it is born. For the school to work in a somewhat different direction with all the power at its disposal could do no great harm. At the most, unless the superiority of its outlook is unquestioned, it can but serve as a counterpoise to check and challenge the power of less enlightened or more selfish purposes (pp. 262–263).

In his monograph, "Dare the School Build a New Social Order?" after describing the potential benefits of collectivism, Dr. Counts wrote:

Such a vision of what America might become in the industrial age, I would introduce into our schools as the supreme imposition, but one to which our children are entitled—a priceless legacy which it should be the first concern of our profession to fashion and bequeath. The objection will, of course, be raised that this is asking teachers to assume unprecedented social responsibilities. But we live in difficult and dangerous times—times when precedents lose their significance (pp. 53–54).

And he repeats the view expressed in his earlier paper:

If the schools are to be really effective, they must become centers for the building, and not merely the contemplation of our civilization. This does not mean that we should endeavor to promote particular reforms through the educational system. We should, however, give to our children a vision of the possibilities which lie ahead and endeavor to enlist their loyalties and enthusiasms in the realization of the vision. Also, our social institutions and practices, all of them, should be critically examined in the light of such a vision (pp. 36–37).

Then comes this bold counsel, regarding which we will have more to say later:

That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and then make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and procedures of the school they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation. * * * It is my observation that the men and women who have affected the course of human events are those who have not hesitated to use the power that has come to them (pp. 27–30).

The "Call to the Teachers" is a call to participate "actively in the task of reconstituting the democratic tradition and of thus working positively toward a new society"—page 19. They "must work boldly and without ceasing for a better social order."

That what is demanded is a complete revision of the teacher's role both in society and in the schools is made crystal clear by the following injunction, one which should do more to provoke curiosity as to what's going on in the schools than all of the criticisms of lay groups or individuals:

If the teachers are to play a positive and creative role in building a better social order, indeed if they are not to march in the ranks of economic, political, and cultural reaction, they will have to emancipate themselves completely from the domination of the business interests of the Nation, cease cultivating the manners and associations of bankers and promotion agents, repudiate utterly the ideal of material success as the goal of education, abandon the smug middle-class tradition on which they have been nourished in the past, acquire a realistic understanding of the forces that actually rule the world, and formulate a fundamental program of thought and action that will deal honestly and intelligently with the problems of industrial civilization. They will have to restate their philosophy of education, reorganize the procedures of the school, and redefine their own position in society. Such measures will of course require fundamental changes in the methods of teacher training and the assumption on the part of the profession of an increasing burden of cultural leadership (pp. 20–22).

The reference to changes in methods of teacher training should particularly be noted. It is a reminder of the basic importance of the teacher training institutions to the entire educational program. And, by the same token, it reinforces a basic premise of this documentation, namely, that the extent of the permeation of collectivist philosophy into teacher colleges in an important index—the most important index—to the extent of the permeation of that philosophy into the public-school classroom.

That what Dr. Counts envisioned is also a complete revision of the philosophy and role of the school in society is made equally clear by the following:

In the collectivist society now emerging the school should be regarded, not as an agency for lifting gifted individuals out of the class into which they were born and of elevating them into favored positions where they may exploit their less-favored fellows, but rather as an agency for the abolition of all artificial social distinctions and of organizing the energies of the Nation for the promotion of the general welfare. This, of course, does not mean that the individual should not be encouraged to succeed. It means instead that he should be given a new measure of success.

Throughout the school program the development of the social rather than the egotistic impulses should be stressed; and the motive of personal aggrandizement should be subordinated to social ends. In promotion practices, in school activities, in the relations of pupils and teachers and administrators, the ideal of a cooperative commonwealth should prevail, due allowance being made for the requirements of special knowledge and the discharge of social responsibility. * * * All of this applies quite as strictly to the nursery, the kindergarten, and the elementary school as to the secondary school, the college, and the university (pp. 20–22).

Plainly this is a blueprint for converting the schools—from nursery through high school, and upward to college and university—into agencies for promoting the collectivist social order and developing a generation acquiescent to that social order.

The opening wedge for such a program was provided in the Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association's Commission on Social Studies.

The point of entry is clearly defined and adroitly chosen. The commission proposed consolidation of the traditional high-school subjects of geography, economics, cultural sociology, political science or civics, and history, in a single educational category to be designated the "social sciences."

It is obvious that this is the most strategic of all teaching areas so far as advancement of collectivist philosophy is concerned. Success in enlisting the teachers in this field in the cause of the "new social order" would have an effect and influence out of all proportion to the relative number of teachers involved.

The commission's Conclusions and Recommendations were addressed particularly to this area of education, and evidence of the purpose to exploit this newly designated educational field is found in the following recommendation:

The commission * * * deems desirable * * * the incorporation into the materials of social science instruction in the schools of the best plans and ideals of the future of society and of the individual (p. 27).

This particular paragraph brought a tart rejoinder from one "unreconstructed rebel" on the commission. Isaiah Bowman, who appended a minority report to the commission's recommendations, asked simply, "Who is to know the best?" No answer was forthcoming. But the answer is clearly implied in the document—the educators, of course, are the ones who will "know the best."

Bearing in mind the commission's conclusion that collectivism "is the future already coming into reality," the following recommendations clearly indicate the sweeping reconstruction of the schools and the education program proposed to serve this "future":

Organized public education in the United States, much more than ever before, is now compelled, if it is to fulfill its social obligation, to adjust its objectives, its curriculum, its methods of instruction, and its administrative procedure to the requirements of the emerging integrated order. * * * It must recognize the new order and proceed to equip the rising generation to cooperate effectively in the increasingly interdependent society and to live rationally and well within its limitations and possibilites (pp. 35–36).

By way of conditioning the child for this new order, "in the organization of the life of the school and the conduct of instruction, emphasis will be placed on the development of the social and creative rather than the acquisitive impulses"—page 40.

Furthermore, "the competent teacher, sensitive to the implications of the democratic ideal and conscious of the growing interdependence of social life, will appeal as little as possible to those motives which tend to exacerbate the struggle between individuals and will encourage the fullest development of the social and creative impulses"—page 81.

The import of these recommendations was accurately summed up by the late Professor Harold J. Laski, philosopher of British socialism, in an article in The New Republic, July 29, 1936:

At bottom, and stripped of its carefully neutral phrases, the report is an educational program for a Socialist America (pp. 342–345).

Mr. Laski further commented that the report calls for "education for a life socially controlled," and for "a teaching that definitely emphasizes the implications of a new social orientation." More later about Mr. Laski's estimate of this report.

The educational literature produced by the disciples and sponsors of this program is filled with plans for reshaping education for this new task of social reconstruction.

Dr. Harold Rugg, in his address before the New Education Fellowship in Nice, France, in 1932, said:

Before the school can be used as an agent for social regeneration, it must undergo thorough reconstruction.

How is the problem to be attacked? The first step is the building of a new program of work, a new content for the curriculum, directly out of the problems, issues and characteristics of our changing society. (Progressive Education, December 1932–January 1933, pp. 11–18.)

Among "the basic concepts that should constitute the guiding skeleton of our new educational program," according to Dr. Rugg, is the alleged "need for change in political, economic, and social government" and "the utter lack of economic government in the modern world."

Therefore:

Our new materials of instruction shall illustrate fearlessly and dramatically the inevitable consequence of the lack of planning and of central control over the production and distribution of physical things.

The large-scale undertaking assigned to the schools in promoting the new social order is made clear in this further comment by Dr. Rugg:

Thus through the schools of the world, we shall disseminate a new conception of Government—one that will embrace all of the collective activities of men; that will postulate the need for scientific control and operation of economic activities in the interests of all of the people. Political government in a new connotation, then, including economic government and social government.

Dr. Willard W. Beatty, president of the Progressive Education Association, writing in 1933, asserted that the educator "who would contribute materially to social planning" must "be prepared to undertake the instruction of children for their share in the new order"—Progressive Education, October 1933, page 304.

Dr. Norman Woelfel, in the January-February 1934 Progressive Education, argues that "educators are inevitably propagandists for one kind of social order or another."

Woelfel holds that with "our thin crust of culture breaking before our eyes" the educators' "ancient tactics of care and tact and impartiality are, of course, basically futile today." Neutrality is out:

If we wish to mutter longer the old rhetoric about democracy, as we pursue under capitalism our almost secret routine in the schools, that is a possible choice also, but there can be no assurance that it will long remain a possible alternative. If we will, as teachers, individually and then collectively, make this fundamental choice between clearly distinct social ideals, further procedures will be envisioned more clearly (pp. 107–112).

But the real danger before educators, as Dr. Woelfel sees it, is "this mental attitude which makes a supreme virtue out of listening to both sides forever and forever without ever making a decision." Obviously mere teaching about socialism is not enough for him.

This same premise that the purpose of teaching is not merely to present alternatives but actively to propagandize in behalf of a definite course of action is stated in a Social Frontier editorial on "The Ives Law"—October 1934, page 9:

They (the teachers) should proceed to a consideration of the changes in its (the Constitution's) provisions which the rise of industrial civilization is making desirable or necessary. And in doing all this, they should endeavor to carry their pupils with them.

Dr. John Dewey, while exceedingly dextrous in the manipulation of words, makes it equally clear that the premise of a collectivist social order calls for action in its behalf in the classroom. Because of his immense influence in modern education, I quote Dr. Dewey's statement at some length—"Can Education Share in Social Reconstruction?"—Social Frontier, October 1934, pages 11–12:

I do not think * * * that the schools can in any literal sense be the builders of a new social order. But the schools will surely as a matter of fact and not of ideal, share in the building of the social order of the future according as they ally themselves with this or that movement of existing social forces. This fact is inevitable. The schools of America have furthered the present social drift and chaos by their emphasis upon an economic form of success which is intrinsically pecuniary and egoistic. They will of necessity, and again not as a matter of theory, take an active part in determining the social order—or disorder—of the future, according as teachers and administrators align themselves with the older so-called "individualistic" ideals—which in fact are fatal to individuality for the many—or with the newer forces making for social control of economic forces. The plea that teachers must passively accommodate themselves to existing conditions is but one way—and a cowardly way—of making a choice in favor of the old and chaotic.

If the teacher's choice is to throw himself in with the forces and conditions that are making for change in the direction of social control of capitalism—economic and political—there will hardly be a moment of the day when he will not have the opportunity to make his choice good in action. If the choice is conscious and intelligent, he will find that it affects the details of school administration and discipline, of methods of teaching, of selection and emphasis of subject-matter. * * * The task is to translate the desired ideal over into the conduct of the detail of the school in administration, instruction and subject matter. Here, it seems to me, is the great present need and responsibility of those who think the schools should consciously be partners in the construction of a changed society. The challenge to teachers must be issued and in clear tones. But the challenge is merely a beginning. What does it mean in the particulars of work in the school and on the playground? An answer to this question and not more general commitment to social theory and slogans is the pressing demand.

An editorial in the April 1935 Social Frontier rebukes the magazine, the Nation, for criticizing a statement attributed to Dr. Jesse H. Newlon to the effect that "teachers are today justified in assuming a partisan position upon basic social and economic issues and in preaching the apparent truth of an impending collectivism." The critical view taken by the Nation, the editorial asserts, amounts to saying that "educational leaders are stepping over the proper bounds when they advise that teachers should build in youth attitudes more vital than that expressed in the platitudinous affirmation, 'there is much to be said on both sides' "—page 7. In the same issue, the Social Frontier calls upon teachers "to make clear by all means at their disposal that only social ownership and democratic control of the means of production can secure a free and democratic life." And it urges "effective counter propaganda" against the "propagandas of profit-motivated reactionaries"—page 9.

The same view that "education cannot be neutral" was expressed by Dr. Newlon during a panel discussion before the Department of Superintendence—NEA—meeting February 26, 1935. Dr. Newlon, professor of education and director of Lincoln School, Teachers College, Columbia, insisted that "the school will be employed either to support the existing order or to build a better social order"—NEA Proceedings, 1935, pages 540–541.

Dr. Harold Rugg, writing in the Social Frontier of October 1936, emphasizes that "a necessary first step in educational reconstruction lies in the remaking of the curriculum"—pages 12–15. Teachers should be brought into contact with new ideas in order to change their "understanding, outlook and method." The importance of such a change is made clear: "To change the outlook and procedure of teachers is to change the very lives of the children in their care."

An extreme example of the proposed changes in curriculum and instructional material is provided by the comment of James M. Shields, former supervising principal of elementary schools at Winston-Salem, N. C.—Social Frontier, June 1936, pages 281–284:

It fairly staggers one to consider the tremendous task ahead in revision of our existing instructional literature if it is to be of any use at all in a collectivist society.

Hardly a public school textbook now in use but is saturated with the profit psychology. Arithmetics are permeated with profit and loss, gain, "making" money. One would hunt in vain through their pages for any incentive to economic cooperation. Even geographies are replete with production for gain. And as for histories. No wonder the Russians started from scratch in creating an entire new educational literature under the Soviet system. Almost we may have to discover America anew.

The question of whether, and to what extent, "indoctrination" in behalf of the new collectivist social order is permissible, become a much debated issue in educational circles. It is not necessary to go into the technical details of this controversy. In many instances the views expressed by the same educators are self-contradictory. Dr. Rugg, for example, wrote—October 1936, Social Frontier, pages 12–15—that he did not advocate "the construction of any theoretical social order and its 'teaching' in the schools." Yet in the October 1939, Frontiers of Democracy, he insisted upon the necessity of a "scheme of central control" and added, "that is what we must teach"—pages 9–11.

Dr. Dewey similarly expressed disapproval of "undemocratic inculcation of ready-made conclusions" in the classroom, but added:

If teachers who hold that there is an intrinsic relationship between actualization of democracy and social planning of economic institutions and relations, hope to bring others to the same conclusions by use of the method of investigation and free cooperative discussion, I see nothing undemocratic in the procedure. It looks to me like an educational procedure and (one) * * * that teachers who have been led to accept the conclusion might then use with their own students. (Social Frontier, December 1938, pp. 71–72.)

Whatever the euphemisms employed to soothe suspicions, the basic fact remains that the program here being described contemplates activity in the classroom designed to propagandize for collectivism and designed to condition the child for a collectivist social order.

Dr. Boyd H. Bode, professor of education at Ohio State University, a sharp critic of this program, accurately described its propagandist character in a debate with Dr. John L. Childs in the columns of the Social Frontier:

Under the impetus of indignation * * * he (Dr. Childs) shows a disposition to identify democracy with a campaign for a specific scheme of ownership and distribution. Hand in hand with this goes a bold demand for "inculcation" and for a crusade to win adherents (November 1938, pp. 38–40).

Dr. Harry D. Gideonse—Social Frontier, January 1935, pages 15–18—rebuked the proposed program even more sharply with this prophetic warning:

The peril of it all might well be that history (or social studies) under such a definition is likely to become a controversial subject comparable to religion and unsuitable for instruction in the schools for the same reason. Whatever propagandists may call such new "education," it smells like propaganda—and a viciously untruthful sort—under any other name. We might leave these things to the American equivalents of Moscow and of Dr. Goebbels. A free school should have no truck with it.

The length to which this action program in support of the collectivist society is carried is indicated by the assertion of Dr. Jesse H. Newlon—Frontiers of Democracy, April 15, 1941, pages 208–11—that "the so-called child-centered school goes into the ashcan." The school, Dr. Newlon held, must become "society centered." It was statements of this type which prompted John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City schools, to question indignantly whether a person holding such educational views "has a moral right to enroll himself as a teacher of children or as a teacher of teachers-of-children"—Social Frontier, IV, pages 319–322. And Dr. Tildsley angrily charged that the leaders of this movement "lose sight of the child as the center of the educative process and are not concerned with his growth, save in one direction, namely, his growth into an accelerator of a democratic collectivist social order. They view the child as collectivist-futter—fodder—to be utilized without regard to the effect on him of the collectivist-society-making process."

VII. CLASS WAR IN THE CLASSROOM

Should the public school classroom become a battleground of the class war? Should American teachers join in that war?

It is a shocking thing that such questions should even be asked in the United States.

It is vastly more shocking to find supposedly responsible American educators answering these questions in the affirmative.

Extremist advocates of the collectivist premise of course believe that the transition from capitalism to collectivism will probably, if not inevitably, involve stern resistance on the part of the owner class and therefore lead to open conflict—political or worse—between the owner and worker classes of society. These extremists likewise hold that the schools cannot escape this conflict, and that teachers who would contribute to the realization of the collectivist society must cast their lot, in classroom and out, with the worker class.

Class war, of course, is a tenet of Marxism, and whether or not they accepted the Marxist label, the more extreme advocates of the achievement of collectivism-through-the-classroom embraced this class-war tenet.

Even Dr. Counts, who later vigorously repudiated communism, showed strong leanings toward this Marxist tenet in his earlier writings:

If democracy is to be achieved in the industrial age, powerful classes must be persuaded to surrender their privileges, and institutions deeply rooted in popular prejudice will have to be radically modified or abolished. And according to the historical record, this process has commonly been attended by bitter struggle and even bloodshed. Ruling classes never surrender their privileges voluntarily.

* * * There is little evidence from the pages of American history to support us in the hope that we may adjust our differences through the method of sweetness and light. (Dare the School Build a New Social Order? pp. 50–52.)

The implications of this view are developed in the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

Even the taxpayers have no special claim on the schools; they are but the tax collectors of society; ultimately school revenue comes from all who labor by hand or brain. This the teachers should never forget. Their loyalty therefore goes to the great body of the laboring population—to the farmers the industrial workers, and the other members of the producing classes of the Nation. They owe nothing to the present economic system, except to improve it; they owe nothing to any privileged caste, except to strip it of its privileges (pp. 19–20).

One of the most vigorous advocates of collectivism-through-the-schools during the past 20 years has been Dr. Theodore Brameld, professor of education at New York University. Dr. Brameld held that "realistically minded teachers might profit by greater acquaintance with Marx." While disclaiming advocacy of Marxism, Brameld pointed out that "several of his"—Marx's—"basic postulates are likewise those of a considerable group of progressive educators," especially his belief "that the profit system is the root of our social troubles" and his insistence "that collectivism has to replace it"—"Karl Marx and the American Teacher," Social Frontier, November 1935, pages 53–56.

Brameld called attention to Marx's statement in a letter to his friend Kugelmann that "the solution cannot proceed along pleasant lines." He emphasized the Marxian principle that "the opposition of the class in control of capitalist society is so tremendous that nothing short of counter-opposition frequently bordering upon, indeed crystallizing into, illegality will suffice to defeat it." Brameld declared that in Marx's view violence was to be avoided if possible; "but it should not be characterized categorically as immoral under all circumstances."

Dr. Brameld believed that Marxism "would applaud" the statement of Professor Newlon that "teachers must prepare to join in an organized way with the liberal forces seeking to build a better society, with labor, farmers, professionals and all others who do the actual productive work of the country, in the struggle of the people against special privilege"—Science and Society—A Marxian quarterly, fall, 1936, pages 1–17.

And Brameld held that, consistent with the Marxian strategy, teachers who wish to conduct their activity "within the school and without in behalf of the collectivist ideal must influence their students, subtly if necessary, frankly if possible, toward acceptance of the same position"—Social Frontier, November 1935, pages 52–55.

Dr. William H. Kilpatrick, chairman of the board of the Social Frontier, followed up publication of the Brameld article with an emphatic rejection of Marxism. But in the discussion which ensued the class approach to the fight for collectivism found vigorous espousal, even in one editorial in the Social Frontier. This editorial, in the February 1936 issue, pages 134–135, asserted:

To us the class approach to society appeals as the most promising to an understanding

of the processes of history and the complexities, conflicts, difficulties, and problems of life today. It appeals to us, also, as an extremely useful point of departure for a method of bringing about those changes which are necessary for an equitable distribution of the goods of life.

There then follows this brutally frank line of argument:

If we wanted a society dominated by either men or women, by Negroes or Nordics, by Jews, Catholics, Protestants, or atheists, we would approach society with a sex, race, or religious orientation. But we want a society dominated by and managed in the interest of those who create national and cultural wealth. We want a society in which goods will be produced for use, and not for the profit of owners of means of production. We want a society in which the wealth-creating resources and instruments will be owned collectively, controlled democratically, and managed efficiently. We want a society in which the fruits of economic effort will be distributed in such a way as to liberate the masses of the people for creative and appreciative experiences in the realms of culture.

In the process of creating such a society the needed classification—and we have indicated that classification of one kind or another is necessary for social engineering—is the classification of "worker" and "owner."

This classification, the editorial contends, meets the need for "an appeal that cuts across the maze of interests of the various groups" in society. "That appeal is the workers versus owners appeal."

The editorial further holds that "America now consists of one self-conscious class and one class that is not yet self-conscious." The "self-conscious class" is represented by the American Liberty League and the National Association of Manufacturers. The workers, of course, are the class "not yet self-conscious."

On the basis of this premise, the editorial states its conception of the task of education:

In view of the absence of a class mentality among the workers, it would be reasonable to assume that it is the problem of education to induce such a mentality, rather than to take an existing mentality and base a course of action upon it. In the interests of a genuinely classless society the crucial class distinctions which now exist ought to be emphasized.

Despite the extremely radical departure from the traditional American conception of our society and of the role of education, advocates of this view are emphatic in their insistence upon it as a necessary feature of the reconstruction of both society and the school. This view is given forceful expression by Dr. John L. Childs, professor of education at Teachers' College, Columbia University:

No matter how unaccustomed we Americans may be to thinking and operating in class terms, if we are empirical, we cannot shut out this possibility on a priori grounds. Here, also, the appeal must be to conditions, and not simply to what old habits of mind make congenial.

The institutions and practices of our historic American economic individualism are in irreconcilable conflict with the patterns of life implicit in the present interdependent industrial economy. * * * The collective, scientific planning and utilization of resources, material and human, in the interest of the whole community * * * is incompatible with the continuance of the historic profit system. * * *

If affairs are studied in relation to vital national trends the "class" concept seems to many to be less doctrinaire than the "classless" doctrine. So also from an empirical point of view does the notion of a deepening conflict of interests between owners and workers correspond more closely to the actual situation than does the view that all will collaborate in the transformation of our economic system. (Can Teachers Stay Out of the Class Struggle? Social Frontier, April 1936, pp. 219–222.)

Dr. Childs further contends that "the educator who now seeks to compromise or reconcile" this difference between the owner-worker classes "is not using his energies to good advantage." Childs is convinced that "we shall not make the transition to an effectual, planning society by the collaboration of all groups" and that "educators can play an important role" in the reconstruction of society only as they accept this premise.

Therefore, he concludes:

Educators, aware of what is now involved, and content to be guided by probabilities, in the absence of demonstrated certainty, should not find it difficult to decide where they belong in this deepening struggle of classes.

This view provoked violent dissent even among so-called liberal educators. In response to this criticism, Dr. Childs agreed that "the experimentalist educator will not encourage the preaching of violence and class hatred," because "his experience teaches him that when passions of this sort are aroused, it is generally chance operating as brute force and not intelligence which decides the issue." Such tactics, he warned, "might also lead to a sweeping reaction which could easily result in some form of Fascist control."

But Dr. Childs still insisted that "the only adequate social point of view for education is one which includes as an essential part the conception of the class struggle." And he warned that the experimentalist educator "will recognize that democracy involves the right of a majority to make its will prevail even if the power of government and law must be utilized to coerce reluctant minorities entrenched in outmoded institutional arrangements. Political democracy is not to be opposed to engaging in group and class struggles"—The Social Frontier, June 1935, pages 274–278.

It remained for Dr. Boyd H. Bode to reduce to man-in-the-street terms the import of what the advocates of class war in the classroom were proposing. He warned that however cleverly or carefully the proposals might be worded, the fine phraseology "must not be permitted to obscure the fact that this proposed scheme of education is deliberately aimed at fostering a disposition which will make the pupil intolerant and 'sore' with respect to the contrast between employers and workers"—the Social Frontier, November 1938, pages 38–40.

VIII. "FOLKS AREN'T GOING TO LIKE THIS"

From the very outset advocates of the promotion of a collectivist society through the public schools recognized the inevitability of powerful opposition to their program and its objectives. The leaders of the movement were too intelligent, too realistic, and too discerning not to do so.

The emphasis which they placed upon this anticipated opposition, and the pains to which they went to devise and recommend a strategy for overcoming that opposition, is itself a significant indication of the revolutionary character of their basic program.

Realization of the inevitability of this opposition explains Dr. Counts' statement, in his monograph, Dare the School Build a New Social Order?

We know full well that, if the school should endeavor vigorously and consistently to win its pupils to the support of a given social program, unless it were supported by other agencies, it could act only as a mild counterpoise to restrain and challenge the might of less enlightened and more selfish purposes (p. 24).

It was the same realization of this inevitable opposition which prompted Dr. Counts' startling injunction to teachers "deliberately"—to—"reach for power and then make the most of their conquest"—page 30. In this same vein, Dr. Counts warned that—

The power that teachers exercise in the schools can be no greater than the power they wield in society.

For this reason teachers "must be prepared to stand on their own feet and win for their ideas the support of the masses of the people"—pages 30–31.

The problem posed by the certainty of powerful opposition is stated even more clearly in the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

Thus we are brought face to face with the paradox: The school must participate in the task of social reconstruction, yet until society is already transformed the school can scarcely hope to function effectively (p. 23).

The reason for this paradox is obvious. As the "Call" warned, efforts at social reconstruction through the schools are certain to be confronted by "the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged."

No one saw more clearly the certainty of this opposition and the threat which it involved than Prof. Harold Laski. In describing the Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association commission as "an educational program for a Socialist America," Laski offered a powerful warning against the practical obstacles in the pathway of such a program—a program which, of course, he heartily endorsed. He said, with respect to this educational program:

It is a direct criticism of the ideals that have shaped capitalist America; the ideals, also, that American capitalists still stoutly hold. To them it says in effect: We want you to agree to the trial of educational practices built upon the assumption that you and all that you are stand in contradiction to the needs of America. Our spirit is a denial of your spirit. Where you deny, we affirm; where you affirm, we deny. What you think are the safeguards of America are the things we believe will work disaster for it. We ask you to allow the schools to be used for the destruction of those safeguards.

Continuing this interpretation of what the proposed program involves, Mr. Laski pointed out that it says, in effect, to the leaders and exponents of the present American way:

We want to fill them (the schools) with teachers who will analyze critically all the things for which you stand. We want to create in the schools a new generation which will realize that your ideals, your purposes, your methods, are both dangerous and obsolete. We believe that it is to the interest of America—even, on a long view, to your interest—to help us to realize our program. Cannot we rely, in this crisis of America's destiny, upon your willing support for this adventure?

And, Laski concludes:

Virtually * * * the report (of the commission) asks the present owning class in America to cooperate in facilitating its own erosion. I know of no historic experience that makes that demand likely of fulfillment. * * * The report, I believe, underestimates the passion with which men cling to the religion of ownership; and its impact upon the votaries of that faith would, if they read it, lead less to conviction that conversion was desirable than to the angry perception that the liberal teacher is an even more dangerous heretic than they have hitherto been accustomed to affirm. (New Republic, July 29, 1936, pp. 342–345.)

John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City schools, and a sharp critic of the Counts' program, envisioned opposition on an even broader scale:

Does Dr. Counts really believe that when he has won over the teachers to his revolutionary program, the parents, most of whom are opposed to the program, will continue to support teachers who (against the wishes of the parents) are making converts of their children for an industrial system that never has been operated successfully anywhere? (Social Frontier IV: 319–322.)

The same objections were anticipated by President Willard W. Beatty of the Progressive Education Association, writing in 1933:

We must recognize the fact that schools cannot offer their children instruction in political or economic doctrines which differ materially from those understood or accepted by the adult community. (Progressive Education, October 1933, p. 304.)

We will have occasion, presently, to note Beatty's formula for overcoming this obstacle.

In its final paragraph, the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation" stated the problem with breath-taking candor:

In conclusion, an obvious truth must be emphasized. The individual teacher cannot fight the battles of the profession alone. To advise him to do so, would be the counsel of madness. Working in isolation he cannot convert the school into an effective instrument of social reconstruction. If, unsupported by his colleagues, he should attempt any considerable part of the program outlined in these pages, almost inevitably his days as a teacher would be speedily numbered. He would fall before the onslaught of some body of witch hunters or some selfish interest (p. 26).

The problem is clearly enough defined. Its recognition by the advocates of social reconstruction through the schools is sufficiently established by these citations. I proceed to the various proposals for meeting this acknowledged hazard.

IX. STEPS TO POWER

However vague the leaders of the campaign for collectivism through the schools may be about some of the details of the new social order they are promoting, there is no corresponding vagueness about the measures they regard as necessary to equip and prepare the profession, and particularly its progressive element, for the coming struggle. There is no lack of imaginative and ambitious boldness in planning preparations for both offensive and defensive warfare.

The preparations envisioned include such mundane matters as professional tenure for teachers—job security, in other words—accumulation of necessary financial resources for the war chest, and even anticipation of need for legal aids. They include insistence by the teaching profession upon academic freedom, professional status, public deference to "trained judgment" of the educators, and, as a corollary, a minimum of "interference" by the lay public. There is recognition, too, of the need for "more liberal school boards"—since these agencies remain an unavoidable evil.

The proposed preparations also include strengthening of professional organizations and "solidarity," unionization of teachers, enlistment of the support of other social groups and organizations of kindred "liberal" spirit and aims, and even utilization of the "class approach" as a "resource" in the campaign. In a few instances the promoters of this campaign do not scruple to justify resort to deception and slyness.

Finally, and most ambitious of all, is the call for an all-out effort of adult education in behalf of the social reconstruction program—held to be necessary to provide a favorable climate of public opinion, at least among the "thinking minority," and to assure the ultimate success of the immense undertaking of building a collectivist society.

It is hard to spot a detail in the preparations that these educational-reform strategists overlooked.

The "Call to the Teachers of the Nation" lists many of the essential steps which teachers must take to fortify themselves for the struggle: It warns that "any program of education designed for the coming generation, if it is to be successful, must march hand in hand and be closely coordinated with a program of adult and parent education."

Furthermore, it asserts the profession's "members must prepare to struggle cooperatively and valiantly for their rights and ideals. They must fight for tenure, for adequate compensation, for a voice in the formulation of educational policies; they must uphold the ancient doctrine of academic freedom and maintain all of their rights as human beings and American citizens"—pages 24–25.

Let me interject, at this point, that no right-thinking person would deny the public-school teacher any of his rights either as a human being or as an American citizen. The "Call" continues:

Also they must insist on the public recognition of their professional competence in the field of education; they must oppose every effort on the part of publishing houses, business interests, privileged classes, and patriotic societies to prescribe the content of the curriculum. * * *

* * * The progressive-minded teachers of the country must unite in a powerful organization, militantly devoted to the building of a better social order and to the fulfillment, under the conditions of industrial civilization, of the democratic aspirations of the American people. In the defense of its members against the ignorance of the masses and the malevolence of the privileged, such an organization would have to be equipped with the material resources, the legal talent, and the trained intelligence necessary to wage successful warfare in the press, the courts, and the legislative chambers of the Nation (p. 26).

The Conclusions and Recommendations of the American Historical Association commission stressed the need for the public to defer to the profession:

If the school is to discharge the highly conservative function of relieving tensions in American society and of bringing thought and reason to bear on social adjustment, then reliance must be placed on the trained judgment of those to whom the actual conduct of public education is entrusted (p. 125).

This commission also emphasized that:

If the teacher is * * * to free the school from domination of special interests * * * there must be a redistribution of power in the conduct of education. * * * The boards of education will have to be made more representative (p. 128).

This same preoccupation with the make-up of boards of education is revealed, with a note of pessimism, in a review of Dr. Counts' book, "The Schools Can Teach Democracy," by Dr. Harold C. Hand, associate professor of education at Stanford University:

Given the present class-composition of virtually all of our boards of education, and the administrator-dominated type of teachers' organization to which the vast majority of the affiliated teachers now belong, what hope that such a splendid program of democratic education could be translated into actual practice in the classroom? (Frontiers of Democracy, October 1939, p. 24.)

In a similarly pessimistic vein, John Lloyd Snell, writing on "Social Attitudes of California School Board Members"—February 1940, Frontiers of Democracy, pages 141–142—offered this conclusion:

In general, the preponderance of evidence afforded by the investigation shows that high-school board members in the State of California, judged by their affiliations with organizations, are allied with the more conservative elements in our society and, in general, share their attitudes. It seems logical to assume that this conservative attitude is now operating and will continue to operate to modify and limit the possible directions that education may take in the State. Few of the many needed departures from the traditional secondary school curriculum may be expected to emanate from high-school boards as set up at present in California.

One of the most recent restatements of the necessity of stronger teacher organization to protect members of the profession in their self-appointed task of social reconstruction was made by Kenneth D. Benne, in his presidential address

before the American Education Fellowship—Progressive Education Association—in 1951:

Both preservice education of teachers and in-service education, through conferences, institutes, study groups, and school experimentation, must help teachers * * * to become actors as well as students in the struggle to determine the shape of the future * * * whether progressive or static, reactionary and dead.

One other lesson teachers must learn. This is the lesson of organized professional responsibility and solidarity to protect schools and teachers in the responsible, daring and open study, discussion and experimentation which the teaching task requires; to enlist the aid and support of other forces and groups who, like progressive teachers, are devoted to a democratic future for America and the world in protecting the transformation of the schools, to oppose forces and groups which would make of schools the passive and impotent hawkers of harmless, irrelevant, and outworn knowledge and values, the agents of social reaction. (Progressive Education, April 1951, p. 196.)

A similar emphasis on "professional solidarity" is provided by the counsel of Superintendent Virgil M. Rogers of Battle Creek, Mich., in an address at the July 1951 NEA meeting in San Francisco. Dr. Rogers urged:

Teachers must close ranks professionally, remove the schisms, and solidly unite professionally in every community and throughout the Nation.

A statement prepared by the NEA Committee on Tenure and Academic Freedom rightfully asserts that "pupils need protection from the possible bias of teachers on certain issues" and that "community groups have the right to assume that they may justly protest, if convinced that both sides of an issue are not being fairly presented." At the same time, however, it cites as an example of "whims of unduly sensitive individuals or groups" criticism of a textbook which charged that "The typical newspaper is far from being impartial. Editorials that might offend big advertisers are not approved." And the statement insists that there is "need for professional solidarity in protesting all forms of censorship, suppression, and attacks on education" and "need for organized action from state and national arms of the profession for the preservation of our fundamental freedoms"—NEA Journal, May 1951, pages 321–322.

The call for professional solidarity takes many forms. Thus, Dr. Theodore Brameld, in his discussion of possible contributions of Marxism to the profession, said:

Particularly would he (Karl Marx) be pleased to see that at least a few teachers have already gone so far as to unionize themselves as a class, conscious of interests fundamentally separate from most school boards or from others sympathetic with the status quo. (Social Frontier, November 1935, pp. 53–56.)

Again, in Science and Society—A Marxian Quarterly—fall 1936, pages 1–17—Brameld wrote:

Marxism would applaud * * * the statement of Professor Newlon in the Social Frontier, "Teachers, if they are really opposed to suppression that is fascism, must prepare to join in an organized way with the liberal forces seeking to build a better society, with labor, farmers, professionals, and all others who do the actual productive work of the country, in the struggle of the people against special privilege."

That the purpose of such organization is not merely that of collective bargaining with respect to tenure, salaries, etc., is made clear by Dr. John Dewey—Social Frontier, April 1935, pages 11–12:

An open alliance of teachers with workers would greatly strengthen the educational as well as the economic position of the teaching body.

Organization among teachers is imperatively needed to stem the rising tide of brutal reaction and intimidation. But so many teachers are timid because of "hostages to fortune" that it is foolish to suppose that this organization will be adequate unless it is supported by wider and deeper organization with others who have a common interest in the reconstruction of the present regime of production for personal gain and personal power. * * *

What can be done? The direct answer is: join locals of the American Federation of Teachers where they exist; help form them where they do not exist. * * * I would heartily second the motion of Heywood Broun for an alliance of teachers with the Newspaper Guild. Actors and writers are organized or beginning to organize. Ministers in the churches, while not yet widely organized for other than purely professional purposes, have spoken, through their various organizations, more and more openly about the injustices of the present order.

What is needed is an aggressive alliance of these various groups. Divided, we may fall. United, we shall stand, and in standing shall do our special work.

It is significant that some educators flatly rejected this counsel. Thus, Dr. H. Gordon Hullfish, professor of education at Ohio State University, writing under the title, "Why I Am Resigning From the Teachers' Union," said:

I see no justification for throwing the allegiance of the school at either extreme (left or right), thus placing greater pressure upon the school than already exists, and this at a time when so many factions in our society are giving evidence of a measure of social motivation. (The Social Frontier, January 1937, pp. 110–112.)

In a similar vein, Pearl A. Wanamaker, State superintendent of public instruction of the State of Washington, said in an address before the NEA representative assembly, July 7, 1947:

The best interests of public education are not served by affiliation of the teaching profession with labor. * * *

Teachers, like physicians and lawyers, work in a specialized field with no more relation to one than another area outside that field. * * * Why, then, should members of our profession single out for a special kind of cooperation a part of our population devoted to a special economic viewpoint?

All professions must cooperate with each other and with nonprofessional organizations in joint projects devoted to the Nation's welfare. That is the democratic way. * * *

The NEA stands firm in its objection to organized affiliation of the profession, as a body, with any part of the national life that entertains an exclusive economic, religious, or political point of view. (NEA Journal, Sept. 1947, p. 434.)

In line with the call for professional organization and solidarity here being documented, Dr. Norman Woelfel urged "a united front of radically inclined educators"—Progressive Education, January–February 1934, pages 107–112. He urged that educators "form their defensive lines under the banner of basic convictions, ally themselves with all other social groups of similar orientation among the people, and fight heroically against whatever forces elect to lay down the gage of battle."

Dr. John L. Childs, exponent of the class approach in the effort to achieve a collectivist society, insisted that "the present conflict of classes presents not only a problem, it also presents a resource"—Social Frontier, June 1936, pages 274–278.

The educators' "struggle for academic freedom and adequate support for the public school" is, in Dr. Childs' judgment, "related to the deepening conflict of class interests in American society." This is obviously so, he believes, because the educators' "experience indicates that not all classes in the economic life of the United States are so situated objectively that they will be inclined to favor this fundamental social reconstruction." Indeed, Dr. Childs adds, "a small, but economically and politically powerful, class of owners is already taking active measures to forestall it."

Conversely, "honest appraisal of conditions convinces him"—the experimentalist educator—"that certain elements of the population are much more likely to respond to this program of socialization than are others. If, as this movement of workers—farm, factory, office, and professional—gathers momentum, he finds that class cleavages in American life grow sharper, he will not thereby be deterred from continuing his work of political and economic organization."

In Dr. Childs' view, far from being deterred, the teachers should welcome allies in the conflict:

To entertain this end of drastic social reconstruction but to be unwilling to cooperate in developing the means necessary to achieve it is to be guilty of a most nonexperimental mode of behavior.

* * * In my opinion, the chance for a peaceful, orderly transformation of our economy will be increased, not lessened, by an open alliance of professional groups, including educators, with the working class (ibid, pp. 274–8).

In an earlier article, Dr. Childs expressed the belief that—

If the schools are to be kept free to perform their important intellectual function during this period (of transition to an effectual planning society, they will need the support of those groups whose interests will be advanced by the change from capitalism. (The Social Frontier, April 1936, pp. 219–222.)

One of the most remarkable statements with respect to the potential power of the teaching profession and the strategic employment of that power is contained in an editorial bearing the statistical title—"1,105,921"—published in the January 1935 Social Frontier, pages 5–6. The title represents the number of persons teaching in the schools and colleges of the Nation in 1930 as disclosed by the Fiftieth Federal Census. The fact that one out of every 45 persons gainfully employed was engaged in teaching was described in the editorial as "a fact of far-reaching social significance—a fact whose meaning has been

fully grasped neither by society at large nor by the teaching profession."

Elaborating on this significance, the editorial emphasizes the role of teachers as professional specialists:

The responsibility of educational workers for shaping the program of the school has become perpetual and inescapable. They could not be mere instruments if they tried. This is due chiefly to the fact that in the course of the past several generations organized education has developed to a point where it requires in its conduct an enormous and ever-growing body of professional knowledge and experience. In large part, therefore, the actual administration of the school must be left to those who are technically competent—the teachers of the country. The only alternative is chaos and cultural regression.

The next sentence is extremely significant, and it raises the question as to the extent to which the wish is father to the thought:

In the very nature of the case no clear mandate covering the details or even the major outlines of an educational program can be given by society to educational workers.

Elaborating this view, the editorial continues:

Differentiation of function and delegation of responsibility are of the essence of industrial civilization. Increasingly, it would seem, if this civilization is to perdure and develop, the discharge of a particular function will have to be entrusted to the appropriate special group. The inherited conception of Government as a police or regulative agent, external to the economic and social process, is already breaking down under the impact of new forces. In the state now emerging organized education must take its place alongside the other great coordinate functions of industrial society and become an integral part of government.

The conception of organized education as "an integral part of government" when combined with the proposition that "no clear mandate covering even the major outlines of an educational program can be given by society to educational workers," seems to me to add up to an amazing totalitarian, free-from-accountability - to - anyone - but - themselves role for members of the teaching profession. It is a demand for carte blanche for the profession—the ultimate in a "hands-off" notice to the "educationally incompetent" lay public including, presumably, elected members of boards of education. Successful establishment of such a role for the teaching profession obviously would solve most of the practical difficulties of achieving the envisioned collectivist society through the classroom, provided the advocates of that goal could, in turn, capture control of the teaching profession.

The editorial goes on to deplore the "tragedy that the teachers of the Nation, as a body, are unprepared, in either knowledge, disposition, or organization, to discharge intelligently and effectually the responsibilities which events have placed on their shoulders." And it adds that "to those who say that the profession dare not show independence in the formulation of either educational or social policies, it should be pointed out that the potential power of teachers in terms of today and tomorrow has never been put to the test."

By way of elaborating on this "potential power," the editorial points out that on the basis "of simple numerical strength alone" the members of the teaching profession, "if organized and conscious of their strength, could wield enormous power." The editorial continues:

With the enfranchisement of women the teachers of the country have become a potential political force to be reckoned with. They have the power to throw the fear of God and of unemployment into the hearts of many a machine politician. The Social Frontier is of the opinion that the judicious and courageous use of this power in advancing the interests of education and protecting the civic and professional rights of teachers is a responsibility which they can no longer escape.

A further factor of "potential power"—one of utmost importance—is cited by the editorial:

The strength of the teachers * * * is by no means to be gauged by statistics. Their strength is strategic and functional as well as numerical. They spread over the country in a fine network which embraces every hamlet and rural community. And the function which they perform brings them into close and sympathetic relations with the rank and file of the people of the Nation. No occupational group in society is equally favorably situated.

As still another "source of strength" of the profession, the editorial cites the fact that membership of the profession as a whole "compasses all fields of knowledge and thought and is thus peculiarly armed to do battle in the contemporary world."

The editorial concludes:

Clearly, if they but utilized the resources within their grasp, teachers could become one of the major forces in American life. Particularly might they aspire to such a position, if they should choose to identify themselves with the masses of the people and refuse longer to make obeisance to the badges of wealth and rank. All they lack is organization, vision, and courage. Perhaps these things will come.

In conjunction with this emphasis on the "potential power" of the teaching profession, I call attention to a proposal to give the public schools a total monopoly on the primary and secondary education of American youth. I sincerely trust that there is no extensive disposition in the circles of professional education to revive and promote this particular, iniquitous proposal. But it cannot pass unmentioned.

In the April 1943 Frontiers of Democracy, pages 215–216, an anonymous article was published in the magazine's "What Do You Believe?" section, entitled "Shall We Revive the Oregon School Law?"

The article recalls that some 20 years earlier Oregon had enacted, by referendum, a law establishing the public school as the only available school for all its children between the ages of 8 and 16. The article points out that this law was ruled invalid by the courts, but ventures the belief that "with the new attitude on the United States Supreme Bench there is no certainty that the decision would now be against the law."

The article proposes a Nation-wide Oregon law, which would, of course, ban private or parochial schools for this age group. As arguments for creation of such an educational monopoly, the article charges that the private—secular—school "exists primarily to shelter the privileged from the common-run" and that "such segregation in the degree present tends to hinder the mutual give-and-take of conference and opinion necessary to the successful operation of a democracy."

So far as the parochial school is concerned, the article contends that it "exists primarily to segregate its school population from assimilative interaction with the rest of the people. Insofar as the parochial school succeeds, it builds a mind different from the common American mind." The article adds:

A democracy depends for its success on discussion, on honest shared search to find out what to think and do. The method of certain parochial schools is dogmatic authority, not shared inquiry; their students, therefore, do not learn how to discuss and inquire and even worse, they acquire such closed minds, such fixed and absolute ideas, that in too large measure they are unable to participate profitably in discussion. The democratic process is closed to them.

This amounts to a claim by one educational group of the right to define the democratic process and to impose its concept of that process upon other groups by law, regardless of contrary educational, political, or religious views. Triumph of such a proposal as a Nation-wide Oregon law would, of course, create an educational monopoly. Presumably it would remove important obstacles to the program of social reconstruction through the classroom. Fortunately there are no grounds for anticipating any extensive public support for such a move.

One other device proposed for offsetting or circumventing public opposition to collectivism via the classroom must be mentioned. I am certain that advocacy of this technique is the rare exception. I refer to the method of slyness or outright deception.

This, of course, is what Dr. Brameld was talking about in his discussion of "Karl Marx and the American Teacher" when he said that teachers favorable to the collectivist philosophy and program "must then influence their students, subtly if necessary, frankly if possible, toward acceptance of the same position"—Social Frontier, November 1935, pages 53–55.

This is also the same method referred to in the instructions to teachers published in the May 1937 issue of "The Communist"—cited, with vigorous condemnation, by V. T. Thayer, education director of the Ethical Culture Schools, in his book, American Education Under Fire, 1944:

The party must take careful steps to see that all teacher comrades are given thorough education in the teaching of Marxism-Leninism. Only when teachers have really mastered Marxism-Leninism will they be able skillfully to inject it into their teaching at the least risk of exposure.

In view of the fundamental integrity of the overwhelming majority of American educators, it is shocking to find the

Progressive Education magazine as recently as February 1951 carrying an article advocating outright deceit—apparently without any editorial repudiation of the suggestion. I quote from an article, "Guarding the Freedom To Teach," by A. Max Carmichael, professor of education at Ball State Teachers College, Muncie, Ind.:

I suppose there are cases where teachers live under a constant threat. * * * Our teacher will have to choose whether * * * to try to live up to the principles which he morally can accept, and risk being discharged, or whether * * * to temporize with the situation, abiding actually or ostensibly by the decision of those in control, but here and there, perhaps, secretively failing to abide by the injunction and not stating his position too openly in the wrong places. Some teachers can find moral justification for that latter procedure under these circumstances. It seems to me that the individual teacher will have to make up his mind in terms of the alternatives before him, to wit, how well he can make an adjustment if discharged, how likely he is to get caught, etc. It seems a shame to have to talk in these terms, but one must meet opposition that is without moral principle in ways that implement one's long-time goals rather than the more immediate ones. Ultimately, force may often best be met with force and with its accompanying deceit. Let me here add that so long as no threat of discharge exists, I see no reason for any other behavior than that of candid discussion. Even in the case of threat, there is little need for innuendoes, name calling, sarcasm, even though there may be occasion for deceit (p. 110).

This is appalling counsel, especially from a professed teacher of teachers. Even more appalling is the apparent failure of the progressive education leadership to repudiate such counsel and its author.

By comparison with this vicious counsel, the final proposal for overcoming public opposition to collectivism-through-the-classroom which I shall document at least has the virtue of forthrightness and integrity.

Many advocates of the reconstruction of the social order via the schoolhouse also call for a corollary campaign for collectivism through adult education.

The practicalities which dictate this proposal are obvious, and were well stated by President Willard W. Beatty, of the Progressive Education Association. After pointing out that "schools cannot offer their children instruction in political and economic doctrines which differ materially from those understood and accepted by the adult community," he wrote:

A double burden therefore rests upon the educator who would contribute materially to social planning. He must be prepared to undertake not only the instruction of children for their share in a new order, but also leadership and guidance of the adult community in its groping for individual and social security in this rapidly changing world. (Progressive Education, October 1933, p. 304.)

Prof. Harold Rugg, who for 20 years has been the most zealous advocate of such a program of adult education, expressed the "need" in terms of the creation of "an informed climate of opinion by a dramatic Nation-wide campaign for social reconstruction." He insisted that "this step is a necessary preliminary to the rebuilding of the social-science program of the elementary and secondary schools," since "these, too, are molded by the dominant climate of opinion in the community"—Progressive Education, January–February 1934, pages 3–5.

Earlier, in The Great Technology, 1933, Dr. Rugg insisted that "the remaking of minority opinion in American life is fundamental to the reconstruction of public opinion," page 203. It is curious that this exponent of democracy constantly talked in terms of a "thinking minority," which he usually estimated in terms of some 25,000,000 people.

Dr. Rugg's advocacy of such a program of adult education reached a climax unequalled before or since, when, in 1942, he addressed open letters to President Roosevelt, United States Commissioner of Education John Studebaker, and to public-school superintendents of the Nation, under the resounding title, "The Battle for Consent: Gentlemen, This Is Our Moment—If."

It called for an all-out, high pressure, Government-sponsored, financed, and directed campaign of adult and youth education designed to "redirect social trend," to wage a "war-at-home over a free, abundant, and creative world," to promote world rehabilitation and "full-employment at abundance level." The social program thus to be promoted included economic planning by Government, "interjection of social capital into the system" by Government "if private initiative does not act promptly to maintain full employment," and the proposition that "with our giant resources we need not fear the national debt."

In his letter to the President, Dr. Rugg said that educators who have reached "much the same conclusions and affirmations, more than all else crave a chance to teach these great ideas to their high school youths and to the prospective teachers in the colleges of education. They want to write them into the new textbooks that will be made to herald the new day"—Frontiers of Democracy, December 1942, pages 75–81.

He said that "to do that would be a thrilling experience" and added:

I know, for I tried to do it during the great depression in my Man and His Changing Society—a series of books which was studied by some 5,000,000 young Americans until the patrioteers and the native Fascist press well-nigh destroyed it between 1939 and 1941.

Dr. Rugg called for creation of an office of education for peace, with "unlimited resources," with "a budget running into billions if necessary, to reach ten, twenty, thirty million Americans day after day, week after week, without let-up."

In his letter to Dr. Studebaker he called for "an all-out campaign over every trunk line of communication in this country, a Nation-wide barrage of ideas and attitudes that will reach every city, town, and hamlet—a barrage day after day, month after month, not letting up for years to come."

To carry out this program, "the Government must get access to national radio and movie newsreel chains, to the movie houses, to syndicate space in the newspapers, to 200,000 secondary and college teachers and their classrooms and their curricula."

More than that, "the Government must be ready to print and sell at a nickel or a dime hundreds of pamphlets and bulletins in 10,000,000 lots." Further outlining his program, he wrote:

This campaign requires a pamphlet-bulletin-article-book-writing program that would dwarf anything that has ever been dreamed of in this or any other country. The Nation's finest novelists, poets, essayists, columnists, and other publicists, drafted to write. Drafted, I say. The Nation's scholars in the social sciences—economics, politics, government, history and sociology, social psychology and public opinion—drafted to organize topics, to outline material, to collaborate with the professional writers in preparing books, pamphlets, bulletins, articles printed by Government printing presses and syndicated at cost throughout the country.

He insisted that "the time is short" because with the end of the war "the incipient fascism that is latent in most of our communities today could quickly and virulently infect the social blood stream of our country; it could utterly strangle our treasured democratic process and turn your teachers and youth into fearsome parrots of an authoritarian regime." In a later article—Frontiers of Democracy, January 1943, pages 101–108—he again warned:

There may not be time enough * * * to silence the isolationist, exploitive, back-to-normalcy, die-hard right and their vicious press.

This fantastic, grandiose proposal was snubbed by President Roosevelt. Commissioner Studebaker aptly pointed out that "political democracy in the United States requires that orderly means of ascertaining the collective judgment and will of the people be secured through the mechanism of political parties, political campaigns, and free elections."—Frontiers of Democracy, March 1943, pages 172–175. Reluctantly, Dr. Rugg thereafter wrote:

I am unhappy to report that the hoped-for attack from Washington has not been forthcoming. * * * I very much fear that as in the past we shall be driven back upon private initiative to take the lead. (Frontiers of Democracy, May 1943, pp. 246–254).

And he issued a significant summons to colleges of education:

Let them become powerful national centers for the graduate study of ideas and they will thereby become forces of creative imagination standing at the very vortex of the ideational revolution. Let us make our teacher education institutions into great direction-finders for our new society * * * pointers of the way * * * dynamic trail blazers of new frontiers (ibidem).

The hope dies hard—the hope of achieving the longed-for social reconstruction through the schools, through adult education, through teacher-training colleges. Indeed, the hope does not die. Despite temporary set-backs and disappointments, it stubbornly persists.

X. CHANGING OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

Fundamental changes in the philosophy and procedures of American Gov-

ernment are, of course, implicit in the very concept of collectvism and socialization being documented herein.

In addition, the movement here being described has produced numerous by-products and offshoots in the way of subsidiary and auxiliary proposals for changes in the philosophy and procedures of American Government. These proposals and ideas are all grist for the mill for the educators who seek to achieve a new social order through the schools.

Space forbids more than a brief cataloging of a few of these propocals and ideas. They represent a part of the indoctrination of teachers, and, presumably through the teachers, of children designed to prepare them for the new day.

One premise, stated early in the history of this movement, is that "Democracy should not be identified with political forms and functions—with the Federal Constitution, the popular election of officials, or the practice of universal suffrage"—Counts', "Dare the Schools Create a New Social Order?" page 40 ff. And Dr. Counts adds, "the most genuine expression of democracy in the United States has little to do with our political institutions: It is a sentiment with respect to the moral equality of man; it is an aspiration toward a society in which this sentiment will find complete fulfillment."

Dr. Counts later came to attach much greater importance to the political forms and functions of the American Government—"Education and the Promise of America," 1945. But in this earlier view he was opening the way for reckless advocacy of changes in forms of Government, supposed to serve the ends of social reconstruction.

This premise leads, logically, to the view expressed by Dr. Rugg in The Great Technology, that we must "build systematically the attitude among the young people of the world that the trend toward representative democracy has produced nothing more than important experiments in Government." Likewise, they must be taught that "every form of Government on earth today must be regarded frankly as an experiment, tentative, and to be changed as new social and economic conditions develop"—page 270.

This encouragement, through the schools, of a flippant, lighthearted, and casual attitude toward government and the basic principles of government, yields some fantastic byproducts.

One, of course, is the glib acceptance of big government, especially at the Federal level.

For example, "fear of centralized governmental administration and control" is dismissed as a "bogeyman," not because a trend in that direction does not exist, but because the trend is inevitable and even desirable. Thus Arnold E. Joyal, professor of educational administration at the University of Maryland—Frontiers of Democracy, February 1941—argues that there is nothing to fear in this "inevitable trend" if people only "realize that the Federal Government is as much our Government as is the State or the city or the school district. It is capable of functioning only with our sanction."

With this glibly experimentalist attitude, it is no surprise to find Stuart Chase, writing in the May 1934, NEA Journal, page 147, that one of the changes required by an abundance economy is "the scrapping of outworn political boundaries and of constitutional checks and balances where the issues involved are technical."

Similarly we find the John Dewey Society yearbook, "Teacher and Society," sympathetically proposing regular 10-year conventions for revision of State and Federal constitutions; removal of the power of the Supreme Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, and "a change in our constitutional pattern which would eliminate State boundaries and set up a system of representation based primarily on economic and geographic regions"—page 174 ff.

Again we have the proposal that the United States Supreme Court have a "substantial minority" membership of laymen—that is, nonlawyers—with the suggestion of the name of Henry Wallace as one lay Justice—telegram to President Roosevelt from the directors of the Social Frontier and the fellows of the John Dewey Society, February 21, 1937, the Social Frontier, April 1937, pages 197–8.

There is also the denunciation by the late Dr. William H. Kilpatrick of the "threefold governmental arrangement of President, Senate, and House" as "a misconceived system," because it "embodies inherent conflict where there should be inherent cooperation"—Frontiers of Democracy, March 1943, pages 164, 165. One wonders as to the qualifications for grounding the younger generation in the basic principles of our Government system possessed by a teacher or by a teacher-of-teachers with such views.

Then as a further example, there is the theory advanced in the book, New Schools for a New Culture—Charles M. MacConnel, Ernest O. Melby, and Christian O. Arndt. In a chapter, appropriately titled "Sailing for Utopia," it argues that "democracy has little to do with majority rule." True democracy operates, according to the authors' theory, through the process of "consensus"—agreement reached through discussion in small groups. This theory holds that the "action bodies" of government "must be reduced to a size that they may act with efficiency and dispatch in times of emergency or crisis," and adds that "Congress and many State legislatures have long outgrown such specifications."

Under the utopian scheme envisioned, "war and other national emergencies may still have to be handled by a small national deliberative body," but the great bulk of less urgent problems would be handled by the consensus method through a "hierarchy of deliberative bodies," extending from the grass roots to the national level (p. 196 ff.).

Still another device proposed under this experimentalist approach to the business of government is the development of "do-democracy" through the medium of citizens' advisory committees, working with elected administrative officials, which, it is held, would open up "opportunities for a large number of citizens to participate directly in government." (Practical Applications of Democracy, George de Huszar, page 44, 1945.) The question of how responsible public officials could thus delegate authority and responsibility imposed by law, or how these committees could in turn lawfully accept the authority and responsibility, is not too clear. Possibility that the citizen committee-method of government might become a source of serious conflict and confusion when undertaken on this basis, should be obvious.

Much more serious are some of the proposed changes in the basic philosophy relating to the powers of Government, especially in the realm of freedom of speech and press.

Thus we have Kenneth D. Benne, professor of education at the University of Illinois—Progressive Education, May 1949—depicting teachers and school administrators as "social engineers" and "change agents."

And we have the amazing proposition that—

> The engineering of change must be anti-individualistic, yet provide for the establishment of appropriate areas of privacy and for the development of persons as creative units of influence in our society.

Dr. Benne regards as "unscientific" the concept of "natural rights" of man. Moreover, "human rights and duties are grounded in the institutions and ideologies of a culture, not in a nature independent of man's social relationship."

Accordingly:

> That a wise social policy will establish areas of privacy for persons and voluntary associations within the society is undoubtedly true. In such areas private judgment may rule. But the determination of the proper boundaries of these areas must, in an interdependent society, be based on a collective judgment.

It would take some doing to rewrite the Bill of Rights on the basis of such a political and social philosophy.

The extent to which the Bill of Rights is at issue in this whole movement is well illustrated by the series of articles by Dr. Norman Woelfel, professor of education at Ohio State University, on "Communications," in the October 1945 and January, February, and May 1946 issues of Progressive Education.

The philosophy underlying these articles is epitomized in his discussion of the newspaper, which he regards as merely a mirror of "the peculiar ideological idiosyncracies of an owning and ruling class."

Dr. Woelfel offers the startling conclusion that:

> It may be necessary, paradoxically enough, for us to control our press as the Russian press is controlled and as the Nazi press was controlled. However, even if this were truly the only way out it is not "control" that we should fear, for we already have a very vicious type of control. We need only to look carefully at the objective in whose name control is exercised. Democratic objectives are open, intelligent, creative; they are pointed at the

welfare of every individual and at the realization of a great common culture. Surely we could have nothing to fear from a press controlled to reflect, realize, and glorify such objectives. (Progressive Education, May 1946, p. 266 ff.)

The control proposed by Dr. Woelfel would take the form of "continuing national, regional, and local controlling boards on which the consumer, the journalist, and the educator are represented" (ibid.).

Not content with "capturing" the public schools, Dr. Woelfel and his fellow educators insist that control of the press, radio, and cinema cannot be left to "their owners and their hireling practitioners if we wish social salvation."

A great many Americans are likely to conclude that the price of salvation, as set by Dr. Woelfel, is impossibly high.

XI. QUIZ GAME FOR TEACHERS AND PUPILS

Since, under the educational movement here being documented, teachers are envisioned as "engineers of social change," it is only natural that the leaders of the movement should be interested in the political-economic-social views of members of the profession. Particularly there is an interest in the presence or absence of so-called liberal views among the teachers.

This interest is graphically illustrated by a survey of teachers' views on such subjects conducted in 1936 by the John Dewey Society for the Study of Education and Culture.

This survey and its findings are described in the society's first yearbook, issued in 1937, in the chapter, "The Social Attitudes and Information of American Teachers," written by Dr. George W. Hartmann, associate professor of education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

In opening the discussion of this survey, Dr. Hartmann offers this thesis:

Any system of public education that seeks to equip the Nation's youth for effective participation in the life of a complex society cannot be indifferent to the social, political, economic, and general philosophic attitudes of its teachers. * * * We cannot doubt that the teacher's personal acceptance or rejection of significant institutional practices and proposals has at least some influence upon the actions and opinions of his pupils and consequently upon the thoughts and behavior of future citizens of the country. * * * In a period of rapid social change the particular attitudes of the teacher lose whatever irrelevancy they may have appeared to possess in a stabler era and become instead crucial matters for urgent consideration (pp. 174 ff.).

One phase of this survey was the circulation among 9,300 junior and senior high school teachers of the country of a "testing instrument" listing 106 propositions to which the teacher was asked to express agreement or dissent. According to Dr. Hartmann, usable results were obtained from 3,700 persons, or about a 40-percent return. Returns, of course, were unsigned.

Most significant is the fact that in publishing the tabulated returns, Dr. Hartmann indicated the "liberal" and therefore the desired answer, for each proposition and rated the replies by this liberal criterion.

This quiz game for teachers is cited for obvious reasons. Efforts of lay citizens or organizations to determine the political views of teachers would rightfully be condemned. As long as the teacher keeps his political and economic prejudices out of the classroom, they must rightfully be regarded as his own private affair—exactly as are his religious views. I agree, of course, with the comparatively recent official NEA position that membership in the Communist Party is quite a different thing and properly disqualifies a person from being a public-school teacher.

Moreover, the first to condemn inquiries as to teachers' political or economic views would be the so-called liberal educators—if the inquiries came from outside "busybodies, patrioteers, American Fascists," and so forth. Yet in this 1936 survey the liberal educators not only canvassed the teachers' political and economic views but rated them as acceptable or unacceptable, on the basis of their conformity to the "liberal" line.

Nothing more clearly reveals the effort to capture and employ the schools for the collectivist ideology than this example of interest in the teachers' views.

Following are samples of the 106 propositions included in the testing instrument and the tabulations of the replies. Note particularly, the slanted character and obvious implications of many of these propositions, and also the listing of the preferred or "liberal" view as indicated in the column headed "Key":

Distribution of opinion among high-school teachers with respect to some of the major political, economic, and educational issues facing contemporary American society

[The column headed "Key" gives the "liberal" answer: P means plus, or agreement; M means minus, or disagreement]

	Percent marked plus	Percent marked minus	Percent omitted	Key
Education should develop among its beneficiaries a disposition to participate ethically and intelligently in the solution of social problems	100	0	0	P
Capitalism is immoral because it exploits the worker by failing to give him the full value of his productive labor	40	58	2	P
The regular calling of conventions for the revision of State and national constitutions at 10-year intervals would eliminate some of the evils of social lag	68	30	1	P
A classroom teacher should make every effort to prevent his pupils from discovering his position on controversial issues	38	62	0	M
A policy of maximum international cooperation is morally superior to national isolation from world affairs	90	10	0	P
The United States Supreme Court should be deprived of its power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional	19	80	1	P
Our national health would suffer if physicians were made civil servants like the public-school teachers and placed on the Government payroll	30	69	1	M
Persons who wish to bring about a "New Social Order" make poorer teachers than those who adhere strictly to their own specialty	34	65	1	M
Indoctrination by conservatives plays a smaller part in American schools today than radical propaganda	30	69	1	M
It is pedagogically unprofitable to discuss serious social problems with adolescent youngsters	16	83	1	M
A satisfying life for the masses of people can be secured without introducing important economic changes	24	75	1	M
Income and social usefulness are closely correlated at the present time	47	51	2	M
The smooth functioning of a profit economy depends upon either natural or artificial scarcity	58	39	3	P
Most of the 10,000,000 or more unemployed will never again find steady work at good wages in a capitalist society	49	50	1	P
Production for use and present-day capitalism are incompatible systems	53	44	3	P
Adequate economic security for all is impossible under a laissez faire system	72	25	3	P
No person should be permitted to have an income of more than $25,000 a year until such time as the average wage earner receives at least $2,000 a year	51	48	1	P
Cheaper electric light and power could be had if the industry were owned and operated by governmental units	75	24	1	P
Transport service would deteriorate if all railroads were owned and managed by the Federal Government or one of its agencies	34	65	1	M
We need a Government marketing corporation empowered to buy and process farm products and to sell them here and abroad	47	51	2	P
The coal mines of the Nation should be taken over by a public agency and run for the benefit of all the people	50	49	1	P
All foreign trade should be a monopoly of the Federal Government	22	76	1	P
No government has a right to experiment with different social policies	16	83	1	M
All banks and insurance companies should be run on a nonprofit basis like the schools	35	64	1	P
The best way to secure decent homes for most of the people will be for the Government to build them for its citizens on a large scale basis	41	58	1	P
All farm mortgages should be assumed by the Federal Treasury at an interest rate not in excess of 1 percent	28	70	2	P
Most of the undesirable features of the newspapers, the movies, and the radio come from their being controlled by profit-making corporations	68	32	0	P
The largest possible amount of business competition is necessary to national wealth	40	60	0	M
The practice of birth control should be discouraged	11	88	1	M
The Federal Government should provide all classes of people opportunity for complete insurance against accident, sickness, unemployment, premature death, and old age	66	33	1	P
If we had to choose between German fascism and Russian communism, I should prefer the former	41	53	6	M
Genuine individual liberty will flourish under socialism as it never did before	18	81	1	P
Public business enterprises are always inefficient	12	88	0	M

Distribution of opinion among high-school teachers with respect to some of the major political, economic, and educational issues facing contemporary American society—Continued

[The column headed "Key" gives the "liberal" answer: P means plus, or agreement; M means minus, or disagreement]

	Percent marked plus	Percent marked minus	Percent omitted	Key
For most people the opportunity to exercise beneficial personal initiative would be increased by life in a socialist state	21	77	1	P
The greater the amount of governmental control over anything, the greater the increase in graft	43	57	0	M
The formation of a comprehensive anticapitalist Farmer-Labor political party in the United States would contribute greatly to our social progress	42	56	2	P
There is nothing fundamentally wrong with our society; all we need to do is to introduce a few reforms which will correct abuses and make some institutions more humane	65	34	1	M
If the best possibilities of the American tradition are to be realized, a new social order qualitatively different from private capitalism must be built	45	54	1	P
An improved American nation will result from step-by-step advances in the socialization of the means of production and distribution	74	24	1	P
There is no such thing as a "class struggle" in American life today	12	87	1	M
A classless society is possible	20	79	1	P
A classless society is desirable	39	60	1	P
Whenever great social needs require it, the ruling class will always be found willing to surrender some of its privileges in order to meet them	29	69	1	M
Capitalism can be abolished only through a violent seizure of power by anticapitalists	18	81	1	M
If we put capable men into office, most of our social problems would be solved	78	21	1	M
The less government the better	24	75	1	M
No economic system can function efficiently without appealing to the desire for private profits	64	35	1	M
Teachers have a moral obligation to remain rigorously neutral on all debatable issues both in class and out	13	86	1	M
The best form of society is one in which an intelligent and forceful elite rules over the stabilized masses	35	64	1	M
Although some persons take advantage of it for unworthy ends, at bottom our industry is organized on a fundamentally ethical basis	71	28	1	M
I believe that the United States is just as selfish as any other nation	61	38	1	P
All social planning leads to human regimentation	32	67	1	M
As the economic crisis lengthens and deepens, society tends to divide into 2 mutually opposed sections	81	18	1	P
It is as difficult for a man of property to support basic social change as for a camel to go through the eye of a needle	40	59	1	P
The behavior of the capitalists is doing more to discredit and undermine capitalism than all of the activities of anticapitalistic groups	71	27	2	P
The exceptional wealth of the United States is the result of our continued loyalty to the capitalist system	33	64	3	M
A system that has worked as well as capitalism has in this country for the last 150 years should not be changed now	32	66	2	M
Teachers should affiliate with some genuine labor organization of their own choosing	37	62	1	P
Contemporary school practice generally develops a fixity of outlook which hampers social readjustment	44	55	1	P
Economic individualism is more appropriate to contemporary America than any proposed form of collectivism	63	34	3	M
Whenever social ownership is substituted for private ownership, at least partial compensation for the value of the property transferred should be made	93	6	1	P

NOTE.—A "liberal" answer, as defined by the key, was given by a majority of the teachers replying on 78 of the 106 questions.

A similar type of opinion test was developed and used as part of an educational experiment conducted in the Floodwood, Minn., high school, under the auspices of the University of Minnesota. This experiment is described by its director, Dr. Theodore Brameld, in his book, "Design for America" (1945). It was part of the collectivist educational movement and was termed by Dr. Brameld "an educational exploration of the future of democracy for senior high schools and junior colleges."

This test was used with pupils participating in the Floodwood experiment. It likewise involved a series of propositions to be affirmed or denied. And here again the returns were rated on the basis of the liberal or preferred answers.

Following are typical statements with the preferred answers indicated in parentheses after each proposition:

There should be Government ownership and control of radio stations. (Affirm.)

Liberal interpretation of the Constitution has permitted too great expansion of the powers of the Federal Government. (Deny.)

If European countries want to establish left-wing governments after the war, we should support them. (Affirm.)

A program to legalize and educate for birth control should be instituted in the Nation. (Affirm.)

The power of unions should be curtailed. (Deny.)

America has never been interested in imperialistic gains. (Deny.)

Should any plan of socialized medicine be established, the caliber and the ability of the medical profession would fall. (Deny.)

Family life is in need of no change in its traditional form. (Deny.)

What this country needs is more TVA's. (Affirm.)

If the creed of the postwar world be the betterment of the common man, then it follows that public medicine should become a main part of that program. (Affirm.)

If medical care is to be made available to all families at costs they can afford, these costs must be shared by all. (Affirm.)

The Federal Government should finance Government projects for the advancement of the arts. (Affirm.)

The Constitution needs some radical modifications. (Affirm.)

There is need of a change in our constitutional pattern which would eliminate State boundaries and set up a system of representation based primarily on economic and geographical regions. (Affirm.)

There is too much bureaucracy in Government already. (Deny.)

Our economic base must be shifted from rugged individualism to economic planning. (Affirm.)

The chain of middlemen that connects the producer with the consumer is unnecessary. (Affirm.)

The more State authority and the less Federal authority, the better. (Deny.)

Unless business makes a profit, the worker will be unemployed. (Deny.)

Economic planning and control of production by Government could never eliminate depressions and unemployment. (Deny.)

Without individual competition for profits, our economy would slow up and soften. (Deny.)

Income taxes on the rich should be greatly increased. (Affirm.)

Wealth should be much more equally distributed. (Affirm.)

The Government should take over much larger areas of northern Minnesota iron mines now entirely in private hands. (Affirm.)

XII. A NEW "CALL" AND A NEW STRATEGY

To a large extent the Second World War, and the tasks and problems which it posed for public education, diverted the attention of educators from the program of social reconstruction through the schools. This was true even of the most outspoken advocates of that program.

Testimony to this fact is provided in a postwar statement of policy adopted by the American Education Fellowship—the new, euphemistic title of the Progressive Education Association—at its Chicago convention, November 29, 1947. This policy statement reviewed the reform movement of the thirties, cited its eclipse during the war period, and issued what was, in effect, a new "call" to the teachers of the Nation. I quote from this document—Progressive Education, February 1948, pages 33, 40–41, 46, 58:

Memories are not so short as to forget the economic events following World War I—the years of reckless prosperity and high living, of growing corporate power and disparities of wealth, followed by years of devastating depression, hunger, fear, and waste of human resources. During the thirties some American educators became sufficiently concerned to voice their anger at this tragedy through the pages of one journal, the Social Frontier, and through the volumes of the Commission on the Social Studies—American Historical Association. They courageously analyzed the failures of a system which could cause such havoc, and they demanded fundamental changes to eliminate those failures. Yet, as the depression waned and the Nation became preoccupied with winning of World War II, even their voices softened to a whisper. It was almost as if those theorists were right who have said that education is always chiefly a reflector of the social order—rather than its critic, leader, and recreator.

This declaration of policy of the American Education Fellowship is significant on many counts. Perhaps its greatest significance lies in the fact that it was officially adopted, first by the board of directors of the AEF and then by the delegates at the Chicago convention, and subsequently was submitted to a vote of the AEF membership. The policy statement was approved by a majority of the mail ballots returned. It will be recalled that the original "Call to the Teachers of the Nation," while drafted and approved by a committee of the Progressive Education Association, was never formally adopted by either the PEA board or its membership—a fact which the association's president emphasized at the time the original "Call" was published. Thus the postwar policy statement has an official status lacking in the earlier pronouncement. To that extent it is a bolder action and a more significant pronouncement than the original "Call."

The "new call" also reflects a new strategy in the social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, a strategy of euphemism, double-talk, more guarded phraseology, and more cautious commitments. That undoubtedly was due, in part, to the necessity of modifications in order to find a broad basis of consensus and agreement within the larger group. We know, from a sympathetic report on the session at which the policy statement was adopted, that there were those in the group who were concerned lest the statement "commit the AEF to an advocacy of a socialistic economy"—Progressive Education, January 1948, Report on the National Conference, Archibald W. Anderson, assistant professor of education, University of Illinois.

Whether the final document avoided such a commitment is a matter of opinion. But it obviously provided a common ground, or a common roof, for those who, at one extreme, do advocate socialism and those who either do not advocate socialism or do not want to appear to the public or their colleagues in the teaching profession as advocates of socialism.

By fortunate circumstance, we are given an insight into the evolution of this particular document which is most enlightening. The AEF policy committee, of which Dean Ernest O. Melby, of the New York University School of Education, was chairman, designated Dr. Theodore Brameld, perhaps the most radical of the present-day leaders of the social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, to prepare the draft of the statement of policy for submission to the Chicago convention. Dr. Brameld's first draft was carried in full in the November 1946 issue of Progressive Education.

According to Professor Anderson's report on the Chicago convention, Dr. Brameld's original draft was discussed at length by the AEF board of directors and by delegates in the opening days of the Chicago meeting. Anderson adds:

They—

The directors—

appointed a committee to attempt certain modifications which seemed desirable. It was this modified form which was finally presented to the conference as a whole.

The official statement of policy, as adopted by the Chicago convention, was published in full in the February 1948 Progressive Education.

A sentence-by-sentence analysis and comparison of the original and final drafts is most enlightening. It discloses the attempt to modify the more extreme and forthright Brameld statement of policy to satisfy the apprehensions of more conservative, or at least more cautious, members. It also discloses, as I shall point out, that the camouflage operation was something less than perfect. There are numerous obvious give-away bare spots in the final product.

Following is an analysis of the most important portions of the policy statement:

First. The statement cites approvingly the trends, outside the United States, toward increasing public controls over "economic processes" and deplores the failure of this country to match these trends.

The following paragraph was adopted in the final draft unchanged from the original Brameld draft:

In only one great respect—though a most crucial one—the present decade differs from the twenties. While America seems to have learned little from its recent economic experience, other parts of the world have learned much. All over the earth powerful movements of the common people are demanding that these absurd and destructive fluctuations of the industrial system should end—that public controls be exerted over economic processes of sufficient strength and rationality to guarantee stability, much greater equalization of wealth, and the securities of a rising standard of living which the proven potentialities of abundance make entirely feasible.

The next paragraph shows the following interesting change:

Brameld draft: "America is out of step with the world."

Final statement: "Since the end of the war, America has shown a singular reluctance either to take cognizance of the democratic nature of these movements or to deal with the serious social problems which have called them forth."

Second. The original and final drafts also show some significant changes in the wording of the two major policy declarations of the American Education Fellowship.

Brameld draft: "The two great constructive purposes which should now govern the AEF follow directly from this brief analysis. They are:

"I. To channel the energies of education toward the reconstruction of the economic system—a system which should be geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries; a system in which national and international planning of production and distribution replaces the chaotic planlessness of traditional 'free enterprise'; a system in which the interests, wants and needs of the consumer dominate those of the producer; a system in which natural resources, such as coal and iron ore, are owned and controlled by the people; a system in which public corporations replace monopolistic enterprises and privately owned public utilities; a system in which Federal authority is synchronized with decentralized regional and community administration."

Final statement: "As a result of the analysis made above, two great constructive purposes have first claim for active support.

"1. The reconstruction of the economic system in the direction of far greater justice and stability; a system to be secured by whatever democratic planning and social controls experience shows to be necessary."

(Unchanged in two drafts.)

A system in which social security and a guaranteed annual wage sufficient to meet scientific standards of nourishment, shelter, clothing, health, recreation, and education are universalized; a system in which—

Brameld draft: "The majority of the people" is the sovereign determinant of every basic economic policy.

Final statement: "The will of the majority with due regard for the interests of all the people" is the sovereign determinant of every basic economic policy.

(Unchanged in two drafts.)

Brameld draft: "II. To channel the energies of education toward the establishment of genuine international authority in all crucial issues affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war (including atomic energy, first of all) and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic planning of trade, resources, labor distribution and standards is practiced parallel with the best standards of individual nations; an order in which all nationalities, races, and religions receive equal rights in its democratic control; an order in which 'world citizenship' thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

Final statement: "2. The establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority in all crucial interests affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war and police forces are finally under that authority; an order in which international economic coordination of trade, resources, labor and standards parallels the best practices of individual nations; an order geared with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand and certain other countries; an order in which all nationals, races, and religions receive equal rights; an order in which 'world citizenship' thus assumes at least equal status with national citizenship."

It will be noted that the Brameld draft, as cited above, calls explicity for advocacy of Socialism, which he defines in detail. This detailed proposal of Socialism is omitted from the final draft. But note this: whereas the Brameld proposal to gear the economic system "with the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, Sweden, New Zealand, and other countries" appears in the section calling for "reconstruction of the economic system" in the United States, the final draft shifts this endorsement of "the increasing socializations and public controls now developing in England, and so forth" to the section of the policy statement dealing with "international economic coordination." Just how this relocation of this phrase makes the document any less an endorsement of Socialistic principles and methods is a puzzling question, to say the least. The Socialistic slip still plainly shows beneath the verbal outer-garments of the revised document.

Third. The sections of the two drafts dealing with the question of "classroom

indoctrination" are interesting. I cite these sections:

Brameld version: "In 'taking sides' against the unworkable economic system and unworkable nationalism, and with a workable system and workable internationalism, there is need to develop consciousness of a distinction between the convictions already held by those who take such sides and those who do not yet do so. This is necessary in order thereby to permit development of new educational techniques of learning through social agreement, not by superimposing prejudgments. Only thus can majority rule eventually become rule by an informed majority who understand what they want and how democratically to get what they want. The school should become a center of experimentation in attaining communities of uncoerced persuasion."

Final statement: "In implementing the above outlook there should be no attempt to indoctrinate for any political party or for any given economic system. It is vital to maintain democratic intelligent discussion and decision but also to make sure that the process will lead to conclusions. This can only be done by informed teachers who have convictions of their own—convictions which they do not foist upon their students but which at appropriate age levels they share with students. The task is to experiment with techniques of learning which look toward intelligent social consensus, not to superimpose prejudgments or dogmatic doctrines. Only thus can majority rule eventually become rule by an informed majority who understand what they want and how, democratically, to get what they want. The school should become a center of experimentation in attaining communities of uncoerced persuasion."

The original Brameld draft includes a concluding paragraph which was deleted from the final policy statement. It said:

To prove that education is not a mere mirror of dominant ideologies, not a device for bolstering outmoded economic systems and diseased nationalisms, but rather that education is a penetrating critic, dynamic leader, and imaginative recreator which anticipates dangers before they crystallize into calamities, which helps simultaneously to reshape the culture of America and the world in accordance with the imperatives of our revolutionary age—this is the supreme obligation of the American Education Fellowship in our time. This is its new policy.

Regardless of the professed repudiation of indoctrination, the policy declaration makes clear that certain "conclusions" by the pupils are desired as the result of the educational process.

Fourth. One other deletion from the Brameld draft is particularly noteworthy. Citing the alleged contradictions in public-school teaching regarding foreign affairs, the original and final drafts contain this identical wording:

They (schools) may study and endorse the United Nations, to be sure; and that is helpful. But they seldom face the contradiction between high-minded objectives for all nations and the still dominant power of sovereignty of each nation. Students are taught that internationalism is desirable; they are also taught that the United States is supreme in its own right. They are taught that all countries must cooperate; they are also taught that we should keep the secret of atomic energy. They are taught that we should support the efforts of common peoples in other parts of the world to rise in power; they are also taught to be uncritical of a foreign policy (which) when it serves to thwart those efforts.

In the original Brameld draft, the last sentence of the foregoing included seven additional words, so that it concluded:

They are also taught to be uncritical of a foreign policy which serves to thwart those efforts in countries like Greece, China, and Spain.

Obviously, the counsels of caution in the Chicago convention dictated that the AEF policy statement should not include this specific mention of Greece, China, and Spain which paralleled the ther prevalent Communist line.

Fifth. That the new AEF policy statement—regardless of its cautious double-talk—constitutes a new "call" to teacher activity and effort, in and out of the classroom, in support of increasing social controls and subordination of the United States to world government, is made clear by other sections of the draft finally adopted. Thus the final draft adds this paragraph to the original version:

Inasmuch as the forces that shape society are those that determine education as well, educators should understand what is taking place in the community, and should take stands as adult citizens on controversial issues of the day. It is their right and duty to participate actively in political and economic life.

Both the original and final drafts also declared that the "two great guiding principles"—those mentioned above—"involve a multitude of specific educational tasks to which the AEF should now devote itself." That these tasks relate to the curriculum and the classroom is made clear in the final draft, which varies only in minor details from the Brameld version:

Their precise delineation should involve every member and the closest cooperation with all groups and forces which share generally in its purposes. In this statement of policy, it is possible only to suggest what some of these tasks may be.

1. A subject of first importance in the reconstructed curriculum is the careful study of evolving economic and political systems characterized by developments both in our own country and in other countries.

2. Of great importance also is the study of both the successes and failures of attempts to move toward genuine world order.

3. As indicated above there is desperate need to prepare realistic materials regarding the economic system, and for skill in penetrating propaganda.

4. There is need to develop consciousness in students, teachers, administrators, and other citizens of the meaning and content of the values which should govern new social arrangements and purposes.

5. There should be extensive educational practice in building detailed social designs which come to grips with problems arising in, for example, social planning. Intensive study is needed of experiments and institutions already under way, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the postal system, the consumer cooperative movement, the social-security programs of America and Europe. Psychological problems such as motivations and incentives; political problems such as bureaucracy and reorganization of State and Federal Governments; social problems such as neighborhood life and the role of women; economic problems such as the place of private property in an evolving democracy—

Incidentally, in the Brameld draft, the phrase "increasingly socialized order" was used instead of "an evolving democracy"—

problems of civil rights such as those raised by the President's committee on civil rights—these are equally pressing.

The finally approved draft also revived the appeal for adult education along the lines of the social reconstruction program:

Vital education of the adult population at the "grass roots" should occupy a place of importance comparable to education of youth, and should include all the issues exemplified above.

Sixth, the document as finally adopted proposes close cooperation and affiliation with other educational organizations. It urges that the AEF "seek to influence" these organizations "to experiment with its new materials and methods." It cites particularly UNESCO, and urges AEF to "push for recognition by the U. N. of the need to lift UNESCO above its present purely advisory status."

With respect to other educational organizations in the United States, the policy statement says:

Cooperation with the United States Office of Education is also important, looking toward crystallization of its own objectives and toward the provision of more authority to assist in improving the public schools. The National Education Association, American Federation of Teachers, Association for Childhood Education, and American Association for Adult Education should learn of the new AEF program, and should consider its reformulated ends and means just as they have done during the earlier period of AEF history.

The policy statement as adopted calls on the AEF to "support the democratic potentialities of the labor movement, the consumer cooperative movement, and quasi-political groups of sufficiently similar intent." Significantly, an additional phrase, "such as the Political Action Committee and Union for Democratic Action," which appeared in the Brameld draft, was deleted from the final statement. The Union for Democratic Action, incidentally, is the subject of extensive discussion in the Special Report on Subversive Activities Aimed at Destroying Our Representative Form of Government, of the House Un-American Activities Committee—Report No. 2277, June 25, 1942—which lists affiliations of 50 leaders of the UDA with the agencies and fronts of the Communist Party.

Seventh, the policy statement, as finally adopted, calls for the editorial content of the AEF's magazine, Progressive Education, to be "explicitly geared to these purposes." Furthermore, it states that the magazine "should give much more consideration to fundamental analysis of social, economic, political, scientific, esthetic, and philosophical issues arising from them, and it should assist teachers in putting AEF purposes and methods to work by providing actual materials and examples of where and how it is being done."

Eighth. This AEF policy statement, setting forth the postwar program and objectives of this movement, emphasizes that even the traditional educational objectives of the progressive education movement must be subordinated to the

task of social reconstruction. The statement as finally adopted, concludes as follows:

In making these important recommendations, the AEF will continue to support the kind of experimentation for which it is most famous. It will continue to emphasize "learning by doing," "community schools," "the integrating curriculum," "teacher-pupil planning," "child development," and other objectives of progressive education as these now become more widely accepted. These types of experimentation should emphasize the social-emotional development of children and adolescents, and parent education.

In terms of organizational imperatives, however, such objectives are now subordinate, even while indispensable, to the larger, more audacious and magnetic objectives impelled by a world in crisis. Faced by the alternatives of economic chaos and atomic war, on the one hand, of world-wide plenty and enforceable international order, on the other hand, the AEF should become the clearest, most purposeful educational spokesman for the second of these alternatives. Thus, and only thus, can it become even more the great vanguard influence which it has been for nearly three decades—an influence which, as before, is certain to extend far beyond its own membership and even its own country.

Social reconstruction and "world-saving" obviously still are to have top priority rating in the program of progressive education—a rating even above that of the less audacious and magnetic objectives of routine education.

And it is equally obvious that the progressive education leadership still claims, and expects to exercise, immense influence in more conservative educational ranks, despite the embarrassed efforts of some present-day leaders of educational officialdom to disprove the existence of the educational Peck's Bad Boy by denying or ignoring that existence.

The new strategy of the progressive education movement is that of guarded caution and carefully phrased euphemism, which, especially for the "outsider," obscures meanings and befuddles issues.

Of course, this is not characteristic only of the spokesmen of progressive education. Consider these statements from Schools for a New World, the twenty-fifth yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, issued in February 1947:

The supreme problem of our society in our day, then, is the retention of the essence of our liberties—freedom of education, opportunity, choice of career, suffrage, speech, press, and assembly—while creating and establishing the controls of a democratic social order in which individual lives merge in a supreme entity of purpose and being that in itself is the ultimate goal. That means, inevitably, a vast stepping-up of the functions of government on all levels; it means a vastly increased emphasis in our schools upon education for civic and economic understanding and competence; it means a fundamental shift in emphasis throughout our whole educational program, from helping to educate the individual in his own right to become a valuable member of society to the preparation of the individual for the realization of his best self in the higher loyalty of serving the basic ideals and aims of our society.

* * * The realities of the world in which we now live endows "community" with a new meaning. It can no longer be merely "a body of people living under the same general conditions" (dictionary definition). If our civilization endures, it will be because community becomes both a primary and an ultimate functional entity—an end in itself (pp. 43–44).

Dr. Counts and others said all that 20 years ago—said it much more clearly and forthrightly.

Even more recent comments of advocates of social reconstruction through the schools disclose the persistence of the basic premises first set forth 20 years ago.

Thus we find Kennth D. Benne, professor of education at the University of Illinois, interpreting the role of the public school educator as that of social reconstruction in terms unmatched by Dr. Counts for complete frankness:

The central counsel of this number of Progressive Education to teachers and school administrators is that they come to see themselves as social engineers * * * They must equip themselves as "change agents."

The engineering of change must be anti-individualistic, yet provide for the establishment of appropriate areas of privacy and for the development of persons as creative units of influence in our society * * *

Individualism today tends to threaten rather than to promote the values of individuality. We are brought back to the processes of planned social change and to the formulation of an adequate methodology of social engineering as a necessary condition for the conservation and extension of democratic values. (May 1949 Progressive Education.)

This view holds that teachers are not only to be "social engineers," and "change agents," but that they must take a lead in the "development of skills necessary for creating common public judgments" which will have a priority over "unchecked private judgment." Educators are to help "groups and organizations to define and redefine those areas of life in which common values and standards are necessary." Educators are to take a lead in "inducing, directing, and stabilizing changes in persons, groups and organizations." Certainly that is acceptance with a vengeance of Dr. Counts' advice to teachers to "deliberately reach for power."

That the program of social reconstruction is still viewed in terms of collectivism is reaffirmed by Dr. John L. Childs as recently as February 1950. Writing in the Progressive Education magazine of that date, Dr. Childs asserts:

The fundamental interests of teachers as teachers are not restricted to the effort to get an adequate material and spiritual support for the public school. Teachers are also concerned with the effort to organize and maintain a society that can make a productive use of the human product of the schools. * * *

* * * We must develop a more sensitive regard for the cultural aspects of human existence, and be prepared to support a vastly extended program of community services. This, in turn, means frank commitment to the "welfare state," and to the planned organization of the productive enterprises of our country. The real issue is no longer one of social and economic planning versus an individualistic system of laissez-faire; it is rather one of what forces are to do the planning, by what means are controls to be exercised, and for what purposes. In sum, a functional education must now be associated with the task of the achievement of a more functional society, and teachers interested in democracy have a basic stake in the development of this functional society (p. 118).

Doctor Childs sums up the current attitudes of American educators in three categories: First, those who believe in the Communist solution of the problems, which group, he believes, "fortunately are very few," second, "a numerically large group" who feel that "resolution of social, economic and political problems" is not properly the responsibility of educators as educators but who believe they are justified in pressure tactics to secure greater support for the schools; third, a third group, with which he identifies progressive educators. He continues:

This third group * * * believes that in the long run both the material and the spiritual interests of public education depend upon the achievement of a reorganization of our economy. They therefore do not have faith in a policy that insists on teachers working separately as a mere educational pressure group, and which discourages from uniting with other functional groups in a common effort to develop an economy in which production will be cooperatively planned for the welfare of all * * * a more socialized economy (p. 120).

Dr. Childs believes that educators, by identifying themselves with groups "which are uniting to support the social, economic, and political developments which Americans have chosen to describe as the 'welfare state,' will be taking the step most needed to preclude a Fascist development in our country"—page 120.

Finally, Dr. Brameld in his recent book, "Ends and Means in Education," 1950, defines this concept of education with the apt term, "Reconstructionism."

This educational philosophy—

He asserts—

would attempt to build the widest possible consensus about the supreme aims which should govern mankind in the reconstruction of world culture. The world of the future should be a world which the common man rules not merely in theory, but in fact. It should be a world in which the technological potentialities already clearly discernible are released for the creation of health, abundance, security for the great masses of every color, every creed, every nationality. It should be a world in which national sovereignty is utterly subordinated to international authority. * * *

Education sufficiently dedicated to this purpose no longer remains, to be sure, on the fence of intellectual "impartiality" (pp. 17–18).

Further, Dr. Brameld declares:

The kind of education here being discussed encourages students, teachers, and all members of the community not merely to study knowledge and problems considered crucial to our period of culture, but to make up their minds about promising solutions, and then to act concertedly (p. 86).

The new terminology actually emphasizes and reaffirms the basic premises of the original social-reconstruction-through-the-schools movement, rather than altering or abandoning these premises.

XIII. "I PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE TO" WORLD GOVERNMENT

As the policy statement of the AEF discloses, a major addition has been

made to the program of social reconstruction through the schools. One of the "two great constructive purposes" which have "first claim for active support" in the public schools, according to this pronouncement, is "the establishment of a genuine world order, an order in which national sovereignty is subordinate to world authority in all crucial interests affecting peace and security; an order therefore in which all weapons of war and police forces are finally under that authority."

Dr. Brameld, in his "Ends and Means in Education," 1950, states it even more bluntly, though with a word of reproach that dedication to this ideal is not more complete:

> There is widespread, if still superficial, acceptance among teachers of the belief that national sovereignty must go (p. 125).

This advocacy of a supernational sovereignty particularly welcomes an opportunity to promote supergovernment in the field of education, through UNESCO. Thus, Dr. Brameld writes:

> The majority machinery of the United Nations, UNESCO, or any similar organizations created on behalf of world order should be so greatly strengthened that no member country, including the Soviet Union and its satellites, can conceivably refuse to abide by its own power-backed decision (ibid, p. 117).

The potentialities of UNESCO are similarly emphasized by I. L. Kandel, of Teachers College, Columbia University, writing in the April 1946 NEA Journal:

> Nations that become members of UNESCO accordingly assume an obligation to revise textbooks used in their schools. The International Organization for Intellectual Cooperation sought to promote the revision of textbooks. * * *
>
> For the present there is no provision for the scrutiny of textbooks in the UNESCO constitution on the assumption that they are matters within the domestic jurisdiction of the member nations in which the organization is prohibited from intervening. Under these conditions, each member nation, if it is to carry out the obligations of its membership, has a duty to see to it that nothing in its curriculum, courses of study, and textbooks, is contrary to UNESCO's aims. This task has already been undertaken through voluntary activities in the United States in the study of textbooks dealing with Latin American countries and Canada.
>
> Recent history has shown, however, that unilateral efforts to revise the materials of instruction are futile. The poison of aggressive nationalism injected into children's minds is as dangerous for world stability as the manufacture of armaments. In one, as in the other, supervision of some kind by an international agency is urgent (pp. 175 ff.).

Implications of this proposal become even more ominous when read in conjunction with the following extracts from volume V of the UNESCO pamphlet series "Toward World Understanding." This volume, "In the Classroom with Children Under 13 Years of Age," 1949, says:

> School textbooks have, as a rule, been written with so little objectivity and integrity that history, as generally taught up to now, has been an obstacle to international understanding. The child has been led to conclude that perfidy and oppression are always and solely the characteristics of the enemy. The need is urgent for a general revision of textbooks, both national and general (p. 16).

The pamphlet continues:

> This revision, another task worthy of UNESCO, should carry much further the elimination of events which, from the world-education point of view, have no value, such as the endless catalogs of wars. It is not to these accidents which have periodically jeopardized and distracted civilization that the child's attention should be drawn, but to the constructive activities which help to advance civilization, materially and spiritually * * *. History must cease to be a military history and must become the history of civilization.
>
> There is need above all for universal history. Just as the child must grow used to considering the earth as his habitat, so he must learn to consider the whole of humanity as the fatherland in whose service the particular fatherlands, his own and all others, are enrolled (p. 16).

The pamphlet deplores the fact that "before the child enters school his mind has already been profoundly marked, and often injuriously, by earlier influences"—page 7. Among these "injurious influences" are "errors of home training"—page 9—and the fact that "it is most frequently in the family that the children are infected with nationalism"—page 54. In the same vein, it points out:

> As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The school should therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism (p. 58).

The pamphlet, which is a group report on a UNESCO seminar conducted in Lausanne, Switzerland, concludes:

> Education for world-mindedness * * * is a political problem even more than an educational one, and the present position of the teachers does not, in general, permit them to intervene in the field of politics with requisite authority. * * *
>
> We expressed the wish that UNESCO would persuade not only governments, but also public opinion, that the most urgent problem in the political field is the educational one, and, more particularly, that an intellectual and moral attitude favorable to international understanding and cooperation (which is civilization's only hope) can be promoted only by a school reorganized to this end and equipped with everything that is indispensable to its effort; that, consequently, the cost of such an enlightened education is a wise investment of the national income; and that activity of the school cannot bring about the desired result unless, repudiating every form of nationalism, the policy of the nation itself is one of international understanding and cooperation (p. 60).

Practical implications for American education of this new internationalism are revealed with disconcerting frankness in the Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, vol. III, page 48:

> The role which education will play officially must be conditioned essentially by policies established by the State Department in this country, and by ministries of foreign affairs in other countries. Higher education must play a very important part in carrying out in this country the program developed by the UNESCO and in influencing that program by studies and reports bearing upon international relations. * * * The United States Office of Education must be prepared to work effectively with the State Department and with the UNESCO.

It is interesting, in this connection, to read the view advocated by Lewis Mumford, for a number of years on the Committee on Teacher Education of the American Council on Education. In an address at a Conference on World Order in Rochester, N. Y., November 13, 1951, Dr. Mumford urged adoption by this country of a "universal policy" which "would offer" to the rest of the world "practical cooperation and tangible wealth and welfare."

Such an offer, Dr. Mumford holds, "would be hard to resist, all the more because we ourselves, as the wealthiest nation in the world, would by the very principles we uphold, have to pay the largest tax and receive the smallest amount of tangible benefits." That, of course, would be a super-Marshall plan.

The program of social reconstruction through the schools becomes something indeed to contemplate if and when American teachers become the handmaidens of the welfare state in America and, in addition, of a world welfare state with America picking up the check.

XIV. A SUMMING UP

Responsible public criticism of the schools is an American right and duty. It is the only way of progress and improvement. It is the only safeguard against unhealthy, harmful, and subversive developments.

Responsible criticism will inevitably include, from time to time, criticism of the type which some educators and some members of educational officialdom dislike and resent and, therefore, brand as "destructive."

Notable recognition has recently been given these elementary principles in the State of Michigan. The State superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Lee Thurston, has created a commission on educational policies which includes in its membership both professional educators and representatives of the lay public. This commission has undertaken to appraise public criticism of the schools, to encourage responsiveness on the part of educators to legitimate criticism, and to establish greater mutual understanding between school leaders and the public they serve.

In a communication to the school administrators of Michigan, the Commission has said:

> In our American way, the supreme judge of the merits of the public school is the people. In the last analysis they pronounce the verdict.

I cannot commend too strongly this undertaking, or the spirit reflected in this statement. It has a direct relevancy to the movement here documented.

Insofar as there is a movement within public education circles to convert the schools into an agency of social reconstruction, into promoters of collectivism, socialism, or the welfare state, the American people have a right to be aware of that fact and to have full information regarding that movement.

They have a right, furthermore, to criticize the movement, to oppose it, to brand it as "subversive," and to hold educational leadership and members of the teaching profession strictly to account for it.

To deny these propositions is to deny the people the right and duty to "pronounce the verdict" on their own schools. To hold that the American citizen lacks the right to criticize, on the grounds that he does not possess sufficient "educational competence," is to say he lacks the competence of citizenship and the competence to pass judgment on what he desires either his society or his schools to be. I cannot think of any more undemocratic premise than that.

One of the current alibis for this social-reconstruction - t h r o u g h - the-schools movement deserves passing note. In his book, "This Happened in Pasadena" (1951), David Hulburd comments on the criticism offered during the Pasadena controversy that Dr. Kilpatrick and other Dewey disciples "advanced, especially in their written works, many radical, political, and economic theories." Of this Mr. Hulburd says:

> It might be remembered, however, that these radical theories had been advanced in the thirties, when it was not uncommon for genuine liberals to espouse points of view which they no longer hold (p. 53).

The record documented herein has clearly established that the basic points of view espoused in the thirties are still espoused by the leaders and disciples of this movement. These points of view are reaffirmed in the AEF Statement of Policy, in the writings of numerous progressive educators, and in modified form in the publications of the American Association of School Administrators.

As recently as early 1951, Kenneth D. Benne, in his presidential address at the National Conference of the American Education Fellowship in Philadelphia, was urging a new "Call to the Teachers of the Nation." Such a call, he said, "must have many elements in common with its forerunner of 1933"—Progressive Education, April 1951, page 195. And Dr. Benne pointed out that "the way of thinking which the—original—call represented was never absent after 1933 from the thinking and activities of organized progressive education." He even credited this "way of thinking" with influencing the National Education Association "to somewhat similar though more cautious conclusions."

The record does not bear out the effort of Hulburd to dismiss thus casually the "radical theories" of educators—and of this movement—in the thirties as "points of view which they no longer hold." The movement, as we have seen, persists, regardless of any changes of views on the part of some individuals.

Even if there are individual advocates of these theories who have subsequently abandoned these views, that fact would provide the strongest possible indictment of the proposal to promote social reconstruction through the classroom. A procedure can scarcely be dignified with the name "education" if it involves promoting certain theories among students which the advocates of those theories later casually discard. On such a basis, the schools would become merely the mirrors of the prevailing fads of so-called "liberals."

Educational officialdom and its spokesmen do the public schools a grave disservice by attempting to deny the record of the movement which is documented here. They perform an even graver disservice by attempting to suppress or "punish" discussion or criticism of this movement. A blanket denial is as unwarranted, and is as certain to create suspicion of the schools, as a blanket indictment of the schools.

I have endeavored throughout this documentation to avoid not only a blanket indictment of the schools but any resort to emotionalized denunciation. I have endeavored to describe and define a movement which, I believe, is subversive both of American principles and of sound education.

I believe that such a documentation will be welcomed not only by thoughtful American laymen, but by countless teachers and educators, who are concerned about certain trends in American life and education.

Out of the experience of assembling this documentation has come the conviction that the American educational system, like America itself, despite its shortcomings and vagaries, carries within itself the seeds of self-correction and improvement. It is my firm conviction and deep faith that responsible criticism within and outside the professional educational circles constitutes a logical and effective partnership in the continuing task of achieving better schools and better education.

I should like to emphasize one fact, which by the very nature of this documentation, has received scant recognition—the fact that the movement which I have here described has today, and from the very outset has had, outspoken and vigorous opponents within the educational profession. Present-day lay critics of this movement may take heart from this fact, for it is proof that their hostility to the movement does not arise solely from their "incompetence in educational matters" and it is assurance that they have powerful allies within the educational profession itself.

Immediately following Dr. Counts' historic address at the Baltimore convention, a Short Hills, N. J., teacher, Ellen Windom Warren Geer, raised these penetrating questions to which no effective answers have been supplied in the 20 years since:

> Shall we indoctrinate (young people) with social theories which seem sound to us today, but which, by the time our children are able to accomplish anything for their furtherance, may be hopelessly outdated, and the adherence to which will have incapacitated them for open-minded recognition of that fact? Or is there a higher courage in remaining faithful to the hitherto untried experiment of developing a courageous open-mindedness in the belief that so equipped, the new generation may be able, after they leave us, to cope with a changing civilization, only dimly foreseen by us, with far more wisdom than we can hope to attain ourselves? What course is truly "progressive?" (Progressive Education, April 1932, pp. 265 ff.)

Then there is the judgment offered by the distinguished American historian, James Truslow Adams, commenting on the "Call to the Teachers of the Nation":

> I do not see that the teachers of America have any right to set up as a "powerful organization," free from all influence outside—except for being guaranteed tenure and adequate compensation by the economic order which otherwise they are free to flout—to say precisely what the future society must be and to train the youth of the Nation to believe solely in the teachers' utopia.
>
> My experience with graduates of the public schools is that they have never been taught to use their minds or to learn the use of intellectual tools. It seems to me that there is a task calling for all the abilities of such teachers as we yet have, rather than shattering this world to bits to mold it nearer to the Teachers' Union's desire—even if the union could agree on a desire. (Progressive Education, October 1933, pp. 303–314.)

There is also the warning of John L. Tildsley, associate superintendent of the New York City public schools, offered in 1938, against the "seeming indifference" of the frontier thinkers "to the steady deterioration in an ever-accelerated degree in the quality of public elementary and secondary education in this country."

And Dr. Tildsley offered the further counsel that—

> The supreme need of America today is neither an immediate democratic collectivist society nor more complete academic freedom. It is the creation of a highly intelligent, social minded, self-disciplined, efficient body of citizens and a supply of thoroughly trained, courageous, strong-willed, potential leaders and administrators. (Social Frontier, IV: 319–322.)

There is the sober counsel offered by President Orville C. Pratt of the National Education Association in the NEA Journal of November 1936—page 238:

> Should we * * * not emphasize both sides of academic freedom? The issue of loyalty oaths would have made less headway if, in connection with the statement of our right of academic freedom, we had at the same time clearly and emphatically stated our duty to be absolutely loyal and to inculcate American ideals.
>
> As a result of neglecting to state the duty side of academic freedom, we find ourselves now in the position of being regarded in some quarters with suspicion. We know that the suspicion has no foundation in fact and we resent it. Under these circumstances what we ought to do is to assure the public that the teachers of America are overwhelmingly and intensely patriotic. By all means, let us insist on our rights, but let us be no less zealous in acknowledging and performing our duties.

There is the penetrating criticism of the AEF policy presented by two directors of that organization in 1948, Lester B. Hall, superintendent of schools of Highland Park, Ill., and Harold G. Shane, AEF vice president, and superintendent of schools of Winnetka, Ill.

In their criticism of this policy declaration, they wrote:

> It appears from study that a particular doctrine or body of dogma has been established, which presumably is to be accepted for implementation by members of the association. It does not seem that this acceptance of a "line" or "position" is compatible with the progressive tradition. (Progressive Education, April 1948, p. 110.)

Continuing, the educators point out:

In the policy * * * sharp criticism is directed at the present American economic organization, without any comparable attempt to analyze the strengths of the system. Nowhere in the document is a scholarly effort made to evaluate the strengths of a capitalistic organization, or to point to ways in which it might be improved. Instead, emphasis is placed by implication upon the strengths of a more socialized economy, which presumably has no weaknesses worthy of mention. Such a bias seems a marked and undesirable departure from the association's belief in free inquiry, full discussion, and intelligent decision in view of all pertinent facts.

This discerning criticism likewise points out that the policy statement constitutes "the tacit assumption of general approval of the direction being taken by most of the socialized states in the world today," and that "criticism of America's economic order and foreign policy in the document is not balanced by analysis of the policies of other nations, including those within the Russian orbit, whose policies are at least as much, if not more, open to question"—page 110, ibidem.

Finally, this criticism offers the stern warning that progressive educators "must avoid being duped by those who would use the liberal movement in American education for ends other than the orderly advancement and achievement of the ideals of free peoples"—ibidem, page 111.

There is the view expressed at the Barnard Forum in New York City in February of this year by Dean Francis M. Crowley, of the Fordham University College of Education:

The progressive social philosophy of education generates confusion and fosters disintegration. The school should not be used as an instrument to agitate for overthrow of existing society.

Finally, there is the discerning analysis of current "attacks" on the schools offered by Dr. Willard B. Spalding, dean of the College of Education of the University of Illinois, writing in the November 1951 Progressive Education. Dr. Spalding frankly acknowledges the existence of a "cluster of stereotypes" which have developed in the minds of a growing number of Americans with respect to progresive education.

One of these clusters—

He adds—

centers around the belief that progressive education is attempting to indoctrinate boys and girls with an idea about the form and nature of our society and the government which it should have, which will erode away or destroy the type of government which we now have. * * * In this cluster, we find that progressive education is directed toward indoctrinating belief in the welfare state; that the social-studies teaching is done by teachers who are opposed to the capitalistic system of free enterprise and favor socialism or some other brand of collectivism; and that progressive education is opposed to patriotism and to a belief in the fundamental principles which underlie our country.

Dr. Spalding refuses to attribute the persistence of such beliefs solely to the sponsorship of "self-seeking groups and individuals." He refuses to accept the explanation that they are "kept alive by subversive right-wing groups in order that they might strengthen their own treasuries or have some theme which they could use in their literature."

On the contrary, Dr. Spalding believes that whereas progressive education originally was concerned with "the development of the science of education," it has "somehow got off the track." He believes that dogma was substituted for scientific inquiry and adds that he "is proud to be one of many" persons who left the Progressive Education Association and the American Education Fellowship because of this trend.

With a frankness and fairness not always paralleled today by educational leaders, Dr. Spalding concludes:

Why do they (these stereotypes) persist and why are they so widespread? I submit that perhaps the major reason for this is the abandonment by the progressive-education movement of its early search for a science of education. * * *

The * * * cluster of stereotypes * * * about indoctrinating a political theory, is a direct result of publications of organizations like the AEF. Few teachers do what is charged against all, but people do not read the list of members, and attribute those ideas to all teachers.

Some of us feel that the progressive-education movement has been captured by a group who are more concerned with changing society than with improving the quality of instruction in the classrooms of America. I think that change in the direction of the movement, because of this change in leadership, has been unfortunate for American education as a whole. * * *

In the long run, we can only eliminate the sterotypes about education from the American mind by eliminating the conditions which cause them.

It is inexpressibly heartening to read these words.

I believe the elimination of the conditions in the American public school described by Dr. Spalding and documented herein is a joint concern and a joint enterprise of professional educators, elected public school officials and lay citizens and organizations.

I do not look to repressive legislation, to indiscriminate denunciation, to reckless witch hunting, or to the high-voltage emotional tactics of name calling, to accomplish this result.

Rather, I believe that the key to the elimination of these conditions lies primarily in full exposure of these conditions to public knowledge, in fearless criticism of the movement which has created the conditions, and in increasing public cooperation between educational leadership and all interested citizens through agencies and procedures exemplified by the Michigan Commission on Educational Policies.

MAJOR SOURCE MATERIALS AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive? Paper by Dr. George S. Counts, delivered at Baltimore meeting of Progressive Education Association, February 1932. Progressive Education, April 1932, pages 257–263.

Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order? Monograph by Dr. George S. Counts, April 15, 1932, incorporating material presented in three addresses, Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive? Education Through Indoctrination, and Culture, Social Planning, and Leadership.

A Call to the Teachers of the Nation, 1933; Committee on Social and Economic Problems of the Progressive Education Association.

Conclusions and Recommendations of the Commission on Social Studies, American Historical Association, 1934.

The Report of the Committee on Education for the New America of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association 1934 Proceedings, NEA.

The Social Frontier, a monthly journal published from 1934 to 1939.

Frontiers of Democracy, successor to the Social Frontier, published from 1939 to 1944.

Progressive Education, official journal of the Progressive Education Association, now the American Education Fellowship, 1932–51, inclusive.

Yearbook of the John Dewey Society, especially the First Yearbook, 1937, The Teacher and Society.

Proceedings of the National Education Association, 1932–51, inclusive.

Yearbook of the American Association of School Administrators, especially 1947 and 1952 editions.

A New Policy for the American Education Fellowship, November 1947, and February 1948, Progressive Education.

The Soviet Challenge to America, Dr. George S. Counts, 1931.

National Education Association Journal, 1933–51.

This Happened in Pasadena, David Hulburd, 1951.

Bulletin No. 35, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, NEA, Harold Benjamin, chairman, 1951.

American Education Under Fire, Ernest O. Melby, 1951.

A New Education for a New America, Prof. Harold J. Laski, the New Republic, July 29, 1936.

American Education and the Social Struggle, Theodore Brameld, Science and Society—a Marxian Quarterly, fall, 1936.

The Great Technology, Harold Rugg, 1933.

New Schools for a New Culture, Charles M. MacConnel, Ernest O. Melby, and Christian O. Arndt.

Design for America, Theodore Brameld.

Ends and Means in Education, Theodore Brameld, 1950.

Toward World Understanding, volumes I to VII, UNESCO.

Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education, volume III.

Who Owns Your Child's Mind? John T. Flynn, Reader's Digest, October 1951.

Who's Trying To Ruin Our Schools? Arthur D. Morse, McCall's magazine, September 1951.

The Civil Rights of Conservative Men in Education, the Case of Alpheus W. Ray, superintendent of elementary schools, Roseville, Calif., brief issued by California Sons of the American Revolution, 1951.

Eighth Report, Senate Investigating Committee on Education, State of California, 1951.

Statement to Michigan School Administrators, the Michigan Commission on Educational Policies, 1951.

The Pasadena Story, National Commission for the Defense of Democracy

Through Education of the NEA, June 1951.

School and Society, particularly October 29, 1949, Communism and Fascism in the Schools, John J. DeBoer; March 25, 1950, review of Communism and American Education, W. W. Brickman; April 22, 1950, the Politics of Scholastic Criticism, Col. George C. Reinhardt; July 22, 1950, Fear Is the Enemy, John J. DeBoer; October 14, 1950, What Is the Enemy? Col. George C. Reinhardt; January 20, 1951, the Danger of Authoritarian Attitudes in Teaching Today, Sidney Hook; February 10, 1951, Policy and Leadership of the American Education Fellowship, Frederick S. Breed; July 14, 1951, Mr. Breed and the AEF, Kenneth D. Benne, and the Scapegoat Value of American Public Education, Douglas Rush; July 21, 1951, Why Raise an Oath Umbrella? Thomas Woody; and October 27, 1951, In Defense of the Critics of Education, Hugh R. Fraser, education editor, Pathfinder magazine, and Attack and Counterattack in Education, W. W. Brickman.

Fortune, January 1952, the Social Engineers, and March 1952, Groupthink, William H. Whyte, Jr.

Investigation of Teachers Union, Local No. 555, UPWA–CIO, special subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, 1948.

Atlantic Monthly, Quackery in the Public Schools, Lynd and Case, March and May 1950.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 3 minutes.

GREAT FALLS AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a telegram from the Great Falls Chamber of Commerce, which reads as follows:

GREAT FALLS, MONT., *March 20, 1952.*
Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Wednesday morning's Tribune has Washington AP dispatch in which congressional House committee charged triplication and waste of manpower at Great Falls Air Force Base. Particularly commenting upon the burdensome function of keeping hundreds of certain roads in Montana open during winter. These, as you well know, are in conjunction with off-base secret installations which are classified as pertaining to national defense. Newspaper item also criticizes duplication of mess halls, where in fact new buildings are taking the place of old obsolete ones, the life of which was 5 years, but they have been built 10 years and that these buildings were constructed on authority of Army Air Force officials and properly passed through Congress.

It seems that everything mentioned in this dispatch is distorted and without foundation. Would appreciate it if you could inform the committee and Congress of the true conditions. Would appreciate your cooperation.

GREAT FALLS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
LLOYD M. CROXFORD, *President,*
A. J. BREITEINSTEIN, *Secretary.*

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to me how a House subcommittee can make such charges on the basis of a 1-hour stopover at Great Falls Air Base. I understand the reason they stopped at Great Falls was not to investigate the base, but was due to engine trouble on their flight to Alaska.

There is, as near as I can find out, no basis for the charges made. The Air Force did not use personnel to clear and maintain roads, as this was done by the Montana State Highway Department. Insofar as housing is concerned, there is absolutely no duplication, but, as a matter of fact, there is a great need for more housing. Because of the lack of this needed housing, the Great Falls Air Base is in a sadly dilapidated state. This is deplorable when one considers that of all the air bases in the United States this is, in my opinion, the most important one in the entire Nation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio and to include a radio speech.

Mr. O'TOOLE and to include an article from the Seafarers Journal.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia to revise and extend remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter in two instances.

Mr. BRYSON and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MCGUIRE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SHELLEY (at the request of Mr. MCGUIRE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania and to include an article.

Mr. ROBERTS (at the request of Mr. RAINS) and to include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. DONOHUE and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. MILLER of New York in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee and to include an editorial.

Mr. LATHAM (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAKEWELL (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CHENOWETH.

Mr. MULTER and to include extraneous matter in remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. MULTER in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANNON and to include a speech delivered in Chicago.

Mr. MCCORMACK and to include an address recently made by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENSEN and to include a statement.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MORANO (at the request of Mr. SEELY-BROWN) on account of illness.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. WALTER), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

Mr. HELLER on account of official business (SEC investigation).

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. STANLEY, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 20, 1952, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1012. An act to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 24, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1269. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting the annual report of the Department of the Army relative to the disposal of Army excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the calendar year 1951, pursuant to section 404 (d), title IV, of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1270. A letter from the chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the Thirteenth Semiannual Report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, for the period July to December 1951, pursuant to section 9 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1271. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of the accounts and financial statements of certain banks and corporations supervised by Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 399); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KIRWAN: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7176. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Miss THOMPSON of Michigan: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1184. An act to extend

the Youth Corrections Act to the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 7176. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ENGLE:

H. R. 7177. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, lower San Joaquin Valley, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 7178. A bill to authorize works for development and furnishing of water supplies for waterfowl management, lower San Joaquin Valley, Central Valley project, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 7179. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Texas:

H. R. 7180. A bill to provide for the further development of cooperative agricultural extension work; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 7181. A bill to appropriate $25,000,000 for the establishment of laboratories for research and study of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases, as authorized by section 12 of the act of May 29, 1884, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 7182. A bill to provide for the deduction by a divorced husband of certain payments for the support of minor children, for the reduction of the exemptions claimed by the divorced wife in such cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7183. A bill to amend section 112 (n) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to nonrecognition of gain from sale or exchange of residence) with respect to persons serving on active duty with the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 7184. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), to provide overtime compensation for employees of the postal transportation service for service in excess of 32 hours performed in any calendar week in which a holiday occurs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 7185. A bill to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 7186. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to require Federal grand and petit jurors to take an oath of allegiance and subscribe to an affidavit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7187. A bill to provide reduced annuities at age 55 after 15 years of civilian service for persons involuntarily separated from the Federal service not by removal for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 7188. A bill to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 7189. A bill to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barreled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESS:

H. J. Res. 407. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning October 20, 1952, as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. J. Res. 408. Joint resolution authorizing the Commissioner of Labor Statistics to prepare and publish a Consumers' Price Index and certain other indexes and budgets; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. Res. 585. Resolution authorizing the printing of the committee print entitled "Federal Educational Activities and Educational Issues Before Congress" as a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Resolution of the Massachusetts Legislature, memorializing Congress to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON: Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets: Resolution of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7190. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Como; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7191. A bill for the relief of Antonio Messina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7192. A bill for the relief of Luigi Rizzi, also known as Louis Rizzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 7193. A bill for the relief of Marina George Loizas Kellis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 7194. A bill for the relief of Adamantios Niamonitakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7195. A bill for the relief of Harilaos Filippos Ikonomou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 7196. A bill for the relief of Antonio Fopp; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 7197. A bill for the relief of William E. Ackerknecht; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 7198. A bill for the relief of Louis Joseph Rago; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 7199. A bill for the relief of Shung Yon Rhee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

643. By Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Resolution of the Woman's Club of Irwin, Pa., demanding that immediate steps be taken to increase aircraft production so that, without delay, the air forces of the United States will be superior in type and number to any other in the world; to the Committee on Armed Services.

644. By Mr. PRESTON: Petition of the Uvalda (Ga.) Lions Club, relative to preservation of constitutional government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

645. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Walworth County Taxpayers Association, that Congress be urged to take note of the recommendations of its bipartisan fact-finding bodies such as the Hoover Commission, and adopt their recommendations as a move toward balancing the Federal budget, reducing Federal debt, and placing the Federal Government on an efficient and sound financial basis; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

646. Also, resolution of the Milwaukee County Highway Committee, requesting the Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen to assist in obtaining such radar equipment for General Mitchell Field; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1952

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and most gracious God, whose mercy is from everlasting to everlasting and whose goodness is new every morning and fresh every evening: We bow before Thee in contrition and gratitude. In Thy light we would find wisdom for each perplexity, strength for each testing situation, safe guidance through every peril, and courage for every emergency.

We thank Thee for our ability to respond to good impulses. Incline our hearts to obey every beckoning finger which invites our souls to larger life. Make us eager to translate the glowing impulse into the worthy deed. Give us a divine discontent with low levels of life.

We bring our Nation to Thy throne. Protect, preserve, and unify our people. May we see Thee as the guardian of our Republic and the keeper of our destiny.

In this time on ages telling, endue with wisdom our leaders. And grant that this Nation, made and preserved by Thy power, may be a channel of blessing to all nations of the earth. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., March 24, 1952.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STENNIS thereupon took the chair as acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 20, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 20, 1952, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1851) to assist in preventing aliens from entering or remaining in the United States illegally.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. BRIDGES, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today, tomorrow, and Wednesday.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and to transact other routine business, without debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REVISION OF A PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. DOC. NO. 109)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Department of Labor, fiscal year 1952, in the amount of $110,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, RENEGOTIATION BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 110)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Renegotiation Board, in the amount of $300,000, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Army relating to the disposal of Army excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the calendar year 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SURVEY REPORT ON THE DELAWARE RIVER WATERSHED, NEW YORK, PENNSYLVANIA, NEW JERSEY, DELAWARE, AND MARYLAND

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report dated October 1950, together with accompanying papers and illustrations of the Delaware River watershed in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland (with acompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

SURVEY REPORT ON SCIOTO RIVER WATERSHED, OHIO

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report on the Scioto River watershed in Ohio, dated October 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

SURVEY REPORT ON SEVIER LAKE WATERSHED, UTAH

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a survey report on the Sevier Lake Watershed in Utah, dated May 1950 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON COOPERATION WITH MEXICO IN CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of January 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

A letter from the Commissioner of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on administration of Public Laws 874 and 815, for the year ended June 30, 1951 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Government Operations:

"Resolutions memorializing Congress to place a limitation upon the amount of money to be spent by the Federal Government

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation in accordance with House Joint Resolution 352 of the Eighty-second Congress; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In house of representatives, adopted, March 4, 1952.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"*Clerk.*

"In senate, adopted, in concurrence, March 10, 1952.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"*Clerk.*"

A resolution adopted by Boynton Beach Townsend Club, No. 1, and senior citizens of southern Palm Beach County, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Jewish Forum, New York, N. Y., relating to the establishment of a Nation-wide day of prayer every year on a day other than Sunday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS IN WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA—RESOLUTIONS OF PRINCE GEORGES BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS AND MONTGOMERY COUNTY CIVIC FEDERATION, MARYLAND

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Prince Georges County, Md., relating to the inadequacy and deterioration of transit service in the Washington metropolitan area.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 22—1952

REQUEST FOR HEARING ON H. R. 4604 AND S. 1868 BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE OF UNITED STATES CONGRESS

In view of the present inadequacy and deterioration of transit service in the Washington-metropolitan area, the existing inequalities in fares, and the continuing increase in costs of the service to the communities in the area, and in view of the importance of adequate transit service at reasonable cost to the economic life of the area and its citizens, the Board of County Commissioners of Prince Georges County, Md., urges necessary action be taken to assure that hearings are held on H. R. and S. 1868, now before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, that an appropriation of necessary funds be provided

by Congress, and that passage of the bills are accomplished.

Adopted this 11th day of March 1952.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FOR PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.

By THOMAS E. LATIMER, *President.*
THOMAS F. HICKS, *Clerk.*

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Montgomery County, Md., Civic Federation, favoring a congressional investigation of transportation problems in the Washington metropolitan area.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTGOMERY COUNTY CIVIC FEDERATION RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE REGULAR MEETING HELD MARCH 10, 1952

Resolved by the Montgomery County Civic Federation, That it endorses a congressional investigation of the transportation problems of the Washington metropolitan area and recommends that the consent of Congress be given to the States of Maryland and Virginia, and the District of Columbia, to enter into a compact or agreement providing for the unified regulation of common carriers transporting passengers in the abovenamed jurisdictions, but that any such compact or agreement shall not obligate any of the parties thereto, unless and until it has been approved by the legislatures of said States and by the Congress of the United States for the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2786. A bill to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1343).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4387. A bill to increase the annual income limitations governing the payment of pension to certain veterans and their dependents, and to preclude exclusions in determining annual income for purposes of such limitations; with amendments (Rept. No. 1344); and

H. R. 4394. A bill to provide certain increases in the monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans and their dependents, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1345).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 2905. A bill for the relief of David T. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2906. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at San Francisco, Calif., as the William Randolph Hearst Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 2907. A bill to prescribe policy and procedure in connection with construction contracts made by executive agencies and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2908. A bill to exempt Blackfeet tribal loans from certain restrictions applicable to Federal funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 2909. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of the Coronado International Memorial, in the State of Arizona," approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO ARRANGE FOR INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT-ELECT, JANUARY 20, 1953

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January 1953.

INCREASE IN PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED SERVICES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LONG submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (f), 302 (g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended; which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him, reviewing certain farm matters, broadcasts from Station WBEV, Beaver Dam, Wis.

Address delivered by him, entitled "Building for an Expanding America," broadcast March 22, 1952, from Station WGN, Chicago, Ill.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Address entitled "The Bread of Democracy," delivered by James S. Kemper, chairman, Lumbermen's Mutual Casualty Co., before the Rotary Club of Los Angeles on March 7, 1952.

By Mr LEHMAN:

Address summarizing advances in rehabilitation of the Philippines, delivered by Gerald Wilkinson, published in the Manila Bulletin of February 28, 1952.

Letter addressed to him by William T. Field, of Watertown, N. Y., dated March 17, 1952, and relating to the St. Lawrence seaway and power project.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Resolutions adopted by the Kansas Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution at Hutchinson, Kans., March 8, 1952.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Article entitled "Uncle Sam Buys Dear, Sells Cheap, and Some People Get Rich Quick," written by Herman A. Lowe, and published in the Philadelphia Sunday Inquirer of March 23, 1952.

Editorial entitled "It Was Taxpayers' Property—So Nobody Cared," published in the Philadelphia Sunday Inquirer of March 23, 1952, dealing with recent losses in Government-owned grain stored in warehouses.

THE JAPANESE PEACE TREATY—TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATIONS BETWEEN GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR AND HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the debate on the Japanese peace treaty last Thursday, the question was raised as to whether or not General MacArthur had participated in the conferences, and whether he had been consulted and had approved the treaty. I now ask unanimous consent that I may read into the RECORD a telegraphic exchange between Mr. John Foster Dulles and General MacArthur following the ratification of the treaty.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Under date of March 20, which was the date the treaty was ratified, Mr. Dulles telegraphed Gen. Douglas MacArthur as follows:

MARCH 20, 1952.

Gen. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
The Waldorf Astoria Hotel,
New York:

Now that the Japanese Peace Treaty has been approved for ratification by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, I want again to express my appreciation for the inspiration and support which you have given toward the accomplishment of this work of peace.

JOHN FOSTER DULLES.

To that telegram, under date of March 21, General MacArthur telegraphed Mr. Dulles as follows:

MARCH 21, 1952.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES:

Thanks and deepest appreciation for your gracious message. It is a happy ending to a great task.

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR,
General of the Army.

CONDITIONS IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, during the past several months references have been made on the floor of the Senate and in the press to the prevailing state of affairs in the Territory of Puerto Rico, with special regard to the administration of Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín. Some misleading criticisms have been made.

Soon Congress will be called upon to consider a constitution for Puerto Rico, recently approved in a plebiscite of the Puerto Rican people. Congress authorized Puerto Rico to draft such a constitution.

Because of the importance of our considering this constitution in the light of facts rather than of unsubstantiated allegations, I was very much interested, indeed, in two letters I have recently received, one from the Governor of Puerto

Rico, himself, and one from Assistant Secretary of State Edward G. Miller. Both letters deal with the constitution, and with the actual state of affairs in Puerto Rico. Both letters deal with facts and with opinions based on intimate acquaintance with the facts.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Secretary Miller, who has a long personal acquaintance as well as an official interest in Puerto Rican affairs, and the letter from Governor Muñoz, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 20, 1952.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: Your constituents in New York City (particularly in the Eighteenth Congressional District where I have lived and voted) include some tens of thousands of United States citizens who were born on the island of Puerto Rico. As you know, I am one of them. While it happens in my own case that my parents were merely temporary residents, spending very few years there, the island's welfare has always been a matter of great personal interest for me, and I was delighted last year when my native town of Juncos honored me by the designation of a "favorite son."

Consequently, I have a double source of gratification, as a citizen of the United States whose birthplace was Puerto Rico, in the overwhelming approval which Puerto Rican voters gave on Monday, March 3, to the constitution drafted by a constitutional convention elected by themselves, and authorized at the unanimous request of their own legislature by the unanimous vote of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

There now remains only the final step: Ratification of the constitution by Congress. The purpose of this letter is to call to your attention the importance of ratification as speedily as possible. It is my conviction that it is hardly less important to the United States as a whole than it is to Puerto Rico. I am taking the liberty of writing you about the matter because I remember your very sympathetic interest in Puerto Rico when I appeared before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in support of S. 3336 on May 17, 1950, pursuant to which the constitution was placed before the voters of Puerto Rico.

It is important to us as a people because the new status given Puerto Rico by this constitution, a status chosen and carefully worked out by Puerto Ricans themselves in accordance with a pattern which they believe fits the island's needs and fills out with mutual satisfaction its relationship to the United States, is proof incontrovertible of the good faith of our people and our Government in dealing with the island. It is proof no less substantial of the solidarity of the Puerto Rican people with their fellow citizens in the continental United States, and of their unwavering adherence to the principles of our common democracy. I should like to make special mention here of the devoted service of the Honorable ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, in introducing the bill which authorized Puerto Rico to write its own constitution and in acting as president of the constitutional convention.

In accordance with the new constitution, Puerto Rico will have a unique relationship with the United States Government: That of an associated free state, a commonwealth. Puerto Rico will make its own laws, elect its own legislature and its own government, appoint its own supreme court justices, collect its own taxes. The island will still be subject to tariff rates fixed by the United States Government. The judiciary will have added dignity: The supreme court can be increased only at its own request; and the administration of justice will be not under the Governor, as at present, but under the chief justice.

This brings to mind some criticisms that have been made recently on the Senate floor with respect to what was more than once termed the dictatorial administration of Governor Muñoz Marín. These criticisms are obviously based on an incomplete knowledge, or a complete misinterpretation, of the facts. The paramount fact is that the constitution of Puerto Rico as drawn up by Puerto Ricans jealously safeguards democratic rights. These safeguards are the more noteworthy since Governor Luis Muñoz Marín was a member of the constitutional convention and strongly supported, in some cases himself initiating, the limitations on the Governor's authority. For instance, the constitution takes from the Governor his supervisory power to suspend habeas corpus. While he can still proclaim martial law, the legislature can repeal it; and it can also override the Governor's veto by a two-third vote. The Governor insisted (and let us not forget in this connection that he is the leader, with a tremendous personal popularity, of the party which came into power by a landslide vote) upon inclusion of constitutional guaranties that minorities shall always have adequate representation in the legislature. Those guaranties, I may add, have been incorporated in the Puerto Rican Constitution with a respect for minority opinion rarely paralleled in political history.

There can be no doubt that the constitution is a worthy contribution to the political economy of our time. In the words of Governor Muñoz Marín, the first elective Governor in Puerto Rico's 460 years of recorded history, "it demonstrates eloquently both the democratic maturity of the Puerto Rican people and the democratic justice of the United States. Congress and our Puerto Rican voters," he said, "are creating a new manner of freedom in the relationship between peoples of different cultural origins and equal democratic rights." Puerto Rico is the unanswerable proof that the United States is not an imperialist nation despotically striving to build a colonial empire, but a free democracy zealously defending and extending democratic freedom.

Since the constitution is the tangible expression of this fact, the incontrovertible piece of evidence, it is obviously to the best interests of the United States that it be approved by the Congress at the earliest possible date, so that it may speedily go into effect. The constitution of Puerto Rico is a telling answer to the barefaced lies, the poisoned innuendoes, the cunning distortions, which communism and terrorism are employing assiduously against the United States, using the patient, forbearing and patriotic people of Puerto Rico as involuntary subjects of their libels. I am therefore urging you in my own behalf and that of your other constituents, of whatever racial or linguistic background who have at heart the best interests of the United States, to do what you can to bring the constitution of Puerto Rico to the speedy consideration and the overwhelming vote of approval which it so richly deserves.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD G. MILLER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

LA FORTALEZA,
San Juan, P. R., March 5, 1952.

The Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: First of all, let me express to you my deep gratitude for your able and generous defense of this government before certain incredible attacks in which, I am afraid, the good faith of some Senators has been abused by a sordid interest.

The constitution was approved a couple of days ago, 4 to 1 (375,000 to 82,000), a still greater majority than the one by which Law 600—"the compact"—was approved last June 4, which was only 76 percent. We are all very proud of the quality of the constitution, especially of the relationship of equal dignity that it establishes between the people of Puerto Rico and our fellow citizens of the States. It is, of course, not federated statehood. It is something new and different, but we believe on an equal level, because it is based on agreement, instead of on a treaty ending a war 54 years ago, or on the unilateral application of a clause in the Federal Constitution designed for the administration of sparsely settled territory. Its significance for us goes deep and it is more than just political—it has a spiritual quality.

The significance is twofold: (1) The constitution creates a more democratic structure of government and division of powers than under the organic act, and (2) it is part of a process of great political dignity based on free agreement between Congress and our people. It adds to the stature of the United States in our moral fight against communism.

The constitution divests the Governor of many powers that he has had since 1900 under the organic acts, enhancing thereby the powers of the legislative and of the judiciary. Under the organic act, the Governor's veto was practically absolute; under the constitution, the legislature can override it by two-thirds majority. Under the organic act, the Governor could declare martial law without any check from the legislature. Under the constitution just approved, the legislature must get together immediately at its own call upon a declaration of martial law to approve or disapprove it, and in all cases it is subject to judicial review as to its justification. The Governor could suspend the writ of habeas corpus indefinitely under the organic act; under the constitution only the legislature can suspend the writ of habeas corpus, subject to judicial review. Under the constitution only a foreign or revolutionary enemy by force can close the courts even under martial law.

Under the organic act the attorney general, appointed by the Governor, is the administrator of the courts; under the constitution the chief justice of the supreme court, appointed for life and removable only by impeachment, is the administrator of the whole judicial system. A new feature of the constitution is that the legislature cannot increase or decrease the number of judges of the supreme court unless it is at the request of the court itself. Under the organic act the auditor was a part of the executive; under the constitution the auditor is responsible to the legislature and serves for a long term of years. Under the organic act, if the majority party had a large percentage of the votes, minorities elected a ridiculously small membership to the legislative houses; under the constitution minorities are practically guaranteed having one-third of the seats in each house, even if they are not very strong in the districts. Under the organic act the legislature could abolish courts of justice and thereby legislate judges out, and on one occasion did so; under the constitution judges will serve to the end of their terms even in the case of the legislature abolishing their courts.

Many of these extensions of democracy in the constitution, I am proud to say, have been adopted at my own motion. Among them the placing of court administration under the chief justice of the supreme court instead of under the attorney general; the transfer of the power to suspend habeas corpus to the legislature and the strict limitation of the Governor's power as to martial law to the first few hours of its declaration.

Bear in mind that habeas corpus has never been suspended nor martial law declared in Puerto Rico at any time, not even when, under my administration, in October 1950 the independentist nationalists staged a terroristic insurrection.

The basis of consent and compact on which the whole process is founded has been the source of the tremendous spiritual release that our people are experiencing through the creative constitutional process. Hundreds of thousands of people in Puerto Rico have been in the past under a kind of spiritual trauma with the feeling that they were treated as a colony in their relationship with continental United States. In my youth, as you may know, I believed in independence, in the old Liberal Party, and underwent this trauma. Many of our people that do not wish independence or statehood, have for years suffered the anguish of believing that the only alternative was what they conceived as a humiliating colonialism. Many of our people do not wish independence—because they believe in the profound freedom of American institutions; and do not wish federated statehood—because they believe that Puerto Rico's relations to the American Union can be of the greatest historical significance in the hemisphere by developing into a new kind of commonwealth associated with the American Union in full equality of dignity, although under a different structure of association. But they did not want forever to be colonials. It has been our achievement to let them see that the alternative to independence or statehood is not colonialism, but a new kind of commonwealth that is being developed in a great creative collaboration between the Congress of the United States and the people of Puerto Rico. That spiritual understanding has been achieved through law 600, in its nature of a compact approved by Congress and by the voters of Puerto Rico, and through the fine quality that everybody sees (except the independentists) in the actual constitutional document that has now been approved at the polls.

During the voting on the constitution on March 3 we had the good fortune of having with us Congressmen CHESTER MCMULLEN, of Florida, and FRANK BOW, of Ohio, and they visited many polling places in the urban and rural areas in different parts of the island. They can tell you what splendid understanding and practice of democracy there is among all Puerto Ricans.

We are all feeling very happy and we know that we owe a good part of this to your constant sympathetic understanding, great friendship, and good will toward Puerto Rico.

With best wishes,

Cordially,

LUIS MUÑOZ MARÍN,
Governor.

P. S.—I am sending you a copy of the constitution as approved at the polls on March 3.

THE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order heretofore made reads as follows:

Ordered, That on Monday, March 24, 1952, upon the convening of the Senate, it proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar, beginning with Order No. 1146 and including Order Nos. 703, 1088, and 1270.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. The calendar can now be called.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Thursday, the calendar will now be called. The first measure to be called under the unanimous-consent agreement is Calendar No. 703, House bill 2737.

REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTAIN EXPENSES

The bill (H. R. 2737) to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries, was announced as first in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HUNT. The bill provides for reimbursing certain naval attachés for moneys which they have expended out of their pockets to carry on what was apparently their duty and for which they have never been reimbursed. On the last call of the calendar the Senator from Illinois objected and the bill went to the foot of the calendar. However, I understand that he has now withdrawn his objections, provided that the amount due these men be paid out of current appropriations, with no additional appropriations being made for this purpose.

Accordingly I send the following amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, after the period, it is proposed to insert:

All payments made under the provisions of this act shall be made from, and all payments validated under such provisions shall be charged to, the amount appropriated by the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1952, to the Department of the Navy for emergencies and extraordinary expenses, as authorized by section 6 of the act of August 2, 1946.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield for a question?

Mr. HUNT. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming whether he can give any indication as to what the cost will be? Does he know how much money is involved?

Mr. HUNT. I regret to advise the distinguished Senator from Kansas that the matter was acted on in committee several months ago. It was called to my attention only a few minutes ago. I understand that the total cost will amount to approximately $42,780.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2737) to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER TO NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 1331) to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, with respect to Calendar No. 1088, on the last call of the calender the bill was objected to, and at that time I asked that it be placed at the foot of the calendar. I am advised that the calendar committee of the minority desires further information with respect to the bill, so as to make a further study of the subject. For that reason, I ask that the bill go over, with unanimous consent that it may be called on the next call of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill will be included in the next call of the calendar.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 539) relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is on the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I ask that the bill go over, not to the foot of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the bill goes over.

AMENDMENTS OF PENALTIES PROVISION OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1940

The bill (S. 2390) to amend section 302 (4) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, relating to penalties, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the measure? I understand that it involves certain technical amendments to a statute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation of the bill is requested.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, Senate bill 2390 amends the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act by the insertion of the words "make or" so as to impose liability upon one who actually performs an illegal act under the present statute. The present statute relieves from liability one who actually performs such act but punishes only the one who causes the act to be done. Therefore, the Department of Justice has suggested that the statute be amended by the insertion of the words "make or" so as to permit it to prosecute successfully those persons who actually perform an invalid act under the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

Both the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration have approved the proposed amendment, and it was reported unanimously by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on February 27.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2390) to amend section 302 (4) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, relating to penalties, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 302 (4) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended (56 Stat. 772, 50 U. S. C. War App. 532 (4)), is amended to read as follows:

"Any person who shall knowingly make or cause to be made any sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property, defined as invalid by subsection (3) hereof, or attempts so to do, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year or by fine not to exceed $1,000, or both."

APPOINTMENT OF WOMEN PHYSICIANS AND SPECIALISTS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

The bill (S. 2552) to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all laws or parts of laws, which now or hereafter authorize appointment of male commissioned officers in each of the several corps of the medical service of the Regular Army, and the reserve components thereof, or as medical, dental, and Medical Service Corps officers of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve, or as officers of the Air Force designated to perform medical, dental, veterinarian, or medical service duties, shall be construed to include authority to appoint female personnel thereunder and all laws and parts of laws now or hereafter applicable to male commissioned officers and former male commissioned officers of each of the several corps of the medical service of the Regular Army, and the reserve components thereof, or as medical, dental, and Medical Service Corps officers of the Regular Navy and Naval Reserve, or as officers of the Air Force designated to perform medical, dental, veterinarian, or medical service duties, shall, in like cases, be applicable to commissioned female officers and former commissioned officers so appointed and to their dependents and beneficiaries: *Provided*, That except with respect to the Career Compensation Act of 1949, the husbands of female officers appointed under the provisions of this act shall not be considered dependents unless they are in fact dependent on their wives for their chief support, and the children of such officers shall not be considered dependents unless their father is dead or they are in fact dependent on their mother for their chief support: *Provided further*, That the cognizant secretary, under the circumstances and in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President, may terminate the commission of any officer appointed pursuant hereto.

PRESENTATION OF MEDAL TO HENRIK KURT CARLSEN

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that there is an identical House joint resolution on the calendar, Calendar No. 1271. Without objection, the House joint resolution will be considered.

The clerk will state the House joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 363) to provide for the presentation of the Merchant Marine Distinguished Service Medal to Henrik Kurt Carlsen, master, steamship *Flying Enterprise*.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 363?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 363) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 124 will be indefinitely postponed.

DECORATIONS FOR HEROISM OF MERCHANT MARINE PERSONNEL

The bill (S. 2530) to provide certain decorations for outstanding and heroic conduct or service by persons serving in the American merchant marine was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Maritime Administration is authorized and directed, under such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, to provide and award medals of such material and design and with such devices and inscriptions as it may deem suitable to (a) each person who in the American merchant marine, on or after July 25, 1947, has distinguished himself by conduct or service in the line of duty which is extremely outstanding and heroic; and (b) each person who in the American merchant marine on or after July 25, 1947, has distinguished himself by conduct or service in the line of duty which is outstanding and heroic but not to the extent that is required for a medal under the provisions of part (a) of this section. Such medals shall be presented with appropriate ceremony as specified by such Administration.

SEC. 2. There may be issued with each medal awarded under the provisions of this act a rosette or other device to be worn in lieu of the medal. Not more than one medal shall be issued under the provisions of either part (a) or part (b) of the first section of this act to any person, but for each succeeding instance sufficient to justify the award of the same medal to such person the Maritime Administration may award a suitable bar or other emblem or insignia to be worn with such medal and the corresponding rosette or other device. In case any person who so distinguishes himself as to justify the award of a medal or decoration under this act dies before the award can be made to him, the award may be made and the medal or decoration presented to such representative of the deceased as the Maritime Administration deems proper.

TEMPORARY OPERATION OF CANADIAN VESSELS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND ALASKA

The bill (S. 2721) to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, until June 30, 1953, notwithstanding the provisions of law of the United States restricting to vessels of the United States the transportation of passengers and merchandise directly or indirectly from any port in the United States to another port of the United States, passengers may be transported on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation: *Provided*, That such Canadian vessels may transport merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports and points herein enumerated.

SERVICE RIBBON FOR MERCHANT SEAMEN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2485) to provide for the issuance of a distinctive service ribbon bar in recognition of the services of merchant seamen which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "June", to strike out "27" and insert "25", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed to provide and issue, under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time prescribe, a distinctive service ribbon bar to each person who serves or has served honorably as an officer or member of the crew on any vessel documented under the laws of the United States while sailing in a combat zone during the period of Korean hostilities beginning June 25, 1950, to and including the date of termination as shall be determined by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

SEC. 2. The manufacture, sale, possession, or display of any ribbon bar, or any colorable imitation of such bar, provided for in this act, is prohibited, except as authorized under this act or any rule or regulation issued pursuant thereto. Whoever violates any provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $250 or by imprisonment not exceeding 6 months, or both.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR AND INTER-AMERICAN CULTURAL AND TRADE CENTER IN NEW ORLEANS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La., was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that there is on the Calendar a House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) dealing with the same subject matter. The Chair is further advised that the House joint resolution differs materially from the Senate joint resolution. Is there objection to considering the House joint resolution, striking out in the House joint resolution all after the enacting clause and substituting therefor the text of the Senate joint resolution?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the provisions of section 2, and then I should like to suggest and move that this joint resolution go to the foot of the calendar, inasmuch as I hesitate to object on the basis of some questions which might be cleared up in the interim. If placed at the foot of the calendar it might be possible to pass the joint resolution, if there is no further objection to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation of the joint resolution is requested.

If an explanation is not available at this time, the Chair understands the Senator from Kansas to move that the joint resolution go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes, Mr. President.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will go to the foot of the calendar, for consideration later today.

Mr. LONG subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Senate Joint Resolution 22, Calendar No. 1153, which a few minutes ago was placed at the foot of the calendar. At this time I wish to explain the joint resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Louisiana is recognized and may proceed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is the desire of the sponsors of this joint resolution, my colleague and myself, that the House joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 108, Calendar No. 1263, be substituted for the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution simply encourages the people of New Orleans to hold a fair in celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase. The House joint resolution has an additional provision in line with precedent in this matter, so as to permit exhibits to be brought into the United States from foreign countries, and later at the close of the fair, to be returned to those countries, without the payment of duty on them; the duty would be paid only on exhibits remaining in the United States. I understand that such a provision has precedent on the basis of previous expositions. So far as I know, there is no objection to it.

So, Mr. President, I desire to move that the House joint resolution be substituted for the Senate joint resolution and be now considered. The House joint resolution is House Joint Resolution 108, Calendar No. 1263.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana tell us whether his committee considered the House joint resolution? It is materially different, so I am advised by the Chair, from the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. LONG. Yes, the Senate committee reported the Senate joint resolution. My colleague from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who is not present today, discussed this matter with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Finance Committee, and also with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. Neither of them felt that there should be any objection to substituting the House joint resolution for the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am inclined to believe that the House joint resolution should have been considered by the full committee, inasmuch as that measure is different in text and in substance.

Mr. LONG. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that I am not on the committee. However, the House joint resolution has also been reported favorably to the calendar, as has the Senate joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. But I understand that the House joint resolution has not been reported from the committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say that in regular order this measure should have been referred to the Finance Committee, for it deals with the tariff. However, in some way or other the joint resolution was referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, which reported it.

I have examined the joint resolution, and it is in the regular form of such measures in the case of expositions held in this country, for which machinery and other articles are admitted under bond, and subsequently, if exported within a certain period of time, are exempt from taxation.

Mr. LONG. That is the difference between the two joint resolutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana that House Joint Resolution 108 be substituted for Senate Joint Resolution 22 and be now considered. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 108) providing for recognition and endorsement of the International Trade Fair and Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center in New Orleans, La.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the national security and prosperity of the United States require the development of improved relations and increased trade with Latin America and the world; and

Whereas international friendship and trade are founded upon the good will and mutual respect of the people of one nation for those of another, and must be based primarily upon extensive popular contact and understanding; and

Whereas the natural expansion of our trade with Latin America and the world, without subsidy or compulsion, will sustain employment and production and improve living standards both in the United States and throughout the world, preventing the infiltration of undemocratic philosophies there while promoting mutual good will, understanding, and confidence, lasting trade connections, and solidarity among all the nations of the world; and

Whereas any constructive long-range program for the development of a balanced foreign trade with the world must provide ample opportunity for the participation of small businesses, together with adequate merchandising facilities for their products and their representatives; and

Whereas there is a compelling need for the establishment of a trade center which will aid in carrying out these objectives and which will provide an opportunity to bring together large numbers of people from throughout the world and give recognition to their respective cultural, scientific, and artistic and industrial achievements; and

Whereas during the past quarter century outstanding statesmen, industrialists, and internationalists have frequently urged the establishment of such a trade center; and

Whereas the city of New Orleans, La., has been for over 200 years an international city and the natural gateway to the United States from much of Latin America for over two centuries by virtue of its geographical position and the rail, water, air, and highway connections with all parts of the United States; and

Whereas New Orleans in 1944 established International House which has become a world-famous institution for the promotion of peace, trade, and understanding, and in 1947 established the International Trade Mart which has assumed a position of much importance in world trading circles, and particularly in Latin America; and

Whereas New Orleans today is the second port of the United States in dollar values of foreign trade, and in recent years has made very rapid progress in foreign trade and has spent several millions of dollars in developing a foreign trade consciousness in the Mississippi Valley region, and has worked diligently, intelligently, and with results in promoting healthy two-way foreign trade; and

Whereas the city of New Orleans, therefore, is a natural location for further development as an international trade center operated in the national public interest; and

Whereas 1953 is the sesquicentennial anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase, which united the United States and started them on the way to becoming a world power, and this purchase was negotiated and consummated in New Orleans, capital of the Territory, and the business, cultural, social, and

intellectual center of the South then and now: Now, therefore, be it

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 22 is indefinitely postponed.

INCREASE IN FOREIGN SERVICE ANNUITIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3491) to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I shall not object, let me say that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] left with the minority calendar committee a statement regarding this bill. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the statement in explanation of the bill by the Senator from Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING BILL TO INCREASE FOREIGN SERVICE ANNUITIES

The purpose of this bill is to provide increases in annuities to presently retired Foreign Service officers or their widows in an amount equal to that granted to Civil Service annuitants by the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act of February 28, 1948 (Public Law 426, 80th Cong.), which provided an increase of $300 or 25 percent, whichever is lesser.

The proposed legislation was approved by the House of Representatives on July 25, 1950, but did not receive consideration in the Senate before the expiration of that Congress. It was again considered and reported favorably by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs during the first session of the present Congress and was passed by the House of Representatives on May 1, 1951. Other legislative items have prevented its consideration by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee until this time.

Persons now on active duty in the Foreign Service will have their annuities computed at date of retirement on the basis of a 5-year period of service at the comparatively higher salaries provided by the Foreign Service Act of 1946 and subsequent pay-raise bill. The retired officers and widows covered by the proposed legislation receive annuities computed on the much lower salaries which formerly prevailed, prior to 1943.

Increased living costs have so diminished the value of annuities based on the former lower salary rates that many officers and widows are having great difficulty in meeting their living expenses. Their problems are similar to those faced by other persons on fixed incomes. The Congress made adjustments on behalf of other annuitants when they increased the retired pay of military and Public Health personnel and when they enacted the Langer-Chavez-Stevenson Act which increased the annuities of retired civil-service employees. The Department of State urges strongly that similar relief should be extended to Foreign Service annuitants.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, so that Members may have an opportunity to study the statement which has just been submitted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1310) amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

EASEMENTS FOR ELECTRICAL TRANSMISSION LINES, ETC.

The bill (S. 1630) to amend the provision in the act of March 4, 1911 (36 Stat. 1235, 1253), authorizing the granting of easements for rights-of-way for electrical transmission, telephone, and telegraph lines and poles, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire about the need for the bill. As I understand, the bill provides for increasing the right of way from 40 feet to approximately 400 feet.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, which handled this bill, asked that precise question. The Senator from Kansas will note that on page 2 of the committee report it will be found that we insisted on having interviews on that very point with officials of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Defense.

It was apparent that the present law, providing for rights-of-way only 40 feet in width—that is to say, 20 feet on each side of the center line—was completely inadequate, and that many forest fires were resulting from breaks in the high-tension lines in time of storm because of the fact that under present transmission arrangements, frequently the towers, which are very high steel towers, are a long distance apart, and when a transmission line is broken by storm and is blown to one side, the result is frequently to set on fire the national forests or the timber in the case of other lands.

So all the Departments affected asked to be given discretionary power in cases where it was requisite—but only in such cases—to have a right-of-way as wide as 400 feet, which would be 200 feet on each side of the center line.

After considering that point, the committee felt that it was well made; and the bill as reported provides for that discretion regarding the right-of-way.

Let me point out that there is a new problem, namely, the location of relay stations for both television and radio. That situation is not covered by the provision with respect to poles and wires. So Senators will find in the bill, as reported, a committee amendment allowing for the sites of such needed relay stations for both television and radio.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question: Over what lands do these lines pass? Do they pass over private lands or over public lands?

Mr. HOLLAND. They pass over public lands—through the national forests and the lands administered by the Department of the Interior and also the lands administered by the Department of Defense.

Incidentally, after hearing from all those Departments, the committee was conclusively and unanimously of the opinion that the present law is inadequate. If an easement for longer than 1 year is given, the width of the land thus leased must be confined to 40 feet; in all other cases the easement is on a year-to-year basis. The companies which at this time are having to make very large investments in connection with transmission lines, do not find the year-to-year system at all adequate to meet their problem.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me add that the armed services did not want to come within the provisions of this bill. They wanted to have an unrestricted right to grant rights-of-way or easements of any dimensions whatsoever. The committee thought that if 400 feet was wide enough for a right-of-way through the national forests or the lands controlled by the Department of the Interior, it should also be adequate through lands controlled by the armed services. Therefore, for the first time this bill will place a limit on the rights-of-way which can be granted by the armed services.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Vermont is correct, and the limit in respect to the various tracts of land will be identical.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1630) which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the fourth paragraph under the subheading "Improvement of the National Forests" under the heading "Forest Service" of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912" (36 Stat. 1253, 43 U. S. C. 961), is amended to read as follows:

"That the head of the department having jurisdiction over the lands be, and he hereby is, authorized and empowered, under general regulations to be fixed by him, to grant an easement for rights-of-way, for a period not exceeding 50 years from the date of the issuance of such grant, over, across,

and upon the public lands, national forests, and reservations of the United States for electrical poles and lines for the transmission and distribution of electrical power, and for poles and lines for communication purposes, and for radio, television, and other forms of communication transmitting, relay, and receiving structures and facilities, to the extent of 200 feet on each side of the center line of such lines and poles and not to exceed 400 feet by 400 feet for radio, television, and other forms of communication transmitting, relay, and receiving structures and facilities, to any citizen, association, or corporation of the United States, where it is intended by such to exercise the right-of-way herein granted for any one or more of the purposes herein named: *Provided*, That such right-of-way shall be allowed within or through any national park, national forest, military, Indian, or any other reservation only upon the approval of the chief officer of the department under whose supervision or control such reservation falls, and upon a finding by him that the same is not incompatible with the public interest: *Provided further*, That all or any part of such right-of-way may be forfeited and annulled by declaration of the head of the department having jurisdiction over the lands for nonuse for a period of 2 years or for abandonment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERDINA JOSEPHINA VAN DELFT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 148) for the relief of Gerdina Josephina Van Delft, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gerdina Josephina Van Delft shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WANDA CHARWAT AND HER DAUGHTER, WANDA AINO CHARWAT

The bill (S. 603) for the relief of Wanda Charwat and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Wanda Charwat, and her daughter, Wanda Aino Charwat, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

HISAKO HANABATA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1050) for the relief of Hisako Hanabata, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That Hisako Hanabata, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking prior to 1 year after the effective date of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Hisako Hanabata shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDI BERTOLI, GINO GUGLIELMI, AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1154) for the relief of Edi Bertoli, Gino Guglielmi, Serafinio Ballerini, and Giuseppi Biggi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the name "Guglielmi", to insert "and"; in line 5, after the name "Ballerini", to strike out the comma and "and Giuseppi Biggi"; and in line 11 after the word "deduct", to strike out "four" and insert "three", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Edi Bertoli, Gino Guglielmi, and Serafinio Ballerini shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Edi Bertoli, Gino Guglielmi, and Serafinio Ballerini."

PIETRO MEDURI

The bill (S. 1162) for the relief of Pietro Meduri was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Pietro Meduri shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

GEORGE GEORGACOPOULOS

The bill (S. 1494) for the relief of George Georgacopoulos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, George Georgacopoulos shall be held and considered to be the minor child of his father, Rev. Elias Georgacopoulos, a lawfully admitted legal resident of the United States.

ANDY DUZSIK

The bill (S. 1565) for the relief of Andy Duzsik was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Andy Duzsik shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

HARUMI KAMIAKA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1765) for the relief of Harumi Kamiaka, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Harumi Kamiaka, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Sergeant and Mrs. James B. C. Wells, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANICE JUSTINA KING

The bill (S. 1812) for the relief of Janice Justina King was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Janice Justina King, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Capt. Reuben R. King, a citizen of the United States, and Mrs. Reuben R. King.

YUKIO NIIMURA

The bill (S. 1863) to effect the entry into the United States of Yukio Niimura, a minor Japanese national, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration

Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the said act, the minor child, Yukio Niimura, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Tech. Sgt. Donald E. Wilson, citizen of the United States.

GIUSEPPA S. BOYD

The bill (S. 2033) for the relief of Giuseppa S. Boyd was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Giuseppa S. Boyd shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

CHARLOTTE ELIZABETH CASON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2034) for the relief of Charlotte Elizabeth Cason, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Charlotte Elizabeth Cason, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant and Mrs. Wesley Cason, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEIDI GERALDINE CONNELLY

The bill (S. 2066) for the relief of Heidi Geraldine Connelly was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Heidi Geraldine Connelly, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Captain and Mrs. Chester C. Connelly, citizens of the United States.

MICHIKO IHARA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2220) for the relief of Michiko Ihara, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "child", to strike out "Michiko Ihara" and insert "Theresa Hatcher", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions of law excluding persons of races ineligible to citizenship from admission to the United States, the minor child, Theresa Hatcher, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. and Mrs. Richard G. Hatcher, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Theresa Hatcher."

TERUO UECHI

The bill (S. 2462) for the relief of Teruo Uechi was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, Teruo Uechi shall, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corp. Leroy F. Canty, a citizen of the United States.

JUDICIAL RELIEF UNDER TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The bill (S. 2544) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for judicial relief was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. May we have an explanation?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation is requested.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill permits the institution of suits in equity by persons who are eligible under section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act for the return of property vested by the Office of Alien Property. At the present time, vested property may be returned administratively under section 32 by the Director of the Office of Alien Property. This authority is permissive, not mandatory, and is circumscribed only by certain requirements necessitating some positive determinations and some negative determinations. Typical illustrations of the positive determinations required are the provisions that the claimant be the owner or successor in interest of the property vested and the return be in the interest of the United States. A typical illustration of the negative determinations required is the provision that no return shall be made to a citizen of Germany who was resident therein after December 7, 1941, and who was not a persecutee.

Section 32 was designed to permit the return of vested property to persons who, while enemies in the strict sense of the term, were not actually hostile to the United States. However, as of June 30, 1951, only 4,631 claims under section 32 had been disposed of by the Office of Alien Property out of a total of 14,272 claims filed with the Office. In many cases, administrative action has been both slow and inadequate as these figures indicate.

The committee felt that the persons who are entitled to the return of their property under section 32 should be permitted to have their day in court in a manner similar to that already provided in section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act for other claimants. Consequently, the committee recommends favorable consideration of this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is further amended by adding after subsection (g) thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Any person eligible for a return under this section who has timely filed a notice of claim for return or who may hereafter file a notice of claim within 2 years from the date of seizure by or vesting in the Alien Property Custodian, may institute a suit in equity to recover such money or other property in the manner provided by subsection 9 (a) hereof and with like effect: *Provided*, That said suit may be filed within 1 year from the date of enactment of this subsection, anything in section 33 hereof to the contrary notwithstanding, but in computing such 1 year there shall be excluded any period during which there was pending a claim for return: *Provided further*, That the court in which suit is filed shall advance the cause for hearing and determination with all possible dispatch."

ERNEST DANIEL DAVIS, JR.

The bill (S. 2571) for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr., was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

ALLEGED DIVERSION OF ECA WHEAT INTENDED FOR INDIA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to proceed for 5 minutes under the rule.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington wishes to offer an important question to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to the Department of State. This question was raised in the March 15 issue of the Marine Digest, which is published in Seattle, Wash., and is edited by responsible persons who provide news and information while commenting on shipping, foreign trade, and other maritime subjects.

The Marine Digest editorial reflects briefly but pregnantly under this title, "Is the ECA Wheat to India Program Repeating UNRRA Fish-Boat Scandal?" I think the editorial should be read in its entirety, for the reading will consume but a few moments. It reads as follows:

IS THE ECA WHEAT-TO-INDIA PROGRAM REPEATING UNRRA FISH-BOAT SCANDAL?

Some years ago, the Marine Digest exposed the UNRRA fish-boat scandal in China. Well-meaning American taxpayers had given these boats to help out the starving Chinese. However, when the vessels arrived in Chinese waters, they were either tied up (later to be used as river boats) or were forced to limit their catches to what the local Chinese fish merchants could profitably market. Fish rotted on the docks while hungry coolies begged for food only a few feet away.

Now the Marine Digest learned from a reliable source that a far greater scandal appears to be in the making. Its scope and ramification will make the fish-boat deal look like a few peanuts. Well-founded suspicion indicates that a large portion of ECA grain to India's poverty-stricken millions is being diverted and going over the Burma Road to the Communist Chinese.

Although we are pouring an unseemingly unending stream of millions of bushels of wheat into India, virtually not a single word of this great United States gift appears in the local papers of India which are filled with pro-Russian propaganda.

Why?

Is the United States making the same mistake in India as she did right after World War II in China and other areas? At that time, we shipped billions of dollars worth of goods to aid suffering humanity around the globe, but we did not follow the distribution of these gifts to their final destination. We did not see to it that the aid reached the people for whom it was intended.

This time are we unknowingly bolstering Communist Russia's domination of China with grain intended for India? This grain that was to build good will for America and keep India from becoming another Communist satellite.

Has Stalin succeeded in cutting a hole in this bag of channels into Red China?

Maybe the State Department, which has missed the boat in so many other problems in the Far East, can come up with the answer to this one.

Mr. President, I have advised the Marine Digest that I would state their question publicly and offer it to the appropriate committee in the Senate and to the State Department. I feel certain that those in authority will carefully study the question and examine the issues involved. I am likewise hopeful that those who have jurisdiction over the question will make their findings available to the Senate and to the Nation.

ERNEST DANIEL DAVIS, JR.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate bill 2571?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2571) for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr., shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. Ernest Daniel Davis, citizens of the United States.

JEAN HAMAMOTO, ALSO KNOWN AS SHARON LEA BROOKS

The bill (S. 2593) for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purpose of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provisions excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks, a minor half-Japanese child, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Capt. and Mrs. Robert N. Brooks, citizens of the United States.

KATHLEEN COWLEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2643) for the relief of Kathleen Cowley, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Kathleen Cowley, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Capt. and Mrs. James E. Cowley, citizen of the United State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECORDING OF LAWFUL ADMISSION FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE OF ALIENS MAX MAYER HIRSCH WINZELBERG AND MRS. JENTY FUSS DE WINZELBERG

The bill (H. R. 648) to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of aliens Max Mayer Hirsch Winzelberg and Mrs. Jenty Fuss De Winzelberg was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MERING BICHARA

The bill (H. R. 773) for the relief of Mering Bichara, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this bill, because of the amount involved?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is a private bill which will pay the sum of $25,000 to Miss Mering Bichara of Washington, D. C., in settlement of her claim against the United States for money and supplies furnished and distributed to American prisoners of war, in the hands of the Japanese, in the Philippine Islands during World War II.

The Department of the Army and the House of Representatives, after carefully considering the evidence, are of the opinion that money and supplies were furnished to the total value of at least $25,000. Several officers and enlisted personnel submitted affidavits and/or gave oral testimony before the Judiciary Committee in the House which are heroic testimony of the work performed by this lady at the risk of her life.

In recommending that this bill be favorably considered, the committee wishes to point out that Miss Bichara does not ask reimbursement either for the risks which she undertook or the time and effort employed in saving the lives of American prisoners.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 773) for the relief of Mering Bichara, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. SELMA CECELIA GAHL

The bill (H. R. 1234) for the relief of Mrs. Selma Cecelia Gahl was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIGNA ANGELA MAINO CRISTALLO

The bill (H. R. 3153) for the relief of Signa Angela Maino Cristallo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK J. LOGAN

The bill (H. R. 6065) for the relief of Patrick J. Logan was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 66) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 3, 1952, pp. 1698–1700).

MRS. INEZ B. COPP AND GEORGE T. COPP

The bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say, on behalf of the distingushed junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], that we have some questions not only about Calendar No. 1183, House bill 646, but about Calendar No. 1184, House bill 643. There have been submitted two amendments by way of a substitute, and for fear we may not be given an additional opportunity for checking on the question, I suggest that if the amendments are not acceptable, these two measures go to the foot of the calendar, at which time we may have additional information.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, possibly I could explain these bills if the Senator has any questions.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia that in the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], I would be constrained to ask that both these bills go over. I would much prefer to ask that they go to the foot of the calendar, at which time we may have an opportunity to have certain questions cleared up.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the junior Senator from New Jersey be here today?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. He may be here. That is the information which I have. There is a statement coming to us, and I would want to give consideration to it before waiving objection.

Mr. KILGORE. I shall not object, provided I have an opportunity to be present when the bills are considered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, House bill 646, for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp, and House bill 643, for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham will go to the foot of the calendar.

BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5715) to amend sections 291 (a), 301 (e), 302 (f), 302 (g), 508,

527, and 528 of Public Law 351, as amended, was anounced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I must object to the consideration of this measure at this time. I do not think it is properly a bill which should be considered on the call of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 203) amending the cloture rule with respect to the number required for adoption of a cloture motion, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE and other Senators. Over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

HIRAM R. GALE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The bill (S. 645) to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Seattle, Wash., shall be known and designated on the public records as the Hiram R. Gale Memorial Hospital.

REGULATION OF DENTISTRY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2380) to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto," approved June 6, 1892, and acts amendatory thereof, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act approved June 6, 1892, as amended (title 2, ch. 3, D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), is amended by striking the figures "20" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "30," and by striking the figures "10" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "15."

SEC. 2. Section 14 of such act, as amended, is amended (a) by striking the figure "5" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "10," and (b) by striking the second figure "5" in the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "10."

SEC. 3. Section 23 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking the figures "10" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "15."

SEC. 4. Section 26 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking the figures "10" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "15."

SEC. 5. Section 27 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking the figure "3" and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "5."

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 67) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 11, 1952, pp. 2072–2075.)

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 68) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens was considered and agreed to.

(For text of above concurrent resolution, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 11, 1952, pp. 2075–2076.)

MRS. HILDEGARD PIELECKI KENNEDY

The bill (S. 171) for the relief of Mrs. Hildegard Pielecki Kennedy was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (e)), which excludes from admission into the United States persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Hildegard Pielecki Kennedy, the wife of an American citizen.

MAY HOSKEN

The bill (S. 569) for the relief of May Hosken was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, May Hosken shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALEXANDER URSZU

The bill (S. 762) for the relief of Alexander Urszu was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alexander Urszu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ZIEMOWIT Z. KARPINSKI

The bill (S. 779) for the relief of Ziemowit Z. Karpinski was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ziemowit Z. Karpinski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MRS. SHU-TING LIU HSIA AND HER DAUGHTER, LUCIA

The bill (S. 794) for the relief of Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Shu-Ting Liu Hsia and her daughter, Lucia, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

PINFANG HSIA

The bill (S. 1420) for the relief of Pinfang Hsia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Pinfang Hsia shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

JULIE BETTELHEIM AND EVELYN LANG HIRSCH

The bill (S. 1469) for the relief of Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Julie Bettelheim and Evelyn Lang Hirsch shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

SISTERS DOLORES ILLA MARTORI, MARIA JOSEFA DALMAU VALLVE, AND RAMONA CABARROCAS CANALS

The bill (S. 1527) for the relief of Sisters Dolores Illa Martori, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sisters Dolores Illa Martori, Maria Josefa Dalmau Vallve, and Ramona Cabarrocas Canals shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon

the granting of permanent residence to each such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ROSARINA GAROFALO

The bill (S. 1555) for the relief of Rosarina Garofalo was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of section 6 (a) (2) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Rosarina Garofalo shall be held and considered to be under 21 years of age.

FREDERIC JAMES MERCADO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1766) for the relief of Frederic James Mercado, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Frederic James Mercado, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. and Mrs. Hector R. Mercado, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Frederic James Mercado, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Master Sgt. and Mrs. Hector R. Mercado, citizens of the United States.

JOACHIM VOLK, ALSO KNOWN AS STEVEN CRAIG DELANO

The bill (S. 1855) for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, solely for the purposes of section 4 (a) and section 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, Joachim Volk, also known as Steven Craig Delano, shall be considered the alien natural-born child of Warrant Officer (jg) and Mrs. Norman Delano, citizens of the United States.

LUBO PASKALOVIC

The bill (S. 1891) for the relief of Lubo Paskalovic was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Lubo Paskalovic shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

ALCIDE ORAZIO MARSELLI AND ANGELO BARDELLI

The bill (S. 2102) for the relief of Alcide Orazio Marselli and Angelo Bardelli was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Alcide Orazio Marselli and Angelo Bardelli shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon the payment by them of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens, as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

PERIODIC PAY INCREASES FOR CERTAIN TEMPORARY NAVY DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

The bill (S. 2266) to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy, within the period of March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of this measure?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to relieve a certain group of temporary employees of the Department of the Navy from liability to refund the amount of periodic pay increases granted them through administrative error, and through no fault of their own. The bill would also authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to repay to some members of this group the amounts already refunded by them, or deducted from their salaries, and would also relieve the disbursing officers involved of liability for the erroneous overpayments.

The compensation of these employees was governed by regulations promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy. A change in these regulations, occasioned by a Civil Service Commission ruling, was issued March 17, 1947, but through administrative error this change in the regulations did not reach the attention of the administrative officers at certain naval installations, principally at Cherry Point, N. C., and Pocatello, Idaho, for some time after that date. Consequently, the group of employees involved herein were granted periodic pay increases as they became eligible for such increases, pursuant to the regulations believed to be governing and in full force and effect, but which had, in fact, been amended so as to preclude such increases.

Since no fault is attributable to the employees and the disbursing officers involved, and since considerable hardship would be imposed on them if they were required to bear the liability for the erroneous overpayments, the committee recommends favorable consideration of S. 2266. The Comptroller General, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of Justice all favor enactment of this bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. What is the amount involved?

Mr. McCARRAN. Approximately $35,000.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2266) to authorize and validate payments of periodic pay increases for temporary indefinite employees of the Department of the Navy within the period of March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) all persons who were awarded administrative pay increases as temporary indefinite ungraded employees of the Department of the Navy within the period March 17, 1947, to July 1, 1948, through administrative error, are hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the amounts of such unauthorized pay increases.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the persons described in subsection (a) such amounts as have been paid by them, or deducted from their salaries, on account of overpayments of compensation occasioned by such unauthorized pay increases.

(c) All disbursing officers, or other responsible officers, who made or authorized the pay increases to the persons described in subsection (a) are relieved of all liability for any such overpayments and their accounts shall be credited with the amounts erroneously overpaid.

MATHEOS ALAFOUZOS

The bill (S. 2270) for the relief of Matheos Alafouzos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the marriage between Martha Vlahos, a United States citizen, and Matheos Alafouzos, a citizen of Greece, shall be deemed to have occurred prior to January 1, 1948.

DANIEL WOLKONSKY AND HIS WIFE, XENIA WOLKONSKY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 992) for the relief of Daniel Wolkonsky and his wife, Xenia Wolkonsky, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 11, after the word "deduct", to strike out "one number" and insert "two numbers", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Daniel Wolkonsky and his wife, Xenia Wolkonsky, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each such alien as provided for in this

act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTHONY LOMBARDO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1189) for the relief of Anthony Lombardo, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anthony Lombardo shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN KINTZIG AND TATIANA A. KINTZIG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1843) for the relief of John Kintzig and Tatiana A. Kintzig, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 7, after the word "visa", to strike out "fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available" and insert "fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, John Kintzig and Tatiana A. Kintzig shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota or quotas for the first year that such quota or quotas are available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAOMI SAITO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2051) for the relief of Naomi Saito, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of section 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding any provision of law excluding aliens inadmissible to the United States because of race, the minor child, Naomi Saito, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant and Mrs. Edgar W. Thompson, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOLGER KUBISCHKE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2307) for the relief of Holger Kubischke, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 9, after the word "laws", to insert a colon and the following provision: "*Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Holger Kubischke becoming a public charge.", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of the ninth category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Holger Kubischke, the minor son of Herbert Kubischke, an alien resident of the United States, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against Holger Kubischke becoming a public charge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MARIE Y. MUELLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2635) for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the words "as of", to strike out "October 1, 1933" and insert "the date of the enactment of this act", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond which may have been issued in the case of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller, of Spokane, Wash. The said Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller, who has resided in the United States since 1933, shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws, the said Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment by her of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEAN KRUEGER AND EDITH KRUEGER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 365) for the relief of Anna Krueger, Jean Krueger, and Edith Krueger which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 4, after the word "laws", to strike out "Anna Krueger, Jean Kruege:," and insert "Jean Krueger", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jean Krueger and Edith Krueger shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jean Krueger and Edith Krueger."

BASIL VASSO ARGYRIS AND MRS. ALINE ARGYRIS

The bill (H. R. 748) for the relief of Basil Vasso Argyris and Mrs. Aline Argyris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GUISEPPE VALDENGO AND ALBERTINA GIOGLIO VALDENGO

The bill (H. R. 1416) for the relief of Guiseppe Valdengo and Albertina Gioglio Valdengo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETSUKO YAMASHITA AND HER SON, TAKASHI YAMASHITA

The bill (H. R. 2283) for the relief of Setsuko Yamashita, the Japanese fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II, and her son Takashi Yamashita, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNELIESE BARBARA VOLLRATH AND MRS. MARGARETE ELISE VOLLRATH

The bill (H. R. 2775) for the relief of Anneliese Barbara Vollrath and Mrs. Margarete Elise Vollrath, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUDOLPH BING AND NINA BING

The bill (H. R. 2833) for the relief of Rudolph Bing and Nina Bing was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID YEH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3668) for the relief of David Yeh, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment in line 4, after "December 17", to strike out "1923" and insert "1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MALKA DWOJRA KRON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 899) for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Malka Dwojra Kron and Tauba Kron shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Malka Dwojra Kron and Tauba Kron."

EXEMPTION OF APPLIANCES FOR THE BLIND FROM FOURTH-CLASS MAIL LIMITATIONS

The bill (S. 2677) to restore to 70 pounds and 100 inches in girth and length combined the maximum weight and size limitations for appliances, or parts thereof, for the blind, sent through the mails, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation is desired. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, this bill simply makes clear that on appliances for Braille writing and Braille books the blind will receive the benefit of exemptions similar to those granted under the weight and size limitations enacted at the last session. The total cost of all such material is about $5,000 a year. Less than that amount is involved in the bill, but these exemptions will be of great benefit to the blind.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The proposed legislation is expressly designed to take care of the unfortunate blind, is it not, does not go beyond that, and will not affect any other rules and regulations or legislation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is absolutely correct. It affects only Braille writing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objections to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the case of reproducers for sound-reproduction records for the blind, or parts thereof, and of Braille writers and other appliances for the blind, or parts thereof, when mailed under the provisions of the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the act of October 14, 1941, as amended (Public Law 270, 77th Cong.; 39 U. S. C., sec. 331), the maximum limit in weight shall be 70 pounds and the maximum limit of size shall be 100 inches in girth and length combined.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 10 days after the date of its enactment.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 245) to investigate the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act since December 18, 1941, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary on January 28, 1952, with amendments, and subsequently had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an additional amendment.

The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were, on page 1, line 3, after the word "complete", to strike out "investigation" and insert "examination"; in line 4, after the word "and", to strike out "study" and insert "review"; in line 8, after "(1)", to strike out "the most"; on page 2, line 4, after the word "been", to strike out "carried on in an" and insert "(A)"; in line 5, after the word "and", to insert "(B)"; in the same line, after the word "sound", to strike out "manner"; in line 10, after the word "of", to strike out "business enterprises and" and insert "vested"; in line 11, after the word "a", to insert "properly"; in line 23, after the word "basis", to strike out "that is"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "the date six months after the approval of this resolution" and insert "January 31, 1953"; in line 8, after the word "other", to strike out "assistants as it deems advisable. The" and insert "assistance (including professional firms or consultants), to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of the amount herein authorized) as it deems advisable. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words. The", and in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, on page 3, line 9, in the amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, after the word "assistance", to strike out "(including professional firms or consultants)."

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration to the amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was agreed to.

The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary as amended were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete examination and review of the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act during the period from December 18, 1941, to the present for the purpose of determining whether or not during such period—

(1) efficient procedures have been used for the prompt and equitable adjudication of claims under such act;

(2) the administration of business enterprises and property under such act has been (A) efficient and (B) financially sound;

(3) sound policies have been used in the appointment and employment of personnel to administer such act, and in the obtaining of various services for business enterprises and property being administered under such act;

(4) the liquidation of vested property has been carried on in a properly prompt, equitable, and competitive manner;

(5) every reasonable and proper effort has been made to maximize the funds to be made available to the War Claims Fund for payment of claims of former civilian internees and prisoners of war, as well as other categories of claimants;

(6) proper consideration has been given in such administration to the promotion of healthy competition in American industry; and

(7) scientific and technical discoveries and technological advances have been made available to the public on the widest possible basis consistent with the aforementioned objectives.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1953.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistance, to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of the amount herein authorized) as it deems advisable. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The title was amended so as to read: "To review the administration of the Trading With the Enemy Act since December 18, 1941."

DEPENDENT RESIDENTS ON NORTH LOBATO AND EL PUEBLO TRACTS, NEW MEXICO

The bill (S. 1536) to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to ask my colleague, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who reported this bill from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, certain questions.

I call the attention of my colleague to that portion of the Department's letter to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee, found on page 3 of the report. The letter describes the land, and reads, in part, as follows:

These lands were acquired as part of an effort to give stability to the operations and to bolster the incomes of the nearby resident population. These people live on very small farms in the river valleys. Such farms through constant subdivision due to sales and inheritances had, at the time of purchase of the lands with which this bill is concerned, become so small that incomes therefrom were insufficient to support the people on them. Other sources of income were meager or absent. Many families were wholly or partly dependent on public-relief programs. However, increased livestock production, with consequent increased income, appeared possible if the necessary range land could be assured these people on a permanent basis.

Does the bill propose, by giving the land involved a permanent status under the Forest Service, to insure that the residents there will continue to have the land for use under a permanent status?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes, I may say to my colleague; that is the only purpose of the proposed legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The letter from the Department proceeds:

The two tracts herein discussed—

And I may say to my colleague that he knows that I am familiar with the tracts—

The two tracts herein discussed were purchased to that end.

That means to the end of putting the land on a permanent basis, and assuring the residents of protection of their rights on a permanent basis. The letter proceeds:

The two tracts herein discussed were purchased to that end. These lands have since contributed substantially toward bettering economic conditions of the area. Last year the North Half Lobato tract furnished about 5,100 animal months (cattle and horses) of forage, and the major part of which was used by 32 permittees having paid permits. The Pueblo project furnished about 4,340 animal months of forage to 23 permittees.

Can the Senator assure those permittees that it is the purpose of the legislation that they may continue to use the lands on that basis?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I will say to the senior Senator from New Mexico that not only is that the assurance by the authors of the legislation, but the Department of Agriculture in its report has given such assurance. I therefore think it would be bound to carry it out. The letter from the Acting Secretary further states:

It is our understanding that this section does not contemplate special concessions in the matter of fees or land-use practices.

In other words, if the Department wished to do so it could raise the fees which these people are paying and take them off the land, perhaps. The Department has promised that it will not do so, and its promise is made a part of the history of this legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to make a part of the history of this debate also the following from the letter of the Acting Secretary:

The Pueblo project—

Which is on Pecos River—

furnished about 4,340 animal months of forage to 23 permittees.

Does my colleague understand that it is the purpose of this legislation that those permitees will be allowed to continue on a permanent basis?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I can assure my colleague that that is exactly the purpose of the legislation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to associate myself with the report of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1536) to stabilize the economy of dependent residents of New Mexico using certain lands of the United States known as the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts, originally purchased from relief program funds, and now administered under agreement by the Carson and Santa Fe National Forests, to effect permanent transfer of these lands, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 3, line 13, after the figures "23", to strike out "lot 1, section 25;"; in line 14, after the word "section", to strike out "26," and insert "26;"; in line 18, after the word "section", to strike out "35;" and insert "35,"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 36,"; at the top of page 4, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "five hundred eighty and forty-nine one-hundredths acres" and insert "four hundred sixty-four and forty-six one-hundredths acres,"; and at the top of page 5, to insert:

SEC. 4. The following public domain lands are herby reserved for administration under the act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 35, 16 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 475), as amended or supplemented: Lot 1, section 25 and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 36, all in township 13 north, range 15 east, New Mexico principal meridian, containing one hundred sixteen and three one-hundredths acres, more or less.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 499, Eighty-first Congress, approved May 3, 1950, the Secretary of Agriculture, with the consent of the New Mexico Rural Rehabilitation Corp. so to do, evidenced by an appropriate resolution of its board of directors, is hereby authorized and directed to convey, grant, transfer, and quitclaim, not later than May 3, 1953, to the United States for subsequent administration subject to the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to national forest lands acquired under the act of March 1, 1911 (36 Stat. 961), as amended, all right, title, claim, interest, equity, and estate in and to the following-described lands administered by the Secretary as trustee, under an agreement of transfer dated May 16, 1937, as amended January 20, 1939, with the New Mexico Rural Rehabilitation Corp., and situated in the counties of Rio Arriba and San Miguel, respectively, State of New Mexico, together with the improvements thereon and the rights and the appurtenances thereto belonging or appertaining, to wit:

That part of the Juan Jose Lobato Grant No. 164, as shown on plat approved by decree of court of October 13, 1895, and filed in volume 4, page 12, New Mexico Private Land Claims Records of the Bureau of Land Management, which lies northerly of the Chama River, as conveyed to the United States by William S. Jackson on the 30th day of December 1942, and as more specifically described in the deed of conveyance recorded in volume 25–A of deeds, at pages 463–472 of the records of Rio Arriba County, N. Mex.

That part of the Anton Chica Grant Numbered 29, as described on plat of survey approved February 15, 1882, and filed in volume 1, page 18, of New Mexico Private Land Claims Records of the Bureau of Land Management, which has been acquired by the United States as part of the El Pueblo project, from Gross, Kelly and Company, of Las Vegas, New Mexico, by deed dated October 23, 1939, and recorded in book 128 of deeds at pages 534–537, records of San Miguel County, New Mexico, on February 27, 1940, and north half section 3; lot 1, southeast quarter northeast quarter section 4, township 12 north, range 15 east; south half of fractional section 14; east half southeast quarter section 22; fractional section 23; fractional section 26; east half northeast quarter, northeast quarter southeast quarter, south half southeast quarter, southeast quarter southwest quarter, section 27; north half, east half west half southwest quarter, east half southwest quarter, southeast quarter section 34; section 35, township 13 north, range 15 east; south half southwest quarter section 17; lots 1, 2, northwest quarter northeast quarter section 20; southwest quarter section 26; lot 5, northeast quarter southeast quarter section 27; lots 1, 2 of section 35, township 13 north, range 16 east, New Mexico principal meridian, containing twenty-six thousand four hundred sixty-four and forty-six one-hundredths acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. The lands conveyed to the United States under this act shall, subject to adequate protection and conservation of soil and vegetative resources and the forests therein, be administered with due regard to the purposes for which the lands were originally acquired by the United States in its program of rural rehabilitation.

SEC. 3. That pending said transfer of the above land to the Forest Service and thereafter, mineral deposits within said tracts of land, whether acquired by purchase with said land or reserved to the Government in the original patent, shall be administered under the Mineral Leasing Act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913; 30 U. S. C. 351), as to the minerals specified therein, and as to any other minerals in the manner prescribed by section 402 of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 (60 Stat. 1099). Applications for mineral leases at any time heretofore or hereafter filed with respect to said mineral deposits shall be considered and acted upon in the manner prescribed, notwithstanding the provisions of Public Law 499 of the Eighty-first Congress, approved May 3, 1950.

SEC. 4. The following public domain lands are hereby reserved for administration under

the act of June 4, 1897 (30 Stat. 35, 16 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 475), as amended or supplemented: Lot 1, section 25 and lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, section 36, all in township 13 north, range 15 east, New Mexico principal meridian, containing one hundred sixteen and three one-hundredths acres, more or less.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT TO CERTAIN INDIAN LAND IN RONAN, MONT.

The bill (H. R. 3847) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue to school district No. 28, Ronan, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian land was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT TO CHARLES A. GANN FOR CERTAIN LAND IN CALIFORNIA—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 651) to provide for issuance of a supplemental patent to Charles A. Gann, patentee No. 152,519, for certain land in California, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. By request, I ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am happy to do so.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let us see if there is any possibility of clearing up whatever question there is with respect to this bill.

This is a case in which a person originally obtained a survey which he thought contained the proper number of acres. Later it was discovered that the documents did not grant him 160 acres. He had already sold a part of the land. This legislation merely provides that those who have bought land, and who still have the land in their possession, on which they have built houses, may be granted title to those properties. It authorizes the Department of the Interior to enter into negotiations with them and to grant title to the properties to them.

For a long time it was suggested that the bill carry a provision granting the original patentee additional lands. That provision has been removed from the bill. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has very carefully screened the bill. It is the opinion of all members of the committee that it is now in proper shape. I hope that if the Senator making the objection can be contacted we may pass the bill. It has been requested by the representatives from the State of California.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield to answer an inquiry, I may say that it was the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] who objected. If the Senator from New Mexico can clear up what is in the mind of the Senator from Oregon, who has lodged an objection, the Senator from Kansas will have no objection to the passage of the bill. However, since an objection has been lodged, I must ask that the bill be passed over.

Mr. ANDERSON. I shall try to contact the Senator from Oregon. I know that generally speaking the Senator from Oregon objects to giving away the property of the Government without some recompense. I think this is an entirely different situation, which my colleagues on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will admit.

I thank the Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 6242) to restore certain land to the Territory of Hawaii and to authorize said Territory to exchange the whole or a portion of the same was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

QUALIFICATION OF JURORS IN HAWAII

The bill (H. R. 4798) to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act relating to qualifications of jurors was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEDICAL SERVICES TO NON-INDIANS IN INDIAN HOSPITALS

The bill (H. R. 1043) to provide for medical services to non-Indians in Indian hospitals, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNIFORM SYSTEM OF BANKRUPTCY—BILL PASSED TO FOOT OF CALENDAR

The bill (S. 25) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested of Senate bill 25.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Noting that the Senator who might be interested in making an explanation of the bill is not in the Chamber, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed to the foot of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COST ADJUSTMENTS, GREENFIELDS DIVISION, SUN RIVER IRRIGATION PROJECT, MONTANA

The bill (H. R. 3144) relating to certain construction-cost adjustments in connection with the Greenfields division of the Sun River irrigation project, Montana, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

The bill (S. 2569) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senate bill 2569 is designed to extend for two additional years after this year, the calendar year 1952, the agricultural conservation program provisions of the present law. The Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, was last amended in 1950 to continue the present program for 2 years before placing it on a grants-in-aid basis, thus allowing more time for the respective States to meet the terms of the act.

Many of the States have not enacted legislation authorizing them to operate the program on that basis. The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry still thinks that the present act should stand with respect to its provisions requiring the program to be placed on a grants-in-aid basis sometime in the future. In the meantime, however, it does not want the agricultural conservation program to cease to exist in many of the States. Therefore this measure is to continue the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make conservation payments directly to farmers for 2 years following this year, so as to give the States more time to meet the conditions of the original act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That section 8 (a), as amended, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, is amended (a) by striking out "January 1, 1953" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1955," and (b) by striking out "December 31, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "December 31, 1954."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended."

CONVEYANCE OF LANDS FROM MOUNT OLIVET CEMETERY ASSOCIATION TO CITY OF SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3954) to authorize the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association of Salt Lake City, Utah, to grant and convey to Salt Lake City, Utah, a portion of the lands heretofore granted to such association by the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "State of", to strike out "Utah, the unrestricted fee simple title to a tract of land" and insert "Utah, for use for street or highway purposes, a tract of land"; on page 2, after line 22, to strike out:

The reversion or reverter to the United States if such land shall cease to be used

as a cemetery for the burial of the dead is, as to the tract of land described in the first sentence, hereby waived. This act shall not alter or affect Mount Olivet Cemetery Association's ownership of, or its rights and privileges with respect to, the remainder of the lands heretofore granted to it by the United States.

On page 3, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance of the tract of land described in the first section hereof shall contain a provision that such tract shall be used for street or highway purposes and that so long as the said Salt Lake City uses the tract of land for such purposes, the reversionary clause set forth in the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), shall not be operable with respect to that tract.

SEC. 3. This act shall not alter or affect Mount Olivet Cemetery Association's ownership of, or its rights and privileges with respect to, the remainder of the lands heretofore granted to it by the United States.

On page 2, after line 21, to strike out:

The reversion or reverter to the United States if such land shall cease to be used as a cemetery for the burial of the dead is, as to the tract of land described in the first sentence, hereby waived. This act shall not alter or affect Mount Olivet Cemetery Association's ownership of, or its rights and privileges with respect to, the remainder of the lands heretofore granted to it by the United States.

And on page 3, after line 4, to insert:

SEC. 2. The deed of conveyance of the tract of land described in the first section hereof shall contain a provision that such tract shall be used for street or highway purposes and that so long as the said Salt Lake City uses the tract of land for such purposes, the reversionary clause set forth in the act of January 23, 1909 (35 Stat. 589), shall not be operable with respect to that tract.

SEC. 3. This act shall not alter or affect Mount Olivet Cemetery Association's ownership of, or its rights and privileges with respect to, the remainder of the lands heretofore granted to it by the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO MOUNT OLIVET CEMETERY ASSOCIATION, SALT LAKE CITY, BY ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The bill (H. R. 5598) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to convey a parcel of land to the Mount Olivet Cemetery Association, Salt Lake City, Utah, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOUND CITY GROUP NATIONAL MONUMENT, OHIO

The bill (H. R. 5951) to add certain federally owned land to the Mound City Group National Monument, in the State of Ohio, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WITHHOLDING OF STATE INCOME TAXES BY FEDERAL AGENCIES

The bill (S. 1999) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of any statute of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An explanation is requested.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, at the present time the State of Vermont levies an income tax and uses a withholding system in connection with it. Of course, we are aware of the fact that the Federal Government has a similar system. Although the Federal Government would like to cooperate with States which have such a withholding system and would like to withhold for the States, it does not feel that it has the legal authority to do so. The situation is now applicable to Vermont and, as I understand, to Hawaii and Alaska. It seems perfectly evident, at least to me, that if the States are to withhold for the Federal Government, the Federal Government should cooperate by withholding for the States. The Federal Government is willing to do so. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Finance.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1999) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That since the internal revenue laws of the United States impose upon States, Territories, possessions of the United States, and political subdivisions thereof the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees, the Congress hereby declares it to be in the public interest to promote harmonious relations and reciprocity by consenting, under certain conditions, to the application to the United States of any statute of any State, Territory, possession, or any political subdivision thereof which imposes upon employers generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees.

SEC. 2. Where any statute or provision of law of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any political subdivision thereof, provides for the collection of a tax by imposing upon employees generally the duty of withholding sums from the compensation of employees and making returns of such sums to the authorities of such State, Territory, or possession, or any political subdivision thereof, the Secretary of the Treasury, pursuant to regulations promulgated by the President, is authorized and directed to enter into an agreement with such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision within 120 days of the request for agreement from the proper official of such State, Territory, possession, or subdivision, to provide that the head of each department or agency of the United States shall comply with the requirements of such statute or provision of law in the case of employees of such agency or department who are subject to such tax.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to consent to the application to the United States of any provision of any statute which has the effect of imposing more burdensome requirements upon the United States than it imposes upon other employers, or which has the effect of subjecting the United States or any of its officers or employees to any penalty or liability.

GLORIA WILSON

The bill (S. 420) for the relief of Gloria Wilson was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. Gloria Wilson, a native-born former citizen of the United States, who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, may be naturalized by taking, prior to one year from the date of enactment of this act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act. From and after naturalization under this act, the said Mrs. Gloria Wilson shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

MARIE CAFCALAKI

The bill (S. 869) for the relief of Marie Cafcalaki was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marie Cafcalaki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

WAI HSUEH TAN ET AL.

The bill (S. 1037) for the relief of Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Wai Hsueh Tan, Mrs. May Jane Tan, Robert Tingsing Tan, and Ellen Tan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

JERRY J. LENCIONI

The bill (S. 1422) for the relief of Jerry J. Lencioni was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Jerry J. Lencioni,

of Geneva, Ill., the sum of $5,012.17, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of injuries sustained when a plane he was piloting crashed on August 5, 1942, at which time he was an aviation cadet in the United States Naval Reserve and participating in a civilian pilot training course sponsored by the Civil Aeronautics Administration but was not entitled to full medical care and hospitalization at Government expense due to his inactive duty status: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

STEPHEN GOROVE

The bill (S. 1679) for the relief of Stephen Gorove was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stephen Gorove shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

RICHARD A. SEIDENBERG

The bill (S. 2210) for the relief of Richard A. Seidenberg was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Richard A. Seidenberg, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of First Lt. and Mrs. Russell A. Seidenberg, citizens of the United States.

CARL HIMURA

The bill (S. 2294) for the relief of Carl Himura was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of such act, the minor child, Carl Himura, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Corp. Dalton C. Boster, a citizen of the United States.

EUGENE RICHARD SUSHKO

The bill (S. 2554) for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Eugene Richard Sushko shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of First Lt. and Mrs. Albert R. Sushko, citizens of the United States.

FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

The bill (S. 2611) to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of Senate bill 2611?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation is requested.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill would strengthen the Foreign Agents Registration Act by requiring the registration of every diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is engaged in the preparation or dissemination of political propaganda. The Foreign Agents Registration Act is basically designed to cause the disclosure of the identity of certain agents in the United States of foreign principals, and the filing and labeling of political propaganda which these agents disseminate in the United States. The act exempts from registration a duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is recognized by the Department of State, while said officer is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of functions of such officer.

In 1946, the then Attorney General requested an interpretation of the law with regard to the scope of activities of the diplomatic and consular officers. The Department of State ruled that informational activities were within the scope of the proper functions of the diplomatic and consular officers, and as a result there has been an increasing tendency on the part of foreign governments, particularly the Soviet bloc, to operate their propaganda activities in this country through diplomatic and consular officers and thus avoid the registration and labeling requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

In August 1951, the Department of Justice requested the Secretary of State to reexamine the question of exempting from registration the informational activities of Soviet bloc nations which are being conducted in the United States by diplomatic and consular officers; but the Department of State refused to change its position so as to permit registration and labeling of Communist propaganda disseminated in this country by diplomats from the Soviet bloc nations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2611) to amend section 3 (a) of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clause (a) of section 3 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (22 U. S. C. 613), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) A duly accredited diplomatic or consular officer of a foreign government who is so recognized by the Department of State, while said officer is engaged exclusively in activities which are recognized by the Department of State as being within the scope of the functions of such officer, except that no person engaged in service as a public relations counsel, publicity agent, or information-service employee, or who is engaged in the preparation or dissemination of political propaganda shall be so recognized."

ELISABETH MUELLER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2672) for the relief of Elisabeth Mueller, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, in line 5, after the name "Mueller", to insert "(also known as Elizabeth Philbrick), so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Elisabeth Mueller (also known as Elizabeth Philbrick), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Chief Warrant Officer and Mrs. Alton H. Philbrick, citizens of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Elisabeth Mueller (also known as Elizabeth Philbrick)."

YURIKO TSUTSUMI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Yuriko Tsutsumi, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to the exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Yuriko Tsutsumi, the Japanese fiancée of Sgt. (1c) Alfred A. Wetmore, a citizen of the United States presently serving in the United States Armed Forces, and that the said Yuriko Tsutsumi shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Yuriko Tsutsumi is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Sgt. (1c) Alfred A. Wetmore, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Tsutsumi, she shall be required to depart from the United States, and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Yuriko Tsutsumi, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yuriko Tsutsumi as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee and head tax.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DR. MANUEL J. CASAS AND MRS. JULIA NAKPIL CASAS

The bill (H. R. 827) for the relief of Dr. Manuel J. Casas and Mrs. Julia Nakpil Casas was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CALCEDONIO TAGLIARINI

The bill (H. R. 1446) for the relief of Calcedonio Tagliarini was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA SZENTGYORGYI MAYER

The bill (H. R. 1828) for the relief of Maria Szentgyorgyi Mayer was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION OF LUIGI MORELLI TO UNITED STATES FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE

The bill (H. R. 1831) to admit Luigi Morelli to the United States for permanent residence was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES YAO

The bill (H. R. 1857) for the relief of James Yao was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADELAIDA REYES

The bill (H. R. 2923) for the relief of Adelaida Reyes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LOURDES AUGUSTA PEREIRA LADEIRO ROSE

The bill (H. R. 3374) for the relief of Mrs. Lourdes Augusta Pereira Ladeiro Rose was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM GRANT BRADEN, JR.

The bill (H. R. 4010) for the relief of William Grant Braden, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELVIRA ZACHMANN

The bill (H. R. 4268) for the relief of Elvira Zachmann was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FUSAKO TERAO SCOGIN

The bill (H. R. 5347) for the relief of Fusako Terao Scogin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHING WONG KEAU

The bill (H. R. 5389) for the relief of Ching Wong Keau was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA MARIA KRAUSE

The bill (H. R. 5558) for the relief of Anna Maria Krause was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REFERENCE TO COURT OF CLAIMS OF BILL FOR RELIEF OF MRS. CLAIRE PHILLIPS CLAVIER

The resolution (S. Res. 293) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 911) for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution? I understand that there would be no liability to the Government with respect to the amount of any of these claims.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this Senate resolution will send S. 911, for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier, to the Court of Claims in order to have a findings of fact made thereon and reported to the Congress for further action.

This claimant alleges to have furnished funds, food, clothing, and medicine to certain guerrilla forces and to American or Allied inmates in prisons in the Philippines during World War II, and it is for these sums expended that she now desires reimbursement. Inasmuch as there are many issues of fact and law to be determined, together with a determination of the amount of money involved, the committee is of the opinion that this matter is a proper subject to be studied by the Court of Claims and a report thereon rendered to the Congress.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 293) to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 911) for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 911) for the relief of Mrs. Claire Phillips Clavier, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant: *Provided, however*, That the passage of this resolution shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1739) to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "section", to strike out:

Upon the application of the health authority of a State, Territory, or possession, which is outside the continental United States and which provides facilities, care, and treatment, found by the Surgeon General to conform to reasonable standards for patient care, for persons afflicted with leprosy, the Surgeon General shall arrange to make payments to the health authority of such State, Territory, or possession for the care and treatment in its facilities of persons so afflicted at a per diem rate, determined from time to time by the Surgeon General, which shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, be approximately equal to the per diem operating cost per patient of the facility, except that such per diem rate shall not be more than the comparable per diem cost per patient at the nearest suitable facility of the Service.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

The Surgeon General is authorized and directed to make payments out of funds available for the maintenance of hospitals of the Service to the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment in its facilities of persons afflicted with leprosy at a per diem rate, determined from time to time by the Surgeon General, which shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, be approximately equal to the per diem operating cost per patient of such facilities, except that such per diem rate shall not be greater than the comparable per diem operating cost per patient at the National Leprosarium, Carville, La.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5369) to authorize the exchange of certain lands located within, and in the vicinity of, the Federal Communications Commission's primary monitoring station, Portland, Oreg., was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said:

Mr. President, I wish to ask unanimous consent that House bill 5369, Calendar 1266, which I have asked to be passed over at this calendar call, be included in the next calendar call.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMISSION TO FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO MAKE COMMITMENTS TO PURCHASE CERTAIN MORTGAGES

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to permit the Federal National Mortgage Association to make commitments to purchase certain mortgages was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That subparagraph (G) of section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out of the proviso: "commitments made by the association on or after the effective date of this proviso and prior to December 31, 1951, which do not exceed $200,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if such commitments" and inserting in lieu thereof: "(i) commitments made pursuant to Public Law 243, Eighty-second Congress, or (ii) commitments made by the association after September 1, 1951, which do not exceed $252,000,000 outstanding at any one time, if applications for such commitments were received by the association prior to December 28, 1951, or in the case of title VIII mortgages, if the Federal Housing Commissioner issued his commitment to insure prior to December 31, 1951, but subsequent to December 27, 1951, and if such commitments of the association."

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 143) to authorize the appointment of a special investigator and not to exceed five deputies with power to investigate improper and illegal conduct in the transaction of the business of the Government of the United States, and to prosecute such conduct where found, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 143 was reported by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary upon the unanimous request of the committee. The joint resolution follows the President's message in which he requested Congress to grant subpena powers and other powers to an individual named in the message.

The committee reported the joint resolution after long and careful study. It is the opinion of the chairman of the committee that in all fairness to all members of the committee and to everyone concerned, the joint resolution should receive careful consideration by the Senate. I think the Senate should hear an explanation of the joint resolution, should understand it, and should pass on it then, rather than to have it passed upon during the call of the Consent Calendar.

Therefore, I suggest that if it is possible for the majority leader to have the joint resolution considered at a time in the reasonably near future, it might now properly go over until such time.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I see no reason why the joint resolution cannot receive early consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being heard, the joint resolution will be passed over.

INCORPORATION OF CONFERENCE OF STATE SOCIETIES

The bill (H. R. 4467) to incorporate the Conference of State Societies, Washington, D. C., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF DEFENSE DEPARTMENT FROM LAWS GOVERNING FEDERAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1828) to exempt certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense from the laws governing the employment, removal, classification, pay, retirement, leave, and disability and death compensations of Federal officers and employees, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That civilian employees, compensated from nonappropriated funds, of the Army and Air Force Exchange Service, Army and Air Force Motion Picture Service, Navy exchanges, Marine Corps exchanges, Coast Guard exchanges, and other instrumentalities of the United States under the jurisdiction of the Armed Forces conducted for the comfort, pleasure, contentment, and mental and physical improvement of personnel of the Armed Forces, shall not be held and considered as employees of the United States for the purpose of any laws administered by the Civil Service Commission or the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended (5 U. S. C. 751 and the following): *Provided*, That the status of these nonappropriated fund activities as Federal instrumentalities shall not be affected.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes."

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 106 (c) OF THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2786, a bill which was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. There has been no objection to the bill, because in the end the bill, if enacted, will save money to both the Federal Government and the local governments.

The bill is not on the calendar because the committee reported the bill during the hearings on the controls bill.

The substance of the bill is that certain grants which are to be made to communities should be made progressively in order to save interest and to save cost.

The bill received the unanimous vote of both the Republican and the Democratic members of the committee. The bill was introduced some time ago by the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], a member of the committee, is very familiar with the bill, and he suggested that he would join with me in urging its passage, inasmuch as at this time the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is in New York, and will not return to Washington until later.

As I have said, in the end the bill, if enacted, will save money to both the local communities and the Federal Government.

Let me ask the Senator from Kansas if he will speak to the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, in confirming what the Senator from South Carolina has said, let me say that the bill will save money and will be of decided help. The committee went into the matter very carefully, and I concur and join in the statement and request made by the Senator from South Carolina.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of Senate bill 2786?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I feel that the bill should go to the calendar. I see no objection to having it called up and considered some morning, by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill is not now on the calendar for the reason that in the Banking and Currency Committee we have been extremely busy during the last 3 weeks, as the majority leader knows, in holding hearings on the proposed legislation for controls. Our hearings have begun at 10 o'clock in the morning and have continued until 6 p. m. or sometimes later.

However, if the majority leader believes that it would be better to call up the bill tomorrow or the next day, I shall be agreeable to having that done.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think that would be the better procedure.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from South Carolina, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time the clerk will proceed to call the bills which have been placed at the foot of the calendar.

The bill (H. R. 646) for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, this bill and the next bill, House bill 643, Calendar No. 1184, for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham, have previously been passed over, to be placed at the foot of the calendar. I now ask that both these bills go over to the next call of the calendar.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to have them included in the next call of the calendar?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and both of these bills will be included in the next call of the calendar.

The next bill which has been placed at the foot of the calendar will be stated.

The bill (S. 25), Calendar 1232, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was announced as next in order.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, let me say very frankly to the Members of the Senate that this bill is quite long in its technical and other details. I believe it is not a bill which properly should be considered during the call of the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I shall object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard, and the bill goes over.

That completes the calendar.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to provide for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, to encourage the continued development of such leases, to provide for the protection of the interests of the United States in the oil and gas deposits of said lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, unless some Senator wishes to speak now on the unfinished business, I shall ask that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. When the consideration of the bill is resumed, I hope we may make some progress on it and may dispose of it rapidly.

OVERPOPULATION IN PARTS OF WESTERN EUROPE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 400)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the problems arising from the present world crisis created by the overpopulation in parts of Western Europe, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For President's message, today's proceedings of the House of Representatives, see pp. 2758–2761.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

AGREEMENT WITH CANADA FOR PROMOTION OF SAFETY ON THE GREAT LAKES BY MEANS OF RADIO—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive M, Eighty-second Congress, second session, an agreement between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Ottawa on February 21, 1952, for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the agreement, and the agreement, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the agreement between the United States of America and Canada signed at Ottawa on February 21, 1952, for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the agreement.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 24, 1952.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report by the Secretary of State; (2) agreement with Canada for the promotion of safety on the Great Lakes by means of radio.)

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 25, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24, 1952:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

George P. Shaw, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to El Salvador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay, vice Howard H. Tewksbury, resigned.

Angier Biddle Duke, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to El Salvador, vice George P. Shaw.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

Rosa M. Belle, N900254.

PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be majors

AIR FORCE

With rank from December 6, 1951

Duffy, Ann, 21253W.
×Kubli, Lorna Virginia, 21327W.
×Franzel, Adeline, 21336W.
×Foxworth, Dorothy Marguerite, 21381W.
Culbertson, Omer William, 6191A.
Whittington, Riley Norwood, 6193A.
Van Neste, Henry Irving, 6198A.
Baker, Donald Ralph, 6209A.
Sarte, Victor Joseph, 6214A.
Alford, James Strickler, 6218A.
Mendelsohn, Irving Philip, 6224A.
Wilson, Campbell Perry Monroe, 6229A.
Pomeroy, Don Allen, Jr., 6237A.
Thompson, Milton Elmo, 6239A.
Woltanski, Thaddeus Lewis, 6240A.
McNelly, Fred Wright, 6241A.
×Babb, Harold Thaddeus, 6242A.
Schupp, Ferdinand Francis, 6259A.
Vaughn, William Enoch, Jr., 6261A.
Abington, Edward Gordon, 6264A.
Wooles, Marcellus Ronald, 6271A.
×Sutin, Nathan, 6295A.
×Winget, Francis Edward, 6296A.
Gaylord, Maurice Bailey, 6299A.
Verbeck, Peter, 6300A.
Gaffney, George Preston, 6301A.
Lyons, James Thompson, 6302A.
×Bainer, John William, 6313A.
Fogle, Melvin Woodrow, 6317A.
Ridgell, James McLaurin, Jr., 6319A.
Delia, Andrew, 6321A.
×Murphy, Edward Aloysius, Jr., 6323A.
Root, George Raymond, 6326A.
Haist, Glade F., 6333A.
Scott, Travis Moran, 6352A.
Maples, Clyde Alexander, 6354A.
Feallock, William John, 2d, 6358A.
Pratt, Ogden Nelson, 6359A.
Carwell, Ivan Leon, 6368A.
Lucas, Noel Alex, 6370A.
Brockway, Gerald Marion, 6372A.
Oldershaw, Douglas C., 6377A.
Noonan, Stephen Frederick, 6380A.
×Eyres, William Gordon, 6390A.
Koger, Harlis Raymond, 6393A.
Cade, William Albert, Jr., 6397A.
Vignetti, John Lawrence, 6410A.
Bondhus, John O., Jr., 6411A.
Martin, Stanley Everet, 6413A.
×Kommers, William Westover, 6414A.
Magrill, Arthur Edwin, 6416A.
Harris, Richard Clayton, Jr., 6424A.
Hall, Joseph Andrew, 6426A.
×Atkins, James Martin, 6428A.
×Denton, John Hartig, 6433A.
Belgard, John Robert, 6436A.
Watkins, John Raymond, 6445A.
×Coburn, Blaine K., 6447A.
×Ziegeweid, Eugene Joseph, 6448A.
×Miles, Charles Clinton, 6450A.
Stafford, Gordon Howard, 6454A.
Watson, Richard Clark, 6455A.
×Urban, Emil Lewis, 6460A.
Gilbert, John Holman, Jr., 6463A.
Hamilton, Frank Alexander, 6474A.
Raymond, William Henry, Jr., 6476A.
Walker, John Henry, 6483A.
Schwengels, Forrest Victor, 6485A.
Kraft, Eugene John, 6490A.
Davis, Jesse Charles, 6492A.
×Miller, Kenneth Robert, 6493A.
Williams, Richard Arnold, 6498A.
Roberts, Joe Edward, 6499A.
McEvoy, Edwin Walter, 6506A.
Murray, Norman Leroy, 6513A.
Anderson, John McLemore, Jr., 6514A.
Dennis, Charles Gardner, 6515A.
Duke, William Francis, 6521A.
Manuel, Earl H., 6523A.
Boone, Lewis Perkins, Jr., 6524A.
Poppell, James Marvin, 6528A.
West, Howard Fletcher, 6529A.
Disbrow, Bill Louis, 6539A.
McDowell, Rex Wampler, 6541A.
Christensen, William Robert, 6545A.
×Taylor, Charles Meredith, 6551A.
×Middlebrook, Paul Louis, 6552A.
×Cabell, John Kennedy, 6555A.
Shirk, Harley Owen, 6556A.
Husztek, William Stephen, 6561A
Price, Thomas Llewellyn, 6567A.
×Suggs, John Jacob, 6570A.
Francis, Howard Champney, 6575A.
Frost, Lyle Gooden, 6583A.
×Walker, William Allan, 6586A.
×Bush, William Kenneth, 6588A.
×Phillippe, Hilbert Wayne, 6593A.
×Hicks, Jefferson Pascal, 6595A.
×Naffke, John Henry, 6606A.
Eldridge, Sheldon Fleming, 6607A.
×Romaine, Owen Wallace, 6614A.
×Wood, Marvin James, 6615A.
×Kennedy, Elmore McIntosh, Jr., 6634A.
×Graham, Charles Samuel, 6642A.
×Birbeck, Richard Wellington, 6655A.
×Clarke, Walter Campbell, 6657A.
×Joos, Walter James, 6671A.
×Williams, Hilbert Baker, 6683A.
Paddock, Kenneth Quentin, 6689A.
Cabral, William Mervyn, 6692A.
Loomis, Richard Edward, 6694A.
×Monsell, Charles Frederick, Jr., 6706A.
×Pengue, Marcy Louis, 6713A.
Garrett, Leslie Fraser, 6725A.
×Stafford, Robert Cottom, 6735A.
Bracy, Carroll Harlan, 6741A.
Eldridge, Arthur Clarence, 6753A.
×Metz, Robert Carter, 6769A.
Halsey, Fryer Preston, 6772A.
Krafka, Edward, 6783A.
×Fallon, Edward, 6805A.
Brownell, Gerald Simpson, 6808A.
Williams, Yancey, 6822A.
Johnston, James Eston, 6827A.
Willis, Lloy Cecil, 6828A.
Woodruff, David Terry, 6829A.
Ferrelle, Charles Harvey, Jr., 6835A.
×Sanborn, Bert Sumner, 6845A.
Brock, Richard Crawford, 6863A.
Garland, William James, 6872A.
Ford, Wilson, 6878A.
Gamage, Leonard Alfred, 6888A.
Smith, William Kirkland, 6895A.

Bachman, Lawrence Frederick, 6896A.
Geer, John Henry, 6905A.
×Schlukbier, Alvin George, 6909A.
Donuma, Cyril Raymond, 6910A.
Shotwell, William Bedford, 6915A.
Roderick, Walter Henry, 6923A.
Marks, Robert Joseph, 6927A.
Brown, Albert Kenneth, 6929A.
Jones, Grafton Kenneth, 6931A.
Echols, George Blakey, Jr., 6933A.
×Young, Gail, 6937A.
×Nuthall, Alfred Jack, 6939A.
Byrd, Bacchus Bright, Jr., 6949A.
Schenk, Norbert Rieder, 6950A.
Sorrell, LaRue Scott, 6958A.
Berry, Lon Bernard, 6960A.
DeMelik, Andrew Arthur, 6964A.
Pearson, Harvey Albert, 6969A.
Avery, Edwards Stephen, 6972A.
Murrah, Idas Tolbert, 6979A.
Steiner, Irvin Carl, 6988A.
Cooke, Sherman Cecil, 6990A.
White, Andrew Milton, 6991A.
Voruz, Herbert George, Jr., 6994A.
Smith, Richard Earl, 6998A.
Chessington, James Buell, Jr., 7002A.
Cooper, James Howard, 7004A.
Butler, Henry Forde, 7008A.
Watson, William Burdette, 7011A.
Wright, Wallace Ashley, 7015A.
Bertsch, William Preston, 7020A.
Klingbiel, Sherman Fredrick, 7021A.
Tracy, Henry Lewis, 7029A.
×Engels, Anthony Mathias, 7033A.
Butcher, William Andrew, Jr., 7035A.
×Frey, Robert William, 7038A.
Gail, Elmer Charles, Jr., 7039A.
Beresford, Harry Edward, Jr., 7041A.
Thompson, Jesse Duncan, 7116A.
Briggs, Leon Arthur, 7117A.
Freese, Ralph Earl, 7119A.
×Trimble, Harry White, 7127A.
×Bowen, Jarette DeLeslie, 7130A.
×Martin, Thomas Edward, 7142A.
×Butler, Robert Andrew, 7143A.
Finan, George Keith, 7146A.
Pratt, Jean Gardner, 7151A.
Hohlaus, Kenneth Herman, 7162A.
McNamara, James Fredric, 7167A.
Jolly, Hoyt Avery, Jr., 7180A.
Hays, Nathan Bourne, 7188A.
×Gerhart, Quinter Paul, 7189A.
Veatch, Bernard Willmore, 7197A.
Hoewing, Ralph Clair, 7198A.
×Fishburn, James Butterfield, 7201A.
×McFall, Silver Ray, 7203A.
Stevenson, Robert John, 7209A.
Woida, Joseph Anthony, 7215A.
Bogda, Michael Philip, Jr., 7216A.
Duncan, Edward Keytron, 7236A.
×McWalters, Frank William, 7264A.
Fatzinger, Charles William, Jr., 7272A.
×McCraw, Ruth, 21268W.
Brown, John Robert, Jr., 7334A.
Carruth, Francis Sumner, 7341A.
×Aszman, Burton Hughes, 7342A.
Courchene, Alberta Marie, 21270W.
Folts, John Lloyd, 7387A.
Huey, Stanley George, 7393A.
Sydnor, Robert Austin, 7395A.
Neill, William Howard, 18093A.
Chapman, Benjamin Frank, 7402A.
Kelly, Thomas Clyde, 7411A.
×Egan, John Lloyd, 7414A.
×Boedeker, Charles Wilson, 7418A.
Booth, Elmer Ellsworth, 7424A.
Jones, Frank George, 7431A.
Brown, John Henry, Jr., 7433A.
Barton, John Richard, 7450A.
Crandall, Thomas Oakey, 7460A.
Bowden, Theodore Watrous, 7467A.
Selling, Holger Arthur, 7468A.
Irwin, Robert Bigelow, 7474A.
Rosenthal, Herbert, 7484A.
Miller, George Lyon, 7494A.
×Swanson, Darwin Earl, 7496A.
×Noriega, Virgil, 7507A.
Rhoads, Frank Hayden, 7515A.
Davis, Green Robinson, Jr., 7525A.
Wallen, Francis Leroy, 7528A.
Bauer, Maurice Hatter, 7534A.
Salter, Richard D., 7536A.
Riley, Lewis Robert, 7537A.
Conley, David Morrow, 7543A.
Nelson, Arthur Lewis, 7545A.
Wight, Carroll Herbert, 7555A.
×Biehm, Harold Emanuel, 7566A.
Davis, Harvey Milton, 7642A.
×Collis, Edwin Martin, Jr., 7647A.
Medvedeff, Harold Cyril, 7653A.
Mullis, Roy Winston, 7687A.
×Jarvie, William John, 7688A.
Brown, Robert Bruce, 7689A.
McCord, Louis Broughton, 7694A.
×Schmoldt, Harold Dale Louis, 7697A.
Ryan, Richard Eugene, 7698A.
Murray, David Hugh, 7700A.
×Jackson, Elwin Henry, 7705A.
McElhone, James Thomas, 7712A.
Sanders, William Breeding, 7753A.
Wallace, Robert Davis, 7757A.
×Stevens, Kenneth Ray, 7766A.
Muller, James LeRoy, 7774A.
Cox, Eugene Wesley, 7803A.
Trotter, Claude Augustus, Jr., 7830A.
Goodrich, Earle Arthur, 7837A.
Watts, Ralph Kenton, 7844A.
×Stewart, Tom Benjamin, 7854A.
Founds, Joseph William, 7873A.
Montgomery, Douglas Murray, 7874A.
×Rehrer, Harvey Eugene, 7882A.
Suehr, Richard Charles, 7886A.
Ridings, Charles Albert, 7948A.
×Hunt, Marvin Louis, 7951A.
Shadell, Kenneth Lee, 7959A.
Cobb, Melvin Burdette, 7966A.
Fava, James Archie, 7981A.
Nold, Ewell Kay, Jr., 7983A.
×Donohue, Timothy Willard, 7995A.
Buckley, William Arthur, 7998A.
Wenk, Walter Rudolph, 8000A.
Smith, William Kennett, 8002A.
Hull, Robert Richard, 8003A.
McGee, Donald Charles, 8108A.
House, A. T., Jr., 8130A.
Newbury, Edward Stewart Elder, 8144A.
Johnson, Clarence Trevitt, Jr., 8154A.
Carter, Clifford Gordon, 8159A.
Workman, Bryant Arthur, 8201A.
×Nunn, John Walter, 8245A.
Coonan, Daniel Joseph, Jr., 8247A.
Paulson, Myhre Elroy, 8319A.
Hunner, Paul Charles, 8350A.
×King, William Gregg, Jr., 8356A.
Biscayart, Jules Dominique, 8374A.
Berger, Raymond John, 8392A.
×Francis, Roderick Leland, 8421A.
×Herman, Boyd Francis, 8422A.
Waldroup, Marvin Martin, Jr., 8426A.
Seiler, James Richard, 8429A.
Odren, Harry Melvin, 8492A.
Bentley, Delwin Dale, 8528A.
×Glover, Donald Sheldon, 8547A.
Wheeler, Frederick Grant, 8553A.
Kramer, Robert Herman, 8579A.
Carter, John Davis, 8580A.
Wigbels, Lawrence Gerrard, 8586A.
Dawson, William Stone, 8597A.
Greensides, Lawrence Aubry, 8606A.
×Morrison, Bruce Lamont, 8672A.
×Millin, John Andrew, Jr., 8722A.
×Hickambottom, Verdia May, 21274W.
Blanchard, Virginia Marie, 21276W.
×Nading, William Donald, 8804A.
Treland, Oscar, 8818A.
Scott, George Edward, 8820A.
Paulsen, Daniel Henry, 8823A.
Kane, Raymond Joseph, Jr., 8845A.
Giffin, Charles Wallace, Jr., 8854A.
Weller, Russell Kenneth, 8865A.
×Pedeza, Edwin Felix, 8888A.
×McCarthy, Wayne George, 8911A.
Marshall, Leonard Samuel, 8951A.
Braden, James Savage, 8952A.
Schmidt, Herman James, 8962A.
×Guerin, Merrill Robert, 8980A.
×Wilfong, John Jay, 8983A.
×Peschel, Viola May, 21277W.
Bussey, Donald Glenn, 9010A.
×Comstock, Harold Elwood, 9104A.
×Milowski, Walter John, 9111A.
Brewster, John Howard, 9113A.
Fisher, Jack Charles, Jr., 9129A.
Coffield, Peter Lewis, 9150A.
×Stokely, Joe Edwin, 6396A.
Jackson, William Cole, 9167A.
×Tyler, James Otey, 9168A.
Sours, Robert John, 9179A.
×Markham, Theon Edward, 9180A.
×Garvin, Earl John, 9181A.
Brewer, Edwin Henry, 9208A.
Renaud, Louis Clement, 9213A.
Rowntree, Ruth Ellen, 21280W.
Cannon, James, 9303A.
Lamb, Hal William, 9344A.
×Smith, Charles Chesely, 9354A.
Knox, Glen Edward, 9365A.
Robertson, Lawrence Russell, 9367A.
Pletcher, Gaylord Lorenzo, 9378A.
Murphy, Benjamin Styles, 9421A.
Stevenson, John Thomas, 9448A.
Knapp, Robert Harold, 9465A.
Parris, Harry Neil, 9487A.
Thompson, Mary Shull, 21285W.
×Ellingson, Elsie Ovedia, 21287W.
Waller, Walter Ralph, Jr., 9549A.
×Ryan, William George, 9555A.
Hansinger, Michael John, 9561A.
×Kolody, Walter John, 9596A.
×Bossardet, Charles Walter, 9612A.
Slusher, John Thomas, 9614A.
Bell, Homer Clark, Jr., 9652A.
Howard, James Paul, 9660A.
×Allenby, Donald Roscoe, 9673A.
×Balliet, William Edward, 9683A.
Benedict, William Pershing, 9685A.
×Lovett, John Rossignol, 9849A.
×Gillmore, Lawrence John, 9859A.
Arnold, William Clyde, 9869A.
Bachtell, Robert Carithers, 9891A.
Flannagan, Mary Elizabeth, 21293W.
Powers, Harold Milledge, 9906A.
Driessel, Sylvester John, Jr., 9944A.
Johnson, Robert Jay David, 9947A.
×Hearn, James Andrew, 9979A.
Larson, James Russell, 10026A.
Bowen, William Douglas, 10054A.
×Hall, Paul Morgen, 10069A.
Gary, Virginia Spence, 21296W.
Teller, J. Craig, 10184A.
Hough, Luther Walker, Jr., 10193A.
Agostinho, Robert Joseph, 10204A.
×Couch, Paul Frederick, 10227A.
×Wayne, Byron Mitchell, 10234A
Machemer, Carl Conrad, 10251A.
Kilness, Kenneth Freeman, 10255A.
Bashant, Norman William, 10256A.
Cantor, Al, 10257A.
Evens, Bruce Harvey, 10259A.
Williams, Owen James, 10261A.
×Specht, Leonard Harvey, 10262A.
Malmgren, Victor Paul, 10263A.
McIlhaney, Sam Frank, 10264A.
Gilkerson, Harold Raymond, 10265A.
Knisely, James William, 10267A.
×McKenny, Donald Charles, 10268A.
×Kreps, Conrad, 10269A.
Lee, Merle Julian, 10270A.
Swan, Frederic Ferris, 10271A.
×Downing, Alvin Joseph, 10272A.
Trewitt, Harvey Sidney, Jr., 10274A.
Keith, Benjamin Martin, Jr., 10276A.
Delanoy, Charles Wesley, 10277A.
Nicholson, William Stevens, 10279A.
McDonald, Paul Roger, 10280A.
Adams, Charley John, 10281A.
Rogers, Robert Charles, 10284A.
Erspamer, Curtis Richard, 10285A.
×Park, Lionel Ormandy, 10286A.
Farrell, John Edward, 2d, 10288A.
Wojdyla, Henry Edward, 10289A.
×Gordon, Anyan Allison, 10290A.
Kendig, Robert Lintner, 10291A.
Conley, Bruce Roff, 10292A.
Brown, Ned Halstead, 10293A.
Smith, Harold Vincent, 10295A.
Champion, Patrick David, 10296A.
×Wood, Willis Herbert, 10297A.
Beckham, Vance Wesley, 10299A.
Hooker, Freeman Fernando, 10300A.
Fortner, John William, 10301A.
Davis, Charles Irving, Jr., 10302A.
×McLean, Lawrence Sylvester, 10304A.
Thomas, William Kirby, 10307A.
Hickman, John Clark, 10308A.
Manship, Joseph, 10309A.
×Mende, Robert Gerald, 10310A.
×Kunde, Clinton Myhre, 10311A.
Knauber, Leo Von Molkie, 10312A.

Huguley, Edward Amos, 10313A.
×Stewart, Raymond Ronald, 10314A.
Shellito, Robert Thomas, 10316A.
Snodgrass, James Pope, 10318A.
Caldcleugh, Clarence Milton, 10319A.
Gordon, Benjamin, 10320A.
×Oehlman, Gene W., 10321A.
Freed, Lyle Chalmers, 10322A.
Harvey, Luther Rockwood, 10325A.
Floyd, Percy Mellor, Jr., 10326A.
Whitescarver, John Thomas, 10327A.
Hamilton, George Granville, 10328A.
Ladner, Pat Harrison, 10329A.
×Kirby, Frank Ernest, 10330A.
×Cullen, Gilbert Mouzon, 10331A.
Noble, Daniel Joseph, 10332A.

To be captains

AIR FORCE

Stewart, Kenneth McMillin, 16667A.
Scott, Emil John, 16668A.
Blair, Robert Andrew, 16669A.
Hicks, Ralph Lee, 16670A.
Foreman, Shirley Leon, 16671A.
×Higdon, Robert Thomas, 16672A.
Conway, Edward Joseph, 16673A.
Martin, Theodore Phillip, 16674A.
Sheehan, Daniel Joseph, Jr., 16675A.
Banner, Alvin Willard, 16676A.
Wilson, Nelton Ronald, 16677A.
Apt, Milburn Grant, 16678A.
Chapman, Andrew Jules, 16679A.
Rova, Paul Enos, 16680A.
Kaltenbacher, Robert Francis, 16681A.
×Moseley, Billy Gordon, 16682A.
Allen, Jack Victor, 16683A.
Van Pelt, David Both, 16685A.
Howard, Douglas John, 16686A.
Gay, Robert Ewing, 16687A.
Pierce, Robert James, 16688A.
×May, Donald Graham, 16689A.
Boyd, William, Jr., 16690A.
French, Robert Rufus, 16691A.
Ninde, Albert Edwin, 16692A.
Smith, Elmer Roy, 16693A.
Ball, Harlan Eugene, 16694A.
Swanson, William Alfred, 16695A.
Thomas, Lawrence Oscar, 16696A.
×Davis, James Millard, 16697A.
×Berg, Delbert Volney, Jr., 16698A.
Twyman, Richard Gene, 16699A.
Walter, Stephen Phillip, 16700A.
Bush, Jesse Charles, Jr., 16701A.
Scott, Rufus Winfrey, 16702A.
Leonhard, James Edward, 16703A.
Baca, Leo Cayetano, 16704A.
McGregor, William Stanley, 16705A.
Werb, William Richard, 16706A.
Holloway, Paul Quillian, 16707A.
Beck, Donald Oscar, 16708A.
Putt, Leo Dee, 16709A.
Miller, Marvin Walter, 16710A.
McEntire, Don Byron, 16711A.
Francis, John Richard, 16712A.
Melluish, David Sylvester, 16713A.
×Thompson, Montie, Jr., 16714A.
Kalina, Robert Joseph, 16715A.
Barton, Ray, 16716A.
Fountain, Carl Bryan, 16717A.
Payne, Donald William, 16718A.
×Weddle, Walter Marion, 20024A.
Clark, Joseph Robert, 16719A.
Welch, Bushnell Nelson, 16721A.
Whalen, Edward Charles, 16722A.
Monasee, Theodore Leonard, 16723A.
Monasee, Charles Arthur, 16724A.
Kehrli, Gerald Vern, 16725A.
Reitman, Frederick John, Jr., 16726A.
Dixon, Von Harold, 16727A.
FitzGerald, Gerald Francis, 16728A.
Lineberger, John Edward, 16729A.
Schweizer, Rudolph Junior, 16730A.
Weldon, William Claude, Jr., 16731A.
Buchanan, M. L., 16732A.
Mode, Clayton Darrell, 16733A.
×Jolley, Bryan Roscoe, 16734A.
Badger, Walter Brooks, 16735A.
Mann, Frank, Jr., 16736A.
Trogdon, Floyd Harrison, 16737A.
Trazise, John William, 16738A.
×Douglas, Clarence James, Jr., 16739A.
Craft, Jewel Neal, 16740A.
Crum, Walter Scott, 16741A.
Kristoff, Joseph Michael, 16743A.
×Gruben, James Fred, 16744A.
Burgmeier, John Joseph, 16745A.
×Petree, Harold Wendell, 16746A.
Flaig, John Boyd, 16747A.
Dano, Donald Eugene, 16748A.
Fisher, Ellis Leroy, 16749A.
×Novotny, Robert Allen, 16750A.
Smith, Donald Howard, 19782A.
Hansen, Leroy Perry, 16751A.
Lewis, Russell Lamar, 16752A.
×Davis, William Everett, Jr., 16753A.
Johnston, William Daniel, Jr., 16754A.
Joy, Frederick Warburton, Jr., 16755A.
Crossman, Philip James, 16756A.
Reeves, Andrew Raymond, Jr., 16757A.
×Tomlinson, Robert Charles, 16758A.
×Nelson, Nils, 16759A.
×Savage, Spencer Crosby, 16761A.
Potter, Francis Harold, 16762A.
Morgan, Cullen Bryant, 16763A.
Potter, Alma Lord, 16764A.
Tom, Jerry William, 16765A.
Coolidge, Benjamin Wilder, 16766A.
Bethell, Hoyt Cecil, 16767A.
Lowell, James Russell, 16768A.
Von Fossen, Smith Lorenzo, 16769A.
Howard, Marlin Clyde, 16770A.
Stutts, Martin Luther, 16771A.
Wofford, Kenneth Omar, 16772A.
Proctor, Charles Herbert, 16773A.
Denny, Robert Marion, 16774A.
Lighty, William Orville, 16775A.
×Dodson, Robert Wendell, 16776A.
×Robison, Keith Gordon, 16778A.
×Butterfield, Donald Raymond, 17963A.
Loeser, Norma Maine, 21402W.
Wykert, Lyle Albin, 16779A.
Nelson, Douglas James, 16780A.
Lovelace, Hewitt Eldridge, Jr., 16781A.
Schofield, James Stuart, 16782A.
×James, Gordon Joseph, 16784A.
Storrs, Elwood Dean, Jr., 16785A.
Morley, William George, 16786A.
Protsman, Ward Ellsworth, 16787A.
Lochry, Robert Rean, 16788A.
Hegenberger, Robert Francis, 16789A.
Cummings, Handford Lindsley, Jr., 16790A.
FitzPatrick, Hal Lloyd, 16791A.
Hynds, Wallace Gourley, Jr., 16792A.
Horowitz, James Arnold, 16793A.
×Bond, George Frederick, Jr., 16794A.
×Baker, Paul, Jr., 16795A.
×Farrar, William Estes, Jr., 16796A.
Holden, Gifford Merrill, Jr., 16797A.
Summer, James Arthur, 16801A.
Warren, Henry Lee, 16802A.
×Stoer, John Standish, 16803A.
Stebbins, Albert Kellogg 3d, 16804A.
Richards, John Edward, 16805A.
Steele, Arthur James, 16806A.
×Johnson, Maxwell Oscar, Jr., 16807A.
Knolle, Byron Franklin, Jr., 16808A.
Russell, Kendall, 16809A.
Marks, Thomas Russell, 16810A.
×Lish, John Francis, 16811A.
Briggs, Warren Marshall, 16814A.
Nichols, Offa Swann, Jr., 16815A.
Preston, William Tuinenburg, 16816A.
Reints, James Arnold, 16817A.
Foley, Roland Daniel, Jr., 16818A.
Marvin, Frank Freeman, 16819A.
Maynard, Harry Lee, 16820A.
Jarrell, William Robert, Jr., 16821A.
×Clark, Charles William, 16822A.
Marlow, Bobby Lee, 16823A.
Givens, Vergil Calvin, 16824A.
Hartwig, Frederic William 16825A.
Duvall, Robert Eugene, 16826A.
×Brewer, Martin Harvey, 16827A.
Farris, Kelton Merrill, 16828A.
Whitcraft, Daniel Doremus, Jr., 16829A.
Coffey, John Will, Jr., 16830A.
×Townsend, James Brierton, Jr., 16831A.
×Raymond, William Derrick, 16832A.
MacWherter, John Baird, 16835A.
Draper, Frank Winthrop, 16836A.
Stewart, Malcolm Nebeker, Jr., 16837A.
Jones, William Atkinson, 3d, 16838A.
Thompson, Alfred Gardner, 16839A.
Crouch, Jack Graham, 16840A.
Conniff, Richard Patrick, 16841A.
Manlove, William Robert, 16842A.
Williams, George Alexander, Jr., 16843A.
Smith, Vernon Monroe, 16844A.
×Neville, Albert Roland, Jr., 16845A.
Basham, Ray Scott, 16846A.
Smith, Robert McChesney, 16847A.
Moran, William King, Jr., 16848A.
Swain, Harold Dow, Jr., 16850A.
Skelton, Chester Arthur, Jr., 16851A.
Barnett, Charles Edward, 16853A.
Davies, Franklin Case, 16854A.
Stick, Henry Hull, 16855A.
Valpey, Robert Graham, 16856A.
Coulter, Marshall Glenn, Jr., 16857A.
Parrish, Anthony Roberts, 16858A.
Attinger, Frank Sylvester, Jr., 16859A.
Thompson, Earl Milton, 16860A.
Holway, Orlando, 3d, 16862A.
Gilbert, William Frank, 16863A.
Ford, Ralph Joseph, Jr., 16864A.
Allen, J. F., Jr., 16865A.
Gandy, Charles Lewis, Jr., 16866A.
Adams, Samuel Brown, Jr., 16867A.
×Chickering, John Bradley, 16869A.
×Lindsay, Robert George, 16870A.
Spear, Shelton Gillespie, 16871A.
Minor, Richard Byrd, 16872A.
Webster, Robert Morris, Jr., 19670A.
Golden, James Richard, 16873A.
×Patrick, Harry Randolph, 16874A.
Swartz, John Broomhall, 16875A.
Pettee, Jack Chase, 16876A.
Avery, Charles Jerome, 16877A.
Storb, John William, 16878A.
×Davidson, Kingdon Alva, 16880A.
×Lake, Robert Goodman, 16881A.
Munyon, Edgar Marvin, 16882A.
Hollis, Billy Neel, 16883A.
Rutledge, Cecil Leland, Jr., 16884A.
Wood, William Sterling, 16885A.
Craig, William Blount, 16887A.
Rafalko, Edmund Anthony, 16888A.
Marston, Roy Leon, 16890A.
Lessey, Samuel Kenric, 16892A.
Gault, Duncan, 16893A.
Rupert, Charles Brown, 16896A.
Pauly, John William, 16897A.
Giles, James Adolphus, 16898A.
Field, David Murray, 16899A.
×Myers, Clifford Edward, Jr., 16900A.
Nichols, Edgar Walker, 16902A.
Estill, Calvert Lewis, Jr., 16903A.
×Campbell, John William, Jr., 16905A.
Cobb, Henry Lee, Jr., 16906A.
Davis, Ernest James, Jr., 16907A.
Hoffman, Jack Norman, 16908A.
Hearin, Jesse Bethea, Jr., 16909A.
Ledford, Joseph Denton, 16910A.
×McGlynn, William Edward, 16911A.
Patterson, Archie Rice, Jr., 16912A.
Berger, George Combs, 18105A.
Romney, Jack Harding, 16913A.
×Gatlin, Jesse Cecil, Jr., 16914A.
Taliaferro, Russell Eugene, 16915A.
×Daubert, Charles Irvin, 16916A.
Ludlow, John Duer, 16919A.
×Fitzpatrick, John Malcolm, 16920A.
Thayer, Frederick Clifton, Jr., 16921A.
Wayne, James Clark, 16922A.
Galligan, Walter Turbush, 16923A.
Treester, James Lee, 16924A.
Bissell, Donald Ray, 16925A.
Simpson, William Spearman, 16926A.
Perez, Richard Allen, 16928A.
×Blessley, Rowland Charles William, Jr., 16929A.
×Ellis, Ralph Alan, Jr., 16930A.
Rouch, James John, 16932A.
Whitney, Clair Gene, 16933A.
Wohlford, Harold Ballard, 16934A.
Jackson, Kenneth Lee, 16935A.
Mason, Edward Jones, 16936A.
Sherwood, John Wesley, Jr., 16938A.
Jones, Ray Stanley, Jr., 16940A.
×Middleton, Harry Richard, 16941A.
Werner, Kenneth Homer, 16942A.
Trimble, Robert Finley, 16943A.
×Kellum, Edwin Godwin, 16944A.
Knight, John Jacob, 16945A.
Slack, Clarence Virgil, Jr., 16946A.
Breene, Robert Gale, Jr., 16947A.
×Kuntz, Scott Anthony, 16948A.
Moran, Charles Edward, 16950A.
Puchrik, Augustine Stephen, 16953A.

×Lee, Frank Aloysius, 16954A.
Mason, James Gordon, 16955A.
Seeger, Charles Morgan, Jr., 16956A.
Linton, Clarence Leslie, 16957A.
×Bartron, Robert Simpson, 16958A.
Trustin, Yale Francis, 16960A.
Morris, James David Morrison, 16963A.
Wildman, Winthrop William, 16966A.
Dillard, Walter Branham, 3d, 16967A.
Nelson, Daniel Jack, 16968A.
×Bailey, Alfred Lewis, 16970A.
Van Matre, Peter, 16971A.
Peterson, Lorrin Carlton, 16972A.
Minckler, Homer Robert, 16973A.
Farr, James Thomas, 16974A.
Byron, Joseph Rice, 16975A.
×Schibilsky, William Joseph, 16976A.
Callahan, John Ash, 16977A.
Fite, Theodore Mayer, 16978A.
Bacon, Cole Dempster, 16979A.
Coulahan, John Edward, 16980A.
×King, Nat Dulaney, 16981A.
Bruton, Earl Dudley, Jr., 16982A.
Hurdis, Richard Warren, 16983A.
Croal, Ralph Francis, Jr., 16984A.
Martin, Louis Lyon, 16986A.
Foster, Ivan Leon, Jr., 16987A.
Fingar, Claudius DaSilva, 16988A.
×Miller, Roger Eugene, 16989A.
Findell, Max, 16990A.
Beezley, Jacques George, 16991A.
×Dombrowski, Leon Alexander, Jr., 16992A.
Pratt, Charles William, 16993A.
Wilkinson, Earl Vane, Jr., 16994A.
Heard, Randolph Carrington, 16995A.
Evans, Robert Allen, 16996A.
Pulliam, Marshall, 16998A.
Liebel, John Pagenstecher, 16999A.
Brett, Devol, 17000A.
Sauer, Norman Gardiner, 17005A.
Huseby, Donald Einer, 17006A.
Carter, Walter Aaron, Jr., 17007A.
Spiegel, Morton, 17008A.
Walker, Harry Grady, Jr., 17009A.
Blesse, Frederick Corbin, 17010A.
Froede, Alexander Otto, Jr., 17011A.
Lilley, Leonard William, 17012A.
Perry, Daniel Crawford, 17013A.
Stabley, Stewart Sylvester, Jr., 17014A.
×Chase, Nathan Brown, 17015A.
McCaddon, Joseph Francis, 17016A.
Bullard, Paul Kenneth, 17017A.
Shaffner, George Elden, 17018A.
Brenneman, Harold Frederick, 17019A.
Brown, William Philip, 17020A.
Blue, Alfred Dixon, 17021A.
Drake, Harry, 17022A.
Pugh, Wilbur Raymond, 17023A.
×Nash,James Slade, 17025A.
Rochfort, Robert Emmet, 17026A.
O'Neal, Joseph Thomas, 17027A.
Gerald, Walter Leslie, Jr., 17028A.
Willox, Lyman Screven, 17030A.
Curtis, Thomas Hanley, 17031A.
McCance, Donovan Low, 17032A.
Chesney, Hally Delmar, Jr., 17033A.
×Broughton, Jacksel Markham, 17035A.
Farr, Daniel Ely, 2d, 17036A.
×Blood, Kenneth Thompson, Jr., 17037A.
Newbold, Rodney Hugh, 17039A.
Hippert, Robert Dias, 17040A.
×Johnson, Jesse Henry, 17041A.
Jablonski, Theodore Mark, 17042A.
Rose, Anthony Joseph, 17043A.
Moeller, Robert Leon, 17044A.
Miller, Lloyd Gerald, 17045A.
Killion, Lawrence Eugene, 17046A.
Welbes, Alvin Mathew, 17047A.
LeMay, George Drexel, 17049A.
Dahl, Herbert Richard, 17050A.
Lawler, Lawrence Thomas, 17051A.
Julin, Walter Eugene, 17052A.
Poy, Harris Ong, 17053A.
Toler, Alfonso Christopher, 17054A.
Thomasson, Samuel Maxie, Jr., 20025A.
King, Don William, 17055A.
Williams, Lewis Eugene, 17056A.
×Kosciuszko, Alphons Edward, 17057A.
Sterling, Ray Eugene, 17058A.
Nee, Robert Francis, 17059A.
Van Sant, Edward Richard, 17060A.
McAdams, Glendor D., 17061A.
Parish, John Tilla, Jr., 17062A.
Small, William David, Jr., 17063A.
Metsopoulos, William George, 17064A.
Hegg, James Holte, 17065A.
Jacobson, Gail Eugene, 17066A.
Grimm, Harley LeRoy, 17067A.
Hasty, Delphin Randolph, 17068A.
×Connolly, James Joseph, 17069A.

MEDICAL

×Tracey, John Francis, 20527A.
Nichols, David Harry, 19376A.
Philbin, Philip Henry, 19658A.
McCann, John Patrick, 20528A.
Cocks, George Rowland, 20529A.
Robards, Robert Erwin, 23061A.
Green, Harry Carnahan, Jr., 20838A.
×Fenno, Richard Montgomery, 21848A.
Thiele, Arthur John, Jr., 23105A.
×Minnihan, Robert William, 20530A.
×Cook, Ferris Edward, Jr., 20532A.
×Bulen, James Arthur, 20548A.
Hook, Frederick Raymond, Jr., 20839A.
×Anderson, George Raymond, 22950A.
×Dudley, Arthur Vernon, Jr., 20534A.
Curtis, James LeRoy, 21688A.
×Holloway, William Harold, 22985A.
Poole, Chester Robert Francis, 22951A.
Claypool, Harry Richard, 22952A.
Sturtevant, Harwood Northmore, 23106A.
Muhich, Ralph Anthony, 20539A.
Stavig, Paul Hjertaas, 20538A.
Hedin, Roger Willard, 20535A.
Russell, Carl Milton, 20536A.
Auld, David, 20540A.
Hensler, Nestor Michael, 20840A.
Arnold, Roger Charles, 20841A.
Jay, Jack Bonner, 20842A.
McGeary, Joseph Daniel, 23062A.
Hood, Richard Hall, Jr., 23035A.
Rogness, John Alden, 20541A.
Harrington, Louis Eugene, 20843A.
Gaines, William Stewart, 22553A.
×Trimmer, Kenneth E., 19613A.
Troy, Richard Earl, 19659A.
Hill, Samuel Richardson, 19660A.
Morgan, Robert Frederick, 20543A.
Cheeseman, Sumner Arthur, 20544A.
Jernigan, James Austin, 20545A.
Smith, Dasil Clawson, 20542A.
×Sorensen, Charles Cole, 20844A.
×Cooley, Glen Ernest, 23148A.
×Banning, George Samuel, Jr., 20547A.
×Dixon, William Martin, 20546A.
Latty, Samuel George, 22392A.

DENTAL

O'Leary, Timothy Joseph, 18966A.
Hemphill, Charles Binion, 19620A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

Hunter, John Hall, 19530A.

To be first lieutenants

AIR FORCE

Nelson, Harold D., 18058A.
Barkwill, James William, 22785A.
×Allison, John Slaton, 21479A.
Kaiser, Charles, Jr., 22786A.
Stewart, Laslie M., 18098A.
Brown, Earl C., 18099A.
Ledlie, James E., 18100A.
Cooper, Arthur, 18101A.
McClure, Richard Manning, 22787A.
McClure, John Calvin, 18596A.
×Sullivan, Edward J., 18111A.
×Jones, Walter Gilbert, 18110A.
Brisick, Edward Joseph, 21480A.
Jones, James Theodore, 21481A.
×Carvolth, Richard Theron, 3d, 18354A.
×Stender, Robert Clarence, 18553A.
×Iverson, Emmett S., 18424A.
Goering, Albert Hauck, 18394A.
×Rumney, Richard Grams, 18527A.
×Dickinson, Ben Wade Oakes, 3d, 18370A.
Dow, Paul Crowther, Jr., 18374A.
×McGurk, Dan Lockwood, 18472A.
Janer, Richard, 18428A.
Banister, Arthur Williams, 18324A.
Robison, William Clay, 18522A.
Smith, Russell Hinett, 18544A.
×Armstrong, John William, 18320A.
Greenleaf, Abbott Congleton, 18399A.
×Roper, Kenneth Hall, 18524A.
Poulson, John Archer, 18512A.
Gillam, Max L., 18391A.
Slizeski, Robert Stanley, 18541A.
Eaton, Norman Dale, 18375A.
Henry, Richard Charles, 18414A.
×Olson, Robert Harley, 18502A.
Trubin, Chester Stuart, 18567A.
Norby, Wayne Aaron, 18499A.
Swantz, Robert Frederick, 18559A.
×Klein, Donald Davis, 18440A.
Sylvester, George Howard, 18560A.
×Vandervoort, John MacEwan, 18570A.
Westfall, Fredrick Robert, 18581A.
Friend, John C., 18384A.
Neal, Marshall Edsel, 18495A.
×Terrell, William Brown, Jr., 18561A.
×Bowman, Richard Carl, 18338A.
Trautvetter, William Jackson, 18564A.
Zimmerman, Elsworth James, 18595A.
×McMullen, Philip Cummings, 18474A.
Baumgarten, Harry E., Jr., 18329A.
Brandt, Schuyler Buell, 18340A.
Ike, John Edward, 18423A.
Pratt, Thomas Sheridan, 18513A.
Mueller, Wilbur John, 18489A.
Bodager, Bill W., 18335A.
Lake, William Howard, 18447A.
Carroll, William Arthur, 18353A.
Liddicoet, William Battelle, 18455A.
Schoeneman, Richard Howard, 18532A.
Wall, Orlando A., 18574A.
×Pursley, Robert Edwin, 18516A.
×Wynne, Hugh, 18594A.
Mione, Anthony John, 18482A.
Hammack, John Asa, 18402A.
Hansen, Robert Adair, 18404A.
Neef, Charles Franklin, Jr., 18496A.
Kostyniak, Edward Anthony, 18443A.
×Barnes, David Porter, 18325A.
Heesacker, Edward Joseph, 18409A.
Katz, Norman Fredrick, 18434A.
Hartinger, James Vincent, 18406A.
Benzing, Louis Henry, 18331A.
Gustafson, William Walter, 18400A.
Main, Kenneth Alden, 18460A.
Nelson, Edwin Arthur, 18497A.
Leisy, Robert Edward, 18451A.
×Kinney, E. Hugh, 18439A.
Schall, John Thomas, 18529A.
Mitchell, Hugh, Jr., 18483A.
Dirkes, William Eugene, 18371A.
×Derrickson, Robert Armstrong, Jr., 18369A.
×Spencer, Robert M., 18547A.
Pospisil, Joseph Lee, 18511A.
Schmidt, James Forrest, 18531A.
×Latham, David M., 18449A.
Gorog, William Francis, 18395A.
Jamison, Lewis Maverick, 18427A.
Appelbaum, Stewart Martin, 18317A.
×Branch, Louis E., 18339A.
Paull, William Thielman, 18508A.
×Bonner, M. Michael, 18337A.
×Marsh, Robert Thomas, 18465A.
Brooksher, Dan Austin, 19549A.
Martin, Abner Broadwater, 18466A.
×Anderson, Charles William, Jr., 18315A.
×Hilton, Edward Robert, 3d, 18415A.
Lambert, William Roth, 18448A.
Weaver, Robert B., 18579A.
×Mundt, William Edward, 18491A.
×Moore, Lewis Franklin, 18484A.
×Braun, Robert Joseph, 18341A.
×Bondurant, Frank Banker, 18336A.
Agnew, Malcolm Joseph, 18313A.
Shebat, Robert, 18535A.
×McDonald, Irving T., Jr., 18471A.
Finley, Jack Dwight, 18380A.
×Wilmoth, Evart D., 18587A.
Smith, Mansfield Irving, 18543A.
×Kramer, Milton Arthur, 18444A.
×Rice, James Blayney, 18520A.
×Albert, John George, 18314A.
Ross, William Carroll, 18525A.
Helfrich, Gerard Francis, 18410A.
Barton, Robert Cooke, 18327A.
Agnew, Harman Charles, 18312 A.
White, Cyril R., 18582A.
Cassler, Luther Henry, 18355A.
Wilford, Edward Burke, 3d, 18586A.
×Arantz, Carl Franklin, Jr., 18318A.
Milliken, Walter Reed, 18481A.
Hendrickson, David, 18412A.

Spragins, Stewart VanVliet, 18549A.
Raabe, Ralph Christian, 18517A.
×Ashcroft, Dale L., 18322A.
Woods, Donald Rey, 18591A.
×Shiel, William Chapin, 18637A.
×Miller, Louis V., 18478A.
Guyton, Daniel, 18401A.
Parrish, Davis Pendleton, 18507A.
×Whittier, Ralph D., 18585A.
Butler, Robert Paul, 18348A.
Klemmer, Raymond James, 18441A.
×Pafe, Basil, 18506A.
Johnson, Miers Cornelius, Jr., 18432A.
Rawers, James Walther, 18518A.
Miller, John Edwin, 18477A.
×Kiely, John Richard, 18438A.
Finnigan, Robert E., 18381A.
Triner, Edwin George, 18566A.
McCrary, Leon Witcher, 18469A.
Wallace, John Thomas, 18576A.
Hawn, John Powell, 18408A.
×Barnes, Frank Gentry, 18326A.
Kenyon, Jerry R., Jr., 18436A.
×Leslie, Gene E., 18453A.
Crites, Carl Raymond, 18363A.
Chamberlin, George Barrett, Jr., 18357A.
Shirley, Harold James, 18538A.
×Mosny, Milan, 18487A.
Luzon, Thomas Bernard, 18459A.
Reed, John Charles, 18519A.
Maughmer, Frederic Hine, 18467A.
×Pfeiffer, Robert Michael, 18510A.
Cronin, Timothy Cornelius, 3d, 18365A.
Millett, Virgil, Jr., 18479A.
×Culbertson, Alexander Brown, 18366A.
×Seney, Howard Francis, 18534A.
×Tye, Joe B., Jr., 18568A.
×Corley, Henry Porterfield Taylor, 18361A.
×Hustad, Eugene Earle, 18422A.
Austin, Albert Morris, 4th, 18323A.
×Brock, Frank Hawkins, 18342A.
Schlosser, William Leo, 18530A.
Overton, Dolphin Dunnaha, 3d, 18504A.
Littell, Robert Oliver, 18457A.
Smythe, George Winfered, Jr., 18546A.
Spillers, Willum Harry, Jr., 18548A.
Nemzek, Thomas A., 18498A.
Orem, Robert Lloyd, 18503A.
Winter, Arnold, 18588A.
Cronin, John Henry, Jr., 18364A.
×Workinger, William Clinton, Jr., 18593A.
Smith, William Cremin, 18545A.
Berg, Robert S., 18332A.
Graham, George Dudley, Jr., 18397A.
White, Robert L., 18584A.
Kessler, Charles William, 18437A.
Stewart, Gordon G., 18555A.
Hinchion, Francis, 18416A.
Van Cleeff, Jay, 18569A.
×Davis, Thomas Gifton, 18367A.
Steger, Michael John, 18551A.
×Keffer, Charles Thomas, 18435A.
Hurst, James S., 18421A.
Cheever, Charles Emmett, Jr., 18358A.
Lemay, Ronald Emile, 18452A.
Scholtz, John Christopher, Jr., 18533A.
×Henry, Joseph Robert, 18413A.
Crawford, Thomas Maurice, Jr., 18362A.
×Gillette, Jack Worrell, 18392A.
×McNamee, Michael Werner, 18476A.
×Trieschmann, William Frederick, Jr., 18565A.
Stemple, William Kent, 18552A.
Hisken, Perry Carnot, Jr., 18417A.
Ford, Wallace Addison, 18383A.
McLean, Donald Andrew, 18473A.
Gilliland, Robert J., 18393A.
Foley, Williams M., 18382A.
×Kretschmer, Charles G., 3d, 18445A.
×Campbell, Edward Joseph, 18351A.
×Swanke, Don Reetz, 18558A.
Benitez, Maurice Manuel, 18330A.
Thompson, Joseph James, 18562A.
×Stansberry, James Wesley, 18550A.
Ellis, Atlee R., 18377A.
Bumpus, William Wesley, 18347A.
Rufsvold, Paul Sherman, 18526A.
×Brunhart, Roy Cleveland, 18345A.
Fulton, William M., 18386A.
Browne, Lewis Carlton Lindsey, 18344A.
Weart, Douglas Spoor, 18578A.
Jones, Kelso, 18433A.
Shepherd, George Marvin, 18536A.
Wentsch, George Maurice, 18580A.
×Lay, Chris Andrew, Jr., 18450A.
Moss, Raymond, 18488A.
DeMuro, Theodore Francis, 18368A.
Dougherty, Ralph Emerson, Jr., 18373A.
×Hammer, Irving Leonard, 18403A.
Gibson, Norman Lawrence, 18389A.
×Wakefield, Victor Reed, 18572A.
James, Robert E., 18426A.
Clark, John R., 18359A.
Woodson, John Donald, 18592A.
Jenkins, William Griffith, 18431A.
Stillson, James Reddick, 18556A.
Wallace, Jay R., 18575A.
Prescott, James Delahunt, 18514A.
Stuart, Robert Jack, 18557A.
Wogan, John Beugnot, Jr., 18590A.
Brown, Charles Henry, Jr., 18343A.
×Ivy, Edward Weber, 18425A.
×McCarthy, John Norman, 18468A.
×Marr, James Frank, 18464A.
×Cameron, Mortimer Browne, Jr., 18350A.
×Morrison, Joseph R., 18486A.
×Hendricks, James Robert, 18411A.
×Purnell, Earry O., 18515A.
Walter, John Adkin, 3d, 18577A.
Cleveland, Charles Goold, 18360A.
Everest, Emmet Tinley, 18379A.
Bullock, Thomas Farris, 18346A.
×Rice, William Vaughn, Jr., 18521A.
Oliver, Charles Whitney, 18501A.
Toth, Richard Earl, 18563A.
Green, William Lee, 3d, 18398A.
White, Richard Arthur Eric, 18583A.
Murray, Louis Paul, 18493A.
×Boag, John Robert, Jr., 18334A.
Walker, Winston Guerd, 18573A.
×Howard, Robert James, 18419A.
Knoble, William S., 18442A.
Garrett, Robert Russell, 18388A.
×McMurry, William Fletcher, 18475A.
Graham, Floyd W., 18396A.
Makinney, Robert Lucas, 18461A.
O'Brien, Philip Raymond, Jr., 18500A.
Howe, John P., 18420A.
×Krimendahl, David Christian, 18446A.
Carey, Jay Allen, 18352A.
Owen, Robert Edwin, 18505A.
Nakfoor, Emil Abraham, 18494A.
×Gilbert, Chester Charles, 18390A.
Andrus, John Stebbins, 18316A.
Ennis, Robert Brower, 18378A.
Arnold, David Lee, 18321A.
Mulkey, Reed C., 18490A.
×Byrne, Charles Artaud, 18349A.
Harris, Leslie Earl, Jr., 18405A.
Dolan, John T., 18372A.
Levings, Nelson Trimble, 18454A.
Simpson, Jefferson Allan, 18540A.
×Frost, Richard F., 18385A.
×Blake, Thomas Frederick, Jr., 18333A.
×Howell, Robert William, 19537A.
×Dederich, F. William, 19674A.
Gardner, William Alfred, Jr., 19675A.
Smith, Mahlon Allison, 2d, 18542A.
×Guthrie, Joseph Aloysius, Jr., 19676A.
Hunnicutt, Julian Perry, Jr., 19546A.
×Saxon, John Harold, Jr., 18528A.
Ellis, Alston R., 18376A.
×Lindy, Alan M., 18456A.
Roland, Frank O., Jr., 18523A.
Willcox, Tilton Lee, 18086A.
×Rosenblatt, Richard David, 19539A.
Haughey, James Ross, 18407A.
Cecil, Charles P., Jr., 18356A.
Braun, Donald Vincent, 19547A.
Colgan, David James, 19538A.
×Sieck, John P., 18539A.
Sayler, John Milton, 19677A.
Peters, John C., 18509A.
Newby, Willis Charles, 18311A.
×Mechling, Eugene Burlingame, Jr., 19940A.
Spry, James Wrathall, Jr., 19678A.
Hinckley, Paul Ray, 19990A.
Stewart, Wesley Thomas, 22788A.
Bond, Alpha Robert, 21482A.
×Hobbs, Lauren Dale, 19807A.
Normand, George Henry, 22789A.
Taylor, Harry Whittier, Jr., 22790A.
Sanks, Julius Fleischman, 22791A.
Larsh, Robert Lawrence, Jr., 19973A.
Stanley, Ellis Early, 22792A.
Castle, Clarence Edward, 19934A.
×Wilson, Charles Beatty, 21483A.
Longstreet, Allen Jacob Rank, 19881A.
×Beale, George William, 18629A.
×Barlow, John W., 18634A.
Hamlett, Lloyd George, 18598A.
Hamill, Howard Fancher, 18601A.
Lamont, Maximilian, 18626A.
×Adams, Grey Littleton, 18606A.
English, Paul Jackson, 18612A.
Fowler, Jack Augusta, 18614A.
Clyburn, Robert Eugene, 18611A.
×Briggs, Charles C., Jr., 18602A.
Langdon, Leonard Coles, Jr., 18619A.
×Elliott, Raymond, 18600A.
Besaw, William J., 18605A.
Sheldon, Robert Jerome, 18607A.
×McAllister, Robert Marcus, 18608A.
Hansen, Richard Oliver, 18617A.
Shoemaker, Alonzo Melvin, Jr., 18620A.
McDowell, Clayton Lee, 18609A.
Barmettler, Robert Stephen, 18613A.
Merrill, David Kenneth, 18618A.
Riley, Charles Rufus, 18625A.
×Gallup, William Henry, Jr., 18628A.
×Monts, Rufus, M., 3d, 18599A.
×Perselay, Gerald, 18630A.
×Hamilton, Robert Lee, 18597A.
×Luna, Benjamin Charles, Jr., 18627A.
Killpack, Larry Movell, 18623A.
×Geiger, James W., 18604A.
×Scheuer, James Carlyle, 18631A.
Brooke, John Edgar, 18622A.

MEDICAL SERVICE

×Morgan, Fred Baxter, Jr., 21643A.
Zinnemann, George, 21644A.
×Morris, Floyd Marvin, 21645A.
×Rhodes, Stanley, 21646A.
Windsor, Noel Franklin, 21647A.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947, as amended by Public Law 514, Eighty-first Congress. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be captains

NURSE

Manahan, Flora Elisabeth, 21022W.
×Garvin, Sara Elizabeth, 21045W.
Obletiloff, Anna, 22071W.
Bell, Theresa LaVerne, 22073W.
Lawrence, Evelyn Normalee, 22075W.
×Waite, Hope Evlyn, 22074W.
×Whitehead, Zada Zarling, 22076W.
Thompson, Jean Elaine, 21155W.
×Martell, Genevieve Eva, 22077W.
Mills, Margaret Joan, 22078W.
Murray, Evelyn, 21089W.
Sebasky, Madeline Patricia, 22079W.

To be first lieutenants

NURSE

×Vsetula, Josephine M., 21177W.
Dunnum, Delores Ione, 21178W.
×Hall, Matie, Lucille, 21179W.
×Lichtenhan, Margaret Ann, 21181W.
×Duplease, Margaret Louise, 21180W.

WOMEN'S MEDICAL SPECIALIST

×Rader, Marjorie Anne, 21199W.
×Northrup, Barbara Louise, 21183W.

NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion to captain and first lieutenant will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 24, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, in this moment of prayer we are seeking with one accord to know Thy holy will and to be governed and guided by it.

We acknowledge how slow and stupid we are in understanding that apart from Thee there is no hope that our dreams and desires for a nobler civilization will ever be fulfilled.

Grant that we may hold our own wishes in abeyance and begin each day with the prayer, "Lord what wilt Thou have me be and do?"

We pray that our listless and languid spirits may be quickened into newness of faith and hope, and may we be confident that better days are dawning when all the needs of humanity shall be supplied.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 21, 1952, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on March 19, 1952, the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3219. An act for the relief of Robert E. Vigus; and

H. R. 5317. An act to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the George H. Whike Construction Co., of Canton, Ohio.

AN INADEQUATE RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the sad effect of our failure to obtain the enactment of a satisfactory Reserve law is being felt more acutely each day that passes. The House passed this Reserve bill during the last week before summer adjournment last year. It is now lodged in the other body.

At the present time our Reserves are being obtained almost entirely from draftees who perform 24 months of duty in the Far East; and finishing this, they are by law placed in the Reserves. At the present time there is no Reserve volunteering. This means that in the event of another emergency we will call again upon the veteran who is a reservist—upon the man who has already done 2 years of duty under the draft.

But, more important, it means that since the Army is taking almost all draftees, it is the one service which is making some progress in building up its Reserves. The Air Force and the Navy still depend upon volunteers who are not required to go into the Reserve components and, consequently, these two branches of service—the Navy and the Air Force—are not getting any Reserves, and the day may soon be at hand when these two great departments of our national defense wake up to find themselves stripped of Reserve organization.

I hope we get a good strong Reserve bill within the near future.

THE TORNADO DISASTER

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, the terrible tornadoes experienced in the last few days by the States of Arkansas, Tennessee, Missouri, Mississippi, and Alabama have dramatically brought to the attention of all of us the great need of doing something, if at all possible, to more fully protect the lives of persons and property, from the fury of such disasters. My own State of Oklahoma is often the victim of such storms.

For quite a long while I have been making a study along this line and have come to the conclusion that something definite can be done.

According to information furnished me by the United States Department of Commerce Weather Bureau on February 27, and again on March 7, this year, if more funds are provided by Congress, effective service in this regard can be rendered relative to research, investigations, and warnings of approaching storms. It is my understanding that it has been established that various weather phenomena may be successfully detected by means of radar and a more dense network of rawinsonde—upper-air sounding—and surface stations.

Funds necessary to implement all phases of this program total at least $2,500,000 which would be small, indeed, to help prevent the loss of lives and property. Also, I believe there should be an authorization that would permit the Weather Bureau to accept other than Federal funds to assist in supporting this important program.

Therefore, if I have the opportunity to do so, at the proper time, I expect to offer before the proper committee, or the House, or both, an amendment to the current Department of Commerce appropriation bill which, in substance, will read:

Tornado investigations and warnings, Weather Bureau: For necessary expenses in carrying out the purposes of Public Law 657, Eightieth Congress, enacted June 16, 1948, $2,500,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to cooperate with State and local governments, institutions of learning, and private individuals and corporations and in this connection to receive and administer funds contributed for the object of investigating tornadoes and other severe storms and for developing and testing methods of forecasting such storms and disseminating timely warnings thereof. Funds so received may be credited to this appropriation, which appropriation will remain available until expended.

I sincerely hope that this amendment, or something along this line, will be adopted.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to direct to the attention of the Members of the House, especially those Members on the left side of the aisle, the slash that has been made in the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service for the fiscal year 1953. It amounts to $179,000.

I am placing in the Appendix of the RECORD the reason why Mr. Ching's cut should be restored.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SUTTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the Congress should be highly cognizant of the recent decision handed down by the Wage Stabilization Board pertaining to the steel industry. The very serious factor in this is that the United States of America will, if this practice continues, drift into compulsory arbitration, thereby destroying collective bargaining.

I sincerely hope that when we review the Defense Production Act, which expires on June 30 of this year, we will explore all the provisions of that act and ultimately relieve the War Stabilization Board of its power to settle disputes.

GEN. DOUGLAS MacARTHUR

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ARMSTRONG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CORRUPTION IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter addressed to the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, I have urged the House Rules Committee to set an early date for hearing on House Resolution 492 to create a special bipartisan committee to investigate corruption in the executive branch of the Government.

I supported this request with material containing reasons and arguments for this action. Briefly, these can be summarized as follows:

First. Everyone recognizes that the widespread corruption in the executive branch of the Government must be exposed and weeded out. Even President Truman conceded this in his state-of-the-union message.

Second. The American people will not have confidence that the Executive can honestly and completely investigate itself.

Third. The Department of Justice, itself under investigation for its past failure to enforce the law and prevent the growth of favoritism and influence and corruption which has been revealed by congressional committees, is disqualified.

Fourth. Newbold Morris, by his performance before the Hoey committee and his involvement in tanker deals, has exposed his unfitness as corruption cleaner-upper.

Fifth. The American people expect their Representatives in Congress, which is, or should be, independent of the executive branch, to conduct a thorough, impartial, penetrating examination of the activities of corrupt officials in the executive branch of the Government. Such an investigation would be accorded public confidence. It would lead to legislative and administrative remedial action which would restore the confidence of the American people in their Government.

LETTER SENT TO ALL MEMBERS OF THE RULES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE

MARCH 22, 1952.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I respectfully request an opportunity to be heard by the Rules Committee on House Resolution 492 which I introduced January 14, 1952. A copy of this resolution is enclosed for convenient reference. It would create a special House committee to investigate corruption in the executive branch of the Government.

In support of this request, I refer to the remarks I made on the floor of the House January 14, 1952, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day on pages 159 and 160. Also, there are enclosed herewith tear sheets of the RECORD of March 17, 1952, in which are contained additional arguments.

I hope an early date for my appearance before your committee can be set. If action is to be taken along the line recommended in the resolution, it should be gotten under way as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MEADER.

WAGE INCREASE IN THE STEEL CASE

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MUMMA addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Wednesday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in times gone by I have been highly critical of the Secretary of State and also the State Department for both its words and its actions and its policies. I now stand before the House and speak a word of approval because of two actions the State Department has taken: First, in limiting the movements of foreign representatives in our country whose government in the Old World have limited the movement of our representatives in their country, particularly those of Russia; and, second, for condemning and protesting the action of the Polish Embassy here in Washington for its attack upon the action of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee of this House in trying to do its duty as directed by the House of Representatives.

It is high time that something be said in opposition to the actions of such governments, which seem to think this country is an open field where they have diplomatic immunity here in the Nation's Capital. It is contrary to all precedent. The State Department was correct in protesting their action.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR'S SPEECH IN JACKSON, MISS.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, whether you agree with Gen. Douglas MacArthur or not, he made one of the most impressive speeches in Jackson, Miss., last Saturday that has been delivered by any American leader in the last 20 years, and he was given one of the greatest spontaneous ovations from real Americans that any public speaker has ever received.

I may not agree with General MacArthur on everything, but I certainly do agree with him on some statements that he made. One of them was on the dangers of communism here in America, and another was when he pointed out the stupidity of trying to get us into another European war.

I agree with Douglas MacArthur that it is not necessary for us to be preparing to plunge into another European conflict. If we will build up our own Air Force and build plenty of atomic bombs, that little bunch of atheistic Communists that have control in Russia will never attack us.

If we want to save American institutions, perpetuate American freedom, and pass it on down to our children, and our children's children, then the thing to do is to steer clear of any more foreign wars, to expose and drive from power every Communist in America.

By doing that we can save our own country, build the strongest nation on earth, and lead the world by precept and example into a new day of peace, progress, and prosperity for all mankind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

RELIEF OF OVERPOPULATION IN WESTERN EUROPE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 400)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

One of the gravest problems arising from the present world crisis is created by the overpopulation in parts of Western Europe, aggravated by the flight and expulsion of people from the oppressed countries of Eastern Europe.

This problem is of great practical importance to us because it affects the peace and security of the free world. It is also of great concern to us, because of our long-established humanitarian traditions. The Congress has recognized the importance of this problem and has already enacted some legislation to help meet it. I ask the Congress to give early and favorable consideration to additional legislation to make more adequate provision for meeting this situation.

Specifically, I ask the Congress to authorize a program that will—

(1) Provide aid for the unfortunate victims of oppression who are escaping from Communist tyranny behind the iron curtain;

(2) Continue our participation in the international effort now being made to assist in the migration and resettlement throughout the world of a substantial number of persons from the overpopulated areas of Western Europe; and

(3) Authorize additional immigration into this country, on a limited basis, to aid in alleviating the problems created by Communist tyranny and overpopulation in Western Europe.

The solution to these problems cannot, and should not, be the responsibility of any one nation. It is an international responsibility—an integral part of the world crisis which the free nations must meet together. It demands the cooperative efforts of all interested countries. But a real solution can be found only if the United States does its part. We have done our part in the past; we must not falter now.

World War II left in its wake a tremendous upheaval of populations in the countries of Europe. To meet the situation, this country took the lead in establishing the International Refugee Organization, which provided care and protection for displaced persons and made possible the migration of more than 1,000,000 of them to 48 countries throughout the free world.

As our own contribution to the common effort, the Congress in 1948 enacted the Displaced Persons Act and subsequently amended and extended it. Both the Congress and the American people

have every right to be proud of the achievements made under this far-sighted humanitarian legislation.

The Displaced Persons Act is now approaching the termination date fixed by the Congress. When operations under this law have been finished, almost 400,000 victims of tyranny will have been resettled in the United States. The first major phase of the program was completed with the issuance of practically all of the 341,000 visas authorized to be issued by midnight, December 31, 1951. In addition, the Congress authorized the admission of 54,744 Germans who had fled or been driven from areas east of the iron curtain. There is every likelihood that the remaining visas for these German expellees will be issued ahead of the June 30, 1952, dead line set by the Congress.

The job has been well done by the Displaced Persons Commission and other cooperating agencies of the Government. Much of the success of the program is due to the vital work accomplished by private voluntary agencies, representing our major religious faiths and nationality groups, and by the State commissions appointed by the governors of 34 States. These organizations of citizens have contributed their efforts and resources to resettling the greater part of the displaced persons admitted to this country. Without them and without the good will and cooperative response of thousands of American families and church groups, this great program could never have been carried out.

Thus, by doing our own share and by acting together with the other countries of the free world, we have been dealing successfully with the major dislocations caused by Hitler's policies of brutality and aggression.

But the movement of large masses of distressed people across international boundaries is by no means over. Communist tyranny has taken up where Hitler's brutality left off. We are, therefore, now turning our attention to the innocent and unhappy victims of Communist oppression.

Throughout the Soviet-dominated area of Central and Eastern Europe, the Communist regimes are increasing their repressive measures. Some of the enslaved people are managing to escape to the West. Some 15,000 to 20,000 Germans are slipping over the border from the Soviet zone of Germany and crossing into Western Germany every month. From the Communist countries to the south and east the movement to free Europe is much smaller, but still they come, at the risk of their lives, past border guards and through mine fields. There are about 18,000 of these people already west of the iron curtain, and they are coming in at the rate of about 1,000 a month.

The people in all these groups come into areas where, for the most part, the local economy is unable to support the population already there. Western Germany, for example, is overcrowded with almost 9,000,000 people of German ethnic origin who were driven there from Eastern Europe after the war. Trieste, which is receiving many of those escaping from the satellites, is badly overcrowded. Italy is struggling with very serious problems of overpopulation and is urgently trying to resettle large numbers of its people overseas. Greece faces great difficulty in absorbing the refugees of Greek origin who are being driven out of the Balkan satellites by the Communists. Thus, the brutal polices of Soviet tyranny are aggravating overcrowded conditions which are already a danger to the stability of these free nations.

This, in general terms, is the nature of the problem that now confronts free Europe.

The Congress is aware of the importance of this problem for the free world and the security of the United States. Congressional enactments and appropriations recently enabled the United States to take the lead in establishing the Provisional Inter-Governmental Committee for the Movement of Migrants from Europe, which 17 governments have already joined. This organization is already at work providing overseas transportation for migrants from areas of overpopulation to lands where more people are needed.

We are taking part in the work of this organization and have contributed $10,000,000 to its operation. The organization has taken over the fleet of ships formerly operated by the International Refugee Organization.

The legal authority to participate in this organization is contained in the Mutual Security Act of 1951. This authority should be extended, and the Congress should make provision for continuing our financial contribution to this work for the next fiscal year.

This is of great importance, but much more needs to be done.

In the first place, specific aid and assistance should be provided for the people who are fleeing at the risk of their lives from Southern and Eastern Europe. These people are Balts, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Albanians, Ukrainians, and Russians.

These people face a desperate situation. Not only do they arrive destitute, with only what they can carry on their backs, but they find themselves in totally strange lands among strange peoples speaking strange languages. The local authorities do not have adequate resources to care for them properly. These people need better care when they first arrive and they need assistance if they are to move on and resettle elsewhere.

The miserable conditions in which these fugitives from communism find themselves, and their present inability to emigrate to new homes and start new lives, lead inevitably to despair. Their disillusionment is being effectively exploited by Communist propaganda. These men and women are friends of freedom. They include able and courageous fighters against communism. They ask only for an opportunity to play a useful role in the fight for freedom. It is the responsibility of the free world to afford them this opportunity.

The need is well recognized, both in Europe and in this country. Private welfare organizations of American citizens, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish, have been working hard to help these people. Last year these organizations spent substantial amounts for their care and resettlement. These organizations will continue their efforts this year, but the need is greater than they can handle.

First of all, these fugitives from communism need supplemental care and maintenance after they arrive in Western Europe. Local governments and private relief organizations give a minimum amount of this type of aid, but their resources are inadequate. Additional food, better shelter, clothing, medical care, legal advice, and other kinds of material assistance are needed.

These people also need assistance in financing overseas transportation. The new international migration organization and the American private relief agencies can and do help with this, but a concerted effort is needed to give these people an equal opportunity to share in the migration program. At present, because of inadequate resources, it is these fugitives from communism who have the greatest difficulty in arranging for overseas migration. If funds were provided, and an adequate administrative organization set up, these people would have a better chance to migrate.

I am convinced that we must help these people. Therefore, acting under the authority of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, I am authorizing the Director for Mutual Security to go forward with a limited program of assistance in this fiscal year. Four million three hundred thousand dollars will be allocated for this purpose. This program will help alleviate the condition of these people in the countries to which they escape and will enable many of them to move out of Europe. The funds that are being made available will supplement—but not in any sense supersede—the efforts now being made both by the governments of the countries where these people have sought refuge and by private American organizations.

Supplemental care and overseas migration do not, however, constitute all that should be done for those who escape from Eastern Europe. A substantial number of them want to stay in Europe and should have the chance to do so. They should be welcomed in Western Europe and given the opportunity to make their individual contributions to the free world. Many of them will need further education or training so they can prepare themselves for useful and productive work in the North Atlantic community.

I urge the Congress, therefore, to provide clear and adequate authority for the coming fiscal year—together with the necessary funds—so that the program of assistance we are now starting for the refugees from communism can be carried forward and strengthened along the lines that I have mentioned here.

In addition to these types of aid, the opportunity for military service may provide an answer to the problems of a small number of these refugees. Some of these people will be able to enlist in the United States Armed Forces overseas, under Public Law 597, the so-called Lodge Act of 1950. So far, however, only a handful have been allowed to do this. Security screening requirements have necessarily been high, since each person under

the provisions of the Lodge Act is a potential United States citizen. Another type of military service for these people is authorized under section 101 (A) (1) of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, which provides that they can be formed into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The question of forming such units presents great administrative and political difficulties, but it has been receiving careful study. Even if it proves possible, however, to create such units, military service could utilize only a relatively small number of these people, and would not eliminate the need for additional measures to use their skills and energies in civilian life.

Such, in brief, are the measures that can help to alleviate the problems of these fugitives from Soviet terror. But these problems, important as they are, are overshadowed by the need for increasing migration from the overcrowded areas of Europe.

Overpopulation is one of the major factors preventing the fullest recovery of those countries where it exists. It is a serious drag on the economies of nations belonging to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. A solution to this problem, therefore, becomes vitally necessary to strengthen the defense of the North Atlantic community.

Our common defense requires that we make the best possible use not only of the material resources of the free world but of our human resources as well. Men and women who cannot be productively employed in the free countries of Europe because of conditions there are a net loss to the strength of the free world. In other countries, where they are needed, these same people could add to the output and growing power of the free nations. But left in idleness as they now are, wasted and hopeless, they become an easy prey to the demagogs of totalitarianism, both right and left.

The bulk of the emigration needed will have to be taken care of by countries other than the United States. Some of the free nations, particularly those with large unsettled areas or undeveloped resources, have a pressing need for large numbers of immigrants to build up their countries and increase their production. Canada and Australia, for example, have already initiated substantial programs of immigration. The Australian immigration program calls for an annual immigration of at least 150,000 persons per year. Canadian absorption in the last year was at the rate of 180,000. Additional opportunities for migrants are opening up, although more slowly, in the Republics of Central and South America.

But the United States can and should take some of the migrants now available in Europe. One of the reasons we lead the free world today is that we are a nation of immigrants. We have been made strong and vigorous by the diverse skills and abilities of the different peoples who have migrated to this country and become American citizens. Past immigration has helped to build our tremendous industrial power. Today our growing economy can make effective use of additional manpower in various areas and lines of work.

The rapid expansion of our industry and the enlargement of our defense forces have increased the demands on our available manpower reserves. Our industry can readily absorb a limited number of skilled and trained personnel in the years immediately ahead.

In our agriculture particularly we have a need for additional people. Farm operators and farm workers are essential in our defense effort. Since 1949 there has again been a downward trend in the farm population of the United States. With the resumption of the movement from the farm to the cities, there is a real danger that in the years just ahead our agricultural production may be seriously hampered.

A rich pool of surplus farmers and farm workers exists in the overpopulated areas of Western Europe. Among the expellees in Western Germany there are many agricultural families with no opportunity for employment on the land. In Italy and the Netherlands, too, there are large groups of agricultural workers who cannot find productive employment on the limited arable land available.

Besides farm workers, our experience under the Displaced Persons Act has demonstrated that we can obtain from Europe some trained factory workers, engineers, scientific technicians, and other kinds of specially qualified people whose skills can be put to good use in our economy.

I am convinced that we should welcome to this country a number of those who now must emigrate from Europe. We should do this, not only in our own self-interest, but also as a way to reaffirm the great tradition of freedom and opportunity which we have proved in our own experience to be the surest path of progress and prosperity.

In considering the steps to be taken, we should measure the needs of the distressed people in Europe against our own capacity to make good use of additional manpower and the extent of our international responsibilities. The problem we face is in the nature of an emergency. This emergency can be of limited duration, if we of the free world act wisely and resolutely. The plight of the refugees in Europe and the demands of our national defense are both related to the threat of Communist aggression. When that threat wanes there will be less need for extraordinary measures. But while it persists we should move promptly and effectively to meet it.

The existing immigration laws are inadequate—both in general and as regards this special problem. The Displaced Persons Act will end this year, and we will be thrown back on the quota system of immigration. So far as the people escaping from communism are concerned, many of them will be completely blocked from coming to this country because their quotas have been mortgaged under the Displaced Persons Act for many years in the future. For example, half of the Latvian quota has been mortgaged ahead three centuries to the year 2274, the Estonian quota through the year 2146, the Lithuanian quota through the year 2087, and the Polish quota through the year 2000.

Furthermore, under present law we will be unable to make any substantial contribution to meeting the problem of overpopulation in Germany, the Netherlands, Italy, or Greece. In the latter countries, for example, where the need is particularly acute, we can admit annually only 5,677 Italians and 310 Greeks under the law as it now stands.

To meet the present emergency, we should enlarge the numbers of immigrants that can be taken in from all these critical areas. I ask the Congress to authorize the admission of some 300,000 additional persons over a 3-year period. This would include, on an annual basis—

(1) Seven thousand religious and political refugees from communism in eastern Europe;

(2) Seven thousand, five hundred Greek nationals from Greece;

(3) Seven thousand, five hundred Dutch from the Netherlands;

(4) Thirty-nine thousand Italians from Italy and Trieste; and

(5) Thirty-nine thousand Germans and persons of German ethnic origin.

Immigration in these amounts and from these sources could readily be absorbed in this country, and together with a far larger volume of immigration to other free countries, would go a long way toward solving the emergency problem in Europe.

While the admission of these particular groups should constitute a temporary program of limited duration, it could well be fitted into desirable permanent changes in our present immigration-quota system if the Congress finds itself able to make such changes at this session.

Our present quota system is not only inadequate to meet present emergency needs, it is also an obstacle to the development of an enlightened and satisfactory immigration policy for the long-run future. If our quotas were revised and made more flexible, they could probably be utilized to take care of most or all of the immigration required to meet the present emergency situation. The balance, if any, could be admitted without reference to quota numbers. These are considerations that the Congress will wish to keep in mind when it takes up the question of improving our over-all immigration laws.

It is most important to remember, however, that action to meet the emergency problem is needed this year. If the Congress cannot agree at this session on desirable improvements in our whole system of immigration that would take care of the emergency problem, it should act to take care of the emergency directly. In no event should this vital emergency program be tied to or associated with restrictive changes in our permanent immigration laws—changes which would in themselves hamper or nullify the operation of the emergency program.

In addition to this emergency 3-year program; I recommend that steps be taken to alleviate an unfortunate situation arising under the operation of the Displaced Persons Act. Although all visas authorized for displaced persons were issued, some 7,500 of them were lost because the persons to whom they were granted did not actually come to the United States. On the other hand, a

number of persons who were seeking admission under the act, and whose applications were under consideration, were unable to obtain visas prior to the time the authority to issue such visas expired on December 31, 1951. A substantial portion of these applications were admissible under the standards of the act, and would have made as good immigrants as those already admitted. The voluntary agencies or individual citizens have given the assurances necessary for the admission of these persons. There is still place for them in the United States. It seems unjust and unwise to deprive them of the opportunity for which they are qualified. Seven thousand five hundred visas should be ample to take care of the displaced persons in this category. I recommend that the Congress authorize up to that number of visas for them.

In carrying out this proposal, and the 3-year emergency program as well, we should follow the lessons of the successful experience we have had under the Displaced Persons Act. The same kind of provision should be made, for example, for security safeguards with respect to those admitted to this country, for means to effect their settlement here on a wide geographic basis, and for safeguards against displacement of United States citizens from housing or employment. And similarly, as under the Displaced Persons Act, there should be no religious, racial, or other discrimination in the selection of the immigrants.

With respect to the financing of the emergency 3-year program, however, the situation is rather different from that under the Displaced Persons Act, where transportation was financed through Government funds.

Except for the refugees from communism, the people from the overpopulated areas, who constitute the bulk of the migrants to be admitted, are in a better financial position than the displaced persons of former years. They are not stateless, or dependent wholly on charity. Their countries are interested in seeing them migrate and can be called on to help with the expense of getting them started. The migrants themselves can be asked to repay the cost of their overseas transportation, once they have resettled. Some of them have assets of their own which can be used. While it may be advisable to provide a source of funds to be loaned to these migrants to pay for their passage, the net additional cost to this Government of transporting the people from the overpopulated areas should be small.

The years through which we are passing are tragic years for many people. We are faced with extraordinary problems which demand extraordinary solutions. The problem of the refugees from Communist tyranny and that of overpopulation in Western Europe are matters of practical concern to the entire free world. To us in America, whose most basic belief is in the inherent worth of the human individual, these problems present a challenge as well as a responsibility.

The programs I have here recommended are designed to meet the challenge and accept the responsibility. I hope that the Congress will give them prompt and favorable consideration.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 24, 1952.*

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in response to many inquiries, may I say that the Committee on Appropriations expects to report all appropriation bills before Easter. And we hope, with the cooperation of the Members, to get them through the House and over to the Senate before we adjourn for the Easter holiday.

This week the committee expects to call up three bills in the House, the Labor-Federal Security Agency bill, the Interior Department bill, and the District of Columbia bill.

The following week we expect to call up four bills in the House: The civil functions bill, the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments bill, the legislative bill, and the agriculture bill. That will leave only one bill remaining, the defense bill, which we will mark up on the 1st of April, and report to the House on the 7th.

All of these bills will be reported out and will be available to Members at least 5 days before they are brought up for consideration in the House, with the exception of the defense-appropriation bill. The defense appropriation bill hearings will be printed and released as soon as possible with the last volume to be available not later than April 4. It will not be brought up on the floor until April 7.

So, after consultation with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the defense-appropriation bill, the last appropriation bill when reported to the House Monday morning, the 7th of April, be taken up on Tuesday for general debate, and that reading for amendment begin on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that the hearings will all be available on the defense bill, if you do that, at least by the Friday before.

Mr. CANNON. That is correct; we will have them ready at least 4 days ahead of consideration on the floor.

Mr. TABER. So the Members will have an opportunity to go over that thoroughly before the bill is presented.

Mr. CANNON. That is our plan.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. These appropriation bills do not include the foreign-aid bill.

Mr. CANNON. They do not include the foreign-aid bill. That will necessarily be delayed until authorized by the legislative committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman stated that the District of Columbia appropriation bill would be reported out this week. Does the gentleman mean reported out for next week's action or for action this week?

Mr. CANNON. Reported out for action this week if that is agreeable.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think there is a little misunderstanding about what the gentleman from Missouri said. What he intended to say was that if the defense bill was reported on Monday the 7th of April that hearings would be made available by the 4th.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; the preceding Friday.

Mr. TABER. The preceding Friday.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. That it would be taken up for general debate on Tuesday, the 8th, and be ready for amendment not earlier than Wednesday, the 9th. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. CANNON. That is the schedule. It will not be brought up for reading under the 5-minute rule until Wednesday after being reported on Monday morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. In view of the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that the District of Columbia appropriation bill would be reported out and that it was expected to be acted on this week, I announced that that will follow the Interior Department appropriation bill. I suppose that is what the gentleman from Missouri has in mind.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. If it meets with the approval of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. TABER. And the Defense bill to come up on April 8?

Mr. CANNON. The Defense bill will be brought up for general debate on the 8th.

Mr. TABER. I would not object to that, Mr. Speaker.

CONSENT CALENDAR AND SUSPENSIONS ON MARCH 31

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday, March 31, 1952, to consider eligible bills on the Consent Calendar, and that it also be in order on that day for the Speaker to recognize Members for motions to suspend the rules and pass bills.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this merely moves the Consent Calendar ahead a week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The next regular Private Calendar day is a week from tomorrow, whereas the next Consent Calendar day is 2 weeks from today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DAY

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McMILLAN] is recognized.

EXEMPTING FROM TAXATION CERTAIN PROPERTY OF THE AMVETS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3635) to exempt from taxation certain property of the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if this is not the same type of legislation that exempted the American Legion and the Disabled Veterans in the Seventy-ninth Congress from taxation of property which they used here for a national headquarters.

Mr. McMILLAN. The gentleman is correct.

The purpose of this legislation is to exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia property which has recently been purchased by the AMVETS at 1710 Rhode Island Avenue NW., to serve as national headquarters for this organization. This property would be exempt from taxation only so long as it is owned and occupied by the AMVETS as their national headquarters and not used for commercial purposes.

Such an exemption was granted in the Seventy-third Congress, Public Law 335, to the American Legion, and in the Seventy-ninth Congress, Public Law 380, to the Disabled American Veterans.

The loss of revenue to the District of Columbia, under this proposed legislation, would amount to approximately $938.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. The bill was reported out unanimously.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the property situated in square 160 in the city of Washington, D. C., described as lot 805, owned, occupied, and used by the AMVETS, American Veterans of World War II, is hereby exempt from all taxation so long as the same is so owned and occupied, and not used for commercial purposes, subject to the provisions of sections 2, 3, and 5 of the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCORPORATION, REGULATION, MERGER, CONSOLIDATION, AND DISSOLUTION OF CERTAIN BUSINESS CORPORATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the District of Columbia I call up the bill (H. R. 15) to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read H. R. 15.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is designed to furnish the District of Columbia with a modern statute regarding the organization of business corporations, a need which has existed for many years. The present business corporation law of the District of Columbia has been on the books without change since 1901. It is incomplete, obsolete, and wholly inadequate for present day activities.

The present law contains no provisions whatsoever for such normal, customary, and necessary procedures as mergers, consolidations, and reorganizations, or for the highly important topic of the domestication of foreign corporations. The law does not permit District of Columbia corporations to issue no-par stock, to purchase the stock of other corporations, or to have more than a single corporate purpose. A District of Columbia corporation may not buy, sell, or deal in real estate—except those engaged in business as real estate agents or brokers. Not only must directors be stockholders, but a majority must be citizens of the District. Since many persons doing business all their lives in the District live just outside the borders in nearby Maryland or Virginia suburbs, this provision is usually restrictive. The provisions regarding dissolution are so onerous that practically all dissolutions are effected under a provision which relates to sale of assets rather than to dissolutions.

Perhaps the most serious defect in the present law is that no charter may be filed under the present law until all of the capital stock has been subscribed for in good faith in advance, and, further, that 10 percent of the par value of the stock has been actually paid in, in cash, and the money is in the possession of the persons designated as the first board of trustees. As a consequence of these provisions, it is impossible to form under the District of Columbia statute a corporation whose stock is intended to be issued and marketed under the SEC rules and regulations.

The present corporation law is so unsatisfactory that although several thousand corporations are at present licensed to do business here, less than one hundred corporations a year have been organized under the District of Columbia statute during the past several years. The overwhelming majority of corporations operating here were organized under the laws of Maryland, Delaware, New York, or other States.

In 1933 a new bill was proposed which was introduced and reintroduced at various sessions of Congress. It was finally introduced in 1947 in the Eightieth Congress as S. 8. Attempts were then made to amend S. 8 to bring it up to date but the Bar Association of the District of Columbia decided that it would be more appropriate to redraft an entirely new bill. H. R. 15, embodying the Bar Association draft, was introduced in the Eighty-second Congress, first session.

The bill in its present form is patterned after the model business corporation law prepared by the American Bar Association as revised in 1950. It is similar in most respect to the business corporation statutes of Delaware, Maryland, and Illinois. It does not repeal any existing statutes or special acts of Congress under which corporations have been credited in the past, nor does it affect existing corporate charters. It does permit, however, existing as well as new corporations to be organized under its provisions.

This legislation has the approval of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the Bar Association of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order on District affairs for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on the matter of fluorides in water. I do this because of the interest of my colleagues in the subject and the apparent misunderstanding of some folks as to what fluorides in water will do. It was about a year ago that I introduced some legislation which would permit the District Commissioners to add fluorides to the communal water supply of the District. We never did have a hearing on the bill. The District Commissioners, without legislative authority, appeared before the Appropriations Committee and got appropriations to go ahead.

I introduced the bill with the knowledge or feeling then that universally the use of fluorides in water was probably a good thing for everyone, that it had the unqualified endorsement of the United States Public Health Service, that they had gone all through the program of intense research to establish all factors of the program. Then we had some hearings before a Special Committee on Chemicals in Foods, which sort of opened my eyes to some things I did not know. So I want to apologize to any Member of Congress that might have been misled a year ago when I said that I thought the question of fluorides in water had reached the point where I could recommend it.

I was misled by the United States Public Health Service, that made me believe it was probably a good thing. But in our Special Committee on Chemicals in Foods we had 18 witnesses, the best experts there are in this country on flourine in water. There certainly was not a unanimity of opinion among the experts

as to what fluorides might do when added to water. I am still of the opinion that fluorides added to the drinking water of children, whether you take it in water or milk or by a little tablet, and Dr. Scheele, of the United States Public Health Service says he gives it to his children in tablet form, will cut down the amount of caries dental care in children under 10 years of age by about 50 percent. I think that is true. But I was surprised and rather hurt when I found out the Public Health Service was recommending universal medication by putting fluorides in water when they had not made one iota of investigation as to what it does to children who are sick, who may be chronically ill with nephritis, or what it may do to older people who have tuberculosis, a liver condition, nephritis, or other chronic illness.

I was further a bit amazed when I found that the Public Health people, like Dr. Arnold, Dr. Dean, and other top men, in whom I had confidence on most public-health matters, and I am a former State director of health in Nebraska, came before the committee and in published testimony—I am going to put some in the Appendix of the RECORD—stated that as late as 1951 experiments had not been carried on far enough or long enough to evaluate the effects of fluorides in water.

Up at the laboratory in New York they have set up a 10-year study of what fluorides might do to children who are sick or old people who might have chronic diseases. That experiment will go on for another 4 or 5 years. Many people have written to me about it. I have tried to tell them that these experiments are in progress; that the results have not been decided upon; that it will take another 5 years before this study is completed, and it seems to me that in the public interest we ought not to put fluorides in water until we have the answer to questions that are not now answerable as far as the effects of fluorides in water are concerned. I think it is in the public interest to wait results of these experiments. It has been demonstrated in England that fluorides in water does something to the bony tissue of individuals. My colleagues who have been sending out the Yearbook on cattle diseases will find that there is a section in there on drugs, and you will also find that they issue a warning and tell what fluorides do to animals, and the Department of Agriculture has even put out a pamphlet saying to the hog breeders, "Do not feed fluorides to brood sows." Now, there has been no work done as to what it might do to the unborn child. I think the Public Health Service, in my own opinion, has gone too far, too fast, and too soon in recommending that fluorides be used in water until the experiments that are now in progress have been completed, and that is the thing that I am asking for. I feel it does reduce caries in children 50 percent, but these other questions are so grave and so far reaching that to have universal application for all of us, when we just want to get to children is not right. It only affects about half of the children who have caries. There are places in the United States that use no fluorides in water where the youngsters have almost perfect teeth, and there are places where some fluoride is used where they have mottled teeth.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] for his forthright, informative statement and for his advice to the Members of the House on this very important subject matter. I think the House is extremely fortunate to have a man of the ability of the gentleman who has given so much study to this particular problem and who has had so much experience in dealing with health problems. I hope the distinguished gentleman who now has the floor will expand and extend his remarks on this subject matter, and I do hope that this House will go a little slow in dealing with such an important subject. This House and the Congress is fortunate to have a man of the ability and training as that of Dr. MILLER, upon whose advice we can depend on such important matters.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I felt rather badly, I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, because I stood in the well of this House in June last and recommended it, because I thought the Public Health Service had completed their investigations. But, when we had these 18 witnesses before the committee, good men, with no unanimity of opinion, I have had to change my mind. I am sorry if I misled anyone. I think most of them agreed it was good for children up to 8 or 9 years of age. It reduces caries about 50 percent. I was shocked to learn the work was far from completed when it came to children and adults with chronic or acute illness.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman spoke about unanimity of opinion. I wonder if the gentleman would tell us whether there is any unanimity of opinion as to the effectiveness of smallpox treatment and inoculation, and if there is not still some opposition to that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, very little, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Well, there is not complete unanimity of opinion on that, is there?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, I would say, yes, there was; 99 percent, at least.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Is there not a lot of treatment advocated by many medical men that there is no unanimity of opinion on?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is right, as long as we have people who do their own thinking there will be differences.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I would like also to commend the gentleman for telling us that he had recommended this very same thing that the Public Health Service has recommended, and he has further confused us again.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Well, if I speak differently today than I did yesterday, I will say that I am wiser today. There is also an old proverb, I will say to the gentleman that says that a fool never changes his mind, but a wise man does. I am not sure that I am wise, but certain people do change their minds. The hearings brought out so many facts I did not know about—I am proud that I can adjust my thinking.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. I, too, want to commend the gentleman on his study and research in connection with this very important subject. However, I feel that a number of people in the District now misunderstand the gentleman's position on this. I think they should be enlightened as to why the gentleman was so enthusiastically for it at one time and is now against it. Does not the gentleman believe that probably within a year or so it will be very pertinent?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think in 3 or 4 years when these experiments are completed I might be wholeheartedly for it. I am still of the opinion it is all right for children.

Mr. KEARNS. I hope the gentleman will get a good press interview and clear it up, because many people are interested in his views on this matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. As to the abnormal child with a chronic disease, I am not so sure. Certainly no experiments have been completed as to what it does to older people or those with chronic diseases.

I am making these remarks, Mr. Speaker, because many of my colleagues felt they were misled when I now suggest that we go slow with the problem of fluorides in water. I want to point out that the men who are now advocating the use of fluorides in water, were in 1950 and 1951 saying in substance: "The evaluation of the effects of fluorine in water has not been established and must wait until the experiments now in progress have been completed."

I would also call your attention to the erroneous impression that the American Medical Association has given it their wholehearted endorsement. They did give the plan their general endorsement, but when they appeared before our committee on March 6, 1952, Dr. George Lull, the secretary and general manager of the American Medical Association, prepared the following for presentation at the hearing:

> The council purposely refrains from making any recommendations that communities support or oppose projects for the fluoridation of water supplies.
>
> The house of delegates did not urge or recommend that any community undertake to fluoridate their water supplies.

The hearings clearly show that the dental group, the medical group, and the many health organizations have merely echoed the opinions given by the United States Public Health Service. They have actually done no original investigations.

It does seem, Mr. Speaker, that it is in the public interest that wholesale fluoridation of water not take place until the experiments now in progress are completed.

I expect to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, this week, some additional remarks upon this timely subject.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a short statement with reference to this bill, known as the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act. This bill is designed to correct what is a very serious situation in the District of Columbia, in that the laws pertaining to the organization and operations of business corporations have not been amended or changed since 1901. As a consequence, the corporation laws in the District of Columbia are quite outmoded and chaotic, and in the organization of new corporations it is practically necessary generally to go to Delaware or Maryland or New York for initial incorporation.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill is reported unanimously out of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, it has been worked upon for a great many years, first by the Bar Association of the District of Columbia. The bill is patterned after the suggested uniform corporation code recommended by the American Bar Association. It has the unanimous support, I believe, of the bar of the District of Columbia. A great deal of work has been done by the appropriate committee of that bar upon this proposed legislation, as well as by the Corporation Counsel.

The bill was first considered in the Eightieth Congress. It was not reported out until the Eighty-first Congress. It passed the House but failed of passage in the other body. I do hope this bill, which will be passed by the House, may be acted upon by the other body because of the dire need for this legislation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am quite sure there will be no difficulty in this bill's passing the House because of the confidence the Members have in the author of the bill the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA]. He is a trained lawyer. He is a student of corporation law. I know he has given this legislation the careful study to which it is entitled, and I am sure the House can depend upon the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota to submit legislation that is for the best interests not only of the District of Columbia but of the country at large. It is a great compliment to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] that his bill, comprising 165 pages, and of highly technical matter, is approved by this House upon his recommendation and without further debate.

Mr. O'HARA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF RUBBER ACT OF 1948

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Committee on Rules has reported out House Resolution 577 providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6787) to extend the Rubber Act of 1948—Public Law 469, Eightieth Congress—as amended, and for other purposes, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of that bill and that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. COX. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like the RECORD to show that as the member of the Committee on Rules who is in charge of this resolution reported by the committee I am present and do not object to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. May I say also that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], representing the minority members of the Committee on Rules, is likewise present, has been consulted, and has no objection to the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (a) of section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948 (Public Law 469, 80th Cong.), as amended, is further amended (1) by striking out "April 1, 1951" and inserting in lieu thereof "April 1, 1953", and (2) by striking out "January 15, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof January 15, 1954."

(b) Section 20 of such act, as amended, is further amended by striking out "June 30, 1952" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1954."

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, it is a rare occasion for me to come before this House and urge the membership of this body to extend Government control over a rather large segment of our industry for a period of 2 years. It is even rarer for me to find myself in accord with an administration recommendation, although I prefer to consider this bill as an indication that the administration agrees with me.

But regardless of my personal convictions concerning Government controls, or administration policy, I will always place national security above those personal convictions. Were it not for the fact that the security and well-being of every American citizen is directly involved in the measure now before the House, I would not advoate the extension of the Synthetic Rubber Act for an additional 2 years. But rubber is so vital to our military and civilian needs that it must overshadow all objections that anyone might have concerning the interference of Government with legitimate private industry.

When I think how close this Nation came to losing World War II because of the critical shortage of rubber, it strengthens my resolve that in this particular defense need, private enterprise must give way temporarily to the overwhelming arguments in behalf of continued operation of the synthetic-rubber facilities by the Federal Government.

More than a ton of rubber is necessary to produce a tank. It requires over 75 tons of rubber to build a battleship. There is not an airplane, a jeep, a truck, or a submarine that does not need some rubber. Today we have that rubber and the facilities to make more.

Perhaps our security in rubber is due to the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948. As the author of that act, I would be less than modest if I claimed that that act is fully responsible for our security in rubber. But we still have 26 of the original 51 complex and highly technical facilities that were constructed during World War II in connection with our synthetic rubber program. These plants are now in full operation and are capable of producing 950,000 tons of synthetic rubber annually.

Any number of results might have taken place had we not retained these facilities under the 1948 act.

Had they been sold in 1948, they might well have been allowed to stand idle or have been converted to other uses when, in 1949, the average price of natural rubber dropped to 18 cents a pound. If that had happened, we might not have met our defense and civilian needs as we have done since Korea and are continuing to do today. We might not be attaining our stockpile objectives in natural rubber, as we are doing today.

Had we followed the President's recommendations in 1950, just prior to Korea, an entirely different result might have taken place. What do you suppose would have happened to the price of synthetic rubber right after Korea, when natural rubber rose to 80 cents a pound, and everyone was scrambling for natural and synthetic rubber? Well, I think it is obvious that synthetic rubber would have climbed from 25 cents to 26 cents a pound to 75 cents a pound in a very short time. And it would have been the rubber products consumer who would have paid.

And without the authority to allocate natural rubber, where do you think our stockpiling program would be today had the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948 not been in effect when war broke out in Korea? We would have purchased natural rubber in competition with private industry, and it would have been the taxpayer who would have taken it on the chin.

But we did retain our controls and our facilities, and today these facilities are producing the rubber that makes it possible for us to meet all the civilian and military needs of the Nation. We did retain them, and during the days when they were not in operation we kept them in excellent stand-by condition. As a result, today they are capable of producing more rubber than when they were originally constructed. Today we are producing better synthetic rubber and more of it. Perhaps all of this would have taken place without the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948, but it is also possible that it would not have taken place.

Today there appears to be a leveling off in the supply and demand situation. The Government has announced its withdrawal as the sole and exclusive purchaser of natural rubber, an authority granted under the Defense Production Act, and starting with June deliveries, private industry will again be allowed to purchase natural rubber on their own.

Likewise, the supply of synthetic rubber is now large enough so that substantial quantities are available, and no allocation is necessary.

Specification controls will continue, but manufacturers are permitted to distribute their proportionate required consumption, with only minimum requirements in each product.

Our stockpiling program has made excellent progress and we are now reasonably secure in our natural-rubber supply.

But, we are still faced with the potential loss of southeast Asia; we are still faced with the possibility of almost complete dependence on synthetic rubber, except for our stockpile of natural rubber.

Today the specter of communism looms on the horizon of southeast Asia like an angry octopus whose tenacles reach out farther and farther for the raw material areas so vital to the United States. In my opinion we would be foolhardy to take any course other than to extend the present Synthetic Rubber Act so long as the spectacle is so apparent in that area of the world.

If we let the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948 expire and permit these plants to be sold, no man can predict what the effect would be on the price of synthetic rubber. Synthetic rubber, now selling for 23 cents a pound, might well rise to staggering heights. If so, it would be the taxpayer and the consumer who would pay the cost. On the other hand, if natural rubber flooded the market, the plants might well be shut down and allowed to deteriorate. No private company could afford to maintain, for any long period, a nonproducing plant without Government support.

Again, with modesty, I can say that today we have a good law which is working to the satisfaction of all concerned. The rubber industry is making money; our defense needs in rubber are being met; our stockpiling program is attaining its objectives; tires at reasonable prices are available to American car owners; controls have been relaxed upon the purchasing of natural rubber, and there is an adequate supply of rubber available to meet all needs.

The present law is not unreasonable in its demands, nor is it difficult to administer. Private industry, through operating agreements with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, manufactures the feed-stocks and finished synthetic rubber. Manufacturers of rubber products pay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the synthetic rubber. The National Production Authority exercises the specification and allocation controls over natural and synthetic rubber.

As much as I am opposed to Government interference with private enterprise, I feel that the retention of these facilities and their operation by the Federal Government, authorized under the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948, is necessary and fully justified. For that reason, I sincerely hope that this House will unanimously approve this measure and continue our security in rubber.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I would like to ask the gentleman what might have happened also if we had not stockpiled quite a bit of this rubber.

Mr. SHAFER. Yes. Many questions might be asked.

Everyone knows the necessity for extending this act for 2 years.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] was placed in charge of this bill in the Armed Services Committee.

Back in 1949 he presented to the House the first bill in regard to the synthetic-rubber situation I wish to say for the RECORD that I hope by 1954, 2 years from now, world conditions may be such that the Government can get out of the synthetic-rubber business.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Would you say, then, that if this comes before your committee in 1954, and world conditions are such that we do not need controls, you would be for abandoning further control?

Mr. VINSON. I am only in favor of control when world conditions are such as they are today. I do not believe it is the function of the Government, even though we made $11,000,000 off the operation this year, to be in the synthetic-rubber business. It is a business for private industry to handle when world conditions are such that it can resume the operations.

Mr. AYRES. But at the present time you feel there is absolute necessity for continuing controls for another 2 years.

Mr. VINSON. I am satisfied there is absolute necessity for controls being extended for two more years. My position is exactly in line with that of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], and I feel confident that that is the views of the overwhelming majority of the members of this committee.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am not sure the gentleman is permitted to tell us this, but if you could will you tell us how much rubber the military has already stockpiled?

Mr. VINSON. I am sorry, but those questions cannot be answered in public.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I know that when they went into the rubber market to buy, the price went up immediately.

Mr. VINSON. If the gentleman will consult the gentleman from North Caroline [Mr. DURHAM], who is in charge of stockpiling, he can give you that information, but we cannot tell that in public.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. When the Army went in to buy the price went up to $1.60 to $1.70.

Mr. VINSON. It went as high as 80 cents a pound for natural rubber.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And natural rubber went as high as $1.60 or $1.70?

Mr. VINSON. No; about 80 cents a pound.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. And what is it now?

Mr. VINSON. About 36 cents a pound.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, we all heard what the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said regarding rubber controls. I have learned to respect the judgment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and when he said that he would oppose a 1-year extension, even though men in the rubber capital of the world, Akron, Ohio, said they would like to have a 1-year extension only, I felt it would be rather futile for me to put up a fight for it and take up the time of the House. After all, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] has been a Member of this body 3 years longer than I am old, and when he gives me his word that he will do his best to get controls removed, if in his judgment they are not needed, I am inclined to go along with his opinion.

However, I think it should be called to the attention of the House what a fine job the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] has done on this act.

I am vitally interested in the rubber industry both from the viewpoint of management and labor. If there are questions unanswered on the completion of my remarks I will be glad to get the information for any of you Members who desire it.

Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Michigan takes proper credit for the authorship of a good law. The rubber act has been a good law. It provided the Government 4 years ago with a single-purpose tool, especially designed by the Armed Services Committee in the course of long and tedious hearings to do one important job.

The job was to attain security in rubber. That was the only job.

The doctrine of Government-controlled industry was as repugnant to this House in 1948 as it is today. But security, and security only, the single overriding consideration before the Eightieth Congress in its deliberation of this act, compelled its acceptance. It was an urgently needed stop-gap which gave us time to build an adequate security stockpile of a vital raw material and to bring to husky manhood the vigorous but then infant synthetic rubber industry.

The job has been done, expeditiously and economically. The Munitions Board has indicated that it has now passed the "peril point" in its accumulation of strategic stocks of natural rubber. We have been assured by two eminent authorities, John L. Collyer, chairman of the B. F. Goodrich Co., and H. E. Humphreys, Jr., chairman of the United States Rubber Co., that we now have in our security stockpile enough natural rubber to fight a 5-year war at a level of civilian and war production much higher than that achieved in World War II. Physical stocks on hand and afloat to this country are now more than a million tons.

Synthetic rubber plants in Government and private hands are pouring

another million tons of special and general purpose chemical rubbers into the channels of domestic trade and export.

On the record, we say to the gentleman from Michigan: "A job well done."

But at the same time, we are compelled to ask whether section 2 of the act which we are now requested to extend for two more years has its original force and meaning. In this section both the Eightieth and the Eighty-first Congresses concurred with the architect of this law in declaring:

It is the policy of the United States that there shall be maintained at all times in the interest of the national security and common defense, in addition to stockpiles of natural rubber which are to be acquired, rotated, and retained pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act (Public Law 520, 79th Cong., approved July 23, 1946), a technologically advanced and rapidly expandible rubber-producing industry in the United States of sufficient productive capacity to assure the availability in times of national emergency of adequate supplies of synthetic rubber to meet the essential civilian, military, and naval needs of the country.

It is further declared to be the policy of the Congress that the security interests of the United States can and will best be served by the development within the United States of a free, competitive synthetic rubber industry. In order to strengthen national security through a sound industry, it is essential that Government ownership of production facilities, Government production of synthetic rubber, regulations requiring mandatory use of synthetic rubber, and patent pooling be ended and terminated whenever consistent with national security, as provided in this act.

What does that section do? It lays down three criteria, which if satisfied give us, by our own definition, security in rubber. It also states that having attained security in rubber, the interest of national security will best be served by placing our great synthetic rubber industry in the hands of private, free and competitive industry.

Let us measure our present position against the criteria we laid down for the acheivement of national security in rubber.

Our first condition was the accumulation of an adequate stockpile of natural rubber. Our stocks of this raw material were dangerously low when this act was written. As noted above, both the Government agencies concerned and the industry report that our security stockpile of rubber is now substantially above the "peril point."

The Members of this House would rest with a much greater sense of security, I am sure, were our stockpile position in other strategic materials as fundamentally sound as it is in rubber. I refer particularly to such items as manganese, tin, copper, and similarly scarce metals, which we have actually doled out of our jealously guarded strategic stocks to sustain private industrial production in this period of limited emergency.

If this is the case, we have satisfied the first of our security criteria as to rubber.

Our second condition called for the existence of "a technologically advanced and rapidly expandible rubber-producing industry in the United States." In June 1950, at the outbreak of the Korean war, the Government was producing general-purpose synthetic rubber at the rate of 342,000 long tons a year. More than half of our synthetic plants were then in stand-by. Gaining valuable experience in reactivation, the Government and industry quickly brought our stand-by capacity into production. Output of GR-S was more than doubled in 1951 when these plants turned out more than 700,000 long tons of this rubber. Production of special-purpose butyl rubber was increased by more than half in that period to a rate currently in excess of 90,000 tons a year.

Since March 1948, when this House first voted on the Rubber Act there have been sweeping technical improvements in the field of synthetic rubbers. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has produced and evaluated more than 600 types of synthetic rubber polymers, many of which have proved superior in special end uses to any material heretofore known. The two most far-reaching improvements, however, have been the development of cold rubber, a product with wearing qualities superior to either natural rubber or earlier types of GR-S, and oil-extended rubber, which gives us from our present plants upward of 20 percent more rubber at considerably less cost. These developments, I say, satisfy the second security requirement of this House that we have in the United States a technologically advanced and rapidly expandible rubber-producing industry.

Our third requirement was the availability in times of national emergency of adequate supplies of synthetic rubber to meet the essential civilian, military and naval needs of the country.

We are informed that the Munitions Board and the National Production Authority have blueprinted mobilization plans for rubber and that officials of those agencies are in agreement with the best qualified experts of the industry that stockpile supplies of natural rubber and the production potential of synthetic rubber are more than adequate to meet all essential civilian and military requirement for several years in event of an all-out war.

But we are not in an all-out war today. We are in a period of limited defense build-up as distinct from full mobilization. Our position is this: we have natural rubber stocks of more than one million tons, on hand or afloat. We have available to the United States over the next 12 months approximately 1,000,000 long tons of synthetic rubber and 700,000 of natural rubber—a total of 1,700,000 long tons of new rubber to meet industry requirements which the gentleman from Michigan describes as being in the order of 1,300,000 long tons.

This condition of surplus coupled with the demonstrated capacity of this country to maintain our present production of synthetic rubbers at the rate of 1,000,000 tons a year seems certainly to satisfy our third and final security requirement.

Now if the single criterion of the need for rubber controls is security as we defined it, and if we honestly believe our future security will best be served by placing the synthetic rubber plants in private hands, what purpose is served by extending the present act for 2 years and freezing in a state of suspended animation an industry whose dynamic growth potential is the true key to our national security in rubber?

If it is simply controls for controls sake as an easy solution to the admittedly difficult problem of disposal, I must register my objection. And I am constrained to ask: Is the committee taking the easy way out?

We find its spokesmen coming before this House to ask us to continue controls over a $5,000,000,000-a-year industry without having even explored in public hearings the Nation's radically changed and vastly improved security position in rubber. Neither the industry nor the agencies of the Government concerned with the rubber program were asked to testify in public hearings as to the measure of our progress since 1948 and 1950, or as to the degree of need, if any still remains, for continuing these controls.

That the committee should not seek the counsel of industry and Government experts on a matter of national policy having so many complicated facets is a matter of no little surprise.

More than anything else, the committee's splendid past work on the rubber problem points up the difficulty of its solution. Again and again the intricate and complicated character of the problem has been demonstrated in the wide disparity between industry proposals for a solution and by the diversity of approaches suggested by Government agencies.

But I have never sensed that it was the temper of this Congress to give victory by default to the philosophers of control simply because a problem is difficult.

If the security aspects of the rubber problem are satisfied, the sole justification for extension must be to provide 2 more years for the development of a plan to get the synthetic plants into private hands.

And if that is the reason, I must ask: What has happened in the past 2 years? In June of 1950 the Eighty-first Congress directed the administration to develop a disposal plan by January 15, 1952.

What of that disposal plan? Has there been one? Have there been public hearings on it? If so, what did the administration have to say in its support? What views were expressed by the potential buyers?

Or if there has been no disposal plan, at what point has there been failure to require administrative accountability to the directives of this Congress?

Are we to look forward to an indefinite series of biennial extensions which would cause us to renounce our declared adherence to the principles of free enterprise and our proclaimed intent to divest the Government of its synthetic plants at the earliest opportunity?

If no disposal plan has been developed, it is perhaps true that more time will be required. But with 4 years of study and experience behind us, an additional 2 years is entirely too long to wait. I would concur in an extension for 1 year, but only if it carried a firm and clear directive to the administration to carry out the intent of Congress within the period provided by that deadline.

The plan should be specific. It should specify what butadiene, styrene, and copolymer plants are to be disposed of, to whom, and for how much. It should detail conditions of contract which would clearly spell out the security obligations of the buyers to maintain inactive facilities in stand-by and to reactivate them in emergency.

Since the reorganization of the RFC—largely as the result of the interest of Congress—I gain the impression that we can now look to that organization for aggressive action in carrying out our declared policies. Even now, I understand, the agency is preparing a realistic disposal blueprint. With the push that seems to be behind this effort, I feel confident that we can find ourselves well along the road to the solution of this problem in the period permitted by a 1-year extension.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on December 7, 1941, we faced a serious and critical shortage of an item that this Nation required in large quantities in order to successfully prosecute World War II. That item was rubber. Our total natural rubber supply at the outbreak of World War II here, and afloat, bound for the United States, consisted of 633,000 long tons.

This was less than a 1-year supply of peacetime consumption and considerably less than the 700,000 long tons per year required for military and essential civilian needs. When Singapore fell, 90 percent of the world's natural rubber supply fell into enemy hands.

As a matter of fact from January 1 1942, to September 2, 1945, we were able to obtain from all other sources throughout the world only 315,000 tons of natural rubber.

Without a substitute for natural rubber our defense production would have been reduced to such a point that we could not have equipped or maintained an army in the field. Without rubber we could have lost the war. We desperately sought a substitute for natural rubber and, as the world knows, we gambled with synthetic rubber and we won the gamble.

In 1941 we produced approximately 8,000 tons of synthetic rubber in small, privately owned plants. Faced with the absolute necessity of expanding this capacity, the Government expended almost $700,000,000 to build a great synthetic rubber industry. All told, more than 51 different projects were constructed. As a result, we reached a point in 1944 where we were capable of producing over 1,000,000 long tons of chemical rubber.

Throughout the war it was, of course, necessary to allocate not only natural rubber, but also the synthetic rubber and, of course, it was necessary to exercise specification and inventory controls. At the end of the war, the Government began closing down some of its synthetic rubber facilities. But we did not allow these plants to deteriorate, nor were they sold for scrap, nor were they sold and reconverted for other uses. I think the Congress of the United States can look with pride upon its far-sighted approach to the rubber problem. In March of 1947 the Armed Services Committee reported a resolution which eventually became Public Law 24. This law extended allocation, inventory, and specification controls and extended the authority of the Government to produce and sell rubber to March 1, 1948. In addition, the law required the Congress to make a thorough study of the means of maintaining a domestic rubber-producing industry in the United States.

Shortly after that, under the able chairmanship of the Honorable PAUL W. SHAFER, of Michigan, a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services began a very thorough and painstaking study of the entire chemical rubber situation. The outcome of that legislation was the Synthetic Rubber Act of 1948 which was to have expired in 1950, but again, through the wisdom of the Congress, was extended until 1952.

Now we are again faced with the situation of attempting to determine the necessity for extending this act for an additional 2 years.

I don't believe that anyone can dispute the fact that our security in rubber is now well established. We are producing a sufficient amount of synthetic rubber to supplement the short supply of natural rubber that is available in world markets. But, above all, we are meeting our stockpile objectives. We have reached a point now where we could be self-sufficient in rubber for a number of years should war come.

We have seen the price of natural rubber fluctuate from 80 cents a pound to 37 cents a pound. Without the synthetic rubber industry it is anybody's guess as to how high natural rubber would have gone. What this industry has meant to the American consumer with respect to the price of rubber products and what it has meant to the American taxpayer with respect to the rubber purchased for the stockpile is obvious.

By retaining these plants in Government ownership we have prevented a run-away price in synthetic rubber, we have assured the production of ever-increasing supplies of synthetic rubber, we have made available for stockpiling purposes natural rubber that might otherwise have been purchased for private consumption; and at the same time, we have completely met our defense needs with respect to rubber products. At the same time, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has operated the program on a sustaining basis. In fact, last year we made a net profit of $11,700,000 on our synthetic rubber program.

In that connection, I might say that not only do I find nothing wrong in making a profit on this operation, but I will go even further and say that I feel the price of synthetic rubber should come closer to reflecting the normal profit that private industry might reasonably be expected to make if they were operating the facilities as owners. When the time arrives for us to consider a fair disposa' program, I believe the price of synthetic rubber, and a normal expected profit, will play an important part. We should anticipate that day by attempting now to ascertain and charge a fair and reasonable price for Government-produced synthetic rubber.

I hope that by 1954 world conditions will permit the Government to get out of the synthetic-rubber industry. I am confident that great progress will be made in the further development of synthetic rubber in private industry. But in spite of all of the claims made for the potential progress to be made in synthetic rubber, I cannot help but observe that we have done remarkably well under Government operation.

We have increased the capacity of our plants and we are producing a far superior synthetic rubber than that which was produced during World War II. In other words, progress has been made under Government operation; production has been increased under Government operation; the rubber-manufacturing industry has not suffered in any respects under Government operation; the stockpiling program is attaining its natural rubber objectives; and above all, we are assured of almost complete security in rubber under the present law.

Faced with these facts, I do not believe that anyone can take the position that we are wrong in any respect in extending this law for 2 years. By 1954 or sooner I am confident that our entire stockpiling objective will be attained. By that time the situation in southeast Asia may well have resolved itself so that we may be able to ascertain what the future holds in store for the United States with respect to this area where 90 percent of the world's natural rubber is grown.

But until that time I believe it would be a tragic mistake to upset a going operation, an operation that has proved itself successful in every respect.

I again compliment the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], and the Members of this body for their wisdom in enacting the 1948 Rubber Act, their wisdom in authorizing its extension in 1950, and for the wisdom they will display on this measure which will extend the Synthetic Rubber Act to 1954.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider and House Resolution 537 were laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF FORMER NAVAL AIR STATION TO TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] I call up House Resolution 574.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4511) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the

chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4511) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to convey certain lands in Hawaii to the Territory of Hawaii.

The rule provides for 1 hour of debate.

The purpose of the bill is to convey to Hawaii the title, right, and interest of the United States in a former naval air station at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H. comprising 1,341 acres, together with improvements thereon.

The bill does not provide for reimbursement. The Department, however, reported that it had no plans for the future use of this property.

The original land cost was $500,000 and construction on the area amounted to a total of $28,000,000.

The committee was informed that the Department of Defense favored the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4511) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4511) transferring certain land to the Territory of Hawaii, with Mr. LYLE in the chair.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] is entitled to 30 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] to 30 minutes.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a rather short bill and I do not think it necessary to take up much time, although it involves the transfer of property worth around $18,000,000. But under an agreement the committee has, we ask for a rule on any measure involving over $500,000.

This bill transfers the naval air station in Maui, a small island off the main path of the Hawaiian Islands. It was built there during the war. By this bill we transfer it to the Territory of Hawaii, but there is a recovery provision in the bill permitting us to recover it in case of emergency.

I think it is to the best interest of the United States and our Government to transfer it, because at the present time it is deteriorating very rapidly. The Territory of Hawaii has quite a sum of money that they wish and desire to expend on this port which will keep it in good shape in case we do need it in an emergency.

For this reason the committee felt it wise to grant this authority and transfer the land and port to the Territory of Hawaii. The airport at the present time is an excellent one. Personally I would hate to see the airport deteriorate and I am quite sure it will unless some funds are expended on it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, one of my colleagues advises that General Gruenther from the office of Supreme Commander General Eisenhower is today before a Senate committee telling of the necessity for appropriating $7,900,000,000 to aid our foreign policy, the authorization being for an appropration for the Mutual Security Agency. I am not too deeply concerned as to which particular agency it is because it does not seem to make very much difference. Just so the dollars and men go out of this country to aid other nations some folks seem to be satisfied.

Permit me to call your attention to an editorial in the Washington News of today.

Before the Senate committee last week we had Mr. Harriman, Mr. Acheson, oh, I do not know how many, but all that group of internationalists who want us to do so much for others. From General Eisenhower's headquarters comes his No. 1 man appearing before a Senate committee to tell us again that if they cut so much as a dollar from this $7,900,000,000 request we are going down the road to destruction.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. You know, there are some nine nations that have refused to take our money. Is there not discrimination there when they have refused to do that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am sorry the gentleman has called attention to that because he has overlooked the program of the administration. Some might think we are not offering enough. I told the Members of the House last week how the Department of Agriculture was having trouble up in my own county getting the farmers to take money; so they hired others to try to persuade the other farmers who were not taking checks to take those checks. Why should we not do the same thing abroad?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It looks like discrimination there and I think we should pass a law perhaps making them all take it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know the gentleman and I would have ended these hand-outs long ago. It must be very disappointing to some members of our Committee on Foreign Affairs to think that some of these other nations will not take this money without urging.

Now, listen to this one. This paper says here in an editorial that they still have $11,700,000,000 from appropriations that have been voted in the last 3 years and which have not been spent.

There would seem to be something wrong with the State Department, the armed services and the rest of these Federal agencies, when they cannot spend the money as fast as it is appropriated. Or it may be there is a screw loose in congressional machinery. Think of the danger of eleven billion seven hundred million of unspent dollars lying around. If appropriating money as we have does not call for an increase of taxes, what does it call for?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Do not bring the armed services in here. They have much more than that. This is just unexpended foreign aid.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do not make me feel worse than I do. I feel badly enough the way it is.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The figure of $11,000,000,000 is the foreign give-away program. I think the military probably have something like sixty or seventy billion dollars that have not been spent.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That they have not spent?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell me why it is that Congress keeps on appropriating more money then?

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman's discussion in regard to unspent money reminds me of what the old sailor said about a piece of rope. He said that if a piece of rope is too short you can splice a piece on it, but if it is too long, what are you going to do?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, if it was a two by four you could cut it off, you know. You have heard of that.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. That does not seem to be the way we have been operating, though.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, of course not. This administration when it has more money than it can spend justs gets a foolish Congress to give it more. Every time I go home the folks back home say, "How come you fellows down there are increasing our taxes all the time? The papers tell us that you still have billions of dollars, and yet Congress goes along and makes it possible to spend more of my money." Now if the gentleman will tell me, what should I say to them? You do not want me to confess that I do not know better? They really think we are silly. But, I have to have some good excuse and to date I have not found any, only the one that while I have voted for less spending I have been outnumbered.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am pleased to yield to my delightful friend from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The people of California are really alarmed about these high taxes, and the Farm Bureau Federation passed a resolution and called it to our attention that the farmers were to take the shirts off their backs and send them to us. Up to the present time I have gotten about 50 shirts. Even the women are afraid of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Wait a minute now. I do not want to go into that.

Mr. JOHNSON. Because last Friday I had a letter——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment. I hope the gentleman will proceed in order now. He is getting on debatable grounds.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think I should put this in the RECORD so that the world will know it. Last Friday——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Last Friday this lady in Sacramento—a very fine lady, a married lady sent me a letter to this effect, that your actions in Congress, speaking of Congress as a whole, have been such that you are taking the shirts off the backs of our men.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I know the gentleman is a very fine Representative, always on the job, always voting against unnecessary appropriations. There are some old fashioned folks here who just cannot keep up with California; cannot keep up with Florida. Last week the gentleman from Florida was talking about a bill, it was on housing—he said we ought to give them more housing down there at Miami; that some were living in slums and freezing. I hope the gentleman from California will take care of that, because when it comes to the merits of the climate of the two places, Florida and California, that was a dangerous admission for the gentleman from Florida to make.

I have not received any of those shirts. Perhaps it is because my folks back home know I have not voted for those appropriations. If the gentleman from California will bear that in mind when we get a roll call on the next bill for foreign aid. My people are asking:

TAXES HIGHER?. WHY?

If you ask, "Are high taxes going still higher?" The answer is "Yes." Your taxes are high—you are working 2½ days a week to pay them—because, with the exception of 2 years—1947–48—you have had a spendthrift administration and a spendthrift Congress. During the Eightieth Congress, the budget was balanced, tax lowered from 5 to 12.6 percent. Facts and figures from Legislative Reference Service are:

The national debt as of March 7, 1952, was $260,234,137,459.

The national debt anticipated, on the basis of 1953 budget programs, to be realized by June 30, 1953, is $274,922,000,000.

The computed interest charge on the debt outstanding on February 29, 1952, was $5,962,944,000.

The interest estimate for fiscal 1953 is $6,255,000,000.

The average interest rate is 2.31 percent.

That we have a spendthrift Government is a matter of common knowledge. Scarcely a day goes by that the press does not carry documented stories of billions of dollars wasted here at home and abroad. Perhaps the latest is the waste of billions on airfields in North Africa. Some self-respecting nations—believe it or not—refuse to accept our gifts.

The wasteful, unnecessary spending of billions is the reason for your present high tax rate.

WILL THE TAXES GO STILL HIGHER?

They certainly will if our present foreign policy continues.

Last week, W. Averell Harriman and Dean Acheson, before a Senate committee retold the old story that the country would be in danger if the Congress cut President Truman's demand for $7,900,000,000 for the Mutual Security Agency.

Today, March 24, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower's spokesman, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, sent here by the general, expressed a like opinion.

If the Congress yields to the demand of Mr. Harriman, Mr. Acheson, and General Eisenhower as expressed through General Gruenther, your taxes will be still higher.

IS THIS APPROPRIATION NECESSARY?

We are all willing to do whatever may be necessary to save our country, but this attempt to frighten us is being overworked. This year, in spite of the greatest tax ever collected, we face a $14,000,000,000 deficit. But, grab your hat, for this should shock you. Mutual Security Agency and the agencies which it succeeded have an unexpended balance of $11,700,000,000 from appropriations which Congress has voted those agencies during the past 3 years. Yet, here we are today with General Eisenhower's representative backing up the State Department, asking for $7,900,000,000 more to spend abroad. A $6,255,000,000 interest charge means taxes of more than $500,000,000 a month for interest alone.

Take another look at those figures—a deficit this year of $14,000,000,000; an interest charge of more than $6,000,000,000. Yet Mr. Truman demands, as does the supreme commander in Europe, when there is on hand, unexpended, $11,700,000,000, that we give the President an additional $7,900,000,000—some for countries which have a surplus in their own treasury.

What can you do about it? I have done my utmost by not only speaking but voting against this class of expenditures. Listen to those of us who vote as well as talk economy; to men like Senators BYRD, GEORGE, RUSSELL, Congressman DOUGHTON—all Democrats; and your humble servant. Elect a President and a Congress willing to end the useless, wasteful spending abroad, revise a foreign policy which will ruin us; do only those things which are necessary here at home; avoid an ever-increasing public debt, an ever-increasing tax bill.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] is unavoidably out of the city. He appeared before the committee and wholeheartedly supported the measure.

I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to convey, without reimbursement, to the Territory of Hawaii, subject to the reservations set forth in section 2 hereof and to such other terms, conditions, reservations, and restrictions as he may deem to be in the public interest, all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the former Naval Air Station, Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., comprising 1,341 acres, more or less, together with all improvements thereon and such personal property relating thereto as the Secretary of the Navy may select.

SEC. 2. The conveyance to the Territory of Hawaii herein authorized shall be made subject to the following terms and conditions: (a) That the Territory shall at its own expense preserve and maintain in a condition suitable for public airport purposes the improvements now existing on said property and those which hereafter may be constructed thereon, and (b) that in time of war or national emergency the United States shall have the right of free and unlimited use, exclusive or nonexclusive, of the land conveyed, together with any improvements thereon and personal property relating thereto, and may after 30 days' notice in writing to the grantee or its successor in title, enter upon, repossess, and reassert ownership of and title to said property, including within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy all or any part of the improvements erected by the grantee or its successor in title, whereupon title to said property shall revert to and revest in the United States: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall make just compensation for the use or acquisition of any improvements made without Federal aid.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out lines 4 to 23 and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The conveyance to the Territory of Hawaii herein authorized shall be made subject to the following terms and conditions: (a) That the Territory shall not alienate its title to the property conveyed nor shall it lease the same or any part thereof except for public-airport purposes: *Provided*, That particular structures or parcels not suitable for airport purposes may be leased for other purposes with the consent of the Secretary of the Navy; (b) that the Territory shall maintain or cause to be maintained in a condition suitable for public-airport purposes, the improvements now existing on the land as well as those which may hereafter be constructed thereon which the Territory and the Secretary of the Navy may mutually agree are suitable for such purposes, and (c) that in time of war or national emergency the United States shall have the right of free and unlimited use, exclusive or nonexclusive, of the land conveyed, together with any improvements thereon and personal property relating thereto, and may after 30 days' notice in writing to the Territory, enter upon, repossess, and reassert ownership of and title to said property, including within the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy all or any part of the improvements erected by the Territory, whereupon title to said property shall vest in the United States: *Provided, however*, That the United States shall make just compensation for the use or acquisition of any improvements or personal property made or acquired without Federal aid."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, as you notice, the committee has substituted its own language for the original section 2, which, in my opinion, makes this a much better bill than the one we had before us to begin with. We also inserted the recapture clause which we carry in all other bills relating to transfer of property.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LYLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4511) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Wailuku, Maui, T. H., pursuant to House Resolution 574, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules and at the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], I call up House Resolution 576 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6336) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the rule makes in order the consideration of the bill, H. R. 6336, which provides for a construction program under the direction of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Because of the importance of the subject matter, the Committee on Rules urges favorable action on the legislation. As the bill indicates the NACA has recommended the expenditure of a little over $20,000,000 for various projects, which will improve and modernize research facilities of that organization.

This bill has nearly the same provisions as the legislation adopted by the House during the first session of the Eighty-second Congress, H. R. 1179. The other body, however, did not act on this measure. The necessity of defense demands research facilities of the highest efficiency. Highest efficiency cannot be obtained unless the research tools, both mental and physical, are the best obtainable. We cannot wait for problems to arise. Today, problems must be foreseen and answers found before the plane goes into use.

In order to meet the ever-increasing problems of transonic and of supersonic flight, the question posed here today probably is not whether the facilities here contemplated are needed but whether those here proposed are sufficient to assure adequate basic aeronautic research and development.

The records indicate the fatal mistake of the Germans in 1941 for shifting emphasis from basic to applied research. We are happy the Germans made this mistake for it probably shortened World War II. But we should make sure we do not make the same, or a similar mistake, by failure to push research to the utmost.

Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee, in reporting this measure, join the Armed Services Committee, in urging improved facilities to test new plane models for vibration, for research in high temperatures generated by transonic and supersonic speeds, and for the importance of jet engine improvements.

In this highly technical field, experience proves that we can only keep and stay ahead in aeronautics, if we keep ahead on research. This has often been pointed out to the Congress. In 1946, a report which I submitted in the other body stated:

> We must, as a matter of vital national defense, devote sufficient attention and effort to scientific research and development in aviation.

This remains as true today as it was in 1946.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Dr. A. L. Magnelia on the occasion of the community appreciation dinner honoring Col. Fred J. Ascani, sponsored by the Rockford Chamber of Commerce, Thursday, February 28, 1952.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

I have been assigned the role of representing at this memorable occasion all the Americans of Italian extraction, including each of the Italian-American organizations of our city. In this capacity I feel highly honored, and it also gives me no small degree of personal pleasure and satisfaction.

A number of years ago a young man came to my office. In his quiet unassuming way, he spoke to me of his ambitions and dreams. As I listened, I quickly realized that this young man, even in his youth, already had both feet firmly planted on the ground. He knew what he wanted to do, and he had the determination, the strength of character to do it. He was seeking the door of opportunity and a key to open it so that the seed of his youthful dreams could have the chance to grow to full realization.

This evening, after many years of absence, he is back with us again, though only for a fleeting moment. We Americans of Italian extraction feel deeply honored, humbly proud of the fact that we can point to him and say he is one of us.

We fully realize that only in this good land of ours could he have found the door of opportunity open to him. Of this we are forever mindful and grateful. But, we are no less aware of the fact that having been given the opportunity, he made the most of it, and above all, that he serves his country well.

What those years of absence have meant only he can know. We can merely surmise and guess. The amount of tedious study, the grueling hours of work, the ever constant flirtation with death itself, are things that we can't possibly fathom. However, there is one thing which we do know, and that, ladies and gentlemen, is the fact that this evening he is with us as an example of the typical American boy who has made good. He stands before us tonight, exemplifying the growth of all the dreams and ideals which should burn in the hearts of millions of other American boys. Ideals born from, and nursed by, the freedoms and liberties of our true American way of life.

Yet today, ladies and gentlemen, as you must realize, these same ideals are being endangered. For the world is sick. There is a cancer growing, and that cancer is communism. Cancer starts very insidiously without any symptoms. As it grows symptoms appear, but these are so vague that only if one is trained to look for them does he realize their importance. Cancer starts in one organ and slowly destroys it, and then attacks other organs until the whole individual collapses and dies. Medical science believes that cancer starts because the individual as a whole is not up to par.

Communism began in Russia, then spread to its neighboring countries, and is about to envelop all of Europe and Asia. A few of its deadly cells have found good growing soil in this country, good growing soil because we, as a Nation, are sick at heart. We have become smug from too much material wealth. The quest, the struggle for more dollars, more and bigger automobiles, radios, houses and so forth, has become so demanding and produced such a degree of selfishness and greediness that we lost the knack for good straight thinking. We lack the urge to question, to learn, to formulate our own opinions. We are confused, undecided; we are groping in the dark; for the light that shone so brightly during the American Revolution has been dimmed until it is almost out.

In this darkness unscrupulous men have infiltrated our Government. Corruption is rampant. The pattern set by these men has affected every walk of life, so that degeneration of character is evident everywhere. The yearning for easy money, the unwillingness to shoulder responsibility, and above all, the lassitude, the don't-care attitude all point to a slowly but surely decaying nation. The fire of true American idealism seems all but spent.

To make you more aware of this cancer—this communism which is threatening the world—I should like to recall to your minds those concepts which are the foundation of our free government. The phrases—freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of worship—have been so accepted that they fail to stimulate any further thinking. However, there is something more basic, something that was well understood, leading the fathers of this country to formulate such a government. These basic principles are quite simple, yet any deviation from them carries the seed of collapse and death to our freedoms.

The difference between communism and our free government is that our Government is based on the integrity of the individual man. That each individual has a soul, a God-given soul. This is the equality of each of us, and with this, the God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. In more simple terms, it boils down to the principle that the individual, being God-created, is supreme and above any man-formulated laws or government. Certainly, you understand that man came first, and that governments were evolved through the action of men. Our Government is unique in this respect, for there is no other government in the world which is based upon such fundamental principles.

Communism, or its first cousin socialism, is entirely opposed to these premises, because, first, they exclude God as the most vital force; they subjugate man to government; that is, government is supreme. The rights and freedoms of the individual are nonexistent.

William Penn stated "those people who are not governed by God will be ruled by tyrants."

Surely you remember the concentration camps; the human incinerators; the long, wide, deep trenches with human bodies covered with lime; the mass movements of peoples from fertile soils to the snow and ice of Siberia; the liquidation of hundreds of thousands of human beings. These are the horrible facts that reaffirm the wisdom of William Penn. Yet we are slowly, unconsciously, drifting toward the same fate. The symptoms may still be vague but they are very definite and real. We are developing a class consciousness which is totally un-American. The accent is on minority groups, on labor or capital, on producers or consumers, on the little fellows or the big fellows, on the haves and have-nots. These differences which heretofore were always resolved successfully and without too much fuss, now are inflamed into wide chasms by selfish men.

A government which has deviated from the sound principles of Americanism, which at every opportunity extends its arm of supremacy, enacts more laws, restrictions, regulations, controls, and subsidies, appoints boards to dictate to labor and capital, to the producer and consumer, is a far cry from that true Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, who said "that government is best which governs the least."

Do not allow the spirits of those men whose thinking and philosophy was the very foundation of our freedoms to become merely a memory. Do not allow their principles to be discarded and forgotten. Principles that place you as an individual on a pedestal where God meant you to be. Beware of those men who would shackle you to an all-powerful state. They will accomplish their ends insidiously and slowly, without your realizing it. You will be sold a bill of goods which, on the surface, may seem enticing and even necessary; but, again, beware, for its underlying purpose is, nevertheless, evil and vicious.

The man who believes that his lot will be improved by partial or absolute central control is laboring under a misapprehension. Let him look across the ocean to the fate of those whose governments have usurped the power that should rest with the people. Not only did they lose every vestige of personal freedom, but their economic miseries have not decreased, but have instead multiplied.

I do not choose to be specific and bring to your attention instances of governmental transgressions against principles before mentioned. That would be politics, and I am not a politician. However, I should like to leave the key that may open your avenue of thinking, that should help you formulate your own opinions. Above all, as individuals or groups, recall to your consciousness, at frequent intervals, your early religious teachings—that God is supreme, that you have a soul which makes you all equal, that you have certain God-given rights to life, freedom, and pursuit of happiness, that these rights are so important to you that you are willing to sacrifice every material advantage to preserve them, knowing that these rights once lost, you and your children will be forever vassals of a supreme state. You will be at the mercy of many little Caesars, Hitlers, Mussolinis, and Stalins, men hungry for power and unscrupulous in their designs who do not believe in the integrity and dignity of the individual and, hence, would have no qualms or hesitations to erase you.

Remember, then, that you have a responsibility to those men who are today bleeding and dying in Korea that our freedoms may live. You have a responsibility to the many Fred Ascanis who, flying through the stratosphere, strive so hard to make this country strong so that your children may still know the true meaning of American opportunities.

That responsibility is the duty to an everlasting vigilance, to the awakening and realization of the dangers which are constantly undermining our American freedoms.

To you, Fred, we extend our thanks for having set an example so that others may profit. You chose a life of service instead of material wealth. From this and from your ever-constant efforts the Nation has profited. You are upholding the dignity of man with the strength that comes from adherence to those lofty ideals which you have always cherished. May your life continue to be a source of inspiration to young and old America.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the minority has no further requests for time on this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6336) to promote the national defense by authorizing construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6336, with Mr. YATES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this measure authorizes the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in the amount of $19,700,000. The construction under this bill will be carried on at two of the major NACA installations, Langley Aeronautical Laboratory at Hampton, Va., and the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio. At the Langley Laboratory $3,955,000 will be spent on the conversion of the 19-foot pressure tunnel for dynamic model testing and $4,153,000 for a high-temperature structural research laboratory. At the Lewis Laboratory, we will spend $1,642,000 for a high-pressure air supply and distribution system, and $4,850,000 for the expansion of air facilities for full-scale jet-engine research.

I would like to show as briefly as possible the technical sides of what these facilities are all about. As the speed of aircraft and operation have increased, the structural problems have become more difficult.

Under conditions of normal flight, there is a certain distribution of pressure which support the weight of an airplane. Airplanes must be strong enough to withstand these loads. There are definite changes in the character of the distribution when you go to a higher speed airplane. We have had very active programs to find out and solve these problems. The particular problem now with us is jet aircraft—going to higher altitudes and higher speeds. The structure types are changing very considerably. One of the big design problems now is to so arrange the stiffness of the structure and the disposition of the masses in order that this thing we have heard so little about, called flutter, can be solved and will not occur in the operation of the plane. When it does occur, it is catastrophic and the plane is usually destroyed. We are now approaching in our research and activity on many designs, a situation in which the heating of the structure is a very serious matter. We have all observed meteorites which have such a terrific speed, move through the air so fast the skin gets so hot that the structural properties usually burn up. These are the problems we are bringing before you today in this measure.

Now we have pretty good facilities for wind tunnels, but our facilities for studying areodynamic heating problems are limited and on a very small scale. It will become more serious in our missile program. The committee was shown confidential charts that proved that this facility is necessary. We have already reached the speed of sound and now moving into a field far beyond that and thermal problems particularly in the missile field will require this facility. This will permit us to carry out full size wing structure research and this facility is estimated to cost $4,000,000, which the authorization carries in this measure.

The other facility is a modification of the 19-foot pressure tunnel being one which will enable us to do the flutter testing on substantial size models. The other two deal with engine facilities at the Lewis Laboratory. Charts were also shown to the committee in regard to the problems which we face with the thrust of jet engines being so rapidly increasing, and also the process of design.

The measure carries the approval of the Budget Bureau, and also it has been approved by the Defense Department, and it has been approved by the Research and Development Board as being necessary.

The committee today feels that these programs will round out what we believe to be pretty fair research tools for the NACA.

Today we are operating in conjunction with the Air Force, the one in Tennessee which we authorized. Those supersonic

tunnels will be completed sometime this year. Personally, I think we started this rather late. I wish I could say that we had done some of this research back in the thirties, so that we would not be faced with the problems we read about in the newspapers today. We are going to be faced with problems of temperature from now on more and more.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time on this measure to tell the House about some previous work on this subject done by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], the member of the Rules Committee who handled the resolution on this measure.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that on the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] is somewhat of an authority in his own right. I recall when he was a Senator and a member of the Senate War Investigating Committee, I think back in 1945 or 1946, he headed a subcommittee which conducted a very thorough investigation into the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and wrote a report on that subject which is among the documents and files of the Senate.

The reason I happen to know that is because at that time I was Chief Counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, then better known as the Mead committee; I know that that committee was very much interested in this matter of basic research in aeronautics. The committee approached its task in full sympathy with the efforts of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The committee sought to encourage NACA to do even more than it was doing in basic research in aeronautics.

The Mead committee also in its fifth annual report, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] being a member of the committee at the time, took the position that in our peacetime national defense one of the phases which ought to be given the greatest emphasis was research and development in weapons.

I am somewhat disturbed to read the reports appearing in the papers to the effect that we, apparently, at least from the amount of information that can be made public on it, are not taking the lead we ought to take if we are to maintain a strong national defense. Very disturbing reports about the characteristics of the Russian fighter planes in Korea compared with the characteristics of our own make one wonder whether that leadership in scientific development and research which we hoped to have for our national defense has been and is being maintained.

I am in full accord with the purposes of this measure in strengthening the hand of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, in facilitating the conduct of research in aircraft and aerodynamics without which we shall not be in a position to lead our potenial enemies in this very vital field of national defense.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask someone a question, I presume my colleague from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. On page 2 of the bill, two items are carried which total $19,700,000; then in section 2 there is the statement: "That any of the approximate costs may be increased 10 percent"—but still they cannot go beyond the limit of $19,700,000. I do not understand it. Some of our other committees would like to know how to increase costs and still keep within the authorized total.

Mr. DURHAM. It means that in these technical developments they could increase any of them 10 percent but still may not go beyond the total limit authorized.

Mr. PHILLIPS. It means, then, that if they increased it one place they would have to take it off somewhere else.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion and the comments of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]. Yesterday I read a very interesting article in reference to the MIG–15s of the Russians as compared with the F–86s, the Saber jet, of the Americans. Up to the present moment our fighters are in command of the air and are clearly superior to the Russians. We must remember, however, that when you compare airplanes there are many different characteristics to be considered. It is difficult to make general comparisons. One plane may fly faster, one may dive faster, one may have better visibility, and so on. But when you consider the aerial battles we have had in high altitudes, 30,000 feet and up, our performance in combat has been clearly superior.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Are we superior in combat because of the planes or because of our pilots?

Mr. JOHNSON. That is another consideration, too. We have skillful pilots, so does the other side, but I think our planes are superior, and in the category of pilots I think we are also superior. Perhaps in some other categories we are not superior, but taking a broad view of the comparison we are clearly superior in combat air fighting in the Korean war in supersonic flight.

The thing I want to impress upon the Members is that every time a plane comes off the production line, and there is mass production of it, a younger plane starts at the beginning of the production line which will be better than the one that is presently coming off. It is a continual process of evolution. It may be that we are approaching a speed beyond which no airplane can go in the future. It may be that we are approaching the ultimate. But in making a comparison of these things I think it is well to keep various aspects of the problem in mind.

The purpose of this bill is to permit this research body—the NACA—that has been working since 1916 on aircraft problems and development to conduct some very important experiments on supersonic speed. For this reason in my opinion it would be well to give them the authorization. Over the span of 30 years this group has produced some very remarkable results. It started out in a very small way with a limited number of people who were interested in developing aviation. It has grown into a tremendous organization and has produced very fine results for the United States of America so far as the building of a strong Air Force is concerned.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. I wonder if the gentleman can assure the House, since he is a member of the Armed Services Committee, that the staff of the Armed Services Committee is following our research and development in military weapons, including aircraft, so that we may have some assurance that we are not falling behind our potential enemies in these very vital aspects of national defense?

I realize Members of Congress and the public cannot be told about the progress being made in the development of new weapons because of security reasons. However it seems to me that somewhere in the Congress, and probably the appropriate place is in the gentleman's committee or the staff of that committee, there be some assurance given to the American people and to Members of Congress that proper progress is being made in maintaining our position in the development of new weapons relative to that of our enemies or our potential enemies?

Mr. JOHNSON. I only have the word of men who testified before our committee, and I was not a member of the subcommittee that held hearings on this bill; but I am firmly of the opinion that those who are developing policy in the Air Force have listened to the NACA and to every scientific group that is working on the problem. They have the responsibility of making us secure in the air. I think they take it very seriously and are following the guidance of scientists and development people who are going to bring forth the results that we hope for. I will be glad to have the gentleman from North Carolina comment on that because he held the hearings.

Mr. DURHAM. I realize the gentleman is concerned about this matter. If any Member could visit Langley Field or the laboratory or any of these installations which he can at any time and see actually what they are doing he would be amazed.

I was at Peenemunde when we took over the base right after the end of the last World War. I was so amazed at the development and the research. The gentleman knows what we gained from taking over those plants. We not only got some of the finest equipment in the world, but we got some designs that have been used since. We will just have to admit that the Germans have done an excellent, oustanding job on basic and fundamental research in the field of high temperatures, high speeds, velocity, and other things after 20 years or more.

They took it just in their calm way. I read the reports that the getnleman speaks about and what the Congress learned at that time. Still we did not put the right impetus upon this program. I feel like now we have got a good program, and I hope this Congress will continue to support what I believe to be the heart in the development of an air force that cannot be accused of being behind anybody, at any time, at any place in the world.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] first, whether there is any restriction upon information furnished to his committee on the basis of classification, whether it is secret or top secret, or does his committee have access to such top secret information?

Mr. DURHAM. It is all confidential secret information, highly classified. Some of it, I will say to the gentleman, is available to any Member of the Congress who cares to come to the committee and ask for it. The hearings are quite extensive but we will be glad to go into and explain to any Member of the House in detail what our information is.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman how much of an investigative staff he has to help him in following this particular matter of research and development with respect to aircraft?

Mr. DURHAM. Well, I would say to the gentleman that we have quite a staff over there that keeps up to date on these things all the time.

Mr. MEADER. I am speaking of the committee's own staff.

Mr. DURHAM. Well, as a subcommittee we have the authority to delegate anybody we care to investigate anything that happens at any time that we want to visit there. Last year I think there were two or three delegations that went down to Langley Field to visit this place on an inspection trip. We do that frequently two or three times a year.

Mr. MEADER. The gentleman, I understand, just draws upon the investigative staff of the full committee for making any inquiries along this line that are made.

Mr. DURHAM. I think what the gentleman is striking at, these things are of such highly technical nature that it does take a man of some background, acquainted with physics, to understand some of the things explained to us. We have no research man connected with the committee. I think each committee that deals with these things should have. Now, on the Atomic Energy Commission we have specialists in this field, and I think it is well to have them in the other committees where it is necessary.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is the question whether or not we have a way of checking on the data given us by the Armed Forces representatives?

Mr. MEADER. My question proceeds from a belief that congressional committees need staffs to continue to follow these important developments in our national affairs, and specifically on a matter which is shut off from general public knowledge, such as this matter of technical excellence in aircraft. We ought to have people, qualified investigators, under the direction of a congressional committee, who are following and pursuing these matters, who can assure the other Members of the House who cannot have access to this classified information that we are properly developing our national defense. I was trying to find out, if I could, how many people the Armed Services Committee has on its staff, what their qualifications are, and how diligently they are following this particular question.

Mr. JOHNSON. I will answer it this way: Up to now we simply have to take the word of the witnesses from the Air Force on the problem. We have no scientific men to check and weigh their conclusions in the matter, or their presentation. In the Eightieth Congress I was a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Scientific Research and Development, and we had no expert to advise us as to the reliability of the testimony of expert witnesses in the various fields that we pursued. In fact, I sort of agree with the subcommittee chairman that we should have, perhaps, a scientific man who could help us appraise the scientific opinions and conclusions that these witnesses give to us. But when it boils down to everything, we simply have to rely on the integrity and intelligence of the statement the Air Force people submit to us.

Mr. MEADER. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that what the gentleman describes is precisely what I think is inadequate investigation on the part of Congress. We sit here frequently and are forced to take ex parte representations by people in the executive branch of the Government, with no means of checking those statements to see whether they are reliable. If we simply passively receive information presented to us by the Air Force, I believe we are not discharging our responsibilities to the American people to go into these questions and to study them and come up with the independent judgment of the Congress. I do not believe Congressmen by themselves, with the limitations on their time, can possibly go into these questions without the help of an investigative staff. I believe our committees must have able and qualified staffs, loyal to the Congress itself, to penetrate into these questions and assure the committee and the Congress and the American public that the powers we lodge in the executive agencies are being handled in the public interest.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I believe if the gentleman knew Dr. Dryden and Dr. Hunsaker, who are top scientists, as well as the committee does he would be convinced that these people are doing a very fine job. They have worked for a longer time and worked harder on matters such as these than any other class of people in the country today. Basic, fundamental research is something you cannot go into and change every day and pull out as you can an assembly line.

The thing that disturbed me last week when we cut 800 employees from this organization was the fact that practically all of these people are not just ordinary types of minds. They have to be a little beyond the average individual in order to go into high physics, high thermal problems, high velocity, and all of those things that come into this field of operation. Of course, we have machines that do a large part of the work, but it takes the human brain to direct it, and the man has to have a little better than the average brain. You do not find in this country a large number of people who are qualified 100 percent in aerodynamics. They just do not exist, because it is not a line of work where you can just pick up somebody and say, "You find out what this man has in his brain." The only thing we can do is what we do do. I can assure the gentleman that we are providing the men to do a good job.

This is not facetious, but I was talking to one of the top scientists of the world a few days ago and along with him was one of the large manufacturers of the country. He said, "You people just keep on fiddling and fiddling and fiddling and do not fill up the warehouses." It does sometimes seem that they procrastinate and do not get the job done as quickly as possible, but these things do not come off the assembly line like chewing gum and other things. They have to be worked on.

Anytime the gentleman cares to go with the committee to one of these plants, I can assure him we will take him and do the best we can to explain to him in detail that this agency is doing an outstanding job for the country.

Mr. MEADER. May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I am acquainted with Dr. Hunsaker and some of the other members of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. My acquaintance with them dates back to the time I referred to, when the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL] conducted an investigation of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. Let me say to the gentleman, we did not have the scientists that he speaks of as being the experts in this field as members of the staff of the committee. Notwithstanding that the staff that we did have was a good staff, I am not speaking of myself because the investigation was handled by other attorneys. Mr. Andrew G. Haley was one. Mr. Francis D. Flanagan, my executive assistant, also worked on the hearings and the preparation of the report. Mr. Flanagan is now the very able counsel to the Hoey committee of the Senate I merely consulted on the matter. We were able to get at the facts even though we were not scientists. In some particulars we did not agree with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, which the gentleman well knows, if he read the report and the hearings to which I refer.

Now, I am interested in whether or not that type of staff, not necessary engineers or designers of aircraft, but people who have at least a modicum of intelligence and loyalty to the Congress, are studying this subject so that the Congress is advised by something more than by merely passively receiving the representations which may be made by an executive agency. I believe it is important that the Congress should follow these matters actively and be informed.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman on that.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK].

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question. There can be no doubt that research is tremendously important and that it is difficult to overemphasize the importance of it. At Wright Field, near my home, in Dayton, Ohio, a great deal of research has been carried on for many years. The question I have is this: Last week in the 3 days we gave to the consideration of the appropriation bill, we spent a great deal of time on amendments, even those which cut out $100,000. Here we are asking for another appropriation of almost $20,000,000 or $19,700,000. I am wondering, and my question is, Is there not someplace in the Defense Budget where this $20,000,000 can be taken out so that it will be unnecessary to appropriate another $20,000,000?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SITTLER], and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ITALY AND THE UNITED STATES: CULTURAL ALLIES

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Chairman, it was with a feeling of warmth and satisfaction that I read an Associated Press dispatch from Ravenna, Italy, in the March 19, 1952, issue of the Washington (D. C.) Star.

This is the item I read:

Cultural leaders of the world will pay tribute here—

In Ravenna—

to the memory of Dante Alighieri at the forty-seventh International Congress of the Dante Society.

The congress will be held there September 1–15, for the second time in this century. Dante died September 13, 1321, and is buried here.

The Italian delegation will be headed by Vittorio Emanuele Orlando, president of the Italian Dante Alighieri Society and sole survivor of the Big Four of Versailles. The United States will send a delegation.

We must not lose the real implication of this event, Mr. Chairman. Dante, the exile, was the literary flower of the period when Western culture was reborn. He stirred a cynical world with his matchless poetic tributes to Beatrice. He spurred creative artists in all fields with his "Divine Comedy."

He died in 1321—631 years ago. When he died, Columbus had not discovered America. When he died, our Constitution was still more than 450 years in the future. Since he died, our Republic has twice faced his countrymen on the battlefield. Our language is not his language: Our years are not his years.

Yet, the burning beauty of his words has transcended time and crossed the barrier of speech. We are moved by the classic cadence of his deathless poetry.

Mr. Chairman, in these days of confusion, when we of the United States are seeking for a common ground of understanding between nations, we must not, we dare not, neglect the powerful significance of cultural bonds. If such bonds are strong enough to endure through centuries, if such bonds are strong enough to surmount our divergent tongues, then these bonds are also strong enough to hold our peoples together—in spite of the centrifugal pull of today's confusion.

I hail the coming meeting of the Forty-seventh International Congress in Ravenna, Italy, next September as a guidepost, a preliminary pattern, of the promise of the very real possibility of future international understanding.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to briefly answer the question propounded by the gentleman from Ohio. This is only an authorization bill and does not involve the expenditure of any cash at the present time. Later on the matter will be presented to the Appropriations Committee and we will then have our opportunity to pass on it more in detail.

Mr. DURHAM. The appropriation passed last week had some funds for starting all of these. It is already appropriated.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I take this additional time because I now have before me the report to which I referred earlier, namely, the report of the investigation of the national-defense program, being Senate Report No. 110, part 6 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session.

This additional report is entitled "Aircraft—Production, Development, and Research." It was filed with the Senate by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MITCHELL], who at that time was a Senator and a member of the Senate War Investigating Committee.

When we go back into the House I intend to ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include as a part of my remarks the findings and conclusions of that committee bearing upon the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and its discharge of its functions.

The findings and conclusions of the Senate War Investigating Committee in its report on NACA were as follows:

AIRCRAFT (PRODUCTION, DEVELOPMENT, AND RESEARCH)

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Actual and projected improvements in aircraft and missiles threaten to dissipate our historic natural defenses. We must, as a matter of vital national defense, devote sufficient attention and effort to scientific research and development in aviation and adequate aircraft productive capacity.

2. We may be justly proud of our war record of mass production of aircraft. The 300,000 airplanes produced exceeded by a wide margin the most optimistic expectations.

3. Notwithstanding the quite miraculous achievement of the aircraft industry, there were costly errors and unnecessary wastes. The greatest handicaps to the development of our aerial arm in World War II were the almost complete lack of realistic preplanning by the responsible Government officials and the delay of the industry to avail itself of outside mass production facilities by subcontracting and licensing. The services also failed to investigate and clarify many of the problems of mass production.

4. Since hostilities ended, the wartime aircraft industry has made a remarkable adjustment to the severe reduction in aircraft production and has demonstrated ingenuity in converting to peacetime aircraft production and in switching to other civilian products. However, it must be borne in mind that the airplane industry has been deflated to the approximate size it was in December 1940. It would take 2 years to rebuild the industry to its productive capacity of September 1945.

5. We have not yet developed a clear and farsighted national policy in aircraft research and development. Furthermore, we have not set a policy for the level of production of military-type aircraft and the aviation productive capacity to be maintained in stand-by condition. In the opinion of the committee, this policy should have been established prior to the drastic cuts and termination of contracts on VJ-day. Then, the problems of the aircraft industry in adjusting itself and in reconversion would have been easier. Moreover, the peacetime character of the industry could have been evolved more rapidly and at less cost. Here again is an instance of too little planning done too late.

6. Military procurement during peacetime should allow for the purchase of a sufficient quantity of models to conduct experimental and service tests expeditiously and to afford manufacturers an opportunity to work out problems of production engineering, planning, and tool design.

7. Our present facilities for aeronautical research and development are indaequate. The Government should encourage, by financial assistance and otherwise, the establishment of a body of qualified research and technical personnel and the acquisition of adequate scientific research and testing equipment so as to insure that the United States will maintain a position in the science of aviation second to none.

8. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics has made many valuable contributions to aviation during the past 30 years. However, in the last decade that agency, as well as the Armed Forces has failed to exercise vigorous leadership in the field of aeronautical research and development. Furthermore, they have been slow in initiating and conducting research and development in such important phases of aviation as jet propulsion and guided missiles.

9. The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics should be modified and expanded, in the light of our war experience. Represented in its policy-making body should be all of the principal elements of our economy interested in furthering aviation science, especially groups which give promise of assuring more aggressive leadership in scientific research and development. The committee is of the opinion that a greater voice in the affairs and policies of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics should be given to representatives of the various branches of the aircraft manufacturing industry.

10. We must establish clear lines of responsibility, coordination, and relationships between the armed services and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and other governmental agencies and private industry concerned with air development.

As Members of the House will note who read these findings and conclusions, the Senate War Investigating Committee did not in every particular agree with the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, yet its report was sympathetic, realizing the important nature of the work of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. In fact our committee encouraged the NACA to take

more vigorous leadership in the field of scientific research and development.

I mention the work of the Senate War Investigating Committee in this field because I believe that gives support to the position I have tried to urge during the debate this afternoon, namely, that the committees of the Congress ought, through able and loyal staffs, to continue to watch the discharge of functions which we entrust to executive agencies. I urge now that the Armed Services Committee of the House and the subcommittee dealing with this particular agency acquire sufficient staff to enable it to follow more closely the manner in which NACA is performing its functions.

Mr. MITCHELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. MITCHELL. I just want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his kind remarks about me and for calling the attention of the House to the report on NACA filed by the Senate War Investigating Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount of not to exceed $19,700,000 for construction and equipment pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1 of Public Law 672, approved August 8, 1950, as follows:

Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Hampton, Va.: $13,108,000.

Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: $6,592,000.

SEC. 2. Any of the approximate costs enumerated in section 1 of this act may, in the discretion of the Director of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, be varied upward 10 percent and, with the concurrence of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, by such further amounts as may be necessary to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work so enumerated shall not exceed the total appropriation authorized.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and on page 2, lines 1, 2, 3, and 4, and insert "That pursuant to subsection (b) of section 1 of Public Law 672, approved August 8, 1950, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is authorized to undertake additional construction, and to purchase and install additional equipment at the following locations:

"Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Hampton, Va.: Conversion of pressure tunnel and construction of high-temperature structural research laboratory, $13,108,000.

"Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio: High-pressure air supply and distribution system and expansion of air facilities for jet engine research, $6,592,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 23, strike out "the total appropriation authorized" and insert "$19,700,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 1, insert:

"SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. YATES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6336) to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, pursuant to House Resolution 576, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNISTS IN INDUSTRY

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most significant developments in the expanding fight against communism in industry was the action taken this week by Howard Hughes, head of the RKO studios in Hollywood, in going into court to seek support for his firing of Paul Jarrico. Paul Jarrico had been identified by six witnesses before the House Committee on Un-American Activities as a one-time member of the Communist Party. There is little question that those who support the Communist Party by membership or in Communist front organizations owe a portion of their income or their salary to the Communist Party. Mr. Hughes has very rightfully decided, in my opinion, that no portion of the funds of RKO is to be channeled off into the coffers of the Communist Party.

The Hollywood Citizen-News in its editorial states:

PRAISE FOR HUGHES

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON in Washington yesterday praised RKO's court action to relieve it from responsibility to Paul Jarrico because of his refusal to answer the House Un-American Activities Committee's question of whether he had been a member of the Communist Party.

JACKSON, a Member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, referred to the action as a healthy thing and said that six one-time members of the Communist Party had identified Jarrico as having been a party member.

Motion picture producers know that the industry's public relations are damaged when its workers refuse to answer the question of Communist Party membership on the grounds they might incriminate themselves. Producers know this notwithstanding the fact that two juries have determined that such refusals do no damage to the industry.

Though it might be much less costly to settle the claims of motion picture people who are discharged because they refuse to answer on the grounds of self-incrimination, Howard Hughes has determined that it is for the best interests of his company, the industry and the country to fight the issue out in the courts, regardless of the costs.

"As long as I am an officer or director of RWO Pictures Corp.," said Hughes, in commenting on the suit, "this company will never temporize, conciliate with, or yield to Paul Jarrico or anyone guilty of similar conduct.

"A great deal of pressure has been brought to bear upon me to pay off and settle Jarrico's demands out of court.

"It would be much simpler, easier, and probably cheaper to pay what Jarrico demands than to resist. And at first, it seemed the sensible decision to pay off and forget this matter, just get it over with and proceed to more productive duties.

"And maybe it is the sensible thing to do.

"The RKO executives, attorneys and I have our hands full to try and run a successful company operation in these times, and we do not have the man-hours for the endless depositions, harassment, legal study, conferences and preparation which are necessary to fight a lawsuit.

"However, for several days now, I have been giving this matter my most careful and conscientious thought.

"I have reached a decision and it is final and irrevocable, regardless of what it leads me to."

That statement has brought many cheers, not only from friends of the motion picture industry who want its good Americanism established in the public mind at the highest possible level, but from citizens everywhere who believe that the fight for the protection of this country's liberties is vital enough to call for the best that lies within any man or group of men.

Let's find out for all time whether or not the motion picture industry must be at the mercy of folks who refuse to assist Government investigators by telling whether or not they are or have been members of the Communist Party.

THE POLISH EMBASSY

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to remind the Congress today of the order issued last Friday by Secretary

of State Dean Acheson banning all Polish Embassy publications and inflammatory press releases by their Embassy headquarters here in Washington.

This action deprives the Kremlin of its most effective communistic propaganda outpost in the United States. In issuing this ban, the Secretary condemned the Embassy's press release denouncing the purposes of the Congressional Special Committee Investigating the Katyn Massacre.

On March 11, when the Congress was considering House Resolution 593, I called the attention of the House to the inflammatory and insulting propaganda release critizing the Congress of the United States by the Polish Embassy. On page 2105 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date I stated that—

> The Katyn committee was going to ask the State Department to demand an apology from the Polish Ambassador to the Congress of the United States for the insults contained in the above-mentioned press release.

On behalf of the members of the Select Committee to Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre, I wish to thank Secretary Acheson for his prompt action against the Polish Embassy for violating the rules of propriety and friendly diplomatic relations by representatives of foreign governments stationed at our national capital.

The following is an editorial from yesterday's New York Times of March 23, 1952, commending Secretary Acheson for his prompt action:

REPERCUSSIONS OF KATYN

Secretary of State Dean Acheson has acted very properly in banning virtually all Polish Embassy publications here in retaliation for the Embassy's offensive press release of last March 3 accusing this country of using "poisoned weapons inherited from Goebbels." As Mr. Acheson rightly put it, this and other statements in the release "exceeded the limits of propriety" for press offices of diplomatic missions in foreign countries.

This new high in Communist Poland's abusiveness here was prompted by the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre of Polish officers and soldiers now being conducted by the Madden committee of the House of Representatives. That most grisly incident of World War II has long been the subject of debate. The Soviet Union and its satellites assert that the Germans perpetrated this crime; assorted other groups charge that it was committed by Soviet troops against Polish prisoners they captured during the infamous Hitler-Stalin partition of Poland in September 1939. The Madden committee hearings held so far have uncovered serious evidence pointing to Soviet culpability, but Moscow has restricted its formal rebuttal to republication of the unbiased report prepared by a Soviet commission during the last war.

The issue of culpability is still unsettled and further hearings are to be held, but if one is to judge by the fury of Soviet and satellite reaction to these hearings this is a matter on which the Communists are most uneasy. The amount of newspaper space and radio time devoted to denunciation of the charge by Communist organs is enormously greater than the attention the hearings have received in this country. It may be that the Kremlin has a bad conscience and doth protest too much. In any case it would not have launched such a giant counteroffensive if it did not fear that many within the Soviet orbit blame Stalin rather than Hitler for the crime. Whatever the truth about the matter, the world's conscience cannot rest easy until the full story is revealed. The more the Soviet Union obstructs the uncovering of the truth the more will suspicions grow that it fears what may be learned.

SHORTAGES IN POST EXCHANGES IN KOREA—CAN THIS BE TRUE?

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and include my remarks at this point in the RECORD and request an investigation by the Hébert subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee to ascertain the facts in what appears to be an outrageous abuse of American justice to our boys in Korea by the military authorities there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes you wonder about the state of the world, about just what does go on in Korea, and how we got into the whole confused mess. If there is concern in our minds back here, think of what must be going on in the noggins of the lads who are doing the fighting. This letter is from Robert A. Neuleib, formerly from Owatonna, who was inducted in September of 1950. Since then he has become a supply sergeant for a rifle company and right now is on the front line in Korea. He writes:

> It's part of my duty to determine the needs of this company and requisition items through normal supply channels. Many things are hard to get, other things we just never get. Three days ago three men and I took a jeep and trailer into the Seoul area, 110 miles away, to try to get some necessities and some luxuries for the men of our company through the Seoul post exchange. The PX was almost as bare as Mother Hubbard's cupboard, but the things we saw in Seoul gave us the shock of our supply careers. The very things we have been hunting for were being sold on the black market in huge quantities in Seoul. And the business wasn't being carried on in the back streets in a hush-hush fashion. Everything was out in the open smack under the noses of both military and civilian authorities.
>
> Binoculars which our ordnance supply catalogs list for $89 were being peddled for $15. Flashlights, Coleman gasoline lanterns, and many types of clothing were being sold by civilians. Expensive, American-made wrist watches, literally hundreds of them, were being sold for native currency or military script. Radios were sold the same way. Packaged GI clothing such as combat boots, woolen ODs, socks, underwear were being sold right across makeshift counters within the shadows of the MP jeeps themselves. Even the shops were covered with GI shelter halves and rubberized ponchos. Why is it that the men in my company as well as so many front-line troops should suffer while their officers and our allies seemingly completely overlook these criminal practices. Nothing is done to curb these sales, nothing is done to try to stop them, nothing is done to try to discover the source of these illegal supplies. Is this sort of thing helping to spread democracy? Is this helping the fighting man on the firing line in his efforts to preserve our way of life? I'm writing you, Cedric, in hopes that you may pass this information on to interested parties. This is no chronic beef from a serviceman. We're just fed up with wanton criminal negligence on the part of our civil and military authorities and we think something should be done.

PROTECTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter from the Secretary of Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the controversy on the floor several days ago, in regard to the attitude of the Department of Commerce toward small business and to agencies calculated to assist the same, I requested of the Department of Commerce a detailed statement on the subject. I have received a reply from the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, and because of the very informative nature of the same, I am asking that the letter may be printed in the RECORD at this point:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, March 19, 1952.

The Honorable ROBERT CROSSER,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I appreciate very much your letter of March 15, 1952. I had learned of the debate to which you refer, but have made no comment upon it. I am glad to comply with your request and to have this opportunity to outline for you and other interested Members of Congress the facts with reference to the relationship of the Department of Commerce to the Small Defense Plants Administration and its functions, my attitude with respect to special emergency agencies, and in general the relationship of this Department to small business.

I have on numerous occasions stated my opinion that the creation of temporary agencies (which have a way of becoming permanent) is the source of much unnecessary expenditure of Government funds, and that a careful review before they are created would save large amounts of the taxpayers' money. It is probably those remarks which furnished the basis for some inaccurate statements made in the course of the congressional debate to which you refer.

The statement that I opposed the creation of the National Production Authority is, of course, wholly untrue and silly. I myself created NPA within my own Department, and I am proud of its accomplishments. With reference specifically to the SDPA, I felt and still feel that it furnishes a good example of a place where savings might have been made. The Congress did not agree with me, however, and completely contrary to statements about my lack of cooperation, I began immediately upon its creation to assist the new agency in its work for small business in connection with procurement.

As soon as the Administrator was appointed I offered him the services of nine employees of the small-business office of the Department in NPA, which he accepted. At his request I also sent him four Commerce employees to assist him in handling personnel problems, and one employee who has been handling his publicity. All of these employees, who have been for several months working for SDPA, have been (until 9 o'clock on Monday of this week) paid by the Department of Commerce.

SDPA collaborated with the Bureau of the Budget in the development of a Presidential directive for the transfer of personnel, functions, records, furniture, and money from the Department of Commerce to the SDPA. When this directive was presented to me by the Director of the Budget, I approved it the same day without requesting any changes

whatsoever. The Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Department stated on several occasions within the last few weeks our readiness to make the transfers involved in this directive. The order to put these transfers into effect came from the Bureau of the Budget last Friday; it was carried out completely and in every detail, including the transfer of a portion of the funds originally appropriated to the Department of Commerce, on Monday morning at 9 o'clock. The statements and inferences that I was trying as a matter of empire building to keep within my Department the activity to be carried on by the SDPA is stupidly baseless. With all of the varied and great responsibility resting upon me as Secretary of Commerce, I am not afraid that the importance of the Department will be impaired by the transfer which has been made.

It should be clear to anyone who is interested in the facts that we have conscientiously undertaken to comply with the wishes of the Congress. We shall continue to do so. The responsibility for getting contracts for small business from Government agencies is now in the hands of the SDPA and out of the hands of the Department of Commerce.

I should like now to elaborate upon the third matter mentioned by you, the relationship between the Department of Commerce and small business. Contrary to the belief of some, including some Members of Congress, the role of the Department of Commerce in connection with small business is not by any means confined to obtaining contracts for manufacturers. The transfer of functions which I have above referred to still leaves in the Department the responsibility for services to the millions of small businesses engaged in other lines than manufacturing. The number of business units in the country for several years now has been approximately 4,000,000. Of that number slightly more than 300,000 were manufacturers, or less than 8 percent. It is interesting to note that since the war began in Korea there has been a slight increase and not a decrease in the number of manufacturing concerns. Not only is 90 percent of small business not engaged in manufacturing, but many manufacturing concerns themselves have problems aside from the problems of procurement. As a matter of fact, it is a safe estimate that less than one-fifth of the 300,000 manufacturing concerns seek or use the aid of other Government agencies in connection with obtaining contracts from the Defense Department or the General Services Administration. It is therefore clear that the creation of the SDPA and a recognition of the functions which it performs has not disposed of the problems and responsibilities of the Federal Government toward small business in general.

In the light of your request for information, a brief review of some of the things done by the Department of Commerce for small business may be in order.

In 1941 a small business economic study group was established in the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce of this Department.

Upon liquidation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation in January 1946, the Department accepted some of the more useful programs of that organization and on January 16, 1946, established the Office of Small Business. The personnel transferred from SWPC was promptly reduced and the residuum of 220 persons who were transferred within a period of a few months was brought down to 83. This Office of Small Business effectively assisted small firms in the process of converting from war to civilian work, represented small establishments before the Civilian Production Administration in the diversion of materials back to civilian production, and put out the first document ever issued to identify the type of commodities purchased by Federal agencies, listing the names and addresses of each procurement agency responsible for the purchase of each item. This was known as the Federal Procurement Manual. It was issued immediately following the close of World War II, and distributed to Department of Commerce field offices, manufacturers' associations, trade associations, chambers of commerce, and others. The Small Business staff in the Department has serviced this manual constantly since its issuance. Just last week I released a completely revamped edition which represents many months of work by the Small Business staff of the Department of Commerce and splendid cooperation by the many agencies which have procurement authority. This manual was promptly made available to Mr. Taylor, Administrator of the SDPA, for the use of his agency.

Late in 1946 the programs of the Department's Office of Technical Services were coordinated with the activity of the Office of Small Business to provide technical and production guides and methods to small manufacturers returning to their civilian lines.

Immediately following World War II, recognizing that problems of demobilization involved other things than production, the Office of Small Business in the Department initiated for the first time in Government a series of small business management aids to provide the owners of small businesses with the latest and tested management methods. These publications were concise treatments of specific management problems. They were prepared in nearly all cases by businessmen who could vouch for their usefulness and were distributed free to small business through Department of Commerce field offices, more than 600 trade and professional associations, chambers of commerce, and representatives of manufacturing and distributing concerns. Many of these outlets reproduced the aids in quantities of many thousands.

It is interesting to note that in April of 1948, more than 2 years before Korea, the Department's Office of Small Business completed, and the Secretary of Commerce distributed among the appropriate agencies, a plan for participation of small business in industrial mobilization. That forward-looking paper reviewed mistakes of World War II days with respect to the use of small plants and laid out a program for peacetime planning and emergency mobilization of small plant facilities. Many of the proposals made in that document have now been carried out and others have been enacted into law.

In March of 1950 following negotiation by my small business staff, I developed a method and entered into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the General Services Administration for the compilation, publication and distribution, for the first time in Government history, of a daily listing of Government-wide invitations to bid on items to be purchased by the several agencies. This program was broadened in succeeding months to include listings of military contracts awarded and notices of intent to negotiate contracts. This Synopsis of Government Procurement Information is still being published daily through our Chicago area office and is being made available to the manufacturers of the country without charge through our own departmental field offices and more than 6,300 chambers of commerce, banks, employment offices, etc. The benefit of such daily notice of Government contract and subcontract opportunities for the small-business man is obvious.

When the ECA was created in 1948 I arranged immediately for a cooperative effort by that agency and the Department of Commerce to insure a maximum of benefit for American small business under the foreign aid program. That liaison and the activities growing out of that arrangement were the basis for the creation of an Office of Small Business in the ECA.

Over a period of several months in 1949 I toured this country talking with businessmen—for the most part small-business men—in an effort to ascertain how the Department might best serve them, as well as to hear their problems, complaints and suggestions. An earlier opinion of mine was confirmed by these meetings, to the effect that Government action benefiting large segments of small business is more desirable and effective than expensive individual spoon-feeding.

During 1949 my small business staff developed facts and proposals concerning capital and credit needs of small business and the Small Business Advisory Committee to the secretary provided valuable data and counsel. In 1950 I strongly supported publicly and before committees of Congress the Small Business Act of 1950, which would have provided insurance for small business loans made by local banks, and the organization of regional small business investment corporations to provide equity capital for new or expanding small businesses. I met repeatedly with groups of bankers and businessmen in connection with this proposal. While the emergency following the Korean war caused the deferment of this legislation, the activities of the Department of Commerce undeniably stimulated banking groups to give greater attention to small business concerns and their loan needs and thus furnish substantial help to small business generally.

There are many definitions of "small business." Two years ago I suggested that a study be made within the Department of the size characteristics of the manufacturing industry for the purpose of establishing a definition of "small business." This study used the data assembled by the Census Bureau for its census of manufacturers. It was completed in November 1951, and within 2 days of his taking office I submitted to the new Administrator of the SDPA our current definition of small business for each of 452 separate categories of manufacturing. The amendment creating SDPA gave a general definition of small business, but I feel certain that the new agency will benefit from its use of the Commerce definition, which was carefully and painstakingly prepared.

I mentioned earlier the creation of the National Production Authority within the Commerce Department. Advance planning within this Department enabled this organization to get into motion promptly and effectively. Within 90 days after NPA was established, order M–6 was issued by NPA to direct the flow of steel from mills to warehouses so that small manufacturers might get such materials at their accustomed point of supply. During World War II a similar but less effective provision was not made until more than 2 years of war had passed.

Approximately 20,000 individual small firms have requested supplementary assistance from the Department of Commerce in securing adequate though minimum supplies of scarce materials. Most of these cases were handled directly by the Office of Small Business in NPA in the Department. It can be conservatively estimated that more than two-thirds of these cases merited help and obtained it.

The head of the Small Business Office in Commerce participates with top-level staff in the development of the policy and procedures of the National Production Authority, and the small-business staff reviews all orders and regulations to insure fair treatment for small business.

Through cooperation between NPA and DPA a simplified system has been put in operation for the review of all applications for certificates of necessity (accelerated amortization) to segregate those made by small concerns and expedite their handling.

Under an operation such as that performed by NPA, it at once became necessary to establish a large number of advisory committees from industry. The Office of Small

Business immediately set up a system for reviewing the lists of firms nominated by each industry division for membership on industry advisory committees to insure proportionate representation of large, medium, and small firms. The advisory committee service established by NPA has been widely acclaimed by industry, trade associations, and other agencies of government for its balanced representation.

Recognizing that many small firms have neither records nor staff necessary for the filing of applications for controlled materials, regulations were developed by NPA permitting such small users to certify their own purchase orders up to certain limits and providing the same priority position for such self-certified purchase orders as would be accorded an allotment issued by NPA. At present this regulation permits a manufacturer to self-certify for 100 percent of his base period usage of steel, copper, or aluminum up to a quarterly limit of 30 tons carbon steel, 8 tons of alloy steel, 500 pounds of stainless steel, 3,000 pounds of copper, and 2,000 pounds of aluminum.

The NPA inaugurated a reporting form (NPAF 103) by which it is enabled to develop facts concerning receipts and shipment of controlled materials for defense and nondefense production by size of business enterprise. This has been the only continuing set of data in Government for indicating the use of materials by small manufacturers in the production of defense and civilian goods and has been of great importance in the development of NPA allotment policy.

In December 1951, the Office of Small Business analyzed the allotments of steel, copper, and aluminum made by NPA for the first quarter of 1952 to manufacturers of consumer type items and compiled a list of all firms which received less than 35 percent of their base period usage of these metals. This tabulation included data concerning the regular type of products manufactured and the general class of equipment used by the firms listed. Copies of this listing of "low-allotment" firms were delivered to defense procurement agencies as the first tool developed for planned procurement to compensate with defense work for curtailment in civilian production because of the diversion of materials.

This same listing of "low-allotment" firms was used by the Office of Small Business, NPA, and the Munitions Board Office of Small Business for the organization of a series of Industry Assistance Clinics throughout the country. Department of Commerce field office heads and the Chairman of each Armed Forces Regional Council cooperated to arrange for and conduct these clinics. These field meetings were the working type of conferences, where the representatives of the firms which received low allotments met face-to-face with Federal procurement officers and representatives of prime contractors to assess production facilities in line with defense requirements. More than 2,500 small firms were represented at the 15 clinics, many reported that they were presently engaged in defense work but were interested in more, nearly 70 percent were regarded by procurement officers as potential prime or subcontractors and about 17 percent were listed as not having equipment suitable for defense work.

This latter group were given special consideration in the allotment of materials. A check up will be made early in April by the Department of Commerce, Office of Field Service and Office of Small Business to determine the number of potential suppliers who followed up on their clinic contacts and secured defense business.

Early in November the NPA Administrator announced a policy for providing special supplemental allotments for small single line manufacturers faced with serious hardship. Realizing that such a policy could be meaningful only if specific quantities of materials were set aside for the purpose, he directed the head of the Office of Small Business to develop procedures for the establishment of a special reserve for a continuing hardship program. For the second quarter of 1952 a small-business hardship reserve has been set up and a review panel appointed to examine requests for supplemental allotments from small single line producers faced with shutdown or financial failure. Incidentally, a representative of the Small Defense Plants Administration was invited to be a member of this panel. This hardship reserve is an example of the effort of NPA to adjust mass distribution of materials to meet specific cases and will be of major benefit to the small concerns which cannot obtain defense contracts and must continue their regular products.

For the convenience of small manufacturers, I have provided for the partial decentralization of NPA's allotment process. Appropriately situated field offices now make direct allotment of 25 percent of all of the controlled materials under the jurisdiction of NPA.

I wish to note for your attention that the allotments of metals which I have mentioned above are made under the regulations of the controlled-materials plan. When this plan was proposed to me I favored it and urged its prompt adoption because it is an affirmative system for forcing materials into every phase of our production system. The system requires that certain producers of items, the need for which can be deferred, will receive less materials than the manufacturers of highly essential items. As I have stated on numerous occasions, big business is pretty well able to take care of itself in case of shortages but the little fellow needs the help of Government. Without a controlled-materials-plan arrangement I was sure the little fellow would be pushed away from the supply line and would be faced with material starvation and perhaps failure.

Early in 1951 when the House Small Business Committee held hearings in various parts of the country to ascertain how small manufacturers were getting on under the defense program, at the chairman's request I assigned representatives from the Small Business Staff of the Department to accompany the subcommittee. The testimony taken during those hearings was reviewed by my staff and all requests for assistance regarding materials have been given careful consideration by the Commerce Department. Those firms requesting guidance in making proper contact for the purpose of bidding on defense work have been directed and aided. The hearings disclosed that a number of small-business men did not understand new regulations, some stated they were unable to obtain materials, but the record discloses no more complaint than one might expect about any phase of Government action through interviews with several hundred people. Every request for assistance which was presented at the hearing was acted upon promptly and apparently satisfactorily since members of the committee, including Congressman EVINS and Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, wrote letters complimenting my staff and commending their action as reflecting credit on the Department and much good will for the Government generally.

These are some but by no means all of the things done and being done by the Department of Commerce for small business.

I have never believed that the solution of all of the problems of small manufacturers depends upon getting orders or contracts from the Federal Government. This is, however, in a time like the present, and increasingly so in a great emergency, an important part of their operation and should be encouraged and assisted by the SDPA, as I am sure it will be.

There are, however, many concerns who cannot transfer from their normal civilian-goods operation to the military procurement program. It is obvious that these manufacturers need and are entitled to the counsel and help, where it can be given, of the Government. It was obviously not the congressional purpose in establishing SDPA to give this type of help, and we in the Department of Commerce will continue to furnish it.

It may be proper for me to point out that while it sounds simple and sensible to talk about segregating the Government activities bearing upon small business, getting everything together in one place, so to speak, as a practical matter it is impossible. Even within my own Department there are many different agencies who in one way or another benefit small business. To undertake to rip out of each of these the personnel and functions which would deal only with small business would not only be an impossible task, would not only destroy their ability to help small business, but would effectively destroy their ability to do anything.

I am sure you will agree that the Patent Office in many ways is a great benefit to small business and to new business. In fact, its basic function is to foster new business through the protection of scientific invention. The Bureau of the Census continually provides vital data for specialized analyses for treatment of small businesses. The Department's development of foreign markets provides new sales opportunities for large and small manufacturers, and the encouragement of selected imports provides new materials for small manufacturers and new items for the shelves of the small retailer. The development of new products and processes has valuable support and encouragement from the National Bureau of Standards and the Office of Technical Services.

Each of these agencies helps small business, but neither small business nor the agency would be helped by an effort to tear out of it separately and completely every person or function which helps small business.

I have had personal experience with many small business ventures. My interest in and knowledge of small business does not depend upon articles I read or stories I hear. It is my firm conviction that the economy of the country must constantly expand and that this can best be done by nourishing the business seedlings and maintaining a climate in which they can grow and flourish.

The Department has at all times been ready and glad to cooperate with congressional committees. As recently as March 4 of this year the Administrator of the National Production Authority addressed a letter to Congressman PATMAN reviewing the progress report of the Select Committee on Small Business, undertaking to show in what ways we were endeavoring to comply with the suggestions it set forth and also acknowledging the assistance rendered by the committee reports.

We shall continue to cooperate.

Yours sincerely,

CHARLES SAWYER,
Secretary of Commerce.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the other special orders.

Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 20 minutes.

FISCAL PROBLEMS

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, the fiscal affairs of our country are in a very precarious position. We are facing an all-time high in peacetime appropriations and possible deficit.

It has been my attitude during the time I have been privileged to serve in public office that the duty of public officials is to honestly portray to the people how much is being spent and for what purpose.

Especially in the Congress have I been insistent that insofar as Government spending is concerned we should pay as we go.

I may not agree with the proposed spending as finally determined in the appropriation bills, but these bills do represent the best judgment of the majority of the House.

The proposed spending, whatever the amount, must be paid for by the tax dollars of our people.

In managing the business of the Government we must either provide the money to pay the bills or the Secretary of the Treasury will borrow the money thereby increasing the Federal debt.

It has been my thinking that when the Congress is confronted with the choice of either paying the bill or charging it, we should pay the bill and thereby let the people know exactly what their Government is costing them rather than hide behind the subterfuge of increasing the national debt.

In the opinion of the people if the Congress is taking too great a percentage of their earnings then they should make their reaction known at the polls.

In my judgment the Congress has been appropriating and spending far too much money and I have consistently tried to help reduce most appropriations.

I have likewise attempted to help bring about greater efficiency in Government and thereby reduce the cost.

During the past few years the Congress has been following a policy of pay as you go for military appropriations.

Appropriations for defense are very often long-range ones. In other words, money appropriated last year to build planes and tanks and guns may not even be spent this year or next.

Until the military appropriations became a major part of our annual budget practically all of the appropriations were spent during the current year for which they were appropriated.

I have agreed with the theory up until now that it is better to provide the money for proposed expenditures so that the Congress can know exactly where it stands with regard to its obligations.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to introduce an article from the Washington Evening Star of March 17, 1952, entitled "Sixty Billion Dollars Lies Idle in Treasury as Services Ask for More Funds," by Martin S. Hayden:

SIXTY BILLION DOLLARS LIES IDLE IN TREASURY AS SERVICES ASK MORE FUNDS

(By Martin S. Hayden)

A total of nearly $60,000,000,000 lying idle in the Treasury while administration leaders urge new defense tax boosts has split House and Senate leaders in bitter disagreement over the right way to finance rearmament.

Heading opposite camps are, on the one hand, Senators GEORGE, of Georgia; DOUGLAS, of Illinois; and MOODY, of Michigan, all Democrats, who would limit military appropriations to the amounts Pentagon purchasers can actually spend this year, and Representative CLARENCE CANNON, Democrat, of Missouri, the House Appropriations chairman, who insists on the status quo whereby the full cost of each contract is laid aside before an order can be signed.

AUTHORIZATIONS SUGGESTED

The new dispute was touched off Monday when Air Force Under Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric told a Senate subcommittee that, because of an average 24-month "lead time" between contracting and delivery of planes, Congress could cut $3,500,000,000 from current Air Force requests for funds without crippling air rearmament. Speaking as an individual taxpayer, Mr. Gilpatric suggested that Congress could approve contract authorizations which would permit the armed services to place their orders, and then appropriate the actual tax money when bills for the finished items become actually due.

IMMENSE FROZEN BALANCES

Senator MOODY, who initially ran with the economy ball when Mr. Gilpatric told the story before the Small Business Subcommittee which the Michigan Senator heads, came up today with Budget Bureau and Defense Department figures showing the immensity of the frozen balances of cash on hand.

As reported to Senator MOODY, the Pentagon, when the fiscal year ends next June 30, will have on hand an unexpended $56,900,000,000 including $19,300,000,000 in Army money, $15,700,000,000 belonging to the Navy, and $21,900,000,000 in funds on hand to pay for still undelivered Air Force items. Added to $14,200,000,000 in Army money, $13,200,000,000 for the Navy, and $20,700,000,000 for the Air Force being sought in the new budget, this would give the three services a total of $104,000,000,000 available for 1952–53 expenditure.

TO SPEND $51,000,000,000

"The best estimates I can get," Senator MOODY said, "indicate that, during the next fiscal year, the three services will actually spend about $51,000,000,000, which would mean that another $53,000,000,000 would be left in the Treasury, unexpended, when next year ends. In addition to all the above, I am told that, out of a new $3,500,000,000 supplemental bill for military pay and public works, an additional $1,500,000,000 in unused money will be left at the end of next year."

Senator MOODY added that "to me it looks ridiculous to talk of a deficit, or increased taxes, when the money is simply going to lie idle."

Joining Senator MOODY today, Senators DOUGLAS and GEORGE took a rougher approach that the present system was desired by the military services as a way of getting out of the financial control of Congress.

"I had a row with one of the service Secretaries about it the other night," Senator DOUGLAS said. "I told him I thought the military was trying to accumulate all the cash they can possibly spend in the next few years and thus make themselves independent of Congress. Actually, I am so distrustful of the whole military approach to money that I sometimes am afraid I am getting a little pathological about it. Their whole system strikes me as being loose and wasteful and I for one will approve no more blank checks until they show signs of a housecleaning."

Senator GEORGE seconded Senator MOODY'S theory that the current tax crisis could be lessened, and the military needs met, with contract authorizations.

"The high brass," he said, "have taken the completely fallacious approach that they must have all the money tied down when they sign a contract. That is absurd. Contract authority gives full assurance that Congress will make the money available when it is time to pay the bills and has the added value of assuring that no more will be appropriated than is actually necessary to meet the costs. The services just do not want their independence abridged in that manner."

Mr. CANNON took the opposite tack and assumed for himself the blame for the present system.

"We put this system in several years ago," he said, "because we found this contract authorization business was a snare and a delusion.

"When Congress just approves orders, but doesn't put up the money to pay the bills, it leaves an impression that it is actually spending less than it is. Then a later Congress has to pay the bills. The people should not be so misled. In addition, by forcing Congress to vote the cash when we sign the orders, we encourage the individual Members to take a second look and be sure they want to go through the pains of appropriating the money and taking the responsibility for it."

This article sets forth very clearly the developments that have come about due to this policy I have just described.

It seems to me the Congress must take a more realistic approach to the policy and make revision for the following reasons:

First. We are accumulating through taxes enormous sums of unspent money.

Second. This accumulated money places within the hands of the military, amounts of money exceeding the total amount we have previously considered necessary for all Government purposes.

Third. There is no apparent clearly defined program on the part of the defense officials for providing for the orderly production of the tools of war.

The article by Mr. Hayden sets forth very clearly that there is now a total of $60,000,000,000 lying idle in the Treasury while the military—Army, Navy, Air Force—are asking for more than $40,000,000,000 additional for further authority to spend for the weapons of war.

In other words, if we are to grant the current military request we could conceivably have the staggering total of $100,000,000,000 piled up and no immediate obligations to pay. The effect upon our economy will certainly be depressing.

This is serious in itself but it is even more dangerous because there is apparently no sound plan within the armed services for the eventual spending of this fabulous sum.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include an editorial from the Washington Daily News, of March 13, 1952, entitled "Heads I Win" and another from the Washington Times-Herald,

entitled "National Defense by Flipping a Coin":

[From the Washington Daily News of March 13, 1952]

"HEADS I WIN"

If this had happened in Russia, those responsible for it would have been shot. In Britain, it would have brought a vote of "no confidence," and a change in governments.

Since it happened here, where we have come to expect such things under this administration, nothing is likely to be done about it. But it helps to explain why Russia's armament industry is able to outproduce ours—particularly in combat aircraft—despite our great superiority in plants and equipment.

Here is the story, right out of the mouth of Air Force Under Secretary Roswell L. Gilpatric, as told to a Senate committee:

Twenty months after the outbreak of the war in Korea, our military leaders still have not made basic decisions which should have been made in 2 months.

Until last fall, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had not decided the relative importance of various weapons competing for the same short-supply tools and materials. Today, out of 256 which the competing services regard as all important, only 12 have been given priorities.

Note that term—"all important."

"The only way we could get anything at all done last fall," Mr. Gilpatric lamely explained, "was to agree to a Joint Chiefs' plan by which each service selected the four items which it considered most important and which were then put on a special list with the code name 'brickbat' and given special and equal priority."

To most men the use of that code name would have suggested that the place to use brickbats was on the heads of the Joint Chiefs. But Mr. Gilpatric doesn't appear to be that kind of a man. However, we are at least indebted to him for telling us the source of our trouble.

When Senator MOODY, of Michigan, asked Mr. Gilpatric how the Joint Chiefs ranked nonbrickbat items in allotting for their production tools and materials, he made another amazing revelation.

"Actually," he said, "the Joint Chiefs were unable to agree on any system."

So what did they do? Why, what three small boys might have done under similar circumstances.

"They just tossed a coin and the Air Force won."

So the Air Force picked the first item on the list. The Army won the second toss, and got the second item. The Navy came in last, then the Air Force was given a second selection.

As one result of this "heads I win" war planning, Mr. Gilpatric is afraid that a number of critical programs, including the F–84 Sabre jet planes, will not be in real production this year.

Bad as things are, they would have been much worse had it not been for a lot of pressure from Charles E. Wilson, Chief Defense Mobilizer, and his aide, the Air Under Secretary said.

Here we have an inside picture of unification under a President who doesn't seem to know how to put his house in order—or who may not even know that it is out of order.

If the boys in Korea wonder why the Reds have more jet planes than we have, the answer is here for them.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of March 18, 1952]

NATIONAL DEFENSE BY FLIPPING A COIN

Roswell L. Gilpatric, Under Secretary of the Air Force, had a rare flash of candor the other day before a Senate small-business subcommittee. He said the Air Force budget for the coming fiscal year would be cut $3,500,000,000, representing the amount for deliveries which will neither be made nor paid for until 2 years from now.

Not content with suggesting economies in a military department of which he is a top functionary, Mr. Gilpatric went on to describe a few of the crazier features of what is called defense planning. He said that, although some tools and materials are in short supply, the Joint Chiefs of Staff had no listing of the relative importance of various weapons competing for these tools and materials. Only 12 items have yet been assigned priorities out of the 256 that the various services consider to be of greatest importance to national defense, he said.

Mr. Gilpatric then described the daffiest procedure of all. When the Joint Chiefs were unable to determine the relative combat importance of airplanes, ammunition, and warships, they tossed a coin and the Air Force won, so that planes have highest priority.

This episode recalls Mr. Roosevelt's method of deciding the daily price of gold, as described by his Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau. Morgenthau said Roosevelt simply picked a number out of the air. One day he decreed the price should rise 21 cents—three times seven, a lucky number.

Senator TAFT says he has no faith in the Joint Chiefs. It is hard to see how anybody could have when national security is managed by men who reach their decisions by tossing a coin.

When it becomes apparent to the Congress that the Armed Forces so casually spend these hard-earned tax dollars by the mere flip of a coin, it is obvious to me that we need to call a halt and change our policy.

I would say to the military: "When you can come to us and prove that you know exactly what you want and how you are going about getting it, then we will give consideration to the appropriation of those funds."

I anticipate the fact that military men are going to say they cannot precisely prepare for war when there are unknowns—when and where it might occur, and in what broad type of fighting we would have to be strongest—land, sea, or air. But to this I would remind these gentlemen that they are demanding the country pay the high price of a vast defense build-up, and such a build-up, when intelligently carried out, leaves only minor problems of logistics, armament, and tactics to be solved if overall strategy is carefully planned.

Certainly the American people have a right to expect that the dollars taken from them by the Government should be spent with great care and forethought.

The tax load is becoming increasingly heavier; in fact it is a terrific burden upon all the taxpayers.

For this reason I believe the House should change its policy and not appropriate more money until we have assurance from the Defense officials that the money is needed and will be spent carefully.

It is my hope that the Members of the House will join me in this stand.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to what the distinguished gentleman from Indiana has had to say and I want to commend him for the position he has taken.

While we all realize that huge sums of money must be spent in order to bring about national security, I think we are also beginning to realize that the waste and the extravagance carried on in the Military Establishment has become shocking. I quite agree with the gentleman that we should appraise more carefully the requests of the military authorities for appropriations in the future. We have seen instance after instance where requests have been made for appropriations, and very shortly thereafter they have indicated that they do not need them, or we have found on investigation that the money has not been wisely spent. As the gentleman knows, we have a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services known as the Procurement Subcommittee, which committee has conducted and is conducting exhaustive investigations into the procurement practices of the military services. Some of the things that that committee has found out have been very disturbing to us. We are continuing our investigations in the hope that we might be able to save for the taxpayers of this country some of the dollars that have been appropriated. We also hope that by our investigations we may cut down appropriations in the future which, I am satisfied, can be reduced without in any manner impairing our national safety.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman. Might I ask him this question at this point, because I am aware of the fact that he is serving on that very important Procurement Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee? Does the gentleman think at this point it is necessary that we pile up a total of $100,000,000,000 of unspent funds as a blank check for the armed services?

Mr. ELSTON. I will say to the gentleman while it is necessary that some sums be piled up so that the military authorities may make plans extending over a considerable period of time, I believe that the sum which has accumulated is too large. I do not think it is necessary that so huge a sum be built up. It has caused those in the Military Establishment who have to do with spending to feel that there is no limit to the amount that they can spend and that there is no limit on congressional appropriations. I think that Congress should very carefully scrutinize future appropriations and see to it that the amount available is cut down to a minimum.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to join in congratulating and commending the gentleman from Indiana for the very excellent statement he has made here and the position he has taken. I also want to take this opportunity, if I may, to again express my appreciation of the splendid work that my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] has done in attempting to bring an end to waste within the Military Establishment. There has been great waste and extravagance not only in the Military Establish-

ment but throughout most of the agencies of this Government. Too often there has been graft and corruption accompanying that waste and extravagance. Just this morning I received a communication which gives a great deal of information and a very strong indication of waste and extravagance that seems to be almost criminal in nature, in connection with military construction and some military housing installations in this country, which I expect to turn over to the appropriate committee of the House for further study and investigation.

I want to join with the gentleman from Indiana and my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON] in seeing that the time has come when the American people are demanding and have the right to demand that the Congress of the United States, as their representatives, scrutinize with great care every expenditure made by this Government of ours, whether it be for military purposes or other purposes. I believe millions and billions of dollars can be saved by so doing. I again congratulate the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I certainly want to compliment the gentleman from Indiana on the thoughtful speech he has prepared on this vital subject, and also to pay tribute to the painstaking work he did during the last session of Congress as a hard-working member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Here, he was working on the very problems he has pointed out today, in a constructive way. He has shown a sincere and well-informed interest in cataloging and the other phases of supply management which would overcome many of the military's wasteful practices if they were properly implemented.

I also call attention to the fact that much the same situation as the distinguished gentleman from Indiana has discussed exists also in the foreign-aid and mutual security field. Although the most ardent proponents of the appropriation for the Atlantic Pact program contended last year, as they now contend again, that every cent of foreign aid was necessary at once, the record shows that Congress has been appropriating more money for foreign assistance than the program has been able to absorb. There is an unexpended balance of $11,700,000,000 from appropriations voted over the past 3 years.

In that field, too, mutual security, we are going to be asked again to appropriate $7,900,000,000 faster than it can be properly spent and without any definite or concrete program's being presented to the Congress. The obligation clearly rests with the administration to show that the dollars are needed now and will be spent to obtain the maximum value in defense and the maximum value in effective foreign aid. I agree with my distinguished colleague. We need more defense for the dollar at least as much as we need more dollars for defense.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman very kindly for his contribution.

May I say also that I am fully aware of the fine fashion in which the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNSON] is carrying on in this very worthwhile committee, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the very fine stand he has taken. Frankly, the extravagance and even corruption that exists in the military spending are most disgusting. Lenin once said that he did not have to worry about the United States, that the United States would spend itself into ruin. If we keep on as we are, that is exactly what will happen. Whether it is military spending or not, the taxpayers are entitled to a dollar's worth of value for every dollar spent.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman. I know that the gentleman from his own experiences in the armed services is fully aware of the possibilities for saving I have suggested. I thank him again for his contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

WASTE BY ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly agree with the gentleman from Indiana concerning the waste in the military. As most of you know, in the past few weeks I have been exposing some waste by Lt. Gen. Edward H. Brooks, commanding general of the Second Army at Fort George G. Meade, Md. Recently I accused him of wasting the taxpayers' money in supporting a hunting lodge at A. P. Hill Military Reservation. I notice in the Sunday Star of yesterday this statement:

> Second Army quotes affidavits denying SUTTON's lodge charge.

They bring out an affidavit from Sergeant McNeil, who is reported to be assigned to the A. P. Hill Military Reservation.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that Sergeant McNeil made this affidavit. He would be nutty, if the commanding officer of A. P. Hill requested that he make it and he refused, unless he wanted to go to Korea immediately. It so happens that Sergeant McNeil, according to the reports, which came to me from the boys at A. P. Hill reservation has a carry-all for his personal vehicle. Then he has a beautiful home at A. P. Hill. So why should he not make an affidavit contrary to anything that I or anyone else might say, if the Second Army commander told him to? I saw service myself. You do not go against those three-star generals unless you want to get your head cut off. Sergeant McNeil is smarter than that. They also say a Mr. Crabtree in a sworn statement said:

> I categorically without reservation deny making any statement that General Brooks has a hunting lodge here.

Mr. Speaker, I hope General Brooks thinks I was not dumb enough to be there alone. I had a witness with me all the time, Ernest Raspberry from Hohenwald, Tenn., was there with me. He heard the statement. Now, General Brooks, we remember that not so long ago, you placed Mr. Crabtree's place off limits to all military personnel. Naturally, he would make an affidavit in your favor. He did not want to be off limits again, because he depends on the A. P. Hill Military Reservation for his livelihood. If you place him off limits, the boys cannot go there to eat, the boys cannot go there to sleep, and they cannot rent cottages from him, and they cannot buy gas from him. So, sure, Mr. Crabtree will agree with you. But, if you want an unbiased opinion of what happened, ask Ernest Raspberry from Hohenwald, Tenn. He was right along with me when the whole incident happened. Mr. Speaker, after the exposé of this hunting lodge, I received numerous letters from all over the United States of America congratulating me on exposing the waste by the high-minded brass, especially by Gen. Edward H. Brooks, who thinks he is a Greek god. If you do not believe it, go up to Fort Meade like I did last night, and ask the boys. In these numerous letters, I have one of them here in which I think the Congress will be interested. It is postmarked March 22, 7 a. m., 1952. The dateline is Fort Meade, Md., March 20, 1952. It says:

> Hon. Representative SUTTON,
> *House of Representatives, Capitol,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SIR: I am glad to see that you are looking out for the taxpayers' interest in investigating the waste of money by the Army command. In addition to investigating the commanding general's private hunting lodge, for instance (which it is), at Camp A. P. Hill, I suggest that the following be investigated also:
>
> 1. A private yacht of the commanding general which is manned and maintained at the taxpayers' expense.
>
> 2. Private railroad's special train, which is kept steamed up and manned with a permanent crew at Fort Meade—the crew, consisting of at least four, at all times at Government expense.
>
> 3. Two Government Cadillacs for the exclusive use of the commanding general and his wife, with two master sergeants on permanent duty as chauffeurs with full-time quarters and assignment at the post.
>
> 4. Addition to commanding general's quarters and three complete renovations in the last 5 years.
>
> 5. Two airplanes assigned to the commanding general's exclusive use, with crews waiting for call whether used or not.
>
> For obvious reasons, and because I am a civil employee, it would not be in my interest for my name to be disclosed.

He is a civil employee. Mr. Speaker, I was at Fort Meade last night. I saw the train. I do not know whether it is General Brooks or not, but it is at Fort Meade. It is behind warehouse T14, if anyone wants to go and see it. I have heard lots about the yacht of the commanding general. I do not

know whether it is his or not, but it should be investigated.

I did see a Cadillac up there at General Brooks' house. He is not supposed to have a Cadillac or any other vehicle except for his use. His wife is not entitled to ride in it. Under Army regulation 700–105, paragraph 26, subparagraph (c), it specifically sets out who shall ride in Government vehicles. An Army general's wife is not included in that. If she is riding in one of the Government-owned Cadillacs, if there be two Cadillacs, he should be court-martialed himself for misappropriating Government funds, which carries a dishonorable discharge and 2 years' imprisonment, under the Court-Martial Manual.

The boys at Fort Meade last night told me they had seen Mrs. Brooks riding in this Cadillac. If that be true and it is Government owned, General Brooks should be court-martialed.

Now, I have heard of the addition to General Brooks' quarters. I understand they had the tile ripped out in the kitchen six times because it was not satisfactory to Mrs. Brooks.

Now, let us see if there have been any parties down at Camp A. P. Hill Reservation. General Carter is Chief of Staff of the Second Army. Perhaps we should ask him about it. It so happens that on or about December 22, 1951, which was on a Sunday, General Carter appeared at A. P. Hill Reservation for an inspection—on Sunday. That is the first time I ever heard of an inspection on Sunday. The boy who was on duty said he went from there straight on to the lodge. This boy on duty was not permitted to go to the lodge. Was that a party? Perhaps we should ask General Carter.

Let us see if there have been any girl friends down there at A. P. Hill Reservation. You might ask Captain Johnston who was engineer officer at A. P. Hill Reservation if on the night of December 18, 1951, Captain Doherty's car did get stuck on A. P. Hill Military Reservation. Captain Johnston ordered a lieutenant not to drive the jeep, but to let his girl friend, whose name I will not call at this time, but whose name I have given to Congressman CURTIS, drive the jeep. That is a violation of regulation 700–105. That was after Colonel Raymond had been down there. There was no traffic investigation made. This boy on duty was ordered not to investigate or make a report. This boy goes out of military service soon. He said he would be glad to testify before the committee and I could expose his name soon, after he gets out from under the jurisdiction of General Brooks. I have told Congressman CURTIS the boy's name, and I am sure this will be looked into.

However, it is funny that previous to the expose of the A. P. Hill Reservation lodge there was no MP on the gate. Since this exposé you cannot get in there without getting a special permit from Colonel Raymond. What is the matter? Are they afraid somebody is going to see something down there?

Then we get into another little matter of waste. It so happens that the MP's on duty at A. P. Hill Reservation were directed never to go wrong and patrol by the lodge, up until this exposé of the lodge. Why that was, I do not know, except perhaps there were private parties.

Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to bring this up today. I wanted the Committee on Expenditures to investigate it. I have given them some information, and I will give them some additional information, but I thought it was necessary to answer the little article in the paper.

However, what I wanted to bring to the attention of the House was from my own outfit, where I am still in the Reserve in the United States Navy. They are likewise guilty of waste. It so happens that if an officer is in a combat zone he is exempt $200 a month income tax. If an enlisted man, he is entirely exempt. It should be that way. Any man who is in a combat zone should not have to pay any tax at all, but the law says he is exempt $200. I have recently talked to some boys who are back from Korea and Japan. They say that on the month end in Japan you will not find any high-ranking officers there; they have all flown down to Pusan to stay there on the last day of the month and over the first day of the next month so they will have both months exempt from income tax; so much so that if you go to Pusan over the month end you cannot get a billet there.

It so happens that the U. S. S. *Ajax*, a destroyer tender, always has a training maneuver just at the last of the month so that they can get into the combat zone on the last day of the month and out the first of the next month.

Mr. Speaker, that is not the intent of the law. We intended when we passed that law to benefit those boys who were actually in combat, not those who fly in one day and fly out the next. That, to me, looks like defrauding the Government of income tax.

But there is a little more waste that I would like to bring to your attention: The Navy has recommended Admiral Ira Nunn to be a judge advocate general of the Navy. We have had a wonderful JAG, Admiral Russell; he has done a wonderful job as JAG, and has a brilliant legal mind. It just so happens that Admiral Ira Nunn was admitted to the Massachusetts bar on October 19, 1949. It also happens that we in this Congress passed a law, Public Law 506, which requires that a JAG of the Army, Navy, or Air Corps, must have 8 years' legal duty or experience. The only way that Admiral Nunn can accumulate that 8 years is for them to count the time that he was in law school, which, to me, is not legal duty or legal experience.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I was concerned about that when it was called to my attention. The top legal officer of the United States Navy is required, and very properly required, to have 8 years of legal service, but in order for Admiral Nunn to meet that qualification they would have to include the time he spent in law school.

I have been concerned with another phase of that same subject, about the entire picture of taking regular naval officers who are supposed to be trained in naval affairs where they would be valuable to this country for service in time of war along the lines in which they have been trained at the Academy or wherever they may have been trained; they have taken these men off their regular duties as naval officers, if you please, and sent them to law schools to study to become lawyers so they can get in the Judge Advocate's department.

Mr. SUTTON. Will the gentleman permit an observation at that point?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. SUTTON. I would be glad to supply a list of those who are stationed right here in the District of Columbia going to law school now, at Georgetown, George Washington, and Catholic Universities; there are 40 of them.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I intend also to ask the United States Navy to substantiate those names and to find under what theory they are taking men who are supposed to be trained in military duties and giving them extra training and schooling in an entirely different field, as I understand, completely at Government expense.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman is correct; it is at Government expense.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. To train them to be lawyers. I am a lawyer and I happen to know, having been in the Reserves and in the Navy myself, that there are many young lawyers educated at their own or their families' expense, who are available to the Armed Forces for legal duty. I will ask the armed services that very question; whether as a matter of fact they do not have an overwhelming list of applicants for billets as legal officers. There is no earthly excuse that I can see for the United States Government's training military officers and then sending them for 3 to 4 years to law school and have them no longer available for military duty in the field in which they were trained. I wonder if by any chance the real reason behind it is that the military is very anxious in its Regular Establishment, and I am referring in particular to the West Point and Annapolis graduates, to keep control over the legal departments of the Armed Forces?

Mr. SUTTON. I may say to the gentleman that seems to me to be what is coming sooner or later, because as he knows and I know and as other Members of this body know, there are lots of men in civilian life and in the Reserves, as well as those who have gone back into the service, who are attorneys, not functioning as JAG officers or legal officers but are not doing what they are used to doing in civilian life.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. During 4 years of the last war, being a lawyer and being in the United States Navy, they had me doing engineering duties.

Mr. SUTTON. The gentleman was well qualified for that.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The real answer is this, and I know the gentleman agrees with me, when you are training a man to become a lawyer, whether his duties happen to be in the practice of law or in the legal department of some large corporation or whether it happens to be the legal section of the Air Force or the Army or the Navy, you are doing essentially legal duties in which your qualifications lie along those lines. If we are

going to train young men at Government expense to go 4 years to Annapolis and West Point to learn military science, we certainly do not expect them 10 years later to be sent at Government expense to law school so that they can then go on and become the head of the legal department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. Let us go out and get them from civilian life where they are properly trained. Incidentally I might remark this is the basis probably of the whole problem of universal military training, if you please, where actually 90 percent of those in the Armed Forces are engaged in occupations that do not have anything to do with military skills. For example, your legal department, that has very little or practically nothing to do with military science, yet the Armed Forces insist that they train their military men for that purpose. I suggest that in civilian enterprise is where you can best train men needed in these special skills who go into the various Armed Forces for actual work.

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Missouri. Although I am a Democrat and he is a Republican, we certainly agree in cutting out the waste that we have in the military today.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there is absolutely no criticism of Admiral Nunn, who is a very fine officer and who certainly knows a great deal about legislation and what is to be expected.

Mr. SUTTON. I am actually criticizing the Navy for recommending a man to the JAG office who has not had legal experience.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. There is no criticism of Admiral Nunn as an individual or as an officer; but whenever the Congress in its wisdom, and I submit it is wise, says that a man in order to become the top legal officer of the Army or Navy has to have 8 years of legal experience working as a lawyer, we do not expect them to come in and count the 3 years he has gone to law school as legal experience. We expect the Navy to obey the laws as written by the Congress.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They better give the Reserve officers a break.

Mr. SUTTON. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me we have a very able officer in Admiral Nunn.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. He is an able officer, but you cannot make an exception in his case or in anyone else's case. There are many more able lawyers, I can tell the gentlewoman, than Admiral Nunn, as able as he might be.

Mr. SUTTON. Maybe the gentleman from Missouri, [Mr. CURTIS], and I will be called back into the service and go into the Navy, after this exposé, and be sent to Pango Pango or some such place.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give to this House and taxpayers of this country the names of those whom the taxpayers of this country have already educated at Annapolis and who now, after their adoption for military service, are being educated again for the legal service at the expense of the taxpayers:

Anderson, E. E., lieutenant colonel, United States Marine Corps.

Beckingpon, H. L., captain, United States Marine Corps.

Blackburn, G. P., major, United States Marine Corps.

Capellos, Henry J., lieutenant commander, United States Navy.

Cutaiar, Frank H., lieutenant commander, United States Navy.

Davis, Charles R., lieutenant.

Doyle, James H., lieutenant, junior grade.

Eaton, Jno. D., lieutenant.

Eastman, R. E., first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps.

Eugene Fallon, captain, United States Marine Corps.

Garraty, R. F., major, United States Marine Corps.

Goulet, Lionel J., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Gulick, R. I., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Heff, Lawrence E., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Holden, D. E., first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps.

Hunter, Daniel B., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Johnson, E. W., captain, United States Marine Corps.

Johnston, Frank F., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Kelly, Wm. W., lieutenant commander.

Kerr, Alex A., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Kerr, N. H., captain, United States Marine Corps.

Knaug, Robert C., captain, United States Marine Corps.

Lawrence, J. F., Jr., major, United States Marine Corps.

Mann, Clyde R., first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps.

Moritz, A. B., first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps.

Munns, D. L., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Peltzer, V. A., major, United States Marine Corps.

Price, Jno. D., lieutenant commander.

Robertson, H. B., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Smith, G. F., captain, United States Marine Corps.

St. George, Wm. R., lieutenant, United States Navy.

Stubbs, R. S., captain, United States Marine Corps.

Tinsley, Wm. G., lieutenant colonel, United States Marine Corps.

Valentine, Andrew J., lieutenant, United States Navy.

White, E. G., Jr., captain, United States Marine Corps.

Whitescarver, K. T., Jr., captain, United States Marine Corps.

Wood, T. B., major, United States Marine Corps.

Ehnert, Robert C., captain, United States Marine Corps.

Lucy, Robert M., first lieutenant, United States Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, every one of those is a Naval Academy man.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. As the gentleman said, those are all graduates of the Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Mr. SUTTON. That is right; not a reservist in that list.

Mr. GROSS. That is a most appalling situation. I want to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee and the gentleman from Missouri for having brought this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. SUTTON. I think that this is something that we could cut out in the next appropriation bill, because that is strictly waste. With as many legal minds as we have in the Reserve and as many officers as we have in the Navy who are qualified attorneys that are called back into service, I do not see why they could not be used in the JAG Section immediately. Maybe they want to pursue the policy like they did with the gentleman from Missouri and use him in the Engineering Service, when he is a lawyer.

Mr. Speaker, I am getting tired of the waste in the military, and that is why I am continuing to expose it. I hope the taxpayers of America, wherever they might be—in the military, in the Govment, or as private citizens, if they see any agency of this Government of ours that is wasting money or spending money unnecessarily—it may be waste or graft—that they will write to their Members of Congress so that we, as the Representatives of 150,000,000 people, can expose them right on this floor and create such public demand for economy that we can cut out this wasteful spending and cut this deficit spending, so that we will not appropriate as much as we are today. Personally, I feel if we would cut out the waste of the military we would not need to appropriate $52,000,000,000, and at the same time give them adequate money for national defense.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to compliment the gentleman from Tennessee on the fine work he has been doing and is doing in bringing this matter to the attention of the House and to the people generally. I would like to ask one further question of the gentleman from Tennessee. The thing that to me is just as disturbing as the fact that we are spending money to send certain people to law school when we have all the people that we need in civilian life who are available to the military, is the fact that here are 40 officers, men whom we have trained for 4 years in the military academies of this country, who now apparently will not be available for military work where we need them so badly at this time.

Mr. SUTTON. They will have a seat over at the Pentagon, though.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Yes; but what are we going to do about manning the ships? I thought that is what the men going to the Naval Academy at Annapolis were being trained to do.

Mr. SUTTON. I thought so, too. That is the reason I wanted to expose this program.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. These are all young men, because in this day and age lieutenants and lieutenant commanders, even, are relatively young men.

Mr. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman. I am one myself.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I presume they are capable of duty aboard ship. I know there are plenty of men out of the Reserves who have been called to active duty on the plea of the United States Navy that they are needed. They probably are in Korean waters now. I want to know why these men who have been specially trained at Government expense at the Naval Academy at Annapolis are not aboard ship in Korean waters instead of going to law school here in Washington, D. C.

Mr. BYRNES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUTTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES. I did not hear all the gentleman's remarks but I think I got the gist of them. I certainly want to give him credit for bringing this matter to the attention of the House.

The gentleman read a list of names.

Mr. SUTTON. Some 40.

Mr. BYRNES. My understanding is that the gentleman does not wish to throw any discredit on these individuals?

Mr. SUTTON. None whatsoever.

Mr. BYRNES. It is the service itself the gentleman is criticizing?

Mr. SUTTON. It is just to back up what I was trying to show. As far as these young gentlemen are concerned, I do not know any of them, not one. I am criticizing the Navy, not these boys. They take orders just as the gentleman and I did when we were in the service.

Mr. BYRNES. I just wanted to make that clear.

Mr. SUTTON. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

WAGE STABILIZATION BOARD

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that over a year ago when we passed the Defense Production Act we made it possible for the Executive of our Government to appoint a board by which he would advise himself in connection with wage stabilization. That board was set up, and then by Executive order on September 9, 1950, Executive Order No. 10161 was issued, giving the Wage Stabilization Board the power not only to make recommendations in connection with economic matters and wage disputes but to recommend to the Executive what should be done in connection with noneconomic disputes such as the union shop, jurisdictional strikes, and so forth.

Following the issuance of that Executive order the House Committee on Education and Labor became very much concerned about what appeared to be assumed powers of the Executive to void the statutory provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act. A subcommittee was appointed, and studies were made. The hearings have been printed. At that time, members of the Wage Stabilization Board, the National Labor Relations Board, and other executives having to do with the functions of control of wage and price were called before the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. It appeared at that time that the President had set up the Wage Stabilization Board, or rather had given that board power to act in case of agreed statements of dispute between employers and union officials by which the Board would act in a quasi judicial capacity. At that time, it was admitted that the recommendations, under such circumstances, of the Board could be enforced in court. In other words, a union would agree with an employer that they would be bound by the decision of the Board in connection with designated disputes. It was also pointed out that the President could act when he thought a dispute might jeopardize production, certify a dispute, and the economic and noneconomic matters involved, to the Wage Stabilization Board, and that then it would make recommendations on which the President could act.

At that time several representatives of the executive department, including the present chairman of the Wage Stabilization Board contended that there are inherent powers in the President to take over any plant that he believes necessary to the security of this country. They also contended that Congress had given that authority—which was disputed. In the course of those hearings, it developed and was made very clear that in the heavy industries, wage disputes could be faked, and agreements entered into with a handful of labor leaders who were supposed to turn over the vote on election day, and that additional wage costs could be put into durable goods that must be paid by consumers of America, 90 percent of whom are other workingmen. It was made very clear in those hearings that the labor leaders would periodically make such demands. The hearings disclosed that the minimum wage at the present time is about $17.50 a day in the coal fields, and that the average wage in steel is about $2 an hour, or with the retirement fund, around $17 a day. Similar conditions existed in the auto industry, and by virtue of these conditions about a $400 wage differential appears in a workingman's automobile together with about $511 in taxes collected by the manufacturer at the plant. In other words, it was fairly obvious to anyone who would analyze the testimony that you still have your $900 Ford, if you can take the politics out of it. It was admitted by the executives testifying at the hearings that unless a man was in organized labor, and there are 45,000,000 or 50,000,000 of them, he could not get a wage increase unless his employer voluntarily went before the Wage Stabilization Board and made the request. The old argument whereby our Government has capitulated to the demagogues for 20 years in the labor movement was laughed off. No longer is an employer presumed to be unwilling to pay an increased wage. No, we should expect them all now to come in and ask that they be permitted to pay more. It was admitted, however, that the Wage Stabilization Board is designed only to get benefits for those in the consumer field in America who are organized. It should be pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that one year before this hearing in the Education and Labor Committee, at the request of the administration, we made it a crime for any man in America to pay less than 75 cents an hour in interstate commerce.

Just before the hearing a year ago, in the Committee on Education and Labor, the President made it a crime for a man to pay more than 75 cents an hour, by Executive order. By the administrations' own testimony, when we considered the minimum wage and hour law, there were 12,000,000 people in America making less than 75 cents an hour in interstate commerce alone. Their wages are frozen.

Mr. Speaker, we have recently had another threatened strike in the steel industry. We have a majority report by the Board, where the labor members of the Wage Stabilization Board supported certain demands of the labor demagogues in the steel industry to be paid by other working men in America, and where the public members capitulated; they even capitulated on the subject of whether or not the Taft-Hartley law means anything in regard to union shop; they made a recommendation on noneconomic subjects in dispute; and then, if you please, recommended a greater increase than has ever been granted by collective bargaining or by Government recommendation at any time in the past, war or peace.

This is the Board that this Congress set up to stabilize wages.

There is a minority report signed by the industry members of the Board. I told this Congress during last session, I am afraid we have reached the point in America where business will buy anything that it can mark up and sell for a profit, including regimentation and socialism. But this report still sounds American.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I want to include the minority report of the Wage Stabilization Board in connection with the recent recommendations of the Board to settle the steel strike. I ask unanimous consent that I may do so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The report referred to follows:)

STATEMENT OF INDUSTRY MEMBERS

MARCH 20, 1952.

The recommendations of the labor and public members of the Wage Stabilization Board in the steel dispute manifestly do not constitute fair and equitable terms of settlement. On the contrary, they are unfair and inequitable, and in terms of stabilization are in serious disregard of the public interest.

The recommendations in this case are made by a board which is called the Wage Stabilization Board and which purports to be engaged in stabilizing wages. Yet ironically the increases recommended are far greater in the aggregate than any increases ever before voluntarily bargained, or recommended in the steel industry.

It is absurd that the largest increases in history should be recommended in a dispute case during a period of wage stabilization. And it points to the obvious conclusion that the exercise of a dispute function by this Board is entirely antagonistic to the principles of stabilization.

In recommending that the union's demand for a union shop be granted, the Board has

prejudged an issue which belongs in the field of collective bargaining, has greatly increased the potentiality of industrial strife, and has invited other labor unions to bring this issue to the Board. Such result will further handicap the Board as an agency for wage stabilization.

The recommended increases in wages and other employee benefits would, if granted, increase the direct employment costs of the steel companies by approximately 30 cents per employee hour and on the basis of past experience would result in increasing the companies' total costs (including the increased cost of purchased goods and service) by approximately 60 cents per employee hour.

By their decision in this case the public and labor members of the Board have seriously impaired the ability of the Board to effectuate wage stabilization. We cannot escape the feeling that the dispute processes of the Board have been used as an instrument of union appeasement.

Mr. WERDEL. In closing I only say to the Members that I hope they will look at the second to the last paragraph of that report. I will read it:

The recommended increases in wages and other employee benefits would, if granted, increase the direct employment costs of the steel companies by approximately 30 cents per employee hour and on the basis of past experience would result in increasing the companies' total costs (including the increased cost of purchased goods and service) by approximately 60 cents per employee hour.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is planned inflation leading to socialism. If we do not guarantee local autonomy in unions, if we do not guarantee the secret ballot in union elections, the union labor barons will destroy their unions and the labor movement and our form of government.

In addition to the powers of the Wage Stabilization Board to favorably recommend and thus bring about satisfaction of the demands of labor leadership in certain industries where employers are on a rising market, we have this newly discovered power that is to be used. The recommendations of the majority of the board is the largest increase in history. When prices and wages should be stabilized, we find that industry insists it will need an increase in steel prices to pay the increase in wage cost. The Price Stabilizer's Office says that it will not grant a uniform price increase in the industry even though the wage increase is recommended by another agency of his office—the Wage Stabilization Board—to be uniform.

Mr. Speaker, this voice of our President is telling us that they are going to consider the request for price increases of the various steel companies in the industry as individuals. I ask the Congress to consider this question. Will individual employers be granted a price increase if they do not capitulate to the recommended union shop? Will they be granted Government contracts if they don't capitulate? If they are marginal producers in a supposedly free enterprise system, how can they stay in business and not capituate? When they capitulate, their guaranteed right under Taft-Hartley to not have a union shop is voided through regimentation, precipitated by undeclared war through the action of the same President. If they give up their right in order to stay in business, they destroy the Taft-Hartley protection extended to employees who do not want to participate in present union activities.

Mr. Speaker, when they all capitulate as Congress sleeps, the labor barons will collect additional millions for political elections from the lunch boxes of the beneficiaries they purport to represent, but who are unwilling to voluntarily make such contributions. In order to get these pennies, they will increase the wage cost of steel in iceboxes, washing machines, and all other durable goods used by other workingmen in America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

SMITH COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to lunch with Miss Ryder, a professor from Smith College, and 12 students of different nationalities who are studying there. They came to this country on scholarships to Smith College. Their courtesy, their grasp of our country and its institutions amazed me. When they return to their own countries they certainly will be ambassadors of good will, and will take with them an interest in our country and an understanding of our country. I repeat, it was a privilege to know them and to be a part of their luncheon and of their discussions. Every year Smith College graduates here bring a group of a dozen or so to Washington to see the Capitol, see the Congress and all the operations of the various Government departments. It is a wonderful thing to do; and as I have been in some of the countries from which those girls came it was an especial pleasure to me to see them here.

TORNADO DISASTER

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, appearing last Friday before a special panel of the Office of Defense Mobilization considering the serious distress of the textile industry in my and other areas of the North, I proudly pointed to the fact that whenever flood, fire, earthquake, or other disaster had struck any section of our country the people in all other parts had never failed to come to the rescue.

Within hours I was shocked to hear radio reports of the raging tornado which was sweeping across six Southern States causing several hundred deaths, injuring and hospitalizing greater numbers, and destroying hundreds of homes and other property valued in terms of millions of dollars.

My good friends and colleagues from the Southland tell me that compared with a real twister an atom bomb seems a puny thing.

I have seen the devastation caused by bombs in London and Berlin, and I was in Hiroshima and Nagasaki shortly after they were almost erased from the face of the earth in World War II. I agree that the tornado pictures of this weekend's disaster in the South could hardly be worse, and my heart goes out to the sufferers, so many of whom have lost so much.

The disaster has given extreme concern to chapters of the American Red Cross in my area, and they are cooperating with their national organization in seeing that necessary blood, plasma, drugs, and food are furnished at once. They are asking for additional funds to be helpful, and I am certain they will not be denied.

I am glad that the Federal Government has directed the RFC and other agencies to be of assistance in rehabilitation.

How we rally to help our distressed countrymen wherever they may be is a test we must pass with the highest honors.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. BROOKS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. TEAGUE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LYLE and to include an address delivered by Mr. Symington at Yale University.

Mr. ASPINALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. OSTERTAG and to include a message from the International Joint Commission.

Mr. MILLER of New York (at the request of Mr. O'HARA) in three instances.

Mr. JACKSON of California and to include two editorials.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE and to include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. BOW in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY and to include an article from the Factfinder entitled "Mr. Truman, Meet Thomas Jefferson."

Mr. COLE of New York and to include a statement by Dr. E. O. Condon, notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages of the RECORD and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $252.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska and to include an editorial from the New York Daily News.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LUCAS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BECKWORTH in two instances.

Mr. MOULDER and to include an editorial from the Columbia Daily Tribune.

Mr. MCMULLEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROOSEVELT in two instances, in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCCORMACK in two instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin in three instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VORYS (at the request of Mr. JOHNSON) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MEADER to revise and extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. HARDEN.

Mr. HARVEY and to include a speech made by Mr. Charles Lynn, of Indianapolis.

Mr. MANSFIELD (at the request of Mr. SUTTON) and insert various articles.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CHATHAM (at the request of Mr. KERR), for Monday and Tuesday, on account of official business.

Mr. STOCKMAN (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts), for an indefinite time, on account of official business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 25, 1952, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1272. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting certain publications as follows: (1) Electric Utility Depreciation Practices, 1950; (2) Statistics of Publicly Owned Electric Utilities, 1950; and (3) Federal Power Commission Reports, volume 8; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1273. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, for the fiscal year 1951; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1274. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Public Law No. 37 enacted by the First Guam Legislature, pursuant to section 19 of Public Law 630, Eighty-first Congress, the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1669. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, with respect to payments for the benefit of persons under legal disability; without amendment (Rept. No. 1630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRANAHAN: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 5385. A bill to amend section 7 of the War Claims Act of 1948; with amendment (Rept. No. 1631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3719. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war; with amendment (Rept. No. 1632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BECKWORTH: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 4345. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for unpaid compulsory labor and inhumane treatment of prisoners of war and for other enemy violations of the Geneva Convention respecting prisoners of war; without amendment (Rept. No. 1633). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANTAFF:

H. R. 7200. A bill to provide for the hearing and adjudication of claims which would have been cognizable by the Mixed Claims Commission, United States and Germany, if they had been filed in time; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 7201. A bill to increase the personal income-tax exemption of a taxpayer and the additional exemption for his spouse from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 7202. A bill to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25, 13 U. S. C. 216); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7203. A bill to revise certain laws relating to the mail-messenger service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7204. A bill to amend section 5 of the act entitled "An act to credit certain service performed by employees of the postal service who are transferred from one position to another within the service for purposes of determining eligibility for promotion," approved June 19, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 7205. A bill to amend section 3841 of the Revised Statutes relating to the schedules of the arrival and departure of the mail, to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to the postal service and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. R. 7206. A bill to provide that certain combat veterans of World War II may receive constructive credit in the ratio of 2 to 1 for time served on active duty in the Korean hostilities, for the purpose of computing the duration of their required service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 7207. A bill authorizing the construction and operation of facilities for experiments in underground gasification of coal and lignite, oil shale, and other carbonaceous deposits to promote the national defense and increase the energy and chemical resources of the Nation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. J. Res. 409. Joint resolution to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 so as to abolish the Wage Stabilization Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, with reference to an interstate civil-defense compact as entered into and ratified by the State of Maine, pursuant to subsection 201 (g) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950 (Public Law 920, 81st Cong.); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, commending Congress for its action taken in investigating the legal proceedings involving water rights brought by the United States Attorney General against the residents of Fall-Brook, Calif., and vicinity, and urging prompt consideration on H. R. 5368; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 7208. A bill for the relief of Manuel Maria Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7209. A bill for the relief of Jose Nacimento Vargas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 7210. A bill for the relief of Vassilios Dertouzos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 7211. A bill for the relief of Hideko Takiguchi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 7212. A bill for the relief of Misako Kanai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 7213. A bill for the relief of Sister Serafin (Elizabeth Radics); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 7214. A bill for the relief of Luigi Di Massa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 7215. A bill for the relief of George Ban McCleland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

647. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Robert Barkley, president, Boynton Beach Townsend Club No. 1, Boynton Beach, Fla., requesting passage of House bills 2678 and 2679 known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

648. Also, petition of national commander, Philippine-Pacific War Veterans, Minneapolis, Minn., requesting the House of Representatives to authorize petitioners' representative to appear before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee for the purpose of presenting evidence in support of certain grievances; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.